UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 87—PART 13

JULY 14, 1941, TO OCTOBER 10, 1941
(PAGES A3403 TO A4596)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1941

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

JUL 17 '42

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

Business Responsible for Hitler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DAVIS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM LABOR

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Business Responsible for Hitler," taken from the July 15, 1941, issue of Labor, a national weekly newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Labor of July 15, 1941]

BUSINESS RESPONSIBLE FOR HITLER—BANKER DECLARES NAZIS WERE ON WAY OUT WHEN INDUSTRIALISTS GAVE THEM HELP, EXPECTING THEM TO DESTROY UNIONS

The frightful mess in which the world finds itself today is very largely the result of the stupidity and greed of European businessmen. Labor has repeatedly made that statement, and it is confirmed up to the hilt by T. Graydon Upton, who represented large American financial interests in Germany and England from 1932 to 1940.

In an article in Harper's magazine, Upton declares that Hitler today would be but an uneasy memory had it not been for the support he received from German businessmen and industrialists. In 1932, the banker asserts, the Nazis were "all washed up" and were about to disappear from the scene. They had lost heavily in an election, were deeply in debt, and had no funds with which to start a new campaign.

Business was picking up and workers were restless and demanding a share in the increasing prosperity, which employers were unwilling to grant.

"During these crucial days," Upton says, "important business interests swung their support to the astounding Hitler-Hugenberg-Papen coalition which ushered in the National Socialist domination. Looking back, it seems quite possible that if businessmen had given less consideration to immediate industrial problems and more to the deeper implications of national socialism, Hitler never would have ruled Germany."

All that businessmen saw in national socialism was an ally against the power of the trade unions, Upton declares. They thought, he said, that after the unions were destroyed and their leaders shot or sent to concentration camps it would be easy to handle Hitler and his assorted thugs.

The unions were destroyed according to plan, but businessmen learned to their sorrow they had jumped out of the frying pan into the fire.

"Today," Upton says as a warning to American businessmen, "German businessmen are suffering more under the Hitler regime than any group in the country except the Jews."

Upton insists that businessmen in England, Holland, Belgium, France, and other countries now under the heel of Hitler's troops made the same mistake.

"There was a tragic failure of the business mentality to comprehend the forces, aims, and methods of national socialism," he says. "They thought Hitler was out to destroy labor and other liberal organizations, while all the time his sole purpose was to destroy everything that civilized man holds precious.

"In every major country of Europe business has played a vital role in preparing its own destruction. By ignorance and refusal to cooperate with liberal forces it has aided a reaction which has dispossessed and destroyed it. By its failure to rise above the 'business outlook' and comprehend the deceptive tactics and terrible scope of national socialism, it has been bombed and annihilated in the office and in the home.

"In this there is a lesson to us businessmen. We can avoid a similar catastrophe only if in thought and action we deliberately give first place not to business factors but to social progress within our democratic structure."

And the same advice might well be taken to heart by labor-hating Members of Congress who are looking for a Hitler to "put workers in their place."

United States Citizens May Not Enlist in the Armed Forces of a Foreign Country

REMARKS
OF
HON. LEWIS D. THILL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, there has been some agitation of late to enlist American manhood in the armies of foreign powers. These war salesmen who are so anxious to have someone else do the fighting and dying are either deliberately encouraging the violation of law or they are proceeding with their nefarious importunings ignorant of certain provisions of the Criminal Code. It is an outrage against humanity and decency to play upon the emotions of impressionable youth and by the use of insidious wiles and devices to induce them to enlist in the armed forces of a foreign power.

The following provisions of the Criminal Code prohibit any United States citizen from entering the service of a foreign power against any country with whom the United States is at peace:

Title 18, chapter 2 of the United States Code details the following offenses against neutrality:

Section 21 (Criminal Code, sec. 9): Accepting commission to serve against friendly power. Every citizen of the United States who, within the territory or jurisdiction thereof, accepts and exercises a commission to serve a foreign prince, state, colony, district, or people, in war, by land or by sea, against any prince, state, colony, district, or people, with whom the United States are at peace, shall be fined not more than $2,000 and imprisoned not more than 3 years (Rev. Stat. sec. 5281; Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 321, sec. 9, 35 Stat. 1089).

Section 22 (Criminal Code, sec. 10, amended): Enlisting in foreign service; exceptions. Whoever, within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States, enlists or enters himself or hires or retains another person to enlist or enter himself, or to go beyond the limits or jurisdiction of the United States with intent to be enlisted or entered in the service of any foreign prince, state, colony, district, or people as a soldier or as a marine or seaman on board of any vessel of war, letter of marque, or privateer shall be fined not more than $1,000 and imprisoned not more than 3 years: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to citizens or subjects of any country engaged in war with a country with which the United States is at war, unless such citizen or subject of such foreign country shall hire or solicit a citizen of the United States to enlist or go beyond the jurisdiction of the United States with intent to enlist or enter the service of a foreign country. Enlistments under this proviso shall be under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War (Rev. Stat. sec. 5282; Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 321, sec. 10, 35 Stat. 1089; May 7, 1917, ch. 11, 40 Stat. 39).

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN C. BUTLER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before Rivers and Harbors Committee in opposition to St. Lawrence seaway:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, I am JOHN C. BUTLER, Congressional Representative of the Forty-second District of the State of New York. I have lived all of my life in Buffalo, and for 15 years of that time have been associated with the grain-elevator business. I notice in this Report IV, page 52, of the Department of Commerce that they have made a lot of statements about the little loss to this industry the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway would cause. I don't know where they got their figures; they don't match the figures that I know are true figures in many cases.

For instance, they state that the "entire discussion reveals that the largest loss to Buffalo is likely to be in its grain transfer activities, a loss estimated to affect 200 jobs." Why, in Local No. 109 of the Grain Shovelers alone there are 555 members; and in the Grain Elevator Employees Local No. 1286 there are some 550 members. Then take the flour-mill workers. They have more than 500 members in Local No. 21021. Besides, there are many other large labor organizations such as car sealers, weigh masters, samplers and tallymen, stevedores, feed and cereal plants, and railroad employees, such as engineers, firemen, switchmen and trainmen, clerks, section hands, coal-trestle operators, auto carriers, and terminal operators And this list does not cover all of the industries depending upon the water front for their existence and maintenance.

Indirectly, anything affecting those industries is reflected in the repair shops and shipyards dependent upon the front-line trades of the water front for their income. That section of my district known as the First Ward of the City of Buffalo is made up of people who earn their livelihood from water-front industries. Most of them have lived there all their lives—own their homes, which in turn have been owned through several generations of the same family. If the incomes in these homes are cut out or cut down through lack of employment on the water front, these properties and buildings will be vacated and the city will not be able to collect the taxes which it now collects. Factories and homes in that district would simply fall into the hands of the city for nonpayment of taxes. To the youngest and most inexperienced economist this can mean only one thing—the income of the city will shrink in like proportion as these men and factories and mills lose their financial mainstay.

The statements made in this report, No. IV, concerning the number of employees directly affected by the seaway are confused generalities—the same generalities I have noticed throughout the other reports on this subject which have been issued by the Department of Commerce. For instance, in speaking of the workers directly affected by the seaway, they state, I quote, "The statistics concerning them are very meager" (p. 52). How in heaven's name, I ask you, can we then accept their ridiculous conclusion a few paragraphs later on, and again I quote, that the "losses in terms of economic activity, employment and pay rolls * * *" would be "in round numbers, 200 workers."

Buffalo is acknowledged to be the largest flour-milling center of the world; how then can these men who have made the report and who have nothing to lose through the transfer of foreign grain traffic from Buffalo to upper lake ports, have the audacity to state, that, I quote, "the position of Buffalo is benefited"? (p. 56). In my opinion, the people who compiled this Report IV were given a job to do—to show in roundabout and highly technical terms that it would be economical to put millions of dollars into the building of an unnecessary seaway which would deprive present transportation and terminal facilities of their livelihood. This scheme which would tie up so much money and material has long been a daydream but now it has become a nightmare to deprive us of just so much money, men, and material so badly needed for our defense program.

Gentlemen, the untold number of clerks who worked on this survey for the Department of Commerce apparently had no time or thought for the cost to Lake ports should this seaway actually be put into operation. If we take away the source of revenue from these port cities—their very heart's blood, taxes—how can they be expected to have any money left for the improving or rebuilding of their harbors so as to accommodate the ocean-going vessels which are predicted to travel the route opened by the St. Lawrence seaway?

According to the report of the Department of Commerce, although, I quote, "Buffalo would lose all its transfer business on grain destined to ocean ports," I heard the Governor of our great State of New York testify before this committee that the St. Lawrence seaway is necessary in order to increase the power to meet demands of its industries, etc. Gentlemen, the obvious reason why he would come down here to testify to such nonsense is that he was merely doing as he was told. He hasn't called in the workers of the lake fronts—he hasn't consulted with the owners of lake fleets; he hasn't consulted with the city engineer of the city of Buffalo, for instance, to find out what it would cost the city to improve its harbor in order to accommodate those boats. He hasn't even consulted our mayor, or if he did he is disregarding his advice, for our mayor opposes this project. No; he has taken the word of a few so-called experts who, like himself, have been sold this thing from a political angle.

From what I can learn right there in my own part of the State, if there is any need for more power there, we have considerable idle capacity at Niagara Falls that can be put into use and if more is needed over and above the amount now under construction in Buffalo, I am convinced that the logical and sensible program to enter upon would be that of constructing steam plants in the areas where there are demands for the power. If our water-front industries are forced to close, we won't need more. It seems to me that we have met all the demands for shipping, storage, and power up to now and are in shape to take care of increased demands on all of those facilities.

I urge you to consider the plea of those of us who have made an honest, thorough study of this question as it concerns our own community and as it concerns the Nation at large. Every man in all of the groups I have mentioned in water-front labor at Buffalo would be ready and willing for the deep waterway to be built from Montreal to Duluth if he thought it would in any way strengthen our national-defense program—yes; they would probably be among the first to use their picks and shovels to hasten the work if they believed it a true defense measure. But we cannot believe it would aid in national defense—it would take too long to build, and I can only see the use of those words, "national defense," as a mask to hide its real nature.

Therefore, gentlemen, I hope that your decision in this matter will be consistent with our theory that this agreement between the United States and Canada should not be ratified.

Bastille Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES AND NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials on Bastille Day, one from the New York Times and one from the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

BASTILLE DAY

There will be little dancing in the streets of Paris today, the anniversary of the fall of the Bastille. This national holiday, so similar in significance to the Fourth of July, will be a day of sadness for the people of Paris and of all France.

Once the castle of the Bastille overshadowed the city of Paris. Within the castle, from time to time, were incarcerated the men held dangerous in a stirring France: Voltaire; the Encyclopedist Morellet; La Beaumelle, Marmontel. The prison was surrounded by a wide moat and guns, ready to quell any uprising, pointed down upon the city. Yet the Bastille was stormed and taken.

Today on French soil a new Bastille has risen. It is not visible, but one may see its jailers as they march through the streets of occupied France in the brown uniform of the Nazi invader. The lettre de chacet is no longer employed, but daily disappear men and women who knew too much or spoke too freely. The writers of France are scattered, her patriots hushed. The terror is not bounded by walls and turrets, but it is swift and merciless.

This is a bastion that must be stormed and destroyed; a new emblem of tyranny that must disappear from France. The task is gigantic, but the French, remembering their past, will be equal to the future. While the Nazis occupy France each day is Bastille Day for its people—a reminder of their tradition of liberty and a renewed call to action.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

TWO BRIEF YEARS

It is a fantastic experience to look back across 2 brief years to July 14, 1939, the

one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the fall of the Bastille. Europe was officially at peace then; the outlines of the continent had suffered little apparent change since Versailles, although Austria was gone, and Albania, and Czechoslovakia. Down the Champs-Elysees paraded the principal supporters of the European order, the French Army, unmatched in prestige in the world. In a position of honor in that traditional display were British guardsmen in red coats and bearskins, British sailors and marines—and the close-packed Parisian crowds shouted "Vive l'Angleterre!" President Lebrun, speaking at a demonstration of French unity, flung the challenge of the democratic way into the teeth of that black cloud of reaction mounting east of the Rhine: "Immutably attached to these principles of 1789, France recognizes for all men, without distinction of birth, color, or religion the right of access to liberty and equality."

One year passed. Poland, Norway, Holland, and Belgium went, in flame and blood, the way of Czechoslovakia. The French Army was swept from the field, and the armistice at Compiegne and the tragic necessity of Mers-el-Kebir divided France from her former ally, Britain. There was a government at Vichy that claimed to speak for France, that cast scorn upon the principles of 1789 and entered upon the pathetic and inglorious program of placating victorious Germany by imitating her vicious system.

Another year has seen the piecemeal destruction of Europe continued with the fall of Yugoslavia and Greece; it has seen the government of Marshal Petain go ever father along the road he chose in his first days of power; has seen him give his blessing to Frenchmen who might be deluded enough to fight beside the Germans in the east, to the end that Hitler's fetters might be the more irrevocably fastened upon France; has seen the culminating tragedy of Frenchmen battling Frenchmen in the strange and unhappy little war that has just ended in Syria.

From that Bastille Day of 1939 to today the record of events makes somber reading for Frenchmen—less so because of France's defeat, for many nations have lost wars without losing self-respect, than because the self-appointed leaders of France have capitulated spiritually to the enemies of France and of the human race. Yet Frenchmen have matter for pride as well; the muzzled millions of their nation have not succumbed to the alien poison; the free spirits under General de Gaulle have kept the tricolor in the fight against Hitlerism, and that fight will be won. Men of courage in France and without its borders can still say, as Winston Churchill said on the dark Bastille Day of 1940:

"And I proclaim my faith that some of us will live to see a 14th of July when a liberated France will once again rejoice in her greatness and her glory, and once again stand forward as a champion of the freedom and the rights of man."

Penalty on Wheat Raised in Excess of Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, untold thousands of our farmers are struggling for their existence throughout the Central and Middle Western States. They have been regimented throughout the past 8 years and they have been told what they could do and what they could not do. Our farmers have become confused, and they cannot tell when they plant their crop whether they will be entitled to harvest that crop or whether they will be penalized by their Government because they do harvest that which they have sown and planted. They have the one certain element however, and that is that their taxes in ever-increasing amounts will have to be paid. When their own Government forces them to curtail their crops, and to limit their production, they have no way to raise the money with which to pay their taxes. At the present moment our farmers are called upon to give to various funds for the benefit of our soldiers now in the camps—they are called upon to make their contribution to every request—and now our Government has reached the point that it fixes allotments for wheat long after the wheat has been planted and sown, and if the farmer exceeds a quota which is fixed at or near the time he is ready to harvest his crop, he is penalized.

The recent penalty provisions in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, of 49 cents per bushel on the excess of wheat raised over the quota, fixed long after the crop was sown, which was approved by the Agricultural Department, and also by the Agricultural Committee, in the House, is one of the most unjust provisions which has been foisted upon our farmers. Our farmers could not know when they sowed their wheat in the fall of the year 1940 that some agency would change their quota at harvest time, and they could not tell that the penalty provisions would be changed from 15 cents per bushel to the unusual and unjust amount of 49 cents per bushel. This high and unusual penalty will be highly injurious to our farmers. It has been placed upon them at a time when they had no opportunity to protect themselves by reducing their wheat acreage in accordance with a fixed allotment—because the allotment was fixed at the time the crop was ready to be harvested. With that exceedingly high penalty, in many instances the penalty will far exceed any profits which might have been derived from that crop, and I have discovered some instances in which the penalty exceeds the total amount the farmer could receive from his entire crop of wheat. That policy is destructive of our basic industry—farming. This penalty on the excess of wheat, above the quota fixed at harvest, is one of the rankest injustices our farmers have experienced at the hands of the New Deal. Those in charge of the administration of this unjust program should allow every farmer to feed the excess of his wheat, above the quota, to his own livestock, and poultry, and without any penalty attaching for so doing. This penalty provision should be decreased, immediately, to 15 cents per bushel, as is provided in the original act.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced two bills today, one of which provides for the reduction of the penalty on wheat raised in excess of the quota fixed to 15 cents per bushel, as was provided in the original act; the second bill provides that our farmers will have the right to feed all wheat in excess of the quota fixed this year to their own livestock and poultry on their own farm without any penalty attaching to such excess.

Our farmers are struggling to pay their taxes and to meet their debts. They are the producers from the soil. Quite soon they will be called upon to produce to the limit of their ability in order to feed the warring nations and our own vast Army. Our agricultural communities are the command post of our national defense. If agriculture fails, then our defense fails. We should never countenance our own Government imposing penalties upon our farmers because they produce in excess of the quota fixed by some man, somewhere, when there are starving people throughout the world, and our own Nation is no exception, because we have hungry people within our own borders.

LETTER TO SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker, I have written a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture upon this highly important subject. I desire to incorporate a copy of my letter to the Secretary herewith, and I ask unanimous consent to include, with my own remarks on this subject, a copy of the letter which I have written to the Honorable Claude Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, upon this subject, which letter follows:

JULY 12, 1941.

HON. CLAUDE WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Quite recently I have received many petitions from the farmers within my district, and in the State of Indiana, wherein they are vigorously protesting against the imposition of the penalty of 49 cents on wheat raised in excess of the quota. Many public meetings have been held throughout Indiana, and other States, and many such meetings will be held in the future, protesting against the imposition of such penalty.

May I say that it is my firm belief that the farmers are entirely justified in making these protests. I feel confident you will agree with me on this point.

At the time the wheat was sown, in the fall of 1940, the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was in force, and the penalty provided in the act was then 15 cents per bushel on the excess of wheat raised on each farm. The farmers knew of that law and they knew of the penalty provided in it, and with that knowledge they sowed their wheat. They did not contemplate that any change would be made in either their allotments or in the penalty.

Almost at harvest time, this year, the recent and very excessive penalty was included in the amendments presented by the Agriculture Committee of the House. Since that amendment became law new quotas have been established and the excessive penalty is subject to be applied. Our farmers had no way of protecting themselves. Their wheat had been sown, and when it was harvested and threshed the penalty attached. This penalty must be paid, or adjusted in the manner required, before the farmer can sell or dispose or use his wheat, or any part thereof. This is a most unjust imposition upon our farmers. My construction of the present policy is that the Department of Agriculture should want to help the farmer rather

than to injure him. If this policy of imposing the penalty of 49 cents per bushel on the excess of wheat is enforced this year, it will be highly injurious to every farmer, both large and small.

As you know, our farmers must pay their taxes upon their farms; this burden is inescapable. When they sowed their wheat last fall they invested their labor, the cost of seed wheat, and the cost of fertilizer, and when the very recent allotment of allowable acreage was announced, which applied to all farmers, in many cases the penalty imposed, of 49 cents per bushel on the excess, will exceed any profit in the wheat after the labor and the cost of seeding has been deducted.

I am convinced your Department does not desire to injure our farmers by imposing this unjust penalty. It certainly was not your intention to impose that heavy and excessive penalty upon our farmers at the time the amendment was reported out of the Agriculture Committee. My better judgment advises me that it was intended to force the storage of the wheat at the moment and to prevent a large volume of it from entering the market immediately after the threshing was concluded.

Many farmers need this excess of wheat for feeding purposes upon their farms. The corn crop was short last year because of drought, and the excess of wheat at this time would be exceedingly helpful for feeding purposes. This should be permitted without any penalty being imposed. A vast majority of our farmers are insisting that the excess of wheat over the allotment recently fixed be allowed to be used for feeding livestock and poultry on their farm without any penalty being imposed against them. I am in full accord with that policy.

In the light of fairness to our farmers, and in view of the policy of your Department to aid our farmers rather than to injure them, I hope you will, in the administration of this law, allow all excess of wheat to be used by the farmer upon his own farm for feeding purposes without penalty; that the penalty provision be restored to 15 cents per bushel, as is provided in the original act. May I say that I will introduce on Monday two bills which will embrace the items embraced in this paragraph of my letter, in which I hope you will concur. In the meantime I trust you will use your good office to aid the farmers in this matter. We are struggling to develop our national defense, and if we should become involved in this war you will call upon our farmers to produce as never before. In the face of that threat of war, I hope you will not impose upon these producers—our farmers—this unjust and unprecedented penalty.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND S. SPRINGER,
Member of Congress,
Tenth District, Indiana.

Hidden Hold-up Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS AND EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK WORLD-TELEGRAM

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of the House membership to H. R. 5259 which I have only recently introduced.

The bill is simple in its objectives—that is—to remove from blanket exemptions under the antitrust laws certain immunities now being used by a small minority of labor leaders to restrain trade and to conspire to further monopolistic practices. The bill in no way interferes with the legitimate objectives of labor organizations, but would prohibit those nonlabor activities that are so adversely affecting many workingmen and businesses through misuse of their union power to restrain trade.

Under recent holdings of the Supreme Court, especially in the Hutchinson case, the Court has held that present authority is lacking for restraining these activities. H. R. 5259 would especially grant such authority to the Antitrust Division to act in such cases of willful conspiracy to victimize consumers and honest contractors and businessmen under the guise of union activity.

In view of the completeness of two articles, I am including a news story from the Washington Daily News regarding the bill, and also an editorial from the New York World-Telegram, which I would like to incorporate in my remarks:

[From the Washington News of July 10, 1941]

"UNION TOLL BRIDGES" HIT—"LABOR'S HOLD-UP MEN" TARGET OF TWO BILLS

(By E. A. Evans)

Two bills before Congress today are aimed at demolishing what Thurman Arnold calls "the union toll bridges that now victimize consumers, small business men, and workers alike."

One was introduced yesterday by Representative MIKE MONRONEY (Democrat, Oklahoma), the other a few days ago by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER (Democrat, Pennsylvania). Both are designed to make the Federal antimonopoly laws a more potent weapon against what Mr. Arnold, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust-law enforcement, calls "labor's hidden hold-up men."

Each bill undertakes to define what shall and what shall not be considered legitimate objectives of labor organizations and to declare that unions, their officers, and members, shall be subject to antitrust prosecution, either civil or criminal, if they restrain trade in pursuit of illegitimate aims.

COVERED BY CLAYTON ACT

The Clayton Act, passed in 1914, provides that unions shall not be punished under the antitrust laws for "lawfully carrying out" their "legitimate objectives." Labor leaders contend that this confers complete antitrust immunity on their organizations.

Mr. Arnold maintains, however, that "a few powerful, strategically placed unions" have robbed the public by imposing trade restraints for purposes which have nothing to do with such unquestionably legitimate labor objects as collective bargaining, better wages, shorter hours, or improved working conditions.

He has charged many conspiracies by unions, acting alone or in concert with employers, to raise prices, prevent use of improved materials and methods, compel the hiring of unnecessary workers, drive independent concerns out of business, and destroy other unions.

EFFORTS RESTRICTED

Recent United States Supreme Court decisions have drastically restricted Mr. Arnold's efforts to prosecute unions for engaging in such conspiracies. In effect, the Court has held:

That an A. F. of L. union can, with impunity, use boycotts, strikes, and other means of attempting to ruin an employer's business because he deals, legally and in good faith, with another A. F. of L. union.

That an A. F. of L. union can use similar methods to attempt to compel an employer to violate a National Labor Relations Board order directing him to employ members of a C. I. O. union.

That the antitrust laws do not protect a builder who is prevented by a union from using cheaper or better materials.

BEYOND COURT REACH

By these decisions the Supreme Court is widely believed to have placed unions beyond reach of the antitrust laws unless they are caught conspiring with employers or other outsiders. And, observers have pointed out, if labor is immune to prosecution merely because it acts alone, the full effect of a union-employer conspiracy to restrain trade probably can be attained without danger to either party. Instead of making an agreement with the employer—for instance, to raise prices—the union can make a "demand" and the employer can plead that he was forced to accede to it.

These decisions represent what the court interprets to be the will of Congress. The Monroney and Walter bills amount to proposals that Congress shall assert its own will and undo what the court has done.

SIMPLE AMENDMENT

The Monroney bill is offered as a simple amendment to the Clayton Act, which itself was an amendment to the original Sherman antitrust law. The bill declares that it shall not be considered a legitimate labor object for a union to act alone or combine to restrain trade for the purpose of:

1. Compelling an employer to cease dealing with another union which has been designated by the N. L. R. B., or with a union which is not company-dominated.

2. Inducing an employer to pay bribes or blackmail to union officers, agents, or representatives.

3. Restricting the use of any materials, machines, or equipment, unless the restriction is related to wages, hours, health, safety, or working conditions, or unless it is a merely temporary and good-faith method of retarding technological employment during a period of orderly change or is designed to forestall imposition of a speed-up system.

4. Fixing prices, allocating customers, restricting production, eliminating competing employers, or monopolizing commerce.

OTHER MORE SWEEPING

The Walter bill is much more sweeping, and it goes beyond the mere antitrust objectives by proposing to confer upon Federal district courts' jurisdiction over all threatened labor stoppages, with special emphasis on strikes in defense industries.

It provides that any person who is affected, injured, or threatened with injury by a strike may apply to any Federal court for relief. Pending determination of the action, a strike would be contempt of court. Strikes involving defense activities would be referred by the courts to the National Defense Mediation Board.

The duty of the courts or the Mediation Board would be to determine whether the strike or threatened strike would have the effect of obstructing commerce, and, if so, whether it would be for the purpose of a lawful labor objective. Persons found guilty of conspiring to restrain trade for purposes which the bill defines as unlawful labor objectives would be subject to a fine of $5,000, imprisonment for 1 year, or both.

[From the New York World-Telegram of July 10, 1941]

"HIDDEN HOLD-UP MEN"

We're glad to see action starting in Congress at last toward curbing those whom

Thurman Arnold has so accurately described as "labor's hidden hold-up men."

These are the individuals who have seized control of a few powerful and stategically placed labor unions and are exploiting them for purposes having no relation to legitimate labor objectives.

Such purposes as boosting prices, preventing use of improved materials and more efficient methods, driving independent employers out of business, destroying other unions, and generally preying on the public.

Mr. Arnold, being Assistant Attorney General of the United States, determined to do something about these robbers. He went after them with the Federal antitrust laws—and with much success for awhile. He thought that union officials who stopped interstate commerce for reasons having nothing to do with wages, hours, working conditions, or collective bargaining should be punished just as businessmen are punished for restraining trade to increase their own profits.

But the United States Supreme Court thought that Congress intended otherwise, and it has pretty effectively tied Mr. Arnold's hands by decisions which seem to mean, in practical effect, that the antitrust laws can't touch crooks who victimize consumers, businessmen, and workers under the cloak of unionism.

Two bills have now been introduced in Congress proposing, by different methods, to undo what the Supreme Court has done. These bills are described in an article by E. A. Evans of our Washington bureau on page 2.

The one introduced by Representative MONRONEY of Oklahoma seems to us the simpler remedy. It would amend the antitrust laws to say plainly that unions and union officials can be prosecuted for restraining trade for certain purposes which obviously are not legitimate objectives of labor organization. The other bill, by Representative WALTER of Pennsylvania, goes much further, entering the field of strike prevention, which perhaps could better be the subject of legislation addressed specifically to that problem.

But we hope the House Judiciary Committee will hold prompt and public hearings on both these measures and report one of them out for a vote by the whole membership of Congress.

The practices at which these bills are aimed do not benefit labor as a whole. They benefit only the "hidden hold-up men" at the expense of higher living costs for rank-and-file union members as well as for everyone else in the country. Labor bosses, of course, will cry that these measures are attacks on labor's rights. That simply is not so. They are attacks on wrongs perpetrated in the name of labor and to the great injury of honest labor.

An Editorial Eulogy of Secretary Harold L. Ickes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM TACOMA NEWS-TRIBUNE

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am quoting a recent editorial from the Daily News-Tribune of Tacoma, in which Secretary Ickes is lauded for his devotion to, and friendship for, the Pacific Northwest.

Because this editorial incorporates views generally entertained by the progressive people of that enterprising section, I am reading it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The editorial is as follows:

[From the Tacoma (Wash.) Daily News-Tribune]

REAL FRIEND OF NORTHWEST

Three years ago when Tacoma was making another of its desperate efforts to get construction on its Narrows Bridge started Secretary Ickes was taken to the site.

"What's over there?" he asked grumpily as he gazed across at the tree-covered western shores of the Narrows.

But we got the P. W. A. grant from Ickes which made the bridge possible, and this was but one of a series of proofs of friendship and interest for Tacoma and the Northwest of the Interior Department's chief.

And now, as the Nation's productive forces are geared up for an all-out program of national defense and aid to the beleaguered British Isles, it is becoming more apparent that the man who is doing more than anyone else to shape the destiny of the Pacific Northwest is the honest, courageous, plain-spoken but sensitive Harold L. Ickes.

All during the depression years the anti-irrigation bloc in Congress and the Industrial East threw farm surpluses at him to stop the well-planned irrigation and reclamation programs, but to no avail. Mr. Ickes persevered and won, and now Dust Bowl victims are rolling west to greener pastures.

Over the bitter opposition of all power interests, most of the Nation's press, and organized business groups, Secretary Ickes insisted on building the high dam at Grand Coulee and the great Bonneville project on the lower Columbia. A mounting Government debt, huge surpluses of power everywhere, a Nation's income cut in half was the picture Mr. Ickes faced when he appeared before the Appropriations Committees of Congress asking for funds and more funds to finish the jobs and create a new industrial empire in the Pacific Northwest. Support from his chief and a faith in the Northwest equaled by few pioneers were his chief weapons, but they were sufficient, and now the Department's half a billion dollar babies are grown and ready for work. Long before Grand Coulee's little brother Bonneville turned is first turbine Mr. Ickes had skilled industrial engineers covering the country looking for industries whose basic raw material is power. At Tacoma, Longview, Vancouver, and Portland great plants are under construction and operating, and others are on their way.

Mr. Ickes has needed and used his influence as a Cabinet officer to create competition in the aluminum industry and to bring that industry to the Northwest. He is now calling for the making of aluminum from our native alunite ores and for the building of aluminum fabricating plants here so as to insure the continuous operation of plants when the emergency is over and normalcy returns.

It is now Ickes' turn to smile at the cartoonists, the gossip columnists, and anti-western development bloc in Congress. There is a power shortage. Night ball games are threatened in the East, power conservation is the order of the day. Senators are crying out for plants on the Tennessee, the Arkansas, and St. Lawrence Rivers to furnish power to speed up defense industries. This is an ominous sign for Washington and Oregon. It means serious competition for later power that will be coming in at Coulee and Bonneville. No Senators as yet are talking of the possibilities of further Columbia power. It is eastern power that is demanded.

It would seem that the policy of the Northwest is clear cut. We should support, with real unanimity, Mr. Ickes and his Federal power administration.

Valley Forge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. DAVID D. TERRY, OF ARKANSAS, DELIVERED AT WASHINGTON MEMORIAL CHAPEL, VALLEY FORGE, ON ARKANSAS STATE SUNDAY, JULY 13, 1941

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. DAVID D. TERRY, of Arkansas:

This is the eighteenth annual Arkansas State Sunday at Valley Forge, and it is my very great privilege to represent our Governor, the Honorable Homer M. Adkins, and to speak to you under the auspices of the Arkansas State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

It happens that all my life I have wanted to see Valley Forge, but this is my first visit.

It is impossible to hear the name Valley Forge or even to think of it without emotion; one's heart expands at the sound; no place in our land means so much; it is the richest spiritual heritage of our country.

From my earliest childhood the name has brought before my mind's eye a cold, bleak, snowbound countryside, with ragged, unkempt, half-starved Continental soldiers warming their numbed hands and bodies before the flickering flames of their meager camp fires.

That was in the winter of 1777–78. No better description of the miseries of that winter can be found than the words of Washington himself:

"Without arrogance or the smallest deviation from truth, it may be said that no history now extant can furnish an instance of an army's suffering such uncommon hardships as ours has done, and bearing them with the same patience and fortitude. To see men without clothes to cover their nakedness, without blankets to lie upon, without shoes (for the want of which their marches might be traced by the blood from their feet), and almost as often without provisions as with them, marching through the frost and snow, and at Christmas taking up their winter quarters within a day's march of the enemy without a house or a hut to cover them till they could be built, and submitting without a murmur, is a proof of patience and obedience which in my opinion can scarce be paralleled."

The first Roosevelt thus described the situation in an address delivered here July 4, 1904:

"Here at Valley Forge Washington and his Continentals warred not against the foreign soldiery but against themselves, against all the appeals of our nature that are most difficult to resist, against discouragement, discontent, the mean envies and jealousies and heart-burnings sure to arise at any time in large bodies of men, but especially sure to arise when defeat and disaster have come

to large bodies of men. Here the soldiers who carried our national flag had to suffer from cold, from privation, from hardship, knowing that their foes were well housed, knowing that things went easier for the others than they did for them. And they conquered because they had in them the spirit that made them steadfast, not merely on an occasional great day, but day after day in the life of daily endeavor to do duty well."

At the time the Continental soldiers were famishing for want of food and perishing for want of cover at Valley Forge the soil of my State belonged to a foreign country. Arkansas, over a thousand miles to the southwest and a journey of weeks through the trackless forests, was a part of Spain, for that was a quarter of a century before Thomas Jefferson purchased from Napoleon Bonaparte the empire west of the Mississippi, from which my own State was carved. Although Arkansas was never one of the Thirteen Original Colonies, which wrested their liberties from the English Crown, many of the people who settled in Arkansas came there from older sections of the country, and their descendants among our citizens proudly boast of membership in the societies that go back to ancestral participation in the struggle for independence.

Valley Forge is truly symbolic of the great qualities of character, fortitude, and devotion that in Washington and his heroic band made possible the difference between success and failure in that great experiment in freedom. Valley Forge envisions to me a quiet, dignified soldier on his knees in prayer before his Maker, asking for strength and guidance in difficult days; it means the putting aside of the temptation to take the easier road to surrender and to the bright lights and warm homes only a few miles away; it means a little band of resolute men, buoyed up by the example of a God-given leader, who were willing to suffer unto death rather than betray the confidence of that leader and their country's cause.

It is well, my friends, that we should repair here today and breathe deeply of the air of this historic spot. Sometimes I feel that it would do all of us good if from time to time, we should be permitted to touch hallowed ground. I think in that way we might be better able to cleanse our spirits and revive our souls.

To me, it is in the nature of a religious experience to stand before Washington's tomb at Mount Vernon on a quiet afternoon and commune for the while with the spirit of the Father of our Country; and, although I am a southerner, one of the greatest privileges that my stay in the Capital City has afforded me is to visit the Lincoln Memorial and pause for a while at the feet of that most lifelike statue of the great Civil War President. I sometimes feel that perhaps the spirits of these great men brood over the places that are so closely linked with their earthly trials and struggles.

Last week we celebrated the one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. Probably at no time since the close of the Revolutionary War has the future seemed so dark or our path so uncertain as at this particular time in the history of our country. The Revolution was fought and the blood of our patriot soldiers was shed in order that an experiment might be tried on this earth—our country was to be the crucible in which the test should be made as to whether or not a government of the people, by the people, and for the people could be wrought from the forms of older governments and made to endure.

We have gone onward and upward as a nation since that first lowly beginning, which was fashioned out of the toil and sacrifice, sweat, and blood of our forefathers, until now we are the richest and strongest Nation on the earth. And yet at this time the very principles upon which our Government was founded are being weighed in the balance, and liberty and freedom and equality of opportunity are threatened with extinction by the rising tide of brute force that is now sweeping over this earth. Democracy is on trial. It is flaunted and despised as being weak and inefficient by those who now seek to supplant it by deceit, duplicity, and armed might.

While we have grown into a great Nation, I sometimes feel that our uniformly successful journey down the road of national life has softened our citizenship so that we cannot bear hardship and suffering and deprivation in the way of our ancestors, and that the keen realization of the principles for which they fought has been dulled by the passing years.

Have we eaten the cake of life so long that the effort is too great to go back to the simpler fare of the earlier days? Have we strayed too far away from the Oregon Trail, blazed by settlers of the great Northwest? Have we as a nation lost from our blood and sinew the iron put there by the heroic days of 1861–65, when in defense of what they thought was right brother met brother on the field of battle, from Bull Run to Appomattox? Have we become so weak and anemic that we cannot as a nation decide upon the course of conduct in our relations toward aggressor nations and have the hardihood and stamina to pursue that course to the end?

Since March 1938, 17 nations of the earth have lost their liberty. Are we in our own country taking liberty too much for granted? On The Archives Building in Washington, which contains the records of our heroic past, are graven these words: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Have we enjoyed so long the blessings our valiant forefathers won for us that they seem not privileges to be won and preserved by each generation but attributes of life, as unfailing as the daily rising and going down of the sun?

We in this country are too prone to sit supinely by and let our fellow Americans bear the burdens of citizenship. Going back to Biblical days, we may learn something from the example of Moses when he, too, even as we today, stood on holy ground. You remember that God spoke to him and said, "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place where thou standest is holy ground." The story continues and Moses communes with God. He is a Jew. He knows the sufferings of his people; he is a foster son of the Egyptians, and knows them also. Clearly he is the appointed one to rescue his race. But he does not want the task and tries to avoid it. He argues:

"Who am I that I should go to Pharaoh?
No one will listen to me if I go.
I am slow of speech and of a slow tongue.
And, finally, Lord, send someone else."

His attitude is not an uncommon one in our own day. All too many of us turn the running of our country over to the so-called politicians and take no further interest in public affairs. We may exercise our right of suffrage if it is not too hot or too cold on election day, or if we have nothing more important to do. All too many of us have no time to make up our minds about State, National, or international matters, except when our own personal or financial interests are affected.

In a period like this, when our country is facing great social, economic, and political world problems, and when we are beset with doubts and difficulties on all sides, it is meet and proper that we should turn our eyes and steps to this historic shrine of our country, so that we may be reborn and acquire new strength and determination to press on to the ultimate goal of our national ideal.

The national ideal is the ideal of freedom—freedom of thought and speech, freedom of assembly, freedom to worship God. The cause of religious freedom is the cause of mankind. The conception of one God and one human family, of all men as brothers and sons of God, is the source of the conception of freedom and democracy in the modern world.

In conclusion, may I quote from the message of our President to the Congress on May 16 of last year? He said:

"For more than three centuries we have been building on this continent a free society, a society in which the promise of the human spirit may find fulfillment. Commingled here are the blood and genius of all the peoples of the world who have sought this promise.

"We have built well. We are continuing our efforts to bring the blessings of a free society, of a free and productive economic system, to every family in the land. This is the promise of America.

"It is this that we must continue to build—this that we must continue to defend.

"It is the task of our generation. But we build and defend not for our generation alone. We defend the foundations laid by our fathers. We build a life for generations yet unborn. We defend and we build a way of life, not for America alone, but for all mankind."

Closer To It Than You Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion Members of Congress who have supported legislation surrendering their powers to the Executive, should read the forceful editorial, Closer to It Than You Think, which appeared in the July 12 issue of the Chicago Tribune. I therefore include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Chicago Tribune of July 12, 1941]

CLOSER TO IT THAN YOU THINK

One of the administration's War Department bills, introduced without approval by Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, provides that notwithstanding the provisions of any other law the President may "employ any and all members and units of the Army of the United States * * * in such manner and in such places, either within or beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere, as he shall deem necessary in the interests of defense."

No Member of Congress will deceive himself as to the meaning of that grant of authority. It plainly takes from the National Legislature the power to preserve the Nation's peace by refusing to declare war. It nullifies the constitutional prerogative of Congress and removes an all-important check upon a willful and ambitious Chief Executive.

If a President had the power to employ the American armed forces "in such manner and in such places" as he wished, the only restraint upon him would be the congressional control of the purse. Appropriations

could be refused, but with an American force once engaged in a war abroad, with its fate dependent on supplies, the moral coercion to provide them would be supreme. Others of the War Department bills propose to inflict upon the National Guard and the drafted men the intolerable bad faith of retaining them in service indefinitely—in spite of the previous acts of Congress limiting their training to 1 year.

The new powers Mr. Roosevelt seeks in his quest of the military dictatorship over the country are to be exercised during any period which he proclaims one of unlimited national emergency. He has proclaimed such an emergency, although it is meaningless in law, representing nothing more than his own edict. The already partly stupefied country did not much inquire where Mr. Roosevelt got the sanction to declare that he had more authority merely because he said he had it, and said he had it because of conditions which he said existed. His assumptions were accepted.

He has already made treaties and occupied territory with merely a nod to Congress as he rode over it. He has nullified the constitutional requirement that he act upon the advice and consent of the Senate. When he has done a thing he fulfills what he thinks is his full obligation to his oath of office by notifying Congress that he has done so. The agreement Mr. Roosevelt negotiated with the Prime Minister of Iceland was submitted to the Parliament of that little sovereign nation and ratified by a vote of 39 to 3, although candor would compel the Icelanders to admit that it was only a formal action, the decision having been forced upon them by the British and the Americans, whether they liked it or not. However, it was, even as a formal recognition of parliamentary procedure, a great deal more than Mr. Roosevelt thought necessary.

Congress is committing suicide. It is not only killing itself, but it is killing the American system of government. It is going down the path taken by every legislative assembly in the countries which submitted to a Fuehrer and found itself his slave. There are disloyal Americans who are trying to put the Nation in the British Empire and make it a dominion in that monarchial system of government. There are other disloyal Americans who would add the United States to the Communist union of sovietized subjects. The question of what the American Republic will be under the military dictatorship which Mr. Roosevelt has established and seeks to extend will be decided by the Seventy-seventh Congress, and very soon.

If this Congress abdicates, it will never regain its powers. The issue is very grave and is made graver because of the confusion in which so many of the people have been thrown and by the synthetic war hysteria produced by artful manipulation of emotions and fears. The propaganda which is driving the country to war and to the destruction of its free political and economic system is powerfully organized, with subsidized and purchased newspapers, and with access, under covert threat, to all the various chains of communications—all willingly or unwillingly playing their part to execute the great conspiracy.

Our polls show 80 percent of the people against war and against dictatorship. At times they must think their form of government is utterly failing them when their opinions and their wishes, their good judgment and their common sense, prevail so little against Mr. Roosevelt's drive to accomplish his ends and impose his will. He rides down the good judgment of the people and by undermining and by direct assault he storms Congress. The issue is with the Congressmen. If they leave the American system of representative government an empty shell on Capitol Hill, they will have destroyed this Republic.

Preserve American Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR, OF MONTANA

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] recently delivered a characteristically moving and challenging address on the subject of international relations. In this speech Mr. O'CONNOR presents remedies and recommendations as to the policy to be pursued by Congress. I read it into the RECORD as part of my remarks:

Ladies and gentlemen, last week we Americans celebrated the most important holiday in the world, the most important to us and to the world because it marked the birth of a new world freedom.

Our Declaration of Independence and the struggle of 13 weak Colonies to win our freedom from foreign oppression did more to set the world free than all the wars in history. We lighted a torch of liberty which lifted the dark shadows that hovered over all lands. We gave courage and resolution to oppressed peoples everywhere. Ours was the spark that lighted the fire of revolt for liberty and economic justice in France and Italy and Germany, and in the nations of South America. By precept and example we proved that liberty and democratic self-government can be attained if only a people want it and have the courage and hardihood to fight for it.

It is said today that there is disunion among our peoples. This is hardly true. Our people are united as never before on their resolution to maintain and keep our liberty and democratic form of government and defend ourselves. There is only disunion and difference of opinion among us as to the best way to preserve our independence, freedom, and democracy and defend our country. Our objective is the same. We disagree only as to the method. I do not charge those with whom I find myself in disagreement with being appeasers, tories, and dishonest or moved by any ulterior motive. Through our history, people have differed. I refer to the beginning of our national history. Today, more than ever before, Americans should remember the year 1776.

Then, too, there were two factions. One was the appeasement group, better known as Tories. They believed that the Colonies should remain under the British Crown; they believed we were not strong enough to stand alone in a hostile world; they pointed to the fact that English troops were all around us and that other greedy European powers—France, Spain, and Portugal—all had footholds in this hemisphere.

The other group; well, you might call them isolationists; they believed we should break with the Old World; we should live our own life; we should not involve ourselves in European troubles; we should not submit to dictation and interference and meddling from across the Atlantic; that we could and should be a democratic republic in a world of monarchs and autocracies.

This was the group which won the fight in the First Congress, and we boldly proclaimed our intention to govern ourselves. Washington, Franklin, Adams, and Jefferson carried the day, the die was cast, and freedom was born.

Today we stand again at the crossroads. There are those advocating union; and again what road shall we take? We hear that the world has become smaller on account of aircraft, and that a madman is loose in Europe, and because of aircraft we may be in his path of destruction. To make this statement is to answer in the negative. You cannot invade a country except with an army. You cannot transport an army by aircraft a distance of 3,000 miles or more. The army would have to be transported to our country by ships. Our aircraft, fighting planes, and bombers could and would destroy the ships before they ever reached our shores. I have never heard any informed Navy or aircraft officer say we could be invaded. Yet we must arm to the teeth and be prepared against any eventuality. Now, why are we urged to throw ourselves headlong into one of Europe's hundreds of wars that have been going on for centuries and will continue to go on? It has been contended that we want to restore democracy in the world; that we want to establish the four freedoms everywhere—freedom from want, from fear, of speech, and religion. Fathers and mothers, this is a big order for your boys, your girls, their children, and their children's children to carry out everywhere when we have been unable to establish the four freedoms here in our own country thus far. Yes; also to destroy nazism and fascism. Well, every country is entitled to its own form of government. We must not impose by force our views or form of government on any other country. They have the right to choose their form of government the same as we.

The Congress has made certain commitments. It passed the lease-lend bill and implemented it by passing a $7,000,000,000 appropriation bill to help England with materials. We did this on the theory that it was a peace measure to preserve our peace. Now, what is happening? The President of the United States is being pressed by every possible means by those surrounding him, and particularly Secretary Knox, to go into this war, to engage in an undeclared war on the Atlantic Ocean. It is said the Navy now carries shooting orders. Churchill is asking us to pool our Navy with the British Navy. Gen. Sir Archibald P. Wavell and Lt. Gen. Sir Claude Auchinleck said at Cairo that another American Expeditionary Force would be needed if Britain and the United States were to defeat Hitler. Churchill told these men to make these statements. Let us think through on these demands; what they mean to us. We must save Soviet Russia from Hitler. We would have to bring freedom to China, to crush imperialistic Japan, to reconstitute Poland, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Belgium, Holland, France, Norway, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Albania, Ethiopia, and countless other nations, besides conquering Germany. If we could do this job, what would we do with them after we did it? Could you control them, and would you want to if you could? Would you want to place an army of occupation to see that they stayed good? In the meantime, we would have lost millions of the flower of our young manhood buried in foreign countries or sea and billions and billions of our material wealth. Yes; we are willing to sacrifice every dollar of our wealth and every drop of blood of American manhood and womanhood in defense of our country, but only in defense. We must not let Churchill dictate to us and tell us what to do and when to do it. You heard about a quarter of a century ago the same slogan, "We must destroy the Kaiser." We helped destroy the Kaiser, and at what cost. Did it help us or anybody else? Thousands of our sons lie buried in

France. Although 24 years have gone by, those war debts are still unpaid. I am begging the fathers and mothers and the young manhood of this country to demand of their Senators and Congressmen to help our President resist the forces that are trying to drive him into this war. We in Washington know the influences that are back of these moves that would take our finest young men and destroy them in foreign battlefields and fill our hospitals with insane men as well as bankrupt our country. Ah, do not be sure that in trying to save so-called democracy in Europe by getting into this war that we won't lose it at home.

Picture shows, radio commentators, scare headlines, writers whose words are gold bought, international newspapers, are getting their work in on official Washington. Here we are thinking only of war and what is going on in Europe and little of our own problems. We live in a great big country. Our resources are numberless and matchless. It is a big job, big enough for anyone to look after this country instead of trying to police and look after the world. We cannot have everything we want everywhere.

Now, I want to make this point clear that nothing can happen in Europe, Asia, or Africa that will free America from its economic ills, and victory, defeat, or compromise over there will leave us with our major problems: Unemployment, poverty among our poor people, and lack of distribution only magnified many fold and made more difficult of solution. The repercussions, whatever they are when peace is finally declared, will put us in a position facing the most trying and arduous times through which this country has passed or we hope we will ever again have to face. So, looking for no hope from that source on the conclusion of this debacle in Europe; unemployment, hunger, and a lower standard of living for everybody will stalk our footsteps everywhere. We must prepare now to absorb this shock.

There is no denying the fact that democracy is the hope of the world. We cannot hope to challenge the world's attention to the benefits of democracy unless we make democracy work in America. We cannot sit supinely by and deal in platitudes and say we have a Nation of four freedoms. In theory that is right, but we have not been making this theory work. One-third of our people would today be in want were it not for the defense program, in being engaged in the manufacturing of things to kill people with, and even with this program, millions of our people are in want. Are those poor people who are in want free of fear? When they get up in the morning of the first day of the month, they don't know if they will have enough to get through until the last day of that month. Freedom of religion—let us see. We are all striving for the same objective, namely, the salvation of our soul and the betterment of mankind and we are supposed to have the right to obtain those objectives through any religious faith we adopt. Yet, I have known where people were discriminated against because they were of a certain religious faith. We have not equality of our racial groups. Persons are today being discriminated against because of by accident they happen to belong to a certain racial group. This is not democracy at work.

Nazi-ism, fascism, communism won't do. They deny the freedom of man. Man was not born to be dictated to by any person. I am opposed to any form of "ism" that has for its purpose a state or socialized ownership and control of the personal privileges of the people.

The most that can be said as between these "isms" is that there is a distinction without a difference. Hitler and Stalin, each the leader of a pack, are now at grips. It is to be hoped that they will bat the brains out of each other. So far as affecting the morals and welfare of the world, victory either way would make little, if any, difference. However, these wolves have been hunting for victims in two packs in the past. Should either win now all would hunt together. In the past, each, fearful of the other, spent time on the watch. Should a winner emerge, the pack would give its entire time conquering free peoples. The history of both show that they have been trying to outdo each other in brutality, human massacre, wickedness, and human slavery. Each hand is equally bloody.

Let there be no doubt whoever wins we must be on our guard. We have called them every name in the catalog and we now must be prepared to back those accusations up. I want to emphasize that we must not get into this European war. It is going to be a long, disastrous, and bloody one. Human lives do not and will not count. We must stay out of this caldron of human butchery. We must be on our guard to keep this country free from any foreign entanglements with any foreign nation. We are willing to help England short of war without stripping ourselves of our needed defense materials.

If you agree with what I am saying, demand of your Senators, Congressmen, and President more thought and consideration of our problems here in America. Let us not follow some fine-spun theory that England is our first line of defense. Why, as I said before, that when we were in our swaddling clothes we kicked ourselves loose from England. Are we weaker now than we were then or are we stronger? If we are weaker, let us hide behind England's skirts. If we are stronger, let us stand on our feet. When we were only a baby we didn't need her protecting skirts. I have no patience with the claim that is made that England is fighting our war. We can fight our own wars.

I pledged my people in Montana that I would do everything within my power to keep this country out of war; to keep our boys from being sent to Europe whether they are soldiers or seamen to be killed in any foreign war. I am keeping that pledge. I am pleading for your help to keep us out of war; to wire your Senators, Congressmen, and President to keep us out.

Now, in closing, let us first of all thank God that we are Americans; that we are a free people. Let us continue to lend every mite of our power to preparing defense for our Nation so that it may achieve victory in any contest. Let us at the same time pray to God that the leaders in our world, who are motivated by pride for fear someone else will go down in history greater than they, also by greed and selfishness because of the desire for power, be given light to the end that this insane destruction of human lives and property cease and that God in all His wisdom will again save the world. Let us have faith in our God. Let us have faith in our country, and lastly, let us have faith in ourselves. Let us be Americans for America.

Monument of Deficits

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to set up a red monument today to the greatest deficit that the world has ever known, which has been created by the present administration. I will place in the RECORD the annual deficits of this administration from March 3, 1933, to date, and it will show that the average deficit has been over three and one-half billion dollars annually. There has been nothing like it in the history of the world by any nation anywhere. If that is a credit and an honor, then we have this monument constructed to perpetuate the memory of this administration. To me, though, it is a disgrace and a dishonor, and especially so when we realize that our children and our grandchildren will have to pay the bill for this monument that has been erected. A monument of inefficiency and incompetence for no competent administration would have permitted such inefficiency.

When President Franklin D. Roosevelt was seeking office in 1932 he made this statement on October 19 in Pittsburgh:

> The credit of the family depends chiefly upon whether that family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.
>
> If government lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily at reasonable rates. But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.

Now the statements that he made and his performance are very, very far apart, for I give you a list of the deficits of the Federal Government since Mr. Roosevelt has been at the head:

Mar. 4 to June 30, 1933	$392,600,000
1934	3,935,991,685
1935	3,575,357,963
1936	4,763,841,642
1937	2,707,347,110
1938	1,384,160,931
1939	3,542,267,954
1940	3,611,056,036
1941	5,167,678,471

In red average over three and one-half billion a year.

Mr. Roosevelt criticized very greatly the administration of former President Hoover and in reference to Mr. Hoover's administration he made the following statement in his speech at Sioux City, Iowa, September 29, 1932:

> We are not getting an adequate return for the money we are spending in Washington, or to put it another way, we are spending altogether too much money for Government services that are neither practical nor necessary. And then, in addition to that, we are attempting too many functions. We need to simplify that the Federal Government is giving to the people.
>
> I accuse the present administration of being the greatest spending administration in peacetimes in all our history. It is an administration that has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission, and has failed to anticipate the dire needs and the reduced earning power of the people. Bureaus and bureaucrats, commissions and commissioners have been retained at the expense of the taxpayer.

Now all you need do is to examine the record of Mr. Hoover and you will find that in 4 years Mr. Hoover did not go in

the red as the average of Mr. Roosevelt's deficit for the past 8 years. It certainly should cause him at least a little concern, but he says nothing about the deficit any more than he says about balancing the Budget. But all he is thinking about and his administration is spend, spend, spend. Some day it will be too late, and that will be when the Nation is bankrupt and when we go through the greatest revolutionary changes any nation has ever known, and the responsibility is due to the President of the United States. Why does he continue this extravagant, wasteful expenditure of funds, heaping the burden on the children of oncoming generations. This is the question I cannot fathom and I hope that the good thinking Jeffersonian Democrats will storm the White House with requests for economy in government before it is too late.

Robert S. (Bob) Kerr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

TELEGRAM FROM HON. ROBERT S. KERR TO OKLAHOMA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, recently the Democratic national committeeman from Oklahoma, Hon. Robert S. Kerr, was scheduled to lunch with the congressional delegation from Oklahoma in the Speaker's dining room in the National Capitol, but it became necessary for him to return to his home, and he sent a telegram which was read at the meeting. Because of its patriotic spirit and its complimentary references to our delegation, I have asked and secured permission to have his message printed in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Bob Kerr quite intimately for 30 years and have always found him to be an honorable and upright gentleman. He was born and partly reared in a log cabin in Pontotoc County, near Ada, Okla., where the old Kerr home is still standing. He comes of a splendid family. His aged mother is one of the sweetest Christian characters it has ever been my privilege to know. His late father, a highly respected and stalwart Christian gentleman, while engaged in farming, was elected to county office and then moved to town. His several children attended the public schools of Ada and continued their education at East Central State College at Ada. It was my happy privilege to go through college there with Bob, as he was called by his friends. He was a brilliant and popular student.

It was also my pleasure to be a member of the First Baptist Church of Ada, where he was general secretary of the Sunday school and an active leader in the church. Unlike some who have succeeded in the business world, Bob Kerr has not departed from his early training. For the past 8 years he has been teaching a Bible class in the First Baptist Church of Oklahoma City. He is an honest and upright man. He is as clean as a hound's tooth. All his life he has had strong and definite convictions, with the courage to express those convictions at all times and under all circumstances. His word is his bond.

He was born on a red-clay hill in Pontotoc County in circumstances peculiar to pioneer Indian Territory, inheriting not wealth but, rather, an indomitable courage to move ever westward, onward, and upward to success. He is an outstanding example of a self-made man. I am familiar with his early struggles. One of the schools I taught was at Eubanks, 4 miles north of Tupelo, Okla., where I received $60 per month. When I left to assume a better position as a teacher in another school it was my pleasure to recommend Bob Kerr for my place. After teaching for $60 a month for some time, he completed the normal course at East Central State Teachers College. Later he engaged in the wholesale produce business, then studied law in a law office and passed the bar examination. From law he entered into the oil business, and is now president of Kerlyn Oil Co., of Oklahoma City.

Mr. Speaker, it may be a little presumptuous on my part to make these complimentary remarks about an old friend, but a "rose to the living is more than sumptuous wreaths to the dead," and I appreciate the opportunity to say these things about Bob Kerr.

The following is the telegram addressed to the Oklahoma congressional delegation on June 9, 1941:

I had hoped to attend your luncheon tomorrow, the 10th, but am compelled to return to Oklahoma tonight. The entire Oklahoma delegation is to be congratulated upon the wisdom and courage it has shown and is showing in the effort being successfully made to bring an end to unnecessary and unwarranted strikes against national-defense projects. Oklahoma democracy is overwhelmingly in favor of a program of total defense of America and keeping the horrors of this war removed from our shores by providing planes and tanks and all other necessary munitions of war, including food, to England and her allies and insuring the delivery of these supplies to Great Britain by whatever means necessary to get them delivered. To be successful in our great effort for this national-defense program the entire energy of America's manpower, resources, and industrial capacity must be cooperatively utilized and any and all subversive and alien agencies or forces must be rooted out and destroyed. I have every confidence that American labor and capital will fully cooperate. I again congratulate you upon your courageous leadership in this matter and pledge you any help and support I am capable of giving you.

ROBERT S. KERR.

American Involvement in European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WABASH (IND.) PLAIN DEALER

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wabash (Ind.) Plain Dealer of July 11, 1941:

[From the Wabash (Ind.) Plain Dealer of July 11, 1941]

CONGRESSMAN HARNESS REPLIES TO THE OPEN LETTER

The following is the reply of Congressman FOREST A. HARNESS, of the Fifth Indiana District, to the Open Letter editorial of the Wabash Plain Dealer and Times Star of July 2 relative to the war issue and the advisability of a national poll on the question.

"It is, I assure you, a pleasure to tell the people of Wabash County through the Plain Dealer my own position on the matter of American involvement in the European war, and to cite my record in Congress as it touches that question.

"I am sincerely and vigorously opposed to the United States participating in the present war in Europe now, just as I have been in the past. As evidence, I cite you to my position on the following measures:

"I opposed the revision of the Neutrality Act in the special session of 1939. While I have never believed that a nation could legislate a state of neutrality, or that it could advantageously follow a fixed and rigid course in its international relations, basic fallacies enacted in the Neutrality Act, I nevertheless foresaw that the revision asked by the administration would open the way for the increasing degree of intervention in the present struggle which has followed.

"I opposed the Selective Service Act. While I have always believed in preparedness for America, and while I believe universal military training is the most democratic way to man our defenses, I felt that the act was designed more for the purpose of entering the European war and for the immediate effect it would have in our international relations than for the real purpose of strengthening our own defenses. I felt that the age limits of 21 to 45 in the bill as it passed the House and the Senate (the age limits were reduced from 21 to 35 in conference) would cause unnecessary hardships and tend to upset domestic business and industry. I also insisted upon the provisions in this act which guarantee that men drafted for service shall not be sent outside the Western Hemisphere. Unrelated to the question of foreign involvement, but important in causing me to vote against this measure, was the administration's provision to authorize the seizure of industries by the President.

"I opposed the Lend Lease Act because I believed it gave the President entirely too much unrestrained authority to involve us in actual hostilities.

"I opposed the Ship Seizure Act which gave the President the authority to take over

the vessels of belligerents and captive neutral nations for the sole purpose of placing them in the service of Great Britain.

"I have protested the policy of the President in stripping our own Navy and Army of ships, planes, guns, and munitions for Great Britain, not only because he has repeatedly committed acts of outright hostility, but because all of these acts before the passage of the Lend Lease Act were clearly in violation of his constitutional rights.

"Finally, I have spoken and worked consistently against the several steps by which the administration has taken us closer and closer to actual hostilities. On several occasions, I have spoken on these subjects in our district. Many Wabash people will remember that I warned against these recent developments a year ago when I addressed a meeting in the city of Wabash.

"I agree fully with your observation that the American people were denied their fundamental right to vote upon this issue of involvement in the last national election. That may yet prove to be a truly tragic misfortune. I think, however, that the views of the people on this great issue have been made unmistakably clear by every poll and every expression of public opinion within the past few months.

"A single poll, such as that recently taken in the President's own congressional district, should not in my opinion ever be made the basis for a Representative's action. As you know, too much depends in such polls upon the wording of the question submitted for a vote, I would very much prefer, therefore, to depend upon the mail I receive from my constituents on any subject from day to day; and upon my own personal contacts with the people back home. This is not intended to discount a popular poll by any means. It is merely to make the point that continuous mail and personal contacts are, in my opinion, a more accurate and dependable measurement. As you know, any issue of importance will elicit hundreds—even thousands of letters.

"Within the past year I have received no less than 7,500 letters touching this main issue in every possible way. As big a job as it is to read and answer that many letters, the people at home who have written me know that these letters have received my personal attention. The direct knowledge gained from these letters, checked against the information coming from personal contacts at home, from the opinions of qualified local observers, and from polls of public opinion, such as that conducted by your own paper, give a far more complete and accurate picture of the public sentiment than any single poll.

"Again, let me say, however, that I do not discount the common poll method. While I am in favor of the principle, I think it ought to be checked against the methods suggested, which I follow in my own office. To keep in touch with the sentiment in our district, I shall continue to welcome individual letters from the home folks and shall continue to talk to and exchange ideas with as many people at home personally as I possibly can.

"Let me repeat that I am vigorously opposed to our entrance into this war and shall continue to do everything in my power to avert the final and last step that would plunge us into the conflict. I shall also oppose the removal of the restriction in the Selective Service Act against sending our drafted men outside the Western Hemisphere. Furthermore, I do not believe that we should break faith with nearly a million of our young men who are now in training under the Selective Service Act by authorizing the President to keep them in service beyond the year for which they were inducted."

More Recent Developments in Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK H. BUCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, a little more than 6 weeks ago I rose in the House to make a few remarks concerning the dangers to the United States in the existing world situation. I propose today to discuss this subject briefly in the light of recent developments.

The German attack on Soviet Russia, launched on the morning of June 22, has tremendous implications for the United States and for the entire Western Hemisphere. We are reminded anew that armies bent on conquest cannot stand still; that they must ever push on and on. We see further and conclusive evidence of Hitler's plan for world domination. We see another example of Hitler's treachery. We see again that nonaggression pacts made by Germany with other nations are not a protection for these nations, but a trap to ensnare them. We see another endeavor of Hitler to destroy a nation, enslave a people, and steal their economic resources, as German engines of destruction bomb, blast, and burn their way into the heart of the Soviet Union with the vision before them of the wheat fields of the Ukraine and the oil wells of the Caucasus.

There are new dangers for the United States in this latest move of Hitler's monstrous military machine. If he should be successful in the conquest of Soviet Russia, he would be master of continental Europe and of a large part of Asia. He would control territory within 50 miles of our own Alaska. German military forces would be able to move into a position facing us just across the Bering Sea. The Nazi air force could prepare bases so close to our shores that its planes could bomb American territory with great ease. German submarines and sea raiders would be in a position readily to attack American shipping in the Pacific. In short, if Germany should succeed in the conquest of Russia, the political and military situation in the Pacific would be vastly affected.

The German attack on Russia must have ominous meaning for Japan, a partner of Germany and Italy in the military alliance of September 27, 1940. Japan by now should be able to read unmistakably the handwriting on the wall. She should see that Italy, which started out as a partner in the alliance, is now in fact a vassal of Germany; that Italy is almost as completely dominated by Germany today as many of the European countries which have gone down before Hitler's armies. Japan should realize that if Hitler overcomes Soviet Russia and thus dominates Siberia, the Japanese position would be seriously menaced; that if Hitler's legions should reach the borders of Mongolia and Manchuria, Japanese safety would be imperiled. Japan must realize that a successful conquest by Germany of Soviet Russia would mean that her people might soon be goose-stepping at Hitler's command.

In the present situation the policy to be followed by the United States is clear. We, in the United States, everyone of us, should unite overwhelmingly in the task of safeguarding our Nation. We should increase the tempo of our defense effort. Faster and faster we should build planes and ships and tanks and guns. We should prepare for a challenge in the Pacific and in the Atlantic. We should make our Nation an impregnable fortress in this world of danger.

The safety of our Nation is the goal of the hour. Speed of production is our paramount need. There must be no interference in work toward our goal. Production must not be interrupted through lack of cooperation of labor and management. Every man and woman must do his or her duty in providing for the common defense.

The question has arisen whether we should furnish supplies to the Russians in their fight to repel German aggression. The President has answered that question in the affirmative. He has said that this country will give all possible aid to the Russians for their defense against the Nazis. I am in entire accord with the position taken by the President. I favor aiding Russia to the extent that such aid does not interfere with our established program of assisting Great Britain and China. To help the Russians does not mean that we approve of their system of government, of their philosophy of life. We in the United States are opposed to the fundamental concepts of the dictatorships of the Nazis and the Communists. But we must be realists. In the present situation, with Hitler endeavoring to conquer the world, the United States and the Soviet Union have as a common purpose the defeat of Hitler. In this situation it is in our own national interest, in our own self-defense, a wise policy to furnish all feasible aid to the Russians to carry on their struggle.

Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles has stated well the attitude of this Government in the following words:

> Any defense against Hitlerism, any rallying of the forces opposing Hitlerism, from whatever source these forces may spring, will hasten the eventual downfall of the present German leaders, and will therefore redound to the benefit of our own defense and security.

If Hitler should conquer Soviet Russia, there is good reason to believe that, with his east flank secure, he would make an all-out attempt to crush Great Britain; that he would transfer his armies from the east front to the west front for a great assault across the English Channel. The outcome of that battle obviously would be of incalculable importance for the future of the world. Consequently we should continue and increase our aid to Great Britain. This course has been overwhelmingly approved by the people of the United States as a part of our pro-

gram of national defense. The British people, in their courageous battle to preserve their nation, have great need for increasing amounts of military, agricultural, and industrial supplies from this country. These supplies are needed now. We must insure that they are speeded to the British in adequate quantities. We must insure that, if and when the hour for the complete German assault against Great Britain comes, the British people shall not want for weapons to defend themselves.

In addition to extending aid to Great Britain, we should continue our assistance to China. The Chinese people manifest to the world the magnificent will of a people to resist the dismemberment of their country. They are battling heroically against the sweep of the general conflagration. Recent events have shown conclusively that the safety of this Nation and of this hemisphere calls for resistance to aggression wherever resistance will be most effective. As a part of our own program of national defense, therefore, we must send more and more supplies to China for use in repelling attack.

We must not forget that the entire Western Hemisphere is threatened by the aggression rampant in the world today. We must remember also that an attack by an aggressor power against any nation in the Western Hemisphere would clearly menace the United States. Consequently, we should continue and perfect our cooperation with the other American nations for the defense of this hemisphere.

I should like to refer briefly to the ruthless sinking by a German submarine of the American merchant ship *Robin Moor* in the South Atlantic Ocean. This vessel was sunk on May 21, without provision for the safety of the passengers and crew and in spite of the fact that its American nationality was admittedly known to the commander of the submarine. This lawless German act appears to have been committed to intimidate the United States; to drive American commerce from the high seas. It is another assertion of Hitler's purpose to obtain control of the seas as a part of his program of world conquest. Our Government has wisely made clear to Germany that we will not be intimidated, that we will not permit Germany to drive American ships from the high seas.

Now and then we hear talk of appeasing Hitler, of endeavoring to negotiate with him, but realists cannot take this talk seriously. The record of Hitler is too clear in our minds. Actions speak louder than words. This subject was referred to by President Roosevelt in his fireside chat of December 29, 1940. His words, true then and truer now, I quote as follows:

> The experience of the past 2 years has proven beyond doubt that no nation can appease the Nazis. No man can tame a tiger into a kitten by stroking it. There can be no appeasement with ruthlessness. There can be no reasoning with an incendiary bomb. We know now that a nation can have peace with the Nazis only at the price of total surrender.

When I last spoke to the House 6 weeks ago I expressed concern that many people in this country were complacent about the dangers to the United States in the international situation. I am inclined to believe that in the light of recent developments this complacency is disappearing. I do not believe that many American citizens can be undisturbed when, in addition to the other dangers on the international horizon, we are faced with the possibility that Hitler may obtain control of territory adjacent to our own; that the Nazi flag may be planted on the Bering Strait.

The defense task before us is hard. A long time may be required for its completion. There can be no shirking from it. I have faith enough in the American people to believe that in the face of the present dangers they will unite wholeheartedly and labor faithfully in a mighty and sustained defense effort which will insure the safety of our Nation.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Is Vital to Our National Defense and to the Nation's Future Growth

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS OF ARKANSAS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, on July 8 I delivered on the National Radio Forum program of the blue network of the National Broadcasting Co. an address on the St. Lawrence seaway proposal. I quote it here in full:

On June 5 President Roosevelt recommended to Congress the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway; that, in the interest of our common defense, we join with Canada in harnessing the vast power of our mutually owned St. Lawrence River, now running in wanton waste to the sea, and in eliminating the barrier that stands between the world's greatest inland waterway system and ocean navigation.

It is interesting that roughly every 5 years since 1897 some joint commission of the United States and Canada has been appointed to study the feasibility of all or part of this proposal. Without exception, each has recommended it—including the 1920 commission, of which Herbert Hoover was chairman, both for navigation and hydroelectric development.

On March 19, this year, an agreement was signed between the United States and Canada providing for immediate action "when it is approved by the legislative bodies of the two countries."

Briefly the agreement provides for several miles of channel deepening, two dams, locks, and a powerhouse.

And because a lot of false statements have been made, and will continue to be made about it, I give you the following figures:

Cost to the United States, $200,000,000—definitely not a billion dollars, as has been suggested, but one-fifth of that.

Period of construction: Three to four working seasons—and with types of labor and materials in which there is still a surplus.

Result: 1,100,000 horsepower for each, this country and Canada, the opening of the greatest inland waterway on earth to ocean shipbuilding and world commerce and a shorter and less hazardous route to the British Isles.

It has been my privilege for the past 3 weeks, as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives, to participate in hearings on the proposal. We have heard Secretary of War Stimson, Secretary of the Navy Knox, and Office of Production Management Director Knudsen, all urging speed, for Hitler's power production has dwarfed ours long ago. He is sinking two merchant ships for every one that both Great Britain and the United States are building—and we need a two-ocean Navy as quickly as we can get it. We have heard Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones brilliantly picture its importance to the country's total industrial and commercial vitality now and after the war. We have heard Assistant Secretary of State Berle explain the proposal in the light of threatening international developments, for in the event of a world naval race the Lakes would offer our safest haven of construction. We have heard Chairman Olds of the Federal Power Commission in an eloquent appeal for the immediate utilization of the river's power resources—enormous power, at half the cost of steam.

And finally we have heard General Robins of the Corps of United States Army Engineers reveal the comprehensive plan for the greatest benefits at the lowest cost of any American project yet proposed, save only the Panama Canal.

These men are charged with the defense of this Nation. They all say it is vital and they are best in position to know. If we don't follow our chosen leaders on matters of defense, whom shall we follow?

"What a boon it would have been to our present defense program," said Mr. Knox, "had this project been constructed when first recommended."

Most railroads, protecting the value of a top-heavy capital structure, view with alarm any proposal to make available to the people of the United States the natural advantages of water transportation by development of the rivers with which this country is so generously endowed. Their lobbyists pack our committee room. Their dog-in-the-manger attitude disregards paralyzing transportation bottlenecks already developing.

Joseph Eastman, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, stated recently, "The transportation facilities of the country will be strained to the utmost before we are through. The railroads are going to need all the help they can get and it is no time for petty hostilities."

The Power Trust, which has fought every move of the Government to relieve the people of its monopolistic control of the God-given resource of electrical energy, has been so discredited by its own scandalous methods, previously employed to prevent progressive legislation, that it no longer dares approach a congressional committee in open support of its reactionary self-interest. But it has no difficulty in hiring others, camouflaged as officials of disinterested planning boards or cross-section commercial groups, to represent its opposition to any measure which would expand our power production. Even as power rationing goes into effect in many parts of the country, even as farmers and housewives, businessmen and manufacturers face a shortage of the electricity so essential to the preservation of our modern civilization, spokesmen for the private utilities are organizing every pressure that money can buy to assure the continued extravagant wastage of the abundant potential natural-hydroelectric resources of our rivers.

Mr. Knudsen revealed the quality that makes him what he is when he stated to our

committee "Power is progress and I do not believe there will ever be power enough in the United States, our country is growing so fast."

We have also heard the expression of opposition from representatives of private groups in cities and sections of our Nation who fear the loss, to some extent, of what they regard as an economic advantage over the rest of the country because of existing geographical factors. It is interesting to note that the areas from which these groups come are largely those that have already enjoyed the benefits of river, harbor, and inland waterway improvement at Government expense.

Faith in the wide horizon has been passed down to us by our forefathers who had the vision to develop a continent-wide Nation. Even they had to fight a vehement and self-righteous minority who saw American destiny as limited only to the Atlantic seaboard. One Cabinet member told us, "Every selfish group that has ever gambled yet on the improbability of future American growth has lost."

These hearings have epitomized a struggle now going on in this country that will determine whether we are serious in our fight against nazi-ism and to preserve democracy by the utilization of every resource at our command. Germany, in her ruthless and devastating drive for world domination, has achieved an almost miraculous production of comparatively meager resources by forcing maximum results from monopolistic industries which preferred, like some of ours, to preserve a scarcity economy. Yet we in this country, where our philosophy of government centers in the welfare of all our citizens, must fight at every hand the crippling effect of those who measure every defense activity in terms of its ultimate effect on their invested capital or special privilege

By what suicidal reasoning is it argued that the necessary expansion of our productive capacity, on which our survival as a nation depends, will ruin us in the future?

This is a war of production. The President stated it clearly and emphatically in his message, and I quote:

"Production and more production is the keynote of our all-out race for national defense. Electric power and transportation are limiting factors in the production of planes, guns, tanks, and ships.

"The enemies of democracy are developing every hydroelectric resource and every waterway from Norway to the Dardanelles. Are we to allow this continent to be outmatched because short-sighted interests oppose the development of one of our greatest resources?"

The St. Lawrence project will add to our available electrical energy an amount which if transformed into aluminum would make 30,000 planes; it will open up facilities for ship construction which, as Mr. Knudsen has pointed out, could deliver 500,000 to a million tons of additional ships a year, even while this project is under construction; it will offer a transportation route for 16,000,000 additional tons of freight at a time when our railroad facilities are already becoming overtaxed to a dangerous degree; and it will shorten by a thousand miles the dangerous open-water route to the beleaguered British Isles.

Some have suggested that the war may be over before the seaway and power units can be completed. It may be over before the battleships we are building can be completed, too. But, said Mr. Stimson: "* * * it is necessary to prepare for a very long emergency. * * * There is a very good chance, a very strong chance, in my opinion, of the emergency lasting long enough to enable this country to reap the benefits of this construction." And, said Mr. Knox: "We are going to live in a disturbed world for a long time."

Should the war come to an early end, then this is one of the projects we shall need anyway to help absorb the shock of the inevitable post-war chaos.

But the opponents have been obliged, in a miserably poor showing, to rest their case largely on the argument that the project is economically unsound.

I come from a part of the country which has benefited little from the industrial development of the rest of the country and which has suffered much from discriminatory conditions imposed upon us by monopolistic financial and industrial interests. The State of Arkansas will never be convinced that we in this country have reached the peak of our economic development at a level which gives its citizens an average income of $244 a year. We know what it means to suffer the debilitating effects of absentee ownership, discriminatory freight rates, and abominably high power rates imposed by companies more interested in their own profits than the welfare of the people.

The T. V. A. has brought great benefits to our neighboring States and is a masterpiece in defense preparation. I am sponsoring in the Congress a bill which would provide a similar development for the basins of the Arkansas, the Red, the White, and the St. Francis Rivers in eight Southwestern States. On such projects depend not only our ability to survive in a world at war but our future as a vital and dynamic democracy.

Even when the present conflict is ended, the war of production will not be over. Either we will find ourselves confronted with the competition of a slave economy dominated by a victorious Germany or we will face the supreme challenge of a devastated world looking largely to us for economic salvation and the reestablishment of democratic principles everywhere.

The St. Lawrence project presents itself to you and to us in Congress as another test of our temptation to take the short and selfish view like the fallen democracies abroad, or of our ability to make democracy work for the common good of all and to turn the total productive capacity of the mightiest nation of the earth toward our only hope of defeating the totalitarian brutes of Europe.

Grand, Glorious Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. JACOBSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DAVENPORT (IOWA) DEMOCRAT AND LEADER

Mr. JACOBSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial which appeared in the Davenport Democrat and Leader, of Davenport, Iowa, on July 10, 1941:

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Democrat and Leader of July 10, 1941]

GRAND, GLORIOUS IOWA

"In all that is good, Iowa affords the best."

Where have we heard that slogan before? Though familiar in our minds, we feel that in this troublesome world it affords repetition today.

While most of the nations of the Old World border on starvation, Iowa remains the land of plenty. It is the bread basket of the United States.

Revised statistics available at the moment show Iowa to be first in:

Corn production—19 percent of United States total.

Oats production—17 percent of United States total.

Hog production—27 percent of total number slaughtered under Federal inspection.

Horse numbers—7 percent of United States total.

Grade A land—25 percent of United States total.

Value of livestock and poultry—8 percent of United States total. Total estimated value of Iowa livestock and poultry on January 1, 1941, was $428,318,000.

Hog numbers—17 percent of United States total.

Poultry numbers—7 percent of United States total.

Poultry production—6 percent of United States total.

Egg production—7 percent of United States total.

Per capita production of agricultural products:

Soybean-hay production—18 percent of United States total.

Timothy seed—44 percent of United States total.

Popcorn—53 percent of United States total.

Percentage of total land area in farms—97 percent of the land area in Iowa is in farms.

Cash farm income—8 percent of United States total.

Percentage of improved farm land:

Production of all grain crops—13 percent of United States total.

Marketings of grain-fed cattle.

Undoubtedly, most of us should know Iowa better than we do. How many at random could name the official State flower? Before hands are raised we'll tell it. It is the wild rose. How many know the lettering on the great seal of the State of Iowa? The words are as applicable today as when first placed thereon: "Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain." The "Ioway" corn song is familiar in most States of the Union. Its chorus:

"We're from Ioway, Ioway,
State of all the land,
Joy on every hand,
We're from Ioway, Ioway,
That's where the tall corn grows."

Iowa, "beautiful land," as the Indians called the region, was first seen by white men when Marquette and Joliet touched the west bank of the Mississippi River near the mouth of the Des Moines in 1673.

Marquette, a Jesuit priest, and Joliet, a fur trader, entered the great Father of Waters by way of the Wisconsin River and traveled downstream several days before noticing the first signs of habitation. They had almost reached what is now the southern boundary of the State when near the confluence of the Des Moines and Mississippi Rivers they discerned footprints on the west bank of the Mississippi and a path leading through the woods. Following the path they came to an Indian village and met friendly Indians. History thus records the first visit of white men to the country which many years later became the State of Iowa.

Yes; Iowa is a great State. We should all be proud of it.

Interest on Farm Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently discussed, from time to time, the situation of the farmers, particularly those in the South, during the present emergency. There seems to be a general misunderstanding on this situation. The efforts to freeze farm prices considerably below parity, and the general statements made in various quarters to the effect that the spending for national defense has brought relief to the farmers, are all evidence of this misunderstanding.

As a matter of fact, spending for national defense has been largely concentrated in large industrial centers, and unemployment in the farm sections has not been relieved to any great extent by the national-defense program. And unless and until our agricultural products are sold at 100 percent parity to the farmer, the American farmer will continue to bear an unjust proportion of the burden.

I have recently received resolutions from three national farm-loan associations in my district, namely, Ascension National Farm Loan Association, Gonzales, La.; Clinton National Farm Loan Association, Clinton, La.; West Feliciana National Farm Loan Association, St. Francisville, La.

These resolutions truly represent the feelings of the farmers in this section. They know what the condition is that confronts them. These people do not now and never have asked for anything that is not justly due. After a thorough canvass of the situation facing the farmers in that section, these members state that the temporary reduction of interest rates to 3½ percent, which has been granted in the past, should be continued on farm loans. I know from personal experience that what these farmers say is based upon fact, not fancy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the three resolutions in question, which are as follows:

Whereas borrowers through the Ascension National Farm Loan Association have obtained loans from the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans and the Land Bank Commissioner, these loans bearing contract interest rates of up to 6 percent; and

Whereas during the past several years Congress has seen fit to provide for a temporary reduction of this interest rate to 3½ percent, which reduction has been very beneficial to the borrowers through this association; and

Whereas it is felt that conditions in agriculture will not have sufficiently improved to warrant a return to the contract rates on the various loans at the time this temporary reduction expires: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the stockholders of the Ascension National Farm Loan Association, in session this 27th day of June 1941, do express to the Congress of the United States their appreciation for this reduction in interest and respectfully request a continuance of this benefit to the borrowers through this system; be it further

Resolved, That the president and the secretary-treasurer of this association are authorized to furnish certified copies of this resolution to the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans, to the Farm Credit Administration, and to our Senators and Congressmen.

I, L. B. Duplessis, president of the Ascension National Farm Loan Association of Gonzales, La., hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted at a meeting of the stockholders of said association duly held on the 27th day of June 1941.

L. B. DUPLESSIS,
President.

Attest:

CLIFFORD C. REDDELL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Whereas borrowers through the Clinton National Farm Loan Association have obtained loans from the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans, and the Land Bank Commissioner, these loans bearing contract interest rates of up to 6 percent; and

Whereas during the past several years Congress has seen fit to provide for a temporary reduction of this interest rate to 3½ percent, which reduction has been very beneficial to the borrowers through this association; and

Whereas it is felt that conditions in agriculture will not have sufficiently improved to warrant a return to the contract rates on the various loans at the time this temporary reduction expires: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the stockholders of the Clinton National Farm Loan Association, in session this 3d day of July 1941, do express to the Congress of the United States their appreciation for this reduction in interest, and respectfully request a continuance of this benefit to the borrowers through this system; be it further

Resolved, That the president and the secretary-treasurer of this association are authorized to furnish certified copies of this resolution to the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans, to the Farm Credit Administration, and to our Senators and Congressman.

I, W. L. Haney, president of the Clinton National Farm Loan Association of Clinton, La., hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted at a meeting of the stockholders of said association duly held on the 3d day of July 1941.

W. L. HANEY, *President.*

Attest:

CLIFFORD C. REDDELL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Whereas borrowers through the West Feliciana National Farm Loan Association have obtained loans from the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans and the Land Bank Commissioner, these loans bearing contract interest rates of up to 6 percent; and

Whereas during the past several years Congress has seen fit to provide for a temporary reduction of this interest rate to 3½ percent, which reduction has been very beneficial to the borrowers through this association; and

Whereas it is felt that conditions in agriculture will not have sufficiently improved to warrant a return to the contract rates on the various loans at the time this temporary reduction expires: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the stockholders of the West Feliciana National Farm Loan Association, in session this 3d day of July 1941, do express to the Congress of the United States their appreciation for this reduction in interest and respectfully request a continuance of this benefit to the borrowers through this system; be it further

Resolved, That the president and the secretary-treasurer of this association are authorized to furnish certified copies of this resolution to the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans, to the Farm Credit Administration, and to our Senators and Congressmen.

I, R. H. Daniel, president of the West Feliciana National Farm Loan Association of St. Francisville, La., hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted at a meeting of the stockholders of said association duly held on the 3d day of July 1941.

R. H. DANIEL, *President.*

Attest:

CLIFFORD C. REDDELL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The Agricultural Situation of 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

ADDRESS BY OSCAR B. SMITH

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Oscar B. Smith before the Clinton County Farmers Guild at Frankfort, Ind., on July 5, 1941:

THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION OF 1941

BACKGROUND

In any discussion of the present-day agricultural situation a more comprehensive grasp is had by reviewing the history thereof. The details of a picture become diminished or increased according to the background against which it is projected, and our appreciative concept is governed by our reaction to the setting forth of these fundamental principles. The background, or history, of present-day farm conditions is not a thing of beauty despite the efforts of past leaders to delineate a rosy hue or a silver lining. Possibly the brightest spot in agricultural history appears in 1925 when, after the land-grant colleges threw up their hands in horror of attempting to solve the farm economic problem, the farmers took hold of the situation themselves and proceeded to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling. At a joint meeting of the National Grange, Farmers' Union, Farm Bureau, the present officers of the National Farmers' Guild, and commodity cooperatives there was formed the Corn Belt committee. This committee in turn appointed a subcommittee, consisting of Milo Reno, Edward E. Kennedy, John Tromble, Thomas Cashman, and Henry A. Wallace, now Vice President of the United States, and together they set up a schedule of minimum prices for farm products. These were called cost-of-production prices at the farm and were as follows: Milk, $2.76 per hundredweight; corn, 94 cents per bushel; hogs, $11.32 per hundredweight; wheat, $1.38 per bushel; cotton, 25 cents per pound; oats, 50 cents per bushel. Mr. Wallace insisted that these figures were too low, and he proposed a schedule of prices which were: Milk, $4.04 per hundredweight; corn, $1.36 per bushel; hogs, $13.60 per hundredweight; wheat, $2.90 per bushel; cotton, 32 cents per pound; and oats, 75 cents per bushel. This schedule was then adopted and was enthusiastically endorsed by one of agriculture's true friends, Senator CHARLES L.

McNARY, of Oregon. From the principles expounded, Senator McNARY and Representative Haugen drafted the McNary-Haugen bill only to see it twice vetoed.

THE A. A. A.

Then came the Agricultural Adjustment Act which was of some help economically, but its regimentation policies cost the farmer his freedom. Its storage of surpluses acted as a ceiling over farm prices, and fulfilled a scriptural passage, "He that withholdeth corn, the people shall curse him: But blessing shall be upon the head of him that selleth it." (Proverbs xi: 26.) Mr. Wallace became Secretary of Agriculture and announced that cost-of-production prices in Iowa and Illinois were 54 cents for corn, 30 cents for oats, and 86 cents for wheat. The drop in prices resulting from this statement called for the grain markets to close to prevent utter collapse. Markets gradually pulled back to normal and in February of 1937 corn in Clinton County, Ind., stood at $1.03, soybeans, $1.50, wheat, $1.32; and oats, 49 cents. Mr. Wallace and three of his assistants spoke over the radio decrying high prices, and on February 27, 1937, under the advocacy of Mr. Wallace, Mr. Morgenthau addressed the Harvard Conference to this effect. Banks doubled their reserves, credit was contracted nearly $2,000,000,000, and the farmer was again forced to take it on the chin.

PARITY PAYMENTS

Parity payments are considered the keynote of the A. A. A., but are indiscriminate in their allotment. For instance, cotton in 1940 was listed seventh in farm value of crops produced in the United States, only contributing 5 percent to national farm income. Yet cotton farmers drew the lion's share of parity payments, receiving 46 percent of the total payments. Corn was second place in farm value of agricultural products, producing 14 percent of farm income, yet only drew 28 percent of the parity payments. Wheat, in eighth place, producing 5 percent of farm income, draw 25 percent of parity payments. Rice is in twenty-eighth place and draw 1 percent of parity payments. Milk is in first place as a producer of farm wealth, yet received no subsidy, but contributes 17.5 percent to farm wealth. Oats, potatoes, barley, oranges, soybeans, apples, sugar beets, peaches, and sorghums all have a greater farm value than rice, yet are disregarded in the parity program. The 1941 amendments to the A. A. A. have slated tobacco and peanuts to be added to the list of parity-payment subsidies, making a total of six products, accounting for only 27 percent of the value of all farm commodities.

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

The House of Representatives in April and May conducted hearings before its Committee on Agriculture and listened to the testimony of farm leaders on pending legislation affecting the agricultural situation. Supporters of the A. A. A. demanded its continuance and indulgence of subsidy payments of 85-percent parity loans. They refused to ask for 100-percent parity, and failed to offer a substitute plan to relieve the Federal Treasury of its obligation to the Nation under the defense emergency. Another plan being considered is the income-certificate plan, commonly known as the refined-processing-tax plan. It only applies to cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts, or in other words, is applicable to those items which are only 13 percent of the farm value of all agricultural production. The Massingale proposal outlined in H. R. 1101 is the streamlined version of the farmer's hopes originally embodied in the McNary-Haugen bill. If the Massingale proposal had been adopted years ago, marketing quotas would have been unheard of and our defense forces would now be comfortably outfitted and in readiness.

MARKETING QUOTAS

To mention marketing quotas is to take notice of their effect. The A. A. A. calls for a 50-percent penalty of the 85-percent-parity loan on excess production, and thereby imposes a higher tariff against the American farmer taking his excess wheat into the American market than the Government imposes on the Canadian producer selling wheat in the American market. The penalty against the American farmer for selling his excess wheat is 49 cents per bushel, while there is only a 42-cents-per-bushel tariff against the Canadian farmer coming into the American market. This also applies to corn. The marketing-quota penalty against corn would be 35 cents per bushel, while the tariff on imported corn is 25 cents per bushel. The marketing-quota penalty against cotton is 6.9 cents per pound, while there is no import duty on cotton except on the long staple above 1 inch. Most of our cotton is less than 1 inch staple. The first 3 months of 1941 saw imports increase 910 percent of Canadian hogs and pork products as compared with the corresponding period of 1940. What this means is that Canada gets cash on the barrel head in our markets, and under our lease-lend program we buy Canadian pork and with American-produced pork we lease-lend it to Great Britain, the mother country of Canada. If Canadian pork is to be donated to Great Britain, Canada should be the donor. As Congressman LAMBERTSON narrates, "Daddy, why do we celebrate the Fourth of July?" "Hush, child."

THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION OF CIVILIAN SUPPLY

The administration evidently discounts the irritation the foregoing causes the patriotic American farmers, for it recently established a Bureau known as the Office of Price Administration of Civilian Supply, under Mr. Leon Henderson. This distinguished citizen henceforth announced his capabilities by announcing a speculation warning, and a planned ceiling over certain farm commodities. It was a Triple A Junior. Simultaneous with this statement wheat prices dropped 4 cents, rye 5 cents, soybeans 8 cents, lard $1 cwt., hogs 15 cents cwt., and cotton $1.50 a bale. All this was done despite the fact that only 2 weeks before on June 16, the Senate had passed a resolution, Senate Resolution 117, which was sponsored by Senator THOMAS, stating that no agency of the Government should undertake to fix minimum prices below parity on basic farm commodities which at present, would be wheat $1.149, cotton 16.12 cents, corn 83.5 cents, rice $1.057, and Maryland tobacco 17.9 cents. My friends, it is inconceivable that a mere agency should so brazenly override the desires of the Senate of the United States. Is it possible that these agencies constitute a supercongress? Our elected delegations in Congress remain our only hope and their actions must be respected.

SURPLUSES

Instead of surpluses, I contend that we are confronted with threatened shortages. The two greatest corn crops ever produced in the United States was in 1920 and 1906. The yields of 1932 and 1937, which were supposed to create such large surpluses, favorably compare with the yields of 1896 and 1905. The all-time record yield of wheat was in 1915, and cotton reached its peak production in 1926, yet in all those years of peak production the surplus problem solved itself. Why? Because our iron laws of economy or the 1-1-7 ratio of national income was functioning properly. Wealth was created at its sources, namely the soil, the water, and the air, and of these the soil created 70 percent of the total. A dollar of farm income supports $1 in pay rolls, and $7 of national income.

Overproduction, underconsumption, and lack of purchasing power are synonymous. Farm surpluses melt away when this ratio is not interfered with, and under it Triple A's, programs, subsidies, allotments, quotas, and penalties are relegated to the junk pile. Farmers realize that something has gone wrong, and they are determined to have it uncovered. Witness the recent birth of the National Marketing Quota Protest Association. No farm organization ever developed so suddenly or spread so rapidly, and I glory in the spunk of its founding fathers. In common with the National Farmers' Guild they ask no favors, only a square deal. Farmers do not object to a 10-percent, cost-plus defense contract being awarded their industrial brethren, but they would appreciate the same treatment instead of merely recovering the cash outlay required to produce a crop, to say nothing of contributing time, equipment, and investment as gifts to the consumer. The bill H. R. 1101 now pending in Congress will correct all the foregoing evils. Introduced by one of the most lovable men that ever graced the Halls of Congress, the late Representative Sam Massingale, this bill will apply to 52 farm products which are 99 percent of the value of all farm production. It will eliminate the patchwork and give the farmer his parity income from the market places and preserve to him the American market. It will eliminate subsidies, allotments, penalties, quotas, and foreign dumping. It will automatically dispose of so-called surpluses.

CONGRESS

In Congress there are many friends of the farmer. Being human, they make mistakes, but in the spirit of brotherhood, we the people, overlook their little inconsistencies and frailties, knowing that we all constitute an indivisible economy. These noble characters with whom we have entrusted our destinies have heard of the "plight of the farmer" for so long, that I do not blame them if the phrase makes them sick. They are overworked, but rest assured they are trying to reach solutions though many of them have undermined their health in so doing. For these good efforts we owe them endless homage. With the endorsement of the National Farmers Guild, they have enacted the Frazier-Lemke Act, the Federal Land Bank Low Interest Act, the Wool Labeling Act, Department of Agriculture Memo 893, and many others. The farmer's thanks also to the Senate for its recent passage of the Hog Processing Tax Refund Act. This bill carries the endorsement of the National Farmers Guild and the National Grange. Locally, the Indiana Farmers Guild endorsed and secured the passage of amendments to the Soil Conservation Districting Act and the Farm Truck License Act at the last session of the Indiana Legislature, hence a word of gratitude to our State lawmakers is not amiss.

However, the most important legislation still lies ahead as H. R. 1101 rests its case before Congress. It echoes the voice of truth to this age. Will the door be opened or closed to this visitant? The grains of truth have been sown, and the weeds of error are being displaced.

America and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. GERALD W. LANDIS, OF INDIANA

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio ad-

dress which I delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System, Washington, D. C., on July 12, 1941:

Fellow Americans, we are at the crossroads of America. On the decisions now made by our people and their leaders on matters of foreign policy may depend our national welfare for years to come. I have no personal ax to grind. I want you to realize I am above the draft age and have no near relatives who would have to fight. I also have no financial interests in Europe or Asia.

As a veteran of the World War, however, I fervently believe we should never again soak Europe's soil with American blood. My pledges in the last election were not mere campaign oratory. I have made an honest effort to make all of them come true. My pledge to the people of my district was to keep our American boys out of foreign struggles unless we were attacked. I have voted against every step which I believe would lead to war.

The minds of the American people are confused. The people who must suffer and give up their lives are entitled to know all of the facts.

America is on the verge of throwing our treasure and our blood in the European war, with the consequences that no one can foretell. I believe our true mission is to follow the principles of the foreign policy laid down by the founders of our country. I don't believe that Paul Revere made a mistake when he took his horse out of the stable, nor do I believe that George Washington and his men made a mistake when they fought, bled, and died for us in 1776. Under this foreign policy we became the greatest democracy, the most powerful and the most prosperous in the world. For more than a hundred years we were content to work out our own destiny.

In 1917 we deviated from this doctrine and entered the World War to save this country for democracy. The United States received nothing from this war, but a several-billion-dollar war debt, thousands of disabled young men, shiploads of flag-draped coffins, and three cemeteries in France.

Again, today, this administration is departing from the established foreign policy made by the stalwart founders of our Nation. I believe it is a grave mistake. Surely, it has not come to the point where America must raise a crop of boys every 20 years to be slaughtered in Europe. We do not want to create a new generation of Gold Star Mothers.

War, in reality, is the destroyer of life and property. War means black-outs, shrieking shells, and speeding bombing planes across the sky. Most of us remember the horrors of the last war and its aftermath; the dead upon the battlefields, the bitter tears of womanhood, disease, and hospitals where armless, legless, and blinded men await eternity. We also recall the terrible depression. The insufferable burdens of costs, and the dislocations of everything that makes for normal happiness.

I can close my eyes and hear the voices of our soldier dead buried on Flanders Field, who must now realize that they fought and died in vain. I can see the outstretched arms of millions of mothers who see their sons in danger of becoming cannon fodder, in another World War.

Fellow Americans, would you be willing to risk the lives of at least 6,000,000 American boys and $200,000,000,000 in a struggle across the seas? Do you believe it would be easy to transport and land millions of American boys on unfriendly soil? Are we to rush arms and the cream of American youth every time Europe is in trouble? Would you be willing to maintain standing armies abroad and battleships in foreign ports to enforce peace? Are you willing to neglect our own national defense by sending most of our war equipment to foreign lands?

At this point I want to pay tribute to the mothers of America who have thus far done their share in keeping America out of war. They have spoken fearlessly and courageously regarding their feelings concerning America's involvement in another European conflict.

In thinking of these mothers, I am reminded, however, of the words of Mark Twain. "A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war with speech and pen and at first will have a hearing and will be applauded, but it will not last long; the others will outshout them. * * * Before long you will see this curious thing: The speakers stoned from the platform and free speech strangled by hordes of furious men who in their secret hearts are still as one with these stoned speakers but do not dare say so. And now the whole nation, pulpit and all, will take up the war cry and shout itself hoarse, and mob any man who ventures to open his mouth, and presently such mouths will cease to open."

It is true, American sympathies have crystallized. Our hearts go out to freedom where it fights or falters. But do we want to support these sympathies by sending American sons to rot and die on foreign fighting grounds, battling for a peace no man has yet been bold enough to define or wise enough to propound?

From our vantage point 3,000 miles away, we cannot direct the destiny of Europe, unless we annex the Continent or patrol the battle fronts forever. And to undertake such a colossal task might dim the destiny of all the world by bringing the black-out of human liberties to the Western Hemisphere.

Our first plan was not to sell war materials to nations who have repudiated their honest war debts. Then Congress repealed the Neutrality Act and established "cash and carry." Later Congress eliminated the cash feature by passing the lease-lend bill and appropriated $7,000,000,000 to carry it out. Now they want us to convoy and deliver the goods. The next step will be to man the tanks and bombers, and last we will be asked to send millions of young Americans to do the fighting.

I believe the defenders of America have more courage than any people in the world, but it will take more than courage to win this war. We need tanks, antitank guns, antiaircraft guns, bombers and more bombers. We do not have enough equipment for our draftees and National Guardmen who are already in service.

If we go to war now, we will be facing the greatest odds we ever faced. Why make the same mistake other countries have made, by going off to war while tragically unprepared in terms of modern fighting equipment? If we get into this war, there will be no 40-hour week and time and one-half overtime for labor. There will be no parity prices for the farmer, and there will be no peacetime profits for industry, if we expect to win. We will be compelled to pay taxes and more taxes. If we go to war unprepared, it will be a long, hard struggle.

Many have said it will be impossible for Hitler to invade England. If this is true we know it would be impossible for him to invade America. With the proper defense, I don't believe he would have one chance in a million in making a successful invasion of the United States. There are not enough ships in all the world to transport an army of 1,500,000 men and supplies to America.

Both the opponents and proponents of the lease-lend bill believe that incidents which would certainly involve us in war could not occur if American vessels were kept out of danger zones. If we convoy, our ships and planes undoubtedly will be attacked by the Germans. Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war.

I would like to quote from Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 2, 1941. "As plainly as I can, I have always stood against convoying vessels by the American fleet, and will stand against convoying vessels by any unit of the American fleet until and unless the point shall come when I shall be willing to vote for war, because, in my judgment convoying would lead us into actual war."

Good old common sense and old-fashioned strategy would be to build up a strong national defense before we ever attempt to convoy or even talk about going to war.

It stands to reason if Great Britain can continue to maintain her export trade and deliver the goods to the Western Hemisphere in direct competition with the United States, without convoys by the United States, then certainly she can take war materials from this country over to England without United States convoys.

By making democracy work at home we can best give service to the world by protecting what we have on the continent on which it functions, we can do, by our example of success, that which our armies could not permanently achieve. Right ideals can move eastward from this continent to Europe as readily as wrong ideals can move westward from Europe over here. Let us give devotion to our right ideals at home.

It is impossible to predict the future of America unless we focus our attention upon our national defense and our unsolved problems of unemployment, underprivileged citizens, underpaid farmers, and idle capital. We must first set our own house in order if we are to be of service to our neighbors across the seas.

Real Americans must be placed on guard for the greatest test of moral, physical, and spiritual courage. America has no place for an individual who places any other flag, constitution, way of life, or any other ideals of government above our own. If we are to preserve our liberty and continue to go forward, we must gird ourselves to resist all attacks from within on the American way of life.

This Nation is united on a real defense program. Americans are all willing to pay their share of the costs. But they want, and they are entitled to have, full value received for the money spent. They desire the elimination of waste and red tape They would like to see more workers transferred from New Deal departments to the national-defense program, rather than adding more civilian employees to the Federal pay roll. They also desire that the defense production be expanded by farming out some of the defense projects to smaller communities.

We must have unity in keeping America out of war. Is the executive department divided on this issue? Do the Secretaries of the Army and Navy express the sentiments of the President? The American people are entitled to know all of the facts. Let us help the President keep his sacred pledge he made at Boston, when he said, "And while I am talking to you fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again—your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

America must wake up. Let's meet the challenge to America with American courage and in the American way. Our destiny is to make America the home of democracy. Our big job is to keep America out of Europe and Europe out of America.

And you fellow Americans can help win this fight for peace. Write your President, your Senators, and your Congressman and express your desires for peace. Write those letters today.

R. F. C. Loan to Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. PADDOCK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great satisfaction that I invite the attention of the House to recent newspaper statements showing the repayment of most of the $90,000,000 loan made in June 1932 by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago. As is shown by the accompanying article which appeared in the Chicago Daily News of June 19, 1941, more than $77,700,000 has been repaid, with additional collateral amply in excess of the balance.

These facts not only justify the original loan, but indicate that the liquidation of assets under the direction of Jesse Jones has been well handled.

It seems particularly appropriate to note in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the satisfactory progress made toward repaying this loan. Frequently in the past, partisan discussion has treated this transaction with great inaccuracy.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News of June 19, 1941]

FAMED DAWES LOAN OF $90,000,000 TO BE PAID IN FULL—COLLECTIONS ALREADY OVER $77,700,000; $42,900,000 OF COLLATERAL LEFT

(By Royal F. Munger)

Every penny of the principal of the famous $90,000,000 Dawes loan by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. is practically certain to be repaid, according to information gained through authoritative sources today.

The loan, it will be remembered, was made in the days of wild excitement in June 1932, in the worst month of the national depression, when every leading banking institution in the city was facing unusual depositor activity, and many banks were surrounded by such huge crowds as to require police regulation of the clamoring depositors.

At a stormy session of bankers, Charles G. Dawes refused to accept a loan of any kind unless assured enough to protect every penny of the money of his depositors. The loan was made, but subsequently was made the target of terrific criticism.

It was political ammunition in political campaigns because of the fact that Dawes himself, famous general, famous diplomat, and ex-Vice President of the United States, was a leading Republican.

And now the evidence begins to build up that the loan was sound. According to the best figures which can be obtained, and admittedly not official in character, although indisputably true, the liquidation of the assets of the Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. turned over to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has already brought in funds to repay the bulk of the money.

Repayments have amounted to more than $77,700,000, or around 86 percent of the loan, of which about $9,000,000 was made up of payment of the stockholder liability. That leaves, at a rough calculation, about $12,300,000 of principal still to be paid. That it will be paid appears more than a certainty.

Here again the officials of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would naturally be reluctant to make any official statement, but shrewd banking estimates can come fairly close to the facts.

The remaining collateral in the hands of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to be liquidated to meet the remainder of the loan has a face amount of $42,900,000. At the very worst it is considered that this will bring in at least $13,300,000 under liquidation, and the returns may easily be considerably better than this.

In every year in which the liquidation of collateral has been progressing, and that covers an 8-year period, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation officials have made estimates of the value of the collateral.

In each case, before the end of the year, it has been necessary to make an upward revision of values in the light of experience. In most years the upward revision has been as much as 10 percent.

At a conservative estimate, therefore, the assets still to be sold under the Dawes loan liquidation will bring in enough to cover every penny of the principal, to pay all the costs of administration of the loan, and to apply at least $1,000,000 on the accrued interest. The cost of administration, incidentally, is understood to have been extremely low.

At last accounts—and our information is up to a comparatively recent date—the total expenses of the handling of the Central Republic loan on the part of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, including the expenses of litigation, have amounted to $1,041,819.52, or a total of less than 1½ percent on the amount collected. That is really an extraordinarily low collection cost in comparison with the costs of some other situations involving smaller banks in the Middle West.

There will be no sharp increase in expenses, for the bulk of that work has been done, and the only marked change that is likely to take place is an increase in the sums realized from the remaining assets.

In fact, this last is quite likely, and there is better than an even chance, even from our own somewhat sketchy information, that the recoveries will cover all the $90,000,000 principal, all costs, and as much as $3,000,000 on the accrued interest.

That factor of interest is one on which there might well be considerable discussion. At the time of the banking crisis, when no man knew what the next day might bring forth, the bank was in no position to argue. It took what it could get.

Since then the general rate of interest on banking funds has gone down and down, but the R. F. C. bookkeeping, originally set up to let the R. F. C. show a profit if possible, has continued to charge against the big loan the original rate of 5½ percent per annum.

Technically, this would amount to something like $20,000,000, but, of course, that is entirely out of line with subsequent R. F. C. policy. The rate on preferred stock taken in banks to keep them in a strong position, for instance, has been cut repeatedly. No one has cared particularly, since the stockholder liability has already been applied, and the actual interest payment will be what excess is realized from the assets.

At this moment we are not in a position to try to estimate the credit that should go to different individuals in connection with the collection of the big loan. Jesse Jones, of course, deserves some credit for the fact that it was a sound loan in the first place.

Aside from that, somebody—whom eventually we hope to recognize clearly enough to identify—must have done a whale of a good job.

Letter of Charles Wesley Heard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHATTANOOGA EVENING TIMES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter from Mr. Charles Wesley Heard to the editor of the Chattanooga Evening Times, Tuesday, July 1, 1941:

I ask space to answer a few questions by Times readers.

Question from an Irish-American friend. So we must destroy Prussia to save British imperialism and Russian bolshevism?

Answer. No. In this war there are only two sides—the German side and the American side. Both England and Russia are fighting on the American side for American freedom—and for Irish freedom, as well as their own. On the record since Munich neither Ireland nor the United States deserves freedom—and will not remain free long unless straight-thinking Irishmen and Americans wake up, take over, and force our Governments to act against Hitler. Because what we do—or fail to do—during the next 3 months will decide the future of nations on six continents, including our own.

Question. You say in the Evening Times that Germany must be destroyed before there can be peace in the world. Why?

Answer. I thought I gave valid reasons for the statement. If not, here is a fundamental reason for it: Civilization rests on the sanctity of the contract. Unless agreements are kept, there can be no commerce, no government, no social order; only chaos and return to savagery. Hitler and the German Government have broken every pledge they have made. No mentally competent person would accept a promise—whether verbal or documentary—from either.

Question. You demand the destruction of Prussia, but Hitler is fighting our enemy, communism. Would it not be better to let Germany and Russia destroy each other?

Answer. Judgment poisoned by emotion is blind; religion that conflicts with common sense is spurious. The Master said: "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." And He gave us a scientific method of orderly thinking based on common sense to enable us to discover the truth about any matters. Here is formula—His yardstick by which to judge men and nations:

"Judge not according to appearances; judge righteously."

That is, judge not according to prejudice, according to wishful thinking, according to emotional appeals by gangsters and aggressors to deceive the ignorant; but, judge according to known facts—or, knowledge acquired through scientific research or premediated, orderly thinking.

Both religion and science rest on this Christ formula for orderly, unemotional, scientific thinking which has met every test of recorded time. Every great document from the Ten Commandants and the Sermon on the Mount to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States; every great discovery, every great invention, every constructive act of every individual, group, or nation—from the time of

Moses to the present, has resulted from the application of this Christ formula for straight thinking. It is the one infallible rule we have by which to judge Germany; and its application to the activities of Hitler and the German people will convince any man of principle who is 14 years old mentally, that peace, safety, and justice can never be established in the world until Germany has been destroyed or rendered harmless.

Question. Don't you know this is a war in defense of capitalism?

Answer. It is not. It is a war in defense of freedom and against enslavement by Germany. The best the Rockefeller, Morgan, Mellon, and Du Pont families can expect in event of German victory is to become German stooges and minority stockholders in their own corporations. And, there are four American Quislings whose activities indicate they hope to be elected President in 1944—either of whom, if elected, would, under German pressure, soon see that our perennial plutes received "blocked" dollars in exchange for even their minority holdings in their own corporations.

For 40 years I have opposed and exposed the many injustices of privilege. I shall never let up on them. But, compared to the Germans, our pampered plutes are fumbling amateurs at enslaving peoples. The German people are neither better nor worse than Hitler. Led by Prussia, they are mankind's deadliest menace—a menace to all that self-respecting white men hold dear. They must be destroyed or rendered helpless and taught the wisdom of self-restraint.

Wake up, America.

CHARLES WESLEY HEARD,
EAST CHATTANOOGA.

Argentina's Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR OF JULY 11, 1941

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Friday, July 11, 1941, entitled "Argentina's Anniversary":

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 11, 1941]

ARGENTINA'S ANNIVERSARY

It is 5,216 miles from Washington to Buenos Aires, but current events have served to shorten the distance in theory if not in fact. President Roosevelt, greeting the people of the Republica Argentina during their celebration of the one hundred and twenty-fifth aninversary of their independence, declared that "during these critical times * * * it is especially heartening to participate in an eloquent expression of the unity of ideals which firmly binds" the several countries of the Western Hemisphere.

Such words would have meant little had they been uttered 50 years ago. Conditions in the world as recently as 1932 called for no particular identification of interest among the diverse communities of the Americas. Yet as far back as 1816 there were ties between the United States and the provinces of the Silver River. The constitution of Argentina, when it was adopted in 1853, showed noteworthy similarity with that framed at Philadelphia in 1783.

Generally speaking, however, only casual mutualities bound Argentina and the United States during more than a century of their parallel existence. The compelling changes in communication and transportation since the opening of the present century were necessary, it would seem, to prompt an effective fraternity in Pan America. Now, in reaction to processes more or less cataclysmic, the western half of the earth is being unified. The impact of "the challenge abroad to the Christion civilization which they cherish as a precious heritage" is apprehended by all the nations of the New World.

Resolutely faced, of course, that menace to which Mr. Roosevelt referred may prove to be a beneficial power in its constructive effects. Something was required to bring together the liberty-loving peoples of the Americas. The passing of the next few months may serve to show that evil on occasion brings forth good. Perhaps the friendship of Argentina and the United States may prove to be one of the great creative motives of the age.

Meanwhile, let there be no question about the sincerity of the good wishes extended to the citizens of the Argentine Republic on the anniversary of their separation from Spain. Their brothers, their neighbors in the United States truly entertain for them the kindliest and most generous feelings.

Unemployment Problem and W. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, when relief legislation was pending before Congress during the last few days of June, I took occasion several times to protest the cut in the amount of appropriations for the Work Projects Administration. I pointed out that while war industries had furnished additional jobs in some sections of the country, this was not true in my district. No war industries have been located in northern Minnesota, and the need for furnishing jobs for the unemployed is just as acute as ever. During the debate I indicated that a large number of people now employed on W. P. A. projects would be laid off and forced back on the county relief rolls. That is exactly what has happened. I quote from a typical letter to show just how this policy of cutting down appropriations and discontinuing W. P. A. projects is working out. The writer says, after discussing the fact that she is a widow and that she and her children were dependent on relief, and after telling me that her daughter was on a W. P. A. project:

My daughter received her lay-off notice, effective at once, the reason being that there were insufficient funds.

The writer continues—

Due to my health, I am dependent on my daughter and she certainly needs her job. She is willing to take a position in private employment, but it seems as though there isn't such a thing.

And then the writer makes this significant statement—

Seven billions for England and insufficient funds here for our needy workers who receive only $65.60 a month on which to live is incomprehensible.

I concur in the statement of this very sincere person, and I think the administration leaders committed a grave injustice on the unemployed people in this country when they refused in June to increase the amount of appropriations for W. P. A. projects. There is still time in which to rectify this error, and I hope that proper steps will be taken along those lines.

Evidently the Board of County Commissioners for St. Louis County, Minn., agrees with me in these conclusions, and I submit herewith a resolution adopted by the county board on July 7, 1941, which reads as follows:

Whereas there has been a great reduction in the W. P. A. quota for the county of St. Louis, Minn., which necessitates an increase in direct relief furnished to those who were dropped from the W. P. A. rolls; and

Whereas peculiarly the county of St. Louis has not been successful in obtaining an increase in employment under the defense program; and

Whereas the county of St. Louis has suffered an approximate 40-percent decrease in valuation for taxation purposes in the last 10 years, and it appears to this board that there will be a further reduction in valuation for the year 1942: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board goes on record petitioning President Franklin D. Roosevelt; Howard Hunter, acting W. P. A. commissioner; Congressman William A. Pittenger; and United States Senators Henrik Shipstead and Joseph H. Ball to reestablish the W. P. A. quota for St. Louis County as of June 1, 1941; be it further

Resolved, That the county auditor is hereby requested to send a copy of this resolution to each of the persons above named.

Farmer Must Obey Triple-A Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. EATON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Mark Sullivan:

FARMER SEEN WITH NO CHOICE EXCEPT TO OBEY TRIPLE A PLAN—MARK SULLIVAN DECLARES GOVERNMENT'S PROGRAM TO KEEP WHEAT PRODUCTION UNDER CONTROL HAS BECOME COMPLETELY COMPULSORY

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, July 13.—I sat in the living room of a farmer in Pennsylvania. I saw a triple A agent come in with a brief case of documents. I saw the agent hand the farmer the card, and the farmer sign the card and

pass it back to the agent. I saw the agent countersign the card and pass it back to the farmer. I heard the agent say, quite amiably and matter-of-factly: "That's your marketing card—you can sell your wheat now without any trouble."

I came back to Washington. I set out to find how come. I think I have it correct, though I can't be positive. It is not just a single statute—I could read one statute and by concentration understand it. But this is the sum of several statutes, passed at different times, and many regulations handed down by triple A. The net of all is this:

Triple A tells every farmer how many acres of wheat he may plant.

If any farmer plants more than Triple A dictates, he is fined 49 cents a bushel on the excess he raises. (Forty-nine cents is nearly half the recent price of a bushel—it is a penalty of nearly 50 percent.) Until he pays the 49 cents a bushel fine the farmer cannot sell the excess to anybody.

He is not even allowed to feed it to a steer or hog, if that steer or hog is to be sold off the farm.

He is not allowed to feed it to a cow, if the milk from that cow is to be sold off the farm.

He is not allowed to feed it to a chicken, if that chicken, or the egg thereof, is to be sold off the farm.

All he can do with the excess, if he wants to escape the fine of 49 cents a bushel, is to feed it carefully to only such steers or hogs as he and his family will eat on the farm; or to those cows whose milk and butter he and his family will eat on the farm; or to such chickens as, or the eggs thereof, he and his family will eat on the farm.

INTRICATE BOOKKEEPING

This is going to mean some pretty intricate bookkeeping on the farm. "Hey, Jim, don't feed that wheat to the red hen—we're going to sell her eggs. Feed it to the white hen—we eat her eggs. Remember what I told you—feed the wheat from the big bin to the white hen, and the wheat from the little bin to the red hen."

In order to police all this, make everybody pay his fine and catch the lawbreakers, they have a thing they call a "marketing card." Every farmer who raises wheat must have one. It is a Government license, must be signed by the local Triple A agent, and must bear also the signature of the farmer himself. No farmer, in all the United States can sell a bushel of wheat without a license to sell, signed by a Government official. Think that over. (Theoretically, a farmer who raises less than 15 acres does not need to have a marketing card. But, practically, he must—for no dealer can take the risk of buying a bushel of wheat from any farmer unless the marketing card is produced. The dealer must guard himself against "bootlegged" wheat.)

There is just one way by which the farmer can get Triple A to relieve him from paying the 49 cents per bushel fine. He can give the excess wheat away. Not give it to a neighbor—if he gives it to any neighbor or friend, he must pay the 49 cents per bushel. But he can give it to—guess whom? He can give it to Triple A. I quote from a Department of Agriculture announcement issued July 2:

"Under provisions of the wheat-marketing quota law, the farmer who produces wheat in excess of his farm quota has the choice of: (1) Paying a penalty of 49 cents a bushel on this excess; (2) storing the excess wheat in accordance with regulations, thus postponing the payment of penalty; or (3) delivering the excess to the Department of Agriculture for use in relief programs, thus avoiding payment of the penalty."

COULD PLOW UNDER WHEAT

There is, of course, another way. The farmer could plow under some of his wheat in the spring while there is still time to plant something else. I imagine some farmers must have done this.

For administering all this intricacy, measuring the farmer's acreage keeping records on him, Triple A has an immense army of agents all over the country. There is one or more in every farm community. The total throughout the country for administering the whole triple A program on all crops runs into tens of thousands.

What is the purpose of it all? To compel farmers to raise less wheat. I said "compel," and "compel" is the word. A fine of 49 cents a bushel is a good compeller. As Representative FREDERICK C. SMITH, of Ohio, put it the other day: "The Government's farm program has become completely compulsory. * * * The strong arm of the law stands over the farmer * * *."

Why does the farmer stand for it? Because he must. It is the law passed by Congress; it is part of the New Deal.

I think I have got this straight. Some of it seems incredible. But the most incredible parts of it are told me by a competent person who assures me it is "unqualifiedly 100 percent correct." If there is any error, I am sure those alert and diligent publicity men in the Department of Agriculture will correct me, and I will print the correction.

Saving America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. HOMER D. ANGELL, OF OREGON

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address I delivered before the sixth national Townsend convention at Buffalo, N. Y., June 30, 1941:

It is a very great honor, indeed, to be accorded the privilege of speaking to you assembled here in this great convention. You come from the four corners of our broad land and from all walks of life with a single determination to find a solution for our social and economic ills which threaten to destroy our democracy. As one of the Representatives in the United States Congress I embrace the opportunity to meet with you and all good American citizens having our Nation's welfare at heart, and to discuss with you the momentous problems confronting our Nation today.

My good friends, we face a grim task here in this Republic today. The loyalty and sacrifice of all of us is challenged. For over 150 years we have gone forward, building a society which stands foremost in the nations of the world as a country giving to its citizens the opportunity and the right to live and to work in peace and to enjoy unmolested the freedom, rights, and privileges only enjoyed by a free democratic society.

Now, however, we find ourselves in a world that is topsy-turvy—a world that has gone stark mad in the lust to kill, to conquer, and to destroy. As we survey the ravages of the holocaust of war sweeping over Europe and Asia, leaving only slavery, death, and chaos in its wake, we have been brought to the stern realization that we must put our own house in order, so that we may keep the ravages of war from our own shores. As a result the Congress of the United States, with hardly a dissenting vote, has authorized a preparedness program to make our country impregnable against attack. We, in the Congress, have appropriated and authorized for the coming fiscal year $48,000,000,000 for national defense. I know that you and I cannot fully appreciate the size of such a stupendous sum of money. However, the total cost of the first World War was only $60,000,000,000. The very preservation of this Nation we all love may indeed turn upon the course we take and the success that attends our efforts. We are arming for defense in a world at war.

We want to make America strong—strong to protect our country from invasion and attack from without, and equally strong to prevent the insidious inroads from within of anti-American doctrines and subversive activities; strong in our ability to stamp out and banish from our land "fifth columnists," saboteurs, "reds," and all others who seek to undermine our Government and substitute in its place false doctrines founded upon the ideologies of the Old World. America is a broad land, but there is no place, even in its far corners, to harbor any of these anti-Americans. We must either be for America or against it. In this time of peril and crisis, when the very existence of our Nation is at stake, we must see to it, you and I, that those who are against America find no refuge within our gates. There is no room in America for Quislings or Trojan horses.

We cannot escape the conclusion that the stupendous work we are doing to provide for all-out national defense may be of no avail if, in the very efforts we put forth, we fail to preserve and protect the democracy that is America—our own American way of life. We have 132,000,000 American citizens whose welfare is the first consideration of our Government. If, in our axiety to make our country impregnable, we lose sight of the welfare of the men, women, and children who are America, we will fail miserably. For 10 years—long before there was any threat or possibility of war—we have been wrestling without success with this great domestic problem, our own economic and social welfare. When the nightmare of war shall cease—and it will cease some time—this domestic problem which so far we have been unable to solve will be intensified manyfold. When the war ends we will have a Federal debt in excess of one hundred billions of dollars. When defense activities stop we will have economic chaos. We will have many millions of American citizens called home from service in our armed forces and from the defense industries without work, and we must see that they find employment in private industry. The Federal Treasury will be sucked dry, and it cannot support them. We will have the job of transforming our whole economic and social structure from a wartime basis to peace activities. When we were confronted with this World War II we had 10,000,000 unemployed, and there has been no appreciable absorption of the unemployed in other than defense activities. With the ending of the war the unemployment problem will be many times more acute than it was when our national-defense program began. Reconstruction of our economic and social structure during the post-war period will put to the test our democracy. We must meet the challenge. We must begin now to find solutions.

Our Government recently made an extensive survey and study of the incomes and economic and social welfare of our American families. Some 29,400,000 families and 10,000,000 single individuals were considered, representing over 126,000,000 American citi-

sens. This survey discloses an appalling situation in the economic condition of our people. We found that 14 percent, comprising over 4,000,000 families, had an average income of only $312 a year for an entire family; 27½ percent, more than 8,000,000 families, had an average income of $758. Two-thirds of our American families had incomes on an average of only $826 a year, or $69 a month, for an entire American family. Such a meager allowance provides only 5 cents per meal. It means undernourishment, stunted children, and disease. This demonstrates conclusively that the foremost domestic problem confronting America today is underconsumption.

America is endowed with an abundance of natural resources, the richest country on earth. It is able to produce more of the necessities of life for each and every one of its citizens than any other country on earth, and yet in the midst of plenty there is dire need. The fault is not due to production, as our factories, our broad fields, and farms are producing great quantities of foodstuffs, clothing, and the necessities of life of every kind, for which there has been no market. The Government, through huge subsidies and the surplus-commodity program, has purchased or controlled and stored great quantities of these essentials for human welfare, and yet two-thirds of our American families are in tragic need of these necessities to maintain themselves, because they are without the power to purchase them. We yearn for markets for the productive enterprise of America so that our farms may be put to work, our factories kept open, and the 10,000,000 unemployed before the war may find purchasing power, and yet right here on our doorstep in the homes of two-thirds of our American families is the greatest market of any in the world, unsupplied. The stumbling block is that these American families, deprived of the necessities of life, have been unable, under our economic and social structure, to find remunerative employment. They are without the purchasing power that would not only provide them with food and clothing and other essentials but which would in turn make markets for the huge surpluses piling up from the farms, the factories, and the workshops.

The tireless energies of the human mind have wrought unceasingly, by inventions, scientific discoveries, and new processes, to extend the scope of human activity and accomplishment in the field of technology. Through such processes has America developed the American productive system to its present marvelous perfection. In the United States today, through the use of the physical sciences and mechanical arts, the major part of the goods and services consumed are provided by scientific processes and power machinery. Our workers are able to produce a much greater volume and variety of goods than heretofore to provide food, clothing, and shelter, as well as a higher standard of life to our people. Our productive capacity per man has multiplied manyfold. In supplanting handicrafts by scientific processes and mechanical devices, a maladjustment has taken place in manpower or labor, resulting in unemployment and loss in purchasing power. The loss of purchasing power in the workers displaced has thrown the industrial machine out of balance. To restore this balance, purchasing power must be provided. Fewer workers being required in productive enterprise to supply our wants, it follows a portion of the body of workers must be retired.

Eighty-five percent of the farmer's income comes from the production of foodstuffs. We at once see that if we rid ourselves of this bottleneck in our distribution of American production, we will not only provide for this great group of American families in want, but we will provide an ample market, not only for farm production but all of the necessities of life. Twenty-five percent of our people live on farms, yet they receive only 6 percent of the total national income. The national income in the 30 years, 1909 to 1939, increased 250 percent—from twenty-six and four-tenths billion dollars to sixty-seven and six-tenths billion dollars. The farmer's cash income, however, in 1939, was approximately the same as it was in 1909, when the farmers received 16.4 percent of the total income. The farmer's average wage for his labor is from 5 to 20 cents an hour.

The United States census for 1890 shows that at that time 75 percent of all our people over 65 years of age were gainfully employed. At the present time more than 75 percent of them over 65 are not only dependent upon others for support and are not employed, but practically no persons of that age can secure a new job. Let us heed the admonition and wisdom given by Paul 19 centuries ago in his letter to the Romans, when he said: "We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves." (Romans xv: 1.)

For some 2 years now I have served on a voluntary committee of the Members of the House of Representatives seeking a solution of the problem of unemployment and the break-down of our distribution system. We have come to some definite conclusions, as follows:

With modern and scientific methods of mass production during this machine age, a large group of our citizens remain idle and are not utilized in productive enterprise. Industry has rejected and refused to employ persons 60 years of age or over. This large group of our people is elected to be retired against their will. These elder citizens who have served their time as workmen in American enterprise and have helped to build America, but now in their later years are being cast off from productive enterprise, are the ones that are entitled to retirement and to receive an annuity sufficient to maintain them in decency as befits an American citizen.

Our conclusion is that there should be adopted a Federal old-age annuity plan, universal in its application, for all citizens 60 years or over, financed by a broad tax. The amount of the annuity should be of sufficient size to permit these elder citizens to live in comfort and according to the American standards. Such a plan, we believe, would not only provide purchasing power to these elder citizens, but it would help to bring about national recovery and provide markets for American produce. Such a program would assist materially in correcting the evils of our system of distribution, and would permit all of our citizens to share equitably in the fruits of American enterprise.

In conclusion, I repeat, Let us provide for our national defense—strong and impregnable, with power on land, sea, and in the air to beat off the attacks of all who may seek to attack us. Let us dedicate this great power to the defense of America. Then let us, with equal will and power, take up the battle from within and solve our economic and social problems which bid fair to wreck our democratic way of life. We must prove that our democracy can meet this challenge, and that democracy will work. Let us retire our senior citizens on a decent annuity, put back to work our young manhood, restore the balance between production and distribution, that every American family may have gainful employment, providing the purchasing power necessary to right living according to American standards. This is all-out defense for America on all fronts and will save the American way of life.

Let you and me and every American in this tragic hour in our Nation's life, when doubt, false prophets, and propaganda are abroad in our land, keep our feet on the ground and our eyes on the stars, and, as did our fathers of old, with firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, pledge our lives and our fortunes to the one end of saving America.

After the War—What? Boom or Bust?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

ARTICLE BY BLAIR MOODY IN THE DETROIT NEWS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, here is further evidence from one of our ablest students and writers on public affairs as to the almost desperate importance of the passage at an early date of the Wagner-Voorhis resolution, to create now a commission of outstanding citizens and Members of Congress and the executive department to make sure we do not "bust" when our defense program is over, but that, instead, we establish on a sound basis a long-time answer to unemployment and related problems.

Mr. Blair Moody has written a series of articles on this subject, and as a matter of fact every one of them ought to be read by every Member of Congress. I have selected the first article of the series for inclusion here, but would like, before quoting it, to give you one paragraph from the third article in his series:

There simply haven't been enough goods to go around or, rather, there hasn't been enough money to take off the shelves the goods that could be produced. Obviously, Government spending is justified to tide over an emergency, but is it justified perpetually if nothing is being done meanwhile, to straighten out what is basically wrong?

And now here is Mr. Moody's first article in full:

[From the Detroit News of June 16, 1941]

AFTER THE WAR—WHAT? BOOM OR BUST?

(By Blair Moody)

WASHINGTON, June 16.—Obscured by the rush to arm and the pressure of imminent war, there is taking shape in the highest reaches of official Washington a sweeping shift in basic slant, a gigantic awakening to economic realism.

Nothing except the single issue of peace or war is so important to the average citizen as whether this little-publicized but rapidly spreading point of view fades or becomes the dominant pattern of the United States after the crisis. On what President Roosevelt does about this, scarcely less than what he does about the Nazis, may rest the future welfare of the American people.

For when and if Hitler is thwarted in his plan to dominate the world, the American family will have to live. There will have to be a job at a wage high enough to rent a home, or own one, and buy every month the necessities of life and a few luxuries.

Either that, or the whole structure of the country will explode in universal suffering and confusion.

For the doleful, "orthodox" economists, who have never yet found out enough about the American economy to make it function on all cylinders, are now predicting:

"After this boom there's no way to escape a bust that will make the crash of 1930–32 look like a minor dip."

And what then?

The people have served notice in three Presidential elections how they feel about closed factories, impoverished farms, and breadlines.

That bust will come, all right, if things move along the same old groove of producing only what can be sold at a predetermined high price, ballyhooing overproduction in a land where two-thirds of the families have incomes under $1,500 and therefore scarcely can be glutted with goods, and accepting as inevitable ersatz farm income and folklore finance.

But some of Mr. Roosevelt's economic realists do not concede it is necessary to plunge down that road to disaster. They think there is only one thing sure about our framework of the future—and that is that it will be different.

If we continue to accept the slow strangulation of scarcity policies, it will be worse—much worse, they say. But if this country gears itself to use its tremendous power to produce—and forces itself to lick the distribution problem which has so far bogged down in clashing self-interests and stupid preconceptions—standards of living can be immeasurably better.

A system keyed to production rather than price would, obviously, mean a terrific wrench.

It would jar the mentalities of those who do not yet realize that drastic changes have become unavoidable, that the system that has been kept alive for two decades by stimulants and opiates—the foreign loans, installment buying and credit inflation of the twenties, and the New Deal spending experiments of the thirties which never really worked until, with the war, it reached a magnitude that has now provided the clear alternative:

Use our power to produce or collapse.

Those drastic changes would not, of course, alter the basic idea of our system of incentive, initiative and profits. Their objective would be to make that system work—produce enough for a decent living for everyone who will work—so it will not be strangled by its own strictures and stupidities.

Mr. Roosevelt's progressive brain trusters—who are, by the way, not of the old New Deal hit-'em-in-the-jugular type, but liberal middle-roaders—believe that the tremendous performance of our industrial and agricultural systems in stepping up production for war provides the answer.

If we can produce for war, they ask, why not for the people? Why not to increase the standard of living in peacetime?

If Government spending on arms can make the factories whir, if the shortage of food abroad can reverse our whole "scarcity" farm plan, if the bookkeeping items that represent Uncle Sam's borrowing can increase profits and shove the national income right up through the skylight, why cannot the factories and farms be made to whir also by spending of the people—people buying to increase their own standards of living with money they earn, in the aggregate, producing those goods?

In other words, if we turn our productive power loose when the war is over and call "overproduction" by its real name, "underconsumption," why would not that provide the answer for which we have all been looking? Certainly, it could not be much worse than what seems inescapably ahead under the alternative system of "scarity!"

READJUSTMENTS AHEAD

Readjustments? Of course. But the readjustments are long overdue. The architects of this new economy point out that the rubber-stamp traditionalists who are resisting economic expansion overlook the two most important facts of the modern age.

The first is that the masses of the world are in revolution against unfair and insufficient distribution of the world's goods.

But both communism and fascism have proved, by and large, tragic for the masses themselves.

In the United States the revolution took the milder form of the New Deal, which improved conditions by stimulants and palliatives but now must make a choice that will kill the capitalistic system or cure it.

The second great "forgotten fact" is that, for the first time in history, man is able to (but doesn't) produce enough so everyone can have a decent living.

That so many millions still have living standards a thin slice above the Middle Ages not only is needless tragedy for them, but also impending disaster for those who have most to lose if our system blows up—for now that we have a system of mass production we must have mass consumption to sustain it.

The President's progressive economists assert that producing more is not a scheme to share the wealth by shearing the wealthy; its objective is to make more and gear prices, wages, and production so those who now have too little may buy and, incidentally, improve business. That, they say, is the only way capitalism can long endure.

Their text was uttered at Des Moines by HENRY A. WALLACE, probably the best economic mind in Washington, in his first speech as Vice President: "The battle of peace is to raise the living standards of the common man by distributing what we have learned to produce."

When WALLACE'S disciples have their case assembled, they'll put it to the President once more like this:

"How else can you attain that war aim you fought for long before there was a war—'freedom from want'? Fall in that and the profit system may strangle itself to death and drag down with it democracy and your other three hopes for the world—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom from fear."

The President is listening.

Importance of Air Power Calls for Independent Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, those who believe in a separate air force for the United States and those who are against the plan—all are in agreement certainly that air power is growing in importance, due in large measure to lessons coming out of the present world conflict.

GERMANY RECOGNIZED AIR POWER

Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, writing in the July issue of Flying and Popular Aviation, has the following to say:

Throughout history, new weapons have imposed new tactical principles upon the science of war making. Throughout history, too, some nations have been quicker than others to recognize and apply those principles. Because they were more alert, or simply more desperate, they have utilized the new weapon for the conquest of neighbors—if those neighbors remained muscle-bound by traditional thinking.

This familiar pattern of behavior was illustrated perfectly and with tragic results in the years preceding the present world conflict. In Germany the new weapon—air power—was being forged with great energy for all the world to see. Yet, on the other side of its frontier, France continued to live complacently in its fool's paradise of military delusions. It remained comfortable and self-satisfied behind its useless Maginot Line. France had put up a dam, and actually expected it to keep out the torrential rains of air attack from overhead.

But before we Americans speak too harshly of the blindness and inertia of France, let us take a good look at ourselves. The sad fact is that even today, with the second World War nearing the end of its second year, the United States has not yet fully recognized the new weapon and its implications for America's defense program. We build two-ocean navies in about the same spirit that France built its frontier fortifications, without reference to the new dimension of modern warfare. Not only do our air defenses remain inadequate and technically backward, but we continue to divide them between the Army and the Navy, each of which, naturally, treats aviation as a mere adjunct or extension of its own organization.

American military aeronautics, to put the matter bluntly, is still in a primitive condition—this in the country where modern aviation was born. Those of us who have grasped the meaning of genuine air power therefore have a clear duty. It is to hammer away, day and night—and even at the risk of making ourselves a nuisance—at the mind and conscience of our Nation, to awaken it somehow to the realities of the new situation.

Only air power can fight and defeat air power. The hope that antiaircraft artillery on land or on ships could meet the threat from the air has by this time been abandoned. Such artillery can keep the enemy planes at a higher altitude, thus reducing their accuracy of aim. The actual elimination, or even stalemating, of an attacking air force, however, can be achieved only by a superior air force. This principle is especially recommended to the attention of those who still like to fool themselves with theories of defensive equipment. The only defense against the menace of attack from the skies, are planes in the skies.

In a hundred ways the war has shown that all activities of military aviation must be concentrated into a single department or ministry, autonomous in its own field and directed by aviation experts. We need only think of an infantryman, or an admiral, in command of the all-air battle of Britain to see the absurdity of keeping the new weapon tethered to the older services.

Both Germany and Britain have separate air power, on a par with their respective navies and armies. With every passing week both belligerents have come to regard this independence and equality as essential. Proposals to put their air forces under command of the army or the navy would sound to them as insane. Now that the primacy of air control as the condition for any other type of fighting is apparent, it seems actually ludicrous that we should in our country still be obliged to argue the matter. With battles under way overhead, in which ground troops and naval contingents are little more than helpless onlookers, it is truly tragic that we should continue to keep American aviation subordinated to the elder services.

Those responsible for America's national security must break through the psychological restraints of inherited ideas and tackle the new realities. The American people must bring the leverage of their opinion to bear on

the situation. The problem is too important to be ignored or slurred over. Let's build for genuine air power, in line with the lessons and the warnings written big as life on the skies over this war.

AIR-BORNE TROOPS WIN BATTLE

The foregoing paragraphs are but a small part of an article which I trust will be read in its entirety. I wish to direct attention to a further discussion of this subject from an article in Military Review, published by Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans. It is called Men Descending From the Clouds and is by Lt. Col. Leo Donovan and Lt. J. J. Gleason, United States Army:

Benjamin Franklin in 1783 wrote: "Five thousand balloons, capable of raising 2 men each, could not cost more than 5 ships of the line; and where is the prince who can afford so to cover his country with troops for its defense as that 10,000 men descending from the clouds might not in many places do an infinite deal of mischief before a force could be brought together to repel them?"

There is nothing new except what is forgotten, so the saying goes, and certainly it applies to the case of air-borne troops.

On the 10th of May 1940 and the days immediately succeeding, the world was startled by news of military developments which seemed well-nigh beyond credence. * * * Fantastic developments were happening. The renowned and powerful fortress of Eben-Emael, key of the Belgian defense lines guarding the Meuse and the Albert Canal, a gun-studded mass of masonry which loomed proof alike against bombs, artillery, tanks, shock troops and gas, had fallen within a few hours of the time the attack began. Scores of miles behind the Dutch defensive positions, which had not as yet been successfully penetrated, the airports of Rotterdam were in the hands of the foe, vital bridges had fallen to the invader and savage assaults were being launched upon the invirons of The Hague by gray-clad infantrymen. A startling technique was being employed by Germany—a new "Angriffsmittel" the Reichswehr called it—a "secret weapon" the headlines proclaimed.

As a matter of fact, save in an applicatory sense, there was nothing new and nothing secret about what was being done. Simply, the situation was that air-borne troops—parachute troops and air-landing infantry—were functioning for the first time on a large scale in actual warfare. "Vertical envelopment" had arrived and was passing a practical test.

The nature of air-borne troops and of their organization and equipment, the principles applying to the way in which they could be successfully used, had been the subject of study at one time or another during the last 10 years by the armies of Russia, Germany, Italy, France, England, and the United States.

There is a wide gap, however, between military theory and experiment, however sound, and the actual appreciation of a new technique by the conservative body of armies at large. Only the German Army seems to have carried through seriously in the matter of a parachute and air-landing forces. Russia, to whom goes the credit of having pioneered boldly in the field, seems in late years to have been seized by doubt of the new method's validity. Other armies appear to have dabbled in it, but to have regarded it, in the final analysis, as a sort of spectacular military sideshow rather than as a practical way of winning wars. So Germany got the jump on the rest of the world.

In the air-borne operation we find a dynamic technique, new at least in the sense that it has gone hitherto unappreciated. Its practical worth, its lightninglike power, have been indisputably settled. Yet its potentialities have only begun to reveal themselves. Does it not behoove us, then, to master this technique of the sky in our own laboratory of military study and experiment? Should the air-landing force, after all, be a type unit, specially trained for its work? If so, what will be the composition of such an organization? How will it be trained? For what missions will it be employed? Can new weapons be found to add to its powers? The army that answers such questions may be well repaid for its effort.

SEPARATE AIR FORCE NEEDED NOW

Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with Owen L. Scott, writing in the Sunday Washington, D. C. Star, when he says:

Every development in this war suggests that the airplane is the weapon that will decide the presently disputed issue of world control. Experience in Russia is only confirming the lesson written over Poland and France and Britain, as well as over the Atlantic and the South Pacific.

Control of the air over Britain will determine whether that island is invaded. Control of the air over the Atlantic will determine whether Britain will starve. Air control over the South Pacific will decide whether Japan dares to venture in that direction. Given air control, China could turn the tables on Japan.

These now accepted conclusions provide the one lesson of the present war that cannot be mistaken. The question is whether the United States is learning the lesson and, if so, whether it is applying it in practice. The answer is that the United States certainly has learned the lesson and is beginning to apply it in practice.

The Germans, who have led the world in development of air strategy and in airplane development for military purposes, say there are only two areas in the world with the resources adequate for development of air dominance. Those areas are the United States and Russia. Germany may be seeking in Russia those resources in metals and in lubricants and fuel which a really vast airplane development requires. The United States has everything at hand for development of its own air power—from the materials to the skills and abilities.

However, like any nation that is inclined to be fairly content with its lot, the United States was slow to turn its attention to development of military and naval aviation on a vast scale. This fact gave Germany and, to some extent, Japan, a chance to forge ahead temporarily in the actual building of military aircraft.

The writer goes on to say:

There remains the question of whether the American Army and Navy are prepared to get the most that they can out of the airplanes that American industry is equipped to build.

Aviators are almost a unit in arguing that the potential air power of the country never will be developed adequately until aviation is recognized as a separate military force—as the Army and Navy now are recognized.

Hitler gave his air force full head. Results are to be seen in the conquest of all of Europe. But Hitler hasn't been able, with everything he has, to conquer the British Isles owing to their air defense. This means that the United States still has time to bring its potential air power to bear in the present struggle. Similarly, the Japanese, with their production of 250 planes a month, will not be able to overcome the Chinese or to conquer in the South Pacific before American air power can be felt.

It is this country's opportunity to develop its air strength to gain ascendancy in a world in which distances are shrinking and in which air power is becoming dominant.

AL WILLIAMS PREACHES AIR STRENGTH

My colleagues, there can be no doubt that this Nation must continue to turn its attention to strengthening our air force. We need to preach this doctrine over and over again, just as Maj. Al Williams does so dramatically and factually daily in his newspaper column. There are others who are doing a fine work in this fight. Let us cooperate in telling the story to all our people.

The President as the Maker of High Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following article by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Saturday, July 12, 1941:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 12, 1941]

THE PRESIDENT AS A MAKER OF HIGH POLICY

(By Walter Lippmann)

In a more perfect world no great action involving war and peace would ever be taken by the President without first obtaining the explicit approval of Congress. We have never had a President, it is fair to say, who would not have preferred to obtain prior authorization from Congress rather than to act on his own responsibility and depend upon a subsequent ratification or on some kind of tacit assent.

The whole action of the Government would be immensely stronger, and, therefore, in the end less costly if this procedure could be followed.

But as a matter of historic fact, none of the decisive developments of American policy has ever obtained prior authorization from Congress. The historic moves which mark the rise of the United States as a great power have all of them been decided upon by the President and initiated by Executive action. Congress did not authorize Jefferson to make the Louisiana Purchase, and Jefferson at least thought that if he went first to Congress he would either fail to get the authorization or would lose the chance to obtain Louisiana: "A John Randolph (the Burton Wheeler of that time) would," said Jefferson, "find means to protract the proceedings on it by Congress until the ensuing spring, by which time new circumstances would change the mind of the other party."

The basic foreign policy of the United States, namely the Monroe Doctrine, was announced in a Presidential message to Congress. The doctrine was a direct challenge to the purposes of all the great powers of the continent of Europe and, if the challenge was accepted, it committed this country to war as a belligerent partner of Great Britain. There was no prior authorization by Congress, nor even a subsequent ratification. Yet the Monroe Doctrine has stood for more than a century as the central purpose of American foreign policy, approved today by those who

call themselves isolationists as well as by the rest of the Nation.

The Mexican War had begun, and two big battles had been fought, before Congress acted. In the Civil War Lincoln acted 10 weeks before there was a vote in Congress, and it is by no means certain that Lincoln would have obtained authority from Congress if, instead of acting to save the Union, he had invited a debate. These are the facts of experience, disconcerting as they are to our ideas of how representative government ought to work. Nor was that the end of it. The two most far-reaching developments of American foreign policy in the period between the Civil War and the first World War were the establishment of an American interest in the Far East and the construction of the Panama Canal. Neither of these momentous actions had the prior authorization of Congress.

Yet every one of these great measures which have shaped the very life of the Nation—its territorial limits and its place in this hemisphere and its position in the world—have been decided upon by the President and set in motion by his orders. The Louisiana Purchase, the Monroe Doctrine, the Mexican War, the preservation of the Union, the Far Eastern policy, the Panama Canal, not to mention the expulsion of Napoleon III from Mexico and the stabilization of the Caribbean, we owe to the fact that successive Presidents have done what they deemed necessary and expedient, relying upon their constitutional powers in the conduct of foreign relations and as Commander in Chief.

It is an abuse of language to describe this time-honored procedure as "dictatorship" or to profess to believe that measures which conform with the practice of our greatest Presidents for a century and a half are somehow a novel usurpation of power. The truth of the matter is, and all our experience proves it, that in these largest questions the President, who is elected by the whole people, more truly represents the Nation than do legislators elected by relatively small constituencies.

Jefferson had a better mandate from the people than John Randolph, a Congressman from Roanoke, Va. Time has proved that Jefferson was right, as it has proved that Monroe and Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt were right when, faced with momentous decisions, they took the decisions rather than risk the consequences of the obstructive delays of the filibustering minorities in Congress.

It is unfortunate that they had to choose between the imperative interests of the Nation and the ideals of a harmonious collaboration with Congress. But almost invariably they have had to make this hard choice, the reason being that the Senate of the United States has a set of rules and customs which prevent collaboration.

The rules of the Senate today, like the rules of the House before they were reformed, create the condition described by former Speaker Reed when he said that the "only way to do business inside the rules is to suspend the rules. * * * The object of the rules appears to be to prevent the transaction of business."

This lamentable state of affairs cannot be remedied merely by insisting that the President go to Congress for specific authority whenever he deems an action necessary or expedient. There have been occasions, and they have been among the most critical in our history, when the duty to act transcended the duty to obtain prior authority from Congress. It is true that some Presidents have managed to keep closer to Congress than have others. It is certainly true that Mr. Roosevelt would be better off if he kept the responsible leaders of Congress more thoroughly informed.

But the fact remains that there are in every Congress men who cannot be consulted, because they refuse to treat any information as confidential, and no delicate diplomatic policy, much less a military measure, can be conducted successfully in the newspaper headlines. The minority who will not act responsibly disrupt all intimacy between the branches of the Government. This fact, plus the fact that the rules of the Senate are a license to obstruction and filibustering, have made Congress virtually unable to take a deciding part in the formation of great policy. It is too bad. But there is no remedy for it unless there is a reform in the rules of the Senate or in the practices of a handful of Senators.

The Grange's Part in the Building of the United States Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NATIONAL GRANGE MONTHLY

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the July issue of the National Grange Monthly contained a very interesting and instructive article on the part played by the National Grange in originating and developing the United States Department of Agriculture. This article was written by Mr. Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the Grange, and I feel it will be of interest to every farmer and to everyone who is interested in farming.

The article follows:

[From the National Grange Monthly of July 1941]

Among the foremost legislative projects of the Grange in its early days was that which called for Cabinet rank for the Department of Agriculture. The story of the leading part played by the Grange in this successful campaign, covering a period of nearly 15 years, is one that deserves to be retold during this diamond jubilee year of the organization. Strange as it may seem the work of the Department of Agriculture had its origin in the Patent Office of the United States. It was in 1835, 106 years ago, that Henry L. Ellsworth, of Connecticut, was appointed as Commissioner of Patents by President Andrew Jackson. From his youth Ellsworth was deeply interested in agriculture and from 1804 to 1806, when he was still in his early teens, he conducted a column in the Connecticut Courant called the Farmers' Repository.

Prior to 1835, he traveled in the prairie States and became convinced that they had great agricultural possibilities. He therefore began to purchase for himself and others large tracts of public land in the region from Michigan to Iowa. The problem concerning the most profitable crops to grow on these lands, and the need of improved implements for their culture and harvest, were never absent from his mind.

When the Hartford County Agricultural Society was formed in 1817, Ellsworth was chosen as its secretary, and among his publications was an address which he delivered before the society March 24, 1818. In this he stated that one of the objects of the society was "to aid them [the farmers] in their labors, by the introduction of new seeds and implements of husbandry, and by the distribution of the most valuable publications on agricultural subjects." It is, therefore, easy to understand why Ellsworth was profoundly interested in the Patent Office, which held the numerous and constantly growing records and models of inventions of agricultural implements and processes.

NEW SEEDS AND PLANTS DISTRIBUTED

As Commissioner of Patents, Ellsworth immediately began to collect from various sources new and valuable varieties of seeds and plants, and to distribute these with the aid of Congressmen and others. Naval officers, consuls, and private citizens traveling abroad were frequently bringing to this country seeds and plants which might be used in our agriculture, but which were largely lost because there was no agency for their preservation and distribution. In his report for 1837, Ellsworth therefore suggested the creation of a public depository for such articles "whence they may be dispensed to every part of the Union."

This part of the Commissioner's report was referred to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, together with a resolution on this subject, introduced on March 5, 1838. Two days later Congressman Joseph F. Randolph, of New Jersey, made a report from this committee favoring the project recommended by Ellsworth. He also introduced a bill appropriating $5,000 to create "an agricultural depository" in the Patent Office and to provide "a clerk to be denominated the agriculturist, at $1,600 and two laborers." The report of the committee called attention to the embarassment which had resulted from the loss of seeds and plants stored in customhouses and elsewhere, which had been brought to this country in obedience to a Treasury circular of September 6, 1827, requiring consuls to collect and transmit seeds and plants, information regarding climate, soil, propagation, cultivation, insect pests, and uses, and agricultural literature. The Secretary of the Navy had asked naval officers to assist in this work.

Congress did not pass this bill, and the efforts made by Ellsworth to aid agriculture without authority from Congress aroused some criticism. This led to a letter from the chairman of the House Committee on Patents January 21, 1839, asking for information "relative to the collection and distribution of seeds and plants; also the practicability of obtaining agricultural statistics."

In his reply, Commissioner Ellsworth defended the work he had done to aid agriculture and asked for a small appropriation from the patent fund for seed distribution, in order that he might be relieved from expenses already becoming onerous to himself individually. He also expressed a willingness to collect and report agricultural statistics.

In the Appropriation Act of March 3, 1839, Congress allocated from the funds granted to the Patent Office the sum of $1,000 for the collection of statistics and for other agricultural purposes. Since agricultural inquiries were included in taking the census of 1840, the Patent Office spent very little of its appropriation for that purpose.

In 1840 more than 30,000 packages of seed were distributed. That year Commissioner Ellsworth urged the importance of an annual report of the state of the crops in different sections as a preventive against monopoly and a good criterion to calculate the state of exchange.

In 1841 the Commissioner of Patents stated that the plan of making a complete collec-

tion of agricultural implements used, both in this and foreign countries, and the introduction of foreign seeds, was steadily pursued.

In this report, Ellsworth strongly urged the importance of the application of the sciences, particularly chemistry, to agriculture. The analysis of soils and the extraction of oil and sugar from corn were cited as examples of the benefit to agriculture from chemical investigations. The appointment of a single clerk to collect agricultural statistics was also suggested.

ELLSWORTH RESIGNS AS COMMISSIONER

Commissioner Ellsworth resigned in 1845, and the report of the Patent Office for that year was prepared under the direction of his successor, Edmund Burke, a native of Vermont, who practiced law in New Hampshire, from which State he had served as a Representative in Congress. This was a document of 1,184 pages, nearly 1,100 of which were devoted to statistics and miscellaneous information on agricultural subjects. Much space was given to potato diseases. Because of the growing volume of business relating to patents, and dissatisfaction with the use of the patent funds for agricultural purposes, Commissioner Burke suggested that Congress make a special appropriation for the agricultural work of the Patent Office. The result was that Congress made no appropriation for such work in 1846. There was, therefore, no report for that year.

In 1847, more than 60,000 packages of seeds were distributed from the Patent Office, including some contributed by the French Minister of Agriculture and Commerce. In his report for that year, Commissioner Burke said that a new era seemed to be opening in agricultural education with a beginning of instruction related to agriculture at Yale, Harvard, and in Ohio. He expressed the thought that lecturers could do much to diffuse agricultural knowledge. It was not until many years afterward that the farmers' institutes were established, which in turn have been largely superseded by the Agricultural Extension Service.

Under the act of March 3, 1849, creating the Department of the Interior, the Patent Office was transferred to that Department. That year Thomas Ewbank became Commissioner of Patents. Devoted to literary and scientific pursuits, Ewbank delegated to Daniel Lee, editor of the Genesee Farmer of New York, the preparation of the agricultural part of the report of the Patent Office.

Dr. Lee emphasized the importance of agricultural education, on the ground that a scientific knowledge of agriculture is essential as a basis for improved practice and conservation of fertility of the soil. He held that along with the things needed to help agriculture were studies which would aid in the control of insect pests and plant diseases; analysis of soils, marls and fertilizers; improvements in dairy animals; better methods of preserving agricultural products used for food; distribution of better seeds and plants; and the more thorough collection of agricultural statistics with the aid of States and counties.

There can be no doubt that much valuable work was done through the agency of the Patent Office, in the dissemination of information relating to agriculture and particularly in the distribution of improved varieties of seeds and plants. In recognition of the growing importance of this work, there was a demand that a separate bureau or agency be created to look after it.

CONGRESS CREATES NEW DEPARTMENT

Accordingly, on May 13, 1862, Congress passed a bill creating the Department of Agriculture, which was approved by President Lincoln on May 15. However, the Department so created was merely a little bureau, headed by the Commissioner of Agriculture, who had no seat in the President's Cabinet.

The first Commissioner of Agriculture was Isaac Newton, who was promoted on July 1, 1862, from his position as chief of the agricultural section of the Patent Office. Newton was a successful and progressive farmer of Delaware County, Pa. He continued to serve as Commissioner of Agriculture until 1867, the year of his death.

Particular interest attaches to Newton's name in Grange circles, for it was he who commissioned Oliver Hudson Kelley, then a clerk in the Department, to make a survey of agricultural conditions in the South immediately after the Civil War. As is well known, it was while engaged in this enterprise that Kelley first conceived the plan that led to the establishment of the Grange.

In developing the Department of Agriculture, Commissioner Newton kept in view the plan which had been outlined about 20 years before by Jesse Buell, as follows: (1) Collection and dissemination of statistical and other useful information relating to agriculture; (2) collecting and distributing seeds and plants for use in this and other countries; (3) answering inquiries of farmers and others on all matters relating to agriculture; (4) testing by experiment implements, cereals, seeds, and plants; (5) chemical analysis of soils, grains, fruits, plants, vegetables, and manures, and publication of results; (6) establishing professorships of botany and entomology; (7) establishing an agricultural library and museum. While the Department today has a suitable library, it still lacks anything resembling an adequate museum.

The initial appropriation for the Department was $60,000, to which was added on March 3, 1863, a deficiency appropriation of $20,000. For the fiscal year 1867 the appropriation for agriculture was $199,100.

APPOINTMENT OF WILLIAM SAUNDERS

In 1862, soon after becoming Commissioner of Agriculture, Newton called to Washington William Saunders, a leading horticulturist and landscape gardener, for consultation in laying out the Department grounds and planning its horticultural work. Saunders was appointed botanist and superintendent of the propagating gardens, and served in the Department for 38 years, or until his death in 1900.

Very few men have had better preparation for their life work than William Saunders had. He came of a family of noted gardeners and throughout his early life he enjoyed exceptional opportunities to study botany, horticulture, and landscape gardening in Scotland, his native country. To an excellent general education, he added besides a course in horticulture in Edinburgh College and several years' training in practical gardening.

He came to the United States in 1848, and engaged in gardening on an estate at New Haven, Conn. Immediately he began to contribute articles to Hovey's Magazine of Horticulture and wrote much for other journals. In 1854 he entered into a partnership with Thomas Meehan at Germantown, Pa., and the firm built up a large business in horticulture and landscape gardening. He was broadly interested in all phases of rural life. In 1855 he published suggestions for farm organizations, with features like those of the Grange, and is well known. In 1867 he was one of the founders of the Grange and became the first master of the National Grange.

Under Saunders' direction, the Department's propagating garden was used during Commissioner Newton's administration for growing grapes, pears, strawberries, gooseberries, grain, and vegetables. A glass house for orchard fruits was erected, and in 1865 a greenhouse with a section for tropical plants was built.

CONDUCTED ON MODEST SCALE

The modest scale upon which the Department was conducted may be gathered from a letter written by Commissioner Newton's successor, Horace Capron, on January 13, 1868, to Schuyler Colfax, of New York, Speaker of the House of Representatives. It was in part:

"For the purpose of a better organization of the clerical and other necessary force of the office, I would respectfully recommend that the act of Congress approved March 15, 1862, establishing the Department, be amended by supplementary legislation, so as to fix and define the disposition of its officers, as follows, that is to say: One statistician, one entomologist, one chemist, one assistant chemist, one superintendent of seed room, one librarian, one disbursing and auditing officer, three clerks of the fourth class, four clerks of the third class, six clerks of the second class, seven clerks of the first class, five copyists and attendants on museum, one chief messenger, two assistant messengers, two workmen, and six laborers."

NATIONAL GRANGE LEADS FIGHT

The movement which led to the establishment of the Department of Agriculture was in no sense a manufactured demand. It was spontaneous and came up from the grass roots. As the first general farm organization of the country, the Grange made articulate the demand that the activities of the Department of Agriculture should be expanded and that the head of the Department should be given Cabinet rank. It was at the tenth annual session of the National Grange, held at the Palmer House, in Chicago, in 1876, that M. G. Davie, master of the Kentucky State Grange, introduced resolutions bearing on this subject.

These resolutions were unanimously adopted, and the campaign to raise the Department of Agriculture to Cabinet rank got under way in real earnest. One of the chief promoters of the plan in Congress was D. Wyatt Aiken, of South Carolina, who was one of the most active backers of the Grange in the South in the early days, and who served as a member of the executive committee of the National Grange from 1873 to 1885.

CONSTITUTIONALITY QUESTIONED

While most Members of Congress expressed themselves as being in hearty sympathy with any plan calculated to improve agricultural conditions, there were those who had doubts regarding the constitutionality of the proposal that the Department of Agriculture should be raised to Cabinet rank.

Up to that time, the seven executive departments of the Government that had been created, State, Treasury, War, Justice, Post Office, Navy, and Interior, bore the same relationship to all the people. It was, therefore, argued in certain quarters that to create an executive department for one particular group, those engaged in agriculture, would be class legislation, and therefore unconstitutional.

It was likewise contended with some degree of justification that if agriculture was entitled to a seat in the President's Cabinet, industry and labor should be accorded equal recognition. There were those who advocated that any new department which might be created should contain separate bureaus, charged with promoting the interests of agriculture, industry, labor, transportation, and business. But that did not suit the farmers. They argued that agriculture was justly entitled to a department of its own, while carefully refraining from saying or doing anything to offend or alienate any of the other groups in our national life.

The attitude of the farmers of the country with reference to this matter was well expressed in an address delivered by Norman J. Colman, Commissioner of Agriculture, at a meeting of the National Grange at Lansing, Mich., in 1887. He said he would not favor any change in the rank of the Department "unless it could be kept for agriculture alone." Numerous petitions to Congress from State granges and others interested in the matter took the same position.

After many abortive efforts, a bill raising the Department of Agriculture to Cabinet rank was passed by the House of Representatives under suspension of the rules May 21, 1888, by vote of 236 to 13.

As this bill passed the House, it contained a section transferring the Signal Service of the United States Army to the Department of Agriculture. Those opposing such a transfer argued that the Signal Corps was composed of enlisted men of the United States Army. "Should the Secretary of Agriculture, a civilian, be permitted to command a unit of the Army?" was one of the questions that was asked. "Who is going to maintain discipline or punish desertion?" was another embarrassing question.

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND APPROVES BILL

Not wishing to jeopardize the chances of the bill, the friends of the measure in the Senate struck out this particular section and the bill passed without a record vote on September 21, 1888. After a long fight, the House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment on February 1, 1889, and the bill was signed by President Grover Cleveland on February 9.

The following year Congress passed a separate act establishing the Weather Bureau in the Department of Agriculture, effective July 1, 1891. Norman J. Colman, of Missouri, was appointed by President Cleveland as the first Secretary of Agriculture, and he served in that capacity until March 4, 1889, when the administration changed.

Colman was founder and first president of the Missouri Horticultural Society, president of the Missouri Live Stock Breeders' Association, and the publisher of Colman's Rural World. He was likewise an active member of the Grange.

WORTHY MASTER BRIGHAM COMMENTS

Referring to the influence exerted by the Granges throughout the country in raising the Department of Agriculture to Cabinet rank, Col. J. H. Brigham, of Ohio, master of the National Grange, had this to say in his annual address at the twenty-third session, held at Sacramento, Calif., in November 1889:

"For several years we have sought to secure the elevation of the Department of Agriculture, and annually my predecessors have reported the failure of a measure introduced in Congress for that purpose. Repeated failures did not discourage us. The scoffs and sneers of opponents—some of them farmers—only caused us to reform our lines and return to the field where we had met defeat. It is my privilege at this session to report that our perseverance has been rewarded. The chief of the Department of Agriculture will henceforth be a trusted adviser of the President, a position from which he can at all times secure a recognition of the chief industry of our country and through the Executive make such recommendations to Congress as the interests of agriculture may demand."

Fifty-two years have gone by since the Department of Agriculture was made an executive department of the Government. During this period, 12 Secretaries have presided over the Department, all but 2 of them coming from the Middle West. Their names and the States from which they were appointed are as follows:

Norman J. Colman, Missouri; Jeremiah M. Rusk, Wisconsin; J. Sterling Morton, Nebraska; James Wilson, Iowa; David F. Houston, Texas; Edwin T. Meredith, Iowa; Henry C. Wallace, Iowa; Howard M. Gore, West Virginia; W. M. Jardine, Kansas; Arthur M. Hyde, Missouri; Henry A. Wallace, Iowa; and Claude R. Wickard, Indiana.

Space forbids any attempt to mention even briefly the widespread ramifications and the manifold activities of the Department of Agriculture as it is constituted today. That the scientific work conducted by the Department has been of inestimable value to agriculture cannot be doubted. Its far-flung regulatory work simply reflects the growing complexity of our modern civilization.

If the Department has shown a tendency to become top-heavy during recent years, it is sufficient to say that this is a characteristic that distinguishes practically all the other departments of the Federal Government.

The Idea of a University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

ADDRESS OF DR. PAUL F. DOUGLASS, PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address given to the faculty of the School of Social Sciences and Public Affairs of the American University by Dr. Paul F. Douglass, president of that institution. I believe that Dr. Douglass's conception of the idea of a university should be read by all those interested in the part which higher education must play in our present world chaos of ideas and values.

The address follows:

A university is a voluntary human association for the communication, circulation, and cultivation of knowledge. It is a fellowship of generations; not merely of master and student, representing two generations, but of a timeless and immortal unseen comradeship in that infinite continuum of perplexity and achievement which we call culture and which is the cumulative bequest of time to eternity. It is a place, as Cardinal Newman so well said, "where inquiry is pushed forward, and discoveries verified and perfected, and rashness rendered innocuous, and error exposed, by the collision of mind with mind, and knowledge with knowledge."

A university is life moving in the stream of time, with points of reference and dimensioned obligations. John Dewey explains the process (for a university is certainly a process) by saying that "we who now live are parts of a humanity that extends into the remote past—a humanity that has interacted with nature. The things in civilization we prize most are not of ourselves. They exist by the grace of the doings and sufferings of the continuous human community in which we are a link. Ours is the responsibility of conserving, transmitting, rectifying, and expanding the heritage of values we have received that those who come after us may receive it more solid and secure, more widely accessible and more generously shared than we have received it."

I do not like to say that the function of a university is to teach. We are all aware that the university in the beginning was actually an apprenticeship. The emphasis was always on the student's ambition to learn; to learn by becoming an intimate part of a voluntary human association existing for the communication, circulation, and cultivation of knowledge. There is, of course, a continuing ethic in such an association. Any master who is worthy of his calling pours forth his wares to his apprentice as a missionary, because he sees in the maturing generation a bearer of culture which must transmit a heritage of values to be made more widely accessible and more generously shared.

Here and there in the intellectual history of the Occident there have on some few occasions been produced, and I use the passive voice, seminal groups from which new lines of thought and values have emanated and which have created a contagious environment of discriminating inquiry and coherent statement. That discriminating inquiry and coherent statement is a function of the total situation and the totality of the group. Such seminal groups cannot be hired; they cannot be planned; they cannot be coerced. They seem merely to exist and to appear as full-blown gifts of God.

When a university does become such a seminal fellowship, the university becomes a life of free and enriching communion and is a cooperative means for the progressive attainment of significant personalities. In the intimate face-to-face relationships of these local communities, logic, as John Dewey says, "recurs to the primitive sense of the word. Dialog. Ideas which are not communicated, shared, and reborn in expression are but soliloquy, and soliloquy is but broken and imperfect thought. There is no limit to the liberal expansion and confirmation of limited personal intellectual endowment which may proceed from the flow of social intelligence when that circulates by word of mouth from one to another in the communications of the local community. We lie, as Emerson said, 'in the lap of an immense intelligence.'"

I am fearful for our culture only when social inquiry is stifled in soliloquy and when the liberal expansion of limited personal intellectual endowment is stymied and when the flow of social intelligence is dammed up by the power of the police, which can be either a uniformed squadron or a state of mind. I am fearful for our culture in America because I am observant of the retarding effect of the power of police, defined as a state of mind, which is now inhibiting the flow of social intelligence.

We are suffering in American education and in American culture from intellectual and spiritual astigmatism. Our minds do not quite bring things to focus and as a result our vision is indistinct and the images by which our minds operate and our hearts beat are blurred and imperfect. Our action is adjusted to our distorted sight. The result is that we have too few university comradeships which exist as contagious environments of discriminating inquiry and coherent statement. We are surrounded by practitioners of intellectual and political homeopathy.

For a time we had reason to believe here in America that our social science was moving in the direction of a functional realism possessed with the spirit of ethical revolution and social reconstruction. We are disappointingly witnessesing, however, the renaissance of mysticism in the university world. This intellectual mysticism, on the one hand, as emotion sinks below the level of mind and, on the other, as an intellectual theology transcends the level of mind.

John Dewey is quite correct when he says that "if external authority in action is given up, it must be because internal authority of truth, discovered and known to reason, is substituted. It is because we are appalled by the tremendous responsibility incumbent upon us who are willing to submit ourselves to this internal authority of truth that we, in our weakness, are all too often ready to relinquish it for the deadening substance of an external authority and dogma. To me, the faith for which the American university stands is just this willingness to submit ourselves to the discipline and the responsibility of this internal authority of truth, projected in the spirit of ethical revolution to the ends of social reconstruction.

I have only this to say to the scholars who are joined together here in this comradeship this noon: May this be our collective endeavor—to sustain a genuine university as a voluntary human association for the communication, circulation, and cultivation of knowledge; as a place where inquiry is pushed forward, and discoveries verified and perfected, and rashness rendered innocuous, and error exposed, by the collision of mind with mind, and knowledge with knowledge; as a contagious environment of discriminating inquiry and coherent statement; as a seminal fellowship in whose free and enriching communion by cooperative means significant personalities are nurtured; as a school of functional realism possessed with the spirit of ethical revolution and social reconstruction; as a comradeship subjecting itself to the discipline of accepting the responsibility of the internal authority of truth, discovered and known to reason; as a contagious environment in which the patterns of culture are brought to bear on the behavior of the individual for the release of collaborative and constructive intelligence.

It is our good fortune to be united in a program of cooperation in a new Dark Age; in the Capital City of the world where what flickering light still shines sheds its rays upon intimate groups of men who possess in quality and quantity a more vital conception of the dynamics of human fellowship than exists elsewhere in our world. The problems of human management, to which our school is now dedicated, are the real issues of our age; and we are surrounded and counseled and sustained by a society of souls concerned with making an inner truth, guided by a knowledge of the past and fortified by reflective choice, the power by which we shall transmit to other generations refined tools of hand and mind and strengthened and redeemed powers of the heart to make man worthy of the image in which he has been created.

I wish only to add this testimony in closing. For the second time in my life I have been thrown intimately in association in a common enterprise with Leon C. Marshall, chairman of our faculty. At Chicago he was reaching for something in the content and technique of education which could not be attained in the field of economics in Chicago. A mighty array of volumes bear witness to his quest. At Johns Hopkins he was still in quest of something in the content and technique of human society which could not be attained in the field of jurisprudence in Baltimore. A library of statistical monographs, which some day will be restudied and their resources discovered, bears witness to his pilgrimage.

The aspiration which was young at Chicago, the dream which dwelt at Hopkins, is now in Washington among us in the maturity of a life. Perhaps I am presumptuous to seek to state it, but I believe the dream, which was spiritual, was merely this: That by discriminating inquiry and coherent statement the past experience of mankind can be brought to bear upon the present conduct of the individual so that man can make his contribution by the understanding of himself and his world to his neighbor and to posterity. It is our fortune now to share in the fruition of that dream in the maturity of Dean Marshall's scholarship and leadership. It is our duty to play our part in this vital reconstruction of the ways of knowledge of world and self for the achievement of an ordered society and a disciplined soul.

Plight of Small Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE TYLER (TEX.) COURIER-TIMES

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I think the comments contained in the following editorial published in the Tyler Courier-Times, under date of June 6, 1941, are very timely. The authorities of our Government should give immediate consideration to the problems and difficulties facing small industries. That every small industry suitable for utilization for national-defense purposes should be in use admits of no question.

[From the Tyler (Tex.) Courier-Times of June 6, 1941]

PLIGHT OF SMALL INDUSTRIES

The Nation is just beginning to realize the seriousness of one of the problems presented by the huge defense effort. This is the plight of hundreds of small nondefense industries whose operations have been greatly curtailed if not wholly stopped by the demands of the armament program.

Without the testimony of one O. P. M. official, in the defense contract division, it would be easy to see the effect of priorities on little plants which find themselves unable to get the raw materials necessary for production. Now, it is predicted that about one-third of the Nation's industries will be seriously affected by midsummer, some of them perhaps forced to shut down.

There is a growing belief that a system of subcontracts should be encouraged. The more large orders are farmed out to small industries, the easier it will be to cushion the economic shock of priorities. And many factories now engaged in making nondefense articles can be converted to some line related to defense. Some have already made the adjustment, thereby assuring for themselves the privilege of priorities.

The Federal Government cannot permit a large part of the capital investment of the Nation to be destroyed unnecessarily. Although military needs come first, the distribution of the work and the profits over a large area can be promoted by official action. New lines of manufacture can be recommended.

Unless this job is done and done well, the collapse of many small businesses will have far-reaching effect. Idle machinery means idle men, especially if they are not fitted for defense work.

France Forever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 15 (legislative day of Monday, July 14), 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. HAROLD L. ICKES, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, in New York City on Monday night, July 14.

This address of Secretary Ickes so thoroughly and completely expresses my opinion and conviction on the subject matter with which it deals that I commend the address very highly to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today free Frenchmen everywhere are celebrating Bastille Day just as 10 days ago free Americans everywhere renewed their devotion to their country and its institutions.

Independence Day for Americans commemorates the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. That revered document, written by Jefferson, whose firm friendship for the French people I need not elaborate upon, is still in physical existence—the most cherished exhibit in the keeping of the Nation. Bastille Day, on the other hand, is celebrated, not only by the French but also by lovers of liberty everywhere, precisely because the Bastille no longer exists.

French liberties sprang from the destruction of a physical symbol that represented oppressions and terrors that the French people had suffered for centuries.

Today, unhappily, France lies crushed. Some may think that France will never rise again. But these think wrongly. Their conclusion is not based upon a just estimate of the French will to liberty and the determination of its people that France shall rise again as she has in the past.

You could not have chosen a better title for your organization, or a more inspiring battle cry, than "France Forever." France Forever may be parsed as either past, present, or future. For France has been forever. And France lives today. Even in lovely Paris, where the Nazi war lords scornfully regard the Parisians as inferior human beings, France lives and will continue to live.

That it should be France Forever is also the determination of America. No country has contributed more to the civilization that we enjoy and in which we delight than has France. France has given the world some of its greatest scientists and scholars and artists. It was France that first developed and then generously shared with mankind the arts of civilized living. Not since ancient Greece—and perhaps not even then—has there been any land comparable to France.

Such a country cannot die. Americans who owe so much to France will help her to regain her independence.

On the face of it, France was defeated on the field of battle, but that is neither the whole nor the real story. French soldiers, than whom there are no braver in the world, fought with their usual courage, but their real foe was not military. Their actual enemy was treachery, lying words, and subversive activity. French newspapers, with few exceptions, spoke falsely to them, lulling the French people into an illusory sense of security. Some French politicians were too rapacious for power to care about the Nazi menace that must have been apparent to them. Venality in high places—among political leaders, newspapers, and even the armed forces—corrupted the very core of French public life.

Every country has always had people willing to sell their homeland and even their religion and families for money or power. France has her Lavals, Norway her Quislings, and Yugoslavia her Paveliches. In our own country we have doubtful public characters whose motives cannot be seen clearly until the curtain rises a litle higher.

France was not merely defeated. She collapsed. France was destroyed from within in the same manner that Hitler has boasted that he will destroy America. France was not crushed in the war. She was beaten before the war.

What we Americans must etch into our own brains and hearts is why France collapsed. We must avoid repeating the blunders of France; we must correct glaring mistakes that already exist.

One good way to find out how to avoid the tragedy of France and to understand what Hitler proposes to deal out to us is to read Francis Hackett's recent book What Mein Kampf Means to America. This should be on the "must" list of every thoughtful American. Hackett writes of Hitler's methods of internal demoralization—a technique he used with particularly deadly effect in France. I recommend especially the chapter entitled "Typhoid Mary." This chapter helps one to understand ex-Colonel Lindbergh. It makes one realize what a menace he and those like him are to this country and its free institutions, whether they know what they are doing or whether they don't.

Too many of France's public men were corrupt or inefficient. They were ready victims of the Nazi poison. Vaunting their own patriotism and willingness to sacrifice all for France, men of influence and wealth went about talking appeasement and defeatism. I say again that we have precisely the same kind of people in this country. French appeasers and traitors excused Hitler's breaking of solemn treaties on the cowardly justification that France must maintain peace at any price. They could not see that peace can be maintained at any price only if men are willing to pay any price for liberty.

Goebbels' lying words did more to destroy French democracy than Hitler's marching soldiers. In a thousand ways and by a thousand tongues, Nazi propaganda subtly but surely undermined French self-confidence, cast doubts, spread disunity, induced race hatred, instilled hate in the employer against labor and in labor against the employer. French morale was destroyed by an inner canker.

Nazi propaganda and treacherous leadership kneaded France into soft dough, ready for the fiery oven of the Nazi baker.

There is a frightening lesson in this for us.

Amongst us, too, Nazis, pro-Nazis, and crypto-Nazis are active. We have our defeatists and appeasers, Hitler's conscious and unconscious tools, who would make us soft and malleable against the coming of Hitler's angels of hell. With forked tongues and foolish yammerings, they fill the air with their lying voices and treacherous arguments. They strive with might and main—these American Lavals and Quislings—to paralyze our wills and undermine our confidence.

They do not care what they say. They are indifferent to truth, they despise logic, they hate facts. They want only to confuse us and to deceive us. They use whatever words may accomplish their purpose. Persuaded by Hitler that the art of propaganda is to make heaven appear to be hell and hell, heaven, they would convince us that night is day; that black is white; that a lie is the very truth.

These Nazi scuttlefish pour ink on the truth in order to blacken out the light of freedom.

Let me give you a recent example.

Soon after Hitler once again had broken his solemn pledge and treacherously attacked his Russian ally, ex-Colonel Lindbergh was asked what he thought of it.

Sententiously he replied: "A very, very unusual development. * * * It is something that requires profound analysis."

It was clear that Lindbergh did not have his cue. Cautious man that he is, he did not want to say the wrong thing. So he posed as a heavy thinker, making an effort to concoct an effective apology for this latest flowering of Hitler gangsterism.

Nine days passed, during which the Nazi party line was worked out and the official Nazi propaganda was handed out in Germany to Hitler mouthpieces and Nazi fellow travelers all over the world. Then arose the Knight of the German Eagle and offered this Nazi party line to the country.

This is what Mr. Lindbergh said. Listen carefully:

He said that Hitler had gone to war against Poland because the British and the French had forced him to.

He said that Hitler had been forced to attack France and Britain because—believe it or not—the British would not permit him to attack Russia.

In other words, Hitler would have us believe, via Lindbergh, that the English people and the French people have been undergoing horrible sufferings in order to protect Mr. Stalin and to prevent Russia from being invaded. The incredible Mr. Lindbergh would have us believe that so great, so self-sacrificing, was the love of the English people and the French people for Russia that they were willing to die and turn their countries over to rapine and murder in order to save Mr. Stalin.

Mr. Lindbergh has a reputation as a practical joker, and perhaps this was offered as a ghastly jest. In any event, he spoke these words, apparently in sober earnestness—and was applauded by the pro-Nazis in the audience that gathered to hear him—in the Civic Auditorium in the city of San Francisco on July 1, 1941.

Goebbels was undoubtedly chuckling at this shameless distortion of elementary truth, this pathological violation of the canons of decency. Undoubtedly he enjoyed it all the more because it fell from the lips of a man who had gained fame and riches at the hands of the American people.

Why, every child who can read knows that France was destroyed and that England is in deadly peril today because the Lindberghian appeasers who were then in power in those countries spent all of their energies and precious time trying to prevail upon Hitler to attack Russia and leave them at peace. This effort to persuade Hitler to turn on Russia was the very cornerstone of the abortive and destructive policy of appeasement, the perfect flower of Munich.

The Goebbelses and the Lindberghs do not fool the American people now that we have seen the grisly Hitler strike one deluded victim after the other in the back.

The American people have learned the tragic lesson of France and of Europe. The American people know who is the enemy of human decency and civilization.

That enemy is still Hitler. The Nazis are still the most immediate and terrible threat to our freedom and our way of life. The American people know that you can't make a skunk cabbage smell like a rose; a menacing Nazi cannot be made to look like a friendly human being.

Lindbergh pretends to be shocked that Russia is now in this war, although Russia is only fighting in desperate self-defense. Lindbergh, with mock piety, exclaims that he would rather be in alliance with Germany, or even with England, than with Russia. Well, he has always been in comfortable alliance with Germany, but why does he maliciously sneer at England? He can always find some left-handed way of sticking a pin into England for the benefit of Hitler.

It is dreadful to Lindbergl. that Russia should defend herself against Hitler and thus find a common objective with England, but he experienced no shock when Hitler signed a treaty of nonaggression with Stalin 2 years ago. Lindbergh did not damn Germany when Hitler and Stalin were holding hands. On the contrary, according to the Lindberghs, Hitler and his ally, Stalin, were riding the "wave of the future." There was no use fighting or even protesting against the "wave of the future," the Lindberghs were telling us. Now they sing a different tune.

No one has ever heard Lindbergh utter a word of horror at, or even of aversion to, the bloody career that the Nazis are following, nor a word of pity for the innocent men, women, and children who have been deliberately murdered by the Nazis in practically every country in Europe.

The Lindberghs, as cheerers-on of Hitler when the latter was an ally of Russia, actively helped communism. In defending nazi-ism, Lindbergh was defending communism when these two were making common cause against the democracies. Lindbergh now denounces communism because it defends itself against the aggression of Hitler, but I have never heard this Knight of the German Eagle denounce Hitler or nazi-ism or Mussolini or fascism. I have never heard him raise his voice for any of the raped countries of Europe, not even for France where, for a long period, he collaborated with Dr. Alexis Carrel, who is reputed to be a Nazi sympathizer, in developing an artificial heart. I could tell ex-Colonel Lindbergh where he could readily locate an artificial heart with the aid of an X-ray machine.

No; I have never heard Lindbergh utter a word of pity for Belgium, or Holland, or Norway, or England. I have never heard him express a word of pity for the Poles or the Jews who have been slaughtered by the hundreds of thousands by Hitler's savages. I have never heard Lindbergh say a word of encouragement to the English for the fight that they are so bravely making for Lindbergh's right to live his own life in his own way, as well as for their own right to do so. As a matter of fact, I have never heard Lindbergh say a word for democracy itself. Has any one of you?

No; all of Lindbergh's passionate words are to encourage Hitler and to break down the will of his own fellow citizens to resist Hitler and nazi-ism.

But exposing enemy and subversive propaganda is only one of our tasks. We must also take active steps to avoid the tragedy that has befallen France and to help that great country resume her place in the family of civilized nations.

Some of these steps we have already taken.

Our Navy has occupied Iceland, an island that lies athwart the ship lanes of the North

Atlantic. Iceland will become another one of our great bases, where our armed forces will do their part to keep Hitler out of America and thereby help to isolate him on the continent of Europe. It is both fitting and prophetic that Iceland, the oldest democracy in the world, should become a vital outpost in the world war for freedom.

On the industrial front, our tremendous plant is now beginning to turn out great quantities of the weapons and materials that will ensure our liberty and help to restore that of others. Much, much more, is still to be done; but we have already accomplished much. I know that you will be heartened to know that our rate of plane manufacture is increasing greatly. In the last 12 months the output of machine tools has doubled. Garand rifles have trebled. Minor naval craft under construction rose from 54 to 407 in the last year. We are now producing 6 times as much powder as we did a year ago. We are manufacturing 14 times as many tanks as we did a year ago. And all of this is only a start.

But we need time, and time is not like rubber. You can't stretch it. You can't buy it. We have been borrowing time from the British but we have no right to borrow any more.

Fortunately, a miraculous turn of events has given us an opportunity to gain precious time. Hitler's unexpected attack on Russia is a golden chance of which we must take full advantage. Such a gift of precious time is not likely to come again.

While Hitler is busy waging his wanton war with Russia—despite his solemnly plighted word—we must utilize every moment to increase our production, step up our output, and swiftly pour the resources and materials of war into Britain.

Let me say emphatically that, together with the overwhelming majority of the American people, I repudiate communism no less than nazi-ism. I have always fought both of them with all my might. But I denounce with all my heart the obvious trick that Lindbergh and others are helping the Nazis to play when they say that to help Britain to defend herself from the Nazis while the latter are fighting Russia is to help communism. We are not helping communism. We are fighting the scourge of Hitler, who is bent upon destroying civilization, who has announced his intention to dominate the world, with whom hatred for democracy is a wild obsession.

If Hitler should conquer Russia, it would not be a defeat of communism; it would be a world-shaking victory for nazi-ism.

Let me tell you what would happen if Hitler were to defeat Russia:

He would acquire enormous stores of military supplies—planes, guns, tanks, trucks, submarines.

He would seize vast oil fields and refineries.

He would come into possession of a staggering amount of natural resources—coal, minerals, and timber. He would control more than 11,000,000,000 bushels of wheat, rye, oats, barley, and corn—which not only are vital foodstuffs but are also capable of yielding important oils. You can realize how stupendous is this total of 11,000,000,000 bushels of grains when you are told that all of the democracies combined produce only 9,000,000,000 bushels.

He would be in a position to make slaves of nearly 200,000,000 Russians.

He would stop all aid to China, so that Japan would be free for new reckless adventures in Asia and in the Pacific.

If he should control Siberia, Hitler would become a menace to nearby Alaska and threaten our Pacific coast and outlying islands.

A victory over Russia would give him incalculable prestige in South America, and it would also encourage our own defeatists, appeasers, and Fascist fellow travelers.

In other words, the defeat of Russia would mean a nightmare for us and for Britain. Russia's enormous resources would give Hitler powerful weapons for his unfinished attack on Britain. And should Britain go down under the onslaught of a Nazi military machine reinforced by the tremendous resources of all Europe and most of Asia, we would be left isolated and forced to fight, alone, for our very lives.

Hitler hates us just as vengefully today as did the German General Staff a quarter century ago. In the last war Admiral von Tirpitz, the German sea lord, said bluntly to James W. Gerard, our Ambassador to Berlin:

"We shall exact as a condition of peace the surrender of the British Fleet. We shall man that fleet with our sailors and sail for America and collect from that fat, rich degenerate nation the entire expenses of the war."

Even before he came into power, Hitler said that he hated America because it was the strength of America that had brought about the defeat of Germany in the last World War.

If we permit Britain to be defeated, Hitler will be in a position to wreak his vengeance upon us.

This must not happen.

The American people are determined to defeat Hitler at all costs.

Our Government is under a mandate to help defeat Hitler at all costs.

We will do this. But make no mistake about it, there is a long and bitter struggle ahead. It will call for work and tears and sacrifice. It calls for work and sacrifice now.

What we are engaged in is a struggle for our existence as a free nation.

If Britain depends upon us for help in her fight to remain a free nation, we depend, in equal measure, upon Britain. Whether it shall be France forever, in the future as in the past, hinges upon the outcome of the momentous struggle that is going on in the world today. Upon this outcome also depends the fate of the once independent nations of freemen of which Hitler and his hordes have made a holocaust.

The Late Governor A. B. White of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 15 (legislative day of Monday, July 14), 1941

ARTICLE BY CHARLES B. SMITH

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article from a Capitol reporter, Mr. Charles Brooks Smith, published in the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times, relative to the recent death of former Governor White of West Virginia, going into his history in previous crises of the Government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times of July 8, 1941]

STATE JOURNAL RECALLED WITH MAN'S PASSING—DEATH OF A. B. WHITE, OF PARKERSBURG, BRINGS UP MEMORIES

(By Charles Brooks Smith)

WASHINGTON, July 7.—The death of Albert Blakeslee White, 84, brings back memories of other days. Personal to this writer is one which recalls—as if it were necessary—that Mr. White was his first employer. We proudly became a cub reporter for the State Journal of Parkersburg, and, if they heard about it, we have no doubt that Charles A. Hanna and Marse Henry Watterson took a firmer grasp on their journalistic laurels and resolved to keep a more watchful eye on them. We knew more about the newspaper business then than we learned during the 48 years ensuing.

Mr. White was a red head. Temperamentally he ran true to the color. He was impulsive and fiery at times, knew it, sought and took advice from friends whose hair was not red and whose heads were cooler. It no doubt saved him from a lot of trouble, but he managed to get into a lot of it at that, for those were the days of personal journalism, when rival editors hurled insults at each other and frequently fists when they met on Court Square. Everybody in town took sides in these quarrels and they themselves held the editor personally responsible for every item in his newspaper. He wrote the whole sheet, ignoring the members of his staff. They just sat around loafing, while the editor did all the work, fading away ever and anon to make a call on a sympathetic beer merchant down the street. Mr. White's old State Journal turned out such well-known names in West Virginia in their time as Matt Hughes, who became one of the Methodist Episcopal Church's greatest bishops; Waitman Barbe, than whom the State never produced a finer; and F. Kent Loomis, who lost his life carrying from Washington to Abyssinia, the first treaty which King Menelik II ever made with a civilized country. The brilliant and magnetic Matt Hughes didn't get religion when he was a reporter. The old State Journal office had no spiritual atmosphere to speak of. It was no exception to the rule, then or now; newspaper offices are no substitute for meeting houses.

AT THE PEAK

Red-headed "Bert" White was started on his political career when this blazing symbol of youthful precocity began to practice on a dilapidated, two-deck Smith-Premier, with two fingers, and it was as noiseless as "Squire Kork's" sawmill. Mr. White was aiming at the governorship; young Mr. Smith at Mr. White's sacred sanctum. How it turned out, if you haven't heard, Albert Blakeslee White became Governor of West Virginia in 1900 and, if you don't mind, we'll just skip what happened to the other chap, merely mentioning that years later Mr. Smith Goes to Washington. And was still there from last reports.

Mr. White's success was confined to the realm of politics and public affairs. In every position he held he was outstanding as a leader, an administrator, and a maker of policies. He had about every talent it takes to make a success in politics and government, and in this career he was most assuredly a success. As late in his life as 1921, President Harding tendered him the position of United States Commissioner of Internal Revenue. He declined it with thanks; he did not wish to come to the National Capital. Had he wished otherwise, we wonder how much higher he might have climbed up the ladder. He had what it takes—we repeat—and the setting here at that time was perfect for him.

Whether he ever regretted this, we do not know. We do know that he did regret selling his majority interest in the State Journal, after he was nominated for Governor. He had the idea that continuing to own it and being its nominal editor would embarrass his campaign. Friends tried to argue him out of this idea, but it was fixed, and he carried it out. They were right, he was wrong; he said so himself in later years. Had he retained possession of the State Journal what might the newspaper situation in the Parkersburg field be today? The old State Journal folded up and passed away.

A GREAT GALAXY

For 40 years the Republican Party was dominant in West Virginia, and it, in turn, was dominated by four men whose word was the law and the gospel and the discipline of that habitually victorious organization. And one of the members of this powerful quartet was Albert Blakeslee White. The other three were Stephen Benton Elkins, Nathan Bay Scott (whose widow died at her home here last month, aged 94), and William Meekins Owens Dawson.

Elkins and White were college trained, brainy men. Dawson was self-educated, a student, possessor of a wonderful mind. He couldn't have been abler if he had a couple of college diplomas. Scott was a rugged, strong character, a straight shooter, said what he thought regardless, friend and companion of Mark Hanna and the big shots of that day, who understood him and loved him. He made his "pile" in mining in the West and in industry and banking in the Wheeling area before he crashed the gate to big-time politics. He was a foundling, reared by a Scot couple in Ohio not far from Wheeling, until he marched off to the Civil War, a Union soldier. He loved them; he kept their memories green with words of gratitude, respect, almost of worshp, as his friends well knew. The Republican Party in the State never had a more generous financial backer than Scott. He put in his own money. Elkins and Scott had two terms as Senator; Dawson succeeded White as Governor in 1904. White was ambitious to become Senator. He tried for the nomination twice in the twenties, but failed to make it. His political day was past; many of his powerful associates and lieutenants were dead or outmoded; a new generation had come on. The last 10 of his 84 years he lived in retirement with the memories of his greatness.

"And life runs on, the road grows strange
With faces new—and near the end
The milestones into headstones change—
'Neath every one a friend."

Tribute to Nelson Rockefeller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 15 (legislative day of Monday, July 14), 1941

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by David Lawrence with respect to the very valuable work being performed by Nelson Rockefeller respecting our relations with South America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCKEFELLER'S IMPORTANT TASK—INTER-AMERICAN OFFICE CAN SERVE UNITED STATES WELL

(By David Lawrence)

More and more the attitude of South American countries toward the future policies of the United States is giving genuine concern. The theory that Latin America is wholly sympathetic with President Roosevelt's foreign policy is a bit outworn. European inroads into the thinking of governments to the south of us are such that the United States Government has reverted to the policy it applied during the first World War—an active educational campaign among the peoples of Central and South America with the hope of maintaining their cooperation, no matter what contingency may arise.

To carry on an educational campaign in Latin America, where Nazi agents are numerous and where newspapers and magazines are subsidized directly by Nazi funds, is a difficult task for the United States. Thus far the American Government has not resorted to such tactics. The plan rather is to make available information through legitimate channels with the hope that persons influential in the Latin American scene will see that America's side gets a fair deal.

Certainly South America needs certain raw materials on which priorities have been established here. Financial aid for commercial transactions is also essential. Under such circumstances and with so many ramifications to the whole program, it was most natural that President Roosevelt should create an agency, now known as the office of Inter-American Affairs, which is headed by Nelson Rockefeller.

RED TAPE MUST BE CUT

But as often happens in the case of an expanding government, the department which has hitherto handled all matters concerning external relations finds it necessary to take into account activities by other agencies of the same government which cannot operate under the strict rules of a foreign-office procedure. Red tape, for instance, has to be cut, and the customary diplomatic machinery cannot be used sometimes to obtain action on various commercial matters growing out of an emergency.

For several months the problem of adjusting the office of Inter-American Affairs to the work of the State Department and its representatives abroad has been one of the challenges of the war emergency. But it can be stated that the integration of the two agencies has been accomplished, due especially to the tact and skill of Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, who is No. 1 man in knowledge and background of Latin-American affairs covering the last quarter of a century.

SEPARATE STAFFS ADVISABLE

It is no criticism of our trained diplomatic officers in foreign countries to say that they are not technically familiar with all the problems growing out of attempts to improve public opinion in the countries where they reside. They are trained in the art of silences and cautious statement rather than aggressive combat against such bold and at times vicious opponents as the Nazi agents can be. The situation properly calls for a separate set of representatives who, while working with the embassies and legations, are not restricted by diplomatic etiquette in dealing with anti-American manifestations.

During the first World War, the United States Government, through the Committee on Public Information, headed by George Creel, established information centers in many foreign capitals and this proved an effective way to get the doctrines of President Wilson printed in the foreign press, to say nothing of the many tasks of counteracting attacks on the United States, which were likewise performed.

MAY OUTLAST EMERGENCY

The office of Inter-American Affairs, which Mr. Rockefeller administers, has just received a small appropriation from Congress, which it will devote to the improvement of America's prestige abroad by educational campaigns. For the first time in many years, the United States Government formally has recognized that it was important to pay attention not only to commercial but cultural relations, and such splendid work has already been done by the hundreds of persons operating under the office of Inter-American Affairs that it would not be at all surprising if this continued as a permanent institution long after the emergency had passed.

Mr. Rockefeller seems to have the organizing qualities which have brought to his side some able volunteers familiar with Latin-American relations. His engaging personality has made him quite popular among the officials of the New Deal. The main reason is that he works night and day at the job of speaking for and to Latin-American commercial and cultural interests insofar as they affect national policy here. This is something too big and far reaching to be left as a side issue of a department which has to care for our diplomatic interests not only in Latin America but all over the world, and that's why the working arrangements between the State Department and the office of Inter-American Affairs constitute a milestone in efficient progress.

War Polls and Realism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 15 (legislative day of Monday, July 14), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WHEELING (W. VA.) INTELLIGENCER

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Wheeling Intelligencer of the issue of July 8, 1941, on the subject of war polls and realism. The editorial discusses polls and their lack of benefit.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer of July 8, 1941]

WAR POLLS AND REALISM

Polls conducted by newspapers and various sampling organizations designed to sound out public opinion report uniform and overwhelming sentiment against participation by the United States in what now is called a shooting war.

The essence of public feeling on the question seems to be all possible aid to the adversaries of Nazi Germany, short, however, of actual participation by American forces.

That, incidentally, has been the stated position of the administration from the beginning, and still is the position, so far as may be judged from anything said by Mr. Roosevelt at any time up to the present writing.

It might be in the interest of national well-being to examine this attitude in the light of the realities.

What will we do if this aid short of fighting proves inadequate?

That is a possibility that none of the short-of-war champions, from Mr. Roosevelt down, seems ever to have taken into consideration—at least publicly.

Yet it is a very real possibility, as should be apparent to those willing to look the facts in the face.

The British, we may be very sure, have been counting on it for a long time, though most of their official statements on American participation have carefully avoided the suggestion that anything more than supplies from the United States ever will be needed.

One of the exceptions to this rule is General Wavell, the British soldier to win more acclaim than any other in this war. About to relinquish his post of commander in chief in the Middle East, General Wavell voiced some war opinions in a recent interview with Harold Denny, published in the New York Times. The general's conclusions are of interest and importance to every American. In brief, here they are:

Whatever happens in eastern Europe where Germany and Russia now are locked in combat, the war will be determined finally in the West as it was in the last war.

In the end, it will be a battle of manpower.

Airplanes, tanks, ammunition, guns from America, valuable though they have been, are and will be, will not be enough. American manpower will be needed.

Germany will be beaten eventually only by an invasion of her soil, which will require the assistance of American troops.

In brief, Hitler cannot be defeated, says a man whose opinion merits respect, unless the United States sends soldiers to Europe.

Well, what are we going to do about it?

We are going to send soldiers, of course. And every public man who assures American mothers that we will not do so is deceiving them.

The last chance to avoid the sending of American soldiers was lost when we abandoned our neutral status and committed acts of war against Germany.

Whether that was a wise or unwise course to pursue is no longer important and is not, in the present circumstances, a proper matter of debate. The step was taken and we must abide by it. We are the enemy of Germany and her allies, by our own choice. A conquering Germany in Europe, therefore, can be expected to act toward us only as toward an enemy.

The point we wish to make is that the time is past when sentiment about whether or not we want to go to war is pertinent, or when debate of the matter can serve any useful purpose. The time to have shaped official action to public sentiment was before steps which meant war were taken. We are in the war now, and will have to see it through. If that means sending troops to Europe, we will send them, no matter what our preference might be. And the sooner we quit shadow boxing with straw votes and evading the facts in official quarters, the better prepared we will be for what the future holds.

Extension of Time for Which Selectees Have Been Called

REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, regarding the meeting at the White House yesterday attended by congressional leaders and Chief of Staff Gen. George C. Marshall published reports have it that the President persuaded Congressmen to begin action immediately to hold selective-service men in active service beyond the year. Mr. Speaker, I am a supporter of President Roosevelt, but why should I vote to disregard an implied obligation, if not a direct contract, simply because professional soldiers warn that more serious crises are imminent?

Our soldiers who are privates in the Army are paid $21 per month and have to like it. Our selective-service soldiers at the end of 1 year's training become increasingly valuable in our armed forces. Therefore, Congress should increase the minimum pay of such soldiers from $21 to $45 per month and make appropriate increases for noncommissioned officers. Then an appeal could properly be made to such soldiers to volunteer for further service during the period of this emergency.

To this good hour the young men in our armed forces—selective-service men and National Guard men and their mothers are the only individuals who have made sacrifices in this national emergency. At the time these young men were ordered from their homes and peacetime pursuits there was an implied agreement, if not a direct contract, that they would be permitted to return at the end of a year's training unless this Nation was actually at war. This Nation is at peace. We are providing national defense measures for Western Hemisphere protection.

Our need is for a compact, mobile, thoroughly mechanized army notwithstanding the plea of professional officers who apparently desire that our armed forces be expanded to about 3,000,000 men. Hitler conquered France with 12 panzer divisions of thoroughly mechanized soldiers; 120,000 men plus a couple thousand pilots. The bulk of his great army of 2,000,000 was useful only in occupying captured territory. Of course, American professional Army officers will receive quick promotions in a rapidly expanding army. Let us disregard pleas not based on fact and preserve the morale of our Army and the sanctity of contract. Our Government is dependent upon the faith and confidence of its citizens.

Some advocates of this plan to keep selective-service men for a further period of training say the American soldier is the best paid in the world. They know not whereof they speak. Canada, though poor compared to the wealth of this Nation, pays its privates $1.30 per day. Canadian non-coms receive as much as $100 per month. In addition, the Canadian Government makes dependent allowances to families of men in the service. For example, a dependent wife of an army private or noncommissioned officer receives $35 per month and $12 additional each per month for 2 children. Thus, the Canadian Government pays the Canadian soldier and wife and 2 children $99.30 per month. Also in Canada skilled workers in the army receive extra pay. Certainly our soldiers should receive as much as unskilled labor in private industry.

Indianapolis Association of Credit Men Leads the Way Toward Fiscal Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, out in Indianapolis we have many sound thinkers who believe that in the matter of Government financing we cannot forever overwork the outgo without paying some attention to the intake.

The Indianapolis Association of Credit Men has taken the lead in the restoration of a sound national fiscal policy in the United States by asking Congress "to devote as much thought to cutting expenses as is devoted toward raising taxes."

In standing and influence the Indianapolis Association of Credit Men ranks at the very top among organizations of American businessmen. Its executive manager, Merritt Fields, is nationally known as an able business executive, a fiscal expert, a keen analyst, with extraordinary breadth of vision.

I think the Congress and the country generally would like to know what the Indianapolis Association of Credit Men is doing in the vitally necessary task of restoring a sound economy. With a cut of at least $2,000,000,000 in national nondefense expenditures as its goal, the association is preparing to flood Congress with a vast number of petitions urging the national lawmaking body to study the program of savings in nondefense outlays that was suggested to the Ways and Means Committee by Dr. George S. Benson, president of Harding College, Searcy, Ala., on May 15 last. The cuts proposed by Dr. Benson would effectuate a total saving of $2,031,000,000, which the Indianapolis association believes should be the very minimum as an objective.

In a bulletin sent out to the members of his association on July 1, Mr. Fields, the executive manager, said:

There is no way in conscience that Congress can levy the new taxes of $3,500,000,000 upon you, the taxpayers, without first cutting to the bone all unnecessary expenditures. Even Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau testified expenses could be cut by $1,000,000,000, but he refused to be specific, and, we repeat, nobody so far has disputed Dr. Benson's testimony. We stand on that, and think if Congress is prodded it can make even greater cuts. The third page of this bulletin is your petition to Congress. Just detach the petition from the bulletin, sign, and mail it to us. We will then present the petition to the Ways and Means Committee with a frank statement that this is an organized effort on the part of the Indianapolis Association of Credit Men to cut expenses.

PARTIAL LIST OF PARTICIPATING FIRMS

That Congress is in for a good deal of "prodding" is indicated by the speed and alacrity with which these petitions are being signed and rushed to Washington. Although the campaign is hardly more than started, petitions have been received at my office from firms affiliated with the Indianapolis Association of Credit Men and are being introduced by me today in the House.

This movement of Indianapolis businessmen, many of whom are nationally and internationally known, to induce Congress to make a start toward drastic retrenchment in Government nondefense expenditures no doubt will have a profound reflex effect on business circles throughout the entire country. Already a number of business organizations throughout the land are planning to follow the lead of the Indianapolis association and the Indianapolis campaign may be the prelude to a Nation-wide awakening to the danger of astronomical spending and continued unbridled license in piling up national debt without reference to national income. It begins to look as if the Indianapolis Association of Credit Men may have started something really worth while in the direction of national fiscal reform.

TEXT OF THE PETITION

The text of the petition already signed by a large number of Indianapolis businessmen, and which undoubtedly will be signed during the next few weeks by many hundreds more, is as follows:

A PETITION TO THE CONGRESS TO SAVE AN ESTIMATED $2,031,000,000 FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

We, the undersigned, at the suggestion of the Indianapolis Association of Credit Men, Indianapolis, Ind., who have to pay and will pay cheerfully for the defense of our country, earnestly urge Congress to devote as much thought to cutting expenses as is devoted toward raising taxes. That seems only fair. We ask Congress to study the following suggested savings, which were included by Dr. George S. Benson, president of Harding College, Searcy, Ark., in his testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee, May 15, 1941:

Items that probably can be eliminated during the emergency

C. C. C.	$265,000,000
N. Y. A.	99,000,000
Soil conservation	500,000,000
Federal aid to roads	180,000,000
Total	1,044,000,000

Company	Address	Representative
A. & J. Manufacturing Co.	Gadsden, Ala.	J. C. Greene.
Adams-Rogers Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	C. O. Rogers.
Adding Machine Service & Sales Corporation	do	L. I. Bland.
Allied Truck Equipment, Inc.	do	E. J. Hermann.
Allied Weld-Craft, Inc.	do	P. B. Hall.
American Linen Supply Co.	do	C. A. Sellars.
American Zinc Products Co.	Greencastle, Ind.	C. W. Martin.
Anderson Lumber & Supply Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	Edward L. Anderson.
Peter Anderson Co.	Lafayette, Ind.	F. W. Kennedy.
Anderson Stove Co., Inc.	Anderson, Ind.	Arthur A. Brady.
Associated Seed Growers, Inc.	Indianapolis, Ind.	G. R. Vaughn.
Associated Service Co.	do	W. C. Holmes.
E. C. Atkins & Co.	do	J. G. Martin.
Backstay Welt Co.	Union City, Ind.	G. G. Barr.
Baldwin-Miller Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	Silas B. Reagan.
Banner-Whitehill, Inc.	do	R. B. Stokes.
Barnes-Ross Co.	do	W. R. McCullough
Adam H. Bartel Co.	Richmond, Ind.	F. J. Bartel.
Barton, Curle & McLaren	Indianapolis, Ind.	E. E. McLaren.
Basca Manufacturing Co., Inc.	do	Horace M. Read.
Paul F. Beich Co.	Bloomington, Ill.	Ernest H. Black.
Belmont Casket Manufacturing Co.	Columbus, Ohio	E. S. Albin.
Bemis Bro. Bag Co	Indianapolis, Ind.	Geo. H. DuRie.
Benham Press	do	Hal T. Benham.
Berne Furniture Co.	Berne, Ind.	C. T. Michaud.
Beverage Self-Service, Inc.	Indianapolis, Ind.	Brunson Motley.
Biggs Pump & Supply Co.	Lafayette, Ind.	F. B. Timberlake.
Biltwell Chair & Furniture Co.	Denton, N. C.	C. L. Kearns.
Bittner Hunsicker & Co.	Allentown, Pa.	Clarence A. Kistler
Blue Bell Globe Manufacturing Co.	Greensboro, N. C.	R. S. LeMatty.
Bowes Seal Fast Corporation	Indianapolis, Ind.	Chas. E. Bowes.
Brace Engineering Co., Inc.	do	Karl R. Zimmer.
W. C. Brass & Associates	do	W. C. Brass.
Bundy Incubator Co.	Springfield, Ohio	B. A. Mayer.
A. Burdsal Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	Dwight Sherburne.
Burnet-Binford Lumber Co., Inc.	do	Chas. E. Wagner.
C. & G. Foundry & Pattern Works	do	N. E. Baker.
Caldwell Furniture Co.	Lenoir N. C.	A. L. Moore.
E. W. Camp Plywood Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	E. W. Camp.
Campbell Oil Co.	do	T. D. Campbell.
Campbell-Smith-Ritchie Co.	Lebanon, Ind.	Harold Vice.
Capital Paper Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	K. C. Duncan.
Capitol Lumber Co.	do	L. C. Huey.
Carolina Motor Express Lines, Inc.	do	Harris W. Lee.
Carter-Lee Lumber Co.	do	F. L. Carter.
Central Indiana Coal Co.	do	H. W. Behrmann.
Do	do	B. E. Lundblad.
Central Machine Works	do	Robert F. Duke.
Central Paper Box Co.	Peoria, Ill.	Jas. H. O'Brien.
Central Rubber & Supply Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	A. G. Ruddell.
Champion Co.	Springfield, Ohio	Paul A. Pence.
Chattahoochee Furniture Co.	Flowery Branch, Ga.	Forrest Additon.
Churchill Cabinet Co.	Chicago, Ill.	A. J. Ehrlich.
Citizens Gas & Coke Utility	Indianapolis, Ind.	Victor C. Seiter.
Clark Chemical & Supply Co., Inc.	do	Robert S. Daily.
U. O. Colson Co.	Paris, Ill.	U. Rae Colson.
Columbia Conserve Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	H. E. Herner.
Comstock-Castle Stove Co.	Quincy, Ill.	R. W. Spake.
Conklin Lumber Co.	Greenfield, Ind.	A. P. Conklin.
Culver Manufacturing Co., Inc.	Buffton, Ind.	W. E. Culver.
D-A Lubricant Co., Inc.	Indianapolis, Ind.	Frank Binford.
Duncan & Miller Glass Co.	Washington, Pa.	L. K. Evans.
Employers Mutual Liability Insurance Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	Herbert Higburg.
Enterprise Aluminum Co.	Massillon, Ohio	John M. Luckner.
Evans Milling Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	E. E. Harlan.
Excelsior Stove & Manufacturing Co.	Quincy, Ill.	John J. Fisher.
Farley & Loetscher Manufacturing Co.	Dubuque, Iowa	E. A. Loetscher.
Faucett Umphrey Corporation	Morgantown, Ind.	F. H. Waycott.
Ferree-Case Lumber Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	F. E. Pence.
W. M. Finck & Co.	Detroit, Mich.	Chester E. Baker, Jr.
Fletcher Bros. Co.	Winston-Salem, N. C.	
F. C. Foltz Co., Inc.	Terre Haute, Ind.	G. M. Foltz.
Forbes Lumber Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	B. M. Forbes.
Fort Dearborn Paper Co.	do	Geo. E. Daniels.
Foster-Forbes Glass Co.	Marion, Ind.	W. P. Forbes.
R. S. Foster Lumber Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	R. S. Foster.
Franklin Life Insurance Co.	do	Ralph L. Colby.
Jesse French Corporation	New Castle, Ind.	H. Edgar French.
French Saxon China Co.	Sebring, Ohio	W. V. Oliver.
Gates Manufacturing Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	R. E. Gates.
G. E. Contracts Corporation	do	R. A. Cox.
LeRoy George Gordner	do	LeRoy George Gordner.
J. P. Gordon Co.	Columbus, Ohio	J. P. Gordon.
Grain Dealers National Mutual Fire Insurance Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	Gage McCotter.
Grapho Products, Inc.	do	D. I. Smith.
Gregory & Appel, Inc.	do	M. M. Waltman.
Grey Iron Casting Co.	Mount Joy, Pa.	J. Roland Kinzer.
C. E. Griener Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	C. E. Griener.
Guarantee Tire & Rubber Co.	do	W. W. Kuhn.
Do	do	Elmer H. Vahle.
Hall-Neal Furnace Co.	do	Fred S. Boone.
Harker Pottery Co.	East Liverpool, Ohio	David G. Boyce.
Henkel-Randall-Warner Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	A. J. Randall.
Herbrand Corporation	Fremont, Ohio	E. Traub Gottron.
Hermetic Corporation	Indianapolis, Ind.	T. W. Smith.
Hiller Office Supply Co.	do	R. C. Hiller.
Geo. Hitz & Co.	do	Benj. D. Hitz.
Home Stove Co.	do	Geo. Alig, Jr.
Hoyt Machine Co., Inc.	do	J. P. Atkinson.
Huntington Laboratories, Inc.	Huntington, Ind.	O. R. Foust.
Indiana Condensed Milk Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	Marion Moore.
Indiana Gear Works	do	Louis C. Buehler.
Indiana Glass Co.	Dunkirk, Ind.	E. W. Merry.
Indiana Lumbermen's Mutual Insurance Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.	Carl S. Jones.
Indiana Oxygen Co.	do	R. J. Walden.
Indiana Paper Co.	do	Fred J. Ostermeyer.
Indiana Wall Paper & Paint Co.	do	Walter H. Vahle.
Indiana Wheel & Rim Co.	do	F. W. Dennerline.
Indianapolis Engraving Co., Inc.	do	E. A. Morris.
Indianapolis Glove Co.	do	B. Elsey.

Company	Address	Representative
Indianapolis Paint & Color Co	Indianapolis, Ind	Byron J. Smith.
Indianapolis Wall Paper Co	do	Henry Gramse, Jr.
Ingersoll Steel & Disc Division	New Castle, Ind	T. L. Nelson.
Ingram-Richardson Manufacturing Co	Frankfort, Ind	R. S. Dukes.
International Steel Wool Corporation	Springfield, Ohio	M. A. Stybr.
Irvington Ice & Coal Co	Indianapolis, Ind	L. L. Swartz.
Jasper Novelty Furniture Co., Inc	Jasper, Ind	R. F. Schnaus.
Jasper Office Furniture Co	do	R. E. Sturm.
Jay Garment	Portland, Ind	(Forrest Harness.)
Karpex Manufacturing Co., Inc	Indianapolis, Ind	R. R. Wotring.
Keller Moulding Co	do	Wm. A. Keller, Jr.
Kennedy Car Liner & Bag Co., Inc	Shelbyville, Ind	P. T. Hunter.
Kennedy Tank & Manufacturing Co	Indianapolis, Ind	W. E. Kennedy.
Kiefer-Stewart Co	do	G. B. Moxley.
Kingsbury & Co., Inc	do	George H. Kingsbury.
Klieber & Hellmann, Inc	do	Cordelia Klieber.
Knoxall Corporation	do	O. P. Epler.
George T. Kraas Co	do	George T. Kraas.
Kramer Corporation	do	Edwin B. Ash.
Kuhner Packing Co	Muncie, Ind	H. C. Kuhner.
Eli Lilly & Co	Indianapolis, Ind	C. F. Eveleigh.
Lilly Varnish Co	do	Fred J. Hamerin.
MacCollum Paper Co., Inc	do	S. E. Weinland.
John J. Madden Manufacturing Co	do	John J. Madden.
Harry B. Mahan Co	do	G. C. Bosley.
Marion Tool Corporation	Marion, Ind	N. H. Motsinger.
Marsh Furniture Co	High Point, N. C	J. E. Marsh.
Marshall Studios, Inc	Indianapolis, Ind	Grace Marshall.
McCormick Lumber Co., Inc	do	S. L. McCormick.
Lewis Meier & Co	do	Theodore H. Seuel.
Miller Bros. Hardware Co	Richmond, Ind	F. O. Chambers.
L. B. Mosiman Corporation	Indianapolis, Ind	L. B. Mosiman.
Mouldings, Inc	do	Norman R. Kem.
Muehlhausen Spring Corporation	Logansport, Ind	M. L. Beutel.
Mutual China Co	Indianapolis, Ind	Ferd. L. Hollweg.
National Mitten Works	Kokomo, Ind	Willis H. Howell.
National Sewing Machine Co	Belvidere, Ill	R. F. List.
New Castle Casket Co	New Castle, Ind	J. G. Burris.
Noblitt-Sparks Industries	Columbus, Ind	Yandell C. Cline.
Northwestern Cabinet Co	Burlington, Iowa	E. A. Stanton.
The Nurre Co.s, Inc	Bloomington, Ind	Paul W. Shertzer.
Geo. S. Olive & Co	Indianapolis, Ind	Geo. S. Olive.
Op-Al Electric & Manufacturing Co	do	A. H. Opperman.
Osgood & Sons, Inc	Decatur, Ill	H. M. Osgood.
Oval & Koster	Indianapolis, Ind	Chas. J. Oval.
Paper Package Co	do	R. F. Stilz.
Peerless Foundry Co	do	T. J. Cornwell.
Perfection Paint & Color Co	do	George Gable.
J. C. Perry & Co	do	Fred H. Bruhn.
Pullman Couch Co	Chicago, Ill	Theo. F. Schmidt.
Pure Oil Co	Indianapolis, Ind	W. H. Martindill.
Quaker State Oil Refining Corporation	Oil City, Pa	H. L. Luse.
W. T. Rawleigh Co	Freeport, Ill	Roy F. Crinkshank.
W. P. Ray & Co., Inc	Indianapolis, Ind	W. G. Dithmer.
Recreation Equipment Co	Anderson, Ind	O. W. Douglas.
Richmond Baking Co	Richmond, Ind	J. R. Quigg.
Richmond Malleable Castings Co	do	
Rockwood Manufacturing Co	Indianapolis, Ind	W. D. Hamerstadt.
Rodefeld Co	Richmond, Ind	Mr. Springer.
Roots-Connersville Blower Corporation	Connersville, Ind	W. E. Newkirk.
Rough Notes Co., Inc	Indianapolis, Ind	A. J. Wohlgemuth.
Royal Metal Manufacturing Co	Michigan City, Ind	C. E. Gaul.
Rybolt Heating Co	Indianapolis, Ind	T. M. Rybolt.
Rytex Co	do	M. J. Hammel.
Sargent-Gerke Co	do	R. F. Behrmann.
Schlosser Bros., Inc	Frankfort, Ind	Gustav Schlosser.
Schramm & Schmieg Co	Burlington, Iowa	C. W. Dwight.
Sentinel Printing Co	Indianapolis, Ind	Walter J. Twiname.
Shaw-Barton, Inc	Coshocton, Ohio	J. S. Shaw.
Shelbyville Desk Co	Shelbyville, Ind	
Shirk Lumber Co., Inc	Indianapolis, Ind	C. J. Shirk.
Siegler Enamel Range Co	Centralia, Ill	E. Siegler.
M. B. Smith	Burlington, N. C	M. B. Smith.
Henry C. Smither Roofing Co	Indianapolis, Ind	Jos. E. Mattingly.
Southern Desk Co	Hickory, N. C	G. F. Ivey.
Southern Saw Works, Inc	Atlanta, Ga	Ed L. Humphreys.
Southport Lumber Co	Southport, Ind	T. W. Davidson.
Spann Co., Inc	Indianapolis, Ind	B. W. Duck, Jr.
Spickelmier Fuel & Supply Co	do	
Springfield Leather Products Co	Springfield, Ohio	R. N. Lubfer.
Stark-Wetzel & Co	Indianapolis, Ind	George W. Stark.
Theodore Stein, Jr	do	Theodore Stein, Jr.
Stone, Stafford & Stone	do	F. A. Wilkins.
Sun Glow Industries, Inc	Mansfield, Ohio	W. L. Scheiffey.
Superior Paper Products Co	Marion, Ind	Wm. H. Willen.
Syndicate Glass, Inc	Indianapolis, Ind	P. H. James.
Tell City Desk Co., Inc	Tell City, Ind	M. J. Kinsh.
Thiele Furnace Co., Inc	Indianapolis, Ind	J. H. Turnbull.
Towle Manufacturing Co	Newburyport, Mass	Stanley R. Noyes.
Toycraft Rubber Co	Ashland, Ohio	R. T. Scantlebury.
Troy Oil Co., Inc	Indianapolis, Ind	Francis J. Schuster.
Tucker Duck & Rubber Co	Fort Smith, Ark	H. Temple Tucker.
Udell Works	Indianapolis, Ind	H. T. Griffith.
Uhl Pottery Co	Huntingburg, Ind	O. I. Lett.
United States Veneer Corporation	Indianapolis, Ind	Ira A. Minnick.
Universal Potteries, Inc	Cambridge, Ohio	Robert Secrest.
Van Camp Hardware & Iron Co	Indianapolis, Ind	G. C. Klippel.
Van Wert Co	do	Cecil A. Van Wert.
Vaser Machine Co	do	E. M. Vaser.
Vick Chemical Co	Wilmington, Del	J. W. Roberts.
Virginia Sweet Foods, Inc	Greenfield, Ind	M. L. Pernice, Jr.
Vonnegut Hardware Co	Indianapolis, Ind	Charles E. Wagner.
Wabash Fibre Box Co	Terre Haute, Ind	Lee M. Black.
The Wadley Co	Indianapolis, Ind	D. D. Cutright.
Wege Marble & Tile Co	do	G. C. Wege.
A. D. Wiles Co	do	A. D. Wiles.
York & Foster, Inc	Union City, Pa	C. R. York.
Zenite Metal Corporation	Indianapolis, Ind	J. I. Garrett.
Ziffrin Truck Lines, Inc	do	S. Ziffrin.
Zimmer Paper Products	do	Karl R. Zimmer.
Galax Furniture Co., Inc	Galax, Va	J. A. Matthews.

Items which can probably be cut in half during emergency	
Rivers, harbors, and flood control	$121,000,000
National park improvements	10,000,000
Agriculture, forests and trails	10,000,000
Rural rehabilitation	66,000,000
Food-stamp plan	100,000,000
Export bounties	100,000,000
Last year's appropriation for W. P. A	1,325,000,000
(Will not the $20,000,000,000 defense program cut employment at least in half?)	
Departmental publicity and franking	39,000,000
National Resources Planning Board and Office of Government Reports, about	3,000,000
Total	1,774,000,000
One-half is	887,000,000
Items the total of which can probably be reduced 25 percent	
Agriculture departmental expense (in addition to agriculture aids)	$114,000,000
Department of Commerce	31,000,000
Department of Interior	70,000,000
Department of Justice	55,000,000
War Department—nonmilitary activities	45,000,000
Miscellaneous independent offices	66,000,000
Refugee relief	18,000,000
Total	399,000,000
One fourth is	100,000,000
Grand total	2,031,000,000

We, the undersigned, plead for reduced expenses in the belief the national welfare is endangered, and that the Nation cannot afford to have a single dollar spent for unnecessary nondefense expenditures.

JULY ——, 1941.

Name of firm_____

Name of representative_____

City or town_____ State_____

World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 15 (legislative day of Monday, July 14), 1941

ARTICLE BY C. J. CORMIER

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine, the History of the American Merchant Marine, Recruiting Service, During the World War of 1917–18," by Clarence J. Cormier, charter member of the World War veterans of the United States merchant marine, 1917–18.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine—The History of the American Merchant Marine, Recruiting Service, During the World War of 1917–18

(By Clarence J. Cormier, charter member of the World War Veterans of the United States merchant marine, 1917–18)

By the Urgent Deficiencies Act of June 15, 1917, the President of the United States was given the power to use for the national security and defense a fund of $6,250,000, for recruiting, instructing and training of officers, engineers, and crews for American ships.

The President granted this power and fund to the United States Shipping Board and authorized the establishment of the recruiting service, with headquarters in the United States customhouse at Boston, Mass., under the supervision of Henry Howard.

The first school of navigation was opened in Cambridge, Mass., June 4, 1917, under the direction of the United States Shipping Board, and others were established on the Atlantic, Gulf, Pacific coasts, and the Great Lakes, until 43 schools were in operation.

Men who had some experience in seamanship were to be given a short, intensive period of training in navigation by experienced sea captains, as well as teachers from scientific schools and universities.

The next work to which attention was directed was the training of engineers. Schools were opened up and maintained in 12 engineering schools, chiefly at technical colleges.

For admission to navigation or engineering schools, candidates must be American citizens between 19 and 55 years, inclusive.

The graduates from the navigation schools from June 4, 1917, to November 9, 1918, numbered 3,300.

The graduates from the engineering schools as marine engineers from June 4, 1917, to November 9, 1918, numbered 2,960.

By the autumn of 1917 the ship-construction program of the emergency fleet had reached such a stage that the Government authorized the United States Shipping Board to establish a recruiting service for young men who wished to enlist as sailors in the American merchant marine.

To enlist in the merchant marine, a man had to be an American citizen between the ages of 18 and 35 years. It will be noticed that no other branch of the service, that is, the Navy, Army, or the Marines, during the World War, were as strict in the citizen clause.

Deferred classification under the selective-service regulations applied to regular members of merchant crews, while apprentices enroll for training in the United States Shipping Board Recruiting Service were held to be not available for military service. If such men left the merchant marine service they were liable to immediate draft.

In December 1917 the Sea Training Bureau of the United States Shipping Board Recruiting Service was ready to receive application from Americans willing to take a course which would fit them for service as sailors, firemen, coal passers, oilers, water tenders, cooks, and stewards on vessels of the American merchant marine.

Applicants were enlisted for the "duration of the war" and were trained on seven ships in Atlantic waters, four on the Pacific, one at New Orleans, and one at Cleveland, Ohio. Headquarters were established at Federal pier, East Boston, Mass., where the former Eastern Steamship Line steamers *Calvin Austin, Governor Dingley, Governor Cobb,* and later the *Meade* were stationed.

The thousands of men who were needed for this new service could be obtained only through the aid of recruiting stations in all large cities. President Louis K. Liggett, of the United Drug Co., came to the assistance of the Recruiting Service by placing 6,854 stores of his company available as recruiting stations. How effective this recruiting service was can be shown by the rate at which recruits, all of whom were volunteers, were obtained. During the first 3 months 7,500 men were enlisted, while by November 8, 1918, 3 days before the armistice, 32,014 applicants were inducted into the service.

The men enlisted were given a course of training from 6 weeks to 3 months and then assigned to merchant ships with regular prewar seamen in the proportion of four recruits to six able seamen. It is a matter of record that 75 percent of these sailors came from New England, living up to the traditions of the men who "went down to the sea in ships" from the earliest New England days.

A Sea Service Bureau was created which had charge of the assignment of graduates of the training ships and the enlisting of crews for all United States Shipping Board vessels. This shipping agency has been continued to the present day. It is interesting to note that Mr. Harrington Pike, who was in charge of the Boston office of this Service during the war, is still carrying on that position. Mr. Henry Howard was director of the Recruiting Service during the war, and it was his capable leadership that was responsible for the success of this Service.

Before the World War about 70 percent of the crews on American ships were foreign, but at its close nearly all crews were American citizens. The records show that the service rendered by the merchant marine, of its ships that were sunk and men killed or disabled is sufficient to say that a large, well-operated merchant marine was undeniably essential to bringing the war to its successful close.

Government Should Protect Defense Workers in Order To Provide Equipment for Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for section 9a in the House amendments to S. 1524, which provides for Government protection of persons who wish to voluntarily return to work in defense plants where production has been stopped "through subversive influences or otherwise."

The Nation is confronted with a condition which, in my opinion, demands that nothing be left undone in the production of defense articles.

The conscription law, against which I voted, is now forcing millions of young men into military service. They have no choice in the matter; neither have they anything to say as to how much pay they shall receive. The Government dictates that, too. The base pay is $21 per month.

The men in uniform are being trained for war. The President has already, secretly and without congressional consent, dispatched some of them nearly 3,000 miles across the sea to Iceland, which lies in the European war zone of the Eastern Hemisphere.

Since British soldiers also are in Iceland, the same is a battlefield. Therefore the inescapable fact is upon us that the President has now actually put the United States into the European war.

The public does not know but what the President has also sent come of our soldiers to other distant battlefields.

This is the condition that actually confronts us.

I feel it is now the first duty of the Government to provide the proper equipment and supplies for our soldiers.

The very least we could possibly consider to be our duty in this situation would be to make it possible for those persons who voluntarily choose to do so to work in the production of the defense articles that are vital to our soldiers.

The boys in camp have a right to expect of us at least this much. The fathers and mothers who have sons in uniform have a right to demand it.

I shall, of course, also support the provision lowering the draft age to 28 years.

Citadels of Democracy Being Undermined by Inefficiency, Mismanagement, Waste, and Probable Corruption

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this morning my office received copies of a publication entitled "Citadels of Democracy." Just a few weeks ago we received another propaganda book entitled "Arsenals of Democracy." Some day soon we may have a book entitled "Destroyers of Democracy" for in my opinion that is just what we are about to do, when we allow the funds appropriated for national defense to be spent upon useless propaganda such as the books received today.

Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been wondering just when we are going to have a real investigation of our whole defense program. An investigation, sir, that goes to the bottom of things. An investigation that will sift out the mismanagement, the inefficiency, the waste, and the corruption no doubt attached to the program.

I say that we need this investigation now, for the citadels of democracy are slowly being undermined by the inefficiency, the mismanagement, and the waste that is apparent on every side. This propaganda pamphlet is a striking illustration. No publication is necessary to tell the American people of the finer qualities of our defense effort; but, Mr. Speaker, we certainly need some publicity about the things I have mentioned. This is a wonderful effort we are making. It is an effort that requires untold sacrifices upon the part of the people, and I insist, Mr. Speaker, that it is a shame and a disgrace to ask our people to buy

savings stamps and defense bonds and to turn around and let the War Department squander the money for propaganda of this type.

Now just a word about our Army. Lt. Gen. Ben Lear, after reviewing the maneuvers of the Second Army last month, is quoted as saying:

Our troops average about 6 months' training, and a lot of polishing is needed, but today they could occupy a comparatively quiet defense sector in actual combat.

This is the commanding general's opinion of the real defenders of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, instead of squandering the money appropriated by Congress for publicity stunts and propaganda, I believe we ought to concentrate every dollar on tooling up our Army for the day when it may be called upon to really defend democracy on the field of battle.

I do not believe the next war is going to be any flag-waving, shotgun affair. But from the purchases that have been made during the last year, I am frankly puzzled. I wonder just how we can defend our democracy with organs and hymnals, with shotguns and clay pigeons, with motion-picture theaters and recreational centers, with flags and banners.

Mr. Speaker, there are many questions that create doubt in my mind as to the quality of leadership so far exhibited in our defense effort, but I have no doubts as to the loyalty and patriotism of the men and women of the United States, whether they are in the service or out of it. It is for them I speak, in protest against the continuing waste of public moneys for propaganda, to glorify war, and to drag this Nation into a conflict which the Americans desire to keep out of.

With the lady from Arkansas I say:

We've had our share in Flanders field,
We'll stay at home and mind our own,
For we've a job to do.
We'll lick the "isms" one by one,
For old red, white, and blue.

We'll sit on our veranda, and read your propaganda,
But we won't be over "till it's over" over there.

Order of the Sons of Italy

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the permission given me to extend my remarks, I submit an editorial from the Boston Post of July 10, 1941, entitled "Loyal Sons," and one from the Boston Traveler of July 10, 1941, entitled "Answering the Call."

Each of these editorials commend the Order of the Sons of Italy for the fine, patriotic example that organization has set in purchasing $20,000 worth of national-defense bonds.

The grand venerable of the Order of the Sons of Italy, Mr. Joseph Gorrasi, lives in my congressional district, in the city of Woburn. He is an outstanding example of the extremely high type of Italian immigrant who has come to our shores. At the present time Mr. Gorassi is 39 years of age. He was born in Italy and came here when a young boy. He worked hard at various jobs while earning his way through Boston University Law School, graduating with the class of 1924. He was admitted to the Massachusetts bar the same year.

Attorney Gorassi typifies the progressive type of the newer races to settle in this country. He has studied hard, worked diligently, and has made a host of friends throughout our Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He is now the city solicitor of Woburn, a post he also held in 1930. At one time he served in the capacity of claims attorney with the New England District, Public Works Administration.

In these strenuous and trying days when there is so much feeling and confusion, it is especially fine to record the loyalty and patriotism of those who came here to escape the bondage and lack of freedom in their fatherlands. It is a token of their protest against the present governments of their native lands, and it is an endorsement of the freedom and liberty of our United States of America. They are fine loyal Americans.

The editorials follow:

[From the Boston Post of July 10, 1941]

LOYAL SONS

In a day when accomplishment is far more valuable than words and far-fetched plans, the Order of the Sons of Italy in America set a fine practical example. Recently the Massachusetts grand lodge of this organization purchased $20,000 worth of defense bonds and already it has instituted an excellent system for the forwarding of gifts and for visits to its members in the various training camps.

Within a short time it will have working a plan for the entertainment of out-of-State members in training in Bay State camps with sightseeing trips and other services. Here is a loyal, up-and-coming organization really getting things done.

[From the Boston Traveler of July 10, 1941]

ANSWERING THE CALL

The most loyal American is not necessarily the oldest American; he may be a very new American. Strong confirmation of this undoubted fact may be seen in the action of the Sons of Italy in America, whose Massachusetts lodge recently purchased $20,000 worth of defense bonds.

These times are trying ones for loyal Americans whose ancestry stems from Axis countries. One may have a true and devoted love for Italy or Germany, and with it a detestation of their present governments.

Perhaps those newer Americans, whose faith in the land of their adoption is so strong that it overshadows ancestral ties, are the best Americans of us all.

Seventy-seventh Annual Convention of Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 15 (legislative day of Monday, July 14), 1941

ADDRESS BY JOSEPH G. BUCH

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, last evening in Independence Square, Philadelphia, the Grand Lodge of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks met in its seventy-seventh annual convention. It was a time of genuine inspiration, with patriotic music, stirring addresses, and a great gathering of warm-hearted Americans.

The spirit of the founding fathers seemed to be thoroughly expressed by the spirit of the Elks in this memorable meeting. Prominent citizens were present from practically every State and Territory of our Nation.

Hon. Charles H. Grakelow, director of supplies and purchases of the city of Philadelphia, was chairman of the meeting.

Gen. John J. Pershing from his sick room sent his greetings over the radio.

Mr. James R. Nicholson, chairman of the Elks National Defense Commission, told of the great contest conducted among 400,000 school children on the subject What Uncle Sam Means to Me. Governor Cross, of Connecticut, served as chairman of the board of judges of this contest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the eloquent address of Grand Exalted Ruler Joseph G. Buch, of Trenton, N. J., delivered on July 14 at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, over a Nation-wide radio chain. In over half a century of experience with fraternal leaders I have never had the honor to hear a more inspiring message.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, past grand exalted rulers, officers of the grand lodge of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, members of the Grand Lodge, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: As the benevolent and Protective Order of Elks prepares to meet tomorrow in its seventy-seventh annual convention, it is fitting that in these opening exercises we gather tonight at the historic Independence Hall, where the principles of free government were translated by great patriots into simple, clear, and lasting words.

And here, I know, we will be inspired by the high ideals of these early American leaders to examine into the resources and potentialities of our great fraternity so that we may make further contributions for the security and protection of the liberty they helped to establish.

In these days of uncertainty we must give careful consideration to the serious problems before us. Nowhere could this be more appropriately done than in Philadelphia, one of the world's greatest municipalities; a city characteristic of the high, patriotic, and fraternal aims of our order, not only because it is justly known as the City of Brotherly Love, but because here was cradled the very liberty we enjoy.

From the inception of our order we voluntarily entered into a partnership with America—a partnership cemented by loyalty and patriotism and by widespread civic and humanitarian services. We linked the destinies of our order with those of our country, and for over 70 years this chain of love and devotion has remained unbroken.

The Bible and the flag and the invocation of a Divine guidance have graced and adorned the teachings and the beauty of our ritual and lodge rooms throughout the development of our order from its humble beginning—with a little group of men—to its full expansion of over 500,000 loyal American citizens.

And perhaps this fully explains the unusual growth of the order from its original founders' group to over 1,400 lodges in every State of the Union, and in all our Territories and possessions; an order which spreads its benefactions to every important municipality of our great country, and which proves to the entire world that trust in God and patriotism, with an abiding love of fellow man, form a union against which no force or forces can prevail.

Our fraternity is typical of the great American family. To this annual reunion it has summoned its members from the far corners of the land, and its deliberations and decisions will be marked by a judgment and a wisdom that grows out of the philosophy and experience of life in the city and the country, the mountains and the wilderness.

Men who have mined the gold of Alaska and the coal of Pennsylvania are here.

Men who have sailed our inland waters and the high seas are here. We have represented in this convention not only the 48 great States, the island possessions, and the Territories of America—we have here men representative of every phase of American action—educational, cultural, industrial, financial, social, military, and civil.

The true American spirit is here today—eager, courageous, determined.

In the shadow of the liberty bell, whose history reaches back to the birth of our freedom, we will take under consideration matters that concern the progress of our order, the welfare of our people, the security of our institutions, and the safety of our country.

We come here conscious of a confused world but with a full and clear understanding of our responsibilities as Elks and Americans. We come, too, with the knowledge of a task already well done.

I look back to Houston where, before me, I saw a year full of hope. I review the months, that have since passed, and I see a realization of that hope and I am proud of the privilege that was given me to lead so many hundreds of thousands of loyal Americans during a year of useful service.

In every respect we have made an honest effort to fulfill our obligations to our order, to our country, and to our fellow man.

We sought the aid and cooperation of one of the outstanding men of the times, a great American, and a good Elk, Gen. John J. Pershing, and he responded by permitting us to use his name and prestige in connection with a new membership class, and the result was remarkable.

Through other mediums, with the full aid and cooperation of our subordinate lodges, we have made tremendous gains. Elkdom, however, will always remain indebted to, and honor the name of, General Pershing, for the part he played in strengthening the hand of our fraternity.

And it will afford me a deep personal satisfaction when, later in the program, as grand exalted ruler, I will have the privilege of presenting to General Pershing, through his chosen representative, a duly inscribed plaque as a token of appreciation and of the love and esteem in which he is held by every one of his fellow members of our order.

At the outset of my administration, I appointed the Elks' national defense and public relations commission. Through this body we have more than justified the prophecies of our patriotic performances of the past. With over 1,400 lodges as sponsors, we have reached out to millions of people with a program of patriotism and practical American action.

One cannot examine the work of the past year and not be inspired by the results that have been attained.

No field was left unexplored in spreading the lessons of Americanism.

An achievement worthy of special note was the national essay contest—an educational and patriotic movement—which induced thousands of the youth of our land to ponder upon and translate into writing the wealth and goodness of American resources and American institutions.

Picture, too, if you can, thousands of patriotic exercises by the subordinate lodges in which entire communities committed themselves to shoulder the responsibilities of American citizenship and to associate themselves with governmental authorities and agencies in the general movement to make America safe for democracy.

Try to vision every conceivable patriotic effort: Enlistment for service; the care of the families of the enlisted; the raising of funds for defense through the direct purchase, and by sponsoring the sale of United States national-defense bonds; the donation of ambulances to the Red Cross, and you begin to grasp the tremendous effort Elkdom put forth as it proceeded to execute its part of the patriotic partnership which has existed throughout the years.

For these things Elkdom finds its inspiration in the simple truths of life. It recognizes the principle that the strength of a democracy is in its people, and that the strength of the people must rise out of the family circle.

"Love of country and home and friends" expresses the philosophy which, based upon right thinking, and right living, prompts its every benefaction.

This philosophy spreads sunshine into the dark corners of life. It invokes the divine guidance and shapes its course around the Golden Rule. It seeks crippled children and straightens their little limbs, searches out the blind and giving them the "seeing eye", reaches out to the sick and gives them relief, finds the oppressed and gives them hope.

And, with an eye to the future, it searches out the strong and courageous youth of our land and seeks not only to arouse in these leaders of tomorrow a full appreciation of their heritage as Americans but to instill in them the love of home that must always be the strength of a God-fearing people.

It is these, the simple but fundamental things, that the war makers have all but forgotten.

We are living in a fast-changing world, when every turn of the clock produces effects that seem to alter the structure and stability of nations and long-established institutions.

It would seem that all the weaknesses of society are coming to the surface and that man, in a vain attempt to cure these weaknesses, has lost his sense of direction and balance and is slowly destroying himself.

Nations are fighting, not for ideals, but for raw materials; not to protect their homelands, but to acquire and to enslave new territories and peoples.

War appears to be gradually crushing all the fine instincts that make for culture and enlightenment. It is destroying works of man whose perfection and beauty have helped to inspire and develop our civilization.

And, with all this, hate and bitterness are creeping closer and closer to our shores and the barriers of distance and great seas are shrinking. For years America has felt herself safe from the consequence of world wars. Our people have sought peace, not strife. They have wanted to be left free to enjoy that peace, and with it to speak honest thoughts and to pursue decent impulses.

Yet as machines of speed and destruction become more numerous and perfect and the might of militaristic nations becomes more arbitrary, America senses the danger of relying upon mere geographic advantages. And, having witnessed the invasion and destruction of smaller and independent nations, she has fully awakened to the grave possibilities of an unpredictable future.

There seems to be a difference of opinion regarding the danger which now faces America. Men also differ upon the presence of this danger and the existence of a challenge. Yet our common sense and our loyalty tells us that, regardless of these uncertainties when, through the orderly processes of democracy, America makes her final decision the world must find her a strong and unconquerable nation.

Men, who have practiced charity and justice find it difficult to visualize the present plight of humanity. Shadows are slowly gathering over most of the world. Death and destruction have left many nations prostrate. Free people have been enslaved. Rich territories have been impoverished. Innocent men and women have been killed. Countless children have been made orphans. Millions of tons of shipping lie at the bottom of the seas. Blind passion and bitterness threaten to engulf civilization. Because all this is counter to the hopes and ideals of democracy, the survival of America and its way of life may soon be a matter for definite and drastic action.

There is now a great conflict between two opposite philosophies. It is said, on the one hand, that there is room in this world for both. It is also said that one must eventually destroy the other. America does not wish to destroy anything. It would rather preserve than destroy. By the same token, America itself will not be destroyed. How our national security is to be accomplished, no one can foretell in exact detail but one thing is certain—in order for America to preserve herself and her democratic ideals, she must be strong.

In order for America to acquire her maximum strength, in order that she may be able to meet any challenge and overcome any danger, and, if necessary, destroy any enemy or combination of enemies, she must be strong from within as well as from without. One fact, therefore, remains dominant and uncontradicted and that is the necessity for national preparedness.

Preparedness, however, does not mean alone the wholesale manufacture of armaments and munitions. It means, not alone the drafting of soldiers and the building of camps. Preparedness is something which calls for initiative and courage, for speed and action, for cooperation and unity, for loyalty and patriotism. Above all, it calls for a personal sacrifice by every man, woman, and child.

If rapidly moving events bring danger even closer to America, it follows, as the night the day, that any attempt at slowing up the machinery of our defense must be considered unpatriotic and treasonable.

It is here that Elkdom must play an important part for the most effective medicine that America can apply to the "fifth-column" cancer is Elkdom's creed and Elkdom's watchfulness. By the same token there is no agency through which America can better combat its enemies from within than the Order of Elks.

Nor is the patriotic action and influence of Elkdom new in American history. In the past our order has made many sacrifices in money and men, to the end that America might be strong, free, and powerful. In the present crisis Elkdom is already on the way to rerendering the patriotic services that brought us the universal commendation of all the civilized nations during the World War.

Our work as Elks is predestined. The very nature of our order and its ideals, its history and traditions, shape our course. Today our country is girding for a tremendous effort and, as your grand exalted ruler, I say to you Elkdom is again ready to do its full part.

It has been my privilege to meet my fellow Americans, in many visitations throughout the country, and I have been impressed with the fact that State lines are no barriers to American life. I am also convinced that the great family of people who now make up America is moved by the dominant thought of patriotism, of faith in our institutions and a keen desire to preserve and enjoy the sacred privileges of democracy.

While it is true that we are a mixed family of races, all reaching back to the other countries of the world for their ancestry, our people, with few exceptions, are loyal to America and its institutions and favor the American way of life above the way of life of dictator-ridden nations.

And to keep ourselves strong and secure against the world, if need be, we have but to encourage and develop the unbounded strength and loyalty we now possess. I say, then, to you my brothers, go back to your homes bearing the message of Elkdom—for that, in truth, is the message of America. Against the doctrine of hatred preach the ideals of brotherly love.

To you who help the blind or support the fight against tuberculosis, who furnish iron lungs, or assist in accumulating blood banks; to you who make the highways safe for travel or the great industrial plants safe for labor; to you who bring gladness into the hearts of crippled children and hope into the souls of the aged and weary; to you who give scholarships to spread the light of learning; to each of you and to the lodges you represent I say: Your service is not only to the order, to the community, to the State, or to our great country—your service is to mankind.

You are giving the example that the rulers of the world so sorely need. By your fraternal action you are shedding light upon a way of life that must eventually reach the darkened lands of the oppressed peoples of the world.

You are beautifying the four freedoms, that bespeak sacred rights and privileges, with the four cardinal principles that teach love of man for man. You are preaching the golden rule to a civilization that must, sooner or late, grasp the Divine significance of universal brotherhood or perish.

And I say to you, my brothers, our year has ended but the tasks to which as a free people we are committed have just begun. I go into the ranks with you again, proud of the knowledge that you have honored me with this high leadership, happy that I have been spared to work with you and to enjoy your companionship, thankful that, with your loyalty and your cooperation, we have been enabled to speed Elkdom on its course in its humanitarian and patriotic endeavors.

And so, with the hope that our next convention will find America and the world enjoying a state of peace and contentment which is based upon the principles of charity and justice, brotherly love and fidelity, and with the sincere wish that my successor in office will enjoy the same fraternal good will and faithful assistance which has been accorded me, I close by wishing you all good luck and Godspeed.

Address Before National Conference of 4-H Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. WRIGHT PATMAN, OF TEXAS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the National Conference of the 4-H Clubs on Tuesday, June 24, 1941, in the auditorium of the South Building, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.:

Mr. Chairman, members of the 4-H Clubs, and guests, upon this occasion the words of President Woodrow Wilson are very fitting and express my sentiments exactly. President Wilson said:

"I stand here not to welcome you to the Nation's Capital as if I were your host, but merely to welcome you to your own Capital, because I am, and am proud to be, your servant."

The theme of your camp for this year, Rural Youth Responsibilities in the Present Crisis, impresses me very much. In order to know about your responsibilities, it is absolutely necessary that you have a good idea of the functions of our Government, particularly since it is the greatest democracy in all the world today.

Please do not consider that an expert on the functions of government is addressing you upon this occasion. Such is not the case. It happens that I have been serving in the Congress of the United States longer than 12 years, and during this time I have naturally become acquainted with many of the functions of our Government. Recently the Congress—House and Senate—unanimously passed a resolution providing for the printing of 177,000 copies of a booklet which I prepared on Our American Government—What Is It? How Does It Function? This I considered a great compliment, since it is the largest number of publications of its kind ever authorized by Congress. However, I hope you do not harbor the mistaken belief that I am an expert because my book was given such recognition and wide distribution. If you have not already received a copy, I shall be very glad to send you one.

DEFINITION OF AMERICANISM

In any discussion of our American Government, I believe that a good definition of Americanism should first be stated. In February 1927 the commanders in chief of the five big World War veterans' organizations met here in Washington, D. C., and agreed upon a definition of Americanism. To my mind, this definition cannot be improved upon. It is:

"Americanism is an unfailing love of country; loyalty to its institutions and ideals; eagerness to defend it against all enemies; undivided allegience to the flag; and a desire to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

That is a good definition of Americanism to remember.

VALUE OF EXTENSION SERVICE

For many years I have admired the great work that is being done by the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture. By reason of the teaching and training one receives in an organization connected with the Extension Service, our country is made a much better place in which to live. I do not know of any group that is more helpful to our Government, in time of war or in time of peace, than the groups associated with the Extension Service. I consider each of such groups, including your own, a school of citizenship, composed of the very best American people; our American way of life is more secure by reason of the existence of your organizations.

FIRST 4-H CLUB IN TEXAS

It is very pleasing to the people of Texas to know that the first organization of 4-H Clubs was in our State. It was a corn club, organized at Graham, Tex., in 1910, by Hon. C. M. Evans, who is now director of the Farm Security Administration in Texas and Oklahoma at this time. The first livestock 4-H Club was organized by him in 1911, at Coleman, Tex. The first 4-H Club agent to be appointed was in Texas, and his name was Dr. H. H. Williamson, who is now serving as director, Extension Service in Texas, at College Station, Tex. It is interesting to note that all of the boys and girls, who pioneered this work commencing in 1910 and for several years thereafter, are now among the most prominent agricultural leaders in all the world. It makes one feel proud of his country to know the fine service that is being rendered through these great organizations.

The Government receives more value in the form of constructive, helpful, humane, and material services from the Extension Service for every dollar that it pays out than from any other Government expenditure that I am acquainted with. As an example of how far the Government is going to encourage your particular work, if a boy or girl desires to cooperate as a 4-H Club member and does not have sufficient finances to do so, the Farm Security Administration, an arm of our Government, will provide the finances.

HARD-WORKING GROUPS

It is my pleasure and privilege to know the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Claude Wickard; Dr. M. L. Wilson, Director of Extension Service in that great Department; and the Honorable Grover Hill, Under Secretary of the Department of Agriculture; and other executives in that Department. I also know the officials in the A. & M. College of Texas, who have charge of the extension service in our State, as well as a large number of the county agents, county home demonstration agents, and others who are instrumental in conducting and carrying out this fine service sponsored by our Government. These people do not watch the clock; they work many hours a day and night. I have never known public servants to be so greatly interested in the welfare of our country, and the farm people especially, as the ones whom I have named and referred to. By reason of their faithful, efficient, and effective service the

groups under them, including your own—the 4-H clubs—and particularly the home demonstration clubs, are often referred to as the most conscientious, sincere, hard-working, and unselfish groups in America. They represent the "salt of the earth."

PLEASURE TO SERVE PEOPLE

Many people cannot understand why one works so hard and faithfully to serve the people, oftentimes at a great personal sacrifice and seldom receiving sufficient compensation for his labors. The answer is demonstrated by the fact that agents of our Government have plainly and unmistakably shown the pleasure they actually receive in rendering service. They do more than their assigned duties. I shall not attempt to leave the impression that Members of Congress do better work than your own, although it is different in its nature. The fact is, however, that a Member of Congress has no assigned duty. When he takes the oath of office he swears that he will faithfully perform the duties of his office; but as a matter of fact, neither the Constitution nor the laws of this country compels him to perform any duty whatsoever, yet Members of Congress work night and day trying to render the best service possible to their constituents.

KNOWLEDGE OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

You are a leader, or you would not be at this conference here in Washington, D. C., today. As a leader, you must have knowledge of parliamentary procedure. Rules of procedure are necessary to properly conduct any meeting composed of a number of persons. Our Government is a parliamentary government, and when you acquaint yourselves with parliamentary procedure you are acquiring knowledge that will be very valuable to you throughout life, not only in your local community meetings but as members of other groups, as a member of the State legislature, or as a Member of the United States Congress. In Congress, a Member would be like a carpenter without tools if he did not possess a knowledge of parliamentary procedure. A well-directed point of order can be as effective in an assembly as cannon upon the field of battle. Without a knowledge of rules one is almost helpless in an organization. Therefore I recommend to you that you study and become thoroughly familiar with parliamentary rules of procedure.

POLITICS NECESSARY

You have heard politics, which is the basis of any democracy, criticized. You have doubtless heard the statement made, "Let us keep politics out of this or that kind of work," and "Let us not have any politics in connection with what we are attempting to do." These statements are often made, but on careful analysis they do not hold water. The truth is, politics is the masses controlling. One who is against politics is against the people ruling and, therefore, against our American way of life and our democratic form of government. One who holds a political office has been successful because he has the good will of the people who elected him. One who succeeds as a merchant, as a doctor, as a lawyer, or in any other business or profession, succeeds because he has the good will of the people. Hitler does not believe in politics; neither does Mussolini. They are opposed to the people ruling. They want a dictator form of government. Anyone who is opposed to totalitarianism and dictatorship is in favor of politics, which is our American form of government. Politics can be good or bad. Let us work to keep politics clean and our elections fair, in order properly to preserve our country.

GREECE'S PURE DEMOCRACY

On a certain day in one of the ancient cities of Greece the people would meet together and make the laws or change existing laws. That was a pure democracy. But in our country, or in any large country, obviously a pure democracy is impossible because all the people cannot assemble at any one time or place for the purpose of making their laws. We adopted the representative form of government, which means we select representatives to go to legislative bodies, either to the State legislature or to the Congress of the United States to do for the people what they would do for themselves if they could all assemble and vote personally.

When a pure democracy prevailed in this ancient city of Greece, when one went to the platform to address the assembled people to propose a law, a halter was always placed around his neck. This halter was placed around his neck for the purpose of impressing him how easily he could be hung if he proposed a law that was not in the interest of the people. Fortunately, our present-day lawmakers are not so intimidated. If they were, doubtless many laws would not be proposed that are now so vigorously advocated.

OFTEN DEPENDS ON WHOSE OX IS BEING GORED

In connection with different proposals in the forms of bills pending before a legislative body, there is almost invariably divided sentiment among the people. Some people selfishly interested will be for it, and some of them selfishly interested will be against it. In other words, it all depends upon whose ox is being gored. It is the country's good fortune that there is always a broad, enlightened, educated sentiment, which is not selfishly interested, which points out the honest and best way to the true representatives of the people. The lawmaker listens to both sides and weighs and considers what is said, whether the people are selfishly interested or not, it makes no difference.

LOBBYIST

The word "lobbyist" does not appear in the Constitution of the United States. Neither does it appear in the United States Statutes, but a lobbyist is a very important person around any legislative body. There are good lobbyists, who are helpful to the lawmakers by suggesting the good things and the bad things about every proposal, and then there is the bad lobbyist, the offensive type, that is willing to resort to any method of cheating, trickery, or undue influence in order to try to force a lawmaker to vote the way he wants him to vote.

DEMOCRATIC FORM OF GOVERNMENT MAKES NATION GREAT

Our democratic form of government is established upon the will of the people. Public sentiment controls our Government. In other words, representatives must carry out the will, the wishes, and desires of the people who elect them. Otherwise it would not be a true representaitve democracy.

I believe that it can be truthfully said that a Nation's greatness can be measured by the happiness and prosperity of the people who produce the Nation's wealth. Therefore, our country is becoming greater all the time, because the poor people, and especially the farming people, are being given greater and better opportunities. This makes our Nation great and strong.

ONE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS A YEAR LOSS ON LOW POSTAGE RATES DEFENDED

The lawmaker's service is made much easier by information that he receives from the people he represents and who are properly and correctly informed through our great system of dissemination of information. Our first President, George Washington, advocated the free distribution of newspapers through the United States mails in order that newspapers might be more widely distributed, and thereby encourage a dissemination of knowledge. President Washington's policy is in effect today. The postage rate on newspapers is very low. In fact, a newspaper may be circulated in the post offices and over the rural routes in the county where it is published absolutely free, and if the newspaper sends copies outside of the county, the postage rate is very, very low. The postage rate on books is very low, as well as magazines and periodicals. The Government loses almost $100,000,000 a year on account of these low postage rates, but I think it is absolutely justified and should not be changed. Such a system has enabled our newspapers and other periodicals to have a much wider distribution, and under such a system no family is so poor that it cannot afford at least one publication that will give them current information. Another famous President, Thomas Jefferson, said:

"Man may be governed by reason and truth. Our first object should, therefore, be to leave open to them all the avenues of truth."

Mr. Jefferson further said:

"Whenever the people are well informed, they can be trusted with their own government; whenever things get so far wrong as to attract their notice, they may be relied on to set them right."

The Bible says that where there is greed, there is no vision; and where there is no vision, the people perish. The people cannot be expected to have the best vision without correct knowledge and information in their possession. Without wide distribution and dissemination of current information, our people cannot be informed, so the present system of our American Government to widely disseminate the news and current information by newspapers, radio, screen, and magazines is certainly a commendable one and in the interest of our country.

LOW ELECTRIC CHARGES

Congress has never before had such difficult problems. For instance, Congress is divided on electric rates. Many people in Congress would like to have power rates high, others would like to see them as low as possible. President Franklin D. Roosevelt rendered a very fine, humane, and justified service to the American people and especially to the farmers when he established a yardstick to determine the cost of electric power and caused the creation of the agencies that have electrified millions of farm homes and whose policy is to electrify every farm home in America before they are finished.

LOW INTEREST RATES

Many people in Congress would like to see higher interest rates. Our Government in recent years has deliberately forced down the price of hiring money, or the cost of use of the other fellow's money. Now, one can purchase a $5,000 home and pay for it over a period of 20 years and expend $1,600 less than he would have expended prior to 1933, if he had purchased the same price home on the same terms.

BRIGHTER FUTURE FOR AGRICULTURE

Today, agriculture has a brighter future than any other time in the history of our Nation. Congress, through demands by reason of information possessed by the people, which caused Congress to take the necessary steps, has provided for the first time in history the payment of parity prices for farm products. This year, the five basic agricultural commodities—cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice—will bring what is known as parity prices. This is a new day in agriculture. Many Members of Congress opposed this type legislation. Unless you help keep the people informed as to its necessity and as to its fairness, such a policy will be in danger. The farmers have not won their battle with parity prices.

A fair annual income is much more important and that should be the next goal for them to strive for. Many people in manufacturing, mining, and business, who are working for good wages are now demanding a fair annual income, as well as a fair daily

or hourly wage. One group in the mining industry, for instance, is demanding that they be allowed to earn at least $1,300 per year per family. It would certainly not be unreasonable if each farm family in America were allowed to earn $1,000 per year per family, if the farm family produces sufficient products at a fair price to enable the family to acquire the $1,000 per year. Now is the time to commence working for a fair annual income for the farmers.

MAJOR QUESTIONS BEFORE CONGRESS

Permit me to suggest some of the questions that are now confronting the Congress of the United States.

1. Will we get into this war? It is my belief that when the historians 50 or 100 years from now read what happened during the last few years, they will arrive at the conclusion that our country has been very much interested in this war since it commenced in Europe. A Nation cannot furnish a belligerent nation food, supplies, and other materials, including planes, tanks, and guns, without being considered a party, either directly or indirectly, in the outcome of the battles. It is my belief that we will continue to furnish all-out aid to Britain, but that we will not send men overseas to engage in a foreign war.

The tragedy of destruction in Europe is not what happens to buildings and homes, but what happens to men. Buildings will rise again; torn cities and towns will be quickly repaired; but when men are degraded, it may be generations before the damage is undone.

2. How large will our national debt become? The answer is, it depends on Hitler. Practically everything we do here in America today is dictated or governed by what we believe Hitler has done or what Hitler expects to do. In other words, he is indirectly controlling the major affairs of our country today. If the emergency continues, our national debt will increase. There will be no way to avoid it, but there will not be national bankruptcy. A nation that has the power of creating credit or money cannot go bankrupt.

3. How will this enormous public debt be paid? It will be paid by taxation. The people are perfectly willing to be taxed to protect our liberties and our rights, and to make sure that the American way of life continues in the grand old United States of America and to make sure that no dictator or foreign desperado ever sets a hostile foot upon the Western Hemisphere.

Other questions coming up are: Will the trainees be compelled to continue to accept $21 per month, while people in industry are receiving wages from $7 to $24 per day? When will the strikes in defense industries be stopped and how will they be stopped? When will Congress adjourn, etc.?

INCREASED LAND VALUES

It is thought there will be somewhat of a land boom in this country before very long. The reasons are obvious. First, agriculture is being made profitable, and as any business becomes profitable, a few people jump in and try to buy up a large part of it. Second, people from the very large cities, and especially those who came here during the recent past from foreign countries, are considering settling in the interior, and are desirous of buying large blocks of land for cultivation and colonization. Third, people with money are buying land as a hedge against inflation. As the value of money goes down—and it is going down, down every week—the value of everything else, and especially tangible property, goes up in value. At this time, all signs point toward higher land values. Let us hope that every farm family may be permitted to buy and own a home and be given preference in land purchases over hedges and speculators.

THREE GREATEST INSTITUTIONS

A Nation's greatness can also be measured by the three greatest institutions on earth—the home, the church, and the school. Around these three institutions our civilization rests.

The home implies these things, which are the greatest things in the world. One for man, one for woman, and one for child. It implies a man who works, a woman who is good, and a child who is taught.

Only the man who works is a good citizen, for he assumes due responsibilities, keeps the peace, observes the law and his veins are the veins of wealth to any land.

Only the woman who is good is fit for mothering and the world needs mothers more than statesmen, scholars, and professors.

Only the child who is taught is fitted for citizenship.

FOUR GREATEST EVILS

Our Government is working to rid our country of the four greatest evils. They are: poverty, ignorance, disease, and crime. More has been done in the direction of ridding our country of these four major evils in the past 8 years than any other similar period or any other period of a half century preceding.

Our American Democracy is fortified by the people generally having a knowledge of and practicing the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule. There are exceptions to every rule, but we must not pick out an exception and point to it as the general rule. Generally, the people of this country are unselfish and patriotic. They have an inborn desire to do right and keep in mind at all times to live and let live.

GREAT NATURAL RESOURCES IN UNITED STATES

Our country possesses the greatest natural resources of any country in all the world. For instance, one-half of all the petroleum in the entire world is in the United States. The people of Texas point with pride to the fact that one-half of all the oil in the United States, or one-fourth of the oil in the entire world, is in Texas alone.

More than 70 percent of all the motor vehicles, automobiles, and trucks are in the United States. Texas, for instance, has more motor vehicles than Germany, or France, or Canada. China only has 1 motor vehicle for 6,000 people; Japan has 1 to every 380 people; Germany has 1 for every 41 people; England has 1 to every 19 people; France 1 to every 17 people; but the United States has 1 motor vehicle to every 4 people. In other words, all the people in this Nation could ride in a motor vehicle at the same time.

Among the things that have been accomplished in the recent past, of which we are very proud, and are of great help to agriculture, are low interest rates, low power rates, and other benefits, such as N. Y. A., F. S. A., tenant purchase, old-age assistance.

COOPERATION

The famous poet, Kipling, writing on cooperation, duty, and working together for a common cause, truthfully said:

"It is not the individual
Nor the army as a whole,
But the everlasting teamwork
Of every living soul."

Our country faces a brighter future because of the great work through cooperation your groups are performing, and I congratulate you.

TEN SPECIFIC DUTIES RECOMMENDED BY 4–H CLUBS

Mr. Speaker, Charles Ball, of Minter, Lamar County, Tex., was the only representative of the 4–H Clubs from the congressional district I have the honor to represent. Charles, after his return to Texas, stated the following about the conference:

Each day we had group discussions about rural youth's responsibility in the present crisis. We composed a bill of duties consisting of 10 duties. They are briefly:

1. Vote in every election.
2. Keep physically fit and encourage others to do the same.
3. Don't abuse freedom of speech and freedom of press.
4. Protect religious freedom by taking part in church activities.
5. Uphold the Constitution of State and country.
6. Understand the principles of democracy.
7. Appreciate home life.
8. Criticize laws constructively—but obey them until they are changed.
9. Support community education activities.
10. Apply the Golden Rule to every situation.

Santa Claus has Changed Rules in the Middle of the Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL A. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of America are in a rebellious mood over efforts of this administration to regiment them.

Scores of letters complaining about the 49-cent-per-bushel penalty on excess wheat have come to me. I agree with the farmers that this high penalty is not just. Farmers who overseeded Government allotments in the autumn of 1940 did so with the express understanding that if they suffered loss under a 15-cent penalty the fault would be their own. But when the penalty was increased from 15 cents to 49 cents per bushel, the crop was being harvested and there was no opportunity for the farmer to change his set-up. Further, the election came at such a busy period on the farm, and the time given was so brief a large percent of the farmers did not know about it early enough to vote. Now they face restrictions placed upon them by a minority of farmers and bureaucrats of the Department. As one who has lived by tilling the soil, I agree with the farmers that it is unjust and un-American. "So what?" say the bureaucrats. "The people will not vote against Santa Claus." But, I say, let Santa Claus beware when he changes the rules in the middle of the game.

LITTLE FARMER, THE FORGOTTEN MAN

Mr. Speaker, the little farmer is the forgotten man of the New Deal. Over $6,250,000,000 in cash farm aid has been checked out of the United States Treasury through the Department of Agriculture during the last 8 years. The spending of this huge sum sets a record peacetime spending on the part of a governmental department. Yet, while this huge

sum was being spent or loaned here at home, other millions were poured out to encourage and subsidize agriculture in other nations.

Perhaps the most recent case in point was the announcement on May 6, 1941, by Jesse Jones, Federal Loan Administrator, that the Export-Import Bank of Washington had on that day authorized a credit of $25,000,000 to the Republic of Cuba for agricultural development and diversification and public works.

Mr. Speaker, before we go further with plans to run the business of other nations, we would do well to remember that we have a lot of unfinished business at home.

I think there is a lot of merit in the suggestion of a farmer who wrote me saying that the law which created the Department of Agriculture should be repealed and the $1,068,500,063 appropriated for that Department this year be divided among those farmers in the Nation whose property has been valued at less than $2,000 for purpose of taxation. Certainly these are not the farmers who are helped by Government checks. Here are a few of those who were helped by Government checks:

Prudential Insurance Co	$133,191
Metropolitan Insurance Co	96,332
Federal Land Bank of Omaha	92,963
Mississippi State Penitentiary	52,528
Arkansas Penal Board	30,935
General American Life Insurance Co	43,441

Eleven other insurance companies received in excess of $35,000 each.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that these large checks to rich corporations is putting the cart before the horse. They are not the ones who are pulling the load. The fellows who deserve our attention and help are the men who live on the farms; whose hours and wages are not fixed by law, but who labor from daybreak to sunset, in rain or sun, heat or cold; who are the best customers of our factories; who burden their Government with less criminal costs than any other group and who are most dependable in peace or war. Benefit checks should go only to those who actually live upon farms and whose chief income is from the farm. The farmer is our only producer who delivers his products to town where he inquires, "What will you take for your goods and what will you give for mine?"

PARITY FOR FARMERS

Mr. Speaker, I have favored parity for the farmer. And I will say further, if it is constitutional for the Government to fix minimum wages and maximum hours for some workers, it would be constitutional to fix a minimum price on products of the American farm. Let us think less about lending, leasing, and giving to other nations and more about our own—"He that provideth not for his own hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel."

Each year under the New Deal the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture has increased by thousands while the farmer's plight has grown worse. I ask in all seriousness, is the New Deal more interested in regimenting the farmers than in improving their condition? Thousands of Missouri farmers would answer "yes" to such question. If you want to know the reason, investigate the acts of men on the Federal pay roll who tried to force through the Missouri Legislature House bill 565. More than 1,600 farmers, representing 66 counties, quit their harvest fields on June 24, 1941, to tell the Missouri Legislature that they would not stand for the dictation provided by that bill.

It is infamously unfair for any agency of the Federal Government to say to the people of a State that "unless you do thus and so we will withhold certain benefits." Missouri is one of the States that has paid more money into the Federal Treasury than it has taken out each year under the New Deal, and Missouri is displeased over so much talk in Washington about dictators abroad while the executive department of their Government constantly demands more power. Let our leader consider the "beam in his own eye."

This administration, having miserably failed on handling domestic problems, seeks to take the Nation into war in an effort to cover up its tragic mistakes. National problems are grave and made graver because of the confusion in which so many of the people have been thrown by the synthetic war hysteria produced by artful manipulation of emotions and fears. The propaganda which is driving the country to war and to the destruction of its free political and economic system is powerfully organized, with various groups and interests willingly or unwillingly playing their part to execute the great conspiracy.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AN EXPANDING UNIT

Under the New Deal the Department of Agriculture has not only broken all records for peacetime spending, but its profligate waste has been attended by the most remarkable expansion of the Department as well. To illustrate the mushroom growth of the Department, the following figures are presented: In 1929 the Department's appropriation was $171,147,000, and the number of employees but 16,795. By 1939 the employees had risen to 107,712, and the expenditures for that year were $1,524,221,133. Due to the transfer of several bureaus formerly within the Department of Agriculture to other agencies and departments of the Government, employment in the Department as of December 1940 stood at 81,886, and the expenditures for the fiscal year 1940 were $1,403,500,000.

FARM INCOME BELOW NORMAL AVERAGE

While the huge outpouring of cash and credit in favor of agriculture was expected to solve most of the farmer's economic problems, the results have been extremely disappointing not only to the farmers themselves but to the gentlemen in Washington who planned it that way.

The cash farm income, which between 1920 and 1930 averaged about ten and one-half billion dollars, has averaged about $7,000,000,000 in the years from 1931 to 1940, which included benefit payments of over $3,000,000,000 during the decade.

REGIMENTATION

As the average farm income is reflected in the general prosperity of the Nation, so too have the efforts to regiment and restrict the farmer been reflected in repressive legislation applied to other phases of the national economy.

While the farmer has been the innocent victim of a blitzkrieg by the departmental bureaucrats from Washington, the rest of the Nation has been quietly taking it on the chin, thinking meanwhile that their submission to certain types of state socialism was necessary to bring order out of chaos, that the farmer might be saved. Thus it came about, that the workingman in the city had the price of his bottle of milk fixed, not by the economic laws of supply and demand, but by the Department of Agriculture's bureaucrats and the business agents of the milk-wagon drivers' unions.

BUREAUCRACY ATTENDANT WITH WASTE

The growth of the Department of Agriculture from a comparatively small department of the Government employing less than 17,000 persons, to one of the largest has been told. However, the story of the waste, lost motion, and inefficiency connected with the Department's activities will possibly never be told.

Every operation in connection with the Department is so bound up with red tape that the following news item from Greenville, S. C., well illustrates the point. A colored woman who received a 3-cent check from the A. A. A. took the check to the bank and was informed it would cost her 10 cents to get it cashed. The colored lady remonstrated, said the amount was too small and finally walked out of the bank.

Now you folks can imagine what it cost the Government to audit this colored woman's claim for benefit payments, make out the check and go through all the other formalities necessary in mailing it to her. But you have no idea of the red tape still to be gone through if, in the course of time, this check does not turn up so the books can be balanced and the account closed in Washington.

THE FARMER HAS BEEN MADE A GUINEA PIG FOR EXPERIMENTS IN SOCIALISM, INTERNATIONAL TRADE, AND POLITICS

During the last 8 years all kinds of new schemes have been tried, always with the hope that a way will be found to solve the major problems facing the farmer. Sad to say, none of the schemes so far has been generally effective. And, while some of them might have worked by a fair trial in a limited area, it will be readily understood that as long as one department of the Government is actively promoting world trade on a reciprocal basis, the farmer who is forced to compete in the domestic market with foreign producers will always be in hot water.

While we have been importing large quantities of agricultural commodities we have been exporters on only a limited scale. Much of the export business, such as our cotton trade, has been on a subsidy basis or by barter agreements as was the case last year when we exchanged cotton

for rubber and tin with Great Britain. Both our export and import business has been severely curtailed by the present war in Europe. Of food products alone our exports for 1940 totaled $240,000,000 as compared with $312,000,000 in 1939. The dollar, however, is not an accurate measure of quantities for imported foods entering the United States at the declared value of the country from which they originate. For example: If we buy $1,000,000 worth of beef or corn from the Argentine, at their low prices, the quantity is very great and the loss of market to the American farmer much larger than the sum spent indicates. In other words, $1,000,000 spent for corn in South America might mean loss of market for $3,000,000 worth of corn grown at home.

PURCHASING POWER OF AGRICULTURE

The Department of Agriculture for many years has issued bulletins and reports on price levels and indexes. In February 1941 a 1-point decline in the index of farm prices was recorded. Since that time there have been consistent advances due primarily to the increased consumer demands, resulting from public employment in the defense program and the buying of huge quantities of food products by various governmental agencies, including the Department of Agriculture. But defense spending will end eventually, and it will be found that little of a permanent nature has been done for agriculture.

AMAZING DISCLOSURE

On April 29 the Department of Agriculture issued a news release declaring that the all-commodity index as of April 15 stood at 110 percent of the 1910–14 level. However, while the price index was up to 110 percent of the 1910–14 level, the index of prices paid, interest, and taxes had also risen and stood at 129 percent of the 1910–14 level. The farmer thus was progressively approaching bankruptcy the more business he did under the present order.

FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. Speaker, if we are to maintain the American standard of living it is obvious that we must take immediate steps to protect the farmers of America in the domestic markets. The men and women who labor to produce the foods we eat and the fibers out of which our clothes are made are far too important to the Nation to be exploited or neglected for the benefit of the economic internationalists and the free-traders. I am thoroughly convinced that there is no place in the whole world, except in our own country, where it is possible now, or at any normal time in the future, that agriculture may be maintained at a high level and with a profit to those who engage in it. I personally believe that foreign trade in agricultural products can only be maintained on a subsidized or give-away basis. I believe this Nation's best course lies in reserving our own markets for our own producers, buying for cash the things we need but cannot produce, and selling our surpluses the same way. I, too, want to be a "good neighbor," but I have sense enough to know that friendship cannot be purchased. I shall support every measure which will benefit our farmers, for I believe that when we save the farmers of America from ruin we will also have saved our Republic from decay.

Mr. Hoover's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NASHVILLE (TENN.) GLOBE-INDEPENDENT

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Nashville Globe-Independent:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Globe-Independent of July 4, 1941]

MR. HOOVER'S SPEECH

"There are those who argue that we are already in this war. The Constitution of the United States provides that Congress has the sole authority to declare war. It is equally their responsibility to see that this country does not go to war until they have authorized it.

"The only reason for not submitting the matter to the Congress would be that Congress cannot be trusted. Or that the people, through them, should not be allowed a voice. No President in a democracy should take that responsibility for there will be no unity or spirit in an executive war. If Congress decides to go to war, then we willingly give all; we willingly surrender all our freedom necessary to win that war. And until Congress shall by constitutional action declare war, no man in America may demand the end of debate on this issue of war or peace."

The above paragraphs are quoted from the notable and enlightening address delivered to the Nation over the radio on Sunday night, June 29, by former President Hoover. The words are as heartening to the God-fearing men and women of America, composing that overwhelming majority of the people who remain adamant to all of the attempts to get them reconciled to going to war, as they are disconcerting to the members of the blatant war party in this country.

And the war-party members need not assume that the words of Mr. Hoover do not carry weight. They carry weight not only with the great masses who do not want their sons butchered on foreign battlefields but also with thinking Americans who are aware of the downright hypocrisy and hooey in all of the arguments with which the leaders of the war party continue to insult the intelligence of the American people.

We never have had, and do not now have, any reason to be a participant in Europe's war, and as long as there are great leaders like Mr. Hoover expounding the kind of common-sense doctrine as that contained in his recent address, the people most certainly will dare to continue debating the issue of peace or war until they, through their Representatives, have taken the awful plunge into the war in Europe.

In this address of less than 45 minutes Mr. Hoover blasted away the froth and false pretense of the warmongers, showing not only that there are no ideological reasons for us to plunge into war but, what is more important, that this Nation is wholly unprepared to go into war with any hope that we either could bring the war to an early end or win it eventually. He likewise endorsed what is the contention of all Americans with ordinary common sense, that Hitler cannot invade and conquer the United States, nor can America, in cooperation with England, invade the continent of Europe and conquer Hitler.

Mr. Hoover disposed of the demagogic appeal that the warmongers make to us, urging war to prevent Hitler's new economic order from strangling the economic life of this country, by pointing to the fact that America depends upon her own people, here at home, for 93 percent of her national income. The warmongers think that we ought to send our boys to fight and die in an effort to preserve the little 7 percent of our annual trade.

The former President, impressed with the belief that a majority of Americans want to aid Britain as much as possible, thinks this can be done better by our staying out of war than going in; that we should turn over to Britain whatever ships we might have intended using to carry goods to Britain and let British people, and not American boys, run the ships for Britain.

Mr. Hoover's great speech was "played down" by the Nation's warmongering press, as was to be expected. But there was enough interest aroused in the speech, by previous announcements that it was to be made, to give the former President a great radio audience. And it was an audience that will redouble its efforts to make Congress not only retain its constitutional right to declare war but use its power to keep the Nation from drifting into an undeclared war.

If Congress fails the people in this great crisis, it is going to be terribly tough on all Senators and Congressmen who betray the trust reposed in them.

Let's Get National Defense When It Will Do Us Some Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, charging unnecessary and inexcusable delay in the national-preparedness program, Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, minority leader in the House of Representatives, demanded an immediate speed-up in national-preparedness production. He called for more efficient planning, unified control, elimination of red tape, and an end to the concealment of mistakes, together with the eradication of all other causes which are hamstringing preparedness efforts.

Representative MARTIN of Massachusetts said:

The administration has been given ample power and ample appropriations by the Congress to carry out our national preparedness program. The program is not being adequately carried out.

A subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee, which certainly cannot be said to be hostile to the administration, has been compelled by its findings to report bad management, bureaucratic interferences, poor planning, red tape, and lack of unified control as causes of highly dangerous delays in the building of our military, naval, and air programs.

It has been stated by authoritative sources, and, so far as I am aware, has not been refuted, that the administration in a full year of armament effort has produced a volume of arms which Germany's Europe could turn out in less than 2 months, and England in about 3 months. It has further been charged, and remains unanswered, that while ships, planes, tanks, guns, and munitions are needed in vast quantities, these supplies, except for planes, "are flowing out of American factories today in a mere trickle."

The funds available for the building of the preparedness program now amount to $45,000,000,000. This $45,000,000,000, beside including aid for Britain, is for a two-ocean navy, equipment for an army of 1,400,000 men, and an adequate supply of airplanes of the proper military types. Contracts amounting to about $18,000,000,000 have been let. It also appears American industry in a year of effort has turned out $7,000,000,000 worth of production, including British as well as American orders. Of this amount it is reported less than $3,000,000,000 has been spent for guns, aircraft, ammunition, and ships, and the other implements and supplies which would be vitally necessary in a shooting war. The rest of the seven billions went into cantonments, clothing, nonmilitary construction, and other activities merely preliminary to preparedness.

Entirely aside from any question of whether or not we should participate in a shooting war, it remains a fact it would be a crime of inexpressible magnitude to send American boys overseas without adequate equipment, supplies, or even training with which to defend themselves, let alone to win any battles. It would be unspeakable to expose our boys, helpless to defend themselves, to slaughter by the murderous fire of airplanes, such as were the French, Belgian, and English boys, and the soldiers of other countries.

Every straight-thinking person must realize our first job under any circumstances and in the light of every logical consideration is to achieve impregnable national preparedness and a fully mechanized, trained, and equipped army. We must hunt down all subversive elements and "fifth columnists" and throw them out of the preparedness program. Bureaucrats cannot be allowed to impede national preparedness. The Nation should be led and guided to unity and singleness of purpose in the building of the preparedness program and an adequate supply of training and fighting equipment for our boys. Informed Members of Congress know this is not being done now. They know the lag in the production for national preparedness is a matter for grave worry. Nothing should be permitted for a moment to stand in the way of the immediate economical and efficient building of an adequate, modern military and naval force. The military and economic security of the Nation must be made the paramount consideration. Mere appropriations are not achievement.

We demand the Nation be informed of the facts concerning the real state of the national preparedness. We demand the President take such steps, under his present authority and appropriations, as will break the bottlenecks, free the log jams, and get our national preparedness program moving as it should. The Nation expects this to be done.

A Letter Which the New York Herald Tribune Refused to Publish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

LETTER OF ARCHIBALD F. STEVENSON, NEW CANAAN, CONN.

Mr. TINKHAM Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent recently to the New York Herald Tribune, which was rejected:

To the New York Herald Tribune:

In a stirring speech before the conference of Governors at Boston the other night, Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, called for immediate action on our part "to clear the Atlantic of the German menace."

"Now is the time," he said, "to put in motion the huge machine we have been building since the war began. This is true," he added, because "we can insure, beyond a shadow of a doubt, the defeat of that pagan force, and insure a victory for a Christian civilization." (New York Herald Tribune, July 1, 1941.)

There are very few who doubt that the courage of American manhood, our genius for production, and our great natural resources could ultimately win for us a military victory over the Axis Powers or any other combination of nations. But I fear only wishful thinking can make us believe that such a victory would be a triumph for Christian civilization.

As I listened to Secretary Knox, my memory evoked an almost forgotten picture. It was the slender figure of Woodrow Wilson, standing before the assembled Houses of Congress that fateful April day in 1917, when he called for a declaration of war against imperial Germany.

I could almost hear him say: "But right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own government, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free."

These inspiring words expressed the faith which steeled the hearts of American doughboys to meet the cruel ordeal of battle in Flanders and in France. It seems almost an ironic sacrilege to repeat those words today. For after 8,538,000 soldiers died in service during the World War and some 21,000,000 more were wounded, after billions in money were expended and untold wealth destroyed, after Austro-Hungary and Turkey were dismembered and Germany rendered impotent, what was the harvest of all the suffering and sacrifice? It was military victory. But did it bring a better world to live in? You know that it did not. The net tangible results seem to have been the firm establishment of Stalin in Russia, Mussolini in Italy, Hitler in the Reich, and a host of lesser despots in the four quarters of the globe.

These were the cruel and unexpected fruits which blossomed and ripened on economic systems that had been ruined by that war. And the seeds of that fruitage are like the dragon's teeth of old, falling upon the blood-soaked soil of bankrupt Europe, have now sprung up once more as hosts of armored warriors bent on new destruction. The last World War, which most of us believed would herald a new era, ruled by justice and freedom, brought only tyranny to the greater part of Europe and painful economic depression to those countries which were fortunate enough to escape the yoke of dictatorship—our own included.

Nor should we forget that all this happened to a world in which, before 1914, public debts were almost negligible everywhere, coffers of private enterprise were filled to overflowing and the thrift of individuals had heaped up resources seemingly inexhaustible. Indeed, in those halcyon days we had enjoyed the security of peace and plenty for so long we had forgotten that human freedom is indissolubly bound to the fruits of labor held as private property. We did not realize that when a people's savings are devoured by a war, liberty is always swallowed up along with them.

In the bewilderment and despair of general poverty, factions inevitably arise and, as President Washington said, "the disorders and miseries, which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this despotism to the purposes of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty."

These words explain the triumph of every modern dictator. There could scarcely be a clearer warning to those of us who still think only in terms of military victory or defeat. For always beyond the battlefield there lies the "reconstruction" and no stable political edifice for the housing of free men can be erected without the bricks and mortar of private property.

Those among us who, like Secretary Knox, wish to cajole and frighten the rest of us into war, seem to think we can make a better fist of it this time. If the last war made the world worse, this one, they say, is going to make it better. Do you really believe that? I do not.

In 1917 America was a strong and united Nation. No shadow of doubt had crossed the minds of our citizens that our way of life was good. No collectivists then lurked in high public places, secretly at work to gather the country's political and economic power into their own hands. Our whole national debt was then little more than the annual debt service of it is now. For more than 2½ years the wealth of western Europe had been pouring into our coffers. We were rich, prosperous, and confident. By going to war then we took small risk of losing our heritage of freedom. But times have changed. Our leadership has changed. A new philosophy of personal power is loose in the world, whispering a promise of unlimited authority to every ambitious ruler, whether he be a premier or a president. We begin to see it taking root even now in Washington.

Our national debt is already more than forty times what it was in 1917, and it is growing with stunning rapidity. Our Army is as yet untrained and ill equipped. Our Navy is not large enough to defend two oceans. We are unprepared financially, morally, or physically to meet the strain of modern war. And so, if the struggle of 1917–18 brought us the worst economic depression we have ever experienced—war today may well bring on our utter financial ruin. In that wreckage of our economic system, who dares to say that the minds of men among us will not "seek security and respose in the absolute power of an individual" just as the people of Russia, Italy, and Germany did in like circumstances?

I am no pacifist. If we are set upon, come what may, we must and will defend ourselves. But we have not been attacked, though we have constantly invited it. Nor is there much real danger of it, if we arm ourselves as only we can arm when industry is free from political interference. For we must not forget that dictators, like ordinary folk, use up their strength and pass off the world's stage from sheer exhaustion. That, I think, is Hitler's ultimate destiny, whether we intervene or not. Hitler is no superman and the Germans are not supermen, either.

But if we hate Hitler more than we love freedom—if the destruction of the Beast of Berlin seems worth the utter ruin of America and the loss of every vestige of our liberty, then by all means let us enter the war now. If we do so, let it be with our eyes wide open, knowing that we are not defending democracy, we are not making the world a safer place to live in, and that our victory will not be a victory for "Christian civilization."

No—if we enter an unprovoked war, even the oldest man among us on that fatal day may well live to see freedom guillotined in America, just as liberty has already been crucified abroad.

ARCHIBALD E. STEVENSON.

NEW CANAAN, CONN., *July 2, 1941.*

Grand Coulee Dam Ready to Provide One-Sixth of Existing Power Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, we have repeatedly been told that there are two outstanding bottlenecks in our national-defense program. One is electrical energy, and the other is light metals, to wit: aluminum and magnesium.

EIGHTEEN GIANT GENERATORS AT GRAND COULEE

Out in the far Northwest, in the State of Washington, the Government is now completing the construction of Grand Coulee Dam, and the mighty Columbia River is actually harnessed. Provision has been made to ultimately install 18 giant electric generators, each with a capacity of 108,000 kilowatts. Ample water now flows and has flowed for centuries down the Columbia River at the point where Grand Coulee is constructed to drive these giant generators night and day at capacity. One generator will be in production in August of this year, and two more by January of next year. Bids have just been accepted for three additional generators, which will be installed in 1942, at which time there will be generated at Grand Coulee Dam 650,000 kilowatts of electrical energy, which will be more than one-fiftieth of all the electrical energy generated in the whole of the United States. If the 18 generators provided for at Grand Coulee Dam were installed, they would be generating more than one-fifteenth of the total electrical energy now consumed in the Nation.

ALL GENERATORS SHOULD BE INSTALLED

Through the years that I have been in Congress I have kept up the fight to secure appropriations to hasten to completion and full utilization this mighty power project on the Columbia River, which is located about 85 miles west of Spokane in my congressional district. The dam itself is now practically completed, but we are far from making full use of the energy that can be secured there.

In our frantic haste to properly prepare this Nation in its defense program we find that we will be short from 5,000,000 to 10,000,000 kilowatts of electrical energy within the next 3 years, and we have been appropriating millions and millions of dollars for the construction of steam plants and the installation of new hydro projects in various parts of the Nation, but have shortsightedly stood by and made no provision to bring in an additional 1,300,000 kilowatts of energy at Grand Coulee Dam, where all that we would need to do would be to place the generators at the foot of the dam, where the falling waters from this marvelous river would create the energy.

TWO MILLION KILOWATTS BY 1943

I am hopeful that the various agencies in the executive branches of the Government will immediately take steps to see that the Columbia River is harnessed to capacity at the earliest opportunity. This could be done if the generators were now ordered and they could be finished and installed by 1943, and it would take care of almost 20 percent of the threatened power shortage. In addition to this it would produce power at only a fraction of what it costs to build new steam or hydro plants. In fact, the sale of the power from these generators to be installed, at existing Coulee-Bonneville rates, would amortize the entire cost of the generators and their installation within 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, with these facts, it is difficult to understand why there should be a moment's hesitation in proceeding with the full development of the generating features of Grand Coulee Dam.

For the purpose of pointing out just what our electric power needs are in the near future under our present defense program, I desire to make a part of my remarks an article by Bryant Putney, which appeared in the New Republic of July 14, 1941, and which is deserving of the most serious and thoughtful consideration of every person in America.

The article follows:

[From the New Republic of July 14, 1941]

SHORTAGE IN KILOWATTS

Events of recent weeks have finally made it clear to the public that the country faces a shortage of electricity, but the extent to which this shortage threatens our whole national-defense effort is not generally realized. Even if civilian consumption of electricity is severely restricted during the next year or two, deficiencies in power supply are certain to limit the expansion of production in some of our most vital munitions industries.

Hoping to avoid plant expansion, utility officials, like their colleagues in steel, aluminum, and other monopolistic industries, have refused to admit the possibility of lack of power, and in their efforts to conceal the truth have resorted to shameless subterfuges. C. W. Kellogg's now famous speech to the convention of the Edison Electric Institute early in June, in which he declared that "an allegation of power shortage is unwarranted," was only one in a long series of attempts by spokesmen for the industry to hide the fact that the restrictive policies pursued in the hope of higher profits have brought about a situation which is so critical that it menaces the country's security. At the time of his speech Kellogg was not only president of the Edison Institute and sometime chairman of the board of Engineers' Public Service Co., one of the utility holding companies which has bitterly fought S. E. C. regulation but also "consultant on heat, light, and power" to the O. P. M. Heaven be praised, he is no longer the latter. (The New Republic of July 7.)

The story of the shortage of electric power is buried in the charts and statistics of the Federal Power Commission. It constitutes a damning indictment of the utility industry. At the same time it reveals that the F. P. C. has shown little foresight and less aggressiveness in doing the work assigned to it by President Roosevelt when the defense program was undertaken in the spring of 1940—to anticipate and to recommend action to prevent the development of power-supply bottlenecks. More than a year ago the Commission set up a national-defense-power staff whose sole duty it was to do this job. With the shortage now upon us, the Commission has at last begun to act. But a broad program to deal with the situation has yet to be announced.

The peak demand for electricity in 1940, class I utilities, including both public and private plants, was a little less than 28,000,000 kilowatts. In its most recent report, made public in mid-June, the F. P. C. estimates the peak demand for 1941 at 34,000,000 kilowatts, and the peak demand for 1942 at 37,000,000. On the basis of these estimates, the utilities must prepare for an increased demand amounting to 6,000,000 kilowatts this year and an additional 3,000,000 next year.

As might be expected, the utilities consider the Government estimates much too high. In their own reports to the Commission, they forecast a maximum demand of 30,500,000 kilowatts for 1941 and 31,000,000 for 1942—an increase by 1942 of 3,000,000 kilowatts over 1940's peak demand, or only one-third of the increase predicted by the Commission. In the same reports, however, the utilities reveal that they are planning additions to generating capacity amounting to a total of 6,500,000 kilowatts in 1941 and 1942. This gives away their hand. It is inconceivable that they would prepare for a peak demand of nearly 35,000,000 kilowatts in 1942 if they took their own estimate of 31,000,000 seriously.

Actually the peak demand by the end of 1942 is likely to be, not 31,000,000 kilowatts, as estimated by the utilities, nor 37,000,000, as estimated by the Power Commission in its published reports, but considerably more than 40,000,000. The Commission itself is well aware of this possibility. It has been careful to point out that its own estimates are subject to revision from day to day. In its June report it observes that "the defense program has been expanded so rapidly that estimates of future load cannot be kept completely up to date."

On June 5 Leland Olds, Chairman of the Commission, estimated that from 10,000,000 to 16,000,000 kilowatts of additional electric capacity would be needed to permit defense industries to attain maximum production with manpower now available. This meant that if full employment were reached by the end of 1942, the expansion of industry alone would increase the demand to between 38,000,000 and 44,000,000 kilowatts, and that the total demand would be still higher because of the growth in domestic consumption resulting from a rising national income.

Less than 3 weeks later Olds again revised his figures upward. Appearing on June 23 before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, he declared that the additional capacity needed to enable this country to match Germany's production of war materials amounted to from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 kilowatts. This would increase the total demand to be planned for to nearly 50,000,000.

That the need for power may reach 45,000,000 to 50,000,000 kilowatts by the end of next year is by no means improbable. To produce 1,600,000,000 pounds of aluminum—the minimum amount which the O. P. M. estimates is needed next year for military purposes—alone would require 2,300,000 kilowatts of capacity.

The chance that we will be prepared by next year to meet a peak demand of 40,000,000 kilowatts—much less 45,000,000 or 50,000,000—is remote. Although Kellogg told the Edison Institute convention that additions to capacity planned by the industry for 1941 and 1942 totaled 7,500,000 kilowatts the utilities themselves reported to the F. P. C. that scheduled new capacity amounted to about 6,500,000 kilowatts—3,400,000 in 1941 and 3,100,000 in 1942. If planned additions were made on schedule, the utilities would be able to meet a peak demand of 35,500,000 kilowatts by 1942. Actually, however, much of the generating equipment will not be delivered by the end of next year.

The production of turbines and generators for steam-power plants is one of the most critical bottlenecks of the entire defense program. Roughly two-thirds of the electricity produced in the United States is generated by steam plants and one-third by hydro plants. Three companies—Allis-Chalmers, General Electric, and Westinghouse—produce all of the turbines suitable for major steam-power plant expansion. In addition, they manufacture most of the steam turbines that drive American ships. Because of the extraordinary demands of our naval and merchant shipbuilding program, and because of shortages of machine tools and materials like steel forgings, all three of these companies are far behind on deliveries. Production at Allis-Chalmers was further delayed by the protracted strike last spring. Deliveries for 1941 will be at least 4 months late.

Under any circumstances, the production of generating equipment is a difficult and time-consuming job. For example, a machine tool known as a boring mill, used to finish the inside of turbine casings, may be tied up as long as 6 months turning out a single casing. Under ordinary conditions orders for generating equipment must be placed 18 months ahead. Under present conditions orders placed now could not be filled for from 30 to 36 months.

Total production of steam turbines for public utilities is estimated at about 4,000,000 kilowatts during the next 2 years. In addition to this steam capacity, some 1,250,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric capacity—most of it at the T. V. A., Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and Boulder Dams—is scheduled for installation by the end of next year. Some additions to capacity can be made also without installing new generators—by bringing present turbines and generators up to capacity through increases in boiler and condenser capacity. It is unlikely, however, that total additions to capacity by the end of 1942 will exceed 5,500,000 kilowatts. By adding this new capacity the utilities can meet a demand of about 34,500,000 kilowatts.

With a peak demand next year of 37,000,000 kilowatts—the present published estimate of the F. P. C.—the shortage at that time would amount to 2,500,000 kilowatts. If, as is likely, total power requirements should rise above 45,000,000, the shortage would amount to at least 10,500,000 kilowatts. This amount of generating capacity would have supplied more than the entire demand for electricity by residential consumers in 1940. Compared with a shortage of this magnitude, savings of an estimated 350,000 kilowatts from a 12-month system of daylight time would be minute, indeed.

In rationing blame for the shortage it is only fair to say that utility officials were in no better position than anyone else to foresee the enormous production program of the Government and the resultant growth in power demands. The private utility industry is to be blamed, however, for pursuing policies for a quarter of a century which made it difficult to produce additional power once the need for it became apparent. It is to be blamed also for refusing to admit the need for a large expansion of capacity months ago, when the broad scope of the defense program become clear, and for failing to discard immediately the restrictive policies which obstructed such an expansion. The industry is to be condemned for its efforts to cover up its own shortcomings by false statements to the public and phony reports on capacity and reserves to the Federal Power Commission. These latter sins come close to treason.

Experience of the T. V. A. and its competitor, the Alabama Power Co. demonstrates that utilities can increase profits by reducing rates and increasing consumption of electricity. A 55-percent reduction in rates brought about a 252-percent increase in residential consumption in Tupelo, Miss., after the T. V. A. began supplying the town with electric energy. Nevertheless, most of the private utilities have continued to operate on the theory that maximum earnings come from high rates on a small volume of business. They have opposed expansion during the war emergency because they feared that excess capacity after the war would threaten dividend payments.

The policy of resistance to expansion—at whatever cost to the Nation's security—has been dictated, not by the operating personnel in the industry, but by the financial interests which control utility holding companies. In a recent forthright speech to the Edison Institute convention, Edward C. Eicher, chairman of the S. E. C., pointed out that "It might be fatal to our national existence if we should experience the power shortages of the last World War." In some respects, he said, the task of providing adequate power for industry is more difficult now than it was then. "Prior to 1914 few holding-company systems had been created. * * * In the last World War the problems of the increased needs of power were solved primarily by true operating men whose interest was in production for service. Today the problem is complicated by the fact that the front-line operating men, those who really know the down-to-the-earth defense power needs of their own communities, are powerless to make decisions. The decisions must come from distant holding-company executives who at best are only remotely familiar with particular power problems and who at worst are selfishly refusing to do anything which they fear might weaken their own stranglehold on a scattered system."

An analysis of the recent reports of the utilities to the F. P. C. provides additional evidence that the private power companies have no hesitation in subordinating the country's interests to profit-seeking. Besides grossly underestimating future demand, these companies have doctored up their figures on capacity and reserves, in an effort still further to conceal the desperate need for expansion of plant. Between September 1940 and March 1941 the utilities increased their reported net assured capacity some 500,000 kilowatts by the simple expedient of reducing their reported required reserves by a like amount. This brought a mild reproof from the F. P. C.: "It is of course obvious that assigning higher values of dependable capacities to existing facilities and also decreasing available operating reserves are only apparent additions to the generating capacity of the country and do not represent real increases. Such practices, if carried beyond sound judgment, may prove dangerous to the defense program and inimical to the best interests of the country."

The timidity of the F. P. C. in dealing with the utilities is of less moment than its shortsightedness and procrastination in dealing with the power shortage itself. The Commission's national-defense power staff not only failed to propose definite measures for meeting such shortages as were foreseen, but, most important of all, it failed months ago to impress upon the public and upon Congress the fact that these shortages would be serious and that effective action should be taken immediately to forestall them. Figures in the Commission's monthly reports were listed according to geographical areas; no total figures to show the power situation in the country as a whole were given. Since the story could only be pieced together with the aid of an adding machine, it escaped public notice until the effects of actual shortages recently began to be felt.

Whatever the mistakes of the past, however, the important thing is to act now to remedy them. First, we should devise methods of expanding and speeding up our output of steam turbines and generators. Second, we should immediately begin to build hydroelectric plants at suitable sites throughout the country. The bottleneck in the manufacture of hydraulic generating equipment is less serious than the bottleneck in steam-turbine production. Five companies manufacture hydroturbines and generators—including Allis Chalmers, which builds both steam and hydraulic equipment. Not all of these manufacturers are now working at capacity. If equipment orders were placed now, it might be possible to make hydropower available in a number of places in 2 years or less. Construction of the proposed St. Lawrence hydroelectric development should be authorized without delay. This project probably would take 4 years to complete, but its capacity would be second only to Grand Coulee. Third, we should extend interconnections between power systems, in order to increase the dependability of existing power supplies. Such transmission lines would serve to reduce the amount of capacity that must now be kept in reserve for equipment break-downs, and would make it possible to supply some deficient areas with surplus power from other regions. Fourth, new defense industries should be located, and defense contracts allocated, with an eye to present and future power supplies. Finally, nondefense uses of power should be rationed where necessary.

If we take these steps at once, and all others that ingenuity can devise, we can reduce the shortage in kilowatts. If we fail to take them defense production will be stalled.

Constitutional Powers and Limitations Respecting the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

ADDRESS OF LT. COL. EDWARD CHAMBERS BETTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following address by Edward Chambers Betts, lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department, United States Army, professor of law, United States Military Academy, before a meeting of the Alabama State Bar Association at Mobile, Ala., Saturday morning, July 12, 1941:

At the risk of oversimplification, it may be said that the military constitutes the initial power of government and the ultimate power of government—initial, as the governing power in the hostile occupation of captured enemy territory; and, ultimate, as the governing power when all other power of government is impotent, either from domestic disturbance or hostile invasion. The exercise by the military of initial governing power is in pursuance of the laws of war, which impose the obligation on the occupying army of providing an orderly government in replacement for the government overthrown by the invading forces. The exercise by the military of ultimate governing power is in pursuance of the inherent right of self-defense enjoyed by all governments without constitutional or statutory grant, though sometimes confirmed and regulated by statute. The ancient "power of the county," evoked by the high sheriff's "posse comitatus" in defending his county against the King's enemies, was itself an exercise of such ultimate power of government—through recourse to the militia.

Thus regarded, the military and the powers of government it lawfully may exercise in peace and in war, in foreign or domestic, friendly or enemy territory hold much of interest for the bar—especially in these turbulent times, which yet may be more accurately rephrased trying times. Happily, and to our professional gratification the American bar is concerning itself most helpfully with aid of the Nation's military power, under the able leadership of Col. Edmund Ruffin Beckwith as chairman of the American Bar Association's committee on national defense. Respecting this, the Alabama bar may justly enjoy a paternal sort of pride in the fact that Colonel Beckwith, now of the New York City bar, was formerly a member of this bar, at Montgomery. Further interest in the efforts of the Government to insure the proper functioning of its military power is manifest by the American Bar Association, through establishment of a scholarship prize to be awarded annually to the cadet graduating No. 1 in law at the United States Military Academy. In this connection, please let it be noted that one of the 13 departments of instruction at West Point is the department of law, staffed with a professor, an assistant professor, and 7 other instructors engaged with the entire graduating class throughout each year—to the end that the Nation's future military leaders receive broad training environmentally suited to increasing the military leverage of their lives.

The Government's object, in respect of such instruction in law, is not to make its military leaders subtle disputants on legal niceties, but rather to insure their having a fortifying understanding of the forthright manner and the justifiable and courageous pride with which the military may exercise the authority entrusted it to insure that "domestic tranquillity" and to provide that "common defense" for which the American States became united under the Constitution. Perhaps I may do no better by my subject than to highlight for you this understanding which the Government thus seeks to give to its embryo Army officers at West Point of the sources and extent of military authority, the limits within which such authority may be exercised, the responsibility upon which the exercise of such authority may be invoked, and, finally, the relation of the Military Establishment to the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government and to the governments of the several States.

Without further caution, please understand me as speaking to my subject as limited to the Constitution of the United States and its military and as designating the United States Supreme Court when reference is made to the Supreme Court or the Court.

This initial power of government is commonly termed "military government"—the law of hostile occupation connoting governmental authority exercised by a belligerent over occupied enemy territory, the inhabitants and property therein, established and maintained by force of arms. Such occupation is a question of fact, to be distinguished from mere invasion, subjugation, and conquest. It does not transfer sovereignty or allegiance, but simply the power and duty to exercise some of the authority of a sovereign. Also, military government is to be distinguished from (so-called) martial law and the jurisdiction there involved in domestic territory—to which consideration will be given in our discussion of the military's exercise of the ultimate power of government. As has been remarked by the Supreme Court respecting military government, such governing authority "may do anything necessary to strengthen itself and weaken the enemy. There is no limit to the power that may be exerted in such cases save those which are founded in the laws and usages of war;"[1] to which may be added, further, save as the exercise of such authority may be qualified by limiting instructions from the President, whose authority as Commander in Chief of the Army, so being exercised, is large and extraordinary.

Though the military carries the flag with it in establishing such government—the Supreme Court held in the Insular cases that the Constitution (in its entirety), to use the lay vernacular, does not "follow the flag."[2] The authority of such government is invoked by military necessity and not by constitutional mandate; though, of course, all authority lawfully exercised in the name of the United States comes from the Constitution. Nor does the Congress attempt to legislate with respect to military government administered by our Army.

Military government under the United States—subject, of course, to the limitations of the laws of war (international common law—so to speak—treaties, protocols, etc.) may be exercised in varying forms and to differing ends. This is clearly illustrated by the unique fact that California was admitted to statehood without having had a territorial form of government. Under its military government, established by the Army upon the seizure of that territory from Mexico, a form of popular government by the people was inaugurated and administered with the aid of local officials and legislators, elected by the people under the supervision of the occupying military. This government culminated in the draft of a constitution, predicated upon which California was admitted into the Union as a State.

A military government, once established, endures until the occupying force exercising it is driven out or is withdrawn from the territory over which it has jurisdiction, or the civil authority of the government of the occupying force is established, or the authority of the vanquished enemy is reestablished by treaty and takes over in fact. It is not limited, ipso facto, by the cessation of hostilities, nor even a treaty of peace.

Such of the municipal laws of the occupied territory, respecting persons and property as the military deems expedient, may be adopted, or modified, and enforced by the military government. Likewise, the military may employ and utilize such of the established courts and other agencies of the vanquished government, for administering its military government, as it sees fit. Or it may employ its own tribunals for administering civil and criminal laws in their application to the inhabitants and property in the occupied area, and, such tribunals may be created and their jurisdiction prescribed, enlarged, or diminished at the will of the occupying military. Such options are matters of right on the part of the commander of the occupying force, and the administrations and practices issuing therefrom are upon the unqualified authority of the occupying force. Obedience to military government may lawfully be exacted of all inhabitants in the occupied territory. Likewise, all property within such area is subject to the authority of such government.

Historically, it may be of interest to note that, except during the Revolutionary War, United States territory has never been subjected to military government by a foreign power, save in the one instance of such government by the British at Castine, Maine, in 1814–15. This brief regime gave rise to the unique and interesting case of *United States* v. *Rice*.[3] (Incident to the War between the States Federal forces maintained so-called military governments over areas of the Confederate States. This was a purely domestic matter, however.)

A comprehensive delineation by the Supreme Court of the powers, responsibilities, and obligations of an occupying army, and the reasons therefor, may be found in the case of *Dow* v. *Johnson*,[4] supra.

So much for that phase of our subject. Let us turn now to consideration of the exercise by the military of the ultimate power of government, more readily recognizable as martial law—to use a conventional term by way of distinguishing it from military government.

A better understanding may be had of this phase if we bear in mind that the military is an arm of the executive branch of the Government, functioning under the President as Commander in Chief, who speaks usually through the Secretary of War: "The regular constitutional organ of the President for the administration of the Military Establishment of the Nation, and rules and orders publicly promulgated through him must be received as the acts of the Executive and, as such, be binding upon all within the sphere of his legal and constitutional authority."[5]

Martial law, or, to use a more descriptive term, martial rule, connotes temporary government by the military of a civil population in domestic territory as necessity may require. This authority of the military to protect the people in the enjoyment of an orderly government is equal to the need for such protection. Necessity both invokes and determines the extent and duration of such rule by the military exercising the Government's inherent right of self-defense against all enemies foreign or domestic.

Martial rule may properly exist in a particular locality, only when and where the machinery of the civil government has broken down and the courts are no longer properly and unobstructedly exercising their jurisdiction. In such a situation, and for the time being, a substitute is necessary to take the place of the deposed civil authority; and, as the only authority remaining available to the government, the military may lawfully govern until the civil government is restored to the proper exercise of its functions. Discussion of this phase of our topic would be incomplete without special mention of the famous *Milligan case*,[6] wherein the Supreme Court, in short, held that the executive branch of the Government could

---

[1] *New Orleans* v. *Steamship Co.* (20 Wall. 387, 394 (1874)); *Dow.* v. *Johnson* (100 U. S. 158, 170 (1879)).

[2] *Downes* v. *Bidwell* (182 U. S. 244 (1900)); *Dorr* v. *U. S.* (195 U. S. 138 (1904)).

[3] 4 Wheat. 246 (1819).

[4] 100 U. S. 158, 166 (1879).

[5] *U. S.* v. *Eliason* (16 Pet. 291, 302 (1842)).

[6] 4 Wall. 2 (1866).

not lawfully enforce its authority by imposing punishment—in that case, capital—upon a civilian convicted by a military commission for violations of law, committed outside the sphere of active military operations, cognizable before tribunals of the Federal judiciary open and ready for the transactions of their proper functions. The dicta of both the majority and minority opinions, in this five to four decision of the Court, have occasioned much continuing discussion—tending to give to martial law a significance scarcely recognizable as the law of governmental self-defense.

Martial law is a term of convenience, and characterizes no recognizable body of law either common or statutory. It does not occur once in the Constitution and only rarely in the great body of extant Federal Statutes—for instance, in connection with special provisions for the governments of Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands.

When the military power is employed in full martial rule of a civil community, over the inhabitants of which criminal jurisdiction is exercised, the municipal law of the impotent civil government is replaced by the martial law of necessity. Of a consequence, the military may have recourse to both preventive detention and punitive detention to enforce its authority, as do civil governments. Such punishment of civilians violating the military's authority may be imposed by military tribunals, such as military commissions and provost courts.

As the powers of a government are commensurate with the needs for its defense, military rule over a civil community may lawfully extend to exercising criminal jurisdiction over the inhabitants subject to its martial law, or be limited to merely restoring order in aid of the functions of civil government—either, or both, as necessity may require. In any of such circumstances the military may lawfully be employed as a regulating force, with authority to regulate equal to the necessity to regulate. And, since the military may properly be so employed only for the purpose of restoring the civil authority of the government, it may not lawfully be employed after such restoration has been accomplished.

Within such proper limits, the government may determine the necessity for using its military power, and the judiciary will not review such acts of state.[7] Likewise, the judiciary is reluctant to review the military's determination of the necessity for and nature of preventive measures—as distinguished from punitive measures—properly to be taken under the instant circumstances.[8] Speaking to these points, Mr. Justice Holmes said of military arrest and preventive detention:

"Such arrests are not necessarily for punishment, but are by way of precaution, to prevent the exercise of hostile powers. * * * When it comes to a decision by the head of the state upon a matter involving its life, the ordinary rights of individuals must yield to what he deems the necessity of the moment. Public danger warrants the substitution of executive processes for judicial processes." [9]

Let it be noted, that this is indeed the very essence of martial law.

Use of the military as a posse commitatus or otherwise for the purpose of executing the law, except when expressly authorized by law, has been forbidden, under heavy penalties of fine and imprisonment, since the act of January 18, 1878.[10] Passage of this Posse Commitatus Act was occasioned by the liberal use made of the Federal military by the reconstruction governments in strong-arm enforcement of harassing measures of oppression throughout the area of the then late Confederacy. The military's disciplined respect for the prohibitions of this act have at times occasioned some embarrassment to the Army because of a lack of understanding on the part of an indignant public of this reason for the Army's seeming lack of self-sufficiency and readiness to rely upon the civil police to cope with emergencies.

Complementing these initial and ultimate powers of government so exercised by the military, is the military's own power of self-discipline administered through its court-martial system—transplanted prior to the Revolution from England, where it had its origin in the "Kings Court of Chivalry," the "Court of Honor."

The jurisdiction to administer military justice is derived from the Constitution, international law, and the laws of war. It is not territorially limited, as is the jurisdiction of civil tribunals, by the venue of the offense charged, the place where the alleged offense was committed being of no consequence. As to persons, jurisdiction is dependent upon military authority to require attendance of the individual at his trial.

In our Army military justice is administered through the disciplinary powers of commanding officers, courts martial, and courts of inquiry in accordance with statutes (articles of war, etc.) enacted by the Congress pursuant to its constitutional authority to make rules for the government and regulation of the Army [11] and under the executive power of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army.[12]

Military courts martial, though no part of the Federal judicial system provided for in the Constitution, have a constitutional entity and a sphere of operation equal in dignity to and coextensive with tribunals of the Federal judicial system—to the full extent of their jurisdiction—and share with these tribunals the immunities of the Federal Government and its instrumentalities from subordination to authority of the States.

Courts martial are not courts of record, have no fixed places nor times of session, no inherent powers to punish for contempt, or to issue judicial writs or mandates, as in the case of civil tribunals. In legal contemplation, the judgment of a court martial is merely a recommendation until approved by the revisory authority—unless the finding is not guilty, when approval is not necessary to its effectiveness. Courts martial being parts of a self-contained system for the administration of military justice, it follows that, properly approved judgments of courts martial are not reviewable by civil tribunals of the Federal judicial system—save, only, when void for absolute lack of authority to try the individual or to inflict the punishment imposed, and this, because courts martial have limited jurisdiction as to persons, offenses, and punishments.[13] For, as has been observed by the Supreme Court, an army is not a deliberative body. Its law is that of obedience. No question can be left open as to the right to command or the duty to obey.[14]

The primary object to be served through military justice is the proper discipline of the military in aid of its training and administration. If patriarchal discipline by the commanding officer under the one hundred and fourth article of war, commonly known as company punishment, proves inadequate as a corrective, recourse may be had to courts martial—as a final resort.

In addition to such procedural and other differences inhering in and peculiar to military justice, the legal consequences of military status are to alter materially the individual's rights and obligations. Just how unique may be the change inhering in such status is emphasized by the fact that, as an army officer, one is liable to criminal punishment by civil courts for violations of the criminal statutes of the several States and of the United States and, in addition to punishment by the States, liable to punishment by military courts for conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentlemen—as adjudged by his contemporaries.

As we all know, justice as administered by civil tribunals in accordance with law is not always in harmony with the moralities involved—because, unhappily, the standards of measure established by the law are inadequate. In contrast, justice as administered by military tribunals is more nearly in harmony with the moralities involved—because, happily, "In military life there is a higher code, termed honor, which holds its society to a strict accountability, and it is not desirable that the standards of the Army shall come down to the requirements of a criminal code."[15]

As qualifying for the responsibilities of passing judgment and imposing punishment in aid of the proper discipline of the Army, in the instruction given in law at the academy, emphasis is placed upon exemplification of law as the science of human wisdom, the ability to judge soundly and deal sagaciously with facts, especially as related to life and conduct; and, as a rational philosophy, "founded upon principles of moral rectitude, modified, it is true, by authority and the habits of mankind, but never failing to do justice equally to all parties, without reference to the power and dignity of either." [16]

In conclusion, let us be reminded that, from the highest to the lowest, all ranks in the Army exercising military authority do so under the executive power of the President; and, of a consequence, it is especially important that military men be ever mindful that they do not exercise an absolute authority innate in the military, but rather that they only representatively exercise authority as trusted public servants.

Nevertheless, let it not be doubted that such initial and ultimate powers of government may be exercised by the military in peace and war, in domestic and foreign territory, in friendly and enemy territory, with entire reliance upon legal justification and supporting sanction of public opinion, if exercised in good faith (without apologetic timidity) with courageous caution, and a high-minded conscience for the just preservation of the authority of the United States and the integrity of its institutions. Finally, it is imperative that those of us so empowered exercise such vast authority with dignity becoming a sincere conviction that it imposes obligations rather than bestows privileges—noblesse oblige.

[7] *Martin* v. *Mott* (12 Wheat. 19, 29–31 (1827)).
[8] *Luther* v. *Borden* (7 How. 1, 44, 46 (1849)).
[9] *Moyer* v. *Peabody* (212 U. S. 78, 84 (1908)).
[10] 20 Stat. 152; 10 U. S. C. 15.
[11] Constitution, art. I, sec. 8, clause 14.
[12] Constitution, art. II, sec. 2, clause 1.
[13] *Smith* v. *Whitney* (116 U. S. 167, 177 (1886)).
[14] *In re Grimley* (137 U. S. 147, 153 (1890)).
[15] *Fletcher* v. *U. S.* (26 Ct. Cl. 541, 563 (1891)).
[16] *McKee* v. *U. S.* (12 Ct. Cl. 504, 537, 538 (1876)).

Proposed Joint Tax Returns of Husband and Wife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

LETTER OF BISHOP WILLIAM T. MANNING, OF NEW YORK, IN NEW YORK TIMES, TUESDAY, JULY 15, 1941

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include a letter written by Bishop William T. Manning, of New York, with reference to the provision of the pending tax bill to require the filing of joint returns by a husband and wife. I take this opportunity of bringing to the attention of the House the statement of this distinguished churchman because it is my opinion that the proposal presents a subject for most serious consideration, especially since it is a radical departure from all previous procedure. My mail in this connection further prompts me to note the opinion of Bishop Manning who undoubtedly speaks out of his broad experience as a high churchman and patriotic citizen.

The letter is as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 15, 1941]

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In this day of crisis for our country and for humanity, we must all of us, whether our incomes are small or large, be willing to bear our full share of whatever increase in taxes may be required for our defense measures and for the defeat of Hitlerism. We are paying now the heaviest taxes in the history of our country and we shall have to pay much more.

In the new tax bill as proposed by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, however, there is one proposal which is so manifestly unfair, which is so reactionary in its implications, and which would be so harmful in its social and moral effects that I hope it will be eliminated at once.

I refer to the proposal that husbands and wives shall be compelled to file one joint income tax return instead of two individual tax returns as at present. This proposal turns its back upon all the progress that has been made in the status of women in recent decades and belongs to the age when women were not regarded as people and a married woman was not allowed to hold property in her own right.

This provision of the tax law would produce some additional money for the Treasury, but that is no defense for its flagrant injustice or for its antisocial influence and effects. This proposal is plain discrimination against those women, and today there are many who have or earn incomes and are married. It gives the unmarried woman or the divorced woman who has an income a definite advantage over the married woman who has an income. It forces the husband and wife to make a tax return which will carry them up into a higher bracket than each one as an individual would be in and thus greatly increases the amount of the family tax.

As has been truly said, "the joint return mandate tends to encourage divorce, celibacy, a mercenary attitude toward intended marriage, and in general a lower birth rate." If Congress retains this provision, those who have been divorced or who have refrained from marriage perhaps for selfish reasons, or who live in immoral sexual relationship, will be called upon to pay far less to the Government than the married couples who in their faithfuness to the obligations of the home and family are the strength and mainstay of our life as a nation. It is the policy of all enlightened peoples to favor and encourage marriage, but if this proposal is enacted the United States will be found discriminating against the stability of the family and the home.

In its resolution adopted on June 12 the Ways and Means Committee specifically expreases its approval of mandatory joint returns for husband and wife, "if living together." The quotes are mine, but the sinister implication of the words is plain enough. This provision, if enacted, will say to married couples that their tax burdens will be lighter if they break up their homes than if they live together.

If there are some husbands who will seek to reduce their tax by ostensibly giving part of their property to their wives, meet this by fair measures—not by penalizing all the married women of our land who have or earn incomes of their own.

Let us call upon all our people to do their part and to bear their full share of the tax burden which Hitler and his partners in crime are forcing upon us. But let us not enact a law which will compel a man and woman who are married—and who stay married—to pay a heavier tax than they would have to pay if they were unmarried or if they were divorced.

This proposed measure is contrary both to moral principle and to public policy.

I hope that the leaders of all churches, and the people of all churches, Catholic, Protestant and Jewish alike, will express themselves in opposition to this retrogressive, inequitable, and indefensible proposal.

WILLIAM T. MANNING,
Bishop of New York.

NEW YORK, *July 14, 1941.*

Improvement of Navigation on the Ouachita and Red Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWT V. MILLS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

STATEMENT BY THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF MONROE AND WEST MONROE, LA., THROUGH G. D. HOLLAND, SECRETARY

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the cities of Monroe and West Monroe, La., relative to the Ouachita and Red Rivers submitted before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the War Department in Washington, D. C., on Monday, July 14, 1941:

To the RIVERS AND HARBORS BOARD,
War Department, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The Chamber of Commerce of Monroe and West Monroe, Ouachita Parish, La., requests your honorable body to make immediate authorization for the expenditure of $7,830,000 for the construction of a series of locks and dams on the Ouachita River to provide a 9-foot navigable channel on the Red, Black, and Ouachita Rivers from a point where the Red River intersects with the Mississippi River to Felsenthal, Ark., as stipulated in a report filed recently with the War Department by the Army engineers office in Vicksburg, Miss., and if possible to do so to erect additional locks and dams to provide an extension of this 9-foot channel to Camden, Ark., present head of navigation on the Ouachita River.

We are informed by the staff of engineers of the Vicksburg Army engineers office that a report on the Ouachita and Red Rivers filed by this office recently with your honorable body makes the following statement: "It is recommended that a project for modification of existing and authorized navigation projects on Ouachita River to provide a 9-foot navigable depth to Felsenthal, Ark., with an estimated construction cost of $7,830,000 to be classed as meritorious; that such a project be given further consideration in connection with the preparation of the authorized river report on Red River and tributaries; and that it be authorized only as a similar coordinated project for Red River proves feasible and justified."

The business, commercial, and industrial interests of Monroe, West Monroe, and in fact all of northeast Louisiana, are very much pleased with this report and recommendation. On February 3, 1939, the Chamber of Commerce of Monroe and West Monroe, La., filed a brief and offered oral testimony at a hearing held before representatives of the Army engineers office in Vicksburg, said hearing having been held in the city hall of Monroe, La., which alleged that House Document No. 196 of the Seventy-third Congress, second session, re the Ouachita River and its tributaries in the States of Arkansas and Louisiana, was seriously in error in making the following statement: "Extension of the existing navigation project is not economically justified" (p. 9, sec. 5, par. (b)).

The chamber of commerce held at that time that a channel of 9 feet in depth for the Ouachita River from the present head of navigation at Camden, Ark., to the mouth of said river was badly needed and was economically justifiable, and requested that immediate steps be taken to provide such a channel to meet present and future navigation needs.

The present channel of the Ouachita River of 6 feet in depth is entirely inadequate to meet present and future navigation needs on this river. A very large tonnage not now being handled on the river would move via water if the channel depth was adequate to handle through barges in connection with barge lines operating on the Mississippi River and its tributaries. The Mississippi River and all its tributaries on which navigation is maintained the year round are equipped with 9-foot channels with the exception of the Ouachita River. The natural result is all of the equipment used on the Mississippi River and its tributaries is constructed to operate in 9-foot channels at a maximum capacity load. The fact that the Ouachita River has only a 6-foot channel prevents the through movement of tonnage on the Ouachita River north to the Mississippi River and its tributaries to such destinations as St. Louis, Chicago, Pittsburgh, and other ports without unloading and reloading in New Orleans.

The cost involved in unloading and reloading from one size barge to another is of such an amount to block the large through-tonnage movements. It is economically unsound to load a 1,200- or 1,500-ton barge with 500 tons for a long trip of this kind.

If there were a 9-foot channel in the Ouachita River it would be possible to handle through-barge loads of paper and pulp to points like St. Louis, Chicago, Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, and other ports which are the large consuming centers of this product without the cost of unloading and reloading. The Mississippi River barge-line operators would then be in a position for their barges to move through the Ouachita River loaded to capacity, while a 6-foot channel which we now have will not permit an operation of this kind.

The Brown Paper Mill Co., Inc., manufactures pulpboard, paper, and other products at West Monroe, La., and must find a market therefor. This is principally in the northern part of the United States, including the eastern seaboard. To reach the latter territory, and meet competition, it is necessary to ship a considerable part of their products via barge on the Ouachita River to the port of New Orleans and transshipment via ocean steamers to North Atlantic ports.

There is also a considerable amount of potential tonnage consumed in Memphis, St. Louis, Chicago, and Cincinnati territories, which could be shipped via barge from West Monroe to points on the Mississippi and Ohio

Rivers. Present navigation on the Ouachita River makes this impossible, because the load of the barges is limited to 500 tons with the present 6-foot channel

If a 9-foot channel is provided and maintained the year round, it would be possible to operate larger barges with heavier loads, which would facilitate the movements of large amounts of paper at substantial savings over the present movement via water.

The establishment of a 9-foot channel on the Ouachita River would open up a development of a very large oil movement from the Arkansas field south and permit the movement of finished petroleum products north from Baton Rouge and other points on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. One large oil company has purchased the necessary site for a water terminal in Monroe but has withheld improvements on this site because oil cannot be profitably moved on the small barges now used on the Ouachita. A 9-foot channel would insure the completion of this project, which would be of benefit to the entire northeastern district of Louisiana.

The present locks and dams system on the Ouachita River has been in use for a number of years. There is no provision on the Ouachita River for making necessary repairs to the locks and dam equipment without closing the river to navigation, with a disruption of service, which is seriously detrimental to the use of the river. The creation of a 9-foot channel would, no doubt, create a secondary set of locks and dams on the river which would make it possible to maintain navigation even at a period when it is necessary to work on the locks and dams. Further, the present locks and dams are in a serious state of deterioration and considerable expense will be involved in repairing and modernizing them. This expense, if directed toward converting the system to a 9-foot channel, would be a long-range program of economy in maintaining navigation on the Ouachita River.

The River Terminals Corporation, which has operated barge service on the Ouachita River for a number of years, averages receiving from 50 to 100 inquiries per year on the handling of through barge-load movements from the northern points on the Mississippi River and its tributaries to Monroe. Due to the draft of the barges with the load involved, these movements could not be brought to a successful conclusion because of the cost involved in unloading and reloading for the complete trip. The fact that the 6-foot channel would not permit enough tonnage on the large barges used in the 9-foot channels to justify the partial loading of this equipment further precluded this movement. Another factor involved was the additional time required for this exchange from the large barge equipment to the smaller.

The size of the present locks in the Ouachita River are 55 by 267 feet. They are too small and too shallow to accommodate large-type barges. Too, they cause too much delay in breaking tows when any appreciable tonnage is being moved. The chamber recommends that, in addition to a 9-foot channel, the locks be made a minimum of 84 by 450 feet to take care of present-type barges used in standard 9-foot channels. This is not an excessive size when it is considered that locks on the Ohio, upper Mississippi River, and the Illinois waterway are 110 by 600 feet.

The present navigation facilities on the Ouachita River, when compared with its parent, the Mississippi, may be likened with an old-time narrow-gage railroad as compared with the present wide-gage railroad. The narrow-gage railroads lost their value and usefulness with the advent of the wide-gage road. The Ouachita, in its present condition, is practically useless save for small amounts of local tonnage. There cannot be any interchange of shipments with the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers which penetrate the heart of the East and Midwest, those areas with which we engage in traffic intercourse.

The chamber of commerce raises the question as to the plausibility of the logic employed in arriving at the conclusion that the past movement of tonnage on the Ouachita River has not resulted in savings which would create a reasonable rate of return on the investment of the United States Government in navigation facilities of the Ouachita River. The method of computation employed, we are reliably informed, in arriving at the resultant savings to the general public through the use of navigation on the Ouachita, was arrived at by subtracting the cost of freight moving by river and which was charged by the barge companies from the then current all-rail rate. The chamber holds that the correct method of computation which would reveal the real and intrinsic value in resultant savings to the general public should be to deduct the then current barge rates on commodities affected by river navigation from the former all-rail rate before navigation on the Ouachita River, assuming that the former all-rail rates were reduced by virtue of river navigation. These tremendous savings to the general public are not reflected in the calculations used by Army engineers in the determining of savings to the consuming public in transportation costs in the Ouachita River area.

A 10-year average of 1928 to 1938 shows that not less than 250,000 bales of cotton are produced per year in the area whose rate structure is affected by Ouachita River navigation. Before the barge line was inaugurated on the Ouachita River the all-rail rate on cotton from Monroe to the port of New Orleans was $4.05 per bale. This has been reduced to $1.15 per bale due directly to barge-line competition. This shows a saving to the farmers within a radius of 60 to 75 miles from Monroe of $2.90 per bale or more than $600,000 annually. Similar savings have been affected on other commodities. The chamber of commerce holds, therefore, that saving already affected to this area by the Ouachita River justify, from an economical standpoint, the Government's further expenditure to provide a 9-foot channel in the Ouachita River. This further thought, namely, that based upon the engineers' method of computing savings resulting from river transportation, the establishment of a 9-foot channel on the Ouachita River would result in increased tonnage on the Ouachita River to show the proposition to be fully justified from the standpoint of economic feasibility.

The President of the United States, after reading the report of the National Resources Committee on the economic conditions of the South, made the statement that this area, of which northeast Louisiana is a part, was the Nation's No. 1 economic problem. With Federal legislation leveling off and making uniform labor costs throughout the Nation, and with economic forces functioning to add uniformity to raw-material costs, the cost of transportation in the future is, more so than in the past, going to exercise a tremendous influence in the future location and maintenance of industry. With the South's present handicap as revealed in the National Resources Committee report, with high transportation costs, it needs, more than any other section of the United States, lower transportation costs.

It is common knowledge that the basic rate structure is higher west of the Mississippi River in the southwest freight-rate area than east of the Mississippi River in the southeastern freight-rate area. The Ouachita River penetrates an integral part of the southwest area, suffering tremendously now from a relatively high basic rate structure. To provide this area with the enormous benefits accruing from deep-water transportation of a 9-foot channel on the Ouachita River would be of tremendous benefit to this section, which needs it much more badly than sections of the country which already enjoy these benefits.

The chamber of commerce understands that the President of the United States has instructed the National Resources Committee to prepare a list of projects which are needed in the public interest, and which will be eligible to receive the expenditure of public moneys from the Federal Treasury at such time as the present national-defense effort of the Federal Government is terminated, to prevent a serious economic crisis in the immediate post-war period. In view of this fact and in view of the further fact that the erection of locks and dams on the Red, Black, and Ouachita Rivers to provide a 9-foot channel to Felsenthal, Ark., has been deemed economically feasible as the result of an exhaustive suvey by the Army engineers of the War Department in this connection, it is recommended that your honorable body make immediate authorization for the expenditure of necessary funds to provide these badly needed facilities. We understand that before appropriations can be made by the Federal Congress to provide necessary funds for these improvements that such an authorization is a necessary requisite.

We believe that your honorable body can be well justified in making these authorizations at this time. The survey referred to above has been made and definitely establishes the economic feasibility and justification for these proposed improvements. In the light of these facts we urge that you make this authorization at this time. We feel that we can depend upon the wise discretion of the Federal Congress as to whether or not immediate appropriations to provide these facilities at an early date are in the public interest. If the Congress decides that these appropriations should be delayed until the immediate post-war period, our position will be to support the Congress in this connection, and we propose not to press for these appropriations to provide these facilities until the present national crisis is passed.

The Chamber of Commerce of Monroe and West Monroe holds that immediate authorization for these proposed improvements will be in line with the expressed policy of our President, and also to be in line with the program and purposes and present efforts of the National Resources Committee.

In 1939 the Louisiana State Flood Control and Water Conservation Commission, under the direction of the Honorable Wade O. Martin, chairman of this body, a resolution was passed through Congress which consolidated for the first time in history the Ouachita with the Red River as regards future improvement of navigation facilities and flood control improvements of these two rivers. The motive behind this action was a plan to divert water from these rivers through specially constructed canals to certain rivers traversing the southern part of the State to provide irrigation for the rice-producing section of southern Louisiana. We are reliably informed that this proposal was based upon certain rice-producing interests of the southern part of this State, and that it was not based upon any basis of sound engineering feasibility, and that no accurate study to determine the economic justification of this proposal had been made by reputable engineers. It is the considered judgment of the Chamber of Commerce of Monroe and West Monroe that a serious error was made in the consolidation of the Ouachita and Black Rivers with the Red River for the purpose of joint future consideration for navigation for flood control improvements. We, therefore, urge and strongly recommend the complete severance

of the Ouachita and Black Rivers from the Red River by the War Department in future consideration of flood control and navigation improvements of the Black and Ouachita Rivers.

In taking this position we desire that it be expressly understood by both the War Department and the interests of our friends located on and in proximity to the Red River, that we did not take this position to discriminate in any way against the interests of the Red River. Frankly, we are of the opinion that such a connection with the Red River would be detrimental to the future interests of the Black and Ouachita Rivers. It is common knowledge that the Black and Ouachita Rivers lend themselves admirably to navigation improvements because of certain physical characteristics of these rivers. With a statement of further frankness in this connection, we believe that this statement cannot be made of the Red River. We further believe that the engineering difficulties involved in providing navigation facilities on the Red River will prove a handicap to our interests in bringing about the desired improvements on the Ouachita River should our river continue to be linked with the Red River. We prefer to have the Ouachita and Black Rivers stand, figuratively speaking, on their own feet and allow the Red River to do likewise.

The Ouachita Valley Association, an organization of individuals, firms, and corporations in South Arkansas, has been interested for a number of years in having the War Department construct dams, create reservoirs on the upper reaches of the Ouachita River and certain of its tributaries with the view of impounding waters in these reservoirs to create numerous hydroelectric, recreational, and flood-control benefits to that area and also to all of the area in Louisiana drained by the Ouachita River. The Chamber of Commerce of Monroe and West Monroe desires to support the position of this association and also the position of the El Dorado and Camden, Ark., Chambers of Commerce in urging that your honorable body give serious consideration to the needs for these proposals.

It is quite obvious that flood hazards will be greatly minimized throughout the entire watershed of the Ouachita River in Louisiana if flood waters of the Ouachita River and its tributaries are impounded in reservoirs at the headwaters of these streams. We desire to magnify the fact that all of the water which falls in north Louisiana and southern and southwestern Arkansas converges upon the cities of Monroe and West Monroe, creating flood hazards which have dealt devastating economic blows to our section in the past. While the cities of Monroe and West Monroe enjoy levee protection against flood hazards at the present, which we have not had in the past, at the same time we feel that it would be definitely to our interests to have these flood waters impounded at their source rather than to be allowed to descend upon us in the future.

In conclusion, we desire to submit the following two specific recommendations. First, that immediate authorization for funds be made to Congress to create locks and dams to provide a 9-foot channel on the Red, Black, and Ouachita Rivers from the intersection of the Red River with the Mississippi to Felsenthal, Ark., and, if possible to Camden, Ark. Second, that the Ouachita and Black Rivers be completely separated from the Red River for future consideration by the War Department for navigation and flood-control improvements.

Respectfully submitted.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
MONROE-WEST MONROE, LA.,
G. D. HOLLAND, *Secretary*.

The American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

ADDRESS OF J. B. JOHNSON, OF THE NATIONAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. J. B. Johnson, of the National Manufacturers Association, before the Ohio Federation of Women's Clubs at Lakeside, Ohio, on Wednesday, July 9, 1941:

I am very much pleased to have the privilege to address you briefly this afternoon on the subject, The American Way of Life. Our way of living is something we have always had, so we have always taken it for granted, something like fresh air and sunshine, but there is nothing self-perpetuating or automatic about it. It is like everything else that is inherited; someone had to work and fight for it originally, and we who have it now must likewise work and fight to keep it just like we must do everything else that is worth while. I believe it is time now, while we still can, to examine it and see what it is made of, because we may lose it if we don't all do something individually and collectively to keep it.

Our first great heritage is the principle of free government. More than 13 years before our Constitution was adopted the Assembly of the Colony of Virginia adopted this resolution: "No free government or the blessings of liberty can be preserved to any people but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue and by a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles."

Certainly we could all profit by them if we put those principles to work and compared our actions now to those standards. There is the cornerstone of the American way of life that our forefathers laid.

Responsibility to our country in the minds of many people is a great thing as long as it remains in the abstract and doesn't affect them individually or interfere with business or the enjoyment of their daily life. That kind of patriotism does not meet present-day requirements because our responsibilities to our problems now must become individual, specific, and concrete if our country is to be kept on the map as the greatest Mecca of freedom of the ages and the emblem of that freedom kept floating in the sky till the end of time.

We as a nation seem to be confused about where we are, so it is time we stopped to think and take a good look at our position instead of rushing blindly around in circles hoping that somehow or other things will come out all right because we all know, if we stopped to think, that nothing can succeed unless everyone individually cooperates and participates to make it succeed. The point here is that under our American way of life and the system of free enterprise we have developed we must know what the principles of free government are and how to make our system of free enterprise work, and that's a serious job, because self-government is the most delicate mechanism ever placed in the hands of man. We have not yet proven that we know how to handle it or that we know how to operate it.

Nearly 25 years ago a prominent American said in the troublous times before the first World War, "A man is not a pessimist who, when he hears the roar and sees the funnel-shaped cloud, directs his children to the pathway that heads to the cyclone cellar; but the man is worse than a pessimist—he is a fool—who stands in front of a cyclone rejoicing in the manifestation of the forces of Nature, or faces a war-torn world expatiating on the greatness of his country and the patriotism and prowess of his countrymen and recognizes no personal responsibility to do something about it." Nature has a peculiar and an effective way of rewarding foolishness whether it finds it in men or in nations. Make no mistake about it, we are in a race between wisdom and destruction, and wisdom at the moment is behind. The thinking industry needs to go to work. That is absolutely necessary to keep our American way of life.

"About the only subject which vitally affects us all—and yet to which few give serious thought—is the science and the functions of government. Our farms and our factories, our mills and our mines, together with current news, much of it frivolous and little of it thought-inspiring, engages our attention, but statecraft as distinguished from partisan politics is accorded scant consideration. In the first place, we are too busy, and, secondly, we do not improve even our available time." It is my humble judgment that many of our problems have arisen because we have not taken time to think them out by the fireside and in the family circle of the home, where character and good citizenship must always begin. May I say to you in all seriousness that right now we need more mothers who will teach their children the Ten Commandments and more fathers who will teach their sons to work and spend less than they earn. That kind of people laid the cornerstone for the American way of life, and only that kind of people will perpetuate it.

Let's pause a moment to ask, "what is the American way?" In a nutshell it's this: Religious, political, and economic freedom. We worship as we wish, we vote as we wish, and there is no limit to our material accomplishments so long as we respect the rights of others. Simple, isn't it? But most of the world doesn't seem to understand it, and sometimes I wonder if we understand it ourselves, even though we talk a lot about it.

When I was asked to present this subject, I did not do it from any expectation that its preparation would solve any of our problems, but in the hope that some thinking might be started that will be worthy of the importance of these problems. I have long been convinced that a great many Americans have been thinking so much about their own business that they have forgotten to think about the very things that make their business possible. If our American way of life should be destroyed, it is not going to be destroyed by forces coming down the street with lethal weapons, but from the obvious neglect of principles and things which make our way of living possible, and by forces so subtle that they may not be seen until it is too late.

You may have a safe-driving record for as many years as you have driven an automobile, but you can lose it by going to sleep for a fraction of a second at the wrong time. The moral of this homely bit of philosophy is "Stay awake and keep interested in what's going on around you." The technique of the Trojan horse has vastly improved since the fall of Troy and the expression, "Beware of Greeks bearing gifts," has to be enlarged to include the subtle cunning of the twentieth-

century politician and the propaganda of the multitudes who are clamoring for selfish gain. It's time for us to think and watch. We have all too many alleged Americans who have no use for the American way unless it serves their own selfish purpose; it's fine only so long as they get theirs. You all know some of them, and so do I. The time has come when our motive must be not how much money we can make but how much we can do; the plus effort is what will keep the American way of life and keep us strong enough to defend ourselves.

We have been performing in this country a vast experiment in government which Lincoln so beautifully described in his Gettysburg address as "a Government of the people, by the people, for the people." That kind of government rests on a tripod of representative democracy, civil and religious freedom, and the institution of free enterprise. These institutions go hand in hand; they are inseperable. When one goes they all go. When one falls they all fall. All we have we have because we have had them. Our country has endured and will continue to endure as long as the people support these three theories of their Government and do not expect their Government to support them. "Allegiance to our flag and to the country for which it stands" does not state nor imply a responsibility on the part of the Government to feed and clothe the people and look after them. If it ever does, the moral fiber of this Nation will be so far destroyed that no recovery of freedom will ever be possible. The fundamental principles on which democratic government is founded are described by Montesquieu as "manliness, ability to carry our own burdens, and to dare to say what we think." If they no longer remain, nothing resembling freedom is possible. Self-reliance is the spring from which all greatness comes, and personality and integrity are the measure of that greatness.

Some of you may still think it can't happen here. That's just whistling in the graveyard, because it can happen here and it will happen here if all of us don't start to think seriously about other things than merely watching the wheels go round. Some time prior to the outbreak of the present war, Premier Daladier, of France, stated in a report as follows: "Actually that part of the French population which creates wealth, which labors for the future, is continually diminishing, while that part which directly or indirectly lives on the state is constantly growing. There is a steady fall in the number of Frenchmen who are ready to bear the risks of enterprise and creation." After it was all over and France had fallen, Marshal Petain said: "The spirit of pleasure has prevailed over the spirit of sacrifice. The people have demanded more than they have given. They wanted to spare themselves effort. Now, misfortune has come."

When the siren blows and the fire department goes down the street, we never pay much attention to it because it's always going to somebody else's home, but some day it will be ours if we never take any precaution to prevent the hazard of fire. It is just good sense to do that. Is it any less sensible to protect the right that we have to build a house when and where we want to, to have and to operate a business, and to work when and where we want to as long as we do it honestly, and to have and to do all the other things that as a free people we can do under our American system of free enterprise, which is the American way of living?

Is it sensible to protect a system that in our short history made it possible to use 69 percent of the world's petroleum in 1938 and 42 percent of its pig iron, 36 percent of its coal, 72 percent of its silk, 21 percent of its sugar, 56 percent of its rubber, 53 percent of its tin, and 48 percent of its coffee when we have only 6 percent of the world's area and only 7 percent of its population? The United States operates more than 60 percent of the telephone and telegraph facilities of the world, owns more than 80 percent of the motor cars in use, operates more than a third of the railway mileage. We produce 70 percent of the oil, 60 percent of the wheat and cotton, 50 percent of the copper and pig iron, and 40 percent of the coal and lead of the world. We own more than three-fourths of the monetary gold of the world and about the same of the world's banking resources. We have more than 14,000,000 home owners, 45,000,000 savings accounts, and more than 130,000,000 insurance policies. But, "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul"? (Mark viii:36.)

Now that we have all these things we seem to be confused and divided. Why? Here's why. We accomplished all this under a certain set of rules of government and conduct. We are trying to hold our position under a different set of rules and we are confused because the rules have been changed and no one knows what all the new ones are going to be. We used to have a motto in this country, "United we stand, divided we fall." It's still a good motto to think about once in a while.

Let's be specific. Suppose you personally owned a business that had an excellent product, had a potential market for everything you could make and had the most ample supply of working capital for every need, and still went deeper in the red every year. Wouldn't you ask somebody "Why?" and wouldn't you do something about it? Permanent prosperity can never be attained or the American way of life can never be retained by government fiat.

We engaged in a titantic program of defense production that is going to tax our manpower, machines, and accumulated wealth to the uttermost. We are confronted with one of the most serious situations in our national history and we must face it and must surmount it, but most of all we must realize what the cost and the consequences are going to be. We must examine first, ourselves, and then all the people and all the things with which we have to work. This is an "all out" emergency for all of us.

This emergency is using up the wealth we have already created at an alarming rate instead of creating any new wealth, because all the money being spent on our defense program, necessary and vital as it most certainly is, is borrowed money that must be paid back from future effort in the form of ever-mounting taxes that everybody must help to pay. Make no mistake about this, what we are spending now will have serious and lasting effect upon everyone of us directly because the money that is being spent is the same kind of money for which we have to work and with which to buy food and clothes. Therein lies one of our greatest dangers, because our system cannot survive the strain of putting too many people on work which produces no new wealth, and the more dependence we have upon that kind of work the more control by government we can expect. Also, since all wars cause waste of accumulated wealth, we can expect our standard of living to be reduced, because the accumulated wealth that supports it is being siphoned away beneath us to the point where government may own and control everything. The American way of life will then have been lost.

We want to be very sure that in making the world safe for democracy we don't lose it at home. Whether we do or not depends upon how well and how wisely we think and act in this emergency. This is the acid test of the American people, American institutions, and of the American way of life. Other nations have been dissolved because they couldn't stand the test. It's time we returned to fundamental principles and to be sure we have what it takes and that nothing happens to us and to our system of living.

If more people had made a real study of history the problem might not be so difficult because history is an ever recurring but ever changing pattern of cause and effect with infinite variations of human emotions, but the main point is this—that civilizations have always traveled in the same direction and have always fell for the same general reason—confusion within the body politic brought a relaxation from the stern duties of life and citizenship and weakened patriotism. Look at France for one of the most terrifying examples in all history. When people forget the very things that made their prosperity and improved condition possible, and forget their religious freedom because there are too many other things that provide more amusement, they have arrived in the danger zone. The fingers of the world are on the pulse of our Republic right now; it's time for us to swear off on riotous living and make some new resolutions—and keep them if we expect to recover and preserve what we have. On January 4, 1941, the French Republic officially ceased to exist because they didn't see the danger until it was about to overwhelm them and then it was too late.

Let's now see how some of these things work and how they have always worked to undermine what has been created by struggle and sacrifice by a free people.

Mr. Henry Thomas Buckle, one of the most able historians of all time, suggested nearly a century ago that progress of mankind depends upon certain propositions, one of which is that it is necessary to develop and maintain a spirit of inquiry by which is meant that people develop and progress only as they inquire and investigate before they accept any statement or theory as fact. Let us inquire for a moment into this proposition and see how it affects us today and then think about our own situation.

First on the list and probably the greatest obstacle to free thinking is the systematic propaganda constantly carried on by pressure groups who want to get something done, or by others urging the subjects to do something without thinking. The urge to act without thinking fills almost every radio program, most advertising, and tons of it are circulated through the mails every day. There is so much of it that clear analysis is exceedingly difficult and yielding becomes a habit. Under such a condition almost anything can happen. Systematic propaganda is one of our greatest dangers today because it undermines the thinking power of the individual and it is then a short step to where the individual is told what to think. One of our great national faults is that people have gotten out of the habit of thinking and asking questions before they act. Let me say to you in all seriousness that one of the things that is a definite responsibility of our citizenship is that we must think and ask questions or propaganda will destroy our power to do so. There is no way to beat propaganda except by thinking for ourselves. It would be a great thing if we could vastly enlarge the State of Missouri of which Commonwealth it is said that the inhabitants thereof have to be shown. It is said that Aristotle, the great philosopher, in reply to a questioner who asked how he became so wise replied, "By asking questions." Present-day America could profit by his example. We must do it if we expect to retain our freedom.

The second proposition suggested by the historian I mentioned is that the protective spirit, by which is meant the notion that the people cannot prosper unless all their affairs are watched over and protected by the Government, is an enemy of civilization. If this theory is an enemy, and I am sure every thinking person is convinced that it is, that enemy is battering at the gates right now and right here at home. Maybe we had better look it over and see how it will work if it is permitted to.

I am sure you will recognize as the protective spirit some of the old perpetual-motion schemes—to get something for nothing.

The protective spirit is a subtle device of demagogues to gain control of accumulated treasure by the propagation of a species known as the "Gimmes" and we can see them already at work all over America. Historians and archeologists are still looking over the ruins left by the "Gimmes" in Egypt, Greece, and Rome, and the technique is always the same; it starts with the protective spirit, sugar coated with a promise of something for nothing and is put over because people don't think and ask questions. It is all done for the purpose of staying in power to distribute the largess. The whole scheme is so simple that a child ought to see through it but, unfortunately, it too requires just a little thinking. Maybe we ought to paraphrase the old nursery rhyme with this one: "The 'Gimmes' will get you if you don't watch out." It might then have a wider acceptance than an appeal to reason and wouldn't require as much thought and it might gain time—reason acts slowly.

The hope of getting something for nothing or reward without effort is sapping the moral fiber of the American people and self-reliance is giving way to the protective spirit because so many people seem to think that freedom comes from plenty. It doesn't. Plenty comes from freedom and no people can remain free if they depend upon someone else or upon government to keep them. Too many people want freedom from work instead of freedom to work.

Have I made the picture clear to you? If not, is it any clearer when it is pointed out that the wave of credulity, which is the direct opposite of the spirit of inquiry, and the culmination of the protective spirit in this country, up to 1941 has cost over $25,000,000,000 in the last 10 years, or about $200 for every man, woman, and child in the country? Suppose you figure out how much it has cost you. Or does it mean anything that the cost of government has increased over 1,000 percent while the population has been increasing 25 percent and there is no end in sight? How long do you think our system of free enterprise can last or how long can free America last with that kind of business going on? How long can any of us stand it or how long can any business stand it? Ask yourself seriously if this didn't happen because we didn't ask questions when we should have done so. In other words, we lost the spirit of inquiry. The next thing we did was resort to the protective spirit to cure the trouble in the hope that if the Government took over the job we wouldn't have to do it ourselves. The stronger government becomes doing that kind of a job, the weaker the people become in the supervision of their own affairs. If this continues long enough the people become so weak they lose all control of their government. All we need to do to see this process at work is to read the newspapers about events in Europe. We don't even need to depend on history to warn us because history is being made now for our benefit if we are wise enough to observe.

The protective debacle has put us in a position where we must charge off nearly $25,000,000,000 that prepared us neither for peace nor for war and as a result we are starting our defense program from a relatively weaker fiscal position than in any similar emergency since the Revolutionary War. Let us hope we really wake up in time.

When the confiscation of our accumulated wealth begins our type of civilization is passing out and can only be saved by a strong military government like Germany, and then liberty passes out. There is yet time for us if we think and act and learn from the disastrous experience abroad and that means to really think and work like hell. No nation or no man ever became great or stayed great by working only 40 hours a week and spending the rest of the time sleeping and playing; it just can't be done. The fourth commandment says: "Six days shalt thou labor." Longfellow, the poet, had rare wisdom when he wrote:

"The heights by great men reached and kept,
Were not attained by sudden flight,
But they, while their companions slept,
Were toiling upward in the night."

Floors and ceilings are great things, and we need them, but we need to be sure the floor is not something that keeps us from getting down to earth and the ceiling is not the top of a cage that stifles genius and ambition. Business and people will grow only when they can accomplish and accumulate; and it is a law of nature that when growth stops decay begins. For nearly 150 years we added to our national wealth about 5 percent per year, a growth unparalleled in the history of any nation, and then we stopped. Why? Here is an excellent place to begin an inquiry, and let it be an inquiry and not an inquest.

We need to refer to the principles that made us a great nation and to repent our political indifference if we are to survive, and I can think of no group more able, or in better position, to do it than you who are engaged in managing the American home. If you all take your job of being citizens and makers of citizens as seriously as we take the job of keeping our business or profession running we will never lose our American way of life. Let's all devote some time to the study of public questions and about the men in public office who carry on the business of the people and spend the people's money—our money; let's ask "Why?" once in a while when somebody wants something and teach your children to do the same thing. Also ask—as we businessmen do in our own business—"How much is it going to cost?" and "Is it worth it?" "Can we afford it?" That, it seems to me, is the way to help keep America free, and is the very essence of patriotism. Raising the stars and stripes on the Fourth of July is only the emblem of patriotism, not the proof. There is too much of this that compares with going to church on Sunday and forgetting every Christian principle the other 6 days of the week. Real love of country helped along by some conscientious effort at public service that will compare with the service devoted to private business and we can leave an America to our children that is a going concern that will reflect credit upon us instead of debts and taxes. What we need to do is to work and prosper instead of waste and suffer.

If the American system ever loses the confidence of its people to the professional politicians we're sunk; because politicians can never maintain our American way or our standard of living. Only a productive people under wise statesmanship can do it. This is because politicians produce no wealth, they only spend it, but wise statesmen operate like wise businessmen who spend less than they earn and build for the future. Confidence in, and support of, our system of living can perpetuate it if we observe instead of just look, if we act instead of just sit, and if we think instead of just hope. Our country can be held together so tightly by every one of us by taking our responsibilities of being a part of it so well that no one will ever try to bind us together by force because we are starting to fall apart, but we've got to hurry and we've got to know what to do and be industrious enough to do it if we want to keep our American way of life.

We must both know and act if we are to preserve America and the American way to ourselves and our posterity, but when dogmatic faith in the theory "Let the Government do it," and government and bureaucracy replaces leadership of wise citizens, when business can only operate during breathing spells or on borrowed money, the eleventh hour has arrived and our working capital and our American way is being liquidated. If our heads cannot guide our hearts and our acts, if we can't see that political freedom has made this great land of ours possible and with it our economic freedom that has made our standard of living possible, we will lose both of them and the Plymouth Rock of religious freedom will have to be discovered all over again. We must decide whether, in the words of Lincoln, "We shall meanly lose or nobly save this last best hope of earth."

What Kind of Social Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

LETTER FROM WILLIAM ANDERSON

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a letter from a man who is blind. His words will be more powerful than mine as an argument for the principle of permitting people who receive blind pensions or old-age pensions to make small earnings by their own efforts without penalties being levied against them. California used to permit earnings up to $15 before deductions were made from the regular pension payments. She can do that no longer because the ruling of the Social Security Board intepreting language inserted by Congress in 1939 is to the effect that no State can permit any blind or aged person to make any additional earnings at all unless the amount of such earnings is deducted from the pension payments. The reasons this is wrong are given in the following letter more forcefully than I can give them. I want only to add that the passage of H. R. 4041 and H. R. 4042 would correct the situation for people like Mr. Anderson.

PITTSBURG, CALIF., *June 4, 1941.*

Congressman JERRY VOORHIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VOORHIS: I am a blind man and am typing this letter with my own fingers.

At present I am receiving the California State aid for the blind and, along with a few pianos I tune each month, I make a respectable living. It is hard for a blind man to make a living by just piano tuning alone, as I have been doing this work for about 15 years, and such has been my experience.

I understand that unless the Social Security Act is amended by your bill that each State of the United States will cease receiving assistance from the Federal Government.

It is also my understanding that unless the act is amended by your bill that Senate bill 608 at the California Legislature will be passed prohibiting a blind person from making anything over the $50-per-month pension which they already receive.

Now, my problem is this, Congressman VOORHIS, I would be forced to receive the $50 per month aid and not have an opportunity to carry on with my piano tuning or to disregard the $50 per month aid and carry on with my piano tuning which falls a lot short of $50. I am a fellow of 39 years of age

and still have the spirit of doing my very best to improve myself at all times and with the California State aid and my allowing to make my $33 by tuning, I am able to live a decent life.

I have a number of blind friends who are also making a few dollars in addition to their State aid and will be in the same position that I am in unless your bill passes amending the Social Security Act. These people, like myself, desire being independent as far as it is possible to be so and unless we are all helped along this line, it is very hard. Even under the very best of conditions it is very hard for any blind person to compete with the sighted.

As you know, there are very few blind who need no assistance financially and the majority of us struggle along the best we can to get by in a respectable way. If we are helped to be more independent, the world would be much brighter to us.

I understand that your bill is before the Ways and Means Committee, and I believe that if each Member would realize the actual position of we blind that they wouldn't hesitate one moment but what they would pass upon it and right now.

I realize that you and all the Members are very busy people, and I know that every one of you are friends of the blind, and if you will realize our need I am sure that your hearts as well as your judgment will help by your bill being passed and amending the Social Security Act.

In closing, I wish you and all Members of Congress the best of health and kindness as well as success in all difficult problems which confront you.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM ANDERSON.

Addresses Rally of the Committee for a Jewish Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1941

ADDRESS OF PIERRE VAN PAASSEN

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Pierre Van Paassen, delivered at a rally organized by the Committee for a Jewish Army, in Manhattan Center, N. Y., on June 25, 1941:

We are living in what is unquestionably the most critical hour in the history of the United States since Valley Forge and the desperate winter of that year when the fate and the future of this Commonwealth swayed precariously in the balance. On the surface there are no indications of danger; the fields are green and the grain is ripening as it has ripened every year, the trains run on time, the church bells ring out on Sunday, and the laughter of little children is heard in the land. We may even say that prosperity has returned to the United States. The highways are crowded and everywhere there is a bustle and activity, an animation and a rush that makes us feel encouraged.

And yet something is wrong. And yet we cannot deny that we are living as under a somber cloud.

The consciousness that we are passing through a very grave crisis of western civilization has become well-nigh general, we may well say universal. True, there have been grave crises before. But always, when darkness was greatest there appeared men who came to announce the return of better things and better times: reformers and prophets, bearers and adherents of renaissance, rebirth, renewal, and reawakening. But these men, in those critical periods of history, pointed, without an exception almost, to past happiness as the symbol and goal of their present striving. They urged a restoration of former purity of morals, former respect for authority, former norms of well-being.

We do not deny the past. We know that we are the product of the past. But we know also this: A general return to the past is impossible. We cannot go back. There is only one road and that is the road ahead.

What is going on in the world today is first of all this: Hitler is conquering the British Empire. The European Continent has been subdued and is being integrated into the new economic order of nazi-ism. But the forces of Germany are beginning to spill over into Africa. The capture of the island of Crete means that flocks of bombing planes have been brought within close proximity of Egype and of the Suez Canal. There will be a terrific battle, but certain German newspapers have boasted that Hitler expects to be in Cairo and Jerusalem and in Morocco and Algiers before the fall. This would mean that the British will lose the Mediterranean and that their Empire is cut in twain. But it would mean a good deal more. The Mediterranean is a stepping stone, a springboard for new attacks in new directions. The road Hitler will take is known. He and his planning commission have announced it time and again with precision, with accuracy. Austria's capture was the first step to take. Czechoslovakia was the removal of a bastion on Germany's eastern flank to give her freedom of movement in the west. The invasion of the Scandinavian countries was the removal of a threat on Hitler's right flank for an attack on the Netherlands and France. Rumania was a preliminary step for the capture of Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and Greece. Crete is to be the jumping-off place for Egype and Palestine. The war against Russia is to capture an arsenal for totalitarianism prior to an attack in the Anglo-Saxon world.

If Egypt and Palestine fall in Hitler's hands, the march goes on. Where? To Irak and Persia and India in one direction. To Ethiopia and South Africa in another. In India, it is expected to form a juncture with the Japanese Army, now stationed in French Indo-China. From there the march will go southward, for an attack on the Singapore base from the landside. In Africa, with the collaboration of the Vichy Frenchmen and Spain, the objective is the two coastlines of that continent, at least the occupation of great bases, such as Tangier, Dakar, and Capetown.

Hitler has no power to engage the British Navy in a duel for the hegemony of the sea, so he does the next best thing, he marches around the oceans. He occupies the bases contiguous to the great Atlantic and Pacific shipping lanes.

In other words Hitler is defeating the British Navy with a land army. This is what is happening. You say: Well, so long as he has not beaten the British Navy, he will not control the seas. What use are navies when there are no ports to go to for munitions, and repairs?

More swiftly than most of us realize, a crisis—perhaps the final crisis—is nearing the armed conflict between the Nazi forces and those who resist that new order into which the Nazis plan to strait jacket us. With the entry of Russia into the war the anti-Nazi cause has overnight received reinforcements in manpower which, if fully utilized, may—I say "may" advisedly—tip the scale in our favor. Yet before we shall fight on even terms with the mighty Nazi war machine in the east or west, we will have to endure new disappointments and much suffering, and, as Winston Churchill puts it, blood, sweat, and tears.

I have always, ever since the very initial stages of this second World War, held the view that the decision of the war will be fought out in the Near East, over the evangelic hills of Galilee. There, on the historic plains and rocks and mountains whence has come much of the wisdom on which our threatened civilization is based, there will take place the ultimate clash between us and the evil forces of our time. There the fate of the British Empire may well be decided, and the very outcome of the present struggle thus hang in the balance.

And that is why the appeal for a strong, well-equipped Jewish army in Palestine is not a matter of concern for the Jewish people alone. For Jewish Palestine it is, of course, of vital concern. For the Jewish people Palestine is a matter of life and death. Everything that was built and rebuilt through years and years of toil and sacrifice, despite the many obstacles and much destructive interference, now stands in danger of being overrun and wrecked by Hitler. The very existence of the Jewish people is involved in that battle of Jerusalem.

But even more than this is at stake. Humanity, Christianity, the very ideals for which we are said to be fighting, are embodied in the hills of Palestine. Should the swastika men crash through this Biblical land and succeed in conquering the Suez Canal, the gateway to world conquest will be wide open for them. They will be on the very threshold of their final goal.

Yes, Palestine is in danger. The great work of redemption of the land and the regeneration of the Jewish people is threatened with disaster. And the cry is already being raised in those Jewish circles which are fanatically and almost psychopathically anti-Zionist that since the Axis threatens the Jewish homeland there is no more use in sending money to Palestine, for it is a wasted effort. Is it? Who is in greater danger, the Yishuv, the Palestinian Jewish community, or American Jewry? I do not know. But I know that if Palestine goes down will that not be a staggering blow to the British Commonwealth of Nations and hence to the United States? Is there not a clear sequence of relations between the position of Palestine and national position of America? Palestine is the key to the defense of the Suez Canal and the goal to the Far East. The Suez Canal is the key to the Mediterranean. The Mediterranean is the "to be or not to be" of the British Empire. The British Empire is the last bulwark between the United States and the Axis in its march to world power, which means in the word of Hitler himself and his brain trusters also control of the Western Hemisphere. Palestine, you say, is a long way off. The general staff of the United States Army does not think so. To America's military experts Palestine is a very vital element in their defense plans of this hemisphere, of this country, just as vital and important as the Panama Canal, or Alaska, or Hawaii. The military staff in Washington is today more concerned with the preservation of Palestine than the Jews of America.

No, this is not the time to slacken the effort to build Zion. This is the time to accentuate and increase and stimulate the work. For Palestine we must redouble, treble, and quadruple our efforts. We must show an intensity of feeling, a unanimity of sentiment that will overcome the obstacles that stand in the way.

Oh, that American Jews would understand what Palestine means to them, to all of us, to Christians also, that the rebuilding of Zion is for the surest instrument of their own regeneration and for the preservation of their children. I know there are Jews who know what Palestine means. They carry it there in their hearts. And they are the Sherith Israel, the saving remnant, the sacred root. But there are many who shrug their shoulders now, even now, after Czechoslovakia and Poland and Germany and Rumania and France and Holland. Forty years ago Herzl was offered Palestine by the Turkish Sultan for a million pounds sterling, the price of many a reformed temple or Jewish center, or Jewish club in this country. Herzl could not raise the money. Of what concern was Palestine to the German Jews who were as German as the Prussians, that klein Asiatisches Land over there in the backward Orient. And yet that little country, that despised land, that Asiatic backyard became a haven of refuge for 50,000 of the children of those German Jews. Had we listened to Herzl and bought Palestine when it was a wilderness and empty—at least we could have told Adolf Hitler to go to hell now and what's more we could be sure by now that the barbarians would not pass up their way to the Suez Canal which is the way to America. Is it any different today than in the days of Herzl? American Jewry is as apathetic as were the German Jews of 30 and 40 years ago.

Palestine, a haven of refuge. Yes; it is that, the only haven of refuge on that side of the water, a haven which took in more Jewish refugees than all the other countries combined in the last 2 years.

But Palestine is more than a haven of refuge. If it were not more than that, I for one would not be here today, nor have ever labored in the strengthening of its defenses. Yes; Palestine is more than that. The purpose and intention of creating a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine was and is—this was the view of the great philosophers of Zionism, Achad Ha'am, Aleph Beth Gordon, Bialik, Herzl, Vladimir Jabotinsky—the purpose was to have one place on earth where the Jew will be absolutely free, untrammeled in carrying out his social, economic, and religious and national aspirations, unafraid, not as Jews in America are of what the goyim will say. One place on earth where the Jew could not only live as a total human being but also set the stamp of his native Hebraic genius in all the manifestations of life.

And then the hope was and still is that in response to that free, unhampered Hebraic life in Palestine, Judaism all over the world, and especially in America where it is rapidly disintegrating and sinking to the level of a mere credal or denominational difference, that Judaism all over the world would reawaken and become once more a contributing factor to the sum total of our western democratic civilization.

That hope has not been dimmed. No; that hope, in spite of everything, is still being fulfilled. Bialik said to me one day in his home in Tel-Aviv, "So much love, so much sweat, so much blood has been poured into this soil of Eretz Israel that one of these days the womb of the earth will grow pregnant again and a prophet will issue. And it is a prophet we need in our time."

Yes, I understand the things that go on in Palestine make some Jews in America tremble, those Jews who are shamed and afraid of their own name. They are afraid to be identified with a national effort, a national home. They are afraid; the Irish are not afraid to be identified with the pathetic attempt to regenerate Eire, nor are the Dutch afraid to let themselves be heard in defense of Holland. The Jews are afraid. They have been following a policy of hush-hush. In nearly every large American city that I visited I have seen the same phenomenon, a handful of assimilationist Jews, haters of Zionism, rich men generally, taking up the role of the medieval batlonim and decide what is to be done in Jewish communal life, what causes are to be supported, with a niggardly, condescending attitude toward Palestine.

They would have us believe that Zionism is a dangerous thing; that to be a Zionist may lay one open to the charge on the part of goyim of dual allegiance, of un-Americanism, of divided loyalty. This said by Jews who consider themselves 100-percent American; who pound their chest in patriotic fervor; who are generally to be found in all the organizations and greeter clubs; and who imagine that they understand the gentiles and that the gentiles understand them and consider them fully equal, similar except for a none too different credal affiliation and for circumcision.

But I say to you, friends, no Jew is so un-American as the non-Zionist Jews. The gentile has ever formulated those accusations, not even Coughlin or the anti-Semites of the so-called Christian Front. Divided allegiance and divided loyalty. Don't they understand that the Jew who is a Jew foursquare, who says yes, the center of my cultural and national life is in Palestine. I am a Jew and a son of the Hebraic tradition that that Jew is infinitely more respected by the gentiles than the Jew who denies his past, his national spirit, himself, who pretends to be something which he is not. The gentiles know the Jew is different. They feel it. They would like to know why. Oh, yes; there are bad non-Jews who do not want to know anything about the Jews. But there are also millions of good goyim, good goyim whose holy land is also Palestine, who owe a deep and abiding spiritual allegiance to the Hebrew Scriptures and to the land of the Book. They are not ashamed of it.

Un-American I call the Jew who withholds from the growing civilization in America the contribution which he as a Jew, as a son of the Hebraic past, as a representative of a great religious civilization, could but does not make. In other words, I call un-American the Jew who impoverishes our American democracy by keeping silent on the subject of the new Hebraic civilization in Palestine, of which he should be the transmitter, the conveyor, the instrument of enrichment to our American people.

For what assimilationist Jews think democracy is? A conglomeration of animated Ford automobiles, turned out on the conveyor belt, all of the same pattern and design; human beings behaving as automatons, as puppets pulled by the string of a manipulator. Does not the greatness of a democracy consist in the very fact of diversity, in respect for diversity, in every group contributing to the sum total according to its own character, its own national genius, its own God-given talents?

To build Palestine, to build a new Hebraic civilization in Palestine, is a task patriotic and American not only because every President and the Houses of Congress have expressed themselves in the most favorable terms for the idea, although that would be enough, but because American civilization needs the beneficent influence and penetration of the ideals of Judaism. Have Jews nothing to give to America; nothing but negative values? What of the spiritual treasures you hold? Jews can enrich America, but not as imitation Unitarians or Kiwanis, but as Jews, sons of the prophets, blood kinsmen and spiritual heirs of Herzl, of Amos, of Akiba, of Jabotinsky.

The Jews of America must learn to lose their fear. They must cease apologizing for their existence. They must stand forth manfully as citizens, sure of their rights, sure of their position. They must give proof to the world that the Jew is still here and that he has a contribution to make, a contribution in the Hebraic fashion, the prophetic way, that he represents a civilization, a great tradition, and that he can fight.

I have raised my voice for a Jewish army from many platforms. This is the first time—through no fault of mine—that I do so from a Zionist platform. I would have been happy if such a platform had been provided for me before. For at this time there can be no Zionist work more important—at this hour there can be no Jewish cause more important—at this moment there are few British tasks more important than the effective arming of as large a Jewish force as is available, to defend the life line of our civilization.

Palestine unquestionably is one of the most important bastions of democracy in the world today. Its defense by those who have built it is not a political question, nor can it be a subject to debate.

I have no patience with those who tiptoe around this subject of a Jewish army and use complicated diplomatic language to present the Jewish claim. I take no stock whatsoever in that whispering which buzzes all around us and which says: "There are many things that must be considered * * * this is the wrong time to speak out * * * hasty action may spoil negotiations * * * the subject is too delicate for mass meetings * * *," and so on and so forth.

I refuse to listen to that kind of superdiplomacy. It smacks too much of appeasement—and appeasement has proved itself to be but synonymous with surrender.

I refuse to recognize in the appeal for a Jewish army any factional views within the Zionist movement. Those who cannot rise above petty partisan squabbles while Palestine is in danger are betraying the Zionist ideal. If Churchill can bury his differences with Stalin and march shoulder to shoulder with him against the common foe, the Zionist factions should, it seems to me, be able to find a common platform. And that common platform must be the defense of Palestine. Everything else dwindles into insignificance when measured against that cause.

There can be no valid objection to a strong Jewish army in Palestine from any source, British, Arab, or otherwise. Those who oppose it are sabotaging Britain's war effort, President Roosevelt's defense program, the very cause of humanity itself. If British officials have difficulty in understanding this, it is for the Jewish and Christian leadership to speak out, openly and fearlessly.

Until a few days ago I was very pessimistic, I confess, about the time element in the organization of a strong Jewish army. I could not repress a feeling that the discussions concerning a Jewish army were fast approaching the academic stage. There seemed to be insufficient time for the effective training and arming of the Yishuv. The Nazi hordes were hammering down the British defenses threatening to launch a giant pincer movement from the Syrian and Libyan sides toward the Suez Canal. It looked indeed as if the Battle of Jerusalem were on the way. Today, however, thanks to the British initiative in Syria and due to the establishment of a huge new war front along the Russian border, there is time to make this Jewish army a reality.

Now it can be done. Now it must be done.

If in wartime, under pressure, on the very brink of defeat, the British Government refuses the Jews the most elementary recognition of nationhood, an army, then the future of the Jewish homeland, even in the event of a Nazi defeat, looks dark indeed.

No; Churchill and Roosevelt can be depended upon to realize the strategic importance, the historical justice, the human significance of a Jewish army for Palestine. It is only up to you to demand it in unmistakable language and to prepare for it and augment its numbers from all corners of the world.

We demand from the British Government the right for Jews to go and die for freedom under the walls of Jerusalem. We demand that they not be slaughtered as helpless children, but that they will be trained and will be given arms in their hands. Arms—airplanes, tanks, and guns.

We demand that the Jewish people be heard; that the Jewish people take their place in the ranks of the free nations of the earth. If Russia can liberate the Poles, free France declare Syria independent, Great Britain can say to the Jewish people, "Come help us fight. Fight for a Palestine that is yours."

We can say this to the British: Whatever friends you think you have in the Near East, of the Jewish people you can be sure—sure of their holy fervor to defend the land, Eretz Israel. No power on earth, no matter what happens, can alienate the Jew from his homeland. In this hour of darkness, let us stand up as men. Let us, as Zionists, show that our love of Zion is a living fire. Let us, in this hour when all hangs in the balance, go to the grave of him who sleeps there in Long Island and say, "Vladimir Jabotinsky, you were right. Let your spirit guide us." Then we will march to victory. In this dark hour, let the Yishuv know that there are millions of unseen brethren who stretch out their hands to them. Tel Chai Israel!

The Power Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I venture a prediction, that, when the history of these times in our country is written the story will be full of incidents demonstrating how selfish interests have, for personal gain, jeopardized national security. I have been intimately connected with the northwestern power and light-metal situation, and can speak on this subject from factual knowledge and experience. Over 3 years ago, I pointed out the role of power in national defense in a speech on this floor and before House committees, and prior to that time, I had a part in writing the basic Bonneville power legislation, in which provision was made against monopolization.

I have also pointed out for the record how the negligence of our defense organization has impaired the national airplane production program. A year ago, in company with Senate and House Members from the Pacific Northwest, I discussed the aluminum and magnesium problem with the then newly appointed defense heads, and urged that the Columbia River power be immediately put to work in such production. We were then told that sufficient light-metal capacity existed in the country or was provided to take care of these needs. Everyone now knows the true situation as to the shortage of this supply.

Over two months ago, O. P. M. publicly admitted the facts and proposed a start on the early utilization of around 400,000 kilowatts of Columbia River power to meet such deficiencies. In spite of this announcement, hazardous delay still menaces our security. No construction has been started on these 400,000 extra kilowatt light-metal plants. Defense heads still debate over details, evidently being again prompted by selfish motives. We should not allow these delay tactics to be continued. Immediate remedial steps must be taken by the Administration to meet the defense crisis.

Much has been said and written on this aluminum situation, including Senate and House committee reports, but unfortunately the true story has not been been fully recited. Those of us who long ago pressed the matter, in advance of any official analysis, and have since followed it in detail, have not been questioned as to the factual narrative. Too much effort has been spent on an attempt to whitewash those responsible for the critical situation and the essential facts have been neglected.

A NEW DISTURBING DEVELOPMENT

The recent proposal to pool Pacific Northwestern public and private power facilities, using national defense as a subterfuge, is disturbing to those of us who have piloted through Congress the basic power legislation and supporting appropriation measures. Such proposals may jeopardize adequate defense supplies and can be operated to circumvent the protective provisions placed in the original Bonneville Act. It would seem, from press accounts, that a little group, which has heretofore had no part in Bonneville legislation or growth, is now urging a course which will bring about a repetition of the scandalous course followed in regard to our aluminum supply. Such a course will curtail the effectiveness of the Columbia River project so far as public use is concerned.

I have previously pointed out how the private power companies, in the last war, used emergency conditions to lay the foundations for a vicious program of manipulation which has financially ruined thousands and created a distrust of private power management. Power pooling was then attempted, and resulted in the creation of barriers which hampered public power-plant development. This plan for unsound interchange must, in the light of experience, be strongly opposed by those of us who have sponsored the public power program.

I do not question the sincerity of some of those who propose a belated interconnection program, but I do question their knowledge of past attempts to sabotage the Columbia River program, their judgment as to the proper course to follow, and above all, their authority to take such action as they are now publicly proposing. These matters were all considered in connection with the policy provisions of the original Bonneville Act, and safety limitations on the Bonneville interconnections were written into the law.

BONNEVILLE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

In the early days of the development of the Bonneville legislation, our colleague from Mississippi, the Honorable JOHN E. RANKIN, suggested that, for strategic reasons, I introduce a Bonneville bill. This I did, after detailed discussion of principles and provisions with congressional associates, engineers experienced in the power business, and public power advocates. During the time that I was at work on this bill, I was asked to consider a draft of a bill that gave the Federal Power Commission a full measure of operating jurisdiction over the Bonneville project. This idea was rejected on the grounds of questionable and confusing administrative practice. It was clearly recognized that the Federal Power Commission was judicial and regulatory in character, rather than an operative organization. Therefore, when my bill was written, the jurisdiction of the Commission was strictly limited to rate approval and cost allocations between navigation and power. These limitations are contained in the legislation adopted by Congress. Therefore, it is apparent that the jurisdiction of the Commission does not extend over Bonneville interconnections and interchanges. This legislation was in process during the heated discussion over the ill-advised pooling proposal for the T. V. A., and, as a result of that unfortunate experience, no pooling authority was included in the Bonneville Act.

THE COULEE PROJECT TIE-IN

Shortly after the passage of the Bonneville Act and the appointment of the late Administrator, J. D. Ross, our colleague, Representative RANKIN, an experienced power engineer, and myself suggested to and urged on Mr. Ross the advisability of constructing the Coulee transmission tie. We found that Mr. Ross visioned the future just as we did. He followed our suggestion and made an application for a P. W. A. allotment for this purpose. Secretary Ickes wisely approved the application and recommended Presidential approval, which was given. This has turned out to be a very fortunate defense investment.

THE ELECTRIC BOND & SHARE ("EBASCO") ENTERS CONGRESS

It was at this stage of the development that the Electric Bond & Share representative entered the picture with tactics designed to sabotage the Bonneville transmission program, and to prevent construction which would bring low-priced power to the farmers and domestic consumers of Oregon and Washington.

When J. D. Ross requested $14,000,000 appropriation for transmission construction in the spring of 1939, Mr. Kinsey Robinson, president of "Ebasco's" Washington Water Power Co., moved to Washington, D. C., and started lobbying activities against Bonneville appropriations. News articles adverse to these appropriations, undoubtedly inspired by this private holding company, appeared in the New York Times and other papers. Members of the House Appropriations Committee were circularized against Bonneville transmission-line appropriations. Finally a fight was made on the House floor against this appropriation. "Ebasco" lost this fight in the House. This debate is a matter of record, and it can be shown that "Ebasco's" misrepresentation was then challenged and their arguments exploded. After this House defeat, Mr.

Robinson transferred his activities to the Senate and appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee in an effort to curtail Bonneville transmission-line construction. He failed in the Senate also.

In the spring of 1940 this private utility lobbyist again came to Washington and appeared before the House and Senate Appropriation Committees in a second effort to kill Bonneville transmission appropriations. House friends of Bonneville were forced into a second fight for these appropriations, and corrected, in debate, misinformation circulated by Mr. Robinson operating through the Utility Information Bureau. Thus, once again "Ebasco" was defeated on the House floor when hamstringing amendments were offered. When Mr. Robinson appeared before the Senate committee, after this second House defeat, Senator BONE cross-examined him thoroughly and placed in the committee record an exposé of this company's wrecking activities. Naturally, after this exposure, Mr. Robinson was turned down by the Senate.

"EBASCO" CONTINUES SABOTAGE

After these four defeats in Congress Mr. Robinson again appeared in Washington, D. C., and let it be known that, although defeated in Congress, he would finally come out on top by circumventing congressional action, either through some type of negotiation or by astute planning. During his 1940 sojourn in Washington, D. C., he remarked that he would defeat, in the 1940 election, those northwestern Representatives who led the floor fight against him. He even went so far as to threaten personally one of these Representatives.

"EBASCO'S" NEXT MOVE

It is currently reported in congressional circles that the present outcry for interconnection interchange, and the fulmination against public power reservations in the Bonneville Act is just another phase in "Ebasco's" carefully planned attack on the public-power program in the Columbia River section. Under the voluminous cloak of national defense "Ebasco" and other self-seeking and sabotaging interests are endeavoring to circumvent congressional action. I therefore consider it my duty to utter words of caution, based on the record, for the benefit of those officials who may not be informed on the past record and may be taken in by siren calls for interconnection.

I might add, at this point, that, if Electric Bond & Share efforts had succeeded in 1939, our country's present aluminum production capacity would now be reduced over one-third, probably one-half.

It seems strange that those whose past activities were so adverse to a program that has become a life saver in our defense preparations should now become prominent in this interchange movement which would still further delay defense production.

In the early part of 1941, over 6 months after our group's warning to the Defense Commission of a light-metal shortage, we found Mr. Robinson's friends opposing the Coulee-Spokane transmission lines on the ground that the Federal Power Commission was convinced that there was a power surplus in eastern Washington. Some of the statements even went so far as to convey the inference that the Commission would convince the Budget Bureau and Congress that there was no need for the Spokane lines, because of this surplus.

THE FACTS ABOUT NORTHWEST POWER SUPPLY

In all Mr. Robinson's appearances before congressional committees he contended that there was a surplus of private plant and transmission capacity in the Bonneville area east of the Cascades.

This same statement about "surplus power" was made, during the hearings on the original Bonneville Act, by speakers from Oregon, including Governor Martin, Mayor Carlson, of Portland, and the President of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Hamilton Corbett.

I answered these absurd but subtly calculated allegations before the committee and in debate. I presented a statistical analysis which demonstrated a threatening power shortage and pointed out that it was folly to claim adequate line capacity for the then-existing lines. I compared the plan for limitation to existing lines with an attempt to supply water to Washington, D. C., through a garden hose.

What has happened in aluminum shortage has happened also in power shortage. In order to curtail Federal expansion, private-utility interests have asserted that there was a surplus when the country was actually facing a shortage. They had so often misrepresented facts that they failed to keep ahead of load growth. Either through a deliberate plan to grab, for their own use, capacity provided by Federal expenditures, or because, like Hitler, they repeated their misrepresentations so often that they themselves believed them, they were afraid to expand, in contradiction to their own false allegations.

"INTERCHANGE" DEMAND IS A SMOKE SCREEN

With the pressing need for defense production, these private interests are up against a power shortage and are now clamoring for interconnection interchanges. From the analysis I have made it appears certain that there is an acute private power shortage east and west of the Cascades, except in the area served by City Light of Seattle. With these facts now before them, the private utilities are clamoring for interchange power instead of outright purchases from Federal plants. They evidently hope to get in ahead of power allotments to aluminum plants and to avoid the statutory requirements of outright purchase of power from Federal plants at Coulee and Bonneville. They hope to "get the camel's nose under the circus tent" and thus short-circuit congressional action.

POWER INTERCHANGE

Interchange of electric power is usually a trade of kilowatts rather than an outright purchase of capacity. It is used, as I pointed out before the Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1937, as a means to augment, with storage capacity, "run of the river" plant hydro-capacity. It is also used for break-down or emergency relief, to avoid duplicating and keeping idle the spare capacity. It is most generally used to take advantage of a lack of coincidence of maximum load occurrences, or what is known in the electrical business as "diversity." When loads operate, as most of the defense light-metal loads do, continuously, every hour in the month, the principal advantage of diversity interconnection is lost, and there is no ground for investments in interconnections under such conditions.

During very short periods, a few percent of a long-time flow record, Bonneville will lose capacity approximately equivalent to the capacity of one Coulee spare generator. Such a short lapse in aluminum production capacity is insignificant, and can be entirely compensated by a few extra pots in any aluminum plant. In addition, Coulee Reservoir has storage capacity equal to three times the plant capacity authorized. Interconnections have been authorized, and funds appropriated, therefore, for tie-ins at Coulee, and with the public plants at Seattle, Tacoma, and Eugene. These tie-ins will balance storage with Bonneville's "run of the river" capacity; therefore, the first cited need for interconnection has been supplied.

The economics of high-voltage transmission lines does not permit of many taps. Therefore, break-down relief must be supplied at the terminals, which appears to be adequately taken care of by the authorized ties which I have cited. Interchanges, when used in a limited way, as I have indicated, are beneficial, but when overused they become revenue reducers for the Government plant rather than revenue producers.

PRIVATE COMPANIES SHOULD BUY, NOT BORROW

It is very bad financial practice to substitute interchange for outright energy contract sales, as required by statute. If the private companies are short of power, let them make outright purchases under the terms laid down in law, provided these purchases do not interfere with light-metal defense production and with the rights of public power plants. If the private companies have a surplus, as generally they do not, let them sell this power the same as all merchants have to do, under like conditions. Because of manipulation tactics the private power interests have failed in their duty to the communities they serve. This is no excuse for Federal plant capacity being diverted from the vital light-metal defense production to make good such manipulated deficiencies.

All of these technical and financial facts were considered when Bonneville legislation was being formulated and the necessary safeguards were written into the Pierce bill and finally into the act.

Through interconnections the private power companies can borrow kilowatt-hours, and there is no way to force a return if the companies are short of power. This has happened.

THE LAW GOVERNING BONNEVILLE POWER

In order to protect and limit the Federal investment, to provide a return to the Federal Treasury, and safeguard the future interests of the ratepapers and the taxpayers, restrictions were placed in the Bonneville Act. It might be well at

this time to restate them for the information of all concerned.

Section 2 of the Bonneville Act provides that the project shall be operated for the benefit of the general public. In this section the only transmission facilities authorized for construction, purchase, lease, donation, operation, and maintenance or improvement are those connected with the outright sale of power or serving potential markets or interconnections with other Federal or public plants. No authority exists for constructing straight interchange interconnection with private companies. Section 7 of the act requires sales on terms that will insure the recovery of the Federal investment. Obviously no authority exists for any power loans to private interests.

If some of the private companies are sincere in their proffer of power defense contributions, section 2c of the act gives them an opportunity to lease or donate facilities, and authorizes the Administrator to condemn them.

Section 5b of the act authorizes contracts with private as well as public systems for the mutual exchange of unused excess power on suitable exchange terms for economical operations for emergency or for break-down relief. This section applies only to unused power and gives no authority for Federal investment in nonrevenue producing exchange interties with private companies. Clearly, taxpayers' funds cannot be used to provide nonrevenue capacity back-ups for the private systems. If the Columbia River power is put to work on defense metals, as it should be, there cannot now be any unused power to make section 5b operative.

The act contains no authority for pooling of private and Federal resources, nor does it authorize Federal transmission circuits to become common carriers for the benefit of the private companies. At no time has Congress appropriated funds for private interchange connections, and obviously funds appropriated for other purposes cannot be used for the construction of such connections.

RESERVATIONS FOR PUBLIC POWER PLANTS

As part of this same program for sabotage of public power, these self-styled patriots are arguing that the reservation of power for public plants, required in the Bonneville Act, is interfering with defense. There is no foundation for such a charge. At no time has defense load been rejected because of these provisions. To raise such a point is gross misrepresentation, as section 4 (b) of the act specifically provides that this reserved capacity not actually contracted by public agencies can be temporarily sold. This has been done.

The public preference provision is a policy established by Congress over 70 years ago. Furthermore, the reservation clause does not apply to Coulee energy. I was responsible for the reservation clause in the original act. It was inserted in order that the farmers and home owners could be protected from the retarding tactics used by the private companies in the T. V. A. regions. I was also responsible for the extension of the 50-percent reservation period from 1941 to January in 1942 as made in the 1939 amendment. It must be remembered that the act contains permanent general reservation clauses protecting the public interest. I was also partly responsible for initiating the Coulee transmission tie.

To advocate at this time rejection of the public reservation provisions along with the advocacy of private interconnections exposes the motive behind this recent drive. All of this is plainly an effort to strangle public power under the name of defense, as was done in the last war. It is also a Nazi type of effort to enslave our farm people and domestic power users and to place them under the domination of the self-appointed financial overlords.

JURISDICTION

The Federal Power Commission, both under the acts of 1920 and 1935, has jurisdiction over companies engaged in interstate commerce. The amended act of August 1935 gives the Commission power over interconnections and coordination of facilities, including temporary connections and exchange of facilities during a war or an emergency. This authority applies only to companies engaged in interstate commerce, and does not apply to the United States Government, which is specifically exempted in this 1935 act.

Congress, since passing the 1935 amendments to the Water Power Act, has established congressional policy for the Federally owned Bonneville plant and did not see fit to include the emergency powers of the Commission over interconnections in this piece of legislation.

It is evident that the Commission has authority to hold hearings on emergency interconnections involving interstate private companies, but by no stretch of the imagination can it be conceived that these hearings can be extended to include Federally owned plants, as the private power interests would lead us to believe. To avoid confusion, this distinction should be kept in mind.

Obviously, the Oregon State Utilities Commissioner has no jurisdiction in Federal matters. The cited circumstances in the T. V. A. area have no bearing in the Bonneville instance, and in no way can be used as a precedent Congress has laid down the Bonneville power policy.

Nearly 2 years ago, all were publicly advised as to an impending power shortage in case of an emergency. Over a year ago, the Federal Power Commission established a defense power unit, but in spite of these indications of shortage the Commission did not come to Congress with any suggestion for a remedial program. It looks as if the utilization of the cited emergency powers of the 1935 act might be an effort to cover up a lack of vision and aggressive handling of the private power companies in the pre-emergency period. This unfortunate record furnishes no ground for attempting to upset policies fixed by Congress. The power supply defense bottleneck, which I predicted on this floor in the spring of 1938, is now upon us, as is the serious light-metal situation. It is high time for the Nation to call a halt to the subordination of national security to the profit motive.

The remedy for this dangerous situation lies not in the creation of hypothetical "interchange nonrevenue-producing interconnection" but rather in placing more generators in the blank flumes at Coulee, and selling this power outright to the regions of acute shortage. If this is not done early, the Northwest will lose industry. Five manufacturing companies have large partially used hydraulic turbine and generator shop capacity. No bottleneck exists in this type of manufacture. The remedy as applied to the Pacific Northwest is easily discernible.

THE PROPER PROCEDURE

Oregon Utilities Commissioner Bean suggests that 100,000 kilowatts additional capacity can be added to the Northwest supply by interconnection. From my own analysis and observation over the past few years, I doubt the accuracy of this figure especially when applied to base defense loads. His figure, like mine, is of course an estimate largely tempered by judgment. But since this possibility has been raised, power estimates for a low-water year should be presented for each private system. This is easy to obtain from the low-output logs of the last dry year and a comparison with snow and rainfall records. This record is the starting point for a comparison with projected peak demands. The private power company hydro plants, for cost reasons, have been located on the smaller streams with resultant greater fluctuations. There are possibilities for some storage gains from water flow and lower load factor diversity load in such plants, but this is the sole problem of the private companies over which either the F. P. C. or State commission has complete jurisdiction. It is outside of my consideration in this speech.

After the comparison of low-flow records and demands has been worked out, the larger and vastly more important determination is necessary, and that is, How many more units are needed for direct power sales in the 12 blank flumes at Coulee, and what additional Federal lines are needed to place this power in the deficient market areas? This is a problem calling for the very early joint efforts on the part of Bonneville Administration, Reclamation Service, and the Federal Power Commission. Necessarily, these estimates have to go first to the Budget Bureau and then to Congress. Likewise, authority and funds for private utility interconnections with Bonneville lines have to follow the same course and these will later be closely scrutinized in Congress, for the reasons I have indicated.

The record I have cited clearly shows that it will be extremely dangerous for any attempt to short circuit Congress on power policy, where congressional expression has been given. In closing I wish to strengthen the hand of Administrator Raver in his reply to Commissioner Bean's demands dated July 3, 1941, as it coincides generally with my own observations. For purposes of preserving the facts I am inserting a copy of this letter. The record of advancing Bonneville development has been written in Congress, and not elsewhere. The

wisdom of congressional action has been demonstrated by the defense contribution Bonneville has made and will continue to make.

DR. RAVER'S REPLY TO ILLEGAL DEMANDS

The following letter from Bonneville Power Administrator Paul J. Raver was mailed to Mr. Ormond R. Bean, Public Utilities Commissioner of Oregon, on Thursday, July 3, 1941:

JULY 3, 1941.

Mr. ORMOND R. BEAN,
Public Utilities Commissioner
of Oregon, Salem, Oreg.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER BEAN: Your letter concerning power supply, which was published in last Sunday's papers, was received by my office on the following Monday, June 30, 1941.

We believe the implications in the original newspaper stories and subsequent articles are answered completely by the record of our activities. The entire staff and resources of the Bonneville Power Administration have been and are now dedicated without reservation to the all-out effort of this country for national-defense production. The Bonneville-Grand Coulee interconnection, which was so bitterly fought by private interests, has now become a vital link in the supply of power both east and west of the Cascades. Our interconnection with Puget Sound is resulting in the conservation of the water resources of the region. Our program for advancing installation of generation and transmission facilities has made the Northwest region one of the most important sources of power for the Nation in this time of national emergency, and has made possible a development of industries which will continue to grow beyond the war period.

My staff has been making continuous studies of possible interconnections with other power systems in the area, and we have already established such interconnections as are currently useful in meeting national defense and other power requirements of the region. Several local utility companies, for what seemed to be political purposes, have recently made extravagant and unwarranted claims of the supposed benefits of additional interconnections. We are not impressed by these claims. However, if and when our engineering analyses show that further interconnections should be made in order to assure the supply of power to defense industries, we will be prompt to demand that such interconnections be made.

As you mentioned in your letter, the Federal Power Commission held a regional conference in Portland on June 12, 1941, on the subject of power supply. You and representatives of the Washington and Idaho public-utility commissions, as well as officers of all power systems in the area, participated in this conference. At this conference, Bonneville made a careful presentation of engineering data, and the Federal Power Commission is now analyzing these data, as well as other material submitted at the conference. Presumably the Commission will release its recommendations in the near future. If you have any new facts which were not revealed at the conference, it seems to me you should submit them to the Federal Power Commission. I would not expect that there would be a great deal to be gained by undertaking the consideration of the same matter in smaller groups.

However, as I have previously indicated to you, I am always glad to confer with you at any time on any matter in which you are interested. If you feel that we should proceed with a further conference without awaiting the results of the Federal Power Commission's analysis, I shall be glad to meet with you. In that event, I hope you will call me by telephone so we can arrange the conference in an informal manner.

Very truly yours,

PAUL J. RAVER,
Administrator.

Wolves in Sheep's Clothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE WORLEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BORGER (TEX.) DAILY HERALD

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in presenting for the consideration of the membership of the House an editorial which appeared in the Borger Daily Herald, Borger, Tex., on Wednesday, July 2, and which, in my opinion, is very timely and appropriate under present international circumstances.

I might say that the writer of this editorial, Mr. J. C. Phillips, editor and publisher of this paper, is one of the closest students of international affairs of my acquaintance. His editorials are consistently keenly analytical and appropriate.

The editorial follows:

[From the Borger (Tex.) Daily Herald of July 2, 1941]

WOLVES IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING

We wonder if top-ranking Communist Joe Stalin ever heard this one: "It is better to have a friend and never need him, than to need a friend and never have one."

It seems that "Big Joe" didn't figure on fighting Hitler; therefore, he kept right on doing Hitler's dirty work in America up to the very minute the Nazi Army started its bloody march into Russia. Then, it seems, "Big Joe" decided that, after all, America might be useful as a friend.

"Big Joe" isn't too dumb. He knows that politics makes strange bedfellows. Isn't it true that he and Hitler have been sleeping in the same political hog trough since the war against Poland began in the fall of 1939? Hitler and "Big Joe" even shared the loot, at very little cost to "Big Joe," so he thought.

So now we have the Moscow radio broadcasting the Star-Spangled Banner and the Communist Party in America making an immediate about face, changing from pro-Nazi to pro-Russia (and America). The "red" bigwigs in the United States who have been fighting all of our national-defense efforts in Congress, suddenly declare themselves in support of the lease-lend-aid bill—for Russia.

Funny how a word from Moscow changes the entire character of the Communists in the United States. First they fought Nazism. Then, in September 1939 they followed Moscow's lead by helping the Nazis in this country. Now they switch back to anti-Hitlerism.

It is not because they are becoming American or because they have any deep-seated sense of right and wrong, but because Russian and Moscow-dictated communism is their religion, and they are in no sense American except for the purpose of getting out of our Nation (actual control by bloodshed if possible) all they can to further the greedy aims of the would-be world-ruler in the Kremlin.

The Bible warns us to beware of wolves in sheep's clothing. "Big Joe" and his Communist subjects in America know that no one has a better chance to stick a knife in your back than one's best friend. Uncle Sam had better watch out and keep an eye peeled on these "friends" who don't stay hitched. The old western code isn't so bad to follow. Strangers must first prove themselves. Friendship follows a certain period of time that develops the character of one's neighbors. Communist "friends" have openly declared themselves opposed to our democracy. What more of a warning do we need?

The American people should bear in mind that the Communist Party in America—notwithstanding a recent claim that it severed relations with Moscow to avoid listing its membership with the State Department at Washington—takes its orders from Moscow, and it does not look to Washington for leadership and a better understanding of democratic procedure.

If the "reds" look to Washington, it is with the thought that, by bloodshed, they might some day control the destiny of the American people. The "reds" dream of the day they can make everybody equal—equal to the lowest among them, rather than to permit the individual liberty to aspire to higher things and to merit the best that honest toil and ability can acquire. In communism, the only ones that can rise above the lowest level, are the Red politicians who rule with a bloody hand and an iron will.

No one wants to see the Communist hordes pour across Germany to the English Channel; nor does anyone want to see the Nazi hordes pour across Siberia to within a few miles of Alaska, in North America. Let the international highjackers bleed themselves white. Then we may have peace and only then.

If Americans are to trust communism, it must be after Moscow has withdrawn its saboteurs and political agents from America. Any friendship that we may come to feel for Russia must be after the Communist Party in America has been dissolved.

Red agents, posing as union organizers who go around the country telling you about Soviet power and the wonders of communistic Russia, are not our friends. They will not admit that they are Communists. They never do. They come to you as wolves in sheep's clothing. They only suggest that you read this and that communistic literature and they either have it with them or tell you where you can send and get it.

Americans—beware of anything that is not 100 percent American. Surely we should look to Washington, not to Moscow, for political and social leadership.

Shipbuilding and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

RADIO INTERVIEW BETWEEN HAROLD J. ADONIS AND MAYOR VINCENT J. MURPHY, OF NEWARK, N. J.

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following

radio interview between Harold J. Adonis and Mayor Vincent J. Murphy, of Newark, N. J., on July 2, 1941, on the subject of shipbuilding and national defense.

I have continually striven to bring to the attention of some of our governmental agencies the facilities now available at Port Newark to further our shipbuilding program and thereby to better prepare our national defenses. The remarks of Mayor Murphy are very pertinent, and it is my sincere desire and hope that Port Newark might be engaged in the construction of the vessels so vital to our program of preparedness.

The interview follows:

Mr. ADONIS. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

Tonight we are again privileged to present as a guest speaker, Mayor Vincent J. Murphy, of Newark, N. J., who will deliver his second regular monthly report on Newark's state of progress. The subject of his address, in the form of an interview, is Shipbuilding and National Defense.

To those of our listeners who may not have had previous occasion to hear the informative and authoritative opinions of Mayor Murphy, may I say that Mayor Murphy has achieved State and National attention for his tireless efforts in behalf of public accomplishments.

Mayor Murphy, I know your message this evening is of vital importance to the City of Newark, the State, and the Nation.

Mayor MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Adonis. I am sure that everyone, both within and without New Jersey, will soon agree with that statement.

Mr. ADONIS. I know they shall, Mayor Murphy. Meanwhile, you intend to emphasize the importance of shipbuilding and its major role in an adequate defense program of national preparedness?

Mayor MURPHY. Yes; with especial reference to the part that the City of Newark can and should play in the field of shipbuilding and as a submarine base. At the present moment, the Nation's naval-construction program is the largest in our history. As the first line of our defense, it is admittedly imperative that we use every means at our command to safeguard our National interests.

Mr. ADONIS. There can be no question with your contention, Mayor Murphy. In the meantime, what do you imply by your statement that the city of Newark "can and should play a major part in the Nation's shipbuilding program"?

Mayor MURPHY. It is my firm belief that we in the city of Newark have the essential advantages and facilities to add form and scope to the naval-construction program.

Port Newark, as you know, is ideal as a site for drydocks and shipyards. As a matter of record, the Federal Government in 1917 selected this location as one of its greatest Army base and shipyard centers along the entire Atlantic coast. The official files show that 20,000 workers were employed there, completing 118 steel ships of 5,000 tons each, 420 feet in length. In addition to that, 10,000 other workers were engaged at the Army depot. Today shipbuilding firms throughout the Nation would find Port Newark an ideal location.

Mr. ADONIS. Mayor Murphy, that is a record of accomplishment the city of Newark should well be proud of.

Mayor MURPHY. Yes; it is. However, I am more concerned with the current national emergency and what we in Newark can do to aid our defense program, with its 4,000 feet of northern waterfront; with its 25,000 creosoted piles intact, inspected, and reported to be in excellent condition; with its land fill rising 10 feet above mean low water, firmer and in better condition than in the past, Port Newark offers improvements and outstanding possibilities which should commend it highly to the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Port of New York Authority, which, incidentally, is approved as an accredited agency for locating and selecting a site for a drydock and repair yard, one large enough to accommodate the Navy's plane carriers and battleships.

Mr. ADONIS. Mr. Mayor, is there any move under way at the present designed to expedite your plan to utilize Port Newark as such a center?

Mayor MURPHY. Congressman ALBERT L. VREELAND, of New Jersey, on May 13, 1941, introduced in the House of Representatives House Resolution No. 207, which states:

"Whereas Port Newark, N. J., was in 1917 during the World War selected by the Federal Government for the construction of the largest Army base and shipyard on the Atlantic coast, and during the period of its operation completed the construction of 118 steel ships; and

"Whereas the Federal Government at that time installed 25,000 creosoted piles at the approximate cost of $500,000, which are still in good condition, and would thereby save 3 to 6 months' time in the construction of ways; and

"Whereas Port Newark is ideally located for transportation of supplies by rail water, and air, being in close proximity to the city of New York, and served by three railroads as well as adjacent to the Newark Airport, the once world's busiest airport, and yet of sufficient distance from the Atlantic Ocean and well protected by coast defense to be strategically safe from hostile attacks: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Navy Department take immediate steps to negotiate with the city of Newark, N. J., for the use of this area for the contemplated Navy Department's program to provide shipyard facilities to construct vessels to push the two-ocean navy program ahead of schedule."

Mr. ADONIS. What action was taken on Congressman VREELAND's resolution, Mr. Mayor?

Mayor MURPHY. House Resolution No. 207 was referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Mr. VREELAND, I understand, took this step because the Maritime Commission was demanding ships, ships, and more ships. It is my further understanding that Congressman VREELAND is now awaiting word from the said committee. He will notify me as soon as there are any developments in this matter.

Mr. ADONIS. Mayor Murphy, how would you summarize the advantages of port Newark?

Mayor MURPHY. Briefly, the Newark Bay shipyard property commends itself for the following reasons:

1. Its near vicinity to the heart and core of the steel supply in the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio.

2. Its unlimited labor market, which ranks as one of the best in the country.

3. Its outstanding service by three trunkline railroads.

4. Its provisions of unexcelled transportation for workers, both by railroad and busses.

5. Its ideal housing facilities.

Mr. ADONIS. Mr. Mayor, you plead your case well, and I am sure the authorities in Washington will give serious consideration to your proposal.

Mayor MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Adonis. I sincerely hope they do. The city of Newark has a genuine concern with the progress of the national-defense effort. In offering its property to the Federal Government for use as a drydock and shipbuilding center, and as a submarine base, the city of Newark has no selfish motives and no designs to capitalize on the national emergency. It is my firm conviction that our offer, if and when it may be accepted, will prove to be a substantial contribution to the defense program.

We are all aware that the Nation's shipyards are now working at top speed and virtually at capacity operation. This includes construction on both naval and commercial vessels.

We know, too, our desperate need for ships, and the role we, at home, must play to insure an adequate supply. Time being the vital factor, Newark's facilities can and should be utilized in the ship-construction program.

Mr. ADONIS. Mayor Murphy, are you planning any other move or moves to bring about the completion of your plans?

Mayor MURPHY. Yes; I have several plans in mind. First, I intend to solicit the cooperation of the Governor of New Jersey, the Honorable Charles Edison. As former Secretary of the Navy, Governor Edison displayed his keen interest in, and desire for, adequate naval expansion. I am sure the Governor will lend a willing ear to the city of Newark in its present efforts to aid the naval-expansion program.

In the meantime, I also propose to communicate with New Jersey's entire congressional delegation, and urge its membership to support my proposals, already initiated by Congressman VREELAND. Finally, I shall invite Governor Edison to join me in requesting President Roosevelt for a personal appointment. If this can be arranged, I am inclined to believe that our Chief Executive will be impressed with the advantages port Newark presents as a possible shipbuilding and drydock site.

Mr. ADONIS. Mayor Murphy, our time is now rapidly drawing to a close. Would you care to emphasize anything else in this connection?

Mayor MURPHY. At this point I would like to stress a statement made on June 21, 1940, by Mr. Raymond J. Dempsey, who, during the first World War, was in charge of personnel at the Army base in Port Newark, and who said in part:

"There is no rail bottleneck here, as there is in other places where sites have been recommended. Our site is served by the Jersey Central Railroad, the Pennsylvania, and Lehigh Valley, all leading directly to the centers of the steel industry and supply centers for other materials needed in shipbuilding and repairs.

"Since speed is one of the major considerations in an emergency, any possibility of congestion is a hazard and a possible source of delay."

Meanwhile, other competent authorities, including Mr. Dempsey, have pointed out that the 30-foot depth of the present channel could be increased to 40 feet by the War Department, at an estimated cost of from $750,000 to $1,000,000 for the removal of 3,000,000 yards at a cost approximating 25 cents per yard. This dredging expense would, of course, be much lower than any place else in New York Bay. The reason for this is because the fill could be piped to the Elizabeth Meadows. Incidentally, there would be no need to build timber or steel bulkheads; sod dikes would be ample.

I also wish to stress that the shipbuilding site proposed by the city of Newark lies at the juncture of Port Newark's ship basin, high-speed highways, trunk-line railways, and adjacent to Newark Airport.

The 40-foot channel required to accommodate the largest ships of the Navy could be dredged during the interval of completing the ways or drydock.

As mayor of the city of Newark I shall continue my efforts to establish Port Newark as one of the Nation's leading drydock and shipbuilding centers.

I thank you.

National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when President Roosevelt addressed a joint meeting of the Congress on January 6, 1941, he not only urged the Congress but the people to unite and stand as one behind the policies of the Government during this national emergency. When he made this plea I was pleased. I felt the President was pleading for a united nation 130,000,000 strong to get behind his foreign policy during this critical period. There came to my mind the many stirring pleas for peace that he had made during the recent campaign and before. I also thought of the many promises the President made that our boys would never be asked to fight on foreign shores. I quote only a few:

July 10, 1940, message to Congress:

That we are opposed to war is known not only to every American but to every government in the world. We will not use our arms in a war of aggression; we will not send our men to take part in European wars.

October 30, 1940, public address at Boston:

And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

December 29, 1940, fireside chat:

There is no demand for sending an American expeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth.

At last, I thought, we have a President who intends to keep his promise concerning peace; one who is calling for a united nation to make every effort to remain at peace with the whole world. Here was an opportunity for all to unite, regardless of party, behind a policy that both Presidential candidates and both the Republican and Democratic platforms in no uncertain terms had emphatically declared.

Now, let us examine the record. Memory is not so fleeting that every one of us does not remember when the lend-lease bill was first proposed. What happened? The President called to the White House several of the prominent Democratic Members of Congress and told them of his plan. But not one Republican was called to the conference.

That was the President's first action after calling for national unity. Should not our foreign policy be far greater than partisan politics?

We all remember that the President did not consult Congress before he gave away 50 destroyers and only told Congress about it after it was all over. This action was taken in spite of the fact the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, had previously appointed a subcommittee with the objective in view of obtaining island bases for our defense. It was not even consulted.

Under the lend-lease bill the President has transferred Coast Guard cutters, mosquito boats, and other huge amounts of matériel to England, but the Congress cannot obtain definite information as to just what action has been taken except in the most general terms. Yet we are asked to be united behind a policy the details of which we are not permitted to know.

This same policy of not consulting Congress until after the course of action determined upon by the President has been taken is still continued. President Roosevelt called to the White House last week several prominent Democratic Members of Congress and told them troops had been landed in Iceland. Again he did not call in one Republican. Again let me say the issue of our foreign policy should be far beyond party politics. Next day he informed the House of the action he had taken.

Over a year ago I called the attention of the House to the fact that Iceland is half in the Western and half in the Eastern Hemisphere; and we all know we have passed laws prohibiting sending our soldiers beyond the Western Hemisphere. But this did not prevent the President from sending our troops to areas prohibited by law.

But I am not trying to emphasize that point. The point I am trying to emphasize is the fact the President did not consult Congress, the representatives of the people, until the act was completed, and then only called in Democrats—completely ignoring the Republicans. And then he asks for national unity.

He never admitted that Americans were building bases in Ireland until confronted with the facts as presented by Senator Taft.

In all fairness, however, I do wish to say President Roosevelt has contributed to national unity by returning Thanksgiving to its original date.

In the last few days it has been urged that our laws be amended so as to permit our soldiers to be sent beyond the Western Hemisphere, and our guardsmen and selectees to remain in our armed forces beyond the 1-year period.

President Roosevelt called in prominent Democratic leaders for the usual conference, and evidently sensing the strong opposition to these proposed measures and perhaps the need of Republican help to secure sufficient votes to pass them, he asked two very able and distinguished Republicans to attend. One is an outright interventionist and the other the author of the conscription bill in the House.

These two gentlemen have a perfect right to their views on foreign policy but certainly their views are not in harmony with the majority of the Republican Members of Congress or the smaller group of Democrats who have been opposed to many of the steps taken by the Congress which they believe are leading us to war.

If we are so anxious to have national unity why was no one invited to this conference who would express the opposition to these measures? It seems to me if we are to have real national unity minority views should at least be heard and considered. I hope we have not reached the point when in the name of national unity everyone must be a "yes" man to the President.

Before you can stand behind anyone he must stand still long enough so that you can get behind him. Before we should be asked to stand behind the President we should have the right to rely on his solemn pledges, solemnly arrived at.

I am ready and willing, as you are, to stand squarely behind the President and his many pledges to keep this country at peace. What I am unwilling to do is to back the President in a policy that will get this country into war when the vast majority of our people do not feel it is to our best interests to become involved.

This is a country of majority rule. That has always been our policy from the days of our founding fathers. Now, how does the vast majority of our people feel on this vital issue? Every poll which has been taken clearly indicates the overwhelming majority are against our entry into this war. This not only includes the Gallup poll but every poll that has been taken. The New York News, in the midst of a so-called interventionists territory, shows 69 percent of the returns received are opposed to entering the war; the Fish poll, in the President's own district, shows a ratio of 9 to 1 against war; a recent poll in Indianapolis shows 92 percent opposed; the Chicago Tribune poll for Illinois shows 80.66 percent opposed to war. This poll includes Galesburg, Ill., which is in my district, with the following result: 87.89 percent opposed and 12.11 percent favor entry.

Why not unite for a policy that the vast majority of our citizens desire rather than for a policy desired by about 20 percent of our people? Why try to wag the dog by wagging the dog's tail? Why should this country be lead into war by the back door? If the President, after considered judgment, feels it is for the best interests of the country to enter the war, why should he not carefully and frankly present such facts to the Congress, and after free and open discussion let it decide that issue?

If the Congress, after full and open discussion, decides it is for our best interests to enter the war, then, realizing they are the elected representatives of the people, whether we as individuals agree or not, right or wrong, we should then all unite as one person in an all-out effort to win the war.

But if, on the contrary, the Congress should decide that we should not enter the war, we should just as freely get behind such a policy and present a unified country devoted to that purpose.

A Layman's Guess Versus Engineering Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on pages A3332 and A3333 of the Appendix of the RECORD appears the speech recently delivered over the radio by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] opposing the St. Lawrence seaway.

The third paragraph of his speech, on page A3332, is as follows:

> When you view the project in two parts, namely as a seaway and power project, the natural question arises, What is the total cost? Those in favor of such a project are ultraconservatives in arriving at a cost figure, while those opposed to the project are unable to accept the modest cost claims of the advocates of the St. Lawrence project. On the other hand, leading and reliable industrial engineers in Canada and the United States place the cost in excess of $1,000,000,000, some contending that $1,350,000,000 is a sensible and sane estimate.

As I am only a layman, I shall not presume to criticize the estimates of cost said to have been made by alleged "leading and reliable industrial engineers in Canada and the United States." Some of these engineers, it is said, have contended "that $1,350,000,000 is a sensible and sane estimate." I will only say that this is approximately six times the cost as estimated by General Robins, Assistant Chief of Engineers of the Army.

In Mr. VAN ZANDT'S speech on page A3332 appears the following:

> In estimating the cost of construction there has been nothing said concerning the cost of defending the St. Lawrence project. Military experts are of the opinion that it will require $1,000,000,000 to erect the necessary defenses at strategic locations along the 1,677-mile front.

Here we are forcefully reminded of the failure on the part of Congress to provide for the defense of our great industrial and commercial enterprises. No fortifications have been erected for the defense of 15,000 miles of river improvements. Many billions for this purpose are necessary as measured by the estimated needs of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence channel made by Mr. VAN ZANDT. His speech says:

> Military experts are of the opinion that it will require $1,000,000,000 to erect the necessary defenses at strategic locations along the 1,677-mile front.

All but a few miles of this front have been in operation for many years. The channel now extends from Duluth to Ogdensburg. On it we have the channels and locks absolutely essential to our great steel industry and without which we would now be powerless in our efforts of national defense. On it we have the great hydropower works at Niagara, where 56,000 cubic feet of water are utilized every second of time in the production of power, now so essential in our national defense. Not a dollar's worth of fortifications have been erected for their defense.

We are now told that when the one additional dam is built it will necessitate the expenditure of $1,000,000,000 for defenses along "the whole 1,677-mile front." If that be true, then we will certainly be in need of another billion to protect the T. V. A.

The Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams on the Columbia are producing much more power than is contemplated for the St. Lawrence. Ocean ships ply on this river through the Cascade Range, passing through the huge locks at Bonneville, where we also have the famous fish ladders for the preservation of the salmon industry. Perhaps much more than $1,000,000,000 will be necessary for the defense of the Columbia.

The Ohio River watershed embraces more than 100 locks and dams, with a commerce of 50,000,000 tons. No fortifications have been erected for their defense. Even the old fort Duquesne near Pittsburgh has long been abandoned, and cotton bales are no longer used for breastworks at New Orleans. As measured by the needs estimated for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence, certainly, at least $2,000,000,000 should be appropriated at once for the protection of this great region.

All these suggested fortifications are absolutely essential, if any of them are. Furthermore, we have 250,000 miles of railroad engaged in transportation which are not fortified. Probably another hundred billions would be sufficient for that purpose.

But, the half has never been told. On the Susquehanna, we have the great Conowingo Dam and hydroelectric power plant. It furnishes light and power to Philadelphia and power for the operation of trains on the Pennsylvania Railroad. It, too, is undefended. Perhaps a half billion would be ample for this purpose. If it should be destroyed, Philadelphia might experience a black-out, and the "Pennsy" might be forced to use more coal and less water power and thus give greater patronage to the coal industry, as she is now advising the Government to do.

Pennsylvania is our foremost State in the production of coal. The Pennsylvania Railroad has hauled many millions of tons of coal at great profit. Yet it is using hydroelectric power in the operation of many of its trains.

Representatives of the Pennsylvania Railroad have been telling the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to promote the use of steam power instead of water power for purposes of national defense. This is urged as an aid to the coal industry. They have told us that coal is far cheaper than falling water in the production of power. Then why Conowingo power?

On the question of maintenance of the seaway, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] in his speech says:

> For the maintenance cost of the channels and locks alone, $20,000,000 will be expended annually for the seaway part of the project.

The maintenance of the seaway on the long stretch from Duluth to Ogdensburg is paid out of the annual lump-sum appropriations made by Congress. There will be but little change in that maintenance cost. The additional cost will be principally on the short section between Ogdensburg and the international boundary line where the new locks and dam are proposed. We are told in the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] that the additional maintenance cost will be $20,000,000 annually.

As a general proposition the cost of maintaining our concrete dams under water is infinitesimal. The principal cost has been in the operation of the locks, rather than maintenance. The locks are electrically operated by power afforded by the river itself. Several men will be required for the 24-hour day operation. These men would receive the major portion of the $20,000,000.

In these circumstances the Budget would be expected to approve the $20,000,000 allowance, and ED. TAYLOR and JOHN TABER expected to be found asleep. Believe it or not, Ripley.

For the current year the Budget made an allowance of $41,723,000 for the maintenance and operation of our entire waterway system. Included in this, are our Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific ports; the ports and channels in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico; our canals and intercoastal channels; our river systems of approximately 15,000 miles, and including the operation of several hundred locks and dams; one port each on the islands of St. Thomas, Midway, and Wake; and our Great Lakes system of more than 60 ports, and including all the so-called seaway except the short stretch below Ogdensburg. We are now advised that the inclusion of that stretch will add approximately 50 percent to our maintenance cost.

Bureau of Mines Has Discovered a New Process for Producing Magnesium From Magnesite Ore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the importance of magnesium in

our defense program has become known to all of us. This very superior light metal not only takes the place of aluminum and is susceptible of being alloyed with aluminum, but it has numerous advantages over aluminum in airplane production.

MAGNESIUM ESSENTIAL

Magnesium is an absolute essential in the manufacture of munitions, in making tracer bullets, and as a principal ingredient in explosives. As a metal it is one-third lighter than aluminum, has an equal or greater tensile strength, and is used not alone in the production of airplanes, but also, because of its lightness, is used as material for casings for the great bombs that the bomber planes carry. Germany has been manufacturing and using this wonderful metal most extensively, and as near as we can learn today, is producing many times as much of it as we are.

MONOPOLY

By reason of monopolistic control, particularly in the field of patents, the Aluminum Co. of America, together with the Dow Chemical Co., have permitted no other person nor concern to enter the field of production in magnesium. Practically all the magnesium produced in the United States is produced by the Dow Chemical Co. from chlorines at Midland, Mich., and Freeport, Tex. The price of magnesium fixed and controlled by the Aluminum Co. of America and the Dow Chemical Co. has always been just one-third higher than aluminum, which strangely enough is the same differential that exists in the weight of these metals, aluminum being one-third heavier than magesium.

While in this country we produce magnesium from salt brines through secret patented processes controlled by the Dow people and the Alcoa people, in Germany they produce it from Austrian magnesite, and actually a better grade of metal, being less subject to corrosion, since its base is ore rather than salt.

WORK DONE AT WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

The United States Bureau of Mines, cooperating with the State of Washington at its school of mines at Pullman, Wash., 5 years ago entered upon a program of research in connection with the tremendous magnesite deposits located a short distance north of Spokane, Wash., in Stevens County. It was known that there were large magnesite deposits running into millions of tons, almost in the shadow of Grand Coulee Dam, where billions of kilowatt-hours of electrical energy would be generated. This research work has been carried on by Dr. H. A. Doerner of the United States Bureau of Mines, and Dr. A. E. Drucker, Dean of the State school of mines. The Congress has been generous in its appropriations to carry this work forward, and as a result of these appropriations a small pilot plant was constructed at the State college at Pullman, Wash., to ascertain the possibilities of producing this marvelous metal from our great ore reserves by electro-thermic methods. This work has been carried forward until today it has reached the point where those in charge of the research have announced the success of their new methods and processes.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from expressing a genuine gratification in this announcement, because of the faith that I have had in these experiments from the beginning, and the profound belief that a practical discovery of a method of producing metallic magnesium from magnesite ore would result in giving to our Nation, both for wartime and peacetime, an unlimited amount of the most wonderful metal that man has ever known, and at a price within the reach of all.

If the Office of Production Management and others who have the responsibility of making available magnesium metal, now that we have proven how it may be produced from the ore, see fit to give immediate consideration to this process, there will need to be no shortage of light metals to carry forward our airplane-production program and our other normal activities wherein we require great quantities of light metal.

ORE AND POWER AVAILABLE

Nature has been exceptionally kind in placing these mountains of magnesite ore in the immediate proximity of the greatest hydroelectric-power development in the whole world, and electrical energy is the major essential in reducing the ore to metal. One kilowatt of electrical energy produces 1,000 pounds of metallic magnesium. Grand Coulee Dam, when developed to capacity, will produce 2,000,000 kilowatts of electricity. This translated into metallic magnesium would be 2,000,000,000 pounds of metal. Of course, we realize that we would not use all the energy for this purpose, but the fact remains that every anticipated shortage of this magic metal can now be cared for by merely taking advantage of what we have and what we know in connection with power development and plant construction, using as a model the pilot plant at the State College of Washington at Pullman, and using as a process the discovery made by Dr. H. A. Doerner and his associates.

MAGNESIUM PROCESS PROVEN

Mr. Speaker, as proof of the fact that this is not merely a burst of local pride nor a fanciful vision or dream, but a cold practical fact, I append hereto a telegram received today from Dr. A. E. Drucker, dean of the School of Mines, at the State College of Washington, at Pullman, and commend it to the serious consideration of my colleagues and every person who has the responsibility of seeing that this Nation is amply prepared in this great crisis.

The telegram reads as follows:

PULLMAN, WASH., *July 13, 1941.*

Hon. CHAS. H. LEAVY,
Congressman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

First uninterrupted test run of pilot plant marking success of this intermediate step between new process and production on a commercial scale. Feel assured now that the equipment and process will function. Ingot metal of surprisingly high degree purity produced exceptionally resistant to corrosion. Impurities found in this electrothermic magnesium are of different kinds and less conducive to corrosion than impurities present in usual electrolytic magnesium. Doerner feels the process being carried out by pilot plant is best possible for magnesite of this State. He feels recent results as gratifying and best thus far. A definite step forward in development of equipment for recovery of magnesium from Washington magnesite has been accomplished at Pullman.

A. E. DRUCKER, *Director.*

You Can Save Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WATCHMAN-ADVOCATE, CLAYTON, MO.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, it is with intense interest for the preservation of the scenic natural beauty and resources of the State of Missouri that I extend in the RECORD an important editorial, published by the outstanding weekly journal in the Twelfth District, the Watchman-Advocate of Clayton, Mo.

I call to your particular attention that I am in full agreement with the position of this comment.

The editorial follows:

[From the Watchman-Advocate, Clayton, Mo., July 11, 1941]

YOU CAN SAVE MISSOURI

The State of Missouri has long been known for fine streams and scenic beauty. Likewise, its people have always been noted for their ability to defend their interests, to campaign for a desirable program, or to fight against any loss of their rights or liberties. At this moment these characteristics of Missouri and its people are closely related. There is a movement on now to ruin our fine streams and scenic beauty and at the same time deprive Missourians of some of their liberties.

The proposed plan to erect 30 flood-control dams in Missouri is making slow but steady progress. While the people of this State are absorbed in other affairs, the plans of those who would dam the State out of existence are being put into effect. High flood-control dams mean higher taxes, fewer schools, lost farms, and ruined counties. Their construction will mean the creation of health hazards and biological deserts. Their construction will result in fewer recreational places, the ruination of some of Missouri's finest scenic beauty, and the total destruction (for all practical purposes) of some of our most beautiful streams.

The only benefit to be derived from these proposed dams is a temporary control of a minute portion of the flood waters that now affect the lower Mississippi River States. The only other benefit to be found in their construction will be in the increased profits of the already wealthy engineering and construction companies who erect them.

There is one way to thwart the schemes of Army and private engineers who are so dam crazy. Only a concerted action of the people of this State can the State of Missouri be saved from the impending fate of being dammed to destruction.

If you believe Missouri is worth saving, if you believe that what was your natural heritage is worthy of being passed on to your children, then write a letter or postal

card today to your Congressman and Missouri's two United States Senators in Washington. Voice your opposition to this unnecessary, unwarranted, untimely, and un-American violation of our liberties!

Protecting the American Sugar Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM S. HILL, OF COLORADO

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, last week I delivered an address over radio station KFKA, at Greeley, Colo., on the subject Protecting the American Sugar Industry. The Mountain States Beet Grower published this article in their July issue, and I ask unanimous consent to have the address included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The address follows:

By the end of 1941, unless a new Sugar Act is passed by Congress, sugar producers of the United States will no longer have any protection against the importation of foreign sugar, except that provided by an inadequate rate of tariff. Without effective protection it is impossible for producers of sugar beets and sugarcane to operate profitably or efficiently. This is a matter which concerns not only the producer of sugar beets and sugarcane, but the consumer of sugar as well, because the existence of a healthy domestic sugar industry is the consumer's only guaranty against excess prices and the manipulation of our sugar markets by foreign interests.

That sugar prices have been low during the 7 years of quota control is generally recognized, and it was mentioned several times during the recent debate on sugar questions in the United States Senate. In 1940 the average retail price of sugar in the United States was 5.2 cents a pound. In 1939 it was 5.4 cents, in 1938 it was 5.3 cents, so that the Sugar Division was able to report just a few days ago—July 9—that the average price paid for sugar by consumers was less during the 7 years of control than in the 7 years preceding.

Making further comparison of sugar with other foods, we discover that in the last 20 years potatoes have increased in price by 71 percent, lard by 50 percent, butter by 45 percent, steak by 180 percent. In 1921 the average retail price of sugar was 8 cents a pound, so that the reduction in sugar prices between 1921 and 1940 was 32 percent. This in the face of the sharp increases in the price of other basic foods.

Even a casual glance at these figures should convince the most skeptical person of the fallacy of the arguments advanced by eastern cane refiners and other selfish groups that the present sugar program has been a burden to consumers. It is not a fact. The consumer has actually benefited in price under the present sugar program.

While the present price of sugar is slightly higher, there is nothing in the picture to indicate that sugar prices will increase out of proportion to the rise of other food commodities. Sugar could increase in price considerably and still be the cheapest of food on the basis of its caloric content. One pound of sugar has nearly six times the calories of a quart of milk; one and one-half as much as a pound of ham or a pound of eggs; six times more calories than a pound of potatoes, and one and one-half more than a pound of bread. Thus, figuring on a basis of calories, sugar is the cheapest food produced.

The farmers of the United States were forced by the Sugar Section of the Department of Agriculture to reduce their beet and cane acreage for 1941. The beet growers accepting a cut of 170,000 acres. All this reduction came in spite of a world situation no man could fathom, and at a time when it was becoming more and more difficult to get ships to bring offshore sugar to our markets. Now to keep their ridiculous regulations from swamping them completely, the Secretary of Agriculture "upped" his estimate of sugar consumption by 273,672 tons for a total of 7,125,561 tons—more sugar than has ever been consumed in any previous year in the history of the United States. With our sugar acreage cut, with ship bottoms getting harder and harder to obtain, with a world situation that will probably consume all our sugar reserve, the short-sighted policy of the men in charge of the sugar program becomes obvious, and it seems high time that Congress should begin working on sugar legislation to save us from the same situation that maintained in the last World War.

The beet and cane growers of every section of our country protested the sharp cut of acreage forced on them this spring by the Department of Agriculture backed by a Department of State determined to make the farmer pay for much of their good-neighbor policy. The Agriculture Department was heedless of the importunities of the sugar-beet and cane-producing areas, but it can be hoped that these two Departments now realize the error of their ways, and that neither will oppose the writing of a new Sugar Act that will give back American markets to our American producers.

The opposition of eastern seaboard cane-sugar refiners to the extension of the Sugar Act may be expected, but with present lack of shipping their arguments should fall on deaf ears. We must have sugar. The beet and cane sections employ 10 men for every 1 employed by eastern refiners. So, when we curtail beet- and cane-sugar production we not only directly create unemployment in domestic producing areas, but indirectly we reduce the employment of railroad men, miners, livestock producers, and dozens of other related industries and enterprises. Add to this the sharp cut in consumers' goods because of this unemployment and you can begin to understand the vast and the far-reaching effect of such narrow-minded regulation.

New sugar legislation should be enacted at once. Congress should begin the study immediately and permit every interested party to present his side of this sugar question. This is not just an issue for cane and beet growers to argue over with the Federal Government. This is a question that affects the purchasing dollar of every member of our commonwealth. The proper relation of our Government to offshore producers of sugar must be carefully considered but when interests conflict the deciding weight must be with our own farmers and consumers. No one doubts the ability of our Department of Agriculture to assist in solving this difficult problem. Let them be fair to the farmer, laborer, consumer, and to the capital invested in these great mills. Leadership can and must be found to solve not only the problems of the beet and cane growers, but also the problems of the producers of other major crops who are now in serious condition.

To further enlighten you on the sugar situation, it is well to recall that during all the period of quota control, not a single cent has been paid to the industry out of the Federal Treasury. On the contrary, the producer and the processor have paid their way and left a surplus in the United States Treasury. This is quite different from the Government assistance given to other farm crops.

Even if the present World War should continue for many years to come, it is hard to conceive of a situation wherein sugar would become so scarce as to cause an extreme increase in price, or the rationing of its use. Plenty of sugar should be available at reasonable prices, unless the bungling methods of the Agriculture Department, unduly influenced by a free-trade State Department, cause such a curtailment of acreage that we fail to have an opportunity to grow sufficient acreage of sugar crops.

New sugar legislation must take into consideration all our experience of the past, coupled with a vision and foresight into the future, all based on the abnormal situations existing in this world of revolution facing us. A proper evaluation of the condition of the farmers of our country, now and in a post-war world, must direct all deliberation on agricultural legislation at this session of Congress.

In closing, let me say that the Congress faces a serious situation, and one that needs careful thought and sound deliberation. In the discussion of the various phases of this problem, we need men that can think in terms of the United States, men that can understand the ramifications and the interrelation of the sugar problem with other agricultural production. I believe there is a correct solution to every problem. Therefore, if men with brains and vision set out to find a proper answer to the sugar problem, it will be found.

"Peace, Be Still"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, about 1,900 years ago a great storm arose on the Sea of Galilee. While the lightning flashed, the thunder roared, and the angry waves churned the foaming sea, a little boat battled bravely with the elements. On that boat was the Son of God. And He was sleeping the sleep of the just.

The situation was supremely tragic. It seemed that at any moment the frail craft would be broken apart or washed under by the furious waters and all on board would be lost. With blanched faces the horror-stricken disciples awakened the Master.

What happened then is graphically told by three competent reporters—St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke.

St. Matthew:

And He saith unto them: "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?" Then He arose and rebuked the wind and the sea, and there was a great calm.

St. Mark:

And He arose, and rebuked the wind and said unto the sea: "Peace, be still." And the wind ceased and there was a great calm. And He said unto them: "Why are ye so fearful? How is it that ye have no faith?"

St. Luke:

And they came to Him and awoke Him, saying: "Master, Master, we perish." Then He arose and rebuked the wind and the raging of the water, and they ceased, and there was a calm. And He said unto them: "Where is your faith?"

In my opinion Christianity is today facing the most supreme test in all of its history. A world tempest is going on and civilization is in the same precarious situation as the little boat that was rocked by the winds and the waves on the Sea of Galilee. The violence of men's hatreds, one toward another, is almost inconceivable. The ideal of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is being shot to death on a hundred battlefields on three continents. The word "mass" used to stand for sweet communion with God, but with paganism sweeping a large portion of the earth the only mass great numbers of people understand is mass murder. The very fundamentals of home, religion, and social security are being warped and twisted by the destructive elements at work. The whole world is seething in the grip of a storm of unimaginable virulence and magnitude. In my judgment the only force that can rescue civilization, the only force that can say, "Peace, be still," is the same force that calmed the turbulent waters of Galilee—the Son of God. I plead, meekly and humbly, that the problem of calming the world waters may be submitted to Him.

In presenting this suggestion I quote an illustrious authority:

"No greater thing," said President Roosevelt a few years ago, "could come to our land today than a revival of the spirit of religion—a revival that would sweep through the homes of the Nation and stir the hearts of men and women of all faiths to a realization of their belief in God and their dedication to His will for themselves and for their world. I doubt if there is any problem—social, political, and economic—that would not melt before the fire of such a spiritual awakening."

It seems to me—and I say it almost with tears in my eyes—that Christianity of today is doing very little to meet the challenge imposed upon it by this greatest of world debacles. Where are the leaders of the Christian church and what are they doing? With the exception of two outstanding churchmen, one a Catholic and the other a Protestant, Cardinal William H. O'Connell, of Massachusetts, and Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, of New York, I know of no eminent leaders of the church who have declared themselves in a forthright manner against American involvement in the orgy of butchery that is going on in foreign lands, or who have indicated a belief that Christianity has a present and imperative duty to perform in proposing mediation to end the war. Because these two great men stand out like mountain peaks on the Christian horizon I quote again, as I have many times heretofore, telegrams which I have received from them, as follows:

BRIGHTON, MASS., *May 22, 1941.*
Congressman LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Read your letter and enclosures with deep interest. There is no doubt in my mind that the American people desire a cessation of this stupid and brutal war, and I may add that no one can doubt their desire to keep out of the conflict.

Cardinal O'CONNELL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 26, 1941.*
Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

I strongly commend your resolution to promote peace by calling a conference of the American republics to offer the nations now at war the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator. This is the only hopeful and constructive way I see out of the present crisis.

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK.

It would seem to me that if the church of Christ were as militant as it should be to meet this supreme test of its efficiency, it would be leading a great moral and spiritual resurgence to lift the world out of hell and sweep it back to safety and sanity.

I speak as a humble member of the Methodist Church and as one who believes in a living Christ, and I say with sorrow that I do not think the Son of God is getting the support he should receive from Christians in performing the task of saving the world, which must be saved by Christianity, if it is to be saved at all. What is the Council of the Churches of Christ in America doing? What are other great religious organizations doing? What are our religious publications saying? Some ministers are openly interventionists and think the United States should become an active belligerent, just as if adding to the already too many consuming hatreds of the world is the way to peace and concord, and as if pouring oil on a fire is the way to put out the fire. Others appear to have succumbed to an apathetic laissez-faire and defeatist philosophy, so that it is difficult to say whether they are paralyzed or petrified. To such Christians I can imagine hearing the Son of God saying from behind the shadows, as St. Luke records Him saying to His disciples on the boat:

Where is your faith?

Christians who are under the defeatist spell should reconsecrate themselves in the faith that made martyrs, shake off their paralysis and get into action, for the world is crying to be saved.

I believe that a practical way for our Christian forces to proceed to do their part in the greatest task ever undertaken or imagined as a Christian objective, the saving of the world from physical and moral destruction, is outlined in the mediation resolution I have introduced in the House, which is as follows:

Whereas it is the overwhelming desire of the American people that the United States shall remain at peace with the world and free from foreign entanglements, while it faithfully performs its duties as a good neighbor; and

Whereas if the world ever needed a peacemaker it needs one now; and

Whereas with war engulfing a large portion of the globe and threatening to draw other nations into its vortex, there is a real opportunity for the United States to demonstrate its sincerity as a good neighbor by assuming the role of a peacemaker; and

Whereas there is a possibility, faint though it may be, that the New World under the leadership of the United States, might be the means of freeing the Old World from the miseries of war and reestablishing peace and tranquillity on earth: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President shall be requested to invite the American republics to send delegates to a conference to be held at the earliest practicable date in the city of Washington to offer to the nations now at war the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator, to the end that the blessings of peace may be brought to a distraught world.

SEC. 2. This concurrent resolution shall be known as the peace resolution of 1941.

The introduction of this resolution is predicated on the belief that the best thing that could happen to the world now would be successful mediation to stop the war, to be followed by reconstruction on a basis of fundamental justice. There is enough land lying uncultivated and fallow to support all human beings on the earth if they would but forget their hatreds, put down their guns, and go to work.

High among the snow-crowned Andes Mountains the face of Christ shines in the bright sunlight. To my imaginative mind, the heroic statue of the Prince of Peace, on the borderland between Chile and Argentina, sends out on the ether waves of love and friendship its mute appeal for the mediation resolution I have introduced. That statue is deeply rooted in the sentiment of the American republics, because it was erected by the two nations to celebrate an accord that was reached after long and intense bitterness. It stands in towering majesty on a spot 13,000 feet high. It can be seen for a hundred miles and all who come near it are enthralled by its beauty and grandeur. The story of the Christ of the Andes has been told many times, but to a world stricken with war, or living in constant fear of war, it cannot be told too often. The statue bears this inscription:

These mountains must crumble to dust before the Argentines and the Chileans shall break the peace which they have sworn to maintain at the feet of Christ, the Redeemer.

Would it not be a grand thing if the moving hand of history were to write into the record of civilization this memorandum:

In the year 1941 a great Christian President of the United States, with the assistance of the 21 American republics, brought a warring world to the feet of Christ, the Redeemer.

Is it not worth trying?

Communism in the Merchant Marine

REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have talked today with a jobless seaman. His name is Joseph J. Doyle. Until a few days ago he was a member of the crew of the steamship *Ancon*. That vessel is operated by the War Department of the United States Government. When the steamship *Ancon* puts out to sea tomorrow, Joseph J. Doyle's name will be missing from the list of the ship's crew.

Why is Doyle jobless today? For the simple reason that he dared to call for an investigation of the alleged Communist control of the National Maritime Union. As a member in good standing of the National Maritime Union and as a properly accredited delegate to the union's annual convention in Cleveland last week, Doyle asked for an open hearing within the union on the charge of Communist control. Immediately the Stalin-Curran machine, which absolutely dominates the National Maritime Union, put Mr. Doyle in his place; that is, in the ranks of the unemployed—the place reserved for all those seamen who dare lift their voices against Moscow's strangle hold upon the shipping of the United States.

The case of Joseph J. Doyle dramatizes an issue which has been facing the United States Government for several years. That issue will not down. It must be met, and I propose—I demand—that we meet it without further delay. For years, the Dies committee has been turning up the evidence which shows conclusively that a vicious and subversive machine of Communist-racketeers controls the National Maritime Union. Our committee agents inform me that there is a great deal of new evidence concerning this machine which controls the N. M. U. Today that machine demonstrates that it is so confident of its power over American shipping, that even the War Department of the United States must knuckle down when it gives the command. I put the issue up to the War Department today: I ask the Department headed by Mr. Henry L. Stimson if it intends to follow the policy of letting Moscow dictate the personnel aboard our ships. I ask the War Department if it intends to connive with Joe Curran and his Moscovite bosses in depriving any patriotic American seaman of his livelihood if and when he challenges the Communist control of the National Maritime Union.

I want to say in closing that the Dies committee has placed Mr. Doyle under subpena, and I intend to see that our committee brings him before us to give the facts and that we probe to the very bottom of this issue which has been dramatized by the case of this seaman. I shall favor bringing the responsible officials of the War Department, by subpena if necessary, before the Dies committee so that we may learn at the earliest possible moment where the Department stands on this issue.

Accomplishments of Farm Security Administration in Stark, Tuscarawas, Wayne, and Holmes Counties, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, not many persons in cities and towns are acquainted with the program of the Farm Security Administration and therefore the information herein is intended chiefly for them. To the farmers, however, the actual results of the Farm Security Administration program in Stark, Tuscarawas, Wayne, and Holmes Counties, comprising the Sixteenth Ohio Congressional District, will be of outstanding interest.

This Administration has for its purpose the extension of loans to small farmers who find credit unavailable elsewhere, with the hope of increasing their incomes so that they may be kept from appealing to the W. P. A. or relief organizations.

Secondly, the Farm Security Administration goes to the relief of the farmer overburdened by debt, and by skillful negotiation arranges a scaling-down of debts or reduction of interest—all voluntary on the part of the creditor.

Thirdly, in certain counties the Administration buys farms for tenants, supplying them with all the needed funds at a rate of interest of 3 percent and providing for easy payments, thus adding to the number of farm owners of a community.

A review of what has been accomplished in the Sixteenth Ohio Congressional District by the Farm Security Administration is contained in the following letter I have received from Mr. C. B. Baldwin, Administrator:

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. THOM: Since the beginning of the present emergency it has been generally recognized that the health, welfare, and morale of our people are vitally important to national defense. Providing for these needs among low-income farm families has been one of the essential contributions of the Farm Security Administration to the Nation's defense efforts during the past year.

We have just completed a special survey undertaken to measure the progress being made by borrowers from the Farm Security Administration. It indicates the gains in terms of money, living standards, and capacity for self-support which have been made during 1940 by handicapped and low-income farm people all over the country. It occurred to me that you might be interested in seeing the figures for your district.

In the Sixteenth District of Ohio there were 502 active standard rehabilitation borrowers at the end of 1940. The survey showed that the average borrower earned a net income of $926 during the year, as compared with $745 in the year before he borrowed from Farm Security. In other words, the typical family increased its annual net income by 24 percent.

Also significant are the gains which these people made in net worth, since that is one of the best measures of permanent improvement in living standards. Borrowers in your district increased their average net worth—over and above all debts, including their obligations to the Government—from $1,156 before they came into the Farm Security program to $1,427 at the close of the 1940 crop year. This is a gain of 23 percent.

These figures mean that farm-security borrowers in the Sixteenth District have added a total of $135,967 to the wealth of their communities, and have increased their total annual incomes by $90,802. Naturally this growth in prosperity and purchasing power has been reflected on the books of merchants and other businessmen of the district.

We were pleased to find that borrowers in your district are rapidly repaying their rehabilitation loans. Already $108,784 has been repaid on loans totaling $454,370, although much of the money does not fall due for 4 or 5 years. Throughout the entire country, rehabilitation loans totaling $420,865,050 had been made as of December 31, 1940, and $149,626,442 of this sum had been repaid. As you know, loan funds currently are advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, instead of coming from direct appropriations.

In view of the fact that none of the borrowers from farm security was able to get adequate credit anywhere else, and that many of them formerly were on relief, we feel that this repayment record is a tribute to the honesty and industry of these needy farm people. There is ample evidence that the great majority of them are getting back on their feet and becoming permanently self-supporting. In large measure, this progress is due to the advice and technical guidance in sound farm and home management which accompanies each farm-security loan.

For example, we encourage our borrowers to get away from one-crop farming—particularly of surplus crops, such as cotton, tobacco, and wheat—and to raise as much as possible of their own food and feed for their livestock. During 1940, the average farm-security family in your district produced $266 worth of goods for home consumption, as compared with $212 before they came into the F. S. A. program. This produce for home use included 405 gallons of milk per family, 431 pounds of meat, and 354 quarts of vegetables and fruit canned for the winter. This increased production of food did not, of course, add to the supply in the commercial markets, since virtually none of it was offered for sale. It simply meant a better diet, better health, and a rising standard of living for these families.

Often it has been necessary to work out an adjustment of the family's old debts, before rehabilitation could be successful. Local farm debt adjustment committees have been set up for this purpose. They have no legal authority to compel adjustments, but by bringing the farmer and his creditors together for a friendly discussion, they usually are able to arrange a scale down of the obligations, reduced interest rates, or extension of the payment period. Such adjustments frequently save the farmer from foreclosure, and at the same time, enable the creditors to get substantial payments on what might otherwise have been bad debts.

This service is available to all farmers, whether or not they are rehabilitation borrowers. Altogether, debt reductions totaling $100,288 have been negotiated for the farm-

ers in your district. This represents a scale-down of 14.6 percent. As a direct result of these adjustments, $10,985 in back taxes has been paid to local governmental agencies.

In making this special survey, our field employees reported that there are 830 families in your district who are eligible and in need of rehabilitation loans but have been unable to get them because of the limited funds available.

In addition to the rehabilitation program, Farm Security is carrying out the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which provides a limited number of loans to competent tenants to enable them to buy family-type farms.

During the first 3 years of this program we made 20 such loans in your district, totaling $153,090. This year we expect to make 5 Bankhead-Jones loans in the Sixteenth District, amounting to approximately $36,856. Throughout the country delinquencies of these loans have amounted so far to only 2.6 percent, or $23,658, and this has been more than offset by the fact that other borrowers have been able to make advance payments totaling $196,765 as the result of good crops and management.

I am hopeful that this rather detailed report may be useful to you; and if you would like to have any further facts about our program, I shall, of course, be glad to supply them. Sometime during the year I hope that you may find an opportunity to visit some of the borrowers from F. S. A. in your district and see for yourself the efforts they are making to get a new start as independent, tax-paying citizens.

Sincerely,

C. B. BALDWIN,
Administrator, Farm Security Administration.

Answering Jackson Daily News

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading newspapers of Mississippi, the Jackson Daily News, edited by Hon. Fred Sullins, hardly lets a day go by without an attack on me for some cause—or without cause.

One of his latest blasts was because of my efforts to do belated justice to the disabled veterans of the World War and their widows and orphans. At the same time, however, he is clamoring for us to plunge into the European war, which means, we are now told, that we must prepare to send an army to Europe. I do not know where we could land them, nor do I know who would take care of the maimed, blind, wounded, and disabled ones when they returned from such a war, or who would care for their unfortunate dependents.

He seems to be trying to convince the people of Mississippi that I ought not to run for the United States Senate. He seems to fear that, if elected, I would spread T. V. A. power rates all over the State—as well as rural electrification.

His fears are well-founded. If I should ever be placed in that position, I would not rest until everyone who uses electricity in Mississippi enjoyed T. V. A. rates, and until we electrified every farm home in the State.

Mississippi cannot remain "half slave and half free."

July 4 Address at Columbus Junction, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN, OF IOWA

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered at Columbus Junction, Iowa, July 4, 1941:

My friends of Columbus Junction and the First Congressional District, it is a pleasure indeed to get back to Iowa and to meet and talk with home folks again. I am convinced more than ever not only that Iowa leads the Nation in grade 1 farm land and in agriculture but also that Iowa leads the Nation in stable thinking in these perilous times.

Iowa has furnished some of the outstanding leaders of the Nation in the matter of clear thinking and determined efforts to bring our defenses up to date. One of your honored citizens, Hon. Floyd Pine, has distinguished himself through his leadership in our State legislature as chairman of the special defense committee created by our State legislature. Within recent weeks we have also been brought to the realization that the sons and daughters of Iowa are in the forefront of our defense efforts throughout the land. This fact has been brought home to us not only by the great work of Floyd Pine but also through the untimely death of Pvt. Charles Edward Bidwell, of Washington, Iowa, in Texas; of Lt. Howard Abbott, of Osceola, in the submarine *O–9;* the death of Lt. Theodore Holsteen, of Burlington, in the Army bomber in Wyoming; and the tragic fate of Betty Streiff, of Albia, in Washington.

As Americans view this challenge today, we can well afford to look to our personal obligations, to the obligations and responsibilities of our Government and to the responsibilities of our Nation. My own obligation as your Representative in Congress carries with it a solemn responsibility. I can only hope to serve you to the utmost of my ability and to do everything within my power to help our Nation achieve its proper place among the nations of this earth. My experience in Congress has been one of facing unpredicted emergencies and decisions continuously. As I face these problems I am reminded of Abraham Lincoln's statement:

"I am not bound to win, but am bound to be true. I am not bound to succeed, but I am bound to live by the light that I have. I must stand with anybody that stands right, stand with him while he is right, and part with him when he goes wrong."

My own limitations also remind me of the following quotation from Edward Everett Hale:

"I am only one,
But I am one;
I can't do everything,
But I can do something;
And what I can do,
That I ought to do;
And what I ought to do,
By the grace of God, I will do."

As to the responsibilities of our Government, I think I should at this time confine my comments to the responsibility of the legislative branch. The greatest job before Congress today is to bring into being an adequate armament and training program, without plunging our Nation into economic and fiscal disaster. With a spending program estimated at some $22,000,000,000 for the coming year, and the prospective increase in our national debt of approximately half that amount, Congress is today facing a challenge far greater than any challenge in history in the matter of fiscal policy. The tax problem will be very dramatically brought home to each of us when the new tax bill becomes effective, and yet there is little likelihood that a new tax program can raise more than half of the governmental spending program for the coming year.

I was assigned to a special national-defense committee of my party in Congress about 18 months ago and our conclusion after a long and careful study was that a sound national economy is of vital importance in our national defense. Briefly, Congress' job is to raise the revenue we need without endangering the very life of industry and agriculture, and also Congress' job is to bring into being a national-defense armament and training program sufficiently strong to meet the dangers that confront us.

As I said before, I will not attempt to outline for you at this time the full duties and responsibilities of the President and executive branch of Government in the determination of policies and the administration of them with the funds made available by Congress. I will first briefly, however, state that the President and the executive branch of Goverment are just as obligated to carry out your will as Congress is so obligated, and, in my opinion, the President and his Cabinet should no more stoop to secret propaganda to influence your views than should any Member of Congress. We are all elected by your votes in our representative form of government, and you voters should not hesitate to tell us all what to do. In my judgment, the only report I should bring back to you should be in the nature of accounting to you as your Representative in Congress.

From this view of the duties of your governmental representatives and officials and because of my view that the Iowa farmer is the greatest thinker in our land today, you can imagine my astonishment when recently the Farm Security Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture sent out instructions to its employees who were qualified as information advisers, setting out that the British shipping situation is much more serious than Americans have realized and then proceeded with the following:

"Department experts emphasize that these facts do not mean that England has lost the war. There is some doubt, however, whether England can hold out through the winter if we do not take immediate and positive measures to see that American food and war materials are delivered at British ports.

"What a British defeat would mean to this country should by this time be obvious to all of us. Many of the best-informed people in Washington predict an invasion of the Western Hemisphere within 90 to 120 days if Britain is defeated.

"The Department feels that the American people—particularly the America. farmers—do not understand these facts, and that vigorous action of the type needed cannot be taken until this lack of understanding is remedied.

"For this reaso.. every agency in the Department has been asked to do all it can to get these facts before the people.

"We cannot issue formal press releases or radio speeches on the subject for two obvious reasons—it is not the official job of the Department to discuss international affairs, and indiscriminate broadcasting of these facts might play into the hands of the appeasement propaganda groups.

"We are requested, however, to carry these facts by word of mouth to as many as possible of our own officials and other key people in Agriculture, such as Farm Security Administration committeemen, etc."

I do not believe I need to emphasize further that such secret efforts to influence your opinion in our present crisis is not a proper function of government.

Our Nation's responsibility involves the responsibility of each and every citizen and resident within our land. The answer of the colonists at Bunker Hill on June 17, 1775, the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, and the adoption of our flag on June 14, 1777, are inspiring examples to us today. Time has ticked off 166 years of history since Bunker Hill, and we are face to face as surely today, as then, with the fact that the things we place most highly—liberty, equality, the right to happiness and security in our homes and persons—are not merely a heritage to be taken as a matter of course. They are ours, not to squander and dissipate but ours to maintain and hold in trust for generations of Americans yet unborn.

We can all agree with R. H. Markham in that:

"The flag of the United States of America has developed step by step as the Nation has developed. It is a living symbol. Each feature of this flag represents a grand deed and a high ideal; represents men and women trying to create a better way of life. It symbolizes the daring devotion of the past, the gigantic efforts of the present, triumphant faith in the future. It is an emblem of frontier hardships and struggles, of peaceful fields, and wonder-working factories, of churches, schools, and love-filled homes. In its colors are reflected the brightest hopes and noblest visions that the good men of every age have cherished. The honoring of this flag is a solemn pledge that these hopes and visions shall be realized."

Throughout the challenge immediately confronting us in the matter of peace or war I wish to emphasize that being peace-minded is not a defense against war. We are all in favor of fair weather, but that does not save us from being blown to kingdom come by a tornado. There is only one way to defend the America we love against the "isms" that are now running rampant throughout the world, and that way is to make our Nation so strong that all the bullies of the world put together dare not pick a fight with us. In so building our arms we must also safeguard our spirit of freedom and recognize that America cannot survive without spiritual faith. With Russia and Germany locked in combat, we are confronted with a real challenge whenever we undertake to visualize either side in that conflict marching arm and arm with us and the other democracies of the world singing Onward Christian Soldiers for the freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

Our American system of Government is in striking contrast to national socialism. We have seen national socialism in Italy develop into fascism, and then into dictatorship under Mussolini. In Russia we have seen national socialism develop into communism and sovietism, and then into dictatorship under Stalin. We have seen national socialism in Germany develop into nazi-ism and then into dictatorship under Hitler. In contrast to all these our American system of government exalts the individual and subordinates the Government and all Government officials to the position of servant of all the people, and that government derives its just powers from the people, who are supreme.

I do agree wholeheartedly with Acting Secretary of State Welles speaking in behalf of President Roosevelt when he told a press conference:

"That to the people of the United States * * * principles and doctrines of communistic dictatorships are as intolerable and as alien * * * as * * * doctrines of Nazi dictatorship. Neither kind of imposed overlordship can have, or will have any support or any sway in the mode of life, or the system of government, of the American people."

In facing our Nation's challenge in addition to spiritual faith the great weapons that will successfully meet the challenge confronting us today are courage, economic strength, and work. Those three factors, coupled with spiritual strength need still another factor to carry us forward and that factor is national unity.

We are today torn between our emotional impulses on the one hand and our logical conclusions on the other. One of my distinguished colleagues Hon. KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska, in a speech to his constituents and which speech appears in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A3005, made a very effective statement of the situation confronting us. This is the time that divides the thoughts and feelings of men, that ruptures friendships, and that may even divide families, and that situation must not happen in America today. With a united America and with our unequaled capacity for mass production and with the unequaled courage and bravery of American youth, America can move forward with a unity of purpose and a spiritual unity to out-build any nation or combination of nations on this earth in the luxuries of peacetime or the armaments of war. Under the benign influences of a free government, of a free economy, of a free enterprise, free speech, and free religion and free politics, the men of America of different races and different tongues have learned to modulate and to adjust their suspicions and their desires, so that in this great free land, each man, woman, and child can have equality of opportunity.

However, until we have carefully planned and prepared and built adequate armament, America today must face probably what is the greatest challenge of all, and that is to expend all of our strength and effort and economic resources and labor to building our armament and training program. We must not plunge hastily and thoughtlessly headlong into an unnecessary war, even when fully armed, and above all I know that the people of Iowa are strongly opposed to plunging into that kind of a war unprepared.

Let us turn to the state of our unpreparedness. It is here that I wish to bring to you an accounting of my work as your Representative in Congress. I have been very fortunate in my assignment to the Committee on Military Affairs, whereon I have served for the past 2½ years. I only wish that I had time to discuss in detail the work of my committee and especially the subcommittee on which I have been serving in the study of strategic materials. You have no doubt seen the newspaper accounts of the report of my committee to the House of Representatives. This report was written after many weeks of intensive study and hearings through the most incongruous, ill-assorted, overlapping entanglement of agencies you can imagine. Notwithstanding that situation in Washington, and the inherent danger brought about by the scarcity of strategic materials which we cannot produce in this country, industry and labor have responded marvelously to the appeal made by our Federal Government during the past year.

I must conclude, however, by saying that America is today far from adequately prepared to join in as an active belligerent in the war now raging in Europe. To plunge in at this moment would mean little less than the slaughter of uncounted thousands of our sons through lack of adequate armament. A few months of time will change this picture somewhat, and 18 months will change it so greatly that it is well-nigh impossible to imagine the difference in our position then and now. I have nothing but praise for the response of American industry and labor to the challenge that came to them only 1 year ago, and I can say truthfully that American industry and labor have gone further in the past 12 months than the industry and labor of any nation in a like period of time in history, but we cannot demand the impossible of them. We have known ever since the World War of 1917 and 1918 that it requires 2 years or more to arm our Nation. The sad part of it is that it requires only a few hours to plunge headlong into armed conflict. But inasmuch as we are situated as we are, my hope is that we can forestall any attack upon our own Nation and that we can at the same time unite in expending our full effort to preparation rather than to hastening our entrance into armed conflict. If America pulls together unitedly and energetically for all-out preparedness during the months immediately ahead and if our Nation also judiciously avoids armed conflict insofar as possible to do so, I can assure you that our Nation will never bow to a foreign master.

From my mail and the newspapers and from my visits with you, I know that the people of Iowa are united and determined to go forward together unconquered and triumphant.

Dedication of the Stonington Post Office, Stonington, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. FITZGERALD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM J. FITZGERALD, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following speech which I made at the dedication of the Stonington post office at Stonington, Conn., on Friday, July 4, 1941:

Mr. Warden, Mr. Postmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to express my appreciation for the privilege of being with you today to take part in the dedication of this splendid building which marks another milestone in the history of your town.

Every man likes to feel that as he goes through life that here and there he builds a sort of monument whereby in the years to come some few people may remember him. Some men give vast sums of money for a school, an art gallery, or a church. Some men construct with their hands and minds priceless works of art and literature. Some men

leave their mementos through important engineering works. I have no gifts which would enable me to leave such a trace of my having lived. Yet I do like to feel that here and there during my lifetime I have been instrumental in the accomplishment of a few worth-while things.

And so I try on occasion to build through politics the sort of memorial which will give me a measure of satisfaction as well as satisfaction and enjoyment to others. This structure was the only post office I recommended.

I want to add in passing my appreciation to your postmaster, William Farnan, who cooperated with me in securing this building.

It probably will be the last post office to be built in New London County for many years to come. All money now is being devoted to projects which will strengthen our national defense. Post offices are the gift of a Government at peace to its communities at peace.

A post office is more than a convenience. It is the central nerve of the town's activities and of the Nation's activities, too. For the mail reaches and connects every individual, every business establishment, and every home with every other. The post office is the center of the connecting link. When a town develops from a stamp window set-up in a home to a separate building, devoted solely to the post office's activities, then that town, although it may be far from being a metropolis, takes on the status and dignity of the largest city in the country.

It is on that score that I congratulate you. It is on that score that I share the honor and the felicitations, which today are being given to you.

Stonington has rich, historical traditions which go back to 1649 when William Chesebrough of Rehoboth in Plymouth colony came here to settle. His home on the west bank of the cove was the first, and he was quickly followed by Thomas Miner, Walter Palmer, and Thomas Stanton with their families. No organized company settled this borough but individuals who came here independently because they liked the land.

Stonington is, therefore, one of our oldest Connecticut towns. There is much in the Stonington of the past 282 years that captures the imagination. There is the loveliness and quiet beauty of the only Connecticut town bordering on the Atlantic Ocean; there is the fact that it is the home of two famous explorers of the nineteenth century, the 22-year-old captain of a sealing vessel, Capt. Nathaniel B. Palmer, who discovered the Antarctic Continent, and Capt. Richard Fanning after whom the Fanning Islands are named; there is the romantic history of Stonington as a port from which Stonington-built vessels in the early part of the nineteenth century went forth in commerce or on whaling and sealing expeditions. Your seafaring history is part of that great tradition of New England's close connection with boat building, and I have aided every effort for a revival of ship construction in this section of the country, particularly in your neighboring town of Groton.

Nor can I forget the Stonington of today, a community that is making a determined comeback after a period of depression and despair. This beautiful post office, I hope, will symbolize the Stonington of the future and reflect the pride and high hopes of this community for the days to come.

There are several things in your history that I think are both interesting and important. For the first, I go back to your earliest history. When the Pequot Indians, who inhabited this area, were defeated by the colonists under Capt. John Mason in 1637, the Indian lands were claimed by both Massachusetts and Connecticut. In 1657, when Stonington—or Mystic and Pawcatuck as the town was then called—had been settled for 8 years, the small community petitioned the General Assembly of Connecticut to be set off as a town. Connecticut refused, and since the colonists doubted the right of Connecticut to the territory, they asked the Massachusetts general court, which also turned them down.

The small group of colonists then in 1658 did something which I believe is worth noting. In the absence of any town government, they set up a miniature republic to govern themselves as best they could under the name of the Association of Poquantuck People. In their compact they promised (and I quote) "to maintain and defend with our persons and estate the peace of the place and to aid and assist one another according to the law and rules of righteousness." True, the self-governing group did not last long, as the royal commissioners later in the year settled the dispute about the Pequot lands, setting up the Mystic River as a boundary and changing the name to Southertown.

I call attention to that early association of Poquantuck people because I think there is an interesting parallel to be drawn. Stonington, even back in 1658, displayed an old-fashioned American trait—to "defend with our persons the peace of the place and to aid and assist one another according to the laws and rules of righteousness."

In the world of today, when we see the forces of brutality and barbarism rampant, it is a good thing to look back nearly 300 years to our early beginnings and find that Americans have always said that they will stick together and fight for the peace of the place.

Today America reams and waits. "The arsenal of democracy," our beloved President has called this country, and not far from here I know the weapons of war are being forged. This is the Fourth of July. Perhaps the most significant anniversary in our national history. And all of us, I know, are trying to get a glimpse of the future to ask the question: "Where are we going?" I do not know the answer, even though in Washington I am closer to the gigantic problems this country faces than most of you. I do know this. Just as Stonington displayed a deep sense of sticking together in the cause of righteousness, so I have faith that we as a people will show that quality of unity and high sense of endeavor in the days to come. Whatever we must face, we, like the pioneers, can endure.

There is one other glorious side of the history of your borough that I want to mention, because it fits in so well with present events. I go back to the Revolutionary War, when Stonington was the only Connecticut town which was the scene of an American victory over the British. New London and Groton were ravaged by redcoats under Arnold, but Stonington repelled a naval attack. It was August 30, 1775, that this happened while the British, besieged in Boston, had sent out vessels along the New England coast to forage for supplies. At Stonington were many cattle sent over by the inhabitants of Block Island.

The British hove to and issued a demand for the cattle, and the townspeople promptly refused. A landing party from the vessel was repelled at Browns wharf by the militia with their antiquated Queen Anne muskets. Thereupon began a naval bombardment by the British for several hours. As the metal poured upon the community, the townsfolk, like Londoners during an air raid, took refuge behind rocks and in cellars. Finally the British, unable to take the town, sailed away.

Another vivid page in Stonington history deserves mention. During the War of 1812, the British again, on August 9, 1814, attacked Stonington unsuccessfully. This time a squadron of 4 vessels, commanded by Capt. Thomas M. Hardy, Lord Nelson's aide at Trafalgar, appeared and issued an ultimatum, giving the people 60 minutes to get out of the town. The townspeople had 3 cannons and little ammunition to pit against 160 guns on the British ships. But they had courage aplenty, and the British demand was refused.

The British then let loose a 3-day bombardment, when 60 tons of metal were dropped on the little port. When the ammunition for Capt. Jeremiah Holmes' cannon gave out, a timid citizen among the defending militia proposed surrender. "No," shouted Captain Holmes; "that flag shall never come down while I am alive." And it never did come down, nor will, I hope, because the British vessels, in the face of cannon manned by courageous Americans, were forced to withdraw to give the Stonington militia victory over the pride of the British Navy.

The defenders of Stonington in 1775 and in 1814, by their courage and fortitude, bring pride to our hearts. I do not have to point out the resemblance to our own times, as we face a world torn by forces of upheaval. Your Stonington ancestors, it seems to me, set up the tradition for all of us to follow—a resolute and courageous attitude in the face of any impending danger. Just as your navigators in their small sailing vessels set their course by the stars, so shall we go forward with faith and trust. And the heritage of your ancestors will be reflected in all of us, come whatever may in the future.

Representative Hamilton Fish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

LETTER FROM NEWBURGH (N. Y.) NEWS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I deplore the vicious attacks being made against Representative HAMILTON FISH, because he has the courage to champion the cause of peace and seeks to prevent involvement of the United States in the war. Since a Member of the upper body on July 7 inserted in the RECORD an article from the Poughkeepsie Eagle News impugning Mr. FISH's motives, I insert herewith, under leave to extend my remarks, the following reply, written by a secretary of Mr. FISH, during the latter's absence at Fort Bragg, N. C., and which appeared in the Newburgh (N. Y.) News:

[From the Newburgh (N. Y.) News of July 11, 1941]

ANSWERS FOR FISH

TO EDITOR, THE NEWS:

As a result of the postal-card poll taken by Representative HAMILTON FISH on the vital question, the United States should enter the war, stay out of war—which went 9 to 1 to stay out—some of the interventionists and war makers in his district are raving and gnashing their teeth and bursting into print.

Among those is a certain Bennie W. Frazier, of Garrison, a graduate of Harvard, unmarried, and 31. This young fire-eater and "eat 'em alive" patriot, who is so anxious to send others to do the fighting for him, belongs to the category of those superpatriots invincible in peace and invisible in war. What is to prevent Mr. Frazier from volunteering his services in the Canadian or British Armies? Or he might, if he tried hard enough, qualify for our own, as I did back in 1917, and am still suffering from the results of being badly gassed in action overseas.

No; Mr. Frazier prefers to bellow for war and attack such real American patriots as Congressman FISH, who knows what war is and is determined to keep this country out of war unless attacked. He has repeatedly said that he knows of only one yardstick to be guided by in this crisis, and that is what is best for America.

The poll taken by Representative FISH was not whether we should like to stay out of war, but whether the United States should go in or stay out. The question was simple and clear-cut and any American schoolboy could easily understand it.

Mr. Frazier, who voted to enter the war, which was his right, showed he understood the question perfectly. However, knowing Congressman FISH was at Fort Bragg, N. C., for 4 weeks training with the armed forces, he rushes into print asking for "Yes" or "No" answers on a dozen or more rehashed questions, all but one of which have been answered by Mr. FISH in the Congress and in public speeches. Time has shown that he was right, for example, in demanding, when the original conscription bill was being considered, that the age limit be set at 28 instead of 35.

Mr. FISH has voted for every appropriation for national defense in the last 5 years except for one in 1938 when he advocated spending more on airplanes rather than on superdreadnaughts. When Mr. FISH asked for 2,000 modern full armed combat airplanes 2 years ago, we did not have any; today we have less than 500. However, Mr. FISH has voted for all airplane and aviation appropriations amounting to $7,000,000,000. He also voted for all military appropriations and has been urging for a long time the equipment with modern weapons such as tanks and antiaircraft guns. There are few Members of Congress who know more about defensive needs of the Army than does Colonel FISH.

Mr. Frazier presented only one new or unanswered question to Mr. FISH: "Did you have an audience with Rudolph Hess while in Berlin?" This question, published when Colonel FISH is in military training and unable to answer, was aimed to impugn his motives, patriotism, and Americanism and is a part of the smear campaign of the warmongers against three out of four Americans who believe it is for the best interest of America to stay out of war. No; Congressman FISH does not know Mr. Hess, never saw him, nor communicated with him.

My advice to Mr. Frazier, as a disabled veteran of the World War and as a fellow townsman, is to stop agitating for war against the will of 90 percent of the people of our own town and to show his devotion to war in more concrete action than words.

GEORGE HILL,
Commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart.

COLD SPRING, *July 9.*

Mr. Hill is also secretary to Congressman HAMILTON FISH, "silenced" during July by reason of his tour of Army duty at Fort Bragg.—*Editor.*

Sending Men Anywhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of July 14, 1941:

[From The Milwaukee Journal of July 14, 1941]

SENDING MEN ANYWHERE

The administration is asking authority to retain national guardsmen and draft selectees beyond the 1-year training period the law provides, and removal of the ban against sending these troops anywhere outside the Western Hemisphere and United States possessions. The country will accept this if it is convinced of need. Short of being convinced, and it is not now convinced, there are grave objections to both extensions of power.

There are two proposals. The first is to retain men who were called for 1 year, with the understanding on their part and on the part of the country that after 12 months other men would take their place in training.

That was a bargain with the men who were drawn, unless Congress should declare the national interest imperiled.

A sense of fairness dictates that one group should not make all the sacrifice, while their fellows who were not taken profit by increased employment at home at good wages. Many of these men in training have been benefited and many would doubtless volunteer for a further period. Unless we are imperiled, they ought to have their choice.

The other authority asked to send men anywhere in the world instead of only within the Western Hemisphere and our Territories, raises the even graver question of accepting at this time the chance of being in total war any day, without declaration by Congress. Senator REYNOLDS says that to grant this would be tantamount to a declaration of war. That is going pretty far, for a declaration of war is directed against a particular nation.

For practical purposes, however, it would be a grant of authority to the President to make war at any time and then present Congress with the accomplished fact. It could be very different from landing in a country which, as Iceland did, willingly accepted our occupation.

Before Congress reaches any such decision, the country is entitled to hear more of the situation. Unless the public is misinformed, production of arms and equipment is not large enough to supply anything like our present Army. Production, though gaining rapidly, is still the bottleneck if land warfare is in question.

What is the situation which faces the United States in this month of July which requires lifting the ban on sending men outside this hemisphere? It is the gravest decision we have been asked to make. It is almost, if not quite, the final point at which Congress can retain any control. For if men are sent, there is no question of the unity of this country in backing them up with everything we have.

Chairman MAY of the House Military Affairs Committee says he has been convinced of the need of such legislation by General Marshall, Chief of Staff. He says: "Information given by Marshall would be enough to knock the hats off Congress, if it could be released."

If that is so it would be enough to convince the country, too. And not all the facts are military secrets. Laymen all over the country see the need of keeping military secrets. They do not want Senators or anyone else even hinting that troops are on the tide. Or giving away our plans of defense to Axis Powers.

But this tremendous power should be granted only if the country is taken into the confidence of the administration more than it has been. The people are not to be treated as children when the question is one of asking them to pay for whatever may be done and back it up with sons and brothers.

A Bundle From Britain—Decomposed and C. O. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that a vast army of British propaganda agents are now in this country, operating with the full knowledge and approval of the President and the Department of State, trying to push this country into the war, and even calling for American volunteers to fight for Britain while America is at peace, I think it will be interesting to Congress and the country to know what treatment is accorded such American volunteers after the propaganda agents have enticed them to fight under a foreign flag. Orlando Davidson, of the Washington Daily News, reveals the sordid facts in this connection in the following article clipped from the News of July 12, 1941.

THE CADAVERS COME HOME COLLECT

Mr. Speaker, the gratitude of the British agents who induce American boys to volunteer for service under the Union Jack seems to cease just the minute these poor boys cease to serve. The sad spectacle of the case of Joseph Anthony Alsop, age 25, which is reported in this article should give serious cause for reflection to every American citizen inclined to put the interests of any other nation ahead of those of the United States of America. Sending dead American heroes home to their final rest, "decomposed and c. o. d.," is just about the most heartless and brazen act of ingratitude that has yet been foisted upon Uncle Sam who seems well on the road to finding himself rechristened in the eyes of the world as "Uncle Sap."

I hope every American citizen who still believes that the Declaration of Independence was not a mistake will read and reflect upon the accompanying article most seriously.

[Article from Washington Daily News of July 12, 1941]

HE DIED TO SAVE DEMOCRACY—BODY COMES HOME C. O. D.

(By Orlando Davidson)

The body of a young Washington father who offered his life for the British cause came home yesterday—decomposed and c. o. d.

And his family does not know yet where or how he met death in the Canadian Army except that he was "accidentally killed by a rifle shot while on active duty July 2."

The young man, who leaves three little children, was Joseph Anthony Alsop, 25, a lumber shipping clerk here until his disappearance after separation from his wife last February. His family has not heard from him since then and did not know of his whereabouts until informed by Canadian officials of his death.

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETEEN DOLLARS TO BRING BODY HOME

The initial wire from the Army commandant at St. Johns, Newfoundland, said young Alsop was killed "here." A later letter of condolence from the Canadian Government spoke of "reports cabled from overseas."

The wire from St. Johns said the body would be buried there or returned to Washington "at your expense." (The United States War Department says the United States Army returns soldiers to places designated by relatives at Government expense.)

"I had to pay $119 to bring Joe home," his puzzled grandmother, Mrs Annie C. Alsop, of 1400 Montello Avenue NE., said today.

'And the body was in such bad shape we couldn't take it in the church," said a brother. The family was not bitter, just surprised.

A member of the family, in contact with the United States State Department, is seeking further information.

CHILDREN DON'T KNOW

Not quite understanding what it's all about and probably unaware they will never see their dad again, Joe's well-scrubbed little family frolicked happily about the grandmother's house today, enjoying all the excitement. Joe, Jr., and Jo Ann, twins, are 5, and Timothy is a handsome 3-year-old.

A former member of the Washington National Guard, the dead man also leaves five brothers—Bernard, of Worcester, Mass.; and Lawrence, Thomas, John, and Ernest, of Washington—and two sisters—Grace and Rita Alsop, of Washington.

Yesterday, Joe was laid to rest beside his father in Mount Olivet Cemetery. A huge wreath from the men of the Victoria Rifles went with him to his grave.

A. A. A. Penalties on Marketing Excess Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE FRANKFORT (IND.) MORNING TIMES

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Frankfort (Ind.) Morning Times of July 11, 1941:

[From the Frankfort (Ind.) Morning Times of July 11, 1941]

FARMERS FORM ORGANIZATION TO PROTEST A. A. A. WHEAT MARKETING—HUNDREDS AT MEETING HERE ON WEDNESDAY—LOCAL OFFICERS NAMED AND AFFILIATION MADE WITH STATE ORGANIZATION

A large group of representative Clinton County farmers met Wednesday evening at the courthouse to protest the lately established A. A. A. penalties on marketing excess wheat. The meeting was held under the auspices of the Indiana Marketing Quota Protest Association which is affiliated with the National Marketing Quota Protest Association. The latter was organized Tuesday night in Indianapolis with Lamont O'Hara, of Newcastle, being named national president.

The local gathering filled the courtroom to overflowing, and an estimated crowd of 350 was present. The meeting was called to order by Oscar B. Smith, member of the state organizing committee of the Indiana organization. He outlined the history, policy, and objectives of the organization, stating the purpose was to remove the increased quota penalty which was placed on wheat after the Government had agreed to keep the penalty at 15 cents per bushel at planting time. He charged that this was a breach of faith with the American farmer to which insult to injury was added when the Government permitted Canadian wheat to flow into the United States under an import duty of 42 cents per bushel, while levying a domestic tariff of 49 cents per bushel against homegrown wheat. If a quota is established against corn, he stated that Argentine corn would be only subject to a 25-cent duty and the American grower would have a quota penalty of 35 cents a bushel.

Mr. Smith then called an open-forum session and asked that Clinton farmers express themselves. William Coapstick was first to respond and gave a forceful talk which drew a large round of applause from the crowd. He was followed by Fred Elston, Mat Hardesty, Silas Wynkoop, Ward Mundell, Sam Mohr, and Sam Bollinger.

Mr. Smith announced that Mr. O'Hara sent his greetings to the gathering but was unable to attend because of his membership on the Henry County draft board, which was in session during the time of the Frankfort meeting. However, Mr. Smith announced that Mr. O'Hara had sent his official spokesman, Stanley Williams, chairman of the Rush County Association, to make a few remarks.

Mr. Williams spoke, in part, as follows: "I bring Clinton County greetings from your State organization and urge you to form a militant, progressive, and constructive chapter in Clinton County. Although this latest penalty imposed on farmers is deeply irritating, yet, in a way, it is beneficial, in that it has aroused the farmers. The noose was put on the farmers in 1933 with the establishment of the A. A. A., and now it is being drawn tighter as the farmer becomes more and more regimented. Mr. O'Hara has sought to avert this thing for years, and hoped that existant farm organizations would find a happier solution. Mr. O'Hara has been a member of the Indiana Farm Bureau since its inception, and begged them to take steps to remove the quota penalty. Early in June he telegraphed Hassel E. Schenk, president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, as follows:

" 'Did our organization support the increase on excess wheat from 15 to 49 cents per bushel? Did our organization endorse the manner in which the wheat referendum was conducted?

" 'LAMONT O'HARA.' "

Mr. O'Hara then received the following wire:

"Mr. LAMONT O'HARA,

"Newcastle, Ind.:

"Farm Bureau initiated and secured passage A. A. A. amendment increasing loan value to 85-percent parity. See my article in July Hoosier Farmer. Please drop in at our office your earliest convenience.

"HASSEL E. SHENK."

Even then Mr. O'Hara was in hopes the penalty could be averted, but no other way was left open other than to form an independent farm organization. He wants the farmers of Clinton County to know that he is working for your interests and that he will continue his efforts until justice is obtained. Let us not only be critical but let us be constructive until legislation is secured that this cannot happen again.

After Mr. Williams concluded his remarks, Robert Spencer, of Monticello, was presented to the audience. Mr. Spencer is president of the National Farmers Guild and also of the Indiana Farmers Guild. He gave his customary colorful and inspiring talk and was abundant in his praise of Mr. O'Hara and his motives. He urged all farmers to support the new organization and write their Congressmen a vigorous protest against quotas and insist that H. R. 1101 be enacted to avert a repetition of the present chaos.

A motion was made from the floor to organize the Clinton County Marketing Quota Protest Association and that it affiliate with the State body. It was unanimously carried. The meeting was then declared open for the election of officers, and the following were elected: William A. Irwin, chairman; Fred Hurless, vice chairman; and Mrs. L. R. Young, secretary-treasurer.

A vote of thanks was given the county officials for use of the courtroom and also to George M. Spahr for acting as temporary secretary of the meeting.

FARMERS ADOPT RESOLUTIONS PROTESTING WHEAT QUOTA RULES

Following are the resolutions adopted by the farmer group present at the wheat marketing protest meeting held in the Clinton County courthouse Wednesday night. The resolutions were introduced by William Coapstick:

"Whereas Congress passed an act in May 1941, amending an act known as the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which permitted farmers to participate in the A. A. A. program or to refrain from doing so; and

"Whereas said amendment was made compulsory and made to apply to the planting of wheat in the fall of 1940, and fixing a fine or penalty on farmers who were not members of the triple-A program and who had sown their wheat in 1940 in good faith, believing they were freemen and within their rights; and

"Whereas said amendment fixed a fine or penalty of 49 cents per bushel on all wheat grown by farmers outside of the triple-A program and to be sold over the allotment fixed by the triple-A program; and

"Whereas said amendment provided for an election by farmers on a wheat quota and the election was held at the end of the month of May 1941, and which election was held and conducted by members of the triple-A program, and said election program disqualified and disfranchised over one-half of the farmers in Clinton County, Ind.; and

"Whereas said election failed to show a majority of votes cast in favor of the wheat quota and also failed to show the required majority in the State of Indiana; and

"Whereas the provisions set up in said amendment passed in May 1941 were retroactive and ex post facto; and

"Whereas the Department of Agriculture is now asking farmers to produce more pork, dairy products, poultry and eggs, and also are requiring less production of wheat, of which it is proposed to reduce the surplus and at the same time prohibit farmers from reducing this surplus by feeding wheat to produce more pork, lard, poultry, and dairy produce; except they pay a penalty of 49 cents per bushel for doing so on wheat that was sown in the fall of 1940.

"Whereas this amendment placed heavy burdens and great hardships on agriculturists: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the farmers of Clinton County, Ind., in mass meeting assembled in Frankfort, Ind., this 9th day of July 1941, That the Secretary of Agriculture in Washington, D. C., be requested to abrogate these penalties and the Congress of the United States of America be requested to repeal the above said amendment and return to the farmers of America the freedom and rights as set forth in the Bill of Rights and in the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be recorded in the records of the meeting and a copy be distributed by the chairman and secretary, and a copy mailed to Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture in Washington, D. C., and to Congressmen from Indi-

ana, and to the United States Senate, also a copy of these resolutions to be furnished the Frankfort Morning Times."

Loyalty to America the Outstanding Trait of Congressmen Who Oppose War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress are opposing the move toward war. These men, most of them members of the Republican minority, have voted against the war bills brought in by the New Deal administration, such as the bill repealing the arms embargo, the $7,000,000,000 lend-lease bill, the foreign-ship seizure bill, and others.

The outstanding trait of these Congressmen who oppose war is their loyalty to America. The interests of the United States are placed above those of any other nation; the welfare of the American people over those of any other people; the security of this country over that of any other country.

Those who argue that we should enter the war do not say how we can land an invading force on hostile European soil. They do not tell us by what method and in what manner we can drive the despicable Nazi hordes back to Berlin. They do not tell us the method by which the war can be won. They also fail to tell us the horrors that war would bring to the United States; the black-out of towns, cities, and villages; the nights spent in bombproof shelters; the rationing of food and clothing; the hardships, suffering, and death which war would carry to our land. Nor do they tell us that aid to England would be lessened by our entry into war, because we would then be forced to turn our energies toward building bombproof shelters, antiaircraft guns, and a tremendous amount of defense equipment for the immediate protection of our own shores and homes.

The peace-loving people of this Nation who oppose the moves of the warmongers can be thankful for that loyal opposition in Congress which has acted with zeal and fervor to preserve and protect this Republic against the horrors of war.

The following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald is worth while reading:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

HIS MAJESTY'S LOYAL OPPOSITION

The minority party in the British Parliament is spoken of as His Majesty's loyal opposition. Where the phrase originated, we don't know.

We have a notion that the general idea began back in the time of King Edward I (who reigned 1272–1307), organizer of the first Parliament that had many of the characteristics of the Parliament of modern times.

SIR EARL; SIR KING

Anyway, Edward I once said to the Earl of Norfolk, who didn't want to lead any soldiers outside England to pay his feudal debt to the Crown: "By God, Sir Earl, you shall either go or hang"—to which the doughty Earl retorted: "By God, Sir King, I shall neither go nor hang," and got away with it.

The idea that the sovereign should have a fearless, critical opposition which is at the same time completely loyal to the Crown and the country is an old idea in England, and is as strong today as ever.

We think a loyal opposition to the majority party is as necessary in Congress as it is in the British Parliament.

OUR LOYAL OPPOSITION

In the present dispute over whether we should go into or stay out of the European war, the stay-out-of-it crowd qualifies, we think, as the loyal opposition.

This crowd is being cursed by the interventionists as a bunch of Hitler dupes, potential or actual Nazis, real or unwitting "fifth columnists," and traitors or would-be traitors. Its loyalty to the United States is continually questioned; and if the interventionists had their way, the isolationists would be labeled the disloyal opposition.

In our opinion, the loyalty of the isolationists is one of their outstanding traits.

AMERICA FIRST; AMERICA SECOND

They are thinking first, last, and all the time of the best interests of the United States of America. Many of the interventionists, judging from their speeches and writings, think first of the welfare of some other country, and how the United States can best serve same.

Fate has brought us to a point where we have a chance to make this country one of the greatest countries in history.

Since 1933, when the New Deal began, we have been redistributing a lot of too concentrated wealth by various means; attacking our malnutrition problem on an ever-larger scale by means of the food stamps; improving our highways, forests, waterways, etc., by large public-works projects of varied kinds; easing tensions between capital and labor; strengthening the banks and straightening out the stock exchanges, and so on and so forth.

This process was well begun when the World War crisis began coming too close to us for comfort.

For the last 14 months or so we have been engaged in a tremendous effort to arm ourselves. The details are too well known to retell here.

What it all amounts to is that we are now well on the way toward becoming a great military and naval power, plus a nation whose social-welfare machine has been modernized and streamlined.

WHY RUIN THE UNITED STATES

If we equip ourselves with a permanent army of, say, 1,500,000 men under arms at all times, plus a two-ocean Navy and a powerful unified air force, we should be able to defy the world.

When this war is over, all the other hitherto first-class powers in the world are going to be in bad shape. If we stay out of it, we shall be in the best shape of any nation in the world. If we throw our big and growing defense machine into it, we'll come out of it in bad shape, too. If we send an A. E. F. II on some wild invasion adventure we are likely to take a terrific scratching from an Axis fighting tigerlike for its life.

Why chance ruin for ourselves? Especially why chance it now that Hitler has attacked Russia and the Axis pressure on the British is relieved, at least for the time being? And why commit ourselves to underwriting Britain's wars for all time to come?

This, as we see it, is the attitude of His Majesty's loyal opposition in the Congress of the United States. If there is a trace of disloyalty in that attitude, we can't detect it. It seems a high order of patriotism to us.

Revenue Act of 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. DUNCAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. RICHARD M. DUNCAN, OF MISSOURI

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I made during the National Radio Forum, arranged by the Washington Evening Star and broadcast over the blue network of the National Broadcasting Co., Monday evening, July 14, 1941:

Within the next 60 days the Revenue Act of 1941 will likely have become a law, and the American people and American business will be called upon to pay more taxes than ever before in our country's history. The foundation for that demand upon the taxpayers is the fact that our country is facing the most serious situation in its history.

Before discussing the provisions of the proposed revenue act, may I take a few minutes to tell you about the preparation of such an act. Of course, you know that under the Constitution all revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives, and under the rules of the House jurisdiction is conferred upon the Ways and Means Committee, made up of 25 members—15 Democratic members and 10 Republican members. And may I say here that during the 6½ years of my membership on that committee I have never seen its deliberation so entirely free from partisan considerations. There were many differences of opinion among the members, but in settling those differences party lines were absolutely ignored.

Beginning on April 24, open public hearings were held, and all who desired were given an opportunity to be heard. Those hearings extended over a period of about 5 weeks. Two hundred and two witnesses appeared and testified, and a total of 301 briefs, letters, resolutions, telegrams, and written statements were incorporated in the record. Thereafter, the committee, with the aid of Treasury Department officials and the committee's own corps of experts, spent several weeks working out the various schedules.

No more complicated and technical problem faces any committee of Congress than the preparation of a revenue measure. It not only requires the combined efforts of tax experts, but the utmost ingenuity of economists, statisticians, and lawyers with special training in the field of taxation must be summoned to the task. Our dual form of government and the highly complex nature of our business structure necessarily complicate the preparation and drafting of such a measure.

Since ratification of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution in 1913, and passage of the income-tax laws, our system of taxation has been based, as far as possible, upon the theory of ability to pay. This theory presupposes that incomes below a fixed amount are consumed in necessary living

costs, and that such necessary living costs should not be subject to an income tax. It seems to me that this reasoning is entirely justified when we realize that such incomes are subjected to all forms of taxation, with the possible exception of State income taxes, for the support of the States, the counties, the municipalities, and the public-school system As a matter of fact, there are about 180,000 separate and distinct tax-collecting units in the United States. They are also subject to State sales taxes and nearly all forms of excise taxes imposed by the Federal Government, which I shall discuss later.

Under the present law, exemptions are $800 for single persons and $2,000 for married persons, and an additional exemption of $400 for each dependent or child under 18 years of age. The same exemptions are retained in the proposed bill.

There has been included by the committee a propcsal to require joint tax returns by husband and wife, which means that where a husband and wife each has an income, it would be added together for the purpose of determining the rate to be applied, and when the amount of tax has been determined, it would be levied and assessed against each party in the proportion that the income of each bears to the whole. Under the present law both husband and wife may make a separate return, one of them taking the exemptions as head of the family and the other reporting individually, thus obtaining considerable benefit in the amount of tax paid.

There are a great many instances where a husband has transferred to the wife large sums of money and paid a gift tax so that the wife might make a separate return upon the income from such property and the husband avoid payment in the higher brackets. A gift tax is paid but once and the income tax recurs each year.

Considerable opposition has arisen to this provision from those affected, but unless it remains in the bill it will be necessary to raise approximately $300,000,000 from other sources to take its place.

Many persons insist that these exemptions should be lowered so that every person earning any sum, however small, should pay an income tax in order that they may become tax-conscious, and thus probably refrain from making demands up their Government for huge expenditures from public funds for the benefit of various groups.

We must meet practical problems in a practical manner. In preparing a revenue measure, we must determine as nearly as possible how much revenue a particular tax will raise, how much it will cost to collect it, and what its effect will be upon the taxpayers and the general economy of the country.

In addition to the ability to pay income taxes, there must be considered also the large sums collected from excise taxes, which are consumer taxes, and therefore fall upon everybody, but most heavily upon those whose entire incomes are consumed by necessary living expenses. These lower-income groups bear approximately 75 percent of the excise or consumer taxes.

Those earning $500 or less—and there are more of them than we should have—pay as great a percentage of their income in taxes as those in the $5,000 to $10,000 group, and those earning between $500 and $1,000 pay as great a percentage as those earning between $3,000 and $5,000. So, if you will look at the record you will see that these citizens are paying their just share of the cost of government.

There is yet another reason, it seems to me, why broadening the base by lowering exemptions is not desirable. It costs the Bureau of Internal Revenue approximately $1.50 to handle each return upon which a tax is paid and 50 cents for a return upon which no tax is paid. Therefore there must be faced the very practical situation that it may cost more for administration than the amount received from these low-income earners. That is particularly true if the rates are in the same ratio of percentages as are imposed upon higher incomes, and certainly it would not be just to impose upon them higher percentage rates.

Excise taxes, which are imposed in various forms upon many commodities and many of which cannot be justified except during a period of emergency, are usually imposed upon commodities which are classified as luxuries, or at least not essential to a reasonable standard of living. In normal times such taxes should not be imposed. They are definitely regressive, and curtail, to a greater or lesser degree, production and consumption. During periods of national emergency, such as we now face, an entirely different situation exists. It not only becomes desirable to impose excise taxes on many commodities to raise revenue, but also to act as a brake on run-away and inflationary prices, which not only protects the average consumer but also tends to minimize the competition between these commodities and national-defense supplies for the materials and labor needed in the manufacture of both.

In considering these problems we must not lose sight of the problem of maintaining our normal economy, as well as providing for the emergency economy. From what I have said it will be seen that in the preparation of a revenue measure during the present period, consideration must be given, not only to the problem of raising revenue, but also to its economic effect upon the people and upon business. Not only the present must be considered but also the future. Destructive taxes may raise revenue now, but next year their destructive influences may greatly reduce the returns and the amount of revenue.

I believe the people of our country are fully aware of the dangers we face, of the uncertainty of our future, and are willing to pay whatever is necessary for our defense and to preserve the American way of life. We would rather give up every dollar of our wealth than to find ourselves subjected to the will of a foreign dictator. Many other countries in the world today are the best proof of what that would mean. Our wealth is nothing compared to our liberty and the right and privilege of those who are to come after us to enjoy the opportunities that we enjoy. We are spending huge sums of money to make that possible. Soon, it is expected, expenditures will reach the staggering sum of $2,000,000,000 a month. The amount ultimately to be reached is impossible of prediction at this time, but whatever it may be the future of America is worth it.

The proposed revenue measure is designed to raise slightly more than three and a half billion dollars in excess of the present law. This is a small amount compared with our expenditures. But in times of great national emergencies countries cannot balance their budgets—a large part of the expense must be passed on. If we are right in our defense policy, and I believe a majority of our citizens are convinced we are, financing it is just as much the problem of those who are to come after us as it is our problem. Liberty and opportunity will be just as dear to them as it is to us and they will have to bear a part of the expense of preserving the old homestead.

In this talk tonight it is not possible to discuss in detail all the provisions of the proposed measure. While the committee has tentatively agreed on the items to be included in it and the rates which are to apply, it will be subject to change until it is finally reported out by the committee in about 2 weeks. A brief discussion, while technical, may be of interest to the many of you who are directly affected.

Respecting individual incomes, the present exemptions and deductions are retained, as well as the present 4-percent normal tax and 10-percent earned-income credit. The principal change lies in the reduction of the amount before applying the surtax rates. Under the present law the surtax begins at $4,000, and increases in percentage on each $2,000 bracket. Under the proposed law a surtax rate of 5 percent—and that is in addition to the normal 4 percent—will apply on the first $2,000 above exemptions and deductions, and will be graduated on each $2,000 of income above that. For example, under the present law a single person earning $900 pays 44 cents; under the proposed law he will pay $5.94. A person earning $2,000 now pays $44, under the proposed law he will pay $110. On an income of $5,000 he now pays $171.60, under the proposed law $437; $10,000 he pays $686.40, under proposed law $1,469.60; $1,000,000 he pays $718,404, under proposed law $737,340.

A married person with no dependents, earning $2,500, under present law pays $11, under proposed law $38.50; $5,000 he pays $110, under proposed law $308; $10,000 he pays $528, under proposed law $1,166; and $1,000,000 he pays $717,583.60, under proposed law $736,519.60.

It must be borne in mind that all State income taxes are in addition to these amounts. This will give you some idea as to the increased amounts you will be called upon to pay, and, while the bill will likely not become law before September 1, it will be retroactive to January 1, 1941, and due on March 15, next year.

The levy of corporation taxes is necessarily much more complicated than individual income taxes. The record shows that during the last war there were about 22,000 millionaires made. It is hoped that during this emergency, when it is necessary for all of us to make sacrifices, there will be no repetition of that fact. With this in mind, rather steep excess-profits taxes are proposed.

The principle of the present law is retained which gives corporations the option of computing their earnings for excess-profits taxes upon the average-earnings basis or upon the invested-capital basis, whichever is the more advantageous. However, there has been a reversal of the method of computing the excess-profits net income. Under the present law the normal tax is allowed as a credit in computing excess-profits net income, whereas under the proposed measure the excess-profits tax is allowed as a credit in computing the normal tax. The proposed measure reduces the invested capital credit from a straight 8 percent to 8 percent on the first $5,000,000, and 7 percent on the excess thereof. The rates are increased. The rate for less than $20,000 will be 35 percent and ranging to 60 percent of amounts over $500,000.

The normal tax on corporations, like individuals, has not been increased, but it is proposed to levy a 5-percent surtax on corporate net incomes of $25,000 or less, and 6 percent on net incomes in excess of $25,000. The reason for levying the surtax instead of increasing the normal tax applies both to individuals and corporations. There are billions of Government bonds which are either totally or partially exempt from the payment of a normal tax, but, in accordance with this provision, are not exempt from surtaxes. By levying the surtax the income from such tax-exempt bonds will be reached.

It is also proposed to increase the capital stock from $1.10 to $1.25 per $1,000, and to give special treatment to new capital.

With respect to excise taxes, it is suggested by the committee that such an additional tax be levied upon distilled spirits in the sum of $1 per gallon. In the case of wines, liqueurs, and cordials, the tax is based upon the alcoholic content and is increased.

The present rate on automobiles is 3½ percent, and that rate is proposed to be doubled. This also applies to trucks and trailers. It is suggested that the rate on tires and tubes be doubled. The tax on mechanical refrigerators is increased from 5½ to 10 percent, which includes air-conditioning equipment. The latter is not now taxed. The rate on radios is increased from 5½ to 10 percent, and there has been added to the list automobile radios.

A few years ago there was a tax of 3 cents per 1,000 on matches. It was repealed in 1938, and it is suggested that that tax be renewed.

It is suggested that the tax on toilet preparations be materially increased.

Until 1938 there was a manufacturers' excise tax on jewelry. It was repealed at that time and it is now recommended that a 10-percent retail tax be imposed. The same is true of furs, and it is now recommended that a 10-percent tax be imposed upon their retail price.

Other items include phonographs and phonograph records and sporting goods, as well as trunks, musical instruments, electrical appliances, business machines, optical equipment, except eyeglasses, rubber products, metal signs, commercial washing machines, and cutlery. A tax on soft drinks, candy, and chewing gum is also reenacted. The excise tax will produce more than $540,000,000.

A tax on admissions to places of amusement will also be increased by reducing the exemption from 19 to 9 cents. Service men in uniform will not be required to pay this tax.

The discussion of the items in the proposal has necessarily been brief. It has been to some extent technical, but tax bills are technical and there is no other way to discuss them. An analysis of our present and proposed expenditures, together with a realization of what we are going to be required to pay in taxes, must certainly convince us that absolute economy, not only in our private affairs but in nonessential governmental affairs must be rigidly practiced. And that all nonessential appropriations should be cut to the absolute minimum. The burden will not become less but rather greater. We have always been a great, self-reliant Nation. That spirit must continue. We are ready to make every necessary sacrifice, but the results of that sacrifice must be utilized to the best possible advantage for our country's future.

Questionnaire on War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

LETTER AND BALLOT MAILED TO VOTERS OF THE THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am today mailing a questionnaire to every voter of the Third Congressional District of Michigan to ascertain the true sentiment of my constituents in regard to the entrance of the United States in the European war. I plan to reveal the results of this poll to the Congress at an early date.

The letter and ballot are as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington.

To the People of the Third Congressional District:

As your Representative in Congress, I want to be guided by the thoughtful opinion of my constituents as to whether the United States should go into or stay out of the European war. I am therefore conducting a poll of the registered voters of my district to ascertain the exact sentiment of the people. I have no faith in commercial polls, which cannot be checked and which, in my opinion, do not reflect the true wishes of the people.

I shall appreciate your cooperation by marking and returning within 3 days the enclosed post card.

Thanking you, I am
Sincerely yours,
PAUL W. SHAFER,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—All that is necessary is to mark and mail the enclosed card. You do not have to sign the ballot; sign only if you wish. No postage necessary.

BALLOT

The United States should
Enter the war---------- ☐
Stay out of war---------- ☐
Please return this ballot within 3 days.

H. R. 1036

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

JOINT RESOLUTION BY THE ILLINOIS STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of House Joint Resolution No. 42, passed by the House of Representatives and Senate of the Sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Illinois, memorializing the Congress of the United States to give consideration to H. R. 1036 and other similar measures without delay:

House Joint Resolution 42

Whereas a crisis exists and millions of once self-sustaining citizens in this Nation have lost their jobs and all their possessions; and

Whereas millions of once self-sustaining citizens of this Nation are wholly dependent upon charity or Government relief in order to provide themselves and their families with the bare necessities of life; and

Whereas as a people we need a more liberal distribution and increase of purchasing power, retiring our aged citizens from gainful employment while improving and stabilizing gainful employment for other citizens, thus stimulating agricultural and industrial production and general business and alleviating the hazards and insecurity of old age and unemployment; and

Whereas there is pending in Congress a measure known as H. R. 1036 and other similar measures introduced to correct these conditions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that the General Assembly of the State of Illinois memorialize the Congress of the United States to give consideration to H. R. 1036 and other similar measures without delay so that the present emergency of our Nation may be speedily ended while providing employment for our citizens, stabilizing industry and business with real social security for all of our citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Member of Congress from Illinois.

Adopted by the house, June 25, 1941.

ELMER J. SCHNACKENBERG,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
R. P. RANDOLPH,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the senate, June 27, 1941.

HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

The "Commies" Are Coming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have here a handbill being distributed in Washington today announcing an open house of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia at the National Press Club auditorium tomorrow night. All members of the party and fellow travelers are invited to attend at 25 cents per head, with no war tax.

Robert Miner, acting general secretary of the Communist Party, will be the principal speaker at tomorrow night's meeting. His subject will be What Does the Nazi Invasion of Soviet Russia Mean to America?

I think I can answer that question to the satisfaction of most Americans. It means that the Communist Party will now invade Washington in an attempt to use every pressure device to secure aid for Russia and recognition for the Communists as allies in our fight to extend the four freedoms to the four corners of the earth.

Mr. Speaker, the American people, and particularly the Members of Congress, will not be deceived by the hegira of Robert Miner to Washington to rally the scattered ranks of the Moscow-line followers hanging on to our Federal pay rolls.

Tomorrow night's meeting will be an interesting one. I can picture the audience now. The "reds," the "pinks," the "fellow travelers," the misguided young folks, Negroes and whites, who attend this meeting will not only be compelled to

pay their quarter to get inside, but before they get out they will be subjected to the usual vacuum-cleaning process that is used at all Communist meetings to extract anything from a dime to a $10 bill—or even a promise to pay—from the suckers who would prefer the godless poverty of the Russian system to the Christian plenty possible only under the American system of government.

Farm Belt Volunteers Top Those From East and South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

ARTICLE BY JOHN DONNELL IN WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the warlike press of the East and South is wont to refer with mild contempt to the Middle West as isolationist territory.

It is true that the people of the Middle West are not in favor of our participation in foreign wars, a sentiment which seems to be somewhat general, if current polls are to be believed. They are, however, very much interested in national defense.

It is interesting to note from an article by John Donnell appearing in this morning's Washington Times-Herald that the percentage of volunteers from Kansas and Iowa far exceeds that from typical States in the East and South. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the article in question:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 16, 1941]

FARM BELT VOLUNTEERS TOP WARLIKE MALES OF SOUTH—EASTERN STATES LAG IN MARTIAL TREAD, DRAFT VERSUS ENLISTMENT QUOTAS SHOW

(By John O'Donnell)

The cold, matter-of-fact adding machines over in the selective-service headquarters are destroying a colorful tradition of American folklore—the accepted belief that the male of the South is more warlike than his cousins along the Atlantic seaboard and responds to a martial tradition more eagerly than the boy from the Midwest Corn Belt.

This might be true back in the days of the War between the States, but now, take it from the experts who are compiling the data on the potential fighting manpower of the Nation, the maxim has now gone with the wind of yesteryears.

HOW THEY RUN

In the present national emergency, the Wheat Belt of the Midwest is contributing more voluntary enlistments in the armed forces of the Nation than such typically Southern States as Alabama and Georgia, or those fighting feudists of the border States of Kentucky and Tennessee.

New York, followed by Illinois, lags behind the four Southern States in the martial tread of enlistments—but so closely runs the ratio of volunteer to draftee in all States studied that the experts in the selective service headquarters have decided:

"Actual records now being compiled destroy the old theory that certain sections of the Nation in a national emergency could be counted on for a higher percentage of volunteers than other sections.

"Actual enlistments in the armed forces and corresponding credits against the selective-service quota in a given State apparently bear no relation to the isolationist or interventionist sentiment of the political spokesmen for the given States."

"SENSITIVE NUMBER"

What the selective-service statisticians call "the most sensitive number" is the service credit figure. This is the number of men in every draft board zone in the Nation who are "actually accountable to the armed forces of the Nation and subject to military law."

These are the men who are in service or are on the Reserve list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, National Guard, or Coast Guard.

The draft quota for each district is whittled down by one man for every man whose name is added to its "service credit list" through a commission or enlistment.

Into the national headquarters of the selective-service system is the daily deluge of cards bearing "names and home addresses" of these volunteers and newly commissioned officers. The home district is given a credit for each new enlistment.

DRAFT BOARD "DEBITS"

In another pile are the cards announcing "separation" from the services—discharges honorable or dishonorable, reports of death or retirement for age or disability. For each of these the local draft board is given a "debit"—one more man must be produced to fill their quota.

By comparing these ever-shifting "service credits" with the potential manpower of the State as revealed in the registration for the selective service, an accurate check can be constantly kept on the flow of men from a given area in the Regular Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps.

"If these ratios mean anything, they mean that a lot of accepted beliefs aren't true any more so far as volunteering in time of emergency is concerned," one of the officials explained.

Back in the World War days there were counties in Kentucky and Tennessee—"feuding counties," they were called—from which came no conscripts. Enlistments exhausted the draft quotas. That hasn't happened in the emergency of World War No. 2.

PUERTO RICO TOPS LIST

As a matter of fact, Uncle Sam's Caribbean ward—little Puerto Rico—tops the list with the highest number of service credits. From a coldly practical standpoint, this patriotic gesture from Puerto Rico was spurred in part by economic pressure—the wage scale of the Army and Navy is far ahead of the average Puerto Rican income.

Taking the island as a whole, the entire quota could have been filled easily by voluntary enlistments. In certain draft boards, the illiteracy test brushed aside enough volunteers to necessitate the calling up of a small number of selectees.

The revelation that typical noninterventionist Farm Belt Iowa has more "service credits" than belligerent Tennessee was one of the surprises of the study. In Tennessee, 367,346 registered for the draft. Iowa's man power was 285,792. But as of today, there are 29,033 enlistments to build up Iowa's service credits on her quota. Tennessee, with greater manpower, has 28,128 credits.

VOLUNTEER ENLISTMENTS, SECTION BY SECTION

This is the way typical States line up in their parade of volunteers into the armed services of the Nation—enlistments and commissions in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, National Guard, and Coast Guard—in proportion to their potential manpower as disclosed in registration for the draft.

State	Registered for selective service	Service credits ratio	Service credits to total registration
Farm Belt:			
Kansas	192,558	31,135	0.1095
Iowa	285,792	29,033	.1016
New York and Illinois:			
New York	1,714,374	107,534	.0627
Illinois	1,011,986	62,438	.0616
Southern States:			
Kentucky	331,547	30,616	.0923
Georgia	397,212	35,976	.0906
Tennessee	367,346	28,128	.0766
Alabama	346,429	24,635	.0711

The General Lear Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

LETTER WRITTEN BY ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, OF NORTON, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter written by Robert W. Hemphill, of Norton, Kans. Mr. Hemphill is a World War veteran and one of our State's most active and prominent members of the American Legion. His letter expresses the views of a large portion of the citizens of my district.

The letter follows:

HARMONSON-REDD POST, No. 63,
Norton, Kans., July 12, 1941.

EDITOR OF THE DAILY TELEGRAM,
Norton, Kans.

DEAR EDITOR: I was pleased to note in one of the Topeka papers received this morning that some Congressman has had the good sense to take in after General Lear. Generally speaking, it has been my impression that politicians did the Army and their country an injury when they attempted to interfere with military affairs. Some military or Navy man makes an honest statement according to his convictions, and a politician sees a chance to make political timber of it and puts the poor soldier or sailor in bad, which is unquestionably ruinous to Army morale.

On the other hand, we have always boasted in America that our Army was not Prussianized, but was in some sense at least a democratic army, and we felt that that fact was in part responsible for our men being able to vanquish Kaiser Wilhelm's goose-stepping legions. We are told that even Germany of today has had the good sense to do away with something of its old caste system in its Army. To me General Lear's disciplining a whole outfit because a few boys let off a little steam smacks of the type of discipline that most Americans disapprove of. I wonder if the old boy was not just trying to show off before his golf-playing girl friend in shorts. If so, there is plenty good enough excuse for some Congressman to show off before their constituents and show up an old goose-stepping general, if that is what he is, and that is what accounts I have read would indicate.

Most of us who were in the service in 1917 and 1918 had a little fun along with it, and I think that we, along with the rest of the Nation, feel that the soldiers of today are entitled to some frivolity, too. I do not mean to condone any actual obscenity. The accounts I have read of the General Lear incident reported none, but there is something wrong with the general and his golf-playing girl friends if they could not take a little doughboy razzing.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT W. HEMPHILL.

The Lear Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

ARTICLE FROM ARKANSAS LEGIONNAIRE AND RESOLUTION BY UNITED STATES ARMY MOTHERS' CLUB, LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an article from the Arkansas Legionnaire of July 11 and a copy of a resolution which I have received from the State:

[From the Arkansas Legionnaire of July 11, 1941]

GOLFING GENERAL MAKES EXHIBITION OF HOW TO DISCIPLINE SOLDIERS—SUNDAY GAME DISTURBED BY FRIENDLY GREETINGS BETWEEN MANEUVER-WEARY MEN AND SHORTS-CLAD LASSIES, GENERAL LEAR SHOWS 'EM WHO'S BOSS

Shades of Captain Flagg and Mademoiselle from Armentieres.

These lusty veterans of World War I would conclude they had fought and comforted in vain, if they could know that things have come to such a pass in this new army that a man in khaki can't even yoo-hoo at a lass in shorts.

Why, in the first World War—but never mind that. Those were the days when a soldier was a man and generals knew when to look the other way.

It seems that a bunch of the boys from the Thirty-fifth Division were returning to Camp Robinson from Tennessee where they had spent 6 long, hot, dusty weeks chasing mythical enemies over the hills and dales.

They hadn't seen anything in skirts in weeks, and now, as they passed a park in Memphis, they spied a bevy of pretty girls—not in skirts, bless their hearts, but in shorts. You know—l-e-g-s.

WHY WEAR SHORTS?

So the boys yoo-hooed, and whistled, and saluted, and otherwise manifested the pleasure of the male animal when he sees a comely specimen of the opposite sex.

And did the girls burst into tears and run, blushing, to the nearest bush to hide themselves in shame and chagrin? They did not. They smiled and waved back, in fact, some reports had it that they waved first, the hussies.

Nearby a man in golfing clothes witnessed this scene with a bilious eye. Some of the soldiers, wasting a glance or two, are said to have inquired if he needed a caddy.

Little did they dream that this sour puss was the biggest brass hat of them all—Lt. Gen. Ben Lear, commander of the entire Second Army.

BEN HADN'T NOTICED 'EM

The general waxed exceedingly wroth. How dared these dusty young whippersnappers even look from their passing trucks at the bare legs of the flower of Memphis womanhood. Of course, the general hadn't even been aware of their skirtless presence. It was a degrading exhibition of unmilitary, uncouth, and ungentlemanly behavior. And, besides, it interrupted his golf game. Well, he'd show 'em.

He showed 'em. The convoy continued to Little Rock where, on orders from General Lear (or is it Leer?), the trucks refueled and turned around and went back to Memphis. There the entire battalion made another practice run through the city, averting their eyes from the possible dangers of parks and playgrounds, listened to a lecture on the evils of yoo-hooing, and then alternately marched and trucked in the broiling sun from West Memphis to Forrest City.

That's what they got for peeping in broad daylight (the Peeping Toms). Of course, after a mile or two of footwork with full packs, they wouldn't have looked up if Lady Godiva had ridden by on her way home from a barber shop. Or, if they had, they'd have said, "Good afternoon, sir."

WHAT—NO POWDER PUFFS

Well, that's the new order of things in modern military training, as administered by a general who doesn't like to have his Sunday afternoon golf interrupted by a convoy of lechers in khaki.

Look out for a general order for regular issue of ruffled shorts for Ben Lear's second army h..llions.

It is rumored that hereafter when the soldiers at Camp Robinson get passes to come to Little Rock they will be required to turn in their gas masks and take out blinders.

Any man caught winking at a girl will be detailed to 2 weeks of K. P., where he and the potatoes can make eyes at each other.

Holding a girl's hand will cost the offender a round-trip hike to St. Louis, on the double and pushing a jeep.

A kiss will sentence the soldier to carry General Lear piggy-back throughout the war maneuvers in Arkansas and Louisiana.

And—well, if the Second Army is sent to Iceland, it's an even bet that the intrepid general will not be caught out in front yelling, "Come on men, let's give 'em hell."

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE UNITED STATES ARMY MOTHERS' CLUB, LITTLE ROCK, ARK., CONDEMNING LT. GEN. LEAR'S PUNISHMENT OF 350 SOLDIERS LOCATED AT CAMP ROBINSON, ARK.

The public has not been apprised of just what the boys were punished for.

Only one thing is clear and certain—they were cruelly punished on the hottest day in several years. As a result of the punishment, we are informed that a dozen or more are in the hospital. All have suffered and some may pay with their lives for violating no law or military regulation known to them; but on the contrary, for exhibiting the national exuberance of healthy young American men.

Before any punishment, much less cruel and unusual punishment, is imposed upon soldier or civilian, in peacetime or war, it appears to us that the American system requires that the law or regulation allegedly violated should be specified. The accused should have an opportunity to defend themselves against the allegations. This is the system which these same boys are being conditioned to defend with their lives.

If General Lear was irritated by the boys in the course of his golf game, then it is only natural to suggest that it might be more significant to national defense if he would get his exercise as our boys are doing.

It has been reported also that General Lear punished the boys for evidencing an interest in girls. We know of no power existing to punish boys who are not in the Army for manifesting an interest in feminine charms. If they must eschew such interest upon being conditioned to defend their country, then God help America. Being of the feminine sex, we hazard the guess that the attention shown the girls was not half so offensive as indifference to their charms would have been.

We regard General Lear's action as capricious and ostentatious of his authority, not to say downright tyrannical.

Even if our Nation were at war, it would be unjustified. It is surely inimical to civilian morale and cannot be conducive to military morale. It was perilous to the lives and health of the boys involved, and civilized people are accustomed to the imposition of physical punishment and the death penalty only for the most heinous crimes, and after careful deliberation.

If General Lear's action is a fair sample of what the American soldier may expect at the hands of superior military authorities in peacetime, then what shall we tell our boys to fear under any other system?

Should discipline be necessary, it should be meted out to the guilty parties rather than to punish all for the conduct of a few. The incident is regrettable and it is felt that a congressional investigation should be made.

UNITED STATES ARMY
MOTHERS' CLUB,
POST NO. 1 OF ARKANSAS,
Mrs. TOM ALFORD, *Commander.*

The President's War Versus People's Mandate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, we have recently seen many big and expensive advertisements in the Washington newspapers in which the Fight for Freedom Committee and the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies have been urging the President to take steps putting this country into a shooting war. Occasionally these committees, which are spending such vast sums in newspaper and radio advertising in an effort to involve America in the war, mention the word "Congress" or refer to the common people of America, but the main theme of their incessant demands for "war now" is that the President should "take action." Apparently what they want is a President's war.

Mr. Speaker, whether the President is planning to put this country into its first President's war is not yet clear. Some say he is resisting the New York City war crowd in its campaign to get our men and our materials in the fighting. Others say he is not adverse to taking risks and making gambles with our national safety which would result in "a Roosevelt war." The next few months

will clearly show whether President Roosevelt desires to keep his campaign pledges or whether he is determined to involve this country in the fighting despite his oft-repeated pledges to the contrary. I personally refuse to condemn him for bad faith until the evidence is a little clearer. I am among those who continue to hope that he will not betray the public trust reposed in him when the Nation elected him for a third term on his platform of repeated promises to keep America out of the War.

POPULAR RESISTANCE TO WAR IS STIFFENING STEADILY

On June 30 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an exchange of correspondence which I have had with Dr. George Gallup, the director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, commonly referred to as the Gallup poll. That correspondence revealed that Dr. Gallup was presently polling America on its reaction to a question which I proposed to the Institute of Public Opinion and which Dr. Gallup agreed to use in making a test poll of public opinion. That question was, Should the United States enter the war now? The first tabulations on that question were recently released to the public and I have a letter from Dr. Gallup under date of July 10 in which he advises me of additional results obtained in the use of this question and mentions plans which he is making for checking them with other questions. He will keep me advised of the results obtained from these tests and tabulations will continue to be made public on the findings obtained in my specific question of Should the United States enter the war now since the word "now" is a traveling date line which is always in harmony with current developments in the international situation. Dr. Gallup is also perfecting plans in cooperation with Professor Childs of the Public Opinion Quarterly for utilizing a committee of outstanding educators to formulate other questions on the war problems and for auditing results obtained by these polls. In so dong it is my opinion that Dr. Gallup and the American Institute of Public Opinion is rendering a great public service in continuing to probe public opinion in an impartial manner on one of the most vital decisions ever to confront America.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that neither President Roosevelt nor this Congress will ignore the findings of these polls. It seems improbable that the noisy and financially powerful 20 percent who clamor for war and spend millions of dollars to involve us in it will be successful in convincing either the President or the Congress that money speaks louder than human beings and that we should enter a conflict overseas to which 80 percent and more of our people are persistently opposed.

Surely the road to national unity is not the one reached when out of a company of 100 men, the will of the 80 is ignored while the wealth of the 20 is implemented into defining a national course of action. The only type of unity we can secure under the American system of life and government is for the minority (in this case only 20 percent) who favor war to cease disrupting public opinion by joining with the majority (in this case 80 percent) who oppose our entrance into war and who support all steps short of war to aid Britain, to protect the Western Hemisphere, to make America impregnable, and to stamp subversive groups out of America regardless of whether they propose to reduce us to puppets under the hammer and the sickle of Russia or the swastika of Germany or whether they try to seduce us to forego our independence by tearing up the Declaration of Independence and accepting the Union Jack as the standard under which we would operate if the Unionists Now had their way with things.

If the noisy interventionists, representing only 20 percent of the people by the returns of every poll that has been taken, will follow the American method of securing unity by responding to majority sentiment, America can have 100-percent unity the American way, and our peace will be protected and preserved. For the 80 percent to join with the 20 percent, as is brazenly asked for in innumerable newspaper advertisements and in repetitious radio broadcasts, is the Hitlerian method of securing unity—by compelling the people to forego their convictions and to yield to the demands of a few men in high places. Such a method is not the American approach to unity of action.

ALL POLLS POINT TOWARD PEACE

Mr. Speaker, not only did the last Gallup poll show a 3-percent increase in the antiwar sentiment in America but the Chicago Tribune and New York Daily News polls, recently completed, substantiate these findings by showing that 80 percent of all Americans are opposed to war. Also the President Hutchins poll of the University of Chicago, the findings of which were released to the public yesterday, confirm these figures precisely, and once again show 80 percent of all Americans united in their opposition to the involvement of this country in the fighting of this war.

Under leave extended to me, I now call attention to an editorial in yesterday's issue of the New York Journal-American entitled "The Mandate Against War," in which this metropolitan newspaper comments upon the fairness and impartiality of the question which Dr. Gallup included in his poll at my request and calls attention to the prevailing majority sentiment in this country against our entrance into war:

THE MANDATE AGAINST WAR

Has Nazi Germany's campaign against Communist Russia made the American people more willing or less willing than they were before to enter the European war?

This is a vital question that Congress should be glad to have answered; for Congress, under the Constitution, has the sole power to declare war, and Congress is elected to represent the will of the people.

An answer to the question has been obtained, and it is a direct, unequivocal answer which nobody can pretend to misunderstand.

Here is the answer:

Our people are emphatically less willing at this time to become embroiled in the foreign conflict than they have been in the past, and more than 70 percent have been opposed to going into the war ever since the war began.

This information has been procured by the Gallup poll in another of its Nation-wide surveys, a survey which was started 1 day after the German invasion of Soviet Russia began and which, therefore, can be accepted and interpreted only as reflecting American opinion in the light of actual events.

The exact query used in the poll was, "Should the United States enter the war now?"

That query cannot be discredited as a trick question; obviously, there is no trick in it.

Neither can the query be disparaged by glibly remarking that everybody is against war on principle, just as everybody is against sin.

The query is plain and explicit—and the public response that it elicited was not less so.

Out of the "representative voting population" interviewed, extending "from Maine to California," 79 percent replied that America should stay out of the war.

The total represents a gain of 3 percent in antiwar sentiment within a period of 1 month, the Gallup poll having reported in June, before the Nazi-Communist warfare, that 76 percent of the American people were then opposed to our entering the war.

Or, in terms of the minority figures compiled, a mere 24 percent of our people thought we should go to war in June, and this pro-war minority has since declined to a meager 21 percent.

There is no reason whatsoever why the credibility and reliability of the Gallup poll should be doubted in this survey.

Newspaper polls which are being taken independently in two most populous States—New York and Illinois—provide confirmation.

In New York, out of 64,000 registered voters canvassed, more than 68 percent oppose our getting in the war.

In Illinois the percentage is more than 80 percent opposed.

These unassailable facts and figures ought to convince even Harold Ickes, Secretary Knox, and Wendell L. Willkie that, if the American people do get into the war, it will be because they are betrayed into it, contrary to their own will and judgment, as well as in flagrant violation of the solemn pledges of both Presidential nominees in the 1940 electoral campaign.

American Interpretation of McCormack Act by Judge Letts

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES KRAMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I feel it of some importance to call to your attention a decision which was handed down yesterday in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, committing three defendants, namely, Raphael Rush, Norman Weinberg, and Morris Liskin, in a conspiracy. The decision was made by the Honorable F. Dickenson Letts. Judge Letts was formerly a Member of this body, coming from the State of Iowa.

I particularly desire to call to the attention of the Members of the House the charge to the jury by the court, in which Judge Letts points out to the jury the

basic reason for the indictment, having to do with an act passed by Congress, which in this instance was commonly known as the McCormack Act. The McCormack Act had its origin by a resolution which was introduced in the House directing the then Speaker of the House, the late Henry T. Rainey, for the appointment of seven Members to investigate Nazi and un-American activities and propaganda, which was then being spread in the United States.

The charge to the jury is quite interesting in that it does, throughout the entire proceeding, refer to the proceedings and testimony which resulted from the investigation of the then committee, known as the first committee conducting un-American activities, and known as the McCormack committee. The act which the court had particular reference to was the McCormack Act, which the judge charges was an act which was the result of the public hearings and activities of the committee, and was designed to remedy some of the ills which that committee had reported to the House, and as a result of the act another law was enacted providing that unofficial agents who are in the United States for propaganda purposes must register with the Secretary of State, and is known as Public Act 583 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, and Public Law 319, of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

The charge to the jury is somewhat lengthy; however, I hope, by reason of the benefits which will inure to the House and the public, that no objection will be made to its publication in the RECORD.

May I at this point also comment on the publicity which the press, particularly the New York Times, gave to the decision in this case, wherein they refer to the hearings of Ida Lee, who testified before our Committee on Un-Americanism, of which I was then a member, wherein a great deal of the money was procured. The investigation resulting in the indictment here was brought about by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under the very able direction of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover. The Government was represented by Benjamin M. Parker, special assistant to the Attorney General, and this is the first prosecution in the courts of the United States under this act. I had the pleasure of collaborating with Mr. Parker on many occasions preliminary to the trial of this case in giving him facts and data from the records of the hearings of the McCormack committee. He likewise is entitled to a great deal of credit with Judge Letts, who has handed down one of the most outstanding opinions, setting out his reasons for the commitment and conviction.

This is one of the finest examples of judicial utterances that I have ever read. Moreover, it discloses a great amount of learning, and is the type of learning which is made manifest only by a former Member of Congress who has full appreciation of the meaning of congressional committee hearings, reports of congressional commitees, and debates in Congress. I know of no writings which could more justifiably present the work of the McCormack committee: I know of no utterances which could have given more meaning to the work of the McCormack committee: I know of no judicial statement which could more accurately reflect the intent of the McCormack Act. Judge Letts has carried forward the work of the McCormack committee. Judge Letts, by his scholarly charge, has given notice to the world that the people of America will not tolerate propagandists in this country who seek to work underground. I know you will be delighted when you read the charge of Judge Letts. I think the people of America will be delighted with it, and I am sure that you and the other Members who served with me on the first Committee on Un-Americanism who gave so much to their country in the course of the investigation will be pleased to know that their work has not been in vain.

The publicity that has been given by the press to this conviction, especially by the New York Times of this morning, highly praises Justice F. Dickinson Letts, who presided at the trial and in imposing sentence says:

"You have been convicted of a very grave offense. After listening to the trial it is my conclusion that the defendants were all so anxious to make money that they forgot their obligations to their country. That being true, they must all have substantial punishment."

The case of the Bookniga Corporation, which conducted a book store specializing in Soviet propaganda literature at 255 Fifth Avenue, New York, was in the nature of a test of the McCormack Act, it being the first prosecution brought under the law, which was passed in 1938.

The instructions to the jury on law and facts by Honorable Judge Letts, and the verdict of the jury in adjudging the defendants guilty is a powerful message that subversive forces in our beloved country will not be tolerated in their vicious efforts to undermine and destroy America.

Justice Letts' instructions to the jury follow:

[In the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. Criminal action No. 65,043. *United States* v. *Raphael Rush, Norman Weinburg, Morris Liskin.* Washington, D. C., Tuesday, July 1, 1941]

The above-entitled cause came on for trial before Associate Justice F. Dickinson Letts and a jury heretofore impaneled in criminal court No. 3, at 10 o'clock a. m.

Appearances on behalf of the United States: Benjamin M. Parker, special assistant to the Attorney General.

On behalf of the defendant Raphael Rush: Isadore Englander.

On behalf of the defendant Norman Weinberg: Leo A. Rover.

On behalf of the defendant Morris Liskin: David A. Hart.

CHARGE TO THE JURY

The Court (Letts, J.). Members of the jury, in the consideration of the indictment and of each count thereof we are concerned with an act of Congress, commonly known as the McCormack Act.

It may be helpful to the jury for me to make brief reference to the legislative history of the McCormack Act. The House of Representatives, in the Seventy-third Congress, passed a House resolution which, as pertinent, provided:

"*Resolved*, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint a special committee to be composed of seven members for the purpose of conducting an investigation of (1) the extent, character, and objects of Nazi propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation."

The special committee appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives became known as the McCormack committee, the committee taking the name of its chairman.

After extensive hearings in many cities which are reported in many pages of testimony before the McCormack committee, that committee, after investigating over 9 months, in its final report, dated February 15, 1935, found that this country has been flooded with propaganda material, and with much propaganda literature from various alien organizations outside of the United States which were engaged in un-American propaganda activities, in an effort to gain adherents, and to influence the political opinions of many of our people and also to influence, if necessary and possible, our Government policies.

It further found that all kinds of efforts and influences, short of violence and force, were used by foreign governments and their various agencies to obtain their desired objective, which was to consolidate persons into one group, subject to dictation from abroad, in distinct violation of every known American principle.

Furthermore, according to the McCormack committee, this foreign political propaganda was not directed merely at adults, but also at children, who were taught to believe that the principles of government taught by the foreign dictator were superior to the principles of our Government. Moreover, the McCormack committee found that American firms and American citizens as individuals sold their services for express propaganda purposes, making their contacts with and accepting compensation from business firms.

The McCormack Act, with which we are now concerned, was the result of the public hearings and the recommendations of the McCormack committee and was designed to remedy some of the ills which that committee has reported to the House of Representatives.

The purpose of the legislation was to require unofficial agencies who are in the United States for propaganda purposes to register with the Secretary of State. It was intended that the legislation should relate to political propaganda, to persons who were engaged by foreign companies, foreign agents, or connected with a foreign government engaged in political propaganda and to those who are engaged in propaganda in this country connected with some particular country, or political party of a country, or some firm, some group or business of the particular country who is using this as a means for that particular country or political party to hide its identity.

The committee maintained that the Congress and the people of the United States are entitled to have notice of any person who is in the United States or who employs any person for the purpose of disseminating political propaganda in the United States. The committee sought through its bill to deter through the instrumentality of registration with the Secretary of State those activities of persons who are engaged by foreign governments directly or indirectly to advise them on what methods or what is the best method to employ public propaganda or who are engaged for the purpose of disseminating political propaganda in the United States.

It was the purpose of Congress to bring out in the open information as to who is disseminating political propaganda in the

United States and the purposes of such propaganda—information which the Congress thought the American public is entitled to have.

The bill as enacted into law was designed to accomplish the ends and aims of the McCormack committee. You are now told, as a matter of law, that through the passage of the McCormack Act the Congress sought:

(a) to force propaganda agents representing foreign agencies to come out in the open in their activities;

(b) to make known to the American people those who are so engaged in this country by foreign agencies to spread doctrines alien to our democratic form of government;

(c) to make known to the American people the sources of any such efforts, the sources that promote and pay for the spreading of such foreign propaganda, and to label the sources of such propaganda;

(d) to publicize the nature of subversive or other similar activities of such foreign propagandists;

(e) to deter the spread of such pernicious propaganda by the spotlight of publicity resulting from the registration with the Secretary of State.

In seeking to attain these ends it was the intent of Congress, therefore, that the following persons should be required to register with the State Department and to supply information about their political propaganda activities, their employers, and the terms of their contracts:

(a) All persons who are in the United States for political propaganda purposes;

(b) Aliens coming to or in the United States for propaganda purposes of a political nature;

(c) American citizens who accept foreign political propaganda employment.

You are further told as a matter of law that the terms "foreign political propaganda," "propaganda purposes of a political nature," and "political propaganda," mean:

(a) Propaganda aimed toward establishing in the United States (1) a foreign system of government; (2) group action of a nature foreign to our institutions of government.

(b) Propaganda for the purpose of influencing American public opinion on a political question.

Furthermore, "propaganda" and "foreign propaganda" are implicitly defined as—

Spreading doctrines alien to our democratic form of government.

Spreading by word of mouth, or by the written word, the ideology, the principle, and the practices of other forms of government and the things for which they stand.

Arbitrarily aiming to inculcate persons in the United States with those principles and teachings which seek to foster un-American activities, to influence the external and internal policies of this country, and to violate both the letter and the spirit of international law, as well as the democratic basis of our own American institution of government.

Accordingly, it is clearly apparent from the foregoing legislative history what type of activity Congress intended should be public information through registration.

The defendants are charged in the first count of the indictment with willful violation of section 2 of the McCormack Act, which reads as follows:

"SEC. 2. Every person who is now an agent of a foreign principal shall, within 30 days after this act takes effect, and every person who shall hereafter become an agent of a foreign principal, shall forthwith file with the Secretary a registration statement, under oath, on a form prescribed by the Secretary, which shall set forth:

"The name, business address, and residence address of the registrant;

"The name of the foreign principal or other person or organization for which such person is acting as agent;

"A copy of all contracts of employment under which such person acts or agrees to act as such agent, if written, or a full statement of the terms and conditions thereof, if oral;

"The date when each such contract was made, the date of commencement of activity thereunder, and the period during which such contract is to be in effect;

"The compensation to be paid, if any, and the form and time of payment under such contract;

"The name of every foreign principal or other person or organization which has contributed or which has promised to contribute to the compensation provided in such contract; and

"If the registrant be a partnership, association, or corporation, a true and complete copy of its charter, articles of incorporation, copartnership, association, constitution, and bylaws, and any other instrument or instruments relating to its organization, powers, and purposes."

The McCormack Act provides that as used in the act:

"The term 'person' means an individual, partnership, association, or corporation;

"The term 'United States' includes the United States and any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof;

"The term 'foreign principal' means the government of a foreign country, a political party of a foreign country, a person domiciled abroad, or any foreign business, partnership, association, corporation, or political organization;

"The term 'agent of a foreign principal' means any person who acts or engages or agrees to act as a public-relations counsel, publicity agent, or as agent, servant, representative, or attorney for a foreign principal or for any domestic organization subsidized directly or indirectly in whole or in part by a foreign principal. Such term shall not include a duly accredited diplomatic or consular officer of a foreign government who is so recognized by the Department of State of the United States, nor a person, other than a public-relations counsel, or publicity agent, performing only private non-political, financial, mercantile, or other activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal.

"The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of State of the United States."

Section 5 of the McCormack Act prescribes punishment for any person who willfully fails to file with the Secretary of State any registration statement required to be filed under the act.

Count 1 of the indictment alleges that each of the three defendants committed the crime of violating the McCormack Act which, by section 2, requires registration with the Secretary of State of every "agent of a foreign principal" within the meaning of the act.

The indictment states that the defendants Morris Liskin, Raphael Rush, and Norman Weinberg were president, vice president, and secretary-treasurer, respectively, and were also the sole stockholders of Bookniga Corporation, a corporation organized and formerly existing under the laws of the State of New York. Count 1 recites that the said Bookniga Corporation, on or about the 8th day of September 1938 and continuously thereafter to the 6th day of April 1939, in the District of Columbia, and within the jurisdiction of this court, willfully failed to file a registration statement as an agent of a foreign principal, as required by the McCormack Act. Count 1 also charges that the defendants "at all times between the 8th day of September 1938 and the 6th day of April 1939 willfully aided, abetted, counseled, commanded, induced, and procured the said Bookniga Corporation in the District of Columbia, and within the jurisdiction of the Court willfully to fail to file the registration statement required by the McCormack Act as the duly authorized agent and representative of the Mezhdunaradnaya Kniga of the City of Moscow, United Soviet Socialist Republics, for the sale and distribution in the United States of America of books, magazines, periodicals, and pamphlets of a political and propagandist nature, and for political and propaganda purposes." The indictment further charges that in order to prevent the filing of such registration statement the defendants did, on or about the 6th day of April 1939, procure the dissolution of the said Bookniga Corporation and the organization of another corporation known as Bookniga, Inc.

Count 2 of the indictment charges the three defendants, together with divers other persons to the grand jurors unknown, with the violation, within the jurisdiction of this court, of section 37 of the Criminal Code of the United States, by unlawfully and feloniously conspiring, confederating, and agreeing together and with the Bookniga Corporation so that the said Bookniga Corporation would willfully fail to file with the Secretary of State a registration statement under oath on a form prescribed by the Secretary of State, as required by the McCormack Act, the said defendants well knowing that the said Bookniga Corporation was the agent of a foreign principal. A few of the overt acts are then set forth.

To the indictment each of the defendants has entered his plea of not guilty.

You are told at this point that at the outset, as in all criminal cases, there is a presumption in law that the person who stands accused is not guilty of the offense with which he is charged. That presumption should remain in the minds of the jurors for the benefit of a defendant until it is overcome by proof which satisfies the jury beyond a reasonable doubt that he is guilty.

The burden of proof is upon the Government. This means that before you will be warranted in finding these defendants or any of them guilty, the Government must prove, and you must find from the evidence, beyond a reasonable doubt, the truth of the allegations of the indictment as to all essential elements of the crime charged, and this proof, as I have indicated, must be to your satisfaction beyond a reasonable doubt.

A reasonable doubt, as the words themselves import, is a doubt in reason. It means such a doubt as will leave the juror's mind, after a full, fair, candid, and impartial investigation of all the facts and circumstances shown in the evidence, so undecided that he is unable to say that he has an abiding conviction of the defendants' guilt; or such a doubt as in the graver and more important transactions of life would cause a reasonable and prudent man to hesitate and pause. The words "reasonable doubt" must be given their usual and ordinary meaning. The doubt must not be trivial or whimsical or based upon groundless conjectures. The doubt must not be sought after; for when it is such a doubt as the law recognizes, it arises fairly and naturally in the mind of the juror upon a full and fair consideration of all the facts and circumstances in evidence in the case. This doubt must arise out of the evidence, or from a lack of necessary evidence, and it must be a doubt which appears to you to be reasonable under the facts and circumstances of the case.

The Government does not claim that these defendants were required to file registration statements with the Secretary of State but it is the theory of the Government that Bookniga Corporation was required by the McCormack Act to file the registration statement therein required of an agent of a foreign principal. It is claimed by the Government that Bookniga Corporation did not file the statement required of it by the McCormack Act and willfully failed so to do; and that the defendants are in law chargeable and criminally liable for such willful failure of Bookniga Corporation to file the registration statement required of an agent of a foreign principal by the McCormack Act.

The Government charges that these defendants between the 8th day of September,

1938, and the 6th day of April, 1939, willfully aided, abetted, counseled, commanded, induced, and procured Bookniga Corporation willfully to fail to file the registration statement required of it by the McCormack Act, and in order to prevent the filing of such registration statement did procure the dissolution of Bookniga Corporation and the organization of another corporation known as Bookniga, Inc.

This contention by the Government seeking to hold these defendants criminally liable for the willful neglect, failure, and refusal of Bookniga Corporation to file the registration statement required of it by the McCormack Act arises out of a statute of the United States which I shall now read to you, as follows:

"Whoever directly commits any act constituting an offense defined in any law of the United States, or aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces, or procures its commission, is a principal."

The essential elements of the offense charged in the first count of the indictment are:

First, that Bookniga Corporation at some time between September 8, 1938, and April 6, 1939, was an agent of a foreign principal within the meaning of the McCormack Act.

Second, that at such time Bookniga Corporation willfully failed to file a registration statement with the Secretary of State.

Third, that the defendants on trial willfully aided, abetted, counseled, commanded, or induced Bookniga Corporation to willfully fail to file a registration statement with the Secretary of State.

If the Government has established each of such propositions against any individual defendant, and you so find beyond a reasonable doubt, then you will by your verdict find such defendant guilty on the first count of the indictment.

If the Government has failed to so establish any one of the three elements as stated as against any defendant, your verdict as to such defendant will be not guilty on the first count of the indictment.

You will be asked for a separate verdict as to each of the defendants.

The McCormack Act does not in any way impair the right of freedom of speech, or of a free press or other constitutional rights. The American public may not be deprived of political information, even though it be propaganda. There is no law to prohibit its dissemination among the people, but as a matter of public policy our Government and the people of the United States are entitled to know the sources of foreign political propaganda and the person or persons or agencies carrying on the work and bearing the expense incident to its dissemination in the United States.

In addition to their general pleas of not guilty, and to maintain such pleas, the defendants claim that Bookniga Corporation was not the agent of Mezhunaradnaya Kniga and that it was not required to file a registration statement with the Secretary of State. It is their further contention that Bookniga Corporation was engaged in a nonpolitical, bona fide mercantile business, and was excused from filing a registration statement with the Secretary of State by virtue of the provision of the McCormack Act which provides that the term "agent of a foreign principal" shall not apply to any person performing only private, nonpolitical, financial, mercantile, or other activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal.

With respect to such contention by the defendants you are now given the following definitions of the several terms used in the provision of the law so relied upon by the defendants:

The term "private activities in furtherance of bona fide trade or commerce" means activities ordinarily and customarily performed by persons for private livelihood or profit, as distinguished from activities of a political or other character, whether or not in the guise of trade or commerce.

The term "nonpolitical activities in furtherance of bona fide trade or commerce" means such activities as are religious, educational, professional, scientific, or related to the fine arts, which do not in any essential respect relate to the conduct of a government.

The term "financial activities in furtherance of bona fide trade or commerce" means activities in which exchange of money or its equivalent is involved through the normal channels of finance and includes the normal incidents of such transactions.

The term "mercantile activities in furtherance of bona fide trace or commerce" means activities directly concerned with the business of procuring, buying, selling, merchandising, warehousing, forwarding, transporting, or processing goods, products, or property of any kind.

The term "other activities in furtherance of bona fide trade or commerce" as used in subsection (d) of the first section of the act means services rendered in connection with private activities, nonpolitical activities, financial activities, or mercantile activities as herein defined.

The term "furtherance of bona fide trade or commerce" means engaging in good faith in the lawful exchange of goods, products, services, or property of any kind, or in any business, occupation, or employment. Such term shall not include any political activities.

To be excused from filing a registration statement it is not enough that a part or even the major part of one's activities as agent for a foreign principal are nonpolitical; on the contrary to be excused from filing such registration statement with the Secretary of State one who is an agent for a foreign principal must have no political propagandist activities either independent of or incident to a bona fide mercantile business.

Perhaps I should give you one other definition. The failure of Bookniga Corporation to register under the McMormack Act was not criminal unless it was willful, and anything done by these defendants or any of them to aid, abet, counsel, command, induce, or procure Bookniga Corporation to fail to register with the Secretary of State was not criminal unless such conduct was willful. You are, therefore, told that "willful" as so used implies knowledge that Bookniga Corporation was an agent of a foreign principal and was required by the McCormack Act to file a registration statement with the Secretary of State, and having such knowledge Bookniga Corporation had the deliberate intention of avoiding the requirements of the law and that the individual defendants with such knowledge deliberately intended to and did aid, abet, counsel, command, or induce Bookniga Corporation to fail to file a registration statement as required by the McCormack Act.

With respect to count two of the indictment you are told that it is provided by statute that if two or more persons conspire to commit any offense against the United States and one or more of such parties do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be punished.

The second count of the indictment in this case charges the defendants Rush, Weinberg, and Liskin jointly with the crime of conspiracy as defined in the statute which I have now brought to your attention. I have earlier in this charge given you the substance of the charge against the defendants as stated in the indictment. Briefly stated, it is this: That continuously from September 8, 1938, to April 6, 1939, the defendants now on trial and others unknown to the grand jury did unlawfully and feloniously conspire, confederate, and agree together and with Bookniga Corporation so that Bookniga Corporation would willfully fail to file with the Secretary of State a registration statement, under oath, on a form prescribed by the Secretary of State, as required by the McCormack Act, the defendants well knowing that Bookniga Corporation was the agent of a foreign principal within the meaning of the McCormack Act.

There follows as a part of the indictment a list of overt acts, which it is not necessary for me to read to you, but you are told that they are alleged to be acts which the Government charges were done by these defendants at various times to effect the object of the conspiracy which is charged in the indictment. When you retire to your jury room, the indictment will be placed in your hands.

You have noticed that the indictment charges these defendants with a conspiracy to commit an offense against the United States. You are now told that the offense described in the indictment is an offense against the United States.

You are instructed that a conspiracy within the meaning of the statute is a combination or agreement of two or more persons by concerted action to accomplish an unlawful object or a lawful object by unlawful means.

The jury are further instructed that the words "any act to effect the object of the conspiracy" mean any act done after the formation of the agreement or combination and before its termination, with the purpose and intention of putting it into execution.

The jury are instructed that in a prosecution for conspiracy the Government is not required to produce direct evidence of a formal agreement between the conspirators. It is sufficient if, from all the facts and circumstances shown by the evidence, the jury find and believe beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendants named in the indictment acted in concert and mutual understanding in the furtherance of a common design, intent, and purpose, substantially as alleged in the indictment.

Looking again at the statute defining conspiracy, it will be remembered that it provides that if two or more persons conspire together to commit any offense against the United States and one or more of such parties do any act to effect the object of conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be punished.

You will notice that this statute has a double aspect. It contains two essential elements. In the first place, before you will be warranted in finding a verdict of guilty on the second count of the indictment you must find that there was a conspiracy substantially as alleged in the indictment, between some of the defendants now on trial. The second element in the statute is that when a conspiracy by two or more persons to commit an offense against the United States is shown, you must further find that one or more parties to the conspiracy did some act to further the object of the conspiracy.

The statute does not mean that each of the conspirators shall do some act in furtherance of the object of the conspiracy, but that one who is a conspirator has done some act to further the object of the unlawful enterprise.

Looking at the indictment you will find that it is charged that these defendants on trial conspired unlawfully, within the meaning of the statute which I have defined, to commit an offense against the United States; and that they so conspired continuously throughout the period of time extending from September 8, 1938, to April 6, 1939. With respect to that allegation you are told that any combination or agreement found to have existed in violation of the statute under which the indictment is drawn will meet the requirements of the law if the conspiracy was in force at any time between the 8th day of September 1938, and the 6th day of April 1939.

The jury may now have a 5-minute recess.

(Thereupon there was a brief informal recess, at the conclusion of which the proceedings were resumed, as follows:)

The COURT. Members of the jury, I now have before me certain instructions asked by the Government and asked by these various defendants which have been allowed by the Court. With respect to these prayers you are told that each prayer states the law of the case insofar as it goes, but that no one instruction states all of the law of the case. In order to have a comprehensive understanding of the law of the case, it will be necessary for you to have in mind what is here said in these several prayers in connection with all matters mentioned by the Court in its general charge.

I shall first read the Government's prayers.

Government's prayer No. 1 reads as follows:

"Members of the jury, the indictment in this case is in two counts. Each of these counts constitutes a separate and distinct charge the same as if each were contained in a separate and distinct indictment, and in your deliberation you are to consider each count separately. You may, after considering the evidence in this case, find any or all of the defendants guilty or not guilty on both counts or you may find any or all of them guilty on either count and not guilty on the other count."

Prayer No. 2:

"The indictment alleges that the Bookniga Corporation, from September 8, 1938, until April 6, 1939, was the 'agent of a foreign principal' known as Vsesojuznoje, Objedinenie, 'Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga,' of the city of Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and referred to both in the indictment and throughout this trial as Mezhkniga."

Prayer No. 3:

"The first count charges, and this is not denied by any of the defendants, that the defendants Rush, Liskin, and Weinberg, during the entire period involved—that is, from September 8, 1938, until April 6, 1939—were stockholders of the Bookniga Corporation and its officers; that the defendant Liskin was its president, the defendant Rush its vice president, and the defendant Weinberg its secretary and treasurer.

"As the evidence has disclosed, the Bookniga Corporation was dissolved on April 6, 1939, and it is not now a defendant."

Prayer No. 4:

"The indictment charges that Bookniga Corporation willfully failed to file a registration statement as 'agent of a foreign principal' with the Secretary of State of the United States.

"The first count then charges that the defendants Liskin, Rush, and Weinberg willfully aided, abetted, counseled, commanded, induced, and procured the said Bookniga Corporation willfully to fail to file the said registration statement."

Prayer No. 5:

"You are instructed that any person who willfully aids, abets, counsels, induces, or procures a corporation to commit an offense is guilty of the offense the same as if such person had himself committed it."

Prayer No. 6:

"It is for the jury to determine whether Mezhkniga was a foreign principal within the meaning of the act. The court charges that if you find that Mezhkniga was a person, or a group of persons, domiciled abroad, acting for a common purpose, or a corporation, partnership, or association, domiciled abroad, and having its principal establishment or place of business in a foreign country, or that if Mezhkniga was a government of a foreign country or any subdivision of such foreign country to which authority or functions are directly or indirectly delegated or permitted, or any political party of a foreign country having for an aim the administration of a government, then Mezhkniga is a foreign principal within the meaning of the McCormack Act."

Prayer No. 7:

"If the jury should find that Mezhkniga was a foreign principal, the jury must then determine whether the Bookniga Corporation was an agent of a foreign principal within the meaning of the act."

The meaning of the term "agent of a foreign principal" as it is used in the McCormack Act is a question of law to be determined by the Court and not one of fact to be determined by the jury.

Hence I shall soon define and explain to you the meaning of the term "agent of a foreign principal" as used in the act in question. Thereafter, based upon such definitions by the Court, it is the duty of the jury to determine whether the Bookniga Corporation was an agent of a foreign principal within the meaning of the McCormack Act.

Prayer No. 8:

"The term 'agent of a foreign principal' as used in this statute includes any individual or corporation who acts or engages or agrees to act as a publicity agent for a foreign principal."

I charge you that a publicity agent of a foreign principal is an individual or a corporation, which, on behalf of a foreign principal, directly or indirectly engages in placing or disseminating within the United States, written or pictorial information, through advertisements, books, periodicals, and newspapers which spread doctrines alien to our form of government; which spread the ideology, the principle, and the practices of other forms of government and the things for which they stand; which spread principles and teachings which foster un-American activities; which violate both the letter and spirit of international law as well as the democratic basis of our own American institution of government; which spread subversive propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries and which attack the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution; and which spread propaganda aimed toward establishing in the United States a foreign system of government, or which spread other foreign propaganda of a political nature.

Therefore, if you find that the advertisements, books, periodicals, and newspapers either published by Mezhkniga or exported by Mezhkniga and imported and disseminated by the Bookniga Corporation were of the character which I have just described, you should find that the Bookniga Corporation was an agent of a foreign principal within the meaning of the McCormack Act.

Prayer No. 11:

"If you find that the Bookniga Corporation was an agent of a foreign principal within the meaning of the McCormack Act, you should find that it was necessary for and mandatory upon the Bookniga Corporation to register with the Secretary of State."

Prayer No. 13:

"You are instructed that the question of the good faith of Bookniga Corporation, or of the defendants, in failing to file a registration statement, is not an issue in this case. If you find that Bookniga Corporation was an agent of a foreign principal within the meaning of the statute and if you find that these defendants deliberately, intentionally, and voluntarily caused Bookniga Corporation to fail to file a registration statement with the Secretary of State, then you must find the defendants guilty even though the defendants, in good faith, thought that the filing of such a statement by Bookniga Corporation was not required by the law."

Prayer No. 14:

"Mistake of law is no defense if you find that Bookniga Corporation as an agent of a foreign principal was required under the statute to file a registration statement, and if you find that the defendants deliberately and intentionally caused Bookniga Corporation to fail to do so, then you must find the defendants guilty, even though the defendants in good faith believed that the law did not apply to Bookniga Corporation."

I will now take up certain prayers offered by the defendants. I am not sure whether each defendant has adopted each of these prayers or not.

Mr. ROVER. Do you want me to tell your Honor what Liskin prayers we have adopted?

The COURT. Yes.

Mr. ROVER. Prayer No. 1, your Honor, and No. 2. The names would have to be transposed, your Honor. Also, No. 3. I believe that covers that, your Honor.

Mr. ENGLANDER. That applies to the defendant Rush as well.

The COURT. Yes.

Mr. ENGLANDER. Also as to the general prayers submitted by Mr. Rover, with the exception of the last one, which is not applicable, as to character witnesses.

Mr. HART. As to the defendant Liskin, we adopt 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17.

The COURT. You adopt 1 to 8?

Mr. HART. Yes.

The COURT. Does that include 8?

Mr. HART. Yes, your Honor. One to 8, and 13 to 17.

The COURT. And 13 to 17?

Mr. HART. Yes.

The COURT. All right.

The prayer which I shall now read is offered in behalf of the three defendants. It reads as follows:

"The jury are instructed that the only object and purpose of an indictment in a criminal case is to inform the defendants of the nature and cause of the accusation against them; that it does not amount to evidence against them in the slightest degree whatever and the only purpose for which it can be considered by the jury is to determine the charge with which the defendants are accused."

Prayer No. 2 is likewise offered on behalf of the three defendants:

"The jury is instructed that the defendants are presumed to be innocent and that this presumption remains with the defendants throughout until and when the jury becomes convinced of their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt."

Prayer No. 3 is likewise offered for the benefit of each of the defendants:

"The jury are instructed in weighing the evidence in the case that if the acts and conduct of the defendants, or any of them, are just as consistent with innocence as with guilt, then the defendants are entitled to the benefit of the presumption of innocence."

No. 4 likewise is offered in behalf of each of the defendants, and reads as follows:

"The jury are instructed that if after considering all the evidence in the case it feels that all the evidence is just as consistent with the innocence of the defendants, or any of them, as with their guilt, then its verdict should be not guilty as to all the defendants, or any of them, as the case may be."

Prayer No. 5 is offered on behalf of each of the defendants:

"The jury are instructed that the defendants are presumed to be innocent until proved guilty, and this presumption continues and attends them throughout the trial until overcome by testimony establishing beyond a reasonable doubt each and every material element of the charge against them as those material elements are defined and explained to you by the court; and it is your duty, if you reasonably can, to reconcile the evidence in the case with this presumption."

Prayer No. 6 is offered in behalf of each defendant:

"The court instructs the jury that in this case the law raises no presumption against the defendants, but that the presumption of law is in favor of the innocence of the

defendants, and in order to convict them of the crime alleged in the indictment, every material fact to constitute such crime must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt; and if the jury entertain any reasonable doubt upon any single fact or element necessary to constitute the crime, it is their duty to give the defendants the benefit of such doubt and render a verdict of not guilty."

Prayer No. 7 is also offered in behalf of each defendant:

"The jury are instructed that the burden is not upon the defendants to prove their innocence, but upon the United States to prove their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt; and unless you find the defendants' guilt to be established beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find them not guilty, and if you can reconcile all the testimony in the case with any reasonable hypothesis of the defendants' innocence, it is your duty to do so, and in such event you should find the defendants not guilty."

Prayer No. 8 is offered in behalf of each defendant:

"The court instructs the jury that a reasonable doubt may be defined to mean such a doubt as will leave the juror's mind, after a candid and impartial consideration of all the evidence, so undecided that he is unable to say that he has an abiding conviction to a moral certainty of the defendants' guilt, or such a doubt as, in the graver and more important transactions of life, would cause a reasonable and prudent man to hesitate and pause."

The prayers which I shall now read are offered on behalf of each of these defendants:

Prayer No. 13:

"The jury is instructed that the business Bookniga Corporation was engaged in was entirely lawful.

"That the only crimes charged are that Bookniga Corporation was required to register and that, under the first count of the indictment, the defendants knowing that the corporation was required to register, one or more of the defendants willfully aided it in willfully failing to register and that, under the second count of the indictment, one or more of the defendants feloniously conspired and agreed that the corporation would willfully fail to register, and that at least one of the defendants committed an overt act for the purpose of carrying out the object of the conspiracy."

Prayer No. 14:

"The jury is instructed that unless it is convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendants, or any of them, willfully and intentionally did some act designed to cause the Bookniga Corporation to willfully fail to register, then its verdict should be not guilty as to all the defendants or as to such defendant or defendants concerning whose conduct in that regard they have a reasonable doubt."

Prayer No. 15:

"The jury is instructed that before it can convict the defendants, or any of them, on either count of the indictment, it must be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that they or one or more of them, as the case may be, knew that Bookniga Corporation was required to register, namely, that it was the agent of Mezhkniga for political and propaganda purposes.

"If it is not so convinced, beyond a reasonable doubt, or if it has a reasonable doubt, as to such knowledge on the part of any defendant, or as to all of them, then its verdict should be not guilty as to all the defendants, or as to such defendants concerning whose knowledge it has a reasonable doubt about."

Prayer No. 16:

"The jury are instructed that the word 'willful' as used in the statute and the indictment in this case implies not only a knowledge that Bookniga Corporation was obliged to register, but deliberately intended to cause it to willfully fail to register."

You have 17 marked on your program.

Mr. HART. That would be the next one, your Honor.

The COURT. Seventeen was not allowed.

With respect to No. 20, I am not sure whether you adopted it.

Mr. HART. I will adopt it now.

The COURT. This is offered on behalf of each of the defendants (prayer No. 20):

"The jury are instructed that it may find one or more defendants guilty and the other defendant or defendants not guilty, depending upon its view of all the evidence in the case."

Then I have this prayer which is offered in behalf of the defendants Weinberg and Liskin:

"The jury is instructed that an established reputation for good character may alone create a reasonable doubt."

I have certain prayers here now. No. 1 is offered on behalf of each of the defendants and reads as follows:

"The jury are instructed that the mere fact that a conspiracy has for its object the doing of an act which may be unlawful, followed by the doing of such act, does not constitute the crime of conspiracy, and unless the jury find that the defendant Liskin was actuated by a criminal intent, or if the defendant Liskin acted under a misconception or in ignorance, without any actual criminal motive, then a conspiracy has not been established by the evidence as to him, and the jury should bring in a verdict of not guilty as to the said defendant Liskin."

Now, the principle of law announced in that prayer has been adopted by the other defendants.

Mr. ROVER. Yes.

The COURT. And it has the same force and effect as though I repeated the prayer by putting in the names of the other defendants, which is not necessary.

Prayer No. 2:

"The jury are instructed that if the defendant Liskin did not have a criminal intent, in union with either Rush or Weinberg, or both, then they should bring in a verdict of not guilty as to the defendant Liskin."

That would be a correct statement of law as to the other defendants if their names were used instead of Liskin's.

Prayer No. 3 reads as follows:

"The jury are instructed that mere suspicion or possibility that the defendant Liskin participated in an alleged conspiracy with the other defendants or either of them, is insufficient to constitute the crime of conspiracy as to him, and before they can convict the defendant Liskin on the second count of the indictment they must find beyond a reasonable doubt that there was an agreement, combination, or confederation with Rush and Weinberg, or either of them, to do an unlawful act; that mere passive cognizance of the crime or unlawful act to be committed or mere negative acquiescence is not sufficient to convict Liskin."

That principle of law might be stated in the same manner as relating to the defendants Rush and Weinberg with the same force.

Prayer No. 4:

"The jury are instructed that any statement, declaration, or admission made by the defendant Rush to the Department of Justice agent, about 8 months after April 8, 1939, at the time of his arrest, or by the defendant, Weinberg, to the grand jury, or to anyone else, is not binding on the defendant Liskin, and must not be considered as evidence against Liskin that he participated in any alleged conspiracy as charged in the second count of the indictment."

Mr. ROVER. That same rule applies to Weinberg as to anything that Rush said.

The COURT. I will cover that later. That relates only to the defendant Liskin.

Defendant Liskin's instruction No. 5:

"The jury are instructed that if they find from the evidence that the defendant Liskin had no knowledge or information of the Registration Act, nor of the correspondence concerning the same with the State Department, then in that event the defendant Liskin would not be guilty of any conspiracy with the other defendants, and their verdict should be not guilty as to the said defendant Liskin."

The COURT. Liskin's prayer No. 7:

"The jury are instructed that the mere fact that the defendant Liskin was the president and director of the Bookniga Corporation does not in and of itself render him criminally responsible for the alleged criminal acts of the other officers of the said corporation, and if the jury finds that the defendant Liskin had no knowledge of any criminal acts or intent of such other officers or directors, then the jury should bring in a verdict of not guilty as to the defendant Liskin."

Liskin's prayer No. 9:

"The jury are instructed that the defendant Liskin was under no obligation to testify in his own behalf, and the fact that he did not testify does not create any presumption whatever against him."

Have I read this character prayer on behalf of the defendants?

Mr. HART. Yes.

The COURT. Another part of the indictment names or describes a number of overt acts. By that is meant acts which it is alleged were done by the conspirators named to effect the object of the conspiracy. As I have indicated, it is not necessary that any particular number of these acts should be proved before you can find the defendants guilty. It is only necessary that at least one overt act was done by at least one member of the conspiracy to effect the object of the conspiracy, and that at least one of those overt acts was done between the 8th day of September 1938 and the 6th day of April 1939.

In our jurisprudence we divide the responsibility in cases of this kind between the court and the jury. It is for the court to direct the orderly proceedings of the trial, to rule upon questions of law as they arise in the conduct of the trial and upon the admissibility of evidence and to declare the law of the case. It is the duty of the jury to take the law as stated by the court and to apply that law to the facts and circumstances shown in the evidence.

It is the exclusive province of the jury to determine matters of fact and the questions of guilt or innocence. In coming to your conclusion you should do so with an understanding of the law, and your deliberations should be orderly to the end that your verdict reached at the end of the case will be a just verdict.

You are the sole judges of the credibility of the witnesses and of the weight you will accord the testimony of each of them.

You should accord to individual witnesses and the testimony given by them that degree of credibility and effect which, in your honest judgment, you think they ought to have, taking into consideration insofar as you are able to do so, from the manner and appearance of the witness on the stand, whether the testimony of that witness is frankly and honestly given, the apparent intelligence or lack of intelligence of the witness, his ability and opportunity to observe the facts that transpired within his presence, and his ability to remember what at a prior time he has observed, and his ability to express accurately and communicate to you through the medium of words that which passed within his observation; also what, if any interest the witness has in the outcome of the case and whether or not on that account he has colored in any way the facts related in his testimony, and again whether or not there is manifested by any witness any bias, preju-

dice, or feeling for or against the defendants, or any of them; and if so, whether or not that has colored the testimony of such witness one way or the other.

Furthermore, you are told that if you find that any witness has knowingly testified falsely with respect to any matter material to the issues of this case, and concerning which such witness might not reasonably be mistaken, you may, if you wish, reject all or any part of the testimony of such witness. The rule of law, however, does not prevent you from giving weight to such parts of the testimony of such witness as you may find to be trustworthy or reliable. Thus you may find parts of the testimony of the witness to be supported or corroborated by other evidence in the case which you may believe to be true, and thus, even though you might find other parts of such testimony to be untrue.

In weighing the evidence you are not reminded that there was received in evidence certain conversations, admissions, or declarations of one or more of the defendants, made after April 6, 1939, the date fixed in the indictment as the time limit within which Bookniga Corporation was required to register as the agent of a foreign principal, and the termination of the time when the conspiracy is alleged to have existed. With respect to any such evidence of conversations, admissions, or declarations by any one or more of the defendants you are told that any such conversations, declarations, or admissions made before September 8, 1938, or after April 6, 1939, were admitted in evidence and may be weighed by the jury only as against the defendant who made same; and you are further told that they do not bind any other defendant and may have no weight in determining the guilt or innocence of any other defendant, and this proposition of law relates to the issues of the case as made by each count of the indictment.

The case to a large extent involves what is known as circumstantial evidence. Circumstantial evidence consists of disconnected and independent facts which give rise to a logical inference as to the existence of the main or principal fact in issue. Direct evidence is that which proves the fact itself. A conviction may be had upon circumstantial evidence alone; but there are certain rules of evidence which you should bear in mind in weighing evidence of this kind. It is the law that circumstantial proof, in order to justify a conviction, must not only be consistent with the guilt of a defendant but it must also exclude every reasonable hypothesis of his innocence. It is for you, and you alone, to say whether the logical inferences and deductions from the facts established by the evidence exclude every reasonable hypothesis of defendants' innocence and lead you to the conclusion beyond a reasonable doubt that these defendants, or any of them, are guilty as charged in the indictment.

You may now take the case and consider your verdict. You will be asked for your separate verdict on each count of the indictment as to each of the several defendants.

(Counsel for all sides approached the bench and conferred with the court in a low tone of voice, as follows:)

Mr. HART. I thought Your Honor might have overlooked the fact that you were going to tell them they could bring in a verdict of guilty on the second count.

The COURT. I will take care of that when they come back.

Mr. ROVER. May I except to Your Honor's describing the legislative history of the act and the purpose of the act?

The COURT. Yes.

Mr. ENGLANDER. I join in that exception.

Mr. PARKER. Both Mr. Englander and Mr. Rover referred to the fact of advice by counsel. That was in their argument, and both of them referred to advice of counsel. Advice of counsel is no defense.

Mr. HART. I thought you had.

The COURT. I don't know whether I did or not.

Mr. HART. Could Your Honor instruct them as to that, if they determine the guilt of the defendant Liskin on the second count, if they take into consideration the testimony on the first count?

The COURT. I think I will take care of that when they come in.

Mr. ROVER. If Your Honor is going to tell them that advice of counsel is no defense, I take an exception to that.

The COURT. Yes.

(At the conclusion of the foregoing conference, counsel returned to the trial table and the trial proceeded as follows:)

The COURT. There is just one further word. Advice of counsel is no defense.

You may take the case now.

The alternate jurors have served their purpose and have done it well. Thank you for your attendance and your service. You will be excused. The alternate jurors will step aside, and the regular jurors will retire to the jury room.

(Whereupon, at 3:55 p. m., the jury retired to consider their verdict.)

Place of United States in the World Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. HAROLD H. BURTON, OF OHIO

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at the Summer Institute for Social Progress, Wellesley, Mass., on July 15, on the place of the United States in the world situation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In order to speak briefly on the place of the United States in the world situation I must choose between discussing our place in the immediate future and our place in the distant future. Coming, as I do, from the governmental forum where the "immediate future of the United States" is discussed day by day, I shall limit myself to the following three aspects of our immediate future: Our war policy, our hemispheric policy, and our internal policy. I shall deal with each only as it affects our place in the world situation.

Our war policy is to preserve America's freedom and ideals at all costs and, if possible, to do it without fighting. On this much of a war policy America is substantially united. This calls for the preservation and defense of our 48 States, our Territorial and insular possessions, and the Western Hemisphere. This does not mean that we will fight some one else's war. It does not mean that we will fight to impose our program, even of "the four freedoms," upon unwilling people. The essence of our independence from domination by others carries with it a recognition of the right of others to a like independence from domination by us.

To make this policy effective Congress passed the Lend Lease Act and appropriated $7,000,000,000 to implement it. To understand our war policy, it is necessary to understand this act. It is an act for the defense of this Nation. It carries no additional powers for the use of convoys or of combatant troops. It does not grant authority to give aid to any other nation, as such. What it does do is to grant the President the authority, and the implied duty, to supply defense articles to the government of any country the defense of which he deems vital to the defense of the United States. This may mean aid to Britain, China, or Russia, or to any other nation, if, but only if and when, the President deems the defense of that nation vital to the defense of the United States. It involves no alliance with any government. It implies no support of the policies of any nation to which our defense materials are supplied.

The doctrine of the Lend Lease Act is a doctrine authorizing aid to be given in defense of the United States "short of war." It does not authorize acts of war, although the acts which it does authorize may be seized upon by others as causes for declaring war upon us. Under this policy we have ceased to be strictly neutral. We have become nonbelligerents guided by the actual needs of the defense of our own Nation against outlaw aggressors.

Our policy is to stay out of the fighting if it is possible to do so and still to preserve our freedom and our ideals. Such a policy not only is to our own advantage and responsive to the instincts of our people but it also is to the advantage of humanity.

Every day that we stay out of the war and still maintain our freedom and ideals yields gains of many kinds. It gives added time during which the outlaw nations may collide, collapse, or explode from within. Their organization rests largely upon force and fear as does that of any outlaw group. It may break up suddenly, at any time. The flight of Hess from the Nazis was an example of its peculiar instability. The war between the Nazis and the Soviets is weakening both.

Every day that we stay out of the fighting gives us needed time to increase our long-delayed production of defense materials. We are far behind in providing either the needed equipment, or the men trained to use the equipment that is called for by even our most conservative plans of defense.

Every day that we stay out of the fighting permits us to keep a strong fleet in the Pacific, whereas actual fighting in or near the Atlantic might soon require most of our Navy to be on the Atlantic Ocean, thus leaving the Pacific Ocean open to aggressive action against our interests.

Every day that we stay out of the fighting helps to stabilize industrial and economic conditions not only in America but in the world, by preserving much of the standard of living which would have to be abandoned if our facilities were destroyed by war or if our productive agencies all were turned from cooking utensils to warplanes, from automobiles to armored tanks, from refrigerators to artillery shells, from homes to warships, and in countless other ways were devoted to destructive purposes.

Every day that we stay out of the fighting it saves American men and money. Heavy as our taxes are and will be under our present program, they might well be doubled in war, thereby threatening the entire financial stability of our Government, of our private investments, and of the world.

Finally, every day that we stay out of the fighting enables the people of America to learn more about the needs and the facts so that when and if a crisis presents itself we shall act with that understanding and unity that is vital to the success of a self-governing nation at war.

America never has failed to fight when that has been necessary to preserve her freedom

or ideals. We must not hesitate to fight now if that need appears again. As yet that need does not exist. We cannot rely on treaties with the Axis Powers for they have adopted the methods of outlaws. They have shown no more regard for a law or a treaty than does the outlaw who robs and kills in obvious violation of the laws of his nation and community. Outlaws rely on force and cunning to make good their escape and their defiance of law. Treaties are still of value between our allies and ourselves, but our relation to the Axis Powers must be that of a policeman to an habitual and hardened outlaw. Just as an outlaw may dominate his immediate family by force, nevertheless many members of his family often are deeply opposed to his course of life and are glad to be freed from it by his capture. So we hope that many of the people now dominated by the Nazi outlaws, will, when freed from that control, respond again to the principles of freedom and of respect for the individual which have formed the basis of the world's progress.

This war policy of the United States helps the forces of law and order and of freedom throughout the world. It is the soundest possible military policy to permit us thus to prepare ourselves, while also supplying materials and aid to those whose defense is vital to our own. It is important also to preserve here, as much as possible of the world's peacetime civilization coupled with a demonstration of the feasibility of self-government. If worse comes to worse the United States will be the last line of defense of the world's free civilization. We must be so well prepared that that last stand shall never fail. Our defense policy not only makes us the arsenal of the free nations of the world, it also prepares us to serve as the last and invincible line of defense for those personal freedoms for which man has struggled for ages and from which springs his hope for the future. It is better for us to make absolutely sure of the success of our final defense than to risk the danger of an earlier and more hazardous test of strength which might leave us with no further final resort.

With our progress under this program there is ample ground for criticism today. Instead of moving at the rate of a $17,000,000,000 program we are moving scarcely at that of a ten- or twelve-billion-dollar program. We are not well equipped. Our production is not moving as smoothly as it should. The program needs greater unity of action and more complete Nation-wide support. The program needs improved organization in the structure of its Government; it needs the elimination of every interruption of production from any source whatsoever. To improve this program we must each lend a willing, vigorous, helping hand at every point.

Turning to our hemispheric policy. This has descended to us from the Monroe Doctrine, but it has been greatly developed in recent times. Through it and the pan-American agreements we are committed to the defense of and to friendly cooperation with the Western Hemisphere. Central and South American nations are exporting and importing nations. They depend upon the ocean and the air highways of the future, especially on the Atlantic side. For many years the control of the Atlantic Ocean has been, and it is now, held by Britain and the United States, and today the government of each of the 20 republics south of us is friendly toward us. If, however, the Axis Powers should seize or seriously threaten to seize control of the ocean or air highways of the Atlantic, then the governments of some 8 or 10 of these southern nations would face serious danger of overthrow by organized opposition parties within their own borders friendly to the "new order" of Europe rather than to the United States. Such opposition governments springing up within our hemisphere and using the already existing Axis-controlled air lines and bases would bring us face to face with danger within our own walls. This means that the hemispheric policy of the United States, emphasizing the control of the ocean and the air, and the development of genuine, strong, and friendly commercial, cultural, and governmental relations with the central and southern republics of America should be a keystone of our policy for both our immediate and our distant future

Finally our internal program is important to the world. It is impossible in these uncertain days to plan in detail, long-term world-wide relationships, but the very cornerstone of any world-wide program that is to be based upon justice and freedom and upon respect for the individual citizen, requires that the United States itself be an outstanding justification of such a program. To qualify as such a cornerstone of the world of the future, we must seek at once within our own borders, at least the following results:

1. Preservation by us of that genuine respect for individual personality that is the foundation of our governmental, social, and religious philosophy. This calls for a rededication to, and a deep understanding of, the principles of the Declaration of Independence. The doctrine was there stated in the following familiar language, the essence of which we need to make again a living faith, expressed in our own terms:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed * * *."

This calls for practice of the great freedoms of religion, press, speech, assembly, and opportunity.

2. Demonstration by us of the capacity of a self-governing nation to set the standard for the people of the world, in living conditions and social security.

3. Demonstration by us of the capacity of a self-governing nation to meet the economic pressure of modern problems of production, distribution, money, taxation, rising standards of living and scientific advances.

4. Demonstration by us of a governmental restraint upon our own expansion of Federal powers, and the performance of our governmental duties with exemplary efficiency, economy, and upon sound financial principles.

5. Development by us of a genuine spirit not only of tolerance, but of genuine brotherly love, evidencing an understanding of the brotherhood of man and the Fatherhood of God which has been the great drawing power of genuine religion and of the development of human happiness since human life began.

America's strongest weapon is her own example.

Chicago Tribune War Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

ARTICLE FROM CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I offer an article from the Chicago Daily Tribune of July 15, containing the total final tabulation of the war poll taken in the State of Illinois. It will be noted that 80 percent of the people expressing themselves on this question voted "No," emphatically expressing themselves against our active participation in the war.

I request that this poll, because of the importance of the subject, be included in the proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I would recommend that similar polls be taken in the various States, for I confidently believe that a vast majority of the people of America, if given an opportunity, would express themselves, as have the people of Illinois, as being opposed to our entering the present war.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of July 15, 1941]

FINAL WAR-POLL VOTES COUNTED—80 PERCENT SAY "NO"—77,229 BALLOTS CAST IN STATE SURVEY

(By Percy Wood)

Final returns in the Chicago Tribune's war poll show an 80-percent opposition to war among the 77,229 Illinois voters who replied to the question: "Shall the United States enter the war to help Britain defeat Hitler?"

The number of ballots received from the 50 Chicago wards, the 30 country townships in Cook County, and from 9 election-board cities down-State constituted about 30 percent of the total of 257,484 mailed—1 to every tenth voter on the polling lists.

The 77,229 State-wide ballots break into the following percentages:

Yes (for war): 14,176, or 18.36 percent.

No (against war): 62,394, or 80.79 percent.

Spoiled ballots totaled 659, or 0.85 percent.

The poll was conducted by post-card ballots printed, mailed, and counted under Tribune supervision by the Buckley-Dement Co., 1300 Jackson Boulevard, the largest concern in the direct-mail-advertising field.

Coincident with the announcement of complete results of the Tribune's poll last night was the announcement of final returns in the poll of New York State on the same question by the New York News. In the Empire State the result was 51,507 for entering the war and 122,802 against.

ANTIWAR RATIO GROWS

Starting with a 3 to 1 trend against intervention in the European conflict, the antiwar percentage in the Illinois poll crept upward daily until it reached 80 percent, or 4 to 1. First returns were printed on July 3, and additional results on each succeeding day, save for the issue of July 5. No count was made on July 4 because of the national holiday.

Down-State sentiment was obtained by sampling one-tenth of the registered electorate in the following cities: Aurora, Bloomington, Cairo, Danville, East St. Louis, Galesburg, Peoria, Rockford, and Springfield.

PERCENTAGE OF RETURNS

Returns from Cook County were 31 percent of the ballots mailed, and by coincidence this figure applied both to the city wards and the country towns. In the city 191,246 ballots were mailed, and 59,314 were marked and returned. The suburbs returned 11,312 of the 36,491 sent out.

Down State, 6,603 of the 29,757 ballots mailed were sent back. This was a 22.2 percent return. The State-wide return was 30 percent.

Only one city ward—the twenty-fourth—voted consistently for war, the final percentage being 53.3. Coincidentally, the twenty-fourth also returned the smallest percentage of ballots mailed—19.2 percent, or a little less than one of every five mailed to voters there.

SLIGHT WAR MAJORITY

The twenty-fourth has an extremely heavy Russian Jewish and Polish population, a great many residents being foreign-born. From the second day of the poll it has cast a slight majority for intervention.

The banner ward in percentage of returns was the forty-seventh on the North Side, where 41.8 percent of all ballots sent were marked and mailed back. It was also one of the strongest antiwar wards, voting 89.4 percent against intervention.

The banner ward for peace was the forty-fifth, also on the North Side, which has many voters of German descent. Noninterventionist sentiment in the forty-fifth stayed above 90 percent almost continuously and closed at 90.9 percent.

Next highest in antiwar strength was the ninth, on the far South Side, including the Pullman district, where the noninterventionist percentage was 90.12. The ninth has many Italian and Polish voters in the Pullman section, and there are also Swedish and Dutch families in the Roseland district.

RESULTS IN OTHER WARDS

The twenty-sixth ward ran next to the twenty-fourth in interventionist strength, turning in a final prowar percentage of 36.3. It has a large Polish majority, with some Russian and a few Italian residents.

Comparatively high prowar percentages were found in the largest colored wards, the second and third, where interventionist strength ran 30 percent. This was a greater prowar sentiment than in most of the other subdivisions of the city.

The neighbors of Senator WAYLAND BROOKS in the forty-ninth ward upheld the noninterventionist position he has taken in Washington, voting 24.2 percent for war and 75.2 percent for peace. In Gov. Dwight H. Green's old ward—the forty-sixth—the percentages were 19.7 for war and 80.3 against war. Mayor Kelly's ward is the forty-second, where interventionist strength was recorded at 27.3 percent and sentiment for peace at 72.7 percent.

CONGRESSMEN'S HOME WARDS

The home wards of Chicago's Congressmen cast the following percentages against war: ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, second, 70.1 percent; RAYMOND S. MCKEOUGH, eighth, 88.4 percent; EDWARD A. KELLY, eighteenth, 89.9 percent; HARRY P. BEAM, twelfth, 79.1 percent; A. J. SABATH, twenty-first, 74.4 percent; LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, thirty-fifth, 84.1 percent; LEO KOCIALKOWSKI, thirty-second, 63.7 percent; and CHARLES S. DEWEY, forty-third, 83.7 percent.

Congressman A. F. MACIEJEWSKI lives in Cicero, where the antiwar sentiment was recorded as 78.5 percent, and Congressman GEORGE A. PADDOCK lives in Evanston, whose voters turned in 83.7 percent against intervention. Both men have Chicago territory in their districts. All of the above, with the exception of DEWEY and PADDOCK, are Democrats.

Down State, Aurora returned the largest number of ballots mailed, sending back 28 percent, while Springfield, the capital made the smallest showing, with a return of only 15.5 percent.

AURORA 90.1 PERCENT ANTIWAR

Aurora was also the top antiwar city, recording 90.1 percent against intervention. Galesburg was next, with 87.4 percent, and Rockford third, with 85.5 percent.

The only city to vote for war was Cairo, 400 miles from Chicago and the southernmost point in the State, separated from Missouri by the Mississippi River and from Kentucky by the Ohio. Cairo is more of a southern town than any other Illinois municipality and is farther south, geographically, than even Richmond, Va. The final prowar percentage in Cairo was 54—about what it has been in the daily totals.

East St. Louis cast the closest vote of any city, finishing at 50.9 percent against war after jumping across the line within the last few days.

INDUSTRIAL CITIES RECORDED

East St. Louis and Rockford are industrial cities. The former virtually straddled the fence throughout the poll, but Rockford, with a large population of Swedish descent, plumped hard against war from the start. Peoria, seat of the State's distilling industry and a principal tractor-manufacturing center, registered its sentiment between East St. Louis and Rockford, turning in 71.6 percent against war.

Galesburg, Bloomington, Danville, and Springfield dot the corn belt in central Illinois. The first three recorded antiwar strength in the 80s, but Springfield registered only 72 percent against intervention.

FINAL WAR POLL RESULTS IN CITY, SUBURBS, AND DOWNSTATE

Final results are given below in the Chicago Tribune's war poll conducted on the question, "Shall the United States enter the war to help Britain defeat Hitler?" Every tenth voter on the polling lists in Chicago, Cook County, and nine downstate cities was sent a ballot.

DOWNSTATE CITIES

City	Vote yesterday		Total vote		Percentage vote	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Aurora	4	82	76	693	9.88	90.12
Bloomington	3	33	88	469	15.80	84.20
Cairo	18	16	88	75	53.99	46.01
Danville	7	32	101	431	18.98	81.02
East St. Louis	69	81	391	406	49.06	50.94
Galesburg	8	46	63	438	12.57	87.43
Peoria	37	109	345	873	28.33	71.67
Rockford	36	173	188	1,110	14.48	85.52
Springfield	56	211	199	513	27.95	72.05
Total	238	783	1,539	5,008	------	------
Percentage	23.02	75.73	23.31	75.84	------	------

Spoiled ballots totaled 56, or 0.85 percent; spoiled yesterday totaled 13 or 1.25 percent.

COOK COUNTY TOWNS

Town	Vote yesterday		Total vote		Percentage vote	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Barrington	------	3	2	41	4.65	95.35
Berwyn	27	133	162	668	19.50	80.50
Bloom	------	17	51	395	11.43	88.57
Bremen	3	9	19	123	13.38	86.62
Calumet	2	29	6	133	4.32	95.68
Cicero	17	49	216	787	21.54	78.46
Elk Grove	2	5	3	54	5.26	94.74
Evanston	10	68	204	1,045	16.33	83.67
Hanover	------	18	3	60	4.76	95.24
Lemont	------	22	16	67	19.28	80.72
Leyden	------	20	50	284	11.52	88.48
Lyons	7	70	76	430	15.02	84.98
Maine	3	33	41	387	9.58	90.42
New Trier	10	41	133	678	16.40	83.60
Niles	1	22	21	205	9.29	90.71
Northfield	4	13	14	146	8.75	91.25
Norwood Park	1	8	10	68	12.82	87.18
Oak Park	15	57	162	1,124	12.60	87.40
Orland	------	2	2	20	9.09	90.91
Palatine	------	15	4	100	3.85	96.15
Palos	1	2	2	19	9.52	90.48
Proviso	7	86	147	1,219	10.76	89.24
Rich	------	3	4	38	9.52	90.48
River Forest	------	7	25	191	11.57	88.43
Riverside	10	45	23	158	12.71	87.29
Schaumberg	------	2	------	11	------	100.00
Stickney	1	6	9	30	23.08	76.92
Thornton	12	53	102	641	13.73	86.27
Wheeling	2	15	12	159	7.02	92.98
Worth	6	28	39	332	10.51	89.49
Total	141	931	1,558	9,713	------	------
Percentage	13.08	86.26	13.77	85.86	------	------

Spoiled ballots totaled 41, or 0.36 percent; spoiled yesterday totaled 6, or 0.56 percent.

CHICAGO WARDS

Ward	Vote yesterday		Total vote		Percentage vote	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1	7	40	122	389	23.87	76.13
2	57	95	360	846	29.85	70.15
3	18	63	262	609	30.08	69.92
4	37	67	377	891	29.73	70.27
5	72	161	467	1,135	29.15	70.85
6	49	205	266	1,284	17.16	82.84
7	32	138	396	1,265	23.84	76.16
8	22	120	189	1,437	11.62	88.38
9	19	181	129	1,177	9.88	90.12
10	15	94	120	685	14.91	85.09
11	22	88	146	614	19.21	80.79
12	26	130	154	583	20.90	79.10
13	29	166	174	1,008	14.72	85.28
14	19	58	105	554	15.93	84.07
15	25	169	141	972	12.67	87.33
16	29	185	165	1,063	13.44	86.56
17	17	132	204	1,277	13.77	86.23
18	29	308	166	1,479	10.09	89.91
19	25	296	180	1,301	12.15	87.85
20	10	97	122	652	15.76	84.24
21	27	83	168	489	25.57	74.43
22	10	34	194	395	32.94	67.06
23	26	65	187	518	26.52	73.48
24	24	26	509	271	53.28	46.72
25	3	29	93	647	12.57	87.43
26	13	34	253	445	36.25	63.75
27	40	100	246	676	26.68	73.32
28	30	167	172	839	17.01	82.99
29	40	130	254	793	24.26	75.74
30	28	195	150	963	13.47	86.53
31	49	115	229	682	25.14	74.86
32	43	59	248	436	36.26	63.74
33	51	185	206	809	20.30	79.70
34	55	226	222	920	19.44	80.56
35	44	221	194	1,027	15.89	84.11
36	47	311	149	1,162	11.37	88.63
37	64	278	248	1,330	15.72	84.28
38	31	212	166	1,419	10.47	89.53
39	32	244	196	1,181	14.23	85.77
40	55	274	256	1,034	19.84	80.16
41	37	293	170	1,392	10.88	89.12
42	55	124	321	857	27.25	72.75
43	22	106	177	907	16.33	83.67
44	25	110	249	969	20.44	79.56
45	23	175	134	1,341	9.08	90.92
46	49	193	270	1,099	19.72	80.28
47	23	154	201	1,699	10.58	89.42
48	64	136	449	1,203	27.18	72.82
49	33	136	489	1,483	24.80	75.20
50	15	116	234	1,466	13.76	86.24
Total	1,627	7,324	11,079	47,673	------	------
Percentages	18.00	81.03	18.88	80.37	------	------

Spoiled ballots totaled 562, or 0.95 percent; spoils yesterday were 88, or 0.97 percent.

State-wide ballots received: 77,229. Vote for war: 14,176; vote against, 62,394. Percentage for war: 18.36; percentage against war: 80.79. Percentage of spoiled ballots, 0.85 percent.

Senator Tydings' Attitude on Jackson Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM FORT WAYNE NEWS-SENTINEL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the News-Sentinel of Fort Wayne, Ind., of the issues of July 12, 1941.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of July 12, 1941]

SO JUSTICE ALSO GOT A BRASS RING?

For some very strange reason, the various brief news stories covering the objections of Senator TYDINGS to confirmation of Robert E. Jackson as Supreme Court Justice seemed well calculated to conceal the real basis of the Maryland Democrat's objections.

Some of them seemed deliberately designed to create the erroneous impression that it was a sort of trivial personal feud that had been aired on the Senate floor in connection with the important question as to whether Jackson should be elevated to the Supreme Court bench.

The News-Sentinel believes that the people are entitled to a clearer appreciation of what was actually at issue in that controversy—largely because of the light which Senator TYDINGS' disclosures threw upon the character of a certain pair of presumptuously pontifical New Deal columnists who, often and artfully mask wanton smear with the superficial appearance of giving the low-down on the news of the day.

The whole thing began in the summer of 1939, when Messrs. Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, coauthors of a syndicated newspaper column called The Washington Merry-Go-Round, included in their Nation-wide radio broadcast these statements:

"BOB ALLEN. And don't forget Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, Drew.

"DREW PEARSON. That's right, Bob. Senator TYDINGS has promised us a poke in the eye. I'd forgotten.

"ANNOUNCER. Well, what's the Senator sore about?

"PEARSON. Well, we suddenly became interested in checking up on Government works and discovered that the Senator had put through a very interesting little deal. Just to help keep the W. P. A. workers busy, he had them build a road and yacht basin on his private estate."

In other words, these highly touted columnists were telling the world that Senator TYDINGS had used the funds of the Government of the United States for his own private purposes—that he had committed fraud, thievery, larceny—that he had stolen funds from the needy unemployed and used them to improve his private property.

Senator TYDINGS immediately called up the broadcasting authorities and asserted that this statement was utterly false. And those authorities straightway got in touch with Colonel Harrington, W. P. A. Administrator, who informed them that this charge had been thoroughly investigated by the W. P. A. and that "never had a cent of Government money been spent on the property of Senator TYDINGS."

This finding was duly carried by the radio officials in a broadcast the week following. But Pearson and Allen have never, on their own account, retracted the charge against the Maryland Senator.

When the radio officials had delivered their apologies, however, Columnist Bob Allen sat down and wrote a nasty letter to Colonel Harrington, a photostat copy of which Senator TYDINGS recently read to his fellow solons:

"DEAR COLONEL: Your letter to Senator TYDINGS and the National Broadcasting Co. was certainly a gracious item. * * * It was very fitting that we, who had defended and fought for W. P. A. from its inception, should be kicked in the teeth by the Administrator in the interests of a man who has done nothing but heap fire and brimstone on W. P. A. and vote to gut it.

"We particularly appreciate your action because you didn't even have the decency to get in touch with us about it or to be frank about it and the real facts of the case. When I was an officer in the Army some years ago, it was the custom for an officer to be a gentleman, but, apparently times have changed."

That little exhibit is highly significant:

It is remarkably typical of the technique of the administration's smear brigade. "Never mind whether somebody is guilty or innocent of a particular charge; hang that charge on him and smear him with might and main—if he has ever been a political enemy!"

Senator TYDINGS looked up the law and found that House and Senate and President, acting together, had placed on the books a Federal law which provides:

"Whoever publishes a libel shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding 5 years, or both."

And so he went to the United States District Attorney for the District of Columbia, who, he says, commented: "All right, Senator, we will proceed with it. But I would like the F. B. I. to investigate it."

Senator TYDINGS said he had no objections to an F. B. I. "prowl." And in good time the F. B. I. returned a report saying: "There has never been a dollar of public money spent on the property of Senator TYDINGS."

By this time the district attorney was "already to proceed." But, said the "D. A.," he had a letter from Attorney General Jackson ordering him, in effect, to dismiss the case, although the Senator had not yet had even an opportunity of appearing before a grand jury.

Jackson is reported by Senator TYDINGS as having then informed him:

"Yes; it is true you were charged with using public funds on your private estate. Yes; it is true that after Colonel Harrington, the head of the W. P. A., said that was a lie, Mr. Allen showed his malice by giving Colonel Harrington a call-down for telling the truth. Yes; it is true that I then had the F. B. I. investigate this matter, Senator, and your connection with your own property, and they exonerated you. Yes; that is all true, and it is likewise true there is a statute, which you have cited, pertaining to libel, and this case is libel; but, just the same, I have ordered the district attorney not to prosecute it."

Jackson declared that "no important question of policy" was involved.

On a most flimsy, unconvincing pretext the Attorney General, on his own responsibility, prevented action by the Government in a case involving charges of serious libel.

In the face of findings by W. P. A. authorities and by his own F. B. I., the Attorney General sent down a letter saying, "Do not prosecute this case."

So Senator TYDINGS asked his colleagues: "Is there one Senator, just one, on the floor of the Senate, who will say that Robert Jackson acted with the dignity that becomes the great office of the Attorney General of the United States? I do not hear any Senator reply to that question."

But very shortly afterward he watched the Senate grant its approval to the elevation of this same Mr. Jackson to the lofty eminence of a place on the bench of the United States Supreme Court.

But even so, the courageous and conscientious gentleman from Maryland remained, not surprisingly, convinced that in his handling of the Pearson and Allen affair Robert E. Jackson had shown that he "has not the character, has not the judicial temperament to fit him to sit on the highest court in the world."

Electric Rate Reductions in Southwest Washington

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the constituency which I have the honor to represent in Congress is rapidly becoming one of the most public-power-minded constituencies in the United States. Starting in 1933, I have actively participated in the fight which we have carried forward successfully to bring low-cost electricity to the citizens residing in the urban and rural communities of southwest Washington. Our development of the Bonneville hydroelectric project on the Columbia River has been an important factor in the progress which we have made.

When I came to Congress in 1933 we did not have a single P. U. D. district in my entire congressional district. After meeting with several defeats and setbacks, we now have P. U. D. districts functioning successfully in every one of the nine counties of my district and we have R. E. A. projects in five counties. We are hooked up with Bonneville in six of my nine counties and in the very near future we will be using Bonneville power in every one of the nine counties.

In addition to the establishment of numerous new industries and pay rolls as a result of this public-power development, we have obtained electric-rate reductions which cause savings to our people of more than $624,374 annually. It is with genuine pleasure and some degree of pride that I insert in the RECORD at this point the statement showing these savings to the citizens of my district.

The statement is as follows:

Estimated annual electric rate reductions, southwest Washington counties, Jan. 1, 1939, to May 1, 1941

County and companies	1938	1939	1940	1941 (first 4 months)
Clark:				
Northwestern Electric Co		$37,000	$26,919	
Portland General Electric			26,812	
Western Light & Power Co			200	
Total		37,000	53,931	
Cowlitz:				
Puget Sound Power & Light Co		3,600	4,600	
Northwestern Electric Co		2,500		
Washington Gas & Electric Co		2,750	38,352	
Public utility district			21,200	
Total		8,850	64,152	

Estimated annual electric rate reductions, southwest Washington counties, Jan. 1, 1939, to May 1, 1941—Continued

County and companies	1938	1939	1940	1941 (first 4 months)
Grays Harbor:				
Puget Sound Power & Light Co		$4,200	$5,200	
Twin Harbors Electric Co	$1,500	2,000		
Public-utility district			150,367	$70,000
Total	1,500	6,200	155,567	70,000
Lewis:				
Puget Sound Power & Light Co		8,600	10,500	
Washington Gas & Electric	600		3,180	
Packwood Electric	600		600	
Centralia Municipal		18,000		
Public-utility district				5,497
Total	1,200	26,600	14,280	5,497
Mason:				
West Coast Power	600	10,277	13,717	
Puget Sound Power & Light Co		12,000	15,200	
Public-utility district (no figures available)				
Total	600	22,277	28,917	
Pacific:				
Puget Sound Power & Light Co		330	400	
West Coast Power		1,519		
Public utility district			51,521	
Total		1,849	51,921	
Skamania:				
West Coast Power	3,200	1,875		
Northwestern Electric		500		
Public-utility district			2,707	
Total	3,300	2,375	2,707	
Thurston: Puget Sound Power & Light Co		26,300	33,100	
Wahkiakum:				
West Coast Power		2,651		
Public-utility district			4,000	
Total		2,651	4,000	
Aggregate	6,600	134,102	408,175	75,497

Recapitulation

1938 reductions	$6,600
1939 reductions	134,102
1940 reductions	408,175
1941, 4 months	75,497
Total	624,374

Planning for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

ARTICLE BY E. D. CANHAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very challenging article entitled "Down the Middle of the Road," by Erwin D. Canham. It calls to the attention of the reader the difference between planning and improvisation and following through. I think it is worthy of reading by all our citizens, so I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOWN THE MIDDLE OF THE ROAD: WISHES AREN'T HORSES, AND STILL LESS TANKS

(By Erwin D. Canham)

As an old Washington correspondent, perhaps this writer may be permitted to give readers a word of caution. It is important, in reading news of the Roosevelt administration, not to confuse the hope or the plan with the deed or result. This was a mistake we tended to make during all the early years of the New Deal. It is a mistake that is being made during the defense effort.

It was the reporter's job, during the early New Deal years, to give an objective picture of what the administration announced it was about to do. Such news occupied the "honeymoon" period. If some of us doubted whether the fine plans would all come to fruition, it was not exactly our job to raise the question until various experiments had had a fair trial. This produced for some time an unduly favorable press for the administration. Passing of this period led to the President's later break with the press.

And perhaps one who reported Roosevelt news in the White House for 7 years may also record his impression that President Roosevelt himself tends to confuse his hope or plan with an ultimate achievement. That is the great flaw in his statecraft. It is the glaring error in his administrative ability. Mr. Roosevelt is a great planner and improviser. He is not a great follower-through.

FAMILIAR SOUND

For a year now, just as in early New Deal days, we have been hearing of great plans and projects. It has been an exciting time, just as it was back in 1933–34. And we have all tended to confuse the blueprint with the dwelling house. The very latest dispatches from Washington must be scrutinized with this vital distinction in mind.

Now we are beginning to wake up. The report this week of the House Military Affairs Committee is a dash of cold water to our hope-bleared eyes. The time has come when we can ask, "How are the plans working out?" The committee report answers, "Very badly, indeed." And now that we have awakened, real and speedy action must follow.

But once again we must beware that just another set of glittering plans isn't substituted for those which have gone awry. That used to be the way of it with New Deal plans that didn't work. Failures were speedily blanketed beneath plans of such grandiose scope that nobody had breath left to criticize. Little plans that didn't work out became, often, big plans that didn't work out either.

Some, perhaps many, of the New Deal projects were carried through to successful completion. But the failures were often as stupendous as the successes. And none of us, not even the administration officials, for their own protection or the opposition for its political benefit, ever adequately checked up on things.

SAND UPON SAND

Today almost precisely the same thing is happening. The defense effort began with a faulty organization. Instead of the faults being rectified, as the House committee points out, new and more complicated boards and agencies and liaison officers were brought into being until confusion was a good deal worse.

There is at this moment a vigorous national demand for reorganization of the defense set-up. The Washington dispatches, just as they did in the old days, are beginning to record that changes are "in the making." But it will require a positive mobilization of public opinion to force President Roosevelt to go to the root of the evil with his changes. As of old, the tendency will be to patch things up and to assume that just because everybody means well, and the objectives are right, that they are thereby automatically attained.

In short, we need—if democracy is to be saved—more delegation of authority by President Roosevelt, who for 8 years has palpably held altogether too many reins in his own hands for sound administration. Friends of the President have quoted him as saying that history's harshest verdict on him will be that he was an exceedingly bad administrator. If he isn't careful, the verdict will be a great deal harsher than that. It will not be pleasant to be the man who saw what should be done and then deliberately refused to do it. Wishes are not horses, not in war times they aren't, and good intentions pave the very worst of roads.

The Congressional Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

TRIP THROUGH AN AIRPLANE FACTORY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, a trip through a large airplane plant is revealing. It reveals how completely the imperatives of war and defense can dominate the life scheme of a vast industry. First, one encounters brilliant young executives wrestling with problems of securing the necessary materials and coordinating a huge industrial process for

the production of instruments designed to kill. Next, one encounters a host of young engineers skilled in the science of flight, who sweat their agile brains to secure constant improvement in winged machines to be used for destruction. Next one encounters a huge throng of trained production supervisors fussing and stewing over each little difficulty which delays the production of these engines of destruction for a single moment. Finally, one encounters thousands upon thousands of able and alert young mechanics and assemblymen who doggedly scan blueprints and, piece by piece, give form and life to these mechanical birds that shall fly through the air with messages of death. Here in a single industrial plant one finds a far-flung combination of the best executive, engineering, and mechanical skill in the world joined with an endless array of the most delicate and precise machines ever devised by human brain to produce slim, trim, speedy, and effective death birds. Suppose this vast aggregate of brain power and skill could be applied to the science of flight for peaceful rather than destructive purposes? What amazing progress we would then see in the field of air transportation.

FAITH AND INTEGRITY

Military experts come forward with a request that Congress change the provisions of the Draft Act so that the inductees might be kept longer than a year. Two reasons are assigned. The first is that the situation demands that they be retained. The second is that they first begin to take on real value as soldiers after the first year of training. Nobody quarrels with this reasoning. But other profound and important facts cannot be ignored. During the first week of September 1940 when the Draft Act was under debate in Congress, its enactment was quite doubtful. There were hours and hours of debate. Time after time it was emphasized that the service would only be for 1 year. Time after time it was pointed out that 1 year would not materially disrupt the life of a college student, a young professional man, a young man preparing to marry or other groups that would be affected by the draft. This time limit of 1 year proved genuinely persuasive in securing passage of the act. To extend that time now that thousands are in the service seems like a breach of faith not only with the young men but as between the prime movers for the draft and those Members of the National Legislature who voted for its adoption because it was only for a year. Can anything better destroy the usefulness and morale of a soldier than to diminish his faith in the integrity of the Government which he is expected to defend?

DAKAR IS EVEN CLOSER

This significant phrase appears in the President's message on the occupation of Iceland by the Navy. He said the United States cannot permit the occupation "of strategic outposts in the Atlantic to be used as air or naval bases for eventual attack against the Western Hemisphere." Iceland, on the twenty-third meridian of west longitude, is 2,600 miles from New York. Dakar, on the seventeenth meridian of west longitude, is 1,600 miles from Brazil. Logic dictates that the Commander in Chief may next undertake the occupation of Dakar in the light of his Icelandic message.

PRIVATE AID TO FOREIGN LANDS

Between September 6, 1939, and May 31, 1941, 338 organizations have reported to the State Department as provided by law their activities in soliciting and disbursing relief to belligerent countries. One organization, known as the Union for the Protection of the Human Person, collected nothing and expended nothing. In terms of results, the most effective group was the Greek War Relief Association, which collected nearly $5,000,000 and expended only 5 percent of that amount in administrative publicity and campaign costs Total amount collected by all organizations was $36,716,273.50, of which $3,701,882.30 was disbursed for collection and publicity expenses.

BLONDES FOR DEFENSE

Weather is enemy No. 1 for aviation. This is true of military as well as civil aviation. Hence plane pilots must be constantly advised of weather conditions. Weather is observed and charted by the United States Weather Bureau and then transmitted by teletype to all sections of the land. The devices used in determining certain basic weather conditions are extremely delicate. Some of them are so devised as to determine certain conditions such as humidity by the contraction of a hair. Oddly enough, it must be a blonde hair. Brunette hair will not serve the purpose. When the need arose recently for blonde hair, Uncle Sam advertised for it. There was a deluge of telephone calls from blondes to the War Department offering their silvery, silken tresses for defense. But shucks! It requires hair at least 22 inches long and most of the patriotic blondes had bobbed hair. Such are the worries of defense.

What C. C. C. Taught Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

ARTICLE BY JAMES W. DANNER

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously given by the House, I offer for the RECORD a very interesting article by James W. Danner, entitled "What C. C. C. Taught Me," published in the July number of the Rotarian magazine. The Rotarian, I might say parenthetically, is edited by a distinguished and beloved brother of mine, Leland D. Case. The article follows:

[From the Rotarian of July 1941]

WHAT C. C. C. TAUGHT ME

(By James W. Danner)

I joined the C. C. C.[1] a year after leaving high school because I was broke, out of a job, and only partly recovered from a nervous break-down. The C. C. C., I hoped, would provide what the doctor had prescribed—freedom from worry, regular hours, an outdoor life. It offered not only a fighting chance for health, but it also paid $30 a month, $25 of which would go to the support of my sister and widowed mother.

Narrowly I passed the physical examination, and Company 595, of Euclid, Ohio, had another scrawny recruit.

There was more than a trace of similarity between an army and a C. C. C. camp: Trim brown barracks set in a quadrangle; husky, jostling, bronzed-faced boys in dungarees and khaki; Hooks, the supply sergeant, grinning as he handed me pants big enough to wrap twice around. "Got only two sizes," he chuckled, "too big and too small, but you'll grow into 'em."

Staggering under a mountain of bedding and other duffle, I was led into Furper's dugout, my new home, a long, cheerful frame building with cots strung in a double row the length of the barracks. Time to fix my bed and then a whistle blew for lunch.

Aluminum mess kits and cups in hand, we filed into the mess hall, and heaps of steaming food were shoveled on as we passed the counter. I scarcely touched mine as I watched the boys stow the grub away. I had never seen fellows eat like this, seconds, thirds, fourths.

Filing out of the hall, we washed our mess kits in cans of boiling water. Scratched deep in the bottom of my kit was the inscription: "Beans—Chateau-Thierry, 1918."

At 12:30 the whistle blew again, and the men lined up for work. I was assigned to the wall-building crew, and a truck carried us out to the work detail, a wild ravine in the State park. Toughest crew in camp, the wall-building gang, I discovered, and I was the scrawniest recruit of the entire outfit. Yet every rookie must be initiated—and promptly. Back in the barracks the second night I climbed into bed hastily. But I didn't stop there. I lit on the floor with a thud. The "cruds" had removed the springs.

The first weeks on work detail remain to me still a black void of aching muscles and the sheer misery of exhaustion. The foreman beckoned, "Guess we'll set you to strumming an Irish banjo." There was a glint of humor in his eyes. I had no idea what an "Irish banjo" was, but it sounded easy. They handed me a shovel! A roar of laughter went up from the crew gathered around to watch—my first lesson in the Three-C "punk's" motto: "We can take it."

Many times during the next few weeks I had cause to think of that motto. Nights I was too tired to eat, and sometimes even to sleep. I could barely drag myself the 100 yards from work truck to bed. But even then there was little peace. Then, suddenly, the first bitterness of toil had lessened, and I began to notice the beauty of the forest, around, behind, above us; towering maples, oaks, and hemlocks, ghost-gray beeches. I began to see what it was that we were building, a great wall. Forty feet high from foundation it would be, and 200 feet long.

---

[1] The Civilian Conservation Corps, 8 years old last April, has 1,481 camps, has a total enrollment of about 275,000 boys and men, has graduated 2,500,000 with "a scholarship in work experience." It has built 45,000 bridges, 6,000,000 erosion check dams, planted 2,000,000,000 trees—and that is only a beginning of its record. It has cost $2,800,000,000 to date. It serves youths aged 17 to 23, though 10 percent of its enrollment may be war veterans.

Each stone must be laid with care if the wall were to hold the hill back and stand secure against freshets. When it was finished, a trail would be built atop the wall, and this wilderness would be opened for soul-thirsty city dwellers to drink in deep with their eyes. I felt for the first time since I had been plunged into the depression in 1933 a stirring of pride that I, humbly, was helping build something worth while. I began to catch the enthusiasm I'd sensed in the other boys.

But wall building was only one phase of our work. I learned to love the thwack of an ax biting deep, the fresh pungency of hemlock chips flying; learned to thrill to the cry of "timber" as a great tree crashed to the ground. I learned the rhythm of swinging a sledge and a pick, knew the salt taste of sweat on my brow.

However, not all the work was labor. Boys with aptitude and interest would be selected to learn such skills as carpentry, tree trimming, truck driving, auto mechanics, cooking, or office work. Many boys had already secured jobs outside on the basis of this experience.

But back in the barracks, evenings, life was pleasant and fascinating. On my left perhaps the Little Mope would be limbering up his mouth organ with She'll Be comin' 'Round the Mountain. Caught by the rhythm, Jughaid would stamp his feet; a guitar and a banjo would join in; "Rubinoff" would saw on his fiddle. Next a broomstick would pound on the floor, and then Stahoo would get out his washboard, and with thimbles on his fingers would whack out wicked rhythm. The music was irresistible; soon 30 or 40 boys would be gathered about the players, whistling and singing the whole collection of hillbilly songs.

Tiring of this I could watch Paul Queer and Kid Colossus wrestling roughhouse style, tumbling over bunks, barracks bags, and boxes.

Or I could observe Michelangelo, on the bunk to my right, penciling some promising woodland landscape. He was enrolled in an art course that met every Tuesday night in the recreation hall. He hoped to land a job in a commercial-art studio. Half the men in camp, I learned, were taking classes in such subjects as aeronautics, public speaking, typing, and shorthand.

Not that they were a bunch of bookworms—far from it. We had a topnotch baseball nine and also a bone-breaking football team, and usually 2 nights a week there would be boxing bouts in the recreation hall. They even conducted dancing classes for us and managed a shindig every second week, a full and absorbing program—provided you weren't a rookie. Most of the time I was too busy being razzed or initiated or made the butt of a joke. Fifteen hours a day of it.

Not an easy task at best being a new recruit, but it was made worse for me because of a painful feeling of physical inferiority. They were such a husky lot of bruisers. I hadn't half the strength of the weakest "punk." But I determined then that I would show them yet. Health and strength; that was my one aim.

I began a series of heroic exercises, publicly, sucker that I was. This was the opportunity the fellows had been waiting for, it seemed. Like hyenas they howled gleefully and gathered around to watch. "Step right up, ladeez and gentlemen," bawled "Paul Queer." "See the seventh wonder of the world, the 97-pound weakling who became the world's most perfectly developed man."

That's how I was christened the "97-pound weakling," the name that was to be dinned into my ears every waking moment of the day for months. And from that time on, at least 100 times a day someone would insist on feeling my "magnificent muscle" which was somewhat the size and consistency of a disrobed oyster. After a week of this, I sneaked out of the barracks after dark to take my exercises. Half a mile from camp, in a hollow log, I cached a collection of old iron weights. Three nights a week, through rain or snow, I stuck to my exercises. Razz me! I would show them yet.

But there was one bright spot in being a rookie—you didn't stay one forever. Three months, and a new enrollment of recruits came in. I was now a "vet." Sweet recompense after an eternity of hazing.

It was a sorry-looking collection of rookies, lifeless, thin, rat-faced products of pool halls and street-corner gangs from the big steel towns and worked-out mining-town slums. Each new group was the same at first. Contrasted with the "vets," they looked almost like an entirely different race of men. Yet almost magically their chests deepened, shoulders broadened and became erect, and the pale listlessness gave place to vital rugged vigor. Most men gained from 10 to 25 pounds within 6 months; some even as much as 40 pounds in a year—not hard to understand when you saw them at chow time. The food was good and there was plenty of it, steaming hot, the "sort of stuff that sticks to your ribs." No wonder we went back for more.

The change in the rookies was as much in character as in physique. Here there was a place for them. They had a job to do now. It taught them cooperation, responsibility. And living together taught them generosity almost to a fault, to share and share alike.

Few "punks" had a complete outfit of civilian clothes, but if a fellow had a heavy date, he would make the rounds of the camp, borrowing a natty gray drape-model suit here, tan polo coat there, then a "knobby" fedora and a flashy yellow tie—all the trimmings. It was like having 200 brothers whose clothes you might borrow any time for the asking.

Some brilliant camp financier even partly solved the money problem by the phenomenal discovery that by making the rounds of the barracks collecting "odd" pennies, a dollar or two could be scraped together. Many an impoverished "furper" was thus aided on the road to romance.

Appearance makes the man. But no less a part in the rebuilding of our morale grew from the public's dependence upon us. Brush fire or timber blaze, they called the C. C. C. In a blinding rain one night 30 of us piled out of bed and swarmed up the valley to rescue two girls whose car had slipped halfway over a cliff. No tow truck needed. We picked the car up and carried it back to the road. C. C. C. boys had proved their resourcefulness. "Lucky" even salvaged two phone numbers!

By this time the nip of frost was in the air. Wild geese wee-ing south preclaimed Winter not far off. Soon the first big snow and the roads closed to trucks. A three-mile hike to work in the mornings, the heady exhiliration of clear forest air, singing, shouting, marching along, diving, or getting shoved into snowdrifts, snowball fights. Once we surprised three deer in a clump of hemlocks.

Work, and the frozen earth flying like stone chips at the impact of pickax. Hard labor? We made play of it. Turnabout at warming aching hands at a blazing log fire. Nights hovered around full-bellied red-hot iron stoves, "bull" sessions, feats of strength. Mornings, up like a shot at the first whistle, slipping into trousers and shoes white with frost, then a dash across the quadrangle for a breakfast of flapjacks, bacon, and eggs, washed down by scalding coffee.

Slowly the wall grew, and slowly strength and health imperceptibly flowed back into my body. Six months had passed; I had gained 25 pounds, and I had already exchanged my first G. I. for a bigger size of clothes. But so far as my buddies were concerned, I still hadn't outgrown the ignominous title of the "97-pound weakling."

The wall was nearing completion. Only the coping stones to lay. Two punks were struggling to overturn one of the foot-thick slabs. I turned to give them a hand, but just then they stepped away leaving me with the entire weight. I strained—lift or have my foot crushed—heave. Miraculously the rock flopped over. The two punks stood openmouthed and so did I. From then on I was called Bruiser.

Three more months and I was promoted to the job of assistant leader—$6 more a month and new responsibilities, a crew of 15 to 60 men to handle. New problems to solve, resentment of older enrollees to overcome. Especially in the case of Monk, the bully of our crew, a sort of ex-officio straw boss by right of sucker-punch knockouts of rookies. From the start he had challenged my promotion with half-aside threats of "knocking my teeth down my throat." The fellows were beginning to talk about it, and when the crew started having doubts about a rated man's guts, you just didn't stay boss much longer. Monk had 30 pounds' weight advantage and 4 inches in height. If I lost, I might as well turn in my stripes.

The issue came a few days later in chow line. The "Old Man" had just ordered crowding ahead stopped, and he had stationed me to enforce the order. No sooner had he gone than "Monk" elbowed his way up to the front.

"Make any report of this and I'll smash your face in," he snarled.

Fight—or don't show my face in camp again. It was now or never! I stepped out of line, fists clenched. Another second, then that hamlike fist would connect and I would be struggling up from the ground. But, oddly, nothing happened. The bully's face had blanched and his loose lips had a queasy look. He was a bluff. His colors were bright canary-yellow and a yard wide.

At last spring came, first the grinding and cracking of the ice and the roaring as it went down the creek, wild geese winging north again, squirrels gnawing at maple branches to drink the sugary sap, the redolent smell of skunk cabbage, carpets of hepaticas and spring beauty. Then the bursting of buds.

Mud, working ankle deep in it, stripped to the waist. The good, warm feel of sun on the skin. Trees to transplant and trails to build.

Summer came on with a rush. Bronzed bodies sweating in the bright rays, swims in the river, the good coolness after toil. In July, "One Punch" and I were selected to go to Fort Knox, Ky., for a lifesaving course. A week's vacation training and back we came to serve as camp lifeguards. None of our buddies would drown if we could help it.

We turned the pages of the calendar, and another summer was approaching; I was well and strong, and I must leave. Waving regretfully "So long" to my buddies, I turned my back on the camp that had given me back * * * life. C. C. C. experience had gained me a lifeguard job at a beach for the summer, and then I'd gamble my newfound health against a college education.

I am now a graduate student at a large State university, and I feel that I learned more of value in a year and a half in the C. C. C. than I have in an equal period of college. I had enlisted a half-sick, discouraged kid, and I left a man, confident, rugged in health and strength.

If I ever have a son, I should like him to spend a year in the Civilian Conservation Corps. I should want him to enter it to learn how to live, to build rugged health, to get seasoning and assurance, before he enters the business world or college life.

But will the C. C. C. last that long? I do not pretend to know—nor, perhaps, does anyone else. Depending, as it does, upon annual congressional appropriation, the corps has no guaranty of long life. What effect the huge Army training plan will have on the

C. C. C. is still another question. Much as it has been discussed in the press, the answer to it also appears uncertain.

But of this I am sure: Anything that lifts a boy out of the dumps of youthful despair and sets him up rugged in health, trained of hand, and charged with a zeal to count—as C. C. C. does—won't suddenly dry up and blow away, leaving no trace. Its roots are too deep in democracy.

GLOSSARY OF C. C. C. SLANG

(NOTE.—Much of C. C. C. slang has been adopted from the Army; a large portion, however, is due to C. C. C. inventiveness. While differing from camp to camp somewhat, the slang of the various camps is similar in flavor. (THE AUTHOR).)

Bleached worms: Spaghetti or macaroni.
Chow: A meal.
C. O.: Commanding officer of camp.
C. Q.: Charge of quarters; fellow posted to watch camp headquarters.
Crud: Slovenly, dirty fellow.
Crumb: Same as above.
Dishwater: Coffee.
Dog-robber: Fellow who tidies up officer's living quarters.
Double scrub: Mythical malady supposedly attacking cruds and rookies.
Fisheyes: Tapioca pudding.
Furper: A sheik or ladies' man.
To furp (something) up: To search for and procure (as firewood).
To go furping: To go out on a date.
Goldbricker: A loafer.
Go-to-hell drawers: Knee-length underwear shorts of 1918 vintage.
G. I.: Government-issued equipment.
John L's: Trunks of long winter underwear.
Kitchen furp: Cook's helper.
K. P.: Same as above.
Mess: A meal.
Monkey jacket: Summer khaki uniform coat.
O. D.: Olive drab; khaki.
Punk: Any C. C. C. boy, excepting "rated" leaders.
Rat: A talebearer.
Rated man: Enrollee in official leadership position.
Rookie: A recruit.
Skag: A homely girl.
Trail furper: Nonexistent object for which rookies are dispatched on wild-goose chases.
The old man: The company commander.

The Actual Facts Concerning the Part Played by Silver in Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

ARTICLES FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the operation of our mining industry is so vital to our national defense and the production of strategic metals is such a controlling factor in the manufacture of war munitions that every energy of our Government is being directed in assisting the mining industry to meet the heavy demands that are being placed upon it.

In this tense situation it is disheartening to find that the great and influential New York Times has accepted and given credence to a story by a thoughtless and uninformed writer as to the facts and actual situation concerning the effect of the administration's silver-purchase program on the mining industry. For the information of my colleagues there is inserted in the RECORD the article that appeared on the front page of the July 13 issue of the New York Times and my reply thereto printed in the July 15 issue of this paper, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 13, 1941]

SILVER BUYING LAW HANDICAPS DEFENSE, SAY O. P. M. EXPERTS—ECONOMISTS ATTACK POLICY OF SUBSIDIZING AN INDUSTRY COMPETING WITH ARMAMENT—DIVERTING MEN, MATERIAL—USE OF TREASURY'S HOARD AS SUBSTITUTE FOR OTHER METALS IS URGED BY SCIENTISTS

(By John H. Crider)

WASHINGTON, July 12.—The defense emergency has injected so many new considerations into the silver situation that there appears to be brewing under cover one of the most imposing attacks on the silver-purchase policy since the Treasury, under a 1934 mandate from Congress, began to buy silver from all comers at artificially high prices.

Experts in the Office of Production Management, Government economists, and far-sighted officials of the American silver industry are asking these questions:

1. Why should the Government continue to finance a domestic silver industry which competes with defense industries for labor, materials, and equipment?

2. Why is this not the time to substitute commercial demand for Treasury support as the economic justification for silver production?

3. Is there any way that the Treasury's hoard of about 42,000 tons of silver bullion (nonmonetized) could be introduced into the defense effort as a substitute for copper and other materials of which there is a dire shortage?

EFFORT FOR NEW USES URGED

Lawrence Addicks, of Bel Air, Md., a consulting engineer who played a major part in recent efforts of the domestic silver industry to develop new commercial uses of silver in anticipation of the time when the public will no longer tolerate its support by Government subsidy, was asked today what he thought of the present crisis in strategic material supply in connection with silver.

"Now is really the time to make hay while the sun shines," he replied. "There are many places where silver can be used in industrial processes as substitutes for metals not now obtainable."

Mr. Addicks was the editor of a book, Silver in Industry, published last year, which records results obtained in the last few years as a result of the American Silver Producers Research Project at the National Bureau of Standards. That research project, which involved considerable cost in providing research fellowship between 1934 and 1940 for a group of scientists searching for new industrial uses of silver, is regarded as the best evidence that enlightened silver producers are themselves interested in making silver "stand on its own legs" commercially, and remove it from its historical classification as a precious metal.

Sponsors of this project were the American Metal Co., Ltd., American Smelting & Refining Co., Anaconda Copper Mining Co., Bunker Hill & Sullivan Mining & Concentrating Co., Cerro de Pasco Copper Corporation, Handy & Harman, International Nickel Co., Ltd., of Canada, Newmont Mining Co., Phelps Dodge Corporation, and United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co.

Quotations from the scientific writers in Mr. Addicks' book will suffice to demonstrate some possibilities of silver in the defense effort:

A. J. Dornblatt: "Magnesium alloys containing about 5 percent of silver, plus a moderate percentage of other elements, are being tried in this country. It appears likely that an important use of silver will result from the application of the ultra-light magnesium alloys in the aviation field."

Lyall Zickrick: "Silver is probably the most widely used precious metal for electrical contacts. It has the lowest electrical resistivity of any metal and is superior to all others as a conductor of heat, two extremely important factors in the making and breaking of electric circuits. * * * Copper is the most commonly used metal for carrying current, and copper contacts are used extensively in heavy-current apparatus. Copper, however, oxidizes rapidly, and the oxide has a very high resistance. * * * Although the superiority of silver contacts over copper contacts cannot be stated in definite figures, it may be safely estimated that silver contacts can usually be expected to give satisfactory service for a longer time than copper."

MOST OF METAL PUT IN HOARD

While industrial uses of silver have expanded considerably in recent years, principally in the electrical, chemical, and metallurgical fields, it is estimated on the basis of temporary figures that only about 10 percent of the silver imported into the United States last year went into industrial uses, the remainder having been stacked in the Treasury's hoards, primarily in the new vaults at West Point, N. Y.

A metallurgical expert in the O. P. M. said today he felt there was no possible justification, economical or moral, for the continued subsidizing of silver production by the Government—he had special reference to silver produced for its own sake rather than as a by-product. It is one of the things, such as building of libraries, not needed in the defense program, which could well be postponed until after the emergency, when all manner of artificial measures may become necessary to take up the slack in productive effort, this expert declared.

WASTEFUL USE DECRIED

He called it wasteful use of the Nation's resources to keep men and materials engaged in silver production when they were needed elsewhere in the defense effort.

The O. P. M. is especially concerned with the increasingly acute shortage of copper and has called a meeting for next Thursday to discuss possible expansion of copper output with the producers of this metal. The O. P. M. estimates that there will be a copper shortage this year of 350,000 tons for military and curtailed civilian purposes, which may be increased if shipping difficulties develop between the United States and Chile, where an extra supply is contracted for.

With an additional 75,000 tons of annual refined copper output expected soon from the new Phelps Dodge facilities at the Morenci ore body, the total supply of copper, including all that could be had from Latin America, is estimated at about 1,755,000 tons per year. With increased brass-mill capacity functioning next year, it is anticipated that the military demand for copper alone will be something like 1,420,000 tons in 1942. This increasingly acute copper shortage gives timely significance to the electrical uses of

silver, as described above by Mr. Zickrick, a research scientist with the General Electric Co., in Schenectady, N. Y.

Even with elimination of the tremendous price differential between copper and silver—copper sells for about 12 cents a pound against 35 cents an ounce for silver—the quantities of silver available are so small, in proportion to the demand for copper, that the whole Treasury silver stock, monetized and nonmonetized, estimated at around 88,800 tons, would hardly constitute a fraction of the plug required to fill the hole.

REPLACEMENT IN SOLDER FAVORED

With the price differential between copper and silver being what it now is, there could be little economic justification for wholesale use of silver as a copper substitute, but monetary experts take the view that if there is still a critical copper shortage after all United States civilian uses of copper have been halted, the price factor would become unimportant in the face of pressing defense needs. There are some who feel that such a situation is not beyond the realm of possibility.

The O. P. M. announced only on Thursday that a committee of the National Academy of Sciences had recommended substitution of silver for tin in solder. The committee recommended that large-scale replacement of tin in solder plus the reduction in tin use already being made by users at the request of O. P. M. would reduce total tin consumption about 25 percent.

It is estimated that 66,000,000 ounces of silver annually should be sufficient for all-out replacement of tin in solder. About 40 to 50 pounds of tin would be replaced by 2½ to 5 pounds of silver, with a resultant raw material cost no greater than for tin.

Under the Treasury's silver-buying policy commercial users of silver in this country must buy foreign silver at the 35-cents-per-ounce price maintained by the Treasury in the New York market, since the price of newly mined domestic silver, fixed by statute at 71.11 cents per ounce, forces all new domestic production into the Treasury board. The Treasury can vary its foreign buying price, but it has stayed at about 35 cents an ounce since 1939, with some slight variations.

Monetary experts saw no reason why Secretary Morgenthau could not sell the approximately 42,000 tons of nonmonetized silver at the purchase price, or as some thought, sell it at any price if such a sale was clearly in the public interest.

ARGUMENT OF SILVER GROUP

The Silver Purchase Act of 1934 was regarded as a sop to western mining interests which the administration wanted to line up for national solidarity in the economic emergency existing at that time. In 1939 the "silver bloc" in Congress was successful in taking the domestic price out of the President's hands and fixing it by statute at 71.11 cents per ounce.

One of the favorite arguments of the silver forces has been that artificial silver prices were justified as a means of keeping miners employed in the Western States. The high prices justified the working of "high cost" mines. But this argument has become fairly shopworn by now, especially in view of the present pressure for labor and materials, and it is clear to most economists that unnecessary silver production and silver purchasing becomes an increasingly dangerous source of credit inflation as the national economy approaches full utilization of resources. It is felt that if an adequate commercial demand could be created for silver at politically feasible prices, this might make possible a basis for legislation taking the Treasury out of the silver market.

The argument is frequently made that a high price of silver makes possible lower prices for copper, zinc, lead, and other metals with which it is combined in nature, but Mr. Addicks writes that "there are relatively few complex deposits which depend solely on the price of silver for their operation," and that, in general, "silver production is much more dependent upon the price of lead, copper, and zinc than vice versa." He estimated that one-third of the silver now produced may be considered as of primary origin, and two-thirds as a byproduct.

[From the New York Times of July 15, 1941]

MARKET FOR SILVER LINKED TO DEFENSE—REPRESENTATIVE WHITE, OF IDAHO, WARNS ON ANY ACTION THAT WOULD CLOSE MINES—PRAISES FEDERAL POLICY—CONTRARY TO VIEW OF SO-CALLED EXPERTS, UNITED STATES PROFITS BY PURCHASES, HE ASSERTS

Any move to cut off the national market for silver at this time would force many copper, zinc, and lead mines in this country to close and further cripple our defense industries, Representative COMPTON R. WHITE, of Idaho, member of the House Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures, said in a statement issued here yesterday.

Mr. White declared the controlling factors in our national-defense program were the cost of production in mining strategic war metals and the Government's profit in its silver-purchase program. He said there were virtually no "exclusive producing" silver mines, and that in this country or anywhere else silver was a by-product of copper, zinc, and lead mines and the profit received for the by-product went a long way in meeting the cost of the production of strategic metals, copper, lead, and zinc.

WARNS ON CUTTING OFF MARKET

He said that at a time when the Government was arbitrarily holding the price of the strategic metals down and combing the Western Hemisphere for lead and zinc, to cut off the silver market now would surely cripple defense.

"Contrary to repeated allegations of the so-called financial experts, the Government is making big profits on its silver-purchase program," Mr. White said. "Domestic silver is bought at the fixed price of 71.11 cents per ounce and immediately put into circulation as money in the form of silver certificate $1, $5, and $10 bills at $1.29 an ounce up to the cost of the silver. The volume of this silver money in circulation has almost reached $2,000,000,000.

"In addition to the silver money in circulation put out by the Government in paying its running expenses, and eagerly accepted everywhere in handling the Nation's business, there is on hand in the United States Treasury over a billion, three hundred thousand ounces of silver that didn't cost the Government anything, representing the difference between the silver taken in and the silver put out as money under the silver-purchase program, which surely represents a profitable transaction for the Government, and in time of national instability and uncertainty is a great bulwark to our national credit.

"Our silver-holding policy proved a Godsend to the British Empire in the emergency of the last war when England had to find a large supply of silver quickly to save her tottering credit in India.

"It was the forehandedness of Uncle Sam in piling up silver in his vaults that put 200,000,000 ounces of the precious metal in the hands of England to save her credit and commerce in the Orient, and the struggling dominions may again rise up to bless Uncle Sam and his silver-purchase program."

Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker—

Concentration of power has been shown to be dangerous in a democracy even though that power may be used beneficially.

These words of Justice Brandeis are significant today as world conditions offer the temptation to the President to assume world leadership.

Once again Mr. Roosevelt has made a sensational move on the complicated and confused international checkerboard. The startling disclosure to the Congress, after it had taken place, of the occupation of Iceland by the armed forces of the United States revived the issue of the assumption of power by the Executive. If the strategic value of such actions, as determined by the President and his Army and Navy advisers, is to be the only necessary warrant for the movement of troops into war zones, then the power of the Congress to declare war becomes a meaningless phrase and its exercise a perfunctory gesture.

A most casual consideration of the incident discloses the possible serious consequences of the step which has been taken. It involves fundamental questions. Its worth depends upon the ultimate purposes of the American people. Whether those purposes should be left solely to the determination of the President is a grave question. That question can be answered in only one way by those whose convictions as to the soundness of constitutional government are deep rooted and whose faith in the processes of self-government has withstood the assault of totalitarian attacks.

The desire of the President to exercise extraordinary authority, despite constitutional limitations, manifested itself from the beginning of his administration. Long before the development of the European crisis, his attitude toward the limitations imposed by the fundamental law of the land on the Executive had been made plain. Brushing aside as inconsequential, established barriers, the President insisted that legislation be enacted which delegated complete control to him over the economic life of the Nation. The effort failed to receive the approval of a single Justice of the Supreme Court. The President left no doubt in the minds of the people that he resented the restraints long recognized as limitations on the possible abuse of power. He chafed under the constructions of the Court, which curtailed the authority that he sought in order to deal with domestic problems. To reconcile

himself to the existence of three coordinated branches of government seemed difficult if not impossible.

Under these circumstances, it is but natural that the larger opportunities afforded by the international situation would be tempting to one whose natural bent disdains custom and tradition. The crusade for the four freedoms "everywhere in the world," hopeless and illusory as it may appear to most practical men, can be a compelling inducement to some idealists to disregard the limitations which have been wisely imposed on the concentration of power.

The warning of Justice Brandeis should be restudied as new temptations threaten.

The Country Editor Speaks

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, all over America the country editor has become an institution. Nowhere else in the wide world do we find weekly papers such as we have in the United States of America. Their editorials speak for the thousands of rural people in this Nation. What our people are thinking in the very heart of our country is clearly expressed by the weekly press throughout the country. These editorials taken from current issues indicate the trend of thought in America today:

[From the Keene Valley Sun, Keenesburg, Colo., June 26, 1941]

(G. C. Lewis, business manager; Mrs. G. C. Lewis, local editor)

Butcher Hitler and old Joe Stalin have a bulldog grip on each other's throat and are slaughtering off women and children at a terrific rate. Any self-respecting bulldog would stick his tail between his legs and slink down an alley before associating with either of these bloodthirsty brutes.

[From the Erie (Colo.) Herald, Friday, July 11, 1941]

(R. W. Hays, publisher and owner)

This problem of United States neutrality is getting thicker and blacker to me. First it was bundles for France, then bundles for Finland and bundles for England, and now its bundles for Russia. Apparently this Russion affair hasn't ruffled Roosevelt and Hull, but for some of the rest of us Americans it is hard to take.

President Roosevelt made a 5-minute speech July 4, suggesting that the American people rekindle the spirit of July 4, 1776, on this Independence Day. It is well that the citizenry didn't take the President at his word while so many British propagandists and members of the royal family are living within the shadows of the White House. Our ancestors in 1776 would have shot any one of them on sight.

Confusion among the superpatriots over accepting Comrade Stalin into the fold of democracy is still rampant. The big shots can forgive the "red" chief for banishing God and the Czar, but when he banished title deeds and mortgages on farm land and property, that was too much. Most Americans would want only one guess for the answer as to how that crimson economic and social attempt at equality will mix with present-day democracy.

A lot is being said and printed today about propagandists, spies, "fifth columnists," or what have you that favors those we are supposed to hate. Closing German consular and propaganda agencies and shipping Germans back to Europe is a step in the right direction, but only a small beginning. Rounding up the British propagandists and nobility and starting them home is the next logical step. Cleaning the United States of all hyphenated Americans is the necessary action to be taken if the United States is to be really free from foreign propaganda.

Compensation for John C. Garand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

LETTER OF LEONARD T. MANNING, OF NEW YORK CITY, IN SPRINGFIELD (MASS.) DAILY NEWS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 1941

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter written by Mr. Leonard T. Manning, of New York City, to the editor of the Springfield Daily News concerning my bill (H. R. 5276) to reward John C. Garand for his invention of the Garand semiautomatic rifle.

The letter is as follows:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News of July 16, 1941]

A friend of mine in Springfield sent me a clipping taken from your publication of July 10, referring to bill proposed by Congressman CHARLES R. CLASON, whereby the United States Government would pay John C. Garand, the inventor of the semiautomatic rifle bearing his name, the sum of $100,000 for his services to the Government.

I note that General Stewart, commanding officer of the Springfield armory, is in accord and stated the armory would be "appreciative of anything done for Mr. Garand," and that as a paid employee of the armory, Mr. Garand turned over all patents and inventions connected with the rifle to the Government as required of him.

General Stewart further stated that, "If the Government had to buy the patents from some outside source, it would cost a pretty penny."

It appears that the Government is once again very fortunate in having among its employees a man with the knowledge and ability to develop a rifle meeting the requirements and approval of the ordnance department and others concerned.

IDENTICAL REPETITION

This matter is an identical repetition of how the Government obtained the 1903 Springfield rifle, developed by my father, Daniel J. Manning, and John L. Murphy.

Both of these men were civilian employees of the Springfield armory and turned over to the Government the improved 1903 Springfield rifle as required of them. Thus, in this case also, the Government was relieved of any expense of obtaining the invention from outside sources.

The 1903 Springfield rifle was considered the best rifle in the world of its type, and was used by the Army since its inception in 1903, and is still being used.

My father, like Mr. Garand, was a civilian employee of the armory and was employed there for over 40 years.

He was retired in October 1926, after reaching the then age limit of 65, and died in May 1927.

GOT ONLY SMALL PENSION

All he got from the Government for his 40 years of service and giving the Government the improved 1903 Springfield rifle was a small pension from the date of his retirement in October 1926 to the time of his death in May 1927, a mere 8 months, the pension ceasing at the time of his death.

It is apparent that there is a change in ideas in matters of this kind and I wish to go on record as heartily in favor of paying Mr. Garand for the rifle which he turned over to the Government as required on account of his being a Government employee

I believe, Mr. Garand should be paid for two principal reasons; first, he is entitled to be paid, and, secondly, to encourage others in the Government employ to improve and make known their improvements, knowing that if they are adopted that they will be properly compensated.

After my father's retirement from Government service he worked to improve on the 1903 Springfield rifle and at the time of his death had completed the working model embracing numerous improvements.

All support possible should be given Congressman CLASON'S bill to insure its adoption.

I am not writing this letter in behalf of Mr. Garand but am merely expressing my thoughts and facts, being thoroughly familiar with a similar prior case where the inventor got nothing.

Extension of Military Service of Selectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. U. S. GUYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received from a constituent, Mrs. Ernest Browning, of Merriam, Kans.:

MERRIAM, KANS., *July 15, 1941.*

Hon. U. S. GUYER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GUYER: We are very much opposed to the idea of keeping the selectives in service for more than the year for which the boys were called to sign up for, and ask that you use your every influence against such a proposal and against sending the boys out of our country for service. We have our only son and only child in training in one of the camps, and hope the Government keeps its word in asking the 1 year

We sent our son through college at great sacrifice that he might be ably equipped in

a life's work, and he had secured permanent employment with chance of advancement in a big concern. The company did as suggested—that the boys be given leave for a year—and no one can expect a firm to hold a position for him indefinitely. He is our only stay in case of an emergency, and we pray that the Government will play fair with him as well as with all other sons who willingly submitted to the proposal of a year's training. Please use your influence to hold to the 1 year's training. I can't believe the emergency warranted it at all.

Thanks for all the good work you have done.

Yours truly,

MRS. ERNEST BROWNING.

Fortification of Western-World Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, of Alabama:

FORTIFICATION OF WESTERN-WORLD ISLANDS

The United States of America can't
  Permit occupation of neighboring isles
By Germany's forces; but there she should
  plant
  Her own naval bases, and win heaven's
  smiles,
And make sure the safety from overseas raids,
  And help give these islanders freedom from
  fear,
Till Germany's covetous, vicious hope fades,
  Of making invasions in this hemisphere.

These islanders' sovereignty must stay supreme—
  No transocean dictator must be allowed,
By conquest, to see his iniquitous dream
  Come true, lest America, humbled and
  cowed,
In helpless surrender, to Hitler should kneel,
  And wrap, in her anguish, the Stripes and
  the Stars
Around the great engineer of the New Deal,
  Defender of freedom, denouncer of wars.

The safety of neighboring islands we must
  At once, for our own sakes, securely defend—
In dictators' promises we dare not trust—
  For "mere scraps of paper" they prove in
  the end.
Americans feel that it's wiser, by far,
  To fortify these islands that are so near
Than, later, to fight these mad pirates of war
  When they start invasions in this hemisphere.

The United States, like a big brother, stands
  In readiness, should the occasion arise,
To render assistance to Western-World lands
  Whose freedom is threatened before their
  own eyes.
Protecting the nations of this hemisphere
  Should be of the greatest concern to them
  all—
They must stand together when dangers
  appear—
  United we stand, but divided we fall.
All Western-World islands, of right, ought to
  be,
  However important, or humble, they are,
American-owned, or else sov'reign and free;
  But should be immune to the horrors of
  war—
No Western-World nation, regardless of
  cause,
  Should ever wage war except on its own
  ground—
All Western-World nations should settle, by
  laws,
  All their disagreements, that peace may
  abound.

The United States, in dispatching her troops
  To fortify Iceland, is at the same time
Safeguarding herself from the dictator groups
  Now cursing the world with rebellion and
  crime.
The Western-World nations are praying today,
  As they never prayed, for their dream to
  come true—
They need faith to conquer, the Golden-Rule
  way—
  "Do others as ye would have others do you."

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Argentine Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

ARTICLE FROM CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Tribune of yesterday:

[From the Chicago Tribune of July 15, 1941]

PRODUCE FIRM TO BUY EGGS IN ARGENTINA

Because lease-lend purchases of eggs for Britain have raised prices in this country to the highest levels in years, dealers will import large quantities from Argentina, they disclosed yesterday. Up until 1938 Argentina was our best export egg market.

Charles S. Borden, of the Chicago office of the Great Western Distributors, New York produce house, announced that his company would purchase 60,000 dozen Argentine eggs a week starting July 21.

Borden said that his company had contracted for 360,000 dozen—30 rail carloads—and is considering importing eggs from Argentina on a much larger scale if the shipments are consistently good in quality.

UNDERCUT DOMESTIC PRICES

He said the present high prices for eggs had caused Argentine dealers to offer to sell this country large quantities at prices well below those paid domestic producers.

The Argentine eggs are being offered to dealers and retailers by Great Western at 28½ cents a dozen in New York. Eggs of a comparable grade from midwestern farms sold at 28 cents a dozen in New York yesterday.

Borden said that the eggs had been purchased from Argentine dealers who have guaranteed weekly deliveries of the eggs by refrigerated boats. The import duty will amount to about 10 cents a dozen.

EXCEEDS IMPORTS IN 1940

The initial egg purchase by Great Western exceeds total imports of eggs from all countries into the United States last year. In 1940 imports totaled 227,411 dozens having a total value of $42,482. The Department of Agriculture reports most of the eggs came from Canada, the Far East, and some European countries prior to the German invasion.

"In the last year or two Argentina has been selling a few surplus eggs to Great Britain," Borden said. "Britain can't get credit in Argentina. Besides, the United States is supplying eggs to Britain. Hence, since the lease-lend program has pushed prices up so high, Argentina plans to sell her surplus eggs to America."

Resolution of the America First Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

RESOLUTION PASSED AT MEETING OF 118 REPRESENTATIVES OF COMMITTEE IN CHICAGO

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution passed by a meeting of 118 representatives of the America First Committee at Chicago on July 13:

Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress has the sole power to declare war; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Navy, in public utterances, has advocated that the American Navy intervene in the present war now; and

Whereas such intervention of the American Navy would constitute actual and open war without the consent of Congress; and

Whereas by his solemn oath of office, the Secretary of the Navy has sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the representatives of chapters of the America First Committee from San Diego, Calif., to Boston, Mass., do condemn and repudiate the unauthorized utterances and conduct of the Secretary of the Navy and by reason of his outright advocacy of undeclared war, in defiance of the Constitution, we do declare it to be the sense of this group that the Secretary of the Navy is no longer a fit person to hold his present high office and should be removed from that office.

Book-of-the-Month Club Becomes Propaganda Agency for Union Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the statement I am about to make to

this House is not intended in any sense to be a plea for the restraint of a free press or of free speech, but it seems to me that it is necessary for the Members of the Congress to keep the people of the United States informed, as accurately as they can, as to the propaganda organizations and agencies which are loosing a veritable flood of war propaganda upon this Nation through the medium of books, newspaper articles and editorials, magazine articles and editorials, news releases, motion pictures, radio broadcasts, and platform speeches.

Now, we all know nobody has to wet-nurse the American people or guard them against somebody selling them a gold brick, or the Empire State Building, or the Brooklyn Bridge, if they know the sources of the approaches to them and the motive behind those approaches. It is, however, vastly important at this time that the American people be informed as to the character of the information, or the argument, or the propaganda, which is being loosed upon them, and the motives behind it, and who sponsors it.

I very much regret to say that a new agency seems to have come into the picture as a propaganda unit in this country. I refer to the Book-of-the-Month Club. This organization has always purported to pick out for the American reading public the best books and to furnish those books to the membership of the Book-of-the-Month Club at a reduced rate. I have never understood, and I do not now understand, that it was the intention of the Book-of-the-Month Club to use this agency under the guise of a service to American readers to foist propaganda works upon the country.

It is reported in the Des Moines Register of Wednesday, July 9, 1941, that at the first annual convention of Federal Union, which is a group of "Anglophibians" who apparently desire to see this country become one of the Crown colonies, or mayhap one of the British dominions, that "in the late summer the Book-of-the-Month Club will distribute 200,000 copies of Streit's two books, Union Now, and Union Now With Britain as dividends to its members."

Now, I assume, of course, that if the Book-of-the-Month Club wants to thus make itself a propaganda agency for Union Now with Great Britain, or to make this Nation one of the British colonies, the Book-of-the-Month Club has a right to. If the Book-of-the-Month Club wishes to make itself an agency for propaganda to get this country into a shooting war, I concede its right under our system of free speech and free press to do so. But I deny, here and now, that the Book-of-the-Month Club, or any other organization, shall pose to the American people as a disinterested public-service organization to serve American readers while in fact it is engaged in a surreptitious, undercover propaganda campaign. I think the American people have a right to know, and I think they ought to know, that the Book-of-the-Month Club has become, apparently, according to this and other reports which have reached me, a propaganda agency, and can no longer be regarded as a disinterested service agency for American book lovers. I think the American people ought to be told, and that is my purpose today, that when books are sent out by this Book-of-the-Month Club, books like Clarence Streit's Union Now and Union Now With Britain, that this is propaganda, that it is not disinterested literature; that the Book-of-the-Month Club is serving those who no longer want to uphold and maintain and perpetuate free constitutional government in the United States; that, therefore, the books chosen by the Book-of-the-Month Club must be regarded by their readers with grave suspicion, unless those readers are ready to favor Union Now With Britain and the reduction of the great free United States of America to the status of a British colony or dominion.

If the subscribers to the Book-of-the-Month Club—the membership—want to stand for this, that is a matter, as I say, between the subscribers and the Book-of-the-Month Club officials.

In these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I have done what I set out to do. I have warned the American people of the change in the purpose and the principles of this former service agency for American book lovers, and having thus accomplished my purpose, I have no more to say.

Gold Star Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. U. S. GUYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

POEM BY NICK KENNY

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem entitled "Gold Star Mother," by Nick Kenny:

GOLD STAR MOTHER

They took her bright-eyed boy away
To die on fields afar,
And so they took her sky away
And left her with a star.

The patter of his baby feet
With daylight used to start,
His baby shoes are empty now—
As empty as her heart.

And there's his helmet, worn while he
Was fighting for the cause;
Fighting out on foreign soil
A war to end all wars.

Her boy who loved the goldenrod
That flamed on hills of home,
Was killed on some unfriendly shore
Across the bitter foam.

One day a year her grateful land
Bedizens her with praise;
One day a year she tries to smile,
But oh—the other days—.

—*Nick Kenny.*

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the one indispensable American for the future is the taxpayer.

With the marines in Iceland, Santa Claus will be safe until the next election.

"Protective custody" of Iceland! We are snatching a sorry leaf from Adolf's Norwegian scrapbook.

Franklin Roosevelt's fear of Hitler will cost us $50,000,000,000 in money alone this calendar year.

The Christian Science Monitor, an international daily newspaper, has become a propaganda sheet for Britain.

The world will never know whether or not Hitler would have attacked us if we had minded our own business.

Every step toward war under the guise of defense has been a 15-cent penalty hiked to 49 cents after seeding time.

The National Art Gallery, the gift of Andrew Mellon, does not bear his name by request. There is some modesty in the world.

One of the best influences for peace the past week was Mr. Wedgwood, of England, while visiting here, denouncing WHEELER.

One of the newest evidences for war for us is the appointment of "Wild Bill" Donovan, a fighting fool, as coordinator of propaganda.

Our President has taunted us about being like the ostrich, which sticks his head in the sand, yet he has not the I. F. to ask Congress to declare war.

The Chief wants selectees to stay more than a year. This is logical, for he announced that the law was not for war, but peace, and we want peace for more than a year.

For years Kenyon, Borah, and Norris were my heroes. The first two are dead and the third was 80 last week. Lindbergh and Wheeler are what Norris used to be before he succumbed.

A rich bachelor of Fairview, who always rode alone and carried an arsenal in his car, finally blew up in every way without a trigger having been pulled. He was primarily for defense.

Some years ago it was declared supreme wisdom to beat swords into plowshares; now under an artificially created orgy of fear we are about to convert cooking utensils into bombers. (Fr. Claude, O. S. B., Seneca, Kans.)

Profiteering Practices of the Telephone Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1941

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of a petition of Oklahoma-Arkansas Telephone Co. for a rehearing in their case against the Bell Telephone Co., which explains some of the tactics of the telephone monopoly to destroy independent telephone companies throughout the country, many of which were in existence long prior to the advent of the Bell Co. to the field where these independent companies were in operation. It appears that President Nakdimen of this independent company has been waging a determined but hopeless fight for justice and fair play for his company, its stockholders, and its patrons against the unscrupulous methods employed by the telephone octopus—the integrated Bell telephone companies. In reading President Nakdimen's appeal it is easy to understand the effect of the strain to which he has been subjected when he says:

> The loss of my case and the expense I have been out are nothing in comparison to the confusion you have placed in my mind. * * * "The injustice," is a mild expression. * * * Not because of the loss that I have been sustaining for 13 years but the loss to know why it was done. It jarred my mind; * * * it jarred my entire mental construction.

Further he states:

> Here is a line that has been built for forty-odd years, and the line was such that the Bell could not steal it, they could not confiscate or manipulate it like they have with all the other independent telephones. They came during the night on Sunday, destroyed the connection, and admit on the stand the reason they came on Sunday during the night was in order that the law would not get them.

In proceedings instituted with the communication commission, the brief cites from a decision in this case:

> Both parties filed briefs with the examiner. * * * The examiner issued his report recommending that the petition be denied insofar as it requests physical connection. * * * The recommendation was based upon the finding that physical connection between the petitioner (the Oklahoma-Arkansas Telephone Co.) and respondent (the Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.) is not necessary or desirable in the public interest.

The petitioner's brief further states:

> Arkansas has a statute which compels every telephone company to receive and transmit all such messages tendered to said telephone company by other telephone companies under a very heavy penalty (p. 29).

In fact, when the case was before the Interstate Commerce Commission, Examiner Myron Witters found:

> Failure of the Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. to use or connect with the toll lines of the Oklahoma-Arkansas Telephone Co. between Poteau, Okla., and Fort Smith, Ark. * * * while at the same time using and connecting with a toll line owned by the Three States Telephone Co. between Hackett, Ark., and Fort Smith, Ark. * * * found unduly and unreasonably preferential and prejudicial. Removal of preference and prejudice ordered. * * * The refusal of the respondent (Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.) to restore said connection and receive messages in interstate commerce is a violation of respondent's (Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.) obligation and duty under paragraphs 1, 3, 4, and 6 of section 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

In fulfilling its responsibility to serve its patrons in putting through interline calls, the injustice of the monopolistic Bell company in dealing with independent companies is demonstrated in the division of tolls, as stated in President Nakdimen's brief:

> If someone in St. Louis puts a call in to Poteau, Okla., the Poteau telephone company, through its operator, has to call the one in Poteau and sometimes is compelled to call them 4 or 5 times before they locate them. Then after the party is located, they connect him with St. Louis. The call may last from 3 minutes to half an hour. The Poteau telephone operator has to watch the call until it is completed. If the parties talk from 3 minutes to half an hour, or longer, the Bell may collect anywhere from $1 to $50 for said call. All the Bell company pays the Poteau exchange for its connection, for its time, and for the use of its exchange, is 4 "measly" pennies (4 cents).

President Nakdimen states further:

> By deciding in favor of the Bell Telephone Co., the commission has caused the Oklahoma-Arkansas Telephone Co. to be robbed of between $250 and $500 per month, and the Bell has been putting it in their pocket when it belonged to the Oklahoma-Arkansas Telephone Co. * * * Now do you think this is a fair division? * * * That is the cause of the Bell getting larger and larger, piling up millions and billions; the poor independent telephone company is starving and striving for existence; * * *
>
> Decisions of this kind caused the Bell Telephone Co. to own 98 percent of the independent telephone lines. How did they secure these favorable decisions? * * * By their crooked manipulations. No one could succeed in monopolizing the telephone all over the country, like the Bell has monopolized, on their honesty and integrity.
>
> To further substantiate my statement about the corruptness of the Bell Telephone Co., I desire to call attention to another one of the manipulations of the Bell. In order to accomplish their purpose, known to themselves, they employed my attorney's son, a boy who just came out of school. The main reason, I suppose, was to get his influence to be carried to his father, who was attorney for the Oklahoma-Arkansas Telephone Co. * * * Before employing my attorney of Oklahoma City to join this fight I asked him particularly if there was any connection between himself and the Bell, and he insinuated that his influence would be such whereby he could accomplish something beneficial in the case. So I employed him. When I employed him the Bell continually wined and dined him in such a way that if he ever was for me and intended to do what he should do, I feel through their manipulations and connection and wining and dining him no doubt changed him considerably, because in the wind-up their reltionship was very friendly.

In these circumstances it is easy to understand and appreciate President Nakdimen's statement:

> The loss of my case and the expense I have been out are nothing in comparison to the confusion you have placed in my mind * * * not because of the loss I have been sustaining for 13 years, but the loss to know why it was done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in considering the tactics of the Bell Co. to beat down and take over this independent company down in Oklahoma and Arkansas, let us see how they are dealing with the Federal Government right here in Washington—right on the desk and in the office of every Congressman and Senator in the National Capitol. In the first place, the departments, the House, and the Senate maintain their own switchboards and pay their own telephone operators. The Government does not own these telephone switchboards, it rents them. The Government does not own these telephone instruments, it rents them. I am told that for two instruments and one line into a Congressman's or Senator's office, the rental is 50 cents a month. When there are two lines in an office with four instruments, the rent is double. The monthly rental for the switchboard in the House Office Building is $270, but in addition to the rent of the telephone instruments and the switchboards, there is a monthly rental charge for practically all the small telephone accessories all through the offices of the House, Senate, and Capitol—wire loops, extensions, switches, cut-offs, and so forth—little gadgets all itemized and placed on a rental basis to make up a huge total in the monthly statement on which the rental collections are made.

But this charge is only the initial payment to the telephone company. For every call outside the Capitol, Senate and House Office Buildings, put through on these rented switchboards and rented instruments by Government-paid operators, there is a toll charge of 1 cent for Department calls and from 3 cents to 5 cents per call on other Government business, depending on the volume of calls. The fact is, the annual telephone bill of the House and Senate, just the House and Senate offices and the Capitol, without a single long-distance call being included, is above $85,000 per year.

The statement—telephone bill—for the month of May for the Capitol, which includes House and Senate Office Buildings—this does not include a single long-distance call—was: House, $4,576.40; Senate, $3,377.26; and these are the only three Government buildings about which I have had an opportunity to obtain any information concerning the telephone charges. In all the other departments, for which I have no information, the telephones are on a dial system and every Government clerk must take time to hunt the dial number of the offices in or out of his particular building and do his or her bit for the telephone company by putting through his own call, which is limited strictly to Government business. Leave it to the telephone company to see to it that this rule is enforced under the regulations from the standpoint of additional revenue. The Government takes kindly care of the monopoly by installing built-in telephone booths all through the departments for the accommodation of the

coin-in-the-slot telephone instrument for the use of Federal employees in putting through personal calls. The profiteering of this monopoly right under the nose of the Congress certainly should be investigated. I do not know what the Communication Commission is doing, but when I find that I am required to pay 10 cents toll for every call I make at my apartment, with a dollar-a-month charge for the rental of the telephone instrument, and then the telephone company has the nerve to offer to list my name in the telephone directory for $1.50 extra for each 6 months, and on top of this, when I come to make a comparison of their long-distance rates, it is appalling to find that while I can be transported personally with 150 pounds of baggage over any of our standard railway lines in an air-conditioned coach costing upward of $30,000, drawn by a locomotive valued at over $100,000, in charge of an expert crew of the highest-paid railway personnel over a railway line, costing on the average of $80,000 per mile for a fare of 2 cents per mile—and I find that in contrast to this service by the railway companies, I am required to pay approximately 1 cent per mile for a long-distance call of 3 minutes over a single wire, strung on telephone poles. Let us thank God that the telephone companies have not a monopoly on transporting and delivering the United States mail, for if they did, we would be lucky if we got by without a minimum charge of 5 cents on local letters and 25 cents postage to the Pacific coast—and this monopoly would bring in all kinds of tables and cost sheets to justify the charge.

I do not know what the Communications Commission is doing—but the telephone outfit has got any monopoly in the country cheated when it comes to getting away with the money. We are told that 30 percent of their stock is held by the general public. Well! The Dalton boys or Al Capone could have well afforded to make a divy of 30 percent for the right to loot the country.

After all, maybe they are proceeding in the right direction, because when they carry their profiteering far enough the people of this country will wake up and in their exasperation direct Congress to take them over and combine this branch of the communications service with the postal service.

David Lasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

ARTICLE AND EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article and editorial on David Lasser appearing in the Washington Daily News of July 14, 1941:

[From the Washington Daily News of July 14, 1941]

IT WORKED A SECOND TIME—DAVID LASSER'S BRANDING CALLED COMMUNIST TRICK

(By Will Allen)

In a successful effort to oust from the Federal Service anti-Communists who are most effective in blocking Communist infiltration into Government departments, Communists have started false reports to the effect that these very anti-Communists are Communists, it was charged today by Representative VOORHIS (Democrat, California), one of leading liberal Members of the House.

Aroused by recent revelations in the News how David Lasser, 3014 Dent Place NW., a leading figure in the fight on the Communists, was cut off the W. P. A. pay roll by congressional action under the mistaken impression he is a Communist, Mr. VOORHIS, whose acquaintance with Communist tactics stems from his service on the Dies committee, told the News today:

"There can be no doubt that the kind of people that Communists have most to fear—and whom they most bitterly oppose—are effective progressives who are anti-Communist and who know a Communist when they see one.

TWO SUCH CASES

"There can be little doubt that one Communist tactic which has been used more than once is that of starting and fostering false reports to the effect that these very anti-Communist progressives are Communists."

It was pointed out in this connection that twice in recent months Congress, moved to action by such reports, has aimed its gun at Federal employees by forbidding the use of appropriations to pay their salaries, under the impression that it was bringing down Communists.

And each time Congress succeeded in blasting an effective anti-Communist off the Federal pay roll—to the delight of the Communists who found their path freer as a result.

In addition to Mr. Lasser's case, it was recalled that last October Congress used a similar technique to oust Dr. David J. Saposs, 1928 Belmont Road NW., Labor Board chief economist and at that time the most effective anti-Communist there.

HIGH DEFENDERS

In the light of an investigation by the News which showed that Mr. Lasser is not and never has been a Communist and for more than a year has conducted an extremely effective exposé of Communist machinations among unemployed, VOORHIS' statement today was regarded as indicating a growing awareness in Congress that a great injustice has been done an innocent man and a valuable public servant.

Those who have joined Representative VOORHIS recently in a warm defense of Mr. Lasser have been Majority Leader MCCORMACK, Representative FLANNAGAN (Democrat, Virginia) and Representative CASEY (Democrat, Massachusetts).

Their attitudes appear to indicate a growing desire in Congress to undo the injury to Mr. Lasser done by stigmatizing him as an undesirable employee.

Mr. Lasser was born in Baltimore in 1902, educated in Newark schools, and was graduated a civil engineer from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. At the age of 15 years and 10 months he told a recruiting sergeant he was 19 in order to enlist in the A. E. F.

GAS RAVAGES LINGER

He saw action at Chateau Thierry and in the Argonne Forest, where he was gassed and was rescued only after a narrow squeak. The effects of that gas still linger in weakened lungs and bronchial passages.

In 1933 he found himself among the unemployed. It gave him first-hand understanding of what the unemployed were up against. His warm sympathies for the common man led him in an idealistic and earnest desire to alleviate the plight of the jobless.

It has been said frequently that if it were not for Mr. Lasser the Communists would have been able to exercise unhampered control of the Workers Alliance and the unemployed. This is important, because the Communist Party, a negligible quantity until 1930, began to acquire influence after that year by basing itself on the unemployed, who at that time numbered between twelve and fourteen million. In similar manner Hitler built the Nazi Party on the German unemployed.

DIDN'T KNOW TRICKS

In the early years of the Workers Alliance Mr. Lasser, inexperienced in dealing with subtle Communist tactics, did not suspect the gravity of the situation.

"It must be noted," he explained, "that acquisition of control by the Communists was a process of years. Much became apparent only in retrospect."

It was not until the late summer of 1939 that Mr. Lasser became personally convinced of the truth of oft-repeated charges that the Workers Alliance was Communist-controlled and he merely a figurehead.

For a year Mr. Lasser quietly fought a bitter internal war to rescue the Workers Alliance from the Communists. When he found this impossible he took the courageous step of resigning as president of the Workers Alliance in order to carry the fight openly and publicly to the Communists, risking the vituperation and calumny the Communists always reserve for those who can expose their "hidden ball" plays most effectively.

REVEALED "RED" TECHNIQUE

Expose them he did, in a series of New York newspaper articles in which he explained the technique they used in dominating the Workers Alliance and from behind the scenes guided it along the "party line."

The Dies committee reported in January that "the non-Communist element in the Workers Alliance withdrew under the leadership of David Lasser in June of that year (1940) and the Workers Alliance became a shadow of its former self."

But Mr. Lasser did more than negatively break up the Workers Alliance so that from a top of a quarter million membership it has dwindled today to less than 5,000. He formed a new organization of the unemployed—the American Security Union. This time, with some experience under his belt, he saw to it that the American Security Union constitution prohibited membership of Communists, Nazis, and Fascists.

PRAISED BY HUNTER

He had built up the A. S. U. to a membership of 20,000 when the W. P. A., because of his experience in dealing with problems of the unemployed, offered him the job of labor consultant to Acting Administrator Howard Hunter, which he accepted.

Mr. Hunter has testified that Mr. Lasser was doing extremely valuable work up to the day he was automatically cut off the W. P. A. pay roll by an amendment to the appropriation act which specified that "no part of any appropriation in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of David Lasser."

Probably one of the most significant things about Mr. Lasser's dismissal is that the Communists made absolutely no protest or criticism of Congress' action, thereby tipping their hand as to how highly they regarded Mr. Lasser.

VICTIM OF MISUNDERSTANDING

Painstaking investigation of facts in the case leads the News to believe an injury and injustice have been done Mr. David Lasser, who, until June 30, was labor consultant to W P. A Administrator Howard Hunter. Beyond question, Congress honestly believed it was taking action against a Communist in the Federal employ when it forbade the use of the W. P. A. appropriation to pay Mr. Lasser's salary, thereby automatically cutting him off the pay roll.

But also beyond question it appears that Congress succeeded in cutting off the pay roll an effective anti-Communist. Every competent authority gives Mr. Lasser credit for single-handedly breaking up the Communist-dominated Workers Alliance. A man might conceivably be rewarded, rather than punished, for such constructive contribution to society.

We are convinced that the action taken against Mr. Lasser was due to a misunderstanding, which it is not too late to correct. And we are convinced that no man on the hill would willingly allow a misunderstanding to persist when it works a hardship and an injustice on a loyal American citizen.

Congress has the right to take such action as it may find appropriate in any case. That is the very heart and soul of our democracy. Administrative agencies particularly should lead the way in recognition of this tenet by showing respect for the wishes of Congress.

But we also respectfully draw to the attention of Congress the fact that cutting Federal employees off the pay roll by naming them in appropriation bills and forbidding the use of such money to pay their salaries is contrary to sound public policy.

As a technique for removing Communists from the public pay roll, it is obviously more desirable to hold a hearing at which all the facts in the case can be laid before the public and where the accused has an opportunity to make a defense.

For such purposes there is the Civil Service Commission, the Dies committee, the F. B. I., and various Federal agencies.

In the case of Mr. Lasser, such a hearing would have enabled Congress to avoid the misunderstanding and its deplorable results.

We concur with Representative BOREN, of Oklahoma, who, though he voted to remove Mr. Lasser from the W. P. A. pay roll, recognized that the technique used was "not the best method of legislating."

The regrettable fact is that at the time Mr. BOREN cast his vote he had not been informed that for the past 2 years Mr. Lasser has been fighting the Communists at least as energetically and perhaps even more effectively than some Members of the House.

Any reasonably thorough hearing would have produced this fact.

Even more, it would have vindicated Mr. BOREN. For the latter, early in 1939, accused the Workers Alliance of being Communist controlled. A hearing would have developed the fact that Mr. Lasser himself confirmed that charge a year later by resigning as president of the Workers Alliance on the ground that it is Communist controlled. And it would also have developed the fact that thereafter Mr. Lasser did everything within his power to expose the Communists and to rescue the unemployed from their clutches.

With such facts in their possession, we are sure Congress would have acted otherwise.

In times such as these it is important to encourage every democratic foe of the Communists to keep up the valiant fight, and to avoid giving aid and comfort to the Communists by striking down the anti-Communist, anti-Nazi, and anti-Fascist foes of the "red" totalitarians.

Marketing Quotas on Wheat—Feeding of Extra-Quota Wheat Should Be Permitted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, a great many of the complaints which are coming from wheat farmers with respect to the imposition of marketing quotas and penalties on the sales of extra-quota wheat are based upon the fact that under the law the feeding of wheat on the farm where produced is considered as a sale, and in the case of overquota wheat subject to a penalty. There is always considerable wheat consumed on the farms as feed, the amount depending somewhat upon the scarcity of other feeds and the price as compared with other feeds as well as the price of livestock. There are many farmers who have always raised some wheat for feed. I opposed the provision in the present act which defines the feeding of wheat as a sale, and believe that it was a mistake to so define it.

Regardless, however, of what reasons may have been advanced at the time this amendment was adopted, it seems to me that there should be a reconsideration of the question at this time. For one thing there are at this time no marketing quotas on corn and there will be none on this year's crop. There is no reason why a farmer producing both wheat and corn should be permitted to produce and feed all the corn that he cares to and yet be restricted in the feeding of wheat to his livestock. There is even less reason why his neighbor who has been in the habit of producing wheat and feeding some of it on the farm and who has produced no corn should be prohibited from using his extra wheat for that purpose.

At this time farmers are being told to produce more meat and dairy products as a part of the defense program. The first requisite in this program is an increased feed supply. Farmers have been invited by the Secretary of Agriculture to increase their corn production and urged to grow more livestock feed. A very large part of the penalty wheat is in the hands of farmers who can feed it on the farm advantageously.

Furthermore, there is certainly grave doubt as to whether under existing conditions we can get rid of our present wheat surplus without further very drastic cuts in acreage unless some of it is fed on the farm. At the present price there is little incentive to feed wheat on the farm which can be marketed without penalty. However, there is a great amount of penalty wheat which, if permitted to be fed, would be consumed in that way and would not be pressing on the market now or at any future time.

It will require legislation to make it possible to feed penalty wheat. I believe that the Committee on Agriculture should at this time give consideration to a change in the basic law which will permit this. Furthermore, I believe that the Department of Agriculture should give its support to such a proposal in the interest of working out a fair program. If such a change can be made in time to be effective in the near future it will do away with much of the dissatisfaction which is being manifested at this time in the wheat-producing sections of the country.

American Physicans Should Not Lose to Foreigners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL A. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this august body passed an act to enable Dr. Gustav Weil, Irma Weil, and Marion Weil to enter and remain in the United States as quota immigrants.

I take this opportunity to mention the fact that notwithstanding there are now over 5,000,000 aliens in the United States—15 percent or 750,000 of whom are illiterates—there is a growing stream of professional people pouring into the country to become ultimate competitors with our own professional people.

This situation has become so acute that only last Monday the Chicago Tribune carried an article entitled "Influx of Alien Doctors Alarms United States Physicians." It seems that during 1940 of 2,092 graduates from foreign medical schools, 948 were granted permission to practice medicine or surgery in the United States. With many of our own medical men giving up their practices to enter the service of the Federal Government, it seems that these alien doctors are taking over the business our own doctors have so patriotically and voluntarily relinquished for the period of the present emergency. For the information of those who should be interested, I ask that the article from the Chicago Tribune be printed as a part of these remarks, and I want to say that in the future I shall object to any unanimous-consent requests for the relief of alien doctors until I am convinced they will not come here to compete with our own graduates and practitioners.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

INFLUX OF ALIEN DOCTORS ALARMS UNITED STATES PHYSICIANS—NEW YORK MADE BOTTLENECK IN OVERFILLED PROFESSION

(By William Fulton)

NEW YORK, July 14.—American physicians, especially here in New York, are manifesting growing concern over the transfusion of foreign refugee doctors into the profession in this country. Already several thousand medical emigrés have been admitted to practice.

As the port of entry and a cosmopolitan city, New York has become the bottleneck for refugee doctors. They stick here, where they find friendly asylum but also where the medical profession is probably more overcrowded than anywhere else in the country.

Native American doctors, who are contemplating entering the country's armed forces in the medical service, are apprehensive that their practices may be absorbed by foreigners during their absence. Complaints of fee cutting and other unethical acts by the recent European arrivals have been filed with county medical societies.

YEARLY INCREASE SHOWN

Last year 2,092 persons holding certificates from foreign universities (except Canadian) were examined by licensing boards in the various States, according to the Journal of the American Medical Association. Of this number 1,429 applied for licenses in New York State.

Year by year the number of candidates from foreign institutions for licensure in the United States has increased. This trend is graphically illustrated in a table of figures on such applicants, from the A. M. A. Journal, as follows:

Year	Number examined	Number passed
1930	167	92
1931	158	91
1932	182	96
1933	200	129
1934	285	170
1935	437	303
1936	588	382
1937	920	637
1938	1,164	716
1939	1,691	839
1940	2,092	948
Total	7,884	4,403

A small percentage of those examined each year represents "repeaters" who have failed in previous examinations. Native Americans who go abroad to study and then return to practice in this country also account for a small percentage.

MANY FROM GERMANY

By far the largest number of candidates come from Germany or countries under Nazi rule. Among the 2,092 applicants for 1940 were 1,378 from Germany, and of that number 613 bore credentials from the University of Vienna.

Harry D. Biele, secretary of the National Committee for Resettlement of Foreign Physicians, an offshoot of the National Refugee Service, declared that the refugee doctor stays in New York and on the eastern seaboard, because many States have raised barriers to his practice.

Most liberal in admitting refugee physicians to examination and practice are New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Maryland, where first citizenship papers are virtually the only requirement.

OTHER STATES MORE STRICT

Sixteen States, taking the position they are unable to evaluate foreign credentials because of the war abroad, do not admit holders of such certificates to examination. Nineteen States require full citizenship, which takes 5 years to achieve. Prerequisites in other States include basic science credits, internship in American hospitals, and work in United States approved medical schools.

In Illinois, where Gov. Dwight Green recently vetoed legislation requiring full citizenship for admission to practice, no more applications from foreign candidates have been received since last February 21. Illinois requires internship as a prerequisite. Of the 141 graduates from foreign universities who took examinations in Illinois last year, 19 passed.

Some American doctors are suggesting that the plea of President Roosevelt and the British Red Cross for 1,000 physicians to volunteer for service in England be met by sending refugees over there.

Who Wants the Seaway?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

ARTICLE FROM MARINE PROGRESS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the July 1941 issue of Marine Progress. Appearing at this time, 1 month after the Rivers and Harbors Committee began hearing testimony on the proposed St. Lawrence project, this article seems to be very timely.

From the poll of replies from letters sent by this magazine to Senators and Representatives in the Congress, it will be noted that the majority of the Members have indicated their opposition to this unwarranted, unnecessary construction.

[From Marine Progress of July 1941]

WHO WANTS THE SEAWAY?—ONE HUNDRED SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN RESPONDED TO THE PROPELLER CLUB'S RESOLUTIONS, BUT THE WRITERS ARE ALL EITHER OPPOSED OR NONCOMMITTAL ON THE SUBJECT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

No one in Congress, either in the Senate or the House of Representatives, openly favors the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. That is, if the response received from Members of Congress by the Propeller Club of the United States to its resolution in opposition to the project may be regarded as a cross section of congressional opinion. Whether this response can be so considered, however, remains to be seen.

The Gallup poll, or any of the organizations specializing in determining the consensus of public opinion by sampling a percentage of the whole, comes close to forecasting results by questioning only a very small percentage. Up to the time of writing, approximately 20 percent of the total membership of Congress has written the Propeller Club. This may be considered a large sample—far larger than is used, for example, in prognosticating the result of a Presidential election.

But Congress is different.

An indication of the attitude of Congress is found, however, in the letters written by Senators and Congressmen.

At its annual convention in New Orleans last December, the Propeller Club of the United States devoted serious consideration to a resolution opposing the construction of the proposed seaway. So important was the matter regarded that the convention voted to submit the resolution to the organization's member ports for individual consideration. The result was unanimous opposition to the project.

Pursuant to this action, a copy of the resolution was sent to every Member of the Senate and House, urging support of the Propeller Club's stand.

The response has been most interesting. Thus far, 99 replies have been received. Twenty-six of these letters are from Senators. Of these, 10 are opposed to the St. Lawrence project; 16 are noncommittal. None says that the writer favors the undertaking—not even Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, majority leader, who generally is understood to reflect the administration's viewpoint, or Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, who is frequently referred to as the President's sounding board.

The Senate score might be tallied as follows:

Opposed: Bennett Champ Clark, Missouri; Styles Bridges, New Hampshire; Warren R. Austin, Vermont; Walter F. George, Georgia; Harry Flood Byrd, Virginia; Robert A. Taft, Ohio; James M. Mead, New York; W. Warren Barbour, New Jersey; Ralph O. Brewster, Maine; James J. Davis, Pennsylvania.

Noncommittal: Alben W. Barkley, Kentucky; Albert B. Chandler, Kentucky; Hiram W. Johnson, California; Sheridan Downey, California; Homer T. Bone, Washington; Mon C. Wallgren, Washington; Burton K. Wheeler, Montana; D. Worth Clark, Idaho; Hugh A. Butler, Nebraska; Claude Pepper, Florida; Elmer Thomas, Oklahoma; Harry S. Truman, Missouri; Hattie W. Caraway, Arkansas; C. Wayland Brooks, Illinois; Josiah W. Bailey, North Carolina; Harold H. Burton, Ohio.

Most of the letters classed as noncommittal are the usual stereotyped acknowledgments giving the assurance that "the matter will have careful attention and consideration." Senator TRUMAN states that when the matter comes before the Senate, "I expect to go into it in detail and try to arrive at a conclusion that will be for the welfare of the country as a whole." Anticipating that the bill will be referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, of which he is a member, Senator BURTON states: "I have refrained from taking a final position on the issue in advance of our hearings. Apart from the project's own merits, however, it seems to me that the present is a bad time to be spending between $250,000,000 and $500,000,000 on a matter only remotely connected with our defense program."

Seventy-two Members of the House have responded. Of these, 42 are opposed to the seaway agreement, and 30 may be classed as noncommital, even such outstanding supporters of the administration as the Honorable J. J. MANSFIELD, of Texas, chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors; the Honorable MARY T. NORTON, of New Jersey, chairman of the House Committee on Labor; the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, coauthor of the Wheeler-Lea bill, and others.

The tally of letters from House Members follows:

Opposed: John Z. Anderson, California; William E. Hess, Ohio; John W. Gwynne, Iowa; John C. Butler, New York; William M. Colmer, Mississippi; Alfred F. Beiter, New York; Guy L. Moser, Pennsylvania; Ben F. Jensen, Iowa; James Domengeaux, Louisiana;

R. L. Rodgers, Pennsylvania; S. O. Bland, Virginia; George H. Tinkham, Massachusetts; James W. Wadsworth, New York; Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois; Joseph J. O'Brien, New York; LeRoy D. Downs, Connecticut; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; Leonard W. Hall, New York; Fred J. Douglas, New York; J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; Gerald W. Landis, Indiana; J. M. Robsion, Kentucky; William T. Byrne, New York; Joe Starnes, Alabama; Hale Boggs, Louisiana; James A. O'Leary, New York; John A. Meyer, Maryland; Harry B. Coffee, Nebraska; Joseph Clark Baldwin, New York; J. William Ditter, Pennsylvania; Charles H. Elston, Ohio; Robert F. Rich, Pennsylvania; Stephen A. Day, Illinois; Leland M. Ford, California; Lewis K. Rockefeller, New York; Paul W. Shafer, Michigan; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; George Grant, Alabama; William T. Pheiffer, New York; Dewey Short, Missouri.

Noncommittal: Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; Robert Ramspeck, Georgia; Clifford Davis, Tennessee; Martin F. Smith, Washington; Earl C. Michener, Michigan; James J. Heffernan, New York; Hugh Peterson, Georgia; Charles H. Leavy, Washington; J. J. Mansfield, Texas; Thomas H. Cullen, New York; Charles F. McLaughlin, Nebraska: Bob Sikes, Florida; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; John S. Gibson, Georgia; Charles A. Halleck, Indiana; Clarence F. Lea, California; Frances P. Bolton, Ohio; C. Jasper Bell, Missouri; Evan Howell, Illinois; Emanuel Celler, New York; Oscar Youngdahl, Minnesota; Vincent F. Harrington, Iowa; J. Percy Priest, Tennessee; Arthur D. Healey, Massachusetts; Lucien Maciora, Connecticut; Fred Bradley, Michigan; Mary T. Norton, New Jersey; William B. Barry, New York; Pat Cannon, Florida; Sam Hobbs, Alabama.

The point is that while some 50 Senators and Congressmen have expressed their open opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project, not one Member of either branch of Congress has advanced a single reason to the Propeller Club why the seaway should be constructed, or why the covering agreement between Canada and the United States should be ratified.

The President is extremely anxious to obtain congressional approval of the agreement; so anxious, in fact, that he has chosen to establish a precedent as to the manner in which a treaty should be ratified. For obvious reasons, he has elected to secure that approval by the adoption of a joint resolution to be voted upon by both Houses of Congress, rather than by the confirmation of a treaty which, under the Constitution, requires a two-thirds affirmative vote by the Senate.

Congress may approve the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. That remains to be seen.

But its heart isn't in the job.

CONGRESSIONAL COMMENT ON THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

Herewith are excerpts from letters written by Senators and Representatives to the Propeller Club of the United States, setting forth their opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway proposal:

Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, Missouri: "You may be familiar with the fact that I led the successful fight against ratification of the St. Lawrence Treaty a number of years ago. I will continue to use every resource at my command to defeat any proposal as I helped to defeat the old one."

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire: "I quite agree with you that such a project is unnecessary and in no way can be construed as necessary to our national defense."

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia: "I voted against the project some years ago. However, I cannot see how it can be urged upon this country at this time as a part of the defense program."

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia: "I, too, oppose this project, and you may be assured that I shall do my utmost against it as I have in the past."

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Ohio: "While this project may have merit, I cannot find that it has any real connection with the defense program. It will involve a very large expense, and divert money and energy from the real task which we have before us today. * * * I shall, therefore, oppose the President's proposal that this project be authorized."

Senator JAMES J. DAVIS, Pennsylvania: "I opposed vigorously the building of this waterway in 1934 when the Senate rejected it on a treaty basis, and I shall continue my efforts against this resurrected and camouflaged proposal under the guise of a revised treaty. * * * The building of the waterway would have a serious effect on railroads and their employees—upon coal industries and the miners. Other industries such as steel and agriculture would also be affected adversely."

Senator JAMES M. MEAD, New York: "I acknowledge receipt of your letter expressing opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project. As you may know, I have likewise expressed my strong opposition to the proposal."

Senator W. WARREN BARBOUR, New Jersey: "You may be sure of my continued opposition to the consummation of the St. Lawrence seaway project."

Senator RALPH O. BREWSTER, Maine: "I feel very strongly that the burden of proof is on those who would divert so substantial a portion of our resources in this period of crisis to a 4-year project under the guise of serving our defense."

Representative WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER, New York: "Not only would it be unsound economically, and divert funds sorely needed for building an unassailable defense for our country, but it would give us one more vulnerable area to defend in the event of threatened invasion. Also, it would play havoc with many of the basic industries of our country and accentuate the unemployment problem."

Representative GEORGE GRANT, Alabama: "I subscribe to the position taken by your organization that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway project at this time is not justified."

Representative IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania: "I am unalterably opposed to the St. Lawrence project and have already personally protested against this project to President Roosevelt."

Representative RALPH A. GAMBLE, New York: "It is a tremendous undertaking and a very costly one. The President is bringing this forward now under the guise of national defense. We have committed a number of crimes under that heading already. I sincerely hope that we will be able to defeat it but it is awfully difficult to defeat the present administration."

Representative PAUL W. SHAFER, Michigan: "It appears to me that such a project at this time would be of doubtful benefit to our American economy. It would obstruct national defense by diverting men and materials from immediately vital needs and would create in itself a new and vulnerable area requiring vast defense work."

Representative LEWIS K. ROCKEFELLER, New York: "I am in hearty accord with the contents of the resolution and am doing, and shall continue to do, all I can to bring about the defeat of the proposal."

Representative GERALD W. LANDIS, Indiana: "I am pleased to inform you that I shall do all in my power to defeat this legislation when it comes before us for debate and vote. Frankly, the administration's desire to build this project is just another New Deal scheme to spend a lot of hard-earned American taxpayers' money."

Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Louisiana: "I share your views concerning the St. Lawrence seaway project and will do everything I possibly can to defeat this proposed measure when it comes on the floor of the House."

Representative JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN, New York: "I am in thorough accord with your views regarding this proposed legislation, and should the bill come to the floor of the House I shall oppose it very strenuously."

Representative CHAUNCEY W. REED, Illinois: "It is indeed gratifying to us who are opposing the St. Lawrence River project to know that our friends are supporting us."

Representative JAMES W. WADSWORTH, New York: "I agree with you about this project. I have opposed it from the beginning, dating back several years, and shall continue to do so."

Representative JAMES DOMENGEAUX, Louisiana: "I do not feel the construction of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway is at this time economically justified. In fact, I feel that the construction of this project would be detrimental to a major portion of this country rather than helpful, so you may be assured of my cooperation."

Representative BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa: "You may be assured that I shall do all in my power to defeat the St. Lawrence waterway project as proposed in H. R. 4927. I can see no good in this project from a national-defense standpoint and most certainly this project would be bad for we folks in the Middle West."

Representative ALFRED F. BEITER, New York: "I have constantly opposed the seaway proposals, and have gone on record in opposition to the pending agreement. My prolonged studies of the proposition have convinced me that it is an unnecessary and unwarranted expenditure at this time which would create additional financial and economic burdens for the people of both countries."

Representative LELAND M. FORD, California: "I have looked into the provisions of this proposal and it appears to me that it is one which is not necessary at this time and could not be made useful at the present time. Inasmuch as there are so many millions of dollars to be expended for national defense this project could well be dispensed with."

Representative CHARLES H. ELSTON, Ohio: "If the President should be successful in having Congress authorize the St. Lawrence waterway project we can expect a demand that Congress also approve of the Florida ship canal, Passamoquoddy, and many other socialistic experiments which have been rejected in the past."

Representative JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN, New York: "The St. Lawrence seaway is not a defense measure. It is either an attempt to create an even larger pay roll for political purposes or it is a promise for cheaper electricity which cannot be fulfilled. A power measure either way you look at it."

Representative JOHN A. MEYER, Maryland: "The proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project has been presented before on its merits and defeated. Its proponents now urge it upon us as a necessity to national defense. I can see no justification for reviving this project as a defense measure."

Representative HALE BOGGS, Louisiana: "I am unalterably opposed to the project and will fight it before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors as well as on the floor of the House."

Representative JOHN M. ROBSION, Kentucky "I have consistently opposed the St. Lawrence seaway project and shall continue to do so."

Representative JOHN C. BUTLER, New York: "I am taking the liberty of inserting this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope this action meets with your approval. I have fought this seaway project for years and shall continue to do so."

Representative WILLIAM E. HESS, Ohio: "I am glad to know of the opposition of your club to this legislation. I am opposed to the

measure and will do everything that I can to defeat it. I cannot approve the tactics of the President in this matter, since he is now attempting to accomplish by indirection what he was unable to do directly."

Keeping Faith With Draftees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE GALESBURG (ILL.) DAILY REGISTER-MAIL

Mr. CHIPERFIELD of Ilinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

[From the Galesburg (Ill.) Daily Register-Mail of July 15, 1941]

KEEPING FAITH WITH DRAFTEES

Congressional leaders in conference with President Roosevelt and his Chief of Staff, General Marshall, are reported to have informed the President that he is in for a hot battle if he insists upon pressing for legislation which would lift the year's limit service for draftees and guardsmen, and also the restrictions upon the use of such service men outside the United States and its possessions.

In spite of these warnings from Members of the House and Senate, it is said that the administration is determined to press for the legislation because of the allegedly startling information gathered by the Army and other service intelligences of dangers impending for this country. This information, the character of which can only be surmised, as its possessors assert its revelation would jeopardize the public interest, is said to be giving serious concern to the high command of the Army and Navy and causes extreme reluctance to forego their plans to retain the trainees in service.

On the other hand, Members of Congress, many of whom voted for the draft law only because it provided that selectees would be required to give 1 year of active service in the United States Army, feel their faith is pledged and that they are obligated to stand by this assurance to the men.

The ultimate action of Congress would seem to hinge solely on what may be the extent and nature of the perils to the country which require that the solons be asked to lay themselves open to the charge of bad faith and keep the trainees beyond their original term. It would appear that there must be some features of the situation, at least, which might be publicized without prejudice to the general interest and which might acquaint the people with the gravity of the situation.

We are not disposed to accuse either the President or the military chiefs with conjuring up bogey men to frighten the people and the Congress into enabling legislation which they may desire. But it does appear that the men involved and their families and the people of the country are entitled to something more specific than the vague and generalized statements so far permitted to be made.

If the circumstances are such that there is immediate danger of hostilities, it should be borne in mind that, if, and when, the United States becomes involved, it will not be President Roosevelt's private war, nor the military chieftain's private war, but a war in which all will be involved. The people of the United States, by and large, presumably are sufficiently intelligent and trustworthy to share in some degree a knowledge of the facts. Nothing could be more prejudicial to faith in democratic institutions and the unity of purpose required to successfully prosecute a war, than an official assumption that a people supposedly qualified for self government, still are too dumb to be entrusted with the truth about the military situation.

An interesting and timely appraisal of the question of extending the service time of draftees and guardsmen is contained in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor which follows:

"Doubtless the Army is dealing with a very urgent situation in the recommendation made by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, that Congress authorize the retention of selective-service trainees, National Guard units, and Reserve officers beyond the year for which they were called into service. Yet the recommendation is a questionable one.

"As to the guard units and Reserve officers the request is not unfair, since the men in these branches of the service have known from their first enrollment that they might be called upon in emergency and for the duration of the emergency.

"However, the selective-service trainee is in a different position. He was chosen out of a large registration, among which there are thousands of others equally eligible. He was given no choice as to whether he should serve. Throughout the discussions of the Draft Act and its early administration there was an implied promise that when the man had completed his year of training he would return to his peacetime occupation subject only to call as a reservist.

"It is important to morale at home and in camp that the Government should scrupulously keep faith with the men whom it has conscripted for service. If those specialists and technicians who are particularly needed in their units can be persuaded to volunteer, that is good. The counter attractions to be considered illustrate anew that the rewards of sheltered jobs at home should not be allowed to outstrip those of service in the armed forces.

"Congress should ponder this question carefully. No objection would be made to notifying draftees called henceforward that they might be held for longer service. But the Senate Naval Affairs Committee has lately refused a request for authority to hold naval enlisted men beyond the term for which they signed. A great number of useful potential selectees are awaiting the places vacated by those who have had their year of training."

Senator Tom Connally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

ARTICLE FROM PATHFINDER

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the following article, being a clipping from the Pathfinder, issue of July 12, 1941, concerning Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, of whom the people of his State are justly proud:

[From the Pathfinder of July 12, 1941]

PRESENTING TOM CONNALLY

Right now there is a reshuffling of administration stalwarts in the United States Senate. That august body has lost and is losing some good men; and good men must be chosen to replace them. Men on whom the President and also the Nation leaned, like Pat Harrison, of Mississippi; Sheppard, of Texas; and Byrnes, of South Carolina, are, like Elijah of old, dropping their mantles on other shoulders.

It is one of those times of change in which merit is recognized and demonstrated ability is rewarded; and for that reason the "wise guys" around the Capitol are saying, "Watch Senator CONNALLY, of Texas."

The tall, good-looking, genial, witty, wisecracking Senator from the biggest State in the Union has in 25 years of activity under the dome of the Capitol been steadily emerging from the hundreds, even thousands, who have served in Congress with him in that stretch of time. He has not only demonstrated his ability and energy—that he can be counted on to handle the job—but he has also shown that he can make friends as well as fight. He even makes friends of the very ones he fights. Nobody hates TOM CONNALLY. The way he wears his name indicates the sort of "good scout" he is. It used to be "Thomas Terry," but did not fit that way.

The value and influence of a man in the Senate is not measured by ability alone; character and personality also count for a great deal. Those qualities inspire trust and cooperation on the part of others. By way of proof that people like Senator TOM CONNALLY is the fact that in his reelection to the Senate for his third term in 1940 he received the largest vote ever polled by any individual in the State of Texas. And, characteristically, he does not mention that fact in his biographical sketch in the Congressional Directory.

Some political observers who work around the Capitol have picked Senator CONNALLY for the chairmanship of the powerful Finance Committee, to succeed Harrison. There are three prominent majority leaders ahead of him in the point of seniority, GEORGE, of Georgia, WALSH, of Massachusetts, and BARKLEY, of Kentucky—but they all have their hands very full for the present, and they will not worry about the job with TOM CONNALLY on it.

The Lone Star State Senator has already shown his taste and capacity for financial legislation. He is the author of a complete schedule of income-tax rates in the Revenue Act of 1932; he was the author of an amendment to the 1934 Revenue Act placing an excise tax on foreign animal and vegetable oils and fats; and he is the author of the bill for the devaluation of the dollar which was put in operation in 1934, and still operates. The administration would probably feel easy with TOM CONNALLY ready to take charge of that big $3,500,000,000 defense-tax bill soon to reach the Senate. CONNALLY is the only Senator who is a member of the three powerful Committees of Finance, Judiciary, and Foreign Relations.

Another writer who watches the workers at the United States Capitol predicts that CONNALLY will be picked to succeed BYRNES, of South Carolina, as floor leader—sort of administration-Senate liaison officer—to back up Majority Leader BARKLEY, and take his place when necessary. This writer says: "The big scissor-tongued Texan, who can soften that cutting edge to a persuasive drawl, or roll it in a yarn that has the Senate rollicking,

has triple-threat talents rare in the Senate." Besides, CONNALLY has already been an assistant to Senator (soon to be Justice) BYRNES in this confidential work. Perhaps no other Senator could approach all his colleagues on more friendly terms. And he has been consistently a militant supporter of the President, though not a rubber stamp. He has "voted wrong" a few times.

A glance at the life sketch of TOM CONNALLY reveals that he came up the hard way. He was born on a Texas farm and went to the country public schools. He went on to Baylor University and the University of Texas and came out ready to practice law. He soon showed special ability as a trial lawyer, and as county prosecuting attorney he made a record that is still envied and aimed at by young attorneys in that county. (His only son, Ben, is now an attorney in Houston, Tex.) CONNALLY'S friends believe he would have been one of the greatest lawyers of the State if he had stuck to the profession, but his interest in public affairs and his ability to make friends soon pointed his career to politics. He served two terms in the State legislature, and in 1916 was elected to Congress.

But TOM CONNALLY'S mature life was not all law and politics. His is a fighting patriotism. When the War with Spain came up, he enlisted as a private in the Second Texas Volunteer Infantry, and got as far as Florida. In rank he got to be sergeant major. He had hardly learned his way around in Congress when America got into the World War, and he went into the Army again, this time as captain and adjutant, Twenty-second Infantry Brigade. This time he got as far as Fort Meade. The Senator claims a sort of record of having been in more wars and done less fighting than anybody.

A little sidelight on Senator CONNALLY'S military career illustrates his honesty and conscientiousness. In 1919, when the House was considering a resolution for the payment of salaries to Members for the time they were in the military service, the former Texas captain and adjutant rose and made it very plain that he would not accept any such money. "When I entered the Army," he said, "I was willing to accept the reduced pay provided as compensation in the Army. Practically every soldier who joined the colors received less than he did in civil life, and I want no more consideration than was accorded to others in the service."

When Representative CONNALLY became Senator CONNALLY in 1929, a Pathfinder sketch at the time credited him with being "colorful," and an orator whose speeches were "full of wit and sarcasm," and said that in his specialty of foreign affairs "he never failed to pour the acid of his sarcasm and irony into any sore or sensitive spot the ruling party might reveal." He was credited with courage for running for the Senate, for his predecessor had lost out—like so many others—by doing that very thing.

It was only in the last 2 years that majority leaders discovered Senator CONNALLY'S special aptitude for committee work and off-floor negotiations. He did yeoman service for Chairman Pittman of the Foreign Relations Committee in smoothing out and pushing through the aid-to-Britain policy with repeal of the arms embargo, and in enacting the lease-lend bill. CONNALLY, rated as a conservative, is able to patch up differences between conservative and radical factions of the party. And, in addition, he is always ready to be sent into the arena against any champion of the foe for a knock-down and drag-out fight.

TOM CONNALLY excels, both in making war and making peace, in the United States Senate, and now, at 64 years of age, a new period of increased power and influence is apparently opening up to him.

When not in Washington, the Senator, now a widower, makes his home in Marlin Falls County, Tex.

The Coast Guard Operating Under the Present Unlimited National Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FRED BRADLEY, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered over Station WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., on July 16, 1941:

During the present unlimited national emergency declared by the President in his proclamation of May 28 last, it has become increasingly evident to all of us that our normal peacetime pursuits are going to suffer in various degrees and we will unquestionably experience more and greater inconveniences as time goes on. This is, of course, much more noticeable and more immediately noticeable in the case of families whose men folks are in, or entering into, the armed forces of the Nation.

The one particular instance that I want to discuss with you at length today is the situation with respect to the United States Coast Guard. Judging from numerous letters which have come to my office, it is apparent to me that perhaps some misinformation has gotten out to the general public by way of unfounded rumors which has caused considerable alarm, not only among the masters and crews on Great Lakes vessels, but also on the part of yachtsmen and again on the part of those ashore, who for various reasons have a great deal of interest in the operation of the Coast Guard stations in their vicinity; and so, perhaps, in this broadcast I may be able to clarify the situation somewhat based on accurate information which has been given to me by none other than Admiral Russel R. Waesche, commandant of the Coast Guard, a splendid executive, a courageous officer, and a man in whom I have the utmost confidence when I promise you that he will do the best possible job with the greatest degree of efficiency under extremely trying circumstances.

First of all, may I assure you that it is not contemplated that any Coast Guard station on the Great Lakes will be closed down during the present navigation season. It is true that there have been marked, and in some instances almost drastic, reductions in trained personnel, which have been occasioned entirely by the present war emergency, but these situations are being rectified as rapidly as possible.

Now let me give you some of the background. As you all know, the United States Coast Guard is one of our very oldest armed services, which for many years has operated under direction of the Secretary of the Treasury in peacetime, but which in the event of war is transferred to the Secretary of the Navy. Inasmuch as we are still not officially at war, this service is still operating under the Secretary of the Treasury, but much of its personnel has recently been transferred to active service under direction of the Navy.

Until comparatively recently, our Coast Guard was operating with a force of 9,000 enlisted men. Because of the present emergency demands, the Congress has authorized an increase of approximately 10,000 men. These additional men have been, and are continuing to be, recruited as rapidly as possible, about 1,000 men still being required to fill the new authorized strength. These new recruits are being trained to serve not only as replacements for the trained men who have been taken away but to meet the expanded activities of the service.

In addition to this personnel, it is well to remember that within the past year, under the President's reorganization plan, the Coast Guard assumed jurisdiction over the former United States Lighthouse Service, by reason of which some 5,000 additional men—who then enjoyed civilian status—some 3,400 of which have been and are now being taken into the Coast Guard as enlisted personnel; and the remaining 1,600 will still be retained in a civilian status, but none of these men in either classification will suffer any loss of pay, rank, seniority, or retiring status. But this transfer, of course, has caused a tremendous amount of difficulty in arranging for seniority status, ration allowance, rate of pay equalization, etc. Furthermore, in some instances the inspection of the various lighthouse stations has been transferred to other personnel, although this is not true in all instances. I feel confident that as rapidly as possible any present existing difficulties caused by this transfer of the Lighthouse Service to the Coast Guard will be rectified and smoothed out. In this connection it is interesting to remember that practically all of the executive and supervising personnel in Washington of the former Lighthouse Service are still on the job and still directly responsible for the detail of handling the Lighthouse Service. Furthermore, these are the men who are directly responsible for the question of ironing out these details of reorganization.

Now, just what are some of the emergency demands which have been made on Admiral Waesche and his aides for trained personnel; and what are some of the difficulties encountered in supplying this unusual emergency demand?

I previously told you that at the start we had an enlisted personnel of about 9,000 men, about 2,400 of whom were generally known by us civilians as lifesavers. These are the men who have been manning the stations on the Great Lakes and our other coast lines.

Recently in one stroke Admiral Waesche was ordered to furnish about 2,100 trained seamen and surfmen for manning transports under the jurisdiction of the Navy; some of these vessels only recently being transferred to the Navy from their merchant-marine status. In the past the Navy would have normally manned these transports with their own men, but, as you all know, we are at present rapidly expanding our Navy from our traditional one-ocean Navy into a two-ocean Navy, and this, of course, has created a tremendous strain on the Navy itself for trained personnel. Therefore, they had to fall back onto the Coast Guard for not only the trained surfmen but for men with seagoing ratings as well. Some 700 of this first allotment went to man one vessel alone, the U. S. S. *Wakefield*, formerly the S. S. *Manhattan*. And the other 1,400 are being divided up for manning fully 4 other new transports and also to furnish small-boat crews for 22 other transports. Doubtless some of these transports have been used for the transfer of men to our new outlying bases far at sea, as for instance in the case of Greenland and possibly also Iceland.

Now, in speaking of small-boat crews, let me remind you that the present war has served grim warnings on us in the case of Dunkirk and again in Crete that there may conceivably arise occasions when it becomes necessary to land or to evacuate troops from beaches in an emergency situation. Consequently, our Army in conjunction with the

Navy and the Coast Guard has developed a special type of small boat for this purpose, and hence Admiral Waesche was recently called upon for some 1,400 additional trained surfmen other than those mentioned above to be assigned to man these boats, two at a time, to train Navy personnel in their proper use, and a number are being used to train Army men as well in the proper use of these small boats. As you seamen all know, it is no small task, and calls for experience of high order, to successfully launch, handle, and land these boats in a surf, and I know of no one in our services who should know more about it, or have had more experience, than the Coast Guard, but here again, you see that we have suddenly been called upon to supply over a third of our trained personnel for this emergency program.

Added to all this let me say there have been other additional duties imposed on the Coast Guard by reason of the emergency. For instance, they have been called upon to board and police those merchant vessels of foreign flag which we recently seized in our various harbors, and which had sought a haven of refuge early in this war when we were supposed to be a neutral nation. The Coast Guard is still policing those boats. Again, they have been called upon to perform considerable harbor police work to forestall possible sabotage to ships loading war matériel for shipment to England and elsewhere. In this task they have been able to fall back rather heavily on the Coast Guard Reserve and have in a great many instances made use of small yachts and other boats which have voluntarily gone into the Coast Guard for the duration of the emergency.

There is another arm of the Coast Guard which is very important and the nature of whose work is somewhat romantic. I refer to the Coast Guard Air Service, whose record of achievement for a number of years has been studded with brilliant rescues at sea and often the thrilling transfer of injured seamen to naval hospitals ashore. Here again we find the Coast Guard has been called upon to loan a number of its well-trained pilots to the Navy for use in training young naval pilots in the correct operation of the famous long-range bombers. We may truly expect those boys will receive the best possible training from these Coast Guard pilots.

All of this, however, has created a tremendous strain on the peacetime operating personnel of our life-saving service and has caused considerable difficulty and inconvenience in the domestic life of these men and their families. It is not expected, however, that for the time being any Coast Guard stations on the Great Lakes will be reduced to less than four trained men, providing that station is equipped with one or more surfboats. And as fast as the trained men are taken away, it is hoped to replace these with the new enlisted men, who will be trained on the job.

One of the things which has caused the most difficulty in these transfers—and I am speaking now directly for any Coast Guard men or those in the Lighthouse Service and their families who may be listening in—is the question of subsistence allowance or ration allowance. And in this, I want to quote directly from a letter received early this month from Admiral Waesche. He says:

"As you will remember, the matter of subsistence allowances for surfmen has always been very troublesome which was increased when we took over the Lighthouse Service. At that time we had a different rate for subsistence for men on lightships, men at lighthouses, men at Coast Guard stations, men on large floating units, men on small floating units, men on detached duty, and probably a few more. Some got a cash allowance for food, others were on a general-mess basis, and still others received a ration allowance (the Government purchased the food up to a certain limited amount per man). The one big difficulty we had in straightening out these allowances was the fact that for many years surfmen received $1 a day cash for subsistence, which they looked upon as part of their pay. Many of them ate at home with their families. If a single man was attached to a Coast Guard station with a number of married men, he fared rather badly. Several months ago we adjusted these ration allowances to bring them into accord but again continued to give the surfmen a cash allowance which we reduced to 81 cents per day but at the same time the Congress allowed these men upward of $34.50 a month as an allowance for quarters, the net result being a distinct gain for the surfmen. But we still had with us the embarrassing situation of paying a cash allowance to surfmen, which they regard as a part of their pay. Consequently, when these surfmen were ordered to transports or away from their stations, they lost their cash allowance and received a ration on board ship with the net result that their families were deprived of this extra amount.

"I have given this whole matter constant thought and study over a long period of time and have discussed it with many officers.

"Today I have drawn up a new plan and issued instructions to place it in effect as soon as possible. Without going into the many ramifications involved, the salient points of the plan are these:

"(1) We will change the basic pay of surfmen from $60 to $72 per month. Those surfmen who have more than 16 years of service and who are now getting $72 a month we will boost to $84 per month (there will be about 150 of this latter class).

"(2) We will take away all cash allowances for food and furnish all men in the Service, including surfmen, food in kind. The increase in pay plus the actual furnishing of the food will more than offset the loss of the cash allowance for food, so that after this plan becomes effective all cash that a surfman receives will be pay and he will receive that pay whether he is at a station, on a transport, or elsewhere, and he will also get his actual food whether he is at a station, on a transport, or elsewhere. In this way, his being moved in an emergency as at present will in no way affect the amount of money he has available for the support of his wife and children. The plan further visualizes that all men in the future will have to pass very rigid requirements to be rated a surfman. I feel that when this plan becomes effective (and it should become effective within a month) it will once for all obviate any complaints from surfmen that have any merit. At present I can understand the discontent resulting in moving a surfman from a station to a transport with an apparent reduction in remuneration.

"I have no objection to your using the foregoing in any way you please as I see no difficulty in placing the above plan into effect. I will have to get the Secretary of the Treasury to go along with me in raising the pay of these surfmen, but I feel that he will do so." (End of quote from Admiral Waesche.)

In conclusion, I personally want to remind all of you men in the Coast Guard and Lighthouse that we are in an emergency. You are in our armed forces—America expects and we know you will do your duty. And to those of you others interested in this whole question, may I say this: I want to caution all of you masters and seamen, all of you yachtsmen and small-boat operators, and all of you who normally rely on the Coast Guard, to remember that this country is facing an emergency—a war emergency. The Coast Guard is an armed military force of this Nation, and as such must take its place out of normal peacetime pursuits on the front line of defense of this Nation. You yourselves have a tremendously important responsibility ahead of you, not the least of that responsibility must be your realization that for the present at least the Coast Guard stations on the Great Lakes are, of necessity, operating with a drastically reduced personnel of trained men, therefore, you must be on your guard, you must be a little more careful than usual to see to it that you operate your boats with safety first in mind. Let safety be your watchword.

Sesquicentennial of Vermont and Lyndon Independence Day, Every Day

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, OF VERMONT, AT LYNDON, VT., JULY 4, 1941

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered on July 4, at Lyndon, Vt., their sesquicentennial day:

Mr. Chairman, you people of Lyndon honor yourselves in honoring the memories of those early settlers of Lyndon, who 150 years ago today held their first town meeting right here and elected their officers for the year ensuing.

Somebody certainly was patriotically and sentimentally inclined who selected the day and date as the Fourth of July for that first town meeting. You have a right to treasure the tradition.

What does make a nation, the philosophers say, is the sharing of the same great traditions, the cherishing of sacred places, the veneration of the same great men, the same wistful memories, and, above all, the tradition of valiance in the defense of freedom.

It is an honor I genuinely appreciate to have a part in the observance of this sesquicentennial anniversary in Lyndon.

This year we, the people of the State of Vermont, as we observe Independence Day, also celebrate the sesquicentennial anniversary of our admission to the Union. As we celebrate that anniversary and yours, we should not lose sight of the fact that the history of Vermont antedates both events by a good many years.

In fact, as has been suggested, Lake Champlain and the Green Mountains were in existence long before the white man appeared on the scene.

Those not so fortunate as to know our story may wonder why it is that Vermont was not admitted to the Union until 1791, and what the Green Mountain boys were doing between 1776 and earlier, and 1791. The answer is found in the fact that for many of those years Vermont was an independent republic, owing and giving allegiance neither to King George the Third nor to the Continental Congress.

Independence in the Green Mountain area was more than political and far from negative. Independence is the correct word to use in order to describe the status of the government of Vermont and the attitude of her people, who were and still are, as Mr. Van De Water pictures them, a remarkable folk, buoyant, boisterous, free from the Puritan gloom, highly individualistic, and withal

passionate lovers of their hard and lonely land.

Having no assurance from the Continental Congress that Vermont would ever be permitted to exist as a State, in fact being refused admission and even denied supplies by the Continental Congress; exposed to attacks on the northern frontier and from Lake Champlain by the British and their Indian allies, they developed that love of the visible land, the hills and lakes and valleys and mountains, which they had wrested from the wilderness at so great a cost, which made them ready to defend it and their lives and liberties at all hazards in order to assure for themselves the permanency of that independence and the transmission to their posterity of that which they had so laboriously won.

It seems to me that it is also very appropriate that we honor ourselves as Vermonters in recalling the fact that we are today observing the anniversary of the birth of Vermont's great son, that typical Vermonter, Calvin Coolidge. Historians, despite the futile attempts of a jealous, small-minded, and inferior group to whom he paid but little, if any, attention, to belittle his achievements—will write his name high on the scroll of those truly great men who have rendered their country outstanding service as its President. Dogs still bark at the moon.

In these days of centralization of government we are too prone to forget that it is not by pruning away individuality but by cultivating it wisely that human beings become valuable to themselves and to others and that human life becomes rich, diversified, and interesting. Individuality is equivalent to development. This the pages of history abundantly demonstrate.

We Vermonters are called rugged individualists. While we know that is true, we modestly conceal from everybody our appreciation of the fact that the story of the Green Mountain boys parallels even that of the Greeks at Thermopylae in its uniqueness with respect to the intrepidity and the bravery exhibited, in its intense interest to students of government and in its appeal to lovers of liberty. That is the Vermonter in us.

So, on this Independence Day, in sesquicentennial year, I would like first to call your attention to the Declaration of Independence. Do you know that a few years ago I found, to my sorrow, that the Declaration of Independence was not included in the histories and civics and other textbooks used in the schools of Vermont? I hope such a situation has been corrected. It should have been.

The papers of this morning carry an Associated Press dispatch which should make everybody sit up and take notice. This is the way it reads:

"N. E. A. RECOMMENDS PURGE IN TEACHING PROFESSION, BOSTON, JULY 3

"A purging of the American teaching profession of educators found 'inimical to the best interests of our country,' was recommended today by the National Education Association, major teachers' organization in the Nation, with a membership of more than 200,000 men and women, from grade-school instructors to university presidents.

"Voting to set up the framework of a national commission of 60 educators, whose duties would include investigation of 'alleged subversive teaching,' delegates to the N. E. A.'s seventy-ninth convention further implemented their action by adopting a resolution opposing the appointment of any teacher 'who advocates, or who is a member of any organization that advocates, changing the form of government of the United States by other than constitutional means.'"

That is a good job, long deferred. You just cannot laugh it off any longer. It is no joke. The threat is portentous. Under the guise of academic freedom a few teachers right here in Vermont (thank God, only a few) who labor under the delusion that they can improve the fundamentals of our form of government have been inadvisedly teaching your children disrespect for American institutions. I am advised that the attention of school boards has been called to the matter by anxious parents, but the complaints have been either ignored or treated as the product of an overenthusiastic American. I have also been advised that one or two school superintendents have insisted on the teachers' right to "academic freedom," which some have made a license to disseminate communistic, socialistic, and un-American theories, right here in Vermont.

The great majority of teachers and superintendents want to rid their profession of these so-called, but pseudo liberals. I know they feel as I do that any man or woman who is not a 100 percent loyal American has no business on any school board, as a superintendent of schools or as a teacher in our schools. Your children should not be subjected to the insidious influence of these mentally unbalanced people.

It is not even smart to be a Communist. There are those who think it is. Despite what they may try to make you think, let me tell you that if they only knew what the Communist Party stands for they must know it is out to overthrow this Government of ours, and by force and violence, or other unlawful means, if necessary to achieve that end. That is in their declaration of principles. They believe in academic freedom. These Communists are a menace to America. So are all their imitators. The N. E. A. is doing a patriotic service and protecting its own good name.

Academic freedom! How many sins against our form of government have been deliberately committed in thy name! The hotbed of anti-Americanism is located at Columbia University, City College, and in other intellectual circles, and in other groups more insidiously un-American, that are encouraged, coddled, and financially supported as pet charities by misguided people, some of whom are in high places. Our colleges and schools have been insidiously communized by these people and the example they have set.

We are so dumb we are fairly numb in our insensibility to what we have tolerated to be done to us. It is time to speak out about some of these things we see and know. The people have a right to be told, and should be told what is being done to them, and for one, I do not propose later to be held accountable for not having done my best to advise them.

So far as I am personally concerned, and as your Representative, it might as well be understood by "fifth columnists," "parlor pinks," "fellow travelers," "pseudo liberals," and all those "lickspittle," "milksop" Americans who criticize me for being outspoken against them and their kind that I have no question as to what my duty is in the premises.

My position can best be stated once for all, and for all time, in the words of Daniel Webster, which I have the presumption and determination to make my own, when he said:

"I mean to stand upon the Constitution. I need no other platform. I shall know but one country. The ends I aim at shall be my country's, my God's, and truth's. I was born an American; I live an American; I shall die an American; and I intend to perform the duties incumbent upon me in that character to the end of my career. I mean to do this with absolute disregard of personal consequences. Let the consequences be what they will, I am careless. No man can suffer too much, and no man can fall too soon, if he suffer or if he fall in defense of the liberties and Constitution of his country."

The principles, methods, and aims of the Communists and their fellow travelers and sympathizers and supporters are the very antithesis of academic freedom. A group that is organized and acts for the purpose of spreading communism through schools and colleges and in youth groups, carrying on its effort underground and clandestinely, has no place in the American system of education, and no place in America anywhere, nor has any individual so inclined. That's plain talk, but true.

Candor is a bitter pill for such people however high they ride to have to swallow, but millions of Americans agree with me and hold that the greed of this group and some individuals for money; their love of power; their obsession for experimentation; their egocentric monomania for publicity at the people's expense; and other things too numerous to mention, are responsible for the weakening of the moral fiber, the breaking down of morale and morals, the turmoil and the lack of confidence found in the body politic today. It is too bad, but too true, but not too late to correct it.

The light of pitiless publicity should be mercilessly turned on the activities of these very people. They should be exposed. No one should be overimpressed, awed, coerced, or cowed by the position any of these people happen to occupy, or by their delusions of grandeur, and least of all by their fantastic theories—social, economic, and paternalistic.

The "fifth column" has been at work here ever since Hitler made his plan to dominate the world. Right here in Vermont, my friends, there have been, and there are still, a few of those who under the egocentric impulse and the camouflage that they are "liberals" are promulgating un-American ideas and theories clearly destructive of those fundamentals on which this State and the United States were founded.

If they love some other country better than their own and what it affords, then they should go to that country or we should send them there. There is no neutral ground. This country was established as an independent republic. It is high time, if not already too late that we should be up and at those who directly or surreptitiously are undertaking in our schools, churches, and elsewhere to undermine our Government and thereby to deprive you and your children of the priceless privileges it is yours and theirs to enjoy. It is either we or they.

Every red-blooded American ought to join in heart and spirit with the cadets at West Point in their Sunday morning prayer when they say, "Strengthen and increase our admiration for honest dealing and clean thinking, and suffer not our hatred of hypocrisy and pretense ever to diminish. * * * Endue us with courage * * * that knows no fear when truth and right are in jeopardy."

But, as I started to say, the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America reads in part as follows:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Did you know that the Green Mountain boys, your great-grandfathers, issued their own declaration of independence? Do you know anything about it? Did you ever read it?

The trouble with all of us Vermonters is that while we inherited the characteristics and the temperament and the disposition of our forebears, yet too many of us do not know what it is all about or why.

We are Green Mountain boys? Yes; but if anybody in this one hundred and fiftieth year of our life as a State should pin us

down to answer the question, "Why are you Green Mountain Boys?" all we could say is, "Ethan Allen took Ticonderoga." That is no answer at all; it only lets us lie back on laurels won for us by somebody else.

And, by the way, did you ever read The Green Mountain Boys or The Rangers? Shame on you who never have. You do not know what you have missed.

Did you ever visit any of the places mentioned in either of those historical novels? What do you know about the historical geography of our State? In my opinion—with which not too many are obliged to agree—The Green Mountain Boys and The Rangers and certain portions of the text found in Governor and Council and a lot of other works covering the early history of Vermont ought to be required reading in all the schools of this State.

However, be that as it may, I started to ask you if you were aware that the Green Mountain Boys made their own declaration of independence. Did you know that it reads in part as follows:

"VERMONT'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

"In convention of the representatives from the several counties and towns of the New Hampshire Grants, holden at Westminster, January 15, 1777, by adjournment

"Whereas the honorable the Continental Congress did, on the 4th day of July last, declare the United Colonies in America to be free and independent of the crown of Great Britain; which declaration we most cordially acquiesce in; and whereas by the said declaration the arbitrary acts of the crown are null and void in America, consequently the jurisdiction by said crown granted to New York government over the people of the New Hampshire Grants is totally dissolved:

"We, therefore, the inhabitants, on said tract of land, are at present without law or government, and may be truly said to be in a state of nature; consequently a right remains to the people of said Grants to form a government best suited to secure their property, well being, and happiness. We, the delegates from the several counties and towns on said tract of land, bounded as follows: South on the north line of Massachusetts Bay; east on Connecticut River; north on Canada line; west as far as the New Hampshire Grants extends;

"After several adjournments for the purpose of forming ourselves into a distinct separate State, being assembled at Westminster, do make and publish the following declaration, viz:

" 'That we will, at all times hereafter, consider ourselves as a free and independent State, capable of regulating our internal policy, in all and every respect whatsoever—and that the people on said Grants have the sole and exclusive and inherent right of ruling and governing themselves in such manner and form as in their own wisdom they shall think proper, not inconsistent or repugnant to any resolve of the Honorable Continental Congress.

" 'Furthermore, we declare by all the ties which are held sacred among men, that we will firmly stand by and support one another in this our declaration of a State, and in endeavoring as much as in us lies, to suppress all unlawful routs and disturbances whatever. Also we will endeavor to secure to every individual his life, peace, and property against all unlawful invaders of the same.

" 'Lastly we hereby declare, that we are at all times ready, in conjunction with our brethren in the United States of America, to do our full proportion in maintaining and supporting the just war against the tyrannical invasions of the ministerial fleets and armies, as well as any other foreign enemies, sent with express purpose to murder our fellow brethren, and with fire and sword to ravage our defenseless country * * *.' "

Do you know that the constitution which your grandfathers adopted was a copy, almost verbatum et literatum, of the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1776? But that's not all the story. The Pennsylvania Constitution which they copied almost in its entirety can be traced back almost a century to 1682 to the Frame of Government granted by William Penn with the authority of King Charles II. Incidentally, William Penn and Benjamin Franklin were the real authors of the remarkable features in the first Constitution of Vermont, and one Dr. Young of Pennsylvania was the guide, philosopher, and friend of the Green Mountain Boys.

Let me this day call your attention to some of the provisions of that first constitution on which rests what Vermont has been and is today.

First, listen to the initial paragraph of the preamble. It was drafted by Ira Allen and is as much a part of the constitution as is any other, and, so far as I know, has never been rescinded. Here it is:

"Whereas all government ought to be instituted and supported for the security and protection of the community, as such, and to enable the individuals who compose it to enjoy their natural rights and the other blessings which the Author of Existence has bestowed upon man; and whenever those great ends of government are not obtained, the people have a right, by common consent, to change it, and take such measures as to them may appear necessary to promote their safety and happiness.

* * * * *

"Therefore it is absolutely necessary for the welfare and safety of the inhabitants of this State, that it should be, henceforth, a free and independent State."

That is rugged individualism exhibited and exemplified.

Now, having examined the preamble, let's look at the original Vermont Constitution itself for a minute. If time permitted, we could do no better than to read and seriously reflect upon chapter 1 thereof, article by article, for therein contained is the declaration of the rights of the inhabitants of the State of Vermont.

It is significant that the first article reads as follows:

"That all men are born equally free and independent and have certain natural, inherent, and unalienable rights, amongst which are the enjoying and defending of life and liberty; acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety. Therefore, no male person, born in this country, or brought from over sea, ought to be holden by law, to serve any person, as a servant, slave, or apprentice, after he arrives to the age of 21 years, nor female, in like manner, after she arrives to the age of 18 years, unless they are bound by their own consent, after they arrive at such age, or bound by law, for the payment of debts, damages, fines, costs, or the like."

This was the first emancipation act in America. It was not a glittering generality, for the General Assembly in 1786 passed an act to prohibit the sale and transportation of Negroes, it having been made to appear that sales "of such persons as slaves" were being made "notwithstanding their being liberated by the Constitution."

From time to time I have been asked how our State came to be named Vermont. Without discussing the suggestions that are made in various books, I am satisfied that the facts are that the State was officially named Vermont upon the advice of Dr. Thomas Young, of Pennsylvania. Originally the area was known as New Connecticut. If you will look at page 43 of volume I of Governor and Council, you will find a statement of facts drawn up by Charles Phelps, of Marlboro, to the effect—

"That on or about the 15 day of January 1777, a number of people from sundry parts of said New Hampshire Grants, calling themselves New Staters, or people in favor of a new State, met at Westminster in the aforesaid county of Cumberland and State of New York, and declared said District and the people inhabiting thereon to be a new State by the name of New Connecticut.

"That all those who so met at Westminister aforesaid, and all the people whom they pretended to represent, as well as all those who, by the advice of Dr. Thomas Young, afterward held a convention at Windsor in June, or at any other time during that year, and formed and established a constitution or plan of government for what, by his advice also, they called Vermont—i. e., the people of the Green Mountains—did not amount to one-hundredth part of the inhabitants of New York State."

These statements are corroborated by official records of conventions and by documents. It may be too bad to spoil some of the fairy stories that have been circulated, but if you are interested in facts, you will satisfy yourself by reading the records of those early days that Vermont was so named at the suggestion and on the advice of this Dr. Young, the guide, counselor, and friend of the struggling commonwealth.

Anyone who is conversant with our early history must be impressed by the fact that the men and women who laid the foundations of our State meant exactly what they said and had the faculty to say what they meant—and in no uncertain terms. It is probably true that "Vermont as nearly as any spot upon the earth's crust has been the scene of the most conspicuous action by men in all efforts to create, maintain, and advance a true independence of person and state and upon principles fundamentally included in the term 'self-government'."

In fact the history of Vermont "upon utmost analysis discloses that no people organized as a State have more nearly attained to perfect sovereignty or maintained it under their constitution and political methods. Vermont has been an extraordinary upbuilder of the Nation because of the intrinsic character of the people who compose it."

The question which now confronts you and me is, Will we carry on? Can we carry the load? Our responsibility is tremendous. Are we afraid? Of whom?

These are critical days and troublesome times for those who love liberty. We come from a stock to whom the more abundant life only means one that we can carve out for ourselves without the dictation or interference of a paternalistic government. We may well remember that a typical Vermonter, Calvin Coolidge, once said that: "The America which Washington founded does not mean we shall have everything done for us, but that we shall have every opportunity to do everything for ourselves." That is 100-percent Americanism.

The problems which confront us are too numerous to permit at this time even a cataloging, not to say a discussion of them seriatim. The question is, Where are we and where are we going? Who knows?

Shall we quit? Never.

It is our task to finish the job or to go down with all that has been accomplished blotted out in a complete black-out. What a picture.

We must go forward. We must turn our faces to the future, come what may. There must be no retreat.

There is no such word as retreat in the vocabulary of a Vermonter.

We might as well, each and all of us, invoke the spirit of Tennyson's Ulysses, who said:

"Come my friends,
'Tis not too late to seek a newer world.
Push off, and sitting well in order smite
The sounding furrows: for my purpose holds
To sail beyond the sunset, and the baths
Of all the western stars until I die.
* * * * *
To strive, to seek, to find—and not to yield."

It is strange that Americans do not appreciate the fact that this world revolution now in progress will not stop short of America. It is incapable of stopping short of anywhere until it has conquered the world or been conquered by the world. "Nobody can stay out of a world revolution. It can be resisted or accepted." It cannot be ignored.

"There will be no second chance for us unless the revolution is beaten" has been well said, for it is true.

So "put the Vermonters ahead once more and close up the column.'

It is no idle boast for us Vermonters to say as Americans that what we purpose that we perform. So today, imbued, enthused, and encouraged by the independence that is ours, and the thought of all that those who preceded us have made possible for us, let us go forward with determination to preserve, protect, and defend all that is ours and to transmit to posterity our priceless privileges on a shield unsullied and without a stain.

"To what new fates, my country, far
And unforeseen of foe or friend,
Beneath what unexpected star
Compelled to what unchosen end?
"Across the sea that knows no beach
The Admiral of Nations guides
Thy blind obedient keels to reach
The harbor where thy future rides!
* * * * *
"I do not know beneath what sky
Nor on what seas shall be thy fate.
I only know it shall be high;
I only know it shall be great."

Public Sentiment Against Participation in European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1941

LETTER FROM WILLIAM BRIGHAM, OF FOND DU LAC, WIS.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress receive many letters from constituents exercising their constitutional right of petition.

I am pleased to incorporate as part of these remarks a letter recently received from Mr. William Brigham, of Fond du Lac, Wis., that voices the sentiment of many people in America and is thoughtful enough to claim the attention of the Congress.

Mr. Brigham's letter follows:

JULY 10, 1941.

MY DEAR MR. KEEFE: In what I am about to say I am giving the views as stressed by the public. However, I do wish to commend you on your stand on the floor and in your articles in opposition to our entry into this inferno of destruction. And now permit me to give the views as expressed by the great majority.

As the warmongers increase their activities to our nearer involvement, the intensity increases against it, both in numbers and bitter opposition. And one other regret is that certain Members of Congress are being softened up and inveigled into the ranks of the warmongers. And, again, we hear the sentiment that Congress is not acting in accordance with our Constitution and for the welfare of the American people. And here are a few of the arguments in defense of their opposition to the billions expended and hurled haphazardly and without any sense of remuneration, but from a realistic sense aiding in our own destruction.

We hear the multitudes opposing the wail of the warmongers: "Help England. Save democracy." The public bitterly assails this unorthodox statement and justly contends that England has at no time operated in any sense of democracy, but has forced its hundreds of millions to exist under the bruising heel of despotism and that England is our traditional enemy, as are all European nations.

Due to these facts, the great majority opposes any union, affiliation, or involvement with any or all European nations other than in a commercial way. Congress should stop and consider its liabilities and duties in behalf of the American people, in that we have 49,000,000 receiving aid and parity, and one-third of our people ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed, and an estimated one-half of these in destitute circumstances, 10,000,000 over 60, and a great majority in dire want. In our small State of Wisconsin we have 51,000 over 65, and one-half of them receiving $10 to $15 per month, which barely supplies sleeping quarters, and to maintain life and existence they are forced to beg, pillage, and steal.

We frequently see in the Appendix and the press by Members of Congress and bigwigs that the public are gullible in respect to the trend of activities, etc. The sentiment I hear expressed is that although Congress and the administration have the bull by the horns, they are not fooling the public and they are well aware they are being sold down the river. We hear much dissent against fondling and aiding Russia, as anyone with little intellect knows that Russia has created more subterfuge, communism, etc., than any European nation and that Stalin is the greatest human butcher of all.

In my various contacts of recent date regarding Iceland, the headlines, orders given to shoot, etc., the sentiment is very tense and bitterly opposed by the great majority, and this is due to the fact that the public realizes these measures and their increased advancement are instigated and operated by an element of totalitarian and monarch-minded warmongers. The public resents the fact that Congress is standing idly by and permitting these un-American activities in defiance to our Constitution and the welfare and the wishes of the American people. We often hear the well-read and intelligent public bitterly denounce the remarks and open activities of Knox, Stimson, Willkie, and others of their ilk.

And let me say that 90 percent of the people give open approval that Congress should arise in defense of their rights and the powers vested in them and disrupt and destroy all warmongering activities and castigate the instigators and operators.

One other cry of the war creators is, "Feed starving Europe." How often do we hear of anything pertaining to aid for the millions of American patriots who gave their all and were instrumental in the creation of this great America and due to fate and circumstances are penniless, ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clothed, and millions half famished, unkempt, and existing in sordid conditions.

If Congress and the administration have any notion that the public approves of these incredulous activities, they are very much in error. These activities are utterly condemned here, there, and everywhere by the American people.

I could continue on, but I have already written to a great extent. I have endeavored to give the sentiment as expressed here and there, and in finale let me say that the public is assuming a deep, smoldering resentment of disapproval and grim determination. While they bitterly regret it and still have hopes, they are in fear that the totalitarian and war-minded element will lure us into this inferno of destruction and despotism And so today we hear the cry: "God forbid it. It must not happen here."

In closing I wish to assure you I mean no discredit to any Member in Congress who is a credit to himself and faithful to the confidence and trust placed in him. I realize the bitter resistance and power of opposition against those who battle for the principles of justice and equality. And so, hoping for a clarification of the difficulties before us, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WM. BRIGHAM,
Fond du Lac, Wis.

Youth Matches the Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. LISTER HILL, OF ALABAMA

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, on the 1st of July this year the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] delivered an address at the seventy-ninth annual convention of the National Education Association, at Boston, Mass. The subject of the address was Youth Matches the Hour. I ask that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As the youth of today views the world with its contradictions and its confusion and looks for light for his guidance or seeks to attune his ear to the voice of reason and finds answer only in the babel of tongues that this day resounds in America, he must feel as did Matthew Arnold when he spoke of the age in which he lived as groping between two worlds—the one gone forever and the other powerless to be born.

In the days before the present emergency we wer the greatest and the richest Nation in all the world. We had a higher standard of living for our workers; we had more children in free schools, regardless of race, creed, or color. We had the best scientists, the best chemists, the best engineers, the best doctors, and the best teachers in the world.

We had the finest transportation system in the air, on the land, and on the water, with a quarter of a million miles of railroads and 3,000,000 miles of paved highways. We

had more automobiles than all the other nations of the earth combined; every fifth person in our land owned an automobile, every seventh had a telephone, and every fifth possessed a radio.

We had more newspapers than the other 20 nations of the hemisphere put together. Our great cities reared their walls like the fabled cities of the giants. We had bounteous crops and bursting granaries. We still had vast forests and untouched minerals and wonderful natural wealth in our soils and hills and streams—capable of being transformed into all those things that please and prosper humankind. Our art had cast off European self-consciousness and obsequity to Old World forms, and from the genius of our artists there was emerging a graphic art and design of our own, while our music was contributing to the gladness of the world.

We are today the only first-class Nation in the world living as free men and free women, able to worship at our own altars, speak our own faith, and walk erect.

And yet, in the days before the emergency with its great tempo of production and the opportunity it presents for employment, we had 9,000,000 men unemployed, walking the streets, and tramping the highways searching for jobs.

A third of our population, 45,000,000 people, received too little to feed, or clothe, or house themselves at a decent level, too little to protect themselves against disease, starvation, and a life of poverty. The question was being asked why was it possible that there was a surplus of food products in one part of the country while hundreds of thousands of people were on the verge of starvation in another part—why were all sorts and kinds of things being produced without any means of getting them into the hands of those who needed them most.

We saw the squalor in the slums and tenements of our cities, the tumble-down shacks in the Cotton Belt, with its poverty and its exploitation, and the Joads roaming the wasted lands of the West. Nearly half the 32,000,000 farm people of our country lived in tenancy, or as sharecroppers, or as day-to-day laborers, with no land of their own, the masters of not a single acre, and with little or no encouragement to save the soil or make better homes for themselves and their families. We saw the deep gullies and the wash of the rich topsoil where the waters had poured down the hillsides in the wake of the lumberjack. We saw our rivers running red to the sea with the soil's rich red blood while woodlands of millions of acres had been depleted. We had wasted, we had exploited, we had forgotten the golden heritage in wild pursuit for the golden dollar.

We witnessed the most appalling differences in educational opportunity both among and within the States—differences due to no lack of effort on the part of the States, but due to economic conditions beyond the power of the States to control—differences in wealth, income, taxpaying ability, absentee ownership of resources and industries—differences in the number of children in proportion to adults.

Eight years ago, stunned and frightened by the depression, we awoke from a dream in which we had been chasing the rainbow of pseudo prosperity and realized that we had passed into a new era; that the old frontier, the land frontier of the United States, was gone; and that we could no longer solve depression by shipping the unemployed West.

Men were hungry, but the good earth that had fed mankind from the very beginning was still here, needing only man's initiative, imagination, and energy to plan, plant, and reap. Bread for thousands of hungry mouths was here, and all that was needed was a way, a way to distribute it, a way to cause it to flow from the farm to the factory and from the factory to the pantries of the people. That was the awakening in our times.

We proclaimed the continuous responsibility of government for human welfare. We set about to repair the damages and ravages of past generations. We launched a great program of conservation of forest and soil and water and human beings. We set aside 175,000,000 acres of beautiful forest land—enough to cover all of France—for the use of our children and our children's children. We began to restore our land to rebuild Mother Earth, and to preserve it for those yet unborn, to eliminate farm tenancy, and to carry the benefits and blessing of electricity to the farm home, to give agriculture parity with industry.

We built and rebuilt countless schoolhouses and in some instances even paid school teachers with Federal funds. We multiplied manyfold the Federal funds for vocational education. With C. C. C. and N. Y. A., we provided educational benefits for disadvantaged youths. We cleared slums, built hospitals, fought disease, lifted mortgages, increased per capita income, restored people, in case after case removed the hand of greed and ruthless exploitation, won inmortal victories for the economic rights of man, elevated the worth and the dignity of the individual, and gave to the people a better day and a new hope.

But the youth of today must realize that the job has only begun.

The great work with the elimination of its errors and its omissions must go on. The youth of today must realize that with the homesteading of the last of the old frontier and with the advent and marvelous development of the machine, the question is not how to compete with each other for enough of this world's goods but to learn how to live with each other in abundance.

Unhappiness and need are the natural forerunners of revolution. Men who are out of jobs, men whose families are in want, cannot be expected to view with satisfaction for long the institutions under which they live.

Wise men, from Benjamin Franklin to Andrew Carnegie, preached that if the individuals in a nation practiced thrift and hard work all would be well. The doctrine may have been right in an economy of scarcity but in an economy of abundance other duties and other qualities are demanded. The youth of today must learn how to obey economic traffic lights and drive great social machines on the right-hand side of the road.

Our fathers who builded our Nation were concerned primarily with political freedom. Our concern must be for both political freedom and economic freedom—freedom from starvation, freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom to enjoy the fruits of one's own honest labors.

America's young men and young women must write the future guaranties for economic freedom just as the writers of the Declaration of Independence and the authors of the Constitution wrote through thought and action the guaranties of the political liberties which they left as our heritage.

The youth of today must hold fast to the sacredness of the individual because on the individual as a cornerstone all American life, all American civilization, and all American success has been built, but at the same time he must realize that the great struggle is on the new frontiers of economic justice.

He must realize that the keynote of the new frontiers must be cooperation through the democratic process even as that of the old frontiers was individualistic competition. He must think more in terms of social invention and less in terms of mechanical invention, more in terms of security, peace, and the good life for all. He must open the doors that common men throughout the land may enter into their inheritance.

That the youth of today may do these things so necessary to the life of our country and to the maintenance of our free institutions, he must be given the best possible training and education.

Educational opportunities throughout the land must be equalized by raising all educational standards to the best. This can be done only through the resources and power of the Federal Government. I make bold to say that it is the solemn responsibility and the compelling duty of the Federal Government to do this. In the tortuous and complex civilization in which we live, a nation cannot maintain its democratic way of life if its people be ignorant. And in this day of gigantic military machines in the air, on land, and on water, made possible by the use of modern technology, a nation is not safe if it be not economically strong and if its people be not educated in terms of literacy, or vocational skill, and of professional skill.

We enacted the Selective Service Act to prepare our youth to serve the Nation, if need be, in time of war. We should pass the Federal aid for education bill now as the handmaiden to that act to prepare our youth to serve the Nation both in time of war and of peace.

The youth of today must recognize that we live in a changing world, that change is the law of life, and that today's problems cannot be solved with yesterday's solutions. He must dare break with the past. Because we live in an era of tremendous acceleration we can no longer trust to the evolution of future decades to meet new problems. The youth of today must be on the way, for where there is no vision the people perish.

And yet whatever threat there may be at home to our ordered liberty and our free institutions, there is an immediate and far greater danger to our freedom from dark and sinister forces from without.

A plague has come upon the world. It has spread over the whole continent of Europe. It threatens to overwhelm the British Isles. We know from the sad experience of history that plagues spread from east to west until they finally encircle the world.

The plague of which I speak is a strange one—a new and terrible scourge. It attacks both the mind and the body of its victims. It throws their minds into confusion and drives their bodies into slavery.

The plague which threatens us was incubated in the mind of one man—Adolf Hitler. The sinister power of that one man has spread death and destruction, pain and misery, hunger and wretchedness indescribable to over 100,000,000 people in Europe. One must be blind indeed who cannot see the tragedy of a continent and recognize the danger to this continent.

For 7 years Adolf Hitler was making ready for war, openly and arrogantly, yea contemptuously while the prospective victims of that preparation gave it insufficient heed. The democracies of the world and the free people of Europe never grasped the terrible meaning of that tireless preparation. Thirteen democratic nations were all too tardy in their counterpreparation, all too short of vision to combine their strength while they were yet free peoples that they might continue free.

The path of destiny was clear for all the people of Europe to see, and they glimpsed it dimly or not at all. They heard but did not heed the rumblings of the storm. Those rumblings now come to us. Shall we heed them while yet there still is time, or shall we disregard them and suffer by default the destruction of all that we cherish?

Adolf Hitler announced his whole plan. He asks, "Can a dynamic revolution stop at a sharing of the world? Must not the struggle continue until the final world dominion of a single nation? At the back of Germany's continental empire stands the will of absolute dominion of the world, the technical means of which are no longer lacking as hitherto.

Could there be better evidence of Hitler's determination to carry out his plan for world domination than his attack on Russia? If this attack be successful Hitler will have the oil, the wheat, and the vast resources which he needs for the success of his plan.

Adolf Hitler speaks of the United States as a decadent democracy and predicts our early destruction. He arrogantly warns the countries of South America that he will hold them to a strict accounting, remembering those who are for him and those who are against him.

All the trade routes of the world, all the sea lanes, all the separate centers of production, agricultural and industrial, Hitler would weave into one web with Berlin the center and the control. If Britain should go down Adolf Hitler and the Japanese imperialists would dominate all of Europe, Africa, Asia, and Australia. The trade of the United States would be so reduced that it would force a disastrous reduction in the standard of living of our people. Regimentation of our economic and national life and more regimentation would be necessary to the end that the liberties of our people would be more and more shorn from them.

With Hitler commanding a navy greatly superior to our own, with him possessing a capacity for shipbuilding seven times our own, the burden of armament that our people would have to bear would be staggering indeed. All America would be an armed camp. The United States would find itself within the jaws of a gigantic pincers movement—one jaw in Japan and the other jaw in world-conquering Germany with South America the handle through which the pressure would be applied to us.

With South America almost entirely dependent upon Europe for the sale of its export products, its vast agricultural surpluses, Hitler would move into South America economically, politically, and militarily. The United States would stand alone, isolated, without trade, without commerce, and without friends. She would be an island surrounded by a cordon of economic and military pressure and Hitler has declared that there are no longer any islands.

One barrier stands between the United States and Hitler. That barrier is the strength of England, the might of the British Empire. Adolf Hitler has resolved that democracies shall perish from the earth. England fights today for the right of a democracy to exist in a world in which Hitler lives, their democracy and our democracy.

We did not invite this battle of warring ideals but it is ours. We cannot escape it. We must face it. And facing it we must be worthy of the freedom we enjoy. As England is our barrier, we must give her of our strength. We must give freely, greatly, with great heart and great courage. If there is a risk involved, we must take it.

How foolish it would be for the people of the United States to turn all their strength to forging weapons of war if after forging them we hauled them to the seaboard and dumped them into the sea. The only weapon of any value is the weapon at hand. We must forge and we must deliver. We must do all that may be necessary to get our help to England. We must give help to all nations and all peoples that struggle in the common cause of destroying the Hitler scourge. We must do all that may be necessary to protect and to safeguard the vital interest of the United States—wherever that interest may be, whether it be here at home, in South America, in some island in the sea, or in some place once distant but which now, due to the conquest of distance by the airplane, has become an outpost of the liberty and the civilization which we enjoy and which we would preserve.

Fear has not guided our past, and fear will not control our future.

Half-way or half-hearted measures are useless. The democracies of Europe held back while there was time, and they perished. If we hold back because there is danger, if we go only half way in our efforts, we shall be as foolish as they.

To do less than enough is just as bad as to do nothing at all. It is to be unworthy of the great heritage which is ours and to be unfit to be the heirs of the men who fought and founded our Government and transmitted to us the blessings of liberty.

And when this plague that sweeps the earth, this menace that is Adolf Hitler has been destroyed, the youth of today must see that our country plays its part in building a world which shall be immune to a return of such a plague. We failed to meet our responsibility at the close of the World War. For ourselves and for our children, we must not fail again. We thought that we could isolate ourselves from the rest of the world. We did not realize that, although we might isolate, we could not insulate—that the fire in its fury would sweep to us. This hour the flame of Hitlerism is scorchingly close.

We must build a world on the ideal of live and let live, in which economic justice shall prevail and every nation shall have access to the raw materials and resources necessary to a sound economy for that nation to the end that there may be no seedbeds for aggression. We must set up an international order strong enough to impose stringent limitation of armaments and strong enough to prevent the rise of aggressor nations. We must help blaze the trails for new pathways for human rights and human progress and human welfare in every land and in every clime.

As Vice President WALLACE said in a recent address to the Foreign Policy Association: "A generation ago the United States missed her first big chance to serve the world in a big way because of a naive belief in such catchwords as 'isolation' and 'normalcy.' Our second chance is now with us. There are those who will wish to make the same mistakes again. There are none so blind as those who will not see.

"God grant that we may now have the wisdom to write democracy's new testament in a bill of duties, a testament which in no way will deny the old testament with its Declaration of Independence, its Constitution, its Bill of Rights, and its Gettysburg speech. The new testament of democracy will fulfill, not deny the old. But to fulfill there must be a sense of interdependence as well as of independence—a sense of duties as well as of rights—a feeling of responsibility commensurate with our power."

Let us teach our young people, before it is too late, that there can be no true and lasting peace; that there can be no real and lasting state of security and prosperity on the face of the earth, until the peoples of the earth understand one another.

And the world's greatest Nation must lead in this program of human understanding. Our young people must be taught the importance of learning the problems and aspirations, the needs and the grievances of peoples everywhere.

We are woefully ignorant about our South American neighbors. The youth of North America must learn to know and understand the people of South America.

The future welfare of the American continents, the future of democracy itself may hinge upon how well the two Americas learn to know each other. And the first move is up to the people of the United States.

As the youth of today face the challenging problems of our country and the world's great tragedy, let us encourage and inspire them to hold fast to their ideals. Let us stimulate them and help them to cherish their faith for it is faith that subdues the kingdoms and removes the mountains. Goethe did well when he defined the Devil as the spirit that denies and showed him as an urbane gentleman of the world who in the most charming manner cast doubt on everything that savored of faith or virtue or honor.

Bishop McConnell tells us that when he was a boy he used to look with awe at the pictures of prehistoric monsters, the dinosaur, the ichthyosaurus, the mammoth. He wondered how in the world this earth ever got rid of such monsters. They seemed so gigantic, so cruel, so overpowering that he wondered how they ever could have been exterminated. Then as he grew older he learned that they never were exterminated or killed off by direct assault. The climate changed and they died.

The men who founded our Government through their faith changed the thinking of men and women and brought into being this Nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the ideal that all men are created equal.

If the youth of today will but keep their faith and hold fast to the principles in which America had her birth and by which America has become the mightiest Nation in all the world's history, they will be able to change the thinking of men and women. Long ago it was said of Christ by someone whom saw Him dimly in the distant future, "This man will be our peace." It is for the youth of today to claim the promise in His words; it is for them to grasp His message when He declared: "I am come that ye might have life and have it more abundantly."

"Dreams are they? But ye cannot stay them,
Or thrust the dawn back for 1 hour!
Truth, love, and justice, if ye slay them
Return with more than earthly power.
Strive if ye will to seal the fountains that
send the spring through leaf and
spray,
Drive back the sun from the eastern mountains,
Then bid this mightier movement stay."

As the young men and young women of today go forth to meet the great challenge, the challenge of life's great adventure, the challenge for service, the challenge for leadership, the challenge for God and country, I have faith to believe that they will not meet it in the wailing and cowardly complaint of Hamlet, "The time is out of joint. O cursed spite, that ever I was born to set it right," but rather that they will meet that challenge in the ringing words of Rupert Brooke, the Christian crusader, who gave his life in the Mediterranean campaign in the World War, "Now, God be thanked, who has matched me with His hour."

Speech Delivered at State College Graduation Exercises, Amherst, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. DAVID I. WALSH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the commencement address delivered by me at the State College Graduation Exercises at Amherst, Mass., on Monday, June 9, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

You are about to take your place in the stream of life under the most unusual and hazardous circumstances. Few who have preceded you have experienced the various uncertainties and the many obstacles that threaten your right and desire to plan your own future life. Good cheer and happiness on class day naturally prevail, but to all of you here today there is a realism of foreboding clouds and storms.

The world is passing through an epoch in which the very basic foundations of society are being undermined as never before. Not only are the social, economic, and political order disturbed and threatened with even greater ills, but the faith in moral law is shaken. In my early life religion found place in nearly every phase of human life, regardless of one's creed. Work, plans for the future, and even pleasure were accompanied by prayer. Faith in the moral order, that priceless heritage which religion has given us, has ceased to be a dynamic force. Of what use are the spiritual values is asked? It is asserted that spiritual values do not make us richer or more successful, do not help us to get on in this world.

You are entering life at a time when the importance of spiritual values is at a low ebb. You will be shocked to find in places that the idea of the truth has broken down before the laws of expediency. Righteousness has come to mean to many the exacting of rights for one's self. Universal selfishness has taken the place of charity and brotherly love.

This depreciation of spiritual values did not come gradually, but indeed imperceptibly. It is the lust for wealth or for power that has come with the development of our valuable resources and the technical sciences of our day. Gradually, but surely, religion in Europe and in other parts of the world, not excluding our own country, had been giving way to materialism, to the exhortation of wealth and power, to the pursuit of comfort and pleasure; and in public life to an opportunism which most often denies spiritual and moral values.

The result is that many of our people, and you yourself, now that you are about to leave the shelter of your home and school, are disturbed, confused, and discouraged. Yet the hour has struck for you. You are now commanded to enter your years of academical preparedness and take your place in the roaring sea of life which you very naturally are anticipating with trepidation and great anxiety. You cannot hesitate, you have no time to measure values or consequences. "The command is forward." You must take your place in the game of life as you find present-day life, even if it is not as you would have it or make it. It is natural, therefore, for you to ask your older brothers for assistance and for advice gained from the abundance of their experience and through the knowledge that advancing years bring. You ask, "What am I to do?" "Where am I to go?" "What responsibility must I assume?" You ask even more—it is in the recesses of every one of your minds—you ask for guidance. You want to know where you can find a place of security, where your young ambitions may be realized, how and where you can lead a normal life. In a word, you want to know what additional armor plate you must put on to combat the uncertain and terrifying immediate future that confronts you.

Repeatedly you have had outlined to you by your instructors the basic and essential qualities for success in your profession: faithfulness to those whom you serve, personal integrity, industry, and perseverance. The absence of any of these from your professional life will doom you, if not to failure, at least to mediocrity. You are determined to employ all these essentials in the life ahead, but how are you to combat the new and undetermined problems that American youth have not heretofore experienced?

It is extremely difficult to suggest the props and inspiration that your hearts naturally crave at this hour. First and foremost, learn to think, to think with your brains and not with your emotions; learn to realize and understand the consequences of your judgments in matters that concern yourself as well as the rights and welfare of others. Courage and faith are indispensable. With them the trials of the future will be less difficult. Without them the new world about you may overwhelm you. Courage, moral and physical courage, determination to battle life's problems unflinchingly; courage to accept cheerfully the risks, dangers, and demands that will come to you as American youths from the constituted authorities, administering the extreme emergencies in which we live; courage to smother the protests against the inequalities of sacrifice that you, by reason of your age, are called upon to make; courage to give and to sacrifice that others may enjoy the priceless heritage of American life. The spirit to give rather than to possess, at least for the time being, must be a dominant factor in your life.

Next, and especially in this hour, faith, a faith that is strong and firm, faith in yourself and your capacity and ability to weather the immediate storms that confront you; faith in the Almighty and in His sustaining and strengthening power; faith in your country prompted by your gratitude for the bounteous gifts that nature's God has bestowed upon us; faith in the future of America, its destiny to continue to be the citadel of democracy in the world; faith in the preservation of its free institutions and in the inalienable rights that our forefathers proclaimed and entrusted to us and to future generations to defend, protect, and preserve; a faith that recognizes no possible compromise between the spiritual values of life and the material and antireligious influence about you.

With renewed and inspired faith and courage you will find the sun still shining behind the clouds, you will pass through the travail ahead stronger and more contented—more devoted than ever to the principles of Americanism and resolved to cling to the spiritual values your fathers and mothers cherished and that have commanded your admiration through all the years of your life.

Fourth of July Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at Morris, Minn., on July 4, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, this is the Fourth of July. With one exception, it is the most significant anniversary in human history. The exception is the day that marks the coming of the lowly Nazarene who became man in order to teach men how to live in peace, love one another, and enjoy the bounties so lavishly bestowed on us by a generous Creator.

He was the Prince of Peace. That is worth emphasizing, because, today, for the first time in the history of civilization, men who dare suggest that races and nations should stop slaughtering each other and once more seek the paths of peace and understanding, are denounced as traitors to their country.

Of all the days in the year, the Fourth of July is the day when Americans should indulge in calm thinking and plain talking. On this day, just 165 years ago, a group of gallant gentlemen proclaimed the Declaration of Independence—a great charter of human freedom—and, quite appropriately, they attached their signatures to that immortal document in the City of Brotherly Love.

They boldly announced our people's desire to sever all connections with the governments and the sordid politics of the Old World.

They did more than that. They proclaimed a new theory of government. They affirmed the principle that government is the servant of the people and not the master of the people.

In support of that principle, Washington suffered at Valley Forge and gloriously triumphed at Yorktown.

A few years later the men who won the Revolution set up our Republic—a new kind of government on the enduring foundation of the Constitution of the United States. That instrument was made the supreme law of the land.

This Constitution of ours is unique in the political history of the world, because it strictly limits the authority and power of the government, itself.

It recognizes that sovereignty and, therefore, power, is inherent in the people and not in the government, and that the government has only a limited power delegated by the sovereign people.

In the Constitution the people have retained the right, not only to limit the power of the Government, but, when they see fit, to take away whatever power they may have delegated.

We should always remember this fundamental fact, but it is especially necessary at this time when the world is plagued by war on three continents and on the high seas. This war, we are told, is being waged to defend various political and economic theories. In the circumstances, it is vital that we do not forget the theory on which our own Government is founded, and that we should remain firm in the faith that the fathers of the Republic transmitted to us.

It may be truthfully said that on July 4, 1776, our forefathers began writing majestic history. Under the benign blessings of the Constitution, our country developed from the Thirteen Colonies spread along the Atlantic coast, with a population of 4,000,000, to its present truly imperial area of more than 3,000,000 square miles and a population of more than 130,000,000 people.

This tremendous progress has been made without sacrifice of liberty. Through it all we have preserved the Bill of Rights and maintained the innate dignity of human beings.

May I emphasize, we have been able to do this only because the people have been jealous of their own power, and have refused to permit their representatives in government to usurp power not delegated to them by the people through the Constitution.

Today we find the world drifting away from constitutional limitations on power and going back to the doctrine of the Middle Ages, that authority must be concentrated in one man. The theory that a leader or

fuehrer shall govern without interference of congresses, parliaments, or courts, is now tolerated on every continent.

That doctrine must not be permitted to gain a foothold in America. If it is accepted, even for a brief period, American democracy as we have known it will be placed in desperate jeopardy with a fair chance that it will be destroyed.

The experience of all nations demonstrates it is comparatively easy for men in power, possessed of what may be described as the "Napoleonic complex," to retain that power and extend it without regard to constitutional limitations.

One of their methods is to lull the people into a false sense of security. We must not forget that the slogan of "All power to the people," brought into existence the cruel despotism of Communism in Russia, crystalizing in the dictatorship of Joseph Stalin.

With that slogan and under the guise of a national emergency Adolf Hitler rose to dictatorship in Germany. First, he induced the German Reichstag to delegate vast powers to him, assuring the people and the legislators that it would be only "for a period of 3 years."

Of course, it didn't end in 3 years. The emergency has been continuing and Hitler is dictator today.

He has ignored every provision of the German Constitution which places a limit on the power of the Chancelor. Through the control of the newspapers, radio, and moving pictures—as has Stalin in Russia—he has made the people believe it is their duty to follow the dictates of their leader as the slave follows his master.

Of course, in the beginning, Hitler had to have money to control the avenues of information needed to put him in power—the newspapers, the radio, and the movies. That money he got from the bankers and munition makers of Germany, England, and France, and the bankers and financiers of our own country were also liberal contributors.

Substantially the same thing happened in Italy. When Musolini set up as dictator, the bankers of New York rushed in with a loan of $100,000,000. With that money Mussolini was able to rob the Italian people of their liberties and now he has assisted in plunging the world into a devastating war.

Now, why do I call attention to these things on this, the Nation's birthday, when we are here to renew our confession of political faith?

I will tell you why I do it: Because the same vicious propaganda which has destroyed liberty in so many lands is being pressed with appalling force right here in the United States of America. Many people know it, but few dare to speak.

This propaganda dragged our country into the first World War, almost 25 years ago. Then we were told we must "save democracy."

You know the result of that adventure. Our boys won the war, but they didn't save democracy. That wasn't their fault; it was the fault of the stupidity, greed, and lack of vision of the so-called statesmen who made the peace and who have ruled the nations of the Old World ever since.

Now we are told it is the duty of America to go to war to establish the "four freedoms"—political freedom, religious freedom, freedom of speech, and economic freedom—"all over the world and in our time."

Soon our American boys may be asked to die for that slogan, but before the dreadful decision is made the American people should do some clear thinking.

Are we prepared to police the world and to impose on other peoples our economic and political theories? That's a pretty big contract. How many millions of Americans will die to carry it out and how many billions of American money will be expended to finance the fantastic undertaking?

President Roosevelt is sponsoring this proposal, and I think we have a right to ask him a few pointed questions:

The President says that in this war for the "four freedoms" we are going to give aid to Joseph Stalin and his Communist government in Russia because Russia has joined in the fight against Hitler.

Are we expected to believe that Stalin is fighting for the four freedoms? Only the other day he was on Hitler's side. Should Stalin defeat Hitler but still refuse to accept the "four freedoms," must we then turn our Army and our Navy against Stalin?

Not so long ago Russia attacked Finland and took what land she wanted from Finland. Without declaring war, Stalin sent his troops into Latvia, Lithuania, and Esthonia, drove their governments into exile, and imposed his own particular brand of despotism. We denounced that act and expressed our sympathy for the victims of communistic power.

Today Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Esthonia seem to be lined up with Hitler against Stalin, to drive Stalin out of the land. Are we to place those little countries on our list of enemies?

France, the country which helped us win our Revolution, built a wall of men along the English Channel so an army of 300,000 British soldiers might escape back to their homeland.

When France could fight no longer Britain attacked the French Navy and sank as many ships as she could find. In addition Britain sent an army to fight in Syria to drive the French Army out of French territory. Are we to count France among our enemies because she rents this treatment from an old ally?

Today Stalin and Churchill are marching side by side with American taxpayers' money to aid them. Do you think they fight for democracy? If and when Hitler shall be defeated, shall we then fight Russia to establish the "four fredoms" there?

These are serious questions. They emphasize what a mess we find ourselves in when we depart from the ancient American doctrine—the doctrine to which we adhered so faithfully until we were lured into European politics and the last World War.

Up to that time it was the fixed policy of this Nation to stay out of the feuds of the Old World and to insist that the nations of the Old World keep their hands off the nations of the New World.

Every public official takes an oath to uphold the Constitution. President Roosevelt took that oath on three occasions. As Senator from Minnesota, I have repeatedly taken a similar oath. That oath binds every man who takes it to respect and obey the Constitution.

When any official, however high his position may be, seeks to evade the Constitution, or to nullify its plain provisions, he is violating his oath of office. I need not tell you that is a most serious offense. It is not only contrary to Christian ethics, but it is a gross act of disloyalty to our republican form of Government.

Now let's attempt to apply that thought to the existing situation. Everyone knows knows that the Constitution vests in Congress the power to declare war. Those who are endeavoring to shove this country into the old World War know that Congress will not approve such a move at this time.

One reason Congress will not approve it is that its members know that 85 percent of the men and women of America do not wish this country involved in foreign wars. Americans are willing their boys should die in defense of our country. They are not willing that they should be again slaughtered on the battlefields of Europe, Africa, or Asia

At this moment, Congress is emphatically in favor of respecting the wish of the people, so the war makers are endeavoring to avoid that provision of the Constitution which gives Congress the exclusive power to declare war.

Almost every day in Washington we are told by men who are close to the President that he is anxiously waiting for some incident which will give him an excuse for starting the shooting. The President has not repudiated these war makers. They occupy responsible positions. They have entree to the White House. They state in print what is in the President's mind.

If that be true, then the President of the United States is seeking to evade and nullify the constitutional provision which says that Congress and Congress alone has the power to declare war. When the President does that, he violates his oath of office.

We should not mince words about such an important matter. The President of the United States is as strictly bound by an oath as is the humblest citizen in the land, and when he violates his oath or when he seeks to evade it, the American people should call him to account as promptly and as emphatically as they would any subordinate official of government who committed a similar offense.

The war agitators, knowing they cannot get a war resolution through Congress, are making a desperate drive to get us into this war by the same methods by which they urged us into the last war. Then Colonel House and Mr. Page, our Ambassador to Great Britain, persuaded President Wilson to so manage our foreign policy as to force a break with Germany.

Today foreign governments, and particularly the British Government, have official and private citizens traveling all over this country, making speeches, writing articles for the newspapers, and in a thousand other ways forwarding propaganda designed to whip the American people into a war fever.

Even so-called peace organizations have become propagandists for war.

That reminds us of what the Carnegie Peace Foundation did to get us into the last war. That foundation got its money from Andrew Carnegie. Carnegie said the foundation was to work for world peace.

However, when Great Britain became involved in the last World War, the Carnegie Peace Foundation promptly became a propaganda agency to get us into that war.

On April 20, 1917, the board of directors unanimously passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, assembled for their annual meeting, declare hereby their belief that the most effectual means of promoting durable international peace is to prosecute the war against the Imperial Government of Germany to final victory for democracy, in accordance with the policy declared by the President of the United States."

In those days, Sir Gilbert Parker, a famous writer, but at the time associated with the British Army secret service, was detailed by the British Foreign Office as chief of propaganda in the United States

His instructions were to get this country into the World War. He did his work very well, and after the war was over he took us into his confidence and told us how he did it.

He said his instructions were to convince the people of this country that we must go to war in order to have peace. He revealed that he started his propaganda with university and college professors After that, he began operating on other groups. One group was made up of our so-called society leaders. Of course, the big financiers and many large industrialists were included.

The same game is being played today. Society leaders, who never moved a hand to relieve the suffering among our own people during the long years of the depression, are now jittery over the condition of the unfortunate people of Great Britain and China.

We all sympathize with these victims of the war, but we also sympathize with the victims of our own economic wars. It is still true that charity begins at home and that man's first duty is to feed his own. After that task has been performed he may,

in good conscience, extend his bounty to outsiders.

You will all recall that during the last campaign President Roosevelt went out of his way to repeatedly promise the fathers and mothers of America that he would not send their boys to war. He still occasionally talks about avoiding war, but his every act takes us nearer and nearer to war.

That this statement is true is supported by the attitude of the members of the President's Cabinet. Every high-school boy knows that under our system of government a member of the Cabinet is not much more than a secretary to the President, and it's his duty to carry out the policies of the President.

It is, therefore, significant that while the President continues to occasionally say he wishes to keep America out of war, his Cabinet officers, on the radio and in different parts of the country, have been making outspoken speeches for war.

Secretary of War Stimson and Secretary of the Navy Knox were for military intervention before they were placed in the Cabinet. I voted against their confirmation, stating on the floor of the Senate I did so because of their well-known attitude in favor of war. Those two gentlemen seldom permit a day to pass without proclaiming their desire to get us into the world conflict.

Mr Wickard, our Secretary of Agriculture, is also busy along the same lines. In addition to heading the Agriculture Department, he is also in charge of the Farm Security Administration. He has tens of thousands of men and women on his pay roll. He is using these men and women to urge Congress to use convoys between this country and Britain. But the President of the United States has said: "Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war."

So, when Mr. Wickard turns his machine loose to advocate convoys, he is really advocating war. That he is doing just that, is indicated by a letter I have just received from Minnesota. It comes from one of Mr. Wickard's employees. I will not give his name, because I do not desire to have him lose his job. However, I assure you the letter is authentic. Here it is:

"DEAR SENATOR: I work for the Farm Security Administration. One day this past week, our district supervisor barged into our office all heated up about convoys for ships to England. He had received a telephone call a short while before from the State office, requesting him to ask each county office to find five people, farmers preferred, who could be induced to send telegrams to Washington endorsing convoys.

"I may lose my job for writing this letter, but I feel you should know the facts. Of course, all this work will be done orally so there will be no written proof to substantiate my statements, unless some of the farmers who were asked to send telegrams would back me up.

"Yours respectfully."

That will give you an idea of the extent to which the warmongers on Uncle Sam's pay roll and the propagandists on the pay rolls of foreign governments are endeavoring to plunge this country into a foreign war in which your boys will do the fighting and the dying.

The President has promised the American people that he would not interfere in a foreign war. People are trying to help him keep that promise. However, the Members of his Cabinet are doing everything they can to stir up our people to intervene in foreign wars.

If that is the policy of the President, he should tell us so. If that is not his policy, he should ask the warmongers in his Cabinet to get out of the Cabinet, and if his close friends and confidants do not tell the truth when they say he is waiting for an incident to begin shooting, he should repudiate them. The President must know what the members of his Cabinet and his close friends are doing. They are trying to get him to violate his oath of office, and in fairness to the American people he should repudiate if they are misrepresenting his position.

I have told you many times I would oppose such a proposal. I am still against it. I assure you warmongers and the propagandists will not change my position.

I do not believe we can insert the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States into the hearts of men with a bayonet. I do not believe that bombs and poison gas should be used as missionaries to spread the doctrine of the universal brotherhood of man.

If we preserve democracy in America, nothing can prevent its spread to the rest of the world. If democracy is destroyed in America, dark centuries will pass before it can be revived elsewhere.

There can be no question but that the American people are united in a determination to defend our interests and our institutions from attack at sea or by land or in the air. A majority of the American people—at least 85 percent—do not think America can best be defended on the shores of Asia, Africa, or Europe. Modern warfare and the experience of this war would lead us to believe the unsoundness of that argument. This war has demonstrated that naval ships cannot survive an attack by bombers based on land. That was demonstrated when the Germans drove the British Navy off the Skagerrack and when bombers based on land wrecked half a dozen cruisers and several destroyers in the Mediterranean. Nor can airplane carriers, even though protected by battleships and auxiliary vessels, successfully launch an attack over 3,000 miles upon the United States, if we have our air bases for bombers and our submarines at home. No reputable military or naval man will deny that.

The hysteria about a Nazi invasion on the North American Continent has now been pretty well dissipated. The great mass of the people understand that. However, they are ready to defend the United States and the Western Continent with their lives and their resources if necessary.

The idea that the Nazis can invade England across the Channel seems also to be well understood now to be very unlikely. At least they haven't been able to do it so far. If they haven't been able to invade England in something like 2 years over a channel of water 22 miles wide, how long would it take them to invade the Western Continent 3,000 miles away?

We do not like the Nazi form of government. There are many kinds of governments in this world we don't like. Are we going to war with them all? We don't like the communistic dictatorship of Russia, and here we have the people of the British Commonwealth standing shoulder to shoulder with the Communists against Hitler, France, and Finland to save democracy.

How shall it then go with presidents, dictators, and kings who have usurped governmental power inherent in the people and have led them into undeclared wars in every corner of the earth? How shall it go with those who have been honored and trusted with power, on their solemn pledge that they would not lead their people to war? How shall it go with fuehrers, presidents, and kings when the world is in shambles and the people see it for what it is, and the disillusioned people shall call them to accounting for having caused the greatest tragedy of the centuries? How can these leaders face the disillusioned mothers of the world, whose sons' rotting bodies fertilize the battlefields of the various continents and feed the sharks of the seas?

Our first duty is to preserve democracy in America. To do that we must keep certain objectives clearly in mind:

First. As a nation, we must learn to mind our own business.

Second. We must get rid of the idea that because Britain or some other nation becomes involved in a war we can't keep out. That doctrine makes us slaves of Britain or any other nation with which may form this unnatural connection.

Third, We must have the strongest Navy and air force in the world, and a small, but splendidly mechanized Army. With these weapons, no power or combination of powers on the face of God's earth will dare attack us.

Fourth. Here at home we must set our house in order. We must see that the farmer and the industrial worker are assured a full measure of economic justice. That's a subject I have discussed with you many times during the 25 years you and I have been coming together at meetings such as this. I have not changed my views concerning the great essentials. The first line of defense of every nation must be the welfare of its people.

Fifth. We must have unity in the Nation's foreign policy. This can best be accomplished by the President making no commitments to any foreign government without first obtaining the consent of the Congress; and

Sixth. There must be unity between the President and the Cabinet. They should speak the same language.

And, finally, we must repudiate for all time this abominable suggestion that Americans should clothe any man with dictatorial powers. We are against communism and fascism; we are against Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin; we will not tolerate either communism or fascism in this country and we will not set up a Hitler, even if the individual who greedily reaches for that power bears a more honored name.

This is America. It was a democracy when we received it as a precious heritage from our fathers. With the help of God, it will still be America and a democracy when we bequeath it to our sons.

This is a time when every American who is worth his salt will have the courage to utter what is in his heart and mind. Remember the lines penned by a great poet:

"Mourn not for the dead
Who in the soft earth lie,
Dust to dust, as will you and I,
But mourn for the cowardly meek
Who see the wrongs of rulers, yet dare not speak."

Service Through Political Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. HAROLD H. BURTON, OF OHIO

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made at the Summer Institute for Social Progress, Wellesley, Mass., July 15, 1941, on the subject How To Serve Your Community in Time of Crisis Through Political Parties.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO SERVE YOUR COMMUNITY IN TIME OF CRISIS THROUGH POLITICAL PARTIES

(Excerpts from statement by Hon. HAROLD H. BURTON, United States Senator from Ohio, at Summer Institute for Social Progress, Wellesley, Mass., July 15, 1941)

HOW TO WORK THROUGH THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The question is asked: "How may we serve our communities in time of crisis through political parties?" and under that general question I am asked: "How may we work through the Republican Party?"

The answers fall into two parts: First, those that apply to all parties; and, second, those that apply only to the Republican Party.

One of the greatest services that can be rendered to our Nation in this time of crisis is the maintenance and improvement of the national party system. The question asked refers specially to service to our communities through political parties. A community usually implies a local community that is a city, village, or town. If it is intended to deal with the relation of national political parties to local communities, I must take exception to the form of the question. I believe that the national parties usually have little or no appropriate place in city, village, or town politics. I believe that local questions and local administrations usually are handled better on a nonpartisan basis, or at least on the basis of local parties based on local issues, rather than on national party lines. If, for historical or other reasons, the national party lines are, in fact, drawn in local politics, they cannot be as effective there as they are in State and national politics. The independent and nonpartisan vote will generally hold the balance of power in local elections in spite of the presence of the national party organizations.

The question here really should be, "How may we serve our Nation in time of crisis through national political parties? In the Nation and in the States, the value of the party system is great.

By the party system I refer to the two-party system, coupled with that freedom of association which makes it easy for new parties to be formed and to enter the party contests either temporarily or permanently. The party system helps to organize the voting public so as to make possible a more orderly and clear-cut presentation of the issues between candidates and policies, and makes possible the conduct of campaigns to reach effectively the millions of voters upon whose decisions the success or failure of free self-government in the world depends today. The party system generally reduces the choice to two opposing candidates or at least to a small number of candidates. It thereby makes orderly argument possible without the endless confusion which results from the presence of many candidates for the same office. Other aspirants are usually eliminated by an orderly primary system, which results in the choice of a single candidate to represent each party in the final election. If this process actually reduces the final field of choice to two major candidates, it performs a valuable service in thus insuring election by a majority vote rather than by a mere plurality vote, and thus assures to the elected official the initial support of more than half of the voting public. In a self-governing nation or state, Lincoln said, "public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment nothing can fail; without it nothing can succeed. Consequently he who molds public sentiment goes deeper than he who enacts statutes or pronounces decisions. He makes statutes and decisions possible or impossible to be executed."

A majority vote is a great practical help in solidifying this public sentiment in support of any elective officer.

Long ago it was stated in the Declaration of Independence that free governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and it is not sound to conclude that a plurality consent, which represents less than 50 percent of those voting, measures accurately the consent of the governed. Hence the party system is an important and fundamentally practical mechanism for helping to determine in an orderly manner the opinion of a self-governing community, state, or nation.

For a vigorous, healthy party system to exist takes time, money, and effort. Nation-wide parties cannot possibly spring up over night. Not even State-wide parties can do so because of the lack of time, personnel and money that is needed to locate, interest, qualify, organize, and bring out to the polls, any substantial part of the millions of voters in such an area. For example, recognizing that about 50,000,000 votes were cast in the last Presidential election and estimating that a single letter sent to each voter by first-class mail, including postage, would cost at least 5 cents, this one contact would cost $2,500,000 in cash. It becomes as necessary as the constitutional structure of the Government itself that there be some kind of voluntary group or party organization, whether old or new, to make the election machinery function intelligently and effectively. It becomes, therefore, an essential part of the obligation of good citizens to take some active part in the organization, reorganization, or improvement of such parties so that the real and free judgment of those entitled to vote shall be expressed. Those accustomed to call themselves good citizens, frequently fail to realize this need. By such failure they not only fail to give aid where aid is needed, but through their failure to make themselves felt through some natural and needed organization they reduce their own influence from one of great possible force to one of negligible practical value. Unless compensated for by some extraordinary independent personal influence exerted on public sentiment, such failure to enter into party effort constitutes a crime of civic neglect of duty in the first degree, however, unintentional it may be.

In time of crisis the need for national parties does not disappear. While probably there will be no party lines drawn on such issues as those of national defense and foreign policy, yet the very absorption of public officials and of the public itself in the issues of the crisis makes it all the more important that there be party activity to interest and to guide the vote of the people on the many candidacies and issues not directly involved in the crisis itself. The volume and importance of normal governmental service in time of crisis is almost as great as in normal times, although its place in the limelight has been taken by the more dramatic questions of life and death that come with the emergency.

A self-governing nation in time of national emergency, like the present, may well consolidate many of the administrative powers of government relating to the safety of the nation. If, however, a self-governing nation in time of crisis is to avoid a totalitarianism from which it might never recover, it must carefully keep alive freedom of popular decision on those matters where the safety of the nation does not compel its temporary abandonment.

Our constitutional Government is not and is not intended to be, a government of, for, and by the majority alone. The essence of our plan of government is that it be of, for, and by the people, including the minority as well as the majority. It is of the essence of our Bill of Rights that the constitutional rights of the individual shall be preserved and protected even when he stands alone as a minority of one member. It is also of the essence of our Government that the way shall always lie open for a new majority to arise, either from the existing minority party or from a new movement. All of this calls for the maintenance of a vigorous and alert party organization at all times. A party that cannot cling to its purposes and principles as a minority party does not deserve to become the majority party, but a party whose purposes survive a long test of adversity will find the justice of its cause so clarified and emphasized that it will in time earn its way to the majority position and will secure the adoption of much of its program.

How such a party organization shall be maintained as a matter of practical mechanics, calls for certain well-known lines of conduct in all parties, coupled with such new methods as enterprising initiative may suggest. There is vital need for much voluntary service and for some compensated service to organize each party all the way from its National and State committees down to each voting precinct where the controlling decisions are finally made. There is continuing need to maintain a complete and active workers' organization ready for use in the next campaign, together with up-to-date lists of voters and addresses of voters for mail and personal contact. Frequent meetings need to be held, publications distributed, and broadcasts made to inform not only the party workers but all the people of the issues as they develop. There is a need for contact with all who have become new voters through reaching voting age, by naturalization, or by moving from one locality to another. There is constant need for the all-important mechanical step, especially in large communities, for advance registration and qualification of eligible voters so that they may be permitted to vote when the time comes for them to do so. The unqualified and non-voting but eligible voters often could wield the balance of power were they induced to qualify themselves and use their franchise. There is the need to maintain the contacts through which necessary funds may be raised both for campaign purposes and for operating needs between campaigns. There is the need to maintain the personal social contact and friendliness that is the best basis for effective action in any organization and which is natural where people have banded together in a common cause or crusade. Finally, there is the need for contact between public officials and their constituents so that the views and needs of the officials and the constituents may be constantly and clearly understood and so that sound and fair policies of government can be intelligently determined.

Turning from these questions of general party organization to the service which the Republican Party can render, we find it in the novel position of being the minority party in the Nation while at the same time it is the majority party in many States and communities. Here I can be more concrete, and, while my answers will relate primarily to the national field, they apply in some degree to the smaller areas.

The following are some of the vital services that I believe the Republican Party can render to the Nation in this crisis, and that people can render to the Nation to best advantage through the Republican Party:

(1) On the very issues of the crisis itself, nonpartisan, as they should be, the Republican Party, as the minority party, can render an important and unique service by emphasizing that these issues are nonpartisan. It can help greatly to solidify the Nation on these issues by refusing to treat them as matters of party alinement. The stronger and better

organized the minority party, the greater is its contribution to the united strength of the Nation on policies of national safety. A citizen contributes doubly to this unity when he not only adds the force of his individual support to the Nation but also joins in guaranteeing to the Nation the support of a great organized political party, which, if used otherwise, would present a grave danger of disunity that would serve our enemies rather than ourselves.

(2) On these nonpartisan issues of national safety Republicans, as members of the minority party, can contribute to their soundness by loyal, constructive, free, and unhampered discussion of the merits of each. If there were no minority party or if this discussion were left only to members of the majority party, the Nation would suffer, because those closely associated by party ties with the national administration for that very reason find it somewhat difficult to present effective and constructive criticism of administration policies for fear of disruption of their personal and party relations. This inhibition does not apply to members of the minority party. Therefore, while definitely not making it a partisan issue, a minority party man does not hesitate to point out the weaknesses in proposed policies in time to correct them.

It is well to bear in mind that as a result of these situations, members of the majority party on these national issues are much more likely than members of the minority party to let partisan considerations sway their conduct. The majority member is likely to let partisan considerations keep him silent on important nonpartisan matters when, in fact, his personal judgment opposes those policies. This silencing effect of majority party influence interferes with the best interests of the Government in a way that is little emphasized. The genuine loyal opposition of a minority member to a nonpartisan issue should not be labeled as partisan opposition merely because his genuine opinion is in conflict with that of the administration and he expresses it. A more just criticism can be leveled at any majority member who allows his genuine and personal opposition to an administration policy to be silenced by party considerations. Here the minority party has the important role of a constructive and free critic.

The Republican Party also has many services to render entirely apart from the issues of the crisis and upon which it seeks to unite its members and in support of which it seeks to add new members to its rolls. To the extent that these policies contribute to the present or future stability and welfare of the Nation, it is vital that citizens adhere to them and join in the active party work which forms the best guaranty of their accomplishment. The Republican Party today presents among others the following appeals of an important and fundamental character:

1. The Republican Party is the party of constitutional government. It seeks to preserve, in fact and in substance, the independence of the legislative and judicial departments from the domination of the executive department. While recognizing the increased work, difficulty, and delay that is inherent in our constitutional form of procedure, and inherent in a government by the people, based upon faith in the people, the Republican Party believes that our constitutional representative form of government offers a priceless opportunity for freedom of popular decision that amply offsets the added work, difficulties, and delays that its observance entails.

2. The Republican Party is the party of economy in administration. The absence of a spirit and purpose of economy in determining and in administering the business of the Nation is today a striking weakness of the national administration. It is one that requires a complete change of point of view to one that carefully conserves rather than thoughtlessly dissipates the public tax funds.

3. The Republican Party is the party that seeks to pay its expenses as it goes and to insure the payment of its obligations when due.

4. The Republican Party is deeply concerned over the welfare and the fairness of treatment and equality of opportunity of all persons without regard to their wealth, poverty, age, sex, religion, race, color, or national descent. It recognizes that America is not so much a place as it is a people, and the welfare of its people, on sound lines of social and political economy, is the first concern of the Nation.

5. The Republican Party is dedicated to full observance of the principles of the bill of rights and the Declaration of Independence, and to the observance of the great freedoms of religion, assembly, speech, press, and opportunity coupled with corresponding obligations of loyal support of the Constitution and principles of our Republic.

6. The Republican Party is the party that encourages private initiative and opportunities for all who are willing to contribute their full share of effort for what they receive. It seeks to encourage increased production, higher standards of living, the development of new products, and the discovery of new wealth, rather than to rely largely upon restriction and regimentation of the existing wealth.

7. The Republican Party is the party of free popular expression of opinion of what is best for the Nation, undominated by the pressure of direct or indirect governmental subsidy and uninfluenced by pressure through governmental employment or assistance.

8. The Republican Party has the opportunity and the obligation in each place where its members are now vested with authority to demonstrate the soundness of its purposes and its policies so that the party may thus earn through actual demonstration the right again to be the majority national party, entrusted with the responsibility of national administration.

9. The Republican Party seeks to determine policies upon the basis of the best interests of the Nation as a whole rather than upon the basis of aid to special and private interests that place their personal welfare and privileges above those of the Nation as a whole.

10. The Republican Party is dedicated to bringing into the spirit of the Nation and of its people an understanding and appreciation of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God consistent with the record of the founders and early protectors of the Republic.

In the present crisis the greatest obligation of America is to demonstrate the soundness and the adequacy of our free self-government to meet the issues of the times. Among the primary elements that make it possible for self-government to succeed on a national scale is the comparatively complete organization and intelligent, honest, and fair conduct of the two-party system through which individual citizens may effectively express themselves. Self-government is the most difficult form of government, and it has been well said that it will survive only so long as we deserve it.

The national political parties provide the natural channels through which self-government can be made a failure or a success, and they depend directly upon the interest and the efforts of the private citizens of America. I recommend active membership in the Republican Party.

What Does Uncle Sam Mean to Me?—Young America Speaks

REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks is one of the Nation's great patriotic fraternal organizations. In accordance with its tradition to foster patriotism and national unity for the preservation of American ideals, this order has just completed a Nation-wide essay competition for high-school students on the subject What Does Uncle Sam Mean to Me? A prize of $1,000 was offered for the best essay. Local lodges and State Elks associations also offered prizes in the competition.

The national Elks convention was held at Philadelphia last week, and I am very proud to announce that Miss Grace Langley of my home city of Red Wing, Minn., was the first-prize winner in the local, State, and national competition. Miss Langley graduated this year from the Red Wing High School. She was a guest at the National Elks Convention, and she is our guest in the gallery today. I wish to present Miss Langley to my colleagues in Congress, and I am very happy to include as a part of these remarks, the prize-winning essay written by her on the subject What Does Uncle Sam Mean to Me?

WHAT DOES UNCLE SAM MEAN TO ME?

For our convenience we talk in symbols. Sometimes we accept the symbol as the reality. Perhaps that is what we have done with Uncle Sam, symbol of 132,000,000 people, symbol of a past that is not dead, symbol of a future unknown. Who is he? He is the sober-clad pilgrim singing hymns on the afterdeck; he is the patriot patiently mending a coat faded with salt water; he is the gaunt woodsman staring out of his study window as he hears the guns of division; he is the bearded miner sifting gravel through hard fingers; the dust-choked farmer watching his bony cattle die; he is the workman swinging his lunch pail down the lamplit street; the bindlestiff asking for a dime. His voice is the moan of the Negro congregation, "Hallelujah, Lord," the shout of the foreman above the blast furnace, the dowager's well-modulated tones as she gives her chauffeur his orders for the day, and the chauffeur's response. His voice is your voice as you read these words, and my voice as I sit in the classroom.

My grandparents needed no definition of Uncle Sam. Grandfather Pritchard left London to find a home for his gentle wife and a family of 12 in Ohio. My other grandfather fled Germany to escape service in a war of autocracy. For them Uncle Sam was real in terms of dark loam to plough, schools for the children, and friendly neighbors to cry the time of day over the garden wall. But to me, child of these men and women, what does Uncle Sam mean to me? Perhaps there are dangers in an inheritance of glory won too easily.

I recently entered a national forensic meet. Little did I realize that in discussing our foreign policy—the labor problem, our defense program, I was exercising a right few people now have. Take the question for debate, "Resolved that the power of the Federal Government should be increased." Where else but in the United States would high-school students be allowed to argue the worth of the administration? I have grown to accept freedom of speech just as I have grown to accept the religious toleration which permits me to be a Presbyterian and my best friend an orthodox Jew.

I am beginning to realize that such rights are not immutable and static. They were not won once by a war or by the scratching of quill on parchment. Ours is a heritage of adventure and promise, a heritage to be earned again and again. We are now required to believe stronger than ever in the American ideal, to believe buoyantly, and earnestly, and joyously.

Who is Uncle Sam? Sing joy! He is the sober-clad Pilgrim singing hymns on the after-deck; he is the workman swinging his lunch pail down the lamplit street; his language is that of all nations; his hope is that of all peoples and ours the responsibility to share.

Memorial to Gen. James Longstreet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21, 1941

ADDRESS BY BRECKENRIDGE LONG AT GETTYSBURG BATTLEFIELD

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, on July 3, 1941, at the battlefield of Gettysburg, Pa., I attended ceremonies in reference to the breaking of ground for the erection of a monument to one of the South's great leaders, Gen. James Longstreet. Among those who delivered addresses at that time were Mrs. Buddy Rogers—the former motion-picture actress, Miss Mary Pickford—and Mr. Breckenridge Long, of the State Department. I have before me a copy of the address delivered by Mr. Long, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are assembled today to participate in the arrangement for a memorial to James Longstreet, general in the Army of the Confederacy, one of its most distinguished sons, one of its outstanding military leaders, subsequently a patriotic servant of the reunited country, and a courageous American.

He and those who participated in the epochal struggle in this valley and over these hillsides contributed, all unconsciously, to the solidification of a great nation. On this battlefield of Gettysburg was born the modern United States. The sons of those who struggled here have lived to rebuild a divided nation, to unify a variety of thought, to provide a more equitable distribution of the opportunities of life, to evolve a national purpose.

These seeds were planted at Gettysburg. Here they were sanctified with the blood of contending brothers. And here again on the scene of Gettysburg the flower of those seeds is heralded by the name "America."

When we say "America" we mean a land of plenty and of peace, a land of happiness and of contentment, a land of fair dealing at home, and of honorable contacts with other lands. But we in America realize that much as we love peace we cannot really enjoy peace if the rest of the world is at war; that as much as we desire happiness we cannot really be happy when sorrow and suffering run rampant through the world and threaten our own domestic order; that we can have no assurance we can have fair dealing from other governments which violate their solemn undertaking.

It is all very alluring for us to sit complacently in our comfortable homes and think in illusory vein that war will not come to us here—that the stories we hear of Europe and of Asia and of Africa are, after all, happenings thousands of miles away—that it cannot happen here. It is all too easy to be deceived by stretches of fertile fields which run out beyond horizons and to feel that no danger from abroad could carry this far. So thought Poland. So thought Norway—stretching way up into the Arctic Ocean. So thought Greece, bathed by the warm water of the Mediterranean. So it was thought on the tropic sands of Africa, in the distant recesses of China, far Indochina, and in old Siam down near the Equator. And so thought Russia—the most recent example of an unholy ambition to destroy nations, to enslave their peoples, to rob them of their resources—to dominate a world.

We must not be beguiled by such thoughts of complacent illusion. We must understand that distance measured in miles has been reduced to inches, that time has been decimated, and space rendered of no protective value. We must understand that the actual waging of that thing called war has changed. There was a time that it commenced when the shooting began. But now it has precursers the consequences of which are worse if possible than the devastation of actual military combat. There is the insidious infiltration of whispering agents casting doubt upon the justice of our own position, faintly praising the qualities of the intending invader. Then come agents of trouble and discord, inciting opposition at home, making disturbance in centers of mechanical production. Then the saboteurs to throw monkey wrenches into the machinery—all with the object of creating discord and dismay and of rendering nugatory efficient organization. The radio becomes the instrument of insidious voices. Doubt is cultivated. Fear is propagated—fear, the worst of our foes, the ally of threatening force.

Another precourser is economic penetration, to destroy markets abroad, to gain footholds in the territory of your neighbors, and, when economic and financial conditions have been sufficiently cultivated, to institute political control over some not distant country. Once political control is established, then the military armies arrive—through the air, on the water, by land—and from the new base the cowering inhabitants become servitors, even unwilling partners of mechanized military autocracy in preparation for its next plunge, with a history of suffering in its wake and a promise of sorrow for the next victim—unless stopped in its mad career.

We have determined that in America these things shall not happen. They cannot happen if we unite as a nation in carrying forward a mighty program of defense; if we build speedily, adequately, and efficiently.

You may be assured that your Government is fully alive to the situation confronting the United States. The officers of your Government are on guard. We only hope that each American citizen realizes for himself the situation as it actually exists and the consequences for himself and his family unless all of us join in a mighty effort for defense.

President Roosevelt has proclaimed a full national emergency. That fact alone should make every man and woman in America realize that the danger is direct. The President has called upon all loyal citizens to place the Nation's needs first in mind and in action to the end that we may mobilize and have ready for instant use all of the physical powers, all of the moral strength, and all of the material resources of this Nation.

The call has gone forth. Let us respond to it with the spirit and courage exhibited by the men at Gettysburg. Whether we are in the armed forces, in the factories, or on the farms, let each of us resolve to make his own worth-while contribution to the cause of safeguarding the Nation during this critical period. Gettysburg echoes the call to the service of a united and determined Nation.

Congress Must Keep Faith With the Selectees

REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, when the Seventy-sixth Congress enacted the Selective Service Act, it was distinctly and generally understood that this act was passed for the purpose of providing this Nation with a trained reserve of manpower to defend the Nation in case of war. The act was presented to the people of the Nation as a defense measure. The young men of the Nation, who were given absolutely no chance to vote on the measure, were told repeatedly that their term of service or training would be for 1 year.

Mr. Speaker, it seems our defense measures of last year are slowly maturing into war measures this year. The boys who were taken into the service ought not be made the victims of the clique in this Government who see Hitler and his armies knocking at our gates, although the Atlantic still separates us from the graveyards of Europe and Asia. We ought to play fair with the selectees and let them know that they will be discharged when their year's training period has ended. Congress has neither moral nor legal right to declare a phony emergency just to give this administration the right to keep these boys in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, if we need more trained men, all we need to do is to draw on the latest registrants promptly, and within 3 months we will have men sufficiently trained to replace the men whose term of duty under the Selective Service Act will be at an end. If we follow this procedure, we will need to discharge only

13,800 selectees in November, 5,521 in December, and 73,633 next January. By February the replacements will be 90,000; March, 150,000; April, 130,000; May, only 50,896; and, if we have not gotten over the emergency by that time and the country is not completely broke, we can start all over taking in new men and releasing those who have been trained. This is the fair way, this is the sensible way, and this is the American way to train our men in time of peace. By this method we will soon have a very great army of trained reserves.

I understand that the President intends by means of radio to try to arouse the country and bring pressure to bear upon Congress to hold draftees more than 1 year. It appears to me that if the country really faces a great emergency, it would be better for the President to talk frankly with Congress in an executive session behind locked doors and give all the facts. All Members of Congress are under oath to protect and defend the country and have at least as much respect for their oath as the President. Unless I have proof that my country's safety would be jeopardized by failure to retain selectees beyond 1 year, I shall vote against doing so.

America's Relation to World Affairs

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, recently a very fine and thoughtful speech was delivered before the Oregon State Grange by the publisher of the Portland Oregonian, Mr. Palmer Hoyt. He clearly shows the present condition of the world and what should be our position in regard to it. I desire to share this with others throughout our country, because I am convinced that it will help to stabilize the thought of the country in relation to the necessity of our defense program.

The article I referred to follows:

[From the Oregon Grange Bulletin of July 5, 1941]

AID TO BRITAIN IS NECESSARY, SAYS NOTED PUBLISHER

(Address of E. P. Hoyt, publisher of the Oregonian, presented at State Grange session at Newport June 17)

I want to talk to you today not about farm matters but, rather, about the national crisis in which we find ourselves. It is very important to me that I give you clearly my views on the various aspects of the greatest emergency in which America has yet found herself. It is very important because if America is to be saved it will be because you are thinking clearly and realistically and because you are able to see the problems we face without the roseate glow of false hope and wishful thinking.

To me it is more than unfortunate—it is a national tragedy that many of our leaders are today dealing with half truths, arguing about things that have never happened and debating hopes for the future that have no roots in the past. I refer specifically to men like Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, Senator Gerald Nye, and Representative Martin L. Sweeney, of the Seventeenth District of Ohio.

It is very unfortunate that these mighty voices are not raised in criticism of the administration for failure to proceed more rapidly with the settling of strikes and the production of armaments. It is tragic that these voices are not raised to urge immediate ceilings on wages, profits, and prices. That they are not questioning the type of army we are raising today, and that they are not demanding further recessions in Government spending aside from defense.

It is unfortunate indeed that they see fit to debate nightly whether or not we will engage in World War II. Such debate is the epitome of futility because we are actually at war with the Axis Powers and have been for months.

It is more tragic than regrettable that these national leaders choose to ignore that America is threatened, even as we talk here today, on every side. Potentially and actually the world has changed from our concept of that world. We are on the "wave of the future," but it is not the wave that the wishful-thinking Mrs. Lindbergh would have you believe. It is a wave of barbarism—the wave of Attila the Hun—a wave armed with new techniques, armed with ability for destruction beyond our powers to conceive only 10 years ago.

WAVE OF FUTURE, WAVE OF DESTRUCTION

The "wave of the future" is the wave of destruction that must be curbed if the world of free men is to survive.

It is more than unfortunate that men of the caliber of those leaders mentioned should make this type of statement to millions of listeners over a national hook-up. And I quote the substance of the statement to which I refer: "I would rather see every bit of material provided by the $7,000,000,000 of the lease-lend bill sunk and in the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean than to see 7,000,000 young Americans dead on foreign shores."

And who wouldn't?

But the tragic fallacy of the statement lies in its false and stupid implications. This is not an era of large expeditionary forces—the war technique of 1941 is not that of 1914. Categorical comparisons cannot be made between these wars. Why then, do men of such prominence insist on making them? I do not know, but at least I hope their motives are sincere and patriotic regardless of how far afield their reasoning may take them.

At the present moment this country is divided into two great camps. In the one camp are the gentlemen mentioned above, some 30 percent of our newspapers, and a like percentage of our population. In this isolationist group are many sincere people—honest people who believe either that we can ignore the rest of the world, or that Mr. Hitler will keep his promises, or that Mr. Hitler truly has no ambitions in the Western Hemisphere.

On the other side, in the so-called interventionist camp are the administration, Wendell Willkie, and Thomas E. Dewey representing the Republican Party, some 70 percent of our newspapers, and two-thirds of our people. They believe that America cannot desert the human soul; they believe that freedom is something not lightly to be discarded; they believe that Mr. Hitler will not keep his promises and that he has every intention of conquering the New World economically, and if necessary by force of arms; they do not believe that the statement: "Since we are not threatened by immediate invasion we should do nothing" can apply to our Government the situation in which we now unhappily find ourselves.

In the history of the world this day, June 17, is an historic one, for it was only a year ago that France on this day formally sued for peace, and on June 22 the armistice was formally signed in the forest of Compiègne. Less than a month before June 17, 1940—on May 21—Paul Reynaud, Premier of France, made a brilliant and historic speech before his country's senate.

Premier Reynaud's address was in itself an historic event because it was the first official admission by the French Government that their case was all but hopeless. The day before the onrushing German war machine had opened a breach of 62 miles in the French lines * * * Arras and Amiens had fallen.

The French Army of 5,000,000 men, considered by military experts to be the greatest army in history and the greatest army in Europe, was hopelessly beaten. A million and a half men of that fine French Army, inadequately armed, led by hopeless and inefficient officers, were in full retreat. It was, perhaps, the blackest situation that France had known in its long and varied history. And with that historic day, May 21, came the first nation-wide knowledge that France, long a world power, faced an enemy so strong as to make further resistance all but useless.

M. Reynaud's official pronouncements to the French Senate came like a death knell when he said:

"The truth, gentlemen, is that our classic conception of the conduct of war clashed with new conceptions. The basis of these new conceptions are not only mass uses of armored divisions, there is not only cooperation between armed divisions and fighting planes * * * there is a determination to disorganize an enemy in the rear by deep thrusts, by parachutists, who in Holland almost took the Hague, and who in Belgium took the most powerful of the Liege forts by orders given on telephone lines which caused premature evacuation."

This was the first official admission that France was not prepared by equipment, by understanding, by tactics.

In this historic speech the French Premier said: "France and England cannot be beaten; they cannot be beaten if they cannot die."

If I were told that a miracle was needed to save France, I would say, "I am a believer in miracles."

I believe with Premier Reynaud that France cannot die; that England cannot die; that France will live and that England will live. And I, too, am a believer in miracles.

There will be a miracle and you are that miracle. You and the millions like you who are the strength of America * * * for America itself is a miracle.

America is the living shrine of human freedom.

America is God's pledge to civilization of the dignity and freedom of the human soul.

The United States of America was founded and a war was fought because our forefathers believed tremendously in freedom. And we have enjoyed that freedom * * * that great freedom. And today, in this calm and peaceful spot in the center of one of the most beautiful areas in this America of ours, may I suggest that such freedom as we have enjoyed connotes and implies great responsibilities.

There are many reasons why America cannot sit idly by and see freedom pass from the rest of the world. One of these reasons is very selfish * * * for if freedom passed from the rest of the world then it would surely pass from this, its last and greatest stronghold. And if freedom passed, so would pass the civilization that you and your fathers and your forefathers have known and fought for.

In the issue of your own Grange Bulletin for May 20 your State master, Ray W. Gill, made comment relative to some of the basic issues involved. His statement thrilled me and encouraged me, coming as it did from

the head of the Oregon State Grange. I quote in part:

"As a Christian people we still must hold for right as against wrong. The innumerable wrongs committed by Hitler must not dull our sense of right or wrong, and yet these wrongs have become so commonplace that we stand in that danger. A Christian faith can only be properly maintained where truth and right are recognized by governments. As much as we hate wars, we know that Christianity has emerged from the bloody battlefields of history. These wars waged around the right of peoples to worship God according to the dictates of conscience. Christianity cannot long survive in a Hitler-dominated world. He cannot or will not discern between right or wrong. His victory would revive the bloody religious wars of the past, for freedom of religion would again become the issue."

But those freedoms will not pass, the freedom of religion, the freedom of assembly, the freedom of expression, of speech, and of the press, freedom to be governed by designated representatives. These things will not pass, for there will be a miracle, and you are that miracle—you and the countless millions like you.

In America we have a manner of life which has come to be called the American way. It is not a life that we want to die because of, but it certainly should be a life we are willing to die to preserve.

What manner of man is this Hitler, who has challenged not only the American way but the right of all men everywhere to live in freedom?

The best illustration I know is the one cited by the distinguished newspaperwoman, Lillian T. Mowrer, in her book, Journalist's Wife. She tells of an incident in Paris in 1935 after she and her distinguished husband, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, had been evicted from Germany for telling the truth, a habit which has never been popular with Mr. Hitler. After their arrival in Paris the Mowrers were invited to an evening salon which was crowded with diplomats and correspondents from all over Europe. Mowrer was picked out by a German count, turned Nazi, who insisted on knowing whether or not Mowrer believed that Hitler was the greatest leader of the world. Mowrer walked away from the count several times but finally turned on him and said: "Yes; I think Hitler is the greatest leader the world has ever known—to lead the people of the earth back to the trees!"

And I think there was not as much exaggeration in Mowrer's cryptic and pointed remark as it would seem at first flush. Already, in many parts of the world, men are cowering underground while sudden death bursts above them with an intensity not even imagined before.

More than a year ago Dr. Arthur Compton, noted American scientist, suggested that science had better be controlled by men of good will in the future or that perhaps the civilization that we have known might be destroyed. In other words, the world today finds itself in a position analogous to that of the fiction scientist who created Frankenstein, a horrible monster, a monster that eventually destroyed his family and himself.

When Attila overran civilization with his Huns, they were truly barbarians and equipped only with the most primitive weapons. This modern Attila of 1941 is at the head of a civilized people with barbaric instincts. The weapons of sudden death and destruction, with as yet untold implications of slaughter placed in their hands by science, make these new Huns even more dangerous to civilization than was Attila.

The thought that if Hitler continues until he has physically conquered the world, and thus will destroy civilization as we know it, is now generally accepted. In whatever way we can accomplish it, our task is to prevent just that.

ARE WE IN DANGER?

May I give you Hitler's box score to date, since the outbreak of the war in September 1939:

Country and days to conquer:

Poland	28
Denmark	hours 11
Norway	24
The Netherlands	4
Belgium	18
Luxemburg	hours 18
France	39
Yugoslavia	13
Greece	17

In addition, Germany has by military and diplomatic pressure taken sovereignty over Austria, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria. Total of nations overrun and held by Germany—14.

You will note that most of these countries are democracies. By quick computation you will realize that there are very few democracies left in the world. Democracies in general are Mr. Hitler's hate—and particularly is it true of the United States.

As H. V. Kaltenborn recently said over the air: "Hitler already hated the United States in 1932 when I first visited him. He said more recently than that:

"'I will not have to defeat America. * * * The confusion my agents will cause will make America defeat herself.'"

America is liberally mentioned in Hermann Rauschning's book and in this documentation of Hitler's talks the eventual conquering of this country is forecast. His dupes and agents are now working in the United States, and they are going on working until he is ready to strike. Hitler actually is making war on us now but he is doing it in secret. And as Mr. Kaltenborn points out, he can accomplish far more against us while diplomatic relations remain unbroken.

Hitler's own explanation of his intent, as quoted by Rauschning in his Voice of Destruction, is:

"Revolutionary propaganda must function before my army acts. We shall have friends in the land of the enemy. They will help us. Confusion, contradiction, uncertainty, panic * * * those are our weapons. I have learned something from Bolshevism, and I am not ashamed to say so. Study intrigue and revolutions. Then you will know our task. Seizure by surprise, terror, sabotage, attack from within * * * that is the war of the future."

As Mr. Kaltenborn pointed out, it sounds fantastic. But we know that it worked in Norway, Holland, and France, in Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and all the rest of the countries.

Yesterday was an historic day in America, too. For it was yesterday that formal notice was given to Germany that they must close all consular offices, eliminate their propaganda news services, and close the German library of information. This should have been done before because German consular offices have become nothing more than espionage headquarters. And under the cloak of diplomatic immunity they have conducted and carried on activities aimed directly at you, the people.

They have been carrying on a basic Nazi principle of war as clearly outlined by Col. Hermann Foertsch of the German general staff, in his article, Heart of Modern Warfare.

"To render an opponent defenseless means to rob him of his will, * * * everything that affects his will and his means to fight must be struck at, not only his military but his moral, spiritual, and economic forces, in which is entire political power."

Hitler, of course, goes much further than his staff tactician; his methods include bribery, blackmail, assassination of lives and of characters, with everything synchronized and calculated to destroy the enemy from within. All of the "fifth column" activities Hitler has used so successfully are being employed now in the Americas, or will be when the need seems to arise.

Basically, Hitler's formula is very simple. It is the use of methods which placed him in supreme power in Germany, with the aid of many of the very men and the very persons he later destroyed, such as Fritz Thyssen. One of the amazing factors of Hitler's march over Europe has been the aid given his conquests by countries who felt they were not yet in danger. For example, Bulgaria aided in the dismembering of Rumania; Hungary and Poland helped conquer Czechoslovakia; Czechoslovakia remained neutral when Austria was invaded and thereby sealed her fate; and England and France were of the greatest help up until Poland was invaded. The Netherlands and Belgium got completely in line when Norway was invaded, instead of allowing Allied troops to come in to defend their borders.

The use of such tactics has been profitable in democratic countries because Hitler has been able to camouflage his real objectives and to influence enough influential people so that his real objectives could always be safely veiled.

There is no question but what one of the bases of the deal between Stalin and Hitler was the use of the Communist Party line in invading American industry and providing England with the tools of war. This slowing-down process has not been as effective as Hitler hoped, but it is far too effective for our own safety, as witness the strikes now on today.

The attitude of the strike leaders in the North American Aviation shut-down was almost beyond belief, if one is to judge by simple American standards. The messages of President Orton of the I. W. A. and the striking machinists in San Francisco seemed little short of treason—statements typical of Communist Party line tactics. Thus the "com-rats" and the "commu-nazis" work.

What can we do to be saved?

As I see it, the problem is hydra-headed:

First, there is the problem of aiding Britain. And I say to you who are anti-British and who are Anglophobes, visualize a world without a British Empire; visualize America alone in a world of totalitarianism. The picture is not pretty, and I can tell you that in such a case, despite the brave words of Colonel Lindbergh and Senator WHEELER, America would be crushed either by the weight of arms manufactured by hundreds of millions of slave states or by the weight of economic destruction.

Then there is the problem of our internal economy. It would be useless for us to save democracy if in saving it we lost our own. And tied in closely with our democracy is our problem of economy. This country could not, in my judgment, pass through a war crisis and an inflation at the same time.

And there is also the problem of unity. This country is not only threatened from without, it is threatened from within.

There is the problem of diverse interests, the problem of labor, the problem of capital, and in a general way the problem of production. Closely allied to that is the problem of sabotage, the "fifth column," and the Communist Party line.

Ladies and gentlemen, these are not bugaboos; these are actual dangers which we face, and serious problems. In this connection I commend your attention to two articles in the current Readers' Digest. One by Stanley High, pointing out under the title "Rehearsal for Revolution," that the Allis-Chalmers strike for 73 days tied up for that length of time one-third of our vital defense industry; it was not a strike for wages and hours, but it was a strike planned in 1936 and executed in 1941 as a part of the Communist Party program. We will have more of these unless our Government acts.

I am firmly convinced that part of the deal between Mr. Hitler and Mr. Stalin was the use of the Communist Party line in delaying and sabotaging American industry in this time of vital need.

I commend also for your attention an article by Mr. Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, in the same issue of Readers' Digest, entitled "Labor's Hidden Hold-up Men," which points out the dangers to industry by the current practices of A. F. of L. unions in demanding high entrance fees into the unions and demanding the presence of men on jobs to fill arbitrary requirements rather than actual needs

Labor presents a problem; and a problem is not born of the average American workingman but created by venal leaders and those loyal to another form of government than our own.

What can we do to be saved?

First. We can enter into the greatest production the world has ever seen; and thus supply England on the first line of defense against the horrors of barbarism with the vitals of war.

Second. We can stop labor racketeering and check the work of Communists and Nazis in labor.

Third. We can, and immediately, put a ceiling on wages, on profits, on prices, to insure against strikes, against inflation, and against profiteering in a national emergency.

Fourth. We can immediately and without further adieu suspend trade relations with unfriendly countries, such as Japan and Russia, allies of Germany, a nation with which we are already actually at war.

Fifth. We can urge our Senators and Congressmen to take their heads out of the sand and, instead of wasting their time arguing against a war in which we are already engaged, demand of the administration that that war be carried on efficiently and speedily; and that pork barreling and boondoggling be halted during the period of emergency.

Let us go back again for a moment to the isolationists and one of their principal spokesmen.

Let us say that Col. Charles A. Lindbergh is sincere. Then his statement of the other night on the radio that new policies are needed in Washington and new leadership are definitely un-American, too, since we cannot have new leadership until we have another election. That is, we cannot have new leadership without revolution.

The Nazis and their allies, the Communists, are working rapidly and effectively in the Americas today. They pack America First meetings; they are responsible for many of the rumors concerning high-ranking American officials; they are responsible for reports which seem to reach and influence many prominent American businessmen, that the Nazis are really not friends to the Communists; they are responsible for continued race hatreds and religious bigotry.

You may gather from the foregoing remarks that our outlook is pretty hopeless; that the future is dark and gloomy. I do not believe that. I think the future is full of hope and that that hope is America.

The future is full of hope if America is able to do the Herculean job she faces—if America does not try to avoid her destiny.

It seems to me increasingly so that there are many bright spots in our economic future. It is not true that a depression will necessarily follow this, our battle for freedom. If the democracies win, and they must win, many multibillion-dollar tasks face the world, and particularly this country.

Just to cite a few of the more immediate and probable jobs to be done: The physical reconstruction of Europe is in itself a multibillion project. China, which now enters into its industrial revolution and into its renaissance, is another great field. In South America, expansion of American trade and American ideologies presents remarkable possibilities.

One of the most cogent factors in America's reconstruction must be the bringing of South America into more complete understanding of democracy, so that foreign "isms" will find the soil there as barren to the enemies of the human soul as we hope to make America's.

Yes, the world is full of hope—and you are that hope.

H. G. Wells is credited with the statement that ours is a generation which has an appointment with destiny. There are few to doubt that statement, nor can we avoid that destiny.

In that connection I want to tell you a little story which appears in one of Somerset Maugham's books. It is the story of Sammara. It seems that a merchant from Bagdad sent his servant to the market place to purchase the day's supplies. In a little while the servant returned, white and trembling. He said: "Master, may I borrow your horse that I may ride away?"

The master said: "What has happened?"

The servant replied: "I went to the market place as you ordered, and there I saw an old woman and she was Death, and she made a threatening gesture at me. Now I want to borrow your horse and ride away to Sammara that I may avoid my destiny."

And so the merchant gave the servant his horse and the servant rode away as fast as he could to Sammara. A little later the merchant, curious as to what had happened, went down to the market place and there he saw the old woman who was Death. He approached her and said: "Why did you threaten my servant?" The old woman answered: "I did not threaten your servant. When I saw him I made a gesture. It was a gesture of surprise, because I had an appointment with him in Sammara tonight and I wondered what he was doing in Bagdad."

Let us remember what Wendell Willkie said only recently:

"The world cannot live without the United States of America."

And let us go a step farther and remember that the United States of America cannot live without the rest of the world.

Blaine-Conkling Debates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21, 1941

CLIPPING SENT BY C. C. JUSTUS, KNOXVILLE, TENN.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper clipping sent to me by Mr. C. C. Justus, county historian and vice president of the East Tennessee Historical Society, giving an account of the debates between Roscoe Conkling and James G. Blaine.

There being no objection, the clipping was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEEN AND HEARD

(By J. A. Dunn)

The famous Blaine-Conkling quarrel reached its climax in the House of Representatives on April 24, 1866, when the House resumed its consideration of the bill entitled "An act to reorganize and establish the Army of the United States." Mr. Conkling objected to the twentieth section, which provided for the creation of a provost marshal-general on the ground that it created an unnecessary office for an undeserved public servant. Gail Hamilton gave the following account of the origin of the quarrel of these noted men, as follows:

"It may be mentioned," says the biographer, "that the officer who was so obnoxious to Mr. Conkling had been assigned to western New York by General Fry. In the debate which followed, Mr. Conkling lost his patience to the point of direct and simple fire. He said among other things, 'I do not wish to have anything to do with the Member from Maine. Mr. Speaker, if he had the least idea of how profoundly indifferent I am to his opinion upon the subject he has been discussing, or upon any other subject personal to me, I think he would hardly take the trouble to rise here and express his opinion. I submit the whole matter to the Members of the House, making, as I do, an apology for the length of time which I pronounced the other day ungentlemanly and unparliamentary, and which had nothing whatever to do with the question.'

"Mr. Conkling was alluding to an interruption made by Mr. Blaine to some of his (Conkling's) statements. Mr. Blaine then arose, and turning directly to Mr. Conkling, there came one swift downpour of scorn for scorn.

"Mr. Blaine replied:

"'As to the gentleman's sarcasm, I hope he will not be too severe. The contempt of that large-minded gentleman is wilting, his haughty disdain, his grandiloquent swell, his majestic, supereminent, overpowering turkey-gobbler strut has been so crushing to myself, and to all the Members of the House, that I know it was an act of the greatest temerity for me to venture upon a controversy with him.'

"Referring then to a chance newspaper comparison of Mr. Conkling to Henry Winter Davis, he continued: 'The gentleman took it seriously, and it has given his strut additional pomposity. The resemblance is great; it is striking. Hyperion to a satyr, Thersites to Hercules, mud to marble, dunghill to diamond, a singed cat to a Bengal tiger, a whining puppy to a roaring lion! Shade of the mighty Davis, forgive the almost profanation of that jocose satire!'

"The House of Representatives proved to be children of a larger growth. It listened to every word and shouted its inextinguishable laughter."

Salvaging Physicaliy Disabled Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21, 1941

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON SUNDAY STAR

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article from the Sunday edition of the Washington Star of April 20, 1941, entitled "Salvaging of Physically

Disabled Presents Possibilities for Defense Program."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star of April 20, 1941]

SALVAGING OF PHYSICALLY DISABLED PRESENTS POSSIBILITIES FOR DEFENSE PROGRAM—REHABILITATED PERSONS BECOME ASSETS OF NATION INSTEAD OF EXPENSE TO COMMUNITY—COST OF SUPPORTING ADULTS IN IDLENESS IS BALANCED AGAINST LATER EARNING CAPACITY

(By David Amato)

John Ruskin once wrote: "This is the help beyond all others—find out how to make people useful, and let them earn their money instead of begging for it." Guided by such wisdom, the States and the Federal Government have vocationally rehabilitated and made self-supporting almost 150,000 physically handicapped persons in the past 20 years.

Although all of the States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico have now accepted the National Rehabilitation Act of 1920, there are many people who are not familiar with the fact that their States are engaged in salvaging the economic and human waste resulting from physical disabilities. While much has been said and done for the conservation of our national resources, each State division of vocational rehabilitation, in cooperation with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation of the United States Office of Education, has been carrying on a small and little-heard-of program of conservation of human energy and manpower. At first it was conducted as a temporary program, but its success in transforming human liabilities into assets was quickly recognized. In 1935, through a provision in the Social Security Act, vocational rehabilitation of physically handicapped persons was made a permanent Federal-State program.

In view of its success in the past, vocational rehabilitation presents interesting possibilities for the national-defense program. From all reports, the totalitarian countries of Europe have been very successful in training handicapped workers for noncombatant, home-defense service. Prompted by labor shortages rather than humanitarian motives, these countries have discovered that such workers could be used to replace the able-bodied workers drafted into the military service. The British Minister of Health proposed before the House of Commons a program of rehabilitation as a means of increasing the supply of labor and absorbing the physically handicapped in industry. Commenting on rehabilitation as a defense measure, the Economist, published in London on November 2, 1940, has the following to say: "Rehabilitation has been defined as 'the process of reconditioning which will be required in certain cases after clinical treatment in order to obtain full restoration of working capacity.' It means more than medical recovery; it involves not simply patching up the injured person at home or at a clinic, but seeing that his ability to work is restored. Its importance is not simply humanitarian. It is economic, and the bringing back of disabled men and women into work with full output and full earnings was never more needed than at this stage of the present conflict of industrial manpower."

The most convincing argument for vocational rehabilitation of the handicapped is the fact that it costs from $500 a year upward to support a disabled adult in idleness, whereas a single expenditure of $300 or less could make him self-supporting. Besides eliminating the high cost of institutional and private care, the rehabilitation of the handicapped adds millions of dollars annually to the national wealth. The average earnings of a disabled worker after rehabilitation are about the number rehabilitated in the last 20 years, $1,000 a year. If this figure is multiplied by the earnings of such workers become an annual income of about $150,000,000 instead of an expenditure of roughly $75,000,000 for their care. The total Federal-State expenditure for the year 1940 (which was the highest since the inception of the vocational rehabilitation program) was less than $5,000,000.

More emphasis has generally been placed on the correction of the physical disability than on the elimination, insofar as possible, of the vocational handicap. This partly explains why not more than 20 percent of all handicapped persons eligible for training are being vocationally rehabilitated. Once the physical disability has been treated, the central problem is that of restoring earning capacity so the handicapped person may become self-supporting. When able to earn a living and care for himself and his family, he is no longer a problem for public or private charity. He becomes a social and economic asset instead of a liability.

Vocational rehabilitation is accomplished by providing for the individual one or more of the following services: First, vocational guidance in the selection of a suitable type of employment; second, physical restoration, that is, surgical or medical treatment when the disability can be reduced or removed, or provision of an artificial appliance to restore the impaired function; third, vocational training in the occupation at which it has been determined the person can work despite his handicap; fourth, assistance in securing employment in the occupation for which the person has been prepared. These services enable physically disabled persons to fill high-grade positions demanding ability and experience as well as other types of jobs. Because of the scientific treatment of the training and placement problems of the handicapped, it is not surprising to find that this type of worker is often more successful in his work than the able-bodied. He is trained and placed in a job where his disability would least interfere with the performance of the normal duties required. Experience shows that certain types of disabilities are adaptable to certain types of jobs. This not only reduces to a minimum the accident risk and its costs but also reduces labor turn-over.

RECORD APPROVED

The actual performance of handicapped persons in a large manufacturing plant was shown to be very favorable. A comparison was made of about 685 disabled workers with a similar group of nonhandicapped employees doing the same type of work. Registrations, absences, and discharges for cause were found to be from 7 to 8 percent higher among the nonhandicapped, while there were 5.6 percent fewer accidents among the disabled. A slightly higher percentage of the disabled (4.6 percent) as compared with the nonhandicapped (4 percent) received increased earnings.

To encourage the employment of disabled workers, most of the States have adopted a second injury provision in their workmen's compensation laws. In these States the employer of a person who has been handicapped by a previous injury is only liable for the disability caused by the second injury. Fifteen of them have adopted a second injury fund, and in these States compensation for the disability resulting from the combined first and second injury is paid from the second injury fund. The initial rate of compensation insurance for an employer is generally fixed for the industry and the total cost is based on the number of employees, occupations, and pay roll. No information is generally required regarding the physical condition of the employees. The rate is later adjusted on the basis of the experience of the company. The claim that the experience is poor if handicapped persons are employed has not been substantiated. The Ford Motor Co., as an example that the contrary is generally true, employes over 10,000 physically handicapped workers and reports that it has the lowest compensation insurance rate in the automotive industry.

One of the reasons why the seriousness of this social problem has been minimized is that society has not realized its extent. In sizing up the situation, many of us have thought in terms of the scattered cripples who have been selling papers or shoestrings on the street corner or of only those who become handicapped through infantile paralysis. The plight of the many thousands who become disabled each year through diseases and injuries, both industrial and nonindustrial, has not been fully appreciated.

DEFECTS SHOWN

One of the most recent studies on the prevalence of disabilities was conducted by the United States Public Health Service in a national health survey. From the data gathered by this survey it is estimated that 23,000,000 persons, or more than 1 person in 6 in the United States, have some chronic disease, orthopedic impairment, or serious defect of vision or hearing. Of course, not all of this number need vocational rehabilitation. It is estimated, however, that at least 3,000,000 of this group are in need of self-supporting employment. According to another estimate, 800,000 persons become permanently handicapped every year. Of this number, roughly 1 out of every 8 can be made employable with proper guidance and training. Estimates show that the number of seriously disabled increases as the income level decreases. Accordingly, the need for vocational rehabilitation and the benefits of possible employment are greater among the lower income groups.

One of the principal reasons why we have not recognized the problem of the growing number of handicapped people is that we have been thinking principally of returning the able-bodied to gainful employment rather than retaining the worker who has become disabled. We have been inclined to overlook the possibility that a large number of the unemployed may not be working because of serious handicaps. Estimates of the number of seriously disabled persons on relief in the urban population run as high as 25 percent. In times of economic depression the number of persons listed as handicapped increases. During prosperous times many of these persons are absorbed in the economic picture and therefore do not present an acute problem to the community. They are, however, the last to be rehired, just as they are the first to be dismissed.

TRAINING PROGRAM

The success of the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program can well be taken as an index of the practicability of such training for national-defense purposes. Such a training program would be effectuated by making funds available for the expansion of the present vocational rehabilitation programs of the States. It would cover training in many of the 127 different types of jobs now necessary in the defense industries and training in purely nondefense jobs to replace the able-bodied in case of a national emergency.

The types of training provided under a defense program would be based largely on the supply of and demand for certain jobs not only during the national emergency but also in normal times. This would insure employment of these individuals after the crisis is over. Such a program would make available a supply of workers already exempt by law from military service.

Extension of Service of Members of Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21, 1941

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann appearing in the Washington Post entitled "The Army in the Hands of Congress," which is most appropriate in view of the message from the President of the United States read to the Senate today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE ARMY IN THE HANDS OF CONGRESS

There is not the slightest ground for recrimination over General Marshall's request that Congress should extend the service of the men in the Army. In enacting the Selective Service Act Congress expressly laid down the rule, as a matter of fact by amending the original bill, that Congress and not the President would determine whether the men should be held for more than 12 months. They can be held only when "the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled." In conformity with the law General Marshall has now gone back to Congress.

The law, which now requires General Marshall to ask Congress for new authority, is entirely in accord with the spirit and intent of the Constitution and with the traditions of liberty in the English-speaking countries. The ultimate control of the Army is the historic power by which the legislature opposes usurpation at home or wars of conquest abroad. This, rather than the somewhat academic and legalistic power to declare war, is the effective power of the representative legislature in the whole process of wa. and peace. In reserving the right to say whether the Army authorized a year ago is now to be maintained, or reduced, or even in effect largely disbanded as an effective force, Congress was assuming a responsibility which in any free country ought to rest upon the legislature. The American Army is commanded by the President. But it can exist only by authority of Congress. What Congress willed a year ago has now happened: the future of the Army is in the hands of Congress.

Once the Members of Congress have studied General Marshall's testimony there is little doubt that they will not wish to repeat in this crisis the errors of every other Congress in every other crisis in our history. This is the first crisis in which we have seriously prepared for war before war actually began, and Congress, considering that there was an election in progress last summer, has already shown greater foresight and courage than any other Congress in any similar period in our history.

But if by any chance it now refuses General Marshall's request or subjects it to emasculating amendment or filibustering debate, Congress will be repeating the errors which in 1776 and in 1861, not to speak of 1812, caused immense unnecessary sacrifice and very nearly led to disaster. The problem of the short enlistment, which now troubles General Marshall and threatens to disrupt the whole Army, was the main military trouble which beset Washington in the Revolutionary War and Lincoln in the Civil War. Before any conscientious man ventures to oppose General Marshall's request he should read the history of the Army in time of war as set forth, for example, in General Upton's The Military Policy of the United States and the recent book by General Palmer on America in Arms.

Washington's Continental Army was composed of volunteers from the militia of the States, and in the beginning Congress insisted that the Continentals should be enlisted for 1 year instead of for the duration of the war.

"Due to this folly," says General Palmer, "it was necessary to train a new army each spring. * * * It was Washington's opinion that but for this stupid decision * * * the war would have ended in decisive American victory before the winter of Valley Forge."

What Washington though of the 12-month enlistments is to be found in a letter to the President of Congress dated August 20, 1780. There is not space to reprint all of it, though all of it is well worth reading today: "Had we formed a permanent Army in the beginning, which, by the continuance of the same men in service, had been capable of discipline, we never should have had to retreat with a handful of men across the Delaware in 1776, trembling for the fate of America, which nothing but the infatuation of the enemy could have saved; we should not have remained all the succeeding winter at their mercy, with sometimes scarcely a sufficient body of men to mount the ordinary guards. * * * We should not have been under the necessity of fighting Brandywine * * * of seeing Philadelphia fall a prey * * * we should not have been at Valley Forge. * * * There is every reason to believe the war has been protracted on this account. * * * The fluctuations of our Army kept alive their (the enemy's) hopes and at every period of the dissolution of a considerable part of it, they have flattered themselves with some decisive advantages."

This same story was repeated, perhaps even more disastrously, in 1861. There were in the Army then about 200,000 volunteers for the term of 3 years and about 75,000 militia with a 3 months' term of service. One can appreciate the feelings of General Marshall today when one reads the following from a dispatch of General Patterson, commander of the Army of the Shenandoah, on June 28, 1861: "I beg to remind the general in chief that the period of service of nearly all the troops will expire within a month. * * * The new regiments will not be fit for service before September, if then, and meanwhile this whole frontier will be exposed."

The disastrous and humiliating Battle of Bull Run, which very nearly resulted in the loss of the war, was almost certainly precipitated because the Army was melting away. It was certainly lost because on the day of the battle "some of the volunteers and militia had been mustered into the service less than a month; the term of service of all the regiments of militia was on the eve of expiring." Thus, "discipline, the only sure bond of cohesion, was entirely lacking." (Upton, p. 246.)

With the record of the past before it, with the position today set forth by General Marshall, there should be no reason to fear that this Congress will refuse to do its duty in accordance with the responsibility it has expressly accepted. Unlike any other Congress, and to its everlasting credit, this Congress raised an Army to prepare for war before the outbreak of war. There is no reason to suppose that in the situation which now exists the Congress will listen to those who ask it to refuse to maintain the Army which it raised.

Comments of Col. Josiah C. Wedgwood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21, 1941

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Times-Herald of Saturday, July 19, 1941, entitled "A British Official Tells This Nation Where to Get Off."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 19, 1941]

IN THE NEWS—A BRITISH OFFICIAL TELLS THIS NATION WHERE TO GET OFF

We have been honored by a visit from a typical member of the British ruling classes.

He is Col. Josiah C. Wedgwood, of the Wedgwood porcelain family.

He is likewise a member of the British Parliament.

He tells us all about our American business—"where we get off," when we get off, and how we get off.

We are punks.

We are too slow.

Colonel Wedgwood wants to give us the "bum's rush" and throw us out of our peace, out of our independence, out of our public welfare, out of our free institutions, into the gutter of war.

He allows of no argument.

He says:

"This is your war and you are in it up to your necks."

He continues:

"The trouble with you Americans is that you are afraid to assume responsibilities."

Friends and fellow Americans, we sort of thought that we had assumed quite a lot of responsibilities during the last war that England was in.

And that we had assumed obligations, too—obligations of foreign nations that were in no way ours and debts that were theirs but were repudiated, and damages and depressions, too, that we have never been able to recover from.

And we thought we had conferred quite a few boons and benefits, especially upon England, pulling John Bull out of the bloody mess he had gotten himself into, and putting his topper back on his head, and dusting off his clothes, and wiping his bruised nose, and standing him back on his unsteady feet.

For all of which we were called "Uncle Sap"—and rightly so called.

Now comes this British warrior and statesman and crockery manufacturer and shows us up.

He tells us how wrong we are, and have always been, and how only our President

is willing to assume "a large share of responsibility"—which he certainly is overwilling to do, and has considerably overdone.

Then this British member of Parliament asks us why we have not got a "sensible Congress," and says:

"In England all the best people (including Colonel Wedgwood, of course) go into Parliament."

But, remarks the colonel disparagingly:

"They don't try to go into Congress here."

Then Colonel Wedgwood, warrior, diplomat, and parliamentarian, tells Senator WHEELER "to go soak his head," and says:

"I would be glad to see physical intervention (of America in the war) tomorrow," and further says:

"I would like to see American troops fighting beside ours, flying American planes, sailing American ships over and in the war zone."

The "Union Now" movement, declared Colonel Wedgwood, is "far more advanced" in England than in the United States.

"The people (in England) are ready for it now.

"We've all got to hang together or we will hand singly," says the colonel, adopting Benjamin Franklin's dictum in the reverse, and applying to America what that revered signer of the Declaration of Independence had to say about England.

As a matter of fact, Americans would have no particular objection to seeing Colonel Wedgwood hanging singly.

Indeed, they would rather favor the idea.

But they do object to all of us being hanged together in support of the jealousies and commercial rivalries and selfish political policies of any foreign nations whatever.

Still, there is no use becoming unduly incensed at this crockery warrior.

His opinions are characteristic of his present Government.

In the press dispatches of the same day appear the remarks of Lord Vansittart, member of the British House of Lords, who says:

"Any talk of peace with the Nazis is impossible. Persistent bombing may weaken German morale and may start a crack-up.

"But land success is needed against the Reichswehr. This will take immense manpower, and unless the Russians crush the Germans in the East, America is the only hope.

"In the long run American manpower will be needed for a land victory over Germany."

And a few days before, General Sir Claude Auchinleck, commander in chief of the British forces in the Middle East, said:

"I've always thought the war must be won in Europe, in Germany, on Germany's own soil.

"Therefore, I see as much need for American manpower in this war as in the last."

And Lord Elibank, speaking before the House of Lords Wednesday, advised that the British war cabinet "include representatives of the dominions, India, and the United States, who soon will be nearer to us in war than they are at present."

How gratifying it will be to the once free people of the United States to be back in the British Empire on the same terms and in the same rank with the subject races of oppressed India.

The facts are, folks—in the plain English which we are only now beginning to hear spoken—that England knows she cannot win the war against Germany.

But she positively will not make peace, no matter how honorable a peace might be offered.

"Any German offer of a peace conference with honor," Lord Vansittart says, "will always have a certain degree of acceptance among 'mugs' of high circles as well as low."

But "no comprehensive peace is possible."

Because the British Empire expects America to do her fighting for her, and to drag her chestnuts out of the hot coals of the war she has declared, and the diplomatic complications she has involved herself in.

We Americans could not say this and be believed, but when English lords and generals and members of Parliament say it, it must be recognized as true.

Moreover, Mr. Atlee, member of the British War Cabinet, repeats it; and Mr. Churchill, Premier of England, definitely declares it.

"The age of appeasement and isolation is gone," says the truculent Col. Josiah C. Wedgwood, speaking for us Americans as well as for the British Parliament.

"We've had years and years of these wretched appeasers, like WHEELER, in England."

And "by wretched appeasers I mean all people who are not prepared to consider their duty to the rest of mankind."

"And," continues the crockery colonel emphatically, "this includes all those who think they can keep out of the war and let the other hemisphere settle its own difficulties."

According to these British statesmen and generals, we Americans must take on the age-old hatreds and jealousies of Europe, the ancient racial and religious antagonisms of Asia.

We must carry the four freedoms futilely to the four corners of the earth, only to have them rejected and ridiculed when they arrive there.

Meanwhile we must deprive ourselves of every phase of freedom here at home—of every ounce of political liberty, of every atom of prosperity, of every shadow of public or private welfare.

We must even sacrifice our independence so that a foreign nation, against which we formerly rebelled because of its exactions and harsh domination, its ingratitude and injustice, can now use us as part of its war machine, and make us a part of its long-sought world dominion.

In discussing this flagrant British war propaganda on the floor of the Senate, Senator TOBEY recalled the fact "That Lord Northcliffe said in his book in 1928 that he spent $150,000,000 in the United States in 1917 to get America into the war.

"How much," continued Senator TOBEY, "do you suppose they (the British) are spending today?"

"This man Wedgwood," said Senator TOBEY further, "is only a disciple of Winston Churchill. The same Winston Churchill who said in his book written in 1925—'the best way to secure American sympathy is to get American blood shed on the field.'"

Senator WHEELER, also on the floor of the Senate, defended the United States Congress against the attacks of Colonel Wedgwood, and repelled with admirable restraint the amazing personal assault against himself made by the British premier.

Said Senator WHEELER:

"Lord Halifax and the other English statesmen may take Mr. Willkie into camp; they may take Mr. Morgenthau into camp; they may take Mr. Knox into camp; but they are not going to run the Congress of the United States, in my judgment."

Let us hope that Senator WHEELER's judgment is sound and true.

But the people of the United States have small belief that this cowering Congress will possess the courage to assert any form of American independence, or to stop in any manner the offensive foreign propaganda which is rushing our country into an alien war.

Colonel Wedgwood is on his way home, to be sure, but Lord Halifax, the authorized and official interferer extraordinary, and meddler plenipotentiary, in America's personal political affairs, is still at large in this land of the free, and still perpetrating—without protest from our pseudo-American Congress—his humiliating affronts to the independence and the self-respect of the American people.

The Army We Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21, 1941

ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an article by Mark Sullivan entitled "The Army We Need," published in the Washington Post of Monday, July 21, 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 21, 1941]

DRAFT ALTERNATIVES

(By Mark Sullivan)

THE ARMY WE NEED

General Marshall says that August 1—that means next week—is the deadline for action by Congress to keep draftees in service beyond the 1 year for which they were inducted. General Marshall wants the draftees kept. Much of Congress is reluctant.

The few days left for decision may be too short a time to talk about alternatives. It may be the only practicable thing is to hold the draftees. If General Marshall says so, that carries the greatest possible weight. If the head of the Army says this is unqualifiedly the best way, that his judgment is not affected by enforced expediency, that he is not merely asking for the best than can be done under the circumstances—if General Marshall says that, then no reasonable person will wish to argue.

But there remains a sound judgment that merely keeping the draftees beyond their year will not fully solve our ploblem. It will lead to future situations as embarrasing as the present one; and it will leave a bad taste among many draftees and their families, who understood their period of service was to be but a year. Finally, keeping the draftees will not give us the kind of Army America needs.

The kind of Army America wants is composed of two things. The first is a permanent Regular Army, a standing Army. By "permanent" is meant permanence of the individuals composing the Army. Our permanent Army should be made up of men who remain in the Army, make a lifetime career of it.

It is such men who have always made up our Regular Army, men who enlist voluntarily because they like the career, and for the same reason reenlist when their 3-year terms of service end. The permanent standing Army must be made up of soldiers of this kind. For the essentials of a modern army are that it should be highly mechanized, highly mobile. In such an army, the soldiers must have greater mechanical skill than can be commonly acquired in a single enlistment. Also, such an army needs the sort of teamwork, the quick coordination and maneuvering in units that can only be acquired by fairly long experience with the same personnel, training shoulder to shoulder in the same units.

This permanent, standing Army need not be extremely large. General Marshall, before a Senate committee last Thursday, said that 1,600,000 would be enough. That is an outside figure—some judge that a million would

be enough. (Bear in mind we are speaking of the figure for the permanent standing Army. Bear in mind also that every discussion of the size of our standing Army includes the assumption that we shall have in addition an extremely strong Navy, and an air force practically without limit.)

This regular standing Army of say 1,600,000, is what we need as a permanent army. In addition, we need, for possible emergencies, a reservoir of additional material. This reservoir should be provided by adopting universal military training—military training as distinct from induction into the Army. The military training should be given to every youth during the first year following school or college. After a few years we would have an adequate reservoir of young men with 1 year of military training, available for addition to the Regular Army in emergency.

These two things together compose what America needs for its permanent military system.

The immediate question is, Can we set about building up this system now? Is it too late to make a fresh start? As Congress debates whether to extend the service of the draftees, is it practicable to consider, as a substitute, the permanent two-part military system here suggested? Could we get it started in time?

The first concrete question is, Can we build up our Regular Army quickly enough to a figure of approximately 1,600,000? To start with we already have 476,000 Regulars. (These are the regular 3-year voluntary enlistees, as distinct from 1-year draftees.) As an addition to these, we could probably get many of the draftees now approaching the end of their service. The total of these is about 600,000. Many of them, having become familiar with the Army, and having already been detached from their ordinary peacetime employment and associations, might be willing to become Regulars.

In addition, we could renew the mechanism for stimulating enlistment of Regulars, which was more or less dropped when we adopted the draft system. Whether we could attain the total of approximately 1,600,000, and attain it in time, is for General Marshall and the other Army experts to say.

Whether or not we can begin the two-part system now, there can be little question we would have done better to adopt it instead of the draft system a year ago. Much that we have done was awkward and wasteful, and is now being undone.

We took men up to 35 away from industries in which they were useful and put them in military training, where they were little needed, and from which those over 28 are now being released. Some of the notions of a year ago are now seen as fantastic. How many remember that the original proposal was to register every male from 18 to 64, and put under draft all up to 45?

Sign of the "V"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21, 1941

ARTICLE BY BARNET NOVER

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an article by Barnet Nover entitled "Sign of the 'V'" published in the Washington Post of today, July 21, 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIGN OF THE "V"

(By Barnet Nover)

NEW WEAPON IN THE WAR OF NERVES

"There is no more welcome gift to men than a new symbol."

—*Emerson.*

How it began, by whom, and where is not quite clear. The inhabitants of occupied Europe live behind a high wall closely guarded by the Gestapo. But from time to time news from that vast concentration camp does manage to get out.

Early this year it was learned that in Belgium the population was giving vent to its hatred of the conqueror by chalking defiant inscriptions on walls and doors. The writing was usually done in the dead of night. When day came the German authorities saw to it that the inscriptions were erased, sometimes taking punitive action against those deemed responsible. The next night the same inscriptions reappeared. Among them one was notable for its stark simplicity—the letter V.

Writing on the wall is an old political habit in many parts of Europe. It was so prevalent in France that laws had to be passed by the chamber prohibiting the practice. It was so common in Italy that Mussolini saw to it, soon after he came into power, that the walls were covered with his pet slogans, such as, for instance, Believe! Obey! Fight!

The inscriptions that began to appear on Belgian walls this year were manifestations of passive resistance. The movement was individually initiated, the reflection of a spontaneous urge to express the loathing felt for the conqueror. And what was happening in Belgium was happening elsewhere in Europe as well. It may, therefore, be that the "V" symbol first made its appearance not in Belgium but in France or Holland. The important fact is not where it originated but that it soon began to spread.

British propaganda has tended to be far from effective in this war. The Nazis have had the jump on them in waging psychological warfare as in the field of military action. But somebody in London was wise enough to see the effective use to which the "V" symbol could be put. So beginning in April the B. B. C. broadcasts to occupied Europe began to urge people everywhere to manifest their spirit of defiance, their hope of an ultimate victory over the Nazis, by making the widest use of the symbol.

It is a capital offense in the conquered countries to listen to foreign broadcasts, particularly those originating in Great Britain. The spread of the "V" campaign shows how little this drastic law operates to prevent such listening. By June the letter V had become the symbol of a silent crusade against the Nazis. Then people began to tap out the letter V in Morse code—three dots and a dash. Then the discovery was made that this rhythm was to be found repeated in endless variations in Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, now the Marseillaise of a new war for liberation.

What does "V" stand for? Alone it stands for the twenty-second letter in the English alphabet, the Roman symbol for 5. But to the oppressed people of Europe it has taken on a far greater meaning. To the people of France and to the French-speaking Belgians it means "victoire"—victory. To the people of Holland and Flanders it mean "vrijheit"—freedom. Repeated thrice Norwegians recognize it as an abbreviation for "ve vil vinne"—we will win. In all languages it means: "We are not alone." The man who wrote the V or whistled its musical counterpart or tapped it out in Morse code and the one who reads or listens to it form part of a great brotherhood: "We are weak today. We shall be strong tomorrow. We are disarmed but not conquered. We are fighting back. We shall triumph. We shall be free again."

This theme of solidarity and hope the B. B. C.'s mysterious speaker, Col. V. Britton, has hammered home to the conquered peoples of Europe almost daily. And at the end of last week the movement was given official sanction by none other than Winston Churchill in a special broadcast.

In unity there is strength. Hitler has sought to unite Europe by transforming it into a continent of slaves ruled by a master race.

Writing the letter V on doors and walls will not give arms to the disarmed, destroy prison walls behind which 135,000,000 people are being held in subjection. But by enabling the conquered to express their feelings the movement is nonetheless one of great potential significance. So much so, indeed, that, acting on the theory that if you can't beat them you join them, the Nazis are now proclaiming that V means viktoria—the victory of the German arms, or veni, vidi, vici, which they insist they have a greater right to say than did Caesar. But this clever ruse of appropriating the symbol of the enemy will not work. It comes too late. Besides, the German word for victory is not viktoria—that is a word borrowed from Latin—but sieg. Those in Germany and Austria who write V on their walls may have quite another word in mind—vergeltung—revenge, for instance, as Erika Mann suggests, or verdamt—damned, or vernichten—to wipe out.

In the meantime R. A. F. squadrons flying in V formations over the Channel to their targets on the continent are reminding the people of Germany and the conquered peoples of Europe that V can also stand for vengeance.

Labor and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the Washington Post of Saturday, July 19, 1941, entitled "Labor and the Law":

[From the Washington Post of July 19, 1941]

LABOR AND THE LAW

When strikes paralyze defense industries, they are, as Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold points out in a current article, dramatic enough to receive spectacular publicity, and public opinion is focused upon the problem of finding a solution for such disturbances. Mr. Arnold is, therefore, more concerned about illegitimate union practices that are carried on unobtrusively or under cover. More particularly, he is irked because of the inability of the Antitrust Division, which he heads, to proceed vigorously against such practices. In the now famous Hutcheson case, which came before the United States

Supreme Court last winter, it was held that restraint of trade due to jurisdictional disputes is not one of the practices banned by the Sherman Act. The effect of that and several subsequent decisions handed down by the Court has been to leave the Department of Justice helpless to proceed against practices that further no legitimate ends of labor organizations but serve only to impose antisocial restraints upon interstate commerce.

Apparently the only way to secure relief from the exactions of racketeers, large and small, who prey on labor unions without running afoul of the law is to amend or extend the Sherman Act so that the unions may no longer restrain interstate commerce for purposes unrelated to their primary and legitimate objectives. Those objectives are, briefly, the securing of better wages, shorter hours, generally improved working conditions, and the right to collective bargaining.

Two bills designed to outlaw specified antisocial activities of labor unions have recently been introduced in Congress by Congressman MONRONEY and Congressman WALTER, and are now before the House Judiciary Committee. These bills would make it unlawful for unions to engage in strikes designed to prevent the introduction of labor-saving devices, to coerce employers into hiring unneeded men, or to compel recognition of a nonrepresentative labor organization for purposes of collective bargaining. The mere recital of the numerous activities that these bills propose to bring within the scope of laws designed to protect the consumer, the businessman, and labor itself from oppressive restraints and monopolies is enough to show the need for a legislative redefinition of labor's rights under the Sherman Act.

Mr. Arnold's especial aim is to protect low-income consumers from union exploitation and to prevent the destruction of small independent businesses by unreasonable union demands. Obviously, practices that impede the effective functioning of industry in normal times also retard our defense program. Hence, amendment of the antitrust laws to cover antisocial labor activities can be urged as a defense measure as well as for the more immediate and germane reasons stressed by the Assistant Attorney General.

How to Stop Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

RADIO BROADCAST OF ALBERT W. HAWKES, PRESIDENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES; JOHN Q. CAREY, MAYOR, TOLEDO, OHIO; EDMUND RUFFIN, DIRECTOR, TOLEDO INDUSTRIAL PEACE BOARD

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co., Friday evening, July 18, 1941, participated in by Albert W. Hawkes, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Hon. John Q. Carey, mayor, Toledo, Ohio; and Edmund Ruffin, director, Toledo Industrial Peace Board.

It is encouraging in times such as we are now experiencing in the industrial world to find men, outstanding in business, public affairs, and in the field of labor relations exchanging views on a subject which is close to the heart of every thinking person in this country. In a discussion free of any self-serving motives and designed to further the progress of our national-defense program by the elimination of any and all industrial misunderstandings, these gentlemen, in my opinion, have presented a constructive and workable plan. Let us hope that their suggestions will find ready and enthusiastic support.

The radio broadcast follows:

ANNOUNCER. "How to Stop Strikes." The National Broadcasting Co. presents a progress report on a strike-preventive plan that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States advocates for adoption by the Nation's industrialized communities. This report will be delivered by Albert W. Hawkes, president of the national chamber and outstanding American industrialist. What is the plan and how does it function? To bring you a specific illustration, N. B. C. presents, with Mr. Hawkes, a first-hand report on the work and accomplishments of the Toledo Industrial Peace Board. The manufacturing city of Toledo, Ohio, has attained national prominence because of its remarkable record of steadily diminishing strikes. Here this evening to tell Mr. Hawkes and the radio audience the success story of the Toledo Peace Board are Toledo Mayor John Q. Carey and Edmund Ruffin, the board's director. And now, Mr. Hawkes.

Mr. HAWKES. The destructive tidal wave of strikes that swept the country has now subsided somewhat, but there is no assurance that there won't be a recurrence. Therefore, the issue is far from being settled. Strikes have not ceased altogether by any means. Threats of strikes continue to hover ominously over the Nation.

The serious problem of industrial strife—strife that interrupts the flow of the machines and materials of defense—warrants the painstaking consideration of every patriotic and public-spirited American.

In my last talk to the N. B. C. network audience several weeks ago, I pointed out emphatically that legislative compulsion in the settlement of defense strikes is not the answer in a representative democracy—that voluntary cooperation is the American way. We do not and cannot defend ourselves against totalitarianism through adoption of totalitarian methods.

What, then, is the solution to the strike problem? Well, here's the most logical answer that I know. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States strongly urges that employers and employees declare a Nation-wide moratorium on industrial strife for the duration of the emergency. This moratorium may most effectively be realized through local and voluntary action. Though national in effect, defense strikes are mostly local in origin. Communities throughout the country are answering the national chamber's urgent call for a cessation of industrial disputes—disputes that disrupt not only defense production but the Nation's very unity.

Local chambers of commerce have been instrumental in the organization of moratorium committees composed of the most progressive elements of local labor, management, and the public. These committees are making possible the machinery of mediation locally, and employers and employees are talking their differences out instead of fighting them out. That method, I submit, is the American way—and we believe that is the only way.

The progress thus far achieved through this voluntary method of settling disputes is encouraging. But now let's listen to a first-hand account of a strike-preventive plan, similar to that advocated by the national chamber, which has been operating with increasing success in Toledo, Ohio. As our announcer has already informed you, John Carey, Toledo's mayor, and Edmund Ruffin, director of Toledo's peace board, are with us this evening. Mayor Carey, will you tell us something about your city?

Mr. CAREY. Well, Mr. Hawkes, we have approximately 325,000 people in our city and its environs. We have about 500 industries. We are the center of the glass industry, and we're large manufacturers of automotive parts. We are mainly an industrial city—a city that under ordinary circumstances would be just as subject to labor disturbances as any other highly industrialized community.

Mr. HAWKES. Mayor Carey, all evidence indicates that your conditions are ordinary, but that your accomplishments are extraordinary. Industrial relations in your city have become singularly free from discord. How do you account for Toledo's industrial harmony? Surely you have had labor troubles in the past?

Mr. CAREY. Toledo's record of industrial disputes was no different from that of many other harassed manufacturing cities before we organized our peace board. As a matter of fact, we experienced labor difficulties of a rather spectacular character in 1934. Our peace board came as a result of those hectic times.

Mr. HAWKES. What was the nature of those labor troubles, Mayor Carey?

Mr. CAREY. Well, it wasn't so much the extent of the trouble as the violence of its character that worried us. The State guardsmen had to be called out. Two persons, innocent bystanders, were killed, and we suffered from a rash of lesser strikes. Then a general strike threatened to smother Toledo's production almost entirely.

Mr. HAWKES. And did this general strike occur?

Mr. CAREY. Fortunately, it didn't. But it made us stop to think—think fast and hard. In the meanwhile, Edward McGrady, former Assistant Secretary of Labor, had traveled to Toledo time and again in connection with industrial conflicts. Finally, Mr. McGrady told us that our problem was a local one and should be solved locally. He suggested that we form a local industrial peace board. We acted on his sound advice and set up a board composed of five labor leaders, five manufacturers, and eight representatives of the Toledo public.

Mr. HAWKES. I understand that the peace board met with success from the start.

Mr. CAREY. That's right, Mr. Hawkes, and the city is determined that it will continue to be successful. Not only city and peace board officials, not only employers and the labor unions, but the Toledo public in general is determined that wasteful deadlocks must be forestalled. And right here, Mr. Hawkes, I should like to express my belief that the determination and cooperation of the community means everything to the board's successful operation. There's no magic in the plan itself. But behind it is the will of the people. It was formed at the insistence of the people, the employers, the workers and the press. In my opinion, the peace-board plan, which is generally the same as the moratorium plan advocated by the national chamber, can succeed anywhere if the community stands firmly behind it.

Mr. HAWKES. The peace board is a part of Toledo's city government, isn't it?

Mr. CAREY. Yes; it is, Mr. Hawkes. And the cost of the board to the city is only a little more than $6,000 a year.

Mr. HAWKES. What have been the results of the peace board's activities so far as the city is concerned?

Mr. CAREY. The results in man-hours saved, in orders to Toledo industries which would have gone elsewhere if labor conditions had been disturbed, in wages earned and paid, and in uninterrupted production total savings of many millions of dollars. But that's only the material side of Toledo's success story. Our town is more unified now, more friendly and its people are more neighborly. We are not only more peaceful in our industrial relations but in our personal relations as well.

Mr. HAWKES. You've given us a good idea of what the peace board means to Toledo, Mayor Carey. Now, let's take a closer look at the methods used by the board.

Mr. CAREY. Ed Ruffin is the outstanding authority on the work of the board, Mr. Hawkes. Since Mr. Ruffin is a modest sort of fellow, I won't embarrass him with too much praise of his qualifications. But I do want to say that Mr. Ruffin, as director of the peace board, is the key to its success. He has the respect of employers and employees. As a newspaper labor reporter at the time of his appointment as the board's director, he had an excellent knowledge of Toledo's labor relations. In many instances, an entire dispute is handled by Mr. Ruffin, without recourse to the volunteer members of the panel.

Mr. HAWKES. Thank you, Mayor Carey, for your instructive and interesting comments, and I want to talk with Mr. Ruffin in just a moment. First, I should like to tell our audience in the many communities throughout the country that I believe the picture of Toledo painted by Mayor Carey—a picture of peace in industry—can be painted in your community through adoption of the national chamber's proposal for a moratorium on industrial strife. These are perilous times for our Nation. The need for the highest degree of unity and harmony in our relations, industrial and social, is urgent and vital. As president of the national chamber, I urge every local chamber of commerce, every community worried by strikes or threats of strikes, to give immediate and sincere consideration to the national chamber's plan. And now, Mr. Ruffin, briefly what is the record of Toledo's peace board?

Mr. RUFFIN. We are proud of our record, Mr. Hawkes. During the 6 years of the board's life, 181 disputes have been settled without stoppage of work in any instance. These disputes involved 36,244 employees. Over the same period the board helped settle 52 lesser strikes involving 6,090 employees. And I am happy to say that not a single strike has occurred in Toledo's defense industries.

Mr. HAWKES. Those figures pretty much speak for themselves, Mr. Ruffin. What authority has the board?

Mr. RUFFIN. None at all, Mr. Hawkes. We don't actually hunt disputes, and the board's decisions aren't mandatory. Our function is to mediate disputes brought to us. However, our recommendations are virtually always accepted as just and fair.

Mr. HAWKES. Since the board itself has no legal powers of intervention, will you tell us how you proceed when a dispute is referred to your agency?

Mr. RUFFIN. Well, first of all, Mr. Hawkes, we guard against either side bringing a trifling matter to the board. While either side can appeal to the board, our first step is to determine if the disputants cannot agree without our help.

Mr. HAWKES. Then, what's the next step?

Mr. RUFFIN. The next step isn't always the same. Sometimes we hold a hearing. Sometimes a round-table conference. Then, again, we center our efforts on what is obviously the point of greatest difference and suggest concessions of one sort or another.

Mr. HAWKES. Will you relate a few instances?

Mr. RUFFIN. Well, in one instance, we persuaded a union to forego its demands altogether in view of conditions prevailing in a firm—conditions which made it impossible for the firm to meet the union's demands. In other instances, we've persuaded employers to grant at least a part of wage increases demanded—and in some cases the full increase. Working conditions have also been a field of many compromises. And both with C. I. O. and A. F. of L. unions we have managed to iron out tangles involving perhaps only one or two men. You know, of course, that considerations involving only one or two employees are often the cause of a strike. In other instances we have not completely settled issues, but at least have obtained delays. During the period of delay tempers cool and give employer and employee an opportunity to work out a congenial and logical solution to their dispute.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. Ruffin, do you feel that Toledo has definitely secured insurance against major strikes through the peace-board plan?

Mr. RUFFIN. It is possible for Toledo to have a bad strike at any time, Mr. Hawkes. However, I do believe that such a strike is much less apt to occur in Toledo than in most industrial communities. I most certainly feel that before a strike is called, every effort would have been made to effect a peaceful settlement. And we would exhaust every resource before calling on the Federal Government.

Mr. HAWKES. In Toledo, then, there is little likelihood of your having to call upon the Federal mediation agencies?

Mr. RUFFIN. That is correct, Mr. Hawkes, as effective as they are, we would only call on them as a last resort. You see, Mr. Hawkes, we believe that we shall have set a new pace in settling labor difficulties through voluntary local cooperation. Like all people with good reputations we feel compelled to maintain that reputation to the best of our ability.

Mr. HAWKES. I see your point, Mr. Ruffin. It's largely a matter of civic pride. I commend the people of Toledo for the intelligence they show in using brains instead of force in conducting their community affairs. Peaceful labor conditions are the best advertisement any city can have. Thank you, Mr. Ruffin, and you Mayor Carey, for taking time to come to the broadcast studios and tell us about Toledo's industrial peace board. What has been accomplished by Toledo in bringing peace to management and labor can be accomplished by other American communities. In this connection telegrams just received today from chambers of commerce in Atlanta, Ga., Savannah, Ga., and the Oranges and Maplewood, N. J., advise us of the successful organization of moratorium committees in those communities. We hope they will be as successful as the Toledo board has been. Other cities throughout the country are in the process of forming moratorium committees as advocated by the National Chamber. If Nation-wide support is given the National Chamber in its plan to put an end to disputes between employer and employee, I believe we shall have advanced toward a solution of our entire problem of industrial conflict—both in peacetime and preparedness industries. Any American community interested in the National Chamber's plan for a moratorium on industrial strife, which would like to adopt it, can receive complete information by writing to me in care of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C.

ANNOUNCER. You have just heard a discussion on the subject How to Stop Strikes, presented by National Broadcasting Co. in cooperation with the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Participating in the discussion were Albert W. Hawkes, president of the National Chamber; John Q. Carey, mayor of Toledo, Ohio; and Edmund Ruffin, director of Toledo's industrial peace board.

Defense Highway Program Means Strengthening Transportation Arteries for Increasing Preparedness Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, by passage today of H. R. 5110 the House of Representatives has again definitely displayed its determination to proceed wisely in building the strongest defense program possible for America. We have been slow in realizing that our highways were not improved and built for military uses—and for this reason there must of necessity be a speedy undertaking of the construction of roads which will supplement the regular Federal Aid Road Act funds.

The time is long overdue for action—and yet we must not go forward with haste which will in some instances cause reckless procedure. But we must start now to put into motion the forces vital to getting the work under way in the next few months at the latest. Wisdom certainly dictates that we take stock of our highway deficiencies and begin the work which will modernize our national highway system, making it the finest for peacetime service and at the same time a highly developed and definitely efficient adjunct for our national defense.

SUPERHIGHWAYS NEEDED NOW

Mr. Speaker, it has long been my belief that many-lane roads and superhighways were urgently needed in the United States. I am pleased at the reaction which has come to the building and use of the so-called Pennsylvania Turnpike. I hope it will not be many years until there will be a vast network of such highways. They will be of great value to the country in future time—when war, we trust, is banished and free men are once again able to work in peace. It is necessary that we not close our eyes to what has happened and our responsibility to the same in these days of all-out defense effort.

In this connection I should like to include at this point parts of an address which I delivered on December 11 of last year, when speaking before the annual banquet of the Illinois Road Builders' Association. Excerpts follow:

HIGHWAYS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

An outstanding lesson in Germany's amazingly successful blitzkrieg is the importance of an adequate and integrated system of highways. From the day he attained power until he struck his first devastating blow Hitler had some of the best engineering brains of Germany constructing a network of superhighways on a scale the nation had never

seen, coordinating it with the development of rail, water, and air transportation systems. It was this system that made possible the gigantic expansion of German armaments in the few short years that followed Hitler's march into the Rhineland. And when Poland's hour struck it was the broad, perfectly constructed roads right to the border which enabled his swiftly moving mechanized hordes to accomplish what military men considered an utter impossibility.

NARROW ROADS HAMPER ALLIES

In Hitler's headlong rush to the French coast it was again the superhighway system that transported his unending stream of tanks and motorized troops, in contrast was the relatively inadequate system of narrow roads used by the French and British. The Allies were slow in their initial advance through Belgium to meet the Germans, and then were bottlenecked without supplies or reinforcements when the narrow roads were choked with fleeing humanity and blasted by Stuka bombers. It was the story of one- and two-lane roads, vulnerable to attack, against a vast system of six- and eight-lane superhighways.

In relation to our industrialization, size, and strength, our highway system today is little better than were those of the conquered countries. Nearly one-third of our 75,000 miles of strategically important highways do not at the present time meet even the minimum requirements of the War Department. Some of it is too crooked, some too steep, some too light in construction to stand military transport. During the October maneuvers of the District of Columbia National Guard, centering in the West Virginia mountains at my home town of Elkins, heavy trucks carrying antiaircraft guns had to be rerouted from the main highway between Washington and Elkins because in that 230-mile strip of excellent road there were two bridges over which the trucks could not pass. This condition is duplicated in all parts of the country; maneuvers in Texas this year showed that only 25 percent of the roads used were adequate to handle even the comparatively light 10-ton tanks and 155-millimeter howitzers, which were the heaviest equipment used. What would we do if the coming heavy tanks were rushed into this possible invasion site under conditions of actual warfare?

NEW HIGHWAY BILL NEEDED

With the convening of the new Congress in January we must meet the responsibility of preparing and passing supplemental legislation to provide for an immediate program of constructing highways adequate for our national-defense requirements. This should be in addition to the regular biennial Federal-aid highway measures, the last one of which was passed a few months ago. Moreover, I believe that the Federal Government should bear the brunt of this cost, perhaps as much as 80 percent, instead of the 50 percent borne under our regular Federal-aid legislation.

I believe the Federal Government should bear this high ratio of the expense because such a program is as essential to our rapidly expanding defense effort as are new manufacturing facilities. We need transport and more transport, particularly since the Federal Government has at long last recognized the need for decentralizing defense industries. Four years ago I advocated such a plan; today factories by the score for production of aircraft, munitions, engines, nitrates, and other sinews of war preparedness are being located in Illinois, Kansas, Iowa, Missouri, Ohio, Kentucky, West Virginia, and other interior States.

Industrial mobilization, plus an increasing peacetime traffic, already threatens to overtax our present transportation system. Railroads, with equipment depleted by depression years, may soon feel the pressure of transporting defense materials. Waterways have been steadily improved in recent years, but still fall far short of carrying their share of the load. Commercial aviation, with emphasis on passengers and speed, grows in importance daily but cannot be expected to help materially in the transport of bulky materials. The automotive industry, which grew to its present giant stature with the growth of highways, can lend its facilities to speeding defense transport, provided we build the roads to carry the trucks. Our transportation network must be strengthened at every point. To you who are road builders there appears the challenge of uniting your forces in the planning, improvement, and extension of our highway development. I am sure you will not fail in this obligation.

STUDIES BEGAN 20 YEARS AGO

Some 20 years ago the War Department began studies of our highway needs, which are being modified today to meet the new tempo of modern war. We realize that we must revamp our conception of minimum requirements. Testimony before the House Roads Committee, of which I am a member, revealed that there are some 6,390 miles of highway in the New England States alone that should be rebuilt, widened, or relocated. There are also 506 bridges that should be widened or rebuilt. And these recommendations, which will cost an estimated $388,223,000, are based only on our immediate peacetime needs to better traffic conditions and promote highway safety. The cost of building New England's highways to serve the dual purpose of civil and military use would probably reach the staggering total of $600,000,000. At this time it is impossible to estimate accurately how many billions will be needed for necessary highway expansion and improvement through the entire Nation.

As I said in the foregoing, the task is going to be a gigantic one, and the cost will be staggering. Revenues will be tapped deeply to carry out such a program. But the people will find a way to do the job. By passing H. R. 5110 an important start is made. Access roads and strategic highways will receive the bulk of the program, although we have not forgotten to provide for surveys and experimental phases, such as flight strips. The testimony of Maj. Gen. George H. Brett, Chief of the Air Corps, leads us into new fields—but they are of growing importance as air power dominates the war scene.

FLIGHT STRIPS URGED BY BRETT

General Brett, in his testimony before the Roads Committee, wisely stated:

The establishment of auxiliary airdromes, satellite fields, as we call them, is a strategic problem in certain sections of the country.

He then went on to say that it was believed that widening of the roads, by giving right-of-way for about 450 feet at road intersections where advantage could be taken of wind conditions that real benefit would come to the Air Corps, and that the public would be benefited with the improvement of the roads themselves.

The money which is to be spent on this experimental work will, I feel, be returned manyfold. National defense will surely be strengthened by this work.

In conclusion may your attention be directed to the fact that some 33,000,000 motor vehicles are operating daily over the roads of this country. To better serve our civilian needs, to increase the safety factor, to bring about a greater degree of national defense—all these are cogent reasons for making more adequate the highway system of America.

Generation of Electrical Power from Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. JOHNSON

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

CORRESPONDENCE OF HON. GEORGE W. JOHNSON OF WEST VIRGINIA AND W. L. BATT, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C., July 14, 1941.

Hon. GEORGE W. JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: This is in further response to your letter of June 9, addressed to Mr. Knudsen, outlining your views of the desirability of constructing steam electric-generating facilities to provide power for national defense.

We are giving the subject of adequate power supply for defense most careful consideration. It is our present view that the country will need as much low-cost generating capacity, both steam and hydro, as our manufacturing facilities for turbines, boilers, generators, and related equipment can produce.

For the most part, the privately owned utilities are dependent upon steam electric installations to meet additional demands for power in their respective service areas. For this reason, to the extent possible, the productive facilities for steam-electric equipment are being reserved to meet the requirements of private power systems. This means that public agencies must be relied upon to develop hydroelectric power and under certain conditons, as in the Tennessee Valley region, a combination of hydro and steam power.

We are rushing to completion our surveys of probable power demands by areas. As soon as these studies are completed we will be in a position to make specific recommendations to the private and public power systems throughout the country on how much additional capacity must be installed to meet anticipated requirements. We shall be pleased to keep you in touch with developments in West Virginia.

Very truly yours,

W. L. BATT,
Deputy Director.

JULY 21, 1941.

Hon. W. L. BATT,
Office of Production Management,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BATT: I have your letter of July 14 in reply to a letter I addressed to Mr. William S. Knudsen, under date of June 9, with reference to the generation of electrical power from coal, instead of depending entirely, or to a large extent, on generating this power from hydroelectric power. This letter was published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2746.

I have read your letter of July 14 with a great deal of interest; however, I do not feel that it throws very much light, or gives very much encouragement.

Somehow, I feel, that the hydroelectric group is very wide awake to the development of hydroelectric power, while, on the other hand, the coal industry is, seemingly, asleep at the switch. It is evident from your letter that even the O. P. M. realizes that energy developed by the use of coal is more dependable than hydroelectric energy, for at most, if not all, your hydroelectric plants you have installed plants for the use of coal to help out when waterpower fails.

While I am not authorized to speak, I feel confident that the coal industry, as well as the coal miners, would be glad, indeed, to do their part in aiding you in installing coal-burning plants for electric energy at the mouth of the mines. I am hopeful that I can arouse the coal industry to take action.

I note what you say about the apparent need for providing so much additional electric generating capacity as will tax to the utmost the manufacturing facilities for turbines, boilers, generators, and related equipment. This is substantiated and amplified in the report which the Federal Power Commission submitted to the President on July 16, a copy of which I have at hand. The latter report gives rise to many questions of policy, as well as of need, that the Congress will necessarily have to examine into with great care.

In your letter to me you suggest that in the consideration of the question of steam power versus hydro power, you are proceeding upon the assumption that private utilities in expanding their own electric generating facilities will absorb all of the steam power plant equipment that the manufacturers are able to produce, and that hence, the Federal Government in any steps of its own to increase electric generating facilities is virtually compelled because of a manufacturing bottleneck to have recourse to hydroelectric power for generation, rather than to steam power. I find myself unable to accept that assumption.

Obviously, either new steam generating plants or new hydroelectric generating plants will impose heavy demands on the manufacturers of turbines, boilers, generators, etc. As to some of this equipment the requirements of steam and hydro plants are very nearly identical; some of the equipment will be quite different.

But, in the case of the steam plant, the generating equipment is all there is to it except the building in which it is housed, whereas in the case of the hydroelectric plant, dams and waterworks representing large capital expenditures and entailing large amounts of labor and material are requisite in addition to the generating equipment. Of course, the interval of time between the commencement and completion of a hydroelectric project is ordinarily twice as great as in the case of a steam plant. Further in favor of steam plants is the greater flexibility with respect to location and often the escape from the problem of long-distance transmission.

We know that time is of the essence when it comes to providing these electric facilities. I believe we may assume also that if other factors are anywhere near equal we should elect the course that costs the least and involves the least in terms of men and material. It seems to me a poor justification for new hydro power plants to say that we build them because the manufacturers of steam power-plant equipment are already overloaded with orders.

It seems to me that the thing to do is to increase the manufacturing capacity of the generating equipment for steam plants and concentrate on equipment of that type except with respect to enlarging the generating capacity of hydro plants already in being.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. JOHNSON,
Member of Congress.

President Roosevelt Is an Unconscionable and Lawless Dictator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT BY AMOS PINCHOT

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the President by Mr. Amos Pinchot:

NEW YORK, *July 11, 1941.*

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Nine scant months ago, by the election of a Chief Executive for a third consecutive term, a dictatorship was begotten on the body politic of this country. Your occupation of Iceland, without knowledge or consent of Congress, together with your July 7th message and July 8th press conference, disclosing your intention to wage an undeclared war on German sea power in the Atlantic, give proof that the period of gestation is over, and a new dictatorship born to the world.

Mr. President, if you act upon your proposition to shoot it out with the German Navy, should it attack vessels carrying contraband to England, or even show itself in the waters between Iceland and the United States, you will do this in clear defiance of international law and our Constitution, that places the war-making power in Congress. Moreover, this act of war will be a repudiation of your pre-election contract with the people, to keep America out of war provided they would give you a third term in office. and it may be said that, for the performance of this contract, you were paid in advance on November 5, 1940, by the votes of 27,000,000 then trusting, but now betrayed, citizens.

Mr. President, some of us have short memories nowadays. Consequently, with your permission, I will remind you of the evening of October 23, 1940, when in Convention Hall, in Philadelphia, you addressed some 16,000 wildly cheering citizens as follows:

"To Republicans and Democrats, to every man, woman, and child in the Nation I say this—your President and your Secretary of State are following the road to peace. We are arming ourselves not for any foreign war.

"We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: 'We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army, Naval, or Air Forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack.'"

And these citizens certainly believed that, by the word "attack," you meant attack, and not some seizure by Germany of some other nation's bases in Africa, or the Indian Ocean on the far side of this planet. In Madison Square Garden, on October 28, you said:

"We shall continue to go forward in firm faith. We shall continue to go forward in peace."

And 2 days later, at Boston, you rammed home your New York and Philadelphia pledges in the following now familiar words:

"And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

Mr. President, Iceland is not in the Americas, or even in the Western Hemisphere, as you have erroneously claimed. It is as much a foreign country as England or France. It is in the war zone, 3,000 miles from the United States and but 700 from the English coast. Nevertheless, you told your press conference that you propose to relieve its British garrison with American boys.

More than that, you said you would "act" in other undisclosed places outside this hemisphere, without authority of Congress, whenever, in your opinion, such action might be necessary. In a word, you propose to act, not as an American President, but as a confessed dictator equally scornful of his own promises and of the public will. And in a hilarious mood you wound up that strange conference, where the floor was littered with your torn up pledges, with jocular remarks on the fallibility of geographers, and a comic story about an old woman in a boat.

Mr. President, I earnestly beg you to reconsider the course you propose. For, if you continue on that course, that is to say use Iceland and ports in far away parts of the globe as bases from which to launch attacks against Germany, in your personal, unauthorized war, you will not merely kick down the ladder on which you climbed to the highest, if most perilous, honor ever given an American—three terms in the White House—but break the downright agreement you made with Congress, before the lend-lease bill was passed. Namely, that our Government would not be responsible for delivering goods lent, leased, sold, or given to Britain, and that the provisions of the bill should in no case be used to provoke war.

Today there is no defense reason in God's world for entering a declared or undeclared war that did not exist in greater measure when you made your peace pledges last fall at Philadelphia, Hartford, Boston, New York, Brooklyn, Cleveland, and Washington. We are far better prepared for defense than then, and so is England. And, with our rising production, we can admittedly make America impregnable before Hitler, involved as he is, could organize an expeditionary force, if he were mad enough to do so. No military authority has dared testify otherwise.

That is one reason why the majority of Americans are little moved by the cowardly doctrine that we cannot defend ourselve and will be enslaved by Hitler, unless we go forth and fight him in Africa and Asia, or in Europe on his home grounds. That doctrine does not make sense. And everybody knows it. The one place where the English have stopped Hitler is England. And yet, from the moment of your reelection, you have not ceased to use every expedient to spread a psychology of hysteria and blind funk in the United States. And you have invited German attack and total war by aggressive, provocative acts that follow each other in ever faster succession.

The unvarnished truth is that you are taking part in something which can only be described as an international conspiracy to draw America into participation in bloody, foreign wars that are needless for defense and prejudicial to every legitimate interest of our people. Meantime you and your spokesmen, in and out of Congress, are reviling every loyal American who says now precisely what you said 9 months ago, and whose cardinal sin is that he loves his own country better than any other.

So this, Mr. President, is democracy—your democracy, democracy à la mode and à la New Deal. It is the first fruit of your four freedoms—especially including freedom of speech and freedom from fear and war—which you propose to install and defend in every part of the world. A people that does not want war dragged into war by the irresponsible will of an individual who rose to

power by promising to keep them out of war. Mr. President, once more I urge you, in the name of your country's good, and the reputation of American democratic government, to reconsider your course before it is too late.

Personally, I do not believe you can either force, frighten, or finesse a great self-respecting people into foreign wars which their common sense and considered judgment tell them to avoid. Nevertheless, if you do not abandon the purposes you announced in your message to Congress of July 7, and your subsequent press conferences, you will do your country an unforgettable injury by serving notice on the world that the integrity of America's White House is no longer intact.

In closing, may I remind you that not long ago you stated that the world can neither deal nor make peace with a man who does not keep his word.

Sincerely yours,

AMOS PINCHOT.

Extension of Period of Military Service Under the Draft Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. ALF M. LANDON, OF KANSAS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered over the radio yesterday by Hon. Alf M. Landon:

The President's drive to extend the period of service under the draft act is just the beginning of a sad revelation to the American people. A revelation that major statements of policy of candidates for the Presidency were "mere campaign oratory." Frankness and candor compel me to say that in the last national election only one of the candidates for President has been loyal and consistent to his preelection policies and promises, and that was the candidate of the Socialist Party, Norman Thomas.

Lack of confidence in the word of its chief executive is a real disintegrating force in any nation and any army. Last year, when the President, speaking as a candidate, was telling the American people of the beneficial results of a year's training for boys—and girls also—in Army camps and labor battalions, France and Holland and Norway and Belgium were conquered countries. He, the President, and the Presidential candidate, must have known then the demands his provocative speeches and acts would place on the draftees. But he has shown himself a master at changing his pace. One day he threw provocative words at the bloody dictators. The next day he assured the American people that their boys would never be sent to Europe to fight, but would only be given a nice healthful outing by a year's training in outdoor exercises.

But that is not all of it, nor the worst of it. Within 2 months Mr. Roosevelt, according to press dispatches, repeated his assurances that the boys would be sent home at the end of the year, and so would the National Guard.

The world situation has not changed any since that latest promise to the American people, except for the war between the Communists and the Nazis. And the average man is getting a cynical laugh out of the flip-flops that are being done, not only by the American Communists but by the war crowd in meeting the shifting line-ups characteristic of European wars. The Communists had to join the administration over night. But the administration has also taken the Communists as partners.

The only invasion this country has suffered since the war with England in 1812 is the organized propaganda invasion by Soviet Russia.

I quote from the July Readers Digest:

"Representatives of the Soviet Government offered to insert a clause in a contract with a machine-tool manufacturer, guaranteeing that while the company was working on Russian orders there would be no strike."

As Stanley High points out, the Communists' union leaders belong to "an invading Communist army, shielded by an uninformed public and coddled by the authorities, which has moved into position from which, on orders from Moscow or Berlin, it can jam the wheels of American production and paralyze our national defense."

Of course, this was written before the "Commies" and the Nazis fell out.

From this startling revelation by a reputable and accurate reporter it is evident that the greatest violation of our national rights, the most wholesale commitment of unfriendly acts by any foreign government against us, has been committed by the very government that we are now expected to help, the "red" Soviet.

Now, if the period of service under this Draft Act is extended, I predict the next step will be to remove the prohibition against any draftees or National Guardsmen being sent outside the Western Hemisphere. The newspapers reported: "Both the White House and the Army are willing to abandon at this time the resolutions which would remove this prohibition" [against sending the draftees and guardsmen outside the Western Hemisphere by mere Executive order].

That is a qualified position similar to Churchill's speech last April that England didn't need American soldiers "at this time."

With the President's proposal to extend the Draft Act we are getting down close to brass tacks.

Another "fooler" of the President in the campaign was the repeated promise of "business as usual." The President was the author of that sleazy slogan. Another "fooler" was that we would keep all our social gains. The President repeated that one in his May fireside chat.

But if the President is to blame for trying to hoodwink the American people, so are his fellow conspirators, including members of his Cabinet. There are those who sold the lease-lend bill to the country under false pretenses.

Then there are certain labor leaders. These know—the tops at least—that Mr. Roosevelt is heading for war, and that if we get into war, business will not be conducted as usual, and social gains will be sacrificed. Yet John Lewis is the only national labor leader who has the guts to stick his neck out and tell labor what is going to happen to it.

Finally, what are those democratic Members of the Congress going to do who promised never, never, never would they vote to send an American boy to fight in Europe—let alone Asia, and Africa, and the seven seas.

This political chicanery, this hoodwinking the American people, is the enemy that is flooding our homes, at one of the six most critical times in our national life. Because the American people have been denied the truth, and treated as weaklings, confidence and trust in leadership is being destroyed at a time when it is most needed.

No wonder the world, as well as his fellow Americans, are puzzled at the President's leadership. Friendly New Deal columnists printed the fact that a few months ago the President, for the first time, realized that he couldn't defeat Hitler by speeches.

So maybe the President was fooled himself, while he was fooling the American people.

In any event, he has persisted in a course of action that his closest supporters said meant war, while at the same time protesting that he did not mean war.

And now, realizing at last that his course means war, he wants to extend the draft act so that he can keep the boys in the Army and have them available to send overseas without any further interference from the Congress.

A logical explanation for his sudden reversal on the period of service of the draftees and the guard could be his sudden awakening to the fact that wars are not won by words, or diplomacy, or halfway, half-baked measures. But many men, including myself, saw this clearly and said so on repeated occasions. Mere campaign oratory is bad enough in the great national referendum. It can be fatal in international affairs.

Now, from the viewpoint of pure consistency, some who have opposed Mr. Roosevelt's war policies can honestly and sincerely support the extension of the period of service in the Draft Act. These are neither handicapped by having attempted to hoodwink the American people, nor can they be accused of not accurately foreseeing the inevitable result of Mr. Roosevelt's war policy.

I am compelled by circumstances, brought about partly by the President's policies, to take the position that it is unsafe to release from service these men who have had some physical training and some fundamentals of military coordination. They are all we have in the way of land defense.

However, for the sake of national morale, the President must advise the Congress definitely what unforeseen events have caused him to change his statements of even 2 months ago to the American people.

A vigorous independent legislative branch of the Government should require such a statement. That is the way to public strength as well as legislative strength. The Congress should require the President to advise it where these boys are to be used, and what the Nation and the Army are to prepare for. Neither the country, the Army, nor the O. P. M. knows for sure—in fact, no one can be sure—whether we are preparing for defense of the Western Hemisphere or underwriting an English-Russian victory. This confusion handicaps all our defense preparations.

Today, as a Nation, we are wide open. Under the provocative words and bellicose policies and acts of the President and his Cabinet we have gone too far not to be armed to the teeth.

The President has been guilty of using the pretext of national emergency time and time again to rush through the Congress vague and limitless grants of power. His short cuts to obtain legislation have established the seeds of totalitarianism in this country as nothing written in the legislation itself has done.

But this is one time the national emergency is real. So the American people will have to take it on the chin. It is a gross breach of the promises that this administration made the country and the draftees. But then, that is the record of the New Deal in many other cases in past years.

But I do think the amendment to the Draft Act calls for a frank, clear-cut statement, with no weasel words in it, from the President himself, as to whether he believes we are in the war or not.

The most vicious part of this whole business is the attempted terrorization of all who dare to say that our participation in the war is still an issue. This terrorization has all the earmarks of the methods of the Nazi, Fascist, and Communist dictators.

It is evident from the statements of the two field commanding British generals that they think we are already in the war as an ally of Great Britain and Communist Russia. They say it is our war. They say if Hitler is to be defeated the United States must land another A. E. F. in Europe, and that we must face the probability that Britain cannot be expected to cripple her own defense by sending British boys to fight in Europe.

The right basis for national unity cannot be obtained by declarations and coaxings and chidings. A free people cannot be driven or coaxed into flaming national unity, any more than they can be driven or coaxed into the true spirit of religion.

A people can be fused by the fire of events, and by a wise, vigorous, candid, and forthright leadership into a unity of purpose built on confidence and faith, which will achieve wonders against great odds.

One cannot read history without being impressed with the fact that one people may possess a great inner fortress of the spirit while another does not. One regiment will possess this exalted, magnificent battling spirit, and another fighting alongside of it will not. Here we see the effects of the weight of the imponderables, the opinions, the sentiments, and the conscience of humanity.

This is the effect of aggressive, straightforward, wise, unwavering leadership that diligently devotes itself to welding together the fragments of the mass for the building of a united people.

We have not had this kind of leadership from the President. He has not developed teamwork throughout the Nation, nor even in his own Office of Production Management, that we need, that we must have.

This is the President's great task and duty. The more critical our situation, the more desperate the need. The quality of the leadership and the character it develops in the people is the heart and soul of national life.

The spirit of a free people, the spirit of this Nation, is not expressed by blind following of any leadership. The right leadership stirs a country to great deeds. That is what we expect from a President of the United States.

America has always cheerfully contributed her wealth and her manpower when the country was in danger, and there never was any need of deceiving the people.

So, my reluctant support of the amendment to the Draft Act to continue the draftees and guardsmen in service is based on preparations for defense of the Western Hemisphere. Furthermore, if there is no stopping of Mr. Roosevelt's war policies, he will throw the finest untrained and unequipped army in the world into a shooting war.

The President has the country out on the limb now, and we have got to strengthen the tree at the base.

Joint Income Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor:

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

INTIMATE MESSAGE: WASHINGTON

(By Mary Hornaday)

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND WOMEN AND $323,000,000

Wendell Willkie declared here the other day that the House proposal to require husbands and wives to file joint income-tax returns would set women back 500 years in their progress toward freedom.

His summarization may be debatable, but, at least, it serves to focus attention on one of the most controversial sections of the new tax bill Congress will consider this summer and autumn.

The provision that married couples must hereafter file joint returns was inserted in the bill by the tax subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee to bring in $323,000,000 more in taxes than will be paid if joint returns are not required.

Latest internal-revenue reports show that approximately 150,000 husbands and wives, or about 2½ percent of those filing returns, choose to make them separately rather than jointly.

With most the reason is economic; with a few, ethical.

If both husband and wife earn money and pool it for tax purposes, the tax sometimes runs into higher brackets and bigger sums than if they make separate returns.

Suppose a man makes $10,000 a year. His wife, through her own effort, makes another $10,000. On a separate return basis, they would pay $1,540 on their 1941 earnings. With the proposed joint return, they would pay $4,356 on their 1942 salaries; $3,190 if Congress allows them to file separately.

Protests on the proposed joint-return provision have come from many sources. Clergymen are writing in to predict it will break up or delay marriages. Feminists say it is no more fair to require joint returns from husband and wife than from brother and sister.

Economic and moral factors in the case are being confused in many of the protests. In some, opposition to paying heavier taxes is being cloaked under feigned solicitude for the rights of married women workers. Yet the feminist has a point.

Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, chairman of the National Woman's Party, has written a letter to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee describing the provision as "accentuating the common-law concept of the wife as her husband's chattels," and jeopardizing women's independent and equal status as American citizens. Since the World War Congress has advanced the position of American women, through the suffrage law granting them the right to vote, the nationality law allowing them to retain their citizenship though married to a foreigner, and the wages-and-hours law assuring them equal wages and conditions of law in interstate commerce. To curb her freedom as independent agent required to pool her resources with her husband, in the name of defense, would be a "retrogressive and reactionary step," Mrs. Wiley told the committee.

Especially aroused over the joint-tax-return plan are couples in community-property States, 45,000 of whom now file separate returns even though all the income is earned by the husband.

Community-property laws, handed down from the old Spanish or Mexican law, still stand on the statute books of Arizona, California, Idaho, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Washington. Instead of giving a married woman outright control of all her earnings, the community-property system automatically designates property acquired after marriage as community property. The wife is automatically given title to one-half, but the husband has sole management and control rights.

Filing half their income under their name and half under their wives has enabled thousands of taxpayers in community-property States to avoid high surtaxes. Use of the two-income system has been especially popular in Hollywood. Nearly half of the community-property returns are now filed in the State of California.

If the compulsory joint-return clause stands, the community-property law will become practically a dead letter on State statute books, since its actual operation within States is now carefully safeguarded in behalf of the wife, and the once overlording husband now has little authority not shared by his wife.

Ironically enough, the Nation's feminists have always fought community-property laws as un-American and old-fashioned. Now they are lined up together to fight the "tax on marriage and equality."

War on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

NEWSPAPER EDITORIAL

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

WAR ON THE HOME FRONT

New Deal consistency is ever a rare jewel. Today farmers are in the midst of the worst muddle they have yet seen in the whole A. A. A. program, and in rightful indignation they are protesting governmental regimentation and partial confiscation of their business.

Not many months ago farmers were forced to curtail production, little pigs were killed, cotton was plowed down, allotments were set up for grain crops, some crops even were destroyed, millions were spent to force farmers to produce less. Now an "emergency" is declared, and these same farmers are being asked to produce more than they ever did before, especially more hogs, more hens and eggs, more milk and butter and cheese.

Yet, regardless of this about-face program, a handful of faithful followers of the A. A. A. held a referendum last spring and a majority voted to impose wheat allotments, making regulations mandatory upon every grower who raises as much as 200 bushels or 15 acres. Ohio farmers voted against the proposal, but western wheat growers swung the vote to their side.

Now each county agricultural conservation committee must decide upon an allotment for every farmer, issue him a marketing card, police his farm, measure the fields and yields, figure any penalty and collect it. If a farmer sells over his quota, he must be fined 49 cents a bushel, which amounts to virtual confiscation. He cannot even feed this wheat without penalty, except to members of his family, but we'll bet there will be some mighty big families from here out. Of course, he can store the grain or give it to the Government for relief, but woe unto him if he tries to sell or feed beyond his quota. How the regulation will be enforced is not explained, nor even any reason why it is necessary.

The irony of this situation is to see the New Dealers now asking farmers to feed more hens and thus produce more eggs as a defense

measure, also to keep more heifers for milk production and feed more grain so that additional milk will be produced, and thus canned milk, butter, and cheese can be shipped to Britain. The Secretary of Agriculture has even asked Americans to eat less cheese so that more will be available for export, even though there are now storage holdings far beyond average. Livestock feeders are asked to raise more hogs.

Wheat enters into the rations of cows and hens and hogs. It makes more milk and butter and cheese, more eggs, and more pork. Yet if a farmer strives patriotically to fulfill the governmental request and has some extra wheat to produce more milk and eggs and pork, he must pay 49 cents a bushel to the Government for this privilege.

Is it any wonder farmers are holding indignation meetings and besieging their Congressmen with protests? Any grower should demand of his Senator and Representative that he use his influence to amend a law that permits such a jargon of inconsistencies and imposes such limitations on farmers' liberties.

Deem or Find

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post:

[From the Saturday Evening Post]

DEEM OR FIND

When the figure of HATTON W. SUMNERS rises in the well of the House of Representatives the parliamentary principle shudders. He is going to say it again, a thing everybody knows, and it will be again unanswered.

On June 6 he said it: "This Government has not had the benefit, except in a very modified sense, of an independent legislative body for a good many years. We all know where the important bills have come from. We know, speaking generally, that matters of policy of major importance are not fashioned by the policy-fixing agency of the Government. Speaking generally—and the exceptions are rare—important legislation cannot be put through which the President does not want. Prominent Members of the House state here as a thing to be proud of, that they are for whatever the President wants. They could not be important people in this House unless that were true."

Echoes of the President's mighty declaration of foreign policy were at that moment going around the world. That was his unlimited-emergency speech. He had not consulted Congress about it. He did not address it to Congress. Never once did he mention Congress. He delivered it over the radio, and among the listeners were the Members of Congress, knowing no more what he would say and what the foreign policy of the Government was going to be than the people knew.

The speech appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the next day, along with the emergency proclamation, not as a message from the President of the United States to the Congress of the United States but as matter referred to in the course of a debate in the House on Executive powers.

The second day it was formally brought to the attention of the Senate by a resolution offered by Senator PEPPER. The resolution read: "*Resolved*, That being informed of the forthright and straightforward address by the President on the 27th instant, it is the sense of the Senate that the President was right and deserves the full confidence of the Congress and the country."

The Senator was persuaded to let his resolution lie on the table. The argument for doing this was, in the words of Senator GEORGE, that if the resolution were pressed it "would precipitate an unnecessary and most regrettable debate at this time."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas says everybody knows where the important laws come from, meaning that they come from somewhere on the Executive side and are sent to Capitol Hill to be passed. That is all the Congress knows. Who writes them it does not know. It was never able to find out who wrote the lend-lease law.

On being asked to amend the wartime passport law so that it could be made effective in the emergency by proclamation of the President—exactly the same law but for that one difference—the House fell into a dispute over the distinction between "deem" and "find," because the old law read, "If the President shall find," and so on, and this one had been changed to read, "If the President shall deem," and so on. Who made that change and why, saying notwithstanding that it was exactly the same law? Nobody knew. Representative JONKMAN said, "I do not think that if we were to want the person produced who changed the word, we would find him very quickly."

Recently in the Senate there was an hour of painful debate on why certain columnists were apparently better informed on the foreign policies of the Government and about the intentions of the President than United States Senators. Spreading one such column on the record, Senator WHEELER said: "Some of these columnists get from the War Department, from the Navy Department, and from the State Department information which no Senator and no Member of the House of Representatives is permitted to have."

Hear a Member of the United States Senate—this is Senator TYDINGS—saying, "I have remained silent * * * hoping, always hoping, that leadership would be assumed and that action, which is vital to the safety of this Nation, would be taken by the President. I now call on him in the name of the American people * * * to give us some leadership in the solution of the difficulties between capital and labor. * * * I ask the President, in the name of all the people of this country, to save our financial front, too. * * * If the President will take the leadership * * * all the people of this Nation will support him, and I know that the Congress of the United States will do so."

"Then the Senate," says the official reporter, "resumed the consideration of the bill to amend section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1937."

The Congress of the United States calling for leadership! To whom, then, shall the people call?

We see clearly enough what has happened elsewhere in the world to the parliamentary principle. Do we realize what is happening to it here? It has forsaken leadership. It has surrendered the purse, it has delegated more and more of its power to the Executive, and now a Senator calling upon the President to act in the name of the American people!

Government will survive. It is only the parliamentary principle that can fail. And if it does we shall have another kind of government.

The Distribution of Defense Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. HALE BOGGS, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over the radio on July 3, 1941:

Ladies and gentlemen, the subject of my talk tonight, The Distribution of Defense Contracts, has given rise to endless controversy throughout the Nation and is fast becoming the favorite topic of columnists and investigators. It is not my purpose to add to the controversy nor to be critical in my approach to the subject. Time has been the essence of the national-defense program, and in many instances it has not been possible to indulge in long-range planning.

By now, however, it must be obvious to all Americans that "business as usual" has been necessarily junked. We are talking about gasless Sundays, about drastic price-control legislation, and we have ordered a vast curtailment in automobile production, and have even designated a day for housewives to donate old pots and pans to assist in overcoming the critical aluminum shortage.

Astronomical sums of money have been appropriated and a new tax law is being prepared by the House Ways and Means Committee to raise billions in new revenues. Hence it is my thought that it is entirely logical to discuss at this time some of the phases of the national-defense program which are bound to affect our country in the years to come.

Many of us are fearful that we have lost all sight of the day when the national emergency will cease and the Nation will attempt to return to normal times. Some are saying that unless we give consideration to that time we may build up problems and difficulties in our Nation which defy solution.

Some months ago the Temporary National Economic Committee in a special report to Congress asserted that the Office of Production Management, set up to mobilize and organize the productive resources of the United States for national defense, was an instrumentality of economic concentration the like of which the world has never seen. This Committee was created by Congress to study our entire business and industrial structure.

Its report on the national-defense program says, in part:

"Far from detracting from the importance of economic reconstruction, the events of the past year have served only to emphasize the need for readjustments after the present crisis is over. It is quite conceivable that the democracies might attain a military victory over the aggressors only to find themselves under the domination of economic authority far more concentrated and influential than that which existed prior to the war.

"Our investigations offer ample evidence of the dangers of size and concentration of plants and industries. We therefore submit to all public and private bodies responsible for industry location the desirability of decentralizing industry to the end that the

economic benefits can be secured from plants operated at their most efficient size, that the depressing aspects of the factory system prevented, and the American way of life preserved."

For years the Nation has recognized the danger of overconcentration of industry, of wealth, and even of population. Yet well over 75 percent of all defense contracts have been awarded to firms in the East, in the Great Lakes area, and on the Pacific coast. I realize fully that in most instances the fact that the old-established industries capable of efficient mass production are located in these areas has been responsible. But it is well to review the consequences before establishing new plants and industries in the same localities.

Additional plants in these areas will inevitably result in housing shortages with spirals in rents and the cost of living. Warehouses are fast becoming jammed, and it is almost impossible to maintain the normal flow of rail traffic, thus eventually a shortage of rolling stock and a bottleneck in transportation can be expected. Skilled workers are now being siphoned from other sections of the Nation to the concentrated centers, resulting in a loss to many cities and adding confusion in the area of concentration. As the cost of living increases, workers demand greater wages and further work stoppage and strikes can be anticipated.

I will cite one or two examples to make my point clear. Representatives of the Government several weeks ago, testifying before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in behalf of the St. Lawrence power and seaway project, asserted that the project was necessary to national defense because it would make possible the utilization of shipbuilding facilities on the Great Lakes, despite the fact that all industries in that section are now jammed with defense contracts, and despite the fact that it will be 4 or 5 years before this project can be completed.

Yet these men must know that ideal locations are available throughout the entire length of our Gulf Coast for the building of ships now. Such a program there would employ thousands of men and would take up much of the unemployment caused by the diversion of ships from the coastwise services. It is worth noting, too, that recently workers and employers in the Gulf area in the shipbuilding trade voted to ban strikes for a period of 2 years, and throughout this area production may be maintained the year round due to ideal climatic conditions.

It is impossible for the Nation to prosper if industry, commerce, and wealth are concentrated in a few areas, while the remaining territory is seeking work and occupation. A prosperous farmer or worker in Georgia or Idaho is essential for the maintenance of the factories in Detroit and the trade centers in Chicago.

As the defense program has advanced we have heard almost daily reports of power shortages. One reads that soon it may be necessary to ban night baseball and that the next heavyweight championship boxing match may be fought in the daylight. There seems to be almost a frantic effort to build new dams and to lay new pipe lines.

Yet throughout the great Southeast and Southwest there are idle tonight thousands of gas fields in which are stored limitless tons of energy and power. This power requires no dams before it can be utilized by the arsenal of democracy. In my own State of Louisiana nature has beneficently distributed its resources in such a fashion that the Nation need but to build the plants to manufacture much-needed chemicals and munitions. The same may be said of many other States of our country.

No part of the Nation, except possibly the agrarian Midwest, has suffered more from this shortsighted policy of concentration than the South. Nor did our suffering begin with the national-defense program. For years an arbitrary and indefensible system of discriminatory freight rates has been maintained and much of our natural wealth has been exploited through absentee ownership. Nor can it be said that any section will suffer more as the result of the present world conflict. With a diminishing market, the production of cotton during the past 20 years has steadily decreased, and now the entire export market has been virtually lost. The South must turn to industry to balance its diminishing agriculture returns.

Aside from basic fundamental economic reason, the present policy of concentration is wrong from a military point of view. France was destroyed and forced to surrender when the plants concentrated in a narrow northern section were overrun. The production of Great Britain has been seriously crippled by bombing of the congested industrial midlands. The Nazis, on the other hand, have scattered their industries throughout Germany, making disruption of production extremely difficult. Yet the most vulnerable places in America, the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, are the center of most of our vital industries. How much wiser would it be from the standpoint of defense to establish plants between the protecting mountain ranges and within the vast plains of the Mississippi Valley, where raw material need be transported but a few miles and where the entire area is safeguarded by our mighty bases in the Caribbean.

I realize, of course, ladies and gentlemen, that we must work with all speed, but I have attempted to point out some of the practical considerations that must be studied as our program advances if we are to maintain the system of free enterprise which has made our democratic institutions possible.

We are on the eve of celebrating the birth of our independence. The Fourth of July 1941 should mean more to Americans than ever before. As some of us casually accept the institutions which have made our Nation great, as many of us take for granted our civil liberties which make it possible for us to worship God as we please, to express our opinions by word of mouth or by the pen, the vast continent of Europe which nurtured liberty and equality is blacked out, and there roams about it strange doctrines, fostering dictators who make the despots and tyrants of the Middle Ages fade into insignificance.

Never since that first Independence Day has America meant more to the world and to Christian civilization. It is the sacred and solemn duty of each of us to fortify and strengthen our democracy so that the mighty currents from abroad will be interrupted and controlled as they splash on our ramparts. The lesson that has been taught in Germany, in Italy, and in Russia is that the tempest that succeeds, however, is not always that which comes from without. Economic unrest, domestic insecurity are the fertile fields for the demagogs, the dictators, and the "isms."

It is with this thought that I have spoken tonight. The national-defense program can and should be double-edged sword to protect us from without and to make us secure from within. If we will study and plan in the distribution of contracts, the location of plants, the construction of ships, the manufacture of armaments so that all phases of the national economy will be balanced and cushioned for the inevitable difficulties which must follow in the wake of this world conflict, our defense program will accomplish its double purpose, and national unity will be achieved by national participation in our mighty effort to safeguard our liberties and our way of life.

Daylight Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON HERALD

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald:

NATIONAL DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME

The President's proposal for extension of daylight saving is an obvious method of relieving the power shortage now threatening the defense program. Electric power is extremely important at this time. Without it the raw materials we are amassing cannot be molded into guns, planes, and tanks. For example, the reduction of aluminum from its naturally occurring ore, bauxite, requires tremendous amounts of electricity.

Power production cannot be stepped up automatically. It must be generated from water in hydroelectric plants or through the burning of oil or coal. Then it must be transmitted over cable networks of definitely limited capacities. The problem is to use our existing power facilities more efficiently. To this end the President has asked for legislation to provide daylight-saving time "upon such a regional or national basis, and for such part, or all, of the year, as he might deem necessary in the interest of our national defense."

There are two principal ways in which extension of daylight saving can free more power for defense uses. First, reduction of consumer demand for electricity would save water and fuel stocks. These sources of power could then be used to create additional electricity for industrial production. While it is not quite as simple as turning off the lights in your home an hour earlier and using the current to run a lathe, that is the ultimate effect.

Daylight saving could also permit more efficient use of existing power capacities. In some respects, this is even more important than the first economy. An electric-power system which has a maximum of half a million kilowatts can deliver only that much power at any one time. Sometimes, it may operate at that peak. At other times, the demand falls off and it functions at only a fraction of its full capacity. If excessive demands at peak hours—demands which the plant cannot meet because of its limiting capacity—can be spread to those hours of low demand, the total power delivered in a 24-hour period will increase.

Daylight saving can accomplish that in this way. There are two general peaks of power consumption, at about 11 a. m., as the morning shift operates full blast, and at about 4:30 p. m., as the afternoon shift reaches high gear. Daylight saving cannot lighten the load at the morning peak. By prolonging daylight for 1 hour in the evening, however, it can considerably lessen the danger that the afternoon industrial peak and a consumer peak will occur simultaneously. This would be especially true in the winter, when the sun sets early.

Daylight saving was first tried in Germany in April 1916 as a war measure. Other European nations quickly followed. Congress prescribed it for this country in June 1917,

and it went into effect the following April. The farm States opposed it vigorously when the war ended, and it was repealed in July 1919 over the veto of President Wilson, who maintained that it had "resulted in very great economies of fuel and a substantial economy of energy." Massachusetts has had daylight saving on a State basis since 1920. Several other States and many of our chief cities, including New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Chicago, also observe it. Great Britain and Germany are now saving not 1 but 2 hours of daylight as a war economy.

Experts have estimated that Nation-wide, year-round daylight saving of 1 hour would reduce the annual consumption of electricity by 736,282,000 kilowatt-hours. Officials of both the Office of Production Management and the Federal Power Commission have urged such a program strongly. The saving may seem a drop in the bucket compared with our national consumption, but drops in the bucket are important these days. As Senator AUSTIN, of Vermont, has pointed out, most of the opposition to daylight saving arises from confusion concerning it. The facts prove it highly desirable.

War, Peace, and Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

ADDRESS BY GEORGE N. PEEK

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by George N. Peek:

The war interventionists, in their campaign to involve this country in foreign wars, have made some broad and unsupported assertions respecting our foreign trade and our dependency upon it which they ask us to swallow whole—hook, bait, and sinker. A short time ago Wendell Willkie, in an article published in a national magazine, appeared as an advocate of the view that participation in the war was necessary to save our foreign trade. No reasons were given, however, why his views should be taken seriously on account of any special knowledge or experience in the field of trade, foreign or domestic. His statements again may be regarded as just campaign oratory—this time in a campaign to involve us in a foreign war. On May 17 the President, and on May 18 Secretary Hull, added their voices and the prestige of their high offices to this same view and this same campaign, seemingly oblivious to the fact that for 7 years past they have been acclaiming their foreign-trade program as a great instrument of peace. Nevertheless, the high prestige of their offices will not overcome this inconsistency. Enough to say that the arguments of one are the arguments of all. They stem from the self-interest of a few. They are built on a false theory of trade. Their case will not stand up before a jury of American informed opinion.

The American people are entitled to hear both sides of this question before being stampeded into war and they should be afforded an opportunity to make up their minds after full and open discussion, in their own forum, the Congress of the United States. So far, that opportunity has been denied them just as it was in the 1940 election.

The assertions of the interventionists fall into three general classes:

That Hitler can impoverish America by causing our economic collapse by cutting off our export markets and by denying us access to the imports of vital materials we need;

That if Hitler controlled a large part of the world politically, thus increasing his bargaining power, he would be in a position to dictate terms to us; and

That we cannot compete with his slave labor, his barter system, and his goldless economy.

All of this would result, they say, in our regimenting our whole economy.

These assertions are based upon the assumption that Hitler will control all the world, politically and economically, with the possible exception of North America. To assume that he can do this is a counsel of unreasoning defeatism. Few, if any, informed people in or out of our armed forces accept this assumption. Moreover, the assertions would apply with equal force to any other nation occupying a position of similar prestige. Could you imagine a victorious Britain giving us many trade advantages?

In considering their assertions there are certain fundamentals of trade to be borne in mind:

First. There is no difference in principle between foreign and domestic trade. Confusion has arisen, however, because foreign trade is complicated somewhat by restrictions imposed upon the entry of goods and the transfer of funds between countries and by differences in language and customs.

Second. It takes two parties to complete a trade. Continued and satisfactory relations are based upon recognition of the needs and desires of each.

Third. Competition is the life of trade and is always a threat in private business no matter from whom it comes. So it is with nations.

Now, as to the specific assertions: That Hitler can impoverish America by causing our economic collapse by cutting off our export markets and by denying us access to the imports of vital materials we need.

We are more nearly self-contained than any other nation. More than 95 percent of our trade, as a whole, is domestic and less than 5 percent foreign. Of that 5 percent the Americas account for 2 percent of it, leaving but 3 percent for the rest of the world. An increase of 5 percent in our domestic trade would amount to more than an increase of 100 percent in all of our export trade, including the Americas. Certain industries differ from others in their pecentage of export trade. Some radical readjustments would be necessary in some industries if we were to lose all of our export markets, but they would be nothing compared to the hardships we would have to endure through participation in a foreign war.

Every informed person knows that 5 percent added to or deducted from the gross income of an American industry does not represent the difference between profit and loss. Yet the fanatical war interventionists do so assert. It is clear, therefore, that even if Hitler could stop all of our exports he could not cause our economic collapse.

All over the world nations have been trying to make themselves more self-sufficient and independent of their neighbors, near and far. This trend has been especially evident following the first World War. We supplied men, money, and materials everywhere to help the rest of the world take advantage of technological development, much of it our own, apparently with no thought that by so doing we were cutting the ground out from under our own export trade in those countries, and building active competitors, not only in our export trade but in our home markets as well. Examples are Czechoslovakia with shoes, Japan with textiles, and more recently Brazil with cotton. The development of wheat production in France and Italy is notable also as evidence of the efforts of nations to become self-sufficient.

A few instances of the decline in our farm exports, because of the growth of competition and the effort of nations to become self-sustaining, suggest that we must not build our economy upon the foundation of export trade.

Let me show you how our farm exports have been slipping.

In 1910 we exported 68 percent of our cotton; in 1940 less than 8 percent.

In 1910 we exported about 31 percent of our tobacco; in 1940 about 18 percent.

We exported about 11 percent of our wheat in 1910 and less than 7 percent in 1939.

Corn about 2 percent in 1910 as compared with 1.3 percent in 1939. (See table I.)

Henry Ford was right when he said during the depression:

"Whatever we do, we shall need to do at home. The place to revive the standard of living of the United States is within the United States, and the idea that we can revive our own industries and promote a higher level of domestic exchange by foreign trade is without foundation. In the first place, the world could not offer us enough sales to make any material difference in our home production, and in the second place, business founded upon foreign markets, instead of our own markets, is only temporary."

As to the imports of vital materials we need—let us see how important they are.

Rubber accounted for 12½ percent of our imports in dollars in 1940. Tin 5.1 percent, coffee 5 percent, raw silk 4.9 percent, cane sugar 4.5 percent, newsprint paper 4.9 percent. No other items amounted to more than 3 percent except wool, 3.3.

Now let us see what technological development is doing in these fields.

Rubber: The production of our own rubber has progressed to a point where we may say that, if necessary, we are no longer dependent upon the Eastern Hemisphere. Very shortly we can produce our own rubber, synthetically as well as from new plant material. Germany is doing it. A number of our most important rubber manufacturing and chemical companies are active in this field.

Tin: The same thing is true of tin. We are now preparing to smelt a considerable proportion of our tin requirements in the United States from ore coming from Latin America. In addition, important substitutes have been developed from plastics and other materials replacing tin. These are so important that one of our largest users says he believes that even now his company is entirely free from dependency upon tin imports.

Silk: Witness the great development of rayon and now nylon. Some authorities forecast that within a reasonably short time we will be entirely independent of silk imports.

Newsprint: Most of us are familiar with the development of this new industry in the South using slash pine as a raw material according to processes originated by Dr. Herty. This development, plus the supply from Canada, promises to fill our requirements independent of the Old World.

Coffee, sugar, and wool can be supplied from the Western Hemisphere. But the interventionists say that if Hitler controlled a large part of the world, politically, he could dictate terms to us.

Napoleon had a similar idea in 1806 when from Berlin he established the continental blockade against England. He could not make it work. Portugal, Russia, and even France persisted in maintainirg their English trade connections. Human nature was too strong, and it is likely to be always.

Political control is one thing; economic necessity, quite another. The war interventionists' theory is that one party to a

transaction could dictate all the terms and conditions of trade between two or more parties. How false. Every man, woman, and child knows, if he will think but for a moment, that it takes two parties to complete a trade. As to Hitler's ability to dictate terms of trade to us in the event of a victory—no. The interventionists entirely overlook the importance of our markets to foreign nations. That is where economic necessity comes in.

We have the greatest consuming market in the world. This is our high card. Our purchases from foreign countries support a large part of the economy of many of them. This economy does not shift overnight with the flag of the overlord. It must continue to rely upon our market. Let us look at the situation with respect to a few important imports and not how the income of the supplier rose or fell with the amount of our purchases.

Rubber: The Malay States, the Dutch East Indies, and small neighboring countries produce nearly 95 percent of the world's rubber, of which we use half.

In 1929 we imported over 526,000 tons for which we paid over $247,000,000. By 1932 our imports had dropped to less than 394,000 tons; we paid less than $35,000,000. By 1937 we had increased our imports to more than 592,000 tons. We paid nearly $253,000,000.

Tin: The case of tin is similar. The Malay States, the Dutch East Indies, and small neighboring countries, and China produce 60 percent of the world's tin. We use 40 percent of the world's production.

In 1929 we imported 195,000,000 pounds for $91,839,000. In 1932 we imported less than 78,000,000 pounds for less than $16,500,000. In 1937 our imports amounted to more than 197,000,000 pounds and we paid over $104-000,000. (See table II, last page.)

The last 2 years show a greatly increased tonnage on account of our Government policy of storing up rubber and tin.

Silk: Japan produces nearly 90 percent of the world's silk. We buy 90 percent of her exports.

Manganese and potash: We can supply our requirements from this hemisphere for these products, manganese through the development of machinery and new processes for refining low-grade ores here and in Cuba; also there are further possibilities in Brazil. Potash has been made available through the development of our own mines.

These are examples only of the dependency of foreign nations upon our market. Others may be cited—jute from India, diamonds and gold from South Africa, tea from southeastern Asia, etc.

A careful canvass of the world's mineral production discloses that the non-American nations of the world are more dependent on the Western Hemisphere than it is dependent upon them.

The world marches on.

Trade is never static; conditions and methods change; demand and sources of supply with them. Many examples could be cited of where one concern or one country—a principal source of supply one year—has given way to another concern or country in the year or two succeeding. Manganese, cement, matches, and various food products are examples. But so long as we retain our great consuming market we shall find the rest of the world ready to compete to fill its requirements.

But the war interventionists insist that we cannot compete with Hitler's slave labor, his barter system, and his goldless economy. Let us consider these claims briefly.

Other things being equal, free labor can out-produce slave labor. We made our greatest progress after we abolished slavery. Slave labor produces little buying power. American wage levels support our higher American standards of living. They protect the American workers on our farms and in our factories against the lower standards not only of the forced labor of the Axis Powers and Russia, but of the low-paid labor of the Argentine and China, and the cheaper labor everywhere outside the United States. Our wage levels must be insulated against the competition of a world turned upside down.

About the barter system: All trade is barter. "Trade" is defined by the dictionary as "an act or business of exchanging commodities by barter or by buying and selling for money." Barter is the simplest form of trade. Of "money," the dictionary says, "In a comprehensive sense, anything customarily used as a medium of exchange and measure of value as sheep, wampum, copper rings, et cetera; hence in economics anything having a conventional (i. e., generally recognized) use, either as a medium of exchange or a measure of value, or as a measure of value alone." Money, in other words, is a convenient medium for facilitating the exchange of goods. But we have allowed money to dominate trade rather than serve it. We have our wires crossed.

We have seen England abandon the practice of a century as the leading advocate of free trade and the gold standard, and for the last decade follow a new policy of tariffs, trade agreements between nations, and managed currency, which is often indistinguishable from barter. I do not say that this is or is not the best way to conduct trade between nations, but the point is that that is the way world trade has been trending for more than 10 years. We are the only important nation attempting to ignore this fact.

In 1933 and 1934 we demonstrated that we could barter with other nations to our advantage. Indeed, we made some desirable trades, mutually agreeable ones, receiving from France modification of their quota restrictions against American apples in return for import licenses for French wines. Similar trades were made with Spain and Italy when we received, in return for the issuances of liquor licenses, the restoration of our markets for tobacco in both countries. But the administration refused to continue to trade. The reason given was that to do so would interfere with our trade-agreements policy which was one of reduced tariffs and international altruism toward every country in the world—save one. The real reason, however, was more obscure. In the case of Germany, notwithstanding that her two great necessities were understood to be easier access to raw materials and larger markets for her manufactured products, the New Deal denied her both, beginning as far back as 1934.

The reasons were social and political. Vice President Wallace now says (address, Foreign Policy Association, April 8, 1941), "The next peace must give the * * * aggressor nations the opportunity to buy materials and sell manufactured goods without discrimination." Recent statements of the President and Secretary Hull support this view. If these officials and their associates had recognized Germany's legitimate necessities in 1934 and since, instead of declining to trade with her, they might have made a real contribution toward world peace. Moreover, such recognition might have checked the rapid rise of nazi-ism, thus avoiding the danger of America involvement in this war. It will be necessary in the post-war period if we are to avoid depression at home and further war abroad.

As to gold. It is frequently asserted that Germany does not want gold. Hitler himself, in a recent talk to his nation, refuted this assertion. No one is going to repudiate gold except those who do not have it and cannot get it. Remember the fable of the fox and the sour grapes. But even if we had no gold in this country we could still lead the world in trade on account of our unrivalled resources and the productive labor of a free people.

There are many considerations involved in trade besides price. Design and adaptability of products for the work desired, terms, delivery dates, personal equation between buyer and seller, and numerous other things. Frequently we hear the phrase, "Quality is remembered long after price is forgotten." If price were the sole measuring stick the manufacturer with the lowest price would be selling all the goods, be they automobiles or what, but this does not happen.

The answer lies in the diversity of human demands and in mutuality of interest between nations and regional economic areas, all things considered. Under these circumstances there is only one intelligent procedure for us to follow, and that is to recognize the conditions under which trade is now conducted between nations, and then, so long as governments control the foreign trade of their nationals, to negotiate country by country for the terms and conditions under which goods may be exchanged satisfactorily. Each country must recognize frankly the needs of the other.

If regimentation is to result, as the war interventionists say it will, my answer is that I would prefer to regiment the 5 percent of our economy which is represented by our foreign trade, than the 95 percent which is devoted to our domestic needs.

We must recognize the fact that we cannot prescribe the rules and regulations for all the world. Rather, if we are going to engage in trade with other nations, we should use our strategic advantages to negotiate in our own interest.

We should, of course, keep ourselves in a position to join with other nations in improving methods of trading if and when the time comes that the rest of the world is ready to consider a change. But, in the meantime, we should refrain from playing Santa Claus and from opening our markets recklessly to nearly all the world and so exposing our national economy to influences from abroad over which we have no control. Our need is for more defense of our national economy—not less.

The preservation of our free institutions is essential, not only for the peace and welfare of our own people, but as an example to the rest of the world of the success of the American way. Nevertheless, any attempt arbitrarily to impose our way upon other peoples, regardless of the social and economic structures of their own making, would be futile and foredoomed to failure. It should be resented just as we resent propaganda antagonistic to our form of government.

Earlier in my remarks I referred to the arguments of the war interventionists as stemming from the self-interest of a few. Generally I referred to the 18 percent shown by the Gallup poll of the people constituting the interventionists. More specifically, I referred to those who profit most from international trade—the international bankers, ocean transportation companies, marine insurance companies, exporters and importers, and so forth, as distinguished from the business concerns who do some foreign business incidental to their domestic business but whose business is primarily domestic. All of the latter group, if compelled to choose between a prosperous American market and one periodically shot to pieces by foreign events, in times of peace and war alike, as ours has been, would choose the American market.

I think that all of our foreign policies, political and economic, should be related definitely to our American needs and ideals,

with the objective of protecting and perpetuating the form of government and the economic policies which have made our country great. Our aim should be to make possible to all Americans the fullest benefits of our form of government as granted by our Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The first requisite to this aim is knowledge based on reliable and comprehensive information, so that we may know what the problems are and consider them fairly. The second is a realization of the principle that foreign policies, whether political or economic, must not be permitted to destroy or impair either our form of government or our standards of living.

The question boils down to this, Shall we take advantage of our position of geographic and economic security and contribute to world peace and prosperity by developing our own country and by attending to our own affairs, or shall we involve our Nation in foreign wars under the guise of protecting a theory of foreign trade which, as has been shown, is detrimental to our welfare? Shall we dilute our Nation's strength with the world's weakness? There rests our choice.

TABLE I

	1910		1940	
	Net tons	Percent	Net tons	Percent
Cotton:				
Produced	2,902,000	------	3,172,000	------
Exported	2,000,000	68.0	250,000	8.0
Tobacco:				
Produced	571,000	------	929,000	------
Exported	178,000	31.0	171,000	18.0
			1939	
Wheat:				
Produced	18,800,000	------	22,500,000	------
Exported	2,100,000	11.0	1,500,000	7.0
Corn:				
Produced	79,900,000	------	72,900,000	------
Exported	1,800,000	2.2	1,000,000	1.3

NOTE A.—Import percentages of vital raw materials (p. 4) from U. S. Chamber of Commerce data.

TABLE II

	Imports	Price per pound	Total amount
Rubber:	*Net tons*	*Cents*	
1929	528,602	20.5	$247,420,000
1932	393,731	3.4	34,273,000
1937	592,528	19.4	252,859,000
Tin:	*Pounds*		
1929	195,165,000	45.19	91,839,000
1932	77,995,000	22.01	16,474,000
1937	197,377,000	54.24	104,285,000

Veterans' Preference on W. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, organized veterandom throughout the United States is deeply appreciative of the fact that Congress has at last recognized the need for a real veterans' preference provision in the annual Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, commonly referred to as the W. P. A. law.

For years confusion has prevailed in the interpretation of veterans' preference, and numerous Congressmen were at their wits' end in trying to find a solution as a result of the faulty interpretation and the discrimination that became widespread.

During the consideration of the W. P. A. bill for the fiscal year 1942 Congress recognized the fact that the veteran was not receiving the preference intended for him on W. P. A. To correct the situation a real veterans' preference provision was written into the W. P. A. law when my amendment was adopted which guarantees that the needy unemployed veteran or the wife of an unemployable veteran or the widow of a deceased veteran will receive preference to which he or she is justly entitled.

Commissioner Howard O. Hunter, of the Work Projects Administration, has issued the following letter to State Work Projects administrators furnishing a uniform interpretation of veterans' preference on W. P. A. Mr. Hunter's letter is as follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1941.

Commissioner's letter No. 18 to State Work Projects administrators.

Subject: Provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1942, affecting eligibility and assignment of veterans.

SECTION 1. General: The Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1942, contains certain provisions which necessitate important changes in present policies and procedures governing employment of veterans. Necessary revisions to the appropriate sections of operating procedure E-9 will be issued in the near future. General directions as to the necessary changes are set forth in the following sections.

The pertinent provisions of the act are as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) Section 15 (a) of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941, is hereby continued in effect for the month of July 1941. Effective on August 1, 1941, in employing or retaining in employment on Work Projects Administration work projects, preference shall be given to veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, except that discharged draft enrollees other than those with service-connected disability shall not be considered as veterans for the purposes of this subsection), and unmarried widows of any such veterans, and the wives of any such veterans who are unemployable, who have been certified as in need of employment by the Work Projects Administration or by any agency designated by it to so certify: *Provided*, That if the total monthly income from all sources of any such veteran or of the unmarried widow of any such veteran, or if the total combined monthly income from all sources of any such unemployable veteran and his wife, as determined by the Commissioner (whose determination shall be final and conclusive), is less than the monthly earnings the veteran, unmarried widow, or wife would receive if employed as a project worker of the Work Projects Administration, then such veteran, unmarried widow, or wife, as the case may be, shall be certified as in need of such employment, and when assigned to such employment he or she shall be employed for such period as will permit the total monthly income of such veteran or unmarried widow, or the total combined monthly income of such unemployable veteran and his wife, to be approximately equal to the amount which would be obtainable by full-time employment on any such project. Thereafter preference in such employment shall be given on the basis of relative needs, as far as practicable, to other American citizens, Indians, and other persons owing allegiance to the United States who are in need."

SEC. 2. Determination of need of the veterans' group: The effect of section 10 (a) is to entitle employable veterans, wives of unemployable veterans, and unmarried widows of veterans to certification if the total income in the family from all sources is less than the amount which he or she would earn on a project.

For the purpose of effectuating this provision when a veteran, the wife of an unemployable veteran, or the unmarried widow of a veteran applies for certification for project employment, it shall be assumed that if he or she were assigned to a project they would receive the unskilled "A" wage. Therefore if the income in the family is less than the unskilled "A" wage, the veteran, the unmarried widow of a veteran, or the wife of an unemployable veteran shall be certified even though the income is sufficient to meet the subsistence needs of the family. This does not preclude the referral and certification of veterans, wives of unemployable veterans, and unmarried widows of veterans whose income is equal to or greater than the unskilled "A" wage if they are in need and otherwise eligible.

The act provides that the need of the veteran group shall be based only on income. Accordingly, resources such as non-income-producing property, life insurance, etc., cannot be considered in determining the need of members of the group. However, all forms of income, including disability compensation, whether in cash or kind, shall be considered, including earnings of other members of the family group, such earnings to be considered on the same basis as for nonveterans. Since unemployment-compensation benefits are income, eligibility for such benefits does not render a member of the veterans' group ineligible for certification if the amount of the benefits plus any additional income in the family is less than the unskilled "A" wage.

Wherever possible the determination of need of the veteran group should be made by the referral agency if it is willing to accept the standard established by the act. However, if the referral agency is unable or unwilling to apply such a standard to the veteran group, the responsibility for determining the need of this group must be assumed by the Work Projects Administration.

The regional and central offices should be advised at the earliest possible moment whether the referral agency is able and willing to apply this standard or whether it will be necessary for the State work projects administration to assume the responsibility.

SEC. 3. Preference in employment: Preferences in assignments to projects are set forth below. All preferences are subject to the requirement that persons assigned to projects shall be qualified to perform satisfactorily the work which they are assigned.

Preference in assignment and in retention of employment shall be given the following order:

1. Certified persons having veteran's status.
2. Other certified persons in relative need, category A.
3. Other certified persons in relative need, category B.

SEC. 4. Assignment: When members of the veteran group are assigned to projects they shall be assigned for the normal schedule of hours.

HOWARD O. HUNTER,
Commissioner of Work Projects.

Mr. Speaker, briefly, Congress has provided that a veteran, the wife of an unemployable veteran, or the widow of a deceased veteran is entitled to preference

on W. P. A. in the event that the total income of the veteran or his family does not exceed the monthly W. P. A. wage. If, however, the veteran's income does exceed the W. P. A. wage, and such income does not meet his subsistence needs, the veteran is eligible for preference on W. P. A. and entitled to work the normal monthly schedule of hours.

In determining the certification of a veteran for W. P. A. employment, it need only be shown that the veteran is in need of employment and that his income from other sources is not sufficient to provide for himself and family. The question of certification rests entirely in the hands of the W. P. A., but according to Commissioner Hunter's letter it is intended to delegate such certification to the State relief agencies. In the event the State agency declines to act as a certifying agency it is incumbent on the W. P. A. to establish such a system.

In the past several months many veterans have been included among those furloughed from W. P. A. employment. In such cases the W. P. A. is faced with the duty of giving preference to such veterans in filling vacancies.

In some instances veterans have been unable in the past to obtain certification by State relief agencies because of the relative-needs clause. Under the provisions of the 1942 W. P. A. law the relative-needs clause is abolished and those veterans formerly denied certification should make application under the provisions of the 1942 W. P. A. law to the nearest certifying agency.

The previous exemption from the 18-month, 30-day furlough provision continues to apply to all veterans, their wives, and widows.

The Struggle for Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM SALTIEL

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Saltiel:

THE STRUGGLE FOR AMERICANISM

(By William Saltiel)

No man of my acquaintance has ever possessed profounder appreciation of America than did my father, Leopold Saltiel. He came to this country at the age of 19, imbued with a burning zeal to foster and to enjoy the blessings of freedom, which were not vouchsafed to those who lived in the Old World.

He was a lifelong student of ancient and modern philosophy. He knew the painful struggle of men in their groping for wider expression. Plato, Aristotle, Aurelius, Spinoza, Descartes, Rousseau, Paine, and Jefferson were a part of his very soul.

He was born and raised in Vienna, Austria, in the reign of Emperor Franz Joseph. The monarchial and feudal theories which obtained in that land and in that time met with his fervent disdain. They were stultifying to those who believed in the inalienable rights of men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, though in the light of present-day Europe the Austria of my father's time was incomparably freer than it is today. True, there was a certain degree of persecution and oppression, but it was as nothing compared with the savagery which now crushes humanity. Even then there were millions who came or who sought to come to America. It was the Promised Land.

To my father, it was not just a land of milk and honey; it was the country of opportunity for the broader life of the spirit. It was not the economic urge alone that brought him here. He wanted to breathe the air of a nation which lived under a constitution which safeguarded all men, a country where men had opportunity to develop themselves. He knew full well that what freedom he would enjoy, he must, himself, help protect.

He knew that this was not a perfect land, that its institutions had not attained perfection, that all things human, being fallible, constant sacrifice, devotion, and even martyrdom might be expected. He resented the attitude of some who thought democracy could go on without having its altar fires refueled.

When he came to America in 1889, he struggled mightily to build a home for himself. He came without money, and the fact that he was a cultured gentleman with scholastic background often impeded rather than accelerated his endeavors. There was no work too hard for him. While studying law, he supported a family. He worked from early morning until late at night to build a career, as well as to create a home. He worked in the spirit of those pioneers who made this country great.

INTERDEPENDENCE BRINGS STRENGTH

In my long walks with him, as a child, he always sought to impress upon me that mankind was interdependent, that everything we possessed mentally and materially we owed to many people, as well as to the ages which have gone before. Only stupid conceit would make any man believe that he himself had acquired what he possessed. To him, therefore, democracy was based upon the broad foundation of appreciation. Appreciation naturally leads to acceptance of humanity, to acceptance of brotherhood and fellowship with all peoples.

He believed in peace with a deep and fervent belief but not in the peace of cowardice. He believed moral courage was greater than physical courage and where either or both were required, men could not flinch. If they accepted wrong supinely, then they must expect the forging of slavery's chains.

Even while he searched for truth in all things, he never permitted himself to become a zealot. He remained essentially human, understanding sympathetically that wise change is only brought about through orderly processes. He was never blindly partisan. He resented the crusader who could not or would not see the other man's side of the case. He fought against force and violence, knowing that those who employ such methods only evoke counterforce and violence, which in the end results in destruction. This principle applies to the technique of all total wars, whether they be of the spirit or of the battlefield.

He knew that democracy was dependent upon patience; that in some aspects it was slower than personal government. But certainly it was always fairer, freer, surer of results over the years.

Many like my father have made America better because they looked for better things in America. They brought with them the spirit which they sought. They lighted the fires to which they came; fires which are still glowing in a world of black-outs. This cosmopolitan America gives humanity its only hope because it has given these men haven and refuge. The spiritual pluralism of our country is the crowning achievement of the ages.

My father died 2 years ago, a few days after reports from Germany that a reign of unprecedented terror had fallen upon that afflicted nation. The memory of those days will always remain with me because it constitutes a challenge to justify the faith that he had, the faith that mankind could and would overcome its present nightmare.

The army of which he was a part must not fail in this crucial hour. His Americanism was one of nonacceptance of evil, an Americanism of battle, not of resignation.

Recognized Engineering Experts Versus Administration-Controlled Mathematicians in Estimating Cost of St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on page A3460 of the Appendix of the RECORD appears the extension of remarks of my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Texas, JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, entitled "A Layman's Guess Versus Engineering Facts."

Congressman MANSFIELD'S remarks were intended to challenge the authenticity and accuracy of the statements contained in my radio address of July 8 in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway.

Following the tenor of Congressman MANSFIELD'S remarks it is not my intention to pose as an engineering genius but rather would I take my place at his side as a humble layman eager for the truth. In our quest for the truth it is incumbent upon us that we look at the facts.

We have before us the picture of the administration marshalling every wheelhorse in true "Charlie McCarthy" fashion in a frantic effort to convince the American people through distortion of figures and facts that the St. Lawrence seaway is not a political pet but an economic necessity.

A careful digest of the survey made by the United States Department of Commerce reveals without doubt that in a frenzied effort to build a case for this economic monstrosity known as the St. Lawrence project every conceivable means was employed to twist and turn the real facts in the hope of creating a favorable impression in the minds of the American people for this proposal.

The true answer as to how much the St. Lawrence project will actually cost is not definitely known. This fact is borne out on the basis of the experience gained in building other waterways.

As an example, the following table gives the estimated cost of several well-known large navigation projects, together with the actual cost when these various waterways were completed:

	Estimated cost	Actual cost on completion
Panama Canal	$160,000,000	$375,000,000
Suez Canal	30,000,000	80,000,000
Chicago Drainage Canal	16,000,000	53,000,000
Welland Canal	50,000,300	131,000,000
New York Barge Canal	62,000,000	176,000,000

The above figures speak for themselves and reveal that the projects cost nearly three times their original estimates. It is an accepted fact that Government engineers in the majority of the above-named projects made the estimates so that their figures on the St. Lawrence seaway may be taken with the proverbial "grain of salt." Then, too, modern construction costs have skyrocketed when compared to those encountered in building the above-named navigation projects.

Turning our attention to the subject under discussion—the total cost of the St. Lawrence seaway—we have the following figures representing the seasoned judgment of nationally known and reliable engineering experts. Their estimates are as follows:

G. L. Cooper, industrial engineer	$1,350,000,000
E. P. Goodrich, consulting engineer	1,054,000,000
Dr. Moulton, Brookings Institute	712,000,000
Herbert Hoover, engineer	800,000,000

On the other hand, General Robins, Assistant Chief of Engineers, United States Army, when appearing before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors on July 8, testified that the estimated cost to complete the St. Lawrence seaway would be $429,474,515. In addition, General Robins stated it would cost an additional eight or nine million dollars to deepen the channels and turning basins in six or seven harbors. This would bring General Robins' estimate to $438,474,515.

It must be remembered that my good friend and colleague, Chairman MANSFIELD, of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, relies on General Robins' estimate. However, the great discrepancy between the estimates of renowned engineering authorities and General Robins raises a doubt as to the correctness of the figures relied upon by the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway.

On page 983 of volume XII of the hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway we have a striking illustration of the differences of opinion as to the estimated cost involved in making the necessary improvements to the Buffalo Harbor. General Robins is quoted on page 983 as follows:

> Our figures for port facilities at Buffalo show it can be adapted to meet the needs of the immediate future, after the St. Lawrence project is constructed, at a cost of a little over a million dollars—$1,200,000.

On the same page my colleague, Congressman RODGERS, of Pennsylvania, quoted from a letter he received under date of July 2, 1941, from Frederick K. King, city engineer, city of Buffalo, that—

> Our estimate of the cost of the work involved for the necessary improvements was carefully prepared and is based on quantities readily ascertainable, and the unit prices employed are those used by Great Lakes dredging contractors. Our total estimate for this work is $46,909,709. Included in this amount is the sum of $3,349,525 for protection of existing docks due to additional depth of channel adjacent to these docks.

From the above statements we have an estimate from General Robins that the cost of improving Buffalo Harbor will be $1,200,000; yet Mr. King, city engineer of the city of Buffalo, states the cost to be $46,909,709, a difference of $45,709,709.

Mr. Speaker, if the above discrepancy prevails in the improving of Buffalo harbor alone, it is not difficult to understand that the St. Lawrence seaway has earned the cognomen, "An economic monstrosity," and is destined to cost in excess of $1,000,000,000.

My colleague Congressman MANSFIELD questions the cost of defending the St. Lawrence seaway. In this connection, it is timely to recall the great cost of defending the Panama Canal.

It is certain that we will be called upon to defend the St. Lawrence seaway in like manner with the added thought that 90 percent of the St. Lawrence project is within the Dominion of Canada. In the event of any misunderstanding with our Canadian neighbors, we would be denied using the St. Lawrence seaway as well as defending it.

Congressman MANSFIELD took occasion to mention in his extension of remarks on July 15 the Conowingo Dam in Maryland. The Conowingo Dam is one of many hydroelectric dams constructed with private capital and not with the money of the already overburdened American taxpayer. The consumers of electricity generated by the hydroelectric dams in Pennsylvania pay for every kilowatt-hour of electricity and enjoy no Government subsidized electric power such as furnished by the Tennessee Valley Authority and other Government subsidized projects.

As a Representative in Congress of the Twenty-third District in Pennsylvania, which includes 27,000 employees of 5 major railroad systems and 14,000 coal miners, together with thousands of employees of related industries, I am content to join my constituents in opposing the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as a menace to the welfare of not only citizens of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania but of many other States.

No one can deny that when the St. Lawrence seaway is completed, dirty, ill-manned foreign steamers, with crews paid starvation wages, will ply the Great Lakes and divert cargoes that should be hauled by the American transportation systems. It is well to remember that for every ton of freight diverted to these dirty, ill-manned tramp steamers, the American taxpayer will be called upon to pay a subsidy of $3.50, inasmuch as these foreign vessels will not be called upon to pay any taxation or toll costs for the use of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Truly the St. Lawrence seaway permits an invasion of the rights of the American workingman by permitting low-paid foreigners to force good American citizens to the bread lines.

As for the power part of the St. Lawrence project, the late Thomas A. Edison correctly defined the situation when he said:

> The first and best source of power is coal.
>
> We shall steadily require more power, but a great deal more fuss is being made over hydroelectric power than its intrinsic value warrants. The amount of coal available is not limitless, but for all practical purposes it is limitless. We can probably use coal at our present rate for a thousand years or so without any danger of exhausting our supply, and it is highly improbable that we really know our supply. * * *
>
> The development of hydroelectric power is very important, but also it is very expensive and usually requires an auxiliary coal steam plant. Some of the best water power is too far away from our manufacturing centers to make its utilization wholly practical.
>
> Water power is a political issue, not a business one. It can never at best mean very much to us except as something to talk about. The monopolizing of water power is also just a political idea. * * * There is far more danger in public monopoly than there is in private monopoly, for when the Government goes into business it can always shift its losses to the taxpayers. If it goes into the power business it can pretend to sell cheap power and then cover up its losses.
>
> The Government never really goes into business, for it never makes ends meet. And that is the first requisite of business. It just mixes a little business with a lot of politics and no one ever gets a chance to find out what is actually going on.

There is a wealth of truth in the statement of the American genius, Thomas A. Edison, when he said in speaking of our Government going into the power business:

> It (the Government) just mixes a little business with a lot of politics, and no one ever gets a chance to find out what is actually going on.

The St. Lawrence seaway is a striking application of the above quotation, since it is in reality the politicians' golden dream and the American taxpayers' hideous nightmare.

Work for Unemployables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of July 19, 1941:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of July 19, 1941]

WORK FOR "UNEMPLOYABLES"

Who is an unemployable?

Relief departments tell us that a considerable percentage of those now on general relief are unemployable in industry. W. P. A.

authorities declare that many on W. P. A. are "slowed down" workers, unacceptable to the private employer.

Yet we read that Ford, who is reputed to be a "hard boiled" employer in that he demands utmost efficiency, has on his pay roll some 11,800 "handicapped" men and women. Among those employed are 54 deaf mutes, 24 blind, 1,200 with one eye, 800 with very much impaired vision, 80 with one arm or none, 21 with no hands, 13 with no legs and 29 with one leg.

We know, too, that in Europe considerable effort has been made to fit handicapped persons into jobs which will pay them at least a subsistence wage. Work has been found for the blind which they can do better than the average-sighted person. Work has been found for other handicapped persons which they can do at least as well as physically sounder individuals.

Now, with relief loads still high and with labor demand abnormal due to the emergency, is it not time for this country to broaden its up to now somewhat apologetic program for the rehabilitation of the handicapped? If we are making an "all out" effort, the effort should include not only every able-bodied person but every person who can be fitted into a job, despite deficiencies we have looked upon as "incapacitating."

Not Breaking Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

EDITORIAL BY CHARLES BIGLER

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial entitled "Not Breaking Word." This editorial was written by Charles Bigler, editor of Goodland Daily News, and expresses the view of a large number of citizens of my congressional district:

[From the Goodland Daily News]

NOT BREAKING WORD

The President and the high Government and Army officials arguing now to keep the soldiers in the Army longer than their year are contending that it is not breaking the Government's agreement with the men by extending the year indefinitely.

We have become so accustomed to the Government changing the contract in the middle of it that no surprise is occasioned by this two-faced policy. In fact, we predicted from the start that the men would not be released in a year, and have never spoken of "a year of service" in connection with the Army training.

It was never the intention of the administration to let the men off with a year. The whole idea has been to build up a big army, and then send it overseas. But to have started with that, in the open, would have created so much opposition that the country would not have accepted the peacetime draft. The idea is to get something started, then add to it.

A year ago the same people who now are hollering for keeping all possible men in the Army were "pooh-poohing" the idea that it would take more than a year to train the men, that there would be any idea of holding them longer.

We do not oppose military training for the young men. In fact, we favor it. But we would like to see it made fair, and not require one eligible to go to the Army at $21 a month and another just as eligible exempt and given a dollar an hour with double pay for more than a short week. It has always seemed to us that the obligation to use skill or training for the benefit of the Nation was just as binding as to shoulder a gun. But it wasn't in the last war, and it isn't being done now.

The idea of the citizen army was to give a lot of men the rudiments of military training, and create a huge reserve that would be ready and able, if the Nation was endangered, to take up arms and do something with them. It has never been the idea of the people of the country to train a few million men and send them overseas to fight the battles of Europe and Asia, for the "four freedoms in all the world." We tried sending 4,000,000 to Europe once to save democracy and end all wars, and look what we got out of that.

There can be no faith in the word of the Government until at sometime it keeps its word. The citizen owes something to his Government, but he has a right to expect a square deal from his Government in return.

The President can say the Nation is not breaking its word with the soldiers. That, however, is exactly what he is asking the Nation to do.

Joint Income Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ROCHESTER (N. Y.) TIMES-UNION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial which appeared in the July 17, 1941, issue of the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union relative to the storm of indignation that has been aroused throughout the length and breadth of the Nation at the proposal to require joint returns from married persons for Federal income-tax purposes:

[From the Rochester Times-Union of July 17, 1941]

UNFAIR, INJURIOUS

The proposal to require joint returns from married persons for Federal income-tax purposes has aroused a storm of opposition. So Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Ways and Means Committee, concedes.

And small wonder!

More than the money issue is involved, as women's organizations have been quick to recognize and emphasize.

In essence, it involves a return to the old common-law idea that a wife's property comes under the control of the husband.

Indeed, that was the actual ground on which a small minority of the Supreme Court once argued a State had a right to impose such a requirement. They held a State could revert to the common-law theory.

But the Court, by a substantial majority, rejected that theory.

The Ways and Means Committee has a responsibility to do what is just, fair, and in accordance with an enlightened view of the marriage relation, the very basis of the home and society.

It should not ask helplessly: "What other way can we raise this money?"

Opposition to this particular tax provision indicates widespread belief that the proposal is unjust, reactionary, and socially injurious.

This country has not yet come to the pass where it must resort to such oppressive taxation.

Suppose two sisters each receive the same inherited income. One marries.

The unmarried sister pays the regular tax rate, whatever it may be, on her income. But the income of the married sister goes into a joint return of husband and wife. That means a higher rate of tax for both, since it brings in the surtax rate on the combined income of the couple.

Why should our Government discriminate against marriage?

Why should it encourage separation, even divorce, by thus imposing a higher tax on married persons living together?

That is socially unsound, as well as financially unfair.

Nor should it be alleged that this concerns only persons of wealth or applies only where wives have an income bequeathed them.

It will not require a large total to bring in surtax rates. The plan hits middle-class folks chiefly.

Take the case of a married woman who earns a modest income comparable to that of her husband. Considered separately, neither income is large enough to pay surtaxes. But the combined income would immediately jump into the surtax rates, and thus impose an onerous and unjust tax burden.

Obligations of all sorts have been founded upon the assumption that there will be no special increase for married persons, above what all have to pay.

Couples who have built or bought a home may be taxed so heavily that they will not be able to keep up their payments.

The committee should drop this unfair and unwise provision.

If it fails to do so, Congress should refuse to approve the joint-return plan.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION OF ALABAMA

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the American Legion of Alabama:

Be it resolved by the American Legion, Department of Alabama, in convention assembled at Huntsville, Ala., this 15th day of July 1941, That we do take this opportunity to express our scorn and contempt for the defeatists, Quislings, and appeasers who afflict

our glorious country, and our unhesitating confidence in our duly constituted authorities and especially in our wise, far-seeing, and courageous President of the United States of America, who, as Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, has had the intelligence to take the advice of the War College, of the Chief of Staff of our Army, and of our Navy chiefs in matters of military and naval strategy. He has proved himself an able, bold, and resourceful leader. Let us say to him and to the world that the men of the American Legion value our precious freedom above and beyond any possible sacrifices; we stand ready for any service to which we may be called, and ask only for an opportunity through blood, sweat, and tears, if need be, to stamp from the face of the earth the Hitlers and jackal Mussolini and all those who disturb the peace of the world and threaten our security, our homes, and our free way of life. We have what it takes and we are ready to go, to transmit to our children and our children's children our glorious heritage of liberty and equal justice to all; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Iowa Responds to Food Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. JACOBSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

Mr. JACOBSEN. Mr. Speaker, that Iowa farmers are responding to the call for more food is the conclusion of the agricultural economists of Iowa State College in a survey indicating increased purchasing power for the Iowa farmers.

On April 3, 1941, Secretary of Agriculture Wickard issued an appeal to farmers to increase food products, as follows:

1. Send hogs to market at heavier weights.
2. Increase fall pig crop about 20 percent.
3. Increase milk production from 6 to 8 percent.
4. Increase egg production 6 percent.
5. Increase poultry production 15 percent.
6. Increase canned tomatoes 50 percent.

This appeal did not find the Iowa farmer entirely unprepared. In September 1940 the Iowa State College Extension Service started to advise farmers with warnings of prospects for 1941. From the following indication the results will apparently be profitable and warrant their action:

IOWA FOOD PRODUCTION SITUATION AS OF JUNE 1941

Hogs: The Government June survey shows a 5-percent increase in the Iowa spring pig crop for 1941, 11,264,000 head.

The Government June survey indicates an increase of 30 percent in sows bred in Iowa for fall pigs.

On the basis of the above estimates Iowa will produce 16,000,000 head of hogs in 1941. This would be a little less than one-fourth of all hogs produced in the United States. This number has been exceeded but once in Iowa.

The weight of hogs going to market has apparently increased from 3 to 4 percent, which further markedly increases the meat supply.

The production of hogs in the entire United States has remained stationary. The estimated increase of sows bred for fall farrowing in the United States is 13 percent.

Dairying: The Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates that total milk production in May was 9 percent and in June was 5 percent larger than a year earlier and the highest on record for those months. Iowa dairymen are milking from 1 to 2 percent more cows, and for the first 5 months the average increase per cow in Iowa was about 6.5 percent, and the total production will be about 8 percent over the first 5 months in 1940.

Poultry and eggs: Iowa egg production for the first 4 months of 1941 was 7.5 percent above the production for the same period in 1940, according to U. S. D. A. reports. This is an increase of about 3,000,000 dozen eggs for that period. During 1940 Iowa produced 168,000,000 dozen eggs and she is requested to produce 180,000,000 dozen for 1941.

Iowa commercial chick hatching is 18.3 percent higher in 1941 than in 1940. It is estimated that 75,000,000 chicks were hatched in Iowa this spring. Iowa produced 43,000,000 chickens to maturity or market age in 1940, and with the large increase in hatching this year Iowa should produce about 55,000,000 birds in 1941, or 5,000,000 above the Government request of last April.

Tomatoes: The best estimate indicates a 40-percent increase in acreage.

General crop conditions in Iowa are good. Iowa farmers have met Government requests for food for defense to date, have gone far in the lead on hogs, and are in a most favorable position to meet any future demands.

Welcome to Officers of Veterans of Foreign Wars of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY PAUL C. WOLMAN, WITH INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY HON. PETE JARMAN, OF ALABAMA

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I submit herewith a speech of Past National Commander Hon. Paul C. Wolman, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, together with my introduction of him:

The service, to his country and to his comrades, of the distinguished gentleman and comrade it is my privilege and pleasure to introduce has been long, regular, consistent, and valuable indeed. Entering the service when scarcely 21 he remained in the Army practically 2 years during the World War, considerably more than half of which was spent overseas. He served on numerous active fronts including the vividly-recalled Argonne Forest and attended a British university after the Armistice.

Returning to his native Maryland he resumed his study of the law and pursued it to graduation, having enjoyed an excellent and lucrative practice in Baltimore since. He was appointed assistant State's attorney of that city in 1938.

Long active in both the American Legion, of the Montfaucon Post, of which he is a member, and particularly the Veterans of Foreign Wars, he has repeatedly been signally honored by the latter. After serving as national judge advocate general of our great organization, he made a most enviable record in the highest office within our gift, which I regard as one of the highest within the gift of Americans, that of national commander. Not content to rest on his laurels and his comrades being unwilling to be denied a continuation of his valuable service, he is now ably performing the duties of the important post of national legislative chairman.

Long a member of the Maryland War Memorial Commission, he was less than a month ago appointed a major in the Maryland State Guard and very appropriately assigned to the G–2 or intelligence section.

It affords me unusual pleasure to present to you that excellent soldier, patriotic citizen, and outstanding Veteran, former National Commander Paul C. Wolman.

ADDRESS BY PAUL C. WOLMAN

I am deeply appreciative of the privilege of participating in this fine program arranged for the welcoming of the officers chosen to guide the destinies of the Department of Virginia, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, during the next 12 months.

The pleasure of having attended the Virginia encampment in Staunton will long be remembered by me. There I found a gathering of American men and women who served as our country's defenders in our wars. They were the same type of men whom the immortal Washington had with him when he first set forth to make American history.

They were serious and determined men and women from the cradle of American democracy, who had journeyed from Arlington and Alexandria, from the tidewater regions of Norfolk and Newport News, from the orchards and farmlands of Winchester and Harrisonburg, and from the southern hills of Roanoke and Bristol.

There were laborers and farmers. Doctors, lawyers, artisans, merchants, and mechanics filled their ranks. The rich and the poor voiced their thoughts with equal freedom. It was, in reality, a cross section of the peoples of our great land.

These veterans met to renew acquaintances made on the battlefields of France, or on the mine- and submarine-infested high seas, or in the Philippines, in Cuba, or China. They met to exchange views and to become better versed in the horrible affairs of a seemingly God-forsaken and war-torn world. They met to find out what, if anything, they might be able to do to assist our President and the others clothed with the serious responsibility of preserving our American way of life; that which we recognize as American democracy.

These men, ordinary citizens now, who in years past had the privilege of extraordinary service, gathered to rededicate themselves to the cause of preserving the principles of American constitutional freedom. In addition to electing the officers, to whom we are expressing our greetings tonight, the members of the Department of Virginia, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, discussed and passed many resolutions.

As veterans, we know that the United States of America cannot satisfactorily progress as a first-rate nation by building a complete wall around our country and saying that whatever goes on outside of our

continental and hemispheric limits is of no concern to us. We appreciate the fact that we now live in an age when nations and their peoples are more interdependent than ever before. Try as hard as we may, we cannot entirely ignore the events which go on in other parts of the world, for they can and must have great and telling effect upon our Nation and its people.

Certain well-meaning individuals and the spokesmen for various mushroom organizations tell us that the wide spans of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans will forever protect us from invasion. They say that whatever goes on outside of our hemisphere need not concern us.

These folks who call themselves noninterventionists and isolationists talk as though America has a choice between assured and permanent peace and willful and needless participation in the world conflagration.

As veterans of past wars we know that they lose sight of the fact that if we allow Great Britain to lose the war, we must then fight a victorious Hitler and Germany alone, whenever Hitler sees fit to attack us. We know how long our blessings of liberty and self-government would last, with Great Britain out of the way, with Nazi Germany in possession of the British Fleet and its islands so near to us, and with Hitler in control of Siberia, so close to Alaska.

Yes, as veterans who once fought for freedom and democracy, we think we know what would be in store for us. We know that the fight for liberty is never completely won, that liberty is not only a heritage but a fresh conquest for each generation.

We feel as Sergeant York, that great soldier and member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, when asked what the veterans of World War I gained by fighting to make the world safe for democracy, he replied:

"It gave me 23 years of living in a country where the Goddess of Liberty is stamped on men's hearts as well as on the coins in their pockets. By our victory in the last war we won a lease on liberty, not a deed to it. Now, after 23 years, Adolf Hitler tells us that that lease is expiring; and, after the manner of all leases, we have the privilege of renewing it or letting it go by default."

I am proud to say that the Department of Virginia, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, demonstrated its attitude upon that question for another democracy, when, by unanimous vote, it decided to purchase and present to the British Government a new and fully equipped ambulance for use on the battlefields. Ere the wording of the resolution had been recorded, pledges were forthcoming in amounts almost sufficient to defray the costs of the whole outfit. Such is the spirit of these men who hail from the great Commonwealth of Virginia.

I would that time permitted me to tell you more about the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and particularly about the members of the organization from the State of Virginia. I would love to tell you a lot that I know about these fine folks tonight. Each has made a name for himself or herself in the service of our country during time of war, and since the close of hostilities in time of peace. It is because of the faith and confidence that their comrades have in them that they were chosen to lead the organization within their State.

There is much I could tell you about William D. Morgan, the new department commander, who comes from the hill lands of Roanoke and whom I had the pleasure of installing to take over the duties that were so ably performed by the now past department commander, Oscar J. Jungbluth, of Norfolk, who, by the way, was just called back into the active service of the United States Navy. Also I would like to tell you of the fine work of the new senior vice commander, Austin J. Matthews, of Arlington. Likewise, I would be happy indeed to give to you the history and backgrounds of each of the other officers who will carry on for both the men's organization and the ladies' auxiliary as well.

Unfortunately, however, our time on the air is limited. I must, therefore, content myself by saying that each of these officers who will guide the destinies of the Department of Virginia, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has been chosen for the able work done and the interests taken while holding other or lesser offices. They have all served their respective communities, State, and their Nation in time of war and in time of peace. This year they are rededicating themselves to the unselfish service of their fellow comrades and to the upbuilding of our great organization. They know that this year may be a most important one for them as well as for the leaders of all other veteran groups.

These officers of the Department of Virginia, as well as the leaders of the other departments in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, fully appreciate that their responsibilities may increase as the national emergency becomes greater. Nevertheless, as veterans they are willing to "carry the torch" that was handed to them by their now departed comrades.

One of these new officers whom I had the pleasure of installing recently told me, with tears in his eyes and a quiver of his lips, that when he raised his right hand and placed his left hand upon Old Glory and faithfully promised to discharge his official duties to the best of his ability he closed his eyes and thought of his deceased comrades sleeping the eternal sleep of peace in the American cemeteries in France and in Arlington. He said he could hear them whisper from their sacred resting places:

"Have you let us die in vain? Will you stand by idlly and permit democracy to wither and decay? We died so that you may live in freedom. Unless you preserve those principles for which we made the supreme sacrifice, our souls shall never rest in peace."

Those words, this officer of the Department of Virginia said, have rung in his ears for years and will ever serve as his incentive to work and work for the preservation of American liberty and all that it implies.

There is hardly a man, who served in the armed forces, on foreign soil, or in hostile waters, who has not had similar experiences, and who has not heard the same voices whisper to him. It is because they have heard those voices, and know what they mean, that they have and should have the God-given right to speak out for their comrades, and for the rest of the liberty-loving people as well, upon the all-important questions of democracy, liberty, freedom, tolerance, and understanding.

What fair-minded American would challenge the honest, unselfish leadership of such men, who learned what it means to fear death in the form of an enemy submarine, a burst of shrapnel, the deadly fire of a machine gun, or the sudden explosion of a hand grenade; of the men who know what it means to seek shelter from a hail of lead in the mud and filth of a trench; of men who know the utter weariness and the hunger and the suffering of the endless marches, under the cover of darkness. Yes, of the men who know, too, of the screams of a dying comrade, crucified on a cross of barbed wire, because he was willing to give his life to protect our freedom and our liberty.

Men, with such recollections, are the leaders in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Such men have pledged their allegiance to the President of these United States of America, in his efforts to preserve the American way of life. Such men have undertaken to do their parts to help convince the public that our country is something worth living for, in time of peace as well as dying for in time of war.

And so we take this opportunity tonight to salute those new leaders of the Department of Virginia, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and the leaders in the other departments as well. In doing so, may I say that we wish that their duties may not be too arduous and too trying. However, whatever they may be, we shall stand beside them, shoulder to shoulder, as we stood beside our comrades in time of war, that we shall lend to them every encouragement in their efforts to further instill the spirit of patriotism and Americanism, in the minds and in the hearts of all of the people in our land, and that when their terms of office shall have expired, we will take our hats off to them and say:

"We are glad you accepted office in our great organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and so willingly gave of your time and efforts in order that this country and all that it stands for may continue to be a free land and "One Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

We Should Not Have Hedged in the First Place

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE STERLING (COLO.) ADVOCATE

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sterling Advocate, of Sterling, Colo.:

[From the Sterling (Colo.) Advocate]

WE SHOULD NOT HAVE HEDGED IN THE FIRST PLACE

The Government, which is to say, the people of the United States, faces a dilemma.

Less than a year ago Uncle Sam made a contract with several hundred thousand young fellows for a year of military training. Now, Chief of Staff Marshall perceives that "the possibilities of a year ago have become dangerously near probabilities today, and it is vital to the security of the Nation that the hazards of the present crisis be fully recognized." Specifically, the Army wants the selective-service trainees and the National Guard men retained for more than a year, because some of them have been stationed in Hawaii, the Aleutian Islands, and other distant places. Their dismissal soon, to quote the Chief of Staff further, would mean that "our present trained forces would largely melt away."

Army chiefs are not politicians. It is probable that General Marshall had little to say about the selective-service plan when it was adopted. Congress, it seemed, did what the executive branch of Government wanted. It is obvious now, however, that someone lacked a reasonable measure of foresight.

It isn't wholesome for the Government to violate contracts with its citizens. Granting the right of the country to conscript the services of any who may be needed for the national defense, it isn't moral to make promises and forsake them.

It was silly for Congress to legislate that the services of certain armed forces should

not be utilized outside the Western Hemisphere. The only defense that is effective is that which meets the enemy long before he has invaded our shores and which is free to anticipate his strategy. That, of course, is not to argue for an expeditionary force without consent of Congress.

It should have been clear a year ago that no modern army could be constructed within a year and even if it were that 1-year enlistments would dissolve the army just as it became effective.

The truth is that much of the first year has been in large measure wasted because the Army did not have the equipment to train men in mechanical warfare. The fact is that, as the Secretary of War has admitted, even should the first selective service trainees be retained we should not immediately have an adequate army, because we lack modern weapons still. Millions of man-hours wasted in strikes have helped prolong our unpreparedness.

Nevertheless, many of the selective service trainees entered training as volunteers, keeping faith with the Government. Some volunteered with careful calculation of plans for education to follow and for their vocational careers. Had they anticipated prolonged service, or had they desired military careers, they would have entered the Army through the route of regular enlistments. Doubtless the selective service plan thwarted in considerable degree recruiting of the Army.

The fact is that the administration has not been frank with the American public in this matter or its calculations were extremely poor. Polls of public opinion still register the fact that the people are overwhelmingly opposed to participation in the European war, and yet they support the administration at Washington in steps which lead us closer day by day to participation. The public has been led to believe that we could decide the outcome of the European war without fighting and without incurring any grave danger. An original cash-and-get-it-on-credit policy was revised to a come-and-get-it-on-credit policy, and recently, without specific authorization of Congress, our Government has inaugurated a policy of take it to them on credit. Whereas in the beginning the administration condoned, if it did not champion, a policy of withdrawal which took our ships and our travelers out of danger lanes, our fighting forces of late have been rushed to one of the potential hot spots of the conflict, in Iceland. The neutrality policy which we were told should be good, and which many think we are still following, has been completely reversed.

The imperative need for continuance of training and service for the selective-service men and National Guard men is but one of the developments growing out of the use of oblique methods that lead the public nudge by nudge, rather than plain talk which bravely faces the unpredictable future. For purposes of the third term it was more expedient to reassure the public boldly and take half-way measures. But compromise for political advantage has not altered the course of events beyond our control.

Fair Enough—the Real Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under and by virtue of leave granted, I am including and inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of last Friday, July 18, 1941. Every man who is more concerned about preventing the destroying of this Republic than he is for votes for himself ought to read, reflect, and carefully consider what his duty to himself, to the selectees, and others, and to posterity may be and is.

This is no community picnic, to which willy-nilly we have been invited. We are in this war whether we like it or not. "None are so blind as those who will not see."

It is my well-considered opinion that the way to keep from sending our best blood and brain to Europe is to keep it here and to train it to that point of efficiency that no man and no combination of men dare attack us. To do less is to betray everybody; or that is what I think.

[From the Washington Post of July 18, 1941]

THE REAL ISSUE

When General Marshall first appeared before the Senate Military Affairs Committee to urge the extension of Army service, his main job was to convince the committee that service extension is absolutely necessary. On the basis of his testimony, some of which has been made public, no person with even an elementary grasp of our defense problem can fail to acknowledge the soundness of his appeal. Nor can there be any logical refutation of the general's argument that failure to extend Army service would mean the virtual disbandment or immobilization of two-thirds of our trained enlisted strength and three-fourths of our trained officer personnel. Congress appreciates this, of course, as does every thinking person. Yet it is disconcerting to find that in a matter of such urgency Congress, convinced for the most part of the advisability of extending Army service, must first resort to the ancient technique of finding the correst formula. No formula, no bills such as the War Department has sent to the Senate committee, are required. The Selective Service Act gives Congress the power to extend Army service by passing a simple resolution declaring that the national interest would be imperiled, as it obviously would be, if selectees leave the Army at the end of their year's training.

Two factors militate against immediate acceptance of such a resolution. One is the apparent fear on the part of some Members of Congress that isolationists would interpret the resolution as authorization for the President to take direct action leading to a shooting war, and might even rally enough support to defeat the measure. The other is the moral issue involved in extending the service of draftees who were originally led to believe that they were to serve 1 year and no more. Bother factors would and should arouse some debate. This would give Congress an opportunity to assume a larger responsibility for the defense program—which Members of both Houses feel has been increasingly commandeered by the President. And it would also focus national attention on the fallacy of short-term military service, which in 1776, in 1812, and in 1861 caused unnecessary sacrifices and near-disaster, and which now threatens the very existence of the Army.

Those who raise objections to immediate acceptance of a congressional resolution supporting extended Army service really evade the main issue. That issue, whether or not we acknowledge it, is that this country is at war now. It is not a shooting war, to be sure, but there may be shooting at any time, regardless of our efforts to avoid it. If we recognize this unpleasant fact—and it is sheer folly to try to dodge it—the arguments against extending Army service collapse of their own weight. Congress faces no dilemma; its duty, consistent with the convictions of the American people, is to free the Army from the necessity of having to begin all over again.

And one thing more! Do you know that we have just two divisions, or at most four, in shape now for action? Well, so says Raymond Clapper, who goes on to say that—

Of the Regular Army divisions, only one, the first, is a solid Regular Army outfit, with only a negligible sprinkling of less than 10 percent of selectees. And this division has 75 percent Reserve officers, meaning that approximately three out of four of its officers are free to leave the Army at the end of 1 year.

The other divisions have from 20 to 81 percent selectees who cannot be held more than 12 months. In fact, all except the second triangular division have more than 30 percent selectees and most of them more than 50 percent. All of them have 75 to 80 percent Reserve officers.

Take the four armored divisions, in which long training and technical skill are required. Eighty-two percent of their officers are Reserve officers. Their percentage of selectees runs: First Division, 50 percent; Second Division, 45 percent; Third Division, 62 percent; Fourth Division, 81 percent.

In all we have some 40 divisions in preparation, compared with Germany's 260 divisions. Germany and Russian each have more than 160 divisions fighting against each other now. Those figures give a general idea of the size of our Army against the two main armies in the world. Russia has almost twice as many divisions in Eastern Siberia alone as we are organizing of our entire Army, which must protect not only the United States but which also must garrison all of our numerous outposts and bases.

The prospect of having virtually to disband this army, which would be none too large even if it were thoroughly trained and equipped—and it is neither—is what has driven General Marshall to insist upon a show-down in Congress, although warned that there is intense opposition to continuing draftees in service beyond 1 year.

Wheat Farmers and Cotton Farmers—Let Us See the Whole Thing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

ARTICLE BY J. M. ELEAZER, COUNTY AGENT, SUMTER, S. C.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article which was carried in the Sumter Daily Item, contained in the weekly write-up by Mr. J. M. Eleazer, county agent at Sumter, S. C., which should be of interest to wheat farmers and the Members of Congress representing the wheat growing section of the United States.

One of the reasons that we are having some trouble with a number of farmers in the various sections of the country is that when their major crop is reduced under the agricultural program, naturally, they want to go into various other

lines, all of which would be in competition with other farmers and other sections of the country.

Therefore, this article, to my mind, is very timely, and I congratulate Mr. Eleazer on his position in connection with this most important matter.

[From the Sumter (S. C.) Daily Item]

LET'S SEE THE WHOLE THING

One farmer told me the other day that his neighbor has been driven to more profanity, had lost more sleep, had stood on the corner and at the crossroads and talked more heatedly to all who would hear about the farm program not letting him sell the wheat from his 13 acres than anything that had happened in a long time.

What are the facts surrounding this situation? Here they are: The West grows wheat for a living and we grow cotton for a living. The national farm program will not permit them to grow cotton in competition with us, and it will not permit us to grow commercial wheat promiscuously with competition with them. But it will permit us to grow wheat for home use.

The above unhappy man was permitted to grow as much as 10 acres of wheat and do as he pleased with it. Any farm could do that. Any farm also could plant as much as 3 acres per family, if 10 acres were not enough for the farm. But in the event none was to be sold from the farm. That was written to every farmer in every country, published in the paper, and carried over the radio. With 10 acres or less you were in the clear, but over 10 acres could be planted for home use, but not in excess of 3 acres per family. If that much per family were not needed then it should not be planted. In short, the regulations did not want to cramp any farm in growing the wheat for home use, and neither did it intend opening up commercial wheat production in competition with the Wheat Belt. Yet it did permit any farm to grow as much as 10 acres and sell it all if the farmer wished.

Now, that farmer saw red when he thought of his wheat dilemma, which was due to a pure misconception of his. I chanced to see him the other day and think he sees it in its true light and is satisfied.

The whole thing wasn't so bad when he realized twenty-odd dollars per bale on his loan cotton and recalled parity and other payments, etc.

To have a national farm program we must all see the whole picture. Congress has to see it. They have to legislate for the West as well as for the South. They can't let the Cotton South ruin the Wheat West, nor vice versa.

Test for Congress—The Yellow Race, or Is It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

ARTICLE BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am placing in the RECORD an article by Ernest K. Lindley, which appeared in the Washington Post of Friday, July 18, which deserves the careful consideration of Congress and of the people.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 18, 1941]

TEST FOR CONGRESS—THE EXTENSION OF ARMY SERVICE

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

Many Members of Congress are uncomfortable over having to vote whether to extend the service of National Guard men, selectees, and Reserve officers beyond 1 year. With forethought this decision could have been lodged with the President, as Commander in Chief. But by law Congress specifically prevented him from exercising such discretion. This was entirely proper, and perhaps desirable, but it means now that Congress must take a responsibility which many of its Members would like to dodge.

The main facts are plain. The discharge of all guardsmen, selectees, and Reserve officers at the end of 1 year would demolish the Army. The Army at present is drawn from these sources:

Officers:	
Regulars	14,700
Guard	21,800
Reserve	55,000
Total	91,500
Enlisted men:	
Regulars (3 years)	476,000
Regulars (1 year)	18,000
Guard	266,000
Selectees	597,000
Total	1,357,000

Even this table underemphasizes the difficulty. A majority of the enlisted men in the Regular Army have been recruited within the last year; many are selectees who volunteered. Only 200,000 men have had more than 1 year of training.

Experienced officers and men had to be spread thin as the framework for the new Army. Only two divisions—the first and second—have less than 30 percent selectees, and so would not be crippled if the 1-year rule were to stand. Most others have more than 50 percent selectees. And in all the Regular Army divisions, including the first and second, approximately three-fourths of the officers are Reservists.

The National Guard provides many of the special defensive units. A National Guard antiaircraft unit had to be sent to Hawaii because no other was ready for duty. For the same reason, a National Guard Coast Artillery unit was sent to Alaska. These can be replaced—by straining limited shipping resources—but only by Regular Army units containing upwards of 40 percent selectees whose 1-year service will begin to expire a few weeks later.

The Army estimates that it needs for present assignments a minimum of 640,000, 3-year men. It has only 476,000, less than half of whom are fully trained. It might have been better if, a year ago, Army pay had been raised and an all-out recruiting campaign had been launched, so that selectees in Regular Army units could be kept few enough to be rotated easily. But this was not done. The 1-year limit was put on selectee service in the face of the Army's desire for 18 months and the obvious fact that full training requires more time.

The argument that the Nation is in greater peril now than it was a year ago hardly carries conviction. A year ago whether England would survive the summer was doubtful. But the peril obviously has not vanished. And the Selective Service Act stated that when Congress declared the national interest to be imperiled the term of service might be extended by so much as the President deemed necessary. In time of war there is no limit on the service of the National Guard and Reserve officers.

General Marshall has explicitly pledged that the 80,000 draftees over 28 years of age will be discharged if they so desire. For others, a scheme for gradual replacement can be worked out. Likewise, it may prove possible to let some National Guard units go home, although the Army is making no promises. The Reserve officers it plans to rotate, anyway, but the automatic 1-year rule would play havoc with many units.

Our diplomatic experts know that failure to remove the 1-year limit would do terrible damage to our position in Latin America. One of the most difficult tasks our Government has had is to convince Latin Americans that we intend to, and can, defend the Western Hemisphere. Many of them are still highly skeptical. The disintegration of our Army at this point would be worth a major military victory to the Axis.

The greater perils—if England should go down or the Nazis should arrive on the Pacific, or start toward South America via the Iberian Peninsula, West Africa, and the Atlantic Islands—are obvious.

Congress will squirm and offer every variety of compromise. But if the President and General Marshall stand firm, it is hardly conceivable that they will not win. The responsibility of voting no is too grave to be assumed, in the show-down, by any man who puts the national security first.

A Bill To Amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as Amended, for the Purpose of Regulating Interstate and Foreign Commerce in Potatoes So as To Provide an Adequate and Stable Supply With Fair Prices for Producers and Consumers, and for Other Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a brief summary of a bill which I am introducing today, which should be of great interest to the potato growers of this country, as well as the Members of Congress who represent potato-growing districts.

These farmers are suffering perhaps as much, or more, than any other group of farmers because of the unfair price which they are receiving for their potatoes.

I believe that this bill will mean much to them.

It is my purpose to hold hearings on this legislation during the early part of the coming fall.

SUMMARY

A summary of the provisions of the bill by sections and subsections is as follows:

Subsection 360A: This subsection is a statement of "legislative findings" and points

out that the chaotic condition existing in the marketing of potatoes with wide fluctuation from year to year in the quantity of potatoes marketed and in the prices therefor results in disaster to producers and periodic excessive costs of potatoes to consumers.

Subsection B (1): This subsection provides for proclamation of a national marketing quota and particularly a quota for commercial farms—those raising over 9 acres—not later than September 15 of each calendar year for potatoes of the crop to be harvested in the next succeeding year. The quotas are converted to acreage allotments on the basis of average yields.

B (2): Not later than September 30 of each calendar year the Secretary is required to conduct a referendum of commercial growers. The quota can be in effect only if approved by two-thirds or more of the farmers voting in the referendum. If a referendum approves quotas, the vote will apply to the crops of the 3 succeeding years.

B (3): The national commercial-acreage allotment is apportioned among States on the basis of the acreage of potatoes harvested on commercial farms in the past 5 years, with adjustments for trends, abnormal conditions of production, and State potato-acreage allotments for the preceding year. Not over 2 percent of the national allotment is set aside for "new" farms.

B (4): The State acreage allotment is apportioned through local committees among commercial farms. Special provision is made for determination of allotments in areas where potato production normally is shifted from one farm to another from year to year and also for the determination of allotments for "new" farms.

B (5). The farm marketing quota for any farm is the actual production of the harvested acreage, if such acreage does not exceed the allotment. If the harvested acreage exceeds the allotment, the quota is the actual production of the farm minus the "farm marketing excess." The farm marketing excess is the smaller of the actual or normal production of the acreage harvested in excess of the farm acreage allotment. Provision is made for reduction of the farm marketing quota in any area by not more than 10 percent if the Secretary finds that the supply of potatoes available for marketing from the area is excessive in relation to the supply normally marketed and if such reduction is necessary in order to enable farmers to obtain fair prices. The quantity of potatoes represented by any such reduction of the farm marketing quota may consist of potatoes of any specified grade or size.

Subsection C: This subsection relates to penalties upon excess potatoes and to the operation of programs to aid farmers in obtaining fair prices for their potatoes. The penalty is 1.25 cents per pound upon the marketings of the farm marketing excess of potatoes from the farm, but payment of penalty is not required if excess potatoes are disposed of by diversion outside of normal trade channels in accordance with regulations approved by the Secretary. In connection with excess potatoes the Secretary is authorized to establish an agency or agencies to receive the excess potatoes and divert them to uses other than those afforded by normal trade channels. In such case, the Secretary can pay to producers whatever amount can be obtained for the potatoes, less any cost for handling. Provision is made that legislation authorizing marketing quotas for potatoes shall in no way affect the operation of any programs authorized by existing legislation (such as marketing agreements, diversion programs, or surplus purchase programs) which the Secretary finds will assist farmers to obtain fair and reasonable prices for potatoes.

Congress Will Check the War Makers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. STEPHEN A. DAY, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before America First Committee at Pittsburgh, Pa., on July 18, 1941:

Foreign influences have so penetrated the atmosphere of Washington that it is impossible to make a true appraisal of our national affairs without coming to a great industrial center like Pittsburgh. In Washington today foreign prapaganda is running at such speed that only the most loyal still retain their grip on that fundamental Americanism which has made us great.

Since my national broadcast of June 14 entitled "We Must Keep America Independent," many of the prophecies which I then made have been transacted into actual events. I said at that time that Winston Churchill and President Roosevelt contemplated a pooling of the British and American Navies in the Atlantic. Winston Churchill has already proclaimed this on the floor of the House of Commons. I asked the question, Why was Knox appointed Secretary of the Navy? He has answered that question, and it is now no longer doubtful that his function in the present crisis is to take the leadership in the waging of an undeclared war. In his recent speech at Boston, Secretary Knox without any previous authorization from the Congress, which under the Constitution has the sole power to declare war, said that the time had come when the American Navy under his control must make war on Germany in the Atlantic and blow up and drive from the seas all German submarines. American armed vessels do not operate without officers and crew. Secretary Knox, therefore, urged that our manpower be forced into an actual shooting war against Germany. It is reported and not denied that at least one depth bomb has been used against a German submarine and it is not definitely stated, but implied, that the German submarine was destroyed.

One week after my last broadcast Germany declared war on Soviet Russia. To any mind this is actual war as plain as any war could ever be. I said at that time that the President had no regard for the fundamental law of the United States. We now have additional positive evidence to prove that statement. In open defiance of the Neutrality Act, the President refuses to apply its provisions to Soviet Russia. The only reason assigned for this glaring violation of his duty is the simple one that the United States is to give total aid to the Communists.

Bear in mind that the lend-lease bill was passed with the express promise that it was a peace measure and that it was intended for aid to Britain so that Britain might defeat Germany. We are now advised that the President will soon come to the Congress with a demand for an additional $7,000,000,000 and I am confident that it will not be for Britain but will be for the aid of Soviet Russia. This step will perfect the new union of Britain, Soviet Russia, and the United States for a fight to the finish that Soviet Russia shall not fail.

The time has come for plain speaking. Ever since the President recognized Soviet Russia in 1933 we have witnessed the gradual undermining of our American way of life by the steady destruction of this serpent of internationalism that we call communism. But did any American ever believe that the time would come in this great land of constitutional liberty when we would go so far beyond mere recognition that we would make it the foreign policy of the United States to encourage communism by embracing it?

I charge here tonight that the administration has departed from the shores of free America and we are taking our orders from Winston Churchill. American boys, wearing the uniform of the United States, are today in far off Iceland brigaded with British troops. Winston Churchill has said that these British troops will remain in Iceland. When the day comes that the armed forces of Germany attack their enemy represented in these British troops in Iceland, aggressive war will be made upon these British troops and the American boys who will stand there beside them. No one can dispute that Germany has the right to attack these troops. Britain, no matter what may be the reason, declared war on Germany, and under all rules of war and international law Germany has the right to defend herself. Furthermore, it has been announced and not denied that Winston Churchill has forbidden American newspaper correspondents to land in Iceland. We also know that after Germany and Russia became involved in war the participation of the United States was announced not by the President but by Winston Churchill, who guaranteed to the world that Soviet Russia would be aided to the fullest extent not only by Britain but by the United States. When it came to the President's turn, he echoed this promise of Winston Churchill.

Since then the British Ambassador and Molotov, Stalin's right-hand man, signed in Moscow a solemn and formal treaty of military alliance to fight to the bitter end, one for all and all for one. Right here let me explain just what this means. When we use the term "Soviet Russia" we are apt to think of the old Russia as a separate nation—the Russia of 1917 that was one of the Allies in the last World War. But what is the truth? The other contracting party with the British Empire is the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics of the World. It is well known that things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other. I therefore charge that at this hour, to all intents and purposes, the British Empire is a part of the Soviet Union of Socialist Soviet Republics to the bitter end. Students of communism know that the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics of the World recognizes no national boundaries; that this godless union extends wherever it is in existence. In my last broadcast I warned against the treasonable scheme of Union Now with Britain, devised to make the United States a colonial dominion of the British Empire, to fight and pay for Britain's wars and to forever surrender American citizenship for the mongrel slavery in which American men and women of today would be on a level with the hordes of India and the tribesmen of Africa. I could not believe that in less than 2 weeks these same Americans would be virtually threatened with the surrender of their American citizenship to follow under the bloody red flag of communism and to proclaim the leadership of Stalin, blood-soaked with the murder of over 2,000,000 innocent people in what was formerly Russia.

Whither are we drifting? This week in Washington I listened to a broadcast coming not from Moscow but from Washington. The broadcast frankly stated that it was the broadcast of the Communist Party in the

United States and undoubtedly paid for by this branch of the Communist Party of Stalin. The leading official representative of the American branch of the Communist Party openly praised the President of the United States for his all-out aid to Stalin and expressed his pleasure that we were all pledged to the perpetuation of the Soviet Union. The attitude of the Communists in America has changed. We are facing a vastly more powerful propaganda of communism than we have ever known before, no matter how damaging and polluting it has been. Unless something be done, and done at once, to check this closer association of the administration and the Soviet Union, no matter what may be the outcome of the present war, the destructive and subversive forces of communism in the United States will have grown so powerful that we can never eliminate from our American life this cruel serpent of internationalism.

What, then, is our duty at this hour as free Americans? We must in positive terms declare that we shall preserve our American independence under the Constitution of the United States against all foreign influences. We must omit no effort to defend America to the fullest extent for the protection of the United States and the Western Hemisphere. But we must not spend one dime or spill the blood of a single American boy in the surrender of this independence for the perpetuation on the free soil of America of a union now with Britain, or a union now with Soviet Russia, or a union now with Britain, Soviet Russia, and the United States.

Fortunately for the American people the time has arrived when a vital decision must be made. This decision will be made by the people themselves through their chosen representatives in Congress. Step by step, the President has been carrying forward an undeclared war. He now realizes, on the advice of General Marshall, that he cannot carry this undeclared war any further without the use of the American Army. Congress now faces the test vote that will go far to check the war makers and the outcome of this vote may well be the turning point which will bring peace and freedom from war to the American people. Certainly the American people do not wish to enter the war on the side of Britain to defeat Germany. This has been clearly shown by every test of public sentiment. The American people stand today 80 to 20 against war.

The test is coming on the issue of whether the Congress shall extend the service period of draftees beyond 1 year. The Selective Service Act in plain terms states that the draftees were called for 12 months of active duty "except that whenever the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled, such 12-month period may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interest of national defense."

The Congress must now decide whether the draftees at the end of their 12 months of active service are to be placed in reserve or sent abroad for active duty on foreign soil and, to all intents and purposes, be drafted for a war of intervention in foreign disputes. To send the draftees to foreign soil will be in direct violation of the pledge of President Roosevelt made on October 23, 1940.

"We are arming ourselves not for any purposes of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: 'We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack.'"

For the Congress to declare that the national interest is imperiled as provided in the Selective Service Act it must declare that a national emergency exists. This is tantamount to a declaration of war and has been so interpreted by Congressman Woodrum of Virginia, a staunch supporter of the President and the man who, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives piloted to success the appropriation of $7,000,000,000 to implement the lend-lease bill. On the floor of the House on June 28 of this year, on this subject, Congressman WOODRUM of Virginia stated:

"The man today who stands before the American people and advocates a declaration of war either does not know anything about what he is talking or else he is utterly stupid, or both.

"The idea of this country going off now and trying to settle the conflicting emotions and ideologies of Europe to me is ridiculous, even if we were prepared to do so, and we are not. There are many reasons why we should not go abroad. It is only necessary to state one, and that is we have not the troops nor the equipment.

"Mr. Speaker, if anybody has a notion in his head, either in the War Department or in any other department, that they can come to this Congress and get any sort of declaration that will put us aggressively into the European war or that will send American expeditionary forces abroad, I think the sooner they get the idea out of their heads the better it will be."

General Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, this week in Washington testified that he and the War Department felt that the time had come for Congress to declare the existence of a national emergency, and stated as follows:

"The President has deemed it expedient to declare an unlimited emergency concerning civil functions, and the War Department and I personally now believe it urgently necessary in the public interest for Congress to declare the existence of a national emergency."

This makes it positively clear that the Army dare not and will not send the draftees to foreign soil under the national emergency declared by the President on May 27 of this year but must have the legal sanction of the Congress by a declaration of a national emergency.

The time has come for the Congress to check the war makers, and this can best be done by the refusal of Congress to declare a national emergency. The President has tried to force the hand of Congress by sending American troops to Iceland. But these troops are now only Marines, and there are not sufficient of them to constitute the 80,000 armed soldiers which the President wishes to place in Iceland. It is now known how many the President wishes to place in Ireland, Scotland, and England. It is safe to say that it is contemplated to send 800,000 American soldiers beyond the shores of the continental United States. Questioned by Senator DOWNEY, General Marshall said the Army now has 476,000 3-year volunteers, and that this figure will be increased to about 800,000 "as we occupy the Atlantic bases and increase our overseas garrisons." We must contrast this statement of General Marshall with his statement of 1940, when he said that an Army of 700,000 would be amply sufficient for American defense. The present personnel of the Army is 1,400,000. The President plans to increase this figure, and no one can dispute that it will be increased not for defense but for intervention in foreign disputes.

It must now be plain to anyone that without asking the Congress to declare war, the President is asking Congress to declare a national emergency and to use our armed forces for service on foreign soil. That is the issue which Congress must decide, and in my opinion the Congress will refuse to declare the national emergency. This will be the turning point on the road to war, and I want to make this issue perfectly clear to the American people so that they can lend their support to the Members of Congress who will vote against the President's demands. We have no time to lose. This decision will be made next week, and I ask you to write and wire your Representatives and Senators to vote against the extension of the service period of the draftees.

The American people are sick and tired of deception and double-dealing. The Constitution provides the direct and honest method of declaring war. To obtain national unity in the United States we must put an end to totalitarian methods and give the people and their chosen representatives the opportunity to pass upon this vital question. This was recognized in the impressive statement of Senator WALTER GEORGE, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, when he arose on the floor of the Senate on June 28, of this year and stated:

"Mr. President, the way to national unity in America is not through methods of totalitarianism. It is not through asking for powers for which there is no need, and which cannot be wisely exercised without disrupting the orderly processes of living and making a living in the United States.

"The way to national unity is to give our people the assurance that when we are called upon to move into the actual range of fire and send our men there, whether on board naval vessels or in the aircraft, the American people themselves will have some opportunity to pass upon that question; in other words, that they will have the ultimate decision, through the machinery to which they have become accustomed and the only machinery which they have at hand, will be able to pass upon the question of whether an actual state of war shall be brought into being or a formal declaration of hostilities shall be made by the people of the United States."

Members of Congress feel that a pledge was given to the boys who were drafted, amounting to a contract, that they would not be called into active duty for more than 12 months and would not be sent outside of the Western Hemisphere. These boys heard the pledge of President Roosevelt made at Philadelphia on October 23, 1940, and doubtless many of them, like other millions of American people, voted for President Roosevelt because of the pledge which he then made. They also heard him say and believed him when he said 1 week later, on October 30, 1940, at Boston:

"Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars. They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores."

The covenant made with our boys is sealed with the words of the late Senator Key Pittman, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the time of the passage of the Selective Service Act. On September 18, 1940, he placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the letter which he had just written to the Secretary of State of Nevada, his native State, to assure the mothers of America that their boys were not in danger of involvement in foreign wars. He said in part, as follows:

"I have your letter in which you state that you will no doubt receive a great many inquiries concerning the contents, operation, and effect of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. I will have sent to you a number of copies of the act so soon as printed as a public document. * * * Unfortunately public opinion was based upon the Burke-Wadsworth bill as introduced. This is quite natural. A number of speeches were made against the bill before the limiting and protective amendments were adopted in the Senate. * * * The second important amendment adopted on the floor of the Senate was a provision that these men inducted into the service for training shall not be used in the military service outside of the Western Hemisphere and our own possessions. That means that the President and the military departments are absolutely commanded not

to send these soldiers outside of the Western Hemisphere except to our own possessions. It is true that it is contended by two or three able and sincere Senators that the President of the United States would violate this law. Such an attempted violation by any President of the United States is inconceivable. Not only would Congress refuse to appropriate the money for such an undertaking but the President would be subject to impeachment. * * * It is hardly worth while, however, to discuss these legal questions, as the President has time and again promised the country that he does not intend to take our soldiers into the European war. It would be impossible for the United States to land the soldiers in Europe, and the President, having great knowledge of these subjects, is aware of this fact. * * * If anything on earth will prevent war being forced upon us, it is the action taken by the President and the Congress in preparing such a defense that no one will dare attack us. It knows that our boys will not be led into any war outside of the Western Hemisphere and our own possessions, and only within the Western Hemisphere if we are threatened with attack. * * * For the sake of their peace of mind, let the mothers of Nevada and the rest of the country banish groundless fears."

There can be no doubt that the draftees were called into an army of defense of our shores and for no other purpose. The danger of invasion has passed and no one now claims that we need fear an attack by Germany. Many will ask: Why does the President send our troops into the war zone to seek war with Germany? There can be only one answer. The war makers are determined to get us into war and knowing that Congress will never declare war, secret and unconstitutional methods are utilized to involve us in war. This is plain usurpation. The people must rebuke this usurpation by any method at their command. We are still an independent nation governed by law and it is the duty of every citizen in office and out of office to see that the law of the land is observed.

President Roosevelt, on August 14, 1936, recognized the right of the people to assert themselves and check the war makers. He must be made to recognize this right today. At Chautauqua, N. Y., on that date he said:

"We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say 'No' to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war."

The Congress of the United States is not telling us to go to war. It is the war makers led by Secretary Knox, Secretary Stimson, Secretary Ickes, and Secretary Wickard. Have we the courage to say "No" to them?

When Josiah Wedgwood, a member of Parliament, was asked when we would have union now with Britain, he stated that all that was necessary was a common war cabinet between the United States and Britain. The press carried a news item a few days ago that Harry Hopkins had been secretly sent to London. Today we find that upon the invitation of Winston Churchill, Hopkins sat with the British War Cabinet. Do we need any further confirmation that there is a secret understanding for union now between Churchill and President Roosevelt? We recall that Hopkins lives at the White House and is the director of the $7,000,000,000 lend-lease fund. What are we going to do about it? The answer will soon be given by the people of the United States through their chosen representatives in the Congress. This has gone far enough. We must take action.

A Tribute to Stephen Bolles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, after a full and splendid life our friend, STEPHEN BOLLES, who had achieved fame and honor and glory, has gone "to a laurel rest at the goal."

Those of us who were privileged to know him intimately will miss him most intensely. Such a friend he was.

The world saw but one side of him. Those of us who have sat at his feet and listened to him will never forget his comments on men and things and will long remember his positiveness, his tenderness, and his fighting heart.

Some of us recall an occasion when, after he had done his best to aid the passage of a measure in which he was interested and which had failed of passage, he said to us, his companions of the hour: "The bill failed of passage, but I remember the poet says:

They never fail who light
Their lamp of faith on the unwavering flame
Burnt for the altar service of the race
Since the beginning."

And he went on to say, "Don't worry; I shall live to see my dream come true," for, as Dana Burnet said—

Who dreams shall live! And if we do not dream
Then we shall build no temple into time.
Yon dust cloud, whirling slow against the sun,
Was yesterday's cathedral, stirred to gold
By heedless footsteps of a passing world.

The faiths of stone and steel are failed of proof,
The king who made religion of a sword
Passes and is forgotten in a day.
The crown he wore rots at a lily's root,
The rose unfurls her banners o'er his dust.

The dreamer dies, but never dies fair dream,
Though death shall call the whirlwind to his aid,
Enlist men's passions, trick their hearts with hate,
Still the fair vision lives! Say nevermore
That dreams are fragile things. What else endures
Of all this broken world save only dreams!

To those who did not know him as I did, this chance meeting was the revelation of a side of this man that they had never seen and did not know.

And so I might go on at great length, but the memories of our most pleasant and to me most profitable association over the years are mine, to be kept in the casket of the mind as precious jewels are by those who treasure them.

Today—

Like a young child who to his mother's door
Runs eager for the welcoming embrace,
And finds the door shut, and with troubled face
Calls and through sobbing calls, and o'er and o'er
Calling, storms at the panel—so before
A door that will not open, sick and numb,
I listen for a word that will not come,
And know, at last, I may not enter more.

Silence! And through the silence and the dark
By that closed door, the distant sob of tears
Beats on my spirit, as on fairy shores
The spectral sea; and through the sobbing, hark!
Down the fair-chambered corridor of years,
The quiet shutting, one by one, of doors.

—*Hermann Hagedorn.*

The Nation's Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22 (legislative day of Monday, July 21), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a radio address delivered by me at Minneapolis, Minn., on Saturday, July 19, 1941, dealing with the Nation's foreign policy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the 4th day of this month all over the United States were gathered men, women, and children in Nation-wide ceremony, pledging loyalty to the flag of the United States.

The 48 stars in the flag symbolize the 48 States of the Union. These States jointly are tied together by the Constitution of the United States, the supreme law of the land.

It is surprising sometimes to discover how many of our citizens, even among the most learned, have given but small attention to the study of that law.

Every public official, before taking office, takes a solemn oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. It must be self-evident to everyone that the best way to preserve, protect, and defend it is for public officials to confine their activities within the limitations allotted to them by that instrument.

The duties of the Congress, the courts, and of the Presidency are clearly defined. For instance, among the powers delegated to Congress is the power to declare war.

There are people in these days anxious for us to become engaged as a belligerent in the present World War. These people do not relish reading that section of the Constitution conferring that power upon Congress. They know that a resolution declaring war cannot be passed in the Congress of the United States at the present time. So they are urging the President to adopt policies that bring us nearer and nearer to a state of war, hoping for incidents that will precipitate us into a state of belligerency without a declaration of war by the Congress.

Members of the President's Cabinet are notorious for making prowar speeches. Secretary Knox, of the Navy, has intimated to

newspapermen that the Atlantic Fleet is policing the Iceland route and has orders to shoot at German submarines and bombers if shooting appears advisable. If that is true, he assumes the right to make war.

Our armed forces have occupied Iceland because it is claimed that it was necessary to do so for the protection and defense of the United States. It is even claimed now that Iceland is in the Western Hemisphere. This is done to give a shadow of legality to the occupation. It has never been considered in the Western Hemisphere before. If merely saying it is there places it in the Western Hemisphere, then all we have to do to place Africa, France, and Italy in the Western Hemisphere is to say they are in the Western Hemisphere too.

Both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie gave their promises before the last election that if and when elected they would not interfere in foreign wars except by aid to England short of war.

Roosevelt has sent troops to Iceland, which is a European country occupied by British troops.

Mr. Willkie is quoted in the press as stating that—

"It looks to him like only the first step of several needed steps and that he favors bases in Northern Ireland and Scotland."

These ideas of aid short of war appear now to be as phony as the last national Presidential election appears to have been.

Many people in the United States who favor war are anxious to have the President conduct an undeclared war and as an excuse for doing so they point to our war with Mexico. In that war the United States was an aggressor nation and it comes with poor grace to hold that up as an example in statesmanship when we are urged to join a world war against aggressors.

It is also claimed that Lincoln's defense of Fort Sumter without a declaration of war by Congress was an example to be followed in starting an undeclared war at the present time; but Fort Sumter was not on foreign territory, it was United States territory and American property that was attacked.

Theodore Roosevelt's activities in the Panama affair have been cited as a worthy example to follow; but in that case we were again an aggressor nation, and without declaring war we found some excuse to occupy and to set up a puppet government of our own.

I repeat, these acts of aggression are a poor foundation upon which to base the policy of conducting war without the consent of Congress.

As I said in the beginning, the Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land and confers war powers on Congress.

Article I, section 8, subdivision 11, states:

"The Congress shall have power to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and to make rules concerning captures on land and water."

Congress has not declared war, nor has Congress made any rules for the capture of Iceland. Congress was not told about it until it was done. It is reported that the British Ambassador to Iceland induced the Icelandic Government to invite us to come in. Congress was not consulted about the matter. Congress was not consulted about the 50 destroyers that were given to Britain. These are warlike acts, and they seem to occur with more and more disregard for provisions of the Constitution.

As a matter of fact, step by step, we are are being dragged nearer and nearer into war, in spite of the fact that the Congress or the people of the United States are overwhelmingly opposed to our going into war.

The New York Daily News has taken a poll involving more than half a million votes in the State of New York, where most of our war propaganda comes from. These votes show that the people of the State of New York are opposed to becoming involved in a shooting war by a ratio of 3 to 1.

The Chicago Tribune has taken a similar poll in Illinois on the same question. That poll showed the vote to be 4 to 1 in Illinois against entering the war.

In spite of the sentiment of the people and the sentiment of Congress—which has the only legal authority to take us into war—the President and his Cabinet are following a policy that will sooner or later bring about such a condition that a state of war will actually exist without a declaration of war by Congress.

There are men in public life and commentators who tell the American people that the President is charged with the sole authority in foreign affairs. If that were true, the Constitution would confer the power of declaring war upon the President. That is the most important foreign policy of the Government. But nowhere in the Constitution is there any foundation for the charge or the claim that the President is the sole authority in foreign affairs. It is true the Supreme Court has said that he is the authoritative spokesman for the United States, but the Court has also said his authority as spokesman is limited by the Constitution to inquiry and negotiation; but he cannot commit the Government of the United States by any promise or act except by the advice and consent of the Senate.

It is amazing to learn how many editors and public speakers take the position that Congress should waive its responsibility and power and follow the President blindly in foreign affairs, even into war, although the Congress may disagree and sincerely believe that the policy enunciated would mean ruin for the United States. They forget that the Congress has its own responsibility under its oath to the Constitution. It is for the Congress to determine whether our policy shall be one of peace or war.

It is very clear that the American people overwhelmingly support the present attitude of Congress. It is a libel upon Congress to say that a majority of Congress are opposed to going to war for partisan reasons. All Congress asks and all that the American people ask is that if our policy shall be war, that policy shall be declared by the only authority that has the power to declare it, and that is Congress. Though the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, he has no right to conduct a policy or use the Army and Navy for purposes that will involve us in war without the consent of Congress.

If and when war is declared by the Congress there will be no question of national unity.

If the President is opposed to going to war, he should say so, and have a Cabinet who speak the same language and conduct public business accordingly.

Does anyone believe that by going to war we can enforce the "four freedoms" upon the people of Japan, China, Russia, or anywhere where the people themselves have not the will to maintain them?

Does it seem sensible to depose dictators we don't like and impose upon foreign peoples dictators according to our own liking, who will force the "four freedoms" upon their people who have never heard of the "four freedoms"?

On the standpoint of common sense, is there any reason in proposing a world-wide crusade that so far as the world is concerned would be as futile and as pathetic as the Crusades of ancient times?

Europe and Asia have had their recurring wars for thousands of years, and in spite of anything we can do will have bigger and better wars in the future.

When this war is over, it is very safe to predict that a treaty will be made which will contain the seeds for the next war.

If we go to war with Germany today, whom shall we be at war with tomorrow?

Today Stalin and Churchill are marching side by side, with American taxpayers' money to aid them. Do you think that they are fighting for democracy? If and when Hitler shall be defeated shall we then fight Russia to establish the "four freedoms" there?

A year ago we lauded Finland as a brave democracy. Today Finland is again fighting Russia. Are we today going to take the side of Stalin against Finland?

In the beginning, England and France declared war against Germany. France fought as long as she could, and now England is fighting France. I ask, if we go to war with a totalitarian nation today, what democracy would we fight tomorrow?

These are serious questions. They emphasize what a mess we find ourselves in when we depart from the ancient American doctrine—the doctrine we adhered to so faithfully until we were lured into European politics and the last war. So long as we followed that doctrine we prospered, and had friends in every land, and had the respect of every government in the world.

There can be no question but that the American people are united in a determination to defend our institutions from attack at sea, on land, or in the air, but an overwhelming majority do not think America can best be defended on the shores of Asia, Africa, or Europe.

Our present war has determined that navies cannot successfully contest with bombers based upon land. Nor can airplane carriers, even though protected by battleships or auxiliary vessels, successfully launch an attack over 3,000 miles on the United States if we have our bombers and submarines at home.

We do not like the Nazi form of government. There are many other governments in the world that we do not like. Are we going to war with them all? Our first duty is to preserve a democracy in America. To do this we must keep certain objectives clearly in mind.

1. Let not public officials exceed their responsibilities under the Constitution, nor usurp powers and authority not delegated to them therein.

2. As a nation we must learn to mind our own business.

3. We must get rid of the idea that because Britain or some other nation becomes involved in a war we can't keep out. That doctrine makes us the slaves of Britain or any other nation with which we may form this unnatural connection.

4. We must have the strongest Navy and air force in the world, and a small but splendidly mechanized Army. With these weapons no power or combination of powers on the face of God's earth will dare attack us.

5. We must have unity in the Nation's foreign policy. This can best be accomplished by the President making no commitments to any foreign government without first obtaining the consent of the Congress.

6. Let all public officials be mindful of their limited power under the Constitution. It is still the supreme law of the land. This is necessary if we are to remain a government by law instead of a government according to the whims of men.

This is America. It was a republic when we received it as a precious heritage from our fathers. With the help of God Almighty it will still be America and a republic when we bequeath it to our sons.

Coffee Sugar Bill, H. R. 3582

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY B. COFFEE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1941

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I am submitting herewith certain facts to clarify some of the objections that have been raised against the Coffee sugar bill, H. R. 3582, now pending before the Rules Committee. This bill is very similar to the Adams-O'Mahoney bill, S. 937, which passed the Senate by a vote of 45 to 26.

H. R. 3582 simply provides that if the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands will be unable to market its duty-free quota of sugar in the United States, he shall prorate the deficit among the domestic sugar-producing areas.

Unless this amendment to the Sugar Act is enacted, the Secretary of Agriculture must prorate any deficit in the Philippine quota to foreign countries other than Cuba. This bill does not disturb the full-duty quota of sugar which is allocated to the Philippines and which has always been reallocated to foreign countries. Under the Philippine Independence Act, the Philippines are given a duty-free quota of 982,000 short tons of sugar, raw value. Because ocean freight rates from the Philippines have advanced almost 500 percent since the European war began and since cargo space now is unobtainable, the prospects are that there will be a deficit of at least 150,000 tons of duty-free Philippine sugar.

The question involved is whether this deficit shall be allocated to foreign countries or allocated to domestic areas. If this deficit is allocated to domestic areas, it would be distributed as follows:

Area:	*Percent*
Domestic beet sugar	41.72
Mainland cane sugar	11.31
Hawaii	25.25
Puerto Rico	21.48
Virgin Islands	.24

Unless this deficit is allocated to domestic areas there is little likelihood that the domestic beet-sugar industry will be permitted to sell any sugar this year from the 1941 crop.

On January 1, 1941, the domestic sugar-beet industry had on hand an inventory of 1,754,879 tons of sugar. The marketing quota announced at the beginning of this year it was 1,589,100 tons. As the marketing quotas were originally announced, it meant that the beet-sugar industry would have to carry over 165,000 tons of the 1940 crop into 1942 in addition to their entire production of 1941. Since the marketing quotas are based on estimates of consumption, and since the estimate of consumption has been recently greatly increased due to hoarding and fear of a possible shortage of sugar, the beet-sugar industry will now be permitted to sell during this year approximately the amount of their invoice on January 1 this year. This surplus beet sugar was produced in strict compliance with the Sugar Act.

In spite of prospective difficulties in bringing in sugar from offshore areas, the sugar-beet acreage was reduced 16.2 percent this year by order of the Secretary of Agriculture in compliance with the Sugar Act of 1937. By permitting the sugar-beet industry to absorb their prorated portion of the Philippine deficit, some of the 1941 crop of beet sugar could be sold. This would relieve the pressure for acreage restrictions and would permit beet growers to again resume their normal production. It is essential that continental beet- and cane-sugar production be encouraged in order to assure the domestic market of an ample supply of sugar and to prevent the consumers from having to pay exorbitant prices as was done during the last war, when we depended upon offshore supplies. This bill is opposed by the Seaboard Cane Refiners, who are interested in refining offshore sugar. They feel they may lose a little business to the beet-sugar industry.

The Sugar Act of 1937 provides that the United States beet-sugar area shall be allotted 41.72 percent of the quota for domestic sugar-producing areas. Thus, if a deficit of 100,000 tons were to occur in the duty-free portion of the Philippine quota and were, under the provisions of the Coffee bill, allotted to the domestic areas, the share of beet-sugar producers would be 41,720 tons. The remainder, 58,280 tons, would be made up of raw cane sugar and would be available to refiners.

Seaboard refiners normally handle each year about 4,500,000 tons of sugar, so that the allocation of 41,720 tons of a Philippine deficit would represent less than 1 percent of their average volume. To assert that the diversion of that amount of tonnage to beet-sugar producers would seriously affect the refiners' operations or work hardships on refinery labor is clearly ridiculous. From year to year the volume of sugar handled by refiners has varied by more than 300,000 tons, as shown in the following table, which covers the years for which sugar control has been effective:

Annual meltings of seaboard refiners

[Short tons, raw value]

Year	Meltings	Increase or decrease from preceding year	Percent of change from preceding year
1933	4,128,808		
1934	4,182,368	+53,560	+1.30
1935	4,509,176	+326,808	+7.81
1936	4,513,602	+4,426	+.10
1937	4,845,169	+331,567	+7.35
1938	4,576,957	−268,212	−5.54
1939	4,487,499	−89,458	−1.95
1940	4,630,068	+142,569	+3.18
Average	4,484,200		

There is no evidence to indicate that employment in the refining industry is directly proportionate to the volume of meltings. In 1935, as an example, the refiners melted almost 400,000 tons more than in 1933, and 2,337 more men were employed in 1935 than in 1933. In 1937, however, meltings were 335,000 tons greater than in 1935, but only 192 more men were averagely employed. In 1939 meltings were 358,000 tons less than in 1937, but employment in the latter year was nevertheless 109 men greater than in 1937 despite the significantly smaller volume of sugar handled. Variations in refinery employment are shown in the following table, based on the biennial reports of the Bureau of the Census for the years indicated:

Census year	Average number of employees	Increase or decrease from preceding census year	Percent of change
1933	11,495		
1935	13,832	+2,337	+20.3
1937	14,024	+192	+1.4
1939	14,133	+109	+0.8

The only conclusion to be drawn from these facts is that year-to-year fluctuations in production are not necessarily reflected in corresponding increases or decreases in employment. That being true, there is no reason whatever to believe the allocation of 41,720 tons of a Philippine deficit to the beet-sugar producers would result in any measurable decrease in employment in the seaboard refineries.

Between 1937 and 1939 meltings of the refiners decreased 357,670 tons, and at the same time there was a slight increase in employment. Before the beet-sugar quota could be increased by that amount through an allocation from the Philippines, it would be necessary that a deficit of 857,310 tons be determined in the quota for the islands, which is inconceivable. In other words, the year-to-year variations in the operations of the refiners, as the Sugar Act now stands, have been as great as those which would occur if the Philippines were able to market only 13 percent of their quota in any year—about 130,000 tons—and 41.72 percent of the deficit were allotted to the beet-sugar industry.

Far from operating at a reduced level, reports of the Sugar Division of the Department of Agriculture indicate that in 1941 the refiners are operating on a scale which may well exceed the volume of any recent year. Meltings for the first 4 months of the year—more recent figures are not yet available—were only a few thousand tons behind 1937, when the refiners handled more sugar than at any time since sugar control has been effective. The situation is shown in the following table:

Refiners' meltings, January to April, inclusive, for certain years

[Short tons, raw value]

1935	1,581,233
1936	1,720,981
1937	1,856,268
1938	1,308,593
1939	1,514,480
1940	1,410,636
1941	1,819,109

On the basis of these figures and in view of the demand for sugar which has

been apparent for the first 6 months of the year, it is entirely probable that the refiners' meltings for the year will equal, if they do not exceed, the 4,845,169-ton melt of 1937.

If the seaboard refiners have reason for complaint, the reason is not to be found in the competition offered by the beet-sugar industry but rather in the excessive expansion of refining capacity in the United States. That excess capacity, constructed under boom conditions and high prices, is a condition for which only the refiners themselves are responsible. John E. Dalton, one-time chief of the Sugar Division of the Department of Agriculture and now secretary of the United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, deals with this point in his book, Sugar, A Case Study of Government Control, as follows:

The expansion of the refining industry, consisting almost entirely of fixed plant of a highly specialized character, went beyond the needs of the artificial wartime market. When the "abnormal" war export trade disappeared, and when the "normal" export trade of the early twenties was killed with the dumping of refined sugar in the world's market by the highly subsidized European industries, the domestic industry found itself facing an overextension of facilities. Its exact amount is impossible to measure, but the Supreme Court in the Sugar Institute case stated that there has been "* * * an overcapacity since the war of at least 50 percent." For a few years, however, the loss of export demand and the existence of overcapacity were partially offset by the rapidly growing consumption in the American market which, in 1926, reached the all-time high of over 6,350,000 tons, refined basis.

No Hired Agents Needed To Procure Federal Grants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

LETTER FROM JOHN M. CARMODY, ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, when the City Council of Canton, Ohio, was asked to appropriate $2,000 to hire agents in Washington to promote the application of that municipality to obtain funds under the Lanham Act for water works and sewage improvements, certain members of the Canton council asked me if such an expenditure was necessary and if Washington persons who offer themselves for such service were in a position to influence the Federal Works Agency. In reply to an inquiry made by me of John M. Carmody, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, the following letter was received from him:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOM: In response to your question about the attitude of the Federal Works Agency and its constituent units with respect to lobbying to get projects through, or to get contracts for work, I should like to quote two regulations that have grown up as a result of experience in trying to render intelligent service to citizens without at the same time leading them to believe that they need special pleaders who collect fees from them.

Under Public Works Administration the following regulation is effective: "This offer is made subject to the express condition that, if the Commissioner shall determine at any time that the applicant has paid or agreed to pay, whether directly or indirectly, a bonus, commission, or fee to any person, firm, or corporation for attempting to procure an approval of the applicant's application, or for alleged services in procuring or in attempting to procure such approval, or for activities of the nature commonly known as lobbying performed or agreed to be performed in connection with the application, then the Commissioner shall have the right, in his discretion, to rescind this offer and any agreement resulting herefrom, and, in the event of such rescission, the United States of America shall be under no further obligation hereunder."

The following is quoted from contracts made by the Public Buildings Administration: "Covenant against contingent fees. The contractor warrants by the act of accepting and executing the contract that it has employed no person to solicit or secure the contract upon any agreement for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee. Breach of this warranty shall give the Government the right to terminate the contract, or, in its discretion, to deduct from the contract price or consideration the amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fees. This warranty shall not apply to commissions payable by contractors upon contracts or sales secured or made through bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained or regularly employed by the contractor for the purpose of securing business during the 2 years next immediately preceding the award of the contract."

These represent specific statements. I think it is fair to say to you that no local officials and no group of citizens ought to allow themselves to be mulcted by people who tell them that they have special influence or inside information with respect to any projects that are under consideration in these agencies. All projects are processed on their merits, to the extent that it is humanly possible for men to handle this business.

Let me give you an example of what I encountered myself in another agency 2 or 3 years ago. Four or five groups of citizens in different parts of an outlying State were interested in similar projects. The projects had merit, and were being considered on that basis, but funds were not immediately available. They knew about this. When they went home they discussed the matter, and a man in a nearby city persuaded them that he could get the projects through. He visited our offices. He was given precisely the same information that the other citizens had been given.

What did he do? From a Washington hotel he sent a wire to each of these groups saying that the projects were practically through, and that if they would wire him a named sum of money—in this case a few hundred dollars for each of them—he could get final approval. I did not learn of these telegrams for several weeks, because he had sent them to his own people from a hotel. In the meantime, of course, the projects were not approved because the appropriation had not yet been made available, but he had collected his money from some; not from all, however. It was not until I discovered by accident during a visit to the field that these telegrams had been sent that I was able to tell the citizens they had been bamboozled.

The fact of the matter is that we all get along better if we know we are dealing with officials doing their job, whether they be local officials or State officials, or Members of Congress, than when we think we are dealing with special pleaders.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. CARMODY,
Administrator.

Living Costs and Buying Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1941

AN EDITORIAL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

LIVING COSTS AND BUYING POWER

The National Industrial Conference Board presents its monthly statistical records, which show that the cost of living of wage-earner families in the United States in June rose 1.3 percent over the May level. That this is not the small figure it appears at first glance is shown by the fact that it is the largest monthly increase in the last 7 years with the exception of the advances in August and September 1939. Food prices led the upswing, with rents and clothing little changed.

While the consumer will not regard the National Industrial Conference Board's statistical news as cheering, he will find something better emanating from the Department of Commerce, which indicates that many Americans will have more money to spend this year than ever before in their history. The Commerce Department report shows that income payments to individuals in May reached a record high equal to an annual rate of $86,000,000,000. This compares with total income payments last year of almost $76,000,000,000 and with a peak in 1929 of a little better than $82,000,000,000.

The advance in living costs appears to be causing less official concern currently than the increase in buying power. Some commentators claim that an outpouring of purchasing power in excess of the volume of goods to be purchased will bring inflation. So they urge the taxing away of a part of the excess purchasing power.

In the preparation of taxation for this purpose, it should be realized that the rising tide of income payments mostly mirrors war orders and the Federal Government's colossal spending program. Everyone is not benefited financially by this arms and defense prosperity, at least not directly. So-called white-collar workers have been mentioned recently by some writers as the most notable exceptions. Taxes intended as a brake on excess purchasing power should not bear down on those classes which have no excess purchasing power and which, by reason of the continued rise in living costs, may even be finding it increasingly difficult to meet their monthly bills.

There is widespread skepticism manifested toward Government price controls, which failed to work well in World War days and

which hold no guarantee of doing better now. An even less charted sea to navigate is that of tax controls of purchasing power. Tremendous problems are being imposed upon Congress, and that happy solutions to all of them can be quickly found is too much to expect. What can be demanded of our representatives in Washington is that they seek earnestly to arrange that no unnecessary burdens be placed upon the people to bring discontent in this period of emergency. Intelligent protection of the American way of living will most speedily and surely advance us toward our goal of adequate defense against totalitarian aggression.

W. P. A. Writes a Great Chapter in the Construction of Grand Coulee Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1941

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River is rapidly becoming a completed project. W. P. A. performed a great job in making this possible. The massive block of concrete, containing more than 11,000,000 cubic yards of material, is in place. It is the largest structure of its kind in all the world. It harnesses one of the earth's grandest and mightiest rivers, the Columbia. Behind the dam the stormy, turbulent, and at times, treacherous river has become a placid, beautiful lake, stretching back 151 miles to the international boundary between this country and Canada. I give briefly the facts of the tremendous contribution made by W. P. A. to Grand Coulee Dam.

W. P A. PROJECT

In order to prepare the area lying back of the dam and reaching to the Canadian border, it was necessary to perform a tremendous amount of work in the alteration of highways; the removal of railroads; the shifting of villages and towns and farm homes; the removal of timber and similar obstructions, and even the removal of one of the most ancient Indian cemeteries in the western part of the United States. To perform this Gargantuan task, one of the greatest W. P. A. projects in the United States was set up, and during the last 3 years 3,000 men as W. P. A. employees were engaged in this work, working in all 10,000,000 man-hours. Their great task is now complete.

There must be a genuine personal pride on the part of the unnamed thousands of W. P. A. workers who can now stand on the shores of the altered Columbia River and view this great inland sea that has been created and know that each of them was one of the constructive builders who made it possible.

To the critics of W. P. A., who always seem to look for the shortcomings of that agency, I would recommend that they travel into the great Northwest, into the State of Washington, and into my congressional district, and go by boat from the dam northward for 151 miles to the Canadian border. For each mile of this marvelous journey let them bear in mind that the beauty and perfection of the artificial lake upon whose waters they are traveling was made possible by W. P. A. workers. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, to pay this deserved tribute to those thousands of unemployed men who here found an opportunity to turn their idle hours into enduring, constructive, and useful effort.

THE COULEE DAM RESERVOIR

This great reservoir will not alone be 151 miles in length, but it will have a width varying from 2,000 feet in the canyons to 4 miles where the mountains are less rugged, with a maximum depth of 375 feet. The dam will back water into the Spokane River, a tributary of the Columbia, for 35 miles; into the San Poil River for a distance of 8 miles; and a similar distance into the Kettle River. This storage reservoir will cover 82,000 acres of ground, or 130 square miles, and it will have a storage capacity of 10,000,000 acre-feet of water, which would be sufficient water to supply the needs of New York City for a period of 10 years. The shore line of this newly formed lake will be 550 miles in length.

The project was one that was sponsored by the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, and drew most of its manpower from the counties of Douglas, Grant, Okanogan, Ferry, Lincoln, Stevens, and Spokane. The first work began in December 1938, and it included clearing 54,000 acres of land along both banks of the river that was later to be submerged and become a part of the bed of the newly formed lake.

MANY W. P. A. CAMPS REQUIRED

In order to provide living quarters for the W. P. A. workers on this job who were miles removed from their homes, it became necessary to establish camps. It has been my pleasure upon several occasions to visit these camps, and they were models for efficiency and sanitation as well as wholesome surroundings. Three of the camps, because of their temporary nature, were tent camps and were designated Camp Spokane, Detillion, and Little Falls, each housing about 200 men. Four of them, to wit: Lincoln, Jerome, Keller, and Gifford were wood-construction camps accommodating from 400 to 600 men; and, oddly enough, one was a floating camp called Camp Ferry, which consisted of three barges 24 feet wide and 64 feet long, containing double-deck quarters, including kitchen, dining room, and refrigerator space. This camp accommodated a crew of 130 men, whose work it was to clear trees, brush, stumps, and debris from steep cliffs along the river, which were inaccessible to land crews.

PAUL BUNYAN TOOK PART

In order to tow the floating Camp Ferry from place to place on the river and transport the heavy equipment required, as well as transfer men, the W. P. A. constructed a Diesel power boat 65 feet in length with a 20-foot beam and a 4½-foot draft. This motorboat was provided with twin Diesel motors, which gave it a speed of 12 miles an hour, and it had a capacity of 100 tons of material and would transport 300 persons. The boat was used to run river rapids as well as navigate the artificial lake, and because of its size, and in keeping with a forest tradition in the great forests of the Northwest, it was named by Frank A. Banks, the supervising engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation, under whose direction Grand Coulee Dam was built, after that giant hero of whom every lumberjack has heard in the Pacific Northwest, Paul Bunyan. *Paul Bunyan* was the flagship of the W. P. A. navy on the new inland sea.

In addition to the flagship *Paul Bunyan* there were numerous other boats used by the W. P. A. crews, there being more than 21 boats and barges, and all of them, with one exception, were built by W. P. A. workmen. This exception was a 42-foot Diesel power tug, which was called the *Blue Ox*. It had been built for use in the construction of Boulder Dam. Two other well-known towboats were named the *Nespelem* and *Wellpinit*. These boats were named for historic Indian villages on the Colville Reservation.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned this watercraft used in the making of the marvelous new lake that is now in existence, because in future years, by contrast, it will seem crude when viewed in the light of the marvelous modern boats of every type and character that will be seen in service on this lake.

THE COLVILLE INDIANS AND THE COULEE DAM

No statement of the remarkable work done by the W. P. A. people in preparing the reservoir to become a great lake would be complete without some reference to the effect that it has had upon the genuine native Americans who have resided on the shores of the Columbia River for centuries.

The Colville Indians, as well as those of many other tribes, hundreds of years before the white man came, and up until the time of the construction of Grand Coulee Dam, would gather each year at Kettle Falls on the Columbia River, which constituted the major fishing ground for the Indians, and there would catch thousands of pounds of salmon, which fish were on their way to the spawning grounds from the Pacific Ocean. Kettle Falls was a point on the Columbia River more than 100 miles above Grand Coulee. The construction of the dam and the storage of the water behind it has completely submerged the falls, and likewise the construction of the dam forever put an end to the annual salmon runs at that place.

THE CEREMONY OF TEARS FOR KETTLE FALLS

The passing of Kettle Falls, by reason of the white man's work in his march of progress, left the Colville Indians and those of other tribes heartbroken. On June 17, 1941, just before the waters backed over the falls to forever hide the numerous giant boulders and the jagged rock formations that made the falls, the Indians gathered for a final 3-day meeting. They appropriately designated their meeting as the Ceremony of Tears for Kettle Falls. They stood solemnly and silently on the rocky banks of Kettle Falls and mourned the passing of their ancestral fishing grounds. The white brother,

who has been driven through the years by a spirit of progress, could not help but feel a bit of remorse as he observed this simple yet touching ceremony. Today, only a month later, as one stands on the shore of the newly formed lake, there is no evidence under the pleasant, quiet, cool waters of the Columbia at this point that through the centuries before it was a rushing torrent, where the great salmon leaped by the thousands out of the water in their struggle upstream to their native spawning grounds, and where they were taken by the thousands by the native Indians as a source of subsistence, to be used through the long winter months, their meat being preserved by a process of smoking peculiar to the Indians of that region.

ANCIENT INDIAN BURYING GROUNDS

Another very interesting phase of Indian life was involved in this unusual W. P. A. project. For years and years it had been the custom of the Indians to bury their dead near the river, and the great Columbia that served them as a highway of transportation and a source of food also became the final resting place for their loved ones when death overtook them. The Bureau of Reclamation made provision to remove the remains from these graves insofar as they could be located, and there were more than 1,200 such graves opened and the remains removed to higher ground. Some of the graves were so old that they were found beneath giant trees. Some were placed one above the other, indicating that one had disappeared before the second grave was dug. Some held the remains of one person, while others contained entire families. It was recalled by old Indians that more than a century ago a smallpox epidemic that swept through that region had wiped out whole families. The fact that there were so many graves near Kettle Falls was accounted for by the statement that when the Indians became afflicted they would go to the Falls for the purpose of being cured. Their treatment consisted of long hours in the sweat house, which was followed by a plunge in the icy waters of the river. The plunge was usually followed by a burial ceremony.

Pages could be written of the fascinating Indian legends connected with the upper Columbia River and particularly with Kettle Falls. That this portion of the river played an important part through the long years in the life history of the Northwest Indian could not be doubted by anyone, nor can anyone fail to feel some compassion for those Indians now residing in that region to whom Kettle Falls, as Nature had built it, had meant so much. It is only another evidence of the irresistable march of progress that in its forward movement at times would seem to be relentless and cruel, but from it all, through the years that lie ahead, we know there will come much to lighten the burdens and bless the lives of both Indians and whites.

THE COMMERCIAL SIDE OF THE W. P. A. PROJECT

In the clearing and preparation of this great reservoir there was a certain financial gain to the United States Government. There was much timber of commercial size and value, and more than 32,000,000 feet board measure of merchantable timber was cut, scaled, and delivered to sawmills farther down the stream. In this regard we had already begun to recover some of the cost incident to the mighty Grand Coulee Dam construction.

The electrical energy to be developed at Grand Coulee, when installation is made to capacity, will be more than 2,000,000 kilowatts. To translate this into kilowatt-hours the number would be multiplied by 365, and that in turn by 24, thus giving the kilowatt-hour production in 1 year. This electrical energy sold at the insignificant sum of 2 mills per kilowatt-hour would make an annual return in money to the United States Treasury of the colossal sum of more than $25,000,000.

Already industry is coming to the Northwest in volume and begging for this potential electrical energy. This beloved Nation of ours in its feverish haste to prepare itself from its enemies is finding the mighty Columbia an anxious and willing servant, and these unnamed thousands of W. P. A. workers who participated in this great task each may have the joy of knowing that they were a part of it.

THE NEW LAKE THAT WILL BE FORMED

Mr. Speaker, I have already stated that the lake that will be created as a result of the construction of Grand Coulee Dam which rises from bedrock to its crest some 550 feet, will be 151 miles in length. It will become a great transportation artery. Upon its surface thousands of commercial and pleasure craft will move. Along the shores of this lake many new industries will find suitable locations, and in some of the pleasant and picturesque spots attractive summer homes and resorts will be built. The lake itself will be a region known far and wide to sportsmen. By reason of the rich mineral resources existing in the great mountain ranges bordering on this lake, undreamed of mineral development will take place, made possible in a large part by the tremendous electrical energy output at the foot of the dam. It seems almost incomprehendible to realize that if the 18 giant generators were today installed and being driven by the falling waters of the Columbia River, they would be turning out more than one-twentieth of all the electrical energy now produced from every source in the whole of continental United States. This project is truly so colossal that the mind of man cannot comprehend it.

GRAND COULEE, THE KEY STRUCTURE

Grand Coulee Dam is referred to frequently as the key structure in a comprehensive development plan of the Columbia River in the United States. It is so called by reason of the fact that the 10,000,000 acre-feet of water that it will store will so regulate the flow of the river from the dam down to the Pacific Ocean, a distance of about 350 miles, as to increase year-round navigation in the river, so as to insure against floods, and above all, so as to greatly increase hydroelectrical energy production in all downstream dams.

The Army engineers' survey indicates that nine great power and navigation dams below Coulee are possible by reason of the tremendous fall of this river on its way to the sea. Two of these dams are now in existence, one being at Rock Island near Wenatchee, Wash., and the other the great Bonneville structure near Vancouver, Wash. When the remaining seven dams are constructed and power facilities installed, this great giant, the Columbia River, will be producing energy equal to that of 10,000,000 horses harnessed and at work, and the dam at Grand Coulee will be the greatest of them all. It will be the controlling and regulating dam upon which all those downstream will be dependent. When this day comes—and I do not believe it is far distant—there will arise a new electrical empire, both industrial and agricultural, the like of which will not exist anywhere else in the world.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to say that I have not discussed the tremendous possibilities incident to the development of 1,200,000 acres of the most fertile land on the globe that now lies a barren waste because it is without water. The Grand Coulee project will supply all the water needed to make homes for half a million people on this land, and in the cities and towns that will grow by reason of this development.

The brief outline that I have given in this short space of time indicates how lavish Nature has been to our region in giving us the mighty Columbia River. The results of converting the river into a useful instrumentality to bless mankind must never be permitted to pass into selfish private hands for exploitation, nor be subjected to the collection of a tribute from the general public, for whose benefit and advantage this whole project was undertaken and constructed.

I have gone somewhat into detail in an endeavor to give a picture of this great project in my State, and I, like the thousands of W. P. A. workers who were engaged in the clearing project, and the other thousands of mechanics and artisans who were directly employed upon the dam, and the additional thousands of people who have battled to make this great undertaking a reality, feel a just pride in being able to say with all those others, "I, too, had a part in building Grand Coulee."

Saturday, July 19, Seneca Falls Day, or Women's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1941

MEMORANDUM FROM NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum of the National Woman's Party regarding Seneca Falls Day, Saturday, July 19, or Women's Independence Day.

We are apt to assume that the freedoms we enjoy have existed forever and forget

that the rights and privileges which we enjoy have been made possible by the wisdom and vision and courage of men and women who have given their lives to securing those blessings for us.

The young people of the present day may easily forget unless they are reminded by the recognition of this anniversary that the women of the United States gained the vote after a long and gallant and bloodless campaign which had its inception 93 years ago in Seneca Falls, N. Y.

To that village in 1848 were called the liberal-minded men and women of this country for the purpose of examining the laws and customs of the Nation to the end that they might discover what the position of women was and how it might be raised to the same position held by men.

Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton signed the call.

By that time the suffrage had been extended to all white men, but to no women, and this first convention demanded "the sacred right to the elective franchise."

Due to the introduction of machinery and the consequent flight of women's work from the home to the factory, women were already entering industry in appreciable numbers. They were paid then as today much less than men. The convention demanded equal pay for equal work.

Seven years previously, in 1841, the first women had been granted degrees in Oberlin College, but universities, most colleges, all technical schools, and even high schools were closed to women. The convention demanded opportunities for education equal to those given men.

In addition they demanded equality with men in the professions, in marriage, and in the church. They demanded the right to contract, to be joint guardians with their husbands of their children, to possess their own property and their own wages.

Of all these demands only one has been thoroughly secured. The vote has been guaranteed to women because it rests no longer upon the whim of the States, but has been declared theirs by the Constitution itself in the nineteenth amendment. No State can now withdraw the vote from women.

Some of the States have granted some of the other demands. Some of the States added further discriminatory laws, and all States have it in their power to discriminate still further against women.

An amendment to the Constitution granting women the same protection that men now enjoy would wipe out the laws which now discriminate against them and prevent the enactment of new ones.

Such an amendment would grant women the same kind of citizenship now given men and complete our democracy It reads:

"Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

Wheat Marketing Quotas Unjust and Unfair in 1941 Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1941

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday we passed H. R. 5300, and I was glad to give this bill my active support.

The bill was in the nature of an amendment having the effect of modifying the farm marketing quota for wheat in 1941, but it only applied to a single unjust and unfair situation that has revealed itself in giving application to the marketing quotas and parity payment loans on wheat. This bill takes care of the wheat farmer who was a noncompliance farmer at the time the quotas and increased parity payment loans went into effect, if he finds that his crop has been a partial failure, and the total wheat that he produces is less than the normal yield would have been on his quota acreage.

WHAT ABOUT OTHER WHEAT FARMERS?

Mr. Speaker, out in the far Northwest we have one of the greatest wheat-producing regions in the Nation. This year, generally speaking, we have a crop above the normal yield. At the time this crop was planted the penalty for producing wheat on excess acreage was 15 cents a bushel, and no farmer could have been advised that it would be otherwise when harvest time came. Later we changed the law increasing parity loans to 85 percent of parity. In giving application to this increased loan, however, the Agriculture Department deducts a freight differential of about 12 cents a bushel, and then calculates parity on that basis, thus resulting in a loan of about 86 cents per bushel to our farmers, instead of 98 cents per bushel. At the same time the law provides for a 50-percent penalty on parity loans without giving any consideration to the freight differential. In other words, farmers in my district are discriminated against. The penalty of 49 cents a bushel is calculated on a 98-cents-per-bushel loan instead of 86 cents per bushel that we can get. Therefore, our penalty in no event should be more than 43 cents.

If a wheat farmer in the State of Washington sees fit to harvest the wheat grown on excess acreage, and takes advantage of the maximum loan on such wheat, which is 60 percent of parity, he would be able to borrow 52 cents a bushel, and immediately be subjected to a 49-cents-a-bushel penalty, thus leaving a margin of but 3 cents a bushel gross. It should require no argument to convince anyone how unjust and unfair this is to such farmer. This is even more true when we consider that the excess acreage was planted at a time when no one could have known that the penalty would be more than 15 cents per bushel.

In addition to this injustice there comes the further injustice in the fact that the noncompliance farmer is not given the right to the 85-percent parity loan, or any loan, on the wheat that he produces on his quota land. Surely, when he complies, either voluntarily or by compulsion, he should not be denied the privilege granted farmers who were compliance producers in 1940. These injustices arise largely out of passing a retroactive law.

THE REMEDY

To remedy the inequitable and, in many instances, ruinous effect, we should go much further than the mere enactment of H. R. 5300, which only cares for subnormal crops.

First. We should recognize the fact that the noncompliance farmers are not law violators and should not be so treated, because the penalties being imposed grow out of a condition that did not exist when the crop was planted.

Second. We should permit all wheat farmers, since quotas have been imposed subsequent to the planting of their crops which they are now harvesting, to borrow from the Commodity Credit Corporation 85 percent of parity on all wheat produced on quota acreage.

Third. In calculating penalty on wheat produced on excess acreage, the freight differential should be taken into consideration and the farmer given credit for it, just as it is deducted when a Commodity Credit loan is made.

Fourth. The farmer should be permitted to feed to livestock so much of his wheat produced on excess acreage as he desires without penalty.

Fifth. Storage facilities and storage provisions should be both more adequate and easy of application insofar as they involve wheat produced on excess acreage.

Sixth. Finally, due regard should be given to the fact that representations in many instances were made, and perhaps honestly, that if the wheat farmers voted for quotas, such quotas would not be effective as against the crop already planted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored in this brief period of time to point out some of the outstanding injustices resulting from the situation as it now prevails. By the legislation that we have just passed we have afforded some relief to the farmer producing a subnormal crop, but there still are thousands of wheat farmers in my district and State that will sustain great losses by reason of the existing situation, and I am hopeful that the Committee on Agriculture will shortly report out legislation that will correct the evils I have mentioned.

It is true that the 85-percent parity loan substantially increases the current market price of wheat, and in the crop to be produced in 1942 will doubtless prove of great help to the American wheat farmer, but it is not in keeping with the principle of American justice and American fairness to place a penalty upon the thousands of honest, patriotic American wheat growers, who are not, and who had no thought of committing any act that would subject them to a penalty in connection with their wheat acreage planted in the fall of 1940 or the spring of 1941.

Creed of Life of John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1941

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD

a statement of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., one of the country's great men of affairs. I consider his creed of life, which he enunciated recently in a radio program under the auspices of the United Service Organization's campaign, to be one of the most inspirational messages which it has been my pleasure to read. He reaches into the depths of his lifetime of experience and sets out 10 rules for conduct that have tremendous application today.

The moral philosophy of Mr. Rockefeller I conceive to be the essence of what has made America great. I wish that I were able to place this message into every home in the land, to every mother and every father, to every young man and young woman. The trouble and travail of today would melt away if these principles of conduct could find more general application here and abroad.

Mr. Rockefeller's rules are:

I believe in the supreme worth of the individual and in his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I believe that every right implies a responsibility; every opportunity, an obligation; every possession, a duty.

I believe that the law was made for man and not man for the law; that government is the servant of the people and not their master.

I believe in the dignity of labor, whether with head or hand; that the world owes no man a living but that it owes every man an opportunity to make a living.

I believe that thrift is essential to well ordered living and that economy is a prime requisite of a sound financial structure, whether in government, business, or personal affairs.

I believe that truth and justice are fundamental to an enduring social order.

I believe in the sacredness of a promise, that a man's word should be as good as his bond, that character—not wealth or power or position—is of supreme worth.

I believe that the rendering of useful service is the common duty of mankind and that only in the purifying fire of sacrifice is the dross of selfishness consumed and the greatness of the human soul set free.

I believe in an all-wise and all-loving God, named by whatever name, and that the individual's highest fulfillment, greatest happiness, and widest usefulness are to be found in living in harmony with His will.

I believe that love is the greatest thing in the world; that it alone can overcome hate, that right can and will triumph over might.

William Brockman Bankhead

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1941

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BROCKMAN BANKHEAD, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, we arrest our activities to pay tribute to Speaker BANKHEAD, who, well beloved and crowned with the most enviable honors that confidence and station can bestow, was taken from us in the midst of the performance of his duties at the moment of the highest possibilities of service. It is fitting that we should render the official tribute of respect, but the significance of this occasion is far deeper than that. It is the tribute inspired by love of country, as laying aside the differences and controversies, which seem but trivial in the face of man's adventures and God's providence, we stand united by the indissoluble bonds of common patriotism, knowing well that ungrateful republics cannot endure. The temples of democracy will be but as vain vestiges of a vanished faith if their altar fires are not kept burning by the memory of those who have met the supreme test and have laid down their lives in heroic fidelity and self-sacrifice. Above all, we give the tribute of the deep affection which moves us to speak in tender remembrance of a generous and kindly spirit who counted human fellowship more precious than all the pomp and circumstance of power. Not only those who had the privilege of intimacy, but the vast multitude who bowed in grief at his passing, had responded to the grace of his gentleness and called him brother and friend as well as Congressman.

It is difficult, while still we labor under the sense of personal loss to appraise fairly the qualities or to estimate justly the character of the departed friend. We are too apt at such a time to permit our emotions to color our judgment and to sway our verdict.

It is hard to restrain the ardor of friendship in writing of so widely gifted and attractive man, but a just appreciation should stand upon a foundation of understatement.

It was Macaulay who said that if one stopped under a doorway for a moment with Edmund Burke to escape a shower, he would be impressed with the certainty that he had met a kindly man. That was true of Speaker BANKHEAD.

His charm of manner, his musical voice, his unexcelled diction, his general knowledge made him a personality at once outstanding, remarkable, and pleasing.

His vigorous and penetrating mind, always at work, gained for him an immense extent and variety of knowledge. He had the learning of a philosopher, and to that learning he added the manners of a gentleman. His company was sought by the Members of Congress from all parts of the United States, for he was witty with a subtle sense of humor and a keen knowledge of proportion. He had an inexhaustible sense of discourse, with constant cheerfulness and high spirits.

Suffice it to say that for all of his adult life no great cause affecting his city or State has been discussed upon which he did not spread the luster of his talents, the spell of his eloquence, and the music of his voice. He was a strong partisan, but never permitted his loyalty to his party to interfere with his duty to his country. He was an aggressive advocate, but he always tried to be fair with an opponent, even when dealing his most telling blow. He believed intensely in his own side of an argument, but he was tolerant of opposition, and ever ready to applaud in an adversary that ability and character which bespeaks conviction and denotes sincerity. He has gone to his reward after having fought a good fight. May I now say in closing, as one who knew him, who admired his extraordinary talents and unrivaled attainments, that the great outstanding quality in his make-up was his intense and ever-present belief in the God of his fathers. WILLIAM BROCKMAN BANKHEAD was gifted and blessed above most of the men of his day and generation, but above all in that simple, childlike faith which was fostered at the knee of his mother, and which survived and grew with all the triumphs of his great career, and carried him onward into the next world with the fervor of a martyr and the certainty of one who knows.

May the Lord deal with him as one who has gained the palm and may his place in the world beyond the grave be even higher and more glorious than that which he won for himself among men.

Joint Income-Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE UNITED STATES NEWS

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the news dispatches of this morning carried word that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives voted 15 to 10 to retain as part of its new tax bill mandatory joint income-tax returns for husband and wife. I think it pertinent at this time to insert in the RECORD a résumé from the United States News.

This indicates that the press of the country has correctly sensed that mandatory joint returns is not a matter which concerns only the community property States but will be felt in every State in the Union. It will be thoroughly unpopular and will not produce sufficient revenue to justify its adoption.

Further, it is bound to face the possibility that it may fail on constitutional grounds and thereby deprive the Government of $300,000,000 of badly needed revenue. It would be the part of wisdom to prepare adequately in the first place and leave out of our financial planning a provision which may be unconstitutional and certainly is unwise.

The item from the issue of the United States News for July 25, 1941, is as follows:

[From United States News of July 25, 1941]

MANDATORY JOINT TAX RETURNS: VIEWS OF THE NATION'S PRESS

The proposal of the House Ways and Means Committee that the new revenue act provide for mandatory joint income-tax returns

by husbands and wives living together is generally condemned by the commenting press. Many of the commenting editors describe the proposal a penalty on marriage, while others contend it would nullify the independent status of women, acquired through long years of struggle.

"Enactment of the provision," declares the New York Sun (independent), "as pointed out by John G. Jackson, president of the New York State Bar Association, would go counter to the laws of New York and other States that a married woman is entitled to her separate estate and separate income. The protests that have already been made against this proposal are only a foretaste of those that Congress will get if it is written into the bill."

"If it becomes law," according to the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle (independent), "it will mean that the wife's income must be merged with that of her husband for tax purposes, and thus be raised into the extremely high surtax brackets of the pending bill. It puts a penalty on husbands and wives who have separate incomes."

Emphasizing the fact that "at present the filing of joint or separate returns is optional," the Worcester (Mass.) Gazette (independent) argues: "The weight of the amount which the new scheme would be expected to raise would fall chiefly on couples of the middle class in moderate circumstances, couples that are trying to maintain homes and educate children, couples in which the wife is trying to earn a little extra to provide such home and education. This is not a case of soaking the rich. It is the imposition of a special burden on a special group. There need be no fear that couples with two incomes are going to get off lightly by allowing them to continue the present option of filing joint or separate returns. Nobody is going to escape under the forthcoming tax schedules."

"The Government estimates that this change in the law will net something over $300,000,000," says the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette (Republican), with the conclusion that "there are other and better ways of raising this amount." The Post-Gazette comments further: "Why should their taxes be higher than those of a single man and single woman who may work right beside them and have exactly the same earnings? And if the single man and single woman are considering marriage, they may count up the extra tax and consider it as a deterrent."

"Congressmen," according to the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram (Democratic), "who in the past have violently condemned the separate return privilege as a piece of favoritism to the States which have community property laws investigated to find out just exactly how it operated in the country as a whole. They were more or less astonished to find that separate returns are filed everywhere. The discovery increased the likelihood that the fight of the community-property States to retain the separate return will be successful."

The Los Angeles (Calif.) Times (Republican) comments: "The fact that, in some cases, the surtax causes the aggregate payments of husband and wife to be somewhat smaller than if a single return were made is a peculiarity of the income-tax law which in no way affects the justice or validity of the community-property system. But if the wife's right to make a separate return is denied, then her right to half the property and income is also denied and the law declares her equality is voided."

"Against such a proposed invasion of constitutional rights," asserts the New Bedford (Mass.) Mercury (independent), "the House committee has offered only one argument—purely political—that a greater sum in taxes could be collected by the proposed method. Adding insult to injury, the committee was hypocritical in its attempt to justify the joint return, when it asserted that individual returns permitted 'avoidance' of surtaxes. Fortunately for the married taxpayers of the Nation, the tremendous growth of opposition to the committee's plan indicates public sentiment may force its abandonment."

H. R. 5336, Farm Credit Act of 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1941

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF H. R. 5336

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a summary of the provisions of the farm-credit bill, H. R. 5336, introduced on June 16.

This is a very important piece of legislation, and I am hoping that the Members of Congress, as well as all other interested parties, will give this legislation careful and serious consideration.

I expect to hold hearings on this bill sometime during the first of the coming fall.

The summary follows:

SUMMARY OF THE PROVISIONS OF PROPOSED FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1941

The basic objectives of the bill are two: First, to eliminate those factors which heretofore have caused break-downs in the national farm loan associations, which constitute the underlying structure of the Federal land-bank system, and to enable the system, on a sound, permanent, and self-sustaining basis, to extend credit to farmers at the lowest interest rates consistent with sound financing and operating practices; and, second, to provide specific authority for the Federal land banks and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to identify and adjust to their true status those of their loans which so far exceed the capacity of the borrower to pay that there is no hope of his financial rehabilitation through mere adjustment in the terms and conditions of payment. It provides also a method, adequately safeguarded, for making practically effective the right conferred upon farmers by section 75 (s) of the Bankruptcy Act to repurchase at their real value farms which, at the present time, for want of credit facilities, they are unable to repurchase, despite the fact that the law as recently interpreted by the Supreme Court gives them the right to do.

In order to accomplish the first of these objectives the bill provides for reorganizing the Federal land-bank system on a membership and patronage basis in lieu of the present stock basis. Borrowers from the banks would become members of the national farm loan associations, which, in turn, would be members of the Federal land banks.

The bill would require the retirement at par, in accordance with the present statute, of all outstanding stock of the banks and associations. Membership interests of the new members would be acquired by the payment of a membership fee equal to 2 percent of the unmatured principal of their obligations held by the bank. The proceeds of this fee would be used by the association to purchase an equivalent membership interest in the bank and would remain available as capital in the system. Fifty percent of it would be subject to the satisfaction of losses on loans made through the associations. Generally the proceeds of the stock of present borrowers would be available for payment of the 2-percent fee and for application on existing loans.

The bill would not become effective until a number of borrowers adequate to enable the system to operate effectively as a system of membership cooperative organizations had agreed to pay the fee and participate as members.

The stock now held by the United States in the land banks, together with the amount contributed by the United States as paid-in surplus of the banks would be converted into a single flexible revolving fund of Government capital available for allocation within the system at those points where it is most needed to accomplish the objectives of the system.

Former borrowers from the system who, on the retirement of their stock in the past, have not received payment or credit for the full par value of their stock, would be paid the difference between what they received and the par value of their stock.

Three major sources of income would be provided for the associations. First, they would be assured each year of income in the form of special preference distributions equal to one-eighth of 1 percent of the unmatured principal of the obligations of their members to the bank, and authority would be provided whereby the banks, with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, might pay out of net earnings, as additional preferential distributions, further amounts up to a total of one-half of 1 percent of the members' obligations. Second, provision is made for sharing net earnings of the system with the borrowers through patronage dividends to be paid to the associations. Third, provision is made for the banks and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to compensate the associations for the services the associations perform on behalf of the banks and the Corporation in handling and servicing loans.

On the other hand, the losses which heretofore have fallen upon the local associations would be limited in the future to 50 percent of the losses incurred. In this way half of the loss which heretofore has been absorbed by the local asosciations and has remained to form a cumulative burden upon them would be absorbed in the first instance on a district basis. Thus, by broadcasting the cooperative base through which, initially, these losses are absorbed, the threat of insolvency to local associations would be cut in half at the outset.

To the satisfaction of this 50-percent share of losses to be borne by the association would be applied the income available to the associations except—in order to avoid penalties upon sound management—income derived from compensation for their services to the banks, and income obtained by independent enterprise or investment. One-half of the association's fee fund and all of the association's income from the banks, except its compensation for services, including the one-eighth of 1-percent special-preference distribution and distributions to be made to the associations out of net earnings in the form of additional preferential distributions or dividends, would be subject to satisfaction of losses occurring in any year on loans made through the association. Provision would be made also for the orderly establishment by the associations of reserves, which likewise would be available for the satisfaction of their 50-percent share of any losses which occur on the loans of their members. The associations would satisfy their liability for losses on loans of their members annually out of these funds. If a loss should exceed the combined amount of annual income available for the satisfaction of losses, the reserves and the portion of the fee fund subject to losses, any unsatisfied residue of that

year's losses would be borne by the bank and the association would start the next year free of obligation for prior losses.

In this way the individual association's responsibility for losses would be limited to an amount which the association would be in a position to meet annually out of its income, reserves established for that purpose and 50 percent of its fee fund. The rest of the losses would be absorbed on a district-wide basis. Through this method the concentration of losses which in the past has wrecked more than 60 percent of the associations would be dispersed and the associations would be kept constantly in a situation where it would be feasible for them from time to time to make distribution, as dividends to their members, of a share of the net earnings realized on a district basis. The result these provisions are designed to accomplish by thus spreading costs and losses on a wider basis than has been possible under existing law is to establish the cooperative participation of members in the system's gains and losses at a broader level and thereby to provide reasonable assurance that local losses resulting from uncontrollable local causes cannot wreck the local units as they have in the past and to permit the system's profits to be shared more evenly among its members.

Additional strength in the form of greater and more flexible capacity to meet local or district emergencies within the system would be provided through the creation of a system-owned revolving fund to be built out of earnings. This capital fund, as it grows, will be available in increasing amount as a fluid capital fund for the system as a whole to supplement or replace the Government capital.

On the basis of this principle of greater fluidity of the Government capital and the system-owned capital, the strength and effectiveness of the system's capital resources are proposed to be increased by making them more flexible than is permitted by present requirements, which have been found to tie the funds at places in the system where they have not been needed and withhold them from places where their availability would have enhanced the effectiveness of its operations.

The bill provides that the rate payable to the banks and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation should be continued at 3½ percent until July 1, 1946, when the last of the presently outstanding bonds of the Federal land banks are callable. The rate on loans made after that date would be computed on the basis of the average annual cost to the banks and to the Corporation, respectively, of the funds they procure through sale of bonds to finance the loans they make, plus a charge of 1½ percent to cover operating costs and losses, and in the case of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation an additional charge sufficient to maintain the rate on Land Bank Commissioner loans ½ percent above the rate on land-bank loans. Loans made between the effective date of the act and July 1, 1946, would be computed on a similar basis after the latter date, but would be subject to a top limit of 4 percent. Loans outstanding when the act becomes effective would be computed after July 1, 1946, on the same basis as new loans made after that date but would be subject to a top limit equal to their original contract rate.

The new basis for computing the interest on land-bank loans is designed to permit a better distribution of the maturities of the obligations issued by the banks in order to procure funds with which to make loans. Heretofore, with the loan rate tied to the last issue of bonds, it has not been considered feasible to take advantage of low rates available in recent years on short-term financing, inasmuch as the issuance of short-term bonds at low rates would result in disproportionately low interest rates to those farmers fortunate enough to have loans granted before the next issue of bonds at a higher rate. Utilizing, as the bill does, a basis of average money costs, automatically weighted to take into account the volume of bonds outstanding of various maturities, sharp fluctuations in the loan rate would be avoided and the banks' financing could be conducted on the basis most desirable in view of market conditions when the financing is undertaken. As a consequence it is probable that it would be possible to carry on the system's financing operations on a basis far sounder and more realistic than that possible under the present law and credit could be made available to farmers at lower rates not only without weakening the system but on the contrary, as the result of adoption of fundamentally sounder methods of financing, on a sounder basis than is presently possible.

During the period prior to July 1946, while the 3½-percent rate prevails, the banks and Corporation would continue to be subsidized from the Treasury to the extent of all bond interest paid by them in excess of 2 percent.

Under the bill presently outstanding bonds of the banks would be fully guaranteed by the United States. Those held by the Corporation would be immediately callable as long as they were in the hands of the Corporation, and could be refinanced at current, more advantageous rates. New issues of bonds, however, would not be directly guaranteed. Instead the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation would be required to buy them if they could not be marketed within one-fourth of 1 percent of the market for guaranteed bonds.

The bill would make available also, as an additional source of financing for the land banks, discount privileges with the Federal Reserve banks.

The authority which the bill gives to the banks to refinance excessive indebtedness is limited to those cases where the bank or the Corporation is a creditor. Authority is given, however, to refinance the borrower's whole indebtedness in such cases up to but not beyond the appraised value of the land. Anything short of that would, of course, be a waste of effort.

The bill provides that committees selected by the local national farm loan associations shall have the responsibility of reviewing applications for refinancing. They are to determine, and to certify to the bank or the Corporation, whether the farmer has any reasonable expectation of being able to meet his indebtedness, or any reasonable expectation of being rehabilitated through adjustment of the terms of payment of the amount he owes, and whether he would be able to carry out the obligations required of him if he should be refinanced on the basis of his application.

This screening of applications by the association's committees would be supplemented by careful review of the applications by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation and, in the case of an obligation due to a Federal land bank, by the bank.

If the application is granted the farmer would be required to transfer title to his property to the bank or to the Corporation and operate it under a lease for a period of 5 years, at the end of which, if he has carried out the requirements of the lease and demonstrated his ability to carry on with the obligation, the property would be retransferred to him subject to a mortgage for the balance remaining after crediting an appropriate part of the amount he had paid as rent during the lease period. A similar method would be followed in connection with the refinancing of obligations of persons whose debts had been scaled down by the courts through proceedings under section 75 of the Bankruptcy Act and who had established the right under that act to refinance or repurchase their farms.

The bill provides also for limiting the taking and enforcement of deficiency judgments by the land banks and the Corporation to those cases where the borrower has not dealt fairly with the bank or the corporation or has available, or in reasonable prospect, means with which to pay his obligations without impairing his capacity to produce a living for himself and his family.

In order to facilitate the carrying out of the bill's provisions the time within which land bank commissioner loans may be made would be extended indefinitely, and the limits on the amount of such loans would be made to correspond with the land-bank limitations.

The bill contains other provisions incidental to these principal ones and amends or repeals those provisions of existing law which would be in conflict with the provisions which the bill makes effective.

Woman's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1941

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, July 19, was the ninety-third anniversary of Seneca Falls Day, or Woman's Independence Day. It is an important day in the long history of woman's struggle for liberty and equality.

In 1840 two women delegates to a world antislavery convention in London were denied the right to participate in the sessions. They were Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott, both Americans.

This denial led these women to examine the conditions under which women were living and the circumstances which denied them the right to participate in this very important convention. They found that women were living in a world of discrimination. They had no right to vote. In education, in industry, in the professions, and even in the church they had no equality with men.

On July 19, 1848, these women called a convention at Seneca Falls, N. Y., to discuss the future of women and to plan action to remove as rapidly as possible these many discriminations. Thus began a movement which spread all over America and had a marked influence even in other countries.

Gradually the rights of women in regard to their own property were extended. They became eligible to hold minor offices and to vote in certain localities on local issues. Eventually that part of the program culminated in the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution, providing—

> the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Participation by women in politics has now become an accepted fact. They hold many important offices in both the State and Federal Governments. In my own State of Iowa women some years ago were made eligible for jury service both on trial juries and on grand juries. It is now the overwhelming opinion among judges and lawyers that this step was

one of the greatest ever taken in the interests of law enforcement.

In the fields of education, business, and the professions important progress has also been made. In Federal legislation Congress has twice recognized the principle of equality since the adoption of the nineteenth amendment. The Nationality Act enables a woman to retain her citizenship even though married to a foreigner, and the Fair Labor Standards Act has given to women practically the same conditions as to men.

Although much has been accomplished, a great deal yet remains to be done. It was very fitting that representatives of the National Woman's Party who are now devoting time and energy to the struggle for equality for women should pause to pay tribute to these great pioneers in the field.

"Red" Soldiers Aid Democracies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. TAMMANY FARMER, COVINGTON, LA.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, to get real Americanism and a revelation of the sturdy, courageous spirit that has made America great, it is necessary sometimes to go out into the small towns and talk with these honest, God-fearing people who do not think that a dollar is the greatest thing in life, and who think that America is more than a stretch of land between two oceans. No factor has played a greater part in keeping alive this spirit of Americanism than the weekly country press.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to put into the RECORD an editorial from the St. Tammany Farmer, a weekly published in Covington, La., in my district, which I believe is fairly typical of the viewpoint of our people back home on present world developments.

The editorial in question was published in the issue of July 11, 1941, and is entitled "'Red' Soldiers Aid Democracies" and is as follows:

[From the St. Tammany Farmer, Covington, La.]

"RED" SOLDIERS AID DEMOCRACIES

Few people in the United States would have expected a few months ago that the "red" army of Soviet Russia would ever carry the blessings of the British and American Governments in battle.

This strange turn-around that puts Soviet soldiers fighting in common, and dangerous enemy of every democracy is retributive in that the menace that now threatens Russia was loosed upon the world largely because Joseph Stalin attempted to be smart.

This strain of selfish and cynical acquiescence in the inexcusable aggression against other peoples has come home to roost in the Soviet barn. Much of the same attitude was adopted by Poland when Czechoslovakia was invaded. It was the pattern followed by other smaller nations as the Nazi machine wantonly invaded its neighbors, regardless of solemn professions of nonaggression.

Despite the lessons that are available from Europe, where victimized nations rue the day of indecision, there are people in the United States who still profess to believe that a negotiated peace with Adolf Hitler is worth considering. What has any nation in the world up to this time gained from any agreement with the Nazis?

It is a frightful conclusion to be convinced that there is no way to peace and order in the world except through force of arms, ruthlessly applied to the marauders who molest civilization and destroy culture. It is a bitter choice for a peace-loving people to decide that they must prepare for total war, regardless of their dislike of war and understanding its folly.

In the face of recent history no government in the world would be fit to serve its people or hold office if its responsible heads were unwilling to face the brutal truth and to tell all citizens exactly what the world situation is today. The time has surely arrived when those who believe in truth, freedom, and honor must be ready to give more than verbal support to the principles by which they profess to live.

The Massachusetts Gerrymander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. ELIOT
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the redistricting of Massachusetts, where the Republican legislature is planning 10 Republican congressional districts and 4 Democratic districts, even though the State is actually divided 50–50, I include an editorial from the Boston Post of July 20. The Governor, despite all his protestations about his faith in democracy, is said to approve of the plan. And nobody has heard the Republican Senator from Massachusetts protest against it, as he should—as all believers in honest representative government should.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Boston Post of July 20, 1941]

THE GOVERNOR'S WORDS

Apparently the Republican Cliveden set of Massachusetts, which is desperately trying to anchor itself in political power for all the days of our generation, has failed to observe the one paramount issue in the rising tide of criticism that its actions have provoked.

There has been only one issue in all the spending program, in all the gerrymandering, in all of the political knifing, and in all the settling of scores.

The issue is simple honesty.

We contend, as do honest Democrats and Republicans throughout every district in the Commonwealth, that the gerrymander is a dishonest political maneuver, handed down to a sincere and trusting electorate, which deserves a better deal at the hands of its leaders.

The latest and most distressing example of this lack of straight dealing is the statement issued jointly by Speaker of the House Herter and Floor Leader King in defense of the plan for the embarrassment of Congressman TINKHAM as well as Congresswoman ROGERS, and the elimination of Congressman ELIOT and perhaps Congressman HEALEY.

Do not these men know that Representatives are elected to carry out the will of the people?

Do they not know that Congressman TINKHAM has been obeying the mandate of the people of his district, as he is required to do by sacred oath, and not the will of Republican whips on Beacon Hill? Do they not realize that Mrs. ROGERS also clings to the old-fashioned, but intrinsically honest belief that she is a representative of all the people, the poor and distressed as well as the wealthy and the privileged?

Is it getting so that a Representative in Congress has to obey like a robot the commands of this Cliveden set?

Can't we have a Congressman in this State who is able to carry out the bidding of the majority of people in his or her district, without suffering possible defeat because of the desires of a ring of bosses?

The people of Massachusetts will discount the paltry excuses of the Herters and the Kings, but will remember one salient and established fact.

This is, that the balance of power over the legislature is held by one man. He is Governor Saltonstall. The Bushnells, the Herters, the Goodwins, and the rest have not edged far enough into power to swing the heavy majority of the Republican legislators into line.

But the Governor can do this.

He still has in his hands the reins of power. He can swerve away from the new course he has pursued ever since he went into office for the second time.

He can remember his promise to be a good Governor, a servant of all the people, a man who was returned into office by more votes of the opposition party than any other in recent political history.

But will he remember? Were those words just campaign oratory?

We are forced to conclude that he will not remember and that his words were just so much campaign oratory.

Ninety-third Anniversary of the Equal Rights Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

DECLARATION OF SENTIMENTS AND RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED IN 1848

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, July 19 marked the ninety-third anniversary of the equal-rights movement. It was begun in the United States by the calling of what has become known as the Seneca Falls Convention.

The men and women who assembled in that little village of New York State nearly a century ago adopted a declaration of sentiments and a set of resolutions.

Of the 12 demands made upon the Nation, only 1, that of the vote, has been completely won. For all the rest women are still struggling. The sentiments and the resolutions follow:

DECLARATION OF SENTIMENTS ADOPTED AT SENECA FALLS CONVENTION, 1848

The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has never permitted her to exercise her inalienable right to the elective franchise.

He has compelled her to submit to laws, in the formation of which she had no voice.

He has withheld from her rights which are given to the most ignorant and degraded men—both natives and foreigners.

Having deprived her of this first right of a citizen, the elective franchise, thereby leaving her without representation in the halls of legislation, he has oppressed her on all sides.

He has made her, if married, in the eye of the law, civilly dead.

He has taken from her all right in property, even to the wages she earns.

He has made her, morally, an irresponsible being, as she can commit many crimes with impunity, provided they be done in the presence of her husband. In the covenant of marriage, she is compelled to promise obedience to her husband, he becoming, to all intents and purposes, her master—the law giving him power to deprive her of her liberty, and to administer chastisement.

He has so framed the laws of divorce, as to what shall be the proper causes, and in case of separation, to whom the guardianship of the children shall be given, as to be wholly regardless of the happiness of women—the law, in all cases, going upon a false supposition of the supremacy of man, and giving all power into his hands.

After depriving her of all rights as a married woman, if single, and the owner of property, he has taxed her to support a government which recognizes her only when her property can be made profitable to it.

He has monopolized nearly all the profitable employments, and from those she is permitted to follow, she receives but a scanty remuneration. He closes against her all the avenues to wealth and distinction which he considers most honorable to himself. As a teacher of theology, medicine, or law, she is not known.

He has denied her the facilities for obtaining a thorough education, all colleges being closed against her.

He allows her in church, as well as in state, but a subordinate position, claiming apostolic authority for her exclusion from the ministry, and, with some exceptions, from any public participation in the affairs of the church.

He has created a false public sentiment by giving to the world a different code for men and women, by which moral delinquencies which exclude women from society, are not only tolerated but deemed of little account in man.

He has usurped the prerogative of Jehovah himself, claiming it as his right to assign for her a sphere of action, when that belongs to her conscience and to her God.

He has endeavored, in every way that he could, to destroy her confidence in her own powers, to lessen her self-respect, and to make her willing to lead a dependent and abject life.

Now, in view of this entire disfranchisement of one-half the people of this country, their social and religious degradation; in view of the unjust laws above-mentioned, and because women do feel themselves aggrieved, oppressed, and fraudulently deprived of their most sacred rights, we insist that they have immediate admission to all the rights and privileges which belong to them as citizens of the United States.

In entering upon the great work before us, we anticipate no small amount of misconception, misrepresentation, and ridicule, but we shall use every instrumentality within our power to effect our object. We shall employ agents, circulate tracts, petition the State and National Legislatures, and endeavor to enlist the pulpit and the press in our behalf. We hope this convention will be followed by a series of conventions embracing every part of the country.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT SENECA FALLS CONVENTION, 1848

Resolved, That such laws as conflict, in any way, with the true and substantial happiness of woman are contrary to the great precept of nature and of no validity, for this is "superior in obligation to any other."

Resolved, That all laws which prevent woman from occupying such a station in society as her conscience shall dictate, or which place her in a position inferior to that of man, are contrary to the great precept of nature and therefore of no force or authority.

Resolved, That woman is man's equal—was intended to be so by the Creator—and the highest good of the race demands that she should be recognized as such.

Resolved, That the women of this country ought to be enlightened in regard to the laws under which they live, that they may no longer publish their degredation by declaring themselves satisfied with their present position, nor their ignorance, by asserting that they have all the rights that they want.

Resolved, That inasmuch as man, while claiming for himself intellectual superiority, does accord to woman moral superiority, it is preeminently his duty to encourage her to speak and teach, as she has an opportunity, in all religious assemblies.

Resolved, That the same amount of virtue, delicacy, and refinement of behavior that is required of woman in the social state should also be required of man, and the same transgressions should be visited with equal severity on both man and woman.

Resolved, That the objection of indelicacy and impropriety, which is so often brought against woman when she addresses a public audience, comes with a very ill grace from those who encourage, by their attendance, her presence on the stage, in the concert, or in feats of the circus.

Resolved, That woman has too long rested satisfied in the circumscribed limits which corrupt customs and a perverted application of the Scriptures have marked out for her, and that it is time she should move in the enlarged sphere which her great Creator has assigned her.

Resolved, That it is the duty of the women of this country to secure to themselves their sacred right to the elective franchise.

Resolved, That the equality of human rights results necessarily from the fact of the identity of the race in capabilities and responsibilities.

Resolved, therefore, That, being invested by the Creator with the same capabilities and the same consciousness of responsibility for their exercise, it is demonstrably the right and duty of woman, equally with man, to promote every righteous cause by every righteous means; and especially in regard to the great subjects of morals and religion, it is self-evidently her right to participate with her brother in teaching them, both in private and in public, by writing and by speaking, by any instrumentalities proper to be used, and in any assemblies proper to be held; and this being a self-evident truth growing out of the divinely implanted principles of human nature, any custom or authority adverse to it, whether modern or wearing the hoary sanction of antiquity, is to be regarded as a self-evident falsehood, and at war with mankind.

Resolved, That the speedy success of our cause depends upon the zealous and untiring efforts of both men and women, for the overthrow of the monopoly of the pulpit, and for the securing to woman an equal participation with men in the various trades, professions, and commerce.

F. B. I. Cooperation With State Authorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under permission given me to extend and revise my remarks, I present the following copy of a bill which I introduced today, authorizing the assistance and cooperation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation with the local authorities in cases of felony:

A bill authorizing the Federal Bureau of Investigation to cooperate with State authorities in the investigation of certain crimes

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever there is reason to believe that a felony has been committed resulting in the death, or disappearance of, or serious injury to, any person, the Federal Bureau of Investigation may assist and cooperate with the local authorities in the investigation of such offense.

Many Camps Unsuited for Training of Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, during the World War the War Department established training camps in a number of out-of-the-way places that were wholly unsuited for the purpose of training soldiers. At that time it was suspected that a number of the selections had been made largely to appease certain parts of the country or that they involved real-estate transactions that would not bear investigation.

It had been hoped that the War Department would not commit the same mistake should occasion again arise when it became necessary to establish camps to train men in future emergencies. Evidently the War Department is incapable of learning or profiting by past experiences.

Sheriff William J. Butcher, of Morrison County, Minn., recently visited four camps located in the deep South, which included Camp Claiborne. I quote from the Little Falls (Minn.) Daily Transcript of Monday, July 7, as follows:

[From the Little Falls (Minn.) Daily Transcript of July 7, 1941]

Poisonous snakes, spiders, mosquitoes, and stagnant water infest the area of the four big

camps, into which the Government has poured millions of dollars. Reports which Sheriff Butcher received at the camp, though not official, are that there will be no maneuvers and that all four camps have been condemned—the troops will have to move out.

"Don't go back to Little Falls and tell them that this is a good camp," one of the men admonished.

OFFICERS DOING GOOD JOBS

"But the officers apparently are doing all they can for the safety of the thousands of soldiers who are in training under these conditions," the sheriff said. Every possible health measure has been taken, but training is confined to the filled-in areas, which limits activities. Rumors are that the troops soon will be moved to some part of the country where climatic and topographical conditions will provide more efficient training. No mention was made of Camp Ripley in this respect.

Water stands everywhere except on highways and areas which have been built up. Animals roam the high places and go to sleep at night on the public roads. Motorists have to drive with extreme care to avoid striking them.

FABULOUS SPENDING IN EVIDENCE

Evidence of fabulous spending of the public's money is to be seen throughout the military areas, but Louisiana simply is no place for a white man to live, the sheriff declared. The food is good, but the drinking water is warm and insipid. And the heat is terrific.

Hundreds of boys are in the hospital for insect bites and stomach ailments, Sheriff Butcher was told. There were no local cases that he heard of. Morale among the Little Falls men is high. No member of Company D or Company E has been put in the guardhouse or a civilian jail.

All the boys wanted to say hello to everyone back home, which is a pretty big order, but Sheriff Butcher thought he could fill it through the Daily Transcript.

The State of Minnesota has on numerous occasions offered to transfer Camp Ripley to the Federal Government for training purposes. That camp has been pronounced one of the best camps in the country as to location, area, climate, drainage, transportation, and geographical location. For years it has been used by the National Guard from a number of Mississippi Valley States, and at times as many as 35,000 men have been garrisoned there at one time. Officers and men have pronounced it one of the best camps in the country. The Minnesota Legislature, at its last session, appropriated a million dollars to enlarge the camp so as to provide as much land as the Government could possibly use. The excuses given by the War Department for not designating Camp Ripley will not hold water. It may be true that there were not enough barracks available. To that excuse let me call attention to the fact that there were no barracks or buildings of any kind on sites that have been selected in the South—not even roads in some instances—where Ripley already had thousands of acres of cleared, high, dry, and accessible land that were all ready for maneuvers as compared to some of the swamp sites selected by the War Department in the South, that must be abandoned after the expenditure of millions of dollars. At this point I desire to quote from a report recently made on Camp Ripley:

Topography of Camp Ripley and the surrounding area, the report said, "is exceptionally well suited to military training and maneuvers and the soil will stand up under all types of weather conditions."

FAVORABLE WEATHER CITED

The report in addition pointed out:

"This area has more clear days and fewer rainy days than most parts of the country, and precipitation is well scattered through the year, assuring no prolonged interruption of training due to weather.

"The State of Minnesota has signified its intention of cooperation by appropriating $1,000,000 for land acquisition to enlarge the camp, which, with $4,000,000 already invested, brings to $5,000,000 the cost of development for Army use.

"AMPLE LABOR

"Ample labor exists in the area for any large expansion, and housing facilities for several thousand workers are available on the reservation.

"Camp Ripley is strategically located in almost the exact center of North America, has excellent railroad and highway facilities north, south, east, and west.

"The rich agricultural Northwest can easily supply an abundance of the best health-building foods obtainable.

"The camp is situated in the heart of the 10,000 lakes of Minnesota with all the attendant recreational advantages."

I do not know who is responsible for some of the selections that have been made, but I will say without fear of contradiction that the sites were selected because of political and other considerations that wholly disregarded the welfare of the country at large and of those who were to receive their training in these camps. I would suggest that civic and patriotic organizations, and the national committee cause the whole mess to be investigated and that the facts be made known to the American people who will take remedial action in November 1942. The facts, as I get them, present an indefensible situation that is little short of scandalous.

Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO NEWS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the San Francisco News of Tuesday, July 15, 1941, entitled "Time for Action."

[From the San Francisco News of July 15, 1941]

TIME FOR ACTION

Organized labor has a specially protected status under the Federal antitrust laws for a thoroughly good reason.

Strikes, boycotts, picket lines affect interstate commerce. Labor often gains its demands by restraining trade. But workers must have the right to act as groups—as unions—to seek better wages, shorter hours, safer working conditions.

And so Congress, on the sound principle that "the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce," has guaranteed this right. Unions per se are not to be treated as illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade. They and their members are not to be punished by the antitrust laws for using lawful methods to attain legitimate objects.

But the men who control certain unions have abused the right. They have restrained trade in order to increase building costs, to boost food prices, to prevent use of improved materials and more efficient methods, to compel the hiring of useless and unnecessary labor, to help certain employers drive competing employers out of business, to enforce systems of graft and extortion, and to injure rival unions.

The guaranty given by Congress to protect honest labor has been used as a screen behind which dishonest labor bosses prey on the public.

We do not believe Congress ever intended union leaders to be immune to antitrust prosecution when they do such things. The Supreme Court has held that they are not immune if they do such things in conspiracy with employers. But recent decisions of the Court interpret the intent of Congress to be that immunity shall apply to all restraint of trade by unions alone.

These decisions have encouraged "labor's hidden hold-up men" to believe that they have a special license to engage in their antisocial practices. It's up to Congress to remedy that bad situation by restating its own intent in language that labor bosses and courts cannot misunderstand.

So, again, we call attention to the Monroney and Walter bills now in Congress.

These measures clearly define the legitimate objects of unions—collective bargaining, wages, hours, working conditions, and the like. Thus they would strengthen the guaranty that labor shall not be punished for seeking these objects. They also define objects that should be illegitimate for labor, just as they are for everyone else—illegal price fixing, competition killing, graft, extortion, etc.—and provide that unions, union officials, and members shall be subject to the antitrust laws if they restrain trade to gain such objects. Thus they would give the public, including honest workers, greatly needed protection.

Both bills are before the Judiciary Committee of the House, of which Representative SUMNERS, of Texas, is chairman. Let's have action on them.

American Blood Demanded by Great Britain in Her Present War and the Permanent Occupation of Germany by the United States and Great Britain Planned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of July 16, 1941:

[From the New York Times of July 16, 1941]

GREATEST UNITED STATES AID SEEN ONLY IN A. E. F.—VANSITTART, "SPEAKING PLAINLY," ON HIS RETIREMENT, ASSERTS OUR ARMY IS NEEDED

(By Craig Thompson)

LONDON, July 15.—Lord Vansittart, retired permanent Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, today declared that the only

thing possible to be gained from the German attack on Russia is time—time wherein Great Britain and the United States can continue preparations—and he asserted that American help to Britain will be most effective when another American expeditionary force lands in France.

Lord Vansittart was permanent Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs from 1930 to 1938, and then was diplomatic adviser to the Foreign Office until his recent retirement.

In a remarkable meeting with a small group of correspondents today he made plain that he had long wanted to speak plainly to America, and now being outside the governmental strait jacket he intended to do so. Tomorrow he will take a seat in the House of Lords at the age of 60.

For the present he gave no credence to Japanese action on a large scale because he believed such action "would depend on the outcome of the European effort."

EXPECTS DEFEAT OF RUSSIA

He declared that the Germans had made substantial progress in Russia, and he doubted seriously any possibility except a German victory. His one hope was that the Russians would hold up the Germans long enough to permit the British and Americans to get into full swing production.

He subscribed fully to the theory that the German attack on Russia was at least partly dictated by the desire to release a million, or possibly two million men for production. These men are needed not only in German factories but also in those of occupied countries. In the German view, as understood here, that could only be achieved by immobilizing the Russian Army.

Lord Vansittart suggested that the only way a permanent peace can be obtained and maintained is by the British and Americans—if victorious—sitting on the Germans with knife in mouth prepared to break any sword raised.

"The present generation of Germans," Lord Vansittart declared, "are so poisoned with Nazi doctrine that there will be nothing to do but take them into protective custody. If the democracies expect to survive, they must be dominant. If their dominance affords protection, they must protect it."

WAR SEEN AS COUNTERREVOLUTION

Speaking as one who had had some hand in shaping British policy for the past few years, Lord Vansittart declared that the war against Hitler was not a world revolution but, in effect, a counterrevolution. He said nothing had been spread so rapidly as Nazi doctrine in the last few years. He expressed the belief that it had poisoned much of England and America. On the other hand, he regarded spread of Russian doctrine as far less dangerous or likely to make converts.

He asked, "Is Anglo-Russian alliance one more step in world revolution?" And answered, "I don't think so. Nazi-ism is a much more exportable doctrine and more efforts have been made to export it."

He added that in the 3 or 4 years wherein the Nazis have been exporting their doctrine to the United States and South America they had made more progress than the Communists in 20.

With a sigh of regret he declared that "it would have been a great gain if our diplomacy had succeeded in bringing Russia in on our side."

He predicted that a tender peace would be offered by Herr Hitler and it would be very specifically directed at America and the British dominions. He said the offer would be intended to give the Germans time to mobilize their forces for striking at the rest of the world, and any such peace would mean that the next war would come far sooner than the war that followed Versailles.

He used one figure of speech that Americans should remember: "World politics," he said, "is a bridge game and it is important to remember in bridge that a player must have a lock at his hand before he can bid."

Steam Plants Are Needed by United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

ARTICLE FROM BUFFALO EVENING NEWS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article, which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News on July 18, 1941.

In the light of the present cry of the President and his political mouthpieces or spokesmen that "more power is needed for national defense," this seems to be a very timely statement. Hearings on the St. Lawrence project before the Rivers and Harbors Committee have brought out the fact that steam plants can be more readily and cheaply constructed for an immediate emergency. Those opposing this unnecessary construction have continuously and constantly insisted that numerous steam plants should be constructed when and where needed instead of using a huge amount of men, money, and materials for the construction of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of July 18, 1941]

STEAM PLANTS ARE NEEDED BY UNITED STATES

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, July 18.—Within the last 48 hours there was held at the White House a conference, the true significance of which has not been reported in the press. What was announced was the proposed expenditure through Government subsidy or loans of about $1,000,000,000 for new plants to take care of a shortage in electric power. What was inadvertently concealed was the real responsibility for the tragic situation in which the electric-power industry finds itself today as a consequence of a blunder in judgment made by President Roosevelt, aided and abetted by some of the very men who conferred with him on Wednesday, namely, Secretary Ickes; Senator Norris, of Nebraska; Ben Cohen, and the other advocates of public ownership who have influenced the President for the last several years to harass and smother the privately owned public utilities.

The death-sentence law, which has kept the executives of holding companies busily occupied for 18 months now in almost daily conferences at the S. E. C. instead of tending to their jobs, has had the effect of stunting the growth of electric power in America by preventing financing for needed expansion over a period of 7 years.

The present shortage of electric power was foreseen as far back as August 1937, in a memorandum submitted to the President by the Federal Reserve Board, but not made public. The Federal Reserve Board memorandum said in part:

"It takes ordinarily about 2 years to plan and equip a modern steam-generating plant and 3 years more to develop new hydroelectric stations. Apart from some large Federal hydroelectric projects, there are at present comparatively few important new central stations under construction, and if the expansion of generating capacity had to await the planning and completion of such stations, an acute power shortage would inevitably ensue before they could be brought into production.

What happened to this report? It was pigeonholed because the President, fearful of antagonizing the public-ownership school of thought in the New Deal, let matters drift and refused to accept the well-worked-out compromise for settling the whole electric-power problem submitted to him in confidence by Wendell Willkie in January 1938. Mr. Roosevelt allowed enough money to go into Federal-aid projects so that investors were frightened. This killed the market for the financing of common stocks from which utility companies have since been told by Government decree they must get their expansion money instead of by further issues of bonds.

Then in September 1938 the President admitted in a press conference that he feared an electric-power shortage in the event of war. Today the administration is to lend $475,000,000 a year for the next 5 years for new plants—a fraction of needed expansion—and recognizes at last that steam plants are an essential part of the electric-power plant of America, as contrasted with hydroelectric developments, and far more certain as has been proved now by the drought in the Tennessee Valley which at times seriously curtails power production.

If administration officials were not constantly seeking to shift the blame as they are repeatedly trying to do in the case of aluminum production, which is inadequate to meet the fantastic figures of needs being bandied about, there would be no inclination now to go back to the record as it would be much better if bygones could be bygones—a lesson apparently which Secretary Ickes refuses to learn and which the President does not encourage him to learn in the interest of national unity.

The Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D. WINTER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article appearing in Coronet magazine written by A. B. Lee, box 171, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, D. C., which has a peculiar interest to me.

Kansas is the State of pioneers in the kind of home construction, "Houses of earth," with which this article deals. With the coming of the earliest settlers the sod house came into being as the only kind of home available for those hardy pioneers. In 1855 Lawrence was a village of sod houses. Many of them had crude thatched roofs of prairie grass. In building a house on the homestead the line for the wall was usually drawn after dark

so that it could be located by the North Star. One pioneer said the whole thing "was made without mortar, square, plumb, or greenbacks." All that was needed was a pair of willing hands. Buffalo robes sometimes closed the windows and doors, but the poverty of those early settlers was shared by all. Occasionally the newcomer had a "bee," and the neighbors for miles around gathered at the "claim" and they would put up his house in a day. The principal tools of construction were a sod plow and a spade.

These houses were mighty comfortable in the winter and did not need much fire to keep them warm. Those constructed in later years had the luxury of frame roofs, windows and door sills, and gave the settler a substantial house which was warm in winter and cool in summer. Many a family whose children constitute the substantial citizens of Kansas today were reared in sod houses and some of them attended schools held in houses built of this material.

It seems particularly fitting that the State of Kansas should have recognized the earth structure wall as an "economic out" for the home builders, because our sod house frontier is a history of these dwellings and the University of Kansas has been exploring every possible method of earth structure walls and is now contemplating the erection of a building on the campus of this university at Lawrence, Kans., with walls of rammed earth. So, when I read this article in Coronet expounding the fact that anybody who owns a lot is standing on his own best building material supply, I was impressed with the possibility of accomplishing low-cost housing which will give our citizens the maximum of housing facilities at the minimum of cost. The findings of this author, who has published a booklet of complete and illustrated instructions on how to build these houses, are unqualifiedly supported by the findings of Dr. Lyman J. Briggs, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, and other eminent authorities. The Bureau of Standards, at the request of the N. Y. A. and Indian Affairs Commission, has made structural tests of rammed earth and adobe walls, and its preliminary reports appear in the Coronet article. I desire to call it to the attention of Members of Congress by including in my remarks both the article in an abridged form and the Bureau report, which is as follows:

HOUSES OF EARTH

(By A. B. Lee)

Since human beings stopped living in caves they have built their castles in the air or their cabins in the sky and hoped they would some day make them come true. But too often they faded with the mirage.

In our struggle toward a higher civilization we have standardized our way of life, and this new order to which we must conform has forced the many to become cliff dwellers in huge piles of masonry that are shelters, but never homes. For years a housing shortage has existed throughout the country for that great army in the low-income group. If their courage should exceed their caution, and they erected homes on plots they had acquired by small payments, they are weighed down for years by the tribute paid to contractors, unions, and material dealers. Added to this is the fear of foreclosure if these mortgage payments, "that are just the same as rent," are not met. A way out would be a godsend for those who long for a better way of life.

And there is a way out.

Back in 1937 the writer submitted an article titled "Houses of Earth," to Coronet magazine, and it appeared in the June issue of that year. It briefly told how castles in the air might be brought down to earth and built of the earth itself. There is nothing new about the method, for it is as old as recorded history, and is known in France as Pise de Terre.

The response to that article was immediate and amazing. Thousands of inquiries were received by the editors and the author asking for additional information on rammed-earth houses. Every State in the Union was represented, as also were such far places as China, South Africa, Australia, India, and many European countries. But when members of the building trades were approached for their views on this type of construction there was little enthusiasm evinced. Doubts were raised in the minds of a few as to whether all was well along the rammed-earth front.

EARTH WALLS WILL BEAR THE LOAD

The answer was forthcoming at the National Bureau of Standards, from a man who has demonstrated unusual ability in being able to know with given material what can and what cannot be done. This man is Dr. Lyman F. Briggs, noted for his intensive laboratory procedure. The problem laid before him was the ever-recurring contention by building contractors and private individuals that rammed earth walls would crumble when subjected to stresses and strains. Dr. Briggs' answer was emphatic and gratifying: "These walls will bear the load."

The following statement was made by Dr. Briggs:

"I feel that Coronet's articles on rammed-earth houses serve effectively to bring this type of construction to the attention of the public and to stimulate the interest of home owners.

"Although walls of earth have been known and used successfully since prehistoric times, there is very little data on their strength, weather resistance, and heat transfer; therefore, at the request of the National Youth Administration and Office of Indian Affairs, we included five earth-wall constructions in our program on the determination of the structural properties of low-cost house construction.

"We believe that the strength and other structural properties are adequate for one- and two-story houses if the work is done by persons who have had some training. There is reason to believe that anyone with a little instruction can build earth walls successfully.

"The fact that people having little money can build earth walls themselves with materials readily available appeals to me very strongly. Making information on earth constructions available through our reports is, I think, an effective way to help the people of this country to help themselves.

"Our study was planned by a group of experts who were experienced in such construction. The group included Mr. Thomas Hibben, who has built rammed earth houses under the Farm Security Administration; Mr. Elbert Hubbell, instructor of rammed earth, Office of Indian Affairs; Commander C. S. Stevenson, Navy Department, who has constructed field hospitals of earth in China; Mr. T. A. H. Miller, Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering, a well-known authority on rammed-earth construction; and Mr. Francis MacDonald, consulting engineer, who developed the use of earth with admixtures of portland cement, called terracrete. Messrs. Hubbell and MacDonald supervised the construction of all specimens.

"Five types of earth construction were studied, adobe brick, bitudobe brick, monolithic terracrete, terracrete block, and rammed earth. The earth used was a mixture containing 50 percent of clay loam and 75 percent of sand gravel with moisture content between 10 and 12 percent. Analysis of the mixture showed it to consist of 43 percent of fine sand, 19 percent coarse sand, 22 percent silt, 17 percent clay, and 8 percent colloids.

"The weights of all five constructions were nearly the same ranging from 120 lb./ft. 3 for the bitudobe to 137 lb./ft. 3 for the terracrete block. The monolithic terracrete and rammed earth walls were 14 inches thick, the block walls approximately 12 inches thick. The adobe, bitudobe, and rammed earth walls carried compressive loads up to 11 lb./in. 2; the terracrete walls were stronger, carrying compressive loads up to 800 lb./in. 2, both under eccentric loading All of the walls withstood transverse loads such as are produced by the wind of 50 lb./ft. 2 or more. The performance under impact was better than that of many types of masonry walls, and, like masonry walls, the earth walls resisted concentrated loads extremely well, except near sharp corners. The racking strengths of the adobe, bitudobe, and rammed earth walls were of the order of 2,000 to 3,000 pounds per foot, while those of the terracrete walls were greater than 6,250 pounds per foot.

"From the point of views of the structural properties, all five forms of earth construction are quite satisfactory. Our measurements of heat transfer are not completed. Earth walls have high heat capacity which aids in reducing fluctuations of temperature and maintaining a more uniform temperature. In summer, the temperature inside an earth house does not rise to as high values as houses having walls of lower heat capacity. Earth walls are, of course, fireproof. Earth walls must be protected against the erosion of driving rains.

"The Bureau has made no special study of protective coatings for earth walls, but a large amount of work has been done at the Agricultural Experiment Station of South Dakota State College. In many climates protection can be secured by using an overhang on the roof.

"Members of the Bureau staff have had no personal experience in the construction of complete houses of earth and are not in a position to advise on the structural details. Some instruction is required, and the moisture must be held within definite limits. The cooperating experts referred to earlier in this letter are in a better position than we are to provide advice on the construction of houses. Whether or not earth walls will solve to a great extent the urgent problems of adequate houses for low-income groups must be decided by housing experts and by experience.

"Respectfully,

"LYMAN J. BRIGGS,
"Director."

The Coronet article continues:

One of the chief stumbling blocks to the use of rammed earth as a building material has been the attitude of the Federal Housing Administration. When approached on the subject of accepting rammed-earth houses as security for long-term loans, the requests were denied. Such a loan was sought by Mr. Henry Hassey, of Irvington, N. J., from both the Federal Housing Administration and the Farm Security Administration. He was refused this aid on the grounds that "at the present time no adequate basis has been developed upon which the permanence and durability of rammed-earth construction can be sufficiently predicted to justify F. H. A. acceptance as security for long-term loans." And yet F. H. A. had only to observe in Washington, D. C., a guinea pig of rammed hilltop earth in a house built in 1773 at 1300 Rhode Island Avenue NE. and still occupied and in excellent condition.

To Mr. Hassey it was a paradox that some Government Departments spent money on rammed-earth projects while other Departments of that same Government refused to earn money through loans on them.

Being a persistent person, he learned that several hundred rammed-earth houses had been erected in Puerto Rico by the Puerto

Rico Reconstruction Administration. He heard of the pisé houses built on the Indian Reservation in South Dakota by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the work at Gardendale, Ala., by the Resettlement Administration. Among the letters received in his search for information on rammed-earth houses was one from Ralph L. Patty, chairman of the department of agricultural engineering, South Dakota State College, who wrote:

"It is not the cheapness of rammed earth walls that we are interested in. We are interested in the fact that they are the most valuable, and that it would be practically impossible to equal a wall of this kind, which is almost a perfect insulator; at the same time, being fireproof, soundproof, weatherproof, and proof against termites or white ants. We know that a rammed earth wall made of satisfactory soil and stuccoed properly is absolutely permanent in its construction. If the stucco is maintained intact, it should last indefinitely."

One of the most enthusiastic boosters for pise de terre construction is Col. Paul S. Bliss, of the Social Security Board, Kansas City, Mo. Colonel Bliss built a one-story farmhouse and large garage on his Scoria Lily ranch at Hettinger, N. Dak., and it has become the show place of that section. So many persons have visited his ranch to inspect and obtain information about rammed earth walls that Colonel Bliss has erected a large bulletin board on his premises, to which he has attached photographs of all the building processes, together with instructions on the method pursued. He states that it is "the best house I ever lived in." The cost of the house built by Colonel Bliss at Scoria Lily ranch was $1,700, of which the material cost $700 and the labor $1,000. Commander C. S. Stevenson, United States Navy, believes that such walls can be built from 12½ to 15 cents per cubic foot. The general estimate for the cost of rammed earth structures is placed at 70 percent for labor and 30 percent for materials.

The question most frequently asked about rammed-earth buildings is what they will cost. The answer depends upon the cost of labor in the building area being considered. If the builder is fortunate enough to have men relatives who will lend a hand, after the architect has completed his plans, the cost will be reduced to whatever carpenter work is required on the roof and inside the dwelling, together with the plumbing and electric wiring needed to modernize it.

We travel at breakneck speed over roads that have borne more intensive weathering than pise walls, yet the factors that protect them both are identical. By using the dirt under our feet we can have walls as enduring as rock; walls that harden with exposure and protect our homes from fire and storm hazards. All this we can have simply by using Mother Earth.

Other examples of pise construction near the Nation's Capital are to be found at Monticello, home of Thomas Jefferson. Several of the farm buildings there are of this material and Jefferson recommended this method for its low cost and permanency. In the suburbs of Washington there is a Dutch colonial house built 20 years ago by Dr. H. H. Humphrey, a scientist of the Department of Agriculture. The walls are of rammed earth taken from the cellar excavations, and are capable of supporting a weight of more than 2,000 tons.

At Lanham, Md., is an eight-room, two-story house of rammed earth built by the owner, Mr. Robert Cook, on week ends. The building was erected by unskilled labor under the direction of the owner, who is not a builder by trade.

Pise de terre construction has not been eagerly seized for commercial promotion, because there is very little money to be made from it by contractors and the building trades, yet the low-cost housing problem might well be solved if it were promoted with that thought in mind. However, an awakening to its possibilities is imminent, for a number of projects supervised by the officials of N. Y. A., C. C. C., and W. P. A. are now under way. Such a plan has been developed by H. Serkowich, industrial consultant, of Washington, D. C. His plan is well adapted to mass construction of houses of earth, by use of which individual developers can get more value from the citizen's home-building dollars.

So far it is the first commercial project launched for mass construction under the supervision of expert building authorities in close cooperation with Federal experts.

For those planning to build a house of earth, the most important thing to know is whether the soil they intend to use is of the proper mixture. Advice on soil analysis can be received by sending a letter self-addressed, etc., to Mr. Thomas Hibben, Vienna, Va., who will arrange to make the analysis or advise where such can be obtained.

War-Issue Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. PADDOCK
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

RESULTS OF POLL AND LETTER TO PRESIDENT PRINTED IN WAUKEGAN (ILL.) NEWS-SUN

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, Lake County, Ill., is representative of intelligent, patriotic American opinion. It contains prosperous farming territory, industrial centers, and residential suburbs of Chicago. The accompanying statement of a poll just completed by the Waukegan News-Sun is therefore an exceedingly interesting document. The poll is discussed and analyzed in a letter from the publishers to President Roosevelt.

[From the Waukegan (Ill.) News-Sun]

NEWS-SUN WAR-ISSUE POLL BY COMMUNITIES

Question: "Shall the United States enter the war to help defeat Hitler?"

	Vote		Percentage	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Waukegan	182	1,176	13	87
North Chicago	25	120	17	83
Antioch	3	29	9	91
Deerfield		1		100
Fort Sheridan		1		100
Fox Lake	1	8	11	89
Grayslake	1	22	4	96
Great Lakes	4	2	67	33
Gurnee	4	10	28	72
Highland Park	8	82	9	91
Highwood	1	12	8	92
Ingleside	1	7	12	88
Lake Bluff	1	11	9	91
Lake Forest	3	43	7	93
Lake Villa	2	18	10	90
Libertyville	3	28	9	91
McHenry		28		100
Mundelein		11		100
Ravinia	1	1	50	50
Round Lake	4	6	40	60
Wadsworth	1	7	12	88
Winthrop Harbor		4		100
Zion	10	117	8	92
Outside Lake County	8	38	17	83
Camp Forrest, Tenn		2		100
Total	263	1,784	12	88

Question: "Shall the United States give all-out aid to Britain short of actual war?"

	Vote		Percentage	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Waukegan	501	755	44	56
North Chicago	80	71	53	47
Antioch	18	13	58	42
Deerfield	1	1	50	50
Fort Sheridan	1	1	50	50
Fox Lake	5	6	45	55
Grayslake	6	18	26	74
Great Lakes	4	1	40	20
Gurnee	10	4	72	28
Highland Park	32	32	50	50
Highwood	5	8	38	62
Ingleside	6	2	75	25
Lake Bluff	5	6	46	54
Lake Forest	30	24	56	44
Lake Villa	9	14	39	61
Libertyville	16	17	48	52
McHenry	2	26	7	93
Mundelein	6	5	54	46
Ravinia		1		100
Round Lake	8	4	67	33
Wadsworth	10		100	
Winthrop Harbor	1	2	33	67
Zion	95	60	61	39
Outside Lake County	25	22	53	47
Camp Forrest, Tenn	1	1	50	50
Total	959	1,092	47	53

EIGHTY-EIGHT PERCENT VOTE AGAINST ENTRY IN WAR—AID TO BRITAIN ALSO LAGS IN POLL CONDUCTED BY NEWS-SUN; FINAL FIGURES SENT TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

(Editor's note: The following is an open letter to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, with copies to Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Senator C. Wayland Brooks, Senator Scott Lucas, and Congressman George Paddock.)

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Waukegan News-Sun has just completed a poll of Lake County, Ill., asking its readers to answer the following questions:

"Shall the United States enter the war to help defeat Hitler?" and "Shall the United States give all-out aid to Great Britain short of actual war?"

Here are their answers:

Against entry into war: 88 percent, by a vote of 1,784 to 263.

Against aid to Britain: 53 percent, by a vote of 1,092 to 959.

The questions were framed so as to eliminate any propaganda angle. This newspaper advised no voter as to how it thought he or she should vote; this is purely a citizens' poll and not a newspaper poll.

TYPICAL MELTING POT

For your information, Mr. President, Lake County is a typical melting-pot community in northeastern Illinois. We represent a score of creeds and nationalities of all colors. We have heavy German populations in McHenry, heavier Italian populations in Highwood, British sons and daughters in strong numbers at Zion, all nations in the mammoth factories of North Chicago and Waukegan. There are Poles, Slovaks, Finns, Swedes, Lithuanians, and Russians. We have our unemployed John Does, our Armours, and our Swifts. In fact, we're pretty typical.

Ours was not a street-corner nor soap-box poll, Mr. President. It was a postcard poll in which ballots went out to our more than 10,000 home subscribers, newspaper readers who have been anxiously following the day-by-day events of this topsy-turvy world. Many others, newsstand buyers and members of families divided on the war issues, came into our three offices to sign separate ballots. Strikingly enough, there was not one flippant ballot turned in. And approximately 20 percent of all the ballots were returned, an unusually high return in such a poll. The answers were all serious, thoughtful.

SENTIMENT AGAINST WAR

You probably will not be surprised, Mr. President, to find the Midwestern sentiment against war so much greater than the senti-

ment you hear expressed in Washington and along the Atlantic seaboard. However, it may surprise you to see that 53 percent vote against aid to Britain.

We offer no propaganda and no advice, only the honest, accurate figures to the man we elected to lead us through these tremendous times.

Very sincerely yours,

THE PUBLISHERS.

Extension of Military Service of Selectees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

LETTER PRINTED IN THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which was printed in the New York Times of today:

[From the New York Times of July 23, 1941]

LONGER SERVICE IS FAVORED—SELECTEE, RECOVERING FROM SHOCK, THINKS TERM SHOULD BE EXTENDED

To the EDITOR of the New York Times:

My first reaction to the request of the President to extend the period of service for selectees was one of chagrin and then disappointment. That response, I admit, was purely emotional. After applying logic to a situation which requires it, I have been compelled to conclude that President Roosevelt faced no other course.

It is conceded by all that this Nation needs a well-trained army to preserve peace, if possible, or to prepare to acquit itself ably in case of war. We must face realities before we decide on our course of action. One year's service is insufficient in which to knit together a powerful army, strong enough to deter others from forcing a war upon us and powerful enough to win, if that time ever arrives.

True, the normal lives of many of us selectees are disrupted by this period of training. Nevertheless, I would rather face the risk of disrupting my life than losing it. The time spent in the service is not wasted, even if we never make use of the knowledge we acquire in the Army.

Aside from the obvious benefits to the country as a whole, there are many advantages which accrue to the men. We have learned how to live compatibly with our neighbors. We have learned that no political group, religious faith, or economic class has a monopoly on patriotism. All this will contribute to making us better citizens after we return to civilian life.

The great majority of men are more than willing to continue their service for the duration of the emergency. The morale is extremely high, due, no doubt, to the solicitous attitude of our officers, the excellent living quarters, and the high degree of cooperation among the men. The gains to be realized by keeping us for an additional period so far outweigh any advantages to be gained by an early discharge, it should be apparent to every Congressman that there is but one possible way to vote on the impending legislation.

CORPORAL.

PINE CAMP, N. Y., *July 16, 1941.*

Out of Their Own Mouths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE HOLLAND (MICH.) EVENING SENTINEL

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Holland (Mich.) Evening Sentinel of July 21, 1941:

[From the Holland (Mich.) Evening Sentinel of July 21, 1941]

OUT OF THEIR OWN MOUTHS

Those who are hot for getting us into a shooting war—Ickes, Knox, Stimson, and many others—expect the American people simply to take their word for it that the way they interpret the international situation is the only Simon-pure correct one. And when someone has a different interpretation he is called unpatriotic and is sometimes even said to be in league with Hitler. But only 3 or 4 years ago those same shouters for war were shouting just as loud from the other side of their mouths.

Examples aplenty could be given of this fact. Suppose we go right to headquarters and quote the President himself. On August 14, 1936, in an address at Chautauqua, N. Y., the President said these words:

"We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if at the same time they possess the courage to say 'No' to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war."

That statement would seem to carry its own comment. That phrase, "the small decisions," seems so ironical in the light of the record of such small decisions since that have led us to the very edge of war that the President's severest critic could hardly have improved on his words.

The President has now, under pressure of congressional leaders, abandoned "for the time being" the proposal to acquire the right to send troops anywhere in the world where they may be needed. But the mere fact that the President could for a while at least back this proposal of General Marshall's gives an odd sound to these words spoken by the President in his fireside chat of December 29, 1940: "There is no demand for sending an American expeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can therefore nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth."

That was spoken only a little over 6 months ago. Those who oppose sending American boys outside America are basing their opposition on such and other statements by the President and by his chief aides. They are assuming that words mean what they appear to be saying. It is not unreasonable for them to expect that such pronouncements by the most responsible member of the Government can be depended upon.

And there are others. Speaking in Boston on October 12, 1940, Mr. Willkie said: "Our boys shall stay out of European wars. We must be strong." That is exactly what those who oppose entering the war stand for today: America must be strong and stay strong. Today Mr. Willkie is singing another tune. In Baltimore, October 30, 1940, Mr. Willkie said: "We are against sending our boys into any war other than the defense of our own country." Today it is easy for him to interpret any step as "defense." But the American people took those words of his and of the President's seriously. Yet today those leaders are wondering why Americans are not more war-minded than they are. Here they have the answer out of their mouths.

What of the Future Monetary Policies of the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

EXCERPT FROM BOOK ENTITLED "PLANNING FOR AMERICA"

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, a very significant book has recently come off the press, entitled "Planning for America." The book is edited by George B. Galloway, one of the ablest research men in the United States, and consists of chapters by a score of eminent people. The book is a frank and fearless appraisal of what we are up against and of the things we must do if we are to beat this economic problem. I take special pleasure in including herewith a passage from the book, taken from chapter 32, on Tools of Financial and Industrial Management, and written by Mr. Galloway himself:

MONETARY POLICY AND MANAGED CREDIT

The chief functions of monetary policy, as distinguished from fiscal policy, are to control the volume of money and credit and their distribution between alternative uses in order to promote the full and balanced use of the productive resources of the country. To this end, the guiding principle of monetary policy should be to stabilize the per capita supply of money, including credit created by banks which accounts for most of the Nation's money supply.

Prior to the New Deal, the Federal Reserve System relied largely upon market operations—the purchase and sale of Government securities—to regulate the supply of money, stabilize the general price level, control interest rates, and mitigate depression. Its easy money policy stimulated stock and real estate speculation and aggravated the unbalance in the distribution of the national income among farmers, wage earners, and investors. Prices were stabilized while costs of production were rapidly falling, thus widening profit margins. Meanwhile the weakness of the labor movement and the displacement of men by machines widened the disparity in income distribution and put the economic system seriously out of balance. Current demand for consumers goods was temporarily maintained by installment buying and the expenditure of the paper profits of speculation on the stock market.

New Deal banking policy has restored the financial soundness of the banks by R. F. C. loans and investments and by infusing fresh supplies of money into the economic system. But it has not sought to acquire permanent public ownership of the banking system. The divorce of the security affiliates was designed to increase the soundness of commercial banking practice, not to increase

State control. New Real banking measures have extended public control over monetary policy as distinct from commercial banking practice, but they have left the commercial banks comparatively free from public interference. Public planning in the field of financial policy has taken the form of monetary manipulation by open-market operations, public spending, and currency depreciation. The former raised industrial prices, while the latter was designed to help the farmers.

Gold imports, amounting to $14,000,000,000 since early in 1934, have created excess reserves in our banking system amounting to $7,000,000,000 and have reduced interest rates to unprecedentedly low levels. At the end of 1940 the volume of demand deposits and currency was 50 percent greater than ever before. Meanwhile these huge and increasing excess reserves provide a base for more than doubling the existing supply of bank credit. In the light of these facts, and in order to forestall the development of inflationary tendencies attributable to defects in the machinery of credit control, the Federal Reserve System submitted a series of recommendations to Congress on December 31, 1940. In the first place, it urged Congress (a) to increase the statutory reserve requirements for demand and time deposits in all banks to certain percentages; (b) to empower the Federal Open Market Committee to make further increases in the reserve requirements sufficient to absorb excess reserves; (c) to authorize the committee to change the reserve requirements from time to time; (d) to make them applicable to all banks receiving demand deposits, whether or not they are members of the Federal Reserve System; and (e) to exempt the reserves required under paragraphs (a), (b), and (d) from assessments by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. In the second place, it recommended that various sources of potential increase in excess reserves be removed, i. e., the power to issue $3,000,000,000 of greenbacks, further monetization of foreign silver, the power to issue silver certificates against the seigniorage, and the power further to devaluate the dollar. It also suggested that the Federal Open Market Committee should be consulted before the stabilization fund is used. Its third recommendation in the field of monetary policy was that future gold acquisitions be insulated from the credit system and not restored without consulting the committee.

The measures proposed by the Federal Reserve System to prevent inflation should eventually be adopted in order to strengthen the machinery of credit control. But they should not be put into effect as long as idle capacity and idle labor are available. For there is no danger of general inflation before the point of full employment of resources has been reached. "The immediate danger today is not that we will produce inflation but rather that premature efforts to head off inflation might retard recovery, reemployment, and full defense."[1] Particular bottlenecks can be prevented by increasing capacity and training more skilled workers in those fields.

Huge supplies of idle money have accumulated in recent years due to the alleged lack of profitable outlets for private investment, because private enterprise has found it more remunerative to leave productive resources unemployed, and because industry to a large extent has been "rolling its own," i. e., financing its capital needs out of its own reserves. The Government has put some of this idle money to work by borrowing it at interest from the banks or their depositors and using it to promote the fuller use of human and material resources by means of a public-works program. This policy has greatly increased the Federal debt and its annual burden of interest charges.

[1] Mordecai Ezekiel, Full Production Without Inflation, Common Sense, February 1941, pp. 35-38.

A much better course of action would be for Congress to exercise its constitutional power to "coin money and regulate the value thereof" and itself create the money, paying no interest for its use, but limiting the amount created to that required to effect full use of the available productive resources. There is no earthly reason why the Government should pay interest for the privilege of borrowing from banks money which the banks have created in the exercise of a privilege conferred by the Government. If the Government manufactured its own credit, it would get its public works for nothing, and at the same time obtain fuller use of productive resources. The creation of new money without interest would not create a new debt, nor would it be any more inflationary than for banks to loan money they have made by entering credits on their books. Inflation would not follow because the newly created money would be offset by the public works and social assets (houses, utilities, etc.) which the public credit would be used to produce. Moreover, the repayment of temporary bank loans may lead to a subsequent deflation, which would not happen in the case of publicly created credit because it would constitute a permanent addition to the money supply. If this were done and "Congress exercised the sovereign right of the Nation to create its own money, then the mystery of money would disappear, and no longer would the financial pundits be able to deceive the people into thinking that fiat credit created by banks is sound money, while national currency created by the people's Government is not."[2]

The problem of financing the defense program directs attention anew to this tool of credit management. President Roosevelt has estimated the total cost of this program at $28,400,000,000, not including the cost of aid to Britain. If this huge sum were entirely raised by borrowing, it might lead to inflation and would increase the national debt by so much. It should be financed in part by borrowing, in part by tapping new sources of taxable income, and in part by national interest-free credit. The way to avoid national bankruptcy, as Congressman VOORHIS of California has long argued, is to employ our vast metal stocks ($20,000,000,000 of gold buried in the Kentucky hills) as a base for national money and credit, or use stock piles of critical and strategic raw materials as reserves behind monetary issues (proposed by Benjamin Graham),[3] or to buy the capital stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks (it would cost $132,000,000) and make them a real bank of issue, employing national credit to reduce the public debt by retiring outstanding Government bonds and saving the taxpayers the interest on them. This simple reform in the method of public finance is one sure way of financing our defense and public-works programs and of reducing the public debt.[4]

The problem of the distribution or direction of credit, as distinguished from its volume, could be managed through a central bureau or a national investment board. Such a board would supervise the relative growth of individual industries and also the financing of new industries, forbidding new investments in industries which had expanded too rapidly. The planned distribution of credit would lead to a more balanced development of production. It would be the function of the national investment board to distribute the available supply of capital among different uses in accordance with the requirements of the national plan as determined by a central planning authority.[5]

[2] From a speech on When Is a Nation Bankrupt? by Representative JERRY VOORHIS in the House of Representatives, August 19, 1940.

[3] Cf. Benjamin Graham, Storage and Stability. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1937. The Graham multiple commodity reserve plan would provide a monetary base of essential, storable raw commodities in common use, against which currency would be issued, by which it would be secured, and in which it would be redeemable, thus according the same monetary treatment to a composite group of specified commodities as was formerly accorded to the single commodity, gold. This plan is advocated by the Committee for Economic Stability, 80 Broad Street, New York City.

[4] See Dollars and Sense, remarks of Representative JERRY VOORHIS in the House of Representatives, June 6, 1938.

BALANCING SAVING AND SPENDING

The tools for financial management examined in this chapter—taxation, public expenditures, the compensated and capital budgets, and monetary and credit management—are not offered as a panacea that will prevent depressions and solve all our problems. They are techniques that can help, if wisely used, to balance saving and spending. Taxation can help by converting excess savings into public investments segregated in a capital budget. The compensated budget can be used, as described above, to counteract the ebb and flow of private investment. Planned control of the volume and distribution of credit will also help to promote a better balance and prevent inflation.[6]

Insofar as these devices have been used they have helped to correct rather than prevent unbalance. They need to be sharpened and refined. They give promise of facilitating the fuller use of resources, but they are limited by the restrictive nature of the system within which they operate. Monetary policy is not an independent tool of public policy, but only the necessary complement or auxiliary of general national planning. Financial planning affords us no escape from the task of economic planning.

Refinement of these tools of over-all financial planning and the formulation of coherent long-run fiscal policies wait upon the evolution of suitable "organs of fiscal thought" within the Federal Government. It is a nice question, as yet unanswered, just where the function of long-range fiscal-policy planning should be performed—in the Bureau of the Budget, the Federal Reserve Board, the Treasury, or the National Resources Planning Board. Each of these agencies is concerned with financial policy, each is working on some aspect of it, and each has its champions. The proper place for the coordination of fiscal policy would appear to be the Bureau of the Budget, leaving monetary policy and credit control to the Federal Reserve Board and tax policy to the Treasury. The proper place for the over-all articulation of fiscal policy with monetary and credit policy, tax policy, natural-resources planning, industrial planning, public-works planning, social welfare, and

[5] G. D. H. Cole, Economic Planning, p. 328-329.

[6] In addition to the devices described above, Mr. Adolf Berle has recommended three steps which he thinks would provide the elements for a "modern financial tool kit." First, creation of a Public Works Finance Corporation which would undertake the direct financing at flexible rates of interest of the self-liquidating public works of the Federal, State, and local governments. Second, a bill to insure loans to small business so that the little fellow will have as good access to the capital markets and to banking facilities as the large corporation. Third, the creation of a new system of capital credit banks to provide capital for public and private construction, such capital to be derived from ordinary savings or from bank-created credit or both, and to be controlled by open market operations, flexible rediscount, interest, and amortization rates, and the power to limit or suspend rediscount privileges. (New Directions in the New World, p. 124.)

defense planning would seem to be the National Resources Planning Board. For fiscal policy is only one element of financial policy, and fiscal planning is at best an instrument of national economic and social planning. In the event, however, the answer will probably be determined empirically by the ability of the leadership of these rival agencies to effect the greatest concentration of expert talent in this field.[1]

The "Two-Thirds" Argument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY NEWS AND WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial printed in the New York Daily News and the Washington Times-Herald of July 23, 1941:

THE "TWO-THIRDS" ARGUMENT

We quote from the President's July 21 message to Congress:

"I need scarcely emphasize the fact that if and when an organized and integrated company, battalion, regiment, or division is compelled to send two-thirds of its members home, those who return to civil life, if called to the colors later on, would have to go through a new period of organization and integration before the new unit to which they were assigned could be depended on for service."

UNTRUE PICTURE

This is the main point brought forth to date by the President and Chief of Staff Marshall in their pleas for power to scrap the 1-year limit on active service for draftees, National Guards, and Reservists. The implication is that the Army is threatened with sudden disappearance of two-thirds of its officers and men on a single day—which would indeed be a calamity.

But the picture is not an accurate one. The fact is that the approximately 600,000 draftees now in service entered the Army in this fashion:

November	13,806
December	5,521
January	73,633
February	90,238
March	153,159
April	123,207
May	56,896
June	79,522

Therefore, the largest number of draftees who will leave the Army in any month up to next July under the present law will be 153,159, scheduled to go home next March. That will be a shade over 10 percent of our present Army. It will not be anywhere near the 66⅔ percent envisioned by Messrs. Roosevelt and Marshall as quitting on 1 day.

We'd recommend a little more frankness on this point.

We think, too, that a compromise could be arranged. Terms could be extended in enough cases to prevent more than 100,000 men leaving the Army and being replaced by 100,000 novices in any 1 month. We do not see how this could discommode the Army or imperil the Nation, and it would build up the Reserve at a rapid rate.

We do not believe, though, that the administration is interested in compromise. We believe its object is to freeze the present contingents into the Army indefinitely, lift the 900,000 lid off the number of draftees usable at one time, and build a huge Army to send to Europe to lick Hitler.

[1] Cf. Arthur N. Holcombe, "Over-All Financial Planning Through the Bureau of the Budget," Public Administration Review, Spring, 1941. Prof. Roswell Magill, former Undersecretary of the Treasury, has suggested the formation of an Advisory Council on Fiscal Policy. (See Investor America, March 1941.)

"Young Man, Young Woman, You're Hired"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF JERRY VOORHIS, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on July 19, 1941:

I am talking tonight, I hope, to thousands of young men and young women. I am afraid many of you have been saying what I know some of my young and very close friends in California have been saying. They have been writing to me and asking questions like these:

"What is going to happen to us after this national-defense work is over?"

"Will we find ourselves in another depression with unemployment and poverty all about us?"

"Where are we going to get jobs then?"

"Why are we being asked to sacrifice for national defense if these other problems are not solved?"

"Where will I find an opportunity to build a real future for myself and, I hope, a family?"

But it is not only you young men and young women who have been asking these questions. Older people, and especially men and women who are past 50 years of age, have been and are asking these questions.

I know it is common practice now for us to worry about our future and complain about what a mess older generations have made of the world. And no one would deny that there are problems, terrific problems confronting us—probably greater problems than any American generation ever faced before. But this is no hour to complain—we haven't time—and real men and real women neither seek nor accept sympathy.

There has never been an age of great opportunity that was not borne out of great problems and great trials. And people have never learned to be great men or great women except in times when they had to be big and broad—yes; and great—in order to carry through at all.

We live in such a time.

Not in hundreds of years has the world seen a time so fraught with possibilities for good or ill for mankind as is the case today. Which of these it is going to be depends to a very great extent on what you and other American young people like you do about it. And the purpose of this speech is to show you that there is something you can do about it.

There is one immediate task we have before us.

There is now before Congress a resolution known as the Wagner-Voorhis resolution which, if passed, would create now an outstanding commission composed of Members of Congress, people from the executive branch of the Government, representatives of farmers, labor, business, cooperatives, and the church. The job of the Commission will be to work out a program for the basic, long-range solution of the unemployment problem and to make certain that a depression does not result when this period of great defense spending is over. One thing we can all do is help to get this resolution passed. And after that, if the Commission is created, I would hope with all my heart that the young people of America would follow its work day by day, send in suggestions and proposals, consider it a sort of clearing house for our work of building a new world.

And now to take up our main message again.

In 1929, an old order died. It would be a waste of your time and mine to talk about it. But it died. As a matter of fact it had been dying for years. It was sick unto death with unemployment, with poverty, with injustice, with the cancers of selfishness.

It is true that under that old order great material progress was achieved. We built railroads and made them run. We learned to build airplanes, but we did not learn how to keep them from being used to destroy cities. We built machines, but we did not learn how to prevent them from taking jobs away from people. We were content to think in terms of money and material progress and profits while men and women and little children were destroyed. It wouldn't work. It never will work. I am no revolutionist in saying this—I am only repeating the words of some of the greatest of spiritual leaders. In fact, I am repeating what has been said in effect by some of the great encyclicals of the Catholic Church itself.

We are not going back to the old world of before 1929. We are not going back to it primarily because we couldn't if we wanted to. Many of us are not going back to it because we wouldn't want to even if we could. Either we are going to prepare wisely, with vision, and with devotion to live in a new world—or else we are probably not going to really live at all.

And so we have a job to do. Part of that job is understanding and believing in and protecting the principles for which our country stands. She stands today for the hope of equality of opportunity, and she is the only nation that ever came anywhere near giving it. She stands for the principle that one citizen is exactly as good as any other citizen, that each stands equal before the law and the ballot box. She stands for an incessant, unrelenting war against privilege of every sort—economic, social, political—and for the right of her people to carry on that war and to use their whole soul, minds, and hearts for that purpose. Above all, America stands for the right of all her people, rich and poor, of whatever race or creed, to be free in their homes and lives from arbitrary action against them by their Government. America stands for the principle of government by consent of the governed. Making democracy work simply means making real these ideals and principles for which our country stands but which, of course, we have never fully achieved.

It is a hard job to make democracy work. And the reason is because it depends for its success upon the voluntary, unselfish devotion of its people.

You young men and young women, whether or not you have gained a profound religious faith—and with all my heart I hope you have that—you young men and women must know from hard experience that there is eternal war going on in this world. I do not mean the war between Germany and England or between China and Japan.

I mean war between the worst in us and the best, the war between greed on the one hand and devotion on the other, the war between our selfish desires and our spirits and souls. The easy thing to do is to slough off responsibility, to let a dictator take that over, and then to be free to enjoy the eating and drinking part of life without concern for the future of oneself or anybody else.

It is a lot harder to fight temptation, a lot harder to seek hard work, to seek to serve others, to abandon pleasures for the sake of a job that needs doing. It is harder to follow the eternal voice within our souls. But it is of soul and mind and conscience that democracy is born and by which democracy lives.

And you will never escape from the cry of the soul. The cry for freedom of the spirit will always haunt you. Francis Thompson in his great poem, The Hound of Heaven, tells the story of how God pursues man in the effort to save him—and it might well be added, that just so does our conscience which is of God pursue us all and attempt to make us worthy to live in a democratic nation.

Our job is no simple job. It includes building a great military defense—not because we want to but because we must. But it includes far more than that. For it includes taking such measures with regard to our domestic problems as will give promise to our people and the world that we are indeed building an American new world—a free, not an enslaved world, a world far more glorious and full of hope than any so-called new order in Europe put forth by a swashbuckling dictator of whatever stripe.

The promise of that American new world must include that we shall refuse to see hunger and surplus side by side. There shall be no farm surpluses because we will use them to feed hungry children.

That promise must include that we shall refuse to waste the ability, skill, or labor of a single willing worker. There shall be no unemployment and no idle men. That promise must include that we shall refuse to see our Nation go on paying tribute to private creators of credit. There shall be asserted the right and duty of the Congress to create the Nation's money and regulate its value.

That promise must include not governmental aid or subsidy, but encouragement to every cooperative effort, movement, or organization among groups of the American people, that there shall be no stumbling block placed in their way. For cooperation is the opposite of dictatorship and of monopoly, of regimentation, of totalitarianism, of governmental control. Cooperation is, I am convinced, the basic hope of democracy.

Why do I say that? I do so first because the pattern of a solution for our problem has already appeared within the framework of the free economic order of other nations before this war broke over Europe. That pattern was found in the cooperative movement of such nations as Sweden, Denmark, England, and some other countries. With the work of such movements many people are familiar but few of us realize, I think, that here in America we have as a matter of fact an extremely healthy, sound, and inspiring cooperative movement of our own. Very briefly that movement consists of 20 national and regional cooperative organizations with 1,115,000 families affiliated as members. It includes the Cooperative League of America, a great Nation-wide organization existing primarily for education of the Nation in cooperative principles and practices, with offices in Chicago, in New York, and in Washington.

Then there is National Cooperatives, Inc., a Nation-wide purchasing federation set up by the various cooperative societies. Through cooperation among cooperatives this organization has succeeded in bringing to the consumer members the great savings and advantages of large-scale buying operations. By similar methods thousands of American farmers have materially improved their conditions. And in most parts of the country we have only scratched the surface of what can be accomplished by the application of this principle of one member, one vote mutual aid to our problems.

Our cooperatives now own oil refineries in Kansas and in Indiana, leases on oil lands, gathering pipe lines, motor transport, paint factories, fertilizer factories, feed and seed mills, a small tractor-manufacturing plant, coffee-roasting mills, baby-chick hatcheries, the fifth largest casualty-insurance company in the country, a life-insurance company, and several banks. They are now doing business which runs close to three-quarters of a billion dollars each year, and they are saving millions of dollars for their members, through whose hands it flows back into the stream of active consumer-buying power. There are a million farm families which are associated with farm marketing or producing cooperatives; and there are several million persons who are now solving their personal loan problems through credit unions, which are, of course, credit cooperatives. Nor does this include the 1,000,000 or more members of rural electrification cooperatives—the cooperatives that are literally lighting up the farm homes of the whole United States.

All these things are the work of people like you. People who started with little, if any, money but who were equipped with certain essential knowledge and understanding gained through study and who saw clearly that problems which no individual could cope with were, however, capable of solution if a group organized and tackled them together.

Let me relate a little story. In Nova Scotia some years ago the people were in far worse plight than we are now. Compared with what most of us have, they had nothing. But they found a leader and a great idea and principle.

They found an old priest known as Father Jimmy Tompkins—and, by the way, one of his ablest assistants now is a Presbyterian minister, I am told. Father Jimmy went out among his people to tell them the hard truth, and to let them tell the same hard truth to him. He never talked to them about their troubles without making them tell him what they thought caused them. He made them wonder why they did not ask themselves about these causes in the first place. He got them to thinking. He got them into little discussion groups, then into study clubs. Every study club was organized with one determination—they would study for a definite, immediate purpose, to find out why, for example, they could not get a fair price for their fish; why clothing cost so much; why they could not afford shoes. They studied to solve each problem, one by one. And the best of it is they largely succeeded.

For out of these study groups came the great consumer cooperative movement of Nova Scotia. But something more came out of it. The men and women of Nova Scotia rapidly began to acquire an education. They began to solve their problems. They began to own their stores and their farms and their homes. As one of their leaders said, "Our people in Nova Scotia are too busy getting an education to go to college."

They are becoming the best-educated people in this part of the world. We can do that, too. All that happened in Nova Scotia can happen here.

But it will take people to do it. It will take the right kind of people—not people who will expect to step into lucrative jobs, but people who have sufficient faith in their fellow men to work both with and for them in the building of organizations for the promotion of the economic health and well-being both of their own membership and also the Nation as a whole. For no cooperative can be successful unless it is fundamentally unselfish. The very genius of cooperation lies in the fact that the more people it benefits the better off it is. The interest of a true cooperative is identical with the interest of the Nation itself. I have said this movement needs people and the right kind of people, but especially it needs young people—young people who have a vision of the future, a vision which does not require the achievement of a Utopia all of a sudden by the passage of some oversimplified and far-reaching piece of legislation, but a vision which sees that the great accomplishments of mankind have always been constructed stone on stone, and mostly by the hands of humble people whose names have been but little known.

One or two suggestions of the specific things you can do:

Get 10 of your young friends, men and women, into a study group and vow the night you meet to stick with your study and your work until you solve your problems.

I have already told you there are literally millions of people who are members of successful credit unions in this country—people organized into groups paying interest to each other on their savings and borrowings from each other at reasonable rates when they need to. The Cooperative League can tell you about it. So can the Farm Credit Administration in Washington. Write one of these organizations or to me if you are interested. You see, you're hired to work at these things because you can hire yourself.

But you must study in your study groups before you can make progress. You've got to grow your wings before you can fly.

In the few minutes that I have this afternoon, it is, of course, impossible for me to describe in detail all the different sorts of things that America's young people can do, in and for existing cooperatives, or new ones that they might help to start. But if you are interested and will write to me about it, I will see that you are referred to the nearest going cooperative to your home. And you will find people there who are not making speeches like I am making this afternoon, but who are conducting businesses not for their own benefit or profit but for the welfare of the people who do business with them. They are actually living out a principle which many of us have preached, the principle that through service one achieves the greatest welfare for himself. Through cooperatives the power of monopoly over our people can be broken. Through cooperatives the purchasing power of our people can very largely be spread so as to stimulate vast amounts of additional employment. Through cooperatives our farmers can achieve a price for their products which will enable them to recover a fair rate for their basically essential labors.

I do not say, nor can anyone say, that they offer a cure for all the ills of the world, but grown large enough they might well be the answer in America to the problem of overgrown government on the one hand and monopoly industry and monopoly finance on the other.

There must be born a dynamic faith in America—the sort of faith that has sent out missionaries to work and perish in far-off lands. It must be a faith practical and realistic, but with its sights fixed on a new world that we are beginning now to build. It must be faith in something better, something far, far deeper than a bill for an expanded program of public works.

Can there be such a faith?

Can the answer to unemployment and monopoly and farm distress and dependence on government be found?

I believe so. I believe the cooperative movement can give America that faith. And I believe it can supply these answers. I believe it is democracy in practice, the antithesis of dictatorship, monopoly power, and the rule of force. I believe—and I say it reverently—that it is the translation into everyday economic terms of the basic principles of the Christian faith as well as of every great religion that man has even known.

Many, Many Congratulations Upon Your Forceful Leadership In the Matter of Parity Privileges for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, it is very encouraging to a conscientious, hard-working Congressman to receive letters, many of them coming from districts and States other than his own district or his own State, expressing appreciation of the efforts of the Congressman in the interest and welfare of the great masses of the people.

During all of these years there have been three classes of people who have not been getting a square deal in the way of beneficial legislation in line with special privileges given to other groups under legislation passed by the Congress.

I refer to laborers, farmers, and consumers.

It is true that under the present administration, after many years of struggling, the wage earners of this country have been able to secure helpful legislation, and these wage earners should be proud of the fact that they have men connected with the Labor Board who are standing up and demanding that to which labor is entitled.

However, up to this good hour we have passed too many bills in the name of the farmer which, in the last analysis, either because of the manner in which they are written or administered, have failed to give to farmers that which they have been promised and that to which they are clearly entitled.

The great, consuming public, including farmers, who are large consumers today, as during all the past years, are just as hopeless and helpless as can be in securing value received in spending their hard-earned money.

What I mean by this statement is that under the present old, wasteful, and disgraceful marketing and distributing system speculators and thousands of parasites, operating between farmers and consumers, are sapping the very lifeblood out of producers and consumers.

Today in the South we are shipping beautiful vegetables and fruits. However, farmers are not receiving a price sufficient to pay the expense of gathering, crating, and shipping these products, while in all of the large marketing centers of the United States consumers are paying a fixed price containing numerous profits in the way of a spread between the producer and the consumer.

It is high time for the consuming public, including the farmers of this country, through the representatives of these two large groups, to demand that type of legislation which will bring about a proper marketing and distributing system, weeding out this tremendous spread and giving to farmers and consumers a fair price.

I am inserting herein a letter just received from Mr. M. G. Montrezza, 764 Stone Avenue, San Jose, Calif., who is deeply interested in the farm credit bill, H. R. 5336:

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
July 20, 1941.

Hon. H. P. FULMER,
Congressman, House of Representatives
Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Re H. R. 5336 bill—Farm Credit Act 1941.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: First of all, many many congratulations for your forceful leadership in the matter of parity privileges for farmers. I hope you will carry on with the same directness of purpose, and farmers throughout the Nation will be grateful to you. God knows how much we need friends to help us out of a rather distressed price situation.

Then again profuse thanks for the introduction of the Farm Credit Act of 1941. We all hope you will not permit any time to be lost on this bill and will report it out on the floor without delay. You know, I am sure, that the F. C. A. and the Agricultural Department made fools of us all last year by dropping the Wheeler-Jones bill, after all the promises of former Secretary Wallace which were never kept. Farmers are no longer in the mood of having their legs pulled and this piece of legislation is sorely needed, as all know. In our county alone, out of some 20,000 fruit growers and farmers, 95 percent are about bankrupt, unless liberal credit for a long-range reconstructive period is extended to them.

Messrs. Wickard, Black, Appleby, Woolcott, Milo Perkins, and the rest of these gentlemen know our story well, as no doub' you do, and we feel that the time for dilly-dallying and procrastination is past and farmers demand action and not hidden political deals, whereby the farmer is left to carry the bag and go hang after election. Pardon me, honorable sir, for writing rather excitedly about all this, but I assure you that we have reasons to feel aroused over the neglect of the farmer's plight and the continuous threat of dispossession.

Let me, and for all our farmer friends, thank you for your aggressive attitude on behalf of the farmers' interest, and God may guide your steps in your legislative labors.

With kindest personal regards,
Faithfully yours,
M. G. MONTREZZA,
Director of State Agricultural
Association, Fifth District.

P. S.—I would appreciate having a few printed copies of H. R. 5336 and such brief analysis as you may have.

M. G. M.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting also a letter just received from Mr. Richard Stearns, 49 Wall Street, New York City, as follows:

GERTLER, STEARNS & CO.,
New York, N. Y., July 22, 1941.

Congressman H. P. FULMER,
House of Representatives Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FULMER: I want to thank you very much for your kind letter of the 11th and I would have answered it before this only I have been out of town.

It certainly is most gratifying to know that men like you are in Washington, and while it may seem strange for a New York City man to write you in reference to the farmers, I have been fortunate enough to have spent a great deal of my time in the country over the past 40 years and realize only too well the vital problem the farmers present to the country.

I have a summer home in Hampton Bays, Long Island, and a great many of the people in the town make their living digging clams. This entails arising every morning at 4 o'clock and working anywhere from 12 to 14 hours. These men, I am told, receive $1.50 per bushel basket for their clams, and I understand a bushel basket contains approximately 450 of them. As we both know, any average restaurant charges about 30 to 40 cents a half dozen.

Down my way potato farmers are also very plentiful, and now that the defense program has taken a great many young men away from the farms it is necessary for most of the womenfolk to get out with the men to make the crop possible. These people receive very small recompense for hard and laborious work. I definitely am for a platform with a minimum for farm prices, but I am more in favor of decent prices so the farmer cannot only pay off his mortgage, but have something left to aid him in making his later years in life more comfortable. I wish you all the success in the world in getting legislation like this through Congress. Certainly the American citizens making up the farmers are richly deserving of it when one thinks of the tremendous wages paid to the C. I. O. and A. F. L. union members.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
RICHARD STEARNS.

Mr. Speaker, it is very heartening to me to receive a letter from a resident of New York, especially Wall Street, who fully realizes the problems of the farmer and the consumer.

In the third paragraph of this letter Mr. Stearns gives you definite information in regard to what I have been talking about, which clearly indicates the tremendous spread between the producer and the consumer.

Democracy Has an Obligation to Our Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, with so many voices raised in a cry for war and a way of death, I presume that one voice calling for a way of life will have

small audience. By way of life I mean an American way—an American standard and design for living for the aged.

We are stirred with great compassion when we see the pictures of the aged refugees of other lands who have been made destitute and homeless by wars. This is as it should be. The great collective heart of America rises to the occasion, and we become the Good Samaritan for all the world.

But we have the aged and homeless here, too. When the pathetic picture of senior Americans in shabby tenements, in overcrowded homes for the aged, in poorhouses, in bethels, and other institutions is shown it seems that the great heart skips a beat and our national conscience goes to sleep.

Why do so many of us refuse to recognize this problem? Are we ashamed to admit that in the wealthiest land in all the world we have not been able to care for our elders? They are the people who built this great industrial economy, the ones who with great sacrifice pushed our frontiers to the very limits of our land, now they are neglected and conveniently forgotten.

Here is the greatest deliberative body of any of the great governments of the world and the majority of the Members are choosing to ignore a situation which bids fair to question our very moral integrity as a nation. There must be a reason unannounced because an examination of the pledges of the men who now sit in Congress—within whose province it is to do something—reveals that they are all on record to insure the right of the oldsters to spend their twilight of life without want.

We are on the threshold of a great war to keep democracy alive in distant lands, we are in the midst of herculean efforts to assist those embattled democracies by industrial production—we are spending untold billions of dollars to accomplish this. I am grateful for a chance to live under a democratic form of government in a free country.

To me democracy has always meant that all shall have a voice in being governed. That the lawmakers shall consider all the ways presented, to question their soundness, examine their feasibility, and subject them to debate and vote, at the very least to consider them in open hearings. This should be true without partisan consideration as to the origination of the bill at hand. Since when has the creative mind of man gained more brilliancy or impetus from his political label or association?

I am sorry to say that today my ideal of democracy is not working. We have the problem of the aged before us; it is getting more acute with present rising costs of living; it must be solved by Congress; it should be solved by this Congress. The Townsend recovery plan, the one bill designed to do the job effectively, has been introduced year after year. Instead of considering it in a democratic manner it has been autocratically buried in committee. For years I have been a member of the steering committee which has been fighting for a fair hearing, to get the bill on the floor of this House so that it can be debated and considered in an impartial and democratic way. We have had to dissipate our efforts in attempts to get signatures on a discharge petition to force it out of committee. In the meantime the aged, with little help, with little hope, wait for action and aid. This is not democracy working! The people believe in this system of government; they believe in the fairness of their representatives. In order to keep faith with them I urge you, now, today, to respond to this call for fair play and add your name to those who believe in democracy, to those who believe in a government of, by, and for the people, by signing discharge petition No. 7 for H. R. 1036. Signing this petition does not commit you to vote for the bill, but it will bring the bill on the floor so that we all may express our views on how to provide security for the aged and jobs for the younger generation. In fairness to yourself and the people you represent, sign today so we may consider this most important problem while we are not pressed for time and are waiting for future developments.

Flag-Dedication Exercises at St. Stanislaus Orphanage, Nanticoke, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HAROLD FLANNERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ANTHONY B. DREIER

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Assistant District Attorney Anthony B. Dreier, an outstanding young lawyer of Luzerne County, Pa., at the flag-dedication exercises held at St. Stanislaus Orphanage, Nanticoke, Pa., July 20, 1941:

Ladies and gentlemen, standing here on the occasion when the national emblem is to be raised over this institution, it is altogether fitting that we allude for a moment to the glorious history of that flag.

Its origin is an authentic legend. Before the Declaration of Independence in 1776 each of the Thirteen Colonies had its own individual flag or emblem. In that year General Washington stepped into a small upholstery shop on Arch Street, in the city of Philadelphia, which shop still stands as a national shrine, with a new design for a flag to be adopted by the Thirteen Colonies. He asked the proprietor whether she could make one from the rough design which he himself had drawn. The woman he spoke to was Betsy Ross. In that simple transaction originated the symbol which was to fly over millions of free and independent people. The origin of our national emblem has a unique place in civilized history. It symbolized for the first time in the recorded pages of man's struggle with oppression, a successful and enduring Nation of free and equal people whose Government derived its right from the consent of the governed. And it is the only flag symbolizing any nation in 5,000 years of history which has never known defeat.

Only once before this year of 1941 has it been seriously threatened, and that only from within our own Nation, at the fateful battle of Gettysburg in 1863.

Among America's most important historical documents is Colonel Haskell's description of that battle. I quote that part of his notable eyewitness account wherein he speaks of the flag:

"General Gibbon rode down the lines, cool and calm, and in an unimpassioned voice he said to the men, 'Do not hurry, men, and fire too fast; let them come up close before you fire; then aim low and steadily.' Cap boxes slid around to the front of the body; cartridge boxes opened; officers opened their pistol holsters. The trefoil flags, colors of the brigades and divisions moved to their places in the rear; but along the lines in front that grand old ensign that first waved in the battle of Saratoga in 1777, and which these rebels would rob of half its stars, stood up, and the west wind kissed it as the sergeant sloped its lance toward the enemy. I believe that there was not one above whom it waved but blessed his God that he was loyal to it, and whose heart did not swell with pride toward it, as the emblem of the Republic before that treason's flaunting rag in front."

What I have just read to you was written by the aide to General Gibbon, who later fell mortally wounded in defense of those colors.

That emblem was to go on to other victories; it was to fly over many a victorious army or American ship, it was the flag which eventually would lead a million Americans into France to fight for the preservation of the democratic way of life.

But greater than its victories in war was its victory in peace. We who are the blessed heirs of all that this flag represents, standing at this great distance from the struggle of our forefathers, who created under it the free institutions we now enjoy; separated by three generations from that heroic struggle on American soil, of those who fought to preserve those institutions; I say that without occasions such as these that we might tend to forget those sacrifices, might tend to take for granted as natural heritages the institutions of free speech, freedom of divine worship, and the right to be represented in the affairs of government, and to freely choose those who are to govern us. But they are not natural heritages. When our forefathers made this flag proclaim the equality of man, this was the only land on the face of this oppressed and troubled earth where that principle had been written into law or actually observed.

In 1775, when that principle had been established here, France was under the despotic rule of Louis XVI, and pinched in cruel famine; Russia was sweating and bleeding under Catherine; Poland, where the lamp of freedom was first lit, was still licking the wounds that Alexander of Russia had inflicted; even in the freedom-loving British Isles, the people suffered the oppression of a half-lunatic king. Here, and only here were the people really free to carve out their own glorious destinies.

From the success of that experiment in government, from that first proclamation of the rights of man, came gradual, painful development of freedom and democracy in other civilized lands, until that first threat against it in 1914. The men who fought and suffered in that war, did so to preserve that principle, as they believed, forever.

But not then, nor any time during the bloody wars and revolutions during that development have we stood as dangerously close to the brink of disaster as we are today.

The weakness with the republican form of government is that it is designed to pro-

cure the blessing of peace at the expense of efficiency in war. It promotes the maximum of comfort in all phases of life for the individual. It must be thoroughly aroused or alarmed to cope with a nation that is willing to throw away its liberty and who become the fanatical slave of its masters. Such nations forfeit all that mankind in its struggle toward civilization has given them. They have forfeited their right to be considered as human beings in order that they might crush smaller and weaker, but more enlightened neighbors, who have devoted their lives to the arts of peace instead of preparing themselves for the bloody butchery of war.

Never in the last century and a half have we stood as close as we stand today to the loss of everything that we, as free Americans, hold dear. Not at Valley Forge, when the American Army only had General Washington to stand between order and complete disintegration; not at Brandywine, when a hungry army retreated to Philadelphia; not at Bull Run, when a disillusioned Union Army faced complete rout or disaster; no, not even in 1917, when the German Imperial Army was close enough to sight the spires of Paris, was that spirit represented by the flag as close to disaster as it is today. Here and in England only does that spirit still live.

That is why these occasions of raising our flag become solemn and significant. They reawaken the fighting spirit of America. They represent a new awareness of danger, and a willingness to sacrifice anew as the spirit of America turns the wheels of industry to forge our weapons of defense with the resource and intelligence to be found only among truly free men.

Today we do not raise our flag in the atmosphere of empty oratory or confused symbolic language. We raise it in the spirit of America getting ready after a period of sleep, to grid itself once more to lead the world in the forward march of civilization. At this dedication, then, let us also dedicate ourselves to the spirit of these glorious Stars and Stripes that they may continue to wave.

A Secretary for Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Americans are still looking very hopefully at the broad expanses of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans as our chief bulwarks of defense against the wars raging abroad. But like far-sighted citizens of the last great democracy in the world, we are not relying exclusively upon the waters which separate us from both Europe and Asia. We are making tremendous preparations for any possible combination of foes. As observers of the world's most horrible war in recorded history, we are in a unique position to learn some very valuable lessons without the necessity of experiencing the horrors occurring on the battlefield.

There is one obvious lesson which has been suggested at least a thousand times by important and intelligent men and women which we have completely ignored. It is a lesson which cannot be long delayed if we are to guarantee for ourselves and our posterity the peace we cherish so highly.

The No. 1 lesson of the war in China and throughout Europe is the lesson of aviation. The military experts who have regarded aviation as merely an auxiliary force to supplement the basic work of land and sea forces are far behind the times. Aviation is a separate, independent arm which must, of course, work in coordination with the others. But it possesses a unique striking power even without such coordination. Aviation demands recognition as a truly vital part of the defenses of our country. This recognition has been mighty slow in coming.

A decade or so ago, Arthur Brisbane wrote daily columns seeking to impress upon the American people the real need for recognition of aviation as the most important single branch of military preparedness. When he died, aviation lost its most compelling spokesman. The Nation remembers all too well the sad case of Billy Mitchell, who shocked his Army superiors by public demands for an independent air arm. For his pains he was court martialed and died without seeing the fruition of his dreams.

America today must recognize the validity of Arthur Brisbane's arguments and Billy Mitchell's martyrdom. We need a Secretary for Air who will sit in the Cabinet of the United States and take part in the promotion of a really great air force. If we are to build the 50,000 planes our President has envisaged, if we are to man, equip, and keep them flying, we shall need an experienced leadership devoted exclusively to this field.

We have a Secretary of War in the Cabinet of the President whose job it is to keep the armed forces of our country in complete readiness. In time of peace the task of our Secretary of War becomes one of administrative routine. We have in the Cabinet of the United States a Secretary of the Navy whose job it is to see that our fleet patrols the seven seas wherever Americans seek to travel and wherever the American flag is flying. In time of peace the job of our Secretary of the Navy also becomes one of administrative routine.

A Secretary for Air would be valuable to our country not only in time of war or threatened war, but also in the days of peace. His task would be the development and coordination of air lines, of stimulating commercial aviation, of building this newest development of man's ingenuity into a vast American industry girdling the entire globe with American transportation.

A Secretary for Air would be one of the most valuable additions to the President's Cabinet in days like the present. Our country has become aviation-minded in the short space of 5 years. Our young men are eager to fly the skies. This is the time for us to take one more step in the protection of our country. Let us have a Secretary for Air—now.

The Power Utilities Are Asking the Federal Government to Help Them Further Enslave Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Teapot Dome scandal was a baby as compared with what the Power Trust is trying to do to the people of Arkansas and other States of this Union.

The Office of Production Management was for several months ready, willing, and anxious to locate an aluminum plant in Arkansas, but it needed 120,000 kilowatts of firm power. The same utility companies that had fought the Government's effort to produce power in the area through hydroelectric projects, and the same companies who were at the same time running full-page ads in the Arkansas papers to the effect that they had ample power for defense industries were called upon to furnish power for an aluminum plant for the State. They made their proposal, and when we got into it we found that they were promising 20,000 kilowatts of power from the Possum-Kingdom Dam on the Brazos River in Texas that belonged to the Rural Electrification Administration, and that they were promising 32,000 kilowatts of power from the Pensacola Dam on the Grand River in Oklahoma that did not belong to them. Actually they were able to show a grand total of 33,000 kilowatts of their own power, and all of it was to come from outside Arkansas.

My attention has been called to a press release of the Arkansas Power & Light Co. in which the company says that it can furnish ample power for an aluminum plant anywhere in Arkansas. This statement is for public consumption and by the company's own admission to the Office of Production Management is wholly untrue.

The Rural Electrification Administration proposes to furnish the power at cost for the aluminum plant. Their proposal has the full endorsement of the Federal Power Commission.

Actually what the Arkansas Power & Light Co. wants is for the Federal Government to lend it the money to build new plants and new transmission connections so that it can strengthen the clutches of its monopoly and continue to bleed the people of Arkansas with its high and exorbitant rates. It wants to furnish power for the aluminum plant at an enormous profit.

An aluminum plant of 110,000,000 pounds of annual capacity was allocated to Arkansas on the basis of the R. E. A. proposal to furnish the power.

The Power Trust has failed the American people in this critical hour of need for more and more power; it has caught

our people with their backs to the wall, and it is trying to love us and stab us at the same time.

I am convinced that Director General William S. Knudsen and J. A. Krug, head of the Power Division of the O. P. M., are doing their best to hold the fort, but they have been besieged now for about 30 days with a Power Trust blitzkrieg, and we can only hope their strength will hold out.

View of Kansans on the Retention of National Guard Men, Reservists, and Selectees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

ARTICLES FROM THE NEWTON (KANS.) EVENING KANSAN-REPUBLICAN AND THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD a press dispatch printed in the Newton (Kans.) Evening Kansan-Republican of July 21, 1941, and an item from the Washington Times-Herald of July 23, 1941, as follows:

[From the Newton (Kans.) Evening Kansan-Republican of July 21, 1941]

HOUSTON FAVORS HOLDING SELECTEES—FIVE OF KANSAS' REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS OPPOSE NEW DRAFT ACT

WASHINGTON, July 21.—Five of Kansas' seven House Members expressed outright opposition in interviews to Gen. George C. Marshall's proposal that selectees, National Guard men, and Reserve officers be kept in training more than a year.

One said he was inclined to oppose the Presidentially approved suggestion now but might change his mind later.

Only Representative HOUSTON, the delegation's lone Democrat, said he favored the plan.

"I am for keeping them in more than a year in view of statement made by the Chief of Staff," Houston said. "We should take the advice of military experts and hold the Army at the required strength."

Representative HOPE said he was "inclined to oppose the suggestion" at this time, but added he still had "an open mind."

Representative GUYER said in his opinion efforts to keep the men in service was just another step toward participation in war.

"I'm opposed to it unless my mind can be changed," said Representative WINTER. "These men were taken into the Army for 1 year's training. I feel that when that year is up the Government should keep it's word to them."

"I'm against it," commented Representative LAMBERTSON. "It is natural for a soldier to want to keep his men together a long time."

Representative CARLSON also voiced disapproval.

"We promised the men they would have 1 year's training," he said. "I feel we have violated several other pledges. We should keep this one. If any of the men wish to volunteer to remain longer that would be all right."

Representative ILLES said the selectees, guardsmen, and Reserve officers should be released after 1 year of training unless the Nation is at war or Congress has declared a national emergency exists.

"It would create a better feeling to release them for that was the understanding," he said. "They can be called back if necessary. They will not leave the service all at once and as small groups go other men can take their places."

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 23, 1941]

BACK ROOSEVELT, WHITE URGES—"CONGRESSMEN WHO DON'T FACE DEFEAT"

EMPORIA, KANS., July 22.—William Allen White, outstanding Kansas editor, today warned Kansas Congressmen that continuous voting against President Roosevelt's foreign policy would work to eventual repudiation by their constituents.

In an open letter to the "boys" in his Emporia Gazette, the former chairman of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies called attention to the support which the President has enjoyed from the people in regard to every "incident."

Scoring the Kansas delegation for their almost unswerving isolationist record, the editor said, "you are entitled to think that he (President Roosevelt) is leading us into war if you want to. But most folks think that he has been right * * *

"Ninety-nine percent of America would vote to keep out of war. But every poll printed shows more than 65 percent of the American people are in favor of aid to Great Britain so far as the President has given it—to date," the letter continued.

Warning that "we are likely to be in war" within 60 days, White indicated the threat would probably come eventually from Japan, at the instigation of the European Axis Powers. In such case, he said, "watch out for a record vote which you can never explain if this country is in war in 1942."

Dedication of the New Wing of the Royal Norwegian Legation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

ADDRESSES AND FOREWORD OF PROGRAM

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the addresses delivered during the dedication of the new wing of the Royal Norwegian Legation, in the city of Washington, on Tuesday, July 22, 1941. I also include the foreword from the program issued for the occasion, entitled "Norway Looks Ahead," because it contains an inspiring message of faith which I am sure will be of interest to Members of the Congress:

NORWAY LOOKS AHEAD

On this little spot of free Norwegian soil the representatives of the lawful Government of King Haakon and of the Norwegian people are happy to welcome officials of the United States Government, members of the Supreme Court and Congress, representatives of the brave nations that are fighting against Nazi oppression, members of the American press, and the many other distinguished friends of Norway.

The adding of this new wing to the Royal Norwegian Legation—while answering urgent practical needs—is also a concrete symbol of Norway's faith in victory and freedom.

Though temporarily overrun by foreign aggressors, the Norwegian people—both inside their country and beyond its borders—are continuing their struggle for independence. For Norway, like her allies large and small, has confidence in the final defeat of rule by force and looks ahead to the establishment of a world where justice, good will, and civilization shall prevail.

ADDRESS BY HON. WILHELM MORGENSTIERNE, MINISTER OF NORWAY

May I wish you all a hearty welcome. We are happy to see here, on this July afternoon, so many friends of ours, of Norway's, of the things for which we fight: Freedom, democracy, and international faith.

This little piece of glorious American soil, today Norwegian territory, on which this building has been erected, was given to us a few years ago by American friends of Norway's, for a garden, a playground. Little did we know that so soon we should need it desperately for a workshop.

But we do. At the time of the invasion of Norway in April last year there were eight of us at the legation. Today we are 40 strong.

In itself it is not a very remarkable thing, of course, to build a new wing—some new office rooms. Thousands upon thousands of them, I suppose, are coming into being these days. But when, in spite of this, we asked you to come, it was because we hoped that perhaps you might feel as we do, that the idea is bigger than the house; that, if I may say so, this is a wing with wings. We hoped that the very fact of our expanding at this time, when Norway temporarily is being occupied and raped by foreign masters, might symbolize to you, to the world—yes, to the aggressors themselves—that we defy them, that we are building for the future, that we have abundant faith in victory and freedom.

Was there not a famous general who said something like this: "My left has been turned, my center smashed; the order of the day is forward"?

Norway was one of the most peace-loving countries in the world. We were pioneers in the field of international understanding and conventions. The great Swedish industrialist Alfred Nobel left it to a Norwegian committee to distribute the annual Nobel peace prize.

Today we are at war. In the dead of night, without warning of any kind, without the slightest provocation on our part, the Nazis broke into our peaceful land, bombing our cities, towns, and farmhouses, killing our men, women, and children.

From the first moment, in the face of the overwhelming mechanized forces of the invaders, our leaders and people stood up and refused to accept the slave terms offered to a proud and free people. Experience has shown only too clearly what happens to those who attempt to appease the insatiable aggressors.

Under the leadership of our great King Haakon and the legal Norwegian Government of Prime Minister Nygaardsvold, the Nor-

wegian people fought for 2 months on Norwegian soil.

They fight today on the home front, a bitter, heroic fight with weapons of the spirit, of the will, and love of country. They fight in such a way that nazi-ism in Norway today has suffered one of its greatest ideological defeats.

We also fight on the external front, and we are proud to fight side by side with the incomparable, heroic British and our other friends and allies. May I say how particularly happy we Norwegians are to see here as our guests today the representatives of our valiant brothers in arms, and in ideals and aspirations.

Yes; we are at war, we peace-loving Norwegians. We have learnt reluctantly, by bitter experience, that there is something still greater than peace. That life has little meaning without freedom. That there is something still more abhorent than fighting—and that is to have Quislings within one's gates.

There is a beautiful saying: "God gave us memory that we might have roses in December." Yes; what sustains the Norwegian people in these days of darkness and trial is the memory of those roses, of that life of freedom under the law, of protection and not persecution by the authorities, of safety and peace for the family around the hearth, of that way of life which was ours and still is yours, and the blessings of which are not fully realized until lost. Perhaps they cannot be realized until the heel of the barbarians is on one's back and the monstrous "new order" in deadly practice has become a bitter daily reality.

I cannot close without trying to express what the understanding, sympathy, and aid of this our mighty sister democracy has meant and means today to the Norwegian people. The vision of your great President and Congress in realizing the true nature of the present World War for freedom and the determination of the American people to aid the fighting democracies immeasurably strengthens our faith in victory and freedom. Among Norwegians at home and abroad it was a day of joy when our friends the Americans landed in Iceland. We like to be your good neighbors. You cannot come close enough.

We are honored and happy to see here on this occasion so many distinguished men and leaders of this great Nation, and again I wish them, and you all, a hearty welcome.

ADDRESS BY HER ROYAL HIGHNESS CROWN PRINCESS MARTHA OF NORWAY

I am happy to be here today at Norway's Legation in the United States.

Having lived in this country for almost a year now, I think perhaps I can bear witness to the fact that the American people increasingly realize that, in spite of everything which has happened, Norway still lives and fights.

Some of you may ask, "Why has the Norwegian Government built this addition to its Legation, now that the legions of Hitler have overrun our country?"

The answer is quite simple and clear. As the Minister just said: Norway is at war. It is fighting with all its strength and all its resources, to regain that freedom and independence which was our precious possession until 15 months ago.

The great Norwegian merchant marine of 4,000,000 tons and its 25,000 sailors are sailing the seas for our common cause, under the Norwegian flag and the management of the free Norwegian Government in London.

Norwegian soldiers, sailors, and pilots are training in Norwegian camps in Great Britain and Canada.

The Norwegian Government also under present conditions are upholding their unbroken tradition of never defaulting on an obligation. Interest is being paid, for instance, on all our dollar loans in the United States.

Yes; the free Norwegian Government is a going concern. It makes its great daily contribution, on land and sea, to the common fight of the democracies against the aggressors.

And so I raise here for the first time the unsullied and unyielding flag of Norway. I thank my people at home and abroad for their faith and courage, and I pray that Norwegians everywhere will always keep Norway's name as clean and honored as it is today. May this flag soon fly again over my beloved land, over a Norway that is once more free and happy and a good neighbor to the whole world.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE SUMNER WELLES, ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE

We are met here today to join in the dedication of the new wing of the Norwegian Legation in Washington.

These ceremonies are surely symbolic of the hope and of the faith with which we meet.

Those of us who are citizens of the United States are taking part in these dedication ceremonies not only because of the welcome privilege which it affords us of rendering this tribute to our traditional friends, the heroic people of Norway, but also because we can thus best evidence our conviction that the Kingdom of Norway of the past, as we have known it, some day—and we trust that day will come soon—will once more be free and independent.

We here in the United States will always remember the superb courage with which the Norwegian people fought in the defense of their homes and of their liberties against the overwhelmingly superior strength of an invader who had treacherously taken them by surprise. We know how bravely they are still fighting with their Allies on sea and land in many parts of the world.

We shall always remember the heroism of their monarch and of their crown prince. And we have heard with emotion the words of that same monarch when he said to his people only a few days ago, "Hold out. Don't lose courage. And be assured that Norway will once again be free and independent, provided that we all continue to do our duty and our utmost to reach our goal in the battle which is now being fought."

Those words seem to us to exemplify the soul of a people which will never admit defeat and which will never be cowed by alien domination.

But in a larger sense these ceremonies constitute an act of faith in the ultimate victory of the forces of human liberty; in the triumph of civilization itself over the forces of barbarism.

I feel that there are joined with us in spirit here today, as silent witnesses, the peoples of all of the other countries which have been mercilessly overrun during these past 2 years. I know that they believe as we do that out of this holocaust into which the nations of the earth have been plunged by the criminal obsession of world conquest of one man and of the satellites who surround him, there can come no peace until the Hitlerite government of Germany has been finally and utterly destroyed.

For I am confident that the cause of liberty and of freedom will not go down to defeat. The determination and courage of free men and women everywhere must now be exercised to the full limit of endurance until their victory is won.

And yet I do not doubt that millions are asking tonight—millions in England and in China—millions of enslaved peoples in Norway and in the other countries now temporarily occupied—millions in the countries which have not experienced war—yes; and millions in Germany and in Italy—are asking, What does the future hold for us after this struggle is over?

Does the end of the present carnage mean only a return to ruined homes; to the graves of slaughtered wives and children; to poverty and want; to social upheaval and economic chaos; to the same gray and empty years of confusion and bitterness, so barren in vision and in human accomplishment, which marked the decades after the termination of the last war?

It seems to me that those of us who are fortunate enough to be able to live as citizens of the free American republics have our great responsibility in the framing of the answer to that question.

For we, all of us, now see clearly, if we did not before, that no matter how great our American capacity for defense may be, no matter how perfect our hemispheric system may become, our future welfare must inevitably be contingent upon the existence in the rest of the world of equally peace-minded and equally secure peoples who not only will not, but cannot, become a source of potential danger to us in the New World.

I feel it is not premature for me to suggest that the free governments of peace-loving nations everywhere should even now be considering and discussing the way in which they can best prepare for the better day which must come, when the present contest is ended in the victory of the force of liberty and of human freedom, and in the crushing defeat of those who are sacrificing mankind to their own lust for power and for loot.

At the end of the last war, a great President of the United States gave his life in the struggle to further the realization of the splendid vision which he had held up to the eyes of suffering humanity—the vision of an ordered world governed by law.

The League of Nations, as he conceived it, failed in part because of the blind selfishness of men here in the United States, as well as in other parts of the world; it failed because of its utilization by certain powers primarily to advance their own political and commercial ambitions; but it failed chiefly because of the fact that it was forced to operate, by those who dominated its councils, as a means of maintaining the status quo. It was never enabled to operate as its chief spokesman had intended, as an elastic and impartial instrument in bringing about peaceful and equitable adjustments between nations as time and circumstance proved necessary.

Some adequate instrumentality must unquestionably be found to achieve such adjustments when the nations of the earth again undertake the task of restoring law and order to a disastrously shaken world.

But whatever the mechanism which may be devised, of two things I am unalterably convinced:

First. That the abolition of offensive armaments and the limitation and reduction of defensive armaments and of the tools which make the construction of such armaments possible, can only be undertaken through some rigid form of international supervision and control, and that without such practical and essential control, no real disarmament can ever be achieved; and

Second. That no peace which may be made in the future would be valid or lasting unless it established fully and adequately the natural rights of all peoples to equal economic enjoyment. So long as any one people or any one government possesses a monopoly over natural resources or raw materials which are needed by all peoples, there can be no basis for a world order based on justice and on peace.

I cannot believe that peoples of good will will not once more strive to realize the great

ideal of an association of nations through which the freedom, the happiness, and the security of all peoples may be achieved.

That word "security" represents the end upon which the hearts of men and women everywhere today are set.

Whether it be security from bombing from the air, or from mass destruction; whether it be security from want, disease, and starvation; whether it be security in enjoying that inalienable right which every human being should possess of living out his life in peace and happiness, people throughout the length and breadth of the world are demanding security and freedom from fear.

That is the objective before us all today—to try and find the means of bringing that to pass.

"Not in vain the distance beacons."

ADDRESS OF SIR ARTHUR SALTER, BRITISH SHIPPING MISSION

Lord Halifax, who is in the West of America, has asked me to represent him at this ceremony, which he is extremely sorry to be prevented from attending himself. He has, however, sent a message which he wishes me to give to you in his name. "No people," he says, "have met the trials of the present time with a more stanch courage than the people of Norway, and their resolution has excited the admiration of the free world.

"Day in, day out, through every hazard, Norwegian seamen are doing their duty with single-hearted devotion. In the stout hearts of the Norwegian people, loyal to their king and their country's cause, freedom has one of its strongest guaranties of victory."

May I, as head of the British Shipping Mission in the United States, say how wholeheartedly I agree with what Lord Halifax has said? When Norway was invaded, the Norwegian Government at once offered their great mercantile marine, freighters, tankers, and passenger ships for service in the war effort. The great bulk of that fleet, with the exception of what was trapped in enemy waters, has since been carrying vital supplies in the war zone. The rest of the Norwegian vessels, which have been engaged in useful but less dangerous work, chiefly in this hemisphere, are now also coming into the war zone. The officers and crews of these additional vessels will doubtless show the same courage and devotion as their compatriots who have long been in this service. All together share with British seamen the perils and the pride of combatants in the battle of the Atlantic; and in one respect they bear a heavier burden than British crews in that they are cut off from their wives and families until the day when victory is won and Norway is again free. They are sustained by their native hardihood, by the assurance that victory will in time be achieved, and that they themselves will have made a vital contribution to it. For the issue of the battle of the Atlantic—still being fought, and hard fought on both sides—is the issue of the war itself; and the prize of victory, whose symbol "V" is now passing like a torch throughout the occupied territories, will be freedom for all of us.

It is a thousand years since Norsemen braved their way through the perils of the North Atlantic to the Western Hemisphere. Now, a millennium later, their worthy descendants are braving new perils in the same stormy seas to bring the resources of a free world to the rescue of the enslaved continent. Norway's great instrument of victory is her merchant fleet and the men who man it. And her government, people, and seamen alike have made it clear that this instrument will be used 'till victory, and with victory, liberation is achieved and assured.

Voorhis Resolution Advocating Economic Advisory Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I appeared before a labor subcommittee of which Congressman ROBERT RAMSPECK is chairman. This subcommittee was then conducting hearings on the resolution introduced by the able and distinguished statesman from California, Congressman JERRY VOORHIS, which provides for the creation of an economic advisory commission to study post-war conditions. When speaking to the committee members, I informed them that I heartily favored the creation of such a commission as is proposed in the Voorhis resolution, to earnestly study this vital problem of post-war demobilization of industry and manpower so that we can build an economy and a post-war period of prosperity, unparalleled in our youthful Nation's history. I have great faith in, and personal admiration for, the sponsor of this resolution, and do not believe that any Congressman is more sincerely interested in the welfare and well-being of the people of this Nation than the studious gentleman from California. I believe a well-composed commission with a highly competent research staff could render a service to our Nation that would stand as a monument to democratic government and dispute the challenge of the dictators. I think it is essential to the preservation of our democracy to create a commission of this nature. This commission, in order to carry on a constructive program, must be created immediately to plan for the mobilization of all our resources, human and material, in a youthful nation rich with natural resources, for a happier living and a more equal distribution of the wealth of the Nation among all the people living in a world at peace.

I am herewith submitting an editorial that appeared in the July 5, 1941, issue of the McKeesport (Pa.) Daily News, one of the outstanding liberal newspapers in my district. Said newspaper is edited by W. D. Mansfield, former senator of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and former commissioner of Allegheny County, Pa. This editorial heartily supports the Voorhis resolution:

[From the McKeesport (Pa.) Daily News of July 5, 1941]

AFTER-THE-WAR PROBLEMS

One of the soundest congressional proposals in months has been made by a subcommittee of the House Labor Committee.

The subcommittee has given its support to a resolution introduced by Congressman JERRY VOORHIS, of California, which would set up a commission to study social and economic problems which will arise after the war.

Of course, there are many more pressing problems confronting Congress, the administration, and the people of the Nation, the most important being defense, foreign affairs, and the preservation of some sort of stable economic structure during the war.

There are even some persons who assume that the war and gigantic Government spending will have solved our economic troubles by the time the war has ended. Defense production has served in some measure to blot out the idea that limitation on productivity, a policy of scarcity, is to be desired, but on the whole the war has aggravated our economic ills more than it has alleviated them. Present prosperity is deceptive; we haven't been presented with the bill yet.

It is not too early to begin plotting the course that we will take in peace. Our post-war policies will have to be well planned if they are to be successful, because there will be many difficulties in the way.

The success of such a social and economic study will depend upon the attitude of the members of the commission.

If the study is unduly influenced by the pet theories of some of its members or by political considerations it will only muddy waters which will be dangerous enough to navigate when clear.

The Voorhis resolution holds a great opportunity. We hope proper use is made of that chance for keeping the Nation on the rails in the post-war years to come.

H. R. 965—Fourth-Class Postmasters Salary Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. BURCH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, by passage of H. R. 965, the House of Representatives has recognized the wisdom of placing postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis in lieu of compensation on the basis of cancelation.

The purpose of H. R. 965 is to eliminate the present cancelation system for payment of compensation to postmasters of the fourth class and substitute therefor fixed annual salaries, based on postal receipts, under the same plan as that in effect in post offices of the first, second, and third classes, which would provide a uniform system for all classes of postmasters.

The present cancelation system, which provides for commissions of 160 percent of the first $75 value of stamps canceled, 85 percent of the next $100, and 75 percent of the remainder during 3 months' quarterly period as compensation to postmasters, is a very complicated system, which has proven unsatisfactory to the Department as well as to the postmasters.

First. The system is complicated and subject to errors.

Second. Postage purchased from a Presidential post office and used on mail matter deposited at a fourth-class office

results in two payments of compensation for one service.

Third. The cancelation system makes every postmaster his own accountant with no accurate method of determining the correct basis of claims. While this privilege is seldom abused, it unfortunately directs suspicion against the integrity of any and all postmasters of the fourth class.

Fourth. There is no way to determine advanced compensation, as the cancelations fluctuate daily and the postmasters cannot under any cancelation system accurately determine their compensation until the end of a 3-month period.

Fifth. Because of the complicated system fully 50 percent of the quarterly reports require audit corrections, which is expensive to the Government.

There has been a growing demand for a change of the method of payment of compensation to postmasters of the fourth class for more than a quarter of a century, but no definite steps were taken to accomplish this purpose until the latter part of 1939, when the Post Office Department appointed a committee of post-office inspectors to thoroughly investigate receipts and cancellations of these offices and to determine, insofar as possible, a fixed annual rate of pay in line with the present compensation.

The salary schedule contained in H. R. 965 embodies the plan drafted by the committee of postal experts, and it is believed to be a solution to this problem.

On January 1, 1941, there were 28,973 post offices of the fourth class which would be affected by the passage of this measure. The postmasters are strongly favorable to this proposal, which will remove the guesswork as to their compensation through the fixing of definite annual salaries.

The Department's report, compiled by the committee of inspectors, submitted with the draft for this legislation, indicated that approximately 22,000 postmasters would have their compensation slightly increased, while 6,918 would be reduced in compensation. Of the number reduced, 3,620 will be reduced 5 percent or less; 1,680 will be reduced more than 5 percent but less than 10 percent; while the postmasters, numbering approximately 1,500, who would be reduced 10 percent or more are protected under the provision contained in the bill for a period of 2 years to enable the Department to investigate and confer with the postmasters in such offices with a view of bringing about a normal average between receipts and mail dispatched insofar as possible, and to readjust the salaries at the end of 2 years in the proper salary grade. This provision will not increase the cost of the service in such offices but will actually reduce it by relegating it to the grade below for a period of not exceeding 2 years.

Under the present cancelation system the compensation of postmasters of the fourth class ranges from a few dollars up to $1,100 per annum, with the average compensation of $533 per annum. However, more than 9,000 postmasters receive less than $300 per year.

There will be savings resulting from the measure which are impossible to estimate, but it is believed that these savings will almost, if not entirely, eliminate the additional cost indicated by the Department.

The bill will eliminate padding of cancelation accounts by indiscreet postmasters; it will reduce expensive errors in counting cancelations, and will prevent duplicate payments of compensation to two post offices where mail is diverted.

This is sound legislation, and will put into effect a businesslike system which has long been needed. Postmasters generally will give hearty approval to this constructive measure.

Trouble to the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1941

ARTICLE BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD a timely article by Ernest K. Lindley which appeared in the Washington Post of July 23, 1941, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 23, 1941]

TROUBLE TO THE SOUTH—THE NAZIS IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

At least four events and statements of the last few days must be considered together:

1. The Nazi putsch quashed in Bolivia.

2. Under Secretary of State Welles' statement that the United States has information that Germany is planning new steps of aggression against remaining independent countries in Europe—meaning Spain and Portugal. (There are only two others—Sweden and Switzerland.)

3. The President's declaration to Congress: "I do believe—I know—the danger of today is infinitely greater." (Meaning "than a year ago.")

4. General Marshall's testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee that the United States has been in imminent peril for 2 months, and that if he told all he knew it "might result in something like the sinking of the *Maine* or the Zimmerman note."

The putsch nipped in Bolivia was not imaginary. The Bolivian Government had documentary evidence that a conspiracy to overthrow it with the aid of pro-Nazi Bolivian Army officers was being planned by Nazi agents, working through or in close cooperation with diplomatic representatives of the Nazi Government.

The date for the putsch had not been set. A well-informed guess is that it would have been timed to coincide with similar attempts in a few other Latin American nations. All of them might have been synchronized with a Nazi move into the Iberian peninsula and the shoulder of Africa.

Serious Nazi activities in Latin America may seem implausible now while the main Nazi armed forces are engaged in the invasion of Russia. But many military observers believe that the Nazis, even if they have not destroyed the Russian regime, will have pushed what is left of the Russian armies to the Urals by mid-September. Then, it is conjectured, they will turn their attention to Spain, Portugal, the South Atlantic islands, the shoulder of Africa, and South America.

In our Government there are, broadly speaking, two schools of thought concerning Nazi activity in Latin America. One is that it is intended to divert our attention from the main theaters of war; to make us hesitate to give all the aid of which we are capable to the British. As a rule, but not in all cases, this view is held by those who think that if Britain goes down, we are lost.

The second view is that, whatever the motive, a serious Nazi thrust toward the lower half of this hemisphere is being planned and that it must be frustrated, by armed force if necessary.

But among our well-informed officials there is no doubt that Nazi activity in Latin America is being intensified. It is passing from propaganda of a general type to what appear to be definite plans for action.

Suppose that about the time the Nazis headed into Spain and Portugal there were putsches in several Latin American countries. Suppose also that the Nazis should succeed in landing troops in the Azores or the Cape Verde Islands. With such forces as we now have we would face a serious military predicament.

As General Marshall pointed out, the marines had to be sent to Iceland because Regular Army units contained selectees and Reserve officers whose terms of service under existing law will soon expire. The Marine Corps units in Iceland have had special training in landing operations under fire. They might be needed in case of trouble in Latin America or if the Nazis got to the Azores, and selectees can be sent anywhere in the Western Hemisphere, the present 1-year service law for the latter two is an effective barrier to their use in Brazil, let us say.

We are pledged to the defense of Latin America. Many Latin American army heads have had their advanced training in Europe, including Germany. Some of them perhaps admire the Nazi scheme of things. Many of them, in any case, have indicated doubt about our ability to defend the Western Hemisphere. The Nazis know this and are capitalizing on it.

The idea, accepted by some of our isolationists, that the defense of the Western Hemisphere is easily within our capacity does not seem to have made much of an impression on some of the military experts in Latin America. They want proof, and lacking it, tend in some cases to gravitate toward the Axis.

As a soldier, General Marshall is not given to loose talk. When he alluded to an incident like the sinking of the *Maine* or the Zimmerman note he was not speaking idly. In World War I the notes of Chancellor Zimmerman of Germany offered Mexico definite inducements, including the recovery of Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona, to ally itself with Germany in the World War.

The Zimmerman notes probably were intended only to divert our energies. But one can never be sure when some Nazi-influenced government or group may take the bait. General Marshall did not indicate whether he was referring to a certain Latin American nation or to Japan. But he plainly indicated that he knows that the Nazi are offering specific inducements to certain nations to ally themselves with Germany in war against us.

The President's strong references to defense of the Western Hemisphere in his message to Congress underlines the same situation.

Beneath the Bolivian counterputsch and the statements of the President, the Chief of Staff, and the Acting Secretary of State there is plenty of TNT in our own backyard.

Peace Rather Than War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. LEWIS D. THILL, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following radio address delivered by me over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co. on July 23, 1941, through the facilities of station WRC in Washington:

Fellow Americans, more than a century and a half ago, as Benjamin Franklin stepped out of the historic room in which the Constitution of the United States had just been drawn up, he made one of the greatest American statements which has reverberated down the corridors of time. A bystander called out, "What do we have, Mr. Franklin, a monarchy or a democracy?" Benjamin Franklin responded with these simple but significant words, "It's a republic, if you can keep it." Today, as this country faces the serious problems of keeping our national credit or going bankrupt, of retaining government of the people here at home, as against adopting a foreign system of fascism, of protecting and preserving the independent destiny of the United States and the Western Hemisphere, as against giving up our independence and merging our destiny with Europe's by joining in the endless wars which have scourged that continent, Benjamin Franklin's warning takes on new significance. Indeed, we have a republic in this country—if we can keep it.

Whether or not we can keep it depends almost entirely upon whether or not we go to war or stay at peace. Even many of the war group, who are today urging that we send our men, our money, and our materials to join forces with a foreign country, are honest enough to admit that the United States cannot fight in this war and remain a republic. They grant that if we go to war, we must have one-man government here just as Germany, and Italy, and Russia have one-man governments over there, and just as Britain herself grows more and more totalitarian and dictatorial every day, as her war effort saps more of her strength and denies additional rights and privileges to her citizens. In other words, it is now generally believed by serious students of government on both sides of the question of war or peace that if we go to war the first casualty in this country will be the loss of our liberties here at home. Labor will lose its right of collective bargaining and its social gains certainly for the duration of the war, and no man can safely predict for how many long years after the end of the war; private property and industries, already threatened, will be taken over by the Government and conscripted for war needs; farmers will find themselves working their fields to produce food to be sold under price-fixing regulations which will condemn them to the virtual role of European peasants; and Congress itself will come more and more to be a mere committee in Government with the President and his personally selected advisers running the country by Executive decree. Under the pretense of trying to stop Hitler over there we have already copied many of Hitler's methods over here. If we follow the pleas of the war crowd and again send our men to fight and die on foreign battle fronts, we shall find ourselves setting up dictatorship in America under the false slogan of stopping dictatorship in Europe.

Ever since this war began, nearly 2 years ago, we have been subjected to the greatest propaganda program in history. Fortunately the propaganda agents of Germany and Italy have now been checked and many of them have been sent home where they belong. But the propaganda agents of England and Russia are being given the run of this country. Certain newspapers, radio commentators, moving-picture companies, and even some administration spokesmen have joined in the propaganda chorus of such titled Englishmen as Sir Josiah Wedgwood and Lord Halifax. And now the great underground subversive system of the Communist Party in America is engaged in an all-out effort to push this country into the war. No stone has been left unturned in the stupendous endeavor to propagandize America into another war. The effort has been made to repeat the performance of 1917, when after spending over $150,000,000 to propagandize America into war, with success crowning their efforts, the British turned the job of winning that war over to American soldiers. Later on Winston Churchill wrote a book condemning us as "meddlers" because we got into the war. Thus Uncle Sam concluded his first adventure into European power politics with the title "Uncle Sap."

The war propagandists are reviving the slogans they used 24 years ago, hoping that Americans have forgotten the devices used to plunge us into that conflict. Again they shout over the radio to the unsuspecting, or flash upon the pages of newspapers in which they spend thousands of dollars for advertising space, "This is a war to end war," "this is a war to protect democracy," "this is a war to preserve Christianity." Again the moving-picture industry is lending itself in large part to spreading propaganda through distorted news reels and hate-stimulating pictures. By every trick known to the propagandists, and with every scheme that money can buy, the war promoters in America, and the foreign agents working with them, are trying to scare or entice this country into war. But America is not so easily fooled a second time. Persistently and consistently, in every public-opinion poll that is taken, the people who have to fight the wars are telling the people who try to make the wars that the people want no part in the wars. Four-fifths of the people in America are opposed to entering this conflict; even in New York City and New York State the latest poll shows over 70 percent of the people opposed to joining this war; in Congress, today, in the Senate and House combined, less than 40 men could be found who would vote to put this country into the battle overseas.

America is telling the war crowd, America is warning the agitators from foreign countries, America is serving notice on its President who secured his coveted third term on the solemn promise to keep this country out of war, that it is united today in its opposition to entering another foreign war. America is telling Benjamin Franklin across a century and a half, "We have a republic where the people rule, and we propose to keep it; and we know that the only way to keep it a republic is to stay out of this war."

The overwhelming determination of America to remain at peace is making itself felt. A significant demonstration of this was reported in the Washington Times-Herald of July 18. Under the headline "Paramount bans propaganda in films," Neil F. Agnew, vice president of Paramount Pictures, Inc., is reported as telling a Paramount sales conference in Chicago—and I quote his words:

"It's purely a matter of dollars and cents. The public has shown that it does not want propaganda on the screen. So far as Paramount is concerned, there will be no propaganda in its pictures."

This demonstrates once again how the people in a republic can get what they want.

Frequently people write their Congressman asking what they can do to help keep America at peace. The statement I just read you suggests one answer to that question. If you are among the vast majority of real Americans who want peace, who put their flag and their country ahead of any other, if you are really Americans first, last, and all the time, you can win this fight if you will work for peace one-hundredth as hard as you must work if we get into war. Here are some specific things you can do if you really want peace and are willing to work for it. Take the movies, for example; you can let your theater manager know that you will not support his place of business if he persists in putting war propaganda on his screen; you can also assure the loyal American theater manager who does not use his theater as a sounding board for the war propagandists that you will patronize him. When you hear radio commentators trying to propagandize for war write the companies sponsoring them and register your protest. When you hear commentators who are fair and honest, send your encouragement to their commercial sponsors. There are many more things you can do to offset the millions of dollars the war crowd is spending in an effort to stir up your emotions or confuse your judgment to the point where you will be forced to send your sons to die fighting in Russia, China, or Africa. You can and should write the President a personal letter asking him not to break his contract with you, asking him to keep the good faith with you and to fulfill his freely and frequently given promises to keep this country out of war. You should write to your two Senators often and frankly ask them to become active in the fight against the war-propaganda machine. You should write your Representative and tell him that you want more than just his vote against war and his vote against further steps into war; tell him you depend upon him to render real service in this hour of need by taking an active part in the peoples' fight to protect and preserve the peace of America.

Letters reaching Washington are being carefully read these days, both in the White House and in every office on Capitol Hill. A recent poll shows a 3-percent increase in the sentiment against our entering the war. It shows that the war crowd has begun to lose ground despite its expensive campaign to stampede confused Americans into another foreign war. Your efforts have produced results and you should now devote increased time to the task of defeating the war propagandists once and for all. Opposition to war here in Washington is gaining ground every day. Many who a few months ago were weakly saying, "We are in the war," are now convinced that America can win its fight to stay out of the war. If America responds with an emphatic and permanent "no" to the enticements of the foreign agents, the communistic "fifth columnists," and the war promoters, we can be sure that never again in our history will public men seriously suggest that we send our sons to fight and die for a foreign cause. I cannot impress upon you too strongly how effective the people's crusade for peace has become and how important it is that you do your part with personal letters to hold the gains for peace which have been made.

If you who want peace, you who comprise the united majority of this country, if you

who love freedom in America more than you hate the foreigners of any land, if you who place the Stars and Stripes above the emblem of the swastika, the hammer and sickle, or the union jack—if you will exert your influence upon your elected public officials by petitions and letters which is your right and privilege under our form of government, the cunning campaign of the war group in America will be held in check and your country and mine will show to all the world that America is determined to keep faith with Benjamin Franklin and the founders of our Republic.

Alabama Youth Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD 2D, OF ALABAMA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting address delivered by my colleague the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr BANKHEAD], on National Youth Day at Birmingham, Ala., on June 26 last, captioned "Alabama youth defense day."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to be present on this occasion to speak to you on the place of youth in the national-defense program. It has been my happy privilege to have had some part, as a Member of the Senate of the United States, in planning and providing for the youth program which we recognize here today. It is with a great deal of pride in its achievements that I address you.

I am sure that I need not emphasize the supreme importance of our national defense. Whatever confidence we may once have had in the impregnability of our ocean frontiers, the modern airplane has destroyed. Whatever belief we may have had that men without arms fighting in the defense of their country have a supernatural strength which can match that of any conqueror has been left in the wake of the Nazi juggernaut as we have seen it sweep over the continent of Europe. The men of Poland and of Norway and of Yugoslavia and of Greece lacked nothing in courage or patriotism. They were fighting for the preservation of their national existence; yes, even for the preservation of their homes and families. Yet with all their courage and effort each of these nations fell under the onslaught.

With the fall of France we here in America began to see more clearly than we had ever seen before that war today is truly total war. No longer may a nation send its army out to fight while "business as usual" carries on at home. Whether its purpose be aggression or defense the modern nation must be prepared to wage total war if it is to have any hope of success or survival.

Behind the Army and the Navy there must be an efficiently functioning industrial system; there must be a never-ending flow of supplies and equipment; there must be swift communications; and equally important, there must be a united people with a firm belief in the principles they are defending.

We in America have realized the mistakes of the wishful thinkers of Europe, and we are determined to build a system of national defense which will withstand attacks from any source. We know that to accomplish this end we must have more and more production of war materials. We must build plants and we must man those plants with skilled workers. We must turn out airplanes, tanks, guns, and munitions in ever-increasing quantities.

Your Government is fully aware of the needs of the hour and is rapidly bringing this national-defense program into top-speed operation. Agencies have been established to supervise the construction of defense plants, to plan their activities, to insure the sources of supply of raw materials, to see that prices do not get out of reason. A selective-service system has been set up to provide a trained Army adequate for our needs. A civilian defense program is being set up with a place for every citizen who wishes to serve his Nation.

Fortunately we have not been faced with the necessity for setting up new agencies to deal with every phase of the national-defense program. Six years ago today Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, by Executive order established the National Youth Administration. For 6 years young men and women have been going from National Youth Administration shops and projects into American industry. Thousands of young American workers are better qualified today because there was a National Youth Administration to give them work experience. This has been a wise investment by the American people—an investment which today is paying rich dividends in terms of national defense. This agency, established through the wise foresight of the greatest advocate of democracy in the world today, originally planned to give assistance to needy youth, has become in the truest sense a bulwark of our national defense. Today as the requirements for experienced workers in defense grow hourly the National Youth Administration stands ready to supply those experienced workers.

Three hundred and seventy thousand young people are now employed by the National Youth Administration on its out-of-school work program. One hundred and fifty thousand of these are employed on shop projects and are receiving experience which will fit them for jobs in defense industries.

These young people are ready for places of responsibility in this emergency. If theirs is the task of keeping the factory wheels turning so that men at the front line will lack nothing in equipment or supplies, they will be prepared to take up their tools and do the job. If their assignment lies in the maintenance of the vital communication systems of the Nation, they will be ready to do their part. If it be their lot to wear their country's uniform in service on land, on the sea, or in the air, they will be better prepared to defend their homeland.

Under national-defense appropriations many large factory-type work centers have been established where young workers are now producing useful goods for the armed services, including equipment, supplies, arms, and parts for ordnance depots, arsenals, and Army camps. N. Y. A. now has more than 5,307 such shops, and of these at least 1,000 are expected to be used intensively under the new defense work experience and training program. Most of these will be operated with two and three shifts a day to meet the emergency need for new workers in defense industries, which, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, may amount to more than a million eight hundred thousand during this year. If all defense plants go on a three-shift basis, which is a likelihood, 6,000,000 more workers will be required.

Not only is N. Y. A. making its contribution through the preparing of young workers for jobs in defense industries and in the production of defense materials, but in many other ways. Fifteen thousand young N. Y. A. workers are now employed in Army posts, cantonments, and other military establishments throughout the country. Some of these youth live at their homes and are transported to the project where they work under skilled Army supervision on nonmilitary duties, such as the repair of buildings and facilities and clerical work. This work has particular importance, because it frees the Army personnel for a greater amount of military training. In addition, a large number of youth have been assigned to provide clerical assistance to selective-service boards all over the country, thus rendering service in this gigantic undertaking.

I am proud of the record of the Alabama Youth Administration in this great work. Two thousand Alabama boys and girls are living in resident centers while working on projects and in shops, many of which may be classed as defense plants. Twenty-five hundred others are employed on nonresident workshop-production projects, gaining experience in such types of work as sheet-metal work, welding, automobile maintenance and repair, machine shop, and electrical and radio work. Three thousand others are working on construction projects. About 500 Alabama N. Y. A. young men and women are employed on projects in connection with military establishments under the supervision of Army officials. Numbers are assisting their local selective-service boards with their work. The work record of these young people not only is a credit to themselves and to the Youth Administration, of which they are a part, but to the State of which they are young citizens.

Today we find youth fired with the flame of patriotic fervor, devoted to the cause of democracy, willingly giving their best efforts to the defense of their Nation. We find the doors of industry opening to those whom the N. Y. A. and other agencies have prepared for jobs. We see them happy in finding work to do. Contrast this picture with that of a few short years ago. The world was sunk in the depths of the great depression. In every nation youth suffered most severely from economic dislocation. Here in the United States there were 6,000,000 young people unemployed and with no hope of employment. The only doors open to youth in those dark days were the doors of empty freight cars, of the corner pool halls, and the back alleys. American youth suffered a tremendous loss in those years—a loss in morale, and of the educational experience which comes from holding down a job. They left their high schools and colleges with high hopes, but those hopes were soon shattered with the endless denials of their requests for jobs. They had no experience. There weren't jobs enough for the experienced workers, much less for inexperienced youth

The stage was set for action. In other nations we saw this action take violent forms. We saw youth, unable to get jobs in normal ways and set up homes and bring up families of their own, don black shirts and brown shirts and learn to goose-step at the command of leaders who promised them a way out of unhappiness into glory. Today these youth carry the torches which daily add to the flames in Europe. There is no unemployment for them, for they are employed in the business of destruction.

American youth had the same problems. Undoubtedly they had the same temptations to take the road of violence and destruction. But fortunately for the future of our democracy, they were made of a firmer stock, and

they found a leadership devoted to building a better life for all within the framework of democratic government.

While the youth of other nations were being regimented in their activities, with opportunities for free employment and free education restricted, the United States, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, embarked on a program designed to expand the services for employment and education offered to youth instead of restricting them. The Civilian Conservation Corps was established early in the present administration to give employment to youth whose activities had been confined to tramping the streets or roaming the open road. Then on June 26, 1935—6 years ago today—the National Youth Administration was established. Its purposes were to give employment to youth who were out of school and unemployed, and to give work to students who were still in school and in need of funds to continue their studies.

The value of this program can never be computed. Over one and a half million unemployed youth were given jobs and new opportunities during the first 5 years of the N. Y. A. One million seven hundred and fifty thousand students were given work which enabled them to earn the money necessary for them to remain in school. This very year 473,277 students in 30,118 American high schools and colleges were enabled to continue their education through part-time employment on the N. Y. A. student work program. N. Y. A. has meant a great deal to these youth. It has turned despair into hope; it has opened doors that once were closed; it has brought opportunity in the place of disappointment; it has given eager youth a chance to work and learn.

If we were to eliminate from our consideration the other manifold contributions of the National Youth Administration to national defense, the improvement of the morale of unemployed youth in making democracy real to them, would warrant its being placed in the highest rank of defense agencies. When the call to service comes, it will receive a ready answer from these thousands of young men and women whose faith in democracy has been renewed and whose courage has been strengthened.

From its establishment down to May 1 of this year the National Youth Administration has spent $8,627,367 in the State of Alabama to provide new opportunities for Alabama boys and girls. Of this sum $2,344,286 went to students in our high schools and colleges, giving hundreds of youth an opportunity for greater educational advancement than would have been possible if there had been no National Youth Administration. That these students have been worthy of the interest of our Government is demonstrated by the fact that they have maintained scholastic records superior to the average of their fellow students.

This very month of June 4,200 students are graduating from 1,385 schools and 26 colleges and universities in Alabama who would have been unable to complete their education without the part-time work provided by the N. Y. A.'s student work program. Six million two hundred eighty-three thousand and eighty-one dollars have been expended on the out-of-school work program, furnishing employment to approximately 50,000 Alabama youth in the past 6 years.

We now have 38 resident work centers employing 1,954 youth and 3 new centers are under construction. There are in addition 63 workshops employing 2,538 youth. In both these shops and resident centers Alabama youth are getting experience in jobs related to defense industries. N. Y. A. is also assisting in the development of vocational education in rural areas by constructing farm shops. Nineteen of these have already been completed and 25 additional ones are in the process of construction. In these farm shops, which are connected with the local school systems, rural youth in Alabama will gain experience of a vocational nature which is much needed in our present emergency.

The success of the N. Y. A. program both in its national-defense and in its youth-serving aspects must be measured by the number of youth whom it prepares for places in industry and who subsequently do find those places. The statistics are striking. During the 5 months December 1940 through April 1941, 151,949 young men and women left the rolls of the National Youth Administration in the country to take jobs in private industry. At least 50,000 of these received jobs in manufacturing industries which are directly or indirectly related to national defense. In the 4-month period December 1940 through March 1941, 1,546 Alabama N. Y. A. youth received jobs in private industry. These young people are now employed turning out iron and steel to strengthen our defense arms, building aircraft to guard the skies, manufacturing radio equipment to maintain communications with our farthest outposts north and south, east and west, building ships to carry the life-sustaining flow of supplies to the valiant defenders of democracy in other continents, and in a thousand other ways working to make our Nation stronger.

When we are thinking of these statistics let us not lose sight of the individuals. Behind every figure of these placements in industry there is a youth. It may be the boy who discovered while on N. Y. A. that he liked to work with machines and who, because he found what he wanted, has a good job in a ship-repair plant. It may be the girl who worked on an upholstery project, and now is employed by an automobile company to do the work for which she is fitted. Every figure is the story of a youth who has learned how to work, whose way in the world of business is more sure because he has had experience, and who is a citizen ready and willing to be of service to the country which gave him his opportunities.

The National Youth Administration has carried on a great work. The results of its activities will be felt for many years to come as its finest products—the youth themselves—take their places in American life as workers and as citizens. We will see as the years roll on that our money and our effort was well spent in giving American youth an opportunity to achieve a better life within the framework of our democracy.

In closing, I wish to address a word to you young men and women present here today who are employed by the National Youth Administration: You and your supervisors in N. Y. A. have worked faithfully and well. Almost every community in our Nation can point to tangible benefits which have come as a result of the National Youth Administration. In working you have added to your skills. You have new talents to offer your future employers. I congratulate you on your achievements, and I know that you yourselves are filled with the just pride that comes from a job well done. There is much for which we should be thankful; there is much with which we are highly pleased. But the job is not yet completed. We must not now rest on our laurels. You and I and every loyal American has a job to do in the defense of America. Let us each put the best we have within us into that job. Do not be content with less than the best. If we do that much—you on your N. Y. A. projects and later on in your jobs in private industry, the rest of us in whatever position in this emergency we may fill—God willing, this Nation of ours will survive the threatening tempest, and democracy will stand unbowed.

My Reply to Secretary Knox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me over the Columbia network on July 16 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I speak tonight particularly to the fathers and mothers of America.

Near the end of my term as Governor of New Hampshire I visited the veterans' hospital at Bedford, Mass, to make a personal call on the New Hampshire World War veterans among the several hundred mental cases in that institution.

Our reception committee was a brass band, made up of mentally sick veterans, doing their best to play the national anthem. It was a pathetic sight. Those shell-shocked patients, who 13 years before had been fine specimens of American manhood, the pride of loving parents, and who had left their homes, their wives, their children behind them on a venture into the hell of war on the European Continent, on the promise—on the promise, I tell you—that the statesmen, the world politicians, would make the world safe for democracy and would see to it that there would be no more wars in the world.

We went from bed to bed in that veterans' hospital, and when I came out into the open air again, mightily moved by what I had seen, I made a solemn vow to Almighty God that if any future attempt should be made to launch my fellow men on an expeditionary force into another European war I would crack it, and crack it hard.

Since the outbreak of the present war I have kept faith with that solemn vow, and so long as I have the strength to carry on I shall strike out at the continual sinister moves of those so-called leaders who seem bent on involving us in the ruinous, drawn-out death struggle in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

It is high time to speak frankly. The interventionist leaders of the Nation are using subtle propaganda, deceit, and misrepresentation to push the American people into the war. Someone has defined a lie as the intent to deceive; and in this crucial hour deception, rather than truth, is the weapon used by the warmongers to steal the minds of the people.

On October 30, in an appeal for votes for reelection, the President addressed the people of the Nation from Boston. The highlight of his message was the following promise: "And while I am talking to you fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign war. They are going into training, to form a force so strong that by its very existence it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores. The purpose of our defense is defense."

And on November 2, he definitely said, "Your President says this country is not going to war."

Fathers and mothers of America, that assurance could not have been more definite—could not have been made any stronger—by any use of the English language. The people believed him. Relying on that assurance, they reelected him. We demand that he keep those promises.

Yet in the face of these assurances, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, has, with the consent of the President, declared for immediate warfare by our naval forces, in direct violation of his promises before the Senate Naval Committee when he sought confirmation. On that occasion, he testified that he was opposed to any steps by the United States Government, which would involve this country in the war. He further testified that he would not go to war under any circumstances. On the strength of those promises, the Senate voted to confirm him. But now those promises have gone with the wind.

On this record of broken faith with the people of America, I say that this is truly a solemn, sad, and crucial hour in our Nation's history. There is great need in America right now of a revival of common honesty and integrity.

Mothers and fathers of America, let us get together and make the only kind of promise that cannot be broken—a collective promise to each other, that we will do everything within our power to keep America out of the battlefields and oceans of Europe, Asia, and Africa. Let us promise each other to work and arm America so that our shores will be impregnable to the combined forces of a war-torn and war-devastated world.

Any interventionist who says that we of America, 130,000,000 strong, with a productive capacity greater than all Europe combined, cannot make our shores impregnable must admit, by the same reasoning, that we are far from ready to launch ourselves onto the battlefields abroad with any hope of overcoming the highly mechanized armies of Europe. And yet they would have us do just that.

On July 7 General Auchinleck, commander of British forces in the Middle East, urged the United States manpower as necessary to win the war on Germany's own soil. He was following the advice given many years ago by Winston Churchill in his book, who said, "Nothing will bring American sympathy along with us so much as American blood shed in the field."

Of his interview with General Auchinleck, the New York Times correspondent wrote as follows: "If America adopts a status of active belligerency, she must prepare to wage war on the Continent of Europe compared to which our expeditionary force of 1917-18 was an Elks' picnic. * * * She must be prepared not only to enter on a grand scale but quite possibly to bear the brunt of it. This time, in all probability, we shall not go into the existing battle line as we did in the nick of time in the last war. Quite probably we shall have to make our own landing somewhere in the Eastern Hemisphere, for, as Auchinleck said and Wavell indicated, the war can really be won only in Europe and probably only in Germany."

As pointed out by the well-known writer, Bill Cunningham, stripped of all romantic language it would result in permitting the British Army to revert to the status of home guards, while we send our richest blood on the highly questionable task of shooting out a landing place somewhere in Europe and launching, unaided and at tremendous loss of life, a desperate expedition at the end of the longest and most dangerous lines of supply in the history of the world's military endeavors.

It would mean fighting and dying and paying out billions on a venture costly in blood and with direful results. That is the picture, and that is what the interventionists and false promisers are heading us into.

It is an unnecessary, unpardonable, reckless scheme. I say this because it is obvious to those who have studied the situation, that Hitler has built up so many hates in Europe that he will never be able to untangle the potential fifth column against him, which exists throughout Europe, should he live a thousand years.

Each new conquest—each new country he invades—only weakens him and hastens his downfall. He cannot turn his back on the people of Europe and Russia and threaten the United States. And economically, as testified by Bernard Baruch, Germany, not the United States, will be the loser of an economic struggle for world trade, even though she wins the war in Europe.

For the administration to launch the people of America into the war would be an act of reckless and criminal disregard of the interests and lives of the people. In addition to the promises made to keep the people out of the war—in addition to the moral aspect of the case, I cite the editorial of the New York Times of July 3, which reads as follows:

"The evidence mounts that all is not well with the national-defense program. Our military reporter, Hanson Baldwin, finds that after a year of expansion and preparation, the United States is still months away from adequate combat efficiency. Not a single division is yet ready for war. In many cases the unfit are in positions of responsibility.

"None of our four armored divisions has as yet received a single new medium tank. There is not today a single Army dive bomber available. Ammunition shortages are still acute. This report is confirmed in many particulars from high quarters."

The simple truth is that we are far from prepared to go to war. As has well been said: "If anything calls for us to keep out of the war now, it is just this unpreparedness; can we not recall the experience of France and England, in launching unprepared wars?"

I sincerely want Britain to win and I detest Hitler and his philosophy. Let us give England all aid possible, but I am under conviction that the best interests of the American people demand that America stay out of this war. We should be governed by self-interest on this issue. Great Britain has demonstrated time and again that this policy of self-interest governs her every move. Because of self-interest Britain sacrificed Czechoslovakia to Germany. She egged on Poland to fight Germany, by empty promises of aid; she did the same to Belgium and France, to Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Greece—one after the other. Because of Great Britain's self-interest she has now blockaded the people of Greece, who recently repeated the heroisms of their ancestors in the passes of Thermopylae.

Today the Russians are dropping bombs on the defenseless civilians in the cities of little Finland. Do you recall the lip service which the President paid to the people of Finland when Russia did this earlier in the war? But today, what does he say? On July 11 Mr. Roosevelt sent a message to the Soviet Government in Moscow. I quote from his message: "The American people are bound with strong ties of historic friendship to the Russian people. It is, therefore, only natural that they are observing with sympathy and admiration the valiant struggle which the Russian people are waging at the present time in self-defense. On behalf of the Government and people of the United States, as well as on my own behalf, I thank you for your friendly greetings. I extend best wishes for yourself and for the welfare and success of the Russian people." End of quotation from the President's message.

Small comfort for brave little Finland in that message.

Our Nation has just observed Independence Day, the anniversary of the signing of our Declaration of Independence. The fundamental provision of that declaration is that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, the people.

Therefore, people of America, write the President and Congress of your convictions. Demand that we shall not enter upon a shooting war without the people's representatives in Congress voting thereon.

Let him who swore to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution keep that oath, by first securing the consent of Congress, which has the sole power under the Constitution to declare war. That way lies national unity.

In conclusion, I use the closing words of a recent speech of Herbert Hoover:

"Here in America today is the only remaining sanctuary of freedom, the last oasis of civilization, and the last reserve of moral and economic strength. If we are wise, these values can be made to serve all mankind.

"My countrymen, we have marched into the twilight of a world war. Should we not stop here and build our defense while we can still see? Shall we stumble on into the night of chaos?"

God forbid!

A Die-hard Defender of Judicial Sabotage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA RECORD

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Record entitled "A Die-Hard Defender of Judicial Sabotage."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Record]

A DIE-HARD DEFENDER OF JUDICIAL SABOTAGE

Until William M. Hargest, president-judge of the Dauphin County Common Pleas Court, was elected last June the Pennsylvania Bar Association had a long-standing rule against judges serving as officers of the association.

In the light of Judge Hargest's intemperate tirade against Federal and State administrative agencies in his speech at the annual convention in Bedford it seems demonstrated that the bar should not have broken its rule.

Hargest deplored modern trends in government. Forgetting the complete failure of the courts in the good old days to protect consumers, he denounced the various Federal and State administrative boards, such as the utilities commission, I. C. C., Federal Power Commission, and other regulatory bodies created to protect the public from unrestrained exercise of monopolistic power.

In the old days it was much nicer. A corporation-controlled judiciary would simply grant injunctions when corporations wanted them, approve interminable delays, and uphold whatever rates the utilities wanted—and the public had to like it.

Today it doesn't work that way. As Public Utility Commissioner Richard J. Beamish points out in his forceful statement resigning from the bar association and denouncing Hargest:

"We now have in the administrative agencies power to impose temporary rates upon companies that seek to delay justice to consumers. Through the Federal Reserve Board banking has been stabilized; through the insurance clauses of the National Banking Act deposits are secure; through the Interstate Commerce Commission rebating by railroads and chiseling by truck companies have been curbed; through the Securities and Exchange Commission Wall Street and piratical holding companies are being curbed; through the Federal Power Commission cooperating with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, the manipulations of Hopson and his gang have been exposed and their practices abolished. You pass over all the good that has been accomplished by these agencies to take a crack at young lawyers who are used as examiners in investigations by these bodies."

There is the story in a nutshell.

These regulatory agencies were created because the courts, Federal and State—and notoriously the courts of Pennsylvania—failed to protect consumers and taxpayers, and behaved precisely as one would expect corporation lawyers to behave when put upon the bench.

Judge Hargest's own court is probably the most notorious example of an obstructive judicial agency that we can bring to mind. Its record is enough to curl the hair. His Dauphin County court is on record as having—

1. Delayed operation of the Pennsylvania Pawnbrokers' Act for 2 years, by use of the injunction, at a cost of $2,000,000 to borrowers;

2. Killed the law creating a 44-hour workweek in Pennsylvania;

3. Blocked, by injunction, the full-crew bill;

4. Blocked, by injunction, the liberalized Workmen's Compensation Act put through by the Earle administration;

5. Blocked transfer of Byberry to the State;

6. Blocked a State probe of an alleged gasoline monopoly;

7. Lent itself to the notorious political inquisition into the Earle administration, which ended as a complete fiasco.

We could name other instances of shocking behavior by Judge Hargest's court. But these samples should be enough to refresh the memory and to show exactly that kind of judicial obstruction, delay, and political influence which discredited this court and nullified the public usefulness of so many other courts.

It was only after the courts had failed in so many instances; only after the United States Supreme Court tried for years to plant itself in the path of progress, that our regulatory agencies were created.

They were created to protect a helpless public from being gouged by monopoly, the lawyers of monopoly, and the courts of monopoly. And that very pressure has had much to do, since, with improving the personnel of the courts themselves, and leading most of them to march forward with the times.

Not so Judge Hargest. The Dauphin County court remains one of the few strongholds of special privilege in these parts, and Judge Hargest remains one of its few champions.

We are glad to see Commissioners Beamish and Buchanan telling the judge off. He had it coming to him. It is unfortunate that the really important applause for his attack will be confined to Tory dinner tables.

One way to judge judges is by those who cheer them.

Veterans' Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, many of us are under many misconceptions as to the extent of our Nation's expenditures on behalf of its veterans and their dependents, currently and as to past years.

Mr. Millard W. Rice, national service director for the Disabled American Veterans, recently compiled some statistics, which he secured from the Veterans' Administration, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, and so forth, which are so illuminating that I feel they will prove of interest to my colleagues:

I am sure that some of you have been of the impression that the Federal expenditures on behalf of veterans constitute a very substantial sum, but I want to point out that during the current fiscal year it will approximate only about 2½ percent of all Federal appropriations, and probably a much smaller percentage before the year is over. Since the inception of our Nation, expenditures on behalf of veterans have constituted only about 13 percent of all Federal expenditures of nearly $200,000,000,000, of which more than three-fifths has been incurred directly for preparation against or for war, participation in war, and to provide for the human aftermath of war.

Less than 9 percent of all living World War veterans receive any Government compensation by reason of service-incurred disabilities, and 60 percent of them receive less than $40 per month compensation, whereas more than 80 percent of them receive less than $60 per month compensation.

Less than 10 percent of all living World War veterans receive any kind of monetary benefits from the Federal Government.

World War veterans are now dying at the rate of 103 per day, Spanish War veterans at the rate of 24 every 24 hours, and Civil War veterans at the rate of 3 a day.

Although the average age of World War veterans is now about 48 years, it is interesting to note that there are nearly 766,000 who have not yet reached the age of 45, and there are only slightly more than a million who have passed the age of 50.

Although more than 200,000 World War veterans were wounded during their active service, only 77,772 are now receiving any compensation from Uncle Sam because of such wounds.

The compilation by Mr. Rice is as follows:

VETERAN STATISTICS AS OF JUNE 30, 1941

4,057,101 served in Army, 2,059,629 overseas.

596,073 served in Navy and 104,066 in Marine Corps, about 50 percent overseas.

24,234,021 registered for the selective draft.

2,810,296 were inducted after draft selection.

250,240 were discharged from the draft after being called.

10,250 Army men were dishonorably discharged.

130,128 total deaths.

39,362 were killed: 37,568 Army, 1,454 marines, and 340 Navy.

14,009 died of wounds: 12,942 Army, 1,008 marines, and 59 Navy.

53,371 were combat deaths: 50,510 Army, 2,462 marines, and 399 Navy.

75,460 died of diseases: 69,446 Army, 701 marines, and 5,313 Navy.

1,297 died of other causes.

201,325 wounded, not mortally: 193,611 in Army and 7,714 in marines.

349,779 World War veterans—less than 9 percent of all—receive compensation for service-connected disabilities: 32,455 on temporary partial ratings, 1,514 on temporary total ratings, 282,322 on permanent partial ratings, and 33,488 (9.57 percent) on permanent total ratings.

27 percent of all service-connected disabled World War veterans receive less than $20 per month compensation; 46 percent less than $30; 60 percent less than $40; 66 percent less than $50; 81 percent less than $60; 91 percent less than $100; and only 8.8 percent receive compensation of $100 or more, an average as to all of $39.71 per month ($39.77 year ago).

72,333 World War veterans receive pensions for permanent total non-service-connected disabilities of $6 (single men in facilities) or $30 per month.

37,926 disabled Regulars were receiving pensions averaging $31.90 per month (only $31.48 year ago).

1,560 Civil War veterans were receiving pensions.

1,955 Indian war veterans were receiving pensions.

152,591 Spanish-American War veterans were receiving pensions (Philippine Insurrection and Boxer Rebellion) averaging $55.90 per month ($54.96 a year ago).

2,617 emergency (including 5 provisional) World War officers were receiving retirement benefits, also 4 retired Reserve officers (Public, 18, sec. 5, 76th Cong.).

161,107 service-connected death claims have been allowed; 96,491 are now active, providing pensions for 29,478 widows, 31,462 children, and 77,885 parents at an average monthly payment of $46.65 per case.

21,903 deceased World War veterans who died by reason of some disability other than their service-connected disabilities, provide pensions for 18,527 dependent widows and 32,104 children at an average monthly payment of $35.31 per case.

60,589 deceased Spanish-American War veterans provide pensions for 58,148 widows, 7,451 children, and 328 parents, a total of 65,927 dependents.

3,836 deceased Indian war veterans provide pensions for 3,798 widows, 68 children, and 10 others, a total of 3,876 dependents.

43,313 deceased Civil War veterans provide pensions for 41,279 widows and 2,211 children, a total of 43,490 dependents.

107 widows of Mexican War (1848) veterans receiving pensions.

1 deceased War of 1812 veteran provides pension for 1 daughter.

251,761 veterans received hospital treatment during the last fiscal year, of whom only 26,141 were for service-connected disabilities.

57,988 persons were in hospitals on June 30, 1941, of whom 12,825 were veterans with service-connected disabilities.

51,838 were World War veterans, of whom 10,829 were service-connected, 40,731 non-service-connected, and 278 observation cases; 3,301 were other war veterans; 2,849 disabled Regulars, 38 allied veterans, 127 C. C. C. and W. P. A. employees; and 90 miscellaneous.

34,257 were neuropsychiatric patients, 18,691 general medical and surgical patients, 4,758 were tubercular patients and 535 observation and non-V. A. not classified.

30,724 veterans were admitted for domiciliary care last fiscal year; 13,926 remaining on June 30, 1941, of whom 12,831 were World War veterans (12,134 non-service-connected).

80,596 beds—61,849 hospital and 18,747 domiciliary—in 91 Veterans' Administration facilities.

2,570 beds in other Government hospitals (Army, 705; Navy, 995; Public Health Service, 790; and Interior Department, 80).

39,097 veterans were under guardianship.

4,121,543 veterans and dependents have applied for adjusted compensation involving $3,766,840,086.74.

4,500,000 World War veterans applied for war-risk insurance, involving $39,000,000,000.

613,320 Government life-insurance policies were in force with face value of $2,567,154,350.

356,789 national service life-insurance policies in force, with face value of $1,159,296,000.

766,476 World War veterans were then less than 45 years of age, 2,102,566 between 45 and 50, 1,068,447 between 50 and 60, 3,241,322 more than 45, 1,138,756 more than 50, 70,309 more than 60, and 25,688 more than 65.

4,007,798 living World War veterans now constitute about 3.18 percent of the total population and about 4.7 percent of total adult population of the United States.

$579,693,162 appropriation to Veterans' Administration for year ending June 30, 1941, is only about 2.5 percent of all Federal appropriations for year.

$24,706,700,000 has been expended because of relief to veterans and their dependents since Nation was founded, which, however, is only about 13 percent of the grand total of all Federal expenditures of about $198,000,000,000, of which more than 60 percent was incurred directly because of preparation against or for war, participation in war, and to provide for the aftermath of war.

Age and death rate in 1941

	World War	Spanish-American War	Civil War	Indian War
Average age of all veterans in 1941	48	66	96	81
Average age of widows on rolls in 1941	47	62	79	
Average age of emergency officers in 1941	53			
Estimated number of veterans dying per day in 1941	103	24	3	1

Estimated number of living World War veterans at the beginning of each calendar year by age groups

Attained age	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951
35-39	11,068	1,414	245	56	2							
40-44	1,304,670	765,062	410,535	238,326	90,036	10,691	1,366	236	54	2		
45-49	1,823,976	2,102,566	2,136,345	1,934,814	1,655,710	1,254,991	735,415	394,322	228,655	86,295	10,242	1,308
50-54	753,698	956,957	1,116,212	1,301,575	1,507,983	1,743,152	2,008,021	2,037,762	1,842,698	1,574,670	1,191,978	697,802
55-59	86,583	111,490	225,704	361,738	526,354	709,554	898,946	1,048,225	1,221,810	1,414,901	1,634,450	1,881,052
60-64	39,295	44,621	51,462	58,982	67,827	78,937	101,514	206,514	330,950	480,839	646,753	817,375
65-69	14,286	16,933	19,620	23,611	28,353	33,968	38,334	44,167	50,653	58,288	67,902	87,451
70-74	5,501	6,334	7,170	8,546	9,792	11,255	13,209	15,293	18,453	22,175	26,551	29,884
75-79	1,597	1,985	2,399	2,734	3,258	3,702	4,173	4,725	5,647	6,481	7,439	8,727
80-84	303	384	444	577	708	844	1,003	1,207	1,376	1,643	1,861	2,092
85-89	36	48	55	67	78	107	125	143	188	229	274	324
90-94	4	4	3	3	4	4	5	6	7	8	12	14
95-99												
Total	4,041,017	4,007,798	3,970,194	3,931,029	3,850,105	3,847,205	3,802,111	3,752,600	3,700,491	3,645,531	3,587,462	3,526,029

National Morale of Vital Importance in Modern War

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in olden days armies went out to do battle either offensively or defensively and lived and maintained themselves very largely as they traveled except for a base of supplies such as ammunition, rifles, cannon, and so forth. The populace generally had comparatively little to do with the business of fighting. The armies usually foraged and lived on the sections through which they marched, ravaging the countryside like locusts.

In those days, military commanders recognized the vital necessity of a high morale and a high state of esprit de corps among the soldiers. What the populace thought about the war made comparatively little difference in the military outcome.

In modern war, armies operate through airplanes, trains, ships, motorized transports, sometimes hundreds of miles away from their bases, and hundreds of miles over or in the interior of the countries with whom they are at war. Modern warfare is no longer a matter of an army in uniform on parade with flying banners and blaring bands. It is unromantic science, technology, and machinery. Therefore, all the populace, all of the people, men, women, and children, because of employment in necessary industries and the bombing of the cities and those industries, are just as much in the war, and are just as much a part of the fighting forces of their country, as are the uniformed soldiers, whether those soldiers be uniformed in gaudy colors or drab overalls.

It has, therefore, become a matter of vital importance that the morale and the esprit de corps of the citizens in general be kept at as high a point as that of the actual soldiers themselves.

The first objective of modern war strategy is to suddenly and quickly crush the morale of the people behind the army. If that can be accomplished, the army has no base of operations to fall back on and its cause is lost.

All of these things being accepted facts, and vital facts, among the best military strategists today, it becomes a matter of grave import as to the effects upon the morale of the American people, which may be wrought by continued broken promises, inconsistencies, contradictions of policy, concealments of mistakes and motives, and the employment of hair-splitting technicalities and "weasel words" to fool the people step by step into a shooting war in which they want no part.

It makes no difference whether it is the term for which the conscriptees and the National Guard shall be held in service, or the progress of airplane production, or the concealment of the sending of troops to Iceland, or the secret building of bases in Ireland and Scotland.

All such moves hurt national morale. The people feel that they are entitled to know the truth from their Government. The administration and its political strategists may think they are getting away with something clever, but the fact is that, blow by blow, and step by step, this sort of thing breaks down the public morale and must, if persisted in, eventually destroy the confidence of the people in the administration. When that point is reached, if it ever is, in this country, the morale of the people will be gone, the esprit de corps of Americans will be damaged or destroyed, and any war would be lost before we went into it.

The President of the United States is, by virtue of his office, Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the Nation. In time of national peril the President is supposed to rise entirely above all political or personal feelings and to think and work and act only for the best interests of all the Nation. If the people of the United States get the fixed idea their President is playing politics, or trying to force through some new social theories under the guise of a national preparedness, or if the people become convinced New Deal political bureaucrats or strategists are utilizing the war and national preparedness for personal or political purposes, the damage to the national morale might well become irreparable.

Gen. Hugh S. Johnson has time and again referred to the strategy of New Deal politicians and bureaucrats as being "too damned clever," and some of us in Washington are beginning to wonder if this cleverness may be "too damned clever" for the security of the country.

Every clear-thinking person must realize that it is vitally important for all the people to have unbounded confidence not only in the Commander in Chief of the armed forces and the military and naval leaders, but they should have the same degree of confidence in those civilians who are placed at the head of important work, like Harry Hopkins, Sidney Hillman, and others engaged in equally as important functions. Thomas Jefferson was right when he once said:

> In a government like ours it is necessary to embrace in its administration as great a mass of confidence as possible by employing those who have a character with the public of their own and not merely a secondary one through the Executive.

Having mentioned Thomas Jefferson, it might be well for us to also remember that he said:

> I have ever deemed it fundamental for the United States never to take active part in the quarrels of Europe. Their political interests are entirely distinct from ours. Their mutual jealousies, their balance of power, their complicated alliances, their forms and principles of government are all foreign to us. They are nations of eternal war. All their energies are expended in the destruction of the labor, property, and lives of their people. On our part, never had a people so favorable a chance of trying the opposite system of peace and fraternity with mankind, and the direction of all the means and faculties to the purposes of improvement instead of destruction. * * * I do sincerely wish that we could take our stand on a ground perfectly neutral and independent toward all nations. * * * After plunging us in all the broils of the European nations, there would remain but one act to close our tragedy—that is, to break up our Union. * * * I hope we may still keep clear of them, notwithstanding our present thralldom, and that time may be given us to reflect on the awful crisis we have passed through and to find some means of shielding ourselves in the future from foreign influence, political, commercial, or in whatever form it may be attempted. I can scarcely withhold myself from joining in the wish of Silas Dean—that there were an ocean of fire between us and the Old World.

We must guard, and guard well, the morale of the American people, and to do that we must maintain—and merit—the confidence of the people in the administration. Only the administration can do that.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed of the feeble stand I have taken for peace.

The generals do not want to let the boys return home, for they have given them so little that they are ashamed of it.

It is reliably reported that two American companies of private enterprise have recently bought aluminum from England.

To Hades with the Roosevelt-Willkie foreign policy which will destroy us, win or lose. Attention William Allen White: This is not partisan.

At a picture show I had to see four fat-headed Russian generals decorated by their Henry Stimson, and the propaganda was paid for by our taxpayers.

The Chief wants selectees for the duration of the emergency. The emergency will last as long as F. D. R. is President, and he will be President as long as he can.

There is only a very remote possibility that Germany will take us some day, but for the present we are under another foreign power. Our flag is always accompanied now.

They are planning on taking the 24,000 employees in the War Department from the 17 buildings they now occupy to a new plant, within a year, on 67 acres next to Arlington. The Department and the cemetery should snuggle.

We passed a $7,000,000,000 bill Thursday for Army-Navy-maritime deficiencies in 2 hours, and the Senate will debate for 30 days on a tax bill half as large, which the House committee has worked on 4 months. Where is sense?

Whether the selectees are kept or released is not the important question. The real issue is, Shall we add the cloak of congressional constitutional sanction to the thin-iced emergencies declared by another branch for 2 years? If they win, it is a green light.

Proposed Federal Communications Commission Investigation of Newspaper Ownership of Broadcasting Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

STATEMENT OF POSITION OF THE DETROIT NEWS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, on August 20, 1920, the Detroit News founded the first commercial broadcasting station, WWJ, and this station has operated daily since then. WWJ is outstanding in its field and is greatly appreciated, especially by the people of Michigan and surrounding territory.

In response to a request from the editor of Editor and Publisher for a statement of the position of the Detroit News, with respect to the proposed Federal Communications Commission investigation of newspaper ownership of broadcasting stations, they submitted a statement and, pursuant to permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit that statement, which is as follows:

> It seems to the Detroit News that the Federal Communications Commission has an obligation to the public to see that radio stations are operated in the public interest, and that naturally entails its seeking assurance of the responsibility of those seeking licenses to operate. As the founder of the first commercial broadcasting station WWJ which we have operated daily since August 20, 1920, we ask for nothing more than a dispassionate examination of our record of service for 21 years including our pioneer efforts toward the development of broadcasting in ultrahigh frequency, and more recently in the frequency modulation fields. The traditions of ethical journalism are wholly harmonious with the Commission's purpose to see that radio operates in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. We could ask no better witness than the competitive stations in our own area and the public we have sought so diligently to serve. The original intent of the Detroit News in entering the radio field was to further reliable methods of communication as a natural step in the advancement of journalism, and increase our service to the public. To this end we operated our station for 5 years without accepting any revenue of any kind from any source. It is now, as always, our aim to maintain those standards of integrity in advertising which characterize not only good stations but good newspapers, and to put the public welfare and interest ahead of profit at all times. It would seem to us fundamentally unjust to judge any applica-

tion for a new license or the continuance of an old one on any other basis than the good character, fitness, and responsibility of the individual applicant.

Stop Hitler From Sending His Spies Here—Close the Door Against European "Isms"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN, OF LOUISIANA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL COUNCIL, JUNIOR ORDER OF UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS, AT THE ANNUAL NATIONAL SESSION HELD IN WASHINGTON ON JUNE 17, 1941

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the annual national session of the National Council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, at the annual session held in Washington June 17, 1941:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am glad to have the opportunity of addressing you. I am glad because I realize that I am talking to an organization of red-blooded, true Americans. I have known something of your fine, patriotic order and of your very high and noble purposes. I am honored, therefore, this evening by your kind invitation.

We are facing what is probably the most critical time in the history of our country. You have heard that before. It is no news to you. Some of you may know more about it than I do.

I came here at your kind invitation primarily to discuss with you the question of immigration. I will necessarily have to be brief. In this day of chaos and world strife, when nation is arrayed against nation, the question of immigration presents a serious problem. It has always been a serious problem but it is more serious now than ever because of the existence of widespread national and international treachery. In our country here we have citizens who believe that the door should be shut against aliens from Europe for the present, and those who believe that we ought to let the Europeans come in freely. I readily admit that I belong to that group that believes that we ought to close the door for the time being at least. In other words, I am a restrictionist. I am not antialien but I am pro-American. I have no hatred against anybody or any group, but I have a deep devotion for America and her institutions and I do not want to see anything done at this time that might in any manner endanger our country.

A few days ago you read statements in the papers attributed to high officials in the Government to the effect that America should continue to be the asylum for the oppressed peoples of Europe. You hear it said that we are all the sons of immigrants—that we all got here somehow and from somewhere. They use that as an argument that we should continue to hold the door open to those of other lands who wish to come here at this time.

The fact that most of our ancestors came from Europe certainly is no argument that we should receive Europeans with open arms now. Conditions have changed. Europe is filled with distrust, hate, and fear. It is the breeding place for every sort of ideology and philosophy contrary to our American concepts of government. Those who come from such surroundings certainly bring with them their own preconceived ideas and philosophies, and many of them strive to propagate them in America. I would not argue that all of them come for such purposes. Unquestionably some of them come with the best of motives, but can we afford at this critical time to take a chance on those who come with a wrong motive? Now, back to the argument that America should be the asylum of the world. That is a fallacy. It is a fallacy because, unquestionably, we cannot take care of all of the oppressed peoples of Europe. Europe is exploding. The fires of hate and oppression have been kindled all over Europe. Hundreds of millions of people are oppressed. It is ridiculous, therefore, to contend that America can be the asylum of these people. We sympathize with those who are oppressed, who do not enjoy our liberty, but we cannot relieve the situation, and I am unwilling to endanger the peace, happiness, and security of a hundred and thirty million Americans by taking the chance at this time of admitting the hordes from Europe, some of whom certainly would be "fifth columnists" and Quislings. Away with that slogan that America should be the asylum of the world. It will not work now. Some contend that it is contrary to the fundamental principles of America to place restrictions on immigration. Since when did it become un-American to try to guarantee to a hundred and thirty million Americans the right to be free from the infiltration of "isms" from Europe? I am reliably informed that Hitler is sending men here now to America with the instruction that they must report to him what they see and hear. In some cases members of their families are held as hostages, so to speak, and those who come here under such circumstances are compelled to report to Hitler or their loved ones will suffer. How can anyone say that we should not stop them from coming here? Do you remember a few days ago, when the British left Greece and went to Crete and the press reported that the very boat that carried the British to Crete carried also some so-called refugees who were supposed to be running away from Hitler? The same news dispatch informed us that when these British got to Crete these same refugees who went with them changed in a moment and became "fifth columnists." In these days of treachery how can we know what an immigrant's real position is? How can we know what his real motives are?

A few days ago we read in the papers of ships coming from France to the island of Martinique in the West Indies. These news accounts told us of how the water was strewn with letters and papers which many on board, fearing detection, had thrown into the water.

My friends, we should certainly beware of those who come from Hitler-dominated regions. I repeat, we have no way of knowing whether Hitler sent them or not. We do know that he sent them to Norway, that he sent them into France, and that he sent them into Greece and other countries. This is a time when we should be on guard. Let every man take his stand today for America. Some of us on Capitol Hill are waging a fight to keep those from coming here who might cause us trouble. We need your help and your cooperation. We intend to continue the fight because we are fighting for America.

The records show that we have received over 10,000 visitors this year. Our danger at the present time is not so much from the quota immigrants. Our danger lies chiefly, in my opinion, in those who came in as visitors and they are coming every day. Those in that class as a rule are the intelligent ones, who are in most cases highly educated and capable of deceiving. We read in the papers a few days ago where a famous German visitor, supposed to be a German businessman, who had been in this country for several months, turned out to be, according to reports, one of Hitler's chief agents. There was secured from the State Department a few days ago a list of a thousand people who have come in recently. Mind you, this is only about one-tenth of those who have come in this year as visitors.

Listen to this partial list: In this 1,000 there were 90 classed as journalists, writers, and authors. Can you imagine the type of journalist, writer, or author that we would now get from Russia or Germany or France, all dominated by Hitler and Stalin? In the list there are 32 attorneys and lawyers. I think we have no need for them here. There are listed 25 professors and teachers; 70 artists, art dealers, and lecturers; 15 physicians and doctors; 8 social workers, and so on. Can you imagine the type of social worker that we would expect to get out of Russia and Germany now? They tell us that they are particular about the type of people they let in. Well; this same list includes 40 under the heading "No information." In other words, in that group they admit that there are 40 persons concerning whom they have no information. Can anyone argue that it is safe now to admit from Stalin's domain, Hitler's domain, and other sections dominated by them, these journalists, writers, authors, teachers, professors, social workers, and so forth? I do not believe that our American schools need these European teachers now. I do not believe we need these European doctors, these social workers, and others. My friends, this infiltration from Europe is going on. I repeat that we should be on guard.

A few days ago Col. John Thomas Taylor, national legislative representative of the great American Legion, came to me and told me of a situation which he considers alarming. He revealed to me how England had taken into custody certain foreigners at the outbreak of the war in 1939; how England considered these foreigners dangerous to her own safety and sent a part of them to Canada and other places. Some 2,500 of these people that England considered unsafe to run at large were sent to Canada and Canada also considered it unsafe to give them their freedom. Colonel Taylor learned of a diabolical scheme to bring these persons interned in Canada into the United States. I introduced a bill, H. R. 4873, to prevent that. As usual, certain interests, who delight to welcome the hordes from Europe to our country, are fighting this bill. We do not say that all of those persons interned in Canada are bad, but it is safe to conclude that some of them are bad and we take the position that if England considered them unsafe for her, and if Canada considered them unsafe for Canada, in the name of common sense we have no business taking a chance on letting them come into our country.

I have recently introduced another bill, H. R. 4861, dealing extensively with this question of immigration. The American Legion and other patriotic groups are behind it also. I have just been informed that your splendid organization has endorsed both of these bills which I have introduced, and I want to thank you for it and I appreciate the fact that you have taken this forthright stand. This latter bill undertakes to regulate the conduct of aliens in the United States and to deport where possible. It further undertakes to keep undesirables from Europe out of this

country. It does not exactly stop immigration completely, although I would like to see that done for a while at least.

In passing I wish to mention another bill, H. R. 3, which is known as the Hobbs bill and which in its present form is very dangerous. A part of that bill meets my entire approval, but a great portion of it is bad. It would go far to destroy our quota system. That bill is being opposed by the American Legion and other patriotic groups, and I am happy to know that your fine organization is included in that list of opponents.

My friends, we are still fighting. We are fighting against odds. We are fighting against great influence. Great pressure is being brought to bear now to cripple our immigration laws and admit the peoples of Europe. Let us stand with America and for America. Let us stand against Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, and their agents. In the name of America and all of the people of America let us not take a chance on further infiltration of undesirables from Europe. We must carefully watch the "fifth columnists" who are here, and we ought to make it impossible for any more of them to come in. That is our job. I implore all Americans to be on the job and help to protect this country.

Letter of Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

EXCEPPT FROM LETTER TO GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a portion of a letter written by Thomas Jefferson to Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko. At that time, as today, the world was torn with war and bloodshed. The following words of Jefferson are worthy of serious consideration in this present trying hour, when the passions and excitement of war threaten to overcome common sense and the interests of the American people.

EXCERPT FROM THOMAS JEFFERSON'S LETTER DATED APRIL 13, 1811

But when we see two antagonists contending ad internecionem, so eager for mutual destruction as to disregard all means, to deal their blows in every direction regardless on whom they may fall, prudent bystanders, whom some of them may wound, instead of thinking it cause to join in the maniac contest, get out of the way as well as they can, and leave the cannibals to mutual ravin. It would have been perfect Quixotism in us to have encountered these Bedlamites, to have undertaken the redress of all wrongs against a world avowedly rejecting all regard to right. We have, therefore, remained in peace, suffering frequent injuries, but on the whole multiplying, improving, prospering beyond all example. It is evident to all that in spite of great losses, much greater gains have ensued. When these gladiators shall have worried each other into ruin or reason, instead of lying among the dead on the bloody arena, we shall have acquired a growth and strength which will place us hors d'insulte. Peace, then, has been our principle, peace is our interest, and peace has saved to the world this only plant of free and rational government now existing in it.

The Negro Discriminated Against in Our National Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, which I am making over the radio today:

In the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, early in the year of 1935, I introduced several bills which had for their purpose the improvement of race relations in this country and the securing for the Negro the same rights and privileges enjoyed by American citizens of other races. Among these bills was H. R. 5733, a bill to create an industrial commission on Negro affairs. The purpose of that bill was stated in section 4, which reads as follows:

"That the duties of the Industrial Commission on Negro Affairs created by this act shall be to study the economic conditions of the Negro; to study the labor problems in which the Negro is fundamentally interested; to stimulate and encourage thrift and industry among the Negroes of this country; to promote the general welfare of the Negro in industrial pursuits, and to encourage his general uplift; to work out plans looking toward the solution of the different problems confronting the Negro race of the United States; to consider all questions pertaining to the Negro that may be referred to said Commission by any department of the United States Government; and report a suggested solution of any and all problems that may be presented to the Commission by any officer of the United States, the Governor or attorney general of any of the States, or labor department of any State in the United States; to recommend what may be necessary for the stability of labor in the different States; to discourage subversive doctrine and propaganda; to work toward the formulation of a policy for mutual understanding and confidence between the races; to report to Congress through the President of the United States all their acts and doings; and to make such recommendations for the solution of any problem or problems affecting the Negro that they may deem advisable."

I have reintroduced this bill in the Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses. It is now before the Judiciary Committee of the House and is know as H. R. 109. As early as June 18, 1935, the Judiciary Committee held rather extensive hearings on this bill but has never reported the bill out for the consideration of the Congress. Sometime during 1935 I had a conference with the President of the United States in which we discussed at some length the provisions of this bill and the necessity of its passage, and the far-reaching effect it would have in the general improvement of the status of the Negro as an American citizen. With this as a background, it is not difficult for anyone to understand that the major effort which I have made as a Member of the Congress of the United States during the past 7 years has been to bring about a larger degree of justice, economic opportunity, and civic recognition for America's largest minority group, the Negro.

I am deeply gratified at the action of the President of the United States in his order of June 25, 1941, which provided for the appointment of a Committee on Fair Employment Practice. This, as everyone must know, is only one of the many provisions of my bill, the passage of which I have urged over a long period of years, and which bill should have the endorsement of every American citizen believing in fair play for American citizens. Who can say that this bill is asking too much of a nation leading the fight for genuine democracy for the world? At present, we are making a desperate effort to create and maintain stronger friendship and better relations with South American countries so as to protect democracy in the world. It is my candid opinion that our task in this connection is made most difficult because of our failure to practice these very principles among ourselves, and to extend the proper recognition and justice to the Negro who is an American citizen, living in this country and performing every duty imposed upon him by the Government, and whose loyalty to this Government has never been questioned and cannot now be questioned.

At this very moment when this country is straining every nerve and fiber to prepare itself for defense against subversive doctrines and activities; calling loud and long for workers in every field, the Negro is not included except in the most limited way. Let me state briefly the results of a survey recently made on the employment status and practice of employment by large industries and factories in the manufacture and production of our material and defense equipment.

J. H. Kindelberger, president of the North American Aviation, Inc., announced to the Kansas City Star, March 1941, that Fairfax Bombing Plant, which North American Aviation, Inc., will operate at Kansas City, Kans., would not use any Negro skilled workers, no matter what his ability or training. This announcement was made despite the fact that Negro freeholders had voted 4 to 1 for bond issue to purchase property upon which the plant was to be built.

Vultee Aircraft Corporation in California informed all applicants and Negro organizations that employees in their plant would have to be of the Caucasian race only.

Baldwin Locomotive Co., of Philadelphia, flatly refused to consider hiring Negroes in the tank-production work, despite the fact of an acute shortage of labor in the plant. White workers are being recruited from all parts of the Atlantic coast. They are also taking 40 white defense trainees every month but are refusing to accept any Negro trainees at all.

Fairchild Aviation Corporation, of New York, announced through its personnel manager that they are not at all interested in employing Negroes and that they will not employ any Negro workers in the plant. About 900 workers are now being employed and they will employ two or three hundred more in the next month. The personnel manager stated that they would only employ Negroes if the law made them do it.

Glenn L. Martin Co., of Baltimore, has employed about 18,000 workers in the last few months and has flatly refused to hire Negroes. Mr. Martin himself stated recently before the Tolan Committee that if he put any Negro workers in the plant the white workers would quit immediately. This statement is refuted by the fact that in the Edgewood Arsenal located near the Glenn L. Martin plant Negroes comprise 12.5 percent of all

employees. Both races work well together in that plant. Mr. Martin's plant will eventually hire 40,000 workers, and he stated that none of them will be Negroes.

This survey disclosed further that the following international unions bar Negroes through constitutional bans, thus preventing their employment in any industry dominated by these unions:

Airline Pilot Association, A. F. of L.
Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, A. F. of L.
Brotherhood of Railway Car Men, A. F. of L.
Brotherhood of Dining Car Conductors, Railway Brotherhood.
Grand International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers—Railway Brotherhood.
Brotherhood of Railway Firemen and Engineers, Railway Brotherhood.
Railway Mail Association, A. F. of L.
International Organization of Masters, Mates and Pilots of America, A. F. of L.
Switchmen's Union of North America, A. F. of L.
Order of Railway Telegraphers, A. F. of L.
Train Dispatchers Association of America, Railway Brotherhood.
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Railway Brotherhood.
Railroad Yardmasters of America, Railway Brotherhood.
Wire Weavers Protectors Association of America, A. F. of L.
Order of Railroad Conductors, Railway Brotherhood.
Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Conductors, A. F. of L.
Commercial Telegraphers Union of North America, A. F. of L.
International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Dropforgers, and Helpers, A. F. of L.

Could these conditions exist in a real democracy? I point to this defect in our present democracy as being the weakest point in our fight for world democracy. While I am interested in the spread of democracy to all parts of the world, I do not see how we can afford to overlook and to neglect the important matter of setting our own house in order, so that no one can point to the beam in our own national eye while we engage in removing the mote or beam from our brothers' eye.

Crossing Over Delaware River Near Wilmington, Del.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, on July 21 the House passed without one dissenting vote H. R. 5110, providing for a vast defense roads program, and as a member of the Roads Committee I was more than glad to be able to give this measure my support. I wish to congratulate our able chairman of that committee, the Honorable WILBURN CARTWRIGHT, for his efficient and capable handling of the bill.

On July 7 I introduced H. R. 5250, providing for the creation of a Wilmington, Del., bridge authority, to construct and maintain a suitable crossing over the Delaware River near Wilmington.

Delaware has needed a high-speed crossing for years, but recently, with the increase in traffic and with national defense being uppermost in the minds of all, it is especially desirable at this time to proceed with all possible haste to erect a suitable crossing to take care of the traffic demands that are now so urgent, particularly in Delaware, the Delmarva Peninsula, points south, and the southern part of New Jersey, as well as the northern Jersey points and New York City. The enabling act which I have introduced, seems to be the most feasible method by which this crossing can be accomplished. The legislation is designed to protect the public and within a given number of years, the crossing, whether it be a bridge or a tunnel, will be given back to the joint States, New Jersey and Delaware, free of encumbrance. Provision is made in the bill to take care of any existing facilities and so far as can be seen by experts, the legislation is very desirable.

As a member of the Roads Committee of the House of Representatives, I feel that this crossing will fit in very well with the program of strategic highways provided for in H. R. 5110, our national-defense program. It will give this area a vital crossing which can be used to quickly transport convoys of men and equipment from one State to another.

Recent large-scale movements of troops and equipment from northern camps to southern maneuvers resulted in unusual and unnecessary delays, account of there not being sufficient crossings in this particular area.

A recent report indicated that the present bridge facilities in the Philadelphia area must be heavily taxed with traffic. The more than 7,000,000 vehicles crossing this bridge in 1926 are now to be matched against the nearly 15,000,000 of the fiscal year, 1940–41, the best year in the history of the span. With the important assistance of hindsight, it is now possible to judge how conservative were the views of even the rosiest optimists on the utility of the Delaware River Bridge. In comparison, I feel that there will be more to tell of the filling of a great necessity by the construction of a crossing in the Wilmington area.

A Superhighway System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VIRGIL CHAPMAN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. BUTLER B. HARE, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a very timely and interesting address delivered by the Honorable BUTLER B. HARE, Representative in Congress from South Carolina, at a meeting of representatives of chambers of commerce, civic and automobile clubs of Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, and South Carolina, in Knoxville, Tenn., July 18, 1941:

Mr. Chairman, there is sufficient evidence at hand to justify the thought and conclusion that this country has been marked for invasion by the organized and combined world leaders of those forces of government which have long hungered and fought for the destruction of democratic systems of government; that they have made their plans, arranged their programs, and are reported to be on their way.

More than a year ago we were told by military experts and those in our executive departments who are in a position to form fair and definite conclusions that there was a pressing necessity for inaugurating a large and increased national-defense program. We were told that such a program was indispensable; that we should have a two-ocean Navy, a greatly enlarged Army, an almost unlimited air corps, and that there was also a great necessity for better and enlarged transportation systems throughout the Nation. My remarks this evening will be confined to the last-mentioned phase of the suggested program, and in this I shall not go into any great detail but will endeavor to confine my discussion of one outstanding century-old proposal.

In case of an attempted invasion of this country the necessity for an efficient transportation system in our national-defense program approaches in importance the need for any other military facility; and from a military standpoint we are probably more deficient in adequate transportation facilities than in any other defense unit. So far less attention has been given to this matter than to any other phase of our defense program.

This is not a criticism, for I am not saying we have made a mistake by giving priorities to other units or other facilities, but, on the contrary, I think we have acted well and wisely so far, but since the groundwork is approaching completion and the preparation for other military facilities are well under way and approaching the peak of construction and production it is highly important that our attention be directed to putting our transportation systems in military order.

I know it is contended by some that we are in little or no danger of invasion and that expenditures for increased transportation facilities are unnecessary. We all hope they are correct in their guess, and if we were certain about it there would be no necessity for much of the expenditures in our defense program, but since we are not absolutely certain and since we are laboring under the necessity to make ample preparation for defense we insist that our transportation systems should be enlarged and improved, particularly our highway systems.

With the rapid recurring events in Europe within the past 18 months, it is now easy to vision that if the Nazi Powers continue to succeed in their program, and the contemplated invasion of the Western Hemisphere becomes a fact, the assembling or maneuvering grounds for our Army, Navy, and air forces will be found in the South Atlantic and Gulf States, and if the assembling process should become necessary at any time within the near future we feel that our present transportation facilities in this section are totally inadequate to cope with such an emergency, and to await the arrival of this emergency with the information now before us without taking any action would be almost suicidal. In an attempted analysis of the pictures before us we were reminded about a year ago that this is not the first time in history when the thought or threat of invasion aroused the apprehensions and fears of our national and business leadership and forced them to a similar conclusion.

Following the war of 1812 when increased interest arose out of a careful study of the operations of the American and British Navies in that conflict, our political as well

as military leaders felt that in case of a future conflict with any of the European nations the South Atlantic seaboard would not only be the scene of conflict by the navies but would be the battling ground between the contending armies and they were firmly impressed of the great military necessity for better transportation systems leading from the granaries of the Midwest to the South Atlantic States. They considered the matter sufficiently important to warrant the construction of such a system at public expense.

Therefore, the suggestion of a super-transportation system between the two sections is not a new proposal. It is a century or more old. The value and wisdom of the propcsal was recognized by President Jackson in 1832 when he designated Army engineers to assist in making preliminary surveys of several proposals with this same objective in mind. It is reported that a number of routes to provide adequate transportation between the two sections were considered but study and investigation revealed that instead of crossing the Allegheny Mountains it would be advisable to go farther south where a system could be constructed with shorter mileage and at less expense.

It was agreed that probably the most feasible route would be from Cincinnati, Ohio, by way of Knoxville, Tenn., Walhalla and Columbia, S. C., to Charleston, S. C.

Both military and business experts considered the proposal as being essential for the proper defense of the Southern and Midwestern States in case of an attack or invasion by armed forces. They felt it would enable them to be better prepared in securing the necessary materials in the manufacture of munitions and implements of war, in supplying coal and equipment to our Navy, and in the transportation of an army from one section of the country to another.

Following the appointment of an Army engineer a tentative survey was made from the mouth of the Nolichucky River in Tennessee through the Blue Ridge Mountains by way of Walhalla, S. C., to the head of the Congaree River made by the confluence of the Saluda and Broad Rivers at Columbia, S. C.

Robert Y. Hayne, a former United States Senator and Governor of South Carolina, manifested a great deal of interest and enthusiasm in the proposal from the standpoint of both national defense and commercial development of the entire country. In discussing the proposal November 4, 1832, he is reported to have said:

"The period has arrived when the work can no longer be neglected without a criminal supineness and fatal disregard of our own best interests as well as the duties which we owe to ourselves and to posterity."

The first great national economic depression in 1837 seems to have been responsible for delayed action on the part of the Government. However, it is interesting to observe that while the States and the Federal Government were slow in completing the project as a military necessity, those who saw the commercial value of the proposal practically captured or appropriated the idea and proceeded to inaugurate plans to construct a road with private capital. A company or corporation was soon formed and a charter obtained proposing the construction of a railroad from Maryville, Tenn., to Columbia, S. C., connecting with other transportation systems at each terminus, the estimated cost being placed at $11,884,046. The road was surveyed and most of it graded both east and west of the Blue Ridge and Great Smoky Mountains territory, all but about 80 miles being actually built and put into operation.

Twelve or thirteen small mountains were to be tunneled, 1 or more of which were partially completed, and about two-thirds of the 5,800 feet through solid granite in what is known as Stump House Mountain was completed before the project was abandoned at the beginning of the Civil War. The distance remaining to be constructed proceeds west from Walhalla, S. C., across the Blue Ridge Mountains through what is known as Rabun Gap, down the Little Tennessee River toward Knoxville, Tenn., to Maryville.

Apparently, representatives of the Federal Government were very much interested in this proposal, and there is little doubt but what a substantial grant would have been made had it not been for the panic of 1837 and the local opposition based upon the ground that it would be an unwarranted invasion upon the rights of the States. Some of the local newspapers violently opposed the suggestion that the road should be built by the Federal Government, even though it was admitted to be of great military and commercial value to the country.

Their attitude is well illustrated by an editorial which appeared in the Athenian, published at Athens, Ga., March 17, 1829. I quote:

"The South has thus far kept aloof from all participation in the pecuniary gifts and loans of the Federal Government; our hands remain untainted with these indirect bribes; we have always opposed them when extended to others upon principle; and we are sorry to see agents from South Carolina, men of standing, members of the legislature, knocking at the doors of Congress, and with cap in hand begging a portion of the Treasury scraps. Still more should we regret to see them succeed. We know the language held by pliant politicians on such occasions, that while these good things are going we might as well take our share. This is bad reasoning and will produce bad consequences. It is admitting by our acts what we deny by our words, the power of Congress to make such grants. And it will be a most pernicious example to our younger sisters of the South. If we hope ever to bring Congress to a rigid adherence to the letter of the Constitution and prevent them from assuming every power by construction, we should abstain from all participation in the unholy thing, and instead thereof steadily assert our principles and show by our example what we really believe and wish to establish, what we are contending for."

Looked upon from the standpoint of local commercial value, this view may have been well taken, but from the standpoint of internal improvement or national defense I do not know of any reason why such a project could not be sponsored by the Federal Government, particularly at this time when Congress has only recently said to the world that we intend to uphold and if necessary defend the Monroe Doctrine. A study of the map in the light of present world conditions removes every doubt as to the necessity and wisdom of immediate and favorable consideration of this proposal; that is, if the Congress meant what it said a few weeks ago when it adopted a resolution reasserting the Monroe Doctrine, it is no time to back-track or quibble about making the preparation necessary to execute this purpose.

If it becomes necessary to defend the Monroe Doctrine, our South Atlantic coast will certainly furnish the rendezvous for our military activities, the loading place for naval supplies, the storehouse for every implement of war, and there should be no delay in providing transportation facilities that will mean shorter mileage by both land and sea to the scene of operations, for speed, distance, and direct transportation are vital factors in any defense program.

Some of the many reasons that may be assigned in support of this project as an aid to national defense we submit as follows:

1. It will facilitate the transportation and concentration of the many essentials in wartime to the South Atlantic ports that will be indispensable should an attempt be made to attack the United States through the countries south of us—and our military experts are saying that if attacks are made they will come from that direction.

2. It will afford easier access to those sections of the country where, on account of climatic conditions, our soldiers are trained in peacetime and would be assembled in wartime.

3. It will afford better connection with the textile and munition plants, the iron and steel plants, the munitions factories, and storage plants in both the South and Midwest areas.

4. It will in time of war furnish quick service in the delivery of coal, iron, etc., to plants engaged in the manufacture of munitions, war implements, etc.

5. The territory immediately adjacent to the project furnishes most desirable locations for underground storage places for fuel oil, gasoline, tin, manganese, rubber, and other materials used in the manufacture of explosives and other war essentials.

6. It will be an outlet for the transportation systems of the interior to the South Atlantic seaports from which South America and the Panama Canal Zone will necessarily be served in case of war, particularly if air and naval bases are to be established and developed on nearby possessions recently obtained from England.

7. It will furnish a right-angle route from the interior to the navy yard at Charleston, the marine barracks at Parris Island in South Carolina, the ports at Savannah and Brunswick, Ga., the increasingly large air base at Pensacola, and other ports on the Gulf coast.

8. It will mean that all the steel mills, munition plants, airplane factories, packing plants, grain elevators, cheese factories, garment factories, and other industrial or military enterprises between the Allegheny and Rocky Mountains on the one hand and the T. V. A. and the Great Lakes on the other will be from 200 to 300 miles nearer the southeastern seaboard—the base of concentration of our every military agency, including the Army, Navy, and Air Corps—should this country become involved in the war we are now trying to obviate or are preparing to meet.

9. In addition to facilitating transportation, the suggested superhighway could easily be made a further vital factor in the defense program by having runways or landing fields thereon at points varying from 10 to 15 miles apart so as to accommodate the landing or taking off of any type of airplane. The terminal of this highway should, of course, be on the Atlantic coast and some central point in the interior, probably Charleston, S. C., on the coast and Cincinnati, Ohio, in the interior, and possibly extending northwest from there to Chicago and St. Paul and northeast to Cleveland or Buffalo. Such a highway will be a dependable outlet or feeder from the industrial center of defense industries to the assembling ground of defense implements.

10. Press reports say that if the invasion of Britain does not come this fall or winter, it will come when and if Germany manages to smash the railroads and highways to be used in bringing men to the scene of attack, showing that the transportation facilities in Britain today is one of its great military assets.

In addition to the reasons already submitted in support of the proposal, it should be said that a great deal of work has already been done in the Blue Ridge Mountains between Walhalla, S. C., and Maryville, Tenn., in the way of constructing fills, excavating tunnels, and installing culverts, and we might suggest, in passing, that some of these tunnels should afford excellent sites for underground munition plants and storage of war materials, explosives, etc.

Proceeding from Walhalla to Charleston, S. C., the proposed route parallels the Savannah River, only a few miles distant, for about 150 miles and passes near Clarks Hill, where Army engineers and other govern-

mental agencies have recommended the construction of a dam for flood-control and power purposes, and when the dam is completed there will be sufficient power for any war industries that may strategically be located nearby. The system would be equally near the inexhaustible kaolin deposits found in Tennessee, western South Carolina, and eastern Georgia, which would be of unusual strategic military value should it at any time in the future become necessary to obtain aluminum from such deposits for use in the construction of airplanes, for it is quite conceivable that the present source from which 60 or 65 percent of aluminum material is obtained in French or British Guiana may no longer be available and we would then be forced to obtain aluminum from kaolin or other sources.

Furthermore, the proposed route would pass through the T. V. A. area where a number of defense industries are located; it would pass through the heart of the textile business of South Carolina—an industry of extreme importance in case of war or in the preparation for defense; it would pass within sight or a few miles of the recently constructed Buzzard Roost power project at Greenwood, as well as the power plant on Lake Murray, near Columbia, and the Santee-Cooper power project now under construction between Columbia and Charleston, S. C., all of which go to emphasize the strategic military value of this proposal.

This proposal was submitted nearly a year ago to the President of the United States for attention and consideration. In his report several weeks later he stated that the matter of studying the relationship of highways to the national defense had been submitted to the general staff and so far no recommendation had been made for this particular road. However, he concluded by saying:

"While I have no doubt that a superhighway connection such as you propose would be a meritorious project and contribute much to the national good, I am sure you will agree that under existing conditions our efforts should be concentrated on work certified by their proper authorities as of primary importance."

I thoroughly agree with the President's conclusion and have so indicated, but in view of the fact that the defense matters which have been given priority are well under way, we are of the strong conviction that this proposal should now be certified as one of the pressing projects in our defense program.

Several plans have been suggested by which funds may be obtained and the project constructed, but as I have already spoken too long, I will not detain you further by attempting to outline or discuss them. I would suggest, however, that a committee or organization be perfected to study, devise, and present ways and means to the proper officials in charge of our national-defense program for further determination.

Definition of "Security" Under Securities Act of 1933

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. PADDOCK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5065, which I introduced a few days ago, will beneficially affect many thousands of American workingmen, and hundreds of corporations, situated in each of the 48 States.

This bill amends the definition of the term "security" under the Securities Act of 1933, in order to make it clear that interests of employees under certain employee-benefit plans are not securities and subject to the exacting and expensive requirements of registration with the S. E. C.

There are two types of plans which fall within the express language of this amendment. First are trusts which form a part of employers' stock bonus, pension, or profit-sharing plans and which meet the requirements of section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code. This section grants tax advantages to such trusts, and in order to qualify for those advantages a trust must be part of a plan for the exclusive benefit of some or all of the employees, and the trust assets must be so kept that they cannot be diverted to any purpose other than for the exclusive benefit of participating employees. Contributions to the trust may be made by both employers and employees. A provision similar to the present section 165 was first included in the Federal Revenue Act in 1921 for the purpose of encouraging such plans, and since that time there has been continuous congressional favor shown toward plans of this character.

The second specific exclusion from the definition of "securities" covers employees savings account plans. A good many corporations have permitted employees to build up savings accounts by regular salary deductions. Under these plans the employer, in order to encourage and reward thrift, guarantees principal and interest, and employees may withdraw the whole or any part of the amount on deposit upon demand.

It is not believed that either trusts under section 165 or savings account plans involve the issuance or sale of securities under a proper interpretation of the Securities Act of 1933. Neither the language of the act nor the intent of Congress supports the view that employees participating in such plans are buying securities. Many plans of both kinds were in operation at the time of the adoption of the Securities Act, and many more have been put into operation since that time. Yet for at least 5 years it did not apparently even occur to anyone, either in industry or in government, that there was any need for registration of such plans as securities.

About 2 or 3 years ago, however, the Securities and Exchange Commission evolved the theory that such plans were investment contracts and a few employers were approached with requests for registration. There has been uniform disagreement with the interpretation placed upon the act by the Commission, although several such plans have now been registered in order that controversies with the Commission might be avoided.

A number of the leading proponents of the principle of profit sharing have continued to resist the requests of the Commission, firm in their belief that these plans do not involve any issuance or sale of securities nor any public offering thereof. These companies further believe that the cause of profit sharing and of pension or retirement programs, which have been so long fostered and encouraged by our Federal Government, will be dealt a serious blow if they are to be subjected to the needless and expensive burden of registration under the Securities Act of 1933.

It is not my desire nor intention to judge the merits of this controversy insofar as the language of the present act is concerned. It is, however, important to remove the doubt and uncertainty which now exists. It is certainly not the wish of the many reputable concerns operating these employee benefit plans to violate the Securities Act. Yet they hesitate to use the funds, which would otherwise go to employees in the form of pensions or retirement incomes, to compile and print lengthy and involved registration statements and prospectuses which they believe would serve no useful purpose. On the other hand, the Securities and Exchange Commission undoubtedly will welcome a clear expression of congressional will so that it may be certain that it is correctly administering the law.

There are two basic reasons why I believe, Mr. Speaker, that these employee benefit plans should be specifically excluded from the requirements of the Securities Act. First, such exclusion is in harmony with the will of Congress as expressed in other legislation. Second, and most important, there are no benefits in registration comparable with the serious burdens and substantial expenses involved. It should be worth while to consider each of these points in turn.

Reference has already been made to section 165 of the revenue act and the 20 years of congressional approval and encouragement of profit sharing under that section. Mention should also be made of the study and report of the subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee which so thoroughly investigated profit sharing under Senate Resolution No. 215. Most direct evidence of congressional intent is found, however, in the terms of the Investment Companies Act of 1940. This law, which was intended to expand the regulatory power of the Securities and Exchange Commission, expressly excludes employees' trusts under section 165 of the Revenue Code from the definition of "investment company." An examination of the Investment Companies Act discloses that there would be much more reason for including these employees' trusts under that act than there would be for bringing them under the Securities Act of 1933. It seems hardly conceivable that in view of this legislative history there could have been any intent to include these employees' trusts as securities under the 1933 act. The form of the amendment proposed in this bill has been adopted almost exactly from the exclusion of the same type of trusts from the Investment Companies Act. Thus there is reason to adopt this bill in the interest of uniformity.

There is also some interesting legislative history with regard to savings account plans. Section 21 of the Banking Act of 1933 imposed certain obligations upon the business of accepting deposits. A question arose as to whether that section applied to employee savings account

plans. In 1935 an amendment was adopted to make it clear that such employee-benefit plans were not covered and did not need to submit to examination and publication of reports of condition. The report of the Committee on Banking and Currency stated that—

> Hundreds of corporations * * * permit employees to leave part of their wages on deposit * * * so as to encourage thrift.

Fear was expressed that employers would abandon such plans if required to submit to the requirements of the Banking Act. It does not seem reasonable that Congress could have intended these plans to be subject to the even more burdensome requirements of the Securities Act of 1933. Thus this bill, which is intended to make it clear that these savings account plans do not fall under the terms of the Securities Act, is in harmony with prior legislative action under the Banking Act.

While uniformity of legislation on the same subject matter is of importance, this bill must stand or fall primarily on its own merits. In view of the undoubted desire of Congress to encourage these employee-benefit plans, and in view of the substantial expense which would result if registration is necessary, the sole question would seem to be whether such registration is necessary for the protection of employees.

In my opinion, registration of these plans would add nothing of real value. Section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code is the result of long experience in the field of profit-sharing, and compliance with the condition of that section should afford adequate protection to participants. No part of the amounts deposited by employees ever reaches the employer's treasury. The trust must also be so set up that neither the contributions of the employer or of the employees can be diverted to any purpose other than for the exclusive benefit of participants. Thus there is no opportunity for misappropriation of the trust assets. Unless the plan contains this protection for employees, it would not qualify for exemption under this bill.

Perhaps of even greater importance is the fact that the only possible value of such plans to the employer lies in the increased good will and cooperation of employees which flows from the operation of a successful employee-benefit plan. The cost to the employer under these plans is great. The money spent cannot be recovered. To produce value the plan must work out to the financial benefit of employees, and must create employee satisfaction. Thus there is neither incentive nor opportunity for defrauding employees. This is not to say that there are not, and will not be, plans under which employers defraud or attempt to defraud their employees. It is to say, however, that such schemes will not qualify for exemption under this bill, as they could not meet the requirements of section 165.

It should also be kept in mind that registration under the Securities Act of 1933 would not give the Commission any regulatory powers over these employee-benefit plans. This act was passed to provide "full and fair disclosure of the character of securities." This is of great value and filled a real need in connection with public offerings of securities. There is no such value or need for registration and issuance of prospectuses in connection with these employee-benefit plans. This is true because it is already an accepted practice for employers to give employees full explanations of plans of this character, in much more understandable form than a prospectus meeting S. E. C. requirements.

There is no case within my knowledge of any abuse by employers in this regard, and consequently no indicated need for corrective legislation. The reason for this is obvious and stems back to the fundamental nature and objective of all such plans, that is, creation of employee good will and satisfaction in their jobs. No employer is going to adopt a plan which employees have the option of accepting or rejecting, without giving them full opportunity to understand the offer. A plan of this character is of value to the employer only if it is sufficiently attractive to induce a major portion of the employees to participate, and if these employees continue to regard the plan as satisfactory.

It is believed this bill meets all the requirements of good legislation. It will eliminate an existing controversy as to the proper interpretation of a present law. It will remove a possible obstacle in the way of employee-benefit plans which have long been in legislative favor. It would be in harmony with existing laws relating to the same subject matter. Finally, it would save great expense for employer or employees, or both, though sufficiently limited in scope to insure protection of employees' interests.

Ochiltree County Wheat Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

ARTICLE FROM OCHILTREE COUNTY (TEX.) HERALD

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to direct the attention of the other Members of Congress to the first wheat festival ever held in the United States. This plan, formulated by the people of Ochiltree County, Tex., is unique in that the people are so thoroughly sold on the good that the United Service Organizations are doing that they believe in participating in an actual and concrete fashion by pledging to the U. S. O. one bushel of wheat for every man, woman, and child in that county. Ochiltree County has long been known as one of the most important units in the world's "bread basket" and as a county of 100-percent native-born white Americans. Because of these unique facts, and because I am justly proud of the patriotic spirit of these fine American people, I take pleasure in calling this festival to the attention of the Members of Congress and their constituents by presenting an account of the affair which appeared in the July 3, 1941, issue of the Ochiltree County Herald:

[From the Ochiltree County (Tex.) Herald of July 3, 1941]

With band music blaring, wheat threshing on Main Street, 13 beautiful aspirants to the crown of "wheat queen of the world," and the main address by E. B. Germany, United Service Organizations director for the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana, broadcast from Perryton over the entire Texas State network, Ochiltree County's first wheat festival held Saturday was a grand success. The unique feature of the festival, the pledging of 4,213 bushels of wheat, 1 bushel for every man, woman, and child in Ochiltree County, to the United Service Organizations, centered the eyes of the Nation on Perryton and Ochiltree County. Donations are now pouring in from the good people of Ochiltree County to fulfill this pledge.

GERMANY LAUDED OCHILTREE

E. B. Germany, Dallas, State chairman of the Democratic Party and regional United Service Organizations director, arrived by plane shortly after noon. He was accompanied by Jay Taylor, eighteenth district United Service Organizations chairman; Cedar Puckett, Potter County United Service Organizations chairman, and Adjutant W. T. Johnson, of the Amarillo Salvation Army.

Mr. Germany was profuse in his praises of Ochiltree County for making the highest per capita donation of any county in the United States. He declared, "Our soldiers have nothing to fear in support from such citizens as yours." He also brought out in his address, which was broadcast over 116 radio stations of the Southwest, the fact that Ochiltree County has the highest percentage of native-born white American citizens of any county in the United States.

The Perryton Equity Exchange, one of the world's largest and most successful cooperatives, owned and operated by the farmers of the Perryton area, bid in the 4,213 bushels of wheat at 90 cents per bushel. L. R. Conner, prominent in farm organization circles auctioned the wheat.

Music for the program and broadcast was furnished by the Perryton Ranger Band, under the direction of Glenn A. Truax. Mayor W. H. Lance presided at the program and introduced Mr. Germany.

Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to extending the period of service for our selectees while America remains at peace. It is important to morale at home and in camp that the Government should keep faith with the men whom it has conscripted. Congress made a contract with the selectees that they stay in service for only 1 year. Let us keep that contract and let us keep our promises to the American people.

Is this a training program to have our boys ready to defend America or is it a program to police the world by sending an American army to every continent in the world? The people have a right to know the attitude of the administration on this question.

According to the Constitution of the United States, article I, section 8:

Congress shall have power to make rules for the Government and regulations of land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

Congress should not give up this right. It has already transferred too much power to the President.

If we discharge the selectees at the end of a year's service they can be replaced each month by new draftees. According to information I have received from the national headquarters of the selective-service system, the following number of men were inducted, by months: November, 13,806; December, 5,521; January, 73,633; February, 90,238; March, 153,159; April, 123,207; May, 56,896; June, 79,522. You can readily see that these men can easily be replaced each month without disrupting the present training program.

Canada and Australia do not conscript men for overseas service. Canada pays her men $1.30 per day for home service. Give our boys $40 per month and a guarantee that they will not have to fight on foreign soil and Uncle Sam will have more volunteers than he can handle.

Here in our Republic we lead our people, but under a dictatorship they drive them. Our President should realize by now that he cannot drive our farmers, laborers, and businessmen, and I do not believe that he can drive the young people of America.

The future of America depends upon the youth of our land. They must rekindle not only the fires of patriotism, but there must be a willingness to do the practical things that make a Government strong and enduring.

News From the Training Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. PADDOCK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

ARTICLES FROM THE MESSAGE CENTER, FORT ELISS, TEX.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, news from the training camps is just as important as news from Washington. The attitude of our soldiers toward their training is as noteworthy as the views of Congressmen on legislation. From all reports, the men in the camps are doing their work with a loyalty, efficiency, and high morale, which may well be an example and inspiration to us, their Representatives.

The Message Center is published by the Two Hundred and Second Coast Artillery, antiaircraft, one of our fine Illinois regiments, now stationed at Fort Bliss, Tex., and commanded by Col. Charles C. Dawes, a veteran of World War No. 1. The Message Center is an excellent newspaper, and from my own 1917 experience at Camp Grant I can appreciate the value to the regiment of such a publication. These quotations from its columns will be of interest not only to Members of the House but also to that large audience of Americans throughout the country who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Message Center, Fort Bliss, Tex.]

THE LADIES FROM HEAVEN

We heard them say:

"You look grand, son," and "Sweetheart, you're heavier and harder and handsomer," and "O Bud, we miss you so at home, but, gee, you're looking fine."

They were mothers, sweethearts, and sisters, 300 of them, and they swarmed from a Chicago limited onto a cactus-covered field just beyond the Two Hundred and Second area.

Three hundred women who rode 1,500 miles, yet sprang, fresh and eager, to hug and squeeze their loved ones. Unmindful of the burning sun, not heeding the stares of strangers, asking a million and one questions, and answering them at the same time.

More than 300 soldiers from this regiment were manhandled, or should we say womanhandled, and they loved it. More hundreds stood off to one side and felt lonesome; many rough hands of hard-boiled soldiers brushed mists from in front of their faces; collars were tight on throats that tightened; Adam's apples did flip-flops.

The ladies from heaven, and that's what they were the morning they arrived.

Shortly after the men from the Two Hundred and Second were inducted a women's Two Hundred and Second auxiliary was formed in Chicago, under the leadership of Mrs. Pierce. From the start they planned a trip to Fort Bliss to see their sons. The movement gained momentum. Sweethearts and sisters clamored to come along. They did.

Hustled aboard the huge Army trucks, they were escorted through Fort Bliss, into the city of El Paso, and lodged in comfortable quarters.

After a short rest they eagerly boarded the trucks once more and drove out to the homes of their menfolk. A khaki canvas city on the slope of the towering Franklin Mountains extended them a warm welcome.

Colonel Dawes and his staff were on hand to greet them. One thousand five hundred men stood by to serve their every wish. Cooks worked overtime so that mothers, naturally critical cooks, would have the finest meal they ever had. Men scrubbed and polished everything in sight. They remarked, these visitors, the streets were clean enough to eat from.

Men who have been heard grumbling about the hot Texas sun gladly took part in a regular field meet. They chased the greased pig, they ran potato and three-legged races. They competed in sprints and track events. They played at tug of war. And a more sincere effort to win was never witnessed anywhere.

Immediately after supper they all adjourned to the boxing arena. In the cool of the shade of Mount Franklin these visitors watched the muscular soldiers put on a boxing exhibition to rival any sports arena.

After dark the giant searchlights spread daylight over the area and the women trooped to the recreation hall to see the regimental play, All Bliss and Two Hundred and Two. The play was good. They enjoyed it immensely. They laughed until their sides ached and applauded the soldiers' efforts until their hands were sore. That night they were taken to their quarters by truck. The cool night air was conducive to sleep.

Returning to camp early next morning they arrived in time to see the regimental ceremony. The thrill of a parade was doubled when they watched their "own" march by. The throb of drums counting steps and the bray of brass with its stirring measures brought them cheering to their feet. However, when the colors marched by the atmosphere was charged with something that couldn't be seen—it was felt. It was the women of America at attention.

For the most part Saturday afternoon was spent visiting and shopping in Juarez, Mexico. Saturday evening, another rendition of All Bliss and Two Hundred and Two brought many back for a second time.

Sunday morning several different church services were held for the benefit of those wanting to attend. Later a general service was conducted by Chaplain Cunningham.

Sunday evening came all too soon for most. At the last minute, however, many decided to stay until Thursday, last day of the excursion schedule. For the most part these latter spent the days in between visiting the historical spots of the surrounding country.

In the past, El Paso has been invaded many times. Never before was an invasion so welcomed. Particularly were the officers and soldiers of the Two Hundred and Second elated over the invasion. We hope to have many more of the same nature.

To those of you who were fortunate enough to have guests, those of us who were not so fortunate express our thanks for the splendid hospitality you showed in inviting us to join you in your happiness.

To mothers, especially mothers of the Two Hundred and Second who made this trip possible, we are grateful.

OUR CLUB

Looking just a little like a dumpy old lady from the outside, the A. A. T. C. Service Club belies this first impression when you enter. Consisting of a large common room for dancing, a balcony replete with magazines, writing desks, and innumerable games, like monopoly, chess, checkers, a fine modern lending library of 5,000 volumes, and a first-class cafeteria and soda fountain, it offers the men of the Two Hundred and Second more in the form of relaxation and recreation than anything this side of Chicago.

Under the supervision of Lt. Peter Ball, A. A. T. C. recreation officer, and the able guidance of Mrs. Juanita Pratt, senior hostess, and Mrs. Connie Diehl, recreation hostess, the club is launching a comprehensive program for the entertainment of the men of the six antiaircraft regiments, the reception center, and the Thirty-ninth Brigade Headquarters Battery.

Monday evenings are devoted to special classes in Spanish, English, dancing, and bridge. These classes are open to everyone in this command and all are urged to attend. Should you have a yen for any subject not too individualistic, the hostesses will request the services of a qualified teacher through the Army Recreation Service in town.

Tuesday evenings are the only ones reserved for special parties. This is the time for you to get up that battery dance you've been talking about or join up with two or three batteries for a real blow-out. The hall is free and will be reserved for your group if a week's notice is given. Dinner and supper dances are possible at a nominal cost

through the cooperation of the cafeteria. During such functions the cafeteria is reserved during the serving of meals or refreshments. The Two Hundred and Second Band is always willing to oblige, for a fee, as is the good old battery fund. So pull up your socks and get party-minded. Last but by no means least, the gals are El Paso's prettiest, and, as those of experience will testify, they are plenty pretty.

Wednesday evenings are amateur nights. A different regiment will sponsor the Wednesday evening programs each week, but all are welcome to participate or watch. Whether you make bird calls or do the nigger-toe shag, you'll want to participate to win a handsome prize. And everyone is an amature, despite previous fortunes accumulated on Broadway.

Thursday is the day set aside for harmonizers and shouters. Each Thursday evening a different regiment will conduct a community sing complete with piano accompanist, swing band, or whatever it desires. Words to popular songs will be given out, and from that point on it will be every man for himself.

Friday is casino night, gamblers to the fore. Each man on entering the club that night will be given a certain amount of stage money. From then on it's up to him to pad his wad on horse races, bingo, and a dozen other chance games. The man holding the money at the end of the evening wins a prize.

Saturday night is a night open for suggestions. There will always be a program, but it will not be of any certain type or form. This Saturday, for example, those of us appreciating really top-notch singing by a fine voice will ankle over to listen to Salvador Trivizo, a supporting member of the Metropolitan Opera Co. in New York, who has generously offered his talents to the A. A. T. C. for the evening. Accompanied by Paul Moor, who is a virtuoso in his own right, Mr. Trivizo will offer a varied program—lots of light popular numbers along with your favorite airs. Mr. Trivizo is a tenor.

Sunday gives each regiment in turn the opportunity to show off its band. The weekly concert will start at about 2:30 and will be followed by tea dancing.

At all times an excellent juke box is available to jitterbugs and dream dancers alike with a frequent change of records. Ping pong tables are on hand for experts and those who only think they are. Bats and balls can be had by applying to the hostesses or to Willy, the ever helpful caretaker.

It's our service club and with its attached guest house where mothers, fathers, and relatives can stay for 50 cents per night, it offers us a real rendezvous where we can find a home away from home.

If you know where you can find more, let us in on it.

They Should Be Retained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MEMPHIS COMMERCIAL APPEAL

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of July 16, 1941:

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal of July 16, 1941]

THEY SHOULD BE RETAINED

The decision as to whether the National Guard, Reservists, and selectees are to be retained in military service beyond their original year has now been placed squarely up to the Congress.

Viewing the situation in all its realities, it seems incredible that any decision other than that of retention could be reached.

To release the categories mentioned would be to dissipate two-thirds of the present Army—none too large numerically—at a time when none can predict what terrible thing is going to occur within the next 24 hours.

Unpleasant as the situation will be for selectees and their parents, there are some realities which must be faced.

The transition from a state of nonbelligerency to that of all-out war can occur at any moment, a transition which might require far greater trained manpower than is now available.

The question of use of guardsmen and selectees beyond the Western Hemisphere has been momentarily sidetracked, but the question of using Regulars in possible battle sectors remains alive if never mentioned. Trained men would have to take up the jobs and posts left vacant by regular combat troops.

Selectees now in service are nowhere near trained to a point where they could be turned into the Reserve pool. They are not trained sufficiently for many reasons, not the least of which is the fact that those who were to train them—Reserve and National Guard officers—required further training themselves, needed a stepping up in their zeal, and a vast improvement in their own efficiency. The Army has not yet been able to rid itself of the incompetent officer class. It has not undergone the thorough shaking-down process it requires. Coming maneuvers have been designed for that purpose.

The Army has not had, does not have, the equipment it needs. For that the Nation can thank lack of foresight, lack of coordination, and the obstructive tactics in planning and production.

It can thank, in a large measure, those obstructive labor groups which have promoted strikes in defense industries on the theory that self-interest comes ahead of the national weal and security.

That's not a pleasant thought for selectees in service, but truth is not always pleasant.

Should the Congress refuse to retain the National Guard, for instance, the movement of National Guard troops out of Hawaii would have to start on August 15, due to deficiencies in the shipping situation. Japan is making some nasty gestures in the Far East right at this moment.

Getting down to rock bottom, the imposition of so many selectees, the terrific expansion of the small Regular Establishment, imposed insuperable training burdens on the Regular Army cadres. Too much was asked of them in too short time.

Should the selectees be released, the entire Army structure would be torn apart. Whether it could be reassembled in time is highly questionable. We do not believe that it could be. There are some units in the Corps of Engineers, for instance, which have as high as 80 percent selectee personnel.

To release any selectees now would mean that the Army would have to go through again all that it has gone through during the past year. A total of 900,000 selectees was authorized in the first call. Less than 700,000 have been absorbed into the Army, yet the time for the first to be released is nearly here.

In the meantime the totalitarian threat grows greater and its conquering forces advance. Either this threat of totalitarianism is starkly real or else we are all the victims of a terrible hallucination.

The Commercial Appeal believes it to be real. It believes the security of all free men wherever they live to be in terrible danger. That being so, it believes, then, that every possible precautionary step should be taken. The development of a capable field fighting force of adequate size is the first step.

As a people we are yet equivocating, we are yet refusing to face realities, we are not, by any means, fully awakened to the need for tremendous sacrifices. We are yet doing by indirection what should be done forthrightly.

The Chief of Staff of the United States Army says that retention of the selectees is a vital necessity. So be it. Let them be retained, but on the day the Congress makes that decision let it also decide that an end must be had to any process, plan, or technique which hinders maximum equipment production, or in any way betrays those men of the armed services over whose destiny the Government assumes full control.

There has been too much one-sided sacrifice, too much subserviency to politics, and to obstructive groups. The defense theories have been fine. Their execution, in some respects, has been putrid. If selectees must forego freedom from military service, others must forego selfishness.

The Groton Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. FITZGERALD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NORWICH (CONN.) BULLETIN

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial taken from the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin in reference to the Groton shipyard:

[From the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin]

THE GROTON SHIPYARD

Following the visit of the Subcommittee on House Naval Affairs to New England points, including Groton, there were intimations that some use ought to be made of the facilities at the Groton Iron Works, long since idle, as a shipbuilding plant.

Then it didn't seem to be advisable to utilize it for naval construction, but in the report which has been made to the full committee there is the recommendation that the yard be used for the expansion of the Electric Boat Co., which has been building submarines, which has been expanding its plant and which has many submarines to be built as rapidly as possible.

The inference to be gained from this report is that the subcommittee doesn't believe that the Groton facilities should be allowed to stand idle at a time when there is such need for getting the naval-construction program completed as quickly as possible, and when there is the need for more and more vessels of other kinds.

The subcommittee tempers its recommendation with the observation that the six idle ways should be employed if sufficient labor is obtainable. That has been one of the points raised whenever the use of the yard

has been considered. But while nothing has been done about that yard, the construction of entirely new yards has been authorized without any question being raised concerning the needed hands to operate them.

Whether the Groton yard is put to use for the building of submarines or for the construction of cargo ships or tankers makes little difference. It is unfortunate that such a plant, which could be made ready for use in a comparatively short time, is allowed to remain in disuse when there is such a demand for more ships.

What the full Naval Affairs Committee of the House will do with the recommendations of the subcommittee there is no way of telling, beyond the fact that as long as the few were designated as the investigators for the committee it is reasonable to expect that careful consideration will be given to their findings. Otherwise such an inspection trip wouldn't amount to much, and the opinions of those who have been on the ground wouldn't be of any greater value than those without first-hand knowledge of the situation.

During the prolonged efforts which have been made to awaken an interest in the utilization of the yard, the Maritime Commission has displayed its opposition. It is nevertheless calling for more ships, arranging for the building of more of them elsewhere at either new yards or expansions of existing ones. Plans are being made to turn out a big tonnage at the end of next year, but the quicker that tonnage can be acquired and put into use, the quicker the ship problem is going to be solved, and it is through the use of such yards as that at Groton, practically in condition for production to start, that the greatly desired speed-up can be accomplished.

The chance of getting desired results the quicker exists whether the yard is used for submarines or other types of vessels.

Inland Shipbuilding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. FITZGERALD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SUN

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Sun in reference to inland shipbuilding:

INLAND SHIPBUILDING—FAILURE TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE GREAT LAKES FACILITIES

To the EDITOR OF THE SUN:

SIR: Predicated upon the experience gained in the past war and anticipating that an even more acute shipping shortage would develop in the present conflict, as long ago as September 27, 1939, the writer addressed a communication to the United States Maritime Commission in which certain observations were made with respect to the matter of constructing 10,000- and 12,000-ton ocean-going cargo vessels and tankers on the Great Lakes.

During the World War period 430 ocean-going steamers were constructed on the Great Lakes with aggregate cargo-carrying capacity of 1,612,500 tons. The 12 yards participating represented more than 25 percent of the Nation's steel shipbuilding output.

Although 21 months have elapsed since this matter was first directed to the attention of the Maritime Commission, not a single seagoing, cargo-carrying steamer is today being built at any shipyard situated on the Great Lakes. In responding to the writer's letter of September 27, 1939, the Commission merely made a formal and bland acknowledgment under date of October 9, 1939, to the effect that its program of vessel construction was being handled satisfactorily with the then-existing facilities. Yet only a few months later this same Commission established a policy of wholesale subsidization of new yards at ports remote from sources of essential supplies.

As an indication of the incongruous nature of such a fatuous vessel construction program, makeshift plants have been hastily thrown together at such places as Wilmington, N. C.; New Orleans; Orange and Houston, Tex.; San Diego, Los Angeles, and Richmond, Calif.; Portland, Oreg., and Seattle. Since all of these ports are remote from the mills which roll the steel and the places where boilers, engines, and ship auxiliaries are built, one wonders what possible reasons justified the selection of sites almost completely bare of everything entering into the construction of vessels.

As the emergency grows more acute daily, railway cars and boats must be taken out of essential national-defense services in order to drag more than 75 percent of these shipbuilding materials halfway across the continent. This is a strange sort of economy to conserve the Nation's transportation resources.

Indeed, it is most extraordinary that these improvidently subsidized, mushroom shipbuilding plants which build no boilers, engines, or any other auxiliary machinery should have been brought into being at the expense of the Nation's taxpayers, while old-established, financially strong, and adequately equipped yards—situated just across the streets from the mills which roll the steel—are without a single order from the Maritime Commission.

LOUIS I. KEHOE.

NEW YORK, *June 23.*

Keep Faith With Our Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been asked to change the selective-service law so as to permit the Army to keep the draftees indefinitely or for the duration of the emergency. Personally, I believe that such action would be a most dangerous one, in that it will undermine the faith in our Government, and thereby weaken the morale of the Army.

I have no apologies or excuses to make to these men or their families, because I did not believe it necessary to draft men in peacetime, and therefore voted against the conscription bill last year. But the administration and those that voted for it assured the country that these men would be returned to private life after 1 year's training. That bill was passed shortly before election, and most everyone that voted for the bill made certain to explain to his constituents that 1 year was all that was required of them, and that every safeguard had been provided to hold their positions open for them, so that they could step right back into it at the end of a year.

The boys, as well as their mothers, wives, and sweethearts, marked down the date of their return; so did his employer, who advised the man that took the draftee's place that in a year he would have to step down and turn the position over to the man that left to serve our country a year. The President and most Members of Congress, over the radio and in campaign speeches, assured our people that no expeditionary force would be sent across the ocean, and that all we expected of the boys to be drafted was 1 year of military training, so that in case of an attempted invasion we would have several million men with fair training. What will be our excuse to these boys, their families, and employers for keeping them on indefinitely, when no one has thus far officially advised us of any greater danger of attack against the Americas than existed when the draft started about 9 months ago, and even considering the need of aid to Britain now as compared with a year ago when the conscription bill was being prepared. Is her position any worse now than it was then? Did we not all fear last fall that Hitler would be able to cross the Channel and conquer the British Isles? Has nc her position and her ability to match Hitler's air force been greatly improved since the two arch enemies of democracy—Hitler and Stalin—are clasped in a death struggle? It is almost certain that Hitler will be well occupied in Russia the rest of this year, thereby giving England still more time to strengthen her position. No; I do not believe that Hitler is in any better position now to conquer the world than he was last year after the fall of France and Belgium. He has to police ever-increasing territory, and even though he may gain in foodstuffs and other materials, his army has to be constantly kept on the job policing conquered countries to guard against the possibility of preparing for a revolt.

I am certain that our leaders did not dare to come out before election last year and say or do what they are doing now. That is not being fair with the people and cannot strengthen democracy or the much-discussed and badly needed unity. Did not everyone of us who were seeking votes last fall promise to oppose another expeditionary force or involvement in Europe's war unless we were attacked? General Marshall last year stated that a well-trained and modern-equipped army of 380,000 men were sufficient to defend our country from invasion. Then, if an expeditionary force is not contemplated, why is it now stated that to permit draftees to return at the end of the year it would take away two-thirds of the Army? The total Army strength now is nearly 1,500,000. Approximately 600,000 have been drafted

from November up to July 1. If we live up to our agreement, only 13,806 would return home during November, 5,521 during December, 73,633 during January, 90,238 during February, 153,159 during March, 123,207 during April, 56,896 during May, 79,522 in June of next year. Therefore the largest number of draftees who will leave the Army in any month up to next July, under the present law, will be 153,159, scheduled to go home next March. That will be about 10 percent of our present Army.

It seems to me we should be honest with the people and state actual facts, and not attempt to make our people believe that two-thirds of our Army would be dropped all at once. I am certain that a great many of our men, especially officers in the National Guard and the Reserve, will volunteer and remain in the Army. They get fairly good pay and intend to make Army life their career. Why not keep our promise and permit those that want to go home, and encourage volunteers? Letters are pouring into my office on this subject and thus far not a single person has asked me to vote for the indefinite retention of the boys. Due to the fact that General Marshall says "saboteurs are at work among the boys in training camps," I am forced to guard the identity of the boys who have written to me, and therefore will quote only one letter which is typical. I am certain that 99 percent of all our boys will be glad to offer their services and their lives if necessary for the defense of our country, but so far the large majority do not feel that we are in immediate danger of being attacked, and they cannot see why they should be asked to offer their lives on the battlefield of Europe or Asia. The law provides that they be placed in reserve after the training period and are subject to be called at any time for further service if the President deems it necessary. They will have had a year of training, why not train others, and permit these boys to enjoy home life and its advantages for awhile.

By all means, let us consider what it means to the morale of these young men if we force them to doubt promises made by their Government. What is most important, morale and unshakeable confidence in our Government or a little more military training? Following is one letter similar to a great many others:

Congressman GEHRMANN,

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I would like to enter my protest against the passage of the bill to declare a national emergency which will prolong the tenure of service of the said emergency.

Just what has suddenly disrupted our national safety? What violent change has taken place? I am only one of many selectees who would like to know the answers to these questions. We are thoroughly bewildered knowing not what to believe. Can it be that our patriotic fervor is being taken advantage of to satisfy the whims of a small group of men? If, on the other hand, we knew definitely that our national safety is imperiled, we would more than gladly render our services for the duration of the emergency.

I volunteered my services for the 12-month training period firmly believing that I would be discharged upon the expiration of that period. Now on the eve of discharge for many selectees, we learn that the peril has increased—that we must remain in service indefinitely. We have kept faith; why can't you keep faith?

There are 22 men in our department, and of that number 22 are of the same opinion. Prove without a doubt that a national emergency exists, and we will stay without a grumble.

Cordially yours.

Senatorial Ostriches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

ARTICLE BY RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an article by Mr. Raymond Clapper, the well-known columnist, appearing in the Washington Daily News of July 22, 1941.

In one of the never-to-be-forgotten sermons delivered by the Master of Men while He was on earth, and recorded in the New Testament. He upbraided His hearers and compared them to those who have eyes to see and see not, and ears to hear but who hear not.

Mr. Clapper applied this admonition to our present crisis, and points out that some of the critics of our foreign policy are as blind and as deaf as were those listeners of nearly 2,000 years ago.

Unfortunately, the ostriches of which Mr. Clapper speaks are not confined alone to a few in the Senate and House, but some of the organized propagandists, whose criticisms of our Government's policy, are giving aid and comfort to Hitler, also come within this category.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of July 22, 1941]

SENATORIAL OSTRICHES

(By Raymond Clapper)

The most baseless complaint is that which comes from some Senators who say they are not being told the facts that make the situation of the United States as grave as the administration insists it is.

The essential facts are plain enough for anybody who will allow the facts to speak for themselves. They are available to anybody who reads the newspapers.

Senators and Representatives, least of all, have complaint on the ground that facts are being withheld. Senator WHEELER knew about the plan to occupy Iceland before the public knew it. Senator TAFT knew, before the public did, that American contractors were building naval air bases in Ireland for the British Government.

In fact Senators and Representatives on both sides have had the situation spelled out to them time and again. Confidential military information concerning the details has been given to them. Members of the House and Senate Military Affairs Committee have been told more military secrets than any except our highest Army and Navy officers know. The whole picture has been laid not only before Democratic leaders but before some of the Republican leaders such as Senator AUSTIN, of Vermont, and Representative WADSWORTH, of New York.

But that is not necessary. The military secrets are not essential to an understanding of the picture. The picture is clear without knowing just where our Panama Canal defenses are located, how many marines we have in Iceland, and where in Latin America we are building air fields. The facts that count in this situation are plain to all except those who read with blind eyes. They are the facts that have been in the war news for weeks and months. They are the facts that shout at you from the map. They are the facts that you read in the dispatches now from Bolivia, which has just frustrated a Nazi-inspired attempt to overthrow the government and has had to kick the German Minister out of the country. They are the facts such as the simple geographical fact that South America is nearer to Africa than to the United States. They are the elementary strategic facts such as the fact that the British Navy in German hands would completely alter the balance of the Atlantic world.

These facts have been spelled out day after day. They are not military secrets.

It isn't any military secret that if Hitler licks Russia, as most military experts expect, there will be left nowhere in the world any army or any combination of armies capable at this time of putting up a fair fight as of today. It isn't any military secret that if Hitler had occupied Iceland, he would have been able to use that strategic spot for flank attacks on shipping to England. It isn't any secret that if Hitler cracks down on weak Portugal and Spain and takes possession of the Azores, the Canaries, and the Cape Verde Islands, he will have bases from which to attack shipping in the south Atlantic. It isn't any military secret that we have 25 or more outposts and bases that must be garrisoned, at which air defenses and protection for naval craft must be maintained, and that it takes an army of considerable size to spread out over these posts.

The cry that unless military secrets are disclosed the country can't make up its mind is bunk. The cry that we are not being told the situation is bunk. You can find the warnings from Secretary Hull beginning back at the time of Munich. Events time and again since then have demonstrated that these warnings were soundly based.

The only trouble is that some people have refused to listen, have refused to think, have stuffed cotton in their ears, and have done nothing except to run around screaming that Roosevelt is trying to get us into war.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1941

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the new tax bill will soon come before the House for debate and vote. The people of our country are greatly exercised over the provisions of this revenue law, because they have suffered from every plan of control over business, agriculture, and industry to the extent that their earning capacity has been minimized greatly, all of which has been asserted by their National Government. Yet in the face of

this situation, and in the face of their greatly lessened ability to pay, they are confronted with the largest tax bill this Nation has ever imposed upon the people. This is the result of 8 years' excessive spending by the administration now in power. The untold billions which have been spen by this administration, much of which was uselessly spent, if available now, would lend material aid to our defense program. But that spending is in the past. The past cannot be recalled. However, the exercise of business judgment throughout the past 8 years, in the slightest degree, would have made available now, when we are in need, that revenue which has been wasted and frittered away by this spending administration.

Mr. Speaker, at this very hour, when our peril is great and when our people are struggling to pay their taxes, this administration continues the mad rush of spending the taxpayers' money for useless nondefense items. I have urged repeatedly that the spending of the taxpayers' money, in the face of our defense preparations, be limited to those items which are absolutely essential to the maintenance of our Government and defense items. Every nondefense item should be cut down and reduced. In the nondefense items I am confident at least $2,000,000,000 can be deducted therefrom and the functions of our Government be not impaired thereby. These reductions should be made, and this ruthless spending of money must be curtailed to the end that the financial structure of our Nation may remain intact. If this constant spending of the taxpayers' money is continued, without regard to the ability of the people to meet their debt, we will soon face a general financial break-down and utter chaos in our country. This Nation cannot finance the world and prepare for our own defense in this country. We cannot withstand the continuous increase of the spending of money for nondefense items and at the same time prepare for our own defense. This policy of the administration will quite soon hurl us into the throes of a wild inflation which will result in disaster to our Nation and to our people.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a short article which appeared in the Indianapolis Star, of Indianapolis, Ind., of recent date, for which I ask unanimous consent, which article reads:

TAXING WAGE INCREASES

The idea of raising taxes as a means of preventing inflation is a prize example of killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. Administration economists have proposed an increase in social-security taxes to cut the consumer purchasing power that results from higher employment and salaries. They are becoming disturbed over the indications of inflation, as they well may be, but are mistaken when they figure the preventive would be to tax the wage earner so that he would not have more to spend.

If wages go up and the workers have increased buying power, there will be greater industrial activity. The manufacturer, the retailer, and others will be unable to make money with which to pay the advances in pay rolls. If the employee's wage increase is taken by any form of taxation, there will be no addition to the volume of business. Industry will not be able to earn the money to meet the increase in pay roll, to say nothing of contributing to the Treasury through increased profits taxes.

Industry does not manufacture profits or cash. It acquires them through the purchasing power of the ultimate consumers. If they are not permitted to spend more than at present, industry will be in no position to shoulder additional pay-roll burdens. While we do not want inflation, we cannot have a one-sided prosperity. If wages and salaries are to go up those called on to meet the increases must be permitted to earn the money through greater purchasing power of the consumer. A program which takes a wage increase by taxation would hamstring industry and be an imposition on the earner.

National Grange Supports Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

STATEMENT BY LOUIS J. TABER, MASTER OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith statement in connection with H. R. 4927, a bill to ratify the agreement between the United States and Canada for the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project. This statement was made by Louis J. Taber, master of the National Grange, before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the United States House of Representatives on July 17, 1941, and is as follows:

Chairman MANSFIELD and gentlemen of the committee, I appear before this committee representing the National Grange and its million dues-paying members in 37 States, because of resolutions passed by our national organization favoring the completion of the St. Lawrence project.

We advocate it on the broad principle that as we improve our transportation facilities and create additional power we are thereby adding to the national wealth and contributing to the general welfare.

The Grange favors every constructive step that will aid in the military and economic defense of the Republic and promote its social advancement. Every agency that adds to the detvelopment of the resources of this Nation is a benefit to all our citizens. True conservation requires the utilization of our natural resources, the prevention of exploitation, and also the elimination of waste. Power resources wasted prevent the creation of needed national wealth.

In my first master's address at the Atlantic City session of the National Grange in 1924, this statement was made in dealing with conservation and waterpower:

"The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway should be built because of the benefits conferred on the entire Nation." (See p. 18, 1924 Journal of Proceedings.)

Later in that same session, the Committee on Forestry and Conservation reported:

"We recommend the building of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway." (See p. 217, 1924 Journal of Proceedings.)

Thus, 18 years ago, the National Grange definitely and for the first time came out for the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway. This position of the Grange has been reaffirmed on more than one occasion and never at any time since 1924 has the Grange taken adverse action on this question.

BILL PROVIDES FOR MODERNIZATION OF AN EXISTING TRANSPORT FACILITY

One very important feature of the pending bill, which should not be overlooked, is the fact that it authorizes the modernization of an existing waterway, not the undertaking of an entirely new development.

The United States and Canada have already improved the connecting channels of the Great Lakes to a minimum depth of more than 20 feet. From the Atlantic up the St. Lawrence River, a channel 35 feet deep has already been provided 1,000 miles inland to the port of Montreal. Just above Montreal the rapids of the St. Lawrence River form a bottleneck which today blocks off deep-water navigation from the east and from the west. This bottleneck is less than 80 miles in length. The rapids are at present bypassed by outmoded, antiquated, 14-foot canals.

The building of the works authorized by this bill and the completion of less extensive improvements in the Canadian section of the river will provide a minimum depth of 27 feet throughout the 2,687 miles of the entire Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system.

This will give the United States a fourth seacoast. It will permit the great agricultural and industrial areas of the Midwest to ship their products by deep water without transshipment or change in bulk. By spending less than $200,000,000 in new Federal funds, we shall thus greatly enhance the value of the investments already made by the United States and Canada on the upper Lake channels, the Welland Canal, and the other great improvements now in use. In addition, we shall make available 2,200,000 horsepower of the cheapest hydroelectricity in the world, to be divided equally and distributed by public agencies of the State of New York and the Province of Ontario.

PROJECT INCLUDED IN LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE FOR 1941

The completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project is included in the legislative program of the National Grange for 1941, which we submitted to the President and to the Members of the House and Senate upon the convening of the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

I quote from the statement of policy accompanying this program:

"The first and foremost duty of the Nation is to defend America and to preserve American ideals. We must build a system of defense that will be strong enough to meet any emergency, and we must do it with the utmost speed.

"As a part of our scheme of national defense, it is vital that agriculture, our fundamental industry, should be given proper consideration and placed on a sound basis. Agriculture asks for fair treatment rather than special privilege. It seeks economic justice rather than subsidy."

In item 15 of this program the Grange states its position on the project now before this committee in its general relationship to the whole transportation picture. I quote:

"The Grange is firm in the belief that each type of transportation should be allowed to develop and operate without undue restrictions or handicaps on the part of the Government. * * *

"We favor the speedy elimination of all artificial and unnecessary transportation barriers as between the several States.

"Since the Federal Government over a period of many years has expended large sums of money for the development and improvement of our inland waterways, which, in addition to their great value in times of peace, enter into our scheme of national defense, we are opposed to the adoption of any policy which will destroy this wise investment. Our water-borne commerce should not be hindered or restricted by unnecessary regulation or interference on the part of the Government.

"We favor the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project."

As the oldest general farm organization in the United States, the Grange has supported the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, on the broadest grounds of public benefit. The 8,000 granges among our membership are so well versed in the fundamental principles of Grange philosophy that it is safe to say not one of them would advocate or oppose any project under consideration by Congress on narrow, sectional grounds.

The Grange has consistently favored the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway for the same reasons, and in the same spirit, that it advocated the creation of the Department of Agriculture with Cabinet rank in 1876, led the movement for rural free delivery of the mails, urged the establishment of the Parcel Post as early as 1887, gave pioneer support to the creation of postal savings banks, experimental stations for agriculture, and the Pure Food and Drugs Act. Early in the seventies, the Grange endorsed legislation to encourage the building of transcontinental railroads. It was the first national farm organization to give its unqualified support to the building of the Panama Canal.

The Grange has constantly adhered to a policy calling for the wise conservation and use of our natural resources, and has opposed their exploitation by selfish monopolies. It has favored the preservation of forests, mineral wealth, and the power sites of our rivers for the benefit of all the people. For more than a generation it championed the cause of rural electrification. The Grange originated the movement for farm-to-market roads.

In its support of these and many other constructive measures, the National Grange learned that it sometimes requires 10 or 20 years of constant effort and struggle before a great public improvement can be achieved. This has been the history of the St. Lawrence project since commissions set up by the United States and Canada first recommended the seaway and power development and the Grange endorsed it.

DEVELOPMENT OF OUR INLAND WATERWAYS EXPRESSED AS A CARDINAL PRINCIPLE OF THE GRANGE IN ITS DECLARATION OF PURPOSES, 1874

The support which the Grange has given this project is wholly in accord with the declaration of purposes, adopted in 1874 at St. Louis, soon after the organization of the Grange in Washington, D. C., December 4, 1867.

From this historic expression of Grange philosophy I quote:

"We shall therefore advocate for every State the increase in every practicable way of all facilities for transporting cheaply to the seaboard or between home producers and consumers all the productions of our country. We adopt it as our fixed purpose to open out the channels in nature's great arteries, that the lifeblood of commerce may flow freely. * * *

"We cherish the belief that sectionalism is, and of right should be, dead and buried with the past. Our work is for the present and the future. In our agricultural brotherhood and its purposes, we shall recognize no North, no South, no East, no West."

GRANGE FAVORED PROJECT APPROVED BY MAJORITY OF CONGRESS IN 1933–34

Many years of negotiation through the administrations of Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and Roosevelt contributed to the pending agreement now before this committee.

Had the 1932 draft treaty with Canada been ratified, as the Grange recommended, the seaway would now be in operation, serving the defense needs of the present emergency. Seagoing merchant and naval vessels would be building in the developed shipyards of the protected waters of the Great Lakes. And 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectricity would today be available on the St. Lawrence in an area which has a serious shortage of power for defense industries.

A majority of the Senate approved the seaway treaty of 1932. A majority of the House adopted the St. Lawrence power resolution of 1933. The Grange gave the reasons for its advocacy of the project and strongly supported the position then taken by a majority of both branches of Congress in a statement issued January 13, 1934, as follows:

NATIONAL GRANGE RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

"The National Grange has for years advocated a ship canal from the Great Lakes to the sea to open up the heart of the continent to the benefits of ocean navigation. The Grange believes that this provision of cheap transportation, linking a great economic area with the markets of the world, will either directly or indirectly benefit not only those engaged in agriculture but also the Nation as a whole.

"The area directly tributary to the seaway produces more of the cereal crops of the Nation than all other sections of the country combined, and many other important agricultural interests are centered there. Both leading dairy areas are located on the seaway.

"The opportunity to further rural electrification through public development of St. Lawrence power as a part of the project is also of vital interest to many of our local and State organizations.

"The fact that at least 90 percent of the seaway mileage is already available for navigation by ocean-going cargo vessels is a cogent argument for removing the few remaining barriers which still bottle up this important agricultural area.

"Every Chief Executive since President Wilson, regardless of party, has advocated this improvement and contributed to the negotiation of an agreement essential to any joint undertaking affecting two neighboring nations. President Roosevelt is to be congratulated upon his decisive action to make the project a reality.

"FRED J. FREESTONE,
"Chairman, New York.
"E. A. ECKERT,
"Secretary, Illinois.
"ROY W. GILL, *Oregon.*
"LOUIS J. TABER,
"Ex Officio, Master of the National Grange, Ohio.
"Executive Committee of the National Grange.
"WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 13, 1934."*

The resolution adopted by the Grange 7 years ago summarized what we still believe are compelling reasons for the immediate completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project.

PENDING BILL AN IMPROVEMENT OVER PREVIOUS PLANS

In some respects the bill before the committee, H. R. 4927, is an improvement over previous plans. It provides for a single-stage power development, as advocated by the United States engineers and the Power Authority of New York, instead of the more costly two-stage development formerly proposed for the International Rapids section.

The major portion of the works to be erected under this bill will consequently be built on the United States side of the international boundary. The bill also preserves American sovereignty over Lake Michigan and leaves the Chicago diversion problem where it rests under the decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

As introduced by Chairman MANSFIELD, the bill clearly conforms to the requirements of the International Boundary Waters Treaty, ratified by the Senate in 1910. That treaty provided that the United States and Canada might authorize future projects for improvements in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system by means of concurrent legislation.

NEW YORK'S POWER PROJECT, UNDER THE FEDERAL-STATE ACCORD, PROVIDED FOR IN SECTION 2 OF THE BILL

Section 2 of the bill provides for the adoption, by mutual agreement, of a Federal-State accord on the conduct and operation of the power works to be built in the State of New York.

In 1934, when the Grange supported the St. Lawrence project as presented at that time, we likewise approved the Federal-State accord of 1933. This accord was embodied in a bill passed by the House and recommended by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. It has since been approved by every official agency which has passed upon it and is similar to the Federal-State agreement contemplated by section 2 of the pending bill.

Section 2 provides that the power facilities to be built in New York may be transferred to the power authority, a public agency of the State, upon such terms and conditions as Congress may later approve, upon provision by the power authority for the payment of $93,375,000, the sum allocated by the engineers as the construction cost of these works.

Heretofore private utility interests have opposed many power developments on the ground that such projects should not be conducted by the Federal Government but should remain the exclusive concern of the States.

The Grange has supported the development of our power resources under legislation which covers a wide range of Federal and State responsibility. On the Columbia River, Federal agencies undertook the tremendous task of developing and operating the Grand Coulee and Bonneville projects which no single State was in a position to assume.

The 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectricity to be developed on the St. Lawrence under the pending bill will be made available in the International Rapids section, lying wholly within the State of New York and the Province of Ontario. The Province of Ontario has already been accorded the responsibility of conducting the power project on the Canadian side of the river, as it was in connection with the 1932 treaty. The maintenance of the Federal-State accord would give the State of New York a similar responsibility on the United States side of the same section of the river. This would be in keeping with our previous policy of dealing with the St. Lawrence development as a cooperative enterprise. There is no doubt that the public agency of the State of New York, which has guarded this resource against private exploitation for many years, will be able to furnish St. Lawrence power to public power districts and rural cooperatives in neighboring States.

BENEFITS OF PROJECT NATIONAL RATHER THAN SECTIONAL IN SCOPE

In accordance with its traditional policy, the National Grange supports the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project as a public improvement that will bring permanent benefits to the entire Nation, and not merely to one class of our people or to one section of our country.

Several members of the committee have raised the question as to what effect it will have upon the great agricultural and stock-raising regions lying west and southwest of the Great Lakes to the Rocky Mountains. Undoubtedly, the people of this whole region will benefit from the project, both as producers and consumers. Farmers in the Missouri River Valley, Arkansas, Colorado, Wyoming, and other interior States today ship vast quantities of farm products by rail to markets on or near the Great Lakes and thence by rail or lake-rail to the great consuming centers of the East. Similarly, the people in this interior area consume many products of the East which move by the same route. In both instances, the St. Lawrence seaway offers a net reduction in transportation costs which will immediately be reflected back to this interior region.

The interior sections of the West will of course continue to use the railroads for much of their shipping. But they should get the benefit of lower rates and the full extent of the savings in costs which will result from bringing ocean freight vessels more than a thousand miles closer to their primary markets. This will be of advantage not only to the great agricultural areas but also to other sections in the development of our intercoastal as well as our foreign trade.

The use of all our transportation facilities, including the St. Lawrence seaway, to reduce the cost of shipping our products to market, will obviously help our entire country, not hinder it, in meeting the competition of other countries in the post-war period. Protection against cheaply produced foreign goods will not be increased by making our methods of transportation expensive. We must utilize each of our transport facilities that can be developed with maximum efficiency. In addition, we can and should revise our tariff schedules wherever necessary to insure to our producers the full benefit of the home market.

The St. Lawrence project can be completed in 4 years, according to the estimates presented to the committee by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

The new locks at the Panama Canal cannot be provided before 1945 and many of the battleships now building as a part of a two-ocean navy will require as long as 7 years for completion. What the world situation may be in 1945 we cannot now foresee. We know, however, that the St. Lawrence project will contribute to our national well-being and that when the emergency ends it will be available for centuries to come to serve the needs of all our people. We, therefore, renew our recommendation to Congress to complete this great public improvement on the St. Lawrence, by enactment of the pending bill.

Why Don't We Arrange to Produce War Minerals at Home?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, now that the bill under consideration making supplemental appropriations for national defense for the year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, is to be held over for another legislative day, I would like to present some views having a remote bearing on it. I did not take up time earlier today, for I had hoped that the measure would be put through with little delay. Of course, there is no opportunity now for further amendment under the rules. Therefore, the suggestions I have to offer are intended only for subsequent legislation or for the administration of this measure in some of these broad powers and blanket appropriations.

I notice an appropriation item in the bill for nearly $82,000,000 for military posts. After exhaustive study, the War Department no doubt desires further development of those military posts located in the most strategic, as well as favorable spots, where soldiers can be best stationed, maintained, and trained with the highest degree of efficiency and the greatest amount of protection to our country. I am heartily in favor of this item in the appropriation and regret that it was pared down $2,000,000 from the estimate. However, this is a technical question, both as to the nature and the amount of the need, on which I am not qualified to speak. I am trusting the War Department in this matter to get the most for the money.

There is another technical matter about which I may be unable to speak scientifically but cannot refrain from mentioning it. It is a matter of strategic materials. For 5 years now I have been following the lead of Western mining Members in urging the development of war minerals and other strategic materials within our own borders. It seems to me extremely unwise that we continue to depend upon foreign sources for these vitally needed minerals and metals. It is strange what reluctance is shown to get these things out of the ground at home when our very national safety depends upon our having them and our former supply abroad has been jeopardized or entirely cut off. I doubt whether we are in a very good position now with respect to those war materials of which we planned to lay in a stock pile, just before the beginning of the second World War. I am not inclined to say, "I told you so," but I am in a position to say that certain Members of this body, long before I arrived in Washington, had been trying to prevent our getting into the very difficulty we are now in because of the lack of these strategic minerals and metals.

It is to be earnestly hoped that we do not have the experience again which the country had in the first World War. At that time we were caught in a predicament and our Government set up a great cry, asking the mining regions to go ahead and produce and making some provision against loss for those new producers if the war should close soon. The result was that many small mining men invested heavily getting ready to produce the war minerals and found even before their plants were constructed or completed that there was no longer a need for their anticipated output. This severe individual loss was not fully compensated for in all cases and it has left a bitter memory in the minds of many mining men. I am positive that we have within our limits almost all of the strategic minerals, but we have done little or nothing to encourage production. Time will not permit the suggestions that come to my mind as to the best way for us now to encourage such home production.

This matter occurs to me today because of a relatively small amount that I find in this bill for the Bureau of Mines and its study. I believe it has been suggested that something ought to be done toward developing western coal fields. I wonder if it has ever been pointed out that there is coal in Arizona? Yes; there's a lot of coal in Arizona, but perhaps most of it is on the Indian reservations. I assure you it is well locked up on an Indian reservation. There is a lot of natural wealth in my State and in other Western States locked up by the action of this Government and some of it locked up by governmental inaction. I am told by men who know that there are great quantities of manganese on an Indian reservation in Arizona. Of course, under present law, it will stay right there even if we have to have some other country to make our steel. I doubt whether the Indians will ever make use of it for themselves but they might be willing to permit its use in a matter of national defense, especially if some royalty were paid them. The whole matter, Mr. Speaker, seems to hinge upon this, that we know what we need but apparently we do not know that we have it.

Extension of Service Time Under the Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. LARRABEE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I offer a statement of my views favoring the extension of the service time of selectees under provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

The question of extending time of selectees in military training under provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, while very unpleasant to consider, can be based only on the question of national necessity—the necessity of making adequate provision for the security and protection of our Nation, our people, our homes, and property.

We should have learned from recent events, in which we have seen one nation after another, unprepared to defend themselves against ruthless invasion, fall to brutal and unprovoked attack of war-mad dictators. If we have learned nothing else, we must have learned that we cannot wait until attack has been launched against us, or war has been declared, to prepare an adequate defense force. France, Belgium, the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries, the Balkans, Greece, and other nations who felt that the military and naval forces they had

created prior to the attack would be sufficient to insure their security, awakened too late to the bitter realization that they had listened too long to dictates of sentiment.

The most loyal and patriotic service we can render today is to make every effort within our power to be prepared for any eventuality, whenever it may come. Recent developments abroad were such that we must realize our Nation is in far greater peril today than it was 1 year ago, when some officials, including some Members of Congress, were led by sentiment to give vocal assurances that service under the Selective Training and Service Act would end within a year. That was wishful thinking. The days of wishful thinking are past.

Today we must consider facts alone. The facts are that if we hold to the much-discussed implied contract that draftees would be limited to 1 year of service, we shall wreck our armed force. Another year will be required to train another minimum force to a meager minimum of efficiency.

Army officials have labored at top speed to organize and develop an impregnable army, based upon the small force of Regulars that were in service 1 year ago. They have scattered the selectees among the older, trained, and seasoned troops for training purposes and the new troops are being developed to a status of satisfactory efficiency. However, if we now permit the discharge of these draftees, we shall be right back at the place where we started 1 year ago, with a very small force of Regulars, among whom several thousand new draftees, without any training of any nature, will be infiltered for training. All that we have gained during the year, in effect, will be lost, and we will have presented Army officials with the impossible task of guarding the United States territory with an army that will keep fading away.

Efficiency in modern military tactics may be upheld only through the maintenance and continual improvement of the personnel of available units.

Had there been developments abroad during the past year which would have given us reason to believe that the peril facing our national interest had diminished, then there would be no reason to require continuation of the men in service. Since conditions have grown more grave rather than improved, the necessity for this unpleasant action is increased.

Opponents of the extension of service time place stress on the so-called "implied contract between the Government and the draftees" to release them to private life after 12 months of training.

The act, in fact, provides for release only in the event of national interest is not in peril at the end of the 12-month period. The law is specific in this provision. The act also gives the Commander in Chief of the Army the authority to keep the men in service without referring the question to Congress for decision or action. The President has given definite proof of his desire to be meticulously scrupulous in handling this important matter by refraining from using all the powers granted in the act, and by referring the matter back to Congress so that the elected representatives of the people may decide the issue. I appreciate this attitude on the part of the President.

The principal provisions of the act were—

> Each man inducted * * * shall serve 12 consecutive months * * * except that whenever Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled, such 12-month period may be extended by the President to such a time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense.

Thus, all that is required to keep the men in camps is a resolution of Congress holding that it is found that the national interest is imperiled. The President and Army officials have indicated their desire that the matter be treated in the democratic way after open hearings and debate in Congress. This is possible, even in the emergency, because it will be several weeks before any of the men will have completed their year of training.

Congress went all the way in providing for eventualities in drafting this act. The law further reads that—

> Each such man [selected for service under provisions of the act] after completion of his period of training and service * * * shall be transferred to a reserve component of the land or naval forces of the United States; and until he attains the age of 45, or until the expiration of the period of 10 years after such transfer, or until he is discharged from such reserve component, whichever occurs first, he shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component and shall be subject to such additional training as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law.

The law clearly intends that the men be not entirely severed from obligation to such additional defense duty as may be necessary. The law does not provide for actual or complete discharge after 12 months, but for automatic transfer to the Reserve forces.

As Reservists they then become immediately subject to active duty at such time as the Commander in Chief feels their services are needed.

Accordingly the President could, without breach of faith and without usurpation of any powers which have not already been granted him by the Congress and the Constitution, recall every man to additional duty for duration of the emergency as soon as the routine of his transfer from the 12-month training period as a selectee to the Reserve forces had been completed.

In refusing to resort to this section of the law, the President has held to his faith in democratic processes and his faith that Members of Congress will be fearless and able enough to rise above political expediency and consider and act upon the question in the interests of the Nation.

However, if it should develop that Congress does not authorize the suggested extension by a new and specific act, or adoption of a resolution declaring the national interest to be imperiled, the President will most likely be required to authorize the War Department to resort to the alternative of transferring the men, immediately, to the Reserves and then call them up from those ranks under authority of existing law for further service.

I feel that it would be very dangerous for Congress to force the President and Army officials into this necessity.

There is some misapprehension also as to the extent of the expression or action desired of Congress at this time. It has been misstated that it is proposed in pending or suggested legislation to authorize the President to send selectees outside the Western Hemisphere. There definitely is no such clause or provision in proposed new legislation which would give the President and Army officials such authority. It is my personal opinion that if the time should come when the President would feel it to be in the national interest to take such action he will call upon Congress to decide whether or not such action is to be taken. This should clear up the question of foreign service for selectees, at least until such time as the emergency may become more acute.

The President has expressed his desire that provision be made to relieve individual cases of undue hardship, and also to relieve older men whom he feels in justice, should be permitted to resume civilian life as quickly as their services can be spared.

It is encouraging to note that the Chief Executive has taken into consideration the desirability of discharges for some when their discharge will serve to relieve suffering in their families or serve other good purpose.

Congress should have no difficulty in making provisions for the relief of such cases, and I feel certain that these situations will be taken into consideration and adequate provision will be made for proper and early action.

It is obvious that those best able to evaluate the needs for adequate defense are unanimous in their opinion that the national interest is sufficiently imperiled as to require the proposed extension of service time. It is likewise obvious that most of those who are opposing the extension of service time are neither qualified by knowledge available to them or knowledge of the requirements for adequate defense to sit in judgment of this question, on which the future security of our Nation may depend.

It is also deeply significant that not one voice of opposition that I have heard raised against the proposed extension even so much as suggests consideration of the question of whether or not the national interest is imperiled.

Most of those who are opposing extension of service time—at least most of those voices of opposition that I have heard—seek to base their case on the charge or claim that the Government "made a sacred obligation with the selectees not to continue their training period for more than a year."

I find nothing in the law, nothing in the record, which bears this out, although it is true that such assurances may be implied from some of the debate on the bill. The law, quoted above, surely sets forth no contract for discharge of men from training at the end of 12 months in the event of continued, increased, or extended peril.

I do not believe that there are many persons anywhere who in their own minds feel that the national interest is not in peril. In the light of most recent developments abroad it is clearly obvious that so long as the present conflict continues, even on foreign lands, our own national interest is in peril.

It is evident that ever in the heat of the debate on the original Selective Service Act, a year ago, Congress realized the necessity of providing for this eventuality, and made provision in the drafting of the law. In the light of sober reasoning, the anticipated eventuality for which provision was made a year ago is a sober fact today.

From the recommendations the Chief of Staff of the Army has made and the statements made by the President, it is obvious, however, that the President feels that it is best in the interests of harmony, and unity of spirit and purpose, for Congress to assume the responsibility of making the decision as to whether or not the service of the men shall be extended. In so doing, the officers of the Army and the President have made it plain that in a matter of such importance they do not wish to assume the power that has already been granted them, and which power appears to not have been thoroughly understood. It appears that they prefer that the people have an opportunity, again, to be heard through their elected representatives on this subject.

The service of the men in training in the armed forces, or at least many of them, is seriously needed. The President knows this and he knows that he has the power to keep them in service, under terms of existing law, without further action by Congress. The fact that he does know it, and the fact that he has asked Congress to decide, should be adequate proof that the President has every desire to be conscientiously scrupulous in dealing with the problem.

Perhaps many of the men now in training could be persuaded by appeal to patriotism, by other inducement, or their liking for the service, to sign up for an added 2 years, equaling a Regular Army enlistment.

But those who may be needed most for their skill or training to keep combat and technical groups intact, might prefer to return to private life and that action could easily result in complete disorganization of the entire defense force.

Army officers have pointed out that draftees necessarily have been filtered in among the Regular and National Guard troops in order to make the most use of their civilian skills, that some of them fill key positions in specialized task units, and that some are on duty in Hawaii, Alaska, or Atlantic bases where their transfer and replacement would act to disrupt the program for months.

A year ago when Congress passed the selective service law, many Members of both Houses of the Congress were hopeful that developments abroad would be such that it would be unnecessary to consider the question of training of men for periods of longer than 12 months. We did not know whether or not the existing threat would exist at the expiration of the first year's training period. We did hope and pray that it would not long continue.

Today, we do know that the emergency has not cleared. We do know that the danger continues, and that, in fact, the threat against the national interest has become even greater.

For the conditions that exist and the increased danger we now must realize is facing us, we are required to plan and prepare. However unpleasant the fact may be, the time is past to regard Army draft service as just 1 year of good training. Congress is forced, or soon will be, by conditions over which we in the United States have no control, to require unlimited service for draftees. Congress is, or soon will be, forced to keep present service men in service or work out a compromise.

The only alternative is to offer Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, the impossible task of guarding the United States with an army that will keep fading away.

We face enemies with armies of millions of men. The Regular Army of the United States, a year ago, was made up of some 200,000 men experienced in cooperation as combat or defense units. These were broken up and to them some 600,000 draftees were added, to spread them for more adequate training of the new recruits. Surely it is quite plain that to discharge so many partially trained men in the face of existing conditions would serve only to give new courage to the aggressor nations.

There is also another factor of utmost importance that we must consider. Modern armies must be technical as no army before has been. It is necessary that complete familiarity with tanks, new types of armored cars, new types of guns; some of them, such as antiaircraft guns and long-range field rifles, requiring the highest degree of skill to operate—a skill that is not easily developed in a year of training, especially when it has been difficult to obtain implements and materials as quickly as they should have been placed at the disposal of the Army officials.

Coupled with training in the skill of operating these defense machines is the requirement of skill in mobility—the skill to move the machines quickly from one field of operation to another. And, in our defense program, we are required to prepare to move the defense machines to any possible place of entry of any possible aggressor. Our lands are broad. Our borders and shore lines are long. Our defenders must be trained adequately in the art of moving as small units, or as large units, or perhaps, as as entire force, from one point to another far distant. They must be skilled in moving at a pace that no other army has ever moved.

We are told, and the information comes from those best qualified to know, that we need an army skilled in these defense tactics, of about 1,000,000 men. And that we will likely need this army more in the future than we have needed it in the past year is beyond doubt or question—regardless of whether or not we may be attacked. We know now that if an attack should come it will be in the future and for that date we must be prepared.

To the highly skilled army of 1,000,000, we are best advised, we should have another 2,000,000 trained men that could be called in for grave emergency, to repel an actual attack or invasion attempt, should such arise.

Those opposing a large army say that Hitler conquered France with about 12 panzer units comprising some 200,000 men supported by some 3,000 pilots of attack planes and dive-bombers. That may all be true, but at the same time many thousands of other men were in constant training, or were on guard at other borders. Hitler had no such expanse of land as that of the United States to guard, and it is also known that he managed to rotate his troops, replacing the worn and injured men at the front at intervals with well-trained, fresh troops quickly transferred from quiet guard posts on other borders.

We will do well to learn our lesson in modern warfare from those who have been successfully prosecuting modern war abroad and be so prepared that aggressors will have no desire to attempt to lodge an attack upon us.

Another argument brought forth by those who oppose continuation of draftees in service is their claim that the defense production program has failed to provide adequate arms, implements, and machines for the proper training for men and that there is an insufficient supply on hand to warrant continuation of men in training service.

It is my opinion that if their claim of inadequate supply were true, that fact alone would be sufficient reason to hold the men in service—to require that they be held in training until they have at least had ample opportunity to be schooled in the actual usage of mechanized equipment.

However, the figures released this week by the War Department at the request of the Senate Defense Investigating Committee do not support these claims of insufficient materials.

The figures released by the War Department are as follows:

Ordnance: Procurement of latest types of weapons is continuing at an accelerated pace, with approximately $2,000,000,000 having been spent for equipment and $60,000,000 for new plants.

Aviation: The industry has orders for 74,000 military aircraft, and it delivered $625,000,000 worth of equipment in 1940, a 250-percent boost over 1939; 22 manufacturers already have increased 1941 deliveries 300 percent over those of 1940.

Construction: The Quartermaster Corps has completed or is completing on schedule a 250-project construction program costing $1,900,000,000.

Motorization: There were 29,867 vehicles on hand July 1, 1940. A total of $296,176,000 was appropriated for motorization during the past year; of the 233,084 new vehicles provided for, 209,541 have been ordered and 103,395 delivered.

Engineers: Of $638,969,811 made available for Air Corps construction work,

such as bases and schools, $490,000,000 has been obligated; not including work on overseas bases, 41 percent of this work has been concluded. A total of $26,377,000 has been spent for the past fiscal year, and $44,000,000 is slated for expenditure this year.

The new Army appropriation bill, officials of the War Department point out, will enable the Army to procure "a great deal more equipment" for its mechanized divisions.

While it is frankly admitted that greater production speed will be required in order to provide necessary supplies to replace expendable materials and equipment which it must be assumed might be lost or destroyed in use or worn out in training activity, it appears from the above figures that we need have no fear concerning an adequate supply of arms, ordnance, and mechanical equipment for successful training activity.

Officials of the Army, possessed of the best available information on this subject have given us this assurance and on this assurance we are required to rely.

In the face of these facts, these possibilities, and in view of our definite knowledge that the ultimate crisis at least has not passed, probably has not yet developed, I can see my way clear to follow no course other than that of supporting the request that Congress act to continue the service period of the selectees for the duration of the emergency.

I am not willing to be a party to any act, regardless of how distasteful the duty of this decision may be to me, that may endanger the future security of our Nation and all of the people of our Nation.

Beware of Foot-and-Mouth Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, as pointed out in the preface to Farmers' Bulletin No. 666 issued by the Department of Agriculture the "foot-and-mouth disease is one of the most universal diseases of cattle as well as one of the most difficult to suppress." It is a disease which takes its toll not only among cattle but it strikes at other farm animals as well. That it is difficult to eradicate once it has taken root is attested to by the fact that "in most European countries the disease has gained such a foothold that it has probably become a permanent infection."

At the present time this dread disease does not exist in our country but in years past it has been a costly evil. In the bulletin already quoted it is stated that—

The United States has suffered nine foot-and-mouth visitations, ranging in date from 1870 to 1929. Fortunately, after persistent efforts by the Government, the States, local authorities, and individual stockmen, each outbreak was entirely stamped out.

It is, therefore, a threatening evil at all times, and alert attention should be paid to the timely warning of Dr. H. A. Seidell, chief of the division of animal industry in my State, as emphasized in the following letter:

STATE OF IOWA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Des Moines, July 22, 1941.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: House file 502, if enacted, would give authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to lift the sanitary embargo on chilled and frozen meat carcasses from countries where foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest exist. The recent ruling of the Attorney General admitting frozen mutton and lamb carcasses from Tierra del Fuego perils the livestock industry and the human health of this country.

Congress should enact legislation that will protect this Nation from the disastrous condition that would result from the lifting of this embargo which is our only defense against the introduction of these two most dreaded diseases, namely, rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease. The latter is the most dreaded of all livestock diseases and affects all cloven-hoof food-producing animals as well as others.

The virus or germs of these diseases are not affected by freezing and can be carried on shoes, clothing, or by poultry, birds, dogs, etc., that have been in the immediate vicinity of the infected animals. Furthermore, this virus is carried in the lean or muscular tissues, the bony structures, the internal organs, the hide, etc., of the diseased animals. Science has proven that this virus or germ will live in frozen carcasses for a period of 9 months or longer.

At the present time the United States and Canada are the only countries free of rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease. During the winter of 1914 and 1915, we had quite a severe outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Iowa and some of the other States which cost the States millions of dollars to destroy all animals on the infected farms.

If it is necessary for us to import meat products from the foreign countries where these diseases exist, they should be in a canned form where the meat has been properly cooked as that is the only sure means of destroying the organisms that cause these diseases.

Thanking you for any consideration you will give us on this measure, I am

Very truly yours,

H. A. SEIDELL,
Chief, Division of Animal Industry.

Mr. Speaker, farming involves many risks and hazards. Some of the risks such as droughts and windstorms cannot be controlled. But experience over a long period of years has proved that the foot-and-mouth disease can be eradicated, although the remedy is a costly one. It is saner and cheaper to prevent it from taking root. The old adage that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" was never more fully applicable than in a matter of this character. Let us beware of the foot-and-mouth disease.

General Welfare Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 28, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM LANGER, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very interesting speech by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] on the General Welfare Act now pending in Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator LANGER. Mr. Chairman and friends, I bring you greetings from each and every one of the United States Senators interested in a decent pension for our senior citizens. I am here to tell you that we in the Senate are not lagging in interest in your measure, the General Welfare Act, H. R. 1410. In talking to my colleagues on the Senate floor and in the cloak rooms, I find a growing sentiment for a reasonable flat Federal annuity for our senior citizens.

SENATE SEEKS GUARANTY FOR ALL

This demand has resulted in a resolution (S. Res. No. 129) being adopted by the United States Senate to appoint a special committee of seven Senators to inquire into the workings of the Social Security Act and to investigate the ways and means for bringing about the early realization of a minimum pension for all reaching the age of retirement who are not gainfully employed.

GENERAL WELFARE ACT ONLY MEASURE FILLING THE BILL

While I am supporting all old-age pension measures, there is only one measure pending before the United States Congress which falls squarely within the purview of this resolution, and that is the General Welfare Act, H. R. 1410, of which I have introduced a companion measure in the Senate known as Senate bill No. 1178.

COMMITTEE APPOINTED

The Vice President has, pursuant to the resolution I mentioned, appointed the following members of the Senate to serve on this committee: SHERIDAN DOWNEY (Democrat), of California, who introduced the resolution; TOM CONNALLY (Democrat), of Texas; CLAUDE PEPPER (Democrat), of Florida; THEODORE F. GREEN (Democrat), of Rhode Island; ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr. (Progressive), of Wisconsin; JOHN THOMAS (Republican), of Idaho; and C. WAYLAND BROOKS (Republican), of Illinois.

WILL ASSIST AT HEARINGS

This committee is already functioning, and hearings on the whole subject of social security will be begun very soon. I understand that your national executive and legislative secretary, Arthur L. Johnson, has written the chairman of this committee asking the privilege of being heard. He will be able, I know, to present valuable data to the committee, which he has accumulated in the 4½ years he has been in Washington working on this sub-

ject. I shall help him all I can. In this way, we expect to see another definite step taken toward universal security for people in the sunset of life cast aside by industry.

TOOK ON AN OBLIGATION

Personally, it needed no persuasion on the part of your legislative representative to get me interested in the General Welfare Act. Like Dr. LARRABEE, who introduced the bill in the House, I looked Mr. Johnson up and told him of my interest. And the whole subject of old-age pensions is by no means new to me. When I was Governor of North Dakota I was proud to be called the farmers' friend, and I sponsored many measures to alleviate the distress of the poor and the aged. I realized, however, that these were mere palliatives and that the real remedy must come from our Nation's Capital. So when I got into the race for the United States Senate, I accepted a very definite obligation, an obligation which I am now endeavoring to fulfill through my work in behalf of your measure, which I think is the best in the pension field.

FOR PROTECTION, NOT EXPLOITATION

Merely reading the measure you will see that Mr. Johnson is more concerned with giving real protection to the aged than with leading them on with false hopes to an unrealizable Utopia. First he decided that the old people must be protected by a proper floor under pensions, something to keep them from falling into the basement. No one else in the pension field seemed to care about that. They were all concerned with how much they could hold out to our needy elderly citizens as a maximum or top pension regardless of any actual chance of getting it. Not so with your legislative representative. He said that the old people must be protected, not exploited. So he put in a floor of $30, below which pensions must not be allowed to fall in any State or under any circumstances. This feature attracted my attention especially.

RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT AGED

Reading further, I noticed that he had even provided for a reserve fund to make certain that the annuitants would really get the guaranteed pension called for in the bill. This set me to thinking as to what would really happen if the war should end suddenly and all our defense industries should stop. Would not the revenue under the bill drop appreciably and would not more of our aged be thrown out of work and be forced to apply for the pension to which they would thereby become entitled? I could see that there might be a squeezing of both ends against the middle and that the aged would be the victims unless a proper reserve fund were provided in the bill—something to guarantee that they would actually get the $30 each month without fail and not $28 or $18 or $8, due to a falling tax yield and an increasing pension roll.

EVEN FUNERAL BENEFITS PROVIDED

As I read further, I said to myself, why he has even provided for funeral benefits in this bill—another absolute essential of any program aiming at decent care for our aged.

SOUND TAX BASE MOST IMPORTANT

Then I checked on the tax base to support the measure—which, in my opinion, is the main thing in a measure of this type. Could it be that the measure also had a sound tax base? If so, I said to myself, I will jump right in and support it to the limit of my ability. I turned the pages of the measure. Yes; the proper deductions from gross income were there to make the tax base sound—deductions for the cost of materials or of the product or property sold so that in no case would there be a tax on a deal in which there was a loss instead of gain and so that the tax would not pyramid its burden upon the poor by a tax upon tax upon tax upon tax on the same product every time it changed hands, which would be an inconceivably vicious tax base—deductions also for the first $80 per month or $960 per year of gross income so as to protect the farm groups and the low-wage groups in all walks of life and not tax the purchasing power of the very poor. By Jove, I said to myself, here is a measure I can really support wholeheartedly.

SECURING SENATE SUPPORT

I contacted Mr. Johnson immediately and told him of my decision. So I presented the measure in the Senate as Senate bill No. 1178 and am now doing everything I can to get support for it on the Senate side.

PROGRESS TO DATE MARVELOUS

Mr. Johnson has done a marvelous job on the House side. Never before in the history of America has there ever been such a document as you have on exhibit here today—a steering committee resolution with 7 feet of congressional signatures thereon. Just think of it—a steering committee of 157 Congressmen, all eager to see pensions taken out of the football field and put into the stomachs and around the shoulders of those who built America and made it what it is today—the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

A MOST PRESSING PROBLEM

I am glad indeed to be able to be here with you today. I congratulate you upon the progress you have made and upon your sound approach to a practical solution to the old-age pension problem—a problem with which America is squarely faced today and one that must be solved if we want to survive as a Nation. It will be solved, and we are the ones to do it.

Certainly Not Treason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 28, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK SUN

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Sun of Friday, July 25, 1941, under the heading "Certainly not treason." The editorial has reference to certain statements which have been made about the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and his right to say what he wants to say. I do not agree at all with what the Senator from Montana is doing or what he has been saying, but I will fight for his right to say it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Sun of July 25, 1941]

CERTAINLY NOT TREASON

This newspaper holds no brief for Senator WHEELER, nor does it sympathize with the course he has pursued with regard to national defense, but it must insist that one of the things Secretary Stimson said about him yesterday was plain nonsense. Accusing the Senator of having written to Army officers and men urging them to oppose American entry into the war, the Secretary of War went on to assert:

"I think this comes very near the line of subversive activities against the United States, if not treason."

That is a strange use of the word "treason" to be made by a distinguished member of the bar. Surely Mr. Stimson must know how the Constitution of the United States defines treason. That crime, it says, consists only in levying war against the United States or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. The United States Supreme Court has declared not only that no other facts than these can be declared to constitute the offense, but also that Congress can neither extend, nor restrict, nor define the crime, having only the power to prescribe punishment for it. That tribunal has also declared that to constitute the specific crime of treason, war must actually be levied against the United States. In *United States v. Bollman* (1 Cranch C. C. 372), it was said that, however flagitious might be the crime of conspiring to subvert by force the Government of the United States, such conspiracy is not treason; that to conspire to levy war and actually to levy war are distinct offenses; that to complete the crime of levying war against the United States there must be an actual assemblage of men for the purpose of executing a treasonable design.

Since this country is not now at war and does not now acknowledge as its enemies any of the countries that are waging war, whatever else may have been said of Senator WHEELER'S acts, they certainly do not in any true sense constitute treason or come anywhere near constituting it. The propriety of his writing to officers and men of the Army to the effect reported is seriously open to question. Officers and men who followed the advice imputed to him could easily get into trouble under the Articles of War. But to attach to such impropriety an imputation of treason is to be a little extreme, not to say ridiculous.

Dedication of New Wing of Norwegian Legation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. SUMNER WELLES

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, day before yesterday I attended the dedication of the new wing of the Norwegian Legation in Washington. The Acting Secretary of State, Hon. Sumner Welles, delivered a thoughtful and statesmanlike address on that occasion, which seems to me to be worthy of wide reading and careful consideration. With Mr. Welles' approval I had intended to ask for unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. However, it has just been brought to my attention

that it was offered in the House of Representatives which met yesterday and printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of the whole program entitled "Dedication of the New Wing of Norwegian Legation." I now ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are met here today to join in the dedication of the new wing of the Norwegian Legation in Washington.

These ceremonies are surely symbolic of the hope and of the faith with which we meet.

Those of us who are citizens of the United States are taking part in these dedication ceremonies not only because of the welcome privilege which it affords us of rendering this tribute to our traditional friends, the heroic people of Norway, but also because we can thus best evidence our conviction that the Kingdom of Norway of the past, as we have known it, some day—and we trust that day will come soon—will once more be free and independent.

We here in the United States will always remember the superb courage with which the Norwegian people fought in the defense of their homes and of their liberties against the overwhelmingly superior strength of an invader who had treacherously taken them by surprise. We know how bravely they are still fighting with their allies on sea and land in many parts of the world.

We shall always remember the heroism of their monarch and of their crown prince. And we have heard with emotion the words of that same monarch when he said to his people only a few days ago, "Hold out. Don't lose courage. And be assured that Norway will once again be free and independent, provided that we all continue to do our duty and our utmost to reach our goal in the battle which is now being fought."

Those words seem to us to exemplify the soul of a people which will never admit defeat and which will never be cowed by alien domination.

But, in a larger sense, these ceremonies constitute an act of faith in the ultimate victory of the forces of human liberty; in the triumph of civilization itself over the forces of barbarism.

I feel that there are joined with us in spirit here today, as silent witnesses, the peoples of all of the other countries which have been mercilessly overrun during these past 2 years. I know that they believe as we do that out of this holocaust into which the nations of the earth have been plunged by the criminal obsession of world conquest of one man and of the satellites who surround him, there can come no peace until the Hitlerite government of Germany has been finally and utterly destroyed.

For I am confident that the cause of liberty and of freedom will not go down to defeat. The determination and courage of free men and women everywhere must now be exercised to the full limit of endurance until their victory is won.

And yet, I do not doubt that millions are asking tonight—millions in England and in China, millions of enslaved peoples in Norway and in the other countries now temporarily occupied, millions in the countries which have not experienced war; yes, and millions in Germany and in Italy—are asking, What does the future hold for us after this struggle is over?

Does the end of the present carnage mean only a return to ruined homes; to the graves of slaughtered wives and children; to poverty and want; to social upheaval and economic chaos; to the same gray and empty years of confusion and bitterness, so barren in vision and in human accomplishment, which marked the decades after the termination of the last war?

It seems to me that those of us who are fortunate enough to be able to live as citizens of the free American republics have our great responsibility in the framing of the answer to that question.

For we, all of us, now see clearly, if we did not before, that no matter how great our American capacity for defense may be, no matter how perfect our hemispheric system may become, our future welfare must inevitably be contingent upon the existence in the rest of the world of equally peace-minded and equally secure peoples who not only will not but cannot become a source of potential danger to us in the New World.

I feel it is not premature for me to suggest that the free governments of peace-loving nations everywhere should even now be considering and discussing the way in which they can best prepare for the better day which must come when the present contest is ended in the victory of the forces of liberty and of human freedom and in the crushing defeat of those who are sacrificing mankind to their own lust for power and for loot.

At the end of the last war a great President of the United States gave his life in the struggle to further the realization of the splendid vision which he had held up to the eyes of suffering humanity—the vision of an ordered world governed by law.

The League of Nations, as he conceived it, failed in part because of the blind selfishness of men here in the United States, as well as in other parts of the world; it failed because of its utilization by certain powers primarily to advance their own political and commercial ambitions; but it failed chiefly because of the fact that it was forced to operate by those who dominated its councils as a means of maintaining the status quo. It was never enabled to operate as its chief spokesman had intended, as an elastic and impartial instrument in bringing about peaceful and equitable adjustments between nations as time and circumstance proved necessary.

Some adequate instrumentality must unquestionably be found to achieve such adjustments when the nations of the earth again undertake the task of restoring law and order to a disastrously shaken world.

But whatever the mechanism which may be devised, of two things I am unalterably convinced:

First, that the abolition of offensive armaments and the limitation and reduction of defensive armaments and of the tools which make the construction of such armaments possible, can only be undertaken through some rigid form of international supervision and control, and that without such practical and essential control, no real disarmament can ever be achieved; and

Second, that no peace which may be made in the future would be valid or lasting unless it established fully and adequately the natural rights of all peoples to equal economic enjoyment. So long as any one people or any one government possesses a monopoly over natural resources or raw materials which are needed by all peoples, there can be no basis for a world order based on justice and on peace.

I cannot believe that peoples of good will will not once more strive to realize the great ideal of an association of nations through which the freedom, the happiness, and the security of all peoples may be achieved.

That word, security, represents the end upon which the hearts of men and women everywhere today are set.

Whether it be security from bombing from the air, or from mass destruction; whether it be security from want, disease, and starvation; whether it be security in enjoying that inalienable right which every human being should possess of living out his life in peace and happiness, people throughout the length and breadth of the world are demanding security and freedom from fear.

That is the objective before us all today—to try and find the means of bringing that to pass.

"Not in vain the distance beacons."

Fight for Freedom

REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on page 4 of this morning's Washington Post there appears a quarter-page advertisement of Fight for Freedom, Inc. It pictures a hideous figure representing nazi-ism purporting to attack the United States via Siberia, the Bering Straits, and Alaska. The folly of such a bogeyman scare is as preposterous as it is self-evident. This tommyrot characterizes the entire advertisement and shows the lengths to which the war makers will go to mislead that portion of the public which is confused and uninformed.

The advertisement asks a number of plausible but unrelated questions, for instance, "Do you think Joe Louis could win a fight if he were not allowed to cross the middle of the ring?"

If the President, his four horsemen, Knox, Stimson, Ickes, and Wickard, as well as Fight For Freedom, Inc., really wished to take a page from the book of Joe Louis, they might recall that a few years ago a Nazi by the name of Max Schmelling came to America to fight Joe Louis. Like his prototype, Adolf Hitler, he had spent a long time preparing a highly specialized offensive good only if he could catch Joe Louis without a defense for the same. It was a right to the jaw and catching Joe Louis without preparation for the same, like Hitler's blitzkrieg, it worked. It knocked out Joe Louis and flabbergasted the fight world just as Hitler's blitzkrieg against defenseless nations flabbergasted the whole world. This is the position we would be in now if Hitler could come over here, which he will not, however, for a long time to come.

After that experience with nazidom, did Joe Louis in his then condition go chasing into Europe or sticking his chin out to Max Schmelling? No; Joe Louis stayed right here and prepared and perfected a defense for this one blitzkrieg weapon that Max Schmelling had. And when Max Schmelling came to America a year or two later to again attack Joe Louis, he found a defense against his blitzkrieg offensive, and he was just a flat-footed push-over.

If we would take a lesson from Joe Louis, we would prepare our defense at home and make ourselves so impregnable that any time Hitler came over here he would be a flat-footed push-over. Instead of that, we are sticking our nose into Europe, sticking our chin out, and doing everything except to prepare our defense.

If we would really take a page from the book of Joe Louis and prepare our defense at home, we would not have the problem of whether the President is going to break his promise to keep us out of the European war unless attacked; we would not have to break faith with our National Guard and trainees on the 1-year training bill; we would not have disunity on the question of whether Britain, who never fights her own battles but has others fight them, is pulling us into this war. In short, we would have a unity and solidarity which would be the best guaranty of not only our safety but the perpetuation of free constitutional government.

W. P. A.—Dinosaur Bones and Tracks

REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am now addressing myself solely to the seven Members who stood up with me when the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] offered his motion to reduce W. P. A. to $500,000,000. The rest of you need not listen. This is a report of the community-service program of the Work Projects Administration in Oklahoma, and it is entitled "Major Accomplishments From October 1, 1940, to July 1, 1941," and they recite the following accomplishments:

Fifty-five blocks containing a series of large dinosaur tracks from Cimarron County.

One thousand one hundred and twenty-eight large dinosaur bones from Cimarron County cleaned and prepared.

Three thousand five hundred and seventy small bones and fragments from Cimarron County cleaned and prepared.

Seventy-eight dinosaur bones from Atoka County cleaned and prepared.

One hundred and sixty fragments from Atoka County cleaned and prepared.

One hundred and twenty-three plaster casts of specimens prepared.

Four hundred and seventy-nine photographic prints and slides prepared.

Three hundred and seventy-six blocks of dinosaur and alligator bones from Cimarron and Atoka Cos. excavated.

Three Buettneria skulls (Triassic amphibian).

One complete skeleton of Diplocaulus (Permian amphibian) mounted.

One complete skeleton of Elephas columbi mounted.

One technical paper on Pliocene mammals from Optima, Texas County, Okla.

Work is progressing on two dinosaur mounts from Montana, one small dinosaur mount from Atoka County, Okla., one Dimetrodon skeleton, one Permian reptile mural, one elephant skull from Lawton.

Four thousand nine hundred and sixteen counted visitors to the museum; 670 counted visitors to the laboratory. Among these visitors were many groups from high schools and college science classes.

If this project continues to operate, we expect to complete the following program:

1. Excavate two new dinosaur-bone sites and complete one Jurassic alligator and fish site in Cimarron County. In addition, we expect to do research for the preparation of two technical papers on these specimens.

2. Complete the survey of southeast Atoka County for new Cretaceous dinosaur sites and to excavate two sites which are now awaiting development. These Cretaceous dinosaur remains are the first to be found in Oklahoma and present a new field for paleonotologic research which may change our present theories on the stratigraphy and sedimentation of this region.

3. We expect to prepare and paint a number of dioramas and murals illustrating the mamals, reptiles, and other fossil life which we are collecting.

4. We expect to secure larger exhibition space from the sponsor and to mount some of the larger specimens which have heretofore been cleaned and stored.

5. We shall collect data for the preparation and publication of several technical papers to be written by the sponsor's director. Dr. Stovall.

6. We shall continue to catalog, photograph, and exhibit specimens as they are prepared and strive by means of conducted museum tours, lectures, feature articles, and other publicity methods to keep the public informed on all of our activities. Our files are always open to reputable scientists and we have always invited and encouraged high school and college science groups to visit our museum.

American Blood to Defend the British Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of this morning:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 28, 1941]

DESIGN FOR A SHOOTING WAR

To repeat some things we've said before:

On July 4 last General Sir Archibald P. Wavell, British commander in chief in the Middle East, was quoted as follows in an interview at Cairo with Harold Denny, of the New York Times:

" 'Can you win the war without America's full-scale participation?' "

"General Wavell answered with a slow shake of his head, then he said, "We shall have to have airplanes, tanks, munitions, transports, and finally men.' "

" 'When?' "

" 'The sooner the better,' was the reply. 'But that depends on when you are ready, doesn't it? I suppose when you get into all-out production you will be able to equip any number of men for anywhere in the world.' "

Lt. Gen. Sir Claude J. E. Auchinleck presently succeeded General Wavell in the British Middle East command; and on July 7 the United Press had this report from Cairo:

"Lt. Gen. Sir Claude Auchinleck, new British Middle East commander, said today that American manpower eventually would be just as necessary 'to win the war properly' as it was in the World War."

And Cecil Brown, C. B. S. Cairo correspondent, quoted General Auchinleck as saying American manpower would be needed "within the next 12, 14, or possibly 24 months."

We remarked at the time that this must be the voice of Churchill, though the words were those of Wavell and Auchinleck.

We have a hunch that it was not the voice of Churchill alone. Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt are known to be in constant and sympathetic communication regarding the conduct and course of the war. We think it is reasonable to assume, though we have no proof of it, that Generals Wavell and Auchinleck would not have made those public remarks about American manpower in this war without the sanction of Mr. Roosevelt as well as the authority of Mr. Churchill. We think it certain they wouldn't have made them if Mr. Roosevelt had said he didn't want such things said.

WHAT GOES ON, ANYHOW?

It is important to repeat these things, we believe, because they seem to us to be key pieces in the jigsaw puzzle of this administration's real plans and hopes regarding this war.

Further pieces in the puzzle are: (1) President Roosevelt's message to Congress asking removal of the 1-year time limit on service of draftees, National Guards, and Reserve officers; (2) Chief of Staff Marshall's insistence on this measure, and on removal of the limit of 900,000 draftees usable in the Army at one time; (3) Marshall's rejection of Senator TAFT's proposed compromise on a 16-month top for non-Regular Army soldiers' service; (4) Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles' talk about a post-war league of nations to impose the "four freedoms" on the whole world after Britain and ourselves have smashed Germany.

We think all this adds up to an administration plan to build up a big army for eventual use abroad in an effort to lick Hitler.

WHAT IS THIS AWFUL PERIL?

The plea that our peril is infinitely greater now than it was a year ago looks hollower with each day the Russian-German war lasts.

Hitler and Stalin have been at it since June 22 in the morning, or 37 days today. No signs of a quick, decisive German victory are apparent as yet. If and when Hitler beats Russia, he will have to rest a lot of troops, repair a lot of panzer equipment, replace a lot of planes, and pacify a lot of Russians before he can turn again on Britain. If Stalin beats Hitler, Stalin will be a black cloud overhanging all Europe; but the Russians never have proved good offensive fighters outside Russia.

Where, then, is our immediate peril, that makes it imperative to freeze the Army at its present size of about 1,450,000 and pour new men into it without stint or limit?

We don't think there is any such immediate peril; and we're still waiting for those who claim they can see it to point it out convincingly to the American people.

The World as a Junior Sees It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

ESSAY WRITTEN BY DONNA JEANNE WRIGHT, OF GREGORY, S. DAK.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an essay written by Donna Jeanne Wright, of Gregory, S. Dak., which was awarded first place in the American Legion Auxiliary's national essay contest for junior members.

Donna Jeanne has been a junior member of the American Legion Auxiliary all her life, and is now serving as first vice president of the Gregory, S. Dak., junior American Legion Auxiliary group. She has won several honors in essay writing and in dramatic declamation, winning State honors 3 consecutive years while still in grade school.

For her essay, The World as a Junior Sees It, Donna Jeanne was awarded a State prize of $2 and a national prize of $35, with which she says she intends to buy defense-savings bonds.

The prize-winning essay follows:

We, the juniors of the American Legion Auxiliary, see the world today as a world of strife and distress in which America stands out as the land of plenty and freedom.

Many peoples of the world today have forgotten to worship God and to "love thy neighbor." If brotherly love, instead of hatred, could be instilled in the hearts of men they would find a much better method of settling their differences than by human slaughter, such as is now being done in Europe and Asia. Only when differences of nations can be settled through honest and sincere discussion and friendly deliberation can we hope for enduring peace.

In 1917 and 1918 our fathers served in the World War, a war to end all wars and for the preservation of democracy. Today these World War veterans are a disillusioned group of men for they realize that that war was in a measure fought in vain and that it has again become necessary for the United States to become involved in another European entanglement. No wonder tears come to their eyes as they see their sons leave for military training. Will every generation be called upon to defend democracy?

We see a bleeding Europe looking to the United States for aid, that millions of people now forcefully ruled by the brutal iron hand of Hitler, may again enjoy peace and independence. Will the United States have to police the world in order to maintain peace?

Perhaps the war scene in Europe would have been somewhat different if the request of the American Legion for an adequate national defense had been favorably regarded in the past. The United States would then have been better prepared to meet the emergency of today and aggressor nations would not have been so bold in overrunning weaker countries. But we also realize that guns and ammunition will be of little use if the youth of our land do not have a genuine desire to defend our democracy. Therefore true Americanism and love for our country must be taught in our schools.

We see un-American activities promoted by the German Bund, National Youth Congress, Jehovah's Witnesses, and other subversive organizations in an attempt to overthrow our democratic form of government. This has become a matter of deep concern to the members of the Junior American Legion Auxiliary as we have benefited greatly by the patriotic teachings of our parent organizations, the American Legion and its Auxiliary. We believe that only through love of country, courage, and steadfast faith in the American way of life can democracy survive.

Our prayer is that democracy will endure and that Americans will continue to defend it in every crisis.

We see in this world of struggle for supremacy a world of hope, where once again peace and good will will prevail; a world where God will reign supreme, and a more sympathetic understanding between nations will govern mankind.

The American Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. PADDOCK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ANTIOCH (ILL.) NEWS

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, this interesting and thoughtful editorial recently appeared in the Antioch (Ill.) News, a paper which for more than 50 years has given leadership and inspiration to a loyal and patriotic community.

Congress has voted enormous sums and has delegated unprecedented powers to create an impregnable national defense. However, if the use of these powers results in a break-down of our great American institutions, we have met a more disastrous defeat than could come from any invader. We can and will defend America, but it must be the same America we have known and loved.

[From the Antioch (Ill.) News of July 24, 1941]

THE AMERICAN DESTINY

The world knows what appeasement and vacillation mean to a nation confronted by an aggressive and ruthless enemy. It leads to one certain goal—disaster. The once proud nations which have bowed their heads in defeat, are grim proof of this. Today's dictators give no quarter. They are after but one thing—total victory. The nation which gives a little, eventually gives all.

What is true in international affairs, is true in domestic affairs And that is a truth that must be brought squarely home to the Nation's leaders in both industry and government. There are those in high places who argue that our basic freedoms cannot be wholly maintained in a changing world. They say that the private enterprise system cannot be kept intact. They would, in short, appease and attempt to conciliate with forces which are as dangerous to our existence as a free people, as any potential military aggressor.

We see this in governmental inroads into the field of business. When government goes into business, the private enterprise system—which is the democratic system—becomes a little weaker. It loses a little ground. The political bureaus grow in number and power and extent. The hand of government is felt in more homes. And government gradually grows great beyond necessity, and the traditional democratic balance is slowly lost.

There are two types of offenders against the American way of life. First, there are those men in government whose real goal, though they may not admit it, is to establish some form of socialistic totalitarianism here. They would use the world crisis to gain their ends. In the name of national defense they would appropriate basic industries which are vital to our survival as a free people.

Second, there are men high in industry whose instinct is to make deals—in short, to appease, to compromise with socialism. They seem afraid to fight for the principles of individualism that are at stake. They see temporary personal gain by going part way along the road to totalitarianism. They forget that, in all the history of the world, no nation has long endured which has attempted to reconcile two diametrically opposed principles of life and living. Lincoln said no nation can exist half slave and half free. By the same token, no nation can exist half socialistic and half free.

The President has lately talked of our fundamental rights which must not be sacrificed. Those rights inevitably involve the right to own property, to go into any legitimate business, to be free from political persecution and government competition with private endeavor, to live in a land where the government exists for the people, not the people for the government.

The man who does not fight for those eternal principles for which this country stands has no place in this country. We now have the opportunity to prove to all the world that a free people, working in a free economy, can outmatch the dictators and their slave peoples in any contest of any kind. That is the American destiny.

The New War Department Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a collossal expenditure of money is embraced in the deficiency bill, now under consideration, by which it is proposed to allocate the huge sum of $35,000,000 for a new War Department Building. It has been suggested that this will be the largest office building in the world when it is completed, and this is a permanent construction. The building is to be located, we are advised, across the Potomac River, in the State of Virginia. The proposed location for this mammoth structure will be in the low land immediately adjacent to the river, and near the west end of Memorial Bridge. This land is wholly unimproved; there are no

sewers, and the drainage is not established; the only means of ingress and egress to and from this site is Memorial Bridge, with the use of Fourteenth Street Bridge, which is far down the river, a possibility and the further use of Chain Bridge, far up-stream, as another possibility. The construction of a new and permanent War Department Building at the location now proposed will entail the expenditure of huge sums of money for the incidental improvements required for such an extensive office building. The original cost of $35,000,000 for this new building is merely the beginning of the spending for this project. No one can now predict what the cost will ultimately be.

Mr. Speaker, we have a huge War Department Building, located on Constitution Avenue, where all incidental improvements are already constructed, and which building is in use; just recently an addition was constructed to this and the Navy Department Building; those buildings have served us well, and they are now serving us well; they have housed this vast army of employees to this very hour, and if there should develop a great need for more room in the War Department or the Navy Department, we can well construct temporary quarters which will well serve our purpose during these critical times. Such temporary quarters for additional employees would be insignificent in the amount of the cost thereof, and the demand for a huge outlay for permanent construction, such as is contemplated, would not be required. If we are not to become militaristic in the future, why the construction of this huge building for our War Department. It is unnecessary and we can well do without it. We should conserve the taxpayers' money and we should think of some of the needed equipment for our own defense of our country, our people, and our institutions. This staggering project, which will cost the people a staggering sum of money, should be entirely eliminated at this time. No one appears to know whose suggestion it was that brought this tremendous building into the pending bill. This expenditure should be entirely eliminated from this proposed legislation. Our present War Department Building will well serve all present needs. We do not want a militaristic nation in the future, and therefore we do not need the largest office building in the world for our War Department.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of recent date, which editorial follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star]

A STAGGERING PROJECT

The $35,000,000 War Department Building project planned for Arlington County, Va., is so staggering in its proportions as to be difficult to grasp on short notice—and the notice was so short that even such customary planning agencies as the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Fine Arts Commission were not consulted by the House Appropriations Committee before it reported the proposal favorably to the House yesterday. That the plan was drawn in haste is evident from testimony given before the committee. Brig. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell of the Quartermaster General's Department of the Army, who was identified as author of the plan, told the committee he had not had time to confer with the Fine Arts Commission. He explained, moreover, that the Park and Planning Commission was not consulted because "of course it is outside of the jurisdiction" of the Commission. This view, however, is in conflict with the act of April 30, 1926, which gives the Commission authority to develop a plan not only for Washington proper but for its environs.

Since the record of the hearings shows that the project was first described to the House committee on Tuesday of this week, it is natural that questions should arise as to practical as well as esthetic aspects of the plan. Disregarding the long-approved Northwest rectangle program, which called for the new War Department Buildings near Virginia Avenue and Twenty-first Street and a new Navy Building west of the Naval Hospital, the new plan provides for a structure on the old Arlington Experimental Farm large enough to accommodate 40,000 employees, about 15,000 persons less than the present population of Arlington County and some 18,000 more employees than work in all of the buildings of the present Federal Triangle. The cost will approximate that of New York City's Empire State Building and the area of its three floors will be about double that of the Empire State Building, according to General Somervell, although other figures contest the accuracy of such a comparison.

A building of such colossal size requires adequate sewerage, water, and other utility services. It is assumed the War Department and Congress will take into consideration the fact that Arlington County's water and sewerage facilities in the proposed area already are undergoing strain.

County officials recently declared that a new sewage disposal plant and other equipment would be required to serve any large new Federal buildings on that site. Bridge connections with Washington are taxed to capacity by existing traffic. The committee was told that the bulk of War Department employees live in the District, which means that additional facilities for crossing the Potomac may be necessary.

Surely Congress will not adopt so far-reaching and revolutionary a project without affording the Park and Planning Commission and other interested agencies or officials an opportunity to pass upon the technical, artistic, and other aspects of the undertaking. It may well be that careful studies by building and planning experts will show that the proposal is feasible and, in view of emergency conditions, altogether desirable. To ignore the advice of experienced planners, however, would be a serious mistake that might bring disastrous complications later.

Lincoln Holiday Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

JOINT RESOLUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution recently adopted by the Legislature of the State of Illinois:

Senate Joint Resolution 40

Whereas the Sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Illinois has by law declared the birthday of Abraham Lincoln to be a legal holiday in this State; and

Whereas it is altogether appropriate that the birthday of Abraham Lincoln be made a national legal holiday; and

Whereas Senator BROOKS, on June 9, 1941, introduced in the Senate of the United States a bill declaring the birthday of Abraham Lincoln to be a national legal holiday: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That we respectfully importune the Seventy-seventh Congress of the United States to enact the Brooks' Lincoln holiday bill; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Congressman and Senator from Illinois, by the Secretary of State.

Adopted by the Senate, June 20, 1941.

HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the House of Representatives, June 30, 1941.

ELMER J. SCHUECHEULING,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
R. R. RANDOLPH,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Let Reason Guide American Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. HJALMAR PETERSEN

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 4 Hon. Hjalmar Petersen, former Governor of Minnesota and now railroad warehouse commissioner of that State, delivered a very thoughtful address entitled "Let Reason Guide American Course," which I consider timely and worthy of careful consideration by the Congress. Under leave granted me, I desire to have Mr. Petersen's address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. His remarks follow:

When we think of world conditions today, and compare them with conditions in America, we have abundant reasons for being thankful and to really celebrate this one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, which made America a free country. The Fourth of July is a great day—it is a joyous day in the lives of all Americans—and it marks a significant day in the history of all the world.

The Pilgrims came to American shores at Plymouth Rock back in 1620, because they were seeking religious freedom. To be sure,

these religious people in the very early history of our country, encountered the hardships of pioneer life, but they were free to worship God in their own way. That torch of religious freedom has been held uppermost in America ever since 1620, and its later embodiment in our Constitution.

FREEDOM GAVE GROWTH

As the original Thirteen Colonies developed in farming and industry, and the population increased, there also developed friction with the mother country, England. It is well for Americans today that their forebears severed connections with England, and that the United States of America became a free and independent country. Had we remained under England, we would likely have been another Canada, Australia, New Zealand, or any one of the many other countries under English rule, instead of a nation today of over 130,000,000 people.

Prior to the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the Original Thirteen Colonies were obliged to fight in several wars in behalf of England as the other English colonies have had to do all along. Today, there are forces in America whose purpose it is to again join us up with the British Empire. The result of such a union would be to nullify our Declaration of Independence.

In the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, John Hancock, and the other signers, listed a long train of abuses and usurpations on the part of the English Crown. They told the world that the King kept standing armies in the Colonies without the consent of the legislatures. Militarism was made superior to civil power and in general there was delayed justice; they burned towns and killed people; they erected a multitude of new offices and appointed officers to harass the people; our trade was cut off from the rest of the world; there was taxation without representation, and tyranny over the Colonies.

NO FOREIGN WARS

The Declaration of Independence was adopted on July 4, 1776, at Philadelphia. Not so long ago there was another meeting in the City of Brotherly Love. That was in 1940. It was the national convention of the Republican Party, at which time nominations were made for the offices of President and Vice President, and a party platform was adopted. That 1940 platform states: "The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign wars."

Another national political convention was also held in 1940. The Democratic Party platform, adopted at Chicago, states: "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, Navy, or air force to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

There we have the platforms, in a nutshell, from both of the dominant political parties in 1940, with reference to war and foreign affairs. The people were led to believe that either President Roosevelt or Mr. Willkie, if elected President, would keep us out of the European conflict, unless we were attacked.

We are not in the war, and it is to be hoped that we will never enter another European war. We had that experience 24 years ago and that is enough. Those who want war say that the American people have spoken, but certainly the American people did not vote for war when the President was reelected. On the basis of the political platforms, the American people would not have voted for war either had they elected Mr. Willkie as President.

If the people had become dormant and permitted things to drift, we would likely have been in the war already, but the White House heard from the people.

MUST KEEP PROMISES

What the American people have a right to demand, and what the great majority is demanding, is that the promises made in the 1940 campaign be kept. The form of government that we have can last only when elected public officials and servants of the people keep their promises.

Before a huge crowd at Dubuque, Iowa, on June 21, Archbishop Francis J. L. Beckman, of that city, reminded the President of his commitments to the American people. He said:

"You have given the people of these United States your solemn pledge that the youth of our land will not be sent to fight in any foreign wars. To repudiate that pledge, Mr. President, would be to break down the last vestige of public trust in Government.

"Your pledges will be kept because we will help you keep them.

"For my part, Mr. President, I would rather go down fighting the cause of peace, suffering any abuse and persecution, than to stand idly by while millions of our youth are prepared for the slaughter.

"If Christ Himself were this moment to return and confront these modern Herods, and Pilates, and Neros, for their crimes before the world, He, too, would be crowned by them a bundist."

We can help the President keep his pledges by writing to the White House today.

NOT OUR WAR

The passage of the lend-lease bill by Congress is another incident that the war-minded throw up as an indication that America should enter the conflict. Passage of the lend-lease bill and appropriations for aid to Great Britain do not mean that America should risk another war to give that aid. Furthermore, we were told by advocates of the lend-lease bill that it would be a measure to keep America out of war.

These questions might be asked: How many countries are giving aid to Great Britain in this war without cost to Britain? Are they lending, leasing, or giving materials, or are they selling the goods to Britain? Is England giving or is she selling goods to other countries? And in the final analysis: Is it our war or is it the war of other countries?

America, a country of free speech, free press, and religion, wants nothing of the Hitler philosophy of totalitarian government, nor does she want the Stalin communistic dictatorship. Those two dictators are now at war, and certainly democracy is not at stake between Germany and Russia.

WANT STRONG DEFENSE

Military experts are agreed that America is not prepared for war, but our people are agreed that we should have an impregnable defense and be prepared against attack. Setting up a strong defense here in America will cost plenty without plunging ourselves into a European war.

America would have had a stronger defense today had the Government followed the advice of the American Legion which also advocates conscripting of wealth as well as manpower in war.

When the smoke of battle has cleared away, those unfortunate people in the war-torn countries, who are unemployed, hungry, starving, and bewildered, will need aid and guidance. It would be well then that there be one country in the world, with natural resources and manpower, where conditions are fairly normal. Then America can be of aid and guidance to a bewildered world. Then we will not be isolationists, for the American people have always been willing to give aid and comfort to people in need. Isolation means isolation from war—it does not mean that America is not interested in the people of other lands.

Aside from our part in the World War in 1917–18, America has adhered to the policy of refraining from entering the European border disputes, which have taken place for centuries. We have followed the advice of Washington and Jefferson, and have adhered to the policy of protection for the Western Hemisphere and leaving Europe to itself.

RISING ABOVE WAR

Even today, we still have many Americans who are natives of foreign countries, naturalized citizens who are good Americans, and we have descendants from Great Britain, Germany, Finland, the Scandinavian countries, Poland, Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, and many other countries. It is natural and proper that there be friendly feelings and sympathy toward the homelands of our forebears, whatever country we may have come from, so long as America is not at war with any of those countries. But, today, we are Americans—we came to these shores of our own volition. We, or our ancestors, came here because we wanted to work, build homes, and rear our families in a country that is not everlastingly at war with other nations. We came here because we love the freedoms that America has given us. Let us, as Americans, keep America free.

We learned through the World War of 1914–18, that we cannot force our way of life, our free democratic institutions, upon other nations. We went into that war on the slogan to "make the world safe for democracy." But what a sad result!

WILSON ASKED FAIR PLAY

President Woodrow Wilson was undoubtedly sincere in desiring that peace reign over the world after that great holocaust. He presented his 14 points to Congress on January 8, 1918, and enlarged upon those points in later addresses. President Wilson wanted freedom of navigation on the open seas in peace or war. He wanted removal of economic barriers, equality of trade, reduction of national armaments to a point consistent with domestic safety. He requested mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

President Wilson wanted peace that would be permanent and settlements to be fair and just to bring that about. He said in one of his speeches to Congress: "Every territorial settlement involved in this war must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned, and not as a part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims amongst rival states."

But when Lloyd George of England, Clemenceau of France, and Orlando of Italy got through with the so-called peace conference it was an entirely different matter. America fought for an ideal in that war. The European leaders were not idealists but played the old game of power politics and they had their way. Wilson surrendered his peace points for a League of Nations that the European leaders knew they could and would control.

SENATE REFUSES TO RATIFY TREATY

We had helped part of Europe defeat another part of Europe, and in doing so we lost over 100,000 brave sons and crippled for life tens of thousands more. We burdened our country with a $25,000,000,000 debt. We loaned over ten billions to various European nations which they refuse to repay and which is now being paid by the American taxpayer. After the World War was over we helped to draft one of the worst peace treaties in all history, so bad, indeed, that our own Senate refused to ratify it.

Instead of ending all wars and making the world safe for democracy, we helped create the situation that brought on countless more wars, including those now raging. We helped prepare the soil of Europe for the dictators that are now battling for supremacy.

Today we have people among us who would repeat the stupid blunder of 1917. It is a wise child that stays away from the fire after having once been burned.

We are interested in the welfare of America and interested in preserving liberty and

democracy in this country. We are interested in keeping America strong so that she will be in a position to help rebuild the world after this disastrous war is over. Therefore, we must let reason, and not our emotions, guide our course. Our indignation must not replace our reason.

HATE PROPAGANDA SPREAD

Students of history will recall reading about the propaganda spread in America for America to help the French Revolutionists and, also, for America to save the world from Napoleon.

Former President Herbert Hoover, who directed the work of the Belgium commission during the World War, reports that he saw the pernicious technique of propaganda developed for 8 years in Europe. He dealt with leading officials of the various countries. Mr. Hoover states: "Daily I read of atrocities on both sides that, to my knowledge, were sheer inventions. They were invented by the thousand to create hate."

Mr. Hoover, who speaks from experience and first-hand knowledge, says that "if we go into another World War liberty will be lost to America. Surely the voice of experience calls to us that we are little likely to emerge again without great impairment, if not total loss, of our American system of liberty. What shall it profit a nation that loses its own soul?

"During the World War we professed we were fighting only the dictator over the enemy people. Then we punished the enemy people for the war.

"The social regeneration of nations must come from within. It cannot come from without."

A JUDGE AFFECTED

Let me give you another illustration of what war propaganda and hysteria can do to people. The elder La Follette made a speech in the United States Senate in which he embodied an Associated Press dispatch of October 1, 1917, from Houston, Tex., as follows:

"Judge Waller T. Burns, of the United States District Court, in charging a Federal grand jury at the beginning of the October term today, after calling by name Senators Stone, of Missouri; Hardwich, of Georgia; Vardaman, of Mississippi; Gronna, of North Dakota; Gore, of Oklahoma; and La Follette, of Wisconsin, said: 'If I had a wish, I would wish that you men had jurisdiction to return bills of indictment against these men. They ought to be tried promptly and fairly, and I believe this court could administer the law fairly, but I have a conviction as strong as life that this country should stand them up against an adobe wall tomorrow and give them what they deserve. If any man deserves death, it is a traitor. I wish that I could pay for the ammunition. I would like to attend the execution; and if I were in the firing squad, I would not want to be the marksman who had the blank shell.'"

COMPARED WITH LINCOLN'S POISE

Imagine a Federal judge wanting five United States Senators shot to death for having voted against entering the World War and wishing that he could buy the ammunition and be part of the firing squad that would kill them. Yet that is what propaganda and war hysteria does to people otherwise considered sensible. What a difference between the words of this pseudo patriot and those of Lincoln who said in the midst of war, "With malice toward none, with charity for all."

Here in Minnesota the elder Lindbergh was hounded by the mobs for being a real American and trying to keep us out of war. Senator Shipstead's house was painted yellow. The late Senator Lundeen was thrown into a refrigerator car in the middle of winter by an un-American mob because he opposed our entry into the war and our joining the League of Nations.

As Senator La Follette, in the speech referred to, said, "A declaration of war is the highest and most awful exercise of sovereignty."

The most un-American thing, short of treason, that an American citizen can do is to abuse a duly elected Representative or Senator for voting his honest conviction on the question of peace or war.

THE VOTER IS MASTER

The great Henry Clay, speaking at Lexington, Ky., on the 13th day of November 1847, while the Mexican War was taking place, took a strong position in behalf of the right of the people to freely discuss every question relating to the war, even though the discussion involved a strong condemnation of the war policy of the Executive.

As to the question of declaring war aims, Clay, in the same speech, said: "Either Congress or the President must have the right of determining upon the objects for which a war shall be prosecuted. There is no other alternative. If the President possesses it, and may prosecute it for objects against the will of Congress, where is the difference between our free government and that of any other nation which may be governed by an absolute czar, emperor, or king?

"The right to control their own government according to constitutional forms is not one of the rights that the citizens of this country are called upon to surrender in time of war."

We should remember that Congress alone has the right to declare war and Congress alone has the right to declare the objects of war. We should further remember that the Congressmen are the elected servants of the voters who place them there. How ridiculous for anyone to say that the master cannot criticize the acts of the servant. Under our form of government the voter is the master, and must always be the master, if liberty and democracy are to be preserved.

WEBSTER AND OTHERS SPOKE UP

In the midst of the Mexican War Abraham Lincoln, then a Congressman, severely criticized the President for his conduct of that war. During the same war Daniel Webster said: "We are, in my opinion, in a most unnecessary and therefore, unjustifiable war."

I have quoted from these great men to show that even while a war is on the true American policy is to permit free speech and open discussion of all the issues relative to the war. Yet, in America today, we have some people in high places who are criticizing distinguished American citizens for urging that we keep out of the European war.

Secretary Ickes states that he thinks Lindbergh has an understanding with Hitler. It would be just as unfair for you or me to accuse Mr. Ickes of having an understanding with the King of England to drag us into the war.

Secretary Ickes goes on to say: "If it is not to be 'America next,' we must leave nothing undone to help England repel the brutal hordes of Hitler and to destroy them."

NAME CALLING AND PLEAS FOR WAR

Ickes called Colonel Lindbergh an "ex-colonel," "our Knight of the German Eagle," "Hitler's stooge," "an American Quisling," and a "Nazi wolf in pacifist's clothing." Ickes claims to get his inspiration from Washington, Lincoln, and Prime Minister Churchill. The Prime Minister, by the way, said that this is no time to moralize about communism.

Another Cabinet member, Secretary Knox, said a few days ago that we must immediately "clear the Atlantic of the German menace." Knox is several weeks behind Minnesota's appointed junior Senator in asking for American naval intervention.

Senator BALL urges America to face war courageously now. That will be done if we are attacked. In that event we will fight for home and country, but let us not invite war. The Senator pictures France as a country that tried to make peace with Hitler. She is today suffering from the so-called peace settlement after the World War, and is a next door neighbor of Germany, not 3,000 miles away.

READY TO REPEL INVADERS

Members of the American Legion and other service organizations who were in the World War know something about war from first-hand knowledge. They know the suffering and the agony that men must go through in the hell of battle. They have seen thousands of comrades killed outright and thousands of others maimed for life. They appreciate more than any other class of our citizens the suffering that is still being endured by these men who served in the last war and who are now filling all the beds in the 80 Government hospitals that were built to take care of the disabled.

I am firmly of the opinion from conversation with men who served overseas in 1917 that all of them want America to be adequately prepared to defend herself. I am equally convinced that the veterans of our previous wars would be willing and eager to defend America against invaders. But I am just as convinced that the overwhelming majority of veterans of the last war are opposed to another expeditionary force being sent to a foreign country to help settle any quarrel that is going on in the Old World. On this Independence Day it is well to remind ourselves of what Washington once said: "I want an American character."

WHERE IS DEMOCRACY IN RUSSIA?

Those who would have America go to war say that we must fight for democracy. It was recently announced from Washington that the United States as the arsenal of the democracies will supply Soviet Russia with munitions of war. Thus we find President Roosevelt, Willkie, Stassen, and Ball ranging themselves on the side of the purging Joseph Stalin.

Russia is at war with Finland, and the Soviet air forces are bombing the civilian population of gallant little Finland, a country which approximates our conception of democracy as closely as any country in Europe, with the possible exception of the Scandinavian countries and Switzerland. Our munitions in the hands of Communist Russia are to be used to subdue democratic Finland, and all this in the name of democracy. Recent events have made it plain that all talk about America's going to war for democracy is a travesty and a farce.

There is plenty of evidence that Stalin's agents have worked in America to create class hatred. I know something of what they did to the progressive movement in Minnesota, but will not here dwell on that.

FOREIGN TRADE MYTH

One of the main arguments advanced by the war-minded is that we must make war to protect and defend our foreign trade. In 1929 our foreign trade equalled 10 percent of our total trade. That was the peak.

The latest available statistics disclose that American foreign trade was 4 percent of our total trade in 1939. Since then many of the markets of European countries under Hitler's domination have been closed to us, and it is now reliably estimated that our foreign trade is less than 3 percent. It is for this 3 percent of our total trade that some of our citizens urge us to go to war.

During the last 12 months of the World War the United States spent almost $20,000,000,000. With greater mechanization the cost of war has greatly increased. Today an effort comparable to our effort in the World War would cost at least forty billions a year. For the cost of America's participation in Europe's war for 6 weeks we can buy and destroy, if necessary, our surplus wheat and

cotton, or, better still, we can buy and distribute to those of our people who are undernourished and underclothed all of our surplus wheat and cotton.

I do not believe in a foreign policy which goes to war on a calculated basis of profit in dollars and cents. I believe there are civilization values, cultural values, spiritual values, which flow from peace that cannot be measured in money.

WE WILL HAVE TRADE

But even on the basis of a cold-blooded dollars-and-cents foreign policy we will save money in the long run if we stay at home and mind our own business and accept and pay for the curtailment of foreign trade which results from a war-torn world.

America, however, is as nearly self-sufficient as any nation. And let us remember that, regardless of the outcome of this war, America will have foreign trade. For example, the East Indies will continue to sell rubber where there is a big market, and in turn those islands and other countries will need our exports.

Even the victors as well as the vanquished in war have to return to the paths of peace if they are to recover from their own exhaustion.

I am a liberal. I believe that liberalism is largely an attitude of mind. It is the attitude which wants to be helpful to the underdog, which wants to make his lot better wherever opportunity offers.

True liberalism seeks not to destroy but to preserve the basic fabric of American government, American law, and American life. True liberalism rejects communism, fascism, nazi-ism, and all the other "isms" which today afflict the national life of America. True liberalism seeks to work out within the fabric of our fundamental law a more equitable distribution of this world's goods and preservation of the personal liberties which have been handed down to us in America by those who came before us.

GUARD CIVIL LIBERTIES

The preservation of these personal liberties is absolutely essential to the working of the democratic process in America. Without free speech, a free press, free religion, and the right of free assembly, democracy cannot work. In these days of complicated issues confronting our people it is only by argument and counterargument, and fact and counterfact, that our people become informed, that the popular opinion slowly crystallizes, and ultimately makes its effect in governmental action.

Should America ever go to war again even our civil liberties are in jeopardy. War brings a rising tide of intolerance. It prompts neighbor to suspect neighbor and friend to suspect friend. Under the guise of war necessity, the civil liberties are curtailed, restricted, and all too often ultimately destroyed by war. If we would guard democracy in America we must guard our fundamental civil liberties which are, and always will be, the very lifeblood of our democratic process.

In these days of turmoil, excitement, and emotion, let us reaffirm our original and traditional American policy. As Hoover has said, we should "maintain a nondefeatist, nonisolationist, and noninterventionist status."

Let us "improve the four freedoms within our borders that the light of their success may stir the people of the world to their adoption."

LET US HELP BUILD

Let us concentrate on how humanity can win the peace, and how freedom and economic security can be harmonized.

On this Independence Day, let us rededicate ourselves to the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence. Let us reaffirm the foreign policy of Washington, Jackson, and Lincoln. Let us make America strong for defense, and keep America strong economically. Let us keep calm and think clearly. Let us penetrate the fog of propaganda, hate, and falsehoods that comes to us from Europe and from some people here in America, who would profit from war as was done in 1917–18 when 22,000 new millionaires were created in America.

Let us think of America first in order that we might preserve our heritage of freedom, and be in the best possible position when this awful war is over to serve the peoples of the world. "With malice toward none, with charity for all," let us continue to serve mankind with an example of peace and freedom, and a generous hand of helpfulness, rather than to try by force of arms and bloodshed to impose our will on other nations. Let us help rebuild the world, but let us do it in the American way.

Hibernians Pledge Allegiance to Constitution and Institutions of Government Founded Thereon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT NATIONAL CONVENTION, ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS, ST. PAUL, MINN., JULY 22–24, 1941

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted at the national convention of Ancient Order of Hibernians, St. Paul, Minn., July 22–24, 1941:

As American citizens, proud of our Irish ancestry, we again pledge our unswerving allegiance to the Constitution of the United States of America and to the institutions of government founded thereon.

We pledge our undivided support, moral and material, to the defense of America, its ideals, its free institutions and laws, and we commend our Senators and Members of Congress for their action of national preparedness, particularly our past national president, Representative MARTIN L. SWEENEY, from Ohio.

We abhor and condemn every form of aggression whether it be the aggression by a totalitarian or imperialist dictator or by the representative of a self-styled democracy. And further:

Resolved, That we renew our spiritual allegiance to our Sovereign Pontiff, Pope Pius XII, and express our full sympathy with his efforts to restore peace to the world, and we hope that rulers everywhere will listen to his pleading for a return of reason and sanity in the councils of nations before chaos comes.

Resolved, That we, as the organized representatives of thousands of citizens of Irish blood, who cherish the ideals of liberty and justice and those principles of government handed down to us by great Americans of the past, insist that the pledges be kept which were made to the people of the United States before the last national election by the leaders of both major political parties, that American soldiers would not be sent to take part in the war which has developed out of the power politics of the Old World. If the political leaders in this country break faith with the people who are opposed to American involvement in another foreign war, the first principle of our democracy which is "that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," will be violated and the foundations of American liberty imperiled.

Resolved, That we congratulate and commend the people of our blood and race in Eire for the example which they have given to a war-mad world by adhering to an attitude of strict neutrality, at a time when the rulers of other lands, impelled by the desire to retain loot of old conquests, or by ambitions for new possessions, and to acquire greater power, are exposing millions of human beings and many countries, to the horrors and devastation of modern warfare. We rejoice because the people of Eire and their spokesmen have resolutely refused to be drawn into the war by surrendering territory to England or any other nation for war bases, as such a surrender would be a violation of Eire's neutrality and an abandonment of her sovereign right to control her own territory and make her own decisions on questions involving her peace and security.

Resolved, That we urge the Government of the United States to sell ships, arms, ammunition, food, and other commodities, in the quantities requested by the Government of Ireland, to enable the Irish Nation to maintain its policy of absolute neutrality.

Resolved, That we again denounce the puppet government set up by England in six counties of Northeast Ulster as a despotism functioning with the aid of subsidies from the English Imperial Treasury. An English commission, which investigated conditions in that area declared that under the government in power there, "the rule of law and justice has been abrogated." We arraign the Government of Northern Ireland before the court of American public opinion for having governed tyranically and unjustly since it was brought into existence, by English statecraft and to keep Catholics and Protestants divided in that area, in pursuance of the old imperialist policy of "Divide and conquer."

We demand in the name of justice that Irish nationalists imprisoned there without a charge being preferred against them be liberated and that the boundary set around these six Irish counties be abolished, and that they be restored to the Irish nation, of which they are a part.

T. V. A. Concentrates Help Feed Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, when the Tennessee Valley Authority was set up originally, it was promoted principally on the theory that the enterprise would be a great boon to the farmers of America through the production of fertilizers. Today I learn through an article in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday that much of the fertilizer produced by T. V. A. will go to enrich the soil of England. Already 40,000 tons of concentrated superphosphate have been ordered by the British Government.

Where, Mr. Speaker, does the American farmer come in on this deal? Will he be taxed, and taxed off the farm, just to give everything we can to the British? When are we going to stop coddling foreigners and start taking care of our own people?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 27 be included as part of my remarks. I want the American farmers to know that the benevolence of this administration is not local in character, not State-wide in prospect, but world-wide in fact.

The article follows:

T. V. A. CONCENTRATES HELP FEED BRITAIN WITH FEWER SHIPS

Concentrated superphosphate fertilizer produced in T. V. A.'s electric ovens will help to feed the people of England under war conditions, by maintaining fertility of British soil.

Because the concentrated T. V. A. product requires less than half the shipping space of the normal superphosphate, the British Government has ordered 40,000 tons to be supplied as rapidly as possible.

The concentrated superphosphate made by T. V. A. is 45 percent available plant food. This means 45 pounds of plant food in a 100-pound bag. The ordinary type of commercial phosphate fertilizer contains about 15 to 18 percent available plant food. The concentrated product thus reduces the volume of material which must be handled and shipped to get a given amount of plant food to the soil. This is highly important in view of the shortage of ships to carry supplies to England.

Steam Power Development

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks we have been hearing of a shortage of power, and our attention has been directed to the possibilities of the development of the St. Lawrence waterway in order to relieve this shortage. It seems to me we can very easily kill two birds with one stone by providing for the increase of the facilities of the existing companies that manufacture power by steam. The anthracite region of Pennsylvania is within a radius of 200 miles of one-fourth of the population of the United States, and if power plants were located in that section it would be a comparatively simple matter to move the coal from the mines to the power plants, and the power could then be distributed to the sections where it is needed.

According to my understanding, the Government advances money to manufacturers of war matériel, which is repaid to the Government in annual installments. Why cannot the same system be employed in the creation of electric power facilities? By so doing there will not be added to the multiple problems of the anthracite-coal regions of Pennsylvania that of increased unemployment. The fact that transportation costs could be greatly reduced if power was manufactured in the anthracite regions should be taken very seriously into consideration, as well as the cost of producing power in steam power generating plants. I have been very reliably informed that the power produced at Lake Wallenpaupeck costs considerably more than the power produced at a steam power generating plant within 50 miles of the water-power development. In the sections of the greatest industrial activity, power can be provided cheaper than and the cost of installation would be less than the cost of a water-power development.

The anthracite-coal regions have suffered ever since the World War, and are still suffering, because of the overdevelopment of the coal-mining operations that took place at the time of the World War. The defense effort has not relieved unemployment in the coal regions, because no new industry has located there, with the result that our relief load is nearly as great as it was during the depression years. The only thing that can bring about stability in this region is an increase in the use of anthracite. The construction of the St. Lawrence River project will very materially affect one of America's basic industries without justification. Much of the coal used in Canada comes from the anthracite section of Pennsylvania and is used in the manufacturing plants in Canada. In the event that the St. Lawrence project is completed, this market will be very seriously affected, with the resultant loss of work for thousands of our coal miners.

I earnestly hope that the Government will cooperate with some company that produces electric power through the use of coal powered steam plants in the construction and operation of a plant or plants that will provide the power so badly needed in our defense effort. In view of the fact that Army engineers have completed studies of the Delaware River and have prepared plans for the damming thereof, work could be promptly commenced on a steam-power program.

Electric Energy Is the Magic Key to Production—The A. V. A. Is Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE SOUTHWEST AMERICAN, FORT SMITH, ARK.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the clearest and most concise statements I have seen yet on the proposition of power production and the development of the abundant natural resources of the Southwest is contained in an editorial which appeared on July 18 in Arkansas' third largest newspaper, the Southwest American, of Fort Smith.

I quote the article written by the editor, Mr. Clarence F. Byrns, in full as follows:

Electric energy is the magic key to production, in peace or war time.

The area which has power plants, whether hydro or steam, has the foundation for a great industrial wealth, in peace or war time.

The vast expansion of electric energy production, occasioned by the war, can easily become the foundation on which we shall build a new and higher level of life when the war emergency has ended.

The particular application of those truths to our situation here in the Southwest is this:

We have a prospect of important increase in our power production facilities as a result of the war emergency. The Federal Government is planning to spend tremendous sums to build hydro and steam plants to get electric energy where it can be produced economically, and to encourage industry where the power is available.

We have at the moment a prospect of a steam power plant in western Arkansas, fired by Arkansas-Oklahoma coal.

We have the best opportunity that has yet appeared to get favorable consideration for our long-time dream, the Arkansas Valley Authority, for development of the power, flood control, navigation, and irrigation possibilities of our streams.

The Federal Government is preparing for a long war. The Federal Power Commission, fitting its plans to this long-range war program, has proposed to President Roosevelt a power expansion program designed to spend a billion dollars over a 5-year period in developing new electric energy sources.

Leland Olds, Chairman of the Commission, said:

"There is no question about this investment being self-liquidating, as all the proposed units would be installed in the normal course of events.

"The total investment in steam stations will average about $75,000,000 to $100,000,000 a year in addition to the cost of the generating units. This investment may be expected to come largely from private sources.

"The total investment in hydro projects, including dams, reservoirs, power houses, etc., but exclusive of the cost of generating units, will average about $170,000,000 a year, of which more than one-third will be allocable to flood control, navigation, and other benefits."

Reading between the lines, this program means the Arkansas Valley Authority has an excellent chance for favorable action now to serve the double purpose of power production for the war effort and a foundation for economic growth after the emergency is over.

The sponsors of the Arkansas Valley Authority have thought of it chiefly in terms of a long-range program for production of cheap power, flood-control works, navigation aids, and irrigation supplies in the slack period when the war is over. It has not been expected that it would be approved immediately or that actual work under it would start during the war emergency, except for the projects already underway in the area under control of the United States engineers.

This tremendous program of power expansion sponsored by the Federal Power Commission changes the picture materially.

Here in the valleys of the Arkansas, the Red, the St. Francis, and the White, there is abundant opportunity for development of hydroelectric power by harnessing the energy of falling waters. The United States engineers have proposed for final construction

no less than 35 separate projects in the valleys of the 4 rivers, and others are under consideration. Two important dams for power production and flood control are under way in this section of the A. V. A. area at this time. Norfork Dam in Baxter County, Ark., is under construction, and recommendations have recently gone to Congress for additional funds to equip it for power. Denison Dam, between Oklahoma and Texas, is under construction as a dual-purpose project. Table Rock and Bull Shoals Dams, on the White River in north Arkansas and southern Missouri, are being urged for immediate construction. All these are part of the Arkansas Valley Authority program.

If the administration approves the expansion program now proposed by the Federal Power Commission the valleys of the Arkansas, the Red, the St. Francis, and the White offer ideal opportunity for doing the very thing the Commission is recommending. Power production can be greatly expanded in this section of the Nation. That production can contribute vitally to the defense effort, and it can contribute vitally after the war to a level of life in the Southwest which our people have never known before.

Mandatory Joint Income Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 28, 1941

ARTICLE BY GODFRY N. NELSON

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there appeared in the New York Times on July 20 a very able article by Mr. Godfry N. Nelson on the subject of the proposed change in the tax law whereby joint returns would be compelled on the part of husband and wife. I ask that the article be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 20, 1941]

PROBLEMS POSED BY JOINT RETURNS—ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED CHANGE DISCUSSED—UNCERTAINTY IS STRESSED—CONSTITUTIONAL STATUS UNDETERMINED—LAWFUL AVOIDANCE ALSO POSSIBLE

(By Godfrey N. Nelson)

If the provision for mandatory joint income tax returns of husband and wife should be permitted to remain in the forthcoming tax bill, nearly 10 percent of the anticipated revenue will be placed in jeopardy. The total revenue sought is $3,500,000,000, of which the compulsory joint return is expected to raise $323,000,000.

Undesirable tax measures, the legality of which, however, had not been questioned, have been enacted in the past and in the course of time either repealed or not reenacted—two undistributed profits taxes, for example—one shortly after the World War and the other more recently. Both were experimental legislation and neither was adopted in a period of national emergency. Now, in an extreme national emergency, it is sought to enact a measure which is not only of doubtful validity, but in itself unsavory, and in some of its aspects contrary to what should be public policy. One must doubt the wisdom of such legislation at this critical time.

MOVE IS HELD EXPERIMENTAL

The enactment of the compulsory joint return would be in the nature of experimental legislation both from the point of view of constitutional uncertainty and because of its possibility of legal avoidance. It is questionable that even a liberal court would view the issue as lightly as did Justice Holmes in his dissenting opinion in the Hoeper case (284 U. S. 206). He knew the majority opinion, not his opinion, made the law. Moreover, the issue now would be Nation-wide, not merely State, and conceivably many resulting controversies as to respective liability of the husband and wife for the higher rates of taxes on the combined basis would find their way to the courts, culminating ultimately in the divorce courts. Any form of taxation which even potentially can lead to a disturbance of domestic relations is a threat to the tranquillity of the home and the family.

Apart from its constitutional uncertainty, it is a question whether the mandatory joint return provision could be administered without advantage to those who legally sought to avoid it. The law now is that in order to obtain the right to make joint returns the husband and wife must make their returns for identical periods; they must both use the calendar year or the same fiscal period, the latter being a taxable year ending at the close of any month other than December.

Certainly, if the husband and wife determine to make returns for different taxable periods, they could not be deprived of so doing. Their business interests may be such in fact as to require unlike taxable periods. And if they have different taxable years, they could not make joint returns. Prior to 1918 individuals were required to make returns on the calendar-year basis. Since then, however, all taxpayers having books of accounts are required to report income on the basis of the accounting period employed in keeping the books. Only taxpayers who do not have books must compute their incomes and file returns on the calendar-year basis. It is highly unlikely that the original law, confining individuals to the calendar-year basis, could be reenacted.

Heretofore only married couples living together have been permitted to file joint returns. If they lived apart, they were required to file separate returns. Although the personal exemption must be apportioned in case of a change of status during the year, as from single to married, a married couple must live together at the close of the taxable year in order to be entitled to file a joint return. Since married couples not living together could hardly be compelled to make joint returns, separation at the close of the year would seem, technically, even under the mandatory rule, to require the filing of separate returns. But this merely illustrates how conveniently the proposed rule may be circumvented. Or will it be required that couples living apart shall periodically report their marriage status in order to entitle them to file separate returns? A sort of periodical questionnaire. This would call for rather unsocial social legislation.

Except for its profound seriousness, the proposal suggests extravagant situations, as, for instance, a husband joining the Army in order to save income taxes. The taxing authority would have to take the position that he was living with his wife despite his absence, which, on the other hand, he would have the right to claim under present law in order to obtain the exemption of a married man. Whose word will be determinative if he asserts his right to a separate status?

Perhaps the proposal was presented by the committee with a view to placing the burden elsewhere to suggest a substitute. Last Sunday this column suggested a tax of 1 percent on all salaries and wages, to be collected at the source, carrying no exemption. If one-third of the national income consists of earnings from employment and the national income is estimated at $90,000,000,000, such a tax should raise a revenue of $300,000,000. No separate return would be called for except one from the employer stating only the total pay roll and 1 percent of that amount.

If the Congress, in the face of a questionable constitutionality and the administrative complications, should persist in legislating the committee's proposal, there are other legal phases which will be dealt with by the courts. In *Schlesinger* v. *Wisconsin* (270 U. S. 236) (in which Justice Holmes also dissented) invalidating an inheritance tax on gifts presumed to have been made in contemplation of death, the Supreme Court observed that the tax was defended on the theory that, exercising judgment and discretion, the State legislature found the taxation necessary in order to prevent evasion of other taxes. The court concluded that "A classification for purposes of taxation must rest on some reasonable distinction. A forbidden tax cannot be enforced in order to facilitate the collection of one properly laid."

Dinner in Honor of Members of Rivers and Harbors Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. PIERRE F. CASGRAIN, SECRETARY OF STATE OF CANADA

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable Pierre F. Casgrain, the Secretary of State of Canada, on July 21, 1941, at the dinner given by the Dominion Government in honor of the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the United States House of Representatives at the Royal St. Lawrence Yacht Club, Pointe Claire, Province of Quebec:

Members of the House of Representatives in the United States Congress and gentlemen, as we are meeting in Quebec, by the great river, discovered by Cartier, it is not unfitting that my first words of welcome to you should be in the language of Lafayette and Laurier.

C'est plus qu'un agréable privilège, c'est un véritable réconfort d'accueillir dans notre pays les distingués réprésentants de la grande nation américaine.

Aussi le Canada tout entier vous souhaite-t-il la plus chaleureuse bievenue.

Il est tout naturel que cette réunion économique et amicale ait lieu dans la grande province canadienne et française, face ou grand fleuve que vous venez d'explorer. Et la vieille province est heureuse de vous accueillir en se souvenant des relations amicales qui ont toujours existé entre les deux pays depuis prés de trois siécles et que servant d'exemple à toutes les autres nations du monde.

I am glad to welcome you in the Province of Quebec which is today so well led, in church and in state.

This French welcome will also help to remind you that friendly relations between our two countries date as far back as 1651,

when a Quebec delegation visited the American Colonies to propose a treaty of trade and friendship, the first reciprocity treaty declined by you, gentlemen of the South.

May I also remind you while delving into our common past, that you are not the first committee of Congress to visit our shores. You had predecessors, and most distinguished ones.

Indeed, three signers of the Declaration of Independence—Samuel Chase, Charles Carroll, and the great Benjamin Franklin—came to Montreal in 1776 to adjust the difficulties of the officers of the American Army in Canada.

At that time American finance, with its Continental paper money, was so far from leading the world that the delegates had to borrow silver from Canadian friends to pay for their transportation from St. John to Montreal.

I feel sure there has not been any occasion for borrowing in the course of the present trip; things have greatly changed since those days. I fear that most of the borrowing has been reversed, but the friendship has continued unabated for over a century between our two countries.

Perhaps there are no two peoples who feel so much at home when visiting each other, and there are, perhaps, no two countries who exchange the whole years so many visits. Our Prime Minister vacations in Virginia and your President does some of his fishing in New Brunswick.

For several years my own constituency boasted the presence of President Taft as a summer resident. This generously proportioned, huge visitor used often to donate part of his wardrobe to neighboring villagers and fisherfolks. Returning the next summer, he asked a woman what she had done with his last suit: "Well," she said, "with the coat I made two suits for Joseph and Baptiste; with the trousers legs I made pants for Henri and Adélard, and with the seat I made a sail for my husband's boat."

Today it is my great privilege to welcome you in the name of Canada, as the distinguished representatives of the great American Nation, of which we are proud to say that she is our neighbor, our friend, and also our economic and moral ally.

You have come to Canada on an economic and pacific mission, but this mission will indirectly tend to increase our war effort.

It is your President who said that "wartime industries urgently require additional power that could be developed on the river and that the pressing demand for ships would be effectively met only by making possible their construction at points on the Great Lakes."

He also said, "The Government of the United States of America is engaged on a great defense program. It is determined to supply all such aid in material to Great Britain, the members of the Commonwealth and their allies as may be necessary to enable them to bring the war to a successful termination."

These are noble words which ought to ring in the ears and impress the mind of every true Canadian and true American. The world cannot be half free, half Nazi.

Your mission more especially proclaims the moral and financial alliance that binds our two countries in their common wish, will, and aid for the victory of free and democratic institutions against the tyranny and violence of brutish dictators aiming at the destruction of religion and liberty.

It is not my intention to enter into the field of your mission. You have come to see and judge for yourselves.

Our own task is only to welcome you and extend to you all facilities during your visit.

The undertaking in hand will, I have no doubt, prove highly beneficial to both countries.

The agreement which brings us together today will not fail, notwithstanding certain fears unjustified, to bring to the Province of Quebec real benefits, such as the stabilization of the water level of the St. Lawrence at Montreal, the increase in commerce and trade, and the establishment of new industries, due to electrical power which will accrue from the development of the St. Lawrence waterway.

Criticism born from ignorance, fears, even if supported by legitimate interests, will I have no doubt, prove unfounded and unjustified. As one who from his birth has always admired the beauties of our great St. Lawrence, as one who has always lived in Montreal—I have never been afraid of this project; I always had faith in it. I believe we must look beyond the present moment and the present day. Population will expand, production increase, which both require more power and better transportation facilities. The future does not belong to men of little faith.

When the Erie Canal was built in 1825, there was only a population of 11,000,000 in the United States; today the canal has to serve 135,000,000 population.

Today the duty of everyone is to discharge his immediate task to the best of his ability. So civilization and liberty expect every man to do his duty.

It is up to every one of us to keep his courage, faith, and hope hitched up to the stars.

Today Canada fights on land, on sea, and in the air, and her forces are growing all the time, and will grow according to the needs of Britain.

Canada today is spending more than 40 percent of her income for war and victory, and we are not sparing our men either.

We have stood for peace in the past, we now war for right; and it is because the Province of Quebec wants to remain French, with its British institutions, that she fights so nobly with her sons at the side of Britain; and it is because she wants to remain free that she works hand in hand with her neighbor, the great American Nation.

Canada, however, does not forget that war is an accident and that she must even in war prepare for the future. That is why she is going ahead with the St. Lawrence waterways development. In the working out of this far-seeing and far-reaching project, she feels doubly confident, since she has the immense advantage and benefit of the American cooperation.

So Canada is glad, this evening, to welcome the distinguished delegates of the American Congress, as she knows that their presence is one step further toward the realization of the magnificent plan of an open seaway from the Atlantic to the heart of the North American Continent.

Letter of the Fifth Avenue Association of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

LETTER FROM THE FIFTH AVENUE ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I am in entire accord with the request of the Fifth Avenue Association of New York as contained in a letter to the President under date of July 10.

The correspondence follows:

THE FIFTH AVENUE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, July 24, 1941.

Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: For your information, I am enclosing a copy of our letter of July 10, 1941, addressed to the President urging that consideration be given to the removal of some of the Federal bureaus, agencies, and commissions to New York City in view of the shortage of housing and office space in Washington D. C.

We hope that you will use your good influence in helping to accomplish this desired end.

Very truly yours,
WM. J. PEDRICK, *Vice President.*

THE FIFTH AVENUE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, July 10, 1941.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The expenditure of billions of dollars for national defense purposes necessarily involves the creation of new agencies and bureaus and the expansion of existing governmental departments. According to a recent congressional committee report, the effect of such an enlarged program of activities has created a serious problem in Washington in providing adequate office space and housing facilities to meet these new demands.

To relieve this congestion and also to make room in Washington for those defense bureaus that must remain there, the Fifth Avenue Association recommends that some of the departments, bureaus, and agencies of Government be moved to New York City. It seems hardly necessary to point out what this city has to offer, but the following are some of the advantages it possesses and can provide:

1. Adequate and comfortable housing accommodations for workers.
2. Plenty of vacant office space in well built and conveniently located buildings.
3. Every facility for the expeditious handling of business.
4. Ample hotel accommodations.
5. Educational and recreational facilities, such as art galleries, museums, theaters, parks, beaches, and so forth, that are exceptional in their scope and variety.
6. A large and varied labor market.
7. One of America's greatest railroad points.

While it is appreciated that Washington is the headquarters of the Government, New York City has the largest business, financial, and shipping facilities. It would, therefore, appear reasonable and logical that consideration be given to moving to this city such bureaus as the Maritime Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, thus releasing the space occupied by these agencies and making it available for the emergency defense bureaus which, of necessity, must be located in Washington.

Mayor LaGuardia has advocated and urged the removal of some of the Federal agencies to New York City, and in wholeheartedly supporting the idea the Fifth Avenue Association strongly feels that such a move would be mutually advantageous to the Government and to the city of New York.

Respectfully yours,
WM. J. PEDRICK,
Vice President.

The Congressional Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

JOURNAL FOR A WEEK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the week beginning July 21 the greatest highlight of the week was the message of the President delivered to Congress on July 21, in which he requested an Army of unlimited size to serve for an indefinite period. On that same day Congress recognized the tumultuous protest which came from the wheat areas of the country and passed H. R. 5300, which has for its purpose a modification of the penalty provisions on wheat in certain hardship cases where small yields or small acreage are involved. On July 22 the House passed the Defense Highway Act of 1941, authorizing the construction of a strategic network of highways supplemented by access roads, off-street parking lots, and flight strips along the highways for the landing of airplanes. This measure authorized an appropriation of $262,000,000. On Wednesday, July 23, the House considered a number of bills dealing with postal workers, including one measure which provides a longevity bonus of $100 per year after 10 years of continuous service to the Federal Government, and an additional $100 for each additional 5 years up to the thirtieth year of service. The net effect of this measure would be that a postal employee who had worked for the Federal Government for 25 years would receive an annual bonus of $400 after the twenty-fifth year, in addition to his regular base pay. On Thursday, July 24, the House considered a supplemental appropriation bill which provides more than $7,000,000,000 for additional requirements for the Army, the Navy, and the United States Maritime Commission. The largest items for the Army were $443,000,000 for clothing and supplies, $347,000,000 for the Signal Corps, and $204,000,000 for the Air Corps. This bill carried $698,000,000 for the United States Maritime Commission in furtherance of a program which embraces the ultimate construction of more than 1,200 vessels. Within the next few months it is expected that cargo vessels will be completed at the rate of 1 per day. This measure also carried $35,000,000 for the construction of a new War Department building on the Virginia side of the Potomac River. Objection developed to this item. The committee in charge of the bill withdrew further consideration until Monday. These are the highlights of the legislative week and embrace authorizations and expenditures exceeding seven and one-quarter billion dollars. The President's message was followed by the introduction of a bill for a congressional declaration of an emergency under which draftees might be kept in service for more than a year. The floor fight on that measure will probably begin on the fourth day of August.

THE SOVIET JOINS UP

In normal times, it is not customary for foreign embassies and legations to inform Congress of what is happening in their countries. Their functions are essentially diplomatic and commercial, and contacts are made through the State Department. But the war has changed all that. Believing that the Congress and the country should be informed of what was taking place overseas, first one country and then another began to publish and supply a digest of information. First came the Nazis with what was known as the German Library of Information. Then came Poland and Czechoslovakia with bulletins. Later came Norway and China. Latest addition to the bulletins which now appear regularly is that of the Soviet. It is issued by the Soviet Embassy in multigraphed form about 10 pages in length and contains a variety of treatises. Included in the list of articles are those on Parachutists and Glider Pilots in the U. S. S. R., Bulgaria Under Germany's Heel, Soviet People Praise Stalin's Appointment as People's Commissar of National Defense, together with recent war communiques.

THE ILLINI COUNTRY

The State of Illinois has enjoyed membership in the sisterhood of the United States for 123 years. In 1820, but 2 years after admission to the Union its population was but 55,211, substantially one-half the population of the city of Peoria. Today its official population, by the census of 1940, is 7,897,241. From 1810 to 1820 the population increased by 349 percent. In the following decade it increased by 185 percent. From 1830 to 1840 it was 202 percent. From 1840 to 1850 the increase dropped to 78 percent but turned up to 101 percent between 1850 and 1860. Thereafter, with but one exception, there has been a steady decline in the rate of increase in population and in the last 10 years amounted to but 3.5 percent. Deaths, lowering birthrate, and departures account for this gradual decline in the rate of population increase. In 1820 Illinois had but 3 cities. Today it has 208. Perhaps the most interesting trend in Illinois population is the continuing increase in the number of people who reside in cities and the declining percentage of those who reside in rural areas. Just 100 years ago, only 2 out of every 100 persons in Illinois resided in the cities. The other 98 were classified as rural. From that time on, the gravitation toward urban life has continued until in 1940, 74 out of every 100 people reside in the cities and but 26 in the rural areas. This trend has great industrial and economic significance.

CHANGE BEGETS CHANGE

Suppose you operated a distillery? Suppose you place a barrel containing 49 gallons of spirits in a warehouse and left it for 4 years? Suppose at the end of 4 years, the barrel contained but 42 gallons? Suppose the Government made you pay internal-revenue taxes on the number of gallons which were originally placed in the barrel? You would then be paying tax on 7 gallons of spirits which you did not have and could not sell. Believe it or not, as brother Ripley would say, that's exactly what happens. Through evaporation and outage, the number of gallons of spirits in a barrel diminishes with the years. Sixty years ago, Congress took cognizance of this fact and established by law what is known as the Carlisle allowance—named after Congressman John G. Carlisle, of Kentucky—which permitted distillers a credit of 7½ gallons for loss over a period of 3 years. This loss allowance has been gradually increased until it now amounts to an allowance of 13 gallons per barrel on spirits stored for 80 months and 13½ gallons for any period over 80 months in warehouse. This formula has been in existence for many years, but conditions change and there is now a demand to change the formula because it is estimated to cost distillers $6,000,000 a year in losses in excess of those for which allowance is made. Today, barrels used in the distilling industry are larger and have a longer stave. Hence losses are greater. The white oak staves in use today are more porous than those of two generations ago. This increases loss. Years ago, barrels were made by hand and the staves were "rived" by hand which partially sealed them. Today, barrels are machine made. This is another loss factor. Finally, spirits are stored in heated warehouses today which increases evaporation. The distilling industry is asking Congress to relieve it of the burden of internal-revenue taxes on spirits which they do not have because they have gone with the wind.

Proposed Separate Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 28, 1941

GALLUP POLL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a preliminary Gallup Poll on the subject of whether or not there should be a separate air force for the defense of this country.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 26, 1941]

THE GALLUP POLL

MAJORITY IN WHO'S WHO SURVEY APPROVE SEPARATE AIR FORCE; 27 PERCENT ARE UNDECIDED

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., July 25.—Whether America should have an independent Air Corps headed by a separate Cabinet department, or

continue with Army and Navy air sections as at present, remains a subject of debate in official Washington and in the American press.

While the general public has yet to hear all the arguments pro and con, the opinion of at lease one relatively well-informed group of citizens has apparently been thrown on the side of a separate Air Corps. A survey of representative groups of men and women listed in Who's Who in America, familiar red book of American achievement in many fields, shows those with opinions about 2 to 1 in favor of a new air establishment.

Twenty-seven percent are undecided

Educators, scientists, engineers, businessmen, political leaders, and others in Who's Who were asked:

"A bill has been introduced in Congress to provide for a separate national air force under a Secretary of Military Aviation. Do you think Congress should pass this bill?"

The answers of those in the cross section were:

	Percent
Favor separate air force	49
Oppose separate air force	24
Undecided	27

Daylight Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHENANGO (N. Y.) TELEGRAPH

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chenango (N. Y.) Telegraph:

[From the Cenango (N. Y.) Telegraph]

LET THE SUN MOVE

"* * * and he said in the sight of Israel, sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, moon, in the valley of Ajalon." Thus spake Joshua. "And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies."

It was on that day the Amorites were delivered up before the children of Israel. Perhaps this is a portentous moment in which history is repeating itself, for Franklin D. Roosevelt asks the power of Congress to command the sun to stand still so that our enemies can be delivered up before him.

The President, in the daylight-saving-time bill, seeks the means to establish the time wherever he chooses because of the need for conserving electric power. While we, too, believe that the Nation's resources should be turned all out to the war effort, nevertheless it is significant that power shortages are possible only in a few isolated sections of the country and it is doubtful if moving the clock hands would effect any appreciable savings.

Furthermore, localities where power is at a premium could themselves adopt time which would serve best.

The President and the Congress, in our opinion, have more important matters for consideration.

United States Aid to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D. WINTER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH OF OHIO

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of my colleague, Hon. FREDERICK C. SMITH of Ohio, delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System Wednesday evening, July 23, entitled "United States Aid to Russia":

Fellow Americans, the President has announced it to be the policy of our Government to give aid to Russia in her war against Germany Supplies for Stalin are doubtless already on their way to Russia. We are told that a request will soon be made to Congress for additional billions in appropriations for the lend-lease program, much of which is to be used for aid to the Soviet Union.

Americans have been told that in our aid to England we have been promoting certain ideals, the establishment of the four freedoms, etc. Just how now can we square those ideals with the ruthless policies of the red Stalin? Should Russia, with the aid of England and America, be able to defeat the despised Hitler, what should we expect Stalin to demand at the peace table?

How, indeed, shall America enforce the four freedoms on communistic Russia?

Much as we may desire the destruction of Hitlerism, we as free Americans cannot afford to pay the price in money and blood to strengthen and enhance the power of communistic Russia.

We, who have been and are opposed to the United States entering the European war, have consistently claimed the war was not being fought for idealism, but was in fact a continuation of the age-old hatreds and struggles for power which have kept Europe embroiled in wars for centuries.

America has no place in such a war, and could contribute nothing toward a permanent peace, should she enter it, as was abundantly proven by our entry into the World War. If any proof of our position were needed, surely this struggle between Hitler and Stalin should be sufficient. Certainly no one will contend that either Stalin or Hitler are fighting for idealism, or the four freedoms of which we have heard so much.

Assuredly the new line-up of forces in Europe should give America cause to carefully consider the implications and the likely consequences to our Nation of joining up with Stalin in this war.

I consider any alliance between our country and Russia as an act of the utmost gravity and fraught with the most dire consequences to our Nation. There is no doubt that any union between ourselves and Russia will operate strongly to encourage the further development of communism in this country. It will, I fear, do much more than this.

The association of our people with Russians in a war must have the effect of disarming the opposition which our people have been developing against communism. We cannot become partners in war with Red Russia without in some degree condoning communism.

What, for example, about the work of the Dies committee? Of what value will it be to us now? Will not all the good it has done in exposing the subversive forces which are imposing their vicious schemes upon our country be wiped out by this joining up of our Nation on the side of Stalin? Will not such an act in a large measure give immunity to the foreign agents serving Russia in the cause of communism in our country?

Certainly the communistic elements which swarm in high and low places in our Government need no longer fear this committee.

Note the effect this new alinement of ours has already had upon the leading communistic elements in our country. Before Russia and Germany engaged in this war against each other, and before the President made his promise of aid to Russia, those Communists vehemently protested that the war was imperialistic and that the United States should stay out of it.

Immediately following hostilities between Hitler and Stalin, and the President's promise of aid to Russia, these leading Communists immediately crawled in bed with the war group of this country who are doing everything possible to catapult us into the war.

According to newspaper reports, Robert Minor (who is perhaps as red as Earl Browder, whose place he is filling while the latter is in prison) said it was the sacred duty of the American workers to produce every article of war at the greatest possible speed for war on all fronts against Hitler.

Harry Bridges, west-coast red, told the Maritime Union at its convention in Cleveland recently that he favored helping anybody, even Tory England, if it meant helping Russia to defeat Germany. Overnight the Daily Worker, leading Communist paper, switched from its position of opposing our entrance into the war, to support of the war policy.

My fellow Americans, I ask you, are these communistic forces interested in what is best for America, or do they serve Red Russia?

Are these Communists interested in preserving our way of life, and our form of Government, or do they seek only to strengthen communism, not only in Russia, but in our own land as well?

Do they seek to build America strong for her own defense, or are they using this opportunity to weaken and destroy that which we as Americans cherish and love? The answer is all too obvious to leave any doubt.

Communism is seeking to destroy everything that opposes communism throughout the world.

What a boon, also, this alliance with communistic Russia will be to the political planners in Washington, who have drawn so much of their inspiration from the Moscowinian philosophy of nihilism.

It is when we reflect upon how well the ground is prepared in our own country for the spread and growth of communism, and the extent to which it has already infiltrated itself into our institutions and Government that we realize the dangers of this unholy alliance with Red Russia.

If our people in general only knew what this subversive cult really is, and how strongly it has already entrenched itself in our country, they would be more able, and more concerned, to protect themselves against its further spread.

I believe nothing is needed so much in this country as a true understanding of what really constitutes communism. The usual definitions of communism were formulated at a time when little or nothing was known of the real operation of this cult. Now, however, we have before us the grand experiment of communism. For nearly 25 years Russia has been operating under this political scheme, on a scale, and in a way, that leaves no doubt of what communism really is, not in theory but in action.

So if we wish to know what communism really is and what it does to the lives of the

people, individually and collectively, how it affects their institutions and way of life, all we need to do is look at Russia.

One can now see in Russia what really happens where communism is in complete control, the starvation and massacre of millions of people; millions more confined in concentration camps; the ruthless tearing from their hearths of members of families and banishment to distant places, possibly to perish from cold and want; the destruction of all labor rights, and the institution of conscript labor; the wholesale murder of the clergy and destruction of churches.

In short, communism in Russia reduced a hundred and sixty million people to an indescribable state of barbarism.

At the same time that we note what Russia is and has done, it may help us to understand better where we are headed for by making a few comparisons.

The Bolsheviks in Russia confiscated all the people's gold and silver money and forced them to use print currency.

Our Government also confiscated all our gold money and forced us to use print currency.

Communism in Russia nationalized all the banks.

Our Government also is now well on its way to complete ownership and control of all banks.

The Communist government in Russia fixes by decree all prices and wages.

Government price fixing also is developing rapidly in this country and threatens now to include wages.

In Russia all homes are owned by the Government.

The United States Housing Authority now has a plan under way which, if continued also will lead to complete Government ownership of all homes.

Communism in Russia operates through a gigantic bureaucracy. Is it not true our Government has developed also into a gigantic and all-powerful bureaucracy?

Thus it is seen that the foundation has already been well laid in the United States for the full development of communism.

A dangerous fallacy prevails among our people that communism establishes itself by the violent overthrow of government. This was largely true of Russia, but in our country the principal means by which communism has entrenched itself is by deception, by concealing its true aims, Government control and regulation, under the cloak of the public good.

We see in the 49-cent wheat penalty a perfect example of how this deception operates. Certain farmers are penalized, not for wheat they might plant in the future, but for wheat which they had planted a year ago and were already harvesting.

By a long series of receptive pieces of legislation and false propaganda the farmers, and a good part of Congress, have been blinded to the real purpose of the political planners of the triple-A farm program.

Always they claimed this program would be voluntary—never compulsory. Now, when they have succeeded in getting sufficient power, they come out into the open and reveal it to us that their real aim always has been to make the farm program compulsory for all farmers.

By the most cunning and sinister scheming they succeeded in setting up what, in my opinion, history will designate as one of the worst injustices and frauds that ever was perpetrated upon any people, namely, the so-called wheat-marketing-quota referendum. This scheme was so devised by the political planners as to make certain its passage; in fact, they could almost count the votes before they were cast. Less than 1 in 6 farmers in the United States were permitted to vote. Only 7 percent of the farmers of the United States voted for the so-called quotas.

The laws that set the referendum up were so cunningly framed that if the marketing quota carried the farmers who had signed up with the triple A would receive high Government loans on their wheat, but if the referendum failed they would receive no Government loans on their wheat.

Here was a strong inducement to the few farmers who were allowed to vote to cast their ballots for the marketing quota. At the same time this set-up acted as a powerful threat that they would be punished if they voted the wheat-marketing quota down.

Thus were the few farmers who voted "yes" in the referendum completely deceived and tricked into voting the 49-cent penalty onto their own neighbors and friends and making compulsory for all farmers the triple A farm program. If this penalty is allowed to stand it will strongly tend toward totalitarian regimentation of all farmers.

Nearly every segment of our economy is now infested with communistic elements which are undermining it. It is, as stated, only when we realize how far this subversive cult has already insinuated itself into our whole scheme of life that we can appreciate the danger of tying ourselves up in a war with Communist Russia.

Communism is a real threat to America today. Our entrance into the war would greatly increase that danger.

America now has no business trying to straighten out the world. We have all we can possibly do to prevent our own self-destruction.

As true Americans our first duty is to preserve our own country, our freedom, our Constitution, and our form of government. Let us defend America not only from aggressors from without but from those forces within our borders that insidiously seek her destruction. In defending communism in Russia we are defending communism in the United States. No man can serve two masters. We cannot serve both liberty and communism. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

Why Power is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial published in the New York Times, July 19, 1941.

A review of the testimony of witnesses recently appearing before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee on the question of the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project, would lead us to believe that there is a great power shortage in the United States, due to the underdevelopment of power by private utilities.

Clearly, any underdevelopment in this field is not the fault of the private utility industry which has spent over $650,000,000 a year during one 5-year period, over $700,000,000 during a subsequent period and $308,000,000 during the years of the depression for over-all construction. I have no connection whatever with the power utility companies, but I believe that they are unjustly branded by the fair-haired boys of this administration in order to cover up their own mistakes and unjustifiable practices. Under the guise of national defense they are straining every effort to put through another T. V. A. in the northeastern section of this country by developing the St. Lawrence water power by claiming a shortage of power for defense industries.

I believe that investigation will clearly vindicate the private concerns who have been struggling under the yoke of tax policies, rate policies, Federally financed and subsidized competition. This article very clearly states my views on the subject, and I therefore take the privilege of inserting it in the RECORD so that my colleagues may also have the benefit of its clear analysis.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times of July 19, 1941]

WHY POWER IS NEEDED

Through the Federal Power Commission the Government has announded an electric-power expansion program involving the expenditure of perhaps $470,000,000 annually for the duration of the defense emergency. This is to be paid for in part out of Federal funds supplied by the R. F. C., though it is expected that the steam plants in the main will be financed by private intertests, while the Government will supply the funds directly for the hydroelectric expansion.

There can be no doubt that the size of our defense program is limited by the extent of our electric-power facilities. But the policies of the administration must bear a heavy share of the responsibility for whatever power shortage now exists. In many ways—through tax policies, rate policies, federally financed and subsidized competition, the policies of the Securities and Exchange Commission—the administration has profoundly discouraged private investment in and expansion of the electric-power facilities of public utilities. The "death sentence" law applying to public-utility holding companies was drawn not in a judicial and constructive but in a punitive and vindictive spirit. The inevitable effect was to undermine the confidence both of public-utility managements and of investors and to lead to a drying up in the flow of capital into private utilities.

In the 5 years from 1921 to 1925, inclusive, the private utility industry spent an average of $659,000,000 a year for over-all construction purposes (steam plants, hydro plants, transmission, and distribution lines, etc.). In the 7 years from 1926 to 1932, inclusive, the average spent by the private utilities for this purpose was $711,000,000 a year. But in the 7 New Deal years from 1933 to 1939, inclusive, the amount spent by the private utilities for electric power expansion averaged only $308,000,000 a year. The difference cannot be set down to the depression, for the earliest period includes the depression years 1921 and 1922, and the second period the actual depression bottom of 1932.

It is significant that the falling off in private expansion of more than $400,000,000 a year in the New Deal 7-year period almost equals the $470,000,000 annual program now planned by the Government. But lost time cannot now be made up. A healthy expansion program in private utility construction in the years from 1933 to 1940 would have greatly reduced unemployment and the Government's relief burden. Today, however, the labor, materials, and time given to electric power expansion must necessarily be at the expense of some other part of the defense program. Those in charge of priorities must

decide, for example, whether we are to have fewer planes, tanks, and guns in the next 2 years, in order that we may have more big turbine generators to help us turn out more planes, tanks, and guns 2 years from now. If power expansion had been what it could and should have been, this problem would not now have arisen.

Proposed St. Lawrence Seaway in Relation to Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

STATEMENT BY THE BUREAU OF RAILWAY ECONOMICS, ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILWAYS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Commerce in a report made public by Mr. Wayne C. Taylor, Under Secretary of Commerce, released for distribution part 5 of the St. Lawrence survey entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway and Future Requirements."

It is revealed that the survey is being issued in several sections or parts, and at this time parts 3 and 7 have not been made available. These missing sections of the survey are very important, since they will contain estimates of future traffic on the project and its economic costs and benefits which should be made available to the Rivers and Harbors Committee as well as to Members of Congress before the committee hearings are concluded.

Part V of the St. Lawrence Survey ignores the defense aspects of the project despite the repeated urging of advocates of the St. Lawrence project that it is a vital arm of our national defense. The absurdity of the claim that the St. Lawrence project is necessary to our national defense is becoming increasingly evident as the searchlight of truth is focused on the many wild claims made in support of this economic monstrosity.

The views expressed in part V of the St. Lawrence Survey do not appear consistent in view of the study made by the Bureau of Railway Economics, and it is pertinent at this point to discuss the fallacious observations that we are being asked to accept in part V of the St. Lawrence Survey.

Practical railroad men whose lives have been spent in operating and expanding the railroads of our Nation are best qualified to convey the true picture of the future of the American railroad industry.

At my request the Bureau of Railway Economics of the Association of American Railroads has compiled the following information which refutes the observations of the Department of Commerce contained in part V of the St. Lawrence Survey. The article referred to is as follows:

PROPOSED ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY IN RELATION TO TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors began hearings on June 17, in the course of which to consider and formulate a report on H. R. 4927, designed to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin, for the purpose of both transportation and power.

The committee has heard many witnesses for and against the project, and the hearings are still in process. In addition, it has had submitted to it for consideration parts of a study by the United States Department of Commerce entitled "The St. Lawrence Survey." This survey, "designed to explore the economic advantages and disadvantages of the St Lawrence waterway and power project and its effects upon existing harbors," is being issued in several sections or parts. Only five parts (I, II, IV, V, and VI) have been issued to date. Thus the complete results of the survey are not yet available, and the two missing parts will contain estimates of future traffic on the project, and its economic costs and benefits. These parts (III and VII) should certainly be made available to the Rivers and Harbors Committee and to Members of Congress before the committee hearings are concluded in order that they may reach their decisions in the matter on a complete, rather than a partial, record.

Part V of the St. Lawrence Survey, which has recently been issued by the Department of Commerce, is entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway and Future Transportation Requirements." It is devoted largely to an estimate of freight traffic that will be offered to the railways for movement in the future. Having reached an estimate of the future traffic volume, part V then proceeds to consider the ability of the railroads to handle such a volume, and reaches the conclusion that they will fall down on the job. Therefore, the St. Lawrence project should be carried out in order to relieve congestion on the railroads.

Although the St. Lawrence waterway is being urged upon us today as a national-defense measure, part V largely ignores the defense aspects of the project. This is not surprising, in view of the fact that at best the project could not be made available for navigation purposes for from 4 to 8 years ahead. Within that time, the defense emergency peak will have been passed. So far as transportation is concerned—and the same is true of the power phase of the project—its importance in the national-defense program is hard to find.

The authors of part V clearly regard the St. Lawrence project as of negligible importance for national defense. In making their elaborate forecasts for the future, they start with the year 1950 and end with 1969. They pass over the intervening period between now and 1950, when rail carriers must meet the extra traffic load resulting from the defense program. That extra load, in fact, will be met this year, and in 1942 and in 1943, long before the St. Lawrence could possibly supply relief to the transportation agencies of the country. The load is being met this year, and the railroads expect to meet the load next year, and the year after, without any assistance from the St. Lawrence project.

For the longer look ahead, and it is only the longer look that is significant in the case of a waterway that will not be ready for use inside of from 4 to 8 years, the country will have not a shortage of transportation facilities, but a surplus. This fact is fully established by outstanding authorities, and is generally accepted.

Part V of the St. Lawrence survey is devoted to developing the assertion that there will be a large increase in available railroad traffic from 1950 on. The future traffic requirements for agricultural products, manufactured articles, and mineral products are examined in detail. The conclusions reached are stated briefly in table 32, on page 62, of the report. Taking the so-called medium estimates throughout, the authors of part V show that the average annual totals of tonnage originated on class I railways have been and will be as follows:

	Tons
1930–39	859,542,000
1950–59	1,099,180,000
1960–69	1,303,545,000

They point out that their annual estimate for the 1950–59 period is 28 percent greater than the actual average for 1930–39, and that their estimate for 1960–69 is 52 percent greater than the 1930–39 average. They then proceed to prove, to their own satisfaction at least, that the railroads will be unable to handle any such tonnage aggregates as those estimated by them for the future.

The estimates of future railway traffic arrived at in part V appear to be generous estimates, but they may be accepted as approximations. Any venture into the future of this country, 10 to 30 years ahead, is a highly speculative undertaking. The railroads do not contend that their traffic will not increase in the future; on the contrary, they earnestly hope that there will be growth, and that the progress will be as great as estimated in part V. We can reasonably join them in that hope. Furthermore, no one who looks to future progress in the United States would question that railroads will share in the commercial and industrial activity of the country.

Part V makes an estimate of an average annual railway tonnage of 1,099,180,000 tons in the 10-year period 1950–59. Can the railroads handle such a volume of traffic? Part V replies in the negative. The record of the railroads themselves supplies an emphatic affirmative answer. They have handled such a volume in the past, they are handling it today, and they will handle it in the future if it is offered to them.

Look at the record. The railroads surpassed this total of 1,099,180,000 tons of freight as far back as 1913, again in each of the 5 years from 1916 to 1920, and in each of the 8 years from 1923 to 1930. It was closely approached in 1937, when rail carriers originated 1,009,000,000 tons of revenue freight. It will again be surpassed this year, 1941, by from seventy-five to one hundred million tons, while indications are that it will be surpassed by even greater margins in 1942 and 1943. What the railroads accomplished 28 years ago, in 1913, they can accomplish 10 to 20 years from now, in the decade beginning 1950. If the railroads handle more than that amount of freight in 1941, 1942, and 1943, they can certainly handle it in 1950, 1951, and 1952, and later years.

Part V next estimates an average annual tonnage of 1,303,545,000 tons in the 10-year period 1960–69. If such a traffic develops, the railroads will have 10 additional years to prepare and expand their facilities for it, to whatever extent may prove necessary. But take the record as it stands. Such a traffic level as part V estimates for the 1960–69 decade has been surpassed a number of times in the past, as it was in the years 1917, 1918, 1920, 1923, and in each of the 5 years from 1925 to 1929. Present indications are that the railroads will handle more than that volume of traffic in 1942, and a still greater tonnage in 1943. What they are doing today and tomorrow, they certainly can do 20 to 30 years from now. To claim otherwise is equivalent to saying that the rail industry is incapable of expanding its equipment and motive power to meet future expansion of traffic, a claim that is challenged by the whole record of that industry, down to the present moment.

For more than a hundred years the railroads have carried the tonnage that has been

offered, and with few, if any, car shortages in recent years. It is safe to assume that they can be depended upon to meet the requirements of future years. Traffic expansion in the future will probably be relatively less than it has been in the past.

Furthermore, the recent expansion of railroad tonnage came in a few months, not over the period of a decade. Yet the railroads have carried, and are carrying, this increase without car shortages. During the first 6 months of 1941 railroad carloadings were 17.3 percent greater than in the same period of 1940 and 30 percent greater than in the same period of 1939.

As a matter of fact, the authors of part V themselves admit the elastic nature of the railway plant, particularly that part of it represented by motive power and freight-car equipment. They stated that the amount of equipment actually required to handle traffic can be quickly increased in response to increased traffic demands. Page 68 of part V carries this statement: "New cars can be purchased, locomotives can be repaired or constructed as desired." The report adds that "the way and structures of railroads as presently constituted will be assumed to be sufficient, with repairs, to handle increased traffic in the future." This is a sound assumption, based on the fact that the fixed plant of the railways can handle a much larger traffic than the present level with no great need for physical expansion.

Part V might have added that railroad equipment sufficient to handle the potential traffic assigned by it to the proposed waterway can be provided at a cost far less than that of the waterway. In addition, provision of railroad equipment is, under normal conditions, a matter of speedy accomplishment. On the other hand, part V admits (p. 1) that under normal conditions the St. Lawrence project would not be completed inside of 7 years, and further states, on page 83, that it would take some time to establish facilities and services on the waterway, if constructed, before full use could be made of the new route. The exact language used in part V is as follows:

"It is very unlikely that the seaway will accommodate its maximum additional traffic in the very first year. As new shipping facilities and services will have to be established, it will take some time before full use is made of the new route. The increase of St. Lawrence traffic to full capacity will come gradually. This has been the experience on other canals."

Again, it is admitted that the St. Lawrence as a navigation project would be closed by ice for 5 months or more each year, when it will be of no service whatever, and when the railroads will be called on for such stand-by service as may be required.

Part V discusses the St. Lawrence project from the standpoint of the railroads as a national group, and does not relate its findings to the special problem in the area to be served by the project. Such a study should consider the waterway in connection with those particular railroads with which it will compete. If the waterway is to be constructed to relieve the railroads of traffic which which they must purchase additional equipment to handle, surely the roads most concerned would be those in the St. Lawrence area. Furthermore, a detailing of the commodities that might be expected to move on the St. Lawrence waterway would have been enlightening, and would have made the findings more useful.

It would appear that the fears entertained by the authors of part V, with respect to the inability of rail carriers to meet the traffic demands over a period of 10 to 30 years ahead, are wholly groundless.

The authors of part V contradict themselves in one important respect. They magnify the extent to which the St. Lawrence waterway, if constructed, would relieve the railroads of a traffic load that they contend will be too great for them, while at the same time they minimize the importance of the St. Lawrence traffic in its relation to total railroad traffic. They say that 10,000,000 tons per year is the maximum amount of American commerce that will use the project. This is in fact a negligible proportion of total railroad traffic, and the relief the project will afford the railroads will also be negligible.

This seems to be tacitly recognized in part V. The negligible character of the anticipated St. Lawrence traffic is emphasized over and over again. For example, the report at page 4 says:

"The St. Lawrence seaway will accommodate a small part of the increased demand for transportation."

Again, on page 8, the report minifies the importance of the St. Lawrence traffic, in the following language:

"In face of these magnitudes it is plain that the additional American traffic of 10,000,000 tons that may use the St. Lawrence seaway at its maximum utilization recedes into insignificance. A glance at the Interstate Commerce Commission statistics will show that the annual fluctuations of traffic on American railroads are many times this amount.

"Under these circumstances, the additional traffic that will utilize the St. Lawrence seaway will be a slight, almost unnoticeable, recession from the large increases in traffic which the railroads can confidently anticipate."

And again, in closing the summary of part V on page 9, the author says:

"The St. Lawrence seaway will do no more than assist in carrying a small part of the greatly increased load in the future for which the railroads are not yet equipped."

These statements are more an argument against the waterway than an argument for it. If the tonnage to be diverted from the rails is so trivial in amount, certainly the Government under present defense conditions, where every dollar is vital, cannot afford to spend this large sum of money for a project which accomplishes so little.

However, the railways would lose more, by reason of the construction of the project, than the 10,000,000 tons that would be diverted to the St. Lawrence. That loss alone would cost them close to $60,000,000 in freight revenue, of which more than $25,000,000 would be taken out of the pay roll of American railway labor. In addition, the National Coal Association has estimated that the power and transportation phases of the project would mean a loss to the coal industry of perhaps 40,000,000 tons of coal output per year, or even more. This loss to them would also be a loss to the railroads in freight revenue from hauling coal of at least $90,000,000 per year.

While the total loss to the railway industry cannot be computed with exactness, it would be at least $150,000,000 of freight revenue per year, of which railway labor would contribute more than $65,000,000 per year. This represents the jobs of more than 35,000 workers.

American labor would lose, American producers of coal and other materials purchased by the railroads would lose, the railways would pay smaller taxes to the Government and would have less net for themselves. The chief beneficiaries would be foreign operators of merchant ships. No transportation benefit would accrue, so why spend hundreds of millions of dollars at this time on so doubtful an enterprise?

Furthermore, to carry out the project now would funnel off needed funds, material, and manpower into activities that cannot be useful for several years ahead, while the immediate and crying needs of the defense program are to that extent unsatisfied.

It will be seen from this brief review that the author of this report has not taken the trouble to examine the statistics indicating the amount of traffic handled by the railroads through the years. The whole argument falls to the ground when consideration is given to the fact that the large amount of traffic predicted for the railroads is not large at all, considered in the light of what the railroads have accomplished and what they will easily be able to accomplish.

Then again, no action should be taken by Congress based upon the theory that the railroads should not be allowed to expand and increase their activities as essential agencies of transportation and important employers of labor. What reason can be given for saying that the railroads should be deprived of $150,000,000 of revenue per year, which will deprive 35,000 workers of employment, in the interest of a project which will be of benefit only to foreign shipping and which will be so serious a detriment to American interests?

Famed Speech of Chief Seattle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

ARTICLE FROM SEATTLE (WASH.) STAR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the famous address of Chief Seattle, commemorating the signing of a treaty with the Indians, which was printed in the Seattle Star of June 21, 1941:

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Star of July 21, 1941]

HERE'S FAMED SPEECH MADE BY CHIEF SEATTLE

(By Chief Seattle)

Yonder sky that has wept tears of compassion upon my people for centuries untold, and which to us appears changeless and eternal, may change. Today is fair. Tomorrow it may be overcast with clouds. My words are like the stars that never change.

Whatever Seattle says the great chief at Washington can rely upon with as much certainty as he can upon the return of the sun or the seasons. The white chief says that big chief at Washington sends us greetings of friendship and good will. This is kind of him for we know he has little need of our friendship in return. His people are many. They are like the grass that covers vast prairies. My people are few. They resemble the scattering trees of a storm-swept plain. The great, and I presume—good white chief sends us word that he wishes to buy our lands but is willing to allow us enough to live comfortably. This indeed appears just, even generous, for the red man no longer has rights that he need respect, and the offer may be wise also, as we are no longer in need of an extensive country.

ONCE-COVERED LAND

There was a time when our people covered the land as the waves of a wind-ruffled sea cover its shell-paved floor, but that time long

since passed away with the greatness of tribes that are now but a mournful memory. I will not dwell on, nor mourn over, our untimely decay, nor reproach my paleface brothers with hastening it, as we, too, may have been somewhat to blame.

Youth is impulsive. When our young men grow angry at some real or imaginary wrong, and disfigure their faces with black paint, it denotes that their hearts are black, and that they are often cruel and relentless, and our old men and old women are unable to restrain them. Thus it has ever been. Thus it was when the white man first began to push our forefathers further westward. But let us hope that the hostilities between us may never return. We would have everything to lose and nothing to gain. Revenge by young men is considered gain, even at the cost of their own lives, but old men who stay at home in times of war, and mothers who have sons to lose, know better.

DIFFERENT GODS

Our good father at Washington—for I presume he is now our father as well as yours, since King George has moved his boundaries farther north—our great and good father, I say, sends us word that if we do as he desires he will protect us. His brave warriors will be to us a bristling wall of strength, and his wonderful ships of war will fill our harbors so that our ancient enemies far to the northward—the Hydas and Tsimpsians, will cease to frighten our women, children, and old men. Then in reality will he be our father and we his children. But can that ever be? Your God is not our God. Your God loves your people and hates mine. He folds his strong protecting arms lovingly about the paleface and leads him by the hand as a father leads his infant son—but He has forsaken His red children—if they really are His Our God, the Great Spirit, seems also to have forsaken us. Your God makes your people wax strong every day. Soon they will fill all the land. Our people are ebbing away like a rapidly receding tide that will never return. The white man's God cannot love our people or He would protect them. They seem to be orphans who can look nowhere for help. How then can we be brothers?

TWO RACES

How can your God become our God and renew our prosperity and awaken in us dreams of returning greatness? If we have a common Heavenly Father, He must be partial, for He came to His paleface children. We never saw him. He gave you laws, but had no word for his red children, whose teeming multitudes once filled this vast continent as stars fill the firmament. No; we are two distinct races with separate origins and separate destinies. There is little in common between us.

To us the ashes of our ancestors are sacred and their resting place is hallowed ground. You wander far from the graves of your ancestors and seemingly without regret. Your religion was written upon tables of stone by the iron finger of your God so that you could not forget. The red man could never comprehend nor remember it. Our religion is the traditions of our ancesors—the dreams of our old men, given them in the solemn hours of night by the Great Spirit; and the visions of our sachems, and is written in the hearts of our people.

Your dead cease to love you and the land of their nativity as soon as they pass the portals of the tomb and wander way beyond the stars. They are soon forgotten, and never return. Our dead never forget the beautiful world that gave them being. They still love its verdant valleys, its murmuring rivers, its magnificent mountains, sequestered vales and verdant-lined lakes and bays, and ever yearn in tender, fond affection over the lonely hearted living, and often return from the happy hunting ground to visit, guide, console, and comfort them.

Day and night cannot dwell together. The red man has ever fled the approach of the white man, as the morning mist flees before the morning sun.

However, your proposition seems fair and I think my people will accept it and will retire to the reservation you offer them. Then we will dwell apart in peace, for the words of the great white chief seem to be the words of nature speaking to my people out of dense darkness.

It matters little where we pass the remnant of our days. They will not be many. The Indians' night promises to be dark. Not a single star of hope hovers above his horizon. Sad-voiced winds moan in the distance. Grim fate seems to be on the red man's trail, and wherever he goes he will hear the approaching footsteps of his fell destroyer and prepare stolidly to meet his doom, as does the wounded doe that hears the approaching footsteps of the hunter.

ALL WILL BE GONE

A few more moons. A few more winters—and not one of the descendants of the mighty hosts that once moved over this broad land or lived in happy homes, protected by the Great Spirit, will remain to mourn over the graves of a people—once more powerful and hopeful than yours. But why should I mourn at the untimely fate of my people? Tribe follows tribe, and nation follows nation, like the waves of the sea. It is the order of nature, and regret is useless. Your time of decay may be distant, but it will surely come, for even the white man whose God walked and talked with him as friend with friend, cannot be exempt from the common destiny. We may be brothers after all. We will see.

We will ponder your proposition and when we decide we will let you know. But should we accept it, I here and now make this condition that we will not be denied the privilege without molestation of visiting at any time the tombs of our ancestors, friends, and children. Every part of this soil is sacred in the estimation of my people. Every hillside, every valley, every plain and grove has been hallowed by some sad or happy event in days long vanished.

EVEN ROCKS REMEMBER

Even the rocks, which seem to be dumb and dead as they swelter in the sun along the silent shore, thrill with memories of stirring events connected with the lives of my people, and the very dust upon which you now stand responds more lovingly to their footsteps than to yours, because it is rich with the blood of our ancestors and our bare feet are conscious of the sympathetic touch. Our departed braves, fond mothers, glad, happy-hearted maidens, and even the little children who lived here and rejoiced here for a brief season, will love these somber solitudes and at eventide they greet shadowy returning spirits. And when the last red men shall have perished, and the memory of my tribe shall have become a myth among the white men, these shores will swarm with the invisible dead of my tribe, and when your children's children think themselves alone in the field, the store, the shop, upon the highway, or in the silence of the pathless woods, they will not be alone. In all the earth there is no place dedicated to solitude. At night when the streets of your cities and villages are silent and you think them deserted, they will throng with the returning hosts that once filled them and still love this beautiful land. The white man will never be alone.

Let him be just and deal kindly with my people, for the dead are not powerless. Dead, did I say? There is no death, only a change of worlds.

United States Must Stand United in Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE BOSTON TRAVELER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Traveler of July 19, 1941:

UNITED STATES MUST STAND UNITED IN PERIL—MUST GUARD AGAINST REPEATING ALMOST FATAL CIVIL WAR DISUNITY

(By George Farnum, Boston lawyer and former Assistant Attorney General of the United States)

We are at war—to all intents and purposes. It is true we are not actually shooting at an enemy, but we have decisively taken sides in the great conflict. We are acting in the vital role of "the arsenal of democracy." Military supplies and equipment are moving to Britain in ever-increasing volume. We are supplementing her merchant marine. Our citizens have enlisted in her fighting forces and are employed in numberless civilian roles that aid and abet those who bear arms.

English war vessels are being repaired and reconditioned in our navy yards to an extent preempting much of their capacity for such work. Our fighting craft are patrolling miles of sea lanes that embrace the life lines of democracy—the shipping routes between America and Britain. We have occupied and established a far-flung strategic base on Iceland and are contemplating other equally bold steps to insure hemisphere defense. Consular relations with both Germany and Italy have been terminated, and the end of diplomatic relations may come at any time.

FORCED UPON US

To a large majority of the American people these things have been the inevitable results of circumstances forced upon us and dictated by the realistic logic of adequate national security. But whatever regrets may be indulged, whatever mistakes may have been made, the eloquent fact remains that the leadership under which this situation has come to pass was so ardently desired by the American people that, to insure it, they broke a political precedent previously regarded as sacred.

In any event, what has transpired is water over the dam. We cannot retrace our steps in this hour of peril, even in the remote event that we should wish to do so. We have crossed the Rubicon. Our commitments have been irrevocably made. If there was a time when it were other than folly to vacillate and procrastinate, that time has definitely passed. This is the hour for maximum effort by a united nation, thoroughly aroused to the dangers, grimly determined to dedicate its entire resources in men and materials to national defense, and convinced that there can be no security for democratic America if Great Britain is crushed by the brutal force of the Nazi war machine.

CONFIDENCE IN PRESIDENT

In this critical situation no man can do his country a greater injury than to undermine public confidence in the President by

reiterated and violent attacks on his purposes and policies, and by persistent efforts to impugn his motives. Blinded to urgent realities or lukewarm to basic loyalties is that man who in this hour of peril abuses the privileges of free speech, whether in the halls of Congress, on the radio, or in the press, to deliberately play upon the fears, prejudices, and passions of the people.

Free discussion is one of our fundamental rights, guarded by constitutional guaranties. But, like all rights, it should be exercised with an intelligent understanding and responsible sense of time and occasion. History has demonstrated that the welfare of a democracy depends to a large degree on the self-discipline of the people and, in times of emergency, on their readiness to cheerfully subject themselves to self-imposed restraints.

CIVIL WAR DISUNITY

The outcome of the Civil War was put in grave jeopardy by the disunity of the North. In retrospect, and with the dispassionate judgment now possible of the issues involved, the violent feuds, turbulent dissensions and bitter recriminations of the times seem incredible—to say nothing of the martyrdom to which Abraham Lincoln was subjected throughout the years that he kept his lonely vigil on the bridge of the wracked and storm-tossed ship of state. The cost of this disunity in the prolongation of the conflict and in its losses of men and material can never be acurately computed, but it is certain that the North paid dearly for its divided councils.

Exemption of Salaries of Soldiers and Sailors From Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS A. COLLINS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to exempt the salaries of persons in the military or naval forces from the income tax. This bill contains substantially the same provisions as section 213 (b) (8) of the Revenue Act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919.

In order to strengthen the national defense under conditions which are threatening the peace and security of our country we should relieve our soldiers and sailors of all the burdens which it is possible to remove. All citizens are under obligation to do their parts. So far as possible the burdens should be equitably divided. However, those men who leave their businesses, their homes, and their dear ones, those who face the dangers and make the greater sacrifices which will be required, give far beyond that which is contributed by those who remain at home. Furthermore, these men do not share in the increased earnings of the rest of the people of the country and likewise their buying capacity is lessened because of higher prices they must pay for articles they have to buy.

The soldier should feel that he is serving a government which appreciates his services. He should feel that the people at home recognize the great service he is rendering and that they are grateful for it. After we have done all we can we still owe him a debt of gratitude.

Therefore, as one means of building up the morale and courage of our defending forces and of expressing our appreciation of their services and patriotism I propose that we relieve them of the income tax.

Resolutions of the American Legion of New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT STATE CONVENTION

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, during the State convention of the American Legion in New Mexico, members of the Civilian Conservation Corps failed to pay respect to the flag of our country as it passed by them during the parade.

Members of the American Legion of New Mexico were properly upset and disturbed by the situation, feeling that it could only be due to a lack of training or the result of ignorance as to the regulations and practices automatically observed by citizens of this country.

Further, the Legion feels that there is a flag code designated to govern respect for and use of the flag. This code the American Legion heartily endorses as do all citizens of our land generally.

It is my feeling that the American Legion is continuing to serve America well when it calls attention to the flag code, and when it urges the adoption of appropriate legislation governing the civilian use of the flag as outlined in that flag code. It is my hope that the officers of the Civilian Conservation Corps will take recognition of the incident at the convention in Ruidoso, N. Mex., and will make sure that the persons in charge of their camps do not fail to insist upon the strictest observance of the respect due to the emblem of this country. Further, it is my hope that the Congress of the United States may at this particular time pass appropriate legislation to guard against the improper use of the flag of the United States, and to make sure that the treatment of the flag is not left to chance.

I desire to include certain appropriate resolutions adopted in convention by the American Legion, two of them dealing with the flag and proper respect for it, and a third, touching the problem of German sailors now interned in New Mexico and permitted to roam at large in their internment camp.

Whereas yesterday, June 19, 1941, during the parade of the National Colors by the United States Army, the American Legion and its auxiliary, and the Boy Scouts of America, employees of the Civilian Conservation Corps failed, neglected, and refused to pay respect to the flag of our country; and

Whereas we believe such disrespect was due to disinterest, lack of training, and discipline; and

Whereas we believe that of all persons who should respect, honor, and revere the flag of our country are those who are the recipients of the Nation's bounty, in excess of those of equal rank, who are presently in the armed forces of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of New Mexico, in convention assembled in Ruidoso, N. Mex., That we condemn and deplore the obvious laxity, ignorance, indifference, and lack of instruction prevalent in the Civilian Conservation Corps regulations and practices; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Corps Commander at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., Area Commander at Fort Bliss, Tex., to the New Mexico congressional delegation in Congress, and to the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps at Washington, D. C.

DONOVAN N. HOOVER,
Department Commander.

Attest:

H. W. NEELY,
Department Adjutant.

Whereas the Federal Government has seen fit to quarter in New Mexico an appreciable number of interned German nationals; and

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the officers of the American Legion, Department of New Mexico, that notwithstanding the most recent difficulties in the relations between the German Government and the Government of the United States of America, that such interned German nationals are presently permitted to roam at large in and about their internment camp: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of New Mexico, in its twenty-second annual department convention, now assembled in Ruidoso, N. Mex., That the officers of the department be, and they hereby are, directed to request the New Mexico congressional delegation to make appropriate representations to the responsible authorities in Washington for closer supervision and control of said interned German nationals; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly certified, be enclosed with such representations, addressed to the Honorable CARL A. HATCH and DENNIS CHAVEZ United States Senators, and Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DONOVAN N. HOOVER,
Department Commander.

Attest:

H. W. NEELY,
Department Adjutant.

Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that all people living within its boundaries shall have the right of free speech, freedom of the press and the permission to worship their God in any manner they see fit; and

Whereas a large number of groups who do not have the welfare of the United States at heart, and are taking advantage of their privileges of citizenship; and

Whereas some of these groups are carrying on and abusing some of the privileges permitted in this country, especially in relation to the flag of our Nation; and

Whereas in the United States there is a flag code designated to govern respect for and the use of the flag, which code the American Legion heartily endorses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the American Legion, Department of New Mexico, in convention assembled at Ruidoso, N. Mex., That the Congress of the United States be urged to adopt appropriate legislation, governing the civilian use

of the flag, as outlined in the flag code, and provide penalties for the improper use of the flag of these United States.

DONOVAN N. HOOVER,
Department Commander.

Attest:

H. W. NEELY,
Department Adjutant.

Beware of Foot-and-Mouth Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, as pointed out in the preface to Farmers' Bulletin No. 666 issued by the Department of Agriculture, the "foot-and-mouth disease is one of the most universal diseases of cattle as well as one of the most difficult to suppress." It is a disease which takes its toll not only among cattle, but it strikes at other farm animals as well. That it is difficult to eradicate once it has taken root is attested to by the fact that "in most European countries the disease has gained such a foothold that it has probably become a permanent infection."

At the present time this dread disease does not exist in our country, but in years past it has been a costly evil. In the bulletin already quoted it is stated that—

the United States has suffered nine foot-and-mouth visitations, ranging in date from 1870 to 1929. Fortunately, after persistent efforts by the Government, the States, local authorities, and individual stockmen, each outbreak was entirely stamped out.

It is, therefore, a threatening evil at all times, and alert attention should be paid to the timely warning of Dr. H. A. Seidell, chief of the division of animal industry in my State, as emphasized in the following letter:

STATE OF IOWA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Des Moines, July 22, 1941.

HON. HENRY O. TALLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: House file 5032, if enacted, would give authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to lift the sanitary embargo on chilled and frozen meat carcasses from countries where foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest exist. The recent ruling of the Attorney General admitting frozen mutton and lamb carcasses from Tierra del Fuego perils the livestock industry and the human health of our country.

Congress should enact legislation that will protect this Nation from the disastrous condition that would result from the lifting of this embargo which is our only defense against the introduction of these two most dreaded diseases, namely, rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease. The latter is the most dreaded of all livestock diseases and affects all cloven-hoof food-producing animals as well as others.

The virus or germs of these diseases are not affected by freezing and can be carried on shoes, clothing, or by poultry, birds, dogs, etc., that have been in the immediate vicinity of the infected animals. Furthermore this virus is carried in the lean or muscular tissues, the bony structures, the internal organs, the hide, etc., of the diseased animals. Science has proven that this virus or germ will live in frozen carcasses for a period of 9 months or longer.

At the present time the United States and Canada are the only countries free of rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease. During the winter of 1914 and 1915, we had quite a severe outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Iowa and some of the other States which cost the States millions of dollars to destroy all animals on the infected farms.

If it is necessary for us to import meat products from the foreign countries where these diseases exist, they should be in a canned form where the meat has been properly cooked as that is the only sure means of destroying the organisms that cause these diseases.

Thanking you for any consideration you will give us on this measure, I am,

Very truly yours,

H. A. SEIDELL,
Chief, Division of Animal Industry.

Mr. Speaker, farming involves many risks and hazards. Some of the risks such as droughts and windstorms cannot be controlled. But experience over a long period of years has proved that the foot-and-mouth disease can be eradicated, although the remedy is a costly one. It is saner and cheaper to prevent it from taking root. The old adage that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" was never more fully applicable than in a matter of this character. Let us beware of the foot-and-mouth disease.

The events leading up to the danger which now confronts the livestock industry in the United States, as pointed out in the preceding remarks, may be summarized in chronological order, as follows:

First. Section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 reads as follows:

(a) Rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease: If the Secretary of Agriculture determines that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exist in any foreign country, he shall officially notify the Secretary of the Treasury and give public notice thereof, and thereafter, and until the Secretary of Agriculture gives notice in a similar manner that such disease no longer exists in such foreign country, the importation into the United States of cattle, sheep, or other domestic ruminants, or swine, or of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, or pork from such foreign country is prohibited.

Second. The foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent in Argentina, hence, the importation of the above-listed products from that country is prohibited.

Third. In 1935 the State Department negotiated a treaty with Argentina which, if ratified, would have modified section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930; article III of that treaty proposed to "zone" Argentina and to permit the importation of animal and plant products from the zones which were free from diseases and insect pests. Our livestock industry, naturally, objected to the zoning proposal for the practical reasons that (a) there is no way in which the United States could govern the transportation of these products from an infested to a noninfested area in a foreign country; (b) nor could our country supervise the employees of a foreign government in enforcing the regulations. This treaty was sent to the Senate on June 5, 1935, and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee did not act upon the treaty and, consequently, it has never been ratified.

Fourth. It was, therefore, a startling revelation which came to light on June 26, 1941, when the following Associated Press dispatch was sent out from Buenos Aires:

Daniel Amadeo Videla, Argentina's Minister of Agriculture, announced tonight that the United States had agreed to permit importation of meat from Tierra del Fuego territory at the southernmost tip of South America.

Since it is a sheep-raising section, only fresh frozen or chilled lamb will be available for export from Tierra del Fuego. No immediate shipments were expected, since the territory's output all goes to Britain at present.

The minister termed the agreement an important step in dissolving the years-long dispute between Argentina and the United States after the latter barred importation of Argentine meat due to prevalence of hoof-and-mouth disease.

The announcement of this agreement between the United States and Argentina came as a complete surprise to the livestock industry, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the American public as well.

Fifth. Tierra del Fuego (references: Encyclopedia Brittanica and Encyclopaedia Americana) is an archipelago (group of islands) at the southern extremity of South America from which it is separated by Magellan Strait. At the First Narrows and at other points the strait is scarcely a mile wide. Politically, it is divided into two parts: (1) The western part, an area of 19,500 square miles, belongs to Chile; (2) the eastern part, an area of 8,500 square miles, belongs to Argentina and forms a territory of that republic.

Sixth. The following facts have now been revealed with reference to the secret agreement announced on June 26 from Buenos Aires:

(a) On April 10, 1941, the United States Secretary of State addressed an inquiry to the United States Secretary of Agriculture requesting an opinion from the legal division of the Department of Agriculture as to "whether Tierra del Fuego may be regarded as a country, separate from Argentina and Chile, within the meaning of section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930."

(b) On May 14 the Secretary of Agriculture referred this inquiry to the Attorney General of the United States.

(c) On May 16 the Attorney General signed an opinion to the effect that Tierra del Fuego, though a part of Argentina, was not the same foreign country within the meaning of section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 and that meat and livestock could be imported therefrom to the United States at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the Tariff Act of 1930 sought to prevent further outbreaks of the foot-and-mouth disease and has been fully successful in this objective. It is most regrettable that a questionable interpretation of the law by the Attorney

General may expose our people to this peril again.

At this point attention is called to the following comments on my remarks by Mr. George Stimpson, Washington correspondent, in the Gazette, published in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on July 27, 1941:

TALLE ATTACKS ARGENTINE IMPORTS—SAYS THEY EVADE LEGAL SAFEGUARDS AGAINST DISEASES—REASONING WHICH LED TO TIERRA DEL FUEGO PACT CALLED QUESTIONABLE BY REPRESENTATIVE

(By George Stimpson)

WASHINGTON.—Representative HENRY O. TALLE, of Decorah, Saturday declared that the State Department is circumventing a specific act of Congress forbidding the importation of meat from a foreign country in which foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent.

Under the tariff act of 1930 the importation into the United States of cattle, sheep, other domestic ruminants, hogs or fresh, chilled or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, or pork is specifically forbidden from any foreign country so long as rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease is known to exist in that country.

Up to the present day the Secretary of Agriculture has never declared under the terms of the act that foot-and-mouth disease has ceased to exist in Argentina.

But the United States Government, for obvious reasons wanted to placate Argentina as part of the good-neighbor policy and make it possible to purchase Argentine beef and other meat products.

TREATY NEGOTIATED IN 1935

So in 1935 the State Department negotiated with Argentina a sanitary treaty, one provision of which would permit the importation of animal products from disease-and-insect-pest "zones" in Argentina, notwithstanding the specific prohibition in the 1930 Tariff Act.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee proceeded to pigeonhole this sanitary treaty, and in spite of pressure from Secretary Hull has persistently refused to present it to the Senate, largely because of the objection of Senators from the Western cattle States. There are several on the Foreign Relations Committee.

Later President Roosevelt patted Argentina on the back by publicizing the fact that Argentine canned beef had been purchased for American military use.

Then, out of a clear sky, as TALLE points out, a few weeks ago the Argentine Minister of Agriculture announced that the United States had agreed to permit importation of meat from Tierra del Fuego, a territory of Argentina separated from the mainland by Magellan Strait, which in some places is only about a mile wide.

SAYS CONGRESS SURPRISED

The Argentine Minister said that only frozen or chilled lamb would be available from Tierra del Fuego, and that no immediate shipments were expected because of the British demands, but he hailed the agreement as an important step in dissolving the old dispute between the two countries over the foot-and-mouth disease. This announcement, declared TALLE, came as a complete surprise to the Congress, the livestock industry, and the public.

This, according to the Iowa Congressman, is what happened behind the scenes:

On April 10, 1941, Secretary of State Hull asked the Secretary of Agriculture for the opinion of the latter's legal department as to "whether Tierra del Fuego may be regarded as a country, separate from Argentina and Chile, within the meaning of section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930."

Secretary Wickard, apparently realizing that it was a hot potato, referred the inquiry from Hull to Attorney General Jackson, who on May 16 signed an opinion to the effect that Tierra Del Fuego, though a part of Argentina, is not the same foreign country within the meaning of the Tariff Act of 1930 and that the Secretary of Agriculture may at his discretion import meat and livestock from that area.

TALLE said it "is most regrettable that a questionable interpretation of the law by the Attorney General may expose our people to this peril again," referring to the dreaded foot-and-mouth disease, which, if it once establishes itself in a country, is difficult to eradicate.

He adduced evidence to show that the foot-and-mouth disease is one of the most universal diseases of cattle; and that it is difficult to eradicate once it takes root is attested by the fact that "in most European countries the disease has gained such a foothold that it has probably become a permanent infection."

The Iowa Congressman raises another interesting point. Since the United States has no control over internal affairs in Argentina, what is to prevent the taking of all sorts of livestock and meats from other parts of that Latin American country and sending them to Tierra Del Fuego for transshipment to the United States?

"Farming," declares TALLE, "involves many risks and hazards. Some of the risks such as droughts and windstorms cannot be controlled. But experience over a long period of years has proved that the foot-and-mouth disease can be eradicated, although the remedy is a costly one. It is saner and cheaper to prevent it from taking root. The old adage that 'an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure' was never more fully applicable than in a matter of this character."

Food for Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely and thought-provoking question propounded by the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. RICHARD P. GALE, in a recent news letter sent by him to his constituency:

When and if the war ends by an English victory, a Hitler victory, or a stalemate, will the United States be friendless, accused, in any event, by England of helping too little; by Germany of helping too much?

In propounding this question, our colleague, with his usual perspicacity, hit the nail right where the manufacturer intended.

Dinosaur Tracks in Oklahoma—Testimony of Gov. Leon C. Phillips Before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, our able and distinguished colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] told us a few minutes ago that W. P. A. workers in his State had found dinosaur tracks that are said to be a million years old.

Just what devastation that ancient quadruped wrought in his day we do not know. But I do know that we have uncovered in Oklahoma tracks of a monster more dangerous and more deadly to the prosperity of the people of that great Commonwealth than all the dinosaurs that ever roamed the jungles of prehistoric times.

I refer to the Power Trust, that gigantic octopus that sprawls over the Nation, reaches its tentacles into every home and every business establishment that uses electricity, and sucks the lifeblood from the ultimate consumers of electric lights and power.

Victor Hugo once described the octopus as one of the most baneful of all living beings. He said that it wrapped its tentacles around its helpless victims and sucked out their lifeblood, and that it was so vicious that under its sinister gaze a seed would never sprout and an egg would never burst to life.

Therefore, the octopus has been selected as a fitting emblem of the Power Trust, and its record in Oklahoma is a fair sample of its ruthless depredations.

In 1940 the people of Oklahoma used 1,164,094,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $26,462,962. Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $13,119,888, which shows an overcharge, according to those rates, of $13,343,074.

Under the Ontario rates the cost would have been $11,757,509, which shows an overcharge, according to the Ontario rates, of $14,705,453.

I know it will be charged that the Ontario system pays no taxes. I have a record of the taxes paid by the power companies in Oklahoma in 1936, and the Federal Power Commission informs me that there has been little or no change since that time. In that year all the taxes, cash contributions, and free services paid or rendered by both private and public electric utilities in Oklahoma, including both State and Federal income taxes, amounted to $3,321,576. Take

that from the overcharges according to the Ontario rates, and it still leaves a net overcharge of $11,383,877.

This equaled the value of more than 227,000 bales of cotton at 10 cents a pound—which is more than cotton sold for in Oklahoma last year. That would be more than 2,500 bales, on average, for every county in Oklahoma.

Just how the people of that State can continue to stagger under such a burden is more than I can see. They have coal, gas, oil, and water power in the State in sufficient quantities to produce all the electricity they need, and at the lowest possible rates. That power could be distributed over the State, and extended to every farm home in Oklahoma, at the T. V. A. rates or the Ontario rates without loss to legitimate investors. That would bring to the people of that proud Commonwealth a new day of happiness, contentment, and prosperity for all.

Several days ago Governor Phillips of Oklahoma came to Washington and appeared before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which I am a member, in opposition to the development of the St. Lawrence project, and I had the pleasure of cross-examining him. I am inserting here some of the questions and answers as they appear in the records of the proceedings.

EXTRACTS FROM TESTIMONY OF GOV. LEON C. PHILLIPS, OF OKLAHOMA, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS ON THURSDAY, JULY 17, 1941

Mr. RANKIN. Now, let us get back to the power situation. You say that instead of developing this St. Lawrence we should develop the power to be produced by steam in Oklahoma; is that what you say?

Governor PHILLIPS. I said that you can get closer to it or that that is necessary in national defense, within a period of a year and a half, by the development of the natural resources in Oklahoma and Texas, so that it will come within the stated reasons of an emergency defense measure.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with you that we can develop electricity in Oklahoma and distribute it anywhere in Oklahoma at T. V. A. rates, to farmers, to householders in towns and cities, to merchants and manufacturers, amortize the investment within a reasonable time, and pay a reasonable return on legitimate investments.

Governor PHILLIPS. I am talking about the minerals we need for defense.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand. I am talking about electricity.

Do you know how much electricity they use in Oklahoma a year?

Governor PHILLIPS. I do not have that total in mind; no.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, last year you used 1,164,094,000 kilowatt-hours.

Have you ever compared the rates in Oklahoma with the T. V. A. rates and Ontario rates, to see how much you are overcharged?

The overcharges in Oklahoma last year, Governor, according to the Ontario rates amounted to $14,706,453.

Now, we have a man who testified here the other day——

Governor PHILLIPS (interposing). Of course, that all depends. That is a relative proposition and depends on where we are going.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, we are just talking about the overcharge.

According to Ontario rates——

Governor PHILLIPS (interposing). I do not know who made those figures. They might be right. I say I am not prepared to go into that proposition. I did not prepare for it. I did not think it would be germane to this subject.

Mr. BEITER. The Governor is correct. It is not germane.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; it is. The gentleman from Buffalo does not think that anything is germane that is in favor of the bill.

Now, Governor, I know that they will come back and say that the difference is that the power companies pay taxes in Oklahoma.

I dug up the taxes in Oklahoma which the power companies paid for the year 1936.

Governor PHILLIPS. I will agree with you on that. We raised their taxes. I was on a commission that raised their taxes this year. They will pay. We will make them pay.

Mr. RANKIN. I find they paid $3,321,576.

Governor PHILLIPS. They will be worse than that next year, because we went into that; we raised them. They will not go down.

Mr. RANKIN. That is both public and private electric utilities. That included the taxes, cash contributions, and free services rendered, and also their State income taxes and Federal income taxes.

Governor PHILLIPS. I do not hold any brief for that bunch.

Mr. RANKIN. And that still left a net overcharge——

Governor PHILLIPS. Notwithstanding that little story I saw in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few months back.

Mr. RANKIN. That still left a net overcharge to the people of Oklahoma $11,383,877 for last year.

Governor PHILLIPS. You see, that gets to be relative. We put in $65,000,000 taxes into the Federal Government last year to help buy some of this other stuff that we are not getting back there.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; that is in the State; but I am talking about your electric utilities.

Now, do you know how much power the average householder uses in Oklahoma?

Governor PHILLIPS. I know how much I use, but I do not know about anybody else.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I will tell you. They use only 59 kilowatt-hours per month.

Governor PHILLIPS. I used more than that.

Mr. RANKIN. Where they have the T. V. A. rates, I notice here, they used 170 kilowatt-hours a month in my town, and that enabled them to use those electrical appliances necessary for the average home and the average business establishment.

This engineer who testified the other day—and he was a very brilliant gentleman—and I think that he is present in the room today—I have his statement before me, and it shows here that you could generate power with coal in New York at from 3.4 mills to 4.5 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Governor PHILLIPS. Well, of course, I went this far, Mr. RANKIN——

Mr. RANKIN. Wait a minute. In New York they have to ship in their coal.

Governor PHILLIPS. That is a good thing; we need to send it to them.

Mr. RANKIN. You have coal over a large part of Oklahoma; at least, over a large area of it.

Governor PHILLIPS. Yes; all over eastern Oklahoma.

Mr. RANKIN. You have gas all over Oklahoma?

Governor PHILLIPS. Yes; all over the State.

Mr. RANKIN. What can you buy coal for laid down at the mouth of the mine in Oklahoma?

Governor PHILLIPS. Well, there are five different grades. All of the way from 70 cents for slack to $2.50 for fancy lump.

Mr. BEITER. You have an oil pipe line from Oklahoma into my district.

Governor PHILLIPS. I beg your pardon.

Mr. BEITER. You have a pipe line running directly into my congressional district from Oklahoma.

Governor PHILLIPS. What State?

Mr. BEITER. New York.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman opposed that, did he not?

Mr. BEITER. No.

Governor PHILLIPS. It was not built by Government subsidy.

Mr. RANKIN. If you can lay this coal down—I am taking the top figures—if you can lay this coal down at $2.50 a ton, you can generate power and distribute it all over Oklahoma at or on T. V. A. rates or the Ontario rates. You can do the same thing with oil.

Governor PHILLIPS. You have got to have four or five miracles performed in the Interstate Commerce Commission before you can do that. You cannot ship coal from western Arkansas to Memphis, Tenn., as cheap as you can ship it from Pennsylvania out there.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not talking about shipping it across the State line.

Governor PHILLIPS. You cannot ship our coal up there at all.

Mr. RANKIN. You do not have to ship it. You can generate this power at the mouth of the mine and distribute it all over Oklahoma with long-distance power lines, and nothing in the world can keep you from doing it.

Governor PHILLIPS. I am for that program.

Mr. RANKIN. Nothing in the world can keep Oklahoma from being a veritable electric paradise, and yet here we find that they are struggling along under a burden of overcharges amounting to more than $11,000,000 a year after allowing for taxes.

Governor PHILLIPS. What we need to do in Oklahoma is to be permitted to grow enough cotton and corn to make a living.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. Because it takes so much of what they make to pay for the things that cheap electricity would afford them. Now then, Governor——

Governor PHILLIPS. Of course, a great deal of our State is sparsely settled and we could not have electricity out there; nobody could ever run a line out there.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, we can; we can get it to every farmer in the country.

Governor PHILLIPS. Somebody else would have to do it.

Mr. RANKIN. We are going to get it to every farm home in America, and it is not a question of the Government going into business, and it is not going to ultimately cost the Government anything; but it will add untold billions to the wealth of the Nation and untold comforts and conveniences and relieve untold drudgery to the people in Oklahoma and people on the farms everywhere.

Governor PHILLIPS. I just say that I am not in favor of doing that until we get some guns into the hands of our soldiers. We may not want to put in those lines in that light.

Mr. RANKIN. We can do that without withholding a single gun from a single soldier, a single cap, or a single article from the Army, or anything that is necessary for any soldier.

Now, Governor, you have natural gas in Oklahoma?

Governor PHILLIPS. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. In addition to your water power, you have a world of natural gas in Oklahoma.

Governor PHILLIPS. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. A large portion of that gas is going to waste, is it not?

Governor PHILLIPS. No, sir; no, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. What you call sour gas?

Governor PHILLIPS. No, sir; there is not any of it wasted in Oklahoma.

Mr. RANKIN. I see.

Governor PHILLIPS. Secretary Ickes to the contrary notwithstanding; no, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. Now, Governor, you can produce gas as cheaply in Oklahoma as they can in Louisiana, can you not?

Governor PHILLIPS. Yes, sir. Of course, that is a relative term. We have some fields that are 1,800 feet and some 6,000, and you can drill a hole in Oklahoma a thousand feet deep as cheaply as you car in Louisiana.

Mr. RANKIN. All right.

Governor PHILLIPS. And whether it is going to cost a stated number of dollars, a different number of dollars, depends upon the strata from which the oil and gas is taken.

Mr. RANKIN. But you can produce this gas just as cheaply in Oklahoma as they can in Louisiana?

Governor PHILLIPS. Yes, sir. Our boys down there are doing it.

Mr. RANKIN. In the State of Louisiana they are generating electric power—the Louisiana Power & Light Co. is—and shipping it up into Arkansas and selling it at wholesale for 2.2 mills per kilowatt-hour. That is prime power. You can do the same thing in Oklahoma, can you not, if they can?

Governor PHILLIPS. I am not familiar with that. I would not be able to state.

Mr. RANKIN. If you can produce this power with gas in Oklahoma as cheaply as the Louisiana Power & Light Co. is generating it in Louisiana and laying it down 200 miles away in Arkansas; if you can even do that, you can wipe out this $11,000,000 overcharge to the people of Oklahoma; increase the use of electricity in every home, every business establishment, increase the use of electrical appliances which go to make the homes and business establishments more profitable and more attractive, more pleasant, and more free from drudgery, and at the same time electrify every farm home in Oklahoma.

With that picture before you, do you not think that instead of opposing this power program that we are trying to take to the people of the Northeast you ought to join us and help to produce electricity at rates that the people can afford to pay?

Governor PHILLIPS. We are talking about some of our farm problems——

Mr. RANKIN. No, no

Governor PHILLIPS. And I say to you, the problem in Oklahoma, if you are talking about what we need is we need to have relief from this condition whereby you can put a man in jail for growing 11 acres of wheat when he ought to be growing 50. Somebody comes around after he has planted and says, "You cannot grow but 9."

We cannot electrify the farms in Oklahoma until we get a farm program which fits.

Mr. RANKIN. How many counties do you have in Oklahoma?

Governor PHILLIPS. Seventy-seven of them.

Mr. RANKIN. Seventy-seven counties.

Governor PHILLIPS Yes sir.

Mr. RANKIN. Have you ever figured out how many bales of cotton at the present prices these overcharges for electricity in Oklahoma amounted to last year?

Governor PHILLIPS. No.

Mr. RANKIN. An average of over 2,000 bales of cotton for every county in the State, after allowing for all taxes, cash contributions, and free services paid or rendered by both private and public electric utilities.

The record shows that while the private electric utilities in Oklahoma paid only 11.9 percent of their gross earning in taxes, cash contributions, and free services, the publicly owned plants paid 55.1 percent of their gross earnings in taxes, cash contributions, and free services.

Mr. Speaker, if we had the support of every Governor and every other official throughout the country, we could reduce electric light and power rates to their proper levels in Oklahoma and in every other State and could electrify every farm home in America at rates the farmers could afford to pay.

The World's Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 29 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ARTICLE BY REV. CHARLES M. SHELDON

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief article by Rev. Charles M. Sheldon, entitled "The World's Problem," which appeared in the Pathfinder magazine as a guest editorial from the pen of this distinguished clergyman. Dr. Sheldon, author of many religious works, but well known as the writer of In His Steps or What Would Jesus Do, now lives in his eighty-fifth year in Topeka, Kans. He is hale and hearty, and his comments on the current scene are always interesting and timely.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pathfinder of June 28, 1941]

THE WORLD'S PROBLEM

(By Dr. Charles M. Sheldon)

There are a great many problems facing the human race at present, and a good many people are discussing them from the platform and in the press and on the street, and there is a Babel of tongues that result in a great deal of confusion and make a great deal of noise without much real value.

There is the economic problem, the financial problem, the taxation problem, and, to cap all, the war problem. The papers are full of all these problems, and the Morning Shudder and The Evening Depressor take away the average citizen's appetite for breakfast and ruin his digestion for dinner.

For, after all, the greatest problem in the world is the human problem. We will never have a better world until we have better people. And we will never have better people until the human race repents, turns around and goes the other way from the practice of hate and selfishness and greed, and begins to practice love and friendship and the brotherhood of man.

Jesus paid no attention to human governments. He lived under the worst totalitarian government, called the Roman Empire, and He never mentioned it but twice. He spent His whole time teaching men how to behave. For conduct is what makes history, not knowledge of science or sociology or languages or graduation from universities that have never taught the student to love anyone. And until the human race begins to live as Jesus lived and taught, we shall continue to have war and economic troubles and trouble of every sort.

I have been waiting all my life to hear some Member of our Congress stand up in the Senate or the House in Washington and tell the Members the truth about human conduct as Jesus taught it. I have never heard such a talk from any Member of the Congress. They talk politics and economics and everything but conduct. It is human behavior that the world needs today, the behavior that loves instead of hates and believes in friendship instead of force. And until we have that sort of human race we shall always have human trouble on earth. The greatest human problem is the "human problem."

And when that is settled all other problems will be settled.

The Investigation of Royalty Payments

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES KRAMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives, I feel impelled to make a few remarks in connection with some recent hearings of our committee on the subject of royalty payments.

The Committee on Patents held these hearings on three similar joint resolutions, 32, 73, and 123. These resolutions were designed to deal with a problem which arises from the fact that certain foreign countries, principally Germany, prevent the payment to American citizents of money due to them from the use of patents, trade-marks, and copyrights of that country owned by American citizens. Some citizens of foreign countries own American patents, since by treaty this country is obligated to grant patents to citizens of other countries on an equal basis. Americans who may be operating under these foreign-held patents had to pay royalties to the foreign owners under their contracts and agreements. Consequently there was a very unequal flow of royalty payments—Americans had to make their royalty payments to foreigners, but at the same time royalty payments due to Americans from abroad would not be paid, owing to the control of the foreign government.

The resolutions provide that in case a foreign government refuses foreign exchange to its nationals for the payment of the use of patents, trade-marks, and copyrights owned by American nationals in such country, although the nationals of such country receive payments due them from Americans, all amounts due from persons in the United States shall be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary would deposit this money in a special account and would be au-

thorized to pay the claims of persons in the United States from the special account.

Testimony before the committee showed that in a number of instances royalty and other payments under patents due to American citizens from foreigners have not been permitted to be paid by the foreign country, and there is no doubt that this practice is extensive in several countries.

Reports on the resolutions have been received from the Department of State, the Treasury Department, and the Department of Justice. It is pointed out by these reports that the resolutions are very restricted, dealing with only a narrow aspect of a larger problem of international payments, being concerned solely with payments under patents, trademarks, and copyrights, and that the matters covered by the resolutions should be a part of the study of the larger problem. The Department of State indicates that the procedure contemplated by the resolutions would raise questions of a difficult character, both legal and practical, and that the amounts of money involved in the payments which would be affected by the resolutions form a relatively small proportion.

It may also be pointed out that the resolutions as drawn might be inconsistent with our treaty relations with countries other than those intended to be affected.

The recent action of the President of the United States in freezing the assets of the Axis countries accomplishes one of the principal results of the resolutions, that is, the prevention of the sending of royalty payments to those countries. In view of this action the resolutions are believed to be unnecessary, at least in their present form.

For the above and other reasons the Committee on Patents has not taken further action on any of the three resolutions.

During the course of its hearings the committee had occasion to receive testimony bearing on the subject matter of an article appearing in a magazine published in Philadelphia. Inasmuch as this article has been inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—page A2300—I feel it is necessary to make a few comments on this matter in justice to the company concerned.

The article is headed "Is Hitler financed by America's defense program?" and the subtitle refers to "the way United States dollars flow into the Nazi war treasury." The article refers to the Rohm & Haas Co., of Philadelphia, and two related companies. The whole implication of the article, the manner in which it is written and in which the material is arranged, amounts to an indictment of the company, an accusation that it is unpatriotic, and that it is working in a way detrimental to the best interests of the United States. The article is not merely a factual statement but is written in a manner calculated to contain many inferences, such as that this company, with mysterious German connections, is not only sluicing money into Hitler's hands, but apparently is a little more than anxious to see that Hitler gets the money.

The committee has been given full information concerning the company and its activities, which presents a wholly different picture from that obtained in the article.

The business was established in this country in 1909 to manufacture here a chemical product which had been invented in Germany by one of the partners. The partnership was incorporated in 1917 and subsequently half of the stock was seized and sold by the alien property custodian—later repurchased by the company. Since that time there has been no alien control in the company; the stock being controlled by American citizens.

The company has been and is engaged in manufacturing and introducing new products. Some of these were developed by their own research, and others were obtained by purchasing patents or securing rights under patents for inventions made abroad. Many of the products manufactured eliminated the necessity of importations from abroad.

The company has a subsidiary which was purchased and is practically entirely owned by it. Another company, the Resinous Products & Chemical Co., was organized in 1926 to manufacture synthetic resins, which had been invented in Germany. Thirty percent of the stock was paid for the rights to the inventions, and this stock was subsequently transferred by the German owner to a Luxemburg corporation. Complete details as to the ownership of the stock in the three companies are in the committee records.

All of the testimony presented to the committee cannot be reviewed here. Two of the products made by the company or the associated company which are mentioned in the article will be briefly discussed, and also the question of royalty and other payments. The article refers to "Tego glue film," a cementing film which is used in making plywood, which is used in airplanes and for many other purposes. The article states, "Hitler shares Tego profits, too," and, further, that the product is "a great source of revenue for the gold-hungry Nazis." This sounds as if Germany were receiving vast sums of money. The testimony shows, however, that with respect to royalties which the company pays on this product, a total of $22,109.08 was paid in 1940 to a New York corporation, on which amount both Federal and State income taxes are paid by the recipient. Payment of the royalty for the first quarter of 1941, amounting to less than $9,000, was intentionally delayed and was not paid until after consultation with the Department of Justice and being advised by the Department, after investigation, that there was no basis for withholding of the payment. A letter from the Department of Justice concerning this payment follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1941.

Re Theodore Goldschmidt Corporation.

Mr. S. C. KELTON,
Secretary, Resinous Products & Chemical Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. KELTON: Since about April 22 you have repeatedly discussed with me the question of paying to Theodore Goldschmidt Corporation of New York City the royalty on Tego Gluefilm for the first quarter of 1941, amounting to $9,299.03. You had agreed not to make this payment without letting the Department of Justice know in advance. At the end of last week you mentioned to me that the Theodore Goldschmidt Corporation is insisting on having the payment made, and you showed to me on Tuesday of this week the letters from the Theodore Goldschmidt Corporation, insisting on this payment.

The Theodore Goldschmidt Corporation telephoned you again this morning, but you refused to accept the call until I could get an answer from Washington on this point.

I accordingly took this matter up with the Department of Justice as of today, and you are advised that the Department of Justice has no basis at the present time for requesting you to withhold this payment.

Yours very truly,

WALTER R. HUTCHINSON,
Special Assistant to the Attorney General.

The New York corporation receiving the payment also assured the company that they were owned entirely by American citizens, and that none of the royalty payments would be sent abroad in any form.

With respect to dividends due on the portion of stock in the subsidiary which is owned by a Luxemburg corporation, no payments to them have been made for over a year and a half, the assets of Luxemburg having been frozen by Presidential proclamation in May 1940.

Another product mentioned in the article is plexiglas, a plastic which is used in airplanes and also in many nondefense fields. This product was first developed in Germany, and rights to the inventions were acquired by the company in 1934. Their development of the product, their facilities, and their cooperation in the defense program has been very important. Prices have been reduced, rather than increased. The office of the Chief of Air Corps of the War Department recently wrote to the company as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF THE AIR CORPS,
Washington, June 26, 1941.

Mr. C. S. KELTON,
Secretary, Rohn & Haas Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. KELTON: Your testimony before the Patents Committee of the House of Representatives on June 12, 1941, has been brought to my attention. This hearing appears to have been in connection with reports of an attack upon the patriotism of your company.

During the past 4 years your company has been a source of supply for plexiglass used in the manufacture of Army airplanes; and the quantities of plexiglass now required by the present increased program of airplane production requires a major part of your output. Your company has always been most cooperative and has increased capacity and by entering into the competitive field reduced prices for plexiglass to meet the Air Corps' constantly expanding requirements.

O. P. ECHOLS,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Chief, Material Division.

The company has been most cooperative in the national-defense program in every possible way.

The company has not paid any royalties to Germany either directly or indirectly since January 1, 1941, on any sales of the products manufactured by it or its

subsidiaries. Even before this time, during 1940, any payments due were withheld as long as possible and then only paid after assurances that there was no basis for withholding them. The royalty payments, when they were made, were reported simply in amounts in dollars so that there would be no possibility of anyone knowing how much of any commodities was going to any particular field. Since the materials are used in many nondefense fields, the possibility of foreigners obtaining information as to amounts used for any particular purpose was thus avoided.

The company has been anxious to have any funds due to Germany frozen, and of their own initiative, before the President's recent order, withheld money due abroad. They employed various schemes to delay and to avoid making payments abroad whenever possible. A letter from the secretary of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia to the chairman of this committee, dated May 22, 1941, reads:

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF PHILADELPHIA,
May 22, 1941.

The Honorable CHARLES KRAMER,
Chairman, Committee on Patents,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Mr. S. C. Kelton, secretary of Rohm & Haas Co. and the Resinous Products & Chemical Co., 222 West Washington Square, Philadelphia, has shown me your letter to the Rohm & Haas Co. of May 16, 1941, in regard to the Click article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 14, 1941, by Hon. A. J. SABATH, of Illinois.

You might be interested to know that about July 1 of last year Mr. Kelton took up with me the question of whether any freezing orders had been issued by the President prohibiting the transfer of royalties or other funds to Germany. The Rohm & Haas Co. and Mr. Kelton appeared to be strongly in favor of having such an order issued. At least half a dozen times since then I have discussed the matter with Mr. Kelton, who hoped that such an order would be issued.

I advised Mr. Kelton each time he saw me me that no Executive order had yet been issued which would relieve United States business houses from any obligation they might be under for making payments, such as royalty payments, to Germany. Mr. Kelton told me that his company was withholding the royalties on plastics at the end of each quarter for several months with the hope that such a freezing order would be issued.

Mr. Kelton mentioned to me that you had kindly written to him, and if I had no objection to his doing so, he would like to advise you that he had discussed the question of the freezing of these royalty payments with me. It is for this reason that I take pleasure in sending you this letter.

Very truly yours,
ARTHUR E. POST,
Secretary.

The true picture of the Rohn & Haas Co., as evidenced by the testimony before the committee, although only a small part is referred to here, indicates that the company has always acted as a patriotic American organization and that the industries established and developed by the company, and the products it has introduced and manufactured, have proven to be an asset to our country as a whole and to the national-defense program in particular.

I am satisfied the committee was gratified to have had an opportunity to examine into this matter at some length, and I feel that a magazine article of this kind presents a grossly unfair picture of a company which has been cooperating with the national-defense program. An article of this character, maliciously attacking the reputation of this company, can serve no useful purpose; to the contrary, by creating discord, it could amount to an unintentional sabotaging of the efforts of this company to cooperate with our Government.

Many who first read an article of this kind, without obtaining all the facts, may be led to endorse what on the surface is apparently accurate, but actually contains vicious and untrue inferences.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. KRAMER. I yield to the distinguished dean of the House.

Mr. SABATH. I note what the gentleman from California has stated. Personally, I inserted the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some months ago bearing on the Rohn & Haas Co. which appeared in the Click magazine. This was only after I had received assurances that the statements carried therein were based on facts. Acting on such representations and feeling that it was high time that we should stop feeding Hitler, I felt it my duty to insert the article for general information. However, since that time Mr. S. C. Kelton, secretary of the firm, called on me and satisfied me that the charges contained in the article were not founded on facts. He further assured me that none of the moneys handled by his company was diverted abroad and I am informed that the State Department and the War Department are satisfied that the firm is complying in every way with our laws and is not guilty of the accusations contained in the article.

Referendum on War and Convoys

REMARKS
OF
HON. KNUTE HILL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as the leading and most momentous question before us today is whether we should participate in the war across the sea, 2 weeks ago I sent a questionnaire to 96,000 registered voters in my district, asking them two questions.

One was whether we should participate in the war across the ocean, and, secondly, whether we should send convoys. Up to the present time we have received about 15,298 cards in reply. For sending convoys there are 2,903, and against convoys 11,679, or 75.2 percent opposing the sending of convoys. On the question of participating in the war there are 1,925 favoring going into it and 12,720, or 84.9 percent, against participating in the war. Some of my very good personal friends in letters take issue with me on my stand against participation in war on foreign soil and sending convoys. But their letters are very fair, and they express respect for my having convictions and having the courage to state them frankly and openly. However, a few of the letters favoring participation and convoys are so bitterly partisan and viciously personal that they are not fit to print. It is rather strange that honest difference of opinion should cause some otherwise sensible people to lose their courtesy and sense of decency. The many letters—enclosed with ballots—opposing participation and convoys not only show a full understanding of the issue involved and the inevitable consequences of such participation but they express the sincere desires of a patriotic people. It is my firm conviction that the percentages against participation and convoys would be the same throughout our splendid State of Washington should a like poll be taken. They believe in billions for defense of the Western Hemisphere but not one cent for aggressive warfare in either Europe or Asia. In other words, the great majority of the rank and file of our people do not want our boys to go across. They remember, thank God, the aftermath of the A. E. F. of the first World War. They hate communism, fascism, and nazi-ism alike. They feel that wars brought on with periodic regularity in Europe without our consent or making should be fought out by those who instigated them or failed at crucial times to so act as to stop the dictators before it was too late. Possibly many of them believe with Al Williams, whose article, Oceans Are Wider, printed in this Appendix, is right in assuming that if we had a strong separate Air Department in the Cabinet functioning efficiently and successfully no Hitler nor group of Hitlers could invade the Western Hemisphere. I am personally gratified that so large a percentage of my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of Washington have expressed themselves as supporting my stand. More than ever I shall use my efforts and vote to represent this majority. This will be with not the least resentment nor recrimination against those who honestly express their disagreement with my views. This is still America, and may we hope that the "four freedoms" may be guaranteed for decades to come in this land of ours.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

LETTER FROM N. R. DANIELIAN, DIRECTOR, ST. LAWRENCE SURVEY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, July 28, 1941.

Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE MANSFIELD: In the course of the hearings on the St. Lawrence project many members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors have inquired from the St. Lawrence survey of the Department of Commerce concerning the effect of this project upon the American coal industry.

The survey has made an extensive study of this problem and I wish to present herewith the results of our study so that you may place them in the record of the proceedings before your committee.

Our study considered the effect of the St. Lawrence seaway upon the domestic market for coal in the United States, and upon the demand for American coal in the Canadian market, and the effect of the hydroelectric project upon the consumption of coal.

Generally, the survey finds that our domestic market for coal will be unaffected; that the Canadian market will remain unaffected and may even increase; and that the consumption of coal in the generation of electric energy, as well as for industrial uses, may be greatly increased on account of the low-cost hydroelectric energy that the St. Lawrence will make available.

THE DOMESTIC MARKET

That the domestic market for coal in the United States will be unaffected by the St. Lawrence seaway is patent from a comparison of the total imports into the United States with total production. In discussing this matter it must be kept in mind that there is no tariff in this country on imports of coal, and that our principal markets on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts are open to foreign shipping, coming from all the principal coal producing areas of the world. In spite of this, the total imports of coal into the United States in 1932 were less than 800,000 tons compared with total domestic production of nearly 360,000,000 tons. In relative terms the imports in that year were 22/10,000 of 1 percent of domestic production. In 1939 total imports were slightly over 650,000 tons as compared with domestic production of 445,000,000 tons, or about 14/10,000 of 1 percent—admittedly an infinitesimal amount.

If the point is made that these figures are not relevant since the St. Lawrence would be utilized by ships coming back from Europe in ballast, it may be pointed out that the usual balance of cargo between United States and European ports shows ordinarily an excess of export tonnage over import tonnage. A large amount of empty space on ships coming back from European ports to the United States is a normal condition. In 1939 the tonnage of exports from the North Atlantic district ports to the United Kingdom was 1,470,000 and the imports 631,000, indicating the availability of over 800,000 tons of shipping space on the way back from England—space that was not apparently utilized for the transportation of coal to the North Atlantic district. The same relationship exists between all North European ports and North Atlantic ports.

If British coal is unable to compete with American coal in the North Atlantic districts of the United States in spite of the absence of a tariff, in spite of the availability of unutilized shipping space, by what reasoning can one expect an influx of foreign coal into the Great Lakes industrial area where the shipping costs from abroad would be greater than to North Atlantic districts, and the costs of hauling American coal from the West Virginia, Ohio, and Illinois mines would be much less than it is to the northeastern industrial area? The argument that such an influx can take place is equivalent to the argument of "carrying coal to Newcastle."

THE CANADIAN MARKET

To understand the effect of the St. Lawrence seaway upon our Canadian market for coal it is necessary to state certain basic facts. Canada obtains its coal principally from the United States and Nova Scotia. Great Britain supplies but a small portion of the Canadian needs.

The following tabulation presents the 5-year annual averages, 1932 to 1937, inclusive, of imports to the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec from United States, Nova Scotia, and Great Britain:

	United States	Nova Scotia	Great Britain
	Net tons	*Net tons*	*Net tons*
Anthracite to Ontario	1,334,824	----------	501,877
Bituminous to Ontario	8,771,275	803,949	----------
Total to Ontario	10,106,099	803,949	501,877
Anthracite to Quebec	334,564	----------	824,936
Bituminous to Quebec	753,399	1,847,020	192,944
Total to Quebec	1,087,963	1,847,020	1,017,880
Grand total	11,194,062	2,650,969	1,519,757

This tabulation shows that the total average annual export of coal to Canada during 1932 to 1937 was 11,194,062 tons, whereas in the same period Great Britain exported to Canada an annual average of 1,519,757 tons, and Nova Scotia 2,650,969.

A break-down of American exports by destination indicates that an average of 1,087,963 tons went to the Province of Quebec in competition with the British anthracite and British and Nova Scotian bituminous, in spite of the fact that the Canadian tariff on imports of coal from the United States is 75 cents per ton, whereas on British coal it is 30 cents per ton, and in spite of the fact that presumably some of the British coal came as ballast on returning grain carriers, whereas a good portion of American coal sent to Quebec Province is transported by rail at very high freight rates.

Since the Province of Quebec is east of the proposed seaway and already accessible to ocean shipping, the coal market there could not be adversely affected by the seaway. On the contrary, if the large economical lake carriers can go from Lake Erie points through to Montreal and Quebec, it is not unlikely that the American market in the eastern Province of Quebec may expand as a result of the seaway, barring, of course, any artificial impediments by the Canadian Government. This is particularly true since the United States already sells almost four times as much bituminous coal in the Province of Quebec than Great Britain, even though British coal has all the advantages in Quebec Province which the opposition to the seaway anticipates for Ontario. Average American exports from 1932 to 1937, inclusive, to the Province of Quebec amounted to 753,399 tons as against 192,944 of British coal. If British bituminous coal cannot compete with American bituminous in the Province of Quebec, why should we expect British coal to have a greater advantage in the Province of Ontario west of the seaway where British coal would be more expensive and American coal a dollar cheaper?

The argument that ships coming back in ballast from England will bring coal cheaply into the Great Lakes fails completely in view of the fact that there is and always has been available empty shipping space between British ports and eastern Canadian ports. Montreal is the largest grain-exporting center in the world, and the balance of cargo for the port of Montreal and European ports is always in favor of east-bound traffic, which means that there is always available shipping space from European ports to eastern Canada. In spite of this, however, British bituminous is unable to compete with American coal on an equal basis in the Province of Quebec.

There is no reason to expect that empty shipping space and ballast rates from Europe to Great Lakes ports after the seaway is built and available for the transportation of coal will be any greater or any cheaper than the shipping space under such conditions ordinarily available from the same European ports and to North Atlantic and Canadian ports. The amount of space required for the eastward-bound grain trade, part of which comes back in ballast, will not be much different when the seaway is available than without it. The only difference will be that some of these ships will come back into the Great Lakes, whereas now they stop at Montreal or New York. If these ships are not economically able to bring coal into New York or Montreal to compete with American coal, it is difficult to see why these same ships can carry coal more cheaply farther inland, nearer to the source of American coal. This expectation is particularly difficult to understand in view of the price advantages of American coal in the Ontario market even in relation to Nova Scotian coal. American bituminous has ranged between 50 cents and $1 below the price of Nova Scotian coal at Toronto, which receives about half of the American exports of coal to Canada. Next to Toronto the largest market for American bituminous is in Windsor and northern Ontario, where, of course, British or Nova Scotian coal would be at much greater disadvantage.

The conclusion is then that American coal may obtain a further advantage in the eastern Province of Quebec and will be at no greater handicap in the Province of Ontario. The reasons as stated are that space at ballast rates is not now utilized for the importation of British coal to North Atlantic and Canadian ports and hence there is no reason to expect that it will be utilized to a greater extent in the Great Lakes area where American coal costs about $1 less than at Montreal.

Nova Scotia mines are now operating at capacity of about 8,000,000 tons a year, and it is unlikely that this can be more than doubled within a short space of time under economical conditions of operation. Furthermore, Nova Scotia would have no greater advantages by the seaway in the movement westward than American producers would have in the movement eastward, for both now use small canal carriers in this trade and both would be able to use larger, more economical bulk carriers in both directions. On the basis of the past trade records and in view of limitations of capacity of Nova Scotia mines, one is justified in concluding that there is no foreseeable danger to the American market of coal in the Province of Ontario.

DISPLACEMENT OF COAL BY WATER POWER

Technically it is true that a given amount of hydroelectricity has an equivalent value in terms of coal. The St. Lawrence project would make available a total of 13,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity to be divided equally between Canada and the United States. The Canadian half cannot be considered a substitute for coal for the reason that the Province of Ontario would probably develop other water-power sites if the St. Lawrence River is not developed. The American share—6,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours would be the equivalent, on the conservative basis of 1 pound of coal per 1 kilowatt-hour, of 3,300,000 tons of coal.

It is erroneous, however, to consider this a loss of an existing market for coal. In the experience of the last 8 years it has been proved that low-cost water power creates its own market for energy which would not exist otherwise. Furthermore, low-cost electricity expands the market for coal because

of the response of domestic consumers to low rates, where a 50-percent reduction in rates often causes a 100-percent expansion in consumption of electricity. At the same time low-cost electricity encourages industrial expansion which in turn utilizes more coal. For these reasons in the Tennessee Valley area in 1934 only 540,000 tons of coal were consumed in the generation of electricity, whereas in 1940 this consumption had increased to 1,891,000 tons, an increase of almost 250 percent, in spite of the fact that during that period the States in this area increased hydroelectric capacity to a very considerable extent. Hence the St. Lawrence hydroelectric project should be looked upon not as displacing coal consumption but as a method of encouraging the utilization of electricity and expansion of industry which will inevitably require the installation of additional steam-generating stations in order to meet the expanded demand.

For the reasons given above the St. Lawrence Survey of the Department of Commerce has come to the conclusion that the claims of the coal operators and the mine workers concerning the disastrous effect of the St. Lawrence project upon the coal industries are unfounded in fact, unsupported by past experience, and completely erroneous.

Very truly yours,

N. R. DANIELIAN,
Director, St. Lawrence Survey.

Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Support St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Rivers and Harbors Committee of which I am a member has been holding exhaustive hearings on the St. Lawrence project. In this connection I am glad to include with my remarks the following article from the Journal of the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and Operators:

[From the Journal of Electrical Workers and Operators of July 1941]

HUGE POWER OUTPUT INVOLVED IN ST. LAWRENCE—SEAWAYS CONTROVERSY DEPENDS ON TRANSPORTATION AND HYDROELECTRIC DEBATE

Once again the St. Lawrence project has come into the limelight of public attention—this time, perhaps, to stay until the plan becomes a reality.

The St. Lawrence development contemplates a combination seaway and hydroelectric power project. The seaway plan would provide for a unified water route from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean, a distance of 2,687 miles. By far the greater portion of this extensive marine highway, however, is already in existence. It consists of the natural waterways of the lakes and rivers, plus the locks and canals which are the product of man's industry. Only 258 miles, less than 10 percent of the total, remain to be completed. The uncompleted sections would require the construction of additional locks to accommodate vessels to the varying water levels which aggregate approximately 580 feet between Lake Superior and St. Lawrence tidewater, and the dredging of channels in certain places to a minimum depth of 27 feet.

CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS

Original or additional locks would be required at the following points: in the St. Mary's River, connecting Lakes Superior and Huron; in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, bordering New York; and at the Soulanges and Lachines Canals, both of which are in Canada. Additional dredging would be required in the St. Mary's River, in Lake St. Clair and its two connecting rivers, and at the Welland Canal between Lakes Erie and Ontario.

PRODUCTION UPS LIVING STANDARDS

The desirability of a navigable waterway from the Great Lakes to the sea by way of the St. Lawrence has long been recognized by many people in both the United States and Canada, the first proposal therefor having originated more than a century ago. An appreciation of power aspects of the St. Lawrence project, however, naturally depended upon the development of applied electricity and accordingly was of more recent origin. But in later years, especially since the beginning of the century, the power side of the project has received an ever-growing emphasis.

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers has long advocated the development of hydroelectric resources. This policy is based upon the proposition that the first step on the way to an increase in living standards is an increase in productive capacity. In the field of economic production, electric energy is the most versatile and boundless force subject to man's control.

Consistent with its general policy, therefore, the I. B. E. W. has supported the St. Lawrence hydroelectric project. As long ago as 1924, I. B. E. W. International President James P. Noonan served on the St. Lawrence Commission of the United States under the chairmanship of the then Secretary of Commerce, Herbert Hoover. The Commission submitted an exhaustive report, based upon a 2-year study and a consideration of the many earlier engineering and social reports, in which it recommended both the construction of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway and the St. Lawrence power project in cooperation with the Dominion of Canada. This report, as all those preceding and following likewise did, recognized the special benefits which New York would derive from the program and, accordingly, recommended a formula wherein the State of New York would bear a proportionate share of the cost. This point is emphasized because some opponents of the program foster the impression that the cost of the power development would be distributed on all taxpayers without regard to benefits, an impression contrary to realities.

ACTION DEFERRED

Every administration since Wilson's has favored development of the St. Lawrence, and both major parties have adopted recommendations to that end. President Hoover negotiated a treaty with Canada which provided for its joint development by both countries, which was submitted to the United States Senate in November 1932. Thereafter there were extensive hearings and debates. The United States Department of Commerce, the Federal Power Commission, the Power Authority of the State of New York, 13 State governments, and numerous commercial and industrial interests and private associations went on record in favor of proceeding with the seaway and power projects.

The development was opposed by representatives of internal waterways, railroads, and Atlantic and Gulf coast ports on the grounds that they would be injured by such a seaway and that its benefits would not justify its cost. Finally, in March 1934, the treaty was submitted to a vote. In the meantime the depression was taking its toll and the cost factors had assumed relatively greater importance. Though a majority of the Senate voted in favor of ratification, the measure failed for lack of the required two-thirds vote. A new emergency now brings the entire subject once again to the foreground.

The hydroelectric project calls for the construction of a power plant at the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. The water flow at the rapids averages about 220,000 cubic feet per second, capable of producing about 1,650,000 kilowatts, of which the United States' share would be approximately 820,000 kilowatts. It is estimated that from this capacity an annual average upwards of 5,700,000,000 kilowatt-hours could be produced for the United States and an equal amount for Canada.

By themselves these figures fail to reflect the profound social and economic significance of the power project. Substantial though it is, the relationship of the St. Lawrence potential capacity of 820,000 kilowatts and potential annual production of 5,700,000,000 kilowatt-hours, to total United States capacity of approximately 41,000,000 kilowatts and total United States production of about 147,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, may easily lead to an underestimation of the importance to the American economy of the St. Lawrence power development. More revealing in appraising the value of the project is the fact that the defense program is actually confronted with a power shortage. That shortage is bound to grow increasingly acute within a very short time for the reason that real defense production, as distinguished from planning and tooling, is only now beginning to get under way. Electric power is the most universally essential element in modern industrial production. Yet estimates of electric-power requirements for the near future disclose a capacity shortage of from fifteen to twenty million kilowatts—subject to indefinite revision upward.

This actual and prospective power shortage may be the gravest impediment to our defense effort, even as it constituted a serious difficulty during the last war and is causing increasing difficulties in Canada's present struggles. Power is more important today than ever before because of the great metallurgical and chemical industries engaged in the production of aluminum, magnesium, and metal alloys. The Office of Production Management has estimated that aluminum production alone will absorb 1,000,000 kilowatts in additional capacity. The United States is now importing 234,000 kilowatts of capacity from Canada in the Buffalo-Niagara area, in spite of which there is a shortage of power for existing requirements in that vicinity. But the increasing burden which the war has imposed upon Canada, especially since the loss to Great Britain of the electro processing which had formerly been done in Norway, has made the power problem additionally critical there. Canadian industry has not been able to participate fully in aiding Great Britain because her industrial expansion is conditioned upon a power expansion. Since it is probable that Canada will shortly be obliged to cease the exportation of electrical energy to the United States, which she has the right to do under existing agreements, the situation in the Buffalo-Niagara area will be even further aggravated.

The New York area is not the only one faced with power shortages. Many sections of the country are having a similar experience. The defense program has expanded so rapidly that estimates of future loads become obsolete within a period of 2 or 3 months. The problem confronting those responsible for United States defense is therefore crucial. And as the horizon is searched for fifteen to twenty million kilowatts of additional power sources the St. Lawrence looms as the largest single source available. Its potential capacity makes it the second largest single dam

power source in the world, exceeded only by Grand Coulee.

The St. Lawrence project has been condemned by certain groups on the grounds that the urgency of the defense needs make the development impractical. It is contended by those opponents that the St. Lawrence would require workers and materials of all kinds which could be assigned to such project only at the expense of more vital defense needs. Opponents also insist that the construction could not be completed soon enough to be of value in the present emergency. There are other grounds of opposition, too, including those which reject the program as being uneconomical because it would injure some communities to a greater extent than it would benefit others.

It is curious that the same emergency arguments were used in the period of World War I, and yet during the years of depression the project was dismissed as one which was unnecessary and which we could not afford. The premises purporting to support conclusions that the St. Lawrence development will be too late to affect defense beneficially have been disclosed as gratuitous assumptions. Last month the council of the Office of Production Management—which includes the Secretaries of War and of the Navy in its membership—went on record in favor of "both the waterway and electric-power phases of the project as part of the all-out defense effort.' President Roosevelt has shown the lack of logic of those who oppose the St Lawrence program because it will require about 4 years to complete, while they endorse a battleship-building program which requires at least as long. Moreover, by the President's allocation last October of $1,000,000 of defense funds to the Army engineers and the Federal Power Commission for preliminary borings, soil analyses, and surveys, it has been estimated that a full year has been saved in the time required for completion of construction.

It is obvious that the St. Lawrence project will not of itself meet the Nation's power demands. But as the most important remaining source of undeveloped hydroelectric power, it cannot be neglected. Furthermore, it would serve one of the most highly industrialized sections of the Nation. The Federal Power Commission and the New York State power authority have concluded that St. Lawrence power can be economically transmitted 300 miles. This would include not only upper New York but the entire State, northern Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and most of New England, an area with a population of 13,000,000. In an emergency it could serve the area bounded by Chicago, on the west, Washington, D. C., on the south, and Boston on the north.

The economy with which the St. Lawrence power can be developed is no less important than its volume. The cheapest power source in the United States today is Bonneville, where the at-site rate is $14.50 per kilowatt-year. This in turn compares with the typical charge of $26.75 per kilowatt-year from the Niagara Falls power plant, which is also one of the cheapest power sources. Yet the Federal Power Commission's engineers estimate that the cost per kilowatt-year of St. Lawrence power will be less than $12.50. Such economical production makes the dispersion of its use over a great area economical, for even with the added cost of transmission, the power will sell for less than in any other region.

Nor would this project destroy the value of existing generating facilities. The present peak load in the area primarily to be served is about 3,800,000 kilowatts. It is conservatively estimated that by 1945 the requirements will reach 5,394,000 kilowatts, a load far in excess of prospective capacity. In terms of economical cost, which concerns the entire Nation since so great a proportion of the defense industry is located in that area, the St. Lawrence assumes even greater importance. The commercial rates of electricity in New York State are the highest in the country, and except for some Niagara hydropower, it has industrial electric rates higher than most States.

In relation to defense or to normal peacetime industry, therefore, the St. Lawrence project has unique virtues. Because of its urgencies, most of the figures here presented relate to defense. But here is a significant indication of the power development's effects in normal times. Because of the present high cost of electricity in New York State, the residential use of electricity there is lower than that of the United States as a whole. The average residential consumer in New York State uses less than half of the electrical energy used by the average residential consumer in the communities served by the T. V. A.

The benefits of the St. Lawrence project promise to stimulate industry by economic production and at the same time increase the American standard of living. These benefits will not be at the expense of other industries or of other communities. Cheaper production based on sound economics benefits all markets reached by such production, and the interchange of products between all regions of the United States is such that all will benefit.

If the narrow standards of private profit are to be relied on, however, the St. Lawrence project will never be undertaken. But standards of private profit are not valid if economic production is the objective. Private profits are too frequently increased by reducing production. On the other hand, economic production will always destroy disproportionate profits. The American economy, including its emergency defense program, has already suffered severe jolts because of the "do nothing" complacency of those whose habits and training led them to confuse profits with production.

Likewise, there is no merit in the bland and appeasing counsel that the St. Lawrence project should be put off until a sunnier day. There is a power shortage now. There is an airplane shortage now. There is a transportation shortage now. There is a shortage of processed light and heavy metals from which the instruments of defense must be made. Without the needed power, without the needed airplanes, and without the needed ships, there may never be a sunnier day.

National Aeronautic Association Advocates Single Department of Defense With Air Force Being Given Deserved Importance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the fight for a separate air force is continuing with increased vigor. Latest support comes from the National Aeronautic Association, which is, as Jack Purcell said in the Washington Times-Herald today, a "long step forward in the congressional drive to create an independent air force."

INVINCIBLE AIR FORCE NEEDED

Action of this body was taken by the board of directors. It is believed by this largest and oldest aviation group in America that such a department, with three divisions of land, sea, and air, will best insure the development of "an invincible air force," in the opinion of the board, whose membership is drawn from all branches of aviation. The resolution follows:

The present war has revolutionized methods of warfare and shown the vital necessity for the closest cooperation and unity of command between all fighting forces, with emphasis upon air power.

The War Department has recently reorganized the Air Corps, creating a semiautonomous air force within the Department. While this reorganization is a step forward, N. A. A. believes it does not offer a solution to the national-defense problem. It does not guarantee the fullest cooperation, coordination, and development which we believe necessary in the land, sea, and air forces.

N. A. A. therefore recommends that the President of the United States promptly call upon the proper executive officers and Members of Congress to make a study looking to reorganization of the War and Navy Departments with a view to consolidation into one Department of National Defense, headed by a Cabinet officer, and subdivided into three divisions of land, sea, and air, each headed by an Under Secretary. Such a single Department of National Defense, we believe, will best serve the country by insuring the development of an Army and Navy of highest efficiency, together with an invincible air force, all properly coordinated.

AVIATION LEADERS DRAFT REPORT

The resolution was drafted by a subcommittee of the N. A. A. board appointed last month under the chairmanship of Frank A. Tichenor, of New York. Other members of the subcommittee are: Earle L. Johnson, Cleveland, Ohio; Franklin K. Lane, Jr., Washington, D. C.; Lt. A. H. Near, Louisville, Ky.; and Wayne Parrish, Washington, D. C.

I know these men and can say sincerely that their judgment is highly important. Their recommendations will be regarded with favor.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the National Aeronautic Association for its courage and foresight by its resolution to establish a single department of national defense. We should have a streamlined and unified department of national defense instead of the now separate War and Navy Departments. Under legislation which I sponsor these departments would become important segments of a single defense command and our air force would become a separate part of the unified whole. Our three important fighting forces—Army, Navy, and air force—should be welded into one efficient defense machine under leadership of one coordinating head who would sit at the Cabinet table and speak for all branches of our fighting forces. There may have been a time when we could afford the luxury of separate War and Navy Departments. Such a time has become history with the swift-moving conflicts of the last 20 months.

AIR POWER NEEDS ITS OWN HOME

Our air power cannot be developed under the framework of land power and

sea power. It should be given a home of its own. It must be controlled and directed by men whose entire life has been devoted to the art of preparing and waging war from the air. The soldier and the sailor is no more qualified to direct the building of America's air strength and to control its employment in war than either is qualified to guide the destinies of the other. Until we realize that vital fact, our air force can never become a highly potent factor in the defense of this country.

We must liberate our air-fighting power from under the bushel that is now hiding its true light. I know the Army and Navy have not placed sufficient emphasis on air power.

The National Aeronautic Association is to be congratulated for its forthright declaration on this increasingly important subject. I am sure other Members of Congress who sponsor separate air force bills join with me in commendation of the leadership of this organization in the fight which is being waged with vigor.

We are all interested in making certain that future development of United States air power will be placed in the hands of those who have only one responsibility—maximum development. We can make the United States air force the most efficient and powerful in the world, and to achieve this I feel every military plane in the Nation should be under one command. That is real unity—the essence of our national defense.

A HEARING IS NEEDED NOW

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, there is a determined effort, and I hope a successful one, to see this issue adequately gone into by a committee of this House. We must join forces in seeing to it that no proper steps are overlooked in gaining this goal. Now, not later, is the time to go forward. Our Nation's fighting strength is our chief concern.

Extension of Selective Service and Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. FRED BRADLEY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address I made over radio station WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., July 23, 1941:

Prior to the President's message of Monday a great many of you anxious and distressed mothers and fathers whose sons are in the Army, either through the medium of the selective service or through the National Guard, had been writing me asking whether or not your sons will get out of the service after their year of training is over. I predict the answer will be, "No." You ask whether or not they may be sent overseas. I must reply bluntly, "Yes." Then you complain that you were deceived into thinking that your sons were merely going into training and that if the Congress now keeps them in uniform it will be breaking faith with those boys and with you. That is probably true in the first part only. You were cruelly deceived by both Presidential candidates last fall and by many political spokesmen. However, the National Guard and selective service so-called training acts both stated that these boys might be kept in service after a year "if the Congress then thought that necessary." I fear powers which always had belonged to the Congress but which have lately been usurped by the President have been exercised by him to put us into such a precarious position that we cannot now back down. It is very true that most of our Army still is but very little trained and very poorly equipped, but the coach has trotted our team out on the field just as it is, the whistle is about to blow, and it is too late to pull the line of trainees off the field and trot out another team without even uniforms and which never even saw the game before. Where would our veteran Regular Army backfields run with the ball then?

Last fall we had two coaches asking you for the job. We had a Presidential political campaign in progress. Did either or both of these coaches fool you with false promises and golden words? Have you a right to feel you were being deceived by what you were told or what you read during that campaign, and particularly when Congress was debating the Selective Service Act? Let us see what made so many of you write me then, protesting my stand in opposition to warlike moves which I felt sure would eventually lead us into active participation in somebody else's war; and I recall also those many letters in which so many of you told me that you thought the "universal training" bill would be a good thing. You were being kidded by political candidates, by administration or warmonger controlled news writers, and other war-minded speakers who told you that your boys would benefit from a year of military training, from a year of hardening up, from learning how to shoot a gun to defend our country in case of need. Would they be sent overseas; would they be permitted to serve outside of the Western Hemisphere; were we going to fight again in Europe's constantly recurring wars? Oh, no; then that was out of the question because any war-minded candidate who had dared to tell you then what they have advocated since would have been shouted off the platform. Now, I do not want to be unfair so let us look at the record.

In Boston over a Nation-wide radio hook-up on October 30, 1940—just at the very end of the campaign, when the political iron was red hot—Candidate Roosevelt said this: "And while I am talking to you fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars." Could anything be much plainer than that as a promise? Were you not being deceived? Again, in Philadelphia, just a week earlier, Mr. Candidate Roosevelt said this: "We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: 'We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack.'" Was that not deception in view of what has been happening steadily since last fall's election? Can we by any stretch of imagination include Iceland, or possibly even Greenland, as part of the Americas? Are we not coming very close to participation in foreign wars when we are now putting 70,000 of our troops side by side with the belligerent British troops as a garrison for Danish Iceland, 2,000 miles away from our shores? Were you then told that our outposts would cover over three-fourths of the earth? Were you then told that our Navy would be given orders 10 months later to force surface ships or submarines to come to the surface and be recognized or be shot at? Were you then told that hundreds of American Army pilots would be stationed in England today as "observers" when it has been known for months that hundreds of our latest fighter planes have never been removed from their shipping cases since landing in England on the pretext that it was necessary for American Army mechanics to assemble them? Were you told then that within a year the United States Army Air Corps would be ferrying American-made bombers to England in a steady service routine? In fact, was it then even so much as intimated to you that within 2 months after election America would become the arsenal for democracy, which now means that we give all aid possible to blood-thirsty, atheistic Russia? No; you were not told anything about these all too clear warlike moves, and there are unquestionably many more moves which have already actually been made and about which we shall learn sooner or later. And unquestionably many commitments have been made from which we shall in all probability be unable to back down without having to shoot our way out. There is—there can be—no question that you were deceived by Candidate Roosevelt last fall.

Now, there was another Presidential candidate last fall; another man wanted to coach our team on which your boy is now playing. What did candidate Willkie have to say during the campaign? In Boston and over the National radio hook-up October 12, 1940, Willkie said this: "To begin with, we shall not undertake to fight anybody else's war. Our boys shall stay out of European wars." Was that not plain enough? Were you not being deceived? Again among many other similar statements he said this: "I have given you my pledge many times over. I will work for peace." Has he worked so hard for peace ever since? Was he guilty of deception? Of course he was. Did he then, or at any other time by his word or tone of voice, indicate to you that from the very end of the campaign he would be advocating the sending of our sons overseas to take part in somebody else's war in order to defend America? Did he tell you then that within 10 months he would be advocating that we establish Army bases in Ireland or belligerent Great Britain itself? Did he tell you then that within 10 months he would be advocating the sending of our American Army to garrison the British Isles, not as a fighting force but as a home guard in order that British troops themselves might be released for active fighting duty elsewhere? And, in passing, may I ask you if there was ever a greater insult handed the American Army or a greater challenge to its courage? Well, after all, perhaps, Mr. Willkie may be pardoned for his deception practiced during the campaign because he may have been misled by someone or by some selfish interest.

I do know that I was a member of a Republican congressional delegation which went to Philadelphia prior to the convention and urged the adoption of a strong peace plank in our platform. I know also that I was among many Republican Congressmen who wired and wrote and urged Candidate Willkie to actively oppose peacetime conscription and the attendant fraud and deception being handed to you with it. Yes; perhaps, it would be charitable to say that Mr. Willkie may have been misled or misadvised, but I charge him with deliberately and maliciously mis-

leading you, because he later said before a Senate committee that these statements and others were but "mere campaign oratory." Personally, I feel that today, more than ever before in its history, America needs sincere honest convictions, sincere honest effort, and sincere honest patriotism far more than it needs mere campaign oratory. No; I cannot personally accept his brazen explanation, and, as far as I am personally concerned, I repudiate any allegiance to Mr. Wendell L. Willkie. He is not my Republican leader and has not been for many months.

During that campaign I too was a candidate for reelection. I told you that I would continue our aid to Britain policy as far as consistent with our own defense requirements but that I considered our own rearmament of the paramount importance. I said that I would cast no vote for anything which I considered would be a further step toward war for us. Now, we were considering the conscription bill toward the end of the primary campaign in which I could take no active part because of our duties in Washington. As I have said, when I expressed my opposition to it—because I felt that voluntary enlistment had not been given a fair chance, and the facts proved that we were not then able to uniform, equip, and train the volunteers as fast as they were coming to our defense—I learned from letters that many of you were being deceived as to the true intent of the conscription bill, and hence I tried to warn you of the consequences in my weekly news letter of September 5, 1940, which as usual I sent to every newspaper in our congressional district for publication. I hold in my hand the copy of my home-town paper, the Presque Isle County Advance, from which I quote that news letter as follows:

"In the first place, many of my correspondents seem to have the idea that such boys as are inducted into the service will be there simply for training purposes, and therefore they assume that they will go to training camps for some intensive training in new methods of warfare in a manner similar to that carried out during the World War. Nothing could be further from the truth, under present plans. (And then I told you why, as follows:) The facts are, as stated by General Marshall, there are insufficient noncommissioned and commissioned officers in the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Reserves who are sufficiently trained themselves in modern warfare to undertake the training of these 400,000 trainees in separate camps and as separate units without emasculating the present established units of the Regular services. Therefore, these boys—as drafted—will be assigned directly to standing units in the Regular Army and National Guard for service anywhere within the Western Hemisphere. They may conceivably, therefore, serve not only in the United States and its island possessions but also in Alaska, Canal Zone in Panama, and even in Central and South America or in Canada as the future needs may determine. In other words, for a period of 1 year, and longer if Congress later determines they are necessary, they will actually be full-fledged members of the Regular Army of the United States under arms for the defense of this Nation."

Thus I warned you over 10 months ago that your boys were going into the Regular Army and that they might not get home at the end of the year. Of course, they went into training—but just to the same extent that every other rookie from time immemorial has had to go into training. But your boys were then inducted into the Army, they will be again tomorrow, and the day after, as often as the Commander in Chief and his advisors call for them; but the point is they are not going into anything but the Regular Army. As usual when an unpopular decision has to be made, when a bitter pill has to be swallowed, the President passes the buck back to the Congress and theoretically the Congress will decide whether or not it is "necessary" to keep these boys in the Service and in all probability whether or not they may serve outside the Western Hemisphere—even though the President now blandly has ruled that to be but an imaginary line.

Well, my friends, as one Member of Congress, I do not see what choice the Congress can make. The boys are already serving on outpost duty over three-fourths of the globe. We are already established in what Germany has long since declared as a combat zone, in Iceland. As a matter of fact, our troops are already in Trinidad, British Guiana, and may soon be in Brazil. Our Navy is patrolling each of the seven seas with orders to stop all suspicious craft for identification or to be shot at. Many of our Army pilots are in England and wherever England fights, as observers, but with American planes crated up nearby awaiting assembly by American mechanics. Our naval aviation is at full war strength and is right behind Britain in getting priority of new American planes as they come off the production line—and that naval air force is at sea with orders to protect, along with the Atlantic Fleet, all shipments of all war materials as far as Iceland—and that includes Britain's war matériel. And so my friends, don't you see—we have our team on the field. It is on the field admittedly half trained in some instances—half equipped, in more instances. But that team is on the field awaiting the whistle. The coach put them out there. How can you expect the Congress, which now is only the cheer leader to pull the partially trained line off the field and leave those experienced backfield men with nothing but an entirely untrained line ahead of them—yes, without even a uniform for them? No, my friends, I think your boys are in the Army line for the duration. I don't like to tell you that but I would be false to you if I did not speak out frankly in answer to your letters.

Discrimination Against Private Utility Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress is being bewildered by legislation that comes to the floor of the House, in all probability the handiwork of experts at the White House, our American plan of life is being endangered by agencies of the New Deal as they wildly cruise their course, bent on the destruction of private enterprise. Yes; the Congress is bewildered. We are asked to appropriate $35,000,000 for a war building, and countless other items come to us for attention shrouded with the sugar coating of defense. Much of it, unfortunately, is the fulfillment of the ambitious program of the New Deal. It is that continuous "emergency" that found its inception with the New Deal.

The distinguished columnist David Lawrence, in a recent syndicated article, points out the dangerous route that we are following. The whole program of New Deal electric-power development is based on the principles of the department headed by Mr. Ickes of gaining control of industrial power for political purposes. It is a dangerous situation that might well attract the attention of Democrats and Republicans alike.

DAILY WIRE ON NATIONAL AFFAIRS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—America's $12,000,000,000 private utility industry is in danger of being taken over permanently by the administration with the war emergency as the excuse for the fulfillment of a plot that has been evolving for the last 8 years.

Violating the promises solemnly given to the investors who own the utility stocks and bonds of operating companies as well as holding companies, the squeeze by the Government to force the private companies either to sell out or go out or business has begun. The tremendous power of priorities in equipment and materials is being used already in discriminating against private companies and the Government power project directors are being compelled on orders from Washington to take steps that will force the private companies out of existence.

On September 21, 1932, President Roosevelt in a campaign speech at Portland, Oreg., said:

"State-owned or Federal-owned power sites can and should properly be developed by Government itself. When so developed private capital should be given first opportunity to transmit and distribute the power on the basis of the best service at the lowest rates to give a reasonable profit only."

On July 6, 1941, the Seattle Times in a news article on its front page said:

"Secretary of the Interior Ickes believes there is no place for the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. and similar power companies in the State as private utilities, says Abe Fortas, newly appointed public power division director. Private power is a 'handicap' to the Ickes program."

Already the officials of the Bonneville project are refusing to make a contract with the Portland General Electric Co. for the continuance of power supply unless the latter agrees to sell out the company to the Government. Having discouraged the private power companies from their normal expansion, the administration refuses now to assure these companies that the power they are now getting from Bonneville will be sold to them as in the past, and hence arrangements are on a month-to-month basis — a death-sentence leverage.

Meanwhile there is a big demand for power for defense. It might be assumed that the present shortage justifies the building of the T. V. A. and the Bonneville projects. But the fact is that the reliance of the country on hydroelectric plants is dangerous and already drought seasons in the Southeast have demonstrated how much more secure the Nation would have been had the private utilities been permitted to balance expansion between steam plants and hydroelectric developments as in the past.

What really has happened will some day be recognized as a major political scandal. In their anxiety to get power loads for the big hydroelectric projects, the New Dealers used their influence at Washington to compel the locating of big defense plants and industries near the big dams of public power, thus taking away from the normal industrial growth of the area the power it might have had and ignoring the big power reserves in and around New York and Chicago and other midwestern and eastern points. Senators and Representatives from these States have been asleep even as Congressmen from far Western States have jeopardized the expansion of the normal industrial operations in their own areas.

Then, too, through rural electrification money furnished by Congress, transmission lines are being duplicated in several places, notably Texas, so that the markets of private power companies are being raided. Coincidentally the Federal Power Commission is sending its agents around the country to reduce the valuations of existing operating companies and thus cut down potential income that can be earned under State regulation of rates. This, together with the growth in taxes, is suffocating the operating company financial structures and making it difficult for them to raise new money.

A feud is on, moreover, between the Federal Power Commission and Secretary Ickes for control of the big public power systems. Mr. Ickes already has his clutches on oil and is now after the job of dictator in the electrical power industry. This together with control of coal and mining would make Mr. Ickes the most powerful man in Washington next to the President and build up a political machine for his use in 1944.

As for the investors they stand to lose far greater sums through these new Government holding-company maneuvers than they ever did in the days of the manipulators of high finance back in 1929. It is estimated that if the war goes 3 years, the private utility industry will disappear within that time. Under public opinion calls a halt it may be doomed anyway by the Government competition which now demoralizes operating companies and by the strangulation process now being applied to holding companies by the S. E. C. Thus is America introduced slowly to state capitalism and national socialism.—Copyright 1941.

"Hot Wheat"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ONTARIO (OREG.) ARGUS

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ontario (Oreg.) Argus:

[From the Ontario (Oreg.) Argus of July 17, 1941]

"HOT WHEAT"

Newspaper reports tell of ranchers who now face the penalties of noncompliance with wheat quotas. Along with these stories are others revealing the extent of the bumper crop that is in the process of harvesting. It appears now there will not be sufficient space in the terminal elevators for the golden grain threshed from the fields of the United States and Canada.

At first blush one is inclined to sympathize with the man who sowed the wheat he now cannot sell save by paying the penalty of 49 cents per bushel. But second thought erases the sentiment of sympathy.

This second thought arises from the natural answer to the question: Why did the farmers plant this excess wheat in the face of the knowledge that the application of the law was a risk he had to take along with that of adverse weather?

Did he not plant it in the hope that wheat prices would follow the pattern cut in the years 1914 to 1918, when wheat went to more than $2 per bushel, with the result that he would make a "killing"? The chances are he did.

If that was the thought behind the excessive planting there is no occasion for sympathy. It is too bad for that particular farmer or group of farmers, but they were not farming when they made that decision. They were gambling, taking a chance that adverse weather elsewhere might so reduce the crop that the quotas would not be applied. They lost! That is all there is to it.

"Blessed Are the Peacemakers"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, about 1,900 years ago the Son of God, who was then on earth, walking among men, went up into a mountain.

And when He was set His disciples came unto Him and He opened His mouth and taught them, saying, among other things:

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.

The Son of God was also the Prince of Peace. This title, which has been applied to Him throughout the ages, is an eloquent tribute to His godliness of character. St. Luke, who was a competent reporter, tells us that while the baby's mother was wrapping Him in swaddling clothes and laying Him tenderly in the manger, a multitude of the heavenly host appeared and sang to the shepherds watching the flocks in the field near Bethlehem—

Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace, good will to men.

See St. Luke ii:14.

Thus from His bed of hay, where He first rested in His infancy, the Son of God was introduced to the world with heavenly sanction and joyous angelic acclaim as the emissary of peace and good will. He came not to destroy, but to bring to men the peace that soothes and heals. Such a leader! Shall we forsake Him now, when the world is crying for His leadership?

MAN'S INHERITANCE

In searching our souls to decide where our duty lies in this supreme crisis of the world, when vast numbers of people are in the grip of war madness, and paganism is sweeping entire continents, let us first take a look at man's inheritance from the loving Father of us all. That inheritance is a cosmic commonwealth of infinite beauty. Vast, fertile plains to yield the things that sustain life, great rivers that flow in majesty to the seas, cascades that dance and sparkle in the sunlight, mountain slopes that rise in towering grandeur to the very feet of the Creator. Vineyards and orange groves, and the sunshine and the shadows chasing each other over waving fields of wheat and corn. In the depths of the earth God deposited untold billions of tons of coal to warm the human family, in the waterfalls he placed power without limit to drive the wheels of commerce. All things that make for prosperity, welfare, and happiness of the human race are embraced in God's gift to man on the morning of creation.

MAN'S OPPORTUNITY

Now let us turn from man's inheritance to man's opportunity. The Creator of this beautiful world made plenteous provision to sustain the lives of all the millions that might ever inhabit it. There is enough land lying uncultivated and fallow to support all human beings on the earth if they would but forget their hatreds, put down their guns, and go to work. The prospect for humanity's deliverance from the unspeakable conditions that now beset the world depends on how far men are willing to go in accepting the doctrine of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. If this conception of divine origin should be accepted as the order that should rule the world, there would be no such thing as economic insufficiency in any country, for when love is planted in the place of selfishness in human hearts there will be enough of the means of life to go around.

HUMANITY'S GREAT NEED

What the world needs now to lift it out of hell and to sweep it back to safety and sanity is a revival of religion and something more than that. It needs a Niagara-like resurgence of religion. It needs what Franklin D. Roosevelt, our President, years ago declared it needed, when he said:

No greater thing could come to our land today than a revival of the spirit of religion—a revival that would sweep through the homes of the Nation and stir the hearts of men and women of all faiths to a realization of their belief in God and their dedication to His will for themselves and for their world. I doubt if there is any problem—social, political, and economic—that would not melt before the fire of such a spiritual awakening.

There are 64,501,594 church members in the United States who, humbly kneeling at God's sacred altars, have professed their loyalty to the living Christ. Now is the time to show that loyalty. Let us, here in America, bring into the morbid world picture a leader who has been sadly neglected in the saturnalia of world hatreds and strife, a leader infinitely greater than all of the dictators combined, Christ, the savior of men.

Let us rally under His leadership and consecrate ourselves to the task of trying to bring about the world order that He envisioned, based, not on mass murder and wholesale destruction, but on the Christian teachings that we who belong to the church have accepted as the highest attainable rule of life.

CHRISTIANITY IS LAME AND HALT

It seems to me, and I say it with sorrow, that Christianity in America is not rising to the occasion. It is lame and halt. It is not meeting the challenge imposed upon it by this greatest of world debacles. It is not showing a realization of its responsibilities. It is not backing its leader, the Savior of mankind, as it should.

It is the duty of the church that represents the living Christ to be doing something about ending this horrible war.

Such a movement, if given the strength and direction that is possible through capable leadership, will be supported magnificently by the American people, for, as Cardinal O'Connell so well says in a telegram to me:

There is no doubt in my mind that the American people desire a cessation of this stupid and brutal war.

INDIFFERENCE AND LASSITUDE

This is no laughing matter. This is a grand assize and sooner or later people must stand up and be counted, either for Christ or against him. The indifference and lassitude exhibited by many Christian leaders, organizations, and publications is appalling. We find that there are preachers who are ardent interventionists and who if they could have their way, would put America into a shooting war, as if peace could be promoted by adding to the already consuming hatreds of the world and as if a fire could be put out by pouring oil on it. We actually find some preachers who have embraced Senator Glass' sanguinary formula: "Let's go over and shoot hell out of 'em." These pulpit militarists are the exception and not the rule but there are far too many of them.

WHERE ARE YOUR VOICES?

There are 21,284,455 Roman Catholics in America. Cardinal O'Connell, who enjoys the faith and confidence of millions, has spoken out in clarion tones against the mass butchery that is going on, but what are the archbishops and bishops of the Catholic Church doing to stop the war which threatens to destroy civilization and set the world back a thousand years into the dark ages? There are 7,377,487 Methodists in the United States and, being one of them myself, I have a right to ask what the bishops of the Methodist Church are doing to restore peace to a sorely afflicted world. What are the Baptists doing? There are 8,603,675 of them. What are the Presbyterians, the Episcopalians, the Disciples doing? What are the religious organizations and the church publications saying and doing? Hundreds of the world's greatest clergymen are Americans.

Sometime somebody will call off this list of distinguished names and say to these eminent churchmen: "Where are your voices?"

If they reply that there is nothing they can do about it they will be asked, as Christ asked his disciples after the storm on the Sea of Galilee: "Where is your faith?"

NATIONAL PEACE CONVENTION PROPOSAL

I speak gloomily, but that is because I passionately love my country and my fellowmen. Some outstanding person or organization in our church life needs to take the lead toward swinging the religious forces of the Nation into action behind the living Christ in an effort to bring about mediation that will stop the war insanity and save civilization. This leadership might well be assumed by such organizations as the Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the Methodist Board, or the Catholic hierarchy, or all jointly. If this leadership would call a grand convention of all of the religious forces of America, to be held in some central place, to initiate steps to end the war, the world would take notice, and the day of liberation from the tyranny of war would come nearer. When 64,501,594 church members pray and act in unison to get the peace machinery in motion something is going to happen.

TEXT OF MEDIATION RESOLUTION

I ask the Christian people of America to examine a resolution I have introduced, known as House Concurrent Resolution No. 20, a resolution which proposes a practical plan by which Christian forces may proceed in an effort to bring peace to the world. This resolution is as follows:

Whereas it is the overwhelming desire of the American people that the United States shall remain at peace with the world and free from foreign entanglements, while it faithfully performs its duties as a good neighbor; and

Whereas if the world ever needed a peacemaker it needs one now; and

Whereas with war engulfing a large portion of the globe and threatening to draw other nations into its vortex, there is a real opportunity for the United States to demonstrate its sincerity as a good neighbor by assuming the role of a peacemaker; and

Whereas there is a possibility, faint though it may be, that the New World under the leadership of the United States, might be the means of freeing the Old World from the miseries of war and reestablishing peace and tranquillity on earth: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President shall be requested to invite the American republics to send delegates to a conference to be held at the earliest practicable date in the city of Washington to offer to the nations now at war the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator, to the end that the blessings of peace may be brought to a distraught world.

SEC. 2. This concurrent resolution shall be known as the peace resolution of 1941.

The introduction of this resolution is predicated on the belief that the best thing that could happen to the world now would be successful mediation to stop the war, to be followed by reconstruction on a basis of fundamental justice. When the present cataclysm is over there must inevitably be a large-scale readjustment that will take into consideration the needs of the entire human family. If we stay out of the war and chart the way to peace, America will have the opportunity of being of inestimable service to mankind in building a new and juster world out of the ashes of the present conflict. If we yield to intervention pressure and enter the war that opportunity will be lost forever.

THE FACE OF CHRIST STILL SHINING IN THE ANDES

High among the snow-crowned Andes Mountains the face of Christ shines in the bright sunlight. To my imaginative mind, the heroic statue of the Prince of Peace, on the borderland between Chile and Argentina, sends out on the ether waves of love and friendship its mute appeal for the mediation resolution I have introduced. That statue is deeply rooted in the sentiment of the American republics, because it was erected by the two nations to celebrate an accord that was reached after long and intense bitterness. It stands in towering majesty on a spot 13,000 feet high. It can be seen for a hundred miles and all who come near it are enthralled by its beauty and grandeur. The story of the Christ of the Andes has been told many times, but to a world stricken with war, or living in constant fear of war, it cannot be told too often. The statue bears this inscription:

These mountains must crumble to dust before the Argentines and the Chileans shall break the peace which they have sworn to maintain at the feet of Christ, the Redeemer.

Would it not be a grand thing if the moving hand of history were to write into the record of civilization this memorandum:

In the year 1941 a great Christian President of the United States, with the assistance of the 21 American republics, brought a warring world to the feet of Christ, the Redeemer.

Is it not worth trying?

America's Defense Is Up in the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR., OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech which I made on July 23 over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co. on the subject of a separate air force:

Napoleon once said, "Proper organization is the most important of all military functions." You don't have to be a Napoleon to know that no army, navy, or air force, or in fact, any defense can rise above the quality and character of its administration.

It is obvious to all that unless we have air power, real air power, unified, purposeful, and strong, we will never be able to defend America—in a war-mad world. Because of the threat to our national security, real or implied, every citizen must take it upon himself to examine and judge our defense position. Many will say that they are unqualified as individuals to discuss or judge military and naval problems. Let me say to them that the application of plain common sense to these problems by everyone will help considerably toward proper solutions.

In the United States we now have four air forces, Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine. I have proposed to the Congress that with the exception of the water-borne planes of the Navy, these four be combined into one great fighting air force under the leadership of a Secretary for Air in the President's Cabinet.

If we have learned anything at all from the war in Europe, we have learned that nations without real air power are wiped off the map after attack. Secretary of War Stimson, has admitted, and I quote him:

Air power has decided the fate of nations. Germany with her air armada has vanquished

one people after another. On the ground large armies have been mobilized to resist her, but each time it was that additional air power that decided the fate of each individual nation. End of Secretary Stimson's quotation.

For real defense America must have the greatest air force in the world, commanded not by Army and Navy brass hats who regard air power as a side issue, but by real air men. The second best air force is no good in the world at all. The danger to America lies not in invasion by land or sea, but solely in attack and invasion from the air. Therefore, we must look with closest scrutiny upon our Nation's efforts to develop the air power so necessary to the safety and security of us all.

The present split command has produced confusion, chaos, and danger. Army and Navy leaders, because of their early training in land and water combat seem to make a distinction between the air that lies over water and the air over the land. The sooner we all realize that air is one vast ocean covering the entire globe, the quicker we shall understand that the defense in that vast ocean must be a single command, not one butchered into four parts.

Supposing we should be attacked. In view of traditional jealousies and rivalry between the Army and Navy it is conceivable that the Navy will fight air invaders while they are over the water and the Army will then go to work when the shore line is crossed. Or possibly, the high command intends to use the Army and Navy air forces on alternate weekdays and Sundays. As the citizens who are being bombed, we would derive as much humor from this situation as the average Frenchman derived from a study of the fall of France.

Public clamor for the creation of a separate and unified air force has finally broken through the heavy insulation of the War Department. To silence that cry and at the same time to maintain the sacred status quo, Secretary Stimson has ordered a reshuffling of the air force. It was a sly move to trick the public into a false confidence that it was being given a separate and unified air force. Autonomy is not unification. Actually what Secretary Stimson's gesture meant in combining the General Headquarters air force and the office of the Chief of the Army Air Corps was that the air force went back to the same status it held in November 1940.

In the past 21 years there have been 19 distinct investigations into the organization of the Army Air Corps. This, says General Arnold, chief of the Army Air Corps, "is indicative of the acknowledgment that the proper air organization has not yet been discovered."

Courageous, far-sighted military leaders like Billy Mitchell have paid dearly for their foresight. Court martial and disgrace were his rewards for speaking out in behalf of his country's defense. Others of similar courage in the Army and Navy have been relegated to insignificant assignments for daring to favor the consolidation of our air forces.

In addition to the main purpose of my bill I have proposed to the Congress that we establish a United States Air Academy similar to West Point and Annapolis. Nearly every flight training center is now called the West Point or the Annapolis of the Air. They are no such thing. They are fine flying schools, but we need a full 4-year course of air command training for our future flying officers.

The evidence in support of a separate and unified air force is written daily in bold type across the front pages of every newspaper in the world. Small wonder it is that many of us are impatient and fearful.

How long would Britain last without a strong, unified, and separate air force to combat the invader? Hitler would still be making speeches instead of conquests if Germany's air power were dispersed into three or four branches. So long as any other nation on earth possesses bombardment planes with sufficient range to reach the United States, there necessarily is the implied threat that one day our coasts will be bombed, our people murdered, and our industries and our homes destroyed and our way of life exploded.

In this day we can afford to trust no one. We must make ready to defend ourselves against any and all. How long will the American people stand silently by, watching the tradition-bound politicians of the Army and Navy play chess with our first line of defense? Only yesterday Admiral Towers complained to the Naval Affairs Committee of Congress that Army competition was slowing down the production of Navy aircraft. How long is this silly competition for men and machines to continue?

During one raid in London recently 5,000 fires were started in a period of a few minutes. Planes loosed thermite bombs which spread fire after fire indiscriminately among military and civil targets. As the gallant London firefighters rushed to the frantic task of quelling these quick-spreading blazes, the bombers with 1- and 2-ton high-explosive bombs were upon them. We cannot afford to place our destiny and the destiny of future generations of Americans in the hands of those who place uniform, rank, and the romance of the regiment first.

At our present rate it will be years before we are ready to fight a major air engagement. Our air forces must be commanded by air officers. The Army says that it recognizes the need for strength in the air, yet out of 408 officers on the General Staff, only 19 are air men. The dismal picture of American air power cannot be brightened by optimistic propaganda concerning the possible power we may have some day.

Whether the fighting-plane equipment now leaving our plant lines is up to the standards set by this war is seriously open to question. Despite the thousands of planes we have sent to Britain, the news dispatches still report only the activities of hurricanes and spitfires in the defense of that country.

Some will say that a separate and unified air force will make for a lack of coordination. Such a contention is ridiculous in the light of Germany's experience with its separate air force.

Air power today is no longer an experimental plaything. It is no longer the last romantic stand of the knight-errant. In the World War swashbuckling daredevils flew canvas coffins and shot at each other with sputtering machine guns. Air power today is an integral, vital part of any nation's defense with strategy, tactics, and mission all its own. No longer is it used solely for reconnaissance and for nuisance value. Today it is artillery, transport, and home defense.

What has kept the morale of London, Liverpool, Coventry, and Plymouth at such a remarkable level? The innate courage and stolidity of the Briton? That, of course, but even more it has been the bark of his antiaircraft guns shooting it out for all they are worth against the Nazi bombers. And even more than that, the heartening zoom and roar as the spitfires and the hurricanes take off to pour the wrath of eight machine guns into the steel hides of the enemy death ships.

How long do you suppose the morale of England would last, or England itself if German planes did not meet a swarming, stinging nest of English fighters spitting death from the barrels of machine guns each time they came up the Thames estuary?

Let us pray God that we in America may never go through the same ordeal of fire and shell to which the cities and citizens of England have been subjected. But let us not say it is impossible that we may not, and trust alone to the bulwark of the Atlantic and Pacific to guard our industry, and cities, our children and ourselves.

The best and greatest guaranty that enemy bombers will not reach these shores is that American fighters will meet and shoot them down before they do. And if and when that bleak and fatal day comes, we do not want to have our defense chiefs debating what type of plane we are going to use, who should man it, or from whence it should fly. We want our air force ready, eager, and capable. We want no bickering about policy when the enemy is loading his bomb racks to drop tons of explosives on our homes and factories. We want him shot down before he gets here. And the best way to insure that our air force will be eager, ready, and capable is to have it in under a separate command which understands the job of aviation and is ready to do it. England found that out, and will give thanks to her dying day to the heroes, the machines, and the skill of the R. A. F.

And should the enemy bombers come and write their frightful message on our doorsteps in letters of blood, we want to know that at least all that can be done is being done for the civilian population. We want to know that we have adequate air-raid shelters, adequate antiaircraft, adequate firefighting equipment, and we want to know that all this has been planned and organized well in advance so that every man and woman knows his or her task when death begins to rain from the skies.

We will never get it by the well-meaning helter-skelter and pandemonium of what we are now calling civilian defense. We will not get it by the mincing, dilettante efforts of politicians trying to do too many things at once. But we will get it if there is a plan far in advance and that plan is carefully and intelligently executed. My bill provides for an assistant secretary of air defense who would be charged with the adquate protection of the civilian population, not in time of war when it is too late, but now, when we can plan and execute it without the feverish, fatal rush of the unready democracies across the sea.

In addition to my own bill there are other measures in Congress that will accomplish this same purpose. All of these bills now languish in congressional committee too tired or too busy with piddling politics even to hold hearings. There is a growing suspicion here that the Army and Navy high commands are deliberately sabotaging efforts to bring this matter before the public. If true, we have reached a sad state of affairs in our defense effort.

I urge you all to write your Congressman and demand action and results before it is too late. Remember well, a second best air force is no air force at all.

Joint Income Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

LETTER FROM WALTER W. RICHARDS

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WILMINGTON, DEL., *July 28, 1941.*
Congressman PHILIP A. TRAYNOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DOCTOR: To the many criticisms I presume you have received of the attempt to make mandatory the filing of joint income-tax returns by husband and wife, I wish to add my own protest of this suggested provision.

Undoubtedly you are familiar with the various arguments that have appeared in the public press and, while not meaning to minimize those that have to do with the moral side, it seems to me that the important angle is the impracticability of attempting to assess discriminatory and class taxation against people who have seen fit to marry—a perfectly natural state which should not be penalized.

Furthermore such taxation would not only be unsound but definitely unconstitutional. The Supreme Court already has rendered a decision that it is unlawful to measure the tax to be assessed against one person by the income of another and, according to all the information I have been able to obtain, the principle involved in this decision never has been questioned.

The weakness of the position of the House Ways and Means Committee in deciding to recommend that this provision should be embodied in the proposed tax bill is shown by the fact that, according to the latest information I have seen in the papers, the vote on the matter was relatively close—I believe only 15 affirmative votes against 10 negative. Thus, if only 3 members of the committee voting affirmative had cast negative votes, the provision would not have remained in the proposed tax bill.

Further weakness of the proponents of this feature of the proposed legislation is evidenced by the following. One of the reasons stated for the mandatory provision is the desire to change the rights of citizens living in the so-called community-property States, where, under State laws, a husband and wife have the right to file separate income-tax returns, even though their income is all received by only one of these. Is there not enough gray matter in Congress to accomplish this objective, if it is a legitimate one, without attempting to do so by such a shotgun method as now is proposed, which would affect not only the citizens of community-property States but also all married citizens where the husband and wife each have separate incomes? It seems to me that if Congress cannot find a means of correcting the community-property State situation without affecting citizens living outside these States, this is the best proof available that even the rights of citizens in community-property States should not be tampered with.

Another reason that has been cited for the proposed legislation is that while filing separate returns is permitted under the existing law, the committee recommends that this be prohibited to prevent married persons from evading the higher surtaxes proposed in the new bill, this for the purpose of increasing Government revenue without raising surtaxes to everybody as high as otherwise would be required. This is a strange and totally indefensible philosophy. In the first place, it is not correct to say that husbands and wives now are permitted to file separate returns. This is an inherent right—not a permission that has been granted—as is shown by the Supreme Court decisions referred to above; also, there is no justification for punitive tax legislation affecting a special class of citizens in order to soften the tax burden to be carried by the remaining and much larger group of citizens, i. e., single individuals or married couples without separate incomes.

The husband is naturally the head of the family, and I am sure that in most instances where the husband and wife each have separate income it is primarily the income of the husband that supports the home and the life of its members. If mandatory joint returns are legislated, there must be numerous instances in which the tax to the husband would be so high that he would not have remaining sufficient income to support the home, and likewise in many of such instances the wife would be unable to contribute to the maintenance of the home and its members because of other obligations.

Why should husband and wife, for purposes of taxation, not be recognized as separate persons when they are so recognized for practically every other Government purpose? The income of a wife cannot be attached for the personal debts of the husband. Why should it be merged with the husband's for purposes of taxation?

I know your sense of justice and philosophy of life too well to believe that you could lend your offices to the support of legislation that savors so strongly of political dishonesty.

With best personal regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

WALTER W. RICHARDS.

Peace or War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

ADDRESS BY REV. DR. JOHN A. O'BRIEN

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, among all those Americans who have carried the fight to save our beloved country from participating in another shooting war in Europe, no one has contributed more than the Reverend Dr. John A. O'Brien, of my own alma mater—Notre Dame. The following is a recent address by Father O'Brien:

America stands today at the crossroads, facing the road to war and the road to peace. Which will she choose? Upon that choice hinge the lives of millions of American boys and the civilization which we have built by two centuries of toil.

I am asking my fellow countrymen to choose the road to continued peace. For it is only by walking along that road that we can effectively assist the distressed peoples of the Old World and preserve our freedom and our democracy. The path to war means not only national impoverishment but the loss of our freedom and democracy. It is the path to bloodshed, ruin, and death.

Because I have a profound solicitude for the lives of our youth and the welfare of our country, I leave the cloistered quiet of the university to raise my voice against those forces which daily are seeking to edge us closer to the flames of the European conflict. In pleading for the peace of America, I wish to make it clear that I am speaking neither for Notre Dame nor the Catholic Church, but in my own name as an American citizen. I have abhorrence for Hitlerism, sympathy for the victims of aggression everywhere, but devotion to America and our own people first of all.

"If this war is fought to mutual exhaustion," I heard the English labor leader, Arthur Greenwood, tell an Oxford University audience, "the British Empire will experience a degree of impoverishment the like of which we have never known. And at the end of the road of all our bloodshed and sacrifice, we shall find not a democracy but an authoritarian regime of the right or of the left." Uttered during the early months of the war, these words should be placed before the people of America that we, too, might see what awaits us at the end if we take the road to war.

STALIN—A DESPOT

With the entrance of Russia into the fray, and the removal of any immediate threat of a German invasion of Britain, the last pretense for dragging America into the tangled, stupid, brutal European strife is gone. For the American people can't be driven by propaganda, trickery, or deceit into fighting to maintain the Christ-hating despot, Stalin, in his tyranny over 180,000,000 enslaved people.

The propaganda that we must eventually enter the war to save democracy and Christianity has now received its death blow. For in duplicity and cruelty, Stalin is the equal of Hitler and surpasses him in his hatred of Christianity, of our system of private ownership, and of our democratic way of life.

In asking the American people to turn our weapons against brave little Finland, the one country which has honored its obligations to America, to maintain on his bloody throne the worst butcher of Christians in the world, Churchill does violence to the feelings of our people.

We must demand protection from this form of insidious propaganda which threatens our peace and our welfare not less than the propaganda of the Nazis. We want to believe that we are still governed from Washington and not from 10 Downing Street. This is not lack of sympathy with Britain, but ordinary loyalty to America and devotion to her interests above those of any foreign empire. We want no union now or ever with any foreign monarchy.

In spite of the smoke screen of war propaganda laid down by the handful of interventionists, the voice of the overwhelming majority of the American people is being heard with increasing clarity throughout the land—even in Washington.

That voice is shouting: Don't sentence America to national impoverishment. Don't sentence millions of American boys to death on foreign battlefields, fighting a war that is not our own. Don't condemn the American people to national suicide. Don't crucify the youth of our land on the cross of another European war. Don't go berserk with the bodies of other people's sons. End the slaughter by bringing the leaders to the peace table.

NO STAGED INCIDENT

That such is the sentiment of more than 80 percent of the American people no honest and informed person can deny.

Instead of being weakened by interventionist propaganda and the provocative acts and speeches of governmental officials, American public opinion has become more vocal and insistent that no staged incident be permitted to pull the nation through a back door into an undeclared war.

The American people are sick at heart at the spectacle of an administration which instead of lubricating relations with European powers has made them yield spark after spark with the apparent intention of setting off the explosion of war.

STEP BY STEP

Step by step, an administration solemnly sworn to keep the nation in peace has paralyzed by subterfuge and evasion the plain purport of the neutrality law and of the Johnson Act and has dragged us to the very brink of war. Only the thunder of the masses against public betrayal prevented the use of convoys and certain entrance into a

shooting war. That protest must continue until the battle for peace is won.

What did America gain by her participation in the World War of 1914–18? Absolutely nothing. She asked for nothing, and she got nothing. Oh, yes; she got a bill for millions from Britain for transporting our boys to save her from destruction.

She got a bill from France for the use of the trenches—for all except the front-line trenches. "Uncle Shylock" they called us when we asked for a small payment on the loans we furnished with the reckless abandon of a drunken sailor.

We poured billions into that orgy of bloodshed and destruction. We lost 244,086 men from all causes in that ghastly involvement in European feuds. We helped the Allies sink the fangs of hatred into a prostrate foe. We set the stage for the worst depression in our history. We gained nothing. We lost everything. We did not help Europe. We did not help ourselves.

What about the Wilsonian shibboleths, "Make the World Safe for Democracy," "Fight a War to End All Wars," for which we were allegedly fighting? They became nightmares of disillusionment. What a mockery. Europe called us "Uncle Sap."

Shall we ignore that costly lesson burnt into our bodies and our minds by that ghastly departure from the traditional American policy of minding our own business? Shall we ignore the voices of our soldier dead pleading with us not to crucify their sons as we crucified themselves on the cross of a foreign war?

NEVER AGAIN

"No," respond the American people with almost a single voice. "Never again." We shall give our treasures and our blood for the defense of America. But never again shall we be tricked under the lure of dulcet-sounding slogans about democracy into the ever-erupting volcanoes of European feuds and congenital hatreds.

America's destiny lies in the Western Hemisphere. Here is her legitimate sphere of influence. Here she has a chance to translate those great ideals of democracy, freedom, equal opportunity for all into living realities.

In this New World, providentially raised up out of the western seas, thousands of miles from the flaming hatreds of the Old World, America has the opportunity of rearing the shining temple of her hopes and dreams. Let us make it the sanctuary of peace, freedom, and democracy. Let us elevate the torch of liberty high into the sky that when all the lights go out in Europe mankind will know that the flame still burns in the West and that from this undying flame their lamps can forever be rekindled.

HOW CRUSH?

The slogan of the interventionists, "We must crush Hitler and the Nazis now," is seldom, if ever, translated into American lives and fortunes. They simply shout: "We must stop Hitler." "How?" I ask. "What more could we give Britain? Are we not stripping our own defenses naked and bleeding ourselves white in sending her the bulk of our munition products?"

To crush Germany, Europe would have to be invaded. Britain has lost every major campaign and cannot think of such an invasion. That would be the role left for America.

If Germany, with her superior air force and air bases and greater military machine, cannot land a force in England only 22 miles away, how could we with an inferior air force land troops on a continent 3,000 miles away? To invade Nazi-dominated Europe and face Hitler's highly efficient mechanized army of 6,000,000 men would require us to send at least 5,000,000 men in addition to the British Army.

TEN YEARS TO BUILD

To be effective they would have to be landed quickly. This would require 40,000,000 tons of ships. It would take 10 years to build such an armada. Even at the end of that period there would be little prospect of landing them successfully.

For thousands of bombing planes would be likely to blow them to bits. The advantage would all be with the forces defending their own shores. While this tells strongly against an American invasion of Europe, it tells not less strongly against any Hitler attempt at invasion of America. He too would require 10 years of building and then would be facing sure destruction on this side of the Atlantic. The logic of modern air-force development commands Europe and America to stay in their own hemispheres.

The British method of blockade of food, effective in the previous war, now misses fire and results not in the starvation of Germany but only in that of the overrun countries. For Germany has virtually all Europe to draw upon for food, and her people will be the last in Europe to feel the pinch of food shortage.

Britain seems to be in greater peril from the blockade than Germany. Requiring the daily importation of 50,000 tons of food, her vessels attacked by planes and submarines, and vastly inferior in air force, she is in a far different position than in 1914–18.

Yet she gives evidence of being able to stave off indefinitely a Nazi land invasion because of the overwhelming advantage resting with the defenders fighting on their own shores with their supply bases close at hand. Russia's entrance further removes all danger of any near attempt at invasion of Britain.

COST IN MEN

American involvement would mean, therefore, the sending of our boys by the millions to fight a Hitler-dominated Europe. No one knows where or how they could be landed. The chances are overwhelming that their transport ships would be blown to bits and they would be drowned like rats. They would be facing, if any succeeded in landing, the greatest military machine in all history. Behind it are the resources of most of the Continent of Europe.

In the Pacific we would be exposed to attack from Japan, pledged to support the Axis, if we enter on the side of Britain. While we have a splendid navy, our naval experts are the first to declare that we do not now have, and could not have for years, an adequate two-ocean navy.

Above all these considerations looms the stark fact of our utter unpreparedness. Nearly a year will be required to throw our armament-production plants into high gear to catch up with the needs of our own defense equipment.

We do not now have equipment in tanks, planes, and guns for 300,000 men to face a similar number of Germans, to say nothing of facing 6,000,000 of them. Another year will be required to turn out equipment for 1,500,000 men. We have no substantial air force of the modern type to compare with Germany's armada of the sky. This is the equipment which the present war has shown to be of supreme importance.

WANT NO WAR

Back of all our military unpreparedness is the lack of morale of our people for war. Wars require not only weapons but the will to fight. This was lacking in the people of France and lies back of her collapse. The American people want no involvement in this foreign war.

Men are willing to train for the defense of America, but they have no zest, but only a loathing, for war in foreign lands. Millions for defense but not one cent for aggression in other continents. Millions of men for the defense of American shores, but not one American life for the defense of any foreign empire whatsoever.

I have mingled, perhaps, as freely as any man among the youth of our land. Young men who will have to do the fighting and the dying have no zest for fighting for the British Empire in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Elder statesmen who fight with words and stay 3,000 miles from falling bombs might change their tune if they were to be sent to the foreign battlefields to which they are so ready to sentence American boys to fight and die. Youth is asking that we do not betray them to the fate meted out to their fathers in the ghastly blunder of 1917–18.

HURT BRITAIN

America's entrance into the war at this time would not help Britain. It would hurt her. It would deprive her of the enormous supply of war material which we are now sending, because we would need that for our own military operations. Otherwise we would have an army whom we would be expecting to fight with naked hands.

American entrance now would work irreparable injury to our Nation. Our boys would be led like sheep to the slaughter on the battlefields of all the world. For with the exception of Britain and the question mark of Russia, we would be sending our boys out to fight the major powers of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Millions of American boys would be killed, millions wounded, blinded, gassed, and crippled. Our national economy would suffer pernicious anemia. Poverty, hunger, and disease would stalk our land. The civilization that we have prided ourselves upon would be a shambles.

PATH TO RUIN

To save America, to keep our democracy and our freedom, we must stay out of the inferno now devouring the peoples and the civilization of Europe. War is not the path to the "four freedoms." It is the sure path to the destruction of all the freedoms. In all the thousands of years of human history man has devised no means of destroying more effectively freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear than the institution of war. To appeal to modern total war to secure such freedoms is to fly in the face of all history.

Modern total war means mass destruction, mass slaughter. It means the reduction of civilization to a shambles. To appeal to a method for the butchery of the largest number of human beings as the method of securing spiritual values betrays a strange concept of the sanctity of human life and the dignity of the human personality. Modern total war is better described as a form of mass insanity.

STARK REALITIES

In the light of the stark realities of the European scene, American intervention would not tip the scales as in 1918. It would not help Britain, nor America. That is the conclusion reached not by wishful thinking but by careful analysis of stubborn facts.

Let us suppose, however, that by some unexpected circumstances, American resources and American lives thrown with prodigality into the inferno should effect an invasion of Nazi-dominated Europe and eke out a victory after some 10 or 20 years of combat. What would we have gained?

Europe would be a desert. America would be bankrupt. Civilization would be reduced to dust and ashes. Fifteen or twenty million human beings killed. Disease, want, hatred would be rampant.

Who would the real victors be? Destruction and death. A high-powered microscope would be required to distinguish the nominal victors from the vanquished. So sunk in misery, want, and woe would both sides be.

Every dictate of common sense, of solicitude for the war-torn peoples of Europe, of devotion to our own country, commands us, therefore, not to plunge the resources and the lives of the American people into the bottomless pit of Europe's inferno. By remaining an island of peace and sanity in a war-mad world, by making democracy work

at home, by establishing the four freedoms first among our own people, we shall render the greatest service to Europe, America, and to all the world.

I spent the first year of the war at Oxford University, England. I am in sympathy with the common people of Britain as I am with the common people of every land. For a year I witnessed the daily sending of a stream of propaganda to American shores, all designed to drag our Nation into a foreign war as they did in 1917. That propaganda aims to sell us the fairy story that this is our war, that they are merely fighting for us. Despite the help of governmental officials and magnates of great wealth, the American people recognize it for what it is—a yarn and a tall yarn at that.

AMERICAN GULLIBILITY

I hope it will not be construed as unsympathetic with Britain if I say that many cultured English people, among whom I lived, marveled at the gullibility of Americans who could be swindled into believing that a war not of our making, about which we were not even consulted, 3,000 miles away, was "our war," and that we ought forthright to jump in, clothes and all.

My friend, Hillaire Belloc, gives in the Cruise of the Nona an amusing picture of this in the first World War. "The most comic part of the affair," writes Belloc, "was the attitude toward America. We dared not insult America, for we were naturally as keen on getting American help as is a drowning man on catching a deck chair.

"In their ignorance, many people came to believe that it was the duty of the Americans to come over and help, and what was more astonishing still, it was represented to them as a matter of life and death—not to us but to themselves.

"The Americans were told (heaven knows whether any of them believed it) that if the Germans, Turks, Austrians, Bohemians, Slovenes, Croats, Bulgarians, etc., won in their push against the English, French, and Italians—that if the half-baked won against the baked—the next thing would be a sailing of the conquerors over the sea for the rude domination of Scranton, Pa. Fiddlesticks!

"But the people did really talk like that. They shook their fingers at the United States and said, 'It will be your turn next.'"

History repeats itself. Today we have them doing the same thing. And the comedy or rather the tragedy is that many of our governmental officials have swallowed the bait—hook, line, and sinker. Thank God, however, the people have not.

WAR SETTLES NOTHING

On moral grounds there isn't a shred of justification for our entering the war. Moralists demand that before a nation enters a war she must exhaust all pacific means of settling the dispute. What have we done but to call names and shake fists? Moralists demand likewise that the good effects must outweigh the evil effects, otherwise the war must not be waged.

Who will say that the good effects remotely equal the incalculable destruction, agony, and death in modern total war? Not Hitler. Not Daladier. Not Roosevelt. For before the outbreak all declared that the only victors would be destruction and death.

His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, expresses the mind of humanity the world over when he declares: "Nothing is gained by war that cannot be achieved by peace; in war all is lost." The nation that tries to solve its disputes by proving it can destroy more cities, slaughter more people than its opponent is foredoomed to failure. "War," declares His Holiness, "settles nothing." Herein lies the tragedy of war—it is meaningless, utterly and abysmally meaningless.

After cities are laid waste, civilization reduced to a desert, and millions of human beings slaughtered like cattle, what has all the sacrifice yielded? Nothing. Absolutely nothing. After all the destruction and killing are ended, a little group of diplomats gather around a table. "You take this territory, and you take that," they say.

Then, wearing spats and boutonnieres in their Prince Alberts, they put their papers back into their portmanteaus and go home. But there are some things they do not put back. Among them are the precious lives of the millions of young men whose broken bodies rotting beneath the soil proclaim them to be the tragic victims of war—the bankruptcy of statesmanship.

COURAGE TO SAY "NO"

What message would we address respectfully to the President today? I suggest this: "But all the wisdom of America is not to be found in the White House or in the Department of State; we need the meditation, the prayer, and the positive support of the people of America who go along with us in seeking peace. * * *

"At this late date, with the wisdom which is so easy after the event and so difficult before the event, we find it possible to trace the tragic series of small decisions which led Europe into the Great War in 1914 and eventually engulfed us and many other nations.

"We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war, and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say 'no' to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war."

PATH TO PEACE

These are your words, Mr. President, uttered on August 14, 1936. We respectfully ask that you put them into practice. We ask you to have the courage to say "no" to the warmongers, the interventionists. By so doing you will win the everlasting gratitude of America and the world. Turn from the path to war. Lead us, as you swore you would, along the path to peace.

If you will not listen to those authentic voices of the American people—Lindbergh, Wheeler, Nye, Clark, Johnson, Brooks, and all those valiant pleaders for peace—I beg you, Mr. President, listen to that venerable prelate Cardinal O'Connell, when he pleads: "There is no doubt in my mind that the American people desire a cessation of this stupid and brutal war, and I may add that no one can doubt their desire to keep out of the conflict."

By putting into practice your own wise admonition and hearkening to the pleaders for peace, you will win greater renown than all the generals who ever lived. You will win the eternal gratitude of humanity the world over. For you will have made your foreign policy mirror the deathless truth expressed by the Prince of Peace when He said: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

How Can the American Businessman Pay His Taxes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the tax bill is up. United States citizens are expected to dig down not only to the bottom but far below the bottom of the pocketbook to meet the expense of the national-defense program, so-called. In reality we are making gifts not only to Britain but to other countries of millions of dollars and millions of dollars' worth of materials. All to be paid for by the American taxpayer, and while this overwhelming additional burden is being saddled upon the backs of our own citizens, the Government is making it more and more difficult for the taxpayers to meet the additional burden.

Here is what is happening to a manufacturing concern in the Fourth Congressional District. I take the clipping from the Chicago Tribune of July 15. It is as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of July 15, 1941]

BRITISH RUBBER FOR SALE IN UNITED STATES; EMBASSY REPLIES TO CRITICISM

FIRM TO PROTEST

A small rubber-manufacturing company, facing shut-down through Government curtailment of civilian rubber consumption, has received a letter from a British firm offering to supply any type of rubber product, an official disclosed yesterday. The official is William H. Boyd, treasurer of the Vail Rubber Works, Inc., of St. Joseph, Mich., which manufactures highly specialized rollers for paper mills, tanneries, and meat packers.

His company, Boyd said, is being strangled by a Government order issued in June that crude-rubber consumption must be cut 20 percent in the next 6 months. He said he will protest to the Office of Production Management as the result of the letter from Anglo-American Equipments, Ltd., Birmingham, England.

All kinds of rubber goods

It is dated and postmarked June 19, the day before the Government reduction order was disclosed. The letter says the firm is "in a position to supply you with all kinds of rubber goods, either finished or unfinished, which are manufactured in this country."

"As you know, there is a great deal of export trade at the present time," the communication continued, "and we shall be very pleased to receive a definite inquiry from you, to which we will give our immediate and best attention."

Boyd said he is going to ask Federal authorities why the British, apparently plentifully supplied with rubber, should profit by forced American scarcity.

Asks rubber in return

"We're doing everything we can to help the British, but what are we receiving in return?" he said. "Why don't they give us some of that rubber in return for all we're giving them?"

Boyd said he could not explain how the British firm obtained the name of his company. As far as he knows, he said, there is nothing to prevent his doing business abroad if he chooses since Anglo-American Equipments offered finished and unfinished materials, and the reduction order applies to crude rubber.

Boyd said his company probably would be forced to close because of the specialized nature of its business.

It manufactures only on custom order and, consequently, has used relatively small amounts of rubber in the last year. Supplies generally have been obtained in quantities sufficient only to turn out orders on hand.

The firm's principal customers are devoting an estimated 70 percent of their productive capacities to rearmament contracts, Boyd said, and would suffer loss of time and money using other types of rollers.

The Vail works has 16 employees.

CLAIM EXPORTS CUT

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 14.—Great Britain, denying today she was taking advantage of American lease-lend aid to promote her own export trade, asserted she had cut her exports to the bone.

The British Embassy issued a statement in reply to criticism in Congress and elsewhere. Representative JAMES F. O'CONNOR (Democrat of Montana) had asserted American exporters had complained the British were selling American steel and other lease-lend goods to Latin America. He called for an investigation of such "double dealing."

Reports drop in exports

The Embassy said it would not be in the interest of Americans for Great Britain to abandon its export trade entirely. By exporting, the statement explained, Britain earns foreign exchange to help pay her way and thus her dependence upon lease-lend aid is reduced. It added, however, that the lease-lend program makes Britain less dependent upon exports and these are fast being reduced as standing orders are filled.

On the question whether lease-lend material supplied to Great Britain might be reexported, the Embassy said that American authorities must be satisfied as to the ultimate destination and use of all these goods.

Goods called similar

"It should not be assumed," the embassy said, "that the mere fact we are exporting goods of one sort or another which may be more or less similar in character to goods which we are obtaining from America under the Lease-Lend Act or by cash payment is an indication of any violation of the spirit of the Lease Lend Act or is in any sense a violation of the letter or spirit of our obligations to the United States."

British shipments to all South American markets have been drastically restricted, the embassy said, except to the Argentine, where large-scale British purchases of meat have to be paid for. Argentine trade is being reduced to about half what it formerly was, it was stated.

Britain to get United States corn

Great Britain will take about 2,250,000 bushels of Government-owned corn under the lease-lend program, Agriculture Department officials said.

It was said the Commodity Credit Corporation, owner of the corn stock, would transfer this amount to the Surplus Marketing Administration by July 27 for British use.

It was described as a "cash sale" to the Surplus Marketing Administration, which purchases surplus commodities for Harry L. Hopkins, lend-lease administrator. Details of the transaction with Britain were withheld. The Commodity Credit Corporation reported it owned 201,000,000 bushels of corn and held 95,000,000 bushels under loan.

Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a beautiful little cameo of literature entitled "Indiana." The author is an esteemed constituent of mine, Mrs. Frances B. Brundage, of 3345 Park Avenue, Indianapolis. The poem is as follows:

INDIANA

I love you, Indiana, with your prairies, dunes, and hills.
I love your verdant valleys and your sparkling, rippling rills;
The lordly sun above you smiles down on your fair face;
I adore you, Indiana, you have every charm and grace.

Your heroines and heroes far surpass all those of Greece;
Your Junos and your Jasons and their quests of Golden Fleece;
I extol you, Indiana, every river, each blue lake;
And I bend my knees before you—here's my heart and soul to take!

I salute you, Indiana, fair land that gave me life;
May my children and your children praise you through all storm and strife,
May God keep you, Indiana, 'neath the shadow of His wing,
And may noble statesmen guard thee, praise of thee we'll ever sing.

L'ENVOI

With banners bright and garlands thy halls we'll decorate,
And of thy honor and thy fame we'll early sing and late;
Fair queen of all thy sister States, with laurel now we crown thee;
Sanctuary of democracy, a halo clings around thee.

—*Frances B. Brundage.*

Oceans Are Wider

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KNUTE HILL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

ARTICLE BY AL WILLIAMS IN WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS, JULY 28, 1941

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, Oceans Are Wider, by an outstanding airman, Al Williams, which is revealing as well as convincing. He proves conclusively than an air force is the supreme fighting force both in offense and defense.

The present conflict in Europe has shown the superiority of the air force over the army and the navy.

We should have a separate and distinct air department. For years Billy Mitchell fought for this against great odds, which persecuted him to his death. At his side stood Major General Arnold, urging a separate air department. Today the fight for such a separate department is led by Al Williams.

Today, more than ever, this change is necessary. The air force is now handled by four departments or branches: The Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Coast Guard. The result is confusion, jealousy, and lack of cooperation. In the present emergency nothing would be more conducive to the success of our defense program than the creation of a separate air department, when it could really expand, develop, and function to the fullest extent. We all want the most adequate defense possible. I sincerely hope the Army and the Navy will join with this public demand for so necessary a change in our fighting defense program.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of July 28, 1941]

OCEANS ARE WIDER

(By Al Williams)

Air power as we know it today has widened our oceans, militarily, instead of narrowing them. There's something to chew on. We have always depended on the oceans to protect us against everything but enemy warships—and that's the way it is right now. Beyond a few demonstration bombers—and there are mighty few in the world capable of the Atlantic round trip—what else besides warships need we fear coming to attack us over the Atlantic? They—warships—are the only European weapons that might in the wildest conception attack our shores with the idea of effecting a landing for an expeditionary force. Where does the "widening of the oceans" come in? Well, it's the major point proved in Europe's war, the point that no warships can withstand attacks from shore-based air forces. Therefore, since the British Navy—the mightiest in the world and 10 times the strength of the German outfit—could not maintain control of the North Sea or the Mediterranean, and now confesses its inability to rule the seas a thousand miles out in the Atlantic in the face of German air power and submarines, why cannot we plan to work the same factors against any fleet—no matter how great—that might contemplate attacking our eastern seaboard?

With any decent force of bombers we can stop any sea fleet 500 miles off our shores. It must be remembered that a sea fleet is one thing. It takes years to build. It would have to move with all its strength—as a unit. Therefore, it is one bull's eye for the air power designed to bomb it. Assuming that the British Fleet were still at its pre-war strength, plus all the warships the Germans possess and whatever the Italians have left—is there anyone who dares maintain that a thousand American bombers could not smash that armada as effectively as European air power routed British sea power?

A thousand bombers are by no means a great force in view of what is considered air power today. But they constitute, far and away, enough striking power to smash the daylights out of any sea fleet. Why, that job would be a joy ride—especially since all the aircraft carriers of Europe would be smashed as soon as they came within range of our patrolling bombers.

With European aircraft carriers smashed, the ultra-vulnerable sea fleet with its train (and a vast number of supply and cargo ships would have to accompany a fleet of warships aimed at attacking us in such fashion as to effect a landing of army forces) would be wide open to our bombers.

These are not only my thoughts but the sound and technically supported opinions of the best military and naval minds in this country. And I believe that with their own war lessons strongly in mind, European strategists would agree. In the event of such a sea invasion attempt, the holocaust would be the most disastrous affair ever waged and staged by sea power. The result would leave us commanding the entire Atlantic—and Europe without warships.

Freedom Stops When War Begins!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, while the United States is the cradle of democracy and the hope of millions in foreign lands, our past experience has shown us that when we are engaged in war, democracy stops working and a military dictatorship takes its place.

Freedom of speech is assured in this country by the Constitution, and enforced by decisions of the Supreme Court, but when war comes, freedom of speech disappears.

At the present moment the Secretary of War cannot wait until we are actually at war, but takes it for granted that we are in and immediately starts to throttle free speech. If he had his way we would be in the war, but he has spoken out of order. We are not yet in. The Secretary indicts Senator WHEELER and convicts him himself for sending out cards to the public urging them to make their wishes known to Congress. These cards were not sent out to selectees under the draft law, but to the public long before the selectees had entered training. It appears that a few cards were remailed to the selectees in camp. This was the natural thing for postmasters to do.

Mr. Speaker, there was absolutely nothing wrong about sending these cards to the public. Everyone in the possession of his normal senses knows that. But the Secretary of War says this act is close to treason! His exact statement about the matter was:

> Some matters have come to my attention today, including two circulars franked by Senator WHEELER. Without expressing legal opinions, I will simply say that I think that comes near the line of subversive activities against the United States, if not treason.

This is a fair sample of what will be done to the average citizen when we get into war. If a Secretary of War can launch such outrageous charges against a Member of the United States Senate, when we are not at war, just contemplate, Mr. Speaker, what would happen to the average citizen and his right of free speech when war actually comes.

The Secretary of War is so determined to have war that he becomes impatient and loses his sense of balance when confronted with any force, which, to his obviously prejudiced mind, tends to interfere with what he wants done. A wise Secretary of War, before saying anything in this case, would have first looked up the facts. If he had done that, no such expression would have come from him. But his mind is so keyed to actual war that he couldn't wait to find out the facts, but jumped to conclusions all of which are now known to be erroneous and false. After making this monumental blunder and knowing that the effect of his statement has injured Senator WHEELER in the eyes of the public, the least the Secretary can do is to publicly withdraw his statement, apologize to Senator WHEELER and resign his position. I do not believe that the American people want any such "powder box" at the head of the War Department.

Every citizen knows that he cannot be deprived of his life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Yet in time of war, this due process of law is lodged, not with the courts, but with the military authority. Does anyone doubt that in time of war private property can be taken without due process of law? Right now, before we are actually involved in a war, is private property being taken without due process of law?

There is absolutely nothing in the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, or subsequent amendments that cannot be suspended in time of war, and the Government exercised by military authority.

For all of these reasons the people of the United States do not want any war except a war of self-defense. They do not mean that "self-defense" constitutes going across the Atlantic or the Pacific to fight with American soldiers. They will support the Monroe Doctrine, but they do not think the Western Hemisphere extends to England, Germany, Italy, Africa, and Japan.

In a straight war of self-defense the American people are one solid unit. They will offer their property (which they will soon do in "takes"), and their lives for the defense of this land, but they cannot understand why we must fight to defend every so-called democracy on earth before we can defend ourselves.

There is great sympathy for England in this country—aside from the British propaganda—but the American people cannot understand just what England is trying to do in this war. England has refused to declare her war purposes. The nearest she has come to it is to approve something our representatives have said.

It is difficult to understand what Churchill is trying to do. Just at present he drools down his shirt front for Russia, but here is what his views about Russia were a short time ago:

[From The World Crisis, volume 4, The Aftermath, by Winston Churchill]

[Chapter IV, Russia Forlorn (p. 71)]

> But Russia had fallen by the way and in falling she had changed her identity. An apparition with countenance different from any yet seen on earth stood in the place of the old ally. We saw a state without a nation, an army without a country, a religion without God. The Government which claimed to be the new Russia sprang from revolution and was fed by terror. It had denounced the faith of treaties, it had made a separate peace, it had released a million Germans for the final onslaught in the west. It had declared that between itself and non-Communist society no good faith, public or private, could exist and no engagements need be respected. * * * The old Russia had been dragged down and in her place there ruled "the nameless beast" so long foretold in Russian legend. Thus the Russian people were deprived of victory, honor, freedom, peace, and bread. Thus there was to be no Russia in the councils of the Allies—only an abyss which still continues in human affairs.

[P. 75—Lenin]

> "A Russian statistical investigation" writes Professor Sarolea, "estimates that the dictators killed 28 bishops, 1,219 priests, 6,000 professors and teachers, 9,000 doctors, 12,950 landowners, 54,000 officers, 70,000 policemen, 193,290 workmen, 260,000 soldiers, 355,250 intellectuals and professional men, and 815,000 peasants." These figures are endorsed by Dr. Hearnshaw, of King's College, Cambridge, in his brilliant introduction to A Survey of Socialism. They do not, of course, include the vast abridgements of the Russian population which followed from famine.

[P. 80—The Supreme Committee—1917]

CROCODILES WITH MASTER MINDS

[P. 99—Chap. V.—Intervention]

> The Bolsheviks who, on January 4, had joined with the French and Swedish Governments in recognizing the independence of Finland, invaded Finland and captured Helsingfors on January 28, 1918. This was no ordinary war of troops and cannon. The Soviet Red Guard advanced by moblike methods, and before them, more deadly than carnal weapons, sprang up the local forces of Communist propaganda and revolt. Two horrible pages in Finnish history were successively written. On March 1, a treaty of peace and amity was signed between the Finnish Republic and the Soviet. A "red" terror followed in Finland. But here the Germans intervened as rescuers. * * *

[Chap. V. Intervention * * * p. 102.—The Ukraine]

> Everything is relative. Everyone tries to remember (and tries to forget) the German occupation of Belgium. Here in the Ukraine these same Germans came as deliverers and were spontaneously recognized as such, not only by the general population, but by those patriotic elements most hostile to the invaders of Russia. A dose of communism induces a desire in any population to welcome any other form—even the hardest—of civilized authority. With the arrival of the German "steelhelmets" life again became tolerable.

We will suppose that Russia defeats Germany and starts an invasion of Germany. What will Churchill do then? The natural thing for him to do—and I venture the prediction that he will do it—is to revert to his former opinion of Russia, voiced in his book and quoted above.

Russia receives the applause of England today because she is fighting Germany, not because the English have anything in common with the Russian Government. England has a capitalistic government; so has Germany. Russia has not. Russia is a government where state ownership has supplanted private ownership or capitalism.

England would not be fighting Germany today if Germany had not defied the English monetary system. Germany has no gold or silver standard. She bases her dollar on labor, but at the same time allows the capitalistic system to function under a new monetary system. Germany has defied the Bank of England and seems to function very efficiently under a different system.

In this country those who are loudest in their demands for war are the most concerned with maintaining the Bank of England's scheme of finance. The present monetary system in the United States is duplicated in the monetary system of England, and because of this duplication there is a close unity between the powers that govern both countries.

We often hear it said that we should get into this war to preserve our civilization. That is not what these people mean at all. We should get into this war to save the money system of England and the United States.

We are not now at war, thank God, and I can say what I actually think on the floor of this body. I shall speak the truth as I see it and run the risk of being labeled a Nazi, Fascist, Bolshevik, or any other appellation. I know myself that I am an American and will fight to the last breath for the protection of our territory.

I say to you right now that in this world struggle one of two things must happen eventually. If it does not happen at the close of this war, it will happen some time and there will be more wars as soon as the people are able to fight on. There will either be governments which operate under the capitalistic system, under a free monetary system, or there will be no capitalistic system at all. We can take our choice.

Here in the United States we should change our monetary system now and divorce it from the Bank of England. We should base our dollars on labor and not on a false standard of any metal. When we have done that we shall not have hunger in the midst of plenty; we will not have millions looking for work where there is no work. Our country will then serve the people as a class and not a few that now own it all. With this system in operation, we can pledge our property and our lives to defend that democracy which our forefathers intended it should be.

The people of the United States should not be fooled by paid British propaganda now running into huge millions, and which, through our lease-lend bill, we will pay ourselves. Remember we are not in this second World War and will not be if the people themselves keep their feet on the ground and do not consume the war hysteria now so rampant in this country.

Remember also we had to whip England twice before we could secure our own independence. Remember that the agents of Great Britain now have the gall to come to this country and say that our Members of Congress are not to be compared with those of England, where they only elect their intelligent and influential men to Parliament. For the present, forget England and remember the United States.

The Most Important Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received from one of my constituents:

MEDFORD, WIS., *July 21, 1941.*

THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION

When will Uncle Sam cease "Santa Clausing" the foreign warring nations at the expense of the citizens of the United States in amounts of many billions of dollars?

This is a question of utmost importance at this time, when the United States of America is approaching the brink of World War No. 2, by sending ammunition and other war supplies to Great Britain on credit. Great Britain, on account of credit extended prior and after the World War armistice, owed the United States $4,600,000,000, according to agreement by the World War Foreign Debt Refund Commission, and A. Geddes, His Britannic Majesty's Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, which agreement was signed on June 19, 1923, by A. W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury and ex officio Chairman of the World War Foreign Debt Refund Commission, and was approved the same day by Warren G. Harding, President of the United States (vide record of proceeding of said Commission, pp. 108–113). Under said agreement, Great Britain was to refund the $4,600,000,000 in 62 annual installments, the first installment of $23,000,000 to be paid December 15, 1923; the last one of $175,000,000 to be paid December 15, 1984. The first 10 installments were to bear 3-percent interest, the last 52 installments to bear 3½ percent interest. The interest was to be paid in gold coin or gold bullion of equal value at the Treasury of the United States or at the Federal Reserve Bank in New York City. All interest was to be paid semiannually.

How did Great Britain carry out this agreement?

A report from the Treasury Department, dated July 14, 1941, signed by Charles Schwarz, Director of Public Relations, shows that on June 30, 1941, Great Britain owed the United States a total of $5,805,850,288.81 on account of World War No. 1. This consisted of $4,368,000,000 of unpaid principal and the balance of unpaid interest. Thus, Great Britain, on June 30, 1941, owed the United States $1,205,850,288.81 more than they did June 19, 1923.

JOHN GAMPER.

United States Selectee-Parents Legion Against Involvement in European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

LETTER FROM THE UNITED STATES SELECTEE-PARENTS LEGION

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNITED STATES
SELECTEE-PARENTS LEGION,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

Honorable MEMBER OF THE CONGRESS:

Respectfully we ask you, sir, to use all of the command and influence of your high office to keep our sons out of Europe.

We are not yet the self-anointed saviors of the world, nor yet breathed upon to make the world safe for democracy, again; we are concerned most vitally with preserving democracy in these United States, rather than impressing our way of life upon Europeans, or Asiatics, who may choose to decide their own way of life.

We do not believe it is our lot to determine the balance of power in Europe, as between imperialism on the one hand and dictatorship on the other. We have no irrational dreams of a world empire.

Mothers and fathers of sons enlisted or selected will march to defend these United States. We believe in the best military training, under auspices of Uncle Sam's own men, as we believe in maintaining at all times, not only in times of political expediency, adequate preparedness to keep our United States secure from all combinations of foreign powers.

While he may have the power to commit our beloved country to war, declared or undeclared, we are of the opinion our President has not the right, under our laws and under international law, to do and say those things which force us into Europe * * * which mean another expeditionary force to Europe, with more plowing under of the flower of young United States American manhood, our sons.

Most powerful in these United States is the family group. Who betrays first and destroys secondly this same family group, helps tear democracy apart and outrageously ignores the will of the fathers and mothers, who, all over our land, are most emphatically opposed to having their sons blown to bits in foreign battlefields. To these parents, in Boston last October, our President said: "I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again; your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

Convoys of war supplies into combat zones by our ships and men spells war; we fathers and mothers of sons know it and want none of it. Hon. C. W. TOBEY's bill, to ban such acts, should be approved.

May we depend, sir, upon both your respect for and your support of our will in these matters, as we depend upon the Congress to represent the people * * * while we give all we have for defense of the United States, in the United States?

Very sincerely yours,

GEO. ALBERT SHIVES, *President.*

PRINCIPLES AND PURPOSES OF THE UNITED STATES SELECTEE-PARENTS LEGION

First. To organize and establish a national incorporation of parents and wives of soldiers, with national headquarters at Cincinnati, Hamilton County, Ohio, which headquarters shall thereafter, upon petition received and approved by the national body, further establish State associations to be known as departments and community associations to be known as home-defense units throughout the United States;

Second. As hereafter provided, national and local activities shall be determined by the national headquarters board of governors, assisted by the national board of control, which latter board shall consist of one representative of each State department, each of whom shall be elected by one elector each from the several home-defense units of each State represented;

Third. To admit to membership in this national organization, upon application and approval thereof, any person or persons being parent or wife of a selectee, draftee, enlistee, or being parent or wife of a person who, during any period of emergency as declared by the Congress of the United States, may be called into the armed forces of the United States, or any person or persons standing in or taking the place of the natural parent (loco parentis), provided nevertheless that such person or persons shall be agreeable to and abide by the principles and pur-

poses for which the United States Selectee-Parents Legion stands united;

Fourth. Steadfastly to preserve, protect, and defend the principles of American democracy, as stated in the Constitution of the United States and as exemplified in the historic traditions of our country; in war or peace, we stand for the preservation of the democratic way of life, with government truly of, by, and for the people.

Fifth. To maintain by all means of assistance at the disposal of our members an impregnable, all-inclusive defense of and for the United States of America, without special privilege and with no one escaping the duties and obligations necessary to such object, within the limits of his or her ability and means;

Sixth. To use all lawful means and effort of our membership and our national organization to prevent using or sending our youth again to fight or making war in foreign lands, for any cause whatsoever;

Seventh. To strive to avoid the participation of this Nation in any war except one of absolute self-defense, and to keep the power of decreeing war, declared or undeclared, in the Congress of the United States;

Eighth. To protect, defend, and sustain the moral and civil rights and the spiritual, mental, and physical life of our youth, now and hereafter;

Ninth. To assist, by all lawful means, in extending humanitarian aid to all oppressed peoples of the world, so long as that aid does not weaken adequate economic and military security of the United States of America:

Tenth. By example, rather than by interference, to help show Europe and Asia that people can lay aside national animosities and live in peace, when government is indeed of, by, and for the people;

Eleventh. To do all things necessary and incidental to accomplishment of the foregoing and matters related, best to maintain the welfare and the future security of the United States of America;

Twelfth. To perpetuate this national organization, so that the voice of parents and those nearest in interest to our boys may be heard as never before provided.

United States Selectee-Parents Legion, National Heaquarters, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Hearings on Air Force Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

ARTICLE BY CHARLES T. MALONE

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article on the subject of a separate air force by Mr. Charles T. Malone, president of the American Glider Association, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 11, 1941]

ASKS HEARING NOW ON UNIFIED AIR FORCE—GLIDER ASSOCIATION HEAD REVIEWS HISTORY OF LONG DEBATE

(By Charles T. Malone, president, American Glider Association)

The question of whether or not to unify our air services, first seriously raised in 1919, has reached its majority. It is old enough to vote, but it has not yet been voted upon.

Following the return of our boys from the battlefields of the World War, a great discussion arose among our pilots relating to the value of air services attached to the Army and to the Navy as against the value of a combined air service such as the Royal Air Force of England. It was argued that the combination of the Royal Flying Corps and the Royal Naval Air Service at the height of the war saved England—and that we should follow suit. Another serious subject of discussion of that period concerned the future of the aircraft industry which had grown up during the war and was abandoned forthwith upon the cessation of hostilities. The English, it seems, had subsidized both manufacturers and air-line operators—and other European nations were doing likewise. We, however, feeling that the growing industry could take care of itself, were content to let things slide.

Bills were introduced in both the United States Senate and the House of Representatives which provided for the unification of all Government air services into one group—and also provided for Government encouragement of the commercial manufacturers and operators. Hearings were held on the House bill by a subcommittee presided over by Representative F. H. LaGuardia, acting chairman. Many prominent men testified, and the weight of the evidence indicated that the proposed legislation should have been passed—but it wasn't!

The next really serious attempt to obtain legislation unifying the air services resulted in the appointment of a select committee of inquiry into operations of the United States air services by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. This committee, known as the Lampert committee, examined more than 150 witnesses under oath, and its work extended over a period of 11 months, terminating on December 14, 1925. The parade of witnesses passing before this committee was indeed an aeronautical who's who. Here was presented evidence to prove that Gen. William Mitchell's airplanes had succeeded in sinking the German battleships in the 1921 tests, and evidence to prove that the battleships would not have been sunk if there had been fire power aboard when the bombers flew overhead. General Mitchell testified several times, and several admirals testified to opposing facts. It was indeed a battle of the giants.

Since the question of a unified air corps is becoming of increasing interest to the public who, after all, must pay the bill, it should prove interesting to ascertain the results of the Lampert committee hearings. These are probably best expressed by Representative Reid, of Illinois, a member of the committee and the person chosen by General Mitchell to represent him when the general was tried by court martial for insubordination, in his special concurring report, which was painstakingly documented. A few of the choicer paragraphs are quoted herewith:

"The testimony—Army, naval, and civilian—before the committee is unanimous in support of the 'indispensability' of aircraft, both alone and in cooperation with the military forces, and the bulk of it is clearly to the effect that 'the potentialities of aircraft * * * are almost incalculable' and that 'our national defense must be supplemented, if not dominated, by aeronautics.'

"Considering the probable increase in the power of aircraft in the future, this opinion must outweigh certain testimony placing aeronautics as a mere 'adjunct' or an 'auxiliary' to land and sea operations.

"The uncontroverted evidence presented in support of this indispensability and potentiality is so definite and overwhelming that one is convinced that its importance demands that, at least, air power must have a "coordinate voice in the councils of the nation with sea power and land power.'"

With respect to the suggested unified air service, Representative Reid had the following to say:

"Considerable divergence of opinion is found among those who favored the secretary for air controlling military, naval, and civil aeronautics (or the Air Corps as an intermediate step) and those who were definitely against either but favored maintaining aeronautics in the Army and Navy under the present system, or under the present system but placed under one secretary for defense.

"In addition to general objections to the unified air service * * * specific objections were registered.

"As to the specific objections, it is believed that they represent merely unwarranted anticipations of minor difficulties."

Congressman Reid's keen analysis of the problems raised with respect to "unity of command" is represented in part by the following:

"The opponents of the unified air service are horrified at the idea of a 'trinity of command' which the 'proposed organization creates,' and it is argued that 'another uncoordinated national defense force in the field of battle' would be a catastrophe, yet the cooperation between the Army and Navy is claimed to 'be very good.'"

"One is forced to believe that unified national defense effort is obtained only by the unified air service proposal, with the Army, Navy, and air under one secretary of defense."

In 1925, when the Lampert committee hearings were held, air power was practically unknown—at least air power as we know it today was not even dreamed of by the average man or, one suspects, by the average general or admiral.

The unified air force question, or the department of defense question, is of sufficient importance to warrant public hearings being held immediately, before we become active participants in the current war.

It is recommended that the President immediately request the Speaker of the House to appoint a select committee of 9 members, in accordance with the Mundt resolution, House Resolution 228, for the purpose of holding hearings and conducting an investigation into the advisability, if any, of giving the air forces of this country a coordinate standing with the War and Navy Departments either by the creation of a Secretary of Air Defense having equal rank with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Navy or by the consolidation of all defense establishments of the Government under a Department of National Defense with heads of the Divisions of War, Navy, and Air as Assistant Secretaries of Defense. Certainly this proposal is worth a hearing.

Investigation of the National-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 29 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

RADIO PROGRAM ENTITLED "THE CONGRESSIONAL MAILBAG"

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like at this time to submit for the

Appendix of the RECORD the script of a radio program sponsored by the Committee of Americans and participated in by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and Hugh A. Fulton, chief counsel for the National Defense Committee.

The program, called The Congressional Mailbag, was broadcast July 22 last over the Nation-wide facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting System. It was the third in a series of programs designed to reacquaint Americans with the work and importance of the legislative branch of our Government.

Mr. Berkley Thomas, of New York City, is president of the Committee of Americans. Royce Powell, of Washington, acted on behalf of this committee as master of ceremonies for the broadcast.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. The Columbia Broadcasting System presents tonight the Congressional Mailbag in cooperation with the Committee of Americans. This is the third in a series of broadcasts brought to you from Washington by the Committee of Americans. Tonight we look at the mail of two members of the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, and of a member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee. What is the concensus of American opinion about the various aspects of national defense? Let's have a look at the contents of the Congressional Mailbag and see. Presiding over the letter opening will be Royce Powell, of the Committee of Americans.

Mr. POWELL. This is Royce Powell in Washington about to open the Congressional Mailbag. Tonight the Committee of Americans presents two United States Senators, members of committees especially concerned with national defense. They obligingly have agreed to let us have a look at their mail from back home and hear their comments upon it. It is a pleasure to announce the following guest speakers: Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri, chairman of the Special Defense Committee; Hugh Fulton, chief counsel for the Special Defense Committee, who is pinch hitting tonight for Senator MEAD, of New York, a committee member, who has been unavoidably detained; and Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, a member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee. In the order named, I am going to ask each of these gentlemen to give us the general contents of his mail from back home. Senator TRUMAN, as chairman of the special committee, generally known as the Truman committee, you're from Missouri. So will you, therefore, lead off by showing us your mail and what it shows you?

Senator TRUMAN. Yes, Mr. Powell, I'm from Missouri, both actually and in the sense that I have to be shown. In that sense, all of us concerned with national defense should be from Missouri. Each day the mail bags bring letters from all over the country to me and to my defense committee; we not only welcome these letters, we need them. It gives us a feel of the pulse of America. For instance, a worried mother writes to complain of conditions in her son's Army camp. Another is a penciled note from a man in Texas. He owns a small but well-equipped machine shop. He has tools needed for defense, and he knows how to use them, but he can't seem to get a Government contract. Priority regulations prevent him from getting materials to make every-day civilian things. He may have to close his shop. I get many, many letters like that one. Here's a telegram from my own State of Missouri. It reads in part, "there are thousands of small shops such as ours with idle equipment because we can't get defense work on the one hand nor material to make nondefense products on the other." In this connection, Mr. Powell, I would like to assure this Nation-wide audience that the whole question of defense contracts is a paramount consideration of the National Defense Committee. We are going to make sure that the defense contracts are so drawn and so executed that Mr. Taxpayer gets his money's worth.

Mr. POWELL. I'm sure all we taxpayers are happy to hear that promise, Senator TRUMAN, for we will soon get the tax bill. Thank you, Senator Truman. Before asking you for a further outline of your mail and your opinions on it, I would like to ask Mr. Fulton about what the postman drops on the desk of the Senator from New York. Mr. Fulton?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Powell, during his 22 years in Congress Senator MEAD has observed great changes in both the mood and volume of his mail. There was a time when he could personally attend to each item of correspondence. Not any more. Whereas mail used to arrive in pouches it now comes in carloads. For every one letter received before the war and before we launched our national-defense program, there are now hundreds of letters. Everybody seems to be Government-conscious. The cry is "Write your Senator!" And believe me they do. During one particular week his office was smothered with 20,000 letters and telegrams every day. To handle such bulk we need an electric gadget just for opening envelopes and two special clerks working at top speed. Even so Senator MEAD cannot begin to acknowledge all of it. There are such extraordinary demands on his time these days that he can personally read only a few hundred a week. His assistants must read the rest and tell him their contents. Nevertheless, he warmly welcomes all this mail from home. By that, he means however, that he welcomes the honest, straightforward, and constructive type of mail because very often criticisms, suggestions, and ideas offered by constituents prove most helpful. Unfortunately though, he gets barrels of the other kind, too—letters obviously inspired by pressure groups, letters that are abusive or threatening or demanding.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Fulton, just what is Senator MEAD'S run-of-mine mail all about?

Mr. FULTON. Well, Mr. Powell, when you consider that the State of New York has more than 13,000,000 inhabitants representing just about every race, creed, and walk of life, you can well imagine that the contents of Senator MEAD'S mail runs the gamut of what people want, think about, and worry over. Flood control, droughts, the milk strike, defense contracts, jobs, taxes, airports, and harbors. Those are but a few of the subjects. And there are the more bizarre requests. Senator MEAD has been asked to review poetry, to settle bets, to advise the lovelorn, to sign notes, and to lend money. One morning he even received a crate containing an ailing dejected-looking chicken. The owner wanted the Senator to diagnose the illness.

Mr. POWELL. I presume that chicken had merely mislaid an egg. But seriously, Mr. Fulton, what about the mail dealing with defense?

Mr. FULTON. This mail Senator MEAD feels to be the most important of all during this crucial hour for America. Senator TRUMAN just a moment ago referred to these letters and he has mentioned how much the defense committee is concerned over them. I mean the letters from businessmen and manufacturers who can no longer get the raw materials to make the things they have all along been making * * * for the reason these raw materials are needed for tanks, bombers, helmets, and hand grenades.

Mr. POWELL. I believe the congressional mailbag audience would like to hear about this in some detail, if you will. But first, if I may, I would like to call on Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, for a brief index of his daily mail. Will Mr. Fulton yield?

Mr. FULTON. Gladly, Mr. Powell.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you, Mr. Fulton. Then, to hear next from Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire.

Senator BRIDGES. My experience has been identical with Senator MEAD'S. My mail from New Hampshire and New England simply pours in nowadays. To be sure the people back home are profoundly concerned with the violent events in Europe, but they are even more concerned with the huge defense effort here in America. And being hardheaded New England Yankees they want the facts about this defense job, and they want their facts undiluted. Furthermore, they want action, not excuses or promises. You'll have to admit that we have seen lots of promises made and broken, and lots of excuses offered as substitutes for efficiency.

My friends in New England aren't easily fooled, and if I do say so they are past masters at reading between the lines. For example, all sorts of optimistic reports have appeared in the papers and over the radio. One official says our tank program is well ahead of schedule. Another says the same thing about our airplane production. Those announcements listen well, but they're too pat for comfort.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you, Senator BRIDGES, for these introductory remarks which promise some very interesting listening a bit later. At the moment and for the benefit of many, perhaps like yourself, who are not fully acquainted with work of the Senate Defense Committee, I would like to call again on its chairman, Senator TRUMAN. Senator, would you briefly sketch the character and work of this special committee?

Senator TRUMAN. Well, Mr. Powell, we who are on the Special Defense Committee are assigned to the job of finding the logs that jam the flow on our vast river of national defense. When we find these logs we try to discover how they got there. And then we try to ascertain the best and quickest way to pry them loose and dig them out.

Mr. POWELL. As a matter of fact, Senator, didn't this committee play a principal part in the settlement of the April coal strike?

Senator TRUMAN. Well, Mr. Powell, it took the participation and cooperation of a lot of persons and agencies to effect that settlement. Our committee acted as a sort of clearing house of information where opinions were crystallized and issues threshed out in the open. Several hours following the close of a stormy public hearing, we received word from the White House that terms of agreement had been reached. So the answer to your question, Mr. Powell, is that the committee did not directly settle the strike. But it helped to get those miners back to their digging. And that's the important thing.

And right here, Mr. Powell, I would like to point out that the national-defense committee does not seek to substitute its judgment for that of other governmental departments or agencies of defense. They have their own jobs to do. However, we can and will and do ascertain the facts about what they are doing and why they are doing it. And we bring these facts to light and suggest that they consider changes or different courses of action whenever we think it necessary to the effective working of the defense program. We leave the determination up to them, but we want to be very certain that no stone is left unturned. And, Mr. Powell, every citizen in this great Nation during this great emergency has a stake in that. And furthermore, these defense contracts must be distributed in such a way that every person who can do his share, gets his share of the work. This defense job includes everybody, big and small, the plain, unvarnished people as well as the wealthy and influential.

Mr. POWELL. Senator Truman, would it be possible to sum up in a single definition the character of this committee? That is, is it a dictatorial oligarchy of legislative punitive powers vested in a hierarchy of bureaucratic solons, or is it——

Senator TRUMAN. Whoa, Mr. Powell.

Mr. POWELL. Thanks for stopping me.

Senator TRUMAN. Briefly put, you might say our committee is a benevolent policeman. We play no favorites, and we don't propose to whitewash the walls of any office. Ours is the painstaking labor of sifting the truth from the masses of evidence. We must be circumspect in our attitude and fair in our judgment. As important considerations present themselves we hold public hearings. Also from time to time the committee Senators make speeches explaining their findings from the Senate floor. Periodically, too, the committee submits reports to the Senate. For example, we did that in the case of aluminum. We heard all sides of that situation. And when we got through we realized that there was not onl, a serious shortage of that light, precious metal, but also that there was delay and lack of cooperation right down the line. Senator MEAD spoke out sharply about aluminum from his Senate desk. And in our report we reemphasized the need for greater speed and better teamwork. We rapped some knuckles to be sure, but we tried to do it in a constructive way. We didn't take the easy course and blame the President. We want aluminum, not excuses. The same goes for anything else that's not coming down the river of defense. The goods either will come down or we'll know the reason why. Mr. Powell, I'm from Missouri.

Mr. POWELL. So is the whole country, Senator. And thank you very much. I would now like to ask Mr. Fulton if he would resume his earlier discussion of the problems facing business hit by priority rulings involving shut plants and unemployment.

Mr. FULTON. Yes; I was pointing out that some business, long engaged in peace industry, can no longer get raw material now going into implements of war. Fortunately some of these businessmen and manufacturers have been able to convert their machines and equipment. This makes them eligible for defense contracts and raw materials. Thus they can help make the helmets and hand grenades. However, many—all too many—seem unable or unequipped to do that. What happens then? Well, let's take a hypothetical case. Here is a small, peaceful, and prosperous community. The one large factory in this little town makes, let us say, garden implements. Many hundreds of the town's inhabitants work in that factory. Now along comes the defense program and priority regulations. The factory in the little town can no longer get all the steel needed to make garden implements. Rakes, trowels, and sprinklers aren't needed very much for defense.

At first gradually, and then in increasing numbers, men are laid off. Soon the factory shuts down altogether. Whole families of good Americans face a perilous future. And at a time, moreover, when their skills and determination are needed most.

Mr. POWELL. I gather, Mr. Fulton, that Senator MEAD's concern over this perplexing dilemma is occasioned in good measure by what he hears from home.

Mr. FULTON. Yes, indeed, Mr. Powell. He's getting letters in increasing numbers from people facing this tragic possibility. They all ask their Senator for a quick, fair solution. It isn't one easily arrived at. It will be reached, however, because America must finish this defense job and still stay in business when the war is over. For instance, we are locating the bottlenecks caused by defense demands, so they can be opened, thus holding the defense plan at express-train speed. We are studying how we can quickly put to work available tools and machines usable for defense. In other words, we want to see to it that this big job is so spread out that everyone can roll up his sleeves, spit on his hands, and pitch in. In that way our imaginary little town will be saved. The machinery and tools in the factory will be readjusted. Instead of rakes and trowels it will produce actuating pins for hand grenades and buckles for helmet straps. Gradually the workers will return to their jobs and life in our little community will go busily on.

With it all, Mr. Powell, Senator MEAD's mail does include a chuckle now and then. The man with his chicken, and then there's always the ingenious scientist who secretly tells us about a mysterious, all-powerful, death-dealing device almost ready for sale. Yes; the mail bag is always full and he'll probably never get caught up with it. He's still glad to get it. It's part of the way of life we're striving so hard to maintain.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you kindly, Mr. Fulton. And now to hear further from Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, who indicated earlier in the program that his people back home were a bit skeptical about optimistic reports and headlines on the defense program. How about it, Senator?

Senator BRIDGES. Yes; they are skeptical and there are reasons, despite the fact we seem to have a booming defense industry. To get an accurate, over-all picture, we must realize that for this year we are planning to produce only $17,000,000,000 of defense materials, or about one-fifth of our total income. At best this is a modest schedule. But we're even 20 to 30 percent behind on that. And remember Hitler turns more than 45 percent of German capacity to war use. Yet only last week our Under Secretary of War made the statement that—and I quote him—"I doubt that more than 15 percent of America's productive endeavor is devoted to defense work." There's your true situation and it's not one to write home about. But you can readily see why people write to me about it here in Washington. Here is a typical letter. I quote: "Why aren't we moving faster? Why are we still so far behind on all our effort, when a year has passed since we started on this major program? Billions have been spent, but with insufficient result. Senator BRIDGES, what is the answer to this—that's what we people here in New Hampshire want to know."

Mr. POWELL. And Senator, what is the answer to that letter?

Senator BRIDGES. The answer, I am convinced, and I'm not injecting a partisan note here, lies in the lack of a single unifying agency responsible directly to the President, yet having full power to get this job done right. All too many Government units are now operating and often at cross purposes. If we don't adopt some intelligent way of pulling this whole thing together, America is heading for trouble. Let me refer to the situation on aluminum. I understand that when all the evidence placed before the Truman committee had been gathered, separated, and weighed they found that there was no one individual or agency upon whom the blame could be placed. All they knew was that there was a serious shortage with no one responsible for seeing to it that the shortage was made up. The same holds true of our machine-tool capacity. Fifty percent of such capacity is still idle this very day. That couldn't happen with responsible administration.

Mr. POWELL. Senator BRIDGES, do you not find that your constituents feel that the national program is not a thing apart, but very much an integral element of their daily budget? That is to say, Senator, that the people back home, the taxpayer, if you please, wants to be reassured that his extra tax dollars are not being spent for those things which are not basically part of our defense program?

Senator BRIDGES. Yes, Mr. Powell; the mail I receive which does not directly deal with Government contracts for defense orders, reflects a genuine concern on the part of the average voter as to whether there is not room for economy even in a super super spending program.

Mr. POWELL. You mean, Senator, to put it another way, that the rank and file of America has billions for defense business, but not one cent for monkey business.

Senator BRIDGES. Put it that way if you will, Mr. Powell, but in the words of those from whom I hear, America wants an accounting of its tax dollars.

Mr. POWELL. I see, sir. And what do you think the Congress ought to do in this respect?

Senator BRIDGES. It is hard to say, with the new revenue bill not yet out of the House Ways and Means Committee, but I am convinced that the new revenue bill should directly call upon the executive branch of the Government to specify wherein cuts can be made in Federal expenditures to the benefit of both taxpayer and the defense program.

Mr. POWELL. In other words, you feel the President himself should indicate to Congress how it can prune and where?

Senator BRIDGES. I do, indeed.

Mr. POWELL. Well, if I'm not talking out of turn, those are exactly the sentiments of the large membership of the Committee of Americans. And, in fact, the membership of this committee, individually and collectively, has urged upon the House Ways and Means Committee that a resolution accompany the new three and a half billion dollar revenue bill calling for a restriction of spending on all items not directly contributing to national defense.

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Powell, I hope you're right, and I don't think your group or anyone intelligently seeking a cut in nondefense spending is talking out of turn.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you, Senator. What do people up your way consider as a typical nondefense expenditure?

Senator BRIDGES. No. 1 on the list of unnecessary things should be the proposed St. Lawrence waterway. This project would probably cost around $1,000,000,000. It would require from 6 to 8 years to complete. It would divert to a questionable project men and material vitally needed to build planes, ships, tanks, and guns.

Mr. POWELL. Aside from the vast cost of this project, do you feel, as a member of the Military Affairs Committee, that it might turn out to be a military liability instead of a military advantage?

Senator BRIDGES. I do feel it would be a liability. I have sat in committees and listened to the testimony of experts. I have talked with our military leaders, who have stated that if this country were invaded the best way for a foreign power to invade it would be down the St. Lawrence, splitting this country in two. In other words, if we should build the St. Lawrence waterway, we should be offering to any hostile invading power a paved highway to the heart of America.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you very much Senator BRIDGES. We have a few minutes left and in this interval, I would like to recall the chairman of the Special Committee Investigating National Defense, Senator HARRY TRUMAN, of Missouri. Senator TRUMAN, you said that your mail brought an inquiry from a mother who wondered whether her boy was comfortable at camp.

Senator TRUMAN. Yes, Mr. Powell, I have received not one, but many such letters.

Mr. POWELL. Fact is, Senator TRUMAN, I understand that your committee has been conducting an extensive investigation into Army-camp construction and partly because of the pressure from back home. Just what do you and your defense committee hear from back home in this respect?

Senator TRUMAN. I have been hearing plenty, Mr. Powell. I have received a surprising number of communications from persons who are shocked at some of the waste and negligence that they have seen. Also, I have personally inspected several of the camps and talked to the soldiers themselves. After all you can't expect an electrician, for example, who has been drafted at $21 a month to find pleasure in watching an Army camp building being completely wired three times. And you can't blame soldiers who were professional carpenters before the Army got them, for being indignant when they see a gang of highly paid novices standing around leaning on their ladders.

I do think that we all have to expect a certain amount of waste because of the tremendous emphasis on speed. But I for one have been amazed at the extent of this waste. In fact at the present time Senator WALLGREN, of Washington, a member of our defense committee, and Charles P. Clark, the committee's associate chief counsel, are out on the West coast investigating the defense situation out there.

I attribute this waste largely to the lack of proper planning. The Army had 20 years to prepare for this emergency, and, like most other Americans, I had always thought that when M-day came around the Army would simply open its files, take out carefully prepared plans, and quickly provide the necessary construction along lines predetermined long ago.

Mr. POWELL. But that wasn't the case, Senator TRUMAN?

Senator TRUMAN. No; the fact is that M-day or mobilization day came and they didn't even know it until several months later. And then it turned out that the plans available were all based on assumed facts. The assumed facts proved false, and hastily improvised plans had to be substituted.

Mr. POWELL. If you please, Senator TRUMAN, give us just one "for instance" to illustrate what you mean.

Senator TRUMAN. Very well. For instance, one camp site was presumably chosen because it was in an area having an adequate supply of water. It developed subsequently, though, that the same site had to be abandoned because of the actual inadequacy of the water supply.

Mr. POWELL. It certainly is no joking matter, but it would seem the situation you describe practically turned M-day into thirst day.

Senator TRUMAN. I can't exactly subscribe to that, Mr. Powell. But it was just one of those things which you are bound to find in a democracy which overnight girds itself to meet dictatorship. We start slowly, but we finish fast.

Mr. POWELL. I know you are perfectly right there, Senator.

Senator TRUMAN. Moreover, Mr. Powell, I am glad to be able to say that the Army did get the camps constructed in time; that they were in fact very good camps; and that the soldiers, furthermore, are today well housed, well fed, and well taken care of.

Mr. POWELL. Then your criticism, Senator TRUMAN, is what?

Senator TRUMAN. My criticism of camp construction is limited to criticism of the high cost, the waste, and the inefficiency. And you and I are going to have to pay for the cost, the waste, and the inefficiency in the form of increased taxation for years to come.

Mr. POWELL. Senator TRUMAN, the clock tells me I must forbear asking you and Senator BRIDGES and Mr. Fulton any further questions with respect to our national-defense program. But I see I have a few seconds to pay my grateful respects to you all. In this connection, and on behalf of Dean Emeritus Roscoe Pound, of Harvard, who is chairman of the Committee of Americans, I wish to thank you most appreciatively for your joint contribution of this third presentation of the Congressional Mailbag. Joining with me in this expression of gratitude are Prof. Edwin Kemmerer, of Princeton, and Berkley Thomas, who are respectively vice chairman and president of the Committee of Americans.

Senator TRUMAN. Mr. Powell, if I may have a second, I wish to say that we on Capitol Hill who have followed these programs of the Committee of Americans, bringing the legislative branch closer to its constituents back home, are happy to have the opportunity offered.

Mr. POWELL. Very kind of you, Senator TRUMAN, and thank you, Senator BRIDGES and Mr. Fulton for your part in the development of this program, the Congressional Mailbag. This is Royce Powell saying good night.

ANNOUNCER. You have just heard from two United States Senators appearing on a presentation of the Committee of Americans entitled "The Congressional Mailbag." This program marked a third in a series of programs brought to you from Washington and featuring Members of both Houses of Congress who read from and comment on the mail they receive from back home. On tonight's program were Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, a member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, and Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri, chairman of the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, and Hugh A. Fulton, who spoke in behalf of Senator MEAD, of New York, a member of that committee. Royce Powell, acting for the Committee of Americans, presided over the opening of the Congressional Mailbag. For copies of this broadcast, write to Committee of Americans, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

Unlimited Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

RESOLUTION OF PACIFIC NORTHWEST CONFERENCE OF SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Northwest Conference of Savings and Loan Associations recently met at Gearhart, Oreg., at which conference approximately 300 people were present, representing the savings and loan associations from the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, and Utah. The conference adopted a resolution, which I ask to include in my remarks. The resolution follows:

Whereas there exists an "unlimited emergency" as declared by the President of the United States, it is incumbent upon us as citizens to consider well to what extent and in what manner we may best contribute to the welfare of the Nation:

First. By placing our personal time and talents at the beck and call of our leader, President Roosevelt;

Second. By placing the institutions which we represent in a position—

(a) To assist in furnishing housing in defense areas,

(b) To continue to finance homes in our several communities to the extent that such construction is justified by a healthy demand for housing,

(c) To use to the fullest extent the facilities of our institutions for the distribution of United States defense bonds;

Third. By anticipating the effect upon our industry of the national emergency and making recommendations to the Congress and to the administrative and independent agencies of our Government so that regardless of conditions, we may make the maximum contribution to our Nation's welfare during the emergency and also during the difficult transition from a wartime to a peacetime basis which will follow: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this conference urge the immediate enactment of such legislation as is necessary for the further purchase of shares in building, savings, and loan associations by the H. O. L. C.

That a revolving fund be established consisting of the present unexpended portion of the prior appropriation, together with any and all future appropriations for such purchase; and be it further

Resolved, That the president and secretary of the Pacific Northwest Savings and Loan Conference send a copy of this resolution to each Member of Congress from the States comprising the eleventh home-loan bank district; to the Honorable Jesse H. Jones, Federal Loan Administrator; to the Honorable John H. Fahey, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; to the Honorable James Twohy, Governor of the Federal Home Loan Bank System; and to Mr. Morton Bodfish, executive vice president of the United States Savings and Loan League.

Lord Halifax Should Be Sent Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE GAELIC AMERICAN, NEW YORK, JULY 26, 1941

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaelic American, New York, July 26, 1941:

[From the Gaelic American, New York, July 26, 1941]

LORD HALIFAX SHOULD BE SENT HOME

Lord Halifax never tires in his task to inveigle America into the present war to protect and extend the British Empire. Wherever he can secure a tolerant gathering, generally at luncheons, he tells his audience that his country is fighting for world freedom and democracy and he never fails to couple the United States as an actual ally of his country. Already the leaders of England talk as if the United States were their partner in the war against what they call the domination of the world by Hitler.

In their estimation Hitler is the big bad wolf and on the highways of the world they are denouncing him and begging aid from America and other countries for his defeat. So far they have been unsuccessful in their appeals and it is doubtful if they had any important part in bringing about a rupture between Germany and Russia. From the start of hostilities in Europe, Russia seemed to be

unfriendly to Germany. In the early stages of the war Russia moved her forces toward the German frontier and gobbled up a part of Poland after its people had been defeated by the German Armies. In the Balkan war she increased her forces on her Balkan front and though she did not actually interfere her forces remained as a constant menace to Germany which she regarded at least as a powerful rival. This threat remained so menacing and constant that war was inevitable for many months before Germany turned her armies eastward and invaded Russia.

England has pinned her hope of victory in American intervention and her officials in this country, including Lord Halifax and his aides and propagandists have redoubled their efforts to involve America in a foreign war.

Lord Halifax, the English Ambassador, speaking on July 18 at San Francisco, at a luncheon of the Commonwealth Club, coupled the United States with his own country. After paying a tribute to the Russians, he said, in part:

"If Hitler's campaign against Russia goes according to his calculations, and it certainly has not done so yet, we may expect that he will turn to us and make an offer of specious terms of peace. What are these likely to be? He may announce that, having conquered Europe, his ambitions are now satisfied; that Europe must remain a closed continent in which he must be allowed to do as he pleases, that he will leave the British Empire and the United States in peace, though trade and commerce would necessarily, in some circumstances, have to be carried on on his terms."

He said it is the settled policy of the British Government, and also the Government of the United States, to do all in their power to preserve peace in the Pacific.

Lord Halifax, if his words are to be accepted as sincere, regards the United States as an ally of his country in her war against Germany. As America has not yet declared war, this assumption on the part of Halifax is at least premature More than 80 percent of the American people are opposed to intervention in Europe's imperialist war and they are unalterably opposed to spilling American blood or wasting American treasure in a conflict which has no concern for them. Of course, Lord Halifax can fall back for justification of his statements on the words of Knox, Stimson, and other high-ranking members of the Washington administration. Our warmongers assert that England's war is our war and that she is protecting us against German invasion. The administration spokesmen take no note of the fact that Germany's hands are full, perhaps more than full, in her colossal campaign against Russia on her eastern frontier and with the British Empire with her colonies and possessions in every continent, facing her in other directions. Under such circumstances it is either foolish or dishonest to speak of Germany as a prospective invader of America. The warmongers go so far as to say that the invasion may come through Siberia, Alaska, and Canada. An invasion from the east is as impossible as an invasion from the west over the 3,000 miles expanse of the broad Atlantic. In the gigantic struggle waged at present in Russia we read that the German forces have been delayed in their progress by rivers, such as the Dnieper and lesser rivers. Has not the 21 miles of the English Channel prevented for nearly 2 years the invasion of England by Germany's Armies? In the World War the French rivers delayed the onward rush of the German legions? The talk of the invasion of America by Germany with the thousands of miles of ocean separating America from Europe is propaganda which can only deceive the credulous and uneducated. England's propagandists, in their efforts to create hysteria among Americans, are going to great lengths in spinning fairy tales of invasion via Siberia, Alaska, and Canada. The vast Atlantic is regarded as a rivulet by the scaremongers, but its waters remain as an insuperable obstacle to invasion from Europe.

At one time Lord Halifax and his hordes of propagandists would be called to task by a virile American Government for their stunts to involve this country in a war to protect the British Empire. In Grover Cleveland's time an English Minister, Lord Sackville West, was promptly sent home because of his interference in an American election. Today an English Ambassador and his aides are permitted to roam the country unchecked and unafraid in their frantic efforts to involve our young men in imperialist wars, and, furthermore, they are backed up by the Knoxes, the Stimsons, the Ickes, and the entire Washington Cabinet. Is the age of patriotism and Americanism gone?

V-5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZEBULON WEAVER
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

EDITORIAL BY DAN TOMPKINS, EDITOR JACKSON COUNTY (N. C.) JOURNAL

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Hon. Dan Tompkins, editor and owner of the Jackson County Journal, published at Sylva, N. C. The editorial is as follows:

[From the Jackson County (N. C.) Journal of July 24, 1941]

V-5

The symbols are appearing everywhere in the German-occupied portions of the continent of Europe. V, the first letter in victory, is also the Roman figure 5. Hence the numerous variations, the figure 5, the Morse code for victory, the playing of the Fifth Symphony, and so on, has spread throughout the continent like wildfire. Hundreds of arrests have been handed out. And yet the V symbol appears everywhere, on buildings, is tapped out in Morse on the tables of cafes, is heard on radio receivers, appears on windows, walls, sidewalks, barns, outbuildings, on the backs of German soldiers, on the German Embassies in Rome, Istanbul, Madrid, and every conceivable place from the fjords of Norway to the blue waters of the Mediterranean. For V stands for victory for democracy and Christianity over this new tyranny and new paganism. The V's are said to irk the Germans no end. It is the pledge of man to man and woman to woman that the freedom-loving peoples will continue to struggle until the light once more wipes away the darkness of this new night that has settled like a miasmic mist upon Europe, the cradle of our race. It also causes the Germans to tremble for it is the living symbol of unconquerable mankind, a token of the great caldron of wrath that is brewing. "Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord. He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored."

Little would one have dreamt, a few years ago, that history would so far repeat itself as to recur to the days when Christianity was living underground in the catacombs of Rome; when the symbol of the fish was the shibboleth by which the followers of the light, that was brought into the world by the Nazarene and spread throughout the empire by the fishermen of Galilee, made themselves known to each other and defied the temporal power of Rome to forever imprison the souls of men or to keep light and liberty in hiding beneath the ground.

There is a marked similarity between the then and the now; between the V and the fish. Both quietly hurled their defiance to the tyrant and his cohorts, and brought the rays of hope to the hearts of sorely oppressed men and women.

There is one difference. The Christians of the catacombs were waging their campaign alone except for the power of God, who always bides His time and brings better days when the fullness of time arrives. The V army in Europe has behind it the power of the British Empire, the blessings of the United States of America, and the prayers of the sons of liberty everywhere.

V stands for victory. And a British victory is the hope of the restoration of liberty to men and women, of a return to sanity and the days when a human being will be recognized as the most valuable of all earth's riches. Liberty and Christianity are again going through the fiery trials. The aim of the Hitler revolution is to wipe both from the face of the earth; and Hitler indicts himself of that charge in his own words:

"Two worlds are in conflict, two philosophies of life. One of these worlds must break asunder. Can a dynamic revolution stop at a sharing of the world? Must not the struggle continue until the final world dominion of a single nation? My motto is 'Destroy by every means.' So-called international law will not check me—one is either German or Christian. You can't be both."

There you have the truth, the meaning of all this titanic conflict, and from the lips of Hitler himself. Germany has set about to blot out the Bible, both Old and New Testaments, to destroy by every means known to man or devil, Judaism, Freemasonry, and Christianity, for the reason that the teachings and philosophies of these stand in the way of his hopes of enslaving the bodies and the souls of men, of substituting totalitarian frightfulness for fredeom, and of forcing all Germany to do the will of Hitler, and all the world to do the will of Germany.

Winston Churchill has said that the mightiest weapon the Empire has is the spirit of the people That is profound truth. It is impossible to overcome spirit by physical force. For that reason, of all the diabolical weapons used by Hitler, the propaganda is the worst, for it is directed not against physical armaments but against the spiritual bulwark of the free peoples. By cunning lies, frequently repeated, by half-truths reiterated, the way was paved between 1918 and 1939 for the present assault by Germany upon the free institutions of the world. How cunningly that propaganda was devised, how potent it was, is proved every day. It enervated France until she folded up like a mushroom when the attack by force came. It held the British people within its grasp until the real truth was so apparent that anyone could read, and until it was almost too late to retrieve the threatened liberties of the peoples of the Empire. It was taught in the schools in America, preached from the pulpits, hurled at our ears over the radio, published in our papers and magazines, and spoken from the platform, until the voice of sanity and of the traditional love of liberty in America was almost drowned out. Its manifestations became a national disease and a national scandal. Youth movements that recognized not the ancient landmarks of freedom as set up by our fathers swarmed over the land like a pestilence. Pacifist groups were so powerful that the American Legion could not make its voice heard in the councils of the Nation.

The majority of Americans actually believed that the Treaty of Versailles was an atrocity, although our country was not a signatory to it, and although a young German had been sent to a concentration camp for

an indefinite time for expressing the opinion that its terms were not nearly so harsh as those that would have been imposed had Germany won the last war. Many Americans, the majority, we believe, came to the conclusion that American participation in the last war was a mistake, that our leaders were duped into entering it, that those of us who waged it in mortal combat were imbeciles and fools, and that our country was actuated by the low motive of trying to save somebody's money (whose, it was never said, except for the indefinite term "international bankers") instead of the high purpose of preserving the liberties that had been so dearly won for us by our forebears. It brought about, in 20 years or less, a complete reversal of the thinking of a great Nation regarding practically every principle upon which our country was founded and for which it had ever contended. In other words, it made us a different nation, for, "As he thinketh in his heart, so is he."

When the physical onslaught came France fell, Britain had to again find her soul, and America had to regain her high principles.

The V in Europe, the spirit of the British, and the reawakening of America are the answer to the German horror. The spirit of freemen will again sweep the world clean of this unutterably filthy thing that Germany has set up for all the world to worship.

A Slight Case of Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ROXBURY (N. Y.) TIMES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Roxbury (N. Y.) Times of July 26, 1941:

[From the Roxbury (N. Y.) Times of July 26, 1941]

A SLIGHT CASE OF CONFUSION

It is no novelty, to be sure, to find various departments of government working at cross-purposes. But political thinking on the subject of the automobile industry's place in defense offers a particularly interesting current example in this line.

It was only about a year ago that the Federal tax on gasoline was raised 50 percent to meet defense needs. Now a further jump of 65 percent is being debated.

Meanwhile an administration spokesman is talking in terms of gasless Sundays and other measures to cut down the use of automobiles. Proposals are also advanced to cut down the production of cars even more drastically than originally planned and to place a tax on the sale of each new and second-hand car—the latter a deterrent tax aimed more at cutting down purchases than at raising revenues.

It may be naive in this period of Alice-in-Wonderland economics to invoke simple rules of mathematics and logic. But it is hard to see how the Government proposes to raise higher revenues by raising tax rates and then greatly curtailing the operations that are being taxed. In otherwords, you can't take the cake and then expect to have it given to you, too.

The International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

LETTER OF HON. JOHN J. O'CONNOR, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS, TO THE EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely letter by our former colleague, Hon. John J. O'Connor, of New York, to the editor of the Washington Times-Herald. When metropolitan newspapers pose the question, "What the hell is going on, anyhow?" it is time for the Representatives of the people in Congress to forget their partisanship and find the answer to what is going on in many of the responsible agencies of our Government.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 24, 1941.*

EDITOR, WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The editorial in today's issue titled "President of the World?—Maybe," winds up with "What the hell is going on, anyhow?'

That question should be the keynote expression of all thinking Americans. Some of us have been saying it for a long, long time. It should serve to counteract the prevailing slogan of surrender, "What can you do?"

The latter cowardly expression plays right into the hands of those who intend to do what they want to do—lead us into war.

"What can you do?" now fall from the lips of even Republican leaders in Congress—and out. Our leading citizens of both parties seem to have succumbed to this apathetic attitude—"planned that way."

At least one of the fallacies pervading the whole situation, as evidenced in the recent about-face of some leading columnists, for instance, is that each step taken becomes an irrevocable premise. "There's no going back" they say, even though the start was all wrong. "There's no stopping now." Let the drunkard drink himself to death. He shouldn't have got drunk in the first place—or was it "the second place"?

That logic of keeping on going after the first false step—or even many—seems to pervade our best minds.

There was a day, however, when some men were big enough to call a halt, long enough, at least, to say, like you, "What the hell is going on, anyhow?"

"What is all this?"

"What got us into this mess?"

"Let's pull one foot out of the mud before the other gets in."

"Let's call a halt."

There still must be heaps of people thinking that way, who, with a little encouragement, may yet dare to stand the "smear" of "Roosevelt hater," "appeaser," "pro-Nazi," etc.

Schicklgruber was O. K. when Mr. Roosevelt telegraphed him to go ahead with the Munich plan and swallow Czechoslovakia.

Big Joe was N. G. when he was tied up with Schicklgruber. Now he's aces.

It all makes one dizzy—and, of course, that also plays into the hands of the dreamers of Union Now and a World-Wide Democracy with such "democratic" components as the British Empire, China, Greece, Russia, et al.

However disappointing it may be to Mr. Roosevelt, I now nominate "Pal Joey" as the most logical, best qualified head of that potpourri.

Keep up the good work.

Minorities have often been right.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN O'CONNOR,
Former Congressman.

Copy to New York Daily News.

Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BROOKLYN TABLET

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I recommend the following editorial from the Brooklyn Tablet, entitled "Declaration of Independence," to my colleagues as worth-while reading during this hysterical period through which we are now going:

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Next Friday Americans will celebrate the Fourth of July. We shall commemorate the signing of the Declaration of Independence which is reprinted on another page. This epoch-making document announced to the world that the American people, then numbering but 3,000,000 people, were able to run their own affairs. They told foreign governments to clear out of the country, that this Nation no longer depended on Europe for its life.

As we celebrate this eventful day in the year of our Lord 1941, Americans should once more tell the world that ours is a free and independent Republic and no invasion or external interference with our life will be permitted.

The Declaration of Independence on this year takes a new face because the United States is threatened, aye, is suffering, from a new invasion. There are foreign agents here galore; there are organizations in defiance of our Constitution, insisting on "Union Now"; aye, there are those who think the United States should be run from 10 Downing Street, London; and on the air we hear British officials in London telling us what to do, when to do it, and how to do it. As a matter of fact, more is suggested to us than if we were one of the dominions.

On July 4, 1776, Americans expressed their desire to be rid of foreign entanglements. They wanted the world to know that this Nation was independent of foreign rule, of the hates, divisions, jealousies, and wars of ancient nations.

The tablet follows the ideals set forth by our forefathers. We think it was a blunder to have entered the World War in 1917. We

stated mixing in foreign entanglements was not only contrary to the lessons taught by our forefathers and contrary to the Declaration of Independence but was an outrage on the American people. For more than 2 years before the present war commenced, and ever since, we have consistently stood for the sound teachings of the fathers of the Republic. We have received direction in the Holy Father's message; namely, "Nothing is gained in war that cannot be achieved by peace; in war all is lost." For these reasons, among others, we have said, and the common people overwhelmingly support our position, that the stupid suicide of Europe is something we should avoid.

Do not Sunday's events prove once more the sound judgment of the vast majority of the American people? Two of the dictators have fallen out. The vicious Hitler attacks the equally vicious Stalin—leaders of two corrupting regimes which all true Americans denounce and in which they will have no part. Several hours after those two totalitarians got together, Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain, in a typical blood-curdling dictatorial speech, threw off the mask. The British Empire, which we have been told was fighting for the highest ideals for civilization, liberty, and even God, as Mr. Churchill said, grasped the hands of Stalin as an ally. Here is Stalin, his hands dripping with the blood of Christians and Jews, the worst persecutor of Christianity since Nero, the foe of the family, and the champion of nihilistic revolution, the partner who gave Hitler the go-ahead signal to start the war, the invader and robber of large sections of China, of Finland, of Rumania, of Poland, and the aggressor who seized all of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and the man who sent his agents all over the world plotting the destruction of Christian civilization, this man now becomes the ally of Great Britain, the one whom Mr. Churchill is pleased to embrace.

Is not Churchill's expediency about the same as Hitler's, Stalin's, and Mussolini's? Is he not as cold-bloodedly anti-Christian in violating pledges, in ridiculing ideals, in championing anti-God?

What is more degrading is the brazen effrontery of the Prime Minister in telling the United States—this Nation dedicated to God and freedom of religion—to follow his lead in marching alongside of Stalin, Satan's satellite. In this respect it was shocking to Americans to read that President Roosevelt on Tuesday accepted Under Secretary Welles' tortuous reasoning that the end justifies the means, that expediency is superior to principles; that the Soviet beliefs are immoral but the Soviet aims are godly. Only recently, on May 27, 1941, President Roosevelt in his radio address in speaking of the possibility of a Nazi victory, said: "Even our right to worship would be threatened. The Nazi world does not recognize any god except Hitler, for the Nazis are as ruthless as the Communists in the denial of God. What place has religion which preaches the dignity of the human being, of the majesty of the human soul, in a world whose moral standards are measured by treachery and bribery and 'fifth columnists'?" Now, however, the President indicates that American treasure and goods will be made available for an anti-American, Christ-hating government which is the antithesis of everything for which freemen stood. Soon, perhaps, it will be bundles for Moscow, then a change on our coins from "In God we trust" to "In Stalin we trust," then the placing of Browder on a throne of fame, and finally American blood being shed abroad because a boat was sunk at Vladivostok or "Siberia is our first line of defense."

In the war which now has degenerated into a fight between Hitler and Stalin, with England but an onlooker, any aid we give to either of these tyrants means that morality is gassed, liberty shelled, the four freedoms mined, Christianity sabotaged, and American civilization betrayed.

Americans should stand as one in saying we cannot have any part in this imperialistic and hypocritical championing of Soviet Russia. We have sympathy for the suffering Russian people—like Churchill has—and we have sympathy for the suffering German people—which Churchill has not—but we have no support, no friendship, for the gigantic Russian liquidating machine which has been a curse to humanity. The traditions, the history, the ideals, and the sound sense of our American people forbid any truckling, any partnership, any support even indirect, with these Communist and Fascist destroyers of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Catholic Americans in particular cannot have any part in supporting the master of the Kremlin for, as Pope Pius XI said in his Encyclical on Atheistic Communism.

"See to it, venerable brethren, that the faithful do not allow themselves to be deceived. Communism is intrinsically wrong, and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever. Those who permit themselves to be deceived into lending their aid toward the triumph of Communism in their own country, will be the first to fall victims of their error. And the greater the antiquity and grandeur of the Christian civilization in the regions where Communism successfully penetrates, so much more devastating will be the hatred displayed by the godless."

Aside from assisting Stalin in Europe abroad we must not forget the vast, well-organized army in the United States dedicated to the furtherance of the socialistic aims of Soviet Russia. By joining with Russia, as Churchill wishes, we clasp the hands of the Communists here for the purpose of defeating the paperhanger menace. Joining with Russia means a Declaration of Independence for the "reds" in America from all the ties which bind civilized, Christianized, and democracy-loving people who love America first.

Sunday's events once more tell Americans we should keep out of this insane war and indict the judgment of those who favor giving our substance and pledging our future to either side in the war. If Germany conquers Russia, we have the triumph of the hated nazi-ism; if Russia defeats Germany, we have the triumph of the hated communism. We want neither. We stand for America and America at peace. Keep America out of war; keep war out of America. Uphold our Constitution, which includes, "Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort" (sec. 3, subdivision 1, of art. III).

The Declaration of Independence was founded on a united America, free of obnoxious ideologies which have made Europe a playground for war. Our forefathers hated no nation. They loved freedom and peace and for this reason they resolved to mind their own business and to listen only to Europe's appeals for charity. It was this spirit which made America strong, self-reliant, and not a cringing supplicant or a reckless and stupid spender of the lifeblood and patrimony of its future children. Make 1941 a great day for celebrating our American independence and tell the defeatists, who think this Nation cannot defend itself, and the international warmakers, who would sacrifice American youth abroad, and the "Union Now," "Hands Across the Sea" groups, as well as the Communists, Fascists, Nazis, you have no place here. This is the American Nation—land of the free and home of the brave—and not a group of automata or sheep, fit to be ruled but not to rule. Away with war, away with foreign entanglements. Let that be the Declaration of Independence, of peace and defense in 1941.

The Golden Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

POEM BY EMMA LAZARUS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the ninety-second anniversary of the birth of Emma Lazarus, an American poetess, who died at the untimely age of 38.

Miss Lazarus' name appears in many anthologies, and she is best known for the poem which adorns the Statue of Liberty at the entrance to the New York Harbor, and which reads as follows:

THE GOLDEN DOOR

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Remedy Versus Subsidy for the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. GUY M. GILLETTE, OF IOWA

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me on the subject Remedy Versus Subsidy for the Farmer.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Unfortunately in the past the farmer has had to pay for the wars. I hope that we can arrange matters better next time. The farmer has had to pay for them, because, unlike industry, he is not organized to take care of himself in the great economic upheaval which wars create.

Obviously I am in favor of helping the farmer in these great emergencies by Government subsidy or any other means which are necessary for his survival, and have consistently supported such proposals in the Congress, but I am far more interested in relieving the causes of his distress rather than in treating the symptoms. One of the potent causes is the great, closely integrated business organizations, on the one hand, and the disorganized farmers on the other, which results in the farmer both selling and buying in controlled market when all of the cards of the game are stacked against him.

The whole pressure of the present emergency is against the interest of the farmer. We must keep down food prices in the interest of the consumer; we must follow the good-neighbor policy with Latin America by holding down prices and perhaps taking some of their farm surpluses; we must absorb the domestic surpluses arising from reduced exports by a policy of low prices; and under the defense program we must throw more and more of our raw materials and labor into the war machine to the detriment of the farm population which must buy from the pool of depleted necessities.

In the long run we may have to assist the farmer in this unbalanced emergency even more than under present provision of law, but I should prefer to treat the disease first rather than the symptoms; namely, to open up free rather than controlled markets for the farmer's products and reduce the prices through some competition in the things the farmer must buy.

The farmers are approximately the only group yet remaining who must produce all they can and sell at any price the buyers offer. The industrial world, on the other hand, is in a position to decide in advance how much it will produce and what the price shall be. A few great companies in each of our major industries are in a position to dictate price and production policy.

I should like to emphasize this point with a few figures. The iron and steel industry turns out products valued at about $8,000,000,000 annually; yet a dozen or 15 steel companies dominate the whole with 3 or 4 companies producing 75 percent of the total. Petroleum products amount to about $2,500,000,000 annually, with 20 companies covering most of the field, of which a half-dozen are dominant. Rubber products run to $1,000,000,000 annually, with 4 companies producing 80 or 90 percent.

Contrast this concentrated control of industry with the farm situation. There are approximately 7,000,000 farms in the United States supporting a farm population of around 35,000,000 people, producing farm products valued at approximately $7,500,000,000.

Stated in other and more startling terms, ten to twelve million farmers produce products valued annually at something less than the values produced by 15 or 20 steel companies. I submit we should do something about this situation before we talk about the burden of subsidizing the farmer. One chance in a million as compared with the large industrial organizations are odds against the farmer that should be reduced.

But what shall we do about it? The first and most obvious step is to call for a more vigorous and pervasive enforcement of our antitrust and monopoly laws. In the long run, we may require more legislation to break up some of the great industrial organizations which are hampering trade, but I agree with the representatives of the Department of Justice that with a little money we can go a long way toward breaking up these log jams without passing more laws.

There are all stages of legal and illegal organizations which dominate American industry to the detriment of the farmer and the consumer. I shall start in with perhaps the most innocent one from a superficial point of view; namely, large size. Fancy anyone trying to make headway in a competitive struggle against the United States Steel Corporation, the Standard Oil Co., or the Aluminum Co. of America. It is true that they may allow competitors to exist, but only on sufferance.

Another form of the same problem is the dominance of these large concerns over prices. It is taken as a matter of course that when the United States Steel Corporation or Bethlehem—or even Republic or National Steel—announces a price of $50 per ton for black sheets, that is the prevailing price. Of course, no small company can sell sheets a dime a ton more, and they would be foolish to price them at a dime a ton less if they sold enough to attract attention. The dominance of this force, which the economists call "price leadership" can scarcely be overestimated. What fixes the prices even under the most innocent circumstances, not to mention monopoly agreements, of such products as gasoline, tobacco, chemicals in a hundred forms, cement, lumber, agricultural implements, beef and pork, and cattle and hogs? The answer is both simple and startling. A single, large, dominant corporation announces the price at 10 o'clock some morning and that's the price for the United States until further notice. This is a long way from our old standby, supply and demand.

In a few industries the number of producers is sufficiently numerous to cause the leadership method of price fixing and control of the industry to be somewhat awkward. When there are 50 or 100 concerns, they sometimes get their wires crossed. This situation, however, is readily taken care of by the device of trade associations. Fancy a midwestern farmer competing with a great trade association. I assume that most of the trade-association activities are technically within the law, but I am speaking of the broader problem of industrial organized control as against the chaos of the farm situation. A few well-placed statistics put out by trade associations can do wonders toward keeping the boys in line. Some of them go so far as to show the individual position of each producer each week or each month. If one gets out of line on his production or price, a telephone call can usually take care of that.

Still within the framework of technical legality we next have the fair-trade laws in 44 of the 48 States to hold the price lines from the producer through the wholesaler and jobber down through the local retailer to the consumer. Imagine what a furor would be created if I should introduce a bill enabling the farmer to fix the price of a Poland China hog or a Hereford steer all the way from the farm through the slaughterhouse, to the regional distributor, down to the butcher shop in the sale to the consumer. That, I submit, would be downright socialism or something equally reprehensible. Yet Swift & Co. and Armour can do it under the fair-trade laws, if they want to, after they have stamped their brand on the beef or the pork.

The next step in the organized control of industry is still within the framework of the law, in many cases, regardless of the shady details. This method of control is through patents. Apparently what can be done through a patent control is scarcely less than startling. We have been taught to believe that patents are the very foundation of our industrial supremacy; that poor but honest inventors contrive machines, patent them, and thus lead the whole community to prosperity. As a matter of fact, that apparently is not the way the patent racket is run. In the first place, the overwhelming percentage of patents are taken out by great corporations on the broad chance that the stream of them which comes out of their shops and laboratories may be useful to the company for various purposes, including forestalling and blackmail. In the second place, the great majority of them may be found to be not fundamental improvements, but mere gadgets added to a machine to control its price.

I understand from those familiar with the patent situation that after a basic patent on an important product has expired—perhaps 50 years ago—there will be found a constant stream of minor improvements released in anticipation of the 17-year patent law, to keep control of the price of the product for several generations. In fact many firms have a reserve bank of patentable gadgets which will carry the control into the next century. For example, the farmers look forward to the development of the frozen-food industry in the United States as a means of freezing their surpluses in a different sense than we now talk about freezing the cotton surplus. I venture to predict, however, that the frozen-food industry will benefit the farmer only to the extent that the several owners of the patents will decide it is wise to do so.

The same sort of problem confronts the farmer with respect to many other food processes. I understand that the few great dairy companies either secured their start or are perpetuating their control through patents on many dairy processes. The cheese dealers took a new lease on life when one of the great companies patented the process for making "processed cheese." Ice cream has had its share of patent control. Milk containers, which are less cumbersome than bottles, are now patented. Even doughnuts are now subject to a levy for the doughnut machines. As for the new flour—the so-called reinforced or vitamin flour, I shudder to think what someone will do with the patent process on this product unless there is timely control of the situation.

The patent control on food processing is, of course, only half the story. The other half is the strangle hold the patent monopolists have upon the products which the farmer buys. This extends all the way from the unending series of patented gadgets on agricultural machinery down through the various patented processes for making gasoline to the patented chicken feed which he feeds the hens. Even the medicine which he gives his children is likely to be patented or controlled by other means which makes it equally expensive.

After patents comes the indefinite stream of industrial controls which are not reputable enough to have a name, except the blanket ones of monopoly and collusive agreements. It would be impossible for me to name them in the short time available, even if anyone could know a fraction of the details. In the case of livestock and meat products, for example, a generation ago the Government forced the packing houses to divest themselves of the control of the stockyards. The packers turned this necessity to good account by going out to the farms and buying the livestock at prices prevailing on the day they reached the market. Then, with the big buyers out on the farms instead of in the terminal markets, the stock was sold to a few dealers at ruinous prices and used as a basis for settlement on the arrivals. This sounds complicated, but it is quite an easy and effective way for beating down farm prices of livestock. The same thing happens, I understand, with much of our fruit and vegetable products. Huge quantities will start toward the market priced on-arrival basis. When they arrive, the big buyers step out from under and let the hucksters quote prices on the ruinous surplus in the market. In the case of cheese, I understand, the game is much better organized. At 2 o'clock each Friday afternoon 10 or a dozen great cheese dealers meet for lunch in Plymouth, Wis., a village of about 4,000 population. After lunch they meet for a few minutes and fix the price of American cheese for the whole United States for the coming week.

In the case of milk the procedure is more complicated, but perhaps equally certain. The farmer will get 4 or 5 cents a quart for his milk, the distributing dairy will get 6 or 8 cents' margin, and the consumer will pay 12 to 14 cents.

In the case of truck crops, the farmer is usually no longer a farmer but a hired man working for the great fruit and vegetable dealers in the terminal markets. They tell him how much potatoes, tomatoes, or cabbage to put out, how much fertilizer to put on them, how to pack them, when to deliver them at the railroad or truck station, at which point they take charge of the proceeds of his labor. From then on the railroads, the truckers, and the various groups of dealers all take out their share. If there is

anything left, the farmer gets a part of the remainder. If there is nothing left, as is often the case, the dealers will lend the farmer money for the next year, because they have got to have the supply as the seasons roll around.

This procedure, of course, is essentially characteristic of the whole agricultural industry. If there is anything left, the farmer gets a part of it. If not, he goes in debt.

If you will look at the price charts of most finished products made from agricultural commodities, such as the various cuts of meat, lard, vegetable oils, fruits, and vegetables, and canned goods of all sorts, you will see that the price curves go up and down violently as if there were a lot of competition in these industries. If you will look a little deeper, however, the basic tendency is for each of the several processors and handlers to take out their share of the market value at as near a constant figure as possible and leave the tail end, namely, the farm price, to take care of itself. This, of course, is the very essence of control—being able to get yours and let the fellow below shift for himself.

What can be done about these industrial organizations against which the farmer and the consumer are largely helpless? I think the activities of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in recent years has pointed the way to the answer. Primarily we do not need new laws but adequate enforcement of the old laws to break up these log jams in the manufacturing and distributing processes. Beginning in 1938, the Antitrust Division had 265 defendants in court and 923 complaints of monopolistic practices in its files. This activity grew throughout 1939, and with some substantial increase in appropriations for 1940 there were nearly 2,500 defendants in court and almost 3,500 complaints in the files. According to present estimates for the year 1941, there will probably be more than 3,800 defendants before the year is over. Speaking more specifically, the Antitrust Division, in addition to a multitude of what might be termed "run of the mill" cases, has made organized drives in several lines of industry with a view of getting away from piecemeal enforcement into the more effective prosecutions covering an industry as a whole or groups of related industries.

During the past year there have been a number of indictments in the lumber industry, for example, on the grounds of price fixing, restriction of output, and the improper use of the grade markings on the lumber. These cases have retarded the rise of lumber prices during the present emergency when the great demand for Army cantonments and defense factories has strained the resources of the industry.

Another significant group of cases brought by the Antitrust Division are those covering the whole fertilizer industry. A total of several hundred firms and individuals have been indicted, and in spite of threatened shortages due to the elimination of foreign sources of supply of some fertilizer materials, such as potash, the price structure has held an even keel under the observation of the Department of Justice. In some areas of the country there have been net decreases in the price of fertilizer materials in spite of the abnormal conditions.

The Division's unified drive on the petroleum industry has also been beneficial to farmers as well as to other consumers. In the Washington area, for example, which operates directly under the eye of the Antitrust Division, prices have ruled about 2 cents per gallon of gasoline less than the regular prices throughout the country. The filling stations call this 2 cents a "discount due to price wars." As a matter of fact, it is an approach to reasonable prices of gasoline due to some competition among local filling stations. This figure of 2 cents can run into an enormous sum of money for the country as a whole. On the basis of an annual consumption in the United States of about 25,000,000,000 gallons, 2 cents per gallon amounts to $500,000,000. Taking into consideration farm tractors, trucks, and the family car, a saving of 2 cents per gallon, especially on a cash outlay, is an important sum to the American farmers.

The present abbreviated drive of the Antitrust Division on food processing and distribution will aid the farmer in two ways: First, as a consumer of these processed products; and, second, in offering him a freer market in which to sell his products. This term "free market" for farm products sounds too general and theoretical to carry much weight to the average man. Perhaps a more concrete meaning of the term will be more significant In many areas of the country, as motor trucks hauling the farm products to market approach the city limits, they are met by representatives of the truckers' union. In some cases, the farm truck may have to be unloaded and the produce transferred to a union truck. In other cases the union driver climbs up beside the farmer and rides into town for a fee of $8 to $10. In other cases four men, at high wages, must unload crates that one or two men can handle.

In other cases the farmer may deliver the product to the market but he cannot deliver it to the buyer; he must stop in the middle of the street and have a union truck transfer it at a high price, and perhaps deliver it the remaining distance across the street. In still other cases the terminal distributors have agreed with the union truckers that they will neither accept delivery of farm products from any other trucks, nor will they sell to anyone who uses nonunion trucks to haul it away. Stated in these terms, the lack of free flow of goods from the farmer to the consumer has a definite and sinister meaning. I am told that a 3 months' investigation of the food-distribution problem in the city of Philadelphia last summer has done more to clean up a bad situation in getting the food from the farm to the table than anything else that has occurred in a generation in that city.

With these concrete examples before us as to what a little enforcement of the antitrust laws can do in the way of aiding the farmer and getting his products to those who need them, the way is clearly marked for a solution of many of the important farm problems. I therefore am in favor of a substantial increase in the appropriations for the Antitrust Division, especially in view of the fact that during the past year it has gone far enough into the food-distribution problem to know its far-reaching consequences and to be able to throw a large group of men into the field at a minimum of time and with a well-organized program which has been developed gradually during the past year. Speaking specifically, I take Mr. Arnold at his word when he says that he needs at least a million dollars more to develop his campaign against restraint of trade in the vital industries of the country in the present emergency.

No A. E. F.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. GERALD P. NYE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] on Saturday, July 19, 1941, over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It may seem ages ago that America was quite unanimous and vociferous in its cry of "Never again," meaning there would be no toleration of effort to move our country into another European war. But it was really only 2 years ago when memories of our last experience in Europe were still sufficiently clear to let us see what folly it would be to let ourselves be taken again into the wringer across the Atlantic. But propaganda and its children (emotionalism, hate, and fear) have so dimmed those memories that we have had fastened upon us a wartime spirit which at once threatens with another American expeditionary force.

Go back to the beginning of this propaganda blitz which has brought dullness to our memories; go back to 1938 and 1939, when Europe was showing first inclination to suicide. Starting there, trace those innocent short-of-war steps, beginning with repeal of the arms embargo. It was following that step that the President vowed a determination to keep Americans and their ships out of war-infested waters. But our steps since, by the same President, have our boys and ships in Iceland now, just a hop from the battlefields of Europe, a hop waiting, perhaps, only for approval of the present pending request of the President for the surrender of more power to him by Congress.

But, going back 2 or 3 years, survey, if you dare, what has been happening to our sight, our hearing, and our thinking—changes which put to shame the accomplishments of the man on the flying trapeze.

Back there in 1939 our cry was: "Save France!" Today we consent to starve France.

Less than 2 years ago our hearts bled for courageous little Finland. Today we speak harshly about the same Finland, because she takes the one means at hand to win back the sovereignty she lost in 1939.

Russia, a few months ago, was counted a terrible creature waiting to eat the flesh of a Europe that was killing itself. Today, well, today we fold our arms about her.

One year ago the "best" of our American society started knitting, sewing, and bundling for Britain while it deplored the awfulness of Russia and her aid to Hitler. Today we cheer Russia, and if only she will continue to hold her own against the Nazi hordes, we'll soon be playing the game of "bundles for Russia" while we condemn Finland and Germany for their war upon "blessed Russia."

Of course, all these gyrations are in the interest of democracy, in the name of humanity, and dedicated to the salvation of civilization.

What manner of thing is it that has so turned us upside down and inside out?

What is it that had folks like Dorothy Thompson chasing communistic Russia all over the pages of American newspapers just a few months ago and then, of a sudden, had her writing this: "The Communist revolution has not been a real menace anywhere."

What is it that causes Walter Winchell to thirst for European blood (blood to be drawn by other Americans than himself, of course) when in 1939 he was writing:

"Once again Europe is rolling the loaded dice of destiny. And once again America is asked to play the role of international sucker. The time has come for us to pause and consider. If we must have another Unknown Soldier, let us not ask him to die for an unknown reason: And just what will be accomplished by dying in the mud? He will not increase America's resources; the last war nearly ruined our fertile lands. He will not increase America's wealth; in the last war we

loaned our gold and were gold-bricked in return. America must learn that her sons abroad will bring monuments to her glory—but her sons at home are a monument to her common sense. The future of American youth is on top of American soil—not underneath European dirt."

What it is that has done these things to us and opened our mind to consideration of another A. E. F., of course, is propaganda and her children—hatred, fear, emotionalism. It is propaganda made bold and brazen by the encouragement of our country's top officials. So bold and brazen have become the foreign propagandists operating in our land that they dare to berate and question the Americanism and the integrity of such Americans as will not consent to the pouring of America's best blood and her wrath into the destruction Europe again visits upon herself.

This propaganda, plus a hunger for war profits, has so successfully blinded us that we've consented to step after step to war while the interventionists preached that they were only steps to peace, steps to avoid war.

At the moment this blindness has our Government in danger of breaking faith with hundreds of thousands of American men and boys who have been giving a year to the tuning up of our preparedness for the worst that might come out of Europe's war. Likewise, creeping up on us is the demand for new powers for the President, power to send our troops and our ships wherever he chooses to send them. We may expect in these next 2 weeks an unmerciful pounding by propaganda. Indeed, it is already started.

General Marshall, great soldier, but no relation of the Col. Thomas Marshall who fought so gallantly in the American Revolution to win freedom from the tyranny and power politics of Europe, is at this time pleading that power be vested with the President to let the President ignore the restrictions written by Congress as to where our boys shall and shall not be sent, without a declaration of war by Congress. The general also begs that the National Guard Reserve officers and draftees be kept in the service beyond the year which the Government assured them would be the time they would need plan to give.

If his Commander in Chief, the President, has wished him to do what he has done with respect to these things, no one is going to hold it against the general. But it would seem that in the argument advanced by the general he should refrain from unjustified grounds. Much emotionalism has already resulted from General Marshall's representation that to let the Guard and the draftees return home when their 1 year of service was up would mean a mass exodus from our machinery of preparedness.

Naturally no one determined that our country shall make strong and maintain a constant preparedness in these hours wants mass exodus from our military forces. And if the public will be permitted the facts, it will be readily seen that keeping faith with the draftees and letting such as wish to return to their homes and their chances at making a normal place for themselves in a nation still at peace, will in no sense constitute a mass exodus.

It was a feature of the conscription plan that not all the trainees would come in and go out of the service at the same time. Induction in the service was to be staggered. As those who finished their year of training would be turned back into private life, new draftees would be brought in to take their places.

Now, we are told that this operation is going to cripple and leave our Army a mere skeleton. That representation is not borne out by the facts. The facts are deserving of presentation.

Induction of the draftees commenced last October. Additional numbers came in during each month since, until nearly 600,000 are now in service. Assuming that we keep faith with these draftees, the year of service will end next November for, in round numbers, 13,000 men; next December for 5,000 men; next January for 73,000; next February for 90,000; next March for 153,000; next April for 123,000; next May for 56,000; and next June for 79,000. Only 19,000 men need be mustered out before next January. By that time these men can be replaced by new selectees.

How is such a process going to cripple the Army and leave it only a skeleton? It will be skeletonized only in the degree that the Army is skeletonized now. It can actually be strengthened to the extent that the authorities will take more draftees already authorized in the future months than it has taken in the past.

As for the National Guard, there is no mass exodus occasioned by demobilizing at the end of 1 year of service because, here again, mobilization was staggered through the last 10 months. Under the plan in operation the 156 units in the field now would be demobilized and returned home as follows: 25 units in September, 15 in October, 14 in November, 3 in December, 47 in January, 37 in February, 6 in March, 7 in April, none in May, and 2 in June. How, in fairness, can this be called mass exodus?

On the first of this month only 55,000 of the 100,000 eligible Reserve officers in the Army were on active duty. Shall we call it mass exodus if through the months those in service drop out and are succeeded by other Reserve officers who have not yet been called?

If it is a professional Army we want, why not go about organizing it in a cards-on-the-table manner? A few days ago General Marshall testified that it was estimated that the Army would need at the present time between 640,000 and 800,000 3-year volunteers, and that the Army already has 476,000. This is quite remarkable, this voluntary enlistment, since the Army has been refusing to allow men to enlist until they had completed their 13-week training period, and since there has been no real serious enlistment program undertaken. A genuine effort, it is apparent, would surely bring the 800,000 total 3-year enlistments declared to be the maximum need, only 300,000 more than are already enlisted.

Why all this alarm about needing the draftees, Reserve officers, and National Guard longer than a year if we would avoid crippling our Army? If our emergency today, while we are at war with no one, is more desperate than it was when these men were called to service, then our preparedness effort of the past year must have left us worse off than we were before we started. There is no greater need for concern today than a year ago—I would say not as much, since we have had chance to prepare for emergencies which might arise.

Where are we going to use this professional army, pray tell. Are we not told again and again that we will not send our boys into Europe's war? Hasn't this been declared to be a policy of preparing against war which might be brought to us? Then why the fear of "crippling" our Army by excusing the draftees when their year is up and inducting new draftees, even more than leave, in their places.

There is too much reason to believe that the suggested plans to keep men in the service beyond the 1-year limit and to destroy the limitations upon where these troops shall be sent is indication of plans to put American troops onto the European battlefields, even though 75 and 80 percent of the people of America are determined that shall not come to pass. It all looks too much like a new A. E. F. plan—far too much so for comfort.

Fair play, realization of the sacrifices made, the question of morale, and the fact that not even Canada has yet found it necessary to conscript trainees for more than 4 months—all these seem to demand that our Government keep faith with the boys in the service. Respecting Canada, it should also be said of their 4 months' compulsory military training program that their service abroad is only upon a voluntary basis.

If we would prevent another A. E. F., another dangerous play without proper authorization, then American fathers and mothers had best be making themselves heard. It is timely to be suggesting that simply because someone thousands of miles away doesn't bring a war to us, is not good reason for us to go hunting for it. To do that is too much like the Irishman at the Saturday-night dance, back in the rough days, who grew impatient when 10 o'clock came without a fight. He straightway took off his coat, dragged it behind him upon the floor as he marched about calling: "Ten o'clock and no fight? Won't someone please step on me coattails?"

"Red" Tentacles in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ADDRESS BY ALEXANDER I. RORKE

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent address by Alexander I. Rorke, an attorney of New York City, at the annual communion breakfast of the Holy Name Society of the Sanitation Department of the City of New York, on Sunday, May 11, 1941, the subject of the address being "Red" Tentacles in America.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today many millions of affectionate American mothers are justly proud of the achievements and patriotism of their sons; but no mothers' sons are better American patriots than the members of the Holy Name Society who, like you, have pledged their loyalty to the flag of the United States and to the God-given principles of freedom, justice, and happiness for which it stands, and who in peace or in war loyally support all lawful authority, both civil and religious.

These sons—steadfast followers of Christ the King—are not only the religious bulwark and shield of His Excellency the Catholic Archbishop of New York; they are also the first line of patriotic defense of the Government of the United States of America.

Now that the specter of the war abroad seems to be casting its ugly and realistic shadow upon the United States, that many men in high places, who appear to have no such hatred of war as that expressed by the President, are variously advocating and insisting that the United States take such action as may involve us in the century-old disputes and wars of Europe, patriotic American mothers are prepared, if needs be, to offer their sons for service in the military, naval, and air forces of the Nation.

They and their sons, have but one national loyalty—that loyalty is to the United States alone—first, last, and always; and they owe

no loyalty, and will render none, to any other country or countries on the face of the globe.

Once the United States, whether rightly or wrongly, enters the conflict, Catholic soldiers, without question, will stand by the flag and the principles and institutions that it represents with the same loyalty that Catholics have exhibited in every conflict that beset America from the days of the Revolution to the Treaty of Versailles and will sacrifice life, liberty, fortune, and honor in order that the United States may continue to exist as a democratic republic, guaranteeing freedom of speech, assembly, press, and religion to all citizens who live and breathe under the aegis of our country.

But today American religious mothers and their soldier sons have reason to be apprehensive for the future welfare of the American Commonwealth and its democratic-republican institutions.

They have made vast contributions to the good and welfare of America both in the colonial and the Federal periods of its history.

They are Christians, Protestants, and Jews in a country whose courts have taken notice that ours is a religious nation.

They are zealous in behalf of the freedom of religion and the institutions of their country.

They elect men to office to protect and defend their freedoms, and they have a right to insist that those for whom they may be called upon to make the supreme sacrifice shall be Americans, who will zealously safeguard those rights and liberties while they are at the front; that those who hold key positions in cabinets, offices, bureaus, and other departments of our national, State, and municipal governments shall be men and women who are loyal first, last, and always to the United States and its democratic forms; that the professors in seats of learning—conducted at public expense—shall not be "reds" of the right or left wing of the Socialist Internationale, who teach hatred of God and religion and hatred of the Government of the United States, who advocate the destruction of church and state and who plot to establish a "red" government here as another red ruby in the national treasure chest of European socialism, but shall be loyal, patriotic men and women who believe in and support the Constitution and Government of the United States.

What a travesty today in America! Loyal soldiers of God and the United States asked to go forth and die for disloyal, traitorous "reds," who are bound by every tenet of the "red" terror to destroy the Christian religion and all other religions and the very Government that Americans are loyally bound to uphold and support.

"Reds," who obtained everything they possess from the United States, particularly their higher education in American colleges and universities, founded by patriots and maintained and supported by the donations made and taxes paid by patriots—taxes and benefactions that were diverted from loyal teachers to pay the salaries of domestic and imported radical professors—are and have been openly and surreptitiously instilling into American youth the licentious doctrines of free and unmarried love, the socialistic contempt for religion and the Government of the United States, and designedly neglecting to teach them that they owe loyalty to the Government of the United States that fed and nursed the "red" vipers biting at its entrails.

Does any sane man in private life or in public office, especially those who have coddled them, believe for one moment that the indoctrinated "red," "pink," and "yellow" so-called intelligentsia will, while our American youth are offering their lives on foreign fields and on the seven seas, stand loyally by our democratic republic, a form of government they hate, while America is engaged in a life and death struggle with the socialistic governments of Europe that they adore?

I ask in all sincerity, Can the "reds," "pinks," and "yellows" serve two masters? Will they be loyal to the so-called capitalist Government of the United States? Or will they be loyal to the socialist governments of Europe that will be fighting against the United States? Will they not hate the one and love the other?

But what of the "reds" whom "red" professors and students have taught to destroy religion and the capitalist governments? Will they stand loyally by the sons of American mothers who patriotically wage war for America?

They are the "red, pink, and yellow" workers in our tool shops, in our munitions and powder factories, in our airplane, engine, tank, and gun-making establishments. Can they be relied upon to lend loyal support to an America which they regard as capitalistic in a contest with the socialistic, totalitarian, economic states of Europe which they regard as the ideals of government?

Will they, in the rear, loyally strive to keep up the supplies for the army of patriots at the front? Will they hamstring the Government in the devious ways prescribed by the manifestos and proclamations of the heads of their parties? Will they labor 24 hours a day and serve 7 days a week to win victory for the United States? Will they follow the "red" mandate and sabotage the job, slow down the output, put sand in the gears, fling monkey wrenches into the machinery, create defects in the tools, and sit down in our defense industries in order to invite national tragedy for America? They are bound to do so.

And what of the many "reds" holding key positions and other jobs in our Federal, State, and municipal governments?

All Americans who have kept abreast of the recent times know that the disciples of Marx, Lenin, Novimersky, Engels, and others of their ilk have bored into our patriotic labor unions, our Army, Navy, and merchant marine and into the departments, bureaus, and cabinets of our city, State, and Federal governments. As they were advanced to key positions by politicians who had profited by their votes they brought into the service other men and women who, like themselves, were "red" and placed them in positions of power and authority over patriotic men and women.

What a spectacle! Loyal and capable American men and women, boys and girls who are always ready to sacrifice everything for the Government of the United States literally kicked aside and out to make way for "reds" in vital key positions controlling the very life stream of the Republic, and who, despite the earnest efforts of patriotic men and women in the past few years to get them out, are still retained in those positions by the responsible officials of the Nation, the States, and the municipalities—a situation that impels the ordinary everyday average American citizen to ask whether or not our Government today is a democratic Republic or a semisocialistic state.

Has the United States in the recent past been quietly changing from the type of government established by the founding fathers to a form of economic socialism that they would have abhorred? Have the responsible officials of our Federal, State, and municipal divisions knowingly or unwittingly aided the "reds" in a move to peacefully and unobtrusively take over our Government? Have they, within the democratic-republican structure of our Government, introduced, accidentally or by design, a socialistic economic state that they have neither the inclination, the will, the courage, nor the cunning to cast out? Have they permitted the "red" camel to stick its ugly snoot under the walls of the American tent, and is it now on the inside insidiously easing the American owners out, as it ousted the too-trustful patriots of France?

The men and women of America who are going to fight this threatened war, when, as, and if it is declared, have a right to demand now and do demand that none but American patriots, loyal to the American democratic republic shall teach our youth, handle our war supplies, and stand guard over its destiny in public office.

The "red" professors may claim the right to academic freedom—they already have that on the soap boxes and in their bloc and cell meetings; but paying them to preach hatred of religion and disloyalty to American youth out of public funds or manipulating the rules of civil service to give "reds" point advantages over really loyal Americans with long years of patriotic service should be made a criminal offense.

They may claim that they display the red, white, and blue flag in their shops, their clubs, their meetings, their homes, and their parades, but, in the hearts of them, only the red stripes of the Star-Spangled Banner appeal to them, and they long for the day when the "red" flag will float from every public building in our land.

What a pity the Rapp-Coudert committee bill was vetoed at Albany last week. That committee—like the Dies committee—is badly needed.

Catholics are peaceful because they follow the Prince of Peace; but they want an America geared and armed to the teeth—an army, navy, and air force that will annihilate any invader or invaders that will dare join battle with America. Should war come, they will rally 'round the flag, but they demand security for the democratic republic government and institutions that they defend.

So long as a single "red" occupies a post in our Government America is insecure.

American public officials who know that the "red" flag denotes mortal antipathy to religion and to our Republic and who place the followers of the "red" flag in red schoolhouses and colleges and in the public services of our country are open to the same charge as that made against Benedict Arnold who bargained to betray West Point in the Revolutionary War.

France and Holland allowed the reds to penetrate; so too did many other European nations; the United States may well gain advantage from their sad experience.

If these remarks be treason, let those whom the shoe fits take up the challenge; if these observations be patriotism, let Americans profit from them, ere it be too late.

Ickes on Lindbergh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Westbrook Pegler which appeared in the Washington Post on July 18, 1941, entitled "Ickes on Lindbergh."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 18, 1941]

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

ICKES ON LINDBERGH

With the major part of Harold Ickes' latest tirade against Charles Lindbergh it is impossible to disagree, except on grounds of propriety, but that this swollen little man, himself a greedy authoritarian and a fighter for his own brand of national socialism, should denounce another as a Hitlerite is almost beyond understanding. Ickes' hatred of Lindbergh for the reasons given would be utterly confusing but for the fact that he himself is a Hitlerian socialist, which explains everything. The Hitlerian socialist, or brown Bolshevik, and the "red" Communist are alike in most things and absolutely identical in their redoubtable inconsistency. Thus an Ickes, devoted to state control of the lives and property of the people and the stealthy substitution of the one-party system under a pretense of social reform, can swing out into space chattering shrilly against another whom he perceives to be sympathetic with the same ideas. He probably sees no inconsistency in this, for that is the way of the political malady from which he suffers.

Here we have a powerful and self-important official of our own maturing socialistic dictatorship, corresponding in rank and in some of his official functions to Joseph Goebbels, of Germany, inciting himself to frenzy against another man on the ground that the other man is friendly to the Nazi regime of Germany.

But Ickes obviously cannot be anti-Nazi in view of the fact that the Government of which he is a militant part obtained its power first by shameless misrepresentation of its objectives and since then has adhered closely to the methods of the German Fuehrer in establishing state control over industry, over labor through the state's moral subsidy for brutalitarian unions, over agriculture through bribery and regimentation of the farmers, over the elections by bribery of the voters and false gifts to the union leaders, and over the whole Government by bribery and intimidation of Congress.

Ickes has worked tirelessly ever since the day when, by some absurd accident, he first obtained his job, to promote in the United States a rough duplicate of the essentials of Hitlerism. He has succeeded better than most Americans realize.

All Americans know that Lindbergh's fortune was thrust upon him and that he might have had a hundred times as much for the mere taking. Ickes also acquired a fortune by means certainly no more manly than Lindbergh's, but, nevertheless, was thrifty enough to sponge on the American people for two sojourns in a public hospital in which he had no legal right to be, and for a vacation fishing trip on a warship, whose log for that occasion would reveal evidence that he regards himself as a prince of privilege.

These are trivial items of expense incurred for the personal benefit and economy of Mr. Ickes when compared with the billions that he has delighted to spend toward the destruction by bankruptcy of the American system of government. But the incidents reveal in Ickes an attitude irresistibly comparable to that of the favored nobilities of the Hitler regime. They show how his thoughts run.

But it is when Ickes attacks Lindbergh for associating with Hitlerians and for failing to deplore the brutalities of the foul regime that he reveals most alarmingly that inconsistency which more plainly than any other trait identifies the Bolshevik—"brown" or "red." For if Lindbergh has had any traffic with the Nazis, Ickes, in even more cordial way and in flagrant contempt of the American way, has been guilty of notorious association with the Communists, who have been working here for the same objectives. And if Lindbergh has been silent on the atrocities of the Hitler Government, Ickes has avoided equally tempting opportunities to denounce a regime which, in Russia, far outscored even Hitler himself in cold ferocity and has killed in two decades more human beings than the American Armies have lost in all the wars of the Republic from 1776 to the date of these presents.

Perfunctorily Mr. Ickes said he deplored communism and national socialism equally, but that remark does not even expunge his record of open association with Communists and their fellow travelers. He reserves the right for himself to associate with "red" Bolsheviks but attacks Lindbergh for associating with the brown.

None of which abates the fact that the regime of which Ickes is so furious a spokesman has been adopting, consistently and insidiously, the national socialism which he, nevertheless, takes frequent occasion to deplore.

Well, that is Hitlerism, too. Hitler constantly told the German people that his only purpose in enslaving them was to make them free.

Mayor LaGuardia on the St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

STATEMENT BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we are gradually winning our fight for reasonable electric-light and power rates for the people of this country. We still have a long way to go, but we are making progress.

We are also winning our fight for rural electrification. If the bill which I have introduced (H. R. 4931) is enacted into law, we can electrify every farmhouse in America within the next few years.

Several days ago Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, appeared before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House to testify on behalf of the St. Lawrence project, and I am inserting in the RECORD that portion of his testimony in which I did the questioning.

I hope every Member of the House and of the Senate, and everyone else who scans this RECORD, will take time to read these questions and answers.

The matter referred to follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rankin.

Mr. RANKIN. Mayor LaGuardia, just before you and I came to Congress——

Mayor LAGUARDIA (interposing). They did not get along so well then, did they?

Mr. RANKIN. They did not.

Cleveland, Ohio, the city from which the gentlemen from Ohio comes, also made an investment, and at that time it had one of the most distinguished men in this Nation as its mayor, Tom Johnson, whom you and I always revered. They put in a municipal light and power system, and I have the record of it before me now. They have invested $12,688,641, and it has been paid down to $2,745,352. They have the lowest rates of any city east of the Rocky Mountains outside of the Tennessee Valley area, and that is the same system, as I understand it, that you have been advocating in the city of New York; is that correct?

Mayor LAGUARDIA. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, I have pointed out time and time again that if all of the people of Ohio received their electricity at the same rates provided by this municipal plant in Cleveland they would save around $40,000,000 a year, just the people in Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. And there have been Republicans operating that all the time.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. It is true that either a Republican or a Democratic administration can run a power plant economically for the benefit of the people, just as it is true that it makes no difference where your power gang is, whether you have a Republican or a Democratic administration, they get away with it.

Mr. RANKIN. I will tell you what they will do; they will go out and pick out a Democrat and nominate him for President, the Power Trust will. I have seen them do it in the last year. I say that advisedly.

Mayor LaGuardia, I think you and I understand each other on the power question, because I expressed my views a while ago, and I have heard you express them time and time again when you were in the House. They talk about going down into the Federal Treasury and getting money to develop this power. As a matter of fact, this power, sold at the rate mentioned by the Army engineers, would pay this entire investment back to the Government, would it not, over a period of 50 years?

Mayor LAGUARDIA. Forty or fifty, which is it?

Mr. RANKIN. Fifty years.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. Fifty years.

Mr. RANKIN. And, that would leave them one of the greatest developments of ancient or modern times.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, I have just looked at the figures of the Army engineers, General Robins, who is sitting behind you, and it shows that this power can be delivered to the city of New York at 3.132 mills per kilowatt-hour or, we will say, 3.14 mills per kilowatt-hour. That is wholesale.

Now, that is much cheaper than any of this power in the Tennessee Valley as turned over to the municipalities in that area.

The city of New York is just as capable of distributing this power if turned over to them as Cleveland, Ohio, or Tupelo, Miss., is it not?

Mayor LAGUARDIA. Absolutely.

Mr. RANKIN. So, if this power were turned over, if it were delivered to the city of New York, if you had a municipal system, as you will have without doubt ultimately, and this power were laid down there at that price, you could distribute it at the Ontario rates or the T. V. A. rates, or the Bonneville, or Tacoma rates, without loss on your investment, could you not?

Mayor LAGUARDIA. It is my feeling we could.

Mr. RANKIN. I have just gone over the rates with you here, and it shows that the householder in the city of New York, or throughout the State of New York, only uses about 65 kilowatt-hours of electricity a month. I do not know what it is throughout the T. V. A. area, but in my town it is 178 kilowatt-hours a month. That is residential.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. They use it for cooking, too?

Mr. RANKIN. We use it for cooking and washing, refrigerating, and also heating our houses.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. You will find that the difference in our city is we use mostly gas for cooking, and there is no reason for that.

Mr. RANKIN. Another reason is that your rates are so high.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. That you cannot use it for heating purposes at all, and many families cannot use it for refrigerating.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. And do not forget that the same interests own the gas companies.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, and that exactly the same persons are down here and they have the same agents down here to fight this project just as they had them down here to fight the T. V. A. While we were having those hearings we had one excited gentleman come before this committee who said that he represented the railroad brotherhoods, and went back and wrote me a letter against flood control on the Tombigbee River, as if it would hurt the railroads. I am going to read it again. I understand that he is going to testify in opposition to this, and I am going to read it then.

Now, I have some figures here that I want to call your attention to. I have the rates for the city of New York. I believe you would call it the Queens, would you not?

Mayor LAGUARDIA. Queens is a part of New York City.

Mr. RANKIN. In Queens; and I also have the rates here for the T. V. A. area—the T. V. A. rates.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, you will notice that I am not objecting to any of this.

Mr. RANKIN. You ought not to, because this is on the subject.

Mr. BENDER. What subject?

Mr. RANKIN. I want to call this to your attention if I may.

For instance, in the city of New York, 40 kilowatt-hours of electricity per month costs $2.24; in Tupelo it costs $1.

One hundred kilowatt-hours a month in New York, that is, Queens, costs $4.69; in Tupelo it costs $2.25.

In New York 250 kilowatt-hours a month costs $8.67; in Tupelo it costs $4.25; and 500 kilowatt-hours in New York City costs $13.47, and in Tupelo $6.18.

Now, those are the rates to residential consumers.

We turn over now to the commercial consumers—the forgotten men in this electric game are the men who pay commercial rates, and I find that 1,500 kilowatt-hours a month in New York City costs $88.17.

Probably I had better go back and say 150 kilowatt-hours a month in New York City costs $8.28, in Tupelo it costs $1.75; 375 kilowatt-hours a month costs $19.57 in New York—that is, for the merchant, the hotel operator, the restaurant operator, the filling stations, garage operators, people who pay commercial rates. If they use 375 kilowatt-hours a month, it costs them $19.57, in Tupelo it costs $8.28; 750 kilowatt-hours in New York City costs $44.54, in Tupelo it costs $13.28; 1,500 kilowatt-hours a month in New York City, or in Queens, costs $88.17; in Tupelo it costs $21.90.

That is the reason they do not like to hear me talk about electricity on this committee.

Now let us turn over and see what it costs a man who pays in the higher brackets.

A commercial consumer in Queens, who uses 6,000 kilowatt-hours a month, pays $179.54 a month; in Tupelo, where you have the T. V. A. rates, instead of paying $179.54 he would pay $78.

Now, that gives you an idea of the difference in what it means to have the St. Lawrence inland waterway developed and this power made available to the people of New York, and what it means to let it run waste to the sea throughout the next few generations.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. I find that in Jacksonville, Fla.—I want to call your attention to this—Jacksonville, Fla., has one of the great municipal systems of this country. It only makes one mistake. It tries to make money out of it.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. Most of the city's income comes from their electric plant.

Mr. RANKIN. They use it to pay taxes on vacant lots and on the other fellow's property.

In other words, they pick the pockets of the consumers, you understand, to pay the taxes on the other fellow's property, and that is exactly what we protested against and that is what we have prevented in the Tennessee Valley area.

Jacksonville has a plant valued at $15,224,000. The debt on that plant is $3,873,000.

It has rates which compare with or are lower than the rates in the Queens.

Last year the city of Jacksonville produced and sold electricity to the amount of $4,134,838. Its operating expenses were $1,519,041. It made a gross, had a gross earning of $2,216,797; gross earning only.

Then for depreciation it allowed $42,157. That left a net earning out of $4,134,838—left a net earning of $2,573,000.

Jacksonville hauls its fuel from Louisiana or California or Texas, because there is no fuel produced in Florida, and yet their municipal plant pays more than 50 percent; and has the lowest rates or among the lowest rates in Florida, and makes a profit of 50 percent or more.

It paid taxes to the amount, or it gave free service to the amount of $100,000.

It paid taxes of $57,090 and still turned into the city treasury $1,780,000.

Now, that gives an idea as to what can be done even on the rates you are paying in New York; but you cannot do it and keep up all of these holding companies, and finance all of this propaganda and finance all of these fake lawsuits, and hire all of these lawyers, and all of these agents that have been over the country to carry on the propaganda that they have carried on here in opposition to public power or to cheap rates ever since you and I have been working on this.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. You are telling me.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. RANKIN, in that connection, will you yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I will yield; yes.

Mr. GREEN. Down in Miami, Fla., where a private concern owns a plant, they pay the highest rates in the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. And, furthermore, in that connection, the power properties that they bought a few years ago were valued at about $21,000,000 or $22,000,000. They supplemented that investment by repairs and enlargements to the extent of some $3,000,000 and turned around and issued $48,000,000 worth of bonds and sold them and left no investment at all, and now they are making 100 cents on the dollar.

Mr. RANKIN. The day the Commonwealth & Southern was organized—and I am quoting now from the report of the Federal Trade Commission—they took four small holding companies and threw them together. They threw their securities together on their books and that day they amounted to $341,000,000. They organized the Commonwealth & Southern, which is neither commonwealth nor southern, and put those same securities, same securities on their books the same day at $872,000,000.

Now, that is the record of the Federal Trade Commission.

Yet every time we have attempted to do anything about this—which I consider the greatest racket of modern times—every time we have attempted to turn in the sunlight to show what electricity ought to cost the people; every time we have attempted to develop a natural resource from the Tennessee River to the Columbia, or the St. Lawrence, we have this barrage of propaganda against it and all of the misleading statements that they can accumulate.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. You must admit, though, that the opposition is becoming weaker all of the time and less effective.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; because we are getting the facts to the American people and they understand them.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. You remember, the older Members will remember what we went through on Muscle Shoals. Most of you gentlemen were not here. It is almost unbelievable. This is easy sailing now. I think the opposition is pretty well shot now.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. LaGuardia, you remember that they told us when we were fighting for Muscle Shoals, you remember when we passed a bill here in 1927 and tried to get President Coolidge to sign it, and he vetoed it——

Mayor LAGUARDIA. They were about to give it away. You remember that.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; they were.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. Sure enough, a 99-year lease, or 999 years, I do not remember.

Mr. RANKIN. So at that time they said we had a surplus of power, did they not?

Mayor LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. We were using 68,000,000,000 or 62,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and now we are using 118,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and if we had the T. V. A. rates all over the United States, we would be using 300,000,000,000, probably, and still there would not be a surplus, would there?

Mayor LAGUARDIA. People would live better, happier, and easier.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, Mayor LaGuardia, let me say this to you, because you know the answer to this proposition. We hear a great deal about slum clearance in New York and other big cities.

Nothing in the world would contribute more to that end than to deliver to those people an abundant supply of cheap electricity.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. It would be very helpful.

Mr. RANKIN. It would enable them to use the electric appliances that are necessary to make their homes pleasant and attractive and to lift the burdens from the shoulders of the housewife.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. Of course, you know in our city we have to have electric light. There is no other way. And we provide for electric light in our relief. We have to provide light in our relief allowances, and it is quite an item.

Mr. RANKIN. You do not have any coal in New York State at all?

Mayor LAGUARDIA. We have a little coal, have we not? It does not amount to much. All of our coal comes from Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

Mr. RANKIN. You have no oil in New York, do you?

Mayor LAGUARDIA. No.

Mr. RANKIN. No natural gas?

Mayor LAGUARDIA. No.

Mr. RANKIN. They have none in New England.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. No.

Mr. RANKIN. In New England they have no oil, or no coal.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. No.

Mr. HALL. We do up in our part of the State. There is some natural gas up in our State.

Mr. BEITER. We have natural gas and oil in Allegany County.

Mr. RANKIN. But you do not have enough to generate any electricity or to supply any of the cities.

Mayor LAGUARDIA. No; water power is our hope.

Mr. RANKIN. This water power is your hope to get cheap electricity to the people in that area?

Mayor LAGUARDIA. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, then, going to the amount generated. You do not know how much electricity the people in New York use a year?

Mayor LaGUARDIA. I did know, but I have forgotten.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, 15,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours or 15,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

It is true that this project will only generate about 6,000,000,000, and some of them are going to contend that that will not be sufficient to supply them all.

Mayor LaGUARDIA. All right.

Mr. RANKIN. But if it is used as a yardstick——

Mayor LaGUARDIA (interposing). Take your Cleveland illustration. There you have a privately owned and operated plant and the municipal plant.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mayor LaGUARDIA. But your rates came down.

Mr. RANKIN. The rates are the same.

Mayor LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Or practically the same. I have them right here before me.

Mayor LaGUARDIA. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, if you build a line into New York City, and into every other city, and make electricity available, and then they know that you can get this power at this rate, it will force the power companies to come down to that level, will it not?

Mayor LaGUARDIA. Absolutely.

Mr. RANKIN. I will give you a concrete illustration. Tarrant City, Ala., and Bessemer, Ala., or what you might call suburbs of Birmingham—municipalities on each side of Birmingham.

Mayor LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. We were enabled to get the T. V. A. power to those two cities. Frankly, I helped to do it. Members of the Alabama delegation came to see me, and I went to bat for them, and we got the T. V. A. power into those two cities. It immediately broke the rates in Birmingham a million dollars a year, and they are using power generated by coal out there at the Gorgas plant they took away from us when you and I were in Congress. You remember that?

Mayor LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Which was built for a stand-by for the T. V. A.

Mayor LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. So if this power is developed it will not only pay for itself in 40 years or 50 years, but it can be used as a yardstick to force these rates down all over the State of New York?

Mayor LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. And all over the surrounding States.

Mayor LaGUARDIA. All over that whole section.

Mr. RANKIN. That whole section.

Mayor LaGUARDIA. Quite right, into New England, as you say.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you know what the overcharge in the State of New York last year was, for the whole State?

Mayor LaGUARDIA. It was pretty big.

Mr. RANKIN. According to Ontario rates—Ontario, of course, is right across the river, and that is a public system. According to the Ontario rates the people in New York State last year paid in overcharges a sum amounting to $201,000,000.

Now, I know that the opposition is going to come back, just as they came back at you, about taxes. They are going to say that the Ontario system pays no taxes, which is true, but in 1936, according to the report of the Federal Power Commission, all of the taxes, cash contributions, and free services paid or rendered by all of the power companies, all electric utilities, both public and private, in the State of New York—and that includes income taxes to both the State and the Federal Governments, amounted to only $48,000,000.

The Federal Power Commission tells me that that situation has not changed.

Taking that $48,000,000 from that $201,000,000, it shows a net overcharge for which you get absolutely nothing in return in the State of New York alone amounting to $153,000,000.

Mayor LaGUARDIA. Well, you take your Jacksonville illustration. They charge themselves taxes there.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; they pay taxes.

Mayor LaGUARDIA. And it is a steam plant.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mayor LaGUARDIA. And still their rates are lower.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

I took the trouble to work out the figures for that whole area and I included the Niagara development, because there is a proposition incorporated in the bill which I have introduced for an authority in that area to cover both Niagara and the St. Lawrence Rivers.

A line 300 miles long from those two projects would cover practically all of New York, nearly all of Pennsylvania, nearly all of New England, and a large portion of Michigan and Ohio.

I took the troube to go into the overcharges and figured them out and also took the taxes paid for 1 year, and the overcharges paid in those, I believe, 10 Northeastern States, after deducting all of the taxes, cash contributions, and free services paid or rendered by both private and public utilities last year, still left a net overcharge for those 10 States of $401,000,000. That is enough to pay for this entire development and have considerable margin left.

The People Demand Immediate Embargo of Export of Petroleum Products to Japan

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am the author of House Concurrent Resolution 30, which is identical with Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, introduced by Senator GUY GILLETTE, of Iowa, and which is now pending in the Senate.

Hearings were held on my resolution before the House Committee on Rules on June 5 and 6. Subsequently I made a national radio address on June 20, 1941, giving arguments supporting my contention that Congress should make a full and complete investigation as to the reasons why shipments of essential raw materials of war and munitions, metal products, and scrap, from which the United States already suffered a woeful paucity, were allowed to be carried on, seemingly with little interruption, to the Axis Powers and their vassals.

I quote from pertinent portions of this resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a special joint congressional committee * * * to be composed of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. * * * It shall be the duty of the committee to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the extent to which, the sources from which, the manner in which, and the mediums through which, the so-called Axis Powers are obtaining or have obtained essential war materials from the Western Hemisphere. The committee shall report to the Senate and to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable time, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

Mr. Speaker, for years, the United States, despite the strenuous objection of 75 percent of the people, as shown in Gallup polls and other people's opinion polls, has carried on its course of trying to appease the Japanese by bribing them with the shipment to it of petroleum products in vast quantities. Long before this war, I repeatedly denounced this policy on public platforms throughout the country. In a previous Congress, I introduced a bill to embargo the sale of petroleum products and matériel of war to Japan on the ground that we were thereby assisting in the aggression against China. Tremendous sentiment was manifest through the length and breadth of the country in favor of my bill, but, though the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on the matter, and although distinguished figures of national prominence appeared before that committee to champion that legislation, our State Department frowned upon it and the committee permitted the bill to die aborning.

The State Department attempts to justify its course by claiming that this policy of appeasement toward Japan has prevented it from seizing the Dutch East Indies and invading Singapore, and perhaps Hong Kong.

I decry such a course. Long before World War No. 2 commenced on September 3, 1939, the American people had shown in no uncertain terms their disgust with this policy of furnishing Japan with the means of carrying on its ruthless war against its peaceful neighbor, the Chinese Republic.

The policy of appeasement has been repeatedly denounced by the State Department in relation to Holland, Czechoslovakia, Norway, and Yugoslavia. This administration has graphically pointed out the folly of appeasement toward the Axis, yet we are practicing it in this hypocritical, unconscionable, and shoddy business by tolerating, if not encouraging, the sale of war supplies to Japan. There is no support for such a policy throughout America except in certain isolated newspapers.

It is contended that realism justifies our course, but realism compels the conclusion that Japan will spread her aggressions to the Dutch East Indies, to Hong Kong, and to Singapore when and if she feels herself strong enough to do so, regardless of appeasement. Japan respects the presence of the United States Fleet in the Pacific. She has a strange habit of striking when the potential enemy's back is turned. She will hit at Siberia when she thinks the Soviet Union

is quivering and lying on its back from its wounds. In the interim we have been supplying Japan with the means by which our friends might possibly be subjugated.

If certain gentry in the British Foreign Office have approved, if not directed, this policy of appeasing Japan by furnishing her with vast quantities of war supplies, particularly petroleum products, that is not an extenuation or exculpation of our responsibility and liability.

The policy of appeasement proved a frightful failure in the case of Vichy France. England and the United States attempted to bribe her without avail.

The policy of appeasement proved a colossal folly in the dealings of Britain and the United States in the case of Franco in Spain. Let us have no more of it, lest we continue to delude ourselves by the comforting thought that Franco has been won over to us by our bribes to him. No; he is keeping technically at peace until he can squeeze the last drop of tribute from Great Britain and the United States, and when he has effectuated that objective he will invite the Fascists to use his territory as a base of operations. Mark that prediction.

Meanwhile, Japan is storing up huge quantities of surplus oil beyond her immediate war needs, all because our Government, in conjunction with that of Great Britain, has pursued its mistaken course. May our State Department and those who guide our foreign policy learn the folly of their ways before it is too late. May they crack down now and end this farcical partnership with our potential enemies. May they prohibit further business relations of the character mentioned, with Japan and thus restore the confidence of the American people in the consistency of our course.

To show that I am not alone in these views, I include certain newspaper statements which speak for themselves. There is tremendous support for my resolution in the editorial columns of the Nation's newspapers and for the objectives sought to be attained in such resolution.

From the Free Press, Burlington, Vt.:

How long, we repeat, is the United States going to try to "buy off" Japan by sending her oil which we may need at home and which may be used either to fly the planes which bomb China or to operate planes which may embarrass us elsewhere before we are through with this mess?

From the Call, Paterson, N. J.:

Certainly it is an injustice and bad policy to provide large shipments of oil to Japan, an Axis partner, which probably are later transferred to Germany and Italy, while at the same time creating a shortage in the most populous section of our own country that contains many defense industries. It is to be hoped that Mr. Ickes' latest order will be carried out and that oil shipments from the east coast to foreign nations be stopped.

From the Sun, Williamsport, Pa.:

Secretary Ickes has ordered a halt to preparations for the shipment of a cargo of oil bound for Japan, on the grounds that a threatened shortage of oil and gasoline in the eastern part of the United States makes it unwise to permit such shipments. One excuse may be as good as another, but a lot of Americans would prefer to see the shipment countermanded because of the use to which Japan is putting her oil supplies in her continued war upon China and because of the attitude which she is taking toward the United States. Why should we supply to Japan anything which can be used in war with China or in preparation for possible war with ourselves?

From the Mail, Charleston, W. Va.:

There is no more puzzling phenomenon before the American public than the impending threat of an oil shortage on the eastern seaboard while the Nation blithely ships vast quantities of oil from the west coast to Japan. Matters are not simplified, at least so far as the public is concerned, when the President proclaims a responsibility to arm China out of our arsenal of democracy and, at the same time, releases to Japan the very material which she most desperately needs to continue the aggression against China.

* * * * *

Whatever are the reasons for this state of affairs, they have not been made clear to the public. With no explanations offered, it is not unreasonable for that public to ask why it should be called upon to exercise care in the use of petroleum when the industry itself announces that there is an ample supply of oil for years to come to meet all of the country's normal as well as defense needs.

Presumably the real reason lies in the diplomatic maze of the State Department. It has been suggested that we allow Japan to have American oil as a sort of bribe to keep her from making a grab at the Dutch East Indies, the only other available source of supply. That reason, if it is true, smells suspiciously like appeasement. Assuming that it is this country's policy to preserve the status quo in the Pacific, it should be apparent from recent history that appeasement is a bad way to begin.

From the Record, Troy, N. Y.:

Could there be anything more completely cockeyed than our export policy of fueling the Japanese war machine?

Not unless it is our continued policy of supplying * * * Japan * * * with other war essentials in addition to oil and gasoline.

Amid all the talk about gasless Sundays here at home, and perhaps even more drastic restrictions on gasoline and oil, it is cold comfort to know that Hitler's far eastern partner still gets generous allotments of our petroleum products.

* * * * *

It is, in fact, about the most reckless, shortsighted course that could be imagined, particularly in view of the danger of our embroilment in the Atlantic.

We should drop this idiotic policy right now. We should impose without further perilous delay a tight embargo on shipments of oil and gasoline to the Japanese.

From the Evening Post, New York City:

Let us face the fact that the administration has embarked on a policy of appeasement toward Japan. Occasional gestures in the opposite direction do not obscure this fundamental truth. A bit of bellicosity now and then, never too much and never long continued, is a necessary part of every appeasement program. But when Japan's funds are not tied up, while Axis funds are, when oil flows freely to the Japanese, while it is shut off as against Germany and Italy, then we are appeasing Japan, and no other word can describe our policy.

* * * * *

We ask to be shown that appeasement works. We urge that no case has been made for it. We assert that it has been adopted without public approval. We say that the burden of proof is upon those who favor selling $3,500,000 of oil each month to an Axis partner. We say that no responsibility lies with the oil companies; all responsibility lies with the Government. We ask an embargo on oil.

From the Record, Greensboro, N. C.:

How much longer will Uncle Sam continue to play the Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde role—supplying aid to the fighting democracies with one hand and passing out essential war supplies to the Axis aggressors with the other?

We favor a leak-proof boycott against the Japanese, the Germans, and the Italians.

The very least we could do to aid Britain and China, holding the line for democracy and for us, would be to stop selling fuel to drive the war machines that are smashing down upon them.

From the Star, Meridian, Miss.:

With one hand we lend China $100,000,000 to defend herself.

With the other, we send tanker-cargoes of gasoline to help Tokyo to bomb Chungking.

On one side, we supply our potential Oriental enemies with motor fuel to wage aggressive war.

On the other, we propose to deny our own people gasoline for the recreational or daily needs of peace.

Apparently, someone in Washington is slipping up.

"Consistency, thou are a jewel."

We respectfully refer these imponderables to Mr. Ickes.

From the Courier, Camden, N. J.:

Figures on oil shipments to Japan henceforth will be a military secret.

Roll out the barrels for the Mikado, boys—but do it softly.

Think this over:

In March of this year, latest month for which figures are available, we sent Japan 50 percent more oil than we sent her in March of 1940.

The total was 1,553,000 barrels.

* * * * *

It is the story of France, all over again.

France sold war materials to Germany up to the very day war began. Certain French business firms then kept on selling Germany war materials, through Spain.

To prevent those unpleasant truths from reaching the French people, a rigid censorship on such exports was proclaimed—

Exactly the way our own Department of Commerce has now proclaimed a censorship on all exports from the United States, which covers up completely the oil exports to Japan—partner of the Axis.

* * * * *

But it is impossible to sell the American people on the notion of doing without oil and gasoline, while our abundance is shipped to a member of the Axis we call the enemy of all civilization.

God spare us from the day when our motorists walk up to empty gasoline pumps and cry bitterly:

"Check my 'four freedoms.'"

From the Daily News-Tribune, Tacoma, Wash.:

The State Department has declined to embargo such shipments and Congress backed off mysteriously on its proposed investigation when an Assistant Secretary of State told Members that such a public airing of the question would be embarrassing.

* * * * *

The shortage on the east coast is due to the transfer of oil tankers to the registry of other nations. This could not have been done without the consent of the Government. The question has never been answered as to what these tankers are doing. Some of them are

carrying gasoline to Britain, but the charge has been made that others are taking their cargoes to the Axis.

This whole contradiction in policies ought to be cleared up. It has all the appearance of developing into a great national scandal.

From the Herald, Grand Rapids, Mich.:

But that is not the worst of it. There are plenty of tankers in the Pacific, but they are busy transporting oil to Japan, a nation with which we are likely to find ourselves at war almost any day, and a nation which is seeking to conquer China, to which we are giving material aid. So, perhaps we are to live in cold homes and enjoy gasless Sundays in order that we still may ship oil to a prospective enemy, at any rate to an enemy of a friend of our own.

It may well be expected that so long as this practice is continued and countenanced, gasless Sundays and cold homes will not be very popular in the United States. It may be found rather difficult to enforce such restrictions. So long as we have plenty of oil and the means with which to get it about the country if we would use the facilities we have instead of using them to supply others, including enemies, the people of the United States will not be inclined to cheer very loudly if ordered to hold down the temperature in their homes or to keep the family bus in the garage Sundays.

Aren't we a queer people, though?

From the Call, Allentown, Pa.:

In the meantime, though, there is a lot of question in the minds of people who dislike the idea of gasless Sundays or any such prohibitions as to continued exportations of gasoline to Japan. What is the idea, they say, in permitting continued exportations to Japan for an army and navy that are fighting our friends, the Chinese, and even may be stocking up for an attack upon the United States, if the people of this country are going to be put on short rations as to fuel?

It does all seem to be a paradox, and it can be assumed that if pressure be placed upon the people to save gasoline, pressure will in turn be put by the people on the Federal Government to do something about the exports to Japan.

From the Tribune, Chicago, Ill.:

There was quite a fanfare when last year an embargo was placed on iron and steel scrap going to Japan, after years of unprecedentedly large shipments. But little has been said about cutting off American gasoline from Japan. This is especially to be wondered at because the step-up in the flow of gasoline to Japan started in October last year, right after the Japs signed up with the Axis. Can it be that they are buying enough gasoline from us to supply themselves—with considerable left over for Germany? American gasoline may be an important item in the increased trade of Nippon with Hitler.

From the Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio:

What, in this drama, has become of that good fairy, that angel of Oriental peace, the American policy of appeasing Japan with oil and other war materials? It has not only failed, like all appeasement gestures, it has enabled Japan to continue the war in China and to build up the means with which to attack the Indies and other European possessions.

This may spell disaster to the United States. From the Orient this Nation obtains not only the bulk of its tin and rubber, but a score of small yet important products, without which the inddustrial might of America soon would collapse. It is not too late to retrieve this error. When it comes to stamina in dealing with the aggressors of Asia, Washington can learn much from Batavia.

From the Intelligencer, Wheeling, W. Va.:

ENGLAND AND THE MAIN CHANCE

Some days ago this newspaper raised the question of whether or not the transfer of 50 oil tankers from the American coastal service to the British service was necessary to England's war effort. The question was pertinent, we felt, because the loss of these transport facilities threatened the eastern section of the country with an oil shortage despite the productive capacity of the country.

The Oil Weekly provides at least a partial answer, assuming the accuracy of its facts. "The public must realize," it says editorially, "that this situation (the threatened oil shortage with gasless Sundays and all that sort of thing) has come about solely because facilities which the industry has maintained for years, ample facilities, have been requisitioned by the Government and put into service moving foreign oil to England at a time when England still chooses to move oil from Iran, Persia, around the tip of Africa, in what is a 22,000 mile round trip, instead of taking the oil from nearer home."

If this be true, it would seem that the principal purpose to be served by the stripping of our own oil-transport system is to make it possible for England to carry on her foreign trade on the business-as-usual basis. That, we submit, is hardly a cause for which the American people should be asked to forego the usual Sunday automobile ride.

From the Capitol, Topeka, Kans.:

This latest move of the administration does not yet solve the problem of furnishing Japan the oil and scrap iron she is using to carry on Axis activities in the Pacific. We are steadily marching down the road to war, and Japan is obligated to attack us when Hitler orders, yet in May some 800,000 barrels of oil left our west-coast ports for Tokyo. To pay for oil and scrap iron Japan sends gold which we buy at a high price.

It would seem that this Government is shaking its fist at the Axis Powers, yet doing about everything it can to help a potential enemy get ready to harass our Navy in the Pacific if our aid-to-Britain program precipitates a shooting war in the Atlantic.

From the Union, San Diego, Calif.:

The removal of the 50 tankers from eastern commerce will, of course, curtail the delivery of oil and gasoline to certain sections in that area. But it certainly will not affect it in most of the rest of the country. On the Pacific coast, for example, most of the gasoline is transported by tank trucks. Most of the refineries are in the oil fields and the transfer of the refined product to the consumer is simplified and requires virtually no tankers. In many of the Middle Western States pipelines carry the needed fuel over long distances.

If we actually are to have a transportation shortage, let's call it that. If it affects certain areas of the country, temporarily causing a shortage of gasoline and oil for a day or so occasionally, why penalize the whole nation, particularly regions where supplies are plentiful and are moving normally? Let's hope that Mr. Ickes becomes oriented and realizes that he is administering the oil industry in the United States and not in Great Britain or some other country that produces none. That might go a long way toward solving his "problem."

From the Record, Philadelphia, Pa.:

Talk of gasless Sundays for the United States, of a possible ban on pleasure driving, of campaigns to reduce waste of gasoline by slower driving.

Japan, which is getting our oil by the million barrels, should reciprocate, we think. There ought to be gasless Sundays in Tokyo and Yokohama.

Perhaps, too, Japanese pilots flying over China could be taught how to reduce their gasoline consumption, so that the Chinese could be bombed with less gasoline per bomb.

But if we can't start such a drive in Japan, perhaps we can arrange a barter deal. We'll sell Japan oil in return for rickshas.

Then, on our gasless Sundays, we can go riding in our rickshas—pulled, we hope, by career men in the State Department.

From the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah:

It does not seem consistent, under these conditions, that the American people should face a shortage of oil at home while shipping 800,000 barrels of oil to Japan every 30 days. With Americans warned that they will be called upon to discontinue unnecessary driving and to use less oil in their homes, with increases in gasoline and fuel-oil prices predicted, is it not foolish to use American ships to transport huge supplies of oil to a country that is not even friendly to the United States?

There are sound reasons why the United States Government should cease supplying Japan with oil. The oil is needed in America. The ships are needed. Under such circumstances, a ban on oil exports to Japan would not be punitive but dictated by American requirements. The problem is one that concerns the War and Navy Departments even more than it does that of the Departments of Commerce or the Interior.

From the Daily Times, Tacoma, Wash.:

Maybe, as Harry Hopkins, the President's right bower in the lend-lease set-up, says, we're "too dumb to understand."

Be that as it may, we, and other American simpletons of equal density, see something incongruous in the talk of gasoline rationing in this country while we still ship gasoline to Japan and Russia.

We're willing to do our share in defense of democracy, but we're not willing to miss a single Sunday picnic in order to help fill the oil drums of the dictatorships.

As Congressman JOHN COFFEE has told the House at Washington, the tankers still are crossing the Pacific westbound and loaded. And Japan and Russia not only frown upon us at present but are pledged to aid Germany and Italy.

Yesterday a Petroleum Industry Committee at the National Capital suggested "rigid restrictions" on gasoline usage, including "gasless Sundays." The committee forecast "acute shortage" by July 1. The report was made to Cabineteer Ickes, new defense oil czar.

For all of this there may be adequate explanation.

But if so, we haven't heard it—and neither has Congress.

A congressional committee, urged by COFFEE, is beginning a private inquiry today, we understand.

We wish the committee well.

And we hope the bureaucracy at the National Capital, burdened as we know it sometimes feels it is by the stupidity of the American public, will tell us why we must even talk of gasoline rationing while still shipping the fuel to our asserted potential enemies.

From the Post, Milwaukee, Wis.:

It is hardly likely that our State Department * * * can be so naive as to believe that these nations in the Axis or in the Axis orbit have suddenly become enriched to the point of buying extra-large quantities where they bought only moderate amounts before. The type of the exports themselves should be a severe indication of their purpose.

It seems that we are exporting to Hitler as well as to Japan. American businessmen re-

fuse to take the situation seriously, and they are nullifying a good deal of the work that the country in the main is trying to do. We are trying to be an arsenal for democracy. They are making of us also a warehouse for the Axis.

From the Tribune, La Crosse, Wis.:

With Americans being warned that they will be called upon to discontinue unnecessary driving and to lower the heat in their homes, with increases in gasoline and fuel-oil prices predicted, is it not foolish to use American ships to transport huge supplies to a country that seizes every opportunity to insult the United States?

If the United States Government does decide to stop supplying Japan with oil, it will have sound reasons. The oil is needed in America. The ships are needed. Under such circumstances, a ban on oil exports to Japan would not be punitive but dictated by American requirement.

But the problem is more in the field of the State, War, and Navy Departments than in that of the Departments of Commerce or Interior.

From the Express, Easton, Pa.:

The time has certainly come, in the circumstances, for taking a bold stand against Japan and for translating what we think and feel about the matter into forcible action—and if Japan doesn't like it, let her try to do what she can about it.

This country at the present time is not only attempting to aid Britain and maintain the traditional American principle of freedom of the seas but we are also trying, as best we can, to aid China in her efforts to oppose Japanese domination and thereby maintain for ourselves the policy of the open door in that vast country. These things being true, it behooves the United States to tell Japan and her belligerent admirals and bellicose generals where to get off—and stay off.

From the American, Austin, Tex.:

During the 4 years since the invasion of China, public sentiment in this country has been overwhelmingly in sympathy with the Chinese, whose courageous fight has meant much to the democratic cause throughout the world. Now that our oil shipments to Japan are seen in their proper relationship to the Eastern States' shortage of motor fuel, there is due to be a demand for a sharp change in policy.

From the Herald-Journal, Syracuse, N. Y.:

Each step by Washington to shut off supplies has brought a growl from Tokyo. There have been threats that such action would force Nippon to seize the Dutch East Indies to obtain needed materials. This would bring danger of involvement for the United States. Any clash with Japan would distract our attention from the job of supplying war materials to Britain.

* * * * *

It is easy to guess what Nippon's policy would be if the situation were reversed. It would make sure that its own needs were supplied first. Of course, the Nipponese will pull all the wires known to them to keep the oil stream flowing but if they are bluffing there is an excellent chance that the bluff will be called.

From the Journal, Lansing, Mich.:

The authorities at Washington seem to feel that somehow they can keep Japan satisfied until such time as the combined fleets of America and England are in condition to meet Japan on better terms in the Pacific. The onlooking citizen is beginning to doubt if that is so. They think that Japan is merely intimidating England and the United States and will keep up the intimidation as long as possible.

It is not agreeable to citizens when they find the matter of foreign policy reduced to terms of common blackmail. Perhaps the public—especially the seaboard public—would not think much of the matter if there were guaranty that there be no limit put upon the use of the family jallopy, Sundays and all.

From the Daily News, Miami, Fla.:

So in this weapon of embargo we have a threat of which little show has been made. Japan meanwhile gains domination of French Indo China, seeks the same in the Dutch East Indies, preaches the doctrine of Pan-Asianism in China, marks out her sphere of influence to include Oceania, which some geographers define as all the oceanic islands in the Pacific.

In addition, Tokyo as an Axis partner, must be presumed, and certainly has indicated this presumption to be correct, as ready for open hostilities with this country if the United States becomes actively embroiled with Germany or Italy.

We talk of an oil embargo against Japan, and Japan immediately presses southward for new oil supplies. Talk of a complete embargo might be more impressive, both to China and Japan.

From the Tribune, Scranton, Pa.:

In addition to stopping oil shipments from eastern ports, Secretary Ickes should take it upon himself to find out how many American tankers have been transferred to foreign registries and are engaged in carrying oil to Japan. It seems that the sensible procedure would be an administration order to prohibit all oil shipments from eastern seaports except those for Britain.

The whole problem of fuel exports to this country from Japan should be carefully examined. Japan gets almost 80 percent of her petroleum from the United States. In fact it is contended that she is receiving from the United States far more oil and gas than are required for her present needs, the theory being that she is storing it up—perhaps against the day when she may as an Axis partner use it to the detriment of this country.

In any event, the Ickes nonshipment order is a blow to the appeasement clique in our State Department. We have seen too much of the tragic futility of appeasement in our times.

From the Herald, Durham, N. C.:

There is the point, however, that transportation facilities have been depleted by transferring tankers to routes carrying oil to Britain, for reason that we have decided it is vital to us that Britain be supported against German aggression. And since Japan is a proclaimed ally of Germany, active enemy of our ally, Britain, and our active enemy in all except name, our people simply do not want Japan to accumulate stocks of American oil for use against American interests, ships, planes, etc.

From the Daily Advertiser, Montgomery, Ala:

Oil shipments to Japan are defended with the supine argument that she is so dependent upon us for her supply that she might get mad and do something desperate if it should be cut off. We heard the same sort of talk against the scrap-metal embargo, but nothing came of it. At best it is a novel explanation, that we must continue to provide our enemy with the sinews of war because he cannot get them elsewhere. It is on a par with saying that a law-abiding citizen and prospective victim should hand a gangster a gun, lest the thug attack him with his fists.

The State Department is reported divided over the wisdom of an oil embargo. Apparently some of these quill-drivers are inclined to accept Japan at her own estimate, to view her utterances as fraught with dire menace and disaster to this country, instead of the despairing squeal of a cornered rat.

Anyway, the United States has a bunch of ninny-nincompoops, under the generalship of chief ninny Breckenridge Long, in its State Department it could well do without.

While purging the Axis diplomatic corps in the United States, we might as well start purging our own State Department.

From the Sun, Lowell, Mass.:

The oil and gasoline which we sell to Japan will no doubt be delivered by her to the Axis Powers, or used by Japan as an ally of the Axis, in an effort to defeat the democracies of the world.

This is a policy which is so inconsistent that it should not be countenanced by the people of this country. Our Nation has given aid to China, and to the democracies, by way of supplies and money. When we sell oil and gasoline to the enemy of those democracies we are placing the weapon in their hands with which to defeat the same democracies which we have been attempting to aid. It is an unholy policy, to say the least.

From the Sacramento Bee, Sacramento, Calif.:

A fantastic state of affairs exists wherein Americans are straining their productive resources to the breaking point in order to supply Britain, China, and other foes of the Axis with desperately needed war supplies, and at the same time are permitting the export of petroleum, scrap metal, and other raw materials to Axis partners or friends.

Such a policy does not make sense to the citizens who are going to be taxed in the billions for all-out aid to the Allies.

From the Christian Science Monitor:

And up to a point they are certainly right. But the time comes when popular pressure cannot be ignored, even by brahmins in a state department. That time in relation to supplies to Japan came some months ago, and the State Department took apparent action to cut off airplane gasoline and the better grades of scrap iron. But the public has now found out that this action was largely illusive—that considerable quantities of both commodities continued to go to Japan and to Vladivostok.

Now, it may be that the State Department officials are quite right. But if they don't explain their reasons to the public pretty soon, they may one day find themselves in a very uncomfortable position. For popular indignation cannot be ignored forever. A good rousing demagogue in the Senate or House could make a lot of trouble for the State Department on this issue, and he might be a patriot as well as a demagogue.

Moreover, there is evidently great division between Government experts on the problem, with some officials and some departments supporting the popular side of the case. Harold L. Ickes, the new oil conservator, is obviously very anxious to cut off the shipments to Japan, and has already curbed some of them, whether the export-license officials of the State Department go along with him or not.

* * * * *

The people are beginning to suspect that other phases of the work of the Munitions Control Board are not all they should be, that proper vigilance has not been shown. What about shipments to Finland, to Spain, the public asks? This is a touchy point. Deep-seated popular distrust of governments and "international cliques" stems back very largely to the sale or interchange of valuable commodities between enemies just before or even in the early stages of previous wars. The idea that wars are not worth fighting, that they come from selfish economic motives and not from causes of national survival or basic ideals, feeds on just such situations. The hands of few of the belligerents were clean in

the last war, and the post-war revulsion which the world felt came greatly from revelations of sinister commercial motives. The hands of some belligerents were very dirty early in the present war. It appears that the United States hands, despite an elaborate control system established by Congress, have been none too clean this time. The public—everywhere I have talked with people across the continent these last 2 weeks—demands an explanation.

From the Daily Record, Stockton, Calif., in an editorial entitled "Our Strange Oil Policy":

One explanation is that Japan has stored up so much fuel for future use that curtailment now by Uncle Sam could not embarrass her. Hence there is no disposition in Washington to arouse her resentment by shutting off the supply. Also it is figured that American shipments will keep Nippon from reaching out in a Netherlands East Indies grab.

Washington diplomacy unquestionably is playing for big stakes in a perplexing world situation. It may be that the administration hopes to wean Japan away from her Axis alinement, for which her ardor seemingly has abated. Presumably the Washington government would not follow its enigmatic oil policy if it did not expect important returns. The American people, threatened with gasless Sundays and gas rationing, and witnessing the prospect of American fuel in Japanese hands being turned against American interests, will expect the returns from our policy to be important and valuable indeed.

From the Dispatch, Roswell, N. Mex.:

How any nation can continue to supply materials to a potential enemy is beyond the comprehension of the average American citizen. State Department officials report that they do not desire any embargo beyond that limited embargo already placed, for fear that Japan will take the Netherlands East Indies, a valuable and essential source of tin and rubber for this Nation. However, the Dutch of the Indies recently refused to grant Japan any additional imports of oil or petroleum products beyond that amount they had already been receiving. If the Dutch, directly on the spot of any possible Japanese aggression, have the courage to refuse Japanese requests, it makes a pretty weak case for this country, which would be only indirectly affected.

When a dictator nation goes to war, it goes to war in all directions. Democracy must find the way to counteract that fact by using something of the same method prior to actual hostilities. There is no reason that we should continue to arm or supply the Japanese with any of the materials of war—they may be used against us in the future.

From the Gazette, Charleston, W. Va.:

If there is any reason we should continue to "appease" Japan by sly help during loud talking for home consumption, we want to know what it is. As we have remarked before, WHEELER and his ilk would serve their country far better in calling for debate on such matters as this than by mumbling over the old bones of "we don't wanna fight nobody."

We don't want to fight unless we have to, but when it comes to the pinch that we must fight we certainly don't want our enemies stocked from our own supplies.

Unpack the State Department and get some sure enough Americans in there.

From the Statesman, Boise, Idaho:

Such mercenary activities, however, when proved to exist, should be throttled immediately. An example of such verified nonsense is America's supplying Japan with war sinews while grunting an extra groan to help China.

It is highly important to domestic morale to know to what extent America's effort to vanquish totalitarianism is being neutralized by material misdeeds that tend to sustain it.

From the Daily News, Albany, N. Y.:

Concretely, they think it is high time to stop furnishing Japan with oil and other supplies which are being used against those with whom we have taken our stand and which may one day be used against us. That seems to be simple common sense.

From the Daily Times, Louisville, Ky.:

Individuals, for private profit, you understand, are selling war materials to Japan. They are, probably, in some instances, individuals who expect to sell war materials to the Federal Government in its drive for defense and for stopping Hitler.

Senator GILLETTE demands appointment of a joint committee of Congress to investigate the manner in which Axis Powers are getting war materials from the United States. His demand seems reasonable.

From the Times-Star, Bridgeport, Conn.:

Embargo of certain materials has been ordered against Japan long since But the articles that would do her the most good, scrap iron and oil, we have been shipping to Japan freely.

* * * * *

So now exports of oil to Japan are to be blocked, or at least the President is preparing to exercise his power to block them. It's about time.

From the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash.:

If this means, as it appears on the surface, that Americans must use less gasoline while gasoline continues to be shipped from this country to Japan, possibly later to be used in attack by Japan upon American troops and ships, then surely our Government moves in a mysterious way its wonders to perform.

From the Press-Telegram, Long Beach, Calif.:

Californians have been aware that Japan has been receiving immense quantities of oil from this coast, although such oil is supposed to be banned, except as licenses are issued by the National Government. There have been other reports that military supplies are slipping through Latin America direct to Germany and Italy.

Both British and American companies are said to be refining and transporting oil from Japan to the Axis Powers.

The facts should be known and appropriate action taken to prevent further American support to the enemies of democracy.

From the Dispatch-Herald, Erie, Pa.:

Much talk is heard of an oil and gasoline shortage being in sight, and stories are coming out of Washington to the effect that gasless Sundays are in prospect.

This suggests a question. If gasless Sundays and stricter productior controls are necessary to assure that "the supply of petroleum and its products will be accommodated to the needs of the Nation and the national defense program," as one official statement has it, then why in the name of reason does the United States permit gasoline and lubricating and fuel oil to be shipped—as it has been from west-coast ports for months at the rate of a tanker every 2 days—to an avowed ally of the Axis, Japan?

Chester Rowell, in the San Francisco Chronicle:

The situation now is that a Japanese attack on the region radiating from Singapore no longer depends on the mere immediate supply of American oil. They have enough of it stored up already for the purposes of that attack and they will have plenty more if they win it. They openly threaten that attack and are making visible preparations for it. We, on the other hand, are now committed, as we were not before, to resisting that attack. When or if the attack is made depends on the course of the war in Europe and on the course of politics in America. Whenever the Japanese are convinced that Britain cannot and America will not defend Singapore, they will move. Meanwhile they will blow alternately hot and cold.

So the time is up. The embargo on oil and gasoline, as well as all other war supplies to Japan, should be immediate and total. It will mean risk, of course, but only a risk which we have announced ourselves ready to take and less risk than would be involved in not doing it. And the time to do it is now, when we can still afford to keep our main battle fleet in the Pacific.

From the Chicago Daily Times, Chicago, Ill.:

We've been playing a rather shoddy game of appeasement with Japan by continuing to supply her with oil for her war machine while extending lease-lend aid to China at the same time. This has been excused as being the lesser evil of the choices confronting us. If we had stopped all oil shipments, Japan almost certainly would have moved into the South Pacific out of force of necessity.

It might be possible right now, however, acting jointly with our friends in the Pacific, on the one hand to threaten such an embargo and its consequence of war with the combined American-British-Dutch forces, and on the other hand offer some genuine inducements to Japan to withdraw from China and to break with the Axis.

To achieve a formula which would give China an honorable peace, save Japan's "face," and offer adequate guarantees that any agreement reached would be kept inviolate wouldn't be easy. But it's worth trying.

Of course, any withdrawal from China by Japan will entail some loss of face. But even the Japanese realize that sometimes there has to be a choice between a little loss of face or a complete loss of pants.

Congressmen, Be Warned!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF THE MOST REVEREND FRANCIS J. L. BECKMAN, S. T. D., L. L. D., ARCHBISHOP OF DUBUQUE

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Francis J. L. Beckman, S. T. D., L. L. D., Archbishop of Dubuque, Sunday evening, July 27, 1941:

I regret that circumstances arising in the wake of my recent broadcast have impelled me to this microphone again tonight. Oh, the misfortune of controversy over vital principle which in its fury spares neither friend nor feeling, which counsels deceit and crass

misguidedness, which cleaves to the bone the whole body of truth and makes of ignorance a virtue.

I am filled this evening, my dear Catholic and Christian people, with an indignation akin perhaps to that which Christ the Saviour demonstrated in the temple despoiled. In the past weeks we have witnessed an unholy merger of Christianity and communism under the guise of military necessity; we have seen what amounts to dictatorship pseudo-officially canonized by a brother cleric; we have witnessed the beginning of the end for pledges which however well given had not truth for their backbone. "Strategy," what crimes are committeed in thy name. The bland assurances of peace for the people it seems are so much honey on the lip. Step by step, my dear friends, just as surely as I stand before this microphone tonight, our unhappy Nation is being propelled into an honest-to-goodness "blood and tears and sweat" shooting war. A war not to end wars, forsooth, but, whether we know it or not, a war to make the world, and particularly this beloved America, safe for the new bolshevism.

I think at this time I might appropriately restate my position on this momentous issue of war or peace for the American people. From the beginning I have maintained that this war, however falsely represented, is an economic war based on greed, a vast struggle for power and possessions between two diametrically opposed systems of finance. The problem over which the warring nations have come to death grips is simply this: Whose economy shall be dominant in Europe, ours or yours? In short, who is to exploit whom? The entrenched internationalists had their day; they financed the world into eternal debt and milked whole peoples, grinding them down into the dust of ignorance, poverty, and abject despair. When the crimes of these vendors in human misery arose to confront them, when other nations dared to challenge their tyranny, then it was war—war in the name of democracy and a hundred other slogans—yes; even war in the name of God Almighty Himself. If it suited their purpose to call it a holy war, that was all right too. Anything to persuade the gullible millions to go out and do the fighting and the suffering and the dying that the system might survive.

So today the propaganda—smooth stuff it had to be this time for the American people were weary and disillusioned of "war to end wars." They had been fooled once and they knew it. Oh, for a new slogan! Then out of the mysterious somewhere was born that supreme insult to the intelligence of our people, "Aid to the Allies Short of War." This was a clever bait and, anxious to aid Britain, while remaining ourselves at peace, we swallowed it, hook, line, and sinker. A few saw into the hypocrisy of this proposition, but their warnings went unheeded. In no time at all "measures short of war" had become an established axiom. The foundation was laid, the course set, and, whether they liked it or not, the American people once again were on the spot for Britain. A few well-chosen words to mark the gravestone of our folly; a "slimy slogan" had done it again. Here is His Eminence the great William Cardinal O'Connell, dean of the American hierarchy, on slogans: "Of all the things in the world, I think what we have to be on guard against are these slimy slogans that mean nothing. They are insults to one's intelligence. And, worse than that, they are dishonest. 'Make the world safe for democracy.' 'The war to end wars.' Oh, how slick that is. It sounds so nice, 'the war to end wars.' Of course, everybody wants to end war, so they rush in to end the war that they began. We have had wars ever since. And the worst one the world has ever known has come about since this slogan was manufactured to fool the people. 'The war to end wars.' How lovely and glib it sounds on the tongue. And the poor people; what a crime it is to deceive the poor people. What a crime! To play on their generosity of heart and even their trust in those who govern them; to play on that, that is pretty vile. To bring about what? To bring about disunion, confusion, and, little by little, the loss of everything they hold dear, the loss of their own children, the loss of their possessions, the loss of their civil rights."

People, here is a stirring indictment of deceit and a glimpse of what we may expect if as a result of our folly we get into this war unto annihilation. I reaffirm to you that the present conflict is not a "holy war," least of all a just war; but a war of one imperialism against the other in which godlessness is incidental to all belligerents. Neither side is interested in God so much as gold or its equivalent. And there is no crusade for Christianity or democracy afoot anywhere in the world today either, all high-sounding slogans to the contrary notwithstanding. Further, we may be sure that abroad the "four freedoms" have a phony ring. To the war-weary people of Europe this slogan is just another mask for the imperialism of the new world.

Again I quote Cardinal O'Connell: "And there is one thing certain: we cannot—and we ought not try to—impose our form of government on the whole world. Why, they don't want it. If you are going to impose it on them, then you are doing an act of tyranny. I wonder if anyone really believes he could do that. If he doesn't believe it, and if he says it—I don't want to use the word. If he says what he doesn't mean, then you know what the adjective is; that is false. You can't in honesty try to deceive a whole people, much less the whole world. They know perfectly well what the American Government is, and most of them, many of them, don't want it. Their traditions are all the other way. Very well; it is for them to decide, not for us. But as for our going out and trying to impose our method of life on the whole world, it is not only nonsense and impossible, but because it is utterly wrong—it is tyranny."

No, my dear American friends this war is nothing more or less than a struggle to reestablish the shattered boundaries of international finance, and other things international, in countries which have had their fill of them and do not want them anymore. This is a struggle which if prolonged through our efforts, but for a miracle of God, may go on interminably until universal chaos and exhaustion encompasses the warring nations.

And chaos—there is a whirlwind for you—a wind to scatter the deadly communism like a plague through all the world. If we in this country sanction even by our silence the hatred and revenge which dwells in the high places and relentlessly, hypocritically prosecutes this war we may well fear for that super doomsday of a world disillusioned in its faithless leaders, hungry at the stomach and weary unto despair. The weight of a long and terrible war will crush and distort the human spirit, deprave and bestialize. Oh, my dear friends, not death but sin is the horror of war. Maimed bodies are but an external evidence of the mangled spirit within. And the spirit of whole peoples shattered by interminable warfare will prove fertile soil for the cockle of a new type of communism. This "new godlessness" I will call it, because it is like to be a composite of that paganism prevailing in high places everywhere today, is something I tremble to contemplate. I pray heaven that we shall all be spared so terrible an alternative to an early peace with justice.

But I do know that the business of this great land is the business of peace. Defense? Certainly defense—defense to the hilt, but let us not discard the moral armament of a peaceful and freedom-loving way of life pursued for the edification of all the world. The great Prelate of the East advises: "Teach them (the nations) by example." Yes; let them all learn to look to America as a great country, where people are contented and happy, and are working day in and day out for the welfare of their family, for the welfare of their Nation, contented, honest, upright, obedient to the laws. Let them learn that. By that example, show the world what a great, big united country like this can be, united of all the different races in the world, by love of their native land, of their country whether it is their native land or not, of their Nation to which we belong. And with God's help, God, who has showered His blessings upon this country, and from whom it seems He gets very little thanks; this breadth of land from ocean to ocean, the mines, the farms, the mountains, the hills and lakes. O, God, what a country it is; a country to die for in defense, yes; but not to fritter away or barter out, but to preserve as it came to us from those glorious founders, whose memory ought to be our great strength and support. That is what we mean when we say "defense." Yes; all out for defense and then keep out of these foreign wars. I say that; you say that. Well, Washington said it, and he was a fairly big man, one of the great men of history. And he was the one who began with the solid idea upon which this whole Nation rests, or at least ought to rest.

Ought to rest, indeed. Too long in this country the American people have been led around by the nose, told what to do, robbed, kicked, and abused by the high-and-mighty masters of international finance; too long have they tolerated corruption and dishonesty in politics; too long have the Christian people of this Nation remained divided on fundamental issues. Yes; I fear that we have been nothing more than pawns in the good old game of divide and rule. It seems we can't get together for long on any one thing, and small wonder with these past masters in the art of long division ruling the roost. It is high time that the Catholic Church in particular and all good Christian Americans put aside their differences, unite in the common cause of Americanism and by legal means, but do it, put out these pirates who would rob and despoil our people of their very birthright, milk the Nation and then go off to abuse and ridicule it for another 20 years.

And while I am at it I think this is a good time to lay an old ghost. In late years it has become the fashion of much of the secular and even the Catholic press to place official interpretations on the pronouncements of clerics newly returned from abroad. Every scrap of news which might be construed as comforting to the cause of the interventionists has been hungrily seized upon and used to further divide, confuse, and exploit the Catholics of the Nation. Sadly enough the flagpole on the White House lawn has never lacked for clerical adornment. This is a disgraceful condition of affairs—the Catholic Church being used to further the evil ends of a privileged group. I cried out against this abuse 2 years ago, and with all my strength I cry out against it now. No man speaks for the Catholic Church save the Holy Father himself, and he must of necessity remain far above all this controversy. I do not claim to speak for all the Catholic people in this country; but I am well-advised enough to know that the overwhelming majority of our people are unalterably opposed to participation in this war. I am prepared to risk the proof of that point, and in the wake of crumbling pledges I turn once again to the representatives of the people:

Congressmen, be warned. You know that the people of this Nation are overwhelmingly opposed to becoming embroiled in this war. In the past many of you have voted legislation which was represented as designed to keep this country out of war. Subsequent

events must have convinced you by now that the opposite appears to be true. Congressmen, the people of this Nation will never forgive, much less forget, a negligence which permits the stealthy maneuvering of this beloved America into war either by the front or the back door. God forbid; I do not wish to speak disparagingly or distrustfully of our highest magistrates. I concur that in these anxious hours of deliberation and decision they are deserving of our deepest sympathy and the comfort of our prayers. But there are powerful figures moving in the background of this picture, and powerful pressure is certainly being brought to bear upon positions of responsibility. The smack of totalitarianism, of secret counsels arriving at decisions which, as I have said before, will effect whole generations of the unborn—these are realities we may not ignore. Remember, the stakes are high, and a few in this country would pay almost any price for the vindication of their monstrous greed, hatred, and deceit—any price, that is, in the blood and treasure of the American people. These manufactured crises and prayed-for incidents bear witness to the point.

And our boys—those fine young lads who are the hope and promise of this land—must they spill their blood for Britain and Bolshevism? They have a right to decent, unequivocal leadership. They will not shirk discipline nor will they hesitate to sacrifice, yes, even to die if necessary in the cause of a strict defense of this Nation. But the interpretation of the phrase "national defense" has lately become alarmingly broad. At this very moment only a mere pledge and an incident stand between the American people and full-fledged warfare, declared or undeclared. Congressmen, your people entreat you to look well to this state of affairs. There is still time to circumscribe and temper the dangers which threaten us, to put on the brakes and stop for a last look around before we take the fatal plunge.

And if we but stop, look, listen, we see the strangest sights in this land of ours. Men of stanch patriotic convictions who dare to oppose our entrance into this war are immediately smeared and classified as Nazis, bundists, yes, even traitors to their country; and again I quote His Eminence: "I thought that we were all taught from our infancy that we must love America and love it more than any other nation in the world. And to bring that into question was supposed to be a rather mysterious sort of treason. And now, for saying that very thing, one is very apt to be smeared by somebody or other who, from his own reasons—God knows what they may be—seems to take offense at the fact that Americans ought to love America and ought, as it is their duty bound, to see that the welfare of America is nearest their heart."

Let no man say that the Archbishop of Dubuque has not the welfare of America nearest his heart. Everyone of us who is fighting to keep this Nation at peace is fighting because we love that Nation. Everyone of us has an abiding disgust and just hatred of nazi-ism, communism, all "isms" everywhere. But we love our country, this great America, above everything and we believe firmly that remaining at peace it has a superb destiny, a sublime mission in a world almost totally at war. "Our duty as Catholics and as Christians, is to help pacify the world," says Cardinal O'Connell, "yet to say the word 'peace' nowadays would be almost to bring down upon your head a torrent of abuse."

Indeed, matters have come to a pretty pass with all of this smearing of righteous men. And it is high time that we ask ourselves, men of the Congress, who are these people who dare to vilify decent Americans, calling them Nazis and bundist and traitors? And while we are on the subject, in this so-called great Christian democracy of ours, how can we account for the coddling of Communists in every responsible branch of our Government? Truly there is something rotten here. Again, Congress, be warned. These unmolested commissars are the disciples of that new order we may expect as masters if this country goes to war. These want war. I fear that we are already dangerously honeycombed from within; that we have been blind and criminally irresponsible in harboring these arch enemies of Christianity. Today, the mask is off; it is communism, communism, communism everywhere gaining ground. We are in danger of being slowly poisoned, debilitated, and disarmed by this monstrous malady. Now, in the name of the four freedoms, all aid to Red Russia is urged upon us while Britain in desperation has allied herself with a devil. So, Britain has been fighting the battle of Christianity—there is a fallacy exploded. If we go into this war now we shall be nothing more or less than a criminal nation, and let no one look to our Catholic people for comfort. In conscience we bishops are all bound to listen to the voice of Pius XI, who wrote in his renowned encyclical on Atheistic Communism: "See to it, venerable brethren, that the faithful do not allow themselves to be deceived. Communism is intrinsically wrong, and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any manner whatsoever." So, there can be no collaboration for communism as far as the Catholic Church in this country is concerned. We have been pushed far enough in this abominable game of aid to Britain and bolshevism. We are sick and tired of broken or badly bent promises, of hypocrisy and deceit, of false hysterias and manufactured crises. We want no would-be commissars occupying positions in our Government. We want no war declared or undeclared; no trumped-up emergencies.

Men of the Congress, the great majority of our people look to you for earnest, speedy, patriotic action on their behalf; action which, in concert with the executive branch of our Government, will preserve this great Nation at peace and insure against any wholesale frittering and bartering away of our vital resources. They have every hope that you will do valiantly that which needs to be done and undone. The will of your people is and should be a vital, throbbing, prevailing thing urging you on to magnificent decisions in the name of constitutional government. So long as you loyally reflect that will, we shall not lack for unity in this Nation or for strong arms to defend it. "On the question of defense we are all entirely united," vigilant, determined, unafraid; but "the vast majority of the American people who stand for the defense of our Nation also has gone on record again and again and again as being opposed to participation in foreign wars"—Cardinal O'Connell. Certainly the majority millions of our Catholic people are opposed to it, to the coddling of Communists, to aid for "red" Russia. In farewell tonight I would draw upon this great body of opinion, Catholic in particular, Christian in general, mutually American, and unequivocally patriotic. Three times I have come to the microphone to voice the sentiments of this body—not a pleasant duty in these days of abuse. Now I charge you, Catholic and Christian citizens, to do your duty. I charge you this very hour to sit down, mothers, fathers—you who have most to lose and most to gain—make yourselves vocal to the Congress. Get out the letters and the post cards and write, write, write. Let both your Senators and your Congressmen know where you stand in this matter now. Your right of petition implies also a sacred and a solemn obligation. It is your duty to exercise it freely, fearlessly, incessantly. In the very teeth of the slurs which have been cast upon that right I charge you to persevere. In the corridors of Congress make the welkin of petition ring today, tomorrow, and throughout all the years; for it is the sweet bell of liberty, my dear people, a deathless voice which is democracy.

Henry Ford at 78

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

EXCERPT FROM EDITORIAL IN THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR AND POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the opening paragraph of an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star of today entitled "Mr. Ford at 78," to be followed by a short poem by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, a well-known poet of our Capital City, entitled "Henry Ford."

There being no objection, the editorial and poem were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. FORD AT 78

Time has not discouraged Henry Ford in his hopes for peace. On the eve of the seventy-eighth anniversary of his birth he told newspapermen: "I believe that, right now, a new world is being born—a very different world * * *. Contrary to what appears on the surface, this war is bringing the people of the world together as never before. It touches every race and people on earth. The radio and the airplane are bringing communication and transportation such as has never been before. Every race and people is getting to know more about other races and peoples. They're beginning to see that you can't build anything permanent on hate. The world is learning tolerance as never before. We're right on the verge of a federation of the whole world. There'll be more tolerance in the world, because there'll be more understanding."

HENRY FORD

(1941)

Seventy-eight years ago there was born into being,
In a humble but honorable home,
One, to be later blest with the power of seeing
Things that are and that are apt to come—
In his earlier struggles for just recognition
'Mongst the powers-that-be, he ignored
All their insolent slights, for he had the ambition
To produce a real self-running Ford.

Ridiculed for his vision of a real horseless carriage,
With the power to turn its own wheels—
The more those that derided him tried to disparage
His design, and to spurn his appeals
For financial assistance to put into action
His unique dream—the more he implored
The Great Helper to give him the great satisfaction
Of producing a self-running Ford.

Henry Ford laughed to scorn every senseless suggestion
That he quit and give up in dismay,
And became, in the United States, beyond question,
The great motorcar chief of his day—
Wheresoever the Stars and the Stripes of the Nation
Are unfurled, the fact can't be ignored,
That there's no auto maker in all God's creation
That has helped transportation like Ford.

Henry Ford, in his marvelous, up-climbing stages
Of prosperity, justly has shared
His success with his men by increasing their wages,
For he has for their happiness cared.
Disagreements between employees and employers,
The fomenter of strikes, he's deplored,
Because such inharmonious acts prove destroyers
Of that justice inherent in Ford.

Sacred honor, in Ford's master organization,
Has stood uppermost, up thru the years,
The supreme polar star in the Ford constellation,
The one star by which wisely he steers
His great enterprise, wherein he is the chief actor—
Wheresoever Ford motors have roared—
Recognized, everywhere, as a great benefactor
To humanity, is Henry Ford.

Tho great statesmen have blest our great civilization,
None of them have, perhaps, yet surpassed
Henry Ford, the past master in land transportation,
Whose great name will endure to the last.
Henry Ford's benefactions, on history's pages,
By posterity will be encored—
He succeeded by raising his co-workers' wages—
Yea, and God raised the wages of Ford.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Branding Price-Fixing for What It Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

LETTER FROM ERNEST H. HAHNE, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I place in the RECORD a very interesting and thoughtful letter from Ernest H. Hahne, professor of economics at Northwestern University, which is most pertinent to a subject now before the Congress, Price-Fixing. I hope every Member will read it. The letter follows:

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS,
Evanston, Ill., July 28, 1941.

Hon. FRANCIS H. CASE,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASE: The current discussion of price control for the purpose of preventing inflationary tendencies prompts the following letter, which I hope may assist you in formulating a sound judgment with respect to this extremely important issue.

I am assuming that it is necessary to maintain capitalistic democracy with both sound military and economic measures, and that military measures alone are inadequate.

THE EUROPEAN PATTERN

The experience in European countries where price controls have been used most extensively now shows a vaguely defined pattern or stages of historical development. Those stages have been set forth by eminent German economists as follows:

1. Spot control: Originally intended as temporary price controls for particular prices, but subsequently proving to have been the beginning of a permanent program.

2. Key-price controls: Maximum prices for selected commodities or industries, usually those which have been well cartellized during peacetimes.

3. Antiprofiteering laws: Primarily excess-profits taxes followed shortly by penalty taxes and/or administrative "price-discouragement methods" aimed to discourage evasions and violations of maximum price decrees.

4. Wage and price freezing decrees (Italy, 1927; Germany, 1936; Japan, 1939): Intended to apply generally to the whole economic order, somewhat along the lines of the Baruch plan as outlined by C. O. Hardy in his War-Time Control of Prices.

5. Rationing: Beginning with priorities and supplemented with noneconomic sanctions.

6. Centralization and the use of equalization funds: Centralized control for both wholesale and retail prices through buying and selling agencies supplemented with offices which supervise interdependent prices.

Such price control developments could be followed here in the United States, provided there is an agreement to modify the economic order, and to abandon sound economic principles, and to adopt the policy of conscious control by a few power-using agencies.

It is very desirable that the proposals now being made which look toward the abandonment of sound economic principles be branded and recognized for what they are worth. It is unwise for regulatory agencies, as well as legislative groups to adopt price control systems that are founded upon fallacies that can be proved to be unsound in advance of opportunistic experimentation.

FALLACY NO. 1

One commonly accepted fallacy is that output can be restricted as a part of the program for preventing inflation.

Take, for example, the proposal to restrict the production of automobiles. Suppose that for purposes of price controls the administration has been able to fix absolutely the total quantity of purchasing power, which, to say the least is a questionable assumption, and that at any given time there is a totality of $200,000,000 that may be spent as purchasing power. All other things remaining the same, a reduction in cars will raise prices; thus if 1,000,000 cars are made then they will sell for $200 each, if 500,000 cars are produced they will sell for $400 each, while 100,000 cars would sell for $2,000 each.

Of course, this is absurdly simple, but not clearly understood, because it is reported in the press that O. P. A. C. S. desires to avoid price increases, and the dangers of inflation, while at the same time they recommend curtailment in the output of cars. The purpose and policy are contradictory.

Unless restriction of output is simultaneously accompanied by similar, or greater, restriction of total purchasing power, price rises will take place. The abnormal war demands automatically disturb industry and inevitably lead to curtailment of output of normal consumer goods. The conscious effort of the past decade to raise prices is now being supplemented by the normal workings of the economic system, and this disturbs those who feel that the situation is getting out of hand because it is no longer subject to their theories of conscious control.

The efforts to raise prices during the thirties were approved by the people at the polls, therefore, a repudiation of that policy today is politically dangerous, at the same time that it is economically unsound.

FALLACY NO. 2

A second common fallacy is that prices can be regulated without regulating incomes.

Initial proposals for price controls always assure that there will be no regulation of wages, except in countries where there is a definite attempt to redistribute incomes and wealth. This fallacy is founded upon a failure to recognize the close relationships between incomes, costs, and prices. To wage earners higher wages are desirable because they are incomes; to management higher wages are undesirable because they constitute higher costs; in short, costs are incomes.

Prices are related not to past but to prospective costs, and if prices are controlled by administrative fiat, there must be regard for costs, one of the most important of which is wages.

Whenever Congress grants price-control powers to the administration it impliedly grants powers to control wages, plus interest, plus rents.

Congress cannot separate incomes and costs, neither can any administrator.

But from a tactical viewpoint it is always emphasized that prices are controlled for the sake of the wage earners, while in the long run wages must be fixed if prices are fixed.

Will Congress, after these years of cooperating with the trade unions of America in securing the rights and recognition of collective bargaining, want to deprive those same trade-unions of their very purpose of existence by taking from them their powers of collective bargaining with respect to wages, hours, and conditions of labor? I doubt if trade-unions want to freeze wages, and especially if that power is lodged in the hands of an administrator that might find it difficult to separate incomes and costs.

A congressional vote to grant price control is a vote to hand wage control over to the administration, perhaps not at once, but insidiously and invidiously.

FALLACY NO. 3

A third common fallacy is that it is possible to check the threat of inflation by controlling particular prices, and that this automatically involves control over the price level.

Unless control over particular prices is accompanied by control over the general level of prices conflicting economic forces will be set in motion that would lead to the defeat of price controls. That there is a general level of prices different in 1932 than in 1940 cannot be denied, nor can it be denied that the value of money is different than the value of goods.

To regulate the value of money, the general price level, it is necessary to manipulate the rediscount rate, the reserve ratios, the open market operations, the flow of specie, the extension of bank credit, and these controls must move in harmony with those over particular prices.

This calls for a centralization of powers that is now diffused in the hands of the Federal Reserve Board, the Treasury, the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, and placing these powers in the hands of that central agency which establishes control over particular prices.

To assume perfect harmony, say between the Department of Agriculture with respect to the fair price of farm products and the price administrator who fixes the prices of

the things the farmer buys, requires considerable faith in human nature. Harmony can be best established when the centralized powers of the price administrator include that of fixing all prices.

Moreover, if those now exercising powers over the extension of bank credit should make a move that would upset the apple cart of the interdependent prices fixed by the price administrator, it would be eventually necessary to divest the Federal Reserve Board and Treasury of their controls over credit and lodge such powers in the hands of the price administrator.

Do you think that under the American economic system there is anyone, or any group of men, sufficiently omniscient to exercise such control over the economic order?

FALLACY NO. 4

A fourth fallacy now current is that the proposed taxes under the revenue revision of 1941 will prove a sufficiently powerful check upon spending as to prevent inflation.

From 1933 to 1939 taxes and loans were used to finance spending and raise prices; now, with substantially the same taxes, the theory has changed and taxes will lower prices. Since the taxes are the same, the taxpayers the same, the tax incidence the same, it necessarily follows that the effects will be the same. The only variable factor in the situation is the willingness of the people to spend. Thus taxes were used during the great depression to pry people loose from their money, get it into circulation, and assure spending, whereas today it is assumed people are willing to spend and should be prevented from spending.

The funds collected by the 1941 taxes and Treasury loans will be used to buy war needs; then the laborers, managers, and industries supplying these needs get the funds; they will spend the money raised by these taxes. Hence the only difference is found in the time when the spending takes place.

To prevent inflation it is necessary that the taxes be accompanied by some method of absorbing the funds after they accomplish war purchases. Should this be left to the price administrator? My suggestion is that it could be much better accomplished through a deferred income plan.

FALLACY NO. 5

In the fifth place, a common current fallacy is that all inflationary measures are undesirable.

The fact is that the problem of price control involves a judgment as to the merits of relative values. Thus on July 24 the House was told that appropriations and contract authorizations for defense purposes would reach $52,000,000,000. We now know that the State and local debts reach about $19,000,000,000, that the Federal direct and guaranteed debt is about $56,000,000,000, or a total governmental load of $121,000,000,000.

Assuming that the present tax load of $3,500,000,000 proposed in the pending revenue legislation is continued simply to pay the principal of this existing governmental debt, it would take 35 years to pay the principal, let alone the added interest loads that must be borne.

The relative question, then, is this, Is it better to allow some inflation and the normal economic method of defraying acute indebtedness, or is it better to fix price controls that interfere with the normal workings of the price system?

Some reputable economists now regard inflation as a kind of tax, a creditors' tax, a tax on fixed-income receivers. If this view is sound, the issue then centers on the question as to the most desirable form of taxation. Before conceding control over prices to any single agency, which by virtue of the great burden must assign details to less and less competent assistants, it is desirable to weigh these relative values.

TWO SUGGESTIONS

May I offer two suggestions?

First. Congress should give further consideration to the deferred-income plan.

Thus by mopping up the tax and loan funds after they have been used to buy war materials, through the sale of bonds the limit placed on purchasing power becomes direct and effective. Such bonds should not be used as collateral for bank loans, nor should they carry conversion privileges, nor should they be cashed before the end of the military emergency, and then they should be used to buy the peacetime goods which will have experienced a curtailment in demand because of the war program.

England steered away from the deferred-income plan until it became apparent that price controls were breaking down, when the plan was finally adopted. Many sound and reputable economists favor this plan for America.

Second. Congress should at once set up a special committee to investigate and report a program designed to integrate fiscal and monetary policy.

Perhaps this could be done through some of the proposed committees already proposed by several Congressmen. Any intelligent citizen familiar with the overwhelming load imposed upon a diligent Congressman knows that he has neither the time, human endurance, nor inclination to master the complexities surrounding the predicament now caused by depression financing, defense financing, and prospective war financing.

Just as Great Britain called for the Colwyn Debt Committee to help solve the national-debt problem and the Macmillan committee to help solve the monetary problem, so, too, Congress might call for assistance from the reserves of the legal, statistical, accounting, and economic professions. This store of information is equal to that to be found in the different departments and agencies in the administrative branch, and would doubtless be welcomed by many in the different bureaus.

The responsibility belongs to Congress alone; aid can be secured from many untapped sources. Time is of the very essence of the price-control problem and such a committee should be established by Congress immediately.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST H. HAHNE,
Professor of Economics.

Observations Concerning the Grants of Aid to the Axis Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

LETTER FROM C. A. BROOKE-CUNNINGHAM

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I herewith read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a very intriguing, highly intelligent, emphatically scholarly, and argumentatively persuasive, letter from a distinguished citizen of Massachusetts. In this epistle the author, Mr. C. A. Brooke-Cunningham, expresses his reaction to a recent radio speech delivered by me and entitled "Is America Arming the Axis?" Mr. Brooke-Cunningham pays his respects to the influence of corporate greed in international relations. I believe it to be a splendid, dispassionate statement, reflecting the views of millions of Americans in their reaction to the shoddy business of putting profit before patriotism.

The letter follows:

GREAT BARRINGTON, MASS., *July 17, 1941.*

The Honorable JOHN M. COFFEE,
1608 House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COFFEE: I am tardy in thanking you for your gracious letter of July 3, and for that I crave indulgence, but my very tardiness seems somehow to have increased the earnest of my appreciation, not alone of your kind letter but of the forthright, even scholarly, presentation of the momentous facts answering the question, Is America arming the Axis?

Certainly America is arming the Axis, has been for years, and, but for such intelligent efforts as yours, would continue to do so indefinitely. And to that conscienceless betrayal of the nations now struggling to preserve freedom and decency the giant corporations you mention have added, with characteristic effrontery, the exaction of tribute from the whole American people. And tribute it is, demanded not as by valiant conquerors but as by crafty victims of that personality disorder commonly known as greed, but nonetheless as rulers, rulers requiring acknowledgment of submission and conformity by the entire Nation.

Even the title of your address reveals the extent to which those corporations have commanded submission and achieved control. Your instinctive response to the factual evidence you had assembled was that America is arming the Axis. In the body of your article you fined your material down to the real transgressors. Still it was America that was arming the Axis.

And that is as it should be. America permitting treachery is America traitorous, if only on the classical basis, qui facit per alium est perinde ac si facit per se ipsum. If America permits perfidious conduct on the part of her nationals, she must endure the smudge on her honor and the damage to her prestige. This is a factor and a function of the national motto—perhaps unanticipated by the writers of it.

Generally speaking, I do not hold with the principle of government ownership, but I should like to see the Government take over the oil and coal properties of this country. They are essential to too many people to be managed and manipulated by small, uncontrolled groups. The oil companies, in particular, constitute a kind of class domination in which the people have no voice whatever. Strong and agile as he may be, if Mr. Ickes fondly imagines that he is going to run the Standard Oil Cos., he will soon find himself "run ragged." These companies have a positively serpentine power of finding the interstices in the most closely set bars of control. Mr. Ickes would as easily control a snake by putting it in a cornfield—as Congress has discovered for itself during 40 years of trial and error.

The situation is wholly anomalous. America has ample oil, but the American people cannot justly enjoy it, not because England and America need it for purposes of defense, but because 50,000,000 gallons of high octane gasoline were shipped to Russia to enable her to slaughter the Finns and a million barrels of refined oil were shipped to Japan for reshipment to Germany. There is no just reason why Americans should suffer for want of heating oil, or pay exorbitant prices for what little they can obtain. We are not so prodigal with our helium, and helium is not important to more people than adequate heating in winter. We expect and desire to pay for national defense. We have no ambition to

recompense the Standard Oil companies for destroying it. Nor yet do we wish to abet hyena habits of nocturnal marauding.

That sounds somewhat emotional, but that is only because the facts are so intense and glaring that, when the light is turned on their cold glint lends them a dramatic quality. And I am sure that you will be quick to perceive that the conditions I mention are, in every respect, correlative to the aid and comfort to the enemy to which you so courageously call attention. I can only hope that your endeavors may prove as effective as they are right and conscious.

I employ that word "conscious" as Sir Oliver Lodge once used it to me in describing a man who was about to act with me in the conduct of some research work. Sir Oliver said, "He is an intelligent, thoughtful, and conscious man. You will like him."

Thank you for being a conscious man.

Yours sincerely,

C. A. BROOKE-CUNNINGHAM.

P. S.—My nearest neighbors to the north are Mr. and Mrs. A. A. Berle, and to the north of them, on the other side of the political fence, is Mr. ALLEN T. TREADWAY.—C. A. B.-C.

Agriculture in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report to the House our colleague, Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS, hospitalized recently because of a sudden illness, is now at his home in Allendale, N. J., and convalescing satisfactorily. I called on him last Sunday morning and was delighted to find him gaining in strength and much improved since a like visit the week before. His doctors have prescribed an extended rest.

Congressman THOMAS's front porch was a little "Library of Congress." He has been spending the hours reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and delving into Government reports. He was particularly pleased this last Sunday with a report he had on New Jersey farm income, this being from Mr. Fred W. Jackson, director of information, New Jersey Department of Agriculture, at Trenton. It points out that New Jersey holds third rank in average cash income per farm in the country and at my colleague's request I present it for the RECORD:

New Jersey holds third rank in average cash income per farm, second only to California and Nevada. The average size of the farms in California is 202 acres and in Nevada 979 acres, while in New Jersey it is 65 acres. This means that New Jersey is holding third rank with a very small acreage per farm.

When this acreage factor is considered in calculating the average income per acre, New Jersey ranks first in the Nation with an average income per acre of $52; Massachusetts second with $34, Iowa seventh with $19, California eighth with $18, New York eleventh with $17. Wisconsin is seventeenth with $12, while the average income per acre for the entire country is only $8.08 compared to $52 in New Jersey.

New Jersey farmers have attained this high rank through their own efforts in farm management and marketing, rather than being dependent upon Government payments. Out of each dollar of cash income New Jersey farmers received only about 1.4 cents in the form of Federal Government payments. In contrast to this, one might cite Alabama, where, out of each farm dollar, 24 cents is received in the form of Federal subsidies; North Dakota, 22 cents; Mississippi, 21 cents; Texas, 20 cents; and South Dakota, 18 cents.

New Jersey's total farm income represented approximately $121,000,000 in 1940. For comparison it may be of interest to note that the entire income of the whole radio industry of the United States for time, talent, and services amounted to about $123,000,000 in 1939.

Mr. Jackson's statement also points out that New Jersey ranks fourth in rural electrification, with 84 percent of its farms electrified. "In the last few years," he continues, "dairying has become an extremely important source of income, yielding $31,000,000 annually. Poultry products and potatoes follow."

The Wheat Program in Major Exporting Countries

REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, there have been some criticisms received by Members of Congress in the last few weeks with regard to the wheat program. I am placing in the RECORD today some information which I believe will be helpful to every Member of the House. It gives a comparative statement of the program in the United States; in Argentina, in Australia, and in Canada, showing how the wheat program is managed in the four great wheat-exporting areas. It shows, for instance, that today the Canadian wheat producer is permitted to sell only a percentage of his crop and receives 52 cents per bushel; while in Australia they receive a maximum of 51 cents per bushel and in Argentina from 42 to 45 cents per bushel. I believe this information will be helpful to Members in answering complaints which they receive.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include this statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WHEAT PROGRAMS IN MAJOR WHEAT-EXPORTING COUNTRIES JULY 1941

The world's four major wheat-exporting countries are the United States, Canada, Argentina, and Australia. In the days when the world market took all the wheat it could get, these countries developed wheat-producing capacity far in excess of home needs. Now the world growth of nationalism, controlled commerce, and artificial trade barriers has hit them all. War blockade has hit them all. With most of their world markets gone, all face growing surpluses, and they have found that uncontrolled surpluses mean low prices and bankrupt producers.

Each of the countries has had to adopt wheat programs to meet the surplus and income problems. These programs have had two common objectives: (1) Finding foreign outlets for production grown in excess of domestic requirements, and (2) maintaining domestic returns to growers in spite of depressed world market conditions. Each has had to adopt some sort of marketing control and some form of price guaranty. Several have tried price fixing, pooling operations, and currency depreciation. In every case these programs to help the farmers have meant changes in the usual production and marketing processes, but the United States farmers' gains have been considerably greater than in the other countries.

A comparison of 1941 programs in the four countries follows:

In the United States: Cooperator's return, approximately parity ($1.15); noncooperator's return, market price protected by 98-cent loan for entire production of acreage allotment plus loan averaging about 59 cents a bushel for excess wheat, or market price for all wheat grown, less 49 cents penalty on the excess. Voluntary acreage adjustment of about 20 percent; payments for compliance of 18 cents a bushel on normal yield of allotted acreage; marketing quotas applied with approval of 81 percent of growers voting in referendum; all farmers may sell entire production from acreage allotments on market supported by 85-percent-of-parity loan; program cooperator may put entire production under nonrecourse Government loan averaging 98 cents a bushel; noncooperators subject to penalty of 49 cents a bushel on normal or actual production, whichever is smaller, of acres in excess of allotment unless this excess wheat is kept off market by storage under bond or by delivery to Government for relief use; stored excess eligible for 2-year Government loan at rates averaging 59 cents a bushel; Government pays storage on collateral delivered in settlement of loans, 7 cents a bushel to farmer who stores collateral on farm until April 30, 1942, and 12 cents for storing excess wheat to postpone penalty until April 30, 1943; crop insurance guarantees 50 or 75 percent of normal yield.

In Canada: Growers' return, guaranteed price averaging about 52 cents a bushel on the farm, Canadian money (equivalent to about 47 cents United States money) plus maximum of $4 per acre on land diverted from wheat; Government asked voluntary acreage cut of 35 percent under 1940; bonus to farmers who shift land from wheat; wheat board offers fixed price averaging 52 cents a bushel on farm for not more than 230,000,000 bushels; deliveries to be made on per-acre basis as storage room becomes available; stocks now fill 460,000,000 out of 575,000,000 bushels of available storage space, farm storage allowance to be paid on undelivered portion of 230,000,000 bushels only; fine and imprisonment for delivering or selling wheat in excess of quotas.

In Australia: Growers' return, averaging about 51 cents on the farm (United States money) if they comply with acreage control program and also market their wheat through Government channels; all farms growing wheat must be registered and growers licensed under new control program; control calls for stabilization of wheat growing at annual production of about 140,000,000 bushels, or about an average harvest allowing for seed and feed on the farm.

In Argentina: Growers' return, averaging about 42–45 cents a bushel on the farm (United States money); government purchases crop; grain board authorized to secure a promise from growers that 1941 acreage will not be increased and, if requested, to make as much as 10-percent reduction; no request for such a reduction appears to have been made this year.

The following makes a comparison of the situation in Canada and in the United States, and also compares the programs now in operation to solve the problems.

THE 1941–42 SITUATION

Canada	*United States*
Acreage: 22,000,000 acres sown for 1941 harvest as compared with 29,000,000 acres in 1940 and 26,000,000 acres the previous 10-year average (1930–39). The 1941 reduction amounted to about 25 percent.	Acreage: 64,000,000 acres sown for harvest in 1941 as compared with 62,000,000 acres in 1940 and 70,000,000 acres the previous 10-year average (1930–39).
Production: Early unofficial estimate is about 300,000,000 bushels, compared with 551,000,000 bushels in 1940, the second largest Canadian crop on record. The 10-year average production is 330,000,000 bushels.	Production: July estimate is 924,000,000 bushels compared with 817,000,000 bushels in 1940 and 748,000,000 bushels the 10-year average.
Carry-over: 480,000,000 bushels on August 1, the largest quantity ever carried over by a single nation. The 1940 carry-over was 301,000,000 bushels and the 10-year average 133,000,000 bushels.	Carry-over: 395,000,000 bushels on July 1, the largest on record in United States. The 1940 carry-over was 282,000,000 bushels and the 10-year average 241,000,000 bushels.
Supplies: Estimated at 780,000,000 bushels as compared with 852,000,000 bushels for 1940–41 and 464,000,000 bushels the 10-year average.	Supplies: 1,319,000,000 bushels on basis of July estimates, as compared with 1,099,000,000 bushels for 1940–41 and a 10-year average of 997,000,000 bushels.
Domestic consumption: Estimate for 1941–42 is 132,000,000 and for 1940–41, 125,000,000 bushels. The 10-year average is 110,000,000 bushels.	Domestic consumption: Estimate for 1941–42 is 650,000,000 bushels and for 1940–41, 671,000,000 bushels. The 10-year average is 695,000,000 bushels.
Exports: Prospects uncertain, but the estimated probability is about 200,000,000 bushels. Exports in 1940–41 were 225,000,000 bushels. The average for the 1930's was 201,000,000 bushels and in the 1920's 272,000,000 bushels.	Exports: Prospects uncertain, but exports to foreign countries and shipments to United States possessions may not be far from the 30,000,000 bushel total exported in 1940–41. Exports averaged 60,000,000 bushels in the 1930's and 170,000,000 bushels in the 1920's.
Surplus: From estimated 1941–42 supply of 780,000,000 bushels deduct estimated 132,000,000 bushels for domestic consumption. This leaves 648,000,000 bushels available for export and carry-over at end of the marketing year.	Surplus: From the estimated 1941–42 supply of 1,319,000,000 bushels deduct estimated 650,000,000 bushels for domestic consumption. This leaves 669,000,000 bushels for export and carry-over at end of the marketing year.

1941 WHEAT PROGRAMS

Canada	*United States*
Acreage adjustment: Each wheat producer is urged to seed not more than 65 percent of 1940 seedings. Compliance is voluntary.	Acreage allotment: Each wheat producer gets share of national allotment that is based on Nation's wheat needs, export outlets, and reserves. The 1941 allotment of 62,000,000 acres is roughly a 20-percent reduction below average seeded and diverted acreage. Compliance is voluntary.
Compliance bonus: Wheat acreage left to summer fallow draws a bonus of $4 per acre. If it is seeded to feed grains or rye, $2; if seeded to grass or clover, $2; and an additional $2 if still seeded to same crop July 1, 1942.	Compliance payments: For compliance with wheat-acreage allotment, farmer may earn 18 cents in conservation and parity payments on normal yield of acreage allotment.
Delivery quota: (1) Established by Canadian Wheat Board on the basis of normal production on 65 percent of 1940 wheat acreage on individual farm.	Marketing quota: (1) Proclaimed by Secretary of Agriculture and approved by 81 percent of farmers voting in a referendum held May 31, 1941.
(2) Wheat Board will take delivery of not more than 230,000,000 bushels (about 11 bushels per acre on basis of reported seedings). Delivery made under a system of quotas with amounts accepted dependent upon available storage at that time.	(2) All wheat produced on acreage allotment may be sold on open market free of penalty if producer seeds within acreage allotment or if he pays penalty on excess or stores it under bond.
(3) Excess wheat must be held on farm by producer, and it is a punishable offense to sell it without permission of the Wheat Board.	(3) Excess wheat (smaller of normal or actual yield on acreage seeded in excess of allotment) subject to penalty of 49 cents a bushel (50 percent of basic loan rate), unless stored under bond or delivered to Government for relief use. Excess if stored is eligible for loan at 60 percent of regular rate.
Storage: No loans, but farmers are given storage allowance at rates to be announced, but only on undelivered portion of 230,000,000 bushels (1940 rate was two-thirds of a cent a month for 9 months).	Storage: Cooperators in the farm program may store wheat under Government loan averaging 98 cents a bushel until April 30, 1942. On farm-stored collateral, Government pays borrowers 1 cent a month or 7 cents storage allowance for the full loan period if wheat is delivered to Government. Noncooperators may store excess wheat under loan at 60 percent of regular rate until April 30, 1943.
Price: Government, through Wheat Board, offers to buy wheat from the producers at fixed price of 70 cents a bushel on the basis of No. 1 northern spring, f. o. b. Fort William. This price level last year averaged 52 cents a bushel (Canadian money) to producers.	Price: Prices supported by an 85-percent of parity loan. For the country the loan averages 98 cents a bushel.
Crop insurance: None.	Crop insurance: By paying premiums based on loss experience of locality and individual farm farmer may guarantee himself 50 or 75 percent of normal yield, depending on type

Canada

Surplus removal: Wheat Board may sell its wheat at home or abroad by marking up the difference between selling prices and fixed price to farmers, plus freight, handling, and storage charges.

Financing: Partly through Dominion Government appropriation, but in addition a processing tax of 15 cents a bushel on all wheat converted into products used for human consumption domestically, realizing approximately $7,500,000 annually.

COMPARISON OF 1941 PROGRAMS IN ACTION

For this illustration of how the Canadian and the United States wheat programs operate, the same size farm with the same yield is used. It is assumed the operator of each farm has been seeding an average of 300 acres of wheat in the past. The average yield is assumed at 15 bushels per acre.

FOR THE GROWER WHO REDUCES HIS ACREAGE

Seeding: He would reduce his acreage by 35 percent to 195 acres.

Production: On the basis of an average yield of 15 bushels per acre, he would produce 2,925 bushels. Assume he keeps 585 bushels for feed and seed, leaving 2,340 bushels available for market.

Marketing: He is permitted to market a per-acre quota (not yet announced). Assume the Government takes normal deliveries of about 12 bushels to the acre. For this farmer this would be 2,340 bushels. At the average wheat board price of 52 cents (Canadian money) his return will be $1,216.80.

Loan: Except for loans which he may be able to get from private lending agencies, he has no other way of financing himself except by selling his wheat as he can. And it is a punishable offense for him to deliver more than his quota. Several provinces have various forms of debt moratoria to aid the grower until he can sell his crop.

Storage allowance: Delivery quotas and storage rates have not been announced. In 1940 he got two-thirds cent a bushel a month for 9 months.

Government payments: Assume he diverts wheat acreage to summer fallow to get the maximum rate of $4 per acre on 105 acres. This amounts to $420.

Income

	In Canadian money	*In United States money*
Sale to Wheat Board	$1,216.80	$1,095.12
Government payments	420.00	378.00
Total income	1,636.80	1,473.12
Average return per bushel, not including feed and seed	.70	.63

FOR THE FARMER WHO DOES NOT REDUCE ACREAGE

Seeding: He would seed his entire 300 acres.

Production: With a yield of 15 bushels per acre he would get 4,500 bushels. Assume he keeps 585 bushels for feed and seed, leaving 3,915 bushels available for market.

Marketing: Government has promised to take delivery of about 12 bushels on 65 percent of last year's acreage. This means he

United States

of policy. Farmer who has excess wheat, in effect, has additional insurance if he stores this excess because he can draw upon the excess without penalty by the amount by which his next year's yield falls below the normal yield on his allotted acreage.

Surplus removal: Some exports are being assisted by the Government and the machinery is available for keeping a fair share of world market for the United States. Increase in domestic consumption is encouraged by distribution of surplus products to needy, as through stamp plan.

Financing: Appropriation from Federal Treasury.

COMPARISON OF 1941 PROGRAMS IN ACTION

For this illustration of how the Canadian and the United States wheat programs operate, the same size farm with the same yield is used. It is assumed the operator of each farm has been seeding an average of 300 acres of wheat in the past. The average yield is assumed at 15 bushels per acre.

FOR THE GROWER WHO REDUCES HIS ACREAGE

Seeding: He would seed within his A. A. A. acreage allotment. This would be, roughly, 20 percent less than his average acreage, or about 240 acres.

Production: On the basis of an average yield of 15 bushels per acre, he would produce 3,600 bushels. Assume he keeps 585 bushels for feed and seed, leaving 3,015 bushels available for market.

Marketing: Since he seeded within his allotment he may market entire crop or he may store it under loan. Average United States farm price in June was about 83 cents. If he sells his 3,015 bushels at this price he gets $2,502.45.

Loan: If he prefers to store his wheat under loan rather than to sell it at harvest time, he can put it under Government loan which for the Nation averages about 98 cents. On 3,015 bushels this would bring the farmer a total of $2,954.70.

Storage allowance: By storing the loan collateral on his farm, the borrower will get storage allowance of 7 cents if he delivers his wheat to the Government at the end of the loan period. This amounts to $211.05. If he redeems his loan he does not receive a storage allowance.

Government payments: For seeding within his acreage allotment the farmer receives a conservation payment of 8 cents and a parity payment of 10 cents a bushel of the normal yield on his allotment (3,600 bushels). Altogether his payment would be $648.

Income

Government loan	$2,954.70
Government payments	648.00
Total income	3,602.70
Average return per bushel, not including feed and seed	1.19

FOR THE FARMER WHO DOES NOT REDUCE ACREAGE

Seeding: He would seed his entire 300 acres.

Production: With a yield of 15 bushels per acre he would get 4,500 bushels. Assume he keeps 585 bushels for feed and seed, leaving 3,915 bushels available for market.

Marketing: Under quotas, he is asked to make an adjustment in marketings similar to the adjustment the program cooperator

Canada

can deliver 2,340 bushels at 52 cents, or $1,216.80.

Handling excess: He will have 1,575 bushels which he will have to keep on his farm until quota wheat has found a market.

Storage allowance: He has to store his excess as best he can.

Income

	In Canadian money	*In United States money*
Sale to Wheat Board	$1,216.80	$1,095.12
Excess—no sale now [1]	---	---
Total income [1]	1,216.80	1,095.12
Average return per bushel, not including feed and seed [1]	.31	.28

[1] He may be able to sell his 1,575 bushels later, which would bring up his income and average return.

United States

made in seeding. In this case he will have 900 bushels of excess wheat (normal production of acreage above his allotment). In other words, like cooperator he has 3,015 bushels of free wheat to sell. At 83 cents (June farm price) his return will be $2,502.45.

Handling excess: He has three choices for handling his 900 bushels of excess: (1) He may store it under bond and get a loan on it at 60 percent of the regular rate or 59 cents. This amounts to $531. (2) He can market it and pay the 49-cent penalty. Deducting 49 cents from 83 cents, this means he sells 900 bushels for 34 cents a bushel or $306. (3) He may deliver it to the Government for relief use.

Storage allowance: By storing his excess under loan on his farm, he may get a 12-cent storage allowance if he delivers his wheat in settlement of the loan at the end of the 2-year period ending April 30, 1943. On 900 bushels this amounts to $279. Delivery of excess wheat in satisfaction of a loan, however, does not satisfy the marketing penalty. In the meanwhile, he can free his excess from penalty by seeding below his 1942 allotment by a corresponding amount.

Income

When storing excess: [1]	
Selling free wheat	$2,502.45
Loan on excess	531.00
Total income	3,033.45
Average return per bushel, not including feed and seed	.77
When paying penalty: [1]	
Selling free wheat	2,502.45
Selling excess and paying penalty	306.00
Total income	2,808.45
Average return per bushel, not including feed and seed	.72

[1] This assumes he will reduce his acreage in 1942 below his allotment or that his production falls below the normal yield on his allotment. If he redeems his excess in 1942, he may pay up his loan and sell his excess wheat at market price, which at present market level would increase his income.

Stimson's Wild Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SIOUX FALLS (S. DAK.) DAILY ARGUS-LEADER

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader]

STIMSON'S WILD ATTACK

It is tragic, indeed, when a man so highly placed as Secretary Stimson of the Department of War descends to the low level of abuse and inflamed anger that he did in his attack upon Senator WHEELER.

The Montana Senator had mailed out about 1,000,000 postcards to a general list of American citizens. The cards quoted excerpts from some speeches against our participation in the war and urged the recipients to protest official acts that might lead the United States into the conflict. A few of these cards were received by men now in the military service. This is not surprising in view of the fact that many men have been called from private life to the uniform in recent months. It should be emphasized, however, that the mailing was not generally intended for military men.

Attacking WHEELER, Secretary Stimson went to the inexcusable extreme of stating that the

mailing of the cards "comes very near the line of subversive activities against the United States, if not treason."

This is a pathetic lapse on the part of the Secretary of War. It is an unfortunate reflection of his attitude. Any Cabinet member who stoops to such methods and who makes such an attack without a complete investigation deserves a sharp reprimand. In fact, it appears that the removal of Stimson from the important post which he now holds is in order.

He has departed from the rules of common sense, understanding, and tolerance. He is losing the respect of the American people, as Secretary Ickes has done.

Unfortunate, too, is the realization that this is a part of a general smear campaign in which perhaps several leaders of the American administration are participating. Somewhat similar tactics have been employed in an effort to discredit Charles A. Lindbergh with the slightly veiled hint that he is a pro-Nazi.

The Argus-Leader suggests to the administration leaders in Washington that their ends would be better served if they utilized more logic and less smear in their efforts.

Personal attacks don't refute arguments. If the administration does not have sensible explanations to offer for its position, it had better remain silent.

The Nation-wide reaction to the scurrilous attack upon WHEELER is already being felt. Even those who believe with the administration that we should prepare to play a large part in the international situation are dismayed by the tactics employed by Stimson and Ickes.

It was hinted recently that Charles Michelson, the smearing press agent who conducted the campaign against Herbert Hoover in 1932, is active again. His methods were effective 9 years ago because the people were in a mood for a change. But they are likely to be a boomerang in a situation such as that which exists today.

Mandatory Joint Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

STATEMENT BY ROSCOE POUND, DEAN EMERITUS OF HARVARD LAW SCHOOL, AND CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House the statement of Roscoe Pound, dean emeritus of Harvard Law School and the chairman of the Committee of Americans. This statement very concisely sets forth the objection to the proposal to require the filing of mandatory joint returns by husband and wife for income-tax purposes.

Because of my opposition to this attack upon both family and home under the guise of taxation, I wish to make available to my colleagues this brief criticism of this proposal, which has been so well expressed by this most distinguished educator. The text of the statement follows:

The freedom of wives and the institution of marriage are being attacked for the sake of a few paltry tax dollars.

In many cases a wife may be living apart from her husband. As said in a recent decision: "There are those who have religious scruples against divorce and others who look upon it as a disgrace. While the law recognized the right to divorce for a statutory cause, it neither criticizes nor penalizes those who do not see fit to avail themselves of that remedy" (*Rademacher* v. *Rademacher*, 61 Idaho, 261,209 (1940)). If a wife because of a husband's misconduct is living apart from him and has separate property and income, the effect of requiring a joint return is to compel her to act with him and contribute her share to a joint assessment of tax. In effect, she is coerced to a joint relation which in justice and law she is excused from. For example, he might be living in California and she in Massachusetts, and then be compelled to in some way join with him in computing their aggregate income. On the other hand if the proposed statute were to be altered so as to provide for a joint return where husband and wife are living together, but separate returns where husband and wife are living apart, the effect would be to put pressure on them to live apart in order to avoid excessive taxes. This obviously runs counter to the settled policy of maintaining the institution of marriage and to the ordinary dictates of morals.

President Quezon Expresses Filipino Loyalty to the United States

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of Congress to the speech delivered on Loyalty Day on June 19 last by Hon. Manuel L. Quezon, President of the Philippines. Among other things he said: "Should the United States enter the war, the Philippines should follow her and fight by her side, placing at her disposal all our manpower and material resources to help her in achieving victory, for the cause for which America would fight is our own cause." As a Member of Congress I wish to express my profound appreciation and admiration of President Quezon's stirring expressions of solidarity with the United States in these times of emergency.

The speech, for which I am indebted to Mr. Vicente Villamin, who himself as a private Filipino citizen has expressed the loyalty of the thousands of Filipinos in America, follows:

My fellow citizens and friends, we have set aside this loyalty day to express the wholehearted and unswerving loyalty of all the elements of our population to the United States of America and to the Philippines, as well as to the great principles of liberty and democracy which are cherished by Americans and Filipinos alike. This enthusiastic demonstration is doubly significant because it is held upon the initiative of our laboring masses and their leaders who, in this manner, have sought to prove that their loyalty to our country is above their loyalty to any class, and their condemnation of communism and other political philosophies which are subversive of the present order under our Constitution. No more fitting day could have been chosen for this purpose than the anniversary of the birthday of Rizal, for the ideals and way of life for which he strove and died are the same as those for the defense of which we are ready to sacrifice our lives and our all.

LIBERTY THREATENED

I wish to speak to you today about the grave national emergency that we are facing. Events that are fast happening beyond our borders are rapidly and deeply affecting our lives and our fate. Nearly two-thirds of the peoples of the world are at war in three continents and the remaining one-third, including ourselves, is in some way already involved in the conflict. No greater ordeal has afflicted the human race since the dawn of civilization than that which it is going through now. Most of the democracies of Europe are already under the iron heels of military conquerors. And the onward march of military conquest is proceeding relentlessly and with unabated speed. Britain remains alone fighting gallantly against tremendous odds to stave this march and to maintain the flame of liberty in those lands where western civilization was born and where it attained its highest development. Liberty itself and all the principles which we ourselves cherish and which are the foundations of our culture and political ideology are in the throes of agony threatened with extinction from the face of the earth.

The United States, faithful to her traditional policy of noninterference in the affairs of other continents, followed a course of strict neutrality at the beginning of the war. She not only adopted a policy of nonintervention but, through the Neutrality Act passed by Congress, took the necessary precautions to avoid incidents that might drag her into the conflict. Gradually, however, the people of America have sensed from the trend of world events a grave threat upon the security and future welfare of the Western Hemisphere. They have seen that the course of conquest undertaken by the totalitarian powers is designed to effect the domination of the whole world, to uproot democracy wherever it may be found, and to destroy the free way of life of the common man. This program was at first considered too astounding to merit serious concern, but not now, for later events have proven that the dictators are capable of achieving what many believed impossible, and even today are pursuing a course which clearly points to that goal.

WHAT IS OUR DUTY?

President Roosevelt, that great and inspired leader with an unquenchable love for peace and liberty, fully comprehending the dangers which the totalitarian march of conquest has brought upon the Western Hemi-

sphere and all the Territories under the American flag, and to democracy everywhere, has aroused the American people to a keen consciousness of these dangers. With the approval of Congress, he has proclaimed the United States the arsenal of democracies fighting to maintain their liberties. In a recent address he informed the peoples of America and of the whole world of the policies which the United States will follow in the present emergency and the reasons for such policies. This address will go down in history as one of the most fateful documents of all times, and the decisions enunciated therein will, I believe, affect the destiny of mankind. No one who has read or heard that address can doubt the motives of America. No one can question her unselfish devotion to peace and democracy.

Now, my countrymen, what of the Philippines? What is our duty at present? What line of policy should we follow? What direction should the national efforts take? What is our stake in the present war?

We owe loyalty to America, and we are bound to her by bonds of everlasting gratitude. Should the United States enter the war, the Philippines should follow her and fight by her side, placing at her disposal all our manpower and material resources to help her in achieving victory, for the cause for which America would fight is our own cause.

OUR WAR, TOO

The United States seeks to defend the principles which we cherish and without which we could not live as a free Nation. She is striving to preserve liberty and democracy and individual freedom, and these are things for which we, too, would fight and die.

The United States is struggling to prevent the domination of the world by dictators and we, too, would fight and die against such masters. The United States wants to uphold the rule of right and justice in international relations and to safeguard the independence of small nations, to free them from the fear of aggression and subjugation by military powers, and we, too, would fight and die to save our country from such threats and perils. And so, if the United States decides to enter this war, it will be our war as much as the war of the United States, and her decision will be our decision. In such event, she will find all the people of this country to the last man on her side, fighting under her banner and praying to Almighty God for the victory of her arms.

Our stake in this war is more than the continued existence of democracy and individual freedom in the world. It is more than the maintenance of a free economy and free commercial intercourse among nations, and an unregimented social life. Our stake in this war is our own future independence and the assurance that that independence may endure.

I have endeavored to the full measure of our resources to hasten the execution of our national-defense program. The United States, I am happy to inform you, is also doing everything to strengthen the military defenses of our country. I trust that very soon it will be possible for the Government of the United States to send us more planes and more guns and ammunition to increase our power of resistance against invasion. We only need more equipment and more supplies, for we have abundant manpower. We have strong, intelligent young men who are eager to join the ranks for our defense and to uphold the principles which President Roosevelt has proclaimed to the world.

"THIS WE CAN DO"

For the safety of our civilian population I have, jointly with the High Commissioner of the United States in the Philippines, established the civilian emergency administration and called upon the men of the Philippines to enlist as volunteers to protect our homes, to track down spies and saboteurs, and to help minimize the damage and destruction which the enemy might inflict upon us. I urge upon our women the duty of cooperating in this civilian effort and to train themselves properly to give first aid to the wounded and those that may receive injury of any sort by enemy action.

These are times of stress and great danger. Every Filipino should awaken to the realities of the situation confronting us. Our first concern should be to insure an adequate food supply. The government is trying to build up stocks of food that may be used to relieve shortages of such commodities. But these will not be sufficient, if our lines of communication with the United States are disrupted. We can only insure an adequate food supply at all times and in any emergency, by producing in our country all our requirements. This we can do. This we should do. I call upon all the people to bend their every effort to increase their production of food articles, particularly rice and corn, to avoid hunger and suffering among our population. Housewives should also look forward to the danger of shortage and, even now, should build up individual stocks in their homes to meet their needs in an emergency, and begin to avoid waste and economize on these supplies.

Labor and capital should likewise comprehend their duties and responsibilities in the present crisis. They should avoid conflicts that will stop production. Strikes are wasteful, and I hope they will not be resorted to except in extreme cases and only after giving the agencies of the government an opportunity to settle the controversy.

GOVERNMENT IS ACTING

In order to finance our defense preparations, I have requested the President of the United States to make available to our government the funds derived from the excise tax on Philippine sugar, as well as the funds accruing to our government from the devaluation of the American dollar. I have assurances that this request is receiving sympathetic consideration by the American Government, and I trust that favorable action will be taken thereon in the near future. Your Government has also been taking steps to obtain equipment and war materials from the United States under the Lend Lease Act. It is my expectation that supplies will be given us through this method in increasing quantities.

The Commonwealth Government has been working in intimate collaboration with the United States High Commissioner and American military and naval authorities in the Philippines in relation to our national-defense program, and I wish to make public my appreciation of the splendid spirit of cooperation which has been patent in all our dealings. Above all, I wish to express our gratitude for the interest which President Roosevelt and the American Government as a whole have shown in the defense of the Philippines.

QUOTES ROOSEVELT'S CALL

I wish to close this address with the words of President Roosevelt in his proclamation declaring an unlimited national emergency, for these words convey the same call to duty which I should like to urge upon my fellow countrymen:

"I call upon all loyal citizens * * * to give precedence to the needs of the Nation to the end that a system of government that makes private enterprise possible may survive. I call upon all loyal workmen, as well as employers, to merge their lesser differences in the larger effort to insure the survival of the only kind of government which recognizes the rights of labor or capital.

"I call upon loyal leaders and officials to cooperate with the civilian defense agencies to insure our internal security against foreign-directed subversion, and to put every community in order for the maximum productive effort with a minimum waste and unnecessary friction.

"I call upon all loyal citizens to place the Nation's needs first in mind and in action to the end that we may mobilize and have ready for instant defensive use all of the physical powers, all of the moral strength and all the materials and resources of this Nation."

Agricultural Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS A. COLLINS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, it is a notorious fact that because of the low prices they have received for their farm products, the farmers of the United States have suffered more than has any other class of our people. Clearly this should not be the case.

The Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee of which I am a member has made an effort to remedy this condition and we have succeeded in giving our farmers some measure of relief. I believe that that subcommittee has done more for the American farmer than has any other committee in the House of Representatives, for it holds the purse strings and produces the bills appropriating the funds which make possible our agricultural activities. Parity payments originated in that subcommittee. I was one of the principal sponsors of the soil-conservation program. I supported appropriations to remove surplus crops from the market so that farmers would be able to secure a reasonable price for them, and I helped obtain funds to maintain the food-stamp program.

This year Congress enacted a law making the Federal loan value of 5 basic crops, including cotton, 85 percent of parity. That was a fine bill and it had my enthusiastic support. To some degree it will do much this year to remedy the immediate plight of our cotton farmers, but it does not provide a permanent long-range program to restore prosperity to the agricultural sections of our country, such as Mississippi. Our thoughts and plans must anticipate and deal with the problems of tomorrow as well as the necessities of today. It appears to me that the making of loans on cotton year after year, as surplus after surplus piles up unsold in Government warehouses, contributes little toward the solution of our fundamental problem, and, as a permanent policy, will fail to provide our agricultural sections with that degree of

prosperity so necessary to the economic well-being of our country as a whole.

We cannot export in this year over a million bales of cotton. We cannot consume over nine or ten million bales of cotton. Taking into consideration our anticipated crop and existing surplus, that will leave us with a surplus of this year's crop of about 4,000,000 bales. With this war going on—and even if it ends—our exports and consumption will not greatly increase, and our surplus will continue to pile up year after year, until eventually, I fear, it will reach the breaking point.

What is my solution of this problem? I say, get back our foreign markets, of which high tariffs have deprived us

Extend and enlarge the reciprocal tariff program of our great President and Secretary of State, and repeal or revise downward prohibitive tariffs which keep out of the United States the products of countries wishing to buy our cotton, but unable to obtain the dollars with which to do so because they are not allowed to sell their goods here.

Prior to 1860 Mississippi was regarded as one of the half dozen richest States in the Union. That was because it raised cotton which was sold all over the world. Today it is one of the poorest States in the Union, and that is because high tariffs on the industrial products of other nations have killed our foreign markets. We raise the best cotton in the world, and the whole world wants to buy it. Other nations cannot trade with us and secure the dollars with which to buy our cotton, however, unless we in turn trade with them and buy what they produce. Prohibitive tariffs which have the effect of subsidizing the industrial regions of the United States by protecting them from competition with industries abroad not only compel our agricultural sections to pay more for the tools and machines and other products which they use, not only destroy our agricultural export trade, but also drive our foreign customers to the necessity of themselves growing the agricultural products which they otherwise would buy from us. Today cotton is grown, and on a larger and larger scale each year, in India, in Egypt, in South America, and even in Russia. This should not be the case, and it would not be if the nations which want our cotton could sell their products here so as to enable them to buy it.

I shall sponsor and support legislation creating research laboratories to find new uses for cotton and the other products of our farms and forests, and thereby increase their consumption both here and abroad. Who knows, for example, what effect it would have had upon the consumption of cotton if the du Pont people had had a reasonable basis to experiment with cotton instead of coal tar in producing Nylon, the new synthetic silk?

For many years I have believed the farmers of the country should have equal opportunity with people residing in cities and towns to have the use of electric current, and I have thought that it was the duty of the Federal Government to appropriate and lend to cooperatives, formed and operated under Federal supervision, sufficient funds to enable them to build electric power lines into rural districts. Accordingly I have cooperated with the Rural Electrification Administration program, leading the fight in the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee to obtain funds for that agency, and each year I have succeeded in having them increased. For the fiscal year 1942, upon my motion, the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee increased the amount for expansion of rural electrification from $40,000,000 to $100,000,000. Mr. Harry E. Slattery, the head of the Rural Electrification Administration, in response to an inquiry about my record on rural electrification, said this of me in a letter dated July 17, 1941:

I can say from my own knowledge that Congressman COLLINS' attitude toward the rural electrification program has been very friendly and very favorable.

I have always been, and I am now, in favor of every proposal which would enable the citizens of our cities, towns, and rural communities to obtain electric power for the smallest possible cost. And in that connection I have voted for every bill and every appropriation enlarging the field of operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority. In a letter dated July 12, 1940, Mr. David Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, made this very generous statement to me:

You have been a supporter of the T. V. A. project for many years; in fact, long before I had anything to do with this project; and since the creation of T. V. A. in 1930 you have been most helpful in the halls of Congress and in your counsel to us in its enlargement and development. * * * I will tell you frankly, Congressman COLLINS, that I have never come in contact with one who more eloquently espoused a desire for securing electricity for T. V. A.

It is with great pride, Mr. Speaker, that I add to my remarks a very fine letter that I received on June 14 from Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1941.

Hon. ROSS A. COLLINS,
Member, Agriculture Department Appropriations Subcommittee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ROSS: I have already thanked you personally for the great help you, as a member of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, have given to the farmers of the country. I feel, however, I should write you and express my further appreciation and the appreciation of the farmers everywhere for your untiring efforts to give them a price for their crops that approximates parity.

The passage today of the loan bill, which you and I have advocated as a temporary measure for many years and which we helped to pass, may be of some benefit. However, I believe that the great drive we are making for the defense of the country will give to farmers a much larger price for their cotton and other products than they would receive through Government loans. I do know that the funds that you and I and the other Democratic members of the agricultural appropriations subcommittee have with difficulty through the years provided have given and will continue to give farmers much more for their crops than they would have received otherwise.

In brief, here is what we have done:

1. Our subcommittee provided $212,000,000 for parity payments.

2. For agricultural conservation payments we provided this year approximately $500,000,000, about $40,000,000 more than we appropriated last year.

3. For the removal of surplus farm products we appropriated approximately $225,000,000. Of course, $150,000,000 will be used in the food-stamp program, an increase of about $20,000,000 over the amount that we appropriated last year. This increase will enable many more counties in your State to get the benefits of food stamps.

4. Upon your motion in the subcommittee, rural electrification appropriations were increased from $40,000,000 recommended by the Budget Bureau to $100,000,000. Your persistent efforts to electrify farms of the country with cheap electricity are well known to every Member of Congress.

5. For regional laboratories we appropriated $3,500,000. With that amount we hope that new uses for cotton and other agricultural products will be discovered.

All in all I know that you have been a tireless advocate for agricultural people. You have had the vision to see correctly the need for increasing the earning power of the American farmer and your efforts have met with a measure of success. I feel that it is my duty to tell you my feeling of appreciation because like yours my district is largely made up of splendid agricultural people.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely,

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee.

Unjust 49-Cent Wheat Penalty

REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to register the protest of thousands of farmers residing in the Second Congressional District of Michigan against the imposition of the 49-cent penalty on excess-quota wheat under the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Those opposing this penalty may be classified in two groups:

First. Farmers who have not complied with the A. A. A. program and are willing to forego benefits and subsidies for the privilege of operating their own farms in their own way.

Second. Those who have complied with the A. A. A. program, are receiving benefits and subsidies, but protest against the method pursued in the placing of this penalty.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 laid down a formula by which a compulsory quota on the marketing of wheat might be invoked. The penalty for noncompliance, however, was limited to 15 cents a bushel on the excess wheat. Under that law there was exempt to each farmer 200 bushels. This compulsory quota and penalty were never invoked, however.

The act of May 26, 1941, supplemented by regulations made by the Department of Agriculture, changed the exemption

from bushels to acres, making the exemption 15 acres rather than 200 bushels. It also changed the formula, increasing the possible penalty from 15 cents to 49 cents for the year 1941.

When the 1941 winter-wheat crop was planted in the fall of 1940, there was no indication that a marketing quota and penalty would be put into effect; that is, the farmers who had not subscribed to the A. A. A. program had a right to believe that for the 1941 crop they could grow, harvest, sell, and use their wheat as had always been the custom, and they acted accordingly.

The farmer who complied with the program was in exactly the same position. Consequently the act of May 26, 1941, and the Department regulations were, in fact, retroactive; that is, the wheat had been planted and the gathering time was at hand, when the farmer was startled by the news that if he had planted more than 15 acres of wheat, he could not sell any of his wheat without getting a permit from the local A. A. A. agent. That is not all. He could not feed, use, give away, or otherwise dispose of any of his surplus wheat without getting a permit and paying 49 cents a bushel on every bushel theoretically produced above the 15-acre limit or else impounding the surplus under A. A. A. direction. Therefore, the effect of changing the exemption from 200 bushels to 15 acres is if, in the fall of 1940 the farmer planted 17 acres of wheat, he is bound to pay the penalty on the average acreage yield of the 2 excess acres, even though he did not harvest those acres.

Let me call your attention to the case of our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], a noncomplier, who planted more than 15 acres in the fall of 1940. Shortly before the harvest time, a hailstorm destroyed much of his crop, and the excess acreage was not even cut. Yet, before he could sell, feed, or otherwise dispose of any of his wheat, grown on his own farm, the law required him to pay 49 cents a bushel for the acreage on which the wheat was not even harvested.

Is this fair procedure?

There is difference of opinion among the farmers as to the desirability, workability, and soundness of the A. A. A. program. Soil conservation is approved by all good farmers, but there is a question as to whether the Federal Government should subsidize compliers for properly farming and conserving their soil. The farmers are not agreed as to production control.

However, the A. A. A. is the law of the land. The policy has been determined upon and there is no possibility of repealing the law at this time.

The most relief that can be hoped for is elimination of the 49-cent penalty on the 1941 crop and the restoration to the farmer of the right to use wheat grown on his own farm for seed and to feed his own stock and poultry. Such amendments to the law are in the process of consideration in the Congress, and I am encouraged to believe that this limited relief will be given, despite the opposition of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Regardless of their attitude toward the A. A. A. program, all thinking farmers must agree that it was unfair, undemocratic, and un-American to change the law between planting time and harvesting time. Common decency and fairness rebel against changing the rules in the middle of the game.

I have no sympathy with the argument that these wheat farmers voted this penalty and marketing quota on themselves. Yes, the law provides for an election, but that means a fair election, with the electors fully advised concerning the matter upon which they are to vote. Was that done in the present case? Well, let us see. The law providing the 49-cent penalty became effective on May 26, 1941. Five days later, on May 31, 1941, the election was held in every wheat-producing county in the United States. Is there anyone so naive as to believe that all these farmers were fully advised during this 5-day period? As a practical matter, it just does not make sense.

Then again, were all of the wheat-producing farmers of the country permitted to vote in this election, the purpose of which was to place a 49-cent penalty on surplus wheat? The answer is that they were not. Even the qualifications of voters were changed in the 1941 law and accompanying departmental regulations.

If there is anything in the world that the average farmer abhors, it is subterfuge, deceit, and half truths. He is willing to meet any issue head-on. He is honest himself and he does not relish being taken for a ride by shrewd propagandists, whether they are found in the A. A. A. or elsewhere. He is often called a kicker and one hard to satisfy. Well, who would not kick under such treatment? When the independence is legislated and administered out of the farmer the independence of the Republic is indeed imperiled.

The general feeling of the farmers of Michigan with reference to this 49-cent penalty perhaps finds best expression in my home county of Lenawee.

This is one of the finest agricultural counties in the United States, made up of family-sized farms with diversified crops, for soil conservation in crop rotation was participated in long before soil conservation in Washington was ever dreamed of. These farmers are not radical, and, generally speaking, there is little distinction between farm tenants and farm owners. All of these farmers represent our highest type of citizen. I make these observations to show the background of the people of this particular county.

So incensed are these farmers over the imposition of this 49-cent penalty and inability to feed or use wheat grown on their own farms that a large mass meeting was recently held on the fair grounds at the county seat. More than 2,500 farmers were present. Resolutions were unanimously adopted by the meeting as follows:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

Whereas the American wheat farmers are suffering an invasion of their constitutional rights and privileges at the hands of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration; and

Whereas the wheat-marketing-quota referendum was conducted in a manner that prevented the farmer from freely exercising his elective franchise and denied to him the right to express his wishes in relation thereto, with the result that the wheat-growing farmer is now being most unjustly penalized for doing that which he had a right to do, and is being deprived of his property without due process of law and in direct violation of his constitutional rights and privileges; and

Whereas an appeal to the courts would not give an effective remedy, due to delays incident to court procedure: Therefore

The undersigned respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to remove the marketing penalties on the products of American agriculture and to restore to the American farmer a free market.

In addition, I am in receipt of a petition embodying these resolutions, signed by more than 1,000 representative dirt farmers of Lenawee County. I am filing these petitions with the Congress and having them referred to the Committee on Agriculture for consideration.

An Associated Press dispatch dated at Detroit, July 22, is as follows:

DETROIT, July 22.—A regional director of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration said here last night that protests over wheat quotas and regulations arose from misunderstandings or came from areas heavily populated by farmers of German ancestry.

In a talk broadcast from Detroit, Harry N. Schooler, director of the A. A. A.'s north central region, asserted:

"It is significant to note that whenever there is a concentration of farmers of German ancestry one finds this agitation to overthrow the work of the Department of Agriculture.

"Farmers who are influenced by their own economic welfare, who are free of political prejudice and foreign entanglement, are in complete accord with the wheat-control program."

This regional director, Harry N. Schooler, is clearly unfit for the position which he occupies. Imagine a man of this type, in these days of stress, making so unnecessary, unreasonable, and absolutely false an assertion in a radio broadcast, which the people have a right to assume was made by authority of the Department of Agriculture, whose representative he is. Possibly there are some farmers of German ancestry who are not in agreement with this particular law, yet for an official of the Government to charge that these protests "came from areas heavily populated by farmers of German ancestry" and that "it is significant to note that whenever there is a concentration of farmers of German ancestry one finds this agitation to overthrow the work of the Department of Agriculture," shows clearly that the official is attempting by innuendo to charge these farmers with being unpatriotic.

It is ridiculous to charge that "farmers who are influenced by their own economic welfare, are free of political prejudice and foreign entanglement, are in complete accord with the wheat-control program." This Mr. Schooler is an insult to the farmers of the Nation and especially to those of German descent. He plainly indicates that one who disagrees

with any law or regulation which the Department of Agriculture sponsors is un-American, and is influenced by "foreign entanglement" and is opposed to A. A. A. regimentation because of his German ancestry.

I cannot find language too strong to condemn such an unjustified course on the part of any official or representative of our Government. If the time has come when the farmers of the Nation cannot meet in public assembly and express their views concerning the operation of a law passed by their representatives, affecting their own farms and their manner of life, then indeed the days of the Republic are numbered, then the constitutional right of petition is a mockery. I call upon the Department of Agriculture to take proper action in the Schooler case.

In conclusion, I can assure the wheat farmers of the Nation that their Representatives in Congress are conscientiously trying to solve their problem, and I want to assure my own constituents that I am doing, and will do, everything I can to eliminate the injustice of this unfair 49-cent wheat penalty which the Department is now invoking on the 1941 crop.

Accomplishments of Farm Security Administration in the Fifth Congressional District of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district consists of eight counties located in the northeastern section of the State of Washington. These counties are Spokane, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Ferry, Lincoln, Douglas, Okanogan, and Chelan.

By far the greater proportion of the people living in these counties, all except Spokane, are engaged in agriculture, and in one county, Chelan, the principal crop produced is apples. This county is perhaps the greatest apple-producing county in America, and the congressional district as a whole produces more commercial apples than any other congressional district in the entire Nation.

AGRICULTURE HAS SUFFERED TREMENDOUS LOSSES SINCE THE LAST WORLD WAR

In common with all agricultural sections in America, the farmers in my district have seen conditions go from bad to worse. They have fought on despite adverse conditions, always in the hope that the next season would be better. Nature has been kind enough to them, and production has been abundant, but the farm economy has been most unfair and resulted in disaster to the farm owners. As a result of all this, actually thousands of farms that were operated by owners 20 years ago are today operated by tenants. Land holdings in the hands of a few individuals and corporations have increased at an alarming rate.

HELP FROM THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

In recent years there have been numerous attempts made by the Federal Government to solve the farmers' problems, reduce farm tenancy, and increase farm ownership. Much effective work has been done and much good has been accomplished. There is one agency that has made a record of accomplishment that is worthy of special note, and that is the Farm Security Administration. By this I do not intend to in any way minimize the exceptionally splendid work that has been done and is being done by other Government agencies in the Department of Agriculture, because just at this time several other branches of the Government are doing a magnificent job. I particularly refer to some of the agencies under the Farm Credit Administration.

SOME OF THE FACTS

Mr. Speaker, broadly speaking, the gains of the Farm Security Administration in terms of money, living standards, and capacity for self-support made during 1940 by handicapped and low-income farm people present a most interesting and promising picture.

In my district in 1940 there were 969 active standard rehabilitation borrowers at the end of that year. The average borrower earned a net income of $895 during the year as compared with $666 in the year before he became a borrower from Farm Security. In other words, he increased his annual net income by 34 percent. This percentage as applied to the whole number of borrowers means a total annual income increase of $221,387 for the 969 families. This increase naturally reflects itself in the prosperity of the merchants, business, and professional people living in the district, as well as raising the standard of living of the farmers.

UNUSUAL RECORD OF REPAYMENTS MADE

So, frequently persons who criticize the Farm Security Administration either do not know the basis upon which it functions or are not particularly interested in the welfare of the farmer. All Farm Security assistance is in the nature of loans, made upon a basis that insures their ultimate repayment. It is not charity, subsidy, nor Government donations, and the borrowers in my district are rapidly repaying these loans. The total loans made in my district at the end of 1940 amounted in all to the sum of $2,496,600, and although much of this money does not fall due for 4 or 5 years, there has already been repaid to the Government the enormous sum of $1,518,835. I do not know what better evidence one could ask as definite proof that here is a program that is really working and really helping the farmer who needs help. The funds that are loaned to the farmers do not come as direct appropriations out of the Federal Treasury, but they are funds advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The repayment record, accompanied by the marvelous results obtained in giving new hope to hopeless farmers, and in raising their standard of living from an extremely low standard, in many instances, to more nearly an average American standard, justify the conclusion that the program should be substantially expanded.

FARMERS ENTITLED TO ADEQUATE CREDIT

Mr. Speaker, we all know, of course, that the major cause of the farmers' troubles through the years, and even now, is the inadequate and unfair price for his product, when the price he receives for his crops is compared to the prices he must pay for the things he must, of necessity, buy. When you add to this disparity a high rate of interest on his indebtedness, and then, with many of the poor farmers, a total denial of credit, it is easy to see why we have met with so much ruin and the accompanying misery.

When the repayment record which I have just cited in my district is considered, it is a tribute to the honesty and industry of those needy farmers who were helped through the Farm Security Administration program, and it is proof that they are getting back on their feet and becoming permanently self-supporting. The success of this program is not based alone upon the financial credit extended, but also upon the advice and technical assistance and guidance given in sound farm and home management, which are such very important factors.

AN EXAMPLE OF IMPROVED CONDITIONS ON THE FARM

During 1940 the average farm-security family in my district produced $192 worth of goods for home consumption, as compared with $138 before they came into the F. S. A. program. This produce for farm use included 276 gallons of milk per family; 305 pounds of meat; and 316 quarts of vegetables and fruit canned for the winter. Now this increased production of food did not in any way add to the commercial markets, since none of it was offered for sale. It simply meant a better diet, better health and a rising standard of living for these families.

FARM-DEBT ADJUSTMENT

In many instances in my district where farm security has come into the picture and helped work out the problems of the farmer who was deserving and yet needed help, it was found in the first instance that he was carrying a debt burden which created an impossible situation for him. In cases such as these, the farmer and his creditors were brought together and the entire situation was frankly and fully discussed, and with rare exceptions the creditors usually agreed to arrange a scale-down of the obligations, and in some instances I know where the amount ran as high as 60 percent of the total debt. With refinancing from F. S. A. on a low interest rate, immediately a new promise of hope and actual accomplishment came into the life of the particular farmer involved and his family. The adjustment was on a basis that he could work out. The farmer was saved from foreclosure and the creditors received cash payments for what otherwise might have been a worthless debt.

In connection with debt adjustment it is interesting to note that the total debt adjustments in my district negotiated for the farmers up to and including the year 1940 amounted to the sum of $1,623,588. This represents a scaledown of 40.3 percent. In other words, creditors, who in

many instances would have gotten little or nothing, realized approximately 60 cents on each dollar that was due them. At the same time the debtors, who through F. S. A. discharged their obligations on this basis, took on new obligations bearing a lower rate of interest with fixed periods of payments. They were encouraged and directed by representatives of F. S. A., and took new courage and a new lease on life. From what I have stated, remarkable progress is shown to have been made. As another result of these debt adjustments $5,576 in back taxes has been paid to local governmental agencies.

THE FARM SECURITY PROGRAM SHOULD BE EXTENDED

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the 969 active rehabilitation loans in my district, there are today 1,880 farm families in my congressional district who are eligible and in general need of rehabilitation loans, but they are unable to get credit because of the limited funds that Congress has appropriated for this service.

Where a practical, sensible, and worthwhile program has gone forward as has the farm-security program in my district, it would seem shortsightedness not to allow it to expand to the maximum to meet the existing needs. This is particularly true when we realize that in the end there will be practically no financial loss to the Federal Government, and the rehabilitation of these hundreds of families, or hundreds of thousands throughout the Nation, will go a long way toward establishing a genuine and fundamental "first line of defense." The program causes us to realize fully and completely that after all, our democracy exists for the service it can render its citizenship, rather than the citizen existing for the use and benefit of the Government. In other words, it is a very beautiful and practical illustration of the contrast between our philosophy of government and the Hitler "new order."

American Blood Demanded for Aggressive War in Europe, Africa, and Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following despatch from the New York Times of yesterday:

DE GAULLE SEES UNITED STATES ENTRY—BACKS BRITISH EAST ARMY CHIEFS' VIEW ON NEED OF OUR TROOPS

BEIRUT, LEBANON, July 28.—General Charles de Gaulle, leader of the Free French, before leaving here today for Damascus, endorsed the opinion previously expressed by Gen. Sir Archibald Wavell, former British commander in the Middle East, and by his successor, Gen. C. J. E. Auchinleck, to the effect that, to accomplish the complete and final defeat of Germany, American troops must be dispatched to this hemisphere.

Asked in a hurried interview if he agreed with the view the two British generals voiced to the press, General de Gaulle said categorically that he did.

Addressing a French gathering here, General de Gaulle remarked that, contrary to Adolf Hitler's expectations, America was taking an increasing part in the European war and was now "marching straight toward intervention."

Jewish War Veterans Present American Leadership Award to Hon. Wendell L. Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

ADDRESSES OF HON. WENDELL L. WILLKIE AND FRED S. HARRIS, NATIONAL COMMANDER, JEWISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, through its national commander, Attorney Fred S. Harris, of Meriden, Conn., in my own district, presented the American leadership award of the organization to Wendell Willkie on Saturday, June 28. I am taking advantage of my unanimous consent to insert the speech of presentation of Commander Harris and the speech of acceptance by the recipient, the Honorable Wendell L. Willkie.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH—OUR FREEDOM AT STAKE, SAYS HON. WENDELL L. WILLKIE

I am very proud to receive this award. I am very proud of all the veterans of the last war. In view of the disillusionment that came to us in the years of depression and false political leadership following the last war, it might well have been that it would have been the soldiers of that war that today would be leading America to isolation and defeatism. I am very proud that it is the leaders of the organizations of the soldiers of the last war that are leading us to the other path, to the path that will preserve liberty.

I am greatly concerned about the preservation of liberty. As a matter of fact, I know that in bestowing this award upon me that you have not done it as a personal tribute. You have done it as a recognition of your belief in the things that I have advocated.

Liberty is a passion with me. It is the obsession of my life. As a boy I fought for the right of men to organize in the labor unions. In the early twenties I gave myself to the struggle against those who were seeking to impose upon our minority groups a restriction in their liberties; and in the thirties I fought with all the force of my being against what I thought were unfair and discriminatory and punitive impositions upon the free enterprises of men. And now I am happy, in the forties, to be joined with you men in fighting for the liberty of freemen everywhere.

But we shall not preserve this liberty through wishful thinking. We shall not preserve this liberty through boasting about the strength of the United States. We will preserve this liberty if we are willing to make the sacrifices necessary to preserve it and we exercise the mental equipment of this country to see that those sacrifices are made effective.

I read in the paper yesterday where the President said that the United States was far short in its production of explosives as compared with the production of those instruments such as rifles which use those explosives. I hope his statement did not mean all that it implied or it then would mean that our defense organization has been a failure. But it means much more than that. It also means that not tomorrow, or the next day, but at once, that the President should appoint one man responsible to him with full authority, in charge of our defense program. All of this to the end that our production may be coordinated, planes and tanks and guns and ammunition may be simultaneously produced. It does no good to produce an airplane if at the same time you have not completed the building of the guns that go with that airplane, and it does no good to produce the planes and the guns unless you simultaneously produce the powder and the shells, and all of those together are no good unless you train a pilot at the same time.

My fellow veterans, our very freedom is at stake. We have been extremely fortunate that our delays have not already brought us to grief. Everyone who understands the problem at all knows that our race with Hitler is a race of production. I hope that by constant reiteration I can convince my fellow countrymen that we cannot have peace nor can we have liberty as long as Hitler survives. Nor can we defeat the forces of nazi-ism except by out-producing the Nazis.

The time for speeches and politics and for economic and social theories on the part of those handling our defense is overpassed. The time for work and organization is overdue. We want production and we want production coordinated. And we can only do that by putting into effect the fundamental principles of organization with one responsible head.

For more than a year I have been saying to my fellow countrymen only the productive can be strong, only the strong can be free. I hope to say that so many times, plus the fact that we may organize our defense system along these fundamental lines, that they will become accomplishments, because only thus, my fellow comrades of the last war, can America come through in this present struggle for the preservation of liberty.

PRESENTATION ADDRESS BY NATIONAL COMMANDER FRED S. HARRIS

We are gathered here to do honor to a great American citizen, a man whose name has become a synonym to all the world for courage, determination, and a deep and abiding faith in the ways of democracy. Actually, of course, Wendell Willkie has honored us—every one of us in this place and every person in the United States.

He has honored us first of all by sticking to his principles. He believes in being honest—honest with himself and honest with his country. A lesser man would have done things differently. A lesser man would have made political capital out of differences of opinion concerning American defense policies during a campaign for the Presidency. A lesser man would have sought personal gain and personal glory. A lesser man would have appealed to prejudice and intolerance. But Wendell Willkie could not do those things and remain an honest man in the sense in which he understands the words.

And in acting and speaking and working as he did, Wendell Willkie became a shining symbol of democracy at its best. In a world

grown cynical and weary, in a world where hatred and bitterness and doubt were eating like evil acids into the souls of men—in that world his example came like a welcome inspiration for us all. I do not think I exaggerate when I say that his story, written in the history books of tomorrow, will have a profound and important influence on the youth of America and the world.

During the election campaign Mr. Willkie spoke out strongly against those false Americans who were seeking to stir up religious prejudice, racial intolerance, and group misunderstanding. He repudiated the support of the elements which were trying to divide us into isolated groups, each suspicious of the other and each eternally quarreling with the other, and with all the force at his command he warned us again and again of this peril to our unity and our independence.

In a time of crisis he called on us for the best that was in us. Nor did he stop there. After the election was over he called on his supporters—on the millions of American men and women of every faith, color, and viewpoint who had voted for him—to stand together behind the President in a united front to resist all hostile influences. He spoke up for democracy in ringing unforgettable terms. He showed great physical courage when he ventured abroad into war-torn England to learn the truth at first hand. He came back doubly strengthened in his conviction that only by a complete and unyielding unity of all the American people could we preserve our democratic system.

In recent months Mr. Willkie has helped to make things clear to us. But his greatest contribution has been to demonstrate to all the world that democracy has an inner strength of its own, a strength that flowers in time of crisis. We are convinced now that, as free men standing shoulder to shoulder and working in the cause of liberty, we can face anything the dictators can produce. We know that the spirit of the free soul cannot be resisted, and that the human will of free men is 10, nay, a hundred times, as potent as that of slaves. We know that the weakness of nazi-ism, fascism, and communism lies in that fact, and that one day those systems will disappear from the face of the earth, even as slavery disappeared from the American scene.

But meanwhile we have a job to do. We must bolster our democracy militarily and economically. We must preserve and intensify our national morale. We must pour our energies, our intelligence, every ounce of our determination into the task at hand. For, like it or not, we are concerned in this war—and its outcome will decide the way of life of generations to come. We are concerned in this war, and we have chosen sides. We are on the side of democracy.

That is the order of the day. If we do it well, free men in a nation dedicated to the cause of freedom, the dictators cannot last long. If we allow un-American ideas of race supremacy and the division of humans into slave and master categories to enter into our lives, the dictators will be that much harder to get rid of. If we take our time, and argue, and get into quarrels among ourselves, the years to freedom without fear will be long indeed.

These, it seems to us, are the ideas Mr. Willkie has been seeking to get across to us Americans for the past 2 years. Together with other patriotic and far-seeing Americans, he has called us to action. The Jewish war veterans are proud to answer that call, proud to stand, as we did in the World War, at his side and on the side of American democracy. We fought for our Nation in time of war, and we are ready to do our part, as former soldiers and active citizens, at a time when war threatens us from every side.

In this respect, all veterans and all good citizens—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—stand alike. All of us together are today dedicated to the cause of democracy. We know no other way. We will support no other view.

Mr. Willkie, it is my great honor and pleasure to present to you at this time the annual American leadership award of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

"The Jewish War Veterans of the United States presents this award for American leadership to Wendell L. Willkie because he has demonstrated that for him love of country transcends party allegiance and personal ambition.

"His loyalty to the code by which freemen live has established a course of conduct that will become a beacon in the history of our country for men yet unborn.

"By his intellectual honesty and his physical courage; by his tolerance and his selflessness he has given strength, dignity, and increased stature to the cause of national unity and the divine privilege of American citizenship.

"Given on the one hundred and thirty-second anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln and in the one hundred and sixty-fifth year of the Republic."

Taxes on Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

TELEGRAMS FROM MICHIGAN CITIZENS

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams:

IRONWOOD, MICH., *July 29, 1941.*

Hon. FRANK E. HOOK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

In behalf our two radio stations, WATW, Ashland, Wis., and WJMS, Ironwood, Mich., we protest as unfair, confiscatory, and discriminatory, the proposed taxing of radio and outdoor advertising revenue in occupational tax provision of general tax bill. Urgently request you consider carefully all points brought to your attention by National Association of Broadcasters and proceed to drastic modification or elimination of advertising taxation feature of the bill. Certainly due consideration should be given to great demands made by Government Department and defense program for free radio and billboard publicity. We have always complied with each request and propose to continue to do so, but such discriminating taxes, omitting newspapers, magazines, direct mail, etc., will make our costs much higher. Though applying to large stations now, the step will affect small stations as well.

UPPER MICHIGAN-WISCONSIN
BROADCASTING CO., INC.,
N. C. RUDDELL,
Vice President and General Manager.

ISHPEMING, MICH., *July 29, 1941.*

Representative FRANK E. HOOK,
Office Building of the House of
Representatives and Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently protest occupational tax on individuals rendering outdoor advertising service to others, because it is both confiscatory and discriminatory in character. This tax would absorb entire profits of my business, which provides me with a living. Have donated much space free displaying national defense and other posters of national interest whenever requested by the Government. A tax on any form of advertising is uneconomical and will serve to slow up business and in turn decrease national income. Outdoor advertising is an efficient and economical method for the Government and industry to advise the Nation and its citizens of subjects important to its welfare. I earnestly solicit your aid to defeat this proposed tax bill.

MRS. ED. J. BUTLER,
Butler Poster Service.

GLADSTONE, MICH., *July 29, 1941.*

Hon. FRANK HOOK,
House of Representatives:

TAX bill on outdoor advertising confiscatory and discriminatory. Would appreciate your vigorously opposing same. If to pass would work severe hardship on us.

HALE OUTDOOR ADVERTISING CO.

Air Service Between New Orleans and Certain Latin American Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in a time and era when we are attempting to develop friendship with our Latin American neighbors to the south of us, the membership of this House should be interested to have brought to its attention a remarkable and extraordinary opinion recently expressed by a Mr. Joseph M. Paul, Jr., counsel of the Civil Aeronautics Board, in connection with an application for air service between New Orleans, the gateway to the Mississippi Valley, and certain Latin American countries.

In a most astonishing opinion, Mr. Paul has asserted that there is no need for such a line because there is "the least degree of community interest" between the terminals of the proposed line.

I do not know what Mr. Paul means by "the least degree of community interest," but I do know that it is a thin thread on which to hang such a far-reaching and weighty opinion.

Not only New Orleans, but the whole Mississippi Valley has for years been interested in the development of the Latin Americas. This is not a recent interest. This is not an interest inspired by recent actions of the Federal Government following the outbreak of the war in Europe. It has been a natural interest of long standing, but now Mr. Paul tells us there in this section we find "the least degree of community interest."

I wonder what the real reason for Mr. Paul's remarkable decision is. I wonder what the real motives behind such an opinion are. I would not like to believe that Mr. Paul has rendered such a decision because of conditions not revealed at the recent hearings, but on the face of the hearings and the strong case made

before an examiner of the Civil Aeronautics Board, I cannot see how Mr. Paul could so express himself.

And I am not alone in this opinion of Mr. Paul's opinion.

With the permission and unanimous consent of this House I have herewith included editorials from New Orleans' great newspapers, the New Orleans States, the Times-Picayune, and the Item—and all are in agreement that Mr. Paul's opinion is slightly askew to say the least.

The New Orleans States calls it "A ridiculous finding."

The New Orleans Item says it is "Sheer nonsense."

The Times-Picayune more generously terms it "One man's opinion."

Governor Sam Jones of Louisiana, in a letter which I am also attaching to this statement, tells the Civil Aeronautics Board that he is "astounded" to read of the opinion.

Certainly everybody cannot be out of step except Mr. Paul.

As I keep Mr. Paul's opinion before me I am compelled to keep my tongue in my cheek in view of the rather difficult manner in which the proposed airline was finally brought before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

At least one application had been pending for more than a year before the hearings finally got under way. First there was one delay and then another. First there was one excuse and then another. First there was one petition and then another. It has been all too confusing to an ordinary mind like mine and now I find myself more confused than ever.

I never was much of a mathematician but I do still remember my elemental geometric problem that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points. Mr. Paul must have been a worse mathematician than myself because he apparently does not agree to the long accepted geometric fact as he concludes that an air detour to Latin America is all that is needed.

Mr. Speaker, Louisiana is not going to take this one man's opinion lying down. We are determined to fight for what we think belongs to us.

Louisiana has been too generous in the national-defense program to be shunted aside in an instance like this.

Louisiana has too long attempted to develop friendly relations with our Latin American neighbors to be told that we must be stalled in our efforts at this time.

This is not the last you will hear of this effort to black-out New Orleans and Louisiana from the Latin American air lanes—it is just the beginning.

And now read what Louisiana's Governor has to say about it and what the people of New Orleans think about this illogical and most astonishing opinion of one man, whose legal training should make him better able to arrive at a logical and sensible conclusion.

And always keep in mind that at least two responsible and reliable operators of air service desire and want to immediately establish this air service. Bear in mind that the citizens of New Orleans, of Louisiana, and of the Mississippi Valley have urged the establishment of this line which Mr. Paul says is of "least community interests."

The letter and editorials follow:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Baton Rouge, July 28, 1941.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I was astounded to read in the papers that the counsel for the examiner in the matter of the proposed air line from New Orleans to Latin America is quoted as saying we do not need this service.

New Orleans has maintained close commercial relations with Latin America, and particularly Central America and Cuba, for better than a century; the entire Mississippi Valley, as to Central America, and the Valley, plus the Pacific coast, as to Cuba, can be more expeditiously served by lines from New Orleans.

The port of New Orleans has been made a port of embarkation for the Army and a supply base for the Gulf and Carribean defenses. Yet the counsel says we don't need the service.

May I suggest that an examiner come down here and let us show him a few reasons why we need the service?

Sincerely yours,

SAM JONES, *Governor.*

[From the New Orleans Item]

NO AIR SERVICE SOUTH?

We are surprised, disappointed, and unconvinced by the report of counsel to an examiner for the Civil Aeronautics Board who has been conducting the hearing of two applications to operate air service between New Orleans and Latin America. Counsel expresses the opinion that neither the route requested by Pan American Airways nor the one asked by American Export Lines, is required by public necessity or convenience. This is an indirect way of saying that no Latin American air-line operation at all, through New Orleans, would serve public necessity or convenience. That, we believe, is sheer nonsense.

"The existing air facilities being operated by Pan American out of Miami, Brownsville, and Los Angeles," says counsel, "appear to supply the present needs of travelers between the United States and Central America."

To our mind, any such conclusion is entirely outlawed by geography, distribution of population, and flying time. The grounds for this feeling, as set forth by spokesmen from New Orleans, and by the two lines competing for a New Orleans franchise, strike us as beyond contradiction. The award of air service to two points so far west as Brownsville and Los Angeles, while New Orleans, at the foot of the great Mississippi Valley, and in the very middle of it, was ignored, was an abuse of direction in the first place.

That New Orleans and the whole mid-continent should be forced to find its southward air service through points on the Atlantic seaboard, and other points on and near the Pacific coast, is an affront to geography and economics. By no means should such an arrangement be longer accepted.

"The benefits to be derived from the new routes are not great," adds counsel, "and they are realized only to points with which the United States has the least degree of community interest."

Yet American Airways and American Export Airlines are asking permission to operate between here and the Panama Canal Zone, Mexico, Guatemala City, San Salvador, San Jose, and Habana. American Exports, moreover, has linked itself with the great Taca system that girds Central America with air services, and makes connections with other lines into South America. And Pan American Airlines would of course tie in down below with the extensive connections that already serve it after it penetrates Mexico and Central America through its present far-western and far-eastern entry points in this country.

This means all the territory that present routes reach, this side of the Canal, and the other side, too. How all this area could be described as "only points with which the United States has the least degree of community interest" is beyond our comprehension. Have we "the least degree of community interest" with the Panama Canal Zone?

We have not seen counsel's whole brief. But if it explains this mystery and justifies the assertion we quote, counsel is a man of commanding talent.

We don't believe he can justify it because we don't believe anybody can. We believe that the two competing air lines know more about the prospects for profitable traffic than anybody else does. They would certainly not be competing fiercely for a franchise through New Orleans unless they anticipated traffic to justify their investment in it.

If the traffic would jutify the investment, that merely means that a southward route through New Orleans would be easier and cheaper for a great many Americans and their Latin neighbors than the route through Atlantic and Pacific cities.

If the Army, or Navy, or both, have had anything to do with shaping Counsel's opinion, because they want no more planes put into commercial service at this time, that should be fairly stated, in order that the matter can be debated in its true relations. We don't mean to say that this is the case. But we can't understand how counsel could have reached his conclusion on the facts and factors that appear on the surface of this business.

We have been urging our people, on an average of once a week for the past year to unite in one combined push with all their energy to bring one of these airlines through New Orleans before unforeseen circumstances could arise to prevent it. Now is their last chance to exert themselves with all their force to avoid being deprived indefinitely of vitally needed air connections with the southern countries that are obviously and properly tributary to our city.

Counsel's opinion is not necessarily binding on the examiner for the Aeronautics Board, but it is a bad start on the last phase of this important matter. Neither are the examiner's findings necessarily binding on the Board. So we have two chances to get a correct judgment in the premises. Will we lose them by default? The answer lies with our commercial organizations, our city administration, our delegation in Washington, and all their allies through the Valley having a common interest at stake.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune]

ONE MAN'S OPINION

Denial of long-pending applications for direct air service between New Orleans and Latin American centers was recommended to the civil aeronautics board yesterday by its counsel, Joseph M. Paul, Jr. He contends that present facilities "operated out of Miami, Brownsville, and Los Angeles" are adequate to present needs; that benefits derivable from the proposed direct lines serving the mid-Gulf area would not be great and would be "realized only to points with which the United States had the least degree of community interest," whatever that may mean. So he urges "outright denial" of the strongly backed and powerfully documented case for the proposed new air line to serve travel and trade between the Americas.

If this facility is denied New Orleans, the Central South and the neighbors across the Gulf, it must be denied in our judgment for other reasons than those advanced above.

The benefits derivable from the service are obvious, incontestable — certainly great enough to justify its moderate cost. As is pointed out in the brief of one of the applicant air lines, "all 20 Latin American countries have recognized the outstanding importance of New Orleans by designating that port as consular headquarters." As a gateway for Latin American trade and travel its advantages are so obvious that aviation experts in commercial and military fields alike long have marked it as strategic base for the air service which the board counsel would deny.

In our own belief the practical, tangible benefits to flow from this service abundantly justify its establishment. In addition it would prove a very present and potent aid to pan-American friendship and the solidarity our Government wisely seeks to promote. Quite apart from its provable benefit to trade and travel between this Republic and the others, it serves one of our objectives, the good-neighbor policy.

So this newspaper cannot conceive of the outright denial of this pan-American facility on the ground of inadequate "benefits." Military need of available equipment for its operation might be a valid ground for postponement, though not for rejection. As matters stand, however, the needed equipment happens to be immediately available. We trust the Civil Aeronautics Board, in passing on the application for this vital service, will weigh the supporting facts and arguments presented for its consideration as carefully and impartially at the least as the opinion of its counsel.

[From the New Orleans States]

A RIDICULOUS FINDING

Joseph M. Paul, Jr., attorney for the Civil Aeronautics Board, advises against both of the proposed air routes from New Orleans to the Tropics for reasons which are either confusing or absurd.

He says that the services which the Pan-American and the Export Air Lines propose to establish between New Orleans and Central America are unnecessary because they are supplied by lines now operating from Miami, Brownsville, and Los Angeles. This is simply spectacular reasoning. Miami and Brownsville are both a good distance away from the great Mississippi Valley, which has more contact with Central America than any other region in the Nation, and Los Angeles is clear across the continent. Valley air travelers, therefore, are expected first to journey to Brownsville, or Miami, or Los Angeles, to take flying boats.

Mr. Paul could as well say that an air route from New Orleans to Chicago would be unnecessary because travelers and the mails could go to Chicago via New York or San Francisco. Well, there is an old theory that the longest way around is the shortest way home, and it seems that the learned counsel of the C. A. B. still subscribes to it.

Mr. Paul gives another reason which we will have to submit to the well-known Philadelphia lawyer for clarification. He says: "The benefits to be derived from the new routes are not great and they are realized only to points with which the United States had the least degree of community interest." If the gentlemen of the C. A. B. understand what that means, they are wonders.

For a guess, we'd say that this C. A. B. attorney meant to declare that the United States has only a very slight interest in the points which the two air lines proposed to link with New Orleans; that is to say, Habana, Guatemala City, San Salvador, Tegucigalpa, Managua, San Jose, and the Canal Zone, in fact the whole of Central America in addition to Cuba.

This is about as dumb a declaration as ever emanated from a Washington bureau. Every one of the Central American countries and Cuba maintain a consular official at New Orleans. Most of their contacts with the United States are through New Orleans. A great part of the commerce moves through this city. All of the large American cities, like New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, Atlanta, Kansas City, Memphis, would be much closer to the Central American capitals by an airline through New Orleans than via Brownsville, and all but New York much closer than via the line through Miami, while the Los Angeles gateway would be out of the question for all of them. The mileage saving for all of these inland cities through New Orleans would run from 255 to 703 miles.

Mr. Paul's adverse decision is merely a recommendation to the C. A. B. He cannot have given the real reasons for declaring both applications out. New Orleans is bound to resent such a ridiculous finding. The fight is not yet over and the business interests of this city should demand a valid reason from the C. A. B., and if none is forthcoming, start some action in Congress.

Tax on Outdoor Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am confronted today with rather a difficult decision even though the cause of the difficulty is an infinitesimal amount when compared with the total tax to be derived from this bill.

I naturally realize, as all the people of America do, the necessity of a tremendous tax bill, and I am therefore not surprised that our excellent Ways and Means Committee has brought in the largest one in history. In fact, I made the statement during the debate on the lease-lend bill that that bill would cost much money, as much as possible of which should be raised by taxation rather than by borrowing so that as little as possible would be passed on for payment by our children and our children's children. Therefore, it is my purpose to vote for this bill regardless of the fact that it contains several items with which I find myself in complete disagreement.

While it is apparently customary to bring tax bills on the floor with such rules, and I am fully aware that considerable time is thereby saved, it is difficult for me to agree with the propriety of bringing such an all-important and tremendous bill here with a rule such as this, which I think might be correctly referred to as strictly a gag rule, so that no amendments may be considered except those introduced by the committee. I am a strong believer in committee integrity and responsibility. I realize, of course, that legislation is in the main created, written, and to all intents and purposes passed in committee. I appreciate fully the responsibility of this great committee in this important matter and wish to heartily congratulate its members on their excellent work. Feeling as I do toward committee responsibility, believing in party organization, and fully realizing the superior knowledge of committee members who have spent months attending hearings and studying the matter while I was otherwise engaged, I invariably vote with the committee in charge of legislation in case of doubt. I generally do so in the absence of doubt unless my constituents are adversely affected or a matter of principle is involved. This attitude will cause me to finally vote for the bill regardless. I am not sure, however, that it will influence me to vote for this rule because of my serious doubt whether legislation of such magnitude should be passed without even the possibility of amendment by those opposed to certain of its provisions.

Even if permitted to do so, I would not vote for many amendments. In fact, the main objection I wish to advance to the bill pertains to a matter of only either $2,000,000 or $7,000,000, $2,000,000 according to those affected, and $7,000,000 as per the estimate of the committee. I refer to the tax on outdoor advertising. Those affected by it who, as I understand it, were not heard by the committee, claim that it is confiscatory in that it amount to from over 50 percent to more than 100 percent of the profits realized annually by those concerned after fair compensation for personal services is deducted. Those engaged in this business would but for this provision doubtless pay considerable income tax on the profits. This provision will not only lose that tax to the Government but will, if confiscatory as they claim, naturally put many of these people out of business and decrease the national income as I shall outline. Consequently, it will absolutely defeat its intended purpose, and "kill the goose that lays the golden egg" as effectively as I have ever observed.

A tax on any form of advertising is similar to one on the tools of a workman or the services of a salesman and should be levied only in dire emergency. Even if this were not true, however, this tax would not be equitable because it not only discriminates between advertising and other selling effort, but between different forms of advertising. While the bill also contains a radio-time tax, no tax is levied on other major advertising media, such as newspapers, magazines, direct mail, window displays, and so forth. Though grossly discriminatory, this is fortunate because it is quite detrimental to the success of the national defense and maintenance of the national morale for any, and would be proportionately more so for all, of the fundamental means of disseminating information to the public to be crippled or made ineffective by the process of taxation.

Outdoor advertising particularly contributes to the success of our national endeavors. Witness the billboards contributed to the Government during World War No. 1 and the recent contribution in behalf of the Army and the United Service Organizations.

During the first World War a similar tax on outdoor advertising, expressly excluding newspaper advertising, was pro-

posed. The Ways and Means Committee, however, realizing it as entirely unfair and very discriminatory, deleted it. Furthermore it was found that the possible returns were so small in proportion to the levy contemplated, and the disastrous effects on business generally, and especially that served by outdoor advertising, would be so great that it would be entirely uneconomical. Such is still the case, and possibly to an even greater degree. The cost of collecting this $2,000,000, or even the seven million, as estimated by the committee, would be so tremendous that I am strongly of the opinion that at the end of the year the Government would find itself on the red side of the ledger in the matter.

Since there can, insofar as I can see, be no possible reason for the imposition of such a tax except the need for revenue, this business should not be harassed and in a large measure bankrupted because of any such doubtful hope of profit to the Treasury. In fact, a tax on any form of advertising is uneconomical since it would serve to retard business activity, thereby decreasing the national income and proportionately decreasing income-tax collections. We have been told that when or if the national income becomes large enough, it will automatically pay off the national debt. I am rather skeptical about this ever occurring, and am very confident that it certainly will not if such steps as this continue to be taken to retard its growth.

Because of these facts I am seriously considering voting against this rule, in which event I believe it will be only the second rule against which I have voted since entering this body.

Conference Report on S. 1524

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

LETTER FROM WILLIAM GREEN

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., July 28, 1941.

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to express the opposition of the American Federation of Labor to the acceptance and adoption of the report of the conference committee upon S. 1524 by the Congress of the United States.

Under section 9 of the Selective Service and Training Act, the President is empowered to seize and operate plants manufacturing arms and ammunition for necessary supplies and equipment for the Army and Navy upon failure of said plant to cooperate in the defense effort. The report of the conference committee seeks to amend and enlarge this power of the President by authorizing him to seize and operate not only plants manufacturing arms and ammunition for necessary Army and Navy supplies but, in addition, plants manufacturing articles "which may be required for the national defense, or which may be useful in connection therewith."

This means, if the conference report is adopted by the Congress of the United States, that the President may seize and operate almost every manufacturing or producing establishment, regardless of what article said plant produces, because every article manufactured or produced in this country could conceivably and reasonably be construed to be useful or required by the national-defense program or to be useful in the defense effort.

It seems inconceivable that Congress would or could invest the Chief Executive of the Nation with such broad and comprehensive power, except when the Nation is actually in a state of war.

The opposition of the American Federation of Labor to the report of the conference committee may be summed up as follows:

First, the conference committee's report strikes at the very vital and fundamental American principle of private ownership. The right to own and manage property is a fundamental American right. Said right should not be interfered with or impaired, except in case of war when the very life of the Nation may be hanging in the balance.

Secondly, the conference committee's report if adopted would impose a condition of involuntary servitude upon labor. Such legislation would be in direct contradiction to article 13 of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Unscrupulous employers would be encouraged under the provisions of the conference committee's report, if adopted by Congress, to exploit labor to the limit. They would take advantage of the threat of Congress to seize industry, to compel labor to work under oppressive conditions, and to impose arbitrary conditions of employment. We vigorously protest against the creation of such a situation.

I assert with all the power at my command that labor is giving to the Nation the highest type of service, and in doing so, is inspired by a spirit of loyalty and devotion to our Government and to its announced policies.

Defense production in practically every line of activity is ahead of schedule. The fine degree of cooperation which is in evidence on every hand ought to be encouraged rather than discouraged through the enactment of repressive legislation, such as is embodied in the conference committee's report.

Voluntary service, which is inspired by a spirit of understanding and cooperation, will produce better results than compulsory legislation, or the application of forceful methods.

An appeal to the heart and conscience of labor and the management of industry for genuine cooperation and the highest type of service, will produce results. All will give willingly and in full measure, but those who would give service of this kind will resent compulsion and force.

I earnestly request the Members of Congress to reject the conference committee's report on S-1524 which amends the Selective Service Act.

Sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

ADDRESS BY HARRY J. PEARSON

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by Harry J. Pearson, director of Sailor's Haven, Charlestown, Mass., in the interest of the World War veterans of the United States merchant marine, Sunday, June 29, 1941, National Maritime Day, in port of Boston:

"Service in the merchant marine is absolutely vital to the success of winning the war." So spoke Secretary of War Newton D. Baker in 1918, and the assertion is equally true today.

The service rendered by the merchant marine of the first World War was of tremendous value in the proper carrying out of America's part in the World War, for it was this service that was the main connecting link between our source of supply in the United States and our troops on foreign soil.

Had the merchant marine failed in its duties it would have been impossible for this country to have accomplished final victory.

Sailing in poorly armed, slow, clumsy vessels through the submarine zones, these men were more exposed to danger than those on war vessels. They wrote a glorious page in history, and the record, listing 156 merchant vessels sunk by the enemy in contrast to only 19 naval vessels, shows graphically the hazards they faced unflinchingly.

Today, while another generation is carrying on the same glorious traditions of the merchant marine, facing the same perils on the high seas, we pause to pay tribute to those merchant seamen of the last World War.

At noon today on the harbor end of Commonwealth Pier, South Boston, memorial services dedicated to all Americans who lost their lives at sea will be conducted by the World War veterans of the United States merchant marine, survivors of those men who enlisted in the service of the United States Shipping Board back in the dark days of 1917, and of sailors who manned United States merchant vessels as well as those in the United States Transport Service.

Annually the survivors of those gallant groups gather to pay tribute to those comrades who gave their lives building democracy's bridge of ships to the expeditionary force overseas.

Probably no more impressive ceremony was ever conducted along the Boston water front than will take place at noon today when 12 veterans' organizations join with the World War veterans of the United States Merchant Marine in a tribute to their lost shipmates.

The memorial services will mark the official opening of the Boston Maritime Day celebration and will get under way with a land parade forming on Northern Avenue and proceeding to the end of Commonwealth Pier.

More than 1,000 including, in addition to the delegates from the veterans' organizations, Girls Scout Mariners, Sea Scouts, and enrollees from the United States Maritime Service training station on Gallops Island

will be in the line of march led by the Girl Scout Drum and Bugle Corps and the Boston Police Department Band.

Guest speaker will be Clement A. Norton, Boston school committeeman and superintendent of Commonwealth Pier.

Climaxing ceremony will be the casting of a wreath on Boston Harbor waters by Mrs. Margaret Mahoney, Dorchester Gold Star Mother, from a Coast Guard boat moored off the end of the pier while Girl Scout Mariners sprinkle flowers from the caplog and the voices of a children's chorus from the Julia Ward Howe School, Roxbury, led by James Talbot, boy soprano, are raised in the singing of Nearer My God to Thee.

Echo taps will be played by Girl Scout buglers. Miss Daisy Lewis, Red Cross nurse, member of the Edith Cavell Post, who sustained shrapnel wounds recently overseas and was decorated for meritorious service by the King of England, will serve as aid for the Gold Star Mother.

Organizations participating in the tribute include the Spanish War Veterans, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jewish War Veterans, Regular War Veterans' Association, British Naval and War Veterans, Sons of Veterans, Kearsarge Veterans, United American Veterans, Newfoundland War Veterans Association, Sons of Veterans, State Guard Veterans, and their various auxiliaries.

Samuel Goldmeer, of the World War Veterans, United States merchant marine, will serve as chief marshall.

Henry Howard, of Newport, R. I., wartime head of the United States Shipping Board's recruiting service, with Mrs. Howard, will be a special guest of the occasion.

Men of the World War veterans, United States merchant marine, are charged with the duty of supporting the Government of the United States in any patriotic work necessary to the welfare of our country, assist in the promotion and support of the American merchant marine, carry on educational and humanitarian work among members and others when the occasion requires and are endeavoring to secure recognition from the United States Government for services rendered during the World War, particularly hospital and medical care and the privilege of using the colors to drape the caskets of their dead.

To all eligible for membership within this area, a welcome hand is extended by Carl A. Meyer, commander of Boston Post, No. 3.

The impressive services to be conducted on the Boston water front today mark but a prelude to one of the most unique and colorful harbor celebrations ever held at any port in the world.

It is an annual port holiday sponsored by public-spirited citizens interested in developing the port of Boston and reawakening interest on the part of New Englanders in the sea and foreign trade.

Selected as the opening feature of the annual conference of Governors it has attracted chief executives from 27 States through the country who will be guests of Governor Saltonstall aboard the Boston pilot boat, *Northern Light*.

In special recognization of their participation the port of Boston, National Maritime Day Committee, sponsoring organization, through its president, Frank S. Davis, will confer the honor of "Port of Boston Commodore" on each of the visiting Governors who will be presented with a yachting cap decorated with gold, and a commission.

Aboard the *Northern Light*, the visiting Governors will lead the colorful floating parade featuring 300 Government, merchant, and pleasure craft, all of them colorfully decorated, up the Boston main ship channel immediately following the memorial services.

Other high lights of the all-day program include lifeboat races over a mile course in Boston Inner Harbor with crews of merchant ships, Army, Navy, Coast Guard, Naval Air Corps, Sea Scouts, and enrollees from the United States Maritime Service training station on Gallops Island participating, a special fisherman's dory race, an aquacade with 150 section and national swimming stars competing, a canoe-tilting contest, concerts, water displays by Boston fireboats, speeches, and other interesting events.

For school children, a special celebration will be held on Castle Island with Edward Rowe Snow, Winthrop historian and authority on Boston Harbor lecturing on the harbor islands. Yacht races for Radio Snipe, Winabout, and Hustler class boats will also take place off Castle Island.

On behalf of the committee, I extend a cordial invitation for all of the listening audience to come to the Boston water front and witness this colorful marine pageant.

And now to turn for a moment to that work which is an integral part of the American merchant marine. Sailors' Haven in Charlestown, as with all seamen's welfare agencies throughout the country, was organized for the purpose of providing seamen arriving in the port of Boston with a home hotel ashore. Many years ago there was no more exploited group of men than those who followed the sea. They were the victims of crimps, boarding-house keepers and shanghaling. The need was imperative; namely, to provide them with protective influences from these evil things. Such days have passed but seamen still need a home hotel ashore.

Mr. Stanton H. King, who sailed before the mast for many years, served as superintendent for 47 years and his salty personality was incorporated into the building and program of the haven.

Days of sail, of iron men and wooden ships are no more, but the men who man our ships are still, for the most part, away from home when they put into the various ports of this or any other country.

Sailors' Haven, with its antiquated structure, poorly situated, and with inadequate equipment, strives to serve as headquarters ashore for men of the sea. However, we are passing through a period of transition, and presently these men will look for and demand much more superior quarters than those at present provided.

There must be established, in this as in all other ports, a home hotel for seamen ashore that shall equal in comfort and attractiveness the constantly improving quarters which are theirs aboard ship. It should be a modern building of hotel-like appearance, but within which there will be a home-like atmosphere, and located in a neighborhood which is as respectable as that where one finds modern commercial hotels. Men will be received therein as guests, self-respecting and self-supporting. Recreational facilities of all kinds will be provided and seamen's material needs will be met. Baggage room, mailing address, lodgings, and all other facilities associated with a seaman's needs ashore will of necessity be provided for. It will be his club, home, headquarters, and hotel ashore.

When material help is required it will be rendered on the basis of a good-credit standing. Landsmen establish credit standing with men's furnishings companies, banks, and other businesses. There is nothing degrading about this. So it is with seamen. When they require lodgings and food for a short time while awaiting ship they, too, can receive credit at their home hotel ashore. It is not dispensing charity nor relief as such, but meeting a situation in an honorable, self-respecting, businesslike way. It is by such means as this that we shall create in the minds of the public an entirely new picture of the men who man our American merchant ships.

My Trip Back Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FRED BRADLEY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over Station WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., July 30, 1941:

During the past 2 weeks I have had a most pleasant and unusual experience of playing hookey from Washington to take a trip throughout our district back home. Legislation has been rather quiet in the Capitol during these last 2 weeks and the Congress has been sort of enjoying the calm before the storm. The storm, of course, broke this week when we started on the all-important tax bill, about which you have read so much in the papers during the past several months while the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee in the Senate wrestled with the all-important problem of who is going to pay the bill for all this very, very costly war program and this equally costly—yes, extravagant—idealistic program which we like to call our program for social gains. After all, this tax bill is one of the few problems really left for the Congress to do—that is one of its constitutional duties that the President has not asked it to give up—that is one function that he loves to leave in hands other than his own. That is one of the tough, disagreeable jobs, one job with which it is most easy to find fault, and one job that is most unpopular. It is always easy to give away somebody else's money, and Santa Claus is always not only that most popular man on earth but also can be the most powerful. But the bill collector, just as the tax collector, will ever be the most unpopular and the most disagreeable fellow we know, the one we least like to see come around our home. Yes; it is always the easiest thing to do to vote for appropriations when we are raiding the Nation's Treasury, but the hardest thing, politically, is to vote for a tax bill. In fact, I heard of one former Member of the House who stayed down here 12 years on only one campaign slogan—namely, that he had voted for every single appropriation but had never voted for a tax bill. Yes, sir; that is the way to be popular, but it is kind of tough on the National Treasury. So, this week the Congress is going to have that disagreeable task of telling you who is going to pay—or rather start paying—this huge bill, when you are going to pay it, how and on what things you are going to pay it. The only thing you will have left to worry about is, "Where are you going to get the money?"

Well, my trip back home was most interesting and enlightening to me. You know if we did not get out of this heat, actual and political, here in Washington once in a while, I think we would all go completely goofy. But on the other hand, we do find it most necessary to get back home ever so often to find out what you folks are thinking and talking about, otherwise we would not be able to learn wherein we might better serve you down here. You did a swell job for me

on both counts. Our biggest trouble here in Washington during July and August is getting cool nights to sleep, and I feel most refreshed after 2 weeks of our cool nights, which make sleeping a real pleasure. And, secondly, I feel most pleasantly refreshed because of what I learned you are thinking and talking about among yourselves. It makes me take on an added enthusiasm for the tremendously important job ahead of all of us down here in these very critical days in our Nation's history. True, most of the time we find that the President has already acted before the Congress is advised of it, and hence all there is left for us to do is talk about it. But so far, thank Heaven, we are still able to talk about it.

As an illustration of what I mean, let us just consider Iceland. It is well known that the overwhelming majority of the American people insisted that our Navy should not be permitted to convoy war materials to England or elsewhere. Numerous bills were introduced—including one by myself—to specifically prohibit the use of our Navy for this purpose, even though there was no authority in law for the President to order the Navy to convoy war supplies for some other nation. So what happens, when our Navy was serving as the all-important "eyes" for the British Navy and the British convoy system and that proved it was not going far enough to satisfy the British? The President simply put a contingent of American troops—sailors and marines—on Iceland, at the very edge, if not over the edge, of the Western Hemisphere, and over 2,000 miles away from our shores and but 700 from England. And having done so, of course, it becomes necessary for us to maintain a line of supplies to this "outpost of our own defenses" and hence we take over the complete convoy of war supplies.

Of course, if some ships laden with supplies for Britain happen to join up with our own ships, so much the merrier for them. We certainly will not hesitate—in fact, we are ordered—to protect ourselves and all with us against attack by German, Italian, or Japanese warships or raiders. Also we were told, after we had taken over, that we did so to prevent Hitler from seizing it as a possible springboard from which to launch an aerial attack on our own shores. We are told the same thing is possible about the Azores, the Canary Islands, the Cape Verde Islands, etc., and all of which we shall doubtless soon learn we have occupied ourselves to prevent Hitler using them as a springboard for an attack on America. Well, if I am not mistaken, a springboard is a thing which can be turned about and we might later be found using them ourselves as our own springboards from which to launch our own aerial attacks on Germany and Italy. After all, it occurs to me that a springboard is far more effective 700 or a thousand miles away from its objective than it is 2,000 miles away as it would be if Hitler had it. So maybe we may have some ideas in the back of our head as to the possibility of our using a few springboards eventually ourselves—provided either of two things happen. Provided, first, that by our continuing to stick our neck out we can eventually bring about that essential attack on our own troops—and you recall the President's campaign promise of last fall when he told you, "I will not send your boys to fight in foreign lands, except in case of attack"; or provided, secondly, the warmongers finally are able to convince you folks back home that this is our war and that we should get into it with both feet and start shooting, whether we can find anything to shoot with or not. One thing is very certain to me; you and I, the people and the Congress will not learn about the actual start of the shooting until long after it has started. The President knows that not 25 percent of the Congress would vote for a declaration of war at this time and I personally think we are much closer to an actual shooting war than is any affirmative vote by the Congress; hence, again, the President will act first and tell us about it afterwards.

I was glad indeed to learn that you do appreciate the gravity and seriousness of our present position. You realize only too well that we are literally sitting on a keg of dynamite and there are too many sparks flying around not to make our position very, very critical indeed. I was glad to learn that most of you are resigned to the fact that in all probability your boys are not going to be able to come home after their year of "training" is over. You are resigned to the fact that your boys are not in "training" in a manner such as that employed 25 years ago, but that on the other hand they have been inducted into, and have become an integral part of, our greatly enlarged, tremendously expanded, and now widely located Regular Army, stationed all over the entire Nation in many camps and on so-called "outpost duty" in over three-quarters of the entire world. These boys, undoubtedly, are "in for the duration"; I join with you in your prayer, "May God protect him wherever he may be."

But I learned also on my trip that you know almost as much about the causes of this war, about the sources and methods of propaganda used, and almost as much about the whole general situation as we Members of Congress are permitted to know—until afterward. I learned, for instance, that many of you were aware of the fact that possibly some of our present most prominent warmongers were undoubtedly among the same people who joined with similar groups in England and France and collaborated in the actual financing, yes, the actual manufacture, of the rearmament of Hitler's Germany in order to make him the threat to "world security" that he is today, in order that they themselves could continue to reap their filthy "blood profits," which Mr. Roosevelt himself called "fool's gold" back in 1936, when he was a candidate for a second term and, therefore, was sponsoring a "Neutrality Act" which was to forever throw that "fool's gold" out the window and forever keep us out of somebody else's war. Yes; I found that a great many of you were aware of the truth of these facts. I did find others who were skeptical, some indeed who denied there was anything to it. Well, to these "doubting Thomases" may I say simply this? What these folks and myself know is not only an unanswered challenge made on the floor of the House but a statement which I personally heard verified by the No. 1 British statesman in this country, who in fact stated that we ourselves had contributed over twice as much toward the rearmament of Germany as had Great Britain and, therefore, stood to lose twice as much in this war. Yes; it does appear that these international warmongers will keep on forever their nefarious trade in "blood profits" in their feverish search for Mr. Roosevelt's "fool's gold."

Yes; and along that same line I found that many of you were also fully aware of the unanswered challenge of the Honorable DAN REED of New York made during the debate on the lease-lend bill. Congressman REED stated at that time that he had been in conference with a leading British statesmen in London just before the outbreak of this war. He charged that this gentleman had told him that there had been a conference held in London between leading English, French, and German statesmen, bankers and industrialists at which time it was decided that they would stage a "phoney war" in which Germany would be permitted to gobble up a number of the smaller countries of Europe. She would be permitted to do this for two principal reasons: First, in order to provide her with more area in order to become more self-sufficient from an economic viewpoint. In other words, she would then be able to produce practically everything she needed without importing things from other nations. Secondly, they recognized that Europe as then constituted with so many small nations each maintaining its own government, its own embassy staffs all over the world, its own armies at full strength, and so forth, was too inefficient in competition for world trade and hence they agreed that Germany should take over these countries to become more on a parity with England and France and then at the end of this "phoney war" those three—England, France, and Germany—would "divide up" the trade of the world—and that would cut us out too.

Of course, England and France had made a defensive alliance with Poland, aimed at Russia. But when Germany jumped on Poland they had to make good on their alliance to "save their face." It was only when Hitler jumped on the Low Countries and Norway that they finally realized they had been duped by a man whose word could not be trusted and they then realized—too late—that they had been guilty of participating in rearming and plotting with an international liar and had neglected taking the precaution to rearm themselves at the same time. Yes, Congressman REED not only challenged any Member of the House to prove him false or misinformed, but also challenged anyone to prove that that conference was not recorded in the confidential files of our own State Department, and that challenge has not only gone unanswered, but I also personally heard its truth verified by the leading British statesman in our country today. The fact we must recognize is that it was only after they realized they had been double-crossed by Hitler that they frantically sought our help—and have been ever since.

Then I learned that some of you were also aware of the fact that, in addition to our difficulties with gasoline on the eastern seaboard, the lease-lend is proving embarrassing to us in other ways. For instance, tin is a commodity on which lease-lend has forced us to establish a priority rating. In other words, some of our industries have to give up tin in order to supply Britain's and our war needs. Yet we find that some of the tin we have been giving England under lease-lend is being sold by her in South America in direct competition with our same American tin and at a lower price. In other words, lease-lend is helping her protect her foreign South American trade against our own American competition in our own famous "pan-American solidarity." Yes; I found many of you were aware of the fact that Uncle Sam is again being played up in his favorite role of "Uncle Sap." Even in the case of Japan, I notice in the press reports that even though we may be freezing Jap assets in this country, the same press reports say that we may not interfere with further shipments of oil and gasoline to Japan, while we on the eastern seaboard are going to be rationed and have gasless Sundays, according to our friend Harold Ickes. It is a strange world, isn't it?

And to get still further back to home, to what we are doing ourselves to make a sucker out of "Uncle Sap," I learned that some of you whose business life is threatened with extinction by reason of priorities, Leon Henderson's price fixing, and so forth, had found out that you could still continue in "business as usual" provided you were willing to "pay the price"—and, undoubtedly, you would pay the price to someone who was now bellowing most loudly for our immediate entrance into this war. If you need steel, for instance, on which the price is fixed and a rigid priority established, you can always buy it from certain "brokers" who seem to be able to get a "priority rating" if you will pay twice and three times its established legal price. Thus you can continue to do business as usual if you will pay the "bootlegger" who seems to have an "in" in Washington. Thus are we to again get our war millionaire after this war?

Yes, my friends, I found out that you do know what is going on, possibly even more so than we do who have been keeping our own nose too close to the grindstone. And I found that you know, too, what is wrong with our defense program and why it has bogged down so pitifully, principally because Washington has not quit playing politics with defense. In other words, you know that if we are in as precarious a position as we are told we are, then it is time right now to stop looking forward to the 1942 and 1944 elections and get down to work to save our country before we save our party. And, finally, I learned that you do have a pretty fair idea of just who and what put our country in jeopardy—if it is—and just who is leading you very, very close to a shooting war, and you will not forget it. Yes, indeed, it does do you good to get back home occasionally. I thank you for the privilege.

Labor For Defense—Unions Tell Their Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

ARTICLE BY S. EUGENE ALLEN, EDITOR OF THE OREGON LABOR PRESS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion of the part being played by labor in our national defense program. I am certain that if we will examine the facts, we will find that labor has been as loyal and patriotic in this great emergency facing us as any other group of American citizens. I know that is true in my own district in Oregon. Mr. S. Eugene Allen, editor of the Oregon Labor Press, published in Portland, Oreg., in my district, recently wrote a most informative article on this subject, which appeared in the Sunday Oregonian under date of June 20, 1941.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include this article and trust that my colleagues will read and examine the facts set forth therein. As disclosed by the table of initiation fees, dues, and benefits of A. F. of L. unions appearing as a part of the article, it will be noted that while in some instances initiation fees are substantial, nevertheless the benefits accorded to members are of equal value to the payment required.

The following is Mr. Allen's article to which I refer:

[From the Sunday Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of June 20, 1941]

LABOR FOR DEFENSE: UNIONS TELL THEIR STORY—"WE'RE NOT LOOKING FOR HALOS," SAYS A. F. OF L. EDITOR, "WE'RE SIMPLY TRYING TO DO THE BEST JOB POSSIBLE"

(By S. Eugene Allen, editor of the Oregon Labor Press)

To Mr. Public labor unions may mean pacing pickets, industrial strife, and a vague, if heated, controversy about initiation fees and union dues, but to the members and officers of the labor unions housed in the Portland Labor Temple the union is an institution to serve the needs of the workers, and is operated just as is any business.

In this period of national emergency, with the Nation increasingly dependent upon the efficient cooperation of all groups in hastening the completion of the defense program, national well-being demands that facts replace prejudice and that enthusiastic argument give way to logic and information.

Characteristic of much current comment is the editorial expression of the Hood River News of June 20, 1941: "It would be well to wait a while before painting in the halo and setting the A. F. of L. into any niche of national honor in this time of emergency. There are little matters of racketeering in initiation fees on a huge scale, with the victim workers engaging in defense industries, and there is also the prospect that some rather messy graft in connection with the building of Army cantonments is in line for a congressional investigation in the near future."

UNIONISTS DENY THAT THEY'RE LOOKING FOR HALOS

Local officials of the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor are not seeking halos, they say. They are simply trying to do the best job they can in speeding the defense effort of the country to a successful conclusion. They say that they are engaged in a business—a business that depends upon the ability to offer value and service to American workmen and a business whose books and records are kept in the same manner that those of any efficiently operated modern business are.

Mr. Average Union Man pays an initiation fee of $31.03 to join his unions and he pays $2.50 per month dues to support its functions. That is what it costs him to engage in the collective-bargaining process with his employer and to provide the other benefits that members of Portland unions enjoy. Some of these are sick, unemployment, and death benefits—an average of $454.41—and which would cost a considerable percentage of the monthly union dues if bought from an insurance company.

Such is the business relationship between the union and its members expressed in general terms. Reduced to specific facts and figures, the situation presents a range of charges from a very nominal initiation fee of $1 in some of the lumber and sawmill workers' unions to a charge of $200 by the motion picture machine operators' union. The lowest dues of any union is that of the musicians' union, 85 cents per month.

Among the highest is the typographical union, which charges a minimum of $1.80, plus 3 percent of the monthly earnings of its members. This totals, on the average, a dues payment of about $7.50 per month in this union. It should be noted, however, that the printers' union maintains a very high scale of wages and that it pays a death benefit to survivors of its members of $1,000, a monthly retirement to its older members of $34.60, and maintains a home for them at Colorado Springs.

PRINTERS WELL PROTECTED THROUGH UNION

Thus, aside from collective bargaining protection, the member of the typographical union receives a high order of security for himself and his family in return for an initiation fee of from $12.50 to $25 (depending on the age of the applicant) and his monthly dues.

Of 59 unions listed in the city of Portland, 41 charge an initiation fee of $25 or less. Only 18 charge more than $25. Initiation fees and dues are based upon two factors—wage scale and benefits paid to members, and, more important, the cost of carrying on the business of the union and insuring an adequate reserve for periods of depression and other contingencies.

Upon the boilermakers' union falls the major responsibility for the speedy and efficient production of the "bridge of ships" to the democracies. These men are aware of that responsibility, and it is around this organization that much of the fervent popular controversy has settled.

Tommy Ray, secretary of the union (not to be confused with the Tom Ray who has recently been identified with alleged subversive groups), has been a boilermaker all his life except for the period during the World War, when he served in the United States Navy. He understands the problems of the industry and of the workers in it. Born in Chicago and brought up in the Windy City, Ray talks the language of the boilermakers—simple and direct. But he knows what shipbuilding is all about and has a keen appreciation of the responsibility resting on his shoulders as leader of this vital group of defense workers.

Until recently the worker taking on a job in Portland's shipbuilding industry was given a probationary period with the union and with his employer. Having proved his qualification on the job and being accepted as a full-fledged member of the union, he was charged an initiation fee of $18.25 if he was an apprentice or a helper, or a fee of $28.25 if he was an experienced journeyman.

During the probationary period he was given a permit to work, which cost him $1 per day. This permit was for a period not exceeding 60 days (Ray emphasizes that the union never charged any "$90" permit fees), but in practically all instances the worker was accepted or rejected in a short while and the permit fee was no longer charged. Few ever worked the full 60 days.

This permit fee was solely a device to enable the union and the employer to learn the qualifications of the new workmen. The reason for its adoption was simple: Both the union and the shipyards were confronted with waves of clamorous job seekers from all walks of life, the unskilled with the skilled, the substantial, loyal American with the subversive agent and agitator. By using the permit system and allowing the worker to take the job immediately—but withholding actual union membership until his competency and loyalty were demonstrated—the union performed, Ray thinks, a real service to the Nation.

Shipyards, like all other defense industries, are concentration points for subversive penetration and influence. And until the union takes into actual membership a worker, it has no direct responsibility or obligation to him, but once a worker is taken into the union he has all the rights and privileges of any other member—something the union does not desire to accord "fifth columnists." Moreover, once the member is in the union, a complicated system of charges and trials is required to dislodge him. It was thought it would be much simpler to use the probationary "permit system" to establish clearly his record and qualifications before accepting him as a member.

However, the plan was so widely misunderstood and misinterpreted that it has now been abandoned. The boilermakers have no permit fee any more. The prospective member is taken directly into the union and pays the initiation fee. If he has not previously been affiliated with any labor union he is charged an additional $15.

The monthly dues are $3 for helpers and $3.50 for journeymen. In return for this dues investment the shipyard worker receives, first of all, the benefits of collective bargaining and stabilization in an industry that is highly complicated and much at the mercy of changing conditions. Moreover, each month $1.25 of the membership dues is immediately allocated to cover the costs of the $1,000 insurance the union pays all its members upon death. (The amount is doubled in cases of death due to accidental means—and shipyard work is highly hazardous.)

WORKERS HAVE MULTIPLIED IN SHIP PLANTS

The importance of this union service to the shipyard workers and to the industry as well as to the national welfare becomes obvious when we realize that in Portland, during the past two decades, not more than 600 workers have been employed in industry

related to shipbuilding—repair work, building barges and tugs, etc. Yet, today, the boilermakers' union has more than 1,000 men working in the shipyards, and the figure is rapidly mounting. It is estimated that at the peak of operations there will be in the neighborhood of 10,000 in the yards building the ships which Uncle Sam so desperately needs.

In the metal-trades industries the average initiation fee charged is $36.88 in the Portland area. The dues average $2.65 per month. These amounts are for workers whose earnings are consistently higher than the average earnings of all workers. The metal-trades council of Portland, headed by Earl Ingram, who is also president of the boilermakers' union, is made up of the unions having jurisdiction over work in those industries. Among them are the auto mechanics, blacksmiths, boilermakers, building laborers, bricklayers, electrical workers, glass workers, general laborers, hoisting and portable engineers, technical engineers, machinists, office employees, painters, pile drivers, plasterers, sheet-metal workers, shipwrights, steam fitters, stationary engineers, and warehousemen.

The building trades council coordinates the activities of the building-trades groups in a manner similar to that of the metal-trades council. This group of unions is also playing a very important part in the defense program. Its members build the Army cantonments and ammunition dumps such as are located at Pendleton and Hermiston and such as are proposed for Medford and Eugene. They have built the ways for the shipyards and will soon be replaced in the yards by the shipbuilders themselves.

Fred Manash, barrel-chested secretary of the building trades council, points to the record of cooperation that has been made in the work that this group of unions does and to the moderate initiation and dues payments as evidence to controvert charges such as made by the Hood River News.

The Oregon Joint Council of Teamsters, which includes all of the unions in the teaming crafts in the State and which has for its president amiable Phil Brady, State representative, is also an important link in the chain of national defense. Brady and the teamsters are proud of their record of low initiation and dues charges. No union of this group in the State charges more than $25 and some units charge less. The highest dues charged is $2.50 per month. The record does not sustain the charges that have been made against the teamsters on this score.

Every union maintains a complete set of books which are audited at regularly stated periods. The books are open to the inspection of members of the union. Typical of the accounts kept by unions are the records of receipts and disbursements of the Portland Office Employees' Union, whose secretary is J. Howard Hicks. The statement is for the month of March 1941:

RECEIPTS

Initiation fees	$70.00
Dues	385.00
Assessments ($1 per month for a period of 6 months to prosecute the strike against Montgomery Ward)	247.00
Sale of union-label stamp to member	.50
Work permits (for temporary employment such as inventory)	29.00
Organizational receipt from American Federation of Labor	33.63
Deposit of withdrawal card by member	1.00
Total for month	766.13

DISBURSEMENTS

Organizational expense (includes contribution of $250 to Central Labor Council fund to care for the Montgomery Ward strikers still unemployed and also a number of payments of rent, lights, gas, medical, and dental bills of strikers belonging to office employees' union)	$420.41
General (flowers for funeral of member's relative)	$5.00
Payment of dues of officers of the union	21.00
Salary of secretary	158.40
Per capita taxes (36 cents per member to A. F. of L., 5 cents per member to Central Labor Council, 7 cents per member to State Federation of Labor, and other amounts to other department councils)	123.33
Office supplies and stationery	18.60
Rent and telephone	41.75
Local defense fund (reserve to meet unforeseen contingencies and financed by 5 cents per member reserve each month)	$12.35
Total expenditures for month	809.00

Unions are made up of human beings. The officials of the unions admit also that they are possessed of the frailties and faults with which the human race is endowed and to repeat what has already been said they are not seeking halos. But they think that this view of the picture has not been seen by many of their critics.

Initiation fees, dues, benefits of A. F. of L. unions

Local union	Initiation	Dues	Benefits
Auto Mechanics, No. 1005	$25.00	$2.00	$300 death benefit.
Bakery Drivers, No. 499	25.00	2.50	$200 death benefit.
Bakery Workers, No. 114	25.00	2.75	$350 death benefit; $75 death of member's wife; $10 week sick benefit (16 weeks).
Barbers, No. 75	20.00	2.00	$500 death benefit; $10 week sick benefit (10 weeks).
Bartenders, No. 496	25.00	2.00	$200 death benefit; $7 week sick benefit (8 weeks).
Boilermakers, No. 72	28.25	3.50	$1,000 death benefit; $2,000 accidental death benefit.
Building Laborers, No. 296	25.00	1.50	$200 death benefit.
Carpenters, No. 226	40.00	2.00	$300 death benefit.
Grocery Clerks, No. 1092	20.00	2.00	$200 death benefit.
Retail Clerks, No. 1257	5.00	1.50	Do.
Cooks and Assistants, No. 207	16.00	2.65	$200 death benefit; $7 sick benefit for 10 weeks, free doctor.
Dairy Drivers, No. 305	25.00	2.50	$300 death benefit; $10 sick benefit for 12 weeks.
Technical Engineers, No. 79	25.00	2.00	None.
Truck Drivers, No. 162	25.00	2.50	$300 death benefit.
Warehousemen, No. 206	25.00	2.50	$100 death benefit.
Garbage Drivers, No. 220	10.00	2.00	None.
Grocery, Meat Drivers, No. 223	21.00	2.50	$200 death benefit.
Garage and Service Station, No. 255	10.00	2.50	$250 death benefit.
Taxicab Drivers, No. 281	25.00	2.00	$200 death benefit.
Laundry Drivers, No. 358	25.00	2.50	None.
Electrical Workers, No. 48	52.00	5.50	$1,500 death benefit; $42 monthly old-age assistance after 25 years.
Electrical Workers, No. 125	27.50	(1)	$1,000 death benefit; $40 monthly old-age assistance after 25 years.
Stationary Engineers, No. 87	51.00	2.75	$750 death benefit; $65 per year sick benefit.
Hoisting Engineers, No. 701	60.00	3.00	$250 death benefit.
Flour and Cereal Workers, No. 20160	10.00	1.50	None.
Garment Workers, No. 228	7.50	1.30	$300 death benefit.
General Construction, No. 320	15.00	1.50	$200 death benefit.
Beauty Operators, No. 75-A	15.00	2.00	$500 death benefit; $6 week sick benefit for 10 weeks.
Ironworkers, No. 29	5.00	5.00	$400 death benefit; $25 old-age benefit after 65 or in case of disability after 15 years.
Laundry and Dry Cleaners, No. 107	10.00	[2] 1.25 [3] 2.25	$200 death benefit; $5 week sick benefit for 7 weeks.
Lumber and Sawmill	5.00	1.50	None.
Machinists, No. 63	25.00	2.00	$300 death benefit.
Meat Cutters, No. 143	61.00	3.00	$300 death benefit; $10 week sick benefit for 6 weeks.
Millmen, No. 1120	20.00	2.00	$300 death benefit; $75 death of member's wife; $400 permanent disability payment.
Motion Picture Operators, No. 159	200.00	3.00	$300 death benefit.
Musicians, No. 99	25.00	.85	$250 death benefit.
Office Employees, No. 16821	5.00	1.50	$300 death benefit.
Painters, No. 10	50.00	2.10	$750 death benefit; also dire need fund.
Pile Drivers, No. 2416	40.00	2.25	$300 death benefit; $400 permanent disability pay.
Plasterers, No. 82	75.00	1.50	$750 death benefit.
Plumbers, No. 51	100.00	2.00	$500 death benefit.
Sheet Metal Workers, No. 16	25.00	(4)	Do.
Shipwrights, No. 1020	40.00	2.00	$300 death benefit.
Sign Writers, No. 428	50.00	4.00	$400 death benefit.
Steamfitters, No. 235	50.00	2.00	$700 death benefit.
Streetcarmen, No. 757	10.00	2.00	$800 death benefit.
Stagehands, No. 28	100.00	1.75	None.
Typographical, No. 58	(5)	[7] 1.80	$1,000 death benefit; $34.60 old-age pension per month; old-age home in Colorado Springs.
Waitresses, No. 305	8.50	1.60	$200 death benefit; $50 per year sick benefit.
Building Service, No. 49	25.00	1.50	None.
Glaziers, No. 740	25.00	3.00	$400 death benefit.
Linoleum Layers, No. 1236	50.00	4.00	$400 death benefit.
Furniture Workers, No. 1482	10.00	1.00	None.
Plywood and Veneer, No. 2531	20.00	1.50	$500 death benefit.
Waiters Union, No. 189	10.00	1.85	$200 death benefit; $1 per day sick benefit for 28 days.
Motor Coach, No. 1055	10.00	2.50	$800 death benefit.
Mailers, No. 13	25.00	(6)	$700 death benefit; $34.60 month pension.
Photo Engravers, No. 31	30.60	4.00	$1,000 death benefit.
Printing Pressmen, No. 43	20.00	2.35	$600 death benefit; pensions; 12 weeks' sick benefit.
Average	31.03	2.50	$454.41.

[1] $3 to $4.
[2] Laundry.
[3] Cleaners.
[4] Average.
[5] $2.50 to $4.
[6] $12 to $35.
[7] Plus 3 percent of earnings.
[8] 3 percent of earnings.
[9] 2 percent of earnings.

The Good-Neighbor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith a copy of a letter which I have just addressed to Mr. Harllee Branch, Director of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

It is amazing to me that, in view of all the efforts being made by practically every branch of the Government to foster the good-neighbor policy that an attorney for the Civil Aeronautics Board should demonstrate a complete lack of understanding of the value of this policy.

One of the most essential factors in developing cordial relationships between this country and countries to the south of us is rapid and efficient transportation. Yet the attorney has recommended that there be no further extension of air service to these countries.

JULY 30, 1941.

MR. HARLLEE BRANCH,
Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRANCH: I have hesitated writing you with reference to the applications of the Pan American Airways and the American Export Airlines for the inauguration of service to Cuba and Central America until I have had an opportunity to study the brief submitted by the counsel for the Board.

I have read this brief carefully and, to say the least, it is unimpressive.

The authors utterly fail to comprehend the close ties in business and culture which have existed between New Orleans and Cuba and Central America for many years. In addition to this, your attorneys have failed to realize the tremendous interest in these applications throughout the entire Mississippi Valley. The many cities of that Valley have a direct interest in this application and yet the potential traffic originating from these sources is ignored in the counsel's brief.

Those of us who are concerned about the future of our Nation have given wholehearted support to the good-neighbor policy. It is my feeling and the feeling of many of my colleagues that rapid and efficient transportation to points to the south of us play a vital role in the development of the good-neighbor policy. Yet, throughout the brief I can find no mention of the value of developing this policy.

I sincerely trust that the examiner for the Board will give every consideration to these commanding issues.

Sincerely yours,

HALE BOGGS.

Sugar From Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 22, 1941:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of June 22, 1941]

SUGAR FROM LATIN AMERICA

Our chief problem in developing sounder economic relations with Latin America is the problem of finding what we can buy that our Latin neighbors have to sell.

This has been emphasized again and again in the Journal editorial columns, also by economists, and by our able Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. The keystone of the good-neighbor policy with Latin America must be our willingness to purchase more of what the southern nations produce.

Yet the Senate of the United States recently passed bill S. 937 (the Adams bill), which is directly contrary to this policy.

In brief, the bill calls for more and more subsidies to expand the uneconomical beet-sugar industry in this country—an artificial industry that has to be subsidized to exist at all. The excuse for this bill is that the Philippines are unable at present, due to shipping difficulties, to ship their quota of raw sugar. The quotas for all sugar, including beet, were set by the Sugar Act of 1937.

The natural and wise place to turn for more inexpensive sugar at this moment is to other Latin American nations of this hemisphere, not to American beet fields. We are trying to woo these nations politically and economically. They have thousands of tons of cane sugar ready to be shipped to the United States, without subsidy.

The House of Representatives should defeat the Adams bill. The beet-sugar industry, artificial and pretty much confined to six States, should not be encouraged to expand beyond present size.

It has been estimated that the Adams bill would result in additional subsidies for beet-sugar growers of up to $50,000,000 a year. And this for a nondefense industry, when we are straining to economize in such fields, so that we may speed up our arming.

The Adams bill should be defeated: (1) To allow us to buy economically a needed product which Latin American nations can sell to us, (2) to save the increased subsidy that would have to be paid to a domestic industry that has to be sustained by the hard-pressed taxpayer on a nursing bottle.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE MONTREAL DAILY STAR

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely and instructive article which appeared in the Montreal Daily Star of July 22, 1941, which quotes Hon. Pierre F. Casgrain, Secretary of State, Canada, which sets forth the attitude of that great country in regard to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

The article follows:

[From the Montreal Daily Star of July 22, 1941]

CASGRAIN SAYS WATERWAYS PLAN ASSURED—UNITED STATES CONGRESSIONAL PARTY AND LOCAL M. P.'S ATTEND DINNER

The St. Lawrence waterway development is "a thing bound to come," Hon. Pierre F. Casgrain, secretary of state, told members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the United States House of Representatives and members of Parliament at the Royal St. Lawrence Yacht Club last night. The United States legislators are in Canada to study the waterways scheme.

"Even in war we must prepare for the future," Mr. Casgrain said. "That is why Canada is going ahead with the St. Lawrence waterways."

The congressional party crossed into Canada from Massena, N. Y., at Cornwall, Ontario, inspected waterways development at Barnard's Island, looked over the area where the waterways scheme would be developed, then came via Beauharnois to Montreal. They reached the Royal St. Lawrence Yacht Club at Dorval before dark. They were accompanied by J. P. Moffat, United States Minister to Canada.

With the Americans were George Fulford, Member of Parliament for Leeds; Lionel Chevrier, Stormont, and Dr. W. D. MacDiarmid, Glengarry. Joining them here were E. Marier, Member of Parliament for Jacques Cartier; Joseph Jean, Mercier; Vincent Dupuis, Chambly-Rouville; Eugene Durocher, St. James; Brooke Claxton, St. Lawrence-St. George; Douglas Abbott, Westmount-St. Antoine; Peter Bercovitch, Cartier; Thomas Vien, Outremont; Ernest Bertrand, Laurier; and Senators A. K. Hugessen, J. H. Rainville, and L. M. Gouin; and Hon. T. D. Bouchard, Quebec Minister of Highways and Public Works.

ASKED TO VISIT AGAIN

Mr. Casgrain welcomed the visitors in French and English and urged them to visit Canada again. He recalled that three signers of the Declaration of Independence, one of

whom was Benjamin Franklin, visited Canada in 1776.

"Perhaps," he said, "there are no two peoples who feel so much at home when visiting each other, and there are perhaps no two countries who exchange so many visits during the year.

"It is a great privilege to welcome the distinguished representatives of the great American Nation. We are proud to say that she is our neighbor, our friend, and also our economic and moral ally. You have come to Canada on an economic and pacific mission, but this same mission will indirectly tend to increase our war effort."

Mr. Casgrain declared that the mission "proclaims the moral and financial alliance that binds our two countries in their common wish, to bring victory for the free and democratic nations."

Continuing, he said: "The agreement which brings us together today will not fail, notwithstanding certain unjustified fears, to bring to the Province of Quebec real benefits, such as the stabilization of the water level of the St. Lawrence at Montreal, the increase in commerce and trade, and the establishment of new industries, due to the electrical power which will accrue from the development of the St. Lawrence waterways."

MUST LOOK AHEAD

"Criticism born of ignorance and fear, will, I have no doubt, prove unfounded and unjustified. I believe we must look beyond the present moment and the present day."

Dealing with the Dominion's war effort, he was cheered when he said that "Today Canada fights on land, on sea, and in the air, and her forces are growing all the time, and will grow according to the needs of Britain.

"Canada," he added, "today is spending more than 45 percent of her income for war and victory, and we are not sparing our men either. We have stood for peace in the past. It is because the Province of Quebec wants to remain French, with her British institutions, that she fights so nobly with her sons at the side of Britain; and it is because she wants to remain free that she works hand in hand with her neighbor, the great American Nation.

"Canada, however, does not forget that war is an accident, and she must, even in war, prepare for the future. That is why she is going ahead with the St. Lawrence waterways development. In the working out of this far-seeing and far-reaching project, she feels doubly confident, since she has the immense advantage of American cooperation.

"So Canada is glad this evening to welcome the distinguished delegates of the United States Congress, as she knows that their presence is one step further toward the realization of the magnificent seaway from the Atlantic to the heart of the North American Continent."

The Legion Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of July 28, 1941:

[From the Boston Post of July 28, 1941]

THE LEGION GROWS

The new all-time high membership record just reached by the American Legion demonstrates clearly the public appreciation of the need for the prepare-for-defense program being carried on in this country.

The Legion, in its twenty-third year and with the number of its eligibles diminishing steadily as death claims the veterans now past middle life, would do well to maintain a membership decreasing only 5 percent each year. But instead of the decrease, the Legion already is some 2,000 members ahead of the previous all-time high, established last year. Its officials predict many more will join before the year closes. One Massachusetts post has doubled last year's membership, and others have nearly done so. It is truly a remarkable achievement.

The men who served in the combat forces in 1917 are joining, legion officials say, because they want to serve again. They realize that for the most part younger men will wear the uniform this time and that they must do their part in some civilian capacity. But whatever it is they are called to do, the men of the Legion are ready and willing. They proved themselves in 1917, and today they are proving the Legion's right to be called America's No. 1 patriotic group.

The Great Game of Politics as Applied to the St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, as the time draws near for consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, almost daily we are hearing from the lips of many Members of Congress that it is increasingly difficult to justify the construction of this so-called international ditch.

One of the finest expositions of the fact that the St. Lawrence seaway does not appear justified is contained in the following article from the pen of Mr. Frank R. Kent, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal July 19, 1941. The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, of July 19, 1941]

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—GETTING HARDER TO JUSTIFY

(By Frank R. Kent)

WASHINGTON.—As the time approaches for floor consideration of the St. Lawrence seaways project, several things become clear besides the fact that, unless the President weakens, the vote on this exceedingly dubious proposal will be close. Two of these things are not subject to contradiction. One is that, left to its own judgment, Congress would not even debate this measure, much less pass it. The other is that its chance of success is wholly due to the fact that the President is making its passage a personal matter.

Evidence of this is found not only in the trouble he has taken to push forward conspicuous members of his Administration, such as Secretaries Stimson, Knox, and Jones, and O. P. M. members Knudsen and Hillman, some of whom have little interest in, and less knowledge of the project, but also in the way the administration publicity forces have been lined up in its behalf. All up and down the line the Government press agents and journalistic reflectors are unitedly pressing favorable arguments and obscuring those against. Even the publicity director of the Democratic National Committee has been prodded into doing his bit. The method adopted by most of these literary aides is to misrepresent and abuse those on the other side rather than argue the merits of their case.

The fact is, the full weight of the White House machine is being used to push this project through a reluctant Congress. Ordinarily, that would be enough. Perhaps it will be this time. Certainly the President can get from Congress anything he asks in the way of legislation or money which he can justify as for national defense. The proponents of the St. Lawrence plan have the greatest difficulty in justifying it on that ground. On the contrary, the statement that at the most optimistic estimate (the President's) the seaway could not be completed within 4 years and that it would divert a large number of men and an immense amount of machinery and other material, vitally needed for defense work at a most critical period, has not been contradicted and would seem to outweigh every argument of the canal advocates, not one of which is undisputed.

Actually, the engineering, financial, military, and industrial facts that are marshaled against this undertaking appear so conclusive as to make it impossible to regard a proposal which has been kicking around for 40 years as an emergency proposition in 1941. Engineers, who contend that 7 instead of 4 years would be required to do the job, estimate that a force of 43,000 men would be steadily engaged, but that at the peak 60,000 would be needed. To complete the job in 4 years double this army would be required. Where are these men to come from? In addition, help must be had from Canada, which, even less than we, can afford to divert labor now employed in producing munitions and other products of which the British are in desperate need.

The reluctance of Canada to participate in this project at this time is attested by the conditions under which the Canadian Prime Minister joined Mr. Roosevelt. In his agreement, Mr. Mackenzie King provided a clear escape clause by which his country may indefinitely postpone any participation or expenditure whatever. In his last letter on the subject—March 5—the Canadian Prime Minister declared that "the growing intensity of the war preparations and the apprehensions that still more serious perils will have to be faced in the near future, necessitate the most careful examination of any proposed expenditure from the point of view of public need and in the light of war requirements." So far from heartily approving the plan, this would seem to indicate great doubt of its present wisdom upon the part of Mr. Mackenzie King—even a desire to reconsider the whole business and lay it on the table.

In addition, the trenchant point is now being made that the proposed depth of the canal—27 feet—will be inadequate to accommodate more than a small percentage of the war and cargo vessels for whose use it is supposed to be. For example, it is said that of 384 ships now being built under the Maritime Commission's emergency program, only about 30 could keep their keels off the seaway

bottom. In itself, this would appear a reason calculated to stall the project, but it seems not to weigh much with its sponsors.

Stress has been laid by the President on the electric-power argument, though it has been authoritatively stated time and time again that we can build highly efficient steam plants more cheaply and more rapidly at strategic points than we can develop St. Lawrence water power. In reply to the allegation that this is a pet project of Mr. Roosevelt's, it is asserted that Mr. Harding, Mr. Coolidge, and Mr. Hoover favored it while in the White House. They did not, however, favor it during an unlimited national emergency, when its construction would sidetrack an army of men and vast quantities of material vitally needed to preserve our ally from destruction and our own security. When they favored it, the utmost speed was not being demanded in our own immediate defense program. Nor were we lagging both on our domestic armament, and in the aid we are giving the British. Nor, in their day, was there any uncertainty as to where the men, the money, and the materials to do the job were to be found.

Adequate Water Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE ST. LOUIS REGIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the resolution adopted on February 21, 1941, at the St. Louis Regional Conference of the United States Conference of Mayors, having to do with transportation, and which is apropos to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway which is at this time under consideration by the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and which urges Congress to plan and work for greater national and adequate systems of waterways and connected roads to supplement our rail transportation.

The resolution follows:

TRANSPORTATION

The United States Conference of Mayors calls the attention of this country to the fact that the nations that have been most successful in modern times, both industrially and in the development and rapid mobility of their military machines, have been those which systematically and intensively developed their transportation systems, most particularly their natural and artificial waterways and highways for purposes of carrying the slow-moving raw materials and cargo; and

Whereas such a development would make it far more practical to construct ships and to locate many war-essential industries in the great valley between the Rockies and the Alleghenies; and

Whereas the past experience has demonstrated that there is a possibility of overtaxing of our railroad transportation system that should be avoided in time of real crisis; and

Whereas the planning if not the building of adequate transportation means is an essential part of any real defense program and is moreover a much needed part of the reconstruction plan to help solve the difficulties of internationally intensified competition: Therefore

We petition the President and Congress of the United States and all those concerned that they commence at once not only to plan but to promote a great national and adequate system of waterways and connected roads to supplement our rail transportation sufficient to meet reasonable military and civil demands.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, "Boy Wonder" of 1918, In Thick of Things

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest contributions that has been made to the strengthening of our national defense is the appointment of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as Commandant of the new Far Eastern Department of the United States Army, with headquarters at Manila, P. I.

In my maiden speech in Congress on the subject of national defense, delivered in the well of the House on January 25, 1939, I pleaded for the recall of General MacArthur to the United States so that the Nation would have the benefit of one of the finest military minds in the world today.

The American people may well feel proud that such a fearless military genius is directing affairs in the Far East as war clouds begin to gather.

On Sunday, July 20, 1941, the Philadelphia Inquirer paid tribute to Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the following article:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 20, 1941]

BOY WONDER OF 1918 IN THICK OF THINGS

One of America's great soldiers, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, may once again become the man of the hour as a result of yesterday's merger of United States and native armed forces in the Philippines.

General MacArthur, the boy wonder of the World War, bowed out of the national spotlight in 1935 when he ended his duties as Chief of Staff of the United States Army and found relative obscurity as military adviser to the new Commonwealth government of the islands.

General MacArthur was the son of Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur, who helped clear the Spaniards out of Manila in 1898, then led the rout of the Aguinaldo rebels in 1899, and served as Military Governor of the Philippines for the 2 years.

Graduated from West Point in 1903 at the top of his class of 93 cadets, the younger MacArthur served as a second lieutenant of engineers in the Philippines. Later he returned to the islands as Manila's district commander from 1922 to 1925 and then as department commander from 1928 to 1930.

MacArthur became a national hero as commander of the Forty-second (Rainbow) Division in the World War. No swivel-chair leader, he accompanied his men into nearly every important battle and was gassed, wounded, and rather thoroughly decorated.

MacArthur became the Army's youngest Chief of Staff in 1930. He personally commanded Federal troops who dispersed the "bonus army" in the national capital in 1932.

MacArthur is known in Philadelphia not only as a great soldier but also as a social figure.

His first wife was Mrs. Louise Cromwell Brooks, a daughter of Mrs. E. T. Stotesbury and the late Oliver Cromwell. They were divorced in 1929 and she later married Lionel Atwill, the actor. MacArthur was married again in 1937 to Miss Jean Marie Faircloth, 38, of Murfreesboro, Tenn.

As field marshal of the Philippine Commonwealth Army, he has said that a successful invasion of the Philippines would take "a half million men, $10,000,000,000, tremendous casualties, and 3 years' time."

The New York Times Article on the Nation's Power Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most complete and comprehensive statements I have seen on the American power situation was contained in an editorial appearing in the New York Times on July 23. I quote it here in full:

OUR VAST POWER PROGRAM

By the time we are spending $36,000,000,000 a year for defense we shall need fully a hundred billion kilowatt-hours a year simply to fill Army and Navy orders. This means a considerable addition to the amount of power normally required. To find that power we must enlarge our existing power plants and build new ones. What the ultimate cost will be cannot be even roughly estimated. The annual expenditure of $470,000,000 for 5 years, now planned by the Federal Power Commission, does not cover the cost of generating machinery, transmission lines, and other accessories. Steam stations, we are told, will be built largely by private systems. All told, a sum that may be double the proposed 5-year expenditure of $2,350,000,000 must be spent by Government and industry.

We have only to consider the gigantic industrial expansion of Germany to realize what stands before us. Before she embarked on her wars of conquest Germany could dispose of about 100 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. The conquest of Norway, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia added another 100 billion. Staggering demands are made on her aluminum industry alone. The Office of Production Management estimates that she is producing a billion pounds of the metal a year. Our revised program calls not only for that much but for 600,000,000 pounds more. Sixteen billion kilowatt-hours a year are needed for this

purpose alone. An unknown amount of magnesium must also be produced, for which another allowance of eight or nine kilowatt-hours a pound must be made.

Add the requirements of the mills that are turning out tanks, guns, planes, trucks, uniforms, ships, and it becomes plain why the strictly defense program alone calls for at least as many kilowatts as Germany needed before she began to overrun continental Europe. In the whole history of engineering there has been no such power effort as ours. It is a challenge to our ingenuity, resourcefulness, and our willingness to work.

Defense of America and Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 31 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA, AT HELENA, MONT., JUNE 4, 1941

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I made at Helena, Mont., on June 4, on the subject Defense of America and Americanism, which was broadcast over a Nation-wide hook-up of the National Broadcasting Co.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to come to Montana because I know and the Nation knows that one can talk about Americanism and patriotism in Montana without pulling his punches. In all of America, Americanism is nowhere more securely rooted than here among these great mountains, upon these broad valleys of the West.

The voice of the West is still the true voice of America.

As a citizen of America I appreciate the opportunity of being here to talk to other Americans about the terrible present, about the menace which hangs over the head of our land.

In order that the discussion might not be one-sided I took the liberty of informing your distinguished senior Senator, Senator WHEELER, that I was going to have the privilege of being here tonight and offered to share with him the platform so that he might say why he did not feel that the President was right in the course he is following to defend America. You have, of course, seen in the papers that Senator WHEELER advised me in a lengthy telegram that his duties in the Senate concerning the radio monopoly had kept him from coming, and offering to debate the rightness of the President's course with me in the Senate. Since the distinguished Senator was the one who chose to carry this question to the American platform, to the American public outside the Senate, I am sorry that he felt his duties would not allow him now to be here in Montana before this great audience tonight.

This mighty issue is too big to be settled on personalities. The stake is nothing less than the future of America, and that momentous question can be settled only upon the high plane of patriotism and principle.

I shudder to think that there is any man in all of America who so hates Roosevelt that he would not follow Roosevelt to save America. Dare any man to think of political profit, of what it may mean to him in the future to be able to say, "I told you so" above the clarion call of his country in her time of greatest peril.

We have seen too sadly that those people in many lands who could not rise above selfishness and ambition, who could not surmount the little things to meet the big things, have now lost all. Party lines do not count now, personalities are not now important; who you are matters not. The question that counts, the only question that counts is, do you love America? Do you want to serve America? Do you want to strike down, to hurl back any foe who is crouching to leap at America?

We see things today we never thought we would see in our time. We can hardly believe our eyes, we can hardly trust our ears, we hardly know how to treat the fear which grips our hearts. But we do know that everything we see, everything we hear, everything we feel, tells us America stands today in danger.

We have seen a man start out as a political agitator in the chaos of post-war Germany. We have seen him gather around himself a group of determined and ruthless men, put upon their lips strange doctrines, and finally fight his ruthless way to the mastery of a great nation. We have seen him drive a whole race from its borders, strip them of their property, break up their families, condemn them to a living death.

We have seen him take the preachers out of the pulpit and thrust them into the concentration camp. We have seen him break up fraternal orders, civic clubs, churches, which men thought no one would dare to touch.

We have seen him take the child from the father and the mother and make him not the child of the home but the child of the state. And into the mind of that child, instead of the sentiments of peace and kindliness and justice, we have seen him plant the corroding seeds of war, cruelty, and injustice.

We have seen him take the fair daughters of a civilized land and tell them it was their duty out of wedlock to breed for nazi-ism.

We have seen him abolish the written law and the impartial court and make crime whatever harmed the state, in the opinion of puppet judges. We have seen him set up a secret police to rove the land, to drag any man out of his home into the darkness never to be heard of again.

We have seen him prohibit the trade-union, the right of the worker to organize, and bind him to the machine as a serf of the new Nazi feudalism. We have seen him confiscate the factory of the industrialists, even those who financed him in the days of his struggle, and drive them like hunted beasts across the face of the world.

We have seen him grasp absolute power, burn down the place where the representatives of the people met, abolish elections, destroy the legislature, and rule a nation of eighty millions with no check except his own cruel will.

All these things we have seen him do to his own people.

Then we have seen him tell every lie, practice every deception, resort to every trick his devilish genius could conceive to divide, to frighten, to break down the resistance of the nations around about him, and finally when he had weakened them from within strike them with the most terrible assault ever hurled by man upon man. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen—fourteen soverign nations, fourteen free people, not including Italy—now lie prostrate beneath his cruel, iron heel.

Now his coast line stretches from the Arctic Circle to the Mediterranean and his bear-like arms are now closing around the whole Mediterranean. His pincers are closing in upon Suez; he is now severing the jugular vein of the British Empire. His sinister hand is already reaching out to grasp the oil lands of Iraq and the Near East, the fertile valley of the Nile, the metals, the minerals, the vast areas of Africa. He is set to grab the islands off Europe and Africa, the islands which command the Atlantic—the Azores, the Madiera Islands, the Canary Islands, the Cape Verde Islands. Now, even now, he is sending his disguised troops into Dakar, which lies just 1,600 miles across the narrow neck of the South Atlantic from Brazil. If he shall possess the coast of Africa his coast line will run from the Arctic at the northern tip of Norway to the Cape of Good Hope, down under in the South Seas; across the Himalayas will lie the fertile plains of India; a little farther lies China.

Did Napoleon, did Julius Caesar, did Alexander the Great ever dream of so vast a conquest?

When this unearthly man began he was just a political agitator in a war-weary land. Now he gives orders not only to the small powers of Europe but to Italy, Russia, Japan, and now France. No great power in all the world stands against him but Britain and America.

For the first time in history the English-speaking peoples stand with their backs to the wall facing the powers of a hostile world.

The strategy of encirclement which Hitler has used to crush every foe is now reaching like a giant boa constrictor around us. Tighter and tighter draw his coils. Russian fortifications lie within sight of the coast of Alaska. Japan glares at us from across the Pacific hungry for more loot and conquest, watching like a hungry beast for a time to strike its prey—lurking with an assassin's knife in hand to pull another Mussolini on us and strike us in the back in some hard-pressed moment.

Hitler bombers, submarines, and surface raiders, some of them new giants, excelling anything on water, rove the seas, almost closing the sea lanes, nearly cutting off every land which does not join their evil Axis, from contact with the principal markets of the world. Like the Barbary pirates of long ago they levy tribute upon all who would use the highways of the world.

In South America he has sent his agents to prepare the way for his coming. For 6 months before they leave Nazi land they are expressly trained to spread propaganda, get control of the means of influencing public opinion, organize all their own people there to carry on a concerted campaign to undermine the independence of those nations, and particularly to destroy good will and trade with the United States. They put money into the hands of local traitors who will stir up sentiment against the local government under some plausible excuse of helping the people.

They buy every possible newspaper, radio facility, almost give away their own cleverly fashioned but propaganda-saturated news services. How near they have come already to setting up their own governments—mere Hitler puppets—in some countries is not generally understood. In some cases only the timely arrival of American naval vessels on a friendly visit gave the local authorities the encouragement and the assurance necessary to throttle such sinister schemes.

Hitler has long had a network of air lines in South America and between South America and Germany. He has offered these large

producers of raw materials ready markets in Germany in terms of bartered manufactured goods. Now with the keys to all Europe in his hands he will offer them again prosperity if they will just join his new order and collaborate with him in remaking the world. If they should determine like the Vichy government in France that collaboration with Hitler is their only choice for a place of power or prosperity then he should without firing a shot have over half of our own hemisphere unless we chose to fight—to send an army to fight—4,000 miles away upon the Orinoco, the Amazon, across the Andes.

Hitler has always boasted that he should not have to batter down our gates from without; that he would open them from within; that in our land of many peoples and many faiths he would raise race against race, religion against religion, section against section, class against class.

How well he knows how to do it. What experience, what success he has had so far in other lands all over the world.

Are there not ominous signs in America today when the name of our President is booed at huge public meetings, when some men hate Roosevelt so much they would rather lose America than to help Roosevelt save it, when prominent men dare to say that Roosevelt is as bad as Hitler or Mussolini or Stalin?

When a man who has been an officer in the American Army and a national hero tells the people we need a new leader in Washington without any apparent reference to the next regular constitutional election which is 3 years off?

When an American Senator says, "Yes, the President has the power to convoy if the Navy obeys him."

When the Senate, recently even refused to consider a resolution saying the President was right in his recent stirring address and deserved the confidence of Congress and the country.

Is it a sign of national health that many manufacturers have thought more about profit than production; have slowed up production because they did not want to run out of orders, and that some labor and labor leaders have struck over petty disputes when the destiny of the world trembles in the balance?

What is this strong power Hitler has to lull his victims into complacency while he, before their very eyes, sharpens his knife to cut them apart?

Like the serpent which whispered into the ear of Eve he says there is no harm while he lures a people to their downfall.

While some cry out that Hitler cannot come here, he is already here with his spies, his "fifth column," his Trojan horses, and those misguided souls who help him without intending it.

He is here through some big businessmen who, like some big businessmen in England before the war, preferred Hitlerism which would crush the labor unions and give them control of the state, to real economic and political democracy.

He is here through some who are waiting to be the man on horseback when things get bad in America in the face of another world depression and post-war turmoil.

His hand has in the last 15 months taken $40,000,000,000—as much as the whole National debt was a year ago—out of the pockets of the taxpayers of our land. And we know that is just the beginning of what we shall have to spend to stop Hitler. In fact, if we were spending at the rate of Britain and Germany we should have spent $100,000,000,000.

Suppose he crushes Britain and we stand alone against him, his navies, his army, his air force vastly outnumbering ours, with all the factories and men and women of Europe to work for him, with all Russia, Africa, the Near East, India, Asia to furnish him raw materials—how much shall we have to spend?

If Hitler controls the markets of Europe where shall we sell the surplus of our farms, our factories, our mines, our forests? What will happen to the price of cattle, wheat, corn, tobacco, lumber—what we make in our factories?

Will he not have the power to impoverish every American workman, every American farmer? How could our businessmen, as private enterprise, compete with the Hitler empire in the world for trade?

Can we stand against the world? Can we stand against a totalitarian world and remain a democracy? Under so great a strain, such stress, can we preserve the freedom which makes America what it is? Could we keep open our schools, our hospitals, keep up the American standard of living?

Yet who among you would not demand that our Government double, triple, quadruple our defense spending if Britain fell today and none stood between Hitler's blitzkrieg and us?

There is no alternative. Hitler must be destroyed or he will destroy us. My fellow Americans, do not let these fake prophets, these modern Pied Pipers of Hamlin, lead you to your destruction.

They cry "peace." How can there be peace with the devil?

What has destroyed the moral sense of Charles Lindbergh, who sees no difference to us whoever wins the war—who sees Roosevelt as much a conqueror as Hitler?

How can they hold back in their hearts a flood of indignation against what Hitler has done to the world? How can they talk about taking his bloody hand in friendship when his bombs have killed 4,022 children in Britain since August last and mangled 3,000 others? When he has thrown the earth back into a sea of blood which may drown civilization?

The old world, the era we knew, and with all of its faults, loved, is dead and Hitler has not only killed it—he has desecrated its body.

Now that is the Hitler they help when they hit Roosevelt.

The time is fast coming when public men, private men, big men, little men cannot be disloyal to the President without being disloyal to America.

Roosevelt has had a twofold purpose. To save us from Hitler and to save us from war. He hates both.

What has the vociferous opposition in the Congress and the country, the America First Committee, done to help him?

In 1938 the President said the peace-loving world must rise up to quarantine those who were spreading the germs of war.

The opposition cried out that the President was a warmonger, stirring up hysteria; that there would be no war if Roosevelt didn't cause it.

We passed a law prohibiting the sale of war material to any belligerent. When the President found the effect of this statute was to help Hitler he asked for its repeal. The opposition leaped to the floor of the Senate, rushed to the platform and to the radio, to the columns of the anti-Roosevelt press, and denounced not Hitler but Roosevelt and started then to broadcast the cruel falsehood that Roosevelt was trying to get us into war.

That opposition for 9 months prevented the repeal of the embargo against arms to the hard-pressed democracies. What might those 9 months have meant to the world? What could we be doing today if those 9 months were behind us in turning out planes, tanks, guns, and not in front of us?

The false prophets were writing their sad story.

Then the Preident called upon the mothers and fathers of America to send their sons to the training camps upon the democratic basis of selective service. Again the opposition dashed to the floor of Congress, to the platform, the radio, the anti-Roosevelt press, and again denounced the dictatorship, not of Hitler but of Roosevelt. Weeks they delayed this vital step in the national defense.

Came then the time when Britain had spent or contracted to spend for war materials the dollars she had available and every dollar's worth of property of every kind and character held in the United States by any British subject. She had up to that time bought at a good profit and paid for in American dollars every article of war equipment we had furnished her.

The President, determined to keep the war in Europe and away from America, proposed to Congress the lease-lend bill. Back came the same opposition to the Senate floor, to the platform, the radio, the anti-Roosevelt press, and denounced, not Hitler, but Roosevelt as a warmonger and a dictator.

More precious months they tore out of the calendar of the progress of national defense.

Now, whatever it is—the pending bill to draft needed defense facilities, the way we have drafted men, and the President's daring appeal to the people to back him up in increasing our production and in getting the goods to the hard-pressed defenders of freedom, or in helping Hitler from getting possession of those strategic islands in the Atlantic from which he can strangle England and strike at us and the same cry rises again from the Senate floor, the platform, the radio, and the still too numerous anti-Roosevelt press denouncing Roosevelt, deceiving the people as to what the issue is, lulling us into a false security, telling us all we need do is just do like France and every other ravaged victim of Hitler—just wait behind some "Maginot line" and Hitler cannot hurt us.

The past few days have shown many national magazines, many newspapers, putting aside partisanship and proclaiming national unity and patriotism.

A nation is grateful.

They see now that the real warmongers are those who would pull down the barriers the President has built up to keep Hitler in Europe. They see that those who really trifle with the blood of American boys are those who have done all they could to keep President Roosevelt from helping to stop Hitler with American materials—so there could be no chance that American men would have to do it anywhere.

I have not spoken of America's duty, but only of her danger. Has America lost a sense of indignation against hellish wrong? Have we sunk so low that nothing but self-interest which touches our soil or our pocketbook can move us?

Where is that America which bruised the head of another tyrant a generation ago; which tore the yoke of oppression from little Cuba; which gave its blood and treasure to free the lowly slave; which won back the freedom of the seas; which tore our freedom from a foreign king?

Where is the spirit of America which swells up from her churches, her firesides, from the hearts of good men and women, wholesome boys and girls? Where is the America which has always been willing to sacrifice for a better world, which through all the years has dared to keep its faith in the high destiny of man.

When a fiend threatens to turn back the clock of time, to dethrone God and destroy the dignity of man—that is America's cause.

If America has lost her soul, what else matters?

In the White House sits a man, often lonely, who has prayed like Lincoln and the Man of Galilee, that this cup might pass from him. But with his conscience bare and his hand in the hand of God, I know he has resolved to do the right as he sees the right.

He needs your confidence and your help. He needs a united Nation behind him in his desperate struggle with the giants of the world.

America needs to be stirred by an old-fashioned revival of old-fashioned patriotism. Good America! Great America! Brave America! You are the real America and against you even "the gates of" (a Hitler) "hell shall not prevail."

Cooperation of States Held Necessary to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 31 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ARTICLE IN REPLY TO AN ESSAY PRINTED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, day before yesterday I asked unanimous consent for the insertion in the RECORD of an article. I obtained the consent, but now I am informed that the article is one-quarter of a page too long and that its printing will cost $101.25. I, therefore, again ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD this article, in spite of the fact that it is a quarter of a page too long. Ordinarily I would cut the article down so as to bring it within the rule of the Joint Committee on Printing, but since the article is an answer to another article which has already been inserted in the RECORD, I think that I am justified in making the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

[From the New York Times]

COOPERATION OF STATES HELD NECESSARY TO WORLD PEACE—RECENT ESSAY BY HISTORIAN RECOMMENDING POLICY OF ISOLATION FOR THIS COUNTRY DECRIED AS BEING OUT OF ACCORD WITH THE FACTS OF OUR TIMES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

An essay by Charles A. Beard under the title of "Giddy Minds and Foreign Quarrels," recently published by the Macmillan Co., invites an answer if for no other reason than the fact that its author is one of the most distinguished of American scholars in the fields of history and political science. In spite of the reputation of the author as a student of American political life, it is probable that few of his colleagues will accept without reservation the assumptions upon which he bases his argument for American isolation. Accordingly we trust that the veteran of many forensic contests will not be offended if we examine his assumptions with the same vigor that has characterized his own polemical achievements.

Assumption No. 1 concerns Mr. Beard's implication that a considerable number of teachers, newspapermen, and professional politicians in the United States have recently made it their major concern to champion "wholesale interference with foreign quarrels and disturbances." He cites no names of persons who propose such "wholesale interference." Certainly the indictment does not apply to Prof. James T. Shotwell, Judge Manley O. Hudson, Clarence Streit, or Senator Elbert D. Thomas, and a host of others who happen to believe in international cooperation rather than in Mr. Beard's thesis of nationalistic isolation. None of these gentlemen, so far as the record shows, has even proposed that the United States interfere on a wholesale scale in all the quarrels and disturbances, external or internal, in every country in the world, or, in fact, interfere at all, if that word is to be taken in its ordinary meaning and is not used to cover every kind of international action.

NOT SO ALOOF

Assumption No. 2 is that until the end of the nineteenth century "the United States kept aloof from the aggressions, wars, and quarrels of Europe," and "proposed no world conferences for correcting the wicked, settling conflicts, and curing unrest in the four corners of the world."

This assumption is not entirely consonant with the facts. For instance, as early as 1786 Thomas Jefferson, then our representative in Paris, proposed to the ministers of the great powers that these countries join with the United States in a joint naval demonstration in the Mediterranean in order to restore the international peace which had been broken by the Barbary States.

From the earliest days of our Republic the dignity of mankind has been one of the tenets of American democracy. Accordingly, we have recoiled from the oppression of racial minorities and have frequently translated our indignation into diplomatic protests. In 1840 the United States joined other powers in protesting against the persecution of Hebrews in Mohammedan countries. Later interventions on behalf of Jewish minorities were our protests to Russia in 1860, 1882, and 1891, and to Rumania in 1872, 1879, and 1880.

OTHER EXPRESSIONS

Our history is replete with many other episodes in which the American people have expressed their ideologies in concrete terms of foreign influence. For example, throughout the nineteenth century our intense championship of democracy led us to accord hasty recognition to new governments created by the overthrow of former monarchies, even when such revolutions were accompanied by brutal excesses.

Comity of nations has always called for a decent interval which, although short in time, may give proof of the deliberate decision of the people to change their form of government. But the United States, in its eagerness to promote the growth of self-government everywhere, has on occasion acted so promptly as virtually to intervene. For example, on the third day of the revolution of 1848 in Paris, our Minister, Richard Rush, hurried to the Hôtel de Ville, where before a large crowd he delivered an address of congratulation to the president of the provisional government. Momentous events for Europe grew out of this change of regime—a change which led to the advent of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte.

American devotion to ideologies moved our people throughout the nineteenth century to engage in all sorts of activities that had repercussions in Europe. For example, in 1851, Louis Kossuth, after a vain attempt to overthrow by force of arms the oppressive Hungarian autocracy, was accorded a magnificent reception in the United States. He was ceremoniously received by the Senate and House of Representatives and banqueted by Congress. Our citizens opened their purses to promote the cause of freedom in Hungary.

WE DID INTERVENE

It is true that American-European relations throughout the nineteenth century witnessed on our part more of nonintervention than of intervention. But there were a sufficient number of political interventions, to say nothing of the actions of private citizens, to contradict the myth of our complete isolation which numerous propagandists have ardently nourished.

There is one phase of Mr. Beard's second assumption that requires particular refutation. His reference to the "four corners of the earth" may lead unwary readers to assume that the alleged nonintervention policy of the United States extends to the Pacific and even to Latin America. This, of course, is incorrect. Even if there has been a pretense of nonintervention in European affairs, this has not applied to the Far East nor to Latin America.

From the first days of the young Republic, American interest in the China trade led to a vigorous foreign policy, which was later supported by the religious ideologies behind our missionary movement in the South Seas. As early as 1813 our Navy began to claim islands in the Pacific as American possessions. Soon missionaries were paving the way for the annexation of Samoa and Hawaii. In 1851 the United States alone persuaded Japan to abandon its hermit habits, but we soon joined in cooperative endeavors to maintain peace and order. In 1861 Anson Burlingame inaugurated the open-door policy in China, which became in time the cornerstone of joint American-European intervention in the Far East. In 1864 the United States participated in a collective manifestation with England, Holland, and France to aid the Shogun of Japan in restraining the daimyo of Satsuma from attacks on foreign shipping in the Straits of Shimonoseki.

Even more eventful has been the American policy of intervention in Latin America. And although some of these démarches are not to the credit of the Washington Government, they must be included in the enumeration of external acts of this Government which may be cited as proof that the concept of American isolation is a myth and has little foundation on fact.

PROPAGANDA IN EDUCATION

Assumption No. 3 is that a large part of the instruction in the field of international relations in the universities of the United States has been "stripped of all scientific pretension and has been little more than propaganda for the League of Nations, collective security, collaboration with Great Britain and France, or some other kind of regularized intervention by the United States Government in foreign controversies everywhere except perhaps at Amritsar or in Syria."

This is a serious accusation, imputing both insincerity and incompetence. Dwelling upon the financial resources of various foundations, Mr. Beard insinuates that numerous members of the faculties of universities and colleges are bribed to teach international cooperation and to condemn the isolation that he so ardently champions. Thus lured with "millions of dollars," they indulge in propaganda under the guise of modern scholarship.

Mr. Beard brings charges of lack of scholarship and of insincerity against a wide field of scholars in universities and research institutions. What proof of their ignorance or insincerity does he offer? None at all, except the implication that they seem to be almost unanimous in their conclusions that the blight of war can perhaps be solved by an American collaboration in some plan of universal collective security.

Mr. Beard offers no evidence of "unscientific method" on the part of these scholars. He ignores the possibility that scientific investigation of the subject of war and peace may lead the majority of scholars in the field of international relations to the conclusion that American consultation in international affairs is probably the most immediate road to peace and justice.

It is indeed true that hundreds of teachers of international relations in Harvard, Princeton, Columbia, Chicago, Illinois, Wisconsin, Northwestern, California, and many other universities and colleges, after long study of the question, have concluded that world peace can probably be secured only by active participation of the United States with the other foreign powers. It ought to be significant that such is their conclusion.

It is also true that the investigations of the great research institutions like the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Brookings Institution, the Council on Foreign Relations, and the Twentieth Century Fund have tended to the same conclusion. None of them, of course, has a monopoly on the truth. But if the extensive application of scholarship represented in these centers of learning leads to the hypothesis that war can be avoided only by collective action, this conclusion ought to carry some weight with persons who are seeking a remedy for war by thinking rather than by appeals to emotion.

EVIDENCE UNCONVINCING

Assumption No. 4 is related to Mr. Beard's charge that President Roosevelt has embarked on a "vast and risky program of world pacification," that he has resolved "to act as a kind of arbiter in world affairs," and that he and Secretary Hull contemplate "running the foreign affairs of the United States on the basis of constant participation in the quarrels of Europe and Asia, with war as their ultima ratio." The evidence offered in proof of these indictments does not appear very convincing, and attention is herewith called to this part of the essay simply because of Mr. Beard's implication that the teachers in our colleges and universities desire the President to pursue such a policy.

The use of this assumption suggests a doubt as to whether or not Mr. Beard has lost touch with the realities of American education or whether he understands the proposals of the scholars whom he attacks. Certainly, their writings do not show that they believe the United States must "accept the obligation of directing world destiny." Most of them believe that the best interests of the United States require not that we should direct but that we should cooperate with other democratic states, or indeed with any kind of states, whether dictatorships or democracies, that desire to preserve peace and render justice. Some believe that this cooperation should be limited to consultation with a view to implementing the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Others would go so far as to join in economic and financial boycotts. Others would even have us participate in reviving the League of Nations or some other form of international organization.

None of our colleagues has proposed that the United States should dictate or that it has the power to dictate, the destiny of the family of nations. To do so would be the very negation of the first principle of a widely accepted conclusion—namely, international cooperation. It is hoped that under such a cooperative system the United States would throw its influence on the side of the peacemakers and thus tend to turn the scales in favor of law. It is hoped also that the United States would be wise enough always to throw its weight on the side of those nations which desire to accomplish justice by peaceful change and thus secure those economic readjustments that promote peace rather than war. It is something of a shock to find a vigorous fighter for law, justice, and good faith, as Mr. Beard has been, so cynically sneering at the attempts of our Government to uphold somehow the sanctity of international law and of treaties, such as the Nine Power Treaty and the Kellog Pact, and so coldly indifferent to brutal international aggressions and outlawry.

CHALLENGE TO BRAINS

Of course, it is possible that there will never be a bloc of states which, even with the support of the United States, will be sufficiently strong to keep the peace without resort to war. If so, our civilization is probably doomed. We know that since the birth of our Republic in 1776 there have been three World Wars—the French Revolutionary Wars, the Napoleonic Wars, and the War of 1914–18. We know that unwillingly this Nation has been dragged into every one of these catastrophes. It would therefore seem sensible to discover, if we can, some method by which war can be avoided for ourselves as well as for others. Surely, it is not unpatriotic or un-American to suggest international collaboration for the avoidance of war. The failure to achieve that end should be a challenge to our scientific wits (Mr. Beard's very clever wits included) and not ground for unscholarly sneers.

So far as President Roosevelt is concerned, there is no evidence, even if we include the "quarantine" speech of October 5, 1937, that justifies Mr. Beard's insinuation that the President is using foreign quarrels to divert the "giddy minds" of the American people from domestic problems. The only proof that Mr. Beard offers to support his charge that the internationalists expect the President of the United States to direct the destiny of the world is a sentence from Walter Lippmann, bad enough as it was printed, but which Mr. Beard tears from its original context and twists and distorts into still more ugly meaning. This commentator once wrote that "America has preponderant power and decisive influence in the affairs of the world." Obviously he meant that the United States is such a potent combination of men and technology that when we throw our weight into the scales of international competition we give ascendancy to the states on our side of the balance.

DISTORTION CLAIMED

Pouncing upon the unfortunate word "preponderant," Mr. Beard, by the aid of an undeniably authoritative dictionary of the English language, causes the columnist to say what he did not mean to say, namely, that the United States outweighs the rest of the world. This kind of labored distortion is not like the Charles Beard we have known and admired; and even if there were no distortion at all of Walter Lippmann's argument, it would hardly prove that either the President or teachers in our universities are misleading giddy American minds with quixotic schemes for guiding the course of the entire world from the White House in Washington.

Assumption No. 5 is the implication that the United States has little to gain from foreign trade. Nowhere in this essay does Mr. Beard attempt to weigh the pros and cons of foreign trade as a factor in national prosperity. But in several places he injects the implication that the country has little to gain from international commerce and much to lose through its possible entanglements. He belittles the China trade with ridicule, the weakest of arguments among thoughtful people, and actually says: "Despite tons of diplomatic notes, despite gunboats, marines, soldiers, Open Doors, and all the rest, the trade of the United States with China has been and remains relatively insignificant."

CHINA TRADE VALUABLE

Mr. Beard is, of course, entitled to his definition of "significant." But the New England prosperity resting on the proceeds of the China trade at the beginning of the nineteenth century would seem to have some significance. Even more than this, 20 years ago China was our second best customer for tobacco, being exceeded only by Great Bratain, and surpassing Germany, France, and Italy. In those years we exported over 40 percent of the tobacco grown in the United States. As late as 1931, China stood in the fourth place as an importer of American raw cotton. In buying over a million bales of our cotton a year, she was surpassed only by Germany, Great Britain, and Japan. Finally, before the World War, China ranked only second to the Philippines in the importation of American piece goods. These are, we think, significant facts.

Mr. Beard's contempt for foreign trade is not shared by the economists of the United States. Most of the studies in our universities as well as in such research centers as the Brookings Institution show that national prosperity is powerfully promoted by external commerce. The calamitous situation of the world today only too eloquently proclaims the fact that the desertion of foreign trade in the quest for self-sufficiency invites war and imperialism.

Obviously, the spread of capital goods into countries which formerly imported chiefly consumers' goods will develop regional economic systems and tend to lessen foreign trade. Likewise, the opening of new fields of raw products—such as cotton in Egypt, India, and China—will also curtail foreign commerce with countries which, like the United States, formerly supplied the world with these raw materials. But even so, new industrial enterprises which expand the purchasing power of many countries and increase the amount and variety of economic wants have ever tended to counterbalance any decline in foreign trade due to realinement of industrial areas. Thus it is reasonable to expect in the future a continuing and perhaps increasing volume of international trade in which it should be the ambition of all countries to share.

Finally, we enter protest against resort to the sophistry of employing Washington's Farewell Address as proof of the present necessity to pursue a policy of isolation. The Farewell Address is a matter of historical record, and it is true that in 1796 Washington actually admonished this Nation in the following words: "The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible."

ARGUMENT NOT VALID

Mr. Beard rings the changes on the tenacious heritage bequeathed us by the Father of his Country. This appeal to authority however, is specious. Washington's proposal for an isolation policy almost 150 years ago is not necessarily a valid argument for isolation today. George Washington saw fit to cultivate his large Virginia plantation with slaves; this fact would certainly not be accepted as an adequate defense of slavery at the present time. Again, the Father of his Country viewed with alarm many democratic tendencies; he actually participated in the drafting of a Constitution which was consciously designed to prevent the growth of political parties; surely Mr. Beard would not accept this circumstance as a proper mandate for the abolition of all political parties in the America of the twentieth century.

More than this, any historian who uses the Farewell Address as an argument for isolation in the nineteenth century is simply trying to pull the wool over his readers' eyes. In this historic document Washington took pains to say: "With me a predominant motive has been to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress without interruption to that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the

command of its own resources." It is obvious that Washington placed a time limitation upon his counsels. To cite one part of the Farewell Address without the other is little less than misrepresentation, assuming, of course, that the person who thus misquotes Washington has been careful enough to read the entire address.

The Farewell Address was superb counsel for its time and place. The time was 150 years ago. The place was a poor, little struggling Republic, in a world where republics were new and monarchies were, as Rousseau described them, ravaging wolves. In the period when we were weak and when our form of government was experimental, isolation may have been an admirable policy. But today we are the most powerful articulation of people and resources in the history of the world. Today our form of government is no longer an experiment in federalism and republicanism. Consequently it does not follow that the foreign policy recommended by Washington for the gangling young Republic should guide the continental empire of 1939.

LESS BARBAROUS WORLD

Washington himself must have had this future of his country in mind when, on another occasion, he said: "I consider how mankind may be connected, like one great family, in fraternal ties. I indulge a fond, perhaps an enthusiastic, idea that as the world is much less barbarous than it has been, its melioration must still be progressive * * * that the period is not very remote when the benefits of a liberal and free commerce will pretty generally succeed to the devastation of war. And I most sincerely and devoutly wish that the exertions of those having this view may effect what human nature cries aloud for—general peace."

In these sentiments George Washington was indeed far ahead of his time and seemed to be arguing for international cooperation and international organization—indeed, for something like a league of nations rather than for isolation. At any rate, if we are in these days to be guided by Washington's advice, it should be clear that the isolationists, including Mr. Beard, have no monopoly on that advice.

FACTS IMPORTANT

The author tells us: "Those Americans who refuse to plunge blindly into the maelstrom of European and Asiatic politics are not defeatists nor neurotics. They are giving evidence of sanity, not cowardice; of adult thinking as distinguished from infantilism."

It is obvious that refusal to plunge blindly is evidence of sanity. There is no need of writing an essay to prove that. Most of the teachers and scholars whom Mr. Beard excoriates simply propose that the American people be not blind to some of the facts of these troubled days. They call attention to the inventions and social developments that are making this globe a smaller world, with the result that no nation can live unto itself. They point to the trends of history, indicating that the domestic policy and institutions of every nation are profoundly affected by the external policies of other nations, and vice versa. They challenge the claim of the isolationists that nations can be immunized from the ravages of war, and propose to seek a solution based on the reasonable cooperation of all nations, including America.

CLARENCE A. BERDAHL,
University of Illinois.
KENNETH COLEGROVE,
Northwestern University.
WALTER RICE SHARP,
University of Wisconsin.
QUINCY WRIGHT,
University of Chicago.

EVANSTON, ILL., *November 7, 1939.*

The Part of the Farmer in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. BURTON
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 31 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY L. J. TABER

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address by Hon. L. J. Taber, master of the National Grange, delivered on the Grange hour, on July 19, 1941, on the subject The Part of the Farmer in National Defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The preservation of the four freedoms here in the United States is the supreme challenge of this generation. It can only be done by adequate national defense and an abundance of food. George Washington and his ragged, rugged, rural Continentals left their blood-stained foot tracks in the snows of Valley Forge; but to bring the victory of Yorktown, food was as essential as were munitions and leadership.

A starving army cannot long survive. The farmer today, in producing the first essentials for victory, has a real struggle. As an illustration, I have a letter from a Wisconsin farmer in which he says:

"I have had three hired men in the last 6 months. The first was taken by the draft, the second left in 60 days for an airplane factory, and the third found a job where with overtime he could quadruple his farm wages. Farm work and 20 cows compelled my wife and daughter to ride the tractor and help with the milking. We are keeping ahead of the requested 8-percent milk increase for cheese and powdered-milk factories. This leaves little time for Grange or community work."

A woman from New York writes: "Drought and high costs are terribly discouraging. All our children have now left the farm, as the youngest boy was taken by the draft. Father and I are past 60. It is pretty hard to answer the patriotic urge of helping America and Britain with more eggs, more milk, and more pork. We are doing our best but isn't there some way we can get some help?"

From Texas comes a similar note. Instead of drought, however, it is too much rain. A young farmer writes: "I have one tractor and some fair farm equipment, I cannot afford to buy more. I cannot get help. My wife and my 14-year-old boy keep the tractor going in daylight. I run it at night."

These three widely scattered glimpses tell the story of the farmer's part in national defense. In 1917 and 1918, agriculture lost more than a million young men in the industrial and military draft; nevertheless, our farmers cultivated 25,000,000 acres more land to produce the food to feed America and the Allies and to bring victory. The farmer will make history repeat.

THE FARMER AND THE NATION

Agriculture will support the Government's program for national defense and for making this Nation strong. America must be made impregnable. It must be done with all possible speed. We have a 50-50 chance to keep out of the war in Europe by doing a heroic, self-sacrificing, efficient production task at home. Just as machines will win the war, so food will help preserve morale in England and at home. The farmer fights for freedom; he fights for justice; he fights for national defense. He asks only that he receive equivalent compensation, consideration, and reward with industry, capital, and labor. The farmer will oppose any freezing of prices or any price-fixing program unless and until he is assured that manufactured articles, labor, profits, and salaries will receive the same treatment from the hands of governmental authority.

The farmer cannot gear his production to changes as quickly as can transportation and business. This is well brought out in the wheat crisis. Many farmers feel the injustice of placing a quota on a crop that was planted in good faith last fall. The Canadian farmer has a 7-cent less penalty than the American and the Canadian dollar is now depreciated, so that the farmer north of the boundary could pay the 42-cent tariff, take back American money, exchange it for his own currency and have from 10 to 20 cents more per bushel than our farmers growing wheat beyond their quota.

The Grange suggests that any farmer who has overproduced, who will agree to cut future acreage, be allowed to feed this year's wheat to poultry, dairy cows, or hogs, the three items on which increased production is requested for defense purposes. Instead of making this penalty wheat and taxing it, put it to a defense and patriotic use. This is sound common sense, good for America, good for the farmer and good for national defense. The wheat situation only emphasizes continued need of being on guard to enable the farmer to take his full and rightful place in the defense program. Scarcity leads to weakness. Controlled abundance leads to strength and power. We must adjust farm prices upward to enable agriculture to employ labor, to secure new equipment and take care of the growing needs of the consuming public.

It must not be forgotten that the farmer has been at a price disadvantage since 1920 when compared with prices of manufactured goods or labor prices. There was too much skyrocketing of all prices during the last war. In 1920 and 1921 farm prices dropped to unheard-of levels, but manufactured prices and labor dropped less than half as fast as did farm commodities. There was a rise in prices again in the 1926–29 period, but in the great collapse of 1930–33 farm prices again fell more rapidly than wages or the price of manufactured goods. In other words, the farmer has been laboring under a price disadvantage for full 20 years. He should have an increase of approximately 20 percent in prices before he reaches equality with other groups.

EQUITABLE FARM PRICES

Justice requires that the farmer receive price parity in this emergency. The 85-percent-loan program is of value. However, the Grange demands other constructive steps. About one-fourth of our agricultural wealth is represented by the five staples of wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, and rice. The other three-fourths of the Nation's food producers must also have equitable prices and fair returns. Marketing orders, Surplus Commodity Corporation purchases, the food-stamp plan, purchases for the Allies, Government purchases for Army camps, and the lease-lend program can help lift prices. Collective bargaining and cooperative marketing must be used to the limit to help agriculture. Our best organized rural groups have suffered the least from price inequality. Every farmer, large or small, East or West, North

or South, organized or unorganized, whether landowner, sharecropper, or tenant, must have price justice. In this battle for the farmer, the Grange insists that by legislation, administration, and self-help methods we must enable rural people to secure sufficient income to make our calling of greater service to the Republic.

Just as a hungry army cannot long win victories, so an impoverished agriculture cannot promote national defense. In addition to increased prices, and larger volume of present farm products, we must develop new uses, new plants, and new crops that can be grown somewhere in the continental United States. Our million Grange members have contributed pots and pans to the aluminum drive. From the soil, however, can come farm products of equal value. Soybeans, oat hulls, cotton linters, and other farm commodities can be made into plastics of a thousand different forms. The chemist, the manufacturer, the scientist, and the chemurgic worker can aid the farmer in finding defense substitutes for metals and materials of which there may be a shortage. As a result of increased prices and increased demand, we can use these steps to protect agriculture during this crisis. More important, we can feed and clothe not only the United States and Britain, but we can provide now and in the future a limitless amount of raw materials for our factories, both in civilian and defense needs.

DANGER SIGNALS

The storm across the sea brings danger signals nearer to all. One of the byproducts of war is the curse of inflation that has brought misery and suffering after every great conflict in history. All patriotic Americans must guard against the dangers of inflation and the destructive spiral that begins to operate when prices, costs, and wages chase themselves up the ladder, bringing no advantages to any group, and followed by the disastrous and sickening thud of deflation that inevitably must ensue.

There is danger of overexpansion in prices in a period of great defense and deficit spending. This can be counteracted in two ways; first, by a just and equitable tax structure that compels every American citizen to make an equitable contribution to the defense of the Republic. And second, by intelligent organization and cooperation of all groups that will check unreasonable inflation. Only when both steps fail should the Government step in. In addition, there must be wise planning for the post-war period, that is inevitable. Hitler will be crushed. All of us devoutly pray for an early collapse of the dictator states. But whether soon or late, the period of peace and readjustment will come. We must prepare for the greatest dislocations that agriculture and the world has ever seen. The Grange is keenly conscious of its responsibility and is working now toward the necessary steps and program to enable agriculture to play its part in world readjustment and to prevent the crucifixion of agriculture that we had after the last war.

NATIONAL UNITY IMPERATIVE

This leads directly to the challenge of national unity. There is nothing more important in America than to promote understanding, teamwork, and progress, and this can only be made possible when business, agriculture, and labor are willing to sit down without bitterness or publicity and frankly face the great problems that threaten the Nation. We must think of victory before we think of ourselves. We must think of this Republic before we think of our own calling. We must remember the consumer at all times and, above all, must try to develop a spirit of tolerance. We have too much bitterness, too much unwillingness, to believe that the other man differing from us may well be a patriotic, God-fearing American, ready when the need comes to give his blood and his all that the American way of life may survive. We can only preserve freedom and liberty by preserving the democratic processes, remembering at the same time that true liberty means restraint, tolerance, discipline; yet no sympathizer of Hitler or the dictator states has a right to the protection of the Stars and Stripes.

THE FARMER FIGHTS AGAIN

Since 1776 and long before that historic birthday of freedom the farmer has been in the forefront of every battle for human liberty. Today the machine age and mass production and distribution have created the need for a Government much stronger than Jefferson or Jackson or Lincoln ever considered necessary to preserve our institutions. Big government, big business, and big labor are projected into the field of national life. Every eleventh American is on some Government pay roll, not including the Work Projects Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, and similar activities. Labor claims 10,000,000 strong. Big business is almost 100 percent organized. The greatest battle for freedom and defense that agriculture has ever fought will not be on the bloodstained field of carnage but in the field of organization. Only by building agriculture, only by making it strong enough to be the great balance wheel between labor, government, and industry can our children still climb the rugged heights to freedom and equality of opportunity.

This year the National Grange celebrates its diamond jubilee. We call on every tiller of the soil to join with us in protecting rural life. From ocean to ocean our members celebrate this occasion by emphasizing patriotic service, increased membership, building a better community life and laying the foundation for a great Grange headquarters in Washington, honoring our founders and helping to make the Grange perpetual. Without a stronger Grange and better organized rural life, we cannot preserve the institutions of our fathers. A great forward Grange movement is essential for the benefit of the open country and the Nation as well. With the clarion call of patriotism, comes a new demand and new need for a Grange continually increasing in membership, service and power.

Without sacrifice there can be no glorious achievement. In thinking of America and victory, we must think soberly of the future of our Republic in this grave hour. All must be willing to rededicate themselves to the priceless privilege of helping to make America the world's greatest bulwark of defense against the enemies of human freedom. We can help defend this land of ours from the dangers of confusion from within, and ruthless dictators from without. We can build an economic defense program preventing collapse when world turmoil ends. To organized agriculture comes the opportunity of being a cardinal part in building an America that will be the hope of the Western Hemisphere and the guiding star of liberty and freedom for all mankind.

Starvation in Small Democracies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 31 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ADDRESS BY MRS. EVE GARRETTE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered on July 19, 1941, as a part of the National Grange Hour by Mrs. Eve Garrette of New York City on the subject Shall the Small Democracies Starve?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL THE SMALL DEMOCRACIES STARVE?

Good morning. For this is a good morning in these United States of America, this typical Saturday morning which all of us take for granted. This morning of filling iceboxes and pantry shelves to overflowing with food for Sunday; this morning of cake baking and pie making and roasting meats—of kitchens fragrant with fine mouth-watering aromas of good food cooking—and rosy, well-fed children running in to say, "Mother, I'm hungry," or "Mother, when do we eat?" Yes; this is indeed a good morning in these United States of America. One for which we should give solemn thanks.

For, as I speak to you, and as millions of you listen, across the sea as many millions just like you and me—our kind of people—are facing starvation. People who are not enemies, but friends. Decent, self-respecting, freedom-loving people who once fought gallantly for freedom by Britain's side for the cause we champion too. They are the people of Poland and Belgium and Norway and Holland—nations that have been our lifelong national friends. They are the sturdy, civilized stocks that have helped to build America's greatness—they are the blood relatives of 20,000,000 American citizens.

Lest it be forgotten in these grim days of swift change, may I remind you that these people already know the terror of war from the skies; they have already seen their homes destroyed; their families scattered and lost; their personal world come to an end. They know all about the humiliation of surrender; the ignominy of subjugation to Hitler's armies. These peaceful, kindly Christian peoples of the little democracies of Europe have nothing more to learn of the horror of war itself. Yet, as I speak, they know war's most dreadful aftermath. Hunger, pestilence, decay, and degradation. On this good Saturday morning, those are the specters that sit at every table in Poland and Belgium and Norway and Holland.

On this Saturday morning, over there, millions of women have been standing since dawn in long weary lines hoping to buy their weekly ration of meat—1 ounce; millions of mothers are receiving their daily ration of milk for the babies in their arms—1 pint; and millions of housewives are stirring up a bit of flour and sawdust and hot-water in a pot, calling it dinner for their families, while listless, pale children stand drearily by—too tired to play, too tired to cry of hunger even. Milk? Eggs? Butter? The life-giving, life-nourishing foods? They are only words over there. Just as America, the land of plenty and abundance, of granaries bursting with surpluses is the land of their only hope.

AMERICA IS THEIR ONLY HOPE

For the people of the little conquered democracies look to us to save them before it is too late. They know that America is the only country in the world today possessed of the power to save them from the most dreadful fate known to suffering humanity—the fate of famine, the fate of transformation from normal, decent human beings into a derelict, disintegrated, and demoralized humanity. They appeal to America, because they know that the force of American public opinion is the most powerful force in the world today. You and I make up that opinion. The responsibility is yours and mine. Therefore, when these innocent starving people appeal to America, they appeal to you and to me, and upon you and me rests their

fate. So let us consider carefully the merits of their case, of good and civilized and Christian people whose only crime is that they were defeated in a war they never made.

These little democracies do not come to us as beggars. They do not ask for charity, unless compassion itself is the highest form of charity. They have the funds in this country with which to buy the food they so desperately need. They are frantic to buy from us; they ask, and they ask pitifully, that we sell to them out of our own abundant stores in order that they may be kept alive and self-respecting human beings until this dreadful war is over. They ask that we raise our voice to bring them aid, before it is too late. The case of the hungry little democracies is as simple as that.

OUR PROUDEST TRADITION CHALLENGED

It is also a challenge to our proudest national tradition. For America is the great humanitarian Nation of the world; it is the only Nation in the world that has ever undertaken great humane works in behalf of people outside its own boundaries. Therefore, a strong, authoritative voice has been raised in America to succor the helpless democracies, through the medium of a Nation-wide committee, already known to many of you as the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies. Herbert Hoover, the world's foremost expert on mass relief administration, the man who once fed half of the world when half the world was starving and who is still revered in many foreign lands, is honorary chairman of the committee. Its roster is comprised of 900 of our most distinguished and responsible citizens, from every State in the Union. Back of the national committee are 4,000 local committees, representing many millions of Americans, all dedicated to the proposition that a way be found to save millions of innocent lives, all dedicated to the proposition of being true to our finest instincts as Americans.

For in these days of a world completely dislocated, you and I specially cherish our heritage of decency; we cling to the honest things we have been taught—the honest and decent things that give us pride in our own souls. And we have been taught that when others are hungry and cold and in human despair, we should be ashamed of ourselves, we are unworthy of ourselves, unless we do something to help them. We all know that to show compassion toward those less fortunate than we is the foundation stone of our religious faith—it is being true to ourselves and our deepest spiritual convictions.

A WAY MUST BE FOUND

Because of our deep spiritual conviction we have an overwhelming desire to help our hungry friends across the sea. We cannot justify our living in plenty—sitting down to three good meals a day—without wanting to save from starvation millions of innocent people. Therefore, the great body of American public opinion and American spiritual leadership is vocal in demanding that a way be found to save these people. Furthermore, public opinion does not consider the difficulties insurmountable. It is well remembered that once before when starvation's blight fell upon the world in the midst of a great World War, millions were rescued from hunger and disease and degeneration without affecting in any way whatever the military outcome. American brains, American ingenuity and American devotion to the cause of humanity found a way. Millions of American citizens firmly believe that what was done once, can be done again. They go further. They say, it must be done again, for the sake of the realities as well as the moralities of this crisis.

And it is here that I should like to address myself particularly to my women listeners. For it is the women who are swift to recognize the vital need of feeding the starving peoples of Europe's best racial strains, because there is stark danger in disregarding their desperate plight. Like the farmer, every mother is imbued with the instinct of looking forward to the harvest at planting time. She recognizes the imperative necessity of proper feeding if there is to be a harvest. She knows that no child can grow up well and strong without proper feeding. She also knows that her own children will have to live in the same world with other women's children, and, if she is to safeguard the future of her own children in that world, she must be deeply concerned about the kind of men and women other women's children grow up to be. Does any mother want the child she so carefully nourishes—she so carefully protects from harm and danger—the child she loves so dearly, to have to live in a world that may be made by children of starvation? Wolfish, animal, mindless children of starvation bred on hate? What sort of a world will they make? Is that not the very danger facing every mother in this land today? With the very prospect that the millions and millions of children in hungry Europe—the millions who are already suffering from the diseases that sign their death warrant where normal adulthood is concerned—the millions who are already dead, but do not die because it is the tragedy of famine that so many of its victims cannot die, are not these other women's children already a very present menace to America's children, unless something is done, and quickly, to rehabilitate them.

AS THOUGHTFUL WOMEN SEE IT

Thoughtful American women are alive to the danger of the present crisis. They recognize clearly that the argument, "Wait until the war is over, then we will feed our hungry friends in Europe" is not good enough, for "wait until after the war is over" sounds much too far away. And as women their every natural instinct is revolted at the thought that, living in this well-fed land of plenty and superabundance of calories and vitamins, anyone can callously condemn millions of innocents to starvation. They do not wish to so condemn them. They recall that there was One who said, "Suffer the little children to come unto Me." They ask, "Dare we forget that? Dare we say 'Suffer the little children to suffer'"? As a matter of fact, it is doubtful whether any American worthy of the name is not desirous of helping the hungry. Only the popular fear that by helping the hungry, Hitler shall also be helped has been the restraining influence.

The question as to whether these peoples can be fed without helping Hitler is an academic one. The pros and cons are argued and argued and argued, still no one knows whether or not it can be done, because the test has not actually been made. And until the test is made, the question continues academic. And now gallant England, fighting for her life, finds herself in the position of requiring food from us. We are asked to conserve food for England and we wish to conserve food for England. We are glad to do so. But what of the claims of our friends in Belgium, Poland, Norway, Holland, upon us? Can we in good conscience deny their need? If we propose food for England, must we not also propose food for the little democracies—England's friends and allies, and ours? Must we at least not make the attempt to aid them? So widespread has become the crystallization of American public opinion on this very point that a formula be found for feeding the little democracies, and at once, that it has become a matter of congressional interest. There is pending both in the Senate and the House of Representatives a resolution asking that our Government, cooperating with the British Government, work out as quickly as possible the setting up of systematic and definite relief for all of the stricken and hungry countries, beginning with Belgium, where the need is now most acute.

If you feel that this resolution deserves your support, a letter or telegram to your Senator or Congressman here in Washington will aid in speeding the day when the trial be made of feeding the hungry. For until the test be made, can there be rest for us in our comfortable homes at night? Can we eat with appetite the food that is set before us every day—the good juicy meat, the potatoes, the bread and butter and pie and cake? Can we watch our children grow stronger and healthier every day, well-nourished on good food—knowing that our helpless friends' children are hungry? Fellow Americans, I ask you this direct question. Not even to try to help our helpless friends, is it not unthinkable?

Advice by an Ex-Service Man to a Draftee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 31 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

LETTER FROM THE ATLANTIC CITY (N. J.) PRESS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, one of my friends and constituents, a leading member of the bar in Atlantic City, N. J., Mr. Harry Gottlieb, has requested me to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a reader's editorial taken from the Atlantic City Press, Atlantic City, N. J., embodying a letter written by an ex-service man to a draftee, giving advice and inspiration to the draftee, in the nature of a big-brother communication.

I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlantic City (N. J.) Press]

A READER'S EDITORIAL

A reader sends copy of letter mailed by an Atlantic City resident to a boy in the military service. We think it provides today's best editorial:

DEAR ———: I have your letter of the 7th. I really don't know how you find time to write all the letters you have written since you entered the service. Your letters home show that you are happy and satisfied with this turn in your life.

I was hoping that you would take it that way. I think you and I have a few traits in common, and I had the feeling that you would feel about the service as I did back in the first World War. It never occurred to me when I went into the service that I was performing a duty to my country, but rather I felt that it was a privilege to serve a country which I loved so much. Some people are a little backward in showing their enthusiasm and love for their country. They think it is a sign of weakness, but I never concealed the fact that I get a sincere thrill in the passing of an American flag or the playing of the national anthem, and always get goose pimples on each of such events. As far as time in the service is concerned, I never considered that it was wasted, or that I could have accomplished more with my life if I hadn't given almost 2 years of service to my country. In fact, I am convinced more

than ever that a man's life is not complete unless he has given some time for military duty for his country. As the years go by, I feel that my life has been fuller and more satisfactory by reason of that military life, and if my health is good today, with these many years of worry and work, I attribute a great deal of that good health to the life I lived in the American Army.

I hope you don't think that this is idle flag waving, because I never meant anything more sincerely in all my life. I know that you have the same attitude, but I believe these few words will crystallize these thoughts in your mind. You, too, now have an opportunity to serve, and serve a country well worth-while. Serve it to the utmost and to the best of your capacity. But I know even before these words are written that you could do no less. Keep in mind that you are serving your country in a just and unselfish cause, and that each man's service to that cause is vitally important to the preservation of the liberty and happiness which its people have enjoyed since its creation.

As ever,

YOUR BIG BROTHER.

Is the Present Administration's Foreign Policy Leading the United States to War?

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the American people within the last week have had revealed to them the extent to which the administration apparently is going toward involving this Nation in a shooting war, with our Army still unprepared and unequipped and without any approval, advice, or consent of the Congress or of the people themselves.

It has been noted in these comments for the past 2 years that most of the accurate information about the administration's foreign policy does not come from Washington, but from London. In these comments for the past 2 years events have been foretold and movements and policies of the administration have been foreseen accurately by statements coming out of London. At the very time when the administration was denying it intended to do certain of these things officials of the British Government were saying the United States did intend to do these things. In practically every case the administration did do exactly what London officials said it would despite New Deal denials to the contrary.

Again we have such a situation confronting the American people. The country is against war. The people of the Nation are overwhelmingly opposed to the country being taken into a world-wide war. The people do not like and do not want any close hook-up between the bloody dictatorship of Joe Stalin in Russia and the free constitutional republic of the United States of America. But within the matter of a few days, Harry Hopkins, superboss of the $7,000,000,000 lend-lease-give program, arrived in London secretly; made a speech in which he bluntly told the British something the American people have not been told—that American warships are convoying materials to Britain alongside British warships; Prime Minister Churchill tells the House of Commons and the British Nation that the United States "is giving us aid on a gigantic scale, and is advancing in rising wrath and conviction to the very verge of war" with Germany; immediately thereafter we hear that Mr. Hopkins is in Moscow clasping the bloody hand of the Russian dictator, Joe Stalin.

It is exceedingly disquieting that the record of the past 2 years or more so completely bears out the fact that whenever some high British official in London announces that the United States is going to do something, or that the administration is going to follow a given policy, it always turns out to be true. It will be a direful thing for the American people, especially the sons of millions of American fathers and mothers, if Churchill's positive, emphatic, and unqualified statement that the United States is "advancing in rising wrath and conviction to the very verge of war" proves to be as accurate as other British official announcements have proved to be.

It has not been very many days since the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox, gave a congressional committee the most solemn and emphatic assurance that American naval craft were not being used in convoy service along with the British Navy in getting aid to Britain. Yet it is inconceivable that Harry Hopkins, bosom friend and adviser of the President of the United States, would broadcast to Britain and Germany, and all other countries who listened in on his world-wide broadcast, that the United States naval craft are patrolling "alongside" and "parallel with" British naval craft, unless that were the fact. The American people are entitled to some immediate explanation of this absolute contradiction between Secretary of the Navy Knox's statements to congressional committees and Super-Lend-Lease-Administrator Harry Hopkins' statements to the British people and the whole wide world.

It is disheartening when we stop to realize that the American people have stood aghast at the bloody despotism of Joe Stalin and his cohorts, who have killed off the intelligent and leading citizens, priests, and teachers of Russia. It has been but a matter of a few months since Mr. Roosevelt himself and all of his responsible spokesmen, along with the American people, were condemning out of hand the unjustified and cowardly attacks by Joe Stalin's military hordes against the brave people of little Finland. No more do we hear from the White House or from administration spokesmen any kind words for brave little Finland, which was the only nation in the world who, despite all hardships and sacrifices, honorably met her payments on the interest and principal of her debt to the United States. Instead of that, we now find that Mr. Roosevelt's bosom companion, friend, and adviser, Harry Hopkins, is in Moscow, dining and preparing to give the products of American workers and American taxpayers' dollars into the hands of this bloody Russian despotism.

What strange events indeed have come out of this war for the United States of America.

The American people are entitled to more explanation and information than they are being given; and if they are betrayed into a shooting war by the administration, the wrath of the American people will be terrible to behold.

And yet these events—Hopkins' speech about American naval vessels convoying British-aid ships, Churchill's declaration that the United States is advancing to the verge of war with Germany, and Hopkins' presence in Moscow—all are warnings to the American people that they had better begin to demand in no uncertain terms that their Representatives in Congress fulfill their constitutional function of representing the people by demanding information and enlightenment—and seeing that it is given—on the operations of a little clique of willful men and women who want to plunge this Nation in bloody warfare up to its neck.

Price Fixing

REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much lately about price fixing.

I notice that bills will be introduced in both Houses today dealing with a price-fixing program.

I have requested this time for the purpose of outlining what I believe to be a sound, common sense, fair, constructive formula to be used if we are to have a price-fixing program.

I am one of those who believe that we should have a price-fixing program provided we deal fairly with all groups. Otherwise, we are bound to enter into an inflationary period such as we have never seen in the history of this country.

The sad thing about inflation is that it not only plays havoc with consumers when prices are continually advancing, but when deflation sets in it plays havoc with producers and millions of innocent people who are turned out of employment.

Well-organized groups are in a better position to handle their business affairs when deflation sets in than these millions of unorganized people.

Industry, for instance, can slow down and, if need be, close down, turning out their employees; in the meantime maintaining a fixed price, gradually liquidating their high-priced goods.

I realize that price fixing is a very complicated proposition. However, if we are to have price fixing, we should consider every angle and every item entering into the picture. All groups should be considered and dealt with on a fair and equitable basis.

PRICE-FIXING FORMULA

First. We should ascertain a fair value for farm products, raw materials; call it parity, if you please. Suppose we find that cotton should sell for 20 cents per pound; cottonseed, $50 per ton; wheat for $1.50 per bushel; and so on down the line.

Second. Then we should determine a fair selling price for the manufacturer, taking into consideration the cost of the raw material, wages, and every other item entering into the cost to the manufacturer, adding thereon a fair profit; thereby setting up a fair and proper differential between the farmer's price, or the price of the raw material, and the manufacturer's price.

Third. On the same basis, a proper differential should be set up between the manufacturer's price and the selling price of the jobber and wholesaler to the retailer.

Fourth. The retailer's price should be fixed including a fair profit.

Fifth. This price-fixing program should be continued on a fair-price basis on agricultural products and raw materials after the war until the real emergency is over. Otherwise you will find, as was the case following the last World War, farm prices will decline far below the cost of production, which will not only bankrupt the agricultural interests of this country, but will tend to destroy wage earners and business.

Any other price-fixing scheme dealing only with the manufacturer, or leaving out a proper program, after the war, as stated, in maintaining a fair price on farm products or raw materials, will certainly not do the job.

Suppose you put a price ceiling on cotton goods, leaving the farmer's price and the consumer's price wide open. Then you will find that the manufacturer, cotton and wheat buyers, those operating between the manufacturer and the cotton and wheat farmers, will be in a position to push the farmer's price down the hill.

The same thing is true on the consumer's end; that is, those operating between the manufacturer and the consumer will be in a position to push the consumer's price skyward.

There are just lots of people who are operating between farmers and consumers, many of whom are nothing more nor less than real parasites. As a matter of fact, this is the major problem of farmers and consumers today.

My program of price fixing deals fairly with all groups, including labor. In the meantime, it will tend to hold down and weed out useless parasites and speculators, both of whom never produced a living thing, but who, from day to day, are sapping the very lifeblood out of farmers and consumers.

Open Letter to Wendell Willkie From America First Committee of Southern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 31 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

LETTER WRITTEN BY JOHN L. WHEELER

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter which was addressed to Mr. Willkie, when he spoke in the city of Los Angeles, by the America First Committee, and which was written by my son as acting chairman of that committee. My son quotes Mr. Willkie when he spoke at Rushville, Ind., when he said:

I shall never lead this country into any European war, and when I say that I mean it.

I ask unanimous consent that that open letter be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO MR. WILLKIE

DEAR MR. WILLKIE: It is the earnest hope of thoughtful citizens in every walk of life that our Nation shall be united in this time of world chaos. We believe, however, that national unity is more than an oratorical flourish and can only be achieved by strict adherence to the fundamental concept that national policy must be based on "the consent of the governed." To proceed on any other basis is to adopt the totalitarian pattern of the Nazi and Communist dictatorships which challenges our democratic way of life.

Our Nation was united by the pledges of all candidates in the last Presidential campaign—that we would never participate in any foreign wars. Poland, Norway, Holland, Denmark, Belgium, and France had already been overwhelmed by the Nazis, and Britain was reeling from the shock of devastating air bombardment. Yet at Rushville, Ind., you promised:

"I shall never lead this country into any European war, and when I say that I mean it."

And at Boston, President Roosevelt pledged:

"And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent to any foreign wars.

"They are going into training to form a force so strong that by its very existence it will keep the threat of war away from our shores. Yes, the purpose of our defense is defense."

Today an overwhelming majority of our people—some 80 percent, representing a far greater vote than any candidate received—are still united in their determination that we shall not enter any war to aid Britain or Russia, defeat Hitler or Finland. There is a national unity in this purpose which is greater than it has been on many issues affecting our national existence. It would be complete were it not for a well-financed minority group which seeks to force the adoption of contrary and undefined policies through coercion and the possession of the instruments through which this overwhelming majority may make its will effective.

You should know, for instance, that the chairman of your "unity meeting," Dr. Millikan, is the principal leader in this area of the movement for "Union now with Britain." You should know that an officer of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies (Britain and Russia) appealed to the American Peace Mobilization Group, a Communist-front organization, for participation by its members in your meeting.

We say you should know these things because no one should serve as a front for these movements other than through choice. A plea for national unity under the auspices of such groups will further confuse the American people. It will tend to confirm the belief of many that their passion for national unity will bear the bitter fruit of union with Britain and Russia—another sacred symbol becom just campaign oratory.

You had confidence in the American people You knew what they wanted. For in Cleveland, Ohio, you said:

"In the present situation my confidence is in the American people. I have confidence in what they want. And I have confidence in their ability to get it.

"What the American people want above everything else is a defense system so strong that none of these nations will dare to strike at us from whatever motives. Until the people have that defense system they don't want any more international incidents. They don't want any more swashbuckling words. Before talking any more, they want to get down to business. They want to build an Army and Navy, and above all an air force. They want to make themselves strong."

We are still united behind that program. We cannot be tricked or coerced or blindly led into any other course of action. We do not need more speeches or committees; we need greater confidence in pledges given. Faithfully keep your promise to us. Help our elected representatives to do likewise, and we shall not only be completely united, but we shall not stumble on into chaos.

Sincerely yours,

AMERICA FIRST COMMITTEE
OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
JOHN L. WHEELER,
Acting Chairman, Los Angeles, Calif.

Price Fixing

REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on the President's message covering price fixing.

This appears to me to be one more step in the direction of socialism or communism, the destination toward which this Government seems to be moving. It must give racketeering, highjacking, socialistic, communistic C. I. O. leadership, and others of the same ilk, great satisfaction to see this country moving so rapidly along the line toward their goal. It is simply too bad that the great bulk of our

people do not realize what is going on, and what is happening to their Government, which involves the loss of their individual liberty and freedom, while certain leaders camouflage and cover up the real situation by shouting for the four freedoms, at the same time destroying every one of them and moving in the direction of socialism or communism.

It is quite clear to me, and to many others, that a movement is on foot by certain groups to destroy business and industry in this country, as well as the financial structure of the country, in order to accomplish their communistic and socialistic purposes. I submit as a fact, that you have never heard Mr. Henderson, Madam Perkins, or Hillman ever say one single word to the subversive leadership in the C. I. O. about curbing their demands for their pound of flesh in their form of profiteering and racketeering, but in every single instance they have always attacked business and industry, threatening to take over business and industry and operate it by Government. Let us meet this fact face to face. If this is not socialism or a form of communism, what is it? On the other hand, this communistic, socialistic, C. I. O. domination, which has been helped along by Perkins, Hillman, and certain C. I. O. leaders, has always granted to the C. I. O. leadership every demand that they have ever made, all down the line, through the Mediation Board, Department of Labor, Hillman's department, the N. L. R. B., and the Wagner law. This same group have used this vehicle for the suppressing of individual liberty of the great bulk of 130,000,000 people, and, in my opinion, have used it in a wholly socialistic, communistic manner. I submit again to you, if the actions of these people in the past are any criterion for the future, if they set up a three-judge court of review as suggested, it will be nothing less than a vehicle for the subversive C. I. O. communistic element to move in and take control of this Government.

Now they scream for price fixing and talk about inflation. Did they ever think about price fixing or inflation when they were granting to this subversive, communistic group of C. I. O. leaders, who never cared anything for the real workman, but always feathered their own nests, all these increases in labor's unreasonable demand for everything they could think up? The record will show that they did not. Then contrast these actions and the treatment of this group with the treatment of the men in the Army who have been drafted, the amount of money they have been getting, and the sacrifices they are making along with it. It is high time that some of us thought of equalizing such situations as this.

If the threat of inflation or the necessity of price fixing is here, then I charge the administration, through its officials, namely, Perkins, Hillman, and Henderson so far as he is concerned, with being responsible for it. Perhaps Henderson is less responsible than the rest.

How can these people reasonably expect the prices of commodities not to go up when they have stepped in and made these unreasonable grants, and then told industry and business that it was mandatory that they pay them? They have gone so far as to make business pay men salaries and wages who have only applied for jobs but never worked for the group. This has been one of the most damnable attacks by these Socialists or Communists that has ever been perpetrated on a free form of government such as we have. Do they think they can consistently raise these prices and indirectly buy the votes of this subversive group for future elections, and continue to have prices remain stable? Any 12-year-old child having normal mentality would know better than that, so they, therefore, cannot hide behind the skirts of ignorance or the skirts of bad administration, because any normal 12-year-old child should be able to figure out that this is a direct attack or approach of socialism or communism. How do they expect to keep the prices of airplanes stable in view of the fact that they stepped into a plant like the North American at Inglewood, in my district, and forced that company, whether they wanted to or not, to accept an all-out, C. I. O., Freytag-led agreement? This agreement, I am told, will raise the price of airplanes $800,000,000. Unfortunately, our people do not know it, but they are going to know it before we are through.

The Government did a good job of police power when it stepped in and opened up this plant, but when it carried out every demand of the Communist subversive leaders there it practically undid all the good that was previously done.

Price fixing has never worked that I know of, and it will never work under a purely political administration. The best example of this was the N. R. A. and the "blue buzzard" that were issued to helpless people. This was one of the first psychological steps that were taken to break down the barriers that existed between socialism and individual liberty and the form of government as we have known it. It is high time that the real, red-blooded Americans, whether they be Democrats or Republicans, get together and take these Socialists and Communists apart, for if they do not, this country is gone.

Further than that, if the real citizenship of this country does not wake up pretty quickly, it might be too late to save some of the things that they hold dear.

I believe that there is a well-directed, well-thought-out move to destroy the defense program of this country. I further believe that this move originated and is directed from foreign countries. In the accomplishment of their purpose they do not care whether they do it through strikes, whether they do it through price fixing, whether they do it through inflation, whether they do it through the destruction of the credit of this Government, or through revolution. Their one objective is to destroy, first, the defense program of this country, then the form of the government itself, so that they then may move in.

Charm—Competency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, the emergency defense program was launched in the early summer of 1940 and has now been under way for more than a year. Opinion is practically unanimous that the progress of the first year is highly unsatisfactory. The Members of the Congress who serve on committees which deal directly with defense problems, and to whom confidential information must be made available, realize that we are woefully unprepared for war today and shall be for some time to come. The objectives set for the first year have not been achieved. Clamor has not produced competency.

One of the major causes for this deplorable condition is the failure of the administration to develop an efficient governmental organization to administer the program. A most incongruous, ill-assorted, unintegrated, overlapping series of agencies has been set up for this urgent and specialized administrative work, each vieing with the other for its proper place in the sun. Confusions and conflicts rather than orderly operations are painfully apparent. Oviously costs are multiplied as agencies are added. And, by the same token, efficiency is decreased as possible conflicts of authority are increased.

The lag in the defense effort cannot be laid at the door of the Congress. Despite the President's pronouncement in the spring of 1940 that the Congress had no more work to do and that it should adjourn, the legislative branch of the Government set itself to the serious task of transporming an "on order" weakness to an "on hand" strength. Congress promptly provided the funds which were requested by those responsible for the maintenance and operation of our armed forces. The further retardation of the program which would have resulted had the President's advice been followed can well be imagined. Thousands of hours of manpower were saved by the rejection of the suggestion to adjourn.

In the defense undertaking, the administration has had the benefit of the entire experience of the Government in industrial mobilization during the first World War. All competent students agree our experience at that time demonstrated the need for a unified, centralized, coordinated program. That experience establishes the fact that the mobilization of the industrial life of the Nation cannot be stimulated by a regard for the number of agencies which can be created or by a concern for the number of favorites that may be pleased. What was necessary then is essential now.

The real bottleneck of the defense program can easily be discovered. It is in the conglomerate mass of conflicting interests, which, by reason of the selfish motives of the component parts, cannot find a definite objective or a singleness of purpose.

The failure to establish an efficient administrative mechanism lodges the responsibility for our unpreparedness today in one place. A crisis demands competency rather than charm.

The Defense of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered at the banquet of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks of Pennsylvania on Sunday evening, July 6, in Pittsburgh, during the annual convention of that organization:

We have heard so many, many times that America is a great melting pot for the nationalities of the world. To be sure it is; and America is the better for what has taken place.

My forbears came from Scotland and England. Yours came from these and many other countries in the Old World. They traveled to this Nation and they gave it life and they breathed into it vitality as they swept ever westward across the great expanse of the country. Those were the men and women of sterling pioneer stock who actually contributed to the Republic of which we are a part. Yet there came to the United States of America more recently, and I shall not name the number of years, too many individuals, far too many, who accepted its privileges, partook of its profits and its protection, but who gave nothing of citizenship in return.

NATURALIZED CITIZENS ARE LOYAL

Naturalized citizens are just as important and loyal as native-born citizens. The time has come when both must join hands in a great fight to rid this country of the unloyal—I use the word advisedly—the unloyal, who are not worthy of citizenship in this good land of yours and mine.

We had better square our shoulders and speak plainly, face the truth and know that there are hundreds of thousands of men and women in this country who are sowing from within the seeds of distrust and unrest. If our country is attacked by any foe or group of foes from without, we have already fostered those within who would join in tearing apart the solidarity of the Nation. It is time for the American people to keep America safe for Americans.

I introduced a bill in Congress—perhaps it will never pass—if you are in favor of it you might let your Representative in Washington know that you support the plan and would like to have it come out of the committee. I do not think it is drastic. I think it is just and necessary. In simple language this is what it will do. It provides that 6 months after the passage of this measure each and every alien in the United States who has not declared his or her intention of becoming a citizen of this land of yours and mine, shall be taken in custody and deported. It is estimated that only about 22 percent of the aliens living here have declared their desire to become citizens. Thousands of these have lived here an average of 15 years.

On June 13, 1940, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 330 to 42, passed a bill to deport Harry Bridges. Since that action more than a year has passed. Not long ago in Detroit, Harry Bridges denounced the Federal Bureau of Investigation in vehement language—the same Bureau which has recently corralled 32 spies, eight of whom have already pleaded guilty of espionage against this country. This is the same Harry Bridges who postponed action on a motion made before the Longshoremen's Union, the group he badly leads, which would have made a contribution of $500 to the United Service Organization because this noncitizen wanted to look into the validity of the drive.

Far too many such persons have wormed themselves into places of leadership. With false tongue they preach not doctrine which builds a better American, but one which causes discord, unrest, and un-Americanism. Hasten the day when the action of the House over a year ago is concurred in and this man and others of his stripe are banished from our shores.

SERIOUS TIMES FACE AMERICA

We know that these are very serious times in the life of our Republic and the eyes and ears of our people are focused on national defense. We know that the youth of the country have placed themselves in the position of giving their services over a period of time—millions of them—to the cause that we believe to be right, and that is the preparation for any possible attack which might ever come to the United States of America.

Industry in general is meeting the challenge of a real production program. I shall not give detailed figures, but I believe you will be interested in knowing that we have stepped up our preparedness output greatly during the last year. In the past 12 months, there has been an increase of 350 percent in military plane production; powder, 1,200 percent; small-arms ammunition, 3,000 percent; Garand rifles, 500 percent; machine guns, 300 percent; and light tanks, 650 percent.

The front line of our preparedness efforts is the production line. That battle will be won not with tack-hammer taps but with sledge-hammer blows. We are just beginning the manufacture of necessary defense items. I believe firmly that America needs 100,000 fighting planes and 20,000 tanks. We are just beginning to realize the implications of the war.

All has not been well, and I personally have not approved of high-ranking defense and Cabinet officials glossing over the paralysis which has sapped our defense production due to jurisdictional strikes and ill-advised walkouts. The American people have a right to know the facts and when so advised they eventually know how to cope with the situation.

Last November the first major strike occurred in a defense industry at Downey, Calif., at Vultee Aircraft. For 12 days that shut-down continued. Twenty-five training planes which were so badly needed for the Air Corps of our country were lost to this Nation during that period.

In Congress on November 20, 1940, I said, "We must take steps now to see that strikes do not occur." But month after month defense strikes occurred all over the land, not only in the key industry of aviation but in other allied fields. In January of this year there were approximately 102,000 man-days lost by strikes in factories essential to military preparation; in February 430,000; and so on through the months until in June, when the situation was said to be much improved, there were more than 550,000 man-days lost by strikes in defense industries. These strikes must stop now and not later.

PEACETIME STRIKES ARE PROPER

I believe the right of labor to strike in peacetime industry is a precious right and one which must be retained. For over 8 years in Congress I have advocated and supported the gains which labor has made and I want to see nothing done to tear down those gains. However, today we must meet our responsibility and both capital and labor must close ranks in this time of crisis. We must march forward in behalf of unity, cooperation, and harmony which will be recognized by all of the American people. No group can be allowed to cripple our preparedness program.

Irresponsible labor leadership on the one hand and selfish employer leadership on the other are not to be tolerated in this hour of our need. The citizens of our country are rightly aroused and demand action. The people of America will enthusiastically commend fearless effort in Congress, as I know they commended the President of the United States for the courageous leadership he displayed in the North American Aviation strike in California when one-fifth of the airplane production of this country was brought to a standstill. We must not allow any ill-advised segment of labor or any greedy segment of capital to destroy the defense effort in this period of crisis.

This is no time for hysteria; it is no time for flag waving; it is just a time for us, in a sane manner, knowing our obligations to the Republic, to stand foursquare together. We have a fight in the world between a system of Hitler, which would bring about the subjugation of man and the blasphemy of God, and our own system of recognizing the dignity of humanity and the freedom of democracy. In such a fight we are called upon to stand united for what we believe to be right. Let us see to it that the defense industries of America continue to turn their wheels and that any difficulties between worker and management are ironed out at the mediation table and not when men are off the job.

We must stand with closed ranks in this time of our country's need. I listened recently to speeches by four men who had been candidates for President of the United States—Cox, Davis, Smith, and Willkie. I liked the sentiment which they expressed. They were more than former Presidential candidates. They were more than men who had disagreed with the President on domestic issues. They were leaders who were big enough to put littleness aside and stand by our Chief Executive in our defense plans for protection of our people, our institutions, and our way of life.

STAND UNITED IN CRISIS

So in our hour of need we stand together. Let us demonstrate to the United States and the world that loyal citizens will not fail in the time of testing.

I trust that as you go from this convention there will be the thought in the heart and mind of each and every one of you that America is your country; that you must keep its institutions inviolate and that your thoughts and acts be directed toward the desired end of seeing to it that the Stars and Stripes of this country continue to wave over this free people, without a single star erased or a stripe obscured.

In this time of crisis, let us breathe new meaning into the words of George Washington, who said:

"Citizens by birth or choice of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of America must always exalt the just pride of patriotism."

Exemption of Strategic Minerals From Excess-Profits Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

LETTER FROM H. D. TUDOR

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. H. D. Tudor, 58 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: The strategic minerals exempted from the excess-profits tax under the Second Revenue Act of 1940 are minerals that ordinarily are not produced domestically in any great quantity.

The lack of production is due principally to the fact that there are few known domestic deposits capable of commercial production under ordinary conditions. There are, however, a great many marginal and submarginal deposits, and there is always the possibility that development and exploration may lead to the discovery of new sources of supply.

Under these conditions, the prospectors and capitalists are most likely to confine their activities to the search for and exploitation of those minerals which experience has proved do exist, more or less bountifully, in our mineral lands.

Only some extraordinary incentive or condition will bring about domestic production of the minerals exempted from the excess-profits tax. Undoubtedly it was the recognition of this fact that prompted the Congress to grant the exemption. It attempted to supply the extraordinary incentive for the investment of time and money in the attempt to increase domestic production. In effect, it said to the taxpayer: "You gamble your time and money in the effort to increase the production of these essential minerals, and if you are successful the Government will give you preferential treatment, not as to normal taxes but as to excess-profits taxes. The Government realizes that you are embarking on an extremely risky and hazardous business; if you are unsuccessful and lose your investment, there is nothing we can do about it; but we do extend to you the promise of preferential tax treatment if you are successful, and we hope you will be successful, because only through your success can we attain our objective, which is solely an increased production of these minerals."

The taxpayer accepted, in good faith, the offer of Congress. Large sums have been spent, much of it lost, in the attempt to find the badly needed minerals. Discoveries of the mineral deposits have been followed by the erection of plants, which, of course, entails substantial additional investments.

It is almost incredible in the face of this history that upon the attainment of the objective of the Congress, and before the taxpayer has had any benefit from the exemption, it is proposed to discontinue the exemption. The amount of revenue involved is insignificant; it might even be argued that by the action proposed that the revenue will actually be decreased. Certain it is, however, that the production of these minerals will be adversely affected by the elimination of the exemption, and many cases of hardship will arise.

That the foregoing statement is not an exaggeration is clearly illustrated by the following typical cases, which apply particularly to quicksilver:

In July 1940, just prior to the passage of the Second 1940 Revenue Act, a corporation was organized in Nevada to buy the quicksilver properties. They held up the development, or the spending of any money on this mine until exemption from excess-profits tax went into the law. The name of this company is the Coroma Quicksilver Mines, Inc., with a mine at Guerneville, Calif.

After the exemption was allowed, we went on with the development and got down to producing from 125 to 150 flasks of quicksilver per month, containing 76 pounds per flask. This development cost in the neighborhood of $75,000. Before going into it, we considered quicksilver was one of the most important metals entering in the defense program. They are now considering the development of two additional mines—one very large property in Idaho and one in northern California; but the development of these properties will depend on whether they get the exemption that they had last year on the excess-profits tax. If this exemption is to be eliminated, they will reconsider whether to go forward or not.

The situation on quicksilver is at the moment extremely tight. There is no way to obtain enough quicksilver to go around—to supply the quicksilver trade and also take care of the enlarged demands of the Army and Navy. At the present time it would take three or four thousand flasks of quicksilver, which is not available to supply the present demand. Quicksilver has a variety of uses. About half of the production of the United States goes into making medicines and dental work. The defense program has brought out an enormous demand for it—one of the largest being for the painting of ships with mecurial paints to prevent barnacles from forming. If they are not so painted, in a few months the ship must go into drydock and be scraped.

The shortage of quicksilver for present defense uses is well known to the Office of Production Management, and it is important for the defense program that every effort be made to increase the production, because it is impossible—even with the present tariff—to bring quicksilver from outside; as the principal sources of quicksilver are now in the hands of the German and Italian Governments. So short is the situation that Australia, Canada, and the Far East are begging for opportunities to acquire quicksilver wherever possible.

With the situation as stated above, the taxpayer made his investment in good faith. He has no reason to believe that exemption would not be continued. He has every reason to feel that he has been treated shabbily.

Sincerely yours,

H. D. TUDOR.

Amendment of Sugar Act of 1937

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is now considering H. R. 3582, an amendment to the Sugar Act of 1937, which was introduced by Congressman COFFEE of the beet-sugar State, Nebraska, and which was reported by the House Agriculture Committee on May 25. The bill would expand the production and marketing quotas for the subsidized beet-sugar industry by up to 25 percent and correspondingly reduce the importation of non-subsidized cane sugar, largely from Latin America.

New Jersey is absolutely opposed to the enactment of this bill. It is not only against the interests of our State, but it is against the interest of the entire Nation.

Since the Civil War, New Jersey has imported and refined cane sugar. Today the focal point of our sugar trade is the large cane-sugar refinery on the Hudson River, employing over 1,300 unionized men and women, and contributing about $22,000,000 a year in purchasing power. But the refinery is only one part of a much larger sugar business which employs thousands in the importing, shipping, unloading, storing, refining, and distribution of cane sugar.

Stripped of all complications, H. R. 3582 is simply a proposal to further expand the production of subsidized sugar in the United States at the expense of Latin America. If the beet-sugar industry is expanded, it automatically means that less raw cane sugar will be brought up from the sugar islands. Latin America has tremendous surplus stocks of raw sugar which have piled up as a result of the Hitler blockade. Latin America also has the existing capacity to greatly expand her production of raw sugar to meet any emergency that might arise in the United States.

At the Habana Conference of the American Republics, July 30, 1940, the United States solemnly agreed to assist the Latin-American countries to market their surpluses created by the war. Under this program the Import-Export Bank, in January 1941, loaned $11,300,000 to Cuba to help finance her surplus sugar crop. That surplus sugar is now lying unsold in the warehouses in Cuba. If we encourage sugar surpluses in Latin America, on the one hand, and artificially stimulate new production in the United States, on the other, we will be justly accused of bad faith and welching on our agreements.

A great deal of loose talk is taking place about the good-neighbor policy. If we want the nations of Latin America to be our good neighbors, we must buy products from them. The purchase of some of their surplus sugar would not harm any domestic grower. The domestic beet-sugar interests are highly subsidized and well protected. No one is proposing to take anything away from the beet-sugar industry and the defeat of H. R. 3582 could not conceivably harm any beet farmer. I see no reason why the United States should pass legislation to undermine our relations with Latin America in order to give more subsidies to a small group of American farmers who represent about one-half of 1 percent of our American agricultural life.

The beet-sugar lobby has argued that H. R. 3582 is in the interests of our national defense. The truth, of course, is

that this bill, if enacted, would be contrary to every phase of a sound defense program. In the first place, it would waste essential war materials and skilled labor. It is impossible to expand the beet-sugar industry without the construction of new beet factories, and beet factories are made with steel, aluminum, and hundreds of other commodities which are now on the priorities list. There is plenty of existing capacity to expand the production and refining of cane sugar. Secondly, this bill would raise the cost of living. American consumers pay out about $1,000,000,000 a year for their sugar. This bill, H. R. 3582, by further stimulating the production of high-cost beet sugar, and virtually embargoing the flow of low-cost cane sugar, would raise prices to consumers by millions of dollars a year. And in the third place, the bill provides that the Federal Treasury pay additional subsidies to the already highly subsidized beet-sugar industry. At best, the beet-sugar industry is a national luxury, and this type of luxury should be minimized rather than maximized in time of war.

No sound argument has been advanced in favor of this legislation. But of all the arguments, the weakest and the most frequently repeated is that the subsidized production of beet and other mainland sugar should be further expanded in order to "protect consumers" and to "avoid" a recurrence of the price rise in sugar which took place in the last World War.

The most recent revival of this claim is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 17, page 6143. Here we find Congressman BOGGS, of Louisiana, favoring a 25-percent increase in the cash subsidies paid to Louisiana planters, an increase which would be granted by the enactment of H. R. 3582. In support of this bill, now before the House Rules Committee, the Congressman said:

> In my opinion, the best safeguard we can establish against a repetition of similar experiences following the second World War is to give every encouragement and stimulation to the production of sugar within the mainland confines of the United States.

The published record shows that during the last World War mainland sugar producers were actually a drain upon consumers. Consumers were saved from further price rises only by the expanded production of nonsubsidized sugar which took place in the nearby islands of the West Indies.

What happened in the sugar industry in the last World War has been described in two official documents of the United States Government. The first is Government Control of the Sugar Industry in the United States, written by Dr. Joshua Bernhardt, who was the sugar expert in the United States Food Administration. This book is an official account of the work of the United States Food Administration and the United States Sugar Equalization Board, Inc.

The second official record of sugar in the last war is the report of the Federal Trade Commission on Sugar Supply and Prices, published November 15, 1920. Dr. Bernhardt's report covers primarily the years 1915 through 1918, and the Federal Trade Commission's comprehensive and heavily documented report covers the price rise following the declaration of peace. The Federal Trade Commission report on the sugar price rise of 1920 was made at the specific request of the House of Representatives Resolution No. 150, October 1, 1919.

THE BEET-SUGAR INDUSTRY FAILED TO EXPAND ITS OUTPUT

During the last World War the United States needed more sugar because we had to feed our Allies—Italy, France, and Great Britain. In 4 years we shipped some 2,000,000 tons of refined sugar abroad. The question immediately arose as to where we were going to get these additional supplies of sugar. The United States Food Administration decided that the only sensible place to get this sugar was from Cuba. It knew that—

> It was inevitable that should the war continue for several years there would be a continuous and progressive decline in domestic sugar production, following the increased absorption of men into the military machine and into war industries (Government Control of the Sugar Industry in the United States, p. 22).

But the Government's skepticism of the possibility of increasing domestic growing and production did not stop it from doing everything within its power to stimulate that production. A great drive took place for expansion, and Mr. Herbert Hoover, as National Food Administrator, wrote a letter to all beet-sugar producers, asking them to increase their crops:

> I, therefore, earnestly appeal to every farmer so situated to come to his country's aid in this hour of need. Without the cooperation of the American beet grower our task will be very difficult and our ability to respond to the calls to be made upon us for this very essential commodity will be curtailed. It is at least the duty of every beet grower to maintain in 1918 his normal acreage of sugar beets. It is his privilege to increase the acreage to the extent that a well-balanced production of crops will permit, and in this manner effectively demonstrate his patriotism.

But this appeal by Mr. Hoover to patriotism was a failure. In 1918 the plantings of sugar beets declined 117,000 acres, or 15 percent below 1917. The acres actually harvested decreased by 71,000, or 11 percent below 1917.

The reasons for the reluctance of the beet-sugar industry to increase acreage in 1918 are given as follows by Dr. Bernhardt:

> It developed, however, that the beet farmers in the West were refusing to sign the customary contracts for acreage with the beet-sugar companies because they felt themselves unjustly treated with regard to (company) prices. Moreover, their costs of production were mounting rapidly, competing crops were becoming more profitable, and there was a feeling that with a price restricted by agreement between the sugar factories and the Government, the raising of beets would become progressively less profitable in comparison with the production of other food commodities, the prices for which were not regulated by the Government. (Government Control of Sugar in the United States, Dr. Joshua Bernhardt, p. 26.)

To overcome this reluctance to plant, the Government, through the Food Administration, stepped in and handed down a decision for a fixed price of $10 a ton for sugar beets of the 1918 crop. This was 35 percent over the $7.39 price of 1917, and 63 percent over the $6.12 price which had prevailed in 1916. But this greatly increased price did not bring forth an expansion of beet-sugar planting, and it was only through exceptionally good weather conditions that a more serious decline in the total output of beet sugar was avoided in 1918.

A quick glance at the figures of beet-sugar output in the war period shows an uninterrupted decline in the 4 years after 1915:

Production of continental beet sugar in war years 1915–19

[Raw value]

Years:	*Tons*
1913	785,000
1914	773,000
1915	935,000
1916	878,000
1917	819,000
1918	814,000
1919	777,000

Source: Table 9, The World Sugar Situation, Department of Agriculture, May 1940.

The reasons why beet farmers did not care to expand their acreage in 1918 are just as applicable today as they were then. Farmers do not like to produce sugar beets if they can produce other crops which are less susceptible to weather variations and to damage by pests and disease. They naturally prefer crops which do not require so much arduous labor and such intensive irrigation, cultivation, and fertilization. Sugar beets are produced typically in the United States in rotation agriculture with alfalfa, beans, potatoes, corn, and other crops. As the price of these other crops advanced during the war, the farmers had an opportunity of making a good profit on them. And, again, the cost of producing beets increases rapidly in wartime because the production of this high-cost crop demands a relatively large amount of labor; and labor comes high in wartime. With men going into the military services and being called to essential war industries, there was a shortage of labor and a consequent rise in wages. As a result, rather than increase their beet-sugar production, the farmers increased the output of other crops which were relatively more productive and lucrative.

The same inability or indisposition to expand production was found in the cane-sugar industry in Louisiana. The production of sugar in Louisiana is carried on under great natural disadvantages, both in climate and soil. When we entered the war, Louisiana, although she had received generous tariff protection for years, only produced about 6 percent of our total sugar consumption. Any increase in Louisiana sugar therefore would have been insignificant in terms of our wartime requirements. Still, any increase would have been helpful. However, Louisiana was unsuccessful in increasing her production, and the crop years under Government supervision—1917, 1918, and 1919—averaged about 218,000 tons of sugar as contrasted with an average production between 1914 and 1916 of about 232,000 tons, raw value.

CUBA ALONE EXPANDED HER PRODUCTION OF RAW SUGAR

The Food Administration, seeing the failure of the high-cost domestic producers to expand their output, turned to Cuba, the most efficient raw-sugar producing island in the world. For 2 crop years, 1917–18, and 1918–19, the entire Cuban supply was purchased by the Food Administration at prices substantially below the prices which were fixed for domestic sugar. Domestic growers always asked for higher prices in order to meet their high cost of production.

Cuba, who had declared war on Germany in April 1917, began to expand her production of raw sugar in the cause of the Allies, and the results were phenomenal. She increased her production from less than 3,000,000 tons to well over 4,000,000 tons a year, and this increase made it possible for the United States, in turn, to furnish refined sugar to her Allies and, at the same time, to maintain in this country a high per capita consumption at a relatively low price.

Increase of sugar production in Cuba in war years 1915–19

[Raw value]

	Tons
1914	2,922,000
1915	3,398,000
1916	3,422,000
1917	3,890,000
1918	4,491,000
1919	4,184,000

Source as above.

CONTINENTAL CANE-SUGAR REFINERS GREATLY EXPANDED THEIR OUTPUT

The additional supplies of Cuban raw sugar were brought to the United States under the supervision of the Food Administration, and these supplies were refined by the sugar refineries in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and other States. While the beet-sugar producers failed to increase their output, the home refining industry expanded its output by about 1,000,000 tons, approximately equivalent to the expansion in Cuban raw-sugar production. The table below shows the expansion in the output of the continental cane-sugar refining industry during that period:

Refined cane-sugar output in continental United States, 1914–20

[Short tons, refined]

1914	3,282,000
1915	3,346,000
1916	3,566,000
1917	3,500,000
1918	3,230,000
1919	4,085,000
1920	4,208,000

Source as above.

The experience of the first World War was that the cheapest, most expansible, and most reliable source of sugar was the combination of the home cane-sugar refiners and the Cuban raw-sugar producers, both cooperating voluntarily under contract with the United States Government.

DOMESTIC SUGAR GROWING INCREASED PRICES, RATHER THAN DECREASED PRICES, IN THE LAST WORLD WAR

In the last war American consumers would have been forced to pay higher prices if more beet sugar had been produced in this country. Although the Government paid sugar-beet prices of 63 percent above pre-war levels, nevertheless this increase was followed by an actual decline in production. If the Food Administration had tried to force an increase in beet production in order to obtain so-called continental self-sufficiency in sugar, it would have had to raise the price of sugar beets not by 63 percent but by 200 percent or 300 percent. The only possible way to expand the production of beet sugar is to plant new acres or to try to increase the yield per acre by more intensive cultivation. But to add new acres or to intensify cultivation means progressively higher costs. These higher costs would drive farmers into the production of other competing crops such as beans and potatoes, unless the prices of beets were raised drastically.

In tropical and fertile Cuba, where it is easy and natural to produce sugar, and where there are practically no alternative crops, a slight increase in sugar prices will bring a substantial increase in output. During the last World War, the United States Government—1918—purchased the entire Cuban sugar crop at a price only 18 percent higher than that received by Cuba in 1916. This modest increase of 18 percent brought out a 33 percent increase in sugar production, whereas a 63 percent boost in sugar beet prices brought about a 7 percent decrease in beet-sugar production—1918 compared to 1916. The Food Administration found that the only way to protect consumers was to turn to Cuba, rather than to subsidize high-cost beet-sugar growers, for an increase in output. In speaking of this policy, Dr. Bernhardt reports:

> A much higher (sugar) price than that which prevailed in 1918 and 1919 might have conceivably increased production in the United States beet industry * * * to the extent of a few hundred thousand tons, but the wiser policy was adopted of assuming a price level which would encourage production in the only source of supply where large increases could be immediately expected in response to relatively small price increases, that is in Cuba. (Government Control of sugar, p. 128.)

IN 1919–20 THE BEET-SUGAR INDUSTRY AGAIN FAILED CONSUMERS

The claim that the beet-sugar industry came to the rescue of American consumers in 1920 is heard every time the beet-sugar bloc argues for more subsidies from those consumers. The reasons for the rise in the price of sugar in 1920 are found in a 7-page letter of submittal of the Federal Trade Commission in its 205-page report to Congress on Sugar Supply and Prices. There is not one word in that report which would substantiate the claim that the beet-sugar industry saved the day. On the contrary, the Commission points out that—

> It seems that the chief difficulty in the sugar trade, with the Government no longer purchasing sugar and directing its distribution, lay in speculation and hoarding (p. 16).

And who were the hoarders? Was sugar hoarded by the foreign producers? No. The amount of sugar imported into the United States from foreign countries in 1920 was the highest on record. These imports hit 3,003,257 short tons in 1920 as contrasted with 2,379,764 in 1919. It was this tremendous expansion in the imports of sugar, made largely by the continental cane sugar refining industry, which finally broke the price. This fact is confirmed by the Federal Trade Commission on page 16 of its report. The Commission said:

> The price in the United States had advanced beyond what world supply and demand conditions appeared to warrant and sugars were received here from countries which do not usually supply this country, in the aggregate amounting to large quantities. A decline in price set in early in June 1920, which not only stopped speculative buying but threw the stocks of many speculators on the market, further precipitating prices (p. 16).

And what were the domestic sugar producers doing in 1920, at a time when there was "speculation and hoardings"? Did the beet-sugar industry in the Western States, and the Louisiana sugar planters, come to the rescue of American consumers? No. According to the Federal Trade Commission, they were engaged in what looked like "speculation and hoarding."

On March 1, 1920, when consumers were paying about 20 cents a pound for sugar at retail, there were 136,000 tons of undelivered beet sugar in the warehouses of the beet companies (Sugar Supply and Prices, pp. 8 and 23). The Commission indicates that some companies in the beet-sugar industry held back their marketings of sugar in order to take advantage of the high prices which were prevailing.

Regarding the withholding of beet sugar, the Federal Trade Commission reported that there was—

> Evidence that certain (beet sugar) companies for longer or shorter periods unduly delayed the marketing of the crops (p. 50).

And the Commission went on to say that—

> There is some evidence that the producers of new beet sugars, whose prices were not controlled by voluntary agreement, as were the prices of old-crop sugars, were holding back for higher prices, which they hoped would be allowed by liberal rulings of the Department of Justice (p. 46).

And on page 74, we find that the Commission had this to say regarding the hoarding of beet sugar:

> On the other hand, complaint has come from dealers that they were unable to get sugar from these (beet) companies even though they furnished the trucks to haul it away.

This evidence does not substantiate the claim made repeatedly by the spokesmen for the beet-sugar industry that it was their industry which came to the front with a supply of sugar in 1920 to break the high price. Their deliveries in 1920 decreased by 48 percent, while the continental cane-sugar refiners expanded their importations of raw sugar and deliveries of refined sugar by 13 percent over 1919. By October 1, 1920, when the new crop of beet sugar came to market, sugar prices had already dropped drastically from their peak and were rapidly decreasing under the influence of the

large contributions of sugar from foreign sources.

And this episode of 1920 seems to have been profitable to the beet-sugar factories. This matter is discussed by the Trade Commission on page 111 of its report. It says:

It follows that such prices as have been secured during April and May, ranging from $17.50 to $22.75, represent excessive profits.

The evidence which destroys for all time the fantastic claim of the subsidized beet-sugar industry that it was the true friend of American consumers in 1920 is found on page 13 of the Federal Trade Commission's report, Sugar Supply and Prices. The Commission reported that the entire 1919–20 crop in Cuba was offered to the United States Government at only $6.50 per 100 pounds. This offer was rejected by President Wilson who decided to terminate war-price fixation, and the only remaining price control over sugar was through the Department of Justice which was empowered to curb excessive profiteering.

This required that the Department determine maximum prices for the various producing areas. Public hearings were held. One of those hearings was held down in Louisiana, and the Louisiana planters came before the Department of Justice, and stated that they needed not $6.50 per 100 pounds, but $16.60 per 100 pounds, raw-sugar basis—page 114. The Louisiana planters testified that in order to get back their costs they needed a price four times as high as the 1915–16 price. And this unprecedented price was granted the high-cost Louisiana producers by the Department of Justice.

Of course, the higher price for Louisiana sugar was demanded and obtained, by the beet-sugar industry. For a while the continental refiners of the 1918–19 Cuban crop continued to sell their sugar at a much lower price—page 114, Sugar Supply and Prices. Shortly afterward, as all prices merged under a free market, the Cubans, who had offered to sell their sugar at 6½ cents a pound, received the higher domestic price. According to the Federal Trade Commission, the prices obtained both for Louisiana and the beet-sugar industry "represent excessive profits."

THE 1920 EPISODE COST AMERICAN CONSUMERS ABOUT $741,000,000

It is estimated that the increase in the price of sugar in 1920, which came about largely because of the demands for higher prices made by continental growers, cost the American public about $741,000,000. At an average retail price of 19.4 cents a pound in 1920, the Nation's sugar bill was $1,775,000,000. If the 1919 price of 11.3 cents a pound at retail had continued consumers would have paid about $1,033,950,000.

There is no reason why the price in 1920 should have been any higher than it was in 1919. And if the Government had maintained control over the sugar industry and had purchased the Cuban sugar crop at the offered figure, it is very doubtful whether prices would have been any higher. The difference between $1,775,000,000 and $1,033,950,000 is $741,000,000. The consumer was saved from further burdens only because the continental refiners were able to import and make available to them the supplies of raw sugar from the tropical producers.

H. R. 3582 WOULD BURDEN CONSUMERS AGAIN IN WORLD WAR NO. 2

In the present war the United States does not need more sugar to feed Europe. Our sugar problem this time is to get new supplies to meet a deficit caused by the fact that the Philippines are not going to be able to send all their crops here next year. Extremely fortunate for the United States there is now in the Western Hemisphere a surplus of sugar which has been created by the fact that the Latin-American countries have not been able to sell their normal quantities of sugar, due to the Hitler blockade in the Atlantic. I have received information from the United States Tariff Commission to the effect that these surplus stocks as of August 31, 1941, are as follows:

	Tons
Cuba	1,869,501
Dominican Republic	72,752
Peru	66,138
Haiti	5,512
Brazil	255,734

About 400,000 tons of this sugar is owned by the United States Government through the Import-Export Bank, which early this year loaned $11,300,000 to Cuba to help her finance her current surplus.

H. R. 3582, stripped of all its complications, would amend the Sugar Act of 1937 in such a way as to deprive American consumers of the right to use this Latin-American sugar. Congressman COFFEE, author of the bill, and the beet-sugar bloc generally, want American consumers to be forced to obtain about 1,000,000 tons of sugar from additional production of beet and other domestic sugars, to take the place of a possible Philippine deficit.

If this bill is passed it will boost the price of sugar, as occurred in the last World War. Beet sugar is high-cost sugar, and the beet-sugar industry cannot be expanded to fill the Philippine deficit without a substantial increase in sugar prices. New beet-sugar factories would have to be built, and no one would make this investment without assurances that prices would be high enough to give a generous profit. Farmers, as in the last World War, will not want to raise more acres of sugar beets unless prices are high enough to meet increased costs. Labor is the big cost item in growing beets, and already serious shortages of labor have occurred in the Middle West.

But even if the price of sugar beets were jacked up, as it was in the last World War, it is doubtful whether additional supplies would be forthcoming. In World War I increased prices and fervent pleas from the Food Administration were ignored by beet farmers. Beet-sugar output actually declined. If in this war we attempt to stimulate the inefficient and subsidized beet-sugar industry it will cost consumers millions of dollars a year.

The facts of the existing situation are briefly as follows:

First. We may have a deficit of 1,000,000 tons in the Philippine quota next year.

Second. There are well over 2,000,000 tons of unsold raw sugar in the warehouses of Latin America.

Third. In addition, there is existing sugar-growing capacity in Latin America and sugar-refining capacity in the United States to expand the production of sugar by two or three million tons a year.

Fourth. The production of beet sugar cannot be expanded without a substantial increase in prices to consumers, and more subsidies paid out of the Federal Treasury.

Fifth. If we use Latin-American sugar, prices will remain low and no new subsidies will have to be paid.

Under these circumstances, to artificially expand the production of beet sugar and to prohibit consumers from utilizing nonsubsidized Latin-American cane sugar would be the height of foolishness.

Letter of United States Selectee-Parents Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the President of the United States:

UNITED STATES SELECTEE-PARENTS LEGION,
Cincinnati, Ohio, May 1, 1941.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: May we respectfully submit to you, sir, that ours is, we believe, a strong, national group representative of the sentiments and of the will of the home folks of these United States; definitely, the most important group of this Nation's people, i. e., the family groups of mothers and fathers and sons. These sons, our sons, all up and down and across the glorious land of ours, are leaving our firesides, giving up their way of life, their educational pursuits, their vocational efforts, and the inspiration and comfort of close association with their loved ones to engage upon a period of military training to defend and secure our country. They owe no allegiance to England, or to any other foreign power, be it of dictator or imperialist leadership. They should not be made party outside this hemisphere, against their will and against our will, to depredation, iniquity, cruelty, and murder. Neither the peerage of England, nor the "60 families" in America should prevail to send them into foreign slaughter, in unholy combat all to no purpose, as has been demonstrated over 1,000 years' experience.

Political ideologies and the spurious symbols they falsify, are mere blinds behind which power and pressure groups operate. Entrenched powerholders of these systems are finding it increasingly difficult to distort

facts and to disable intelligence with propaganda, in whatever inane form it is uttered. Those of us historically high-minded are not totally blind to traditional mendacities. We have been forced by the pressure of logical facts to become more intelligent. The continuous injustice, the tyranny, and the folly that citizens have to suffer by unwonted, enforced participation in these recurrent foreign wars, are the inherent, unmoral attributes of these political systems devised for the most part by plutocrats, call it "fascism," or pseudo-democracy. It is not the will of the people. However falsified or euphemized by the paid propagandists, or the hired "commentators," when, in 1918, the powerholders had departed in safety, 9,998,771 boys had been killed on the "fields of honor," "to make the world safe for democracy," in "the war to end war." Twenty million two hundred and ninety-five thousand five hundred and twelve had been wounded (some of whom had been better dead) and 5,983,600 were unaccounted for.

We most respectfully urge, Mr. President, this criminal carnage as it would again involve our youth in foreign battlefields must stop. We would be mad indeed to countenance further the destruction of the social and vocational achievements and the lives of our sons that these foreign engagements inflict upon us. Categorical imperatives of throne, bank and state, must yield their peremptory power over the minds and the lives of sons and the parents of sons under the gathering pressure of action that follows intelligent skepticism.

Together with the Congress, we depend upon you, Mr. President, to maintain our most emphatic expression of the point that we do not want, neither do we expect, our sons sent into any foreign wars. We are reminded of your own most gratifying assurance in this respect, as pronounced in Boston last October, when you said to us: "And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars. They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores. Yes, the purpose of our defense is defense."

Mothers and fathers, Mr. President, who have always made and will continue to make this Nation the stronghold of democracy it has ever been and will so remain, are not defeatists. We are not fearful of the security of our own country so long as we are kept adequately prepared and so long as the people rule more and are ruled less. We have the manpower and the equipment sufficient to meet any combination of foreign powers. We have been beset before these times, on all sides, by superior forces with more and finer equipment than we had and against our lesser manpower. We have survived and we will survive, just as long as and as well as we have indeed a Government representative of the will of the people. We are not unmindful that you, Mr. President, have been sorely importuned, cajoled, and perhaps even threatened with political oblivion of both your most respectable self and of your admirable party, did you not say and do those things which must, if indulged far enough, bring us certainly into the very battlefields of those foreign lands upon which the unending quarrels of European relatives are never, over 1,000 years' striving, settled.

We are not unmindful that yours is a task demanding the highest order of deliberation upon and consideration of the public will, especially the will of the fathers and mothers of sons who are selected. As yours is the highest office within the gift of the people and carries with it all of the solemn responsibility imposed by a faithful citizenry, so it is to the mothers and fathers of sons to whom you may, if you will, sir, resort for the best counsel, with confidence that counsel from this source, if heeded, will avoid tragedy and best provide that security and unity so necessary to a truly great nation.

Anglophiles, Anglomaniacs, hired commentators, propagandists for pay, internationalists, racial chip carriers who discredit their own race, all of these warmongers are none of them in the same tent with we fathers and mothers of sons they would have you, Mr. President, send to be blown to bits in Europe. They never participate; they take most and give least.

Convoys, it is our conviction, Mr. President, are the first step into Europe, where our sons would be expected to take the brunt of the shooting and bombing between the imperialists and the dictators. This time, the plowing under would be even more deadly, probably two of every four boys instead of one in four. This time, mothers and fathers will react less favorably to those responsible, if we are pushed into Europe. Attempts to put us into Europe's brawls against our vast majority of sentiments and good advice in the matter we would fight more determinedly this time. More vigorously than even before would we fight to sustain those who would, while keeping us prepared with our own sons and our own equipment, seek to impress Europe and Asia with the desirability of a just peace among nations, rather than favor those who seek our own involvement in a war never of our own making. Convoys, may we repeat, sir, by any other name are in effect convoys.

We are not either ripened or conditioned for convoys, nor for that matter, anything that moves our boys into Europe's recurrent wars. We mean not to become ripened or conditioned for ill-advised action. We mean not to become "assimilated," as some of our world travelers like to phrase it among themselves—these puny, little, fat, internationalists who make so much noise as the false front behind which they hide their minority high pressure. They would, indeed, assimilate our sons in war as they try to do it in civil life; they would place our own boys around the checkerboard of hell in Europe, feeling at the same time no more compassion for our sons, no more sincere affection than if they were bits of filthy merchandise.

We think, Mr. President, those today who, in the face of the smear proclivities of those we have indicated, preach and practice peace and preparedness, just as did their own illustrious forebears, are the most courageous souls in America today. It is so easy to indulge in words and acts and incidents that cry for war—it is so difficult to assume the role of the peacemaker when tempted by the Scylla and Charybdis of opportunism and world power.

Mind we not our own affairs; take we seriously the promptings of the Tories among us, who advocate "Union Now," we may yet wake up some fine morning and learn that poor Britain has regained her colonies, lost at the time through the stupidity of another of her German kings.

We haven't recovered from the last European fiasco. Were we to bear the brunt of this scrap for the determination of the balance of power in Europe, as between the house of Rothschild and the imperialists on the one side and the dictators on the other, our sons lost forever and our meager earnings dissipated, our children's great-grandchildren's grandchildren won't live to see the end of it. Spiritual values will decline as never before, Christianity will be divided as some no doubt intend, and unity in America will be found only in the older dictionaries.

We know the Winchells, the Lippmanns, the Thompsons, and the Kaltenborns are among the principal war agitators; theirs is the internationalists' love of show, power, pomp, and money. What have they at stake? What sacrifices do they make? How much remuneration do they realize for their unholy work of propaganda and warmongering? They don't speak the sentiments of the home folks, the family group, in these United States. They are among the world travelers. They are not the fireside type; international trouble is their dish. Their war ideas represent political gambling of the most dangerous, destructive sort, rather than human needs translated in terms of our own country's welfare, peace, security, and unity.

It is indeed, Mr. President, vital that we preserve democracy in these United States, without attempting to impress democracy upon Europeans, or Asiatics, none of whom have any democracy and all of whom probably will continue to choose to decide their own ways of life. In assaying a world empire, we may destroy a nation.

Concluding this appeal to you, honorable sir, to keep our country out of war, so far as it is within your own power to act, let us reiterate, we have the utmost faith and confidence in yourself and the Congress to respect and abide by those guideposts which have never failed America, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, our sacred traditions, and the advice of the founding fathers of our country and their notable successors; all of this, Mr. President, with your own disposition to deal frankly and openly with us, the fathers and mothers of sons, and to reflect, represent, and sustain our will in these serious matters, do we commend most respectfully to your earnest attention.

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE ALBERT SHIVER,
President, U. S. Selectee-Parents Legion.

Michigan, the Pioneer State in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

RADIO ADDRESSES OF HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO, AND HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO, Hon. BARTEL J. JONKMAN, and myself made over radio station WINX, Washington, D. C., July 29, 1941:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

Ladies and gentlemen, through the courtesy of station WINX, it is my privilege tonight to present for your consideration the importance of the State of Michigan as the pioneer State in the educational progress of America.

As president of the Michigan State Society, I greatly appreciate this courtesy. The Michigan State Society is the oldest State society in Washington, having been established in 1862 and consisting of approximately 2,000 fine Michigan citizens, or former Michigan citizens, who are boosters of our great State. I am particularly proud of the State of Michigan, admitted to the Union in 1837, the twenty-sixth State in the Union, with a population of five and one-quarter million. It has had remarkable progress in various lines of occupation and industry.

Michigan can well be called the tourist State of the Union because people from every

State in the Union visit our beautiful State, with its Great Lakes, with its more than 5,000 inland lakes, its picturesque scenery, and its beautiful forests. Michigan is one of the greatest agricultural States in the Union and its farms reflect the initiative and prosperity of our farmers.

Michigan towers above all of the States in the Union industrially, particularly in the manufacturing of automobiles. In my home city of Flint is located the home of the Buick and the home of the Chevrolet, and every time I see a Buick or a Chevrolet car on my way around and through Washington, I know those cars reflect the importance of our great State.

As a former teacher in my native State of Michigan, I have always been vitally interested in books and reading and in the cause of education, and I feel that I know the influence that the reading of good books has been to the youth of the land.

For many years it was my ambition to build up a library that would be well-balanced and would fit into one's scheme of life. After many years I have been successful in accumulating more than 6,000 volumes, and I can safely assert that the influence of those books has been of vital importance to me.

Palmer, in his great book on self-cultivation in English, aptly says:

"He is unwise, however busy, who does not have his loved authors, veritable friends in whom he may seek refuge in the intervals of work and by whose influence he enlivens, refines, enriches, and emboldens his own limited existence."

And Milton, in his splendid essay Liberty of Printing, in comparing men and books says:

"Many a man lives a burden to the earth, but a good book is the precious lifeblood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."

Because of my interest in this subject, I desire to call your attention to the fact that the evolution of the Congressional Library in this country has been very remarkable indeed.

In 1800 Congress appropriated $5,000 as the nucleus of a library. In 1814, as you know, at the time of the British invasion, the Library, which was located in the Capitol, was partly burned. Three thousand volumes of that small library were destroyed.

Shortly after that our Government bought from the Thomas Jefferson estate his very fine library of 6,000 volumes, the largest private library then in the United States. Again, in 1851, a fire swept the Library, which was still located in the Capitol. As a result of that fire only 20,000 volumes out of 55,000 remained.

Then a peculiar thing happened. It required 13 years on the floor of this Congress in debate, in discussion, and in study to convince the people of the United States and to convince Congress that a library was of great public necessity and, therefore, should be properly housed. Finally, after 13 years of debate, the great Congressional Library, as we now know it, was organized.

In 1897 the fine building that we see here, with 14 acres of floor space, with more cubic contents than this entire Capitol, was constructed. Now we in America can look the British Museum Library in the face, we can look the Bibliothèque Nationale in the face, and say that today America has the largest Library in the world.

I know of nothing that is of more vital importance to America than a fine library and a fine collection of books. At this time over 7,750,000 books, maps, and charts are in this great Congressional Library.

In 1934 the Congress again started a new addition, which gives 20 acres more of floor space, and an investment of over $15,000,000 in buildings and grounds alone, aside from the maintenance and cost of the books, all in the interest of this fine Library.

Originally it was built for the Members of Congress. Now, it is called the great university of the American people. Of all things in my Government, I am proud that the Congressional Library exists, not only for the 32,000,000 boys and girls of America but for our 130,000,000 people, because each year over a million people come here to visit the Library of this country and receive an inspiration for reading and study that will favorably affect their entire lives.

My own State of Michigan abounds in fine libraries, including the library at the capitol in Lansing, the splendid library at the Michigan University, and the equally splendid libraries at the various colleges and normal schools of my State.

Michigan has been greatly benefited by the exchange of books between the Congressional Library and our own libraries.

Michigan is highly conscious of the value of books and reading. In many of our factories splendid libraries have been established in order that the men who work by day may have the advantage of books and reading at night.

I am greatly interested in the educational system of my native State. Unquestionably, the honor of leadership in education belongs to Michigan. To illustrate, let me call your attention to the six important educational dates that mark the educational progress of Michigan.

In 1817, the Legislature of the Territory of Michigan sketched in detail on paper, a full program of education from the primary schools to the universities.

In 1827, the Legislature of the Territory of Michigan actually laid the foundation of our common schools.

In 1837, our State legislature, after the admission of Michigan to the Union, created our great university with its then four departments—literature, science and the arts, law, and medicine. This was pioneer work, in many respects, for all the world. Other States had established fragments of such a system, but none had constructed it on so profound a basis. Nothing remained for Michigan to do in education except to elaborate the details and enlarge the structure of our educational system.

Therefore, in 1848, the Legislature of the State of Michigan, realizing that handicapped children were not receiving proper education in our State, created an institution for the instruction of the deaf, dumb, and blind.

In 1855, the Legislature of the State of Michigan organized an agricultural and industrial college, one of the first pioneering agricultural colleges in the United States.

And then, to cap the climax, in 1870, the Legislature of the State of Michigan opened the doors of our university to women, thereby completing the educational system of Michigan and establishing the thorough democracy of the educational scheme.

I am particularly proud of the stand that Michigan has taken on education. In my own State, the superintendent of public instruction and the entire school personnel of the State, superintendents, principals, and all grades of teachers have demonstrated their love and zeal and efficiency for our public-school system.

It has been a pleasure for me to have this splendid opportunity of appearing on this Michigan program. Naturally, we of Michigan love our native State. We are proud of her educational institutions, we are proud of her industrial factories that are without a peer in this country, we are proud of her fertile farms and, above all, we are proud of our fine patriotic citizens.

I sincerely thank Station WINX for this opportunity of saluting our State of Michigan. This station is performing a wonderful educational function in making these programs possible.

ADDRESS OF HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

I am greatly indebted to Station WINX here in the Capital city of Washington for the opportunity to present a salute to my native State of Michigan and it is appreciated.

Michigan can point to its colorful history, which began in 1669—240 years ago. Three flags have dominated its trackless forests and lake-bound shores. Its more than 1,600 miles of coast line is longer than any other State in the Union. Its two peninsulas are washed by the unsalted seas—the Great Lakes. One hundred and four years ago it was accepted into the sisterhood of States as No. 26. Its virgin forests built the homes of the Middle West. Its scenic lakes and natural beauty remain. It is still the "land of the sky-blue waters." Michigan had the first agricultural college in the Union. It also had the first State university in the Nation and it was the first university to admit women.

Today, with a population of more than 5,000,000 people, it stands in the forefront in national defense and in its contribution to the health, wealth, and prosperity of the Nation. The products of its farms and factories are unexcelled. They are the pride of a free people and the wonder of the world. Its gigantic industries constitute the very heart of our national defense.

Michigan produces a higher per capita value of goods for export than any other State in the Union. More than 600 of her industries are engaged in foreign commerce or export trade, and they import 300 commodities from 56 foreign countries used in the manufacture of their products. It now produces thousands of barrels of oil per day.

It is the automobile capital of the world. In 1937 the value of automobiles shipped for foreign points amounted to $350,000,000. Michigan ranks first in the Nation in the export of automobiles, automobile parts and accessories, canned, fresh, and frozen fruits, vegetables, machinery, tools, chemicals, hospital supplies, office equipment, electric refrigerators and ice-making apparatus, stoves and ranges, iron and steel products, hardware, and pressed-metal products. One dollar out of every seven expended for wages and retail trade in Michigan has its origin in foreign trade.

The State stands fourth by customs districts in the value of its exports. In 1939 it amounted to $245,000,000. Michigan is surpassed only by New York, Galveston, and New Orleans in this respect.

The State is situated in the heart of the Great Lakes. These unsalted seas represent one-third of the fresh water of the earth. They are located in the interior of the North American Continent. On the breast of these inland seas is carried nearly one-quarter of the water-borne commerce of the United States, which exceeds all the foreign commerce of our Nation. These mighty inland oceans have but one outlet to the sea—the St. Lawrence River. It is the key to a land-locked empire inhabited by 40,000,000 people who are now denied free access to the seven seas and the ports of the world. Michigan is in the center of this empire.

It is one of the 17 States of the Middle West which needs low-cost water transportation for its raw materials and manufactured products—the products of its farms and factories. This potential low-cost transportation by water has been provided by a generous Providence, namely, through the St. Lawrence River—the only outlet and water highway to the oceans from the Great Lakes—a distance of more than 2,000 miles. It is now completed with the exception of a small section of the International Rapids between Canada and the United States. The two nations have signed an agreement to remove the last barrier so Midwest commerce may move economically and unvexed to the seas. Incidental to its construction 2,200,000 horsepower of electric energy can be produced. It is there now going to waste. That power would be invaluable to our national defense if it were now available. It is the only project in this country comparable with the Panama Canal. No one in this day and generation even doubts the wisdom and foresight of this Government in uniting the Atlantic and

Pacific by the Panama Canal. The whole world benefited by its construction. The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway stands alone—the greatest project on the North American Continent—the master project of our age. Its international character challenges the world. This waterway is there waiting the ingenuity of man to complete it and convert it to his use. Its cost to the United States, after exhaustive study by the Army engineers, is estimated at less than $200,000,000. This is less than the cost of three battleships. The power feature of the project will cost ninety-three million and will pay for itself. The entire work can be completed in 4 years.

When this seaway is completed, part of the future navies of the United States may be built in the Great Lakes, a thousand miles inland—a vital asset for national defense. If the 45 shipyards (30 on the American side and 15 on the Canadian side of the Great Lakes) were now available, they would prove a tremendous factor in our program of national defense. Only small ships drawing less than 14 feet of water can be constructed in them for ocean service. Because of the land-locked, restricted depth of the canals in the St. Lawrence River, larger ships cannot reach the sea.

Build this seaway and we will provide an inland waterway for large ocean-going vessels and accommodate more than 75 percent of the ships of the world. Its cost is moderate when compared with other Government spending. It will pay for itself many times in savings to the people. It will create a new frontier. It will serve to stabilize many important industries in their present midwestern locations, anchor them there for the benefit of the railroads as well as the utilities which will be supplied with greater power facilities, and for the benefit of all other public conveniences which thrive in prosperous communities.

"There are three things which make a nation great and powerful—a fertile soil, busy workshops, and easy conveyance for men and goods from place to place."

The busy workshops of Michigan are now producing the implements of national defense to preserve the Republic of the United States.

ADDRESS OF HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

Michigan, one of the outstanding States of the Union, is blessed with a greater combination of natural and man-made facilities for creating human happiness than any comparable area in the world. Some States may surpass her in industries, others in agriculture, etc., but in her combination of industrial, agricultural, educational, mining, recreational, and other facilities she is unsurpassed and stands in a class by herself.

Consisting of two peninsulas, with a shore line of 1,624 miles, more than any other State in the Union, Michigan could exist as an isolated empire while her people enjoyed all the reasonable comforts and luxuries of life.

Notwithstanding her latitude, the large fresh-water lakes lapping her 1,600 miles of shore line moderate the climate, giving Michigan longer growing seasons than any of the other North Central States.

As a result, Michigan stands out in the production of quality seeds of all kinds. Michigan seed potatoes are sent to Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, New York, and other States south because Michigan's climate and soil conditions produce potatoes of high-producing potentiality. Sections of Michigan produce flax, said to equal that grown in Ireland. Its celery is unexcelled, and Kalamazoo, as the Celery City, is famous throughout the world.

Michigan's other crops are hay, corn, wheat, oats, beans, sugar beets, rye, barley, buckwheat, seed cabbage, onions, cucumbers, and other vegetables. Its fruit, peaches, cherries, apples, grapes, plums, pears, and berries grow in superabundance.

Michigan is rich in natural resources. It ranks first in salt, second in iron and gypsum and gypsum products, third in copper, limestone, and cement, fifth in sand and gravel, eighth in petroleum, as well as general mineral products. I wish I could go into detail and tell you about the richest belt of rock-producing copper, the greatest deposit of surface iron ore, the largest limestone quarries, the thousands of oil and gas wells, but time forbids.

I would like to tell you about Michigan's industries, about Detroit, Lansing, Flint, and Pontiac, world-famed for the manufacture of automobiles. Grand Rapids, my home city, the furniture capital of the world, Midland with the world's largest chemical plant, Battle Creek, whose breakfast foods are known everywhere, Kalamazoo with the largest bookpaper factory. I could dwell on our industries manufacturing lumber, drugs, beet sugar, clothing, machinery, refrigerators, flour, leather goods, dairy products, furs, canned goods, fishing tackle, etc., but I must save a few moments for Michigan's scenic beauties and recreational facilities.

Michigan's sons and daughters have raised her to a state of eminence in these fields of enterprise, but they have been enabled to do so largely because Michigan offers recreational facilities which really recreate, the enjoyment of which has enabled her citizens to raise the trip hammer of work and increased the force of their blows for human progress.

Scenic beauties in Michigan are unsurpassed. Mackinac Island, Island Royal, and similar beauty spots; the Manistee, Michigan, Au Sable, St. Marys, and other rivers, together with over 5,000 inland lakes, and thousands of acres of forest and cut-over lands provide outstanding opportunity for reinvigorating tired minds and bodies with new energies. There are no inland fisheries to compare with those of Michigan. Small game is abundant, and a million deer together with bear roam the cut-over lands inviting an annual trek of 300,000 hunters whose 50,000 kill does not diminish the supply.

Not only Michiganders enjoy this playground but hundreds of thousands from other States take advantage of this health-restoring element in Michigan's make-up. The recreational industry is now ranked as the second largest in the State, being exceeded only by manufacturing. More than 60 State parks, half of them on lakes and streams, offer facilities to visitors and tourists. Michigan is doing all she can to promote and foster this recreating agency for all who may wish to come.

So when you plan your vacation come to Michigan; she welcomes you.

Eternal Vigilance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, censorship has always been a controversial subject. It has become more so as the international situation has become more complicated. Threats of a clamp down on news have been sensed for a long time by those identified with the press and the radio. Vigorous denials have been made in the past by Government officials of any intention to censor. Despite the denials, protests have been heard on all sides against moves which have seemed to indicate that some type of news supervision would be very acceptable to certain men close to the White House. Arbitrary rulings by administrative bodies and the rabid railing of some Cabinet members who resent criticism have contributed in no small degree to the controversy.

The battle flared up again when the first supplemental appropriation bill for the present fiscal year was reported to the House of Representatives. At that time it was discovered that the Navy Department had made a request for an appropriation of almost $800,000 for the establishment of offices in 18 different places for a national cable censorship. According to representatives of the Navy, the unlimited emergency declared by the President made the proposal necessary.

An examination of the hearings conducted by the Appropriations Committee disclosed that the project had been approved by the President, even though no authorization was at hand under existing law. When pressed for further information, the representative of the Navy who attempted to justify the appropriation admitted that an authorization was necessary before the appropriation could be made.

The irregularity of the procedure which was attempted—to ask for funds before a proposed activity was authorized—was, in itself, subject to severe criticism. The door would be opened wide to possible abuses of all kind were Federal funds made available without authorization. Too much has already been done in this direction by the issuance of blank checks and the delegation of extraordinary authority for their use. With the demands being made as they are for stupendous sums for the defense program, the bars should certainly not be lowered. To resort to a practice of this kind in such an important and highly controversial field as censorship was surely an ill-advised move to make. To say the least, it did nothing to allay the suspicions of those who have been apprehensive of arbitrary authority.

It is generally admitted that cable censorship is a necessity in time of war. Naval officials, who should know, have stated cables were censored during the last World War, but that the censorship did not start until after we had entered the war.

But the Congress has not declared war. And until it does some rights, long recognized as fundamental to free men, should be regarded as secure against the possible invasion of emergency powers. Among these rights, freedom of the press and freedom of speech are basic. Eternal vigilance always has been the price of liberty. It continues to be the price which must be paid today.

The Defense of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES F. McLAUGHLIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HARRY B. FLEHARTY, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by Mr. Harry B. Fleharty, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, over radio station WWDC under the auspices of the Veterans of Foreign Wars on July 27, 1941:

Members of the WWDC radio family, those whose duty it is to preside over the destinies of America today, are rightfully seriously and earnestly emphasizing the importance of national defense. Our President, our Congress, our military commanders did not create the emergency, making it necessary that preparation for warfare take precedence over our personal plans in business, professional life, educational attainment, and home life. They did not create the emergency, which makes it necessary that our dreams, ambitions, and longings be sacrificed, and our ability, time, and energy be devoted to the creation of a fighting machine, capable of overcoming the attack of the most efficient war machine the pages of history have recorded.

People who live in a city may have been negligent about preparing about safety from forest fires, but they do not set the fires which make absolutely imperative every possible preparation to suppress the deadly flames that menace every activity of life and even life itself. I wonder if we realize the completeness of the analogy. I know what it is to plow furrows in an attempt to save a homestead from the hungry flames of a raging prairie fire. I know what it is to watch the devouring flames of a forest fire eat their way relentlessly toward the heart of the city. I know how easy it is to summon every possible energy of every person, at whatever sacrifice, to check the progress of the fire and save the homes and lives of the community. The danger is so obvious and so appalling that opportunity is all that is required to command all the ability and energy of every individual in defense of the community from the devastating flames. In the quiet of my home I have asked myself, as I am now asking you, "Is our situation as a nation in any real sense analogous to the homestead or the city threatened by fire? Is our danger as great and as imminent?"

America has lived over a hundred and fifty years with the Axis Powers functioning as strong and active nations. Why are they any greater menace to America and the American way of life in 1941 than in 1925 or 1895? Of course, the answer is obvious. In 1941, the Axis Powers are at war to force all of Europe, Africa, and Asia to adopt their way of life. Success in Europe, Africa, and Asia would either accomplish or make necessary the conquest of the Americas.

Post mortems are often unpleasant, but they are sometimes profitable. It may pay to turn back to the close of the first World War and review the dreams of those who saw a possibility of a world brotherhood arising from the ruins, and who saw their visions blacked out by tidal waves of nationalism. I am sure it will profit us to turn the pages of history back still farther and trace the philosophies that have abandoned the leadership of scholars and enrolled under the leadership of military chieftains, and now are arrayed in battle line.

What are the irreconcilable differences between the philosophy of Hitler, which will rule Europe, Africa, and Asia if the Axis Powers conquer Great Britain and Russia, and the philosophy of America? Of course, we realize that when we adopted as the creed of America, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" that we wrote the obituary of the political concept known as the divine right of kings, but I think we little realize that modern despots have substituted for the divine right of kings the theory that the whole duty of man is obedience to a supreme racial state.

The doctrine that all men are created equal, not in mentality, not in physical powers, but equally endowed by their Creator with the inalienable right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, is an eternal denial of racial superiority and an incentive to brotherhood; a challenge to national arrogance and an impulse toward world unity. The creed of America exalted individualism, by its recognition of each person as a child of a universal Father, who bequeathed to each child equality in inalienable rights. That creed established the supremacy of man over government by the declaration that government was instituted to secure those rights and that government derived its just power from the consent of the governed. The ship of state was created for the crew, not the crew for the ship.

This creed of America is the soul of America. The 48 States may comprise her physical body, but the soul of America is that self-evident truth expressed in the Declaration of Independence. This creed of America is, and of necessity must be eternally at war with the philosophy that the supreme good is force. This dogma of the Axis Powers is as ancient as the story of Eden with the tragedy which blasted the peace of the Garden when the eldest son of Adam, on the theory that might makes right, slew his younger brother and then sought to shake off responsibility by the old query "Am I my brother's keeper?"

The 12th day of February 1809 contributed more generously than other days to the development of the philosophies between which you and I are compelled to choose. On that day two boys were born. One in a log cabin in the clay hills of Kentucky. One in a home of palatial dignity in Shrewsbury, England. The parents of one boy named him Abraham Lincoln. The parents of the other body named his Charles Darwin. Separated in birth as they were by the wideness of the seas; separated in opportunity as they were by the absolute extremes which marked the floorless cabin, the poverty-stricken environment, the association with want and ignorance of Abraham Lincoln and the aristocratic home, the schools and colleges of Shrewsbury, Edenburgh, and Cambridge, the intimacy with wealth and culture afforded Charles Darwin, they were even more widely separated in their philosophies of life.

In 1859 Abraham Lincoln expressed his philosophy of life by assuming the leadership of an effort to prevent America from becoming false to her creed. In a speech that year Lincoln said: "The people of America, by their representatives in Old Independence Hall, said to the whole race of man, 'we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' This was their majestic interpretation of the economy of the universe. They grasped not only the whole rights of men then living, but they reached forward and seized upon the farthest posterity. They erected a beacon to guide their children and their children's children."

In 1859 Charles Darwin gave to the world his Origin of Species, upon which Spencer and the exponents of German kultur founded their version of the survival of the fittest and applied that which Darwin applied to physical form and characteristics, to life as a whole. Darwin did not suggest the substitution of a molecule for a Maker. He did not intimate that moral values were mythical and power alone worthy of consideration. He did not suggest dispensing with the moral universe. Darwin emphasized the theory of progressive development as a method, not as a cause. But the theory of the survival of the fittest was seized upon by Germanic kultur and made the vehicle for an attempted black-out of everything but materialistic force. The conclusion they reached was that the only right is might. That everything in life is, and by right should be, the property of that individual or nation who can take it and keep it. That mercy, sympathy, compassion, love, are weaknesses to be relentlessly stamped out. That the gentle, the sympathetic, the affectionate must be ruled by the strong, the brutal, the pitiless. That man must be subject to the law of the jungle—must be ruled by the law of the tooth, the claw, and the fang.

That is the philosophy of life the Axis Powers present to the world today. Talk of equality of rights—it is a weakling's dream. There is no right but might. If any nation has what an Axis Power wants, it must prepare to defend it or abandon it to the Axis Power.

The weakness of the German version of the survival of the fittest lies in its definition of "the fittest." Who are the fittest? In one of his poems, W. W. Story says:

"Speak history who are life's victors
Unfurl thy long annals and say,
Are they those whom the world called the victors
Who won the success of a day?

"The martyrs or Nero—the Spartans
Who fell at Thermopylae's tryst
Or the Persians and Xerxes, his judges or Socrates,
Pilate or Christ?"

Who are the fittest? The John L. Sullivans, the Corbetts, the Joe Louises, or the Florence Nightingales, the Abraham Lincolns, the Mahatma Ghandas. Who are the fittest? The businessmen or the bandits? The gardeners in their gardens or the gangsters in their hide-outs? Who are fittest? Artists or Amazons? Preachers or plunderers? Musicians or murderers?

What is the fittest? Egotism, vanity, cruelty, malignity, ruthlessness, hate, brute force—or modesty, unselfishness, pity, helpfulness, kindness, brotherhood, love?

I am willing to accept the doctrine of the survival of the fittest, but I cannot accept a definition of the fittest that will drive justice from the purposes of men, service from the lives of men, peace from the spirits of men, laughter from the lips of childhood, and love from the hearts of humankind.

The choice I am compelled to make tonight, is the choice Pilate gave his people. Who shall we loose upon America, upon the world, upon the future of the race of men—Jesus or Barrabas? brotherhood or barbarism?

So I am led to the conclusion, my friends, that all I have ever regarded as of real and lasting value is at stake in the conflict between the philosophy that force is the only thing divine, that we are products of force

and that we become like our Creator only as we become incarnate force. And the philosophy that we are creatures of love—that God is love and that each of us as a child of God can become like our Creator only as we become love incarnate.

I am beginning to understand that the creed of America must be my personal creed. That before America can be American, I must become American—you must become American. Neither Greek nor Jew, bond nor free, but of one brotherhood, one family. It is not easy. I am a bundle of prejudices, a creature of intolerance. But prejudice, intolerance, belong to the disciples of force, not to the apostles of love.

America has declared that every man is endowed by his Creator with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which cannot be taken from him by force or without his consent. Rights which are inalienable. We have builded a citizenship of millions of Jews whom we have taught that doctrine. We have builded a citizenship of millions of Negroes and Chinese and Japanese and Indians to whom we have taught that doctrine. If we do not believe it we have builded a Frankenstein that will at least be a factor in our destruction. Either we must find room in our hearts for the Negro, the Jew, the Japanese, the Chinese, and every other race, or we deny the fundamental doctrine of America, and are but Hitlerites in masquerade. We reject the doctrine of equality, the creed of America, the brotherhood of the Galilean, the fatherhood of God.

Defense of America, therefore, must begin within me—within you. It must be an opening of the windows of the soul to the sunshine of universal brotherhood. It must include driving the bats of prejudice and intolerance from the temple of each individual life.

With an American people freed from prejudice and intolerance, an American people animated by unselfishness, motivated by love, we would have a force as irresistible as the flight of time. We would have a national life so potential for service to the race of mankind that it would be worthy of any and every sacrifice required to make it fully effective in the life of humanity.

I do not know the answers to the problems that we Americans confront tonight, but I do know how one great American sought the solution to problems equally grave.

Abraham Lincoln, charged with the preservation of the Union, bowed beneath the weight of years of bloody warfare, said: "Many times I am driven to my knees because I have no other place to go." After all, what a human experience that was. Margaret Montague told in Harpers of her little granddaughter who told many bedtime stories of the adventures of a bird, sheep, bear, or an elephant, and who always concluded the adventure with the phrase "an nen him went home to hims muvver." If someone else told the story and left the hero at large, the little one would inquire, "An nen didn't him go home to hims muvver?"

The prodigal in the New Testament who fell from happiness to homelessness, from abundance to hunger, said: "I will arise and go to my father." The Shepherd King, when his burdens seemed greater than he could bear, said, "I will lift mine eyes to the hills whence cometh my strength." All akin to the experience of Lincoln when he said, "I was driven to my knees because I had no other place to go."

I do not know the answers to our problems, but I do know that the path "home to muvver," "back to my father," "to the hills whence cometh my strength," is open to us in America tonight as it was to Abraham Lincoln, and I feel certain the surest approach to the safest national defense will be with Lincoln—on our knees.

Joint Income-Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE PLAUCHÉ

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Speaker, coming from a State that has always recognized community rights and community estates, I am delighted that the House will be permitted, under the rule adopted yesterday, to consider an amendment striking from the revenue bill section 111, which makes mandatory joint income-tax returns by husband and wife.

More important, as far as I am personally concerned, than any other argument presented for the adoption of this amendment is the effect upon the marital state that that particular provision of the bill will have if it is enacted into law.

I cannot express my personal views on this subject better than to insert as a part of my remarks a letter received by me a few days ago from the Most Reverend Jules B. Jeanmard, bishop of Lafayette:

The Honorable VANCE PLAUCHÉ,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PLAUCHÉ: No doubt your attention has already been called to Arthur Krock's article, A New Penalty on the Marital State, which appeared in the New York Times of Friday, July 4, and which makes such a clear case against the proposed revision of the 1941 Revenue Act, making mandatory joint income-tax returns by husband and wife. Whilst I am heart and soul in favor of any legitimate measure that has for its purpose the levying of the necessary taxes for the strengthening of our defense, this particular measure should, in my humble opinion, be opposed on the ground that it would, in many cases, penalize marriage, place a premium on divorce and upon celibacy—practiced for selfish and unworthy motives—and promote immorality. Surely no measure should be adopted which would further tend to decrease the birth rate, already at an alarmingly low ebb in this country.

For these reasons, then, I would ask that you oppose this measure which, however well intended by its proponents, will, if enacted into law, be attended by such serious consequences.

With sentiments of esteem and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JULES B. JEANMARD,
Bishop of Lafayette.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to maintain our Christian civilization, we must not penalize the marital state but must help and encourage family life.

The only argument presented in favor of this provision is that it will provide needed revenue.

In my opinion, it is far more important at this time that we will do nothing that will tend to penalize marriage, place a premium on divorce, which is now a national scandal, and promote immorality.

I urge every Member of the House to carefully consider the far-reaching effects of section 111, providing for joint returns, as outlined above, and support the amendment which will be presented striking section 111 from the bill.

The Duty of Congress in Time of Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. LARRABEE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM H. LARRABEE, OF INDIANA

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement that I have prepared to express my views in reply to numerous communications coming to me from my district and from all parts of the country, in which Members of Congress, who support the administration's national-defense program, are being accused of "breaking faith with the people, breaking pledges and promises to young men selected under the Selective Training and Service Act, and resorting to deceit and treachery and contributing to the efforts of the warmongers in leading our Nation into the European war."

Realizing that nearly all, if not all, other Members of this House receive many similar letters, it occurred to me that the nature of my reply to contributors of such emotional messages might be of general interest.

My statement, in which I have endeavored to set forth my views clearly and definitely, follows:

Throughout the history of mankind are to be found numerous recorded occasions when it has become necessary for the chosen leaders or officials to set aside all consideration of the welfare of the individual and their own immediate personal welfare—all thought of the possibility of reelection to office or elevation to leadership—and consider only the greater need, the welfare of all the people whose interests such leaders or officials have been charged with protecting and defending.

If it is true that the majority of the people of our State and Nation are opposed to the plans and program of our national administration for the defense of our Nation, our people and the rights and property of our people from threat of foreign encroachment, then the time is at hand when Members of Congress and other public officials must consider the greater need, that of the entire Nation and all of the people of the Nation, in preference to following the path of easy and pleasant action—that of attempting to satisfy the emotional demands of the individuals.

No one has a more deeply rooted hatred of war; no one objects more sincerely to militarism; no one shuns more conscientiously, than I, all things that tend toward development of armed conflict. Yet Members of Congress should be, must be, big enough to set aside personal feeling, overcome emotional sympathies, resist the pleadings of those who may be temporarily inconvenienced or displeased, and consider first and foremost the ultimate security of the ma-

jority—the very existence of our Nation in the future.

To those who have studied the development of international trends and events during the past few years with sincere and courageous vision there can come but one conviction. That is the conviction that if our leaders are to be true to the mandates of their oaths of office; if our leaders are to shun deceit and treachery and act for the common good and protection of all, they must act with bold determination in preparing for any eventuality.

To do otherwise would be to break the promises that they must have made in accepting their oath of office. To do otherwise would be to resort to the blackest treachery.

To fail to understand a danger which faces our Nation and our people may be forgiven if such failure is that of the individual in private life, but to fail to know of, understand, and prepare for such danger, on the part of a public official, sworn to protect, defend, and preserve our Nation and its people would be an act of highest treason.

Regardless of whether or not my decisions and my acts in the present grave emergency may be pleasing to the electorate, or to any specific individuals, my paramount duty is to my country and its people and I shall continue to act in every instance in consideration of my greater obligation and with regard for the dictates of my conscience. Should I fail in these highest considerations, and in so doing contribute to the downfall of my country and the enslavement of its people, I would have contributed to the destruction of the freedom of the democracy which we all cherish, and which all of us desire to perpetuate, although there are unfortunately widely divergent views concerning the action we should take to preserve our liberties.

For those who differ with my views concerning the paths of action we must follow to defend and preserve liberty and justice for all, I have only the kindliest of feelings, if their views have the substance of sincerity. For that minority who would wilfully sacrifice our national integrity and the security of our people merely for the sake of traveling the easier pathway of shunning the grave responsibility that is theirs, I hold only the deepest abhorrence.

If our Nation lives through the present crisis, and I am convinced that it will, for I am convinced that our Nation is in the right, it is of little importance whether or not my decisions and my actions so please the electorate that they may wish to return me to Congress. If I, and a majority of others in positions of grave responsibility fail in our duty now, and in so failing permit the last great citadel of democracy to be crushed upon us it will matter forever in the minds and hearts of those who may survive.

If each and every one of us is steadfast in our faith in our Nation—if each and every one of us will realize the danger that draws ever nearer and if we fortify that faith and that realization with the willingness and courage of individual sacrifice during the period of the emergency I have no doubt but that the future will bring to us more luscious fruits of peace, liberty, and prosperity than we have yet enjoyed. It is true that the path we must follow is not the easy road. But we have seen other nations endeavor to follow that avenue which is paved with appeasement, lined with concessions—the highway that attempted to circumvent all necessity for sacrifice, only to find that they were speeding to the abyss of national destruction and personal enslavement.

In the light of the greater good, the immediate welfare of the individual—my personal welfare and the personal welfare of every other individual—must be submerged. For the ultimate welfare of all individuals I dedicate myself to these precepts.

August in American History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

COMPILATION OF HISTORICAL HIGHLIGHTS BY HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 30, I presented to this Congress, in my extension of remarks, historical highlights that have occurred in our Nation's history during the month of July. I stated then that I intended to present historical highlights that have occurred during the various months of the year. I now present to this Congress for historical use August in American History:

August 1: Colorado admitted to the Union as the thirty-eighth State in 1876; Federal workmen's compensation insurance law becomes effective in 1908.

August 2: American Dental Association organized in 1855; first street letter boxes set up in America in Boston in 1858.

August 3: Christopher Columbus sails from Palos, Spain, in 1492, on journey that led to discovery of America.

August 4: John Peter Zenger, colonial editor, acquitted of libel in 1735, in famous case that established freedom of the press; United States Coast Guard established in 1790.

August 5: Admiral Farragut wins Battle of Mobile Bay in 1864; first talking motion picture presented in New York City in 1926.

August 6: Norwich College, Vermont, established as first college giving courses in civil engineering and military science, 1819.

August 7: United States War Department created by act of Congress in 1789.

August 8: New York Medical Repository, first medical and scientific periodical in America, published in 1797; Charles A. Dana, noted newspaper editor, born at Hinsdale, N. H., in 1819; mimeograph machine patented by Thomas A. Edison in 1876.

August 9: Dr. William Thomas Green Morton, discoverer of use of ether as an anesthetic, born in 1819.

August 10: Missouri admitted to Union as twenty-fourth State in 1821; Smithsonian Institution incorporated in 1846; United States Naval Academy opened at Annapolis in 1845; Herbert C. Hoover, President of the United States, born at West Branch, Iowa, in 1874; first electric streetcar operated at Baltimore in 1885.

August 11: Robert Fulton's steamboat, the *Clermont*, makes first successful run up the Hudson River from New York City in 1807.

August 12: Gold discovered in the Klondike region of Alaska in 1896.

August 13: Lucy Stone, pioneer of woman suffrage movement, born in 1818; first annual convention of letter carriers held at Boston in 1890.

August 14: First national appropriation for life-saving station is voted in 1848.

August 15: Panama Canal opened to commerce of the world in 1914.

August 16: Battle of Bennington during Revolutionary War, in 1777; first peace society, New York Peace Society, organized in 1815.

August 17: Birth of David Crockett, frontiersman and one of the heroes of Texas' fight for independence, in 1786.

August 18: Birth of Virginia Dare, first white child born in America, at Roanoke Island, Va., in 1587; Meriwether Lewis, explorer of the West with Capt. William Clark, born in 1774; first United States Government exploring expedition under Capt. John Wilkes sails on voyage in 1836 that resulted in discovery of the Anarctic Continent.

August 19: Orville Wright, one of the inventors of the airplane, born in 1871; battle between American frigate *Constitution* and British man-of-war *Guerriere* in 1812.

August 20: Birth of Francis Asbury, pioneer bishop of Methodist Church who established Methodism in America, in 1745; birth of Benjamin Harrison, President of the United States, in 1833, at North Bend, Ohio.

August 21: First adding machine patented in 1888; American Bar Association organized at Saratoga, N. Y., in 1878; Lincoln-Douglas debates began at Ottawa, Ill., in 1858.

August 22: First international yacht race won by American schooner *America* in 1851.

August 23: Birth of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry, whose dispatch from the Battle of Lake Erie—"we have met the enemy and they are ours"—has become part of the American tradition, in 1785.

August 24: Center foundation of Capitol in Washington laid in 1818; Parcel Post Service authorized in 1912.

August 25: Bret Harte, novelist and poet of the West, born in 1836.

August 26: City of Los Angeles founded in 1781; University of Michigan established in 1817; woman suffrage amendment to Constitution becomes effective in 1920.

August 27: First flow of petroleum near Titusville, Pa., marks beginning of commercial development of petroleum industry in 1859.

August 28: Henry Hudson discovers the Delaware River in 1609; Coal first mined in the United States in 1806; Glenn H. Curtiss Wins Gordon Bennett Cup in first international air meet at Rheims, France, in 1909.

August 29: First Indian reservation in the United States established in Burlington County, N. J., in 1758; Oliver Wendell Holmes, famous author and father of Supreme Court Justice of same name, born in 1809.

August 30: Battle of Manassas or second Bull Run during War between the States in 1862.

August 31: Charleston, S. C., earthquake, most devastating east of Mississippi River, in 1886; patent for moving-picture camera granted to Thomas A. Edison in 1897.

Waterways Improved by Russia for Military Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at my request the Chief of Engineers has furnished me with information on the waterway improvements by Russia for military preparedness.

A number of important waterway projects in Russia had been completed and others had been started before hostilities commenced in the Russo-German war. A recent German communique boasted that should her railroads be damaged by

aerial attack she had an adequate system of inland waterways to provide a transportation alternative. The Soviet Union may not be so fortunate but her improved waterways will to some extent provide such an alternative.

The Dnieper River flows from the vicinity of Smolensk through the Ukraine district of southwestern Russia and empties into the Black Sea. A large hydroelectric and navigation project located about 200 miles above the mouth of the river has facilitated navigation over the rapids in that vicinity. The Dnieper is navigable for about 500 miles above its mouth to the general region of the central German offensive toward Moscow. According to newspaper accounts, pitched battles have recently been fought in this region and the river was filled with the bodies of dead soldiers. Kiev, the goal of the German drive for the rich Ukraine territory, is located on the Dnieper some 250 miles above the hydroelectric development referred to. This dam, 200 feet high, was designed and built with American equipment, under the supervision of an eminent American hydroelectric engineer, the late Hugh L. Cooper, and will generate annually 2,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power as well as facilitate navigation through the Ukraine. Russia, like the rest of the world, having become conscious that the power of falling water is an inexhaustible natural resource that can be destroyed only by geological changes in the earth's surface, is proceeding to harness these resources for the use and benefit of all her people.

The rivers of southwestern European Russia more or less parallel her lines of defense and thereby provide natural obstacles to invading forces. They are not so advantageous for the supply of military operations as if they were perpendicular to the military lines. However, prior to becoming defense lines they are valuable for transportation.

The White Sea-Baltic Canal connects with the Moscow-Volga Canal and provides navigation between Moscow, Leningrad, Archangel, and other Arctic Ocean ports. It constitutes an inside route from Leningrad to Archangel less than one-fourth the hazardous journey around Finland, Sweden, and Norway. Light naval units such as submarines and destroyers can be shifted from the Baltic Sea to the Arctic Ocean through these protected inland waterways, a military advantage of no little importance. The newspapers tell us from day to day that Leningrad is about to fall or that the Germans have been repulsed in that region, but it is significant that even if Leningrad should fall and the railroad between Leningrad and Moscow be cut, it would be necessary for the Germans to push more than 100 miles farther east before they could intercept the waterway connection between Moscow and the important resources of the Arctic coastal region.

Until the Baltic-White Sea Canal and its connection with the Moscow-Volga Canal were completed and navigation extended through these canals to the White Sea and Arctic Ocean and thence up the rivers flowing into the Arctic Ocean, the abundant timber and rich mineral resources of the Arctic region including the Kola Peninsula and numerous islands above the Arctic Circle were untouched. In the Kola Peninsula, between the White Sea and the Arctic Ocean, an ore has been found from which aluminum can be produced and two large plants have been placed in operation to supply this essential metal. The Arctic region of Russia has become productive due to water transportation made possible by man-made improvements. Former frozen waste now support communities and ports that have sprung into existence as a result of waterway transportation. Coal and oil abound in the Pechora District, along the eastern Arctic coast. The geological chart of the Arctic coasts of Russia, prepared by the Arctic Institute, shows coal at 73 points, peat in fair quantity, gold and graphite at 26 points on the Chutkotsk Peninsula, lead and zinc on Vaigach Island, copper on Novaya-Zemlya, and iron and sulphite at other localities.

Recent newspaper articles have quoted prominent Russian officials as saying that the Russians had large reserves of men, materials, and factories behind Moscow and even behind the Ural Mountains and that her armies could retire again and again, and still be supplied with war matériel. Information on the exact location of these matériel and manufacturing facilities is not available, but it appears that the abundant resources of the Arctic region have been made available by waterways, which have supplied and will continue to supply the raw materials for military operations.

The partially completed plan for connecting Moscow with five seas has resulted in a network of waterway transportation behind military defensive lines, suitable for military supply, something like the waterway system in Germany. Moscow is connected with the Baltic by the Volga Canal, with the Arctic Ocean by Volga and White Sea Canals, with the Caspian Sea by Volga Canal and River, and has been or is to be connected with the Black and Azov Seas by the Volga and Don Canals. Thus outlying regions of timber, minerals, and other resources are connected with the interior and central manufacturing centers of Russia.

It is comparatively easy to put a railroad out of operation. One bomb hit on one bridge stops operations. A natural waterway can hardly be damaged at all by military operations and even an improved waterway is difficult to put out of operation. One barge tow on a river carries the tonnage carried by 10 freight trains. And a canal or a river can accommodate a great deal more tonnage than a railroad. Naturally countries in Europe, where wars are continually being prepared for or being waged, give prime consideration to the improvements of their waterways, and Russia appears to have attended to and to be attending to the maintenance and improvement of her inland waterways.

Poll Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 29, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM VARIOUS NEWSPAPERS

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, the demand for the repeal of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting is growing by leaps and bounds throughout the United States. All over the country people are realizing that it is more than just a local matter. They are beginning to realize that the votes of those from districts that need not concern themselves with the rights of certain groups are affecting the entire Nation.

It will be noted that the following editorials represent many sections of the country and that one or two of them show conclusively that the bill that I have introduced, providing for the repeal of this tax, is constitutional:

[From the Nashville Tennesseean of July 17, 1941]

MASSES HOKUM

Our esteemed contemporary, the Daily Herald, of Columbia, pleased that the Maury County court again has failed to remove the county poll tax, regrets that the court "skirted a proposal to force collection of the tax."

The Herald should and must know that all county courts faint at the very thought of enforcing collection of this tax, and whether that is because the courts know, better than the Herald, just how much this tax is despised by the people or because the courts, like the Herald, are quite content that the majority of the people should have no vote, the Herald, of course, also knows.

The Herald advocates collection of the tax, but will not, we believe, advocate this too strongly—since nothing would bring about the erasure of this despicable levy from our tax books (and probably the separation of the administration that ordered it from the public pay roll) more promptly and surely than real enforcement of its collection.

In Maury, as in the 94 other Tennessee counties, the great majority of those against whom the tax is assessed never pay it. In Maury, as throughout the State, the vast majority of the people never vote—though our Constitution rightly calls the suffrage a right, and there can be no democracy where at least a majority of the people are not free to exercise the right.

The Herald is confident that if the Maury magistrates could be prevailed upon to enforce payment "Maury County could prove to all the world that the poll tax is not only a fair tax, but can be collected." This, besides being a large if, and a confession of the actual futility of the tax, doesn't make sense—since when in the history of the world was the fairness of any tax demonstrated by the simple ability of the taxing agency to gather it in?

Says the Herald:

"Each year our constables (and those in other counties) take solemn oath that they have been on the property of each delinquent as to poll taxes and found there no property

on which to levy. *They know and all know this is not so.*"

The italics are ours. The perjurers obviously are all the constables in all the counties. And the cravens and scofflaws, it is equally obvious, are those of us who recognize this perjury and this utter and general disregard of a law, even so shameful and antidemocratic a law as that which imposes the poll tax as a prerequisite to the vote, and do nothing about it.

The Tennessean, we like to feel, is doing something. We are trying, and shall not desist, to procure the extermination of the poll-tax law and relief for the supposedly free-born people of Tennessee from the hideous situation of arrant tax-avoidance and official dishonesty so aptly described by our contemporary, and so certainly the effect of the kind of a tax the poll tax is.

The Herald calls this attitude "catering to the masses." We accept the soft impeachment. We refuse to draw a line between the masses and the people. We believe in the right of the people to vote as we believe in the principles upon which our Nation is founded, the principles which alone distinguish a government of, by, and for the people from all the forms of tyranny and authoritarianism that strut the globe.

The Herald calls this attitude "feeding the masses hokum." Let the definition rest with the common sense of all Tennesseans.

It definitely is not hay that there has not been in Tennessee a State or national election by popular majority in upward of 20 years.

Kill the poll tax.

[From the Newark (N. J.) Evening News of July 7, 1941]

FIGHT ON POLL TAX

Before another general election payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting for candidates for Federal office will probably have been outlawed by the Congress in the eight Southern States where the imposition of such a tax still obtains. Hearings will shortly be held by a Senate judiciary subcommittee on a bill to prohibit such restriction. Once passed—and there is no question that it will pass—there will be an end to the means effectively employed for so long to keep the South solid.

Campaigns for State repeal of the tax have been made by such organizations as the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, the Southern Electoral Reform League, and southern branches of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. They have argued that the poll tax is contrary to the fundamental principles of democracy in that it disenfranchises large groups of citizens. In recent years these efforts have been successful in North Carolina, Louisiana, and Florida, where large increases in the numbers of voters immediately resulted.

Those States that have stood against repeal will doubtless put up a fight against Federal action. Already the shibboleth of invasion of States' rights has been raised. It indicates, however, that some southern Members of the Congress have not yet grasped the significance of a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States 6 weeks ago. That decision, reversing a doctine established 20 years earlier, asserted the congressional power to regulate primaries for the nomination of Federal office candidates. Its application to the States' rights issue is found in these words of the opinion by the new Chief Justice:

"While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States, this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject * * * to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections * * * and its more general powers * * * 'to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.'"

The language admits of no doubt as to its intent and scope. Clearly, if the Congress decrees that voters for Federal candidates shall not be required to pay a poll tax, the States have no alternative.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian of July 16, 1941]

POLL-TAX SCANDALS

Only an interest in the cause of clean politics elsewhere will be felt by Oregonians in the indicated renewal of pressure in Congress for enactment of the anti-poll-tax bill. It has no bearing on this State. The bill will not be directed at poll taxes per se, but to making poll-tax payment a prerequisite for voting in Federal elections.

Oregon abolished poll taxes by constitutional amendment adopted in 1910, and while possession of a poll-tax receipt was never a voting qualification, collection of the tax had had some scandalous aspects. The original purpose to use the head-tax principle for county road building was in early days rather generally observed. The tax could be worked out on the roads and in rural communities; that was the common procedure. Even that fell into disuse, and the unpopularity of the tax resulted in enforcement of collections directed at those deemed safe from the political standpoint to crack down on.

Chinese laborers became chief victims, and it was charged that deputy sheriffs who made poll-tax round-ups of Chinamen often pocketed the taxes they paid. Sheriffs were on a fee basis and they got their bit of poll taxes turned in. The Chinese learned to demand "chuck-chee," or receipt, which they could show to foreclose another collection from them in the same year, if they moved to jobs in other counties. Devices were employed to get the chuck-chees away from them in order to soak them again.

The poll tax was in such disrepute that when, in 1910, its constitutional prohibition was offered as bait for a measure granting county option in taxation, the measure was readily passed, to be amended in the next year so as to retain the poll tax inhibition but repeal county tax option.

Payment of poll tax as a voting prerequisite is in force in eight Southern States. It is employed in part to suppress Negro voting and in part as a political-machine device for controlling elections. In some States the tax is cumulative as a voting prerequisite. In Georgia it might cost a tax delinquent $47.47 to vote; in Alabama $36. A time limit for payment prior to election, which runs as high as 6 months, induces forgetfulness among white voters. The tax collector, by reminding those who are "right" with his political crowd, and by predating receipts, becomes a power in his factional machine. Though payment of poll tax in behalf of others is prohibited, it is frequently resorted to in block proportions.

The poll-tax States are not without their own electoral reform organizations, but congressional action is in general opposed by Southern political leaders.

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) Courier-Express of July 13, 1941]

BAN ON POLL TAXES

Hearings are shortly to be opened by a Senate judiciary subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Senator NORRIS, on a new bill to prohibit collection of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections. The bill was introduced by Senator PEPPER, often an administration spokesman, after a conference at the White House. It is expected to have administration support when pressed for enactment after a short midsummer recess of Congress.

Poll taxes were once collected by virtually all States of the American Union, but are now retained in only eight States of the South—Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. Originally, the imposition of a poll tax was employed as a means of extending the franchise. During the early years of the Republic, when a poll tax was substituted for ownership of land as a qualification for voting, exercise of the ballot was extended to hundreds of thousands of citizens to whom it had previously been denied. Massachusetts held to its poll tax until 1892 and Pennsylvania until 1933, but in all of the Southern States, except Georgia, poll taxes had been repealed by the end of the Civil War.

It was not until after Reconstruction that poll taxes as a qualification for voting were reinstituted in the South, with the frankly stated purpose of disfranchising Negro voters. That they have worked effectively to this end is clearly shown by the testimony of all observers of southern elections and by the relatively small proportions of the adult population casting ballots in primaries and general elections in the poll-tax States. In North Carolina, Louisiana, and Florida, where poll taxes have been repealed during recent years, there have been large increases in the numbers of qualified voters.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of June 28, 1941]

HOW A ONE-PARTY SYSTEM OPERATES

It is mathematically possible for the 211,000 Texas Republicans who supported Willkie to elect a United States Senator today, though it is politically impossible, more the pity. A Republican victory would be a blessing in the form of a lesson to the whole one-party South, where the poll-tax qualification for suffrage, plus committee-controlled primaries, perpetuates minority rule.

There are, according to latest reports, 27 candidates in the Texas free-for-all special election to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Senator Morris Sheppard, 24 of them Democrats. That makes one candidate for every 30,000 of eligible Democratic voters. Even though no such division of the Democratic vote is in prospect, the possibility is a significant reflection on the effect of a vicious system in a State whose white voters alone exceed Kentucky's entire population, but which seldom casts as large a vote as Kentucky habitually casts.

Georgia, another poll-tax State, presented a striking illustration of minority rule at a special election on constitutional amendments, June 3. Only 60,000 Georgians, approximately, bothered to vote at all, and the election triumphed by a relatively small majority. Georgia's basic law, thus, was changed by fewer than 2 percent of its citizens.

We need not dwell upon the seriousness of subjecting our organic law to alteration at the will of so small a fraction of the electorate. We can only be thankful that the Bill of Rights is beyond the reach of a one-party system as it is maintained in most deep-south States, where the vote steadily declines while the population increases.

Although Georgia's population is 300,000 larger than Kentucky's its registered voters number only 540,401, of whom 280,000 participated in the last State election, as compared to 815,538 in Kentucky. And Georgia primary returns refute the explanation that, since the Democratic nomination is equivalent to the election, the voters are interested in the primary. They are not. Gov. Keen Johnson, who was nominated by a plurality of 33,000, received more votes in the 1939 primary than were cast for all the candidates in Georgia's last Democratic State primary.

The system in the poll-tax States discourages citizens from qualifying. Primaries are conducted by the party organization. Evidently, to an increasing number of citizens, a poll-tax receipt isn't worth the price for the privilege of casting a vote against an organization which counts the ballots.

We might add that the theoretically elite electorates of Commonwealths which exclude the masses from the polls haven't distinguished themselves by the superiority of their selections. We offer in evidence Governors "Pa" and "Ma" Ferguson, and the incumbent, "Pass-the-Biscuits" O'Daniel, of Texas, as well as Georgia's reelected chief executive, Gene (Suspenders) Talmadge, who seems to be about to purge Georgia's universities of "furrin' professors" to make places for home talent.

[From the Fresno (Calif.) Bee of July 11, 1941]

POLL TAX SURVIVES IN ONLY EIGHT UNITED STATES STATES

The poll tax once was almost universal in the American Union; it survives in only eight States, Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

And in these States it is retained not primarily as a revenue-raising device but rather for the purpose of disfranchising large numbers of voters, particularly the Negroes.

A swift glance at the actual number of votes cast in these States proves the poll-tax requirement has reduced drastically the actual balloting. Moreover, in North Carolina, Louisiana, and Florida the abolition of the poll tax was followed immediately by a large increase in the number of registered voters.

As to the practical evils inherent in the system, the Editorial Research Reports of Washington gives this illuminating sidelight:

"The political machine profits both from a small electorate which can be more readily watched and manipulated and from the direct advantage which the poll-tax system gives to those who are in control of the machinery of government. In the large cities it is customary for the machine to keep a number of poll taxes constantly paid up. If the persons in whose names the payments are made have died or moved away, others can be found to impersonate them at the polls.

"In the counties, if any officeholder is in danger of losing his post, the whole group can pool their resources to pay up enough taxes to insure him a majority of the electors. The tax collector becomes a key man in the system, for he can keep his faction informed of the tax status of his supporters and opponents, can assist his political friends to pay their taxes on time, or can antedate the tax receipts of those who may be dilatory.

"To the candidates he favors, the tax collector can offer advantageous terms of tax settlement, omitting penalties and interest for their followers, or even giving credit for taxes to a list of voters which the candidate hands in to his office. This manipulation in administration of the tax sometimes results in disfranchisement of substantial citizens as well as of Negroes and others in low-income groups."

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare, the Southern Electoral Reform League, and other progressive organizations in Dixie are working to erase all poll-tax laws from the statute books.

And the Federal Government also may take a hand in the fight.

The Senate Judiciary Committee is shortly to begin hearings on a bill by Senator PEPPER, of Florida, to prohibit the collection of poll taxes as a requisite for voting in Federal elections.

This at least would protect the voting rights of the citizens of poll-tax States in the selection of presidential electors and Congressmen.

Best of all, however, would be the awakening of public sentiment throughout the South to such an extent that the eight offending States finally would join the other 40 in making an end to the whole poll-tax system.

Any sort of property requirement for voting is thoroughly abhorrent to the best traditions of our American democracy.

Observations by Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, United States Army, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

LETTER TO HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following letter received from Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, United States Army, retired, gives his views on methods used in the promotion of Army officers.

The letter is as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 28, 1941.*

To the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
The House of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports the passage by Congress of Senate Joint Resolution 88 to strengthen the common defense by suspending section 24b of the National Defense Act during the emergency and authorizing a more expeditious procedure to vitalize the active list of the officers of our Army.

It has long been a major tragedy—and a cause of much loss to the Nation—that we promote the average Army officers, the good officers and the lesser number of superior officers, by the routine method of seniority up to the grade of colonel. When we are at war we do promote all the Army officers by selection.

Promotion by seniority demands that in the confusion of preparing for battle we are compelled to experiment with our Army officers, particularly with the general officers, in the effort to place the more competent officers in the more responsible positions. This experimentation and weeding out the incompetent officers should be done gradually and thoroughly in time of peace. The press has been announcing the names of many general officers who are to be relieved of commands they have had for months in order that these generals may be replaced by more competent and as a rule by younger general officers

This system of experimenting with our Army officers, while we are in emergency preparations for possible war, has in the past produced much confusion and some almost unbelievable results. It inevitably delays and mars the early training of a number of units of the new Army.

All the navies of the world have a selection system for promoting naval officers. All the armies of the world, save only our own Army, use the selection system in advancing army officers. Gen. George C. Marshall, the Army Chief of Staff, is reported by the press as having just stated to the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate that he would prefer a selection system for promoting our Army officers. Gen. Douglas MacArthur said, in one of his annual reports as Chief of Staff, "The main disadvantage of the seniority method is its tendency to discourage initiative and enterprise among young officers of ability." The Newton D. Baker Board on Army Aviation reported, "There should be adopted for the Army a system of selection similar to that now provided for the Navy and the Marine Corps."

The Army efforts in the past to eliminate the incompetent officers have failed. This is only natural; save during a great emergency, boards composed of members of the Army, or of members of any Government bureau, will lack the determination and the courage to eliminate a number of their own comrades each year. Procedure by elimination is a negative measure. Promotion by selection is a positive measure, and it has the powerful element of competition—an element of great value to the State and to the taxpayers.

Our plan of habitually assigning the higher Army officers on an experimental basis at the beginning of an emergency produces some extraordinary results. I recollect training a regiment that I fought in all our major battles in France in a great southern camp. The routine inspections of officers of the inspector general's department caused the removal of all four of the generals in that camp. Two were West Point graduates with long service in the Army. My small command was the only unit sent to France. I went into battle at Chateau-Thierry without a field officer. The War Department had sent me four lieutenant colonels and majors. I had never met any of them. But I had to send each one in turn away, after weeks of effort, failing to secure from them average energy, speed, and power—force of action. The major tragedy of the event was the disappointment of the 20,000 drafted men in the camp. The command was turned into a replacement unit—with no chance to go to France as a division. The fighting power of my men was such that I was made a brigadier general. On going some distance to my three regiments of my new command, I made at once thorough inspection as to their methods and fighting power. I had to send two of the three colonels to the rear. One of the two was a West Pointer with long service in the Regular Army.

We fought behind the lines of British and French troops at first. After the disaster of Bull Run, Mr. Lincoln had ample time to rebuild his new army. He had the greater resources and factories. He had most of the small number of officers of the old Regular Army—and he had 73 percent of the living West Point men who fought in both northern and southern armies. However, we shall now be compelled to maintain a larger military force in time of peace than heretofore.

It is mandatory for the safety of the United States that we have a better Army than we have had in peacetime. The most necessary thing for that is promotion for all officers by selection. Let the privates of the drafted men and all others have the freest chance for promotion for superior work in the training. The two routine objections to promotion by selection are both childish and also inaccurate. They are that the men we see doing well in peace may not do well in war. And that there is injustice in promotions by selection. Indeed there is great injustice in promotion by seniority—the injustice to the able officers with power, force, and initiative and the continuing injustice to the people of the United States. The officers we see doing well in peace are as a general rule the very men who excell in war—they are prepared for war.

A study of the battle of Crete shows that successful Army officers must in the future be men possessing greater and greater qualities of personal initiative and resourcefulness. The capture of Crete in a few days, under the circumstances, was an epoch-making event in warfare. It was the most marked event since the introduction of gunpowder. Britain controlled the sea. But the British were unable to prevent large German forces from being ferried by air across the sea and landing on the island of Crete. This notwithstanding the fact that Britain gallantly sacrificed in the fighting several powerful destroyers and cruisers. The British were in possession of Crete. They had an army there, with defended positions, artillery, tanks, and other heavy equipment. The Germans took Crete without artillery and tanks and other such special equipment. They ferried to Crete thousands of armed infantry soldiers in transport planes and in gliders. The German dive bombers acted in the place of artillery and tanks in the battle, to aid in defeating the British forces on Crete.

German air power in Crete demonstrated the fact that the air forces can now hold as well as seize positions; that air forces are not simply auxiliary to the older arms—as many have long asserted.

Yours faithfully,

WILLIAM C. RIVERS,
Major General, United States Army, Retired.

"I Think America Is Swell," Says Fred Gong, an Oregon Chinese Boy, and Ranks First in a Contest With 1,600,000 American Students

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE SUNDAY OREGONIAN OF JULY 27, 1941

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the melting pot of America is still at work producing young Americans who will carry on and continue to hold aloft the standards we have erected here in this land of freedom in 150 years of progress. This is strikingly brought to our attention by the achievement of a young American of my district, Fred Gong, born of Chinese parentage and recently given the first award in the fourth annual American Magazine youth forum competition. The award was the unanimous decision of the judges who studied the 655,898 articles, paintings, and drawings submitted by America's high-school and preparatory-school students. This represented 1,600,000 students throughout the United States. The prize-winning picture, drawn by this young Oregonian student, is entitled "What My Community Contributes to the Nation," and depicts the scenes of the early Oregon pioneers crossing the plains in their covered wagons drawn by ox teams and the achievements they and their successors have wrought in the Oregon country in lumber, fishing, agriculture, manufacturing, and the harnessing of the great waterways, so as to release to the whole Northwest territory the never ending hydroelectric energy, turning the wheels of industry and lighting the homes of these thriving communities.

The accomplishments of this young man restores and renews our faith in democracy, and gives us renewed energy and vision to press forward in our endeavors to preserve our American way of life and to protect it from invasion by the ideologies of the Old World. We want to continue to preserve America as a haven for those of all faiths who love liberty and want to live under the protection of the Stars and Stripes. The brilliant achievement of this young man of Chinese blood will strengthen our desire to give increased help to the courageous Chinese people in their heroic fight to preserve their own country and beat off the Japanese invaders who seek to subject them to slavery or death.

Mr. Speaker, America will be safe in the hands of young Americans such as Fred Gong. As one of the judges of this contest said:

What impresses me most about the competition is the unanimous conviction among the younger generation that our way of life can and must be preserved. To me this is positive proof that there are no bottlenecks in the production line of the arsenal of young democracy.

Under leave heretofore granted, I include as part of my remarks an article written by this young American, describing his journey across the United States, which was made possible as a part of the award for his achievement. I also include a short biographical statement of this Chinese family and the boy who has performed this outstanding achievement. These articles appeared in the Sunday Oregonian under date of July 27, 1941, and are as follows:

[From the Sunday Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., July 27, 1941]

I THINK AMERICA IS SWELL—A CONFESSION OF FAITH FROM FREDDIE GONG (A VERY HAPPY YOUNG MAN OF PORTLAND, OREG.)

(By Fred Gong)

In two and a half wonderful weeks I traveled from Portland to the tip of Cape Cod, where America's artists have found a paradise among the fishermen of New England. I saw Chicago, Washington, New York, and Boston, and besides the cities I saw the mountains, and fields, and prairies that shape America.

Maybe it's because I am young that everything was thrilling. Sometimes I wonder whether, if I were older, it would have been possible to enjoy America as much, or whether such a feeling as mine must be explained as a byproduct of one's teens.

However you explain it, America to me was all a marvelous adventure, an experience you see and feel more easily than you tell. On the train I tried to put some of my feeling into drawings. My art teacher, Miss Ruth Halvorsen, of Lincoln High School, accompanied me on the trip, also as a guest of the American magazine, and we sketched with water colors whenever there was time throughout the trip.

Riding on the train, we sketched the powerful brown mountains of the Rocky range, and the prairies of Wyoming, where herds of white-faced cattle graze on the rolling landscape. We really saw cowboys, too. If I were a cowboy in Wyoming, I know how I'd feel—it's a place where you seem to rule the world. You feel you are very high up and the land is very far down.

In Chicago, we saw the Art Institute and all its masterpieces. The Institute and the National Museum in Washington, and the fine museums in New York City opened my eyes to the artistic wealth of America. I had always thought the great paintings were kept in Europe, but scores of them are here.

In Washington, we saw the Capitol, the Congressional Library, Washington's and Lincoln's Monuments, General Lee's Home at Arlington, and Mount Vernon, where George Washington lived and died. And from Washington we continued on to New York.

New York—with its skyscrapers and subways, its theaters and hotels, its stock exchange and the long green island called Central Park—holds the finest things man has made. But we saw the lower East River section, too, and it seemed to me New York has the most of the worst, as well as most of the best.

On our trip to Boston and Provincetown, Miss Halvorsen was the guide. I want to go back to Provincetown some day. The colors jumped up like nothing I had ever seen—the water was never so blue, the sand never had so many colors—yellow, ochre, orange, green, Prussian blue.

On the boat returning from Provincetown to Boston, someone heard I had won the American's $1,000 art prize, and I had to make a speech from the bandstand and autograph all copies of the magazine on the boat.

How this could have happened to me, I cannot explain. I only know I think America is swell—it's wonderful.

SO THE FAMILY STAYED IN OREGON—AND FREDDIE WENT TO NEW YORK

The American public likes to have its decisions vindicated now and then—and vindication never came more agreeably than in the case of the Portland Chinese-American family which thousands of citizens have come to know simply, almost affectionately, as "the Gongs."

The Gongs—Fred Gong and his wife, May; their Mexican-born son Henry, 20; and their four American-born children, Fred, 18; Betty, 16; Peter, 14; and Michael, 4—are living useful American lives today because the public came to their rescue 2½ years ago.

Chinese-born, Mr. and Mrs. Gong entered the United States from Mexico in 1922 with their first child, Henry, then 1 year old. They remained after forfeiting $3,000 bond, and 14 years later the father, mother, and son Henry were arrested in Portland on a charge of illegal entry into the United States. By that time there were three more children, American-born, and a baby was on the way.

After 2 years of delay, the case came to a head in 1938, and the crux of the public's concern was this: Should a family with four young American citizens in its ranks be split by a deportation action, or packed off in whole or in part to China, when that land was under Japanese invasion? The public's answer was "No."

So effectively did Portlanders protest that the deportation action was dropped, and the Gongs permitted to remain.

Since that time, son Henry has distinguished himself annually by winning scholarships at Albany College. Daughter Betty has been praised as a pianist.

Now, son Freddie has established himself as the best high-school artist in America. In June he was named winner of the American Magazine Youth Art Forum's $1,000 first award for his oil painting, reproduced above, showing the contributions of the Oregon country to the Nation. In addition to the

$1,000, he was taken to New York City as a guest of the magazine, and he tells about his trip in the story at the top of this page.

With his prize, Freddie Gong plans to pursue his art studies. Those who have watched his progress since the days when, as a 4-year-old, he returned home from the zoo and drew pictures of the animals on the sidewalk in front of his father's barber shop, believe that the young artist's career will be a great one.

And those who went to the rescue of the Gongs 9 years ago are prouder now than ever that, unknowingly, they contributed handsomely to the artistic wealth of young America by the kindly act of saving one family from disruption and perhaps disaster.

War in Heaven Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take this opportunity of calling to the attention of the country and the Congress the following pointed parable from the Christian Century for July 23, 1941. Its author, Rev. John Haynes Holmes, is one of the distinguished clergymen of America, there being 45 lines devoted to his activities and accomplishments in the current volume of Who's Who in America.

[From the Christian Century of July 23, 1941]

WAR IN HEAVEN AGAIN—A PARABLE

(By John Haynes Holmes)

Now the war in heaven had ended with a victory for Michael and his angels; and Satan and all his hosts had been cast into hell.

But Satan was not content with hell and wanted to get back into heaven again. So he plotted and planned another war. Only he doubted Beelzebub, lest Beelzebub turn against him when he was engaged with Michael and his angels and gain the headship of hell. So he took Beelzebub into his confidence and talked with him about his purposes and besought his aid. And Beelzebub consented. And behold, Satan and Beelzebub signed a nonaggression pact. * * *

And the war came and raged a year and 9 months, and Satan won great victories over Michael. But Beelzebub helped not in the fight, but watched Satan and took advantage of him and profited greatly in his own interest. And Satan distrusted Beelzebub the more, and suspected that he had in Beelzebub a jealous rival, and therefore a foe who would rise against him when he was locked in final combat with Michael.

So Satan pondered the problem and took counsel with his infernal ministers and captains. And these ministers and captains also did distrust Beelzebub and advised attack upon him, that he be destroyed. Then would Satan be free to fight and destroy Michael and win again his place in heaven. And Satan agreed and turned all his minions against Beelzebub. And Beelzebub marshaled all his deadly hosts against Satan. And there was war in hell. * * *

Now, when Michael saw this he was glad. And he mounted the ramparts of heaven and lifted a shout. And he hailed Beelzebub as his brother in arms, and promised him aid and comfort in his battle against Satan. He said he took back nothing of all that he had said against Beelzebub; but, he added, "We have but one aim and one single irrevocable purpose. We have resolved to destroy Satan. * * * Any demon who fights Satan will have our aid. Any demon who fights with Satan is our foe." And he sent a celestial commission into hell to confer with Beelzebub and to join hand and heart with him.

And Michael went to God and told the Most High what he had done. And he said, "Behold, O God, Beelzebub is now our friend. We beg that he be received among us and be crowned with light and be given Thine own sword. For this is a holy war, and those are holy who fight against our foe."

And God laughed.

St. Lawrence Seaway Not a Defense Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. WALTER C. PLOESER, OF MISSOURI

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to address the Nation on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway project over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Saturday, July 26. The following are my remarks:

It has been my privilege on two prior occasions to speak to the American people on various phases of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project—once, concerning the treaty history, and once, concerning the detrimental economic effect. Only very briefly have I mentioned anything in regard to the argument being advanced that this is a defense project.

There is an attempt to build in the public mind the false opinion that the St. Lawrence seaway was a defense measure.

Very few people have the privilege to come to Washington and listen to the committee hearings on legislation. The press, restricted by a need for brevity, is unable to get the entire story before the people.

Tonight my purpose is to convince you that the St. Lawrence seaway is not a defense measure. I shall comment briefly on some of the statements of the people advocating the project in the name of defense. By their own statements you and I will be able to judge the truth of this defense claim. You will agree with me that the term "defense" in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway project is but an excuse. It is a pity that at a time like this when the Nation is so heavily burdened with the costs of actual and true defense work that anyone should attempt to foist this additional burden upon the American taxpayer.

For the benefit of those who are not acquainted with the project, I explain. At the present time, the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States is considering a bill which would approve and authorize an agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Dominion of Canada. This agreement calls for the building of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. According to our Constitution, the agreement is really a treaty and should have been submitted to the United States Senate for ratification. This constitutional method has failed once before during this administration. Feeling that it would not be possible to secure the constitutional two-thirds vote needed in the Senate, the devious method of presenting the treaty as an agreement is being used in the hope of obtaining congressional approval by a simple majority vote of both Houses.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project is a plan to open the Great Lakes to ocean traffic and international trade by creating a 27-foot channel through the Lakes and rivers from Lake Superior to the mouth of the St. Lawrence River in Canada. It includes the building of a power dam. The authority sought from Congress would authorize the President to transfer the power produced to the State of New York. The cost, which, of course, would be borne by the taxpayers of the Nation, is estimated by the proponents at approximately $266,000,000. To make the deepened channel usable, it will also be necessary for the Government to deepen many important harbors in the Great Lakes. No estimates are being advanced by the administration for this harbor work, but conservative technicians believe that such necessary work will run the total cost to an amount in excess of $1,000,000,000.

During the last few weeks the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives has been holding public hearings on this St. Lawrence subject. The purposes of the seaway are twofold; first, the development of ocean navigation into the Great Lakes; second, the development of a power dam for the production of electric power. I have strongly opposed the navigation part of the project because of its injury to the Nation from an economic standpoint. The two interests are so joined together at the present time so as to be almost inseparable. I am opposing the power project at this time because of the need of speed in the development of electric energy for defense.

The proponents say it is national defense. The facts, however, are a glaring contradiction to all of the arguments advanced in behalf of the project as a defense measure.

Only a novice would be foolhardy enough at this time to predict the ultimate disposal of the issues involved. They are so numerous and so vitally important that years may be consumed in their final determination. The project itself involves not only questions of international law and international rights, but it also involves questions of sovereignty and the rights of the Federal Government under the general welfare clause of the Federal Constitution. This issue is nonpartisan. The ratification of the agreement is being urged by the powerful forces of the administration, by the Governor of New York, and by a few friends of free trade and economic internationalism throughout the Nation. Oddly enough, among many others, it is being opposed by men in the shipping industry on the Great Lakes, who see in the building of a deep waterway to the ocean the end of American supremacy on the fresh-water seas of the continent.

Is this Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway a defense measure? I say it is not. If it is not, then we certainly cannot afford it at this time. If it is not, then we would be foolhardy to waste time on the project when time is so important. In spite of all of the promises of the administration to cut to the bone all nondefense spending, the administration is already authorized to spend, in the coming year, $88,000,000 more for nondefense expenditures than they spent last year. Whatever might be added by this proposal will be just that much more nondefense spending.

Now, if St. Lawrence is defense, then the two defense aids must be navigation and electric power. If the proponents are to convince us that the project is necessary to defense, two main questions must be answered. These questions are:

First. What defense aid can we obtain which will be immediately beneficial through improved facilities of navigation?

Second. What electric-power facilities can be developed which can be ready for use in defense industry?

The argument from the navigation standpoint has been that when we open the Great Lakes to ocean-going traffic, we can use the shipbuilding facilities of the Great Lakes. Secretary of the Navy Knox testified before the committee that the shipbuilding yards of the Great Lakes are already being used or about to be used to full capacity. Small Navy craft are being built on the Lakes. The deepening of the St. Lawrence channel, therefore, adds no shipbuilding facilities which are not now in good use. We do need more shipways to build ships. But even the inexperienced can readily see that it is much to our immediate advantage to build new shipways on the East or West coasts or the Gulf of Mexico, where they can be used now, without waiting 4 to 8 years before we would be able to get the boats, which are built, into the sea. When I think of building a shipway on the Lakes—then building the ship—then building the deep channel to get the ship out to the ocean where it is to be used, I am reminded of the fellow who built a cabin cruiser in the basement of his home and then had to take the house apart because it was much too big to get through the door.

The President in his message to the Congress on June 5 of this year made a strong plea for the seaway and power project. He used his high office to throw full weight to the statement that this was a necessary defense project. It is unfortunate that this attempt has been made, because it constitutes one more weak link in the chain of nondefense spending attempts. The Nation is continually being told that time is the great factor to be overcome. Time is the most important element and this is, of all times, no time to twist words or purposes. The President said in his message: "The seaway will help prevent transportation bottlenecks. It will increase our capacity to build ships." As a matter of fact, if additional shipbuilding facilities for larger ships are to be had on the Great Lakes they must be built. Therefore, no bottleneck is to be relieved that cannot more conveniently be remedied on the coast line or the Gulf. Obviously, any such facility built on the Lakes becomes bottlenecked by the lack of a deeper channel. The administration's most promising time for completion is 4 years. Any statement to the contrary is unfortunately misleading. Secretary Knox's testimony before the House committee substantiates my statement.

The President further said: "No comparable power, shipbuilding, and transportation facilities can be made available in the time required to construct this project." The President claims 4 years to build the project. Electric power developed by steam plants, which can be built in 18 months, is certainly comparable power for our defense and more consistent with the Nation's rush for time. Water-power development can go forward more leisurely and more beneficially after the war emergency.

Under the present plan, when the power dam is built, it is the intention of the administration to give it to the State of New York. Governor Lehman, of New York, testified that they believe (or he believes) that it belongs to New York. The taxpayers of the Nation pay for it but the State of New York gets it. This is without precedent. Any power so developed belongs to the people of the Nation and not to any one State. One astounding fact revealed in the hearings came out of the testimony of Lieutenant Governor Poletti, of New York. He testified that the State of New York had created, back in 1931, an agency known as the Power Authority of the State of New York. Since creation this agency has had nothing to do but attempt to sell to the Middle West and others the idea of building the St. Lawrence project. For this purpose the Legislature of New York gave the power authority $1,250,000. New York has money to spend to sell the rest of the Nation a bill of goods, but expects the taxpayers of the entire Nation to pay for the goods.

Now, as I have stated, this Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project is to be an agreement between the United States and Canada. The question immediately comes to your mind and mine, Does Canada consider this a necessary defense project? Remember, Canada is at war. Also remember, that the United States is in the midst of a program of all-out aid to Britain and Canada. Canada has therefore a double stake—her own facilities and expenditures for defense or war and her interest in the American lend-lease all-out aid program, which is principally for her benefit as a part of the British Empire.

On March 5 of this year W. L. MacKenzie King, then Secretary of State for External Affairs of the Canadian Government, addressed an appeal to our Minister for a reconsideration of the proposed agreement in the light of the many, many defense needs of Canada and the United States. Couched in very careful diplomatic language, designed not to offend our President, the Canadian secretary sought an "out," because he definitely did not feel that the St. Lawrence project was necessary for defense. From his expressions one can plainly tell that he and his Government, for whom he was speaking, feel that a diversion of energy and money to such a project at this time would be a hindrance rather than a help. I will read very briefly from Mr. King's letter to our Minister on the subject of the St. Lawrence agreement.

Mr. King said: "The growing intensity of the war operations and the apprehension that still more serious perils will have to be faced in the very near future necessitate the most careful examination of any proposed expenditure from the point of view of public need and in the light of war requirements.

"In existing circumstances, the Canadian Government desires to know whether the Government of the United States is of the opinion, in view of the position in Canada, and, of course, the position in the United States as well, that the project as outlined in the State Department's proposals of 1936 and 1938 and under consideration since that time should now be proceeded with."

Remember that Canada realizes that she must not offend us because she is the recipient of our lend-lease program. To Mr. King's letter our Minister gave an insistent reply in the name of the President. The net result is that the whole proposal is before the Congress under the name of defense. It is plainly not a defense matter. It is the duty of the Members of the Congress and of the people who have to pay the bill to defeat this measure. I insist that we must devote our efforts and our resources to real helps for defense and we must not, in any fashion, use "defense" as an excuse to bring about the forced approval of any undertaking which is clearly not a defense project. The Nation now faces the most terrific tax burden in history. The Nation now is struggling under the most staggering and mounting debt in the history of any nation in the world. It is certainly no time to be playing at defense. It is time for us to really work at this job of defense. The administration's duty is to get the job done and not spend its time setting up imaginary bottlenecks or ghost-defense projects. I appeal to you in the interest of your own welfare to urge your Members of the Congress to oppose this waste of fleeting time, manpower, and money. For your interest—for your Nation's interest, oppose the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

A Country Editor Speaks the Sentiments of His People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the South Haven (Mich.) Tribune of July 23, 1941, comes the following:

RUSH MATERIALS, BUT KEEP OUR MEN AT HOME

According to authorities, it is the belief of the President that this country can take many a belligerent step without formally becoming a participant in the war. Judging by recent German statements, that belief seems to be well grounded. Hitler's spokesmen denounce the United States and its foreign policy, but they still say that Germany will not be forced into declaring war on us by "overt acts." In short, Hitler's legions are busy now without taking on a new foe.

If Hitler had wished, he could obviously have construed the United States military occupation of Iceland as an act of war. Iceland is less than a thousand miles from Germany, and could be developed into a major air base for use against the Reich.

The reasons for occupying Iceland are clear enough. First, the American occupation has released numbers of Empire troops for service elsewhere—the bulk of them will probably be sent to Africa, where the British have just won a decisive victory over France, and where there are rumors of German action to pull Vichy's well-burnt chestnuts out of the fire.

Second. The American occupation of Iceland makes it possible for us to patrol and dominate the greater part of the Atlantic Ocean. Thus British men-of-war need only to protect the convoys from Iceland to English ports, which involves a distance of about 700 miles.

Third. The American occupation of Iceland has made it clear to the world that, as the President said, we will recognize no fixed geographical boundaries in carrying out our policy of protecting this hemisphere from aggressors. It is the Government's position that the airplane has made all previous ideas of hemispheric defense more or less obsolete, and that our military outposts may be far-flung indeed.

Fourth. The American occupation of Iceland may have been designed as a move to pave the way for future occupation of other foreign possessions, notably Dakar, in French Africa, and the strategic Cape Verde Islands.

Theoretically our Navy is not convoying British shipping. It is simply patrolling the Atlantic. In actuality, many authorities believe, there is little difference between a convoy and a patrol. It has been announced that an American destroyer dropped depth charges over a German submarine. And American fighting ships are at sea now, warning the British whenever they come on a Nazi raider. The American Navy, in other words, is pretty much in the war.

Furthermore, American aid, though many still feel that it is not great enough, is becoming a real factor in the conflict. Some of the great bombers which have been blasting away at German-occupied areas on the

continent, are of American make. British dreams of air equality and eventual air superiority have not yet been realized, but they are coming closer to actuality. And at this time, with a large part of the German strength mobilized on the eastern front, British power, relatively speaking, is undoubtedly greater by far than in the past.

The recent statement by a British general to the effect that American manpower will be eventually necessary to lick Hitler, caused much speculation in this country. The British position, as stated by Mr. Churchill, has always been that the Empire needed only materials of war, not men. Whether that position will be changed, remains to be seen. Right now, there would be small chance of Congress authorizing another A. E. F.

We are doing enough to furnish materials—let's keep our boys home for our own defense.

Mr. Speaker, the thought expressed in the last line of this editorial, "Let's keep our boys home for our own defense" is but common sense.

Even the most casual student, the most unobservant of international affairs knows that the sending of an American Expeditionary Force for the invasion of Germany and the maintenance of that force across the sea is an impossible task.

Roosevelt's plan of sending the marines, the armed forces, of the Navy or of the Army into foreign lands and then calling for this Government to send an expeditionary force to back them up, is but an underhanded, despicable way of evading the Constitution, usurping the right of Congress to declare war, of dragging America to the slaughter house of Europe.

Congress should have foresight and knowledge enough to know that if Hitler threatens us, our forces should not be dissipated, we should not get into positions which are impossible of defense; that we should prepare to defend ourselves on the battlefields and in the waters where a successful defense can be made.

American Cannon Fodder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have plenty of young men who are suitable and could be used for cannon fodder but why have them shot, bombed, murdered to settle a quarrel between European nations? Why not keep American cannon fodder for national defense?

Note the editorial which reads as follows:

Gen. Sir Claude Auchinleck, the new commander in chief of the British Army in the middle east, says that American manpower will be needed if the war is to be won properly.

"I've always thought the war must be won in Europe," he told correspondents in Cairo, "in Germany, on Germany's own soil. Therefore, I see as much need for American manpower in this war as in the last." Gen. Sir Archibald P. Wavell, whom General Sir Claude succeeded, was of the same opinion. Neither has fought on Germany's own soil. No British land force has been close to it and none has been on it as the war rounds out its second year. American manpower is to break into it and storm Berlin.

The British generals talk of American manpower and mean cannon fodder. Manpower is a gentler word. The British are waiting until the youth of this country, millions of young men, have been conscripted into military service, and trained or untrained, can be carried across seas to be thrown in masses against the German war machine to be blown to bits, to fight their way into Berlin and revenge the defeats in Norway, Flanders, Greece, Crete, and Libya.

The British people have been taught to expect this. The British generals demand it. They are presenting an overdue note signed by the cannon-fodder traffickers of this country. It is natural for British generals who have fought their wars with other people's soldiers to have these ideas and make such requisitions. It is not so natural that American society women who collect bundles for Britain should have the same feeling regarding the youth of their country. It is not so natural for war committees, the Aid the Allies, the Fight for Freedom, the Friends of China, and the Union Now, to echo the demands of the British generals.

But all these people are willing, even anxious, to immolate the young men of America on the battlefields of the whole world and to do it now.

Read two British calls for the sacrificing of a million or more American young men.

THE BRITISH CALL FOR OUR ARMY

The Honorable Mr. Wedgwood, M. P., in this country to sell the war and a sideline of crockery, has been a bit more outspoken than smoother British representatives have thought wise. Mr. Wedgwood remarks that we are in the war up to our necks and we'd better get a sensible Congress and get going. "The trouble with you Americans," he said, "is you are afraid to assume responsibility." It is our war, said Mr. Wedgwood.

Mr. Roosevelt has said there can be no peace with Hitler. Mr. Bullitt says this is our war and the people have chosen their course. Mr. McNutt says it has to be our war. Mr. Hull, and Mr. Knox, and Mr. Stimson, and Mr. Ickes say it is our war. The American people have said it is not. If the British Government officials are listening to Mr. Roosevelt and his proxy voices and listening only to them, they may have the idea that the United States is withholding payment on a long overdue promissory note. The American people didn't sign it.

The British generals say that to do the fighting properly and get the desired results Germany must be fought on German territory and annihilated there, which will require an American expeditionary force of millions. The British can keep an invader from getting to the island but they can't throw an expedition on the continent. Their generals and their spokesmen say that there is where the war must be carried, and for that purpose the Americans are needed.

Probably the British can't understand how a government such as Mr. Roosevelt's could exist when it misrepresents so large a majority of the people. They may think that such a government would have to resign. If a British Government tried to take the British people into a war they saw no reason for entering, a war they knew would be the most deadly in which they had ever engaged, that British Government would give way to one which was representative of the people.

The American people apparently must reconcile themselves to being deceived by their executive branch of Government. They look to Congress to represent them and to make good on the pledges Mr. Roosevelt has given the country. He does not intend to abide by his promises but Congress can hold him to them.

Of this much the American people may be certain: When General Wavell and General Auchinleck—incidentally from the occupied lands of India and Egypt—call for our Army, when their call is echoed by Parliamentarian Wedgwood, by the foreign office man Vansittart, and others, they are demanding what they have been promised. They reveal to the United States why Mr. Roosevelt asks authority to hold the men in service and to send them anywhere he wishes.

The British knew the American Army was being raised to fight its way to Berlin. They want it now for the western front while the Russians are still fighting on the eastern. Mr. Wedgwood voices the impatience.

Mr. Roosevelt creates an emergency without an authority of law. He does something to offend a foreign nation and then he calls upon Congress to back him up—then turns to the people and tries to make them believe that Congress is responsible for his wastefulness, for the national bankruptcy he created, for the unemployment he brought about, for the war which we are traveling across the seas to find.

If Congress is to deserve the respect of the people it should unmask the executive branch of the Government and show the people once for all whether this administration believes in constitutional government, in the preservation of the four freedoms here at home; or whether political ambition has obscured its judgment, destroyed its reason, and undermined its patriotism, and is driving us into this war.

America's Duty To Keep Faith With Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. WALTER C. PLOESER, OF MISSOURI

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to address the Missouri Conclave of the Order of DeMolay meeting at Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., July 26, 1941. The address was broadcast over station KSD, St. Louis.

The following are my remarks:

Dad Land, Brother George Doering, and De Molays, when George Doering asked me some weeks ago to attend this Missouri Conclave of the Order of De Molay, for the purpose of speaking to you, I felt that I had been signally honored. Some of you perhaps know that De Molay has been very kind to me throughout the past 19 years.

Honors have been mine in abundance. In the solitude of my most secret thoughts I have often wondered whether I fully deserve such commendation from my brothers or from an organization to which I personally owe so very, very much. Under no circumstance could I have refused George Doering and under no circumstance could I have refused De Molay or Dad Land. This is the first formal speech, not prepared exclusively, for radio, that I have made in Missouri since my induction into the Congress of the United States. I feel inspired by the complimentary invitation you have extended me. I am, indeed, happy to be here.

If I should dare to reminisce, I would say that appearing before a Missouri Conclave of De Molay is quite like a soldier returning to the battleground of the past. Fifteen years ago when I presided over the Missouri conclave, there existed a lot of well-intentioned, good-natured, healthy, and strenuous competition between chapters and ambitious individuals. Times have not changed—or have they? One regret is that I shall not be permitted to stay continuously with you for the 2 days of your sessions.

I take this opportunity to salute the honor and integrity; to salute the tireless effort and tremendous devotion to the service of the young manhood of America which has been demonstrated over all these years by Frank Land, the founder of the Order of De Molay; I salute the George Doerings, the Fred Reinhardts, and all the others who have for long years so conscientiously served their Nation in the work of De Molay. Reverently, I add my humble prayer to the memory of the devoted servants of American youth, who have gone on to the greater and more glorious field of De Molay service, the Wagners, the Marshalls, and the Dulaneys. Their memory is my shrine.

The youth of any nation is the lifeblood of that nation. So it is that every man who serves youth well serves his nation well. The mothers and fathers of the nation are the direct guardians of the nation's future. The principles and ideals which they inculcate into the lives of their children are the direct plans for the future of America. It is the home and the church and the school with which De Molay coordinates its service to youth.

American youth, your tomorrow is being made today. That which your seniors do today will determine what you must do or undo tomorrow. You men—and you are men—will in a few short years assume the full responsibility of citizenship. My constant hope is that we who are today charged with the responsibility and stewardship of that great privilege of American citizenship will not in any way forsake you. If we create new opportunities, you will enjoy them. If we create unusual burdens, you will have to carry them. If every man in business, if every man in the professions, if every man in public office, and if every father and mother of America would only realize that whatever they do today affects your destiny, this could and would always be a land of peace, tranquility, and opportunity.

Sometimes years and ambition cause men and women to forget the days of their youth. Sometimes men in high and low positions alike, in their selfish march for gain and power, are prone to forget that they, too, were once the youth of the land. When men forget their youth, then, too, is the youth of that day forgotten. When such men forget, we have pain and suffering. When such men forget, we have the misdeeds which injure the world. When such men forget their youth, we have war and famine and hunger and misery and death.

Old men do not fight wars. They only plan them. The youth of the Nation seldom ever plan a war. They only fight them.

As a Member of your Congress, I feel a special responsibility today. My incumbent duty seems to me to be to discuss with you the immediate problems of the Nation which affect you—the young men of the Nation.

The Nation today is in the midst of a false boom of prosperity, brought about through the prosecution of our enormous defense program. This boom of prosperity will fool many old heads and young heads alike. As it grows even larger and larger, many will allow themselves to be lulled into a sense of security, which really exists only temporarily. About the time the very youngest of you have reached majority a new crisis will face the American people, and you, the new citizens of the Nation, will be face to face with cold reality.

After the present emergency, regardless of which ultimate course the Nation may take, you in the first years of your independent responsibilities, will be faced with the period of reconstruction. To rebuild the prosperity and happiness of the American people, will be, in a great measure, your direct responsibility. It will be a trying period. May I caution you to remember that—that which is built now, may be built upon sand. That which you build then, must be built on more solid stuff.

You have a right, as American youth, to be dealt with frankly. To me it seems that America's most important duty is to keep faith with Americans. Keeping faith with Americans is fundamental. This means that every person charged with the affairs of this Nation must keep faith with American youth.

The momentous question before all of us today is: Will America go to war? Men in high public positions have promised that we will not. Men in high public positions have promised that American youth will not be sent to fight on foreign soil. This to me, as a Member of the Congress, is a solemn obligation which I have assumed to the youth of America. For my part, I intend to keep that obligation and to do everything in my power to induce other men to keep their similar obligations. I interpret these promises to mean that we will not send an expeditionary force to fight in any foreign war. I interpret other promises not made by me but by my predecessors in the Congress to mean that when the Government makes a contract with American youth, that contract must be kept.

National unity has but one foundation, faith. Faith is destroyed by broken promises. Faith in America grows greater and greater and greater by the demonstration of those in public places to keep their promises. Our faith made firm, our national unity shall be unquestioned, and our defensibility invincible.

You are the strength of America. You must be made stronger and that newer and greater strength must come from renewed faith and allegiance and loyalty.

Rapidly changing world events may, within hours, change the course of America. The essential performance of the Nation today is to build a strong and impregnable defense. Why should we build a strong defense? Is it because we are threatened with attack? No; I do not believe that we are threatened with attack from without. But we must prepare to defend ourselves from the strongest possible enemy, so that no one nation or group of nations will even flirt with the idea of molesting our peace.

If we are to grow strong defensively, the youth of the Nation, who are and always will be the defenders of any nation, must be trained and equipped. To such a program, the youth of America have willingly submitted.

Now, if we make ourselves strong and invincible in a military way, there is no justifiable reason why America should have to become involved in any other nation's shooting war. It may seem odd to some, but for my part I am peculiarly selfish of America for Americans. I am extremely selfish where American youth is concerned.

In our democratic way, as Americans, we cherish the right to disagree, to hold and fight for our own opinions. Certainly, I do not expect everyone to agree with my opinion as to what constitutes the proper course for America today. I do hold that we are not yet at war, and that if we are determined in our course for peace, there is not likely to be any justifiable reason to go to war. Our course, as I see it, is to complete, in every expeditious way we can, the defense of America and preserve right here all of the freedoms which we claim to be American. In this way only can this Nation be the beacon of freedom for the world.

At times I feel the course of man-made events here at home sweeping us on into the maelstrom of world chaos. If this dastardly curse, known as war, should be ours in the near future—and I promse you that I shall fight such a course to the last—with it will come a special challenge to youth. If over the brink, to war we should go, whether by blunder or stupidity, remember Americans, young and old, that this is our Nation. You and I may not agree with the direction, but at all costs, America must be preserved.

The challenge to youth will be to meet the test of the time. You will meet that challenge and conquer it, you always have—you always will. With your unconquered spirit, you will save America and rebuild it into the glory which is hers for the welfare of her people. You will not fail, because you—youth of America—have the indomitable spirit of the pioneer. Forward is your only goal. May that goal be peace and right for our beloved country, but peace or war, right or wrong, our country first and forever.

The Fundamentals of 1776

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

OPEN LETTER TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AMERICAN COALITION

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the American Coalition:

AMERICAN COALITION,
Washington, D. C. August 1, 1941.

Open letter to the board of directors of the American Coalition:

THE FUNDAMENTALS OF 1776

MY DEAR COMPATRIOTS: Less than 4 weeks ago on the one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of our Declaration of Independence, the President said:

"In 1776 we waged war in behalf of the great principle that government should derive its just powers from the consent of the governed."

The question now foremost in the minds of all citizens of our beloved country is this:

Are we going to wage war now with the "consent of the governed" or in defiance of their will?

Upon the answer to that question may well depend the survival of our constitutional, republican form of government created by the men who fought and won the war referred to by the President.

Last Fourth of July the President also said:

"But now, in our generation—in the past few years—a new resistance, in the form of several new practices of tyranny, has been making such headway that the fundamentals of 1776 are being struck down abroad and definitely they are threatened here."

Let us look at these fundamentals of 1776 now threatened here. They are set forth in the Declaration of Independence. Here are a few excerpts and some comments upon their present-day application.

"The history of the present King of Great Britain," wrote Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of our Independence, "is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States."

Inasmuch as the Constitution of the United States confers upon the Congress and upon the Congress alone, the power to declare war, the greatest injury and usurpation of power the American people could suffer would be the injection of this Nation into war by any other means than that envisaged by the men of 1776 in writing our fundamental law.

Here are the closing statements in the record of the debate on the war power in the Constitutional Convention of 1789. (U. S. Formation of the Union, p. 562):

"Mr. Gerry never expected to hear in a republic a motion to empower the executive alone to declare war.

"Mr. ELSWORTH. There is a material difference between the cases of making war and making peace. It should be more easy to get out of war, than into it. * * * Mr. Mason was against giving the power of war to the Executive, because not safely to be trusted with it; or to the Senate, because not so constructed as to be entitled to it. He was for clogging rather than facilitating war; but for facilitating peace. He preferred 'declare' to 'make.'

"On motion to insert 'declare'—in place of 'make,' it was agreed to."

Could the intent of this fundamental power written by the men of 1776 into the Constitution of the Government which they created in 1789 be more clear? Hardly

Here is another excerpt from the Declaration of Independence worthy of your attention:

"He (the King of Great Britain) has obstructed the administration of justice by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers."

In connection with this fundamental of 1776, be it noted that Mr. Roosevelt vetoed the Logan-Walter bill passed by Congress to grant citizens a review by the courts of acts infringing their constitutional rights committed by an arrogant bureaucracy now in power.

The President's veto of this bill is the more reprehensible because in his message to Congress on January 3, 1936, he said:

"They realize that in 34 months we have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government this power is wholesome and proper. But in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people. Give them their way and they will take the course of every autocracy of the past—power for themselves, enslavement for the public."

Heretofore—with all respect to the President—there never has been an autocracy of any kind in control of our Nation. There is now, and what the President says of autocracy applies to it.

Congressman Cox, of Georgia, whose ability is as unimpeachable as his patriotism, makes the following pertinent comment on the existing situation:

"It is unionist collectivism that hampers, retards, and hinders production for defense today—that defiantly ignores the public interest, threatens the public welfare, and cripples industrial operations by striking at a time of national emergency * * *. The Federal Government has refused consistently to consider any proposal to curb either the powers or the activities of unionist leaders and agitators. Federal authorities, Federal bureaucrats, Federal courts shade all decisions in favor of unionist collectivism. * * * The whole scheme is to let conditions become so bad as to afford an excuse for the Government to take over industry—the very thing which the leftists are seeking and have been working to bring about. The collectivism of labor constitutes a greater danger to the Republic at this very hour than does Hitler and all his kind." (From speech of Representative Cox, p. A2843, Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

But let me quote again from the Declaration of Independence:

"He (The King) has made judges dependent on his will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries."

This Nation will not soon forget the outburst of anger of an outraged citizenry when the President sought to drive through Congress legislation which would empower him to pack the Supreme Court with Justices presumably subservient to his will. To what extent the people's victory in that struggle has been nullified by resignations, death, and the prolongation of Mr. Roosevelt's power through his election for a third term, in defiance of all tradition, time alone can tell.

One more citation should suffice:

"He (the King of Great Britain) has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass the people, and eat out their substance."

Well, my fellow citizens, the President has created scores of new executive agencies of government and increased the number of civil servants by 723,000. He has enlarged the national debt and obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the Federal Government to the stupendous total of $55,362,000,000. He has expended in all, down to June 30, 1941, over $73,000,000,000 of your money. He has called for additional appropriations, now granted, of over $33,000,000,000.

Not satisfied with power, granted by the enactment of H. R. 1776, to give away our ships and our armaments, to take any articles conceivably of use for defense purposes and to give them to Great Britain or to the Soviet Union, the President has now asked of Congress authority to take, in his discretion, virtually any and all property you possess for use in an emergency which he has in large measure created by the foreign policy he has pursued

That, my fellow citizens, caps the climax.

Is it astonishing that the name of the great author of the fundamentals of 1776 was hissed and booed at the last convention of the party which for generations claimed him as its prophet?

The truth is the New Deal needs war to shackle socialism on your backs. The New Deals needs war to blind you to the complete bankruptcy of its pretended restoration of prosperity. The New Deal needs war to make crushing taxation acceptable. The New Deal needs war to destroy the fundamentals of 1776 and establish a personal dictatorship on the ruins of the American Republic.

My fellow citizens, we are on the verge of war.

Again, I quote from the President's address:

"I tell the American people solemnly that the United States will never survive as a happy and fertile oasis of liberty surrounded by a cruel desert of dictatorship."

That gloomy forecast struck a strange note on the anniversary of our Declaration of Independence. The little bands of farmers at Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill were not so easily daunted as Mr. Roosevelt.

The men who proclaimed the fundamentals of 1776 to the world were not deterred by the garrisons of British Regulars and the Fleet of the Mistress of the Sea. Those men in a "desert of cruel dictatorship" hurled the armies of the hated tyrant from our shores not once but twice, and their descendants have maintained our independence for 165 years in the face of all the kings, emperors and dictators of Europe and Asia.

The lessons of history are imperishable.

The Republics of Greece and Rome fell. Why?

Because their people were debauched and their manpower dissipated in the foreign adventures of glamorous demagogues.

The handwriting is on the wall.

To those among you who have written to our office for advice as to what you should do in this crisis, I say to you:

The framework of the Constitution still stands. Its guaranties still hold.

Every man in the Congress is your agent and the agent of your State and your community. Each and every one of them and the executive officers of your Government have taken a solemn oath before God and man to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Call upon them now and continuously for an account of their stewardship, until they again beseech your ballots.

The fundamentals of 1776 are not the property or the creed of any individual or political party, they are the precious heritage of the American people. For their defense Democrats and Republicans have a common cause. None but the spokesmen for foreign nations and foreign isms can cavil at an appeal for union in support of it.

You cannot evade your responsibilities as one of the sovereign people of the United States without paying the penalty for so doing.

The Congress of the United States must not abdicate.

Be an American.

Call on your fellow Americans for an American union now to guarantee our American independence and to preserve our American Constitution—that great charter of our liberties—the embodiment of the fundamentals of 1776.

Yours for America now and forever,

JOHN B. TREVOR.

Antitrust Activities as Affecting Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 1 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NATION'S AGRICULTURE

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Nation's Agriculture, monthly, for July-August 1941, relative to the antitrust activities of the Department of Justice.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nation's Agriculture of July-August 1941]

ANTITRUST AND THE FARMER

The establishment of a special section within the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice whose sole function will be to aid farmers in their fight against organized buying and selling monopolies has been announced by Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust.

Creation of the new section is a recognition of the predominant role farmers have played in the 50-year-old struggle to free American markets from artificial restraints. The antitrust law was passed in 1890 largely as a result of agitation on the part of farm groups.

The attempt during the last 3 years to provide sufficient funds to make antitrust enforcement a reality has had the consistent and wholehearted support of the American Farm Bureau Federation and other farm organizations. Indeed the testimony of Edward O'Neal before the House Appropriations Committee was decisive in obtaining a substantial addition to the appropriation for the Antitrust Division, and the establishment of the new section is at least partly in response to a suggestion made by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The new section in the Antitrust Division will devote its full time to the task of eliminating every illegal restraint of trade which artificially raises prices the farmer has to pay for goods he buys or lowers prices the farmer receives for goods he sells or narrows the farmer's market by raising the spread between farm prices and retail prices for farm products.

EFFECTIVE AUDIENCE

According to Mr. Arnold, the new section will provide a sympathetic and effective audience for farmers' complaints against buying and selling monopolies and also a source to provide reliable information to the farmer, explaining to him his rights to protection under the antitrust laws and the programs undertaken by the Antitrust Division to see to it that those rights are not violated.

Meanwhile, the industry-wide food investigation initiated by the Antitrust Division last fall is already showing concrete results. As of June 20, 17 indictments had been returned against processors, distributors, and labor unions, cutting across the major elements in the Nation's food supply—meat, milk, fruits and vegetables, and bread. From the indictments already returned, the outlines of the types of restraints which lower farm income and restrict farm markets can be seen.

Three indictments charge conspiracy to lower prices paid to producers. The Canners League of California and the major fruit and vegetable canners have been charged with a conspiracy to fix prices paid to growers and also the minimum prices charged for canned products. This practice protects the canners' operating margin at the expense of producers and distributors and consumers.

It is charged that concerted efforts were made to cut off the credit of canners who refused to fall in with the conspiracy. Raising the price of canned fruit indirectly reduced the size of the farmers' market; by limiting the size of the pack it directly brought about a similar reduction; by destroying independents it reduced the number of potential purchasers; by dictating the terms of purchase and particularly the use of purchase contracts in which the price was left open it forced upon the grower marketing methods which protected the canner at the grower's expense.

The Dried Fruit Association of California and the major dried fruit packers have similarly been charged with an effort to fix both prices paid to growers and prices charged distributors and consumers. A grading and inspection system under which the Dried Fruit Association became the sole judge of quality was the principal device used. Small packers and nonmembers of the association were denied equal right to use the grading system and were thus prevented from effective competition. This reduced the number of purchasers of the growers' fruit.

The members of the association agreed to force upon the grower contracts in which the price of fruit was left undetermined; to refuse to guarantee a minimum price or a minimum return to the grower; to refuse to give the grower the benefit of any increase in price which might occur after the date of the contract; to refuse to grade fruit at the point where it is harvested; and to refuse to buy dried fruit except in accord with the grades arbitrarily established by the association. By such rules they decided in their own favor and against the grower every issue as to the way the growers' fruit should be marketed.

LAMB MARKETS

The major meat packers in Chicago have been charged with controlling the prices paid to producers for sheep and lambs. It is charged that, buyers representing the packers agreed not to compete with each other for any shipment of sheep or lambs until late in the day, after the price had been well established; that each alley was assigned to a particular buyer by the toss of a coin and thereby the farmer was deprived of the chance to get more than one bid, and that the firms and individuals indicted control 90 percent of the market for lambs in Chicago.

Another series of indictments charges wholesalers and retailers with a price-fixing conspiracy under the pretense of enforcing State unfair practices acts. In the case against the Washington Wholesale Tobacco & Candy Distributors, and others, the defendants are charged with fixing prices and enforcing their conspiracy under the pretense of complying with the Washington State Unfair Practices Act. They are also charged with boycotting national distributors who sell direct to retailers and allocating markets among themselves.

In Denver, Colo., the Food Distributors Association, the major chains, and others were indicted for price fixing while pretending to administer the Colorado Unfair Practices Act. This law permits the use of cost surveys in determining whether or not the act has been violated. Under the pretext of ascertaining costs, the defendants are reported to have got together and arbitrarily fixed percentage mark-ups which they would use in establishing minimum prices. In 2 years they doubled the percentage mark-up from 6 percent to 12 percent. In this case the defendants have already paid substantial fines rather than go to trial. In Connecticut, the Connecticut Food Council, major chains, and others have been indicted for similar conspiracies under the pretext of complying with the State law.

Another instance of price fixing on the part of wholesalers and retailers has been uncovered in the indictment brought against the Western Washington Wholesale Grocers Association, which charges that members of the association fixed prices and forced manufacturers not to sell to jobbers who were not members of the association.

Two indictments have been returned which involve the use of labor unions to police price-fixing agreements among food distributors. In Washington, D. C., several chains and two bakery drivers' unions have been charged with fixing bread prices and keeping larger loaves off the market. It is said that the union drivers report violations of the agreement and refuse to supply retailers who fail to conform.

In Dubuque, Iowa, the Beatrice Creamery, a local of the truck drivers' union, and several individuals were convicted on a price-fixing indictment. In this case an independent distributor sought to increase his market by establishing a price of 11 cents for the first quart of milk and 8 cents for each additional quart on the same delivery. The conspirators blacklisted this distributor and imposed a fine of $100 upon any driver who accepted for his customers a transfer of patronage from other dairies to the price-cutting distributor. The defendants have been convicted, sentenced to imprisonment, and given a suspension of their sentence on condition that they pay fines and costs

Three other indictments charge major dairy companies with simple price-fixing conspiracies. In New York City, Sheffield, Borden, and their subsidiaries were indicted for fixing prices and attempting to maintain an artificial 2-cent differential between the so-called grade A milk and grade B, which were in reality substantially identical in quality.

In San Francisco, the Evaporated Milk Association—Borden, Carnation, Pet, and others—were charged with collusively fixing wholesale and retail prices of evaporated milk, coercing jobbers and retailers to sell at the agreed prices, and maintaining arbitrary differentials between standard and secondary brands which are in reality substantially the same quality.

In Philadelphia the major baking companies have been charged with conspiring in parts of four States to limit the size and weight of the loaf of bread, to fix prices and discounts, to prevent the sale of day-old bread, and to limit the right to market bread. Supplementary to this indictment is another in Philadelphia which charges the Freihofer Baking Co. and William Freihofer Baking Co. with waging local price wars in order to destroy independents or to force them to adopt the price-fixing schemes of the conspirators.

In addition to those discussed above, indictments have been brought against the California rice industry, the Seattle Fish Exchange, the California sardine industry, and brewing associations in Washington, Oregon, California, and Idaho.

In spite of the progress made so far, the food investigation is still in its early stages. According to Department of Justice officials, a substantial number of additional milk and bread indictments are bound to come following further investigation. Further indictments are to be expected in poultry, eggs, cheese, meat, sugar, ice cream, and fresh fruits and vegetables. The terminal market rackets are slated to be a major aspect of the investigation. The setting up of a special section to deal exclusively with these and other problems faced by the farmer in his struggle against concentrated economic power should facilitate the carrying out of a comprehensive, thorough, and impartial job which is aimed to bring about a better diet for consumers and a better income for farmers.

Churchill's Unfortunate Remark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 1 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, on July 30 there appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch a very able editorial on the subject of the astonishing assumption by Prime Minister Churchill in declaring a foreign policy for the United States. The editorial is entitled "Churchill's Unfortunate Remark." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 30, 1941]

CHURCHILL'S UNFORTUNATE REMARK

Appearing before the House of Commons yesterday, Winston Churchill said:

"The United States, the greatest single power, is giving us aid on a gigantic scale and is advancing in rising wrath and conviction to the very verge of war."

It is both understandable and exceedingly regrettable that the British Prime Minister should have taken it upon himself to make this statement.

It is understandable because Mr. Churchill was opening the debate on British war production and thus spoke officially as the responsible head of the British Government to Parliament. In this capacity, he sought to make a full report to the Commons on the war situation and American relations to it.

But, however good Mr. Churchill's intentions may have been, it is exceedingly regrettable that these words came from his lips. The good and sufficient reason is the fact that the British Prime Minister is not the authority for statements like that on behalf of the American people.

We have our own responsible Government. We have our President and our Congress. If anyone is to say to the world that this country "is advancing in rising wrath and conviction to the very verge of war," it is the Chief Executive of the United States. It is the elected official who holds a commission from the American people. It is not the Prime Minister of Great Britain, who sits in Parliament as the member from Epping.

And if any assembly is to hear and judge a statement like that, it is not the members of the British Parliament but the Representatives and Senators whom the American people have sent to Congress. If a statement of that sort is to be issued, and that in itself is a grave question, the date line should be Washington, not London.

Mr. Churchill's assumption—for he has said something which President Roosevelt has not yet gone so far as to say—is doubly bad. It is bad for England because it inevitably will suggest to many Americans that the British are counting on an American expeditionary force in addition to the generous aid in the form of arms and supplies which is now being provided.

Gen. Sir Archibald P. Wavell, British commander in chief in the Middle East, told American correspondents in Cairo a month ago, that for victory Britain would finally require America's men. A few days later Lt. Gen. Sir Claude J. E. Auchinleck, also interviewed in Egypt, said that American manpower would be just as necessary as in the World War. Now the British Prime Minister says almost as much in other words. It is bad, in short, for the policy of aid to Britain, which Americans by and large endorse.

But it is even worse in its relation to unity in the United States. One of our chief problems is to conduct our foreign affairs in such a way as eventually to win the approval and support of those who now dissent. We live in a democracy, and in a democracy compliance is achieved by discussion and persuasion among its members. By no stretch of the imagination can that end be furthered by having the head of the British Government make policy-shaping declarations for the American people.

This should need to be pointed out only once. The British are such sticklers for form and the amenities that we may expect future pronouncements of this grave character to come direct from Washington, not by way of London.

Tom Girdler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 1 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NATION

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief article from the Nation of July 26, 1941.

I am sure the Members of the Senate will be interested in reading this article in view of statements made to Senate committees by Tom Girdler, president of the Republic Steel Co., about 4 years ago.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tom Girdler is still president of the Republic Steel Corporation, and it was Girdler who declared 4½ years ago that "he would go back to the farm and dig potatoes before he would sign with the C. I. O." But on July 15 Republic Steel, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Committee of Industrial Organizations signed a stipulation settling all charges of Wagner Act violations against the company. Moreover, if the N. L. R. B. certifies that the C. I. O. has a majority, the company will sign a contract with the union. Mr. Girdler explained his about face with the simple remark that Republic is operating at top speed, much of its output is defense work, and "we want to avoid any let-down in production from any cause." Profits and patriotism work wonders, especially profits. Girdler's surrender marks an important victory for collective bargaining, and Republic workers reinstated by the agreement will receive tens of thousands of dollars in back pay, but the price of the victory included the lives of 18 workers killed during the strike in Little Steel in 1937.

Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 1 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ARTICLE BY VARDIS FISHER

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Vardis Fisher, published in the Idaho Sunday Statesman of July 27, 1941, entitled "Birdwells Call It Decency."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Idaho Sunday Statesman of July 27, 1941]

BIRDWELLS CALL IT DECENCY

(By Vardis Fisher)

Stricken, like so many interventionists, with a feverish lusting to see young men fight while he sits at home and applauds, one Russell Birdwell takes a full-page ad in the July 21 Time to ask the President and Congress to give us "marching orders." Maybe Birdwell is only a phoney front for a bunch of industrialists with foreign investments. Maybe he owns a block of International Telephone. Or perhaps he is a sincere and wealthy American who thinks it is our job periodically to save the British Empire. Whatever he is or is not, his hysterical nonsense calls for an answer—because this is not the first time he has jumped into four or five thousand dollars' worth of type.

In huge black words he heads his advertisement thus: "What the hell can we get out of this war?" Decency, he says. A decent world for our children, he says. A noble and sweet and Christian world in which Democracy will be saved and we'll all love one another and listen to the birdies sing. There's another answer, but, first, it is well to pass under review a baseless charge which he repeats.

INVASION-PROOF

A million times over the air and in the press it has been said that isolationists are appeasers. Some of them may be. I don't know. But anybody who calls all of us appeasers is either stupid or dishonest. As an isolationist, I merely echo the sentiment of millions when I say that I believe in arming this Nation to the teeth—and giving it an extra set of teeth. With a mighty navy and air force, talk of invasion becomes sheer lunacy. I'll let my sons go to their death any day to save this Nation, but not to save the 175,000-acre estate of the Duke of Hamilton.

If there's an appeaser in the world at the moment, it is England. Why is she not bombing the huge I. G. Farben powder plants just out of Mannheim? Because they're insured by Lloyd's of London. Why is she taking certain materials we are giving her and selling them to Latin American countries? To keep her economic foothold in our dooryard. Why isn't she doing a real job of bombing Germany now? Because she is interested not in winning the war but in saving the property of the Tories. To sacrifice other nations, including our own if she can, has been her policy; and during the last 15 years she double-crossed France at every turn. That's enough for me. Again and again she appeased Hitler by sacrificing her allies, and

she'll sell us down the river too if she ever gets a chance. The reason England loses all battles except the last battle lies in the fact that she first induces other nations to fight for her and fights for herself only when she must. At this moment, when Germany is engaged on the eastern front, England's bombing of Germany is, in my opinion, nine-tenths propaganda and bluff. She is hoping now that Russia will turn the tide; and if Russia doesn't, well, there's the United States getting ready to plunge in. It's a pity that Americans don't realize that of all nations in the world, none, including Japan, so envies and distrusts and despises us as England does.

REALISTS, NOT APPEASERS

Isolationists of my stripe are not appeasers. On the contrary, we are determined to be just as realistic and selfish as that greedy old Mother of Parliaments. We have only to be hard-boiled and get ready and no combination of powers can ever invade us or ever dare try. It is a deluded and sentimental patriotism that wants us to take up the fight for England where Russia leaves off. Neither in France nor Belgium nor Norway nor Greece did England do much more than to stand at the back of a small ally and cheer him on. Now she is cheering Russia and beseeching us to hurry and jump in. Only after she has exhausted all her allies will she gird her fat old belly and make a fight.

Mr. Birdwell thinks that all isolationists ought to be shut up. He says the world belongs to the "good people"—meaning, I suppose, that war-lusting minority in this Nation which thinks the majority ought to be suppressed. He says gangland must go. It would be well to start at home and wipe out a few Hagues and Kellys first. Above all else, he says that our all-out participation in this war will bring "decency" and "bequeath to our children a decent world."

In the last war, it will be remembered, our part was very small. We lost fewer than a hundred thousand men, and we were in only a few minor engagements. In a wet dismal day in August 1930 I stood on a hill north of Verdun. In no direction could I see farther than a mile, but within that small radius nearly half a million men had been slain. Persons were digging out their bones and piling them up, and when they got an assortment of bones that seemed to make a skeleton they called it a body and hauled it off for burial. On that small segment of the front more than five times as many men were killed as we lost in the war.

FATE OF FOUR

Rigby, Idaho, is a small town with a small high school. Among my classmates are four whom I remember well. One was killed in action. The other three I shall call John and Jim and George. John, after his return, became a dentist, but he had been shell-shocked and gassed, and he knew he could never see his forty-fifth birthday. I talked with him many times and found him disillusioned and sad and bitter. He died a couple of years ago. Jim had been a happy-go-lucky prankster, but after he returned from France he was another man. He was a drunkard, and he was mortally sick. The last heard of him he had been shipped off to a hospital, and he is probably dead now. George used to be in business in Boise. I saw him often, but he never wanted to talk with me. On him was the blight of a sick body and a sick soul. He is one of the living dead who helped to keep the estates for the Dukes of Hamilton. Our hospitals from coast to coast are full of these men who went out to save democracy and came back to be forgotten and slowly to die.

A gentleman up north named Don Moore has recently quoted the commander of the American Legion to prove that we fought in a noble cause last time. He might as well have quoted Charley McCarthy. The real American Legion is not these healthy and prosperous men, not smug men who never saw the front or saw it safely, not the propagandists of our present hour. The real Legion is the forgotten men slowly dying in hospitals.

These Birdwells, these fat old breast-thumping men like Knox, these scurrilous name callers like Ickes, say we shall get decency out of this war. They say if we save the British Empire with its exploiting heel on two-fifths of the earth, we shall give a decent world to our children. But I see something else. I see them a decade after the war has closed gathering up the bones of our men and trying to fit the bones into skeletons. That will be the easiest part of it to take. I see hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions to whom we shall bequeath a living death in our midst. For every man killed, 10 suffer a fate a thousand times more dreadful; and they come back to die among us or to be shoved into hospitals where we can wash our hands of them with a few taxes and forget them and pretend that it was all for the best.

Remember that last time we fought only a little skirmish at the tail end of a war. Remember that this time we shall, if we get in and if we must, fight to the last young man. But remember, too, that most of these young men will come back to us, horribly mutilated, blind, or emasculated, and sentenced to years of agony while we forget them. They will be full of physical and mental sickness that nobody can understand, I imagine, except those who suffer it. Remember, above all, that our hospitals were overcrowded last time, and that this time on the sites of all our fine cantonments and barracks and air fields we shall build hospitals to hold these young men to whom we are bequeathing a decent world. Tens of thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of them will be confined to hospitals for the insane. The others, men bankrupted by murder, with bodies half dead and souls stricken, I saw all over France and Germany. This time we shall have the joy of seeing these corpses walking to the morgues.

"What the hell can we get out of this war?" That, Mr. Birdwell, plus economic chaos and a military dictatorship; but it will be on the conscience of you interventionists, and not on mine.

Analysis of Nondefense Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I notice the minority report on the revenue bill of 1941, under the heading, "The need for economy in nondefense spending," insists that there should be a drastic reduction in nondefense spending. Reference is again made to the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury sometime ago that in his opinion nondefense expenditures could be reduced a billion dollars, and in that report the statement is made that "various other responsible individuals and organizations estimate that a saving might be made of $2,000,000,000 or over" in nondefense expenditures.

In addition to those references there seems to have been created quite a widespread impression that Congress is being extravagant at this critical time in our history in the unnecessary expenditure of vast sums of money in nondefense appropriations. The public is being misled by inaccurate and unwarranted charges. It does seem to me that impression is so widely at variance with the facts that it must be based upon an utter lack of accurate information. I feel that it is unfair to Congress and especially to the Appropriations Committee of the House, to allow that impression to be continually broadcast over the country when it is wholly unwarranted by the facts. I have mentioned this matter twice before. In answer to a letter from the editor of the Rocky Mountain News in Denver, I made a comprehensive statement on this subject and it appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, commencing at page A2424. Again I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24 a comparison of nondefense appropriations for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 as of July 19, 1941, in comparative columns. That statement shows that the total nondefense appropriations for the fiscal year 1942 are $7,145,000,000 in round figures. Of this amount the sum of $3,786,000,000 or 53 percent is due to fixed charges such as interest on the national debt, debt retirement, veterans' benefits, social security, and other grants and expenses, and so forth, and cuts cannot be applied to those definitely fixed charges.

Deducting this amount of $3,786,000,000 from the $7,145,000,000 leaves $3,359,000,000 of nondefense appropriations that are not fixed charges. If a billion dollars is to be cut from this $3,359,000,000 it is equivalent to a 30-percent reduction. I doubt if many Members would vote for that reduction. This percentage would have to be applied to aids to agriculture, aids to youth, general public works, such as roads, flood control, reclamation projects, and so forth, and also to the operating expenses of all ordinary agencies of the Government other than those engaged in national defense. That statement placed in the RECORD on July 24 shows that the nondefense appropriations for 1942 are $342,662,008, net, less than the nondefense appropriations for the fiscal year 1941. Included in the nondefense items for both fiscal years are fixed charges of the character I have enumerated. Those fixed charges against the Government have increased net $250,642,930 for 1942 over and above the same items for 1941. We have not only overcome all that increase, but, we have made a further reduction of $342,662,008. When the increases and decreases in these fixed charges are eliminated from consideration in each fiscal year the decrease in the nondefense appropriations—other than fixed charges—for the fiscal year 1942 under the nondefense appropriations for the fiscal year 1941 is $593,304,938.

Of course, it is very popular and sounds patriotic to shout "Cut down nondefense appropriations. Slice a billion or more dollars off them." I only recall a few who have loudly vociferated in regard to the

reduction of nondefense appropriations who ever definitely specified just what appropriations they would cut and how much on each one. In other words, all of this indiscriminate fusillade of talk about reduction of nondefense expenditures is made without much specification as to where, and how, and how much the reduction should be. Few of them point out the particular items in which they would want the cuts to be made. None of them indicated what reductions they would vote for. They remind me of a remark by that stalwart Republican of bygone days, former Speaker Uncle Joe Cannon. On a similar occasion he said:

> The boys are doing a lot of thundering in the index, but they won't perform much in the text.

The record of Congress in reducing nondefense appropriations is most commendable. Whenever and wherever the facts indicated that a decrease could rightfully bemade it has been made, as I think the decrease of $593,000,000 will testify. If anybody wants to make further reductions let him come forward and specify the place and the reasons and the amounts of each cut.

To the best of my recollection, none of the people who are shouting the loudest about a billion-dollar reduction ever asked for a hearing before the committee when we were considering appropriation bills in order to point out the places they thought those alleged cuts could be made. History is merely repeating itself in connection with appropriations. Everyone is in favor of cutting in the abstract but when it comes to pointing out the specific items and amounts that they suggest cutting, that is another question. People are enthusiastically in favor of cutting appropriations for anybody else, but when applied to them it is horrible.

As everyone knows, every State, every city in the United States, practically every county and nearly every town in this Republic are constantly and vehemently appealing to Congress for appropriations for projects of all conceivable kinds. They vigorously shout "cut down appropriations but for God's sake give us this project." That applies universally throughout this entire Republic. The Appropriations Committee says "No" a dozen times to where it says "Yes" once, and it should be borne in mind that the committee has this year and always cuts many millions of dollars under the Budget recommendations on nondefense appropriations. The House sometimes overrides the committee; and the Senate, which is a coordinating body, always exercises its rights of insisting on additions to our House appropriations; and in conference we are compelled to compromise on those additions.

The minority report referred to seems to criticize the President for not making recommendations for additional reductions. Whether or not that criticism is warranted, it must be borne in mind that Congress is the body that makes the appropriations, and that the Appropriations Committee of the House is, and has been especially for the past 20 years that I have been a Member of that committee, the main watchdog of the Federal Treasury, day in and day out. Regardless of where or what the first line of defense of our Government may be, it actually starts with the Appropriations Committee of this House.

Advocating cuts in the abstract is a politically safe and popular pastime. It sounds good to our constituents out home, but pointing out specifically the items and the definite amounts advocated to be cut is something in which the advocates of this horizontal general cut policy just will not indulge. I cannot believe that the American people will be much deceived by a general clamor for a wholesale reduction of nondefense expenses, when a large percentage of the population from every portion of the United States is frantically appealing to the Congressmen to secure additional projects and appropriations for their localities.

I feel that these gentlemen who make heroic demands for reductions should come before the committee or the House of Representatives and state for the record that they are in favor of reducing aids to agriculture, aids to youth, flood control, reclamation, and the general operating expenses of the Government by the 30-percent necessary to bring about a billion-dollar cut in nondefense appropriations. They will not do so, and the American people know, or ought to know, they will not do it.

Mr. Speaker, I include herein as part of my remarks my former statements above referred to:

Comparison of nondefense appropriations, fiscal years 1941 and 1942 (as of July 19, 1941)

	1941	1942	1942 compared with 1941
Legislative, judicial, and executive	$39, 883, 021	$41, 575, 724	+$1, 692, 703
Civil departments and agencies	1, 034, 113, 062	984, 604, 613	−49, 508, 449
General public-works program	525, 650, 590	531, 233, 060	+5, 582, 470
Veterans' pensions and benefits	578, 856, 984	575, 193, 162	−3, 663, 822
Aids to agriculture	1, 067, 416, 460	1, 100, 535, 785	+33, 119, 319
Aids to youth	437, 151, 020	338, 727, 000	−98, 424, 020
Social security	446, 986, 960	466, 929, 000	+19, 942, 040
Work relief	1, 371, 671, 961	885, 905, 000	−485, 766, 961
Refunds of receipts	83, 011, 000	82, 006, 350	−1, 005, 550
Interest on the public debt	1, 100, 000, 000	1, 275, 000, 000	+175, 000, 000
Transfers to trust accounts	215, 315, 000	273, 735, 262	+58, 420, 262
Statutory debt retirement	587, 915, 000	589, 865, 000	+1, 950, 000
Total, nondefense appropriations	7, 487, 971, 964	7, 145, 309, 956	−342, 662, 008

[From the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 21, 1941, page A2424]

LETTER OF HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR, OF COLORADO, TO THE EDITOR OF THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN NEWS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I have written to the editor of the Rocky Mountain News, Denver, Colo., in response to an inquiry from him as to my position toward the suggestion of the Secretary of the Treasury that a billion dollars should be cut from nondefense expenditures.

The letter follows:

MAY 20, 1941.

MR. JACK FOSTER,
Editor, Rocky Mountain News,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR MR. FOSTER: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of May 14 propounding to me in substance the query: "Do you agree with Secretary Morgenthau who says that the Government's nondefense expenditures can and should be cut $1,000,000,000?"

If I understand the Secretary's position correctly he did not state specifically what items should be eliminated or how much certain specific services should be reduced. I am informed he did outline in a general way certain activities which he termed "nondefense" and to which he thought cuts might be applied such as the National Youth Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, Public Works (which would include Federal-aid roads, flood control, reclamation projects, etc.), agricultural assistance (which would include soil-conservation payments, parity payments, and sugar-crop payments to farmers), and others which he did not list.

Let me say at the outset that I favor making reductions wherever it is possible to cut expenditures intelligently on the basis of the known facts and circumstances surrounding each case and after considering the relationship of those expenditures to our entire governmental program. I would not commit myself in advance to any arbitrary cut of a billion dollars in expenditures without knowing what items are to be eliminated and reduced or without weighing the effect of those proposed eliminations and reductions.

When people casually refer to nondefense activities in Government, they are generally thinking of everything except the Army and Navy. A large part of the Government's civil expenditures are in some manner related to national defense. There is a defense angle to almost everything the Secretary specifically mentioned and in some a very substantial defense aspect.

Modern warfare is economic, industrial, agricultural, and financial as well as military. Getting a nation on a national-defense basis consists as much of gearing the entire population and the entire economic, industrial, agricultural, and financial fabric to that level as it does of training soldiers, building naval vessels, and procuring munitions. If agriculture is depressed, there is a weak spot in the national economic armor. If education is neglected and not sufficient trained workers are available for industry, there is a failure to produce the necessary implements of war and peace. If unemployment, no matter how small, is not relieved, some citizens go hungry. Every phase of any Government activity must be examined to determine the appropriate relationship to the national effort before one can definitely throw that activity aside and say "This is nondefense, it has no place in the picture now." I sometimes hear the question. "What is the use of building these huge dams on some of our rivers; they are not national defense?" Yet if it had not been for the dams at T. V. A., Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and others, there would have been at this moment a serious power shortage for the production of vital war materials. So it becomes necessary to examine each activity on the basis of its own merits and its relationship to the entire national effort.

I have been on the Committee on Appropriations for 20 years. I would not knowingly vote for an appropriation that I believed was not important for the development or welfare of our country. A great many people do not pay much attention to the details of the Federal Budget and think that it is susceptible of being cut arbitrarily any time without harm to our national life. Every item in that Budget is gone over carefully by the President and the Bureau of the Budget before it is recommended to Congress. The Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House go through the Budget

item by item and eliminate and reduce many. So far this session the House Committee on Appropriations has taken approximately $70,000,000 from the Budget estimates and there are still five more bills to be considered and undoubtedly there will be further cuts.

In the next fiscal year our total for other than defense expenses will be about $7,000,000,000 and will probably constitute one-third of the total estimated expenditures of the year. Of this $7,000,000,000 about one-half is for so-called fixed charges such as interest on the public debt, grants to States (such as social security and vocational education), etc., and the other half, where the cut of a billion dollars would have to fall, comprises all the rest of the Government activities. To take a billion dollars out of this half would mean a drastic cut of about 50 percent on the whole one-half or a greater percentage on the general classes which have been suggested for a cut.

Many of the appropriations the Secretary mentioned are yet to come before Congress for action this session. Those for the N. Y. A., the C. C. C., and some others he mentioned generally have not been acted upon by the committee or the House. The agricultural appropriations are still in conference between the two Houses. When these come before the committee and the House I will vote upon them in the light of the information we then have and their relationship to the entire national welfare. If the facts show they can be cut, I will act accordingly.

It is a noteworthy fact that whenever cuts in expenditures are suggested, the proponents usually offer a general suggestion of an arbitrary amount, they do not go into detail. Perhaps an anecdote of history will be illustrative. One of my predecessors as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, before the days of the Budget, took a copy of the old book of estimates under his arm. He was getting ready for the committee work of the session. He wanted to know where to make some cuts. He visited every member of the Cabinet in turn. He displayed to each the book of estimates and asked him privately where some reductions could be made. Each turned to pages in the book and specifically pointed out general items, which, in that Cabinet officer's opinion, were of dubious national value and should be cut. When the chairman got back to his office and summed these visits all up he found to his dismay that each Cabinet member had pointed out cuts in other departments, but not one of them had suggested a reduction in his own bailiwick.

Everyone is in favor of cutting generally; when we get down to specific cases it is a horse of another color. It is incumbent on those who want to make these arbitrary general reductions to point out in detail, item by item, where they are and what amounts should be eliminated and why they can be taken out. Then we will know what cuts can be made and why they should be made.

This is my fifth year as chairman of the Appropriations Committee. It has long been the practice of the chairman of the committee to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the end of each session a summary of the Government's finances. Because of the extent of our present expenditures and the great interest taken in the subject, I have been placing in the RECORD month by month at this session a summary of receipts and expenditures which the Treasury Department furnishes me. It is absolutely accurate and as complete as can possibly be made. Those who have been following this data have found it informative and useful in watching the course of our finances. It prevents an enormous amount of guesswork, speculation, and misunderstanding of all current appropriations.

I trust this information will be of interest to the people of Colorado.

Very cordially yours,

EDWARD T. TAYLOR.

Fixing Farm Prices

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the cotton farmers of this country are very much disturbed over the proposal to fix farm prices. The very suggestion yesterday broke cotton prices $5 a bale. That will cost the American cotton farmers about $12,000,000 unless that price is recovered.

At the prices the farmers of the South are paying for the things they have to buy, cotton should be selling today at 25 cents a pound, at least, and wheat should be selling anywhere from $1.50 a bushel to $2 a bushel.

I want to serve notice now that I do not propose to support any proposition to permit any man or set of men to fix farm prices so as to discriminate against the people who till the soil, the ones who are suffering most as a result of the fixing of industrial wages of labor all out of line with agricultural wages and agricultural prices, which places unnecessary burdens upon the backs of the farmers, the people upon whom we all depend for our food and clothing.

Let farm prices continue to rise until they reach actual parity with industrial commodities and industrial wages. Then the farmer will begin to enjoy a full measure of that prosperity to which he is entitled. And that will result in prosperity for the whole Nation.

Twenty Reasons for Opposing Mandatory Joint Income-Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

STATEMENT BY MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me today to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a joint statement containing 20 reasons why the mandatory joint income-tax provision of the pending bill should be stricken from this legislation. The statement is presented with the approval of several Members of the House, whose names are appended thereto, in order that those Members who are in doubt regarding this matter may have presented to them some substantial reasons for opposing this provision of the tax bill. The statement appears below:

1. H. R. 5417 is one of the most important revenue measures ever to be considered by the Congress. Public attention, however, has been centered almost exclusively upon the social, moral, economic, women's rights, and constitutional aspects of the provisions respecting mandatory joint returns upon which there have been no public hearings.

Is it not sound policy to eliminate the joint returns provision, upon which public indignation rightfully is high, so that the full efforts of the Congress may be directed to the many intricate and technical questions of revenue legislation that must be considered?

2. All taxpayers are faced with drastic increases in their taxes amounting, in some cases, to 200 percent or more. These increases will have the same effect upon family budgets as heavy wage and salary cuts. In many instances they will more than absorb the family's annual savings.

Notwithstanding the above situation, an additional tax would be placed upon a selected group of married people—those who have separate incomes—by reason of mandatory joint returns. Such discrimination is unfair and unjust in the extreme. It may even lead to confiscation of income. By the addition for tax purposes of a small income belonging to the wife to a large one belonging to the husband, the resulting application of surtaxes may largely wipe out any benefits from the smaller income.

3. The impression is widespread that only about 175,000 families would be affected by the compulsory joint-returns provision. That this is an erroneous assumption is apparent from the report upon mandatory joint returns[1] prepared for the Committee on Ways and Means.

The statistics so far made public applied to the 1938 situation when personal exemptions were higher and the surtax rates not only were lower than those proposed in the bill, but affected only individuals in considerably higher income brackets.

Under the bill, tens of thousands of additional families will be immediately affected. Under subsequent levies that will be needed for defense purposes most tax-paying, married couples may be concerned provided each spouse has some separate income, no matter how large or how small.

4. It is stated that the discriminatory penalty tax applies only to families whose income exceeds $4,000 per year.

Is a tax which is unfair and unjust less so merely because it is limited to the families whose income is over $333 per month?

What about the unfairness to those families whose income is less than $333 per month, who are bound to be included in subsequent tax legislation, and who are not even aware that their interests are being affected?

Another group consists of those who will be immediately concerned under the pending legislation but who have not heretofore filed separate returns merely because there was no advantage for them to do so. Most of these people do not realize the significance of the proposed change.

5. Since the mandatory joint-returns requirement would single out married couples for discriminatory tax treatment, it would in effect constitute a penalty upon marriage. This penalty, though small in the case of families having moderate incomes, becomes an appreciable item to the well-to-do and amounts to thousands of dollars a year in a wealthy family.

Admittedly men and women would not or should not let a tax disadvantage stand in the way of their marriage, but no support in principle can be found for tax legislation

[1] Mandatory joint returns prepared for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

which puts barriers of any sort in the way of marriage.

6. Enactment of the proposal would place an estimated annual tax of $329,000,000 a year upon the institution of marriage, of which $275,000,000 would be derived from married people in the 40 States not having community-property laws.

7. In addition to penalizing marriage, compulsory joint returns likewise would place a premium upon divorce.

Is there any justification whatsoever for a tax law which grants a financial advantage to a husband and wife who obtain a divorce?

8. It has been stated that separate returns are not permitted in Great Britain and that the divorce rate is not as high in that country as in the United States. This argument has no validity in the present situation.

In England where divorce is difficult to obtain, there is not the situation of separate states having widely differing laws with respect to the granting of divorces. Furthermore, in the United States, divorce apparently is not looked upon with the same disfavor as in England and some other countries. Any law that would tend to increase the already high percentage of divorce in the United States would certainly be objectionable from the standpoint of public policy.

In Great Britain, moreover, at the time mentioned in the report upon mandatory joint returns, the income-tax situation was not altogether comparable to that proposed under the bill. Greater reliance for revenues was placed upon the normal rate than we place upon our normal rate. High surtaxes upon low income brackets, such as are contemplated in the pending bill, are at variance with the traditional British income-tax procedure.

No less important is the fact that no question of States' rights and the powers of a federal government are involved in income-tax legislation in Great Britain.

9. The report states that "Congress has from the beginning recognized the family status as sufficiently singular to permit of special treatment."

The singular treatment of the family, heretofore, has looked to the protection and to the benefit of the family, whereas, now for the first time, the family is to be discriminated against by taxing individuals in the family at higher rates than other individuals simply because each spouse happens to have some separate income.

Any penalty placed upon marriage is, by the same token, a penalty upon the raising of children.

Personal exemptions were originated to encourage the family and family life. Under this proposal they would be minimized.

10. The special tax imposed by mandatory joint returns upon marriages, the home, and children, is escaped entirely by unmarried and divorced people.

11. Married women have struggled since historical times to achieve their rightful place in the social, economic, and political structure. The requirement of mandatory joint returns, by merging the identity of the wife with that of her husband for tax purposes, is a long step backward in social progress.

In this country Congress adopted the resolution that led to the adoption of the nineteenth amendment, giving women the right to vote, then shortly thereafter it adopted the legislation which permitted wives to retain their own citizenship even though they married aliens. Next, Congress adopted the Fair Labor Standards Act, which gave women equality in employment. Now, it is proposed to reverse this trend by taking away from the rights of women.

12. No amount of language to the effect, as stated in the report, that "there is no imposition of a liability upon one person for the taxes payable by another" will disguise the fact that women would lose an important right, namely that of the complete and separate control of the income from their property.

The statement that the proposal "treats her exactly in the same manner as her husband for Federal-tax purposes" offers no consolation to the proponents of women's rights. This proposal, by accomplishing the very thing it purports to do, would tend to return married women to the old common-law status of chattels of their husbands—the very status they struggled so long to overcome forever.

13. Should tax laws be so designed as to constitute a measurable factor in determining the relationship between husband and wife? Is it a sound social policy to so frame tax laws as to make it profitable on the one hand for a husband and wife to live apart or, on the other hand, where, for justifiable reasons, a husband and wife desire to live apart, to direct them to act together in sharing a tax assessment? Under the pending bill this dilemma cannot be avoided.

14. Married women in community-property States share the ownership with their husbands of the property and income of the community property acquired during their marriage. The proposal would remove an important incentive and otherwise make it impractical for husbands in the 40 noncommunity-property States to give property to their wives. Is this fair to the women who live in the noncommunity-property States?

15. Under our constitutional form of government taxes are based upon individuals and not upon relationships, yet the report states that the proposal "merely regards the marital community as the taxable unit instead of the individuals who make it up."

Is so fundamental a change in our theory of taxation in accordance with State's rights and delegated powers to be overturned by the adoption of a new tax policy?

16. Are the rights of the sovereign States to determine for themselves how property and income therefrom can be owned, to be nullified by a tax measure of the Congress passed by the House without even the formality of a public hearing?

17. Even if an apparent discrimination exists as between married couples in different States by reason of the divergency of State laws, or by reason of the fact that some married couples have separate incomes where others do not, is it the less desirable from the broad, social standpoint to hold firmly to our established policy of holding inviolate the rights of the States?

18. Is it sound policy in a period of national emergency to rely upon any substantial amount of tax revenue from a source which the Supreme Court very likely will hold does not exist and which is certain, in any event, to lead to prolonged litigation?

19. If the tax is a direct tax on property, is it a tax on income within the meaning of the sixteenth amendment, or is it without the scope of that amendment and, therefore, subject to the provisions of the Constitution providing for apportionment (art. 1, sec. 2, cl. 3, and art. 1, sec. 9, cl. 4)?

20. Is the classification which is the basis for the tax so arbitrary as to violate the due-process clause of the fifth amendment, which is applicable whether the tax is an excise tax or a tax on income within the meaning of the sixteenth amendment, or otherwise?

This question may be subdivided as follows:

(a) Is the tax arbitrary in classifying spouses as constituting an economic unit, without so classifying other family relationships, such as parent and children or brother and sister?

(b) Is the tax arbitrary in requiring spouses to reveal to each other the amounts and sources of their respective incomes?

(c) Is the tax arbitrary in requiring a husband and wife each to be responsible for the filing of a joint report of their respective incomes?

(d) Is the tax arbitrary in imposing a joint and several liability on the spouses for the amount of total tax due on their combined income unless either spouse shall seek an apportionment under Rules and Regulations prescribed by the Commissioner?

(e) Is the tax arbitrary in requiring that the income of one spouse be combined with the income of the other spouse to determine the surtax rate applicable to the income of each spouse, thus applying a higher surtax to married persons, each of whom have separate or joint or community income, than to single persons having the same amounts of income as each of said spouses?

(f) Is the tax arbitrary in classifying alike, married persons, each of whom have separate or joint or community income, and married persons, one of whom has no income?

(g) Is the tax arbitrary in classifying alike, married persons, each of whom have separate or joint or community income, without reference to whether such income was acquired either directly or indirectly by a gift from the other spouse instead of being derived by law or by gift, devise, or descent from some other party than the other spouse?

(h) Is the tax arbitrary in classifying alike spouses who have derived joint income from engaging in a joint financial enterprise, and those who have only separate income derived from properties separately owned by them?

Respectfully submitted for your consideration by: Hon. JOHN M. COSTELLO, California; Hon. CHARLES A. EATON, New Jersey; Hon. CHARLES L. GIFFORD, Massachusetts; Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW, Indiana; Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Massachusetts; Hon. OVERTON BROOKS, Louisiana.

Profiteering in Gift Food Packages for Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

EXCERPT FROM RADIO ADDRESS OF FULTON LEWIS, JR.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from broadcast of Fulton Lewis, Jr., Mutual Broadcasting System, from station WOL, Washington, D. C., Friday, July 25, 1941:

Now, I have a rather unusual story for you this evening, a matter which I've been investigating personally for more than 20 days—not only here but also in New York City.

You've heard all the talk, for many months past, about the need for preventing high prices, and profiteering. The President has said, time and again, that he is determined to prevent any fortunes being made out of this war, and in order to prevent any unfair or unreasonable prices, even here in this country, he appointed Mr. Leon Henderson as price control administrator.

Now, with that in the back of your mind, it develops that a new and very flourishing business has sprung up in New York, and it's now spreading out, and operating through agents or representatives in other cities, perhaps in yours. It's a business that's founded

on the misfortune and privation and need of the people in Great Britain—especially on the shortage of dairy products, and fats, and such things.

We might just as well mention names, in this case, so you'll know all of the facts. The particular organization is named "Parcels for the Forces, Inc.," with offices in Rockefeller Center. It's a private, profit-making corporation. There are other concerns, including some of the New York department stores, that also are in the business, but the head of this organization—a man named Leonard Morris—said very proudly that he does almost all of the business along this line, so we'll use his case.

I have one of their advertising sheets in front of me. It says at the top, "Send a gift parcel of rationed food to relatives or friends in Great Britain." Then, underneath, it says:

"Have you ever measured out 2 ounces of butter, 2 ounces of tea, or 4 ounces of sugar? These are the amounts that British people are allowed weekly on their ration cards.

"Why not let us send your relations and friends in Great Britain, one of the following desirable food parcels? It will be a welcome addition to present allowances, and it will not detract from their existing rations."

At the bottom of the sheet is this statement, and listen to this carefully:

"Ten percent of the sum of your order will be contributed to the"—and there in print is the name of a very prominent British charity—"to assist them in their humane work."

Then it lists some nine different parcels which this organization will send to any address in Great Britain for you, for various different prices.

Now, if you'll listen carefully, I'm going to read the contents of a few of these and then tell you the price on each one. For example, here is parcel A—

A 1-pound can of vegetable shortening—that's the smallest can, you know—and vegetable shortening means margarine or any of the ordinary lard substitutes.

A half pound of Kraft's cheese.

A half pound of Hershey's breakfast cocoa.

One pound of orange marmalade and one can of orange juice—the can of orange juice, incidentally, is quite a little smaller than a can of Campbell's soup—and the price for that parcel is $3.25.

And here is parcel F—

A half pound of tea, a half-pound package of Kraft's cheese, 1 pound of sugar in small lumps, 1 pound of butter, one tin of dried onions, a can of orange juice, and a packet of seedless raisins, and the price for that is $4.85.

And one more—parcel I—

One pound of Borden's powdered milk, a small can of boned chicken, a can of orange juice, a tin of dried tomato soup, a can of consomme, a can of lemon juice about half the size of the can of orange juice, one packet of seedless raisins, and a packet of 72 vitamin capsules, and the price for that is $9.95.

Now, in order to be perfectly fair and to get all sides of this story, I went to New York over the week end, to the offices of Parcels for the Forces, Inc., and I interviewed Mr. Leonard Morris. He said quite frankly that it was a profit-making business, and he explained that these prices include not only the cost of the food but also the packing, handling, shipping, insurance, and payment of customs duties. And on checking I find that that is correct.

In fact, in doing that checking, I went so far as to contact the British Embassy here, and the Post Office Department, and the Customs Service, to find out exactly what those costs are, and the facts are these:

These parcels are mailed not by air mail, but by common ocean mail—parcel post—and the rate for them is 14 cents a pound, and, incidentally, British law provides that no food packages may come into the country which have a total weight of more than 5 pounds. That means that even the largest of these packages can't be more than 5 pounds, and even in the case of the $9.95 package, the shipping cost cannot possibly be more than 70 cents.

As for insurance, the Post Office Department says that the absolute maximum cost for insurance would be 20 cents, even on the largest package.

So far as customs duties are concerned, let's take parcel A as an example. The vegetable shortening would have to pay a duty of less than 3 cents; the cheese, less than 2 cents; the breakfast cocoa, 3 cents; the orange marmalade, 3 cents; and the canned orange juice—that is duty-free—so the total customs duties are less than 11 cents, all told.

As for the contribution to the British charity, that's mentioned, I asked Mr. Morris about that, and he made quite a point of those contributions. Remember, the circular which I have here and which Mr. Morris himself gave me, says, "Ten percent of the sum of your order will be contributed to this particular British charity, to assist them in their humane work."

Now, it so happens that this organization is registered with the State Department, under a provision of law that requires the licensing of organizations engaged in charitable work in belligerent countries. The State Department issued a license to this Parcels for the Forces, Inc., and under the law the organization is forced to report its income to the State Department. So I got the latest figures on record for you. The last thing the Department has is up to and including June 1—which, of course, does not include any of the growing business since that time—and the figure was $78,000 then.

But forgetting about the income since that time—just taking that much—10 percent of that, if Parcels for the Forces is donating 10 percent of the sum of all the orders that come in—10 percent of just that much would be $7,800.

I checked with the heads of that charity on Monday, and Tuesday, and again today, and they inform me—the treasurer informs me—that even up to date, the contributions they have received from the organization are only about half that amount.

Mr. Morris, when I called on him, showed me letters that he has received from lord mayors of various cities in England, thanking him for parcels of this kind which he has sent to them, for distribution to the poor. In fact, on the back of this advertisement, facsimiles of some of the letters are printed. There's one from the mayor of Westminster. It speaks of "regarding the allocation of 100 more gift parcels for Westminster people, bombed out of their homes and living in shelters," and it tells how those will be distributed. Mr. Morris played very heavily, in his conversation with me, about this wonderful work that his organization is doing.

On further questioning, however, he admitted that his organization was not footing the cost of those parcels. On the contrary, Parcels for the Forces, Inc., was being paid the full list price by charitable-minded American citizens who wanted to help those in need on the other side, and who bought so many of the packages, to be shipped over for distributing as the lord mayors of the stricken towns might see fit. Parcels for the Forces made the full profit, out of each one.

So it seems that strange commercial successes can be made by capitalizing on the want, and the privation, and the suffering of the very heroic people of Britain. For your own guidance, it's perfectly simple to buy these materials in your corner grocery store and ship them over yourself. You can even buy the canned butter, in most places, condensed milk, and any condensed food in cans is deeply appreciated by the people over there. And there are, of course, numerous established charities that are highly admirable, most of the ones you hear about are. The British War Relief for example has distributed $12,000,000 in money and materials to Britain at a cost of less than 6 percent, including shipping and everything else.

It would be most unfortunate if the activities of these private, profit-making concerns should injure the cause of those organizations, and it may be that one of those recognized organizations will take over this kind of work. In the meantime, the case of Parcels for the Forces has been laid before Mr. Leon Henderson, and his price-control agency, for Government investigation.

Profiteering in Strategic and Critical Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is said that we are dangerously close to war. It is a well-recognized fact that there are numerous small minority groups throughout this country actively engaged in pushing us further along the road to war. Sooner or later they may get us into such a position where we will have our neck out so far that we will be unable to back out without shooting our way out. Many of these minority groups are motivated solely with their quest for "blood profits." These groups are motivated solely by selfish greed and a desire to accumulate what the President himself called fool's gold back in 1936, when he was a candidate for a second term and, therefore, at that time was advocating over the length and breadth of this land the enactment of a neutrality act, which was to forever keep this Nation at peace and from again becoming involved in somebody else's war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, among these minority groups to which I have referred there is a certain class of commercial black and white striped wood-pussy, which not only selfishly seeks to bring about the ruin of this country by bringing about our involvement in this war, but at the same time seeks to pad his own pockets with filthy blood profits. The man I refer to is that man who knowingly bootlegs critical and strategic war materials to nondefense industries in order that he himself can reap wholly unwarranted and unjustified high profits. In every part of this country, Mr. Speaker, these individuals—comparable only to the bootleggers of prohibition days—are speculatively purchasing these critical and strategic materials and are selling them to individuals, firms, or contractors who for various reasons are unable to secure a priority rating, and at prices far above the regularly established and quoted price lists.

It is about time that the Government recognizes that this is going on and

clamps down on these individuals who, if they are sat upon, will be very much less active in their desire to involve this Nation in somebody else's war.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which I hope will receive prompt consideration and action. The bill is very short and, I hope, is sufficiently all-inclusive to make the Government immediately assume control over these individuals and drive them out of existence. The bill imposes a $10,000 fine or not more than 10 years' imprisonment, or both, on anyone who sells strategic or critical war materials, upon which a priority rating has been established, to anyone who has not received a preference rating; and it provides that the President, or such agency as he may direct, shall give written approval of all such sales, deliveries, purchases, and acceptances of all such critical and strategic materials.

If we do eventually get into a shooting war, Mr. Speaker, let us not be guilty of not having done everything in our power to prevent the creation of another group of war millionaires, whose chief interest has ever been their own selfish greed for blood profits rather than patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, you know that in the past I have steadfastly opposed the granting of additional powers to the President, particularly those powers which rightfully belonged to the Congress. However, this is one power that the President should have and is one power he should use—and use now.

Defense Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on small factories in connection with the O. P. M. work:

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

SMALL FACTORIES BID O. P. M. USE THEIR FACILITIES—BUSINESS CONGRESS ASSERTS CONCENTRATION CUTS OUTPUT AND THREATENS SHUTDOWNS

The defense-production program is far behind schedule and thousands of businesses face possible shut-down, with resultant widespread unemployment, because the facilities of small industrial units are not being utilized for defense work, it was charged in a letter sent yesterday to William S. Knudsen, Director of the Office of Production Management, by the American Business Congress, an organization of small manufacturers.

The letter and data on defense-production activities gathered recently were discussed by C. J. Seedman, president of the American Business Congress, and other members of the organization at a meeting attended during the afternoon by newspaper executives at the Advertising Club, 22 Park Avenue.

Mr. Seedman said that the survey made by the organization had established that there was much inefficiency in the operation of the defense-production program, and that an "estimated 50 percent of the Nation's maximum productive plant capacity is not being utilized."

"These unused facilities are essentially in the hands of business concerns who have been unable to secure defense work or the necessary material for their normal civilian production," it was stated in the letter to Mr. Knudsen.

"As you know, small business concerns who pay out about 85 percent of the Nation's pay rolls are the most seriously affected. Yet while they face wholesale extinction, a handful of giant corporations are overloaded with about 75 percent of all defense orders, according to your bureau of statistics."

The American Business Congress suggested to Mr. Knudsen a seven-point program for correcting the situation and protecting small businesses during the crisis. It follows:

"A. Every prime contract awarded should carry a provision for mandatory subcontracting of a portion thereof, wherever possible.

"B. O. P. M. should encourage and assist in the development of 'pools' consisting of a number of small plants whose facilities can be coordinated to produce defense goods.

"C. Procedure should be simplified and assistance rendered by O. P. M. officials to enable small manufacturers more readily to understand how they can participate in production of defense goods. Present regulations are unnecessarily complicated and cumbersome; information required is sometimes unobtainable.

"D. Priorities should not be granted for new plant equipment until it is ascertained that existing facilities are inadequate.

"E. The allocation of civilian supplies should be coordinated with the change-over from 'business as usual' to wartime industrial production.

"F. Unwarranted accumulation of 'priority' materials by one group at the expense of another should be controlled.

"G. Plans should be devised looking to the economic welfare of nondefense industries which face curtailment or shut-down."

The communication also was addressed to Sidney Hillman, Associate Director of the O. P. M. The letter was signed by Mr. Seedman for the board of directors of the small manufacturers' association.

Our "Red" Brethren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, while the President is struggling to find ways to give the Communists in Russia under the leadership of bloody Joe Stalin, the hard-earned tax money of American patriots, the Communists, who believe in and have worked for the overthrow of this Government by force, are doing their dirtiest in California to disrupt the President's so-called fight for the democracies.

While Harry Hopkins, the President's personal friend and special agent is conferring in Russia with the rapist of Poland, with the would-be oppressor of Finland, the "red" leaders in California are doing what they can to impede our national-defense program.

Note the following clippings from the Los Angeles Times sent me by an unnamed but indignant citizen of that community:

MOSCOW-LED "RED" DRIVE IN LOS ANGELES UNFOLDED—COMMUNIST PARTY SECRETARY TELLS STATE ASSEMBLY BODY OF SUBVERSIVE MOVES

While Los Angeles little dreamed of what really was happening, the Communist Party—

Organized Los Angeles harbor fishermen and sailors, and conducted "successful" cannery strikes;

Penetrated Hollywood to foment the motion picture studio strikes that proved disruptive within the industry;

Gave "great help" in the Douglas Aircraft Co. strike, the Tea Garden cannery strike; the 1937 San Pedro water-front strike; and "possibly contributed" in the Los Angeles Railway Corporation and Venice celery growers' strikes;

Secretly conducted "schools" for children as young as 9 years old;

Aided in "labor organization" at the Ford Motor Co. plant; and

Inaugurated the recall petition against former Mayor Frank L. Shaw.

Jack Moore, youthful secretary of the Communist Party in Los Angeles, so testified yesterday before a State assembly committee investigating un-American activities.

"RED" TELLS STORY

He was under oath in the State Building before Assemblymen Jack Tenney, James H. Phillips, and Jesse B. Kellems, and questioned by Richard Combs, Visalia attorney, assisting the committee.

He testified further that at Los Angeles Harbor the Workers' Alliance is a Communist Party fraction, and that some of the party's local funds came from "people interested in doings in Moscow."

Mr. Speaker, is it not about time that the President, who insisted upon the recognition of the Russian Government, his wife, who entertained in her own home and in the Executive Mansion members of the Communist Party, who has appeared at public meetings where their influence was powerful, be a little more choosy in his selection of those who, if he be successful in his present program, will have the power of life and death over American conscripts—American soldiers and men of the Navy.

The President should remember that while the "Bear Who Walks Like a Man" is at present engaged in clawing Hitler, it is quite capable of crushing in its Soviet arms this Republic of the West.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the new lease-lend-leave bill should include freezing in Harry Hopkins in Moscow.

If it is true that Russia is winning, then we should rush aid to Hitler. We must keep Joe and Adolf tied.

We should adopt as the theme song for our State Department, "We won't go over till it's over over there."

George Washington threw a dollar across the Rappahannock. Another has thrown over $7,000,000,000 across the Atlantic.

We wonder how the 100,000 American boys who gave their lives in vain during the last war would vote on a shooting war.

The most recent message on inflation and price control calls for more power to the President. Who would have thought it?

Churchill's wish of our being on the "verge" no doubt is father to the thought but is not in line with the Father of our Country.

If Willkie were speaking at Coffeyville this summer, a handcar would be the only special train needed from northeast Kansas.

Like Ruth to Naomi, only militantly, HIRAM JOHNSON said to BURT WHEELER, "If you must go to a concentration camp, I will go with you."

There is a suspicion that a large part of our Pacific Fleet was moved into the Atlantic to help convoy. Japan fooled Mr. Hull by starting something.

Franklin backed Stimson on his charge of near treason. The Secretary of War apologized to the Montanan, which leaves the former on the proverbial limb.

Hyde Park Cleaners: Specializing in taxpayers' pants and bundles for Britain. Deliveries promised anywhere in the world. For quick service phone Congress 1776. (Advertising.)

We are on both sides and in the middle of the present war. We gave deadbeat Britain the planes to bomb pay-up Finland and we gave Finland the guns and money to defend her democracy.

W. P. A. Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

LETTER FROM E. P. BOLAND, GREEN BAY, WIS.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

GREEN BAY, WIS., *July 15, 1941.*
Congressman JOSHUA L. JOHNS,
Eighth District of Wisconsin,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNS: I want you to know that I have enjoyed reading your weekly letters. They certainly contain a lot of information and it is too bad that everyone, not only in the eighth district but throughout the Nation, does not have an opportunity to read them.

I also want you to know that I enjoyed your last talks over the radio, and as I listen to you talk and read your weekly letters, I often wonder where the American people are headed for.

There is one thing at this time that I would like to bring to your attention although I believe you are very familiar with conditions, and that is when farmers are begging for men to do their haying and harvesting, there still continues to be operating a lot of useless, worthless W. P. A. projects. The one that I am going to describe should be one for the book.

Out in the town of Hobart—that used to be part of the Oneida Indian Reservation—there are still quite a number of Indians who, up to the time the relief took over, were all willing to work and able to make their own living. This took a period of about 25 years to bring them up to this point. Within 30 days after the relief set in, it put the Oneida Indians back about 25 years. One of the W. P. A. projects which I have in mind is about 12 big fat lazy Indians sitting up at the Episcopal Hall for about 2 years, supposed to be writing the Oneida Indian language. After they had it written, they didn't know what to do with it, so they continued with the same project, or a new one, to write a dictionary of the Indian language and they are still sitting there writing a dictionary for the Indian language; each one of them getting $70 a month.

(Now, can you tell me who wants to learn the Indian language, and what are they going to do with the dictionary?)

The reason why I set this project out is because of the fact that many of the farmers in this locality are unable to get help to put in their hay. Four of those fellows used to belong to my crew, but while they can get $70 a month writing the Indian language they will never work for me or for anyone else owning a farm, and the best part of it is that most of the money those fellows earn on W. P. A. goes for booze.

Now, in my opinion, that is one project that should be halted immediately, as there is plenty of work right in their neighborhood that they can do and get, and would be doing something for the good of their country. (Of course, those fellows are our new dealers.)

Then we have several projects over in our courthouse. A bunch of loafers are sitting around tables blocking the hallways, supposed to be working on old records or trying to clear up the family tree of a lot of the old, early French frog catchers or muskrat hunters who lived along the banks of Fox River in early days in little shanties.

I feel, Mr. JOHNS, that you will agree with me, and I know that it is hard, single-handed, to do anything to remedy matters and break up the political machine, but I believe that if more publicity were given to the useless, worthless projects of W. P. A., that today there is absolutely no cause for it, and that some of the "rubber stamp" Congressmen would wake up.

In closing, I will say that it is just too bad that 75 percent of our Congressmen and Senators are not men of your caliber and ideas, and the other 25 percent could be "rubber stamps." With kind personal regards, I remain

Respectfully yours,

E. P. BOLAND.

Will the Government Survive If We Fight in the Present World War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. JOSHUA JOHNS, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I made over the radio on July 30:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, I am pleased to be able to address you tonight upon the subject: Will This Government Survive if We Fight in the Present World War? I feel that, as your representative, I should occasionally report to you what is going on in the Nation and get your ideas of what should be done to solve the public problems that are facing us.

It is needless for me to say to you tonight that, in my opinion, we face in the United States the greatest crisis that we have seen since the early pioneers struggled through those serious days between 1783 and 1787 when there was a question in the minds of all people whether or not our great country could survive. We are a liberty-loving people and we have always had great independence in this country, and the problem that faces us today is whether we can continue with liberty and independence. In studying this problem, I turned to Abraham Lincoln, and a speech that he delivered at Edwardsville, Ill., on September 13, 1858. In that address, he said:

"What constitutes the bulwark of our liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoasts, our Army, and our Navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of these may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors. Familiarize yourselves with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of others, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you."

Today, the world faces this sort of a problem. The question we must decide is to what extent, for practical and effective purposes, can the Government of the United States fulfill its military, naval, and economic commitments on the basis of applying them anywhere and everywhere beyond our own country? This question is not propounded to you capriciously. It recognizes what is increasingly in the minds of the American people as you witness the experiences of Great Britain and new phases of our American policy.

As you perhaps know, I have favored giving aid to Great Britain and the other countries which are trying to preserve civilization, but I am not unmindful of what a great task this is and above everything else, I am for America first. Then, if we can aid somebody else, let us do so.

Let us review briefly the condition of Great Britain at the present time. As an Empire, it is spread all over the map. As a result, her defense is not strong in any particular part of the world. Because of her diversity of territorial and economic interests, calling for first protection, Great Britain has not been able to help much those allied with her in resisting Axis aggression. For instance, the military force that Great Britain was able to send Greece was only about 60,000 men. Compared with the threefold forces the Nazis had in the Balkan area, British help to Greece could not have resulted in other than the forced evacuation that attended the British, fine and heroic as it was.

Because the British Empire is scattered all over the earth, Great Britain, being undermanned in comparison with Germany, cannot concentrate great forces outside of the British Isles themselves to minimize the risks to her own empire and the communications vital to keeping it well knitted. Britain simply cannot give any decisive assistance to what are loosely referred to, here and overseas, as "the democracies."

We have already, to give aid to Great Britain, diminished our naval forces considerably. We have already dispersed troops to Hawaii, Guam, the Philippines, and other American possessions in the Pacific and to the new leased bases all the way from Newfoundland north and east of Canada to the semitropics.

We have assumed responsibility for protecting Greenland, a Danish possession. Then, there is South America. The latter is, truly, in our hemisphere. We also have in effect a wide and ranging sea patrol, so that our naval and military forces are, like Great Britain's, becoming more scattered all the time.

Great Britain's greatest and most disturbing peril is not only a Nazi juggernaut. A grave danger of the British people is inherent in Great Britain's many tenuous and undependable political alliances and obligations, in her vast expanse of territory, and in her great Navy and armies of many races and colors being distributed all over the globe. In this thinment of Great Britain's dispersed power is a signal for the United States not to sprawl itself out too far or bite off more than it can chew. We must have the vision, and courage to think of our own country, too.

The people of this country are interested in what our Government is doing about our own national defense. They feel that if that defense is all powerful the American people will be able to do their part toward ending this conflict, if and when it becomes necessary to do so. The place to find out that this is the sentiment of the people is not down here in Washington, your Capital, but out among my radio audience, away from Washington, where you are able to do some clear thinking. You may be influenced by the propaganda over the radio and in the newspapers and on the screen, but out of all the confusion in your minds, in time you think matters through and come to a correct conclusion if you can sift out the truth from the false statements that are being made to you. In our foreign policy our great need is for orderly thinking, devotion to our Constitution, and faith in the American people.

We need leadership that will unite America in a policy that is unmistakably a policy for the defense of America, on whatever scale and whatever plan is demonstrated to be necessary to meet the needs of the present day. This calls for a program of defense, invincible in modern warfare on land, on sea, and in the air. It must command the unquestionable respect of those who listen only to the strong. We should seek a strength so great that it will guarantee to ourselves and to the world either that we shall be let alone, or that, if attacked, we shall and must win. The Nation already supports and is committed to a policy of this kind. What we need for it, most of all, is time to make it effective.

This naturally means the wholehearted support and preservation of our constitutional structure and procedure and of our Bill of Rights. It means full cooperation between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government. It means that if new governmental policies, such as the authorization of price fixing or the establishment of important executive branches of the Government, are to be adopted, this shall be done by law after consultation with the executive branch of the Government, and should not be by Executive order issued without consultation with Congress. This means freedom of the press, of assembly, of worship, and, as far as possible, of individual opportunity. It means patient and cordial recognition of the right of freedom of speech by those loyally opposing as well as those loyally supporting the administration. This means just now, for example, no convoying by American naval vessels of war materials to belligerents. It does not mean any lack of diligence in policing or patrolling the high seas in defense of American rights, people, and properties, including our insular possessions and the areas that come within our Monroe Doctrine and the pan-American agreements that have grown from it. It means diligent defense, but it does not mean aggression or incitement to aggression. It means limiting our aid to other nations to the lending or leasing of things, not of men. It means a bona fide and convincing recognition of the fact that the American people and the Congress, which is their constitutional representative on this issue, have not declared war, that they do not want to declare war, and that they do not want to enter upon an undeclared war.

Our policy of national defense does not authorize war unless we are attacked or unmistakably threatened with attack. We are not now so threatened. Our national defense does not now authorize an attack by us on anyone. It does not authorize our provocation of attack upon us by anyone. It does not authorize our cargo carriers to enter combat areas. It does not authorize our naval vessels to convoy war materials to belligerent nations, although it does fully authorize the production and supplying of those materials as rapidly as possible and in as large and effective quantities as the President shall deem to be necessary for the defense of nations whose defense he now deems, under the law vesting him with that discretion, to be vital to the defense of America.

In carrying out these policies it must mean unity between the Government, the manufacturer, the farmer, the industrial worker, and the taxpayer. It means that we must have unity between capital and labor in the interest of uninterrupted production. With all of this, it means a Government guaranty of fairness and a governmental policy of firmness toward employer and worker alike. The employer and the industrial worker are at heart the same kind of patriotic citizens out of uniform as are the general and the soldier in uniform. We all are in a common, essential, patriotic service. Genuine, fair leadership can secure the same complete response to a call for patriotic service from men out of uniform as it can from those whom it places in uniform.

The President, in carrying out these policies, should demonstrate a deep faith in the people and in their representatives. He should take the people and the Congress into his confidence and, in return, he will receive their confidence. He should not attempt to force America further than he can carry a substantially united Nation with him. Divided, a free people is helpless. United, a free people is invincible.

A free people will go to whatever limits are necessary to defend and preserve their freedom, but to have the dynamic strength inherent in freedom their action must be voluntary. It must be based upon deep conviction freely arrived at on the basis of facts clearly understood. America will follow a leader who points the way of truth, but he must not hide or color the truth. He should lead in the exposition and analysis of the true facts and in the determination of policy based upon them. This calls for a knowledge of facts by the President and his staff and also for a frank sharing of these facts, and his interpretation of their meaning, with the Congress, the Governors, the mayors, and the industrial, agricultural, military, civic, and religious leaders of the Nation.

There is no doubt in the minds of the American people that with teamwork in industry and a united Nation we can defend America. We must have faith in one another and faith in God. Courage is conviction translated into action. It is as great as the conviction is deep. We shall save America in proportion to our conviction of its soundness and our faith in it. The heart of our foreign policy, as well as of our domestic policy, must be our complete and immediate personal and official dedication of ourselves, our fortunes, and, if necessary, our lives to the service and defense of America.

We are not prepared for war unless we do happen to be attacked and the thing for us to do is to attend strictly to our own business of national defense. When a country sets out to conquer such seasoned customers as Germany, Japan, and Italy together, it is a good idea to have something more tangible than rhetoric with which to conquer them. The risk involved in thinking we can conquer with our bare hands because our hearts are pure is one of the gravest any nation can take. All we need to do to assure ourselves of this fact is to consult the Finns and the Greeks about it. If we go to war unprepared and suffer serious reverses abroad, our position in Latin America will be greatly weakened.

The percentage of Americans who do not want to go to war with actual fighting is about 4 out of every 5, and should they be compelled to get into and fight a war they do not believe in, they would be apathetic about the whole thing. It will be necessary for us to get results if we are to inculcate enthusiasm in them. We may have to fight later and should prepare for it to the hilt, but history has too many surprises to justify the word "inevitable" in connection with our decision.

If we entered the war, what would be our situation after it was over? Not only would we have the crushing burden of war debts, contracted for the material implements of warfare, added to our enormous peacetime debt, but we would have the moral and economic load of war's human wreckage, including insurance and other benefits to the families of the dead. When we were through, we would have widespread want and fear, and we would have the maintenance of order by a Government scarcely distinguishable from those we fought against. In my opinion, it is fairly certain that capitalism would not survive our participation in this war.

The totalitarian powers are reasonably united now and would be much more so if we attacked them, they may not be so united later as Russia is now on the defensive instead of the offensive.

It is too late now to save the little nations as sovereign states. The power age and the

bombing plane have made it impossible for any nation to insist on its sovereignty without the military force to protect it and supply all strategic raw materials within its borders. Only about 4 countries can qualify for sovereignty today: The United States, Germany, Japan, with its resources from China, and Russia. The British Empire is too scattered geographically to form a compact fighting unit. Little nations will have to snuggle under the aluminum wings of one of these 4 countries, or build up federations of their own, to which they must perforce, surrender their sovereignty. The little countries of Europe can only be saved in some kind of United States of Europe. The question arises—have we the plans or the power with which to set this up?

Some day, this unspeakable war will end and the rebuilding of the world, already being planned, will occupy the focus of our minds. Even now, in the midst of the din and chaos, of starvation, death, and disaster, the eternal verities of life and the principles which underlie any order of society that can be called good, need to be affirmed and kept alive. Every voice of reason cries out against this war. Every note of revelation in Christ's Gospel is leveled against it. The still, small voice within our souls insistently speaks against this way of solving the problems of life.

In this crisis and during these distressful days, when each one of us at times feels that the way of life which we call civilized may be lost and forgotten, it is imperative that we take stock of the forces which we can employ to perpetuate it among men. We all owe a positive duty to our community at this time, the neglect of which we cannot excuse on the plea of duty to our private affairs. We are in a great crisis. We should follow understandingly the course of public events and we should then endeavor to act intelligently and efficiently in support of the principles which we believe to be right and which will perpetuate our civilization. In order to better accomplish our objectives, we must develop leaders of inspired idealism; leaders who have been granted great vision; who do much dreaming and are constantly striving to make their dreams come true; who can kindle in the hearts of all true Americans, this spirit, with the fire from their own burning souls; those leaders who not only preach, but those who put into actual practice what they teach.

The world must not fail in the present crisis. Civilization must be preserved—and that it will be—but not unless God shall give us men and women cast in heroic mold; men and women endowed not only with the understanding heart which feels and appreciates the condition of the present, but with the philosophic mind which weighs with just discrimination the accumulated experience of the past; men and women who can withal lift up their eyes in abiding faith to the hilltops of the future which even now are touched and glorified by the light of the approaching day.

You, as good citizens, mindful of your country's traditions and its welfare, should uphold a proper respect for constituted authority and assist in preserving and advancing the integrity and prestige of our Government. As I have stated before, we are now passing through a great emergency, and may I ask of you that you look proudly toward our country, revere its traditions, fight for its prosperity and future, and above all, live that life, whatever be its intrinsic reward, which will cause us to know that we have been honorable citizens, appreciative of the privileges our country affords us, jealous of its integrity, and alert in its defense. Be not afraid of patriotism; it is the soul of citizenship. Be not afraid of service; it is the road to contentment, and it is a thing we can all give.

Lend-Leasing for Atheism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF STEPHEN A. DAY, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio yesterday:

Last Saturday, there arrived in Washington high officials of the Soviet Union. Immediately upon their arrival they went into a huddle with our State Department. Yesterday, Harry Hopkins landed in Moscow. These two events are of such far-reaching importance to the people of the United States that I feel it my duty to speak plainly.

Last March the Congress voted $7,000,000,000 to implement the lend-lease bill. This action followed the message of President Roosevelt, which he delivered in person in the hall of the House on January 6, 1941. In that message he stated in part as follows:

"In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way, everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want, which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants, everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world. That is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation. That kind of world is the very antithesis of the so-called new order of tyranny which the dictators seek to create with the crash of a bomb. To that new order we oppose the greater conception—the moral order. A good society is able to face schemes of world domination and foreign revolutions alike without fear. * * * The world order which we seek is the cooperation of free countries, working together in a friendly, civilized society. * * * Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights or keep them."

We now learn that the President has promised total aid to the Soviet Union and that all necessary steps are being taken to make that aid just as effective as our aid to Britain. It has been stated and not denied that the President will soon come to the Congress for additional billions of lend-lease funds to aid the Soviet Union. The presence of the Soviet officials in Washington and the presence of Harry Hopkins in Moscow totally remove any doubt that this aid has become a part of our foreign policy.

We all know that none of the "four freedoms" exists in the Soviet Union at this time and can never exist there unless the blood-soaked dictatorship of Stalin be overthrown. Millions have been murdered in Soviet Russia without trial or hearing, including thousands of priests. Organizations of the Godless exist everywhere under Stalin and on the walls of the Kremlin are the words "Religion is an Opiate." It is monstrous even to suggest that the second freedom proclaimed by the President, "Freedom of every person to worship God in his own way," can ever exist under the rule of Stalin. There can be no doubt that when the President spoke on January 6, 1941, of "tyranny which the dictators seek to create with the crash of a bomb," he referred not only to Hitler and Mussolini but also to Stalin. It is also perfectly clear that when he said "our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights or keep them", he manifestly did not include the Soviet Union.

By what right then does Harry Hopkins fly to Moscow and assure Stalin that the Government of the United States will provide lend-lease funds for the Soviet Union? I charge here and now that this is plain usurpation of power on the part of the President and that it is the duty of Congress to proceed at once to revoke the authorizations granted to him under the lend-lease bill.

To enable the people of the United States to understand the violent departures which have been made and are being made from our constitutional system of government, I have written a book entitled "We Must Save the Republic." On page 89 of my book in speaking of the lend-lease bill, I state as follows: The lend-lease bill was an act "further to promote the defense of the United States" and was passed as a peacetime measure. There can be no question as to this point. No representative of the administration, from the highest to the lowest, ever advocated any reason for its passage, save that it would preserve peace by aiding Britain "short of war." There was great apprehension that enormous powers were being granted to the President, and, to allay such fears, provisions were inserted expressly limiting the granting of such powers. And the following was quoted from the lend-lease bill:

"After June 30, 1943, or after the passage of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses before June 30, 1943, which declares that the powers conferred by or pursuant to subsection (a) are no longer necessary to promote the defense of the United States, neither the President nor the head of any department or agency shall exercise any of the powers conferred by or pursuant to subsection (a)."

Can anyone honestly state that what Harry Hopkins is now doing in Moscow is necessary to promote the defense of the United States? Can anyone honestly state that the perpetuation of the power of Stalin is necessary to promote the defense of the United States? Fully convinced that the time has come to revoke the powers of the President, and such powers he may have delegated to Harry Hopkins as totally unwarranted, illegal, and unconstitutional, I am introducing a concurrent resolution in the House of Representatives, in conformity with the provisions of the lend-lease bill, which I have just read, to put an end to these activities. I call upon the American people to support me in this effort so as to insure the passage by the Congress of this concurrent resolution. A concurrent resolution passed by both Houses of the Congress does not require the signature of the President and he cannot veto it.

There is another phase of this question that I must once more call to the attention of the American people. It is the grave danger that rests in the attack that has been made on the independence of the

United States of America. If we break down this spirit of American independence, we will be wide open to communism that is creeping into the midst of our people. No one thought that when President Roosevelt in 1933 recognized the Soviet Union that in a few years he would pass beyond mere recognition to active support of the ideologies of communism by actually embracing the Soviet Union. As I have said, the Soviet Military Commission is now in Washington. Harry Hopkins, director of the lend-lease billions, is now in Moscow. These Soviet agents, working with the British agents, are perfecting plans for the total aid to Stalin promised by the President. Though blessed by Winston Churchill and Under Secretary Welles, they are still Communists and have not recanted one word of their blood-soaked doctrines of mass murder.

Communists may be popular in London and Moscow, but they are very much hated in South America. We have assumed the dominant place in the Western Hemisphere. The South American nations are largely Latin in their basic stocks. They will turn from the United States and leave us a colonial dominion of the British Empire without a friend in the New World, except Canada. Why do I say this? The answer is clear. Hating communism more than they do Hitler, all of the Latin nations of Europe—Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal—side with Hitler, not with Stalin. Every student knows that the blood of these Latin nations is the same blood that runs in the veins of the inhabitants of the nations of South America. Communism has poisoned the four freedoms and South America is questioning the close tie that President Roosevelt has established with the Soviet Union.

This should make us pause and reflect. What have we to gain by helping Stalin defeat Hitler if such action will alienate the friendship of South America? In my opinion, we must lose no time in declaring an American foreign policy that will keep our soldiers on the soil of this hemisphere. We dare not add to the $7,000,000,000 lend-lease gift another $7,000,000,000 gift to Stalin. If we do, our own defense is in great danger, not from a foreign invasion by Hitler on our shores, but from the loss of the friendship of our neighbors in South America. It is quite likely that we may witness a general repudiation of President Roosevelt's foreign policy that will be deeply humiliating to the American people. Our great Catholic population repudiates communism and are beginning to seriously question the sincerity of the "four freedoms," if the freedom of religion means the approval of godless Russia. Was there ever such a travesty?

Some may say that after Stalin, with our aid, has overthrown Hitler, Stalin will reform and proclaim, as has the President, the "four freedoms." Have we any evidence of this? Does anyone believe that Stalin will turn Christian and bow on bended knee and ask forgiveness for the 2,000,000 innocent men and women that he has murdered?

Men and women of America, this thing has gone far enough. We have been patient, but we are not fools. The last 9 years have been full of pain and suffering, but we are not ready to admit that all of our history, our great traditions, and our great institutions shall be surrendered to the domination of Stalin. I may be wrong, but I want to go on record now that I shall resist this sell-out of America to Britain and Soviet Russia just as strongly as I shall resist the successful overthrow of this country by Hitler or the Axis Powers. To me it is unthinkable that our foreign policy should condone the cruelties and atheism of the Soviet Union, and just because a foreign nation is at war with another foreign nation in Europe, the American taxpayers should be bled white to pay for gifts which President Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins have promised to Churchill and Stalin.

In a few days the Congress is going to be asked to vote upon the declaration of a national emergency to authorize President Roosevelt to keep our American boys for an unlimited period. He has said that the sole responsibility rests with the Congress. The Congress will give its answer, and from all indications as I speak tonight the answer of the American Congress will be an honest answer. And that answer will be "no." We shall keep faith with our boys and stand by the contract that was made with them in September 1940. The President has passed the buck to Congress. Mothers of America, it is our turn now, and the Congress will keep faith with you.

For the triumph of constitutional liberty in one part of the world, for the sanctity of promises given and accepted, for the example to your sons and the children of America to come after us, I pledge you here tonight that I shall be true to my oath of office and shall not betray you in this your hour of anguish.

A great cleric has recently stated:

"Today the mask is off; it is communism, communism, communism everywhere gaining ground. We are in danger of being slowly poisoned, debilitated, and disarmed by this monstrous malady. Now, in the name of the 'four freedoms' all aid to 'red' Russia is urged upon us while Britain in desperation has allied herself with a devil. So Britain has been fighting the battle of Christianity? There is a fallacy exploded. If we go into this war now we shall be nothing more nor less than a criminal nation, and let no one look to our Catholic people for support."

The law which President Roosevelt signed—the lend-lease bill—provides the way to end this crying shame about to be visited upon the American people. A concurrent resolution of the Congress can do it. It must be done. It shall be done. I shall introduce the resolution and I want your support to make it successful. If you agree with me kindly write or wire your Representative, as I am only the representative of the 8,000,000 people of the great State of Illinois. It will require the favorable votes of a majority of both Houses of the Congress. There is no time to lose. No one can say how far Harry Hopkins has gone in his promises to Churchill and Stalin. Those promises do not bind the American people, if the Congress of the United States shall exercise its power to put an end to the authorizations of the President under the lend-lease bill, by a concurrent resolution.

Sentiment Grows for Separate Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, there is a sentiment for a separate air force for this country which is a moving and vital undertaking—and cannot be stopped. We expect continued opposition, but we are certain that a real case is being made which will be part of a record which is to stand the test.

In the New York Times of last Sunday appeared a letter to the editor, which endorsed an independent air force. It was written by Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, United States Army, retired. I shall not quote the entire letter, but the following is especially pertinent:

What we require at this important time is an additional Cabinet officer—a Cabinet Minister of Defense.

Such an official should aid the President in inspecting and supervising the efficiency and relative progress of three coequal armed branches—the Navy, the Army, and the Air Corps, as is done in Britain, Germany, and 20 other countries. A small national-defense college should be created, under the minister of defense. The students would be a limited number of officers of the three services, with a few civilians from some of the other Government Departments.

SMALL STAFF NEEDED

The minister would require but a small staff. The three civilians at the head of the three armed services would each have large staffs as at present. Unity of command would be assured because the portions of the Air Corps which go to war with the Navy and with the Army would be all the time in peace actually with and under the orders of these respective branches—for training and indoctrination. A Reserve force of the Air Corps would be retained by the Chief of the Air Corps, subject to the disposition of the Minister of Defense. We need a single homogeneous United States Air Corps with its own laws for pay, promotion, and retirement.

Such an organization would result in great improvement in operations and in great savings of public funds.

As to our having in the Army some officers who are not competent, this is natural, because we lack any system of selection in the promotion of Army officers in the grades up to that of colonel. All the navies of all nations have such a system and all the important armies save only ours also use the system of selection in promoting Army officers. Therefore we are now doing much the same thing we have done when an emergency appears. We are experimenting with some of our Army officers in order to compare their relative efficiency when this should have been done carefully in peacetime.

COMPETITION FAVORED

This experimenting with the assignments of some of our higher officers has in the past produced almost unbelievable results. It inevitably delays and mars the early training of some of the new forces. The history of administration indicates that no bureau in which the officials have a life tenure of office will ever retire or discharge in a thorough manner the less competent persons. An automatic system such as selection insures the competition which is effective.

The question of air power and the proper organization for our defense forces must now be viewed after study of the capture of Crete. The capture of Crete in a few days was an epoch-making event in warfare. The British were in possession of Crete. They had an army there, with defended positions, artillery, tanks, and other heavy equipment. The Germans carried to Crete thousands of infantry soldiers in transport planes and in gliders. The Germans captured Crete without tanks and artillery and special equipment. The airplanes not only brought the German troops to Crete, but the dive bombers acted in the place of tanks and artillery in battle to aid in defeating the British forces on the island. We now see that airplanes can be the principal instruments both in seizing and in

holding positions. The Air Corps is not, therefore, as many have claimed, merely an auxiliary force in war.

WILLIAM C. RIVERS,
Major General, United States Army, Retired.

NEW YORK, *July 24, 1941.*

Mr. Speaker, editorially of recent weeks the movement is growing stronger for increased emphasis on our air force and for an independent unit, which was advocated with strength by the late Billy Mitchell, and hundreds of persons since that time. At this point I include the comment from an editorial in Collier's of July 12:

After Crete and the *Bismarck* nobody outside Bedlam has any doubt about the striking power of an air force. The only machine able to resist a hostile airplane is another and better airplane. Against attack from the air the best ship in the German Navy went down. Against air bombs the valiant seamen and the splendid ships of the British Mediterranean fleet were helpless.

We cannot afford to ignore these plain lessons if we want to survive as a free people. In addition to whatever else we want and need to defend ourselves, we need planes and many more planes than we are producing now.

We don't have to fool ourselves or to try to fool anybody else. Our only possible enemies—Germany, Italy, and Japan—know very accurately what we have and what we are producing. The fact is—and it's no secret from possible enemies—we have not enough. Not that we have not done well since once we started. We were slow in starting. Whatever our shortcomings, we are all responsible for that, too. The incredible happened. We did not believe it would. So we were caught unprepared.

We don't have to continue unprepared, however, and we are not. Neither the Government nor the aircraft manufacturers have performed any miracles, but hard, honest, and intelligent work has been done and is being done. Good ships are being built and good minds are being focused on problems of design and of mass production.

We still continue, however, to act as though air power were an adjunct, and a subordinate adjunct, to something else. We underrate the importance of the air force. The military men and the admirals quite naturally have managed to keep the air force subordinate to themselves.

Collier's is not setting itself up as another strategist. Quite enough amateur strategists are struggling for attention. We won't add to their numbers. But without assuming an expert wisdom that we don't possess, we may point out that air power should be raised to equal rank and dignity in our defense establishment with land and sea power.

It is foolish to dogmatize as to just how this should be done. Perhaps a Secretary for Air in the Cabinet would fill the bill. Or perhaps a single department of defense, with coordinated, coequal bureaus for air, land, and sea, would be the proper formula. Of one thing we're convinced—that the naming of Gen. Henry H. Arnold as deputy Chief of Staff for the air arm, though a step in the right direction, is not a long enough step.

It looks as though we were going to rely upon planes to do most of whatever fighting falls to our lot if war be ultimately declared. We shall need planes to keep enemies away from our shores—not that any military authority expects any serious effort at invasion of continental United States—and we shall need planes for offense, if we get into the war.

The only force anyone has pictured carrying the war to Germany is an air force. If we are forced into war we will want planes capable of such fighting. We will want long-range bombers in multitudes never before assembled.

We are getting up speed in production. We are probably past the worst of the delays due to strikes. Organized labor is at heart as much interested in maximum production as any other group of Americans. Stupid and foreign-inspired local leadership led to bad interruptions in California and elsewhere, but that is over. Our guess is that the Army won't find it necessary to intervene in many places.

We need and we are getting a large army of trained fliers. Fortunately, the civilian training program is being continued and expanded. There are some 65,000 licensed private pilots in the United States and 17,000 privately owned planes. These men and women are obviously not military pilots. Some of them at least are able to do defense work in an emergency. We hope that no departmental rivalries or jealousies will prevent the full use of these civilian pilots and plants for whatever services they are actually qualified to perform.

Air power has suddenly come of age. It behooves us to gather up and utilize all the air power we now possess and to make more of it as rapidly as we can.

Tax on Marriage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK FELLOWS
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BANGOR (MAINE) DAILY NEWS

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of July 29, 1941:

[From Bangor (Maine) Daily News of July 29, 1941]

TAX ON MARRIAGE

Aside from all discussion of the relations between church and state, or the clergyman's proper role in civic life, there is wide agreement that there was a time when the cleric was as generally correct as he was generally effective in matters of politics. There is also a widespread belief that, later, this ceased to be the case. Today, though the American clergy are so sharply divided over America's war policies, there is a feeling that they are again beginning to speak of public affairs "not as the scribes."

A striking contribution to this feeling was made at Bar Harbor, the other day, by Protestant Episcopal Bishop William T. Manning, of New York, protesting against the proposed Federal law to exact joint income-tax returns from husband and wife:

"We have got to pay greatly increased income taxes to defeat Hitlerism," said the bishop, "and we must all be willing to do this; but * * * the proposal in question would tend definitely toward divorce, celibacy, and a declining birth rate, and would be a reversal of the progress which has been made, in recent decades, in giving women their true status as individuals and citizens. The strength of our Nation lies in happy marriages and in happy homes and families. This proposed law would say to married couples that they must pay far larger income taxes if they live together than if they break up their homes and live apart, or if they were not married."

The bishop, a staunch supporter of all-out American aid to Britain, urges every citizen to shoulder a full share of the tax burden, but denounces as a bill calculated to force a man and a woman, married and living together, to pay a larger tax than a couple unmarried, divorced, or living apart. Although Dr. Manning speaks primarily as a clergyman, his religious arguments are cogent additions to the purely economic reasons against a measure essentially discriminatory and antisocial.

Amendment of Sugar Act of 1937

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. ROBINSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the national emergency confronting this country today has created a sugar problem which was not contemplated when Congress passed the Sugar Act of 1937. Under this act three-fourths of the requirements of consumers in continental United States depend upon shipments of raw sugar from offshore producing areas. It is obvious that the Sugar Act was written on the assumption that a continuous supply of shipping bottoms would be available to transport sugar from these off-shore areas to this country. It is not necessary to do more than point out that this Nation is facing the most acute shortage of merchant ships in its history. This factor will tend to disrupt the flow of sugar to the United States market and this situation seems increasingly serious in the case of the Philippine Islands.

H. R. 3582 which proposes to amend section 204 (a) of the Sugar Act of 1937 constitutes a necessary step toward meeting the effects of a rapidly increasing shipping shortage.

Since the enactment of the Sugar Act the Philippine quota has been in excess of the duty-free quota established by the Philippine Independence Act. However, the Philippines have never shipped any of their full-duty quota but have always filled their duty-free quota. Now, however, our rapidly increasing shipping shortage makes it at least probable that a deficit in the duty-free portion of the Philippine quota will occur in the near future.

Under the law as it now stands this deficit must be allotted among foreign countries other than Cuba, and it is highly questionable whether these countries could supply the sugar, even if it were deemed advisable to permit them to do so.

The following table shows that in no year, since the Sugar Act has been in effect, have foreign countries other than Cuba been able to fill their quota. This table shows that last year when no Philippine deficit was declared, the total

of these countries was 24,177 tons, and they were able to bring in only 17,400 tons.

Sugar quotas for foreign countries other than Cuba, charges against quotas, and Philippine deficits, 1934–40

[Short tons, raw value]

Year	Final quotas	Charges against quotas	Charges as percent of quotas	Philippine deficits
1934	25,836	29,750	115.15	None
1935	25,228	10,977	43.51	None
1936	29,103	29,024	99.73	[1] 651
1937	114,641	89,155	77.77	86,805
1938	80,683	75,114	93.10	53,883
1939 [2]	85,812	62,021	72.28	59,111
1940	24,177	17,400	71.97	None

[1] Under the Jones-Costigan amendment all areas shared proportionately in deficits wherever occurring. Actual Philippine deficit in 1936 was 97,909 tons, of which full-duty areas were allotted 632 tons. These areas were also allotted 19 tons from a Virgin Islands deficit of 2,230 tons.

[2] Quotas suspended by Presidential order on Sept. 12, 1939.

Feb. 27, 1941.

It has been argued by those opposed to this amendment that it violates, at least in spirit, the provisions of the world sugar agreement. Nothing of the sort is true. The important provisions of the world sugar agreement as it relates to the Philippine Islands and the position of foreign countries other than Cuba in the American market are as follows:

First. The United States undertakes to permit each year the importation from full-duty countries of an amount of sugar proportionately as large as those authorized for the calendar year 1937 under General Sugar Quota Regulations, Series 4, No. 1.—The quotas thus established totaled 26,610 tons at a consumption estimate of 6,434,588 tons.)

Second. The United States undertakes to permit, in case the Philippine quota is reduced below 850,000 tons, the importation from full-duty countries of an amount of sugar at least equal to the reduction.

Third. The Commonwealth of the Philippines agrees not to seek an export quota in the world market so long as its quota in the United States market is not less than 850,000 tons, or until basic quotas in the world market are increased.—The Philippines get 4 percent of any such increase.—However, in case the United States duty-free quota of the Philippines is reduced below 850,000 tons, the Islands are to be allotted world market quotas equal to the reduction.

This amendment makes no attempt to reduce the Philippine quota below 850,000 tons; and the law still specifically provides in section 204 (a), which deals with reallotments of deficits, that "the quota for any domestic area, the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, or Cuba, or other foreign countries shall not be reduced by reason of any determination made pursuant to the provisions of this subsection." Since this amendment does not reduce the basic United States quota for full-duty countries, and makes no reduction in the Philippine quota, it cannot be contended that the world agreement is in any way involved. All that it proposes is a change in the distribution of a Philippine deficit, and this point is no part of the world agreement.

This bill is wholly consistent with the position taken by the State Department when the Sugar Act of 1937 was under consideration.

When the Sugar Act of 1937 was being given congressional attention, Secretary Hull made two recommendations with respect to the quotas of foreign countries other than Cuba; that is, those countries whose sugar shipments to the United States pay the full rate of duty. He suggested, first, that deficits occurring within the quotas of these areas be reallotted to the other sources of supply within the group, and second, that the deficits in the full-duty portions of the Philippine quota be reallotted to these full-duty areas.

With respect to the first proposal, Mr. Hull on March 23, 1937, directed a statement to Representative Marvin Jones, then chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, in which he said (record of House hearings, p. 367):

> It would be highly advantageous to our export trade if some arrangement were to be made to increase the quotas to be allotted to other foreign countries. If, for example, deficiencies in the sugar quotas of any one or more foreign supply areas were to be reallocated with this end in view agriculture and industry would gain additional markets for their products.

On April 30, 1937, in another statement directed to Mr. Jones, the Secretary of State made reference to deficits in the Philippine quota as follows (record of Senate hearings, p. 182):

> In order to increase the full-duty quotas without disturbing the basis of the existing quota allocations, the draft of a bill presented by the Secretary of Agriculture proposed that any part of the full-duty share of its quota not utilized by the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands be reallocated on a pro rata basis to the full-duty countries. Under the Jones-Costigan Act, the Philippines have not elected to use any part of the full-duty portion of its quota so that it would seem reasonable to assume that usually this part of its quota would be available for reallocation.

There was never a suggestion on the part of Mr. Hull or anyone else that the deficits in duty-free portion of the Philippine quota be reallotted to these foreign countries.

Finally, there is one more point. If we are interested not only in protecting our American consumer in his supply and the price of sugar, but believe it more important to keep our pledge to aid England than to promote the interests of a few American capitalists having sugar investments in foreign countries, then we should remember that every acre of land utilized by our American farmers to produce sugar for the American consumer will correspondingly release vital shipping tonnage for use in our national effort to aid Great Britain and the other democracies.

This bill covers only one phase of this major problem by recognizing a greater danger in the Philippine situation in view of the fact that ships must travel over 7,000 miles to bring sugar from the Philippines to San Francisco, Calif., and over 13,000 miles to bring it from these islands to New York City, and the further fact that, according to the Maritime Commission, during the first 10 months of 1940 it required a total of 143 sailings by 103 vessels to move bulk cargoes of raw sugar aggregating 724,335 long tons from the Philippines to the United States. If Congress and the administration are going to be consistent in this emergency there should be no question about the passage of this bill.

Although the Sugar Act is primarily farm legislation this bill is a definite step toward assuring the American housewife that adequate supplies of sugar will be available at reasonable prices despite the imminent threat of a disrupted ocean commerce.

During the last World War there was also a shortage of merchant ships available for the transportation of sugar from the offshore areas. The demand for sugar in continental United States exceeded the supply, the retail price of sugar skyrocketed, and the records show that the National Shipping Board and the Food Administration had constantly before them the problem of restricting the consumption of sugar in the United States for the purpose of relieving our merchant marine of its war burdens.

It may be that there is no immediate shortage of sugar in this country, but history teaches that whenever there becomes a substantial lack of ocean vessels to carry sugar a sugar crisis will develop. Then, of course, quotas will be suspended and domestic producers, instead of being called greedy for wanting to supply the American market, will, as in the last war, be called upon to raise more and more sugar as a patriotic duty. But we also learned that domestic production cannot be stepped up on such short notice. One hundred and thirty million American consumers use approximately 100 pounds of sugar per capita annually, representing 23 percent of the world's consumption. It is the duty of Congress to use every possible means now to prevent an unnecessary shortage of this essential food product.

New Jersey's Contribution to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

RADIO INTERVIEW

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Nation, as a whole, does not perhaps realize the important part that the State of New Jersey is playing in the national-

defense effort and I know of no clearer expression of that activity than an interview had with my very close friend and a person in a position to know whereof he speaks, Mr. George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison Industries, Inc., and president of the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood.

For that purpose I include the following address, given over station WINS in New York City on July 26, 1941, entitled "New Jersey's Contribution to National Defense":

Mr. ADONIS. Men, money, and machines—machines, money, and men—day after day, in ever-increasing quantities, this endless procession of men, money, and machines is enrolled in the cause of American liberty. This, our great program of national defense, is America's No. 1 job.

In this time of national emergency, few citizens realize either the magnitude or the importance of the State of New Jersey's contribution toward our national defense. It is, therefore, the purpose of today's program to better acquaint you listeners with the herculean task shouldered by one of the smallest States in the Union. The simple facts will surprise you.

Our special guest today is Mr. George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc.; president of the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood; and a member of the board of directors of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Stringfellow was selected to speak on our radio forum because of his intimate knowledge of the many phases in New Jersey's national-defense program.

Mr. Stringfellow, in the brief time at our disposal it will be impossible to hear a detailed story of New Jersey's contribution to national defense, but it will be of great interest to our listeners, if you will tell us about a few highlights in this vitally important program.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. It will be a pleasure to do so, Mr. Adonis. First of all, I think we ought to keep in mind the following important facts: That only 3 of the 48 States are smaller than New Jersey, which ranks only forty-fifth in size. However, in population New Jersey jumps to ninth place in the national ranking.

Mr. ADONIS. That's quite a jump and indicates a very high percentage of people per square mile.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Yes; New Jersey is one of the most densely populated States in the Union, and a large percentage of that population is busy working on our national-defense program, too. In fact, here is something of real interest.

Mr. ADONIS. I presume it deals with awards and contracts for defense production.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Yes; it does. You see, New Jersey takes great pride in being first of all the States in the Nation in both the variety of defense products and also in the value of defense contracts placed with our manufacturers.

Mr. ADONIS. That's a startling statement. Could you explain it more fully, Mr. Stringfellow?

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Certainly. During the year beginning with July 1, 1940, New Jersey, through Government contract authorizations and direct expenditures, received defense awards and contracts totaling, $1,469,897,918

Mr. ADONIS. It's difficult to comprehend what a huge sum that really is.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Well, I'll break it down a little. For instance, the United States Government has awarded to the State of New Jersey Army contracts totaling more than $486,000,000 and Navy contracts totaling more than $891,000,000. Other appropriations in the grand total of nearly a billion and a half dollars include W. P. A. defense projects, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, defense housing, Federal loans from the Defense Plant Corporation, and the Office of Education Defense Training.

Mr. ADONIS. I agree with you, Mr. Stringfellow, that those facts and figures are surprising; but can you give us more specific information concerning the number of New Jersey plants which now have defense contracts?

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. At the present time there are more than 400 New Jersey plants which have each been awarded one or more national-defense contracts. Many others, operating under subcontracts, are furnishing special defense materials and equipment.

Mr. ADONIS. What are some of the more important products being turned out by New Jersey for the national-defense program?

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. The list of New Jersey-manufactured products for national defense is far too long to be recited in this brief radio program. However, I'd like to mention just a few. Note the amazing variety of sizes, shapes, weights, and materials involved. For instance, New Jersey industries are turning out smokeless powder, military luggage, radio equipment, battleships, parachutes, cables, uniforms, chemicals. * * *

Mr. ADONIS. They tell me that New Jersey is also responsible for a large portion of the hospital supplies.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Yes; to say nothing of 37-millimeter antitank guns, hydraulic presses, aerial bombs, airplane instruments, propellers, shells, lathes, machine tools, fire extinguishers, long Navy guns, destroyers, small patrol boats, airplanes, airplane motors, compasses, instruments of fire control—all necessary if our national defense is to be complete and thoroughly efficient.

Mr. ADONIS. How about air-raid helmets, portable oxygen sets, maintenance parts for engines, pneumatic life belts and rafts, pyrotechnics, signal assemblies, and footbridges?

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. All made in New Jersey—as are powder and cartridge containers, road-building equipment, pipe lines, wool blankets, bathrobes, pajama suits, handkerchiefs, neckties, raincoats, badges, steel barrels, shaving brushes, coffee urns, drafting material, flares, furnaces, fuses, suction hose, kitchenware, linoleum, mapping equipment, mess and canteen equipment, mirrors, motion-picture necessities. * * *

Mr. ADONIS. Quite a list.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. * * * Lead pencils, tent poles, electric fans, wire cloth, batteries, hammers, saw blades, scissors, springs, telescopes, concrete mixers, pumps, valves, dental supplies, and surgical instruments.

Mr. ADONIS. It would be difficult, indeed, to imagine anything else that could be made for our national defense. That list includes just about everything, doesn't it?

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Well, no. As a matter of fact, that's only a partial list. I was simply trying to confirm what I said a few minutes ago—that New Jersey ranks first and foremost among all the States of the Union, both in the value of its awards and contracts and in the diversification of the articles produced. And, incidentally, Mr. Adonis, I'd like to point out how fortunate we of New Jersey have been. To date, we've been remarkably free from serious strikes and labor disputes, especially within the industries now working on national-defense contracts. In New Jersey, we're particularly proud of our employer-employee relations and of the patriotic spirit demonstrated by the steady speeding-up of our defense work.

Mr. ADONIS. Can you tell us something about the Office of Production Management? What is New Jersey's program for the various divisions of that Office?

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. The Federal Office of Production Management recognizes the position of leadership which New Jersey occupies in the national-defense program. Accordingly, in the principal cities throughout the State, departmental activities have been organized. Thus, their various services have been better developed. This stimulates a maximum yield from the State's production facilities. For instance, the Labor Division of the Office of Production Management has a subdivision called Training Within Industry. This subdivision has its headquarters in Newark, under the able leadership of Mr. Glenn Gardiner, who has been loaned by his employer, the Forstmann Woolen Co., of Passaic, as a dollar-a-year man. Through this division of the Office of Production Management, foremen, semiskilled workers, machinists, and other personnel of our industrial concerns receive intensive training. This training equips them for more skilled operations and for more responsible positions in the rapidly expanding defense plants, which, by the way, are all working night and day in the present national emergency.

Mr. ADONIS. That sounds like a mighty fine idea and seems to be working as smoothly as could be desired.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Yes; it's functioning very well. * * * And so are the offices of the Defense Contract Service. The main offices of this service are in New York and Federal Reserve districts. However, in Trenton and Camden, suboffices of the Defense Contract Service cooperate with State and local chambers of commerce and with other public-spirited service clubs. These organizations are recruiting every suitable factory, large and small, and harnessing its full productive powers for national-defense purposes.

Mr. ADONIS. Sounds like another splendid part of the program.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Yes, sir; and in closing I'd like to add that the services of the Production Division, Priorities Division, and other departments of the Federal Office of Production Management are now available to all New Jersey industries.

Mr. ADONIS. This has been exceedingly interesting, Mr. Stringfellow, and I believe we'll have time for just one more question. Aside from the production of battleships, long-range guns, airplane motors, ammunition, and the various other materials, what would you say is New Jersey's greatest contribution to national defense?

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. That is a difficult question, Mr. Adonis. Of course, any State's greatest contribution to the national-defense program is its quota of fine young American men who are serving their country in military and naval bases everywhere. However, I believe that we at home in New Jersey have reason to be particularly proud of one more great contribution.

The men and women in all sections of our State, agricultural and industrial alike, are buckling down to this job of national defense in a spirit of national unity. We believe that to make our Nation powerful enough to defeat any invader or group of invaders, and to make our citizens patriotic enough to stamp out all subversive activities within our borders, every man, woman, boy, and girl has a job to do. To do this job, each and every true American in the State of New Jersey is helping us build an ever-stronger morale to stand behind the entire defense program of the most glorious country on earth.

Mr. ADONIS. Again I thank you, Mr. Stringfellow. You have given us an inspiring story of little New Jersey's gigantic part in the national defense of our country.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. PIERCE
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE TIMBERMAN, PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Timberman:

[From the Timberman, Portland, Oreg., of July 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

At Washington the Rivers and Harbors Committee is again studying economic and political aspects of the St. Lawrence seaway at hearings expected to last a month. The project, if brought to completion, would provide deep-water navigation to the Great Lakes, enabling foreign and American vessels to pass directly from the Atlantic to the heart of the Middle West. In addition, power would be developed along the St. Lawrence as an adjunct to river improvements.

Six successive Presidents of the United States have endorsed this international waterway, beginning with William Howard Taft. The railroads east of Chicago and the power interests of eastern cities have thus far been able to prevent the culmination of the St. Lawrence project by formidable and well-entrenched opposition.

Former President Hoover has contended that the deepening of the St. Lawrence River would reduce the grain rate to Europe during normal times as much as 5 to 7 cents a bushel. The late Howard Elliott, former president of the Northern Pacific, saw interesting possibilities in the project because western transcontinental lines could establish Atlantic terminals and free themselves to a considerable extent from domination of the carriers operating east of Chicago.

William S. Knudsen, Director of O. P. M., regards the St. Lawrence improvement as a vital part of the all-out defense effort. President Roosevelt favors cooperation with Canada in the completion of the work, a portion of which already has been undertaken by our northern neighbor.

The interest of the western lumber industry in this development would seem to lie in increased purchasing power for the midwestern farmers who would enjoy lower freight rates to primary markets, equivalent to an increased price at point of origin. The greatest value of this new transportation route will come about when peace is restored and highly competitive readjustments must inevitably be made.

The strong opposition to the project, already mentioned, appears to offer one of the most convincing arguments for its completion as an effective regulator of transportation rates.

The project calls for a minimum channel depth of 27 feet, sufficient to accommodate 85 percent of the world's merchant fleet.

Wheat Loans and Marketing Penalties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. NELSON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1941

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, not all the talk in the Missouri district which I try to represent in this House deals with peace or war.

While at home a few days ago representatives of farm organizations, as well as many individual farmers, talked to me about wheat. There were decided differences of opinion regarding marketing regulations and especially the 49-cent penalty as a part of the wheat loan quota program. Supporters of the plan, all of whom have been cooperators, held that even with the penalty fixed at 49 cents, one-half of 98 cents representing 85 percent of parity, they were much better off, the price being double the penalty. It was further contended that but for some such arrangement present prices for wheat would be very much lower. The opposite view was that the 15-cent penalty should immediately be restored, it being asserted, and not without reason, that many did not fully understand the situation when voting on the loans and quotas.

Some held that to make any changes, to accept any compromises, would be to endanger the present farm program, which has been so helpful to so many. Others, equally sincere, were fully convinced that "arbitrary and unyielding action" on the part of those who administer the law, or refusal on the part of Congress to make minor changes, would wreck the farm program.

Mr. Speaker, farmers now, as never before, need to work together. It is with this thought in mind that I suggest that even though it may not be possible to lower the 49-cent penalty, voted for one year, some changes may well be made. The privilege of storing wheat ought to be granted, with the further understanding that, by sufficiently reducing acreage for the 1942 crop, excess wheat now held may be marketed without penalty. Furthermore, where there has been a partial crop failure, the result being not more than an average farm yield, such wheat might well be sold without payment of penalty. In other words, make production rather than acres seeded the basis, as the 49 cents per bushel penalty was not in force, had not even been mentioned, when the 1941 harvest was seeded.

I have still another suggestion. Allow surplus wheat to be fed on farms where produced, this without payment of the 49-cent penalty. To me this seems reasonable at a time farmers are being urged to raise more meat animals, especially hogs. Right now there are farmers who, with a little over-quota wheat on hand, are buying corn to "tide over" until green corn comes.

All legislation, it is said, represents compromises. There is enough war in the world without a "war" between farmers who feed the world. Let us compromise for the present, then look to the future. In the days that are to come—dark days, I fear—there will be required the friendly, united efforts of all farmers if all we have gained is not to be lost.

One further thought about wheat and I conclude. Big as is the wheat supply in the United States, and in the entire world for that matter, this surplus does not scare me a bit. The only fault I find is that there is too much talk about it. A farm surplus is always advertised, always "shouted from the housetops," with price-depressing influences. Not so with a labor surplus, a steel surplus or anything else. I am no prophet, but I venture the guess that before the crop to be seeded 2 years hence has been harvested, a hungry and war-torn world will need every bushel of wheat then available. The world will not be drowned in an ocean of wheat.

Tulsa Tribune Endorses Public Power Development—Proposes Federal Government Take Over Grand River Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM TULSA (OKLA.) TRIBUNE

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the clearest and most logical statements I have seen yet on the question of the development of the vast power potentialities of the rivers of Oklahoma and Arkansas, and of the ultimate use of the Grand River Dam in Oklahoma is contained in a powerful editorial which appeared in the Tulsa Tribune on Monday, July 21. I take great pleasure in inserting it in the RECORD in full:

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of July 21, 1941]

FOR A POWER EMPIRE

Ten years ago, before every Federal project took on gargantuan proportions, an announcement that the Federal Power Commission had recommended the construction of the Fort Gibson and Markham's Ferry Dams

on the Grand River at a cost of $15,000,000 each would have had news banners. Today the news editors reserve a No. 2—not good, not bad—headline for it.

Yet potentially it is the biggest news story in Oklahoma's recent history and the actual construction of these dams, and the Tenkiller on the Illinois River and several on the White in Arkansas, will do more to bring lasting reasonable prosperity to this region than anything else. Integrated into one grid system, they will offer such a quantity of cheap power to defense industry and to normal industry later that blocks of both are bound to shift this way.

We have to be realistic in looking at the power problem. The Public Service Co., the Oklahoma Gas and Electric, the Tulsa Tribune, or the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce haven't been able to, and can't build this region industrially alone or cooperatively. Count on the fingers of your hand the industries any of these, or any others of us, have been able to attract here, other than specialized defense or oil supply factories. We've all tried, but we haven't had the magnet.

Now the Federal Power Commission proposes as a step to an adequate defense to spend an even billion dollars over a 5-year period to add 9,000,000 kilowatts to the country's present 42,000,000-kilowatt capacity. Private as well as public power projects will be expanded. Grand River's two additional dams are high on the list to be built as they should be, for with Pensacola Dam completed for about 60,000 kilowatts yearly, they become sound auxiliaries using the same water a second and third time to produce electricity.

One of the Power Commission's recommendations is that "the United States engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and other agencies concerned should construct a series of river basin projects calling for installation of approximately 1,000,800 kilowatts a year." Now you can't carry out this order every place. In the entire Southwest the Grand and the White Rivers offer the best opportunities for development.

And what is the alternative to thus seeking a good balance between farm and factory for Oklahoma? Those who will give a quick snort at the proposal to spend more Federal money for power projects should ask that question of themselves seriously. Shall we continue to deplete our oil slowly and be prepared to move on to newer pools when the inevitable exhaustion comes—no matter how far away it seems today? Shall we continue to depend so greatly on our comparatively poor efforts at farming in an ever narrowing market as the population we can reach with reasonably priced transportation slips away from us one census period after another?

Indeed, we should not be content to depend on either oil or agriculture or both, but should widen our support as quickly and as soundly as possible, taking advantage of every reasonably good opportunity offered.

Such an opportunity is in the announcement that the two additional Grand River dams have been recommended for construction by 1943. And now the time is at hand to face the inevitable. We believe Oklahomans and Arkansans should seriously consider not waiting for the Government to take over Grand River power operations but should propose that it be done and integrated system developed for the Grand and White River Basins.

For the long pull it looks as though this will be best for Oklahoma, which we think should offer a living and a life for our children, too. Congressman DISNEY and Senators THOMAS and LEE should quickly find a basis of cooperation to this end with their Arkansas colleagues and with Oklahoma G. R. D. A. officials.

Protest Against Joint Income-tax Returns

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Women Investors of America asked for a hearing before the tax committee regarding the joint income-tax return. They wrote to every member of the committee, but they were not given a hearing. So women must approach the matter on the floor of Congress, through the press, plus the radio, which seems to be the only medium through which the women can present their protest against this unjust tax.

I would like to state to the House that I have received just as many letters from men against the proposed joint income-tax return as I have from the women.

I would like to point out to the House also the fact that many Federal employees will be taxed and will come within the high surtax brackets if this joint income-tax provision goes through. They have appealed to me in this matter.

This proposed joint income tax certainly place a penalty upon marriage and puts a premium upon divorce as alimony settlements are tax exempt. They are not prorated. It is interesting that the churches of different denominations are opposed to this joint tax. They believe it penalizes matrimony, that it penalizes the family.

It has been stated repeatedly that England has this joint income tax. We all know that the status of English women is not as good as the status of American women. They are serfs as compared to the wives of America. It has been used as an argument that France and Spain have joint income taxes. The status of women is extremely poor in those countries. The status of women in the United States surpasses the status of women of every country in the world. Women for years struggled and fought for many rights and privileges which were finally granted them. I do not believe that this Congress will set the clock of progress back.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement and letters:

SPECIAL TAX LETTER

MANDATORY JOINT RETURNS

WOMEN INVESTORS IN AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, D. C., July 28, 1941.

The independence of married women in this country will be at stake in the House of Representatives this week when the Ways and Means Committee presents its new tax monstrosity and urges its immediate adoption under a gag rule barring amendments.

If the mandatory joint income-tax return—which the committee inserted in the bill in secret sessions behind closed doors without giving the women of the country any opportunity to voice their opinions—becomes law, married women in the United States will be returned to the old common-law status of chattels of their husbands, the position married women have occupied in Europe for centuries.

If the mandatory joint return is adopted, its effects on the family life of the country and on the income, savings, capital, and assets of wives cannot be estimated. If the Government can merge the incomes of husband and wife for tax purposes, will that make the wife's income attachable for her husband's business and bankruptcy debts? And if the Government can merge their income, cannot it also merge their capital and assets, again making everything the wife may have liable for attachment in case her husband is forced into bankruptcy?

NEW SPENDING RECORD

This new tax bill should give the people of this country some inkling of what lies ahead if this Nation enters the present European war. While we still are supposedly at peace, this bill is designed to raise an additional $3,550,000,000 in new revenues, which, added to those that will automatically be raised under existing law, brings the tax levy to the all-time high of $12,750,000,000.

This action is termed necessary, according to statements of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau at committee hearings on the new tax bill. He informed the committee the Government expects to spend the astounding sum of $19,200,000,000 during the present fiscal year.

That amount—$19,200,000,000—is approximately $700,000,000 more than this country spent during the fiscal year 1918–19 and represents a figure equal to 60 percent of the total amount we spent from 1917 to 1919, when we were at war.

SPEEDY PASSAGE DEMANDED

Attempts to force speedy passage of the tax bill under gag rules apparently is in keeping with what seems to be the present policy of those in power in Washington—rush legislation through before the people can find out what it means—and take steps to protect themselves.

WOMEN ARE AROUSED

Our mail indicates that the women of the country are thoroughly aroused over the unjust treatment accorded them by the Ways and Means Committee and the manner in which it adopted this proposal for mandatory joint income-tax returns.

COMMITTEE MISINFORMED

It would appear from statements by members of the committee that there is a complete misunderstanding about the number and type of families which will be seriously affected, the principles which are involved, and the far-reaching social consequences of this family-disrupting legislation, should it become law.

A careful study of available Government statistics establishes that this proposal will affect at least 17,500,000 families—not about 250,000, as has been announced. Further, it will bear most heavily upon the families of small incomes, not upon the wealthy, as has been claimed by proponents of the measure.

HITS SMALL FAMILIES

In addition, it will bring within the income-tax law approximately 8,400,000 families whose incomes are so small they now are not taxable under present income-tax laws, the majority of them being small suburban and farm families.

These are a few of the facts that would have been made available to the committee by the women, had we been accorded the same consideration extended by the committee to representatives of business and industry.

The printed record of the hearings discloses that the committee listened to the protests

of 110 representatives of the tobacco industry, 73 from the gasoline industry, 8 from musical-instrument manufacturers, 8 representatives of the carbonated-beverage industry, 9 from candy manufacturers, as well as 7 from the liquor distillers and 10 from the beer brewers.

WOMEN RECEIVE NO CONSIDERATION

Yet not one woman nor one women's organization was extended the courtesy or opportunity to voice their opinions or to speak in defense of their rights as individuals or in defense of the American home.

Whoever produced the estimate of 250,000 families to be affected by this tax proposal gave consideration only to statistics relative to present independent tax filings of husbands and wives. No consideration, apparently, was given to the vast number of families—now tax-exempt—who will be brought into the tax-collector's net by this proposed mandatory joint-income return.

The following statistics relative to families and their income are found in the United States Statistical Abstract. This table reveals that about 80 percent of the families earned less than $2,000 per year in 1935. The present chaotic condition of Government statistics makes accurate analysis impossible, but applying the family-group ratios of the 1935–36 table to the family-unit figure for 1940, which is quoted by the Bureau of the Census, we find the following:

Family income groups

Family income	Number of families	Percent of all families	Cumulative percent
Under $250 to $750	9,457,559	27.13	27.13
$750 to $1,250	9,674,100	27.75	54.88
$1,250 to $2,000	8,426,055	24.17	79.05
$2,000 to $3,000	4,479,719	12.85	91.90
$3,000 to $5,000	1,879,042	5.39	97.29
Over $5,000	944,750	2.71	100.00
Total	34,861,625		

Considering the above table, it reveals about 15,000,000 families fall within the family-income band from $1,2500 to $5,000 per year. To this should be added another two and one-half million families in the $750 to $2,000 band who unquestionably will be affected by this proposal.

If official statements relative to increased earnings for workers are correct, then a large percentage in the $750 to $2,000 band in 1935–36 are now above the $2,000 joint-income figure. It must be recognized that the families in this band who, according to official statements, have benefited in the past 6 years by increased earnings, are those of the farmers and mechanical and industrial workers.

INCIDENTAL EARNINGS BECOME TAXABLE

By forcing even the small, incidental earnings of women,[1] as well as the earnings of all minors, into the joint return, the incomes of millions of families will exceed the $2,000 exemption allowed for husband and wife and $400 for each dependent, and therefore will be subject to Federal income tax.

The women of these families have experienced economic hardships during the past several years, but now, due to increased demands for industrial and mechanical workers, are receiving their first real pay envelopes in years. These pay envelopes will be taxed 16½ cents out of every dollar in them over the $2,000-exemption base if this joint-return proposal is adopted, whereas under the present law they would not be reached other than by the existing innumerable hidden taxes which all of us now pay.

PENALIZES HAPPY MARRIAGE

Summing up—the proposal, which was adopted in secret session of the committee, will affect not only the incomes of a comparatively small number of wealthy couples—as has been suggested—but also will place a heavy and unnecessary tax burden on the families of workers with small incomes.

Further than this it will destroy the independence of women and wipe out benefits of wills, trust funds, individual property ownership and legacies. It will return women, free-born American women, to the primitive status of being the chattels of their husbands.

The penalizing of happy married life by levying a discriminatory tax burden thereon, and the subsidizing by Government of separation and divorce by way of lesser tax burdens, is something to which no Member of Congress should be a party.

If there is no intent to penalize marriage why is this proposal designed to apply only to those married couples living together? If living under the same roof is used as an excuse to join their incomes for tax purposes why should it not also apply to brothers and sisters who live together, or to any group of relatives who jointly occupy the same household and benefit by the joint income of all who live under the same roof?

* * * * * *

Sincerely,

CATHRINE CURTIS,
National Director.

WOMEN INVESTORS IN AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N. Y., June 25, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: Many women are greatly distressed at the recent newspaper items relative to the action taken by the Ways and Means Committee in connection with the joint income-tax return of husband and wife, and the merging of the wife's income with that of her husband, regardless of the situations or circumstances existent in connection with that particular issue.

I am sure that, had an opportunity been given for individuals or organizations to present their views on this issue, much enlightening testimony would have been developed for the information of the committee and the public.

I am also very sure if the members of your committee realized the aroused sentiment of countless women throughout this country on this particular issue, you would make it possible to have open hearings in order that some equitable tax program for married couples may be developed in place of this suggested one.

I strongly urge that you give us an opportunity to have such public hearings, and would appreciate hearing from you in this connection.

Very truly yours,

CATHRINE CURTIS,
National Director.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 26, 1941.*

Miss CATHERINE CURTIS,
National Director, Women Investors in America, Inc.,
New York City.

DEAR MADAM: By direction of the chairman, I acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 25, relative to the tentative proposal that mandatory joint return be required of husband and wife if living together, for Federal income-tax purposes.

It is not likely that the hearings on revenue revision of 1941, which were conducted from April 24 to May 28, will be reopened. It is expected that the Senate Finance Committee will conduct public hearings on the bill as it passes the House.

During the hearings which have recently been concluded a number of witnesses proposed mandatory joint returns.

Yours very truly,

BARRON K. GREER, *Clerk.*

---

[1] Women's earnings from such sources as salaries, wages, business, investments, real estate, annuities, tourist, summer boarders, sewing, baking and canning, washing, gardening, raising chickens, nursing, cleaning, teaching, clerical work, clerking, etc.

Freedom and Liberty—Not License—No Broken Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, OF VERMONT

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by me before the Vermont American Legion convention, held at Barre, Vt., on July 25:

To you, my friends of the American Legion, I have but two things, principally, to say: First, you should renew and keep up your fight against the "fifth column," Communists, "lick-spittle," parlor pinks, "wise boys," pseudo liberals, and all subversive and un-American influences, as you have started out to do.

The principles, methods, and aims of the Communists and their friends, "fellow travelers," sympathizers, and supporters are the very antithesis of American and of academic freedom. A group that is organized and acts for the purpose of spreading communism through schools and colleges and in youth groups, or elsewhere, carrying on its effort underground and clandestinely, has no place in the American system of education, no place in America anywhere, nor has any individual so inclined. We have a few of that rattle-brained type here in Vermont; the people have their number. That's plain talk, but true.

Let me say again that candor is a bitter pill for such people, however high they ride, or think they ride, to have to swallow, but millions of Americans agree with me and hold that the greed of this group and some individuals for money, their love of power, their demonstrated irresponsibility and incompetency, their obsession for experimentation, their egocentric monomania for publicity at the people's expense, their exaggerated idea of their own importance, and a hundred other things too impractical, crazy, and too numerous to mention, characteristic of them, are responsible for the weakening of the moral fiber, the breaking down of morale and morals, the turmoil, and the lack of confidence found in the body politic today. It is too bad and too true, but not too late to correct it.

The light of pitiless publicity should be mercilessly turned on the activities of these very people. They are not smart nor are they funny. They should be exposed. Names might possibly be called and perhaps ought to be. They may be. No one should be overimpressed, awed, coerced, or cowed by the

position any of these people happen to occupy or by their delusions of grandeur, their obsessions with respect to their own brainstorms, and least of all by their fantastic theories—social, economic, and paternalistic.

Thank God nobody with brains is influenced by or pays any attention to the ravings of these close to un-Americans. It is not to be denied that they appeal to a class of irresponsible people newley rich and to disappointed and disaffected derelicts and wrecks on the sands of time, who have demonstrated their lack of ability to make an honest living or to function normally. To that extent, and to that extent only, they are dangerous. They should be scraped off the ship of state as barnacles are. They impede progress. They are blood suckers on the body politic. Nobody knows it any better than they themselves. That is what makes them mad at us. That is what makes them enemies of yours and mine—and of their country, when reduced to its final analysis. Nobody is fooled by them, but we are foolish to tolerate them. Perhaps they should be put in a concentration camp "for the duration," for they are the real enemies of the Republic whether we know it or not.

That such people are suspected and are listed with the Dies committee and the F. B. I. as potential enemies, or Fascists, or Communists, does not help us too much. We are just too dumb. We should assert ourselves and rid ourselves of these people as we would rid our hands of a wart.

Freedom is not license. It is time some folks were made to know it. We have been played as suckers too long by too many. I shall not hesitate to say what I think despite the efforts of some of these people to criticize me for so doing. You may rest assured of that.

I cannot say too often that if these milksop, lip-service, hybrid Americans love some other country better than their own and what it affords, then they should go to that country, or we should send them there. We should not tolerate them in Vermont. We know them by name. Of whom are we afraid?

There is no neutral ground. This country was established as an independent republic. It is high time, if not already too late, that we should advise these people that we propose to be up and at those who directly or surreptitiously are undertaking in our schools churches, in the press, and elsewhere, subversively to undermine our Government by innuendo, socialistic, fascist, and communistic and thereby to deprive you and your children of the priceless privileges it is yours and theirs to enjoy. It is either we or they. They had better get out of Vermont, and of the United States of America, while the going is good, for we will not tolerate them here.

Every red-blooded American ought to join in heart and spirit with the cadets at West Point in their Sunday morning prayer when they say, "Strengthen and increase our admiration for honest dealing and clean thinking, and suffer not our hatred of hypocrisy and pretense ever to diminish. * * * Endue us with courage * * * that knows no fear when truth and right are in jeopardy."

I am for freedom of the press and of speech and for every right guaranteed to us by our Bill of Rights, but, in his personal feud with the President, Senator WHEELER has, I think, gone too far. What he says and has done may not be treasonable. It certainly breeds disunity. He has permitted his antipathies to get the better of his usually good judgment. He is an able man, but wrong. He is wrong and so are those who follow him at a time when your liberties and mine are at stake. I do not hold the President blameless for fanning the flame.

There is no neutral ground when national defense is the issue. Methods and policies may be questioned. The necessity for unified action cannot be controversial. Talk is cheap. The Senator is fiddling while Rome burns.

If we do not wake up to realize this and to defend ourselves by adequate preparation and action instead of theory, we shall go down into the limbo of the governments that have been with Rome and Sparta and France. We need practical men these days.

It is time to wake up and get up and put on our clothes for defense against the bloodiest, most cruel tyrant the world has even seen or known. In fact, we may have slept too long already.

In the second place, I want to talk for a minute about the selective-service proposition. It is my well-considered opinion that the way to keep from sending our best blood and brains to Europe is to keep both here and train the selectees to that point of efficiency that no man or combination of men will ever dare to attack us. So far as I am concerned, we have shed the last drop of American blood to be sacrificed on European soil.

We have broken no contract and do not propose to break any. The Selective Service Act, for which I voted, provided that whenever Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled, such 12-month period may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary for the national defense.

Our American boys are no quitters, if some of their elders are. We owe it to them to see to it that they are properly trained and prepared. That is our obligation. It would be a crime to break that part of the contract. The great majority of them know it. They will stay in if the outsider will be half as patriotic as they are.

All this talk about a broken contract is a red herring drawn across the trail by those who do not or will not realize that we are preparing for a defensive war and every minute counts.

I knew what I was voting for and realized that the term of service provided by the act was made conditional and was contingent on circumstances and conditions which might arise to change the existing situation. This was freely discussed in the cloak rooms and corridors of the House, and everybody else understood it as I did, who read the act or knew what it was all about. Moreover, attention was called to the fact that the condition with respect to possible extended service was explicitly expressed. There was nothing hidden about it. It was made a part of the contract about which there is so much talk. We made a contract to properly train the men inducted, and if there is any breach of contract involved, it is found or would be found in our failure properly to train them, or in the failure of the trainees to carry out their part. The selectees knew that they were in for a year, at least, and longer possibly, as provided by the act. All this talk about breaking a contract is an alibi or a camouflage used in an attempt to justify opposition to training for preparedness and to vent a spite. That is an untenable position in view of the circumstances.

The President and the Chief of Staff of the United States Army have told us that our peril grows greater daily and nearer and nearer, and that for us to disrupt and to destroy our Army that is in the making would be suicidal from a national standpoint. When such statements are made by those in authority who take full responsibility for them and who advise us what should be done, you just cannot laugh them off, nor fail to follow the advice safely. Events corroborate the statements daily.

We should tolerate no recurrence of such a situation as obtained prior to 1917. Such a lack of national preparedness as then existed was nothing short of criminal. The thousands of crosses over graves of American boys at Chateau Thierry and Belleau Wood are mute monuments to that fact. It should never be permitted to happen again.

To turn back the trainees and selectees into civil life half prepared for such duties as they might be called upon eventually to perform, as soldiers, would be tragic—and worse than that. It would be as near criminal negligence on our part as anything could be for it would mean, possibly, a horrible holocaust and the needless sacrifice of the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys because of their unpreparedness.

Now I do not propose to be an accessory to any such program. I know from 14 years' experience how long it takes to make a soldier. The time at our disposal is short anyway. I know the emergency is greater and nearer than a year ago. We should spare neither money nor men in order to train and to maintain the Army at a state of effective and necessary preparedness for our defense. Those who oppose this proposition are treading on very dangerous ground from the standpoint of either politics or patriotism.

So far as I am concerned I will not be a party to breaking the contract which calls for adequate preparedness of the boys in service, nor will I permit such a state of unpreparedness as that of 1917 to happen again if I can help it. And that is that.

The deliberate acts of certain people in an attempt to confuse and disturb the men in the Army are not patriotic, to say the least. The purposeful efforts to delay possible action in order to embarrass those in command of the armed forces find their underlying motive in hate of the President rather than in love of country. This is obvious. It is proved by the statements made by the objectors themselves. If, as they say, the President is leading us into war, then we should go into it as well prepared as possible, and they are making such preparation impossible. They are out on a limb.

The President has advised Congress that the National interest is imperiled. Nobody in his right mind can doubt it. He has stated officially that the national peril is nearer and greater than ever before or than that which existed at the time the act was passed. Everybody knows it is true who does not indulge in wishful thinking.

The President is Commander in Chief by vote of the people. He has asked Congress to make such a declaration as is provided for and was provided by the act. Congress should make such a declaration. It will. To do less would be to betray everybody.

There should be no delay. This is no community picnic to which we have been invited. We are in this war whether we like it or not, and without regard to who is to blame for it. It is too late to talk about that. I am for all aid to England short of the sending and the sacrificing of our men. We need them here and we need them trained to the highest possible degree of defensive efficiency if we are to remain and be independent, else the Declaration of Independence is a joke and the Constitution a scrap of paper.

The Minority Has a Mandate, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill is undoubtedly the greatest

orator in the world today. While there may be some who question his military genius or his diplomatic tact, I think none can successfully challenge the statement that he is without peer or equal on the contemporary scene in his ability to convey ideas and convince people by use of the spoken word.

It is probably at least in part because of his great prowess as a debater and orator that Churchill holds so tenaciously to the democratic processes of free speech, free criticism, free press, and free assemblage. He relies on his own ability to meet all comers, convince all critics. He is a strong advocate of the two-party system of government, and a firm believer in the important part to be played by a vigorous minority party in time of stress. He welcomes criticism. He never confuses unity of purpose with unanimity of thought.

A DETERMINED MINORITY AS IMPORTANT AS A DETERMINING MAJORITY

I am one who thinks there is a mountain of prophetic truth in the song, There Will Always Be an England, and one reason I so firmly believe this is that the English have learned that a determined minority party is just as important in a period of national crisis as a determining majority party. In fact, England has seldom emerged from any great war with the same leadership with which she entered it. Churchill, himself, is today's Prime Minister of England because of the critical opposition which he and his fellows laid against the policies of Chamberlain. As the ivy climbs the tallest wall by clinging to its roughest spots, self-government in England has a habit of capitalizing on criticism and testing its most important decisions in the fierce crucible of public debate so that only the soundest can survive. Above all, times of national emergency are the worst in which to proceed with untested, untried recipes born of the moment and not subjected to careful criticism and examination by the opposition party.

Churchill offered a good pattern for today's America in his speech to the House of Commons on June 10 describing the debacle of Crete. His opening paragraph set the tempo for a great orator's great speech. Said Churchill—

> No one, however ministerially minded, could complain of the tone and temper and the matter of this debate. The kind of criticism we have had today—and some of it was very searching—is the kind of criticism the Government not only accepts but welcomes.

It is a tough job to batter down a country that builds upon its criticism in such a manner.

A LESSON AMERICANS SHOULD LEARN FROM BRITAIN

We Americans, younger in form of self-government by many years than the English, can learn something from the manner in which the English "muddle" through adversity. We must learn the value of criticism in the art of government. We must come to learn from those with whom we disagree as well as to lean upon those with whom we are in agreement. We must have the courage to criticize as well as the candor to concede. We who belong to the opposition party in these trying times must recognize our responsibilities to test, to examine, to scrutinize, to question, to amend, and to criticize decisions and drifts in public policy just as the majority party must recognize its responsibility to formulate, to promote, to propound, to explain, and to project the determinations which it has the power and the votes to enact. It is only thus that the strong can help the strong and that the functioning of democracy—government by discussion, by debate, by concession and by compromise—can best succeed.

This most definitely does not mean the minority or the opposition should criticize simply for the sake of being critical or that it should ever be perverse simply to be partisan. Such behavior is neither good politics nor good patriotism. As an opposition party, we Republicans must never be mere obstructionists for the silly exercise of being obstinate. But, since criticism does not function freely on an intraparty basis, it is essential that the opposition party does not withhold from the majority the benefits which both it and the Nation can harvest from a frank and fair and full analysis of proposed paths of public policy. To do less, is for the opposition party to cease to give good reason to exist; it is certainly to cease to give any reason at all for ever changing its label to that of the majority party. An opposition which dares not to oppose would be a majority which lacked the courage to propose and that would be fatal alike to the party and the people.

AN EXAMPLE OF WHAT FAILURE WOULD MEAN

Recent developments in Washington, however, give proof more postive than any words that I command of the validity of the thesis which I have above defined. On June 2, S. 1579, prepared by the executive department bill drafters of the Capital was introduced. Known as the property-seizure bill, the following exact quotations from the bill suggest the scope of its significance:

> During any period of national emergency proclaimed by the President, the President is authorized, when he deems it in the interests of national defense, (a) to requisition and take over, either temporarily or permanently, property of any kind or character, whether real or personal, tangible or intangible, or any part thereof, or any right or interest therein or with respect thereto, whether by virtue of contract, patent, license, or otherwise.

And furthermore:

> Whenever the President shall requisition and take over any property pursuant to the provisions of this act, the person or persons having any right, title, or interest therein shall be paid as compensation therefore such sum as the President shall determine to be fair and just. If any such person or persons entitled to receive it are unwilling to accept as full and complete compensation for such property the sum determined by the President, such person or persons shall be paid 75 percent of the sum as determined by the President and shall be entitled to sue the United States for such additional sum.

And, finally:

> This act shall be effective notwithstanding the provisions of any other act.

With the exception of the capitalizations, the foregoing statements are precisely as they appeared in the body of this legislation as introduced by the majority. What should a patriotic and purposeful opposition do? Accept it? Rubber stamp an O. K. because it is labeled for national defense? Or test, examine, scrutinize, question, amend, and criticize? We who comprise the current opposition party in Congress chose the latter course, with capital letters, with emphasis, with gusto, from the platform, on the typewriter, and through the microphones. Result? It is still too early to predict, inasmuch as a week before this is written President Roosevelt was quoted as saying he wanted the "bill passed in the form it was written." I have made bad predictions before and this may be another one, but "I'm predicting" that the opposition will not surrender to this challenge to the fundamental rights of freedom and private ownership in this Republic. "I am predicting"—and it is a dangerous practice in these dubious times—that the bill will not be enacted "in the form it was written." Just how much protection of private rights we can write into the bill depends upon how large a segment of American public opinion adheres to the philosophy of two-party government and continues to subscribe to the doctrine of private ownership and political freedom upon which this republic was founded.

Suffice it to say in summary, that without criticism the "property seizure bill" would by now already be the law.

A RESPONSIBILITY WE CANNOT DODGE

Without patriotic opposition and sound criticism, whether it comes from an active and organized minority party whence it should emanate or from individuals grouping themselves together in an unofficial opposition bloc, the democratic processes cease to be effective. Without loyal opposition which stresses not only its obligations to be loyal but also its obligations to supply intelligent opposition, the democratic form degenerates into what is actually an oligarchy in function. Without such opposition from some source in the present crisis, America would already be engaged in the convoying of foreign and American ships into belligerent waters, which means that American boys would by now be laying down their lives in actual war in support of their Russian "comrades." President Roosevelt's statement that "convoys mean shooting and shooting means war" has never been successfully denied.

Without opposition to opinionated majority leadership, in this country, both the leadership and the country would suffer seriously, and the very existence of minority-party opposition would cease to continue because it had failed to function when its courage was most needed. Without sincere and loyal opposition, the administration is denied a crucible in which to test its theories; and, in critical times, above all others, a nation cannot afford the luxury of adopting untested recipes or illy considered courses of action.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY CANNOT EXPAND BY EVASION

If fair-minded citizens will seriously reflect upon the destinations both in foreign policy and in the loss of democratic processes here at home at which this Nation would have already arrived had there been no opposition to "test, exam-

ine, scrutinize, amend, and criticize," it will stimulate increased demand that the Republican Party continue and expand its patriotic function as the opposition party in this all-important era. It, too, has a mandate from the people. It, too, has responsibilities which it cannot evade without rendering great disservice to this Republic. It, too, stands on trial before the Nation as its fitness to serve is being tested by the events which come and go. There is no other party or group in America which can fulfill this function. Should the Republican Party fail to meet its obligations and its challenge, the cause for which it preaches will soon perish. If the Republican Party fails to function as an opposition should in government erected on the two-party system, we shall be as guilty of dilatory action as the administration is of dictatorial aim. And if an American form of administrative absolutism shackles itself upon this country while we fail to protest the separate steps by which it develops complete and total power, we shall be accessory to the crime.

It is to be hoped that the Republican Party will write a record of courage and valor, of patriotic opposition and constructive criticism, of real service to the common cause which today challenges the best that is in us all if the American way of life is to survive in the American sphere of influence.

The decisions facing America, today, are too monumental in importance to be left to the judgment of any one man or to any group of men personally selected or nominated by him. They are too vital to be delegated to volunteer prescriptionists outside the main tent of Government whose position as laymen exempt them from assuming direct responsibilities for possible errors in judgment. They are too far reaching to be left solely to the unchecked dictates of appointed men who have not been elected to office by the people and who therefore feel no responsibilities for conforming with the public will. They are too significant to become the sole province of the party which happens to be in power at the time their consideration becomes imperative.

SOUND DECISIONS BEST COME FROM A CLASHING OF SOUND MINDS

America today needs the best minds of its best people throughout the country in focus upon the problems at hand and devoted to working out solutions which will best serve the destiny of this Republic. It is going to take the best collective judgment of the great cross section of American intelligence and common sense in this dark hour, if this country is to avert the catastrophe of national bankruptcy, of loss of its freedoms here at home, of an American totalitarianism, of war, and of the threats to our American destiny resulting from dangers here at home and disrupters from abroad.

We have a crying need these days for the sound decisions which can only emanate from the clashing of sound minds and the determined drive of opposing forces which unite their strength toward a common goal only after each has explored and exposed every possible weakness and error of the other. Against the driving power of such a strength directed down a path selected by such means, no power on earth can offer successful resistance. It is to be hoped, therefore that, like the Churchill government in England, the Roosevelt government in America will cease berating critics as defeatists or obstructionists and some day rise to heights enough to sagely say, "The kind of criticism we have had is the kind that the Government not only accepts but welcomes."

To do less is to follow the totalitarian trail to total tyranny.

Floor Under Industry and Labor, But Ceiling Over Agriculture

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Price Administration, which has been laboring industriously ever since its establishment to keep farm prices below parity, has brought down to the House a bill to give it authority to do what it has been futilely trying to do for the last several months. Fortunately, the subject matter of the bill falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, according to newspaper reports, Chairman STEAGALL is refusing to introduce the bill as Mr. Henderson has written it and, over vigorous protest, is scrapping the measure and rewriting it in an attempt to make the best out of a bad matter. Evidently he is having a hard time harmonizing the demands of the Price Administration for arbitrary authority over the economic system of the country with the national welfare, as he has not yet brought in the bill or made any announcement as to its form or provisions.

Certainly, in the form in which it was drawn by the Price Administration, the bill is inequitable, ineffective, impracticable, unworkable, and unpassable. In the first place, it cannot achieve the purpose for which it was ostensibly written—the freezing of prices and the control of the cost of living—for the reason that the bill completely ignores wages, the principal factor in the price of commodities and the cost of living. The first editorial on the editorial page of yesterday's New York Times calls attention to this defect and says:

> Wages are not only an inherent part of the price structure, entering into all costs, but the greatest single part of the price structure.

And we all know by experience how true that is. For example, following the last war, when wheat dropped from $3.20 per bushel to 30 cents a bushel, and we asked why bread still sold at 10 cents a loaf, we were told that the amount of wheat in a loaf of bread was negligible and that the principal cost was the labor, which had not come down, and so bread was still 10 cents a loaf whether wheat was $3.20 a bushel or 30 cents a bushel.

Likewise, when cotton dropped from 35 cents a pound to 5 cents a pound and we asked why shirts did not come down, we were told that there was less than 10 cents worth of cotton in a shirt and the determining cost in the production of a shirt was wages, which were higher than ever. Therefore we paid more for a shirt when cotton was low than we had paid when cotton was high. Such instances could be multiplied, but it is self-evident that the essential factor in the price of commodities and the cost of living is labor—and labor is not so much as mentioned in this bill. How can you hope to affect costs of living when you put on blinkers and go blind every time the one fundamental consideration in the proposition passes by? As the editorial just quoted from the New York Times very pertinently inquires:

> Can prices be fixed while wages are left free? There could hardly be a more effective way of ultimately disorganizing industry and production. Such discriminatory treatment would be certain to have dangerous results politically as well as economically.

And in like vein, in this morning's issue of the Washington Star the leading editorial also stresses this point. The Star says:

> Wages are perhaps the most important single cost factor. But the President does not ask that they be brought under direct control. Instead, he warns of the hardship which inflation would bring the working class.

As if the farmer, working 14 hours a day, does not himself belong to the working class. As a matter of fact Mr. Henderson's bill is apparently aimed primarily at farm prices and is drawn to give him statutory authority to fix the price of hogs, butter, poultry, and eggs which he attempted to fix at subparity prices on his first venture into the price-fixing field—along with the price of all other products of the American farm.

Of course, this is vigorously denied by Mr. Henderson's staff, and they point out that while it was omitted in the earlier versions of the bill, the last draft carried a provision specifically exempting farm products. But they studiously overlook the obvious fact that control of prices of processed commodities fixes the price of the constituent raw materials, and you can lower the price of wheat by lowering the price of bread and lower the price of cotton by lowering the price of sheeting, and so forth.

However, if you entertain any lingering doubts along this line, they were effectively disposed of when the wires carried the announcement of the arrival of this bill here in the House. Pandemonium reigned on every exchange. The newspapers reported the "wildest decline in cotton since 1935." The wheat pits closed near the bottom. Every agricultural market was paralyzed and this morning's radio reports all market operations at a minimum because of the uncertainty created by the price-control bill. Now, wages were not affected. Industrial prices were unchanged. Markets were normal on everything except farm products, which, notwithstanding

vigorous bolstering, continue to drop steadily throughout the country on the mere possibility—a long possibility—that Mr. Henderson's bill will become a law. You can judge for yourself what the bill is aimed at. You don't have to look any further than the daily quotations to see what the purport of the bill is, and what will be its effect on the farm income once it is enacted and Mr. Henderson has the autocratic power he seeks to wield.

It is rumored just now that the bill, as amended by the committee, will contain a provision to fix a ceiling on farm prices at 10 points above parity and that this should reassure everybody. But there is nothing in such a provision to reassure anybody—except those who want to saddle the cost of this war program on the farmer. It is not a floor of 10 points, it is a ceiling of 10 points; and, while under that provision farm prices cannot rise above the ceiling, they can drop beneath it and undoubtedly will. By depressing the price of processed goods—either by throwing supplies on the market, as the Government threatens to do in the case of sugar, as reported in this morning's papers, or otherwise by the exercise of the dictatorial powers granted by this totalitarian bill—the price of any farm commodities can be forced below parity whenever the bureaucrats in the Price Office choose to do so. And your hands will be tied, for, as David Lawrence well says in his column this morning:

> Once the law is passed, Congress will be a bystander, too.

Why all this assurance that they will put a ceiling over farm products? They put floors under wages. They put minimum prices under bituminous coal. They guaranteed minimum returns to the railroads. They provided established prices under the fair-trade bill, and so forth. But all they have for the farmer is ceilings. And they have built a very low ceiling at that, with barred windows in this subbasement they are constructing for farm labor, while they give the wings of the morning to industrial labor already "standing tiptoe on the misty mountain peaks."

They want to send vast supplies of food to England, bought from the farmer under the ceilings of the price of administration, in the same ships which also carry guns, tanks, and other war munitions bought at cost-plus profits to industry and the highest wages ever paid since Columbus discovered America.

Now do not misunderstand the farmer. He is not advocating the fixing of wage scales—and emphatically he is not urging the inclusion of industrial labor in Mr. Henderson's bill. The farmer believes in collective bargaining, and the farm organizations have always supported labor's right to collective bargaining—as I have, consistently, and on all occasions supported and voted for all major labor legislation on this floor. But the farmer does protest against the drastic discrimination in the Henderson program, and against ceilings over his prices when others are given floors under both wages and prices.

The patrioteers preach to the farmer about the economic sacrifices which must be anticipated and cheerfully borne. The farmer is getting less than 10 cents an hour for his labor while the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports average hourly earnings in building construction as 98.2 cents per hour. Why ask the farmer to do all the sacrificing?

Formerly when Uncle Sam took in $100 of the national income he paid the farmer $19.20 out of the hundred dollars. But the last report from the Department of Agriculture showed that out of each $100 Uncle Sam took in the farmer got only $6.60. The farm share of the national income dropped from $19.20 in 1919 to $6.60 in 1941 including all Government payments, and Mr. Henderson wants to put a ceiling over the $6.60.

In 1919 hogs sold for $21.50 and the average wage for auto mechanics, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, was 59.8 cents per hour. Today hogs are selling at $11.60 and the average hourly wage of the mechanic has gone up to 98.2 cents per hour. And Mr. Henderson says put hogs down to $9 but let wages alone.

And that is the basis of the farmer's objection to Mr. Henderson's bill. Not that it fixes his prices. He is ready to make sacrifices—if anybody else will sacrifice. Put farm prices down if necessary, if the occasion demands it, and the farmer will cooperate. But if you put his prices and wages down, put other prices and wages down with them. Or better still, why not give the farmer his fair share of prosperity along with everybody else. He works 14 hours a day—often 7 days a week—his boys have been drafted or toled away to the nearest munition factory. Letters from Missouri this morning report crops totally destroyed by drought. Labor gets its pay envelope every Friday night, but the farmer must take his chances and too frequently never gets his at all and all his year's work lost. The farmer fights weather, fire, flood, plagues, and pests—and the injustice and inhumanity of those who would take from him the products of his toil and sweat and the toil and tears of his wife at less than the cost of production—yet he feeds the Nation better than it has ever been fed before. There is food and to spare for everyone both at home and abroad. What more can you ask of him? Is not the laborer worthy of his hire?

A Price-Control Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, when an engineer hangs weights on the safety valve and orders the fireman to stoke her up something is sure to happen to the engine internally when the steam pressure gets too high—something is also going to happen to the engineer and fireman.

When President Roosevelt seeks to establish a ceiling over prices and at the same time other Government officials and department heads order increases in the two main factors that produce high costs, namely, wages and farm prices, something is going to happen to the economy of the country and to the men now tinkering with that economy. It is impossible to control prices without controlling the principal factors that produce high prices. If you try to do so something is bound to happen to upset the orderly functioning of our economic system. This thought is so well discussed in the following editorial from the Evening Star of Thursday, July 31, 1941, entitled "Control of Prices," that I submit the same for consideration by the Members of this House:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 31, 1941]

CONTROL OF PRICES

The President's price-control message to Congress is an excellent summation of the evils inherent in any pronounced inflationary movement, and, furthermore, it plainly indicates that a serious inflationary trend already is well under way. There is nothing in the message, however, which leads to the belief that the administration is prepared to take the politically difficult steps which are essential to any adequate and effective treatment of the problem.

Pending the introduction of specific legislation embodying the President's broad recommendations, appraisals of the administration's price-control plans necessarily must be tentative. Nevertheless, certain conclusions can be drawn from the language of the message.

The President told Congress that any legislation "should include authority to establish ceilings for prices and rents * * *." That is broad language, but since the President did not stress the point, there is good reason to believe that he was not asking Congress to bring farm prices, which have played such an important part in the rise in living costs, under the regulatory authority. And if an attempt is to be made to clamp a lid on the price of farm products, what then becomes of the administration's parity-price program?

The parity program has no relation to realities. It is an arbitrary and politically inspired attempt to give the farmer a guaranty—at public expense—that the value of his products in terms of purchasing power shall not be less than during a base period when agriculture enjoyed its greatest prosperity. It has been but a few weeks since Congress passed and the President approved legislation intended, in net effect, to assure the farmer of a 100-percent parity price. Is this to be abandoned, or is the farmer not to share in the "economic sacrifices" which the President said must be anticipated and cheerfully borne?

Control of farm prices, however, is but one phase of the problem. If they are excluded from the regulatory process, it is extremely doubtful that price control can be effective, but that is a doubt which might persist even if farm products are brought under a price ceiling, for any price-control effort is apt to fail unless accompanied by some adequate method of controlling the cost factors that directly and inevitably influence prices.

Wages are perhaps the most important single cost factor. But the President does not ask that they be brought under direct

control. Instead, he warns of the hardships which inflation would bring to the working class, and, in effect, appeals for a voluntary wage-control system. At best, that would be an exceedingly frail foundation upon which to erect a price-control structure, and if it fails and there is to be no power to regulate wages, any effort to control prices in an effective and equitable manner is almost certainly doomed to failure.

High, or relatively high, wages also influence the price level indirectly. As the President pointed out, "Every dollar spent for defense presses against an already limited supply of materials." It is equally true that every dollar of new purchasing power left in the hands of wage earners likewise presses against the limited reserve of materials. The administration has set its face against all proposals to siphon off the excess purchasing power, which competes with defense buying, by a broadening of the tax base or by some system of compulsory saving. But the official frowns directed at these proposals will not check the unfavorable economic consequences which result from pushing up buying power in a restricted market. The problem is there, and it cannot be ignored merely because it carries unpleasant political implications.

It should be recognized, of course, that there is a limit to the authority which the President can hope to get from a Congress in which the various pressure groups will be striving to advance the interests of their particular constituents. That, too, is a fact which cannot be ignored, and this consideration, coupled with the far-reaching importance and complexity of the contemplated legislation, is sufficient reason why Congress should make haste slowly in this matter. If the price-control bill in final form turns out to be a hodge-podge of political compromises, it might well prove to be more harmful to the country than the economic evils against which it is to be directed.

Defense Policies Supported—St. Elmo Legion Takes Position For Dealing Sternly With Nazis and Japs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

RESOLUTION OF JAMES CRAIG LODOR POST, NO. 148, AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution passed on July 28, 1941, by the members of James Craig Lodor Post, No. 148, American Legion:

ST. ELMO, CHATTANOOGA, TENN.,
July 28, 1941.

Whereas there is at the present time in this country a movement on foot among and by a certain group of people, so-called isolationists or pacifists; and

Whereas the tactics of this group, led by Senator WHEELER of Montana, and Mr. Charles A Lindbergh, are devoted primarily to criticisms of President Roosevelt and his foreign policy; and

Whereas the actions of this group tend to weaken the confidence of our people in their President and his policies, and to lend strength to the subversive activities and propaganda of those aggressor nations which are doing all in their power to overthrow all the principles and ideals on which our Nation was founded and in which its citizens believe and which they hold dear; and

Whereas these actions are hindering and delaying the defense efforts of our whole country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the James Craig Lodor Post, No. 148, American Legion, in meeting duly assembled, affirm their support of President Roosevelt in his handling of the foreign policy of the Government under present conditions and denounce the activities of Senator WHEELER, Mr. Lindbergh, and all such critics who are trying to undermine the President and who thus destroy or weaken the defense efforts of our people and encourage the activities of the aggressor nations; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon the President and the Congress of the United States to deal with a firm hand with the German, Japanese, and Italian Nations, using our Army and Navy whenever and wherever it may be necessary to do so in order to protect our rights, and with this end in view to see that both our Army and Navy are at full fighting strength and efficiency in order to cope with any emergency that may arise, enacting such legislation as may be required to continue all selectees, Reserves, and National Guard men in active service as long as is necessary to accomplish this purpose, and also authorizing the use of these men in any foreign countries where they may be needed; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the two Senators from Tennessee, the Congressman from our district, the local daily papers, and that a further copy be spread upon the minutes of this post.

E. W. MCMILLIN,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee,
James Craig Lodor Post, No. 148,
American Legion.

National President of the Young Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

RESOLUTION OF ALABAMA STATE LEAGUE OF YOUNG DEMOCRATS

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas one of the native sons of our neighboring State of Tennessee is a candidate for the office of national president of the Young Democrats; and

Whereas we heartily endorse the good-neighbor policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Alabama State League of Young Democrats does unqualifiedly endorse the candidacy of Mr. Joe Carr, of Tennessee, for national president of the Young Democrats and pledge our sincere efforts to secure his election at the national convention at Louisville, Ky.

Done this 26th day of July 1941 in Montgomery, Ala.

The Congressional Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

TAXES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, taxes are as old as time. More than 4,000 years ago, when the overseers of the Pharaoh of Egypt went abroad on the land with their lashes and said, "Come now with corn," the people knew of taxes. The second chapter of Luke recites that—

> There went out a decree * * * that all the world should be taxed.

And it was. That same chapter records that "all went to be taxed." And they were. Since the beginning of organized society, governments have imposed taxes to provide funds for the discharge of the functions of government. It is no different today. Taxes are important not alone because they touch all living persons, but because the taxing power can become the instrument for completely altering the structure of society and changing the mode of life of a nation. Crushing taxes had as much to do with the decline of the Roman Empire many centuries ago as any other force because it blacked out the substantial middle class and left only a nation of large landholders on the one hand and half-enslaved peasants on the other. All this is by way of preface to some comment on the Revenue Act of 1941, passed this week by the House of Representatives. It is one of the most gigantic tax bills ever passed by Congress.

THE NEED FOR REVENUE

For a dozen years, as a result of the depression, that far-flung corporation known as the Government of the United States was spending more than it took in. On June 30, which marks the end of each official year, the Government bookkeepers hauled out the red-ink bottle and inscribed a huge figure in red on the Government ledger to show by how much the expenses exceeded revenues. It is known as the annual deficit. It is becoming rather permanent. For the fiscal year 1941 it was more than $5,000,000,000. Fiscal wizards who preach the gospel that a nation can spend its way to prosperity call this operation deficit spending. But no matter what it is called, the fact is that the Government is making generous use of red ink. Moreover, it looks as if we shall have to provide an extra supply. We may even have to place red ink on the priority list of essential items because it seems indispensable now to the operations of government.

THEN CAME THE WAR

In the 8 fiscal years from 1934 to 1941, inclusive, Uncle Sam took in forty billion and spend sixty-seven and one-half billion. He, therefore, owed twenty-seven and one-half billion. But instead of

making contractors, steel companies, grocers, tailors, stenographers, clerks, mail carriers, and others wait for their money, he borrowed the money and paid them as he went along. This was a simple operation. He printed his seal and a lot of nice writing on a piece of parchment paper and called it a Government bond. These he sold to banks, insurance companies, trust funds, individuals, and others. He now owes these folks instead of the clerks, contractors, mail carriers, and others. But the debt is still there. Came the war, and with it the necessity for providing battleships, cruisers, soldiers, food, guns, camps, ammunition, airplanes, and what not. We have offered to help the democracies to the extent of seven billion. The two-ocean Navy will cost seven billion. Other items for our own defense will bring the total of defense and aid appropriations to $52,000,000,000. That is real money. For the 12-month period which begins July 1, 1941, and ends on June 30, 1942, we expect to spend $22,000 000,000. That is real spending. It will take expert spenders to spend that amount in 12 months. That is over $1,830,000,000 every 30 days. If our best 18-carat spenders can do it, we would draw on the red-ink supply on June 30, 1942, and close the books for that year by recording that we were $12,800,000,000 in the hole for the year. There are two ways of raising this money which will be spent and which we do not have. The first is to borrow. But borrowing is old stuff. We have been doing it for 11 years. Soon Uncle Sam will be in hock to all his children. The public debt is now at $50,000,000,000. These are Uncle Sam's notes. Sooner or later, they must be paid. But if too many of these notes go floating around, it will be like the case of the man who owed everybody and could not get any more credit. So the thing to do is to raise a larger part of this expenditure through taxes. And that is where the new tax bill comes in.

WHAT THIS BILL DOES TO YOU

For a full year, this new tax measure will raise about $3,500,000,000. That is real money. That is on top of what is now being paid in taxes. In round figures, thirteen hundred million will come out of corporation incomes, twelve hundred will come out of individual incomes, one hundred and fifty million from increased taxes on gifts and estates, and nine hundred million from taxes on liquor, automobiles, saxophones, cold cream, pinochle decks, theater and night club admissions, radios, coca-cola, matches, wrist watches, fur coats, slot machines, pool tables, electric curling irons, and other items which are simply too numerous to mention. These are known as indirect taxes. They are collected from the manufacturer and added to the price. Thus, the public pays them but does not exactly see them. That is why they are called "painless."

THE OVER-ALL RESULT

The revenues to be derived from all sources under existing law as well as the revenues under this new bill will still leave the Government in a deep hole. Since this measure will not become law until later in the year, it is estimated that for the fiscal year which begins July 1, 1941, and ends June 30, 1942, it will bring in a little less than $2,000,000,000 for that year. When the $2,000,000,000 is added to all other receipts of the Government, we will still be shy about $11,000,000,000 of making both ends meet for the year 1942. In other words, we are still in the hole, but not quite down to the bottom. That is to say that if this fiscal hole is 100 feet deep, we are still 40 feet from the top.

ONE EXAMPLE

One example will serve to indicate the proportions of this tax bill. Under present law, a single man whose net income was $2,000 would pay an income tax of $44. Under the new bill, he will pay $110. This is a jump from 2⅕ percent to 5½ percent.

British War Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ARTICLE BY JOHN KNOX

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, some days ago I made a request for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD of an article entitled "British War Aims in the Conflict Beginning September 1939," by John Knox, of Chicago, a graduate of Northwestern University and of Harvard, a law clerk in the Supreme Court of the United States in 1936 and 1937, and at the present time a member of the editorial committee of the Chicago Bar Association.

I now have before me a statement of the estimated cost of printing the article, which is $495. Therefore, I repeat my request for unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH WAR AIMS IN THE CONFLICT BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 1939

(By John Knox, Ph. B., Chicago; J. D., Northwestern; LL. M., Harvard; law clerk, Supreme Court of the United States, 1936 and 1937; member, editorial committee, Chicago Bar Association)

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DO NOT REALIZE WHAT THEY WILL BE UNDERWRITING IF THEY ENTER THE PRESENT CONFLICT

BRITISH WAR AIMS

Herewith are listed the war aims of the British Empire in the conflict now devastating Europe. Most of the aims are admirable enough, but in view of subsequent military defeats these aims cannot be realized unless the United States dispatches a huge expeditionary force to the aid of the empire. Moreover, even if this country drained itself of men and money in order that these aims might be realized, there would result only a substantial reestablishment of the European status quo as of 1938. Nothing fundamental would have been solved, and we would have spent our resources abroad in order merely to reaffirm the boundary lines laid down by the Versailles Treaty.

Let us not forget that Europe has been at war 323 years out of the last 500, and no battle has ever proved to be the last one. As an American of draft age, I ask that this Government inform the British Government without delay that "short of war" means just that, and that there will be no American expeditionary force or naval force sent abroad to the aid of the British Empire.

(Listed chronologically in the order in which they were announced)

1. Poland will be restored and its partition negated by force of arms. Its frontiers must be as unchallengeable as those of September 1, 1939. There must be an access to the sea. The deliberate depopulation of western Poland and the overcrowding of central Poland, as practiced by Germany, will be set aside. Polish populations will be moved back to their former geographical areas, which are now occupied by Germans. (England is determined to fulfill these objectives even though the U. S. S. R. now occupies part of the former Polish Republic.)

2. Restoration of the independence of Rumania. (This war aim was first stated in a modified form on October 16, 1939, when it was announced that the independence of Rumania must be retained despite the disturbed Balkan situation. Rumania did not fall until November 1940.)

3. The United States must take an interest in this war as soon as possible. Visiting Englishmen must play their part, both as exchange professors and public lecturers, in enlightening American public opinion. (By the spring of 1941 this aim had progressed to such an extent that an Anglo-British union was being openly broached.)

4. Restoration of the independence of Czechoslovakia. But Slovakia must be given an opportunity to express herself to a greater extent than she formerly enjoyed.

5. Germany must pay reparations. All the damage that Germany has inflicted upon her weaker neighbors must be repaired as far as it is reparable after the havoc of war. The recurrent acts of aggression of Germany must not benefit her in any way.

6. Liberation of all the foreign races conquered by Germany. This all-inclusive war aim was pronounced on November 20, 1939. It has been followed ever since and was last restated on April 23, 1941, when the restoration of Yugoslavian independence was vowed. It is momentarily expected to be again restated as regards Greece.

7. Political independence must be given to Austria providing she should desire it.

8. A new kind of league of nations or postwar system of cooperation must be made to succeed where the old League failed. It must be strong enough to prevent such acts of injustice and violence that gave rise to the present war.

9. The responsibility for the war must be placed on the whole German people, so that it will not be possible, as it was after the last war, for one section of the populace to blame another section. Any armistice or peace terms must bear the signatures of (1) the government in power at the conclusion of hostilities; (2) the army; (3) the Nazis; (4) the monarchists; and (5) the German democratic element. (It was suggested that Allied troops also show themselves in Berlin and other German cities.)

10. Restoration of the independence of Norway.

11. Restoration of the independence of Denmark. (Because of the great importance of the Norwegian campaign, the above two war aims are separately listed despite the wording of aim No. 6.)

12. Restoration of the independence of Holland.

13. Restoration of the independence of Belgium.

14. Restoration of the independence of Luxemburg. (The above three war aims arose from the events of May 1940, and are separately listed because of the great importance of the occurrence of that month.)

15. Germany must ultimately be defeated in the field in an offensive land war. Victory cannot be won by a mere concentration upon defense of the British Isles.

16. Italy will be crushed and Mussolini punished.

17. Restoration of the independence of France. Germany must not only be expelled from France, but from all the lands that she has overrun. (In other words, Germany must be forced back into her pre-war boundaries.) Security for France must also be the necessary basis for any peaceful settlement of the war, since in 1919 England did not sufficiently recognize the legitimacy of the French demand for security.

18. The British Isles and Empire must be defended to the utmost and the present status quo maintained. The same also applies to the Dutch East Indies, etc.

A realization of these aims, therefore, would be a virtual reestablishment of the status quo in Europe as of 1938, when the boundaries defined by the Versailles Treaty were still in effect.

NOTE.—Quotations and citations listed in the following annotated material merely serve as examples of each war aim. Other similar material was not included. Had it been, this paper would have been of great length. It is believed the material included is sufficient to illustrate each war aim.

J. K.

INTRODUCTION

On January 18, 1941, the Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy, former United States Ambassador to Great Britain, delivered a radio address, in which he said, in part:

"What would be our war aims? We have not had any debate on that score. We certainly are not going into the war just to underwrite the war aims of another country without knowing what they are. * * * Are we to sign a blank check? Common sense would seem to require that there be the most complete clarification of American aims in this conflict before we take the fatal step."

On March 25, 1941, Lord Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States, delivered his first official speech in this country. For a month previous to this address those "in the know" had been whispering that Halifax had brought with him from Britain a complete statement of what Britain is fighting for. But nothing of the sort. He confined himself to generalities, mostly of a moral sort.

On March 27, 1941, Prime Minister Winston Churchill said that the "interests of national unity" caused him to forego producing a "catalog of war aims and peace aims." He also said, "Everyone knows quite well what we are fighting about." I am not so sure of this.

On May 6, 1941, Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson demanded convoys and called upon the youth of America "if need be to die for the conviction that the freedom of America must be saved." This speech was delivered with the knowledge and consent of President Roosevelt, who had not only pledged to keep this country out of the present war but who had said, "Convoying means shooting, and shooting means war."

It is therefore clear that in this month of May 1941 a momentous hour has arrived for the United States. We stand at the crossroads of remaining at peace here at home or of waging a war abroad because the greatest empire the world has ever seen is in danger of destruction. This empire we were once a part of, so its cries for help in its hour of desperation tug all the more at our heartstrings. In our boundless sympathy we forget that long ago the ancestors of the men now dying for the British emblem came to our shores, burned our Capitol, and scattered our population. We forget that only two decades ago we toiled mightily and gave in blood and property that this emblem might not die. We forget many, many other things because there is loose in the world today a terror of destruction that is sweeping Europe. Our foremost military experts agree, however, that this terror can never come to our own shores, under its own power, and successfully invade our territory. The great question soon to be decided, therefore, is, Should we, or should we not, go to war abroad in order to save once again the British Empire, thereby saving certain economic benefits for ourselves?

It may not be amiss for one of draft age to inquire into this problem. My generation perhaps should expect to suffer and not be heard from. Until now I have said little, as have the other millions who registered for the Selective Service Act last October 16, but certain British defeats make it impossible for me to keep silent any longer. I therefore presume to say a few words upon the struggle now raging in Europe.

For many weeks past our interventionists have skillfully brought this country nearer and nearer to the brink of war. In the vanguard of this group has been the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. The policy of this committee has always been several leagues ahead of the public opinion of the day, and its trial balloons seeking to mold public opinion have always been approved by the White House. An effective campaign to silence all opposition has long been under way. It has now progressed to a point where an American can no longer be for America first but must be for England first or China first or Greece first. If he still insists upon being for his own country first, last, and always, he is looked upon with suspicion.

Senator PEPPER (Democrat, Florida), with the knowledge and consent of the President, has demanded a total war on two oceans and the creation of a totalitarian dictatorship. On May 6, 1941, the Senator declared that the American people are ready, if necessary, "to spill their blood" and that "all they need is a Government to make up their minds."

Early this year our President announced the now familiar "four freedoms." He, who was elected on a promise that we would not get into a fighting war, suddenly proposed to establish a new world order. In all parts of the globe he was going to bring freedom of speech and expression, freedom of every person to worship God in his own way, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. A new Sir Galahad had mounted his charger and was ready to set forth; only he had forgotten the pressing problems of the round table at home.

Then followed the great fight on the lend-lease bill. Thereafter billions were voted by our Congress upon the President's plea for all-out aid to Britain. We had begun the journey but did not know where we were going. But now we do know, for we are face to face with total war.

Do any of us know what England is really fighting about? Of course, we have heard many high-sounding phrases such as "ridding Europe of the menace of nazi-ism," but nothing really definite is stated these days.

When I was at Harvard studying law we had to state reasons concretely and not deal in generalities. When I go into court these days I have to do the same. Our interventionists, who deal only in generalities and fine words, would have been "washed out" of Harvard after the first semester for not getting down to the heart of the problem.

Let it be understood that I am thoroughly in agreement concerning the necessity of building up a strong defense for this country. I am in total disagreement with all of the policies of the Axis Powers. I believe in aid to Britain short of war. But I do not believe that we should enter the conflict as an active belligerent. Why? Because I have gone to the libraries in Chicago and read every issue of the London Times since the war began. As a result, British war aims have become very definite indeed, and I feel that the American people have not the slightest idea what they will be underwriting if they formally enter the conflict on the side of Britain.

I need not pause to discuss whether the London Times represents the official British point of view in its columns. All would admit that no publication in the British Empire so represents the official viewpoint of the Government as this one. The Times is the voice of England. Its columns of law reports are cited in the courts as authority. Its editorial columns represent the voice of 10 Downing Street. Its verbatim reports of Parliamentary proceedings intimately disclose statements of even the Prime Minister.

The fourteenth edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica (1938), at volume 16, page 337, says:

"The Times, which occupies the premier position among English newspapers, was started by John Walter on January 1, 1785, under the name of the Daily Universal Register. * * * On January 1, 1788, its title was changed to the Times, and this great newspaper has ever since been the preeminent national journal and daily historical record. * * *

"The Times excels in every department, mainly by employing experts in particular subjects. * * * The Times specializes in its presentation of foreign affairs."

What, therefore, does the Times say concerning British war aims? Let us draw the veil aside.

BRITISH WAR AIMS BEFORE THE FALL OF FRANCE AS STATED IN THE EDITORIAL COLUMNS OF THE LONDON TIMES

September 1939

The war got off to a flying start, and within a few days it became apparent that Poland might be crushed by Germany. Later in the month she was attacked by Russia on the east, so Polish collapse became certain. As the republic was toppling the Times thundered:

"There will be no peace which leaves the brigand in possession of his loot. * * * It is our part, and well within our power, to carry out the official decision to prepare for and to endure, if necessary, a long war, united in a single resolve to secure the final victory for Polish and European freedom." (Leading editorial of September 13, 1939, entitled "War by Land and Sea.")

"None of these speculations can in the slightest degree deflect the determination of the Western Powers to pursue to the end their cardinal war aims, in which the liberation of Poland will take a foremost place. Whether soon or late, that end will be achieved." (Leading editorial of September 19, 1939, entitled "The Price of Freedom.")

"The Poles have therefore laid their allies under an enormous debt. It cannot be fully discharged until complete victory and the overthrow of Hitlerism have restored the liberty of Poland. That may be a long task, but in the immediate present there is an opportunity of repaying some very small part of what we owe." (Leading editorial of September 22, 1939, entitled "The Czech Revolt.")

"They [the people of Warsaw] have proved the greatness of the Polish Nation and have made the world see that its restitution to its proper place among the free peoples of Europe is one of those causes in which the greatest powers may be proud to fight and hazard all that they possess. * * * In 1939 they [England and France] are determined to devote the utmost of their strength

to her restoration." (Leading editorial of September 29, 1939, entitled "Warsaw Surrenders.")

"Freedom and independence for the Polish Nation, within frontiers as unchallengeable as that which Germany violated on September 1, and with full and guaranteed access to the sea constitute in their own right an article of any conceivable peace." (Issue of September 30, 1939, Saturday, leading editorial, The Nazi-Soviet Compact.)

On the 20th of September Prime Minister Chamberlain reviewed the situation in the House of Commons, saying, in part:

"In this situation His Majesty's Government authorized the issue of a statement on September 18 that this attack by the Soviet Government upon Poland (a country with whom she had a nonaggression pact) at a moment when Poland was prostrate in the face of overwhelming forces [hear, hear] brought against her by Germany could not be justified by the arguments put forward [loud cheers] and that while the full implication of these events was not yet apparent, nothing which had occurred would make any difference to the determination of His Majesty's Government to fulfill their obligations to Poland and to prosecute the war with all energy until these obligations had been achieved. [Renewed cheers.] * * *

"The scale of our preparations, and the fact already announced that we are basing them on the assumption that the duration of the war may be at least 3 years, insures that our strength will increase progressively to meet whatever may come." (Issue of September 21, 1939, Thursday, p. 4, Parliament.)

So in September 1939 Britain's war aim No. 1 was stated, namely:

The partition of Poland will be negated by force of arms; Germany, and perhaps Russia, will be driven out of Polish territory; something equivalent to the Polish corridor will be reestablished; and an approximate return to the Polish status quo of September 1, 1939, must be made before England will even consider peace.

October 1939

Poland was now crushed. The first phase of the war had ended. Germany stopped for breath. The conflict was still far removed from England and France.

The leading editorial of October 4, 1939, was entitled "Responsibility for War." Already it was firmly decided who was responsible, and a quotation was printed from an address by Chamberlain. The Times reiterated this statement as being the policy of England. It was:

"No threat would ever induce this country or France to abandon the purpose for which we have entered upon this struggle." (Issue of Wednesday, October 4, 1939.)

With Poland out of the war, England became uneasy about the Balkans. Her attention was turned to Rumania, and war aim No. 2 appeared:

"Rumania is herself uneasily placed. The policy of neutrality adopted by King Carol is wisely conceived and is well understood in this country, which is just as determined that his kingdom shall retain its independence at the end of the war as that Poland shall regain hers." (Issue of Monday, October 16, 1939, editorial Poland in Eclipse.)

Rumania did not fall until November 1940. At that time war aim No. 2 was modified to read that England would restore the independence of Rumania.

In October 1939, England began looking toward America. The Neutrality Act was discussed, and close attention was paid to the debates in Congress regarding the repeal of the arms embargo. A veiled definition of war aim No. 3 appeared, which gradually proved to be: Let us get America interested in this war as soon as possible. Discussion on this point was rather innocuous at first.

"The United States, built up through centuries largely as a sanctuary from the feuds and rancors of Europe, defined its policy of withdrawal through the mouth of President Monroe and maintained its doctrine consistently down to 1917. The Republic entered the four years' war directly challenged by German lawlessness but also inspired by the hope that, by thus departing from their ancient principles, they might make a supreme contribution toward finally exorcising the causes of war from the whole world. When that hope faded, Americans resolved that never again should their blood be shed to such little purpose on foreign battlefields; and it was in that mood that the Neutrality Act was passed.

"* * * The purpose of the [neutrality] bill is not financial; it is simply to keep America out of the war." (Leading editorial Embargo and Neutrality, Monday, October 30, 1939.)

November 1939

The prospect of active American military assistance was very remote, and the Times was gloomy concerning war aim No. 3:

"The ideals that we hold in common with the United States are too fundamental to the whole conception of life and politics in both countries to leave any doubt that the overwhelming weight of American opinion is with us in our fight. At the same time we entirely understand and appreciate the reasons why America is resolved not to participate in warfare on another continent." (Editorial Europe and America, Friday, November 3, 1939.)

A few days later Czechoslovakia was considered and war aim No. 4 announced (restoration of that country):

"Among the Czechs and the Poles today there are thousands of inconspicuous heroes who will never bow to their conqueror and who know that their nations, like Belgium, will some day regain the independence which has never altogether ceased to exist because it has never been banished from their hearts." (Editorial for Tuesday, November 7, 1939.)

German destruction continued apace during November 1939, and war aim No. 5 was pronounced in anger and resentment (Germany must pay reparations):

"We have learned, he said [Lord Halifax, now British Ambassador to America] that there can be no opportunity for Europe to cultivate the arts of peace until Germany is brought to realize that recurrent acts of aggression will not be tolerated—and, he might have added, will in no case be allowed to benefit the perpetrator. For that reason it is all-important that the damage successively wrought by Germany upon her weaker neighbors shall be repaired so far as they are reparable after the havoc of war." (Issue of November 8, 1939, Wednesday, leading editorial The Cause for Which We Fight.)

With the arrival of the first wartime Armistice Day, the Times admitted:

"In a remarkable degree the present conflict is a continuation of the last. We have to fight the same enemy and for the sake of the same principles, though on this occasion those principles are more sharply defined and their full significance is more clearly understood." (Issue of November 11, 1939, Saturday, leading editorial The Faith of Armistice Day.)

In other words, World War No. 1 had to be charged off the books as a total loss. All the blood and tears and casualties and expenditures had been in vain. England and France had so bungled the peace that there had been no peace but only a temporary armistice.

Later in the month war aim No. 6 appeared—a very inclusive and far-reaching aim: Liberation of all the peoples conquered by Germany. (This aim was last restated on April 23, 1941, when the restoration of Yugoslav independence was vowed:)

"No doubt the uprising of the Czech national spirit has drawn sustenance—which is not to say instigation—from the sympathy felt for the Czech cause in Great Britain and France and the knowledge that one of our own professed war aims is to liberate the foreign races which have been conquered and enchained by the Nazis." (Issue of November 20, 1939, Monday, leading editorial Martyred Czechs.)

Ten days thereafter the Russo-Finnish war began (November 30, 1939, at 9 a. m.)

A final event of importance during November 1939 was President Roosevelt's signing of the Neutrality Act on the 4th of November. Congress, after a month's debate, had finally voted for the repeal of the arms embargo. The Times paid close attention to these events. England was another step closer to a realization of war aim No. 3.

December 1939

The English people were shocked that Russia should actually attack Finland. Much attention was paid by the Times to the military aspects of the struggle, but it was the attention that resembled the attitude of an onlooker at an interesting chess game.

England hesitated to send active military assistance to Finland. There seemed to be a feeling that Finland would be defeated as rapidly as Poland and that any military supplies would be eventually lost to the Russians.

England had been at war 4 months, but the struggle in Europe seemed far away. The Times felt that England and France should, of course, give their moral support to the hard-pressed Finns.

Finland surprised the world by hurling back the Russian advance. With the Soviets at bay, England felt that certain supplies should be sent. Ether and antitetanus serum was dispatched late in December, together with £5,000 worth of anesthetics, catgut, antigas ointment, etc. The Times commented that some military equipment had also been sent but did not enumerate what such equipment consisted of. It was admitted that only a small supply had been forwarded to Finland.

December 1939 was a month of victory for the British Navy, and the British public felt very secure. On December 17 the *Graf Spee* was scuttled 5 miles off Montevideo after a losing battle with three British warships. On the 19th the North German Lloyd liner *Columbus* (32,000 tons) was scuttled 300 miles off Cape Henry, Va.

Other events favorable to the Allies were happening. The first contingent of Canadian troops landed in Britain on the 17th. On the 26th the first squadron of the Royal Australian Air Force reached England. On the 27th the first Indian units arrived in France. And, finally, on the last day of the year the Finns won an impressive victory near Lake Kianta and destroyed an entire Russian division. On the same day the second contingent of Canadian troops reached England.

An empire may have been at stake, but England scarcely realized it as yet. During December the readers of the Times were treated to such innocuous announcements as:

"The Queen has been pleased to appoint Lady Helen Violet Graham, D. C. V. O., to be an Extra Woman of the Bedchamber to Her Majesty." (Court news of December 30, 1939.)

"Sir George Ogilvie-Forbes (who kissed hands upon his appointment as His Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Habana) and Mr. David Kelly (who kissed hands upon his appointment as His Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Berne) were received in audience by the King this morning." (Court Circular of December 15, 1939.)

Finally, frequent and prominent pictures of the Maginot line were published. Articles

were written about its impregnability. For instance, it was suggested that if a dent should ever be made in one section of the line the isolated forts could hold out for months against the enemy.

January 1940

The English began the new year with considerable optimism. Accurate forecasts of the future were made, but the public was lulled into a sense of security. For instance:

"Meanwhile there was more than one hint that the area of the conflict might be extended. At one time a German invasion of the Low Countries, in order to turn the flank of the French position and establish bases for air attack against England, seemed to be seriously threatened; but Hitler apparently thought better of the plan, at any rate for the time. * * *

"The opening of the new year finds the Allies supreme on the sea; in the air their machines and men are evidently superior in quality, while their prospects of expansion, thanks to a great project of building and training in Canada, are almost unlimited; on land the battle has yet to be joined. But here also the immense reserves of British manpower have not yet been touched." (Article entitled "Review of the Year 1939" in issue of Monday, January 1, 1940.)

The war, however, was interfering with the peacetime volume of British export trade. Comments were made, for instance, on America's entrance into the Argentine market to an extent not enjoyed before. To combat such developments, which would undoubtedly become more serious in the future, the following was suggested:

[From issue of January 1, 1940, Monday, p. 4]

"Trade Propaganda Abroad—Work of the National Council

"The vital importance of Britain's export trade in war as well as in peace has been emphasized so strongly by your excellent articles and by other correspondents that it would be redundant to add to what has been said in this connection. We would, however, like to urge that more attention should be given to the planning and dissemination overseas of suitable publicity or propaganda on behalf of British commerce. We consider this to be essential if after the war British exporters are to maintain and improve their position in foreign markets.

"The National Council for British Commercial Propaganda Overseas hopes that advertising agents will collaborate with it and that it may also have the valuable cooperation of publishers of British trade and technical journals. Contributions to the fund of the National Council will be welcome and can be used for the general propaganda fund, or firms and companies can arrange for the allocation to them of specific advertisement space in its journals.

"National Council for British Commercial Propaganda Overseas: Sempill, president; D. A. Bremner, Geoffray R. Clarke, Gilbert Gledhill, Dudley Gordon, G. M. W. Macdonogh, Ronald Matthews, W. Norman Vernon, Cecil Weir.

"WALTER HOUSE, BEDFORD STREET, W. C. 2, *December 28.*"

Thus did the month of January 1940 begin. On the 3d President Roosevelt addressed the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress and said, in part:

"I can understand the feelings of those who warn the Nation that they will never again consent to the sending of American youth on the soil of Europe. But, as I remember, nobody has asked them to consent, for nobody expects such an undertaking. The overwhelming majority of my fellow citizens do not abandon in the slightest their hope and expectation that the United States will not become involved in military participation in the war."

The Times noted this statement in a headline to one of its columns: War Aim No. 3 was apparently not proceeding so well. (Attempt to get America interested in the war as soon as possible.)

On the 6th of January 1940, a most important change in the British Cabinet occurred. Mr. Hore-Belisha resigned from the secretaryship of state for war and left the Government. He was succeeded by Mr. Oliver Stanley. Lord Macmillan resigned from the ministry of information and was succeeded by Sir John Reith. For the next few days the Times gave more attention to this cabinet shake-up than to the Finnish war.

On the 8th of January rationing began, 18 weeks after the outbreak of war. Bacon, ham, butter, and sugar were to be rationed first. A real wartime economy was beginning.

Serious inroads were made on the British Navy during January. On the 16th the loss of three submarines was reported, H. M. submarines *Seahorse, Undine,* and *Starfish*. On the 21st the loss of H. M. destroyer *Grenville* was announced, with 68 casualties reported. On the 23d the loss of H. M. destroyer *Exmouth* with all hands on board was announced.

General Hertzog, leader of the opposition in South Africa, introduced on the 23d a motion in favor of concluding peace with Germany. On the 27th the motion was defeated 81 votes to 59.

The entire month of January was marked by severe cold over Europe. Even in Berlin the lack of fuel was so pronounced that the public suffered considerable hardships. Conditions in Poland were very deplorable.

Some more war aims were announced during the month of January 1940. War aim No. 7 appeared (political independence to Austria if she should desire it):

"The immense resources of the British Empire were referred to by Lord Snell in an address broadcast by the British Broadcasting Co. this week. Recalling the help that was reaching the country from every dominion, he said:

" 'Small nations have as much right to live as Germany. This right requires that Czechoslovakia, Poland, and, if it desires, Austria should regain their political independence.' " (From issue of January 6, 1940, Saturday, p. 3.)

"Let the great cities of Warsaw, Prague, and Vienna banish despair even in the midst of their agony. Their liberation is sure." (From issue of January 22, 1940, Monday, p. 6. Quotation from January 20 broadcast by Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, entitled "The State of the War.")

War aim No. 8 concerned some new kind of League of Nations or post-war system of cooperation that might succeed:

"Beyond question the ultimate task that awaits the nations, neutral and belligerent alike, after the immediate injustices have been set right, is the building up of a new international system capable of succeeding where the League of Nations has failed and of preventing the acts of injustice and violence that gave rise to war." (Leading editorial, The War in 1940, issue of January 1, 1940, Monday, p. 9.)

There was a restatement of war aim No. 5 (reparations):

"One of the more obvious reasons why peace cannot be made tomorrow is that the German Government have as yet given no sign whatever of their readiness to repair the damage they have wrought upon their weaker neighbors." (Leading editorial The Allied Cause, issue of January 22 1940. Monday, p. 7.)

War aim No. 4 concerned the restoration of Czechoslovakia. A slight variation of this aim next appeared (Slovakia must be given an opportunity to express herself):

"It must be recognized that until Germany has suffered some serious disappointment our terms could not be accepted. They must include the restoration of the Polish and Czech peoples as fully independent, and this restoration must be secured in act, and not only in word. The Poles and Czechs must themselves, as sovereign peoples, take part in the settlement of the terms of peace.

"Similarly Slovakia must have the opportunity to determine its own future. Most of us wish the same opportunity to be given to Austria, but it is arguable that this should occur as part of the process of peacemaking rather than as a condition precedent to negotiation." (Excerpts from broadcast by Archbishop of York on war and peace aims of Britain. From issue of January 23, 1940, p. 3.)

February 1940

This month was one of comparative calm for the English. The war in France was at a standstill. Casualties were so unusual that considerable prominence was given to the ambushing of 20 French soldiers who had driven across the German line by mistake.

Shipping losses were at a minimum. During the second week in February, for instance, there was only 1 chance in 460 that a ship in a British convoy unit would be sunk. During the third week in February there was only 1 chance in 472. The Times, however, warned that unprotected merchant ships traveling alone would be in considerable danger of being sunk. During the month a destroyer was sunk. On the 17th the loss of H. M. destroyer *Daring* was reported. One hundred and fifty-seven casualties were reported.

On the 8th of February the third contingent of the Canadian active service force landed in England at a west-coast port. On the 9th all men in England of the age of 23 were required to register for military service in the next few days.

On the 9th another event of interest took place. President Roosevelt announced that he was sending Mr. Sumner Welles, United States Under Secretary of State, abroad to gather information about conditions in Italy, France, Germany, and Great Britain. Welles visited Rome, Berlin, Paris, and London. His visit was given great publicity in the Times. Nothing must be left undone to give the American a great welcome.

A minor naval encounter took place in a Norwegian fjord on the 16th. On that day nearly 300 British prisoners were rescued by H. M. S. *Cossack* from the German auxiliary naval vessel *Altmark*. The *Altmark* was boarded by an armed party from the destroyer after the German ship had taken refuge in a fjord. Upon their return to England the prisoners were accorded a great demonstration while the German press raged at what it called a violation of international law. The prisoners had originally been captured by the *Graf Spee* when that warship was plundering in the South Atlantic.

On the 26th the first squadron of the Royal Canadian Air Force to leave Canada arrived in England.

This month, though marked by great calm in England and France, nevertheless witnessed the Finnish war raging to a desperate conclusion. England and France felt that they should do something for the Finns, so the matter was discussed in Paris on the 5th at the meeting of the supreme war council:

"The fifth, and by far the largest, meeting of the supreme war council was held in Paris yesterday. In addition to Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Daladier, and Lord Halifax, the two countries were represented by the ministers and commanders of the three services and by their chief diplomatic officials—a council of 20 in all.

"Of the four previous meetings, two have been in France, two in England. * * *

"At the fourth meeting it is understood that one of the questions discussed was the

possibility of giving assistance to Finland. During the 6 weeks since then the Finnish needs have increased in urgency. More appeals have been made. The Soviet attacks have been intensified on land. Towns have been bombed with ruthless deliberation from the air. Great Britain and France were among the first countries to promise help to Finland in accordance with the League's resolution early in December, and they have not been unmindful of that promise. No doubt they find it useful from time to time to discuss the whole situation as it develops, together with the problems of the wider war. * * *

"After the meeting M. Daladier (quoted by the British United Press) said: 'Harmony was complete. It was the finest war council meeting I ever attended.'

"Technical discussions took place between the defense staffs, over which General Gamelin presided." (From issue of February 6, 1940, p. 8, article entitled "Supreme War Council Meeting in Paris.")

After this meeting France decided to release a small amount of obsolete military equipment to the Finns. Despite the obsolescence angle the Finns profusely thanked the French and said they (the Finns) were "highly satisfied."

Great Britain also sent Finland war material to aid in the struggle which had been in progress since November 30, 1939. England dispatched 144 airplanes (five-sixths of them were announced to be fighters), 59 guns and howitzers, 24 antiaircraft guns, 100 machine guns, with ammunition, "as well as large quantities of warlike stores." The Times said this was "encouraging" and "that nothing we send will go to waste or fall into the hands of the aggressor without serving its purpose." (Issue of February 26, 1940, p. 7, editorial The Cause of Finland.)

On the 27th, however, the Finns admitted the loss of the important island fortress of Koivisto, which had protected their right flank on the isthmus since the beginning of the war. By the end of the month Viipuri had also been reduced to ruins by the Russian bombardment. The Finnish lines were near collapse, and any Allied help that might be on the way would probably arrive too late. Sweden had also refused to give any active assistance other than to allow 10,000 volunteers to leave the country for Finland. No military aid of any kind had been allowed to pass through Sweden. The King of Sweden insisted that his country must not be involved in the war, but he expressed his deepest sympathy for Finland.

Shipments from the United States to the Soviet Union were discussed in Parliament on the 27th:

"Replying to Mr. Mander and Mr. Price (Forest of Dean, Laborite), Mr. Cross said he was aware that shipments of tin and rubber from the United States to the Soviet Union had increased during the last few months; shipments of petroleum appeared, however, to have decreased. He had no information to show whether part of these raw materials was being resold to Germany. * * *

"Mr. Leach (Bradford, Central Laborite), 'Is it not a fact that America prefers Mammon to democracy?' [Laughter.]" (Issue of February 28, 1940, p. 3, Parliamentary debates, Shipments from United States.)

The security of France in the post-war period was also mentioned at this time:

"The Archbishop of York (Dr. Temple), addressing the Rugby branch of the League of Nations Union last night, said that security for France was the necessary basis of any peaceful settlement of the war. In 1919 we, in this country, did not sufficiently recognize the legitimacy of the French demand for security. The France of today had no aggressive designs. We must be ready, as we were not ready in 1919, to accept our share of effort to insure French security." (Issue of February 6, 1940, p. 10.)

A variation of war aim No. 1 also appeared during the month. It will be remembered that this aim concerned the reestablishment of Poland with a guaranteed access to the sea, etc. Since that aim had been announced in September 1939 dire things had been happening to the Polish population. Areas formerly Polish were being forcibly depopulated and Germans were moving in as part of a German plan to Germanize a vast strip of territory.

"The brutal way in which the Germans are driving tens of thousands of Poles from their home lands brought a Government statement in the House yesterday.

"The Prime Minister was asked whether he would state now, without prejudice to the ultimate peace settlement, that those parts of Poland ethnographically Polish from which Poles are being so cruelly removed would be as effectively repopulated by Poles who wished to return to their homes after victory. Mr. Butler, who replied for Mr. Chamberlain, gave an effective reminder that one of the objects for which we are fighting is a vindicate the rights of the Polish people to an independent national existence and to right the wrongs done to them.

"The whole sordid process is being closely watched in London and in Paris. The Allies went to war because of the German invasion of Poland; the restoration of the Polish people is one of their clearest aims; and they are not to be deflected from it because the Germans, in their moment of power, try to fake the map and override all considerations of humanity." (Issue of February 8, 1940, p. 8, Thursday, article entitled "Righting Wrongs of Poland, Families Evicted by Germans.")

"This policy of the deliberate depopulation, as Mr. Chamberlain has called it, of western Poland and of the overcrowding of central Poland has the obvious purpose of making a subsequent appeal to a plebiscite work in Germany's favor; but so crude a maneuver can, of course, deceive no one and must never be allowed to succeed." (Issue of February 14, 1940, Wednesday, p. 9, leading editorial entitled "Lebensraum and Todesraum.")

March 1940

Events began to move more rapidly during this month. On the 2d it was announced that France would begin rationing food on April 1. All citizens were to register for ration cards by that date.

March 3 marked the entry of the Russians into the southern suburbs of Viipuri, where hand-to-hand fighting took place. As the Finnish war entered its fourth month the Finnish press expressed its disappointment at the dilatoriness of sympathizers in sending help.

On the 6th the British Government announced the issue of a war loan of £800,000,000 at par, carrying interest at 3 percent. The loan was to be paid in 15 to 19 years.

The next day the Government disclosed that the unfinished White Star liner *Queen Elizabeth* (85,000 tons) reached New York after a secret 10-day trip without passengers. The liner docked near the *Queen Mary* and the *Normandie*.

The 9th brought the first confirmation of Russo-Finnish peace talks. Sweden was acting as an intermediary. The Finns, however, were still hoping for help, and the Army announced that it was determined to fight on. Fierce fighting took place on the ice of Viipuri Bay despite the peace discussions.

Sumner Welles arrived in London on the 10th (by air from Paris). The Dorchester Hotel, where Lord Halifax had been staying since November 1939, assigned Welles a large suite. On the 12th the Court Circular announced that the King had received Mr. Welles, who had been accompanied by Ambassador Joseph Kennedy.

Meat rationing began in England on the 11th. The same day a settlement was reached of a misunderstanding between Great Britain and Italy. Italy agreed to import no more coal from Germany by sea, and Great Britain agreed to release 13 colliers that she had detained. The colliers had been stopped by the contraband control.

On the 12th it was announced that M. Daladier had stated in the Chamber of Deputies that an allied expeditionary force, the French contribution to which would be 50,000 men, was fully equipped to go at once to the aid of Finland if the Finnish Government should request such aid, and if Norway and Sweden would grant the right of passage. Mr. Hore-Belisha, who had left the British Government in January (resigning from the post of secretaryship of state for war) doubted that any such allied expeditionary force was fully equipped or ready to go to the aid of Finland.

British shipping losses were reviewed on the 13th. Since the war began 12,816 ships (1,614 of which were neutral) had been convoyed by the British Navy. Only 26 of all the ships convoyed had been lost (2 being neutrals, and they had struck mines). The figures of the French Navy were equally impressive. France had convoyed over 2,000 ships since hostilities began, and only 4 of them had been lost.

On the same day (13th) Sir John Simon announced that England was spending £6,500,000 daily in the prosecution of the war.

The same day also brought the announcement of a peace treaty between Russia and Finland. Finland was to cede Karelia, with the town of Viipuri (second largest city in Finland) plus a military base on the peninsula of Hangö. Hostilities continued, however, pending peace negotiations. The Russians occupied part of Viipuri on the 13th, after surrounding the city.

On the 14th it was announced that hostilities in the Russo-Finnish War officially ended at 11 a. m. on the 13th. But sporadic fighting still continued. Holland immediately blamed the Allies for the Finnish defeat. The Dutch view was published in the Times of the 14th (Thursday, at p. 7, in an article entitled "Holland Blames the Allies—Finns 'Abandoned' By Their Friends"). It was said in part:

"The Allgemeine Handelsblad represents the view of the great majority of people when it writes:

" 'Hard words must be said; the Allies have left Finland to her fate. Their assistance came too late, and it came at a moment when Finnish morale was already too greatly affected. The credit of the Allies has suffered another shock. The Finns are in the same boat with Poland and Czecho-Slovakia.' "

The Times itself said on the 14th (in its leading editorial, entitled "Finland," p. 9):

"The criticism that can reasonably be made is that, if the same readiness to help had been shown in the earliest days of the conflict as has been shown in the last few weeks, the Russian forces might never have made the advances which, at the cost of half a million men, they have achieved in a hundred days of hard fighting. Time was spent in exploiting the rather cumbrous machinery of the League when swift and resolute action by Great Britain and France would have had an immense material and moral effect in Finland and in all the neutral countries as well. It was pointed out in these columns very early in the war that a special responsibility rested on the two states, Great Britain and France, who were powerful, within striking distance by air, deeply concerned for the survival of small nations, and already in a state of war. But it was some time before even the movement for volunteers was given any sort of momentum, and only last month that ar-

rangements were made to assemble an expeditionary force. What was done tardily would have had twice the value if it could have been done promptly. Not until the last moment did the western democracies appear to be really in earnest about helping Finland. They must not make the same mistake with other neutral countries whose independence may be threatened."

Debate of a rather heated character followed in Parliament concerning the Finnish defeat. Chamberlain was called upon to explain, and he defended himself with courage and conviction. Certain members of Parliament insisted, however, that there must be a new British war aim. So war aim No. 9 took shape (after the Allies win the war the Finnish status quo must be reinstated).

"Mr. Hannah (Bilston, U.): When we have won the war, shall we allow these terms to stand?" (Chamberlain made no reply to this question, addressed to him in Parliament on the 13th. See Times for March 14, Thursday, Parliament.)

So on the 19th the question was again brought up.

"Mr. MacMillan (Stockton-on-Tees, U.) said that perhaps the most damaging criticism of His Majesty's Government was that having begun to regard the Finnish war as part of the strategic front they did not move sufficiently rapidly or with sufficient determination. In the end we had obtained the maximum of disadvantage with a minimum of advantage. He hoped the Government would find it possible, in consort with the Finnish Government, to issue a definite pronouncement that in the event of the successful victory of the Allies they would do everything in their power to reinstate Finland." (Issue of March 20, 1940, Wednesday, p. 5.)

Chamberlain, however, made no comment on this suggestion. A war with the Soviets, following a victory over Germany, was a proposal of such magnitude that the Times did not adopt it as a war aim, either. The Times thought England should help in the regeneration of Finland by sending her needed supplies. Finland could also count upon English sympathy Finland had put up a brave fight which England admired, but it was clear that Finland need not look forward to any reincarnation after an allied victory on the western front. War aim No. 9 therefore failed of official sanction.

The war had been going 6 months and no blitzkrieg in the west had as yet transpired:

"Few of us can have failed to recall yesterday that other Sunday morning, 6 months ago to a day, and the quiet and incisive words which announced the choice that Britain had made between war and surrender * * *.

"The certainties of 6 months are that there has been no blitzkrieg in the west and that none in the strict sense is now possible; that there will be no shoddy and illusory peace; and that a new phase of the war is at hand * * *." (Issue of March 4, 1940, p. 7; leading editorial After Six Months.)

Another war aim was suggested in Parliament. Mr. Butler, the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, speaking in behalf of the Prime Minister, approved of this aim. Having received official sanction it can therefore be classed as war aim No. 9:

"Mr. Mander (Wolverhampton, E., Opp. L.) asked the Prime Minister if he would consider the advisability of making clear that at the close of the war it would be essential that any armistice or peace terms should bear the signatures not only of the German democratic element but also of the representatives of the Army and Nazis, with a view to the assumption of joint responsibility.

"Mr. Butler, Under Secretary, Foreign Affairs (Saffron Walden, U.): It is clearly premature to specify the signatories of any armistice or peace terms at the end of the war. Our first aim must be to win it. (Hear, hear.)

"Mr. Mander: Does not the right honorable gentleman think it important to place the responsibility on the whole German people so that it will not be possible, as it was after the last war, for one section to blame any other section?

"Mr. Butler: Yes, sir." (Issue of March 7, 1940, p. 4, Parliament.)

"Mr. Mander (Wolverhampton, E., Opp. L.) said that the Government had been found guilty of culpable indecision and delay in regard to Finland * * *

"He hoped that one of the armistice terms would be that the German people should see for themselves who had won the war and that Allied troops should have an opportunity to show themselves in Berlin and other cities. He hoped also that the Allies would insist on the signatures being given not only of the Government which might then be in power in Germany but also of the Army, the monarchists, and the Nazis if there were still any members of the party—so that no section of German opinion could lay the blame for the defeat on any other section." (Issue of March 23, 1940, Saturday, p. 11, Parliament.)

This suggestion met with approval, so War Aim No. 9 concerned placing the responsibility on the whole German nation for having started World War II. There could then be no talk about "stabs in the back" which was heard from sections of the German population after World War I.

On March 15 it was announced that Government expenditures during the coming financial year had been placed at £2,750,000,000 or more, "of which we cannot expect the amount covered by taxation to exceed £1,300,000,000. Some of the remainder can be drawn from capital, but the amount to be borrowed in one way or another will have to be about £1,200,000,000, or at the rate of £100,000,000 a month." (Issue of March 15, 1940, Friday, p. 9, leading editorial Paying For the War.)

On the same day the Finnish Diet ratified the peace treaty with Russia by 145 votes to 3.

Criticism of the Government became more pronounced during March:

"Mr. Dalton (Bishop Auckland, Labor) said that the morale of the country was not being sufficiently sustained by the Government actions, and the question was whether our morale might outlast that of the slave populations under Hitler. Germany was being allowed to draw big supplies from outside, and our blockade was leaking like a sieve so far as cotton imports were concerned. We were much too gentlemanly, slow-witted, and traditional. Hitler was not gentlemanly, slow-witted, nor traditional, and he was making circles round us so far as the economic management of the war was concerned." (Issue of March 20, 1940, Wednesday, p. 5, Parliament.)

Fears were even expressed that a third World War might follow this one:

"Sir Cyril Norwood, president of St. John's College, Oxford, and former headmaster of Harrow, who recently expressed the view that public schools should have to be run by the state after the war because there would not be enough people able to afford to send their children there, lectured to the advanced air striking force [in France] on reconstruction when peace is restored.

"He said he assumed that we should win the war. * * *

"The restoration of civilization must depend on the maintenance of an irresistible air force, an undefeatable navy, and a strong army. The way to bring it about was by close cooperation with France, then bringing in the neutrals, and progressively encircling Germany—an encirclement of good will. When Germany could prove her good will she could join in and start on the long road to get back her own place. But unless we went very carefully, inevitably a third war would follow this one." (Issue of March 11, 1940, Monday, p. 7, article entitled "Europe After the War.")

On the 18th of March Hitler and Mussolini met at the Brenner Pass and conferred for 2½ hours, partly in private and partly in the presence of their Foreign Ministers. The same day Prime Minister Chamberlain celebrated his seventy-first birthday.

Two days later M. Daladier and his entire Cabinet resigned--following a resolution in the Chamber of Deputies demanding a more vigorous prosecution of the war. President Lebrun called on M. Reynaud to form a new Cabinet.

It was announced on March 22 that the *Mauretania* and the *Queen Mary* had left New York for unknown destinations—presumably to act as troopships in the vicinity of Australia.

On the 28th the Supreme War Council met for the sixth time. The meeting was held in London. M. Reynaud led the French representatives, and the whole war situation and the Allied policy passed under review. While the Frenchmen were being wined and dined the First Lord of the Admiralty was at home preparing an address which pointed to the handwriting on the wall. On the 30th Winston Churchill delivered this speech over the radio in a program that was relayed to the forces in France, to all parts of the Empire, and to the United States. He said, in part:

"All's quiet upon the western front, and today, so far, nothing has happened on the sea or in the air. But more than a million German soldiers, including nearly all their active divisions and armored divisions, are drawn up ready to strike at a few hours' notice all along the frontiers of Luxemburg, Belgium, and Holland. At any moment these neutral countries may be subjected to an avalanche of steel and fire. * * * That is the situation of Europe tonight." (Issue of April 1, 1940, Monday, p. 10, article entitled "Mr. Churchill's Broadcast.")

Gamelin and Reynaud posed for photographs in front of 10 Downing Street, and these pictures were published in the Times during their stay in London. The general looked very smart in his highly polished boots and neatly pressed military coat. Little did he realize what the future was soon to bring.

April 1940

With the close of the Russo-Finnish War, the English turned their undivided attention to the subject of Germany's importation of iron ore. Such ore was proving a vital necessity to Germany in her prosecution of the war. Most of it, and that portion which was the most valuable for war purposes, came from Sweden. Some of this ore reached Germany after being shipped through Lulea and other Baltic ports, but a much larger part came via the Norwegian port of Narvik, on the North Sea.

The British and French Navies controlled the European sea lanes, but they felt unwilling to interfere with the Lulea route. It was closed in winter by ice, and in summer its capacity was believed to be strictly limited. However, if the Narvik route could be effectively closed, it was thought that Germany would be deprived of a very large proportion of her entire iron-ore supplies. A powerful, perhaps a crippling blow, would have been struck at the Reich.

Certain incidents occured in Norwegian waters at the beginning of December 1939 which caused the British Government to complain that German submarines were using such waters for operations of war. By January 1940 English and French newspapers took up the cry and accused Norway of being a base for German operations. Protests were made to the Norwegian Government, which declared that such complaints were unfounded. Finally, on March

19, 1940, Prime Minister Chamberlain stated in the House of Commons that, since the incidents at the beginning of December 1939 which caused the complaint, the British had since detected no sign that the Germans were abusing Norwegian territorial waters.

Following Chamberlain's statement, however, the British and French newspapers continued to make the same accusation and even called on their respective Governments to take control of Norwegian territorial waters. The war on the western front was at a stalemate. Certain people had long been saying that after all it was only a "phony war." British and French citizens were perturbed that the Allies should drag along for months without doing anything more vital than talk about sending an expeditionary force to Finland, and by the time such force was supposedly ready to set out Finland had been defeated.

The attitude of the man on the street in London and Paris was, "Why don't we do something? The Germans are always one jump ahead of us. All we do is sit back and wait for the Nazis to strike." French public opinion gradually caused the downfall of the Daladier government, and Reynaud took the helm upon the solemn promise that he would prosecute the war more vigorously than his predecessor had done. Further Cabinet changes also took place in England. On April 3, 1941, Sir Samuel Hoare became Secretary for Air; Sir Kingsley Wood, Lord Privy Seal; Lord Woolton, Minister of Food; and Mr. R. S. Hudson, Minister of Shipping. The office of Minister of Coordination lapsed.

A former Prime Minister, Lloyd George, kept urging Parliament to be more positive. One of his barbed thrusts, which related to agriculture, was:

"Mr. Lloyd George (Caernarvon, Opp. L.) said that the House ought to have some sort of idea of what the agricultural policy of the country was going to be. [Hear, hear.] There had been too much, in our war preparations, of doing a thing just a little and then finding that not enough and doing a little more. We had been getting on with what might be called rabbit jumps—[laughter]—a little jump, then a nibble; then another little jump and another nibble. [Laughter.] In the end we might find ourselves one day in a position with regard to food production when it would not be adequate for the need that would suddenly confront us." (Issue of April 4, 1940, Thursday, p. 5, Parliament, commenting on parliamentary proceedings of April 3, 1940.)

Prime Minister Chamberlain did not respond too favorably to the increasing pressure of public opinion. Essentially a man of peace, he who had carried the umbrella at Munich in 1938 hesitated to start a real shooting war in 1940. An example of his attitude follows:

"No doubt it is the British Government's hope, expressed by Mr. Chamberlain when Parliament reassembled 3 days ago, that it (the war) may be won with the least possible destruction of a spiritual and material civilization, which is the common heritage of many nations; and it is at least certain that the possibility of establishing a just peace will diminish in proportion as the ferocity of the fighting increases." (Issue of April 5, 1940, Friday, p. 9, leading editorial entitled "Mr. Chamberlain's Confidence.")

The newly formed British and French Governments, however, overrode such hesitation. It was now spring with the status quo on the western front unchanged. The generals decided that the modest attitudes of the Allies would henceforth cease, but that attention would not first be given to the western front. The Maginot Line was, of course, impregnable, so nothing needed to be done about that. The air attacks over England had never materialized, and much needless energy had been lost evacuating children, etc., though it was possible that air raids might materialize. After some deliberation it was resolved that the first test case would be made concerning the iron-ore problem. The die was therefore cast. Thereafter events moved so rapidly it is imperative that close attention be given to dates.

During the latter part of March 1940, 10 Downing Street made quiet preparation to choke off further German imports of iron ore. Full support to this plan came from Paris, of course.

On April 3, 1940, which was a Wednesday, the Times carried a picture on page 12 entitled:

"NARVIK.—A view of the Norwegian port of Narvik, through which the Germans are obtaining the greater part of their supplies of Swedish iron ore. The question of stopping this trade is receiving the special attention of the Allies."

Two days later (Friday, April 5, 1940) the British and French Ministers handed to the Norwegian Foreign Minister (Professor Koht) an important note, which was simultaneously transmitted to Sweden. This note declared that the developments during the last 3 months had clearly shown that "without regard to the wishes of the Norwegian or Swedish peoples, the German Government was not willing to allow the Norwegian and Swedish Governments to have that freedom in matters of foreign policy to which they were entitled. The difficult position of the two Governments owing to the threats and pressure from Germany was appreciated, but under the present circumstances the Swedish and Norwegian Government could not be regarded as free organs in every respect."

The Allied note went on to say:

"'Apart from this fact, the Allied Governments can no longer tolerate the present situation, which means that Germany receives from Norway and Sweden important war materials and that Germany benefits from advantages in those countries to the disadvantage and danger of the Allied Powers. They consequently feel that the time has now come to state clearly to the Norwegian Government that the Allied Governments will maintain certain vital claims and defend these claims in every way that they deem necessary themselves.'

"The note also added that they (the Allies) were bound to take appropriate steps to defend their interests, if the Norwegian Government refused to grant or cut down those advantages to trade and shipping which the Allied Governments deem necessary for their warfare, and which they feel that a neutral government may reasonably approve. The Allies were fighting as much on behalf of the small nations as for their own cause, and they could not tolerate their progress being hampered owing to the advantages which Germany was now getting from Norway and Sweden. Consequently they reserved the right to take any steps which they deemed necessary to prevent Germany from receiving from those countries materials or advantages which would benefit Germany in war or be harmful to the Allies. * * *" (For verbatim quotations from the first Allied note to Norway see issue of April 9, 1940, Tuesday, p. 7, Imperial and Foreign.)

Berlin immediately announced with a growl that reprisals would be made if the Allied threats were carried into effect. The Times, however, reported that the man on the street both in Paris and London felt that the Allies had done right and that at last the Allies were showing some initiative.

Berlin could hardly have failed to notice the following words regarding the Allied note:

"The Allied Governments will maintain certain vital claims and defend these claims in every way that they deem necessary themselves. * * * Consequently they reserved the right to take any steps which they deemed necessary to prevent Germany from receiving from those countries materials or advantages which would benefit Germany in war or be harmful to the Allies."

The Reich had destroyed Poland in 3 weeks and had spent the winter of 1939-40 consolidating its conquests to date. The question in the mind of 10 Downing Street, was: What will Berlin do if we cut off this iron ore? What difference did it make, however, since the Allies controlled the seas?

The Norwegian Parliament met on Saturday, April 6, 1940. The Parliament, or Storting, was in an angry mood. Was Norwegian neutrality going to be violated? If so, by whom?

"In the Storting on Saturday the Foreign Minister, Professor Koht, made a statement on Norwegian foreign policy. Professor Koht began by emphasizing the fact that Norway adhered to a policy of strict neutrality. To treat one side differently from the other was out of the question, because that was not true neutrality and might give one side or the other cause for complaint, perhaps forcing Norway into war.

"'A neutral country has to observe the same rules of conduct toward all the belligerents,' he continued. 'This maxim the Norwegian Government have tried most carefully to observe, and I dare to assert that nobody can justly complain that we have broken it. Regarding trade, too, we have pursued the same policy. When the war began, Norway immediately informed Germany that she would maintain the normal amount of commerce, and the same information was given to France and Great Britain. On this basis trade agreements were signed with Germany on February 23, and with England on March 11, and an agreement with France will be signed in the near future. I was pleased to see, some days ago, that Mr. Chamberlain had declared in the House of Commons that the agreement between Norway and Britain complied with British claims of what Norwegian neutrality should be in matters of trade. * * *

"'Three months ago the British Government thought they had reason to accuse us of allowing German submarines to use Norwegian waters for operations of war. We asserted that the complaint was unfounded, and I noted with great pleasure that Mr. Chamberlain on March 19 stated in the House of Commons that, since the incidents at the beginning of December which caused the complaint, the British had detected no sign that the Germans were abusing Norwegian territorial waters. I appreciate highly that Mr. Chamberlain should so honestly have admitted this. Unfortunately, French and English newspapers continued long afterward to make the old accusation against Norway, and even called on their Governments to take control of Norwegian territorial waters. I hope that our British and French friends will understand how offensive was this discussion of plans for enterprises within our borders. They must understand that we wish to maintain our independence without encroachments from any side, because we love our liberty as greatly as they love theirs.

"'I suppose, however, that this inclination to violate our territory arises not so much from the imaginary war activities of Germany as from the desire to secure the peaceful and legal passage of cargo ships, which they believe is a one-sided advantage enjoyed by Germany.'

"Professor Koht then referred to the transport to Germany of Swedish ore via Narvik. 'The export of ore via Narvik to Germany had,' he said, 'been reduced to one-fourth of its previous quantity during the war, and at present more ore was being shipped from Narvik to England than to Germany.

"'Moreover,' he continued, 'the free passage of merchant ships through our territory is more to the advantage of England than of

Germany, as our trade with England is much larger than with Germany. If the Allies should ask us to stop the free passage of merchant ships, it would be a great disadvantage to themselves, and if they demanded that we should only forbid passage to the ships of one belligerent party, it would be an open infringement of neutrality, which would immediately bring us into the war.'

"The Foreign Minister warned all the belligerents that in the future the Norwegians would try to shoot down any foreign airplanes violating their borders. He went on to refer to the encroachments committed by foreign warships in Norwegian waters.

"With regard to the *Altmark*, he said that England and Norway were now agreed about all the facts, and the dispute was only concerned with the interpretation of a principle of international law. He hoped to reach agreement also on this point, so that Norway could obtain reparation for this undoubted violation of her neutrality. There had been no other British encroachments so serious as the *Altmark* affair, and after the speeches of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Churchill he was convinced that England had no intention of breaking international law or violating Norwegian independence." (Issue of April 8, 1940, Monday, p. 7, article entitled "Neutrality of Norway—An Impartial Policy.")

Having been assured by their Foreign Minister that England did not really intend to violate Norwegian neutrality or independence, the Storting adjourned for the week. It was Saturday evening, April 6, 1940, and the Storting agreed to meet on the following Monday.

Things did not look so well on Sunday, April 7, 1940, though Norway observed the day as usual, and nothing really amiss was noted. How Norway spent that last Sunday of her independence is not described, nor did she know that on that day 10 Downing Street was preparing a second note.

At 5 a. m. on Monday, April 8, 1940, the British and French Ministers telephoned to Professor Koht and told him that the Allies had prepared another note.

At 5:45 a. m. on the same day the allied Ministers reached Koht's residence and handed him the note in person. The contents of the second note were alarming in the extreme, and the fateful week of weeks for Norway had begun.

A few hours later the Storting met again. Professor Koht began his address by reviewing the first allied note, which had been handed to him on the 5th. In regard to this note he commented:

"Professor Koht said that he told the Ministers that there was no reason to accuse the Norwegian Government of not being free and independent, and that it was unfair to address the Norwegian Government in that way.

"'I placed the note before the Government on Saturday,' he continued, 'and spoke by telephone with the Swedish Foreign Minister. We agreed to prepare replies following the same line, but before our replies could be sent, developments occurred which created a completely new situation. At 5 o'clock this morning the British and French Ministers telephoned to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and said they had another note. Forty-five minutes later they came to the Ministry and delivered the note, which said that their Governments would at once publish a statement to the effect that they were laying mines in certain areas off the Norwegian coast.

"'I am not going to say much about the ideas and thoughts underlying that note. These violations are carried out solely because they have the power to do so. The Western Powers are carrying the war into Norwegian territory because they think they can more easily win the war by doing so.

"'The Norwegian Government at once published a statement today, and the replies sent to Great Britain and France have the same contents as that statement. I have not a single word to add to that statement.'" (Issue of April 9, 1940, Tuesday, p. 7, "Imperial and Foreign." Article entitled "Allies First Note to Norway—Statement by Foreign Minister.")

A hue and cry immediately arose from the Scandinavian peninsula when the Allied mining operations became known. Was the battle of the giants to be moved northward into a new field of warfare? We can consider the Swedish viewpoint as an example of the editorial comment of the day:

"STOCKHOLM, April 8.—Completely endorsing the Norwegian view, the Stockholm evening newspapers today are strong in condemnation of the Allied breach of Norway's neutrality. N. Y. A. Dagligt Allehanda writes:

"'One cannot be blind to the profoundly serious implication of this neutrality violation carried out with cold deliberation. It means in plain language that Norway now stands nearer than ever to the great war. Already during the discussion which has been going on for about a week concerning the expected Allied measures the German press has let it be understood that Germany is ready for reprisals. In both belligerent camps it is being said that the northern countries are incapable of defending their neutrality. These contentions are nothing but camouflage for measures in contravention of international law.'"

"A war measure

"Aftonbladet says:

"'The Allied measure is aimed directly against northern neutrality and thus violates the principles which have been represented as the very inspiration of the war policy of the Western Powers. The whole plan in reality is a war measure carried out on Norwegian territory and in conflict with Norwegian sovereignty. In Sweden there is particular reason to observe the events in the light of the restiveness of the Western Powers in connection with the war in Finland. That the war is carried all the way to the shores of Norway means a resumption of the intention which could not be realized in time in connection with a Finland expedition. The help for Finland emerges even clearer as a pretext, while the principal aim, the spread of the war into the Scandinavian region, was the real motive.'" (Issue of April 9, 1940, Tuesday, p. 7, article entitled "Criticism in Sweden—Norwegian View Endorsed—Neutrality Violated.")

In reviewing the events of April 8, Monday, the Times announced:

"The Allied Governments have laid minefields at three points along the Norwegian coast. They justify their action in a statement which has been broadcast to the world.

"The Norwegian Government has issued a solemn protest against the allied action, which also meets with bitter comment in the Norwegian and Swedish press.

"In Berlin news of the Allied action has been received with a show of virtuous indignation and 'icy indifference' to the consequences." (Issue of April 9, 1940, Tuesday, p. 9). (From Today's News-Imperial and Foreign.)

Hardly was the ink dry on newspaper editions of April 9, when the story of the German invasion was received in London. At first the news was so incredible as to be unworthy of belief. When the announcement was confirmed, however, England was in a rage. The British attitude seemed to be: "Stop! You can't do this thing! We were supposed to be taking the initiative in this war! You are upsetting our plans!" Subsequently the question was gravely raised in Parliament as to how the German invasion could have taken place when the Allies controlled the seas. Chamberlain did not known and said he would have to wait for more news. He did, however, confirm the following:

The German invasion of Denmark began on the morning of Monday, April 9, 1940. It was made effective by the afternoon of the same day. The King of Denmark and the Danish Government, under protest, decided that they must submit to the force of circumstances and accept German protection.

The German attack on Norway also began on the 9th. Landings were made at various points along the Norwegian coast, and ships entered the Oslo Fjord. Oslo, the capital, was captured. The Norwegian Government retired to the interior—to Hamar in Central Norway.

The Allied Supreme War Council met in London while the Scandinavian events were taking place. It was agreed to give Norway full naval and military aid. At noon on the 9th the British Foreign Office broadcast that the Allied Governments would extend full naval and military aid to the Norwegian Government. In the evening Lord Halifax broadcast a message to the Norwegian people. He said that Britain and Norway would fight side by side until victory was won.

The next day the Times announced war aim No. 10—restoration of Norwegian independence:

"Norway is courageously resisting the invader. German bombers have been over her capital and the Government has moved to an inland town. The full, unstinted, and unceasing help of Great Britain and France has immediately been promised, and will be afforded in increasing measure until her independence is absolutely and finally restored. * * *

"The consequences of making the iron-ore mines a direct prize of war will probably be far-reaching. But the immediate and energetic taking up of the new Nazi challenge by the Allies may prove that Hitler has made his worst and his final miscalculation." (Issue of April 10, 1940, Wednesday, p. 9, leading editorial entitled "Aggression Without Limit.")

The same editorial mirrored the controversy then beginning as to whether Germany invaded Norway before England started to mine the Norwegian coast. The editorial denied that England had ever intended to send troops into Norway or Denmark. It also alleged that the rapidity of the German invasion could only mean that Hitler had long been preparing for it and had dispatched his troops before the mining of the coast had been commenced by the English. The truth of this allegation will have to wait until both German and English archives are opened to historians in some post-war era. Suffice to say that:

(1) On April 11, Thursday, Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, reviewed the Norwegian matter at length in the House of Commons. He said: "The mine fields * * * were laid and declared on Monday last at dawn, and British patrolling craft were actually stationed around them in order to warn all ships off these dangerous areas." (Issue of April 12, 1940, Friday, p. 4, Parliament.)

(2) Subsequent events of the war proved the Nazis could move with lightning rapidity once they set out for an objective. This new and rapid type of warfare was incomprehensible to the English. As for the French, their greatest exertions so far had been to man the Maginot Line. After that had been accomplished there was nothing to do but sit and wait. At least so thought the French General Staff.

(3) It is true beyond dispute that many English and German vessels appeared simultaneously in Norwegian waters—each steaming at full speed in order to gain an advantage over the enemy. The situation at Narvik is an example. Five British and six German destroyers converged on the port. A furious battle ensued, which also involved German merchant ships accompanying the destroyers. One German destroyer was torpedoed; three were heavily hit and burst into

flames; and six merchant ships were sunk as well as a large vessel carrying ammunition. Of the British destroyers H. M. *Hunter* was sunk; H. M. *Hardy* was severely injured, run ashore and wrecked; H. M. *Hotspur* was seriously damaged; H. M. *Hostile* was slightly damaged; and H. M. *Havoc* was unharmed. The Germans were so rapid in landing and erecting shore batteries that even Churchill admitted in the House on the 11th: "The Germans are very quick in landing and making themselves fortified—they are very nimble about these things."

War aim No. 10: Restoration of Norwegian independence was restated by the Times on the 11th:

"Henceforth her cause (Norway's) is ours until victory is complete. The determination of the Allies to fight on until Norwegian soil is cleared of the invaders will not be affected even though her rulers may be compelled in appearance to acquiesce in the usurpation." (Issue of April 11, 1940, Thursday, p. 9, leading editorial entitled "The Eternal Struggle.")

On the same day War Aim No. 11 was announced (restoration of Danish independence):

"Mr. Eden, secretary for the dominions, speaking at the Midlanders' dinner at the Connaught rooms last night, dwelt on Nazi tyranny, and declared that no nation was secure unless it was prepared to join in overthrowing Hitler. * * *

"Mr. Eden said * * * 'the cause of Norway and Denmark was our cause. There could be no peace for Britain and no relaxation of our efforts until their liberties were reestablished and their national existence restored.'" (Issue of April 11, 1940, Thursday, p. 10, article entitled "Ruthless Crime on Small Nations—The Price of Freedom.")

Churchill also restated both aims.

"Another violent outrage has been perpetrated by Nazi Germany against a small and friendly power, and the Norwegian Government and people are today in arms to defend their hearts and homes. [Cheers.] We shall aid them to the best of our ability. [Cheers.] We shall conduct the war in common with them, and we shall make peace only when their rights and their freedom are restored. [Cheers.] * * *

"We are also at this moment occupying the Faroe Islands, which belong to Denmark and which are a strategic point of high importance, and whose people showed every disposition to receive us with warm regard. [Hear, hear.] We shall shield the Faroe Islands from all the severities of war and establish ourselves there conveniently by sea and air until the moment comes when they will be handed back to the Crown and people of a Denmark liberated from the foul thraldom in which they have been plunged by the German aggression. [Cheers.]" (Issue of April 12, 1940, Friday, p. 4, Parliament, text of Churchill's message to the House of Commons regarding Norway and Denmark.)

After Churchill finished speaking before the House on the 12th, further assurances to Denmark were given by Mr. Alexander (Sheffield, Hillsborough, Laborite), who said, in part:

"They [the Prime Minister of Denmark and his colleagues] might feel convinced that when we had finished this fight we were going to see to it that they got their independence and their rights restored." (Issue of April 12, 1940, Friday, p. 4, Parliament.)

The Allied resolution to stop the German importation of iron ore via Norway had brought things to a disastrous pass. The English were not slow to realize that Denmark would henceforth be unable to export products to Britain and Norwegian trade would also be cut off if that country were lost to the Allies.

"Britain imported half her bacon from Denmark, over a third of her eggs, a quarter of her butter. * * * More important * * * are the stocks of petrol now to be seized by Germany. In Denmark alone the stocks had grown to not far short of a quarter of a million tons, a pleasant windfall for the Germans. * * *

"Through Norway, Great Britain gets 40 percent of her iron ore, all of a special grade for which our steel industry is built and equipped. To receive supplies from elsewhere would cause a certain amount of dislocation and reorganization. From Norway also come the highly important ferro-alloys, indispensable for producing hard steel. About 50 percent of British imports of ferromanganese comes from Norway, and over 80 percent of molybdenum and similar products that go into aircraft manufacture. Then there is a great volume of British imports of timber, wood pulp, and newsprint; Great Britain has taken by far the greatest part of her supplies from the Scandinavian countries. Finally, there are the valuable acetylene products used in shipbuilding, artificial rubber, artificial petrol, and many other industries. In the last war one of the great tasks of the British Navy was to insure the transport of these products from Norway and to keep them from Germany." (Issue of April 11, 1940, Thursday, p. 4, article entitled "German Need of Supplies—Danish Petrol Stores.")

All winter long the Times had not been giving much attention to the United States. Even letters to the Times concerning America had all but ceased. There has been a flurry of such letters in the fall of 1939. It was at that time suggested that issues of and cuttings from the Times should be sent to as many of the States as possible in order to help mold public opinion in America. Then followed the stagnant period of the war during the winter of 1939–40, and the subject of the United States faded into the background.

A strange thing happened, however, as soon as Britain realized the seriousness of the Norwegian struggle. The engine of propaganda was suddenly turned toward America, and much attention was paid to war aim No. 3—Let's get America interested in this war as soon as possible.

It was still the month of April 1940. The Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies was not formed in this country until May 1940. On April 15 the Times did an almost unheard of thing by publishing on its editorial page a message from an unknown American citizen.

"A Cable from New York

"To the Times, Printing House Square, London:

"Well done Royal Navy. Thanks from a darned pro-British Yankee."

"HAROLD A. TITCOMB,
of Farmington, Maine."

"NEW YORK, *April 12.*"

Long articles about the United States began to appear in the Times. Isolationism was first considered in an entire column on the editorial page, which column continued onto the succeeding page. It was said, in part:

"The American people as a whole do not want to become involved in the war; once bitten, twice shy, is the prevailing temper. * * * Some highly placed personages and influential thinkers are doubtless aware that the character of the war may change in such a way as to make American participation desirable in her own self-interest. * * * There is ample room for the enlightenment of America. * * *

"What could be done to enlighten American opinion? The main step has in a sense been taken, in that the leaders of American thought are realizing their country's lack of knowledge, or at any rate of clarified thinking, on the war and after-war problems, and the danger of such a situation for its future. Bodies like the Federal Council of Churches, League of Nations Association, Federal Union, Carnegie Peace Foundation, and Foreign Policy Association are already campaigning to bring out the issues and to demonstrate the need for coming to definite conclusions on them. * * *

"Visiting Englishmen can play their part, whether as exchange professors or public lecturers, but their influence will be greater if they are not self-invited guests." (Issue of April 15, 1940, Monday, p. 7, editorial page, column headed "America Looks at the War.")

"Those in Europe who may be impatient of the American attitude would do well to remember our policies of nonintervention and appeasement, which provoked similar impatience in America. But with the growing assurance that their country is not likely to be involved in the war Americans are beginning to pay more attention to their possible role in the peace. In this field there is psychological resistance to be overcome in Europe. Many Englishmen evince great hostility to any idea of such participation. 'If they don't choose to do their bit now, why should they come in and tell us all what to do afterward?' They do not realize that American public opinion could not by any possibility have been mobilized to support American entry into the war. * * *

"Most important of all, perhaps, Americans must realize that the economic world in which their brains, energy, and resources will be called on to play a vital part after the war will be very different from the world before the war. When the fighting is over, all national economies in Europe will be, in essentials, controlled economies; and there is little likelihood that the controls will disappear later, as (largely at American bidding) they did after 1918. * * *

"To put it bluntly, the existing economic machinery of the United States may well look rather old-fashioned by the end of the war. And one of the urgencies of the situation is that American public opinion should realize this, and that American economists should set themselves to consider whether their system needs overhauling if they feel that it should be geared in with that of Europe when destruction again gives place to constructive effort." (Issue of April 16, 1940, Tuesday, p. 7, editorial page, column headed "America looks at the war.")

Important events were occurring in Norway at this time. On the 15th the following took place:

British troops were landed at several points in Norway; British marines landed at Narvik, after the Germans had been shelled and the marines drove the remainder out of town; King Haakon broadcast an appeal to all Norwegian people to do their utmost to save the freedom and independence of the country.

On the 16th it was announced that men of the age of 27 would be required to register for military service on May 25.

While England was in trouble in Norway the Italian press taunted the English about the "colossal fiasco" that was taking place in Norway. The Italians also hinted that Italy had certain rights in the Balkans. The Times immediately took up the challenge.

"The destroyers *Hardy, Hunter, Glowworm,* and *Gurkha* have been sunk, the *Thistle* (submarine) destroyed, one cruiser damaged, and the *Rodney* hit by a bomb, but only very slightly damaged. The 'colossal fiasco' does not seem to have been on the British side. Other losses must no doubt be sustained; but in the meantime Great Britain has 150 more destroyers and flotilla leaders to go on with, and over 50 cruisers, as well as her capital ships and her submarines—all of them ready to proceed, in conjunction with the powerful French Fleet, anywhere the interests of the Allies are endangered or where a threat to the independence

of a small country calls them. They have the power and the determination to intervene forthwith against such a threat. Their instant reply to the attack upon Norway has made it impossible to suppose that they would remain inactive in face of an assault upon the integrity or independence of any of the Balkan nations." (Issue of April 20, 1940, p. 7, Saturday, editorial Italians Misinformed.)

The same day (20th) it was also announced that total expenditures to be met in the 1940–41 Budget would be £2,500,000,000. The Budget was to be presented by Sir John Simon.

The eighth meeting of the Supreme War Council was held in Paris April 22–23. Churchill attended. For the first time the Polish and Norwegian representatives were present. They were heartily welcomed into the Allied ranks.

On the 23d sharp fighting began in Norway north of Trondheim, where the Germans counterattacked. A combined Allied and Norwegian assault on Narvik began. The allied forces occupied Stenkjer, north of Trondheim, but were soon forced to withdraw to a less exposed line—as a result of continuous bombings by German aircraft. A day or so thereafter German pressure in central Norway compelled the Allies to withdraw north of Lillehammer. In a lightning advance the Germans captured Röros 300 miles north of Oslo.

The only cheerful Allied news was that 26 German supply ships were reported sunk on the voyage to Norway. In Oslo Fjord alone 3,000 bodies had been washed ashore between April 9 and 22. Paris also reported that the new French battleship *Richelieu* (35,000 tons) was nearly ready for active service. The English were very gratified to hear this as they had not anticipated the ship being finished so soon.

On the 27th it was announced that, "In face of strong German forces, supported by artillery, armored cars, and low-flying airplanes, Allied forces south of Dombaas have been forced to make limited withdrawals." (Issue of April 27, 1940, Saturday, p. 7, To-Day's News.)

The same day (27th) the ninth meeting of the Supreme War Council was held in London. It "reached unanimity on a number of questions arising out of the present phase of the war" and "considered various situations that might arise in the near future."

The month ended with further Allied losses in Norway. Each day marked a gradual retreat, though the Times cautioned the public not to become excited. The Allies still controlled the sea lanes, so the Germans would ultimately be defeated in their Norwegian project. Much comment was made on the man Quisling, and "fifth column" activities among the Norwegians themselves were blamed for the continuous Allied retreats.

May 1940

Despite allied retreats in Norway, war aim No. 10 was restated on May 1:

"The process of expelling the aggressor is bound to be longer than was contemplated in the optimism engendered by our first naval successes. But, however long the struggle may be, there is, of course, no thought anywhere of relaxing the effort required for the ultimate deliverance of Norway. * * * 'The war,' the Norwegian Government declared on Monday, 'will go on until the invaders are thrown out of the country.' King Haakon and his gallant subjects may rest assured that the utmost strength of his Allies will be exerted, with steadily accumulating power, until that resolution is made good." (Issue of May 1, 1940, Wednesday, p. 7, leading editorial Setback at Trondheim.)

The same issue, however, carried reports of a storm that was brewing in Parliament. On April 27 Stephen King-Hall, a member of the House of Commons, had expressed himself in this fashion:

"While our counterattack was in committee, the Germans were flying troops to their military objectives at 200 miles an hour. There was a moment when our enemy, having gained by treachery and speed a great tactical success, was in grave strategical peril. The moment passed, and with it the opportunity of dealing a shattering blow to Hitler's prestige. Let us profit from this experience * * *. We have a budget which is based on the estimate that during the next 12 months our average expenditure a day for war purposes is going to be only 25 percent higher than our average expenditure a day during the first 7 months of this war. At this rate of progress we shall not have attained our maximum economic war effort until somewhere around 1943–44." (Issue of May 1, 1940, Wednesday, p. 7 (Conduct of the War.)

On the 2d it was announced that British troops, after stubborn resistance, had withdrawn "to prepared positions in the Dombaas area. Allied positions have been improved near Narvik." (Issue of May 2, 1940, Thursday, p. 7, Today's News.)

The next day Aandalsnes and Namsos were evacuated by the Allies. Conditions became steadily worse, until Chamberlain was compelled to announce to the Commons on the 7th that there has been a complete Allied withdrawal from southern Norway.

"The [Norwegian] episode, although the Germans have paid heavily in men and ships for their great gain of territory, remains a conspicuous reverse for the Allies; the impression left of a tame ineffectiveness in the direction of the war is painfully obvious in neutral countries, and has here some substantial evidence to support it, as Sir Roger Keyes showed in a devastating speech." (Issue of May 8, 1940, Wednesday, p. 7, leading editorial, Mr. Chamberlain's Case.)

A deluge of criticism broke over Chamberlain's head, and on May 8 the Prime Minister bravely faced a great ordeal in Parliament. He was severely criticized in both the Lords and Commons, and in the Commons events reached such a pass that the opposition challenged a division on the adjournment motion. Mr. Chamberlain then said he would make the issue one of confidence. The division gave the Government a majority of 81, and the Prime Minister was technically saved from being turned out of office. But such men as Lloyd George rose during the Commons' debate and demanded Chamberlain's resignation. In a stirring address Lloyd George said, in part:

"Scandinavia and Norway, one of the great strategic possibilities of the war, were in German hands. It was no use criticizing Sweden, which was now between Germany on the left and Germany on the right. What right had we to criticize little powers? (Hear, hear.) We had promised to rescue and protect them. We never sent an airplane to Poland; we were too late in Norway. * * * German airplanes and submarines were brought 200 miles nearer our coast. Could anyone doubt that our prestige had been impaired? It was only necessary to read friendly American papers to find that out. We had promised Czechoslovakia, we had promised Poland, we had promised Finland. Our promissory notes were now rubbish in the markets. * * * Tell me one neutral country that would be prepared to stand up to the Nazis upon a mere promise from ourselves. (Hear, hear.) What is the use of not facing the facts? * * * The world knew the state of our preparations. We were promised rearmament in 1935, and in 1936 actual proposals were laid before the House. Everyone knew that whatever was done was done half-heartedly, ineffectively, without drive, and unintelligently. Then came the war. The tempo was hardly speeded up. There was the same leisureliness and inefficiency. Could anyone say he was satisfied with what we had done about airplanes, tanks, guns, and especially antiaircraft guns, and about the steps we took to train an army to use them? All the world knew that we were in the worst strategic position this country had ever been placed in. * * * I say now, solemnly, that the Prime Minister can give an example of sacrifice, because there is nothing that would contribute more to victory in this war than that he should sacrifice the seals of office." (Issue of May 9, 1940, Thursday, p. 3, Parliament.)

The next day, May 10, 1940, proved to be one of the most important days in the entire history of the British Empire. On that day Germany invaded Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg by land and air. Chamberlain immediately resigned, and the King invited Churchill to be Prime Minister. Other Ministers in the Cabinet were requested to remain at their posts pending the formation of a new government.

The Dutch resisted fiercely, but German parachute troops landed near Rotterdam on the very first day of the attack. In Brussels the sound of antiaircraft guns firing at German bombers over the city was the first intimation to Belgium that she had been once again invaded by Germany. Luxemburg collapsed immediately, and its grand duchess fled to France.

British troops immediately crossed the Belgian frontier in response to an urgent appeal from King Leopold. The British were warmly welcomed by the Belgian people.

Switzerland ordered general mobilization. Simultaneously Britain landed a garrison in Iceland.

In the closing hours of this fateful day the English announced three more war aims:

War aim No. 12 (preservation of the independence of Holland. This was later changed to a pledge to restore the independence of Holland).

War aim No. 13 (preservation of the independence of Belgium. This also was later changed to a pledge to restore the independence of Belgium).

War aim No. 14 (restoration of the independence of Luxemburg—that country having fallen immediately to the invaders).

In a radio address King George VI earnestly talked to the people of all three countries and pledged the aid of the Allies in carrying out the new war aims.

Events thereafter moved so rapidly that the attitude of the English people seemed to be, "My God! What's happening? This isn't like any other war we've ever been in."

Within a day or two after the invasion the Belgian Armies on the Meuse and on the Albert Canal, after resisting with all their resources, fell back to their second line of resistance. It was announced that the British and French troops were hurrying to their assistance.

At the Ijssel River the Dutch forces managed to delay the Germans for 48 hours before retreating to the flood zone—also their second line of defense. When this happened the royal family fled to England. Princess Juliana, Prince Bernhard, and their two young children reached London on the morning of May 13. In the evening of the same day Queen Wilhelmina also arrived in London.

The Dutch populace was deeply stunned to learn that the representatives of the House of Orange had left the Netherlands in such haste, especially after the Queen had proclaimed to her people that they must hold fast. But later the public became reconciled to the matter, since it was evident that Holland would be entirely overrun. The royal family would have been captured had they not left immediately.

On the 13th certain changes were made in the British Cabinet. Mr. Amery was appointed Secretary of State for India and Burma, Mr. Bevin became Minister of Labor, and Mr. MacDonald the new Minister of Health. Lord Woolton retained the office of Minister of Food.

By the 14th the battle for Belgium was raging along a hundred-mile front. German columns had broken through the Belgian defenses at Maastricht and were attempting to spread out fanwise in the rear of the Belgians.

The Germans were practically in control of Holland by the 15th, on which day the Nazis formally entered The Hague and Amsterdam. Dive-bombing tactics had practically destroyed Rotterdam. Simultaneously Mr. van Kleffens, the Dutch Foreign Minister, admitted that the Dutch Army had lost one-quarter of its total of 400,000 men. He hastened to add, however, that neither the Government nor the country had capitulated.

Men of 28 years of age were ordered to register for military service in England on May 25.

By the 17th the British Expeditionary Force had withdrawn to new positions west of Brussels. On the 19th the German offensive from the Meuse turned westward. To meet this threat the Allies appointed General Weygand Chief of the French General Staff and Commander in Chief of all the theaters of operations. Weygand, a disciple of Foch in World War I, had been serving as commander of the French forces in the Near East.

The situation was desperate by the 21st, on which day the Germans captured Arras and Amiens and claimed to be in Abbeville. The French Ninth Army had been defeated, and its commander, General Giraud, was a prisoner of the Germans.

For the next few days the British public lacked definite information from the western front. It was known that a great and decisive battle was in progress and that the Allied position was "serious," later becoming "grave." On the 26th Gen. Sir John Dill was appointed to succeed Gen. Sir Edmund Ironside as Chief of the Imperial General Staff. Ironside was designated as Commander in Chief of the British Home Forces.

At this point the Belgian Army was defending the left flank of the Allied forces and the northern approaches to the city of Dunkirk. On Sunday, May 26, King Leopold talked with Allied military representatives, and at that time nothing unusual in his attitude was noted. True the British Ambassador to Belgium had long since noted that Leopold, even in pre-war days, was in a most unfortunate position. Bereft of friends of either sex, crushed since the death of his wife in an automobile accident, temperamental and stubborn, Leopold had not even been seen to laugh since the year 1935. Though possessed of a winning smile and a charming voice, the King had long been in such a state that none of his ministers or acquaintances dared cross him in any vital matter. For some years Leopold had feared a French attack on his country as much as a German attack and had decided to remain aloof from both the French and the Germans. However, his closest advisor was very anti-French, and Leopold was inclined to follow his advisor's viewpoint in this regard. The British Ambassador had mournfully shaken his head and informed 10 Downing Street, "It is too bad the King does not get married again." (After the surrender of Belgium the British Ambassador wrote a long article for the Times describing these matters in detail.)

On the night of the 27th the King decided to withdraw from the conflict without even informing the Allied generals, whose aid he had so recently sought in protecting the sovereignty of Belgium. At 4 a. m. on the 28th the Belgian Army capitulated at the order of Leopold. The King's decision had been taken against the unanimous advice of his ministers, and they soon disassociated themselves from it and from him.

The indescribable confusion that took place within the next few hours need not be noted here. The British and French Armies appeared to be trapped. Officers and men discarded everything they could not carry on their backs, and a stampede toward Dunkerque began. Harassed by German dive bombers, they soon found themselves in a position that the Times called "extremely grave."

On the afternoon of the 28th Churchill addressed the House of Commons and said, in part:

"The House should prepare itself for hard and heavy tidings. I have only to add that nothing which may happen in this battle can in any way relieve us of our duty to defend the world cause to which we have vowed ourselves [cheers]; nor should it destroy our confidence in our power to make our way, as on former occasions in our history, through disaster and through grief to the ultimate defeat of our enemies." [Loud cheers.] (Issue of May 29, 1940, Wednesday, p. 6, article King Leopold Orders Surrender.)

The 29th was marked by difficult British and French maneuvering toward the coast, at the cost of very heavy fighting. The Allies were rushing to Dunquerque strong naval forces, which were powerfully supported in the air. Simultaneously Ostend, Lille, Ypres, and other towns in Belgium and northern France fell to the Germans.

Despite all this confusion the Times restated war aim No. 12:

"The Dutch home fleet will join the Allies very soon, and a Netherland Legion is being formed. Great Britain and Holland and the other Allies will fight side by side to overthrow the pretensions of the usurper, and reestablish the rights of the Royal House which has shared the fortunes of its country through dark days and bright for so many centuries." (Issue of May 30, 1940, Thursday, p. 7, editorial Seyss-Inquart for Holland.)

The Royal Navy began evacuating troops from Dunquerque on the 30th, and possibly a few on the 29th. The British and French forces in the North continued their retreat to the coast. On the last day of the month the death was announced of Lord Frederick Cambridge, Coldstream Guards. Born September 23, 1907, and a first cousin of King George VI, he had been killed in action while serving in France with the B. E. F. Noblemen and commoners alike were being slaughtered in the wild confusion caused by the unexpected loss of Belgium.

June 1940

With the opening of this tragic month the evacuation of British and French troops from Dunkirk was proceeding steadily. "The number so far exceeds all expectations. The men were weary but in good spirits." (Issue of June 1, 1940, Saturday, p. 7, To-Day's News.)

On the 1st it was also announced that the allied troops were pushing ahead in Norway. Narvik had been occupied by them, also Fargernes and Forneset, on the Beis Fjord and Rombaks Fjord, respectively. A British warship, H. M. S. *Curlew*, had been sunk in these operations.

Churchill was in Paris on the 1st for another meeting of the supreme war council. This council was the first to meet with new prime ministers and new military commanders on each side.

The allied retreat in Flanders was turning into a rout. As a result some of England's greatest names began to appear in the casualty lists. The ninth Duke of Northumberland was killed in active service, and his death announced on the 3rd. Born July 15, 1912, he had been head of the great family of Percy. Lord Erne died of wounds, and his death became known on the 4th. Born November 22, 1907, he had been a large landowner in Ireland.

Churchill appeared before Parliament on Tuesday, the 4th of June, and reviewed the situation at length. Announcing that 335,000 men had been brought from Dunkerque before the city was abandoned. He said in part:

"The French Army has been weakened, the Belgian Army has been lost, a large part of those fortified lines upon which so much faith has been reposed is gone, many valuable mining districts and factories have passed into the enemy's possession, the whole of the channel ports are in his hands with all the tragic consequences that follow from that, and we must expect another blow to be struck almost immediately at us or at France. * * * If, which I do not for a moment believe, this island or a large part of it, were subjugated and starving, then our empire beyond the seas, armed and guarded by the British Fleet, would carry on the struggle until in God's good time the new world, with all its power and might, steps forth to the rescue and liberation of the old." (Issue of June 5, 1940, Wednesday, p. 3, Parliament.)

Churchill did not mention the United States by name, but for the first time an English Prime Minister was openly hinting that American materials and manpower might ultimately be needed to defeat Hitler.

The blow that Churchill feared was struck on the 5th of June. On that day the Germans launched a new offensive along the Somme and the Aisne, with massed infantry, tanks, and aircraft.

"The wasted years are come to reproach us for past levities and to warn us against repeating past mistakes." (Issue of Thursday, June 6, 1940, p. 7, leading editorial entitled "The End of a Phase.")

Reynaud dropped Daladier from the French Cabinet on the 6th. General de Gaulle, "a brilliant young military theorist, is the Under Secretary for War."

The Battle of France, as had been called the struggle that was now beginning, reached a crucial stage on the 9th. The Germans had reached the Seine at Rouen. General Weygand "exhorts his men to stand fast for the dernier quart d'heure." Simultaneously the English announced a new war aim. War aim No. 15: We will ultimately defeat Germany in an offensive land war.

"In his great speech on the miracle of Dunkirk Mr. Churchill warned the nation that victory is not to be won by any concentration upon defense. The aims of the Allies cannot be less than the frustration and defeat of Germany in the field." (Issue of Monday, June 10, 1940, p. 7, leading editorial, Aggressive Defense.)

But hardly had this aim been announced when staggering news was received. Italy had declared war (June 10). The rage of the press knew no bounds when contemplating Mussolini's action. He was likened to a jackal accompanying a tiger on the hunt for human flesh. But this was not all. The 10th also brought news that the British and French had entirely withdrawn from northern Norway. The King of Norway and the Norwegian Government had fled to Great Britain. The German flag was flying over Narvik. But there was yet hope:

"The Italian assault is as unashamed as any national crime that history records. The resources of the British Commonwealth and Empire are hardly yet tapped." (Issue of Tuesday, June 11, 1940, p. 7, leading editorial, Perfidious Italy.)

The next day (11th) the French withdrew south of the Marne. Now, indeed, would another great Battle of the Marne take place and France would once more be saved. Churchill rushed to France for a conference with Reynaud, Marshal Pétain, and General Weygand. Though furious fighting was occurring along the Seine, it was heartening to know that Italian air bases in Africa had been bombed.

At this point war aim No. 16 was announced. Italy will be crushed and Mussolini punished:

"The British Nation accepts the challenge of Signor Mussolini, and will henceforth wage war to the end against the forces of Italy. * * * Deeply as the Allies are involved in their death grapple with Germany, Mussolini has been watched for many months, and powerful forces have been reserved to punish the expected crime." (Issue of Wednsday, June 12, 1940, p. 7, leading editorial, The Stiletto.)

But on the same day that this aim was made public, the Germans crossed the Marne.

The unbelievable was now happening. The grim fight for Paris was at hand, but this time there was no "taxicab army" to save the situation. The wireless also brought news that the Germans were attacking Rheims with heavy mechanized forces. Under these circumstances the English announced that men of 29 years would register for military service on June 15; and that men of 30 years would register on June 22.

War aim No. 17 was next announced. Paris will be saved. If not, the Germans will ultimately be expelled from the city and all the lands that they have overrun. (This aim was later changed to read that the sovereignty of the entire French Nation would be restored.)

"We are in the presence of world war * * *. The defense of Paris is the defense of England; it is the defense of civilization; it must not be allowed to fail. Nothing in our power to give for that cause may be withheld. If the enemy is thrown back from the gates of Paris he has lost the war. If he enters we shall still fight on till he is expelled from the city, and from all the lands that he has desecrated." (Issue of June 13, 1940, Thursday, p. 7, leading editorial The Focal Point.)

Events were now moving so rapidly that they can only be briefly summarized. On the 13th, the following happened: A pincer movement was in progress around Paris. The Germans crossed the Marne at several new points. Paris had just been declared an open town, and the Government had fled to Tours. The French counter-attacked near Persan-Beaumont, 17 miles west of Paris, in the Oise Valley, and bravely advanced a distance of 5 miles. Reynaud, the French Foreign Minister, was hysterically appealing via radio to President Roosevelt to send the Allies all moral and material help, short of an expeditionary force.

But France had slept too long and put too much faith in its much-vaunted Maginot Line. The 14th of June brought the following: Germans entered Paris at last. (The English cried that the light of civilization had been extinguished.) The French moved to new defense positions south of Paris, after blowing up armament works in the suburbs. The Government fled from Tours to Bordeaux. The Germans made a violent frontal assault, with tanks and aircraft, on the Maginot Line west of the Saar. New British troops arrived in the fighting line to aid the French. Italy had now lost 210,855 tons of merchant shipping, by capture or scuttling, since she had declared war.

With all this disaster staring the English in the face, they nevertheless determined that there would be no lessening of war aims since the resources of the Empire and the American Continent were inexhaustible. The English, however, still hesitated to refer to the United States by name. Of course, there was no mention of American manpower at this stage.

"For the unsparing use of all those forces we stand pledged to France, as France to the world. The British Government repeated their undertaking yesterday:

"'We renew to the French Republic our pledge and resolve to continue the struggle at all costs in France, in this island, upon the oceans, and in the air wherever it may lead us, using all our resources to the utmost limit, and sharing together the burden of repairing the ravages of war.'

"However great the loss of French territory, and of French and British lives in defending it, the reserves in this island will remain great, and those of the Empire and the American Continent inexhaustible." (Issue of June 15, 1940, Saturday, p. 7, leading editorial Paris in Captivity.)

The crack-up, however, began in earnest on the 16th. On that day the Reynaud cabinet resigned. Eighty-four-year-old Marshal Pétain became the new head of the French Government. The Germans were swiftly advancing southward into territory beyond Paris. General Weygand became the new Deputy Prime Minister. The Germans claimed to have broken the Maginot Line at Metz. Roosevelt telegraphed sympathies to Reynaud and concluded:

"I know that you will understand that these statements carry with them no implication of military commitments. Only Congress can make such commitments."

English determination stiffened:

"An authoritative statement issued in London yesterday made it clear that Great Britain would continue the strugg'e until victory was won, and that the Allied Fleets were fully able to enforce the bl ckade of Germany." (Issue of Monday, June 17, 1940, p. 7, Today's News.)

"The following authoritative statement was issued in London yesterday:

"'Great Britain is firmly and resolutely determined to continue the struggle until victory is won. * * * We are prepared to continue the war just so long as it may be necessary to secure the downfall of our cpponents, even though it may take years to accomplish that task. In their unshaken determination to achieve victory no matter what the cost, the Government of the empire have the united support of their people.'" (Issue of June 17, 1940, Monday, p. 6, article, Continuing the Struggle.)

On Sunday evening, June 17, 1940, Marshal Petain ordered the French Army to stop fighting. The aged warrior asked Hitler for peace terms, and the fateful message was dispatched via the Spanish Government. On the same evening Churchill broadcast:

"What has happened in France makes no difference to British faith and purpose." (Issue of June 18, 1940, p. 6.)

A horrible fate had now overtaken the Allied cause. In the ninth month of the first year of the war all had been lost except for the fact that the English were determined to fight on.

"It is quite impossible as yet to estimate the effect of this immense disaster upon the future course of the war. * * * We are back in something like the situation after the Battles of Austerlitz and Jena. * * * On the other hand we possess now, what we did not enjoy in 1806, not only the strong cooperation of an empire grown to manhood, but the promise of full assistance from the boundless resources of the United States." (Issue of June 18, 1940, Tuesday, p. 7, leading editorial, We Fight On.)

At last the United States was mentioned by name. Did "boundless resources" include manpower or only materials of warfare?

As the French Empire expired the English announced that in the final hours before the end the British Government had offered to conclude a solemn act of union with the French Government, by which France and Britain would no longer be two nations but one Franco-British union. This idea the French spurned, preferring complete defeat to loss of individuality and identity. One of the paragraphs in the document read:

"The Union appeals to the United States to fortify the economic resources of the Allies and to bring her powerful material aid to the common cause."

In the months to come the English were to think again of union, but this time an Anglo-American Union. This proposal was later to find hearty acceptance among certain types of American citizenry residing on the Atlantic seaboard.

Churchill reviewed the situation in Parliament on the 18th. In an historic address he reaffirmed the war aims that had been previously proclaimed by him, by Prime Minister Chamberlain, by the Times, and by other members of Parliament.

"I indicated a fortnight ago, as clearly as I could, to the House that the worst possibilities were open, and I made it perfectly clear then that whatever happened in France would make no difference to the resolve of Britain and the British Empire to fight on if necessary for years, if necessary alone. * * * During the first 4 years of the last war we repeatedly asked ourselves the question, 'How are we going to win?' and no one was able ever to answer it with much precision, until at the end, quite suddenly, quite unexpectedly, our terrible foe collapsed before us and we were so glutted with victory that in our folly we cast it away. * * * We abate nothing of our just demands—Czechs, Poles, Norwegians, Dutch, Belgians, all who have joined their causes to our own, shall be restored." (Issue of June 19, 1940, Wednesday, p. 2, Parliament.)

On the 23d Hitler's armistice terms were accepted. Half of France was to remain occupied. The surrender of the fleet was demanded, and on that subject England began to be very apprehensive. General de Gaulle was in England calling on "free Frenchmen" to resist.

France signed an armistice with Italy on the 24th. The Times moaned that this was double indignity since the French and the Italians had never really come to blows. Never had such a great prize been won so cheaply, but the Times warned that revenge would come ultimately and surely.

War aim No. 17 was restated at this time. (Restoration of the independence of France.) The first hint was given of war aim No. 18, which was later restated many times. (The British Isles and Empire must be defended to the utmost and the present status quo maintained. The same also applies to the Dutch East Indies, etc.)

"The British Empire will fight to the last for its own survival and for the resurrection of France, and in so doing will believe that it responds to the true will of the French people." (Issue of June 26, 1940, Wednesday, p. 7, leading editorial, After the Armistice.)

As the month ended it was noted:

"The apparent surrender in Europe and Africa is so colossal that it is still impossible to appraise it." (Issue of June 27, 1940, Thursday, p. 7, leading editorial, France Despoiled.)

Nor was this all to aggravate the English. On the 27th Russia sent an ultimatum to Rumania demanding satisfaction of Russian claims on Bessarabia and northern Bukovina. On the 28th the Soviets began their march into Rumania, taking possession of Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina. On the same day Great Britain formally recognized the Government of General de Gaulle as being the true Government of France.

The month passed without any attempted invasion of the British Isles. Such an invasion was daily anticipated, and the papers contained full instructions to the public what to do when parachute troops landed. The Government remained calm, but it was evident that the people were more or less demoralized.

July 1940 to May 1941

This period marks the second stage of the conflict, during which England stood

firm on all of her war aims and, in fact, kept gradually adding to them. The latest one to date was announced on April 23, 1941, when the restoration of Yugoslavian independence took its place under war aim No. 6.

"The British Government for its part declares that it is its firm intention to fully restore the independence of Yugoslavia. Meanwhile the Yugoslav Government may count on the fullest possible measure of help from the British Government in the prosecution of the struggle against the common enemy." (Statement in the House of Commons by Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, made April 23, 1941.)

Unfortunately, however, war aim No. 3 gradually became the most important during this period (the United States must take an interest in the war as soon as possible). England was not holding her own but was being slowly but surely reduced to desperation. Shipping losses had increased to an appalling figure, English diplomacy in the Balkans had been a failure, and finally the Greek fiasco resulting in a second Dunkirk had struck a serious blow to the Empire. The one hope lay in America. That hope was developed to the utmost, and English efforts also met with the warmest official response from the United States. War aim No. 3 was apparently a great success. Federal Union and a proposed new flag for America became the ultimate goals of aim No. 3. Gradually and yet almost imperceptibly the United States was being led into the conflict by an articulate minority against the wishes of a confused majority.

To trace this course of events in detail would make this paper unduly long Incidents are also moving so rapidly that the third stage of the war already looms up ahead (active American participation in manpower as well as in materials). To prevent this third step from becoming a reality should be the aim of every American who loves his country and all that it stands for. This is not our war. It was not of our making. It will not be the last European conflict. We have not gone so far into it that we cannot turn back. Beware of the noisy minority. Paul Revere must ride again.

CONCLUSION

With the fall of France the British Empire was brought to the lowest ebb it had ever experienced in its centuries of existence. One of the great foundation stones of the Allied cause had been removed in June 1940, and the Empire was in danger of imminent collapse. Henceforth it must fight the war alone or fight it with the assistance of the United States. It was only natural that a great effort should therefore be made to entice the United States in as an active military participant. It is therefore fitting that we consider three things at this point:

I. British propaganda tactics during World War No. 1.

II. Britain's attitude when the United States was last in grave danger.

III. Attitude of the early founders of this Republic concerning involvement in Europe's incessant struggles.

I

Some years before the present war Lloyd George published his war memoirs. Concerning these memoirs Winston Churchill said:

"Mr. Lloyd George's war memoirs constitute a record of unfading historic interest. * * * No one who wishes to be well informed about the great war should fail to study them."

This endorsement was printed on the paper cover advertising the work.

Lloyd George was not only Prime Minister of England during World War No. 1, but he was also the only member of the British Cabinet who remained continuously in office throughout the war. He therefore could speak with the voice of authority. In six long volumes he traces the tragic course of the war and in the fourth volume he deals with the subject of British propaganda.

In a chapter headed "The tactics of deception," beginning at page 408 of volume 4, Lloyd George says in part:

"While the ghastliness I have inadequately summarized was proceeding, and brave men were being sacrificed to the stubborn infatuation of the high command, the public at home, official and unofficial, were all dosed day by day with tendentious statements about victories won and progress made toward more assured and ever greater triumps. Enemy depression became as deep and his morale as quaky as the bogs of Passchendaele. We were assured that the German peace maneuvers were the indications and expedients of despair. * * * The reports passed on to the ministers were, as we all realized when it was too late, grossly misleading. Victories were much overstated. Virtual defeats were represented as victories, however limited their scope. Our casualties were understated. Enemy losses became pyramidal. That was the way the military authorities presented the situation to ministers—that was their active propaganda in the press. All disconcerting and discouraging facts were suppressed in the reports received from the front by the War Cabinet—every bright feather of success was waved and flourished in our faces. * * *

"Every disquieting fact was explained away without any difficulty. * * *

"The statements about German morale were sometimes grotesque in the gullibility they displayed. * * *

"It may be said that we must have been a very simple lot to have been taken in by all this selected trash. Politicians are liable to be attacked from every flank—simultaneously. They are suspicious, subtle, crafty, and designing, and at the same time they are gullible, simple, and foolish. In this case we were not taken in, but our means of ascertaining the facts were blocked by the complete cooperation that existed between the war office and G. H. Q. * * *

"Nowhere was there a more ecstatic belief in these imaginary victories than at the chateau and village where the field marshal and his staff were quartered. * * *

"During this visit Sir Douglas and his staff dwelt repeatedly on the visible deterioration in the physique and smartness of the German soldiers, judged by the specimens captured in recent victories. I expressed a desire to see them. The proposition was received without any enthusiasm. Would I not prefer to see the Vimy Ridge where I could get a view of the German positions? I preferred to see the last batch of German prisoners. I saw the last 'cage,' and I thought the men were a weedy lot. They were deplorably inferior to the manly samples I had seen in earlier stages of the war. It was some years after the war that I ascertained on authority which is unimpeachable that on that occasion general headquarters rang up fifth army and stated that the Prime Minister was coming down and would go to corps headquarters to see German prisoners. Instructions were given to inform the corps—I forget which one it was—of this, and to tell them to see that able-bodied prisoners were removed from the corps cages. * * *

"There was an elaborate and sustained effort to create an atmosphere of impending victory on an eventful scale. The reports from the front, official and unofficial, became rosier and ruddier. General headquarters could not capture the Passchendaele Ridge, but it was determined to storm Fleet Street, and her strategy and tactics were superb. The press correspondents at the front were completely enveloped and important publicists and newspaper proprietors in this country were overwhelmed. Lord Northcliffe had, ever since 1916, been the mere kettledrum of Sir Douglas Haig and the mouth organ of Sir William Robertson."

Pages of the same reflections appear in Lloyd George's Memoirs. It is well for us to keep such statements in mind, now that World War No. 2 is in progress and every effort being made to involve the United States in the struggle as an active military participant.

II

What was Britain's attitude when our own country was last in danger of invasion? The closest parallel we can draw is to look back to our Civil War period, when the established Government at Washington was threatened with invasion.

During our Civil War period, the London Times (then called simply the Times) commented editorially that England was enjoying considerable prosperity at a time when the United States was tottering on the brink of destruction. By June 1863, General Lee was moving northward with one of the largest armies ever assembled on this continent. Following is a typical editorial comment of that day, taken from the Times for Saturday, July 4, 1863:

"What is America today? How is she keeping the annual festival which she consecrates to her own glorification and the vilification of all the rest of mankind? * * * The signal failure of five successive invasions must, we should hope, have done something to shake northern confidence in the skill of their generals and the invincibility of their Army. The deity of size and magnitude, so often and so devoutly worshipped, has fatally deceived her ardent votaries. Big guns, big ships, big threats, and bulletins replete with statements more enormous than any of them, have all been tried in vain, and the North finds itself the object of that very invasion with which it has so continually and so vainly menaced its antagonist. * * * These are the military prospects for the Fourth of July 1863."

As the war progressed, a group of English citizens formed the Society for Obtaining the Cessation of Hostilities in America. A year later (July 15, 1864) they called on Lord Palmerston, then Prime Minister. Palmerston was not interested. On July 18, 1864, the Times applauded Palmerston's attitude, and its editorial for that day concluded by saying:

"The best service the Government of this country can render the cause of peace is to let events run their course, and not interfere in American politics by word or deed."

It is not difficult to imagine what the attitude of 10 Downing Street would have been had President Lincoln requested Lord Palmerston to supply us with munitions and loans to beat off the Confederate invasion.

As late as 1939 Britain exhibited the same attitude when the duly elected government at Madrid was faced with the invading army of General Franco. Upon the fall of Madrid the London Times said editorially on March 29, 1939:

"The British Government, beset for so long by the clamour of those who would urge them to support of one or the other of the Spanish contestants, now reaps, after much contempt and obloquy the reward of their resolution to commit themselves to favour neither side in a quarrel irrelevant to British principles and interests. * * * Hard things are always spoken of neutrals while war rages, but an honorable and consistent neutrality comes to be appreciated when peace is won."

III

What was the attitude of the early founders of this Republic concerning involvement

of this country in Europe's incessant struggles?

First of all, the interventionist propaganda of 1941 is lifted wholesale from the very words of prominent residents of the eastern seaboard in the first decade of the nineteenth century.

On October 31, 1803, Fisher Ames wrote to Theodore Dwight ("Works of Fisher Ames," vol. 1, p. 330):

"Great Britain is fighting our battles and the battles of mankind, and France is combatting for the power to enslave and plunder us and all the world."

Today France has merely been changed to Germany.

John Rutledge wrote to Harrison Gray Otis on July 29, 1806 (Morrison's Life and Letters of H. G. Otis, vol. 1, p. 283):

"I have long considered England but the advanced guard of our country * * *. If they fall we do."

Timothy Pickering rose during the second session of our tenth Congress and attempted to throw our people into alarm by saying that Napoleon would send troops to the United States "in thousands of British ships." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 21, 1808, annals of 10th Cong., 2d sess., p. 276).

Finally John Adams himself commented on the situation so similar to that prevailing today. On July 25, 1808, he wrote to Rush (Old Family Letters, pp. 191–192):

"Our Gazettes and Pamphlets tell us that Bonaparte * * * will conquer England, and command all the British Navy, and send I know not how many hundred thousand soldiers here and conquer from New Orleans to Passamaquoddy. Though everyone of these Bugbears is an empty Phantom, yet the people seem to believe every article of this bombastical Creed and tremble and shudder in Consequence. Who shall touch these blind eyes?"

Jefferson saw the danger of the rising hysteria, which mounted after each Napoleonic victory. As early as March 21, 1801, he wrote in a letter to Logan (Ford's Works on Jefferson, vol. 9, pp. 219–220):

"It ought to be the very first object of our pursuits to have nothing to do with European interests and politics. Let them be free or slaves at will, navigators or agricultural, swallowed into one government or divided into a thousand; we have nothing to fear from them in any form. * * * To take part in their conflicts would be to divert our energies from creation to destruction."

By October 1803 Jefferson wrote to Benjamin Rush (Ford's Works on Jefferson, vol. 10, p. 32):

"Tremendous times in Europe! How mighty this battle of lions and tygers! With what sensations should the common herd of cattle look upon it? With no partialities, certainly!"

In 1807 Jefferson wrote:

"I cannot, with Anglomen, prefer a certain present evil to a future hypothetical one."

In that same year, 1807, Richard Peters wrote to Timothy Pickering, February 4. (Taken from the Pickering manuscripts in the possession of the Massachusetts Historical Society):

"I think myself sometimes in a hospital of lunaticks when I hear some of our politicians eulogizing Bonaparte because he humbles the English; and others worshipping the latter, under an idea that they will shelter us, and take us under the shadow of their wings. They would join, rather, to deal us away like cattle."

Senator Beveridge in his life of John Marshall says (Life of John Marshall, vol. 4, p. 6):

"Never did Americans more seriously need emancipation from foreign influence than in the early decades of the Republic—never was it more vital to their well-being that the people should develop an American spirit, than at the height of the Napoleonic wars."

Nor must we forget recent statements of Winston Churchill himself. In his volume, The World Crisis, he says at page 110:

"The stake of the United States in the European scene was incomparably small."

At page 450 in the same volume:

"President Wilson sought to play a part out of all proportion to any stake which his country had contributed or intended to contribute to European affairs."

The last book which Churchill published before the war was Step by Step (1939). In it he says:

"It would be a mistake, however, to assume that these friendly declarations imply any intention on the part of the United States to become involved in the quarrels and combinations of Europe. No European statesman should be so foolish as to count upon the armed assistance of the United States even if his country were the victim of unprovoked aggression. It is much better to face the real facts" (p. 111).

"We may be certain that the United States will not intervene in any British or European quarrel" (p. 312).

"Except for a few handfuls of ferocious romanticists, or sordid would-be profiteers, war spells nothing but toil, waste, sorrow, and torment to the vast mass of ordinary folk in every land. Why should this horror, which they dread and loathe, be forced upon them? How is it that they have not got the sense and the manhood to stop it? Nowadays the masses have the power in all democratic countries" (p. 25).

Senator Wheeler and Secretary Stimson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM MAYSVILLE (KY.) PUBLIC LEDGER

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and enlightening editorial from the Maysville (Ky.) Public Ledger, reprinted from the Cincinnati Times-Star, on the subject of the remarks made last Monday with regard to Senator WHEELER and Secretary Stimson.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Maysville (Ky.) Public Ledger]

THE SENATE GIVES ITS OPINION OF WHEELER

It is to the credit of the Senate that it put on quite an uprising Monday in favor of the senior Senator from Montana.

WHEELER has been a Member of the Senate since 1923. His character ought to be fairly well known to Members of the Upper House.

WHEELER had just replied to Secretary of War Stimson's attack upon him in which he charged the Montanan with near treason because some antiwar post cards he had sent out had gone to soldiers. WHEELER repeated his explanation that the cards were sent to a commercial mailing list of a million names; that the order went out before the proposal to extend the service of draftees and National Guard men had been advanced; and that, to the best of his knowledge and belief, only three cards went to soldiers.

Senators LA FOLLETTE, TRUMAN, CLARK of Missouri, and CHAVEZ spoke for WHEELER. TYDINGS called Stimson's statement "an unjust attack on one of the outstanding men of his time." "If this country should become involved in war," said TYDINGS, "no one will work harder to win that war than the Senator from Montana."

"Senator WHEELER," said VANDENBERG, "represents not the seeds of treason but the hope of democracy." The applause at this point was so great that the Vice President warned that another demonstration would cause him to close the galleries. Even BARKLEY described WHEELER as "one of the ablest and most courageous men in the United States." Under questioning by Senator TAFT, the administration leader in the Senate said that he did not believe that WHEELER's action in sending out the cards justified the charge of treason.

ELLISON D. (COTTON ED) SMITH, of South Carolina, asked the Senate to call on the executive departments "to keep their mouths out of our business."

The most dramatic tribute to WHEELER came from HIRAM JOHNSON. "Every man in this Chamber should be proud of you," he said, * * * "I take my stand for the Senator from Montana." * * * "For God's sake, have we reached the point in government where there is no right of petition, where there is no right of free speech? * * * If WHEELER goes to a concentration camp, I will go with him."

WHEELER and JOHNSON make quite a pair. They have been elected time after time by the people of California and Montana. In 1940 JOHNSON had no opposition, having won at all the party primaries. Without having made a speech in Montana before the election WHEELER, with opposition, ran considerably ahead of Roosevelt.

Who ever heard of Stimson getting office by vote of the people, anywhere?

Probably no American has ever been subjected to such a smear campaign as has been directed at WHEELER in recent weeks. They have called this Massachusetts Yankee, transferred to a Montana environment, a user of subversive methods and an ally of Hitler. Of course, those who take the trouble to read history know it's all a part of the usual technique of getting a country into war. The advocates of war always try to frighten and beat down the opposition by methods similar to those which have been used against WHEELER. It is only when men believe very strongly in the cause they are standing for that they will stand against the terrific pressures of a time like this. (Cincinnati Times Star.)

Happy Days Again on Midwest Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD an article which appeared in yesterday's New York Times, by Roland M. Jones, entitled "Happy Days Again on Midwest Farms."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 3, 1941]

HAPPY DAYS AGAIN ON MIDWEST FARMS—GROWERS BASK IN PROSPERITY MADE UP OF GOOD CROPS AND GOOD PRICES

(By Roland M. Jones)

OMAHA, NEBR., August 2.—Barring worry over the war, happy days are here again for the middle western farmer. Look in whatever direction one may from this watchtower the prospect is one of agricultural prosperity. It is a prosperity compounded of two parts, good crops and good prices.

Wheat came through better than was expected, the small feed grains have yielded satisfactorily. Hay is abundant, especially that soil-conserving and highly nutritious forage crop, alfalfa. And corn is now going through its critical pollination stage without the accompanying anxiety which has been so common in recent years. There have been some hot, blistering days, but they have been tempered to the plumy, pollen-bearing tassels of the corn by reserves of moisture in the ground and intermittent thunderstorms which count for so much on the farms at this time of year.

HAPPY STATE OF PARITY

Along with the happy state of having an abundance to sell, the farmer is faced with the perfectly pleasing condition, rarely experienced in the last 20 years, of being able to sell it at parity prices. He can buy with his produce a volume of nonagricultural goods equal to what he could in the days before the first World War, perhaps just a shade more. The prices he gets and the prices he pays have both been going up during the last 2 or 3 months, but the prices he gets have been rising at a little faster rate than the prices he must pay.

According to the computation of local agricultural economists, farm prices, as of July 15, stood at 102 percent of parity in Iowa and 103 percent of parity in Nebraska.

In this condition the natural impulse of the farmer is to view price fixing with suspicion and alarm. And yet these feelings have not so far been greatly manifested. His attitude has been so persistently represented as that of seeking justice by way of the parity formula that he is in no position to ask for more. Whatever form price-fixing legislation takes he thinks he is entitled to have the parity principle recognized, and that agricultural prices should be permitted to rise to that level before any kind of arbitrary control is exercised over them.

What is the farmer going to do with all the additional money he is getting and expects to get for a while yet?

That question recently occurred to the editors of Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead. So they went out and asked a lot of farmers. Good intentions loomed large in the answers.

The first reply of nearly half was that they would pay debts. This may be as much a reflection of how badly farmers are in debt as it is of how much they want to get out. Those who remember the last war were especially anxious to clean the slate now so that they could meet the expected bumps ahead without interest and principal payment charges to complicate the problem of making a living in an agricultural depression.

HOPES OF TENANT FARMERS

A good many, principally tenants, hoped to buy more breeding stock and equipment, a natural desire since the best-equipped tenant usually gets his pick of the farms for rent and the best chance to stay once he has found one that suits him.

A few, also mostly tenants, looked forward to buying land, but only if prices remained reasonable. The savers were more inclined toward Government bonds than toward private investment, an intention that does not augur so well for the promoter as the condition 20 years ago, when "blue sky" stocks were peddled to farmers by the basketful.

Our Madness Increases as Our Emergency Shrinks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. GERALD P. NYE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by me at St. Louis last Friday evening, entitled "Our Madness Increases as Our Emergency Shrinks."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this hour when our actions grow madder while the emergency confronting us grows smaller, we owe it to ourselves to speak plainly.

There are those who interpret every reference of even the mildest critical nature against the British as some sort of condemnation of those brave and splendid people the British people themselves.

This is childish reasoning. But the Government of Great Britain is trying for its own reasons to get us into its war. It is our business and our intention to stay out of that war. To stay out of it, we must oppose those who desire us in that war, and continue this opposition at every turn. The Government of Britain, unblushingly and without reservation, does want us in that war. Our cause today, get it clear, is America's cause, and America's only. Today we must think of, act for, and if necessary fight and die for America—but America only.

When the last war ended and men began to look around at the sinister means that had been used to lure the United States into that terrible and futile war, when they saw how they had been tricked and lied to, they became angry. They began to ask, Who did this to America? Books were written, magazine articles by the score were published and finally a great investigation was held nearly 20 years later to find out who it was and why America had been pushed into the last war. And we did find out. The accusing finger of history all through the years will be pointed at the great American and European bankers and the powerful international munition makers who committed that crime against the American people. But it was too late when all this became known. Our boys were dead and buried beneath the soil of France. Our veterans' hospitals were filled with twisted, suffocated, blinded men. All the terrible costs of that war are still upon us.

And now we see America being stripped, and oiled and groomed for another such war—only a more terrible and an even less justifiable one from our point of view. But this time the people are wiser. They want none of that slaughter and terror in Europe or Asia. Yet, despite that, we are rudely awakened by the British Prime Minister who tells the House of Commons that America is on the verge of war. Well, maybe we have to find out about this from the British Prime Minister. But there is one thing we can find out for ourselves. And the time has come to find out. Who has brought us to the verge of war? Let us ask and demand the answer to this question now. Who is pushing and hauling at America to plunge us into this war? Who are the men? Who is putting up the money for all this propaganda? Who are they? We want to know. And we want to know now. Now, before we plow a million American boys under the dust and mud of Africa, Indo-China, France, and far away Russia, to make the world safe for Empire and Communism.

I have not time to name all those contributing (knowingly or unwittingly) to our march to war. But I will name some of them.

You know that this, as in the last war, has been a propaganda job. To carry on propaganda you must have money. But you also must have the instruments of propaganda. And one of the most powerful, if not the most powerful, instrument of propaganda is the movies. In Germany, Italy, and in Russia—the dictator countries—the government either owns or completely controls and directs the movies. And they are used as instruments of government propaganda. In this country the movies are owned by private individuals. But, it so happens that these movie companies have been operating as war propaganda machines almost as if they were being directed from a single central bureau.

We all go to the movies. We know how, for too long now, the silver screen has been flooded with picture after picture designed to rouse us to a state of war hysteria. Pictures glorifying war. Pictures telling about the grandeur and the heavenly justice of the British Empire. Pictures depicting the courage, the passion for democracy, the love of humanity, the tender solicitude for other people, by the generals and trade agents and the proconsuls of Great Britain, while all the peoples who are opposed to her, including even courageous little Finland now, are drawn as course, bestial, brutal scoundrels.

You have seen these pictures—Convoy, Escape, Flight Command, That Hamilton Woman, Man Hunt, Sergeant York, The Great Dictator, I Married a Nazi. At least 20 pictures have been produced in the last year—all designed to drug the reason of the American people, set aflame their emotions, turn their hatreds into a blaze, fill them with fear that Hitler will come over here and capture them, that he will steal their trade, that America must go into this war—to rouse them to a war hysteria.

You do not have to take my word for this. The President himself after he had forced Congress to pass the lend-lease bill, in a speech to the Academy of Motion Picture Arts complimented the industry on their help in "explaining" the bill. In fact, only day before yesterday, he had Sergeant York at the White House and told him that the new picture would do much to rouse our people.

"Only," the President said, he "didn't like so much killing in the picture." He doesn't like so much killing. Yet he is glad to see that picture and a score of others rousing

the American people to get into the killing and to be killed on a real battlefield, not a movie lot, and on a scale which will make that killing seem mild. Do not take my word for it. Only a few days ago, Mr. Will Hays warned the movie moguls himself, telling them that their great industry is an instrument of entertainment and not of propaganda. But the movies have ceased to be instruments of entertainment. They have become the most gigantic engines of propaganda in existence to rouse the war fever in America and plunge this Nation to her destruction.

And now, let me ask, Who are the men who are doing this? Why are they trying to make America punch drunk with propaganda to push her into war?

There are eight major film companies. The men who dominate policy in these companies—own or direct them—are well known to you. There is Harry and Jack Cohn, of Columbia Pictures. There is Louis B Mayer, of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. There is George J. Schaefer, of R. K. O. There is Barney Balaban and Adolph Zukor, of Paramount. There is Joseph Schenck and Daryl Zanuck, of Twentieth Century Fox, dominated by Chase National Bank. There is Murray Silverstone, of United Artists, and the great Sam Goldwyn, of Samuel Goldwyn, Inc. There are the three Warner brothers, Arthur Loew, Nicholas Schenck, Sam Katz, and David Bernstein, of Loew's, Inc.

In each of these companies there are a number of production directors, many of whom have come from Russia, Hungary, Germany, and the Balkan countries.

Now, do not misunderstand me. I say nothing against the sturdy peoples of these countries. They should have here the same opportunities that are open to every other dweller in our midst. But in this great era of world upset, when national and racial emotions run riot and reason is pushed from her throne, this mighty engine of propaganda is in the hands of men who are naturally susceptible to these emotions. Great Americans like Senator Wheeler, Colonel Lindbergh, and General Wood are in many places denied the use of a hall to speak up for America. But these men, with the motion-picture films in their hands, can address 80,000,000 people a week, cunningly and persistently inoculating them with the virus of war.

Why do they do this?. Well, because they are interested in foreign causes. You cannot doubt that. Go to Hollywood. It is a raging volcano of war fever. The place swarms with refugees. It also swarms with British actors. In Hollywood they call it the "British Army of Occupation." The leaders are almost all heavy contributors to the numerous committees of all sorts organized, under the guise of relief to Britain, Greece, or Russia, to propagandize us into war.

Why do they want to push us into war? Well, they have all sorts of interests. But here is one I can give you: One of the leading Wall Street investment houses made a study of these movie industries only a few months ago. It told its clients that if Britain loses, seven of the eight leading companies will be wiped out.

That report revealed that the quarters and half dollars of the American movie patrons barely pay for the cost of producing these gigantic movie spectacles. The profits depend on the sales in the foreign market, which is now reduced to England and her dominions. Take one of these companies alone. In 1940 the company collected eighty millions of dollars. But eight millions of that was collected in England. That eight millions of dollars just exactly represented the profits of the company. That British market accounted for the profit. The company, it was estimated, could pay $5 a share. But if Britain loses, then that $5 would be reduced to zero. Another company depends for 35 percent of its earnings on the British market. The war has already cut that to 20 percent. And if England loses, the company will lose all of that profit. Moreover, countless millions of dollars of these companies' earnings are tied up in England, held there in blocked sterling, frozen there, and they cannot be taken out unless the war ends and Britain wins. This movie industry has a stake of millions of dollars annually in Britain winning this war. The question is, Are you ready to send your boys to bleed and die in Europe to make the world safe for this industry and its financial backers?

I cannot tell the whole story here. But you have a right to know that story. You have a right to know why it is that patriotic Americans are attacked at every turn as they rise to speak for America, denied halls and stadiums, while these can use 20,000 movie theaters every day to talk to eighty millions of people. But these movie moguls and directors are patriots—these men who only a few years ago filled their pictures with so much immorality and filth that the great Christian churches had to rise up in protest against it and organize the League of Decency to stop it. You have a right to know all about this sordid story of war propaganda in the films, and Senator BENNETT CLARK and I have today called on the United States Senate to investigate it. We want to know what part the Government has played in this—and whether the Government here, like the governments in Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy, is using the films to poison the minds of the American people against most of Europe in order to plunge us into the bloodiest war in history. And for what reason? To make the world safe for British imperialism and Russian communism?

I have said that the people would like to know what part the Government has had in aiding the moving-picture magnets or even compelling them to do this job. Out in Hollywood there is, or was, a certain gentleman named Dr. Leo Rosten. He seems to be the fountain of ideas and data on the Army and the Navy and the air force. And another Government figure, Maj. Gen. Charles S. Richardson, has been sent out there to prepare war films. I am informed that there are Government men on every moving-picture lot in Hollywood for the same purpose. The Government has seemed particularly anxious to whip up the warrior spirit in our young men, glorify war, glorify militarism. Of course, this is all called national defense. Troops and paraphernalia of the Army and Navy, including ships, have been loaned by the Government to the producers to make war-propaganda pictures. All of which is very nice for the producers, because they get it all free, gratis, for nothing, from the Government.

Not only has the industry obligingly cooperated with the American Army and Navy, but with the British Army and Navy. One of the theatrical magazines reports that in 1940 Lord Lothian worked with Mr. Schaefer, head of R. K. O. Mr. Schaefer and R. K. O. furnished the money and England and France furnished the actors—that was back in the days when France was an Ally and before England was starving France. A beautiful propaganda picture was born and the proceeds went to the agencies Lord Lothian was interested in.

What I would like to know is this: Are the movie moguls doing this because they like to do it, or has the Government of the United States forced them to become the same kind of propaganda agencies that the German, Italian, and Russian film industries have become? I have excellent reason to believe that this governmental influence has prevailed.

Remember, this is the worst kind of propaganda because it is the most insidious. When you come to an America First meeting you come expecting to hear an argument in favor of America and if you don't happen to be in favor of America, or if you think more of Britain or Greece or Russia than you do of America, why naturally you steel yourself against what we have to say. If you go to one of these Fight for Freedom Committee meetings, designed to get us into war, well, you know what to expect there—your mind is on guard. Or better still, you don't go at all—they never get a chance at you But when you go to the movies, you go there to be entertained. You are not figuring on listening to a debate about the war. You settle yourself in your seat with your mind wide open. And then the picture starts—goes to work on you, all done by trained actors, full of drama, cunningly devised, and soft passionate music underscoring it. Before you know where you are you have actually listened to a speech designed to make you believe that Hitler is going to get you if you don't watch out. And, of course, it's a very much better speech than just an ordinary speech at a mass meeting. And you pay for it. The truth is that in 20,000 theaters in the United States tonight they are holding war mass meetings, and the people lay down the money at the box office before they get in.

Think that over. Eighty million people will go to the movies this week. Seventy-five percent of those people are against going into war. But those 75 percent will pay three-fourths of the bill for this propaganda designed to get them into a war they don't want to go into. Why, they ask—where are these peacemongers getting all the money to fight war? Well, they don't get much—most of it they get passing the plate at these meetings. But just think what a pitifully miserable pittance it is compared with the hundreds of millions of dollars that are spent making those pictures.

Have you noticed the newsreels? A minimum of 70 percent of the newsreels are what are called national-defense pictures, but really pictures to glorify war, glorify Britain, and now you'll probably begin to see pictures glorifying Russia. I am told that the movie industry has orders from somewhere that all the newsreels must be 70 percent devoted to war pictures. These pictures do not depict the horrors of war. You do not see men crouching in the mud of Greece, English, Greek, and German boys disemboweled, blown to pieces. You see them merely marching in their bright uniforms, firing the beautiful guns at distant targets, and, of course, the marines landing in London—40 of them, by the way. What those 40 marines are doing in London, I do not know. They are hardly enough to stop an invasion, however much we believe in and applaud our marines.

Propaganda is moving us into this dance of death, even while 80 or 90 percent of the people in this democracy of ours are breathing "No. No. No."

And this threat of war endures at a time when we should be breathing easier than we did a year ago. Without a serious or substantial threat against us which those in authority will undertake to define, our Government proceeds to let our country in for the greatest madness in all American history. This process, of course, could never be accomplished except with the aid of propaganda in furtherance of an undefined emergency.

Don't misunderstand me. We are not decrying the need for a furtherance of a defense for America. This need grows out of what we see to be madness abroad. It grows out of such foreign policy as has found us inviting enemies at every turn. A defense to match this sort of policy is of necessity expensive. But if we would confine ourselves to providing a defense adequate to meet the worst that might be brought against us as a result of the wars abroad, we could have it without wrecking our American economy, straining morale, or unnecessary sacrifice by

those thousands of our young men whose services we have contracted in the name of defense.

More billions we pour out, and we propose breaking faith with the men in training in this hour of madness when any emergency confronting our country is immeasurably less than it was a year ago. Look to the facts. A year in which to prepare and train, real defense progress, and potential enemies growing weaker with every hour of war abroad.

To find in such an hour as this, with these facts shouting at us, a serious effort to have Congress break faith with those called into training for a year by keeping them longer, is to find a state of affairs resembling degrees of fraud.

To let these boys and men return home when their contracted year of service is ended and to bring new trainees into their place is not going to cripple or mess up our defense. The propaganda which has us believing that training ending with 1 year will mean our military undoing is hardly called for.

And when some of our leaders persist in their talk about the need for giving the President power to send our troops outside this hemisphere, when they insist upon repeal of existing provisions of law forbidding use of these men abroad, the prospect becomes a most serious one, not only for the boys in camp, and their fathers and mothers, but for all of us and for our Government.

Nothing is more important to the national defense than morale. Belief, confidence, and faith today are essential in any ability which is ours to survive the penalty of these mad years. It is denied that morale in our military camps is low. I hope such denial is honestly founded. There could be larger confidence in the denial if only authorities would lift the restrictions which prevent the boys speaking their minds while we are free from war.

We do know that the men in the training camps are asking embarrassing questions. Like the rest of us, they would like to know just what the emergency is, just what are the causes at stake, that requires a demand for their retention in service beyond the year and for legislation that will let them be sent abroad without a declaration of war. Especially would they welcome knowing why, with their country at peace, more than a year of military training is necessary and legislative consent to their service abroad is called for when so different a situation prevails in neighboring countries which are at war. In Canada the boys are taken for only 4 months of military training and they serve abroad only as they volunteer for such service. Quite natural is the question: "Whose war is this one, anyway?"

Propaganda causes us to overlook some such questions. We can be made to ignore them. There was will to ignore the things that were said of those fine, courageous Americans, Col. Charles Lindbergh and Senator WHEELER. But the people can hardly ignore the conclusions to be drawn when the Stimsons, the Knoxes, and the Wedgewoods make public apology for the things they charged against WHEELER.

Some few weeks back a clergyman in one of our States wrote of an advertised America First meeting: "If I could have my way about it the meeting would be machine-gunned and bombed." The author of such lack of balance, such departure from good Americanism, is quite understandable when we see responsible members of our Government, like Cabinet officers charging treason against WHEELER, however much those officers apologize afterward.

Why shouldn't we have better reason, better balance here in our country? We could have it except for the clever propaganda which stirs our emotions, breathes hates, fans fears, and glorifies the destruction we would avoid.

One day the interventionists call those who exercise their American right to disagree, Communists. The next day they call us something else because we are not sympathetic toward making Red Russia our ally and singing her praises.

Why must there be those who charge disloyalty and worse against others who refuse to take British statesmen at their word, when their word today is so contrary to their word of only 3 years ago? Why do we let Eden and others guide us by asserting that Britain fights for freedom of the seas, when we know it was Britain that scuttled freedom of the seas when Woodrow Wilson presented it as point 2 in his 14 points at Versailles?

Why not use the strength that is ours to resist propaganda, remember the warnings of the fathers who paid so dearly for American freedom from European power politics and wars, and renew that pledge so often heard after our last war: Never, never again?

America is challenged today. To avoid involvement in this war is to avoid bankruptcy, futility, and needless waste of life and property. Yet the danger of such involvement is an hourly challenge.

To keep intact the institutions that are basic to our democracy is another challenge. We must avoid larger surrender to the Executive of power vested with the people and their Representatives in Congress. Just now, while we are at peace, not at war, there comes the demand for power for the President to fix prices, to hold the boys in service, to send the boys where he chooses. It was power, just a little more at a time, mind you, that made Hitler and Mussolini dictators. (In parentheses, I've offered this observation to balance accounts with those who are so persistent in their charge that the kind of talk I am responsible for tonight is the kind that led to the downfall of France, Belgium, Poland, and others.)

Americans, we want to be strong and ready always to effectively defend ourselves against the worst that any part of the world might choose to bring against us, of course. We want to leave no stone unturned that will aid in guaranteeing such a defense.

But, likewise, we ought to want freedom from foreign influence in times like these. Let's have courageous American thinking, not the kind which finds us waiting for the cue that Churchill gives; not the kind that has to be painted and pictured by propagandists or by forces whose profits are dependent upon foreign causes.

Let's be Americans because of and for causes that are American. Let us bury forever the thought that real Americanism is determined only by those who both hate Hitler most and love Britain best. Let us be giving larger thought to what is best for America.

If this be called selfishness, then let me suggest that it will at least bring us quickly to the hour when we can give to the world the most unselfish service, a service essential if the world is to be saved from worse than war. The hour of which I speak is that one soon to come—that hour when all the world, vanquished and victors alike (if there can be victors) will fall exhausted. Sick, hungry, and cold, that world will want a helping hand to supply the medicine, the food, and the clothes so necessary if it is to be saved from communism, which thrives upon destruction, hunger, and suffering. We can give that kind of hand only as we will now avoid the waste of our own involvement in the war; only as we build stronger our resources and reserves; only as we maintain a degree of solvency. Let us not throw away this chance for great service to mankind and to God; let us not do that by destroying the very things which are ours and which some would have us destroy in the name of affording the same blessings for others.

This is a wonderful hour for more America-first thinking; for a fine, clean expression by all our people of determination to stay out of these never-ending foreign wars, to keep faith with ourselves and with those who 150 years ago, won for us divorcement from the hates, the wars, and the power politics of Europe.

Isolationists and Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I have here an article by Walter Lippmann which was published in the Washington Post of July 24, 1941, and which I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 24, 1941]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

ISOLATIONISTS AND SOLDIERS

As the debate on extending the term of service begins, we need to remember why this new American Army was first called up in the summer a year ago; if it was necessary to raise a large Army then, it is certainly impossible to begin disbanding that Army now.

For a Congress which decided now to demobilize two-thirds of the officers and men of this partially trained Army would be saying that there was no good reason a year ago for raising such an Army. The Congress which called these men into the Army would have wasted 12 months of the lives of these men and immense sums of the people's money; the country would not have an effective Army though the only conceivable justification in the first place for calling up these men was that the country needed a large Army.

The fundamental question, therefore, is why—beginning 12 months ago—the United States has needed a large Army. That is the real question for the men themselves and for their families. They have already made and they are making great sacrifices. Congress ought never to have asked these sacrifices of them unless the sacrifices were necessary. The sacrifices can never be justified unless the result is to produce a good Army. To disband these troops now would be to say to the men that they were not really needed in the first place and that their time in the Army has in fact been wasted. For they would go home, themselves only partially trained, and the country would be left without an effective Army.

The principal bill, namely, the Selective Service Act, for raising a large Army was introduced into the two houses of Congress on June 20 and 21, a year ago. The date is of the utmost importance. On June 13, the French prime minister, Paul Reynaud, had vainly made a final, desperate appeal for help; on June 17, Marshal Petain had asked

Germany for an armistice, and it was clear that not only France, but the French Empire and the French Fleet would give up the struggle. Thus, the decision to ask Congress to raise a large American Army was reached in the very days when Hitler knocked out France—and Britain was left standing alone, her Army driven from Europe with the loss of its arms and the British Isles open to aerial attack and invasion, the British Fleet subject to destruction and capture.

Before these events it had not been seriously suggested that the United States should raise a large Army; after these events there was such an overwhelming popular demand for a large Army that, despite the election campaign Congress voted compulsory service. It was plain to the American people that with the French catastrophe the outer line of defense had broken down, that the threat to Britain was such that the next line of defense might fall, and that we, having only a one-ocean Navy, must at once organize an Army for the final defense of the North American Continent. That is why the Army was authorized and that is why the men are now in the training camps. They have been there since the summer of 1940, because in the summer of 1940 the destruction of the Allied Armies on the Western Front, the capitulation of France and the dire peril of Britain, threatened to leave all the approaches to the Western Hemisphere undefended.

The raising of this large Army is part of the price we have to pay for our foreign policy during the past 20 years. We disarmed. We exerted pressure on Britain and France to disarm. When France was being overrun in 1940, we not only had no arms to send to the French but, owing to the dominance of the isolationist policy, we were unable to give the French any promise of future assistance if from the French Empire they continued the war with their navy.

Had we been able to say to France in June 1940 what we have since then said to Britain, we should possibly be living in a very different world today. With the French Fleet and the Empire in Africa, the Battle of the Atlantic would not be in serious doubt. Italy would probably be knocked out by this time. We should not be anxious about Hitler's march through Spain and Portugal to the Atlantic islands and to Dakar. We should have had Indochina with us instead of its falling to Japan, leaving the Philippines encircled and the southern Pacific gravely menaced.

We should not be feverishly training troops to defend our bases nor getting ready to stand guard in distant places. We are paying a most terrible price today because 12 months ago the United States Government was so paralyzed by the isolationist sentiment that it could do nothing to keep the French Fleet and French Empire from surrendering to Hitler.

It is all very well for the isolationists to present themselves as friends of the soldiers and their families. But the plain historical fact is that men had to be drafted, and that these men now have to be kept in service, because the isolationist policy of this country in June 1940 lost us the chance to keep in being the French Navy and the French Empire and the French colonial Army.

The gap in the defense of the Western Hemisphere, caused by the total loss of the French military and naval power, has had to be filled by a big American Army. Yet there are still public men at large who actually wish to compound this calamitous folly by abandoning Great Britain also and advising her to follow the course of Vichy France. Having learned nothing from a policy which has already compelled us to conscript a large Army and hold it in service, they advocate a course which would compel us to quadruple the Army and never demobolize it.

Even today, with the British Empire fighting, we have not enough trained troops to garrison effectively our own immediate territorial possessions—Alaska, the Philippines, Hawaii, Panama, the Atlantic bases. The more we pursue the isolationist line of letting our natural Allies fall, the more men we shall need in our Army and the longer we shall have to hold them under the colors.

We had to raise the Army because we had to let France fall. We have to keep this Army because the fall of France has left the whole southern flank of the Western Hemisphere dangerously exposed. The more we let the isolationists determine our policy, the more soldiers we shall need for an endless period of time. The isolationists cannot deny it. Do they not say that we must build, but all alone, an impregnable defense of the Western Hemisphere? With what, but with American soldiers, do they imagine that the Western Hemisphere and its outposts can be made a secure base for the air force and the Navy? It is isolationism which has driven this country to raising a great army and will, if it continues, fasten permanently upon the country the burden of an immense army.

Importations of Argentine Beef

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

STATEMENT BY AMERICAN LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent statement issued by the American Livestock Association regarding the erroneous report that the ban on importations of Argentine beef would be lifted.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wishful thinking only can be responsible for the despatch from Buenos Aires, dated July 19, stating that "the action of the United States in lifting the ban on the importation of Argentine beef, which was greeted with great satisfaction here, was believed connected with the recent visit to Argentina of a group of qualified American stockmen," according to F. E. Mollin, secretary of the American National Live Stock Association.

Mollin said that the ban against importation of Argentine beef has not been lifted and in his opinion will not be lifted. Apparently, he said, the despatch is based upon the opinion of the Attorney General dated May 16 and released in Buenos Aires on June 27. This opinion attempted to define the Province of Tierra del Fuego as a separate country under the meaning of the embargo provision of the Tariff Act of 1930, and therefore stated that importations of lamb and mutton from this newly defined "country" could be permitted within the discretion of Secretary of Agriculture Wickard.

"The decision when released to the American public by the Argentine friends of our diplomatic officials in the State Department raised such a storm of protest," Mollin declared, "that the Attorney General is now reconsidering it, and after conference with Treasury Department officials, Secretary Wickard announced that the bars were still up and would remain so until he gave official declaration that the embargo against Tierra del Fuego was lifted. Such declaration is necessary according to the terms of the Tariff Act, and since then Secretary Wickard has announced that the matter is now being restudied by his Department along with the reconsideration by the Attorney General's office."

So far as there being any connection between the action of the Attorney General and the visit of the American committee, of which J. Elmer Brock, of Kaycee, Wyo., president of the American National Live Stock Association, was a member, attention should be called to the fact that this committee did not return to the United States until Monday, June 16, a month after the opinion was rendered by the Attorney General, Secretary Mollin said. He added that statements by members of the committee since their return have been to the effect that they were convinced that the foot-and-mouth disease in cattle in South America constitutes a real threat to the health of our livestock.

Foot-and-mouth disease was found wherever cattle were found in Argentina, according to advices from President Brock, Mollin said, and he and the other members of the committee were unanimous in the opinion that the sanitary embargo, long maintained against Argentina and all other countries—some fifty-odd in all—which harbor foot-and-mouth disease, should be maintained in full force and effect, and they so advised Washington officials immediately upon their return to this country.

The committee found, according to President Brock, that not only was foot-and-mouth disease prevalent, but that cattle and sheep scab were common and that little effort was made to control any of these diseases and no effort to stamp them out.

Another member of the committee, Howard Hill of Iowa, said that the party saw evidence of foot-and-mouth disease on every one of the cattle ranches visited in Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil. He furthermore said he saw no evidence of any effort to control the disease. "One operator of an estancia in Uruguay told us that we should take every precaution against the disease if our cattle are now free of it," he said. Harry Terrell, also a member of the 5-man committee, agreed with Hill's remarks.

Dr. T. W. Schultz, another member of the committee, said that "the Argentine leaders must be confronted with the facts of foot-and-mouth as a disease. They need to be told to quit talking discrimination and get to work and clean up their disease-ridden, infected herds. They have done and are doing nothing."

The executive committee of the American National Livestock Association, meeting in Colorado Springs on Saturday, July 19, after listening to a detailed explanation by President Brock of his trip to Argentina adopted a resolution declaring that the opinion of the Attorney General "violates the plain meaning of the Tariff Act of 1930, is contrary to the long-established policy of our Bureau of Animal Industry, and establishes a very dangerous precedent."

The resolution ended in this fashion: "Resolved, That we condemn this effort as a subterfuge to break down the sanitary embargo by administrative action, though the matter of the Argentine sanitary convention is now pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; and be it further resolved that we deplore the tactics employed in allowing the facts of the action taken to become known here only by press despatch from Argentina many weeks after the opinion was given."

"The misleading, inaccurate statement referred to, similar to many which have emanated from Buenos Aires," Mollin declared, "indicates that Argentina will go to any length in attempting to force beef from territory infected with disease onto the markets of the United States."

Obligation to the Public of Motion-Picture Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald on July 31, 1941, entitled "The Public Wants Entertainment and Not Propaganda."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 31, 1941]

IN THE NEWS—THE PUBLIC WANTS ENTERTAINMENT AND NOT PROPAGANDA

Moving-picture producers are wondering what is the matter with the moving-picture business.

Mr. Will Hayes has told them, and told them truthfully.

The facts are that, as a rule, the producers are making pictures for their own gratification and not for the enjoyment of the public.

Consequently, the producers are seeing the pictures and the people are not.

Mr. Hays very frankly says:

"When the public lays down its money at the box office it is primarily for entertainment.

"Those who demand that the screen subordinate its wholesome function of recreation for any cause, however sincere, are sadly mistaken. Significance is not achieved at the expense of entertainment.

"There are those who would use the screen to bemuse rather than to amuse the American public.

"The screen has no room for such propaganda."

This columnist has often ventured softly to intimate the same thing.

But, in the first place, he does not speak with the authority of Mr. Hays.

And in the second place, while he is modestly and moderately interested in the cinema business, he is primarily a publisher and nobody is supposed by moving-picture producers to know anything about popular taste and sentiment except moving-picture producers.

The fact that they have fallen off their high horse of infallibility with some force and frequency does not alter this opinion of theirs in the slightest degree.

It is not pleasant to level even the gentlest and kindliest and best intentioned criticism at fine people and close friends—especially when you sympathize with their sentiments and appreciate the naturalness and reasonableness of their impulses.

But moving-picture producers, like publishers, are in the business of serving the public and must consider the desires and feelings of the public, and also must consider the essential objectives of their industry.

The primary purpose of the moving picture is to entertain the public—to instruct and uplift the public, too, in cultural matters, but not to force down the public's throat a lot of preachment and propaganda which interest the producer but do not interest the public—which express the intense feelings and earnest advocacies of the producer, but which are not welcomed by the public and are often silently but deeply resented.

Speaking as a publisher, this columnist would assert without qualification that if newspapers and magazines were conducted on a similar basis they would not merely have "something the matter with them"—they would cease to exist.

A newspaper, for instance, has a department for the expression of opinion and usually in that department there is a variety of opinion from various contributors.

An editor who is halfway entitled to the name knows that he has to keep the news free from the color of his correspondents' opinion or his own opinion.

The plan and purpose of 95 percent of the space of his paper is to interest and inform and entertain his readers.

The remaining 5 percent of his space is to tell his readers what he thinks but also what other people think.

He must be fair.

He must be impartial.

He must be accurate even in his department of opinion.

Otherwise he has no influence.

And worse than that—otherwise he has no interest.

The screen is even less didactic than the magazine or the newspaper.

Its primary object, its function for which it receives public support, is entertainment.

The moving picture is presented to the public for the most part in the late afternoon and in the evening.

The people, weary from the day's work, go to the picture theater for relaxation—for entertainment and amusement.

Mr. Producer, they do not care what your opinions are, they do not want to be bored by them.

If the people do not want to read the opinions of a newspaper and its varied contributors they can turn to another page, but if they do not want to listen, look, and be bored by your opinions all they can do is to stay at home—and that they are doing to an entirely unnecessary degree.

You, Mr. Producer, are using your great medium of entertainment and cultural uplift for much less worthy purposes and for much less acceptable product.

You are dulling the edge of your fine and useful blades.

You are using your razor as a can opener.

It is a definite mistake.

Mr. Hays is emphatically right.

You will ruin your razor.

You are likely to cut a thumb off in the process and after all is said and done you are not going to be able to open the can.

The people are not going to be influenced by your propaganda or by anybody else's.

The whole country has been saturated with propaganda for a year.

Millions of dollars—yes, billions—have been spent to try to influence the American people into war.

Yet, according to every poll that has been taken, some 80 percent of the people have been on every occasion and still remain absolutely and obstinately opposed to war.

As a matter of fact, the people are getting sore about the matter and incensed at any individuals or agencies that try to get them into war.

In this situation you, Mr. Producer, come along with your propaganda—and not very subtle propaganda—and invite the full force of public dissent and displeasure.

Maybe your columnist is wrong, but not through any lack of kindly interest and good will.

Maybe Will Hays is wrong, too.

But he is a pretty wise guy and you retain him to advise you intelligently, and this he has consistently done.

Yes; we all realize that you know your business and that you know better than anybody the tastes and requirements of the public.

We are all willing to admit that you may be right.

But if you are right, for goodness sake, stop "bellyaching" about the troubles of the moving-picture business.

If you are the doctors, cure the patient.

Importations of Argentine Beef

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM AMERICAN CATTLE PRODUCER

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the American Cattle Producer relating to attempts being made to avoid the ban on importations of Argentine beef.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Cattle Producer of August 1941]

TIERRA DEL FUEGO

For several months past the ingenious diplomats of the Argentine Republic have been racking their brains for some new subterfuge by which to evade, partially at least, the plain intent and purpose of the embargo provision of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act. From past experience they know that they have only to suggest it to the international ring in the State Department to have them accept it as their own.

The most astounding idea they have yet hit upon was that Tierra del Fuego, the island province of Argentina which lies just across the Strait of Magellan from the mainland, was a separate country and that therefore it was entitled to separate treatment under the embargo provisions of the tariff act. Accordingly, the idea was passed along to the State Department, which, of course, true to form, accepted it, and immediately the wheels of the governmental machinery were put into motion to grind out an opinion from the Attorney General in line with the suggestion of the South American diplomats. This opinion, written on May 16, did not come to light in this country until June 27, on receipt of a dispatch from Buenos Aires.

To say that the livestock industry and the country in general were amazed is to belittle the word. While we have known that the State Department has worked hand in glove with Argentine representatives in an effort to find some way to break down our tariff barriers and our sanitary embargo, up to the present time they have confined themselves within the limits of existing law, and this is the first time the law has been openly flouted and a device employed which to say the least is a shady one.

When the storm first broke in Washington, Acting Secretary Welles hastened to announce that this method had been taken to heal Argentina's wounded pride, and that actually there would be no importations of lamb from that province. A few days later, however, Argentina advices indicated that some 9,000,000 pounds of lamb and mutton were awaiting shipment to the United States, and in 2 or 3 weeks came information from other Argentines expressing their glee at the raising of the ban against importations of beef. It has never been claimed that there are any export cattle in Tierra del Fuego, and hence the dispatch just referred to probably gives the key to what is really in their minds.

When President Brock, of the American National Live Stock Association, returned from Argentina there were frequent discussions on the boat with an attaché of the Argentine Government. During one of these discussions a young Argentine headed for the United States to attend college observed that what they most wanted was to have some spot in Argentina declared clean. As he naively put it, "We want some place that we can ship our cattle so that they can be exported to the United States."

A group of influential western Senators immediately rallied to the defense of the livestock industry. They have protested vigorously to Secretary Wickard, to Acting Secretary Welles, to the Attorney General's office, and to Dr. John R. Mohler, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry. Their protests have been actively supported by representations made in Washington by Secretary Mollin and by communications which are going to Washington daily from livestock associations, sanitary associations, and many individual stockmen.

As a consequence, the Attorney General's office has announced that on the basis of new information received the matter is being reconsidered, while Secretary Wickard announces he is restudying the matter. In addition, it is now clearly understood that the bars are still up and that no importations will be accepted from Tierra del Fuego until Secretary Wickard officially notifies the Secretary of the Treasury that this particular province is not infected with foot-and-mouth disease and that it is safe to accept shipments therefrom. In view of the fact that we are advised that beef is being shipped to Tierra del Fuego for consumption from infected portions of Argentina and that bucks for breeding purposes are likewise shipped to southern Patagonia and Tierra del Fuego from infected herds, it seems unlikely that Secretary Wickard will run the risk of declaring Tierra del Fuego a clean territory.

It would seem that this foolishness has gone about far enough. For weeks propaganda was kept up to show that Argentina was in a desperate condition due to restricted shipping outlet caused by the war. The Brock committee has definitely proved this propaganda to be false. The coolers in Brazil, Uruguay, and Argentina were all practically empty, according to the committee's report, and packers had to ride far into the hills to secure beef for urgent European and African contracts. It is therefore clearly apparent that Argentina has deliberately tried to make capital of the war emergency as a means of breaking down our sanitary embargo and that the State Department international ring has worked closely with them in the attempt.

Argentina's purpose is clear. The United States market is well above the English market, and the Argentines would naturally prefer to sell where they can get the most money. The industry in Argentina, however, is and has been prosperous in recent years, much more so than here in the United States for the same period of time. There is no least excuse for the tactics that are being employed to break down the sanitary embargo. On the contrary, it seems inconceivable that responsible officials with the welfare of this country in mind (even if they have no consideration for the livestock industry) would deliberately run the risk of contaminating our herds and flocks with foot-and-mouth disease at such a critical time. Whatever obligation we owe to Argentina in connection with the emergency hemisphere defense plans is an obligation of the entire United States. It cannot and should not be met alone by the livestock industry.

We have not previously referred to the fact that the effort is a deliberate violation of the clear understanding given to the legislative committee of the American National Live Stock Association last February when the famous canned beef deal was made. We deplore this breach of trust. What has Argentina done for the United States that the State Department can afford to break faith with the livestock producers of this country and to run the risks involved as shown above?

Secretaries Stimson and Knox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of August 1, 1941, entitled "Stimson and Knox Should Get Out," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of August 1, 1941]

STIMSON AND KNOX SHOULD GET OUT

Secretary Stimson of the War Department has apologized to Senator WHEELER for saying that the Senator was "near the line of subversive activities against the United States, if not treason" in sending out anti-war post cards, some of which were forwarded from home addresses to men in the Army.

Senator WHEELER, when defamed by intolerable reflections upon his loyalty, explained to the Senate that the names of the persons to whom the cards were sent were obtained from a commercial firm and that the matter was prepared before the question of the military term of service was raised. Mr. Stimson had accused the Senator of addressing the soldiers directly and thus spreading discontent in the Army. The Senate gave the Senator from Montana a demonstration of its confidence in him and it gave Mr. Stimson a demonstration of its lack of confidence in the Secretary of War.

There is a story in Washington that Stimson was guilty more of being a chump than a maligner. The statement he issued regarding WHEELER is reported to have come out of the White House and to have been written by Stephen Early of the secretariat. If that's true, then Stimson was only the proxy voice as he has been on occasions before. He was the tool for scandal. The episode should close the career of the present Secretary of War. No one in the Senate would undertake to defend him. He is an ineffective and unwise old man.

Stimson was appointed to the War Department just as Frank Knox, the other Republican, was appointed to the Navy Department, as a part of the political conspiracy topped off by the nomination of Wendell Willkie to make the phony campaign against the third-term candidate.

Mr. Roosevelt was trying to create the impression that there was only one ticket in the election and that was truer than the people at the time knew. They didn't know that he had a proxy on the Republican ticket, although they could see through the trick of putting two Republicans in his Cabinet as he was about to break down the limitation of tenure in office.

Vanity or other motives prompted these two ancient chair warmers to disregard their party in their declining years and carry their infirmities of judgment into two important posts which neither was at all competent to fill. Their incompetence didn't disturb Mr. Roosevelt. Incompetence never does.

Both these ancient political relics of a discreditable episode should resign. Stimson is a serious handicap to the Army which Mr. Roosevelt is trying to send into the war he is determined to have, and Knox—who was a part of the Willkie nomination conspiracy—doesn't know a battleship from a shuttlecock. He is making the Navy ridiculous.

Mr. Roosevelt is fishing in troubled waters. He should have a real Secretary of War and a real Secretary of the Navy. He needs more than phonograph records of White House speeches in both jobs.

Sale of Aluminum to Russia

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I crossed this country 2 or 3 days ago and in every city I saw piled up scrap aluminum that the Boy Scouts and the women of this country have gathered together because there is a supposed scarcity of aluminum.

I call your attention to a brief statement in the Evening Star of last Saturday from Richmond, Va., in which Mr. Lewis Reynolds, vice president of the Reynolds Metals Co., states that he has sold 2,000,000 pounds of aluminum to Russia because he had no means of disposing of it, and he sold it for less than the regular price.

I hope that all Members will read this article, which is as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 2, 1941]

REYNOLDS PLANE TO SELL RUSSIA 2,000,000 POUNDS OF ALUMINUM

RICHMOND, VA., August 2.—J. Louis Reynolds, vice president of the Reynolds Metal Co., said today negotiations for sale of approximately 2,000,000 pounds of aluminum to Russia had been completed except for approval by the Office of Production Management and the State Department.

The metal, originally destined for France, has been stored in New Jersey since June 1940.

The Reynolds company repurchased about 3,000,000 pounds of the aluminum after the fall of France and sold about one-third after circularizing its customers and asking the O. P. M. to circularize prospective buyers. The metal was offered, Mr. Reynolds said, at prices below the company's regular price lists.

The 2,000,000 pounds sought by Russia is worth approximately $500,000 and is sufficient to make about 200 medium-size bombers, Mr. Reynolds said.

The company, which has expanded its facilities for the production of aluminum during the past year will be turning out finished aluminum at the rate of 15,000,000 to 17,000,000 pounds a month by this time next year, compared to about 4,000,000 pounds produced last month, the vice president said.

Price-Control Legislation

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to be a political economist, but I have read a lot and seen a lot and heard a lot about price control and the attempts which have been made to enforce it since days beyond which the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. It never has worked well. Attempts to enforce it have been responsible for bloodshed and revolution time and again. It will not work alone.

As a remedy for the ills of the body politic, price control alone is as effective as a mustard plaster on a gas heater. It may cover a hole or stop a leak temporarily, tell it is dried out and tried out, but it is too late when it has to be offered as a remedy. The patient will not respond.

The proposed price-control law is no answer to the inflation problem. Standing alone it will not solve anything much.

That there can be no price control without wage control is too elementary and axiomatic a proposition to require demonstration. To say that we can avoid direct control of wages is wishful thinking. It is the only way an upward tendency of costs can be controlled. A general advance in wages, like an advance in the cost of living, means general inflation.

It is one thing to enact a law and two things to administer and enforce it. A lop-sided law falls as it trips over its own feet, and it gets nowhere except into trouble.

The time to think about price control and inflation was 6 years ago, when anybody who could see a hole through a ladder could see where we were headed. We tried to stop it, but the people were more interested in living off the Government than in prolonging their expectancy. I could take malicious pleasure in saying "I told you so" were it not for the millions of innocent taxpayers who are now about to be led to slaughter.

Realizing that if there is to be price control, the tax base must be broadened, and the taxpayers within the lower-income brackets must be included, the President so advised the Ways and Means Committee, whose first concern seems to be to find the easiest way to raise the necessary money, regardless of possible economic effect and notwithstanding the fact that the proposed bill leaves 95 percent of the people free of direct taxation. The committee's bill avoids taxation of ncome in lower-income brackets and centers tax increases on present payers. It is unjust and inequitable, but so are all tax bills.

There will be another bill. There will have to be.

The attempts of the committee to justify the inclusion of joint returns of man and wife are not convincing. To an old administrator of tax laws it would seem, practically, that if they were not killing, they were at least maiming, the goose "that lays the golden egg" and making her squawk.

There will be a tomorrow and a day of reckoning.

But to talk about price control, let me say that what the President did not suggest was the fact that if prices are to be controlled, so also will wages have to be, either by the same or another control board or authority. In fact, we are assured that there will be no attempt to freeze wage levels or to fix wage rates. There is to be a bar to fixing of major farm prices under parity.

Now, we can try to sail head-on into and against the bitter wind of experience if we will, but just as sure as fate we will be blown out of the water, wrecked, and economically sunk unless we realize that price control and wage control go hand in hand. It is probably true that either prices must be controlled or "the country will experience a runaway inflation." If control is the ultimatum, the runaway is on the way.

To attempt to control prices and not to control labor costs involves economic consequences of the most far-reaching nature and grave disturbance of the social order in time of peace or in time of war. Price control without wage control just will not operate, except disastrously, in a democracy any more than in an autocracy. The control of either should never be delegated by Congress to anybody other than to a committee of its own creation. Such action as is taken or had should be that of the people through their representatives in Congress, who should reserve to Congress, as such representatives, complete control, in the final analysis, of the attempt to exercise control of either or both prices and wages.

We are facing an inflation that has been superinduced by the foolish and unwise policies of this administration, but that does not relieve us from our responsibility to save ourselves insofar as it may be possible so to do.

Is price control a way out? Not without wage control, and possibly not then. We could broaden the tax base as has been suggested. Why not? No real satisfactory answer which takes into consideration our economic situation from all angles has been offered by anybody.

"Full control of prices or inflation" should read "full control of prices and wages, and inflation anyway," but possibly modified. There is no use trying to fool ourselves or in being fooled any longer.

That the proposed price-control law, when and if enacted, will not of itself "be an answer to the rising inflation problem; will not solve anything much," was well said by the man or men who are responsible for the column in the United States News called Trend of American Business. It is the truth.

Facing Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the caption "Facing facts" or "Being realistic," we are often told that, if England falls, America will be next and that, to save ourselves, we must give every possible aid to England. Those who so suggest often mean that we must send an armed force to aid her wherever her rulers may think we can help.

The war party in Washington and elsewhere tells us that we are lost unless we destroy Hitler and while, up to this time, they and the administration have denied that they intend to send an armed force to Europe, that denial stands contradicted by the facts.

Let me repeat just what three British spokesmen recently said. A Member of Parliament, Mr. Wedgwood, of Wedgwood crockery fame, here to sell the war and crockery to us, after stating that we were in the war "up to our necks" and that we better get a sensible Congress and get going, said, "The trouble with you Americans is that you are afraid to assume responsibility," and then said that this war was our war.

On July 4, last, the United Press contained this statement:

Gen. Sir Archibald P. Wavell, British commander in chief in the Middle East, was quoted as follows in an interview at Cairo with Harold Denny, of the New York Times: "Can you win the war without America's full-scale participation?" General Wavell answered with a slow shake of his head, then

he said, "We shall have to have airplanes, tanks, munitions, transport, and finally men."

"When?

"The sooner the better," was the reply, "but that depends on when you are ready, doesn't it? I suppose when you get into all-out production you will be able to equip any number of men for anywhere in the world."

On July 7, the United Press contained the following statement:

Lt. Gen. Sir. Claude Auchinleck, new British Middle East commander, said that American manpower eventually would be just as necessary "to win the war properly" as it was in the World War.

The administration intends to build up an army to send wherever Britain may demand.

So let us face facts. Let us be realistic and let us decide whether we would send a million or more American men to fight under a British board of strategy in Iceland, in Russia, to invade Germany, to maintain British interests in China.

Nothing is gained by dodging the issue and the only question should be how can we best defend America. It is my contention that we can best defend America by preparing for national defense here, by conserving our resources, including manpower, by putting our manufacturing plants in order, by making our Navy, if possible, invincible, and by ringing our homeland with airports and weapons of defense, including aircraft.

THIRTY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS

Enthusiastically the House passed the $8,000,000,000 so-called defense bill, which included $35,000,000 for a building for War Department employees in Virginia. Inevitably, this must be followed by appropriations of other millions for either housing for such employees or a bridge or tunnel across or under the Potomac. Sober and second thought, induced someone in the administration to now suggest the size and cost of the building be reduced by half. Sometime Congress may learn that first things should come first, especially when war confronts us.

WHEAT

Wheat farmers who complied with the A. A. A. program are pledged to plant a specified number of acres. Where farmers sowed acreage in excess of the agreement the law requires the payment of a penalty of 49 cents a bushel, even though the yield was no more than what might normally have been expected from a quota acreage. The Senate passed an amendment to waive the penalty on all wheat up to the normal acreage production limit when the excess wheat was used on the farm for livestock feeding or other farm purposes.

COTTON

As a result of the Government cotton program the Government has become the owner of something over 6,000,000 bales of cotton. Do you know that since the second World War the price has gone up, but when the Government began to sell its stored cotton the cotton growers protested, and the Senate approved legislation prohibiting the sale of this Government cotton during the European war? So once more the taxpayers will hold the bag on the Government cotton purchases.

THE TAX BILL

While everyone else is being taxed, the Government again extends special privileges to labor unions. The Naval Affairs Committee recently sent out questionnaires, and from the replies received—105 from A. F. of L. and 45 from C. I. O.—it appears that on September 1, 1939, the total assets of these unions was $38,161,000. On March 31, this year, and undoubtedly because of the national emergency, the strikes to which support has been given by the present administration, and the organizing campaigns carried on in national-defense industries, the total assets had increased to $42,000,000—$11,000,000 of which, or 12 percent, was an increase in the assets of the A. F. of L. and $4,182,000, or 64 percent, was an increase shown in the assets of the C. I. O.

Just why these millions should escape taxation when every other business or industrial corporation, and practically every individual pays, in some form, a tax to the Federal Government, will not be understood by the average citizen. This special favoritism is understood by some of us here in Washington who know that, in return for favors granted, some unions, like the C. I. O., which contributed more than $700,000 to one of Roosevelt's campaigns, enthusiastically support the administration, which in turn extends favors, through the N. L. R. B., the National Defense Mediation Board, the Labor Department, and now the Treasury Department, to the unions.

In Memoriam—M. Michael Edelstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

RADIO ADDRESSES OF HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, OF NEW YORK, AND EMANUEL LEWIS GREENE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio addresses of Emanuel Lewis Greene and myself over station WOV, July 27, 1941.

BY THE CHAIRMAN, EMANUEL LEWIS GREENE

I should like to express my heartfelt thanks to this public-spirited radio station, WOV, for granting its facilities to the M. Michael Edelstein Memorial Foundation. But while thankful, I cannot say that it gives me great pleasure to be present on such an occasion. I should prefer, as would millions of others, to be paying honor to the living Michael Edelstein. There would be such tremendous satisfaction if I knew, that after the various speeches, I'd be able to walk over to one whom I was honored to call friend, and say, "You're doing swell, Congressman." There's nothing in this world I'd rather be able to do. But, if that's to be denied me, I must not let grief blind me to the great work that lies ahead. Although I am most humbly aware of my many limitations, I accept the trust placed in me by the Congressman's army of admirers who earnestly desire that "he shall not have died in vain."

I had the great privilege of assisting the Congressman while he was among us. How much work he took upon himself, how much responsibility he shouldered, how unquestioningly he gave of himself beyond the requirements of his office, how unstintingly he served his fellow man beyond the confines of a district—all this I saw. And my heart was heavy as I realized that no creature of flesh and blood could long stand such a grueling pace. My mind was troubled as I saw this great man, this unselfish servant of the people, ignoring his own needs in his concern over the needs of his fellow man. I pleaded with him to show himself a little consideration—to relax, if only for an occasional week-end. But instead of resting, he poured out to me all that rankled in his heart. He pointed out the dangers that were menacing the Nation. Under such conditions, he refused to spare himself. These troubled times, he said, called for eternal vigilance, without which liberty is a hollow shell. With such turmoil in his heart, no wonder my pleas fell on deaf ears. The Congressman drove himself harder and harder—and liberty's gain is our loss.

Death may have cut short his career, but there is no reason for it to affect the influence for good which motivated his every act. Such a person as M. Michael Edelstein doesn't really die; in the ultimate significance of that word, "life," he remains as vital in the spirit as ever he was in the flesh. Only now, in the face of his premature departure, the fulfillment of his ideals is left to other hands. To be entrusted with any part of the cause to which he gave so fully is a privilege which we, the survivors, accept with profound humility. May we, the living, prove worthy of his great sacrifice.

As the means of best perpetuating his principles and ideals, the many admirers of the late Congressman have founded the M. Michael Edelstein Memorial Foundation, to raise a fund to be used for the betterment of human welfare. There can be no more fitting tribute to the man whose untimely passing has been such an irreparable loss to his family, his friends, his congregation, his profession, his constituents, his Nation, and, beyond that, to all believers in democracy and tolerance. God grant that our combined efforts should not fall too far short of the glorious goal that M. Michael Edelstein had set for himself.

We have with us this evening one who was close to the late Congressman, one who fought side by side with him in the legislative halls of our Nation, and one who will see that his ideals will gain strength and momentum toward that better United States of America which we all envision. I know that you are eager to hear from one so eminent. Therefore, ladies and gentlemen, I proudly present the Honorable SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, Congressman from New York City's Twelfth District, who came here especially from his many labors in Washington, D. C., to tell you about your friend, our friend, and liberty's friend, M. Michael Edelstein:

If ever a man deserved the admiration of his fellow citizens for his sincerity and devotion to duty, such a man was Michael Edelstein, a man who gave his life as a martyr to the cause of tolerance, liberty, and democracy.

Mike Edelstein was a product of the East Side of the city of New York. It was here where he grew up, and it was here where he came in contact with the many citizens from all walks of life who came to him for assistance. His life centered around his district, and in the democratic club of his district he would receive callers all day long, and far into the wee hours of the morning. People came to him with all kinds of trouble, both personal and business.

He was a lawyer by profession and, as such, was familiar with human life from all of its angles. The same knowledge of human life which he obtained in his profession he put into practical application, in his conduct in the club.

Mike Edelstein was one of the best-known men in the city. Representing as he did the many poor people who came to him for assistance and guidance, he necessarily enlisted for their support many men who were high up in the life of this community. Judges, Governors, even the President of the United States received calls from Mike Edelstein on behalf of his constituents. Mike was tireless in his work, conscientious in his duties, persistent in his efforts. It was because of the combination of these qualities that he was able to accomplish for his constituents all the good which he brought into their lives.

Mike Edelstein came to Congress only a year or so ago, but with the background of his work and attention to the duties of a district leader. He conducted as a Congressman the same work which he had been engaged in for years, helping the poor and unfortunate, and making their lives easier.

When accusations were made against the people of the Jewish race, Mike Edelstein could not let them go unchallenged. He took the floor. He branded as fabrications this slander against the Jewish race. He became indignant. He grew eloquent and finally collapsed and died.

There had not been many people of such character and sincerity. Michael Edelstein is a shining example of devotion to truth and making the supreme sacrifice in the cause of truth and justice.

I hope that Edelstein's death was not in vain. I hope that by taking the floor in defense of his people he was able to convince this country of the falsity of the charges which were leveled against the Jews. Michael Edelstein proved by his life and achievements that just as he was sincere and loyal, so was the people he represented. He proved by his devotion to duty that other men of his race are likewise devoted to duty. He proved by attacking injustice that others of his race will not tolerate any injustice. He proved by his ability that others as able as he are ready to take up the torch where it was dropped.

Let us pause for a moment and discuss the feelings of the average American as he is stunned by the death of this great leader. The American Commonwealth was founded on the principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and on the principle that all men are created equal. This is a community which makes no distinction of race or religion, a community which gives to its citizens equal protection of the law.

Every fair-minded person knows that there is no truth or substance or any intelligent basis for the many anti-Semitic charges leveled against the people of the Jewish race, and particularly the Jewish citizens of the United States. In times of stress, when governments are on the lookout for scapegoats, some group or particular people are singled out for persecution. When Germany lost the war the people of that country sought to fasten the blame for it on the inoffensive Jewish population of Germany, and in times of economic stress the Jews have been blamed in many countries of the world as being responsible for the misfortunes of others. But just because blame is cast upon one race, it does not mean that fair-minded people should follow this type of propaganda. It surely has no place in the United States which is erected on the principles of American equality, and which boasts of being the haven for the oppressed from all lands.

At the end of the World War people from many countries came to this country to escape persecution, and we have extended a welcome hand to refugees from many lands enabling them to become American citizens and partake of the blessings of American liberty. Men like Edelstein have labored for the welfare of all races, and in the congressional district which he represented one could find inhabitants of many racial strains. Mike Edelstein gave his services to humanity irrespective of race, and it did not make any difference to him what a man was as long as he was honest and law-abiding and devoted to American institutions.

In honoring the memory of Congressman Edelstein, we honor the memory of a champion for truth and justice. In a democracy like ours we must never forget that only by following the dictates of truth and justice can liberty prevail. Nations have lost their liberty because they were not vigilant, and because they took their democracy for granted. We cannot do so. We must learn that it is necessary to speak again and again without let-up about the blessings of American liberty, if we wish to preserve this race for our children and there descendants. We must not forget that bigotry and intolerance will raise their heads from time to time and seek to engulf our democracy in trouble. Whenever such a situation should arise, men like Mike Edelstein will come to the fore and proclaim to the whole world that America is not only a country based upon liberty but a country which will forever protect and preserve this Nation.

Price-Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

LETTER OF HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG, OF TEXAS, TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] to the Department of Agriculture:

JULY 31, 1941.

Mr. GROVER C. HILL,
Assistant Secretary, The United States Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GROVER: Enclosed you will find copy of a telegram sent to me and signed by some good friends of mine and which is self explanatory.

This telegram is merely one of a great number of communications from farmers, ginners, and interested citizens in my district concerning their feelings with reference to the price-fixing recommendations recently sent to Congress by the President. Their uncertainty is occasioned primarily because of the change in conditions which render the original parity figure both obsolete and unfair with reference to cotton in particular.

I am transmitting the message to you and through you to the proper authorities in the Department of Agriculture, with the hope that that great Department will do its part on behalf of the farmers.

The maintenance of good credit on the part of the Government of the United States is of most vital importance today—now, more than ever before, and the most important stone in the foundation which supports the entire credit structure, both private and governmental, is made up of those elements which contribute to the maintenance of the proper balance between the earning power of real property and its evaluation for taxable purposes and for purposes of collateral. Unless something is done to maintain a reasonable earning power at least a little above cost, the farmers of the Southland will be unable to meet their land notes.

This was exactly the situation which finally occurred in Germany, and was the basis for Hitler's rise to power. As a student of government, I am considerably alarmed over the inevitable results of trends such as the one reflected by this telegram, as I have already said.

If you will check up on the liquidation of the Landshaft Banking System (this was the farm credit system which was set up in Germany) you will find that government money took the place of money of the members and stockholders in this system. In short, the Landshaft Banking System was turned into State capitalism and made the German Government the holder of enforceable liens on approximately 95 percent of the real property in Germany. When this was accomplished, Hitler rose to power and took charge.

At this juncture, I want to assure you, and whoever may read this letter that there is no intention contained herein, or in my mind to charge anyone with predetermined or deliberated effort, looking toward the establishment of a socialistic state, or to convert our government from a representative democracy into any one of the various forms which are referred to, for brevity's sake, as "isms."

Keeping this in mind, however, you will doubtless recall that in 1940, a bill came before the House Committee on Agriculture, known as the Wheeler-Jones Bill, which had for its purpose the lowering of interest rates to the farmers of America below those now available through the Farm Credit set-up The authorship of this piece of legislation is known to me, and here, again, I repeat I make no accusation.

I must point out, however, that this bill to attain the low interest rates, provided for the outright purchase of all stock (in agricultural loan associations and Federal land banks) by the Government, to be paid for by appropriation out of the Treasury of the United States.

At the time this bill was drafted I am sure that its authors and backers did not realize that this procedure set up a system of state capitalism in the Farm Credit Administration.

The reason that this plan (without regard to its mechanics) was considered and presented is found in the then low prices for agricultural commodities and the consequent inability of the farmers to meet their interest on their notes or make payments on the principal thereof. In short, the earning power of the farmers in the use of their property was below the requirements of the collateral which they gave for credit extended to them.

Now, with reference to the telegram, it should be perfectly clear that the parity price or figure used during the consideration and enactment of the Agricultural Adjustment Act is today obsolete because of mounting costs in the field of production of articles which the farmer must buy if he proposes to live as other folks, under our present-day American standards. For instance, there has been no ceiling whatsoever proposed with reference to the wages of organized labor. There has never been any serious contention that their demands for increases might be unreasonable, even though in many instances they have been made without reference to the industry which employs them.

The wages of money are generally referred to as interest, which, like the wages of labor, can be too high just as readily as they can be too low. The maintenance of a living wage by dispassionate assay as a part of the general picture is equal in importance to the maintenance of a fair and just interest rate in a nation where so much depends upon credit. So that, old friend, in this appeal to you for assistance, I am hoping that the great Department of Agriculture will remem-

ber that, with reference to cotton, for instance, the parity figure to be set, if the price-control legislation goes through, must in all events be at least 20 cents. There should likewise be, in my opinion, some elasticity, permitting in the case of unpredictable events, such as a still greater increase in costs, which would permit the price-fixing administration to increase the price up to 22 cents.

I hope that the Department will back us up if this legislation goes through. Personally I have very serious doubts concerning either its wisdom or soundness.

With every good wish and the highest of personal regards and confidence, I am, as always,

Sincerely your friend,

RICHARD M. KLEBERG.

John B. Kelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

TWO EDITORIALS

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

RIGHT MAN FOR THE JOB

President Roosevelt, acting through Director of Civilian Defense LaGuardia, has picked the right man in appointing John B. Kelly as director of physical training in the Nation's civilian defense program.

Kelly is familiar with the need to "toughen up" America for national defense. Last fall the President asked Kelly to map a program for improving the national health. His recommendations were accepted by the President, although pressure of other duties kept the President from acting upon them.

Kelly is ideally suited to the job. One of the Nation's greatest athletes, he is at the same time an able organizer. Champion Olympic oarsman, war veteran, businessman, he still has found time to serve the community as Pennsylvania Secretary of Revenue and as chairman of the Democratic City Committee—a position he is now forced to yield for his new task.

And he exhibits the kind of health all of us would like to have. At 51, 21 years after he first won an Olympic rowing championship, he is still in perfect physical condition. He still rows regularly, plays golf and handball.

We wish him luck in making America strong for defense and for civilian life as well.

A CHAMPION ATHLETE FOR THE JOB

Both his business and political careers give Democratic City Chairman John B. Kelly valuable experience and background for his new job as national director of physical training, to which he has been appointed at the instance of Mayor LaGuardia in his capacity as Director of Civilian Defense.

But besides the organizing abilities Mr. Kelly undoubtedly possesses, he has an equally valuable asset. Past 51, there are few men anywhere near that area of life who can so well measure up to the athletic ideal as Jack Kelly. As a matter of fact, there are many younger men who might envy Mr. Kelly his present condition of health and fitness.

There is ample justification for his own comment yesterday that the health of young men in America is "in a shocking condition." The draft figures eloquently demonstrate its truth. Some facts of Jack Kelly's own life attest that this needn't be so.

By his own account he was a skinny youth when he became interested in rowing and got his chance to learn how on the Schuylkill. But the Kelly who became world champion oarsman was no stripling. He was 31 years old when he swept over the line at Antwerp, in 1920, ahead of Beresford, winner of the Diamond Sculls, and clinched his world title.

Mr. Kelly is stepping out of politics "for the duration." Even his opponents, who have admired his fighting qualities and his sportsmanship, may look upon that with greater regret than Mr. Kelly himself may feel. But he is taking up a task of immense usefulness.

It is one that calls for the qualities of a champion. The President and Mr. LaGuardia made a good choice.

Congress Should Awaken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

STATEMENT OF CATHRINE CURTIS, NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF WOMEN INVESTORS IN AMERICA, INC.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following statement from Cathrine Curtis, National Director of Women Investors In America, Inc., should awaken every true Representative of the people to a program which is moving so rapidly that only prompt and vigorous action will prevent the complete establishment of a dictatorship here:

NEWS CENSORSHIP CONCEALED IN PROPERTY-SEIZURE MEASURE—BILL ALSO CAN END PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERSHIP, WOMAN LEADER CHARGES

WASHINGTON, August 3.—Charging the property-seizure bill, S. 1579, combined with the newly expanded war-materials' list of the export-control office may sound the death knell of free speech and private property ownership in this country, Cathrine Curtis, national director of Women Investors In America, Inc., today called on Congress to return the bill to committee for further study and consideration. The House Military Affairs Committee, through its chairman, ANDREW J. MAY, of Kentucky, reported the bill to the House Friday after hearing only one witness, Assistant Secretary of War Patterson.

The bill will legalize the unlimited emergency declaration issued by the President May 27 and empowering him to requisition the use of any military or naval equipment, supplies, or munitions, or component parts thereof, or machinery, tools, or materials necessary for the manufacture, servicing, or operation of such equipment whenever he determines such action is necessary to the national-defense program. Maintaining that the export-control list—which was hurriedly expanded as the property-seizure bill was being rushed through the Senate—can be used to determine what constitutes "component parts" of such military supplies, etc., Miss Curtis points out this list now includes newspapers, books, magazines, and other publications, as well as newsprint, all types of printing paper and inks, cuts, engravings, and other materials vitally important to newspaper and printing production.

"Not only does this bill threaten the jobs and existence of nearly 6,000,000 workers and the 200,000 small manufacturing plants employing them, it now assumes the aspect of an iron-clad censorship control measure being rushed through Congress under guise of preventing a few second-hand dealers from profiteering in second-hand tools and equipment," Miss Curtis said in her statement. "If the bill becomes law it can be used—together with the export control list—effectively to suppress all printed opposition to the war-involvement program, including publication by newspapers of information which those in power do not wish made available to the public, as well as to end the right privately to own property in this country.

"This is the second time within a week the House Military Affairs Committee has taken such summary action relative to important legislation—hearing only Government witnesses and practically refusing to permit representatives of the people to testify. The last occasion was in the case of hearings on proposals to extend the service of men in the draft where—after protest—the committee finally did reopen its hearings on that measure and to listen to the statements of mothers and fathers of draftees now in camp.

"There are many things connected with apparent attempts to rush this property-seizure legislation through that should be brought to the attention of the public," she said. "In the first place, in testifying before this same committee some weeks ago, Assistant Secretary of War Patterson admitted there now are laws on the statute books permitting seizure of plants and equipment needed in the national-defense program. He also admitted there is no law now existent permitting seizure of personal property.

"It is interesting to note in this connection that—despite the insistence of those favoring the legislation that it does not grant power to seize personal property—the House committee added an amendment to the bill specifying that the personal firearms of citizens could not be seized under it. If there is no power to seize personal property concealed in this bill, why did the committee deem it advisable to add that amendment?

"Continually during Senate committee hearings on this bill, the question was asked as to what might be considered 'component parts' of military equipment and supplies—but no definite answer was offered by its proponents. Now we find an alarming similarity between the wording of this measure and that of the order issued late last month by the Export Control office expanding the number of items that may be considered military supplies, equipment, ammunition or the component parts thereof. It reads:

" 'Military equipment, or component parts thereof, or machinery, tools, or materials, or supplies necessary for the manufacture, servicing or operation thereof * * *.'

"That list now includes newspapers, books, magazines and other publications; newsprint, all types of printing paper and inks; cuts, engravings and other materials required to produce newspapers or booklets. In fact it includes almost every type of article imaginable—including the bathtub and kitchen sink!

"The chronology of this measure is most interesting. The Senate Military Affairs Committee reached an agreement as to its wording about 4 o'clock on July 17. The President issued a proclamation ordering an expansion of the war materials and supplies export control list at 4:30 o'clock the same afternoon—but the order was not published until July 19.

"Senator A. B. CHANDLER, of Kentucky, filed the Senate Committee's report with the Senate Clerk while that body was not in session on July 18. The following day, the Administrator of Export Control—acting under

authority of the President's proclamation of July 17—issued the new list—but did not file it until 10:06 o'clock on the morning of July 21 and it was not officially published until July 22—the day on which the Senate passed the bill after only a few hours debate.

"If there is no intent to suppress free speech in this country and to seize purely personal property for alleged national defense needs why all this hurried action on this bill—particularly since it is admitted there now is sufficient law to permit requisitioning materials and plants actually needed for defense purposes," Miss Curtis asked.

"The President alone is granted power under this bill to determine what constitutes component parts of military supplies. Will he use the newly expanded war materials list of the Export Control Office as his yardstick to determine what he can requisition under this bill if it becomes law?

"These are only a few of the questions to which Congress should obtain answers before it considers this legislation. If the House Military Affairs Committee had given notice of open hearings on this bill, considerable evidence would have been placed before it that would greatly assist Congress in obtaining these answers. The committee-hearing plan is an important part of our governmental system. Through it, the elected representatives of the people are given an opportunity to hear the testimony of their constituents—the people who are requested to provide the money for the support of government. Certainly they are entitled to be heard—in this case particularly—and Congress should refuse to consider this legislation at this time if it believes in Constitutional government and free speech."

The United States Repudiates Its Own Pan American Declaration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of July 26, 1941:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of July 26, 1941]

OUR FORGOTTEN NEUTRALITY

Flies in the ointment of pan-American solidarity, especially Argentina's sullen neutrality toward what its Government still calls the European war, require to be dealt with patiently. We need to remember that neutrality was the first position of the United States Government and the one it very urgently recommended to all its good neighbors in the south.

In September 1939 the 21 American republics sent delegates to a meeting in Panama City to discuss and establish upon common ground a complete and uniform pan-American neutrality. Nine countries sent their foreign ministers in person; the 12 others sent their best substitutes. The Government of the United States sent Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, with 1 assistant, 4 advisers, 1 press officer, and a secretary.

Mr. Welles said, "It is our common desire to take under consideration the complicated question of our rights and duties as neutrals, in view of the outbreak of general war in Europe."

Eight resolutions and declarations were adopted. The important one was the general declaration of neutrality. This was to "reaffirm the status of general neutrality of the American republics," and to that end they agreed, among other things, to:

"Prevent on their respective territories the enlistment of persons to serve in the military, naval, or air forces of the belligerents; the retaining or inducing of persons to go beyond their respective shores for the purpose of taking part in belligerent operations; the setting on foot of any military, naval, or aerial expedition in the interests of the belligerents; the fitting out, arming, or augmenting of the forces or armament of any ship or vessel to be employed in the service of one of the belligerents, to cruise or commit hostilities against another belligerent or its nationals or property," and, "with regard to belligerent warships, that not more than three at a time be admitted in their own ports or waters and in any case they shall not be allowed to remain more than 24 hours."

Compare the precise terms of that declaration with these lines from the President's report to Congress on the first 90 days of the lease-lend law:

"Allied ships are being repaired by us. Allied ships are being equipped by us to protect them from mines, and are being armed by us to protect them as much as possible against raiders. Naval vessels of Britain are being repaired by us, so that they can return quickly to their naval tasks. * * * With our natural resources, our productive capacity, and the genius of our people for mass production, we will help Britain to outstrip the Axis powers in munitions of war, and we will see to it that these munitions get to the places where they can be effectively used to weaken and defeat the aggressors."

The American republics were not consulted about the lease-lend law, although it was going to involve the Government of the United States in the war and involve indirectly the whole hemisphere. The Government of the United States alone departed from its neutrality, as it had a perfect sovereign right to do; but, on the other hand, the Government of Argentina and, for that matter, all the other American republics, have a perfect right to stand on the articles of Panama.

If You Can't Laugh, Cry; If You Don't Swear, Pray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it may be that we have been thinking about the new tax bill, which we just passed and which added $3,500,000,000 on top of the other taxes which you will pay this year.

Note this example: Under the present law, a single man, whose net income is $2,000, pays an income tax of $44. Under the new bill, he will pay $110.

Perhaps it will not make you laugh. It would not make you cry, if you knew that the levying of this new tax was getting us somewhere. During the 8 fiscal years from 1934 to 1941, your Uncle Sam took in $40,000,000,000, but he spent sixty-seven and one-half billions, which leaves him twenty-seven and one-half billions in the hole.

When this new tax money of $3,500,000,000 comes in and is added to all taxes which you will pay during the fiscal year which began July 1, 1941, and which will end June 30, 1942, the Government will still be shy, if we spend as planned on this year's business, something over ten billions.

You know, the administration is giving away the taxpayer's money right and left to China and Russia and others, and Congress has already appropriated, or authorized the expenditure, this year of something like fifty-two billion, and for the 12-month period which began on July 1, 1941, and which will end on June 30, 1942, we expect to spend twenty-two billion. That means over $1,830,000 every 30 days.

Even the New Deal spenders and wasters, experts that they are, cannot spend that much money—at least, they have found it impossible to do so up to this time. So do you know what they are doing? They are giving it away in million- and billion-dollar lots to foreign governments, including the communistic Government of Russia and the Chinamen.

Hang onto your shirt, brother, and do not take off your shoes at night, for the New Deal will get both if it has its way, and you will wake up some morning finding a comrade in Russia wearing their equivalent, while the war party uses more of your tax money to furnish gasoline to Japan, to blow the Chinamen to bits, while furnishing the Chinamen with aviators and planes to shoot down Japanese bombers flown by American gasoline.

For good measure, we are furnishing the Russians the implements of war to deprive the Finns of their territory and lives. And the Finns are the only people who are paying their first World War debt. The New Deal slogan in this instance seems to be, "Shoot your debtor if he starts paying his debt and, if he refuses, lend or give him more."

No, do not swear. I do not approve of swearing. But you might do a little praying, for if God does not help us, it does begin to look as though we shall never have sense or determination enough to keep ourselves from sliding down the broad and easy way to the hell that awaits all foolish nations.

Shall Congress Declare a National Emergency and Shall the Selectees Be Retained Indefinitely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, August 27, 1940, Public Reso-

lution 96 was adopted, authorizing the President to order the National Guard and Reserve officers into active military service for a period of 12 months. September 16, 1940, the Selective Training and Service Act was adopted. In regard to the National Guard, this act provided that whenever Congress determines that troops are needed for national security in excess of the Regular Army and those in active training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act, the National Guard, or such part thereof as may be necessary, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 also provided for the induction for training and service of persons selected between the ages of 21 and 36 (subsequently reduced to 28) for a period of 12 months, except that when Congress declares that the national interest is imperiled, the 12-month period may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interest of national defense.

There is a further provision that each selectee, after the completion of the training and service period, should become a member of the Reserve forces for a period of 10 years, subject to call for service. The number of selectees to be inducted for training and service under the act is limited to 900,000 men.

Both the Selective Training and Service Act and Public Resolution 96, in the case of the National Guard and Reserve officers, limit the service to the Western Hemisphere and the Territories and possessions of the United States.

I believe that the National Guard and Reserve officers are in a separate category, regarding the extension of their service, from the selectees under the Selective Training and Service Act, and I believe that Congress should pass such legislation as may be required to authorize their retention in service as long as may be necessary. Legislation to accomplish this does not require that Congress shall declare a national emergency, and I am not in favor of Congress declaring a national emergency. A declaration of national emergency under present circumstances may be interpreted as an authorization to carry on war. I believe that Congress should discharge its functions as the situations are presented.

The discharge of the selectees under the Selective Training and Service Act after the expiration of their 12-month period does not mean that the United States Army will become disintegrated by the sudden withdrawal of those so inducted. The first selectees were inducted on November 20, 1940. The numbers of selectees inducted by months thereafter are as follows:

November–December	19,327
January	73,633
February	90,238
March	153,437
April	124,902
May	62,456
June	79,522

From the hearings, it appears that the Army General Staff seek the extension of time because they object to being forced to release men after the specific termination of 12 months. They want to release them depending on where they are located and depending on the developments of the national situation. A strong argument is also made on the grounds that the selectees are mingled in divisions with other units of the Army and that some of the units containing selectees, have taken their posts at places such as Trinidad, Honolulu, and Alaska, and there is a time element involved in relieving troops at the end of specific periods.

I have carefully considered these arguments and reasons, and I am in favor of making it possible for our General Staff to form and train an efficient army for the purposes of defending this country and our interests in the Western Hemisphere. I am not in favor of amassing an army of such size that would be designed for an invasion of Europe or any other continent. I am persuaded by the testimony at the hearings that our Army General Staff are preparing a program for the defense of this country and the Western Hemisphere, with which I heartily concur. At the same time it is evident that there is a movement on foot to use our troops abroad. The Prime Minister of England stated in the British Parliament that this country was on the verge of entering the war. The British commander in India and the British commander in northern Africa have both publicly anncunced that they need our troops.

None of the European countries is quite like ours, and we cannot be sure that any of them in the long run will be our real friend. Europe through all the years since our country was founded, has had its royalty, oppression, wars, and poverty, and for these reasons the people who built up this country came here and established a nation which is distinct and different, and which I feel has a destiny for the whole world, and I believe that this destiny will be best fulfilled if we refrain from becoming just another totalitarian belligerent, as we would become if we undertook the invasion of Europe.

Therefore, I believe in a sane program fully to protect our Nation and our interests and our place in the future of the world.

To accomplish those ends, as applied to the present situation presented to Congress, I am in favor of enacting legislation authorizing retention of our National Guard and Reserve officers, or such part thereof as may be necessary.

I favor extending the time of service of future selectees from 12 months to a maximum of 18 months, which provision, I think, will fully meet the reasonable needs of the Army General Staff. I am in favor of releasing all selectees now in service no later than at the end of 18 months from their induction, with the provision that if war is declared by or upon this country, all are subject to service.

Tax on Outdoor Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH A. McARDLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

Mr. McARDLE. Mr. Speaker, being fully cognizant of the task confronting the Ways and Means Committee in bringing about the tax bill known as H. R. 5417, I cannot agree with the committee that that section of the bill which seeks to impose a special tax upon the manufacturers of neon-tube signs, electric signs, and electric advertising devices, primarily because of the hardship which such taxes would impose on labor.

The proposed taxes would produce a comparatively small amount of revenue and the cost of collecting the tax on outdoor advertising would leave little, if any, net revenue for the Treasury.

The tax imposed by section 3269 of part XI, is a tax only upon the concerns engaged in outdoor advertising as a business and therefore would fall upon less than 20 percent of the outdoor advertising signs and structures maintained in the United States, as over 80 percent of the total number and particularly the small signs are maintained by those who use them to advertise their own business and would escape any taxation under this proposal.

This is patently unfair and discriminatory and moreover H. R. 5417 proposes to tax only a portion of outdoor advertising and radio advertising and levies no tax whatever on the other national advertising mediums, such as newspapers, magazines, and direct-mail advertising.

If one national medium of advertising is to be taxed by the Federal Government, then certainly all should be taxed, but I do not believe in excise taxes upon any of them, because they all produce sales and profits and we should tax profits instead of the source of profit. Organized labor would be most injuriously affected by the proposed tax on outdoor advertising companies.

The unions that will be most seriously affected by a restriction in the operation of the source of their employment as a result of the enactment of this section are the sign, scene, and pictorial artists, billposters, electrical workers, sheet-metal workers, carpenters, and common laborers. These are the crafts that are directly employed by the outdoor advertising industry. However, the influence of this industry extends to a great many other crafts which are employed in supplying the materials consumed by the outdoor-advertising industry such as paper, paints, printing ink, metal materials, lumber, brushes, and so forth.

Two of the above-mentioned crafts, namely, sign, scene, and pictorial artists, and billposters are composed of highly

trained mechanics, and since this particular industry offers the only possible employment for their particular type of work and it requires years of training to develop first-class mechanics in these two classes of employment, to place any restriction upon or retard in any way the activities in this industry would inflict a hardship on these two crafts. The other crafts may find other employment and the hardships may not be as great. However, the first two crafts mentioned could not possibly find any other source of employment which would permit these men and women to continue to enjoy the full benefits in compensation for their years of study and training to qualify them as mechanics in their chosen field.

I sincerely believe that the enactment of this section of the revenue bill will inflict a hardship on this source of employment and cause employers to discontinue some of the liberal practices which employees now enjoy, and the elimination or restriction of these practices would materially reduce the working periods of the members of these several classes of craftsmen and by the reduction of the working period, there would be a marked reduction in the amount of income tax which these craftsmen have paid to the Federal Government in past years. By such reduction, the amount of money which may be received by the Government as a result of this excise tax would be wiped out by the reduction in personal income tax.

Some of the practices now in force in the outdoor advertising industry which furnish employment and extend the working periods are the maintenance of plants and plus services which are furnished the advertiser to make the advertising dollar more effective.

On behalf of organized labor I strongly urge that before final enactment of H. R. 5417, it be either amended to include all advertising, such a tax being, in my opinion, economically sound. In the alternative I would favor the elimination of the proposed tax on people engaged in outdoor advertising.

Cutdoor advertising rendered a great service to the Government in the World War, and I am including in my remarks copies of commendatory letters received from the late President Woodrow Wilson, the then Secretary of the Treasury, William Gibbs McAdoo, and Dr. Livingston Farrand, chairman, central committee of the American Red Cross:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 9, 1919.

MR. W. W. WORKMAN,
Poster Advertising Association, Inc.,
Chicago, Ill.

MY DEAR MR. WORKMAN: I am very glad indeed to express through you my sincere appreciation of the cooperation of the Poster Advertising Association with the various publicity departments of the Government during the war.

The members of the association lent invaluable aid to the Liberty Loan, fuel, food, Red Cross and other campaigns by constantly reminding patriotic Americans of their duties to their country during the war.

The value of such a service cannot be overestimated.

Sincerely,

WOODROW WILSON.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, October 23, 1918.

F. H. FULTON, ESQ.,
Vice Chairman of Committee on Cooperation with the Government, Poster Advertising Association,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. FULTON: Will you be good enough to convey to the members of the Poster Advertising Association my deep appreciation of their patriotic cooperation in the Fourth Liberty Loan campaign.

Without cost to the Government, the membership of the Poster Advertising Association donated the posting of more than twenty-three thousand 24-sheet Liberty Loan posters—a service which was of valuable assistance in carrying the message of the Government to the people of the country.

Individual posting companies in writing to the Treasury Department have uniformly volunteered their services in future loans with the same degree of spontaneity and loyalty that has characterized their assistance in the past. It is a pleasure to thank every member of the organization for their helpful cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

W. G. MCADOO.

THE AMERICAN RED CROSS,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1919.

MR. W. W. WORKMAN,
Washington Representative, Committee on Government Relations, Poster Advertising Association,
The New Cochran Hotel,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WORKMAN: Through you we desire to thank the Poster Advertising Association for its patriotic and generous assistance to the Red Cross during its war campaigns for funds and membership.

I am informed by our Department of Development that in the two war-fund drives of 1917 and 1918, and in the two membership drives in the same years, your association handled 43,000 of the large 24-sheet posters. This assistance was given throughout the whole United States and was very helpful to the cause.

Very sincerely yours,

LIVINGSTON FARRAND,
Chairman, Central Committee,
American Red Cross.

The General Welfare Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I made before the General Welfare Federation of America on July 12, 1941:

Mr. Chairman and fellow workers, conventions are inspiring. They spur our efforts and stir our souls. But, like our work in Congress, most of the effective labor which results in the dress parade is performed in the committees before which the various problems of the day are brought and dissected. These committee deliberations are the essence of democracy and pave the way for such occasions as we have here this afternoon.

In Washington we meet much the same situations as you good folks meet out in the field. We have our day to day problems and must face them. As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives I have had my full share of these problems—your problems—and I have devoted full time and effort in helping to work out their solution.

Not the least of these problems is that of how best to provide real economic security in the sunset of life to those whom industry has cast aside with the comment, too old.

This problem is a real one. It is on our doorstep and is crying for solution. All our worry over the defense situation cannot obscure it or lessen its appeal. We must do something about it.

In the Congress of the United States there are 156 Representatives who believe that the measure you are all working for—the General Welfare Act, H. R. 1410—presents the solution. They have studied it. They believe in it. They have signed a steering committee resolution to work for it.

As chairman of this steering committee I am here today to bring you their greetings and to urge you to continue your battle for proper protection of our senior citizens in America. There must be no lessening of effort, no let-up in the struggle.

The international situation is such today that humanitarian reforms are likely to be given scant consideration unless a live, energetic group such as yours stirs up thought and action on behalf of a sound proposal to remedy conditions. I want to congratulate you upon your perseverance in sticking to your campaign all these years.

I want particularly to compliment you people upon the reasonableness of your demands and upon your legislative approach to the problem confronting you. You have asked nothing unfair, nothing that your Government could not grant on a pay-as-you-go basis. Impossible demands get nowhere legislatively, while reasonable demands are considered seriously.

Herein lies the reason for the fact that ever since you have been in existence as an organization you have been one of the outstanding groups in your field of endeavor. There were times when I wondered if your membership were large enough to muster the needed strength in Congress to keep the General Welfare Act alive. Always you have come through and your bill is in fine repute in the Congress with far more strength for it than was expected. It is a tribute to your legislative approach to the problem that you can produce a steering committee resolution with 156 congressional signatures thereon. That, in itself, is a remarkable achievement. To get that many supporters signed up as a steering committee on behalf of any legislative proposal is something unusual in Washington, where a steering committee of 50 Congressmen is considered large. You have over two times that many. You lack but 62 of having enough to pass the measure which is an indication of real strength.

So I say to you this afternoon, keep up the good fight. Try to get a floor under Federal pensions of $30 per month. Ceilings are meaningless in pension matters. It is the floor or guaranty that counts. The Federal Government can always raise the amount later. It should never lower it. Once any legislative gain is made in this field it will remain for all time to come, to protect all

succeeding generations as well as our own. If you can get your unconditional flat $30 per month Federal annuity for all senior citizens regardless of financial circumstances and on a pay-as-you-go basis under present conditions you will be accomplishing marvels. It simply isn't in the cards to get more. As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House I know that this Congress will not appropriate more than $3,000,000,000 additional for pensions, and $3,000,000,000 more than we are now paying cannot be stretched to give more than $30 per month to the 9,000,000 senior citizens who could apply for such an annuity.

Legislative advance is always secured by a series of steps forward and compromise. What would happen if you could get your basic guaranty of $30 per month written into law time alone can tell. But if it is not adequate, you can continue the fight to have it raised, at the same time turning your guns on the State legislatures to get them to supplement this basic Federal annuity on the basis of need. You should have no trouble in this regard. In many States, such as California, Washington, Colorado, and Massachusetts, State pensions of $20 per month in addition to the Federal allotment have already been voted and no change in the law would be necessary to give a full $50 per month total Federal-State pension to those now on the pension rolls. In other States agitation could be created to supplement the general Federal annuity for those unable to live on the $30 granted and the main argument used by the States against such a supplement allowance—that is, its tremendous cost—would be gone, as the Federal Government would have taken over the main pension load of $3,000,000,000 per year. The States could therefore easily afford to at least continue their present total pension load for all the States of $20,000,000 per month or $240,000,000 per year. If the States did nothing more than they are doing at the present time, it would mean pension increases from the States to those now on the old-age assistance rolls, as this group is a diminishing group, and if the States did not have to take on new pensioners because of the Federal Government assuming that load, more and more State funds would become available for the present pensioners as this group becomes less and less numerous by the passing of time and the tolls of the grim reaper.

This is the practical way of looking at this problem. Let us make progress one step at a time and not expect miracles to happen. Let us develop a practicable, workable program that fits into the scheme of things and make what gains we can even in spite of the present emergency conditions under which we are living.

I recall the day when some opposed laws providing for 10 hours per day as a maximum workday on the ground that this would stabilize the hours at this figure. You all know what has happened. We have gone on and on, first from 10 hours to 8 hours and then from 8 hours to 6 hours. So it will be with pensions. If we get our basic principles enacted into law at this session of Congress we will be fortunate indeed. Then we will have our foot in the door. We will have a ladder to climb; the rest will be easy and progress will come in steady strides until we reach the ultimate goal we have set in our measure of $60 at 60, just as the Civil War veterans raised their pensions by successive steps from $6 per month to $60 per month.

I don't know if you people fully appreciate the stupendous possibilities of the reform we are advocating. Roughly, about one-half of our population is now guaranteed social or economic security in their later years under title II of the Social Security Act. We propose in one fell sweep, to grant this same security to the other half of the population by blanketing in all those not now covered by title II or some other form of Federal annuities. Approximately 65,000,000 people will be affected by our reform. The added charge on our Federal finances will be over $3,000,000,000 a year—a charge which must be met by taxation, for we propose a pay-as-you-go system. To ask more than this at the present time is sheer folly. That is why I congratulate you upon the moderation you have shown in your demands upon Congress, and that is why I feel that you will not only be able to keep your measure active at all times but will eventually carry it on to victory.

Just how long it will be before we can accomplish definite results along the lines we are advocating no one can say. The international situation is such that we in Congress have, of necessity, had to turn our attention mainly to the defense of our Nation. We must not, however, in our all-out efforts for defense forget the defenseless. We must not forget the gray-haired men and women who have striven and toiled to make this Nation what it is today. We must not forget our obligation to them. We must see to it that their declining days are spent in comfort and security.

One of the best ways to do this is through the General Welfare Act—H. R. 1410—America's adequate pension measure. No other measure seeks to protect the old folks with a guaranty, except one measure which carries a guaranty of $60 per month, or $9,000,000,000 per year, but which has no support whatever in Washington because of its extremist approach to the problem. No other measure seeks to protect our senior citizens through a reserve fund to take care of the situation should the war end and revenues fall, while more would be forced to apply for the annuity. No other measure carries funeral benefits. No other measure has a sound tax base to support it, a gross profit or added-value tax of 2 percent with exemptions for the cost of materials, and the first $80 per month, or $960 per year, of gross income.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from very responsible authorities in connection with our tax bill which speaks for itself. I might add that even with the taxes from the three other subway concerns in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, not listed in this letter, the yield for the entire industry as common carriers on common-carrier property will be but $75,000. I am certain that the costs of administration for this would be prohibitive from conversations I have had with those who know costs of collections.

As the committee has rightly expressed its desire to remedy the situation which concerns the outdoor advertisers in their plight, I am hopeful that this aid can be extended to these men who employ common carriers for their displays. The doubt about applicability to common carriers ought to be sufficient to remove this group, but that doubt, plus the inadequate returns, ought to definitely settle the question. The argument of the parties affected is so cogent that I am including it in my statement.

AUGUST 1, 1941.

Hon. JAMES A. SHANLEY,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHANLEY: The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives included section 3269 as part of the revenue bill of 1941, which section imposes a tax on outdoor advertising. The minimum rate of $5 for any outdoor billboard less than 300 square feet was subsequently amended by the Ways and Means Committee to $1 for any outdoor billboard less than 100 square feet. Whether this tax is applicable to advertising displays on properties of common carriers is not clear. If the tax is applicable to advertising displays on properties of common carriers, an amendment should be immediately adopted whereby such advertising displays are expressly exempted from this tax for the following reasons:

I. Any excise tax on companies handling advertising displays on properties of common carriers would be confiscatory and ruinous to every company now engaged in such business.

II. The 40 to 60 percent of gross revenue demanded and obtained by common carriers under long-term contracts with these companies makes any excise tax such a burden as to constitute a death penalty.

III. State legislation taxing outdoor advertising has always recognized and exempted as a class outdoor advertising on properties of common carriers.

I. ANY EXCISE TAX ON COMPANIES HANDLING ADVERTISING DISPLAYS ON PROPERTIES OF COMMON CARRIERS WOULD BE CONFISCATORY AND RUINOUS TO EVERY COMPANY NOW ENGAGED IN SUCH BUSINESS

If the revised rates of the excise tax imposed by section 3269 of part XI, outdoor advertising of the Revenue Bill of 1941, are applicable to the advertising displays on properties of common carriers, every company engaged in such business will have to cease such operations because income derived from this medium will not meet the added burden. No tax law should be designed to destroy legitimate businesses, but if this tax on outdoor advertising is applicable to these companies, it will be confiscatory and ruinous. These advertising displays are located on properties of subways, elevated lines, and railroads principally in and around the areas of Boston, Chicago, Philadelphia, New York City, and New England generally. Displays on these properties are commonly referred to in the advertising business as one-, two-, and three-sheet displays which consist of 9, 18, and 24½ square feet, respectively. It is readily apparent that the largest display of these companies is only one-quarter the size of the present minimum of 100 square feet as set forth in the amendment to this tax on outdoor advertising. By far the greater number of displays on these properties are one sheet which is less than one-tenth of the present minimum set forth in the amendment. Such arbitrary classification as contained in the provisions levying this tax is unfair and discriminatory, and could only yield in the instance of the three petitioning companies a gross tax of $25,140; obviously, the administration of such a tax as applied to the three petitioning companies would in our opinion involve more expense than the actual amount of collection.

It is inconceivable that this tax would have been proposed if any information had been sought as to the ability of these companies to pay even the revised rates. For example, of the petitioning companies, the approximate net income for each board for the first 6 months of 1941 before Federal income and social-security taxes, was as follows:

Transit Advertisers, Inc	$0.07½
Chicago Rapid Transit Co	.35
Transportation Displays, Inc	.64½

One of the reasons for this extremely low net income per board for the first 6 months of 1941 is that the companies operating these advertising displays on properties of common carriers always have considerable unsold space. For example, unsold space for this 6 months' period of the companies previously mentioned was as follows:

Chicago Rapid Transit Co., over 65 percent.
Transit Advertising, Inc., over 40 percent.
Transportation Displays, Inc., over 20 percent.

Even though the display spaces may not be sold, the common carriers require that every space have an advertising display in order that the blank spaces will not make their properties less attractive. These blank display spaces, of necessity, being always filled with nonrevenue displays, such as supplied by civic, national, and emergency organizations, Navy and Army and gratuitious showings from advertisers already purchasing space, create the impression with many unfamiliar with the business that it is highly profitable and could easily, without any financial difficulty, pay the taxes proposed by the revised rates.

Any depressed business such as the representatives for the sale of advertising displays on common carriers should not be forced to pay excise taxes as proposed in section 3269 of this revenue bill. Within the past few months additional hope has been manifested for the future of the small and independent companies operating these advertising displays. However, any tax such as that proposed would destroy every possibility of any profit to be derived from their activities, even though the advertising display business were now functioning at the degree of activity at which it formerly operated.

II. THE 40 TO 60 PERCENT OF GROSS REVENUES DEMANDED AND OBTAINED BY COMMON CARRIERS UNDER LONG TERM CONTRACTS WITH THESE COMPANIES MAKES ANY EXCISE TAX A DEATH PENALTY

Any common carrier which has space available for advertising displays exacts a high percentage of gross revenue because it brings together a private audience composed of its fare-paying passengers Being directly responsible for bringing together the private audience and also having complete control over the advertising material which is visible in and about their stations, platforms, and other structures, these common carriers have always demanded as a minimum 40 percent of the gross revenues derived by advertising display companies and in many cases as high as 60 percent of the gross revenues. This high percentage of gross revenues taken by the common carriers must be contrasted with the percentages taken by those other than common carriers. The minimum required by them is 10 percent of gross revenues with a maximum of about 20 percent. Upon analysis the reason is evident for this great disparity between the percentages of gross revenue taken by a common carrier and one not a common carrier. One who is not a common carrier does not assemble a private audience, nor do they provide the facilities for such an assembly, but must rely wholly upon the whims and fancies of the public to pass the location or upon the fact that the location is on some highway constructed and maintained by public funds. Obviously, one depending upon a public audience cannot maintain the same percentage of gross revenues that one can who assembles a private audience within the confines of private properties. For that reason, common carriers have always demanded and have obtained high percentages of gross revenues from advertising companies displaying advertising on their properties.

III. STATE LEGISLATION TAXING OUTDOOR ADVERTISING HAS ALWAYS RECOGNIZED AND EXEMPTED, AS A CLASS, OUTDOOR ADVERTISING ON PROPERTIES OF COMMON CARRIERS

Several States have already had a history in the taxation of outdoor advertising. This is particularly true of the New England States. In the States of Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont, legislation has been enacted taxing billboards but such legislation expressly contains an exemption for advertising displays on properties of common carriers. The exemption provision of the Vermont taxing statute is as follows:

"This chapter * * * shall not apply to signs and other devices on or in the rolling stock, station, subways, or structures of or used by common carriers." (Sec. 8349, Public Laws, 1939.)

The exemption provision of the Massachusetts taxing statute is as follows:

"Certain signs, etc., exempted: Sections 29 to 31, inclusive, and 33 shall not apply to signs or other devices on or in the rolling stock, stations, subways, or structures of or used by common carriers, except advertising signs or other advertising devices on bridges or viaducts, or abutments thereof." (Annotated Laws of Massachusetts, ch. 93, sec. 32.)

Such advertising displays as will be on the above-designated properties will be one-, two-, and three-sheet displays. It has previously been indicated that these displays are only 9, 18, and 24½ square feet, respectively. Undoubtedly, the size of these displays and the gross percentages which the common carriers command have been extremely important to the State legislatures in granting this exemption. In addition, companies displaying advertising material on common-carrier property are actually agents of the common carriers. The companies don't own their own display structures as do the outdoor companies. Then, too, these companies have no control over where or how many displays are to be placed on certain locations. Common carriers not only require the right in the contracts to change the location of advertising displays but constantly demand and force the advertising companies to make such changes at the expense of the advertising companies. Furthermore, certain advertising, either because of the control exercised by the common carriers over the character of the advertising displays or because of State legislation, cannot be displayed on properties of common carriers. Thus, it is clearly evident, we repeat, that these advertising companies and in many cases as high as 60 percent of the gross revenues. This high percentage of gross revenues taken by the common carriers must be contrasted with the percentages taken by those other than common carriers. The minimum required by them is 10 percent of gross revenues with a maximum of about 20 percent. Upon analysis the reason is evident for this great disparity between the percentages of gross revenue taken by a common carrier and one not a common carrier. One who is not a common carrier does not assemble a private audience, nor do they provide the facilities for such an assembly, but must rely wholly upon the whims and fancies of the public to pass the location or upon the fact that the location is on some highway constructed and maintained by public funds. Obviously, one depending upon a public audience cannot maintain the same percentage of gross revenues that one can who assembles a private audience within the confines of private properties. For that reason, common carriers have always demanded and have obtained high percentages of gross revenues from advertising companies displaying advertising on their properties.

An excise tax such as that proposed in section 3269 of the revenue bill of 1941 would absolutely prohibit their regaining this foothold. In fact every company engaged in the business of one-, two-, and three-sheet advertising displays on properties of common carriers would have to cease such business if this excise tax were enacted.

We have attempted herein to set forth what are considered the salient factors to one considering the feasibility of this excise tax imposed by section 3269, if applicable to advertising displays on properties of common carriers. If any further information is desired, the same will be furnished, upon request, by any of the petitioning companies.

Respectfully yours,
CHICAGO CAR ADVERTISING CO.,
By C. H. MURPHY,
TRANSIT ADVERTISERS, INC.,
By MARSHALL C. SEWALL,
TRANSPORTATION DISPLAYS, INC.,
By F. LE MOYNE PAGE.

Mr. Speaker, this fight has just begun. I am confident later review will prove the justice of these remarks.

The Alaska Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

LETTER OF HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, OF WASHINGTON, TO HON. CORDELL HULL

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, the immediate construction of a highway to Alaska is not only economically justified but is demanded by considerations of national defense. So much misinformation exists concerning this proposed road that I am submitting herewith copy of a concise and yet illuminating statement concerning the highway embraced in a letter dated May 8, 1941, addressed to Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, by Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Member of Congress from the State of Washington, and Chairman of the Alaskan International Highway Commission. The letter follows:

HON. CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We are submitting herewith a map and condensed profile of the proposed western route of the Alaska International Highway. The information upon which they are based is a compilation of recent reports of Canadian and American engineers made in connection with the reconnaissance for the highway. This is the first authoritative presentation of the project, and any previous information or conclusions should be revised in light of this study.

It will be noted that fully 90 percent of the route has been covered by foot traverses of the American and Canadian exploratory engineers. The map, recommendations and estimates are based altogether upon the data these engineers have secured. Further data for the remaining 10 percent of the line will be submitted later, but none of this area is critical, for it is covered by lay and other information.

From this map and profile may be derived the following conclusions, all of which are supported by detailed reports and plans too lengthy for discussion in this letter:

1. It is apparent from the data submitted that the highway lies in very simple terrain. The first 600 miles, for instance, only encounters 6,000 cubic yards of solid rock. Therefore, practically the whole area is in soil characteristically of loess mixed with sand, silt, and gravel.

2. For over 700 miles the line parallels and is adjacent to river, lake, and low-grade existing road transportation. The general cross-section is flat. Because of these facts engineers estimate that over half the project can be constructed for approximately $10,000 a mile which is roughly half the per mile cost involved in the total estimate.

3. From Mile 740 to Mile 950 the Canadian engineers' estimate of construction, including the crossing of the Stikine River, is around $14,000 a mile. From Fairbanks, Mile 0, through to Fort St. James at Mile 1430 which is the junction with the constructed road system of the continent and therefore the terminus of this new construction, the cost will approximate but will not exceed $20,000 a mile. All these estimates are based on a 24-foot gravel road or 40 feet between the ditches.

4. For a hard-surfaced road the cost, depending upon type, should be added to this estimate. Gravel is easily available practically throughout the whole route. Because of these favorable conditions, both the Canadian and American engineers are agreed that the road as a rush job could be built in 2 seasons or a period of 18 to 20 months. This is based upon both Alaskan and Canadian experience in road construction. In Alaska a crew of 30 men will construct from 12 to 16 miles of road in 1 season. This would mean the employment of 60 crews of 30 men each, mechanically equipped, the cost for the gravel road not to exceed $25,000,000.

5. The climatological conditions are surprisingly favorable. The areas immediately behind the coastal ranges are always areas of semiaridity. This is the area, of course, in which the highway is located. It is therefore evident that precipitation is very light, and a condition of relatively high visibility is characteristic. Snow depths, of course, will be light. From Fairbanks to Mile 1050 the average depth of snow during the winter months is around 2 feet of very light snow. The extreme average depth of snow is between 3 and 4 feet in limited areas. For a distance of about 75 miles, from Mile 1050 to Mile 1125, greater depths, not exceeding 6 feet, may be encountered on high summits. It is therefore evident that it would be possible to keep this roadway open throughout the winter with greater ease than in any of the Northern States. It also should be remembered that the roadway, even with a gravelled surface, from November 15 to April will be frozen hard and will be equivalent to a hard-surfaced road during that period. These conditions were checked from January 20, 1941, to April 24, 1941. A man was sent who covered the whole route of the project. His information was even more favorable than that indicated on the profile.

6. The great value of this project in a military sense as a defense measure is evident from these facts. It would be possible on such a highway to transport men, equipment, and supplies from Prince George, the most northerly point of the continental rail system, to Fairbanks in 60 hours as against 7 or 8 days, the present schedule by boat and rail from Seattle. This presumes a supply depot at Prince George and relay stations along the route. Vancouver, British Columbia, is 525 miles south of Prince George, Seattle 135 miles south of Vancouver, Fort Lewis 40 miles south of Seattle. Even though the Canadian National Railway system could not meet the transportation needs at Prince George, it would be in easy reach by highway. Also, it would be possible to serve the coastal cities which average about 125 miles from the route of the highway by either branches or by airplanes based on fields adjacent to the road. It is also understood and is clearly visible on this map that the highway closely parallels the line of flight of the western air lines. Therefore, the highway will greatly facilitate the construction of airports along the road and by the roadway; when the terrain conditions are favorable, emergency fields can be constructed. Also, the highway will render possible the supply and maintenance of these fields, and will furnish a ribbon for the flyers to follow.

The Commission feels the matter of supply to Alaska is a transportation problem of air, land, and water which should be considered and correlated as a single unit. At this time air fields are being projected for immediate construction which are not accessible by roads at present, and inasmuch as their location has been determined without reference to the possible location of the international highway it may be difficult to hook them up when and if the road is built.

Alaska is dangerously isolated. She is dependent altogether upon outside sources for all the means of peace or war.

The sea lanes to Alaska—the only available present means of transport—are notoriously dangerous, particularly in winter. The coast here is 26,000 miles long, a component of inlets, bays, islands, and arms uninhabited and seldom visited, subject to rain, fog, snow, and sleet. The channels are narrowly restricted in southeastern Alaska where more than one-half of the Territory's population lives.

As evidence of the dangerous conditions prevailing there have been two regular line ships on the rocks during the past 6 months. In addition, the U. S. transport *Kvichak* was completely destroyed with her valuable cargo and the loss of three men.

Another ship was lost off Katalla. Only the most precise navigation in these waters renders these narrowly predetermined channels usable.

Even in time of peace, the slightest distraction may involve a wreck. What could occur in time of war, with an alert enemy utilizing submarines, destroyers, or motorboats can easily be imagined. In this connection we quote Brig. Gen. S. B. Buckner, in charge of all military affairs in the Territory:

"The international highway will give us an all-land route for the movement of supplies, equipment, and reinforcements. It would make us independent of the control of the sea, temporarily or otherwise; it would not throw us out of Alaska."

Alaskans feel, once cut off by sea, they would be powerless to resist an enemy. They feel that such a catastrophe can occur, and that it should be provided for, is self-evident. They fear that the full force of our Navy may be deflected to the defense of the Atlantic coast, Hawaii, or the Philippines.

Because of lack of beacons, the low visibility, the sudden storms sweeping down glacial valleys, the dangerous icing temperatures in high humidity, have made it desirable for the air lines to take the route of the International Highway, this despite the fact that there are no airfields or road transportation for 600 miles.

In that area the low temperatures have dehydrated the atmosphere, and in both winter and summer flying conditions are favorable.

A year ago the reasons for not considering this project as a military need were given as follows:

1. The road would not be of the right type. Of course, it is evident that any type of road required can be built at a relatively low cost.

2. It was stated that the road could be operated only a couple of months. This is an assumption based on no information at all. We now know that the road could be kept open the whole year around.

3. It was also stated that Alaska could be supplied by air in event she was cut off by sea. The ordinary needs of Alaska are 600,000 tons, and the military needs would raise this to probably 1,000,000 tons. Without further discussion it is certainly evident that Alaska could not be supplied by air. If a road is assumed to be not of the right type for heavy transportation it is hard to see how an air route would solve this problem.

4. It was stated again that it would take years to build the project. This criticism has been effectively answered by both Canadian and American engineers. The Canadian, British Columbia-Yukon-Alaska Highway Commission estimates that a gravel road could be built in 24 months, given sufficient men and equipment.

5. It was considered as impossible to get an agreement with Canada and Great Britain that would give the United States the use of the highway as a military highway. We have now every assurance that this is no longer an obstacle. The State Departments of the two Governments involved are now studying the means to give expression to this accepted cooperation.

With the constant and increasing destruction of shipping the time may soon come when the need for ships may require the deflection of the Alaskan vessels to other more important emergency points. With a constructed highway, and millions of trucks available, this would not constitute a desperate condition.

Under the present unpredictable, catastrophic world conditions the Commission feels we must be prepared to meet any coalition of totalitarian force. Russia has been on many sides in the last year. Today, she has effected a tentative understanding with Japan. Such an alliance while improbable is possible. Alaska could be invaded from Asia 50 miles away. Troops could invade Alaska from a half dozen existing bases in Siberia adjacent to that Territory or by proceeding from Archangel, by the newly determined Siberian-Arctic coastal route. The United States Navy without icebreakers would be powerless to prevent such an attack.

The Commission is of the opinion that the highway should be started immediately. We assume no risks in building it. Its very existence, as an efficient alternate, would deter an enemy from attempting to cut the Territory off by sea.

The only risk is involved in unduly delaying the construction.

Constructed, its value as a powerful instrument of defense is only equalled by its utility as an instrument for developing an almost continental area.

Lastly, and more convincing, is the fact that not only there exists this military aspect but the indisputable fact that its value and benefits are continuing over many years, peace or war.

Respectfully submitted.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Member of Congress, Chairman, Alaskan International Highway Commission.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 8, 1941.*

British Export Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. EATON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

LETTER FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND STATEMENT FROM BRITISH EMBASSY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 16, 1941.

The HONORABLE CHARLES A. EATON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. EATON: This is in further reference to your telephone conversation with me on Friday, July 11, 1941, in which you requested information with reference to the allegations which have recently appeared in the newspapers to the effect that the British have been reselling in South America steel and iron products which they have acquired from this country under the terms of the Lend Lease Act and also to the effect that Canada has been selling United States airplanes similarly acquired by her. This Department has taken steps to inquire into this matter and, on the basis of the information now at its disposal, is unable to find anything which would substantiate these allegations.

The first thing that should be noted is the fact that, in case such sales had been taking place, they would be in direct violation of section 4 of the Act of March 11, 1941 (Lend Lease Act). Section 4 reads as follows:

"All contracts or agreements made for the disposition of any defense article or defense information pursuant to section 3 shall contain a clause by which the foreign government undertakes that it will not, without the consent of the President, transfer title to or possession of such defense article or defense information by gift, sale, or otherwise, or permit its use by anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of such foreign government."

It is clear from this paragraph that no transfer of any defense article acquired under the Lend Lease Act could legally take place without the consent of the President. If there has been any violation on the part of the British of the plain language of the act, no such case has been brought to the attention of this Department.

It may be that what some of those who have made these allegations really have in mind is the sale by the British to South America of iron and steel products of British manufacture, with the inference that the British are acquiring iron and steel products from this country under the Lend Lease Act and using them for their defense needs at home, thus making it possible to maintain commercial exports of their own iron and steel products meanwhile. The fact that appreciable quantities of iron and steel products had been going to South America from Great Britain in past months naturally raises this question and is no doubt a cause of misunderstanding.

On the basis of the inquiries that we have thus far been able to make into this matter, it seems clear that the amount of such exports of iron and steel products to South America is being rapidly reduced to, and is now practically at, the minimum essential to the acquisition by Great Britain of supplies of other products which she must have from South America for her own defense needs. In this connection the following facts are pertinent:

1. While Great Britain must necessarily concentrate her main efforts on production of war essentials, nevertheless many of the materials which are essential for her defense must be imported, and some of them must be acquired from sources other than the United States, as, for example, South America. Means must be found for keeping up the flow of these essential materials to Great Britain. Insofar as other means of payment for such essential materials cannot be found (for example, through invisibles, such as financial remittances, etc.), payment must be made by means of exports of goods. It is our understanding, however, that the present policy of the British Government is to restrict such exports to the indispensable minimum required in order to enable them to pay for absolutely essential imports.

2. It is our understanding that, as regards steel products up to the stage of and including rerolled products, plates, tools, iron rope, wire, etc., exports are not permitted except where they are clearly essential for the British war effort and where the materials cannot be obtained from the United States. As regards machinery, it is understood that exports to all countries have been drastically reduced and each proposed new order made subject to very careful scrutiny. For example, it has been necessary to discontinue supplying essential materials for construction of certain large projects under way in South America for which supplies had previously been promised. In some cases, where it has been found that the completion of orders already partly filled would not appreciably interfere with British defense efforts, shipments have continued. Also, quite naturally, there has been some effort to keep up the flow of spare parts in order to maintain British-made machinery in South America.

3. On the whole, however, it would appear that such exports of steel products to South America as are continuing to take place are diminishing in quantity, are due in every case to special or urgent circumstances which are easily explained, and are calculated to enhance rather than to diminish the effectiveness of Britain's war effort. It is understood that future British allocations of steel for export are set at less than a quarter of what they were even as late as 1940 and will constitute only an extremely minor fraction of their monthly production of approximately 1,000,000 ingot tons.

So much for the matter of iron and steel. Reference was also made by you to charges that Canada has been selling United States airplanes which she has acquired under the Lend Lease Act. Our inquiries reveal no evidence that such a plain violation of the terms of the Lend Lease Act has been taking place. It is true, of course, that airplanes of American manufacture acquired by Great Britain under the Lend Lease Act could go in part to Canada and be used there for training purposes. But they would be planes which had been lend-leased to Great Britain and not to Canada; and if some of them were retained in Canada for training or other purposes, that would be entirely irrelevant.

In connection with this whole subject, I call attention to a press release issued on July 14, 1941, by the British Embassy, a copy of which is enclosed.

Sincerely yours,

SUMNER WELLES,
Acting Secretary.

BRITISH EXPORT POLICY

Some questions have been raised recently concerning the relation of British export policy, particularly in South America, toward the provision of supplies for Great Britain under lease-lend.

Difficulties of shipping and of manpower have been making it increasingly difficult for Britain to maintain a level of export trade even approaching the peacetime basis. Nevertheless, before the lease-lend arrangements came into force it was of such extraordinary importance for Great Britain to maintain her power of purchasing goods abroad that trade was being maintained wherever possible, even at considerable sacrifice.

Since the generous arrangements came into force under the Lease Lend Act, a drastic reduction of British exports has proved possible, thus releasing manpower and shipping for other essential purposes. But the following considerations must not be overlooked.

There have been appearing in the pages of the press and in other connections recently a variety of charges to the general effect that articles or materials which are being lend-leased to Great Britain are either being themselves reexported by the British, perhaps in more advanced form, to foreign markets which Great Britain customarily supplies, in some cases in competition with American export trade, or else are being used in Great Britain to replace similar articles or materials which the British are thereby enabled to export to foreign markets.

These fears are quite without foundation. In the first place, supplies under the Lease Lend Act are only just beginning to flow, and it would have been physically impossible for such supplies to have been processed and exported by now. Careful inquiry indicates no instance in which a violation of the Lease Lend Act has occurred in letter or in spirit. Take, for example, some recent talk in the press and elsewhere in regard to the export of tin plate. In actual fact, tin-plate production in Great Britain has been drastically curtailed in order to release material and labor for war purposes, with the result that markets normally supplied by Great Britain, particularly Australia and the Argentine, now have to obtain their tin plate from the United States. In the second place, the United States departments in charge of the lease-lend procedure have to be satisfied in every case as to the ultimate disposal of the goods, and stringent precautions are taken to see that their instructions and requests are strictly regarded.

The British Supply Council would much appreciate it if any complaints or cases of apparent abuse could be reported to them in the first instance for investigation.

It should not be assumed that the mere fact that we are exporting goods of one sort or another which may be more or less similar in character to goods which we are obtaining from America under the Lease Lend Act or by cash payment is an indication of any violation of the spirit of the Lease Lend Act or that it is in any sense a violation of the letter or spirit of our obligations to the United States.

Obviously, the fact that we are obtaining American aid under the Lease Lend Act does not mean in the minds of Americans that Great Britain should completely abandon its export trade. It would not be in the interest of Americans for us to do so. By exporting Britain earns foreign exchange toward paying her way, and her dependence upon lease-lend aid is thus reduced and the burden of defense from the standpoint of American taxpayers is correspondingly less. Moreover, it is only by this method that we can command from countries other than the United States adequate supplies of many kinds of materials which we require for the prosecution of our war effort.

At the same time the passing of the Lease Lend Act has greatly reduced our dependence on exports, though there has been no time as yet for the change of policy to produce its effect in export statistics. We certainly do not export today just for the sake of doing business. Exports are now strictly limited by a Government licensing scheme to the minimum which is required to pay for current essential purchases.

As regards South America, this means that there is a very drastic restriction of British supplies to all markets except the Argentine, where large-scale British purchases of meat have to be paid for. Even in the Argentine trade is being reduced to about half what it used to be. Elsewhere Great Britain is not only restricting exports to a very small figure but is informing large contractors that it is now out of the question for Britain to facilitate a supply of material for schemes of capital construction in South America. For example, instructions have been issued that

two large schemes initiated before the war, which were of great importance to exporting contractors, must be abandoned, namely, the electrification of the Central Brazilian Railway, which was being undertaken by Metro Vickers, and the Rio Negro hydroelectric scheme.

In the particular case of steel products, including rerolled products—plates, tubes, wire rope, etc.—export is now totally forbidden except where they are needed overseas in connection with the supply of goods essential for the war effort and cannot be obtained from the United States. In the case of machinery, there has been a very great reduction, and every proposed new order is subject to careful scrutiny from the supply aspect.

It will be understood that these new instructions cannot be brought into immediate operation where there are partly completed orders using materials which could not be diverted to other purposes, and where half-finished goods in progress are occupying factory space. These orders tend to give a misleading impression as to the rate of current exports and to hide the extent to which new schemes have been cut out. It is also necessary to keep up a supply of spare parts to maintain British-made machinery in South America. There is, in particular, one large order for oil pipe line for the Argentine Government, expected to absorb some 7,500 tons of steel tubes, which is being allowed to continue for special reasons.

Nevertheless, in spite of the inevitable time lags, the exports in the first 5 months of 1941 were already heavily reduced. Exports of iron and steel manufactures to Mexico, Chile, Uruguay, and Argentina in the first 5 months of 1941 averaged only 6,000 tons a month out of a total monthly United Kingdom steel production of 1,000,000 ingot-tons. Exports of machinery and parts to Mexico, Peru, Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, and Chile averaged just over 1,000 tons a month during the period mentioned. Iron and steel products exported to all destinations outside the British Commonwealth were averaging 14,000 tons a month, and exports of machinery 3,000 tons. Allocations of steel for export from now onward are less than a quarter of what they were in the corresponding period even of 1940.

It is clear, therefore, how mistaken it would be to suggest that Great Britain is using the facilities allowed to her under the Lease Lend Act to push her export industries. On the contrary, she is using the assistance thus granted to cut her own exports to the bone, only maintaining the minimum provision which is necessary for essential purposes.

Avoiding "Ghost" Towns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of August 3, 1941:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of August 3, 1941]

AVOIDING "GHOST" TOWNS

The Government, in its defense-housing plans, is rightly concerned lest when defense needs have subsided, there be a number of "ghost towns" in various parts of the country.

It knows that it is not likely that we shall have too much housing in this land of ours, no matter how many houses are erected for dislocated defense workers at this time. The thing it fears is that, when it is all over, the houses will be in the wrong places.

Mere villages have swelled to cities in the last few months, merely because a new defense factory has been built or a cantonment is near by. When defense needs diminish or the cantonment is abandoned, the workers who flooded into the erstwhile village will go back home. The village will return to its original size. The defense housing will be useless in the shrunken "boom town."

Government knows this and has been acting accordingly. Large numbers of prefabricated houses have been erected in these swelling towns—houses which can be taken apart almost as easily as they were put together, houses which can be moved hundreds of miles almost overnight as there is need for them elsewhere.

There is wisdom in this—and eventual economy. It is one example of long-range Government thinking, a thing to be encouraged.

Sabotage in Defense Factories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

STATEMENT OF J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of J. Edgar Hoover, as it appears in today's Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post of August 4, 1941]

HOOVER CONFIRMS STORY OF PLOT TO BLAST DEFENSE FACTORIES

On the morning of last May 30, the Post, on the basis of numerous dispatches received from areas of camps, plane factories, and other American defense establishments, reported:

"Several agencies of the United States Government moved last night to nip what apparently was believed to be a Nation-wide sabotage effort, presumably timed for Memorial Day."

Troops' leaves at Fort Custer, Mich., were suddenly canceled, Fort Dix soldiers on leave were being rounded up at New York and ordered back to the post, soldiers were placed around aviation factories on the west coast, and heavy guards were put on water-front duty in many cities.

Today, J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in a signed article in the American Magazine, describes in detail a vast plot to bomb American defense plants from privately owned planes on that day. Factories were to be wrecked, ships were to be blown up, and fighting planes destroyed in a conspiracy by organized saboteurs, Hoover writes.

The Memorial Day plot was foiled by the F. B. I. and widespread newspaper reports that troops had been rushed to the danger zones, Hoover's article says.

"It is now possible," he writes, "to tell the real story behind the headlines in the newspapers across the country last May: Troops Rush to Airplane Factories—Soldiers Guarding Ammunition Factories.

PLANNED MASS ATTACK

"The reports were accurate. They caused considerable speculation. Three weeks earlier, startling information from reliable sources had reached the F. B. I. that organized saboteurs were planning a mass attack upon vital defense industries during the long Decoration Day week end.

"Two general plans were to be followed. First, certain individuals were to be inside the factories to stop production bloodlessly, taking advantage of the holiday absence of many employees. If this failed, saboteurs in private planes would destroy the factories by bombing.

"Airplane and ammunition factories were to be the principal targets. On May 27, 3 days before the holiday, the F. B. I. confirmed the reports from foreign sources. The information was transmitted instantly to all field offices, to military and naval intelligence services, to the Treasury Department, to local law-enforcement agencies, and to the factories marked for destruction.

PRECAUTIONS IN TIME

"Precautionary measures were immediately taken to meet any eventuality. Word reached the newspapers and headlines shortly were blazoning a warning that America's defense industries were ringed with steel.

"And nothing happened. Here, national alertness and widespread publicity may have circumvented a disastrous outbreak of sabotage."

In his article, which enumerates many new tricks of spies and saboteurs, Mr. Hoover warns that "modern warfare does not limit itself to battlefields; it can be fought just as effectively in factories, on farms, in schools, and even in homes. In this war the spy and saboteur, working hand in glove, are as important to their country's armies as are the generals themselves."

George N. Peek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George N. Peek was special adviser to the President on foreign trade and president of the Export-Import Bank through 1934 and 1935. He was the first Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1933. He resigned from the administration at the end of 1935 because of irreconcilable differences in point of view on the farm and foreign trade policies of the administration.

For the past 20 years he has given a large part of his time to the study of farm and foreign trade matters. Prior

to that time he was in charge of trade—foreign and domestic—for one of our largest corporations.

He was a member of the War Industries Board in 1918.

It is generally agreed that Mr. Peek is one of America's outstanding authorities on foreign and domestic commerce, especially with reference to the exchange of agricultural products.

Recently Mr. Peek, at the request of the America First Committee, prepared an answer to the claims of the war interventionists that we cannot live in the same world economically with Hitler in the event of an Axis victory. He submitted his answer to the committee on May 14, 1941.

He was invited to present his views on the same subject to a meeting of Town Hall in Los Angeles on July 14, 1941.

In connection with these recent presentations of his views, he has directed particular attention to the addresses of the President and Secretary Hull on the occasion of the celebration of National Foreign Trade Week. At that time the President stated:

> International commerce in a world dominated by totalitarianism would never be carried on for the mutual benefit of all. * * * Therefore, it is idle for us to talk of future foreign trade unless we are prepared now to defend the principles upon which it is and must be based.

At the same time, Secretary Hull set up five peace points:

1. Extreme nationalism must not again be permitted to express itself in excessive trade restrictions.
2. Nondiscrimination in international commercial relations must be the rule, so that international trade may grow and prosper.
3. Raw-material supplies must be available to all nations without discrimination.
4. International agreements regulating the supply of commodities must be so handled as to protect fully the interests of the consuming countries and their people.
5. The institutions and arrangements of international finance must be so set up that they lend aid to the essential enterprises and the continual development of all countries, and permit payment through processes of trade consonant with the welfare of all countries.

Mr. Peek's views are especially timely, and on July 21 I inserted in the RECORD his remarks before Town Hall in Los Angeles, Calif., on July 14, 1941, to which I call the attention of the membership.

The Revenue Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to pay my respects and appreciation to the distinguished gentlemen who make up the Ways and Means Committee. I am sure they have diligently applied themselves to this tedious task, a task that has extended over many, many hours of time. I readily appreciate that theirs is a more difficult problem than of many committees in this House, because nothing comes so close to the people in the matter of government as do taxes.

This tax bill is a difficult bill because it substantially, in its entire amount, represents an increase over and above what has been paid in the years of the past. It has called for the greatest consideration on the part of every member of the committee, and I can well recognize that it has been difficult as they have listened to various evidence that has been introduced against the various schedules to determine just what to do. I recognize that it is not always easy to stand firm against the presentation of what seem to be logical facts, and yet before them was the task of placing upon the Nation a new, comprehensive tax bill. It has required courage. They have shown it. And while probably most anyone may make objections to some phase of the bill, I recognize that such a measure cannot be drawn in a manner to be entirely satisfactory to all. There are many who will regard some phases of it as unjust. Some even will consider it as discriminating. But in a country such as ours, there must be elasticity in our action and in our thought.

It is my personal belief that resulting from the efforts of this committee we have before us for consideration a very satisfactory tax bill; and I am glad to indicate at this moment that I intend to support this bill. I feel that it is reasonably the duty of all of us in this House to assume a responsibility to place upon the people this tax burden. I recognize that it is not a popular thing to do, but most of us have gone along supporting the appropriations for defense, and in many instances the appropriations were not for defense. Most of us in one section of the country or the other have been the beneficiaries of parts of some of these appropriation measures. It is not reasonable, then, that we should fail to stand foursquare behind this committee and support this bill.

I believe the people of the great State of North Dakota, which I have the honor to represent, by and large, wish me to support this tax bill. I believe that the people of North Dakota recognize that the Nation cannot go on spending for defense without facing the inevitable problem of taxation. I should like, however, that my remarks would indicate that this is not an effort of beginning to pay for defense, but rather this tax bill is an effort to stabilize the finances of the Nation, which truly have arrived at a dangerous place.

During the period of 8 years under this administration, there has been little concern about a balanced budget. We have engaged in an unprecedented effort to spend the Nation into prosperity. I am sure that all will agree that this is contrary to the practice of centuries of the past, and I am sure, also, that we all quite agree that it has failed in this experiment.

No real American objects to the plan of preparing our Nation for war, but as we engage our talents in this effort, there is need for an immediate change of policy so far as our fiscal affairs are concerned. We cannot, as a Nation, live in the constant atmosphere of emergency and it is not necessary. There has always been and there must be now, a common-sense route to travel on the matter of economics. There is even greater need today, as we arm for defense, for prudence in our appropriations. These gigantic figures must be arrived at after the most comprehensive study and with the assistance of the Nation's greatest minds. It cannot be the handiwork of inexperience. It cannot come from men who have no knowledge of toil—it cannot come from the schoolroom—from those you have visions and theories. I am not inclined to disregard their part, but they must be balanced with men who know the hard way * * * who have been distressed in meeting pay rolls and who have had sleepless nights as they concerned themselves with the problems of their own economics * * * men who learned early in life that to remain solvent, both they and their business must operate with an income. This is the crying need of the hour as we arm for defense. It is more vital today than ever before, because long before we began this program of defense, we had tremendously impaired the credit structure of the country by impractical and untried day dreams that have brought us to the very brink of disaster, all too often used for a political advantage.

If America is worth saving, if it is worth taking the men into the trenches and on the ships of the seas—if there does exist in the hearts of men that devotion to the country, let it first be expressed in our fiscal policy. Yes; these were noble words once. They are familiar to you. They were expressed back in the year 1932, during the political campaign. They were fundamental then, and like all fundamentals, they do not change; they are fundamental now. They were expressed for political purposes then; they should be practiced for Government preservation now.

> Let us have the courage to stop borrowing to meet continuing deficits. Stop the deficits. Let us have equal courage to reverse the policy of the Republican leaders and insist on a sound currency.
>
> Our party says clearly that not only must Government income meet prospective expenditures, but this income must be secured on the principle of ability to pay. (Excerpts from address by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Albany, July 30, 1932.)
>
> I called attention in my address at Pittsburgh on Wednesday night to the great importance of Federal Budget making as the foundation of the national credit. I pointed out that the Hoover administration had been responsible for deficit after deficit; that as one disastrous year succeeded another, no attempt was made to arrange the finances of the country so that at least the mounting loss of revenue might not be turned into a deficit for the next year. It is my pledge and promise that this dangerous kind of financing shall be stopped, and

that rigid governmental economy shall be forced by a stern and unremitting administration policy of living within our income. (Excerpts from address by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Albany, July 30, 1932.)

Joint Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, had the original rule on the tax bill been presented on last Tuesday, I believe that it would have been defeated. While I am not at liberty to speak for the Louisiana delegation, I would have voted against the rule as originally drafted.

Such a vote, of course, would not have meant that I was opposed to the tax bill, but it would have been the only recourse of the Representatives of community-property States to express their protest on the proposed joint returns for married people.

I realize the crying necessity for raising new revenues, and I, of course, know that our vast national-defense program, which I have consistently supported, must be buttressed by a new program of taxation. All Americans are prepared to make sacrifices and realize the necessity to protect the economic structure of the Nation through adequate taxation.

The Ways and Means Committee, however, did not hold hearings on the question of joint returns. Many Members of the House are unfamiliar with the fact that the community-property system has been recognized in Louisiana since before we were a State. It is an integral part of our law and is a fundamental rule of property. I am somewhat amused at those who say that there is now a discrimination in favor of community-property States. They assume without ever studying the question that the community-property system is merely a convenient device to avoid the payment of Federal taxation.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Under our system the husband and wife own jointly. Every type of property accumulated during the marriage is owned share and share alike by the husband and by the wife. Of course, such a system imposes burdens which are not found in the common-law States, and the system of taxation is eminently fair and equitable because it recognizes the fundamental concepts of the community-property system.

I realize that the defeat of the present provision in the law will result in the necessity of finding new sources of revenue. But I feel that these new sources should be found, and can be found, rather than adopting a plan which abolishes one of our fundamental concepts.

Joint Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I have received many communications from both my district and other districts, urging my opposition to the proposed legislation which is embodied in the national-defense tax bill, which would require husbands and wives to file a joint-income-tax return. Many reasons have been advanced as to the unfairness, lack of economic justification, discriminatory, and arbitrary nature and its probable unconstitutionality. I am inclined to agree with many of our constituents that this bill discourages the type of family life this country is built upon, is discriminatory to certain classes, is economically unsound, and is legally unjust.

The very foundation of this country has been built upon family life, with our married couples living together and raising their families in a democratic manner, with its resultant fruitfulness, clean living, and strict adherence to the moral code. This measure naturally discriminates against married couples and tends to discourage marriage among others, and also stimulates the present recklessness of divorce. It justifies the separation of couples who cannot otherwise provide for children and dependents and in some cases would lead to living in sin instead of wedlock. In this connection I may call to your attention a letter I received from the Most Reverend Bishop Jules B. Jeanmard, bishop of the diocese of Lafayette, La., which is as follows:

The Honorable JAMES DOMENGEAUX,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DOMENGEAUX: No doubt your attention has already been called to Arthur Krock's article, A New Penalty on the Marital State, which appeared in the New York Times of Friday, July 4, and which makes such a clear case against the proposed revision of the 1941 Revenue Act, making mandatory joint income-tax returns by husband and wife. Whilst I am heart and soul in favor of any legitimate measure that has for its object the levying of the necessary taxes for the strengthening of our defense, this particular measure should, in my humble opinion, be opposed on the ground that it would, in many cases, penalize marriage, place a premium on divorce and upon celibacy—practiced for selfish and unworthy motives—and promote immorality. Surely no measure should be adopted which would further tend to decrease the birth rate, already at an alarmingly low ebb in this country.

For these reasons, then, I would ask that you oppose this measure, which, however well intended by its proponents, will, if enacted into law, be attended by such serious consequences.

With sentiments of esteem and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JULES B. JEANMARD,
Bishop of Lafayette.

In addition to contributing to immorality, this bill is economically unsound. It not only increases the risk of new enterprise but it correspondingly reduces sources of future incomes and taxes. If passed, this would not only be an income tax but would also be an artificial supertax placed on the privilege of holy wedlock.

My home State and several other States in this Union have community-property laws under which husbands and wives do not inherit from each other. The marriage is a partnership and the wife as well as the husband is equal owner of this partnership and acquires the assets therein as a matter of legal right. This being the case, there is no more reason or justice in the proposed joint income-tax return to parties of a marriage contract, who are in reality partners, than there would be in the regulation of commercial or any other type of partnership. Under Federal laws and most of our State laws, partnerships are not required to pay income taxes. The partnership itself may be required to file returns; however, it is only the individual partner who is required to pay the taxes. Certainly a marriage contract, which is a partnership, should not be made an exception to this rule. This would be highly discriminatory, and inasmuch as the States themselves control marriage relations, the passage of this measure would annul by implication these State rights and would probably be unconstitutional.

It is the dignity and stability of Christian civilization we are raising these taxes to protect and defend. Defending democracy, we should not attempt to tear down its very foundation, we should rather seek means to uphold it. It is chiefly from married people that this country receives its taxes. Let us not destroy this relationship that has built this country up both morally and financially. Let us not invade State's rights and their organic laws nor pass discriminatory measures that would invade the due-process rights of individuals. I appeal to this honorable body to strike from the defense tax bill that provision which requires joint income-tax returns to be made by parties to a marriage contract. There are many other ways of producing the revenues necessary for our present program other than those that will demoralize and lower our present Christian civilization and probably degrade the sacred institution of marriage.

Radio Talks Over Station WAGE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

LETTER BY HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, OF NEW YORK

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the

following letter which I have addressed to my constituents:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 9, 1941.

DEAR FRIEND: Through the courtesy of Station WAGE, Syracuse, I will broadcast a regular program of informative talks for the benefit of the people of my district. This will start Monday, August 11, with a speech on the drought situation, and will continue every Monday evening at 6:45 daylight saving time.

These talks are designed to bring you in closer touch with the activities of your Congressman as well as with the workings of our constitutional form of government. They are offered as a public service from station WAGE.

I will appreciate your listening to these weekly broadcasts by dialing to 620 on your radio. Your comments will be most welcome if you will write to me or to Mr. Jack Curran, program director of station WAGE, Syracuse, N. Y.

Hoping you will hear my message every Monday evening and let me know your opinions, I am, with warm personal regards.

Your Congressman,
EDWIN A. HALL.

Wisconsin Republican State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican leader in the House of Representatives and chairman of the Republican National Committee. This address was delivered before the Wisconsin Republican State Convention at Baraboo, Wis., on Monday, July 28, 1941. The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, my countrymen, this occasion offers me an opportunity to do something I have wanted to do for 3 years. That is, to come to the great State of Wisconsin and tell you how tremendously it heartened not only the Republican Party, but the Nation as a whole, when you sent to Congress such a magnificent Republican delegation of upstanding, able, courageous men to lend their efforts to the task of maintaining and perpetuating free constitutional government in America. Wisconsin has produced some great men and women, and her record is one of which all of you may be proud. Men and women from this great State have contributed much to the cause of their country and to good government, and they still are doing so. Let me congratulate you on your outstanding State delegation in the Congress of the United States.

This occasion offers me an opportunity to do something else I believe needs to be done. That is to direct the attention of the Nation, if my humble efforts can in some measure do that, to the greatest danger menacing this country, and which is receiving too little attention.

International affairs, wars, and conflicts have so occupied the attention of the press, the people, and the Government that we have almost entirely lost sight of domestic problems which may prove more dangerous to our peace and security, and to our form and philosophy of government than the clashes at arms in other parts of the world.

The problems of unemployment, of relief, of agriculture, of a rapidly rising national debt, of increasing State debts, of sectional and class divisions and jealousies and suspicions—all were assuming very grave proportions before they were obscured by the sudden outbreak of wars and the avalanche of propaganda loosed upon this country to get us into those wars.

Another problem—that of the efforts of some to strangle our American system of bi-party government and to substitute therefor a one-party system, a political monopoly—was challenging our attention when the storm of war broke and we began to look away from our own domestic difficulties to the more spectacular developments across the seas.

So today I want to sound a warning. In spite of the enormous expenditures for national preparedness, there is no indication of effort or intention on the part of the administration to try to cut down the nonpreparedness expenditures and to insist upon efficiency and economy in both the preparedness and the nonpreparedness expenditures. There should be most careful and earnest effort to do this because never in the history of our Nation has there been such need for efficiency and economy. We began the preparedness effort after 10 years of the most intense economic depression this or any other nation in the world ever experienced. Long before our preparedness program was begun a Republican study committee had sounded a warning that the national—and State—debts might prove the undoing of our national security if we became engaged in a war. No attention was paid to that warning. The result was that we had the most enormous and dangerous debt in our history when we were compelled by events and administration policies to engage in the most extensive and expensive national preparedness program ever envisioned by any people since the dawn of history.

National preparedness may well cost a hundred billion dollars. No man today can even guess what our national debt may be when finally exhaustion brings an end to these wars throughout the world. We must look forward to the day when these wars will end and when our national preparedness will be complete. What will we then face?

We will face a public debt so staggering that it will make generations of Americans round-shouldered to bear the burden of the taxes necessary to repay it.

We will face the utter collapse of our foreign markets in a war-exhausted and bankrupt world.

We will face the rapid release of an army of soldiers, and the sudden loss of war work of many millions of civilians who may be walking the streets demanding work and crying for bread.

We will face the most terrible readjustment of world thinking and world economy to a peacetime basis ever conceived by man. The jealousies and hatreds and fears generated by the bloody conflicts going on today will not have been healed. They simply will have been rendered impotent for the time being by exhaustion. The terrible economic readjustment which will be necessary will have to be accomplished in the welter of those hates and prejudices and fears.

The productive capacity and the purchasing power of nearly every other country on the globe outside of America will have been all but destroyed by war. They will begin the drive to persuade the people of this country to put all the rest of the world on American relief rolls. That is coming and if we have any foresight left at all we must get set for it.

We will face an exhausted agriculture, weighed down by taxation, bereft of its foreign markets, suddenly faced by the impairment of its home markets through the discharge of these millions of soldiers and civilians who will be out of jobs and hard up.

We will be faced, thus situated, with our incalculable national debt; with a world which can offer us no markets but which will be demanding that we will restore all the shattered nations and feed all the war-stricken peoples while we are trying to rebuild their economies; with our vast unemployment at home; with taxation the extent of which cannot now even be guessed.

Under such conditions can any sensible person escape the conclusion there will arise among us Communists and Fascists who will propagandize the Nation to repudiate its debt, abandon its form of government and the Bill of Rights, yield to the economic confusion which will be rampant—and embrace some form of dictatorship?

I do not want to appear here today to be an apostle of gloom. Neither do I, fellow citizens, want to see this Nation walk blindly up to the edge of that economic and social abyss and go over and down into the deepest, darkest pit of economic depression and social desperation possible to imagine, without raising my voice to warn of the danger.

If we believe we have seen agitation by the enemies of our American form of Government—by the Communists and the Fascists—let me say we haven't seen anything yet. Under the conditions of chaos, confusion, exhaustion, gigantic public debt, discontent, grief—and the hatreds and agonies left as the awful aftermath of the wars, the Communists and the Fascists will have fertile fields in which to plant their propaganda for debt repudiation, property confiscation, abolition of the Constitution, and the establishment of a dictatorship of the Stalin type or of the Mussolini or Hitler type.

I warn you, my fellow citizens, there will come a vast danger that we in America, in that terrible time, may lose those four freedoms we hear talked about so much and which we are supposed to carry to all the peoples everywhere in the world.

The first World War caught us with a national debt of less than $3,000,000,000. The present war has caught us with a national debt of more than $43,000,000,000. The debt is rising so fast that any figure I might give you here today could not be said to be good for 24 hours.

Thus we can see clearly that when we enter the inevitable after-war depression and economic disruption which is coming we will be entering upon a new depression with a debt so gigantic we cannot even imagine it.

That will be, as I said a moment ago, the opportunity for Communists, Fascists, and other enemies of our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, and our form of government to advocate repudiation, inflation, overthrow of our constitutional forms, and the establishment of a dictatorship.

We must begin now to plan what we shall do when this time comes. We must have a strong agricultural program ready for agriculture will be our national mainstay. We must have a strong industrial and commercial confidence because industry and commerce must furnish management and the jobs to keep discharged soldiers and civilians whose war work has ended from walking the streets and rioting for bread.

In that time of peril to the Nation the great test will come for us in trying to maintain our American way of bi-party government. Make no mistake about it, there are those who today would like to see a political monopoly set up in this country. There are those who are blind enough and selfish enough to

want to see constitutional government by-laws superseded by a political government of men. There are those whose lust for power and profits is greater than their love of country or of liberty.

I want to warn you that in the day—if it ever comes—when the American bi-party system of government is destroyed or abandoned in this Nation the Bill of Rights will be a dead letter; the liberties of the individual will be gone; oppression of minorities will be the order and the greatest experiment in civilization and freedom ever conceived will have been destroyed by our own blind, stupid indifference.

This is a pretty gloomy picture that I have presented to you. But it is far from being a remote possibility unless we are awake to the danger and take steps now to prevent it. I do not believe this picture will be fulfilled because I have faith in the common sense of the American people. I believe that once they fully understand the dangers ahead they will act to protect our beloved liberties and our economic system. To sound the alarm has been my purpose today, but with all my heart I repeat that unless we take seriously the danger, these things will come to pass.

The American people, the liberty-loving, order-loving law-loving American people must organize now to meet this time when the very principles of free government and free educational and religious and political thought will be assailed by the Communists and the Fascists.

The spending and the wasting by the vast political bureaucracy at Washington over 8 years has given us a gigantic national debt that cannot now be avoided. The requirements of national preparedness will add still another gigantic debt on top of the present one. That cannot now be avoided.

Therefore it becomes vitally necessary that we, since we cannot avoid the confusion which will result from the cessation of the wars and the ending of the preparedness effort, and since we cannot now avoid the vast debt which will bear so heavily upon us, and since we cannot avoid the sudden termination at some time in the future of the work of soldiers and civilians in war activities or preparedness efforts, we must—if this Nation is to stand—we must prepare to meet those shocks and survive them.

We Republicans have the greatest task in our history to get ready for that day of national trial.

Make no mistake, fellow Republicans. When the toll of blood and taxation begins to reach the people if we get into this war, or if we do not, the revulsion of feeling will be such that those in this Nation responsible—or held responsible by the people—will be repudiated. The reaction from all this will do one of two things: It will either cause the people to go back to sound Republican principles of government—in which case we will have a vast task to perform to save the Nation—or they will go to some form of dictatorship—which is what those who have brought about the present conditions will have to try to do.

In thus warning you I am not making reference to individuals as such. I am making reference to policies as such, and to developments as such which are driving us toward the time and the conditions I have outlined.

In the name of liberty we must prepare to preserve ourselves and our Government in that time. In the name of humanity we must prepare to preserve freedom, orderly government, and human values in that time.

We must begin to prepare now.

The American people have the resourcefulness, the courage, the intelligence to meet this trial and surmount it. They need but to be told how to prepare; what to do; they need to be warned of what is to come and they will get ready.

The Nation must be unified under a leadership which will single-mindedly and wholeheartedly devote itself to this task. We must unite the whole Nation behind preparations for preservation of our Government, our security, our lives, and our property, our very civilization.

God grant we may have that leadership—and have it before it is too late. God grant that men may rise above lust for power, political greed, and selfishness to the inspiration of national leaders bent upon saving our Nation, our economy, our civilization. As Americans, as well as Republicans, we must be ready to give our utmost support, and counsel, to that end. The welfare of America is, of course, our first concern.

We must prepare now.

Extension of Military Service of Selectees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said regarding the subject of keeping the selectees, now in the training camps, in the service during the duration of this emergency, and I wish to add my voice of protest against this proposed plan. When the boys were inducted into the service they were then assured by the President, and by every one in authority, that they were being taken into the service for "1 year for training purposes," and that at the expiration of that period they would be returned to their homes and their businesses, but to be held in reserve and subject to call in case of war, and that other selectees would then take their places for their year of training. Some have urged that to permit the boys to return home would demoralize the Army. Just a very few weeks ago the President again assured the boys that at the expiration of their 1 year of training they would be returned to their homes and the new selectees would take their places. But now the President has changed his view on this highly important subject, and he wants to keep the boys in the service regardless of his former assurances to them. Of course, this is a breach of faith with the boys, and it is a breach of faith with their fathers and mothers, and with the people generally.

Mr. Speaker, we will remember the boys were not all inducted into the service at one time, but they were staggered into the service over the entire period of the emergency; if the boys are permitted to return home, and to remain in the Reserve, subject to call in case of war, but a very negligible part of them would leave the camps in any one month. The new selectees would be inducted and take their places, and would train with the already well-drilled and trained troops in camp and this would be of great advantage to the new and inexperienced men. My experience in the last World War on this subject leads me to the aforesaid conclusion. The men who have had their 1 year of training would, with their training and experience, be subject to call in case of war—and they would be ready to respond in the defense of their country.

What would be our situation in the camps in our country if all of the boys now in the service should be retained, and the new selectees in the vast number as now proposed should be inducted into the service and taken into the camps? We would not have accommodations available for them, and we would not have the training equipment necessary for their use. In the final analysis, if the President's plan should be followed—that is, his present plan—it would be necessary to increase the size of the camps. More buildings would have to be added; more clothing, shoes, bedding, and equipment would be called for. The expenditure of money required under that recent plan would be enormous. It would call for more officers, more transportation, and more facilities of every nature. Our finances will not permit of such a plan—when we are facing a debt of almost $100,000,000,000—and at a time when we are not in war.

Germany has never kept her trained soldiers in the army constantly; she has trained her soldiers and sent them home—that they might engage in their occupation, but subject to call in case of war. When she became involved in war the reserves were called and they were ready for service. When that call came those reserves took their places in the ranks of her army because they were ready for action. They were trained soldiers.

Our boys who have not yet received any training are entitled to secure that training. The boys who have had 1 year of training are entitled to go home, as they were assured that they would be sent home, subject to call in the future for active service in case of war. I am convinced this plan would aid materially in increasing the morale of our Army. I am convinced the plan, first conceived, would aid in building our armed forces in this country.

Mr. Speaker, a well written editorial appeared in the Times-Herald, of date August 1, 1941, on this highly important subject. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein the editorial, aforesaid, which is very enlightening on this subject, which editorial follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 1, 1941]

HOLD THE BOYS FOR THE DURATION?

Senate debate has begun on the administration's proposal to drop the 12-month time limit on actice service of draftees, National Guard, and Reserve officers. Administration spokesmen are telling us, with shudders you can almost hear, that the peril is greater than ever before; the opposition is pooh-poohing this thesis.

In which connection, it seems worth while to cast a rapid glance over the war situation as it appears at this writing.

Harry L. Hopkins has flown to Moscow, had an interview with Pal Joey Stalin, promised Pal Joey all the war supplies we can send

him, and discussed other matters of undisclosed nature. It's anybody's guess whether Hopkins has committed us to going all-out against Japan in case Japan stabs at Stalin on his Siberian front or tries to interrupt United States shipments to Vladivostok.

Some Japanese bombs fell day before yesterday on the United States gunboat *Tutuila* (pronounced too-tweela) during an air raid on Chungking. The war party's hearts leaped up momentarily, but then sank because the Japanese apologized almost before the bombs stopped falling. Any boat berthing at much-bombed Chungking is asking for trouble, anyway; and anyway, "remember the *Tutuila*" wouldn't be nearly as rooty-tooty a war slogan as "remember the *Maine*."

British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden appears to be getting ready to pull a 1931 on the United States. It was in 1931 that the British needled Henry L. Stimson, then our Secretary of State, to thunder against Japan's invasion of Manchuria; after which the British stepped gracefully back and left Stimson out on a long, shaky limb. Mr. Eden is now putting it about London that the United States will have to take the lead in any further measures against Japan on account of its move into Indochina. He intimates that these measures will most likely have to involve shooting. If we shoot, so will Britain, but Britain will not shoot first.

The British have bombed their former friend Finland's Arctic port of Petsamo, presumably to show Russia that Mr. Churchill really is Pal Joey's Pal Winnie. Since the British admit loss of 16 planes, it must have been a big and businesslike raid, not just a token performance.

News from the eastern front continues conflicting. But this much seems sure: That Hitler's blitz is not proceeding as per timetable, and that the Russians are taking big packages of men, tanks, planes, and guns out of the Germans. Further, it is now reported by a reputable American correspondent at Moscow that the biggest part of the Russian wheat crop has been harvested and rushed far back from the war theaters, with the rest of the crop ripe.

To us, this adds up to two conclusions: (1) That the administration is anxious to get us into this war all the way and on all fronts; but (2) that there is little urgency for us to jump in right now to save the British Empire.

WHAT'S ALL THE RUSH?

The British seem to us to be doing fine at the moment. Their cause seems to be getting enormous help from Pal Joey in the East, as well as from what Mr. Churchill calls the "gigantic scale" of United States lease-lend shipments. The Empire is territorially undented as yet; has, indeed, added Ethiopia, Italian Somaliland, Syria, and Lebanon unto itself.

We're glad of that. But why all the rush to order all 1,450,000 of our soldiers to stay on active duty for the duration, meanwhile adding to the Army without limit?

As Senator TAFT, of Ohio, inquires, how about the Reserve? We still need to build up a big, young Reserve of men who could be called to active duty in a hurry.

Why, then, not forget about this draft time-extension proposal? Or why, at least, not work out some sensible compromise, whereby key men would not be released in excessive numbers at any one time, while a regulated flow of trained men would keep feeding into the Reserve and adequate numbers of draftees would keep feeding into the Army?

We believe such a compromise can be worked out, and should be. With most Americans still unconvinced of the immediacy of our peril, there is danger to both civilian and soldier morale if this flat, 100 percent, time-extension plan is railroaded through Congress.

Reduction of Automobile Output

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

LETTER WRITTEN BY WILLIAM H. ZIEGLER

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
July 29, 1941.

To the Honorable OSCAR YOUNGDAHL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Construction Equipment Distributors of the United States have a national association of some 300 members and about 100 allied members who are manufacturers of construction equipment. This association is known as the Associated Equipment Distributors, with an office in Washington and a secretary in charge. There are over 1,000 manufacturers of construction machinery of all kinds who work closely with the distributors. One distributor will represent a number of manufacturers in a given area, generally a State, which the manufacturers have found very much cheaper in marketing their products than to maintain salesmen or branch offices. Probably the outstanding example is the Caterpillar Tractor Co., who manufacture and sell between fifty and eighty million dollars worth of their products both in the United States and abroad, all through distributors, not having any salesmen of their own. This industry handles its products much the same as the automobile industry.

Our national office in Washington was recently informed by an official of the O. P. M. who was discussing the automobile reduction, that many distributors, jobbers, and wholesalers would be put out of business when the present plans were put into effect. He added that the same thing was true of the construction machinery distributors and their industry as well as many others. The automobile retail industry, we believe, is in most States, according to the census, the largest retail industry we have, considering all of its branches—gas, oil, tires, garages, service, etc.

If the plan is carried out as stated you will have vacant buildings, Main Street will be deserted, taxes will go unpaid, unemployment such as we have never known, and whole industries disorganized and destroyed. There are some 460,000 people in the retail automobile industry, sales, service, etc., plus probably three times as many in the other accessory industries, and corresponding proportion in the construction and similar industries. When all of these people are out of employment, grocery stores, department stores, banks, and every other industry will feel the effect. A few of the pepole in our industry are fitted for defense work, many can be with retraining, but many would never be suited to that work. It takes many years to train even salesmen for our industry, parts men, service men, etc. Inasmuch as Minnesota and neighboring States have little or no defense work to reemploy these people, it would require their moving to other sections of the United States.

Suppose we finish the job we have undertaken for aiding any nation we choose and even winning the battle but destroy our own country by destroying and disorganizing business. Then when this emergency is over we will have to rebuild and retrain and reorganize whole industries, because firms like ours would be gone and thousands of other firms. There are, we believe, some 300,000 small business concerns in the United States like our own, many of which will be put out of business with the program as planned. They do not have the resources to weather any such storm as we are told is ahead of us. This looks a good deal like the operation which the doctor said was successful but the patient died.

Are we more interested in the welfare of our own people, our own mode of living, of doing business, and our form of government than we are in anything else that may occur on the face of the globe? We are faced with answering that question. Is there no medium ground where we can render a certain maximum service to others and yet realize that above all we must preserve ourselves? One gives to charity but not to the point of self-destruction.

While this picture may seem black, we question whether it even indicates what may be ahead. Hugh Johnson's article in last evening's Times Tribune covers the same subject, Shortage Threatens Little Business, and goes even further than some of these statements. This is not a question that can be decided by a few smart college professors or any other one man or group of men, however wise. The import of this terrific disturbance should first be brought to the attention of those who are issuing such orders and then the public should be distinctly and quickly informed what disorganization, what ruin, probably riots and revolution will be ahead if any such plan goes into effect.

Yours very truly,

W. H. ZIEGLER.

Joint Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE WORLEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHILDRESS COUNTY NEWS

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in presenting for the consideration of the membership of the House an editorial written by Mr. Kenneth Fink, owner and publisher of the Childress County News, which is very timely and represents the views of many citizens in the Panhandle of Texas:

SHALL WE PENALIZE MARRIAGE?

To a very large extent, it is the white-collar class of citizens who are "taking a beating" nowadays. Most of them will not share in the wage increases which are being given industrial workers. But they will be forced to pay like all the rest of us as the cost of living rises. It is also these people who will have to bear a large proportion of the increases in taxes. The pending tax bill hits hardest in the middle income brackets.

On top of that, one provision which has been tentatively approved for inclusion in the bill would still further increase the burden for business and professional workers.

This is the provision which would prohibit separate tax returns for husband and wife, even where the wife has a separate income which is earned by her alone. In thousands upon thousands of white-collar families, both husband and wife have jobs and earnings. The income of one is in no way dependent upon the other. To force these families to lump their incomes in one return, and thus pay a higher tax, is a manifest injustice.

Even more important, in the long view, is the patent fact that this provision, if included in the tax bill, would amount to placing an economic penalty upon the institution of marriage. It would place a premium upon divorce. That would be an ironical step indeed for a Nation whose very foundation is the strength of the home and the family.

Observations on Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

LETTER FROM P. H. KUYPER, PRESIDENT OF THE ROLSCREEN CO.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I place in the RECORD a very interesting and thoughtful letter from Mr. P. H. Kuyper, president of the Rolscreen Co. of Pella, Iowa, which is most pertinent to the subject now before Congress, taxation.

The letter follows:

ROLSCREEN CO.,
Pella, Iowa, July 30, 1941.

The Honorable PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

P. H. Kuyper, general manager, writing

I have, of course, noted quite a number of newspaper comments on the new tax bill, but not until today have I had an opportunity to go over a complete copy of the bill as it was drafted by the House Ways and Means Committee. When I came to the office this morning I made the comment, "I wonder what it will be that will knock my ears down today." And I'll admit that this copy of this tax bill certainly did.

If all of this money were to be judiciously spent for defense, I could almost say that I would be happy about it, because I feel that we must pay our way as we go as much as possible. But it is this reckless squandering of hard-earned money that is causing worry to all of us taxpayers. This three billion five hundred and twenty-nine million two hundred thousand that Congress is undertaking to raise is exactly the same kind of money that we are all taking down to the grocery store and spending for bread and butter and meat and clothes and gasoline. And in dealing with these astronomical figures all of us are beginning to lose sight of that.

I have made the remark several times that if Congress were to be fair to the taxpayers, ordinary expenses of government should be cut down by $1 for every dollar of additional tax raised, and I still feel it is well within the realm of possibility to cut this additional tax bill in half on that basis. In other words, I feel an objective of Congress should be to reduce ordinary Government expense by $1,750,000,000 and on that same basis increase taxes by $1,750,000,000.

A little comment I read the other day stopped me. Representative SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, is quoted as saying that the Federal Government now carries a direct monthly pay roll exclusive of the military forces somewhat larger than the weekly pay roll of all of the manufacturing industries in the United States combined.

I note that about 3 days are to be allocated to debating this new tax bill in the House. I feel that 3 days should also be allocated to debating the minority report, with which you are undoubtedly familiar. But we all know that this minority report is already pigeonholed.

The future implications of this tax bill are indeed serious, especially for smaller corporations like the Rolscreen Co. This company has been built up by ploughing back every dollar of profits after paying taxes and by reinvesting every dollar of dividends after paying taxes into the business. Through the good years of 1928 and 1929 we followed that same policy and conserved every dollar of reserve we could. But by 1934 and 1935 we scraped bottom and almost sprung a leak. Building up reserves now under this tax bill becomes practically impossible with an effective rate of in excess of 50 percent of corporation profits and additional personal income-tax rates on dividends which we pay out and which we have always been reinvesting as personal-income taxes. I shudder to think what is going to happen to the thousands and thousands of little corporations all over the country when we go into the unavoidable tail spin after this present emergency. Because there won't be any reserves to tide us over like there were before.

Even at that, I would still take this tax bill with a smile if we could have a semblance of good management in this defense program and eliminate the tremendous amount of waste and graft. I make a motion right now that we turn loose the vast army of Federal revenue agents who check us every year to find that last dollar of income and sic them on to these contractors in these Army camps. Where they will find dollars of additional income among small corporations, they will find tens of thousands of dollars in these Army contracts. Daily newspaper accounts are enough evidence of that.

Personally I think the joint return feature of this bill is most despicable. It doesn't affect me personally to any extent but I know a number of folks around town where husband and wife each work hard and run separate businesses and they surely are entitled to making separate income-tax returns. It looks to me like this is the first step toward communism.

The story books tell us of man and wife being one, but we all know that's a fairy tale—at least I have found that most women still have ideas considerably different from their husbands. And they are still separate entities.

If this feature of this tax bill becomes law, the next step will undoubtedly be to combine incomes of husband and wife and sons and daughters. And when that well is pumped dry, it is just as logical to include the grandchildren—all direct descendants of a so-called head of a family.

Again I must say that I could take this entire tax program gracefully and with a smile if this present administration would make some effort to cut down ordinary expenses of Government. It can be done. Canada is doing it and we can too if our Senators and Representatives would only face these issues fairly and honestly.

There is just one ray of sunshine that I can see in this whole thing—gradually the financial situation of our Government is just going to get so bad that the citizens are going to be aroused to the point where Washington will really hear the voice of the people who are willing to work and to build a strong national economy.

Thank you.

ROLSCREEN CO.,
P. H. KUYPER.

Unity Lacking in Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN TABER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I made last Saturday night:

In these troubled times one can tell little of what is going to happen next. It is a time where our national existence is impaired. It is a time that calls for unity on the part of the people of the United States—unity in preparing our country to defend itself and to protect our liberties. It is a time when partisan conditions should be laid aside. It is a time when even the President of the United States should be expected to cooperate in a defense program and to forget for the time being those advanced communistic ideas which he has endeavored to saddle upon the country.

It is time for the President to place the procurement of things needed for defense in the hands of one man where we can have some efficiency and some planning upon the production. It is a time when patriotic considerations alone should move the President of the United States and those in Congress, and yet what is the situation resulting?

First. The President has now sent to the Senate the nomination of Rexford Guy Tugwell, famous as the head of the Communistic Resettlement Administration in the early days of the administration, to be Governor of Puerto Rico, where he is expected to follow up the efforts to establish a communistic state on the island of Puerto Rico which have so far resulted in failure and the loss of nearly $100,000,000 in relief funds. It is manifest that it is a part of an attempt to establish communism throughout the Caribbean area and that the President is still catering to that group.

Second. It is prophesied by Pearson and Allen, the alleged columnists who are tools of the White House clique, that Tommy Corcoran, a notorious communistic advocate who has long been closely associated with the White House and who has within the last 6 months been reputed to have made over a million dollars in lobbying in departments in Washington, is to be the next Attorney General of the United States—the prize lobbyist and prize Communist to be Attorney General!

Third. The President has placed Harry Hopkins, who was a total failure as administrator of relief and the W. P. A. and who did nothing but promote the cheapest kind of political racketeering, in charge of the administration of the expenditure of the $7,000,000,000 of lease-lend appropriations.

If this lease-lend proposition were an important item, it was important enough so that a competent man who would know how to let contracts, and let them efficiently, and follow up production should be appointed, and not a total failure. Tremendous bottlenecks are resulting from Mr. Hopkins' incapacity and a waste of at least 40 percent of the entire appropriation is to be expected with this kind of management. The appointment of Mr. Hopkins to this position is an absolute breach of faith with the Congress and the American people. The Congress was pledged that he would not be placed in this position.

Fourth. The President so far has steadily refused to give Mr. Knudsen authority over defense production. He has allowed Leon Henderson to interfere with his operations. He has allowed Sidney Hillman to interfere with Mr. Knudsen's operations and he has absolutely failed to put defense production on any kind of honest or efficient basis. It is scattered all over. It is working against a tremendous handicap, and national defense lags as a result.

The camps for which we have drafted 600,000 boys, inducted into service 500,000 National Guard men, and enlisted 450,000 more of the young men of our country into the Regular Army, are without tanks, guns, planes, or other proper equipment for training. In most of the aviation schools no bombing training is available. In almost all of the camps no antiaircraft practice is available, and as far as the production of tanks is concerned, that is lagging.

The President today has the power to order those who have been drafted for service into the Army Reserve upon the expiration of their term of service, and then he has the power to order that Reserve to active duty, so absolutely no legislation is required to bring about the extension of service of these men. And yet the President comes to Congress to ask that this term be extended.

Why does he do this? We should have unity. The President of the United States should show the way to unity by cooperating with the defense program himself. He cannot hope for unity so long as he proceeds along the line of developing a communistic set-up either here or abroad, or so long as he refuses and neglects to apply efficiency toward our defense production.

It is the most serious situation that this country faces today. We are never going to be prepared to defend ourselves in any way so long as the President continues to promote disunity by his own operations.

In these times and these days the young Republicans are showing a great spirit of patriotism in the efforts they are making to bring these facts before the country. They are sounding the battle cry of freedom.

Joint Income-Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARD JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, some mention has been made that the provision requiring joint income-tax returns by husband and wife in the proposed 1941 tax bill is unconstitutional in that it is contrary to the due process of the law as guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution.

At all times since the enactment of the Federal Income Tax Act in 1913, married taxpayers have had the right, at their option, of either filing separate returns or joint returns. It is now proposed to deny married taxpayers the right to file separte returns. Under the proposal the tax on the incomes of married persons will be computed on the joint aggregate income of both husband and wife, rather than separately on the separate income of each, as heretofore. The proposal will not affect the taxes payable by single persons or by married persons whose spouses have no income. But in the innumerable cases where husband and wife each have income, combining the income into one return for the purpose of computing the tax will force the income into higher-rate brackets and accordingly will result in greater taxes than would be imposed if the taxes of each were computed as at present on his or her own income. Thus, under the proposal, a person would be required to pay a greater tax on his income simply because of the fortuitous circumstances of being married to a person who also has income. It is submitted that the Constitution does not permit such arbitrary discrimination.

In the case of *Hoeper* v. *Tax Commission* (284 U. S. 206; 76 L. ed. 248) the Supreme Court had occasion to consider an attempt by the State of Wisconsin to increase revenues in a manner substantially similar to that now proposed. The Wisconsin law provided that in the case of married persons living together the income of the wife should be added to the income of the husband, and that the tax should be computed and assessed against the husband on the combined income. That this scheme is substantially the same as the present proposal is apparent from the following description of it by the Court:

> What Wisconsin has done is to tax as a joint income that which under its law is owned separately, and thus to secure a higher tax than would be the sum of the taxes on the separate incomes (76 L. ed. at 251).

In holding the Wisconsin law invalid, the Court made the following declaration:

> We have no doubt that, because of the fundamental conceptions which underlie our system, any attempt by a State to measure the tax on one person's property or income by reference to the property or income of another is contrary to due process of law as guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment (76 L. Ed., at 251).

And on page 216:

> The effort to tax B for A's property or income does not make B the owner of that property or income, and whether the State has power to effect such a change of ownership in a particular case is wholly irrelevant when no such effort has been made. Under the law of Wisconsin the income of the wife does not at any moment or to any extent become the property of the husband. He never has any title to it or controls any part of it. That income remains hers until the tax is paid, and what is left continues to be hers after that payment. The State merely levies a tax upon it. What Wisconsin has done is to tax as a joint income that which under its law is owned separately, and thus to secure a higher tax than would be the sum of the taxes on the separate incomes.

Preceding these quotations the court had compared the status of the wife at common law with her status in Wisconsin in the year 1927, reaching the conclusion that certain rights of the husband, present at common law, had been lost to the wife since that time. The conclusion that the wife had all the rights in her separate property which she would have had as an unmarried person led logically to the ruling that the husband's tax might not be measured with reference to the wife's, since he had no control over, or possession of, her property. The wife's rights to her separate property have not changed since that time; and, if those rights are to be maintained, her independence must continue to be recognized.

In his dissent Justice Holmes took the position that the nature of the family relationship was such that the husband had considerable control over the separate property of the wife by virtue of his position as head of the family; and further, that a wife's separate income of necessity affected the husband, since, to the extent of the wife's income, the husband's own life was made easier. Thus, the husband's tax might properly be measured by his wife's separate property. Notwithstanding the existence of these facts the husband still does not have final command or control over his wife's separate properties. She may dispose of them in toto of her own will. Indeed, so long as the husband is able to provide a living subsistence for his family, there is no legal obligation on the wife to render support; the husband is primarily liable and the wife's liability arises only after the husband's has been exhausted. If the husband is not legally privileged to share with his wife rights to her separate property, he should not be burdened with the duties which are incident to that property, and consequently he should not be taxed on the income arising from these properties.

It is clear from the Hoeper case that the States may not impose an income tax on one spouse measured by the income of the other spouse. Congress is likewise without power to tax one person on the income of another. Just as the tax laws of the States must be reasonable and must conform to the requirements of the due-process clause of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, so must the tax laws of Congress likewise be reasonable and must conform to the requirements of the due-process clause of the fifth amendment to the Constitution. That the court saw no difference in this respect between the powers of the States and Congress is fully indicated by the fact that the court in the Hoeper case quoted the following statement from *Knowlton* v. *Moore* (178 U. S. 41, 77, 44 L. Ed. 969, 984):

> "It may be doubted by some, aside from express constitutional restrictions, whether the taxation by Congress of the property of

one person, accompanied with an arbitrary provision that the rate of tax shall be fixed with reference to the sum of the property of another, thus bringing about the profound inequality which we have noticed, would not transcend the limitations arising from those fundamental conceptions of free government which underlie all constitutional systems" (76 L. Ed. at 251).

The proponents of the present scheme seek to avoid the clear-cut decision of the Hoeper case by a stratagem. Instead of providing, as Wisconsin did, that the tax on the combined income of husband and wife should be assessed to the husband, it is proposed that each should pay a tax on his or her own income, but that the tax of each should be that proportion of the tax computed on the combined income which the income of each bears to the combined income. This is an obvious subterfuge. The resulting tax under this method of computation is exactly the same as it would be if the tax were openly and directly assessed on the combined income. The language employed fails to obscure the simple fact that the amount of tax imposed upon a married person depends upon and varies with the income of the husband and wife. The plan, accordingly, still falls within the prohibition of the Hoeper case against measuring the tax on one person's income by reference to the income of another. Even though it should be conceded that as a matter of technical statutory phraseology the proposed scheme cannot be objected to on the grounds that it imposes a tax on one spouse measured by the income of another, the proposal would nevertheless still be invalid.

In *National Life Insurance Co.* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 516, 72 L. Ed. 968), Congress attempted indirectly to impose a tax on income from tax-exempt sources which could not be taxed directly, by the clever device of granting a deduction to taxpayers having no tax-exempt income, which was denied to taxpayers having tax-exempt income. The effect of this attempt, if valid, would have been to impose a greater tax on taxpayers having tax-exempt income than would have been imposed if they had no such income. The Court held the attempt invalid and emphatically declared that:

> One may not be subjected to greater burdens upon his taxable property solely because he owns some that is free. No device or form of words can deprive him of the exemption (277 L. Ed. at 971).

The principle of this case is directly applicable to the present proposal. Just as it is clear from the Hoeper case that a taxpayer enjoys a constitutional exemption from being taxed on another's income, so it is likewise clear from the National Life Insurance Co. case that the taxes on a taxpayer's taxable income cannot be increased because of income of another person on which the taxpayer cannot be taxed. No device or form of words can change this result.

The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has prepared for the House Ways and Means Committee a short brief in support of the proposal, considering the possible constitutional objections to the proposed change.

Four of the points advanced by the Government in this brief will be considered here and shown to be inapplicable or inconsequential:

(1) The Government contends the case of *Hoeper* v. *Tax Commissioner* ((1931) 284 U. S. 206), which held unconstitutional a Wisconsin statute requiring a joint return of husband and wife, is no longer good law. This case has not been overruled and the objection to compulsory joint returns has never been met.

(2) The Government maintains that the proposed change is distinguishable from the statute which was held invalid in the Hoeper case, as here one spouse may limit his own liability to that proportion of the total tax which is represented by the relationship between the sum of taxes he and his spouse would have to pay if filing separate returns, and his own tax if filing separately. The minimum for which he is liable exceeds, however, his liability if single. Further, a tax which is measured by the income of one other than the taxpayer is specifically prohibited by the Hoeper case.

(3) The Government believes that a proper classification has been made in recognizing the family as a tax unit, distinct from individual persons; but there is no case authority to support such a classification.

(4) The Government relies on recent cases in which the Supreme Court has held that an individual is liable for an income tax so long as he owns and controls the properties which produce the income, even though the income goes absolutely to someone other than the taxpayer. But a husband neither owns nor directly controls his wife's separate property; and a wife has never at any time had control or dominion over her husband's separate property.

1. HOEPER AGAINST TAX COMMISSIONER

This case involved the Wisconsin income-tax law, which in 1927 provided in section 71.05 (2) (d) that the income of the wife and of each child under 18 years of age should be added to that of the husband or father, assuming the family were living together, and that the taxes levied on the total amount should be payable by the husband or head of the family, but if not paid by him could be enforced against any person whose income was included in the tax computation. There was no limitation on the amount of this secondary liability.

The appellant husband in this case paid his tax under protest, and then, by virtue of the Supreme Court decision, was successful in his suit to recover that amount of the tax which exceeded the total tax computed on his separate income. According to Justice Roberts, who wrote the majority opinion, the question here was whether the State might properly measure the husband's tax by reference to his wife's income from her separate property. At page 215, he said:

> Since, then, in law and in fact, the wife's income is in the fullest degree her separate property and in no sense that of her husband, the question presented is whether the State has power by an income-tax law to measure his tax not by his own income but, in part, by that of another.

Answering this question, on the same page:

> "We have no doubt that, because of the fundamental conceptions which underlie our system, any attempt by a State to measure the tax on one person's property or income by reference to the property or income of another is contrary to due process of law as guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment. That which is not in fact the taxpayer's income cannot be made such by calling it income." (Compare *Nichols* v. *Coolidge*, 274 U. S. 531, 540.)

Since Justice Holmes' dissent was joined in by Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr. Justice Stone, it is possible that should the Court be presented today with the same factual situation, a result would be reached contrary to that in the Hoeper case. However, the argument in Justice Roberts' majority opinion has not been rebutted, and in no tax case which has come down since the Hoeper case was tax liability supported, where the taxpayer's control was as tenuous, uncertain, and devoid of legal sanctions as is the husband's today over the separate property of his wife. For this reason the Hoeper case should not be overruled.

2. JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY TO BE OPTIONAL

The proposed section 111 (a) (b) reads in part: "Liability with respect to the tax so computed; (1) shall be joint and several; or (2) at the election of either spouse" in such proportion to the total tax as the tax computed on the separate income of the spouse bears to the sum of the separate taxes. Apparently the Government places considerable reliance on this optional feature. How the election is to be made has not yet been stated, other than that the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, shall prescribe rules and regulations therefor. In the absence of any other information we must assume that a valid procedure will be set up.

Because of this provision the Government reasons that one spouse will not be jointly and severally liable for the tax on the other spouse's properties, and that a major objection to the Wisconsin tax held invalid in the Hoeper case will thereby have been eliminated. This conclusion does not follow. Although under the proposed provisions one spouse might relieve himself of liability for the actual tax on the separate property of the other spouse, he is nevertheless liable for the full amount of his own tax, and, to the extent that this last amount exceeds his tax liability if he were single, his tax as a married man is being measured by his wife's income, contrary to the express language of the Hoeper case.

And, of course, a wife would be in an exactly similar position. Consequently, the same argument is applicable in her case.

3. CLASSIFICATION

In the Government's briefs some stress is laid upon certain recent cases approving classifications which it is claimed are analogous to the classification contemplated under the present provision, i. e., the taxation of the incomes of the husband and wife as a unit. With the exception of the dissent in Hoeper against Tax Commissioner, no case has been discovered bearing a factual situation close enough to our own to serve as authority on this point. It is believed that the cases cited by the Government in support of this point are so different as to represent no more than a possible tendency on the part of the court.

In *Flint* v. *Stone Tracy Co.* ((1910), 220 U. S. 107), the claim was made that a tax

operating on the income from a corporation was unconstitutional because the classification which subjected such income to taxation and yet left untaxable the income from a similar business, organized as a partnership, discriminated unfairly between the two types of units. Reference is made to this case because it is one so often cited on the subject of classification. Its factual situation bears no particular similarity to our own; it is not authority for upholding the compulsory joint return. Denying the claim which has just been stated, the court said at page 158:

> But it is insisted, this taxation is so unequal and arbitrary in the fact that it taxes a business when carried on by a corporation and exempts a similar business when carried on by a partnership or private individual as to place it beyond the authority conferred upon Congress. As we have seen, the only limitation upon the authority conferred is uniformity in laying the tax, and uniformity does not require the equal application of the tax to all persons or corporations who may come within its operation, but is limited to geographical uniformity throughout the United States. * * *
>
> In levying excise taxes the most ample authority has been recognized from the beginning to select some and omit other possible subjects of taxation, to select one calling and omit another, to tax one class of property and to forbear to tax another.

Helvering v. *City Bank Co.* ((1935) 296 U. S. 85). In this case the taxpayer claimed that the provision of the Revenue Act of 1926 which held the corpus of a revocable trust subject to a tax upon the death of the trustor was invalid since the classification was not proper. The court denied this claim and then went on to mention the extremes beyond the bounds of proper classification. Mr. Justice Roberts, who wrote the opinion in this case as well as the opinion in the Hoeper case, said, at page 92:

> There are, however, limits to the power of Congress to create a fictitious status under the guise of supposed necessity. Thus it has been held that an act creating a conclusive presumption that a gift made within 2 years prior to death was made by the donor in contemplation of death, and requiring the value of the gift to be included in computing the estate of the decedent subject to transfer tax, is so grossly unreasonable as to violate the due process clause of the fifth amendment (*Heiner* v. *Donnan* (285 U. S. 312). Compare *Schlesinger* v. *Wisconsin* (270 U. S. 230)). In the same category falls a statute seeking to tax the separate income of a wife as income of her husband (*Hoeper* v. *Tax Commissioner* (284 U. S. 206)).

This case on its facts is distinguishable from the Government's; it is not authority for the Government's contention.

United States v. *Hudson* ((1936) 299 U. S. 498). This case involved the validity of a tax of 50 percent of the profit made on the sale of future contracts for the delivery of silver under the Silver Purchase Act of June 19, 1934. The Court reasoned that this taxing provision, which referred exclusively to the sale of silver, was a proper classification, saying, at page 500:

> The taxing provision does not impose a tax in respect of all transfers, but only in respect of such as yield a profit over cost and allowed expenses. If there be no profit there is to be no tax. If there be a profit the tax is to be 50 percent of it. Thus, a profit is made the occasion for the tax, and also the measure of it. Because of this, counsel for the Government contend that the tax is a special income tax; and we think the contention is sound.
>
> It is not material that such profit is taxes, along with other gains, under the general income-tax law, for Congress has power to impose an increased or additional tax if satisfied there is need therefor. *Patton* v. *Brady* (184 U. S. 608, 620–622).

This case is mentioned in the Government's brief, but from what has already been said it is obvious that it could carry little weight in a contest involving the validity of the joint tax return.

Heiner v. *Donnan* ((1931), 285 U. S. 312). Involved here was the constitutionality of a classification affecting inter vivos gifts made within 2 years prior to the donor's death. The statute in question stated that such a gift was conclusively presumed to have been made in contemplation of death. The court held that this classification was improper. Mr. Justice Stone and Mr. Justice Brandeis dissented. Referring to the previous cases Mr. Justice Sutherland, in the majority opinion, said at page 327:

> Plainly, this is to measure the tax on A's property by imputing to it in part the value of the property of B, a result which both the Schlesinger and Hoeper cases condemn as arbitrary and a denial of due process of law. Such an exaction is not taxation but spoliation.

In *Helvering* v. *Northwestern Steel Rolling Mills* ((1940), 85 L. Ed. (Advance Opinions) 21), was involved the validity of a classification making subject to excess-profits taxes all undistributed profits of corporations, unless by written contract the corporation was prohibited from making a distribution. A taxpayer contended that the term "written contract" included State laws, by virtue of the fact that corporate charters were contracts between the State of its incorporation and the corporation. The greater part of Mr. Justice Black's opinion is devoted to a construction of this provision. He reached the conclusion that on its face the provision was not intended to include State laws. The contention was then made that the statute was contrary to the due process clause of the fifth amendment, because a tax was imposed where oral contracts or the laws of a State prohibited distribution, but not where written contracts prohibited distribution. The Court said at page 26:

> This contention is without merit. It is not necessary to point out the many obvious reasons that might underlie the distinctions here drawn in granting special deductions from a generally imposed tax.

It will be seen that the Government can draw little support from this case, since the classification at issue involves the measurement of one tax by reference to the income of a third party. There is no question as to the propriety of taxing the income of the husband.

Madden v. *Kentucky* ((1940) 309 U. S. 78). This case was cited by the Government in support of its contention that a tax upon the family as a unit is a proper classification under the revenue laws. Here was involved the validity of a Kentucky tax upon bank deposits. On deposits of Kentucky residents located within the State the tax was 10 cents per $100, and on deposits located outside the State it was 50 cents per $100. The contention was made that such a classification was improper. Two points were discussed in this case by Mr. Justice Reed; one being the propriety of the classification, the second being the applicability of the privileges and immunities clause. At the conclusion of the discussion on the latter point, *Colgate* v. *Harvey* (286 U. S. 404) was overruled. On the classification point the court said nothing which is pertinent to our discussion. The case is mentioned only so that recognition may be given to the fact that it bears no analogy to our own situation and that the factual situation is far removed from our own.

In order to uphold the claim that the husband has such control over the separate property of his wife that his income tax properly may be measured by reference to his wife's income the Government apparently relies on a number of the recent trust cases in which taxpayers have attempted, through legal devices, to make available to designated beneficiaries the income from their assets without losing all control of the corpus or principal from which the income is derived. The theory which supposedly makes these cases applicable is that the taxpayer controls the distribution of the properties in the so-called trust cases in a way which is similar to his control over his wife's separate property. Recently the court has been going out beyond the limits of pure legal control and basing its holdings on the tenuous connections which spring from the family relationship. But the present joint-return situation is distinguishable from the great majority of these trust cases, and the fact that this line of cases has, as just indicated, been greatly broadened in the last few years, does not justify the Government in relying for support on the line as a whole. It would have to maintain its stand on a few general statements, and these are of little consequence since they were made in situations where the trustor, besides having control as the family head or manager, held also the legal incidents of control which are specifically relied upon by the court in the earlier cases.

Lucas v. *Earl*, 1930 (281 U. S. 111). The opinion in this case is less than two pages and was written by Justice Holmes. The contest revolved around the propriety of an agreement between husband and wife that the latter should receive one-half of the husband's salary outright. The taxpayer claimed that this arrangement sufficiently deprived him of the income in question so that he was not liable to the Federal Government for an income tax. The Court denied this contention, recognizing, however, the argument made by the taxpayer's counsel at page 114:

> A very forcible argument is presented to the effect that the statute seeks to tax only income beneficially received, and that taking the question more technically the salary and fees became the joint property of Earl and his wife on the very first instant on which they were received. We well might hesitate upon the latter proposition, because however the matter might stand between husband

and wife he was the only party to the contracts by which the salary and fees were earned, and it is somewhat hard to say that the last step in the performance of those contracts could be taken by anyone but himself alone. But this case is not to be decided by attenuated subtleties. It turns on the import and reasonable construction of the taxing act. There is no doubt that the statute could tax salaries to those who earned them and provide that the tax could not be escaped by anticipatory arrangements and contracts however skillfully devised to prevent the salary when paid from vesting even for a second in the man who earned it. That seems to us the import of the statute before us, and we think that no distinction can be taken according to the motives leading to the arrangement by which the fruits are attributed to a different tree from that on which they grew.

Here the Court squarely based its decision on the control which was necessarily retained by the taxpayer, even after he had entered into a binding contract with his wife. Obviously, if the taxpayer was unable to perform the services for which the consideration was to be paid his wife, she would not receive any consideration. Whether those services could or should be performed was entirely within the control of the taxpayer. The husband has no such control of his wife's separate property, and should not be taxed for a control or ownership he does not possess.

Corliss v. *Bowers* ((1929) 281 U. S. 376). This was another decision by Justice Holmes, involving the validity of a tax assessed against the trustor of a revocable trust. In the familiar language of the eminent jurist, we find on page 378:

> But taxation is not so much concerned with the refinements of title as it is with actual command over the property taxed—the actual benefit for which the tax is paid.

The "actual command" to which reference is made does not include the husband's control over the separate property of his wife.

Burnet v. *Leininger* ((1932) 285 U. S. 136). This case involved the validity of a taxpayer's attempt to escape income-tax liability on one-half of his share in a partnership, which one-half he had assigned to his wife. Referring to the Hoeper case, the Court makes clear the distinction, which has already been pointed out, between property the "actual command" of which is retained in the husband, and property the "actual command" of which the husband never does obtain.

Burnet v. *Wells* (1933, 289 U. S. 670). Here a trust was set up to pay the annual premiums upon a policy of insurance upon the life of the grantor. The Court held in a 5 to 4 decision that the income from this trust was taxable to the trustor, reasoning that it was used to meet one of the common expenses of everyday life. The Court, again emphasizing the retention of control, said at page 682:

> The relation between the parties, the tendency of the transfer to give relief from obligations that are recognized as binding by normal men and women, will be facts to be considered. Cf. *Reinecke* v. *Smith*, *supra*, distinguishing *Hoeper* v. *Tax Commission* (284 U. S. 206). We do not go into their bearing now. Here the use to be made of the income of the trust was subject, from first to last, to the will of the grantor announced at the beginning. A particular expense, which for millions of men and women has become a fixed charge, as it doubtless was for Wells, an expense which would have to be continued if he was to preserve a contract right, was to be met in a particular way.

Helvering v. *Clifford* ((1940) 309 U. S. 331). This case involved the validity of a short-term—5-year—trust which the settlor had set up, with the income for that time being held for the exclusive benefit of his wife. On termination the corpus was to go to trustor. During the term the trustor retained voting powers incident to the stocks forming the corpus of the trust, the power to sell, exchange, mortgage, and deed the pledged securities, the power to invest, the power to collect the income, to compromise claims, and to hold property in the trust estate. The Government contended that during the term the income was taxable to the trustor, and the Court, through Mr. Justice Douglas, upheld the Government's claim. It is here that we find the Court referring to "the family group" as "one income unit." At page 335 the Court said:

> And where the grantor is the trustee and the beneficiaries are members of his family group, special scrutiny of the arrangement is necessary lest what is in reality but one economic unit be multiplied into two or more by devices which, though valid under State law, are not conclusive so far as section 22 (a) is concerned.

The meaning of this language is very substantially modified, however, when read, as it should be, with the following paragraphs. It appears that the trustor retained the all-important control of the corpus. (The Court said at pp. 335–336):

> In this case we cannot conclude as a matter of law that respondent ceased to be the owner of the corpus after the trust was created. Rather, the short duration of the trust, the fact that the wife was the beneficiary, and the retention of control over the corpus by respondent all lead irresistibly to the conclusion that respondent continued to be the owner for purposes of section 22 (a).

In *Hormel* v. *Helvering* ((1941) 85 L. Ed. (Advance Opinions) 651), the Court, through Justice Black, reaffirmed its opinion in the Clifford case. This case involved the attempt of the taxpayer to escape income taxes by setting up a trust in favor of his children, the income from which was to be paid to his wife as their guardian. As in the Clifford case, the factual situation here is distinguishable from our own.

Helvering v. *Horst* ((1940) 85 L. Ed. (Advance Opinions) 99). Here the taxpayer attempted to escape a tax on the income derived from bonds held in his name, by transferring interest coupons, prior to their maturity, to a named donee. In holding this income still taxable to the transferor Mr. Justice Stone referred again to the ultimate source of control, saying at page 101:

> Underlying the reasoning in these cases is the thought that income is "realized" by the assignor because he, who owns or controls the source of the income, also controls the disposition of that which he could have received himself and diverts the payment from himself to others as the means of procuring the satisfaction of his wants. The taxpayer has equally enjoyed the fruits of his labor or investment and obtained the satisfaction of his desires whether he collects and uses the income to procure those satisfactions, or whether he disposes of his right to collect it as the means of procuring them. (Cf. *Burnet* v. *Wells*, 289 U. S. 670, 77 L. Ed. 1439, 58 S. Ct. 760, supra.)

And again at page 103:

> When, by the gift of the coupons, he has separated his right to interest payments from his investment and procured the payment of the interest to his donee, he has enjoyed the economic benefits of the income in the same manner and to the same extent as though the transfer were of earnings and in both cases the import of the statute is that the fruit is not to be attributed to a different tree from that on which it grew. See *Lucas* v. *Earl*, supra (281 U. S. 115, 74 L. Ed. 733, 50 S. Ct. 241).

A similar situation was involved in *Helvering* v. *Eubanks* (1940, 85 L. Ed. (Advance Opinions) 104), which was an assignment by a general life insurance agent of certain renewal commissions.

Another similar situation was *Harrison* v. *Schaffner* (1941, 85 L. Ed. (Advance Opinions) 694), where there was involved the anticipatory assignment of trust income instead of interest, dividends, and rents. The Court reached the same conclusion in the case. Again it will appear that none of these cases presents a situation so closely analogous to our own that it could properly serve as authority for the present proposition. If the husband's control is to be held sufficient to justify compulsory joint returns, the Court will have no more than general authority for that conclusion; there will be no direct authority for such a decision.

Of course, no person has even suggested that a wife has a control over her husband's separate property comparable to his over hers, and yet under the present proposal the wife will be liable for an increase in her tax due to marriage in the same way as her husband is. As to her, it would not seem that the Government could even pretend an answer. Clearly the proposed tax will deprive her of her property in violation of the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BOEHNE, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

CORRESPONDENCE OF THE PRESIDENT, THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AND HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 31, 1941.

MY DEAR BOB: Because of some uncertainties which seem to have developed in regard

to the position of the Treasury Department in regard to some provisions in the tax bill as reported out by the Ways and Means Committee, I asked the Treasury Department for a clarifying letter, and I think it is only fair to send this to you. I enclose a copy of Secretary Morgenthau's letter to me and also an appendix showing examples of corporations which would largely escape excess-profits taxes under the bill.

I am sure that I make it clear that the Treasury Department does not approve of mandatory joint tax returns except on the condition of granting substantial relief to earned income of the husband and wife. In this I heartily concur. But the committee draft leaves out the proviso altogether.

You and JERE COOPER have talked over the problem of the excess-profits tax in its relationship to the omission in the bill of application of this tax to certain types of corporations. These corporations may be making 20 or 30 or 50 percent on their equity capital. It is my definite opinion that they ought to contribute to the cost of our great defense program far more heavily this year than last year or the year before. But just because they happened to have made equally large profits in recent years, they are called on to contribute no more to the national defense under the proposed bill than they did before. That seems to me clearly a discrimination in their favor.

There is one other subject which I did not have a chance to talk with you about. It relates to lowering the exemptions in the lower brackets. I know that very few tax experts agree with me, but I still think that some way ought to be found by which the exemption of a single person should be reduced to $750, with a provision for a straight simple payment of some small contribution to the national tax income through some simple agency and on some simple form.

In the same way I think that the married exemption should be reduced to $1,500, again with a simple method of paying the tax through a simple agency and on a simple form.

Further, I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of our citizens want to contribute something directly to our defense, and that most of them would rather do it with their eyes open than do it through a general sales tax or through a multiplication of what we have known as nuisance taxes. In other words, most Americans who are in the lowest income brackets are willing and proud to chip in directly, even if their individual contributions are very small in terms of dollars. After all, the majority of all Americans are in these lowest brackets.

One other thought: Perhaps your committee will think it worth while to study the filing of low-income returns through the machinery of the post offices. This will undoubtedly save a good deal of the cost of collection under the present system. These simple returns could be sworn to before the local postmaster, who, of course, would have to be authorized to administer the necessary oath.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, July 31, 1941.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You have asked me to indicate the position taken by the Treasury Department during the consideration of the present tax bill with regard to (1) the mandatory joint-tax-returns provision, and (2) the excess-profits-tax provision.

1. Mandatory joint-tax returns: The Treasury indicated to the Ways and Means Committee its conditional approval of mandatory joint-tax returns, the condition being that substantial relief is simultaneously granted to earned income of both husband and wife. No substantial relief is afforded by the provisions of the pending bill from the resulting increased tax in those cases where husband and wife contribute through their labor to the family income. Therefore, in this important respect the pending bill is inconsistent with the Treasury's suggestion.

2. Excess-profits tax: The Treasury has consistently adhered to the position that the excess-profits tax should apply to profits in excess of a reasonable return on invested capital. Many corporations between 1936 and 1939 (the base period) earned average profits far in excess of a reasonable normal return. Nevertheless, the pending bill exempts all such earnings from excess-profits taxation unless they are more than 95 percent of the average profits earned in the 1936 to 1939 period. Therefore, in another important respect the pending bill is inconsistent with the Treasury's clearly announced purpose.

Some of the reasons for the Treasury's position are:

(a) The highly prosperous, well-established corporation which has been making 30, 40, 50 percent or more on its invested capital has a greater ability to pay taxes than a corporation which has been earning only 3, 4, or 5 percent on its invested capital, even though the dollar incomes of the two companies are the same. Congress has established the principle of taxation in accordance with ability to pay so far as individual income, estate, and gift taxes are concerned. The Treasury advocates the application of this principle to corporations as well as to individuals. Taxation of corporations in accordance with ability to pay calls for higher taxes on the profits of those corporations which have the higher rates of return on invested capital.

(b) The corporation which has been making a high rate of return in the period from 1936 to 1939 is given, by the existing law, a competitive advantage over newly organized concerns or those struggling to establish themselves. The older corporations which have been earning high profits are given a much greater rate of return free of excess-profits tax than are their newer competitors. The effect is to confirm monopolies and to protect well-established prosperous businesses against competition.

(c) If we are to expect all classes of society, including laborers and farmers, to accept the sacrifices of the emergency period and not to press for every possible dollar of advantage, they must be convinced that burdens are being distributed according to ability to bear them and that no one is making unreasonably large profits. The imposition and enforcement of a true excess-profits tax will thus help to prevent inflation.

Faithfully yours,

HENRY MORGENTHAU, JR.,
Secretary of the Treasury.

THE PRESIDENT, *The White House.*

EXAMPLES OF CORPORATIONS ESCAPING EXCESS-PROFITS TAXES

The way in which the present law and the committee's tentative plan leave exempt large amounts of excess profits is illustrated by the following actual examples:

A. After paying all taxes an automobile company made during the base-period years of 1936 through 1939 approximately 25 percent. Practically all (95 percent) of this amount can be earned and yet be free from excess-profits tax under the present law and under the committee plan. In 1940 the earnings of this concern, after the payment of taxes, will be approximately 26 percent of its invested capital under the present law.

B. The earnings of a manufacturer of tractors with nearly $50,000,000 of invested capital averaged, after all taxes, approximately 18 percent of invested capital during 1936-39, which amount will be free of excess-profits tax under the present law and the committee's tentative plan.

C. Similarly, a company which has practically a monopoly on one of the important defense materials had earnings, after taxes, during the base period years averaging approximately 19 percent of its 1940 invested capital, which it can continue to earn free of excess-profits tax.

D. A large manufacturer of beverages can continue to earn free of excess-profits tax over 25 percent of its 1940 reported equity capital.

Thus large amounts of the kind of profits which are commonly defined as excess profits and were taxed as such under the 1918 act are free from excess-profits tax under the present law and the committee plan.

JULY 30, 1941.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 2, 1941.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was very greatly surprised to receive your letter of July 31, criticizing certain features of the pending tax bill, which our committee has recently reported to the House after more than 3 months of most careful deliberation and study. The matters discussed in your letter have all received our most careful consideration.

After receiving your letter I called a meeting of the committee for 10 o'clock this morning, and at that time I laid before it the contents of your letter. Each of the three items mentioned by you were again discussed. Then by decisive majorities the committee voted to reaffirm the action previously taken with respect to each of them and instructed me to so advise you with the reasons therefor.

As to mandatory joint returns, we are pleased to learn that you, as well as the Treasury, approve of it in principle. Our whole desire was to place the family upon an equitable basis from a tax standpoint and remove the admitted evil of tax avoidance. The existing law permits a rank discrimination in levying different taxes upon two married couples enjoying equal incomes merely because in one case the income belonged wholly to one spouse and in the other to both. This has been recognized by the Treasury as an evil for many years, and mandatory joint returns have been suggested by the Treasury on many occasions without qualification to remedy this situation.

While the Treasury gave belated approval to mandatory joint returns in the pending bill, such approval was qualified upon the condition that we continue this inequitable feature of existing law as to earned income. After careful consideration of the Treasury qualification, the committee was unable to see any logic in favoring a family in which both spouses earned the income as against a family where one spouse earned the entire amount for the support of the family. That was the controlling reason why the committee almost unanimously rejected the Treasury qualification. It was against extending special earned-income relief to a family in which both spouses contributed to the income. I would be surprised if anyone would be in favor of penalizing the family in which the husband is the sole breadwinner in favor of the family where the wife also draws a salary. Yet this is exactly what the Treasury qualification would have accomplished if we had permitted it to be incorporated in our bill. The mandatory joint-return proposal of the pending bill will not only remove the inequities and close some of the most glaring income-tax loopholes of existing law, which are especially pronounced in the community-property States, but it will also result in the Government securing additional revenue of more than $300,000,000, which, in our judgment, could not be raised from any other source with so little burden or hardship.

Referring to the excess-profits-tax proposal of your letter, our committee recognized that there are differences of opinion as to the proper base for measuring excess profits. This question was thoroughly discussed before the excess-profits tax was enacted last year by the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Finance, and the Congress. It was again fully discussed this year, when the Treasury urged the same proposal which the Congress had decisively rejected in 1940, and extensive hearings were again held on this subject. Following the hearings our committee again refused to adopt this proposal of the Treasury. As a result of your recent conference with Mr. COOPER and myself, I again brought the matter before the committee. After carefully reviewing the subject in the light of our discussion with you, which was fully reported by us to our colleagues, the committee again overwhelmingly rejected the Treasury proposal.

While a corporation's return on invested capital may seem large in some instances, and this is especially true in the case of a business, which has grown from a humble beginning, it does not follow that such a corporation has realized excess profits. The difficulty is that experience has shown that invested capital is not a proper base for measuring excess profits in many cases. Our studies and the overwhelming testimony of witnesses before our committee has convinced us of the undesirability and inequity of measuring excess profits by the sole standard of invested capital. The experience of this method in the last World War and its abandonment by foreign countries show that it does not determine the excessiveness of profits even reasonably well.

The major objections to this form of taxation are set forth on pages 23 and 24 of our committee report.

I feel that no one would be inclined to favor the corporation which had retained its earnings over a long period of time, as against the corporation which distributed its earnings and thereby permitted the Government to secure the individual normal and surtaxes on such earnings. Or to favor the company which by chance was incorporated in a year of high values, as compared with a company organized in a year of low values. Or to conclude that the present shareholders of a corporation have realized an excess profits on what the original shareholders paid for their stock. Or not to give recognition to factors of personal efficiency as well as capital in determining the measure of excess profits. Yet it was demonstrated to our committee that not only these but other inequities existed under a straight invested-capital method, which would prevent such an excess-profits tax from operating fairly on the basis of ability to pay. To punish the small corporation in favor of the heavy or overcapitalized corporations would punish conservative corporation finance and reward stock watering. It would put a penalty on brains, energy, and enterprise, and confirm old ventures in their monopolies.

Our committee believes that the excess-profits tax plan in the pending bill is the fairest which could be devised. Under the existing law, the excess-profits tax was estimated to yield for the calendar year 1941 the amount of $1,026,400,000. An additional amount of $1,198,300,000 is estimated from this source under the bill, making a total yield of $2,224,700,000 from the excess-profits tax. When it is considered that this is the first year in which the defense program has been in full operation, it is believed that we have provided a very effective excess-profits tax for preventing the retention of unreasonable profits from the defense program. In fact, if we had followed the original recommendations of the Treasury, we would have secured only $400,000,000 additional revenue from the excess-profits tax, and if we had followed their revised proposal, we would have secured only $716,800,000 from the excess-profits tax.

In regard to personal exemptions, there were several members of the committee, including myself, who were inclined to look with favor on broadening the tax base by reducing the personal exemptions allowed single and married persons However, the Treasury representatives in their appearance before our committee were strenuously opposed to any reduction in personal exemptions, citing the rising cost of living and the burden of hidden taxes on persons in the low-income groups to justify their view. Undoubtedly, this position of the Treasury had some influence upon our action. I am surprised to learn that your views are antagonistic to those expressed so emphatically by the Treasury as the representative of the administration. The committee at times found it impossible during the course of its hearings to reconcile the testimony of different officials representing the administration.

With respect to that part of your letter relating to hidden taxes, the committee bill more nearly conforms to the views expressed by you than the recommendation made by the Treasury Department to our committee.

The Treasury recommended that the committee levy $1,248,900,000 from this source. The bill, as reported by our committee, recommends only $880,100,000 be collected from excises and other miscellaneous sources, and $160,200,000 of that amount can in no way be termed or classed as a hidden tax.

I submit to you, Mr. President, the record of our committee, as well as that of myself, for the past 8 years as evidence of our desire to cooperate with you and the representatives of your administration to the fullest extent consistent with the proper discharge of our solemn obligations.

Nothing in this letter is intended as a defense of or an apology for the action which we have taken, but only as an explanation, so that you and the country may understand some of the reasons for our conclusions.

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

R. L. DOUGHTON.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

What a Farmer Is Up Against

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in 30 minutes' time on this floor I do not think that I could convey a better picture of the plight of the farmer who is in debt and whose crops have been ruined than the letter just received from Mr. Erick Nordeng, of Schafer, N. Dak. The letter follows:

SCHAFER, N. DAK., *July 30, 1941.*

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: I am in receipt of a letter from the Farm Credit Administration reminding me of the fact that about 7 years ago this office loaned you money, and it seems that now they want it all, or at least full payment of this loan by November 1, 1941, will be expected, and that sounds to me as if they would not refuse a full settlement sometime this fall regardless of the fact that hailstones fell on almost every acre of crop I had in this year.

Perhaps I should state right now that I do not expect you to be able to pay this loan for me, likewise I can hardly expect you to shoot the entire F. C. A. set-up, so they cannot collect, but I am sure that you will be especially glad to learn of their nice attitude, especially to people who can harvest ice cubes from wheat fields. Do you suppose they ever thought it might be hard for a farmer to clean up in 1 year, all of the old bills he ran during the last dozen years? Doesn't this F. C. A. outfit live near enough to the United States to read an occasional American paper and learn that the Government came in here and bought up all of the cattle that the Government had feed loans against—do they expect to foreclose their mortgage now when they bought the cows 5 years ago—just what is the score?

Out here at our farm we get a little old farm paper, and when it hails so hard we don't dare go outside we sit inside and read that paper, and from what we see in that paper it seems that our own Government is looking all over for foreign governments who might be interested in receiving something for nothing—if they won't take it as an outright gift maybe we'll lease-lend it, or figure out something else equally smart. If the Government is so eager to lease-lend why don't they just leave these old loans alone for a while? They already have it loaned—why take it away from us who do not have it to give to others?

Why wouldn't it be a good idea to introduce a resolution to leave the farmers alone during this so-called emergency when it is out of the question to get help on a farm—all of the men have left here to go into the Army or take other emergency positions, and the farmer can whistle and pay back old lend-lease stuff.

Very truly yours,

ERICK NORDENG.

Tax on Radio Broadcasting and Outdoor Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

LETTER FROM JOHN BENSON, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF ADVERTISING AGENCIES

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AUGUST 1, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: The American Association of Advertising Agencies respectfully protests against the imposition of a special

tax on the radio broadcasting and the outdoor advertising media, as recommended by the Ways and Means Committee of the House in the revenue bill of 1941, title VI, section 601, now before the House for enactment.

In fact, it deeply deplores such a tax for reasons brought out in the following statement:

This association is the national body of advertising agencies in this country, handling two-thirds of the total national advertising, and its members practice advertising in a scientific and professional way. They have no bias in favor of one advertising medium over any other, using all of them as required by the advertising or marketing problem to be solved for a given client. They have no financial interest in any media they use; that would be a breach of our ethical code.

Hence we hold no brief for the radio or the outdoor medium, as such, in making this protest. What we deplore about the proposed tax is the burden it imposes upon advertising itself, and hence upon the cost of distribution of consumer goods in this country. Advertising is but one of several forms of selling and is often used to facilitate personal sales effort. All advertising is selling, but not all selling is advertising. A manufacturer uses advertising when he thinks it is cheaper than any other form of selling or wants to economize the time and effort of his salesmen.

If his selling depends upon creating goodwill or a conviction about his product in the minds of millions of consumers, he will find it cheaper to put an advertisement costing several thousand dollars in a publication, on billboards or over the air, reachng several million consumers, than to hire an army of salesmen to call on these consumers and tell them his story personally, or even write them a letter about it.

When you increase the cost of distribution by burdening it with taxes, you at the same time do one or more of the four following things injurious to national defense and to public welfare:

1. You slow down civilian production and nondefense employment—a bad thing for labor. Printing labor is not benefited by a discriminatory tax like this one. Its employment depends upon successful advertising, on the whole, and a lot of it—whatever the media used. Then one medium feeds another, as so often happens, in the widespread campaigns run by successful advertisers.

2. Or, you deprive business of volume and reduce net profit on which taxes are paid at an upward moving rate.

3. Or, you reduce the margin between selling price and cost of distributing goods which might or could be used in increasing wages to labor, or improving the product.

4. Or, when you raise the cost of selling, you add to the upward spiral of prices with its dangerous trend toward inflation and public discontent.

One of the most important services that advertising renders to distribution is to save time, money, and effort. Cost of the media used is a big factor, of course, in the economy of the advertising operation. It does not matter how effective the advertising appeal may be, to increase the cost of the channel used to reach a market will lower the efficiency just that much, with the results above referred to.

The plea has been made that this special radio tax is not imposed on advertising, which is a part of the work of selling, but on entertainment. This is fallacious indeed. Tax on entertainment is imposed on admissions and usually paid by the public. This radio tax will be imposed on the commercial or advertising portion of the broadcasting, and not upon the noncommercial entertainment of sustaining programs. Time sales are entirely for commercial use. They are distinctly advertising, just as much as advertising in publications; both being a commercial message surrounded by entertainment and editorial features. Both need adequate advertising revenues to pay for the best talent in speaking, music, and in writing, which are furnished to the public for nothing in radio and for a very small price in publications, of immense importance to public morale and enlightenment in this country. There is nothing parallel to it anywhere else in the civilized world.

In closing may I say a word about the special public service rendered by advertising during the defense emergency, and why it should not be burdened or handicapped in rendering that service.

Advertising is a definite aid against inflation and higher prices. It does not stimulate desire for more civilian goods than can be produced. It does not encourage indiscriminate demand by the public. It promotes good will for a definite product or service but does not stimulate its immediate sale unless it is available in supply or can be adequately produced. Arousing desire for products which conflict with defense production would not result in sufficient sales to pay for the advertising, and would also cause ill will instead of good will among customers.

Advertising thus diverts public attention and desire away from such goods and toward those which can be made in abundance, and in this area of production builds up volume to satisfy popular need and absorb the expanded purchasing power of the masses employed in national defense. No better hedge against inflation and rising prices could be devised.

As the President has pointed out, the Nation needs all the economic activity it is possible to have, for the welfare of its people and for financing the war effort, and advertising is an effective spur in the right direction.

The cost of it is all-important. When you tax advertising or any medium of advertising, whether outdoor, radio, or printed space, you slow down the movement of goods upon which wages and profits depend and from which taxes can be derived. It is so much more economic to tax wealth and net income than the means of producing them. To do the latter is like consuming seed corn instead of planting it and producing abundant crops for consumption.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN BENSON, *President.*

Metallic Magnesium Can Now Be Produced at Low Cost and in Great Amount

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, in 1937 I visited Washington State College at Pullman, Wash., for the purpose of familiarizing myself with the work being done there in connection with reducing magnesite ore and converting it into metallic magnesium.

This work was being done by a cooperative agreement between the United States Bureau of Mines and the State of Washington at the State college in its mining division. Under the direction of H. A. Doerner, representative of the United States Bureau of Mines, assisted by Dwight L. Harris, of the State college, and in the department presided over by A. E. Drucker, dean of the school of mines, laboratory experiments were carried on demonstrating to a certainty that a new electrothermic method had been discovered, by which the crude ore was being converted into metallic magnesium. The problem immediately presented was to prove that this laboratory method could be carried over into commericial production. To prove this fact it was necessary that the Federal Government appropriate approximately $75,000 to construct a small pilot plant.

Upon my return to Washington I contacted the then Director of the Bureau of Mines and other Government officials, urging that they submit an estimate to the Bureau of the Budget sufficient to carry on pilot plant work in connection with this wonder metal. An estimate was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget but was promptly turned down. When the supply bill for the Interior Department came before the subcommittee of which I am a member, I again presented the facts fully and in spite of Budget Bureau rejection was able to secure an initial appropriation for $40,000, and subsequently additional appropriations have been made.

It has been a long fight, but has finally resulted in success. In order to arouse an interest here in Washington in this matter, I presented it in detail to President Roosevelt, and furnished him with samples of the material that had been produced in the laboratory at Pullman, Wash. I took it up with Secretary Ickes and later with Mr. E. R. Stettinius when the National Emergency Defense Council was first established. I repeatedly brought it to the attention of my colleagues in the House, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, and when Dr. R. R. Sayers became Director of the Bureau of Mines, he actively supported the work.

It is indeed gratifying that these experimental steps, taken with so many handicaps, have now resulted in an accomplished fact, and within the last 30 days the pilot plant at Pullman, Wash., has been producing in quantity, enough of this metal so vital to our national defense as to demonstrate the commercial possibilities.

It is now planned by the Government to build a large plant at Spokane, Wash., using Grand Coulee electrical energy and magnesite ores from Stevens County to produce metallic magnesium of exceptionally high purity.

The story of this development, together with a statement of what it will mean to our national defense, has recently been written by Dan D. Markel, and published in the Seattle Post Intelligencer in the issue of July 27, and I take pleasure in herewith submitting that exceptional and interesting statement, which is entitled to the thoughtful consideration of every person in America because of the great part this metal will play in our national-defense program as well as our future peacetime development.

The statement follows:

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Post Intelligencer of July 27, 1941]

MAGNESIUM KEY FOUND AT WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE—GROTESQUE DEVICE TRANSFORMS ORE INTO METAL

(By Dan B. Markel)

PULLMAN, WASH., July 26.—Cramped in makeshift quarters of one of Washington State College's red brick buildings is the weird cradle of what both Senators and scientists believe will become one of the Nation's vital defense industries.

A grotesque monstrosity of coils and vats, wires, gages, and tubing, it appears to be either the materialization of an engineer's nightmare or what H. A. Doerner, its creator and nursemaid, more simply describes as "Rube Goldberg stuff."

PECULIAR ORE

But it does things. It does things nobody believed possible 2 or 3 years back. It takes a peculiar concentrated ore from the Huckleberry Mountains, of Stevens County, and transforms the whitish powder into a thick black mud and then changes it again into silvery, feather-light metal.

That metal is magnesium. Germans use a lot of it in airplanes. They use it because it is a third lighter than aluminum but just as strong. They have their own process, but they are keeping their process very secret.

American plane manufacturers haven't used much of the metal because little is available. That little is produced from brines and sea water and the cost is 28 cents per pound.

Magnesium from Washington magnesite can be produced by the process developed at Pullman for 10 cents a pound, it has been demonstrated by Doerner and A. E. Drucker, dean of the school of mines.

Drucker visions a $12,000,000 magnesium plant in Washington before long. Only 6 to 7 months would be required for its construction, he asserts, and it would produce 24,000,000 pounds of magnesium in a year.

That is twice as much magnesium as is now produced in the entire United States, where only 1 pound of the metal is now manufactured to 33 pounds of aluminum.

Incidentally, patents to the process developed at Pullman have been assigned to the Washington State College Research Foundation.

Oddly, experiments at the college laboratory did not commence with magnesium. They were begun on manganese and on alumina clays when the college received its first funds for research back in 1937. Only 2 years ago did the work on magnesium get actually under way.

EXPERTS LOOK WEST

Now defense chiefs, officials of the Office of Production Management in Washington, D. C., War Department experts, scientists, and Government engineers have their eyes turned across the country to the magnesium pilot plant on the Pullman campus. The reason is that that pale metal with a moonlight sheen is the dream material for airplanes.

Government officials gave Doerner, Drucker, and their aides 3 years to work on magnesium. A year ahead of that deadline they have assured its completion and success.

And at the same time they have worked on other problems vital to Washington's industrial progress, also with success. They have produced dry ice as a byproduct of the magnesium process. They have produced alumina from Washington clays.

CHROMITE ORES WORKED

They have worked the chromite ores of Whatcom and Okanogan Counties. They have produced muscovite mica, high-grade silica and aluminum sulfate from certain western Washington clays.

But their principal fame rests with magnesium because it is a No. 1 defense item and is vitally needed right now.

"We know our process will work, because it is working," Dean Drucker commented today.

"Our major problem has been with the design of electric furnaces and many automatic parts. Our work had to start from the ground up, because we couldn't borrow anything from Germany's process, which they kept a military secret.

"First we made small furnaces. They were failures. We made them over and over. We ran into all sorts of bugs. But now we have conquered them. We are producing now in our pilot plant 3-pound high-purity magnesium metal ingots."

Scientific "bugs" were not the only ones the scientists encountered. There were many statements and much propaganda advanced against magnesium it was necessary to overcome.

Here are some of them and Drucker's answers:

1. Existing industries are producing all the magnesium the market requires.

Answer. This was true of the past but not of the immediate future and the present preparedness program for our country. Germany, England, Japan, Italy, and Russia have been most progressive in the use of this ultra-light metal for structural shapes, sheet, and castings for airplane manufacture.

America has been asleep and very backward in using this metal. Not until recent years has magnesium had any real use as a structural metal. At the present time about 400,000,000 pounds of aluminum is produced in this country, against only 12,000,000 of magnesium metal. Magnesium is superior to aluminum in a number of ways for airplane construction.

2. You do not know what it would cost to produce magnesium metal.

Answer. We know approximately the cost of open-pit mining, tramming, flotation milling, calcining, direct-carbon reduction, distilling, and casting the high-purity magnesium metal into ingots for the market.

On a basis of 400 to 800 tons per day of Washington low-grade magnesite ore—15 to 25 percent—it will not cost more than 10 cents per pound for magnesium metal. On a basis of that comparable with the present yearly production of aluminum in America it would cost less, possibly 8 cents per pound.

Lead and zinc are produced for about 4 to 5 cents per pound and copper for about 8 to 10 cents with more complicated mining methods, smelting, and refining processes for magnesium.

3. The statement of the large deposits of magnesite in the State of Washington is disputed by the statement that there is a nominal amount of probably six or seven million tons of ore that might be available if needed.

Answer. It has been estimated by the United States Geological Survey that there are 7,000,000 tons of high-grade magnesium in the Stevens County district "and there may be more." Other magnesite deposits have been described by engineers.

VAST FIGURES GIVEN

If you take 5,000,000 tons of ore assaying 26.7 percent magnesium metal, this will contain 1,335,000 tons of magnesium and with an 80-percent extraction by the new process will give 968,000 tons of the metal.

This is equal to 1,936,000,000 pounds of magnesium. The present rate of production is 12,000,000 pounds per year, and this would require 161 years to completely exhaust this reserve of magnesite ore.

Next year the production of magnesium metal will be doubled or 24,000,000 pounds, and at that rate it would require 80 years to exhaust the 5,000,000 tons.

Now with the Doerner-Harris flotation process we have made possible great reserves of the low-grade magnesite ore, assaying 14 to 25 percent. That means we have in Stevens County ample ore reserves for many years to come. We have developed our processes for these vast deposits of low-grade ores, and we need not fear of running out of ore in hundreds of years to come.

Then was added significantly:

"The aluminum bauxite ores will be exhausted in this country long before the deposits of magnesite. The sea water has plenty of magnesium and gold, but it is in a very small percentage, about 2 pounds of magnesium per ton, while magnesite concentrate from the Stevens County low-grade magnesite ores contains over 540 pounds per ton of the lightest structural metal known to industry."

Drucker is particularly pleased that the process patent has been assigned to the State college for research work.

"As royalties revert back to the foundation they will provide funds to support research that will in turn bring new industries in this State.

"It will all go to create successful Washington industries and put our people to work."

Drucker feels that the flotation plant and the "dead burning calcine" plant should be located near the ore body. Fabricating plants could be constructed in other parts of the State.

Chief requirement in the manufacture of magnesium metal by the new process is electric power, but power requirements are not quite as great as that for aluminum.

"Aluminum requires 10 to 12 kilowatt-hours per pound of metal," he observed. "Nine to ten kilowatt-hours will be required per pound of metal magnesium by the process developed here."

Both Drucker and Doerner pointed out that in some respects the process to be employed by the Henry J. Kaiser interests in producing magnesium in a plant being constructed in California and using Nevada magnesite.

There are many minor differences, however, and one major one. Magnesium manufacture requires quick cooling during the process.

Hydrogen gas will be used for cooling in the Kaiser plant.

Oil is used at Pullman.

There is much natural hydrogen gas available in California, none in Washington. On the other side of the ledger is the fact that there is a tremendous amount of low-cost electric energy here which nullifies the expense of using oil here.

And it isn't such a great expense as that for the oil can be used and reused many times.

Hydrogen gas has grave disadvantages also. It is highly inflammable and explosive. In Austria a plant using it blew up. In Korea and England where they also used hydrogen for cooling they likewise had trouble.

Doerner, reticent and engrossed in his task, described the birth of the process thus:

"Five years ago all magnesium metal was made from salts obtained from brine. Previous attempts to make it from magnesite had failed to compete with the brine method.

"The prospect of large amounts of power in the Columbia River developed, but the question arose of markets for this power. It appeared that the most feasible market would be the metallurgical industries which could utilize local raw materials.

"The production of magnesium metal from magnesite appeared the most attractive possibility in spite of the fact that no economically feasible method was known.

"Now a process has been developed through the laboratory stage and is being tested out on a larger scale with highly encouraging results.

"The program was originally intended to cover a 3-year period. Two years have been used. Under normal conditions we would expect to work on another year before announcing our conclusion and expecting the results to be utilized industrially, but due

to the critical situation in the production of magnesium metal we are making every effort to speed up the program."

Doerner reached into the pilot plant and pulled out a magnesium ingot while his coworkers grinned. He looked at it critically. Then he grinned too, with shy satisfaction.

Here is, in unscientific language, roughly how the pilot plant works:

First. The ore is reduced into a crude concentrate and mixed with powdered coal. A hydraulic ram pounds it continuously into an electric furnace, the heat of which vaporizes the magnesium.

The magesium vapor had a temperature in excess of 4,000 degrees Fahrenheit, and would reoxidize were it not chilled instantaneously.

This is done by a spray of hydrocarbon oil as the vapor emerges from the furnace port. The chilled material now appears as a thick, jet-black, slightly oily mud.

The mud is centrifugally scrubbed. The hydrocarbons pass through the scrubber as a vapor and is collected in a refrigerated condenser. Then the oil and magnesium are distilled separately in a two-stage still operating at atmospheric pressure.

The cooling oils are recovered for repeated use.

Pure magnesium is produced.

Dwight L. Harris has been Doerner's principal assistant in developing the process and is a copatentee.

Here are the comparative densities of magnesium, aluminum, and iron compared with water: Magnesium 1.74, aluminum 2.70, and iron 7.86. Present comparative costs are: Magnesium, 28 cents per pound; aluminum, 20 cents; and iron, 1 cent.

"A ton of high-grade magnesite ore can be quarried for not exceeding $6, yet its magnesium content, if reduced to metal, has a market price of about $150," Doerner has stated.

"Such a huge difference between the cost of an ore and the value of the metal that may be extracted is a challenge to metallurgists. The Metallurgical Division of the Bureau of Mines has undertaken to meet that challenge."

Doerner is assigned to Washington State College by the Bureau.

Arms Priorities for Russia

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the headlines in the local newspapers make interesting reading this morning—

United States gives "reds" arms priority—The United States last night opened its arsenals to Russia.

What strange bedfellows the present international crisis has created. After a long struggle we succeeded in removing David Lasser from the national W. P. A., and now Harry Hopkins has gone to Moscow and put Joe Stalin on the international W. P. A.

A strange three-cornered fight has developed in northern Europe with gallant Finland being attacked by Russia on the one hand and Britain on the other, while the United States finances all three belligerents.

A tremendous majority of the American people want to see Hitler defeated. I believe they are willing to furnish the tools in order to insure the fact that this job will be done. I cannot believe, however, that any substantial portion of our population has any desire to ally the United States too closely with the godless and soulless group of international brigands that are represented by Joseph Stalin and his henchmen.

In this connection I believe that the following resolution recently adopted by the California Elks Association is worthy of consideration:

Whereas the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks has been active in its opposition to communism and the infiltration of communism into our communities, State and Nation; and

Whereas we believe that the Communist Party in California and in other States of this Nation does not represent a party but a form of government, whose avowed purpose is the overthrow of our Government by force and violence, and whose party objectives are contrary to and opposed to fundamental principles and laws of the Republic: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the California Elks Association in convention assembled at Santa Cruz, Calif., do hereby petition the Congress of the United States of America and the Legislature of the State of California to enact such law or laws as may be necessary to outlaw the Communist Party as a political party in this State and Nation and to prohibit it from appearing upon any ballot in this State or in the United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded forthwith to the senators and members of the Assembly of the State of California and to the United States Senators and Representatives from California, and be forwarded to the Grand Lodge of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks for its consideration at the next session of the Grand Lodge.

Resolution of the Clan-na-Gael

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT NATIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Clan-na-Gael organization adopted at its recent national convention:

Acting on an order of its national convention, the Clan-na-Gael has released for publication the following statement of policy and declaration of principles:

"1. As the preservation of the free institutions of the United States should be the first and chief concern of our National Government, we exhort the executive department of that Government and the Congress, the law-making body, to be guided in these perilous times, when issues are enveloped in a fog of propaganda, by the warning of the immortal Washington against the dangers of foreign intrigues and foreign entanglements.

"2. We believe in and wholeheartedly support the policy of adequate preparations for the defense of the United States in the United States against the encroachment or aggression of any other nation. Americans standing on their own ground and observing, as our first President advised, "good faith and justice toward all nations," and as he also counseled, "excluding permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachment for others," can without difficulty preserve their free institutions and give, as the cardinal archbishop of Boston has suggested, "an example of peace and religious justice" to the belligerent nations of Europe. We believe that America for her own sake must not be exposed to the dangers which would inevitably assail her if she were to become a partner and participant in the oft-recurring squabbles of Old World nations, which are fighting for balances of power, colonies, control of the seas, trade routes, military outposts, or for the retention of territory acquired by conquest and aggression in the past. No American issue is involved, and no American interest is at stake in the war now being fought in the Old World between two rival groups of nations for the political mastery and economic control of Europe with all the other peoples of that Continent only pawns in the game of power politics.

"3. We assert that American citizens, the majority of whom are opposed to this country's entry into another foreign war, have not only the right but the duty to insist that the pledge against involvement in this war given by the leaders of both the major political parties before the last national election must be kept. If the elected representatives of the American people disregard the wishes of their constituents and fail to keep the solemn pledge made to them, the foundation of popular government here will be sapped, the confidence of the people, so necessary for success in government, will be lost and the great principle enunciated when this Nation was founded—the principle that 'governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed'—will be violated. Such a betrayal of trust would imperil and perhaps destroy the governmental system which Lincoln described and held intact—'government of the people, for the people, by the people.'

"4. We again denounce the dismemberment of Ireland by English statecraft in 1921, when 6 counties in northeast Ulster were separated from the other 26 Irish counties and placed under a separate puppet government for the malignant purpose of keeping religious bigotry alive in that area, in pursuance of the old imperialist policy of "divide and conquer.' We arraign the government of northern Ireland, which has been aided from its inception by subcidies from the English Imperial Treasury, for having functioned tyrannically and for having deprived people of our blood and race in the occupied part of Ireland over which it exercises control of practically every civic right and for having, as an independent English commission, which investigated conditions in northeast Ulster, reported, 'abrogated the rule of law and justice.' We demand the abolition of the boundary set around those 6 Irish counties, where no natural boundary exists, and the restoration of this territory to the Irish Nation, of which it has been a part since the beginning of time.

"5. We congratulate the people of Ireland on their decision to remain neutral in a war which was not of their making, and we approve their refusal to surrender Irish ports and air fields to England, or any other belligerent, for war bases and their determination to defend their territory and neutrality against any aggressor nation. We assert that they have a perfect right to make their own

decisions on all matters involving their peace and security, and we assure them of our continued support, consistent with our duty as American citizens, in their efforts to establish full freedom for all Ireland."

Let Us Use Cotton To Manufacture Parachutes

REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, some are advocating that the entire silk supply be diverted to the manufacture of parachutes and that no more silk be used for ladies' hose and other clothing. I am recommending to you Members of the House and various Government agencies that we use the large cotton surplus for the manufacture of parachutes. It can be used as effectively with safety and at the same time it will insure our farmers a greater return for their cotton.

The Morale of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

BOOK REVIEW FROM THE HARTFORD TIMES

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous permission granted to me to extend my remarks, I am pleased to incorporate herewith a statement in the form of a book review of the book, The Morale of Democracy, recently published by our respected colleague, Representative H. JERRY VOORHIS of California. It is a matter of great personal pleasure for me thus to recognize the observations which he has made therein, and it is also a matter of great satisfaction for me to know that keen interest on the part of many Members of this House is now being evidenced in the cooperative movement.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the basic problem which this great Nation of ours must solve is the lack of productive activity, particularly in those communities and States which are located at the extremities, geographically speaking, of our country. Such lack of productive activity can best be remedied, in my opinion, through the organization of cooperative community efforts based on the natural resources of each community in each and every State so located.

Cooperation of our thinking citizens in these communities will go far in meeting this problem of the lack of productivity. Such cooperation, financed through the medium of local credit pools and reservoirs which would result from the organization and operation of cooperative community credit unions, will develop America constructively and will constitute the very essence of democracy itself.

It is my opinion that this sincere and able work of JERRY VOORHIS is decidedly timely and most valuable in the light of our present-day confusion.

The review follows:

[From the Hartford Times, July 5, 1941]

JERRY VOORHIS SEES BEST HOPE IN COOPERATIVES—RECORDS GROWTH AS INTERNATIONAL DILEMMA SOLUTION.

(The Morale of Democracy, by JERRY VOORHIS. Reviewed by M. M.)

No one in his senses can deny that we have in this country only a potential democracy, not yet a true one. Yet only totalitarian sympathizers will deny that democracy offers the greatest hope of the human race and that we can have one that will work if we only want it badly enough and are willing to work and sacrifice for it.

Francis Williams has analyzed clearly the dilemma of democracy. Laski, Williams, Agar, all of our great liberals insist that we must establish now a real concept of the kind of world we and other freedom-loving peoples want to live in if we are to have an effective force with which to fight the reactionary ideology of totalitarian piracy.

ANSWER IN COOPERATIVES

Democracy, they say, must be international and achieved by all peoples working together, trusting and honoring one another and standing firm on their own integrity. Mr. VOORHIS, leader of the progressive bloc in Congress, finds the most effective means is in cooperatives.

In this little volume he gives the history of United States manufacturing, merchandising, and consumer cooperatives, tells how they work, what they have accomplished, and what we may hope for from them. To him they are the true expression of decency, honesty, faith in and love of one's fellow men, the opponents of short-sighted greed, the way of moral, political, and economic security. Wallace J. Campbell, assistant secretary of the Cooperative League of the United States of America, contributes an introduction that sums up what has been done in other countries. Dr. J. P. Warbasse, founder of the cooperative league, appends an epilogue on Cooperation in the World Crisis, in which he admits that some form of collectivism is inevitable everywhere, and expresses his belief that the form taken by the cooperative may fill the void when totalitarianism collapses, and save the world from chaos. He believes it will find increasing favor in the United States because it stands for private property, private business, and free competition, while preventing the expansion of the state in business.

MANY SURPRISES

Most persons know about Sweden's Middle Way, but they will find many surprises in this book. For example, in pre-Nazi Germany, 15,000,000 persons did $300,000,000 worth of business through retail cooperatives. In Great Britain last year they did a billion and a half dollars' worth. In the United States in 1940 more than 2,000,000 persons purchased $600,000,000 worth of goods through them.

The story of the way various ones have won out despite pressure and trickery by opponents is a dramatic one. The number of successful organizations and the variety of fields they cover is amazing.

Mr. VOORHIS expresses his fundamental belief thus: That the most important single need of the world today is "for one people somewhere in the world to give all mankind a living proof and demonstration that they can, without loss of liberty and without resort to governmental compulsion, solve the economic problems of this power age, end poverty in the midst of plenty, and make the machine the servant of man and not his master." All men need food, safety and security, and freedom of spirit. Those needs he believes we are beginning to solve by cooperatives. He hopes and believes it may be the destiny of America to become the rallying point of a hope for an American New World. Here is a way of working together, for ourselves and our fellow men everywhere, through the most Christian of business institutions.

Not a bad idea to look into it.

Facing the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR WEEKLY NEWS SERVICE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the American Federation of Labor Weekly News Service of July 29, 1941:

[From the American Federation of Labor Weekly News Service of July 29, 1941]

FACING THE FACTS WITH PHILIP PEARL

If there is one thing the Communists lack it's a sense of humor. They're so deadly serious all the time that they provoke a comic as well as an indignant reaction.

All of which is by way of explaining our present hilarity over the latest bit of undercover Communist propaganda which has come to our attention. We were burned up at first. But then, when we got to thinking it over, the ridiculousness of the whole thing hit us and we're still chuckling.

It seems that the Communists have now discovered that Edwin S. Smith, member of the National Labor Relations Board, is "a swell guy" and "honest as they come" and should be reappointed when his term expires on August 27.

We have this startling information on authority of Federated Press, one of the slickest transmission belts in the party's elaborate American set-up. This organization, masking as a labor news service, was exposed years ago by the American Federation of Labor as a Communist propaganda agency. It is still living up to its old standards.

Henry Zon, an obscure fellow-traveler who serves as Washington correspondent for Federated Press, writes about Edwin S. Smith in the July 25 issue of the propaganda service.

TOOL OF THE COMMUNISTS

"A number of labor and other organizations," says Mr. Zon, "are preparing to go into battle on his behalf. Labor enters this one (battle) lustily and with full knowledge that it battles for one of its true friends."

Well, if that isn't a laugh, we give up. If that isn't a dead give-away, there never was one. "A number of labor and other organizations," says Mr. Zon. What labor organizations outside of the Communist-dominated C. I. O., we ask? And we also want to inquire,

What are the other organizations? Is the Communist Party included among them?

It should be, if it isn't. Mr. Edwin S. Smith has been a faithful tool of the Communists. While on the pay roll of Uncle Sam, he went to Mexico City a few years ago with John L. Lewis and was hailed as a friend and fellow traveler by Toledano, the Mexican "red" leader, in a bull ring festooned with "red" flags.

In every decision he has assisted in rendering as a member of the National Labor Relations Board, Mr. Smith has lent aid and comfort to the Communists. The peak point of his career was the decision turning over hundreds of faithful American Federation of Labor members to the clutches of Harry Bridges in the notorious West Coast Longshoremen's case, which has since been reversed by the N. L. R. B. over Mr. Smith's vehement objections.

In his recent public speeches, Mr. Smith has been even more direct and frank. He has protested discrimination against Communists in national-defense plants, and he has upheld Communist strikes in key plants.

HEADED FOR THE ASHCAN

Fortunately for the Nation Mr. Smith and his views no longer control the National Labor Relations Board. There was a time, however, when he was the fair-haired boy. That was when J. Warren Madden and the other Smith boy, whose front handle we've already forgotten, served with him. They almost succeeded in killing all respect for the National Labor Relations Act with their tortured and unfair administration of the law.

Since then, however, the efforts of the American Federation of Labor for a housecleaning of the Board have borne fruit. Madden and the other Smith have been displaced and the changes have proved healthy and constructive. Now it is the turn of Edwin S. Smith. His term expires on August 27. Despite the efforts of the Communist Party and the C. I. O., we venture to predict that on August 28 Edwin S. Smith will be in the ashcan. There is not the faintest possibility of his reappointment.

A word in conclusion about Federated Press. This should be of particular interest to the labor press loyal to the American Federation of Labor. We know, because its representatives have tried to tell us so, that Federated Press claims to be impartial as between the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. We know from reading the propaganda issued by Federated Press that it is completely biased and inimical to the A. F. of L. We could give a hundred instances of this bias. There isn't the slightest doubt about it, Federated Press tries in every way, even by stretching the truth, to embarrass the American Federation of Labor and propagandize for the C. I. O. at all times. And no wonder. Its staff is honeycombed with "reds" and fellow travelers. One of its chief executives, Carl Haessler, is on the pay roll of the C. I. O. Auto Workers Union on the side. Enough said.

Letter From William J. Conlon, of Binghamton, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BINGHAMTON, N. Y., *July 31, 1941.*

Hon. EDWIN A. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On two or three occasions I have had the honor of addressing you on matters that I consider of the utmost importance to all your constituents, no matter what political party they were affiliated with. To all of my messages you replied promptly. From your replies it seems to me that you have a faculty of knowing just what the people back home want in the way of legislation.

Your stand on keeping us out of war—keeping our boys at home—is what the people want, regardless of what the newspapers in this district say editorially. You have the people with you, and I for one want the people to raise their voices in your behalf for the work you already have done since you have been in Congress. Keep up the good work—fight for peace—fight to keep our boys at home to defend our own country.

It has been my pleasure to watch your actions since you first entered our city council. You did a good job there, and I know you will repeat this performance in the Congress of the United States.

While I have been associated with the Democratic Party ever since my first vote 50 years ago, I have always considered myself an independent voter. There are thousands of others just like me who will always cast their ballot for an unbossed candidate, no matter what party the candidate may represent. You, Congressman HALL, are not obligated to any boss. It is my belief that as long as you care to represent this district you can carry it against all opponents.

A few evenings ago I had a very nice chat with a young acquaintance of mine. He told me that he had spent the past week in Washington, and during his stay he had a pleasant visit with you. From his observations he gave me a detailed description of the immense amount of work you perform daily, with no week-end vacations to the shore or mountains. This is all right, but don't overdo; we need you to keep a close check on the people's interest in Washington.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM J. CONLON.

Re House Joint Resolution 225

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution contemplates the observance, with appropriate ceremonies, of the fifty-fifth anniversary of the dedication of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor.

This Statue of Liberty was the first public structure visible from ships which entered the harbor of New York, the harbor which is the gateway to America, and the door to which this country is entered from the east.

When, 55 years ago, the French Government, as a gesture of good will and friendship, sent to this country this beautiful statue, ceremonies were held dedicated to the cause of freedom and liberty which at that time all of us believed would forever be the goal to which mankind would aspire. Now France herself lies prostrate under the heel of a ruthless dictator, and all of Europe is engulfed in a bloody conflict, to determine whether or not this ideal of freedom shall long endure. Europe hopes and prays that the day is not far when mankind again will enjoy the blessings of liberty and peace.

It is on occasions like these that we become aware of our own liberty and freedom and become conscious of the part which we have to play to preserve our precious heritage—liberty and justice.

A few days ago I called the attention of the House of Representatives to the fact that this was the ninety-second anniversary of the birth of Emma Lazarus, an American poetess who died in the city of New York, the city of her birth, at the untimely age of 38. It was Miss Lazarus, whose famous poem, The Golden Door, so fittingly adorns the Statue of Liberty and which reads as follows:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost, to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Let us hope that this country will forever remain the one haven in the world in which the land of freedom will forever be reached beside the golden door of its entrance.

This resolution has for its object our rededication to the cause of liberty and democracy. It will call upon the President of the United States to proclaim this day as Liberty Day, where the flag shall be raised on every Government, State, and public building throughout the country with appropriate ceremonies signifying the liberty which we enjoy in our country and institutions.

Economy in Nondefense Expenditures of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LE ROY D. DOWNS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NORWALK (CONN.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I wish to insert the following resolution calling for rigid economy in nondefense expenditures of the Government by the board of directors of the Norwalk, Conn., Chamber of Commerce:

A RESOLUTION CALLING FOR RIGID ECONOMY IN NONDEFENSE EXPENDITURES OF THE GOVERNMENT BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NORWALK, CONN., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The board of directors of the Norwalk, Conn., Chamber of Commerce, unanimously

urges that in view of the magnitude of the appropriations necessary for national defense, and with the utmost being demanded of our economic and financial resources, Congress and the administration pursue the most rigid economy in nonmandatory expenditures.

The Nation has readily undertaken the greatest tax burden in its history, placing the national defense before all else, and properly all costs other than defense costs now should be kept closely in hand. With steadily rising employment, the decreasing need for public assistance should be taken into account and certainly subsidy programs should be greatly curtailed. Public works and work-relief projects should be examined in the light on nonmandatory expenditures, especially in those many cases where the projects are in direct competition as regards construction labor and materials with vital defense production.

The public debt has increased from $16,800,000,000 in 1931 to $49,000,000,000 on June 30, 1941, and will reach $58,000,000,000 by June 30, 1942. Interest charges alone on the public debt will be $1,250,000,000 in the fiscal year 1942. With tremendous defense expenditures ahead, it is imperative that effective steps be taken by the administration and the Congress to reduce every expenditure not required for defense or essential Government.

The board of directors of the Norwalk, Conn., Chamber of Commerce urges that governmental spending be curtailed in all nondefense fields during this period of emergency, and that nonessential expenditures be deferred until the Nation again enters a normal period of peacetime activity.

The Denationalization of the United States and the Sinister Commitments of the United States to Homicidal, Communistic Soviet Russia

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of August 2, 1941:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of August 2, 1941]

THE FOREIGN MALADY

One effect of Hitler's murderous assault upon his Russian partner in aggressor crime was to make vivid in this country certain extreme and ugly symptoms of the foreign malady. We think no American could ponder what was thereby revealed without a sense of foreboding and sickness of heart.

The news broke on Saturday night, after the Sunday newspapers had gone to press, and for many hours radio was the only means of dissemination.

Two thoughts were immediately present.

The first was to ask whether the Soviet Government, with its hands still foul from the rape of Finland on its own account and the synical murder of Poland in joint account with Hitler, would now be received among the defenders of freedom and have access to the arsenal of democracy.

The second was satirical. Now the sabotage strikes in American defense industries would cease by a new Communist Party line.

The question that came first was answered Sunday afternoon, not by the American Government but by the British Government. Winston Churchill came on the radio, saying any hand against Hitler was welcome, even the hand of Stalin, although, as he himself had often said and would not unsay, this was the hideous hand of a slayer of freedom. "It follows," he said, "that we will give whatever help we can to Russia and the Russian people. * * * It is not for me to speak of the action of the United States, but this I will say: If Hitler imagines that his attack on Soviet Russia will cause the slightest division of aims or slackening of effort in the great democracies who are resolved upon his doom he is woefully mistaken."

This was the British Government pledging to the Soviet Government indirect access to the American arsenal of democracy. And why not? It may do what it likes with the weapons and munitions it receives from that arsenal under the lend-lease law; it may use them itself or lend them to others.

After the Churchill broadcast which, of course, was directed at the American people, there could be no intelligent doubt about the policy of the American Government. Promptly on Monday the State Department restated the Churchill statement and presented it as its own to a "realistic America."

And the satirical thought—that, too, was very soon confirmed. On Sunday afternoon, from the office of the Communist Daily Worker, that had gone to press Saturday night praying for the Stalin-Hitler pact and breathing sabotage against the American armament program, the Communist Party issued a manifesto, saying the Soviet Government was fighting not for itself alone but for the freedom of all people, including the American people—the American farmer, the American worker, the American Negro, and then, for good measure, even the hated middle class. Therefore, down with Hitler. All out for the American effort to destroy him—and save the Soviet Union.

Then something happened in the honorable stomach of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. The New York chapter changed its name. We understand that.

One of the sinister effects of the foreign malady is to make Americans suspect one another and impugn one another's patriotism. Many Americans were moved by both reason and deep feeling to say the Battle of Britain was our battle, too. But to the voices of these were added alien voices saying the same thing in the same words; and their evangel for war was supported by an organized alien propaganda that could not have been thinking, and should not have been thinking, of America first.

Many more Americans—a great majority, we think—were equally moved by reason and feeling to say this country should jealously mind its own defense and stay out of the war, let Europe commit suicide if it would. That is the side we were on. But on that side, too, were alien voices saying the same thing in the same words. After a year it had become a habit, on opening the editorial mail, to glance first at the opening sentence of a letter, and if it was with us against going to war, to look then at the signature; and if it was a German name or any name we knew bearing the taint of communism, we shuddered. Our answer was to wish those who might agree with us for wrong reasons to hold their peace.

The America First Committee made the same rejection; nevertheless, alien voices continued to embarrass its meetings, and Americans on the other side, together with their alien friends, made smear matter of it. Now the problem is theirs—how to repudiate the unwelcome support of the Communist.

Exercises in realistic thinking, now recommended by the American Government were novel for a people who had just been brought to a crusade for the four freedoms in the wide world. Owing partly to the novelty, they were exciting and jammed all the channels of the air, alien voices intervening helpfully; but they were not easy, after all.

The Government was going to hit Hitler in the back with everything we had, by sending it faster and faster to Great Britain, and at the same time it was going to aid Stalin with everything that was left over after we had sent everything to Great Britain; and if that was not clear, you had not yet learned to think in a realistic manner.

In the New York Times, Arthur Krock cynically resolved the difficulty of treating the Stalin dictatorship as a democracy for purposes of aid under the lend-lease law by calling attention to the fact that Greece was not a democracy, nor China, except in a way of speaking.

In the House of Representatives, a Member rose to ask why he should vote for a law forbidding any of the money the Congress was then appropriating to be used by the Government to pay the salaries of Communists employed in its various executive bureaus, some of them mentioned by name. What was the point?

We have produced this view of the formless national behavior only to prepare a question. Where in that view, or in any view you may construct for yourself out of the current materials, do you see America itself, or any true symbol of it?

In all this confusion of thought and feeling and idea, where is the American core?

Russian communism is an international snake, treacherous even to itself, knowing only venomous and deadly enmity to any other kind of social organism. Nevertheless, the New Deal nested it. The White House made a fashion of petting it. Then just when the horrible awakening from this singular ophiolatry seemed about to take place—troops having been sent to dislodge the coil that had been trying to strangle the aircraft industry—a violent turn of events in Europe brings the Soviet Government under the American tent of the four freedoms, and the short-wave listeners in a New York studio hear the Moscow radio playing Columbia, the Gem of the Ocean and other patriotic American and Scottish songs.

Nazi-ism is a similar reptile. Happily, now the Government is killing that one; and yet, even as to this well-doing, our satisfaction must be offset by the reflection that as the American Government puts down one kind of foreign propaganda it favors another kind, and does now itself collaborate with a foreign government in ways of acting upon mass opinion in the United States. And this, we suppose, is so far the extreme phase of the foreign malady among us, all the more critical because it is so little resented.

For more than 100 years this American Republic was the world fountain of political innovation, giving forth ideas to whoever could use them and could make them work as they worked for us. Now we export arms and import ideas.

For more than 100 years there was something we knew for sure about ourselves without thinking of it, which was fixed, and to which all alien isms and all problems of foreign relationship were instinctively referred—an American ethos, that is to say, a characteristic spirit of the Nation.

There was an American ideology, though we did not know it and had not that word for it. That baneful word was taken out of the Communist book of dialectics, along with the proletarian man, a lot of other political jargon, and all the slogans of class struggle. The class consciousness of American labor was cultivated here by liberals and

intellectuals, from foreign seed. Marxian anticapitalism was imported in the same way by those who could not distinguish between the feudal capitalism of the Old World and American capitalism.

Every important idea of the New Deal was borrowed from Europe, out of Harold J. Laski's exquisitely revolutionary mind, or from J. Maynard Keynes' brilliantly insolvent economics, and all of that beautifully printed literature of an aristocratically decadent British radicalism—foremostly of all, the idea of deficit government spending as a way to redistribute the national wealth without pain of vulgar revolution.

What have we been debating with rising fever during the last few years in this country? Foreign ideologies and how they might be adapted and suited to us; or why we should take the side of one to destroy another, lest the other should come and devour us.

Among the principal political ideas now in controversy among us, we can think of but one that could lay even doubtful claim to American origin. That one is the idea of a Federal Union World, called also Union Now and Union Now With Britain, and its proposal is to surrender American sovereignty to a world government and denationalize the United States of America.

Where is this United States of America that would sacrifice its birthright for the sake of the world and give its substance to be spread for an international feast? It is a strange land; and if it is ours, we are strangers in it. But we disbelieve in its existence. Nor do we believe the national totem is extinct. It is only sick.

Gratifying Recognition of Industrial Miracle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WILMINGTON (DEL.) STAR

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilmington (Del.) Star of August 3, 1941:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Star of August 3, 1941]

GRATIFYING RECOGNITION OF INDUSTRIAL MIRACLE

It is not difficult to understand how even one of the world's greatest industrial giants—such as the Du Pont Co. can be thrilled to receive so signal a recognition of splendid service as the award of the Navy Department Bureau of Ordnance flag and official "E" pennant to the company's management and men for what Secretary of the Navy Knox describes as "a miracle of industrial production."

After all, corporations, no matter how huge, are owned and operated by men and women, and those men and women are naturally gratified when some job which they are performing by supreme exertion of brains and nerves and muscles meets with impressive acclaim and commendation.

On Tuesday afternoon the award of the flag and pennant will be formally made to the Carney's Point plant of the Du Pont Co. by Rear Admiral W. H. P. Blandy, Chief of Ordnance, who attended Delaware College from 1906 to 1909, when he was appointed to the Naval Academy by Col. Henry A. Du Pont, then United States Senator.

Award of the flag and pennant carries with it the right for each employee of the Carney's Point plant to wear the Navy's famous "E" button for excellent service to the Nation.

People of Wilmington and Delaware appreciate very much that so signal and well-deserved a recognition of the Nation's approval should be conferred on the Du Pont Co., whose services to the United States have covered much more than a century.

Wheat Quotas

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, approximately 2 weeks ago the House passed the bill H. R. 5300, which is known as the wheat quota bill. It went to the Senate, and that body incorporated by an amendment the right for the farmers to feed their excess wheat. The bill came back to the House about a week ago, and today for the first time the chairman of the conferees is calling that body together to consider the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment allows the farmer to feed his excess wheat the same as was allowed in a bill H. R. 5303, introduced by me on July 14. I trust that each and every Member of this body will contact the conferees and insist on the Senate amendment allowing the farmers to feed their excess wheat and bring them at least some degree of assistance. May I read to you a letter from the National Grange, over the signature of Fred Brenckman, Washington representative, in which he endorses the Senate amendment:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., August 4, 1941.

To the Members of the House:

We are writing to express the hope that the amendment to H. R. 5300, adopted by the Senate, which would permit the farmer to feed his "excess" wheat to livestock and poultry on his own farm, or to use it for seed, may be approved by the House.

As a matter of fundamental justice, it does not seem fair to us that the farmer who sowed his wheat last fall or this spring, as the case may be, when the penalty for excess marketing was 15 cents a bushel, should now be asked to pay a penalty of 49 cents a bushel, besides being denied the right to feed his "excess" wheat to his own livestock or poultry. The whole proposition is undoubtedly in violation of that wise and reasonable provision of the Constitution which declares that no ex post facto law shall be passed.

With the Government urging the farmers of the country to increase the production of dairy and poultry products as a matter of patriotic duty, and in view of the situation with which we are faced, the Senate amendment to H. R. 5300 appears to offer an ideal solution to the questions raised by the 49-cent penalty on "excess" wheat.

Trusting that you may see your way clear to support the Senate amendment in this connection, when it comes to a vote in the House, we are,

Sincerely yours,
THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
By FRED BRENCKMAN,
Washington Representative.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all true friends of the farmers will be present when the conference report comes so, if necessary, we will have full power to insist that the Senate amendments remain in the bill which will allow the farmer to feed his excess wheat.

Independence Day Objectives 165 Years Ago Brought up to Date

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY L. MOSER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1941

THE INDEPENDENCE DAY ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT H. JACKSON, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Independence Day address of the Honorable Robert H. Jackson, Attorney General, now Supreme Court Justice of the United States:

For nearly 2 years now many of us have been bewildered by the headlong course of events in Europe, and not a few of us have been confused as to the course of wisdom at home. We have seen a nation which 20 years ago had been vanquished, rise up with a ferocity seldom seen in the history of mankind. We have seen vaunted armies smashed as if they were so much paper. We have seen Europe overrun and England placed in grave danger. We have seen the dictator idea spread in the world. At first its two principal proponents, communism and fascism, appeared to be mortal enemies. Then, one day, they turned up as partners. Now they battle each other.

For nearly 2 years Americans have been asking each other which way safety and security lie. We have pondered the problem, weighing risk against risk and danger against danger. Now at last, on this Fourth of July in 1941, the truth of our situation is coming home with increasing clarity to all Americans. We are learning the overwhelming fact that now, as in 1776, our Nation together with our sister republics on this hemisphere, faces a preponderantly hostile and undemocratic world. Now, as in 1776, we can turn to the Declaration of Independence for the principles which should guide our action.

You are lifted and inspired, like generations before you, by the majestic cadence of the boldest, the noblest, and best known of all

American writings. The Declaration of Independence speaks strong doctrine in plain words. It is the world's master indictment of oppression. The fervor of its denunciation haunts and challenges dictators everywhere and in every field of life.

But the Declaration of Independence does not stop with mere denials and negations. It sets forth great affirmations as to the permissible foundations of power and political leadership among free men. It lays down a fighting faith in the rights of man—merely as man—a faith to die by if need be, or even more bravely to live by. It impresses upon all political power the high obligation of trusteeship. It established an accountability by the governing few to the governed many. That is why men abroad who wield dictatorial powers over subject peoples would silence the reading of the Declaration of Independence, would tear all mention of it from the record, and torture all recollection of it out of the minds of men. Even at home there are some who hope it will not be read too loudly.

But the masses of warm-hearted people are reared on its strong doctrines of equality and human rights. It has exceeded every other modern pronouncement in its profound influence upon our lives, our culture, and our relations to the world. When the Constitution of the United States was adopted, its foundations were laid in the democratic idealism of the Declaration. It has been the inspiration for every later recognition of broadened human rights and for the extension of justice and security to all men. We do not claim to have reached a perfect fulfillment of its high principles. But we have achieved the nearest approach among all the nations to a classless society, to equality of rights, and to a fair distribution of opportunity and prosperity. Whenever we reproach our own imperfections, as we ought often to do, we must not forget that our shortcomings are visible only when measured against our ideals, never when put beside the practical living conditions of the rest of the world. We have, by Constitution, by legislation, and by judicial decision, translated the Declaration out of the language of abstract philosophy into the idiom of everyday living. We have validated democratic principles by our success.

America's position in the society of nations is unavoidably that of a champion of the freedoms. The reason is aptly stated by Carl Becker, who says:

"In the Declaration the foundation of the United States is indissolubly associated with a theory of politics, a philosophy of human rights, which is valid, if at all, not for Americans only, but for all men."

When our national success demonstrated that freedom is an attainable goal, we made it the ultimate goal of all peoples everywhere. The four freedoms are not local or transient incidents, they are universal and timeless principles if they are valid at all. A blow against their existence in Europe is a blow at their validity everywhere. On the other hand, the example of a great and powerful people governed by their own consent through lawmakers of their free choice is a standing incitement to overturn tyranny anywhere. Malevolent conquests by dictators are silently undermined by our confession of faith in democracy as stated in the Declaration. That carries hope to subject peoples in whom there would otherwise be a noble, but unavailing, fortitude. Overridden countries find a bid to insurrection in its assertion of the right of the people to alter or abolish an existing government that is destructive of life, liberty, and happiness. They read words of invitation in its statement of their right to "institute new government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." No wonder the Declaration of Independence is the nightmare of conquerors.

Some will say that the decision faced by the patriots of 1776 was an easier one than ours, since they had nothing to lose but their intolerable situation. Our task, some will argue, is to protect rather than to win our freedom and that for that reason we should be cautious.

But if the patriots of 1776 risked little by action, we risk much by indifference. Today we risk the loss of a physical, cultural, and spiritual heritage of freedom far beyond the most inspired visions of the leaders of 1776. And the more of the world that ceases to be democratic, the greater our risk will be. We do not need to be imprudent or foolhardy, but we should recognize that no amount of cautious behavior, no amount of polite talk will earn for us the friendship and good will of dictator systems. Ultimately we must come to the day when we shall face their threats and their enmity for no other reason than that we persist in living the kind of life we live.

One fact emerges clear above all others. We Americans cannot cease to be the kind of people we are, we cannot cease to live the kind of life we live. We are not the kind of people the dictators will ever want in the world. They will never have any use for our kind of life, nor we for theirs.

Every American knows now, as he knew it in 1776, that there is nothing for him in that way of life.

There are those who shrink from the risks of standing for a forthright, practical application of democracy. They point to the striking power and efficiency of foes abroad. But the enemies of American democracy today cannot begin to assemble a force so relatively powerful and so encircling as were its foes that day when the signers of the Declaration pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor in its support. The most strategic points in our own country were then in possession of the King's armies. Canada was a base for his operations. Florida, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the mouth of the Mississippi were occupied by forces of Spanish monarchy—no lover of democracy. And the unsolved problem of the colonies along their whole precarious frontier was the Indian. American democracy then had no Navy, only an empty treasury. Its Army was composed of untrained volunteer backwoodsmen who could not get shoes, clothing, or substantial arms to fight the invading British Regulars. There was no national unity. There were cabals against Washington, a "fifth column" of Royalists was powerful and respectable, and the States were jealous rivals who did not act, nor even think, as a unit. But in such an hour our forefathers who believed in freedom did not fear to stand alone and to become, as they continued for many years to be, the world's only real democracy. But the American forces had power—the unseen power of the earnest individual—the individual with what Mr. Justice Holmes called "fire in his belly." Only when these fires go out need we fear the lawless forces of dictatorship. Democracy's strength is in man-to-man measure. None other draws such initiative from its way of life, none invents, and none has so generally and fully mastered in its daily life the technique of handling modern machine transport and production. And we dwell among resources as incredible as acres of diamonds.

But there is at home and abroad an antidemocratic influence, even more cynical and sinister and dangerous than Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin combined. I refer to those who think democracy is a fair-weather ideal—to guide us in soft times—but that when the going is tough we cannot save it without losing it. This doctrine has every base quality of fascism without either its candor or courage. Let us in America never forget that liberties trampled by conquest may be regained, but liberties abandoned by an indifferent people are never recovered. Nor are they deserved.

Let us not forget the example of our forefathers. They, too, heard the argument that time of external danger was no time to advance freedoms. But their answer was to give liberty a new birth not only in the midst of a war but in the very darkest hours of that war, because they knew that what wins struggles are the last ounces of endurance and the reserves of power that come to the common run of men on fire for a cause. Such men do not count costs nor watch the clock. We must keep our freedoms, keep them in face of foreign dangers ever more tenaciously and jealously than in calmer times—keep them because it is our liberty that lifts our cause above material ends and anchors our efforts in timeless things. We know that in the unfolding book of destiny, just as in the closed book of history, it is written that tyranny and oppression bring forth their own downfall and that the irresistible moral forces of the world march always on the side of resolute men when freedom is their goal. We know that the spiritual strength and the moral power of our democratic tradition, authenticated by a century and a half of progress, will not long yield the field anywhere in the world despite the temporary devastations by enemies of the fundamental philosophy of our Declaration of Independence. As Kipling said:

"Though all we knew depart,
The old commandments stand:
'In courage keep your heart,
In strength lift up your hand.'"

My Answer to Hitler's War Song, The Watch on the Rhine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

POEM BY A CONSTITUENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem, written by one of my constituents:

MY ANSWER TO HITLER'S WAR SONG, THE WATCH ON THE RHINE

From over sea there came a call
For bombing planes and cannon balls;
And Uncle Sam he heard the cry
And send this message through the sky:
"This is the land of free and brave,
Americans will not be slaves!"

There is a land "over there" called "Low"
In Flanders' fields where poppies grow;
And there's a graveyard of the dead—
Our sons who fought there once and bled!
Our doughboys like to greet these graves
When marching by and freedom save!
This is the land of free and brave—
Americans will not be slaves!

—*J. Stinebaugh,*
Farmersville, Tex.
Fourth Congressional District.

Who Created the Emergency?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, each day this country is on the verge of sending a million or more American men to aid Britain in restoring the rulers of the countries which have been overrun in Europe to their former positions of power. If we are able to aid Russia in preserving its communistic government, the manner in which we have been brought into the present position is made plain by an editorial from the Sunday, August 3, issue of the Chicago Tribune. It is as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of August 3, 1941]

It is easy to reconstruct the steps which led Mr. Roosevelt and the country into the present predicament. In 1937 it was apparent that all his economic experiments had failed. Although he had been reelected, he was facing the responsibility of continued failure. Time was running against him, and the situation was an unpleasant one. He had overreached himself in trying to pack the Supreme Court, and his prestige had suffered from his defeat in the Senate.

Then, again, in dealing with the Court, he stepped on a loose board when he appointed Black to the Supreme Bench and discovered he had named a man who had joined the Ku Klux Klan. That appointment met universal censure. The Alabama Senator was already justly disliked for his arrogant conduct of an investigating committee, with agents known as the Black Hundreds.

It was time for Mr. Roosevelt to do something to divert the public attention, and he did so in October at the Chicago bridge ceremony. He startled the country by exploding a war speech when America couldn't see the possibility of a war cloud over it. He assailed the bandit nations abroad and demanded that they be quarantined for the protection of the peacable world from their plagues. This speech had the effect of taking Mr. Black off the front pages for awhile. The country had reason to be startled, but could not at the time appreciate how grave those reasons were. Mr. Roosevelt was actually on his way to war, but people couldn't even suspect all his intentions. Most of them thought that he was doing the old trick of pointing to trouble abroad when he had trouble on his hands at home.

What else was behind this speech may be revealed in time. The French and British Governments were beginning to be alarmed by the consequences of some of their mistakes. They had been playing the international game badly. The Treaty of Versailles was falling to pieces. They began to suspect that they had made a terrible blunder in dealing with Herr Hitler. The British must assume more responsibility for this than the French. The Vichy government now says the French would have stopped the Nazis when they went into the Rhineland, but the British wouldn't support them. World opinion might have been against them if they had seemed to deny the German right to remilitarize German territory.

The British and the French turned to Mr. Roosevelt, seeking to scare Hitler, Mussolini, and Japan by shoving the United States to the front. Although they welcomed the diversion in their favor, they appeared to give Mr. Roosevelt cold support when he responded.

It was, however, more than coincidental that his speech was exactly timed with the decision of the Council of the League of Nations to refer the question of Japanese aggression in China to the powers which had signed the pact guaranteeing China's territorial integrity. The people here didn't know that action had been taken when Mr. Roosevelt denounced the bandits. He did know it.

It became perfectly apparent that the purpose was not to do anything for China, because the Brussels conference was a fiasco before it got started. The purpose was to get the United States involved in foreign complications. Those tactics were successful. Mr. Roosevelt has been in the forefront of European power politics ever since. His new rôle was pleasing to him because it was pleasing to the aristocratic governments whose policies he was adopting.

As the tension increased abroad and as coming events became more predictable, more pressure was put upon Mr. Roosevelt. The climax which topped it off was the visit of King George and Queen Elizabeth to Hyde Park. Mr. Roosevelt was thus approached on his most susceptible side. He fed hot dogs and beer to their majesties and, although that was intended to impress the American people and show them how the top royalty of the earth could be introduced to the American way of life, Mr. Roosevelt's sensations were those of one elevated to importance in the monarchical system. The royal ruler unbent and the republican ruler was flattered. Hyde Park was the scene of an agreement which has been unfolding ever since.

Mr. Roosevelt believed in common with everybody else that the French Army was better than the German and that the British Navy was supreme at sea. He plunged into the game of politics in Europe, undoubtedly convinced that he was playing with the more powerful side and that his proclamations and declarations and his warnings to the disturbing nations would be backed up by a superior force. The open record discloses enough of what he did to frighten one side and encourage the other. The unopen record some time will show more of this.

He probably thought with others that Poland, although deserted and betrayed by Russia, would be able at least to soften the German Army before being overwhelmed and that in allying himself with France and Great Britain he was with the ultimate victors and would be at the peace table with them, adding his dictate to the others. When the disasters in western Europe began with the allied failures in Norway and extended all over the Low Countries and into Flanders, Mr. Roosevelt was in the war as far as he personally could get, openly promising all aid to France and Britain.

In the Battle of Flanders he advised that French troops be moved from the frontier of Italy, which had not yet delivered its stab. Reynaud, the then Premier of collapsing France, appealed to him for the aid to continue resistance, and he promised everything but an expeditionary force. France was urged to keep up the fight and retire to its overseas empire, if necessary. After France capitulated, Mr. Roosevelt urged Mr. Churchill to fight on. He urged Greece and Yugoslavia to resist and promised aid. Constant promises of aid were given China.

Every military reverse in the war in which Mr. Roosevelt had involved himself got him deeper into it. He had now been a party to so much havoc that he could not see where he could stop.

He has thrown everything he could of American resources, money, and material, without stint, into the conflict with which he identified himself 4 years ago, and he has wanted to throw men. He wanted to throw men into the fighting in Serbia and Greece. He has wanted to send them to Africa. He is told by British generals and British ministers that the war cannot be won without American manpower. That is the next step in his program, and he is poised to take it.

Mr. Speaker, there is much talk in Washington of unity. Consistently we are told by the administration's mouthpieces and by professors who will take no part in the war, by bankers and businessmen who will profit by a continuance of the war, that England is fighting our battle.

The polls all show that from 75 to 80 percent of the American people are opposed to becoming involved in this war, and if the President and the warmongers want unity, they should abide by the will of the majority, who were promised by Roosevelt when he sought election, that he would use every possible means to keep us out of the war.

The tail can no more wag the dog than can this small war-seeking minority drag enthusiastic support out of the American people for the President's war program.

The Lawyers of America Meet at Habana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

REPORT OF CONFERENCE OF INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association held at Habana last March:

[From the Bulletin of the Pan American Union for July 1941]

THE LAWYERS OF AMERICA MEET AT HABANA

(William Roy Vallance, Secretary General, Inter-American Bar Association; Assistant Legal Adviser, Department of State of the United States)

An historic event occurred at Habana, Cuba, on March 24, 1941, when the first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association was opened with stirring addresses by members of the bar in the hall of the House of Representatives in the Cuban national capitol. When Dr. Gustavo Cuervo Rubio, Vice President of Cuba, called the meeting to order, there were over 600 delegates, observers, and guests representing 46 member bar associations from 16 countries. As these representatives stood when the roll of members was called by the secretary general, a thrill of enthusiasm swept over the audience with the realization that this new association, organized only 9 months previously at the close of the Eighth American Scientific Congress at Washington, D. C., on May 16, 1940, had already achieved hemispheric proportions and included members from Canada on the far north to Chile and Argentina in the south.

Cordial words of welcome were expressed by the Honorable Raúl G. Menocal, mayor

of Habana, by the Honorable José Manuel Cortina, Secretary of State, on behalf of the Cuban Government, and by Dr. Natalio Chediak for the Colegio de Abogados de la Habana. In responding for the visiting lawyers, the secretary general referred to the great contribution that Cuban statesmen and jurists have made to the organization of a better world, and evoked prolonged applause when he paid tribute, particularly, to Dr. Antonio Sánchez de Bustamante y Sirvén for his monumental code of private international law and for his service as a member of the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague. Gratitude was also expressed for the vision, courage, and indomitable will of the great liberators, Martí, Simón Bolívar, San Martín, Hidalgo, George Washington, and other great leaders in the struggle for freedom under law. The spirit of cooperation among our nations was stated to represent no temporary sporadic effort, but a constant and continuous interest reflected in the creation of a permanent organization, namely, the Pan American Union, and in periodic meetings.

In his Presidential address, Dr. Manuel Fernández Supervielle, of Cuba, set forth the goal of the association in part as follows:

"The work of the association in this respect may also be guided toward the unification of the provisions of law that regulate a large number of specific questions that do not raise great difficulties and that would lead to very important advantages of different kinds. For instance, the uniformity of the law on the subject of negotiable instruments (principally the bill of exchange and the check); of commercial associations (corporations and partnerships) and taxes on transmission of property by inheritance (in order to prevent double taxation); and in connection with the protection of commercial trade-marks, of factory brands, patents of invention and copyrights; the condemnation of property for causes of social utility; the requisites for powers of attorney for lawsuits; the collecting of commercial credits; the execution of judgments handed down by foreign courts; the proof of foreign law in lawsuits. While such uniformity would facilitate the realization of the juridical purpose and the judicial function, it would also tend to increase economic relations between the different countries, promoting the investment of capital in the needed channels, and would invigorate international commercial credit."

The sessions of the conference consisted of plenary meetings with principal addresses followed by round tables on subjects of especial interest to particular groups of delegates. Some of the addresses and round-table sessions were of unusual interest. Dr. Enrique Gil, a delegate from Argentina and president of the Buenos Aires Bar Association, contributed a strong note of solidarity when he expressed the desire of Argentine lawyers to make the association a practical force for improving the administration of law and justice in this hemisphere. Great interest was manifested throughout the conference in the subject of hemisphere defense as evidenced by the fact that 13 papers were presented on the topic of The Role of the Lawyer in the Defense of the Americas. President Jacob M. Lashly, of the American Bar Association, stressed the fundamental and strategic value of law in an active and progressive society. He said that law accompanies the businessman to his desk, the statesman to his assembly, the worker to his bench, the banker to his vaults, even the doctor to his patient, the musician to his platform, and the priest to his altar. He further pointed out that "there is no difference in the ultimate aims and goals of the two systems of jurisprudence," and said, "Here Las Siete Partidas of the Spanish republics reach across the channel of the centuries to clasp the hand of Magna Carta." Dr. Dantès Bellegarde, of Haiti, stressed the significance of the presence of the representatives of the Canadian Bar Association. He discussed the importance of laws for the economic defense of the Americas. These discussions led to the adoption of the following resolution:

"The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association declares:

"First. Its unreserved devotion to the democratic principles on which the American republics were founded.

"Second. Its desire for the strengthening of the cordial relations existing between the countries of America.

"Third. Its allegiance to the principles of international law and the precepts of international conduct as set forth in the treaties and resolutions approved by the International Conferences of American States.

"Fourth. Its determination to cooperate effectively in the defense of the foregoing principles and precepts."

Judge Herbert F. Goodrich and Dr. William Draper Lewis presented papers on the work of the American Law Institute in compiling the restatement of the common law of the United States. On motion of Dr. Luis Anderson of Costa Rica, a resolution recommending the translation of the restatement into the other languages of the American republics so that lawyers there might more easily become acquainted with the laws of the United States was adopted as follows:

"The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association

"*Resolves:*

"First To endorse the resolution approved by the Eighth American Scientific Conference, in May 1940, recommending the translation, into the other languages of the American republics, of the restatement of the law of the United States of America formulated by the American Law Institute.

"Second. To recommend that the translation contain, in addition to copious explanatory footnotes, brief historical and analytical introductions on the origin and nature of the corresponding Latin American and Anglo-American legal concepts, principles, and institutions.

"Third. To express the opinion that the result of this work should greatly advance and facilitate the successful completion of the important tasks relative to the unification of commercial and civil law and uniformity and unification of legislation entrusted to official agencies by the International Conference of American States.

"Fourth. To recommend that once the volume relative to conflict of laws of the American Law Institute has been translated, official and private legal agencies and organizations cooperate in a detailed comparative study thereof with the Bustamante Code of Private International Law, for the purpose of examining the extent to which the two systems may be reconciled."

Aviation law received careful consideration at a round table under the chairmanship of Dr. J. Blanco Uztáriz, of Venezuela. Howard S. LeRoy, of Washington, D. C., discussed Trends of International Aeronautical Law and Dr. Antonio Sánchez de Bustamante, after discussing the Constitution of International Committees on Aviation, brought about the adoption of the following resolution:

"The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association

"*Resolves:*

"First. That the President of this conference officially request, in the name of the association, all the governments of America to organize immediately the National Commissions of Aviation recommended by the first Pan-American Conference of Aviation, at Lima, in 1937.

"Second. That he also request the said governments to arrange to have their national committees collaborate with the national societies known as the Inter-American Aviation Squadrons.

"Third. That he communicate this resolution to the Pan American Union with a request that it urge the national committees to undertake the work assigned to them, and that the permanent Pan-American Aeronautical Commission be organized as soon as possible.

"Fourth. That he undertake all the measures of publicity that he may consider necessary and desirable for the achievement of the foregoing objectives, and that he report on the result thereof to the second conference of the Inter-American Bar Association."

Dr. Alberto Ulloa, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Peru and now professor of law at the University of San Marcos, presented some interesting views in his address on the subject Observations on the Present Condition of the Law. President D. L. McCarthy, of the Canadian Bar Association, spoke about the method whereby Canada has coordinated the development of the common law in the Canadian Provinces with the civil law in the French-speaking Province of Quebec.

Legal education was discussed at a round table led by James Oliver Murdock, professor of international law at George Washington University. Prof. Philip C. Jessup, of Columbia University, spoke on the subject The Importance of International and Comparative Law Studies to Inter-American Cooperation; and Mr. George A. Finch, of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace made a very interesting address on the subject Materials for the Study of International Law. A highly significant address was delivered by Dr. Germán Riesco, delegate of the Chilean Bar Association, regarding the importance of high ethical standards in the legal profession. His address was in part as follows:

"Among the objectives of our association as laid down in its constitution there is one that, in my opinion, is as urgent as, and certainly easier than, to spread a knowledge of the laws of the various American countries and strive for their uniformity. I refer to upholding the honor of the profession and promoting cordial relations among the jurists of the Western Hemisphere. * * *

"How shall we learn to know each other better? Something—indeed much—is accomplished by meeting here, by becoming acquainted socially in this beautiful natural environment, welcomed by the cultivated and cordial Cubans.

"Something is accomplished also by reading papers here and by telling each other what we think; but we should progress more rapidly and plumb greater depths if we could also show each other what we are doing in the exercise of our profession. Theory, constructive thought, sometimes is a blinding light that compels our admiration; but what attracts and captivates us is another's way of life, his spontaneous actions and generous deeds.

"I recognize that it is difficult to see each other as we really are. But nothing hinders us from telling each other how we live—for example, what ethical education each country tries to give to a young lawyer, how he is taught that our profession is not simply a means of earning money, but also a ministry, a priesthood that has inherent obligations toward the society in which he lives. Those of us who believe that our countries are doing something in this direction might learn that others are doing more; and doubtless we should all have something to learn."

A resolution reading in part as follows was adopted:

"The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association

"*Resolves:*

* * * * *

"Second. To encourage the establishment, within the law schools of each country, of courses on legal ethics.

"Third To express the hope that the law schools of the Americas shall prescribe, as a

condition of entry and as a requisite for a law degree or of a doctorate in jurisprudence, the satisfaction of high moral standards.

"Fourth. The executive committee shall encourage discussion among bar associations of America on the subject of the formulation of a code of professional ethics, the results of which shall be submitted to the association at the next conference."

Also on the recommendation of the legal education group a resolution of great importance providing for the establishment of an academy of comparative and international law at Habana was adopted on the motion of Dr. Ernesto Dihigo.

The need for new material with which to find the law was strongly emphasized at the round table on inter-American legal documentation, at which Dr. John T. Vance, law librarian of the Library of Congress, presided. These discussions resulted in resolutions recommending the establishment of a journal for the association; the establishment of a legal center in each nation for a collection of books on the laws of the various countries; the compilation of legal bibliographies; and uniformity in the material and standardization in the production of lawbooks.

The urgent need of further protection of intellectual and industrial property was considered at a round table under the chairmanship of Dr. Camilo de Brigard Silva, of Colombia. Stephen P. Ladis, of New York, read an important paper on the status of copyright protection in America. Resolutions were adopted recommending greater copyright protection for the works of authors and a study of the patent laws of the various countries.

The historic fact that the constitutions of the pan-American countries were drafted with the Constitution of the United States as a model was brought out in an address by Frederic R. Coudert, of New York, on the subject of comparative constitutional law. It was further developed in a paper prepared by Prof. Noel T. Dowling, of Columbia University, concerning a comparative study made of over 400 decisions of the courts of Argentina interpreting its constitution. The Honorable William S. Culbertson, former Ambassador to Chile, discussed The Reign of Law.

Dr. Lawrence D. Egbert, of the United States Tariff Commission, read a paper on the subject Latin-American Commercial Treaties, and referred to a Handbook of Latin-American Commercial Treaties which he had recently prepared for the Commission. (Copies are now available to persons desiring them.) He pointed out some of the problems encountered in the negotiation of commercial treaties. A resolution requesting the executive committee to study the desirability of organizing a section of customs laws and commercial treaties was adopted.

The climax of the meeting occurred on March 27 at the closing plenary session, when 8 stirring addresses were delivered in the hall of the house of representatives and 22 resolutions were unanimously adopted, after having been presented by Dr. William Sanders, Chief of the Juridical Section of the Pan American Union, who served efficiently as reporter general for the conference.

The timely address of the Honorable Robert H. Jackson, Attorney General of the United States, read in his absence by the Honorable George S. Messersmith, American Ambassador to Cuba, stirred the delegates to a realization of the legal grounds supporting the strong action taken by the United States in providing aid to the democracies in order to prevent their conquest by the Axis Powers. In part of his paper, Mr. Jackson discussed the advances made by the Treaty for the Renunciation of War and the Argentine Antiwar Treaty, and set forth the implementation of self-defense which began at the first meeting of ministers of foreign affairs of the American republics in 1939 and was developed in relation to the law of neutrality by the inter-American neutrality committee at Rio de Janeiro, as endorsed by the second meeting of foreign ministers at Habana in 1940. In closing his address he said:

"The only sanction that seems available in our time is the freedom of the right-thinking states of the world, particularly the states of the Western Hemisphere, to give a material implementation to their moral and nationally official judgments as to the justice of a war. The American States have done this officially with respect to the invasion of Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg. A public opinion which can express itself only in sermons is not likely to restrain the aggressive propensities of any powerful state. If, however, that opinion may command measures short of war that are likely to prevent the success of aggression, it is certain to have some deference even from the ruthless. Short-of-war measures which enlightened opinion may invoke include all forms of moral censure and diplomatic disapproval, discriminatory embargoes or boycotts, as well as financial credits and furnishing of supplies and material, weapons, and ships. These speak a language understandable to those deaf to the precepts alike of Christian civilization and of legal obligation and scholarship.

"It is upon these considerations that I have advised my Government in the hope that its course may strengthen the sanction against aggression and contribute to the realization of our aspiration for an international order under law."

Dr. Edmundo Miranda Jordao, president-elect of the Instituto da Ordem dos Advogados Brasileiros, pledged the support of the lawyers of Brazil to the principles of democracy and said:

"The 21 American republics can boast to the civilized world of their unique and incomparable condition in the present state of the world; they are free from any fear of mutual aggression, thanks to the sacred principles of American solidarity, in contrast to the nations of the other four continents, which are suffering directly or indirectly the horrors and consequences of the terrible war of extermination and conquest provoked by the madness of some and the unrestrained ambitions of others.

"At the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth, the aura of liberty pervading America was so strong and compelling that the former European colonies, one after another, broke their humiliating chains and won their freedom, becoming sovereign nations and, invoking force, proclaimed their own political independence. And from that moment until now, by force of law and to the glory of America, not one of them has returned to its former status as a subject nation, a fact due to the spirit of democracy that has ever imbued the peoples of this continent.

"A noteworthy affirmation of that historical phenomenon occurred, curiously enough, in Brazil, which then (1821) was under the regency of Prince Pedro, the favorite son of King João VI. The latter had returned the seat of government to Portugal after having transplanted it to Rio de Janeiro because of the Napoleonic invasion.

"The prince of the royal blood, unable to escape the democratic spirit of the Brazilians and inspired by José Bonifacio, the apostle and later the patriarch of our independence, disobeyed the orders of his own father and issued from his palace in Rio de Janeiro a decree stating that, unless previous consent had been given, any and all troops sent to Brazil from Portugal or elsewhere on any pretext whatsoever would be considered as enemies, as well as all the crews of vessels and marines, if they tried to land; and, in case said troops should dare attempt a landing, they would be repelled with arms by the military forces of the first and second line, and even by the people, using all possible means, if necessary, to burn the vessels and sink their small boats."

The enthusiasm of the delegates was raised to a high pitch by Dr. Victor Vega Ceballos, of Cuba, through his address reviewing the contribution of the law in maintaining justice and democracy in this hemisphere. It is regretted that the full text of his address cannot be reproduced. The following brief extract is of exceptional interest:

"The lawyers have done well in organizing this Inter-American Federation which gathers, as in a temple, followers of their admirable profession, and, at a time of profound disturbances such as the present, endeavors to remove the little legal differences which might in any way constitute an obstacle to the forward march of inter-American relations.

"From early colonial times the study of law in our land has had a firm foundation and its practice veritable apostles, from Don Juan de Aréchaga y Casas, who in 1671 held the post of president of the Royal Audiencia of Mexico and wrote a celebrated commentary on civil law serving the attorneys of that era as a work of reference, on down to Antonio Sánchez de Bustamante, that famous savant who has become so great that he has ceased to be ours and has become a citizen of the world—a source of honor to the university, prestige to the bar, and pride to the country. * * *

"Of the two categories into which destiny has divided men—the one extolling the power of material things and force as the only creative elements, and the other considering the power of the spiritual an incontrovertible tenet and holding it the only means of creation and preservation—it has been our good fortune to fall into the latter. Strange to say, our slave-holding and privileged society gave the world forceful champions of equality and ardent defenders of human dignity. * * *

"For some time we have noted a certain uneasiness in our countries and, in spite of the power of spiritual absorption which characterizes us and which causes the foreigner among us to assimilate our ideas and customs more or less completely, certain propaganda of a well known type began to be disseminated, tending to weaken the spirit of unity which always bound us together. Men of America, with their eyes and ears open, perceived a future full of danger and heard unwholesome doctrines intended to undermine their institutions being noised about. To combat these symptoms of possible disintegration we have taken the measures that seemed advisable at the time. Sometimes governments, farsighted and determined, discerned the certain danger and called such meetings as the Conference for the Maintenance of Peace at Buenos Aires and the Meetings of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs at Panama and Habana. At the latter meetings declarations were made creating a neutrality zone to protect us against belligerent maritime activities on the part of nations engaged in the present war, and obligating the American republics to combat all propaganda contrary to democracy in the Americas. In other gatherings outstanding men, as in the present conference, made suggestions, planned orientations, and drew up programs which, designed to bring into harmony the private law of the American nations, tried also to insure protection for and maintenance of the political institutions common to us all.

"The Cuban Government has not been indifferent to the latest events which are stirring European nations and, although it recognizes their right to the kind of government

that pleases them, on the other hand it believes that it cannot permit ideas, methods, or forms of political organization foreign to our psychology and to our constitutional institutions to be transferred to our territory, to the detriment of our sovereignty and to the grave danger of the standards of living on which we have traditionally based our happiness and welfare. The Cuban Government, with profound respect for the opinions of others, but with full awareness of its best interests and needs, as well as the interests and aspirations of its people, has promulgated a decree on national defense, which is a reaffirmation of Cuban spirit and Americanism and constitutes a solid obstacle to the propagandizing of all doctrines tending to undermine the democracy which our Constitution guarantees."

The famous hospitality of the Cubans was well exemplified in the many social events arranged for the delegates. I can mention only the enjoyable reception given by the President of Cuba and Señora de Batista, the delightful reception offered by the Honorable Juan F. Edelmann, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Cuba, the dinner given by the Attorney General of Cuba at the Miramar Yacht Club and the dinner and dance arranged by the Habana Bar Association. On the last-mentioned occasion, Dr. Victor Lascano, Minister of Argentina at Habana, and chief of its delegation, made an interesting address expressing the hope that the next meeting would be held in Buenos Aires and this invitation was gratefully accepted. It is accordingly anticipated that the next conference will be held in Buenos Aires under the sponsorship of the Colegio de Abogados de Argentina, about September 1942.

Assurance was given that the next conference would be equally successful. The Honorable J. Honorio Silgueira, president of the host association, in Argentina, was elected president of the Inter-American Bar Association, the other officers being the following:

Secretary general: William Roy Vallance, United States.

Assistant secretaries general: Raúl Herrera-Arango, Cuba; Walter Villegas, Argentina; Curtis Shears, United States; Dantès Bellegarde, Haiti; Alberto Ulloa, Peru; Camilo de Brigard Silva, Colombia.

Treasurer: William Cattron Rigby.

Assistant treasurer: Howard S. LeRoy.

Executive secretary: Lawrence D. Egbert.

Executive committee: J. Honorio Silgueira, president; William Roy Vallance, secretary general; William Cattron Rigby, treasurer and chairman; James Oliver Murdock; D. L. McCarthy; Luis Anderson; Manuel Fernández Supervielle; Germán Riesco; Edmundo de Miranda Jordao.

Vice presidents: Enrique Gil, Argentina; Tomás Manuel Elío, Bolivia; Edmundo de Miranda Jordao, Brazil; D. L. McCarthy, Canada; Oscar Dávila, Chile; P. Alejandro Gómez Naranjo, Colombia; Lic. D. Alberto Echandi, Costa Rica; Gastón Godoy y Loret de Mola, Cuba; Manuel R. Balarezo, Ecuador; Féliz Magloire, Haiti; Esteban Guardiola, Honduras; Miguel S. Macedo, Mexico; Pedro Moreno Correa, Panama; Manuel C. Gallagher, Peru; Jacob M. Lashly, United States; Arturo Puigbo Ronso, Venezuela.

An executive council consisting of the following persons was also elected:

Enrique Gil, Walter Villegas, Argentina; José Philadelpho de Darros Azevedo, Edmundo de Miranda Jordão, Brazil; Lucien Moraud, D. L. McCarthy, Canada; Germán Riesco, Carlos Estévez, Chile; Camilo de Brigard Silva, Miguel Moreno Jaramillo, Colombia; Luis Anderson, Antonio Picado, Costa Rica, Manuel Fernández Supervielle, Natalio Chediak, Cuba; José Luis Tamayo, Eduardo Salazar, Ecuador; Dantès Bellegarde, Haiti; Antonio S. Bustamante, Honduras; Miguel S. Macedo, Emilio Portes Gil, Mexico; Juan Bautista de Lavalle, Alberto Ulloa, Peru; James Oliver Murdock, John H. Wigmore, George M. Morris, John T. Vance, William S. Culbertson, John P. Bullington, W. E. Stanley, Frederic R. Coudert, Emilio del Toro, William Draper Lewis, United States; Cristóbal Mendoza, J. Blanco Uztáriz, Venezuela.

In conclusion the hope is expressed that the harmony and the spirit of cooperation that pervaded all of the proceedings at the Habana Conference may constitute a significant prophecy as to the future progress and expansion of this important inter-American institution.

Kinda Strange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE STORY CITY (IOWA) HERALD

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Story City (Iowa) Herald:

KINDA STRANGE

Congress is being asked to extend the service of enlisted men to 2 years—after they were definitely assured they were being drafted for 1 year. The argument is "we are in more danger now than a year ago." If that is true, then some high administration officials ought to be hung, as they must have bungled the job of preparedness terribly. If we aren't getting stronger every minute on sea, land, and air, as compared with Germany, it must be our own fault. And, too, right now Hitler seems to be having his hands full fighting Russia, which a year ago was practically his ally. Reminds us that the other day David Lawrence, most experienced of Washington commentators, said: "This administration is the poorest one we ever had for getting the economics of the Nation organized for war."

Editorial Tribute to Senator Wheeler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM SPRINGFIELD (MASS.) FREE PRESS

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Free Press, one of the leading Democratic newspapers of Massachusetts. The editorial is entitled "Wheeler Keeps United States Out of War."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Free Press of August 2, 1941]

WHEELER KEEPS UNITED STATES OUT OF WAR

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana has been called every villifying name of any consequence in the world today. The warminded press and the war-minded administration have hit him from every possible angle in the concerted effort to discredit him. And yet he has persevered in his battle to keep America at peace. He has taken the smear campaign on the chin and continued to expend his full energy in a cause which he and millions of Americans with him consider of vital importance to the preservation of our national welfare.

At first Senator WHEELER was merely labeled an appeaser by the warmongers. When the American people failed to fall in line with this false claim, however, administration spokesmen resorted to more deprecating names. Secretary Stimson, no doubt with full support of the administration, publicly named WHEELER a traitor. But this was too much. Stimson and his associates hung themselves with their own rope. It became obvious to all that the war cabinet was conducting nothing more than a smear campaign.

Secretary Stimson, spokesman for Secretary Knox and others on this occasion, hung himself through asserting that the Senator had committed treason by urging Army selectees to object to being kept in the service longer than the prescribed year. Twelve Senators, some of whom actually differed with WHEELER on the question of America's participation in the war, immediately rallied to the defense of the Montanan. They pointed out that the franked post cards mailed by WHEELER and bearing an appeal for public expression against the proposed extension of the draft service were not dumped into the Army camps, as Secretary Stimson had intimated. Only three soldiers in the entire country are known to have received the cards. Perhaps Stimson foresaw an opportunity to bring formal charges of treason against the America First Senator, but the uproar in Congress this week gave full proof that no treason proceedings could get to first base among the Senator's colleagues. Stimson's smear campaign has boomeranged. He acknowledged this when he apologized publicly to WHEELER this week for misjudging him.

Senator WHEELER is a big thorn in the side of the warmongers. Almost alone he has dared to defy the administration. With the great body of the press against him, he has courageously scored the efforts of a few strong men to get this country into war. He is a big thorn in the side of the warmongers because his arguments make sense with the American people and because there is increasing evidence that the American people are waking up to the vicious interventionist course in which the Nation is being led.

One thing which Senator WHEELER doesn't believe in is keeping secrets from the American people. It was this firm conviction which led him to expose the Teapot Dome scandal of years back. Nor does he believe that the Government should keep the country in ignorance as to the manner in which the future of the country is being gambled. Those who said that the Teapot Dome affair was no business of the public now declare that international diplomacy involving the lives of American soldiers is also no business of the public. But WHEELER pulls no punches. He sees the administration trying to lead us to war, and he is determined that the American people be informed in this respect and be allowed a voice. He epitomized his democratic attitude a short time ago when he said in the Senate:

"Certain spokesmen for the Government are saying that we ought to leave the question of whether we have war or peace up to the administration. But the Government on many occasions has shown that it does not think the American people are to be trusted with information vitally affecting the question of whether their lives or the lives of their sons are to be sacrificed upon the battlefields of Europe, Asia, or Africa. For instance, I am informed that the administration knows all about the Hess peace proposals to Great Britain. But the Government does not tell the people that they include preserving the British Navy and the British Empire. If England and the British Navy are our first line of defense, wouldn't it be to our interest that our people should know the facts before they are asked to sacrifice their money and their sons to defend something which can be accomplished without such sacrifices?"

And the Cornerstone Is Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ARTICLE BY WILL WHITTENBURG

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an article by Will Whittenburg entitled "And the Cornerstone Is Faith," published in This Week magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From This Week Magazine]

AND THE CORNERSTONE IS FAITH

(By Will Whittenburg)

Last month the girl said "Yes." Today the home-loan department of the bank said "Yes." Next week work will begin on our new home.

But:

"I still do not advise it," my uncle said. "Building costs are rising."

"There is a war coming and you might have to go," someone else warned.

"You are wrapping your whole future up in one package. Your marriage, your financial success, everything will go if you put your savings into the down payment on a house and then lose it. Travel lightly in these times, my boy; excess baggage might drag you down."

Perhaps we should be afraid. Undoubtedly there is wisdom in this advice—but not enough wisdom to hinder the determination of a typical young American working couple who are willing to stake everything they have on the future of their country.

Not that we are plunging blindly. We decided to go ahead with our building plans only after seriously taking inventory of our own future and of the Nation's future.

After all, we are merely youth, risking today against tomorrow. Our tomorrow depends upon America as a whole. It depends upon the man who works beside me every day and upon the girls who work as stenographers in the office with my fiancée. It depends upon the men who sit at desks and plan ahead. It depends upon us all—everyone.

So we shall risk our savings in a down payment on our home. We shall do it willingly and with high hope. Because I have faith in the men who work with me, because my fiancée and I have faith in our leaders to steer America straight, we will take a chance. We stake our future on America. And, in turn, we feel that America stakes her future on us, on our not being afraid.

We know that uncertainty produced by world events vitally affects even such small atoms as us. But is this reason enough for us to scurry like rabbits into some dark hole of fear? We are not totally without fear in the face of the world crisis, but our hope is a greater thing than fear. It was the same with the American pioneers.

And what of other working people like us who have already built their rows and rows of homes along the streets of America? Is not their risk as great as ours?

Shall they stop making the payments on their homes? Shall they refuse to buy the refrigerator, the stove, the new furniture they really need because people across the ocean are dropping bombs upon each other?

Not to our way of thinking.

Just what, then are we being advised against? As we see, it is merely against starting. If our home were already finished no one would advise us to stop making the monthly payments. They would tell us to fight to keep making them. So we shall fight to get our home started.

This is not recklessness. It is the faith and courage upon which American institutions were founded, and upon which our way of life depends. We are merely responding to the spirit of America—the spirit that spurns security when security means compromise with hope, ambition, and faith.

The bank will say to my neighbors—the painters, the carpenters, brickmasons, electricians, and plasterers: "Here is a job for you to do, a job for a young couple who have confidence in you and in the future; we must—and do—have confidence in their future."

Thus, in building this home, we in our small way help others to gain confidence; we give them work in the same way that the owners and employees of local business and factories create a job for us.

In the next few weeks, Americans will look with satisfaction at the progress of the National Defense Commission. During that time we shall look at a newly placed joist in our home and experience the same kind of satisfaction. We, too, are preserving civilization. We are erecting another solid rock at the base of democracy—a home.

Already, the very thought of a home has kindled new flames of ambition. We beat the starting whistle by a wider margin when we go to work mornings now. Zest for work during the day has increased. If depressions do come, if war, sickness, and other misfortunes visit us, we shall have more courage to fight them.

Such small things as the pride of accomplishment in having planted a new piece of shrubbery in front of our house; the expected joy of puttering about a kitchen of our own; the satisfaction of the final payment on a favorite piece of furniture—these are the things that spur us on to building a home of our own.

Pessimists, free advisers, and negative critics we shall have with us always. But unless we get started we may never have the one thing so vastly important to us and to the Nation—a home of our own!

Public Services of Senator O'Mahoney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM SIOUX CITY TRIBUNE

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Sioux City Tribune referring in a very complimentary way to the very excellent work being done by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in his subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux City Tribune]

MORE POWER TO O'MAHONEY

Of transcendent importance to the future development and welfare of the United States is a hearing now in progress in Washington which is being conducted by the Senate Public Lands Committee, headed by Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming.

The purpose of this hearing is to set forth for the benefit of Government and the understanding of the citizenry a comprehensive picture of the untapped natural resources of the United States. It is not generally understood, we believe, that title to approximately half the land area lying west of Nebraska and Kansas still is vested in the United States Government.

O'MAHONEY'S committee intends to emphasize the magnitude of the unexploited wealth these public lands contain. These public lands are especially rich in minerals, coal, oil, iron, manganese, tungsten, tin, mercury, molybdenum, mica, nickel, aluminum, lead, zinc, copper, antimony—"a vast storehouse of the very minerals to seize which Hitler has thrown his army against the continental front of Russia," as O'MAHONEY explains it.

The Public Lands Committee will set forth some interesting facts about population trends, industrial trends, and the disproportion of war contracts and the intrinsic unsoundness of putting so many of the national-security eggs in so few baskets. It will emphasize the danger of drawing so much of the western labor supply to eastern industrial centers and the folly of depending upon foreign sources of supply for so many items that could be produced in our own country.

One of the most convincing witnesses to appear before this committee was W. M. Jeffers, president of the Union Pacific Railroad. J. M. Lamson, of the Burlington Lines, shocked members of the committee when he told them that the Germans, in their thorough way, made a quiet survey of these western American resources 20 years ago. Senator O'MAHONEY advanced the thought that Germany wanted to know what these resources were—for the future.

It is a matter of statistical record that agricultural imports during the last year of

which we have a record exceeded in value the total agricultural production of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, New Mexico, and Arizona. That fact should be brought out by the Senate Public Lands Committee in this hearing. There could be no better refutation of the wisdom of the policy our Government has practiced in trying to stimulate international commerce.

It is a common saying around Washington that "the last frontier has vanished." That is too broad a generalization. Granted that little desirable farm land remains to be brought under cultivation, that is just part of the story. The mineral wealth and power potentialities of our public domain affords a frontier that is definitely worth developing.

Wasteful, reckless, selfish exploitation of these resources must be avoided. But there is a difference between exploitation and development. Sound development practices are not inconsistent with sound conservation policies. That is especially true in mining. Proper development makes it possible to utilize vast deposits of low-grade ores which otherwise have little or no value.

Russia as an Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of today entitled "Russia as an Ally."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 6, 1941]

RUSSIA AS AN ALLY

Our State Department has informed the Russian Ambassador in Washington that we will give the Soviet Union all practicable economic assistance and grant unlimited licenses for the export to Russia of a wide variety of articles and materials, presumably including weapons. We will do this because, in the words of Acting Secretary Welles, it is "in the interest of the national defense of the United States" to strengthen Russian resistance to German aggression. To the statement conveying this information, Ambassador Oumansky replies that he wishes "to emphasize the correctness of the view" that, by invading Russia, Germany "is threatening the security and independence of all freedom-loving nations, and that this threat naturally creates a community of interest of national defense of those nations." It is more than a little too bad that Mr. Oumansky's government is just now discovering the community of interest of the freedom-loving nations. Where was Stalin in the summer of 1939, when the war began, if not playing ball with Hitler? And where was Stalin in the winter of 1940-41, if not across his own border making war in Finland?

There are certain points about our new relationship with Russia which ought to be reasonably clear. In the first place, Mr. Welles is unquestionably right when he says that we have an interest in Russian resistance. The longer Russia fights and the more German equipment she can destroy the better it will be for us. It is also clear that it is Hitler and not Russia that constitutes the immediate threat to us. But at the same time it must be clear that our primary interest is not in helping Russia but in stopping Hitler. And in the matter of stopping Hitler there are certain facts which cannot be ignored: (1) Our supplies of planes and guns and ammunition are severely limited; at this moment we cannot send even to Britain one-twentieth as many bombers as we ought to send. (2) By the only route available to us—across the Pacific and then across the whole length of Siberia—it is enormously farther from the United States to Smolensk than it is from the United States to London. We cannot ignore either the distance factor or the time factor, especially when all available information indicates that the decisive phase of the Russian campaign will come within the next 6 weeks. (3) Nor can we ignore the factor of ultimate good faith. Stalin is on our side today. Where will he be tomorrow? In the light of his record no one can say that he will not switch sides again, make a sudden treacherous peace with Germany, and become, in effect, Hitler's gauleiter in the east. We should be in a fine state of affairs if we succeeded in landing a hundred bombers on Russian soil just in time for this reconciliation.

The moral is clear enough. Particularly at a time when we are so hard pressed for war material we ought to make certain that our weapons go into the hands of proved friends. There are two such friends, both of whom have given superb evidence of their courage, their tenacity, and their trustworthiness. These friends are Britain and China. We ought now to be doubling and redoubling our aid to them. We ought to be stripping our own supplies and throwing into the war on their side every bomber, every fighter, and every pursuit plane that can possibly be spared from our own Army. We ought to be using our Navy to make certain that these supplies reach their destination.

The effect of such a policy on our part would not be to let Russia "go it alone." On the contrary, every American bomber that can be sent to China will help to prevent, or to make less effective, a Japanese attack on Russia in the east. And every American bomber that can be sent to Britain, for use either in the air over Germany or against German troops in Africa, will force Hitler to deflect all-important air power from the eastern front, and thereby weaken the force of his attack on Russia.

In following this policy we would be recognizing the realities of time and distance, keeping our supplies in reliable hands, and conserving our full strength for our main objective—stopping Hitler.

We Still Like Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM COLLIER'S WEEKLY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and worth-while editorial entitled "We Still Like Finland," by the editor of Collier's Weekly, published in the issue of August 2, 1941.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Collier's Weekly of August 2, 1941]

WE STILL LIKE FINLAND

We yield to nobody in our dislike for Hitler, or in our hope to see him some day, somehow, kicked up some convenient blind alley for good. Nevertheless, we have to stretch our imaginations strenuously in order to picture ourselves hating Finland.

In the winter of 1939-40, the Finlanders under Field Marshall Mannerheim put up the most heroic struggle against overwhelming odds that the world had witnessed since the Dutch fought off the Spaniards in the sixteenth century.

For one reason or another, neither Britain nor France sent the Finns any aid to amount to anything, though there were loud shouts of "Go it, boys; we're all for you." Could the Finns have held out a little longer, substantial Allied aid would have arrived; but they couldn't, and it didn't. Finland had to quit.

The dauntless little nation was robbed of the best one-tenth of its territory by Russia, and went on semistarvation rations while it strove to rebuild. It gradually moved into the German orbit, as happened during the previous war, and presently the British were blockading Finland. Britain was no doubt justified in doing that, under the rules of war as practiced nowadays; but the effect on the Finns personally was that they got hungrier than ever.

Then came Hitler's decision to leap for Stalin's throat. Rumania, another nation from which Stalin had grabbed territory while the grabbing was good for him, went all the way with Hitler. Finland gagged for a few days but finally also sided with Hitler.

To repeat, we don't blame Finland. We expect never to forget the epic of the Mannerheim Line, or that other epic of little Finland's paying on its American debt year after year. We hope for Hitler's eventual immolation. But we also hope that Finland may somehow come out of this fight stronger, better protected and happier than it ever was before.

Taxes and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of today entitled "Taxes and Inflation."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of August 6, 1941]

TAXES AND INFLATION

There are two main questions about the new tax bill which passed the House on

Monday, after the elimination of the provisions requiring joint income-tax returns for husbands and wives. One of these questions concerns the amount of revenue which the bill in its present form will raise. The second concerns the efficacy of the bill as a device for checking inflation. Many other questions of detail suggest themselves, but these are the two main points, and on both there are grounds for misgiving.

The question of revenue may best be understood by referring to Secretary Morgenthau's original recommendation that the bill be designed to raise Federal taxes to the point at which the Government could pay two-thirds of its expenses during the emergency on a current basis. That seemed a sensible and prudent goal. Even in its original form the House tax bill fell considerably short of the two-thirds ideal, however. It was designed to raise $3,500,000,000 a year, but the official estimates indicated that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942—the year on which Mr. Morgenthau's proposals were based—the return over and above the yield of existing taxes was to be only $1,900,000,000.

In the meantime, the original Budget estimates for the fiscal year 1942 had been revised. Under the revised estimates, it is now indicated that ependitures will be at least $22,169,000,000, and that revenues from existing tax laws will come to but $9,400,000,000. Add the $1,900,000,000 which the new tax bill was expected to raise in the fisca. year 1942, and the total revenue in sight would be $11,300,000,000, which is only a little more than half of the indicated expenditure. In a word, the committee reported a bill which, instead of meeting two-thirds of the Government's Budget in the emergency, promised to meet only a little more than half.

That was bad, but that does not tell the whole story. Among the provisions of the bill as the House received it was one requiring husbands and wives to file joint income-tax returns. Many wives owning property in their own right, or earning incomes through their own efforts, now file separate individual returns, and thus obtain the benefit of lower surtax rates than would be applicable if the income of husband and wife were added together. Moreover, there are nine "community property" States in which the wife has a vested interest in one-half of the family income without regard to her own separate property, if any. Many wives in these States have in the past filed separate returns and thus obtained the benefit of lower surtaxes.

The Ways and Means Committee felt that the privilege of filing separate returns ought to be ended: It therefore included the requirement as to joint returns, expecting that this provision alone would result in an increase of revenue amounting to $323,000,000 a year, of which at least $162,000,000 would have accrued in the fiscal year 1942. Now, in principle the requirement as to joint returns is objectionable. It runs counter to all the prevailing American ideas about a woman's right to own and manage her own property as an individual, whether she be married or single. Its adoption would have been justifiable only by reference to the imperative needs of the Federal Government for revenue in the emergency, and then only after all other expedients to obtain the needed revenue had failed.

Many other expedients might have been tried. The broadening of the base repeatedly urged in the past and suggested by the President in his eleventh-hour letter last week to Chairman DOUGHTON was one of them. The case for the mandatory joint return was, therefore, very weak. The need for revenue, however, was urgent. Yet, though the House rejected the mandatory joint return on principle, it turned its back firmly on all alternative devices for raising money, so that the bill as finally passed promises to yield not $3,500,000,000 a year, but only $3,200,000,000 a year. For the 12-month fiscal year which ends with next June the total Federal return will not be $11,300,000,000 but only $11,138,000,000, which is just barely 50 percent of the estimated expenditures.

Behind these percentages lie issues of much more than academic interest, and here we come to the question of inflation. The less the Government collects in taxes during the defense emergency, the more it will have to borrow. And every dollar that is borrowed and spent for public purposes will add to the inflationary pressure tending to drive prices upward. Had the House bill sought to increase Federal revenues to the point at which the Government would have to borrow only one-third of its outlays during the current fiscal year, the total borrowings would have been only about $7,333,000,000. As it is, the bill leaves a gap which will require $11,031,000,000 of borrowing.

There is a tremendous difference between the two sums when it comes to inflation. If prices rise, consumers will pay out this additional money, anyway, but it will accrue to private firms. If it were collected in taxes, it would accrue to the Treasury and would cut down materially the future burdens of the Government.

A consideration of the excise-tax section of the bill underscores these general misgivings in a particular way. The House bill as drafted by the Ways and Means Committee and as finally passed lays a multitude of excises. But it treats alike articles such as automobiles and refrigerators, which compete with defense production, and articles which do not compete with defense production. This is a serious shortcoming. Heavy excises ought to be laid on articles whose makers compete with defense industries for men, materials, and machine tools. The production of such articles must be curtailed in any event. Otherwise the idea of giving priority to defense production collapses at the very start.

With production curtailed and demand undiminished, there will be a mad scramble for such articles on the part of consumers. Only by laying excises heavy enough to discourage demand will it be possible to prevent an inflationary price rise. Failure of the House to lay such excises threatens, unless corrected in the Senate, to make the task of Mr. Leon Henderson (or whoever is price administrator under the proposed new bill) far more onerous than it should be. It threatens also to lay on consumers price burdens far greater than the additional tax levies themselves.

The Senate, to which the bill now goes, has a chance, by reconsidering these aspects of the measure along with many questions of detail, to throw up a truly effective barrier against the inflationary forces the restraint of which ought to be a first concern of those who wish to minimize the impact of the emergency on our standards of living.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

THE STEALTHY BETRAYAL OF THIS COUNTRY

Senator BONE, of Washington, and Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, both Democrats, have made a demand that British troops be withdrawn from Iceland in accordance with Mr. Roosevelt's treaty with the Government of that little country. Mr Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill apparently haven't the same understanding in the matter. When Mr. Roosevelt told the Senate what he had done—without its advice or consent—he said the American force would supplant the British in occupation there. Mr. Churchill told Parliament that the British Government intended to retain its army of occupation.

The Senators, who were allowed no part in the negotiations with the Icelandic Government, point to the fact that the situation provided for in Mr. Roosevelt's agreement is quite different from that created by Mr. Churchill's policy. Iceland, garrisoned by British troops, is not only in the war zone, but it is a military objective which the Nazis would attack if they were able, and will if they can. So far as they are concerned it is another Crete.

If the British troops remain there, the Americans actually go into battle position with them and would sustain any attack which might be made. There couldn't be much pretense that this was merely an outpost of defense for the hemisphere when British and American forces were on one of the battle fronts of the European war. Of course, it is Mr. Roosevelt's purpose that the expeditionary force should be on the battle front. That's one place where the shooting may begin.

Very likely Mr. Roosevelt would pay no more attention to any demand the Senate may make than Mr. Churchill will. Together they have created a situation highly satisfactory to them and in part their gains would be lost if the British were withdrawn and the contact of the expeditions broken. So long as the British and American forces are operating together, they're in the war together, and that is what is desired, both in Washington and in London. It has been brought about by Mr. Roosevelt over a trail of broken promises. His promises are bothering him very little and his apologists say that the trend of events since last fall has made his pledges obsolete.

This country is in the damnedest train of governmental double dealing and deceit it ever experienced. It is a national misfortune that whenever Mr. Roosevelt publicly announces he will not do a thing he is at that moment preparing to do it. The European artists in perfidy swear falsely to deceive other peoples they intend to attack. The American Government swears falsely to delude its own people, whom it proposes to lead, contrary to their will, contrary to their expressed determination, into a war into which they have been promised time and again, with the utmost solemnity, that they would not be led.

They are completely deceived. They are kept in the dark as to events. They learn by leaks in the official censorship that a destroyer has attacked a German submarine. They discover that Americans, with American materials, are building a base of some sort in northern Ireland. They don't know whether these men are working for the British Government or the American. All they find out is that the people of northern Ireland are rejoicing in the presence of Americans whom they regard as allies.

Americans must feel that forces over which they have lost control are driving them re-

morselessly and steadily into war and that the checks supposed to be contained in their system of government are paralyzed. Their own common sense and their good judgment warn them against all this. They dread the consequences of a European war, both for the present and for the future, and every day they realize that Mr. Roosevelt is closer to the shooting.

Triple A and Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mark Sullivan entitled "Triple A and Wheat," which is a pretty good account of some of the things going on under the triple A in this country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIPLE A AND WHEAT

(By Mark Sullivan)

A PERSONAL STORY

This is about a lady who owns a farm in Warren County, Pa.; her name is Miss Esther Newbold. What is here narrated is based upon letters written to me by Miss Newbold, together with an accumulation of formidable documents and official letters which have descended upon her from Washington during the past 3 months, including also visits to her farm by divers Government officials, one of them bearing a title hitherto unknown to me—unknown, I think, to anybody in America until the New Deal and A. A. A.—a "farm checker."

Last October Miss Newbold planted 37 acres of wheat. In that part of the country wheat is planted in the fall. She planted as much as she thought suitable to her farm. Nobody told her to plant more or plant less. She had never had any contact with triple A. She had never been what they call a participating farmer. She had never "signed up," as they say. She had never received any "farm benefits," which is triple-A's term for cash gifts from the United States Treasury, given to those farmers who do what triple A tells them to. Miss Newbold supposed she was, as she rather plaintively says in her letter, an independent American, free to plant what she deemed best and as much as she deemed wise.

She planted in October. Seven months passed. Come May, as they say in the movies. Her wheat was about half grown; it would be ripe for harvesting about July 1.

On May 12, Miss Newbold received a letter from a local agent of triple A. The letter told her that she might be subject to a penalty. Might be, not necessarily would be. It would not be decided until May 31, when there would be a referendum on whether allotments (quotas) should be applied to the 1941 wheat crop. Meanwhile, the triple-A letter explained to Miss Newbold how she might, as a precaution, safeguard herself against the possible penalty. The letter told her that her allotment was 20 acres—which would put her 17 acres in excess of her allotment. The letter, in a spirit of helpful suggestion, said:

"Those who have planted in excess * * * may get into compliance by plowing down, or otherwise utilizing for soil-building purposes by clipping and leaving on the land the wheat on the excess acres. This must be done by May 25."

Here, then, was the lady farmer's situation: She had planted 37 acres—and had a perfect right to. Even under triple-A theory, she had a perfect right, for the allotment (quota) system was not in effect on wheat at the time Miss Newbold planted, last October.

Then, on May 12 she was told that the allotment system might be put in force—the decision would not be made until May 31. Meanwhile, if Miss Newbold wished to guard against the possibility of penalty, she might plow under 17 acres of her wheat, or cut it down and let it lie on the ground. (She could, if she chose, plant some other crop on the 17 acres after they were denuded of wheat.) But she must do this by May 25—and she would not know whether her sacrifice was necessary until 6 days later, May 31, when decision would be made about applying the allotment system to wheat.

Miss Newbold was disturbed. She wrote to Pennsylvania Senator DAVIS. Senator DAVIS turned her letter over to triple-A headquarters at Washington. From triple-A headquarters Miss Newbold received voluminous letters. But they gave Miss Newbold no consolation—only confirmation of what she had previously been told.

Miss Newbold did not plow under or mow down any of her wheat. She let it all stand, harvested the whole 37 acres. The wheat from 20 of the acres, triple A permitted her to sell freely. But as to her 17 excess acres, she must do one of four things. The four were carefully made clear to her in a letter from triple A:

1. She could pay a penalty of 49 cents per bushel and then sell the wheat. (The penalty, 49 cents a bushel, is about half the price—it is about a 50-percent penalty.)

2 and 3. These are hardly ways out. She could put her wheat in storage, under seal, and under regulations of triple A. She could leave the wheat in storage for a year. Then, next planting season, she could accept a different kind of penalty. She could conform to triple-A rules, accept the quota imposed on her, and plant less than the quota—as much less as would be equal to her old wheat in storage.

4. She could make a present of her excess to triple A—just give it to them without any return.

Miss Newbold, in her letter to me, says plaintively that she is "an American supposed to belong to a glorious democracy." She thinks that what has been done to her is "unjust and arbitrary." She thinks that the allotment—imposed on May 31, on wheat planted the previous October—is a "retroactive law."

Certainly it seems to be either a retroactive law or a retroactive regulation. It would seem to be what the Constitution forbids: "No ex-post-facto law shall be passed." Maybe, if Miss Newbold or someone else will take a case up with the Supreme Court, we may find out how the new majority on the Court interprets the Constitution, when the Constitution inconveniences triple A.

A Minimum-Wage Law for Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY H. L. MITCHELL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on July 18, 1941, a radio address was delivered from station WMC, Memphis, Tenn., entitled "A Minimum-Wage Law for Farm Labor." The address was made by Mr. H. L. Mitchell, secretary of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, whose headquarters are at 2527 Broad Street, Memphis.

Mr. Mitchell's organization is composed of 40,000 small farmers, tenants, sharecroppers, and farm laborers, organized in local units in the cotton-growing States of Arkansas, Missouri, Mississippi, Alabama, Texas, and Oklahoma. This organization was founded some 7 years ago near the little town of Tyronza, Ark., by a group of farm people seeking to protect their mutual interests under the New Deal in agriculture. The Southern Tenant Farmers Union has stood the test of time. It has put up a struggle for the right of all farm people to security on the land. Its fundamental principle is to restore to the land the landless, and to preserve the independence of the small farmer of the South who still clings to his plot of soil in this changing world.

In regard to this union, I wish to say that no believer in democracy need have any qualms about supporting it fully. Once peace has returned to a war-torn world, every true American will feel grateful for the orderly, intelligent, and realistic program this organization seeks to achieve.

Because of its timeliness, I ask unanimous consent to have this radio address on the subject of a minimum-wage law for farm labor printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We all realize that the complicated problems of southern agriculture are by no means approaching solution despite signif.cant progress made in the last few years. That there have been changes in methods of farm operation which have affected adversely the little man at the bottom of the agricultural ladder cannot be denied. The increased use of tractors and other improved farm machinery, widely put into use during the last few years on the cotton farms of the South, has created a serious problem. In many areas, particularly along the Mississippi River and on the plains of Texas and Oklahoma, tenant farmers and sharecroppers have lost their place on the land and have become migratory laborers roaming the highways of

the Nation in search of employment. However, not all of the surplus farm population has had either the means or the inclination to join in the trek to the west coast as did the "Okies" of whom John Steinbeck wrote in The Grapes of Wrath. In reality, these migrant workers are the aristocrats of the dispossessed. For one who is seeking employment, traveling from place to place in a battered jalopy, there are 10 others who remain within a few miles of their former homes. Living in the slum sections of the crowded towns and cities of the South are tens of thousands of farm people for whom there is no place on the land. They depend on seasonal day labor in the fields for their main source of income. There are others who are still sharecroppers and tenant farmers who may have a small crop and a house in which to live, but who also depend on wages earned in cultivating and harvesting the cotton grown on tracts of land worked by machinery.

Having these things in mind, the Southern Tenant Farmers Union is sponsoring in the Congress of the United States a measure, being S. 1435, which was introduced in the Senate by Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, May 2, 1941. I quote: "A bill to prohibit child labor and provide minimum wages as a condition for agricultural benefit payments.

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That no payments, grants, loans, or other benefits shall be made, renewed, or extended with respect to any farm, pursuant to the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, or any other law providing for any form of grant, payment, loan, or other benefit, except upon the following conditions:

"(a) That no child under the age of 14 years shall have been employed or permitted to work on the farm, whether for gain to such child or any other person, except a member of the immediate family of a person who was the legal owner of not less than 40 percent of the crops to be produced on such farm at the time such work was performed.

"(b) That all persons employed on the farm in the production, cultivation, or harvesting of any crops or in the performance of any other farm work shall be paid in full for all such work, and shall be paid wages therefor at rates not less than those that may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be fair and reasonable after investigation, due notice, and opportunity for public hearing."

This bill is modeled on the Sugar Division of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 wherein the Secretary of Agriculture sets wage rates for workers in the sugarcane and beet fields. The method has proven successful and has demonstrated its usefulness to the purposes of the farm program in this field. Legislation similar to this is in effect now in Great Britain where, following the last World War, Parliament enacted a law to provide minimum wages for farm labor. In each English county, a wage board sets rates of pay and determines other working conditions. The National Agricultural Workers Union of Great Britain has played an important part in making the law effective. Though bombs may be falling, the journal published by this organization in England still comes through, reaching my office each month. It is filled with material demonstrating that democracy does work even though its life is at stake in a world in flames.

On May 17, 1941, there appeared in a southern newspaper, the Age-Herald, of Birmingham, Alabama, an editorial entitled "Worthy of His Hire." I quote:

"One of the most crying scandals in our democracy is, as he himself would express it, the 'fix' the agricultural laborer is in. Whether he be a migrant or a casual 'hand' attached to some particular farm, his wages are the lowest in the Nation, his hours the longest, and he enjoys an absolute minimum of legislative protection.

"We now learn that a bill has been introduced in Congress by Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, which would prohibit child labor on farms—exempting the operator's own children if he desired to employ them—and would require the payment of fair minimum wages to laborers, the provisions of the bill to apply to all producers sharing in Government benefit payments. This bill seems a proper complement to the bill just passed by Congress which substantially increases Government loans on major crops.

"It has been alleged, often justifiably, by landowners that they could not afford to pay their laborers American wages because of the depressed prices of their products. Now, with the greatly enhanced values of these products in view, it is only just to devise some Federal machinery which will operate to assure the laborer of his fair share of the value which he has helped to create."

In addition to sponsoring legislation of this type, the Southern Tenant Farmers Union supports fully the program of the Farm Security Administration for rehabilitation and reestablishing farm people on the land. We also realize that the greatest need of this class of farm people is education. Study classes are held in every local with group discussion of day-to-day problems. Use is made of pamphlets and bulletins issued by the various Government agencies, particularly material furnished by the Department of Agriculture.

The Southern Tenant Farmers Union is an independent and unaffiliated organization of tenants, sharecroppers, and farm laborers, having characteristics of both a regular trade-union and an association of farmers.

A committee composed of outstanding American citizens each year conducts what is known as National Sharecroppers Week, usually held during the month of March. Through mass meetings in various cities, radio broadcasts, and special literature, the public is acquainted with the problems of the 11,000,000 southern farm families and the work of the union. During the past 3 years Mayor LaGuardia, of New York City, and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt have been sponsors of the Sharecroppers Week.

In this time of crisis, when the life of democracy is threatened, an organization such as the Southern Tenant Farmers Union is more necessary than ever before. The strengthening of democratic institutions by legislation such as has been introduced by Senator LANGER to provide minimum wages for all farm labor north, south, east, and west is a definite step in that direction.

Price-Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I can conceive of no more important legislation that is needed at the present time than the price-control bill. I know the committee is giving the attention to the matter that it deserves, but I hope there will be no delay in bringing the subject to the floor of the House.

Tanks, planes, warships, and guns are destructive, but inflation would prove equally destructive. We are faced with a condition that requires that we should approach this subject like statesmen. Let the bill come along, thoroughly debated, and perfected on the floor if amendments are necessary.

As part of my remarks I include a timely editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on this subject. The editorial follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

NINE GOOD REASONS

There are nine good reasons why Congress should pass the price-control bill, on which the House Banking Committee expects to open hearings tomorrow. The reasons are all in title I of the bill:

It is in the interest of the national defense and security—

1. To preserve the value of the national currency against the consequences of price and credit inflation.

2. To stabilize prices and to prevent speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases in prices and rents.

3. To prevent economic disturbances, labor disputes, burdens upon commerce, interference with the effective use of the Nation's resources for defense, and impairment of national unity and morale which would result from unwarranted increases in the cost of living.

4. To eliminate and prevent profiteering, hoarding, manipulation, speculation, and other disruptive practices.

5. To prevent prospects of price rises from encouraging the accumulation and withholding of materials needed for national defense.

6. To assure that defense appropriations are not dissipated by excessive prices.

7. To obtain the maximum necessary production without undue profits.

8. To protect persons with relatively fixed and limited incomes, investors, and persons dependent upon life insurance, annuities, and pensions from undue impairment of their standard of living.

9. To prevent a postemergency collapse of values and the reappearance of price and cost disparities for farmers and other primary producers.

As to the administrative aspects of this measure, it should be noted that it is merely permissive. It authorizes the President to establish "ceilings" on the basis of prices and rentals prevailing on July 29. It provides ample latitude for discretion. Further, it provides for speedy appeal for those who may feel aggrieved by any action taken under its authority.

The bill may be less drastic than what was desired by the most ardent of the price controllers, but it does provide a flexibility too valuable to be sacrificed to theorists. It makes it possible to ease inevitable hardships without depriving the Government of vital authority. The law—when it becomes a law—will be just about as good or as bad as its administrators make it. But if they do a bad job, it will not be the fault of the law.

Refinements in the measure are possible. The nature of its administration, whether by an individual or by a board, might be set forth. Its treatment of farm and labor interests is not above criticism.

But the bill should not be sabotaged in the guise of perfecting it. Over the week end, SMITH and a few other Members of the Senate's farm bloc announced that they would insist on incorporating a "floor" for farm prices if the administration insists on a "ceiling."

This does the worst kind of violence to the underlying principle of this legislation. It is not the purpose of the bill to "freeze" all prices rigidly. On the contrary, the measure would permit the free fluctuation of prices below a level deemed dangerous. It would not outlaw free competition, supply and demand and the whole American business philosophy; it would merely authorize certain limitations lest our system be swept away by the whirlwind of inflation.

However many questions of this nature may be raised during the debate, there is one thing Congress should not forget: In the fight against inflation time is of utmost importance.

Complete the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Power Plants, Add Umatilla Rapids, in Aid of Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE OREGON JOURNAL

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

[From the Oregon Journal of August 2, 1941]

COMPLETE THE BONNEVILLE AND GRAND COULEE POWER PLANTS, ADD UMATILLA RAPIDS, IN AID OF DEFENSE PROGRAM

David Lawrence quite logically concludes that power will win the battle of production with Nazi Europe—American power. In that event, neither the Federal Power Commission, which advocates spending another $1,000,000,000 a year for generating capacity, nor the United States Bureau of Reclamation, which urges a 25-percent increase, nationally, in the next 5 years, goes far enough—not half far enough.

If the United States, now devoting 15 percent of its electrical energy to armament, and spending at the rate of $1,000,000,000 a month, reaches its goal of devoting $3,000,000,000 a month to armaments, it must devote at least 50 percent of its power to military production and must increase its productive capacity by 50 percent, or some 20,000,000 kilowatts.

For these reasons, the Journal supports Administrator Raver's request for another $30,000,000 to speed completion of both Bonneville and Grand Coulee, thus adding a total of approximately 2,400,000 kilowatts, or about 3,500,000 horsepower, to the Nation's power resources.

For these reasons the Journal also supports the Bureau of Reclamation's recommendation to start immediately on Umatilla Rapids, where 850,000 kilowatts could be developed, and to undertake, as rapidly as feasible and necessary, work on Priest Rapids and Celilo Falls on the Columbia and Z Canyon and Cabinet Gorge in Idaho, which could add 650,000, 420,000, 200,000, and 100,000 kilowatts, respectively, in the next 5 years.

Such a vast program—vast in terms of peace, but very conservative in the war crisis—also calls for restatement of the Journal's power policy:

1. Rapid completion of all 10 units at Bonneville and all 18 units at Grand Coulee, to answer the necessities of war and the industrial and agricultural requirements of the peace that will follow.

2. Immediate construction of a third dam on the Columbia, at Umatilla Rapids, to supply power needed for national defense and to improve navigation on the Columbia, and the construction, as needed, of the fourth and fifth dams on the Columbia at Priest Rapids and Celilo Falls, and of Z Canyon and Cabinet Gorge projects in Idaho.

3. Passage of a Columbia River Authority bill that will provide a maximum of regional autonomy and a minimum of bureaucratic control, setting up the machinery for acquiring privately owned systems as and if the people desire it, but deferring such a program until after the war emergency.

4. Complete elimination of disruptive power politics, by Federal and local public power agencies and the private companies, until the national crisis is past.

5. Appointment of a Pacific Northwest regional power defense council, made up of representatives of the Federal Power Commission, the Bonneville-Coulee Administration, the State utility commissions, and the private companies to encourage further power pooling and the complete integration of public and private systems for national-defense purposes.

Carl Smith, the Journal's Washington correspondent, estimates that one industry, aluminum, will soon require 2,500,000 kilowatts of firm power. That's slightly more than both Grand Coulee and Bonneville can produce when completed. And that makes no provision for other electro-chemical and electro-metallurgical industries, and for shipbuilding and aircraft construction, much of which now is and must be in the Pacific Northwest.

The five Northwestern States have about 7 percent of the Nation's installed capacity now, hydro and steam. No other region in America can double its capacity as rapidly or as economically as this one. To that end work should begin now. Speed is the essence of victory.

Aluminum—A Case Study in Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, aluminum is an exceedingly important metal in our defense program. The need for aluminum for national-defense purposes has been grossly underestimated and those persons responsible for expanding production to meet such needs were exceedingly dilatory in taking such steps as would facilitate the needed plant expansion. This story of aluminum is one of the best devices that I could choose to illustrate the many defects in the defense program and what can be done to remedy such defects. I intend to demonstrate that the New Deal has not thoroughly envisaged the defense program that it confronted; that the machinery set up for the direction and guidance of the defense effort has been poorly organized; that many governmental agencies are working at cross purposes; and that the defense effort has lacked a single guiding responsible head.

Our knowledge of the aluminum situation is derived primarily from the hearings conducted by the Senate Select Committee on National Defense and from a report of the House Committee on Military Affairs. As a consequence of these two investigations into the subject, certain steps have been taken belatedly by the Government to remedy the deplorable situation. This will constitute a fine example of what results can be expected from sound and informed criticism of defense failures. It clearly indicates that the smug complacency concerning the defense program is ill-founded, and that one of the best ways to get results in attaining our common objective is through informed criticism.

To survey the failures of the New Deal relative to aluminum and to assess the blame for such failures it is necessary first to consider the estimates of the need of the country for aluminum and secondly to consider the potential supply of this material. Aluminum at the present time plays a very important role in the national-defense program. For example, approximately one-half of the weight of all airplanes is aluminum. If we are then to have any informed estimates of the amount of aluminum that will be required for our defense program, we must have some idea of what that defense program is to be. The President himself apparently has never clearly envisaged how extensive was to be the defense program nor how much material it would require. Let me recall to you that in May and early June of 1940 President Roosevelt believed the defense program during the next few years would cost a total of only $4,500,000,000 more than the normal expenditures for the Army and Navy. But during the course of the summer of 1940 we appropriated over $10,000,000,000 in direct appropriations and in contract authorizations for defense. By the time the President submitted his Budget for 1942 the estimates of the cost of the defense program had increased to $29,000,000,000. Then came the lend-lease bill with an additional appropriation of $7,000,000,000, and at the present time appropriations and contract authorizations for national defense total approximately $45,000,000,000. Thus the failure of the administration to fully grasp the implications of the extent of the program for national defense is evident. If the Chief Executive of this country, who is also the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, did not realize the total undertaking required, and present it to his subordinate governmental officials, it is most evident that it would be difficult for such subordinate governmental officials to make adequate estimates of the need for defense material.

Of course, the President asserted in his message of May 16, 1940, that it is desirable to produce 50,000 airplanes within the next 2 years. By the end of the summer the aviation program as finally revised provided for about 18,000 planes for the Army and Navy by the middle of 1942, and this meant that we would have an annual productive capacity of approximately the same number. Subsequently a request was received for 3,600

additional bombers. On May 27, 1940, the President asked Congress for a further increase in the aviation program. This additional program, presented 2 months ago, would ultimately involve 13,000 additional planes. Thus, with these constant increases in the estimates of aircraft requirements, it is difficult for anyone to set forth any informed estimates of what we would require in the way of aluminum.

Mr. W. L. Batt, of the Office of Production Management, testified before the Senate Committee on National Defense on May 12, 1941, that in May 1940 the total demand for aluminum had reached 30,000,000 pounds per month, and that by the middle of 1941 the need would be 50,000,000 pounds per month, one-half of which would be used for civilian purposes. The inadequacy of these estimates was patent by May of this year, for by that time the consumption of aluminum for defense alone had increased from 25,000,000 pounds to more than 50,000,000 pounds per month. In May 1940 the original estimates of the need for aluminum for aviation were 17,000,000 pounds, but by May 1941 the actual consumption was 27,000,000 pounds for this purpose. Subsequently the O. P. M. revised the estimates of the requirements for aluminum to 65,000,000 pounds per month by the end of 1942 and 70,000,000 pounds per month by the spring of 1943. The production of 70,000,000 pounds per month would amount to 840,000,000 pounds per year. With the passage of the Lease-Lend Act the estimates of the need for aluminum were increased by 200,000,000 pounds. In addition, the new heavy-bomber program that was presented to Congress by the President in May 1941 increased the further demands for aluminum by at least 200,000,000 pounds per year. Mr. Batt testified that according to present estimates, the ultimate demand for aluminum for aircraft will be at the rate of 900,000,000 pounds per year, and other direct military needs will be at least 300,000,000 pounds more. Thus the total estimate for defense would be at least 1,200,000,000 pounds per year by 1943. But in the hearings of the Senate Appropriations Committee on an appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority Mr. Batt testified late in June 1941 that the actual needs for aluminum for next year would be in the neighborhood of 1,700,000,000 pounds. These estimates do not include any allowance for aluminum for civilian needs. They are in reality nothing but minimum estimates, and will probably have to be revised upward.

Now, let us see what is the supply of aluminum. As we all know, previous to May 1941 all aluminum produced in this country was manufactured by the Aluminum Co. of America. This corporation has greatly increased the production of aluminum during recent years. In 1938 the aluminum produced by the Aluminum Co. of America amounted to 286,888,000 pounds; in 1939 this had increased to 327,000,000 pounds; in 1940 the actual production was 412,500,000 pounds; the estimate of production for 1941 is 585,000,000, and in 1942 the company estimates it will produce 756,000,000. The corporation testified that in the last 2 years it has invested more than $200,000,000 of its own funds in enlarging its plant capacity. The O. P. M. and its predecessor, the National Defense Advisory Commission, repeatedly asked the Aluminum Co. to increase its production still further.

But there is one crucial element that limits the capacity of the Aluminum Co. to expand its production and that one element is electric power. It should be pointed out that to manufacture 1 pound of aluminum from bauxite ore requires 10 kilowatt-hours of electricity. The use of one installed kilowatt of generating capacity for 1 year will produce about 1,000 pounds of aluminum. Mr. L. W. Wilson, vice president in charge of operations of the aluminum corporation, testified before the Senate committee that the O. P. M. asked the corporation in October 1940 to increase its proposed plant-expansion program by 100,000,000 pounds—that is to increase its production from 750,000,000 pounds to 850,000,000 pounds. The corporation submitted plans to the O. P. M. on how this could be carried out and it has informed the O. P. M. that if it could secure for the corporation the necessary electric power the company could increase production by such further amounts as the Government desires. But by the middle of June 1941 the O. P. M. had not been able to secure the needed power for the corporation. There are several different places where this additional power could be obtained. One is at Fontana in western North Carolina on the Little Tennessee River. Here the requested 100,000,000 pounds of aluminum could be produced, but a controversy with the Federal Power Commission has been holding up this development. Further, the company could produce about 100,000,000 pounds per year in the Bonneville area where there is a large amount of power from Bonneville Dam not contracted for. However, Secretary Ickes, who is in charge of the administration of the Bonneville project, refuses to sell additional power to the Aluminum Co. of America. Another possibility for the production of aluminum is that 100,000,000 pounds could be produced from power generated by the Niagara River by the diversion of about 5,500 cubic feet per second of additional water. But there are difficulties with Canada in securing this diversion. Officials of the corporation also testified that there is unused capacity at its plant at Massena, N. Y., that would produce 70,000,000 pounds a year. There is a lack of power here. There is apparently sufficient power across the river in Ontario, but the Canadian Government will not export it.

In addition to the Aluminum Co. of America, there is one other company that has been producing aluminum since May 1941. This is the Reynolds Metals Co., headed by R. F. Reynolds. In August 1940 this corporation received a loan from the R. F. C. for the construction of plants for the production of aluminum. The original loan was for $15,800,000 and would provide for plant capacity for the production of 60,000,000 pounds of aluminum per year. The loan was subsequently increased to $20,000,000, which would provide plant capacity for the production of 120,000,000 pounds per year. Thus by 1942 the total production of aluminum in this country will be about 870,000,000 pounds, 750,000,000 of which will come from the Aluminum Co. of America and 120,000,000 from the Reynolds Metals Co. Thus there would still be a tremendous deficiency in the production of aluminum in 1942 if the present plans were carried out, for the present estimate of requirements is approximately 1,700,000,000 pounds. As a consequence, we would be producing in 1942, according to present programs, only 50 percent of our requirements. This in itself is a most deplorable situation, and unless drastic steps are taken this deficiency in aluminum will greatly retard our defense program.

Now, let us see upon whose head rests the blame for the failure to make arrangements for aluminum production. There are a number of places where blame can well be placed for the failure to anticipate the need for aluminum and to plan for an adequate supply. Among these are: (1) The President, (2) the Army and Navy, (3) the Office of Production Management, (4) the Aluminum Co. of America, (5) the Federal Power Commission, (6) the Tennessee Valley Authority, and (7) the Department of the Interior.

The President is to blame on several counts. He apparently did not clearly envisage the total ramifications of the defense program. As was previously pointed out he viewed it as being a much smaller undertaking than it really is. He was quite unwilling for many months to take any steps that would upset the philosophy of "business as usual." He was a strong adherent of the "guns and butter" idea until long after it was outmoded. He has presented the program for aircraft construction to the Office of Production Management and to Congress in such a manner that no one could really see what it amounted to and what it would call for. Thus the report of the House Committee on Military Affairs declares:

> Increased sizes of aircraft, especially of bombers, and the rapid destruction of them in the World War have made of necessity a constant revision upward of the requirements for our aircraft program. No one could foresee a year or more ago when early estimates were made that this Nation would be called upon for the enormous amounts of arms equipment which is now being voted by the Congress.

It would appear that neither the Army nor the Navy knew exactly what they would require for defense purposes. To some extent this failure was justified because they were not informed as to what they would have to defend. They did not know exactly the quantity of defense materials that they would require nor the quantity of raw materials that would be needed. The Army had plans for materials and supplies that would be re-

quired for an army of 1,200,000 men, an army of 2,800,000, and one of 4,000,000 men. But apparently these plans were not very accurate as to the requirements for raw materials. Mr. Stacy May, head of the Division of Research and Statistics of the Office of Production Management, testified before the Senate Committee that the Army estimates of requirements were not very accurate. The House Committee on Military Affairs reached a similar conclusion:

It was impossible, however, to obtain adequate estimates of the requirements of fabricated aluminum for military purposes from the Army and Navy.

The Office of Production Management must certainly assume a very large portion of the blame for the failure to adequately envisage the needs for aluminum and to plan to secure supplies sufficient to meet these needs. It did not seem to realize the acuteness of the present situation. It was continually holding out false hopes concerning adequate supplies for the future. Thus although during the last half of 1940 the Aluminum Co. of America was not able to supply all the civilian needs of its customers and at the same time supply all of the defense requirements of the United States and England, nevertheless the National Defense Advisory Commission issued a press release on November 28, 1940, assuring the people that there was then and that there would continue to be adequate supplies of aluminum for all defense and civilian needs. One month later, December 29, 1940, it issued a similar reassuring press statement.

The office of the consultant on aluminum for the Defense Commission and for its successor, the Office of Production Management, has been manned by men who have not had any great experience with aluminum. The first man in charge of this office was Mr. Folsom, treasurer of the Eastman Kodak Co. I suppose such an important position in this great industrial concern engaged in the manufacture of photographic and optical equipment qualifies a man to be an expert in aluminum. In December 1940 he was succeeded by Mr. Granville Holden. Previous to 1939 Mr. Holden had been a graduate student in economics at Harvard University. From September 1939, to the spring of 1940 he had been employed by the Eastman Kodak Co. From the spring of 1940 on he was employed in the office of the consultant of aluminum at the Defense Commission. When Mr. Folsom returned to the Eastman Kodak Co. in the autumn of 1940, Mr. Holden took up his duties. Mr. Holden did not give a very good account of himself and his abilities in the hearings before the Senate committee investigating national defense. He demonstrated his lack of knowledge of aluminum, and there is overwhelming evidence indicating his partiality toward the Aluminum Co. of America. Several witnesses testified before the Senate committee that Mr. Holden had informed them that the O. P. M. was not interested in any proposals for the development of aluminum production other than those that might come from the Aluminum Co. of America. As late as April 1941 despite the quite apparent shortage in aluminum and the unwillingness of the Aluminum Co. of America to invest additional funds in the production of aluminum, Mr. Holden was declaring that the O. P. M. was not interested in any aluminum expansion program that would require Government financing. Finally, by May 1941, Mr. Holden was beginning to see the need for Government loans to assist in the financing of the expansion of aluminum production.

The Senate Committee Investigating National Defense said in its report that the Secretary of the Interior had been willing for weeks to hold conferences with the O. P. M. concerning the expansion of aluminum production, but that the O. P. M. had been unwilling to attend such meetings:

The Secretary of the Interior has testified that at least part of the power necessary to produce additional aluminum is available and that for nearly 6 weeks he has been ready to discuss its application with the Office of Production Management. The Office of Production Management admits that it has no real plans for the production of the 600,000,000 pounds for which it has admitted a need and ascribes that failure to its efforts to survey the power situation.

Likewise, the Senate committee found that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was willing to lend $250,000,000 for plant expansion for the production of aluminum but that the O. P. M. had no plan for such expansion. Thus, the committee said:

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has indicated a willingness to provide $250,000,000 for the construction of facilities to make aluminum available. The Office of Production Management has made no plans for the erection of such facilities, ascribing as the reason their lack of knowledge as to the power sites to be used and the quantities of power which will be available.

Now we come to the Aluminum Co. of America and its part in the failure to plan for adequate plant expansion. There is, of course, some possibility that the Aluminum Co. might be somewhat to blame for the deficiency that now exists in aluminum production. It should be recalled that Alcoa has stated that it has invested over $200,000,000 of its own funds in the last 2 years in plant expansion. It has also borrowed $24,000,000 in long-term credit to finance such work, but inasmuch as there is now pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York an antitrust suit against the company, it is difficult for it to float long-term loans.

I have previously shown that the corporation has more than doubled its productive capacity for aluminum. In the autumn of 1940 the Defense Commission asked Alcoa to expand its productive facilities by at least another 100,000,000 pounds per year. In order to carry out this request the company proposed to build a plant at Fontana, N. C., on the headwaters of the Little Tennessee River. This site was 20 miles above the head of navigation on the river. Between this site and the head of navigation Alcoa had already built two generating plants. Concerning these two plants the Federal Power Commission had ruled that the river was not navigable and consequently it needed no Federal license for their construction. But when Alcoa made application to the Power Commission in October 1940 to determine whether it needed a license for the Fontana site, the Commission ruled that the Little Tennessee River was navigable at that point, although it had previously held that it was not navigable at points farther downstream. The Aluminum Co. of America refused to construct a plant at Fontana if it would require a license. Its reasons for such refusal were several. One was that if the facilities for generating power were built at Fontana under license from the Federal Government, they would be subject to recapture by the Federal Government in 50 years and the price to be paid for the property would be determined at that time. Another reason was that if the plant at Fontana should be recaptured by the Federal Government, that authority, by regulating the flow of water at Fontana, could destroy the utility of the two plants farther downstream. Further, it should be remembered that this plant at Fontana would cost about $45,000,000 and the corporation has had a difficult time raising additional long-term credits because of the antitrust suit. In February 1941 the company once more was interested in developing the Fontana project and presented certain possibilities to the O. P. M. as to what kind of Federal loan might be advantageous to help finance the project. But until late June 1941 the O. P. M. was not able to make up its mind whether there should be a direct R. F. C. loan for this project or whether it should be built by the Government under a plant facilities contract. Until the O. P. M. made up its mind it was impossible for the R. F. C. to make any kind of a loan. In addition the Tennessee Valley Authority had certain objections to the building of such a project with Government funds if it were to be operated by the Aluminum Co. of America. Further, it would appear that the corporation did not know exactly what kind of a loan it desired from the Government.

The failure of the Aluminum Co. of America to undertake the Fontana project under a license from the Federal Power Commission certainly has contributed to delay in securing adequate facilities for the production of aluminum. But it should not be forgotten that the corporation was not entirely to blame for these delays. The Federal Power Commission apparently reversed its previous line of reasoning. The Tennessee Valley Authority has offered certain objections and the Office of Production Management was not able to make up its mind on financing.

Next we come to the Federal Power Commission. Most of the problem relative to this Commission has just been set forth. Exactly what motivated the F. P. C. to change its line of reasoning relative to plants on the Little Tennessee River is far from clear. Certainly its decision on this point was previous to the decision of the Supreme Court in the

New River case and could not, therefore, have been motivated by it.

The Tennessee Valley Authority claimed that the Fontana project, on the Little Tennessee River, is really within its jurisdiction, for the Little Tennessee River ultimately flows into the Tennessee River, which is under the jurisdiction of the T. V. A. Mr. J. A. Krug, then power manager of the T. V. A., testified before the Senate committee that the Tennessee Valley Authority takes the position that it would oppose the use of any Federal funds, either directly or as a loan, for the development of the Fontana project unless the project is developed by the T. V. A. itself. It should be remembered that the land on which the dam and reservoir of Fontana would be built is owned by the Aluminum Co. and not by the T. V. A. Apparently the T. V. A. is very interested in expanding its own jurisdiction and power and not really interested in securing the development of this project.

Finally we come to Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes. As was previously pointed out there is a very large bloc of firm power at Bonneville Dam that has not been disposed of. The dam at Bonneville is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior. The Aluminum Co. of America on several occasions has signified its desire to buy additional power from Bonneville, but Mr. Ickes has refused to sell any additional power to the corporation. Apparently on several occasions, since February 1941, Mr. Ickes has been requested by the O. P. M. to sell additional power to the Aluminum Co. On two occasions the O. P. M. requested the Secretary to sell at least 65,000 kilowatts to the corporation. But the only request he has ever granted was one for 20,000 kilowatts. Mr. Ickes has testified before the Senate committee that he believes the Aluminum Co. to be a monopoly and consequently he will not sell any more power to it:

> In March when we complied with a request by O. P. M. officials that we give Alcoa another 20,000 kilowatts for operating its pots at Vancouver beyond their normally rated capacity, we were told that this would be enough power in that area for Alcoa.
>
> A month later we were again asked to allot 65,000 kilowatts of additional power for the Aluminum Co. of America. This was to be included in a program of 200,000,000 pounds additional. At this time it was obvious that the plans provided for an amount far short of what would be needed, and I replied that we would insist that new requirements be met by plants built by the Government. It was evident that unless this were done we would continue to be at the mercy of the Aluminum Co.'s apparent purpose to continue expansion on a piecemeal basis.

Despite the fact that Mr. Ickes testifies he will not sell power to Alcoa because it is a monopoly, he asserted as follows:

> Well, when the story of this war comes to be written, it may have to be written that it was lost because of the recalcitrance of the Aluminum Co. of America. It is just as serious as that, and they are just as helpful and cooperative as that, too.

Thus the Secretary testifies that he will not sell the Aluminum Co. electric power. Electric power is essential for the production of aluminum. But yet the Secretary asserts that if the war is lost it will be lost for the lack of aluminum, and the Aluminum Co. will be to blame. Certainly it is not the company that refuses to buy from Mr. Ickes, but it is Mr. Ickes who has refused to sell power to the company. The House Committee on Military Affairs criticizes this attitude of Mr. Ickes in the following well-chosen language:

> The aluminum industry relies on power—electric power. The unwillingness of some Government officials to provide hydroelectric energy from Government dams in such an emergency as exists today is at least short-sighted.
>
> Whatever may be the merits of any controversy between these so-called monopolies and the administration, it is the sense of this committee that a squabble at this time on the subject of monopoly is a tragic and sorry spectacle indeed.

Thus, by way of summary, it is quite apparent that no one clearly foresaw what would be the demands for aluminum for the defense program. At the same time adequate steps have not been taken to secure an adequate supply of aluminum. The blame can be allocated to many branches of the Government—the President, the Army and Navy, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Office of Production Management, and the Department of the Interior. The Aluminum Co. of America is not without some blame, but in the last resort the greater part of the blame must be placed upon the President, for he has refused to take any strong position for the coordination of defense activities. As long as there is no head to the defense program other than the President himself, interdepartmental and establishment bickering will continue to hold up the production of aluminum for national-defense purposes.

The Senate Committee on National Defense filed its report on aluminum on June 26, and the House Committee on Military Affairs filed a report criticizing the aluminum program, among other things, on June 28. These reports criticizing the failure to provide for an adequate supply of aluminum have had a remarkable effect upon securing approval of plans for the expansion of aluminum production. On June 27 the Office of Production Management let it be known that it had sent to the Secretary of War a program for plant expansion for aluminum production, and that after his approval the Plant Financing Corporation would be in a position to make loans to make possible such expanded production. This plant-expansion program would provide for the production of approximately 600,000,000 pounds of aluminum a year. According to a statement of July 15 these plants are to be owned by the United States Government and operated by certain specified companies. The Aluminum Co. of America is to operate three plants, with a total productive capacity of 340,000,000 pounds per year; the Union Carbide & Carbon Co. is to operate a plant producing 60,000,000 pounds a year; the Reynolds Metals Corporation will operate a plant producing 100,000,000 pounds a year; Bohn Aluminum & Brass Co., a plant producing 70,000,000 pounds a year; and Olin Corporation a plant producing 30,000,000 pounds a year. The Aluminum Co. of America has agreed to design and supervise construction of these plants without cost to the Government.

Further, according to the New York Times for July 5, 1941, an agreement has been worked out between the T. V. A. and Alcoa whereby the plant at Fontana will be constructed with Government funds at a cost of $45,000,000. Mr. Knudsen wrote a letter to Senator TRUMAN about this; but from the letter it is not clear who is to construct the generating facilities:

> While we understand that no definitive contract has been executed, I am sure the T. V. A. and the company will be glad to furnish a detailed outline of this agreement should your committee be interested. In order that the work on the project may be commenced at the earliest feasible date, we have urged the Authority and the company to embody their understanding in a contract with all possible speed, and they have assured us that this will be done.

On July 2, 1941, the Metals Reserve Corporation announced that it had contracted to import from Canada 616,000,000 pounds of aluminum at the rate of about 200,000,000 pounds a year. This aluminum will be produced by the Aluminum Co. of Canada. Apparently this corporation is not a subsidiary of the Aluminum Co. of America, but it is exceedingly closely connected with it.

With the additional 600,000,000 pounds of plant capacity, the importation of 200,000,000 pounds a year from Canada, and the domestic production next year of 860,000,000 pounds, it is evident that we might finally anticipate a total supply of 1,600,000,000 pounds of aluminum per year. This will just about meet the defense requirements according to current estimates. Apparently, in order to get this program formulated, the exposures made in the reports of the Senate and House committees were needed. It brought to the attention of the American people that we were not planning to secure an adequate production of aluminum. One major reason for this failure is the inability of the divers Government departments and establishments dealing with the program to get together and agree upon a plan. It was only due to this informed criticism by congressional committees that the administration was forced to adopt a farsighted aluminum program designed to meet adequately the defense needs that are confronting the country. It is quite possible that if there had been a single-headed administration of the defense program, a long delay in formulating such plans might never have occurred.

How an Ohio Farmer and His Wife Feel About America's Participation in the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENTS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter directed to the Congress from two of my constituents, Mr. and Mrs. Boyd H. Blackburn, of Sycamore, Ohio. They are typical farm folks and have stated their reaction to the administration's foreign policy and other current national issues. I think it would be well for each Member of this House to take note of their expression.

The letter follows:

SYCAMORE, OHIO, *July 22, 1941.*

To the Congress of the United States of America:

HONORABLE SIRS: We are opposed to sending our American boys to fight in foreign wars.

We are also opposed to breaking faith with these boys and their parents by keeping them in camp longer than the time originally specified. Let them volunteer if they will, but do not compel them. If our Government will not keep its promises, it is not worth fighting for. England should not expect more from the United States than from Canada, and Canadians do not have to go overseas unless they volunteer to go.

We are opposed to the occupation of Iceland and the eliminating hemispherical lines. If Hitler had done this instead of President Roosevelt, what a howl there would have been.

We are opposed to the proposed union with England or any other so-called democracy.

We believe Washington's advice about entangling alliances is as timely today as it was in his day.

We are opposed to aid for Russia. We believe we should conserve our resources for our own defense if and when we should need them, and not weaken ourselves materially and financially by giving too much to other countries.

We believe that England has expected the United States to finance her war from the beginning, and that she would have found a way to end it long ago if she had not thought we Americans such big fools that we would give all we had, even our sons, as we did before. And not even expect her thanks in return.

We are opposed to Congress granting any more power to the President. Why should we fight dictatorship abroad while creating one at home? And why should we help one dictator to conquer another? We cannot see where Stalin's regime is more virtuous than Hitler's.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. BOYD H. BLACKBURN,

An Ohio farmer and wife.

The Sword of Damocles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE AERO DIGEST

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the August 1941 issue of the Aero Digest:

[From the Aero Digest of August 1941]

THE SWORD OF DAMOCLES

There resided in Syracuse, on the island of Sicily, some 23 centuries ago under the reign of the tyrant Dionysius, one Damocles. He was Dionysius' courtier, dependent upon that stern tyrant for his living; nay, for his life. Naturally, he never said a word that might give offense to his lord and master. On the contrary, he leaned over backward, as we moderns say, mak'ng remarks he hoped were pleasing to the tyrant.

However, according to Cicero and to Horace, historians of those times, this boy from Syracuse sometimes leaned over too far in extravagant praise of the tyrant—giving rise to a suspicion in Dionysius' mind that Damocles protested too much, and didn't mean half of what he said. On one occasion, when he had spoken in especially extravagant terms of the happiness of his sovereign, Dionysius invited him to a sumptuous banquet, at which he found himself seated under a naked sword suspended by a single hair. This was interpreted by the historians, and undoubtedly also by Damocles, to mean that at all times Damocles had better back up what he had said—or else.

Now it happens that Damocles has many modern counterparts in the Army and the Navy of the United States of America, where all men are free to speak their minds and to express their honest opinions, if they care to pay the price. The trouble is that in the Army and Navy the price is somewhat high. So, few care to pay it. One did; the late Gen. Billy Mitchell. And what happened to him is a matter of record. The sword descended. Later aviation dependents of the Army and Navy were quick to take the hint, and no more derogatory remarks about the Army's and Navy's handling of aviation have been heard from those over whose head the sword of official displeasure is suspended. And it is suspended, no doubt of it, over the head of every aviation officer in the Army and Navy. They will tell you so, privately, and the record of what has happened to a few with "guts" fully bears it out.

WHAT CAN YOU EXPECT?

Therefore, when a congressional committee, seeking light on the need for a United States air force coequal with the Army and Navy, asks one of these dependent officers what he thinks of the idea, just what do you expect him to answer? Remember, all of these officers of rank have reached that nonindependent status of fathers. They are simple, home-loving, family-loving fathers like you and like me. There is, we will say, in each of these families a boy or two now going to college, a girl going to finishing school.

Now, just what do you expect these officers to do when they are asked to damn the General Staff and its handling of aviation, or the Navy high command and its inability to see that in addition to auxiliary naval aviation the United States needs also a strong land-based air force, divorced from hampering, old-style Army control? Do you expect a bunch of martyrs? Do you expect these Army and Navy aviation officers to sacrifice their careers, to incur official displeasure, perhaps court martial? If you do, then you don't understand human nature, or fathers.

Therefore, to save all this mess, aviation officers in the Army and Navy simply cannot come out for an independent air force. And whenever they are called upon to testify, you might bear this in mind and pay no attention to what they may have to say. The truth is in them; but the welfare of their wives and their children, not to mention their own careers, will not let it come out.

Lost Your Job? Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's press told us that President Roosevelt had agreed that Russia should have priority on all materials necessary to supply her with munitions of war. The morning paper informs us in flaming headlines that the United States is to aid the Far East "red" Army and that this country, as an outstanding feature of its program to aid Rusia, will be a major source of supplies for the Soviet far eastern army.

An Associated Press dispatch of August 2 advises that 175,000 employees will be thrown out of work because the New Deal was preparing to close the doors on the Nation's $250,000,000 silk and hosiery industry.

Nineteen Hundred Corporation, located in St. Joseph, in the Fourth Michigan Congressional District, which makes 1,300 electric washing machines a day, has been advised through the newspapers that it must cut its production 30 percent. This order, if and when it comes down, means that several hundred men will be thrown out of work. Just what are they to do? And who is to take care of them and their families while they are idle?

In the same city the Cooper-Wells Co. will be affected by the order which results in depriving it of its supply of silk, for approximately 75 percent of the firm's output is silk hosiery. Four hundred and seventy-five persons are employed at the St. Joseph plant, while approximately 350 work at the Decatur, Ala., plant.

The silk-freezing order will have a direct effect on the Warren Featherbone factory at Three Oaks, Berrien County, also in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, where silk is used in the manufacture of blanket bindings, braids, and a number of other items.

Day before yesterday we passed a tax bill which will add more than $3,000,000,000 to the burden of the already overburdened taxpayer. In a few months there will be another tax bill calling for like, or even greater, payments.

LOST YOUR JOB? WHY?

The effect of the Government's policy in granting priority orders for all material which it wants to manufacture into munitions of war to give to Britain, China, and Russia, and, for that matter, to any other country which may ask, is to close thousands of small manufacturing plants throughout the country and to throw hundreds of thousands of men and women out of work.

Only a fool would believe it possible to impose and collect additional taxes while drying up the source from which those taxes must be collected. Who pays the taxes which Congress imposes? Corporations engaged in industrial production, businessmen, workingmen.

We all know that the effect of the administration's present program of giving away billions upon billions of dollars' worth of material, of depriving industrial plants of the raw material necessary to enable them to operate, makes it absolutely impossible for those industrial concerns to continue in business and to pay a tax; and the billions of dollars which are imposed and which are paid in hidden taxes by the workingmen cannot be paid if the men are unemployed.

No one having at heart and keeping in mind the continued existence of this Government would pursue such a ruinous policy. Can it be that the administration, not satisfied with bankrupting the Nation, intends to drive our people until, in desperation, they revolt?

Factory after factory is on the verge of being forced to close its doors. There are hundreds of men, businessmen and representatives of small concerns, here in Washington, begging of bureaucrats, who never had a constructive idea in their whole lives, for material to enable them to continue in existence—to give employment to the people of their home towns. But in all too many instances they are told that the needs of Britain, of China, of Russia must be supplied first.

Is our whole industrial system to be bogged down, our people to be unemployed and finally to suffer want and hunger, in order that the war machines of Europe may continue to grind out the lives of those who are being used by Europe's war lords to carry on their campaigns of aggression?

Is it not time that this Congress shakes itself together; gets a few constructive ideas looking toward the preservation of our own Nation, the welfare of our own people; calls a halt to the administration's insane policy of involving us in the European conflict at the expense not only of our material welfare but of our freedom as well?

I call upon the majority party—the leadership of the majority party—to take some active steps which will enable the small industries throughout the Nation to continue in existence—to give employment to the millions of people who live and heretofore have worked in those communities.

Defense Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

LETTER OF MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. RIVERS

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, retired, which was published in the New York Times of July 27, 1941:

[From the New York Times of July 27, 1941]

DEFENSE PLANNING—CREATION OF NEW CABINET POST VIEWED AS NEED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your recent editorial, "Defense Needs Planning," is timely and important. You enumerate a number of deficiencies in our national-defense program—deficiencies pointed out by your military reporter, Hanson W. Baldwin. Among these are that after a year of expansion and preparation the United States is still months away from adequate combat efficiency; that not a single division is yet ready for war; we are still training for a 1917 war; that practically nothing has been done to weed out the senior officers who are wedded to ancient concepts or who are unfit for positions of responsibility. Also, that there is still excessive emphasis on the foot soldier, bayonet fighting, and grenade throwing, and not enough on the tank and the collaboration of planes and tanks.

You also mention the voluminous report submitted by the House Military Affairs Committee, which complains of a series of major failures and delays. You state the War Department has asked Congress to authorize a purge of unfit Army officers. Your own opinion is that "lack of proper planning is the result of lack of proper organization to do that planning. Where the country lacks proper defense organization is at the very top. There is still vital need of a board whose individual members are not tied down by pressing routine duties and who can view the defense picture as a single whole."

PLANNING BOARD OPPOSED

Your recommendation is for an advisory War Planning Board to contain the best strategical brains of the Army, Navy, and air forces, as well as civilian industrial and economic experts and first-rate nonspecial minds. Boards are useful as policy-making instruments but are not as a rule so effective as executives. We have long had many boards in our defense services, principally to coordinate various activities. Coordination involves, or at least invites, compromise and delay.

Much experience with boards during my long service in the Army causes me to doubt the wisdom of your recommendation for an advisory War Planning Board. Prompt and effective action demands the employment of individuals in important positions. Their responsibility is personal and clear. What we require at this important time is an additional Cabinet officer—a Cabinet Minister of Defense.

Such an official should aid the President in inspecting and supervising the efficiency and relative progress of three coequal armed branches—the Navy, the Army, and the Air Corps—as is done in Britain, Germany, and 20 other countries. A small national-defense college should be created under the Minister of Defense. The students would be a limited number of officers of the three services, with a few civilians from some of the other Government departments.

SMALL STAFF NEEDED

The minister would require but a small staff. The three civilians at the head of the three armed services would each have large staffs as at present. Unity of command would be assured because the portions of the Air Corps which go to war with the Navy and with the Army would be all the time in peace actually with and under the orders of these respective branches—for training and indoctrination. A reserve force of the Air Corps would be retained by the Chief of the Air Corps, subject to the disposition of the minister of defense. We need a single homogeneous United States Air Corps with its own laws for pay, promotion, and retirement.

Such an organization would result in great improvement in operations and in great savings of public funds.

As to our having in the Army some officers who are not competent, this is natural, because we lack any system of selection in the promotion of Army officers in the grades up to that of colonel. All the navies of all nations have such a system and all the important armies save only ours also use the system of selection in promoting Army officers. Therefore, we are now doing much the same thing we have done when an emergency appears. We are experimenting with some of our Army officers in order to compare their relative efficiency, when this should have been done carefully in peacetime.

COMPETITION FAVORED

This experimenting with the assignments of some of our higher officers has in the past produced almost unbelievable results. It inevitably delays and mars the early training of some of the new forces. The history of administration indicates that no bureau in which the officials have a life tenure of office will ever retire or discharge in a thorough manner the less competent persons. An automatic system, such as selection, insures the competition which is effective.

The question of air power and the proper organization for our defense forces must now be viewed after study of the capture of Crete. The capture of Crete in a few days was an epoch-making event in warfare. The British were in possession of Crete. They had an army there, with defended positions, artillery, tanks, and other heavy equipment. The Germans carried to Crete thousands of infantry soldiers in transport planes and in gliders. The Germans captured Crete without tanks and artillery and special equipment. The airplanes not only brought the German troops to Crete but the dive bombers acted in the place of tanks and artillery in battle to aid in defeating the British forces on the island. We now see that airplanes can be the principal instruments both in seizing and in holding positions. The Air Corps is not, therefore, as many have claimed, merely an auxiliary force in war.

WILLIAM C. RIVERS,
Major General, United States Army, Retired.
NEW YORK, *July 24, 1941.*

Too Many Dollar-a-Year Men—Corporate Connections and Biases of Business Representatives Now Functioning in the O. P. M.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

ARTICLE IN THE AUGUST PEOPLE'S LOBBY BULLETIN

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appears in the current issue of the Bulletin of the People's Lobby, Inc., and which was prepared by that nonprofit corporation for educational and constructive purposes. It was thought advisable to advise the people of affiliations of certain people now identified with public agencies. The article is as follows:

WHO'S WHO IN WALL STREET'S WAR IN WASHINGTON—TWO BILLIONS OF WAR CONTRACTS TO BUSINESS REPRESENTATIVES IN GOVERNMENT

At least $2,000,000,000 of war contracts, up to the first week in June, had gone to concerns with controlling officers in the Government making the contracts, an investigation the People's Lobby has had made shows.

Specific contracts amount to $1,126,020,978, exclusive of contracts for fuel, supplies, construction, and expansion, and of contracts to subsidiaries, subcontracting, and corporations to cover up, controlled by these corporations. These include:

American Brass Corporation: James H. Madden and James T. Kemp, both in Office of Production Management, $6,857,101.

Bethlehem Steel Co.: George F. Hocker, O. P. M., $71,449,442.

Chrysler Corporation: Edmund S. Chapman, Chief Light Ordnance Unit, O. P. M., $34,179,529.

Colorado Fuel and Iron Corporation: George M. Kirk, O. P. M., $4,587,200.

Crucible Steel Co.: Frank E. Spencer, O. P. M., $14,184,446.

Dravo Co.: Alex W. Dann, Office of Transportation, $10,830,481.

General Electric Co.: F. B. Cliffe, Carl M. Lynge, O. P. M., $106,754,743.

General Motors Corporation: William Knudsen, O. P. M.; Frederick C. Horner, Office of Transportation; and E. F. Johnson, Benson A. Waderlow, Bayard B. Kunkle, and John L. Pratt, all O. P. M., $324,403,069.

International Harvester Co.: Richard E. Evans, $9,368,738.

Lukens Steel Co.: A. J. O'Leary, O. P. M., $8,000,719.

Murray Corporation of America: Clarence W. Avery, O. P. M., $3,079,680.

Procter & Gamble: Rich R. Deupree, O. P. M., $24,720,000.

United Aircraft and Transportation: George J. Mead, O. P. M., $186,439,438.

United States Steel Corporation: E. R. Stettinius, O. P. M., $5,548,143.

Western Electric Co.: J. F. McKermann, O. P. M., $22,017,520.

Westinghouse Electric Manufacturing Co.: E. C. Brandt, O. P. M., $37,747,430.

Available records do not reveal whether contracts were open bidding or cost plus.

The 6 months' delay in the armaments program, due to quibbling over taxes and payments, with corporation officials' acting in a dual capacity as Government and as economic royalist representatives, has imperiled the safety of all of America's armed forces.

DU PONT AND CARNEGIE STEEL

Du Pont contracts amount to $170,329,955, and Carnegie Illinois Steel to $65,191,582, but perhaps since the Du Ponts have married into the Roosevelt family, Du Ponts are no longer "economic royalists." Du Pont is controlled by General Motors, whose president, William S. Knudsen, is Director, Office of Production Management, and Frederick P. Keppel, president of Carnegie Steel, is in Nelson Rockefeller's division.

LIGHT ON SLEEPING SICKNESS OF DEFENSE PROGRAM—ORGANIZATION OF DEFENSE PROGRAM

The organization of the defense program has brought to Washington scores of men from the ranks of business—primarily big business. It is in the defense organizations that business influence in Government administration and policy has reached its peak.

From the beginning of the defense program much of the administration and a major share of the determination of policy has been in the hands of men who have been and still are connected with business.

A number of men from the ranks of big business are today the most important administrators of the defense program: William S. Knudsen, president of General Motors Corporation since 1937, now in charge of the Office of Production Management; Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., chairman of the board of United States Steel Corporation and an old associate of Mr. Knudsen in General Motors, now director, Priorities Division of the O. P. M.; John David Biggers, president, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., another experienced automobile man, now director of production of O. P. M.; Roy Jackson, formerly associated with Ford Motor Co., 1928–31, General Motors Export Co. 1931–34, and United States Steel Export Co. 1938 to date, now administrative officer of the O. P. M.; Ralph Budd, president, Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., now Commissioner of the Office of Transportation of the O. E. M.

Business influence on policy and administration consists of much more than the presence of men such as those mentioned. To these must be added the dollar-a-year men and those who serve W. O C.—without compensation. Shake-ups in the defense organization have not changed this. Big business has not lost its influence.

DOLLAR-A-YEAR MEN DOMINATE

In the second week in June there were approximately 265 dollar-a-year men serving in the various defense agencies.

There were 11 in the Office of Transportation, 22 in the Defense Mediation Board; 31 in the Office of the Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations Between the American Republics (Mr. Rockefeller reported 36 dollar-a-year men to the House Committee on Appropriations, but the Office for Emergency Management has released the names of only 31); 7 in the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply; 5 serving the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense; 186 in the Office of Production Management—Production 92, Priorities 22, Labor 37, Purchase 35. (Donald Nelson, director of the Purchase Division, reported 40 to the House Committee on Appropriations, but the O. E. M. has released the names of only 35.)

Of this number, at least 42 are presidents of corporations. The majority of these are major corporations such as General Motors, Dravo Corporation, Atlantic Greyhound Corporation, American Airlines, Inc., American Coffee Corporation, Carnegie Corporation, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., Procter & Gamble Co., etc.

At least 8 of these men have been associated in a direct capacity with investment or banking concerns. Well over half have been involved in the immediate management of business concerns.

Of the total, only about 42 are technicians, engineers, or professional men.

Spread through all of the defense agencies are to be found 17 men connected with trade associations and business institutes.

In O. P. M. a majority of dollar-a-year men have been active administrators.

These men are the economic royalists made famous by the President's denunciations in the early years of the New Deal. Many of their connections extend to more than one corporation and to countries throughout the world, including Germany.

PROTECTING PROFITS

In the field of production the influence of the dollar-a-year men has been against any proposal to reorganize industry for greater efficiency if it would interfere with their profit position.

The arms program and the domestic economy are now suffering from shortages of certain raw materials and finished products. One of the major jobs in the early days of the arms program was to estimate the amount of raw materials and the productive capacity needed to provide production of goods for the civilian and military economy. The degree of influence of business on the early decisions of the defense agencies can be traced item by item to dollar-a-year men in the defense set-up. This applies to aluminum, steel, automobiles, rail transportation, and electricity.

GOVERNMENT MUST TAKE INDUSTRIES TO DEFEND AMERICA

The Federal Government must at once:

1. Take over every major industry, as well as every defense industry, including transportation and the banking and credit system, on the basis of a fair, instead of a fictitious capitalization, and put technicians and production engineers in charge—to insure production.

2. Create a representative commission to plan for arms and civilian needs, with an executive with plenary powers to order planned production.

Prompt and complete mechanization will reduce the dangers of America's defenders in uniform.

Such mechanization, and the provision of munitions and equipment, cannot be obtained promptly, and civilian needs met, under private ownership, or private control.

Better Get Ready

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEWTON (KANS.) EVENING KANSAN-REPUBLICAN

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following timely editorial from the Newton (Kans.) Evening Kansan-Republican of July 30, 1941:

[From the Newton (Kans.) Evening Kansan-Republican of July 30, 1941]

BETTER GET READY

The continual pounding on the national-defense program, the enormous appropriations of money by Congress, incidents such as the appeal for old aluminum, are gradually bringing the people nearer to the war area. Almost every day the United States draws a step nearer to actual participation in the war. We are already in the war zones. Maybe it is now only up to Hitler or Japan to strike the first blow and we shall be in up to our ears.

Perhaps we on the sidelines cannot always see as clearly as the team manager sitting on the players' bench. Maybe the Commander in Chief and the expert advisers in Washington, from the close-up seats, are seeing things that the ordinary spectator cannot discern. Maybe they think it is necessary to take all of these warlike steps and take chances of overstepping what is considered our rights as a neutral nation.

This much seems certain to all concerned in this country, that we had better hurry up our program of preparedness if we are going to continue knocking chips off the shoulders of other people.

In that connection, and whether we like it or not, and whether it is treating fair with the soldiers, the ominous conditions that now prevail make it seem advisable to hold all the armed forces we have at our command in service and add to them as rapidly as new men can be absorbed and trained.

It is probably almost universally felt by United States people that getting into the war is practically inevitable. We do not want to wake up in the middle of the night and find that we are in and have no inadequate defense force to do the actual fighting. It begins to look like everybody, both citizen and soldier, had better get into training for whatever tasks participation in war may entail.

The Sugar Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

LETTERS FROM AMERICAN SUGAR CANE LEAGUE AND THE NATIONAL SUGAR REFINING CO.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

AMERICAN SUGAR CANE LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.,
New Orleans, July 2, 1941.

Hon. HALE BOGGS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOGGS: I notice during the debates in the Senate on bill S. 937 at page 4596 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 2 that Senator GEORGE was under the impression that the sugar producers of this country are afforded protection to the extent of $47 per ton, this being $37 per ton protection furnished by tariff and $10 per ton afforded by reason of the processing taxes.

If we applied these figures to the 1940 consumption, we would have to multiply 6,865,402 tons by $47 and as a result, we would get $322,673,894 protection allegedly given the sugar producers of this country. This, as you know, is ridiculous. The actual protection afforded the sugar producers of this country for 1940 should be arrived at as follows: At the full-duty rate of 1.875 cents per pound, they were afforded $37.50 per ton on the 24,177 tons of full-duty sugar; at the preferential rate of 0.9 cent per pound, they were afforded $18 per ton protection on the 1,311,356 tons of sugar from Cuba. Thus we see that the domestic sugar producers were afforded a total of $24,511,045.50 protection as against the alleged $322,673,894, or an actual difference of $298,162,848.50. It is erroneous to figure the $10 per ton processing tax as protection of the domestic producers as against foreign producers, because this tax is paid by all producers, whether continental, domestic, or foreign.

The figure which Senator GEORGE used is one of the pets of certain administrative officials of the United States Department of Agriculture and was originally thought up in 1936 in a statement which was issued by the then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. HENRY A. WALLACE. In this statement, Mr. WALLACE said: "The total cost to American consumers of sugar purchased under the quota system during the calendar year 1936 has been estimated (without allowance for the revenue of approximately $40,000,000 the United States Treasury received from import duties on sugar, or for the possible increase in world price that might have resulted from changed conditions) at approximately $350,000,000 in excess of the depressed prices that prevailed in the world market."

You will notice how closely this figure which Mr. WALLACE used in 1936 approximates the figure that I arrived at by multiplying the total consumption for 1940 by $47 per ton.

You will also notice that even in 1936 Mr. WALLACE limited his statement to the calendar year 1936, and he also made the statement that his $350,000,000 estimate did not include $40,000,000 which had been received by the Treasury from import duties on sugar, nor did it include "the possible increase in world price that might have resulted from changed conditions." This last quote is really the bug in the rug.

A great deal has been said about the difference between the world price and the cost of sugar to the American consumer. It must be remembered that for practical purposes the world price only affects a very small amount of sugar in this hemisphere because the only sugar that is sold at the world price here in any volume is that part of the distressed sugars in the West Indies, which are usually sold to Great Britain, and the full duties brought into this country from San Domingo and Peru. That is what Mr. WALLACE meant by "the possible increase in the world price that might have resulted from changed conditions." He was saying, in other words, that if a large purchaser, like the American consumer, went into the world market for any volume of sugar, the world market would not stay at its then low figure, but would approximate the American price within a very short time.

When we consider that in 1940, out of a total of 6,865,402 tons of sugar there was only approximately 24,000 tons of so-called world-price sugar sold in this country, we are still letting the tail wag the dog if we try to make a direct comparison between the American price and the world price insofar as it affects the American consumer.

A parallel could be drawn by finding some distressed farmer who would sell about 3,000 bales of cotton at one-half the prevailing price and then proclaiming to the world that this was the price of cotton throughout the United States.

I believe that the information I have given you above is a much more fair picture of the protection situation insofar as it affects sugar than that given you by other informants.

While I am on the subject, I would like to take a little more of your time to show just why we feel that the sugar people in Louisiana are not being given the full protection that they have earned. In going over the books of several of the Louisiana sugar-producing companies I find that they each pay all of the following taxes:

Federal income tax, State income tax, Louisiana corporation franchise tax, Federal capital-stock tax, Federal miscellaneous-processing tax, Federal sugar-processing tax, Federal unjust-enrichment tax, Federal documentary-stamp tax, business license tax, store license tax, store permit tax, truck and auto license, Louisiana public-welfare sales and use tax, social-security tax, real-estate tax, equipment tax.

One such company with an investment of slightly over a million dollars paid these taxes in the following amounts during the following years: 1936, $68,796; 1937, $71,100; 1938, $59,163; 1939, $40,228; a total of $239,349 for the 4-year period, or more than 25 percent of their total investment paid out in taxes during the 4-year period.

As you know, all of these taxes go to support the cost of government and to support the American standard of living, and I would like for you to ask informed officials from the Department of Agriculture just how many of these taxes, or like taxes, the producers of sugar in Cuba, the Philippines, San Domingo, Peru, and even Puerto Rico, pay toward maintaining the American Government and the American standard of living. I am asking you to ask them how many of these taxes are paid to the American Government, because after all it is our market, the American market, in which they are asking to sell their sugar.

As you well know, in any endeavor the producer of a commodity has to use a certain amount of his productive capacity or he becomes a victim of the law of diminishing returns, and that is what we in Louisiana fear. Let us examine the record for a moment and see just why, under the 1937 Sugar Act, we are justified in fearing this.

Studies conducted by the experimental station of the Louisiana State University, and studies conducted by individual agencies, have definitely stated and proven that when a farm produces sugarcane for sugar, from 65 percent to 75 percent of its total cultivable acreage should be in sugarcane. We here in Louisiana were required to plow up cane in 1939 and in 1940 in order to meet the regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to his authority under the Sugar Act of 1937. As a result, we had the following acreage conditions during the first 3 years of the operation of the Sugar Act of 1937 on farms which raised sugarcane for sugar:

Year	Cropland on farms producing sugarcane for sugar	Harvested acres for sugar
1937	780,630	254,000
1938	816,860	270,000
1939	819,789	238,000
1940	[1]805,760	225,000

[1] 3-year average.

Thus we see that instead of having the ability to use 65 percent of our cultivable land for cane, we were forced, in order to comply with the 1937 Sugar Act, to only use 32.54 percent in 1937, 42.19 percent in 1938, and 29.03 percent in 1939. The 1940 cropland figures are not yet available, but the percentage for 1940 will be even less than the 1939 percentage. Thus, I believe you can readily understand why we not only fear the law of diminishing returns, but resent the fact that our industry has been called inefficient by the officials of the Department of Agriculture.

It is inefficient only because we are prohibited by Federal law from using our full productive capacity in the production of a crop of which approximately 70 percent of the amount consumed by the American public is imported.

We not only feel, but we know, that if we were allowed to use our full productive capacity, we could and would, put sugar in the hands of the consuming public at a cost below that which they pay for practically any other food. We know that we could and would stand between the American consumer and the exorbitant price that they had to pay for sugar during the one time in recent years when the continental American supply was exhausted, and we were dependent on these low-cost producing countries who, although their cost of production was low, their price was high.

As a specific instance, you will recall that Cuba very generously offered to sell one crop of raw sugar to the United States Government at 18 cents per pound, and at that time sugar did go to a point where housewives were forced to pay 25 cents per pound for it in the refined form.

You might also recall that the only thing that stopped this wild skyrocketing in the price of sugar was another American-produced crop coming on the market. More recently, to be specific, in September 1939, when the price of sugar began to skyrocket, Cuba did not sell in this country one single pound of sugar when the President lifted quotas. In this case again it was the domestic sugar that broke the skyrocketing prices.

As I have stated above, we know that we can produce sugar so that it is one of the cheapest foods that the American public consumes. We know that our farming practices on the acreage which we are allowed to cultivate are efficient because if they were not, we certainly could not produce from 29 to 31 tons of green material per acre of land and do this year after year.

With conditions as they are today, we feel that we should be given a chance to show the Government and the people of the United States that we can and will produce sugar at a very reasonable cost, and at the same time make a living for ourselves and our children.

I feel that the most effective means of allowing the domestic industry to demonstrate its ability would be the passage by Congress of the Coffee bill (H. R. 3582) so that this would then become a part of the 1937 Sugar Act, as amended, in the event that Congress decides to extend the 1937 Sugar Act for another year.

Very truly yours,

CHAS. A. FARWELL,
Chairman, Educational Committee.

THE NATIONAL SUGAR REFINING CO.,
New York, July 28, 1941.

Hon. HALE BOGGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOGGS: I have read with interest your remarks in the House on July 17 about pending sugar legislation. I note on page 6141 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you are quoted as saying:

"The National Sugar Refining Co. and Farr & Co. of New York have known interests in several sugar mills in Cuba."

In the interest of accuracy, I would like to say that the National Sugar Refining Co. has no interest in sugar mills in Cuba or elsewhere. Our activities are confined solely to the refining of raw cane sugar. I know that you would wish to have this for the record.

I might add that I am hopeful that the whole industry—beet, cane, and refining—may be able to work out some joint proposal for future legislation.

Very truly yours,

ELLSWORTH BUNKER,
President.

Uniting America to Produce—For War, for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE AMERICAN LUMBERMAN

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely editorial from the July 26, 1941, issue of the American Lumberman:

[From the American Lumberman for July 26, 1941]

UNITING AMERICA TO PRODUCE—FOR WAR, FOR PEACE

Should this be a long war, the decisive weapon is certain to be food control. And when the military phases of the war are over, food will write and underwrite the peace.

Our problem just now is not merely that of raising all we can. World food production, outside the European fighting zone, is enormous; and yet millions are facing starvation. This is due in part to the break-down of transportation; but it is due in part to unbalanced production.

It is our problem to produce not only the amounts but also the kinds of food that will win the war and make the peace. American agriculture, like American industry, is quite certain to be attached to an international economy. At present it is a war economy, but it will change to an international peace economy when the shooting war is over. Agricultural changes are being made now. Admittedly they are as far-reaching as any changes that have come to American farms in a hundred years.

Every European country is rationing food; and no one of these countries is allowing its people the calories needed to maintain normal health.

The British are allowed about 80 percent of the needed amount, the Germans about 70 percent, the Poles 25 percent or less. These are allowed amounts; but few people are able to buy that much, either because they lack money or because markets lack supplies.

Correspondents on the Continent tell us about the increase of pellagra, tuberculosis, and the long list of other diseases caused by malnutrition.

These are grim aspects of the hunger war.

It is against the background of the food race and the starvation in Europe that the American Lumberman offers a suggestion. It is that the United States prepare now to help feed our European neighbors during the period of exhaustion after the war closes and before official control and distribution of food can be started. We know, of course, that the Department of Agriculture is planning big food reserves to be used for diplomatic as well as for humanitarian purposes. But the need will be so great that private and community resources can well be used to supplement the Department's reserves. Our suggestion is to make use of these speecial resources for purely humanitarian purposes.

Such popular methods of food production should not and need not interfere with official projects. But when all such allowances are made, there is still a big supply of land, labor, equipment, and good will. Food so produced ought to be used to feed Europeans without regard to nationality.

Surplus wheat can be fed to poultry, dairy herds, and meat-producing animals. It would not take so much official labor and inspection to insure against upsetting the wheat-production control and to see that food so produced went into the post-war gift warehouses.

In nearly every community there is a canning factory that operates during fairly short periods. Such a plant could be utilized in preserving fruits and vegetables. It has been proved that with simple home equipment vegetables can be tinned that meet professional standards. Four-H Clubs could be enlisted, cooperative projects started.

The idea is that the people of the United States, the people themselves, begin producing and storing vast supplies of food of kinds not subject to spoilage—canned meats, poultry, vegetables and fruits, cheese, powdered milk and eggs, vitamin concentrates.

This would not be charity in the sense that the people make a free gift of their materials and labor. These should be paid for by the Government at moderate, agreed prices; putting the undertaking on a business basis and permitting the unemployed and those with spare time to make some modest earnings. This would cost the Government something; but meanwhile the United States is appropriating billions for munitions and other fighting equipment for our overseas friends, and we look upon these appropriations as virtual gifts. We consider this fighting equipment as gifts to help save our kind of civilization. But civilization depends upon people. The job of saving civilization will not be done until the people themselves are saved.

The purpose would be not to sell these supplies of food but to contribute them to Europe through the Government as an American gift to our needy overseas neighbors.

There would have to be a minimum amount of official supervision to see that no advantages were taken of relaxed agricultural regulations; some professional help, say from the W. P. A.'s food experts, to make sure of standards. But in the main it would be a people's undertaking, managed by the people themselves through their own chosen community, county, and State committees and headed up by a popularly chosen national committee. This is important both in creating morale and in releasing the maximum of popular interest and popular will.

There are plenty of reasons at home and abroad for making America a great food reservoir.

It will save human lives. The United States is better able than is any other country to undertake this humanitarian mission.

It would appeal to American kindliness and generosity; and it would channel the average American's desire to do his personal bit in a great crisis. Home defense is constantly besieged by people asking, "What can I do?" The American people in this practical way can prove that we have a regard for and want to help our neighbors.

Mr. Hoover's feeding of European children after the first war won us more respect and understanding than did all our post-war loans. We lost the loans; but Mr. Hoover and his associates did save the children. It was the lost loans and not the saved children that created animosities.

Our world friends are not numerous. We promised aid to attacked countries and were not able to deliver it. We have taken sides in this war; and for reasons that seem good to us and because of factors we cannot control we express our partisanship in a slowly rising tide of munitions. We need friends, and while we cannot buy them and should not try we can prove that we are worthy of friendship

and have not forgotten. It is an idea in which every successful businessman recognizes merit. Lend a helping hand to your customer when he is in need. When his feet find solid ground again he will be a stanch customer and friend.

Finally, we need unity among ourselves; and one road to national unity is shared work for something larger than ourselves. This is a good-neighbor opportunity.

Taxes on Radio and Outdoor Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

LETTER FROM THE ADVERTISING FEDERATION OF AMERICA

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ADVERTISING FEDERATION OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., July 31, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Advertising Federation of America hereby expresses itself in strenuous opposition to the proposed taxes on radio and outdoor advertising as contained in H. R. 5417.

We consider any tax on advertising, regardless of the media affected, as harmful to the economy of our Nation and detrimental to our well-established system of distributing consumer goods.

The power of advertising as the selling force of industry and as the stimulator and stabilizer of commodity distribution must be protected. This is necessary in supporting the base for emergency taxes, for any impairment in the use of advertising by taxation will in turn affect distribution and the revenues derived therefrom. In our opinion, a tax on advertising will defeat its own purpose.

We are mindful that vast sums of money must be raised by our Government for national defense. This involves the greatest merchandising effort in the history of our country. Hence it is that our merchandising machinery must be keyed up to the highest notch of efficiency.

Business uses advertising to maintain and increase its outlets for goods. Unless such outlets are maintained and increased during the coming years, the expanded income on which taxes are based will not be forthcoming. Nothing should be done, therefore, to cripple the merchandising machine that produces income, and a tax on advertising will bring that very result. Income must be taxed, but to tax the process which creates income is an economic fallacy.

Advertising does not encourage indiscriminate expenditure for civilian goods during the period of national defense. On the contrary, it is used to regulate and stimulate the proper flow of consumer goods based on the products available for nondefense purposes. Advertising will divert public demand to merchandise that can be supplied without harming our defense production and thus keep employment and distribution in nondefense industries at its highest possible level.

As late as May 20, 1941, President Roosevelt, in a letter to our organization, said:

"Advertising has been responsible for many of the good things which citizens of the United States enjoy. It has been a potent force in making available to our citizens the products of American skill and ingenuity. Without it, many present-day necessities would still be luxuries.

"That force needs now to be applied toward the maintenance of our accustomed standards of living and further progress. This may require adjustment but it should mean increased effort."

The advertising business in America is wholeheartedly behind our Government's monumental efforts for national defense. In common with other businesses, it is paying today, and will continue to pay, huge sums in taxes into our National Treasury.

We have offered our services to the Government and will continue to give them willingly, as it is our duty to do.

We strongly urge, however, that a tax on advertising, regardless of its nature, will be a grave economic mistake and harmful to the laudable and patriotic cause to which you, your colleagues, and all other good Americans are firmly dedicated.

Respectfully submitted

ADVERTISING FEDERATION OF AMERICA,
By CHARLES E. MURPHY, *General Counsel.*

Waterways Improved by Germany for Military Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at my request the Chief of Engineers has furnished me with information on waterway improvements by Germany for military preparedness.

While most of the European countries have extensive networks of inland waterways, which have played important parts in all their wars, Germany's waterways system surpasses those of all other European countries in design and improvements for military purposes.

Widespread public recognition, not only of the inherent economy of low cost water-borne transportation for peacetime use, but also of the strategic value of inland waterways in the interest of national defense and as supply routes for the invasion of adjoining countries has long been a basic factor underlying the successful development and growth of German rivers and canal systems. This is demonstrated by the way in which the great natural waterways of Germany have been connected by canals so that water transportation may move to and from the country's frontiers.

The Kiel Canal, probably the greatest military waterway project in the world, connects the North Sea through Germany to the Baltic Sea, thus providing an all-German route between these two seas and permitting Germany's naval vessels to avoid traveling around through the Kattegat and Skagerrak, where they would be exposed to attack from foreign navies. This canal is 335 feet wide and 37 feet deep and can accommodate all but a few of the largest ships afloat. While we read about its being bombed many times, as yet we have not heard of its being blocked. While the Russian Navy is bottled up in the Baltic, German vessels can pass freely from the Baltic to the North Sea and into the Atlantic Ocean.

The Rhine rises in Switzerland, flows along the border of France, then into Germany, and finally turns through The Netherlands into the North Sea. The portion of the Rhine in Germany and The Netherlands is a waterway of considerable capacity. The Ems, Weser, and Elbe flow northwest through Germany into the North Sea. The Oder flows northwest through Germany into the Baltic Sea. These rivers are all improved from their natural state. The opening of the ship elevator at Rothensee, near Nagdeburg, on October 30, 1938, completed the final link in the Midland Canal—Mittellandkanal—which unites the Rhine with the four natural watercourses of the north German plain—the Ems, the Weser, the Elbe, and the Oder Rivers—thus uniting in one system all the rivers of Germany and providing for east and west commerce through central Germany. As a result, the great industrial center of metropolitan Berlin has become one of the most important inland ports in the country.

Among the improvements upon which work has been pushed for military reasons was the Adolf Hitler Canal, from which the first shovelful of earth was dug by Hitler's erstwhile friend, Rudolph Hess. The opening of this canal in December 1939 connected the industrialized Silesian area around Gleiwitz, in extreme eastern Germany, with the Oder River and the central German canal system. The Hohenzollern Canal, which connects Berlin with the Oder River and the great naval shipbuilding city of Stettin, on an estuary of the Baltic, has great military value; and the Dortmund-Ems Canal, which is a link between the Rhine and the northern-central waterway system, has much strategic importance.

Germany's national policy of locating industry at safe distances from her frontiers must necessarily be supplemented by transportation lines capable of carrying heavy tonnages, and inland waterways constitute an ideal strategic lay-out in such a program. Germany's amazingly rapid conquest of the major part of Europe was aided in no small way by her efficient and well-planned transportation system, of which the network of inland waterways is a vital part. Without this efficient system, feeding and supplying the powerfully mechanized armies of Germany undoubtedly would have been much less effective.

The story of German waterways is not complete without including the Danube in southeastern Europe. The Danube rises in Germany, flows through Austria and forms the boundary between Czechoslovakia and Hungary, until it turns southward through central Hungary into Yugoslavia, where it bends eastward again to become the boundary between Rumania on the north and

Yugoslavia and Bulgaria on the south, and finally flows through Rumania to the Black Sea at Sulina. This water-transportation route in southeastern Europe has been in use for a very long time but national jealousies and competitions have prevented its maximum improvement. Germany's pre-war program planned the completion of a Rhine-Main-Danube Canal to provide a continuous water route for vessels, up to 1,500 tons, all the way across Europe from the North Sea to the Black Sea, and when the Nazi Government began to foresee the present war it ordered the rapid completion of this canal as a war measure irrespective of the economics of the project for peacetime use. The Slavs controlled the Danube on the south of the difficult Iron Gate section as well as where the river passes through Yugoslavia so that they could cut off the German waterway connection with the oil and grain of Rumania. This situation undoubtedly tended to provoke the German attack on Yugoslavia, and the first thing the Germans did was to seize the stretch of the Danube passing through Yugoslavia. Now that they have complete control of the Danube, the incentive to complete the Rhine-Danube Canal is greater than ever.

If the intensive improvement and utilization of inland waterways by the Germans is a fair criterion of their value, it is evident that our own inland waterways system can play an important role in the gigantic preparedness program ahead of us. As a result of the careful planning of the past and of the foresight that has been exercised by Congress with respect to authorizations and appropriations, we face the present emergency with our waterways in the United States in pretty fair shape. This status of preparedness is in no small measure due to the fact that our river and harbor improvements are planned, constructed, and administered by our War Department. Although we have done well, we should do better by heeding the transportation developments of waterways for military purposes in foreign countries, and seeing that our waterways are still further improved and developed in the interest of our national defense.

The Telephone Users of the State of Washington Protest Injustices Imposed by the Telephone Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF KING COUNTY, WASH.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I herewith read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, by unanimous consent of the House of Representatives, a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of King County of the State of Washington.

King County is the largest county in point of population in the State. Seattle is the county seat and largest city of the Pacific Northwest.

In this resolution, a rank injustice to which telephone users have been subjected is graphically described. The petitioners memorialize Congress for relief through the good offices of the United States Bureau of Standards, and urge the establishment of an adequate service code. I concur in the recommendations of the statement. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas, as in many other States of the Union, the subsidiary of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., operating in the State of Washington has afforded small demand users of local telephone service optional lower rates through the medium of a central office message-register system, as a preliminary to the inauguration of compulsory central office message-register rates; and

Whereas, in June 1938, the Washington State unit of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. (the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.) filed compulsory message measured rates combined with multiplying zone areas including time units of varying duration replacing optional flat rates for business service; and

Whereas, associated with the application of compulsory message measured rates, the telephone company proposed the withdrawal of the low flat rate four-party residential service, in certain rate areas of this State, now enjoyed by moderate-income homes, the elimination of which will seriously and adversely affect the social, civic, and economic life of the community; and

Whereas King County, Wash., as one of the large users of the telephone service affected by the new rates, contested the reasonableness of these new rate schedules before the State Department of Public Service, and at public hearings before that body presented conclusive evidence, in brief, as follows:

(a) No standard or recognized code relating to the measurement of local telephone service has been established by low or common usage.

(b) A supervised customer's tally of message use compared with the telephone company's central office message registers, involving 1 month's survey, of 477 subscribers' lines, indicated only 12 (2.5 percent) agreed with the company's central office message counters, 66 (13.84 percent) meters, registered less than subscribers' tally by an average of 23 percent, and 399 (83.66 percent) meters registered more than subscribers' tally by an average of 28 percent. An under charge of 1,442 messages for 66 subscribers and an overcharge of 9,636 for 399 subscribers; and

Whereas an engineering investigation of the causes for such gross variation was made by competent engineers and a demonstration at a hearing before the State department of public service, in the laboratory of the University of Washington, at Seattle, Wash., disclosed the fact that six (6) inherent defects exist in the central-office message-register system, certified as the standard system authorized by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; and

Whereas a state of confusion and public distrust now exists in the telephone service rendered to the public in the State of Washington and such distrust will extend into other telephone-rate areas of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., throughout the United States, and particularly in the areas now served through compulsory message-register rates, estimated at over 6,000,000 subscribers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Board of County Commissioners of King County, State of Washington, in regular meeting assembled this 26th day of May 1941, That it does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States for such aid and relief as may be available through the good offices and facilities of the United States Bureau of Standards in the establishment of an adequate telephone-service code and such other aid in the publication and enforcement of such code as may be in the public interest.

Passed this 26th day of May 1941.

TOM SMITH,
RUSSELL H. FLUENT,
A. E. PHELPS,
Board of County Commissioners, King County, Wash.

Midwestern Agricultural Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. R. A. Trovatten, Commissioner, Department of Agriculture, Dairy and Food of the State of Minnesota, has furnished me with two resolutions dealing with subjects of great importance to agriculture.

The Association of North Central Commissioners of Agriculture, representing many of the greatest agricultural States of our Nation, has condemned in no uncertain terms the proposal to modify the embargo against the importation of dressed meats from Argentina and Uruguay.

The following resolution adopted by this Association of Commissioners of Agriculture should have the close attention of every Member of this House who has the interest of the farmer at heart:

Resolution 1

Foot-and-mouth disease

Whereas, as a result of repeated outbreaks of "foot-and-mouth disease" in these United States prior to 1927, there was enacted in that year a congressional embargo against the importation into this country of dressed meats and meat products from any country where said disease exists; and

Whereas prior to the imposition of this embargo the spread of that disease in this country demoralized the domestic livestock industry, seriously jeopardized the public health and resulted in the expenditure of millions of dollars by Federal and State governments and by the livestock industry for the eradification of that evil; and

Whereas the wisdom of that congressional embargo, embodied in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, has been indubitably justified as attested by the fact that since January 1, 1927, there has been only one minor outbreak of that disease—in the State of California in 1929—which outbreak has since been traced directly to a violation of Federal regulations relating to the unloading of certain materials; and

Whereas there is increasing evidence from authoritative sources that a serious attempt is now under way to influence the President of the United States and Congress to circumvent or remove the embargo upon the importation of dressed meats and meat

products for the benefit of certain foreign nations in which the said livestock disease is prevalent; and

Whereas any modification of that embargo would be inimical to the best interests of this Nation and would cause a recurrence of the evils existing prior to 1927 as enumerated above; and

Whereas the agricultural and livestock industry of this Nation is playing and must continue to play, a vital and indispensable part in the program of national defense and nothing would more seriously affect that burden and the program of national defense than a relaxation of the existing barriers to the importation of infected livestock: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we hereby respectfully and earnestly importune the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States for reasons herein stated, to resist any attempts, and to refrain from any action designed to repeal, circumvent, or modify the Embargo Act of 1927 relating to the importation of dressed meats and meat products from foreign lands in which there is prevalent foot-and-mouth disease, the most dreaded disease known to the livestock industry; be it further"

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress be instructed to use their influence to bring about the defeat of the bill designated as S. 1613 or H. R. 5032, which under section 3 would nullify the sanitary pact.

After thorough discussion, upon motion said resolution was unanimously adopted.

Motion made and seconded that we are unalterably opposed to S. 1613, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for Mr. REYNOLDS); also H. R. 5032, by Mr. DOUGHTON, to permit the importation of defense articles and commodities duty free or any other bill purporting to accomplish said objectives as being detrimental to our domestic industries engaged in producing said defense articles and capable of producing adequate quantities of such commodities.

Also, Mr. Speaker, this same Association of Commissioners of Agriculture adopted another resolution, herewith quoted, which gives the midwestern viewpoint on the latest price-fixing proposals. I insist, Mr. Speaker, that if maximum prices are to be set on farm products, we are also entitled to a minimum floor for that price structure.

Resolution 2

The North Central Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture, in session at Deadwood this 19th day of July 1941, unequivocally endorse the statement made by the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture to the Agricultural Committees of the House and Senate of the United States Congress on May 6, 1941, as follows:

"Believing that agriculture is entitled to equal protection as the foundation upon which our national defense must be supported and that it should be assured complete equality with industry and with labor; and

"Believing that the domestic price on these products should be protected by a tariff or excise tax on competing imports to the extent that the landed cost equals parity plus 10 percent; and

"Believing that the surpluses of these products of which we produce more than our domestic requirement be sold in the world markets at world prices, and thus put the American farmer in a position to vigorously compete in the world markets to regain their rightful position to share in the commerce of the world: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we urgently request the Congress to provide the means by which the farmers of the Nation be paid full parity prices on their products consumed in the domestic market.

"*Resolved further*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Senate and House."

Farmers, who make up approximately 24 percent of the population of the Nation, in 1940 received only 6.9 percent of our national income. Whereas during the last World War they received approximately 18 percent of the national income. Since it is proposed through Leon Henderson, Chief of the Office of Production Management and Price Stabilization, to establish a price ceiling over certain farm products, we insist that we are unalterably opposed to such price ceiling being established while prices of the products farmers are compelled to buy and including interest and taxes which they are required to pay are far above parity—the farmer's dollar according to the Bureau of Statistics of the United States Department of Agriculture on June 15 of this year shows the farmer's dollar in terms of things farmers are required to buy, including interest and taxes, stood at only 91 cents.

The American farmer is not being permitted to supply our domestic market to the extent of his ability to do so at prices that would insure to him his fair share of our national income. Imports of agricultural products and substitutes therefor during 1940 were $1,638,000,000. Exports of agricultural products were only $772,329,000; or net imports over exports for the year of $865,000,000. To fix a ceiling on farm-commodity prices on the present basis of price relationship and domestic consumption of domestically produced farm commodities would be not only unfair to the American farmer but manifestly unsound from a national-defense standpoint.

Opinion United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, Decided July 18, 1941

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that on December 23, 1938, there appeared in the Washington Merry Go Round column, written by Drew Pearson and Robert Allen, a false statement charging me in my representative capacity as a Member of Congress in opposing a gentleman for a Federal judgeship in Ohio for the sole reason that he was a Jew and not born in the United States. Shortly after the publication of this article which appeared in several hundred newspapers served by these writers, I wrote Drew Pearson, author of the article, and demanded an apology. I never received an answer to my letter, much less an apology. On May 25, 1939, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the libelous article complained of and my letter to Drew Pearson. Shortly thereafter at my direction my chief counsel, Hon. John J. O'Connor of New York, formerly a Member of Congress, instituted law suits against the authors of the article complained of, the United Features Syndicate, which handles the Merry Go Round column and sells the same to certain newspapers and practically every newspaper large and small that published the article. To date we have secured three settlements and received approximately 100 retractions and apologies from certain newspapers which carried the article in question. In some jurisdictions we have lost cases on the pleadings, the court holding the action not libelous per se. In other jurisdictions courts have arbitrarily dismissed our cases because of the power of the press.

In our case against the Clarksburg Publishing Co., tried to a jury in January 1941 in the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of West Virginia, presided over by the Honorable Harry E. Watkins, a New Deal appointment, we failed of recovery because the judge permitted evidence that was thoroughly incompetent and irrelevant, designed to prejudice the minds of the jury. To illustrate, he permitted the introduction as evidence of a telegram I sent to the King of England while he was a guest at the White House in June 1939 making inquiry of His Majesty's Government on the question of the payment of the war debt of $5,500,000,000 due the United States at that time. The judge permitted evidence to go to the jury that in one of my political campaigns some years back I was a guest speaker at a German-American picnic in Cleveland, Ohio. Despite the fact that the movement led by Rev. Charles E. Coughlin collapsed after the campaign of 1936 and the article complained of was not published until December 23, 1938, Father Coughlin was made the issue throughout the trial.

Not a scintilla of evidence was presented showing that I opposed the individual seeking the judgeship on the grounds that he was a Jew or on any other grounds. The record in this case should be a textbook on evidence in every law school in the country to demonstrate the power of the press and the cowardice of the judiciary in seeking to protect the press and the authors of the article who boast of their close connection to the White House.

Because of the expense involved and the added fact that damage if recovered would not be substantial, and because of the limited circulation of the defendant newspaper, we have abandoned our appeal in this case. In other jurisdictions where the verdict has been adverse our right of appeal has been perfected.

During the course of this litigation we have witnessed a former assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, one whom I once befriended and secured for him his important position in the Department of Justice, absolutely commit perjury in open court.

We nave witnessed an irresponsible, itinerant newspaperman who, for the consideration of a few dollars of "borrowed money" from Drew Pearson, swear falsely to a deposition. The case of the latter is still pending before Edward N. Curran, United States attorney for the District of Columbia. Despite the fact that we have presented evidence sufficient to justify an indictment for perjury against this individual, no action has

been taken for months. Can it be that Messrs. Pearson and Allen have such political strength with the present administration that they are able to thwart the ends of justice? Time alone will tell and we will be watching carefully the action of the district attorney's office.

Because of the interest these cases have aroused among the members of the legal profession, and especially among the Members of Congress, many of whom have been the victims of similar attacks by these brilliant prevaricators, I am including in these remarks the opinion of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, where the majority opinion holds in our favor that a cause of action has been pleaded, and that the action is libelous per se without proof of special damages.

I trust the lawyers and Members of Congress will also scrutinize the dissenting opinion rendered by another New Deal judge and determine whether or not the cause of tolerance in the United States is promoted by such dictum.

Whenever we lose a case, Pearson and Allen prepare the copy which generally appears on the front page of the newspapers carrying their "goulash," and it is significant that Walter Lipshitz, alias Winchell, also shouts about our losses over the radio on his lotions of mud program. When we win a case or two it is significant that "Pal Joey" is very silent. Hence I am taking this opportunity to publish in the RECORD our success in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals decided July 18, 1941:

[United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. No. 350—October term, 1940. Argued June 2, 1941. Decided July 18, 1941. *Martin L. Sweeney, plaintiff-appellant* v. *Schenectady Union Publishing Co., defendant-appellee*]

Appeal from an order of the District Court for the Northern District of New York granting defendant's motion to dismiss the complaint in an action for libel on the ground that no cause of action was pleaded.

Before: L. Hand, Chase, and Clark, circuit judges.

Charles G. Fryer, attorney for defendant-appellee.

DeGraff & Foy, attorneys for plaintiff-appellant; John O'Connor, William F. Conway, of counsel.

Chase, circuit judge:

Jurisdiction in this suit for the libelous publication by the defendant of the statements concerning the plaintiff which will presently be set forth rests upon diversity, the plaintiff being a resident of Ohio and the defendant a New York corporation. The appeal is from an order dismissing the complaint on motion after the filing of an answer consisting of a general denial, special matter in mitigation of damages, and the truth of the matter printed, coupled with the right to comment fairly thereon. No special damages were alleged, and the question before us is whether the publication which on this appeal must be taken for granted as having actually been made and having been false, was libelous per se; *O'Connell* v. *Press Publishing Co.* (214 N. Y. 352; 108 N. E. 556).

The complaint alleged that the plaintiff, a Representative in Congress from Ohio and a lawyer by profession, who was a member of the bar in good standing in the State of Ohio, had been "injured in his good name, fame, and reputation, in the conduct and execution of his official duties as a duly elected and chosen representative of the people of the State of Ohio in the Congress of the United States, in pursuance of his profession as a practicing attorney in good standing before the bar in the State of Ohio, in his standing in the community wherein he resides, and in the high regard, respect, confidence, and esteem he has hitherto enjoyed among his associates both in the Congressnity and elsewhere" by the publication by the defendant in a newspaper called the Schenectady Union Star, which is widely circulated and read "in the State of New York and of the United States and in the legal fraterthe States of the United States and among the people thereof" of the following:

"A hot behind-the-scenes fight is raging in Democratic congressional ranks over the effort of Father Coughlin to prevent the appointment of a Jewish judge in Cleveland.

"The proposed appointee is Emerich Burt Freed, United States district attorney in Cleveland and former law partner of Senator Bulkley, who is on the verge of being elevated to the United States district court.

"This has aroused the violent opposition of Representative MARTIN L. SWEENEY, Democrat, of Cleveland, known as the chief congressional spokesman of Father Coughlin.

"Basis of the Sweeny-Coughlin opposition is the fact that Freed is a Jew, and one not born in the United States. Born in Hungary in 1897, Freed was brought to the United States at the age of 13; was naturalized 10 years later.

"Irate, Representative SWEENEY is endeavoring to call a caucus of Ohio Representatives December 28 to protest against his appointment."

The matter so published was received by the defendant for publication from an organization known as United Feature Syndicate, Inc. It was published in much the same form in many other newspapers in this country and the resulting libel suits brought in various courts by this plaintiff have been numerous. In some instances motions to dismiss the complaint on the ground that the publication was not libelous per se have been granted; in some such motions have been denied. Decisions in other jurisdictions, however, are not only conflicting but are for us inconclusive since they have turned on the application of the libel law of States other than New York while here we must be governed by the law of the State of New York; *Erie Railroad Co.* v. *Tompkins* (304 U. S. 64). We are not concerned, however, with any libel upon the plaintiff as a lawyer, since no reference was made in the publication to that profession of his; *Keene* v. *Tribune Association* (76 Hun. 488).

The false statements published concerning him neither separately nor together make him out to be a character more offensive to right-thinking people than he would be as the spokesman in Congress of Father Coughlin; who opposed the appointment of a man named Freed to the office of United States district judge because Freed was a Jew and one not born in the United States; and who was angry about the matter to the point of attempting to have Ohio Congressmen protest in caucus against Freed's appointment.

But, all else aside, they do clearly attribute to him the desire and purpose to try to prevent the appointment of Freed to the office mentioned for the reason that Freed is a Jew who was foreign-born. The context does not fairly permit reading the language as making the foreign birth of Freed the all-sufficient cause of the plaintiff's opposition to his appointment but rather the contrary by stressing the fact that he was a Jew whose foreign birth apparently but gave an additional basis for plaintiff's opposition. And so the decisive question to be determined on this appeal is whether or not the publication of such false and unprivileged statements concerning the plaintiff within the last few years in the places as alleged in the complaint may be said as a matter of law not to have created any liability in the absence of special damages.

The New York law, as stated in *Kimmerle* v. *New York Evening Journal, Inc.* (262 N. Y. 99; 186 N. E. 217), makes libelous per se the publication of "words which tend to expose one to public hatred, shame, obloquy, contumely, odium, contempt, ridicule, aversion, ostracism, degradation, or disgrace, or to induce an evil opinion of one in the minds of right-thinking persons, and to deprive one of their confidence and friendly intercourse in society." To the same effect is *Sydney* v. *MacFadden Newspaper Publishing Corporation* (242 N. Y. 208; 151 N. E. 209). This is in general accord with the definition found in the Restatement of the Law of Torts. See section 559. The test is whether right-thinking persons would be reasonably expected to be induced by the publication to believe that it truthfully represented the plaintiff's attitude on the subject of Freed's appointment and would be likely to regard him as a consequence in such a way that his reputation was injured in one or more of the respects above noted. It is of course, not easy to apply this general test to a case of this nature. Opinions or prejudices concerning the matter in hand might well lead to different conclusions.

Some principles established in New York libel law are especially helpful in arriving at a just decision. One of them is that a false statement need not necessarily charge the violation of any law to be libelous per se; and another is that, when made of a public official, false accusations which may well lead right-thinking people to believe him unworthy of public trust and confidence are libelous per se (*Bennet* v. *Commercial Advertiser Association* (230 N. Y. 125)). And still another is that an unprivileged, published falsehood need not make all, or even a majority, of those who read it think the less of the person defamed. It is enough if a noticeable part of many who read it are made to hate, despise, scorn, or be contemptuous of the person concerning whom the false statements have been published; *Peck* v. *Tribune Co.* (214 U. S. 195; Restatement, Torts, sec. 559 (e)).

And certainly the time and place of publication must be given due weight and effect. This plaintiff, by being accused of trying to deprive a man of an appointment to public office because, presumably both in race and religion, he was Jewish, would, intolerance being what it is, no doubt gain approval and increased respect in some quarters; and in others, where only the hit bird flutters, there would be indifference; but in a country still dedicated to religious and racial freedom, decent, liberty-loving people still are present in great numbers and still are greatly offended by the narrow-minded injustice of the bigots who see individuals only en masse and condemn them merely because their ancestors were of a certain race or they themselves are of a certain religion. Those who hate intolerance are prone to regard the person who believes in and practices acts of intolerance with aversion and contempt. And in these times when it is universal knowledge that one foreign dictator gained his power by practices which included large-scale, unreasonable Jewish prosecutions which have played an important part in making his name an anathema in many parts of this country the publication of statements such as those alleged may well gain for the person falsely accused the scorn and contempt of the right-thinking in appreciable numbers. Freedom of speech is, as it always has been, freedom to tell the truth and comment fairly upon facts and not a license to spread damaging falsehoods in the guise of news gathering and its dissemination.

Moreover, in places where Jews make up a sizable portion of the population, as they are known to do in part of the territory in which it is alleged that the defendant's newspaper circulated when the publication was made, it may be taken for granted that there will be an appreciable number who will hate or hold in contempt one who discriminates

against a Jew merely because he is a Jew, whether born in this country or not. A majority of the court is of the opinion that the complaint is sufficient under the principles above stated and that the defendant should be required to meet it on the merits.

Order reversed and cause remanded for trial.

Clark, circuit judge (dissenting):

The decision herein seems to me not in accordance with New York law, where the right of comment on a public official has been safeguarded in a practical way by "a somewhat different rule" than in ordinary cases and "a clear charge of corruption or gross incompetence holding one up to disgrace and contumely" is required; even an imputation of corrupt or dishonorable motives will be justified as fair comment if it is a reasonable inference from the facts (*Tanzer* v. *Crowley Pub. Corp.*, 240 App. Div. 203, 268 N. Y. S. 620, 622; *Gardner* v. *Home Life Publications, Inc.*, 237 App. Div. 200, 260 N. Y. S. 872, 874; *Hills* v. *Press Co.*, 122 Misc. 212, 202 N. Y. S. 678, 681, affirmed 214 App. Div. 752, 209 N. Y. S. 848). And so the cited cases hold not libelous per se comments on public officers more directly suggesting corrupt motives than does the one here—which charges rather bigotry and prejudice than corruption or impropriety in office. In the Tanzer case the comment attributed dishonorable motives to a mayor in his appointment of a city attorney; in the Hills case the comment charged special favoritism by a city fuel administrator to particular coal dealers and in the prosecution of cases. I think it clear that the charge must go to the extent of definite impropriety in office, as in *Bennet* v. *Commercial Advertiser Ass'n* (230 N. Y. 125, 129 N. E. 343), but clearly not in the present case, before recovery can be had without proof of special damages.

Moreover, this view seems to be general, as shown by the fact that the majority of the many actions brought by this plaintiff against various newspapers based on this same article have been dismissed. Many cases were disposed of without reasoned opinions; of those where the matter is discussed, reference may be made to the persuasive reasoning of the Tennessee Supreme Court, speaking through Chief Justice Green in *Sweeney* v. *Newspaper Printing Corp.* (147 S. W. (2d) 406); of Cavanah, district judge, in *Sweeney* v. *Capital News Pub. Co.* (D. C. Idaho, 37 F. Supp. 355); of the Ohio Court of Appeals, affirming the dismissal below, in *Sweeney* v. *The Beacon Journal Publishing Co.* (9th Dist., No. 3352, decided February 27, 1941; appeal dismissed Ohio Sup., 34 N. E. (2d) 764, May 7, 1941); and of the district court in this case. Of such opinions to the contrary we find only two, both by the same district judge in the northern district of Illinois, apparently unreported, and based upon an interpretation of Illinois law as limiting comment on public officers.

Not only does this seem to me, therefore, new law, at least for New York State, but also definitely disturbing law. It would be a fine world to live in if only tolerance were so usual that a charge of the lack thereof against a public official could be so presumptively untrue that it would seem on its face unfair and libelous. But in our present world we must not take the naive view that what ought to be is, and that whoever suggest the contrary is a slanderer; for if we do so, we shut off all healthy criticism of prejudice and allow bigotry full scope to act with impunity. Even more dangerous is the rationale of the decision that a comment leading an appreciable number of readers to hate or hold in contempt the public official commented on is libelous per se. Its broad sweep would take in comments found day after day in the most conservative newspapers, either in direct statement or as quotations of responsible critics, that a public official, particularly a legislator, is pro- or anti-labor, or pro- or anti-Nazi, or pro or anti this or that race, color, or creed. Minority comment on labor, religious, and political views and activities of politicians becomes, therefore, hazardous. And the making of fine distinctions in rationale is indicated by the implication that a comment suggesting plaintiff's objection to the judicial candidate for his foreign birth alone would have been proper. Of course, the uncertain threat of suit, invited by a rule at once so vague and so extensive, is a restriction on freedom of the press almost as direct as a rule of clear liability.

I do not think it an adequate answer to such a threat against public comment, which seems to me necessary if democratic processes are to function, to say that it applies only to false statements. For this is comment and inference, as the Tanzer case suggests, and hence not a matter of explicit proof or disproof. The public official will always regard himself as not bigoted, and will so testify, sincerely enough. And then the burden of proving the truth of the defense will rest upon the commentator who must sustain the burden of showing his inference true. If he fails in even a minority of the suits against him—as the sporting element in trials to juries susceptible to varying shades of local opinion would make probable—he is taught his lesson, and a serious brake upon free discussion established. But the common-law requirement of proof of special damages gives him the protection he needs, while at the same time it does prevent him from causing really serious injury and loss by false and unfair statements. That should be the rule applied here, as the district court held.

Bonneville Power and Mineral Development in the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

STATEMENT BY PAUL J. RAVER, BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Paul J. Raver, Bonneville power administrator, before subcommittee of Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

In appearing before this committee I will attempt to develop the important part hydroelectric resources of the Western States are playing and will continue to play in the effective development and utilization of the resources of the West. In order to do so I would like to indicate briefly my experience with the problems of mineral development in the Pacific Northwest, and to sketch some of the apparent obstacles to this development.

In the opening statements of Chairman O'MAHONEY and Secretary Ickes are expressed two major ideas which are in accord with my experience as Administrator of the Bonneville-Grand Coulee Power Administration during the last 2 years. One of these has been the control by a few large industries of mineral deposits,[1] of knowledge concerning them, and of processes for their use.[2] The other has been the obvious tendency to treat the West as a colonial dependency of the United States, not only by industry, but unfortunately to some extent by Government itself.[3] The people of the West and certain Federal agencies are making some efforts to overcome these two major handicaps, but we must recognize that only a beginning has been made in this direction and that much more thorough and far-reaching efforts are ultimately necessary.

In my following remarks I want to discuss three sets of problems affecting the mineral development of the public lands of the West:

1. Those problems concerned with our knowledge of the extent, quality, and availability of the mineral deposits;

2. Those problems concerned with the utilization of deposits through the development of technical processes and industries located near the deposits; and

3. Those problems concerned with increasing the power supply which is so important to the industrial utilization of many of the deposits.

INVENTORY FACTORS

In considering our knowledge of mineral deposits we should realize that it is necessary periodically to retake mineral inventories because the value of a mineral changes from time to time. It changes as technology changes, in accordance with the needs of using less accessible and lower-grade deposits. One classic example is our ability to utilize 1-percent copper ore today, due to developments in the flotation process, whereas 40 years ago such low-grade ore was not even considered for the production of copper. Similarly, magnesite, which has been used principally for refractory brick, today, under the pressure of our growing need for magnesium, will become one source of that metal through processes developed in recent years. Another striking illustration concerns aluminum. Our supply of bauxite in the United States admittedly cannot last more than a few years if we use it as the sole source of our annual production of alumina. However, one of our most common minerals, high alumina clays, may become in the near future a new source of aluminum due to processes now in the developmental stage.

This need for continuous reappraisal of our mineral resources calls for more widespread mineral investigations in the West. These should include some of the more common minerals, like iron ore, hitherto neglected because of the abundance of deposits in other sections of the country. Until we know more about the extent and quality of such common minerals as iron ore we will not be able to answer with finality the question as to the economic feasibility of an enlarged iron and steel industry in the West. This is certainly the case with respect to those phases of the iron and steel industry in which electric power is most applicable.

Considering the exhaustive studies made by qualified agencies, including the United States Geological Survey, I am puzzled by the constant opposition that has been voiced in many quarters toward the establishment of an integrated iron and steel industry in the Pacific Northwest. Twenty miles from Portland lies a body of iron ore that has been investigated at different times over a period of 40 years by private companies. Claims are made that there are adequate amounts of ore to support an iron and steel industry of moderate size; counter claims are also made that the amount of ore is negligible. I am curious why no authentic information is accessible either through private or public channels on the true situation. Isn't it about time that

---

[1] Bauxite, magnesite, molybdenum.

[2] Beryllium, bauxite, ferro-alloys (skill control).

[3] I. C. C. freight-rate structure.

this situation be clarified by a responsible agency and that the findings be made available? I am satisfied that similar situations exist with respect to many other common minerals in the West.

Regarding our knowledge of minerals that have hitherto not been commonly used in industry, we are in a similar plight. These minerals include those for the treatment of which new processes are being developed or have almost reached the stage of commercial feasibility. Here I can indicate our experience in the Northwest with alunite and magnesite. In the past few months questions have been repeatedly raised as to how much alunite we have to sustain the new process that has been developed for the production of alumina. Utah, Washington, and the Nation eagerly await the answer to that question. Although the Bureau of Mines recently issued an excellent report of investigations on known alunite deposits in the United States, the question still remains as to what deposits exist which could not possibly have been known to the author of this report. Compared with other minerals, our interest in alunite deposits is relatively recent, having been first concerned with the uses of alunite for potash. Only very recently has our interest extended to its use in the production of aluminum. Consequently it is highly probable that we have only begun to make the necessary investigations of our national deposits of alunite.

A similar situation applies for magnesite as a source of magnesium. Obviously we need much more knowledge about this entire group of mineral deposits in the Western States which have hitherto been used on a restricted scale in industry.

Another factor of great importance restricting the approach to our mineral explorations has been the limited industrial concept of acceptable grades of various types of ore, such as chromium, manganese, tungsten, and antimony. For reasons often cloaked by technological justification the industry at large has effectively prevented the use of competitive domestic sources of various minerals by specifying grades commonly available only through import. For example, chrome ore as commonly used must have 45 to 48 percent chromic oxide content, and this grade has been imported until recently solely from foreign sources. I am puzzled by this situation when I am informed by competent technicians that lower grades of ores found in appreciable quantities in the West can be utilized economically if minor changes in industrial practices are made.

Besides the inadequacy of information on the mineral deposits, the data that are available are uncoordinated, spotty, and incomplete. Information on some of the best western deposits is closely held in the files of the large corporations that control them. There is no public agency in the country, I believe, with the power to investigate all mineral claims and deposits regardless of their ownership and to publicize the findings. Consequently, in the case of such common minerals as copper it is an amazing fact that agreement does not exist among experts as to the extent of the available copper reserves of the United States.

Furthermore, whatever information exists about mineral deposits is rarely available on the basis of what might be called the region of a drainage basin. This is important because the drainage basin is the unit for hydroelectric developments in such areas as the Colorado River Basin and the Columbia River Basin. The effective utilization of the power resources of each drainage basin requires a complete knowledge of its mineral deposits.

This brief analysis of inventory problems leads me to certain conclusions:

1. The United States Bureau of Mines and the United States Geological Survey should annually receive greater appropriations for mineral explorations in the Western States. These appropriations should be flexibly spent in at least two channels—

(a) In reappraisal of previous exploratory work on the basis of present-day concepts of mineral values and industrial processes; and

(b) In expanded field studies of mineral deposits, including systematic examination and cataloging of the nonmetallic as well as the metallic mineral deposits of the Western States.

2. In order to implement those suggestions it may be that the present authority of the United States Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines should be so modified as to permit access by these agencies to any mineral deposits regardless of ownership.

3. In order to make the results of these investigations of the greatest possible benefit they should be widely publicized and distributed. As a necessary corollary, publication of the findings, at least in preliminary form, should be released as soon as possible in order to expedite the development of many deposits.

INDUSTRIAL UTILIZATION FACTORS

Even with an adequate inventory of our western mineral deposits, there would remain the problem of their proper industrial utilization. We could, of course, continue to rely upon eastern industries to use western minerals at the time and place determined by them. This, however, would leave many western mineral developments to arbitrary decisions governed by special interests. On the other hand, the most effective and large-scale development of western minerals would unquestionably be secured through the development of industries in the Western States using those deposits. Such a development would reduce the uneconomic effects of monopolistic restraints exercised by certain large corporations. This would be especially secured through the exploitation by new western enterprises of deposits of lower grade than those heretofore in use. Such industrial development would go far toward emancipating the West from its colonial status.

A major difficulty handicapping industrial development based upon western minerals is the lack of studies of feasibility of individual industries. It is not sufficiently appreciated how much this lack of feasibility studies retards industrial development. Today corporations spend hundreds of thousands of dollars in research on markets and processes in order to determine the feasibility of new investments and plant expansion. The small investor simply does not have the money to spend in the necessary research to acquire such information. He must have pointed out to him the industrial opportunities that lie in the West, because he will never get that information from the large corporations who have it tucked away in their files and who are especially interested in seeing that no new competition develops. This obstacle can be overcome if the Congress will see that proper agencies study the mineral resources of the West, the processes to utilize them, and the related industrial opportunities, and that these agencies will prepare and widely distribute reports on their findings.

The few feasibility studies that have thus far been made by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Bonneville Power Administration and various other agencies clearly indicate certain obstacles to western industrial development. One of these consists of arbitrary elements in the freight-rate structure on processed and manufactured goods moving between western and eastern points. This subject has been well studied by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and I need merely refer to the reports that the Authority has already issued. Additional study is necessary with special reference to the West.

A related obstacle is the basing-point system under which the prices of many products produced in the West are based upon shipping centers in the East plus freight. This is especially the case of iron and steel products made on the Pacific coast, as has been pointed out in one hearing of the Temporary National Economic Committee.

Another obstacle is the large amount of investment needed in a number of these mineral-using industries. Studies of the Bonneville Power Administration have shown that from $2,000,000 to $9,000,000 are needed for each plant investment in electro-processing industries using western minerals such as electrolytic chromium, electrolytic manganese, electrolytic zinc, and magnesium. While those sums are not very large for many industries, they effectively prevent the average investor from entering these fields. However, there is no doubt that groups of men could be found who would undertake these investments provided other obstacles did not exist.

Among these other obstacles there is, first, the concentration of the output of some of these industries and their markets in the hands of a few corporations. I need not point out to this committee the implications of such concentration to the freedom of enterprise and new industrial development. The chairman is well aware of the classic example of the restraining effects exercised by the aluminum monopoly. He is also well aware of the practices and agreements of the beryllium producers.

Associated with this obstacle of concentration of production and markets is the concentration of technical knowledge of many of these industries in the staffs of a few enterprises. The stimulation of new investment requires the diffusion of this technical knowledge among additional investors and business managements.

I do not mean to imply that these obstacles are completely blocking today all new channels of enterprise in the West. Fortunately, a few new developments are impending. Alumina very likely will shortly be produced from western alunites by means of a process that has been wholly developed by an independent western group, although I must add that this is being accomplished in spite of the stubborn operation of some of the obstacles I have just discussed. Another impending development is the production of magnesium from western magnesites and brucites.

Perhaps a few other recent developments might be cited, but against these are many more apparently feasible opportunities that have not yet materialized. We certainly must question why they have been so long held back. For example, I am greatly puzzled why new electrolytic zinc capacity has not been added to the Pacific Northwest when it is obviously necessary and feasible on the basis of available concentrates and cheap power. Similarly, I am puzzled by the lack of explosives and munitions plants in the Western States in spite of the fact that the raw materials and the power are available, and that there is an undeniable need for the finished products for the defense of the west coast and our Pacific outposts. The same question can be raised with regard to an integrated fertilizer industry for the Western States, based on the tremendous deposits of phosphates in Idaho, the power for the production of nitrates, and the crying need of fertilizer products for western soils. Another case in point is that of the iron and steel industry which I have already mentioned.

In view of these obstacles certain recommendations must follow:

1. The proper agencies of the Federal Government should expand their investigations of processes using western minerals and particularly they should reappraise the possibility of revisions in established processes. A consequence of this recommendation would be the multiplication of laboratories and pilot plants adapting their studies to local resources, fuels, and facilities. This program would be somewhat similar to that of the Department of Agriculture in its

recently established regional agricultural laboratories.

2. The proper Federal agencies should inaugurate a number of intensive feasibility studies dealing with opportunities in industries that would use western minerals, and dealing with those affiliated industries that would further process and fabricate the initial products made from western minerals, as well as those industries that would furnish the necessary supplies and auxiliary materials of the basic industries. Such investigations should be summarized in widely distributed reports. These reports would cover not only the problems of raw materials and processes, but would also cover such matters as the size of markets, transportation facilities and costs, labor supply, availability and costs of fuels, the character and magnitude of competition, and related problems.

3. In order to reduce monopolistic restraints the Department of Justice should be ever ready to undertake investigations where such practices are suspected in industries related to western minerals.

4. Some Federal action should be taken to facilitate investments in new (even if small) business enterprises. Secretary Ickes has already pointed out to this committee the necessity of "providing cheap credit for the development of those resources which have not been a good financial risk up to the present."

5. Under the defense emergency whenever the Federal Government provides for increased production in industries that utilize western minerals, especially where such production is financed directly or indirectly with Federal funds, the policy should be deliberately to have new managements take over any plants or additional plant capacity. If necessary, such managements should be trained by the managements of established plants. Such a program would help reduce the threat of destruction of some small businesses which for various reasons are not receiving defense contracts.

POWER SUPPLY

Today hydroelectric power is the keystone in both the mineral and industrial development of the West. This is due to four reasons. The first is that electric power is an inseparable part of many industrial processes—major electrometallurgical and electrochemical processes, such as those used exclusively for the manufacture of aluminum, magnesium, certain ferro-alloys and certain heavy chemicals, electrolytic zinc, high-grade iron and steel, and many others. The second is that savings due to extremely low-cost power, such as developed by the Federal projects in the West, permits the absorption of certain other costs, such as transportation, which otherwise would render western manufacturing uneconomic. The third is that extremely large quantities of this power are needed which are not readily available elsewhere in the Nation. The fourth reason involves the utilization of electric power in the treatment of low-grade ores whose products would otherwise be unavailable. In view of the fact that a large proportion of the western ores are low grade, the importance of hydroelectric power in the West is immediately apparent.

To illustrate the amount of power required in certain of these products, the now scheduled production of 400,000,000 pounds of aluminum per year in the Pacific Northwest will absorb over 400,000 kilowatts of capacity at Coulee and Bonneville Dams, enough power to meet the ordinary needs of a city of one and one-half million population.

The Bonneville-Grand Coulee Power Administration has assumed an increasingly important role in supplying the large blocks of low-cost hydroelectric power required in the Northwest, particularly in connection with new mineral and industrial development of the region. This administration is the only immediate source of the supply of power in the Pacific Northwest, at least for the large blocks of power necessary in the development of the new electrochemical and electrometallurgical processes utilizing the natural mineral resources of the region. In fact, at the present time, this agency is the major source of supply in the Nation for additional blocks of low-cost electric power suitable for large-scale industrial purposes; the Pacific Northwest contains, roughly, 40 percent of the Nation's potential hydroelectric power, practically all of which remains to be developed by the Federal Government.

The most pressing problem confronting this administration in this region today is to speed up the development of these great hydroelectric power supplies. The great increase in the production of light metals, chemicals, and other materials that must be obtained to meet the present challenge to our national security calls for the immediate expansion of electric power supplies. It is my opinion that the greatest amount of power in the region and Nation can be developed most quickly by installing generators at dams already built, particularly at Grand Coulee Dam.

We are finding that even our most optimistic estimates of power requirements made a year ago must be discarded and replaced by the new and greatly increased power requirements necessitated by the continual growth of industries in the Northwest. In my opinion, the region may be facing during the next few years a critical shortage of power, which may seriously retard industrial development and as a consequence interfere with the present defense effort. Immediate steps to speed the development of additional generating and transmission capacities in the Federal system are imperative, if we are to avoid a critical power shortage and resulting retardation of industrial capacity, as well as possible curtailment of civilian consumption.

During the past 9 years the construction of necessary additional generating and transmission facilities has not been maintained concurrently with the increased power requirements of the Pacific Northwest, so that under even normal circumstances this region would today be faced with serious power shortages, were it not for the power now available at Bonneville Dam and to be available at Grand Coulee. The rapid expansion of industries, due to the national emergency, has made this power situation critical. During the last year demands for energy have increased at a rate unprecedented in the Northwest, resulting from three major factors: 1. Demands for new industries producing vital materials for national defense. 2. Increased consumption generally of electricity due to the continual lowering of electric rates. 3. Increases in consumption resulting from added employment and higher incomes. Inquiries from potential industrial power consumers for information on economic technological and market factors indicate an increasing interest in the advantages of the industrial-power utilization in this region, and negotiations are now in progress with industries expecting to produce ferrochrome, chlorates, and high-grade and alloy steels, all requiring large blocks of power.

In view of these circumstances we have compiled new estimates of the power requirements of the region and have prepared and submitted to the National Resources Planning Board and the Bureau of the Budget a revised 6-year construction program for the fiscal years 1943–48. The net result of this revised program is to advance the Government's hydroelectric power installations on the Columbia River from 3 to 5 years. I am submitting a copy of this report for the record.

Let me point out the significant conclusions contained in this report: Allowing for expansion of production of vital defense materials, particularly aluminum and magnesium, our best estimate indicates that the Pacific Northwest should be prepared to meet a peak load of 1,628,000 kilowatts in 1941, 2,746,000 kilowatts in 1943, and 3,135,000 kilowatts in 1945. The area's present net assured capacity, after allowing only 162,000 kilowatts for reserve and exclusive of Bonneville and Grand Coulee, is only 1,062,000 kilowatts. Since additional load in the area must be met by the Federal system, we must be prepared to supply 566,000 kilowatts of firm power in 1941, 1,684,000 kilowatts in 1943, and 2,073,000 kilowatts in 1945.

The facts appear even more startling when we realize that the projected increase in load calls for additional capacity by 1943 equal to one and one-half times the present capacity of all the Northwest's developed power resources other than Bonneville and Grand Coulee, and by 1945 this demand will have increased to almost twice the present rated capacities of these systems. Putting it another way, the projected increase in demand in the Northwest by 1945 amounts to approximately four times the rated capacity of Bonneville Dam when it has all of its generators installed. To meet these requirements we must advance the present schedule of installation of generators at Bonneville and Grand Coulee and advance correspondingly the installation of necessary transmission facilities. The new schedule for installation of generators is as follows:

Recommended installation schedule for generators at Bonneville and Grand Coulee (estimate of June 4, 1941)

Anticipated date of installation	Units added		Total installed capacity (kilowatts)		
	Bonneville	Grand Coulee	Bonneville	Grand Coulee	Total
	Numbers	*Numbers*			
Present installation	1 to 4 inclusive.		194,400		194,400
Aug. 1, 1941		L3 [1]	194,400	108,000	302,400
Aug. 18, 1941	5 [1]		248,400	108,000	356,400
Dec. 1, 1941		L [2]	248,400	216,000	464,400
Jan. 1, 1942	6 [1]		302,400	216,000	518,400
Mar. 1, 1942		L1 [1]	302,400	324,000	626,400
January 1943	7 [2]		356,400	324,000	680,400
July 1943	8 [2]	L4 [2] and R1	410,400	540,000	950,000
September 1943	9 [2]	L5 [2] and R2	464,400	756,000	1,220,400
November 1943		L6 [2] and R3	464,400	972,000	1,436,400
December 1943	10 [2]		518,400	972,000	1,490,400
January 1944		L7 and R4	518,400	1,188,000	1,706,400
March 1944		L8	518,400	1,296,000	1,814,400
May 1944		R5	518,400	1,404,000	1,922,400
September 1944		L9	518,400	1,512,000	2,030,400
March 1945		R6	518,400	1,620,000	2,138,400

[1] Under construction.
[2] Funds appropriated and foundations under construction
[3] Now under bid. Other generators at Grand Coulee awaiting congressional action as recommended in this schedule.

NOTE.—Schedule based on best construction and installation information as of date. Subject to revision as conditions warrant.

All of the 10 Bonneville generators have been authorized and are under construction, scheduled for completion by 1943; 4 are now in operation; the fifth unit will be completed in August and the sixth unit in December of this year; and the last 4 units will be completed in 1943. The Army engineers are cooperating with us to advance this schedule as much as possible. Only 6 generators have been authorized at Grand Coulee, the first to be completed in August and the second in December of this year, the third to be completed in March 1942, and the remaining 3 units, not yet scheduled, to be completed in about 2 years. According to our estimates, 9 more units, including construction of the Coulee east powerhouse, should be ordered immediately and completely installed by 1945. We have been informed by the manufacturers that with necessary priorities, additional units at Grand Coulee can be completed to meet the generator schedule recommended in this report.

The report also summarizes the additional transmission lines and substations that should be authorized for construction during the next 6 years in order to meet the area's power requirements. This program, summarized in part II, indicates that construction of transmission facilities totaling $66,463,000 should be authorized for the fiscal year 1943, and that an immediate advance on this program of $30,000,000 be authorized in order to avoid delay in completion of the facilities. In other words, in order to complete these facilities in 1943 it is necessary that we be authorized to order certain materials and prepare our specifications and plans for this construction in advance, because it is becoming increasingly difficult to get materials delivered in time to carry out a program for 1 year unless orders for the materials for that year's program are made in advance of that year. We expect to present this request to the Budget Bureau next month.

Finally, the report recommends the immediate authorization for the development and construction of a dam and power house at Umatilla, or other potential site, for a multi-purpose power project on the Columbia River in order to be prepared to meet additional demands for power.

This represents our current forecast of power demands and our program to meet them.

We must consider also, however, the immediate problem in which the region's power demands are reaching the capabilities of installed hydrogenerators, thus necessitating the use of steam.

The latest survey of the Federal Power Commission indicates that a combination of three moves will meet this situation: (1) Interconnections to obtain full benefit of water and demand diversities, (2) use of steam, (3) curtailment of nonessential uses of power (not now necessary, but if it becomes necessary on a priority basis).

The Bonneville Power Administration has been a consistent advocate of all of these moves where the circumstances warrant. Already we have established interconnections with the cities of Eugene, Centralia, Grays Harbor, Tacoma, Seattle's Skagit plant, Washington Water Power Co., Portland General Electric Co., and Northwestern Electric Co. through the P. G. E. Spilled water was stored with the Washington Water Power Co. and returned partially to Bonneville when it was needed. Recently when a generator at Seattle's Skagit plant failed, P. G. E.'s steam was made available.

When and if it becomes advisable from the point of view of national defense to make additional interconnections, the Bonneville Power Administration will make them.

I should like to point out, however, that the Bonneville-Coulee grid will in itself serve the purpose of interconnection as the load in the region grows because it will supply power to the various sections of the Northwest over and above the capabilities of existing facilities. In other words, our tie lines will become the supply lines to the various parts of the area, and interconnections and interchange as such will become increasingly incidental.

Much has been said and done with reference to power for defense industries. The importance of our meeting this industrial demand cannot be overemphasized, and I believe our 6-year program anticipates providing for these plants as they are built. The region and the Nation can benefit further from these developments as the facilities which are provided for these national-defense needs will also meet the long-range, peacetime requirements of the region.

We believe, however, in the development of such local hydro facilities as will contribute to the defense effort and to the future development of this region. We have in mind particularly such developments as Nisqually, Cedar Falls, the raising of Ross Dam, and the additional generators at Rock Island, all of which can be installed as soon, if not sooner, than equivalent steam. These are recommended to be installed concurrently with our 6-year program.

I believe that the Federal Power Commission, which also has recommended the Nisqually development, will concur with me in my recommendation for these other additional hydro facilities. We do not concur in their recommendations for additional steam installations in our region since the hydro installations can be made more quickly in dams already built, are much less expensive to operate, and fit into plans for the long-range development of the region.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that the three programs of mineral development, industrial development, and power development, advancing simultaneously, are indispensable to the sound economic progress of the Western States. If we are to avoid the wide swings of employment and the weaknesses of an economy based largely on the liquidation of minerals, timber, and other raw materials, we must encourage individual enterprise to develop additional western industries. Through this development we will not only strengthen the western economy and release it from its colonial status, but we will also at the same time enhance our ability as a Nation to defend ourselves.

The Nation as a whole will feel more confident, I believe, when a diversified industrial structure in the Western States stands ready to supply defense materials to the East or to the defense bases of the Pacific area.

Discussion of Current Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FRED BRADLEY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on August 6, 1941:

The pro-war spirit here in Washington seems to have quieted down somewhat during the past week, which is probably attributable to several causes. In the first place, we invariably notice that certain of the war-minded administration spokesmen, and, in fact, Washington warmongers in general seem to quiet down considerably when they are trying to put something across, and, of course, right now the matter under consideration is the very important question of whether or not the draftees and the guardsmen will be retained in service after their year of training is over. You can readily appreciate that if the warmongers were at present active in selling the people on the idea that we are dangerously close to war and that their sons might be shot at, they would then expect a greater clamor from the people against retention of these boys. Secondly, despite their more or less quiet attitude, there has already been such a storm of protest coming from you people back home against further retention of these boys in service and against their continued warlike moves, that the interventionists have thought it best to pull in their horns a bit temporarily.

Now, it is very true that all indications point to an overwhelming sentiment in the Nation against keeping these boys in service after their year of training is over because the people generally believe that we, as a Nation, are in a much safer relative position today than we were a year ago, when these boys were called into training.

Now a year ago remember that Great Britain was living in daily expectation of a land invasion by Hitler's hungry hordes. France and the Low Countries had fallen; Norway had long since been occupied and was a potent air and submarine base for Hitler; and also England's fortunes in Africa were none too bright. Also, it must be remembered that a year ago Russia was then regarded as a possible future open ally of Hitler and as such could, of course, be of considerable help to Japan in the Pacific. Today we find the situation entirely different. England, with our help, is rapidly approaching that point at which she will be equal, if not superior, to Germany in the air and Russia has proven to be a far more formidable foe of Hitler's than most people had imagined and now Mr. Hitler finds himself with a real war on both sides of him. Furthermore, he finds an ever-increasing menace from sabotage and undercover guerrilla resistance in the conquered nations whose people may have been conquered physically but are far from being subdued mentally.

Insofar as we ourselves are concerned, no one can deny that, despite its many disappointing aspects, nevertheless we are considerably improved over a year ago in our defense production set-up and we can expect an ever-increasing amount of war material being sent to our training centers or far-flung outposts. Officers recently back from our camps and training centers, in fact, even General Marshall himself, have told me our enlisted men have absorbed a remarkable amount of training considering the inadequacies of equipment and the alarming need for more officer training in modern warfare. Yes; any possibility of invasion by Hitler in the near future is indeed but a mere possibility. Japan is expected by military experts here to continue to bluff, but they doubt she will actually seek war with the United States and Russia. She seeks to ride a winning horse.

Now, with respect to our own enlisted boys who are in training and whose retention is now sought by a bill recently reported on the floor of the Senate and one which has come to us on the floor of the House from our own Military Affairs Committee. These bills seek to do far more than merely retain these boys in service. If passed as now written, and I suspect that they may be passed, then you will have found that the Congress has given the President the go ahead signal to keep these boys in indefinitely and to send them

overseas or anywhere in the world that the President sees fit. The House bill starts right out by declaring that the Nation is imperiled and that a state of national emergency exists and hence the President, as the Commander in Chief, shall thus be given full authority to send our troops any place he wants and whenever he wants to. Furthermore, greatly added emergency powers will be turned over to the Chief Executive.

I have talked to no one and have heard from no one in or out of the camps, sons or parents, who are not willing to lay down their lives for the defense of our country when they feel that the Nation is in true danger, but on the other hand I do find a greater reluctance than ever to engage in someone else's war, the kind of war which many people in America now feel is for the sole purpose of the maintenance of the British Empire. These sincere people's preparation for our defense is one thing but they suspect we may be training for an offensive war—another A. E. F.—thus a great many of these people are disturbed and alarmed over what we have realized here in Washington for a long while is the fact that we are able to rely much more on reports originating in London regarding our future war moves than we can on reports originating in our own Nation's Capital. In other words, more and more people are realizing that to all intents and purposes our present foreign policy is being more and more definitely dictated by Mr. Winston Churchill at No. 10 Downing Street, London. They are justly alarmed because if you will look back through the factual records of the past 2 years you will find that Mr. Churchill and other British spokesmen have been frequently predicting what we in America would do. Official Washington would deny any such intentions but then in a short time the administration would go right ahead and do exactly what Mr. Churchill had predicted we would do.

So these folks are perhaps justly concerned and alarmed by certain London reports of the past week. They are alarmed because while there is an apparent calm on the part of the warmongers here in Washington, nevertheless Mr. Churchill in London makes a positive, emphatic, and unqualified statement that America "is advancing in rising wrath and conviction to the very verge of war." Either Mr. Churchill is grossly misinformed as to the attitude of you folks back home or else he has inside information that that certain little clique of warmongers here in Washington, and in certain other parts of our Nation, is very shortly going to be able to again stick our manpower into England's war of self-preservation and that they will be able to bring about that certain "attack" upon your boys without which "attack" Mr. Roosevelt assured you last fall, your boys would not be sent into any foreign war. And then, too, it is alarming to learn, for instance, that Gen. Sir Claude Auchinleck, the new Commander in Chief of the British Army in the Middle East, says that American war power will be needed if the war is to be won properly. He is reported to have told correspondents in Cairo, Egypt, that "I always thought the war must be won in Europe, in Germany, on Germany's own soil. Therefore, I see as much need for American manpower in this war as in the last." And then we find also that the general whom he succeeded, the famous Sir Archibald T. Wavell, was of the same opinion. Now it is a fact that neither of these generals has ever fought on Germany's own soil. No British land force has been even close to it and none have been on it as the war rounds out its second year. Hence, we do wonder whether American manpower is destined to be the manpower needed to break into it and to storm Berlin. If so, that will be the most costly expeditionary force in all our history. Again it is alarming to find British statesmen, members of parliament if you please, for instance the Honorable Mr. Wedgwood, coming to this country as a guest of this country and informing us that "we are in this war up to our necks and it is up to we Americans to assume some responsibility for the conduct of the war," and above other things, he said that we should get a more sensible Congress and get going.

Well, possibly the Congress has made some mistakes. Possibly it has made many mistakes, and not the least of which, perhaps, has been our lease-lend bill, under which we find that today, at least, Great Britain does not seem to be playing entirely fair with us. She does not seem to be playing cricket. Repeatedly, stories, properly authenticated stories, come to us here in Washington telling us of numerous instances in which we have shipped war materials to London under the terms of the Lease Lend Act only to find that the same materials have found their way back into the commercial trade routes to our neighbors to the south in Latin America, where these same American materials, which we have given her, are being sold by the British in direct competition with our own same materials at much lower prices. Let me cite but a few typical cases which have come to my attention in the past few days. Tinplate and aluminum, of which we have a scarcity, are bing resold in the Argentine. Precision machine tools, made in Wisconsin and consigned to Coventry, have been resold in Brazil. Steel sash given to aid in rebuilding of Coventry has turned up in Brazil. And as a capper, a certain Member of Congress told me he knew of a Pan-American Clipper plane which had been taken off our own commercial runs and turned over to the task of ferrying bomber pilots had just been acquired by the Argentine. There would be a better spirit of lease-lend and in our general attitude toward Great Britain if she played a little fairer with Uncle Sam.

Thus, perhaps, England seeks to maintain her credit in order that she can continue to pay cash on the barrel head for war materials which she is able to purchase from our good friends up north in Canada. And even in Canada, we find some who do not cooperate too well in our concerted war efforts. My attention was called to an instance in our own district where a contractor, unable to purchase steel in the United States for a non-defense building, was able to secure it in Canada at a lower price than our regular prices. Speaking of our good friends in Canada, for whom I have the greatest admiration and sympathy, may I also remind you that in many of the letters coming to me protesting against the retention of our selectees and guardsmen over a year, they remind me of the fact that Canada still has but a 30-day conscripted military training program and that, also, their overseas duty is strictly on a voluntary basis. So these same people feel that our boys will be discriminated against if we do pass a bill calling for a state of national emergency and thus permit our boys, who have been conscripted, to be put in a position where they can be sent to any part of the world to fight on foreign soil.

So while London's predictions are disquieting, we are also concerned by the unusually bold, and often belligerent, front assumed by some of our own statesmen when in London. For instance, it is disquieting to hear Mr Harry Hopkins make an international broadcast to the entire world over a London radio station in which he proclaimed that United States naval vessels are now "patrolling alongside" and "parallel with" British naval craft. This, despite the fact that within the past 2 weeks our Secretary of Navy, Mr. Knox, specifically denied to a committee of Congress that American naval craft were being used in convoy service along with the British Navy and in getting aid to Britain even though our occupation of Iceland provided the best excuse possible. So, after all, many Congressmen and many of you people back home will want to know the exact truth in the face of these conflicting statements by the Secretary of Navy and Mr. Harry Hopkins who, after all, is the super-lease-lend coordinator and a close bosom friend of the President and now apparently is our official ambassador of good will sent to Moscow to grab, in the spirit of friendship, the bloody hand of Joe Stalin—he who for the past 20 years has been doing his level best to create discord and chaos and, yes, even to bring about an eventual revolution in our own land.

All of these things are very disquieting, and it is also disquieting to know that we recently sent hundreds of our best American Army pilots to England as observers. I was told by one of the pilots who recently carried some of these boys overseas in a United States Army bomber, upon whose side was painted an American flag but which otherwise was completely unarmed, that they were greatly concerned when a German plane suddenly swooped out of the sky far out over the Atlantic and easily overtaking our slower American plane, flew alongside of it for a few moments presumably making necessary identification, and then with a graceful wave of her wings turned off her course to be certain that she was not guilty of having caused that so necessary "attack" on your boys.

Yes, indeed; our Nation may be perilously close to actual involvement in a shooting war, a war of offense, rather than defense, a war that may mean the most costly American expeditionary force in all history in order "to defeat Hitler properly." But, if so, we have ourselves to thank for it because we have permitted ourselves to be gradually dragged closer and closer to actual participation in it and now we have our necks so far out we may have to shoot our way out.

Testimony of John L. Lewis on the St. Lawrence Project

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Mr. John L. Lewis appeared and testified before the Rivers and Harbors Committee on the proposed St. Lawrence project, and I cross-examined him. I brought out the fact that in the coal-producing States electricity can be generated with coal and distributed to everybody in those States at the T. V. A. rates or the Ontario rates without loss on legitimate investments. The same thing can be done in those States that use natural gas.

Not only that, but you can generate and distribute power all over the United States at the T. V. A. rates, and save the American people more than $1,000,000,000 a year on their light and power bills without loss on legitimate investments.

That would improve the standard of living on the farms, in the cities, and in the small towns and communities, and would lift from the commercial consumers, the hotel operators, the filling sta-

tions, and the garage operators, and others who pay commercial rates, overcharges that now amount to more than $380,000,000 a year.

It would lift from the industrial users of electricity the present overcharges amounting to more than $275,000,000 a year.

It would lift from the residential consumers their present overcharges amounting to more than $360,000,000 a year.

You could then electrify every farm home in America at rates the farmers could afford to pay.

That would bring to the people of this country a new day of progress and prosperity for all.

I am inserting some excerpts from the testimony of Mr. John L. Lewis before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN L. LEWIS, PRESIDENT OF UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Lewis, you oppose all of these developments of waterways, do you?

Mr. LEWIS. No; we never opposed the T. V. A.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. CARTER, of California, this morning asked why we didn't use coal instead of developing these water-power projects. Were you opposed to the development of the Central Valley project in California?

Mr. LEWIS. No.

Mr. RANKIN. You were not opposed to the development of Boulder Dam?

Mr. LEWIS. No.

Mr. RANKIN. You were not opposed to the development on the Columbia River projects, Bonneville and Grand Coulee?

Mr. LEWIS. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. And the Umatilla project?

Mr. LEWIS. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. You are not opposed to the development of the Florida Ship Canal?

Mr. LEWIS. Which canal?

Mr. RANKIN. The Florida Ship Canal?

Mr. LEWIS. Not for that reason—I am not opposed to the Florida canal at all; I have not expressed any opinion on it.

Mr. RANKIN. Have you expressed any opinion on the opening up of the Tombigbee waterway connecting the Tennessee River with the Gulf?

Mr. LEWIS. I am not familiar with that particular project.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, Mr. Lewis, you are opposed to this project, as I understand it, largely because of its furnishing an inland waterway to the Great Lakes, largely because of the transportation features of it; is that correct?

Mr. LEWIS. No; I am opposed to it because of the tremendous amount of economic effect on this country.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand you mean the economic effect that would occur from opening up the channel into the Great Lakes?

Mr. LEWIS. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. If that phase of it were eliminated, would you be opposed to the development of the water power on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. LEWIS. Well, that would depend upon how much it would cost the United States taxpayers, and for what purpose the power would be utilized and where it would be utilized. That would be a separate study of itself, and that would require some examination in order to give an intelligent opinion on it.

Mr. RANKIN. You did not oppose the development of the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. LEWIS. No; we did not oppose it.

Mr. RANKIN. You did not oppose that?

Mr. LEWIS. No; we had faith in the Government at that time.

Mr. RANKIN. How is that?

Mr. LEWIS. We had faith in the Government at that time.

Mr. RANKIN. We still have faith.

Now, Mr. Lewis, if this water power on the St. Lawrence can be developed at a cost that will amortize the investment in 50 years, would you oppose the proposition?

Mr. LEWIS. Well, I really would not want to answer a hypothetical question. I am perfectly clear in my mind as to what I oppose, but I am not clear in my mind as to what I might oppose in the future under any different set of facts.

Mr. RANKIN. But you are not opposed to the development of hydroelectric power where it can be economically developed and distributed, are you?

Mr. LEWIS. We have not opposed the development of hydroelectric power where it can be economically developed, but we are opposed to this project.

Mr. RANKIN. This morning in reading your statement, you asked this question: "Why is it that public officials, hell-bent on fighting public utilities, seldom, if ever, think in terms of municipal or Government steam-power generating plants—with coal as the basic fuel—when they launch these sporadic attacks on utility rates?"

I presume I am one of the fellows who has been pretty "hell-bent," as you expressed it, on attacking exorbitant utilities rates.

You contend, as I understand you, that you can develop electricity with coal as cheaply as you can with water power?

Mr. LEWIS. Cheaper in most instances.

Mr. RANKIN. Cheaper in most instances?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Then are you opposed to compelling the distribution of that power at reasonable rates to the people who use it?

Mr. LEWIS. Am I opposed to the distribution of it?

Mr. RANKIN. Are you opposed to compelling utility companies to distribute that power at reasonable rates?

Mr. LEWIS. No. I am not opposed to reasonable rates for electricity, if that is what you mean.

Mr. RANKIN. I presume I am one of the men who was referred to here as being hell-bent on attacking utility rates.

Mr. LEWIS. I did not know that you were "hell-bent." If you are and want to so designate yourself, it is all right with me.

Mr. RANKIN. I never heard it expressed that way before in public.

Mr. LEWIS. If you want to put yourself in that classification; all right, I do not mind.

Mr. RANKIN. I am pretty strong on forcing electric rates down to the people who have to pay the bills.

What can you lay this coal down for at, we will say, Chicago, Ill.? How much a ton?

Mr. LEWIS. Sir?

Mr. RANKIN. What can bituminous coal be laid down for at, we will say, Chicago, per ton?

Mr. LEWIS. It depends upon from what field it comes.

Mr. RANKIN. Anywhere you can get it; you represent the coal operators or the miners, don't you?

Mr. LEWIS. For $4 a ton for Indiana coal in Chicago, New River coal.

Mr. RANKIN. That includes everything?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes; that includes everything.

Mr. RANKIN. All right; do you know what it costs to generate power with coal, as a rule, what the thumb rule is?

Mr. LEWIS. I do not pose as a technician on these things, or as an expert.

Mr. RANKIN. The testimony we have had here from men who did pose as experts was to the effect that power can be generated with coal for about 1 mill per kilowatt-hour for every dollar a ton paid for that coal. That being the case, they could generate electricity at Chicago for 4 mills per kilowatt-hour, could they not?

Mr. LEWIS. If you say so, I could not recall.

Mr. RANKIN. You could lay down coal, anywhere in Illinois, at about the same rate as you could lay it down in Chicago?

Mr. LEWIS. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. It does not cost any more to distribute electricity that is generated with coal than electricity generated by water power, does it?

Mr. LEWIS. If you say so. You have drawn your own conclusions.

Mr. RANKIN. You know that much about electricity.

Mr. LEWIS. If you say so, I will accept it. Of course, I do not pose as an expert on that.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand. You would not agree that electricity generated with coal could be distributed at the same rate rate as electricity generated by water power?

Mr. LEWIS. I say, excepting that. Conceivably, that would be a logical assumption.

Mr. RANKIN. A logical assumption?

Mr. LEWIS. A logical assumption; yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Then they ought to be able to distribute this power all over the State of Illinois as cheaply as they distribute it throughout the T. V. A. area, should they not, since they pay more than 4 mills per kilowatt-hour wholesale all over the Tennessee Valley area? Herrin, Ill., is one of your coal fields, or is near one?

Mr. LEWIS. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. What can you lay the coal down at Herrin, Ill., for, bituminous coal, per ton?

Mr. LEWIS. Probably $2.40 a ton.

Mr. RANKIN. Then they ought to generate power there at not to exceed 3 mills per kilowatt-hour.

But, as a matter of fact, when they distribute electricity to those miners they charge them more than twice as much for what electricity they get as they do to the farmers and others in the Tennessee Valley area. So, do you not think that I am justified in being "hell-bent," as you express it, in demanding that this power be distributed to the people, especially the miners who dig this coal, at reasonable rates?

Mr. LEWIS. You know, I did not know what your attitude was, about being "hell-bent," as you described. I said I could not understand why those people who were so "hell-bent" did not insist that there be erected steam plants for producing electricity as against water-power plants at a greater expenditure and investment on the part of taxpayers.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not criticizing your statement. You went a little strong, but that is all right.

Mr. LEWIS. There is not anything between us, then.

Mr. RANKIN. What is that?

Mr. LEWIS. There is not anything between us on that, because I take no exception to your desire to have cheap rates and honest rates.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not taking exception to your statement. But what I am trying to say is that whether this power is generated with coal, gas, oil, or water, it can be distributed to all the American people at the T. V. A. yardstick rates, without loss.

As I understand, the difference that seems to exist is that you think that instead of demanding the development of this water power, we should be demanding the building of steam plants. That is about the only difference I see, so far as it has been developed, between your views and mine on this subject. As a matter of fact, this St. Lawrence project is a long way from the coal fields. It is a natural resource. It is owned, half of it, by the Federal Government, just as the Tennessee River was wholly owned by the Federal Government.

So here is a natural resource going to waste.

Do you not think that we are justified in developing that power, where the development will bring reductions amounting to several hundred millions of dollars a year to the ultimate consumers in that area?

Mr. LEWIS. Is that power plant going to be erected in the United States or Canada?

Mr. RANKIN. One end of the dam is to be in the United States and one end in Canada. I do not know where the engineers are going to put the generating plants; but it does not make any particular difference, provided we get our portion of the electricity; and I have the figures from an engineer here who is opposing the proposition.

He says that it will cost from 3.4 mills at Buffalo to 4.5 mills at Albany, to generate electricity with coal. That, of course, is firm power. Then he also admits that the firm power at this dam would cost 1.77 mills per kilowatt-hour; that it can be transmitted economically within a radius of 300 miles, and that the ultimate cost of the transmission, including the line losses, would be, for the 300 miles, 1.5 mills per kilowatt-hour.

That would bring the entire cost to about 3¼ mills per kilowatt-hour, which is considerably cheaper than he says it could be developed at these points with coal.

Now, if that is the case, do you not think that we are justified in developing this power and saving this great wealth that is going to waste?

Mr. LEWIS. I do not even know that that is the case, because I do not have any confidence in these preliminary estimates of cost for developing this St. Lawrence project.

Mr. RANKIN. This was from an engineer that gave these figures, one who is opposed to the development. Of course, he is opposed to it for different reasons, probably, than what you express; but if that is the case——

Mr. LEWIS. I beg your pardon. I am not trying to ask you a question. I am rather expressing an opinion myself.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. But, is it not true that we rarely find these great projects can be completed upon the basis of the original estimates of the cost of their engineers?

Mr. RANKIN. Well, sometimes they cost more than the estimated costs; but do you realize that if this power is distributed over this area, do you realize what that yardstick will mean in the reduction of electric rates to the people in that area, just in the fixing of a yardstick at the rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution, with a reasonable return on legitimate investment? Do you understand that the chances are that it will break the rates in that area several hundred million dollars a year?

Mr. LEWIS. Again, I ask a question merely to make a point. Is that the only way that Congress can protect the people of this country against excessive rates for electricity, by building the St. Lawrence waterway project?

Mr. RANKIN. Now, Mr. Lewis, you put your finger right on the spot. I will say to you frankly that I have studied this question as much as any man, in the time that I have had, in or out of Congress, I suppose. I have tried to find every way in the world, or any way in the world, to bring these rates down. I have found that there is not a State that depends on a State utilities commission that gets reasonable rates, and I have the figures here from every State in the Union.

The only way we have ever found to bring these rates down is through some public generation, transmission, and distribution, or by the application of a yardstick to various areas that by its very force would compel the private utilities to bring their rates down.

I will give you a glaring example, and it ought to be very impressive to you, because it is right in the center of the coal fields.

Down at Birmingham, Ala., there are two cities that might be termed ordinarily suburbs of Birmingham: Tarrant City and Bessemer. They built a line up to and connected with the Tennessee Valley line, I believe, at Gunthersville; brought this power in and distributed it in those two municipalities at the T. V. A. yardstick rates. It immediately broke the rates in Birmingham a million dollars a year.

That is the effect this would have in New York and Boston and Albany. I know they are going to say what they have always said, that we are selling below the cost of production.

The power at Birmingham is not coming from the Alabama Power Co.—not distributed by the Alabama Power Co., but is distributed by the Birmingham Electric, which is owned by the Electric Bond & Share. They bought that power wholesale from the Alabama Power Co. The Alabama Power Co. is developing this power, generating it at the Gorgas plant with coal; but they sell it to the Birmingham Electric at a fairly reasonable wholesale rate; but when it was distributed to the people of Birmingham, they were overcharged at least a million dollars a year, according to what they are selling it for now, with the result that the laboring people there, as well as all others, were charged such exorbitant rates that they could not use enough electricity to employ those electrical appliances necessary for their homes and for their business establishments. I want to say in this connection, this same Alabama Power Co. shipped its electricity over into my district, in Mississippi, and sold it wholesale for 4 mills a kilowatt-hour in a county that was buying the T. V. A. power at 6 mills a kilowatt-hour, and yet they were selling it retail to the people at about twice what we were selling it for, or what our cooperative association and municipalities were selling it for in the T. V. A. area, in the same county.

Now, do you not think that where these yardsticks can be provided, so as to force these rates down to the ultimate consumers, that that should be done every time there is an opportunity to develop power that is already owned by the Federal Government, as it is in these navigable streams?

Mr. LEWIS. I make no objection to that, sir, providing that can be done on a basis that is economical and will protect the interests of all concerned; but I do object to this St. Lawrence project because of the uneconomic factors that are inherent in the project which will reap inconceivable and almost incalculable damages upon economic America.

Mr. RANKIN. You are speaking of transportation?

Mr. LEWIS. I am speaking of the transportation and the trade impact of the whole thing.

Mr. HALL. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I will.

Mr. HALL. You mentioned about this power reaching the people of Boston, and the other day you mentioned it reaching the people in Michigan.

I am just wondering how that can be done under this bill, which provides that it must go first to the New York State Power Authority to be sold by that body. I believe under the act of the legislature creating the Power Authority—I may be wrong—they can only sell it to the people of the State of New York.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, the Legislature of New York has nothing to do with what I say.

Mr. HALL. This agreement provides that it will be sold to the New York State Power Authority.

Mr. RANKIN. This has not gone through yet, and I think I have announced time after time that when this bill goes through it must not discriminate against other people within the distribution radius.

Now, the gentleman has spoken about my statement the other day. I said that provided we added Niagara Falls to it, Niagara power, that that would reach the State of Michigan; but, of course, the St. Lawrence would be a little too far away.

The reason I said that Niagara power would reach the State of Michigan is because they transmit power from Niagara Falls to Windsor, Canada, which is right across the river from Detroit. It is 238 miles from Niagara Falls.

Mr. HALL. I just wanted to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that as the bill is now constituted——

Mr. RANKIN. I understand.

Mr. HALL. And as it is now written, including the New York Power Authority, this power can only go to the people in New York.

Mr. RANKIN. You understand that this is Federal power, and there must be some change in that provision of the bill to enable us to reach the people within the distribution radius.

Mr. HALL. There is doubt, however, about this, as expressed by the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor as to whether this belongs to the Government.

Mr. BELL. You heard the testimony of the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor say that this power belonged to the State.

Mr. HALL. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. That statement is not borne out by the Ashwander case and the Appalachian Power Co. case. Personally, I never had any doubt about it.

Mr. HALL. They discussed those cases and said that the United States Supreme Court has never decided it.

Mr. RANKIN. They did say that, but I think that they are mistaken about it, because I heard one decision read, and I have read the other one. I am familiar with both cases.

This power would come under the Ashwander case, and Chief Justice Hughes said that power generated by this falling water in navigable streams was Federal power and belonged to the United States. So the same thing would apply here.

Mr. HALL. I said that the contention of the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor of New York is that this power is owned by New York.

Mr RANKIN Well, New York does not own it. I certainly would not admit that New York owns it.

Now, Mr. Lewis, I looked up the rates here in the State of Illinois. We have gone over that now, and I think I have shown that you can generate power anywhere in the State of Illinois at about the same rates that you can generate it with hydropower.

The CHAIRMAN. If you will permit me for 1 minute, on page 3 of the bill there appears this language:

"In addition, the arrangement shall include provisions protecting the interests of the United States and assuring a widespread, equitable disposition of the power to domestic and rural consumers within economic transmission distances."

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not say within the State of New York.

Mr. HALL. Pardon me, Mr. RANKIN. I am talking about the power of our New York State Power Authority under the act of the legislature.

The CHAIRMAN. That applies to your power in New York and does not apply to this.

Mr. HALL. The New York State Power Authority under the act of the legislature by which it is set up, in my opinion, cannot sell power to anyone outside of the State of New York.

Mr. RANKIN. When we make them a Federal authority, they can sell it anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it depends upon what Congress would do.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL] that what we call the power block in the House have a well-defined program that this power shall be generated and distributed to everybody within the distribution radius alike, and we expect to stand on that platform.

Now, getting back to the State of Illinois, Mr. Lewis, I find that last year, according to the Ontario rates, the electric consumers in Illinois were overcharged $92,808,000 for electricity alone. Now, most of that power is generated with coal, is it not? It could have been distributed at Ontario rates.

Then they come back and say Ontario pays no taxes. I looked up the taxes paid in Illinois. The taxes and cash contributions and free services—and the Federal Power Commission tells me that it has changed very little since 1936—in that year taxes, cash contributions, and free services paid or rendered by both private and public electric utilities in Illinois, including both State and Federal income taxes, amounted to only $25,156,865, which, taken from this overcharge last year to the people of Illinois, left a net overcharge of $67,251,474.

Mr. LEWIS. Well, sir——

Mr. RANKIN (continuing) And if you can do it with coal—and I submit that you can do it with coal; not as cheaply as you can with water power, but you can generate power all over the United States with coal, gas, or oil and distribute it at rates that on the present load would save the consumers a billion dollars a year

Now, how are you going to get that done?

Mr LEWIS. Well, my position, in a nutshell, is this, just this: That I strenuously object, as uneconomical to the displacement of coal by water power, where such power can be produced cheaper by steam, simply as a means of circumventing downright incompetence or dishonesty on the part of public-service bodies or local municipal officials.

If it is true that the restraining and regulatory influence of Congress can only be exercised in behalf of the legitimate consumers of this country by going up into Canada and perfecting the St. Lawrence project at an expense of $300,000,000 or a billion dollars, as the case may be, then I think it is just too bad and that the subject needs further consideration by Congress.

Mr RANKIN. You say going up into Canada?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes. The St. Lawrence is all in Canada.

Mr. RANKIN Now, we propose building a project down at Clarks Hill on the Savannah River between South Carolina and Georgia, developing water power there. You would not object to that?

Mr LEWIS. I am talking about the St. Lawrence, which is geographically located, as we know, in Canada.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, and you spoke of it because it was over in Canada, or a part of it

Mr LEWIS. You know the mouth of the St. Lawrence is only 100 miles from Newfoundland.

Mr. RANKIN. How is that?

Mr. LEWIS. The mouth of the St. Lawrence is only 100 miles from Newfoundland

Mr RANKIN. This is a long way from the mouth of the St. Lawrence.

Mr LEWIS. That is a pretty long way up.

Mr. RANKIN. You would not object, then, to this Arkansas Valley development, would you, to develop water power on the Arkansas?

Mr LEWIS. I want to object, and we do object, to the expenditure of public funds for the development of water-power projects for the production of electricity and power where the expenditure necessary is greater than would be required in steam-produced plants.

Mr RANKIN All right; but this money will come back to the Government; this development is amortized through the sale of power, the sale of power which is produced more cheaply than it could be produced with coal. You would not object to it then, if that were so?

Mr. LEWIS. I would not want to give any blanket assurance on that, because I would want to examine on its merits each project, and that is what we are doing with respect to the St Lawrence project.

Mr. RANKIN That part of the St. Lawrence development which would be charged to power would be amortized, according to all of the testimony we have had—not all of it, but the scientific witnesses who have gone into it, including General Robins. It will be amortized in 50 years at a rate of 1.77 cents per mill per kilowatt-hour for the firm power, or a rate of 1.2 mills per kilowatt-hour for all of the power, firm and secondary

Now, under those circumstances, since it would cost from 3.4 mills at Buffalo to 4.5 mills at Albany to generate this power with coal, do you not think that this project would be economically justified?

Mr. LEWIS. No. I think the St. Lawrence project is fantastic and unjustifiable. I think it constitutes a positive menace to economic America.

Mr. RANKIN. In what way?

Mr. LEWIS. In the way that I have been describing here all day.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. Let me give some economic facts now, since you have gone that far.

The people in the State of New York last year were overcharged $201,000,000 for their electricity, according to Ontario rates. Taxes, cash contributions, and free services, including both State and Federal income taxes—that covered both publicly and privately owned electric utilities in the State of New York—all of those taxes, and cash contributions amounted to $48,000,000, leaving a net overcharge paid by the people of New York last year of $153,000,000, which is more than the United States half of this power development amounts to. Under those conditions, do you not think it would be justified?

Mr. LEWIS. You astound me by those figures.

Mr. RANKIN. They astounded me the first time I looked at them.

Mr. LEWIS. I was under the impression that New York had a progressive State administration which was anxious to protect the welfare of the people of the State.

Mr. RANKIN. Did it astound you when I showed you that the Illinois overcharges, after deducting taxes and cash contributions, were more than $67,000,000 last year; did that astound you?

Mr. LEWIS. Certainly.

Mr. RANKIN. And will it astound you when I tell you that in Pennsylvania they were overcharged $86,000,000?

Mr. LEWIS. Do not our public officials do anything about that?

Mr. RANKIN. Wherever they claim to have the best utility commissions in a State they usually have the highest rates. I have noticed that. Where we get the most favorable publicity on the ability of their utilities commissions we usually find that the people pay the highest rates.

Now, Mr. Lewis, by the development—you are not opposed to rural electrification?

Mr. LEWIS. Opposed to what?

Mr. RANKIN. You are not opposed to rural electrification?

Mr. LEWIS No; I am for it.

Mr. RANKIN. You would not be opposed to that power——

Mr. LEWIS. I am for rural electrification; electrification of those areas where there is no water-power electricity.

Mr. RANKIN. How is that?

Mr. LEWIS. I am also for rural electrification in those areas where there is not available water power for electricity.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. In other words——

Mr. LEWIS. I am for rural electrification.

Mr. RANKIN. You are for rural electrification, whether from water power or whatever resources you have to develop it with, provided it can be done economically?

Mr LEWIS. I think that the farmers, the rural fellows, outside of the T. V. A. territory, are entitled to the same service as those people are.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right. In other words, you would be in favor of developing electricity by natural gas in Texas?

Mr. LEWIS. No.

Mr. RANKIN. You would not be in favor of that?

Mr. LEWIS. Not natural gas.

Mr. RANKIN. Are you in favor of developing electricity by gas in Louisiana?

Mr. LEWIS. I do not favor the utilization of natural gas and putting coal miners on the W. P. A.

Mr. RANKIN. Then you would let this natural gas go into the thin air and haul in coal from some other State?

Mr. LEWIS. I do not know what they could do with the natural gas or the owners thereof; but I do know that it is not sound public policy to use Federal money to create unemployment.

Mr. RANKIN. But you think——

Mr. LEWIS. For the effect of that I will refer you to Congressman VOORHIS.

Mr. RANKIN. Suppose that this natural gas is there and otherwise wasted——

Mr. LEWIS (interposing). It is there all right.

Mr. RANKIN. And otherwise going to waste.

Mr. LEWIS Some of it has been there for a long time.

Mr. RANKIN. And these cooperative associations and municipal systems want to borrow money to develop that power, or electricity from that gas——

Mr. LEWIS (interposing). If you will pardon me, I think that America's single basic problem is to provide an opportunity for employment for its citizens.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand.

Mr. LEWIS. And I think that the expenditure of public funds in a manner that superinduces unemployment is uneconomic, unsound, morally wrong, and politically unwise.

Mr RANKIN. All right. I will say this. You have never had anyone who has more sympathy for the ill-fed and the ill-clothed and the ill-housed than I have, but I want to see that the man who goes down into the mines and digs coal has the right to just the same living conditions that those men have who are engaged in any other occupation; and unless you give them an abundant supply of cheap electricity, they cannot enjoy those blessings.

Mr. LEWIS. They cannot do what?

Mr. RANKIN. Cannot enjoy the comforts and conveniences modern living should afford and that could be produced even by the very coal that they mine.

Under those conditions, you would be willing to develop this power at the mine, would you not, and distribute it over the States?

Mr. LEWIS. Where that is practicable. Oftentimes it is not practicable because of the absence of water or other conditions

Mr RANKIN I understand; but if this power can be generated at the mine and economically transmitted over, we will say, the whole State of Illinois and supplied at T. V. A. yardstick rates, you would favor that, would you not?

Mr. LEWIS. We would certainly be glad to encourage any meritorious project, but, as I said before, I cannot endorse these hypothetical projects to which you refer.

Mr. RANKIN. I am going to give you some that are not hypothetical; but I want to get back to that proposition.

You would not object to developing this power with coal at the mine and distributing it over the whole distribution radius?

Mr. LEWIS. You are talking about rural electrification?

Mr. RANKIN. I am talking about all kinds—residential, commercial, and industries, rural and urban.

Mr. LEWIS. No; we would not have any objection if the Congress decided that that was essential.

Mr. RANKIN. That would not put any men out of work?

Mr. LEWIS. Sir?

Mr. RANKIN. That would not hurt the miners?

Mr. LEWIS. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. It would not hurt them; would it?

Mr. LEWIS. That is right; it would not.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words—and this has been my contention all the time—if they will turn over the generation and transmission, and distribution of the power in this country to me, I can take the coal and generate this power at the mines and distribute it over the State of Illinois so as to wipe out that $67,000,000 annual overcharge. I could wipe out that $86,000,000 annual overcharge in Pennsylvania; and the $153,000,000 net annual overcharges in New York; but that would take approximately the same amount of coal that they are now using, would it not? That would not hurt the miners at all, would it?

Mr. LEWIS. The use of coal would never hurt the miners.

Mr. RANKIN. The use of coal, provided you paid them for mining it.

Now, let us see again. Here is another source of power that we have not discussed very much, and that is oil. You are not opposed to generating power with oil, are you?

Mr. LEWIS. If it creates unemployment; yes. I am opposed to the use of public funds to develop power in the United States by the use of oil if it creates unemployment.

Mr. RANKIN. Some of the coal miners came to me the other day and said that they were supposed to be making $7 a day. Is that right?

Mr. LEWIS. That is the new scale.

Mr. RANKIN. One of them said frankly that 75 percent to 90 percent of our miners never see a dollar. I said, "What goes with it?" "Well," he said, "the coal operators"—by the way, I usually find that they are pretty close to the power utilities—"the coal operators own the houses and rent us the houses." Is that correct?

Mr. LEWIS. That is true to a certain degree; yes.

Mr. RANKIN. He said also that they "charge us so much for rent, for coal, for electricity, and for water that we have to use the very minimum and then sometimes are unable to pay the bill."

He said that they also "frequently compel us to buy through commissaries," and one of them told me that he was paying invariably twice as much for his groceries as they were worth. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWIS. I doubt that on the average they are twice as much, although there are many instances where exorbitant charges are made by the company stores.

Mr. RANKIN. One of them made this statement, that a sack of flour which ought to cost 75 or 80 cents, that he himself had seen it sell for $1.50, and he said that they only got about 180 days' work a year. Is that about right?

Mr. LEWIS. Well, in the Appalachian region last year they worked 213 days. It is quite conceivable that in his territory he only worked 180 days.

Mr. RANKIN. He said that by the time they went back to work, invariably they were in debt to the commissary or the operator. He said if this power were generated and distributed at rates based on the cost of generation, transmission, distribution, then they might be permitted to go out and own 4 or 5 or 10 acres of land and not be compelled to live in these company houses.

Then he said, "We could have our gardens, our corn patches, our cow, etc., and live more comfortably and at the same time have something to fall back on when the mine closes down."

Now, do you not think that provisions of that kind would be much preferable to the situation as it now exists; do you not think——

Mr. LEWIS. I do not quite see the objective of your running commentary there. Obviously, of course, the mine workers' union is striving to protect that individual mine worker from these practices and to bring about reforms as we can, both in the living conditions and charges that the coal companies make on rent and doctors and electric lights, etc.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, just leave out the commissary. What I am driving at is to get electricity to everybody in America at what it is worth.

There never could be any slum clearance in New York or any other big city, any slum clearance that would be comparable to giving these people electricity at the T. V. A. rates, or the Ontario rates, or the Tacoma, Wash., rates, and enabling them to buy the appliances that are necessary for the consumption of that electricity.

Mr. LEWIS. Congressman, there is no gainsaying that the fact, as you say, it would be a great boon to the workers in the country and all of the American people if rates for electricity were made on a basis somewhere near actual cost plus a reasonable profit and made more available for the population, it would indeed contribute and greatly improve the standard of living, and there would be a more happy existence. I quite agree with you. And yet, by and large, I do not quite see the application of our discussion to this great project here which involves the building of this great enterprise in Canada, or half way in our own country and half way in Canada, as the case may be.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me make the application: There are the New England States, every one of which is within the distribution radius of this dam. The overcharges for electricity in New England last year amounted to $97,000,000. Their rates were the highest of any section of the country, taken as a whole, and their consumption per capita about the lowest. I have the figures here, but I will not take up the time to read them.

Let us go across the Atlantic Ocean. Of course they are having war conditions there now; but before the war, both Norway and Sweden were not only supplying electricity to all of the people in the towns at reasonable rates, but 90 percent of their farmers had electricity while only 10 percent of ours did, and then they were what we call "town farmers," living around the edges of towns.

It is well known that those people have no coal in New England; they have none in New York; they have no gas; they have no oil.

So, under those conditions, when we can generate this power at about one-half, or at least about two-thirds of the cost per kilowatt-hour that you can generate it with coal, and since this great wealth of power is running to the sea, going to waste, do you not think it economically sound and that we are justified in building this dam and saving that water power and distributing it throughout that area?

Mr. LEWIS. No; I do not think so. I think that the same people you describe can be served by steam plants producing electricity in northern Pennsylvania and western New York and southern New England at a lesser price for the services they will get than it will cost the taxpayers through this project we are discussing here.

Mr. RANKIN. Another thing: This power project will not cost the Government anything. It will amortize itself in 50 years.

Mr. LEWIS. Would not a steam plant amortize itself?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I think it would.

Mr. LEWIS. Will not steam plants furnish electricity to New England at a less cost than you can get it from this project?

Mr. RANKIN. Not at these rates. You cannot generate electricity in that area with coal at the present price as cheaply as you can with water power, because as the gentleman testified here it will cost from 3.4 mills a kilowatt-hour at Buffalo to 4 mills at Rochester; 4 mills at Syracuse and 4.5 mills at Albany to generate power with coal, whereas it would cost only 1.77 mills a kilowatt-hour to generate firm power with water at this St. Lawrence dam.

That would amortize this investment in this power development within 50 years, and then the Government would have one of the greatest projects in the world.

Mr. LEWIS. Well, I submit, sir, that regardless of what your mathematics may be with respect to the possible cost of electricity at this St. Lawrence dam, that we are still unalterably opposed to the project, because of the direct and indirect economic results that will obtain to our major industries in this country, and particularly to the coal industry.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me make this observation to you, Mr. Lewis: I have been the victim of about the greatest overcharge for electricity in the United States. I am now the beneficiary of about the cheapest rates in the United States. Where I was paying 12½ cents per kilowatt-hour a few years ago for the same electricity generated at Muscle Shoals, the power company was buying it at 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, transmitting it 100 miles, which cost less than a half mill, then selling it to me at 12½ cents; now, my city is buying the same power wholesale at 5 mills and selling it to me not at 12½ cents, but 2½ cents maximum.

I have seen that spread throughout the country and nothing I have ever seen or gone into in all of my life has had such beneficial effect upon the economic well-being of everybody, and especially upon the little fellow, as the bringing of this electricity down and supplying it to him in abundance at these cheap rates.

I want to give you this, and then I will not bother you any more. Frankly, I do not see very much difference between us on this question, except that you just want electricity generated by coal only.

Mr. LEWIS. No; I am opposed to the St. Lawrence waterway project in all of its ramifications.

Mr. RANKIN. I see. In 1933 only 900 people in my town had electricity in their homes. It is a town of about 8,000 people with one-third of them Negroes. Only 900 homes used electricity. Nineteen percent of those people had electric refrigerators. Today 1,900 homes have electricity and 91 percent of that 1,900 have electric refrigerators in their homes.

Don't you think that that is a great contribution to the economic well-being of the average man?

Mr. LEWIS. I think it is fine to have a refrigerator.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you not think that it is fine to have the cheap electricity and other things that go with it?

Mr. LEWIS. I think one also has to have a little work to keep the refrigerator going, internally and externally.

Mr. RANKIN. But they are doing the same work now they were doing then.

Mr. LEWIS. There is an internal problem connected with a refrigerator.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that.

Mr. LEWIS. It has to do with some bread and butter.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, and they save more bread and butter.

Mr. LEWIS. And, you cannot trade away 92,000,000 tons of our coal market in this country and expect the refrigerators in the mining areas in this country to be kept going.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. If you generate this power with coal you can keep the refrigerators going?

Mr. LEWIS. Well, if you take a notion to generate some power with a coal plant, I will be glad to talk with you about it, and glad to help you.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not opposed to generating power with coal; but I favor using whatever source of power we have. Take the State of California. It has no coal, but it has natural gas and water power, and some oil. Would you be in favor of using them to develop electricity?

Mr. LEWIS. Why, I have no objection to the Californians having electricity and refrigerators.

Mr. RANKIN. Even if it is generated with water, gas, or oil?

Mr. LEWIS. If it is economically possible to get it to them under sound economic conditions.

Mr. RANKIN. Take the States of Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas, where they have an abundance of oil and gas and a superabundance of water power in some of those States, especially in Arkansas. Would you be in favor of generating electricity with gas, oil, or water in those areas where they have no coal?

Mr. LEWIS. We probably would have the same attitude that we did with the Columbia Dam and the Boulder Dam, and the T. V. A. and other projects. Some water-power projects we have opposed because we think they are unsound. We think that they have been promoted here in Washington by men who want to get a fee and make money out of them, regardless of their merits; regardless of the wasting of the public funds. We have to look at these things from the standpoint of the individual merits of the individual proposition. That is what I am looking at with respect to the St. Lawrence waterway.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, as a matter of fact, do they not use more coal in the T. V. A. area than they did before the dams were built?

Mr. LEWIS. Well, I talked about that this morning.

Mr. RANKIN. I know you did, but there was some noise up here near me, and I did not understand exactly what you said.

But, as a matter of fact, do they not use more coal in that area now than they used before the T. V. A. was built?

Mr. LEWIS. I would have to go into that as a special subject.

The use of electrical power, of course, has some ramifications and the purchasing of refrigerators, and supplies, and electrically operated gadgets in the home create employment and sometimes people are employed in that area and they use coal for making steam, and what have you. It has a direct and an indirect effect. It is quite possible that a million or a million and a half more tons of coal are being used right now really in the T. V. A. area than was used before they went in there, but, of course, as against that you have to consider the fluctuation, the shift in production of the industries; the transmigration of industries of all character. I touched on that in that statement. I will not bother reading it again.

Mr RANKIN. If you can generate this power at the mouth of the mine by generating it with coal and distributing it at rates that justify the people in that area in heating their homes with it, you would be in favor of that?

Mr. LEWIS. Quite.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, my viewpoint is this—I will admit that I am a little ahead of a majority of the men in Congress on my views on electricity—I think that the time is coming when practically every home in America will be heated with electricity, when we generate the power at the dam or at the mouth of the mine and transmit it to the homes over long-distance wires, and distribute it by the communities or municipalities, or cooperative associations and the people heat their homes with it. We are doing that where I live now.

I had this morning a bill from a friend of mine which showed what it cost him to heat his house. One month the thermometer went to 14° below zero. He used 2,030 kilowatt-hours of electricity that month, and it cost him $14.16. Of course, when we were buying through the Commonwealth & Southern 8 years ago that 2,030 kilowatt-hours would have cost $115 instead of $14.16. Now, if this power can be generated with coal—and I am not trying to commit you to water power—if this power could be generated with coal at the mouth of the mine and distributed over we will say the State of Illinois, or the State of Pennsylvania or West Virginia, or any other area at rates that would enable those people to use it for all purposes, including heating their homes, you would be in favor of that?

Mr. LEWIS. Oh, quite. We hold no brief for the exorbitant charges or improper practices of utility companies.

Mr. RANKIN. Here, I am trying to draw this distinction, Mr. Lewis: The railroads' attitude seem to be that they want to keep the raw materials and the finished products as far apart as possible. Their opposition is different from yours. They want to haul coal and other materials and they do not want these transmission lines.

Now, you want to protect the miner who mines this coal, and I do not blame you for that. What I am pointing out is that if you can generate this power at the mouth of the mine and distribute it over the whole country at these T. V. A. rates and enable every home to use all of the appliances necessary and to heat their homes with it, then you would be in favor of that?

Mr. LEWIS. Oh, we are quite in favor of any normal extension of electrical service that won't in itself disturb existing industries or displace manpower.

Mr. RANKIN. The trouble is not in the generation of electricity in this country. It is in two things—the exorbitant overcharges for the distribution and in the manipulation and watered stocks of the power companies, especially the holding companies, the inflating and the watering they do, and then attempting to collect these excessive rates to enable them to pay dividends on that watered stock.

So what I am getting down to here is this: that if we can generate this power at the mine or at the dam and distribute it at reasonable rates, rates based upon cost of generation, transmission, and distribution, with a reasonable return on the legitimate investment, we can put electricity in every home and every business establishment in America at these T. V. A. rates and reduce the present power and light bills of millions of people and improve living conditions and business conditions in every nook and corner of the Republic.

Whenever it is necessary to do this by generating power with coal—and I will certainly be in favor of it; but where we have these water-power projects that can be economically developed and that will bring such benefits to vast numbers of people in a given area, I am in favor of developing the water power.

Midwest Power Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ADDRESS BY ROGER B. McWHORTER

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, several days ago I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Roger B. McWhorter, Chief Engineer of the Federal Power Commission, at the Midwest power conference held in Chicago, his address being on the subject Hydroelectric Power in the National Emergency. The address is longer than the prescribed pages under the rule. The estimate sets forth that printing the address will require three and a third pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and cost $150. I again ask consent that the address may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HYDROELECTRIC POWER AND THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Chairman Elliott, Director Winston, and gentlemen of the conference, Director Winston very kindly invited me to appear before you today and speak on the subject of hydroelectric power and the national emergency. It is with pleasure that I avail myself of this opportunity.

Due in large part to the impetus of the national-defense program, production of electric energy in the United States during the first 3 months of 1941 was 12.5 percent greater than corresponding production during the first quarter of 1940 and 25.3 percent greater than that of 1939. Currently, weekly production of energy is more than 15 percent above corresponding weekly production in 1940. We find this situation to exist soon after the beginning of the defense program, and it may be assumed that the emergency will not be of short duration. The greatest period of industrial activity in the history of the United States is in the offing and, as the national-defense program progresses, demands for electric power will continue to increase. It is too early to speculate on the time when the peak may be reached. Suffice to say that there must be no power shortage if the program is to succeed in fullest measure.

The electric light and power industry of the United States has grown to its present stature in less than threescore years. Prior to 1882 there was not an electric-generating plant anywhere in the world. In 1882, with the genius of Edison ever present, two small generating stations were constructed—the celebrated Pearl Street steam-driven station in New York City and a tiny hydroelectric plant at Appleton, Wis. In the autumn of that year these little plants, the first of the central stations, began serving energy to a few nearby customers for lighting purposes. Here we find the beginnings of the electric light and power industry—an industry of almost inconceivable importance to our people and to all mankind.

Few hydroelectric plants were constructed prior to 1900, but with improvements in electric transmission numerous plants were projected and built during the first two decades of the present century. It was during the decade from 1920 to 1930, however, that truly great progress was first made in the development of the water-power resources of the Nation. The Federal Water Power Act, which became law with the approval of President Wilson on June 10, 1920, gave tremendous impetus to the development of water power. By this act the Congress created the Federal Power Commission and delegated to it authority to license the development of water power on or affecting the navigable waters and lands of the United States. Between 1920 and 1930 hydroelectric plants having aggregate installed capacity of 5,155,000 kilowatts were constructed and placed in operation. Thus, in a single decade, one-eighth of all the electric generating capacity available today was installed in hydroelectric plants. Due to virtual cessation of construction of generating facilities during the long business depression, only 2,600,000 kilowatts of hydro capacity was installed during the decade just ended; but the latter installation, amounting to 6.2 percent of all the electric-gen rating capacity now available, and about 35 percent of all capacity installed during that decade, is not lacking in importance.

INCREASE IN GENERATING FACILITIES AND ENERGY PRODUCTION SINCE 1920

In 1920 the installed capacity for public use in all generating plants of the United States was 14,372,000 kilowatts, of which 3,786,000 kilowatts, or 26.3 percent, was in hydroelectric plants. By 1940 the total installation had increased to 41,576,000 kilowatts, of which approximately 11,550,000 kilowatts, or 27.8 percent, was in hydroelectric plants (table 1).

Production of electric energy for public use in the United States increased from 43,334,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1920 to 144,965,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1940, the 1940 production being approximately three and one-third times that of 1920. During the past 10 years hydroelectric plants, with 27.5 percent of the available capacity, have generated 36.4 percent of all the energy produced for public use in the country. In the depression years 1932 and 1933 hydroelectric plants produced slightly more than 40 percent of the total (table 2.)

In taking stock of installed capacity and energy generation, it is of interest to note the relative use made of the available hydroelectric and fuel-electric capacity. In 1932, the year of extreme ebb tide in the business depression, the hydroelectric installation operated at a capacity factor of 39.7 percent, and the steam-electric installation at a capacity factor of 21.2 percent. In the year 1940, when a new record in electric energy production was established, the hydroelectric installation operated at a capacity factor of 47.2 percent, as compared with 36.9 percent for the steam-electric installation. Once hydroelectric capacity is installed, considerations of economy dictate that it shall be used to the practical limit for the production of energy.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY PORTENDS NEED FOR INCREASED POWER SUPPLY

Electric-power requirements invariably increase concurrently with expanding industrial activity. Recent power demands have exceeded expectations of the utility systems, as evidenced by the fact that the December 1940 peak demand was substantially greater than was forecast by the utilities in September. Constantly increasing requirements for power, as compared with requirements in previous years, may reasonably be expected, as the unprecedented industrial activity occasioned by the national-defense program advances to the peak-production stage, probably during the next 2 years. By this statement it is meant to imply that the peak demands of 1941 and 1942 will each establish a new record. Taking the longer range view, power requirements 10 or 15 years hence may quite generally be of the order of twice the present requirements.

DEFENSE POWER WORK OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

It may be stated with substantial correctness that the defense power work of the Federal Power Commission is only an intensification of the Commission's normal activities in this field. Voluminous data in the Commission's files, collected periodically from the electric utility systems of the country, show the salient facts relating to practically all generating and transmission facilities and to the generation, transmission, and sale of electric energy, however produced.

In pursuance of instructions issued by the President in June 1940, the Commission, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, particularly the National Power Policy Committee, the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense, and the War and Navy Departments, estimates increases in power demands expected to result from the execution of national-defense orders; maintains reliable information on the adequacy of the power supply to meet such demands; keeps records of orders placed with the electrical-equipment industry for additional generating equipment, and ascertains facts as to the ability of the equipment manufacturers to meet such orders with reasonable promptness; engages in planning, in cooperation with the utility industry, to supply power requirements in the most economical manner; and assists the utilities in the protection of power supply against hostile acts.

The Commission obtains and compiles monthly returns from the principal electric utility systems of the country, showing anticipated power loads, existing and planned generating capacity to supply such loads, and reserve capacity required for normal operation. These returns constitute the basis of monthly reports issued by the Commission on the relationship between power requirements and available generating and transmission capacity, in the 48 power supply areas into which the country has been divided. Likewise, the Commission collects information monthly from manufacturers of electrical and hydraulic equipment, showing the amount of steam-electric and hydroelectric equipment on order, scheduled delivery and installation dates, need for additional skilled labor and materials, and other pertinent facts which would be of value in event need for determining priorities for the manufacture of such equipment should arise.

The Commission also obtains and compiles information on the power needs of the many industrial establishments in the country having national-defense orders; receives currently from other Federal agencies concerned with national-defense orders, information as to orders placed, gives consideration to power requirements incident to the execution of such orders, and collates information relative to plans for the expansion of manufacturing capacity.

Every major interruption of electric service is the subject of an investigation and report by the Commission. Investigations of this character are sometimes made at the request of other Federal agencies, but in any event they would be made by the Commission on its own motion.

Much attention has been given by the Commission in the conduct of its power surveys to the advantages to be secured by interconnecting the transmission facilities of different utility systems in the same region and operating the power systems in coordination so far as might be mutually advantageous, thus increasing the available power supply by reducing the reserve capacity which would otherwise be necessary and assuring a more dependable power supply to each of the interconnected systems.

It is of prime importance that planning for power supplies to meet anticipated demands be done on a reasonably long-range basis. The utilities, of course, follow this practice under normal conditions and from time to time modify their programs for the installation of new capacity as prevailing and prospective conditions may seem to justify. In the present situation, however, definite planning to assure an adequate power supply under the assumption of a 5-year emergency seems imperative.

HYDRO PLANTS RENDERING VITALLY IMPORTANT SERVICE

Hydroelectric power from the Niagara Falls and Massena plants in the State of New York, from the T. V. A. plants in the Tennessee Valley, and from the Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants on the Columbia River, is proving to be of special value in furtherance of the national-defense program, particularly as power from each of these sources is used for the manufacture of aluminum. At Alcoa, Tenn., the power demand when aluminum plants are operated to capacity is about 265,000 kilowatts, and a large part of the power so required is supplied by the Tennessee Valley Authority. About 500,000 kilowatts of hydro power is available at Niagara Falls, including power transmitted into New York State from the Canadian side of the Niagara River. The entire output of the Massena plant, supplemented by large importations of hydro power from Canada, is used for the manufacture of aluminum. In the Pacific Northwest 222,500 kilowatts of Bonneville and Grand Coulee power is under contract to the Aluminum Co. of America and the Reynolds Metals Co. for the production of aluminum. All of the larger T. V. A. hydroelectric plants except those at the Hales Bar and Wilson Dams have been constructed during the past 8 years, as have the Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants. Thus hydroelectric power of best quality, which has become available in recent years as a result of the Government's public power program, is now performing a vitally important function.

Additional public power plants, to which more extended reference will soon be made, are now being constructed in various parts of the country, and private interests are constructing two hydroelectric developments in California and two in North Carolina to supply increased power requirements resulting from the national-defense program. A private company is also considering the construction of a hydro plant to utilize the surplus water and head at the Government Bluestone Dam soon to be constructed on the New River in West Virginia.

HYDRO POWER POTENTIALLY AVAILABLE AT PROPOSED MULTIPLE-PURPOSE RESERVOIR PROJECTS

The Federal Power Commission has recently caused studies to be made of power values inherent in some 70 multiple-purpose water-storage projects in various parts of the country which appear to have sufficient merit to warrant their construction in the near future. No projects now under construction, or authorized by the Congress for construction, are included in this group. Preliminary studies indicate that the annual energy output from these projects would be in excess of 7,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The capacity to be installed in each plant will, of course, be determined by the economic limit to which additional hydro-peaking and reserve capacity can be utilized to advantage on the loads of the power systems in the region of the project. Obviously the installation, in the aggregate, will be relatively large.

In areas where the need for additional power within the next 4 to 6 years is now rather definitely foreseen, whether for national-defense purposes or by reason of normal load growth consideration should be given to early development of the power potentially available in projects of this type. Where such projects are economically sound, development of the available power will result in a more desirable distribution of orders for power generating equipment, especially during the period of the national-defense effort, among the manufacturers of steam-electric and hydroelectric equipment. Furthermore, the flood-control and navigation benefits to be derived from these projects will be important contributions to the national defense. Destructive floods occurring at any time seriously disrupt the economy of large regions, and their effects would be far more serious during a period of national emergency.

While it is expected that each of the projects in this group will serve two or more purposes, many of them are sufficiently attractive as water-power possibilities to have been given serious consideration by private power interests. In fact, applications for preliminary permit and license have been filed with the Federal Power Commission for several of these projects.

NOTABLE WATER-POWER PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION—ADDITIONAL INSTALLATION IN EXISTING PLANTS

The Federal Power Commission has recently forecast serious power shortages in several regions of the country where national-defense power requirements are greatest, and it is particularly gratifying at this time that large hydroelectric plants are under construction

in these regions. In the Southeast the Tennessee Valley Authority is now constructing the Watts Bar and Fort Loudoun projects on the Tennessee River between Chattanooga and Knoxville, and the Cherokee project on the Holston River. The aggregate initial installation in these three projects will be in excess of 200,000 kilowatts. The initial installation at Cherokee, a project with large storage, will be 90,000 kilowatts, and as a result of the flow regulation provided by this headwater reservoir, both the quality and quantity of the power output from downstream plants will be substantially improved. It is of interest to note the leverage the Cherokee project has as a part of a coordinated basin development plan: A large amount of power is developed at the site, and the runoff from the drainage area above the dam is substantially, if not completely, regulated for the benefit of navigation and control of floods on the Tennessee, Ohio, and Mississippi Rivers; and the regulated flow is utilized through nine hydroelectric plants on the Tennessee River before it passes into the Ohio River.

The Authority is now installing, or has definite plans immediately to install, additional generating units, having aggregate capacity of 236,000 kilowatts, in its constructed Wheeler, Wilson, and Pickwick plants on the Tennessee River. The Kentucky project on the Tennessee River, the lowermost and largest of the T. V. A. main river projects, is also under construction, and will be completed, doubtless with a power installation, by 1945.

The Nantahala Power & Light Co., a subsidiary of the Aluminum Co. of America, is now rushing to completion its Nantahala and Glenville projects on the headwaters of the Little Tennessee River in western North Carolina. These two projects will provide 200,000 acre-feet of usable storage and have a combined installation of about 64,000 kilowatts. In October 1940 this company, foreseeing the need for greatly increasing its power supply for the production of aluminum, filed with the Federal Power Commission a declaration of intention to construct the 225,000-kilowatt Fontana project well downstream on the Little Tennessee River, a navigable water of the United States. The Commission promptly made a careful investigation of the project, including a review of all authoritative records, as required by law, and made a finding, the effect of which was to require the company to obtain a Federal license. Thereafter the company, after requesting and obtaining a rehearing, decided not to construct the project. Presumably the company contemplates obtaining additional power from the Tennessee Valley Authority for the production of aluminum.

The Santee-Cooper project in South Carolina, now being constructed by a State agency, is scheduled for completion by January 1, 1942. The initial installation in this project will be about 130,000 kilowatts, and the annual primary energy output about 450,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

In the Pacific Northwest, the mammoth Grand Coulee project on the Columbia River, with about 5,000,000 acre-feet of usable storage, is nearing completion. Ultimately this project will have an installation consisting of eighteen 105,000-kilowatt units. Three of these main units are to be installed as quickly as possibly, and it is expected that the first of them will be ready for operation by August 1941, the second by November 1941, and the third by March 1942.

At the constructed Bonneville project, also on the Columbia River, two new 54,000-kilowatt units, in addition to the original installation of 86,400 kilowatts, have just been installed and are in operation; and the fifth and sixth 54,000-kilowatt units are to be installed immediately. Installation of the four remaining units, bringing the total to 518,000 kilowatts, is definitely contemplated.

In California, where the power load is increasing rapidly, the Bureau of Reclamation is constructing the Shasta project on the Sacramento River, and is making special effort to have the power plant completed and in operation well in advance of the completion date fixed in the original construction schedule. It is now expected that Shasta power will be available in 1944. This project will have installed capacity of 375,000 kilowatts. At the Keswick reregulating dam on the Sacramento River a short distance below Shasta Dam, the power installation will be 75,000 kilowatts.

The Federal Power Commission recently authorized construction, by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., of the Cresta and Pulga projects on the North Fork of the Feather River, Calif. The installation at Cresta will be 68,000 kilowatts and at Pulga 80,000 kilowatts. These projects are scheduled for completion in 1943. They were authorized by the Commission after its defense power studies had clearly indicated the approaching need for a larger power supply in that region. It will be noted that the output from the Cresta and Pulga plants will be available to meet increasing power requirements before the Shasta project can possibly be completed.

The Pensacola project on the Grand River in Oklahoma, with an initial installation of 56,000 kilowatts, has just been completed, and the Kingsley Reservoir on the North Platte River, Nebr., which will regulate flow for use in downstream power plants having installed capacity of about 75,000 kilowatts, is well advanced toward completion.

The Bureau of Reclamation is installing three additional 82,500-kilowatt units in the Boulder Dam plant, two this year and the third in 1942. At the Parker Dam plant, on the Colorado River below Boulder Dam, four 30,000-kilowatt units will be installed, the first of which will be ready for operation by December 1941 and the last by July 1943.

LARGE WATER-POWER PLANTS CONTEMPLATED FOR EARLY CONSTRUCTION

Active consideration is now being given to construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Bull's Head project on the Colorado River between Boulder Dam and Parker Dam. The initial installation will probably be 180,000 kilowatts, and the project could be completed and ready for operation by July 1944. This project will provide usable storage of about 1,600,000 acre-feet.

The War Department now has authority to construct the Bluestone Reservoir project on the New River near Hinton, W. Va. The reservoir will be used in part for the production of power, and it is expected that provision will be made for the ultimate installation of 180,000 kilowatts. The initial installation has not as yet been deteremined. If construction work is commenced soon, as now seems probable, the project will be completed and ready for operation late in 1943 or early in 1944. The annual energy output from the Bluestone plant will be about 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

The merit of the Clark Hill project on the Savannah River above Augusta, Ga., has long been recognized, and it may be assumed that its construction will not be long deferred. An initial installation of 140,000 kilowatts at Clark Hill is contemplated, and the energy output therefrom, estimated at 550,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, will be of very high quality. The contemplated increase in power requirements in that region during the next 3 or 4 years, as forecast by the Federal Power Commission, is greatly in excess of the estimated output of the Clark Hill project. It seems desirable, therefore, that this excellent project be constructed with the least possible delay. Aside from power values, the flow regulation afforded by the Clark Hill Reservoir will be of great benefit to navigation in that the ordinary low-water flow of the Savannah River from Augusta to the sea will be more than trebled. The project will also make the city of Augusta more secure against flood damage.

It seems appropriate also to mention the large Wolf Creek Reservoir project on the Cumberland River, Ky., which is now receiving consideration, and where the power installation would probably be 240,000 kilowatts. The average annual energy output from this project is estimated at 800,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The Wolf Creek project is in reasonably close proximity to the Tennessee Valley, where power requirements have increased phenomenally during the past 8 years. By careful planning and timely construction of new power facilities, the Tennessee Valley Authority has thus far been able to provide a power supply adequate to meet all demands. The Authority is due much credit for this achievement. Action by the Congress placing the Cumberland River Basin under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority would seem logical.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER POWER

The project for development of the power available in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River is now receiving active consideration. The prospect that this preeminently meritorious project may advance to the construction stage at an early date should be of much satisfaction to the general public. Unfortunately, this country failed to take advantage of a rare opportunity to start construction of this project 6 years ago. It is gratifying, however, that the project now to be constructed will be more desirable as to general design than the one which might have been constructed at that time. It seems probable that provision will be made for the installation of about 860,000 kilowatts in each of the two power plants, one to be located on the United States side and the other on the Canadian side of the international boundary. The energy available annually from each plant will be in excess of 6,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and due to the remarkably steady flow of the St. Lawrence River, the output will be of very excellent quality, ideally adapted for use by industries requiring cheap power in large quantities for utilization at high-load factor.

POWER POTENTIALLY AVAILABLE AT AUTHORIZED FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

During the past 5 years the Congress has authorized construction by the War Department of numerous reservoirs in various parts of the country, primarily for the control of floods, but with the requirement that any power values that might be inherent in any such project be investigated; and has conditioned such authorizations upon provision being made for the future development of hydroelectric power at these flood-control projects, when found feasible and recommended by the Federal Power Commission and the Chief of Engineers. Many projects of this character have been investigated by the Commission since enactment of the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938. In a number of cases it has been found that with a reasonable increase in the project investment, immediate installation of power-generating facilities is justified. In other cases it has been found that by incurring nominal additional cost initially, provision may be made for the development of hydroelectric power in the future, if and when justified by conditions obtaining at any time. As a national policy, protection and conservation of water power, wherever it exists, seems wise beyond question. This observation becomes more impressive with the realization that the country's natural gas reserves may be practically depleted during the next generation, and with the prospect that coal prices will increase with the passing of time.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER IN ELECTRIC UTILITY SYSTEMS

The generating facilities of a great many of the major electric utility systems of the

United States consist of a combination of fuel-electric and hydroelectric plants. It is only in those situations where hydroelectric power cannot be had that such plants are not found in utility systems. The advantage of having hydroelecric plants for operation in combination with other sources of power, for supplying general utility loads, has been abundantly demonstrated by the experience of both the privately owned utilities and public power enterprises. It is not necessary to labor this question. It has long been settled by the best brains in the electric light and power industry.

Hydroelectric plants with considerable storage have unique value in power systems. With their customary large installations in relation to available primary energy, they are ideally adapted to peak-load operation and for emergency and reserve use. In a system emergency such as arises when, for one reason or another, large steam-electric units go out of operation suddenly and unexpectedly, a hydroelectric plant of the type now being discussed can begin delivering its full output capacity to the transmission system in a couple of minutes and continue capacity operation for hours and even days until normal operating conditions have been restored.

Capacity for low load-factor operation can be installed in such plants at moderate cost. As a rule, the characteristics of electric utility loads are such that a large amount of capacity must be kept available for carrying that part of the load represented by the upper portion of the load curve, and such capacity generates relatively few kilowatt-hours. Dependable and otherwise satisfactory capacity for service of this character can be obtained most economically by installing additional units in hydroelectric plants, provided hydro plants of suitable type are available in the system.

The comment just made, calling attention to the capacity value of hydro power, is valid regardless of whether or not sufficient water is available to permit of plant operation at a high capacity factor throughout the year, or even for a substantial part of the year. A certain part of the installation is provided for the express purpose of obtaining dependable capacity, with foreknowledge that such capacity will not produce a substantial amount of energy. It will be understood, however, that many hydro plants of this type are entirely suitable for supplying the power needs of industries which operate at high load factor, as, for example, the aluminum industry, which utilizes hydro power exclusively. In brief, many hydro plants are exceptionally valuable both for their capacity and their energy output, while others may derive their economic justification principally from their capacity value.

It is regrettable that efforts are occasionally made, without discrimination or reflection, to demonstrate that hydro power is uneconomical almost without exception, and that development of water-power resources stems from misinformation or faulty judgment. The bald facts controvert such contentions. Efforts of this kind constitute a disservice to the industry as well as to the general public, and indict the judgment and business sagacity of the ablest power engineers and executives in the country, both in private and public life. Nearly four-fifths of the hydroelectric installation in the country is in private ownership.

ELECTRIC POWER FOR PRODUCTION OF ALUMINUM

An ample supply of aluminum, the principal material required for the manufacture of aircraft, is vitally essential to the success of the national-defense program. The Bureau of Mines reported on February 4 that 412,560,000 pounds of new aluminum was produced in the United States in 1940, as compared with 327,090,000 pounds in 1939; and that, as indicated in a report issued by the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, the rate of annual output of this metal is expected to exceed 690,000,000 pounds by July 1941 and 825,000,000 pounds by July 1942.

Approximately 10 kilowatt-hours of electric energy is consumed in the production of each pound of aluminum. It may be assumed, therefore, that within the next 18 months the aluminum industry will be consuming energy at the rate of about 8,250,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. It appears certain, moreover, that regardless of the duration of the national emergency, the time is not far distant when the annual energy requirements of the aluminum industry will exceed 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. No future event can be predicted with greater certainty than that the airplane industry, as yet in its youth, will undergo enormous expansion during the next decade. By comparison, aircraft and air transportation are now about at the stage which had been reached by the railroads in 1860 prior to the great period of expansion during the 25 years immediately following the Civil War.

Due to the very heavy energy consumption in the processing of alumina, the unit cost of the metal output is very materially influenced by the cost of power used in its manufacture. In this connection, it is of significance that aluminum is manufactured in the United States only in those localities where an abundant and cheap supply of hydroelectric power is procurable. The power supply of every aluminum plant in the country comes from a hydro source, and new aluminum plants now to be constructed will utilize hydro power exclusively. We may well wonder what the situation as to aluminum supply would be at this critical time had not cheap hydro power been available in quantity during the development stage of this industry.

NEW GENERATING CAPACITY NOW BEING PROVIDED

At present additional generating capacity of about 4,400,000 kilowatts in steam-electric plants and nearly 2,000,000 kilowatts in hydroelectric plants is under construction or definitely planned for immediate construction. It does not appear that there will be much change in the ratio between the country's hydroelectric and steam-electric installations in the immediate future, and perhaps no great change over a longer range of years, although the hydro installation may, and perhaps well might, edge up until it more nearly approaches one-third of the total installation.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS

Hydroelectric energy generated at Niagara Falls is supplied, either directly or in combination with steam-electric energy, to numerous industries which manufacture products essential to the national-defense program, such products including aluminum and steel for aircraft manufacture and general construction; ferroalloys for the production of high-alloy steels; artificial abrasives for cutting and grinding; carbon and graphite electrodes for electric-furnace operation; calcium carbide, from which acetylene gas is derived; chlorine, for water treatment, bleaching, and other purposes; freight cars for the expanding railroad traffic; airplanes for the Army and Navy and for commercial use; and wire and cable for electrical machinery and appliances.

The Tennessee Valley Authority supplies hydro power, either directly or through its wholesale customers, to numerous industrial establishments, large and small, the products of which are of value in the national-defense program. As previously stated, both T. V. A. power and Bonneville-Grand Coulee power will be utilized extensively for the manufacture of aluminum.

The output of the 100,000-kilowatt Hawks Nest plant on New River, W. Va., not previously mentioned, is used exclusively for the manufacture of products of special significance in the national-defense program, and a substantial part of the Santee-Cooper output will be utilized in like manner.

New England is the scene of unusual industrial activity, due in large part to the national-defense program. Nearly all of the electric energy required in the State of Maine is generated in hydroelectric plants within that State, and a substantial part of the energy requirements of other New England States comes from hydro plants on the Connecticut and Deerfield Rivers.

The development of additional feasible water-power resources, as a bulwark to the national security, is unreservedly commended to the consideration of the industry and the public.

Throughout the country hydroelectric power, providing more than one-fourth of the available generating capacity, and supplying, from an inexhaustible resource, from one-third to two-fifths of all the electric energy generated for public use, is patently of prime importance from the viewpoint of our long-range national economy; and there is no gainsaying its value at this momentous time in the life of the Nation.

TABLE 1.—*Installed capacity in electric generating plants in the United States producing energy for public use*

Year	Total	Hydro plants	Fuel plants	Hydro plants, percent of total
	Kilowatts	*Kilowatts*	*Kilowatts*	
1920	14,372,009	3,786,595	10,585,414	26.3
1925	23,512,000	6,158,849	17,353,151	26.2
1930	34,055,319	8,941,020	25,114,299	26.3
1931	35,369,664	9,444,771	25,924,893	26.7
1932	34,991,317	9,582,009	25,408,308	26.6
1933	36,242,916	9,736,063	26,506,853	26.9
1934	35,791,072	9,741,739	26,049,333	27.2
1935	36,074,442	9,795,138	26,279,304	27.2
1936	36,564,442	10,436,493	26,127,949	28.5
1937	37,134,382	10,576,614	26,557,768	28.5
1938	39,042,105	11,066,063	27,976,042	28.3
1939	40,317,924	11,415,165	28,902,759	28.3
1940 [1]	41,576,000	11,550,000	30,026,000	27.8

[1] Preliminary.

TABLE 2.—*Production of electric energy for public use in the United States*

Year	Total	Hydro plants	Fuel plants	Hydro generation percent of total
	Kw.-hr.	*Kw.-hr.*	*Kw.-hr.*	
1920	43,334,282,000	15,949,050,000	27,385,232,000	36.8
1925	65,751,137,000	22,233,423,000	43,517,714,000	33.8
1929	95,925,226,000	33,190,745,000	62,734,481,000	34.6
1930	94,651,597,000	31,737,724,000	62,913,873,000	33.5
1931	90,728,821,000	29,579,863,000	61,148,958,000	32.6
1932	82,376,772,000	33,321,857,000	49,054,915,000	40.5
1933	84,736,229,000	34,058,562,000	50,677,667,000	40.2
1934	90,805,524,000	33,713,222,000	57,092,302,000	37.1
1935	98,464,073,000	39,034,152,000	59,429,921,000	39.6
1936	112,181,242,000	39,516,274,000	72,664,968,000	35.2
1937	121,836,813,000	44,489,183,000	77,347,630,000	36.5
1938	116,681,423,000	44,834,410,000	71,847,013,000	38.4
1939	130,336,050,000	44,021,631,000	86,314,419,000	33.8
1940 [1]	144,965,000,000	47,742,000,000	97,223,000,000	32.9

[1] Preliminary.

Mineral, Power, Land, and Water Resources of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

STATEMENT BY E. W. RISING BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement in regard to reclamation and mineral development in Idaho made by E. W. Rising, vice president of the Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation Project, Inc., before the Senate subcommittee conducting an investigation of the mineral resources of our public lands.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my congressional delegation and as the representative of Hon. Chase A. Clark, Governor of Idaho, I desire to present the following statement.

A study of Western resources would be incomplete, particularly a study with emphasis placed on mineral resources, without including data and directing attention to the great mineral, power, land, and water resources of Idaho.

Production of minerals is the oldest economic pursuit in Idaho. Early settlements of the State centered around the famous gold and silver strikes of the sixties. In late years Idaho has been the leading State in the production of lead, with peak production running as high as 400,000,000 pounds in a single year. Zinc, silver, gold, antimony, and tungsten are produced in quantities.

Most of our current production is in the highly developed areas near Coeur d'Alene in northern Idaho and not far distant from Sun Valley in southern part of the State. Between these two points there is a vast stretch of mountains 300 miles in length, that, while known to be highly mineralized, has hardly been scratched, due to lack of transportation facilities and developed power for mining operations.

Increased scope of the European war has brought keen realization to our Nation of her marked dependency upon foreign countries for materials and commodities which we have come to regard as necessary, and many of which are indeed essential to the tremendous defense effort which we are now putting forth.

Elimination of foreign sources of these materials is causing a painstaking and somewhat frantic search of the resources of our own Nation. The importance of some of these items is so great that a scarcity of them will greatly hamper our preparations for defense.

The emergency is forcing us to do something that we should have done years ago, and that is to make a thorough checkup of the Nation's resources and reserves. We don't know what we have, but we are hoping that we have the materials that we need. If we find that we do have these vital materials and that we can get the machinery of production into action in time to prevent a severe shortage, it can be attributed more to blind luck than to good management.

The western part of the United States is an untold mineral treasure house. The resources locked in the bosom of the earth have hardly been touched, even though mining has been one of our leading industries for three-quarters of a century or longer.

I am more familiar with Idaho than any of the other States and I am certain you will pardon me if I refer solely to that State. The mineral potentialities of Idaho are beyond the scope of present-date realization. We know minerals are there in large quantities, but we do not know exactly how much nor can we look into the future and see all the many beneficial uses to which science will eventually put them.

To illustrate my point, let me call attention to the gigantic phosphate beds that lie in the eastern part of the State. Phosphate here is literally on the surface; it can be mined with a power shovel such as is used for ordinary excavation. No one knows how vast it actually is, and the demand has never been sufficient to cause any extensive mining of the rock that is apparent, much less to bring about any worth-while exploration.

There are other instances, even of metals and minerals of strategic importance. A few months ago the Nation received the welcome news that Idaho could supply some tungsten, which was vitally needed because of the war and was becoming scarce for the same reason. The news went out that tungsten was discovered in Idaho.

The report was not exactly true. For years it had been known that tungsten existed in the district that is now producing, but we didn't know how much nor what was the quality. Some judicious and not too costly exploration has turned an unused piece of ground into a tungsten producer.

The same is possible with other minerals. Let us take antimony for an illustration. We know that antimony exists in the central section of the State, but there has never been any exploration worthy of the name nor any production until recently, except largely as a byproduct of other operations.

One might logically ask why has this production lagged? Why has there been no development or operation of known mineral deposits? The reason is simple. Under existing tariff schedules and transportation rates, these products could be laid down at the point of use from foreign sources cheaper than from Idaho. And the result of that was to make us dependent on overseas markets for products which are necessary to our civilization, while American sources lie unused.

There can be but little question that the time when it is obligatory on our Government to make a comprehensive survey of its mineral resources in the West has come. And such a survey should of course be made with a view to productive capacity, which includes power resources as well as mineral deposits.

Idaho is one of the Nation's most highly mineralized States. Gold was the lure that attracted her first citizens, and throughout her history mining has been a leading industry. The Coeur d'Alenes is one of the Nation's foremost producers of lead, silver, and zinc, and during this emergency these great deep mines are straining every energy for utmost production.

The tungsten source previously referred to, at Yellow Pine, has provided to be an operation of vast strategic importance. A large amount of badly needed tungsten will be available from that development. Another tungsten property is reported in the vicinity of May, east of Challis, and the report indicates that production capacity is the only thing holding down the quantity of tungsten from this operation. Low-cost power would be highly beneficial here in increasing production.

Important mercury discoveries have been made and one such property, near Weiser, is new in successful operation. Here again the ore is plentiful and the bottleneck is production capacity. Additional power and increased equipment would mean larger output.

Even on short notice the Idaho mineral districts are already supplying the Nation with badly needed ores, and yet the great heavily mineralized central section of the State has hardly been scratched. We have the word of competent mining engineers and geologists for that.

What can the Government do to help? There are two principal methods by which the Government can help: One is to assist in exploration of known deposits, which is so often a job beyond the financial resources of the ordinary prospector, and the second is to relieve the production-capacity bottleneck. This second item might be a lack of suitable and adequate machinery, it might be a lack of a transportation outlet, and it frequently is a lack of low-cost power.

Let me quote from a statement by Mr. R. R. Sayers, Director of the Bureau of Mines, with regard to the mineral importance of the Yellow Pine district:

"As a result of exploratory work by the Bureau of Mines in the Yellow Pine district during the past year and a half, the potential importance of the district from the standpoint of mineral reserves has been greatly increased. Surface exploration and diamond drilling during the past year and a half have indicated additional bodies of antimonial gold ore and important reserves of antimony ore and more recently deposits of high-grade tungsten ore. * * *

"The proposed road would aid in the exploration and development of mineral deposits in this region and provide year-round access by truck to the productive area. * * * The Bureau's engineers report that the summer road from Land Mark to Yellow Pine is in bad condition, and probably will require extensive repairs and maintenance within a short time to enable even summer hauling by heavy trucks."

Comprehensive cataloging of the mineral resources of the Western States by type, quantity, quality, and location of deposits would undoubtedly be of important industrial benefit as well as give us a concrete idea of the reserves that we could depend on in case of emergencies, such as the one which now exists. Private development could be encouraged by adequate tariff protection or quotas and in meritorious instances governmental assistance in financing. Production can be encouraged and increased by the provision of public facilities of transportation and power.

In the case of the Yellow Pine tungsten operation, referred to above, an adequate road is also badly needed. The present road, which connects the property with a railhead, goes over two high summits, with the result that for some 6 or 7 months out of the year it is impossible to haul any concentrates from this mine because of the deep snow. Construction of an adequate all-weather road to this mine would be of production value. And in this connection it might be interesting to you to know that the extent of this ore body has been proven by diamond drilling and that it has assayed as high as 5 percent tungsten trioxide, according to the Bureau of Mines, which authority goes on to say that ore assaying as little as 0.75 percent tungsten trioxide is regarded as commercial if

occurring in fairly extensive deposits. It might also be interesting to know that there are reliable indications of sizable antimony deposits in the same area. Antimony is, as you know, a strategic material, and I am told that the need was so great during the last war that antimony concentrates were brought out of the Yellow Pine district by dog team at a cost of something like 50 cents per pound. It does not seem reasonable that we would permit ourselves to be caught in the same predicament a second time. Obviously, since the other war we have been patronizing the foreign sources of tungsten and antimony, while our own deposits have lain idle and undeveloped.

ABUNDANCE OF POTENTIAL POWER

One of the first requirements for the successful development of a mining area today is an adequate supply of low-cost power. While the large mineralized zone of central Idaho is now without power-transmission lines, there lies undeveloped one of the greatest power reservoirs in the United States. No complete inventory of the total quantity of power available for development in this region has even been attempted. From the Bureau of Reclamation Report No. 43, in March 1940, I quote the following:

"No estimate is offered of the ultimate possibilities of power production in this area, as they would appear fantastic. A large part of the latent power resources of the United States lies in the basin of the Snake River under consideration. Fourteen major sites * * * will produce 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually of firm electrical energy for nonirrigation uses * * * permitting extensive development of new uses for electrical energy and export of power to areas adjacent to the basin; westerly to the Pacific coast and southeasterly to Utah, if desired."

Two hundred miles of transmission line running southeasterly from Lewiston, Idaho, will pass through the heart of the mineralized area of central Idaho, picking up en route, when developed, 1,500,000 kilowatts of firm power. The suggested line would make power available for the development of the large deposits of antimony and tungsten in the Yellow Pine district.

LAND RESOURCES

Just south of the highly mineralized area of central Idaho are a half dozen major power sites that will be developed in connection with irrigation projects and will supply another 400,000 kilowatts of power for the crescent-shaped area within the Snake River Valley. In this area there is 4,000,000 acres of land that can be brought under cultivation economically through irrigation. Diversion works and main canals have been constructed to reach 2,800,000 acres of this land; however, a number of storage reservoirs must still be constructed before the entire acreage is under full production. More than 1,000,000 acres of fine land for which no diversion has ever been made is available for irrigation and the resultant production when needed.

The great mineral storehouse of Idaho was tapped in the sixties when the Nation was urgently in need of gold to stabilize its currency. During the first World War huge quantities of lead, zinc, and other minerals and metals were supplied from Idaho's great mines and smelters, and in the emergency antimony was transported from an almost inaccessible region, in central Idaho.

Today Idaho is supplying huge quantities of lead and zinc critically needed for defense purposes, and could, with a little assistance, supply much if not all of the tungsten and antimony needed.

Let us not overlook the fact that from Idaho's irrigated and nonirrigated acres there is flowing a great stream of thousands of carloads of potatoes, onions, wheat, sugar, mutton, beef, dairy products, and other commodities, including wool, all of which are highly important in our all-out defense effort.

WHAT FEDERAL COOPERATION NEEDED

1. Cooperation in the building of 40 miles of access road to the mineralized area near Yellow Pine.

2. An allotment of investigation funds for a comprehensive survey of the mineral resources on the public lands of the State.

3. Construction of power projects and transmission lines into the mineralized area.

4. Construction of additional water-storage reservoirs to provide for the fullest possible production from our irrigated lands.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

STATEMENT OF S. C. LUSH, DEPUTY PRESIDENT, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of S. C. Lush, deputy president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Stephen C. Lush, and while my legal residence is in Minneapolis, Minn., I am located in Cleveland, Ohio, at the headquarters of the Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 820 Superior Avenue, West, and am now and have been for the past month handling the affairs of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen in the office of national legislative representative of that organization, located at 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. I have been assigned by President A. F. Whitney, of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, to appear before this committee and convey to you the position of our organization with regard to H. R. 4927, which would authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway project.

Our organization has a membership of more than 157,000 in the United States and Canada, made up of men engaged in train, yard, and dining-car service upon the railroads of those two countries, and, at the outset, may I say that our organization is not opposed to any waterway improvement which we believe is necessary for defense or for flood control, nor are we opposed to any technological improvements in the science of railroading which benefit the general public, notwithstanding the fact that today approximately 1,000,000 railroad employees are moving the same amount of traffic over the rails as was moved by twice that number a few years ago.

If the deepening of this channel is not necessary for defense—and we do not believe it is—American labor, particularly labor engaged in railroad transportation, is a victim of attack in this bill authorizing construction of the St. Lawrence waterway project.

However harsh this may sound, we believe the facts justify this statement:

First. The fact that construction of the project is, in effect, a subsidy to water transportation that will bring about reduction in hours of employment of railroad workers and workers in allied industries.

Second. The discriminatory character of the project, which will require labor in all sections of the country to contribute to the tax levies constituting the subsidy.

Third. The extent to which labor, particularly railroad labor, is required to finance this tax burden will in effect cause them to contribute to the reduction of man-hours of employment, and therefore reduction of wages in the railroad industry.

Fourth. The fact that labor not immediately affected by the project, in areas far removed from its immediate influence, will by taxation be required directly to contribute to an enterprise that will reduce the earnings of various divisions of labor—workers in transportation, coal mining, ore mining, steel and iron and numerous classifications.

Subsidies invariably work both ways. To the degree they promote the interest of one class or one section, they increase the burden of those who must pay the bill.

In the case of the St. Lawrence project, labor is required not only to pay a great proportion of the bill, but to do so out of reduced earnings in the chief industries of the country, particularly in the transportation industry, and to the members of our organization it will mean that they will be taxed to subsidize a competing transportation agency which will cause many of them to lose their present positions or to have only part-time employment after the present defense program has been finished.

This may be illustrated most graphically by considering the effect of the waterway upon two of our chief industries—transportation and coal mining—which, as it happens, are closely allied in the area traversed by the St. Lawrence waterway.

In that area a very large number of our membership are employed. They work on the railroads serving agricultural States and the Nation's principal industrial areas, and these railroads furnish services which are adequate to meet all demands placed upon them and potential demands of the emergency era, and I submit that these men are the highest type of American labor—home owners and workers who have a stake in the continued prosperity of their community and of the Nation as a whole.

Among other services, these railroads, or many of them, serve the Nation's great ore and mining industries, both of which are threatened by the waterway project. The extent of this threat is dependent upon the degree to which the waterway would be used for export and import traffic.

Proponents of the project do not emphasize the fact that traffic on that waterway would not be one-way traffic. That it will not be should be understood by all of those who will be affected by it.

Testimony before this committee has been introduced to try to convince us that we need not fear foreign ore, grain, coal, etc., as they will be kept out by high tariff, notwithstanding the testimony of Mr. Davis of Boston that for the past 5 or 6 years they have received an average of from 350,000 to 400,000 tons of foreign coal in that port and much of it from Russia.

I am wondering if this is not mere wishful thinking and about as reliable as the testimony which was introduced indicating that 85 ports on the Great Lakes were going to become ocean ports after the waterway was completed, notwithstanding the fact that many of them are similar to the Rocky River port, which we know barely has room enough to provide for the turning of a motor boat and is surrounded by high rock cliffs, or the great number of shipbuilding plants on the Great Lakes, 4 of which were supposed to be on the Cuyahoga River and Congressman BENDER states he could find only one.

Our Government thus far has provided subsidies amounting approximately to $2,-

176,000,000 for inland waterways. They compete for the most part with rail transportation, which employs our members. If we add an additional one-half billion dollars or more to such subsidies—for the ultimate cost of the project will undoubtedly reach or exceed that total—it will be done largely at the expense of labor in taxation, loss of employment and reduced earning capacity.

Right here may I say that I agree with Judge Culkin when he stated a few days ago that if the estimate given by General Robins of approximately $200,000,000 was not the correct cost of the project the people should know about it, and I believe that the people of the country, as well as the members of this committee, should know what this completed project is going to cost before giving the bill further consideration. I believe it is time that the true facts be given the people and not half truths.

I have either heard or read practically all of the testimony of witnesses before this committee and I do not recall one witness who has definitely stated what the cost of this completed project will be, except Mr. Hamlin, who gave an estimate of well over $1,000,000,000.

If a member of this committee were attorney general of a State having a "blue sky" law, I am wondering what action he would take if someone came into his State attempting to sell stock in a proposed railroad to run from Duluth, Minn., to Seattle, Wash. (approximately the same distance as from the sea to Duluth), and told the people of his State that this railroad could be built for $200,000,000 and also told these people that for the $200,000,000 they were going to be able to bring freight to and take freight from each and every town and city through which they were to pass, when in fact this figure only covered the cost of construction of the main line and did NOT take into consideration the fact that ground must be bought in the towns and cities for the purpose of erecting depots, shops, yards, etc., and that these depots, shops, yards, etc., must be built, which might well cost several times the amount necessary to build the main line. Gentlemen, this is exactly what the evidence appears to be which has been submitted to you favoring this project. They tell you the cost of the channel but are silent with regard to the harbors. I have failed to find any definite testimony as to the actual number of ports that will in fact be deepened to 27 feet.

Of course, we know that Judge Culkin has had put into the record the names of 85 lake ports, but no one seriously contends that any great percentage of them will be deepened to receive ocean-going boats, and, in fact, my recollection is that only 10 or 13 ports are suggested to be deepened, and while General Robins has estimated that the cost of deepening these ports will be $10,000,000, he does not state that he has made any study of the actual cost.

The engineer from Buffalo, N. Y., has testified that it will cost more than $45,000,000 to deepen that port alone. Therefore, I would say, gentlemen, that before giving this matter further consideration this committee and the people of the country should be advised of the actual cost necessary to deepen the channel and the ports and to know which ports they will be, as obviously it is economical to buy something at a certain price but uneconomical if it is going to cost several times that amount.

Such persons as Senator WAGNER, on the debate in the Senate on the treaty, said that the harbor improvements would be at least $200,000,000, which certainly does not agree with the $10,000,000 suggested by General Robins. Every dollar spent on water transportation increases competition between rail and water transportation, and this is a form of competition impossible to meet. There can be no comparison of rates between any railroad system and subsidized water carriers.

It is illuminating to study part II of the Department of Commerce report on the St. Lawrence project dealing with shipping service on the St. Lawrence. Aside from the intentions of the authors, the report clearly indicates the deflationary influence the waterway project would have upon labor's stake, their jobs on American railroads. No skill in subterfuge, no dexterity in mathematical calculation, can conceal the primary fact that the waterway will promote a form of competition with existing transportation systems by direct diversion and by splitting of traffic that will react upon labor in the railroad transportation field to the extent of millions of man-hours of employment, and therefore will result in reduced income to many thousands now employed in handling that traffic.

In respect to imports of foreign goods, the waterway would open a 27-foot channel to a rich production and consumption area which now draws its supplies from the industrial East. Foreign ships using the channel to transport bulk cargo to Europe would return laden with ballast cargo—foreign coal, ore, steel, iron, and partly fabricated iron and steel products. Even grains may be dumped in our markets. Such imports are not unknown. Mr. Davis told of the foreign coal at Boston, the mayor of Milwaukee told of iron ore delivered to Milwaukee, even with the present 14-foot channel, and we know of the iron ore now being brought to the east coast as ballast.

Europe will be quick to take advantage of the subsidy we will have granted her exporters. It is not difficult to illustrate the effect of such imports upon American labor and American industry, and particularly our members employed upon the railroads, both in the United States and Canada. The effect of these imports can be well illustrated by considering the effect upon transportation and the coal industry; both employ high-grade labor. At this point let me read to you a letter I received from our Dominion legislative representative, Mr. Kelly:

"Today the railroads transport millions of tons of coal to domestic consumers and to our chief foreign market for coal, Canada. Some 13,000,000 tons of bituminous coal are annually exported to Canada. The railroads have a highly profitable business in carrying bituminous coal to lake ports for transshipment to Canada, and a good proportion of the exports is hauled by rail across the international border line.

"Canada is virtually our sole export market for anthracite coal. Shipments approximate 2,500,000 tons annually. The exact figure in 1940 was 2,643,000 tons. A large proportion is hauled by rail direct to Canada and the balance is shipped to lake ports for transportation by water.

"It is unlikely any project ever proposed constituted so destructive a threat to the coal and transportation industries as the St. Lawrence waterway. By promoting increased imports of foreign coal from Great Britain, Germany, Russia, Indo-China, and other foreign competitors, it would cut into our Canadian export market and cause corresponding reduction in freight hauled by the railroads, with inevitable reduction of employment and wages in transportation and mining, with widespread ill effect upon the general economy.

"It is the opinion of those who have closely studied the St. Lawrence project that the bulk of west-bound cargoes would be coal, although I am not so certain that a considerable amount of the cargoes to the lower lakes might not also be foreign ore."

According to a newspaper article in the Minneapolis Star Journal of July 15, 1941, Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, said that two of the large steel companies, the Bethlehem and Youngstown people, have leased large areas containing low-grade ore and will soon begin large-scale mining, and he further states that the State of Minnesota has 57,000,000,000 tons of this ore and that it will be necessary to use seven times as much manpower to mine this ore as is required with the ore presently being mined. I am wondering how our people in northern Minnesota would expect to compete with the low-paid foreign labor and with transportation rates from Europe so low in some cases as to amount to virtually nothing to the free passage for ore used as ballast. American producers could not mine iron ore and coal and American railroads could not transport it under such competitive conditions.

Mr. O'Brien, chairman of the Port Defense Committee in Buffalo, testified that "some years as high as 158,000,000 bushels of grain are loaded to rail cars at Buffalo for export." These ocean-going bulk cargo boats would naturally not come to this country without ballast, and coal and iron would be the logical cargoes.

Importation of foreign ore and coal is but one example of the effect the St. Lawrence waterway would have upon railroad earnings and wages. Numerous foreign products would be dumped in American markets during those months of the year when climatic conditions would permit use of the waterway. Meanwhile, our members, despite unemployment during the summer months, would be required to stand ready to take up the transportation burden during the 5 months of the year when the St. Lawrence waterway would be ice-blocked.

There is sound opinion that one of the great economic problems of the country is an overabundance of transportation facilities. The development of great highways and motor vehicles has accentuated the problem of a highly competitive field of enterprise. During the period of national emergency, when abnormal industrial production requires increased transportation, this problem will be put in the background, but with the return of normal conditions it will again disturb our economy. To add the St. Lawrence to our already overexpanded transportation industry will merely intensify economic competition.

In 1937 our total ton-miles of transportation amounted to about 589,000,000,000 divided as follows:

Railroads	390,000,000,000
Great Lakes	93,000,000,000
Pipe lines	45,000,000,000
Highways	43,000,000,000
Inland waterways	17,000,000,000
Electric lines	697,000,000
Airways	2,000,000

The total undoubtedly has increased, particularly in highways, air lines, and pipe-line tonnages. All of these methods of transportation are susceptible of growth and immediate expansion to meet any emergency. There appears to be no sound reason for the completion of a waterway which would have the effect not only of cutting into the revenues of existing transportation but would promote foreign competition with the Nation's leading industries to the great disadvantage, in particular, of labor in all of its divisions.

They talk about building boats on the Great Lakes, yet it is admitted that only light cruisers can be built and floated out through the 27-foot channel, in addition to the boats which can now be taken through the 14-foot channel. One would be made to believe that there are a great number of shipyards on the Great Lakes available to build these larger boats. However, Admiral Rock testified that only 5 of the shipyards on the Great Lakes are capable of building light cruisers and that only 2 of those 5 are now large enough to do so.

Ships of this draft can now be built on the Mississippi River at considerable distance from its mouth and you will not have to wait for 3 or 4 years and a lot of luck to get them out, and if built on the

Mississippi they can be taken out at any time, as you will not even have to wait for the ice to go out, as you would if they were built on the Great Lakes, and certinly the 130,000 tons of steel, which would be required to build the seaway, will more than suffice for building the shipyards on the Mississippi.

There has been considerable testimony of the great benefits of cheap hydroelectric power to the people by enormous saving in electric bills, yet when this evidence is analyzed you find that such saving is only going to amount to a few dollars per year for the average person, and it is admitted that a great part of the electric power developed, should the St. Lawrence waterway be completed, will be sold to the aluminum industry, where each worker requires 320,000 kilowatt-hours per year, and I am sure that the members of this committee are not naive enough to think that any part of the power sold to the aluminum industry is going to reflect in the price of aluminum.

From the evidence submitted, it is quite apparent that the aluminum industry is going to be the only real beneficiary of this hydroelectric power, as the evidence has indicated they will get the bulk of it and that the other industries, where the employees only require 5,250 kilowatt-hours per year, will get little, if any. Therefore, we cannot understand the logic of these who contend that labor is going to be greatly benefited by the power developed on this project.

It is fine to talk about saving a few dollars a year for the storekeeper and oil-station man, as well as the laboring man on his electric-light bill, but will those few dollars saved each year by those individuals make it worth while to throw thousands of workers in the transportation industry, as well as other industries such as mining, into the bread lines after this emergency is passed? Will not the people be taxed not only to pay for the St. Lawrence waterway but also to feed those thousands in the bread lines?

Instead of being a defense project, as some of the proponents would have you believe, it is quite clear that the building of this seaway as this time would take thousands of skilled workers sorely needed by defense industries. General Robins testified that of the 10,000 men required to build the St. Lawrence seaway 8,000 would be skilled or semiskilled workers. Where are they to come from?

The New York Times of July 30, 1941, carried an article regarding the meeting of O. P. M. officials, the railroads, and railroad labor, at which meeting the O. P. M. requested the release by the railroads of 100,000 skilled workers to be used by the defense industries. The article states that many of the railroad officials at first said that this was impossible without impairing the operation of the railroads, but that later Mr. Sidney Hillman, Associate Director of O. P. M., had been advised that the railroads and railroad labor will do what they can to help the general defense movements, keeping in mind their first duty to make sure that there is no shortage of railroad transportation during this emergency.

Steam-shovel operators, cranemen, machinists, and many other skilled workers will be required on this work or in the construction of machinery to be used on the project who are now being used on the railroads and other defense industries.

You gentlemen should weigh all of these facts and, if you do, I am sure you can only come to the same conclusion we have reached.

The St. Lawrence waterway is only a dream that looks fine when you look only to the good and close your eyes to the bad, and we urge each and every one of you who have the interest of the workers at heart to vote against this bill.

Steam Versus Hydroelectric Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

STATEMENT BY H. F. McPHAIL BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement recently made by H. F. McPhail, Assistant Chief Electrical Engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation, before the Senate subcommittee which has been conducting an investigation of the mineral resources of our public lands.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Let me introduce my discussion of comparative costs of steam and hydroelectric power developments by saying that to me it is obviously absurd to claim that as a general thing hydropower is cheaper than steam power or that steam power is cheaper than hydropower. The experience of both utilities and Government agencies in the development of power has indicated that in practically all cases the maximum benefits are obtained by a combination of the two.

The cost of either hydro or steam power depends entirely upon local factors and is governed by plant designs, cost of fuel delivered at the site, cost of cooling water, cost of dam construction, and the length of transmission lines required to get the power to load centers. In some instances water power will be more economical than steam power, and in others the opposite will be true. Some situations require combination of the two types of power to balance the system. Through loose talk the impression has been gained that the Federal Government in its projects is pioneering water power and that utilities generally construct steam plants. These are erroneous conceptions. Several large utilities in areas where water power is readily obtainable have developed systems almost wholly dependent on hydroelectric power. Many Government systems will need steam power for balancing purposes.

Combination of steam and hydropower have been indicated by the tabulation of potential developments submitted by the Bureau of Reclamation.

In order that the comparative advantages of particular developments may be viewed with some basis for judgment, a study has been made to indicate how much money per kilowatt may be expended for hydroelectric developments without exceeding the cost of equivalent steam developments.

This study required the making of some assumptions. I submit, however, that these assumptions do not give an advantage either to steam or hydro generation. It was assumed that power from a hydro plant would be delivered to a point equivalent to the high-voltage bus of a steam plant and the permissible expenditures for the hydro development would include all necessary transmission-line costs involved to reach that point. It was assumed that the steam plant would be designed to burn coal, which means that under present conditions the plant would cost approximately $125 per kilowatt for an installation of 50,000-kilowatt capacity. The efficiency assumed for the steam plant was 10,800 B. t. u. per kilowatt-hour produced, which is equivalent to the results secured at the Port Washington plant on Lake Michigan, one of the outstandingly efficient steam plants in the United States. The cost of operation, maintenance, etc., also was based on the experience at the Port Washington plant. It was assumed that both the steam and hydro plants would be financed by the Government, and would be amortized in 40 years with interest at 3 percent. Coal for the steam plant was assumed to cost $2 per ton delivered at the plant if the plant were located at the mine and no transportation charges would have to be paid on the coal. The coal was assumed to contain 12,000 B. t. u.'s per pound as received. These conditions might be obtained in the Colorado-Wyoming-Utah area.

On the basis of these assumptions it was found that electric energy at the bus bar of a steam plant might be produced at a cost ranging from about 3.5 mills per kilowatt-hour at 50 percent load factor to 2.7 mills per kilowatt-hour at 75 percent load factor.

These costs, of course, do not represent possible sale prices for this power as the costs of transmission line, substations, and standby must be added before the sale prices can be determined. They form, however, a convenient and logical basis for comparison.

The annual costs connected with the operation of a hydroelectric development regardless of the plant output remain practically constant. Experience has indicated that plants of about 50,000-kilowatt capacity cost about $1 per year per kilowatt of capacity for operation and maintenance. When this cost of operation and maintenance, converted into unit cost per kilowatt-hour of output, is subtracted from the cost per kilowatt-hour of steam-generated power, a figure is obtained which represents the amount available for fixed charges for a competitive hydroelectric development. With $2 coal the study indicates that on a 50-percent load-factor basis, $300 per kilowatt can be expended for the hydroelectric system while on a 75-percent load-factor basis $330 per kilowatt can be expended without exceeding unit costs per kilowatt-hour of steam-generated energy.

If the steam plant was not located at the mine, however, and transportation costs were involved which increase the cost of coal to $3 per ton, the cost of the steam-produced energy would rise to 3.7 mills per kilowatt-hour on a 50-percent load-factor basis and 3 mills per kilowatt-hour on a 75-percent load-factor basis. The permissible expenditure from a competitive standpoint for hydroelectric developments would then be $335 per kilowatt on a 50-percent and $390 per kilowatt on a 75-percent load-factor basis.

When it is remembered that at Boulder Dam all costs represented much less than $200 per kilowatt of installed capacity, it will be readily seen that it is absurd to say that steam power always is the cheaper. When I say that the average costs of hydro plants which were included in the list of potential power developments presented by the Bureau of Reclamation would be less than $300 per kilowatt of installed capacity, even without segregation of costs for multiple purposes, it will be seen that Boulder Dam is not merely an exception, but that there remain many other potential hydro developments that are economically justifiable.

The figures used in working out this illustration took no account of irrigation, flood control, and related benefits which accompany all hydro developments of the Bureau of Reclamation and other Federal agencies. In reality, however, these benefits give an advantage, in many localities, to hydropower.

A steam plant, no matter how big, would not as an incidental of its operation irrigate the 615,000 acres of the Colorado-Big Thompson project in the State of Colorado; nor would it irrigate the 35,000 acres to which the Bureau of Reclamation is building ditches on the Kendrick project in Wyoming; yet hydro plants on these projects in the Big Thompson Canyon and at Seminoe Dam in Wyoming will make these developments possible through sharing costs.

Hydro power can help build the West in more ways than one. It is helping now through establishment of industries, utilization of minerals, irrigation of farms, reclamation of land, and in many other ways.

Just as the figures I used took no account of multiple benefits of hydro plants, they also took no account of the additional cost of transmission of power from the bus bar to market. In many instances, of course, hydroplants must be remotely placed. It does not follow that steam plants can always be located more advantageously, but I believe it is generally true that in most instances it will cost more to carry the hydro power to load center. That is merely another factor which must be considered when the two types of generation are being compared. The allowable expenditures I have indicated for hydroelectric developments include those necessary for transmission to a common delivery point.

Let us look at the situation from another angle. In the present emergency the facilities of all manufacturers of generating equipment are heavily loaded. This is more particularly true, however, of the facilities of those who make steam-generating equipment, which are affected not only by the requirements of power agencies but also by the requirements of the shipbuilding industry.

It is understood that the available facilities for the manufacture of steam equipment will require at least 5 years to make the apparatus now on order. Early priorities, if granted to the steam-power plant equipment ahead of other orders, would result in the delay of deliveries of equipment now on order for the propulsion of ships. Apparently with priorities of the rating of A–1c or higher 3 years or more will be required to secure large turbine generator units. While the manufacturers of hydroelectric equipment are also heavily loaded, their schedule is not nearly so severe and early priorities can be granted without interfering markedly with other defense requirements. With priorities of A–1c or better, apparently such equipment can be obtained within about 2 years.

The foregoing does not indicate that the Bureau of Reclamation is in any way adverse to the development of power by steam equipment. The contrary is true since this Bureau believes that well-balanced power systems designed to supply power in the western half of the United States should eventually have generating equipment of both characters. While no definite criterion can be laid down for the relationship between the two, the general experience of operating utilities in the State of California appears to indicate a relation of about 1 kilowatt of steam to 2 kilowatts of hydro capacity. As economic hydro developments are exhausted, the tendency toward steam will naturally be increased. The exhaustion point in most western regions is not yet approaching.

The long-range benefits from hydroelectric developments in connection with Federal reclamation projects have exerted great influence on the irrigation and settlement of public and other lands in the West. There are at least 10 Federal irrigation projects now in operation which were made feasible by inclusion of hydro features. Without the contribution made by revenues from power toward repayment of project costs great areas of public lands in the States of Arizona, Idaho, Nebraska, Utah, and Wyoming, would probably have remained undeveloped.

The Boulder Canyon project which met critical industrial and agricultural needs in the Pacific Southwest was deemed to be financially solvent by reason of the power produced at Boulder Dam. The over-all cost of Boulder Dam with 1,322,000 kilowatts installed will be $140,000,000, or an average of $106 per kilowatt. Even after including the cost of transmission to Los Angeles, estimated at $40 a kilowatt, the average capital cost of this power delivered at the metropolitan load center, 250 miles distant, is less than $150 per kilowatt.

Power is to pay a substantial part of the construction costs of the Shoshone and Riverton projects in Wyoming. In the case of the Kendrick project in that State more than 80 percent of the cost will be borne by power.

On the Shoshone project, a relatively small plant of 5,600 kilowatts is paying for the segregated cost of the $1,850,000 dam. This is about $330 a kilowatt. The power costs are about 15 percent of the project costs, and power will pay about 25 percent of the investment.

The Kendrick project on the North Platte River in Wyoming, with the Kortes development now planned included, will represent an investment of approximately $400 per kilowatt. The amount the irrigation interests will pay is equivalent to $48 a kilowatt, leaving the net capital costs chargeable to power at about $350 a kilowatt.

With respect to the $54,288,000 Colorado-Big Thompson project, $25,000,000 has been allocated to irrigation; power will pay the rest with interest. The installed capacity will be 181,600 kilowatts. This makes the average cost, without considering the irrigation allocation, about $300 per kilowatt. Considering the irrigation allocation, which is fairly made, the cost will be reduced to less than $160 per kilowatt.

The power features of certain large projects now under construction offer a striking example of the combination and interdependency of power and irrigation. The Columbia Basin project, for example, is estimated to cost $435,000,000 when completed. It will irrigate 1,200,000 acres of land, and will have a power plant of a capacity of 1 974,000 kilowatts. The over-all cost of this power is slightly less than $221 a kilowatt. Without inclusion of the power features, this great development which eventually will add 350,000 people in a new rural section in the State of Washington could not have been undertaken. With the inclusion of the power facilities, we now find Grand Coulee Dam playing a vital role in defense activities.

On the Central Valley project where hydro power will be produced only at the Shasta and Keswick Dams, and steam power is proposed at a plant near Antioch, the over-all cost of the project represents an investment equal to about $440 per kilowatt of capacity. This project serves nearly 2,000,000 acres of land and makes material contribution to flood control, and navigation improvement on the Sacramento River, and will provide a fresh-water supply for municipal and industrial users along the south side of Suisun Bay.

Altogether there are now about 4,500,000 persons in the West dependent for more than half of their power from these Federal multiple-purpose projects. With the full installation of the capacity of the plants, in operation and under construction, more than 9,000,000 persons will be served at least a part of their supply.

Steam and hydropower form a useful team, and certainly hydro power has teamed well with irrigation and other water-conservation activities in the development of the West. There is every reason to believe it will continue to be so in the future with public benefits being spread ever wider.

Bureaucratic Ambitions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, the President has returned without his approval the bill passed by the Congress looking toward the construction of highways considered essential to the national defense. I have studied carefully the veto message and have weighed the arguments advanced for and against overriding that veto.

Were I persuaded that the course of the President would result in any real economy and at the same time not endanger our defense efforts, I would join with those who feel that the Presidential disapproval should be sustained. But I have not been able to reach this conclusion. On the contrary, I am fearful that the purposes of the President are based on motives entirely independent of any effort to economize. In coming to this conclusion, it is but natural that I have been influenced to some extent by the course of conduct of the administration in its fiscal affairs.

To select one measure, Mr. Speaker, and to manifest a real concern over expenditures in connection with that program, and at the same time to show an utter disregard of care or caution in the general operations of government, is hardly convincing insofar as an economy effort goes.

It would appear that the chief objection to the legislation is the administrative privileges which the States could exercise were the bill to be enacted. The trend toward the centralization of Government; the effort to make the States impotent; the vesting of ever-increasing discretionary powers in the hands of the executive branch of the Federal Government; have been apparent to all. If Washington bureaucracy were permitted to dictate the program embraced in this measure, I doubt whether any objection would be heard.

I believe that the States could and would cooperate in a program by which the defense purposes would be served, and that the construction of much of the needed highways could be completed with expedition, and at a cost much less than that which will be spent under the operations of a Federal supervised project. We have had more than ample evidence of the excessive costs of construction under W. P. A. No savings can be anticipated in this program with the gigantic Federal machine, loaded as it is with patronage privileges, doing the work. I believe that the State of Pennsylvania, with private contractors directing the operations, will do its part in linking together the units of a defense highway system. As a representative of

the Keystone State, I know that Pennsylvania is a most important factor in the defense program, and that the ultimate security which is intended to be advanced by a highway system will be attained if my State is permitted to do its share rather than have its part determined by the autocratic decision of an already too powerful Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, the issue here is not economy. The issue here is bureaucracy. I have been fearful from the earliest days of the administration of the drift toward centralization of power. Alphabetical agencies have appalled me as they have grown day by day. Vanishing States' rights have disturbed me. I cannot reconcile myself to this further effort to implement bureaucratic ambitions.

Mail Handled Under Congressional Frank

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BOEHNE, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, an editorial appeared in the Washington Daily News, which editorial was probably syndicated throughout the United States, a part of which reads, as follows:

Mail handled under congressional frank in the fiscal year 1940—the latest for which figures are available—would have cost $745,992, if postage had been required.

I think the American people would probably be interested in having some additional figures, which the press of the country declines to print, and it is my guess that my statement today will be answered with a lot of sarcastic and derisive remarks, but I will wager that the figures which I will now give to you will not be given the same prominent display on the editorial pages.

The largest loss to the Post Office Department is occasioned by the subsidies granted second-class mail matter, of which the daily newspapers are the largest component part. The following figures are taken from cost ascertainment reports of the Post Office Department for the same year 1940.

Publications exempt from zone rates on advertisement portion, $16,290,550; daily newspapers, $26,909,225; newspapers other than dailies, $12,892,216; all other publications, $22,442,250; free in county, all publications, $7,020,974; total for year 1940, $85,555,224 plus.

The reports further show that in 12 years second-class mail matter has received a subsidy of $1,079,490,416, or an average of about $90,000,000 a year. At the same time for a period of 11 years, the franking privilege for Members of Congress has totaled $6,761,217, or an average during those 11 years of $613,656.

Of course, we have heard the age-old argument about the freedom of the press and all that that implies. But it seems to me that it comes with mighty poor grace on the part of the press of the country to be vociferous in denouncing Members of Congress for the use of the franking privilege on the one hand and being guilty of receiving a huge subsidy on the other.

The Daily News has done a real service in indicating the necessity of an investigation of who is getting free mail service and at what cost.

Recruiting of Men in Civilian Conservation Corps

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from one of my constituents who is in Maine, including an editorial from the Camden Herald, in which they announce that the C. C. C. is so short of men that they are conducting a recruiting drive.

Last week this House passed a large tax measure for defense. It seems to me high time the burden of nondefense spending should be reduced and taken off the backs of the taxpayers, so that we could really spend money on defense. They are trying to recruit eighty or ninety thousand men for the C. C. C. and cannot do it because they find they are either employed or in the Army. To spend Government money on that kind of effort is an outrage to the citizens of this country.

The letter and editorial are as follows:

CAMDEN, MAINE, *July 25, 1941.*

Hon. J. C. BALDWIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BALDWIN: Although in Maine for the summer, I am one of your constituents in New York and should like an explanation of the enclosed clipping. I was under the impression that the Civilian Conservation Corps was one of the relief organizations to take unemployed young men off the streets. I should think the taxpayers might be relieved of 80,000 or 90,000 young men to be supported if they are now in factories or the Army. It seems to me it would be wise to let the Civilian Conservation Corps diminish so that after the armament program is over there will be some place for these young people to go when times again are slack.

Yours sincerely,

HARRIET MUNDY.

[From the Camden (Maine) Herald of July 24, 1941]

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS IN SLUMP, OPENS DRIVE FOR RECRUITS

Short of men for the first time in its 8 years of existence, the Civilian Conservation Corps has opened an intensified recruiting drive for new enrollees in all nine corps areas of the country, it was announced yesterday.

Permitted to have a total of 300,000 men in the Civilian Conservation Corps, authorities disclosed that there were probably only 210,000 to 220,000 now on the national rolls. Recruiting of new men has been unprecedentedly slow and discouraging, and while the 80,000 to 90,000 shortage in the total enrollment is unusually small for the service, authorities are pessimistic and in many cases frankly puzzled over the problem presented by the failure of additional young men to join the ranks.

In the past, ever since its founding in April 1933 and until the first months of this year, the Civilian Conservation Corps has been one of the most popular branches of Government service, and consequently the recent slump in recruiting has been partly attributed to increased employment activities in defense, although officials expressed the belief that national defense and Army enrollments could not be completely responsible for the sudden loss of popularity.

Teaching of the Spanish Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

LETTER FROM ALBERT R. SUTTER

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter which I received from the University of Buffalo advising me of their plans to institute a course of study for the people of Buffalo for the purpose of acquainting them with the Spanish language and civilization in conformity with our national policy of South American unity and because of international circumstances. I thought other Members of Congress, after reading the letter, might feel this to be a good plan for colleges in their own districts.

The letter follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO,
MILLARD FILLMORE COLLEGE,
August 5, 1941.

The Honorable JOHN BUTLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUTLER: In conformity with our strong national policy of hemispheric unity, and because of international circumstances, the Millard Fillmore College of the University of Buffalo has decided to institute a series of Spanish studies for the people of Buffalo. For long our regular students on the campus have been able to acquaint themselves with the Spanish language and civilization. But to achieve true unity and understanding between ourselves and our good neighbors to the south many more people must be made aware of Hispanic-American culture than the few who have the time and money to pursue regular campus courses. Recognizing this fact, the faculty of Millard Fillmore College has decided to put Spanish within the reach of every working person in Buffalo by organizing our evening classes; we plan to make the Spanish language and the people who speak it not merely a subject for the elite, but a living vital thing for our community, for every citizen of Buffalo who has the desire to promote his

own knowledge and to aid his country in its policy of hemispheric unity and understanding.

Beginning in September the college is offering both elementary and advanced courses in Spanish—that is, courses suitable for everyone. These courses are to be taught with the most up-to-date and interesting methods we can devise; they are to be augmented with instruction in every phase of Latin-American civilization as our students progress. Our instructors, having long devoted themselves to Spanish studies both here and abroad, have not only the learning but the affection for their subject which is necessary to inspire the student. And there is the crux of the matter—our whole aim is to interest and to inspire the student, as well as to teach him, so that each one not only will turn his own attention actively toward the south, but also will become an aggressive promoter of community interest in Pan American culture and unity.

The Millard Fillmore College believes that in establishing this series of Spanish studies it is fulfilling a need in our community as well as its duty toward the national policy. As one of the active designers of our national policies, and as a fellow Buffalonian who has always advanced the best interests of our community, we earnestly ask if our program at the college has your full approval.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT R. SUTTER,
Instructor in Spanish,
Millard Fillmore College.

A Republican Declaration of Present-Day Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CROWTHER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

POLICY ADOPTED AT CONFERENCE OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take this opportunity to call attention to the following declaration of policy which was adopted at the conference of Republican Members of Congress which was held in this chamber yesterday:

REPUBLICAN DECLARATION OF POLICY

The Republican Members of the House of Representatives, believing that the people of the United States are entitled to a definite expression of our views on national defense and foreign policy, hereby declare:

PARTY PLATFORM PLEDGES MUST BE KEPT

1. We reaffirm the pledge of our 1940 party platform: "The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war." We approve the restatement of this principle subsequently written into the 1940 Democratic Party platform: "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack." We demand the fulfillment of these pledges.

CONDEMN EXECUTIVE WAR MOVES

2. We reaffirm the declaration in our party platform: "We condemn all Executive acts and proceedings which might lead to war without the authorization of the Congress of the United States."

INSIST ON STRONG NATIONAL DEFENSE

3. We reaffirm the declaration of our party platform, as follows: "Our national defense must be so strong that no unfriendly power shall ever set foot on American soil. To assure this strength our national economy, the true basis of America's defense, must be free of unwarranted Government interference." We firmly believe in maintaining and upholding the Monroe Doctrine and safeguarding this hemisphere from foreign invasion. We insist that our national defense be strong enough to accomplish these objectives.

LEND-LEASE MUST BE KEPT SHORT OF WAR

4. The lend-lease policy was presented to the American people as a measure short of war. We insist that it be administered as a short-of-war measure.

THE ROAD TO NATIONAL UNITY

We are convinced that this declaration of policy is overwhelmingly supported by American public opinion, and that such a program will assure the greatest possible degree of national unity and security.

Tyranny in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

LETTER OF J. A. SMITH, PRESIDENT, INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM AND CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION, AND ARTICLE BY BYRON C. HANNA

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of J. A. Smith, president, Independent Petroleum and Consumers Association, and an article by Byron C. Hanna, entitled "Tyranny in Action":

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM & CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., June 12, 1941.

To the Members of the Senate:
To the Members of the House of Representatives:
To the Members of the California Legislature:
To the California Newspaper Publishers:
To the California Oil Producers:

DEAR SIRS: Last Saturday morning oil producers of the State of California were summoned to appear before two youthful officials of the O. P. A. C. S. to justify the recent adjustment in the price of crude oil.

Apart from the question of prices; disregarding the fact that the dictatorial order of the young bureaucrats has since been overruled to give them time for further study, we believe American citizens everywhere will be shocked and alarmed at the high-handed methods appointed officials of the Government are using in attempting to dictate to the California oil industry—an industry which has already shown its ability to produce and supply petroleum products far beyond the greatest conceivable demands of civilian and military needs.

Members of the press were ordered from the room as soon as the two young administrators took their chairs and plopped feet upon the tables.

The story carried by the San Francisco Chronicle is perhaps the best information obtainable—except for a so-called press conference the bureaucrats held after the meeting—the reporters were forced to interview witnesses as they entered or left the room.

Where, we ask, are our President's four freedoms starting with "We will accept only a world consecrated to freedom of speech."

It should start at home.

A reading of Byron C. Hanna's Tyranny in Action (enclosed) should jar us all into concerted action and "exercise unceasing vigilance to prevent our domestic governmental procedure from degenerating into totalitarianism."

This question goes far beyond the interests of the oil companies of the State. The pattern, if not stopped, can be laid down on any industry—any endeavor in the United States—your own business or profession.

Imagine being called to "submit appropriate data * * * since the office contemplates affirmative action." You submit your data and answer the questions emerging from behind the cigarette. Trying to hide his confusion and lack of knowledge, your politico questioner acts amused.

Stalin-like, he has removed the representatives of the press; he has ordered but one set of the minutes of the hearing and, though you do not know it, he already has his orders. His boss in Washington has told him what his conclusions are to be even before he hears your testimony.

He hears your evidence; there are those present who testify that if conditions in your particular enterprise are worsened, they face certain bankruptcy. He offers no rebuttal; but he announces you are wrong.

What is this kind of cooperation our Government is asking?

Such a demonstration proves they demand nothing short of absolutism, complete control, unquestioned acquiescence from all.

How can there be any kind of harmony—any working together for the common good—the common defense of our Nation? Where is the leadership? Where are we to place our trust in the light of these actions?

To not cooperate they would undoubtedly call revolting. To revolt against these circumstances, we insist, is simply to maintain our constitutional rights and freedoms—freedom of expression, the right to worship, freedom from want and terrorism.

Very truly yours,

J. A. SMITH,
President, Independent Petroleum and Consumers Association.

TYRANNY IN ACTION

(By Byron C. Hanna)

CALIFORNIA OIL PRODUCERS VICTIMS OF ARBITRARY ADMINISTRATION

Introduction

Note: This memorandum is written in the hope that it may serve some part in righting a grave injustice done at San Francisco on June 7, 1941, by representatives of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, to the many thousands of citizens of California interested directly and indirectly in the production of oil.

BYRON C. HANNA.

While engaged in the stupendous undertaking of preparing ourselves to extend a measure of protection to democracy throughout the world, it is of vital importance that we exercise unceasing vigilance to prevent our domestic governmental procedure from degenerating into totalitarian action. The following incident forcefully illustrates the necessity of such vigilance.

The Standard Oil Co. of California occupies such a dominant position in the petroleum industry in this State that prices and policies established by it readily become the prevailing practices in the industry.

In the spring of 1940 the Standard Oil Co. reduced the price of gasoline 1½ cents to 2½

cents per gallon and made substantial reductions in the prices of all grades of crude oil which had theretofore obtained in the State of California for a period of over 4 years. Subsequent experience demonstrated that these price reductions were unjustified and were detrimental to the public interest. During the ensuing period increased consumption of fuel oil (heavy crude oil), due in substantial part to expanded employment of Diesel engines, largely decreased the storage inventories of such oil in the State of California.

To meet this situation, in March 1941 the Standard Oil Co. of California readjusted prices for crude oil, decreasing prices to be paid for the lighter crude oils, and increasing the prices to be paid for heavy crude oils. On April 24, 1941, a further adjustment was made, involving increases in prices for practically all types of crude oils; and on May 23, 1941, a further and additional adjustment was made, involving similar increases.

On April 24, 1941, and again on May 23, 1941, the price of gasoline was increased ½ cent per gallon, a total increase of 1 cent per gallon.

The important point to be observed is that these adjustments and increases fell considerably short of restoring the price levels in effect before the reductions in the spring of 1940, and for more than 4 years prior thereto.

The action

On May 31, 1941, a telegram was forwarded to approximately 30 firms and individuals engaged in the oil industry in the State of California, reading as follows:

"You are requested to have representative your company present early a. m. Room 540, State Building, Civic Center, San Francisco, Saturday, June 7, to confer with representatives this office respecting recent price advances California crude. Please be prepared to submit appropriate data since this office contemplates affirmative action. Will wire specific time later.

"LEON HENDERSON,
"Administrator OPACS."

It will be observed:

(a) That this telegram makes no mention of any inquiry into gasoline prices.

(b) That no suggestion is made of any special formula to be applied in determining the justification for the recent price adjustments.

The hearing

Pursuant to the foregoing telegram, members and representatives of firms and individuals invited, as well as numerous other oil producers, gathered at San Francisco on June 7, 1941, at the conference referred to.

The representatives of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply attending this conference were Dr. J. K. Galbraith and Mr. Quinn Shaughnessy. These representatives are young men, youthful and immature in appearance and obviously devoid of practical experience in commercial or industrial affairs.

The following proceedings are specifically noted:

Item 1: A group of small producers from Kern County, who had found themselves in a desperate condition as a result of the price reduction in the spring of 1940, voluntarily attended the meeting for the purpose of making known the adversity with which they had been afflicted. They were informed that since they had not been invited they would not be permitted to be present. Police were summoned, and they were authoritatively escorted from the room.

Item 2: Although the proceedings of the conference were of great public interest, representatives of the press were excluded from the room.

Item 3: A careful scrutiny was established of the credentials of those applying for admission. Although the hall of the State Building was packed with a vast number of interested citizens, many of whom had come from considerable distances to be present on this occasion, only a few of these obtained access to the conference.

Item 4: The conference had been set to be held at 11:30, but the representatives of the price administrator did not appear until about 11:50.

The hearing proceeded until 1:05 p. m., at which time it was announced that an adjournment of 30 minutes would be taken for lunch.

A mad scramble ensued to get a sandwich and a cup of coffee and return within the brief time limited. Notwithstanding the effort of those in attendance to be punctual, the representatives of the price administrator did not again appear until 1:50.

Item 5: The hearing continued until approximately 5 p. m. Although the time allowed to assemble data had been very brief, a large amount of documentary evidence was presented by those in attendance. This evidence was uncontroverted and conclusively demonstrated the following facts:

(a) That a large portion of oil produced in the State of California comes from approximately 10,000 wells of small production. A large proportion of these wells is owned by various citizens of moderate means, and many thousands of citizens are interested by reason of ownership as land owners, or otherwise, in royalties accruing from the production of these wells.

(b) That the cost of producing oil in practically all of the wells above referred to is in excess of the present partially restored prices for crude oil, and that even large producers cannot operate profitably in the production of oil on the present price basis.

(c) That as a result of the foregoing, incentive for exploration and development of additional oil reserves has been greatly impaired, and such activities have been seriously decreased.

(d) That recent increases in costs of materials, labor costs, and taxes, involved as expense in the production of oil, have been substantial, ranging, according to estimates supplied by different producers, from 12 to 20 percent. (About May 1, 1941, a general increase of 5 percent in wages was made effective in the oil industry in California.)

(e) That intelligent, forward-looking action on the part of the oil industry in California has given that industry the capacity to meet any demands which the present emergency or any conceivable future emergency may make upon it; and that it is now and has been at all times completely and adequately prepared to discharge its responsibilities in the defense program.

Item 6. Let it be especially emphasized that there was not a word or a suggestion of conflicting or dissident evidence introduced. The testimony produced from a large number of different sources, and spontaneously given without opportunity for collaboration, conclusively established the necessity and justification for the recently adjusted prices.

Item 7. Upon the conclusion of the hearing, application was made for permission to obtain a transcript of the evidence introduced, a reporter having been present throughout the proceeding.

In response to this application, it was announced that it was against the policy of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply to permit such transcripts to be obtained, but that further consideration would be given to that subject, and permission might be granted later to obtain such transcript.

The thunderbolt

Upon conclusion of the foregoing, but without examination of the documentary evidence introduced, to the complete and utter amazement of all of those present, Mr. Shaughnessy arose and made the following announcement:

(a) That before this conference a letter had been forwarded to the Standard Oil Co. of California requesting that company to cancel the price adjustment of May 23, 1941. (The letter was received by the Standard Oil Co. after it had sent out its price announcement and at a time when it was too late to alter its commitments.)

(b) That before leaving Washington Dr. Galbraith and Mr. Shaughnessy had been instructed by Mr. Leon Henderson to request the cancelation of the price adjustment of May 23, 1941, unless it should appear that said price adjustments were necessitated by recent increases in costs of operation.

(c) That Dr. Galbraith and Mr. Shaughnessy were primarily interested in the question last referred to, and were not so much concerned with the basic factor that irrespective of recent operating costs the previously existing prices were too low and were inadequate to maintain a healthy condition in the industry.

(d) That the evidence produced had not clearly shown to the satisfaction of Dr. Galbraith and Mr. Shaughnessy that the price adjustment of May 23, 1941, was made necessary by recent increases in cost of operations, and that the data upon that subject were insufficient.

(e) Mr. Shaughnessy thereupon addressed to the Standard Oil Co. of California a specific request to forthwith cancel the price adjustment of May 23, 1941, including the increase in the price of gasoline as of that date, until the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply could study the problem further and determine whether to approve of the price adjustment of May 23, 1941.

Comment

The decision thus rendered involved a request to cancel the increase in the price of gasoline of May 23, 1941. No notice had been given of any intention to consider this subject at this conference.

Additionally, the decision was based upon the special formula of confining the subject of consideration to recent increases in the cost of operation, and no notice had been given of the intention to thus limit the deliberation.

The decision rendered was contrary to the overwhelming and conclusive evidence which had been produced in good faith and with considerable effort by those who were invited to the conference.

There was not the slightest basis in the evidence to support even a suspicion that the price adjustments of April and May 23, 1941, were not wholly justified and essentially required to maintain a reasonably healthy condition in the industry.

In this respect the evidence produced was wholly ignored, and the oil producers of California were condemned solely upon the strength of a prevailing and wholly unwarranted prejudice.

While the decision, which was in the form of a request to the Standard Oil Co. of California, may appear somewhat innocuous, there are existing circumstances which invest this request with the character of a peremptory order.

The Standard Oil Co. of California is a party defendant with other oil companies in an antitrust prosecution now pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia entitled *"United States of America, plaintiff,* v. *American Petroleum Institute et al., defendants,"* being civil action No. 8524. Under date of June 3, 1941, Attorney General Jackson advised Secretary of the Interior Ickes that further negotiations with respect to any consent decree which might be proposed in that case would be submitted to Secretary Ickes.

The existence of this situation is a circumstance which the Standard Oil Co. of California may well consider deprives it of the liberty to act freely in response to this request.

Defense Highway Act of 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt's veto of the $320,000,000 highway bill should be sustained. He said in his veto message:

The critical deficiencies in highways and bridges that may require prompt correction in the interest of our national defense cannot be reasonably related to the population of States or the other factors which enter into ordinary apportionment. The result, therefore, is the necessity for the appropriation of a far larger sum of money to meet immediate requirements than would be necessary if these funds were applied to critical deficiencies without the apportionment method. In fact, it is quite possible that the most critical deficiencies in some areas may not be corrected even with the sum authorized in this bill. I am unable to approve this method of expending money for the immediate national defense and for which I recommended a total of $25,000,000 without apportionment.

The bill really follows the "business as usual" plan for highway construction, in the face of the fact that this was supposed to be an emergency war-defense highway bill for the construction of highways near defense projects to facilitate the movement of supplies, troops, materials, and so forth.

I shall vote to sustain the President's veto because, in effect, the veto cuts out $150,000,000 of nondefense spending.

Somewhere, sometime, a halt must be called to spending. We cannot cut down on expenditures necessary for defense. But the bulk of the projects covered by this highway appropriation, desirable as each separate project may be, are not essential for defense. It will be possible to build all essential military access highways without the enactment of this bill.

Even if we could afford the money for the highways proposed in this bill, they could be constructed only at the cost of delay and weakening of our defense effort. We are learning that we cannot have business as usual. We must economize on gasoline, on new automobiles, on phonographs, on electric washers, on silk stockings, on a growing list of commodities which in ordinary times we consider essential.

Vast new expenditures for defense will soon be asked. In today's press it is predicted that before the end of the year there will not be a jobless man in America. Every man now idle will be drafted into defense industries. Where, then, would we find the men for building these proposed highways, even if we could spare the money and the materials?

In this morning's press also the American Federation of Labor calls for a $600,000,000 housing program for workers in defense industries. This figure may be exaggerated somewhat, but we all know that these vast new factories now being constructed must include housing for the workers. This task will demand all in the way of money and of labor and of materials that we can spare from actual armament work.

In the matter also of providing the needed additional power to make these war industries move, we must spend billions in money and employ hundreds of thousands of workers.

First things must come first. Our supreme task now is to make America so powerful, to extend such overwhelming aid to the nations fighting against Hitlerism, that Hitler shall be stopped the other side of the Atlantic and the Mikado be prevented from realizing his dream of dominating the Pacific.

After those jobs have been done it will be time to consider the big problem of modernizing our highway system.

As I said, the veto message saves at least $150,000,000. I shall vote to sustain the President.

My Solution for Drought in the Dairy Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, OF NEW YORK

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I made recently over station WAGE, Syracuse, N. Y.

Men and women of up-State New York, tonight I am going to talk in particular to the farmers of this great State. That does not mean, however, that the problems of the dairy farmer should not be considered by the many thousands of city folk listening in at this time. Therefore, I feel sure that both rural and urban audiences will give ear to this message.

The last few years of flood and drought and economic barrenness of the New York State dairymen have appeared to me like the 7 lean years which visited Pharaoh's people in the land of Egypt. Just as those ancients were besieged by pestilence and famine, so today are we in this section of the country continually handicapped by year after year of scarcity. The New York milkshed should be the most prosperous dairy country in the world, but unfortunately a chain of circumstances has appeared which deny us this distinction.

If I were to go into some of these matters and discuss them thoroughly, the short time allotted to me tonight would be insufficient to cover more than a few points in the whole milk problem of today. Then, too, by making statements of opinion I would be stepping on the toes of individuals and groups who by their close contact with the dairy industry are in a position to know much more about the whole affair than I am. Therefore, I will refrain from becoming involved in any questions such as debating the existing prices of milk except to say that they are inadequate. Nor could I do justice in a few short sentences to the subject of the milk-marketing order and amendments. Just about every factor in the present scheme of things seems to have some bearing on the situation the farmer finds himself in.

For the first 2 years of the last 7 our part of the country has been ravaged by floods. Since then, in rapid succession, there has followed a series of droughts which have dried up the good earth and devastated the crops on nearly every farm. Coming this year with a serious shortage of farm labor and an increase in wages to that labor, the drought has well-nigh prostrated the dairymen of up-State New York.

Perhaps the most basic crop which we have in this section is hay. For the past 3 years the average price per ton in nearly every instance has reached $20 and over. In most areas there has been a dearth of this subsistence feeding, and it has been found necessary to make great financial sacrifices to purchase enough fodder to sustain life in the dairy herds throughout the State.

Everyone knows it takes years to build up a good dairy herd. It takes a lot of time and patience and hard work. It requires plenty of care and an abundance of good feed. But when a drought comes along, the dairyman must choose one of two alternatives. He must either provide for adequate feeding, or at least from the standpoint of subsistence, if he is going to keep his stock; or he must dispose of that herd which he has taken years to build up. For the past 3 years our farmers have had to face these alternatives; in some cases they have had to borrow money in order to purchase inferior grade hay at abominably high prices. You can readily see that if they chose this course they had to go into debt hundreds—yes, even thousands—of dollars. The tragedy was and is not that they borrowed the money, but that they have been forced to take that borrowed money and put it into an economically unsound proposition.

I mentioned the second group, namely, those who were forced to dispose of their dairy herds. They did so because they had mortgaged their farms, their buildings, and their livestock to the point that no one could safely lend them money. They had arrived at that unfortunate economic situation as a result of years of misfortune. They had a lot of company, so they were forced to abandon and to surrender the only stock investment which could possibly bring in any income.

Ladies and gentlemen, I wish to discuss briefly tonight a plan which I offered last year in the Seventy-sixth Congress, and which I believe, if adopted, would mean the end once and for all to any problem which the dairymen of New York State, or of any part of the country, would ever have to face. I propose that in the event of drought, flood, or fire the farmers of a given area present a certificate of necessity through their farm bureaus, their granges, and their various organizations to the Secretary of Agriculture. In this certificate of necessity they must show that a serious shortage of hay exists within that area. I further propose that when the Secretary of Agriculture receives this complaint he immediately take steps to have hay made available and shipped in from the nearest locality or localities having a definite surplus of subsistence feeding. My plan also calls upon the Department of Agriculture to establish a normal and reasonable price per ton for the hay which is shipped in. And it also authorizes the Government to pay for the

transportation costs of such hay as can be disposed of in the area where the shortage exists.

As a result, with my plan in operation, there would be no danger of any farmer being forced to borrow money, either from a Government agency or a private financial institution forcing him to buy the hay at outrageous prices. Instead of that I further propose that the Farm Security Administration make available to that farmer money sufficient to purchase what he may need at the reasonable price which has been decided upon. I am not criticizing the present policy of the Department of Agriculture, as far as actually making the loan available. My quarrel is with the idea of lending that money to the dairyman when it is economically unsound for him to utilize it to purchase hay at $20 a ton and over.

There are those who deplore the policy which has recently been introduced of deliberately letting the bars down so that feeds of all kinds and descriptions can be brought in from Canada and from the Argentine and other foreign countries. My plan has no place for such procedure. It simplifies the whole process of the distribution of subsistence feed because it simply takes from the area of plenty and makes a market available to an area of want. It is my fervent hope that before very many more months or years go by that some method such as the one I have suggested can be put into practice. We can theorize and we can expound upon what we think the farmer ought to do to better his lot, but until some definite step is taken to correct what has become the No. 1 problem of the dairy farmer of the East, namely, the drought, there can be no escape for the farmer from chill penury and economic extinction.

A few weeks ago the crop-insurance bill came before Congress and a long debate ensued over the proposition of including new basic crops for study and participation in the insurance program. At that time I offered an amendment to add hay as a basic crop to this act. I will read my remarks from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 11.

(Mr. HALL then quotes from the RECORD of June 11, 1941. His remarks can be found on pp. 5040-5041.)

Whereabouts Unknown and Destination Unknown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at the time of these comments President Roosevelt is somewhere on the high seas, whereabouts unknown and destination unknown. According to press reports, Mr. Churchill, head of the British Government, is supposed to be somewhere on the high seas, whereabouts unknown, destination unknown. Harry Hopkins, super-super-super Presidential confidant, counselor, minister plenipotentiary, envoy extraordinary, and ambassador without portfolio, is somewhere on the high seas with Mr. Churchill, whereabouts unknown, destination unknown. At this time this is all press speculation based upon information coming out of the usual sources of intelligence which are most accurate as to American foreign policy—and American purposes—the House of Commons in London.

These press reports arose from remarks in the House of Commons by Maj. Clement Attlee, Labor Party spokesman, member of the British War Cabinet, and Prime Minister Churchill's deputy in the House of Commons.

These reports came on the heels of a secret trip by the President, following the secret trip abroad by Harry Hopkins.

Harry Hopkins was in London, had conferred with Prime Minister Churchill, was out of London and in Moscow, and was shaking the bloody hand of that great humanitarian, liberator, and friend of democracy, Joe Stalin, and assuring him that his Government also came within the all-enveloping folds of the Lease-Lend-Give Act, before the American people even knew that Harry had hopped across the sea at all.

Earnest requests by administration officials that the press not try to follow the President's yacht, ascertain the purposes of his mission, or even speculate as to his destination or objectives, were respected by the American press. Apparently the administration spokesmen forgot to mention the matter to Maj. Clement Attlee and other British officials.

It is becoming somewhat difficult for Members of Congress and other Washington observers to determine just when American policy is being determined at Washington, D. C., and when it is being determined at No. 10 Downing Street, London. Mr. Hopkins, while in London, assured the British people, and, through the British people, the American people, that—Congress and the overwhelming will of the American people to the contrary notwithstanding—American naval boats were patrolling "alongside" or "parallel with" British war boats. On the heels of this announcement, Prime Minister Churchill advised the American people by radio that they had risen in wrath and were advancing to the "verge of war" with the Axis Powers.

It is little wonder indeed that the American people are addled by these kaleidoscopic changes in American policy. A little while ago we were condemning the brutal and ruthless assault on brave little Finland by the hordes of Stalin as a blot on the pages of the history of civilization. Today we are bedfellows with the ruthless rapists of the Kremlin, and Britain is preparing to invade brave little Finland which was the only nation to meet her honorable obligations and indebtedness to this country. It is little wonder indeed that even Members of Congress cannot tell who is making American policy or what American policy is or may be next week.

There is a rising sentiment throughout the United States, as reflected in letters coming to Members of Congress, that the Representatives of the American people ought to have something to say about whether the United States shall be taken into a shooting war.

Meanwhile the war propaganda has reached the point where the United States and Great Britain are exchanging official celebrities and members of royalty in order more securely to bind the United States to a sense of responsibility to pay for Europe's wars and fight them, too.

This rising resentment of the people against the secret moves of high American officials, which are so obvious as to leave no doubt that the administration believes it has taken the Nation into war already, will bear fruit sooner or later—and not so much later—in the Congress. It is now seen by those who are most closely following developments that unless the Congress interferes with a firm hand the administration will carry out its plain intention of building up another A. E. F.

It has been charged several times within the last week that if, as, and when the President gets an extension of the draft approved by the Congress he will promptly come back with a demand that he be allowed to send the men anywhere in the world he believes necessary for the national defense.

The bitter fight which will take place in Congress over the draft-extension proposal will be mild compared to that which will ensue when a demand comes up from the White House for authority to send these men to other parts of the world outside the Western Hemisphere to fight.

Meanwhile, the whereabouts of the President of the United States is unknown; his destination is unknown. The whereabouts of Prime Minister Churchill is unknown; his destination is unknown. The whereabouts of Harry Hopkins is unknown; his destination is unknown. The people may possibly know what is transpiring if they will but carefully listen to what the wild waves are saying.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway Project in Relation to the Iron-Ore Industry of the Lake Superior Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

STATEMENT BY ALEXANDER C. BROWN

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Alexander C. Brown, vice president, the Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co.:

The proposed St. Lawrence waterway by opening the Great Lakes to ocean-going vessels of the world is certain to have an important effect upon the commerce and industry of the entire Great Lakes region. Since the tonnage of iron ore transported on the Great Lakes is far greater than that of any other commodity, the proposal is of vital interest to the iron-ore industry and to the vast population whose welfare is dependent upon it.

The iron-ore industry is of such importance that any harm to it would jeopardize not only

the country's prosperity, but what would be even more important, the future national defense of this country. In order to more fully understand the important place of the iron-ore industry in the national economy, it seems necessary to briefly review some of the more pertinent facts.

This industry, operating on six iron ranges in Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin, supplies nearly 85 percent of the total iron-ore requirements of all United States furnaces. From the six ranges upon which this industry operates in the United States, 63,949,000 gross tons of iron ore were shipped in 1940. Since the opening of these ranges a total of about 1,850,000,000 gross tons of iron ore has been shipped.

This year 295 ore vessels of United States registry, all especially constructed for iron-ore service, are expected to transport approximately 75,000,000 gross tons of iron ore—which is about 10,000,000 tons greater than has ever been brought down the Lakes before. These vessels have a total capacity per trip of about 2,681,000 gross tons. To the above must be added about 100 more vessels carrying other materials for the steel industry.

The importance of the industry to the prosperity of the country is far greater than is indicated simply by the employment of those in mining and transporting iron ore to lower lake ports. Besides being the direct support of about 75 cities and towns on the iron ranges, and contributing indirectly to the support of many other communities, iron ore is the basic raw material required by the iron and steel industry for both peacetime and wartime needs.

If the prosperity of these basic industries is seriously impaired by the St. Lawrence waterway development, this would soon be reflected in loss of employment and income to many thousands of working people. Clearly the welfare of a large section of our country is tied to the Lake Superior iron-ore industry.

If the iron-ore industry is allowed to maintain its natural frontier, it will continue to grow in importance for the iron-ore reserves of the Lake Superior district are estimated at between two and two and one-half billion gross tons of high-grade iron ore—an amount materially greater than the total shipments since the first Lake Superior iron ore was discovered in 1854.

Further, in addition to the remaining tonnage of so-called high-grade ores, there are in the Lake Superior district almost unlimited quantities—billions of tons—of lower-grade iron-bearing material which can be beneficiated by various means to produce highly satisfactory and desirable blast-furnace ore. It is estimated that there is available in Minnesota alone, to a depth of only 400 feet, over 57,000,000,000 tons of concentrate which could be produced from such iron-bearing material.

Each year increasing tonnages of low-grade material are being made merchantable through beneficiation due to advances in the development of suitable processes of treatment. The growing use of these processes continually increases employment on the iron ranges and clearly points the way to the distant future when, with the exhaustion of high-grade ores, the bulk of furnace requirements may be supplied by mining and concentrating ores containing less than 40 percent of iron.

This industry is confident in its ability to supply high-grade iron ore to lower-Lakes blast furnaces for an unlimited time, provided it is not hampered by unjustifiable subsidies to foreign suppliers of iron ore and iron and steel. Foreign ores will not be needed in the Middle West to supplement Lake Superior district ores, unless the Lake Superior iron-ore industry is forced to discontinue its progressive development for the future because of bringing in to the Middle West foreign ores and foreign steel products produced with cheap foreign labor, transported in foreign boats in effect subsidized by American money spent to construct and maintain the St. Lawrence waterway for their use.

If industry and transportation of other countries is to be subsidized by the construction of this waterway, a foreign invasion of midwestern markets is inevitable, since the region tributary to the Great Lakes constitutes one of the most alluring markets in the world. It is also America's own best market, made so by the purchasing power of its vast population accruing from its own industrial and agricultural activities. It is a domestic market, now largely protected from competition with ocean-borne products of ill-paid labor of foreign lands, where for the most part living and working conditions would not be tolerated by the American workman. The St. Lawrence waterway would eliminate this protection to American labor, American products, and lake transportation.

Lake shipping, now largely protected by the natural barriers of the St. Lawrence River, has never had any Government subsidy, which has been enjoyed by such a large portion of the United States merchant marine. This self-supporting enterprise constitutes a vital link in the largely self-contained economy of the populous Middle West—the Great Lakes region.

A picture of Great Lakes cities converted into salt-water seaports has been painted in lurid colors by the proponents of the waterway to tempt the Middle West into a foreign-trade experiment. Those who have fallen for this temptation have done so in the illusive hope of an outlet for American products in the markets of the world. These foreign markets are, of course, inviting, but if they can be obtained only at the cost of a substantial portion of present home markets, this wishful thinking can result only in tragic losses. The waterway should be of much greater concern to Americans lest it be an inlet for dumping cheap goods from the rest of the world than as an outlet for ours.

A newspaper editor in a small midwestern town avoided the pitfalls of this wishful thinking when he wrote:

"Just why we should want to leave our most valuable part exposed to the sharp-shooting merchants across the ocean, and let foreign trade unload their starvation-wage production in the back door of every middle-western home is quite beyond imagination. You can't trade a dollar-an-hour product for a 20-cents-per-hour one and buy many shoes for Johnny."

When the present war is ended and the people of Europe return to peacetime production with their enormously expanded industrial plant capacity, an era of competition for world markets, the like of which has never been seen before, will have commenced. The United States, with its high wage and living standards, will find this competition difficult if not impossible to meet. American iron ore and iron and steel products will be vitally affected by this competition. American labor will be the first to suffer.

An additional factor contributing to the seriousness of this problem is the present protected position of these inland waterway ports. Industries have been established here which could not possibly have been justified had they not been protected from foreign competition. If this geographic protection is suddenly removed, it would invite disastrous results by upsetting this delicate balance.

Where, then, is this threatened foreign competition coming from so far as it relates to the importation of iron ore?

Estimates of foreign iron-ore reserves have been made showing over 45,000,000,000 tons available in Europe, Asia, and South America alone, not including reserves which geologists would classify as probable or possible and which would increase these tonnages many times over.

There is no question as to the suitability of foreign ores for American blast furnaces, since they are being brought into our eastern ports right along, and even without the St. Lawrence waterway, Sweden was able to export some of its high-grade ore into Lake Erie as recently as 1939.

Foreign boats using the present 14-foot channel with cargoes such as this have been paying their sailors about $24 a month in contrast to a minimum of $96 per month now paid ordinary deck hands on the bulk freighters of the United States lake fleet. The labor rate in Brazil, which has extremely rich iron ores, is only 5 cents an hour, whereas the minimum rate in the Lake Superior mines is 72½ cents an hour. What chance has American labor to compete with seamen paid $24 per month and Brazil mine labor paid 5 cents an hour?

Taking the steel industry as an example of the possibilities of competition by American labor with foreign labor and comparing the purchasing value of wages, it has been shown that in 1937 American steel workers could buy a market basket full of food for only 1½ hours' wages while foreign workers must work 3½ to 23 hours to buy the same amount of food in their respective countries.

This low-cost labor is, of course, reflected in the price at which foreign competitors can sell. Before the present war, Belgian and German steel was exported to New York at delivered prices approximately $5 per ton less than domestic base prices. Since that time wages of steelworkers have increased 16½ percent in this country. If this proposed waterway were constructed, foreign steel could be shipped to every port on the Great Lakes at prices still further undercutting domestic producers.

There is no doubt that foreign countries can produce iron and steel cheaper than we can because of their low labor rates. The pay for common labor in England is a shilling (i. e., 20 cents) an hour compared with our 72½ cents. Yet English labor is the highest paid of all foreign countries. France has already shipped cast-iron pipe into the Great Lakes considerably below domestic prices. During the past 30 years India, with 4-cents-per-hour labor, has increased its pig-iron production eightfold by the construction of modern furnaces, each producing 1,000 tons daily. Labor costs are so low that they can make pig iron for $5 a ton, and were shipping it into Philadelphia at $10 a ton and less, tariff paid. Brazil is now building modern American plants, so that with 5-cent labor, their costs of pig iron will be exceptionally low.

Since about 2 tons of iron ore are required to produce a ton of pig iron, any material increase in the importation of not only iron ore but of iron and steel as well, into the Great Lakes region, would inevitably result in serious loss of tonnage and consequent decrease in employment on the Lake Superior iron ranges.

If cheap foreign labor is allowed to compete, it will mean that the millions of dollars which we are at the present time spending on new steel capacity will be wasted, jeopardizing the jobs of thousands of workers who are now employed in these mills. Our present annual steel capacity is about 4,000,000 tons greater than 3 years ago. In the interest of national defense, additional capacity is now being built.

But this country is not the only one that is expanding steel production. The capacity of the European steel industry has been tremendously increased, just as ours has, and when this war is ended, these countries will be hungry for markets to keep their mills running. How can we justify opening this great inland waterway to the unrestricted competition of foreigners? Do we want to spend millions to make it easier for them to invade our markets?

Yet invasion will be forthcoming if the geographic advantage is removed by the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway, unless tariff protection is provided. But why

install the artificial barrier of a tariff after spending huge sums of money to remove an existing natural one?

Accordingly, construction of the St. Lawrence waterway as a transportation project cannot be justified for one or the other of the following reasons:

If foreign ships, subsidized with American money, use the canal to import foreign goods and materials in large volume, irreparable harm will be done to American labor and to our American industries; or

If this cheap foreign competition is excluded to a large extent by a tariff wall, the tonnage transported will be insufficient to warrant the enormous expenditure for construction and maintenance.

Nor can the waterway be justified as a defense project. Instead of aiding defense it would deter it. It would obstruct national defense by diverting men, money, and materials from immediate needs, not only for its construction but also for its defense.

The vulnerability of its lock gates to sabotage or bombing would make completely useless the proposed inland shipbuilding program after the first successful act of sabotage or the first lucky (or unlucky) hit from the air.

How can it be claimed that sea coast shipbuilding facilities are inadequate or could not be built when we have 12,000 miles of ocean shore line to use?

Which is less vulnerable to enemy attack—a fleet of ships under construction on shipways scattered along 12,000 miles of coast line, or the same fleet on Great Lakes shipways dependent on the defense of the locks in the St. Lawrence River?

Of what use would large naval vessels or ocean freighters be if they could not get down the St. Lawrence River any farther than Cornwall because Canada had not completed its construction, which it is not obligated to complete until at least December 1948?

Where would our defense program be today if the waterway had been built prior to 1930 and lake transportation and the iron-ore industry had been faced with ruthless foreign competition during all the depression years?

Would the Lake Superior district mines be ready, as they now are, to take on this peak load, so vital to the steel production of the country?

They would not.

The development of old mines, the opening of new ones, the exploration for additional reserves, and the experiments with new methods and processes would have been made so unprofitable as to result in abandonment in place of development, and ghost towns in place of thriving mining communities.

And would our great fleet of lake carriers be prepared to meet this emergency obligation by exceeding all previous records by about 10,000,000 tons?

It would not.

Eight or ten years of discouraging competition with foreigners would have left this great fleet a mere skeleton of its former self, incapable of performing even a mediocre defense job.

Are we going to permit foreign ships, with un-American working conditions and wages, to ruin our own lake shipping system so essential in supplying the steel industry with its raw materials for national defense?

Assuredly we should not and we will not if this issue is decided on the basis of what is and what is not in the interest of national defense.

It is not the waterway that is required for national defense but the maintenance of our own domestic source of raw materials and our great inland lake fleet, both of which the waterways threatens to curtail, if not to ruin.

Industrial strength resides basically in coordinated mineral industries. Iron ore is its foundation and nations dependent on its importation exist precariously in a world at war.

The iron and steel industry has been the greatest single factor in the rise of this country to its present position of industrial strength. It is necessary to the maintenance of that strength. It was indispensable in the last World War. It is necessary to success in any similar struggle in which this country may again be involved. It was at maximum service during that war because it was not dependent on sea-borne ore. The security of the Nation demands that it remain independent of foreign importation of this basic raw material.

In the face of the present emergency is it conceivable that the American people are willing to subsidize foreign competition so that, when a future emergency arises, this country would be left dependent on some foreign power?

National Defense and Economic Reconstruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ADDRESS BY VIRGIL JORDAN

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech by Mr. Virgil Jordan on national defense and economic reconstruction.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is an occasion which might excuse some ceremonial eloquence and stimulate some personal expression of emotion on the part of one to whom the days of these years of the conference board's life include so many of the best of his own, spent in pursuit of its purpose and devoted to its task. But I shall pass the opportunity of the one and resist the temptation of the other. Tonight there are more important things to be said by any American who speaks in complete candor and utter detachment to fellow citizens associated for many years in a common effort of public service. The conference board does not matter. All that matters is the cause of truth, integrity, and trust which in its humble way it has sought to serve.

In the innermost minds of millions of Americans today there moves the shapeless shadow of a nameless fear which darkens their spirits and paralyzes their efforts. They sense that they now stand in the same profound peril as the people of the French Republic 2 years ago, and the people of the British Empire today. The roots of that peril reach deep into the same dark morass of indifference, delusion, deception, and moral disintegration in which the people of France wandered till they were destroyed. We know that by that defeat and those which have followed it, vast satanic forces of evil, festering for centuries in the poisonous swamps of political perfidy and exploitation in Europe and Asia, have been let loose to range the world, infecting the spirits of men everywhere, corrupting their integrity, crippling their creative power, crushing their bodies, and shattering their civilized life. We know that by the blindness and indolence of their leaders toward this peril in their time and place, the people of Britain may soon be beaten or absorbed into submission and their Empire broken. We know that when this is done we must stand alone in a world laid waste, to face in utter isolation these powers of darkness which have destroyed it, and bear the solitary burden of battle with them, or become their final victim, as all others did who failed to defend themselves in time because their leadership was too false, too feeble, or too faithless. Though few among them can even imagine its meaning, many Americans are beginning to be dimly aware that we, too, have been outtooled, outarmed, outwitted, and outstripped, as these others were, and that by unseen disintegration and dissipation of the community resources we may suddenly find ourselves, like them, silently and insensibly absorbed by the enemy, and subjected to its power, though we never see the invader's uniform, his airplanes, or his fleet.

The peril and the fear which so many Americans sense today lie deeper in their hearts than any prospect of destruction and death by the battleships or bombers of any enemy abroad. They could face a foreign foe with confidence and courage, and find leadership for such a struggle, if they did not feel that even in victory they still must face for an indefinite future the same enemy among and within themselves. The grim juggernaut of supreme personal government in Germany, Japan, Italy, and Soviet Russia seems to many of them merely a magnified image of their own—its steel-plated insect society in human form a mere reflection of themselves in the mirror of modern life. Millions of Americans today already feel like refugees in their own land, much more than those who have fled to it from others. They are beginning to believe that the America they have known and loved has already disappeared, its essential spirit of expansive faith in human freedom and integrity long since surrendered and submerged in the spirit of the ancient world, the normal world of those Asiatic hordes and European masses of humanity who for untold centuries have been concerned solely with bare subsistence and sheer survival.

They feel that long before this war began, or their Government invoked their aid in it, the democracy they are asked to deliver to the oppressed peoples of this ancient world had died or been destroyed in every nation involved in it, and their own as well. They fear that by blind pursuit of absolute personal and group power in their political life, and their passive and complacent acceptance of its bribes for their ballots, the great American experiment in human freedom may have ended. They have seen the control of their Government pass out of their hands and become a private personal and group interest, as it has been and is everywhere else in the world, an entity separate from themselves, to which their life, their labor, and their resources are henceforth dedicated, and for whose sustenance and nourishment they must live, work, and die. By their self-centered indifference, indolence, and failure of foresight they have seen the initiative in voluntary creative effort for security and for productive cooperation of labor, management, and tool-providers in the community pass to the sterile hands of the state, to be exploited for purposes of personal power. They have seen that indispensable copartner of all democracy, their productive enterprise, subtly undermined and destroyed, the consumers it serves absorbed into the single stomach of the absolute state, and its management and labor transformed into mere camp followers or kitchen police of a political commissariat. They have seen the willingness and the strength of great masses of their fellowmen, and of themselves, to assume the risks and make the sacrifices of life and labor wane and weaken to be replaced by a persistent search for passive security and ease at any price, which they ex-

pect someone else to pay. They have seen one group after another among them recklessly destroy, for some immediate imagined advantage to themselves, those constitutional and institutional defenses of freedom and justice upon which these groups and all the rest of us must one day depend for our very survival, forgetting that those who take the sword of the supreme state into their own hands for purposes of personal or group power shall perish by that sword.

They have been told, by those who ought to know, that in all these things they are seeing beaten out before their eyes on the anvil of experience, in blood and bitterness, by shattering bombs and subtle brains, a new world, not so brave as the old but more orderly and less dangerous and hard, in which the gods of some omniscient management or some providential political power will give them their daily groceries and gadgets without risk, sacrifice, responsibility, or cost.

Seeing everywhere the violent and reckless struggle for personal and group advantage and gain, the devious evasion, the contemptuous flippancy, the complacement arrogance toward the American community on the part of government, labor, and business management which accompany the conduct of this holy crusade for the rescue of democracy, they wonder whether this war for which their sacrifices are demanded is not indeed a mere incident in the domestic framework of American life—a mere incident of the same divine mission of permanent power to which its protagonists in Europe and Asia consider themselves called by God. If this be true, they know that long after the struggle to bring liberty to other nations shall have ended, whether in success or failure, the struggle to find it for themselves will only have begun again, and must go on for generations still unborn.

Sensing these things, they wonder where and what is the freedom they are to defend. Where then, and what, the dower of democracy with which they are to endow the world? If these things be blessings, why did these peoples of Europe and their leaders not fight for them to the bitter end, and if they did not, how can we deliver them who are in bondage to the same master in ourselves, and like them have sold our birthright for the same mess of pottage?

So, when we search our hearts for the source of that pervasive fear which cripples and confuses our efforts in this crisis, whether we see our danger at home or abroad, we find that these powers of darkness which dismay us rise in the end out of those deep-seated weaknesses of spirit which have developed in the past quarter-century in the people of our own and other countries and which are expressed in the personalities and purposes of their leaders today. The collapse of European civilization and our own peril are rooted in the failure, both among the community of men and its leadership, of those essential qualities of integrity, independence, self-discipline, and responsibility upon which any enduring civilization depends. To re-create and revitalize them throughout the community and its leaders is the colossal task, not only of the future, but of today. It is necessary not only for reconstruction, but for survival.

It is the disintegration of these qualities which is reflected in the destruction, conflict, and chaos of our time. The world we have known and lived in has crumbled to ruins around us, but the rubble of the bomb-shattered cities of Britain is but a symbol of a catastrophe far more profound which has overtaken us in the past quarter-century. This world was the most abnormal world the human record has ever known, a world of unparalleled progress and unimagined plenty, of unprecedented stability and sustained peace born of the momentous discovery that truth, integrity, and responsibility, embodied and applied in the political and economic institutions and the public and private life of the community, could make men free, prosperous, and secure. It was the most revolutionary discovery ever made by the mind of man, but the world it built lasted only a little more than a century, a mere moment in human history. That normal world to which we sometimes dream today of returning, the world in which men had lived for unnumbered centuries before, was a world of treachery, terror, ignorance, and enslavement. This is the world to which the leaders of our time have once more turned the spirits and the immense productive powers of men which a mere century of human freedom and faith enabled them to command.

But today the time for post mortems is past. Whatever the sources of the peril and the fear that confuse and cripple us, we cannot now escape the task to which by fate we have been committed for the future, the most colossal task that has confronted any community of men in human history—the task of saving ourselves from the destructive power of the dogma of the supreme state which has subdued the world, so that by grace of God we may help to restore, among as many communities of men as may have the aspiration and the strength to sustain it elsewhere that essential structure of truth, integrity, and responsibility upon which the possibility of a humane civilization and human progress depends.

What any of us here may do or say cannot much matter to ourselves, for our lives are largely spent, but it will matter to the Americans who come after us and the world in which they live. We cannot give them, or any other people, integrity or liberty; they will have to attain and preserve it for themselves; but we can at least transmit to them the aspiration and the opportunity which were entrusted to us by our ancestors who won it for themselves.

Despite all that I have said about the doubts and dangers that burden them today, the impulses, purposes, and aspirations of the American people in this crisis are noble in spirit and worthy of their character and of the traditions of their country, a deep expression of that love of liberty, that hatred of tyranny, that generosity and sympathy toward the unfortunate and oppressed which have always marked America. We should be deeply proud to be part of a people who can impulsively present such a spirit to an unhappy and a tortured world, and implement it even to the point of folly.

But I submit that it would be a tragedy too brutal and too humiliating to be borne by the broken heart of mankind today if the spirit of such a people were to be betrayed or exploited by anyone, whether for a few pieces of silver or for the scepter of political power. In this dark hour of their great adventure America surely deserves and as surely desperately needs the utmost candor, competence, courage, and integrity which she can command or which a merciful providence can grant in the leadership of her Government, her business management, and her labor.

We have a right to ask whether those who urge and lead us to this colossal task understand what it means, and whether they mean it themselves. Are they clearly conscious of the suffering, the sacrifice, to which they ask the American people to commit themselves, and are they willing to commit themselves to it? Are they ready to accept for themselves the stern and uncompromising self-discipline which it implies? Are they aware that it will require the sacrifice of numberless lives, and the resignation of all hopes of peace, prosperity, security, comfort, and social or political gains for an indefinite period? Are they willing to tell the American people that, in utter honesty and complete candor?

This is too great a Nation to need or deserve to be driven to defend itself or to fight for a great cause by any synthetic circumstance or political trick, by having its Government range the world begging for a bomb or praying for a politically appropriate provocation. The true America does not move to its battles or its ballot boxes on its belly. It has something more to fight or vote for than its public corncribs, its political swill-barrels, or its silver pigsties.

Despite the doubt, confusion, conflict, and fear which afflict them today, I am sure that the American people are willing to follow with unquestioning unity and allegiance any leader or any group among them who they can feel with complete confidence is utterly committed to the same cause as that for which they are called to make their sacrifices and endure their endless burdens and sufferings, and who is as prepared as they are expected to be to put aside all private purpose or aspiration of personal power, position, privilege, or pleasure in every aspect of life or work. They will make these sacrifices freely and unflinchingly and serve to the bitter end any who commands them in the name of this supreme cause, whenever they know in their hearts that he has won the right as man to man to command them by his unqualified acceptance of them.

Desperately as they may need, and nobly as they deserve such leadership today, whether or not they get it, the American people should remember that the rescue or wreckage of their country does not rest in the hands of those walking shadows, those poor players of political power, who strut and fret their brief hour on this world's stage and are heard no more. It rests in the end in the hearts and minds and muscles of the nameless millions of men and women in America who must and will carry through whatever task and pay the price of whatever waste and suffering the weakness of their leaders has committed them to. No matter how supreme its power, or how complete its competence, the State can create nothing that does not already live and grow, nor destroy anything that is not already dead in the spirit of its people. It is at best but the scavenger of time and human aspiration.

They should remember that liberty is not granted us by grace of governments, constitutions, courts, or congresses, nor can we depend upon these permanently to preserve and protect it for us. It does not prevail or persist by the power of political traditions, parties, personalities, or laws. Liberty springs solely from the spirit of those common citizens who have the will and courage to create it for themselves, the strength and integrity to accept its responsibilities and pay its price, the valor, vigilance, fortitude, and fidelity to defend it with their life against its unseen, incessant, and insidious enemies—indifference, ignorance, indolence, and injustice. Save as it is more precious to us than prosperity, peace, comfort, or security, it will never exist or long endure among us. Every man in each generation must renew and replenish its spirit in himself, and none can demand it for himself and deny it to others without destroying it for all.

The civilization by which we live is a vast, invisible web ever woven anew by countless acts of sacrifice, fortitude, faith, and foresight by unnumbered nameless men. Thread by thread these unseen strands of individual aspiration, effort, adventure, and accomplishment are spun into those indestructible cords of endurance, industry, independence, and integrity of spirit which bind society together. This frail fabric from the ceaseless loom of generations of unremembered lives is the strongest and most precious substance in the world, for by it alone we hang suspended above the abyss of savagery.

Save for these things, the story of the great adventure upon which America embarked a bare century ago must be but as a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing, and all her yesterdays will have only lighted fools the way to dusty death.

We shall win prosperity only if we have the strength to suffer poverty; we shall win leisure only if we have the will to labor endlessly; we shall win security only if we have the cour-

age to risk all; and we shall find peace only if we have the pride to die fighting for freedom, truth, and honor.

Inflation Storm Warnings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

EXCERPTS FROM HEARINGS ON THE 1941 TAX BILL

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the following excerpts are taken from the printed hearings of the Ways and Means Committee on the 1941 tax bill:

Hon. HENRY MORGENTHAU, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury. And finally, it (the 1941 tax bill) is designed to prevent a general rise in prices by keeping the total volume of monetary purchasing power from outrunning production (p. 4).

Hon. JOHN L. SULLIVAN, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. The dangers of inflationary price movements are real, and must be avoided. Excessive reliance on borrowing, together with increased purchasing power, would exert a strong and dangerous upward influence on prices. To avoid this, the tax program is essential (p. 47).

Dr. ALBERT G. HART, associate professor of economics, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa. We do feel that if the defense expenditures go high as it is reasonable to expect from the projects already outlined, and if there is a continued expansion of the defense program as apparently indicated by the aid-to-Britain program, it is necessary that steps be taken to shield the country from inflationary dangers arising out of the huge Government spending. It is very probable that the continuation of only the present tax system will involve considerable inflationary dangers. And to avoid inflationary dangers we urge the enactment of a special national-defense tax upon individual net incomes in excess of modest exemptions (p. 326).

We do reckon that if you get to the point, and when you get to the point where expenditures begin to outrun the flow of consumer goods, taxes are the natural remedy. If this remedy is not used, and you let the people spend without restraint, it results in putting living costs up; that kind of spending leads to inflation. When you get to the point where that takes place, spending must be limited. Taxation should then be used to keep spending in line with amount of goods available (p. 327).

What has happened, gentlemen, is that fate has dropped into your laps the problem of taking care of the soundness of the American monetary system. In a sense, it is not your business; but the existence of this defense crisis has made it your business. I gather from the policy pronouncements I have seen, that you have realized that fact, that taxation does have to take care of the danger of inflationary situations arising in the United States, and I am talking here of means of meeting it. If it is to be met, it has to be met by forging a really adequate revenue system, which will not be too grossly unfair and which will, therefore, have to be some sort of tax on incomes (pp. 334–335).

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia (to Dr. Hart). Just what do you mean by the phrase, "our explosive monetary system"? (p. 353).

Dr. HART. I am thinking, in the first place, of the idle bank balances in the hands of the public. We have about $10,000,000,000 more of bank deposits in this country now than we had in 1929, and we are not doing any more business, in dollars. * * * I am thinking also of the excess reserves of the member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and of the nonmember banks which give them a colossal unused lending power.

And beyond that, of course, but even though that part of the explosives are well in the hands of the Government, behind that is the Federal Reserve's unused lending power, and the Treasury's unused power to issue gold certificates and greenbacks, and the Treasury's unused power to issue silver certificates. There is a whole chain of possibilities there of increasing the circulating medium in the hands of the public. With our present monetary laws, we could increase the total several-fold (p. 353).

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is liable to explode in the direction of inflation.

Dr. HART. If we get an inflationary movement under way which begins to gather speed, there is the danger, it seems to me, that some of these loose funds may come out and start to roll and make a really formidable avalanche. The Treasury's borrowing program is calculated to nail down a good deal of this spending power that might break loose a few months or years from now. Treasury borrowing along the lines recently announced is not solving our more immediate problems, but it may be easing the monetary problems we are due to run into a few years hence (p. 353).

Excerpt from prepared statement signed by 176 economists in the United States (presented by Dr. Hart, of Iowa State College):

"Inflation dangers in defense spending: The increased rate of Government spending resulting from defense means that if heavy additional taxes are not levied there will be a very great rise over the next 2 or 3 years in the prices paid by consumers. Defense spending will produce a continuous increase in consumers' money incomes for some time ahead, raising enormously the amount available for spending on consumer goods. At the same time, defense needs will greatly handicap expansion of facilities for making such goods, and in many fields will actually lower the physical ceiling of production. The impact of increased spending on a constant or possibly declining output of consumer goods clearly spells rising prices. In addition to the direct effect of rising incomes on spending, we must reckon on the likelihood of much spending out of the swollen bank accounts which now exist, and out of bank loans" (p. 364).

Mr. ROBERTSON (examining Livingston W. Houston, chairman, Committee on Government Finance of the National Association of Manufacturers). Do you think that our distinguished Government economist, Mr. Leon Henderson, is going to have success in setting aside the law of supply and demand with respect to prices for consumer goods if we cling to a 40-hour week, under which 72 percent of our industries are operating on a single shift? (p. 572).

Mr. HOUSTON. It will be very difficult to do.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In other words, when production with respect to demand falls, or purchasing power increases faster than production, he will have what David Lawrence said last week was the most difficult and most unpopular task of anybody in the Government, to hold those prices down; is that true? (p. 572).

Mr. HOUSTON. I think so.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And yet, in connection with our tax program we have been giving consideration to draining off, so to speak, a portion of the increased earnings that arise from defense spending to try to hold down the possibility of price inflation; it is a very definitely related problem. Is not that true? (p. 572).

Mr. HOUSTON. We agree that a control of prices to prevent a rapid increase, which we call, or a great many of us call, inflation, is one of the problems that faces the financial administration of our Government (p. 573).

LEON HENDERSON, Administrator, Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my job, first and foremost, is to try to prevent rapid and unmanageable price rises in the country during the defense emergency—to stave off inflation which, as you know, hampered our preparedness efforts during the World War and would destroy us this time (p. 636).

I take it that all of you see eye to eye with me on this matter of inflation. During the World War wholesale prices doubled. The cost of arming was at least $15,000,000,000 higher than necessary, according to Mr. Baruch, Chairman of the War Industries Board.

The securities market reflected the inflation. Many corporations and individuals had unjustifiably large profits; many other corporations were crippled in production because speculators were hoarding goods. Wages never could seem to catch up to the rising spiral of prices. Above all, the collapse of prices which followed just about paralyzed the economy (p. 636).

In my job I have to estimate the effect of the defense program on economic activity, so that I can estimate the size of our tasks in establishing price ceilings, allocating residual supplies, protecting consumers, and increasing total supplies (p. 637).

As regards taxation: Keeping in mind the necessity for getting every man to producing, I feel that the principles of a fiscal program for the year 1941–42 which would be in consonance with our defense needs and which at the same time will not interfere with a successful fight against inflation—always the first consideration with me after the brutal needs of getting the essential defense material—can be set forth in a few paragraphs (p. 642):

First. We ought to finance our total defense expenditures in such a way that they result in the maximum possible increase of both armaments production and total real national income. Expansion of supplies, and particularly of productive facilities, along all possible lines, therefore, must be our watchword and the tax system ought to be so modeled that it promotes this goal (p. 642).

Second. After total production has expanded so that we are using substantially all of our resources, we will have to hold down consumption generally in order to prevent inflation. When that time comes I will be in favor of further stiffening of income taxes or of adopting some form of the Keynes plan, some features of which have just been adopted in Britain.

Third. We must see that the burdens of the defense program are distributed as equitably as possible. This means that we must tax according to ability to pay. This principle is just as valid when we have to tax to prevent inflation as it is in normal times. I have heard it said that this principle will have to be abandoned when we get to the stage of restricting consumption. That argument confuses taxing consumers' income with taxing consumers' goods. What England is now aiming to do is to tax consumers' incomes. As to effectiveness in preventing inflation, excise taxes, which are regressive and inequitable, are no more effective than are income taxes based on ability to pay (p. 643).

One last thing. I have been spelling out some of the ways by which the tax program

might assist in the fight against inflation. I hope you are studying means of making the revenue system more flexible. The time lag between decisions to raise taxes and their collection dates makes the present system sluggish as an inflation control. When we reach a state of reasonably full use of resources, the tax system can be a most effective weapon in helping to control inflation, as it is in Canada and Great Britain (p. 647).

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Henderson, if Mr. Baruch's statements are correct that uncontrolled prices in World War No. 1 added an unnecessary $15,000,000,000 to the cost of our armament, what did those prices add to all the purchases of consumers in the country (p. 648)?

Mr. HENDERSON. I would say at least twice as much a year.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That would be, in cost to the taxpayers and to the people generally, many times the emergency taxes that are now proposed partly to finance our defense program; and partly, as you say, to be used in connection with other things in preventing runaway prices.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is right.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There should be no doubt in the mind of anyone that the lack of price control in World War No. 1 was a very costly error for our Government, and the necessity for it now should be quite apparent. But did we not attempt price control during World War No. 1?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes; but a lot of damage had been done. The war broke, as you know, in August 1914, and it was 3 years later before we got into it. And it was in that period, as I recall it, that the wholesale price level went up about 75 percent. Then in the period of control, they only controlled certain items. There was another 10 to 12 percent advance, and then when these controls were taken off at the conclusion of the war, we had another 20 percent. So that the highest part of the price rise in the last war was really before and after we used the controls.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I recall quite distinctly that the Government indicted a lot of coal operators for selling coal at $15 to $20 a ton, which was about three times the Government price, and then abandoned the prosecution because they reached the conclusion that they had no adequate law to sustain the program. Have you got enough law now to sustain this necessary program that has been loaded on you (p. 649)?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes. At the present time, we have got everything that the War Industries Board had and even more, as far as the ways in which you secure compliance are concerned, leaving out the principal thing, which is the general support of the community for price ceilings.

Let me point out that where the Lever Act fell down was on a constitutional matter of the application, and it was not due to the general powers that had been exercised. The Lever Act tried to control exactly the margins which retailers would be permitted to charge, and I think it failed on a technical point there.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You have all the law that you want to handle this?

Mr. HENDERSON. We have got all the law that we need at this present time. We have had only a 4-point rise in the index since this defense program started. I do not know how long that will continue.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, let us see what this present time is and what may lie immediately before us. You probably heard the radio address last night by the Secretary of War?

Mr. HENDERSON. No, Mr. ROBERTSON; I was working on my statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think he said in effect that we have got to do whatever is necessary at the present time to get our supplies to Great Britain.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, I agree with that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is a big order, is it not?

Mr. HENDERSON. That is a big order.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You probably noticed in the press this morning that after sending up a budget in January, estimating defense appropriations at $28,500,000,000, it was then raised to approximately $40,000,000,000, and now it is proposed to increase that greatly.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think it is big enough yet. I think it should have been bigger, and it should have come earlier.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I believe you told us that if we spent the money that is necessary to be spent to get the production that is necessary to be had, we will have to add four or five million workers in industry alone.

Mr. HENDERSON. What I said was, if we can get that much, we can put that many people to work.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You mean get that much money?

Mr. HENDERSON. No; it is not marked to the credit of the Treasury, such as flow out of an appropriation. What I mean is, get the actual pig-iron capacity built, the blast furnaces, things like that. You can appropriate money, but that will not get 10,000,000 more tons of iron ore down from the Mesabi Range. You can appropriate money, but that will not get 5,000,000 more tons of scrap. The demand is already there, Mr. ROBERTSON, and I am saying if we can find, by working with the steel industry, how we can get additional capacity, we will get $4,000,000,000 more of income, and we will get more people back to work. I said if we had no bottlenecks at all, if we could get next year's production the way we got last year's production, by merely taking up idle capacity, we would put four or five million people back to work.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I was struck with your statement to us, because it defines our experience in agriculture; that it is very difficult to set aside the laws of supply and demand. When we have too much cotton and too much wheat and too much tobacco a Government stabilization program does not get us very far because everybody sees the visible supply, and if the demand is not there the price will not be there I believe you applied that to consumer goods.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That one means of keeping down too-rapid advance in consumer goods would be to produce more goods to equalize this income which you say may go to $108,000,000,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. I said I thought it would go around $95,000,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In which year?

Mr. HENDERSON. In the coming year; that it might go to $108,000,000,000, if we had no bottlenecks.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is an unparalleled income.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I was wondering if other forces are not going to be at work that may make your task more difficult. For instance, you said that the machine-tool workers have found a way to step up production—to meet the stepped-up demand; and is not the way they have found to do that a two-shift program, working one shift 50 hours a week and another shift 55 hours a week?

Mr. HENDERSON. Let me go back I did not say the machine-tool people had found enough. I meant to imply that they had always found some way, even when they felt they had reached their limit, of going further. They have done it in many ways. They have done it sometimes by financing their own plant expansion. They have done it by financial expansion with Government funds. They have done it by reorganization of their own efficiency methods. They have done it by more shifts. Even at that, there is still quite a bit of lag. Some of the machine-tool industry is on a 2½-shift basis, but on the average they are only working about 65 or 70 percent even of that basis.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not know whether I have been correctly informed or not, that the machine-tool industry is working 50 to 55 hours a week.

Mr. HENDERSON. I cannot answer that specific question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I got it from high Government source.

Mr. HENDERSON. I presume it is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then I went to a machine-tool manufacturer and I said, "What are you paying in overtime per week?" And he said, "An average of 12 hours" And I said, "Who pays for that?" Now, what is your guess as to who pays for that?

Mr. HENDERSON. I think, since the Government directly or indirectly is taking most of the machine tools, the Government is.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That was his answer; and he said, "Not only does the Government pay for that overtime but we have an escalator clause in our contract—if wages go up still further, the Government pays still more."

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is true, is it not?

Mr. HENDERSON. That is true.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I saw in the paper this morning * * * that the workers in the shoe industry had notified you that they wanted a 20-percent increase in wages, but that you must not let the price of shoes go up.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct. I might say that is the first time I ever knew a union to make a move toward helping control prices; usually it is the other way. The union and the employers get together and they say, "We will give you a wage increase," and "we will let the price go up." So this was refreshing. And you have got to keep in mind that I was at the N. R. A.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have not forgotten that.

Mr. HENDERSON. And I have not.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Can you do that?

Mr. HENDERSON. Do what?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Give them a raise in wages and still hold the price where it is.

Mr. HENDERSON. In many industries, yes. In many industries sometimes wage increases can come, as they always have come, out of increased productivity of the industry working at a high level of activity.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is estimated by the operators that an increase to a dollar an hour, 7 hours a day, for 5 days a week in coal would probably add $200,000,000 to the cost of coal. And I believe you finally eased off a little bit on the question of the price on coal.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not ease off. It went back under the aegis of the Bituminous Coal Commission.

Mr. ROBERTSON. A few days ago the chairman of the board of the steel corporation observed that the recent increase in wages paid by the steel corporation would add $60,000,000 a year to the costs of the United States Steel Corporation. They do not know yet what the added cost to the coke will be in the production of steel, but they estimate that it would probably be $1.25 a ton.

Mr. HENDERSON. Did you take a pencil and their statement and do a little arithmetic and see how much they would still have left, after they paid that increase?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. I saw that in 1940 they had a net income of approximately $100,000,000. But I also saw that on substantially the same amount of business in 1929 they had a net income of $190,000,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. That year, 1929, is a sport as far as the earnings of the steel corporation is concerned. Between 1922 and 1928, the period of their greatest activity, the average was around $90,000,000, and I do not know of a statistician yet who works with figures that does not throw out 1929 in the steel corporation's earnings.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, I am neither an economist nor an expert, but I saw a chart prepared by Mr. David Lawrence's experts; they are supposed to be economists. And you will see in that chart that between 1929 earnings and 1941 estimated earnings, the earnings of all these big companies would be about $600,000,000 more, while the wage shows an increase of some two billion. Do you think that chart is correct?

Mr. HENDERSON. If it is in the United States News, I would assume that it was.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. But, Mr. Robertson, I do not want to leave the impression that I agree or approve of the distribution of income as between profits and wages in 1929.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, I am not referring to that, but the point I am coming to is this: When you fix prices, you have got to take into consideration the cost of production.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And wages are a part of the cost of production.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. At the present time, in industry in 1941, what percentage of the value of the manufactured product is represented by the wages?

Mr. HENDERSON. On a national-income basis I think it would be somewhere around 63 percent for wages and salaries.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Sixty-three percent of the value of the product is represented by wages and salaries?

Mr. HENDERSON. No; I said that as a percentage of the national income, salaries and wages——

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am trying to get a breakdown, if I can, as to the cost of production, showing what percentage of the cost of the manufactured product is represented by wages and salaries.

Mr. HENDERSON. It varies from a very low percentage in the chemical industry and the cigarette industry to a very high percentage in the coal industry.

Mr. ROBERTSON. What would the average be? I am sure that you have some averages.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, I know the disadvantage of an average like that, using the average between the cigarette manufacturer and the coal industry. I can give you the average if you want it, but I do not think it is useful. I would rather go to the cost of production in a particular industry that we had put a price ceiling on.

Mr. ROBERTSON. When you appeared before the Joint Committee on Labor of the House and Senate on behalf of the 40-hour week did you not give an average in making your point as to what would be the result if you put a limitation on the hours of work to 40?

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, I presented five pages of industries.

Mr. ROBERTSON. What is the general average cost of labor given by you in your statement that if you put a high-enough penalty for working more than 40 hours industry could not afford to do it?

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not recall my testimony before the committee, but I will say that I will stand back of it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Here is your testimony before the joint committee of the House and Senate at that time, in which you state that, based on 1936 production, the wages and labor represented 38 percent of the manufacturers' cost.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would say that I had made a calculation by taking a weighted average of all the industries that had reported to the Department of Commerce, and made a very careful estimate upon it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There have been many increases in wages since 1936, have there not?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Therefore the percentage now would be greater?

Mr. HENDERSON. Not necessarily, because we have got higher productivity from workers.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, some, but not as much higher as the increase in many industries in wages; is that not true? You may have some increase in individual production since 1936, but the increase in most plants has not kept pace with the increase in wages.

Mr. HENDERSON. No; no; it has not in the durable-goods industries. It has in the nondurable; and even in the durable-goods industries it has since 1937.

Mr. ROBERTSON. All right. If we go ahead with our defense program, as you have indicated, and I favor it, and most Members of Congress favor it, and also increase the production of consumer goods that do not compete with it, do you think we will reach maximum employment of labor; that is, of those who are ready, able, and willing to have a job?

Mr. HENDERSON. That depends on how well we plan our expansion. If we let things run for awhile there can be a few months of inflation when we would have. I suspect, nearly full employment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I believe in 1937 you estimated unemployment at 7,900,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is about correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And in order to put people to work I believe you recommended a high penalty for working anybody engaged in any interstate-commerce activity—of course, since that date all distinction has been wiped out, as you well know—a heavy penalty of 50 percent for working a man more than 40 hours, and if you work on holidays or some other such occasions, 100 percent. Is that not correct?

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not recall that I made that specific recommendation, but at times of low employment that is not a bad idea. At a time of low employment, when naturally we require a great number of people to be employed, I would be in favor of any kind of reasonable strategem that would put more people on the pay roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON. At the time of that hearing you quoted with approval the study by Mr. Witt Bowden, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, that you said was published in January 1937, studying the employment of 2,200,000 workers, and you said the wage reduction following the N. R. A. of so much gave a cost average which was reflected in lower prices.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, if wage reduction would result in a lower cost average, high wages would operate just in the reverse, would it not?

Mr. HENDERSON. Not in the same ratio; depending on how large your operation was. I have got some figures, the best I could possibly get, of the unit labor costs. You can get those by calling on the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Now, let me see, that was 1936 or 1937, was it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; 1937.

Mr. HENDERSON. In 1936 hourly earnings on durable goods were about 91 in the index, based on the 1935 to 1939 average. They are now 112, but output per man-hour was only 98 and now it is 113.

The unit labor cost was 93; it went up to 104 in 1937; 108 in 1938; but then it went down to 99 in 1939; and 99 in 1940.

That is, while hourly earnings are going up, the output per man was going up, too. Labor costs are lower than in 1937.

The index of production in that time on the same goods went up from 108 to 135.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I want to read you a sentence from your testimony in June 1937, which is found on page 158 of the printed hearings, in which you stated: "Many lessons are to be learned from the N. R. A. experience, many of which relate to administration. Certainly it was learned that penalizing overtime needs to be stiff to force reemployment."

Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The 50-percent overtime was presented by you at that time, not as a fair wage, but as a penalty to spread employment. Are you still of that same opinion?

Mr. HENDERSON. If we are in a low level of employment, yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is the very point I am trying to come to. And, it has been bothering me all through these hearings about stepping up production of consumer goods and keeping the price down for the manufacturers who must increase production, but if they work their men more than 40 hours a week we will penalize them up to 50 percent for holidays, Sundays, and Saturdays; but we are asking them for 100-percent production and yet we penalize them for meeting the requirements. Now would not the reasons that you advanced in 1937 for the penalty apply with reverse English for taking off or relaxing the restrictions which in 1937, on the basis of employment in 1936 you said would apply to 12,000,000 men?

Mr HENDERSON, Mr. ROBERTSON, I stand on that testimony, and I think it was good. I think at the present time that those in charge of the Wage and Hour Division—and I notice in the press this morning the statement that there were cases where wages and hours interfered—would consider relaxation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It seems to me that the production problem is already sufficiently acute for some action, and do you think they have got the power, in interstate commerce, to relax the 40-hour week?

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, I think there have been many modifications, and there have been a number in the defense industry.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I don't think they could do it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think he could do it—that is my impression—and I think he said he would.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Do you not really think, with this program confronting us, it is vitally necessary to keep down these prices not only for defense articles but in order that we should give people work, and that it is advisable not to penalize an employer who works a man more than 40 hours a week, since, when you are putting that on, you are penalizing the expansion of employment?

Mr. HENDERSON. I think that ought to be given serious consideration if he can't increase the number of shifts.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Thank you very much. That is a better answer than I got from an economist last week when I asked if the economists had endorsed his supplemental statement, and he said they did not endorse his statement but they endorsed the general atmosphere (p. 655).

Mr. HENDERSON. We do not want the kind of wild inflation such as Italy is facing, and perhaps Japan. The only way, in my opinion, to keep down inflation is to have expansion and a full use of our resources.

You can have an inflation in any item that is badly needed by people who are going to have to pay for bread or anything else, when they have got to pay in order to get it. There is no kind of price control short of what the Germans have ever devised that will take care of a situation in a necessity (p. 663).

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have just one matter, and it won't take me but half a minute. When the labor shortage occurs that the gentleman from Michigan referred to shall we relax the restraint upon production of a 40-hour week if we want to carry out your program with the fullest production possible (p. 678)?

Mr. HENDERSON. In the arsenals, Mr. ROBERTSON, when they have run smack up against

that, there has been relaxation. I think that Hillman has found time and time again that there is a lot of complaint where there is no real difficulty, and where they won't take on skilled workers. However, I think on every legitimate case we ought to. I think that that is what the purpose of flexibility act is for.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You and I will have to get together on an amendment to the law because since you have testified this morning General Fleming advised me that no matter how acute the shortage might become he has no power to relax the 40-hour requirement in interstate commerce (p. 678).

Hon. MARRINER S. ECCLES, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I am opposed to a general sales tax, or to an increase or imposition of excise taxes except where it is necessary to curtail civilian demand for products needed in defense, thus preventing inflation (p. 681).

In order to prevent an inflationary spiral of price and wage increases, labor should be willing to moderate its demands for increased wages, but labor cannot be expected to follow such a course if employers are permitted to retain excessive profits (p. 682).

Prof. IRVING FISHER, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. I know of no economic boon, except the prevention of inflation and deflation, as great as that which our people could enjoy, both rich and poor, from removing the stunting influence of taxes on capital accumulation. Moreover, removal would tend to prevent the inflation now threatening us (p. 1056).

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I would like to ask you a question or two if I may.

Dr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. In the very last sentence of your statement you state: "Moreover, removal would tend to prevent the inflation now affecting us."

Dr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I have recognized you as a great tax authority for many years, and naturally I recognize that you know what you are talking about. What is the present danger of inflation?

Dr. FISHER. The danger of inflation now—and we are really having it—for my index number this last week went up, and has gone up each week now for the last 8 weeks except one, so I think you might say that we have inflation already; it comes about primarily through the Government selling the bonds to banks in return for newly created bank credit, which becomes circulating medium.

Insofar as he can do so Secretary Morgenthau has also properly advocated selling bonds to the public in return for savings; any newly created circulating medium inflation would be prevented, and the more savings you have the more that could be done. That is what I meant by that statement; when you stimulate savings you will avoid that method of inflation to a certain extent, which is now being used.

Mr. JENKINS. Would not the ultimate result be then that there would be a tendency on the part of everybody to save money so as to purchase Government bonds?

Dr. FISHER. It would help the Government's revenue in that way.

Mr. JENKINS. I did not quite make myself clear. I thought you said Mr. Morgenthau's plan was a good plan because it induced the people who have savings to lend their money to the Government.

Dr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. And the result would be you would never get people to put their money in industry.

Dr. FISHER. Well, of course, it would do so if you carried it to the extent that the Government got all the savings.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, nearly all of those who have testified here—at least many have testified—to the effect we are facing inflation because of rise in prices.

Dr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. If that is the case, when you take the illustration with reference to using savings to buy Government bonds—and I think I understand how with rising prices that will eventually result in inflation, and that what most of these men have testified is that we must be on the lookout for inflation and must prevent prices from rising. What have you to say about how to do that, if it can be done properly?

Dr. FISHER. Well, the method Mr. Morgenthau has advocated is not a method for preventing the creation of new circulation medium which make prices rise; generally the increase in circulating medium is what makes inflation; and in Germany, where they used the printing press, they were indirectly doing the same thing as we did here in selling bonds to banks.

Mr. JENKINS. It has been argued here, sort of cautiously at times, that the rise in prices has been due to the rise in wages.

Dr. FISHER. Well, that merely means one affects the other, that wages and prices go up, prices go along together, but that does not explain it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Dr. Fisher, for how many weeks did you say the index price has risen? (P. 1062.)

Dr. FISHER. About 8.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think you said because the Government has been selling bonds to banks.

Dr. FISHER. Largely; yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I saw a statement recently that wages represented 40 percent of the cost of steel and that in the United States Steel Corporation the advance granted, amounting to $60,000,000, would add from $2 to $5 a ton to the cost of steel, so there are other items besides selling bonds to banks.

Dr. FISHER. There are other items; yes. I was merely picking out one, and I picked it out particularly for two reasons: One, I believed it the more important item; and the other, because it related to the subject that I am talking about (p. 1063).

Mr. ROBERTSON. Great Britain recently launched a new battleship of 35,000 tons, with 16-inch guns, at a cost of $38,000,000. The next week we launched a 35,000-ton battleship with the same armament, at a cost of almost 100 percent more than what it cost Great Britain. Now, was that because we had been selling bonds to banks, or because of higher wages and things of that character?

Dr. FISHER. Well, there has been inflation in England, too; she has been selling bonds, too.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Why should our battleships cost twice as much as Britain's battleships?

Dr. FISHER. We have a higher level of wages—that is what you are thinking of—that is undoubtedly correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You have seen in the press the account of strikes of machinists in the shipyards that are now getting a dollar an hour, and they are asking a minimum wage of $1.15 an hour and $2.30 an hour for each hour worked over 40 hours a week, and they have tied up $500,000,000 worth of shipping, and if the Government yards and the private yards have to pay a minimum wage of $2.30 an hour for overtime the shipyards will have to increase the price over the margin they have fixed for building ships.

Dr. FISHER. I think it would tend to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, it is a fact, is it not, Doctor, that the sale of Government bonds to banks is just one of the factors, but not the major factor in these price rises to which you have referred?

Dr. FISHER. It depends on whether you are speaking of a special price rise or the general level. I think it is the major factor in the effect on the general level of prices. But there are individual cases of price rises that are new and related to the defense program.

Mr. ROBERTSON. How do you account for the fact that wages are now from 150 to 200 percent higher than parity, and farm prices are about 70 percent of parity; if selling bonds to banks is going to make for inflation, why has it not inflated farm prices as you say it has labor prices?

Dr. FISHER. Selling bonds to banks in order to create new credit would have in part no effect on the relative price of farm products and industrial products; it would be merely the two together as a part of the general level.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, Dr. Fisher, in 1917 and 1918 we sold about $20,000,000,000 of bonds to the banks; that is in World War No. 1.

Dr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In raising money.

Dr. FISHER. That is what raised prices; prices doubled.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, let us see some of the wage scales. In 1919, which was the peak of wage scales, in World War No. 1, plumbers were earning $33.99 per week; in 1940 they were earning $58.10 per week, and have been since advanced; and plumbers working on our camps for soldiers got about $13 a day, and $26 a day for Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. In 1919 electricians were getting $32.99 per week; in 1940 they were getting $58.04, and if they were getting what is called parity in farm income the scale of wage in 1940 would have been $33.42; it is now $58.04.

And $58, $59, right down the line, in 1940 for all these skilled workers. Since 1940 they have been advanced all along the line, and according to a statement put out a few days ago by the C. I. O. they have gotten a wage increase in 1941 amounting to $380,000,000, and the program, according to that statement, is just getting well under way.

Do you agree with me that this rapid increase in wage is bound to be reflected in increased prices?

Dr. FISHER. Yes; I agree with that. And I think that is, to some extent, self-defeating because of prices per hour, that is, wages per hour and wages per week and per year is a very different thing.

Mr. ROBERTSON. What should we do about it? Should we try to bring prices of farm commodities up to 200 percent, or should we try, through some relaxation of the 40-hour program, to keep some reasonable limit upon the advances of wages?

Dr. FISHER. Well, that is on another subject, and I do not like to get too far away from the subject I have been speaking on.

Extension of Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio address delivered by me in Washington on Tuesday night, August 5, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, the measure that is up for consideration before the Congress to extend the time of service of men who have been drafted into the military forces of the United States, beyond the period of 1 year, has far greater significance than most of our people realize. The demand to extend the service of these men is cloaked in that same gown used to cover every other step taken by the administration in the last year, namely, national defense. But, to many of us who have watched this steady march with constant deadly tread, this is but another step toward war. We are now so close to all-out shooting participation in the wars of the world that each step from now on becomes vastly more important.

Our future prospect for staying out of the war is constantly darkened by the progressive and provocative acts by our Government. Bold and belligerent steps are moving us toward the hideous shadow of war with its poisonous fruits of human suffering, misery, poverty, and unbearable taxation, followed by hatreds and moral disintegrations, and, then, the natural consequence of becoming inescapably interwoven with international intrigue for centuries to come.

The steps that we have taken have been rapid toward our all-out participation, notwithstanding the fact that constantly a vast majority of our people have expressed themselves in every possible and in every conceivable way as opposed to our becoming involved as a shooting participant. And, the question now is: "Shall America move on to her destiny, or shall we detour back to the wars of the Old World and there meet our fate?"

In the span of a little more than a century and a half under our American form of Government of divided authority, distributed opportunity, and limitations of power, America, by the constant flow of the strong and sturdy men and women of all the nationalities, creeds, and colors of the world, have built on this continent the greatest civilization that has ever been known to man—a civilization built on faith and confidence in the word of our leaders, tolerance, and respect for each other; a civilization based upon the dignity and rights of the individual citizen; a Government designed for all time to prevent the establishment of a royal house, a reigning family, a dictator, or a clique, class, or clan of men, ever gaining dominant and dictatorial control. Keeping those things constantly in our mind and observing the limitations of power and the restriction of authority, we became the happiest and freest Nation on earth, and we became the richest people in the world. Rich because of the creative genius that comes only from the freedom of the soul and the mind, and the freedom of action that is thus inspired.

Out of our abundance we have constantly contributed to the distressed people of the world scattered to the four corners of the earth.

A quarter of a century ago we halted our own march of progress to go back into the old world to participate in her constant struggle of power politics, bitter hatreds, changing boundary lines which have resulted in constant mass murder through the ages. We were told at that time that we were to participate in a war that would end all wars. We were to make the world safe for our kind of understanding. And we made a tremendous contribution. And the aftermath was shocking to us. The lack of appreciation on the part of the nations whom we defended, their failure to make equitable adjustments among the European nations at the conclusion of the war, their repudiation not only of the debts they owed us but their constant belittling of our efforts to save them convinced the American people that we should never do that thing again.

And we passed a law called the neutrality law. That was to prevent our getting into their next war. And, in the short span of a few months, all under the promise that we would stay out of the war and the pretext of building our own national defense, we have quickened our step until we stand almost at a fateful hour today.

We changed our neutrality law to sell goods to those people fighting for liberty. But to obtain that change in the law both the Executive branch and Members of the Congress pledged that all sales would be for cash-and-carry, and that it would keep war away from our shore.

Then came the original conscription bill. They said it was only for our own defense. The administration and Members of Congress pledged that these men would be taken only for 1 year, and that they would not be taken beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere. Who could be so unpatriotic as not to be willing to serve 1 year to prepare himself to protect our home and our shore?

It was a pledge and it was a promise. It was another step.

Then we were told that Britain needed our airplanes and tanks, and that we must sell them to them even though we didn't have enough to train the men we were calling into service. But that was done.

The law forbade our selling these war implements, but we got around the law by calling them obsolete even though they were of our latest design and the best we had. Still they found a way to sell them. They said it was to keep war away from our shore.

Then Britain said she needed our destroyers. The law forbade it. But we called them obsolete, too. And we were told that we were trading them for bases. Britain got our ships. We got the right to negotiate for and to purchase bases, and to pay for them with cash.

Then came the lease-lend bill. They said it was needed to prevent our becoming involved in the war. Some of us who opposed it said that if one man, namely, the President, was given all the power to distribute our military and naval equipment throughout the world, that it was bound to involve us because he would naturally ask them what they needed it for, and sit in and advise them in the conduct of the war, which naturally would involve us. We were assured that this would not happen. But a little more than a week ago Mr. Harry Hopkins, the personal representative of the President, sat in with the British War Cabinet, if you please, in secret meeting, and Viscount Elibank said that it was fitting that America should have a seat in the British War Cabinet because America would "very soon be nearer to us in the war than they are already."

The lease-lend bill was to give the President authority for what he had already done—the trading of our destroyers. The lease-lend bill provided that the President could give any country in the world whose defense he thought essential to our defense, part of our existing defense equipment, whether it be guns, cannon, tanks, planes, or ships, with the only limitation that he could not give them more than $1,300,000,000 worth combined. Then, when the administration asked for an appropriation to aid Britain, the Congress appropriated $7,000,000,000 more. That was more than we ever appropriated at any one time in our history for the care of our own people.

Then came the problem of production, and a priority system was established. Certain strategic materials were curtailed, and our factories throughout the country began even then to feel that they would soon be faced with shortages that might result in losses or even closing down of their plants completely. But they were told it was to keep us out of the war.

Then the Chief Executive ordered ships of the countries of the world who were fighting those we chose to aid seized in our harbors. Then Congress was again asked to pass a law to give authority for that which had already been done.

Another step. But, of course, they said, to keep us out of the war.

The United States Army moved in on men who were striking for a living wage in a factory that produced airplanes, 90 percent of which were being sent across the sea. There was no authority to move the Army with fixed bayonets into an industrial plant, but after the deed was done Congress was asked to pass a "seizure bill," and in the Senate it was intimated that we were not backing up our President when we wrote in an amendment which merely required that the management and labor be given ample time to conduct negotiations before the Army was used to seize the plant.

The House the other day rejected this right to seize plants in that way. But it was another step toward all-out power for all-out production for all-out participation in the war to which the people have constantly expressed their opposition.

Then we find suddenly that our troops are in Iceland—outside of the Western Hemisphere. Although we were told we were to take over Iceland and protect its people, we find that our soldiers are participating with the British troops there—outside the Western Hemisphere. They say again it is for national defense and to keep us out of war.

Then we find that boys who were drafted from their homes, from their work, under the promise in the law for only 1 year's service, have been sent, some of them, to the bases where those in authority knew at the time they were sending them that they could not keep faith with these boys and return them within the year

Another bold step.

Then they came to Congress again and asked for authority for things that had already been done. What authority did they ask for? To remove the restrictions of the law so that men could be sent anywhere the Commander in Chief wished to send them beyond the Western Hemisphere. And, more—they asked to have every restriction removed as to the number that could be drafted, and they asked to have the restriction also removed as to the limit of time of their service. Yet, when these men wished to protest to their Representatives in Congress against removing these restrictions they were told by their commanding officers that they could not communicate with Members of the Congress.

What conclusion can be drawn from these bold steps and from these bold demands?

The administration will soon ask for an appropriation for critical equipment sufficient to provide an Army of 3,230,000 men. With the President's personal representative sitting in with the British War Cabinet, and sitting in with Joe Stalin, with the British generals, Sir Archibald Wavell and Sir Claude Auchinleck, calling for an American expeditionary force, and with our own Chief of Staff asking for the right to draft as many men as they choose, and to send them where they choose, and to keep them as long as they choose so long as the President will say that it is for national defense and during emergency. What can we think of these demands? When we build a base in Newfoundland to protect our eastern shore, and then move troops to Greenland to protect Newfoundland, and then send troops to Iceland to protect Greenland, and then hear constant rumors that we are building bases in Ireland to protect Iceland, what can we think?

In the face of a demand for an unlimited Army for an unlimited time to be sent anywhere, there can be but one conclusion, and that is that in violation of the pledges made by the Congress to the boys that were drafted, and in violation of the promises made before election to the people that we would

stay out of the war, we are moving steadily toward that fateful hour. Then, add to that the words of the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles, who states that there can come no peace until the Hitlerite government of Germany has been finally and utterly destroyed, and, suggesting that after this war some international "instrumentality" must be brought about to force the various nations of the earth to keep peace, one with the other.

We know from the results of every poll that has been taken that over 75 percent of our American people do not want to become a shooting participant in Europe's war. We know from polls taken in England that 72 percent of the people of Great Britain think America will become a shooting participant in the war.

The question today is plain and crystal clear. Shall Congress represent the will of over 75 percent of the American people, or yield to the propaganda and demand of 72 percent of the people of Great Britain?

If this is a Government by the American people and for the American people, it is the duty of the American people to speak now more forcefully than ever before, and let their Representatives in both Houses of the Congress know that they expect them to represent the American viewpoint, and stop taking further belligerent steps that are in violation of the pledges made to the American people.

This fight to keep us out of war can still be won.

They may silence our citizens who have been drafted for military service, but the people who remain at home must not be silenced. If the people speak, and they must speak now, if those elected to public responsibility keep their pledge to the people, America will move on—America will move on to her destiny, and not be dragged to Europe to meet her fate.

The War on Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of today entitled "The War on Inflation."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of August 7, 1941]

THE WAR ON INFLATION

Testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee on Tuesday, Price Administrator Leon Henderson declared that the country was headed into serious inflation unless something was done about the situation without delay.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Henderson, in urging enactment of price-control legislation, stresses two aspects of the situation which are deliberately soft-pedaled in the pending bill, namely, farm prices and wages. He did not specifically urge the inclusion of these in the measure. But he pointed out that farm prices, along with food prices, are conspicuous for the fact that they have already advanced further than at the corresponding stage of the World War inflation, while wages constitute "the most volatile and dynamic element" in the price picture. Pay rolls, he showed, have risen to the highest point in the Nation's history at a time when, because of defense demands, "there is less and less to buy." He defined this situation—increasing purchasing power coinciding with stationary or declining production of goods to buy—as itself inflation.

If this is the heart of the inflation problem—and there can be little doubt that it is—then we face the question as to whether the whole attack on inflation does not call for thoroughgoing reorganization and consolidation. If the problem is one of purchasing power running away from production, it certainly is not going to be solved simply by granting someone the authority to fix prices. The first and main task, obviously, is to concert all the measures affecting the adjustment of purchasing power to available production.

No one would expect to wage a successful war if the air force was not notified as to what the main objective was; if the movements of the infantry and the artillery were so poorly synchronized that the latter found itself shelling its own troops instead of the enemy; if the tanks had to retire from the engagement because no one had thought to see to it that they had a sufficient supply of fuel, and if the support aviation decided to take time off for a 3-hour lunch and a short nap at the most crucial stage of the attack.

Yet this is a roughly accurate picture of the anti-inflation campaign as it has been waged in the United States thus far. The Federal Reserve Board filed an urgent appeal with the Congress and the President as far back as last January 1, asking legislation to prevent undue credit expansion, but that request was pigeonholed, presumably because the Secretary of the Treasury feared it might increase the cost of Treasury borrowing. Congress, in spite of the admitted importance of reducing nondefense spending, actually voted to increase such expenditures in the 1942 Budget by nearly $100,000,000. At the very time the administration was considering curtailment of installment selling as an anti-inflation move it was liberalizing the terms of its own F. H. A. loans.

Although it has been repeatedly pointed out that the crying need at the present time is for a tax bill which would recapture the excess purchasing power being created by the defense program, Congress, with the support of the Treasury, has placed its greatest tax emphasis on a policy of "soaking the rich." Although the administration admits that farm prices have advanced out of all proportion to other prices, and that wages—now at their historic highs—are the most important single element in prices, it is now sponsoring a price-control bill under which both of these price areas are exempted. Although cotton prices are the highest in 11 years, the farm bloc in Congress is at this moment proposing to "freeze" the 7,000,000 bales of Government-held surplus, lest the liquidation of any part of these stocks prevent the further inflation of prices.

One could go on almost by the hour with such examples of confusion, of working at cross-purposes, and of placing self-interest above the national welfare. These should suffice to show that the present problem transcends mere price fixing. The war against inflation will not be won until a general staff is set up with the acumen and the farsightedness to coordinate a genuine major offensive and with the authority to make its policies effective.

Propaganda Is Pulling Us Toward War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, July 28), 1941

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Propaganda Is Pulling Us Toward War." This is a daily feature under the heading "In the news." This particular article was published in the Washington Times-Herald in its issue of August 6, 1941. It is by the pen of a great patriot and a great American, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, who is doing all he can to keep us out of this war.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 6, 1941]

IN THE NEWS

PROPAGANDA IS PULLING US TOWARD WAR

According to dispatches from Buenos Aires, Argentina has told both the German and British Governments to abate their propaganda.

Otherwise, Argentina would have to take steps to prevent the circulation of foreign propaganda and to close all propaganda bureaus and shut off all propaganda sources.

Said the Foreign Minister in notes to both the German and British Governments:

"The material published in Buenos Aires, 'more or less,' under the auspices of the British and German Governments" has been found to contain "statements injurious or offensive to one side or the other" in the European war.

These publications, the Foreign Minister declares, "constitute propaganda which affects deeply the tranquillity and order of this neutral country" and must be discontinued.

In fact, the Foreign Minister hints at drastic measures in case the "distribution of these publications" is not discontinued.

Apparently Argentina takes its declaration of neutrality seriously and is determined not to have the "tranquillity and order" of its people disturbed by propaganda in alien interests.

Why cannot the United States be as sincere, as honest, as independent, as American as Argentina?

Why do the tranquillity and order of our people have to be disturbed by British and German and Russian propaganda which seeks to involve our Nation in every conflict which arises in every part of the world?

Why has not the United States got a truly democratic Government, a truly American Government to protect us from such propaganda instead of to encourage it to our definite and desperate detriment?

Our whole country is torn with contending fascism and communism—with propaganda for British interests or German interests or Russian interests.

No thought is given to American interests.

Propaganda influences us as a people to give away billions of dollars to warring foreign nations when we have come to the very verge of bankruptcy ourselves.

Propaganda impels us to surrender a considerable part of our naval equipment and almost our entire airplane production for the benefit of alien interests.

Propaganda blinds us to the inevitable results of our folly and makes us forget the proven consequences of our former follies committed under similar circumstances and incentives.

Propaganda destroys our unity and undermines our loyalty.

It infects and contaminates our conception of nationality.

Propaganda transforms our America from a melting pot, fusing various races to a harmonious and homogeneous whole, into a separator—dividing our people into their original racial and national elements and arraying them in conflict with each other, reviving the hatreds and antagonisms of their former fatherlands, and the age-old prejudices and hostilities of Europe and Asia.

Propagandists are abusing the liberties of our free country and running amock in our hospitable land.

Foreign ambassadors and foreign statesmen parade across our country exhorting our people to take part in foreign wars.

Our theaters have degenerated into mere media for propaganda.

The screen reeks with propaganda, the radio smells to high heaven with it.

Propaganda will eventually land us in this alien conflict—propaganda plus the partisanship and alien-mindedness of our own Government.

It is truly unfortunate that we citizens of the United States have not a government with the firmness and independence of Argentina's Government to tell these selfish foreign nations, which are disturbing our peace and unity, our "order and tranquillity," to desist before we close up their propaganda mills and expel their propaganda agents for the protection of our own people.

Quo Tai-Chi, Chinese Foreign Minister, said Saturday that Thailand is coming more and more under the domination of Japan and has granted recognition to Manchukuo as an independent state.

Furthermore, "the influential Chinese newspaper" Takungpao "sharply criticized the United States and Britain for failing to forestall Japanese domination in Thailand."

This "hen track" newspaper assumed to say:

"All our previous appeals for the United States and Britain to protect Thailand and prevent her coming into Japan's orbit have fallen on deaf ears.

"The United States and Britain lagged behind again—always behind."

Now, is not that too bad?

Why and how must it be the business of the United States whether Thailand recognizes Manchukuo or not, or inclines toward the Japanese orbit or the Chinese orbit?

Must the United States interfere to decide the internal affairs and international sympathies of every peewee country in the world?

Must we meddle in the troubles of all of Europe and all of Asia?

And if we must meddle why, when we meddle, do we not stay meddled in one spot and on one side?

First we are meddling to free Finland.

Then we are meddling to enslave her.

First we were interfering to prevent the absorption of the free Republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Now we are interfering to restore them to the sway of Bolshevist brutality.

First we want to fight for that dear France, our beloved ally—"Lafayette, we are here."

And now we want to war against her.

Consistency is a rank imitation jewel as far as we are concerned.

We occupy Greenland.

We occupy Iceland.

We secure British bases by agreement in various British possessions, but offer frantic if futile objections when Japan does a little occupying by agreement on its own account.

We are led into innumerable and unbelievable mazes and messes by our persistent effort to run the universe.

Why not mind our own business and make foreign propagandists go home and mind their own business?

What America needs is unity—and not only unity but sanity.

The Farmers' Interests in the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. CLAUDE R. WICKARD, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the best statements I have heard with regard not only to the St. Lawrence proposal but with regard to the situation generally in this country was made on August 4 to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors by the Secretary of Agriculture the Honorable Claude R. Wickard. I quote his statement in full, together with certain excerpts from the questions propounded to him and his answers:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the farmers of this country have two main interests in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Farmers need more adequate and cheaper transportation, and farmers are vitally concerned with national security.

The testimony of Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox, and others, who have preceded me here, has made it clear that the St. Lawrence project would measurably advance our defense efforts. They have testified that the transportation facilities, the electric power, and the shipbuilding facilities which would be made available by construction of this project are badly needed and that these facilities would make it possible for us to expand our production of defense materials. I accept their judgment on this point, and I am sure that American farmers do likewise.

We are facing at this time a serious prospect of insufficient transportation capacity to meet all the needs of agriculture. Without increased transportation facilities we are not going to be able to move our increased defense production of both industrial and farm goods without delay and difficulty. The burden on the railroads has been further increased by the shift of ships in coastal and intercoastal runs to trans-Atlantic runs. Intercoastal shipping by way of the Panama Canal has been materially reduced, and this means an added demand on transcontinental freight carriers.

All of this adds up to a very real danger that we may soon be unable to meet the transportation needs of agriculture. The Department of Agriculture is taking steps to minimize the effects of such shipping shortages. Ever-normal granary supplies of wheat and corn are being moved into the East for future use. As supplies are used for feeding, eastern storage stocks will be replenished to maintain available reserves. Such measures cannot be regarded, however, as substitutes for needed expansion of transportation capacity to meet the needs of the years to come.

Farmers don't want any such paralysis in transportation as took place in 1916 and 1917. The farmer is one of those who suffers most from a situation of that kind. Preference is given, as of course it has to be, to the transportation of munitions and iron, steel, and other basic materials for industrial defense production. But agricu'tural products are also essential to defense.

In my opinion, construction of the St. Lawrence seaway is one important method of relieving the pressure on railroad and other transport services in the future. The seaway would be a useful auxiliary form of transportation in time of crisis, and linking our whole inland-waterway system, embracing the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Illinois, the Tennessee, and other rivers, and the Louisiana-Texas Intracoastal Waterway, will bring the benefit of cheaper transportation to practically all American farmers.

I would like to point out to the committee that the maximum season for operation on the seaway would be from early May to late November. I understand that opposition groups contend that this seasonal factor would make the proposed seaway of little use. As you know, the months of August through October are the months when the farmers of the Middle West are making their heaviest shipments of crops to market and when demands for transportation facilities are greatest. The peak demand for transport services comes in September and October. For this reason, the seaway would dovetail into our national transportation pattern, providing additional facilities when they are most needed.

The Middle West, and its farmers especially, suffer transportation disadvantages as compared with the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific seaboard areas. I think it is an accepted fact that the construction of the Panama Canal seriously weakened the competitive position of the midcontinental area. It cut the distance from the Pacific to the Atlantic in terms of transportation costs. Because of the low water rates in effect after the Canal was built, the producers in the Middle West and the Great Plains States were farther away from their eastern markets in terms of freight charges than they had been before. This competitive disadvantage has increased with the long-term upward trend of rail freight rates.

Construction of the seaway would give the States in the Great Lakes Basin transportation advantages comparable with those now enjoyed by coastal regions and would overcome inequalities that now exist.

Substantial savings on the cost of shipping agricultural commodities, such as dairy products from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan to the Atlantic coastal area and citrus fruits from Florida back to the Middle West, could be expected with the construction of the proposed seaway. Savings could also be expected on the transportation costs of goods and commodities shipped into the Great Lakes Basin, thus reducing the prices of the products that farmers buy. Lumber and clothing and many of the manufactured items farmers need could be delivered cheaper in the Middle West. This makes for a better situation for both agriculture and industry on a sound, economic, and permanent basis.

The seaway would serve a vast area of the Middle West which normally produces enormous quantities of farm products for export. Right now, as bad as the export market situation is, the Middle West is producing large amounts of pork and cheese and evaporated and dried milk, and beans for export to Britain.

We cannot see the shape of things to come as clearly as we would like to be able to see them, but some things we can see. We can see, for example, that as the German war machine has moved through Europe it has

left a path of famine behind it. The Germans are living fairly well now, but they are robbing other nations to do it. Foundation herds on the Continent are being destroyed to feed the conquerors and the British are sacrificing their foundation herds, too. This destruction is taking away the very ability to produce for a long time to come.

Even if the war should stop soon, it will be a long time before Europe will be on a self-sufficing basis in livestock products. After the war, a large part of the world will be looking to the United States for food. The products of the farms of the Middle West will be needed abroad, and the proposed marine highway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River to the Atlantic will provide an effective means of moving those products to a distressed Europe.

Some people, while admitting that the St. Lawrence seaway would reduce the cost of shipping farm products abroad, have said that our farm export market is gone forever. The truth is that what will happen to the farmers' export market after the war depends on who wins the war. In any event, we should be prepared to compete for world markets when the war is over. All of us are determined to do everything practical to hold and regain our foreign customers on a permanently sound basis. Certainly reductions in transportation costs would increase the ability of American farmers to compete in the world market.

Farmers in the Northeastern States will share in the benefits of cheaper and more available electricity from the seaway project. Studies show that thousands of farmers in the areas bordering the project cannot now afford electricity for economic farm operations.

The St. Lawrence seaway will benefit American agriculture as a whole by lowering transportation charges on the things farmers sell and the things they buy. It will aid in the restoration of our foreign markets after the war. It will increase our national security in times of crisis.

The Mississippi and its tributaries, particularly the Ohio, the Missouri, and the Illinois, have been brought to a high state of development, and they are now a bulwark of our national defense. These inland waterways link up with the seaway, and its completion is therefore the logical and essential capstone for this great development of our internal economy and its adequate defense.

I urge that your committee take prompt and favorable action on H. R. 4927.

EXCERPTS OF QUESTIONS ASKED SECRETARY WICKARD

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Secretary, most of your statements to the effect that this project would be of great benefit to the farmers have dealt with the farmers of what we term the Middle West. We, west of the Mississippi, feel that you are not in the Middle West. I live in Arkansas, and most of the things outside of cotton and sugar, practically all of the things that we purchase, come from that area around the Great Lakes, and most of the things we have to sell move in that direction; that is, cheese, milk, butter, eggs, poultry, rice, cattle, and fruit move northward into those markets that have been developed. Whether that is the best course to the sea, I do not know, but even for world transportation that is the way they go to the world markets. Now, if this project, because of the lowering of freight rates for short distances inland, will help that area, will it not to the same extent help us as far inland as Arkansas?

Secretary WICKARD. Why, I should think so.

Mr. ELLIS. In the same proportion?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. May I ask the Secretary one question?

Mr. ELLIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. It has been brought out here that this would reduce the cost of transporting wheat to the Atlantic seaboard about 8 or 10 cents a bushel. Now, when that is done, that will mean a rise in the price of wheat to the extent of 10 cents a bushel on the Chicago market, will it not?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes; the tendency would be that way. It will surely put the Chicago wheat price nearer the Atlantic coast price.

Mr. RANKIN. When you raise the price of a commodity on the market in its general market it reflects back to every farmer in the country that produces that commodity, does it not?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. So it would raise the price of wheat throughout the country 8 to 10 cents a bushel, would it not?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Secretary, I am very much interested in your statements regarding cheaper power that might be obtained for the farmers from this project. Now, your feeling with regard to this project applies, likewise, to all such other projects constructed and proposed.

Secretary WICKARD. On the whole; yes, sir; that is correct. That is a pretty blanket statement, but I am greatly in favor of increasing power development for opening the field to all American citizens, and particularly that available to farmers.

Mr. ELLIS. You would then be in favor of the proposed Arkansas Valley Authority that is pending here in the Congress and before this committee?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir.

An Efficient Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

ARTICLE OF MR. PAUL MALLON AND AN EDITORIAL FROM THE INFANTRY JOURNAL FOR AUGUST

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Paul Mallon, and an editorial from the Infantry Journal entitled "The Infantry Mind":

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 5, 1941]

FIGHTING SPIRIT STILL COUNTS MOST IN WARS

(By Paul Mallon)

Fighting spirit of soldiers still counts most in wars. Machines only are implements for it.

This is what the Army is trying to say in justification of its mass Army policies against its critics like Representative Ross COLLINS who want machines, machines, machines.

The new fighting creed of this Nation's Army (which is likely to be pinned to the wall at the bedhead of every soldier) may well be a leading editorial in this month's Infantry Journal, answering accusations that the General Staff has an infantry mind. Its gist:

"The infantry mind is a mind which thinks men are the essence of fighting, that the hearts, guts, and blood of soldiers win wars, that bombers, tanks, and jeeps; howitzers, guns, and mortars; grenades, pursuit planes, and rifles—are tools in the hands of men, of fighting men, and can never win wars by themselves.

"The infantry mind is the same mind as the air-force mind, the armored force, the quartermaster, the field artillery, and ordnance mind—one single mind with one single, hard-driving aim—the defeat, the crushing defeat of the enemy."

[From the Infantry Journal of August 1941]

THE INFANTRY MIND

Somebody mentioned "the infantry mind" to us a few days ago, and since then we've been doing some thinking as to just what "the infantry mind" is.

The infantry mind is a mind that thinks men are the essence of fighting power—that the tougher and harder and keener and abler the soldier, the better the army. It thinks that it is men who win wars, and that those who think armies can get along mainly on brains and mechanical ability are already defeated. It thinks that the iron fighting will of men in the mass is the heart of an army, whether they do their fighting in planes or in tanks, or gain their ground by the yard by the use of the ground. It thinks that "men in the mass" means every fighting man and every man who helps him fight.

The infantry mind is a mind that wants every weapon and gadget sought for and adopted that will add strength and power and speed and sureness to the whole fighting force. It is a mind that thinks an army must have such weapons in the numbers it appears to require and a few more still. For it wants to be sure there are enough. And it wants no time to be wasted on argument about what shall be done with new weapons. It wants them to get into the hands of any partner in the fighting team in the shortest possible time so that new power can add to the strength of the team.

The infantry mind is a mind that thinks only in terms of a strong, ready, all-out support. If it's infantry doing the supporting, then the infantry mind is constantly ready to add to the fight every ounce it has of drive, speed, and technical ability expressed in fire power and maneuver, to help the troops it is supporting. If it's infantry that is getting the support, then the infantry mind looks for this same kind of help—for cooperation without thought of collar ornaments from every supporting man and his weapon of ground or air.

The infantry mind doesn't care how it gets to the battle so long as it gets there in time. In time to surprise and in strength to match and outfight the enemy. It is eager to use the plane, the truck, and the jeep to cover the ground and get its men and their weapons wherever their attack can hit hardest and go farthest. It thinks that the fighter in the tank and the plane must have this same unalterable thought of striking where their powerful blows will do most good.

The infantry mind is a crafty mind, not merely a charging, fighting, assaulting mind. For it knows that a stroke that strikes weakness is a stroke that tells heavily, and that every particle of driving power must then be applied. But if it knows that the enemy's weaknesses must be sought; it likewise knows that the enemy's strength must often be overcome first to create a weakness. And it knows that when there is a job like this, it takes more than ever the fighting heart of the soldier himself, of the single man and of men in the mass—of men on the ground, in planes, and in tanks.

For the infantry mind is a mind that thinks men are the essence of fighting, that the heart and the guts and blood of soldiers

win wars, and that bombers and tanks and jeeps; howitzers, guns, and mortars; grenades and pursuit planes and rifles—are tools in the hands of men, of fighting men, and can never win wars by themselves.

The infantry mind, so the infantryman thinks, must be the same mind as the air force mind, the armored force mind, the quartermaster mind, the field artillery mind, the ordnance mind, the coast artillery mind, the finance mind, the cavalry mind, the chemical warfare mind, the Signal Corps mind, the engineer mind, the Medical Corps mind, the morale branch mind, and the minds of chaplains and inspectors and adjutants general. One mind there must be—one single mind, with one single, hard-driving aim—the defeat, the crushing defeat, of the enemy.

Wheat Marketing Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post of August 7, 1941]

ALAS, MR. WICKARD!

Between the Department of Agriculture trying to enforce our farm legislation and the farm bloc in Congress trying to scuttle it, the outlook for agriculture is not a pleasant thing to contemplate. Secretary Wickard has announced that wheat farmers will be asked to vote again next spring on the question of marketing quotas. After the hullabaloo raised by the heavy penalties exacted for marketing wheat in excess of current quotas, the Department of Agriculture may well have hesitated to make this announcement. However, the law provides that quotas shall be proclaimed in any year if it appears that the wheat supply will exceed a normal year's domestic consumption and exports by more than 35 percent. With a bumper crop in prospect and export outlets cut down, the head of the A. A. A. says that the wheat carryover will be the largest on record by next July. So it is a foregone conclusion that the law in regard to marketing quotas will have to be invoked.

As storage facilities are already filled to overflowing with wheat held against Government loans, a good many farmers no doubt are beginning to realize the wisdom of drastic restrictions upon production and sales at present artificially high levels. But the farm bloc in Congress apparently is not convinced of the necessity of curtailing supply under such circumstances. The House and Senate have passed and sent to conference a bill which would permit wheat farmers who had planted excess acreage to market up to normal production without paying a penalty. In other words, the farmer whose crop was below normal in his allotted acreage, would not, as now, be penalized for every bushel sold off the excess acreage. A Senate amendment to this bill, furthermore, would "freeze" Government-held wheat stocks, and another Senate amendment would remove marketing penalties for excess wheat used to feed livestock or kept by the farmer for home use. This perpetual legislative sniping at the production controls which are such necessary safeguards against financial collapse of the farm program is thoroughly disheartening, for it implies either complete ignorance of the nature of economic law or profound indifference to the consequences of defying it.

Federal Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

RESOLUTION OF LOUISIANA HIGHWAY USERS CONFERENCE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Louisiana Highway Users Conference at Baton Rouge, La., on July 25, 1941.

I have always believed that the question of gasoline taxes is one that should be reserved to the several States, and this resolution expresses the appreciation of the people of my district to the Ways and Means Committee of the House for rejecting any further Federal tax on gasoline.

The resolution in question is as follows:

Whereas the highway users of this State, consisting of farmers, merchants, motorists, truckers, and others, have contributed what might be termed the first line of defense in the form of a network of highways reaching into every section of the State and built with the millions of dollars contributed by motor-vehicle owners; and

Whereas the highway users of this State, since 1932, have been contributing an additional 1 cent a gallon "emergency" tax on gasoline to the Federal Government, over and above a tax of 7 cents a gallon on gasoline paid to the State of Louisiana; and

Whereas the Federal gasoline tax was increased from 1 cent to 1½ cents on July 1, 1940 to provide additional funds for national defense; and

Whereas it is noted that the House Ways and Means Committee of Congress has recently rejected the proposal to further increase the Federal gasoline tax from 1½ cents to 2½ cents per gallon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Louisiana Highway Users Conference, assembled at a meeting held at the Heidelberg Hotel, Baton Rouge, La., on this the 25th day of July 1941, go on record as commending the action of the Ways and Means Committee of the House for rejecting this unfair and inequitable proposal, and respectfully requesting and urging all Louisiana Members of the House and Senate in Washington to support the recommendations of the Ways and Means Committee, and to oppose any effort to include a further tax on gasoline in the new revenue bill; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be made a part of the minutes of this meeting and that the secretary is hereby instructed to mail a copy to each Member of the Louisiana congressional delegation in Washington.

Rivers at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW ORLEANS TIMES-PICAYUNE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to place in the record an editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of August 1, 1941, in connection with the development of the Mississippi inland waterway system and a comparison with the St. Lawrence seaway. This editorial contains some very pertinent information. The editorial in question is as follows:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of August 1, 1941]

RIVERS AT WORK

St. Louis advices confirm earlier reports that the Mississippi inland waterway system is carrying a huge and growing share of the Nation's transportation load in this emergency. Tows handling the equivalent of hundreds of carloads are carrying essential materials over the 7,000-mile system to points where those materials are needed. If the rail carriers are having to take over considerable part of the burden normally carried by coastwise and ocean shipping due to the requisitioning of merchant craft for other tasks, the Mississippi Valley's linked and canalized waterways are proving their immediate value in the domestic transportation field.

The Federal barge system according to the St. Louis report is handling 50 percent more traffic than it did last year, while June proved the best month in its history. Between fifty and sixty other companies, we read further, are operating on the Mississippi, Ohio, and other rivers of the linked system. Wheat, corn, sulfur, scrap iron, ore, fabricated steel, oil, gasoline, cotton, chemicals are among the commodities moving in vast volume by the barges.

Among the units registering marked tonnage gain is the Illinois waterway, connecting the Mississippi system with the Great Lakes. Some days ago we summarized in this column, a survey-report urging use of the Lakes-to-Gulf waterway for economical delivery of oceangoing ships built in Great Lakes yards to the sea. The cost of equipping the existing waterways for this service was estimated at a few millions—a tiny fraction of the estimated cost of the St. Lawrence seaway scheme whose construction is advocated for that service. Under the terms of the original St. Lawrence treaty, beaten in the middle thirties by the Senate, the right of the United States to divert from Lake Michigan additional waters when and as needed to maintain navigable depths in the Lakes-to-Gulf channel was surrendered to veto by Canada. One of the conclusions and warnings driven home by the great emergency service now being rendered by the Mississippi system runs to the effect that this great inland waterway facility's capacity for

national usefulness must never be destroyed or impaired by any treaty or other international agreement sacrificing American rights and the national interest.

Is Churchill Over Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN JARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM OIL CITY (PA.) DERRICK

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial taken from the Oil City Derrick, Oil City, Pa., entitled "Is Churchill Over Here?":

[From the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of August 6, 1941]

IS CHURCHILL OVER HERE?

If it be true that President Roosevelt has gone to meet Winston Churchill somewhere on this side the conclusion is obvious. Churchill is going to add his plea to those of other big Britishers that the time has come for us to get into this war as we got into the last one.

That such a meeting is arranged has been deduced from two facts. One is that Churchill is missing from Parliament, and may be away for some days. The other is that Mr. Roosevelt left under great secrecy and gave orders, contrary to the usual custom, that he was not to be accompanied by news correspondents.

The President faces the greatest dilemma of his career. He has ignored promises to balance the Budget, but he cannot ignore the definite and emphatic promises he made to the fathers and mothers of America in his campaign last year that their sons would not be sent to fight in foreign countries.

This promise was repeated. Once it was made under such great emotional stress that there were tears in the President's voice. Now Mr. Roosevelt is being besought to break that promise—not by Americans so much as by the British high command. The new commander in the Near East and his predecessor, Wavell, have stated boldly that American soldiers are needed on the European, African, and Asiatic fronts if Britain is to be saved.

In a thundering address in London on July 29 Mr. Churchill told the British people that the United States "is giving us aid on a gigantic scale and is advancing in rising wrath and conviction to the very verge of war" on Germany. But he warned Britain that she must count on her own strength to repel any invasion gamble by Germany in September.

We hope the President does not misjudge the temper of the American people. Do we have any more reason to go to war today than we had when Candidate Roosevelt promised the fathers and mothers of America that their sons would not be sent to fight abroad? When Mr. Roosevelt uttered these words Germany had smashed Poland. She had taken Norway, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium and she had forced France to surrender. She had begun her bombardment of London, and the world was waiting daily for news of a German invasion of England, promised first for August and then for September.

Since that time the situation has improved. Britain has had a year in which to fortify herself and mobilize her forces. Hitler has his hands full in Russia. The British have wiped out the Italian forces in Africa. The Germans have lost the *Bismarck*. Her two other pocket battleships of the *Graf Spee* class have been bombed repeatedly in French harbors. Nazi sinkings of British supply ships have declined. American planes are being used to batter German channel and Atlantic bases as well as German cities and munitions plants.

A year ago Mr. Churchill said: "Give us the tools and we will finish the job." We are giving him the tools in greater abundance. We are using our own flyers to ferry planes across the Atlantic. We have passed the lend-lease bill providing Britain with credits of $7,000,000,000. The North Atlantic is being patrolled by our Navy. We have taken over Iceland and relieved a British garrison of 50,000 men.

But we have hesitated to send an army abroad for the very good reason that Mr. Roosevelt promised that we would not do so unless we were attacked. Outside of the sinking of the *Robin Moor*, we have not been attacked. Germany has occupied no bases which threaten our security or that of this hemisphere. The *Robin Moor* incident is closed.

If the Roosevelt-Churchill meeting be a fact, the reasons behind it can only be surmised. Is the Nazi conquest of Russia imminent? Is the full Nazi strength to be thrown against Britain and America afterward? Or has the Hitler plan to conquer the world run through itself, and the United States is asked to get in now to bring the war to a quicker end? This is anybody's guess except the few on the inside.

Nor do we presume to say that the defeat of Hitler and the obliteration of Hitlerism are not worth any sacrifice we can make. We believe the defeat of Hitler is the one great job facing the world. We know that if Hitler wins, he will be a constant threat to the peace and security of this country and this hemisphere. But we object to being wooed into this war. If our entry is inevitable now, it was inevitable when Mr. Roosevelt promised the fathers and mothers of America that we would stay out.

The American people are not cowards. British resistance has elicited their intense admiration and their profound sympathy. Britain, Poland, and Greece have suffered cruelly in what Hitler has called his blood bath. We believe the American people will fight Hitler any time and anywhere if the provocation be sufficient, but we ask that we be told plainly why we have to fight.

In this situation there is nothing paramount to the truth. When our leaders make solemn promises, we ask that these promises be kept or be told why they cannot be kept.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BERGEN (N. J.) EVENING RECORD

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bergen Evening Record of August 1, 1941:

[From the Bergen (N. J.) Evening Record of August 1, 1941]

THE ST. LAWRENCE WHITE ELEPHANT

Walter P. Heddon, commerce expert of the Port of New York Authority, must have opened the eyes of the congressional Committee on Rivers and Harbors with his very temperate but devastatingly logical presentation of the case against the administration's pet St. Lawrence seaway project. Because gubernatorial vetoes prevented Heddon's official appearance, he had to appear as a private citizen, but that myth deluded nobody. Actually he presented the result of studies of the Port Authority, which Governors Lehman and Edison tried to block because they said it came in conflict with their States' policy.

Lehman's explanatory statement was true, because his State's legislative body had approved the seaway project; but Edison's cover-up statement withdrawing his veto was glaringly untrue, because his State's legislative body had not only opposed the project but also instructed New Jersey's attorney general to attend the hearings to oppose it. Thus the Governor of New York was truly executing his State's legislative policy, while the Governor of New Jersey was boldly defying and defeating his State's legislative policy. As in executive Washington, so in Trenton legislative bodies are patiently tolerated as governmental nuisances comprised of immature minds unworthy of serious consideration by executive big shots.

Although Heddon pointed out that the commerce of the Port of New York provides employment for 250,000 people, who in turn support a million residents of the port district, and that a billion dollars are invested in the port's shipping facilities, in which Newark, Elizabeth, Jersey City, and New York taxpayers have a $3,000,000,000 public investment, many of whom and much of which would be affected adversely and perhaps disastrously by the St. Lawrence project, he devoted much of his summation to the project's national aspects and its fallacies.

He did, however, point out that the port's annual import-export volume approximates 22,000,000 tons and that the proponents of the seaway expect that project to increase the St. Lawrence traffic by 16,000,000 tons, of which 6,000,000 tons are expected to be of Canadian origin or destination. The remaining 10,000,000 tons would be of American origin or destination now going through our American Atlantic seaboard ports. If only 60 percent of that diverted Atlantic seaboard tonnage is lost by the port of New York—and it is likely to be—local revenues, employment, and port values are likely to suffer correspondingly. That potential reduction of 27 percent in ocean-borne traffic might therefore throw 67,000 commerce workers out of their jobs and cost the private and public investors in the facilities of the port district perhaps $300,000,000.

Another illuminating disclosure is that existing St. Lawrence waterway facilities (Canadian) handle 9,000,000 tons annually, of which 7,000,000 are of Canadian origin or destination. With the completion of the projected seaway the total volume (including the present) would be 25,000,000 tons, of which 13,000,000 would be of Canadian origin or destination. The anticipated cost of the proposed seaway is about $500,000,000, all furnished by the United States, while Canada, which pays nothing, gets 52 percent of the traffic benefits and none of the liabilities resulting from traffic diversions from its other ports.

Proponents who claimed that the seaway would reduce freight rates from the Midwest to New York were confronted by the Heddon figures which show an existing rate of $7.50 per ton via the Great Lakes, New

York State Canal, and Hudson River compared with a probable rate of twice that sum over a seaway route almost three times as long. Using heavily industrialized Detroit as a key point, the present inland-waterway distance to New York is 750 miles, whereas the proposed St. Lawrence seaway route between those cities is 2,230 miles long. Aside from the possible double freight costs involved, there is a probable triple elapsed-time factor in transit, with its sequential necessity of providing two or three times the present number of ships to handle the traffic.

In the light of those figures it, therefore, seems obvious that New York and other Atlantic seaboard ports will not receive much freight through the proposed seaway route. But a glance at the map will show who the main beneficiary of the $500,000,000 project would be. When and if that expenditure opens a channel for deep-water navigation from Montreal to Detroit (and beyond), the marine distance from Detroit to Liverpool via Montreal will be 3,700 miles, compared with the present inland-waterway distance of 4,323 miles from Detroit to Liverpool via New York.

To believe that such competition would not divert millions of tons of Midwest freight and strike a devastating blow against the economics, the finances, and the employment opportunities of New York and practically every other American port on the Atlantic seaboard is a delusion that verges on governmental insanity. And as to the seaway's value for national defense during the current Armageddon, its construction would directly and indirectly divert 60,000 men from our present all-out industrial mobilization during the next 6 years. But perhaps its proponents are thinking of defense in a third World War. If they are, they ought to tell us about it.

A Republican Blast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

EXCERPT FROM THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from the Washington Daily Merry-Go-Round which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of August 5, 1941:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 5, 1941]

A REPUBLICAN BLAST

Such G. O. P. antics drew a withering blast from one of the most revered figures in the party—William Allen White, the crusading sage of Kansas.

In an editorial in his Emporia Gazette, titled "To Kansas Congressmen," Mr. White read his fellow Republicans a scorching lecture on patriotism and concluded with the blunt warning that if they didn't mend their ways the voters will do it for them. The following are some of Mr. White's pointed remarks:

"DEAR BOYS: You have been playing the game, the partisan Republican game, on the foreign policy of this country now for 3 or 4 years. Nearly every vote you have voted has been a minority vote. Come to your senses! * * * You have gone as far as you can on the Quisling route. Watch out for a record vote which you can never explain if this country is in war in 1942 and particularly if this country is losing ground in the war because you have torn our armed forces to pieces by your vote when war was threatened.

"It is all right to be good Republicans and it is all right to hold your job, but, boy, take an old man's advice: When the folks know that you want your jobs worse than you love your country, you'll lose your jobs.

"Yours in affection,

"W. A. W."

There was no affection in the reception of the Kansas G. O. P. Congressmen to Bill White's advice. The boys were burned up. They sputtered all over the Republican lobby in sizzling wrath.

But their ire was really funny, because while fuming in the private recesses of the cloakroom, not one of them dared give public voice to his anger. To a man they were afraid to reply to Editor White's scorching castigation.

NOTE.—Only Member of the Kansas Congressmen to whom White's blast did not apply is Representative JACK HOUSTON, Democrat, from Wichita, a militant nonisolationist.

Prevention May Be the Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

AN ADDRESS BY GOV. ROBERT A. HURLEY, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by Gov. Robert A. Hurley before the annual convention, American Legion, Department of Connecticut, in Waterbury, on July 26, 1941:

I welcome this opportunity to address you all the more because I have just returned from a visit to Camp Blanding, in Florida. As you know, thousands of young Connecticut citizens are now in training down there in preparation for the crisis that our country is facing. Let me tell you something of what I heard and saw there. Let me tell you something, also, of what it made me feel, think, decide, and determine.

I saw our young men in uniform. I talked with many of them. I examined their equipment. I came to feel the spirit of bold determination in which they are doing their necessary work. I found that their morale is high and their purpose solemn. Among them, at least, there is no doubt as to why they are there. Among them there is no ignorance of the terrible danger in which our country now stands. Among them there is no defiance of their leaders and no grumbling at the commands those leaders give. Therefore they are happy men. I do not say that they are comfortable in all ways and at all times. Good soldiers, good citizens, do not expect or ask for that. I only say that they are happy, because they have found their job and are doing it like men, because they are united, because their young hearts and minds are uplifted to the level of their great task. Whoever else may be shirking his duty, these young men are doing theirs. Whoever else may be thinking solely of himself and his own private concerns while the rest of the world is on fire, these young men are thinking of their country. There is no need, therefore, to pity them. Many of us might well envy them, rather. And we had better cease at once from our sentimental nonsense about their lives being broken. Many of them have found a noble purpose in life which, without this experience, they might never have known. And that is why they are happy. That is why they are doing so fine a job. When we back home begin to do our job one-half as well as they, then we too shall be a united people, we too shall be happy, and our country will then be safe.

I am not speaking of the Regular Army alone or of the National Guard, but especially of our thousands of young selectees. So recently we thought of them as boys. Now they are men, of the fine high-spirited American breed, fire-true and blade-straight, that has made our country what she is. Already they are skilled in the handling of complicated mechanical arms. Their bodies have been hardened, their minds have been sharpened, their hearts have been fired by a great resolve. They are better soldiers now than you and I were 22 years ago.

We have all heard rumors that the men in these camps are badly equipped. This is not so. We have heard that they are grumbling at the duty to which the country has called them. This is false. I say again that I have seen these men. I have no reason whatever for saying anything about them but the truth. If they were not doing their job well it would be my present duty to say so. I say they are doing it well. I say again that when we back home do our duty half as well as they are doing theirs we shall be a united, a happy, and a safe people.

But now we are a disunited, a bewildered people, and a people, therefore, in terrible danger. I use these words calmly, carefully, and with full knowledge of their meaning. We are in terrible danger because we are disunited. And we are disunited primarily because we have been systematically deceived, and have not yet found it out. We Americans, we Yankees, who pride ourselves so much upon our quickness of wit, have been fooled by a band of false prophets who attempt to deceive us by propaganda which should not deceive a child. During the last 2 year our "fifth columns" and our "fifth wheelers" have been telling us, yelling at us, that this country is in no danger. Every honest person among us knows that this is damnably false. In the sense that war has been declared against the principles of liberty on which our Nation rests, war may be said to have been declared against us.

Therefore, I now call upon you veterans, I now call upon the people of Connecticut, always first in the ranks of free men and first in the production of arms for the defense of freedom, to be first also in achieving that unity of mind and spirit which the country must at once achieve.

I call upon the Connecticut people to do this not for my sake, not for the sake of the fair name of this State, not for the sake of any political party, for their own sakes. I ask them only to be hard-headed, realistic, sensible, and to face the cold and dreadful facts.

This matter, about which there has been so much spouting from platforms and spurting of ink, is really quite simple. We all desire to be happy, and to be happy we must be free. We Americans have had no experience at being slaves, and we do not intend to set the stage for it now. Are there any of us who could be happy if the Bill of Rights were destroyed? Are there any American parents who could be happy if their children were taken from home, schooled in lies, drilled with guns, and taught to goose-step from their infancy? Is there an American editor who would be happy in having his editorial

policy dictated by a Goebbels? Is there an American businessman—even of those few who long for business as usual—who would be happy under a tyrant who most assuredly would run his plant? Is there a workman who could be happy if his trade-union were forcibly dissolved and its funds confiscated? Is there a student who could be happy within a system in which books are burned, opinion is dictated, and speech is muzzled? Is there anyone to be called an American who would be happy in goose-stepping to a plebiscite which is only a hollow mockery of a free election?

The "fifth columnists" and the "fifth wheelers" are saying that it is too soon for us to act now. Their hope is that we shall soon be saying that it is too late to act. They are asking us all to write to the papers and to the Congress, saying that "America doesn't want war." Whoever supposed that she does? America hates and loathes war, as every decent people must. But America loves and must have, America is determined to keep, certain things no matter what the cost may be.

Frightful as war is there are some things that are worse. One of these is the loss of freedom. When Germany invaded Russia it was made certain at last that she was out for world conquest. America will stand across her path. And we ought not to hesitate because we do not hold the highest opinion of some of these who are now standing in her way. If a thug comes at me for my money and my life, I welcome the appearance of any man who carries even a club which he can use to help me. I do not stop to ask about the character of this man with a club, or about the rectitude of his conduct in years gone by. I am glad to have him on my side, no matter how wicked a man I may think him to be.

What, then, is the program of the "fifth columnists" and the "fifth wheelers"? Do they want us to wait until all of South America is solidly a part of Nazidom? Do they want us to wait until the F. B. I. has rounded up not merely seven self-confessed Nazi spies in New York but several thousand? Are they asking us to wait until their propaganda has completely befuddled and bewildered the national mind? Are they asking us to wait until one of their leaders has received a few more decorations from Hitler? Well, then, gentlemen, let me tell you we will then have waited too long.

We others must save American freedom without their help—and with God's help we will save it!

American liberty was saved 165 years ago in spite of a host of Tories.

American liberty was saved 80 years ago in spite of a loathsome mass of copperheads.

American liberty was saved 25 years ago in spite of pacifists and pro-Germans.

But it will be no easy thing to save American liberty now. This is no work for what Tom Paine once called the "summer soldier and the sunshine patriot." We are facing a foe that is united, that is convinced, that has a faith, that follows a leader thoroughly trusted and obeyed. That foe is united like the demons of hell about their master. That foe is convinced to the point of monomania. The faith of the Nazi world is insane and evil, but it is a faith, and the people of Germany are fighting now in the strength of it.

And what have we to match this dreadful force? We have a leader wise and tried, a lover of peace, a man of great heart and noble brain and deep experience. Ah, but he is reviled as Washington was by the Tories of his day; he is distrusted as Jefferson was by the Federalists; he is hated in many places with almost the same virulence that was displayed against Abraham Lincoln; and the things that are said of him and that we allow others to say of him are like the things that some people used to say against Woodrow Wilson within the memory of us all. This is not, of course, remarkable. It is the usual thing that the saviors of men should be reviled in their own times. But just now the attack upon our leader, inspired as it is by our enemies, is important. It is important because it is dangerous. Every slur and sneer at our leader that is spoken from platforms is leveled not solely at him but at your happiness and mine, at our safety, at America.

And then what faith have we to pit against that of the Nazis? Why, we have the faith of the complacent, of the timid, and of the wishful thinkers. We have a faith in the Atlantic Ocean, which is very like that which was felt by France in her Maginot line.

All this may perhaps be called a faith, but it is a wild one. And you will observe that all it asks of us is that we go on sleeping. People used to say that those whom the gods would destroy they first make mad. Nowadays those whom the gods are planning to destroy they first make stupid—and keep them so. Those whom the gods are tired of they first make prosperous, comfortable, easygoing, and therefore dull of wit. They make them fat-hearted first of all, and then soupy-brained. They make them selfish and greedy. They make them prefer almost any comfortable lie to the rigorous, painful truth. They make them sentimental and soft and sleek, as we are now.

And what are we to do about it? If America means to save her soul and body alive she must awake to the deadly peril in which she stands—not next year, not next month, not tomorrow, but now. She must give up, instantly, all that weak and sentimental chatter about defending herself only when we have seen the whites of Hitler's eyes. Our own life is now at stake. We too, just as truly as England, are standing now with our backs against the wall. Already the battle of public morale is being fought, and we must not lose that battle. Today, at this hour and moment it is being decided whether we are to be a united people. Already it is being decided whether we are to follow our leader to victory or whether we are going to follow the paid or the unthinking Pied Pipers who seek to lead us like children not to death but to a life that will be worse than death.

I have just returned from Camp Blanding, where 60,000 young Americans are being prepared to save their country alive. They are devoted utterly to their high task. They are united. They follow the commands of their leaders without question and without grumbling. I say again that when we back home begin to do our task half as well as they are now doing theirs this country will be united, happy, and safe.

Authors and Scientists Pledge Their Efforts Against Hitlerism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

STATEMENT BY OUTSTANDING AUTHORS AND SCIENTISTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I desire to insert a very interesting and patriotic statement on the part of some of the most outstanding authors, scientists, educators, musicians, and artists of the United States in the hope that it will be reprinted and given the publicity that it deserves. I congratulate the signers for their patriotic spirit.

The statement follows:

A PUBLIC STATEMENT

For nearly 10 years we have watched the steady destruction of the cultural life of nation after nation. Science and the arts, literature, and education have either been wiped out entirely or twisted to barbaric and inhuman ends wherever fascism has laid its hands.

Today the people of three countries—England, the Soviet Union, and China—are engaged in a struggle which must have but one outcome, the emancipation of all mankind from the curse of Hitlerism. We, men and women whose service to society lies within the cultural spheres, dare not sit back quietly with our books and our test tubes while the fate of our country and of the world hangs in the balance. We hereby pledge our utmost efforts to secure the fullest possible aid to these heroic opponents of Hitlerism which the productive capacity of our land will permit.

We must speak out all the more firmly now because of the involvement of the Soviet Union in the war. With profound dismay we have seen the emergence into the full light of day of the internal enemies of American democracy; those who have seized upon the new turn of events to raise false issues in order to mislead our people away from the one fundamental threat to our existence as a free nation—Hitlerism. We say to these Quislings, who secretly desire and even work for the victory of fascism: The American people will not be misled. The American people stand unshakably behind the people of England, of the Soviet Union, and of China in their struggle.

We say further that there can be no victory over Hitlerism abroad if democracy is destroyed at home. The protection of civil liberties and the rights of labor, the maintenance of adequate living standards, the elimination of all forms of racial and religious discrimination from our public and private life—these are an integral part of the world-wide defense of human liberty.

Never before in history has man had the technical potentialities and resources available to him today. Even outside the Fascist countries there is need for much improvement in the functioning of human society. Final victory of the forces of freedom will release men everywhere from their present bondage to war and tyranny so that they may fully exploit their knowledge and resources in the service of humanity. That final victory must be won. To that end, we call for a Nation-wide popular expression of firm solidarity and for the utmost material assistance by our Government to England, the Soviet Union, and China.

Science and education: Comfort A. Adams, Carl Becker, William Beebe, Ruth F. Benedict, Thomas E. Benner, Milton Bennion, Henry E. Bent, Franz Boas, Henry M. Burlage, Haakon N. Chevalier, Arthur C. Coons, Clinton J. Davisson, Ned H. Dearborn, Monroe E. Deutsch, Charles K. Edmunds, Haven Emerson, Irving Fisher, Abraham Flexner, Frank N. Freeman, C. J. Friedrich, Horace L. Friess, Roswell G. Ham, Alice Hamilton, L. L. Hendren, Hamilton Holt, Ellsworth Huntington, Foster Kennedy, Philip L. Klein, Irving Langmuir, Robert M. MacIver, W. M. Malisoff, Ernest O. Melby, Karl A. Menninger, Jerome Michael, Margaret S. Moriss, Samuel Eliot Morrison, Marston Morse, William P. Murphy, Philip C. Nash, William A. Noyes, C. H. Oldfather, H. A. Overstreet, Harold S. Patton, Ralph Barton Perry, Roscoe Pulliam, E. A. Ross, George Sarton, Bernardotte E. Schmitt, George C. Sellery, Henry E. Sigerist, Preston Slosson, J. Russell Smith, Viljhalmur Stefansson, Dirk J. Struik, Oswald Veblen, Harold M. Vinacke, Henry B. Ward, Leroy Waterman, Goodwin

Watson, Charles H. Wesley, F. W. Weymouth, Walter F. Wilcox, Mary E. Woolley.

Music: S. L. M. Barlow, Marion Bauer, Nicolai Berezowsky, Walter Damrosch, Richard Donovan, W. C. Handy, Glen Haydon, Leonard Liebling, Harl McDonald, Walter Piston, Wallingford Riegger, Earl Robinson, Harold J. Rome, Paul Rosenfeld, Ilya Schkolnick, Charles Seeger, Roger Sessions, Bernard Wagenaar, Roy Dickinson Welch.

Literature: Mary Antin, Ray Stannard Baker, Cedric Belfrage, Herbert Biberman, Ernest Boyd, Millen Brand, Bessie Breuer, Louis Bromfield, Van Wyck Brooks, John Corbin, Rachael Crothers, Carl Crow, Countee Cullen, Sherwood Eddy, Leonard Ehrlich, Walter F. Edmonds, Lion Feuchtwanger, Sara Bard Field, Irving Fineman, Mauritz Hallgren, Dashiell Hammett, Hutchins Hapgood, Ben Hecht, M. A. DeWolfe Howe, Fannie Hurst, Marquis James, Sophie Kerr, John Howard Lawson, Emil Lengyel, William Ellery Leonard, Albert Maltz, Klaus Mann, Thomas Mann, Dudley Nichols, Clifford Odets, Bliss Perry, Ernest Poole, Ted Robinson, William Seabrook, Charles M. Sheldon, Odell Shepard, Donald Ogden Stewart, Phil Stong, Julian Street, Ida M. Tarbell, Blanche Colton Williams, Charles Erskine Scott Wood, Richard Wright, Lin Yutang.

Fine arts: George Biddle, Arnold Blanch, Peter Blume, Samuel Chamberlain, Adolph Dehn, Mabel Dwight, Kerr Eby, Angna Enters, Ernest Fiene, James Montgomery Flagg, Wanda Gag, Hugo Gellert, William Gropper, Dalzell Hatfield, Malvina Hoffman, Joe Jones, Rockwell Kent, Edmund Kopietz, J. J. Lanke, Oliver Larkin, Doris Lee, Joseph Margulies, Walter Pach, Arthur Upham Pope, Boardman Robinson, Leopold Seyffert, Moi Solataroff, Moses Soyer, Rachael Soyer, Maurice Sterne, Paul Strand, Frederic Taubes, Max Weber, William Zorach.

Tolan's Fine Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM SAN FRANCISCO NEWS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the San Francisco News of July 22, 1941, in praise of the fine work done by the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN] as chairman of a special committee investigating defense migration. This is a well-deserved tribute to a man who has shown great interest and understanding in this work. He has worked diligently but without fanfare, to learn the effect of the defense program upon the economic life of our country as reflected by the shifting of population from one section to another, and to arrive at some plan to make easier the terrific impact that may be expected when the emergency is over. His work has been tireless, courageous, and faithful. I am glad to see it so well recognized in the editorial which follows:

[From the San Francisco News of July 22, 1941]

JOHN TOLAN'S FINE WORK

JOHN H. TOLAN, Congressman from Alameda County, never set the world on fire with his eloquence, seldom raises his voice on the floor of the House, doesn't wave the flag or spread the eagle, but he is doing one of the most hopeful and constructive jobs for postwar economic stability that is being done in Washington.

In fact, JOHN TOLAN for months has been doing a job for which hundreds of thousands of Americans would acknowledge a debt of gratitude if they knew he was responsible for bettering their lot. But they'll never find it out from him.

Representative TOLAN is chairman of the House Committee on Migration. It was created originally to study the vast population shifts following the Dust Bowl and other agricultural dislocations in the Middle West. Because he was a Californian and the first great movement of migrants had been to this State, he was selected as chairman of the committee. It was supposed to be a sectional problem.

TOLAN soon discovered it was not confined to one State, but was Nation-wide in scope. Quietly and without fanfare he broadened his committee's study to include the whole country. Its interim reports already issued form the most searching and illuminating revelations of agrarian insecurity ever presented to Congress and have resulted in frank admission that the wanderings of masses of agricultural workers is a matter of Federal rather than solely of State concern.

Now the Tolan committee has been assigned a new task—the study of defense migration. And from that it already is looking even further into the future to discover, if possible, what will be the problems of post-defense migration. They bid fair to overshadow all others.

If, when the economic readjustments come after the defense crisis has passed, there is a way to keep workers occupied in their own communities instead of embarking on futile hegiras from one part of the country to the other in search of work, John Tolan and his committee are likely to find that way. They know why the American worker leaves home. They know what is necessary to keep him from leaving.

Through the months of committee hearings, through the present sessions during which administrative heads of the Government are being questioned, Chairman TOLAN has guided his committee's work with rare skill. He seldom says much, asks few questions himself, but sees to it that committee members search out the truth.

When and if Congress gets ready to act upon constructive legislation to stabilize the Nation's working population it will have, in the record this unpretentious Alamedan and his conferees have accumulated, the irrefutable facts upon which to base intelligent decision. Bound up in that decision may be the happiness of American men and women for generations to come.

The Beauty of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. NELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM L. NELSON, OF MISSOURI

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I made over radio station WINX, Washington, in connection with Missouri Society program on August 7:

Missouri is a State of surpassing beauty. Nature made it so. Happily, while making this beauty accessible to the many, to the millions who seek the excitement of its crystal-clear and swiftly flowing streams, the solace of its wooded hills, the charm of its immense mountain-rimmed lakes, among the mightiest of such man-made sources of power and pleasure, or revel in satisfying pictures of plenty as portrayed in farms of fabulous fatness, the beauty which God in his goodness gave has not been destroyed.

An unsurpassed system of highways makes accessible every section, while providing speed and travel comfort. At the same time the lure of quiet ways, of the out-of-doors, has not been lost. Great trees still beckon, providing shade for the visitor who has time enough and sense sufficient to enjoy life in its full and who really wants to be free.

Ours is not an "overstuffed" State. About it there is nothing to suggest the ill-chosen parlor furniture of the suddenly-got-rich. No effort has been made to improve upon Nature, here at her best in every season.

Truly it is matchless Missouri. Here in springtime are bursting buds and fragrant flowers—yes, fragrant as are wild crab-apple blossoms, not odorless as is the overexploited Japanese cherry, now commercialized in our Nation's Capital. Here, too, at planting time plows with polished shares made round upon round on ever-lessening lands while into the sweet-scented soil go magical multiplying nuggets of "silver" and "gold," which with sun and shower, and finally frost, to follow, men in this great corn State mint into money and measure in millions. Here, too, bluegrass, greatest of all grasses, grows best.

In midsummer, as ripens the golden grain,

"Painted binders, fleet upon fleet
Careen through fields of waving wheat."

When the Ozark hills are colorful with redbud, and snow banked, as it seems, with dogwood and when acres of orchard are pink with promises of apples and peaches in plenty, spring passes as in a pageant.

Following satisfying summer, with wheat in shock and hay in stack, roadsides once beautiful with wild roses are bordered by goldenrod and purple aster, symbols of victory and royalty, the only such symbols as are loved by a people free and unfettered. Frost follows. Forests are aflame with color as oak, sassafras, hard maple, and other trees become bouquets of red, gold, and brilliant browns. Then it is that through the ghost-gray midst of matchless Missouri mornings comes the cheery covey call of bob white. Welcomed then is the beauty of winter in this scenic State. Wondrous is the white of a Missouri winter as it lulls into peace the prairies and crowns with heavenly whiteness the hills.

The best was hers when this central State, located midway between the geographical and population centers, was made. It is—

"Neither north nor south, nor east nor west,
But part of each, of each the best."

Missouri, far enough north for hustle and far enough south for hospitality, is as diversified as it is different. Here one may witness cotton pickers at work in fields far to the southeast, for ours is a State not only of diversity of resources but of magnificent distances, while in the extreme northwest, many miles away, ice harvesters are cutting and storing a crop of comfort to come.

The southern section of Missouri is one of swiftly flowing streams, of magnificent forests, of great springs, of immense caverns, and valleys as fair and fertile as are anywhere to be found. The daily flow of several of the larger springs is from 300,000,000 to 500,000,000 gallons.

No camera can catch or pen portray the beauty of the Ozark country. Only when one has paused, as in prayer, at the silent sunset hour when all is still, all save the waters of the rivers and the smaller streams as they go singing to the sea; only when he has watched the purple haze and deeper shadows climb slowly up the heights as the last rays of the sun kiss the far hills; only when he has lingered, loath to leave, until the harvest moon has topped the mountains and made more silvery still the waters of lake and stream—only then can he understand.

Foremost among the beautiful sections of our State is the Lake of the Ozarks country, the central feature of which is a lake 120 miles long and having 1,400 miles of shore line. Instead of being surrounded by mud flats, as are many bodies of water, this lovely lake, to which thousands of visitors annually come for health and happiness, is bordered by beautiful tree-covered hills.

While Missouri fully keeps pace with progress, it discards not the old for that which has no further claim than newness. Old landmarks have not been destroyed. Old houses, set in groves of great trees, for in Missouri trees find their happy habitat, beckon and invite. Here may be found most interesting examples of early architecture. In fact, nowhere in all the Central West are there more old houses which seem to have souls, houses from which have come influences such as are so sorely needed to save our Nation in the hour of storm. So, if you love scenery, if you love—

"Old houses with vines running over,
Houses set in a riot of roses and clover"—

come to Missouri, "old Missouri, fair Missouri."

Three Thousand Americans Petition Congress for House Concurrent Resolution No. 20, the Peace Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the revolting sense of humanity, aroused by the butchery that is going on in many parts of the world, is leading the people of America more and more to examine the resolution I introduced on February 27 last—House Concurrent Resolution No. 20—which proposes that the Western Hemisphere shall be made an arsenal of world peace, and that the Congress shall request the President "to invite the American republics to send delegates to a conference to be held at the earliest practicable date in the city of Washington to offer to the nations now at war the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator, to the end that the blessings of peace may be brought to a distraught world."

I have today introduced in the House of Representatives a mass of petitions, signed by 3,000 American citizens, most of whom are mothers, approving my resolution and urging the Committee on Foreign Affairs to give a hearing on it.

Two splendid women, whose lives have been consecrated to the cause of peace, took upon themselves the task of circulating these petitions throughout the Union. It was a labor of love which made a heavy drain on their vitality and involved expenses which they themselves paid. The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to them for their noble purpose and fine Christian service. I wish here and now to acknowledge my own deep personal obligation to Mrs. Charles H. Clark, of Los Angeles, Calif., and Mrs. Edna L. Moriarty, of Washington, D. C., the ladies to whom I refer.

In transmitting the signed petitions to me for introduction, Mrs. Moriarty sent a covering letter, which I quote as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 30, 1941.*

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: On April 6 a group of American mothers decided to form a Ludlow Peace Group for the purpose of circulating a petition to urge passage of House Concurrent Resolution No. 20, which you introduced in this session of Congress. Within a few weeks the signatures of almost 3,000 American citizens in every part of the country had been obtained. As a member of the organizing group I now have the pleasure of presenting these signed petitions to you.

The international events which have occurred since February 27, 1941, when you introduced this resolution, have made the hope of an immediate peace seem more remote. It is clear, however, that the signers of these petitions have clearly declared themselves in favor of peace rather than war. They expect and demand that the Members of Congress who were elected on a peace, and not a war, platform will devote their time and energies to the realization of a peaceful world order. For when this war comes to an end, as it eventually must, we feel that the United States will be the Nation best qualified to assume the responsibility for establishing the new world order necessary for a lasting peace. This contribution, we believe, can only be made if the United States refrains from entering the present conflict.

Very truly yours,
(MRS.) EDNA L. MORIARTY.

These petitions, numerously signed as they are, represent only a small part of the evidence which is piling up indicating that the people of America, while they are in favor of strong and adequate national defense, would be pleased if this peace resolution were adopted. Many are the persons who agree with the organization known as Women United, headquarters in New York City, which adopted this resolution:

The time has now come when, under the leadership of our President, a decisive step should be made for peace; therefore we suggest that Congress pass the Ludlow peace resolution, requesting the President to call a peace conference in Washington of delegates from all the American countries.

I have received enough telegrams, letters, and postal cards approving my resolution to fill an entire issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These missives are an outpouring of the Nation's hope that our great Christian Nation may take the lead in rescuing civilization from the horrors and destruction of war. Space limitations only make it possible for me to quote briefly from some of these communications, as follows:

Cardinal William H. O'Connell, Brighton, Mass.:

There is no doubt in my mind that the American people desire a cessation of this stupid and brutal war and I may add that no one can doubt their desire to keep out of the conflict.

Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, pastor of Riverside Church, New York City:

I strongly commend your resolution to promote peace by calling a conference of the American republics to offer the nations now at war the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator. This is the only hopeful and constructive way I see out of the present crisis.

Dr. Francis H. Rowley, president, Massachusetts Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and American Humane Education Society, Boston, Mass.:

I am simply writing this to say that I am in hearty sympathy with Harry Emerson Fosdick in what he wrote you on May 26. Surely it would be one of the greatest things, as you say, if the moving hand of history were to write into the record of civilization the words upon the statue erected by the Argentines and Chileans.

Mrs. W. H. O'Toole, secretary of Parents of America, 2176 Caroll Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.:

Thank you for your great effort to bring about peace for all mankind.

Miss Pauline Adams, 511 New Hyde Park Road, New Hyde Park, N. Y.:

Peace could be made if the people could vote their choice. I pray that your peace proposal is put on the floor.

Mrs. Frank H. Lutz, secretary, and many other members of the Friday Afternoon Literary Club, of Indianapolis, Ind.:

We, the members of the Friday Afternoon Literary Club, most heartily endorse your peace resolution of 1941.

As mothers of these boys, who are now facing the prospects of war, we pray with all our hearts that America's sons should not be sent to this war We agree that the United States is the only country that could assume the role as peacemaker.

God grant that we may faithfully perform our duties as a good neighbor to serve humanity and to bring a voice to the peace table free of hate and intolerance. It is our sincere hope that Congress will not delay in adopting this resolution.

May God bless you in your effort to bring peace and tranquillity to a distraught world.

Miss M. Sattler, 3650 North Capitol Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.:

I think your resolution is wonderful. Just wonderful.

Ronald A. Foster, manager, United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., Indianapolis, Ind.:

I think it is one of the most truly noble gestures that have been considered in this country for a long time. No one can predict what can come of it, but it seems awful to watch this beautiful country drift into the horrors of war and a mortgage upon the lives and efforts of several generations, without making every effort to prevent it, and enough people may feel as we do that this will be the beginning of a really important achievement.

Miss Eva Holder, 735 Southeast Thirty-second Avenue, Portland, Oreg.:

Your ideas and plans expressed in this bill at once appealed to me as being very worthy and also very practical, very sound, and the only truly peace effort made recently.

William B. Noelke, 4423 Park Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.:

It is one of the few proposals made in Congress that are based on a practical view

and understanding of world conditions. The common people have suffered enough from wars not of their own making in recent years. Thousands who do not write you are with you in your worthy efforts.

Mr. Arthur Graves Granfield, 2033 Park Avenue, Detroit, Mich.:

That is the most statesmanlike proposal I have read in some time. Congratulations.

Dr. William C. Dennis, president of Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.:

I believe that the effect of this resolution will be altogether good and if I were a Member of Congress I would vote for its passage.

F. Wertgen, Garden Home, Oreg.:

Your resolution certainly takes the only sane position in the prevailing madness.

O. D. Hill, 1580 Lee Street, Charleston, W. Va.:

Every true follower of the teachings of the Prince of Peace is with you, not only in America but throughout the world.

Mrs. Avery H. Clisbee, 4 Everett Street, Malden, Mass.:

I am highly in accord with your resolution to arrange for a peace mediation and have written the President commending your proposal.

Mrs. Lillian Deinbrow, 3102 Derbyshire Road, Cleveland, Ohio:

I am proud of your good work for human betterment. I am 100 percent with your resolution.

Rev. Frank D. Campbell, Dawson, Ill.:

I congratulate you upon your efforts for peace.

Hon. Frederick E. Schortemeier, former secretary of state of Indiana, Indianapolis, Ind.:

I believe you are on exactly the right track.

Mrs. D. M. Coppock, 68 West Third Street, Peru, Ind.:

I brought your resolution up before the League of Women Voters. We passed support of it in a group of twenty-some people with only one dissenting vote. I think your plan is the best one offered. The United States is now in a strong enough position as to production to make Hitler listen to reason, also to make England willing to negotiate.

Harry L. Pfeiffer, 334 Richland Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.:

I hope you will continue to fight for this idea of yours, as it is a good one, and also see that we do not meddle in this mess, but mind our own business.

Mrs. Elizabeth Wysor Klingberg, 945 Manning Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.:

Your resolution is the most constructive suggestion made by any statesman in this country or abroad.

Daniel J. Downing, 140 State Street, Albany, N. Y.:

I think your resolution is splendid, and I am strongly in favor of its adoption by both Houses of Congress without delay.

Mrs. E. Louis Preston, 1646 Kemble Street, Utica, N. Y.:

In reading your peace resolution of 1941 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you are to be commended for your historic remarks. May God grant that the sense of America can be directed along these lines, and may He give men like you courage to fight the good fight.

C. Hanneman, 336 Parkville Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

I want to commend you for the splendid efforts you are making to prevent our Government from becoming embroiled in this terrible mess in Europe.

Mary M. O'Brien, 3564 Eighty-first Street, Jackson Heights, Long Island:

Keep up the good work. The majority of Americans are behind you.

P. A. Hartman, 1658 Eleventh Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.:

Never in world history has been presented such an opportunity to save mundane inhabitants from self-destruction. Please carry on the good work.

Miss Frances Etten, 402 North Curtis Avenue, Alhambra, Calif.:

Many of us think one of the best things the present administration has done is to foster the friendship between the various states in this hemisphere and your resolution offers a magnificent opportunity to make this solidarity work.

Rev. Harvey Daniel Hoover, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.:

Allow me to commend you heartily for your efforts to keep peace and bring about peace elsewhere.

Miss Lenora Craley, 1323 East Market Street, Warren, Ohio:

That is a magnificent gesture. I hope you follow so steadfastly, so unflinchingly, it becomes reality.

"Ugly Duckling"—Another Sell-Out of the American Merchant Marine

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in our feverish haste to aid Britain we are continually recommitting the follies of 1918.

The unfortunate part about it is that in many instances our own shortsightedness will again place us in an unfavorable economic position after this war is over.

We all remember the famous "bridge of ships" which we built in 1918 and which at the conclusion of the war were absolutely useless except for scrap iron. Today we are recommitting that same folly, and why? Is it because it all may be a part of a definite program designed to assure Britain's continued supremacy of the seas after this war is over?

Under the Lease Lend Act we have been giving Britain a number of our latest merchant cargo vessels constructed under our Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and there are no finer vessels of their kind afloat in the world today. These beautiful craft are fast, they are economical, they are safe—insuring safety for their sailors and safety for their cargo. These ships, in our hands at the end of this war, would put our merchant marine on a parity with the merchant marine of the world. But we are transferring these ships to Britain.

Mr. Speaker, the facilities of our shipyards are not only presently swamped with the building of our two-ocean Navy and in continuing to build more of this modern type of merchant vessel, but, in addition, these shipyards, and many others—for which the Government is providing the funds for their construction—are now engaged in building the "ugly duckling" which we are told will be the World War No. 2 "bridge of ships." Seven hundred and thirty-one of these "ugly ducklings" have been ordered; they will be our scrap yard of tomorrow. They are only a 9-knot-an-hour craft, are outdated by at least 30 years, and totally unsuited to the world commerce of tomorrow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in war service there is a vast difference between the two. Your 18-knot vessel is an elusive target for submarine and aircraft alike. Your 9-knot "ugly duckling" is, as its name implies, an easy prey to the hawks of war. No convoy can travel faster than its slower component, and so why make the "ugly duckling" to cling to the tail of the swan?

And after this war is over once again we will find ourselves in the battle for world trade and will soon find that the "ugly duckling" has, indeed, been the sell-out of the American merchant marine.

This entire subject is admirably treated in an editorial written by Clarence Martin, Los Angeles Commercial News of July 18, 1941, which I include herewith as part of these remarks.

[From the Los Angeles Commercial News of July 18, 1941]

IN OUR OPINION

(By Clarence Martin)

The President has asked Congress for another huge appropriation for both naval and merchant ship construction, and according to Washington sources the bulk of the money earmarked for Maritime Commission construction will be used for the so-called emergency-type vessel.

That is to say the United States will build several hundred more ships with reciprocating engines and with a speed of about 10 knots.

Almost anyone will agree that one of the great faults of the American merchant marine of a few years ago was that almost all of our ships were of the same type built during and after the World War—slow, wasteful, and a headache to the operators.

Confidential papers published after the World War reveal that the British encouraged the construction of the so-called Hog Island ship for two reasons. The Hog Islanders were quickly built and served their purpose fairly well, but also they removed any serious threat of competition with British shipping in the post-war period.

We don't know, of course, if the British follow the same reasoning in the present war, but if they do we know they are exceedingly foolish. A 10-knot steamship is easy prey to submarines and an easy mark for bombers, while a 19-knot vessel can and has proven its ability to escape.

Moreover, the Maritime Commission itself has declared that one modern 19-knot vessel is equal to two of the obsolete type, in that it will deliver twice the cargo at considerable saving in operating expense.

The only excuse the Maritime Commission officials give for a return to the emergency

type of construction is that there might be difficulty in securing sufficient quantities of the modern turbines or Diesels.

The Maritime Commission has been more than active in encouraging the construction of new shipyards—even to the extent of providing the funds for the building of the yards and generous contracts to keep them busy.

Yet we know of no similar effort to increase the production of turbines and motors which would turn the coming fleet of "lame ducks" into a serviceable merchant-marine unit of which any nation could be proud.

In other words, in the hysterical effort to produce ships of any kind in quantity and at once, someone in Washington is at once unwilling to seek the better engine and is willing to burden this country with ships which will be a source of grief and loss for years to come.

We feel sure that in the space of a fortnight we could turn up reports on a half dozen Pacific coast plants, many of them working at half capacity, each of them able to turn our turbines or Diesels or essential parts. We feel equally sure that a canvass of eastern industrial centers would disclose a similar condition. We would like to know why these plants are not building the turbines and Diesel engines the Maritime Commission says we cannot get.

Steamship men generally are bitter and disgusted when the subject of the emergency ship is brought up, especially so on the Pacific coast where severe competition between fast modern and obsolete ships is an old story. But these same men are reluctant to protest, for many recall unpleasant experiences in expressing the desires of this area. Which is exactly the sort of attitude to be expected in the very dictatorships these new emergency ships are supposed to defeat.

We think it is time for the Maritime Commission to recognize that the United States can produce turbines and motors as needed and to change its own obsolete method of closing ship contracts and to open the door to plants willing to build modern power units.

Foreign Air Lines Get Airplanes Our Lines Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO HERALD-AMERICAN

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Herald-American, entitled "Foreign Air Lines Get Airplanes Our Lines Need." This item should be of interest to every taxpaying citizen, as it gives an insight into the administration's policy of benefiting foreign nations at the expense of the American public:

[From the Chicago Herald-American]

FOREIGN AIR LINES GET AIRPLANES OUR LINES NEED

More airplanes for our American air lines has become an immediate and mandatory national requirement.

The country now has 19 domestic lines.

All are permitted to operate under the laws because all of them are deemed to be essential; in point of fact, the Federal Government itself has long fostered and assisted the development of commercial aviation as a matter of sound national policy.

With the country now engaged in mighty defense efforts, these commercial air lines are economically and strategically more important than ever before. Apart from their day and night transport service, the Army and Navy regard our civil transport planes as forming an indispensable reserve nucleus for any emergency, which is now only a fraction numerically of what it should be.

Along their regular travel routes, the lines are conveying today one-third more passengers, mail, and air express than they transported last year.

To do this, however, they have only 350 planes all told—the same number as they had nearly 2 years ago.

It is not the air lines' fault that they are in need of planes which they do not possess.

In preparation for the present increased traffic, the executives of the companies bought new planes and ordered still more constructed.

Then the British came along with a demand for transport planes, and the American companies were compelled by the Government to give up 103 of their ships.

Presumably, these transport planes were sent to England for military use, and undoubtedly some of them have been put to that use.

But it is a fact that the British are not only maintaining their own commercial air lines intact, but have even been extending them.

Likewise, the Dutch, who also are seeking American airplanes at Washington, are keeping up their commercial air services in east Asia.

In other words, American aviation has been constricted and prevented from obtaining badly needed planes, and has even been bereft of planes, for the benefit of foreign mercantile aviation.

There is, as might be surmised, a bottleneck in this unfortunate situation.

That bottleneck is the War Department.

Other governmental departments have recognized that some part of our big airplane production must go to our own air services.

But the Secretary of War remains obdurate, and continues to need to be convinced.

Undoubtedly, though, Secretary Stimson will find himself convinced as soon as Congress and the American people begin to understand the amazing circumstances.

Address Delivered by Viscount Halifax, British Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

SPEECH DELIVERED AT A DINNER OF THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 16, 1941

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by His Excellency the Right Honorable the Viscount Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States, at a dinner of the Federal Bar Association in Washington, D. C., June 16, 1941:

It is a great pleasure to be the guest of the Federal Bar Association, even if that pleasure has been mingled with some apprehension at meeting so many representatives of the legal profession. Lawyers as a race are people whom I have always held in considerable respect; such respect, indeed, that I have always wished to keep them at a distance. The further I was away the safer I felt.

A friend of mine high in the legal profession in England once told me that a friend of his, even higher, had said to him, "when I was young at the bar I lost a lot of cases I ought to have won. After I got older I won a lot of cases I ought to have lost. Substantial justice, therefore, has been done." That attitude of mind is typical of the legal profession as a whole and shows what broad-minded views lawyers can sometimes take.

But one special reason for pleasure at being your guest is the fact that your society so definitely represents one side in this stupendous struggle in which we are now engaged.

Those who stand for the law are today the lineal descendants of innumerable men renowned in their generation who have realized what the development of law has meant to human society.

All human progress has depended upon the conception of law between nations, between the state and the individual, and between individuals. And law has been the means by which respect has been secured for the pledged word, security has been given against injustice, and liberty has been protected.

No society, national or international, can possibly exist if no value attaches to the pledged word. Life indeed always proceeds on the basis of probability rather than of certainty, and it is by assurances and undertakings that we attempt to reinforce this basis of probability.

Without this, life speedily reverts to the jungle in which men live in perpetual fear, much as the untutored tribesmen of the northwest frontier of India used to live, and live still in some parts.

To protect liberty and to secure men against injustice has been the object of the great constitutional instruments which have made your history and ours—Magna Carta, habeas corpus, Declaration of Independence, Bill of Rights, and, in the sphere of legislation, the great reform bill in England, passed, I am glad to think, by my great-grandfather, Lord Grey, and the passing of which my own grandfather, then a member of the House of Commons, was able to announce to the crowded House had been by 1 vote—302 to 301.

We have constantly seen, therefore, three stages in this long process. First, the assertion by the state of the main principles which it deemed important; second, the development of practical machinery for giving effect to them, such as, for example, the development of trial by jury; and, thirdly, the protection of these principles by the courts.

It is interesting to observe the different methods by which you and we have sought to restrict the executive from interfering with the legislature and with the judiciary.

We have followed different plans, which I do not here discuss, but one matter may be of interest and is not perhaps generally known either here or in England. On each occasion of the opening of Parliament, after the King's speech has been formally read, each House meets again later in the day, and the Lord Chancelor and the Speaker, respectively, "having," as the phrase goes, "for the sake of greater accuracy secured a copy," read the Royal speech again. But before they do this in each House the leader rises and asks leave to introduce a bill concerning either select vestries (whatever they are) or outlaws, in order to assert the right of Parliament to

legislate apart from the permission given in the speech.

As a result of this development we have both learned that law and liberty are opposite sides of the same coin, and that neither will long exist without the other.

It has been natural therefore that we should have been led on from law to liberty, and that as the idea of liberty has grown, so law has more and more come to be the outward and visible expression of the common social thought and conscience of the Nation.

On these twin foundations the United States and the British Commonwealth of Nations have both tried to find the right balance between the individual and the state, and have both stood for the same standards between states. Both still have work to do. We, having learned the lesson that you taught us in 1776, have realized that freedom is the true foundation, not of uniformity but of unity. That process is complete in our dominions, is still in course of development in the Crown colonies, and most of all is taking shape in the great dependency of India.

I would have you keep certain broad facts in mind when people speak of India. There is a total population of 350,000,000, of which roughly one-quarter is included in the Indian states.

Of the three-quarters in British India, 177,000,000 roughly are Hindus, and nearly 70,000,000 Moslems.

British India itself is divided into 11 provinces, some the size of France, under Indian ministers, presided over by an Indian prime minister, to which are entrusted all internal affairs of the province, including justice, police, education, health, irrigation, agriculture, and so on. These ministers are responsible to the legislature and to the electorate, subject only to certain safeguards in the hands of the governor, for the maintenance of peace in grave emergency and for the protection of minorities.

The difficulty of full responsible government at the center is therefore twofold. Firstly, that it necessarily implies control by British Indian politicians of all India matters, such as tariffs, communications, and central finance, in which the Indian states are as closely interested as the British Indian provinces. Here clearly the solution must be that incorporated in the Government of India Act, 1935, namely, the federation under certain safeguards for the efficient maintenance of defense and conduct of foreign policy.

The second difficulty arising in the center is the distribution of power between Hindus and Moslems, and that problem can only be solved by agreement of the great communities, which is not yet forthcoming.

But I hope I have said enough to show that our purpose in India is to work for a United States of India, free to manage its own affairs, and based on the agreement of its several component parts, British India and the States, Hindus and Moslems. We shall do whatever we can to achieve this end, for just as the airplane is built for the air, the race horse to gallop, the cow to give milk, so the Anglo-Saxon race can work for no other end than that of liberty. Nor do either you or we understand any purpose of treatment of policy except interpreted in terms of freedom.

We have often asked ourselves what is the mental picture that we see when we think of England. Is it the white cliffs of Dover or some familiar country scene of which we have memories, green fields, hedgerows, the smell of nettles in a dusty lane? I have a picture of gulls wheeling over the Yorkshire hills on a stormy day; or, again, it may be some great industrial district such as Sheffield in the West Riding of Yorkshire, or the picture may come to us in terms of persons or long-forgotten impressions of a happier past. For some it will have meant one or all of these things. But today I venture to think that when we think of England, we think rather of the personification in one unit of the single will of 40,000,000 people for the defense of liberty—a cause for which they are ready to throw everything into the scales: Luxuries, comfort, convenience, life itself. And it is because we know that the moral values which have brought us to this conclusion are yours no less than ours, and because we know that, holding this faith, you are giving us in ever increasing volume the material means necessary to secure victory, we are supremely confident of the issue of this grim contest with which the world is now being torn.

Rule by the Minority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

EDITORIAL BY JACOB W. BINDER

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial written by my friend Jacob W. Binder, civic leader, and executive secretary of the Bergen County Chamber of Commerce, in the chamber's August bulletin:

RIGHT ANSWERS REQUIRED

A minority governs this Nation today.

This minority dictates the policies of the Government.

This minority wants us to enter the European war.

Polls taken in different sections of the Nation oppose our entry into the war by percentages ranging from 70 to 75 percent.

There is 100-percent agreement on arming the Nation for defense, no matter what the cost may be.

There is no agreement as to the imposition of our ideals—civic, economic, cultural, religious—on the peoples of the whole world.

These ideals satisfy us. They may be unacceptable to other nations. But the minority insists they must be imposed and enforced.

To do that will require great sums of money, huge armies, navies, and airplanes. The cost of them can come from only one source—the people.

To provide the money, new taxes to the extent of many billions of dollars are to be levied upon the whole people.

The people are told they must do without many things which have become part of the American standard of living.

They must buy defense bonds. These must be paid for out of the wages they have received for their labor, not by bookkeeping.

If they do not buy, it is darkly hinted that to pay for these bonds, enforced savings, through deductions from their pay envelopes, may be made.

Their purchase of new motorcars and the use of cars they now own may be rigidly restricted.

They will be told what they may buy on the deferred-payment plan—if anything.

Many small factories must close because they can get no raw material.

All must be prepared, we are told, for "blood and sweat and tears."

The things produced as a result of these sacrifices may be sold or lent or given to such nations as this minority shall choose.

At least one nation has accepted such goods and sold its own in trade in competition with our products.

When and as these conditions are sensed by the majority—75 percent—of our people, some embarrassing questions may be asked of this minority now governing the Nation.

On that day clear and unequivocal answers had better be ready.

No oil for heat? No gas for the car? Half-pound of butter per week?

One hundred and twenty million people will ask, "Who says so?"

The St. Lawrence Seaway and the Florida Ship Canal Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence seaway and the Florida ship canal projects are coupled together in an omnibus bill. Experts will have no end of difficulty in naming the picture defense. But they will persist and may prevail.

Meanwhile, a long suffering people concerned about rising prices, threats of inflation, and tax burdens, are becoming articulate.

I present today a letter received from Dr. Andrew F. McBride, of Paterson, N. J., a gentleman of medicine, letters, and experience, one-time commissioner of labor of the State of New Jersey, generally hailed as Passaic County's dean of democracy because of his years of service to the Democratic Party. Dr. McBride's message is timely; it is food for thought.

The letter follows:

PATERSON, N. J., *August 5, 1941.*

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GORDON: In common with all others who are sincerely and genuinely interested in our Nation and its people, its progress and its preservation, I am deeply concerned by the ever-increasing tax burden the people in every walk of life are being called to bear.

Now, I am aware that freedom is worth paying for, even if it hurts to do so, but feeling as I do, unless we honestly try to do something about it and are able to justify every dollar that is imposed by Government on its people, then are we likely to lose even our freedom. Now, I say this justifiably because increasing discontent causes people to become disturbed and robbed of their better judgment, causing them to do things that they would not think of doing ordinarily. Discouragement begets despair; this in turn is followed by desperation. When people are discouraged things happen—anything can, and usually does, under such circumstances. Hence my fear regarding freedom.

If constructive good may result after a comprehensive study of the tax question as proposed in a bill by Congressman ANGELL in a speech delivered in the House of Representatives July 3, 1941, I would ask your kind indulgence in giving it your earnest consideration, and if you agree some real good is likely to come through its passage, then may I ask you to support it.

Very sincerely yours,

ANDREW F. MCBRIDE.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman ANGELL'S resolution calls for a commission of 14 House and Senate Members and laymen to compile, analyze, and report upon the facts in relation to the overlapping, conflict, and pyramiding of the intergovernmental structure among the tax-levying units of the Federal, State, and local governments, the commission also being directed to recommend a program to integrate and unify the entire tax structure. It should be promptly and seriously considered.

Labor's Stand on St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

LETTERS FROM DETROIT LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letters, which state the position of labor on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project:

GREATER DETROIT AND WAYNE
COUNTY INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL,
Detroit, Mich.

Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, House Rivers and Harbors Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The St. Lawrence seaway project which is being considered by your committee at the present time is of vital interest to the public, and particularly to labor, and should be of vital interest to the National Government from a defense angle at this time.

We realize that powerful lobbies of the railroads and the seaboard States may be giving you a wrongly colored picture of the situation.

The most natural shipbuilding territory in the world is certainly not on the seaboard, but across several hundred miles of territory of the Great Lakes in a position naturally defended from all enemies of the country.

Certainly a great portion of the United States will be benefited by lower freight rates caused by this inland seaway.

For labor of this territory this development, coupled with the present industrial areas of Michigan and close to the natural facilities needed in the manufacture, means the greatest and most economical industrial area of all times.

We solicit your most earnest effort to give to the people of America the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Respectfully yours,

TRACY M. DOLL,
President.

AUGUST 4, 1941.

Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, House Rivers and Harbors Committee, Washington, D. C.:

We desire to place before your honorable committee the position of our Federation of Labor in Detroit in support of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project. This most desirable development has already been too long delayed.

The section of our Nation contiguous to the Great Lakes district is one of the best industrial developed sections of the country. Its value to the Nation in times of emergency is now demonstrated by the fact that the Government has turned to the Great Lakes district as the natural arsenal.

An orderly expansion and development of this section of the United States definitely requires that it be made acceptable to ocean-going boats.

Surely the selfish opposition of the railroads and eastern manufacturers should not be permitted to continue to deprive the people of this country of the benefits that can come from the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

The ability of science to harness water power and make it the servant of man relieves the human family of the dangerous and drudgerous work in taking coal from the bowels of the earth. The potential water-power development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway will be a great contributing factor to lightening the load from the backs of those who are now employed in drudgery and danger, and, we might add, at subnormal wages.

The Great Lakes district will need the work necessary to its development to keep its people employed, and the shipbuilding and manufacturing to be developed here after the war will provide work opportunities for men who otherwise will be thrown out on the Government for support.

We therefore urge you and your associates on the House Rivers and Harbors Committee to report this project immediately.

Very truly yours,

DETROIT AND WAYNE COUNTY
FEDERATION OF LABOR,
FRANK X. MARTEL, *President.*

Joint Income-Tax Returns for Married Couples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. WHEAT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, on August 4 I voted against the provision contained in the defense revenue bill of 1941, which was then before this House, that would have made mandatory joint income-tax returns for married couples. I opposed this provision of the tax bill for three reasons: First, it is unconstitutional; second, it is a tax on marriage; and third, it destroys the equality of men and women.

Relative to the first point, I wish to call to your attention the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States in 1931 held that an identical provision in the Wisconsin income-tax act was unconstitutional as constituting a deprivation of property without due process of law. In the decision of the case *Hoeper v. Tax Commission of Wisconsin* (284 U. S. 206) the Supreme Court said "that which is not in fact the taxpayers' income cannot be made such by calling it income." This is essentially what such a provision as the one we had under consideration attempted to do. What the Supreme Court held was that this tax on the income of one person as measured in part by the income of another person was a denial of property without due process of law under the fourteenth amendment.

On numerous occasions the Supreme Court has held that the guaranty against the denial of property without due process of law under the fifth amendment prohibiting such action by the United States is identical with the guaranty contained in the fourteenth amendment against such action by the State. Consequently, it is very likely that the decision in this case relative to the Wisconsin statute would be followed by the Supreme Court in any case relative to the constitutionality of such a provision in a Federal income-tax law. Therefore it would have been very undesirable to have adopted this provision.

In the second place this is a tax on marriage. It would be a direct reversal of the normal and accepted policy toward marriage on the part of the Federal Government as exemplified in the income-tax law for more than 25 years. We have always granted larger personal exemptions to married persons than to single persons. In addition, we have always allowed exemptions for children and for other dependents. But now these allowances and exemptions will be made meaningless because the added tax burden on a husband and wife in all likelihood will be much greater than the tax savings that would result from the personal-income exemptions for married persons and the allowances for dependents.

Under the plea of a national-defense emergency the Treasury is urging us to abandon a long-established principle of our normal tax law without giving any consideration to the merits upon which that principle has been established. I really do not believe that there are any couples contemplating matrimony that would fail to marry if this added tax burden should be imposed upon them under this provision, but it certainly does seem illogical to place upon such couples an added burden because they do marry.

In the third place, I strongly opposed this provision of the bill because I believe that it tends to destroy the equality between men and women and the independence of married women from the domination of their husbands. Such equality and independence on the part of women has been won only as a consequence of a long struggle. It is unnecessary for me to point out that under the common law a wife had no effective property rights apart from her husband. She was placed in a state of subjugation under the domination and control of her husband. Now, for more than a century women in this country have been struggling to secure equality of treatment so far as their property rights were concerned. As early as 1839 Mississippi passed legislation to free married women from the tutelage and control of their husbands relative to their property. Nine years later Pennsylvania, Indiana, and New York followed this fine example; and in 1850 California and Wisconsin took similar steps. Before the end of the last century in at least three-fourths of the States a wife could own and control all of her property apart from her husband, and in more than two-thirds of the States she had the right and title to her own earnings.

During the past 40 years much additional legislation has been passed by the States removing discriminations and burdens on the property rights of married women. Let us not forget that one of the major reasons why women were so desirous of obtaining the right of the franchise under the Federal Constitution was because they were so anxious to terminate the discriminations against them that existed in the laws of the several States. And after the adoption of the nineteenth amendment by the United States, women have devoted additional energies toward securing its enactment of State legislation granting them equality with men.

It would appear obvious that if a joint return is required of the husband and wife upon which the taxes of husband and the wife are assessed on the basis of their joint income, the equality and independence of women are destroyed thereby, since there would be imposed upon the property or income of the wife a tax that is not solely based upon her property or income, but which is based upon the property or income of the husband and wife considered together. I declare that the effect of such a provision would be to endanger the position and rights of married women that have been won after a long and hard struggle. A woman because she was married will thereby have to pay a higher income tax as also would her husband.

It is obvious that the enactment of a law requiring compulsory joint returns is a backward step toward the old and discredited view of women as chattels. By slow and painful steps women have gained certain significant rights, including the right to earn her own living, the right to dispose of her own income, and the right to pay her own taxes. If this provision of the bill becomes law, it would deprive women of the right to pay their own taxes. This, then, would constitute a step toward the subjugation of women and away from their equality.

It seems to me to be clear that the arguments against the establishment of the compulsory joint return for a husband and wife are strong—in fact, they greatly outweigh whatever arguments may be made in favor of compulsory joint returns. After carefully considering these arguments and after giving them due weight I voted against compulsory joint returns and I do believe that such a vote is in the best interests of the country as a whole.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, why did William Allen White ever resign from that war committee?

In "Union Now" with Britain there is a weakness that destroys our own Union.

The majority leader of the Senate, on Tuesday, praised the Soviet for her fine accomplishments.

National daylight saving time would add another hour for grim reflection, while shortening the nightmare period.

The father of Greenbelt becomes the Governor of Puerto Rico. Rexford, in the name of dear old Russia, do your stuff.

Three-quarters of all our defense contracts have gone to 56 big corporations. All the rest will sweat to pay the bills.

If a President goes to meet an English premier in the Atlantic it is not for the purpose of planning a joint Sunday school moonlight boat cruise.

Lowden, Hoover, and Landon ask that Congress put a stop to step-by-step projection of the United States into undeclared war. So do 80 percent of the people.

California redwood for benches in the camp chapels and imported Mexican ponderosa pine for kitchen cupboards do not go well with broomsticks for guns.

White House Cleaners: Worn-out and discarded political platforms, remade like new. Political linens cleaned and starched. Quick service. Phone: Franklin 0000. (Advertisement.)

A college-graduate draftee told Senator TUNNELL that "the boys in camps feel very much discouraged because they do not understand whether the Nation is actually imperiled or not."

The lease-lend policy was presented to the American people as a measure short of war. We insist that it be administered as a short-of-war measure—so speaks the militant House minority.

Discovered: The National Guard was called into service before the Army was ready for them in order to help pass the Selective Service Act in Congress. This was the first political maneuver on the war front.

Michigan Newspapers Expose the St. Lawrence Project as Untimely and Unwarranted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM VARIOUS MICHIGAN NEWSPAPERS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, while we are being asked to believe that the people of the great State of Michigan welcome the proposed St. Lawrence project, we cannot help perusing the editorials appearing in widely read Michigan newspapers and pointing out our inability to agree with the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway.

As one editor aptly describes the situation, there will be too much financial "digging" to do in meeting only a part of the requirement for national defense to justify any digging of ditches not necessary at this time.

When you are prone to regard the citizens of the great State of Michigan as being in perfect accord with the St. Lawrence project, it may prove enlightening to read the following viewpoints on the subject from the pens of various Michigan editors. The editorials are as follows:

[From the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer-News of April 30, 1941]

THERE'LL BE "DIGGING"

Some excitement prevails at Detroit over the fact that Michigan is quoted as being against the St. Lawrence waterway, and that the senate at Lansing has refused to send Congress a clarion call to get busy on the matter at once.

An attempt is being made to send out a summons to Michigan public opinion to rise and rally and assert itself.

This newspaper hopes that such messages as are sent by an aroused Michigan populace to Washington or to Lansing, either one, will be in the form of a demand to cut out the needless spending, so that we can get at least somewhere with the terrifically heavy spending for necessary defense.

The billions will go out and are going out almost endlessly for things that we have to have.

Gradually, and painfully, and with still more pain in prospect, we are learning that Treasury money isn't fancy money and isn't magic money and that it isn't made available when some smiling magician waves a wand.

The realization is coming home now, and it will come more fully and painfully from now on, that public money, Treasury money, good-time pump-priming money, is tax money—and that taxes are paid, as a statesman once very earnestly said, "in the sweat of all who labor."

We do not have to have a St. Lawrence waterway now. Perhaps in the regular order of business we should have it. But it is not naturally in this present regular order of business, and an attempt to put it there—an attempt to yank it back into prominence and popularity by calling it "defense"—is tricky business and would deserve condemnation because of its trickiness, irrespective of its threatened diversion of money and effort needed for defense that is defense.

There's too much necessary financial "digging" to do, in meeting only a part of the requirement for defense, to justify any digging of ditches and other landscape changes not necessary at this time.

[From the Sturgis (Mich.) Journal of April 19, 1941]

NO AID TO PREPAREDNESS

Speakers at the Philadelphia conference of organizations opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway project were wholly warranted in emphasizing its futility so far as the national-defense emergency is concerned. This is shown by an admission in the pending agreement that the enterprise could not be completed before 1948.

It is estimated that the cost of this undertaking would defray the construction of fourteen 35,000-ton battleships, or of thirty 10,000-ton cruisers, or of 125 1,800-ton destroyers. Airplanes and tanks, so sorely needed for our all-out defense program, can be turned out much more quickly than big warships, and a lot could be built with the billion the St. Lawrence waterway, a vulnerable target for bombers or sabotage, would cost.

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal of March 21, 1941]

THE INOPPORTUNE WATERWAY

So the United States and Canada have signed a pact to jointly build the St. Lawrence deep waterway, connecting the Great Lakes and the Atlantic?

It would be interesting to know the mind of the President in the matter. He says the project is urgently necessary to the work of preparedness. Well, maybe, maybe. But the present war is likely to be won or lost before the proposed undertaking is well under way.

The cost of the undertaking is placed at $266,000,000. Probably that sum merely indicates the place at which the talk starts. The scheme is more likely to cost a billion dollars. Great public works of the kind are never let off easily when done by the Government.

When the matter of contributing to preparedness is so highly questionable, and when expenses are running so unconscionably high, reflecting sharply in the taxes of people in limited circumstances, why press the matter of the waterway now?

It has to be confessed that the announcement of the project pushes the State Journal out on a limb. We have always advocated the subject on the ground that it has long been naturally indicated. On that basis and on the basis that the project should not embarrass the national budget, we are still for the waterway. But looking at the project realistically, assuming that the waterway will not contribute two cents' worth to present world problems, why put the undertaking through now?

Our Great White Father at Washington is "hepped," as the expression is, on vast electrical power developments. Possibly, he would like one that had some shadow of justification. Spokane has just voted, something like 4 to 1, not to have anything to do with the power from Grand Coulee Dam, now sitting majestically alone out in the desert. The vast Tennessee Valley project has amounted to nothing more than forcing some private enterprises out of business. So, perhaps the President would like to experiment near a market for power.

It will be interesting to observe whether the President will leave the Senate out of the picture because of his new power under the new lend-lease law. As commonly understood he now has full power in the matter.

Oh, well, we may as well be resigned. The President's mania for spending will be satiated perhaps for a little. And while prudence would say that the present, with a war on our hands, is no time for the vast new outlay, yet the scheme has fundamental justification in the long view. As one of our great merchandising concerns puts its position, "Satisfaction remains long after the price is forgotten."

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of March 28, 1941]

ANOTHER STEP AWAY FROM CONSTITUTION

This section of the United States quite generally favors the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway. Seven years ago President Roosevelt submitted a treaty between the United States and Canada to provide for this work. Ratification of a treaty, under the Constitution, requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate. At that time the Senate refused to give that two-thirds vote and the treaty failed.

Now the President has reached an agreement with Canada. It already has been signed at Ottawa. An agreement such as this requires only a majority vote of the Senate. All the President now is asking is an appropriation to start the work. Thus he has found a way to dodge the Constitution, to get around its provisions, to evade, and, in a measure, to nullify the fundamental law of the land. The question is, Does this section of the country, which approves the St. Lawrence waterway, want it badly enough to thus set aside the Constitution of the United States?

Of course, the basis for this agreement is the national defense. Yet that is one of the silliest of all the silly claims with which the defense back has been burdened. The President himself says the waterway under the best of auspices cannot be completed before 1945. The prayer of the world is that the war may not last that long. If it is power that is so sadly needed for defense, that power can be obtained quickly by the establishment of steam plants or by the use of the many other water-power developments of this administration which seem likely not to find many other customers.

Again the President is crying loudly for steel, for ships, for tanks, for guns, for planes, for workers, for railroad cars. Why divert such huge amounts of these materials and these railroad cars and these workers to a project which cannot be completed before the war probably is ended? The question is without answer to date. Certain it is the St. Lawrence waterway will be a fine contribution in time of peace to our industrial development, but in order to get it, should we thus evade the Constitution and block real defense work in order to get it by agreement now?

We think not.

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of March 29, 1941]

CONFUSION

When the resolution urging Congress to get busy on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway was before the State legislature, its author pointed out, "We have always voted for this resolution."

In other words, Michigan is in favor of the St. Lawrence waterway as a general proposition and is in the habit of giving support to the general plan of joining its Lakes with the high seas by whatever means the engineers say is the most practical.

But this session things are different. The St. Lawrence plan is presented in a time when emergency spending places a heavy burden on the taxpayer. New millions have been made available for its promotion in the form of money voted for national defense.

Even its present advocates admit it will take 5 years to complete the project, and other egnineers say it will be nearer to 7 or 10 years. There is also some doubt expressed as to the need of the power that will be developed by the St. Lawrence project for defense industries as steam plants can be constructed in less time and in better locations. There is confusion as to how much of the development is for power development and how much for navigation, and how the cost will be divided between Canada and the United States.

There is apparently a lot of confusion as to the details on the entire project, even though this State, on a general basis, is in favor of it. To have the plan made a part of the rush national-defense program, which must be at its peak within less than a year, is cause for misgivings and doubt. It is possible the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project would look better to the public view if it were allowed to stand on its own merits instead of being hitched to the defense program, to which it has no present relationship.

[From the Sparta (Mich.) Sentinel Leader of April 17, 1941]

WANTED—SOMEONE TO WORRY

The public debt stood at $480 per capita, or $1,813 for the average American family, on July 1. It is higher now, and it will be much higher next year at this time.

But don't waste any time worrying over this debt, administration "planners" say. True, the Federal debt alone amounts to $326 per capita, and no one is venturing to guess what it will be when we get through financing a war to the finish with Mr. Hitler.

"Why should you worry? We aren't worrying," the planners say, in effect. Look at England. Look at France and each of the other conquered countries. For that matter, look at the totalitarian countries. The American tax burden is light compared with that borne by the people of Europe, the free and enslaved alike, and this is the richest country in the world.

Thus the refrain runs. Don't worry. Don't let the prospect of monumental public debt cramp your plans.

So the administration goes ahead with its program of spending, on nondefense projects as well as those squeezed into the category of national defense—$250,000,000 as a starter for the St. Lawrence seaway, a $1,340,000,000 farm subsidy, a 100-percent increase in the appropriation for the New Deal's propaganda bureau, the Office of Government Reports.

Revival of the Florida ship canal and the Passamaquoddy projects would occasion no surprise. An "eat your cake and have it too" psychology pervades official Washington.

But still the country is told not to worry. This is a rich country. Look at England and France, etc. It is the song the American people have been hearing since 1933.

There is a growing feeling that the Nation might be better off if someone did a little worrying over the public debt. (Reno Gazette.)

[From the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer-News of June 11, 1941]

THE FACTS MAY HELP

Intense debate which is accompanying administration demands that the St. Lawrence waterway project be undertaken at this time seems in itself sufficient reason why the facts should be checked before the 4-year program is begun.

The wide diversity of opinion indicates that there is some "middle ground" in the controversy which has not been explored by either side. It is high time that this be done now. For this 1,300-mile waterway is no incidental item which may be included or left out, of the defense program with no particular harm. Instead, it is a gigantic undertaking—an undertaking which will require heavy expenditure of men, materials, and equipment over a period of years. Therefore, if charges are true that the waterway would be of no value in the defense effort, it would be a criminal waste of time and effort now that the Nation is bending all efforts to speed production of the real necessities for defense.

President Roosevelt's recently renewed insistence upon the project has finally brought some of his opponents around to the point of political "horse trading." They would develop only the hydroelectric-power portion of the program at this time Others argue that it probably wouldn't cost much more to build dams and locks for both power and navigation, than to build dams for power alone. From other quarters comes the assertion that Great Lakes shipbuilding facilities, sought as one objective of the project, now can be used by sending partially completed ships from the Great Lakes down the Mississippi for completion.

From all this confusion it is apparent that no one has made a sufficient study of the project to be able to speak with authority. Can St. Lawrence seaway power be obtained as speedily and at as low a cost as other power? Will not the construction of vast shipyards on the Great Lakes cost just as much as construction on the seaways, and once the inland shipyards are built, will not the same shortage of skilled labor exist? Would not the partial completion of ships, using what Great Lakes facilities as are now

available, help to solve the pressing problem of ship shortages? These are questions which call for facts—not guesswork. The facts should be dug up before the first shovel of earth is turned over on the project.

There remains, however, the greatest question of all. It is estimated that the project will require 4 years for completion. Is it not at least a reasonable guess that the war will be over by that time? This question, while unanswerable, throws the balances so heavily against the St. Lawrence waterway plan that one cannot escape the belief that defense motives are not the only ones impelling the administration to battle for the waterway.

[From the Niles (Mich.) Star of June 14, 1941]

DEFENSE OF WHAT?

The American public is currently being called upon to make superhuman efforts to provide national defense that is designed to furnish Army, Navy, and Air Corps with proper equipment in record-breaking time.

In order to accomplish this huge task a tax bill is about to be enacted that will dig deeply into the pocket of every citizen. In one way or another, everyone is to pay a share of the armament program that is now under way.

Under such circumstances it would seem not only logical but a duty on the part of Government agencies to cut regular operation expenses to a bare minimum. Apparently, however, there is no such thought in mind, if present indications are to be used as a weathervane.

A case in point is the St. Lawrence waterway. In this particular instance an accord was reached with Canada for joint construction, with the United States furnishing the money. The O. P. M. has recently termed the project as part of the "all-out defense effort."

Just how this ties with defense is a conundrum. To begin with, construction is estimated to take 4 years or longer. With indications pointing to a termination of the war long before 1945, the project will be of no benefit for defense.

Looking at it from another angle, the cost has been estimated roughly at one-half billion dollars. Just consider for a moment how many fighting planes that amount of money would provide, in addition to tanks, rifles, and other needed weapons.

Consider also, if you will, how much material will go into the construction of that seaway that will be needed by the industries which now are, or soon will be, slowed up on their war orders because of material shortages.

With the public's shoulders already drooping under a heavy load, and soon to be made much heavier, it seems utterly unreasonable that such a burden as the one above should be added at this time. Under no circumstances should the public be misguided into believing that the St. Lawrence waterway has any connection with defense—at least, in our present emergency.

[From the Owosso (Mich.) Argus-Press of May 2, 1941]

THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

One of the pet projects of President Roosevelt, which he has revived at the present time, is that of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway. The President brings it up now in the guise of being a defense measure, and on that basis suggests the entering into contractual arrangements with Canada whereby this waterway would be constructed with American money because it is supposedly a part of furthering the defense needs of the Nation. There has been much argument on the question of the usefulness of this waterway, if it is completed, and whether the potential value of such a waterway is worth the vast expenditure of money it will take to build it and to keep it in operation. The administration is putting considerable pressure on getting this project into being at the present time.

The State of Michigan has a varied interest in such a proposition. There are certain sections of the State, particularly those having ports on the Great Lakes, that may feel that the construction of this waterway would be of great advantage to them because of the increase in shipping that might follow through the opening up of this waterway to the ocean. On the other hand, this waterway very likely would result in distinct harm to many other elements of our population. It would be particularly harmful to the railroad interests, and it is questionable whether the advantages claimed for such a waterway would outweigh the disadvantages that would result because of the harm it would cause elsewhere. Certainly the construction of this waterway right now should not be undertaken from the standpoint that it would form any integral part of our defense program. It would take at least 4 years, and other estimates run up as high as 7 or 8 years, before such a project could be completed and put into operation.

There are people, of course, who think this war is going to last anywhere from 5 to 10 years; but in these days of mechanized and highly organized war it does not seem as though either side could stand a struggle of such a protracted length as the proponents of this waterway would have to claim if it is going to be of any aid to our present defense needs. The money and the labor that would be used in such a waterway project might better be diverted to supplying the war equipment that is so vitally needed by England today. What England needs is boats, airplanes, tanks, and other implements of war. It is not going to be difficult to get that equipment to the Atlantic seaboard. The big question is getting it manufactured first and then across the ocean. Senator Dignan has been criticized by some of the metropolitan press of the State for his attitude regarding the resolution favoring the St. Lawrence waterway, but there are many people who agree with Senator Dignan that the present is no time to seriously consider this proposition. It has been rejected in the past by the United States Senate, and there are many competent engineers who doubt the feasibility of this waterway. It is not a vital need today, and if the waterway is a necessity it should only be constructed after competent engineering commissions have established the necessity and the economic advisability of such a waterway.

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Patriot of May 23, 1941]

THE THREAT AT HOME

There is one threat to our American way of living in this present war situation of which little is being said, but the influence is at work. There is the danger that in the name of national defense we shall become a highly socialized government, with the politicians running almost as many of the industries here as they do in Russia and with about the same effect.

Administration designs on the power industry have been common knowledge for a long time. The same administration has been threatening to take over the aluminum industry under the excuse that it is a war necessity. Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes has talked of a national fertilizer industry to catch the farm vote, and the ground work for that is to be done under the cloak of a war emergency.

There also has been pressure to have the Government take over the steel industry, the shipbuilding industry, and industrial plants making many of the munitions of war. The administration already has the right, written into the defense bill, where the ownership of a plant is unwilling or unable to operate to step in and take over. Those who want this country to go Communist only have to stir up trouble in any of these defense plants, making it appear the private owners are unable to operate their plants; and the administration has the excuse and the instrument to take over.

The danger in this situation is that once the plant is socialized, it never goes back to private ownership and private operation in the old American way. Once they get in, the Government bureaucrats never retreat and never let go. They have the power and authority to pass the laws and make the rules to retain their hold, and they always have the desire to run as much of the country as they can for what they can get out of it. Secretary Ickes went into the rum business in Puerto Rico a long time ago on the pretense that it was an emergency measure; but he's still in the rum business; and will stay until someone with more power than he has kicks him out. He'll have the aluminum business, too, if he can get his mitts on it; and others of his group in Washington have their eyes on steel, the war industries, and possibly the railroads. A considerable start has been made on the power business, and, if the President can have his wish on the St. Lawrence waterway, they'll take another big bite of that.

There is a possibility that we still will be so busy on the defense program that when we take time out to look back of us, the totalitarian boys at home may already have taken over the country on the pretense of patriotic necessity when truthfully they are actuated only by desire to put their own "red" ideas into effect at public expense.

An Appeal to Congress To Put a Stop to Step-by-Step Projection of the United States Into Undeclared War

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of August 6, 1941, containing a statement issued by 15 prominent Republicans urging the Congress to put a stop to step-by-step projection of the United States into undeclared war:

[From the New York Times of August 6, 1941]

FIFTEEN REPUBLICANS SCORE WAR "STEPS"—LEADERS CALL ON CONGRESS TO HALT "PROJECTION OF UNITED STATES" INTO "UNDECLARED" CONFLICT—ANGLO-SOVIET PACT IS HIT—LOWDEN, AT UP-STATE HOME, IS SPOKESMAN FOR HOOVER, COBB, LANDON, LEWIS, DAWES

ALEXANDRIA BAY, N. Y., August 5.—Fifteen Republican leaders, including Alfred M. Landon and former President Herbert C. Hoover, joined today in an appeal that "Congress put a stop to step-by-step projection of the United States into undeclared war."

A statement, declaring that "naval action" and "military occupation of bases outside the

Western Hemisphere," coupled with "promise of unauthorized aid to Russia," has undermined "fundamental principles of democratic government," was made public by Frank O. Lowden, former Governor of Illinois.

"Recent events raise doubts that this war is a clear-cut issue of liberty and democracy," the statement said. "It is not purely a world conflict between tyranny and freedom. The Anglo-Russian alliance has dissipated that illusion."

Others who signed the statement, released at Mr. Lowden's summer camp on an island in the St. Lawrence River, are:

Former Vice President Charles G. Dawes; Irvin S. Cobb and Clarence Budington Kelland, writers; John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, and former head of the C. I. O.; Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago; Geraldine Farrar, opera singer; Reuben Clark, former United States Ambassador to Mexico; Henry P. Fletcher, former Republican national chairman; Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, former Secretary of the Interior; Felix Morley, editor and author; Hanford MacNider, former Minister to Canada; and J. Henry Scattergood, Philadelphia businessman.

TEXT OF STATEMENT

The statement read as follows:

"The American people should insistently demand that Congress put a stop to step-by-step projection of the United States into undeclared war. Congress has not only the sole power to declare war but also the power and responsibility to keep the country out of war unless and until both Houses have otherwise decided.

"Exceeding its expressed purpose, the lease-lend bill has been followed by naval action, by military occupation of bases outside the Western Hemisphere, by promise of unauthorized aid to Russia, and by other belligerent moves.

"Such warlike steps, in no case sanctioned by Congress, undermine its constitutional powers and the fundamental principles of democratic government. The representatives of the people, in passing the lease-lend bill, expressed the national conviction that preservation of the British Empire and China is desirable for us and for civilization.

"We hold that view, but the intent of Congress was that lease-lend material should be transferred to belligerent ownership in the United States and utilized only to protect the independence of democracies.

ANGLO-RUSSIAN ALLIANCE SCORED

"We hold that in giving generous aid to these democracies at our seaboard we have gone as far as is consistent either with law, with sentiment or with security. Recent events raise doubts that this war is a clear-cut issue of liberty and democracy. It is not purely a world conflict between tyranny and freedom. The Anglo-Russian alliance has dissipated that illusion.

"Insofar as this is a war of power politics, the American people want no part in it. American participation is far more likely to destroy democracy in this country and thus in the Western Hemisphere than to establish it in Europe. The hope of civilization now rests primarily upon the preservation of freedom and democracy in the United States.

"That will be lost for a generation if we join in this war. We maintain that American lives should be sacrificed only for American independence or to prevent the invasion of the Western Hemisphere.

"Few people honestly believe that the Axis is now, or will in the future, be in a position to threaten the independence of any part of this hemisphere if our defenses are properly prepared.

"Energies of this country should be concentrated on the defense of our own liberties. Freedom in America does not depend on the outcome of struggles for material power between other nations."

Finns State Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

STATEMENT ISSUED BY FINNISH LEGATION AND PRINTED IN NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is not generally known that Finland was actually driven into the war in order to protect her freedom and sovereignty. Neither is it generally known that from the time that Finland signed the armistice with Russia she had to meet one constant succession of Russian demands, each more brutal than its predecessor. A statement recently issued by the Finnish Legation and reproduced in the New York Times states the Finnish case against Russia in an understandable manner. I feel that the American people should know the facts as they pertain to the brave little country of Finland—the one debtor nation that always paid promptly and on the barrel head. The Legation's statement follows:

[From the New York Times]

FINNS STATE CASE—CITE REPEATED SOVIET VIOLATIONS OF PEACE TREATY AND EFFORTS TO ENSLAVE TINY NATION

WASHINGTON.—Finland's efforts to stave off Soviet demands in the period before the Russo-German war began, and to preserve her independence, were set forth in a statement issued by the Finnish Legation here tonight.

Analysis of the Russo-Finnish situation in mid-June, the Legation said, revealed the following factors:

"Not content with the terms of the March 12, 1940, peace treaty with Finland, Russia has continuously made new demands on Finland. Russia has engaged in subversive "fifth column" activities in Finland, stemming from her consular agents. Before the present crisis Russia already had committed 100 violations of Finnish territory and in 804 instances Russian planes flew over Finnish territory.

"Nevertheless, Finland has continued her efforts toward collaboration with her totalitarian giant neighbor of the east, Russia. Finland, in the midst of the international turmoil, cut off from the western democracies, was nevertheless striving to maintain her freedom and independence; defending herself against the ruthless Russian aggression."

NEW DEMANDS BY RUSSIA

The text of the Legation's statement follows:

The peace treaty concluded in Moscow on the 12th of March, 1940, should have fully satisfied Russia. Finland, left alone in her fight against the aggressor, was forced to make concessions that went far beyond the Russian demands, during the negotiations in the fall of 1939.

Hardly a month after the conclusion of the peace, Russia made a demand that Finland should compensate for or return machinery and other property removed from the ceded territory during the war, a matter that was not mentioned in the peace treaty or raised during the peace negotiations. For Finland this demand was, from the economic point of view, a very heavy one, actually a war levy, which, especially with regard to Hanko, had no legal basis whatever. Russia thus sought by economic pressure to impoverish Finland and reduce the war-exhausted country to distress.

By political claims that soon followed on the trail of the economic ones, Russia aimed to establish rights that would give her a dominating influence—as, for instance, a control of Finnish foreign policy. This had not even been mentioned in the negotiations preceding the peace treaty, and no reference is to be found in the treaty itself. Finland adopted a conciliatory attitude, as far as was possible without giving up her status as an independent nation. Thus she, for instance, assented to transit of Rusisan troops over southern Finland to Hanko in spite of the dangerous character of such a concession.

WOULD DEMILITARIZE AALANDS

In June 1940 Russia presented a series of far-reaching claims. Demilitarization and control of the Aaland Islands was requested and Russia also demanded that the nickel mines of Petsamo be ceded to her.

These new demands were presented as conditions for a trade treaty in spite of the fact that the conclusion of such a treaty was clearly agreed upon in the treaty of peace.

It was pointed out in the ensuing negotiations that the treaty of Moscow contained no stipulations concerning the Aaland Islands. Mr. Molotoff, the Russian Prime Minister, in his reply stated bluntly that the Soviet Government did not want to raise the question at the time of peace negotiations, as this problem might have rendered the conclusion of peace more difficult.

The International Convention of 1921, concerning the demilitarization of the Aaland Islands, was disregarded and belittled by Russia. Being reminded of the convention, the Russian Government asked for a privileged position over the signatory powers. The Finnish Government wanted the signatories to be informed about the matter, but the Russians flatly rejected this suggestion. Russia preferred to omit from the new agreement a statement to the effect that the International Convention of 1921 is still in force.

The demilitarization of the Aaland Islands actually amounted to their abandonment to the mercy of an aggressor.

Russia was in this connection granted the right to maintain a consulate on the Aaland Islands. This right has been abused by Russia; the personnel of the consulate has been increased excessively and the consular officers and the employees of the consulate have carried on subversive and incendiary propaganda among the people of the islands.

DEMANDED NICKEL CONCESSION

The demand concerning the nickel mines of Petsamo disregarded altogether the fact that a concession for the exploiting of the mines had been granted to a British-American company, the Mond Nickel Co. In the negotiations concerning this demand, as in other matters, Russia has repeatedly taken a most threatening attitude, alluding to the use of force and pressing Finland to cancel illegally the concession. The Russian negotiators did not conceal that territorial acquisition was in their mind and that the economic interests came only in second place.

An attempt to wrench from Finland without adequate compensation the energy of the important Vallinkoski waterfalls has also been made by Russia. In this connection she has ad absurdum referred to the peace treaty, being, however, unwilling to recompense for the power to be delivered by the Finnish power station.

The diplomatic and consular representatives of Russia have been engaged in flagrant espionage. They have also in an arrogant and offensive manner urged for themselves privileges which it has been impossible to grant as they would have endangered public order.

Russia has, moreover, by her malicious radio and newspaper propaganda in a disturbing way intervened in the domestic affairs of Finland. She has supported a subversive society working under the misleading name of "The Association of Peace and Friendship With U. S. R. R.," by the help of which she has tried to weaken Finland internally. These subversive methods are well known and contributed to the total destruction of the independence of the Baltic States.

SOUGHT DOMESTIC POWER

Russia even has made official attempts to interfere with the domestic affairs of Finland. She has, moreover, striven to chain the Finnish foreign policy to her own, and, referring irrelevantly to the Moscow treaty, she prevented the conclusion of a defensive alliance by the northern countries, planned in the spring of 1940. Negotiations for such an alliance were under way after the conclusion of the peace in Moscow, and did certainly in no way constitute a threat directed against Russia.

The hidden purpose of Russia was to destroy once for all Finland's possibilities to defend herself against a new aggression.

While adopting, when presenting her new claims, a menacing and imperative attitude, Russia in no way showed willingness to develop the Russo-Finnish relations in a positive direction. Finland, on the other hand, has over and over again in word and deed proved her readiness for collaboration.

A special committee was appointed to draft a program for reciprocal cultural intercourse. The Russian Government ignored all the efforts of this committee. All Finnish attempts to establish a fruitful collaboration in the economic, cultural, and other fields have been repulsed by Russian indifference. Russia has been interested in getting contact only with the subversive elements in Finland. It is an established fact that the Russians have tried to convert into their agents all Finns, including prisoners of war, who have fallen into their hands.

RECENT INCIDENTS CITED

Before the outbreak of the war between Russia and Germany there were 109 registered cases of violation of Finnish frontiers by Russians and 804 cases of Russian airplanes flying over Finnish territory.

Even if the change that has taken place in the balance of power in eastern Europe has had a restraining effect on Russia in her politics toward Finland, she has not abandoned her claims and designs, as some recent incidents show. As late as June 17 the Russian Commissariat of Foreign Affairs, in an evident effort to create complications, asserted that Finland is not fulfilling the stipulations of the Hanko transit agreement. The same day the Commissariat insolently demanded the release of an offender sentenced to prison for espionage.

Since the Moscow treaty and up to the new aggression launched against Finland in June 1941, the attitude of Russia toward Finland made it fully clear that the Russian policy tends to the enslaving of Finland. The final aim of Russian policy has always been the destruction of Finland's independence.

Finland still stands as a bulwark of freedom and democracy against the murderous aggression of a totalitarian giant which has enslaved nearly 200,000,000 people and is not willing to let a small nation of 4,000,000 live in peace and freedom.

Strategic Highways Not "Pork"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the charge that the authorization of $125,000,000 for correcting critical weaknesses in the strategic highway system is dipping into the pork barrel can arise only from a lack of knowledge as to what the system is, its importance in the defense program, and the nature of the work proposed to be done on it.

The strategic highway system includes 78,000 miles of the most important highways in the country. It has been selected after long study by the War Department, the Public Roads Administration, and the State highway departments. A revised system, taking into account the latest developments in the defense program was approved by the Secretary of War on May 15, 1941.

This system includes the major routes over which defense-highway traffic is moving. Already this traffic has reached an enormous volume. Trucking companies keep their vehicles rolling day and night. Already there is a shortage of trucks to handle movements essential to the defense program. Steps are now being taken to coordinate trucking movements so that the available trucks may be used to the best advantage.

Efforts to increase the efficiency of truck use will do but little good if their movement and that of army trains is slowed down by winding roads, narrow surfaces, and short-sight distances, or failure of weak bridges. The increased volume of traffic now on the strategic system is greatly increasing the delays encountered on many sections of the system in every State. These sections were definitely inadequate for traffic without the added burden of the defense movement.

Both the Roads Committee and the various Federal agencies that advised it have adopted a highly conservative policy in dealing with this problem. The bill we reported to the House did not go beyond definitely established and urgent needs from the military point of view. Great pressure has been brought upon those in charge of the selection of the strategic system to include a much greater mileage of highway. From every section of the country have come demands that this road or that road must be included in the system and built with Federal funds if the country is to be saved. Congress has not in any way interfered in the selection of the system, and the proposed authorization is available only for expenditure on the system selected by those charged with our national defense.

If the $125,000,000 is authorized, will expenditures be made on projects not of critical importance to national defense? Upon the answer to this question depends the justness of the accusation that this bill is "pork barrel" legislation.

As pointed out in the President's message to the Congress on June 2, 1941, Senate Document No. 62, it was estimated by the Public Roads Administration of the Federal Works Agency that a minimum expenditure of $458,000,000 will be required to eliminate the most serious deficiencies in the strategic network. According to a careful survey made at the direction of the President, there are 2,436 substandard bridges and approximately 19,095 miles of road that must be widened or strengthened to put the network in acceptable condition for emergency use.

To raise the entire strategic network to the standard eventually desirable for safe and convenient use by both civil and military traffic would require expenditure of several billion dollars, according to Public Roads Administration estimates.

A survey of the defense-road requirements, in which each State highway department was asked to estimate its needs, was reported in the January and February issues of the magazine Roads and Streets. The article says:

> A generalized summary of these reports indicates funds of the order of $1,500,000,000 would be required.

I know that ultimately large sums must be spent on the system, but no member of the Roads Committee thought of spending such sums now. I only cite the figures to show the wide spread between the estimates of State highway departments and the authorization proposed in this bill.

We have indeed been conservative in proposing an expenditure of only $125,000,000, an amount less than one-third of the cost of correcting critical deficiencies in the system, as estimated by the Public Roads Administration.

The Washington Post fears that "a hundred million dollars would be needlessly spent, and the Army would probably lack some of the highway and bridge improvements it so urgently needs." Evidently the Post is unfamiliar with the Army's action with regard to the system, or else it feels that the Army does not know what it needs.

Army and Navy Establishments and defense industries are spread out over the entire country but some sections of the strategic system may be rather distant from any of these concentrated defense activities. The Post appears to see little sense in improving a road one or two hundred miles away from a camp or defense plant. Yet if the men are to be fed and the plants supplied with raw materials, the worst bottlenecks on our most important highways must be removed or conditions alleviated. It is a great mistake to think that our defense activity is confined within a small circle around each camp or plant.

If it were proposed to appropriate the entire amount needed to correct the critical weaknesses in the strategic system and apportion this amount among the States according to the Federal-aid formula then there might be reason to fear that some work not urgent in character might be done. There is no reason for such fear. The careful studies that have been made show that apportionment of $125,000,000 will not give to most States half the amount needed for urgent work.

The advantage of an immediate and general attack on the weak links in the strategic system and avoidance of the rush and clamor to get allocated rather than apportioned funds seemed to dictate that the Federal-aid formulas be used. We were trying to avoid a pork barrel, not make one.

The Federal Government is asking each of the States to concentrate on the strategic network its State highway funds and remaining amounts of Federal-aid funds authorized before the defense program. During the present construction season State highway programs have been revised, many planned projects not on the strategic system have been postponed, and there has been a marked upswing in work on the strategic system. If the Federal Government does not give a moderate degree of financial support to its own recommendation, then there is little reason to hope that the States will continue to do so.

If this effort toward the removal of the worst bottlenecks on our most used highways be pork-barrel legislation, then let the Washington Post make the most of it. Federal laws do not give to any Member of Congress any voice in the selection of the projects to be improved and no Member will be able to make much of it.

Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

ARTICLE BY DR. GEORGE GALLUP

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Gallup on the subject of old-age pensions:

PUBLIC SETTING MODEST SUMS AS PENSION ISSUE LOOMS AGAIN

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., August 7.—The perennial issue of government old-age pensions may be thrown in congressional laps shortly as the result of hearings now being conducted by a special Senate committee under Senator DOWNEY, of California. Washington observers report that the committee is virtually certain to recommend a liberalization of the pension system, and predict that a bill supported by Dr. Townsend or some similar measure may reach a vote in the Senate.

In such circumstances no question is more timely than to ask: Where does the American public now stand on old-age pensions? Is the public satisfied with the amounts now granted to needy citizens at the age of 65? What sums would be paid if the general public set the scales?

As the pension question boils to the top once more, a Nation-wide survey by the American Institute of Public Opinion indicates:

1. That the vast majority of American citizens (more than 90 percent) approve of the basic principle of government-administered pensions. In the last decade the idea that old-age security is a Federal responsibility has apparently taken firm hold.

2. While the public shows dissatisfaction with the amounts now being paid to needy old people (present amounts average about $20 a month for the country as a whole), the typical American's idea of what his Government should pay is a moderate one.

Nor have the public's sums increased substantially over the past 5 years, despite rising costs of living, comparison with earlier institute studies shows.

3. Far from endorsing schemes like California's recent drive for $30 every Thursday, the average American sets a figure in the neighborhood of $42 a month for single persons and $73 for married couples. This fact in itself provides an interesting rebuttal for those critics of democracy who have sometimes forecast dire raids on the Treasury if public opinion were ever allowed to guide fiscal policy.

For the fact is that the public's minimum for a single person ($42) would mean only $500 a year. Moreover, it is very close to the top grants already available in States like California, Arizona, Oregon, Indiana, and Rhode Island—though considerably higher than the averages for some other States and for the Nation as a whole.

4. Finally, the public believes that citizens should become eligible for old-age pensions at the age of 60 instead of 65, as now provided by the Social Security Act.

SEVEN PERCENT OPPOSE PENSIONS

In the preliminary question the institute asked, Are you in favor of Government old-age pensions? From a cross section of men and women in the United States voting population came the replies:

	Percent
Favor Government pensions	91
Oppose Government pensions	7
Undecided	2

Asked at what age pensions should begin, most voters named 60 years of age:

	Percent
Should begin before 60	17
Should begin at 60	47
At 61 or later	36

The survey voters were then asked, What do you think is the smallest income per month that a single person over 60 needs for a decent living in your community? And a similar question was asked regarding married couples over 60.

Though the sums named as averages (medians) are much below what the Bureau of Home Economics and other Government agencies have estimated as necessary for a minimum standard of health and decency, the results are interesting for their contrasts when analyzed by geographic sections and by social groups.

Perhaps most interesting of all is the fact that older people themselves (over 60) set more modest sums than younger people, many of whom, of course, contribute directly to the support of parents at present.

SECTIONAL OPINIONS

Here are the sectional medians for single persons and married couples on the basis of replies from the voting population—those who can make their opinions felt at the ballot box:

	Median monthly sum for single person	Median monthly sum for married couple
National average	$42	$73
New England	50	78
Middle Atlantic		
East Central	42	74
West Central	37	59
South	32	59
West	48	76

Broken down by age levels, the medians are:

Voters aged—	Median monthly sum for single person	Median monthly sum for married couple
21 to 34	$48	$77
35 to 44	46	74
45 to 59	41	73
60 and over	40	62

Among other groups the highest medians for a single person were set in the upper income group ($49 a month) and among people living in cities of more than 100,000 population ($52). Lowest medians for single persons came from the bottom income groups and from farmers in general.

Observations From the East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM NORTHWEST INSURANCE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a constituent has sent me an editorial from Northwest Insurance that deals with our domestic and foreign programs in a realistic and forthright manner. It is in the hope that every Member of Congress will read this editorial that it is inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From Northwest Insurance]

OBSERVATIONS INSIDE THE EAST

We have just returned from a trip into the East. Here is the situation as we observed it:

Washington is in a state of wildest confusion. It seemed to us that radicals are everywhere inside the officialdom of the Government. Bunglers occupy many of the pivotal positions. Hundreds of political loafers with juicy salaries strut around like barnyard roosters.

National-defense statistics are largely fiction. Bottlenecks are numerous almost beyond tabulation, and incompetency is the

worst of them. Money is thrown around as though it were as plentiful as water in the oceans. What a mess will be uncovered when expenditures and procedures of the national-defense program are probed in a congressional investigation.

A manufacturer related to us that he had been 10 days in Washington in an effort to procure instructions on where to make delivery on devices he had produced for national defense. "I have been shunted from one office to another, and after 17 interviews I am still in the dark as to what I am supposed to do," he said.

Stories about extravagances in connection with national defense are many in Washington. They involve purchases of land for military purposes, construction work at Camp Meade, in Maryland, and Fort Belvoir, in Virginia, and contracts of various kinds. Some of them smell like graft on a large scale.

Under the smoke screen of emergency, economic screwballs are busy on schemes for the regimentation and regulation of business in the United States. They seem to have strong support inside the administration for their nefarious operations in the pattern of totalitarianism. Plans in process of development call for additional legislation to expand the supreme authority of the executive branch of the Government to embrace our entire economy and in dictatorial disregard of democratic principles.

The clamor for a declaration of war against Germany is hysterical in Washington. Interventionists cannot understand why the people of the country refuse to be stampeded into belligerency. Millions of dollars have been spent for propaganda to arouse the population to a frenzy that overwhelms reason in support of complete involvement in the struggles of power politics overseas. The results have been negative of late. Many interventionists now argue bitterly that President Roosevelt should ignore entirely the majority of the Nation and that like a dictator he ought to override roughshod the wishes of the people. In that connection propaganda of recent vintage centers upon the creation of public opinion strong enough to stigmatize effectively critics of the executive branch of the Government as traitors, agents of the Axis or dupes of the latter.

The fear of severe inflation is common in business circles throughout the East. Commodity prices have already outrun the efforts of the Government to control them. Here is the opinion of an astute observer: "Inflation is certain to result from a pyramided national debt expected officially to climb to $90,000,000,000. The magicians in Washington are doomed to disappointment if they follow the notion that they can stop inflation with a wand as they mumble hocus-pocus. Experience has proved that war always brings inflation. When Napoleon was on a rampage in Europe prices rose 45 percent. During the Civil War in the United States prices soared to about 120 percent, and through the period of World War No. 1 they jumped approximately 127 percent. The inflation spiral is in motion and we might as well recognize that fact realistically."

Business leaders are also disturbed over what may come in the form of taxes in that taxes are likely to be based on the need for revenue in disregard of their economic effects. Congress is inclined to determine taxes from the standpoint of politics rather than equitable distribution. Along such defective procedures the economic machinery of the country cannot escape serious dislocation.

The situation in Washington is more serious than the majority of the people realize. Wendell Willkie did the Nation a tragic disservice when he flopped back into the lap of the New Deal. Loyal opposition to the administration of President Roosevelt is vitally important in the preservation of democracy in the United States.

Efforts to silence the critics of the New Deal are indefensible except in totalitarian minds. It is folly to believe that national unity requires docile acceptance of everything in the decisions of President Roosevelt.

Congress Should Protect Independent Bankers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before the House a measure of great importance to independent bankers. I refer to the Gore bill (H. R. 4636), which is now before the House Banking and Currency Committee. I am sure I speak for a majority of the House when I say this bill deserves the swift consideration and approval of the Congress.

The Gore bill is eminently fair. It is merely a step toward framing into law a banking policy already approved by the Congress. Simply stated, the Gore bill would require branch banks to publish their individual statements of condition. The branch-banking practice now is to publish a consolidated figure of their statement of condition. For example, let us suppose a parent bank has a branch in some distant city. When the statement of condition of the branch is published the consolidated figure of the entire chain is used. This gives the impression that the published figure represents the assets of the branch, whereas, in fact, the figure is the sum total of the branch bank's various units.

This practice is unfair and should be stopped immediately. It can be stopped by passage of the Gore bill. The Gore bill, as someone has observed, is the truth-in-statement bill. It merely compels branch banks to tell the public the truth of the assets of a branch bank in a particular city or town.

Through publication of the consolidated figure of assets the branch bank gives the impression that it is much stronger and better able to serve the public than the independent bank which is competing with it across the street. This is a gross injustice to the independent banker, without whom this country would not be the great Republic it is.

I believe we should at all times approve every safeguard necessary for the protection and continuance of independent banking. The Gore bill is a step in that direction. The giant branch banks are ever on the alert to expand their interests and swallow up the independent banker. There has been talk in some quarters of making every independent bank with deposits of less than $1,000,000 the branch of some chain. This is sheer nonsense and a dangerous trend.

The liquidity of a bank and its ability to give quick and efficient service in the community where it operates certainly should not be judged on that bank's amount of deposits. That is an economic fallacy, and one about which the public should be informed. There is absolutely no connection between a bank's size and its security. I think the history of the 1933 bank failures well proves that point.

The advantages of independent banking are too numerous to relate. Independent banks operate according to their income. They pay no fancy salaries. They are in an excellent position to know the needs and wants of the community they serve. Independent bankers have, furthermore, a definite social and personal interest in the development of their respective communities, which is more than can be said about branch bankers.

In view of all this, I earnestly hope the House Banking and Currency Committee soon will consider the Gore bill, and that the measure will receive the quick approval of the House and Senate.

The Case of Eire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

ARTICLE BY EDWARD I. FENLON

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edward I. Fenlon, Ph. D., from the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Tablet of July 19, 1941:

[From the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Tablet of July 19, 1941]

THE CASE OF EIRE

(By Edward I. Fenlon, Ph. D.)

Increasing communications relative to the neutrality of Eire have appeared in the press almost daily, including several in the Tablet. A number of these letters seem vague and one-sided, while several miss the mark, or even any mark at all, being random shots, possibly to relieve the itch of prejudice.

The official explanation for Eire's position is simple, viz: Her people overwhelmingly chose the actual status, the status of peace. Her Government, hence, is accepting the sole course consonant with the democratic ideal. The determination of the country is hardly different from that of Switzerland, for instance, or from that of America if democracy were regarded among us today as it is in Fire or was in times well within memory. Actual democracy, as opposed to lip democracy, makes the people of a nation master of its destiny. Meanwhile arguments by persons professing democracy as an ideal, as against the principle now guiding Eire, must necessarily run to sophistry.

Beyond the simple exposition aforesaid, the authorities of Eire, conservative administrators that they are, consistently refuse to go. Nor is it at all necessary that they go further. The explanation suffices; it is clear-cut and sententious; it is complete. It becomes, then, a case of take it or leave it. There is no call for Eire to be apologetic.

We who look on from a distance, however, have grounds to assume that Eire has learned

her lessons. It were irrational to suppose that she has not. Incidentally, the condition is very much more than we dare say for ourselves at the moment—that we have learned our lessons. But now, if Eire's lessons signify anything they show clearly enough that England and Eire can not abide in peace under the one roof. English religious intolerance, the root of Eire's long suffering, and English philosophy, so distasteful to the sons and daughters of Patrick, are as recurrent bomb explosions between the respective peoples, and the too-keen memories of the consequent disasters linger, perhaps never to be effaced.

BRITAIN AND THE RELIGIOUS MIND

Indeed, it were difficult for Britain, maybe impossible, at least from our poor human point of view, ever to come into the hearts of the great body of religious-minded peoples of Continental Europe and throughout the world, not to speak of the scions of Eire. We of America, inheritors of English education and of English tradition generally may, as a nation, never fully understand the religious sensibilities of Europe for Britain. Ordinarily it would be necessary to live for a time in Eire or on the Continent to come into the appreciation. The Belgians, the French, the Italians, the Spanish, the Portuguese, the Poles, great numbers of Dutch and of Germans, and many other spiritually minded Europeans are fervidly and traditionally set against Britain.

Leaving aside even the immediate effects on those people of the so-called Reformation in England, its unhallowed aftermath gave rise to a perennial flow of drab British materialism, a something that the conscience of Eire and that of the religious-minded of the Continent were, from the beginning, prepared tenaciously to resist. To those peoples Britain became a symbol of opposition to the things of the spirit. The progressive world aggrandizement of the Empire that once gloried in an Austin, in a Bede, in an Anselm, etc., etc., and boasted the patronage of St. George—so much of that aggrandizement accruing under conditions that today we are supposed to ignore—only added with the years to this almost innate disposition of distaste.

Even a passing perspective of Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Bentham, the Mills, Huxley, Spencer, Schiller, etc., etc., must reveal something of what I mean. Theirs is shallow philosophy at best, as indeed befits materialism or positivism and agnosticism. Berkeley, it is true, professedly opposes materialism, but does so with such an excess of ingenuity and with such a renunciation of tradition as to illustrate the methods and the manner of the subtle propagandist, which is, undeniably, not alone characteristic of British philosophy but of British diplomacy as well, and which a fair analysis of even contemporaneous history will not fail abundantly to disclose, a characteristic that I have no hesitancy in saying is now palpable in our own American diplomacy, a diplomacy that fits the type of education that is our inheritance. It is, in effect, the diplomacy born of pragmatism, which was a practice ages before it became a theory and which, in verity, results in the end justifying the means, for pragmatism stripped of the rationalized trappings of its proponents is individual choice as opposed to objective truth. To conceal one's ends or aims, even for supposed overt, democratic matters, it becomes necessary to carry the public along, to resort to ingenious, disingenuous, and mellifluous rationalization, to engage in word-enchantment, in the protesting too much, as said Shakespeare, all of which, early or late, reveals the plethora of camouflage above the slender substance. But the British, and now we, call it diplomacy. "Mother country" takes on its peculiar significance here.

THE IRISH HAVE LEARNED

Today persons of the pragmatic mind (they call it humanistic at Oxford) are busily censuring Eire because of her determination to be no part of the actual British stew. When a man makes a treaty with a normal Irishman, the document forthwith becomes a sacred, not merely a potential, instrument. The bargain is closed and the Gael goes his way set to duty by the exactions of the case, not by its concealed exigencies. And when contracts are broken, betimes before the ink is dry, there ensue troubles and even heartbreaks, which, in the instance of the Irishman, are cataclysmic, for he has never learned this shallow philosophy called pragmatism. He is, in effect, too impatient to abide it for a moment. He is, as they say today, conditioned so, built so. His religion, above all, has made him so.

How now, then, is it possible for the Government and the people of Eire to trust Churchill or Lloyd George or any of the coterie related to one or the other? How is it now possible? Think you that the Irish and the other students of real history the world over believe Churchill when he says that Britain is fighting in the interests of the smaller nations or with any other conscious thought but one related exclusively to Britain? First, stands against Churchill what he represents to Eire, namely, a history of 700 years of suffering; and, next, the very pertinent and palpable history that every Irishman and Irishwoman of 25 years of age and over has witnessed in despair with their own simple Irish eyes. The Irish, forgiving by nature, as all of us know, have resolved to forget the past or as much of it as is possible. But, they know immediately, as distinct from report, the very men they are now dealing with as no American knows them, and fools were they not to impound the knowledge. What the Irish have witnessed, of themselves alone, stands starknakedly against both Churchill and George, for they were Britain's administrators during those awful, never-to-be-forgotten, days from 1916 to 1921.

OUT-HITLERING HITLER

A document was signed on March 8, 1921, by seven outstanding Americans, to wit: Jane Addams, Frederic Howe, James M. Maurer, Oliver P. Newman, George N. Norris (Senator), Norman Thomas (Socialist), and L. Hollingsworth Wood, a document that must disclose, but only as an instance among hundreds, why the Irish cannot and will not trust Churchill or Lloyd George, or the English Government generally. To repeat, we offer the matter as merely typical of the centuries. No; it is not a case of opening old sores; it is the fact of a death struggle from yet unhealed sores. As said, the Gael seeks to overlook the past. But is it not asking too much of even a spiritualized human nature to insist that the Irish shut their eyes to the actualities as a matter, not of revenge, but of prudence?

The Americans just mentioned constituted a commission to report of conditions in Eire—the unbelievable conditions that prevailed from 1916 to the end of 1920, conditions that, it is fair to say, out-Hitlered Hitler in the relation of his soldiers to the Jews. These Americans were delegated to make an investigation by a Committee of One Hundred, which committee included 5 State Governors, 11 United States Senators, 13 Representatives, the mayors of 15 large cities, Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Keane, 4 Methodist bishops, clergymen—priests and ministers—educators, editors, businessmen, and labor leaders. Thirty-six States were represented on the committee.

The committee was provided with funds ample for all expenses, including for the calling of witnesses. The British Embassy gave public assurances that its Government would refuse passports to no Irish witness. What happened? If you know the history of even some of the relations covering joint English-Irish affairs, you need hardly be told what happened. It was the same age-old double-dealing, the old, old pragmatism or opportunism, which is really the one thing. Even Irish bishops failed to secure passports. And this is the testimony of none other than the celebrated Cardinal Logue. Donal O'Callaghan, lord mayor of Cork, failing of his shipping credentials, came over as a stowaway. Peter MacSwiney arrived as a common seaman. Messrs. Morgan and Derham landed from a small trading vessel. Others were not so fortunate. Even the nymphs of subterfuge had deserted them. Mrs. MacCurtain was shot at, and her house raided and denuded of evidence shortly after receiving the invitation to testify. Her mail evidently had been tampered with, indicating that, as a witness, she had something to tell, to tell an unbelieving and unsympathetic American public, for then Britain controlled, as she now controls, the worldways of propaganda, and Britain, like Caesar's wife, was then, as now, above suspicion.

I cannot present here more than a few specimens of the testimony, and there is no attempt to cull the mere sensational portions of it.

BRITAIN AND THE COMMISSION

However, one will note at the very outset that Britain and certain of the British became obstructionists, not alone in the refusal of passports to invited Irish witnesses, but also in the sense that Britain completely ignored the commission, while selected British subjects (Englishmen) refused to testify. But let the commission speak for itself:

"It must be pointed out while the reports and documents gathered by the Commission present the case of Ireland from diverse points of view, the direct testimony available gives the case almost wholly from the Irish Republican viewpoint or from sources not unsympathetic to the application of the principle of self-determination to Ireland. In other words, the Ulster Unionist viewpoint and that of British officialdom in Ireland, in spite of every earnest effort of the Commission, were not represented among the witnesses. Diligent efforts were made to remedy this unfortunate defect.

"One of the witnesses invited by the Commission was Rev. T. T. Shields, of Toronto, Canada, who accompanied the delegation of Ulster Protestant Clergymen on their tour of the United States last year, and who, we were informed, had some valuable documentary evidence on Ireland in his possession. Mr. Shields received the advances of the Commission in a mood of unreceptivity, and the effort to secure his testimony, and that of the Ulster delegation, failed. A number of English journalists in the United States were also invited to testify, but in no case was an acceptance received."

Further on the report says: "The Commission planned * * * to send a subcommittee to England and Ireland, and it was arranged that in England this committee should consult every available source of British opinion on Ireland * * * but after passports had been secured from our State Department the British Government through the Embassy refused visas."

Respecting the witnesses who did appear, the report is thus laudatory: "We wish to commend the frank and dispassionate spirit in which the Irish witnesses presented their testimony. They came to us in many cases under conditions of great personal inconvenience, or even danger. Insofar as they represented the Irish people before the Commission, that people has cause for pride in them." Let, then, the attitude of the British Government in the case and the acknowledged sincerity of the witnesses speak for themselves.

CHURCHILL'S RESPONSIBILITY

We note here, again, that the head of the British Government at the time was Lloyd George, and his vicar, immediately responsible for the outrages perpetrated in Eire, Winston Churchill. We quote:

"We find that the Irish people are deprived of the protection of British law, to which they would be entitled as subjects of the British King. They are likewise deprived of the protection granted by international law, to which they would be entitled as belligerents. They are at the mercy of Imperial British forces which, acting contrary to all law and to all standards of human conduct, have instituted in Ireland a 'terror,' the evidence of which seems to prove that—

"(1) The Imperial British Government has created and introduced into Ireland a force of at least 78,000 men, many of them youthful and inexperienced, and some of them convicts; and has incited that force to unbridled violence.

"(2) The British Imperial forces in Ireland have indiscriminately killed innocent men, women, and children; have indiscriminately assassinated persons suspected of being Republicans; have tortured and shot prisoners while in custody, adopting the subterfuges of 'refusal to halt' and 'attempting to escape'; and have attributed to alleged 'Sinn Fein extremists' the British assassination of prominent Irish Republicans

"(3) House burning and wanton destruction of villages and cities by Imperial British forces have been countenanced, and ordered by officials of the British Government; and elaborate provision by gasoline sprays and bombs has been made in a number of instances for systematic incendiarism as part of a plan of terrorism.

"(4) A campaign for the destruction of the means of existence of the Irish people has been conducted by the burning of factories, creameries, crops, and farm implements, and the shooting of farm animals. The campaign is carried on regardless of the political views of their owners, and results in widespread and acute suffering among women and children.

"(5) Acting under a series of proclamations issued by the competent military authorities of the British Imperial forces, hostages are carried by forces exposed to the fire of the Republican army; fines are levied upon towns and villages as punishment for alleged offenses of individuals; private property is destroyed in reprisals for acts with which the owners have no connection; and the civilian population is subjected to an inquisition upon the theory that individuals are in possession of information valuable to the military forces of Great Britain. These acts of the Imperial British forces are contrary to the laws of peace or war among modern civilized nations. * * *

"TERRORISM

"It would appear that the natural fear of the Imperial British forces in Ireland is fostered by propaganda into terror under the auspices of the Imperial British Government. The bearing of this natural and artificial apprehensiveness upon the prevalence of drunkenness among the troops may be surmised if not defined.

"John Charles Clarke, an American, witnessed the shooting of a boy on the streets of Cork by two drunken Black and Tans, who, scarcely able to walk, fired into a crowd, and were then led away by their fellows. * * *

"John Tangney, a former member of the British forces, testified concerning a raid in which he participated, on a village near Ballylarby: 'This County Inspector Lowndes had the orders, and he adjourned to an adjoining saloon and had a drink, and two young military officers, who were in charge of the military party, adjourned with him and got stupidly drunk. All three were drunk. * * * We went home and the military were firing all the way back. I myself had to come to a soldier who was stupidly drunk and take a revolver out of his hand.' John Joseph Caddan, a former member of the R. I. C., testified that the men drank before going out to service, presumably as a spur to courage. He stated: 'They were up there, some of them, most of the night, drinking.'"

Frank Dempsey, chairman of the Urban Council of Mallow, testified that when that town was burned by British soldiers on September 27, 1920, most of the soldiers in the raid were drunk. He said: "The first thing they did was to fire revolver shots and rifle shots about the town. Next, they raided some of the public houses and looted them and got drunk." The witness stated that he complained to the officer, who replied that he had lost control of them: "Damn it, they are all drunk."

Individual shootings of innocent persons in raids on homes seemed to be the common order. A number of such cases are listed in the report. We take just one: "There were no lights at night on the streets of Bantry, and the Black and Tans or the R. I. C.—they were disguised so that one could not tell to which body they belonged—they knocked at the door. She (mother of a hunchback youth) answered the knock with a candle in her hand. The soldiers knocked the candle from her, using an electric light to light them up the stairs. The volunteer boy was not at home. The little hunchback boy ran from his own room into his brother's room. The mother rushed up the stairs after them, and was in sight of the tragedy when it occurred. 'My boy's hands were raised in prayer,' she said. 'They shot him through his uplifted hands.'"

AN APPRAISAL AND A HOPE

Let what we have thus extracted from the report of the commission suffice at least for the moment. We could add very much more, including the testimonies of persons of the highest order to me individually during a visit to Ireland, while De Valera and followers were yet bivouacking in the hills away from the British soldiery—the royal Irish constabulary, the military, and the auxiliaries. But the point in the end would be the same—the Irish will never trust Churchill or George or their associates—men known to be responsible for one of the very meanest recorded outrages of all time—the releasing of armed drunken convicts and irresponsible youths upon a people as the Irish. Nothing that I have thus far heard or read of the actual world catastrophe is comparable, let Churchill inveigh, as he does and may do, against Hitler and Mussolini, for whom, indeed, none of us entertain sympathies of whatsoever sort or degree. I know well how the hand of God upon Churchill, who had more or less immediately to do with the "black and tan" infamies, would be interpreted by hundreds of thousands of religious persons, even as they pray daily for him and his suffering people. Such is the nobility of the Gael.

Perhaps as never before in modern times spiritual leaders today call to England and to the world to hasten the ways of peace by renewing themselves in the things of the spirit, the sole course left to salvage or to save. To Britannia, in very particular, the Empire that has so long ruled the waves to no appreciable uplifting achievement, the appeal has special significance—the great majority of whose immediate sons and daughters follow the lead of divinely appointed religion no longer. The appeal is to recommence to rule its own spirit in and through God. The religious statistics covering England, Scotland, and Wales make discouraging study. Christ remains precisey where England left Him, centuries ago—left Him with His outstretched arms at the unfortunate, alluring crossroads. At that point there must be a renewed tryst or British leadership has likely seen its day, for history is inexorable in this, that mere material power is fated to a relatively restricted term.

If the world disaster prove thus spiritually resultant, the actual unparalleled suffering of Britain and of the nations at large will not have been in vain, and the Irish will not alone unselfishly provide and prepare the fatted calf but will rejoice and be glad as possibly no other people can.

Outline of Lake Superior Iron-Ore Industry and Its Relation to the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE H. BENDER, OF OHIO

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

I. Effect on Lake Superior iron mines:

A. Importation of foreign ores in great quantities would have a ruinous effect upon Lake Superior iron-mine operators, rail and lake iron-ore shippers.

B. Importation of foreign ores for beneficiation of Lake Superior ores might eventually seriously impair the self-sufficiency of the steel industry of the United States and, in the event of another world crisis, jeopardize our national security.

II. Present Lake Superior ore markets:

A. Great Lakes and upper Mississippi Valley region:

B. Supplies 86 percent of iron ore consumed in the United States.

C. In 1937 shipped over 61,000,000 tons to domestic consumers.

D. Shipped over a million tons to Canadian furnaces.

III. Value of iron-ore industry—investment, labor, taxes:

A. Investment—

1. In mines, $300,000,000.

2. In 1,500 miles of railroads connecting the mines of the upper lake ports maintained by iron-ore business and lake vessels carrying that trade, $300,000,000.

3. Many more millions invested in 35 unloading docks on lower lake ports and rail facilities from these to consuming furnaces.

B. Labor, 1937—

1. Over 20,000 persons in Lake Superior iron-ore industry receiving $32,000,000 in wages.

2. Many more thousands employed in transportation of ore and on the unloading docks.

C. Taxes, etc.—

1. Lake Superior iron-ore industry pays $30,000,000 in State and local taxes.

2. The industry pays in wages and other handling charges $150,000,000, exclusive of unloading charges on lower lake ports where ore is consumed or shipped to inland furnaces.

3. Lake Superior iron-ore mining industry alone supports 74 cities, villages, and towns having a combined population of 190,000 persons.

IV. Foreign reserves:

A. Sweden, 1,500,000,000 tons very high grade close to seaports, open all year and connected by rail to mines.

B. Russia, 1,000,000,000 on the shores of the Black Sea—several billion of lower grade ore on the Black Sea but of a type easily concentrated.

C. Chile, 1,000,000,000 tons of high-grade ore near seacoast.

D. Brazil, seven to thirteen billion tons within 300 miles of seacoast.

E. Cuba, three to five billion tons located on coast.

V. Foreign imports:

A. Import of ores from these and other countries have for some years come into the Eastern and Atlantic seaport markets largely to the exclusion of Lake Superior ore—some Swedish ore is already finding its way into the Great Lakes through the existing 14-foot St. Lawrence Canal.

B. Present imports. (See table I.)

VI. Lake Superior iron-ore supplies—high-grade ores:

A. 1925 to 1938, region produced 545,000,000 tons; known reserves in that region were reduced only 129 million tons. (See tables II and III.)

B. Discovery of additional reserves—

1. Constant exploitation and discovery of new reserves accounts for small reduction in reserves as compared with production indicated under A.

2. In spite of the constant discovery of additional reserves, prospecting for these is held back—kept under control, closely watched—so as not to discover too great a quantity of valuable iron deposits too far in advance of when they will be needed. If such a policy were not pursued, the result would be extremely high taxation for a long period of time which the iron-ore industry could not afford on top of its already high tax burden.

VII. The low-grade ores—35- to 45-percent ore concentrates:

A. Almost inexhaustible supply available in Lake Superior district.

VIII. Beneficiation of low-grade ores:

A. Ores are now being beneficiated—concentrated (see table IV).

B. Further concentration practical by—

1. Crushing and screening ore to remove impurities of rock and sand.

2. Log washing to remove fine sand.

3. Jigging to remove larger particles of rock than by washing.

4. Sintering to fuse finely divided ore which would otherwise go up the flues of blast furnaces.

5. Roasting to remove sulphur, carbon dioxide, water, and to prepare for—

6. Magnetic separation, which concentrates magnetic iron oxides.

7. Flotation processes and others, which are now in development stages.

IX. Significance of scrap iron:

A. 1925 to 1936, 160,000,000 tons of scrap iron went directly into steel production.

B. Amount of scrap iron was approximately equal to the iron content of all ore mined in the United States.

C. Over 91 percent of all United States steel production is made in open-hearth furnaces—this process uses about 45 percent scrap.

D. Use of scrap varies with the market for scrap; when the price is high, more new pig iron, consequently more ore, is used. When scrap is cheap, the contrary is true.

X. Conclusions:

A. There still remains a huge quantity of known high-grade ores in the Superior regions which undoubtedly is actually much greater than the amount known because of holding back prospecting.

B. The 35- to 45-percent ores are almost unlimited in supply.

C. Superior ores can be readily concentrated, and this process is rapidly proceeding now.

D. Sweetening of Superior ores with concentrates will be unnecessary for many years to come, based on known deposits.

E. Sweetening of the unlimited supply of low-grade Superior ores in the distant future may be economically accomplished through beneficiation.

F. Sweetening of Superior ores through mixture of high-grade foreign ores would cause a lethargy in improving efficiencies of beneficiation to the point where the United States steel industry might eventually become entirely dependent upon a foreign source of iron ore.

G. In the event of the dumping of huge quantities of high-grade foreign ore—not for beneficiation but for the basic supply of ore—as at Sparrows Point, Md.—it would ruin the Superior iron-mining industry.

H. Either F or G above, or a combination of them, would seriously jeopardize the security of our country in the event of a future world conflict.

I. To suggest preventing this through the imposition of tariffs would be to suggest the incongruous policy of spending hundreds of millions of dollars for the development of a waterway and then to legislate to prevent its use.

TABLE I.—*Iron ore importations from South America and Western Hemisphere countries*

[In gross tons]

Year	From Brazil	Chile	Cuba	Canada	Newfoundland
1925	600	1,113,900	546,130	7,520	----------
1926	3,708	1,364,400	539,000	16,964	119,544
1927	8,905	1,369,200	392,113	26,079	61,080
1928	31,805	1,434,800	369,286	13,309	37,048
1929	46,050	1,699,066	641,350	3,542	76,340
1930	24,507	1,689,071	190,654	395	48,771
1931	25	750,702	89,000	1,490	22,920
1932	----------	218,492	77,000	807	----------
1933	3,600	467,650	143,150	90	----------
1934	----------	938,376	154,500	11,126	----------
1935	----------	788,725	221,010	20,453	----------
1936	6,102	1,264,130	444,500	83,911	11,300
1937	11,000	1,438,886	441,500	5,046	45,080

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines, Minerals Yearbooks.

TABLE II.—*Iron ore production from Lake Superior region*

[In gross tons]

Year:	
1925	52,056,663
1926	57,143,407
1927	51,539,880
1928	52,517,175
1929	62,824,768
1930	49,382,652
1931	25,877,385
1932	8,139,427
1933	14,611,032
1934	21,030,756
1935	25,368,365
1936	41,780,889
1937	61,657,135
1938	21,308,410
Total	545,237,000
Average annual	38,945,000

Source: United States Bureau of Mines, Minerals Yearbooks.

TABLE III.—*Estimated reserves of Lake Superior region*

Year and total reserves: [1]	
1925	1,503,559,725
1926	1,485,932,621
1927	1,446,692,225
1928	1,431,886,157
1929	1,411,490,291
1930	1,403,577,333
1931	1,415,310,071
1932	1,441,301,683
1933	1,453,877,628
1934	1,420,090,388
1935	1,402,009,941
1936	1,415,532,531
1937	1,403,007,384
1938	1,374,380,735

[1] Covering developed and prospective ore in the ground and ore in stack piles.

Sources: Figures for Minnesota furnished by the Minnesota Tax Commission; figures for Michigan furnished by the Michigan Board of State Tax Commissioners and as published in Minerals Yearbook, 1925, U. S. Bureau of Mines.

TABLE IV.—*Percentage of beneficiated iron ore compared to the total ore shipped from United States mines*

[In gross tons]

Year	Beneficiated	Total shipped	Percent of beneficiated to total
1925	8,735,672	63,924,763	13.7
1926	8,371,829	69,292,832	12.1
1927	8,114,673	61,232,473	13.3
1928	8,621,331	63,432,826	13.6
1929	9,424,445	75,602,737	12.5
1930	8,973,888	55,201,221	16.3
1931	4,676,364	28,516,032	16.4
1932	407,486	5,331,201	7.6
1933	3,555,892	24,624,385	14.4
1934	4,145,590	25,792,606	16.1
1935	6,066,601	33,426,486	18.1
1936	9,658,699	51,465,648	18.8
1937	12,350,136	72,347,785	17.1

These figures do not include ore crushed and screened because this is nearly a universal practice with all ores preparatory to any concentration.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines Minerals Yearbooks.

Can We Follow the War Crowd?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. CARL T. CURTIS, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by me over the Columbia network on August 6, 1941:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, in the few moments I have in which to speak to you tonight, I want to ask you, "Can we follow the war crowd?" The bitter controversy today is whether or not the United States shall become a shooting participant in the wars now going on in Europe, Africa, and Asia.

In the first place, I do not approve of any dictatorship anywhere, any time, or under any circumstances. I am convinced the great majority of the American people as a whole are loyal to the United States of America.

Secondly, I believe the defense program in America should be carried forward as rapidly as possible, that nothing should be done to hamper or interfere with the fastest possible attainment of a completely adequate national preparedness. An eminent American has said, "We must build ourselves an air force, a navy, and an army so strong that no dictator will dare to tamper with our commerce, our interests, or our rights. That is the defense program we must have." With this statement I emphatically agree.

In the third place, those people, who are opposed to the United States becoming a shooting participant in these wars, do not contend that they can live in a world by themselves; they cannot be accused of hiding their heads in the sand like ostriches. We Americans have always accepted the Monroe Doctrine, both historically and currently.

That calls for our policing a considerable portion of the earth's surface.

The question before us is, Shall we become enmeshed in the European, Asiatic, and African wars? The American people had nothing to do with starting them. The great majority of American people have expressed their desire that we do not enter these conflicts. A small but very militant minority are attempting to drive the United States into those wars. This minority group who would plunge this country into war are making their influence felt; they have assistance in some high places in Government. I have before me an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune of Friday, June 27, 1941, entitled, "The Time Is Now." It says in part: "The Nazi-Soviet war is 5 days old. The priceless opportunity it has provided for action by the United States has lain unused for 5 days. We are 5 days nearer to the moment when that opportunity may vanish. The time is now. It is imperatively the hour to release our Navy—to win the Battle of the Atlantic."

A few days later when Mr. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, was addressing the Conference of Governors, he used almost the same language and urged that the United States Navy be used to clear the Atlantic. Someone has said that when the master pulls the strings the puppets jump. These men surely knew the United States Navy could not be used to clear the Atlantic and then call the job completed. It would mean only the beginning for us; we would become a full-fledged shooting participant in these foreign wars. We could not withdraw until these wars were over. None of us know how long they will last. None of us know where, to how many continents, and islands of the seas, the American boys would have to be sent to fight. Why don't these pro-war propagandists present the whole case to the American people and frankly tell us the full import of their plans.

The Communists in the United States have joined the war crowd because they want to preserve Communistic Russia. I have no sympathy for them. I hold no brief for those enemies of constitutional government who adhere to the "Union Now" doctrine, for they, too, would undermine and destroy the independence and sovereignty of the United States. As for the real Americans who may be advocates of war, I do not question their sincerity or their patriotism; I do, however, disagree with their judgment and conclusions. I do charge that the war group in America has not advised the American people of the full import of their suggestions and plans and of the far-reaching consequences of the action they propose. Whether they lack the courage to do this, or whether they do not know the ultimate results of their own acts, they, themselves, must answer.

Nothing is to be gained by the interventionists, or the war crowd, and the noninterventionists engaging in name calling. After all, we did have one thing in common, that is, we were all noninterventionists before the last election.

At a time like this when free governments are struggling for survival in the world, it is imperative that public officials remain true and steadfast to those promises and pledges they made to the people when those officials were seeking election. If campaign promises are to be dismissed as mere oratory, what merit—and what hope—is there in a system which provides for party platforms, and for elections whereby the people may choose their public servants. For public officials to violate the confidence of the American people is to strike at the heart of government of, by, and for the people. It must be borne in mind that the promises made to the American people that their boys would not be sent to fight in foreign wars was made at a time when, in the opinion of many, it was far darker than at the present hour. Those promises were made after the Lowland countries had been overrun, the Scandinavian countries taken over, France conquered, and when it was expected England might be invaded and fall any day. On September 15, 1940, the New York Times carried an article which said, in part: "It may be that the coming weeks will be the most critical in the history of the British Empire." Similar stories were running in all the American newspapers. On October 21, 1940, the New Republic carried a summary of news which said: "The press has predicted an immediate German invasion of England." That was the picture before the American people at the time these anti-war promises were repeated again, and again, and again.

Let us examine the record of this war crowd. Not so many months ago they were urging that the United States help brave little Finland in her struggle against the wanton and brutal aggressions of the bloody hand of Dictator Joe Stalin. Today this war crowd wants us to assist Godless communistic Russia. These wars make strange bedfellows from day to day. I believe I express the hope in the heart of every true American when I say that I hope that both the dictatorship of Hitler and the dictatorship of Stalin will wreck themselves completely and beyond repair in their battle with each other. God knows the world would be better off today without the menace of either.

On February 7, 1940, Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, now House majority floor leader, offered an amendment that would have removed our Ambassador from Russia. Less than 1 year later he introduced the lease-lend bill, by which military aid is now being given to Russia.

Speaking of the lease-lend bill, the writer, Frank Kent, who is a strong advocate of our present foreign policy, said on July 23, 1941, "Opponents of that measure were right in regarding it as a bill to take us into war; its proponents were wrong in saying that it would keep us out. That was a piece of false pretense, justified only by the necessity of getting it through."

Last year the war hawks were urging that we go to war with Japan. They argued that we should clear the Pacific of the Japanese menace so that the British Navy could take care of the Atlantic. This was followed by months of appeasement toward Japan, while we actually supplied war materials to that nation. Now the cry is, "Let's clear the Atlantic."

If we are going to follow the war crowd, which way we are going to follow them? Are we going east or are we going west? Will any military expert argue that there is wisdom in fighting all over the globe at the same time; in having our forces spread throughout the world? I ask you, fellow Americans, in all seriousness, can we follow the war crowd?

When the present European conflict started, it was pictured by the war crowd as being a struggle for idealism. They shouted from the housetops that we must save democracy. They talked of preserving our way of life; the British way of life, the Chinese way of life, and other cultures. Today they are engaged in an enterprise to save the Communist way of life, India's way of life, and Cuba's way of life. With open arms they have embraced the cause of Soviet Russia. Fellow Americans, there is a grave and dangerous communistic menace in this country and throughout the world. We can rely upon the findings of the congressional committee investigating un-American activities. There is an attempt upon the part of the Communists to undermine and destroy the Government of the United States.

If these things are true—and they are true—then we cannot ignore these facts in becoming a military ally of despotic Russia. The conduct of Soviet Russia in first acting as an ally of Hitler in their land grab against Finland, Poland, and other small countries, and the reversal of that conduct and their acceptance by the British Empire and the war group in this country as allies, proves but one thing—these foreign wars are not wars fought for any ideal. They are wars being fought to obtain fertile land, world trade, sea ports, rich oil fields, and other things for which the countries of Europe, Africa, and Asia have fought throughout the generations. Can we follow the war crowd in making the United States a party to those wars for conquest? It was the seasoned military expert, Gen. George Washington, who said, "Why quit your own to stand on foreign soil?"

The strongest force in this country today is American public opinion. If it had not been for the strong public opinion against our entrance into wars going on in Asia, Africa, and Europe, our boys would be there now. I urge you not to let that public opinion be silenced by the war drums of a minority. Use your letters, your postal cards, and your telegrams, today, tomorrow, and in the days to come to let your servants in Washington know whether or not you want them to follow the war crowd.

And, finally, remember that it will not be the war propagandists who will do the fighting and the bleeding and the dying. It will be your sons, your brothers, your husbands, who will have to lie mangled or dead in the stench of new no-man's lands, in dark Africa, and in far-off Russia, and mayhap in the innerlands of China.

Remember that all of the horrors, all of the penalties, all of the suffering, all of the agonies of war, if we get into it, will be yours.

Whatever of glamour, whatever of glory, whatever of the shining place in history comes of war, may come to the generals, but the privates get none of that.

I say to you in conclusion, my fellow Americans, no! We can't follow the war crowd.

A Strange Oversight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following article by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the Washington Post of Thursday, August 7, 1941:

[From the Washington Post of August 7, 1941]

A STRANGE OVERSIGHT

(By Walter Lippmann)

The latest statement from Mr. Hoover, Mr. Landon, and a number of other eminent men is so astounding that it can be explained only by saying that the man who wrote it and those who signed it have not taken the trouble to discuss the situation with responsible and informed persons. The whole statement is based on the notion that the question whether the United States goes to war or remains at peace depends upon how much we participate in the European conflict between the Axis on the one side and, on the other side, the British in the Atlantic and the Middle East and the Russians in European Russia.

But as a matter of fact the immediate and critical question of peace or war for the United States arises on the other side of the world, that is to say in our relations with Japan in the Pacific Ocean.

There in the Far East during the past week we have been on the very verge of war, not of the imaginary war of the isolationists in which American soldiers are supposed to be landed in Europe to fight their way to Berlin, but of a very real war in the Pacific which might begin any day. Yet in regard to this extremely urgent and dangerous threat of war, Mr. Hoover and his friends have not a word to say. Indeed they seem to be unaware of it. Thus they talk about the Axis end, which means Germany and Italy, and never even refer to the power—namely Japan—against which the main body of all our forces is mobilized.

They complain about the occupation of Iceland and the Atlantic naval patrol and other belligerent moves against Germany and Italy, but they are silent about the momentous action in freezing the Japanese assets and in establishing the machinery of an embargo against Japan. If only they had taken the precaution to examine the real situation and to inform themselves before issuing their statement, they would never find themselves in the position of seeking to prevent war in the abstract, yet ignoring the most immediate and the most likely actual war in which the United States may become directly and deeply engaged.

In fact, it is evident from their statement that they do not realize that since the Japanese occupation of Indochina, the situation in the Pacific has become so delicate and so explosive that only the most powerful diplomatic action, and some good luck besides, can prevent war. What Mr. Hoover thinks about this desperately real problem in the Pacific, he has never ventured to tell the American people.

Yet as a matter of history the present phase of the conflict between Japanese imperialist expansion and the United States began when Mr. Hoover was President, and the original and fundamental decision to oppose Japan was made by him. He was the President who decided not to recognize the first Japanese aggression in Manchuria in 1931. And he was the President who sent American representatives to Geneva to rouse the world against Japan. And he was the President who sent his Secretary of State to Mr. Roosevelt, when he was President-elect, to see to it that the Hoover-Stimson policy of opposing Japanese aggression would be maintained by his successor.

Yet today when his successor is face to face with the final consequences of that policy, and in the very week that the issue has been rising to the extreme crisis, Mr. Hoover is out with a statement which has been written by somebody who does not know that there is a crisis in the Far East.

For if you take the generalities in the statement and try to apply them to the actualities in the Far East, they do not make sense. One would have to say that Mr. Hoover now advocates the following: That we should not have frozen Japanese assets or cut off fuel and metals, for these are certainly "belligerent moves" which the statement deplores, that apart from delivering supplies to the Chinese Government in San Francisco we should do nothing for China, that we should not oppose Japan if she seizes the Netherlands Indies or Singapore, that we should stand by and let Japan obtain control of the resources of the East Indies, that we should let the British be driven out of the Pacific, that we should let Australia fall under Japanese domination, that we should let the Philippines be encircled and rendered helpless, that we should be uninterested in whether Japan conquers Siberia or becomes allied with a Russian puppet government and thus establishes herself as our nearest neighbor in Alaska.

Thus Mr. Hoover, who initiated the present policy of opposing Japanese expansion, would now, if his statement is to be taken as applying to the Far East, let the Japanese expand, let them conquer the Chinese, the British, the Dutch, and the Russians in Siberia. Thus if we ever do have to fight Japan to make good the policy Mr. Hoover inaugurated, we shall have the satisfaction of doing it all alone, uncontaminated by association with any imperfect or distasteful allies.

It is more generous to suppose that Mr. Hoover does not think these things, that in fact he accidentally overlooked the far eastern situation and forgot to think about it at all. The disservice of a statement like Mr. Hoover's is that it will be read in Japan, and the Japanese will quite naturally suppose no former President of the United States could fail to be thinking seriously and responsibly about the not inconsiderable crisis in the Orient. If they then conclude that Mr. Hoover has announced his intention of obstructing the President of the United States, the Japanese may make the enormous error of thinking it safe to take those final steps which inevitably and inexorably precipitate war.

For the chances of preserving the peace in the Pacific depend altogether upon convincing Japan before the irrevocable steps are taken that she faces a combination which is too formidable for her to challenge. The combination of China Britain, the Netherlands Indies, Russia, and the United States is a very formidable combination indeed, and if we are able to keep the peace, it will be because we have had the intelligence and the resolution to organize that combination—to aline against Japan's final bid for supremacy in the Far East everybody who has a reason for opposing Japan. And when that has been understood, when it is seen that the Russian Army and Navy and air force in Eastern Siberia are worth at the moment a whole fleet of our unbuilt warships, it becomes rather obvious why the United States Government has decided to aid Russia via Siberia.

The Experts in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

ARTICLE OF PROF. WILLIAM F. ROEMER, OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, an overwhelming majority of the American people oppose our entrance into this foreign war. Yet step by step we are being moved closer and closer to its brink.

The leaders of our country have a mandate to stay out of this foreign war. That mandate springs from the platforms and the promises coming from the representatives of both political parties in the elections of last November.

Under our American system of government the war-making powers were given to the representatives of the people. For perhaps the first time in human history they were taken away from the executive.

To be "waltzed" into this foreign war without the formality of action thereon by the people's representatives would constitute a reversion to autocracy. Are we to abandon that awful power that people struggled for for centuries?

It is not only the right, it is the duty of American citizens to petition their Government, to express themselves on questions that so deeply concern them and their children. Such, in fact, is one of the foundation stones upon which our Republic rests. I include herewith a most interesting and thought-provoking article from the Ave Maria entitled "The Experts in Democracy," by Prof. William F. Roemer, of the University of Notre Dame:

[From the Ave Maria of July 26, 1941]

THE EXPERTS IN DEMOCRACY

(By William F. Roemer)

As soon as you manage to publicize yourself as an expert in some line, it becomes your privilege to sit on Mount Olympus in your community with the other man-made gods, thence to prophesy. Your neighbors, who have never built a mousetrap or reported in print their impressions of a blitzkrieg, or received an assignment as a radio commentator to interpret news, are still among the hoi polloi, the multitude of the inexpert.

One advantage of the advertised expert is that people believe him to be above prejudice. They think often that it is the inexpert alone whose opinion is compounded of emotional myth mingled with unsound principles and a few facts. Perhaps that is why such a high premium is placed on glib newspapermen who have picked up along their way some tricks of propaganda. Again, it is a wonder that we continue in our adulation of political experts when we see them disagreeing violently with each other over such questions as the likely victors in foreign wars.

This worship of the expert, whom the modern scientific religionists have taught us to admire when he forgets his dinner, his siesta, and his financial ambitions, deserves a little study. For if we follow the wrong experts our direction may lead us to tragic ends. Were we as careful in awarding the degree of "expertus" in political affairs as we are in educational matters, in science, and engineering, it would not easily happen that medicine men selling hot air could lure us into "holy" wars and imperialistic expeditions.

Why are so many Americans, gifted as they are with the best educational opportunities in the world, so careless in their criticism and acceptance of the so-called expert and the amateur prophet? It seems in part due to the habit of mental laziness induced by incomplete high-school training. At least, we usually attribute to immature high-school minds that fertility which is flattered to discover opinions voiced by favorite news columnists and radio interpreters to be "expert" as soon as they agree with our hasty conclusions. Self-complacency results from the consciousness that we speedily master subjects which the highly gifted research workers acquire after laborious investigation. We adopt a few politicians as our guides and monitors in political science.

The true expert is a specialist, who knows his field thoroughly, who has an unusual facility in finishing off his handiwork. Etymologically, the word "expertus" is the perfect participle of "experior," a Latin word for the phrase "tried and trusty." It is obvious that an expert in one field should not be expected to become overnight an expert in a widely different skill.

The first test of an expert ought to include an examination into his general knowledge of the limited field in which he professes to have achieved experience and proficiency. This test many technicians can meet satisfactorily when their specialty has very narrow bounds. A skilled recorder of current facts need not have even a college education in order to establish himself as an experienced man of records.

An important test of an expert in higher fields of knowledge should include the ability to integrate harmoniously one's specialty with deeper and more fundamental principles of knowledge. In this integration of truth, one meets a hierarchy of expertness in human knowledge, whether it be speculative or practical. For example, an expert architect is expected to know the principles of engineering which underlie the rules of house or building construction. There are similar or analogous principles which serve as presuppositions in moral and political science. A moralist cannot pluck his assumptions out of thin air, beginning, for instance, with gratuitous ideas of racial superiority, one way or another. A moralist and a political philosopher must have the primary principles of humanitarian philosophy to stand on. Indeed, if he is unacquainted with theological theories he runs the risk of neglecting or contradicting pertinent truths known to the other experts. It is hardly necessary to add that one is not a reliable "expert" so long as he is unable to distinguish his own experimental knowledge from his private, wishful thought in matters contingent upon factors of which one is entirely ignorant.

All that has been said above is a prelude to what in common sense should be said about the equipment of expert leaders in the battle for the return of democracy. How can our Winchells possibly inspire us with the spirit of democracy if they do not know the meaning of democracy, advocating measures that are borrowed from totalitarian ideology? If they think that democracy is only a name for "our side" in hemisphere wars, and not a real type distinguishable from other forms of government, such as a kingdom or an aristocracy, they are blind guides in crusading to save liberty in the modern world.

Seldom do any of our leaders make an attempt to define democracy in more than the incomplete term of "majority rule" at elections. The catch comes in this counterfeit democracy after election time when the Government may deem it expedient to disregard the platform on which it rode to power and authority. Without any sort of referendum to the people on critical issues, where is the leverage in the hands of the people to restrain well meaning officials from riding roughshod over the implicit and explicit mandates of the citizenry? Are the electorate so forgetful of pledges and solemn promises made by candidates that they do not resent the repudiation of such promises as "campaign oratory"?

Democracy in its true meaning is a form of government in which the rule of the majority is limited constitutionally by the guaranteed rights of the minority. American democracy is a unique type. Let all our leaders remember this. We have a written Constitution which from the beginning (1789) has provided for the separation of executive, legislative, and judicial functions. The actual separation of powers has been the particular contribution which the United States has made to the world. We Americans did not think of such a division before our European friends did; but America first practiced it and found that this system of balance is successful in maintaining democracy.

The success of our way of life is not due solely to our use of the law borrowed from England and adapted to our needs. The credit for our system and that system's practicability is due in large part under Providence to the wisdom and understanding of the founding fathers who selected the best political methods that had proved soundest in the experience of Europe. We are not serfs of European kings because their forebears are ours too.

Within the framework of democracy it is possible to adapte our life to world conditions by paying our way if necessary in longer hours and more modest luxuries. We will not surrender to totalitarian states abroad. We will resist totalitarianism here. We will help our Government to the best of our intelligence by criticizing its impetuous and radical policies only when common sense and well-informed public opinion is able to detect clearly its dangerous trends away from the legal substance of our constitutional life. While we build an impregnable line of defense in the Western Hemisphere, we can be trusted to unite as always in common sacrifies for the attainment of those democratic conditions needed for temporal and spiritual happiness.

If Americans have a common faith, it is still in democracy here. We do not mind being deceived in minor matters by slogans and advertisements that try our intelligence, but we expect our leaders to be honest and expert in devising means calculated to serve our rightful ends. It is said of the Frenchman that "He keeps his faith in France, be her Government that of king or deputies, be she free or for a time a satellite of her neighbor to the right or the left, east or west." It is also said, and rightly, of the American, that his faith is in the destiny of democratic America. Lincoln was most probably correct in his diagnosis of the North American temper: You cannot fool us all the time. The sons of free pioneers have breathed the air of political freedom long enough to find it good and they will stake their lives on the probability of the defeat of Fascists soon or late. In our Civil War, both North and South fought for liberty as they saw its star and heard its call. Reunited, our Nation has learned many lessons, but it will not willingly submit long to tyranny. Most Yankees will bet you on that—10 to 1. We may have high-school mentality, but we like our bread buttered with liberty.

A free people is one governed by law and not by men. This means that the Constitution is the law for Government officials as for the public. Not without reason has the constitutional law of our land required that officials take a solemn oath before God and their fellow men to obey the Constitution. Among the laws which they are sworn to uphold are those that clearly forbid legislators to enact statutes which interfere with the rights that are reserved to the people. A democracy without guaranteed rights for each physical person within the nation would be a mockery. Duties, of course, go along with rights. It is not out of place for government to exact from the citizens in taxes and in many other ways their meed of duties.

When our leaders in Congress or legislature are concerned in both democracy and the general welfare, they will not neglect to offer the electorate opportunities to vote on amendments to the Constitution whenever clear-cut issues demand change in the fundamental policies of the Nation. This could be done with speed, even in a day, as it is done on general election day. Our whole theory of government is built on the premise that the majority can be trusted to refrain from mutilation of that Constitution which we all revere as a sacred palladium of human rights. We may be ignorant of certain best means to an end; but that the end of human rulership is not the ruler's good alone, we know.

The story is told of a Negro preacher in Virginia, who was urging his flock to "give and give until it hurts for the spread of the Good Word." When the collection box was passed to one old darky, he whispered audibly, "the good tidings of the gospel shall be free to all men." The parson overhead and responded, "Brother, you are right. The gospel is free, but it costs money to pipe it in."

Ideals in government, like the truths of religion, have been "piped" from European ports at considerable cost, it seems at times. To our posterity, our children and their children, we owe it to keep ever alive the principles that we have found true and important. Those guides who put on the wolf's clothing of war and make a noise like experts must not beguile us to surrender the free institutions that make our life full of dignity and pregnant with future good. Certainly the democratic way of life, the constitutional way is what we want for America; why not face the difficulties and call things by their proper names? Do people here want war?

The courses of action given by publicists to keep the freedoms alive throughout the world and especially here where we have a greater chance to achieve them, are the way of war and alternatively the way of defensive peace. If we go forth beyond our depth and succeed in bearding the leopard in his lair, there is some danger, as all will admit, that we may come home with an empty gun to find the animal in our household. The price to be paid for crusades abroad will involve economic centralization, control of oil and of other resources, of markets, businesses, property, and manpower. In war, all is subordinated to the Leviathan in the interests of maximum efficency. The cruel irony of "war to save democracy" is that democracy itself becomes something else for a long time. There comes a time, too, when Mr Hyde can no longer make the transition back to Dr. Jekyll.

On the other hand, if we follow the political dictum of Aristotle, "The government should rely on itself, and not on foreign aid" (Pol., book .v) to preserve its independence, our isolation from the battle front may, it is feared, render us too isolated for comfort, and trade after peace comes to the stricken powers abroad. Then, it is said with considerable probability, that we still face the need of extreme measures of centralization and preparation for defensive war for years to come.

Faced by this dilemma, we might cast about for an escape between its horns. Our "experts" are telling the people that there is no escape, no third choice. It is not too late to reexamine the possibility of evading both disastrous courses. At present, with all respect to our Government which is harassed by this problem and which assuredly is better informed on all the circumstances in which our world crisis is enmired, we in the Middle West have not lost hope. We are honestly and honorably suggesting that America refuse the challenge to open warfare with totalitarian powers across the sea. We believe in building an impregnable defense of our own, in planes, ships, tanks, and guns. At the same time, we would guard against the internal forces of corruption. Knowing the nature of political cancers which have prostrated France and her sister nations in Europe, we can concentrate on surgical reforms and safeguards that will make possible a fuller use of our spiritual and material strength. Of primary value is our free press. Without freedom to offer constructive criticism to the Government we as a people are lost to the totalitarian principle. Without the civil right to review the problems and their solutions for our Nation in this day of danger, democracy would have no champion but the political "expert," and that is national socialism—un-American foe of free men.

We know there is a natural law for men, and a law for nations inscribed in the intelligence of men. To dominate the world is not moral, if in doing so one nation refuses freedom to the rest in the family of nations. There is every justification for a strong nation to resist aggression of such a kind. No one in the Middle West would hesitate to work to the limit to defend from such aggression our coasts and our land. We do feel sure, however, that our Nation is not bound morally, to police the world.

There is then a way out of our dilemma. By self-restraint we can coolly invent and engineer bigger and better instruments of defense, in the air, on land and in the waters of our hemisphere. The part which the humble citizen must play is not an easy one. Each man, woman, and child is called to bend his efforts, spiritual and physical, to the task of supporting for the benefit of society the legal machinery of defense. This includes working mentally and politically. It means contacting our statesmen, our Representatives in Congress and legislature, leaving no doubt in their minds that we the people are alert to the dangers that surround us.

There is no disloyalty in petitioning the Government, in writing to our President, clearly stating our best judgment in affairs that concern every human being in the United States. There is no disloyalty in calling attention to what the common conscience of men knows without special illumination that there is a moral distinction between power and authority. That individuals and governments may not become autocratic, it is the right of citizens to assemble in committees and to advocate that measures "short of war" in aiding friendly peoples be restricted to tactics that stop short of war.

Our expert leaders in America have a mandate from the people to stay out of wars beyond our Western Hemisphere. That was implicit in the expression of support for candidates on election day. The American people have a studied will to pursue the democratic way and to seek the legitimate needs of a strong, independent America.

To Outlaw Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

LETTER AND RESOLUTION FROM THE CALIFORNIA ELKS ASSOCIATION

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

CALIFORNIA ELKS ASSOCIATION,
Richmond, Calif., July 28, 1941.

Representative LELAND M. FORD,
Representative of California,
District No. 16,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed resolution, passed by the California Elks Association at its 1940 reunion in Santa Cruz, is forwarded to you for your information and pleasure.

Yours truly,

E. W. DALE, *Secretary.*

Whereas the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks has been active in its opposition to communism and the infiltration of communism into our communities, State, and Nation; and

Whereas we believe that the Communist Party in California and in other States of this Nation does not represent a party but a form of government, whose avowed purpose is the overthrow of our Government by force and violence, and whose party objectives are contrary to and opposed to fundamental principles and laws of the Republic: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the California Elks Association in convention assembled at Santa Cruz, Calif., do hereby petition the Congress of the United States of America and the Legislature of the State of California to enact such law or laws as may be necessary to outlaw the Communist Party as a political party in this State and Nation and to prohibit it from appearing upon any ballot in this State or in the United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded forthwith to the senators and members of the Assembly of the State of California and to the United States Senators and Representatives from California, and be forwarded to the Grand Lodge of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks for its consideration at the next session of the grand lodge.

Canada's View of the St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MONTREAL (CANADA) GAZETTE

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, I recently visited Canada on an inspection trip of the site for the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project, International Rapids section. When in Montreal I was handed copies of the Montreal Gazette, dated July 18, in which the attached article appeared.

I believe that this editorial clearly states the attitude of the Canadian people in respect to the construction of the St. Lawrence project at this time. My personal contacts and investigations of the question in Canada have convinced me of the fact that the Canadian people do not feel that they should go into such an expenditure of men, money, and materials at this time, when they are so sorely pressed for all of these in their own defense program. Therefore, I take this opportunity of calling the attention of all members of the House to this editorial:

[From the Montreal (Canada) Gazette of July 18, 1941]

OUR SEAWAY VISITORS

Members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the United States House of Representatives arrive from Washington today for a visit to Canada, more particularly to the site of the propose St. Lawrence Seaway development. It is expected that most of the 15 Democrats and 10 Republicans who comprise the committee will be in the party, which will also include engineers, diplomats, and newspapermen. They will all be entertained by the Canadian Government and will have, we may hope, an enjoyable visit. They are welcome to this country—and to Montreal where they will be on Monday—under any circumstances. How much better off they will be from looking at a lot of running water is not so certain. That they will be given any adequate idea of Canadian hostility toward the seaway enterprise, and the reasons for that hostility, is altogether improbable. It is in the last degree unlikely that, shepherded as they will be, they will be brought into contact with those leading Canadian engineers, transportation experts, economists, and businessmen who are convinced that the seaway cannot be made to serve it intended purpose, who regard the navigation facilities and power development as unnecessary and, therefore, unnecessarily costly, and who see in the project a very serious diversion of men and materials from this country's war effort and from the United States defense program.

They will not be told that this country has ample power resources now, actual and potential, or that existing navigation facilities have proven themselves more than equal to all the demands that have been made upon them. Nevertheless, they come here armed with some ideas that have been voiced by their own fellow citizens in recent hearings at the Capitol. They were told nearly a month ago by Brig. Gen. Thomas B. Robins, assistant to the Chief of the Corps of Engineers and senior member of the Rivers and Harbors Army Board, that 10,000 men would be employed on the development, 8,000 of them skilled or semiskilled workers, assuming that all phases were proceeded with. The New York Times reminded them that Canada would have to divert a like number of men; that lake harbors must be deepened for both merchant steamers and the warships that President Roosevelt proposes to build in the interior, and that if this deepening costs another $120,000,000 it will mean the diversion of another 5,000 men from industry, bringing the total to 25,000.

Then, said the Times, behind each worker along the St. Lawrence three more must stand in the mills; ore must be mined, coal and limestone provided, cement produced, steel shapes rolled, and the number of workers involved mounts to at least 75,000 and probably to 100,000. This is the outlook at a moment when Sidney Hillman, Associate Director of the Office of Production Management in Washington, has been charged with the responsibility of supplying 1,400,000 more skilled workmen for armament industries within the next 12 months. General Robins estimates that 4 years will be required to complete the St. Lawrence development and the United States newspapers are emphasizing the fact that during those 4 years both the United States and Canada will need all the men they can mobilize for the manufacture of every sort of war material if Britain is to be aided on the scale that these countries have promised. Doubtless the committee members will have these things in mind when they are looking at the river. They will not be informed that whatever the cost, Canada cannot afford it, because the official cicerones will not tell them.

Presumably, the committee still has a more or less open mind. It has heard a great deal of evidence in support of the President's project, but it has also heard the reasons upon which a widespread and uncompromising opposition, in the United States itself, is based. These reasons have been voiced by representative industrialists, leaders in commerce, and technical officers, the substance of the objection being that the projected undertaking is unsound, unnecessary, and will be an impediment to the defense program. It is unlikely that the committee will find itself in a better position to judge between the arguments of promoters of the waterway and those of the opponents merely by looking at the flowing water, but the splendid spectacle which the St. Lawrence affords should give

them a more accurate idea of the magnitude, and the ultimate cost, of the project than they have been able to obtain in Washington. This should be some help in determining whether the work ought to be undertaken in time of war or deferred until a period when it will not interfere with the winning of the war.

This Nonsense About Farm Greed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED C. GILCHRIST

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DES MOINES REGISTER

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Des Moines Register of August 6, 1941:

[From the Des Moines Register of August 6, 1941]

THIS NONSENSE ABOUT FARM GREED

Every now and then we get red in the neck because of some casual remark by some nonfarmer about the supposedly pecuniary and the supposedly traditional greed of American farmers in the matter of extracting special benefits from Uncle Sam.

It isn't so much what they say that annoys us. It is rather the ridiculously biased state of mind that is demonstrated by the ease with which these critical phrases slip out.

And it is amazing how many quarters they continue to come from.

It is not particularly suprising, despite 20 years of pretty harsh education, including the great depression, when some unadulterated eastern industrialist shows that even yet he has learned nothing along this line.

It is certainly not surprising when some of the small-fry spokesmen for the old, narrow, completely industrial point of view demonstrates that he hasn't yet even caught up with the new enlightenment of a good many of his chiefs.

But it irks us rather particularly when we find some of our "intellectuals," who are not really associated in any self-interested way with the economic groups that in the past have been chronically supercilious and unfair toward agriculture, exhibiting the same bias.

When men who are fundamentally students, who know a lot about history, who have every reason to be familiar with the record of Government's relation to economic groups in this country, prove to have the same gigantic mental blind spot about agriculture, we have no explanation except the simple one that for several generations our whole national thinking was dominated by a chronic city-mindedness that really looked on the farm and farmers as at best a necessary evil.

It was a very casual and even apparently innocent crack by one of these intellectual gentlemen in (of all places) the book-review section of the Sunday New York Times that got us boiling again.

It was just a simple remark about "greedy pressure groups" that, particularly in this time of crisis, threatened to upset Uncle Sam's apple cart by refusing to subordinate their selfish group interests to the national interest and, specifically, by grabbing for more and more special benefits at the expense of Uncle Sam's Treasury and of the American consuming public.

In this gentleman's casual listing of such groups, agriculture came first.

The blunt truth is, as every scholar who will divest himself of prejudiced impressions knows, that the record of governmental economic benefits extracted by special groups through the long years has been a record of overwhelmingly greater success for the nonfarm groups than for the farm.

As a matter of fact, it was the regular, constant success of these other groups, involving steady discrimination against agriculture, that brought about eventually so glaring and disastrous an imbalance within the country as to be largely responsible for the severity of our break-down in 1929. It was that which was responsible for bringing forth, belatedly, the farm drive of the last 20 years for the restoration of economic balance—for the idea called parity.

And, because as a nation we had got so confounded used to having the flow of Government favors all run the other way, the common reaction, when American farmers for the first time since the Civil War began to get some compensation, was to say the least unusual.

It was so novel for the farm to get any kind of break at all that it was looked upon—in all sincerity, even though that was naive—as positively immoral.

When the farm "runt," which had been crowded out of the trough of Government benefits for generations, finally got a chance and rushed in for a relatively modest swig, the big swiggers were horrified.

And the spirit of that absurdly unfair indignation still exhibits itself, even in current discussions.

Now, against that background, we want to call attention to a statement made a few days ago by the head of perhaps the largest and most influential of the Nation-wide organizations of farmers—by Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

What was it that this alleged apostle of unmitigated group greed said to an assembly of farm leaders July 29 at Florence, Ala.?

Well, what do you suppose he said?

This is what he did say:

"I know of no more certain method of bringing about wild inflation than for farmers to drive prices now as high as traffic will bear.

"I counsel farmers to stick to the reasonable demands we have made for 20 years. We have won parity, therefore let us be thankful.

"Let us not make the mistake of getting greedy and insisting on getting more than parity just because we could possibly get higher prices during the emergency period.

"Our own agricultural issues are overshadowed by the issues that face us as a Nation, and to meet those issues we must pledge 'our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.'"

Actually, as Mr. O'Neal implied, the aim of the organized farm drive during the last 20 years has been a deliberately limited one.

It has always had in mind the necessity of workable economic balance among our great groups. It has always had in mind "consumer" considerations.

And now what this particular national-farm-organization leader is saying to his own people is merely that they must remember and abide by their own self-imposed limitations and not be tempted to exceed them merely because there appears to be a temporary "good chance."

Farm leadership and farm organizations have not invariably been all-wise. They probably won't be in the future.

But we certainly think that until the top spokesmen of all other great economic groups declare themselves as categorically for restraint in their own policies, there is no more excuse now than there has been in the past for keeping up the old sport of throwing stones at agriculture.

The glass habitations of the habitual stone throwers dot every hill on the landscape.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE PASSAIC (N. J.) HERALD-NEWS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, that Canadians are not taking too kindly to the American efforts to force through the St. Lawrence seaway project at a time when all her resources are needed for the essential war effort is indicated by a recent editorial in the well-known Montreal Gazette.

Why Americans, determined to promote national defense and at the same time curb nondefense spending and the trend toward inflation, should pay attention, is strikingly emphasized in the following editorial in the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News:

[From the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News]

CANADA DOESN'T NEED SEAWAY

There have been evidences before that the much-touted St. Lawrence seaway and power development project was not regarded with any real favor in Canada, especially in Ontario and Quebec Provinces, where we might expect there would be the loudest shouting in its favor.

Proof of this is supplied by the admirable Montreal Gazette, one of the finest newspapers published in the Dominion, in an editorial in which it discusses the subject seriously and cogently.

Occasion for the editorial was John L. Lewis' testimony before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of our House of Representatives in opposition to the project. The Gazette, while it regretted the feeling expressed by Mr. Lewis that the project called for our making a "gift" to our neighbor to the north, when that neighbor does not appear to be as all-out in its efforts for the war as we are, said frankly that he had a good case against the project.

The Gazette insists that the Ottawa government take proper steps to secure authentic publicity in the United States of the full measure of Canada's formidable war effort. As for the "gift" notion, the Gazette says:

"There is nothing of the color of a 'gift' to Canada in an enterprise toward the cost of which the taxpayers of the Dominion will be liable to pay $277,090,000 of an expenditure which, according to the most authoritative statement submitted to the congressional committee will amount to $579,272,000."

The vital objection to the St. Lawrence project the Montreal newspaper insists—and its insistence must hurt the cause certainly, since its argument is so convincing—is that it cannot possibly be accepted as a war project, which is the only ground upon which it could be held justified. Says the Gazette:

"Mr. Lewis would have been on stronger ground in opposing the St. Lawrence project

had he combated the pretext that the undertaking must be considered as a war project. More hydroelectric power for essential war industries is needed, but it could not be procured through the St. Lawrence scheme until some time in 1945. In 5 years the war will have been won or lost. Were this enterprise necessary to the carrying on of the war, Canada could legitimately be urged to complete it at all costs, but as this is far from the case Canada will not be able to afford to spend upon it the vast sums involved for many years to come."

The Montreal newspaper quotes Premier King of Quebec in the House of Commons at Ottawa as holding that this great project can be "justified only on the basis of war necessity" and the evidence of the Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission that it cannot be so classed. Further Canada's power resources are adequate for all war needs, and, if any lack were found, an additional 4,120,000 horsepower could be developed quickly.

"There will be general agreement" in Canada, the Gazette declares, "that the only thing that Canada can possibly do in the actual circumstance is to tell the United States Government frankly and honestly that she cannot go forward with so costly an enterprise when all her resources are needed for the essential war effort."

The person for Canada to tell is President Roosevelt. Prime Minister Mackenzie King is the man to tell him. If Canada cannot go ahead with the project, neither can we, and for precisely the same reason.

Pitiless Publicity—"The Truth and Nothing But"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, at Montpelier, Vt., on May 24, 1940, I said:

Our domestic and internal problems are our greatest concern. As we solve or fail to solve them, so shall we stand or fall. Our all-compelling obligation and first duty is to make America invulnerable against foes from without and enemies from within our gates. Our duties abroad will to a considerable extent solve themselves as, if, and when this program is speeded to completion.

Secondary things will take second place if we make first things first.

The very perpetuity and security of our democratic institutions depend upon a logical, sensible, definite solution of America's difficult domestic problems. * * *

Unless and until we can solve our domestic problems, you know as well, as I do, that there is no future for democracy, domestic or international, as we know it.

We have plenty of troubles at home. The "red herring" of internationalism dragged across the trail should not distract our attention from nor let us lose the scent of tremendous difficulties to be overcome along the road we will have to follow at home in order to stay there.

Then on January 22, 1941, I told the Vermont Legislature:

Whether we realize it or not, we are today in the midst of a world revolution the ultimate outcome of which is unpredictable, but bound to be more far reaching than any that history as yet records. In spite of ourselves and what we would wish might be, we are close to the climax and are being forced, in our own interest, to militarize this Nation adequately to protect ourselves against the possibility of the last place where democracy, as we know it, exists becoming a slave nation to the Axis Powers. We are threatened by dangers from within and from without. There never has been a more serious hour in the history of this country or, in fact, in the history of the world. We must assume our full responsibility, meet the challenge, surmount the dangers, save ourselves and civilization.

The fact is that this is the new day of testing and trial. As Vermonters, we are again put to the test. To those of us who believe that there can be no real progress without liberty, who know that the story the ages teach is that life is really not worth living if one must live it as a slave, without liberty; for those of us, I say, there is and can be no choice. Our duty, obligation, and responsibility to our own and to succeeding generations is clear and plain. Democracy in America has ahead of it a pitched battle with forces alien to it.

* * * * *

Our Constitution provides that the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and I know you must agree with me that his hands must not be tied; but on the other hand their activities should be restrained and circumscribed by laws equally as emphatically laid down, fundamentally, as the authority given him to act as Commander in Chief, inasmuch as these United States of America are assumed to be a government of laws and not of men.

Now, despite the foregoing, and although in the main I have supported the foreign policy of the President because he is Commander in Chief, I feel more strongly than ever that his domestic policies are poisonously unsound, and I believe he has made a dreadful mess of managing the country's internal affairs.

Perhaps I would not be as aggressively bitter as Frank R. Kent is, but I am compelled to admit that he is telling the unvarnished truth when he says that those of us who are following the international policies of the President are doing so because his in this emergency is the only available leadership under the Constitution.

With respect to us and our following the leadership of the President, Kent had this to say in the Evening Star of August 5:

They (meaning we) are not happy about it—

And he tells why, when he says of us—

Because of the national crisis, they would like now to forget the assaults upon common sense which have characterized this administration. They would like to put out of mind its appeals to the lowest of human appetites. They would like not to think of its success in stirring up class hatred and fomenting discontent. They would like to cleanse their systems of the resentment bred of 8 years of cheap demagogery and get behind the President in his effort to help the British beat Hitler and to equip this Nation to defend itself.

HEADLESS SET-UP

But Mr. Roosevelt is making that kind of support impossible. He is making it impossible by an exhibition of complacent incompetency unsurpassed in the history of American Government. It is so glaring that one of the administration's most consistent journalistic friends recently felt impelled to protest against what he called "the shameful climax of what has gone on ever since the defense effort began." The immediate cause of this outburst was the clash between the O. P. M. and O. P. A. C. S. over automobile reductions, which has left this great industry in a high state of helplessness and shown again the incredible silliness of a defense set-up without a head.

This is only one example. From the start the organization has been tainted by politics, filled with factions, feuds, bitterness, and bad feeling, all of which are the inevitable consequences of its headlessness and all of which have been attested not only by critics of the President but by his friends. Not long ago that highly respected Democrat of the House, Representative SUMNERS of Texas, declared that it was ridiculous to be excited over the threat to our system from the outside when it is being so tragically torn to pieces inside. And from a Democratic House committee there recently came a blistering indictment of the waste, ineptitude, and confusion of the whole defense machinery

SILENCE IN CONNIVANCE

Every reasonably informed person knows these things to be true—knows, too, that they are getting worse, not better. Everybody talks about them, but nothing is done about them because everything heads up to Mr. Roosevelt, and nothing can be done about him. In such times as these there is real reluctance to criticize the President. Yet it seems worse than foolish to pretend that things are all right when it is so clear they are all wrong. Under such circumstances, to keep quiet is to connive in deceiving the people, to their great and ultimate suffering. Responsibility for the situation, which is so bad that General Johnson asserts if something is not soon done to straighten it out, "there will be hell to pay in this country," is directly upon Mr. Roosevelt and upon no one else.

He has denied that his desk is the real bottleneck, but it is nonetheless. Appealing to the country for national unity, the people have seen Mr. Roosevelt yield first to the farm lobby and then to the labor lobby. They find him warning of the danger of inflation and yet refusing to take the obvious steps to avert it. They see him fumbling with the vital price-control problem, shrinking from placing any limit whatever upon farm prices and wages, without which the whole effort to control prices becomes absurd. They see him, with a belated and feeble protest, permitting a politically inspired tax bill to take shape, and they know that he has violated his own recommendation that every nondefense expenditure be cut to the bone.

MUCH BEYOND DISPUTE

Further, they know that he has allowed the Federal finances to get out of control; that he persists in keeping incompetent men in important positions; that he has done nothing to check the radical New Deal group, bent upon using the crisis to promote their State-socialization plans. All this and more is known beyond dispute. It is not even denied. As a result, the defense effort lags. As it grows stronger in military and naval equipment, the Nation grows weaker in every other way.

The idea that because of the war these known facts should be soft-pedaled or ignored seems a dangerous one, indeed. If that idea is to be accepted, the disaster, when it comes—as it inevitably must come—will be complete. A far better idea would seem to be for the millions who are supporting Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policy to understand fully what is going on in Washington and exert their weight to force the President into some approach to competency in the handling of our internal affairs. Because, sound as is his leadership in the foreign field, what he is doing to us at home is a crime.

Mr. Speaker, the beginning and the end of democracy, or is it?

We are the people, or are we?

The merciless, devastating truth is mighty and must prevail.

The whole truth and nothing but the truth is what we, the people, are entitled to know.

A Plea for Honesty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I made over the radio yesterday:

Fellow Americans, I speak to you tonight from your Capital, Washington, D. C. I come to you with a plea for honesty. Every person, whether living in a metropolitan city of the East; the prairies of the great Mississippi Valley; the slopes of California; or in the cabins of the deep South is concerned about the apparent disregard in the moral standards of our people.

I want to make some observations and suggest that we, as Americans, start this very minute to halt any further drift on dishonest paths.

From 1787, when the Constitution of these United States was established to 1917—130 years—this country followed the sound doctrines advocated by Benjamin Franklin that "Honesty is the best policy." For 130 years we were taught that expediency never had been—was not—and never would be a successful alibi for dishonesty.

In that same period of time we grew from a despised group of colonies to a great and respected country. During that time few foreign nations tried to "shove us around." True they talked about it but only two had the insanity to try it.

Our policy then was short and simple—it was just plain, old-fashioned honesty.

This policy was no accident. It was the result of the failure of the Continental Congress to keep its word during the days of the Revolutionary War. In fact, to describe the utter worthlessness of anything was to brand it as "not worth a continental." Those wise and far-seeing men who made up the Constitutional Convention insisted on honest relations between the Federal Government and its citizens.

That relationship between the Government and our forefathers for the first hundred and thirty years was one of respect for each other, and during that period honesty was the very definite policy of the Government. To pay the highest tribute to the sterling character of anything in those days was to say it was "as good as a Government bond." May I ask what happened to that phrase and to that reputation which was built up by the sacrifices of a willing and believing people? May I ask when you last heard that phrase "as good as a Government bond"?

Let me call your attention to the fact that the decline of our moral standards followed immediately after the breaking of sacred promises to the people. In 1916 an election was held in this country on the basis of vindicating the Administration for keeping the country out of another European War. The people had their choice and they voted to stay out. That word was not kept—we went in. What did we go in for? To make the world safe for democracy. What did the world get out of that war? Millions of dead; millions and millions of cripples, and a crop of dictators whose reign of terror is without equal in the history of our times.

What did we get? Very little safety—no democracy—and the start of the lowering of the moral standards of our citizens. It is no wonder that the people lost respect for honesty when their inspiration and even their Government was not honest with them.

Many times we have heard of America being great because of the training of its youth on the baseball and football field of America—and that is no idle statement. Being an old football and baseball player I know well what this training means—it means honesty. No baseball team would ever tolerate a pitcher, who once having accepted the signal for a low inside curve deliberately threw a straight ball that was hit over the fence.

No football team would stand for a dishonest quarterback, who in the huddle agreed on the play to go around left end, then when he got the ball started for right end and was thrown for a loss. Such a player would be benched for dishonesty.

These illustrations are in language that every American believing in fair play understands. Every American knows just how vital it is to follow the signals when once given and that to violate them is dishonest and disastrous.

Of recent years we have seen time and time again the Government go into a huddle with its citizens—agree on the signals—and then see them disregarded. Is there any sound reason why the people are fast becoming of the conviction that a promise and a solemn pledge, once given, is no longer to be relied upon?

A concrete example of what I refer to is found in the conduct of this Nation's foreign policy. Look at the war between China and Japan. Your Government has repeatedly expressed its horror at the way China has been attacked by Japan. It is the sentiment of the American people that the war which has been carried on for years is unjustifiable, unwarranted, and has not one single reason to be continued. Our Government has so expressed itself time and time again and while it gave kind words of sympathy and encouragement to China—it sent shipload after shipload of war supplies to Japan to be used in carrying on that barbarous war—month after month and year after year. The people of southern Illinois think that is dishonest and I agree with them.

A year ago young men in this country were told that a bill was before Congress that would require 1 year of their life for military training. On that basis it was passed. They accepted its terms and answered when called. They left their jobs, professions, and homes for a year and no longer.

It now develops that they were never intended to be discharged at the end of the 12 months of training, but are to be held for a longer period. That, according to the people of southern Illinois, is not honest, and I agree with them. If they were to have been kept for more than 1 year, they should have been told in plain language.

Who are these boys? Well, they are not only draftees but also they are men who will run this country 15 or 20 years from now. What sort of government can you expect from millions of men who as boys were dishonestly treated?

Again I ask, Who are these boys? They are citizens of these United States who have a right to think. They are thinking as you and I. Since being a Member of Congress I have visited many camps and have talked to hundreds of draftees. I have made it a point to pick up many of these fine young men who were looking for rides back to their camp as I drove through the country. They tell me that, in their opinion, we have no business outside of the Western Hemisphere.

No one has ever accused the American people of being cowards. In fact, it was Thomas Jefferson who said, and I quote:

"Whenever the people are well informed, they can be trusted with their own government."

That statement is as true today as it was 150 years ago.

And I want to say to you tonight that if any emergency did arise there would be no need to pass laws to compel these boys to stay in the Army. They would stay because they love America and are just as patriotic as you and I.

If, as has been said, it was the intention to hold our boys for more than 12 months, they should have been told before the law was passed and the American people fully informed as to the reasons why.

The need for honesty in the conduct of the Government was so truthfully set out by James E. Rockwell, in the Daily Independent, of Murphysboro, Ill., on July 11, when, in his leading editorial, he said, and I quote:

"The first essential to a united nation is confidence of the citizens in their own government.

"It is difficult for anyone to have confidence in a government which does not keep its solemn word or observe the contracts it makes with its citizens.

"Remember that even Canada and South Africa have no overseas conscription. They are actually in the war, but their draft laws provide only for service at home for drafted men. South Africans are not used outside of Africa."

Still quoting:

"Despite the fact that we are not at war, not in any danger of invasion, and that all the army needed for the defense of America could have been raised by voluntary enlistment, our Government passed a conscription law. It provided for 1 year's service by drafted men, and it was stipulated that they should not be sent on foreign service. That was a solemn contract made with these men.

"The National Guard was called into service for a year of training on the same basis. Many of these men had to make very substantial sacrifices to answer the call, but they made those sacrifices expecting to complete their training in a year and return home.

"Now it is proposed to keep these men in active service indefinitely.

"So the solemn contract with these young men is to be broken, in true Hitler fashion. They are to be retained in service indefinitely, and may be sent to Iceland or even to Ireland. And the President told us all only last fall, and said it 'again and again and again,' that our young men would not be sent into foreign wars on foreign soil."

And I am still quoting:

"We are no longer waiting for the war to come to us. There is no longer talk of the danger of America being invaded. America is now being extended from Iceland—and maybe Ireland—to Guam and Wake Island. Our 'defense zone' is rapidly becoming the entire globe, and we are roaming the globe with a chip on our shoulder looking for a war. Wars aren't hard to find."

Americans are not afraid. We Americans can play our position on the team, but the signals must be clear, and, when once given, the game must be played according to the rules.

The Selective Service Act provides that it is for Congress to decide if there is an emergency, and in the event that Congress so decides these boys can be held for more than 12 months.

We Americans have not been shown that any new emergency exists now that did not exist last year, and I propose to keep faith with these boys, their parents and loved

ones, and vote against any resolution to hold them for longer than the period agreed upon. To do otherwise is dishonest.

As a Congressman and an ex-ball player who believes in fair play, I want to say that if, as, and when the great majority of our people start on a vigorous program of insisting on absolute honesty by the Government, then, and no sooner, will America be back on the right path and again boast, with a clear conscience, about being "as good as a Government bond."

How Will the Spoils Be Divided After the War Is Over?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, we might give some thought to the problems which will arise after the war is over. How will the spoils be divided? How will European and Asiatic territory be distributed? Who will control the monetary systems of continental Europe, Asia, and Africa? How will the "four freedoms" be brought to the conquered nations? Who will feed and clothe the people who will suffer the consequences of war? Who will supply the funds to reconstruct the cities, towns, and villages that have been devastated?

I pray there will be no Nazi victory and no Communist victory. There can be no freedom for the peoples of Europe and Asia if the ideologies of nazi-ism, fascism, and communism rule the oppressed natives of the Eastern Hemisphere. I despise and reject those doctrines of enslavement which are pronounced and followed by foreign dictators. There could be no better result of the present battle between the Nazi and the "red" than a stalemate, which would mean the end of communism and nazi-ism, doctrines which mean slavery for millions.

The following article, which appeared in the Christian Century, is interesting reading:

[From the Christian Century of July 30, 1941]

IF RUSSIA WINS

(By John Haynes Holmes)

Russia is in the war. Naturally enough, most Americans are rooting for Russia to win. But before we become emotionally too involved it would be well to consider what it might mean to have Russia win this war, or her particular share thereof. What would she get out of the struggle after it is all over? We may be sure that Russia is not going to fight through to victory for nothing. After she has scorched the earth of uncounted miles of her territory, laid down the lives of millions of her sons, seen her industries ruined, her cities bombed, her treasure wasted, and her dream of a Communist utopia postponed for a hundred years, if not altogether ruined, she is going to demand compensation in the settlement. Are we sure we are prepared to grant her demands?

Let us turn away from the battle for a moment and look into the future. Visualize the time when the fighting will be done and the peace must be made. What is Russia going to say and do?

The peace table, wherever it may be set up—in Geneva, or London, or Washington—will be an interesting spectacle. There will be Churchill, Roosevelt, De Gaulle, Chiang Kai-shek, and the representatives of the governments in exile. And there will be Joseph Stalin, smiling amiably through his mustache, as he smiled in that famous picture of Molotov and Ribbentrop signing the Russo-German nonaggression pact, and as he smiled again in what is destined to be that equally famous picture of Molotov and Sir Stafford Cripps signing the Russo-British cobelligerency pact.

I

The Soviet dictator will sit along with the premiers, the presidents, and the kings. His seat will be high up, near the head of the table. For the action of Russia will have been crucial if the Allies win this war. When the peace conference meets, Stalin's decision to fight in 1941 will be regarded as vital to victory in this war, as Wilson's decision to fight in 1917 was regarded as central to victory in the last war. Stalin will be well able to say to his associates, "I won this war for you. I bore the heat and burden of the day when the struggle was most critical. Mine were the blood, the sweat, and the tears. But I won this war not merely for you but for myself, for Russia quite as much as for Britain. I must be listened to. I'll sit here at Mr. Churchill's right."

First on the agenda of the conference, undoubtedly, will be President Roosevelt's "four freedoms," as first on the agenda of the Versailles Conference were Woodrow Wilson's 14 points. With this initial discussion, Stalin will not be much concerned. He will sit there silently in his place, smiling his enigmatic smile, while the conferees debate how to establish the "four freedoms * * * everywhere in the world." Only when this question of "everywhere" comes to the fore will Stalin bestir himself. He will then say, in quiet tones, that these freedoms are interesting and undoubtedly important, but that, so far as Russia is concerned, they are not precisely * * * er * * * er * * * practicable. There will be other peoples excepted from their application, of course. Among these will be the 350,000,000 people of India.

The four freedoms having been dealt with as satisfactorily as the 14 points were dealt with at Versailles, there will next come up the question of territorial settlements. Here Stalin will suddenly become alert, and, before anybody else has an opportunity to take the floor, will draw a slip of paper from his pocket and begin, "Gentlemen." Then he will proceed to lay down Russia's terms of peace. I venture to surmise that they will run something like the following:

1. Russia will annex Finland. In 1940, Stalin will explain, Russia was very lenient with Finland. When Helsinki sued for peace after losing the inexcusable war of 1939–40, Moscow respected Finland's independence and took only certain strategic points necessary to Russia's military security. Then, when Hitler pounced without warning upon the Soviets, Finland followed suit, and Marshal Mannerheim led Finnish armies onto Russian soil. There must now be left no danger of any repetition of this offense, Stalin will affirm. Leningrad must be made safe.

2. Russia will annex Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Like Finland, these countries Stalin will explain, were a part of ancient Russia. The peasants and workers of these countries are entitled to enjoy the same proletarian emancipation that has been granted to the rest of the Russian people. Furthermore, these countries, like Finland, are necessary to Russia's military security. They are her bastions and bulwarks against the chaos of western Europe. So what was done at Versailles in 1919, and undone in 1940, must now be undone again, Stalin will say.

3. Russia will annex Poland, or at least that part of Poland which belonged to Russia before the war of 1914. It is true that the restoration of Poland was one of the noble fruits of the first World War. It is true that the new restoration of Poland, after the debacle of 1939 and the fourth partition of 1940, was one of the few perfectly distinct purposes of the second World War. What did Britain go to war for if not to save Poland? In what hope did Paderewski and all his heroic countrymen live in these last months, and Paderewski himself die, if not in the hope that Poland should be born anew? But Stalin will carefully explain that he shared in none of these promises. So far as the world knows, he gave no pledge to honor them when he joined the alliance with Britain. He has no sentiment about such things.

4. Russia will insist, under one form or another, on dominating the Balkans. Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Greece will fall under her sway as they now lie under Germany's sway. What more natural fruit of a victory in arms over Germany? And to these, undoubtedly, will be added the Dardenelles, as the key that turns the lock on all of eastern Europe.

5. Russia will probably demand East Prussia as her share of a dismembered Germany. Will Germany be dismembered? She certainly will, if this war is won by Britain and her allies. And in this division of the spoil, Russia will demand her ample portion.

6. After Europe, Asia. Here speculation is not so easy. But that Russia will openly and permanently take over Mongolia is probable; and that she will seize Manchukuo from Japan is not improbable. Russia's hunger for Manchuria is as insatiable as her hunger for the Dardanelles. And then there will be the settlement for all the aid she has given to China and the payment of Stalin's debt to the Communist armies in that divided country.

II

Such is the memorandum of demands which Joseph Stalin will quietly but firmly lay before a peace conference gathered some years hence to liquidate a victory which, if won, will be won largely by his arms. Just Stalin's little bill for services rendered. And that bill will be paid, be sure of that, to the very last farthing. When Churchill hailed Stalin as an ally and Roosevelt pledged to him support in this war, this indebtedness was acknowledged. When Britain signed the cobelligerency pact in Moscow, she signed a blank check to be filled in later by Russia. The outcome, if victory is won, is certain. After an immeasurably exhausting effort to destroy Nazi totalitarianism, the world will have succeeded only in putting in its place a more powerful, more widely extended, and therefore more formidable Communist totalitarianism.

Does this mean that I do not want Russia, and with her Britain, to win this war? That I desire a German victory? Not at all. I do not hope for an outcome of this war in terms of victory, but rather in the familiar Wilsonian terms of "peace without victory." Not otherwise, it seems to me, can the interests of humanity be served in contrast to the interests of nations and empires. As I clung to this formula when Britain was fighting alone against Germany, how much more do I now cling to it when Russia has become the possibly deciding factor in the fray. Her entrance makes it certain that, if victory comes to either side, the triumph of totalitarianism is inevitable. There is no solution of our problem of peace in any victory in this war. Only "a peace without victory can last."

What has happened to our minds that we fail to see these plain implications? This is what war does to us. This is what happens when we loose the forces of violence and

expect them to bring us salvation. Everything passes out of control. The worst turns to the best. All the high purposes and ideals with which we entered the fight become poisoned or lost. Our minds become palsied and our consciences dead. In the struggle to beat down our enemy, lest he beat us down, we resort to any means, however vile, that promise to be effective. We accept any ally, however disreputable or dangerous, who agrees to help us out. Before we know it we are crying with Satan, "Evil, be thou my good."

Stalin says that "our war for the freedom of our country will merge with the struggles of Europe and America for their independence, for their democratic liberties." "Democratic liberties"—that phrase is as blasphemous on the lips of Stalin as it would be on the lips of Hitler. Russia in alliance with Britain, as in alliance with Germany, remains what she was and is—a totalitarian dictatorship to be matched point by point with the dictatorship of the Reich. And now we find ourselves fighting against the latter to save the former! Where is democracy in such an issue? What becomes of liberty in such a fight?

This is the insane whirligig of war! Lift up the banner and draw the sword, and this is where we land. Our cause lost, our hope doomed, our integrity sacrificed—and all for nothing!

The Gallup Poll and the Townsend Plan—American Public Approves Federal Old Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Gallup poll on old-age pensions, released on August 7, is a timely and illuminating report. It shows that our American people in all sections of the country are definitely in favor of universal Federal old-age pensions, with payments of sufficient size to provide adequate care for our citizens who are 60 years of age and unemployed. It shows complete disapproval of the existing social-security program for old-age pensions where the average payment throughout the country as a whole is only $20 a month and, in many sections, below $10.

In answer to the specific question propounded in the Gallup poll, which was Nation-wide, 91 percent of our people favor a Government pension and only 7 percent registered opposition. Sixty-four percent answered that the pension should begin at 60 or below, whereas only 36 percent were in favor of an age of 61 or upward. In answer to the question as to the monthly payments that should be made, the national average of the replies show $42 for a single person and $73 for a married couple. These amounts were considerably increased in all sections of the country, with the exception of the West Central and the South. The lower figures in these two sections of our country brought down the national average very materially. The South approves a payment of only $32 for a single person. It should be noted that the South is the portion of our country where the lowest pensions are paid under the present Social Security program. It is interesting to note in this connection that the younger voters of our country definitely approve of this program for Federal old-age pensions, and the voters in the age group of 21–34 approve a payment for a single person of $48 and a married couple of $77, which is considerably higher than the national average under the Gallup poll.

The second section of this poll has not yet been released by the American Institute of Public Opinion, but it is reported that it will show that 70 percent of the voters express a willingness to pay 3 cents out of every dollar of their income until they are 60 years of age in order to get a pension from the Government of $50 a month after they are 60, and only 18 percent expressed an unwillingness to do so. Here again the lower age group, 21 to 29, had a greater majority in favor of being taxed to pay for a pension 77 percent being in favor of the tax.

Mr. Speaker, the results of this poll show that the American voting public approve in broad outline the program which has been advanced by the Townsend organization. The strength of the Townsend plan lies in its soundness and simplicity. It is a universal Federal program providing an old-age pension for all American citizens over 60 years of age, unemployed, financed by 2-percent gross income tax on incomes in excess of $250 a month, the funds to be distributed pro rata to all citizens 60 years of age qualifying under the act. Contrary to widely prevalent belief, the Townsend plan does not provide for $200 a month pension. This is wholly and completely false. It is estimated that under present conditions the funds raised under the Townsend plan would provide a pension of approximately $50 a month for each annuitant, which, it will be noted, is about the amount approved by the voters in the Gallup poll. Statisticians and economists who have studied the plan have arrived at the conclusion that its costs will be below the 3 percent named in the Gallup poll. Furthermore, one of the major objectives of the Townsend program is national recovery. Under it the funds received each month by the annuitant must be spent within 30 days, which will insure continuing increased purchasing power on a pay-as-you-go basis, without adding to the national debt and without taxing industry to accumulate a huge reserve fund, as is done under the social-security program. The draining from industry of these huge pay-roll taxes and freezing them in a reserve fund has contributed to unemployment and prevented business recovery.

Following is the Gallup poll as released August 7:

THE GALLUP POLL—OLD-AGE PENSIONS OF $42 A MONTH FOR SINGLE, $73 A MONTH FOR MARRIED PERSONS ARE FAVORED

(By Dr. George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., August 7.—The perennial issue of Government old-age pensions may be thrown in congressional laps shortly as the result of hearings now being conducted by a special Senate committee under Senator DOWNEY, of California. Washington observers report that the committee is virtually certain to recommend a liberalization of the pension system, and predict that a bill supported by Dr. Townsend or some similar measure may reach a vote in the Senate.

In such circumstances no question is more timely than to ask: Where does the American public now stand on old-age pensions? Is the public satisfied with the amounts granted to needy citizens at the age of 65? What sums would be paid if the general public set the scales?

As the pension question boils to the top once more, a Nation-wide survey by the American Institute of Public Opinion indicates—

1. That the vast majority of citizens (more than 90 percent) approve of the basic principle of Government-administered pensions. In the last decade the idea that old-age security is a Federal responsibility has apparently taken firm hold.

2. While the public shows dissatisfaction with the amounts now being paid to needy old people (present amounts average about $20 a month for the country as a whole) the typical American's idea of what his Government should pay is a moderate one.

Nor have the public's sums increased substantially over the past 5 years, despite rising costs of living, comparison with earlier institute studies shows.

3. Far from endorsing schemes like California's recent drive for "Thirty Dollars Every Thursday," the average American sets a figure in the neighborhood of $42 a month for single persons and $73 for married couples.

4. Finally, the public believes that citizens should become eligible for old-age pensions at the age of 60 instead of 65, as now provided by the Social Security Act.

7 PERCENT OPPOSE PENSIONS

In the preliminary question the institute asked: "Are you in favor of Government old-age pensions?" From a cross section of men and women in the United States voting population came the replies:

	Percent
Favor Government pensions	91
Oppose Government pensions	7
Undecided	2

Asked at what age pensions should begin, most voters named 60 years of age:

	Percent
Should begin before 60	17
Should begin at 60	47
At 61 or later	36

The survey voters were then asked: "What do you think is the smallest income per month that a single person over 60 needs for a decent living in your community?" And a similar question was asked regarding married couples over 60.

SECTIONAL OPINIONS

Here are the sectional medians for single persons and married couples on the basis of replies from the voting population—those who can make their opinions felt at the ballot boxes:

	Median monthly sum for single person	Median monthly sum for married couple
National average	$42	$73
New England	50	78
Middle Atlantic	50	78
East Central	42	74
West Central	37	59
South	32	59
West	48	76

Broken down by age levels, the medians are:

Voters aged—	Median monthly sum for single person	Median monthly sum for married couple
21 to 34	$48	$77
35 to 44	46	74
45 to 59	41	73
60 and over	40	62

Among other groups the highest medians for a single person were set in the upper income group (49 a month) and among people living in cities of more than 100,000 population (52). Lowest medians for single persons came from the bottom income groups and from farmers in general.

Sense of Humor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER PATRICK

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] took occasion to have a word for me on the floor last Monday, assailing my modicum of humor. While I may speak admiringly of his courage, for it did require certain courage in him to so take a fellow Member, yet I must add that the gentleman is all wet. Yes, fellow Members of Congress, Mr. POWERS is all wet. I know he is on the Appropriations Committee, a valuable member too, and he can stay there for my part—but the gentleman remains in the all-wet corner. The mistake he makes is a common one, and having more solemn sense—as good as it is to have—than sense of humor, he will probably remain mistaken and never be able to see or even feel the difference. But the difference is important.

Now, a sense of humor is a great deal more than merely being able to stir up a joke. It is even more than being able to stir up an appropriate joke. Yes, it is more than being able to honestly laugh at a joke. Humor is the saving grace of a sense of proportions. If a man has a sense of humor he has a sense of balance, a sense of the teeter-totter of values—oh, that is it—I have been chasing the term for years and never caught up with it till this minute—humor is the teeter-tooter of values and proportions. Eureka!

Humor prevents a man from taking himself too seriously and allows him to laugh when his own foot is caught in the stirrup. It is that warm quality which allows intelligent men to exchange pleasantries, witticisms, and jokes while sinister war shadows fall upon their way of travel or while they see their nation's debt or family debt mounting daily. They say, "Well, we have that, we shall have this, too." And, glory be, they do have it.

There is no better sign of a secured freedom nor the spirit of true democracy in this land than to see Americans cheerful and out for their diet of entertainment. Compare this country with serious, dour Russia, or with grim, stern Germany. The expanding spirit must be happy. Who started this stuff about humor and intellectuality being strangers? Humor abounds with life but also holds to sound sense the while.

I know what ails the gentleman from New Jersey. He thinks that a cheery or light-hearted approach to a serious subject is necessarily frivolous; feels that light steps cannot lead anywhere. That is where he slips up. He merely needs to open the cockles of his heart and let a little humor ooze through and oil up the stifle valves around those cockles. Then he will be able to understand many things that have mystified and puzzled him all his life. He will see waste places along his pathway suddenly burst into vegetation, life, and interest. He will see dull and listless things become objects of action and vigor. He will find doors opening where he thought only barren walls stood reaching to the sky.

You see, humor is not only smart, it is quickly practical—and do not confuse humor with mere wit. Wit may hide in a cat's ear, but humor is big as the outdoors—humor must be practical. It has to know that human nature is not perfect, that it often fumbles and stumbles, turns its ankle and falls down, sometimes spilling its load. But what does humor do? Runs up smiling and puts a hand under—forgives, overlooks, understands. Humor knew it would most likely happen, and so did not think the world would end and the Heavens fall when it did happen. Humor is kind, is human, is tolerant, and is willing to be helpful. Humor is the set of springs in the automobile, the sunshine by the roadside, and the mirror in the bathroom of life. Disregard the bland smile or the smirking grin if you will, but do not get snooty around the homey chuckle. There is medicine in it—and it may be good for what ails you, especially when times are serious, and when lawmaking is a heavy business. Now, I am ready to take up some other subject.

The Congressional Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

THAT OLD RAGMAN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, do you remember that old ragman with the rickety wagon and skinny horse who drove up one alley and down another in your town and mine and in a resonant sing-song voice cried, "Rags and old iron, rags and old iron." Perhaps he did not rate as one of the elite 400 in those days but today he becomes extremely important as one of the vanguard of national defense. Our steel mills must produce 82,000,000 tons of steel annually in order to meet the demands of defense. Bars, plates, shapes, rods, and a host of other forms of steel are indispensable to the building of ships, tanks, guns, and other military and naval instruments. To make this amount of steel requires about 30,000,000 tons of scrap. Whence comes this scrap? There are the farms and farm yards where worn-out machinery is eligible for the scrap heap. There are the used-car graveyards where an estimated four to seven million rusty chariots might each yield about 1,500 pounds of iron and steel scrap, 20 pounds of aluminum, and 60 pounds of copper and brass. Finally, there is that indescribable array of iron and steel lurking in backyards, cellars, attics, and obscure corners of the land, ranging from rusty sewing machine frames to worn-out lawn mowers, which might be gathered up, taken to the junk yards, and then transported to the steel mills. But who shall gather it and haul it to the market? Upon whom must we depend for scrap that the steel mills might operate to capacity? Why, it is that old man with the rickety wagon and skinny horse with whose melody even the children are familiar as he sings, "Rags and old iron." He is part of defense.

DEBATERS' HANDBOOK ON DRAFT EXTENSION

The Selective Service Act became law on September 16, 1940. It was approved in the House of Representatives by a vote of 263 to 149. It contains three limitations. The draft Army is limited to 900,000 at any one time. Selectees shall serve for 1 year unless Congress extends the term because of a national emergency. Service of selectees shall be limited to American possessions and to the Western Hemisphere. The new measure proposes that two of these limitations shall be modified or rubbed out entirely. The draft extension bill proposes to remove the limit on the number of men in the selective-service forces so that if appropriations are available, it can become an army of unlimited size. The bill also proposes to keep selectees in service for an indefinite period. The United States Senate set a limit of 30 months, but military authorities have consistently expressed a desire to retain men in service for the emergency which means an indefinite period. This bill when reduced to its simplest terms, therefore, proposes a selective-service force of unlimited size for an indefinite period. Shall it be enacted into law?

THE CASE FOR THE BILL

The proponents of this measure contend that it should be enacted because—

First. We are confronted with a serious emergency in the Orient, in South America, and in Europe.

Second. The inductees, only now, after a period of 12 months' training, have developed real military value as a part of our defensive forces.

Third. Discharging them at the end of 12 months would seriously disrupt the efficiency and morale of our present defense establishment.

Fourth. Discharging them now would make it necessary to return some of the selectees from the occupation forces at some of the vital new bases on the Atlantic coast and in Alaska and would present a serious problem both in transportation and in impairing the strength of those occupying forces.

Fifth. Congress has authority under the original Selective Service Act to retain selectees for a longer period than 1 year if a national emergency warrants such action.

Sixth. Discharging the selectees now would leave the United States undefended.

THE CASE AGAINST THE BILL

The bill should be defeated, say the opponents, because—

First. Retaining them in service would be a breach of faith not only with the inductees but with their families.

Second. While it is true that the original act provides that they may be retained by further legislation in the case of an emergency, this provision of the law was played down at the time of passage of the original act.

Third. Spokesmen in both Houses of Congress repeatedly asserted at the time of the passage of the act that it was only for a period of 1 year, and to retain them longer would be a breach of these assurances.

Fourth. The selectees are so distributed through our armed forces that only a small number would be relieved at the end of each month and their discharge would not impair our military efficiency. Figures indicate that slightly less than 14,000 would be eligible for discharge in November and slightly over 5,500 in December.

Fifth. If all of the 613,000 selectees now in the armed forces were relieved at one and the same time, it would still leave a defense force of 750,000 composed of Regulars and National Guardsmen, and that this force is adequate for all defense purposes.

Sixth. The selective-service army should not be increased until the Nation is more definitely advised what we propose to defend, where we propose to defend it, and how we propose to defend it.

Seventh. An army of unlimited size would be an open invitation to become involved in the present war and send an American expeditionary force to foreign soil.

Eighth. To rub out two of the three limitations in the original act becomes a standing invitation to eliminate the other limitations which prevent the use of selectees beyond the Western Hemisphere and open the door to the involvement in war.

Ninth. Selectees are now so distributed among our defense forces, both at home, in the islands, and in our new bases, that a very small percentage of the Regular Army would be required to replace them.

First Monthly Report of Government Finances, Fiscal Year 1942

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 11, 1941

LETTER AND STATEMENTS FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statements from the Secretary of the Treasury concerning receipts, expenditures, the public debt, and other pertinent data relating to Government finances. Each month, commencing with January of this calendar year, I have placed exhibits of this character in the RECORD. There have been six of such monthly statements for the fiscal year 1941, commencing with January and ending with June last. The following tables bring the data down to the end of July, which is the first month of the fiscal year 1942:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington August 11, 1941

Hon. EDWARD T. TAYLOR.
Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations,
Washington D C

MY DEAR MR CHAIRMAN: By direction of the Secretary and in accordance with the arrangements made with you as outlined in his letter of January 31, 1941, I am enclosing herewith the following statements:

Statement No. I, general Budget summary: Receipts and expenditures, showing (1) Budget estimates for the fiscal year 1942 and actual figures for the fiscal year 1941, and (2) actual figures for the first month of each of the fiscal years 1941 and 1942.

Statement No. II, effect on the public debt of financing the deficit, showing (1) estimated amounts for the fiscal year 1942, and actual figures for the fiscal year 1941 and (2) actual figures for the first month of each of the fiscal years 1941 and 1942. This statement shows the extent to which the net deficit has been met through borrowings and reductions in the Treasury's cash balance. It also shows the debt at the beginning and the close of each period.

Statement No. III, statutory debt limitation, showing the amount of the debt outstanding which is subject to the debt limitation and the balance of the borrowing authority, i. e., the amount of additional debt which may be issued pursuant to existing limitations.

Statement No. IV, general fund balance, showing an analysis of the general fund balance and the changes therein during the period. This statement sets forth the balances at the beginning and the close of the period classified as to working balance, increment on gold, and seigniorage. It shows how the general fund balance was affected by (1) borrowings, (2) excess of receipts or expenditures in trust accounts, etc., and (3) the net deficit as set forth in statement No. I.

Statement No. V, obligations of corporations and credit agencies guaranteed as to principal and interest as of July 31, 1941. This statement shows the contingent liabilities of the Government i. e. the outstanding securities issued by corporations and credit agencies which are guaranteed by the United States as to principal and interest.

Statement No. VI, combined statement of assets and liabilities of governmental corporations and credit agencies, as of June 30, 1941, based upon the latest official reports received by the Treasury. This statement shows the total assets of such corporations and agencies, the liabilities (including reserves), and their net worth. The liabilities are segregated according to obligations guaranteed by the United States and obligations not so guaranteed. The net worth is classified as to the amounts of the Government's proprietary interest and of the proprietary interests not owned by the Government. The total amount of interagency interests of all corporations and agencies included in this statement is also shown.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

I. General budget summary—receipts and expenditures

[On basis of daily Treasury statements, i. e., checks paid by Treasurer of the United States. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years		July 1 to July 31	
	Budget estimates, 1942 [1]	Actual, 1941	Actual, fiscal year 1942	Actual, fiscal year 1941
Receipts:				
Income tax	5,420.0	3,469.6	23.7	49.7
Miscellaneous internal revenue	3,135.0	2,966.9	268.2	237.4
Taxes under Social Security Act	847.0	788.2	47.0	38.6
Taxes upon carriers and their employees	145.0	136.9	.9	.5
Customs	390.0	391.9	36.7	25.2
Return of surplus funds from Government corporations		319.2		1.6
Other	177.0	195.8	19.0	14.0
Total receipts	10,114.0	8,268.5	455.5	367.0
Less net amounts transferred to Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund	712.0	661.3	42.6	35.8
Net receipts	9,402.0	7,607.2	412.9	331.2

[1] Revised June 1, 1941.

I. *General budget summary—receipts and expenditures*—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years		July 1 to July 31	
	Budget estimates, 1942	Actual, 1941	Actual, fiscal year 1942	Actual, fiscal year 1941
Expenditures:				
Departmental	875.0	[3] 810.7	87.1	[3] 84.4
Agricultural program [1]	1,202.0	1,126.3	74.8	69.3
National defense:				
War	6,940.0	3,635.5	507.8	79.2
Navy	3,950.0	2,216.8	339.0	98.1
National defense funds for the President	353.0	[4] 103.1	15.4	----------
Selective Service	32.0	17.5	2.5	----------
Emergency ship construction (U. S. Maritime Commission)	200.0	11.6	7.7	----------
Defense aid (lend-lease)	3,500.0	21.4	33.8	----------
Federal Security Agency	69.0	----------	3.5	----------
National defense housing (Federal Works Agency)	225.0	[4] 42.0	19.3	----------
Other agencies	231.0	(5)	10.6	(5)
	15,500.0	6,047.9	939.6	177.3
Interest on the public debt	1,275.0	1,110.7	24.8	20.4
Federal Loan Agency	9.0	11.5	.2	1.1
Federal Security Agency	872.0	[3] 944.0	104.5	[3] 105.4
Federal Works Agency [1]	1,134.0	1,673.9	120.4	145.8
Tennessee Valley Authority	40.0	[2] 51.2	7.8	[2] 8.6
Veterans' Administration	569.0	552.7	45.9	46.3
Transfers to Trust Accounts	268.0	234.6	153.1	113.5
Return of surplus funds from Government corporations	----------	329.0	----------	----------
All other	425.0	[3] 476.1	39.4	[3] 55.5
Total expenditures [6]	22,169.0	12,710.6	1,597.6	818.4
Net deficit (excess expenditures over receipts) [6]	12,767.0	5,103.4	1,184.7	487.2

[1] Not including departmental expenditures of Department of Agriculture.
[2] Includes national defense expenditures augmenting regular activities.
[4] Reflects adjustment to give effect to sec. 5, act of Oct. 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1127), by merging funds allotted to Federal Works Agency from allocations made by the President to the War Department for national defense housing with funds appropriated to Federal Works Agency for the same purpose.
[5] Expenditures included in totals for departmental, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal Security Agency, and all other. See note 3.
[3] Credits, deduct.
[7] Exclusive of National Defense Housing activities shown above.
[8] Exclusive of debt retirements pursuant to sinking fund and other appropriations for public debt retirements.

II. *Effect on the public debt of financing the deficit**

[On basis of daily Treasury statements. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years		July 1 to July 31	
	Budget estimates 1942 [1]	Actual 1941	Actual fiscal year 1942	Actual fiscal year 1941
Net deficit (statement I)	12,767.0	5,103.4	1,184.7	487.2
Changes in cash accounts during period:				
Add: Increase in general fund balance during period	[2] 663.4	742.4	[2] 34.4	367.0
Total	12,103.6	5,845.8	1,150.3	854.2
Deduct: Excess of receipts over expenditures in trust accounts, etc., during period	37.8	[2] 148.1	599.2	51.1
Total financed by increase in public debt	12,065.8	5,993.9	551.1	803.0
Add: Public debt at beginning of period	48,961.4	42,967.5	48,961.4	42,967.5
Public debt at end of period	61,027.2	48,961.4	49,512.5	43,770.5

[1] Revised, June 1, 1941.
[2] Decrease, deduct.
[3] Increase, add.
*Figures in this statement have been rounded to nearest tenth millions and will not necessarily add to totals.

III. *Statutory debt limitation*

[Under sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended. As of July 31, 1941. In millions of dollars]

Limitation	----------	65,000.0
Deduct:		
Gross public debt outstanding July 31, 1941	49,512.5	
Unearned discount on U. S. savings bonds (difference between current redemption value and maturity value)	1,151.4	
	50,663.9	
Less—Debt outstanding not subject to statutory limitation	576.6	
Total	----------	50,087.3
Balance of borrowing authority	----------	14,912.7

IV. *General fund balance**

[On basis of daily Treasury statements. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years		July 1 to July 31	
	Budget estimates 1942 [1]	Actual 1941	Actual fiscal year 1942	Actual fiscal year 1941
Balance in general fund at beginning of period:				
Working balance	1,884.6	1,162.8	1,884.6	1,162.8
Increment on gold	143.2	142.8	143.2	142.8
Seigniorage (silver)	605.4	585.2	605.4	585.2
Total	2,633.2	1,890.7	2,633.2	1,890.7
Increases:				
Borrowings—net increase in public debt	12,065.8	5,993.9	551.1	803.0
Net receipts, trust accounts, etc.	37.8	[2] 148.1	599.2	51.1
Total	14,736.8	7,736.5	3,783.5	2,744.8
Decreases: Net deficit (statement I)	12,767.0	5,103.4	1,184.7	487.2
Balance in general fund at end of period	1,969.8	2,633.2	2,598.8	2,257.7
Analysis of general fund balances at end of period:				
Working balance	1,195.9	1,884.6	1,848.2	1,526.8
Increment on gold	143.7	143.2	143.2	142.8
Seigniorage (silver)	630.2	605.4	607.4	588.1
Total	1,969.8	2,633.2	2,598.8	2,257.7

[1] Revised June 1, 1941.
[2] Decrease, deduct.
*Figures in this statement have been rounded to nearest tenth million and will not necessarily add to totals.

V. *Obligations of corporations and credit agencies guaranteed as to principal and interest*

[As of July 31, 1941. In millions of dollars]

Corporation or agency	Limit of authority	Outstanding liabilities [1]		
		Total	Matured [2]	Unmatured
Commodity Credit Corporation	2,650.0	907.0	----------	907.0
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	2,000.0	1,269.5	0.1	1,269.4
Federal Housing Administration	[3] 4,100.0	16.8	.2	16.6
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	[4] 4,750.0	2,418.2	9.3	2,408.9
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7,408.1	2,101.6	.2	2,101.4
Tennessee Valley Authority	61.8	----------	----------	----------
U. S. Housing Authority	[5] 800.0	226.3	----------	226.3
U. S. Maritime Commission	[6] 200.0	----------	----------	----------
Total	----------	[7] 6,939.4	9.8	6,929.6

[1] Exclusive of obligations owned by the Treasury.
[2] Funds have been deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for payment of all obligations guaranteed by the United States, representing outstanding matured principal amounting to $9.8 million and interest of $3.3 million.
[3] Limit of authority to insure mortgages. This amount may be increased by $1,000,000,000 upon approval by the President. Debentures may be issued and tendered only in exchange for insured property acquired through foreclosure.
[4] The Corporation was authorized to issue bonds for an amount not to exceed $4,750.0 millions to be exchanged or sold to obtain funds for financing home mortgage loans or for the redemption of any of its outstanding bonds. Its authority to make loans expired on June 13, 1936, and the above limit may only be increased for the purpose of retiring its outstanding bonds by an amount equal to the amount of the bonds to be retired, which would not affect the net amount outstanding after June 13, 1936.
[5] Represents gross limit of borrowing authority. The Corporation has issued obligations totaling $495,256,000, leaving a balance of borrowing authority amounting to $304,744,000.
[6] Limit which may be outstanding at any one time with respect to the insuring of mortgages and the issuance of debentures.
[7] The total amount of assets of these corporations and agencies is in excess of the total amount of liabilities, including obligations guaranteed by the United States. See statement VI.

VI. *Combined statement of assets and liabilities of governmental corporations and credit agencies*

[As of June 30, 1941. In millions of dollars]

Corporation or agency	Assets		Liabilities			Net worth	
	Exclusive of amounts due from Government corporations and agencies	Due from Government corporations and agencies [1]	Obligations guaranteed by the United States [2]	Due to Government corporations and agencies	All other (including reserves)	Proprietary interest of the United States	Other
Commodity Credit Corporation	1,082.2	15.0	697.4	140.2	159.2	100.4	----------
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	1,472.1	2.7	1,279.1	1.7	94.0	100.0	----------
Federal Housing Administration	86.3	----------	17.6	----------	4.6	64.1	----------
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	2,491.6	100.0	2,435.5	----------	48.5	107.6	----------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,646.3	1,065.0	1,746.7	69.0	360.4	535.2	----------
Tennessee Valley Authority	401.5	.8	----------	57.2	18.0	327.1	----------
U. S. Housing Authority	455.8	----------	227.0	85.0	6.0	137.8	----------
U. S. Maritime Commission	442.4	12.0	----------	----------	285.6	168.8	----------
Federal land banks	2,233.8	8.2	----------	.5	1,806.5	213.5	221.5
All other	3,726.1	366.7	----------	765.1	992.3	2,132.9	202.5
Subtotal	14,038.1	1,570.4	[3] 6,403.3	1,118.7	3,775.1	3,887.4	424.0
Less: Interagency interest shown above	----------	−1,570.4	----------	−1,118.7	----------	−451.7	----------
Total	14,038.1	----------	[3] 6,403.3	----------	3,775.1	3,435.7	424.0

[1] Includes capital stock and paid-in surplus of Government corporations and agencies.
[2] Includes principal and accrued interest.
[3] Excludes $301.7 millions held by the Treasury.

NOTE.—The foregoing figures are compiled from latest reports received by the Treasury Department from the respective corporations and agencies. The amounts covering obligations guaranteed by the United States differ from those shown in table V for the reason that they are stated in this table as of June 30, 1941, instead of July 31, 1941, and include accrued interest.

Dedication of Kingsley Dam, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 11, 1941

ADDRESS BY K. SEWELL WINGFIELD

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. K. Sewell Wingfield, as the representative of Hon. John M. Carmody, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, at the dedication of Kingsley Dam, Nebr., on July 22, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Public Works Administration is proud to have a part this afternoon in the dedication and presentation of this enormous dam and this wonderful lake to the citizens of Nebraska. Both Mr. Carmody, Federal Works Administrator, and Colonel Gilmore, Commissioner of Public Works, had hoped to be present today but the pressure of work in the interest of national defense has detained them in Washington. They have sent me to represent them and have asked me to express their regret at not being able to be here and to convey to you their sincerest congratulations upon the completion of this great project.

When Senator NORRIS learned that I was to speak today he asked me to read to you a letter of congratulation which he had just received from the President of the United States. I quote:

"DEAR SENATOR NORRIS: I feel that the dedication of Kingsley Dam in your State must not be allowed to pass without my expressing to you, and through you, I hope, to the people of Nebraska, my congratulations and my personal satisfaction over the completion of this splendid undertaking.

"This great dam, largest earth-filled dam in the world, save for Fort Peck, in Montana, takes its place in the front rank of the monumental structures this Nation is rearing to conserve our national resources and use them to build a stronger nation and a better life for our people. It will bring new life to drought-ridden farm lands, new hope and well-being to the victims of the drought.

"It makes possible a unified power pool, unique in certain respects, owned and controlled by the people, serving a very large proportion of the citizens of the State with electricity for their homes, their farms, and their factories. In this light the dam represents an epochal triumph for you, Senator, as the dauntless leader of the public-power movement in America and for the people of Nebraska working with their Government.

"It is a tragic circumstance that such triumphs so often must be achieved against the bitter opposition, legal and political, of short-sighted private interests. Yet all of us may take heart from the amicable settlement of this conflict in Nebraska through the purchase of the private utility facilities by the public power systems on terms which I am assured are fair both to the people and to the companies. The lesson we have all learned from this may point the way for other communities, if there be any, where there is strong and clear-cut demand from the people that power be publicly owned and publicly distributed.

"Again, congratulations to you and to those who have labored with you in the development of this great public enterprise.

"Very sincerely yours,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

I am particularly happy that I should have been chosen to represent them here in Nebraska. My visit today is like coming back home. For 3 years prior to last September I was here in charge of P. W. A. work on all power and irrigation projects. Those 3 years were among the most inspiring of my life.

During that period of time I came to appreciate the spirit of devotion to their less fortunate fellow men that animated men like George P. Kingsley and C. W. McConaughy, both of whom labored on through disappointment after disappointment in their efforts to bring irrigation to the people of central Nebraska. It is indeed fitting that their names should be handed down to posterity and that Kingsley Dam and Lake McConaughy should commemorate their service for all time. But while we dedicate this great project, let us not lose sight of the fact that the entire irrigation and power development of the central and eastern parts of Nebraska are primarily the result of the untiring efforts of Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS. I hope that I may say that during the 3 years I spent in this State, I also grew to a better understanding and appreciation of the service Senator NORRIS has long rendered his fellow men, and of the democratic principles that have animated his whole life.

GEORGE W. NORRIS, above everything else that he may be, is an outstanding fighter for the principles of democracy. Time and again in his long career he has followed those principles regardless of party—regardless of self-interest. He has been a Senator in the finest sense of the word, because he has not only served his State, but has labored ceaselessly for his country. And he who serves his country best serves also his fellow men best.

It is hard for us to realize that just 10 years ago the efforts of Senator NORRIS to make available the great resources of the Tennessee Valley to the people were for the second time being blocked by a President of the United States. It is hard for us now even to imagine all the obstacles that were placed in the way; hard for us to remember all the details of that long, bitter fight which had to be carried on before Senator NORRIS had the opportunity of working with a President who shared his ideals. While the Nation as a whole is more familiar with the achievements of Senator NORRIS in the Tennessee Valley, you who have been participants in the battle here in Nebraska know that nearest to his heart has been the best development and use of the waters of this State for the people of this State. As a dramatic proof of the wisdom of the progress for which Senator NORRIS has been fighting, the droughts of the last few years have come just at the time when the irrigation projects were under construction. Now there are a few of your citizens who have not been convinced, either by Senator NORRIS or by nature, of the necessity for the proper conservation and use of your waters.

You remember the slow disillusionment of the ardent pioneer who followed the railroad and settled on your Great Plains. The spirit that was bold against the Indians, persevering in the erection of sod houses, gradually broke in the fight for water. The research of the scientists at your great university told you that crops should be diversified, but you learned through sad experience that there was not enough water for that necessary diversification. Corn and wheat—wheat and corn—were planted year in and year out, but little or no alfalfa, and always, to use Senator NORRIS' expression, you were "on the ragged edge, waiting for rain."

In 1914, under President Wilson's administration, Senator NORRIS secured a congressional appropriation of $10,000 for a study of the water resources in Nebraska. The people of Nebraska themselves raised money to help in this study. You probably remember that the first report was discouraging, but Senator NORRIS was not to be discouraged; unflagging, he continued his work. In 1922 he introduced into the Senate a resolution calling for an appropriation of $5,000 for a reinvestigation. By the time it got through the House of Representatives and became a law, however, it merely authorized the Bureau of Reclamation to make an additional investigation if money was provided from other sources. Once more the people of Nebraska raised from their own funds the necessary money for the report.

In June 1924 Senator NORRIS introduced a resolution and got it passed through the Senate appropriating $300 for expenses of a visit to Nebraska of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. After the visit hearings were held on Senator NORRIS' bill providing for irrigation in Nebraska. Many of you here probably remember the testimony of Mr. McConaughy and Mr. Kingsley, as well as that of Senator NORRIS, back in 1925. Senator NORRIS' bill proposed to have the Treasury lend some $40,000,000 for the purpose of building reservoirs and canals necessary for this irrigation. His bill was passed by the Senate, but the cooperation which he received from the House of Representatives was insufficient to get the bill passed there.

The plan at that time, as many of you know, was to build the Plum Creek Reservoirs and irrigate from them, as well as directly from the Platte River at flood stages. The hold-up came when it was found that the reservoirs would produce power, and here the liberalism of Senator NORRIS was once more put to the test. There is little doubt that he could have got the passage of the bill by the House if he had been willing to do away with the power aspects of the project or to turn over the power practically free to the private power companies. In other words, if he had been willing to deprive the people of Nebraska of the power which the water generated, the Electric Trust, as he called it in those days, would have allowed the people the privilege of irrigating their own farms; but Senator NORRIS would not make such a compromise at the people's expense.

As the fight developed, the opposition of the private power companies became more serious; their attack came from many parts and in many guises. Even local railroads, which stood to benefit by the prospering agriculture the project would develop, were forced to reflect the opposition of the eastern money interests that controlled both them and the power companies.

It was not until President Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected that this great irrigation project could go forward. And it was not too soon. Crop failures were becoming more frequent, landowners were losing their homes, and it was more and more difficult to hold young people on the farm. In 1933 your State legislature passed Senate File 310, permitting the establishment of irrigation and power districts, and Congress created the Public Works Administration to give Federal aid to power and irrigation, and other permanent and useful projects. Many districts were organized, and most of them applied immediately to Washington for financial assistance.

As you will probably remember, Senator NORRIS urged from the beginning that applications from the two chief districts taking water from the Platte River should be considered together. In the rush of the early days this did not seem feasible; but I think

there are few now who do not realize that Senator NORRIS' suggestions were wise, and if they had been followed would have avoided many difficulties. As it was, the projects which were not opposed by the power companies were the first to get allotments, and it was only after the expenditure of much time and energy on the part of the friends of Tri-County that an allotment was finally made in 1935.

With the approval of Tri-County's application, and the growing realization both here and in Washington that the several districts should be treated as aspects of the same problem of water conservation, steps were taken for a cooperative and unified plan. Immediately the power companies went into the courts and attempted to enjoin such a plan. You are familiar with the long, hard fight; the delays and costs resulting from the court fight; but in the end the people's right to borrow money from their Government and to build for their own protection was upheld.

Now the projects are operating on a cooperative and unified basis, in harmony and understanding, with the common objective of conservation and greatest utilization of water and power. The unified projects extend from the upper reaches of McConaughy Lake, some 25 miles west of here, to Omaha, with thousands of miles of canals and laterals networking central Nebraska, and with thousands of miles of electric transmission and distribution lines forming a grid system over two-thirds of the State. The acquisition by the districts of practically all of the private power companies in the State has created the largest locally owned public power system in the United States. The control by the people of this potential source of wealth will bring for the future increased irrigation, better living conditions, and more jobs to the people of this State to an extent beyond comprehension. But along with these irrigation needs, these better living conditions, and these additional jobs, the project helps to fulfill at this time one of the Nation's most vital needs.

Kingsley Dam and the great power and irrigation system which it completes assumes new significance in the light of our present national-defense efforts. Defense activities are making heavy and increasing demands on our power supply. Recently the Federal Power Commission reported that power demands largely exceeded anticipated loads in nine important war-materials areas. National consumption of electricity continues to mount.

In the face of climbing demands, new Federal and non-Federal projects of the last few years are making their contributions to the power supply. Additional projects are being pushed into production far ahead of schedule. Construction of uncompleted projects has been speeded.

Many of these great power projects encountered the bitterest criticism and opposition when they were launched a few short years ago. Power projects were condemned by self-appointed critics often on the grounds that their production was not needed. The Nebraska projects became to one national magazine, for example, "P. W. A.'s problem children."

Now these same projects are demonstrating that their power output is needed. They are demonstrating that they could dispose of even greater amounts of power than they are able to produce. Over the country major electric projects, financed in whole or in part by the Public Works Administration, are playing an important role in the national-defense program. They are supplying hundreds of millions of kilowatt-hours of electric energy in various localities in which power shortages have become apparent.

We can rejoice that all of these millions of acre-feet of water, which in the past have flowed unused through the State, may now be used to increase and stabilize crop production and to produce power. Both the people of Nebraska and of the Nation have here today a double cause for rejoicing. We can rejoice in a great work well done, and we can rejoice in the completion of a true example of democracy at work, for this project represents the culmination of free, cooperative effort. It represents an engineering achievement constructed and operated in a way that only a free people could follow.

In the United States we have been conducting an experiment in democracy for more than 150 years—endeavoring to develop it so as to safeguard individual freedom and promote the common welfare. On the continent of Europe, 24 out of 27 nations have succumbed to dictators, from within or without, and only 3 small democracies manage to retain a precarious independence Fortunately, we are accustomed to social change by evolution rather than revolution; by voluntary cooperation rather than arbitrary force.

We must be constantly on the alert, however, for the welfare of the masses if our civil liberties, which we hold so dear, are to be preserved. We must realize that people will not long endure poverty in the midst of plenty; that they will not endure the failure to distribute justly the comforts and benefits of modern improvements in living, nor the continued denial of opportunity and an absolute lack of security In such circumstances, people may sacrifice freedom for the false promises of security.

It is human for each of us to prefer to go his accustomed way of life and give little thought to the difficulties and burdens of his fellow men. But the common good is our individual good, and from a purely selfish standpoint must be put first, if democracy is to be preserved. Our forefathers, who set up free institutions on this continent succeeded in founding and developing a great Nation because they sacrificed their individual interests to the common welfare.

And so this great Kingsley Dam and McConaughy Lake are a symbol of a free people. They represent the keystone to the whole irrigation and power program. Built through the joint efforts of local districts and the Federal Government, these projects are controlled and administered by duly elected representatives of the local people and will conserve natural resources not for a privileged few, but for the general public.

When Mr. Carmody visited these projects nearly 2 years ago, and spoke in Hastings, he said, and I quote:

"It is not enough to consider these projects as providers of water, or even as providers of power. They should be considered as a basis for a better life for the people of Nebraska. They should be a means whereby you extend progressive and humane principles. Not only should they provide for the conservation of water to add to the farmers' wealth, but the power they produce should be made available to the maximum number of people in your State. It should be made available to them at prices they can afford to pay, and it should be their insurance against private monopoly and private greed. Moreover, the Nebraska projects should set a standard of public administration that will itself be a yardstick for administrative policy, efficient public operation, proper relations with employees and recognition of their right to bargain collectively and to deal with management."

I know that you have heeded and will continue to heed Mr. Carmody's advice and in the spirit of Senator NORRIS, make these projects represent the continued progressive extension of democratic principles. In that belief and on behalf of the United States through the Public Works Administration, I present our part in this great development to you.

West Point's Visiting Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 11, 1941

LETTER FROM MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. RIVERS, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by William C. Rivers, formerly major general of the United States Army. The letter is about the administration of West Point. While it is critical, it is constructive criticism, as is proved by a portion of a letter which General Rivers sent me, wherein he says:

The Civil War was West Point's great task. About 100,000 officers, most of them from civil life, saw active service in both the Union and Confederate Armies. About 1,000 of the 1,250 West Point graduates who were living in 1861 were officers in the two Armies. During the 4-year conflict 445 graduates of West Point became general officers in both the Union and Confederate Armies. At the close of the war all the armies in the field on both sides, nearly all the corps, and a majority of the divisions were commanded by West Point graduates.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 6, 1941]

WEST POINT'S VISITING BOARD—ANNAPOLIS PROCEDURE IS ADVOCATED FOR THE MILITARY ACADEMY

Maj. Gen. R. L. Eichelberger, Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, explains in his letter in your columns why a recent visitor saw the cadets at West Point being instructed only in close-order drill. The Superintendent states that the cadets were members of the large new fourth class, admitted on July 1.

General Eichelberger explains that the older cadets were engaged in firing all types of antiaircraft weapons and long-range seacoast guns at Fort Hancock, N. J. Other cadets were at Tobyhanna, Pa., engaged in practice fire with different types of mobile guns, and the older cadets have had flying training this summer at Langley Field, as well as some instruction work at Fort Benning, Ga., in advanced field work, including tank demonstrations.

West Point graduates appreciate the marked advance in the academic work at the Military Academy. They are confident that the present authorities appreciate the necessity for types of training which will develop young officers for our Army, with the highest qualities of personal initiative and resourcefulness demanded by new methods of warfare.

Many West Pointers would like to see their alma mater adopt a feature which the Naval Academy uses and which would add nothing to the expense of the Military Academy. The Board of Visitors which makes the annual inspection of the Naval Academy is composed

of six distinguished educators and seven members of the Naval Committees of the Senate and House at Washington. The West Point Board of Visitors contains no civilian educators. It is composed of 12 members of the Senate and House Military Committees.

On the list of the members of recent Boards of Visitors to Annapolis are found the names of the following presidents of universities and colleges: Dr. H. N. Davis, Stevens Institute of Technology; Dr. Edmund E. Day, Cornell University; the Reverend Dr. John F. O'Hara, Notre Dame; Dr. Angell, Yale; Dr. Dodds, Princeton; Dr. Sproul, University of California; and many others. The inspection of the Naval Academy is always made by a quorum of the Board of Visitors, who spend several days at the task. The printed report of these inspections evokes much comment in the press of the country.

For some years no quorum of the West Point Board of Visitors has inspected the Military Academy. The press reported only three members as having visited West Point during a recent year, and only for a single day. Even if a report of a thorough inspection of the Military Academy contained no suggestions for changes in the methods of elementary training and discipline, or for alterations in the curriculum, or concerning changes as to the buildings and grounds, there would be great value in such a report. The Members of Congress and the country at large would know that the school had been inspected by experts in education from other colleges.

WILLIAM C. RIVERS,
Major General,
United States Army, Retired.
NEW YORK, *August 5, 1941.*

Air-Mail Pick-Up Service Becomes Self-Supporting—Remarkable Results Achieved During First Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1941

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the first year of the air-mail pick-up service. During this period the system has reached a basis where it can be considered self-supporting insofar as its direct cost to the Federal Government is involved.

SERVICE PERFORMED WITH PLANE IN FLIGHT

This novel air mail and air express makes pick-ups and deliveries with the plane in flight. It was given a year's trial on an experimental basis by the Post Office Department prior to the establishment of regular service on August 12, 1940. There are 33 communities in West Virginia which are served on the 5 routes, which include 109 communities in Pennsylvania, Ohio, New York, Kentucky, and Delaware.

Much of the experimental work was carried on in the congressional district which I represent. It is my belief that within the next 5 years, barring war developments, 2,500 American communities will receive this service. It is my information that more than 1,600 cities and towns are now asking for the advantages of this system.

At the conclusion of these remarks I have included a table which discloses the volume of air mail originating by communities on the lines, excluding the terminal cities of Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Harrisburg, but including the air mail that is dispatched from these terminal points by air pick-up exclusively. Sufficient postal revenue is produced to defray the out-of-the-pocket cost of the service to the Government.

The air pick-up service is completing tomorrow its first year of operation on a permanent basis as a regular part of the country's domestic air transportation system. In this time remarkable results have been achieved both in performance and in developing the air-mail patronage in the communities served.

SYSTEM COMPLETES 92 PERCENT OF SCHEDULES

During this first year the system has completed over 92 percent of its daily schedules, flying approximately 693,727 miles and making over 32,000 pick-ups and deliveries without losing a single piece of mail or express and without a serious flying mishap.

Considering that the air pick-up routes run for the most part through a section of the country where it is admitted some of the most difficult flying conditions are encountered, and that the operation requires contact flying where the pilot must see the ground at all times this performance record compares favorably with the transport lines which can go over the top in bad weather.

It is an outstanding accomplishment and duplicates the performance made by the air pick-up service in the same region during the year's experiment by the Post Office Department, a record that was subsequently cited by the Postmaster General as one of the most notable achievements in modern air transportation. The service continues to deserve this commendation.

Of equal importance and significance is the surprisingly large increase in air-mail volume in the communities on the air pick-up routes, which can be attributed directly to the establishment of the service. A check was made recently to determine this increase. It was disclosed that since permanent establishment of the service the air-mail volume has increased over 47 percent at the 53 points which were on the experimental air pick-up routes, and 93 percent at the 53 additional points on the present pick-up lines. Individual increases have ranged from 2 to over 1,000 percent.

It was further disclosed that, excluding the 3 terminal points of Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Harrisburg, the 106 cities and towns on the air pick-up lines, which, incidentally, serve more points than any other air line in the country, are dispatching an average of 254,223 pieces of air mail a month. The 3 terminal points are dispatching an average of 161,021 pieces of air mail a month via the air pick-up, making a grand total of 415,244 pieces.

In the annual report of the Postmaster General for 1940, the Cost Ascertainment Division of the Post Office Department estimates that each piece of air mail yields an average revenue of $0.0737. Computed at this figure, the air mail originating at the points on the air pick-up lines combined with the terminal dispatch by air pick-up, is producing at the present time postal revenues averaging $30,603.48 a month.

NO RATE YET FIXED FOR ALL AMERICAN

The Civil Aeronautics Board has not yet fixed the rate of mail compensation for All American Aviation, Inc., the carrier operating the pick-up routes, but this sum is adequate to cover what estimates of the out-of-the-pocket costs to the Government that have been submitted to Congress or that I have seen and still leave a fair margin for error in the calculation of the postal revenue. The estimates of the cost of the service appear to vary between 39 cents and 43 cents per mile. At the lowest figure, the monthly cost of the service to the Government, based on the completion by the carrier of 92 percent of schedules, would be $25,006.02, and at the highest figure the cost would be $27,570.74. On their face, these estimates approximate the rates now in effect on some trunk lines, which may be difficult to reconcile in a comparison of the two operations. The appearance is wholly illusory because the air pick-up estimates include an allowance for the transportation of the air mail between the local post office and the air field, an expense that ordinarily is borne by the Post Office Department. This item amounts to a little over 5 cents a mile.

The term out-of-the-pocket cost to the Government means what is paid by the Post Office Department to an air line for the transportation of the mail. In the case of the air pick-up service, this amount, whatever it may be, will represent practically the entire cost to the Government of maintaining the service, whereas in the case of the transport lines many indirect items also must be computed such as the cost of installing and maintaining the airways and the other elaborate facilities that have been established by the Government in fostering the development of air transportation. The cost of these far exceeds the payments made to the air lines by the Post Office Department.

While the air pick-up system utilizes these facilities, it is largely because they are available. Undoubtedly the service could be operated successfully if they did not exist at all. As far as I have been able to learn, the only expenditure made by the Government for airway aids for the air pick-up service has been for the establishment of two weather stations, which has involved only a very small expense. No town has had to build an airport in order to get the service, because the air pick-up does not need an airport for its operation.

NIGHT FLYING CERTAIN TO COME

Because the air pick-up routes operate during daylight hours and afternoon flights must be scheduled too early at many communities to collect their entire air-mail dispatch, the service obviously is not carrying all of the air mail these communities are generating. However,

this situation will be corrected when schedules are readjusted, extra operations added and night flying put into effect. It has been demonstrated that night operation of the air pick-up is both feasible and practical and All American is now developing equipment which will make such schedules possible in the future.

This pioneer enterprise builds aviation at the base and extends its useful services manyfold. When the defense effort is over, the release of the great productive plants, ground facilities, and thousands of trained men now being mobilized will give an impetus to all forms of flying so that the aviation industry of tomorrow will dwarf that of today.

In that closely woven development, the small plane and the pick-up device have a definite part by giving the benefits of aviation not only to the large cities but covering the entire Nation. Meanwhile, the rapid extension of flying facilities, for which the new pick-up service gives every community an incentive, can contribute greatly to our defense effort.

Increase in air-mail dispatch from cities and towns on air pick-up routes in first year of operation of service on permanent basis, 1940–41

Place	Population	Average number of pieces of air mail dispatched monthly prior to establishment of permanent air pick-up service	Average number of pieces of air mail dispatched monthly at present time	Percentage of increase in average monthly dispatch
Altoona, Pa.[1]	80,071	3,341	4,463	33.6
Ashland, Ky.	29,526	1,301	3,188	145
Be'ington, W. Va.	1,500	26	306	1,077
Bellefonte, Pa.	4,804	281	638	127
Blairsville, Pa.[1]	5,296	180	180	
Brack..ridge, Pa.[1]	6,250	536	893	67
Bridgeport, W. Va.	2,000	51	128	151
Buckhannon, W.Va.	4,374	383	1,363	259
Butler, Pa.[1]	24,448	2,729	3,315	21
Canonsburg, Pa.	12,501	714	1,530	114
Chambersburg, Pa.[1]	15,003	1,735	2,550	47
Charleston, W. Va.[1]	67,282	9,996	10,200	2
Chester, Pa.	59,278	4,029	4,437	10
Clarksburg, W. Va.[1]	30,453	3,341	3,698	11
Claymont, Del.	3,800	230	638	177
Clearfield, Pa.[1]	9,221	688	1,658	141
Coatesville, Pa.[1]	13,989	788	1,020	30
Columbia, Pa.[1]	11,544	306	382	25
Connellsville, Pa.[1]	13,532	1,250	1,530	22
Corry, Pa.[1]	7,152	1,403	1,530	9
DuBois, Pa.[1]	12,059	587	2,678	356
Dunbar, Pa.	1,300	153	204	33
Dunbar, W. Va.[1]	4,189	102	408	300
Duncansville, Pa.	1,000	51	153	200
Elkins, W. Va.	7,345	1,377	4,718	243
Fairmont, W. Va.[1]	23,035	1,477	7,650	418
Franklin, Pa.[1]	10,254	2,265	3,978	76
Gallipolis, Ohio[1]	7,106	485	944	95
Gettysburg, Pa.[1]	5,584	789	1,301	65
Glendale, W. Va.	1,000	51	128	151
Glenville, W. Va.[1]	588	204	791	288
Grafton, W. Va.[1]	7,737	612	1,148	88
Grantsville, W. Va.[1]	1,000	128	638	398
Greensburg, Pa.[1]	16,679	2,602	4,055	56
Greenup, Ky.	1,100	26	255	881
Grove City, Pa.[1]	6,156	1,097	1,479	35
Hanover, Pa.[1]	13,390	1,072	2,233	108
†Harrisburg, Pa.				
Hollidaysburg, Pa.	5,960	459	561	22
Hollidays Cove, W. Va.	4,480	281	638	127
Huntingdon, Pa.[1]	7,558	612	689	13
Huntington, W.Va.[1]	78,781	9,600	11,760	23
Hurricane, W. Va.[1]	1,300	51	306	500
Indiana, Pa.	10,036	561	2,372	323
Ironton, Ohio	15,840	969	1,913	97
Irwin, Pa.[1]	3,443	612	1,148	86
Jackson, Ohio	5,922	358	1,046	192
Jamestown, N. Y.	42,502	4,080	10,328	153
Jeannette, Pa.[1]	16,313	1,454	1,928	33
Jersey Shore, Pa.	5,781	230	459	100
Johnstown, Pa.	66,610	2,341	5,100	53
Lancaster, Pa.[1]	61,284	9,664	10,940	13
Latrobe, Pa.[1]	11,086	791	1,428	81
Leechburg, Pa.	4,489	306	510	67
Lock Haven, Pa.	10,799	587	1,734	195
Marcus Hook, Pa.	4,867	1,352	1,709	26
Marietta, Ohio[1]	14,514	1,863	2,293	32
Martins Ferry, Ohio	14,366	459	1,403	206
Masontown, Pa.	3,873	178	1,275	616
Milton, W. Va.[1]	1,300	128	306	139
Montoursville, Pa.	2,710	255	383	50
Morgantown, W. Va.[1]	16,656	2,625	4,743	81
Moundsville, W Va.	14,162	408	969	138
Mount Pleasant, Pa.[1]	5,869	383	612	60
Mount Union, Pa.[1]	4,892	228	434	90
Natrona, Pa.[1]	7,000	969	1,403	45
New Kensington, Pa.[1]	23,984	2,807	4,718	68
New Martinsville, W. Va.	2,814	179	842	370
Nitro, W. Va.[1]	3,000	102	638	525
Oil City, Pa.[1]	20,251	2,293	4,080	78
Parkersburg, W.Va.[1]	30,088	3,137	4,998	59
Philadelphia, Pa.[2]				
Philipsburg, Pa.	3,600	306	1,020	233
Philippi, W. Va.[1]	1,700	561	842	50
Pitcairn, Pa.	6,317	306	510	67
Pittsburgh, Pa.[2]				
Point Pleasant, W. Va.[1]	3,301	179	612	242
Pomeroy, Ohio[1]	3,563	204	638	213
Portage, Pa.[2]	4,432	357	357	
Portsmouth, Ohio	40,474	3,186	6,095	92
Punxsutawney, Pa.	9,266	460	1,454	216
Ravenswood, W.Va.	1,200	128	485	279
St. Albans, W. Va.	3,254	583	833	43
St. Marys, W. Va.[1]	2,100	305	434	42
Scottdale, Pa.	6,714	275	714	160
Sistersville, W. Va.	3,072	204	893	338
Slipperyrock, W.Va.	1,100	100	100	
South Charleston, W. Va.	10,324	255	561	120
Spencer, W. Va.[1]	2,400	306	893	192
State College, Pa.	4,450	1,454	2,168	49
Steubenville, Ohio	35,422	3,009	4,743	58
Tarentum, Pa.[1]	9,551	765	1,020	33
Titusville, Pa.[1]	8,055	689	1,556	126
Uniontown, Pa.[1]	21,794	3,341	4,182	25
Vandergrift, Pa.	10,699	434	1,046	141
Warren, Pa.[1]	14,863	2,166	3,570	65
Washington, Pa.	26,078	2,346	4,182	78
Weirton, W. Va.	13,291	500	1,250	150
Wellsburg, W. Va.	6,398	357	765	114
Wellston, Ohio	5,319	153	893	484
West Chester, Pa.[1]	13,187	1,630	2,290	40
West Newton, Pa.	2,953	128	306	139
Weston, W. Va.[1]	8,646	536	1,275	138
Wheeling, W. Va.	61,007	6,375	7,013	11
Williamsburg, Pa.[2]	1,898	50	50	
Williamsport, Pa.	44,262	3,749	10,200	172
Wilmington, Del.[1]	112,504	17,060	21,178	24
York, Pa.[1]	56,666	6,884	9,945	44
Youngsville, Pa.[2]	1,907	75	75	
	[4] 1,605,852	[5] 157,124	[6] 254,223	62

Increase in air-mail dispatch from cities and towns on air pick-up routes in first year of operation of service on permanent basis, 1940–41—Continued

[1] Points on experimental air mail pick-up routes between May 12, 1939, and May 14, 1940.

[2] Service inaugurated July 1941. Present air-mail volume estimated.

[3] Terminal points.

[4] Excludes terminal cities of Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Harrisburg.

[5] Computed on basis of official annual count made by Post Office Department from Feb. 11 to 17, 1940. Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Harrisburg excluded.

[6] Computed from figures furnished by local postmasters, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Harrisburg excluded.

Average monthly air-mail dispatch from terminal points via air pick-up: Pittsburgh, 121,410 pieces; Philadelphia, 38,410 pieces; Harrisburg, 1,201 pieces.

Dedication of Kingsley Dam, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 11, 1941

ADDRESS BY J. E. LAWRENCE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. J. E. Lawrence at the dedication of the Kingsley Dam, in Nebraska, on July 22, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPLEMENTS OF PEACE

You see here in front of your eyes the implements of peace.

They include a huge earthen dam upon the river—a dam into which millions of cubic feet of earth, concrete, and steel have been poured through the ceaseless labors of men for months and months; a forming, man-made lake behind that dam; the giant turbines of electrical plants generating the electricity to light the countryside and the towns and cities of the State, and to supply the energy to drive the machines of its factories; and, along the distant horizons, the network of canals and laterals to place water, sweet water, upon growing fields.

You, whose sane vision has been revealed so magnificently, along the distant horizons of those years ahead see more than this.

You see green fields of corn tossing their defiant tassels to the sun, and in the fall, with its first chill, rewarding the industrious farmer with heaping bushels of grain. You see thick, tall, fragrant, dark-green fields of alfalfa, sugar beets, potatoes, beans, and small grains nourished to health and maturity by the waters behind this dam. You see all of this, and more, too. You see the herds feeding peacefully upon the hills and the valleys—the herds of cattle, flocks of sheep, and thousands of pigs and fat hogs.

You see men planting the fields, cultivating the fields, and harvesting the fields—confident and serene in the knowledge that when the heat of summer comes that old tragedy of drought, which has been the familiar story of the truly heroic struggle of farm folks in sections of the plains area, will be rewritten to announce the triumph of men's vision and men's labors over disappointment and adversity.

These are the implements of peace.

This is the way of life, the American way of life of a peaceful people, who do not aspire to conquest, plot, or scheme to seize that which belongs to others, and who ask nothing more than to be permitted to till the soil, to go about the tasks of the husbandmen, and live in understanding with his neighbors, near and far, and to be permitted to build a home for himself and his family where he and they may dwell in contentment, and security.

That is not an unreasonable human aspiration.

It is so everlastingly decent and proper.

Men and women have struggled to achieve it since the beginning.

Out here in Nebraska, where people are young, where habits of life are simple, where

there is still in abundant measure the character and the ideals which are prized, the desire to live in pastoral simplicity and rugged strength, remains unmarked.

And when have the pulses, the heart, and the mind of people in calm, thoughtful contemplation failed to respond to that ageless story of men and women who till the soil, live upon the soil, and in the same measure as the corn of the fields receive strength and life from the soil?

These are the implements of peace, the symbols of peace, the honest thoughts of a peaceful people, the fruits of the planning and the labors of a peaceful people, the physical evidence that there remains in this world those who prefer to build rather than to destroy, to add to the fruitfulness of earth in preference to spreading upon it waste and desolution, hunger and death.

We prize our liberties.

We glory in the privilege which permits us to think what we please, to gather when and where we choose, say what we want to say, and worship without restraint according to the dictates of our conscience. We derive comfort from those delicate judicial safeguards so wisely constructed to protect the individual from the tyranry of a government. We will fight, if fight we must, to protect those liberties which inseparably are a part of American life, to defend American soil against any and all threats directed to it, and, finally, to turn back any challenge to the standards and ideals of the American people. As a young nation, a strong nation, where the blood of its men and women courses through veins without fear, and with clear conscience, we are now preparing to defend ourselves against any and all perils which may arise.

But we prefer peace.

We prefer to think, to plan, and to labor to produce precisely what you see here. We prefer to spend our strength, and our wealth, and our thought that not only we ourselves, that our children, and their children, may live in the hope and the faith which has been the foundation of the American people.

It is impossible under these circumstances to ignore the humble beginning of Kingsley Dam.

It could be desired, and desired so greatly, that some of those, all those who dared to hope, and to dream—they belong to that blessed group of dreamers whose magnificent mind castles take form and reality in solid masonry, earthen mountains, and blue waters—might be here now. They would enjoy it, not in the sense of personal self-gratification but because their spirit was hewed out of that intangible substance which gives to man the impulse to build. This dam is the ultimate triumph of 28 years of planning, labor, and struggle, of persistent hope against seemingly continuous disappointment, of the unshatterable qualities of persistence, determination, and resolution in the achievement of a sane, practical, splendid vision.

I refer, of course, to your pioneers.

I refer not only to the leaders but in equal voice to those who followed them. I refer to the intelligence of a region which recognized in an inspired leadership the elements of an undertaking of such vast proportions as to arouse the derision of some. But I cannot at this time neglect to pay tribute to such men as George Kingsley, W. C. McConaughy, J. S. Canaday, William Dutton, George Holdrege, and A. L. Clark. They were the friends and the neighbors of some of you. They walked among you, mingled with you, and talked with you. You knew them. You, better than anybody else, know how tenacicusly they held to their hope that some day in a future—a strong and certain future—fields which under a hot sun so frequently turned sear and brown and withered for lack of moisture, ultimately would remain green and productive through the help of the waters of a river flowing past your doors day and night.

They would enjoy being here today.

In the confirmation of their judgment, in the realization of their hopes, in the vindication of their faith, they would ask nothing more than to stand here at this dam and to look out upon the surface of the waters back of us, knowing that its stored waters not only would add infinitely to the productiveness of Nebraska but at the same time, through all the seasons of the year, it would bring light to the farm home, a new freedom to the farm wife, and a new, modernized, resourceful rural life to the American people. They would know that from the hours of that August day in 1913, when gathering informally, the crude foundations were laid for a 28-year struggle; a battle which for them never was to end during their lifetime so decent was their cause, so good their struggle, so honorable their fight, that in the end truth had its triumph and the people of this region, together with the people of Nebraska, their victory.

They were an unusual group. One a banker, one a farmer, one an elevator operator, one a jobber and retailer, one of diversified business interests, and one occupied an important and a most responsible post in the affairs of a great railroad. Each one in his own way left the mark of his character upon the thought of this State. They were men of conviction, but of common agreement and common purpose in the upbuilding of Nebraska.

We pay tribute to them gratefully and reverently, and we know that each here now, after 28 years of struggle, happily would say it's work well done.

It is impossible to view this dam, to view this lake, to look at these power plants, or to inspect the far-flung canals and laterals through which water will be placed upon Nebraska farms without thinking of another, or two others. You may be interested in the first day's impression of Nebraska's public works advisory board. While Mr. Dan Stephens, Mr. John Latenser, and your speaker sleepily climbed out of the car on the siding at Elwood for a day's ride by automobile through the tricounty area, it was the chill in the air of an October day which wiped the sleep from their eyes. Perhaps it was well. For after many hours, hours which included Plum Creek, a view of the Platte from the bluffs at Lexington, miles of riding over level stretches of country, magnificent farm land, where in the early days the fields of small grains and corn pushed skyward, that in the late mellow afternoon's warmth, Mr. Stephens leaned forward in the car to say huskily, almost in a whisper, to his companions:

"This is a great vision. Some day this land will bloom, these farm homes again will revel in new dresses of paint, the bins and cribs again will be filled with corn, and the pens and the yards again will be filled with chickens, hogs, and cattle. God intended this country to be peopled with families protected against adversities."

Mr. Stephens offered this benediction to this dam, this lake, these power plants, and these irrigation works, which then were forming and were to emerge from the planning of your pioneers and your people. I wish he were here today. I wish that voice which you came to know, and which you admire and respect, could be heard in grateful acknowledgment of the fulfilled hopes of Nebraska.

That's a salty, homely, old adage that the proof of the pudding is in its eating. By that standard this dam, its lake, and all of the labors back of it, already have been vindicated. You know of one single instance a year ago where water was placed upon parched and thirsty soil, a crop of corn was planted and harvested, and without water this spring that field planted to barley produced more than double the number of bushels to the acre that nearby lands yield. You know of a second instance where under similar circumstances, after irrigation a year ago, a second field demonstrated in simple, convincing fashion what water means to soil.

There is no ordinary ceremony and no ordinary development.

Not even those of the strongest imagination, or the most rugged faith in the righteousness of this development, can foresee all of its benefits or its full influence upon Nebraska thought and Nebraska progress, in the next 50 years.

Among those who came from Washington, among the skilled technicians, the trained engineers, was one who until that initial trip into this area, never had gotten his fingernails full of black dirt, believe it or not. He asked that the car be stopped. He got out, walked to the neighboring fence, and scooped a handful of it. His interest, and his absorbed attention was the most impressive tribute that I have ever seen paid to black dirt. Where he came from it was sand, and rock, and jack pine, and in the distant land where as an engineer he worked it was dry and forbidding desert, where once a decent civilization had flourished with ancient cities of gayety and color but now buried under the dust.

Then it was that he said that in their thoughtlessness nations and peoples wrote the death sentence to their own culture and civilization, to their own proud cities, to their own flourishing works, through their indifference to the conservation of those gifts which God placed in their hands. They were the same ambitious, the same industrious, and the same eager people the Americans were in the beginning, and now are. They had the same hope. They believed that their own paradise, with its abundance, provided them with the guaranty of perpetuity. Then, centuries later, they disappeared completely, or, escaping that fate, continued on and on under increasing oppression of poverty and hopelessness.

We would like to think it will be different here. We would like to believe that where there is the industry and the will to establish the finest democracy man has produced, there also is the foresight, the energy, and the unselfishness to perpetuate—to perpetuate it, not only in its spiritual fountains but to perpetuate it with material tools, through which can be fashioned standards of living for men, women, and children, which each day of the year will give to these fine definitions of freedom the hourly application of physical necessities and comforts in the American fireside.

This is what Kingsley Dam means. This is what the storage of water means—the storage of water in spring, fall, and winter, and those seasons where the river, unharnessed, rolls to the sea to discharge its contents into the Gulf of Mexico. This is what the water which fills the lakes, which fills the canals, which fills the laterals, and which flows out upon the fields means. This is what the electricity generated by the turbines, transmitted by the network of wires, carried to the farms and to the towns and the cities, the cheap electricity with which the streams, properly harnessed, means.

This, Kingsley Dam, its lake, its irrigation system, its power plants, through all the years ahead, will accomplish.

Surely, no one in Nebraska will close their eyes to the significance of the electrification of the farm homes of this State. The pioneer mother faced her task unflinchingly in noble spirit. She cooked the food, mended and made the clothes, looked after the youngsters, was the ministering angel in sickness, separated the cream, churned the butter, fed the harvest crews, and frequently went into the fields to garner the grain. She had a thousand industrious hands to perform an

incredible amount of labor. And, how she would rejoice in the knowledge that her daughter, and her granddaughters will have electric lights, ultimately, if not now, modern refrigeration, and all of the modern electrical appliances to emancipate her from the grinding toil which shortened her own life.

In those friendly, cheering, twinkling lights of the Nebraska countryside 25 years ahead, when, it is to be hoped, peace will have come to the world, when in the gathering dusk of the evening the family gathers around the table, it will be a new and a better farm life to add its contributions to well-being and happiness.

Here in this dam and in these waters is cheap electricity for the homes and the businesses of the cities. There, miles away from the Platte, where will be the reminder that because men had a dream, and believed in it and worked years to make it come true, darkness is banished.

Here in this dam and in these waters is a strong foundation for future Nebraska industry. No State in the Union possessed a people more eager to work, more endowed with habits of industry, and more naturally adapted to the requirements of machine operation. No State provides a more inviting field in so many particulars, and now with the ingredient of cheap power to drive the machines, it is becoming to industry to come here and to establish itself.

If the most practical application and the most useful service is to be made of this, about which men dreamed then every effort must be made to put it to useful work. Their vision will be justified and enlarged only to the degree which we ourselves see clearly and labor energetically. The opportunities are great; it is up to us what shall be made of them.

That is Nebraska's responsibility.

It does not stop. It goes on year after year, adding to the irrigated acres, to the output of the farm, to the improved crops, to their diversification, to the restoration of the soil, to the rebuilding of the water levels; to the ultimate hope that each day of the year shall send a stable stream of water past the towns and farms along the Platte; to more cattle, sheep, and hogs upon the hills, the farms, and the feed lots, to the beneficial use of electricity; and to the ultimate development of a flourishing industry, working shoulder to shoulder with a stable agriculture.

Nebraska does not belong to the past. It is not dedicated to doubts, fears, and inaction. It was established to grow, and it will only grow because men plan, both selfishly and unselfishly; men continue to see what they can do to better themselves, just as those that are responsible for this dam and this lake and all of its works were able to see. There must be no retreat in this State; there must be faith, hope, clear planning, courage, and labor.

That is present-day responsibility.

The tools with which we work are the tools put into our hands, applied intelligently by us, and improved in their use by us. They are simple tools. They are Nebraska's basic and sole resources. They are soil and water and sun. It must be remembered soil, exploited relentlessly, wears out; and water, equally commonplace, in the thoughts of those so pitifully dependent upon it, can be exhausted.

It was a wisdom of the pioneers; a wisdom comparable only to the legendary wisdom of Solomon of old, which recognized this simple, yet vital, fact. In all of their wisdom, some of the ancient and some of the old nations and peoples of the earth, peering into the future, were blind to the facts at their elbow.

We must not and shall not fail.

We could hope for nothing more, ask for nothing more, and seek nothing more than that there shall come to the people of Nebraska a full appreciation of a new state, now dimly taking form of stronger, more stable, and more beautiful homes and businesses.

There is one man, I am sure, who has seen all of this so clearly, and who has fought with the strength of a giant that it might come to pass. He is, as some of his Senate colleagues said only recently, and so fittingly, so genuinely American. In a long and in a distinguished career it is a matter of some interest that he never has surrendered his faith. He has been in many battles, on many far-flung battle fronts in which many different forces were engaged, but in all of them never once did he fall out from the ranks to seek cover and safety for himself.

His fights—frequently misunderstood—as frequently misrepresented, and misinterpreted—have been decent fights. They have represented decent causes. They have embraced undertakings which had for their aims only improvement of conditions which existed. Without exception they were launched, and they were waged with but one single, shining goal in mind. They were the struggles, which in themselves, constitute the continuing struggle of democracy to improve the lives of the people who charter democratic government and who continued to preserve it against the storms.

And, that has been nearest, closest, dearest to the heart of this splendid warrior—so gentle and kindly, so tolerant where tolerance can be exercised, so charitable, and still so loyal to duty and to conscience. That Ohio farm, that hard boyhood was an excellent school. Out of its classroom came strong humanitarian impulses, high integrity, courage in bulk, quality, and devotion. Out of its classroom came a flame of faith in democratic government. Out of its classroom, strangely, came a freshness of view, a buoyancy of spirit, a youthfulness in the ready acceptance of the fact of the constant changes which take place in this world to provide his 80 years of activity with inexhaustible energy. Finally, out of that classroom came the never-flagging spirit of simple birth, and hard work, and infinite yearning to make the most of soil and earth and water.

I do not pretend to speak for him. Yet there is reason to believe that the labor of years in Washington which gives him the greatest comfort and happiness is the knowledge that here in Nebraska, his home, through his own great unflagging labors, year after year, there has taken form a vast, comprehensive program of the conservation of natural resources.

I hail him as the true champion of conservation in America. He has been its best friend, and its most eloquent and able advocate. His has been the patience and determination to carry on the fight where others fail of weakness.

Never in all of his planning has it been for himself. There in his office in Washington, glancing from out of the window, some of you know that he spoke sorrowfully when his thoughts turned to burning fields in a drought State. There in his office he reconstructed the Loup Valleys, the Platte Valley, and the Republican Valley—their rivers harnessed, their waters stored for useful purposes, their droughts softened in harshness, and their floods checked.

That was his future view of Nebraska, and it belongs to him—to GEORGE W. NORRIS, without whom this would not have been possible.

On this occasion I take advantage of the opportunity to say to the friends, the neighbors, and to the people of Nebraska that one of the glorious contributions Nebraska's senior Senator has made to American progress is his ceaseless battle for the conservation of a Nation's natural resources.

These waters of the lake, these waters of the canals and laterals, this great earthen dam, Kingsley Dam, McConaughy Lake, the Jeffry power plant, the Johnson power plant, every foot of them, reflect his image, symbolized his faith, and express his hopes that a State which commissions him to serve it, shall live better.

All honor and all credit to him.

Here in your presence gladly I join with you in dedicating Kingsley Dam. I dedicate it to the reverent memories of those who first dreamed of it. I dedicate it to their sons and daughters, to their friends and their neighbors who now are here. I dedicate it to those women who, as their wives, served with them. I dedicate it to a new Nebraska, strong in purpose, clear-eyed in vision, resolute in the decent aim to create here a continuing culture and civilization under which people may live forever and forever in peace, plenty, and happiness.

President Misinformed on Strategic Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1941

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Roads for the past 7 years, I have become quite familiar with the country's highway needs. In spite of the ever-increasing gas-tax revenues, by States as well as the Federal Government, proportionately less is spent for highway improvements and more and more is diverted for other purposes each year. The tendency of the Federal Government the last few years has been to reduce the amount of Federal aid to the States, in spite of the fact that traffic, especially heavy trucking, is increasing rapidly. Add to that the tremendous amount of military and other vehicles needed in our country's defense program, and it is not difficult to understand why large sums of money must be spent to keep at least the strategic highways passable. This was realized by the President more than a year ago, when he ordered the Bureau of Roads, together with the Army, to make a survey of much-needed improvements on highways designated by those agencies as important to national defense.

After nearly a year's study they made a report designating a total of about 78,000 miles as a strategic and necessary highway system. They found that approximately $500,000,000 would be required to place those roads in a fair condition for use of the Army equipment, as well as the ever-increasing movement of defense material. It would require the rebuilding or strengthening of 2,436 substandard bridges to permit the passage of even medium-sized Army tanks and other equipment, and it would necessitate the immediate widening or straightening of nearly 20,000 miles of road. The

committee held hearings almost daily for many weeks. Highway experts and officials from most States appeared before the committee and testified as to the needs in their respective States. The amount that would be needed to put the strategic network into condition, according to experts appearing from the States, amounted to approximately one and one-half billion dollars. That, of course, would require the matching of State and Federal money and several years to complete. But there is urgent need to strengthen or replace many bridges and remove certain other bottlenecks immediately in order to expedite troop movements and defense materials. In spite of the fact that the President's own committee, headed by Mr. McDonald, for many years the Chief of the Bureau of Roads, and the Army engineers reported that it would require nearly $500,000,000 the Committee on Roads brought in a bill recommending that $100,000,000 be appropriated for the strategic highway system. That was unanimously passed by the House, and the Senate increased this to $125,000,000, which was agreed to by the House membership.

The President objects to the method of apportionment provided in the bill. That $125,000,000 for strategic highways covering every State is apportioned exactly the same way as all Federal aid has been apportioned for many years. Some say that it is pork-barrel method. I resent that, as does every member of the committee. Without this apportionment it certainly would be "pork" for a few influential sections while others would not even get the smell of "pork." There has been altogether too much "pork" or favoritism in defense contracts; certain sections do not get any while other large industries are piling up contracts that cannot be completed for years to come.

The bill in section 3 provides $150,000,000 for so-called access roads. That amount is entirely free to be used wherever the Army with the consent of the President sees fit to use it, and if in their opinion the entire cost should be borne by the Government then the States need not match it. Another $25,000,000 was recommended to be appropriated to be turned over to the Army so that they can pay for repairing roads destroyed or severely damaged in maneuvers or other Army training work. I am of the opinion that the main reason why the President was advised to veto this bill was that the bill specifically provides that all the work is to be done under the direction and supervision of the regular State highway officials. Certain Washington officials want to get control of as much money as possible, and they do not like to have any State organization in a position to show them up as inefficient. Certainly our State and county highway officials, with their equipment and experience, are in a much better position to do this work than any Government agency that would otherwise be designated. The Army engineers stated that they would prefer to have the work done by the State and county highway organization, because their primary training was not building bridges or highways.

The reason why the veto was sustained by a very narrow margin is threefold. First, many leading Republicans realize that much more money than was provided in this bill will have to be spent. But since the President made a gesture of economy they voted to uphold him, knowing full well that he will have to come back and ask for an appropriation later on, unless he uses other defense funds not specifically authorized for that purpose. They believe they can embarrass the President later on. Then there are always a great many loyal Democrats that will uphold the President in anything he does or advocates. And the third group—which are a considerable number—are those who believe in pork-barrel methods, feeling that they have pull enough to get a larger portion if no definite allocation was made than they can under the apportionment method. I am satisfied that we will hear from the people when the Army traffic makes travel difficult, and I am certain that the Army itself will demand removal of bottlenecks on many strategic highways. The Committee on Roads did a fine job, and I am certain we will not yield now or in the future to abandon the present method of highway aid allocation. It is now free of politics and its consequent squandering of public money, and I am sure this committee will never yield to any pressure that would make this a political pie counter.

Retaining Selectees in Service—Soldier's Father Gives Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1941

LETTER FROM JOHN A. CHAMBLISS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter written by John A. Chambliss, of Chattanooga, to a leading isolationist Senator. Mr. Chambliss has two sons in the service. His reasons for wanting them to be properly trained are convincingly in favor of extending the time of service.

The letter follows:

JULY 25, 1941.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You will be interested in the attitude of a plain family that has said little about the war and the part the United States is to take. You are a graduate of the Law School of the University of Michigan, and I am. Furthermore, a son graduated there in 1938. I may also mention that during the last World War the local bar association adopted a resolution the sum and substance of which was that the United States Senate should expel Senator La Follette. His attitude about the war was disapproved. I alone spoke against the resolution and was one of three who voted against it.

For 3 years I went to Virginia Military Institute. My eldest son went to Virginia Military Institute for a short time. Neither of us showed any military ability. Both left with poor records. But both believe no one can be convinced of the worth of military discipline and be trained properly in a year. My second son, who graduated at Michigan, is now subject to military service. My third son has since October last been in the Canal Zone, but yesterday his mother heard that because of a serious physical ailment he is to be returned to the States. My fourth son was inducted a week ago today. He had been at Haverford College 2 years and at Vanderbilt Law School 1 year. His general attitude has been opposition to war. Wednesday he told us that our participation seemed so inevitable that he had enlisted in the Regular Army for 3 years. He feels that the present situation arises directly out of our sense of isolation.

My wife and I can understand the heart strain when a son leaves to go into the service. We all long for the end of world-wide aggression.

It seems that Congress is not opposed to the military program. True Congress does not openly and by act give support. This lack of plain words and speech creates uncertainty. The world order is not plain speech. But would a plain resolution in Congress condemning the proposals of General Marshall get much support? So we conclude that the representatives of the people are really behind the proposals. Further, they may be for active participation in the fighting when trained men are available.

And this reference to trained men brings me back to my purpose in writing. If our men in the service are not well trained and devoted to work that even they do not really wish to do, then they are all in danger. If they feel sorry for themselves they are handicapped. If they think a substantial minority lack respect for their commanders, it hurts them.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CHAMBLISS.

Freezing the Wheat Surplus—Conference Report on H. R. 5300

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the adoption of the conference report on H. R. 5300, which is an amendment to the Triple-A act and relates to wheat-marketing quotas. The conference yielded to Senate amendments, and its report is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 13, page 7084. This bill, when passed by the House, provided relief for the growers of wheat who had harvested light crops and had, unfortunately, sowed more acres than their allotment. It simply gave them the right to compute their actual production instead of their normal production. It weakened the Triple-A program only slightly and benefited those who were unfortunate in their production, by no fault

of their own. This was originally emergency legislation, now hastily transformed into permanent legislation without proper consideration. The bill went to the Senate after passing the House unanimously. The Senate loaded it with dynamite for the Agricultural Adjustment Act, known as the Triple-A program, evidently not understanding the full significance of their action. The bill was then sent to conference. The conferees' report is now to be considered by the House.

I urge all friends of the farmer, and of the Triple-A program to vote against the adoption of the conference report. If the bill is sent back to conference the conferees can then call before them those who are actually engaged in administering the Triple-A program, and they can then learn first hand the serious obstacles that the Senate amendments put in the way of the enforcement of the act.

These Senate amendments jeopardize the whole Triple-A program because they attempt to substitute hasty and binding legislation for wise administration which may be adjusted to rapidly changing conditions and the serious threats of a war-torn world.

These amendments do two things of major import; first, they allow the surplus wheat to be marketed through feeding to livestock; second, they freeze the surplus Government stores of wheat and cotton so they cannot be marketed commercially under any emergency or under any conditions which may arise in these very uncertain times.

This proposed legislation will destroy confidence and break down the morale of the four out of five of the American farmers who are in compliance with the Triple-A program. These compliers who plowed up wheat, in order to comply, will be bitterly resentful if Congress now puts a premium upon noncompliance.

FREEZING THE SURPLUS

Our Government now has on hand 7,000,000 bales of cotton and 180,000,000 bushels of wheat acquired under the loan program. Under the terms of this conference report, the Government will be compelled to hold these surpluses and will not be able to market them. In other words, it freezes them, and allows cotton and wheat produced this year to be marketed ahead of the great surplus carried by the United States Government. Even in case of emergency defense need for cotton, which is likely to develop, these Government stocks could not be used. We found out in the early 1930's what happens to the price of wheat when we have a surplus like that and no control.

We are told by those who agreed to the conference report that the freezing of these surpluses in the hands of the Government raised the prices of cotton and wheat the past few days. I doubt it, but even so, every friend of the Triple-A program realizes that such prosperity is artificial and short lived. As a matter of fact, it was not this action but the tight market situation caused by the loan program that raised prices.

The friends of the program are not asking, and should not ask, the Government to assume all the loss that may result from carrying these surplus agricultural products. Wheat will store safely quite a while, but cannot be carried indefinitely without deterioration. It seems the height of folly to take these chances if we should have the opportunity to divert these surpluses to consumers' use without in any way harming the producer.

I know of no more effective way to kill the Triple-A program than through enactment of this amended bill. It will deal a serious blow to a program which has brought the growers of cotton and wheat out from dire poverty and bankruptcy into a halfway prosperity. One informed witness before the House Committee on Agriculture said:

Nothing was ever done for agriculture before the Triple-A program that was worth the snap of your fingers.

AMENDMENTS BENEFIT SPECULATORS

There may be a chance to work off many bales of cotton in some of the various markets of the world. Why should not the Government avail itself of that opportunity instead of allowing the speculators to corner the market and raise the price on the few bales of surplus this year when there is a much diminished cotton crop?

We have a big wheat crop and a tremendous surplus; but if the speculators know that the wheat belonging to the Government cannot be sold, they will then speculate on this year's surplus and perhaps drive the price a few cents higher than it would have been, but the speculators, and not the producers, will reap the reward. I would rather the producer would lose a few cents a bushel than to suffer the prospective undermining of the entire Triple-A program. If it is rendered less valuable, public sentiment will not support its retention.

"FRIENDS" DESTROY THE TRIPLE A

The farmers of the United States fully appreciate what has been done for them by the Triple-A legislation. Imagine the situation today without the program. There would be bankrupt farmers with great stores of cotton and wheat, and absolutely without buyers for the surplus at home or abroad. No other country can buy the surplus or the new crop. England must buy first from Canada, which has enough surplus to take care of England for 2 years. We have wheat enough on hand now, without raising a single bushel in 1942, to carry this country and afford an ample surplus in September 1942.

The farmers know that those who would get them into a hole by freezing of the surplus for the benefit of the speculators are indeed false or misguided friends. It has been aptly said, "I can take care of my enemies, but Heaven protect me from my friends." That is just the position of the American wheat and cotton farmers today. I am not saying that the Senators who loaded the bill with dynamite were not intending to help the farmers, but I am affirming that they were short-sighted and mistaken. For a little temporary increase in price they were willing to sacrifice a long-range basic program which is the only hope for producers of surplus commodities.

KILL THE REPORT AND HELP THE FARMERS

Very few real farmers, and only noncooperators, will be hurt if this bill resulting from conference is defeated by the House. If it is adopted and if the President should veto it in the interests of American agriculture, we shall certainly sustain that veto in House or Senate because the true situation will then be apparent, and the producers of the Nation will be aroused and demand redress. I wanted to help those few whose crops were cut down by drought or for other unavoidable reasons, resulting in an excess acreage with less than the normal production. It was to help those unfortunates that H. R. 5300 was introduced. I am still willing to help them, but the hasty and uninformed action of the Senate has made it necessary for us to forget the difficulties of the minority in the face of the danger to the majority under threatened destruction of the Triple-A program. Freezing the Government wheat and cotton is the most short-sighted policy that I have ever seen attempted, and to think it comes, too, from the would-be friends of the producer!

FEEDING SURPLUS WHEAT

This conference report provides that excess wheat may be fed to livestock. That sounds innocent enough and very plausible, indeed. I wonder if the Senators who inserted this amendment have considered what it means? To have a real understanding, the legislator must know something of the why and how of the marketing quotas as part of the wheat program. I remind you that we are jeopardizing legislation which assures the American farmer, this year, a return twice as high as any other wheat-producing country anywhere in the world is giving its producers. In Canada, all along the northern boundaries of the United States, farmers are getting about 50 cents a bushel for wheat. In the United States they are receiving a dollar a bushel. Is there any other cause for this difference in price than legislation by this Congress?

I ask the friends of the Triple-A program to recall that when the harvest of the present crop has been completed we shall have on hand 2 bushels of wheat for every bushel that can be marketed. It is only common sense to hold back a part of the surplus in storage so we can sell the bulk of the crop at a decent price. We should not forget that 81 percent of the farmers, voting in a marketing quota referendum on May 31, 1941, demanded that action by their votes. They asked the Department to divide the limited market among the wheat farmers of the Nation. The farmers voted for quotas democratically, fairly, honestly, expecting to cut down their acreage and to hold back a part of the surplus as a protection for the price of wheat.

Now, think with me a minute what the Senate feeding amendment will do to the farmers' program. It proposes to permit the feeding of excess wheat. Actually

it is punching a hole in the gunnysack. You cannot hold wheat in a sack with a hole in it. Farmers know that, even if some of our statesmen do not. It matters little whether you sell your wheat in the grain elevator in its original form or haul it to the market in hogs. It is marketing the wheat just the same.

CORN PRODUCERS INJURED

This country has plenty of feed for livestock aside from a tremendous surplus of wheat. We are just about to harvest the biggest corn crop ever known. What will this proposal mean to corn producers? No amount of shouting or swearing on the part of noncooperators can justify the false assumption that the defense program needs this excess wheat for feed. Again I want to impress upon you that we will, at the end of this year, have on hand an extra year's supply. We could double, treble, quadruple our wheat-feeding program and still not touch a bushel of excess wheat.

CONTROLLING THE SURPLUS

What is the object of the marketing-quota program? It is to keep the surplus off the market so that fair prices for all farmers can be obtained. It does not necessarily mean a better break for a handful of noncooperators who have not made the sacrifices necessary to carry the program to its present satisfactory state. The larger percentage of the wheat growers have gone down the line, year in and year out, cooperating with the program, cutting down their acreage; and for what purpose? For controlling the surplus and upholding the price. They have willingly adjusted their acreage at seeding time. Now we ask the noncooperator to make some sort of adjustment in marketing and to do his share in order to support the program which saved him also.

AMENDMENTS DEFRAUD COOPERATORS

These Senate amendments grant special privileges to the noncooperators. That is the very worst kind of discrimination against the rank and file who have worked squarely for a fair price for agriculture. Freezing Government wheat and cotton is the worst kind of fraud. It is certainly dynamiting the Triple-A program with a vengeance and misusing those who have made it possible.

H. R. 5300, as it left the House, would have been of benefit to a few, not many, but it was intended to help those who were unfortunate in having crop failures. H. R. 5300, as loaded by the Senate, will, I fear, work disaster and may mark the beginning of the end of the greatest program ever undertaken in the interests of agricultural producers.

CITIES NEED FARM PROSPERITY

The real friends of the Triple A appreciate the support of the Members of this Congress who come from the large centers of population. Those Representatives from industrial districts have realized that prosperity for the wheat and cotton farmers meant prosperity for those who live in cities and manufacture things that farmers buy. True, the program has been bitterly fought by reactionaries all over the Nation. Today there is great rejoicing in the camp of those who have opposed the Triple A and would refuse a square deal to American agriculture. The speculator is happy because he sees the entering wedge for the wrecking of the program.

PROGRAM INCREASED PRICES

These Senate amendments constitute the death sentence for the results of 8 years of growing farm legislation. We have deliberately raised the price of wheat in the district which I represent, from 25 cents a bushel to approximately a dollar, and that in the face of almost a double increase in surplus. We have raised the price of corn from 20 cents a bushel to 80 cents a bushel. We have raised the price of cotton from 5 cents a pound to 16 cents a pound.

We have, it is true, interfered with the business of that group of speculators which manipulated the market at harvest-time, forcing the farmer to sell, and then increased the price when the producer had disposed of his crop.

WRONG TIME TO CRUSH FARMERS

This country needs all its united strength right now. Our civilization and our economic system now face the greatest test. In the effort to stop the German war machine we need the farmers' strength as never before. Is it safe to wreck the farmers' program now? I do not accuse the Senators of a deliberate attempt to ruin our program, but that is the effect of their amendments for unlimited feeding of excess wheat and freezing the Government stores. They would try to freeze us into insensibility—try to make us forget we have great stocks of wheat and cotton—try to put off the day when we have to face reality.

This freezing amendment bayonets the vitals of the ever-normal-granary principle. Actually, it goes even further in the wrong direction than an outright repeal of that program. It would also destroy the faith and confidence of the American farmers in the ability of Congress to separate political hocus-pocus from sound agricultural legislation.

ORDERLY MARKETING ESSENTIAL

Farmers are entitled to a stable program of price equality. Their overwhelming vote in the marketing-quota referendum shows that they are ready and willing to do their part in keeping our economic structure on a sound foundation. Both agriculture and the public have accepted the principle of the ever-normal granary, and that means acceptance of the principle that farm commodities are to be permitted to flow into and out of the granary in an orderly manner. If we dam that flow now, the day of reckoning will come when we need room in the granary for more stocks. The orderly handling of agricultural reserves, plus a realistic use of adjustment machinery, distinguishes the ever-normal granary from the disastrous Federal Farm Board program which ended in a "frozen surplus" fiasco.

We have done that which economists have always said could not be done. We have modified the law of supply and demand so far as wheat, cotton, and corn are concerned.

"FIFTH COLUMNISTS" FAN THE FLAME

It has been asserted in a reliable farm journal that much of the unrest and resentment against the wheat penalties has been instigated and encouraged by certain attorneys who are collecting $5 to $10 each from the resentful farmers and doing quite a thriving business. A second element in this situation is undoubtedly partisan politics, and this is, unfortunately, sure to arise even in regard to measures definitely beneficial to the farm interests. It is charged that the orators who are proclaiming the desire to right the wrongs of farmers are actually engaged in advancing the cause of Hitlerism at home and abroad. I do not know all the facts about these ugly rumors, but the Midwest press has taken cognizance of them, and they have been freely discussed. It appears to me in the interests of national unity, and distinctly in the interests of agricultural legislation, to settle this matter speedily by sending the report back to conference, aiding the small minority who have possibly suffered injustice, and proceeding with our Triple-A marketing-quota program.

Iceland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTERS OF HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the agreement concluded between the President of the United States and the Government of Iceland I discussed this subject in two of the news letters which I write to my constituents each week.

In these letters I discussed my views on this subject, and under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD which was granted to me on July 14, 1941, I now include that portion of each of those news letters which relate to the occupation of Iceland:

[From the News Letter of July 9, 1941]

ICELAND

The action of the President in sending American naval forces to protect Iceland from occupation by any hostile power is a wise move which has my complete approval. It is merely a logical continuation of the policy of erecting a series of protective bases established, first, by the acquisition of the naval bases in the Atlantic from the British Government and, secondly, by creating a protectorate over Greenland. Geographers differ slightly as to whether Iceland lies entirely in the Western Hemisphere, but most authorities agree that at least the far greater part of the island does lie in this hemisphere. No one questions its importance to the

United States from a strategic military point of view.

By peacefully occupying this island we have taken a very large step to prevent future attack by an enemy nation upon our country. We have also greatly lessened the risk of war now and in the future. When we take control of Iceland we remove to a great degree the threat of its occupation by an enemy and we also eliminate the possible future danger of a race between our Nation and some other nation to reach it first. Situated as the island is, this country would very probably feel it necessary to attempt forcibly to expel any invader who had either gained control over it or who sought to gain control of this land. That would mean war. By acting now with the consent and approval of the Government of Iceland, it becomes most unlikely that any foreign power will dare to make an aggressive move in that direction. An unprotected small neutral would have been a continuing temptation to aggressors. The stronger the force we place there the more unlikely such an aggressive move becomes. An affirmative action very often is more apt to attain peace than a negative one. The present affirmative action falls in that class, because it renders safe a zone of potential dispute. Iceland is no longer a subject of argument; it is an accomplished fact.

I have always felt that the safest course was to talk little, but to act quickly and decisively. The present move will do much more to safeguard our Nation and to push away and keep away from us the danger of war than did any of the President's many belligerent speeches in which he established various vocal boundaries at various spots in the world. Bellicose talk causes trouble and friction without producing results.

The occupation of Iceland is not directly connected with the Atlantic patrol. The latter has been in effect for some months and had already been extended to include Iceland before our agreement with that country was announced and before our troops were sent there. But the establishment of the bases in Iceland also makes the risk of attack on American ships less likely; permits the transfer of British troops to places where they are sorely needed, and implements our policy of aid to Britain. It is intelligent, defensive strategy. It is dynamic defense. I hope it will soon be followed by the announcement of the establishment of naval and air bases at key points in South America through agreement with our sister republics.

I have secured from the Department of Commerce the following basic data about Iceland in which I believe everyone will be interested:

About the size of Kentucky, 40,000 square miles (only one-fourth habitable), mountains, lava fields, glaciers, and high plateaus sloping to coastal lowlands, no mineral resources, nearly all waterpower—estimated at 2,500,000 horsepower—remains unharnessed. Reykjavik, the largest city with a population of 36,100, is the capital. The entire population of 120,000, almost entirely of pure Scandinavian stock, literally lives off the seas, as fish and fish products constitute about 85 percent of all exports. Only about one-half of 1 percent of the total area is cultivated and short summers limit crops largely to hay and potatoes; on large tracts of grass lands, sheep raising is important.

[From News Letter of July 15, 1941]

NO JOINT OCCUPATION OF ICELAND

In his message to Congress the President said that the United States naval forces placed in Iceland were "to supplement and eventually replace British forces which have been established there." Last week I expressed my complete approval of this action on the theory that the United States alone was to occupy and defend Iceland. Later in the week Prime Minister Churchill told the British House of Commons, "We still propose to retain our Army in Iceland," and further, "it seems very likely that they (Britain and the United States) will cooperate effectively in resistance to any attempt by Hitler to gain a footing." While I strongly favor taking sole possession purely on our own responsibility, which is dynamic defense of America, yet I completely disapprove of a joint occupation.

First, the object of taking peaceful possession of Iceland is to provide for our own security. Hence control should rest exclusively with us to be utilized as our own defensive needs require, so that we can defend ourselves against any aggressor in the world at any time, whether the present status of that nation be that of a potential friend or a potential foe. Secondly, a joint occupation by a nonbelligerent, such as ourselves, and a belligerent, such as Great Britain, greatly increases the risk of our being drawn into actual hostilities. The troops and bases of a belligerent are always subject to attack by its opponent. For its own self-preservation such an attack is almost certain to be resisted by the nonbelligerent joint occupier, as well as by the belligerent. Thirdly, a joint occupation of an area of potential dispute tends to be a full military alliance, and it approaches Union Now, which is strongly opposed by the great majority of the American people.

* * * * *

There are two other items worth noting while on the subject of Iceland. No matter how wide are the differences of opinion as to just where the line of our foreign policy should be drawn, we all agree that our greatest natural protection against European wars and attacks is the 3,000 miles of water that lie between Europe and America. Yet there are three stepping stones bridging this large body of water: Newfoundland, Greenland, and Iceland. If we take the risk of letting any powerful European nation establish itself on this first stepping stone we have allowed this natural barrier to shrink by hundreds of miles. The President has made so many futile speeches establishing vocal boundaries for aggressor nations that we now know by experience that verbal warnings are not enough to prevent such a happening. Every American citizen appreciates the immense value of Hawaii, which is 2,400 miles away from us. All of us realize that our strong fortifications on that isle guard our west coast from the threat of invasion. Iceland, closer on our east coast, where our greatest productive centers are located, should be of even greater importance to us in the Atlantic than is Hawaii in the Pacific. Furthermore, expert opinion agrees that Iceland is much easier to defend than to attack because of its physical characteristics and its water boundaries.

In addition, the action should improve our relations with South America where it is most important that we should secure strategic bases as soon as possible. Some months ago the President pledged the southern republics that the United States would not permit Hitler to seize the approaches to the Western Hemisphere. The Iceland incident implements this promise. It gives further assurance to the republics in South and Central America that we seek these bases solely for the protection of this Nation from aggression and not for the purpose of extending our influence over South America—a course South America tends to suspect and fear.

Farmer Is Entitled to Cost of Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

STATEMENT BY TOM LINDER, GEORGIA STATE COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received the most comprehensive study of agriculture and its relation to the total national income it has ever been my pleasure to observe. It is prepared by Mr. Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia.

While he does not include the largest single agricultural commodity, namely, the dairy industry, I find that these same comparisons apply to that industry as well. I believe these figures should be studied by people, including some of our metropolitan newspapers, that are evidently under the impression that the farmer is rolling in wealth, and that parity or 110 percent of parity as prepared in the price-control bill would be handing him more than he is entitled to. This will show clearly that the farmers' parity prices are based on 1909–13 prices which are 92 percent below present prices on things the farmer must buy. All will agree that the farmers are entitled to cost of production the same as any other individual or business is entitled to. If cost-of-production prices were to be figured based on present-day operating costs, the farmer would receive much more than the 110-percent parity price. The only way to reduce consumer costs is to eliminate unnecessary middlemen, and unnecessary service, all of which has been demanded by the consumers. The farmer cannot operate at a loss, and at the expense of his wife and children who must work like slaves much longer. Mr. Linder's statement follows:

HOW MUCH LONGER CAN THE AMERICAN FARMER LAST AT THIS?

The average national income for the 5 years from 1925 to 1929, inclusive, was $79,217,000,000.

This means that the total income of all kinds of all the people of the United States totaled this figure during those 5 years.

The average cash income to farmers throughout the United States was $10,006,000,000. The farmer received 12.6 percent of the total national income.

During the 5 years from 1935 to 1939, inclusive, the national income dropped to an average of $65,039,000,000 per year. Of this national income the farmers received an average cash income of $6,212,000,000, which amounted to 8.8 percent of the national income.

In other words, from 1935 to 1939 the farmers received only two-thirds as much

of the national income as they received during the 5 years from 1925 to 1929.

For the sake of argument I have included all Government benefits of all kinds received by the farmers during the latter 5-year period.

To show just what has happened to the farmers, I call your special attention to the last column in the following tabulation showing the percentage of national income received by the farmers in different years:

Statement showing gross farm income, with and without Government benefits, also percent of national income received by farmers for the 5-year average 1925–29 as compared with the period 1935–39

Year	Gross farm income, 1925–29	Farm products consumed on farm, 1925–29	All Government benefits to farmers, 1925–29	Cash farm income, 1925–29	Cash farm income without Government benefits, 1925–29	Total national income, 1925–29	Percent of national income received by farmers, 1925–29
	Thous. of dol.	*Thous. of dol.*		*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	
1925	10,581,000	495,000	----------	10,086,000	10,086,000	73,800,000	13.7
1926	10,580,000	922,000	----------	9,658,000	9,658,000	78,900,000	12.2
1927	10,700,000	828,000	----------	9,872,000	9,872,000	79,500,000	12.4
1928	11,089,000	1,090,000	----------	9,999,000	9,999,000	81,000,000	12.3
1929	11,221,000	804,000	----------	10,417,000	10,417,000	82,885,000	12.6
Total	54,171,000	4,139,000	----------	50,032,000	50,032,000	396,085,000	12.6
Average per year	10,014,000	827,000	----------	10,006,000	10,006,000	79,217,000	12.6

Year	Gross farm income, 1935–39	Farm products consumed on farm, 1935–39	All Government benefits to farmers, 1935–39	Cash farm income, 1935–39	Cash farm income including Government benefits, 1935–39	Total national income, 1935–39	Percent of national income received by farmers, 1935–39
	Thous. of dol.	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	
1935	6,138,000	431,000	430,000	5,275,000	5,706,000	55,870,000	9.4
1936	8,012,000	1,415,000	287,000	5,970,000	6,257,000	65,165,000	9.2
1937	8,621,000	1,458,000	366,000	6,378,000	6,744,000	71,172,000	9.0
1938	7,538,000	1,290,000	482,000	5,432,000	5,914,000	63,610,000	8.5
1939	9,769,000	1,229,000	807,000	5,635,000	6,442,000	69,378,000	8.1
Total	40,078,000	5,823,000	2,372,000	28,691,000	31,063,000	325,195,000	8.8
Average per year	9,015,000	1,164,000	474,000	5,738,000	6,212,000	65,039,000	8.8

Column 1 of the above tabulation sets out the gross income received by the farmers each year during the two 5-year periods. The Government, in arriving at the figures in the first column, charged the farmer as an income all farm products consumed on the farm by man and beast.

The amounts charged to the farmer as an income for farm products consumed on the farm are set out in the second column of the above tabulation.

A casual consideration reveals that farm products consumed on the farm do not constitute an income at all. It costs the farmer just as much to grow the products consumed on the farm as it does to produce the products that are carried to the market and sold.

For this reason, I have subtracted the amount set up by the Government as products consumed on the farm from the gross income.

Column 3 of the above tabulation carries the total amounts of Government benefits of all kinds paid to the farmers during the latter 5-year period. I have also subtracted these in order to give a fair comparison of the real cash income of the farmer from 1935 to 1939, as compared to the cash return to the farmers during the 5-year period from 1925 to 1929, during which period there were no Government benefits paid.

Column 4 shows the actual cash return to the farmers for crops produced.

The actual cash return to the farmers for the 5-year period from 1925 to 1929 averaged $10,006,000,000 per year. The actual cash income to the farmers for the latter period from 1935 to 1939 averaged $5,738,000,000 per year.

During the 5-year period from 1935 to 1939 the farmer received 57 percent as much cash income as he did during the first period from 1925 to 1929.

The national income for the first 5-year period averaged $79,217,000,000, while for the latter period from 1935 to 1939 the national income averaged $65,039,000,000.

This means that the national income during the latter 5-year period was 83 percent, while the farmers' income was only 57 percent of the former period.

With the national income cut to 83 percent, it looks like the farmer would have been hurt enough if his income had also been reduced to 83 percent; but instead of being reduced to 83 percent it was actually reduced to 57 percent.

The percentage of the national income received by the farmer during the first 5-year period varied from 13.7 in 1925 to 12.6 in 1929.

The percentage of the national income received by the farmer during the last 5-year period was as follows:

	Percent
1935	9.4
1936	9.2
1937	9
1938	8.5
1939	8.1

It must be kept in mind that the percentage given for 1935 to 1939 include all Government payments to the farmers.

From the 10-year period 1920 to 1929 until 1941 the price of farm products declined about 33⅓ percent.

The percentage of the farmer's income decreased exactly 33⅓ percent, and the actual income was reduced exactly 33⅓ percent.

In my previous communication I demonstrated that the minimum prices that would represent parity for the horse-and-buggy days were as follows:

Cotton	$0.24
Cottonseed oil	.12
Corn	.99
Oats	.56
Wheat	1.64
No. 1 hogs	.12
No. 1 steers	.14
No. 1 veal	.14
No. 1 lamb	.16
No. 1 sheep	.08

In that communication I suggested that Congress should add at least 25 percent to these prices to take care of reduced acreage, protective tariff, high labor costs, and rural education.

The above tabulation demonstrates that the increase added, instead of being 25 percent, should be 33⅓ percent. This would put the price of these farm products as follows:

Cotton	$0.32
Cottonseed oil	.16
Corn	1.32
Oats	.74
Wheat	2.19
No. 1 hogs	.16
No. 1 steers	.17½
No. 1 veal	.17½
No. 1 lamb	.21
No. 1 sheep	.11

The facts are that the Congress has set up a controlled economy.

The further facts are that this controlled economy does not control anybody except the farmers.

The natural result of a controlled economy which does not control anyone except the farmers is to continually rob the farmer of more and more every year of the things he produces for the benefit of those who do not farm.

The national income for the next 12 months is bound to be at least $100,000,000,000. The Government itself is going to spend thirty to forty billion dollars.

During the 5 years period of 1925–29 the farmers were somewhat below parity with the "horse and buggy days" of 1913.

But even on a basis of the 5-year period of 1925–29, giving the farmer an average of 12.6 of the national income, the farmer in the next 12 months should receive a cash income of around $12,000,000,000.

If the farmer is put on an actual parity with 1913, and then we add 33⅓ percent to give him buying power to live at the standard of the present day, the farmers' income during the next 12 months would run around $18,000,000,000, or 18 percent of the national income.

This would be in line with the income that the farmer did receive prior to the enactment of high protective tariffs.

With prices of basic farm products as set out on page 5, and prices of other farm products in line with these, assuming that production is equal to the average production of the last 5 years, the farmer would receive a cash income of around $18,000,000,000.

Any legislation that does not provide actual parity on a basis of today for the American farmer is class legislation.

Any legislation which says to the American farmer, "You must produce food and clothing for the balance of the people at a price which does not give you equality with people in

other lines" is nothing short of legislating the farmers into peonage.

The farmers of America are the most patriotic people in America.

They are willing to make any sacrifice needed for national defense.

But to single out the American farmer and legislate the greatest hardships on him, when people in all other lines are being paid a bonus to support the Government in the war, is uncalled for, intolerable, and will not be forever submitted to.

We say today that the United States is giving $7,000,000,000 to England under the lease-lend bill and that we are going to give them seven billion more in the next 12 months.

Can you name anybody in America today that is giving anything except the farmer?

Do you know anybody else in any line of business that is working below parity?

No. The only two classes of people who are actually giving today are the farmers who raise the food and clothing and the boys who have got to carry the guns and do the fighting.

Statement showing 1925–29 5-year average prices of basic farm products compared with 1935–39 5-year average prices, also comparison of total farm income for the two 5-year periods

Commodity	Average price	
	1925–29	1935–39
Cotton	$0.19	$0.12
Cottonseed oil	.10	.09
Wheat	1.46	.94
Corn	.90	.74
Beef	.14	.12
Hogs	.11	.09

Farm income 1925–29, 5-year period:	
1925	$10,581,000,000
1926	10,580,000,000
1927	10,700,000,000
1928	11,089,000,000
1929	11,221,000,000
Total	54,171,000,000
Farm income 1935–39, 5-year period:	
1935	6,138,000,000
1936	8,012,000,000
1937	8,621,000,000
1938	$7,538,000,000
1939	9,769,000,000
Total	40,078,000,000
Total 1925–29	54,171,000,000
Total 1935–39	40,078,000,000
Difference between two 5-year periods	14,093,000,000

The total farm income for the 1935–39 5-year period includes all Government benefit payments paid from the United States Treasury.

From the above we find that the total farm income for the 1925–29 period was $14,093,000,000 more than for the latter 5-year period.

According to Statistical Abstract of the United States Department of Commerce, sixty-second number issued 1940, the total farm mortgage debt in 1935 was $7,645,000,000.

This shows the loss in farm income during the 1935–39 5-year period amounts to enough money to have paid off all the mortgages on all the farms in the United States twice.

Statement showing the average price of basic farm products for 1913 and the 10-year average price (1920–29) and the percentage increase necessary to give the farmers same purchasing power in 1941 as in 1913 and 1920–29, respectively

	1913 [1]	Increase necessary to reach parity [2]	Parity price for 1941 [3]	1920–29 period [4]	Increase necessary to reach parity [5]	Parity price for 1941 [6]
	1	2	3	4	5	6
		Pct.			Pct.	
Cotton	$0.12	92	$0.23	$0.22	11	$0.24
Cottonseed oil	.08	92	.15	.11	11	.12
Wheat	.95	92	1.82	1.48	11	1.64
Corn	.68	92	1.31	.89	11	.99
Beef	.08	92	.15	.13	11	.14
Hogs	.08	92	.15	.11	11	.12

[1] The average price of 6 basic farm products for the year 1913 are set out in column 1 of this table.

[2] From 1913 until 1941 the average price of the manufactured products the farmer buys has increased 92 percent.

[3] If we take the 1913 prices of the 6 farm products and add 92 percent to them we find that the parity price of these farm products in 1941 must be as shown in column 3 to give the farmers same purchasing power in 1941 as in 1913.

[4] The average price of these 6 basic farm products for the 10-year average period (1920–29) are set out in column 4 of this table.

[5] From 1920 to 1929 (10-year average period) until 1941 the average price of the manufactured products the farmer buys has increased 11 percent.

[6] If we take the 10-year (1920–29) prices of the 6 farm products and add 11 percent to them we find that the parity price of these farm products in 1941 must be as shown in column 6 to give the farmers same purchasing power in 1941 as in the 10-year average period (1920–29).

Amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, this bill calls upon the Congress to extend the term of the selectees beyond the 12-month period which was set forth in the original act passed by the House September 7, 1940. That particular act had a proviso in it—

That persons inducted into the land forces of the United States pursuant to this act shall not be employed beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere except in the territories and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands.

It also sets forth that—

If and so long as the United States is not at war, each man selected for training and service shall serve for a training period of 12 consecutive months: *Provided*, That if during his training period the Congress shall declare that the national interest is imperiled, he shall be subject to service until the Congress shall declare that the national interest permit his being relieved from active service.

Let us see what Canada has done about the draft. Under the Canadian Draft Act the draftee is inducted into service for a period of 4 months instead of 12 months. He cannot be taken for service overseas. Only the volunteers can be transported for service overseas. Furthermore, the age of draft service runs from 21 to 24 years, while ours runs from 21 to 38 years. The Canadian draftee gets $39 per month while our draftees get $21 per month for the first 4 months of service, and then, if promoted to the rank of a first-class private, they get $30 per month. If the Canadian soldier is a married man, his wife receives $35 per month and there is an allowance of $12 per month for each child under 16 years of age. This gives such a man a total pay of $38 per month or nearly $25 per week. In a good many instances a soldier drawing the $98 allowance and pay is earning more than he did in civilian life. That is considerably more money than we are paying our boys. I just wonder how much of this money is made possible by the lease-lend bill.

When this entire subject matter was brought out in the press only a short time ago, it was stated that the Congress would be called upon (1) to remove the prohibition of service of these selectees outside of the Western Hemisphere; and (2) that the national interest was imperiled. Because of the tremendous opposition to the suggestion that the prohibition as to service outside of the Western Hemisphere be removed, it became necessary to drop that issue from this bill and to rely solely on the second contention, namely, that the national interest is imperiled.

NATIONAL INTEREST IS IMPERILED

When this Service Act was passed, the national interest was not considered to be imperiled, because there was no such statement in the bill, and, in addition to that, there is a 12-month limitation on the service. So we must inquire as to what has happened since September 1940 that has created a situation that imperils the national interest. In truth and in fact there is no evidence before the House or any Member of it that we face any more serious situation now than we did when this act was passed. On the contrary, it seems to me that our situation is much better today than it was at that time because, if my memory serves me rightly, this act was passed not long after France had fallen and military experts, newspaper columnists and radio commentators were all predicting that Britain would fall within 4 or 5 weeks. The experts, as usual, were mistaken. Britain did not fall, but made one of the most memorable resistances to invasion that has ever been portrayed in history. The amazing courage of the R. A. F., although outnumbered and with less equipment, faced a storm of fire to aid the retreating foot soldiers and to guard the English coast. They gave such a splendid account of themselves that Hitler and his hoards were utterly unable to land on England's coast. And yet in spite of the fall of France and the hourly

expectation that England would be overrun, the Congress did not declare that our national interest was imperiled.

What is England's position since that day? She has become immeasurably strengthened with additional armaments and additional airplanes until now she claims supremacy in the air over Germany. In addition to that her splendid fleet is far superior to anything that Hitler can offer. Hitler cannot now and does not even try to invade England. It is apparent that he and his advisers consider such an undertaking a lost cause. So we find Britain immeasurably improved in her defense equipment since a year ago.

What is the fact about our own situation? I need not remind you that we have had 1,500,000 men in training for these many months last past; that we have built a huge air force; that we are doubling the size of our fleet which has now been augmented by two very powerful battleships and numerous auxiliary warships and also transport ships; our coastal defenses have been gone over and bases have been built and are now being built in every strategic position, including the Caribbean, Nova Scotia, and Greenland on the east and a number of places in the Pacific on the west, including Alaska.

Therefore, as far as Britain and the United States are concerned, they are both immeasurbaly stronger than they were 2 years ago.

Well, then, how about Germany? Has her fleet increased? On the contrary, the best warship she had, the *Bismarck*, has been sunk and the R. A. F. is doing a beautiful job blasting the rest of them which dare not come out of their harbors. Has Hitler acquired any additional land troops? On the contrary, it is estimated that he has lost 1,500,000 men in his war with Russia alone, to say nothing of the men and equipment he must have lost in his invasion of the Balkans, of Greece, and of Crete. Every day Hitler's strength is growing weaker while, on the contrary, Britain's and the United States' is growing stronger. Has he acquired additional supplies? No one can tell what he has lost in planes, tanks, and other equipment, but we do know from the statements of the British and the Russians that he must have lost a considerable amount of every type of equipment.

Has he acquired new money and additional credit? On the contrary, I think it is safe to assert that he does not have either.

And in addition to the foregoing he has made an enemy out of a powerful ally. When he concluded a treaty with Russia some time ago, all of us were dumbfounded and everyone felt that the British had blundered in their diplomacy. Now, however, Hitler has blundered, for with the invasion of Russia he has committed himself to a difficult, costly, and, in all probability, lengthy war. Hitler may learn, as others with delusions of grandeur have learned before him, that Russia is the burying ground of hopes and aspirations of would-be world conquerors.

I do not profess to be an expert in these matters, but it would seem to me that in view of the present situation of Hitler and Russia and the probability that he will be there until the rains come in September, when the mud will render his mechanized units ineffectual, and later on when those rains turn to snow, Hitler may find himself in the same difficult situation in which another would-be world conqueror found himself more than 125 years ago. The vast steppes of Russia with the snow and cold have decimated more armies than were ever reduced by shot and shell.

Then how can we say that the national interest was not imperiled in September 1940 but that now our peril is infinitely greater and we must hold these men in extra service because of that situation? Where is the new testimony to that effect? Where is the additional evidence that would establish that fact? None has been presented to us and until there is additional evidence to support that contention, it does not seem to me that we should enlarge the scope of existing law.

Without any facts before us that show there is an impending peril and a great need, how can we vote to dislocate the economic, occupational, and social life of a million young men, change their entire futures, and offer as our excuse, when challenged, that we had no facts showing that such a course was necessary? Why, then, this bill?

WESTERN HEMISPHERE

I believe that two other factors contribute mightily to this imperiling business, which were disclosed at the outset when this matter was first suggested, but have since been suppressed and driven into the background, namely, that, first, the Western Hemisphere restriction be removed; and, second, that we ought to have an army of two to three million men. What for? Can we truthfully say that we need such a vast army in the light of the evidence before us in regard to national defense? When the hearings were held on the selective-service bill, our Chief of Staff, General Marshall, testified that an army of 480,000 men fully armed and fully equipped could prevent any corps from abroad from landing on our shores. Then why conjure up a force four, five, or six times as great, if it is not necessary for our defense?

The answer must be obvious. Such an army is wanted for offensive warfare and not for the national defense. Personally I am strongly opposed to a second American expeditionary force. I see no possible justification for shipping men to Europe, to Asia, or to Africa to become involved in this war. We have been advised that the place has already been selected where some of these men are to be sent. It is Freetown, a seaport with a splendid harbor located in Sierra Leone, a British possession on the west coast of Africa, 500 miles south of Dakar. Of course, we have a right to land men there because Britain is a friendly country and Freetown is a friendly port; but when we realize that Dakar is a mighty base, well fortified with modern equipment and with a powerful garrison, held by the Vichy government of France, then we see the reason why our boys are to be sent 500 miles south of there, and why the Western Hemisphere restriction should be removed, and why an army of two to three million men must be enrolled. If our boys can be sent to Freetown, why not to any place in the Union of South Africa, or to British Somaliland on the east coast of Africa, or to the Suez Canal, or Bombay, or Calcutta in India, or to Singapore and Hong Kong, or any other place in the possession of the great British Empire, which extends all over the globe?

I believe that the young men of the United States should have the right to live their own lives in their own way, in their own country, among their friends and relatives; that their occupations should be of their own choosing and that they should not be compelled to underwrite the British Empire and to endure a bath of blood that will run the seven seas crimson with the very lifeblood of our youth. And do not be deceived, my friends. The mind that conjured the idea of removing the prohibition about shipping our boys out of the Western Hemisphere has not given up that idea. It still lurks as a sinister threat in the background, and will, no doubt, be brought forward again when the time is more propitious.

EXTENSION OF TIME

Under existing law the selectee, when he has finished his term of training, is placed in the reserve component. The President has the power under existing law to call out the reserve component, so that it must be remembered that even though the selectee has been released from his period of training after the 12 months have expired, under the existing law, nevertheless, as a member of the Reserve he is subject to the President's call. Therefore it cannot be said that our Army will disintegrate, because the selectees form only 40 percent of our Army and, in addition to that, new selectees are coming up constantly and the old ones will still be available as Reservists.

Another objection that I have to the extension of this time is that it violates the spirit of the contract existing between the selectee and his Government. Every selectee believed, his parents believed, his friends and relatives believed, and the country at large believed that when this act was passed and the young man was called into service, it was to be for the period of 12 months, and then he could return to his home and his occupation. Break faith with the boys in this respect and you destroy the confidence of your people in its Government. Break faith with the selectee and keep him in the Army against his will and against his agreement, which he thought he had, and it will destroy the morale of the Army.

On the American silver dollar is the motto, "In God we trust." Pass this act and the selectee can erase that motto and place in lieu thereof the sign of the double cross.

Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an article from Sunday's New York Times which includes an official table from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics showing the present farm prices, the parity price, and the 110-percent parity price of various farm products as suggested by the new price-control bill now being considered before the Banking and Currency Committee.

[From the New York Times of August 10, 1941]

FARM INCOME GAINS TWO BILLION BY PARITY—PROPOSED 110-PERCENT LEVEL WOULD COST PUBLIC CONSIDERABLY MORE, ANALYSIS SHOWS

(By Wilthrop W. Case)

An increase of close to $2,000,000,000 in the farmers' annual cash receipts and a considerably greater increase in the cost of farm products to the country would be the direct results of the farm bloc's proposed 110-percent parity-price program. Under this program, the farmer would receive 127 percent more for his rye than he now receives, 127 percent more for his hay, 100 more for his barley, 79 more for his oats, 70 more for his buckwheat, 69 more for his peanuts, and 51 more for his wheat.

At the same time, those commodities, the prices of which already exceed the proposed 110-percent basis, could not be pegged at levels below those of July 29, although present prices in some cases run to as much as 26 percent above even the 110-percent level. The net consequence would be that farm prices would on the average be lifted to even more than the 110-percent level.

Although the concept of the parity price was first widely publicized as part of the original A. A. A. legislation in 1933, it antedates that period by many years. Soon after the World War the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in the Department of Agriculture began computing parity prices, and it is to the Bureau's figures that reference is always made in any discussion of the matter. The figures here mentioned are from the same source.

The parity price of a commodity may be briefly defined as that price which will buy the farmer the same goods that it procured him in the 5 years immediately before the last war. Practically, it is equal to the price received by the farmer during the base period, adjusted for the changes in his cost of living and in his farm operating expenses that have since taken place.

It is computed as follows: The Bureau has already compiled by States the average price received by the farmer for each crop during the base period of August 1909–July 1914, and from these State averages has worked out averages for the entire country. It also computes an index of the prices paid by the farmer for his purchases, etc., based on the calendar years 1910–14 equals 100. The average price received during the base period is then multiplied by this index in order to obtain the so-called parity price. The percentage to this price of the price currently received by the farmer for his crop (computed by the Bureau on the 15th of each month on the same basis as in the original base period) indicates, of course, by how much the current quotation falls short of theoretical parity.

Average prices reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics as being received by the farmer as of July 15 as shown in the first column of the accompanying table, the computed parity prices as of the same date in the next, and in the third the percentage of the actual prices received to the corresponding parity prices. In the fourth column are given the prices which the farmer would have to receive in order to obtain the proposed 110 percent of parity, and in the last the percentage increase in price that would be necessary to attain this goal.

It will be noted that a number of commodities are already above even the 110-percent level. These for the most part are products the markets of which are chiefly or entirely domestic and therefore largely unaffected by the wartime curtailment of exports. The farm bloc's plan, as already noted, would attempt to freeze these prices at the July 29 level. The increases in farmer income for 1941 crops resulting from 110-percent parity prices are shown in the following table:

Wheat	$404,543,000
Corn	619,336,000
Oats	311,685,000
Barley	153,294,000
Rye	28,662,000
5 major grains	1,517,520,000
Rice	5,002,000
Flaxseed	22,364,000
Beans, dry edible	14,256,000
Cotton [1]	206,605,000
Sweetpotatoes	19,478,000
Total 10 crops	1,785,825,000

[1] Not including cottonseed, which is already above 110-percent parity basis.

For all farm products the gain would not be likely to fall much short of $2,000,000,000.

Parity prices for farmers as of July 15

	Actual price	Parity price	Percent actual to parity	110 percent parity price	Percent increase required for 110-percent prices
Wheat, bushels	$0.856	$1.706	72.8	$1.294	51.2
Corn, do	.696	.854	81.5	.939	24.9
Oats, do	.327	.531	61.6	.584	78.6
Barley, do	.452	.823	54.9	.905	100.2
Rye, do	.464	.958	48.4	1.054	127.2
Rice, rough, do	1.103	1.081	102.0	1.189	7.8
Buckwheat, do	.628	.971	64.7	1.068	70.1
Flaxseed, do	1.71	2.25	76.0	2.475	44.7
Beans, dry edible, 100 pounds	4.14	4.48	76.4	4.93	19.1
Cotton, pounds	.1432	.1649	86.8	.1814	20.7
Cottonseed, tons	35.90	29.99	119.7	32.99	(1)
Sweetpotatoes, bushels	1.011	1.168	86.6	1.285	27.1
Hay, tons	7.66	15.79	48.5	17.37	126.8
Peanuts, pounds	.0416	.0638	65.2	.0702	68.8
Apples, bushels	.95	1.28	74.2	1.41	48.4
Hogs, 100 pounds	10.20	9.60	106.3	10.56	3.5
Beef cattle, do	8.78	6.93	126.7	7.62	(1)
Veal calves, do	10.27	8.98	114.4	9.88	(1)
Sheep, do	4.60	6.02	76.4	6.62	43.9
Lambs, do	9.13	7.81	116.9	8.59	(1)
Butter, pounds	.314	.339	92.6	.373	18.8
Butterfat, do	.365	[2].326	112.3	.359	(1)
Milk, wholesale, 100 pounds	[2]2.13	2.13	100.0	2.34	10.0
Milk, retail [4], quarts	.107	.090	118.9	.099	(1)
Chickens, live, pounds	.168	.152	110.5	.167	(1)
Eggs, dozen	.266	[2].257	99.6	.283	10.5
Wool, pounds	.365	.243	149.4	.267	(1)

[1] Already above 110-percent parity basis.
[2] Adjusted for seasonal variation.
[3] Preliminary.
[4] Retailed by farmer direct to consumer.

Mr. Speaker, the first reaction I had to this article was "why is the writer so disturbed by this price advance?" Would it be a very serious miscarriage of justice if the national farm income should advance nearly $2,000,000,000 when the national income is expected to rise $25,000,000,000, and when the rural people represent 25 percent of our population? If the ceiling on butter is to be 37.3 cents per pound, the ceiling on cheese will be about one-half, or 18.6 cents per pound.

I especially call to the attention of Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations the proposed ceiling of $7.62 per hundredweight on beef cattle and to the attention of Hon. HAMPTON FULMER the proposed ceiling of 18.1 cents per pound on cotton.

As most States produce butter, which normally represents about 75 percent of the manufactured dairy products, I know this product has universal interest. I will not take the time to try and discuss this butter question, but want you to ask your farmer friends while you are home if they can produce 37.3-cent-per-pound butter at present farm wage levels and with the present prices of products they purchase. Ask any butter-producing farmer if he can produce 37.3-cent butter with 93 cents per bushel corn, 90 cents per bushel barley, 58 cents per bushel oats, and $17 a ton hay, or whether it is more advantageous to him to sell his grains and fodder.

SOME FARM PRICES

The following official letter shows the prices of the major farm crops the 10 years before the House of Representatives came under the control of the New Deal, and the prices which have prevailed during the 10 years since the New Deal has controlled the House of Representatives:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., August 9, 1941.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: In reply to your letter of August 6 requesting 10-year average prices

for certain commodities for the two periods 1921–30 and 1931–40, the following table will supply you with the desired information:

Average prices received by farmers

Commodity	10-year average price (1921–30)	10-year average price (1931–40)
Wheat,[1] cents per bushel	107.2	71.1
Corn,[1] cents per bushel	76.8	58.7
Oats,[1] cents per bushel	39.9	30.4
Barley,[1] cents per bushel	56.6	45.3
Butter,[2] cents per pound	39.9	25.5
Cheese,[2] cents per pound	20.1	13.0
Eggs,[2] cents per dozen	27.2	18.5
Hogs,[2] dollars per 100 pounds	8.95	6.35
Beef cattle,[2] dollars per 100 pounds	7.00	5.78

[1] 10-year season average price.
[2] Average price for 10 calendar years.

Very truly yours,

W. F. CALLANDER,
Head Agricultural Statistician,
In charge, Agricultural Statistics Division.

Percent higher 10 years before New Deal controlled the House of Representatives; wheat 50, corn 31, oats 31, barley 25, butter 56, cheese 55, eggs 47, hogs 41, and beef cattle 21.

Please note that the 10-year Republican average for butter and cheese was higher than the 110-percent parity price ceiling proposed by Henderson, Ginsburg, Hamm, Elliott & Co. When you put a ceiling of 37 cents per pound on butter you put a wage scale of 20 cents per hour or less for a large group of American workers. Cotton representatives say that 18 cents per pound for cotton is not over 18 cents per hour for the labor producing this cotton.

The prices of the great bulk of agricultural products have been so low for so long under the New Deal that farm price advances which would permit the farmer to live like the rest of the people in this world are disturbing to the farm price manipulators of the New Deal. The largest cost of producing agricultural products is labor and the labor which produces the food for this Natior is entitled to the legislative protection which is accorded to any other group of labor. This protection is not going to be accorded by the 37 cents per pound ceiling for butter proposed by the discredited apostles of the more abundant life. One fact is evident. Secretary Wickert will not get the dairy products he wants or thinks he wants with this program suggested by Mr. Henderson.

Since the Agriculture Department has gradually disintegrated into a social and political agency of government, the farmers of the country cannot expect their interests to be protected by the Agriculture Department. Members of Congress should study this problem and see that the rural people of this country receive the legislative protection to which they are entitled.

The Situation in South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, now, as never before in its history, this hemisphere is being subjected to an acute degree of imperilment from within and without due mainly to a well-organized, insidious effort on the part of a combination of foreign powers to disrupt not only the way of life of our people, but also to sow the seeds of discord and distrust among neighboring friendly countries. The form of organization and the methods of spreading subversive threats differ slightly in each American republic, but the aims are always the same—to discredit the efforts of the United States and other governments and to bring into power in each of the several countries a government which will be sympathetic to the totalitarian ideal.

The German organization, with brief reference to others, is considered here because it is a strongly centralized and directed military agent, formed along military lines, with a singleness of purpose to further the German war aims in a manner which has proved eminently successful in Europe—notably in Norway, the Low Countries, and France. Moreover, it is the model organization whose methods all other subversive groups attempt to emulate. Such a cleverly led and organized force requires at least the creation and maintenance of a large and well-trained counter force ready in the Western Hemisphere to assist and quickly move to assist any threatened country requiring aid, if the way of life in our hemisphere is to be maintained and the defense plans of the United States are to be realized.

In a brief review of the ramifications of the Nazi organization in Latin America and threat to all the countries in our hemisphere, only an outline of manysided activities of this huge machine can be covered.

First consider the situation in Argentina. These Nazi activities are controlled by a German who is listed as a civil attaché of the German Embassy staff. Before this man arrived, Christian Zinsser, who was in charge of German espionage in Poland before the war, was chief of the Nazi party both in Argentina and Uruguay. Two hundred and three German schools, 320 old-line German associations, and 102 local groups are used in spreading propaganda. Money for these activities is levied on all Germar nationals, and even Argentine employees of German firms. At least one daily newspaper, two weeklies, and one monthly publication are financed. Proof of the militant intent of the Nazis in Argentina may be found in the Patagonian investigation of German plans for control of this region in the early part of 1939, and the Misiones affair of 1940, where Nazi cells were uncovered in numbers. Another item that should not be overlooked is that a German Army mission directed the training of the Argentine Army until July 1940. The Argentine Government has been showing considerable concern in recent months over the Nazi activities, and recent raids on meetings and propaganda centers have all indicated that this activity is widespread.

In Brazil, the German Embassy in Rio de Janeiro estimates that there are 1,200,000 Germans and descendants of Germans. Here through foreign office officials the Nazis have built up a powerful organization for spreading propaganda, employing many in the Embassy in Rio de Janeiro whose names do not appear on any published list. The large number of Italians and Japanese who have settled in regional groups in Brazil is well known. This situation is of considerable potential danger.

When we turn to Chile we find that there are about 20,000 European-born Germans and between 125,000 and 175,000 descendants of immigrant Germans in the country. With this large German concentration, the German Embassy is able to assess from German firms and citizens enough money to spend 3,000,000 pesos—about $100,000—monthly on propaganda. The Nazis are extremely well organized here, having 65 party leaders, 101 bund leaders, and 107 teachers working throughout the country.

The Government of Bolivia, no less than a few weeks ago, on July 19, was forced to declare a state of siege in order to forestall a serious threat to its sovereignty which would have placed the whole country in strong totalitarian hands. This threat was planned through the assistance of the German Minister to Bolivia, Ernst Wendler. Had the proposed coup détat been successful, the contract for wolfram and tin with the United States and England would have been annulled, and the recently authorized air line operated by Bolivian and United States interests would have been expelled from the country.

In Colombia, which covers the southern approaches of the Panama Canal, the Nazi organization is well set up and very industrious. So far in this country little stress is placed on military activities, but every effort is being made to undermine the faith of the Colombian people in the democratic cause and to create ill will toward the United States. Because of the strong German commercial and financial interests in Colombia, the Nazis are able to spend large amonts of money on propaganda. Possibly the greatest threat to the Panama Canal can come from hidden air fields in the little-inhabiated regions within air-bombing distance of the Canal.

Our closest neighbor, Mexico, has Axis propaganda organizations embracing two separate elements, the international and

the domestic. The German group, which includes the official diplomatic and consular representatives and the unofficial German residents, is the most active and most influential of all.

German businessmen in Mexico are reported to contribute large sums of money monthly for German propaganda. The nerve center of all German financial activities is the German (South American) Bank, some of whose employees are charged exclusively with supervision of all "political-economic" accounts and the disbursement and supervision of funds allocated for these activities. In order to maintain this control, all the coercive methods available to the bank are used to force the German houses to carry on their business through the bank, and any attempt to elude this control brings immediate pecuniary difficulties in reprisal for the guilty one, through denial of credit, boycott on the part of the colony, or in some other form.

The Japanese have also long been active in Mexico for the collection of military information and the gathering of strategic raw materials, with perhaps more than a casual look at the countries of Central America. It is worthy of note that a man who is said to have been the directing agent for subversive activities in Thailand previous to the recent trouble there has been transferred to Mexico.

In Central America the Honduran Government, on March 21 last, declared the German chargé d'affaires at Tegucigalpa, Christian Zinsser, persona non grata because of his activities in spreading propaganda and attempting to provoke trouble between the United States and Honduras. This is the same German official who was reported so active and dangerous previously in Argentina. He was removed from the Argentine and then went to Honduras to continue his subversive activities.

The long-standing boundary dispute between Peru and Ecuador has recently again become active, and there is every indication of the Axis' hand in this incitement. It is events of this kind which the Nazis welcome to fan hatred between neighbors and to weaken the confidence of people in their governments. They also serve to engage the attention of the United States and tend to bring discredit on its good-neighbor policy.

A quick glance at totalitarian air activities in the whole of South America reveals the following:

The German and associate controlled air lines in South America first became active in the early 1920's. These enterprises were primarily commercial in nature and remained so until shortly after the accession of the Nazi regime in Germany. At that time German air-transport policy underwent a fundamental change and German activities in South America, while remaining commercial in form, became largely propagandistic and even military in intent.

A large-scale program was begun early in 1935, the spearhead of which has been the Brazilian Syndicate Condor. This line, to all intent and purposes, is an arm of the German-owned Lufthansa and has been liberally supplied with equipment and funds. In addition to expanding the services of wholly German-owned companies, the Germans have acquired influence over a number of South American-owned lines by selling them equipment and furnishing them with technical personnel on very liberal lines. There are nine Axis air lines—16,600 route miles—operating in South America, which use German equipment exclusively. Seven of these also employ various proportions of German personnel. Two of the latter, Condor in Brazil and Sedta in Ecuador, totaling 8,300 route miles, are completely German-owned and managed. Varig, in Brazil, though partly South American-owned, was originally organized by Germans.

Axis and particularly German air-line activities in South America on the present scale are certainly against every interest of the United States.

They offer both a near-term threat which is primarily military and a most serious long-term menace which in addition is economic and political. Certain of their routes clearly appear to have been opened to tap strategic areas without regard to traffic possibilities.

Since the outbreak of the war, some of the activities of the Axis lines have been almost openly military. Until prohibited by Brazilian Government, Condor used four-engined planes on several occasions to observe the position of British cruisers operating in South Atlantic, probably passing this information on to German surface raiders. As a connecting air link to Europe the Italian trans-Atlantic air line, Lati, today flies from Rome to Buenos Aires, Argentina, by way of the Brazilian coast. In March 1941 Brazil fined Lati because of an extended test flight that seemed closely connected with the departure of Italian freighters from Rio de Janeiro for Europe the next day. While this line normally makes one flight weekly to and from Europe, four flights were made from Natal during the period June 22–29, 1941. This increase of schedule coincided with the preparation for sailing of six Axis surface craft, which actually sailed June 27–29. Lati thus furnishes the Axis Powers in Europe a means of air reconnaissance of the South Atlantic Ocean as well as a fast route of communication and transportation.

The present German air lines represent a distinct threat to the Panama Canal. Should the war permit the Germans an opportunity, this network would undoubtedly be greatly expanded. Elaborate ground facilities of military value would be established and numbers of high-performance airplanes placed in service. Under such conditions the Sedta operations in Ecuador and the Condor in the western regions of Brazil would constitute constant menaces to the Panama Canal. In addition, Condor bases on the shoulder of Brazil would be of great value as a bridgehead for an invasion attempt.

The full story of the extent of the totalitarian effort in Latin America cannot now be told without injury to the measures the United States and other governments are taking to supervise and control this menace. This tremendous threat to our security and way of life can only be removed by a positive, adequate, and competent counter force always ready and available in the Western Hemisphere until this great danger is banished.

Shall the United States Enter the Shooting Stage of War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered recently over the radio:

First of all, I desire to express my thanks to the Mutual Broadcasting System for granting me this time. I am neither speaking for nor appearing for any group, but just as an average citizen expressing my honest convictions.

It is my purpose to discuss briefly the question, Shall the United States enter the shooting stage of war?

This question, of course has nothing to do with the matter of our defense and the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

The Monroe Doctrine, long an accepted policy by our people, was officially approved by an act of Congress only last year. Briefly, the common accepted understanding of that policy has been: We keep to our own Western Hemisphere affairs, and we will also keep out of Eastern Hemisphere affairs, and we expect the Eastern Hemisphere to keep out of Western Hemisphere affairs.

We are agreed on full defense of not only our own country, but also defense of the republics to the south of us who will cooperate with us and who are unable to defend themselves.

In the first place, it is my belief that the question of war or peace is being beclouded by a lot of issues that have little or no bearing upon conditions as they now exist.

War or peace is actually a matter of selection.

We can have either, and it is up to us to make our choice.

We are told that if we don't get into this war and help England defeat Germany, Italy, and Japan, we will have to do it alone later on. This might be true, but I do not believe it. I feel it is a false premise that will not bear up under cold and unemotional scrutiny.

There is no danger of the dictator nations being able to make a successful invasion of this country now or in the near future, whether England stands or falls.

The Axis Powers do not have the ships and lines of supply required for such stupendous undertaking, and they know it full well.

Our own Army and Navy experts are well aware of how supply demands pile up in geometrical progression as lines of communications and transportation lengthen. Nor is there any possibility of the Axis Powers being able to acquire such necessary facilities in the near future, either through the capitulation of the British and their latest ally,

Russia, or by their own shipbuilding and military production efforts.

Now, on the other hand, the United States does not now have the transportation facilities necessary to support the required line of supply for another invasion of Europe. The reason we do not have such facilities is largely because we have been giving too many of them away.

We hear a lot of talk about our coastal cities and industrial centers being bombed from the air. It is probably soon possible for suicide air squadrons to do that, but suicide bomber squadrons do not win wars. If that were so, England would have long since surrendered. No; it takes a powerful Navy, hundreds of cargo vessels, and millions of men to wage a transoceanic war—win or lose. Anything less than that in the way of equipment and facilities is even more foolhardy than even Hitler is apt to contemplate.

It is not my desire to create an impression that we are entirely free from danger. I admit we are faced with an acute danger. But it is from within rather than from without.

I refer to the minority war group, the 10 or 20 percent of our people who are clamoring for and pushing us toward war. What is their goal?

Can it possibly be to develop such a great national fear amongst us to the point where, in desperation, we enter into an offensive war before we are adequately prepared even for a defensive war?

My fellow Americans, should that occur, we will find ourselves in the midst of chaos, and that, I warn you, would be a quick end to all our freedoms and the last real representative form of government would pass from the earth.

A year hence our situation will be changed. We will have a much larger Navy, hundreds of additional cargo vessels, guns, and materials of all kinds, and upward of 2,000,000 well-trained soldiers. From the military and naval standpoint, we will then be much better prepared to aid in the defense of the republics to the south of us. We are in no such position today.

And don't forget—while bombers can level cities, disrupt transportation, and motorized divisions can overrun countrysides, it still takes the age-old foot soldier to win a war by actual occupation. They are just as necessary today as they were in Caesar's time, and probably even more so, for modern war arenas now embrace continents rather than just a few hundred square miles of territory.

So much for the practical side of the question whether or not we shall go to war now or remain at armed peace.

Let us look at the domestic economic angle.

Up to June 26, 1941, Congress has authorized more than fifty and one-half billions of dollars for defense, of which approximately twenty-seven billion has actually been spent for ships, airplanes, ordnance, training of men, and all the other items required to build a huge Army and Navy.

In addition, $8,775,000,000 has been advanced under the Lend Lease Act and through R. F. C. loans to the British, Chinese, and Free French. It is now reliably reported that Congress will soon be called upon for at least another $7,000,000,000 for lend-lease purposes, probably most of which is intended for Russia.

Let us realize the cost of war.

Go back 24 years, when we entered the first World War. Our national debt was then $1,000,000,000. At the end of the war our national debt had risen to the dizzy sum of $26,000,000,000.

During the succeeding administrations of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, that debt was reduced eleven billion in 11 years, to fifteen billion. And may I remind you that we have paid another fifteen billion in interest on the last World War debt.

Since 1930 we have not reduced that debt of fifteen billion. Now we confront World War No. 2 with a $45,000,000,000 debt, and with additional authorized expenditures confronting us it is estimated we will have increased our national debt to $100,000,000,000 this year.

If we are to maintain our national credit and prevent bankruptcy, we are going to pay taxes such as has never before been experienced in America. Yes, we talk about the three and one-half billion dollar tax bill now pending in Congress. That is only the new tax increase over the nine and one-half billion tax under existing law. Someone once said, "The power to tax is the power to destroy."

War and taxes for war can be implements of destruction to ourselves. Such huge expenditures with their attendant waste, if continued long, can have but one result, national bankruptcy.

Concentration of skilled workers into war plants, shipyards, etc., and the curtailment of regular industrial activities in many of the smaller cities of our Nation is already causing severe dislocations in our domestic life.

May I quote briefly from a letter received last week from a hotelkeeper in the Midwest:

"Since the first of the year more and more of our regular patrons are off the road, and always the same answer: 'Nothing to sell.'" Tragically he continues, "I hope that Congress in giving away billions to save democracy will find some way to save the individual, without whom there would be no democracy."

The temporary prosperity we are now experiencing is fleeting. It is not constructive nor enduring, for the reason that most of the defense money is being spent on articles of destruction, and it represents in all important phases a continuation of the distribute-the-wealth idea.

Time does not permit discussion of all the economic inequalities that resulted from the defense program thus far.

To me, the moral aspect of an aggressive war is unsupportable. Aggressors are ruthless; and should we send another A. E. F. to Europe, we, too, would become ruthless.

We are told we must fight the dictators to maintain the "four freedoms." I say the "four freedoms" will survive, whatever their transitory state may be at the moment. Those nations who want them will have them sooner or later.

"Save the world for democracy" is the slogan invented by the war advocates. What democracies are we to save, and who is to save who? Poor Finland, considered by us as the most honorable nation, the one nation who paid her World War debt installments to us, yet last week we read of Finland being bombed by Britain. Part of France fighting Germany and part fighting England. "Red" Russia, our new-found democracy, for years considered by us as our worst enemy because of the secret agents she has employed here in our Nation to plot our overthrow, now appears to have become our bosom friend. We are all beginning to say, "What's going on anyway?"

The greatest boon to mankind will be the powerful example we can set by showing them the futility of war, and that war is not necessary in a true republic. On the other hand, if we do go into these conflicts, we shall settle nothing, while at the same time prove ourselves to be no better than those who started them, and bring upon our own heads, as we did after the first World War, the criticism and even hatred of some of our Allies for prolonging the war.

Ladies and gentlemen, as you hear this talk tonight you may be wondering what you can do to help decide whether this Nation selects war or peace as its national destiny. Let me say in conclusion that you have everything to do with this decision. If you want America to remain at peace, write your President and tell him so. Do not stop there. Also write letters to your two Senators and your Congressmen asking them to take an active part in the crusade to keep America out of this war. Your letters are carefully read here in Washington, and in this final analysis your desires will be followed by your Government. The decision is in your hands.

Is Nation Being Taken Down the Road to Socialism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

AN EDITORIAL

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

IS NATION BEING TAKEN DOWN THE ROAD TO SOCIALISM?

"Are President Roosevelt and his more intimate advisers, in cooperation with the British Labor Party, bent on delivering the United States to Socialism? Are they trying to turn our Government into a labor government, paralleling the effort of Bevin, Laski, and the English radicals, and our economic system into a collectivist system control, as in the European dictatorships, by one strong leader and his aides?

"Have they seized upon the present defense crisis as an opportunity to discredit, then liquidate private enterprise? Is the administration taming a half-puppet Congress with patronage and breaking its prestige in order to forestall opposition to a socialist organization of society? Is it subordinating defense to politics and politics, in the ordinary sense, to class war?"

These are the startling questions that Amos Pinchot, New York statesman and publicist, asks the American people in a pamphlet issued by the Committee for Constitutional Government.

According to Mr. Pinchot, the plan involves continued expansion of Government control until private property will be largely in hands of the state, which will be ruled by Socialist labor parties in the United States and England.

Mr. Pinchot especially names Harold Laski, a British Laborite professor and an adviser of Mr. Roosevelt; Ambassador John C. Winant, Benjamin Cohen, Harry L. Hopkins, lend-lease bill administrator, and Justice Felix Frankfurter as members of this group.

What is most astonishing in this alleged program of upsetting our traditional democratic forms is the part played in it by such Englishmen as Harold Laski and John Maynard Keynes, of the British Treasury, who is generally looked on as the father of the Roosevelt spending-into-prosperity technique, and which sane Americans call squandermania.

It was Professor Laski who now has the President's ear, who said at the University of Wisconsin in April 1939:

"Should war be forced upon us and we see the old, ugly, imperialistic aims dominating the rulers of the democracies, we of the Labor Party and the working class everywhere see

it as our duty to turn those wars into civil wars and remake those governments which disregard the working classes, which are their foundations."

Turning imperialistic wars, so-called, into civil wars is what Lenin advised the workers of America to do in his "a letter to American workers," 1934. The Communist leader said:

"The American workers will not follow the bourgeoisie. They will be for us for civil war against the bourgeoisie" (p. 17).

Professor Laski, also in one of his books pictures communism as an experiment that has brought "exaltation to the common man," when, as a matter of fact nothing has so completely degraded the common man in all history.

As further proof that the administration is drifting into a socialistic government, Mr. Pinchot cites these instances:

"The judiciary bill to pack and control the Federal courts; the executive reorganization bill to move the powers of Congress into the President's hands; the Black-Connery so-called wages-and-hours bill, which, in its original version, was a bill to create a price-fixing and wage-fixing dictatorship over capital and labor; the May bill of 1938, aimed at arming the President with full censorship of the means of communication, and also, like the seizure bill, enabling him to rewrite, at his discretion, every contract entered into in the United States, whether between private persons and corporations, or between them and the Government; the bills providing for agricultural regimentation and price-fixing; the President's effort to place under political control medicine, insurance, railroads, and other enterprises and professions that should be private, competitive, and free."

This is all in line with government by Cabal to which the American people have been subjected for 8 years.

What they voted for three times was more freedom, a balanced budget, a reduction of taxation, no socialism, and no war.

What they have got or are about to get is, without a doubt, precisely what Mr. Pinchot exposes in his pamphlet—plus war!

The Wrath to Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of August 8, 1941:

[From the Chicago Tribune of August 8, 1941]

THE WRATH TO COME

The Republican Party is the minority party, but it represents the majority sentiment in the most important division of opinion in a generation of Americans. The party representatives in the House of Representatives, recognizing this and the obligations it carries with it, have signed a resolution giving the people of the country "a definite expression of our views on national defense and foreign policy.

The declaration was needed to reassure the majority of the people that they have not been wholly deserted and betrayed by their representative system.

The position of most of the Republican Party leaders, both in and out of Congress, has been known, but it had become imperative that something like united party action should be taken to make it plain that the party stood by its own platform and would demand that the majority party, the one which won the election, should abide by its campaign pledges as given by the party platform and by the party candidates.

One pronouncement of weight came from 15 of the party leaders. The resolution of the House Republicans follows that, reinforces it, and puts the party behind it. Thus the party becomes by a full expression of its beliefs and decisions the party of opposition to entering the war abroad.

Under Mr. Roosevelt, the Democratic Party has ceased to be representative of the country which returned it to office. Every testing of public opinion shows that the people are 4 to 1 against entering a foreign war. People whose votes sent Mr. Roosevelt back into the White House and gave the Democrats the control of Congress are against the program to which Mr. Roosevelt and under him his party are openly committed. The program is a breach of faith with the people whose votes were obtained under false promises which they apparently fully trusted.

The Republicans in Congress, in their resolution, repeat not only the Republican pledge but the Democratic. The Republican platform said: "The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war." The Democratic platform said: "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

The phrase "except in case of attack" cannot be used as an escape clause from the otherwise unconditional promise. The country has not been attacked. The people are not to be cheated by the assumption that if we do not at once carry the war into some foreign land we shall be invaded, nor are they to be deceived by the pretense that since these pledges were given them by their two major parties conditions have so changed that Mr. Roosevelt could not now honestly or wisely, prudently or patriotically, pledge himself as he did when he was a candidate. This is a pretense and a falsity.

All changes which have taken place on the war map since the November election have added to the difficulties of the Axis Powers, to the resources and strength of the British, and have improved the defensive position of the United States. Japan, although more aggressive, is in greater difficulties and is aggressive for that reason. Italy has become almost negligible, and Germany, which had gone from one easy victory to another, is engaged to the full testing of its powers in a great war.

These conditions are all favorable to the keeping of pledges, particularly of those pledges unequivocally given by Mr. Roosevelt himself. And yet we have the Democratic Party putting forward as its principal spokesman in the Senate such a man as CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, who demands that the American people commit themselves to a military and financial catastrophe which this little trifler with national destiny describes as incalculable. He talks of the squandering of hundreds of billions of dollars and of the sacrifice of millions of lives, for years and years, as if it were tolerable to the thought or endurable to the flesh. He, speaking for his party and his party chief, confronts the Nation with this fate as if it were unescapable and were already upon us.

There is a design that it should be unescapable, and the Democratic Party in Congress, dumb or indifferent, paralyzed or hypnotized, is surrendering the majority of its votes to authorize war abroad, supporting a policy denounced by the people, denounced by these very Democrats themselves, and by every truly prophetic voice.

Do Mr. PEPPER and those for whom he speaks think there will be anything left of the Democratic Party if what he predicts for the United States should become a reality—because of what he and they have done? Even if the country as we have known it and its Government as we have desired it to be should survive in the long endurance that would be required after such an experience, the men and the party who had brought it about would be buried under a hatred which would last as long as they and their acts were remembered.

Fear of punishment is not a high motive, but possibly these subservient men will listen to none other. The Republicans may be able to do no more than present a front against the misrepresentatives of a people threatened by their own Government, but the Republicans can do no less.

The madness of the war party increases day by day. It has lost reason. It is demanding human sacrifices and wants—to splatter its altars, but there is wrath coming and the persons who betray the country, sacrifice its youth, and leave it in the world's wreckage will feel the edge of that just anger.

Attitude of Management Toward Industrial Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

ARTICLE BY GUY CLOW

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, which was written by one of my constituents:

[From the Coshocton (Ohio) Tribune]

ATTITUDE OF MANAGEMENT TOWARD INDUSTRIAL SAFETY

(By Guy Clow, manager, James B. Clow & Sons Co., Coshocton)

Accident prevention in industry is a divided responsibility. Management must assume its share and the working personnel must also accept its share. Mutual benefits cannot be attained without the assumption of mutual responsibilities.

Speaking from the viewpoint of the employer, I would say that the initiative in any safety program rests with management. It is the duty of the employer to provide safe working conditions and, as far as possible, minimize the inherent hazards of production. On the other hand, it is the responsibility of the worker to make use of the safety measures provided for his protection and also to provide the human element without which accident prevention effort is useless.

We believe that industry, especially that portion which is agreed on the policy of modern and progressive methods, is living up to its ideals as regards safety. Its primary motive in reducing the number and severity of accidents is purely humanitarian. No employer who has kept his standards keyed to the social problems of the day wants to see anyone of his employees suffer injury and

monetary losses incident thereto. Wherefore, his first consideration in setting up a safety program must be predicated upon the desire to maintain the physical welfare of every man or woman in his employ. Regardless of the erroneous impression that employers have no human interest in their employees, we believe that this is rather universally true.

Because of the emphasis given to the economic aspects of safety, and perhaps justly so, many employees have gathered the impression that accident prevention programs in industry are primarily motivated by the desire to save money for the company. As far as progressive industry is concerned, this is a popular fallacy. It is true that the consistent adherence to safety methods and safe practices will save money for the employer in many ways. It cuts down needless overhead expenses, saves the loss of time needed for production, eliminates a lot of waste due to breakage and spoilage and brings to the employee a peace and contentment that is a valuable asset in maintaining plant morale.

No employer, in this age of keen competition, will overlook the real value of accident prevention as an aid in sustaining his economic status, but in the safety movement, these rewards for safety effort should be and, we believe, rather generally are, looked upon as incidental to the human value involved. This is particularly true at the present time, when the entire industry of the Nation is engaged in an all-out effort to increase production for the national defense. Conservation of manpower is just now one of the prime essentials of the defense program and the maintenance of the health and fitness of workers is a necessary step in that direction.

It is not through any selfish motive that industry asks employees to faithfully comply with safety rules and regulations, and be careful of doing things calculated to endanger their own safety and that of their fellow workers. As a matter of fact, the real beneficiaries of a safety program are the worker himself, his dependents, and the community in which he lives. It is the worker who undergoes the physical pain and mental disruption due to a disabling injury. It is the worker who exchanges the wage his labor produces for the $18.75 per week it is now possible for him to receive in compensation, or the $21 per week available after September. It is the worker who is forced to the necessity of curtailing his living expenses in accord with reduced income, and it is his family which must deny themselves the necessities and luxuries made possible by steady work at good wages. To him disability means an irretrievable loss, whereas it is possible for the employer to cover accident outlays into the cost of production.

Burden on Draftee in United States Far Worse Than in Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KNUTE HILL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

ARTICLE BY HAL BURTON

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following article. No comments are necessary. The simple facts recited in this article are conclusive in showing two things: That with proper equipment draftees can be fully trained for defense purposes in a period of 4 months; that Canada, a part of the British Empire, is doing this very thing and that these draftees are not even asked to serve throughout the Western Hemisphere outside of Canada.

BURDEN ON DRAFTEE IN UNITED STATES FAR WORSE THAN IN CANADA—DOMINION SOLDIER SERVES BUT 4 MONTHS; AMERICAN MUST COVER THE HEMISPHERE

(By Hal Burton)

OTTAWA, August 11.—In Canada, a married man is automatically exempt from the draft. In the United States, he is automatically exempt only if he has dependents.

A Canadian draftee need only serve within the ocean boundaries of the country. An American draftee is liable to service anywhere within the Western Hemisphere, which covers everything from Greenland to Hawaii, and from Newfoundland to the southernmost tip of South America.

4-MONTH TRAINING

In Canada, a man who enlists in the reserve force, corresponding to the National Guard in the United States, is not called up in the draft. In the United States, such a man is part of the Regular Army.

In Canada, a man who has completed his 4 months' training under the conscription laws may obtain a leave of absence to return to a job essential to national defense. In the United States, once such a man is classified and sent to camp, he's in the Army to stay.

These essential differences between the Canadian and American conscription systems were elucidated today by a group of government officials. Two additional points were brought out by Maj. Gen. L. B. Lafleche, associate deputy minister of national war services:

1. The Canadian draftee does no K. P. or fatigue duty other than the policing of his tent. Such work is left to overage enlistees, such as members of the veterans' guard—enlisted soldiers of the last war who attend to cooking, sweeping and other services indelibly associated with the American draftee.

DRAFT AGES DIFFER

2. No Canadian under 21 or over 24 is eligible for service under the draft laws. In the United States the minimum age is 21 and the maximum 28.

The Canadian 21-to-24-year-olds have already built an army of 102,000 home-defense soldiers; volunteers from 18 to 43 already have provided an army of 100,000 abroad, with an additional 200,000 soldiers and airmen at home.

The draft regulations specify that those presently subject to call shall be individuals not more than 24 years old on July 1, 1940, and 21 or older since that time.

This week end the Government announced that the 3 divisions presently overseas, plus a tank brigade and corps troops, will shortly be supplemented by 2 more divisions of 10,000 each. In the last war the Canadians had 425,000 men overseas. Before the end of this war the figure may be the same, or higher.

VOLUNTEERS ABROAD

Service abroad, on a volunteer basis, has brought an entirely satisfactory response. The last call, for 32,000 men, brought 50,000. That, officials say, is why no universal conscription for overseas service has occurred, unlike the last war.

"In the new type of war," one official commented, "where the fire power of a group of soldiers is so greatly intensified, 10 men may be as effective as 50 were in the last war. To date, for us, this has been a war of movement, with low casualties. We have sent abroad and are training for service abroad all the men we need at the moment. If we need more, we will call them."

The Canadian Army breaks down into four subdivisions: (1) Those called for compulsory military service; (2) those who volunteer for overseas service; (3) those in the reserve force; (4) those in the veterans' guard.

Those in compulsory service receive 4 months' training and thereafter are held on active duty. Originally draftees received 30 days' training and then went into the reserves. This plan ended February 3, 1941, when the reserve period was expanded. On April 21, 1941, draftees were ordered held in active service "for the duration" after completing their 4 months.

OF DEFINITE VALUE

In this 4 months, Canadian Army officials believe, a man competent for home defense can be turned out. He spends his first 2 months being conditioned in 1 of the 39 training centers. He spends his second 2 months learning a special branch of the service, as he may elect—such as artillery, infantry, signal corps.

He learns, initially, how to do columns, wear his uniform, army routine, to get his infantry training, read maps, fight with a bayonet, and to prepare himself for the branch of the service he wants to enter.

"In 4 months," General LaFleche commented today, "a man can be brought to a point where he is of definite value in defense."

Under the conscription laws, postponements may be granted for a maximum of 6 months to men engaged in essential services—farming, fishing, lumbering, trapping, mining, placer mining, gold prospecting, seafaring, railroad transportation, or other seasonal occupation.

FIFTEEN TO TWENTY-FIVE PERCENT DEFERMENT

When a man is called for service he may apply for a postponement in writing within 8 days. One of the 13 divisional boards in Canada, corresponding on a larger scale to American draft boards, will then consider his application. No postponement for longer than 6 months is granted, and the average is only 2½ months.

If a draftee who applies for a postponement is employed in a key defense industry, he is given no special consideration beyond his initial postponement. The shop for which he works is expected to train older men and women as replacements for such young draftees.

But once he has completed his 4 months' training, if the shop or factory for which he works can prove that he is necessary to its continued operations, he can be released from active duty on leave of absence. He gets no pay from the Army while on leave, and he can be called back at any time.

The number thus exempted varies from 15 to 25 percent in official estimates.

Extending the Period of Service of Persons in the Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I approach this important matter with a

deep feeling and a heavy heart. This is a time to lay aside all prejudices and to calmly and dispassionately approach the subject with one thought in view, and that is the well-being and security of our Nation. What is best and what should be done under the circumstances as they exist today? Does the passage of this pending legislation work a hardship on those in service; and, if so, does the security and well-being of this Nation demand that this hardship and sacrifice be required of those who are now in service and those who may later be called? I do not accept this matter lightly. To me it has meant much thought and consideration and many sleepless nights. There is more involved than a mere affirmative vote. We cannot thus cast the issue aside and let it end there. Unless we are willing to meet the challenge and go further, it is best that the House reject the legislation.

We listen to the war news over our radio and then turn to our favorite orchestra or quiz program. We daily read of the killing of tens of thousands in Russia and China and then turn to the comic or sports sections. It is taken as a matter of course. But, my colleagues, when it is brought home to us, then it is a different story. Yes; today, even this very hour, American boys, our boys, are paying the supreme sacrifice. We are at war in many ways. It is poor consolation to the members of one's family to tell them that their loved one, who has lost his life in training, was not shot down by an enemy and that we are not at war. To them it is war and their loved one has paid the supreme sacrifice in order that we may be prepared.

A relative of mine recently lost his life in a Navy plane and a relative of my wife lost his life as a cadet in the Army Air Corps. This same thing is happening daily to families throughout this Nation. The war is being brought home to them.

I, for one, do not charge anyone opposed to the extension of the draft as unpatriotic. Just a day or so ago, in talking to a Republican colleague, I learned that he had already lost a brother and has a son in the service. While opposed to the extension, I know that he is just as good and as patriotic an American as I.

It is an easy matter to make stirring speeches calling upon someone else to fight and die—yes, and to serve. I know what war is, I know what it means, I know what it is for a nation to be unprepared. God forbid that the youth of this Nation shall ever be called upon to again go into battle unprepared as was done in the last World War. While never being in actual combat myself, I have through my limited service learned and seen the penalties paid by this Nation by unpreparedness during our last war. I want no more of it. I am for peace, but peace with honor and peace with security.

Yes, I shall vote for an extension of service, but in doing so I pledge myself that insofar as lies in my power that I will see that this Nation does its duty toward these men and their families. The veterans of the last war have been called Treasury raiders and vilified. The Nation soon forgets, but my pledge here and now is that as one voting for this extended service that I shall not forget whatever comes. My personal feeling is that we will not become involved in the present war, however, we have no such guaranty. With a wild man loose in the world we must take every precaution. We must prepare for peace, not for war, and then if war comes we can meet the enemy on equal terms.

I realize that the extension of the period of service will work a hardship upon many of the men in service. Certainly no one can argue that if we were actually in war that the men would be turned out in 12 months and while we are not in war, conditions have developed whereby it would seriously affect the safety and security of the Nation to end the training at this time. While it was generally understood at the time of the passage of the act that only 12 months would be required, there was nothing in the act so stating and there was no contract with any such terms. The act clearly states that:

> Each man inducted under the provisions * * * shall serve for a training and service period of 12 consecutive months unless sooner discharged, except that whenever the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled, such 12-month period may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense.

The only question now involved is whether or not the national interest is imperiled. Each of us must answer this in our own mind.

I shall vote to increase the pay of the men in service after his 12-month period of training. I believe this to be right and proper.

In voting for this measure I make the pledge that I will support all legislation tending toward national defense and legislation that will insure those in service the very best and most modern equipment. I do not see how anyone can vote for this measure and stop there. You have just begun—unless we are to follow through, let us not enact this legislation.

We can extend the time of service, but my colleagues our first line of defense lies on the production line. The defense and future not only of this Nation but of those nations fighting the aggressor, depend upon our ability to furnish supplies in ever-increasing quantities. This is more important than any extended service bill, because we must produce supplies, planes, tanks, and other implements to help all nations over the world who are fighting the aggressors. If we are able to send them sufficient supplies, then our boys will never have to fight. This is our first duty, yet we quibble and "fiddle while Rome burns." If the situation is so acute as to require additional service it is serious enough to do something about the strike situation. I maintain that the same power that has the right to draft and extend the period of service has the power to do something about strikes.

Until recently there has been a great lull in the number of strikes, but just at a time when we are considering extending the service limit a new crop breaks out. The papers for the past week have been filled with strikes, strikes, strikes.

The union-shop issue is the only controversy between the Federal Shipbuilding and Drydock Corporation and 16,000 strikers. Work has been halted on the construction of 13 vessels. This strike is the biggest blow at the national-defense program since the North American Aviation strike. The President has been asked to take over the plant in order to enforce the union demands.

A large number of employees failed to report at the Philadelphia Navy Yard in what naval officials describe as a refusal to work unless they obtain double time for Saturday. Admiral Watson, commandant of the yard, said that this action violated an agreement with the union that all overtime and Saturday work would be based on time and a half.

Read the reports and look at some of the pictures coming from these strike centers and see whether you approve of the actions of the picket lines. I do not want any repressive legislation, but I do want something done about the jurisdictional strikes over the country and something done whereby an American citizen who wants to serve his country on the production line will not be molested. And I know that the boys who are receiving $21 a day once a month instead of double time at $21 a day want something done.

Harry Hopkins, administrator of the lease-lend bill, serving as the President's special envoy to London, in a speech broadcast to the British people promised the British that the tools needed for victory are on the way from American production lines. I want to see this promise carried out.

I do not lay all the trouble to labor. Some of it lies with the administrative officials and with the plants. I noticed just a few days ago that one of the large plants was going on a 6-day week. Just think! Here we are in what some consider the worst crisis in our country, and a plant just now going on a 6-day week. Does Saturday work interfere with some of the officials' golf games?

Our much-heralded plane output continues to lag. Only 10 heavy bombers were produced in May and few more in the following months. Do we think that Hitler is going to sit down and wait for us to prepare?

I have been into the homes of the service men of this country. I know what a sacrifice many of them and their families are making. I recently saw one brave old soul who had given several boys for service out collecting aluminum pots and pans for defense purposes. In other homes I have seen mothers grieve for their sons who had been in service for less than 4 months and who were sent to Alaska without even an opportunity to say good-bye. What promise can we give these mothers? I know not what prom-

ise you may make, but as for me, come what may, I solemnly promise to do everything possible, regardless of cost, to see that they are adequately protected by land, sea, and air.

If Congress has the power to enact this law, certainly we have the power to write into the act some definite restrictions as to deferments. It is my understanding that much latitude has been granted the local and State boards in this matter, however, the press informs us that the National Director of Selective Service stopped the New Jersey draft boards from reclassifying the strikers as available for military duty. If this policy is to be followed, it is certainly sad news to the young, patriotic men of New Jersey and other States who will have to fill in while their neighbor down the street, by reason of his having a good job cannot only stay out of service as long as he remains on the job, but can by reason of his once working, stay out on strike and remain exempt. If this fair and right? Is it the way this law should be administered?

Let us so operate this law that there will be a minimum of just complaints. Unless some of the governmental departments here in Washington change their views and actions, it shall be my purpose to introduce a resolution calling upon each of them to submit to Congress a detailed statement as to each and every person that has applied for deferment and what action, if any, has been taken by the department or agency in recommending such deferment. We might as well be frank about this matter. It is common knowledge that many of the departments and agencies are loaded down with young attorneys who have been seeking deferment on account of their indispensable governmental work. It is also common knowledge that thousands of these on the pay rolls would never be missed; that their particular work can just as easily be done by others in the department, many of them older persons who have been pushed aside by the youngsters. It is hard to understand just what a young lawyer out of school for only a few years and, in most cases, has never been engaged in the actual practice of law, can do what some other older attorney with experience could not do.

They are certainly in contrast to the young man who has started a little business and who has to give it up. He has to make a real sacrifice. What can he expect when he returns with his business gone? Not only do we have the men who will lose their business but we have the man who had a steady job. The law stipulates that when he returns that his old job shall be given back to him; however, in many cases the firm will be out of business or, for some other reason, he will be unable to secure his job. Not so with the Government employees. The Government will still be in business—at the same old stand. His job is assured, so why should they be exempt?

Let us make this law of selective service a real American law with "equal service for all."

Extension of Military Service of Selectees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENT AND ARTICLE FROM APPLETON (WIS.) POST-CRESCENT

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and newspaper clipping referred to therein:

AUGUST 8, 1941.

The Honorable JOSHUA JOHNS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNS: No doubt you have received many letters of this nature expressing the real feeling we parents have for our boys in selective service.

We happen to have a son who volunteered in good faith last January because he, like most other boys, had faith in his Government—a faith that every real American had. Why should that faith be broken because the majority of our Congress either don't know the significance of that word or are just taking the destinies of this good country of ours out of the hands of the people?

We've been the one Nation in the world where faith has been the dominating factor—faith not only in our country but in its leaders as well. Making those promises and breaking them as soon as they are made surely doesn't build up the morale of the people, especially young America, now serving their country.

We here in Wisconsin thank God that we have representing us in Congress men who realize what that group is bound to throw us into.

Our son, a boy whose word is his bond, sure has some consideration coming to him.

Parents pride themselves in bringing boys like that to an age where they become good, honest citizens—citizens who can be trusted and an asset to any community. Breaking that faith which they had so strongly entrenched in their hearts is bound to reflect in the type of citizens we are building if this present mad crowd is permitted to dominate the people.

I am enclosing a clipping which I feel pretty much expresses the opinion of all the boys now in selective service.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR C. ECKER,
Appleton, Wis.

[From the Appleton (Wis.) Post-Crescent of August 7, 1941]

APPLETON SOLDIER SAYS "POLL" DIDN'T INCLUDE THIRTY-SECOND DIVISION

That the alleged "poll" of enlisted men in the Army which is said to have revealed that 90 percent of the men were willing to remain in service beyond the year for which they were originally called did not include the men of the Thirty-second Division at Camp Livingston, La., was the interesting observation made by an Appleton member of this outfit in a letter to the Post-Crescent. This young man, whose name is being withheld so that he will not be subjected to censure for expressing his views, said that "not one enlisted man in the whole Thirty-second Division could be found who had been questioned regarding his approval of extended service."

His letter follows:

"My qualification as a military critic due to my status of a lowly private, may be somewhat dubious.

"However, I shall attempt to make up in clarity and understanding what I lack in finesse.

"I hate to explode any myths regarding the intelligence of the enlisted personnel, but if I do I am sorry and beg the pardon of the officers who of course are supposed to possess all the intellectual capacity conducive to an efficient army.

"Some days ago the radio said newspapers heralded the fact that, after an extensive poll of various Army camps, it was found that 90 percent of the men were willing to remain in service. For some reason which neither radio or newspaper failed to divulge, no mention was made as to whom conducted the poll. Another odd fact was that not one enlisted man in the whole Thirty-second Division could be found who had been questioned regarding his approval of extended service.

"After a more thorough probe the same situation was found to exist among the surrounding camps, of which Claiborne, Shelby, and Beauregard are a part.

"Furthermore, not one man questioned showed any desire to stay beyond his 1-year term. They did, however, without exception demand to be placed on the reserve list after their year's service had been completed and, if any hostile moves were directed against this country, such as General Marshall appears so apprehensive of, they one and all expressed their willingness to drop all civilian pursuits and answer the call at once.

"Now, just who was questioned in this so-called poll and who gave the answers remains a mystery. This writer has a sneaking suspicion it was the generals and higher officials of the varying divisions who gave the generous 90-percent estimate. Any person who has had any contact with the Army at all can tell you that an officer would ten times rather have a trained unit under his command than a new batch of recruits. After an outfit has had 6 months or more of service the officers can sit back and the organization will run itself.

"However with a new group of men coming in every year, such as the Selective Service Act calls for, you can easily see how an officer would be required to earn the large salaries that a lot of them are now drawing. In view of all this it is quite obvious why the higher officers are fighting to retain the guardsmen and selectees beyond their 1-year terms.

"Any soldier trained a year and then placed on the Reserve list is just as efficient in a military sense as the one who is compelled to remain in active service and away from home against his will.

"You, as a civilian, may not know that the average soldier kept in camp commences to decay. His morals become lax, his self-esteem practically vanishes, and his morale decreases daily. As for physical condition the boys were in better shape 6 months ago than they are today. However the good general says we are more vital to defense of the Nation stationed down here in Livingston, more so than if we were back in Wisconsin.

"Well, he should know; he's being paid to make observations such as that. Still I don't know; human nature is kind of funny and you can't judge a man's motives by his statements or actions. At any rate the enlisted men are not supposed to reason why, so I'd better lay off."

Labor Profits Unlimited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MEMPHIS COMMERCIAL APPEAL

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Memphis Commercial Appeal entitled "Labor Profits Unlimited":

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal of August 7, 1941]

LABOR PROFITS UNLIMITED

Memphis labor leaders, asked what becomes of the initiation fees charged workers on national-defense projects, have declined comment or have said that the subject is not one on which they could throw light.

They have a perfect right to withhold such information from the public. There is no law which can compel them to reveal the financial status of their organizations. One cannot quarrel with them on that score.

Still, the incident prompts consideration of some important facts:

The union "take" during the construction of Camp Forrest at Tullahoma was estimated at $640,000.

The "take" on the Quartermaster depot at Memphis may run as high as $100,000.

Congressional tax experts at Washington estimate that the building-trades unions, enforcing closed shops in the big cantonment and other huge building jobs of the Army and Navy, collected membership fees from many thousands of temporary workmen. Their receipts during the 9 months ending June 30 have been estimated by authorities as in excess of $20,000,000.

The payment of initiation fees on closed-shop defense jobs is not a voluntary process. The worker is dragooned into making it.

The average individual who makes an investment in a business or industry can withdraw that investment, either at profit or loss as circumstances dictate.

The only thing a defense project worker, who holds temporary membership in a labor union at a price in addition to his dues, gets out of his investment if he quits the union is starvation, for he is forbidden work on any other projects.

The tremendous sums being collected by labor unions are a result of governmental paternalism which makes it possible for union leaders to work their rackets.

The Government neither knows nor cares how much is collected in initiation fees and it requires no accounting.

Contrast that with the position of the average corporation, industry, business, and individual, who, through one form of taxation or another, is compelled to reveal to the Government the most minute details of financial status. Fear of penal confinement spurs the reluctant.

Under the present system of exempting labor unions from accounting or taxation of any kind, the worker, who must pay to work in violation of all the traditions and principles of American freedom, must accept the word of the officers about where his money goes or petition a court for an accounting.

The inequity of such a situation must be apparent to any fair-minded person.

The American people are presently to be taxed to the limit of ability to pay in order that the defense needs can be met. Is there any reason why labor unions, profiting largely as a result of defense projects, should escape? Or, at the very least, be exempt from making a strict accounting to the Government under whose benevolent protection labor unions operate?

The labor unions' position that the public has no interest in their profits is not entirely sound, for the public has a very definite stake if large parts of those profits are being expended for the purposes of maintaining legislative lobbies, or are being tossed into the kitties of union political friends. The taxpayer foots the defense labor bill.

A move is now under way in the Congress to tax labor-union incomes. Such taxation would be one of the most healthful things which could be done in behalf of the general welfare of this Nation.

So long as men are compelled to pay for the right to work—heretofore something the Commercial Appeal had always believed was God-given—somewhere along the line there should be a very accurate accounting, and in view of the strain on the National Treasury, a substantial kick-back.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, during the progress of the public debate and committee hearings on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway project, proponents of the measure have rather persistently encouraged the impression that organized labor was for the building of the waterway. I contended from the very beginning that American labor would be severely injured, if not actually punished by this particular project.

It will be interesting to the Members of this House to know that the following individuals and labor organizations testified against the St. Lawrence seaway project before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee:

Edmund D. Sullivan, representative of Local No. 1462, International Longshoremen's Association, Lakes district, page 1191 of the hearings.

Coleman T. Perkins, president, Grain Shovelers Union, Local No. 109, International Longshoremen's Association, page 1194 of the hearings.

Thomas Kennedy, secretary-treasurer, United Mine Workers of America, page 1461 of the hearings.

John L. Lewis, president, United Mine Workers of America, page 1562 of the hearings.

J. G. Luhrsen, executive secretary of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, spoke for the following organizations: Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Order of Railway Conductors, Switchmen's Union of North America, the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, American Train Dispatchers Association, International Association of Machinists, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, Sheet Metal Workers International Association, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, Order of Sleeping Car Conductors, National Organization of Masters, Mates and Pilots of America, National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, International Longshoremen's Association.

J. T. Corbett, national legislative representative, spoke for the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

W. D. Johnson, national legislative representative, spoke for the Order of Railway Conductors.

S. C. Lush, deputy president, spoke for the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Resolution from the Switchmen's Union, which was passed at their national convention held at Buffalo, N. Y., appearing on page 762.

A. F. Stout, national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.

A Passé Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D. WINTER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEWTON (IOWA) NEWS

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newton (Iowa) News:

[From the Newton (Iowa) News]

A PASSÉ AUTHORITY

We note that Pearson and Allen of the Washington Merry-Go-Round—a feature that is carried regularly in the Daily News—has recently gone to some length to set up William Allen White, the noted publisher of Emporia, Kans., as a sound political critic.

We cannot agree.

Mr. White has recently attempted to blow the Republican Congressmen of Kansas "out of the water" for criticizing the New Deal administration. He even went so far as to say that the Kansas Congressmen were traveling the Quisling route. Then Mr. White blackmails them further by threatening defeat in the congressional election of 1942.

We have a profound respect for Mr. White as a writer, a quipper, a good story teller, and an author. Despite his extreme age, we are inclined to believe that his judgment might still be pretty sound in such fields.

In the field of politics, however, Mr. White has always been a maverick. He is listed as a Republican in political campaigns. For the last quarter of a century, to our personal knowledge, he has always

been on both sides of the fence in every campaign. The Democrats have always known this. During his second campaign for the presidency, Mr. Roosevelt visted Emporia and said many nice things about Mr. White. Mr. White, who was supposedly supporting Alf Landon from his own State, reciprocated notably thereafter and took occasion from time to time to chastise Landon, to the great embarrassment of the Republican Party not only in Kansas but throughout the Nation.

Republicans have long since ceased to consider Editor White as a reliable asset in any political campaign. His make-up and temperament disqualify him as a reliable and trustworthy campaign worker. He blows both hot and cold and no one can tell during the campaign which way he is going to jump.

The Democrats make great use of Editor White as a Republican authority for the reason that he can always be relied upon to perform valuable service for them.

It is our thought that there is still ample room in this country for an intelligent and militant, though loyal opposition party. The Nation needs just such a force at this time. The Kansas Congressman and other Republican Congressmen of the country (yes, and a large number of Democratic Congressmen) are crying out against our own totalitarian Government. They are opposed to one man, our President, making all the decisions for our people. Editor White knows too well what is happening right now and what will happen in the future under the New Deal regime. As a newspaper publisher, he is derelict in his duty if he does not sound warning from time to time as he sees the decay of our representative Government. A publisher and a Kansas Congressman, as public servants, are under obligation to the public to point out vigorously the unsound steps that our Government is taking.

While we do not see Mr. White's editorial column regularly, it is our conviction that he is guilty of more "Quisling" than the Kansas Congressmen if he is swallowing, without a word of dissent, everything that is going on in Washington.

No, we don't want Democrats and New Deal columnists to pick out Republican master minds for us.

A United America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. FRANK B. KEEFE, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]:

My fellow Americans, it is a trite expression that history repeats itself. The shocking, bloody record of 1916 and 1917 is repeating itself today. Hysteria, hate, greed, and avarice are again attempting to ride roughshod over sanity, tolerance, love, and charity. Emotionalism is supplanting cold logic, and wicked attempts are being made by subtle propaganda to scuttle the thinking of the people of America on the all-important subject of peace.

Men and women in high places, unable to meet the issue with facts, are now resorting to name-calling and smear campaigns in a vain effort to vilify patriotic Americans and to stifle free speech and freedom of assembly. They would even deny their right of petition and, by advocating further bureaucratic control of industry, labor, and agriculture, threaten the destruction at home of the so-called four freedoms they hope to give to bloody Joe Stalin and the rest of the world.

I denounce this effort as un-Christian and un-American. I have a sublime confidence that the dominant spirit of the American people will insist that human freedom and constitutional government be maintained here at home and that we must not acquire ruthless dictatorship here as the price for trying to extend our system of government to the four corners of the world. I am convinced that an outraged public opinion will force the advocates of intolerance, gag rule, and war to abandon their bitter campaign and that the recent apology from Secretary Stimson to Senator WHEELER is just the beginning.

Recent press releases indicate that the late candidate for the Presidency on the Republican ticket is making speeches about the country, pleading for unity. My fellow citizens, are the American people divided? Every instrument reflecting public opinion discloses that 80 to 90 percent of our people are thoroughly united against the involvement of this Nation in a shooting war.

I ask the gentleman, What greater unity could he ever hope to attain? Is he in fact asking for unity or is he asking that the 90 percent of our people who are opposed to our involvement in a shooting war abandon their position and allow the 10 percent to control their lives and destinies and their fortunes?

I say to you, my fellow Americans, that, despite all the efforts of organized propagandists to the contrary, the people of this Nation are united.

They are united in demanding an impregnable national defense.

They are united in demanding that money appropriated for national defense be wisely and honestly expended so as to make national defense a reality instead of having it a mere blueprint or on order.

They are united in demanding that campaign pledges solemnly given to the American people be observed and not treated as mere campaign oratory.

They are united in demanding that we stop undeclared acts of war without congressional approval as provided in our Constitution.

They are united in demanding that the administration keep the platform pledge upon which it was elected, namely: "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack."

They are united in demanding that the Nation keep faith with the selectees.

They are united in the opinion that morale and faith in their Government and its objectives are the very foundation and groundwork of national defense.

They are united in the opinion that the recent statement made by Senator PEPPER, of Florida, in which he stated: "Some folks talk about these boys going home. Mr. President, they will be in the Army for at least 5 years and maybe 10," constitutes a tragic breach of faith that threatens to undermine the morale not only of the selectees but of all people who still have faith in representative government.

They are united in their willingness to make every sacrifice necessary to protect this hemisphere against invasion from any foreign foe.

They are united in demanding that defense work be given to the small industries instead of having 56 favored corporations receive 75 percent of all defense business.

They are united in demanding the curtailment of expenditures for nonessential, nondefense items.

They are united in demanding that the Congress function as free men and women and that we maintain a government of law instead of one of men.

They are united in their opposition to ever-growing and expanding bureaucracy in government that is constantly destroying and shackling their liberties.

They are united in their love of country, home, and fireside.

They are united in a common impulse to extend all possible aid to oppressed people throughout the world compatible with their desire for self-preservation.

Yes, my fellow Americans, we are in fact a united people.

That union results from the spirit that has made America great. Make no mistake that such unity means craven cowardice. These same peace-loving Americans, when attacked or when firmly convinced that the Nation is in imminent danger, will fight. They will fight without compulsion, and the brilliant record of our recent past clearly demonstrates that the adventurous spirit of our forefathers still lives.

Stand firm, my fellow Americans. The Congress needs your help and your inspiration. I say to you that there are men and women in the Congress who still have vision, courage, and independence.

We have not forgotten the advice given by the President when he spoke on the subject of "peace" at Chautauqua in New York. Listen to his words. I quote:

"Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality. They would tell you, and unfortunately their views would get wide publicity, that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations, that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world. It would be hard to resist that clamor. It would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace. If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—we choose peace. It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous."

Those were the words of President Roosevelt speaking in 1936 in a period when sanity, calmness, and logic ruled the thought of the people of America. We who oppose the active participation of this Nation in a shooting war are in complete accord with the solemn advice which the President gave the Nation at that time.

We are now in the midst of another World War. The admonitions of the President were intended to guide us in just such an emergency. He was mindful of our experiences in the last World War. He cautioned us to resist the clamor for war. He implored us to look beyond, to realize the inevitable penalties and the inevitable day of reckoning. He predicted the course the American people would follow. He predicted that they would choose peace.

I say to you, my fellow Americans, you have made the choice. Your letters, your cards, your telegrams all tell us of your decision. You have told the Congress and

the President you want peace. Your answer today, as predicted by the President in 1936, is for all practical purposes unanimous. You want preparedness. You want Americanism. You want peace, and the courageous, independent, patriotic Members of the Congress of the United States intend to respect your wishes.

Who are the ones that clamor for war? You know as well as I who they are. Why do they clamor for war? Every honest, patriotic American knows the answer.

Men and women of America, stand firm. We shall resist the rising clamor of greed, intolerance, and war. With God's help and your continued support, we shall work without stint to provide an impregnable national defense. We shall insist that in all our decisions and in all our deliberations the rights of the American people shall be first served. We shall demonstrate to the world that free men and free women still have the capacity for self-government. We shall make democracy function here at home.

While we shall meet the complexities of each sad day with a prayer for peace on our lips, our hearts and our bodies will be prepared to make any contribution necessary for the preservation of our country.

We have but one allegiance, that to the United States of America, one Nation, indivisible, and with liberty and justice for all.

Neighbors and Names

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. NELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIM L. NELSON, OF MISSOURI

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I made over radio station KMOX, St. Louis, Mo., on Saturday, August 9:

Let us, my friends, think together about neighbors and names. A long time ago, before words were wedded by Webster, two-root words being joined together as "neighbor," meaning "near dweller," the neighborhood differed greatly from that of today.

The frontiersman regarded members of the family in log cabin or "soddy," although separated by many miles, as near neighbors. This was true even though such distances, as measured in time, were far greater than now.

Not so long ago we talked of ferrying a small stream. Now American-built bombers are "ferried" over the Atlantic. Time was when men thought of the near neighbor as the one living on the next lot or on an adjoining farm. Then came modern transportation and communication. Again the near neighbor, as in the days of Daniel Boone and other hardy trail blazers, may live far away, hundreds or even thousands of miles. This may not be a pleasant truth. The world may be too much with us. But because men have sought to shorten both time and distance, it is so. For better or worse, we are neighbors to the whole world. As the New York Times so well says, "A new neighbor has moved in. The new neighbor is the world. He is Europe, Asia, Africa What he does concerns us closely. If he is a bad neighbor, we shall suffer. If he is a good neighbor, we shall gain. But get along any more on this earth without an awareness of neighbors we cannot." It is added, "Our peaceful wilderness, which is now the whole earth, is threatened." But for this, I would add, our problems would be less complex, our position more secure.

The frontiersman, when Indians or other dangers threatened, joined with the settler up the creek or across the prairie in the hope that both might survive. It has been said, "Men do not feel themselves to be brothers in days of happiness, triumph, pride, exalted egotism, but in days of danger, misfortune, and sorrow." For much of the world these latter days are here.

As to early settlers, whether descended from native stock of the older settled commonwealths, or followers of Duden, those of German blood largely migrating to the eastern river section of Missouri, all coveted good neighbors.

The man who, with his family, came to clear the forest or break the prairie sod—came with rifle, ax, and Bible, all of which were used as he sought peace and security—raised few artificial barriers.

Facing danger from without, neighbors, near dwellers, sought common ground for cooperation. Whether Protestant, Catholic, or Jew, mattered little. Christianity, in its broadest sense, was placed above narrow creed. Politics played small part, artificial distinctions, less. What do these amount to when weighed in the balance against the safety of the land we love?

I do not wish us to think entirely of national security as determined on battle fronts. Preparedness is the best guaranty for peace. The United States has entered upon a program designed to make it impossible for us to be overcome by any foe or combination of foes. I have little fear of an invasion. I am, though, deeply concerned as to our country when again the dark clouds of war disappear. If old ideas and old ideals are greatly changed; if the home, such as our mothers and fathers knew, is lost; if racial prejudice and hatreds, too often the byproducts of war, are continued, dark will be the day. We must learn to live together as neighbors. While we want to be good neighbors to the whole world, insofar as this is possible, it is very much more important that we be good neighbors with our own people. When sickness or death visits the home, it is not the stranger far away, but the nearby friend, who helps heal our sorrows. Little does it matter how the name of this neighbor is spelled or pronounced. So I want to say a word about names.

The fact that one may have a foreign-sounding name should not cause us to question his loyalty. A number of outstanding Members of Congress have names which even try the tongues of the clerks who call the roll. On the other hand, I would remind you of individuals who possessed fine American names, but whose records stand for shame. The arch traitor of revolutionary days, the spy of whom every schoolboy has read, bore a good American name. The most conspicuous slacker in the last World War has for his first name the name of one of the greatest Presidents of the United States. So, in determining the good or evil in folks, names are not enough.

Speaking of names, there is entirely too much name calling. This statement goes for both sides, the "furs" and the "furnists." Spokesmen for the so-called "war crowd" and spokesmen for the so-called "peace group" are equally guilty. While on one hand impeachment is demanded, on the other there are cries of "traitor." Such talk is harmful now and does not augur well for the future. The guilty need a button on one lip and a buttonhole in the other.

It has been asserted that talk is cheap. This is not true, surely not when unity is so essential to national safety. The period of peace, for which you and I hope and pray, may bring to us even greater problems than now press for solution. Worse than the wounds and worries of war may be the narrowness, selfishness, and sordidness of peace. Now is no time to build spite fences, with a "devil's lane" between. As a people, we must work together now if we are to live together later. How can we hope to be good neighbors with those overseas while failing to live together as good neighbors here at home?

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, in a recent issue, carried a cartoon, the caption of which is "We need some union now at home," and picturing two parrots as they shout at each other, "appeaser," "warmonger," "pro-Nazi," "interventionist."

Yes, wranglings weaken and sap our own strength. Epithets encourage our enemies. Unity here at home will help.

Yet, paradoxical as it may appear, I am for war, for a war against intolerance, a war against suspicion, a war against doubtful "isms" of all kinds, a war against greed, a war against narrowness, a war against hyphens regardless of the nationality concerned, a war against gossip, and, lastly, a war against plain lying.

Again referring to names and origins, while the country from which we come matters little, there must be absolute loyalty to the land of one's adoption. There must be no divided love, no divided allegiance.

The good neighbor is a good American. That name is enough. No hyphen for him. Neighbors and names. There are no other neighbors like Americans, there is no other name like America. Summarizing then, let us say, "America—love it or leave it."

Politics First, America Second

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHARLOTTE (N. C.) OBSERVER

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Charlotte Observer of August 9, 1941:

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of August 9, 1941]

POLITICS FIRST, AMERICA SECOND

Fifteen Republicans, headed by former President Hoover, all of them nationally known, and all of them of rather impressive spread of influence in another period, have signed up to condemn before the American public "the warlike steps" which the administration is taking, and to see what they can do in the way of arousing the people of this Nation to have the President estopped from carrying the country into war.

First off, let us say that such a movement is abominable and contemptible as an act of disunity and obstruction in these grave moments of the Nation's history.

It is putting politics of the worst possible name and brand—partisan politics—first, and the destiny of this Republic second.

These men are Republicans, former Presidents and former candidates for the Presidency, men from the leadership and active authority in the Republican Party, who are trying to lead a purely party protest and rebuke, appealing to their political friends and supporters of the past on a cheap partisan

basis, and endeavoring to revive the ashes of their own dead Republican organization with the fires of discontent over the present policies of the Washington administration.

They intend, if they can, to utilize the present crisis in which America finds itself for personal and political ends.

They would turn the fearful emergency confronting their country into an opportunity for overturning the political leadership of the Nation.

They are manifestly out to smear Roosevelt and all of those who are responsible with him for the steps which have been taken to safeguard the security of this Republic and to arm it against the scourge of Hitler and his mad revolutionaries.

Their direct accusation is to effect that the President is leading us into war; that he is virtually conducting already an undeclared war against imaginary enemies.

They would even attach the label of communism on the White House, because, forsooth, the administration is willing to aid Russia in order that England may be aided in further order to strengthen our own defenses against Hitler.

All through their pronunciamento runs the thread of irrefutable evidence that it is Roosevelt they are after; that means that the enterprise is politically inspired.

It must mean, also, therefore, that the 1942 congressional elections are in their minds, and beyond that, the next Presidential referendum is also in their considerations.

A fortunate factor for the country in this detestable adventure is that the men inspiring and directing it are dead politically and don't know it.

They are not representing the rank and file of the alive and clear-thinking masses who fly the flag of the Repubican Party over their political heads.

They are mostly "formers" and "ex-es." That means their day is done and their race run and their influence is as decrepit as their thinking.

There is "ex" President Hoover, "ex" Vice President Dawes, "ex" Republican National Chairman Fletcher, "ex" Minister to Canada MacNider, "ex" Governor Lowden of Illinois, and so on.

These are men who were vibrant and magnetic in their day, but this is not their day. Their places have been taken by others, who are more abreast of the times and who have wrested the leadership of the Republican Party from its former fossilized leadership.

These are such men as have their feet in the nineteenth century, their heads buried in the sands, their eyes set into the past, their hearts against the chosen authority now established in Washington and their hands lifted against the policies of aggressive defense which this present authority in Washington is wisely adopting.

While one may righteously feel enraged over the meanly obstructionist tactics of even an aggregation of political "has beens," one must, at the same time, feel a measure of sympathy and compassion for them because of their quite evident political senility.

It is pathetic that such able men as these and men once so prominent and influential and wise in their leadership of the American peoples are content to abide in the past and to be unalive to the new, albeit bitter and hate-filled world that has rushed by them and left them standing by the old gates.

Once great men who, somehow or other, can manage to ignore realities, laugh off the terror that fills up the hemispheres, blind themselves to the fires that are consuming the planet and to play with their little political dolls at a moment when a combination of gangster powers are plotting the destruction of their country and their own peoples.

Abominable and contemptible, to be sure; but sad, in a way, and pathetic.

Our Destiny—Socialism or Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DEPOSIT (N. Y.) COURIER

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Deposit (N. Y.) Courier:

[From The Deposit (N. Y.) Courier]

OUR DESTINY—SOCIALISM OR DEMOCRACY

Frequent and informal discussions with many of the so-called thinking people here in our own community have disclosed a common assumption that the remaining democracies will have to live under a taint of socialism when the war is over.

In other words, the idea is prevalent that we cannot survive the current ordeal without absorbing some of the poison that has stricken civilization. Here in our own country, many public officials and thousands of private citizens cry in alarm against "appeasement." They say you cannot appease the monster that is sweeping Europe.

They say, and rightly so, that there can be no compromise with a philosophy whose ultimate aim is enslavement of the common man. But strangely, these selfsame people accept calmly the idea of adulterated democracy. They propose, after the war, mind you, to attempt a compromise with the very thing that they now claim cannot be compromised with, cannot be appeased—authoritarian government. We all know that a Hitler is simply the result when authoritarian government reaches maturity.

There are, of course, certain powers which we must grant the Government to guarantee an adequate defense program. Our President has informed Congress and the country that the existing emergency makes it necessary to hold draftees in the Army longer than the original period of 1 year. Good Americans have disagreed sharply and bitterly and have availed themselves of the rights and heritages of democracy to criticize the President for breaking a contract. Mr. Roosevelt has, and we think successfully, denied the charge.

We approve the granting of power to the Government to take such steps as that concerning the draft duration for we feel it to be necessary and logical. However, there are certain steps which fail to measure up to the standards of necessity.

Right now in this country we are condoning a compromise with the forces that destroy freedom of the individual. We are allowing our basic industries, the key to the whole free-enterprise system, to be edged ever closer to Government domination, apparently in the belief that it cannot be helped in the view of world trend.

Such a theory must certainly be the result of the most feeble rationalizing. We are either going to have freedom and representative government in this country now—and after the war—or we are not. If we try to appease the forces of socialism by allowing the Government to gradually absorb the utilities, the banks, the railroads, mining and oil, under the guise of creating a better postwar society, we are heading for trouble. We will find that our basic industries have become mere patronage machines. All remaining enterprise will be forced to its knees in an effort to "get along" in a corrupt bureaucracy. Labor will find itself caught in a struggle between two systems—the free enterprise system versus an authoritarian socialistic system of the same brand that has engulfed Europe.

We have seen that in Europe power grasppers cannot be appeased. We have not yet found it out at home.

Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the subject before us is of great importance to millions of young men in this country. The fact that I did not vote for the original Selective Service Act should not be taken as an indication of my views on this legislation. I came to my conclusion on the original bill because of the testimony before congressional committees of leading officials of our Army and Navy which clearly indicated that they were not in a position then to either house or equip millions of men. True, before that vote was taken they had supplemented their original statements. I advocated then giving the President unlimited power to call out the National Guard, the Naval Reserve, as well as the Reserve officers, and I did not indicate that there should be a limit as to the time they should serve. Those men, during peacetime, had indicated a desire to serve in the armed forces of our country in the event of necessity and, therefore, it seemed to me they had no reason to complain if called at a time when they were needed.

Following the passage of existing law, 17,000,000 men, using round numbers, between the ages of 21 and 35 registered. It is reasonable to assume that practically all men between these ages registered, because of the fact that the census figures as of April 1940 disclosed an estimate of 16,404,000 men in this country between the ages of 21 and 35, and the registration of over 600,000 for military service over the census figures speaks for itself.

If I had voted for the Selective Service Act a year ago I would not vote for the bill as reported by the committee, because the Congress told the young men of the country in that law that they would only be required to undergo a period of 12 months' training. If I had voted for that law I would feel that I had been a party to making a contract with these young men and I would not now be a party to breaking that contract. Of course, if we were at war, a different situation would be presented.

I have given a great deal of thought to the amendments to the act of 1940 which are being considered. First, I do

not think the Congress should break the contract it made a year ago, but I do think we should make provisions to permit the young men who were called and who desire to remain in the service say, for 1, 2, or 3 years, as they might select.

I have been endeavoring to secure some figures in reference to the number of young men in this country between the ages of 21 through 27. There is no break-down at the present time in the Government agency administering this law because of the fact that those that originally registered were between the ages of 21 through 35.

The most reliable information that I have been able to secure is to take the census figures as of April 1940, showing men between 21 through 27 which is 7,966,945.

As I understand it, there are at the present time over 625,000 selectees in the armed forces. In other words, you still have over 7,000,000 young men whose ages are between 21 through 27 who have not as yet been called. It is my view that it is not fair to the 625,000 young men who have been called to require them to shoulder the entire burden and over 7,000,000 men not be required to do service. Of course, part of the 7,000,000 that I refer to will be called at a later date, but if you are going to retain in the service for an indefinite period those who have already been called you will not have the facilities by any stretch of the imagination to properly house and equip a million or more additional selectees.

This emergency, or whatever anyone desires to call it, affects the entire population of the country and the Selective Service Act should apply equally to all those who are within the ages provided by that act.

What I would like to see is the discharge of those, after they have served 1 year, who desire to leave the service and replacements be made immediately. The men discharged would recognize that in the event of war they would be subject to recall.

I confess that I am not in a position to submit any evidence as to the length of time necessary to properly train young men for military service, but it does seem reasonable to me that you can make a good soldier out of a man in a year's time, other than a combat aviator. One thing is certain, when the boys go home they are going to be in better physical condition than they were when they entered the service, and the great majority of them will keep themselves in that physical condition. I also think that tens of thousands of them will remain in the service; once having had a touch of military life it will appeal to many.

There is one phase of this situation that should give everybody a great deal of concern, and that is to what extent dissatisfaction will exist among the selectees who will be required to remain in the service if this bill passes as reported by the committee. I think we would be far better off if we had 1,000,000 satisfied men in the Army than to have a personnel of 4,000,000, with over half of them dissatisfied. Here is where you are playing with fire. I have heard no one that contends it is going to be necessary to discharge all of the selectees at one time. In other words, the period of service of groups will expire on certain dates, and they can be replaced immediately by those whose numbers have been called. If, in the end, say 5,000,000 of the young men who have registered have received training, the value of that from a military standpoint cannot be underestimated.

I cannot conceive that the action taken by the Congress on this subject will have any direct bearing upon what any foreign nation might do or think, nor do I care. They certainly should remember that we are not at war, and, while we all pray that we will not become involved, nevertheless, if the worst comes, history will repeat itself and the youth of this land will respond to the call.

There is no place in the world where the citizens of any nation have the freedom to express themselves as they have in this country. The feeling of the youth of this country, I think, is exemplified in a letter I received from a very dear friend of mine. I have seen eight children grow up in this family. The mother is a widow and has a number of grandchildren. She wrote me and told me that four members of the family were subject to call and that she had no objection but she did think that one of the boys should remain at home, those not subject to call being married. She wanted to know if there was anything that she could do to keep one of the boys at home. They all had good positions. She stated there was not one of them that would ask to be deferred. Of course, I was forced to advise her that unless one of the young men requested exemption her application would receive no consideration. She replied to my letter and asked me not to misunderstand her as she was simply seeking information and that under no consideration would she ask for the exemption of any one of the boys because of the fact that they all desired to respond to the call. She did say that she felt if three of her sons entered the service it was only reasonable that one might be left at home.

I assume I have received as many communications as anyone else in reference to this legislation. They are not inspired because the language is not the same. Many of them urge that I support this bill as reported by the committee while others take the opposite view. They contain various expressions, outstanding among them being that to change the law today when we are still at peace would be a violation of a contract that the Government made with the selectees. Others have listened to some of the speeches of outstanding Americans saying that the passage of this bill will involve us in war. One said it is common to comment that—

Hitler has never kept his word. Do we want to place Uncle Sam in the same position?

Another letter says:

If the Congress of the United States does not have honor enough to keep faith with its own citizens, where is there any honor left in the world?

Other letters hold that if there is any extension of service it should be voluntary. A draftee writes me that he would be willing to give up his life for the country if necessary and if the time arrives when he must return he will do so at once but he feels that as he entered the service for 1 year he should be released at the expiration of that period.

Writes another:

My son, married for 4 years, volunteered to serve 1 year, which I thought was a noble thing to do. He writes me he does not see how a Government can expect to develop loyalty and all that goes with it by promising one thing and then later break that promise.

Another calls attention to the time of enlistment of Canadians, their salaries, which I know nothing about, but he says it is limited to a few months and not for foreign service in some instances.

If war should come call them back in the service and they will willingly respond, but let Congress keep its word and see that the boys are sent home after their 1 year's service—

Reads another.

I could go on and quote other hundreds of letters I have received. As I previously stated, many of the communications are in favor of the bill as reported by the committee and this includes officials of veterans' organizations.

Feeling it will be for the best interest of the morale of the Army of this country, I propose to vote against the bill as reported by the committee.

If the Secretary of War as well as the Chief of Staff of the Army and other leading military officials know now that it is absolutely necessary to continue the boys in the service, they knew it a year ago and it was their duty to have said so then rather than ask the Congress to call the boys for 1 year and now request that their service be unlimited.

Government Operation by Subterfuge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

ADDRESS OF CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Charles A. Lindbergh before an America First Committee rally in Cleveland public auditorium, Sunday, August 10:

GOVERNMENT OPERATION BY SUBTERFUGE—NATION BEING LED TO WAR OF ATTACK AGAINST WISHES OF MAJORITY OF PEOPLE—EACH STEP TAKEN WITH PROMISE TO STAY OUT

There is no need for me to outline to you the seriousness of the situation we face today in America. In the past we have gone on the assumption that our country was governed according to the will of the people. That has

been taken for granted as a part of the American system of life.

We were taught, even as school children, that government by the people was inseparable from the freedom and liberty for which our forefathers fought.

RECALLS CHECKS

We were taught that, as American citizens, we inherited the right to know about, and to vote upon, the fundamental policies of our Nation. In the past we elected candidates to office to represent us, and not to rule us.

In the past our President was responsible to our Representatives in Congress. And the Supreme Court sat, incorruptibly, as a final safeguard for freedom and justice in our Nation. Each one of these branches of government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial, was intended to be a check upon the others, that our American way of life might be preserved.

But now the question arises whether we any longer have a representative system of government in this country, whether we any longer have the right to know about and to vote upon the fundamental policies of our Nation.

We are faced with the stark fact that we have been carried to the verge of war against the opposition of a majority of our people—a war not of defense, but of attack; a war not in America, but in Europe and Asia.

WITHHELD INTENTIONALLY

We are faced with the realization that our President consults our Representatives in Congress with less and less frequency, and that, while the direct attempt to pack our Supreme Court failed, its membership has now changed indirectly through retirement.

We are faced with the knowledge that the most important issue of our generation—that of peace or war; that of defense or attack; that of whether or not the destiny of America is to be forged with the destiny of Europe—has not been placed before a vote of our people. That issue has been withheld from us, and withheld intentionally.

National polls show that from the time this war started in Europe, when Americans were asked whether or not we should enter it, the overwhelming majority answered "no." National polls today show that the great majority of our people still stand opposed to entering the war. But step by step we have been carried toward it.

STEPS TO GET INTO WAR

The administration in Washington has not even tried to follow the mandate of our people to stay out of war. Many of the officeholders in our Government have made every effort to evade that mandate. Instead of informing us, they have withheld information. Instead of taking steps to keep us out of war, they have taken steps to get us into war.

From the repeal of the arms embargo to the occupation of Iceland, we have become more and more involved. And each step we have made toward war has been with the promise of the administration that it was for the purpose of keeping us out.

Men and women of Ohio: While there is still time to think and speak freely, Americans must ask themselves this question—are we operating under a government by representation, or are we operating under a government by subterfuge? If our Government carries us to war with the majority of our people against it, are we not faced with a problem that is even more fundamental than war itself?

SERIOUS CHARGE

I fully realize that the charge of subterfuge is serious in the extreme; but let me recall to your minds a few of the facts that lie behind it.

Do you remember how we were told that the repeal of the arms embargo would be the surest way to keep this country out of war? The same people who tell us now that we must go to war, told us then that it was only necessary to sell arms on a "cash-and-carry" basis in order to insure victory for the Allies.

They were emphatic in saying that no one asked us to lend money, or to send troops abroad. It was only last spring that the lease-lend bill was passed, again with promises that it would keep us out of war; but by that time we were informed that we had to lend arms in order to insure victory.

RECALLS PROMISES

You remember as well as I, all those other steps that the administration said were so definitely "short of war"—the transfer of planes, and warships, and cannon; the draft of men; the expenditure of countless millions.

We were never told the true meaning of the measures the administration asked us to support. During the weeks before election we were told "again and again and again" that American boys would not be sent to fight in foreign wars. But we now find that inside of these sweetened promises of peace lay the deadly pills of war and that we have been swallowing them one after another for many months.

We find that while the American people were promised peace, the British people were given to understand that we would enter war. Only a few days ago the Prime Minister of England confidently told his people that America is on the verge of war. British generals discuss openly when and where an American expeditionary force is to be sent. And our President does not renew his promise.

CITES MORE EXAMPLES

Now that the elections are over, we in America ask in vain to be told even once again that our boys will not be sent to fight in foreign wars.

These are not the only proofs of the subterfuge in our present Government. Let us cite a few more examples.

Not many months ago our President told us that "convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war." Then, a little later, when we objected to the use of convoys, we were informed that our Navy was not convoying, but that it was already being used to "patrol" the seas for an indefinite distance from our shores.

The word "patrol" has been substituted for the word "convoy," and possibly the letter of the law was satisfied; but whatever may be the legal technicalities, the fact remains that the American people were misled.

CALLED "FIFTH COLUMN"

The hypocrisy and subterfuge that surround us come out in every statement of the war party. When we demand that our Government listen to the 80 percent of the people who oppose war, they shout that we are causing disunity.

The same groups who call on us to defend democracy and freedom abroad demand that we kill democracy and freedom at home by forcing four-fifths of our people into war against their will. The one-fifth who are for war call the four-fifths who are against war the "fifth column."

These interventionists, who call themselves the defenders of freedom and democracy, dare not place the issue of war to a vote of our people. They dared not let us vote on war at the last election, and they dare not let us vote on war today. They are afraid to put the issue to a referendum of the people, or to a vote of Congress.

WARNS OF INCIDENTS

They know that the people of this country will not vote for war, and they therefore plan on involving us through subterfuge. As I said months ago, I have listened to interventionists in this country argue among themselves about what steps "short of war" would take us into war most quickly.

Men and women of Ohio: The war party's plan is clear. Since this country will not enter war willingly, they plan on creating incidents and situations which will force us into it.

The interventionists know that if our defense program is extended far enough into Europe or Asia, they can get us into a foreign war under the guise of defending America.

They now say, with all the power of their propaganda, that we must occupy Africa in order to defend America. They say that we must control islands lying off the coast of the Eastern Hemisphere. They want us to send our soldiers to the East Indies, the Cape Verdes, the Canaries, Madeira, the Azores, Scotland, Ireland, and possibly England as well.

GREATEST BATTLE IN UNITED STATES

And they know that if our occupation of Iceland doesn't bring on the shooting, the occupation of these other places will.

We are told that we must fight for the freedom of mankind. But the greatest battle for freedom is being fought right here in America today. If we cannot maintain our freedom in the New World, we cannot force freedom on the Old World.

What is freedom of it is not the right of a free people to vote on the issue of foreign wars? Where is freedom if four-fifths of a nation can be carried to war against its will?

Where is freedom when Americans ask unanswered whether or not our Navy has already fought upon the sea—whether or not our forces have already been sent abroad? Where is freedom when the American Army is sent to occupy an island of Europe without our Congress even being asked?

HITS FOREIGN AGENTS

Where is freedom when it becomes disunity for citizens to meet and discuss their beliefs on the fundamental issues of their nation? Where has freedom gone when we in America are not even informed of the underlying intentions of our Government; when the agents of a foreign power are encouraged to speak and to travel throughout our land, while the same lecture halls that are open to them are closed to those of us who place the welfare and independence of our own country above the interests of any foreign power?

I will tell you where freedom lies today. It lies in the meetings of fearless men and women throughout this land—in meetings such as we are holding here in Cleveland tonight; in hundreds of similar meetings in every section of the United States—in cities, in villages, and on farms. Freedom for us in America lives or dies with the success of these gatherings of our citizens.

NOT ON SOVIET BATTLEFIELD

Freedom for us does not lie on any Soviet battlefield, or on any coast line of Europe, Africa, or Asia. It lies today in the question of whether or not the action of our Government in America is controlled by the will of our people. If we are represented in Washington, we are free men; but, if we are ruled by Washington, we are not.

Freedom lies in the support we give to those patriots in Congress who still stand undauntedly opposed to war, who still listen to the voice of the people they represent. Freedom for us depends on whether or not we are ready to protect and carry it on through these days of trial and war.

The America First Committee has been organized by American citizens who are ready to fight to maintain the freedom and independence we inherited from our forefathers. We have organized to give voice and strength to the great majority of Americans who oppose this war. We have organized to make their influence—your influence—effective.

ASKS IMPREGNABLE DEFENSE

We stand for the right to vote on the vital issues of our Nation. We stand for the right of citizens to meet and to discuss the problems of war and peace. We stand for the

right of those who do the paying and the dying to also have a voice in the deciding. We stand for an impregnable defense and an independent America.

If you stand with us, we ask you to join our committee. We ask you to help us organize these meetings. We ask you to write to your Congressman and Senators in Washington, demanding that they heed the voice of the people who elected them, and that they in turn demand that the people of our Nation be accurately informed of the developments of this war, and of the actions and intentions of our Government.

Men and women of Ohio: For 2 years I have traveled through this country, speaking in opposition to our entering the war. I have said that I believe it would be disastrous, both for America and Europe, if we took part in it.

MAKE VOICE HEARD

But the issue today is even greater than the issue of war or peace. It is the issue of whether or not we still have a representative Government; whether or not we in the United States of America are still a free people, with the right to decide the fundamental policies of our Nation.

This is an issue that strikes to the foundation of our way of living, our Government, and our rights as citizens. This meeting tonight and the meetings like it that are being held all over this country, are held to protest that this Nation was founded on the principle of Government by consent of the people—an informed people, a trusted people.

These meetings are held to demonstrate our adherence to this principle. If you believe in this principle, we ask you to make your voice heard by our Government in Washington. We urge you to speak, to work, and to pray—that representative government may not perish from this nation.

A Vexing Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of August 8, 1941:

[From the Boston Post of August 8, 1941]

A VEXING QUESTION

There is obviously much justice on either side of the controversy in Congress regarding extension of the selective-service law.

One of the things that we in this country have been complaining about in totalitarian governments is that their word is no good. They have no point of honor. They cannot be trusted.

Yet we can recall nothing more solemn than our promise, both from executive and legislative sources, to the draftees that they would not be held in service for more than 1 year.

That is one side of the argument, and we must not let it be regarded as unimportant.

The other side is that the emergency of 1940 has developed and expanded into a much greater emergency of 1941, and that our country is so endangered that we cannot let our soldiers go home, as we promised.

There is considerable debate upon this angle and upon the extent of the emergency.

But if the emergency is greater, the country has to protect itself. The rights of the individual must be restricted for the good of the whole. That is the way all law and all government works.

One underlying question, which looms large at times, is that the real reason for extending the service of our soldiers is that they have not had the equipment to be trained properly in the space of 1 year. The soldiers themselves say that this is the reason and much credence must be placed on their opinions.

But there is still another aspect of the situation, which, as far as we know, has not been publicly expressed.

The present law is so designed that if a man is released from training at the end of 1 year he still is on the active Reserve rolls and can be called back into service at the onset of a new emergency.

This fact puts a man in position of being temporarily discharged, but with the possibility hanging over him in civilian life of being summarily taken back into the service at any time.

It means that he gets back into a job, and begins to soften again. A few weeks of this and it would take him months to get back into shape. We humans deteriorate very rapidly under soft living.

Thus, if the soldier is called back he has his old "rookie" days of blisters and aches to put in again. He does not like this. In addition, his sense of esprit de corps is ruined, for when he is called back he probably never will see his old company, regiment, or, perhaps, division again.

A soldier, looking at his own future and that of this country, knows that this is something that he does not want. He knows that it is better for all to remain in his own outfit and in physical trim as long as there is any chance of being called for further service.

The efficient soldier is not produced by stops and starts.

Gambling With Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of August 11, 1941:

[From the Washington Post of August 11, 1941]

GAMBLING WITH SECURITY

Some very strange arguments are being advanced by Members of the House against the draft-extension bill. We are told by Representative SHORT, for example, that it would be a "breach of faith" for Congress to keep selectees in the Army longer than the 1-year period provided in the original act. Even a breach of faith would be justified in the eyes of most citizens if that should be necessary for the defense of the Nation. But actually there is no foundation whatever for this charge. Congress did believe a year ago that 12 months of training for the selectees would be sufficient to give the United States assurance of ample military protection. But it also recognized the fact that it was dealing with a fluid situation and therefore provided that the term of service required of drafted men could be extended by a congressional declaration. In other words, Congress left itself free to modify the training period in any way that it might see fit.

One might argue, with an equal poverty of logic, that the enactment of a new tax bill would be a breach of faith with taxpayers. If every change in legislation were to be regarded as a betrayal of citizens affected by it, the hands of Congress would be tied and the country would be helpless in the face of a crisis. Before legislators make use of such shallow arguments, moreover, they ought to remember that their first obligation is to keep faith with the Nation they serve.

Some other Members of the House seem to be disturbed because they can't see the whites of Hitler's eyes gleaming across the Atlantic. "Show us the emergency," they cry; and when no one points to a launching of ships from some foreign shore to invade the United States, they express a willingness "to let the boys go back home." No one would be so nonchalant about protecting his own home. On the contrary, everyone insists that a police force remain on the job all the time and most of us complain loudly when it shows any lack of efficiency. A nation without a powerful police force in a world rampant with conquest, revolution, and war, is not likely to remain a nation for any great length of time.

The simple fact is that we are living in a time of world crisis. We do not know what turn events may take, but the possibility of having to fight for our freedom is ever present. Whether or not the menace of today evolves into war next month or a year hence, we must be prepared to meet it. And that preparedness cannot be achieved on short notice. In the circumstances, there is only one safe course to take and that is ample preparation for the worst that may happen. To gamble with our national security by making any lesser effort would be equivalent to putting a very low price on the blessings of democracy.

Selective-Service Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the bill calling for extension of the service of selectees and the National Guard are entirely too drastic and, I feel, unnecessary under existing conditions.

Are we aiming at another A. E. F.? If not, then the General Staff of the War Department in advocating unlimited service by selectees and National Guard men is admitting its own incompetency.

Because of the tremendous problems involved in setting up the selectee organization when the act originally went into

effect last year, it is conceded that in a great many instances in camps throughout the country it has been an impossibility to adequately train the men within the 1 year specified. Therefore a limited extension of service to make up for those few months lost by delay in starting should sufficiently suffice. But I cannot, for the life of me, see the necessity of keeping these men in service for an unlimited period, or for 2½ years, as has been suggested, unless an offensive A. E. F. is contemplated, and I am definitely against that.

To my mind a standing army, in which a strong morale is necessary, cannot be organized by drafting unwilling men. These selectees have no complaint against being called into service for a reasonable length of time for defense training, and were they convinced that a national emergency exists I am sure that they would gladly serve unlimitedly and their morale would be high under those circumstances. An efficient standing army can only be organized through voluntary recruiting, and since the Selective Service Act became law a year ago the War Department has been lax in failing to diligently pursue its recruiting drive.

There is no need for such drastic legislation as this. Under the provisions of the Selectees Service Act, when a selectee's training is completed he automatically becomes a member of the Army Reserve force of the United States and therefore is subject to recall into service at any time the President deems it necessary.

If our national interest is imperiled to the extent that we would be led to believe, then what are we waiting for? Why waste the time we are consuming in considering this legislation? Why not put into effect immediately this Reserve force?

I have signified upon many occasions in the past my utter antagonism and dislike for Hitlerism and all the other "isms," and I have favored all aid possible to those combating these "isms," but I do not want, and I believe the American people do not want, another A. E. F.

Vote for the Defense of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the extension of the selective-service training because I love America. I think the time has come when the American people and their Representatives must stand up and look at the things as they really are and not as they desire them to be.

I have firm confidence in Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, and I place great weight on his statement which says that the Army would be disintegrated if the selectees are not trained for an additional time.

Our responsibility as Americans is a great one—that of guaranteeing to our children and our children's children a country blessed with free institutions. These great gifts and privileges can only be perpetuated if each and every one of us, young and old, will guard these blessings as we would our lives, and if we are vigilant, so that subversive propaganda and forces from foreign shores are not permitted to influence our lives. We must put our patriotism above our own personal comforts. We can no longer bury our heads in the sand but must face the real crisis in true American spirit.

[From the Baltimore Sun of August 11, 1941]

COMPLETE THE TRAINING

Among the Members of the House who oppose the bill to extend the period of military service are some who would count the noses of pressure groups in any emergency and would vote with an eye single to political safety. Some others are so ruled by political passion as to be blind to reason. But others opposed to the bill, or hesitant over it, are decent men disturbed by the sacrifice required of the soldiers who will be kept in the service for a longer period.

These decent men among Members who oppose or who hesitate ought to put to themselves one solemn question: Can any sacrifice required of the young men of America be more serious, more terrible, than to send them into modern war untrained to protect themselves, or only half-trained? It would be superfluous to restate the nature of mechanized war. Everyone knows. It would be superfluous to restate the art and science now employed in war, or the striking power and the killing power of new weapons. Everyone knows. It must be obvious to the dullest mind that untrained or half-trained men will be slaughtered in battle. Can the Congress exact any sacrifice of American youth equal to that?

There is no doubt that to extend the service of young men now in uniform or to be put into uniform will, in many cases, involve hardship upon them and upon their parents. The original induction in many cases involved hardship. But Hitler has made hardship the lot of all men. We do not have choice between ease and hardship. We have choice between different kinds of hardship. In this case the choice is simply stated. Do the people, do the Members of Congress, prefer that our sons shall have the hardship of an extension of service which will permit them to be thoroughly trained? Or do the people, the Members of Congress, prefer to risk the ultimate, terrible hardship of unnecessary slaughter of our sons?

Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, has clearly illuminated the whole question in his testimony before the House Committee on Military Affairs. At one place in that testimony he said:

"We have had some tragic examples in our history of good men, sound men, being involved in humiliating reactions on the battlefield, and the very same men performing magnificently at a later date, when they had been thoroughly organized and trained. We had such situations in the Civil War. In fact, most of the Union Army ran into the arms of Congress, I think, after the first Battle of Bull Run. And yet later on those same men did some of the heaviest fighting and took the heaviest punishment in the history of the world. But it took years to develop that state of discipline."

Into that professional military testimony must be read the human elements with which decent Members of the House are concerned. Those armies of the past not only failed when fighting as untrained men and succeeded after being trained. They also left in their graves great numbers of men whose lives might have been spared had the training been given before, and not after, initial battles. If that was so in the relatively simple military operations of the past, no great imagination, only simple common sense, is necessary to foreshadow the horrors which will follow the use of untrained or half-trained men against trained armies of today possessed of modern weapons of death and destruction.

Responsible men cannot take refuge in the assertion that there is no real danger that our Army will be engaged in battle. There is danger. An overwhelming preponderance of opinion in the country has declared that there is danger. What else is the meaning of the whole vast armament program which is quickly revolutionizing the social and economic life of the Nation? What else is the meaning of the great lease-lend program? What else is the meaning of the unprecedented enactment of compulsory service in peacetime—an enactment which no one seriously proposes to repeal?

There is danger that the men in our Army will be engaged in battle. While that danger stands before our eyes it will be a sin against American youth to fail in any steps which will assure their thorough training to engage in battle on even terms. It will be a sin against American youth to ease the hardship of extended training and expose them to the vastly worse hardship—the horror—of battle without adequate training. It will be a sin against the youth who are now directly affected by the proposed legislation, for in emergency they may have to return to the ranks only half-trained. It will be a sin against their present comrades in arms, for they will be left to face the future with depleted and enfeebled units. It will be a sin against the youth who are yet to be called, for they will begin their service, in this time of danger, in a weakened and unprepared Army.

To the decent men in the House who oppose this bill of extension, or who hesitate we say: Think solemnly of your responsibility. For every boy whom you relieve of the hardship of extended service, you may consign another boy to unnecessary slaughter on some field of battle where he will face a trained foe.

Construction of Roads for the National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, my very natural interest in both our national defense and in highway improvement has caused me to listen attentively to the entire debate in the other body and in this, and to consider the matter very maturely. My esteemed lamented father was a pioneer in the good-roads movement, and it is only natural for me to wish to go along with my colleagues in their road-building enthusiasm. It is equally natural, however, not only because of my experience during World War No. 1, but because I love America and consider it by far the greatest country in the

world, for me to be intensely interested in our national defense. Undoubtedly the latter is paramount to the former and should in no way be jeopardized thereby. All of my thought and listening leads to the definite conclusion that the whole question here is whether the purpose of this legislation is national defense or highway building. Could I become convinced that it is the latter, my conviction that funds appropriated for that purpose should be apportioned pursuant to the well-established formula is so strong that there would be no question in my mind whatever. If it is defense legislation, however, an entirely different picture is presented. I quote from the title of this bill:

To authorize appropriations during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, for the immediate construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense.

I also quote from the President's veto message:

One of the major provisions of this bill involves authorization of $125,000,000 to correct critical deficiencies in lines of strategic network of highways and bridges with the further provision that these funds are to be apportioned among the several States in accordance with the existing Federal Aid Act. The critical deficiencies in highways and bridges that may require prompt correction in the interest of our national defense cannot be reasonably related to the population of States or the other factors which enter into ordinary apportionment. The result, therefore, is the necessity for the appropriation of a far larger sum of money to meet immediate requirements than would be necessary if these funds were applied to critical deficiencies without the apportionment method. I am unable to approve this method of expending money for the immediate national defense and for which I recommend a total of $25,000,000 without apportionment. Such a distribution formula entirely disregards, it seems to be, the main purpose to be accomplished, which is that of providing highway construction in particular areas, and in those areas only, where there is immediate need of such construction in the interest of our national defense.

Four sections of the bill authorize appropriations. All but one of them do so in this language:

for carrying out the purpose of this section during the continuance of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941.

I can find nothing in these quotations or in the bill from which they are taken on which to base an argument that this is a road-building, rather than a national-defense, measure. Despite this fact, I believe every telegram I received from our State Capital, except one, referred to "a method of allocation which has been in force since the Highway Act of 1916." Now, how can the Highway Act of 1916, and the method of allocation of funds which has been in force since that date, have anything whatever to do with an emergency-defense measure resulting from the emergency which is scarcely more than a year old in this country? These telegrams merely strengthen my conviction that the position of the President is well taken. Furthermore, the fact should not be overlooked that he is Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. As such, he asked for what I regard as a strictly defense measure. The Congress gave him something different than what he requested and thought he needed, and it was in sufficient disagreement with his opinion of the needs that he vetoed the Congressional action. Undoubtedly more than passing consideration should be given to his considered opinion on such a matter, even though the very nature of the case prevents us from having been solicited to sustain his veto.

My position is that I favor, and expect to continue to vote for, the expenditure of any amount of money necessary for legitimate national defense, but I do not believe the defense of our country can know State lines and population. I also favor the expenditure of any reasonable amount for highway construction, my conviction being very strong that such funds should be apportioned among the States according to the formula heretofore mentioned. I do not believe, however, that they should be confused or that any other endeavor, regardless of its merit in its proper sphere, should be thrust into our defense program to slow it down or add to its already necessarily tremendous cost. As the President well says, "the population of the various States in the Union cannot possibly be related to the critical conditions in our highways," for the remedying of which he asked funds. You will recall that he requested $25,000,000 to be used where most needed. Instead, the Congress gave him a hundred and twenty-five million to be apportioned among the States pursuant to a formula in use since 1916. This is his main objection to the bill. Certainly the critical conditions he has in mind could be more quickly remedied under the authorization he requested than the one he received. Therefore, since it is reasonable to assume that if his veto is sustained today the Congress will shortly pass legislation more in line with his needs, I am strongly convinced that the sustaining of his veto will accelerate our national defense. Furthermore, I believe that more of these critical situations will be remedied by the $25,000,000 used where most needed, as the President wishes, than by the $125,000,000 distributed throughout the United States for general road-building purposes, even though many beautiful and delightful highways might be constructed by the distribution.

There are several other angles which should be considered. I realize the necessity of curtailing nondefense spending during the emergency and of preventing the national debt from growing any larger than necessitated thereby. The people of America are going to share this realization, if such is not already the case, when the new tax bill becomes operative. I said while discussing the lease-lend bill that it would cost much, and that as much as possible of the cost should be raised by taxation so as to relieve as much as possible the burden on our children and theirs. The people of America are perfectly willing to pay any reasonable amount of tax for national defense. Whether they are willing to be so heavily taxed for road building and other peacetime activities under the guise of national defense is another question.

Still another angle is our knowledge of the probability that the unemployment situation will be terrific when the dove of peace shall have finally brought this world from its present condition of carnage and ruin. I think the President was absolutely right, for instance, in stopping the construction of post offices and other peacetime public buildings to contribute toward a backlog of employment after the emergency. I do not know whether adequate labor, and particularly skilled and technical labor, such as engineers, which I understand is scarce indeed, is now available for such a road-building program or not, but I do know, or at least I greatly fear, that much more will be available after the emergency, and that unless such peacetime endeavors are postponed until then, we may reflect in comparison on 1929 to 1933 as the good, old prosperous days of yesteryears.

I judge from the telegrams I have received from road building people who are not my constituents that it is assumed that my State would profit in road building by our failure to sustain this veto. I can but believe, however, that since we have numerous defense projects in Alabama, the final result will be that we would fare about as well by the use of whatever money is necessary for emergency defense highways where these emergencies exist as by such a distribution as this. This is particularly true in view of the President's lack of serious objection to the access-roads section of this bill. Regardless, however, of what the result may be in highway construction, our crying need today is national defense. Should our defense prove inadequate, I do not see that there would be much difference whether we have four-lane highways or not. Therefore I believe that this highway-building program is entirely out of place in this particular bill and cannot conscientiously support it. I can find no fault in the reasoning indulged in by the President, who, bear in mind, is also Commander in Chief of our defense. Consequently, though the line of least resistance dictates contrary action, I shall vote to sustain it.

Abraham Lincoln and The Controlled Press

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important newspapers in the country that is shouting for war and carries an editorial a day for the past year to send our boys to foreign battlefields is the Cleveland Plain Dealer. Those who do not agree with their foreign-policy editorials are classified as "fifth columnists," Nazis, Bundists, Fascists, and

before we started to send aid to "red" Russia, they were called Communists. Daily this newspaper attacks men like Senator BURTON WHEELER, Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, Congressman HAMILTON FISH, and Congressman MARTIN L. SWEENEY, because we dare to expose the war racket and urge the people of the country to be for America first over every nation on earth.

This newspaper comes by its policy of name calling honestly. When Lincoln sought election for a second term at a time when the great Civil War was raging, they indicated their espousal of human slavery and editorially made the most vicious attack on the character and reputation of Abraham Lincoln ever made by any publication of that period. Here is what they said about Lincoln, and I am reading from a photostatic copy of their original editorial published September 6, 1864.

[From the Daily Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio, of September 6, 1941]

THE RECORD OF THE ADMINISTRATION PARTY

The bright record of General McClellan is in the possession of the American people and all the efforts of unscrupulous demagogues and a bitter partisan press to impugn that glittering record have miserably failed. No blot or stain rests upon it. But let not the defamers of our noble candidate expect under false cries of unionism, to turn the public gaze from their own past history. Like the blood upon the hand of the guilty murderess, it will stand and all the waters of the earth cannot wash it out. Greeley may prate of the flag, but he cannot burn up in fire, or obliterate from the memories of men his Tear Down the Flaunting Lie. Hale and Sumner and Washburne, with their coadjutors can never destroy their fierce invectives against the Union. The shibboleths under which they waged war against us, "Union savers," "Dough faces," "The South can't be kicked out," "Let the Union slide," "The Constitution is a covenant with death, and a compact with hell," will rise in judgment against them for all time, and will confront them in the last day, before the awful tribunal of the Most High, as dread witnesses of their guilt in plunging this fair and prosperous land in fratricidal war. Lincoln cannot shake off his incendiary declaration in the canvass of 1858, that the country "Must be all slave or all free." He dare not invoke the Union made by our fathers in this political contest. He is chained to the sectional Union of an Abolition Party. He has protracted this war and filled unnumbered thousands of graves to build up such a Union upon the ghastly wreck of that sublime fabric which the patriot statesmen of 1787 created.

The agitations of 30 years on the stump in State legislatures, in town meetings, in Congress, in schoolrooms, in private families, in newspapers, and in the very sanctuaries of worship by these "wolves in sheep's clothing," calling themselves the exclusive patriots, bear grave testimony against them now, refute their pretended loyalty to law and devotion to the national unity, and warn the people to repose in them no further trust or confidence. The lessons of the war add strength to this warning. Who can deny that they have prostituted the men and money freely given by a brave hearted people—to eternize abolition, instead of to perpetuate the integrity of our country. It is a damning fact that cannot be killed and buried by all the political bravos and undertakers in their ranks. Thurlow Weed, one of their own party, admits the fact and attempts to cast the sole odium on Sumner, Wade, and other advisers of Lincoln. The latter gentleman must bear his full share of reproach. The people made him their chief agent. They hold him responsible for the terrible abuse of that high trust. Let the people then judge the Baltimore nominee and the men who nominated him by their past record, and put their verdict of censure upon it, with a weight like the seal of Solomon, in the November election.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE

For the withdrawal of McDowell's Corps, and the abandonment of the seige of Richmond?—Abraham Lincoln.

Who is responsible for Pope's defeat at Manassas?—Abraham Lincoln.

Who is responsible for cheating the country of the fruits of the glorious victory of Antietam?—Abraham Lincoln.

Who is responsible for the slaughter and defeat at Fredericksburg?—Abraham Lincoln.

Who is responsible for the terrible havoc and disaster at Chancellorsville?—Abraham Lincoln.

Who is responsible for the overland route entitled, "My Plan," by which 125,000 men were lost?—Abraham Lincoln.

Who is responsible for the present occupation of Mexico by an Austrian usurper?—Abraham Lincoln.

Who is responsible for keeping our soldiers in southern prisons, unless Negroes were considered equal to white men?—Abraham Lincoln.

Who caused the illegal arrests, suspension of judicial writs, suppression of newspapers, interference with elections in northern States, and manifold other violations of the constitutional law of the land?—Abraham Lincoln.

Who stands like a specter of death in the way of an honorable peace with the Union restored?—Abraham Lincoln.

Who is Abraham Lincoln?

A third-rate lawyer from Springfield, Ill., who once kept a whisky still up a hollow, split 3,000 rails, now splits the American Union, and calls for Negro songs on a crimson battlefield, yet has the audacity to aspire again to the Chief Magistracy of this great Republic.

OH! DON'T!

Some of the Republican journals are finding fault with General McClellan's personal appearance. This is refreshing even for September. But, oh, shades of Apollo, Hyperion, and Adonis, what shall be said of the form and face of the present incumbent of the White House.

We relent. It would be cruelty to pursue the subject.

Mr. Speaker, you will notice that they even made a disgraceful reference to his profile and appearance. What an insult to the Great Emancipator whose picture adorns the walls of every schoolroom in America and whose features are imprinted on our currency and the coin of the realm.

In another issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer on September 13, 1864, and I read from an authentic photostat of the original article of that day. Lincoln is referred to—

as a miserable failure, a coarse, filthy joker, a disgusting politician, a mean, cunning and cruel tyrant, and the shame and disgrace of the Nation.

The people of Cleveland, Ohio, will recall the vile and brutal attack made by Cleveland Plain Dealer and other Cleveland papers upon the beloved late mayor, Tom L. Johnson, in his magnificent fight against special privilege.

Today in Cleveland this newspaper which also financially controls the Cleveland News is joined with the Scripps-Howard newspaper, the Cleveland Press, in violation of the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts. This monopoly, in violation of law, compels the advertisers and readers who use the newspapers to pay "through the nose" by a uniform exorbitant rate of display and classified advertisements and a uniform price for the sale of their papers.

All of the Cleveland newspapers pose as moralists in the community and vilify and insult every public official who will not take orders from them. Witness their brutal campaign against the late Sheriff Martin L. O'Donnell which resulted in his death. They condemn bingo playing and crap shooting as immoral but think nothing of influencing the Department of Justice to fix the case of their lawyer who ran afoul of the law in seeking to make a fraudulent income-tax return. I might say that they were successful in this fix and their lawyer was saved from a criminal indictment which might have sent him to a Federal penitentiary. They refused to expose the vendors of worthless Alleghany stock because some of them were in on the racket. They shout about crime waves which everybody condemns but they should be reminded that any gangster problem we have in Cleveland stems from the time a few years back when during their circulation wars these newspapers placed in the hands of boys 16 and 18 years of age guns and blackjacks which resulted in bodily injury to these youngsters and in one case resulted in the murder of a 17-year-old boy.

In the best organized town in the country they constantly smear the organized labor movement. They forget that labor which supports these metropolitan newspapers can destroy them overnight if they ever entered into a campaign to withhold their patronage from the papers and the few department stores that control them.

Some of us in public life have felt their lash because we voted for the soldiers' bonus, collective bargaining, and opposed wage cuts for Federal employees that were unjustified.

For the past few years their control has reached into the city government of Cleveland. Editors, not a mayor, are running the affairs of Cleveland. They cover up the mistakes and irregularities of the present administration in power, and attempt to dictate to political leaders of both parties. Thank God the people of Cleveland have caught up to the controlled press in their city. Every suspicion points to the fact that they were subsidized in the last World War, and in the present world crisis suspicion again indicates that they are once more subsidized. They have been known in the past to stir up religious and racial intolerance in what was once the most tolerent city in the country.

These newspapers continue to pay their editors salaries equal to that of the President of the United States. The editor of the Plain Dealer receives $75,000 per year and the business manager gets $240,000 per year. Other papers pay comparable salaries to their editors and managers.

Despite the huge profits and large salaries paid to personnel by the newspapers they were cruel enough to drive the newsboys off the streets of Cleveland 1 year ago because they refused to pay a fraction

of a cent on street sales and refused to recognize the Newsboys' Union.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Cleveland have a chance this year to break the power of the controlled press. This will be an important issue in the municipal campaign of 1941. "The people versus newspaper control of our city government" is a timely and necessary slogan.

Public officials who are courageous enough to give battle will be deliberately cartooned, misrepresented, and ridiculed by their $75,000-a-year editors but when this occurs there will always be the consolation "look at what they said about Lincoln."

Proposed Arkansas Valley Authority Endorsed by High Government Officials—All the Nation's Hydroelectric Power Must Be Developed

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Arkansas Valley Authority has received the endorsement of practically every high official in the Government of the United States—including President Roosevelt.

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which I am a member, has just completed hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway project. Certain statements and endorsements were made at this hearing which I feel are important enough to repeat here.

WILLIAM S. KNUDSEN

I quote a question which I propounded to Director General William S. Knudsen, of the Office of Production Management, and his answer:

Mr. ELLIS. Assuming that the Arkansas Valley Authority, which is on the Arkansas, St. Lawrence, Red, and White Rivers on the west side of the Mississippi, would produce about as much power as the Tennessee—the bill is pending before this committee—based on what you have said just now, do I understand you are in favor of that project also?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes (p. 828).

Said Mr. Knudsen, also:

I don't believe we will ever have power enough in the United States. The country is growing so fast, the population is increasing and there is more and more demand for power every day. And if we have the power, why should we not use it? I think it was Mr. Coolidge——

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Knudsen, I didn't quite understand you. Who was it you quoted?

Mr. KNUDSEN. I think it was Mr. Coolidge who at one time said he wanted to save the people, and the more power you have the more people you save.

Hydroelectric power has its advantages. While the first cost is heavy, it is cheaper to produce. Nobody can produce steam power at the cost of hydroelectric power, and wherever it is available, it seems to me we ought to take advantage of it. There would still be room for the use of all the steam power we could make. The distance of transmission, of course, makes it necessary in certain places to have steam power. In some cases we have gas that can be used, and I think that every available fuel, and every available opportunity for power should be developed to the fullest extent.

Our defense industries are in constant need of more power. We work with the Federal Power Commission, and with the Department of the Interior to round up all the available power we can get, and we are constantly looking forward to see where we will have more available power, because, as you understand, the chemical and electrolytic process have been vastly developed during the last 20 years, and I look for still greater forward development in the next 20 years.

So we need power; we need power for manufacturing; we need power for civilian use, and wherever we can obtain such power at low cost, I think we should take advantage of the opportunity.

* * * There is going to be a demand for power in the United States Even after the emergency is over, I think there is going to be a greater demand for power, and I think that any investment you can make in power for the future is a good investment for the United States and for the future of the United States (pp. 812-813).

I say I am not a power engineer, nor can I pose as a power expert, but I bought a great deal of power during my 20 years with General Motors, and my 10 years with Mr. Ford. Whenever I bought water power I got it cheaper than I could get steam power, even if I generated that steam power myself (p. 820).

SECRETARY STIMSON

Congressman SMITH of Washington propounded to Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, certain questions which I quote together with the Secretary's answers:

Mr. SMITH. But are you of the opinion, Mr. Secretary, that the generation of power and making it available to our Government, a large block of power, would be a very valuable factor in the prosecution of any war which we might have to enter?

Secretary STIMSON. With that I heartily agree.

Mr. SMITH. Is it not a fact that Germany, starting with the Hitler regime, has developed all of the available hydroelectric power within Germany and now, since the outbreak of the war, is doing the same thing in all of the conquered countries under her sovereignty at this time?

Secretary STIMSON. Well, I cannot state the extent to which she has done it, but I understand she is making great steps in that direction (p. 10).

SECRETARY KNOX

On the question of whether the projects of the A. V. A. could be completed in time to be of assistance in this emergency, I quote a statement of the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox:

It is driven home to me with the close application I must give to the subject of sea power that we are going to live in a disturbed world for a long time, no matter what the outcome of the war may be, and in that world which is out of balance and struggling for a new and secure footing the control of the seas is going to be of immense importance (p. 95).

On the same point, Secretary of War Stimson said:

There is a very good chance, a very strong chance, in my opinion, of the emergency lasting long enough to enable this country to reap the benefits of this construction of the seaway (Four Years, p. 6).

Incidentally, the following dialogue is interesting:

Mr. ELLIS. But do you think it would be possible to do any of this shipbuilding up and down the Mississippi River?

Secretary KNOX. Yes; I am going to do so.

Mr. ELLIS. I hope you do, and particularly along the eastern border of Arkansas.

Secretary KNOX. I cannot answer as to that.

The CHAIRMAN. On the Arkansas River (p. 111).

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE JESSE JONES

Following is a question which I propounded to the Secretary of Commerce, Jesse Jones, and his answer:

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Secretary, you are also in favor of opening up such rivers of the country as can be opened up—naturally, I have in mind those in the Arkansas country—for navigation also, where that can feasibly be done, are you not?

Secretary JONES. Yes, sir; I have said that (p. 298).

CHAIRMAN OLDS

Chairman Leland Olds, of the Federal Power Commission, stated:

I think every hydroelectric development we can make at the present time is going to strengthen this country in its defense program (p. 347).

Said he also:

Today Germany can command, or it will be commanding within the next 2 years, about 200,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy. Our last year's production in this country was about 144,000,000,000 (p. 330).

Quoting again from Chairman Olds:

Our power flood-control division has been working frequently with the United States Corps of Engineers on these multiple-purpose river plants, and it is surprising how much good water power you can still find west of the Mississippi; that is, between the Mississippi and the Rockies. Among other things, we find very excellent hydro power in the streams of Arkansas, particularly the White River, where the developments at Table Rock, Bull Shoals, and Norfolk combined would give you primary power in a very considerable quantity (pp. 350-351).

JULIUS H BARNES

Julius H. Barnes, three times president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, gave his indorsement, and I quote the following dialogue:

Mr. ELLIS. When were you last president of the United States Chamber of Commerce?

Mr. BARNES. I was president in 1929, 1930, 1931.

Mr. ELLIS. And are you now connected with the chamber in any way?

Mr. BARNES. No.

Mr. ELLIS. You know, do you not, that the United States Chamber of Commerce has condemned, or failed to prove, or has disapproved, this project?

Mr. BARNES. I do, and I differ with the chamber's expressions.

Mr. ELLIS. So do I. You know, too, that the United States Chamber of Commerce has disapproved the proposed Arkansas Valley Authority development and other similar developments?

Mr. BARNES. Is the Arkansas Valley largely a power or an irrigation project?

Mr. ELLIS. Similar to the T. V. A.; power, navigation, flood control, and reclamation. Do you know that they condemned that, too?

Mr. BARNES. I do not know it; but I would not be surprised.

Mr. ELLIS. Well, I am telling you that they have, and I am not surprised; but would you disagree with them on that score?

Mr. BARNES. I think I would (p. 316).

ROOSEVELT ENTHUSIASTIC

Several times lately President Roosevelt has discussed the Arkansas Valley proposal with congressional leaders. On July 16 he discussed it with Senators NORRIS and STEWART and Congressman KEFAUVER and told them he hoped to get it passed at this session. On August 2 he told Congressman JOHN RANKIN that the authority bill must be passed.

STATUS OF A. V. A. BILL

The A. V. A. bill, now pending before the Rivers and Harbors Committee, was referred in regular order to the various Government departments. They in turn made their reports to the National Resources Planning Board and the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Roosevelt requested Harold Smith, Director of the Budget, to make a study of the reports, endeavor to work out any differences, and report back to him. There are questions of administration on which the departments have not agreed, but I am hopeful that a decision may be reached and that hearings may be had before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors within a few weeks.

What a blessing it would have been if we could have had the A. V. A. in operation at this time.

Simon Bolivar Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1941

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of President Roosevelt and address of Frederick E. Hasler, president, Pan American Society, at ceremonies in observance of the one hundred and fifty-eighth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Simon Bolivar, held at the statue of the liberator in Central Park, New York, Thursday, July 24.

The observance of the birthday of the Great Liberator, which is a time-honored custom of the Pan American Society, was of especial significance this year because of events in Europe and the Far East and their possible effect on the welfare of the United States and our sister republics to the south.

The society, which is the oldest nongovernmental organization in this country devoted to the development of true friendship and better understanding between the 21 Pan American nations, is doing splendid work in supplementing the good-neighbor policy of our Government. Its membership, numbering 1,000, is made up of representative men in the United States and Latin America who are working to make and keep the bond between these nations so sound in principle and of such mutual advantage that it will grow stronger and more precious with the passing years. The society and its officers—Mr. Hasler, in particular—deserve our thanks for the many fine things they are doing.

The celebration began with a luncheon held by the society at the Hotel Bolivar, 230 Central Park West. The consuls of 14 Latin-American Republics were present at the lunch, and Dr. Luis Fernando Guachalla, Bolivian Minister to the United States, had come from Washington to attend it. From there the guests marched to the Bolivar statute. They were preceded by a United States Army Band, two rifle platoons of the military police, and a color guard from Fort Jay, Governors Island, carrying the 21 flags of the American nations. The band played the anthems of the American Republics. Wreaths bearing their colors were placed at the foot of the statute by Dr. Guachalla, Mr. Hasler, and various Latin-American organizations. Dr. Guachalla spoke in Spanish of Bolivar's achievements.

President Roosevelt, recognizing the importance of the occasion, wrote the following letter, which was read by Mr. Hasler:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 18, 1941.

DEAR MR. HASLER: Not the weakest among the many bonds which unite the American republics is the memory of the great men throughout the continent who led the struggle for the achievement of the independence of the 21 sovereign nations of America. The life and deeds of Simon Bolivar and of the other heroes of the lands to the south of us are becoming constantly better known in the United States. Conversely, the achievements of George Washington and of those who labored at his side to found our Republic are from year to year the subject of more widespread interest and study in the other American republics. The resulting development of a body of shared knowledge regarding noble and heroic efforts directed toward common goals is a source of strength and vitality in the development of our relations.

It is, therefore, with particular pleasure that I send this message of greeting on the anniversary of the birth of Simon Bolivar. I wish that it were possible for me to be with you at the statue of that great man and join with you in paying tribute to his memory. His ideal of continental solidarity is constantly before us in these tragic times; it encourages and stimulates us in the development of the defenses of our hemisphere against the perils which threaten it.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

FREDERICK E. HASLER, ESQ.,
President, Pan American Society,
New York, N. Y.

Mr. Hasler delivered the following timely and impressive address:

It is in a spirit of deep humility and veneration that we meet today to honor the memory of one of the world's greatest soldiers, statesmen, and patriots—Simon Bolivar, the great liberator and father of Pan-Americanism. No word or act of ours can add to the luster of his sainted memory, but, with each passing year we gain a new conception of how his life and achievements influenced the destiny of a great continent and still shine as a guiding star over the whole Western Hemisphere.

How shall we measure the greatness, the nobility, the self-abnegation of Simon Bolivar? He was a mighty warrior, an inspiring leader, a tireless crusader for the right of humanity, a brilliant statesman with vision, a man who willingly sacrificed inherited wealth, social position, and official prestige so that he might serve his fellow men. As a result of his lifelong efforts, when the short life span of his 47 years passed, he bequeathed to future generations the precious heritage to enjoy and to protect liberty.

Like other great men who had unselfishly served humanity, he died a disillusioned man, with his great plan, an alliance of the nations of the New World, ruined by the indifference, suspicion, selfishness, and lack of vision of men then in power.

Bolivar was gifted with a vision that was almost superhuman. Picture, if you can, a man whose mind was so brilliant that he could gage the ruthless ambitions of men of future generations so accurately that he foresaw the cataclysm which Hitler today is forcing upon the world. Such a mind was Simon Bolivar's. He envisaged the day when his New World would be called upon to save the Old World. That day has arrived. He outlined the formula by which this salvation might be accomplished and the forces of evil might be routed. Let me read you Bolivar's own words, as quoted by John Jennings in his book, Call the New World:

"From the very start of my career," Bolivar said, "this has been my dream; the thing for which I have fought above all else—a free and independent America, united in the interests of democracy, upholding liberty before the world; not an America welded into a single great nation, mind you, for that I recognize is impossible, but a great federation of independent States, each sovereign in itself, yet together upholding the principle of freedom in a world that would stamp it out. This has been my dream of (Latin) America. I had not dared to hope that you of the North would join in it. Now, by the words of your President, this dream is enlarged and made possible. One day, my friend, mark well my words, it will fall to the New World to uphold and defend the civilization which has already begun to decay in the Old. And only by such union will that be accomplished!"

Is it any wonder that the memory of Bolivar is dear to us? Today we raise our faces in devotion before this shrine of liberty which symbolizes his mighty deeds and inspired words.

If some of our statesmen who were contemporaries of Bolivar had possessed his knowledge and distrust of European politics and his vision, and if they had been guided by his knowledge, the Western Hemisphere could have been unified and made invulnerable, both economically and in a military sense, and we would not have to worry about the threat of invasion, as we are worrying today. The Western Hemisphere could have become so strong that no nation or group of nations would have thought of attacking or even threatening us.

Some statesmen of Bolivar's day, for selfish or other reasons, refused to see the dangers which the Great Liberator so clearly saw. We have a parallel to that situation in the United States today. Bolivar was threatened and had to fight hard in his efforts to do what was best for the welfare and safety of the people he loved. Today, our President is being attacked and his motives impugned by the Quislings of this country, in public office and out, who, by undermining public confidence, morale, and loyalty, are in effect sabotaging our defense effort and playing into Hitler's hands.

The pity of it. Civilization, freedom, and democracy are smothered in smoking ruins in most of Europe and the Western Hemisphere is certain to be the next coveted goal of the pagan hordes. These appeasers in our midst would have us believe we are in no danger. Thank God, we have a President and a majority in our Congress who think

otherwise and who are taking the wise course to insure the safety of this hemisphere and the preservation of Christianity and freedom.

We know that today the Latin-American nations and the United States are facing the gravest crisis in their history. Just at this moment the danger is equally as internal as it is external. Sincere men and women are hoping against hope that a decision will not have to be made, that a miracle will spare them the horror of meeting the brutal facts face to face. Like the ostrich, they bury their eyes and minds in the sand of mental stupor. Others, all too many, engage their poisonous tongues and pens in spreading half truths, painting distorted word pictures to distract attention from the main issue. For what reasons? Who knows? Frustrated ambitions? Personal spite? Envy? Desire to keep themselves in the limelight? Whatever the motives of such persons, it is difficult for patriotic Americans to disassociate them from the Hitler-directed "fifth columnists" who are, everywhere active in plotting for our destruction.

Democracy recognizes the right of the individual to express his honest convictions, but for its own preservation democracy cannot countenance the perversion of this liberty of free speech by its enemies.

My friends, only when we have destroyed this danger from the enemy within, can we be certain of victory over the enemy without. To bring the truth of this forcibly home to us, let us read Bolivar's "Manifesto to Cartagena," which, early in his career, he addressed to the people of New Grenada. This manifesto was one of his greatest documents. It was a direct statement of his political philosophy, to which he firmly adhered. He said:

"We had philosophers for statesmen, philanthropy for legislation, dialectics for tactics, and sophists for soldiers—internal dissensions were in fact, the poison which carried the conutry to its doom. * * * It is necessary that a government identify itself with the circumstances, times, and men surrounding it. If they are prosperous and calm, the government can be mild and protective; but if they are turbulent and calamitous, the government must show itself terrible and must arm itself with a firmness equal to the dangers, without paying heed to laws or constitutions until peace is reestablished."

Mark you well those words of the Great Liberator. They are as true today as they were more than a century ago.

In this tribute to Simon Bolivar I should be remiss if I did not mention another heroic figure who was one of his contemporaries—San Martin, a great soldier and a great patriot, who did more than any other one man for the cause of independence in Argentina, Chile, and Peru. Both men were cast in the same mold. Both had the attribute of true greatness—subordination of self. In 1822, San Martin unselfishly relinquished his leadership in order that Bolivar might have undisputed authority to bring together all factions of the revolutionary movement.

Today the Western Hemisphere needs more patriots of the type of Bolivar and San Martin. Were they alive, they would be the first to punish internal treachery and to fight appeasement, and the first to unite us to defend the precious heritage of freedom which they won for untold millions of their fellow men in the New World.

Unless we keep faith with the great leaders of the past—Washington, Bolivar, San Martin, and Lincoln—we cannot hope to continue our American way of life and to enjoy the privileges and blessings of true democracies. Their lives are stories of inspired vision, hardship, and sacrifice. We shall prove unworthy of the heritage they bequeathed us if we are not willing—yes, eager—to work for defense until our muscles ache and our bodies sweat; if we are not glad to economize so that we pay our share of the cost of defense, or if we hesitate to make sacrifices to insure the complete and lasting triumph of Christianity and freedom over paganism and slavery.

Last January, I visited the beautiful city of Caracas, the birthplace and the last resting place of the mortal remains of Bolivar. As I stood in the quietness and peace of that hallowed sanctuary, the Pantheon, there was no feeling that it was a place of death, but only a feeling of beauty, immortality, life everlasting and victory. There "slept" the man who dreamed of a new world where all men should have equal opportunity, the right to think, talk, and live as God intended men should—as human beings.

If Bolivar, the conqueror of the impossible, whose astounding military feats have never been excelled and are so fantastically incredible as to pale into insignificance the vaunted prowess of Hitler's panzer divisions—were he here, today, speaking to us, what would be the burden of his message? Can there be any doubt that he would call upon every man, woman, and child in the nations of the Pan-American Union to uphold and strengthen the men we have chosen as our leaders? I can hear his voice exhorting us:

"This is no time to call yourselves members of this or that political faction. There is but one classification for you today—citizens of the Americas, pledging faith in and allegience to your chosen leaders; backing them up with all you have—heart, mind, and body and worldly goods. Do this and victory shall be yours, as it was mine—victory of freedom over tyranny, of right over wrong, of courage over appeasement and defeatism, of God and democracy over atheism and Hitlerism—victory of honor and life over degradation and death."

The world of free men which we call democracies—our world—is fighting for its very life. It is facing the greatest crisis in its history. The pleading hands of millions of once free people and the hands of others still struggling to hold their liberty are outstretched to the Western Hemisphere. We must not and we shall not fail these brave people who rely on us for help.

Let us not forget in this crisis that one of the vital elements of Bolivar's success over the oppressors was the unity of his people. We can help make this unity ours, if we leave this anniversary celebration with the firm resolution to lay aside all differences and to work as one people, united, unafraid, unconquerable—Americans all.

Letter Concerning Husband Who Is Now in the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, which speaks for itself:

The Honorable MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Although I realize it is essential at this time to develop a well-trained Army, I am very much opposed to the extension of the draft limit beyond the original year. If all the boys were really being well trained in modern warfare, perhaps there would be some value in extending their period of service beyond the year, but from what I have heard from many intelligent young men it seems that the lack of good training is appalling. Therefore, I think it is most unfair to put all the burden on the men who have already been inducted.

In any case those over 28 years and the men who were married before the draft went into effect should certainly be released as rapidly as possible; also, some efficient method should be devised for releasing those on whom retention in the Army is working great hardships. I understand that the Senate passed a proposal to release men over 28, but I do not know what provisions the House of Representatives has made along these lines. I feel very strongly that a bill should be passed to release them right away, regardless of how the draft-extension bill turns out.

The administration of the draft law has been particularly unfair in New York City, especially, it seems, in this district. My husband, who is 31, was inducted into the Army on March 11, although we had been married at that time for 3½ years. He was in business for himself as a commercial photographer; I had continued with my work until his business was well enough established for me to stop and have the family that we had been planning. Just at the time he was getting on his feet he was called into the Army and had to give up his business. If and when he ever gets out, he will have to start at the bottom again unless he is released very soon.

In addition to all the other worries, he contracted pneumonia a few weeks after being inducted and was in the hospital at ——— for 5 weeks. Shortly after he became sick the combination of worry over his condition and the fact that I became run-down physically after he left put me in a hospital in New York at the same time. In May he was transferred to ———, supposedly to be sent to the technical school for aerial photographers, but he still has not gone to school, and until last week was not even a photographer. Aside from the terrible uncertainly and the fact that we can make absolutely no plans for our future, we are both very unhappy, to put it mildly, over this enforced separation. Inasmuch as my husband has received practically no training, due in part to his illness and transfer, is there any way that we could obtain his release from the Army soon?

Of course, as you can see, I have a selfish reason for wanting a bill passed to release those over 28, but even without that I think it is most unjust to hold men in the Army when they were just getting a good start on their careers.

Very truly yours.

Problems of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

SPEECH BY ALFRED C. GAUNT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, unless certain present trends are reversed or at least checked we are going to find the control of American industry

concentrated to a far greater extent than has ever been the case before and to a far greater extent than can presently be safe in any democracy.

This is why I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following speech of Alfred C. Gaunt at a symposium on small business in Chicago last June:

REMARKS AT SMALL BUSINESS SYMPOSIUM

(By Alfred C. Gaunt, Treasurer, Merrimac Mills)

If I may outline what I hope may be a contribution to this discussion on the Outlook for Small Independent Business in Our Modern Economy it might be on the angle of what will be the impact of emergency or war and most war conditions on small independent business.

Professor Cabot, of Harvard School of Business Administration, said this spring that he was greatly impressed by the caliber of 300 small businessmen who were in attendance at a series of conferences there, as contrasted to the representation of big business, who had constituted the conferences of the previous year. He said to the small businessmen's group, "The small businessman is broader in his outlook than the executive in a big business, probably because he has to be more resourceful and have greater initiative."

London reported after two months of war 20,000 small businesses closed and 20,000 more that could go on but little longer. In the line of manufacturing in which I am greatly interested, we are told that England's small manufacturers are by law being combined with their larger competitors, or otherwise eliminated.

Small independent business will be the first to suffer with the advent of war and the program of regimentation that of necessity goes with war. In Italy, Germany, and Russia, small independent business has largely ceased to exist.

We face the serious problem of how to arm ourselves without losing the democratic rights we would defend.

In America, small businesses employing less than 200 workers comprise 98.7 percent of all businesses, according to the Social Security Board's latest figures. They do 65 percent of the Nation's business.

If we believe, as I feel we all do, that the promotion of small independent business today is the preservation of democracy tomorrow, it behooves us to examine now and act now to save from extinction our small independent business, as a means of inestimable service to the welfare of our country.

The United States follows the pattern of Britain to a large degree, especially in this war—and we are only about 1 year behind Britain in many economic processes, perhaps including the rapid elimination of small businesses. The minute we get into war, our economic processes will rapidly catch up and even pass Britain in speed. Are we now, here, on the immediate verge of a wholesale quick elimination of small independents as in Britain a year ago?

There are, fortunately, some forces at work for small independent business that we should support as vigorously as we fight against forces of regimentation or monopoly that would destroy us.

Perhaps you are familiar with the fact that both political platforms, for the first time in their history, mentioned small business by name; and that also for the first time in history Congress has set up a committee specifically for the study of the problems of small independent business. Likewise, the T. N. E. C. has done a most excellent piece of work in its investigation and report on the relative officiency of large, medium, and small businesses, and in revealing factually the dangers inherent in monopolistic practices. And Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, has just announced the setting up of a separate division in the Department of Justice "to be an effective public defender and public agent of the small businessman."

A start has been made toward securing representation for and recognition of the place of small, independent business in our economy and life. The organization and convention of this splendid group of independents is a real contribution to the cause.

But it is only a start. We see labor and agriculture and big business recognized even by Cabinet positions. On the top policy-making Board of Defense and Production is labor's representative and two representatives of big business. They are fine men; but at this particular time of emergency for small independents—do you not join me in asking—why do those who can contribute the most, and who are liable to suffer the most, why do they have no representation?

Do you doubt the need of representation? Do you feel that the interests of small, independent business are adequately covered by the present set-up?

Let me give you an up-to-date example of what is transpiring. Until recently the Army, in invitations for bids on serge for uniforms, set no minimum quantity on which a manufacturer might bid. They received bids from 78 worsted mills. The next invitation said, "No bids for less than 25,000 yards," whereupon bids were received from but 36 bidders.

The small manufacturer was side-tracked, and this action naturally restricted the sources of supply. If less competition means higher prices, then the Army must pay more for its goods. As I left home Saturday, a new call for bids for a further quantity has been issued. This time the minimum has been raised to 100,000 yards.

The Army have, from their standpoint, a logical answer. They say—and they are right—that problems of inspection, etc., are reduced when they have but a few mills to deal with.

But what will be the immediate and post-war effect on the existence of small independent business if this policy is pursued and widened? Can we not agree that even if it is more trouble—it is well worth it?

And yet this is just the plan of saving clerical and inspectors' time at the expense of the very existence of small independents, that we will see employed in increasing measures, unless small independent business is on its guard, and unless it has representation of, by, and for independent small business on all Government policy-making boards and departments. With very great respect for Jesse Jones and other fine men that have preceded him, the Secretary of Commerce should not be a banker, not a lawyer, not a big businessman, not a social worker, but an independent businessman—one of the great rank and file.

The planks on small business of the political parties are good ones, but meaningless unless put into effect.

"Without representation of, by, and for independent small businessmen by representatives of their own choosing, as labor and consumer, and agriculture and big business now have, democracy in the United States cannot be preserved under modern conditions."

In Britain it was neglect rather than design that failed to give representation to independent small business on defense and war council and boards. The same neglect, rather than design, is now hurting small independents in the United States. It is already probably "too late" in Britain to save independent small business. But why should it be allowed to be too late in the United States?

The problem of how to give this representation to independent small business is, of course, a great one. But there are associations such as you have here and some manufacturers' associations and national trade associations, which are made up of and controlled and dominated by independent small business. From these, the Government could at once get representatives of independent small business to serve. The respective association should pay the expenses of these representatives except where the Government or defense commission or council or board pays its other members.

Here are some of the policies for which such a representative might stand:

1. Making such regimentation as may be necessary on a graduated basis, with big business first, medium business next, and the tiny "pants presser" entirely exempt.

2. The promotion, wherever practical, of many prime contracts to many small contractors rather than following the program of big orders to big concerns, with the delays and inequities incident to subletting and subcontracting.

3. The lifting of this inequitable burden on small enterprises of governmental reports and returns and their undue tax on the time of the small businessman.

4. An alleviation of disproportionate cost to small units of credit accommodation and financing and insurance and other service.

5. Insisting that any emergency measures requiring overlong hours of labor, or agricultural or industrial regimentation be effectively limited to the term of the emergency.

6. The continual and vigorous promotion of full, free, and fair competitive enterprise in industry, trade, and agriculture.

7. The encouragement of growth of proprietor-owned-and-operated enterprise with the social benefits resulting from close contact between owners and employees.

8. Discouraging those tendencies toward absentee ownership which work to destroy human relationship, and thus engender the wholesale curtailing of employment at the first sign of business recession.

9. Retarding the absorption of small business by big aggregations of capital, as an insidious menace to the liberty of the citizen.

10. Elimination of State barriers affecting interstate trade.

11. The removal of artificial rewards to bigness, and artificial penalties on smallness.

Senator AIKEN of Vermont said the other day that we have at hand elements that could make for nazi-ism, "big army, big business, big government:" "but," he added, "the good sense of the American people will set up safeguards." We know that this Vermonter is right; but let us now, at the beginning of this war, before it is too late, put into effect policies and support forces already in action, that will effectively prevent post-war depressions and unemployment and disasters, and even revolution.

I close by asking you: Will we move now for representation, that we small independent businessmen may participate and contribute, not as suppliants, but as full-fledged partners?

The Return of the Musk Oxen to Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

ARTICLE BY STANLEY P. YOUNG

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the special committee for conservation of wildlife resources, and the standing Committee on the Territories, I am deeply interested in the result of a program for the return of a herd of

musk oxen to Alaska and the development and preservation of this species of wildlife which formerly abounded in that section of our country. Having been born and raised in the far west and a descendant of covered-wagon pioneers, I have witnessed the disappearance or depletion of many of the species of wildlife which formerly abounded in great numbers in our vast public domains.

In recent years much has been done by our conservation-minded citizens and public officials in preventing further depletion of the stock of these wildlife creatures. Some of our citizens who were residing in Alaska in 1927 caused a memorial to be addressed to the Congress of the United States by the territorial legislature of Alaska requesting that funds be provided to purchase and locate in Alaska a herd of musk oxen. The late Senator Peter Norbeck of South Dakota, an early champion of conservation, and Representative C. C. DICKINSON of Iowa, in cooperation with Irving McK. Reed, who was then a member of the Alaska Game Commission, were successful in securing an appropriation by the Congress of $40,000 to be used for this purpose. The action was approved by the President May 27, 1930. The work in carrying into effect the project was entrusted to the Bureau of Biological Survey of the Department of Agriculture. This Department was later transferred to the Department of the Interior and recently was combined with the Bureau of Fisheries, and is now known as the Fish and Wildlife Service.

When "Ding" Darling was Director of the Wildlife Bureau he placed in charge of the big-game preserves for the protection of the preserves from game-law violators Stanley P. Young. Mr. Young is senior biologist of the Fish and Wildlife Service. He comes from my native State of Oregon and is performing a very fine service in this most important field, and particularly in the conservation of wildlife resources. Mr. Young has written a most amazing and interesting story, describing our Government's successful undertaking in carrying out the mandate of the legislation to which I have referred, in reestablishing a herd of musk oxen in Alaska after the absence of 100 years. The herd is now increasing and has almost doubled in size. I am sure that this article will be of great interest to all who are interested in the conservation of wildlife resources, as well as the development of our outlying territories.

In accordance with consent heretofore given me, I include in my remarks this article by Mr. Young, which appeared in the August issue of the American Forest. The article is as follows:

[From American Forests of August 1941]

THE RETURN OF THE MUSK OXEN—IN ONE OF THE MOST DRAMATIC UNDERTAKINGS IN BIG-GAME CONSERVATION, THESE INTERESTING MAMMALS OF THE BLEAK ARCTIC TRAVEL 14,000 MILES TO BECOME REESTABLISHED IN ALASKA

(By Stanley P. Young)

The musk oxen, one of the most interesting mammals of the bleak Arctic, has returned to Alaska, and while little is known of its disappearance from that region more than a century ago, its return is boldly written in what is perhaps the most dramatic chapter in the annals of big game conservation. Indeed, this remarkable undertaking of reintroducing a game animal into its ancient habitat has few parallels in conservation history.

To reestablish their kind in our northern territory, the musk oxen were transported by boat and by railway a distance of approximately 14,000 miles, the longest and most hazardous journey in the history of transplanting any mammal for restocking purposes. Captured in Greenland, the animals were shipped by boat to Bergen, Norway, and then to New York City. There they were crated and sent to Seattle, Wash., on express railway cars, to again be loaded aboard a boat for Alaska. More than 2 months were required to move the animals from Greenland to Fairbanks. Despite this record-breaking journey, the herd, consisting of 34 animals—15 males and 19 females—arrived at its destination in splendid condition.

This was in 1930. Nine years later, in 1939, when the herd was last counted on Nunivak Island, where it was released, it numbered 60. Biologists have full faith that the animals will continue to increase and in time be of sufficient number to permit restocking of other areas in Alaska.

But before reviewing this amazing undertaking, it may be well to consider the musk oxen and its bleak habitat. The term Arctic, to a great many people, suggests a desolate, ice-bound land—or water—where little life is supported. However true this may at first appear, there is error in such thinking. In our so-called Arctic wastes may be found a profusion of bird and mammal life in season, such as many species of migratory waterfowl, fur bearers, Arctic hares, lemmings, caribou, wolves, and musk oxen.

The greatest concentration of wildlife in the so-called Arctic wastes is to be found during the late spring and summer months, following which nearly all of the mammals either hibernate or, along with the birds, migrate to a more suitable winter habitat. Of the mammals which neither hibernate nor to any great extent migrate from this chosen Arctic home, the musk oxen is capable of contending with some of the bleakest habitats found anywhere.

This picturesque mammal was first discovered in North America by intrepid northern explorers and traders near the close of the seventeenth century. Although, as may be conjectured, the musk ox is related to wild and domestic cattle, it is generally smaller than most breeds, though some of the old animals have weighed 900 pounds. From the tip of its nose to the end of its short rat-like tail, the musk ox is nearly 8 feet long. As with most mammals of the cattle type, the adult bull is larger than the female. The young, one baby calf, is generally born in April or in early May, and this calf is reared in the valleys of the Arctic hills, mountains, and tundra flats. Here a profusion of sedges, grasses, and shrubs blossom in the fast growing short spring and summer, and from these the herds with the young take their subsistence. These herds are generally small, averaging from 5 to 12 animals.

Arctic summers usually disappear with great suddenness, leaving little semblance of an autumn, and early snows cover much of the musk oxen food. With this quick disappearance of fresh grasses the mammal turns to dwarf willows, saxifrage, and other herbaceous plants and grasses which it obtains by pawing through the snow with its broad hoof.

Two of the natural enemies of the musk oxen have been the arctic wolf and the isolated tribes of primitive man, such as the Eskimo and the Indian. Against these enemies this interesting and formidable appearing Arctic creature held its own in fair numbers. The modern firearm, however, coupled with predation and the take by the northernmost tribes, spelled its doom.

Originally, musk oxen occurred from Alaska eastward to and including Ellesmere Island. Crossing Baffin Bay, and still eastward, it was again encountered in the coastal fringes of Greenland. Adolphus W. Greely, leader of the famous Greely Arctic Expedition in the early eighties, found the animal near old Fort Conger, approximately 1,100 miles north of the Arctic Circle, on Ellesmere Island, and points westward. Greely's men captured calves and attempted to tame them, with the result that some became docile and tractable even to the extent of hauling in teams. The chief difficulty was to keep the sledge dogs of the expedition from killing them.

Today, the musk oxen has disappeared from much of its original Arctic domain. The use of modern firearms, which against the musk oxen began 40 years prior to the advent of the present century, has been the greatest contributing factor. For a time its skin was utilized in the fur trade; northern whaling crews killed many animals for food; then the formidable heads with sharp, curved horns became highly prized as trophies. Canada, taking cognizance of this condition, some years ago set up a musk-oxen sanctuary of approximately 15,000 square miles along the Thelon River east of Great Slave Lake in the Northwest Territory.

Research has failed to find any authenticated occurrence of the musk ox in Alaska since it was first explored by Europeans. The various tribes of natives in the Territory, however, state that the animal did occur there about 100 years ago. Also, remains of the mammal have been found in Alaska; and it is known that portions of the Territory are suitable for musk oxen.

So, in 1927, resident Alaskans presented a memorial through their Territorial legislature addressed to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States requesting funds to purchase a small herd of musk oxen. This plea came to the attention of the late Senator Peter Norbeck of South Dakota, that grand old man of conservation, and Representative C. C. Dickinson of Iowa, later a Senator from that State. Together with Irving McK. Reed, then a member of the Alaska Game Commission, they obtained favorable action by Congress for an appropriation of $40,000 to be used in obtaining a herd of musk oxen and transporting the animals to Alaska for restocking purposes. This action was approved by the President on May 27, 1930. The agency of the Federal Government to which this undertaking was entrusted was the Bureau of Biological Survey of the Department of Agriculture, later transferred to the Department of the Interior and, during the past year combined with the Bureau of Fisheries into an organization known as the Fish and Wildlife Service.

By the time the appropriation became available musk oxen in North America had become so reduced in numbers that it was impossible to obtain surplus animals. Finally, contact was made with Johs. Lund of Aalesund, Norway, who was familiar with the technique of capturing musk oxen alive in Greenland. To him, therefore, was given the contract and task of rounding up a herd of 34 animals. The Greenland musk oxen differ somewhat from those that formerly occurred on the continent of North America, foremost in that they are slightly smaller. However, from a practical game-management standpoint, the differences are negligible.

The majority of these Greenland musk oxen were roped by Mr. Lund and transferred from the mainland in whaling boats to a ship which carried them to Bergen, Norway. They were placed in specially constructed crates which permitted the animals to stand or to lie down in comfort. Grasses and hay taken in the locality of their capture provided suitable food.

On September 6, 1930, the herd of 34 animals, half of them calves, the remainder yearlings and 2-year-olds, was shipped from

Bergen and 10 days later arrived in the port of New York. From there they were removed to Athenia, N. J., where for 33 days, in accordance with Federal regulations, they were held in quarantine. This procedure was necessary to be assured that such diseases as foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest were not present in the herd. During this interval two experts from the Biological Survey were placed in charge of the animals, and American grown alfalfa hay became their main food. About 5 pounds of hay an animal were daily consumed along with considerable water, the latter probably caused by excessive heat on the Atlantic seaboard and, in addition, to thirst caused by the great environmental change.

At the end of the quarantine period, the animals, still in their individual crates, and well supplied with hay and water, were loaded into steel express cars for their 5-day trip to Seattle. At this point they were again placed aboard a boat for the week's journey to Seward, Alaska; then in freight boxcars, they made the rail trip northward to College, near Fairbanks. They arrived at this destination on November 4, and on the following day, near the campus of our most northerly institution of higher learning, the University of Alaska, were released into a 7,500-acre pasture—part of the Biological Survey's cooperative reindeer experiment station. This was to be their home for the following 6 years—years of care, study, and experiment. All of the musk oxen reached College in splendid condition.

Accidental injuries reduced the herd to 32 animals shortly after it was placed in the pasture. These, however, soon responded to handling and could be driven easier than reindeer when it was desired to corral them. While under observation at this point, it was found that in spring and fall the animals fed chiefly on grasses and sedges, in summer on shrubs, and in winter on cured grasses, sedges, and, to some extent, on lichens. By 1932, the herd was further reduced, 2 of the animals falling victims to bears.

In April 1934, the first of the calves were born, and in May and June additional calving took place. There were nine 5-year-old cows at this time and 7 of them gave birth to calves. Four cows that were 4 years old did not breed. Of the original 34 animals brought to Alaska, 10 had died by 1934, leaving 24 of the original and 5 new calves, a total of 29. Additional calving during the spring of 1935 brought the herd to 32.

It was ascertained up to this time that apparently the musk ox does not breed until 4 years of age, and calves at 5 years. It was also found that the gestation period is 8 months rather than 9 months, as previously believed.

In the summer of 1935 the first of these musk oxen, two adult bulls and two adult cows, were liberated on Nunivak Island in the Bering Sea. Unfortunately, a third cow was killed en route. This island lies approximately 25 miles from the mainland and south of the mouth of the Yukon River. It is about 40 miles wide and 70 miles long, containing nearly a million acres of superb grazing land. Also, the island is completely free of all predators, such as bears and wolves.

In 1936, when checks indicated the 4 animals were doing well, it was determined to liberate the remainder of the herd there. The animals were accordingly rounded up and crated—27 in all. By this time the youngsters trapped in Greenland had matured into real animals, and it was with difficulty that they were captured. They were hauled by trucks and freight cars to Nenana, from which point they were transferred to the engine deck of the S. S. *Nenana* for the long trip down the Yukon River. Arriving at Marshall 4 days later, the animals were reloaded to a covered barge and, towed by motorship, resumed their journey down the Yukon to its mouth, at Kotlik, thence across Pastol Bay in the Bering Sea to St. Michael. Here they were placed on an open barge, the crates, covered with tarpaulins, being lashed with cables to prevent shifting of the load. On July 14 the barge, in tow of a motorship, headed for the open sea and Nunivak Island.

At this time of year northern Alaska may be visited by sudden and severe storms, so there was great anxiety on the part of us directly concerned with the movement and management of the animals. Three men were assigned to the barge, one to look after the barge itself, the others to care for the comfort of the musk oxen. From the words of one of these men, some idea may be had of the hazards involved in this dramatic trip: "In letting out the towline," he related, "it fouled on an object in the bottom of the bay, perhaps an old 1,000-pound anchor, which was dragged out to Stuart Island, a distance of about 15 miles, before being dislodged. Heavy seas were encountered outside of St. Michael Bay, and until we reached the shelter of Stuart Island the going was rough. The weight on the towline pulled down the bow of the barge and prevented it riding over the waves, so it plowed through them. The barge was put to considerable strain these 2 hours. After freeing the towline the barge rode more smoothly."

"When we reached the open sea the barge began to reveal its age. The drift bolts in the bow parted, opening a seam its full width, through which the water poured each time it hit a wave. Other seams began to open, and by 9 a. m., the water stood 3 feet deep in the well of the hold."

Hand pumps were resorted to and the speed of the towing ship was reduced until a stop was made in the lee of Sand Islands. Here the barge was repaired, and on July 16, the journey resumed to Nunivak. By early in the evening of that day, anchor was made on the east side of the island, a few miles south of Cape Etolin.

A number of Eskimos live on Nunivak Island, and with their cooperation the job of unloading the animals was completed on July 17. The weather fortunately held good, which enabled the men to place the barge well inshore. From this position gang planks were placed onto dry land, and down these planks the crated musk oxen, one by one, were shoved. Released from their crates, the animals soon took to their new and permanent home. A reconnaissance of the island proved that the four musk oxen released in 1935 were definitely established. A check of the island in 1939 revealed that the initial stock of 34 animals received at College from Greenland in 1930 had multiplied to more than 60.

Thus Alaska has her musk ox once again, after probably the longest and most hazardous journey in the history of transplanting any mammal for restocking purposes. The total distance these animals traveled was approximately 14,000 miles. But a sudden storm might have wrecked all the fine work that was so vigorously and effectively sponsored by Senator Norbeck and Representative Dickinson 6 years previously—in fact—wrecked the whole venture and caused the loss of human life. But such is the risk many enthusiasts in wildlife conservation are willing to assume.

It is hoped that as the Nunivak herd continues to increase a surplus will be produced. This will permit the restocking of other Alaskan areas containing suitable habitat where this interesting mammal of the bleak Arctic may live and breed and thus perpetuate its kind again over much of its old range in that romantic territory.

We Should Not Break Faith With Our Conscripted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LE ROY D. DOWNS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I realize that I am serving my first term as a Member of Congress, and I also realize that I have been elected in one of the most critical periods in the history of this Nation to represent 450,000 people. I further realize that these 450,000 people are looking to me for proper representation and leadership.

Carrying out their wishes, I have voted for every act to give aid to Great Britain and her Allies. I hate Hitler, and I sincerely hope that he is defeated. I feel that we should prepare ourselves for any eventuality which may occur during this crisis, but in carrying out this program of all-out aid to Britain and her Allies and our home defenses, we should not break faith with the young men we have conscripted for service in our armed forces.

Congress made a pact with these young men more than a year ago in which it ordered them into service for 1 year. Today we are preparing to tell these young men that Congress did not mean what it said a year ago and now they must serve for an unlimited period. I sponsored an amendment to take them out but it was turned down. I am opposed to adding 18 months.

The only reason that has been given for this attitude is the statement that a great emergency exists. Our distinguished chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, in a statement given to the public press, said that if the Members of Congress knew what was going on it would raise their hats right off their heads. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of Congress should know what is going on when they are asked to vote on legislation of this type. If this country is in grave danger, we should know. If such a terrible situation exists that America is threatened with being wrung from her foundation of democracy, then we should know. There is not one man among the selectees, National Guard men, and Reservists in the service today who would not willingly continue in the service if he really believed that this continuation would preserve this country.

We, in New England, are not seeking to disrupt the armed forces of this country; New England is noted for its patriots from the day of the American Revolution to the last World War. Our young men are willing to serve for any length of time or to give their very lives if the future of this Nation is at stake. But I say, give us the facts—give us the reasons—which make

it necessary to break faith with these young men, and then we are ready to follow.

I am not convinced that the conditions today are as threatening as a year ago. One of the surest ways to bring about the downfall of a democracy is for that democracy to break faith with its citizens. The Congress of the United States made a pledge to its young men and if that pledge must be broken, then these men should be given the true facts which make it necessary to break that pledge.

An Army composed of disgruntled soldiers with broken morale is of no value.

Gallup Poll Shows Overwhelming Majority of Public Favor Adequate Federal Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

SECOND RELEASE OF GALLUP POLL

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 8 I included in my extension some remarks on the first release recently made by the American Institute of Public Opinion, known as the Gallup poll, of the results of the poll made by the institute on old-age pensions. As pointed out in my remarks, the great majority of the American public, including those in the younger groups, favor Federal old-age pensions universal in their application, beginning at the age of 60 and providing a pension sufficient for proper care of this group of our citizens who, under existing conditions of mass production and centralization, are unable to secure remunerative employment after obtaining the age of 60.

I now include as part of these remarks the second release of the Gallup poll on this very important subject. The release is as follows:

THE GALLUP POLL—MAJORITY OF PUBLIC FAVOR OLD-AGE PENSIONS FOR NEEDIEST CASES ONLY, SURVEY FINDS

(By Dr. George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., August 8.—One of the fundamental ideas of the Townsend plan is that old-age pensions should be paid to all citizens past 60 who will agree to quit work, if they have any, and not merely to the neediest old people.

Washington observers would not be surprised if some such proposal emerged eventually from Senator DOWNEY'S Senate committee investigating the pension issue. The California Senator is known as Dr. Townsend's principal spokesman in Congress.

Where does public opinion stand today on the question of universal pensions?

With Congress preparing to tussle with the old-age pension question again shortly, Nation-wide studies by the American Institute of Public Opinion indicate the average American still believes pensions should be limited to those demonstrably in greatest need.

REALITY VERSUS IDEAL

But the survey shows that much of the average man's thinking about pensions reflects a mental struggle between the ideal and present reality. Thus, while the majority feel pensions should now be paid only to persons in greatest need, an equally large majority say they would be willing to lay aside a substantial percentage of their income over the coming years to make pensions, in effect, universal.

This, of course, is the long-time object of the Social Security Act, which calls for a rising scale of employee-employer contributions until 1949, when the worker and his boss will each be required to lay aside 3 cents for every dollar of the employee's wages under $3,000 a year.

How willingly the rank and file would make this 3-percent contribution toward future pensions is indicated in the following question:

"Would you be willing to pay 3 cents out of every dollar of your income until you are 60 in order to get a pension from the Government of $50 a month after you are 60?"

The institute put the question to men and women now under 60 years of age in all parts of the United States.

Their answers were:

	Percent
Would be willing	76
Would not be willing	18
Undecided	6

TOWNSEND PLAN

The survey shows that considerable misinformation still exists regarding the Townsend plan, possibly because of tactical changes in recent years regarding the plan's objectives. Thus the survey found that whereas nearly 9 persons in every 10 had heard of the Townsend plan, the average man with any notion of the sum at all thought it proposed pensions of $200 a month—as once stressed by some proponents of the plan.

Actually, Dr. Townsend proposes a tax which he believes would provide pensions of $50 a month "at the outset" with the hope of larger amounts later.

Voters were asked: "Do you know how much per month each person is supposed to receive under the Townsend plan that is now being proposed to Congress?" In reply, 5 percent said the plan was supposed to provide $50 a month or less, 7 percent named a figure between $75 and $200, and 15 percent mentioned $200. The great majority (73 percent) either had no impression about the figure or had not yet heard of the plan itself.

The Lights of Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMMET O'NEAL

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

POEM BY M. H. THATCHER

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable M. H. Thatcher is a distinguished citizen of Louisville, Ky., and Washington, D. C. Among many high positions occupied by him was that of Congressman from the district which I now represent. As a friend and admirer I was surprised and delighted to read some of his poetry. I am sure that many will be pleased to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE LIGHTS OF OLD

(Hymn Penitential)

(By M. H. Thatcher)

Unveil, O Lord, the Lights of Old,—
  Those which the Fathers knew,
When they designed and built the Ship,
  And formed the Vessel's crew!
The night is dark, and we are lost
  Upon a stormy sea:
O grant us, Lord, the Lights of Old,
  To lead us back to Thee!

We seek to win, with sweatless brows,
  The meeds of thrift and toil;
The sacred altars we profane,
  And strip them from the soil.
Mad cults prevail, and Reverence
  Before us, bleeding lies;
Confusion reigns; while, in our midst,
  The Towers of Babel rise.

The wage of sin, indeed, is death,—
  A truth we have forgot;
As we have sown we must needs reap,—
  Yet would escape our lot.
Thy ways, O Lord, we have ignored,
  The Word we have denied;
The things of sense we have enthroned,
  The spirit crucified.

Neglect hath wrought the Ancient Curse:
  Gone is our hope and trust;
We live the life of Babylon,
  And revel in the dust.
Sackcloth and ashes must we bear,
  The bitter chalice drain,
Ere we may pass from death to life,
  And know Thee, Lord, again.

Serve Thou, O God, the Nation's need;
  The Healing Leaves restore;
Give us the courage, vision, strength,
  That blest the days of yore!
The Heritage we must preserve,—
  Whate'er the cost may be;
Vouchsafe, O Lord, the Lights of Old,
  To make us one with Thee!

Minnesota Newspapers in Discussing St. Lawrence Project Exhort Us "To Look Before We Leap"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM VARIOUS NEWSPAPERS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, volumes have been written employing millions of printed words in a desperate effort by the advocates of the St. Lawrence project to justify its construction as a necessary adjunct to our national defense.

Gayly lithographed pamphlets with Old Glory emblazoned on their red-white-and-blue-bordered covers are being utilized in an attempt to give the St. Lawrence project a patriotic tinge of deepest hue.

In view of the oft-repeated utterances from the lips of proponents of the St.

Lawrence project that the great Middle West wholeheartedly endorses the construction of this proposed international ditch, it is significant to note from the following editorials appearing in Minnesota newspapers that the people of that great State are not as gullible as the rest of the American public is being asked to believe. As a matter of fact, they are leery of the methods being used by the advocates of the St. Lawrence project in selling a Presidential pet to the American people in a foil wrapper with the imprint "national defense"; nor are they content to have the rest of the world believe that the citizens of the great Middle West can hardly wait until the economic monstrosity known as the St. Lawrence project is permitted to shower mankind with its so-called manifold yet doubtful blessings.

The editorials referred to are as follows:

[From the Fairfax (Minn.) Standard of April 3, 1941]

TO LOOK BEFORE WE LEAP

In Ottawa recently Canada signed a pact agreeing to the St. Lawrence waterway. Such a project, furnishing a direct route to the sea from the head of the Great Lakes to both Canada and the United States, would be of great benefit, of course, but would the huge outlay of money, the 5 years' time required to complete it, justify the United States to begin it now, when threats of war hang heavy, when strikes and shortage of manpower would make it still costlier, take still longer to complete?

It is more than a hundred years since the first United States surveys were made for a ship canal to connect the Great Lakes with the Atlantic; 45 years since the first International Waterways Commission was set up; 20 years since the International Joint Commission made its report.

In 1934 the United States Senate rejected the treaty which would have created the seaway. The President is entirely for it, and, possibly the Senate would again obey his crack of the whip—but is that seaway, deemed unwise in 1934, when the world was at peace, when conditions seemed on the way to improvement, any more to be desired today, with conditions as they are?

True, power plants would develop millions of horsepower, seagoing vessels could reach the far inland harbors for 6 or 7 months of the year, and large shipbuilding industries could be developed on the shores of the Great Lakes, close to the natural resources and steel mills.

On the other side of the picture is the cost which would be more than five millions, and possibly very much more—under present conditions. It could not be completed before 1945, and would require huge amounts of material, many thousands of men now needed for defense projects.

It requires, and should certainly receive most careful consideration, most thoughtful study, before our country would undertake this project at this time.

[From the International Falls (Minn.) Journal of April 9, 1941]

POWER FOR DEFENSE

Proposed construction of the immensely costly St. Lawrence power project is again in the headlines. It is now being promoted in the name of national defense. But the inescapable fact is that the St. Lawrence development cannot possibly be put into operation in less than 5 years. The most pessimistic believe the war will end before then.

So, in pushing our own defense program, we must look elsewhere for the power to motivate our machines and to keep our factories pouring out goods in an ever-increasing stream. We must look to the privately owned, publicly regulated electric-utility industry.

This industry now produces 90 percent of all the power used in this country. In the great industrial areas, where the bulk of defense orders must be filled, it provides close to 100 percent of the power used. No industry is doing more to make certain that future demand, no matter how great, will be efficiently and economically met—and at no cost to the taxpayers.

What this country needs is power now—not power which cannot be supplied for 5 or 6 years. And "plenty of power now" is the utility industry's motto. Without argument or debate, it is quietly caring for the greatest industrial production drive this or any other country has ever known.

[From the Marshall (Minn.) Messenger of March 24, 1941]

THE SEAWAY PROJECT

After years of waxing and waning enthusiasm, interest is again blowing hot upon the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River seaway, a treaty permitting development of the project having been signed last week between the United States and Canada.

As is natural, this section of the country is interested in seeing the project to open the Northwest to ocean shipping go through, while the East isn't so sure but what it would be damaging to its own sea commerce.

Chief argument at the moment for the project—an argument probably foremost in the mind of the administration—is that the hydroelectric power that would be forthcoming from such development will be of use in Canadian and American armament efforts.

Furthermore, it would open the Great Lakes area—a region relatively secure from military attack—as a new and important shipbuilding center, one close to the sources of the raw materials that go into that industry.

Too, the advantages of shipping directly from inland harbors, bordering great productive areas of the Nation, are cited.

But there is—as there always is—another side to the matter.

Opponents of the project declare that the seaway as now planned will not be deep enough to accommodate the larger ships, that thus there will be relatively little gain.

It is pointed out that, while the hydroelectric power that would be provided is desirable, facilities to produce it will not be ready until 1945, a fact which is substantiated by the administration. By that time, say opponents, the need for greater power supplies will have passed, assuming, of course, the war will be nearing its end by then.

Likewise, declare opponents, the tremendous cost and the huge quantities of materials required, as well as the great demand for workmen, would deprive the more urgently needed defense industries of resources.

Thus, while there is no doubt but what the Northwest would benefit from the seaway, there is the question of greatest national good.

The seaway should pass that pre-examination before the "go" signal is given. It is hoped, of course, the verdict is that the project will be of benefit to the Nation as a whole.

E. L. B.

[From the International Falls (Minn.) Press of April 10, 1941]

POWER FOR DEFENSE

Proposed construction of the immensely costly St. Lawrence power project is again in the headlines. It is now being promoted in the name of national defense. But the inescapable fact is that the St. Lawrence development cannot possibly be put into operation in less than 5 years. The most pessimistic believe the war will end before then.

So, in pushing our own defense program, we must look elsewhere for the power to motivate our machines and to keep our factories pouring out goods in an ever-increasing stream. We must look to the privately owned publicly regulated electric-utility industry.

This industry now produces 90 percent of all the power used in this country. In the great industrial areas, where the bulk of defense orders, must be filled, it provides close to 100 percent of the power use. No industry is doing more to make certain that future demand, no matter how great, will be efficiently and economically met—and at no cost to the taxpayers.

What this country needs is power now—not power which cannot be supplied for 5 or 6 years. And plenty of power now is the utility industry's motto. Without argument or debate, it is quietly caring for the greatest industrial production drive this or any other country has ever known.

[From the Eveleth (Minn.) Clarion of April 3, 1941]

There's nothing like looking ahead. Editor Rossman of Two Harbors takes the position that everyone in northeastern Minnesota believes in the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway, but he thinks it should not be done right now. This great undertaking should be reserved for the period immediately following the war, he thinks, so that it will help take up the slack which is sure to come when peacetime arrives. All work of such nature which is not essential to immediate programs of defense should be laid over until that time when we shall not be hurrying to make cannons and planes.

[From the Stillwater (Minn.) Post of April 3, 1941]

IN AGREEMENT

In glancing through the Grand Rapids Review last week we observed an editorial pertaining to the much-discussed St. Lawrence waterway project. Despite the war threat the famed project is still pondered, and legislation is still being talked to hurry its start. We're inclined to agree with the writer of the following:

Everyone in northeastern Minnesota believes in the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway.

Where there is an opportunity to greatly improve transportation facilities, progress should be made. Improvements in transportation may adversely affect some interests and some localities. But that should not rule. Industry and business should group itself around transportation. Without such things there is little hope for the general development of the State.

On the other hand, we cannot agree that the St. Lawrence waterway should be built immediately. In fact, that would be shortsighted policy. This great undertaking should be reserved for the period immediately following the war. It should not be started now to add to employment and activities which would otherwise be large. It should be kept to take up the slack which is sure to come when peace arrives.

All work of such nature that is not essential to immediate programs of defense should be laid over until that time when we shall not be hurrying to make cannons and planes.

[From the East Minneapolis (Minn.) Argus of April 4, 1941]

Do you recall all the hubbub when that Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway treaty was turned down by the Senate in 1934? There was much acrid language thrown about and considerable high blood pressure generated. And now the State Department quietly signs an agreement with Canada, and

we suppose the quarter-billion-dollar deal will be consummated without much further ado. While we are delighted to see this go through, we can't help being impressed with the ease with which Washington now does things without giving a hoot what you or I think about it.

Extension of the Selective Training and Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have for past weeks listened to the reasons for and the reasons against continuing selectees, National Guard men, and reservists in training for a longer period. I have at all times in my life tried to analyze the opposition that one faces, the fact being inevitable that one eventually has to face opposition, and then in a very definite way plan to meet this opposition on at least even terms but preferably better terms.

Whether we admit it or not—and I do—the American style of living is today facing serious trouble. The American youth of today, if he thinks of these things in his private moments, must boil over as it is bound to create a rage in his breast.

Masters of propaganda have destroyed nation after nation in Europe by keeping the citizens split up. We are competing today with an ideology for which no real American can have any sentiment, and this ideology is backed up by a scientific war. Scientific war, in my opinion, will govern all future conflicts. It is the duty and job of our citizens to make the most effective use of military weapons and training. To do this in one-tenth the time of any other nation is not sound reasoning. Rapid development in the past few years has established this as a fact.

Today we have listened to the arguments that we are not as much endangered as we were a year go and therefore, no greater peril exists. I wish I could feel that this European war was just another European war and not deliberately steered at our American style. This war is being waged today in every conceivable way in each part of the world where Axis Powers have control and have sympathizers. With the Vichy government yielding day by day to demands for more bases no one can deny that the very lifeline of commerce in the Far East is in much worse situation than a year ago.

Our greatest American joy has been our growth. To continue this we must not weaken at any point, and by this method we will be able to steer this revolution from America. This is what the American youth is called upon to do, and it should be the common goal of every real American to keep this war as far from America as we can. This calls for sacrifices, for how long I do not know, but this I am sure of—the American morale will continue to spread. The larger, the more efficient force we train, the stronger democracy will stand. This is our first duty. The advantages of personal freedom carry great obligations, and unnecessary doubts undermine devotion to duty. I believe that our American soldiers will shoulder this further responsibility with unswerving determination to protect and preserve the American ideals.

Prohibiting Importation of Animals and Their Products From Countries Infested With Hoof-and-Mouth and Other Diseases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I desire to call the attention of Congress to an important bill, known as H. R. 5531, which I introduced on August 8. This legislation provides a definite prohibition against the importation into the United States of beef cattle, dairy cattle, sheep, goats, swine, and poultry—and their products—when such animals are infected with hoof-and-mouth and other contagious or infectious diseases.

The passage of this legislation is imperative. American producers of livestock are now being threatened with a removal of the sanitary restrictions which prohibit such importations. If this is accomplished, domestic producers of beef and dairy cattle will face disaster from the ravages of destructive diseases to their herds.

Strict and watchful enforcement of sanitary laws, by State and Federal Governments, has given to our country herds of cattle comparatively free from infectious disease. We cannot afford to take any chances on importations from infested countries. Surely, foreign producers, who desire to sell their products in the American market, should be compelled to meet the same sanitary requirements now rigidly enforced against domestic producers.

Mr. Speaker, on the 24th day of July, I predicted that through the Machiavellian manipulations of our astute State Department our country would shortly be again subjected to the threat of an epidemic of rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease. I referred to the plans which are being matured as between the State Department and the Argentine Government to remove the quarantine on the shipment into this country of fresh, frozen, and chilled lamb and mutton from the province of Tierra del Fuego. That territory, as you know, forms the southernmost point of South America. About one half of the island is under the control of Argentina—the other half by Chile. It is separated from the mainland by the narrow Magellan Straits, a body of water very easy to cross with flocks of livestock and sheep from the disease-infested mainland of Argentina into Tierra del Fuego where they can be slaughtered and shipped to this country.

I am confidently expecting this removal of quarantine to occur in the forthcoming trade agreement with Argentina at which time we may also expect the duty on canned beef, casein, cheeses, flax, and other farm products to be cut the full limit of 50 percent. Of course, the quarantine removal might be effected by a simpler method, such as a partial lifting of the quarantine which has been laid down against Argentina because of the known prevalence in that country of rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease. But this type of action seems hardly likely, since we know that the Secretary of Agriculture in response to a request from the Secretary of State for an opinion by his solicitor upon this question, passed the buck back to the Secretary of State with the suggestion that the responsibility be thrown upon the retiring Attorney General who now adorns our Supreme Court.

This admirable reluctance of Secretary Wickard, based upon some knowledge, is not shared by the estimable, enthusiastic, and idealistic Mr. Hull, who, in haste to hold the South American countries close to his bosom, either willingly or unwittingly, lets himself be outtraded by them, both in matters of tariff and of sanitary restrictions.

During the past 23 years the Federal Government, the several States, and the producers of livestock, including dairy cattle, have collectively spent over $470,000,000 to eradicate tuberculosis and Bang's disease and keep under control the incidences of those two diseases.

As early as 1884 the Federal Government began taking steps to protect the internal spread of contagious animal diseases and also in later years has taken some precautions to control entry of infected animals and disease-carrying animal products. These steps augmented by the expenditure of vast sums of money have almost entirely freed our country from bovine tuberculosis and achieved great progress in eradicating and controlling Bang's disease and other infectious or contagious diseases of animals.

During this period we have had several outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease, one of which cost the livestock producers of the United States more than $100,000,000. All of these outbreaks have been traced to foreign sources. As a result of the known foot-and-mouth disease prevalent in them, the Secretary of Agriculture, acting under the permissive authority of section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, has established quarantines against practically all of the major cattle and sheep producing countries of the world except the North American Continent and Australia. These quarantines have also included rinderpest, a distemper type of disease which fortunately has not yet been introduced in the United States. The proposed lifting of restrictions by our State Department authorities, who

are more familiar with the blends of tea than the problems of cattle, lays open this country to vast trouble and great losses.

In analyzing the authority given to the Secretary of Agriculture and the President under the progressive types of legislation now on our statutes, I find that it continually has been only of a permissive character. Even with respect to keeping abreast of the spread of diseases and the development of foreign methods of controlling it, the authority is permissive. Also, I am convinced that as long as the major power to establish protective measures against the importation of disease-carrying animals and their products (aside from the protective power afforded by the Lenroot-Taber bill controlling in some degree the importation of fresh milk and cream) lies in the Tariff Act, this power will be jeopardized continually by the activities of those in high authority who appear to be more anxious to protect the economic well-being of the residents of foreign countries than that of our own citizens.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill (H. R. 5531) intended to afford real protection to America's producers of beef cattle, dairy cattle, sheep, goats, swine, and poultry. This bill is intended to constitute permanent, continuing legislation superseding weaker laws and to offset the sapping activities of the State Department. In it I provide for the prohibition of the importation of all animals having infections or contagious diseases, all meat products from animals which at the time of slaughter had rinderpest and foot and mouth disease, all unpasteurized milk and cream drawn from diseased animals, all edible products of unpasteurized milk drawn from animals having tuberculosis, and all dairy products from areas of foreign countries wherein methods of eradication and control are not rated by the United States authorities to be equal to the United States methods.

In the drafting of this legislation I have not been unmindful of the fact that prior to the introduction of my bill previous legislation has been forestalled and thwarted by the State Department by such means as the insertion of so-called sanitary provisos in most of the trade agreements entered into between the United States and several foreign countries.

These sanitary provisos have taken the form of a tacit promise on our part that before applying any new measure of a sanitary character, whenever practicable, we will consult with the other contracting government with a view to insuring that there will be as little injury to the volume of commerce of either country as may be consistent with the purpose of any proposed sanitary measure. Again, most of the agreements contain the further proviso that when either contracting government makes representations respecting the application of any sanitary law or regulation for the protection of human, animal, or plant life and there is disagreement concerning it, the matter will be referred to a committee of technical experts for recommendations, and I wish to add, presumably before any such law or regulation may be made effective.

In other words, our Government agrees to make itself subservient to the views and wishes of foreign countries, as determined by their own self interests, before taking any step to protect the health of our citizens. The Congress, which is obligated to legislate for the public health and welfare is, in effect, supplanted by an array of co-international experts. This presents an excellent device for delaying effective action to protect ourselves by sanitary embargoes and quarantines and makes possible the inroad of infectious and contagious animal diseases to a point where the damage can be measured only in terms of further hundreds of millions of dollars of appropriations by Congress and the States to eradicate such diseases.

Having this in mind I have provided in the bill a regular and legal method whereby the contractual obligations of these sanitary provisos may be terminated, thus once more freeing this country to do what it may please in protecting the heatlh and welfare of its citizens.

I am confident that my bill is of inestimable value to the livestock and the dairy industry of this Nation and that it will receive a widespread support from the people and a strong nonpartisan support in this Congress.

Extension of Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

TELEGRAMS FROM COMMANDERS OF THE MASSACHUSETTS AMERICAN LEGION AND VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams:

BOSTON, MASS., *August 12, 1941.*

Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

General Marshall's advice and warning should be heeded. Urge your vote for extension of military service. Its defeat would constitute a national menace. The Army should be maintained at maximum efficiency during the national emergency.

CHESTER GRANT,
Commander, Massachusetts Division, American Legion.

BOSTON, MASS., *August 10, 1941.*

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

In accordance with resolution adopted at recent department encampment urge adoption of Senate bill extending service of selectees and National Guard.

JOSEPH PETERSON,
Department Commander of Massachusetts Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Draft Bill Democracy's Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA ENQUIRER

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Enquirer for today:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 12, 1941]

DRAFT BILL DEMOCRACY'S TEST

After weeks of debate, of argument, discussion, and maneuver, the draft-extension question, on the eve of conclusive action in the House of Representatives, is still precisely what the Inquirer said it was when it first became an issue. It is a crucial test of the ability of our American democracy to decide with firmness and intelligence what we as a people must do for the sure defense of the land we love, for its way of life and its high and unmatched liberties.

The final approach to the subject must be not emotional but realistic. The decision will be registered by the few hundred men of the Congress of the United States. But supporting them there must be the wisdom and courage of 130,000,000 Americans.

In this and in no other light will their action be judged in the totalitarian chancelleries of Europe; in the war-fevered offices of the Japanese Government at Tokyo; among the disillusioned, bitter-minded men of Vichy.

The cagey statesmen of Latin-American countries who, belatedly but with commendable discretion, have given evidence of a growing realization that their salvation lies in joining us to present a firm front to the forces of aggression, will settle anew in their minds the question whether the American people are infirm of purpose, or are strong and united and determined in the face of danger.

As a people we dare not dispose of this vital question sentimentally, with passion, or with the least regard to partisan politics. Any attempt to build it up into a partisan issue would be despicable.

No one can fail to feel the utmost sympathy for the families of men in the service, or to understand the manifold personal problems involved in our efforts to create a large Army. It is essential that where such problems as those of dependency or partial dependency appear among the men in the camps, early and adequate steps be taken to dispose of them.

It is sheer human nature, and all of us can understand it, for men in the camps, whether harassed by such problems or not, to wish it were all over. It is natural that at the end of their year they should want to go home. Military life, now more than ever, is tough going. But can the American people ever again submit millions of young men to the certainty of enormous and terrible losses by creating armies half taught, barely fit, and totally unready?

There has been passionate declamation that the draft extension is "heading straight for war." We must ask ourselves whether any other course would not be heading straight for disaster. We do not have to be experts

to appreciate the force of what our military leaders say.

Inception of a 12-month training period under the Selective Service Act was a mistake. It has been possible in that time neither to train men adequately nor to provide for a sufficiently powerful fighting force in their place if they are sent home.

There is grave question whether that and other limitations upon our military training program have not been gleefully interpreted by the ruthless masters of aggression as just the sort of weak and ineffective gestures they hoped for. There is an equally grave question, now, whether the proposed 18-month compromise or any other hard and fast prescription will not be laid to half-heartedness and indecision on the part of the American people as a whole.

This is no time for national irresolution. Only those who refuse to see world conditions as they are can fail to acknowledge that the dangers which impelled us to plunge into a vast program of defense a year ago and to start creating a modern Army to make that defense certain, are now multiplied many times.

Theories that we can depend upon this, or that, or the other event to remove the urgent necessity of building up our own defenses fade away in the light of grim realities. The fond hope that Russia can hold or even destroy the Nazi march of conquest is based largely upon wishful thinking. Can we afford to risk our future on so dubious a gamble?

The menacing scourges of humanity who made this war are out to win it at all costs. If they don't they face certain retribution at the hands of their exploited followers. But if they are victorious, it is folly to think they would refrain from attacking a rich, hesitating Western World.

The American people want to live in peace and security. Above all else they do not want war, now or in the future. It is impossible to believe that they would approve action which would weaken our defenses before the sneering eyes of Hitler and the international bandits under his banner.

Passage without delay of a soundly built draft-extension measure will be a ringing assurance to the whole world that the American people know what they have to do and will do it.

Extension of the Selective Training and Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, let us look the issue right in the face and view it in a common-sense way. We are confronted with a great emergency—probably the greatest emergency we have ever faced—and we are right in the midst of preparing against that emergency. We have appropriated billions of dollars, part of which is to be used in building our armament to the point where American will be so formidable that she can withstand any force directed against her, and the balance of which is to be used in training our young men in the use of that armament. The building and training go hand in hand. It would be foolish to train our young men without providing the armament for them to use and it would likewise be foolish to provide armament without training our men in the use of it. America is weak and helpless with trained men but no armament, and she is likewise weak and helpless with ample armament but no trained men. To make America strong, we need both. The trained men are as important as the armament, because, you know, with all our progress we have, as yet, been unable to find a substitute for training and experience.

Now, we all seem to be united on the armament program. What I cannot understand is why there should be a division on the training program. Are there among us those who are so foolish as to vote for armament, and then vote to withhold the experienced manpower to operate the armament? Such voting simply does not make sense to me.

Another thing I cannot get through my head is this: How can the Members who vote against this bill justify their vote to spend billions for armament? If the national interest is not in peril, then I would like for them to tell me why they voted billions for armament. If the national interest is in peril, then I would like for them to tell me why we do not need trained men to man the armament.

In this emergency, as I see our duty, there is but one thing for us to do: Find out what is necessary to preserve the safety and security of America, and then, whatever the answer, execute that answer like true Americans.

We hear a lot about compromising. Compromise what? Would you compromise the safety and security of our country? I am against a compromise. I am in favor of doing the things that those in authority, and who should know what is necessary for our protection, advise. My colleagues, there are some things above and beyond the realm of compromise. No true man would compromise his honor; no true woman would compromise her virtue; and no true American would compromise the safety and security of his country.

And then they tell us if we extend the length of service we will be breaking faith with our boys. I deny it. The original provision in Draft Act of September 16, 1940, reads:

> Each man inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) shall serve for a training and service period of 12 consecutive months, unless sooner discharged, except that whenever the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled, such 12-month period may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense.

I know not what others did, but I do know that I made no promises in conflict with the plain provisions of the act. Had I made such promises, call my vote what you may—breaking faith or any other ignominious name—I would still vote to extend the service period, because I am convinced the national interest is imperiled, and if the test ever comes to me between breaking faith with my fellow man and keeping faith with my country, then you can record me as having voted to keep faith with the country I love.

The Damnable Proposal of "Union Now" Means Renunciation of the Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

STATEMENT OF AMERICA FIRST COMMITTEE

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the America First Committee:

(Prepared by America First Committee Research Bureau, Washington, D. C., August 6, 1941)

DID YOU KNOW THAT UNION NOW MEANS RENUNCIATION OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, AND IMMEDIATE SHOOTING PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE WAR?

UNION NOW?—THE CLAIM

"There is at least a possibility that we are right in believing that we can neither maintain the essentials of our constitutional system, even here at home, nor win the war without establishing a provisional Federal union with the British." (Clarence K. Streit, president, to Convention of Federal Union, Inc., on June 28, 1941, reported in Federal Union, July-August 1941, p. 2.)

"From the war in which accounts between Britain and America are now getting somewhat mixed, the step forward to a common army, navy, and air force—and taxation to pay for them—is not far distant. * * * We in Great Britain have all to gain from a union, and the invitation must come from America." (Col Josiah Wedgwood, Member of the British Parliament, in the course of an American lecture tour, Washington Times-Herald, July 9, 1941.)

THE ANSWER

"We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America, in general Congress assembled, do, solemnly publish and declare, that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is, and ought to be totally dissolved; * * * And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred Honor." (The Declaration of Independence.)

AS OTHERS SEE US

The American people have expressed their desire to aid Britain by "steps short of war." Attempts are now under way to undermine that policy and to drag the United States into the present war by the devious method of urging alliance with Britain. Symptomatic of these attempts have been the recent statements of British leaders. As public officials, of one country, they could not, of course, openly and expressly urge

another country to declare war or to form an immediate alliance which necessarily involved participation in war. But their public statements have gone as far as was possible. Thus, Lord Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States, urged recently an Anglo-American alliance after the war for the purpose of establishing a new world order, to which other nations (including the Latin-American countries) would be permitted to adhere. (Christian Science Monitor, June 20, 1941.) Prime Minister Winston Churchill has called for Anglo-American unity of aims, and has proclaimed that "united we can save and guide the world." (Washington Post, June 17, 1941.) Australian Minister Richard G. Casey announced in one address that neither the United States nor the British Commonwealth could alone solve post-war problems, and asked for recognition of the "fact" that "we are essential to each other in peace—as essential to each other as one blade of a pair of scissors is to the other." (New York Times, June 14, 1941.) In another address, which the press reported as stopping "just short of advocating immediate union of English-speaking peoples * * *" he proclaimed that preservation of the world was in the combined hands of the United States and the British family of nations. (Baltimore Sun, July 5, 1941.) Dr. R. C. Wallace, principal of Queen's University, in Canada, looked forward to a permanent partnership of the United States and Canada as an outcome of the war, for the ultimate purpose of cementing a permanent Anglo-American alliance. (New York Times, June 24, 1941.) The most forthright of British propagandists to visit the United States, Col. Josiah Wedgwood, called for immediate union and American participation in the war in such tactless terms (New York Times, June 3, 1941; Washington Times-Herald, July 9, 16, 1941) that his visit here was soon terminated by the embarrassed British Government.

LEAD KINDLY STREIT

The most important organizational expression of the elements which desire an Anglo-American alliance is Federal Union, Inc., organized in 1939 to promote the plan conceived by Clarence K. Streit, and commonly known as Union Now. According to the annual report of Dr. Emery W. Balduf, executive director of Federal Union, Inc., this organization now has 93 chapters in as many American cities, and 126 separate organizing groups. During the past year and a half they have produced and distributed more than 1,500,000 pieces of literature (Federal Union-World, July-August 1941).

In addition to numerous sporadic broadcasts (including the American Forum of the Air on Sunday, August 3, 1941) Federal Union has recorded a series of some 15 radio talks to be rebroadcast over local stations throughout the country. Extensive publicity in contemporary periodicals presents the message of immediate union with Britain to an audience of several million people. Durng the month of July this propaganda was featured in Readers' Digest, Liberty, and Look. The September issue of Screen Life is presenting a story on the Federal Union plan as explained by those heroes and heroines of Hollywood suddenly turned foreign-affairs experts, who are Union Now devotees. The Book of the Month Club has announced that as their book dividend for September and October they will give away copies of both Clarence Streit's original Union Now and his more recent Union Now with Britain, to from 150,000 to 200,000 of their members. The executive director of Federal Union, Inc., boasts further that from March to May of this year his committee obtained 31,686 inches of free newspaper publicity. (E. W. Balduf, Federal Union Convention Report, Cleveland, June 29, 1941.)

ENTANGLING ALLIANCE

Just what would happen if the United States were to adopt the plan for "union now"? According to the literature issued by Federal Union, Inc., and the answers that literature gives to questions about the nature of the plan, these would be the results:

1. Immediate shooting participation by the United States in the present war. According to advocates of the plan, "we are already involved, through our guaranties to Canada and Latin America, our aid to Britain, our defense preparations, and the conscripting of an army."

2. An American A. E. F. would have to fight to defend every or any part of the British Empire, for Federal Union, Inc., points out that, for example, "American boys (would) have to go to war if Japan attacked Australia."

3. We would be compelled to stay in that war so long as Britain and her dominions desired to keep fighting, and Britain and her dominions could not make peace if we objected. "Union Now" literature points out that "under the Federal Union arrangement, one country in the union could no more make a separate peace than the State of New York could make one for the United States of America," and that the British Government could not make a separate peace or surrender its fleet.

4. There would be a common military machine, composed of the combined armed forces of Britain and the United States.

5. There would be a common citizenship, giving British subjects a voice in effect in American affairs and Americans a voice in the affairs of the British Empire. One of the first and most significant obligations of this new citizenship would be common taxation—on both Americans and British—to pay not only for the cost of the war (which is estimated to be costing Britain now $53,000,000 a day) and for the cost of this combined military machine but also for the cost of post-war reconstruction of the British Empire. Citizens under this plan would owe allegiance not to their respective nations but to a supergovernment which Clarence K. Streit calls "World federation for peace and democracy."

6. A common war cabinet, in which President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill could get together for consultation and decision, would be an important initial feature of this supergovernment. Lease-Lend Administrator Harry Hopkins has already set in on a meeting of the British War Cabinet (New York Times, July 18, 1941), and the rumors, as yet not authoritatively denied, of a meeting now in progress between the two Chiefs of State may be carrying on the trend toward such a supergovernment. (New York Times, August 6, 1941.)

7. The fate and welfare of the millions of people in the colonies and possessions of the British Empire would become in part our responsibility, for "Union Now" would make them part of the territorial possessions of the new supergovernment, without the right to participate in that government. Added to our own problems would then be responsibility for the fate of the 60,000,000 people in British Africa, the 367,086,000 people in British Asia, the 3,249,000 people in British Europe (outside the United Kingdom), the 13,259,000 people in British possessions in the Western Hemisphere, and the 10,516,000 people in Australasia (The Statesman's Yearbook, 1940).

TWENTY-SEVEN TO TWENTY-THREE

The advantages to an embattled Britain of such a union are obvious. The advantages to the United States are less evident, and supporters of Union Now find it necessary to speak in generalities and platitudes in order to sell their plan on this side of the Atlantic. One new feature of Clarence Streit's plan, as revised in his second book, Union Now With Great Britain, is designed to appeal to those Americans who cherish visions of imperialistic grandeur a la Henry Luce. For example, in his column of March 22, 1941 (New York Herald Tribune, March 23), Mark Sullivan wrote:

"While Britain is unable, alone, and the United States is unwilling, the two together could readily dominate the world. Britain could continue to be the greatest mercantile sea-going nation. As to naval power, Britain and the United States in union could have dominance beyond any dream of challenge."

Mr. Streit's latest sugar-coating of Federal Union, to increase its palatability for Americans, would provide for American domination of the union by granting to the United States 27 votes in the world congress as against a total of 23 for the combined British democracies—United Kingdom, 11; Canada, 3; Australia, 3; and 2 votes each for Union of South Africa, New Zealand, and Eire. Mr. Streit does not say whether this suggestion has the approval of Mr. Churchill and his government. H. N. Brailsford, well-known British journalist, on July 20, 1941, stated that British governmental circles do not look with favor upon this plan. (Baltimore Sun.)

SUGAR-COATING

Glossing over their immediate demand to abrogate the sovereign independence of the United States, Mr. Streit and his fellow unionists hasten to assure us of their desire that such a nuclear union between Britain and the United States "shall grow gradually into the United States of Man by peaceful submission of outside peoples to equal membership" as soon as such peoples shall have established their fidelity to the democratic way of life. (Look, July 29, 1941, p. 33.) By thus envisioning as a possible outgrowth of their plan some beatific system of world-wide cooperation for the betterment of man, the federal unionists have corralled into their camp many sincere persons who realize that world peace can only result from universal recognition of the brotherhood of mankind and who hopefully grasp at Union Now as a tangible movement with such an end as a possibility, however remote. These followers are inclined to overlook the imperialist structure of the British Empire, as, indeed, they also overlook the British background of the leading American proponents of Union Now.

BRITISH NETWORK

But a more important fact which is overlooked is that Union Now is geared to American participation in the war and to Anglo-American world domination—its inevitable, if not its ostensible, result. This is not surprising, when the leading supporters of Union Now are identified. The Federal Union organization must be viewed against the long history of attempts in the United States to promote American participation in the League of Nations and to bring about an Anglo-American alliance. Space is lacking to review here what one informed commentator called the British network (Quincy Howe, England Expects Every American To Do His Duty (1937)), but it is clear the Federal Union reflects the influence of such organizations as the League of Nations Association, the English Speaking Union, the Foreign Policy Association, and the Council on Foreign Relations.

WHO'S WHO

Leading interventionists abound in the ranks of Federal Union. Many of the leading supporters of Union Now are members or active supporters of such interventionist groups as the Committee to Defend America (formerly the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies), the Fight for Freedom Committee, the Church Peace Union, and the Interfaith Committee for Aid to the Democracies. Many have signed interventionist statements issued by special groups, or have made public statements of an interventionist character. These include (see New York Times, March 18, April 9, May 9, May 23, June

16, June 15, July 21, July 17, 1941, and Federal Union list of supporters): Margaret Culkin Banning, Stringfellow Barr, Mrs. Emmons Blaine, Clare Boothe, Esther Caukin Brunauer, Lyman Bryson, "Ding" Darling, Russell Davenport, William Alfred Eddy, Charles G. Fenwick, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Henry W. Hobson, Edwin P. Hubble, Frank Kingdon, Mrs. Thomas W. Lamont, Max Lerner, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Thomas Mann, Raymond Massey, Helen Hill Miller, Lewis Mumford, Bishop G. Ashton Oldham, Endicott Peabody, Chester Rowell, Robert E. Sherwood, William J. Schieffelin, Ralph W. Sockman, Eugene Staley, Admiral William H. Standley (retired), Lyman Beecher Stowe, Betty Gram Swing, Edmond Taylor, Dorothy Thompson, Mrs. Frank Vanderlip, J. Skottowe Wannamaker, James P. Warburg, William Allen White, Alexander Woolcott, Mary E. Woolley, Rear Admiral H. E. Yarnell (retired), Henry Goddard Leach.

The most cursory examination of the partial list of council of advisors, printed on Federal Union literature reveals that an overwhelming majority of the council fall into the interventionist class.

OXFORD ACCENT

Despite the claim of Federal Union that their program is 100-percent American, the fact remains that many of the organization's leaders—and followers—have close ties with the motherland. Clarence Streit, founder of the movement, was a Rhodes scholar, receiving his indoctrination at Oxford University in 1920–21. Apparently, his inspiration for the Federal Union scheme came to him at Geneva, after he had completed his studies at Oxford and was employed as a Times correspondent to the League of Nations. Prominent on the national committee of Federal Union is Mrs. Thomas W. Lamont, wife of the J. P. Morgan partner who served as American purchasing agent for the British Government during the World War. In a letter to the New York Times, dated October 18, 1935, Mr. Lamont defined their mutual attitude:

"We were pro-Ally by inheritance, by instinct, by opinion, and so were almost all the people we knew in the eastern seaboard of the United States."

Another leader of the Federal Union movement in this country is Russell Davenport, chairman of the board of editors of Fortune, and personal representative of Wendell Willkie in the 1940 Presidential campaign. At the Cleveland convention of the Federal Union (June 28–29, 1941) Mr. Davenport, who was chairman of the resolutions committee, exhorted his followers to action with these words:

"Now is the time to advocate immediate union with Great Britain, even though this does not meet with the ideal of our ultimate goal. We do not mean to compromise our ideal, but we must seize upon the emergency which will guarantee the advantages that the pooling of all our resources will give." (Cleveland Plain Dealer, June 30, 1941.)

Also on the council of advisors for Federal Union we find Dr. Frank Kingdon, English-born clergyman-educator, and Dr. Stringfellow Barr, president of St. Johns College, also a Rhodes scholar and a classmat of Clarence Streit at Oxford. Another important member of the national committee is Frank Aydelotte, Rhodes scholar, American secretary to Rhodes trustees, former national director of war issues course for the War Department Committee on Education and Special Training (1918), now member of the Athenaeum Society of London, author of The Oxford Stamp, and co-author (with L. A. Crosby) of Oxford of Today. Another member of the council of advisors for Federal Union, Inc., is John Balderston, former editor (1920–23) of The Outlook, published in London, and former London correspondent (1923–31) for the New York World. According to Who's Who for 1940–41, John Balderston is still a member of the Pilgrims Club in London, and makes his home at 38 Trevor Square SW., London, England.

Also listed among the sponsors of the Union Now plan are Rear Adm. H. E. Yarnell (retired), Adm. William H. Standley (retired), and Brig. Gen. George V. Strong, present Assistant Chief of Staff of the United States Army. (Washington Post, June 18, 1941.) This situation was brought to the attention of Congress by Representative GEORGE H. TINKHAM, of Massachusetts, on June 17, when he demanded the removal of these officers who support union of the United States with Britain. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 17, 1941, p. 5387.)

REQUIRED READING

There are signs of official sanction of the Union Now scheme by other leaders of American destiny. In Senate Document No. 182, Seventy-sixth Congress (a report on schools and training courses in Government departments), it is suggested that there is a "tie-in" between lectures scheduled by the Department of Agriculture Graduate School and the movement sponsored by Federal Union. This report includes the following statement:

"Judging by press releases of the past few months, and public utterances of Government officials in high places, the movement has gained such headway as to receive official sanction and advocacy." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 17, 1941, p. 5387.)

The June 1941 issue of Federal Union World boasts that Clarence Streit's Union Now is recommended reading for new officers by the General Staff of the United States Army in a list of recent and standard works. (U. S. War Department Training Circular No. 25.)

In the Ladies Home Journal (July 1941), Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt says on her featured page:

"If you ask me, I think the union of all free democracies, whether English-speaking or not, is much to be desired in the future. Without it, I see no prospect for eliminating war."

Perhaps it is significant that Robert E. Sherwood, prominent writer and important influence upon recent Roosevelt speeches, is an ardent advocate of the plan for Union Now. Perhaps, the plan assumes new significance in the light of current rumors that President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill are presently engaged in conference somewhere in the Atlantic. (United Press from London, August 5, 1941), following the participation by Lend Lease Administrator Harry Hopkins in a meeting of the British War Cabinet (New York Times, July 18, 1941).

On June 16, a Member of Congress called for an investigation by the Dies committee to determine whether the Union Now movement is an un-American activity. (New York Times, June 17, 1941.) The Washington Times-Herald of June 17 observed:

"The type of British propaganda which incites such disloyalty to America and American institutions is distinctly not admirable.

"It is just as dangerous to American unity and American integrity as the Communist propaganda which demands first loyalty of American citizens to Moscow.

"All such propaganda to mislead our citizens and abate their loyalty to their own land and institutions should be branded as subversive.

"Propaganda to lead us into war in the interests of alien lands is bad enough, but the attempt to make us sacrifice not only our welfare but our independence for the benefit of any foreign nation should not be tolerated by a self-respecting people."

At this writing no official congressional investigation of Federal Union, Inc., has yet been launched.

Army Morale Hurt by Sham Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE BOSTON HERALD

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Herald of August 3, written by the well-known and brillian columnist, Bill Cunningham. The article is copyrighted but I have secured permission from the author to reproduce it here. It is most pertinent to the bill we are considering today and well worth careful reading and thoughtful study. Although Mr. Cunningham has described himself in his column as "an old-fashioned model T American with no fancy trimmings," he is most modest. His column is one of the most widely read in the country and his ideas and opinions are highly valued. My plea has always been to give our soldiers the equipment so that they may be trained in its use. Our national defense must be the first consideration.

The article follows:

[From the Boston Herald of August 3, 1941]

ARMY MORALE HURT BY SHAM TRAINING—BORED, DISGUSTED SELECTEES FEEL CHEATED FOR LACK OF REAL WEAPONS

(By Bill Cunningham)

At current quotations, we have approximately one and three-quarter million men theoretically under arms in this Nation, with another three-quarters of a million newly carded and indexed by virtue of the second draft. This coming week the Congress of these federated Commonwealths is apparently going to start its ponderous wheels grinding upon a proposition to hold all conscripts already in the service in for another year and a half, and to make the tenure of service of all yet to come 2½ years, unless, of course, we get in it, whereupon they're in until the arrival of whatever passes for peace.

The idea is, naturally, to give our troops "more training."

That's the expression used.

The term is three-quarters false because of the word "more." If the camps from Maine to California, from Seattle to St. Augustine, dared to stand up and speak with the one thundering voice of the concerned draftee, the shout you'd probably hear would be "What training?"

MILLION MEN WASTING TAX MONEY

Preparing to fight, if we fight anything, the most powerful, most ruthless, most precisely organized, most murderously equipped, hardest hitting, and most ingenious destructive force the world has ever seen, we've held a million men in uniform for almost a year, at an expense our great-grand children, and theirs, will be staggering under, and, in terms of the thing they're to fight if they fight anything, they might as well have been so many juveniles on a semi-serious dude ranch.

Except for a few specialized units, representing a ridiculous minority, they haven't

done any training because they haven't had anything to train with. Where are the guns, the tanks, the grenades, even rifles for the infantry? Have they gone to the British? Are they now going to the Muscovites? Or haven't we made any, for all the taxes and the talk?

There's no finding out from headquarters, for that's a military secret. They won't tell you how many they have at any Army post, either, for that's a legitimate military secret, too. You can always see a few. Especially down at Fort Benning in Georgia, they have quite an array of ugly looking rolling stock, but that's one place and one unit.

The cold truth of the matter on this draft business up to date is that the administration, either knowing a lot the rest of us didn't, and don't yet, or anxious to audition for the star role in Armageddon's third act, rushed all these youths into service with nothing for them to do, and almost nothing for them to do it with.

And that's still where the matter remains almost a year later, with a new crop coming up.

My argument isn't against the calling of them, nor even the retaining of them, but it is against citing a situation as definite and menacing, taking a million loyal men, most of them from jobs, and practically all of them from homes, swearing them to fealty, telling them their homeland needs them to guarantee its future physically, and then turning them into grass cutters, ditch diggers, road builders, and bored and disgusted barracks steps loafers, because, although they're willing and anxious, there's nothing anybody can do about it

When are they going to arm this Army?

When does all this training start?

I'm not speaking for myself. I'm speaking for the soldier Regardless of what you may read or hear from some official spokesman, the morale in this great citizen army of ours is low. It's not strong. The reason is that it feels it's wasting its time. After a manner of saying, it really feels cheated. It went in "to serve." It's ready to serve. There's no rebellion against the general idea. If our Nation is in danger, it wants to be ready. It's not getting ready. It's got nothing to get ready with.

You read a lot about maneuvers, mock war, sham battles—we had one down on Cape Cod this week. It looks serious and professional in the newspaper headlines, with such captions as "Invader cut to pieces" and "Blue Army annihilated." That's newspaper stuff. Actually a Boy Scout overnight hike has as much of the European war in it. Practically everything is "simulated" from the theoretical enemy to physical discomfort.

SIMULATED WEAPONS STILL BEING USED

More than a full year after we started officially talking war, and almost a year after we filled our divisions and flung up our great camps, we have broomsticks and wooden dummies over the shoulders of men who've been in uniform 10 months, stovepipe on sawhorses serving as cannon, old broken-down trucks simulating tanks. Not in every instance, you understand, but in more places than not.

There are crack National Guard outfits with but four Garand rifles to a company. There are artillery outfits still hearing how by way of blackboard. The officers in most units are going to school. The men work as road crews or sit around whittling.

And we're the people who're talking about fighting Germany, and thanking God for the unexpected resistance of Russia because the item of time is so precious to us.

I may possibly be overdrawing the picture a shade, but it isn't much of a shade. The Army's doing what it can to keep the men occupied undoubtedly, but the typical soldier is disgusted and disillusioned. Here's a bona fide letter from Camp Hulen, typical of enough like it to show that the author, unknown personally as he is to your correspondent, is not just a sorehead taking his gripe out on a stranger. It's typical, too, of the way the men from almost all the camps talk when they really let their hair down. Don't take my word for it. Try talking with a few yourself.

HAS "NOTHING TO DO"

But here's the letter. Please ponder it:

"DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: I don't suppose many citizens of this great country are especially interested in the Forgotten Regiment, as we call ourselves, but, as usual, I have nothing to do, so if you don't mind I'll pass on a few of the collective thoughts of 1,400 disillusioned Bostonians.

"First and biggest joke of the situation is the year of 'intensive training' we were going to receive. I think I can fairly say that in 10 months and 3 days we have actually done 4 months' work. When I say 4 months, I am speaking of the days we have actually soldiered.

"The rest of the time has been spent in cutting grass, laying roads, doing various sorts of day labor, and just plain loafing. Now they're talking about extending the period of 'training' a year. General Marshall has said he can't picture returning thousands of men to civilian life, but he apparently could picture taking the same thousands away from homes and jobs and herding them 2,000 miles south of God's country in a snake-infested, bug-ridden swamp to do nothing they could not have done better at home, and to learn nothing they could not have learned better where they were. And he apparently can picture keeping them here.

"President Roosevelt has said he doesn't want to break up 'this fighting force' the Nation now has. Two simple questions will answer the President: (1) What good is a 'fine fighting force' only partially equipped? (We've been in 10 months, and we're still waiting for equipment. What do they plan to train another million men with?) (2) Weren't we learning just as much, and in just as good physical shape, and weren't we certainly off the taxpayers' necks when we were home on the job going to the armory for one drill a week? The answer to that last one is 'Yes.'

"Frankly, I know this is a waste of time writing this way, and if the powers that be knew I was writing to the press, it would mean a month in the guardhouse, but when you have nothing to do with your time but waste it, you might as well waste it in some definite direction. I'm telling you, whether you believe it or not. I'm writing exactly what the enlisted man of the First Corps Cadets thinks. These aren't just only my words. I have heard them expressed over and over in the endless 'bull sessions' and this is exactly the way we all feel.

"The news just stated that President Roosevelt is afraid of 'breaking faith with us.' He is breaking faith. He's already broken faith in herding us into an army without equipment for training and turning us into yard cleaners and loafers instead of what we thought we were going to be—soldiers training intelligently for the defense of our country.

"Every newscast that tells about that law they're considering to give us another year of this sends the morale of this particular regiment crashing to new lows. If they make the fatal mistake of passing that law in Washington, and we are left in Texas to sleep through more of this, open wide the New England guardhouse doors, for, law or not, here we come!"

The soldier signs his name, battery, and regiment.

For obvious reasons, I'm not printing it.

READY TO DESERT

I'm not even guaranteeing that he speaks for the mass of his regiment, but he certainly speaks for himself, and that's the way the mind of at least one trooper in a crack National Guard regiment, famous for its tradition and its spirit runs when it reflects upon the current service. He even concludes with the definite threat of desertion. They shoot a soldier for that in wartime. This must be half-wartime, and that seems to mean that the young man, if he means what he says, is desperate to the point of considering the commission of a really serious military crime.

This particular soldier seems to be suggesting that he and his buddies would and could take the trials and tribulations of of life in the Texas bad lands in stride if they only felt they were really accomplishing the thing they recruited to do. There are others, to what number nobody knows, but we soon possibly may learn, who make no such pretensions. They went because they had to, and with no enthusiasm in the project. They feel they've done their job for the agreed-upon length of time and now they want to be released from it and get home.

There are undoubtedly a few who think it all swell fun and hope it never, never stops, but most of your draft army will be found under the first two classifications. This country is far from being even partially aroused. There's a vast amount of slack between the virtual wartime basis of the administration and the torpor, serenity, befuddlement, or whatever it is, of the general public.

UNITED STATES "CROWN COLONY"

The American public can be aroused. It became so thoroughly aroused in the last war when that German U-boat poked its nose up off the shores of New Jersey and Cape Cod and shelled without provocation, or excuse, some helpless cabin cruisers and fishing boats that 300,000 angry American males stormed the recruiting offices of New York City in 1 day alone. But nothing such as that has happened yet in this war. Nothing of ours has been attacked without provocation. We haven't been insulted nor belittled as a people.

We've got a lot of theoretical reasons to get ready, it's true, and plenty of tragic examples of those who didn't get ready to reflect upon and to profit from. But people are such that it takes fact, not theory, incidents, not parables, really to bring them out of their preoccupation with personal affairs. Fireside chats, the war dance of partisan columnists, the sympathetic turning of the United States into a Crown colony of Great Britain for all practical, and even impractical, purposes, and the resounding contributions to the Letters From Readers columns of metropolitan newspapers written mostly by women who once visited Stratford-on-Avon, or old geezers who can write a great war but who are too feeble even to watch one, won't do it and haven't done it. We're still unconcerned mentally.

NOT MAD AT ANYONE

Ours is a collection of soldiers that isn't mad at anybody nor afraid of anything. Therefore, it's a little short of burning zeal to start with. American soldiers can get mad I have it on the authority of one who's seen them boiling that no breed of human being can be as ruthless, as tough, as really bloodthirsty as the plain garden variety of American soldier when he is really and truly outraged.

The man who told me was a top sergeant in the Philippines during trouble out there.

"You didn't see American soldiers mad in the World War," he said, and, come to think of it, he's correct. It was more the spirit of adventure over there, a thrilling hide-and-seek game with keen and dangerous fun.

"I've seen 'em really mad," he solemnly insisted, "when you come upon a couple of

your buddies, who've been ambushed, and who've then been stripped and mutilated with knives in a fashion that turns your stomach even to try to describe, you see red, brother, and you go out to avenge them. There are still a few of us around who saw some of that and know what proceeded to happen. We're not telling even yet for it's not even pretty remembering. But take my word for it, there's nothing tougher in Germany nor anywhere else on earth than an ordinary American soldier when he really gets sore."

But we've got none of that. And have none of it.

We've got a lot of nice kids from a soft kind of living, in there trying to play soldier for reasons they don't clearly understand and neither do their folks. We've had a million of them almost a year and we've got another million coming up. We've spent an entire dynast's ransom on their keep and we're going to dig for more.

Ask any of them you chance to know, how nearly ready they feel their outfit is to go out and try conclusions with a panzer column. Ask them how many rifles they have, how much work they've had with antitank guns. How much actual shooting they've done and at what?

Some more of those mammoth "full dress" maneuvers are now starting in the South. They've moved the Forty-third Division out of Blanding, for instance, across lots toward Louisiana to participate. Maybe they've progressed a little further in the maneuver department than they were a couple of months ago when I saw a piece of that performance in Tennessee.

TRAGICALLY COMICAL

Part of that were really comical, if the elements of tragedy in terms of absolute preparedness hadn't been such a perfect shadow of their amateurism. It had been announced in dead seriousness that this was it. Here was to be actual war all but the shooting and killing. Here was to be the actual dress rehearsal, European style war under strictest and most taxing combat conditions.

They moved the entire Second Army into the wild Cumberland hill country bringing some from as far north as Michigan, and the problem they gave it made the blood run just a little cooler. One couldn't help feeling that maybe this was the American high command's idea of how Hitler, or whoever might conceivably try to invade this country and that, furthermore, that this was what might proceed to happen if he did.

The problem presupposed that "the invader" had punctured the defenses of this hemisphere by blasting his way in through the St. Lawrence waterway, had paralyzed Canada and had invaded the United States in the vicinity of Chicago. Chicago was considered to be in his hands. Detroit, Cleveland, and all such production centers as Youngstown, Akron, etc., had been bombed to rubble.

TRANSPORT PROBLEM

Transcontinental railway lines had been broken, roads dynamited, bridges blown, so the transportation of American forces back and forth was problematical, and now "the invader" was pouring full force straight down the Mississippi River Valley trying to reach New Orleans and cut the Nation in two.

The American defenders had been unable to hold him or even to slow him appreciably until he reached the vicinity of Tennessee. The invader was still pouring down the valley full blast, but the Second Army had been able to maneuver into position, get organized, and prepared to hurl its full strength in the path of the advance.

To complicate the problem, however, it was also presupposed that the invader had actually effected a landing on United States soil somewhere over on the seacoast of Georgia, and from that direction his dread panzer units were plowing cross country over secret routes to attack the Second American Army from the rear, attempting to encircle it in one of the celebrated Nazi rings of steel. That part about the invader coming down the Mississippi was entirely simulated. There was no invader nor any troops pretending to be one.

The panzer, or motorized, part in the rear, however, was to be the real McCoy, with the tanks and other motor units from Fort Meade, Md., and Fort Benning, Ga., actually coming cross country and going into action as part of their training. Having seen some of those motorized units at Benning, it was that portion of the program that captured my interest. I wanted to see those big babies roll under actual campaign conditions.

And there, so the story went, were to be actual campaign conditions, nothing less.

UTTER FARCE

Actually, that entire part of the performance was a farce. The tanks arrived, not under their own power nor secretly but hauled up in broad daylight to the freight depot of a town in the "battle area" on a series of freight trains, like the Ringling Brothers circus. The war had to be held up a couple of days until they could get them unloaded and gassed up.

And then, they might as well not have had them, for by Army regulations, or something, they couldn't be driven across private property, which meant farms and fields and streams and such, that tanks are made principally to cross. The only place they could move was along public highways. This, as it chances in those Tennessee hills, is often pretty tough traveling, but this wasn't a job of trying to discover what a tank will take in the way of hills. They already know that.

This was a tactical military problem, of trying to spot the approach of tank columns, combining in a secret advance of menacing proportions and intentions, and of quickly and effectively shifting artillery to knock them to pieces.

Your 10-year-old kid and a few of his friends could have solved that particular problem without previous training. All they'd need for props would be a common ordinary road map from the nearest Tennessee filling station. If the tanks weren't coming along the road, they were bound to be on the next one, or maybe the other one over there leading in the same general direction. A kid on a hilltop could wave, "Here they come." The kid playing general would then casually move his theoretical artillery to an eminence commanding that particular cow trail and say "Fire when ready." That would be all there was to it.

Down there, they did it a little more simply. They merely sent up a plane. It looked up one road and down the next until it saw the tanks. One tank company tried to make it a little more realistic—with no results. Conceding that it was spotted and that artillery was going to get it, it tried to turn around and simulate a retreat, but the road was so narrow the drivers found they couldn't pivot the contraptions, so they simply climbed out and down and said, "Aw, shucks."

HAD TO OPEN GATE

More ludicrous still was the episode wherein a file of tanks theoretically became engaged with a bunch of machine-gun nests hidden in the straw stacks of a hay field. Here was one time they got off the high roads, apparently with some farmer's permission. The tanks were supposed to charge into the field and have it out with the machine guns at close range.

But they had to call the battle off temporarily while a guy in the first of the attacking tank file, opened his hatch, climbed out and down and opened the pasture gate, so the tanks could get in. They couldn't bust up private property.

And these were "actual war conditions" * * * "getting ready to fight Germany."

None of this is fiction. It's fact, easily verified, and rather sad fact.

What's the point in kidding ourselves?

That's what France did.

Our Navy and our Air Corps may be something else again, but this is the Army, and that's what all the current talking is about. A million half-busy disgruntled kids in uniform may be a lot of things, but they're certainly not an army fit to grapple with and strangle Nazi mechanized murder. And if it's not to stand ready to stop that, what have we got them together for?

Where are the implements, the instruction, the real training, the true preparedness? I'm asking what the soldiers are asking, and what they've got a right to be asking, for it's they who steeled themselves to make the necessary sacrifice. Hold them, if you will, but give them something to work with, to learn with. Deal summarily with every strike that delays the still mythical production. Quit giving away everything we make until our own are at least reasonably well equipped—I'd even say fully equipped.

Either that or turn 'em loose. We'd have no Army that way, but we have nothing but a largely unarmed mob that would be slaughtered as it is. We've been fully militarized for practically a year, and we couldn't lick the Boy Scouts of America, granting them license to throw plenty of stones.

The imperial legions of Hitler don't throw stones, and they can't be stopped with quotations from Churchill and U. S. O. service clubs. Put a million guns in a million pairs of hands. Sharpen the eye and strengthen the spine. Then the term "fine fighting force" will have some body to it, and the United States will have some genuine protection.

If we're going to have an Army, let's have one. If we're not, let's quit fooling and let these kids go home. I think we ought to have one, but apparently those who yelled it into being are short a follow-through. This first year hasn't got us out of the kindergarten class.

My country, 'tis of thee!

What Constitutes Parity for the Farmer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

EDITORIAL BY TOM LINDER

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial by Hon. Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia. I believe that this editorial will be of great interest to those who are interested in seeing to it that farmers get a fair and square deal under any price-fixing program that we may enter into.

The editorial follows:

On July 17 of this year, together with other commissioners of agriculture, I appeared be-

fore the subcommittee of the Senate Agricultural Committee on the question of price fixing.

At that time I submitted a tabulation of data which shows that on a basis of 1913 the present prices of basic farm commodities are far below parity, even for the horse-and-buggy days of 1913.

On the night of July 17, at a dinner in the Raleigh Hotel, the question of fixing prices was again discussed.

This dinner was attended by several commissioners of agriculture, who had the honor of having as their guests Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, chairman of the subcommittee, Senator TAFT, of Ohio, together with several Members of Congress.

During the discussion I suggested to the Senators and Members of Congress present that it would be unwise for Congress to delegate to any man or any set of men the tremendous power and responsibility to arbitrarily fix prices on any commodities, and especially products of the farm.

I suggested that if price fixing was undertaken by the Congress that the Congress itself should, in any legislation passed, provide a yardstick that would, to a large extent, automatically adjust the relative prices of the different commodities.

I was asked to prepare and submit to the committee a tabulation showing what would be a parity price on basic farm commodities.

Accordingly I have prepared the following tabulation for the information of all parties at interest.

I have tried to make this tabulation as simple as possible.

I have incorporated in this work the figures comparing the year 1913 with the year 1941.

I have also taken the 10-year period beginning January 1, 1920, and ending December 31, 1929, and have compiled a very interesting and revealing fact.

Comparison of the two results is astounding in that it shows the relative economic condition of the agricultural products during the year 1913 to be almost identical with the relative economic condition of the same commodities during the 10-year-period average.

For instance, on a basis of 1913, the present parity price of cotton is indicated to be 23 cents, while on a basis of the 10-year average—1920 to 1929—the parity price of Middling cotton is indicated to be 24 cents.

On a basis of the 1913 figures, the parity price of corn in 1941 is indicated to be 83 cents, while on a basis of the 10-year average the parity price of corn is indicated to be 99 cents.

On a basis of the 1913 figures, the parity price of hogs is indicated to be 12½ cents, while on a basis of the 10-year average the parity price of hogs is indicated to be 12 cents.

On a basis of the 1913 figures, the parity price of wheat is indicated to be $1.30, while on a basis of the 10-year average the parity price on wheat is indicated to be $1.64.

Roughly speaking, from 1913 to the 10-year average the cost of commodities which the farmer buys advanced in price 80 percent, while during the same period the price of cotton advanced a little less than 50 percent.

From the 10-year period to 1941 the price of commodities which the farmer buys increased 11 percent, while the price of cotton and other basic crops decreased 33⅓ percent.

The net result is that farm equipment and supplies cost the farmer today, in terms of farm products, about 45 percent more than they did during the 10-year period.

Taking the average price of several basic farm products over the 10-year period, I have added 11 percent to match the 11-percent increase in farm machinery and supplies. The result is that the following prices are indicated as parity today as set out in the following tabulations:

Farm commodities	Price 10-year average, 1920–29	Percent increase needed for parity	Computed parity price
Cotton, Middling	$0.22	11	$0.24
Cottonseed oil	.11	11	.12
Corn, No. 1	.89	11	.99
Oats, No. 1	.50	11	.56
Wheat, No. 1	1.48	11	1.64
Hogs, No. 1	.11	11	.12
Beef, No. 1, steers	.13	11	.14
Veal, No. 1	.13	11	.14
Lamb, No. 1	.14	11	.16
Sheep, No. 1	.07	11	.08

The proposed parity prices above set out are based on the following tabulation of manufactured commodities which the farmer must buy:

Manufactured commodities	Unit	10-year average price, 1920–29	Price, 1941	Percent change
Farm wagon, 2-horse, complete 42-inch box with drop tongue	Ea.	86.40	87.50	+1
Turnplow, 2-horse, 12-inch (David Bradley)	Ea.	14.66	14.50	−1
Hillside turnplow, 1-horse, 0-inch (David Bradley)	Ea.	5.96	6.70	+12
Drag harrow, 2-section, 70-tooth (David Bradley)	Ea.	17.11	21.00	+23
Hay dump rake, 10-foot, all steel (David Bradley)	Ea.	35.56	43.90	+23
Lift mower, 6-foot cutter bar (David Bradley)	Ea.	65.75	78.85	+20
Manure spreader, 2-horse (David Bradley)	Ea.	128.87	142.70	+11
Combination corn and fertilizer drill, No. 2, 1-horse	Ea.	17.48	21.50	+23
Pitchfork, 4-tine, 4½-foot handle	Ea.	1.24	1.49	+20
Shovel, long handle, round point	Ea.	1.03	1.29	+25
Common nails, 8-penny	100 lb.	3.73	3.60	−3
Ax, 4-pound single-bit, with handle	Ea.	2.04	1.95	−4
Work shirts, cotton, men's	Ea.	.99	.98	−1
Overalls, men's	Pr.	1.37	1.39	+2
Work shoes, men's	Pr.	3.23	2.98	−7
Total		385.42	430.33	+11

The above tabulations and estimates do not take into consideration four main items which should be given earnest consideration by the Congress in any action contemplated.

First. No account was taken of the decreased acreage and production permitted the farmers under the triple-A program.

Second. No account is taken of protective tariff, which has always been a major problem to farmers.

Third. No consideration is given to the increased cost of farm labor.

Fourth. No consideration is given to the major item of additional farm conveniences to provide a better standard of living on the farms, such as the use of electricity for lights, refrigeration, and power; the additional use of automobiles and trucks; and the added expenses incident to better rural education of farm children.

It is my belief that proper consideration of the three major items as set out above would easily justify an increase of at least 25 percent to the above prices for farm products.

During the discussion at the Raleigh Hotel, I made a statement to the Senators and Congressmen present, as follows:

"It is not a question of whether or not we will have price fixing. We already have it.

"When a farmer goes to buy a tractor or a plow of any kind, the price is already fixed. When he goes to buy a shirt, a pair of shoes, back band, or any other article that he must have, the price is fixed. There is no competition on the selling end.

"It is not a question of whether we will have price fixing, it is a question of who will fix the price, and it is a question of whether or not the price paid the farmer for his products will be in line with the prices which the farmer must pay when he goes to buy.

"I suggest that should the Congress, in its wisdom, decide on a price-fixing program, that no power be delegated to any man or any body of men to fix prices on any one commodity.

"There is no man or any body of men wise enough to accumulate and assimilate enough information to be able to wisely fix prices on the many thousands of commodities involved in commercial activity in this country.

"Furthermore, any man or any body of men set up as a price-fixing agency will, in the very nature of things, in a great many cases, hear the evidence on one side of the case only and will not have adequate information before them presenting the other side of the case.

"The only sound basis, in my opinion, for Congress to undertake a price-fixing program would be along the following lines:

"Take the average price of all basic commodities over the 10-year period from January 1920 to December 1929 and provide the relative values of all commodities during that period as a basis for the fixing of all prices.

"This would automatically fix the price on all commodities by the simple expedient of fixing a price on one. This would also simplify the matter to where the ordinary citizen would be able to determine the fixed price on any commodity by applying the 10-year average price plus whatever percentage Congress might determine to arrive at the fixed price."

TOM LINDER,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

Cost of Sugar Production

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday Price Administrator Leon Henderson set a ceiling price of 3.50 cents per pound on raw sugar. This is the first ceiling price fixed for any agricultural commodity produced in the United States and is discomforting and discouraging news for the beet and sugarcane producers of continental United States who throughout the years have struggled so hard to prevent this much needed industry from slipping into the category of utter bankruptcy.

In view of the ever-rising cost of sugar production in continental United States, I wish to here and now publicly protest against what appears to me to be an arbitrary selection of this necessary farm product as a trial balloon for the fixing of ceiling prices of farm products in this country. While sugar is used on every American table, it is still the cheapest food article consumed by us Americans. The cost of producing sugar in this country has risen sky high. Everything the

sugar farmer must spend in the production of sugar, whether it be beet or sugarcane, has risen to such a high level that to fix an arbitrary price of 3.5 cents per pound, without hearing, is an invitation of involuntary suicide to this industry. The labor costs, that of farm equipment, fertilizer, and all things that necessarily go in the production of sugar in this country have increased to a level that there is not a single beet or sugarcane grower in the United States that will be able to make a dollar's profit out of 3.5-cents-per-pound sugar.

With the present international situation, it seems only fair and obvious to me that our Government should be encouraging the production of continental sugar instead of inviting our sugar producers out of this farming enterprise. Our memory is short if we do not remember what happened during the aftermath of World War No. 1, respecting the price of sugar, when the American consumer was compelled to pay anywhere from 25 to 30 cents a pound for this product, due to the low level of production then reached in continental United States.

Sugar production is already unfairly restricted by law and departmental regulation, and to now have to face such a ridiculous price ceiling, is an obstacle we can hardly expect our continental producers to survive. Then woe unto the consumers for whom Mr. Henderson now displays such a solicitous interest. Let the continental producer become discouraged or bankrupt, and we will again witness the price debacle of World War No. 1.

I do hope that every beet and sugarcane producer in continental United States will let his voice be heard in protest of this unfair and lightning-like action of Price Administrator Leon Henderson.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Extension of Military Service of Selectees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

TELEGRAMS, LETTER, AND RESOLUTION ON RETENTION OF SOLDIERS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams, letter, and resolution:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *August 12, 1941.*

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You may use the following as you desire in the consideration of retention of selectees:

"The American Legion feels situation demands enactment of necessary legislation to insure keeping intact during emergency troop units already trained and retention of selectees in service. We want, we need, we must have an Army and a Navy prepared to fight immediately if necessary; prepared to fight as a cohesive, effective unit, and prepared and authorized to fight wherever and whenever necessary, to defend our rights, our property, and our country. We want no shackled Army or Navy. We must be prepared in every way by authorization, training, by equipment, by leadership, and by support to do our defensive fighting outside the United States. To be so prepared Congress should without delay remove the fetters from our Army and Navy and back them up with all necessary appropriations. The Selective Service Act under which the selectees were inducted into service provided at the time they were inducted that they could be retained in the service longer than a year if Congress determined the emergency demanded it. The National Guard men, in effect, enlisted for 3 years or the duration of the emergency. There is no breaking faith with these men. Furthermore, they have proved by their training service and their general deportment and behavior in camp that they are a fine lot of patriotic Americans. It is solely a question as to whether the emergency requires their retention. I am sure that these men in training would say they want to stay in the service if the emergency requires. The Chief of Staff, who should know, says that it does. He has so recommended to Congress. Congress should act promptly and favorably on his recommendation."

MILO J. WARNER,
National Commander, the American Legion.

BOSTON, MASS., *August 10, 1941.*

JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

In accordance with resolution adopted at recent department encampment urge adoption of Senate bill extending service of selectees and National Guard.

JOSEPH PETERSON,
Department of Massachusetts Veterans of Foreign Wars of United States.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., August 11, 1941.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For 20 years the American Legion has advocated and presented to the Congress a program for universal military training in order that the young manhood of our country would be prepared to serve efficiently in the event of an emergency.

On September 16, 1940, the Congress enacted the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. Congress did this because of the emergency threatening the country. Certainly the crisis confronting us is more serious today than it was at that time.

The national commander, Milo J. Warner, has repeatedly stated to the country that the American Legion feels the situation demands the enactment of necessary legislation to insure keeping intact, during the emergency, troop units already trained, and retention of selectees in service.

The American Legion supports unqualifiedly legislation extending the training period for an additional 18 months, and we request your support of this legislation.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

RESOLUTION FOR CONVENTION OF MASSACHUSETTS FEDERATION OF LABOR

Whereas a victory of the Axis Powers in the present war would constitute a fatal blow to democracy all over the world; and

Whereas from their internal actions the German and Italian Governments have demonstrated they are savage enemies of organized labor; and

Whereas only with a defeat of the Axis can there be any hope that various social gains, painfully established since the last war, can be maintained: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention call on the National Government to take any steps thought wise by the administration, acting on the advice of the United States Army Chief of Staff, Secretary of the Navy, and other responsible agencies to keep at maximum efficiency the United States Army, Navy, and defense program; and be it further

Resolved, That this convention urge and will support whatever action is deemed necessary by the administration to make sure that American aid reaches our heroic English brothers; and be it further

Resolved, That this convention pledge itself to the moral unity demanded by an unlimited national emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the American Federation of Labor, to the constituent members of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor, and to the President and Members of the Congress of the United States.

Amendment: Call on the National Government to take necessary steps with the advice and consent of Congress.

The Republicans Keep Faith With the People and Reaffirm Their Peace Pledges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming desire of the people in this country is for peace. In public-opinion polls throughout the Nation Americans have expressed their opposition to entering a foreign conflict. Yet the administration, step by step, is leading this Nation into war, against the wishes of the people. Our disheartened and discouraged citizens can now take hope from a clear-cut declaration by the Republican minority that they reaffirm their pledge to avoid participation in a foreign conflict. The minority party is now representing the majority of the people in this country.

G. O. P. DENOUNCES IGNORING OF CONGRESS BY ROOSEVELT IN STEPS LEADING TO WAR—HOUSE GROUP REAFFIRMS PLEDGE TO AVOID PARTICIPATION IN FOREIGN CONFLICT

Aroused by President Roosevelt's constant disregard of Congress in undertaking steps in the foreign field, a majority of the House Republican membership in conference have adopted a resolution condemning "all executive acts and proceedings which might lead to war without the authorization of the Congress of the United States."

The resolution, supported by an overwhelming number of the House Republicans, reiterated the party's platform pledges of last year opposing involvement of this country in foreign wars. The Republican group likewise pointed to the Democratic platform pledge against sending "our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands."

The text of the resolution was as follows:

"The Republican Members of the House of Representatives, believing that the people of the United States are entitled to a definite

expression of our views on national defense and foreign policy, hereby declare:

"1. We affirm the pledge of our 1940 party platform: 'The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war.'

"We approve the restatement of this principle subsequently written into the 1940 Democratic Party platform: 'We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack.'

"We demand the fulfillment of these pledges.

"2. We reaffirm the declaration in our party platform: '* * * We condemn all Executive acts and proceedings which might lead to war without the authorization of the Congress of the United States.'

"3. We reaffirm the declaration of our party platform, as follows: 'Our national defense must be so strong that no unfriendly power shall ever set foot on American soil. To assure this strength our national economy, the true basis of America's defense, must be free of unwarranted Government interference.'

"We firmly believe in maintaining and upholding the Monroe Doctrine and safeguarding this hemisphere from foreign invasion. We insist that our national defense be strong enough to accomplish these objectives.

"4. The lease-lend policy was presented to the American people as a measure short of war. We insist that it be administered as a short-of-war measure.

"We are convinced that this declaration of policy is overwhelmingly supported by American public opinion, and that such a program will assure the greatest possible degree of national unity and security."

Men Under Arms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES OF WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 13, 1941

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from today's issue of the New York Times, entitled "Men Under Arms."

[From the New York Times of August 13, 1941]

MEN UNDER ARMS

When the House of Representatives voted yesterday on the proposal to extend the present period of military training under the Selective Service Act it had before it the advice of the two public officials above all others whose expert opinion on this question was entitled to respect. The Chief of Staff of the Army had warned the House that the result of failure to approve this plan would be "virtual disbandment or immobilization of two-thirds of our trained enlisted strength," and that this in turn "might well involve a national tragedy." The Secretary of State had warned the House that defeat of the proposal would have "an exceedingly bad effect" on this country's position in international affairs. There cannot be the slightest doubt of the accuracy of this diagnosis. Rejection of the plan would have dismayed our friends abroad, in Europe, in Asia, and perhaps, above all, in South America, and given our enemies a legitimate chance to rejoice over the apparent half-heartedness of our defense effort.

It is deeply regrettable that a single vote should have determined the margin by which the House chose yesterday to heed the clear warnings sounded by General Marshall and Secretary Hull. But at least it is now certain that the new American Army will be kept intact. And before our enemies abroad attempt to draw large conclusions from the strength of the opposition in the House they will do well to note—what any American could tell them—that considerations of domestic politics had an important part in the result. Unfortunately, Republicans in Congress are still playing the old-fashioned American game of politics and still trying to maneuver themselves into a position in which they can profit, some day, from a hoped-for popular "reaction" against the President's leadership.

As a consequence of the decision which Congress has now made, a great many young Americans who will soon have contributed a full year of their lives to the service of their country will be called upon to make a further sacrifice. But they make this sacrifice now to forestall a worse sacrifice later on. They give their time in order that an unprepared American Army may not be butchered in a war brought on by its own weakness, or an unprepared country be exposed to the whims of a dictator. The price is high. But in this uncertain world of 1941 it is a good bargain.

Decentralization of Government Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have advocated decentralization of Government agencies where it clearly develops that it is possible to do so without impairing the efficiency of the agency involved.

As we all know, there is nothing in the Constitution that requires Government departments and independent agencies to be located in Washington, but there is in some of the basic laws provisions where at least part of a department or Government agency must be located in the Capital.

For instance, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Tariff Commission are in a way agencies of the Congress, although independent establishments and directly answerable to the President. To move those agencies from Washington, naturally, it would be a mistake. The Congress is charged with certain responsibilities, but it is impossible for the Congress without aid to carry out the obligations, and it was for that reason that Congress set up some of the independent establishments, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, and so forth, delegating to those Commissions power lodged in the Congress. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that such agencies are not going to be moved from Washington, at least the headquarters of the agencies. It might be possible to decentralize certain divisions of the agencies; and if that can be done without impairing the service, it should be done.

It seems to me that the Social Security Commission, various branches of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, Department of the Interior, and some independent agencies can be moved to the field and should be moved to the field.

Naturally, I want my city and State, both being centrally located, to receive consideration in connection with any transfers. At the present time the Director of the Budget and the Administrator of the Public Works Agency are making a survey, at the request of the President, to determine what branches of departments and what agencies might be moved to the field. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House is likewise giving this matter its attention. The condition in Washington, both from the standpoint of housing Government offices as well as finding places to live for employees of the Government, has become so congested that it is imperative that the situation be corrected wherever it is possible.

Until action is taken to transfer a Government agency no complaint whatever is heard, but when the order is issued then complaints are received, instigated to a certain extent by officials and employees of the agency involved and those doing business with the agency.

Now, let us take for instance the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. The order has been issued to move this organization to New York. Immediately complaints are received and articles are published in newspapers to the effect that the Board was in disagreement in reference to the transfer.

In order to keep the records straight, I include as part of my remarks two releases, one of August 5 and one of August 8, which refer to the transfer of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and affiliated organizations. The releases follow:

WASHINGTON, August 4.—In compliance with the direction of the President, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board announced today that the Board and most of the supervisory operations of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation would be transferred to New York during the period between September 15 and September 29. It is expected that the work of preparing the space which has been leased at 2 Park Avenue, New York City, for the occupancy of the three agencies, will be completed by the middle of September and that practically all of the units can be moved about that time, although it is possible that some of them cannot be transferred before the last of September.

In conformity with the requirements of the statutes as set forth in an opinion submitted to the President by the Attorney General, there will be retained in Washington such representation of the bank system, the Insurance Corporation, and the Home

Owners' Loan Corporation as is necessary to meet such requirements.

In a current bulletin to employees the Board made clear that, as a result of the President's recent Executive order, employees, where conditions warrant, may be promoted, transferred, or assigned as promptly as convenient to positions within or outside of the agencies under the direction of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board without loss of the civil-service status they would acquire by remaining in their present positions. It was announced also that the Board had been assured that full departmental status of employees of the Bank Board and its agencies removed to New York will be maintained.

Arrangements are being made by the Board for setting up special units in Washington and also in New York through which employees will be able to obtain promptly full information as to housing facilities obtainable in and around New York, with rates and conditions. All employees are requested to file promptly with the Personnel Department information as to their needs.

WASHINGTON, August 8.—John H. Fahey, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, today said:

"Certain misleading reports, concerning the removal of much of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board work from Washington, call for a statement of the recorded facts. Contrary to rumors circulated, the votes of the four Board members who were in the city, authorizing the lease of space in New York, were unanimous. All four members of the Board also voted alike on necessary resolutions providing for the removal of our three agencies. The statement to the press on August 5, announcing that members of the Board as well as other executives and employees should make the move, was also approved by the four members of the Board who were present, without a single negative suggestion.

"It is true that when removal from Washington was first discussed the members of the Board, in common with most of our employees, expressed their preferences for remaining in Washington. It was agreed, however, that if we were to move, the Board could not discriminate in its own favor by insisting that its members and certain well-paid executives should continue to live in Washington while hundreds of employees of moderate incomes were being asked to move at considerable discomfort and in some cases at material sacrifice. The statement which has also been made that 60 percent of our employees are declining to consider moving is also without foundation. We do not know how many of our people cannot go. Replies to the questionnaire we submitted only last Tuesday have not yet been returned.

"As has been announced, the Board will continue to have in Washington a small organization of ample size to take care of all work which must be done here and maintain all necessary contacts.

"It is, of course, true that moving from Washington will involve some inconvenience, not only to Board members but other employees, and it will mean some extra work for our executives; but when the transfer is effected there will be no interference with the efficiency of our operation. It is my opinion that every Government department and agency in Washington that can in this emergency possibly make room available for defense units which must be here should do so as quickly as possible and forget personal inconvenience. An especially favored section of the civil population in the present emergency should in the common interest respond as readily to the wishes of the Commander in Chief as do the armed forces."

The United States and Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it has been the consistent endeavor of the Government of the United States to persuade the Japanese Government that Japan's best interests consisted in pursuing the policies of international conduct which this Government advocates.

On July 16, 1937, shortly after the outbreak of the conflict between Japan and China, the Secretary of State made a statement in regard to the position of this Government concerning international situations and problems in various parts of the world in regard to which this Government was deeply concerned. Reference was made in that statement to the principles of support for the processes of negotiation and agreement by peaceful means, of faithful observance of international obligations and treaties, of the modification by orderly processes of treaties and agreements when necessary, of respect for the rights of other nations, of effective equality of commercial treatment and opportunity, of promotion of economic stability and security universally, and of the reduction and limitation of armaments. In a further public statement made by the Secretary of State on August 23, 1931, it was expressly shown that these principles were made applicable to the far eastern situation.

As the far eastern conflict continued and as hostilities spread, American nationals' rights and interests, as well as the nationals' rights and interests of other countries, suffered from the acts of Japanese authorities or their agents. This Government sought with persistence and patience to obtain redress from the Japanese Government; it has endeavored through diplomatic means and by a reasoned approach to protect American interests and rights in the Far East and to maintain the principles of foreign policy which this country regards as fundamental. It has declared Japan and China responsible, respectively, so far as there is such responsibility recognized under international law, for the acts of their respective authorities in China which have caused injury to or the death of American nationals or danger to or loss of American property. It has abstained from giving assent to situations brought about in contravention of international law and treaties and by unwarranted use of force.

This Government has had, in the Far East as elsewhere, over and above its concern for the protection of its nationals' interests, a paramount aim, namely to support orderly processes in international intercourse.

The Secretary of State on April 17, 1940, made a public declaration stating that it would be prejudicial to the question of stability, peace, and security in the entire Pacific area if there should be any big alteration of the status quo of the Netherland East Indies. He called attention on September 4, 1940, to the announced desire of the Government of the United States and several other governments, including the Government of Japan, that there be preserved unimpaired the principles of the status quo. On September 23, 1940, the Secretary of State was moved by developments in Indochina to state that it appeared obvious that the status quo in Indochina was being disturbed under duress. The President in a message to Congress on January 26, 1940, declared that this country must commit itself "to full support of all those resolute peoples everywhere, who are resisting aggression and who are thereby keeping war away from our hemisphere."

This Government has, in dealing with the far eastern situation, exercised great patience in the hope that the Government of Japan might perceive that the best interests of Japan lie in developing amicable relations with the United States and other peacefully inclined nations.

The Japanese occupation of Manchuria in 1931 and the setting up in that territory of a regime under Japanese control under the name of Manchukuo constituted the first serious breach in the basis of international relations which had been established in the Far East by the Washington Conference Treaties of 1922. Hardly had Japan initiated consolidation of its control over Manchuria when it began to carry out a consistent policy of squeezing out foreign interests. Following the Japanese military operations against the Chinese forces which began in July 1937 and which have resulted in Japanese occupation of large areas of China, the Japanese set-up in the occupied areas puppet regimes, following the pattern of Manchukuo, which instituted a system of trade and exchange control and monopolies of a character discriminatory in favor of Japanese trade and business. The trend of Japanese policy in China proper as well as in Manchuria indicates clearly that the Japanese Government is seeking to establish in areas under its military occupation a general preference for and superiority of Japanese interest which will frustrate the practical application of the principle of the open door and deprive nationals of third powers of equal opportunity or even of any opportunity.

During the past year there has been an enlargement of Japan's objectives, which originally envisaged reducing China to the status of a unit in Japan's new order in Greater East Asia, but which have now been extended to include the colonial possessions of European powers in southeast Asia and the western Pacific. From previous experience and current developments in those parts of China which have come under Japanese control we know that the new order means political subservience within the area to the will of Japan, and means economical

employment of the resources of the area concerned to the enhancement of the military and economic strength of Japan.

On November 25, 1936, Japan and Germany concluded the so-called anti-Comintern pact, to which Italy later became a party, and on September 27, 1940, the conclusion by Japan, Germany, and Italy of a tripartite agreement of alliance was announced. Shortly after the conclusion of this alliance both the Japanese Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs issued statements of an intent clearly designed to intimidate the United States.

The Japanese occupation of Manchuria in 1931 gave a strong impetus to the expansion of Japan's armaments, with the result that Japan's economy has been largely subordinated to military and naval requirements.

On September 27, 1940, the world was informed officially of the conclusion by Japan, Germany, and Italy of a tripartite agreement of alliance. This announcement followed a steadily developing trend in Japanese foreign policy. As an illustration of this development, mention may be made of the changes in the phraseology adopted in Japanese official utterances on foreign policy in the past 3 years. When Japan sent troops to north China in July 1937, Prime Minister Konoye stated that this action was taken only "to preserve the peace of east Asia." On November 3, 1938, while Prince Konoye was still Prime Minister, the Japanese Government issued a formal statement in which it announced that Japan was seeking the establishment of "a new order" based upon "coordination between Japan, Manchukuo, and China in political, economic, cultural, and other fields." On August 1, 1940, Prince Konoye, who had again become Prime Minister, stated that Japan sought the construction of "a new order for greater east Asia." Still later the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs stated to Ambassador Grew that it was the intention of Japan to create a "new order in greater east Asia, including the south seas"; and on October 4, 1940, Prime Minister Konoye referred to the aim of the alliance with Germany and Italy as joint cooperation to establish "a new world order."

The technique developed by Japan for the mobilization of the trade of large areas in the Far East has become quite familiar through its use in Manchuria and north China. The first step is military occupation; the second step is the establishment of a Japanese-controlled regime; the third step is the creation of a new currency; the fourth step is the attempt to drive out the Chinese national currency, the pegging of a new currency to the yen, coupled with the imposition of exchange and import and export controls which operated to permit a comparatively free flow of funds and merchandise between the occupied area concerned and Japan but which operate to restrict and impede the flow of funds and merchandise between the areas concerned and other foreign countries.

ECONOMIC AND STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF THE FAR EASTERN AREA

The following excerpts quoted from an article in the Geographical Review for April 1940 by Robert Burnett Hall under the title "American Raw Material Deficiencies and Regional Dependence" may be of interest:

We come now to those most important of all sources of strategic materials—the lands west of the Pacific. By "a pyramidal error of geography" the United States finds itself so vitally and overwhelmingly dependent on southeastern Asia that our entire foreign policy must be adjusted to that fact. What is to be our attitude toward Japanese expansion? Of what value Guam? Are we to relinquish the Philippine Islands? Can we stand by idly if Germany invades the Netherlands, mother country of the East Indian colonies? These and many other questions are involved. It is not an exaggeration to say that the United States would be compelled, for its existence as a major industrial state, to wage war against any power or powers that might threaten to sever our trade lines with this part of the world.

Under present conditions southeastern Asia supplies the bulk, if not all, of five first-priority materials: Manila fiber (100 percent), quinine (99 percent), rubber (98 percent), silk (98 percent), and tin (93 percent). It also supplies the bulk of two second-priority materials: Tungsten (92 percent) and mica (61 percent of preferred grade). The bulk of coconut-shell char is also produced in this region. We import as well large quantities of antimony from China, chromium from the deposits of the Philippine Islands, which are being rapidly developed, manganese from British India, and wool from China and India. From the South Pacific come large quantities of chromium from French Oceania and wool from Australia and New Zealand. Some nickel can be obtained from New Caledonia. The Netherlands Indies have recently developed an important aluminum-mining industry, for which Germany has been the chief market. New nickel deposits are now under operation on the offshore islands of Sumatra.

It seems, therefore, that the lands beyond the Pacific could completely supply the demands of the United States in 10 of the 17 strategic commodities, 6 of which are first priority. Two more first-priority commodities and one third-priority material might also be entirely obtained from southeasten Asia within a short time: chromium, manganese, and aluminum. The rapidly growing chromium industry of the Philippine Islands is of particular significance to us. We could also obtain important quantities of nickel and optical glass. In fact, only 2 of the 17 materials seem to be without productive capacity in this area: quartz crystal and quicksilver.

Certainly no other part of the world bears so vital a relationship to the United States in case of emergency. Fortunately these lands are accessible to us by way of either the Pacific or the Atlantic. There is no very important difference in distance between the Panama Canal route and the two alternative routes to the Atlantic—Suez and the Cape of Good Hope. Under normal conditions of trade, 39.45 percent of our strategic stowage is employed in trade with this region. In terms of unit-miles, the problem is enlarged nearly threefold as compared with trans-Atlantic and Western Hemisphere sources.

In summary, it would seem that in time of crisis we could dispense entirely with our strategic materials trade with Europe without too serious consequences. Neither of our two major deficiencies, quicksilver and optical glass, is a first-priority material. Neither is required in large volume, and both can be readily stored. The production of both can be greatly increased at home, and there are other foreign sources of supply.

Latin-America's monopoly, or near monopoly, of our imports of quartz crystal, antimony, and aluminum is significant; but only quartz crystal is of first priority and cannot be obtained from other lands. Chromium, manganese, and wool supplies are important but not—at least at present—adequate; and other sources are available. Canada's virtual monopoly of the nickel industry, the potentialities of tropical America in coconut production, the possible expansion of Bolivian tin production, and the possible redirection of Argentine and Uruguayan wool exports increase to seven the materials that might be obtained entirely in the Americas. Certainly Western Hemisphere self sufficiency will not be attained within our time.

Africa's manganese and chromium are important to us and may well become more so; but if our South Atlantic routes should be severed, both materials are available elsewhere.

Our dependence on Russia is so specialized, and our relations with Russia so doubtful, that our trade is already rapidly shifting to other sources.

Only on the lands west of the Pacific, and especially on southeastern Asia is our dependence so vital and complete that our very existence as a great industrial power, and perhaps even as an independent state, is threatened if the sources should be cut off.

Who Determines Our Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. ROY C. WOODRUFF, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over blue network, National Broadcasting Co., Monday, August 4, 1941:

The American people within the last week have had revealed to them the extent to which the administration apparently is going toward involving this Nation in a shooting war. This is done while our Army is still unprepared and unequipped, and without approval, advice, or consent of the Congress, or of the people themselves.

It has been noted for the past 2 years that most of the accurate information about the administration's foreign policy does not come from Washington, but from London. For the past 2 years events have been foretold, and movements and policies of the administration have been accurately foreseen, by statements coming out of London. At the very time when the administration was denying it intended to do certain of these things, officials of the British Government were saying the United States did intend to do these things. In practically every case the administration did do exactly what London officials said it would do, despite New Deal denials to the contrary.

Again we have such a situation confronting the American people. The country is against war. The people do not like and do not want any close hook-up between the bloody dictatorship of Joe Stalin in Russia and the free constitutional republic of the United States of America. But within the matter of a few days, Harry Hopkins, superboss of the $7,000,000,000 lend-lease-give program, arrived in London on a secret mission.

He made a speech in which he bluntly told the British something the American people had not been told—that American warships are convoying materials to Britain alongside British warships.

Prime Minister Churchill tells the House of Commons and the British Nation that the United States "is giving us aid on a gigantic scale, and is advancing in rising wrath and conviction to the very verge of war with Germany." Immediately thereafter we hear that Mr. Hopkins is in Moscow clasping the bloody hand of the Russian dictator, Joe Stalin, and promising him every help he asks for at the very time our own troops do not have the equipment with which properly to train.

As a result of the inexplicable policy of the Roosevelt administration, our Nation is confronted by the most serious challenge in its history to its continuance as a free constitutional government.

By successive steps we have been led down a dangerous road toward war. Each one was taken while the people were being assured it was a step in exactly the opposite direction. Each inevitably led to the next. As the Nation is thus led along this road which has brought us to the circumstances and conditions we face today, the people are being told that "since we have gone this far, there is nothing for us to do but go ahead." I wholly disagree with that policy of futility and blind recklessness.

Those who continue to urge us along this road at headlong pace constantly repeat, parrot-like, the insistent assertion that "the people are united on this course of action; they have approved this policy." This assertion is not true, and no amount of repetition can make it true. It is a subterfuge and a device of the propagandists. The people haven't been consulted in advance about any of these policies or acts which have taken us down the road we are traveling. They haven't been asked—and in most cases they haven't even been told.

Our trouble has been that those who want to plunge us headlong down the road to war have not met the criticisms; they simply insisted on abusing the critics. They have not been willing to discuss principles and policies, ways and means; they have insisted on hurling epithets and on making abusive personalities take the place of fair discussion and honest answers. That situation is worse today than it has ever been. The administration does not want to explain its actions, disclose its policies, or account for its expenditures to the people of this country.

Jealousies, bitter quarrels, and mutual suspicions have split the administration's advisers into groups and cliques. Confusion has resulted. The work on the national preparedness program is lagging desperately, while the administration advisers fight and quarrel over who shall have authority and exercise direction.

Recently, the House minority leader, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., pointed out in a statement to the press the grave danger inherent in this bickering and confusion and lag in the preparedness program. The warnings issued then have since been strikingly confirmed. It is revealed that the delivery of machine tools to the Navy is only about 40 percent of schedule. The schedule is only a tenth of what it should be, we are told. In spite of this situation, during the first 4 months of this year we exported—sent out of the country—these tools in the value of $8,000,000.

A bitter dispute between William Knudsen, the able, practical, and experienced production man, and Leon Henderson, the inexperienced, impractical theorist, has shaken the whole flimsy structure of the national preparedness organization—and the end is not yet. We need men and women in charge of the preparedness efforts whose experience, character, capacity, and integrity will inspire the Nation with confidence, courage, resolution, and activity.

Now this attitude, these concealments, these mistakes, and this intolerance of criticism—this unwillingness of the administration to be candid with the people or to submit to any policing of its actions or any audit of its spending, has operated—in conjunction with the events in other parts of the world—to bring about conditions which are dangerous in the highest degree to the security and welfare of this Nation. These conditions must be remedied and remedied quickly. Only the people, by expressing to their representatives in the Congress, and to the President, their determination that these conditions shall be remedied, can bring about the desired result. And we can then keep out of a shooting war.

As it is, we are being plunged headlong toward active participation in a shooting war, for which we are wholly unprepared, either in trained men or equipment, machines, or munitions. Harry Hopkins tells us in a speech from London that the American Navy is convoying British supplies. If this is true, it is a gross overstepping of Presidential authority; it gives the lie to direct and emphatic testimony by Cabinet members before congressional committees; it is a gross definance of the Congress.

Broken promises, contradictory policies, and unexplained inconsistencies are causing the people to lose confidence in the integrity and the capacity of the administration.

The people are beginning to fear audibly that the administration is still centering its eyes and its efforts on continued social experimentation, and on trying out social theories rather than on the paramount and desperate need of proper national preparedness, the one thing that can keep us out of war and perpetuate our liberties, This causes the people to grow more and more uneasy.

The people have awakened to the fact that little if any effort is being made by the administration to achieve efficiency and economy in our nonpreparedness expenditures. They fear the political bureaucrats are bent on perpetuating themselves in powerful and profitable positions by continuing the spending. Those conditions must be remedied. Definite and unmistakable evidence must be given the people of the intention of the administration to at least try to hold down the soaring national debt as much as possible by striving for efficiency and economy in the nonpreparedness as well as in the preparedness efforts.

The people are beginning to realize that excessively high taxes will face this Nation for generations to come. They are beginning to see that these excessive taxes are made necessary as much by the squandering of public funds throughout the last 8 years as by the necessary expenditures for national preparedness. Excessive taxation is the most dangerous cause of grave discontent among peoples, and of the overthrow of governments.

Our people are becoming aware that economic confusion inevitably wil follow the end of the preparedness spending and the termination of the wars. This economic confusion will pervade the world, and may well be vastly more dangerous to the security and freedom of our people than the war itself.

These are the dangers which confront us. There is nothing to be gained by closing our eyes to them. There is less to be gained by abusing those who point them out and who seek remedies for them.

There are those who would like to brand all critics, all those who counsel caution and care, as cowards or traitors. That will gain nothing either for the Nation or for those who would force us into war. There are those who voice futility and say, "Yes; those dangers confront us, but it's too late to do anything about them now. We must go ahead and hope for the best." I repudiate any such theory. It is not too late for the American people to avert these dangers. It is not too late for the American people to demand of their Congress and their Government efficiency and economy. It is not too late for the sane-thinking, liberty-loving, patriotic Americans to do something about this.

We American people are Americans first and political partisans after that. Where the question of the national security is concerned, the American people always have risen above partisan politics. We will do so now. Men and women of every shade of political opinion are joined in an effort to keep this country from active participation in the ghastly wars of the Old World.

Free government is struggling for survival in America—not so much because of conditions in other parts of the world as because of conditions at home. It is true we are more or less affected materially by conditions in other parts of the globe, but it is also true we are the most completely self-contained Nation on earth.

We have the genius, the intelligence, the technique, and the capacity for the greatest production of everything of any nation in the world.

What is needed in this crisis is straightforward, intelligent leadership, the reestablishment of a national confidence which will unify the people in a single-minded effort for national preparedness. This can come only if those in high authority will concentrate their efforts toward keeping us out of this war instead of taking us in, and turn their attention to giving America a preparedness so powerful no nation or combination of nations will dare to attack us.

This can be achieved. Efficiency and economy are always practicable if an administration sincerely wants to achieve efficiency and economy. The people themselves can force this. Most of the American people belong to some civic organization or another, to some religious or educational group. In and through these groups, ready at hand, citizens can voice their demands and lend force to their will for peace and for unity, for efficiency and economy in the national preparedness effort.

It requires no courage to be popular It sometimes takes real courage to pursue the right course. But only the right course, the wise course, will preserve and perpetuate free constitutional government and personal liberty in this land of ours. Congress must see to it that the right course and the wise course are followed. We must not gamble with the security of America.

Write your Congressman and your Senators. Let them know you want no part in the perpetual wars of the Old World at this or any other time. Do it now, while there is yet time to save for the children of the future the freedom and the opportunity we have in the past enjoyed.

Oregon Strategic and Critical Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

STATEMENT OF EARL K. NIXON, DIRECTOR OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND MINERAL INDUSTRIES OF OREGON

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems facing us in our national-de-

fense program is securing the necessary strategic and critical materials, particularly those we have been accustomed to secure from foreign sources. I have long urged that our Government adopt a program having for its purpose the development of our own sources of supply of these much-needed materials. It has now been demonstrated that many deposits which are subgrades, with modern scientific methods and cheap hydroelectric power, may be profitably mined and utilized. We have large deposits of many of these materials in the West and with low-priced hydroelectric power developed on the Columbia River we could supply some of the needs for these materials.

United States Senator RUFUS C. HOLMAN recently held a meeting at Portland, Oreg., of the subcommittee of the Committee for Military Affairs of the United States Senate, which has been making inquiry into this whole subject. Previously, meetings of the subcommittee were held in the Capitol and many witnesses were heard. Mr. Earl K. Nixon, director of the State Department of Geology and Mineral Industries of Oregon, appeared at the Portland meeting and presented some interesting data and factual information with reference to the sources of supply of these materials in the Northwest, and particularly in Oregon.

Under leave heretofore granted, I include in my remarks the statement of Mr. Nixon, which is as follows:

STATEMENT OF EARL K. NIXON, DIRECTOR OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND MINERAL INDUSTRIES, AT A HEARING IN PORTLAND, OREG., OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC MINERALS OF THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

The statements and summaries I wish to make refer to the domestic production of strategic and critical raw materials or, more specifically, to the reasons for the current deficiency in such production. I shall make recommendations for the correction of the situation and trust that these recommendations may receive proper consideration.

First, I wish to present herewith for the RECORD some tables promised either by Mr. Allen or myself earlier in the testimony. Index maps to accompany the tables are being transmitted to Mr. Malone, as he requested.

Referring now to chromite, we submit the following tonnage figures covering Oregon deposits only, except as noted.

General location	Number of properties	Number of properties in estimate	Chromite	
			Probable ore	Possible ore
			Long tons	*Long tons*
Central Oregon	20	12	[1] 125,000	[1] 125,000 [2] 5,000
Southwest Oregon	170	7	[3] 20,000	[3] 75,000
Coastal area (sand)	(4)	5	[5] 80,000	[5] 1,000,000
Northernmost California	30	10	[3] 75,000	[3] 250,000
Total	220	34	270,000	1,455,000

[1] This includes ore running higher than 25 percent chromic oxide (Cr_2O_3).
[2] Metallurgical grade.
[3] Not listed.
[4] This material is black-sand concentrate of the beaches and back beaches of the Oregon coastal area, running more than 25 percent chromic oxide.
[5] These figures include both metallurgical grade and other ores down to 25 percent chromic oxide.

The above figures are derived mainly from an inventory of Oregon chromite ores made by the Oregon State Department of Geology and Mineral Industries in 1939 in anticipation of increased demand for the ores.

Referring now to manganese—an inventory of Oregon manganese occurrences recently made by this department indicates that there are some 80 localities where manganese-bearing materials have been found. Fifty of these are in southwest Oregon and the remainder in eastern Oregon. Only a few of these properties have produced any manganese ore commercially. Since the manganese ores or minerals, in most cases, are siliceous or of low grade, there has been little development or exploration of them. Consequently, we are unable to present any acceptable figures as to tonnage even in the "probable" and "possible" categories. It should be stated, however, that some tonnages of low-grade manganese ores, running 25 to 35 percent manganese, could doubtless be produced and would be produced if there were any market for such ores. Both chemical and mechanical concentration might be applicable to this type of material.

As to the zinc possibilities of Oregon, the tonnage figures in the following table are taken from an inventory recently made by the Oregon State Department of Geology and Mineral Industries covering properties in this State. Although between 25 and 50 properties in the Cascade Mountain area are mentioned in United States Geological Survey reports as carrying zinc in their ores, the figures summarized below include estimated reserves of only a half dozen of the more promising.

District	Calculated as contained metallic zinc		
	Proven	Probable	Possible
	Tons	*Tons*	*Tons*
North Santiam	7,500	20,000	75,000
Silver Peak	2,100	3,000	6,000
Bohemia	7,500	12,600	44,000
Total	17,100	35,600	125,000

The above estimate covers tonnages of Oregon zinc ores that run in excess of 5 percent metallic zinc. Some of the ores, as in the Silver Peak and Bohemia districts, carry substantial percentages of copper, lead, and also precious metals A number of additional properties, in which zinc is an important factor, would doubtless be opened up if there were a smelter in the lower Columbia River area to utilize the concentrates.

Speaking in general as to the difficulties that have beset the strategic-minerals phase of the national-defense program, it seems perfectly obvious to me that whether it be the Government or any large corporation or agency that is sorely in need of such commodities as chromite, manganese, et cetera, the agency in need must pay the price in order to obtain the product. The principal reason that these strategic minerals are not being produced in this country in sufficient volume is that too low a price is being offered to the producers. These strategic minerals come in small packages in nature. It is normal for the value of any desired product to be governed in part by its scarcity. The Government must produce these strategic products by subsidy or pay an adequate price to individual producers.

If I just had to have 500 saddle horses, I would round up four or five horse traders or horse buyers, send a couple to Kentucky, one to Missouri, one to California, or wherever they raise horses, provide these buyers with plenty of money, and tell them to get busy. Their only instructions would be, "Bring back saddle horses and put them in the corral." There would be no specifications as to whether they be 12 hands high, 16 hands high, double-gaited, five-gaited, or pie-faced. They must be saddle horses, not farm plugs, Percherons, or Shetland ponies.

That is the way the Government will have to go about buying and stockpiling some of these strategic minerals. The Metals Reserve Company cannot expect to sit in their offices in Washington and receive visits from time to time from prospectors and miners in Oregon and California who have 100 or 500 tons of chromite or manganese ore somewhere back on a mountainside. They might do it for iron ore or zinc or copper or some of the rest, but not for chromite, for example. It is a different kind of an animal. The strategic-minerals buying program has fallen down in part because of the failure on the part of those in charge to understand the facts as regards habit, distribution, and ownership of the strategic-mineral ore bodies and properties themselves and other facts pertaining to their economics.

In this emergency the consumers of these strategic materials may have to content themselves with considerably lower grade materials than they would like. They have done it before; they can do it again. They may have to change their methods to include using the metal instead of the ferroalloy since apparently the pure metal can be manufactured from these low-grade ores that we have. This idea applies especially to manganese and chromium.

Freight rates in southern Oregon and northern California are among the highest in the United States. Both truck and rail rates from the chromite areas to points of consumption are unusually high. This is difficult for eastern purchasers to understand. It is because we have mountains in this country principally, but even so the rate structures on strategic materials need looking into.

Had anything like a reasonable regard to the element of timing been employed by the powers that be through the years, much of the present embarrassment would have been obviated. Now that we see how critical is this element of timing there seems still to be a most regrettable apathy toward taking the immediate steps that unquestionably will be necessary to place the Government in anything like the safe position it would like to be in. A case in point is that the more important chromite deposits are in the high snow country; delaying a road program even for 3 months is most likely to defer any possibility of obtaining certain substantial tonnages of the higher grade chromite for nearly 12 months. The same applies to quicksilver in some places. The fatal effect of red tape and picayunish scrutiny of priorities covering supply of machinery and maintenance materials to the strategic mineral producers is obvious and is having its effect on the actual production of these materials.

Summing up then, we have the following specific recommendations:

1. Ore prices: A higher price must be paid for these strategic minerals or there will be an insufficient incentive to bring about adequate production by the multitude of small operators. (This applies primarily to chromite and manganese.) For chromite, we would suggest that the following minimum base price for ore at the mine should start some ore coming out—75 cents per long-ton unit for ore running 45 percent chromic oxide, and 1 cent per ton unit additional for each increase of 1 percent of chromic oxide. Thus 45-percent ore would bring $33.75 at the mine, and a 50 percent Cr_2O_3 ore would bring $40.

2. Roads: The prompt completion of a mine-to-market accessory road program by the Federal Government will be essential in getting out a satisfactory tonnage of some of the strategic minerals. It is as important to provide roads to get mining machinery and even equipment for exploration in, as it is to get the product out of the many inaccessible localities.

3. Purchasing system: The present Federal purchase system has been demonstrated as wrong. Individual producers are unprepared

to go back to Washington, sit down with the Metals Reserve Corporation and try to work out contracts for relatively small tonnages of ore. In other words, Federal buyers, each with full authority to negotiate, must go into the field and deal directly with the producers, stock piling the ores obtained in whatever quantities are supplied.

4. Ore specifications: Specifications for strategic minerals must be made more lenient in order that domestic producers can produce the types of domestic strategic ores that exist, rather than the types that consumers have been in the habit of receiving in the past mainly from foreign sources. The present specifications for screening, maximum sizes of chunks, and amount of fines could well be stricken out in the cases of chromite and manganese, at least. The specification for metallurgical grade of chromite ore might well be reduced to 44 or 45 percent Cr_2O_3.

5. Guaranties: Insurance in some form—short-term amortization of plant, relief from certain taxes, or otherwise, must be given to domestic producers in order to assure their interest in producing strategic minerals. Past experience involving cancelation of contracts is not a pleasant memory.

6. Import tariffs: Federal Government must recognize that its import tariff policy may act as a strong incentive for or deterrent against prospective strategic mineral production. The maintained tariff on quicksilver, for example, has been a factor in placing the domestic quicksilver industry in the strong position in which it is today. Import tariff cuts on manganese in recent years have had a disturbing effect on some who would have been domestic manganese producers. To remove import tariffs on all strategic commodities at this time in order to save a few dollars to the Government on their possible purchase of foreign ores would be false economy in the light of the effect that such a move would have upon domestic producers.

7. Priority red tape: The Federal Government, in allowing interminable delays through red tape in priorities, is handicapping especially the quicksilver producers who have great difficulty getting machinery and maintenance supplies. All strategic mineral producers should have the same priorities as consumers—A-1-A ratings.

8. Facts lacking: There is a lack of facts on the part of officials and consultants of the O. P. M. and others in Washington in regard to the supply of zinc ores in the Pacific Northwest. Furthermore, it was brought out at this hearing the there seems reason to believe that the wishes of a handful of large eastern zinc-smelter people have more weight with the O. P. M. in regard to authorization of an electrolytic zinc smelter for the Pacific Northwest than do the real needs of this section, as well as the critical need for new zinc-smelting capacity in the United States. We have been unable, so far, to break down the erroneous impression by O. P. M. that we have any important quantity of zinc in the Pacific Northwest. Whereas, as a matter of fact—it was brought out at the hearing that at no point in the United States at this time does there appear to be a more favorable point than the Portland area for a zinc smelter, considering cheap power, transportation, and availability of zinc concentrates.

9. Power needs: It was brought out forcefully at this hearing by Dr. Raver, Bonneville Power Administrator, who gave facts and figures, that the power program at Bonneville and Grand Coulee must be stepped up to meet industrial demands within the next 3 years.

10. Stock-piling subgrade: It is our opinion that the Government would be justified in stock-piling chromite ores at or near their points of production that run as low as 25 percent chromic oxide. Private interests will not do this. However, the Government could afford to, in order to anticipate the utilization of such ores by processes now completed or under study. We make the same recommendation for subgrade manganese ores of oxide type, running as low as 25 percent elemental manganese.

We further recommend that serious consideration be given to the matter of stock-piling zinc concentrates. They would have to be stocked under shelter to protect them from wind loss. Zinc shipping ore of smelting grade could similarly be stock-piled, although subgrade materials to be concentrated could not be stock-piled more than a year or 2 owing to their tendency to oxidize. A program of purchase and stock-piling by the Goverment of zinc concentrate in the Pacific Northwest would offer a strong incentive for the development of many mines now idle, and at the same time the accumulation of such reserves would help justify the installation of an electrolytic zinc smelter on deep water in this area.

11. Pilot plant: The matter of processes for utilization of subgrade domestic strategic minerals must be given serious and prompt attention. We haven't needed processes because in the past we could obtain ample supplies of high-grade foreign ores. Now we must utilize lower-grade domestic ores. Money should be appropriated for use not only by the Federal agencies but also by the State or even private agencies that have already gone some distance in developing such processes.

Appropriations for pilot plants and metallurgical process work should be promptly forthcoming to justify continued attention to the development of domestic subgrade strategic minerals.

12. Cooperation: There have been too little cooperation and exchange of ideas between the Federal technical agencies and the Office of Production Management in Washington, and the local State and private agencies in the strategic mineral-producing areas. Whereas the local Portland officials of the Bonneville Administration cooperated excellently with the local and State agencies in the Pacific Northwest, there is a distinct lack of such cooperation between the Washington headquarters of other Federal agencies and the western groups. Local agencies are usually well informed and can furnish acceptable information and details which should receive serious attention in Washington.

13. Freight services: Rail freight rates in some of the western strategic mineral-producing areas are among the highest in the United States. It was brought out at the hearing that a complete review and study of freight rates as they apply to the movement of raw materials should be made. Since the disparity in ton-mile freight between manufactured goods moving west and raw materials moving east has a bearing on the logical location of industry, this matter is an added reason for a review of freight structure.

14. Timing: We had better get serious on the question of timing on the entire strategic-minerals program. Some remedial measures must be taken now—not 3 months or 6 months from now. Conditions must be anticipated much further in advance. In this connection the master minds in charge of the defense program are handicapped by lack of facts on the conditions in regions remote from Washington. Many of these facts could easily be obtained if the opinions of individual producers, engineers, and public agencies, located in the area, were sought.

Throughout this hearing the question of giving better attention to the element of timing has been stressed by various witnesses. In the production of strategic minerals the time element is an especially important factor. We recommend that red tape be eliminated and short cuts taken at every possible point.

A Citizen's Peace Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the citizens' peace-petition committee, of which Dr. John Haynes Holmes, of the Community Church of New York, is chairman, and Miss Helen Alfred is secretary, is a nonpartisan, unsubsidized organization, the purpose of which is to organize public support of intercession by President Roosevelt in behalf of an early peace. I spoke last night from Washington over the Columbia network under the auspices of this committee, being introduced by Miss Alfred. I wish to read to you their petition, with its heading and their reasons for signing it:

CITIZENS PETITION FOR AN AMERICAN PEACE OFFENSIVE

Whereas as citizens of the United States of America we are opposed to American entrance into the present wars; and

Whereas as human beings we believe that everything possible should be done to stop the destruction of human values and the slaughter of men, women, and children which these wars entail: Therefore we urge the President of the United States to use the influence which he possesses as the elected representative of the American people for the cessation of hostilities and the achievement of a just peace.

Five reasons for peace offensive now

1. The war-weary, mourning masses of Europe, Asia, and Africa long for the end of wasteful wars.

2. The longer peace is delayed, the more chaotic the aftermath.

3. Return to a peacetime economy is the most certain way to weaken the foes of democracy with their production geared to war.

4. If the United States of America, as a nonbelligerent possessed of a vigorous, loyal people, is strong enough to aid in winning wars, it has sufficient influence and ingenuity to aid in ending them.

5. A Nation-wide demand by American citizens for peace will insure action by the President to induce warring nations to cease fighting.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House was almost evenly divided on the question of extension of the draft. We are divided on many questions, yet in this time of uncertainty and disunity we are all absolutely certain, and completely united, on two things. We all want peace; we all know peace is coming someday. Isolationists and interventionists differ on the best way for us to make peace more secure; an increasing number of people in both camps, or in neither camp, are convinced that, as a practical matter, if the war continues long enough, we will be in it, and our only chance of keeping out of the war is for the war to stop. We are all united, however, in wanting peace, for ourselves and the world, someday; and we know that, while war for us is not inevitable, peace is inevitable.

WHY GIVE HITLER THE INITIATIVE IN PEACE?

Yet we insist upon giving Hitler the initiative in peace, as in war. Anthony Eden, Lord Halifax, our own leaders are warning us, preparing us, against another Nazi peace offensive. Why do not we take the initiative? Why should not we take the offensive against Hitler now with our own peace proposals? The time is ripe for an American peace offensive now.

THE TIME IS NOW

We are not ready to fight now and the world knows it. We can send token forces of planes and ships and men; we, too, can take part in heroic evacuations, but we are just not ready for a military offensive. If we go beyond aid short of war, we may find ourselves in war short of aid.

On the other hand, we are getting ready fast and the world knows it. We are in a strategic position, now, before we go in, to launch an American peace offensive.

We are told this is not the right time. Once we are fighting, there never is a right time. If we are losing, peace talk sounds like surrender; if we are winning, peace talk sounds as if we were demanding a surrender; if there is a stalemate, peace talk sounds as if we were afraid of losing.

On the other hand, right now, when we are not ready to fight, but will be ready soon, we can lead the world in a peace effort, not of appeasement, not of defeatism or surrender, but of justice, for the world knows we are leading through strength and not through weakness.

We are ready now with potent weapons of peace—wheat, and cotton, and gold, and friendship. Used with courage and shrewdness these are almost irrestible weapons.

WE WILL NOT TRUST HITLER

The immediate objection comes, "You cannot trust Hitler." The answer is, we will not. We will not propose or accept a nonaggression pact dependent solely on Hitler's "honor." We will insist upon guaranties by both sides so that we will not have to rely upon Hitler's word, and Germany will not rely upon our word, or Britain's word. Terms could be arranged for impounding arms, planes, battleships, under joint or international control, pledging them as security, to keep the peace; strategic bases and positions could be put under similar control, other conditions could be arranged that would involve no injury or loss of prestige to any nation intending to keep its agreements, so that carrying out the peace would depend upon more than Hitler's mere promise.

WHY GERMANY WOULD AGREE

But we are told that Hitler would never agree to any such terms, or to any decent terms now. We have an epidemic of mind readers. People who cannot tell you what Hitler will do in war next week or next month or next year, can read his mind as to what he will do in peace now, and 10 years from now. They get it from something he wrote or said, although they say you cannot trust his written or spoken word.

I do not pretend to be able to read Hitler's mind, but I can see many reasons why he would not dare to refuse fair peace terms now. His people have had their fill of the glories of war this summer; their civilians have been bombed by the British; they are weary of the rationing, the casualties, the hard labor, the propaganda that goes with war; our possible entry brings up ominous memories of 1917–18. The mind readers may be wrong about Germany and peace.

Another reason for Germany to agree to peace is because they think their system will defeat us in peace. I do not. I believe in the fundamental efficiency of the American system in competition with any other. The propaganda book, You Can't Do Business With Hitler, gives an example which shows how we did do business with Hitler, to our advantage. With Barnie Baruch, I believe that our doing post-war business with Hitler would ruin him, not us. He may be the most successful leader of a godless totalitarian war economy but he can never hold out against a Christian democratic peace economy.

MORE THAN HITLER IS INVOLVED

We overpersonalize and oversimplify this struggle. "Beat Hitler" is a war cry, but it is not a foreign policy. If Hitler were to die tomorrow, if, in fact, he is now dead, the struggle is not over if his system stands. If, on the other hand, his system fails or is overthrown from within or without, then Hitler will not matter any more than the old Kaiser, who died recently, too insignificant to be hated any more. We used to hate Stalin, too, but his picture recently appeared with Harry "Lease-Lend" Hopkins in the paper as our great new friend and ally.

If, however, Hitler alone stands in the way of peace, we should tell the German people about it. If we are embarked upon a policy of dictating who shall be the rulers of other countries, we should at least be explicit. Do we demand Hitler's abdication or surrender or execution? How many besides Hitler are on our blacklist? Goering, Goebbels, Himmler? Rudolph Hess is already gone. We should be willing to state our definite demands and our reasons as part of our peace aims. If Hitler alone stands in the way of a just peace for 80,000,000 Germans and half a billion Europeans, perhaps the majority of all but 1 will eliminate him. On the other hand, we must be equally explicit about what we intend to do. A mere V campaign is not enough. Remember V stands also for Versailles, the treaty that followed victory last time. We must offer something better than a new Versailles as part of our peace offensive.

EVENTUALLY—WHY NOT NOW?

Some day we will have to do this: Think through what our peace aims really are. I have asked my interventionist friends to state just what they would do to Germany if we fought Germany and won, and those who are honest and farseeing, and who do not let their hatred and selfishness run away with their common sense and perspective will finally arrive at terms that would form a satisfactory basis for a peace proposal now. The danger is that once we get in, we could not talk to each other or to Germany; and if we went in and won, our hatred and pride and our weariness would overcome our common sense and foresight. This has happened before. We know that peace is not made wisely in the flush of victory. For this reason we do not want to see the peace dominated by a triumphant Germany, or Russia, or Japan, or Britain. We can make peace better now when there is no victor.

But some will say this would only be a truce. I do not think so, but suppose it were only a truce for a few years. Who would be the loser? We need those years to prepare. On the other hand, as Churchill said, Hitler's "machine cannot stand idle, lest it rust or fall to pieces." Delay is on our side.

Whenever we make peace, I hope that this time we will know that it is not perpetual, that it is only a truce, long or short, unless we wage peace as wisely and as bravely as we wage war.

OUR PEACE AIMS

What are our peace aims? Many thoughtful Americans are studying and discussing this.

Our State Department has a committee and a research section working on the economic phases. We have had vague and general statements from our President, with his four freedoms; our Vice President, with his Pax Democratica; Secretary Hull and his five economic points; Undersecretary Welles' broad proposal of "some adequate instrumentality * * * for * * * peaceful and equitable adjustments," guaranteeing disarmament and equal economic rights for all peoples.

All of the thoughtful American proposals, vague and various as they are, have one thing in common; they describe a world, an America, which is different. They recognize that some sort of world

revolution is going on, as a part of and cause of and result of this war. We are never going back to the "good old days." If America can think through just what this new way should be, and give it to the world, we can make this a better country, a better world. This is a labor of more than one man or group. It must be part of our peace offensive.

LAUNCHING THE OFFENSIVE

To formulate, launch, and carry through an American peace offensive will require Presidential leadership, but the President cannot do it alone. After Europe's experience with President Wilson, and in view of the unreliability of Executive statements in Europe and elsewhere, something more than Presidential action will be needed. We must have congressional authorization and commitments beforehand, and an informed public opinion behind the President and Congress.

THE PEACE PETITION

The purpose of the Citizens' Peace Petition Committee is to stimulate such a public opinion; to back the President in his peace efforts; not to dictate nor demand, but to "urge" him to use his influence toward the one goal on which we are all united, "the achievement of a just peace." I would urge every American citizen who is not just for war, not just for staying out, but for peace to sign this petition.

Taxes Under Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

STATEMENT OF AMOUNT OF TAXES PAID BY STATES AND TAX INFORMATION BY AMERICAN TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which gives the amount, by States, of taxes paid in and the amount of benefits paid out of the unemployment trust funds, as of June 30, 1941:

Unemployment trust fund as of June 30, 1941

	Paid in by employers	Benefits paid out	Interest on excess	Balance in trust fund
Alabama	$39,229,843	$19,010,000	$1,127,540	$21,347,384
Alaska	2,265,625	1,113,378	73,198	1,225,444
Arizona	9,147,522	5,553,235	236,471	3,830,758
Arkansas	13,783,921	7,357,846	502,310	6,928,384
California	323,704,623	169,613,779	11,856,959	165,947,803
Colorado	20,829,283	10,773,040	849,386	10,905,629
Connecticut	75,900,000	24,841,996	2,524,414	53,582,418
Delaware	9,912,814	2,408,070	426,960	7,931,705
District of Columbia	27,570,451	7,330,229	1,343,270	21,583,492
Florida	26,910,821	13,533,551	942,050	14,319,320
Georgia	36,737,192	12,938,609	1,549,767	25,348,261
Hawaii	8,039,253	766,881	377,714	7,650,095
Idaho	8,478,954	6,233,014	247,488	2,492,488
Illinois	290,848,014	90,814,014	12,569,159	212,603,159
Indiana	92,753,113	42,039,592	3,280,406	53,993,926
Iowa	33,484,000	15,832,341	1,198,949	18,850,608
Kansas	22,600,597	8,054,508	1,016,575	15,562,663
Kentucky	46,184,000	13,992,978	2,080,792	34,271,814
Louisiana	39,145,000	21,154,639	1,348,187	19,338,548
Maine	17,227,000	12,255,337	328,986	5,300,649
Maryland	51,393,000	26,370,347	1,363,154	26,385,807
Massachusetts	174,665,000	90,712,726	6,093,118	90,045,393
Michigan	204,214,675	112,831,486	5,175,365	96,558,554
Minnesota	55,736,763	33,311,982	1,754,466	24,179,247
Mississippi	11,024,979	6,627,413	343,681	4,741,247
Missouri	83,919,668	20,346,464	3,700,407	67,273,611
Montana	11,577,697	7,171,104	432,633	4,839,226
Nebraska	14,644,136	5,796,585	681,897	9,529,448
Nevada	3,879,820	2,961,735	116,946	1,035,031
New Hampshire	14,374,068	8,018,106	487,181	6,843,143
New Jersey	187,595,000	42,193,521	8,078,401	153,479,880
New Mexico	5,965,000	3,509,545	223,074	2,678,529
New York	533,034,264	312,157,977	15,703,073	236,579,360
North Carolina	49,536,000	20,903,334	1,542,403	30,175,069
North Dakota	3,998,258	2,158,480	165,708	2,005,486
Ohio	242,438,575	64,678,006	10,981,985	188,742,554
Oklahoma	27,911,000	10,619,133	1,267,682	18,559,549
Oregon	27,768,220	16,510,392	735,324	11,993,152
Pennsylvania	346,125,000	193,198,999	9,104,742	162,030,743
Rhose Island	39,950,728	25,226,992	880,793	15,604,529
South Carolina	19,605,000	6,690,744	835,544	13,749,800
South Dakota	4,562,000	1,416,804	222,179	3,367,374
Tennessee	36,645,000	20,981,440	1,073,330	16,736,890
Texas	93,483,000	37,627,030	3,801,615	59,655,585
Utah	11,509,368	7,036,976	295,445	4,767,837
Vermont	6,478,474	3,007,074	225,063	3,696,463
Virginia	41,786,000	20,228,850	1,393,050	22,950,200
Washington	44,275,603	21,319,679	1,655,510	24,611,434
West Virginia	44,053,468	23,211,586	1,102,702	21,944,583
Wisconsin	79,616,664	23,014,430	4,750,860	61,353,095
Wyoming	5,543,655	3,542,040	186,711	2,188,327
Railroad unemployment insurance account	238,996,702	55,000,000	3,261,278	187,257,980
Grand total	3,861,057,930	1,713,998,110	131,515,956	2,278,575,676

AMERICAN TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
July 19, 1941.

BUSINESS IS BEING GOUGED BY SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES

TAX INFORMATION SERIES NO. 17

We were talking the other day with a businessman from New Jersey.

"The way Jersey employers are soaked by the 3-percent pay-roll tax for unemployment benefits is a crime," he said. "We're paying nearly five times what we should pay. Something ought to be done about it."

Next day we got the New Jersey figures from the Treasury Department. They covered the full period of operation of the social-security unemployment benefit program from February 1, 1936, when it became effective, to June 30, 1941, close of the fiscal year. Here's the showing.

Collected in taxes from employers	$187,595,000
Paid out in unemployment benefits	42,193,521
Excess tax over payments	145,401,429

The official figures backed up our friend from New Jersey. For every $1 paid in unemployment benefits in his State over the past 5 years, the Government had collected nearly $4.45 in pay-roll taxes. The accumulated excess ran to $145,401,429.

But that was not all. Under the law the excess must be invested in United States bonds. These are deposited in an Unemployment Trust Fund in the Treasury. They bear 2½ percent interest. The interest on the New Jersey excess amounted to $8,078,401. Added to the excess, it brought New Jersey's balance in the fund up to $153,479,880.

Thus, while employers were taxed 445 percent of benefit payments, the excess also helped swell the public debt. Under the law, the Treasury had to issue $145,401,429 in United States bonds to cover New Jersey's excess.

On those bonds the taxpayers must pay 2½ percent interest. Our New Jersey employers as part of the general public are taxed about 4½ times as much as necessary and then are taxed to pay interest on the excess. They are soaked in the first place and then are charged interest on being soaked.

This is a one-way form of so-called social security.

Looking at New Jersey's $153,479,880 balance in the trust fund, we did a bit of figuring. Suppose we assumed that this 3-percent tax were wiped out entirely, how long could benefit payments continue from the trust fund alone?

Disregarding all interest our calculation showed that the fund is sufficient to pay benefits equaling 3.63 times the amount paid in the past 5 years. On that basis payments could be made for 3.63 times 5 years. Or, to put it another way, for 18 years, 1 month, and 24 days.

That would carry us up to July 24, 1959. On that date the trust fund, without benefit of interest, would be exhausted. No tax, no interest, and enough in the fund to last till midsummer of 1959. Some fund.

So much for New Jersey. What about the other States? Are the employers elsewhere overtaxed? Are they piling up huge reserves and swelling the national debt? Are they being charged interest for being overtaxed in the first place?

They are. Everywhere. The situation is Nation-wide. It applies to every State.

For the eight most populous States, the official Treasury figures covering the full period of the law's operation—from February 1, 1936, through June 30, 1941—show the amazing situation:

State	Employers' tax payments	Interest on excess	Benefit payments	Balance in trust fund
California	$323,704,623	$11,856,959	$169,613,779	$165,947,803
Illinois	290,848,014	12,569,159	90,814,014	212,603,159
Massachusetts	174,665,000	6,093,118	90,712,726	90,045,393
Michigan	204,214,675	5,175,365	112,831,486	96,045,554
New Jersey	187,595,000	8,078,401	42,193,521	153,479,880
New York	533,034,264	15,703,073	312,157,977	236,579,360
Ohio	242,438,575	10,981,985	64,678,006	188,742,554
Pennsylvania	346,125,000	9,104,742	193,198,599	162,030,743
Total	2,302,625,151	79,562,802	1,076,200,508	1,305,987,449

For lack of space the tabulation covers only States where the tax has exceeded $100,000,000. We have the figures for all the other States and will gladly supply them for any State on request.

For all 48 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii the Treasury showing is:

Taxes collected	$3,621,358,523
Benefit payments	1,549,975,841
Balance in fund	2,283,657,696

Interest on the excess amounted to $131,515,856 over the period.

In the fiscal year just closed employers were taxed more than double the amount of benefit payments—$892,023,224 to $433,242,841. To the fund was credited also interest of $48,952,550. The excess of deposits over withdrawals for the year was $507,732,933.

The public debt was increased automatically $507,732,933.

The tax, bear in mind, is not a general tax for general purposes; it is a special tax for a special purpose.

It is far too high. It should be cut substantially. It is unfair to the employer, to the employee, and to the general public, which pays it in the long run.

Inasmuch as it is a special tax, we believe it can be reduced. A cut to even 2 percent would yield more than is needed and at the same time reduce the employer's burden by one-third.

We are looking further into this tax with the definite view of going after a reduction. That means a lot of work. We will need help and suggestions.

What is your reaction, please?

The Mirage of Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. ELIOT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

ARTICLE BY MICHAEL STRAIGHT

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely and constructive article by Michael Straight, which appeared in the New Republic for July 28, 1941:

[From the New Republic of July 28, 1941]

THE MIRAGE OF PRODUCTION

On April 15, almost a year after the beginning of the defense program, Mr. Biggers, Director of Production of the O. P. M., promised that within a hundred days tanks, guns, and aircraft would be rolling out of the American factories.

On Tuesday of last week the 100 days of John D. Biggers were up. The facts about production seem to be these:

Ordnance: Production is almost criminally low. There is no significant production in ordnance at the present time.

Antiaircraft: The schedules call for great increases in production. But the schedules themselves are puny in relation to need.

Ammunition: The production of ammunition is pitifully small.

Aircraft: The production of aircraft is slowly creeping up, although a year has been wasted because, largely for reasons of prestige, stress was placed on fighter instead of heavy-bomber production. For the aircraft production which we have now we can thank not the War Department nor the N. D. A. C. nor the O. P. M. but the Governments of Britain and France, which ordered the plants and paid early for them.

Railway cars: New rolling stock is essential to the defense effort if we are to avoid a crippling shortage. We need 15,000 new cars a month. We are producing no more than 5,000 a month.

Tanks: The factories are just beginning to turn out tanks, and equipment is lacking for mass production.

Shipping: We are still nowhere near an all-out shipping effort, although the present low schedules are being doubled.

Lease-lend: In the President's progress report on lease-lend of June 10, it was stated that of $1,300,000,000 worth of Army and Navy equipment authorized for Britain, $60,000,000 has been given up by the War and Navy Departments for actual shipment.

In the new heavy-bomber program, the $4,000,000,000 ordnance program, and the new shipbuilding schedules, a vigorous effort is being made by the President to raise defense production. But we are still far from an all-out effort. The War Department is just beginning to think in terms of what is needed for victory.

Why has production stumbled so badly? Each industry has its own well-prepared answer. Why do we lack airplanes? Because we lack ordnance. Why do we lack ordnance? Because there aren't enough machine tools. Why aren't there enough machine tools? The machine-tool manufacturers blame it on the steel industry. The steel industry blames it on the metallurgical industries. The metallurgical industries blame it on the transportation industry. Transportation officials turn it back to lack of steel. Is this our "brilliant if pitiless" industry that General Ludendorff once praised so highly? It has not shown much brilliance; and if it is pitiless, against whom has this quality been mainly directed? The destroyers of democracy or those who are defending it?

The responsibility for our failure so far falls first upon the officials of the Defense Administration. Their sights were set too low; they never looked ahead. They had sufficient power to act on production, but they have, almost without exception, made no dent in the production picture. The officials of the O. P. M. in each industry division are the representatives of the industry in question. The consultant on steel has been the president of the Iron and Steel Institute. The Transportation Division is the personal property of the American Association of Railroads. The Paper and Pulp Section consists of men from the Paper and Pulp Institute. The Copper Division is run by representatives of the Kennecott Copper Co. These men are recruited from the same "noble army of controllers" that nearly wrecked England. Not consciously, not deliberately. They don't try to forward their own immediate interests. But they are in Washington principally to protect the interests of their own industries. They aren't deliberately selfish; they are simply incapable of thinking in terms of the public interest.

Are these men alone to blame? If only they could be blamed, there would at least be something at which to strike. But blows aimed at the officials of the O. P. M. glance off, hitting the entire administrative structure of the defense program. It is loose, illogical, haphazard, and destructive of time and energy. It resembles the earliest attempts at administration in the first World War. These attempts were costly then and they are more costly now. But apparently we have to go through the old process of refusing to be taught by anything but our own most recent mistakes.

There are three main administrative weaknesses in the defense structure. The first is the duplication of authority; the second is the misdirection of authority; the third is the absence of central direction.

The duplication of authority is extraordinary. There is a construction section in the Production Division of the O. P. M. There is a construction section in the Priorities Division of the O. P. M. There are construction units in the Price Administration Section, and the Civilian Supply Section of O. P. A. C. S. Then there is a construction and real-estate branch of the Supply Division of the General Staff of the War Department. There is a real-estate committee of the Procurement Division of the O. P. M. There is a Construction Division in the Office of the Quartermaster General, and a construction advisory committee under this division. There is also the Construction Division of the Navy Supply Division.

In raw materials there is the Materials Section of the Production Division of the O. P. M.; the Materials Section of the Priorities Division of the O. P. M.; the Materials Divisions of both sections of O. P. A. C. S., and the Raw Materials Division of the Army and Navy Munitions Board. All of these sections and divisions break down into almost identical units dealing with iron and steel, nonferrous metals, rubber, etc.

In finished products, there is the same duplication. There is the Aircraft, Ordnance, and Tools Branch of the Production Division of the O. P. M. There are the Aircraft and the Tools and Equipment Divisions of the Procurement Division, and the Machine Tools and Equipment Sections of the Priorities Division, each with their own subdivisions, which in turn have their exact counterparts in the Aircraft and Ordnance Divisions of the War and Navy Departments. The same is true of shipbuilding and of almost all the other items which enter into defense production. Of course, some work is done in each of these units which is not, and could not be, done elsewhere. But, in the main, officials of all of these divisions toil over the same estimates, inspect the same factories, pat the same workers on the back, and give the same hopeful stories to the press. They don't always fight. Sometimes it would be better if they did.

To add to this nightmare of divided authority, there are whole sections of defense, such as propaganda and economic warfare, in which there is no authority at all. We must export the arms that we produce before they can be used, but in addition to the O. P. M., O. P. A. C. S., and the War and Navy Departments, the Lease-Lend Administration, the Tariff Commission, the Maritime Commission, the Office of the Administrator of Export Control, the Division of Controls in the State Department, the Division of Commercial and Cultural Relations with the Latin Americas, and one or more divisions of the Treasury and Commerce Departments, as well as the Bureau of the Budget and the White House, all have a hand in untying and tying up the red tape before clearance for export is finally made. Most of these civilian agencies are constantly trying to increase their own powers at the expense of the others; the results are almost unbelievable.

From the duplication of functions in the defense administration the division of responsibility inevitably results. But, unfortunately, what responsibility there is is centered in the wrong agencies. The outstanding administrative lesson of the last war, which has been so strongly stressed by Bernard M. Baruch and other wartime leaders, is that while the Army and Navy must be solely responsible for determining what war equipment is needed and at what time, the responsibility for seeing that the equipment is contracted for and produced must rest with civilian agencies. Yet today it is the War and Navy Departments which bear almost the entire burden of obtaining defense production. They decide what is needed; they chose the plant sites; they pick the contractors; they draw up the contracts. Because they are inexperienced and ill equipped for the job, it is done slowly and inadequately. But the O. P. M. is permitted to do little more than approve contracts of more than $500,000 and give the manufacturer an occasional dig in the ribs after the contract has been signed and work has begun.

It is terribly hard for people outside of Washington to realize that the officials of the O. P. M., who talk so much, do so little, but it is true. The members of the Labor Division of the O. P. M. and the Mediation Board have their jobs to do and go their own ways. The other 1,400 employees of the O. P. M. sit at their desks all day and seem to be working hard, but what they are working at, what they accomplish, what would happen if a bomb went off and destroyed them all, nobody knows. While the Army and Navy run the defense program, the officials of the O. P. M. make speeches or simply sit "pinnacled dim, in the intense inane."

Once the O. P. M. was nothing more than a little advisory commission. Now it is a great hulk of a thing and it still lives by sufferance of the War and Navy Departments. It cannot initiate any policy without their approval. It cannot for long prevent any move which they care to make. If the O. P. M. were staffed with vigorous men, they would fight for the functions which are rightfully theirs but which the War and Navy Departments have assumed and are reluctant to give up. But instead, the O. P. M. is stuffed with businessmen who are primarily concerned with protecting their own interests, and with good fellows like Merrill C. Meigs, the Chicago publisher who wandered into the Aircraft Section of the O. P. M., of which he is now chief, through his hobby of taking week-end jaunts in his private plane. It is the same story in most of the other divisions. The Army has neither the knowledge nor the inclination to insist on subcontracting in defense contracts. But Robert L. Mehornay, chief of the Defense Contract Service Section of the O. P. M., has to be himself convinced of the need for subcontracting before he can convince anyone else. Never was so much withheld from so many by so few.

In procurement, a forceful administrator, Donald Nelson, has sought to obtain more power. He has still not received it. Procurement of equipment and commercial supplies for the Army is handled by the Quartermaster General. The contracts are reviewed in outline by Nelson's Procurement Division of the O. P. M. Since Nelson does not have any actual procurement responsibilities, and since many contracts are reviewed by the Production Division rather than by the Procurement Division, it might be expected that Nelson would at least be permitted to direct the general procedures of procurement. But the Under Secretary of War has his own committee to provide this function. The failure of this committee to perform its functions was presumably one reason why the inexperienced Quartermaster Corps made so many blunders in its purchases of lumber, shoes, woolen goods, and other products. Nelson was barely consulted in many of these purchases, just as Frank Knight was barely consulted in the last war. Nelson's lack of power led him to the point of resignation in the spring of 1941.

In the administration of priorities, the division of authority is carried to the point of absurdity. Take the case of copper. The copper producers state that their production for July will be, say, 100,000 tons. Of this, 80,000 tons are preempted for Government orders by the Army and Navy Munitions Board. The Board then determines the way in which the defense needs will be given preference within the 80,000 tons preempted. A priorities schedule is prepared in which A-1 rating is given, say, to cartridge casings, A-2 to shell casings, and so on. Amounts of copper are then allotted to each and the final schedule is sent to officers in the field who issue preference ratings to the manufacturers who use the copper. A priorities order is then issued by the Priorities Division.

The allocation of the 20,000 tons which is not preempted remains. It is handled not by the Priorities Division but in the Office of Civilian Supply in O. P. A. C. S., which is without power, and whose recommendations go back to the Priorities Division to administer. Given the kind of officials in the Priorities Division who prefer allocation to expansion, it was just as well that the allocation of civilian supplies was given to O. P. A. C. S. as an insurance that the views of the priorities officials would not be carried to their ultimate conclusion in the total elimination of civilian supply. Yet the present arrangement is not a real substitute for a centralized administration of priorities. The larger part even of civilian supplies is in many cases really for indirect military use, and a division of authority in allocation results in endless confusion.

The Office of Price Administration in O. P. A. C. S. suffers from the same illogical development. It would not have been set up outside of the O. P. M. if the O. P. M. had done its job. Prices, production, and priorities are so interdependent that they are almost inseparable, but today O. P. A. C. S. and the Production and the Priorities Division are as often as not working at cross purposes.

The officials of the O. P. M. have realized how serious the lack of coordination is, and they are today engaged in reorganizing the O. P. M. on an industry basis. In the new structure of the O. P. M., which may be reached within the next 2 months, Stettinius, Biggers, and Nelson will remain in charge of the Priorities, Production, and Procurement Divisions, and will retain small staffs to administer problems of general procedure. But the lower units of each division will be brought together on an industry basis. Each industry unit will deal with priorities, production, and procurement problems, but not with price and labor problems. The units will be divided into three groups, directed by Stettinius, Biggers, and Nelson. They will be divided in such a way that the industries in which problems of priorities are predominant will be placed under Stettinius; those in which production problems are predominant will be under Biggers; and those in which procurement problems are predominant will be under Nelson. But since priorities must be of increasing importance as the diversion of resources grows more widespread, Stettinius, as Priorities Administrator, will have direct entrance to all three groups.

Each unit will have attached to it two committees—a committee of businessmen within the industry which will be purely advisory, and a coordinating committee consisting of representatives of other Government agencies, including O. P. A. C. S. and the Labor Division of the O. P. M. Labor advisory committees will also be established and have already been partially organized in the electrical, rubber, and aircraft industries. Philip Murray, however, has denounced these committees as poor substitutes for the industry councils of his own plan in which labor and business representatives are given power to administer prices, production, and priorities. Murray recently described the labor advisory committees of the O. P. M. reorganization plan as "mere tinsel, mere window dressing," and advised C. I. O. officials to refuse to serve on them.

Whether or not the Murray plan is wiser, it is clear that the present reorganization is insufficient. It does not reallocate authority between the O. P. M. and the War and Navy Departments, and it does not integrate price policies with those of production and priorities; it is simply a reshifting within the O. P. M.; a move in the right direction and no more.

Any real reorganization of the defense administration must work toward three objectives: First, since the best organization will fail if it is staffed by poor personnel, the proved failures that remain in the O. P. M. must be cleaned out and replaced on the basis of strict adherence to the rule that, while advice must be expert, administration must be independent. A clean broom would sweep before it not only such men as Meigs and the spokesmen for special interests, such as Ralph Budd, but two of the three key figures in the O. P. M., Biggers and Stettinius. Biggers today may concede his past errors and promise that the next hundred days will not be like the last. "It is a characteristic of drunkards and other addicts," said the London Economist recently, "that they are perpetually on the point of turning over a new leaf; their latest aberration is always their last one. When this trait appears in the sober and responsible sphere of public policy it is even more deplorable."

Second, the O. P. M. must be transformed into a real ministry of supply, like that of the British, which has full responsibility for procurement and production.

Third we should be working toward the integration of authority under the still unformed Office of Emergency Management. The conservatives of America have understood this need for integration and they have filled the press with the clamor for a "defense czar," which is principally a subterfuge for an attempt to seize complete control of the administration and raise a figure to challenge even the President's authority. A real reorganization of the defense administration is the best defense we could have against the growing agitation of these groups.

"We have been borrowing time from the British," said Secretary Ickes on July 14, "but we have no right to borrow any more." If we stop deceiving ourselves by words like "defense"; if we speak instead of the final superb chance to smash Hitler that the Soviet resistance has given us, then reorganization is even more urgent as the precondition of swift, all-out action.

MICHAEL STRAIGHT.

WASHINGTON.

Florida Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

ARTICLE BY EMILY K. HERRON, OF WINTER PARK, FLA.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by Miss Emily K. Herron, of Winter Park, Fla., which article is entitled "That Perennial Florida Canal—An Indefensible Defense Project," which article is as follows:

THAT PERENNIAL FLORIDA CANAL—AN INDEFENSIBLE DEFENSE PROJECT

Once more, like the hydra of ancient legend, this many-times-slain project of a sea-level ship canal across Florida has squirmed into life in Congress. As might have been expected, it was carefully combined with a few other costly and unpopular schemes and presented in an omnibus bill for power-development work amounting to some half billion dollars, which was approved by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee on April 30, 1941. The now sacred plea of defense has been attached to this century-old project, but before Congress yields to that pretention investigation should be made of the assertions that the canal is being advocated merely for the reimbursement of a few foolish investors at a terrible price eventually to the State of Florida and to the country at large.

As a defense measure the case is decidedly feeble. It is generally recognized that Florida is in a strategic position for the protection of the Gulf of Mexico, Panama, and the Caribbean, and also is the State nearest to the Bahamas and West Indies, as well as to South America. Much traffic will be necessary by land, as well as by sea and air, for the transportation of food, war materials, and other supplies required by our airfields, Army camps, and ship harbors in south Florida. Yet a cross-State canal would make this important part of Florida into an island, connected to the mainland by only a dozen highway and railway bridges to span the almost 200 miles of waterway—by far the longest canal in the world. Not only would this huge ditch delay north and south traffic, but these bridges, 4 of them of the lift type, would seriously retard the average 119 transits that optimistic canal proponents expect to be made every 24 hours. Of course, travel for trains, trucks, tanks, and tourists would also be very seriously impeded; and this would be especially deplorable for the motor vehicles, as the 6 highway bridges would be 40 or 50 miles apart, and the ferries would have to take grave risks among those 119 daily transits.

In advocating completion of the canal the proponents have suggested that it would be possible for an enemy to bottle up the Caribbean and prevent access to the Panama Canal from the Atlantic by placing naval forces along the Florida Straits and the islands that extend from the tip of Florida to South America, thus forcing our fleet to sail around the southern end of that continent in order to get to the Pacific. Hence they claim that a canal across Florida would enable our warships to pass safely from one ocean to the other by way of Panama. While it appears extremely improbable that our Navy would allow such a situation to occur, if a powerful enemy should gain control of the thousand miles between Florida and South America, it is not likely that the narrow entrance to the St. Johns River would be left conveniently open for us, or that the Florida Canal would be spared from attack, or that it would be any easier to defend than are the Florida Straits. An enemy capable of bottling up the Caribbean with all those island hiding places for our ships and planes, could doubtless bottle up the Gulf quite as readily, and so prevent our ships from reaching Panama by way of the Florida Canal. However, that is a problem for our Navy to solve, and long before the canal could possibly be completed, our Navy will have expanded into a two-ocean fighting force. England has already granted us strategic island bases, and we shall soon be strong enough to help in defending her, as she is now valiantly helping to defend us.

The claim of greater safety for ships in the canal is contradicted by experienced sailors. The approved route for this waterway requires 27 miles of excavation through the underwater rock shelf along the Gulf coast. Altogether the canal is to have about 400 miles of jetties and embankments, with lighthouses, signals, bridges, etc., to be guarded night and day in case of war; and it is common knowledge that a single well-placed bomb, or even a little dynamite, could block all traffic for weeks.

The Board of Army Engineers stated in their official report that a ship canal "of adequate dimensions to pass the large anticipated traffic with reasonable convenience and safety should have a depth of 35 feet, increased to 36 feet in the rock sections and 37 feet in the Atlantic and Gulf entrances." The accepted plan, however, lessens by 2 feet the depth recommended in this expert advice. What the proponents want, evidently, is a canal from Jacksonville to the Gulf, and they imply that almost any kind of a canal will do. They even discussed in all seriousness some kind of an amphibian railway for the large ships, but Congress unkindly suppressed the suggestion before the public could toy with the idea. These same proponents also proposed a barge canal along the same route, if the completion of the ship canal were again refused by Congress, thus ignoring the cross-State lock canal for barges already in use further south in Florida. In further evidence of the flexibility of their ideas as to the kind of canal that they would accept, it has been stated that the ship canal will be changed from a sea-level to a lock type if insuperable difficulties are encountered during construction, as has been predicted by many geologists and engineers. The cost of a lock canal, however, would not only be excessive but the time lost in passing through the locks would eliminate, probably, any possibility of saving a few hours for the fast freighters now in use.

Aside from the vulnerability of a narrow waterway in wartime, there are always other serious hazards for large vessels, which were pointed out by marine experts at the hearings before the congressional committees. These are the dangers of grounding and collisions, as large ships in shallow and constricted waterways are very difficult to steer, and in passing each other have a tendency to draw together and collide. We are told that it would not be possible for our great battleships to traverse the canal; and while cruisers might perhaps manage it, a commander hardly would prefer to take such risks of damage and delay either in wartime or in hurricane time, when broad, deep waters are essential to safety. The winter fogs which often prevail in this section would be a further danger in a canal which follows two winding river courses.

In addition to the heavy cost of innumerable surveys for the canal, $5,400,000 has already been spent on construction from relief funds, and it is estimated that at least $197,000,000 more will be required for its completion; but those who know of the probable difficulties that would have to be overcome estimate the further cost at possibly two or three times that amount. Construction, however, would be only the beginning of a huge annual expense bill for upkeep of the lighthouses, pilotage, the constant dredging of this 200-mile channel, the repair of bridges, turning basins, and stilling basins (where rivers rush into the channel too rapidly). More bridges might be required, for which Florida must pay, as well as for any ferries; then there would have to be lighting at bridges and bends, continuous inspection of embankments and depth, and a thousand unforeseen details. All this, with increasing deterioration, will have to be paid for year after year if the canal is ever completed. Where is the money for it to come from? From Florida in particular, and from every taxpayer in the country in general to a greater or less extent. Assuredly the shipping companies will carry but an insignificant share of the burden, as no tolls can be charged, and, indeed, all the large potential users have consistently refused to pledge any use of the canal.

But worse than all this waste of money will be the suits for damages in the 100-mile-wide belt where the most eminent geologists in the country who have made a careful study of Florida's underground water system have predicted progressive contamination of the underground fresh waters by the rise of the underlying salt water when the water table is lowered in the section of porous Ocala rock, estimated to be 30 to 50 miles long, on the canal route. Even the geologist employed by the proponents, who tried to make the best of an obviously dangerous condition there, admitted that such damage would occur, though he narrowed the belt to 15 miles on each side of the cut. At the lowest estimate, this seems to mean that some 900 square miles in central Florida would have contaminated water for municipal and irrigation purposes. As this section includes vast citrus groves, the rich celery lands, and many other valuable crops, as well as lawns and gardens dependent on the fresh-water supply when the rains fail, as they often do, this would be a great calamity for the State's sources of wealth. Would an unwanted and little used canal—a hindrance to every kind of land transportation, the destruction of the beauty of two lovely rivers, and of the vast breeding ground of rare birds and other wildlife—be worth all this great sacrifice? Hear the ominous warning of the War Department's Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors:

"The Board finds that the responsibility for the indirect damage which might result from an impairment of water supplies is beyond the financial resources of any organized taxing district and appears to be beyond the constitutional power of the State. This Board believes that the Federal Government must face the onus of meeting claims for such damage if the canal is built."

What about Silver Springs, Florida's greatest natural wonder? Representatives of the United States Geological Survey have expressed their belief that these springs, which are about 3 miles from the canal route, will inevitably be lowered with the water table to sea level and will disappear forever from the surface. It is stated further that the sinking of 200 feet of cement wall, with which the proponents expect to prevent this, could not possibly close all the devious ramifications of underground channels in this porous-rock formation. The owner of the springs is quite undisturbed by this dire prediction, but his strange equanimity was explained when General Markham said at one of the hearings, as quoted in one of the official reports: "If we can't control the water we can buy Silver Springs for $200,000—for a paltry $200,000." May God forgive him, for Florida will not.

It is indeed incredible that intelligent persons are willing to ignore such warnings of disaster; but the history of this project, as related in the official reports and in the press, shows the utter disregard on the part of those who advocate the canal of all possible and probable, as well as of all certain, dangerous consequences of the proposed excavation. The first appropriation of $5,000,000 from relief funds was made without congressional approval and in direct opposition to the recommendation of the Board of Army Engineers who had put years of study into the surveys. Their report, however, presented December 30, 1933, to General Markham, then Chief of Engineers, was not made public until some months after the canal had been started, and even the members of the Senate Committee on Commerce, who were required to consider the project in connection with appropriations, were not permitted to see the report at that time. It transpired later that the concluding sentence was: "That the construction of neither a barge nor ship canal is economically justified at this time."

In explanation of the delay it was stated: "At the request of local interests, action on this report was deferred by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to afford the proponents an opportunity to assemble and present further data in justification of the project." This disregard for all interests outside of those of the local landowners and other investors in the bond issue of the Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, who hope to gain financially through the vast increase of business that this huge construction project would bring to their section, has turned many thoughtful people against the canal, regardless of any other considerations. There has been considerable unorganized and futile opposition from many citizens of high standing among the central Florida growers, garden clubs, chambers of commerce, etc., but their protests have been made in vain to these very persistent proponents, whose chief reason at first was employment for the unemployed. Later on, in view of the greater cost of shovels over machines, the idea of employing vast numbers of unskilled laborers was dropped, and the cry of defense for Panama was broadcast. Common sense is destroying that idea, and now the plea is to provide employment after the defense emergency.

Mr. Citizen, are you going to do anything about this matter? We Americans, if and when the call of sacrifice comes, will offer our all to our country as willingly as our English cousins are doing, but we have no right to sacrifice to the whims of a little group of thoughtless and selfish people, Florida's future usefulness and her beauty.

The Unemployment Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

LETTER FROM RON STEPHENS, ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY FOR OKLAHOMA

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, some have pointed out that all laborers are employed, but I wish to call your attention to this letter:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION,
Oklahoma City, Okla., August 7, 1941.

The Honorable VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WICKERSHAM: Knowing of your interest in the unemployment situation in Oklahoma, we are giving you some figures with reference to employment on W. P. A. These figures are as of July 30, 1941:

Total number assigned to projects	28,225
Private employment	19,812
Awaiting assignment	32,829
Temporarily unavailable	4,828
Total case load	85,694

We wish to call your special attention to the number of W. P. A. workers shown to be in private employment. We have always made an earnest effort in the State to place persons on W. P. A. in private employment, and we feel that one of the most worthy enterprises that could be undertaken by W. P. A. would be the continued and renewed effort to strive to place the greatest number of workers in private employment.

Your attention is also called to the fact that even though we have 28,225 persons actually assigned to projects, we still have 32,829 persons certified and awaiting assignment to whom we cannot offer a job.

If you desire any additional information on this subject, please call on us.

Very truly yours,

RON STEPHENS,
Administrator.

America Needs All Her Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE F. ARNOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CENTRALIA (ILL.) SENTINEL

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Centralia (Ill.) Sentinel of August 9, 1941:

[From the Centralia (Ill.) Sentinel of August 9, 1941]

AMERICA NEEDS ALL HER STRENGTH

Sometimes we Americans forget one thing that sets us apart from every other country on earth.

It is this: We are a people made up of many peoples. In that lies strength, not weakness.

In European countries where there is a mixed population, one strain usually dominates. Others are always less than equal to this dominant strain, always made to feel that they fall short in an effort to adjust themselves to a mold. Most often they are whipped and jammed by force into that unwelcome mold; of late years those deemed not to fit have been simply murdered.

That is not the American way. Here there is no dominant strain. There is, perhaps, a majority strain, but it cannot be a dominant strain in the European sense as long as the rights of minorities are protected.

Minorities of racial, religious, cultural strains which differ from that of the majority are not made to feel that they are at best inferior imitations of the majority norm.

We glory in our differences and we feel that in them is strength, for each group has something definite to contribute. The sum of those contributions must be greater than any accomplishment by a single inbred group which shuts a lid down on the abilities of others. The thing that binds all together in the United States is not a phony racial doctrine, but the joyous and spontaneous loyalty of diverse peoples who have learned to live together, and found it good.

In the defense effort, equal opportunities to help should be extended so far as practicable to all, not as a grudging concession to a moral principle but as a practical recognition of the practical fact that all are equally needed.

The test is not, "Who are you?" but "What can you do?" It is wise and right that both in the military services and in defense industries, broadening opportunities should be gradually opening up—and they are—to Americans of colored blood. It is wise and right that America should not deprive itself—as Germany has done—of the loyal services of Jews and Catholics because of their race or religion. It is wise and right that America, fostering mother of a hundred races, religions, and peoples should call on all alike to defend her.

That is our strength. Let us use it.

How to Get Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ENID (OKLA.) EVENTS

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Enid (Okla.) Events of August 7, 1941:

[From the Enid (Okla.) Events of August 7, 1941]

HOW TO GET UNITY

It has long been held by the intellectuals that the American public is incapable of mature reasoning. This seems to be the basis for the plaint by many in the administration that the people are not awake to the emergency; that they do not realize the sacrifices necessary if the arms program is to succeed.

Even a casual contact with the "man in the street" reveals this is a misconception. In many ways the public is ahead of the administration.

This writer has talked with persons of various ages and occupations who, like himself, are by no means convinced of the wisdom of the foreign policy. But nearly everyone believed the time had passed to oppose this policy and thought that the Nation should unite to put over the arms program and to carry through to success the project upon which the President has embarked.

To be sure, there is a drag upon the effort to involve us in hostilities now, but it is not due to Wheeler, Lindbergh, Nye, etc., nor is it the result of isolationists as such. Even

here in the center of anti-European-entanglement sentiment, this seeming apathy is caused by confusion and distrust created by the administration of national defense.

When one considers a few of the specific sources of this confusion and distrust, one wonders that the arms program is progressing at all. Indeed, were it not for the patriotism of most Americans, it would have blown up long ago. For instance, the will of the people to support national defense is offset by:

(1) Lack of a responsible director of the whole program, causing interminable delays, waste, uncertainty.

(2) The administration's own insistence on placing national defense second to socialistic reforms, as demonstrated when Mr. Ickes allowed his enmity for the Aluminum Co. of America to deprive the Nation of 60,000,000 pounds of aluminum (remember the aluminum drive?).

This was further demonstrated by the revelations, of which Elmer Peterson's in Friday's Daily Oklahoman was the most dramatic, that the Government is continuing to build competing electric lines, requiring vast quantities of defense metals, regardless of demand.

(3) Continued heavy expenditures for nondefense purposes (these electric lines, for one thing) in the face of the biggest tax bill in history and with a foolish disregard for the shadow of economic disaster looming over us.

(4) Continued pampering for partisan political reasons of Communists and racketeers in the labor movement; thereby putting the whole defense effort in danger of sabotage.

(5) The actual endangering of the lives of American soldiers because strikes and administration failures have been permitted to cut the output of weapons.

(6) Refusal to play fair with the people, as shown by the year's draft limit although it must have been known that longer time would be required. Also the subsequent political handling of the program, casting doubts on the patriotism of most of the draftees and refusing to permit the release of the minority of draftees whose families or positions require them to return home.

Let these points be cleared up—as they can be in short order—and the administration will see such unity of purpose and such cooperation as it had not believed possible.

Extension of Military Service of Selectees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN J. MACIORA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. MACIORA. Mr. Speaker, while it may seem presumptuous for me to take issue with the War Department on a matter concerning defense, I conceive it to be my duty to exercise independent judgment based upon my own analysis of the available facts.

Extended service for selectees was asked on the theory that the emergency is greater today than it was when the Selective Service Act was passed. Then Germany was fighting on a single front, England was threatened by immediate invasion and had not received any assistance from us, and our defense production program was still in the drafting-room stage. Today Germany is fighting on two fronts, there seems to be no immediate prospect of invasion of England, the United States has supplied aid which has made Great Britain stronger than she has been at any other time since the war began, and our defense effort is producing at rapidly increasing tempo. The facts reject the notion that the emergency is greater than it was 1 year ago.

Another compelling reason for adhering to the 1-year training program is the circumstance that, despite increased production, we have not sufficient equipment for the men now in uniform, to say nothing of equipping a rapidly expanding Army. The men who will soon complete 1 year of training are subject to recall for 10 years. It is my considered opinion that it is better to have a huge body of men trained in the rudiments of military technique than to have fewer men who are skilled technicians. Should the emergency approach real danger, a vast body of partly trained men can speedily be assembled and molded into a fighting force.

Far from weakening our military power, such a program would give us the advantage of an army of fullest authorized strength, plus a reserve of invaluable worth. It was the existence of a strong reserve subject to speedy mobilization, rather than a huge standing Army, that gave both Germany and Russia their tremendous manpower.

General Marshall has testified that an army of present authorized strength is sufficient to defend the Western Hemisphere. Nothing that has happened to date could justify military operations by the United States elsewhere.

Underlying it all is the fact that we should not be anxious to create a professional army, but rather to meet an existing emergency.

For these and other reasons, I voted against extending the tour of duty of selectees beyond their promised 1-year period.

Production of Necessary War Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year we have carried on a serious economic war in an effort to avoid a shooting war and in an effort to preserve democracy. Our battle of the production line has not been completely successful. Even now this country is failing to make use of tremendous economic resources and is failing to use vast industrial facilities. Hundreds of small machine shops and manufacturing plants of the great Southwest have been totally ignored in the matter of producing vital and necessary war materials. These shops have been seeking Government business almost entirely without success. To keep in the compulsory military service of this country a million of her best young men and to fail to use all of her industrial facilities in the production of war materials and supplies is not only gross inefficiency, it is almost criminal neglect.

Under priority decrees many of these machine shops will soon be forced to close down; machine tools and skilled workmen will be idle. Are these firms and individuals to be ignored simply because they are small? Is the use of these rescurces to be denied this country in the hour of her peril? These facilities should have been in full operation in the production of war supplies many months ago. Still their cry for business and their ambition to help with the defense program gets a deaf ear from the O. P. M. and the responsible agencies of this Government.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the record a memorandum just given me by a group of these small firms. Unless these facilities are immediately utilized, Congress should institute an investigation to find out why.

The Texhoma Engineering Co. was organized by leading northwest Texas manufacturers at the instigation of the Defense Contract Service, Office of Production Management, in order to group the facilities of both large and small machine shops, fabricators, sheet-metal shops, welding shops, etc., into a united manufacturing unit whose services could be put at the disposal of the Federal Government for national-defense work.

The organization has as its main object to do its part of national-defense work, but in order to accomplish this it is necessary that we be given the opportunity to bid on such work, either on prime contracts or subcontracts. There are several firms in our group who can act as prime contractors and, as a matter of fact, one of them has been awarded several prime contracts by the Ordnance Department. However, most emphatically we want the opportunity to bid on subcontracts that are now going to small shops in the industrial East and Middle West having similar equipment to that found in our small contract shops.

Secondarily, we organized because it is our understanding that unless we act collectively it is not probable that each individual firm will be given the consideration the collective group may command.

Thirdly, we organized in order to protect ourselves from labor migration and to obtain priorities for materials for the maintenance of our commercial work, so long as our services are not being used in the national-defense picture.

The active workers in this organization were drafted from their previous work for a trial period of 6 months; they were selected from among the active organizers of the group. S. T. Mendez, the managing engineer of the Texhoma Engineering Co., was formerly the vice president and general manager of the Wichita Engineering Co., one of the members of the group, and was granted a leave of absence for 6 months by that company. J. C. Boyd, Jr., secretary-treasurer for the Texhoma Engineering Co., is to devote at least one-half of his time to this work. He was drafted from his position as assistant manager of the Wichita Falls Chamber of Commerce and area coadviser, Office of Production Management. The organization is supported by its membership. The salaries of its employees are the same as those they were being paid by their former employers. In this manner the organization is a non-

profit company, organized solely for the purposes explained above.

A list of 36 members is attached hereto. We are enlisting the active collaboration and support of all interested in the industrialization of the South, in order to see that we are given the opportunity to bid on some of the things we can make.

TEXHOMA ENGINEERING CO. MEMBERSHIP, AUGUST 1, 1941

Name of company, location and classification

Abilene Machine Co., Abilene, Tex., contract shop.

Alamo Parts & Machine Works, Borger, Tex., contract shop.

Amarillo Welding & Machine Works, Amarillo, Tex., contract shop.

American Well & Prospecting Co., Corsicana, Tex., manufacturer.

M. V. Bigham & Sons, Lubbock, Tex., contract shop.

Borger Gas Engine & Machine Co., Borger, Tex., contract shop.

Bullington-Mason Co., Wichita Falls, Tex., insurance, bonds.

Clark Machine Co., Wichita Falls, Tex., manufacturer.

Dunigan Tool & Supply Co., Inc., Breckenridge, Tex., manufacturer.

Electra Machine Shop, Electra, Tex., contract shop.

General Machine & Supply Co., Wichita Falls, Tex., contract shop.

Gentry Welding & Machine Co., Lubbock, Tex., contract shop.

Gibson Machine & Tool Co., Borger, Tex., contract shop.

Graham Welding & Machine Co., Graham, Tex., contract shop.

Green Machinery Co., Plainview, Tex., manufacturer and contract shop.

Hardwicke-Etter Co., Sherman, Tex., manufacturer.

Hinton Manufacturing Co., Floydada, Tex., manufacturer.

Lubbock Steel Works, Lubbock, Tex., fabricator.

M. & V. Tank Co., Wichita Falls, Tex., fabricator.

John E. Mitchell Co., Dallas, Tex., manufacturer.

Panhandle Steel Products Co., Wichita Falls, Tex., fabricator.

Marvin Price Machine Shop, Vernon, Tex., contract shop.

Riley Machine Works, Burkburnett, Tex., contract shop.

Riverside Boiler & Welding Co., Wichita Falls, Tex., fabricator.

Star Machine & Foundry Co., Amarillo, Tex., contract shop.

Superior Manufacturing Co., Amarillo, Tex., fabricator.

Paramount Supply Co., Amarillo, Tex., supplies.

Taylor Wheel & Body Works, Wichita Falls, Tex., body builder.

Tarry Motor Freight Lines, Wichita Falls, Tex., transportation.

Texas Steel Co., Fort Worth, Tex., steel foundry and forgings.

Thompson Tool Co., Iowa Park, Tex., manufacturer.

W. M. Whitesides Machine & Metal Working Shop, Plainview, Tex., contract shop.

Wichita Engineering Co., Wichita Falls, Tex., manufacturer and contract shop.

Wichitex Machinery Co., Wichita Falls, Tex., manufacturer and contract shop.

Willborn Bros. Co., Amarillo, Tex., fabricator.

Wilson Manufacturing Co., Wichita Falls, Tex., manufacturer.

Total membership, August 1, 1941, 36.

Estimated value of machine tools represented, $5,000,000.

Estimated value of physical properties represented, $10,000,000.

Estimated number of employees represented, 2,500.

Shall We Abolish or Move the Soldiers' Home?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF JACK KYLE, NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR, REGULAR VETERANS ASSOCIATION

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, there is much discussion today concerning the location of the new War Department Building on the grounds of the United States Soldiers' Home.

For the benefit of Members of Congress I am inserting herewith a radio address delivered by Mr. Jack Kyle, national educational director, Regular Veterans Association, over radio station WINX, Washington, D. C., August 11, 1941.

Mr. Kyle in his radio address develops pertinent information concerning the United States Soldiers' Home, and speaking for the men of the Regular Army joins with many Members of Congress in opposing the desecration of this national shrine in honor of those who have served and will serve honorably in the Army of the United States.

The address of Mr. Kyle follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, we have read much of late on the proposition of doing away with the United States Soldiers' Home. Newspaper writers point out that the home grounds would be an excellent site for a new War Department and other Government buildings.

Do we want to abolish or move the Soldiers' Home? I think not.

One writer wants the space out there for new private dwellings. Let everyone know that the Soldiers' Home is private property, and that there is no law to compel one private owner to transfer his property to another individual.

The Soldiers' Home is a national shrine and deserves the same protection as the Arlington National Cemetery. It was bought and built with $154,391.23 of prize money levied on Mexico City by Gen. Winfield Scott, and it has since been maintained by the soldiers themselves—the men in active service contribute small monthly amounts toward its maintenance. At one time they had built up a fund of more than $5,000,000. Just recently the Federal Government took $2,000,000 from that fund for other purposes.

Every soldier in the active service looks forward to the day when he can come to Washington to enjoy the beauties of the city and at the same time rest in peace in his home.

In 1847 the Congress accepted General Scott's money and constituted the home. The Government thereby became the trustee of the soldiers.

We are now asked to subscribe to the principle that the Government should violate that trust. Why? Can you think of any good reason why we should abolish, or move, the home?

Nothing has been said as to the cost of converting the place to other uses. Did someone say something about waste?

One writer offers the suggestion that the home might well be moved to Virginia—whatever he means by moving. The same writer bitterly opposes a new War Department in Virginia. Can you figure that one out?

That writer also failed to give us any figures as to the cost of acquiring a site and the cost of putting up the new buildings, neither did he say who was to pay the bill.

Traffic surveys show that a large concentration of Government workers in that area would not be a solution to our traffic problems, rather congestion in residential areas would be inevitable and some rezoning to the discomfort of the present residents in adjacent areas would be necessary.

We must assume, therefore, that those who have so actively campaigned to disturb the home have not bothered to investigate or to obtain the available facts.

Perhaps you don't know it, but the National Capital Parks and Planning Commission stated just recently that the grounds of the home were not suitable for large buildings. The land is too rough.

The one thing hard for me to understand is why any civic-minded person would want to move the home out of Washington. You have a fair-sized pay roll out there you know. Perhaps the emergency has made us so prosperous that we have no need for a few hundred thousand dollars now and then.

The Soldier's Home represents one of our very early attempts at social security. In this connection, it might be well to point out that if the country had adopted a system of pay-roll deductions in 1847—as the soldiers did—we might not now have such agencies as W. P. A., P. W. A., C. W. A., and other alphabetical combinations.

Who are the men out at the home? They are the men responsible for our wealth. They are the men who fought the savage Indians; they are the men who gave their health on the frontiers; the men who chased Mexican bandits into their own badlands; they are the men who stood guard for us at salaries from $8 to $21 a month; they are the men who lived on corned beef, hardtack, and black coffee when they could get such food.

They are the men who helped to establish communications in the West; they are the men who opened that great expanse of wealth to eastern capital.

Who wants to disturb them?

In the home's cemetery lie buried heroes of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, of Indian wars, and of a hundred campaigns and expeditions; men upon whom the country has generously bestowed its highest decorations for deeds of valor and bravery.

These men, for the most part, are men who were discharged from the service for disease, or injury sustained in the line of duty; their contributions have been responsible for the home's maintenance, and they ask only that they be not disturbed.

The Regular Veterans Association does not propose to enter the controversy as to where the new War Department should be located. We believe that the Department should have a free hand in selecting its site. No one better than the War Department knows what the country is up against.

Let me also say—and I do so without fear of contradiction—that there is not a general in the Army, not an officer, that would ask the Congress to violate its contract with the old soldiers. Army officers know the history of the home. In this connection I would like to point out that every commissioned officer in General Scott's army signed a petition to the Congress asking that the home be established; their successors will carry out their wishes.

Have you visited the Soldiers' Home? If not, you should. Drive out some time; talk to the old soldiers; they are a friendly lot and will extend to you a welcome hand. Find out from them what the home means to

every one of them. Let them tell you how much they appreciate living in our Capital. They are proud to be our neighbors.

Ladies and gentlemen, I should like at this time to quote a part of General Scott's Annual Report for 1847:

"Attention is invited to the subject of an asylum for the worn-out rank and file of the Army, to be supported by the Army itself by deductions, fines, and reversions. If there is anyone who deserves to have his pathway to the tomb made smooth and pleasant, it is the old soldier who was ever ready to sacrifice his life in defense of his country."

That other Army officers of the day shared the general's views is evinced in another part of the 1847 report: "While the Army under my command," the general wrote, "lay at Pueblo a part of the summer of 1847, a humble petition to the Congress in favor of an asylum on the same plan for the benefit of enlisted men was drawn up and signed by, I believe, every commissioned officer then present."

Another great soldier—Gen. U. S. Grant—said:

"I do not hesitate to say that it would be in the public interest for the Government to see to the maintenance of the home from public moneys; the men got but little pay while making the country safe for future generations; we might well show greater appreciation."

I hope, ladies and gentlemen, that the Congress will settle this question now, once and forever.

In closing, may I offer a word of advice to local newspapermen interested in the improvement of the city. The Soldiers' Home is not a problem—it has never been. Let them write about traffic control, slum clearance, transportation, rent control, the cost of living, and other major problems confronting our citizens. Why, they might even solve the parking problem.

In leaving you may I make a prediction? When the present emergency is over, those of us fortunate enough to remain in Washington, will hear nothing of the present crop of volunteer building experts. That Soldiers' Home pay roll will be a most welcome contribution to the community economy. We'll have plenty of floor space, too.

To the management of Station WINX we are grateful for this opportunity to present the case of the old soldier and I trust that these remarks may help somewhat to clear up a confused situation.

We Cannot Take Chances With Our Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, our vote on the resolution providing for extension of the term of service for the men in the Army may prove to be the turning point that will decide whether the United States will continue as a democracy, with its freedom and liberty, or become subject to the dictates, and the so-called new order of Hitler and his Axis partners.

We are faced with a grave responsibility. Either we must amend our laws so as to enable our country to have an Army that, due to its size and fitness to fight, will preclude attack by any enemy, or permit that Army to be disintegrated and half wiped out by the return of the men to their homes, thereby leaving the country improperly protected, and thus inviting the enemy to strike at us during the time that we would need to rebuild our armed forces.

The President, on May 27 last, declared an unlimited emergency. Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, has informed both the Senate and House Committees on Military Affairs that the national interest of the United States is imperiled and that the circumstances require that the men now in the Army be retained for a period in excess of 12 months.

I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that our decision as to whether or not this bill should pass must be predicated on the question of whether the national interest is imperiled.

I cannot, in conscience, answer the question in any other way than in the affirmative. Certainly our national interest is imperiled. It has been ever since the outbreak of the war in Europe and is, day by day, increasingly more imperiled as the war situation develops and the Axis Powers get nearer to us each time they conquer another country.

Right now, while this bill is under consideration, word comes to us that France has agreed to full collaboration with Germany; that Marshal Petain has entrusted full dictatorial powers in his immediate subordinate, Admiral Darlan.

The declaration of an unlimited emergency by the President affects everything but the military forces. It affects industry, capital, and labor. It affects the country generally. It is evident, therefore, that if we are in an unlimited emergency we must do everything possible to prepare our armed forces to face any situation that may arise. Unless we do so we may find ourselves in the same position in which some 13 other countries now find themselves.

There is evidence on every hand that Hitler is marching on. Italy and Japan are doing his bidding. Vichy, or unoccupied France, as it is referred to now, is under Hitler's lash.

Spain and Portugal, as well as north Africa, are within the realm of Hitler control. German agents, to the tune of some 2,000,000, are already in South America. Japan has already taken over control of Indochina, controls a part of China, threatens to take over Thailand, and is preparing to attack Siberia. In addition, it is the announced purpose of the Japanese Government to rule all of Asia, a large part of the Pacific Ocean, including that in which are United States possessions, as well as portions of British and Dutch possessions. The plan includes the entire southern Pacific down to and including the southernmost tip of Africa, so that she may control the shipping lanes and cut off our supplies of rubber, tin, iron and quinine, and other necessary supplies from the Netherlands East Indies. The plan also envisions occupation of Siberia, so that a real threat to our possessions in Alaska can be made.

This Japan is being prodded by Germany to do, so as to harass us and compel our fleet to devote more of its strength in the Pacific, thereby weakening our Atlantic defense and hampering the delivery of war materials to Britain.

Think what that would mean to us. We would be threatened on the Atlantic side by Germany and the groups she now controls and on the west by Japan's Navy, which is not to be ignored. We also would have to contend with that group of Hitler agents now in South America, the group that fomented the recent uprising in Bolivia and caused the renewed flare-up of border trouble between Peru and Ecuador.

Mr. Speaker, the American people do not want war. We want to do everything possible to prevent our becoming engaged in this war, and we want to keep war away from us. How can we do it? How can we assure ourselves against attack?

To my mind, the best approach to the goal we seek is to face the facts. If we do that, then we have but one choice. We must have a defense that will defy any enemy to attack us directly or indirectly. In order to have that defense, and have it ready for any emergency, we must not permit our Army to be half demobilized for even a day. It must remain intact.

General Marshall tells us, as we have already been told by the Secretary of State, and also by the President himself, that there are no plans nor desires on the part of the administration to prepare an American expeditionary force. Surely anyone who is at all familiar with military operations realizes that an army of 1,750,000, as requested by the War Department, would not be sufficient if an expeditionary force were in contemplation. That number of men is required for the defense of this country—to man the many bases that we have established to guard our shores, to garrison our American outposts, and to have a field army here in the continental United States. That number is necessary, our military experts tell us, to defend properly our country.

The United States is on Hitler's list. How soon or how he will strike at us depends upon his conquest of the other nations who appear on his list ahead of us.

Consider these facts:

Hitler in less than 4 years has taken over or conquered 13 countries. Here is his record since 1938: Austria, with 7,000,000 population; Czechoslovakia, with 10,000,000; Poland, with, say, 20,000,000—now he has it all, but I refer to his share on the partition in September 1939; Norway, with 3,000,000; Denmark, with 4,000,000; Holland, with 8,000,000; Belgium, with 8,000,000; France with 42,000,000; Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, with 35,000,000 together; Yugoslavia and Greece, with 22,000,000 together—thus dominating and enslaving 159,000,000 people, partly by coercion and partly by military conquest. Adding the 70,000,000 in the old Germany, he now has under control about 230,000,000. Adding Italy with 44,000,000 population, the total is 274,000,000; and if he conquers Russia, even up to the Urals, he will have under him about 100,000,000 more, or a total of some 375,000,000 people.

Besides the countries mentioned there remain in Europe: Sweden, with 6,000,000; Finland, with 4,000,000; Switzerland, with 4,000,000; Spain, with 25,000,000; and Portugal, with 6,000,000; making about 45,000,000 more.

So, if, as General Marshall said, we must contemplate the possible overrunning by Hitler of Spain and Portugal, and remember that Sweden and Switzerland are at his mercy. We see that Hitler now has virtually all Europe in bondage. If he continues his schedule in Russia, he will have the complete domination of more than 500,000,000 people. Nothing like that has happened either in the modern or ancient world, nothing even approaching it. That is what we are facing.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that we shall not be compelled to fight. That the war will end without the necessity of a clash of our manpower with that of the enemy. That is my hope, but no one can guarantee that it will be realized. We must, therefore, be prepared to resist any attempt that may be made to attack us.

My country is very dear to me. I appreciate what it has done for me and for my friends and neighbors. Yes; for every citizen of this country. For that reason I do not want to take any chances.

I would much rather be wrong in keeping our boys under arms and not need them than to release them now and find out later that by so doing I had placed my country at the mercy of Hitler and his partners, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I cast my vote in favor of the passage of this bill.

Report on Defense Highway Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the House Roads Committee met again Wednesday, August 13, and discussed at length the situation regarding legislation to provide for the construction and improvement of highways important to national defense.

Col. A. R. Wilson, of the War Department General Staff, and Commissioner Thomas H. MacDonald, of the Public Roads Administration, were present.

An earnest effort is being made to work out a new bill that will permit a reasonable rate of progress toward meeting the urgent needs for improved highway facilities, in the vicinity of centers of defense activity and on routes of strategic military importance throughout the Nation, for consideration after the recess of the House.

We do not want to go off half-cocked or add to the confusion by introducing a new bill now. It would be impossible to get any action by the House before the latter part of next month anyway, and by that time there may be important new developments in the situation.

A majority of the members of the committee still feel that it would be difficult to improve on the bill which was passed and vetoed. They feel that the accusations of "pork barrel" made about any part of the bill were very unfair and showed an utter lack of knowledge of the urgent and critical highway needs of the Nation, viewed solely from a national-defense standpoint.

Mandatory Joint Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

LETTER FROM AMERIGO BOZZANI

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, seldom have I seen a more forceful and complete argument for mandatory joint income-tax returns than the following letter, coming, significantly enough, from one of the leading citizens of southern California:

ITALIAN-AMERICAN
DEMOCRATIC HEADQUARTERS,
Los Angeles, August 2, 1941.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VOORHIS: Giving our full approval to the logical measure of requiring husband and wife to file joint income-tax returns, we are convinced to express the wide popular sentiments of the immense majority of the citizens of the United States, being a well-known fact that only the very infinitesimal percentage of their families enjoy the favored opportunity of a yearly income above $4,000.

We feel confident that you will realize that, similar to other cases, the propaganda against this new measure is spread by the reactionary press, the chambers of commerce, the big corporation lawyers, and the multiple women's organizations representing the wealthy classes who always try to influence the legislators with their "Calamity Jane" predictions of families disrupted, of women considered as chattels, encouraging divorces, etc., etc.; as if conjugal unions or family ties were existing only for monetary conveniences disregarding any spiritual and moral conception which are the principal objects of matrimony.

It seems unconceivable that the well-to-do families, or prosperous married couples occupying two lucrative positions, and depriving small-income groups of much-needed modest work, should be so selfish and egotistical as to object to the payment of taxes according to their large earnings.

Acknowledging with the utmost gratification that your committee has shown it cannot be swayed by the small band of professional lobbyists and propagandists, we will welcome the day when the new measure will become a law, a just law based on the real democratic spirit of the Republic.

Your vote in favor will be sympathetically remembered by your constituents at the next polls when they will have the opportunity of reaffirming their confidence in you for the valid support you are giving to progressive legislation.

With the assurance of our loyal support, we remain

Yours very truly,
ITALIAN-AMERICAN
DEMOCRATIC HEADQUARTERS,
By AMERIGO BOZZANI, *Chairman.*

Feeding of Excess Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, the recent action in the Senate which would allow the feeding of excess wheat is naturally causing considerable concern in the Corn Belt. The conference report in limiting this provision to 1 year is, of course, some improvement.

Everyone is anxious to do everything possible to relieve the situation among the wheat growers. However, it should be kept in mind that the law relating to marketing quotas has been on the statute books for some time. In fact, when the referendum was held, the increased loan which carried with it the increased penalty was already in effect. In spite of that fact the wheat growers approved by a very large majority the application of a marketing quota. The noncooperators now find that they have on hand a quantity of wheat upon which a 49-cent penalty will be assessed if it is used. Of course, nothing in the law prevents the storing of the wheat, and the sale or feeding of it in a subsequent year if done in accordance with the provisions of the law.

The situation now existing is exactly what the law has always contemplated. The whole purpose of the farm program is to maintain prices at parity. In order to accomplish this purpose farmers are asked to keep their acreage within certain limits. The law has also another objective and that is to conserve the fertility of the soil for future generations. The main objective—the maintenance of a fair price—works to the benefit of every farmer, whether or not he be a cooperator. The cooperator pays for this benefit in reducing his acreage and in otherwise conforming to the program. To that he makes no objection, but why should the farmer who conforms be required to carry the obligation also of the wheat grower who does not conform? This wheat grower, after planting as many acres as he wishes and getting also the benefit of the better price, is given by this bill the right to feed his excess or illegal wheat. That this will displace a certain amount of wheat and corn grown by the farmer who is in the program is obvious.

I have always felt the necessity for unity among all the agricultural interests

in the country. Only in this way will farmers be able to secure a fair deal in this country, in which all the farmers are in the minority. Therefore we should be careful to stir up no unnecessary quarrels between the various agricultural sections of the Nation. The growers of corn, of wheat, and of cotton have more interests in common than they have in opposition. However, it is only fair to call attention to the fact that Iowa, for example, while admirably adapted to the growing of corn, is not so fortunate in the growing of cotton and of wheat. Our farmers very generally comply with the farm program. But if the noncooperating wheat farmer is to be allowed to accept the benefits of the wheat program and put the burdens on the cooperator, it is liable to reduce the participation in future programs of the Corn Belt.

Defense Maze Baffles Seekers of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

ARTICLE BY MARCIA WINN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Marcia Winn from the Washington Times-Herald of today:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 13, 1941]

DEFENSE MAZE BAFFLES SEEKERS OF INFORMATION—VISITORS FIND THEY CAN DO BETTER BY WRITING FROM HOME

(By Marcia Winn)

When the city of Washington originally was planned, one could stand on Capitol Hill and look down the broad vista of Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House. Now, by an irony that has become timely, that vista ends in the Treasury Building.

This fits in well with the theory of government expressed some time ago by Henry F. Ashurst, former Democratic Senator from Arizona. To get an appropriation bill passed, he advised his confederates, "Just add a nought. If you don't nobody pays any attention to it."

The add-a-nought school of Congress now goes merrily along its unimpeded way. With twenty-seven billions in defense contracts already let, the Capitol still foams with lobbyists, contractors, and visiting chambers of commerce, who hang their hats on the lowest pegs at home so they can reach up, clap them on, and hurry back to Washington to nail down a defense plant.

HOME-TOWN LOBBYISTS

Congressmen are besieged by home-town lobbyists who thought, until they reached Washington, that Congressmen were omnipotent. One harassed Democratic Congressman said he spoke for all with, "Wouldn't it be wonderful to be back in the days when all the party in power had to dispense was postmasterships?"

The defense muddle is a vertiginious one. It centers in the new Social Security Building, where the O. P. M. holds forth. The lobby of this building is of green marble. It contains shining escalators. It also has a large but neat sign, "O. P. M. Bureau of Information—Room 5525."

The reception room to room 5525 is full of assistant dispensers of information. An enormous banner, "Time Is Short," the official O. P. M. work slogan, hangs on one wall, just as it ornaments many portals in the building. "Keep 'Em Rolling," another slogan, hangs on another wall. The 18 new insignia for civilian defense buttons, geometrically red, white, and blue, hang on another.

A businessman came in then to ask where he could find some new agency.

"Um," said the giver of information, a girl, "I think that was Nelson Rockefeller's outfit."

NAME CHANGING

"Do you know where it is now?" he asked her.

"No"; she answered blandly. "They've just changed the name."

She then began to discuss the civilian defense insignia with another questioner. A committee of women had been set up to decide on uniforms, she said. "Who is on the committee?" "Well, Mrs. Roosevelt, and"—

Here she reached for the telephone to ask somebody else. That person didn't know. She asked another. Neither did he. She hailed a passer-by. He suggested she send for the minutes of the meeting, but added he thought Daisy Harriman (former Minister to Norway) and Anna Rosenberg (regional director of the Social Security Board for New York) also were on it. She sent for the minutes and riffled through them.

"I can't find it," she said at last. "But I know Mrs. Roosevelt is one of them. It's in here somewhere, but I haven't time to look."

A neat young man in a gray suit then came in with his brief case. He approached in humility.

"I'd like an organization chart."

"We haven't any," she said. "Where did you see one?"

"I've seen them all over the United States," he told her promptly.

"Oh, but they've all been changed," she assured him. "Everybody has different jobs. So they are going to get out a new chart."

"Isn't it revised yet?" the first man asked her.

"No."

"Well, can you mail me one?"

She could, in time, and would. She took his name and address. He was a brass and iron foundry man from Montana. "What do you want it for?" she concluded conversationally.

"So I'll know whom to write a letter to," he told her glumly. "I haven't been able to find anyone around here."

Endorses Demands of America First Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENTS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the Van Doren family of Clarksville, Ohio:

MAPLE FARM,
Clarksville, Ohio, August 11, 1941.

Representative CLARENCE BROWN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are glad to relate that the America First Committee are taking somewhat the same proceedings as our ancestors in 1700, when King William III would not listen to the people complaining about the Governor's intolerance. So today Franklin D. Roosevelt is pursuing same procedure as King William III of England; and therefore as members of the America First Committee, but having no other Van Dorens in our immediate family, we are writing you asking that you read this letter in the session of House of Representatives of the United States of America, and that we, with all other members of the America First Committee, demand no war, no A. E. F., no totalitarianism for America; also demand a national advisory referendum, a chance for the people to be heard before Congress decides the question of war or peace. Further, on behalf of my brothers and myself, we do not think it would be out of place to start impeachment proceedings against F. D. Roosevelt, the would-be dictator of the United States of America.

Yours for America first,
W. M. VAN DOREN,
ZENAS G. VAN DOREN,
ROSALIE L. VAN DOREN,
Daughters American Revolution.

Resolution of Ottowa County (Okla.) Unit of American Indian Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

LETTER AND RESOLUTION FROM OKLAHOMA CITIZENS

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and accompanying resolution:

MIAMI, OKLA., *July 8, 1941.*

Hon. WESLEY E. DISNEY,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN DISNEY: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted at a meeting of our unit in Miami, July 7.

Of course, the purchase of defense bonds will not be greatly augmented directly through our activity. We will, however, cause our membership to give thought to the grave problem now confronting our country and fit them for events to come of a really serious nature, if we are forced to enter actively into the European conflict as a matter of self-preservation of our way of life.

Some criticism has crept into hearings before Congress, in the past, touching the Americanism of the membership of this organization. We have been accused by Government officials, high in office, as being identified with the German-American Bund. Would it be asking too much of you to make the enclosed resolution a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? We are not seeking a controversy.

We merely wish to appear before the Congress and the public in our true light:

Loyal Americans, ready and willing, if need be, to sacrifice both life and property in the cause of our country.

Thanking you in advance, I am,

Sincerely yours,

L. R. WALKER,
President, Ottawa County Unit,
American Indian Federation.

Be it resolved by the Ottawa County Unit of the American Indian Federation, in special convened session in the city of Miami, Okla., this 30th day of July 1941, That—

Whereas our Nation is struggling against grave difficulties from within and abroad, constantly faced with increased financial commitments in its efforts to maintain national security and defend against those who seek its destruction; and

Whereas these are times when we each and all should sacrifice in the interest of all, to the end that liberty and the American way of life may endure: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, members of the Ottawa County Unit of the American Indian Federation, here and now pledge and agree to advance or take part in no program providing for new commitments or expenditures on the part of the Government at this time growing out of Indian claims. We should extend helping hands instead of hands to be helped; be it further

Resolved, That we decree and commit to the purchase of national defense bonds one-half of this unit's share of 1941 federation dues; also, that national dues paid into the Ottawa County unit treasury be retained therein and released to the national treasurer upon condition that 50 percent thereof be invested in national defense bonds. The credit of our Nation is the backbone of its defense; it is the duty of every citizen to sustain the Government: its credit must be kept strong. We urge upon every member of this unit the immediate payment of 1941 dues.

Unanimously adopted.

L. R. WALKER,
President, Ottawa County Unit,
American Indian Federation.

Attest:

C. K. CHANDLER,
Acting Secretary.

Sacrifice—the Watchword

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

On House Joint Resolution 222, declaring a national emergency, extending terms of enlistments, appointments, and commissions in the Army of the United States, suspending certain restrictions upon the employment of retired personnel of the Army, making further provision for restoration of civil positions to members of the Army on relief from military service, and for other purposes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, as we listen to the debate upon this issue of such grave importance to the life, liberty, and happiness of millions of the Nation's most splendid young men, we can, I am sure, be pardoned if sometimes we wonder if some appreciate the gravity of the situation and the seriousness of the hour. As one member of this body who is fully cognizant of his own shortcomings and who does not arrogate unto himself all of the virtues of patriotism and courage, I have willfully refrained from giving voice to some of the thoughts which well within me and which now motivate me to make my humble contribution to the debate. This is an issue of utmost importance. The issue of whether these young men shall be compelled by their sovereign Government—through the agency of the Congress—to further undergo the trials and the hardships of a strenuous career of preparation to defend their country, or be permitted to return to the peaceful pursuits of life and the bosoms of their families, is no easy one to decide. It is a question which must be decided without sentiment on the one hand and beyond the pale of political expediency on the other. It must be decided upon the question of what is to the best interest of the country, however much we would prefer to grant the wishes—and no doubt in many instances the prayers—of the mothers and fathers of these young men. We must be oblivious to everything but the future welfare of our common country.

As one who has briefly experienced the tribulation of an enlisted soldier, and as the father of one, and possibly two, splendid sons who may be called upon to render such service to their country, I approach the subject of the continuation of this service by the youth of our land with no illusions but with a full realization of what such sacrifice means.

If I were possessed of the powers of a seer or, more practically, were conversant with all of the facts concerning world affairs and imbued with a full knowledge of what the future holds in store for us, naturally I would, under such fortuitous circumstances, be the better qualified to act more intelligently. But, unfortunately, like most Americans, I know not what the future may bring. I can only be guided by the wisdom of the past. Who is there in this body who can successfully deny that Mr. Hitler is motivated by the same arrogant ambitions which controlled the actions of Alexander the Great, Napoleon, and Kaiser Wilhelm in their quest of world domination? Who is there here today who can rise from his seat and tell us with positive assurance that Japan is not now on the verge of jumping off for further conquests in the Western Hemisphere? Who can gainsay that within another 6 months—aye, even within 30 days—the United States, even as unprepared as she is, may not defensively be engaged in all of the terror and sacrifice of a bloody, shooting war? Is it not a fact that all of the implications of the present situation point to an affirmative answer to these questions? Under all of the circumstances, can you and I as civilians, with the terrible responsibility which rests upon us as the final arbiters of this question, afford to gratify our own wishful thinking by permitting these partially trained young men to scatter to the four corners of the Nation? Can we afford to take that responsibility in view of the advice and positive admonition of the Commander in Chief of the Army, his Chief of Staff, the Department of State, and the experts who are more conversant with the facts and whose primary duty it is to see to it that the heritage of our forefathers—the American way of life—is defended and not further imperiled?

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who has not approved in full, nor been thoroughly in accord with, all of the phases of our foreign policy. I have from the floor of the House when that policy was being formulated taken occasion to differ with it in some respects. I have thought that we have talked too much; that possibly we were sticking our collective neck out too far. But the question of whether we should defend the Monroe Doctrine, whether we should keep inviolate from aggression the Western Hemisphere, and whether we should adopt the lease-lend policy toward England are no longer issues for debate. Whether our foreign policy has been right or wrong, the fact remains that it is our policy, and for the welfare and preservation of this cherished heritage of our forefathers—the American Republic—we must face the issue as it is today. The challenge to America today is, Shall we permit this, possibly the last stronghold of democracy, to perish from the earth? It makes no difference that you and I would prefer to pursue the even tenor of our ways. Apparently it is no longer for us to determine what our course shall be; that has been determined by the mad man of Europe. That challenge is made to the young men of the Army whose immediate future we debate here today. That challenge must be successfully met by them lest this young Republic, the greatest embodiment of free government ever established by man, shall perish from the earth. Today that freedom is threatened; tomorrow it may be assailed; the day after tomorrow it may, like the governments of helpless Poland, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, France, and Greece, fall prey to the ambition of this man Hitler. I cannot but believe that these splendid young men, through whose veins courses the blood of the patriots of Bunker Hill and Valley Forge, Charlottesville, and Gettysburg, Belleau Wood and the Argonne Forest, are willing and eager to accept the challenge and as courageously meet the needs of the hour as did their illustrious forefathers.

But, Mr. Speaker, I also believe that these young men would approach their tasks and meet their sacrifices with lighter hearts and graver appreciation of the dangers of the hour if they had reason for a fuller realization that all other American citizens were just as courageously and patriotically ready to carry on in their contributions to the Nation's defense. These splendid specimens of young manhood are just as patriotic in their zeal to protect the Nation from impending disaster as any other class of citizens. But who is there on this floor or elsewhere who will deny that these boys have the same right to expect all other classes of American citizens to make equal sacrifices in the country's defense? What must be the reaction of

a young man who gives up a splendid position in civil life, carrying with it a handsome salary, to serve his country at $21 a month, enduring all of the hardships of weather, physical and mental strain, and other discomforts, in order that he might prepare himself in the art of war to bare his breast if need be in defense of his country, when he reads in the daily press of the shameful spectacle of industry and labor profiteering on his sacrifice?

Mr. Speaker, the situation is serious; the hour is grave. Franklin Roosevelt today could with propriety repeat what Woodrow Wilson, the great wartime President of yesterday, said: "We know not what a day may bring forth." The time has come for a full realization of the American people of the gravity of the hour. The time has come for sacrifice. The time has come for all Americans—young men who must fight the country's battles; industrialists who must prepare the sinews of war; and laborers who must build the guns, planes, and boats—to throw off their lethargy and indifference and awaken to the full realization of the fact that if we, too, would not become the victims of Hitlerism like the other democracies of the world we must as a united people make "sacrifice" the watchword of the future. Profiteering in industry and strikes in defense construction during a national emergency should no more be tolerated than desertion in the Army.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported the foreign policy of this administration. I have voted for the expenditure of billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money with which to build up this national defense and with which to combat Hitlerism. I voted for the original Draft Act because I thought it was the democratic and equitable way to secure an army. I shall vote for this legislation not because I want to but because I refuse to take the responsibility for the tragedy that might occur should I do otherwise. As one who for years earned his keep by the sweat of his brow, I have voted for all legislation aimed at the betterment of the laboring man since I have been a Member of this House. I am ready to compare my labor record with that of any Member of the Congress. I have always been fair and just in my legislative attitude toward capital. But I must confess that within the last few months, when I have beheld the sorry spectacle of capital profiteering in the ventures growing out of the threat to this country and have witnessed the unconscionable, and in many instances communistic, labor leaders bringing about a cessation of work on defense projects vital to the country's defense, I have been astonished and dismayed. This condition cannot prevail. An outraged public opinion will not much longer tolerate it. Mr. Speaker, I belong to that school of thought headed by the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the illustrious President Roosevelt, who believes that the future of the country is imperiled and the necessity for preparation for the coming events is essential. But I disagree with that school which advocates that we can prepare for the critical hour by pursuing the even tenor of our way, with "business as usual" as a slogan, without disturbing our normal and peaceful pursuits of life, and without injury to some of the social reforms that have been gained. If the history of this war so far has demonstrated any one thing, it has demonstrated the fact that those nations which subscribe to that doctrine have fallen by the wayside and their peoples today are the slaves of Hitler.

Mr. Speaker, the Almighty God above, who is familiar with our every thought, knows that I harbor no desire for the entry of this country into this great world holocaust of war. On the contrary, if my foreign policy were summed up in a phrase it would be to prepare for such an eventuality and pray that it would never come. When the lease-lend bill was under consideration, it will be recalled that it was I who offered the amendment, which was finally adopted in a modified form, which would prevent these war materials destined for England from being carried in American ships. It was my thought then, and I think time will justify that thought, that such entry of our ships into the combat zones would result in their sinking by Germany and the involvement of this country in war. For more than a year I have advocated that hand in hand with our defense program should go our diplomatic efforts to keep this country out of war, at least until we were prepared to become involved in such a war. We were not prepared then, we are not prepared today, and unless the American people realize the full gravity of the situation and make the necessary sacrifices, we cannot be prepared for another 2 to 5 years.

While we in this country and France, in continental Europe, for the past decade were following the pursuit of building up a Utopian theory of the more abundant life, Mr. Hitler was turning the whole economy of the German people about the construction of a gigantic war machine. It makes no difference that you and I do not approve of either the machine or the means used to construct it. The fact remains that that machine has proved so successful that no nation or people have been able to stop it other than temporarily. The fact also remains that that machine is the marvel of military history. There is but one answer to that machine and the egotistical mania of the man Hitler in his desire to dominate the world. That is to build a machine that is superior to the German machine and to build that machine while we still have time to build it. The best assurances we can have that we will not need such a machine is to build it. But I repeat that if such a machine is to be built it must be built upon sacrifice. We cannot build it without the sacrifices which we call upon these young Americans to make by breaking their home ties for the hardships of intensive military training. We cannot insure the stability and future of this country and the American way of life with profiteering and strikes in vital defense industries. France tried that and the cemetery of nations is marked with the monument of France and the other nations who tried to combat the German military machine without such sacrifice. America must awaken and America must sacrifice if our people are not to be added to the list of Hitler's slaves.

Inside America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

ARTICLE FROM CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which recently appeared in the Christian Science Monitor. In this article Mr. Strout gives a true and interesting picture of something great that is happening in this country in the progress of our defense program:

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

FROM TOURNAPULLS TO "PLEASE" NOTICES, THE STORY OF THE GREAT POWER PROJECTS AND THEIR PART IN EMERGENCY IS AN INSPIRING ONE, AND THE OBSERVER FINDS MUCH UPON WHICH TO RUMINATE

INSIDE AMERICA

(Fourth of 30 articles)

(By Richard L. Strout, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

CHEROKEE DAM, TENN.—Every so often I discover what I would do if I had a million dollars. Here where the T. V. A. is building its big new Cherokee Dam, lickety-split, night and day—to pile up water, to make electricity, to make aluminum, to make airplanes, to aid national defense—I would drive a Tournapull. I would drive a Tournapull for the rest of my days.

You don't know what a Tournapull is? Well, I have watched one fascinated all day, and I don't believe I can describe it very well, at that. It is an immense earth-moving machine, a digger and tractor all in one, that lollops like a mad elephant all over the landscape on the biggest rubber tires I have ever seen, and first scoops up the red clay inside it with its hind end, and then hauls it with the Diesel motor in its forward end to where it should be dumped, and then dumps it. But that only begins to start describing it, and it only begins to tell the latest chapter in the inspiring defense story of T. V. A.

MADE IN PEORIA

This Tournapull thing is made at Peoria, Ill., by R. G. Le Tourneau, who is reputed to give 51 percent of all his company's earnings to the church. He is a deeply religious man and one of those authentic American individualists, like Henry Ford, who make the United States the most extraordinary and fascinating nation on earth. He travels by airplane, leads revival meetings, and makes Tournapulls. But this story is about the machine, and not the man.

The machine is a long, hump-backed affair, like a grasshopper, with a sort of dustpan bottom in the rear that lowers down and sim-

ply ploughs the earth up inside itself, usually with a supplementary tractor pumping behind. Its peculiar feature, which gives it its uncouth and unspeakably awkward gait, is that the engine is mounted in front on a see-saw arrangement over two enormous wheels, said to cost $2,900 apiece, projecting out into nowhere, like a horse's head, sometimes up in the air when it is gallumphing along with no balancing load in back, sometimes with its nose down, when it is rolling downhill with enough earth inside it to fill the living room of a New York apartment.

* * * * *

RECORD SPEED

With machines like this, not to mention elevating graders with trucks, the earth fill is going up at this power dam in record time. The dam was authorized by Congress July 31, 1940, work started next day, and it may be finished by December, or earlier, if these operators have their way.

The story of T. V. A., which is the most comprehensive laboratory of social and economic experiment in America, has been told many times, but there is a new phase in this defense emergency. You see it in the guards mounted at the seven dams already built and the four buildings. You see it in the rope that prevents you from tossing a bomb down on the little cement powerhouse many feet below on the grayish-white dam.

They take a lot of precautions here, as Public Safety Chief Thomas A. McKenzie explained to me. I asked him if there was any radicalism, and he said, "No," and added, sorrowfully, that that was one of his problems. "What?" I said. "Yes," said he, "the mountaineer workers, with their intense patriotism, wouldn't understand this radical double talk, which might be all right in New York, and might do something foolish to anybody uttering it." Fortunate Chief McKenzie, whose worry is what the Tennessee laboring man will do to the troublemakers rather than the other way round. It should be added that the T. V. A. workers are mostly trade unionists, and have a unique and apparently equitable bargaining arrangement with the Government.

This business of rushing more power for aluminum is inspiring from one aspect, and a sad and sorry story from another. It is another case of "too little and too late." It ties in with the whole vast T. V. A. experiment. Perhaps, under the circumstances, nothing else could have been expected. The T. V. A. authorities who warned Congress repeatedly from 1935 on that a power shortage would occur in a defense emergency are the ones now who are trying to make up the gap which Congress until the last minute declined to fill.

"INTERLUDE"

I suppose the changed public attitude toward T. V. A., and public ownership, tells better than any other one thing the difference between 1918 and 1941, the amazing 23 years which make up a neat little time capsule that every future historian of the United States is going to ticket with a chapter entitled, "Interlude." Muscle Shoals was intended to make nitrates for World War I but wasn't finished in time, and the cry went up to turn it over to private operation. Public operation, it was urged, would be "degeneration." Henry Ford offered to take the white elephant off the Government's hands in a 100-year lease. Calvin Coolidge wanted to sell it to the highest bidder. That was the official attitude 13 short years ago. Mr. Coolidge vetoed the first T. V. A. bill in 1928, Mr. Hoover vetoed the second T. V. A. bill in 1931; Mr. Roosevelt established T. V. A. in 1933. That was only 8 years back and yet it is doubtful if you could get 10 votes in Congress today to revoke the act and undo what Morison and Commager in their Growth of the American Republic call a candid acceptance of socialism in the realm of public utilities and a commitment to the experiment of a planned economy.

So time flies. It flies fastest of all in national emergencies.

In 1935 David E. Lilienthal appeared before the House Military Affairs Committee and urged that T. V. A. extension was imperatively needed for national defense. On February 29, 1940, he told a business audience in New York that a power shortage threatened in the defense picture. The speaker immediately following him, subsequently high in defense matters pertaining to power, insisted that the power supply would be adequate. It is the same sorry story that Washington has heard again and again. The country was assured there would be plenty of steel, plenty of power, plenty of aluminum. And today Boy Scouts go from house to house collecting pots and pans.

Until the emergency, the Aluminum Co. of America had a monopoly of aluminum production. At its Alcoa plant it had a contract with T. V. A. for 30,000 kilowatts of power, and at its own plants on the Little Tennessee, it could produce 70,000 kilowatts more, or 100,000 kilowatts all told. And yet it needed on an all-year basis 250,000 kilowatts to operate. What the company did, in order to get the cheapest possible rate, was to buy T. V. A. surplus power instead of making an advance contract for it. In ordinary times, if power were scarce it would simply shut down, until surplus power reappeared. With a tight grip on aluminum production, and aluminum selling at 27 cents a pound, it was able to operate this plant on a hand-to-mouth basis.

Richard Reynolds, head of the Reynolds Metals Co., principal fabricator of aluminum parts in the Nation, testified before the Truman Senate committee that in May 1940, he went to the chairman and directors of Alcoa, and voiced his alarm over the prospective aluminum shortage. Alcoa officials poohpoohed the idea. The facts seem to speak for themselves. It is hard not to feel that Alcoa was caught napping by the emergency.

But let us turn to a happier subject. Let us chronicle the intensely human story of how salesmen, whose every instinct is to get customers to use more electricity, are now patriotically urging them to buy less. In fact, let us deal with the unfortunate predicament of Wells M. Stanley.

For 13 years Wells M. Stanley has devoted every waking minute to furthering the sale of electricity by the Alabama Power Co. He is vice president in charge of sales. He has got up early and gone to bed late and all the time he has been thinking, "Wells M. Stanley, how can I sell some more electricity today?" He has seen electricity grow cheap in the mountain area. He and his salesmen, and the salesmen of other private utilities, as well as of T. V. A., rode and often walked miles to tell some farmer who was willing to spend $100 for lightning rods on his barn that electricity could be used also in the home. He and his sales force have personally toted out electric ranges to prove that you cook with the funny stuff in wires, and followed it up with refrigerators to show to doubting Thomases that the same stuff that will heat things up will cool them down.

And now, see what has happened. The world is upside down. Wells M. Stanley and all the other patriotic salesmen, private and public alike, have gone gratingly into reverse. Instead of staying up to midnight figuring how to get people to buy more electricity, they are planning how to cut sales down. They want the extra power to go into aluminum. You won't believe it unless you see it. Whole towns in this neighborhood are blacked out at night. Store windows are dark. I have a red-white-and-blue card in front of me as I write this, that is in every hotel bedroom, saying "please" and urging me to cut down on electric current.

Well, that's the present story of T. V. A.—From Tournapulls to "Please" notices. T. V. A. is supplying Alcoa with two to three times the power it contracted for, and rushing new dams; and private utilities are cooperating in every way. Of one thing you may be sure; this aluminum plant is going to be kept going if every home in the patriotic Southeast has to go back to candles.

If He Could Reach the Ostrich Minds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WILMINGTON (DEL.) STAR

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilmington (Del.) Star of August 10, 1941:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Star of August 10, 1941]

IF HE COULD REACH THE OSTRICH MINDS

It is hardly likely that so sane and moderate, and yet so enlightening, an address as that made by Admiral W. H. P. Blandy at Carney's Point on Tuesday could open the eyes of the isolationist ostriches typified by Senator WHEELER, yet one wishes WHEELER and his like might read it, or better still, might have heard it.

The occasion for the address was the presentation of the Bureau of Ordnance flag and the Navy E pennant to the Carney's Point works of the Du Pont Co. for what Secretary of the Navy Knox called "a miracle of industrial production."

The parts of Admiral Blandy's address which seemed to us particularly impressive were the following:

"The basic reasons for our being in this race against time find their origin in the popular will of our people over a period dating from the first World War up to about a year ago. The popular reaction against further participation in any kind of war was widespread and deeply rooted. It is still so in relation to our accepting war as a policy for aggressive purposes. But since the more rapid expansion of the present European conflict we have been entirely willing to face realistically the matter of our own defense. And as we have turned our attention to this task the country as a whole has learned what military and naval men have always known, that the really effective weapons of defense are also the instrumentalities for wars of aggression. This is because the only true defense in war is to wage offensive warfare against the enemy.

"But, due to our revulsion of feeling against war and to our belief that war would never again come near us if we didn't go near it, we placed too much faith in treaties and not enough in ships and planes, guns and powder and shell, bombs and torpedoes. A small but determined group of men in high public places even believed that making and possessing munitions of war, or even the facilities to manufacture them, would cause wars, no matter which nation it was that was so engaged. Private companies undertaking such work were scourged and reviled by these men and branded as "merchants of death." I

suppose most of these zealots were well-meaning citizens, sane and sound in all other respects. But they didn't know the facts of international life. They couldn't believe that nations like Germany, Italy, and Japan would glibly sign a treaty today, to throw a pacifistic cloak over their real intentions, and then throw it off in the flash of an eyelash when it suited their purposes to do so.

"It is true that if, even now, we should continue to follow the teachings of such men, we will not have war. It is equally true that we will not have a country—at least not the country of free men and women that we know today—the country our forebears fought and died to establish and maintain."

Admiral Blandy, we think, describes the real opinions of the overwhelming majority of the American people. As a policy, we want nothing of war, but we intend to remain a free, democratic Nation or perish fighting to be so.

We Defend This Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE OCHILTREE COUNTY HERALD, PERRYTON, TEX.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the membership of the House to the following editorial which appeared in the Ochiltree County Herald published by Hon. Van W. Stewart, county Democratic chairman, at Perryton, Tex. I consider this editorial very timely.

[From the Ochiltree County Herald, Perryton, Tex.]

WE DEFEND THIS TRUTH

What are we arming to defend? What is it that we Americans hold so precious that we are willing to accept great material and physical sacrifices if need be to make sure that it is not destroyed?

Not just the good land we have here, or the wealth of useful goods and products that private enterprise has spread among the people of this country. Much as we value these, a better answer than that is needed. And Roy W. Moore, noted industrial leader, recently provided a sound definition of the heritage we intend to defend. Addressing the Commercial Law League of America, Mr. Moore described our American way in the following words:

"It is the way of liberty. It is the right of a man to think his own thoughts through and to express them decently in print or by word of mouth. It is the right of assembly and petition. It is the right of protection against tyranny of ukase and edict as opposed to the due process of responsible law. It is the right to choose that device of relations with the almighty spirit of life which best will nurture the individual's spirit. It is the right to choose those officers of governance who must truly represent the will and the conscience of the people, and to hold them to the responsibility of representation.

"And it is the right of the individual to engage in any decent occupation of his choice, and to follow it where he wishes, and to reap as his reward such returns as are in decency earned by his skill, his ability, his energy, and his effort."

The words are moving, because the force they describe is eloquent, too. Needing clear definitions of where we stand in the difficult world of today, we can all find in the above words a goodly part of that larger truth in which all Americans believe.

How Axis "Fifth Column" in Cuba Strikes at United States—The Complete Inside Story of How the Fascists Battle Democracy in the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

ARTICLE FROM CLICK MAGAZINE

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the current issue of Click magazine:

[From Click for September 1941]

HOW AXIS "FIFTH COLUMN" IN CUBA STRIKES AT UNITED STATES—THE COMPLETE INSIDE STORY OF HOW THE FASCISTS BATTLE DEMOCRACY IN THE AMERICAS

Less than 2 hours away from Florida by plane, the Axis maintains an army and a field headquarters for spies, saboteurs, and Fascist propaganda agents. These forces, centered in Cuba, are mobilized to make serious trouble for the United States—and to seize control of Central and South America for Hitler.

Incredible? Of course, it sounds incredible. But Click sent a trusted investigator to Cuba to check this danger thoroughly. He wormed his way into the secret headquarters of the Falange and the Italian blackshirts. He checked the confidential files of the Cuban officials—who are fighting this menace. He stole sensational pictures from the Axis agents themselves, and, he came back with proof enough for anyone that Hitler, acting through the Italian blackshirts and the Spanish Falange, has a vast, dangerous machine in Latin America.

When Click's investigator spoke to Dr. Gustavo Gutierrez, Speaker of the Cuban House of Representatives, the Cuban statesman said, "We are prepared to act quickly. Since the Nazis and the Italians find it hard to operate openly through their own organizations, they work mainly through their puppet, the Franco Falange. We have made the Falange illegal in Cuba. They think they can still hide their Fascist plotting from us, but wait and see."

Scarcely had our investigator left Dr. Gutierrez, when the Cuban authorities made a sudden raid on a macaroni factory in Guanacoba. The factory was headquarters of the Falange. Seized in the raid were documents which proved that the Falange maintains an army in Cuba that includes a full infantry regiment, an artillery battalion, a cavalry squadron, engineers, and an aviation squadron of over 200 men.

Also seized in this raid were messages from the Cuban Falange to the Spanish Falange in Madrid—letters asking Serrano Suner, No. 2 Hitler puppet in the Franco cabinet, for more war materials for this Axis army on American soil. There were also letters from Post Office Box IPL 244, Hamburg, Germany, concerning German raiders off the coast of Brazil and German submarines in Cuban waters. Finally, there were large quantities of forged government stationery, forged passports (very handy for smuggling Axis agents into the United States), and plans of key public works.

To Cubans like Dr. Gutierrez this came as no surprise. But to Americans who think that the only Axis danger lies in Germany, Italy, and Japan, there is a very grave warning in these revelations. Hitler's Trojan horse in the Latin American countries takes the shape of the Falange Española, the Fascist Party of Spain.

Since the Falange, in Central and South America, has declared war on America, Click feels that Americans should know all they can about this new, secret Fascist Axis enemy which seeks to aid in our destruction.

Whether Franco stays in office as puppet dictator of Spain or not depends on whether puppet-master Hitler wins this war. Therefore the Falange, Franco's personal Fascist Party, is doing everything it can to bring about a Hitler victory.

To Franco, Hitler dangles an additional bait. Not only does Hitler promise to maintain the Franco dictatorship in Spain, but even, for services rendered, Hitler promises Franco the restoration of some of the former Spanish South American colonies to the new Imperial Spain. The services Hitler wants of Franco are performed by the Falange throughout the Western Hemisphere.

Service No. 1 is the creation of disunity in the Americas. At this task of setting brother against brother, inciting artificial race hatreds, and creating terrorist gangs to prey upon bewildered populations, Franco is proving an apt pupil of his Nazi masters. The center of all these New World Falange activities is in Cuba.

There the illegal Falange has 30,000 members. Working under the direct supervision of the Spanish and Italian Ministers—who in turn get their own orders from Hitler—the Falange is doing yeoman service in the Axis cause. Their program calls for the return of Cuba to Spain, the victory of Germany, and a complete break from the United States. They spread scurrilous attacks about the "inferior racial origin" of President Batista, and they distribute Fascist propaganda all over the hemisphere.

But the activities of the Falange do not stop at politics. Not only do they include organized violence—as we shall show—but they also include the smuggling of Axis agents with forged passports into all Western Hemisphere countries. More than one mysterious passenger has left a Spanish ship at Habana, been furnished with fake passports by the Falange, and then proceeded on to the United States in small fishing boats that put in at Florida shores. Sometimes these boats are spotted by Cuban anti-Fascists. In this case they often mysteriously blow up an hour after sailing.

The leading Quislings of the Axis Falange in Cuba are Senator Arguelles, Jose Rivero, and Raoul Maestri. The activities of these three are closely followed by Berlin.

Elicio Arguelles, elected to the senate as candidate of Menocal's party, organized the Comite Nacionalista Espanol de Cuba at the outbreak of the Spanish war in 1936—when Hitler and Mussolini sent their armies to guarantee the success of Franco's militarist putsch against the Spanish Republic. This organization spread propaganda and raised funds for Franco.

At the end of the war, in April 1939, it dissolved. Actually, it was absorbed by the Falange, which was then legal in Cuba.

A new organization, the Auxilio Social, took over the alleged functions of the old Comite. The chief of this organization—and of the Falange—was Genaro Riestra, the Spanish

Consul General. Early this year the Cuban Government decided to expel Riestra from Cuba. When the issue came up in the Cuban Senate, the one senator who led the defense of Riestra was Elicio Arguelles.

Habana's largest newspaper, Diario de la Marina, also defended Riestra. The paper is owned by Jose Rivero, fellow member with Arguelles of the Comite, the Auxilio Social, and the Falange. (In fact, both are leaders of individual secret Falange cells. Arguelles heads cell A–1; Rivero is leader of cell R–1.) Rivero's paper, which finds it profitable to pay lip service to democracy on page 1, is filled with Fascist propaganda on its other pages. During World War I, the pro-German stand of Rivero's paper got him into difficulties he would like to forget.

But far more interesting than either Rivero or Arguelles is Raoul Maestri, subeditor of Diario de la Marina, whose picture revealed so much when examined. German-educated and German-trained, Raoul Maestri is more than a Cuban leader of the Axis Falange. Maestri is the one-man brain trust of the Cuban "fifth columnists."

When the United States Minister invited Maestri to come to America as our guest and lecture on democracy and pan-American friendship, he probably had not the slightest inkling that Maestri's real work is the guiding of the Legion Nacional Revolucionaria Sindicalista, the military arm of the Falange in Cuba. The leaders of this group, the grayshirts, secretly meet with Maestri to plan their actions.

The nominal Caudillo of the grayshirts is a man named Marinas. The organization, which has a standard storm-troop structure, has its headquarters at 311 Mission Street in Habana. Those headquarters display the Falange and the swastika flags. Members of the grayshirts drill in a stadium owned by the Spanish firm, Galban Lobo. The son of one of this firm's heads is married to Rivero's daughter, Sylvia.

The illegal publication of the grayshirts, Accion Legionaria, shouts for a Nazi victory in this war. Its editors look upon Colonel Lindbergh as one of their spiritual leaders, and proclaim him as the real President of the United States.

Under Maestri's guidance, the grayshirt leaders are trying to form a mass movement named the Nationalist Workers Committee, embracing all of South America.

Crafty, ambitious, ruthless, Raoul Maestri is the man most likely to cause trouble for the democracies in Latin America.

Illustrations accompanying the article are described as follows:

ITALIAN MINISTER GIOVANNI PERSICO IS AXIS KEY MAN IN CUBA—BUT WHO IS THE BEAUTIFUL BARONESS LISETTE VON KAPRI?

PERSICO SPEAKS AT JOINT BLACKSHIRT-FALANGE MEETING

Sleek, oily, sharp-tongued Giovanni Persico, Italian Minister to Cuba, is the man who gives Hitler's orders to the Falange. It is to Persico that local Falange big shots come when they want to go over the head of Spanish Minister Espelius. And Persico will often aid them. One of them, who gave this secret picture to Click, will get in trouble when Persico sees it in print. At Persico's right hand is Prince Ruspoldi, the Italian Blackshirt chief. Note the flag of the Falange. This Blackshirt-Falange meeting was held in the Blackshirt office in Habana.

PERSICO TOOK THE BARONESS TO CUBAN AIRPORT

Last summer a beautiful brunette, Baroness Lisette von Kapri, suddenly showed up in Habana for a rest—during the hottest season. Persico, at whose office she received her mail, introduced her to officials of Ranchos Boyeros Airport as his secretary. An excellent flyer, she made friends with United States aviators flying planes to our base at Guantanamo. She brought a man named Otto Weh to the field for flying lessons, but Weh, a Nazi aviator, outflew his teachers. Finally Cuban authorities warned all naval and civil aviators to shun her or face court martial.

BARONESS VON KAPRI NOW LIVES AND FLIES IN UNITED STATES

Cuban authorities stopped Cuban flyers from talking to the baroness, and soon she went to the United States. She is now at Roosevelt Field, Long Island, mixing with American flyers near a key Army air base. Martin Harris took these pictures of her and sold them to us in good faith as a story of a typical modern woman flyer. The baroness, who is now applying for American citizenship, is far from being typical. Not only has she been personna grata to Axis emissaries in this hemisphere but her various stories of her origins clash too violently for comfort.

Dr. Raoul Maestri, editor of Habana's largest paper, was lecturing in America as a guest of the United States when Click's investigator called at his office, asked for his photo. While Maestri's secretary left the room, our man lifted the photo you see below.

The smudge of retoucher's water color that attracted our investigator's eye was rubbed with a damp cloth. This revealed what Maestri was hiding—the pennant bearing the emblem of the Falange. Maestri, guest of America, is actually a Falangist chief.

Jose Rivero toasted Musscilini with the Italian and German ministers when they gave him an Italian medal. Publisher of Habana's largest paper, Diario de la Marina, he poses as a friend of America. The picture below was removed from his own files. It shows Rivero, third from left, with a group of Fascist officers of Franco's army in Burgos during the Spanish War.

Bearded Gen. Mario Menocal, ex-President of Cuba is the Machiavelli of Cuban politics. His son, Raoul, holding his arm, is mayor of Habana. Holding Raoul's arm is Senator Elicio Arguelles, a relative of General Menocal and co-Quisling with Rivero of the Cuban Falange. Below you see Arguelles at his desk under a picture of Franco. The arrow points to swastika.

Italian Prince Camilo Ruspoldi is head of the Italian Blackshirts (Fascisti) in South America. He makes his headquarters in Habana, where he is frequently closeted with Spanish Minister Espelius, who betrayed the late Spanish Republic while in its service.

Fiery Genaro Riestra until early this year was Spanish consul general in Cuba, and also chief of the Falange and the Auxilio Social. In addition to directing the Fascist drive, he also raised funds for Franco. Cuba, like Mexico, finally threw him out for subversive activities.

Documents show the true nature of the Falange in Cuba. 1. The application for membership in the Falange includes questions about military service. A translation of the Falangista oath appears on it. 2. When the Falange was rendered illegal, it hid behind the false front of an alleged charity organization, the Auxilio Social. First head of Auxilio Social was Spanish Consul Genaro Riestra. 3. "The noble ally" is how official literature of the Falange describes Adolf Hitler. "I swear loyalty and absolute submission to all the chiefs of the movement. * * * I swear to give my life, if it is necessary to fight with arms, to the cause of the Traditionalist Spanish Falange and of the J. O. N. S. and of the Caudillo (Franco)."

Curtailing of Nondefense Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by me on June 3 last before the Tax Foundation:

Many of you have read the story told by Kipling in his Jungle Book about the little boy Mowgli who was raised in the wolf family. When all the members of the jungle decided to leave upon the invasion of the wild dogs, whose prowess was due to their traveling in packs of from 200 to 500 per pack, Mowgli decided to stay and defeat them. Those of you who have read the story know that he did not use an elephant, a lion, or a tiger for this purpose; they had already fled. He used the little stinging people—bees, wasps, and hornets—no one of which could have had any effect whatsoever alone, but through the cooperation of several million of these tiny creatures the great scourge of the jungle was put to flight.

Our Nation has brought to the average man the greatest luxuries and comforts known in the history of the world. If you wish to save this established form of government from the destruction of unlimited inflation, socialism, or dictatorship, it cannot be done by calling upon the elephant, lion, or tiger, such as our industrial giants, financial leaders, or great statesmen. No one of these great powers alone can save our system of commerce, industry, and living. Like Mowgli, we must call upon the millions of little people, each one of whom will be powerless alone, and must get them behind the great needs of today. I know of no organization better equipped to educate, influence, and arouse the millions of little people to the necessity of their taking part in these great problems, not the least of which is eliminating $2,000,000,000 of unnecessary governmental expense—than the organization which I have had the honor of addressing tonight.

When Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau appeared before the Ways and Means Committee to open the hearings on this year's tax bill, he recommended to the committee that the Congress raise an additional three and a half billion dollars in taxes. The enormous size of this tax bill so impressed the Secretary that he recommended very definite savings in nondefense expenditures to the extent of a billion dollars. His language was that of genuine statesmanship. He said:

"We are now awake to the need * * * to make this country safe and strong. We have not, however, kept pace with events in our thinking about defense and nonrelief spending. We have remained curiously static in our conceptions of what to spend on those things not directly connected with defense. Ordinary traffic must now get to one side to let planes and tanks and guns have the right-of-way. Other traffic can be permitted only if it does not obstruct the national purpose.

* * * * *

"We have not reexamined all of those expenditures that have been sort of grafted onto the Government during the last 10 years. We go on just the same."

Obviously, the Secretary of the Treasury was alarmed, because we had before us the 1942 Budget, amounting to $19,000,000,000. He hoped that by current taxes—an additional tax bill—we could raise two-thirds of this amount and borrow the other third. Since that date the President has recommended to the Congress Budget estimates which will run the 1942 budget figure up to $22,169,000,000—nearly $5,000,000,000 more than the estimate in his January 3 message to Congress. Now Mr. Morgenthau wonders if we don't need a still bigger tax bill.

Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones has stated that our national debt, as a result of the war, will climb to $90,000,000,000. Some think that it will be more, even exceeding $100,000,000,000. Our national debt is at present $47,600,000,000 with additional deficit debits of $12,800,000,000; and the State and municipal debt is approximately $20,000,000,000.

It has been stated on good authority that our 1942 fiscal deficit will exceed $10,000,000,000.

In the face of these enormous figures the Treasury Secretary suggested saving a billion dollars. I later suggested means of cutting nearly two billions from the current Budget. Both seemed a mere bagatelle when compared with a year's expense of twenty-two billions.

Defense is mandatory. Its expense must be met. Many nondefense items can wait if they are ordinarily necessary.

It will be well to take a view of our fiscal history in order to correctly approach the subject. In the last 40 years extravagance in government has been tolerated by the people. It has constantly grown in volume. The responsibility for such expenditures, great or small, rests primarily on the administrators of government, but ultimately on the whole people of the Nation.

Governmental expenditures fall roughly into two groups. The first includes payments for government per se; that is, the protection of life and property. This represents the cost of primary or fundamental functions of government. The second group is mainly for the support of social welfare activities of government. Roughly we might state that the first group of expenditures represents 25 percent and the second group 75 percent of what we spend on government.

Unusual expenditures in government have grown steadily in the past two or three generations. For instance, expenditures of State government increased 437 percent from 1903 to 1922. The passage of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the income-tax amendment, marks the beginning of the epoch of increased expenditures for government of all types and kinds and of easy acquisition of money by the Government from the taxpayer. Its enactment really marks the date of the great spending era in America. You will remember that Governor, now retiring Chief Justice, Hughes vetoed the resolution in the New York Legislature ratifying the sixteenth amendment because he was afraid the rates might reach as high as 10 percent.

The sixteenth amendment took the lid off spending, so far as the Congress is concerned, and the Federal Government began to spend heavily. The State and local governments followed suit, so that we find that while in 1916 total Federal expenditures were $1,034,000,000, at least one department spent more than that much money annually in the budgets of recent years.

Within 10 years after that, during the era from 1923 to 1932, the annual Federal Budgets ran between three and four billion dollars.

A Federal Budget of $1,034,000,000 in 1916. In 1940 it reached almost $9,000,000,000, exclusive of the emergency defense budget. If the last quarter of a century has produced such results, what may we expect in the next 25 years? That is, if we expect to continue to think of money with relation to our fiscal policies?

The exact figures are available for the year 1938 for Federal, State, and local expenditures. They run like this: The grand total was $18,300,000,000, divided as follows: Federal $7,691,000,000; State $4,358,000,000; and municipal, $6,150,000,000. In that year our total national income was $64,000,000,000. A quick calculation based upon these figures shows that almost a third of the people's money went to government—and that in times of peace.

Remember that three-fourths of this money spent, went not for the primary purposes of government, for the protection of life and property, but for social welfare. This vast fiscal growth of the Federal system is largely accountable to the growth of administrative or bureaucratic public administration. The growth of boards, bureaus, commissions, and departments has necessarily been attended by the vast expenditure of tax money.

For illustration, in 1916 as I have said, the total Federal Budget was $1,034,000,000, yet since 1937 the budget of the Department of Agriculture has vastly exceeded the whole Federal Budget for 1916.

In 1928 the Congress spent $845,000 for the franking privilege at Government expense. The executive departments spent 6 millions. Ten years later the Congress spent $737,000, but the taxpayer paid for the franking of free mail by the executive department the staggering sum of $39,000,000. The publicity departments, and each division has one, must have spent much money in preparing the material to frank out.

These are but illustrative of the general trend. It might interest you to know that the fiscal year 1940 saw the traveling expenses of the Government reach $99,000,000 plus. Our national symbol, Uncle Sam, rode high, wide, and handsome that year, but the fiscal year 1941 will see him spending $150,000,000 for traveling expenses. The first 4 months of this fiscal year showed a Federal travel bill of $47,000,000.

We in the Federal system cannot retrench as against the defense program. Even the waste and extravagance necessarily attendant on a large and speedy program such as we are embarking on will be tolerated by the people. So our only recourse is to attack those expenditures which are not related to or attendant on defense.

There are no signs that the States and municipalities intend to cut their budgets in behalf of the taxpayers who are to be burdened with this fearful national-defense program.

The old slogan, "Soak the rich," is ceasing to be realistic even for the purpose of demagoguery. If the Government took every dime of all individual net incomes in the United States over $50,000 in 1938 it would have collected only $1,056,222,000. If the Government had taken all the net incomes above $5,000 in 1938, the yield would have been $6,702,582,000—less than that year's annual current Budget. If we soaked both the rich and the middle-class taxpayers and took all their net income, the Government would raise just about enough money to pay the current annual expenses.

Remember, again, that only one-fourth of this money spent goes for the primary objectives of government—the protection of life and property. A colloquy at the hearing before my committee between a member of the committee and the college president I have referred to brought the suggestion from the member that the economies the college man was calling for could not be accomplished unless the local interests should cease putting pressure upon the Congressman. The college president very properly replied in substance, "During the spending psychology of the recent years, each community assumed that the Government has already planned to spend several billion each year for the purpose of creating prosperity and, therefore, reasoned that it was up to them to get as much as they could of the Federal largess for themselves. Now that we are in a different era, where economy and saving are paramount, I believe that if Congress will take the initiative, not only state that the reduction of unnecessary nondefense expenditures is imperative but actually use the knife and pare these expenses to the bone, the communities will probably say Congress is right in taking this step during the emergency, and we must do all that we can to assist in this economy wave and must refrain from embarrassing our Congressman by requests for expenditures.'"

Returning now to the prime object of this address—the curtailing of nondefense appropriations. A curious phenomenon is arising: Every bureau and department of the Government whose existence or whose appropriations are threatened by the demand to go all out for defense, and to trim nondefense items, has evolved some type or scheme or system to prove their necessity or worthiness as defense projects. The N. Y. A., due for a cut of about ninety-two millions if Secretary Morgenthau's advice were followed, secured a "defense budget" of about $157,000,000.

It will not do to say that these nondefense agencies can be transformed into defense agencies. They cannot by a wave of the hand be given attributes and functions they lack. They are subject to all manner of local, State, and Federal political influences. Their administrators cannot say "No" as a practical matter. The Army can—and by the very compulsion that is involved in the Army organization—prevent any type of logrolling that is necessarily involved in the relief agencies. The Army can and does enforce the $21 a month wage upon the draftees. Actual defense projects necessarily imply Army organization and compulsion. It would be playing with defense to permit these relief agencies to pretend to be defense agencies.

There is hardly a single function of government at present that cannot be colored with some defense characteristics. But real money needs to be spent on real defense, unless this whole thing is simply a great, good-natured drama with an overweaning desire to please the audience.

The Secretary of the Treasury was specific in his suggestions. He did not mince words nor dodge the issue. He suggested that N. Y. A., C. C. C., and W. P. A. appropriations could probably be trimmed or disposed of and for agriculture could be drastically reduced; and he recommended a careful study of other functions of government with a view to saving the money spent on them, and the use of it for defense. Immediately all the forces of departmental propaganda went into action. Defeatism and futility were the chief weapons. "It just can't be done" was the principal argument. The Secretary's suggestions were made to the Ways and Means Committee which, under the rules of the House of Representatives, has no jurisdiction over appropriations. Immediately it was said that the Ways and Means Committee was helpless, although it claims to be the most powerful policy committee in the House. That atmosphere has pretty well settled down over Congress—that nothing can be done about it. But every individual Member admits that something ought to be done.

W. P. A., C. C. C., N. Y. A. were all organized for relief. Yet now they are claiming to be defense projects. They are creatures with overlapping functions and conflicting jurisdictions. Three great overheads are maintained for these institutions; all relief departments. But, for illustration, the president of a little college in Arkansas solemnly

told the Ways and Means Committee that the average income of the individual in Arkansas was $255 and of an average family in Arkansas $909. He emphatically stated and proved to the committee that for the cost of one boy in a C. C. C. camp he could give four boys in his college a year's education. How failure to economize can be justified cannot be explained to an American taxpayer. It is insolence to attempt it.

These bureaus, boards, commissions, departments, and divisions grow and grow like the Rose of Sharon. Each head of a subdivision is working industriously to justify his division's existence, to be promoted in salary, and to enlarge the jursdiction, scope, and appropriation of his division, be it big or little. It is easy to say that Congress "just ought to cut them out." I wouldn't be personal for the world, but you businessmen know the difficulty involved in disposing of a department in your corporation, or even of firing a deserving stenographer, or maybe one not so deserving. During the depression an oil company's board of directors decided to retrench. The board concluded that the retrenchment was mandatory and that a certain department must go. A resolution was passed dispensing with the geological department, disposing of the employees, and eliminating their salaries. One hard-headed director said this didn't do the job. The other members inquired why. He replied, "We've got to sell all the desks, typewriters, rugs, lamps, cuspidors, and get them clear out of the building. If we don't, in 3 months some of us will see those offices filled up again with employees."

If it is this difficult in a private business, do you not realize how much more difficult it is in government, under political pressure, with Uncle Sam a sort of magic Santa Claus paying the bill?

To pass a $3,500,000,000 tax bill and cut no expenditures will come home squarely to the taxpayer with the $2,500 salary, who has been paying $11 taxes, it and when this amount jumps to $72; to the $5,000 taxpayer, now paying $110, if when his taxes jump to $506; to the $10,000 taxpayer (as for instance a Congressman), if when his annual Federal tax jumps from $528 to $1,628.

Especially will this come home since these taxes are retroactive to January 1, 1941, and most especially when excise taxes to the amount of nearly $1,000,000,000 are being raised on many of the necessities of life these taxpayers buy. These are the Treasury's proposals in the present tax bill. We may have to adopt these proposals. Then there are the so-called hidden taxes which the Twentieth Century Fund says run to large amounts annually for the individual.

The 1942 fiscal year Budget totals $6,675,000,000 of nondefense items. Of that sum, fixed charges, like interest on the public debt, pensions, and so forth, amount to $2,716,000,000. The balance of $3,959,000,000 could be reduced in part and eliminated in part For instance, various aids to agriculture are budgeted for $1,061,600,000. I would cut that to $500,000,000, especially since agriculture should do well under the defense-spending program, and agriculture will get much indirectly from the lend-lease appropriation.

W. P. A. is budgeted for $1,034,000,000. The President has recommended a cut of $109,000,000. I would reduce it to $500,000,000.

General public works should be reduced to $250,000,000 from the $502,900,000 budgeted.

Aids to youth, represented by C. C. C. and N. Y. A., should be eliminated saving $362,600,000. These two relief agencies, even though we retain the W. P. A., should be eliminated, because they do not represent defense and do not represent any type of relief that could not be taken care of by the $500,000,000 for W. P. A. which I have suggested.

The magnitude of the defense program in its general aspect staggers the imagination. As I have stated, our national annual income in 1938 was $64,000,000,000. If in the near future, as Secretary Jesse Jones says, we are to have a national debt of ninety and maybe one hundred billion, and a State and local existing debt of $20,000,000,000, the disbalance baffles any fiscal student, even any prophet. We might ask, "Whither are we going?"

Remember that the Congressman nowadays is the errand boy of the Frankenstein called the executive department. His ability as statesman is gaged by his prowess in procuring Federal largess—Federal projects.

One of the most vocal advocates of economy of Government has been the United States Chamber of Commerce. It has been heretofore militant on all occasions on this subject and has drawn the fire of the spenders. However, you members of that great organization or of local chambers of commerce, know that it is composed of chambers of commerce all over the Nation. We have heard much about minority groups—I think pressure groups, if you please. It can hardly be contradicted that during the era of spending that has gone on in the last few years, local chambers of commerce have been among the heaviest contributors to pressure upon their Congressmen. Pressure to get things from the Government for the locality, and pressure to keep them after they are gotten. Yesterday the President suggested $125,000,000 for defense roads. Probably tens of thousands of letters will flow to the Congress from local chambers of commerce showing definitely that these roads ought to be located in their vicinities and the feeder roads headed in the direction of the local chamber of commerce should be added. Nobody ought to fool himself about this pressure weighing heavily with the Congressmen.

This is not intended to be mere ranting about the cost of Government, nor the learned display of taxpayers' figures. It is rather intended as an approach to the consequences of the outline detailed. Several observations may be made about these fiscal circumstances.

First, the thoughtful student of government should be impressed with the tremendous growth of power in the executive department in recent generations, as evidenced by the figures adduced. It amounts to turning over the purse to the executive branch of government and the necessarily attendant obsolescence of the legislative department. Then, too, the immense influence of a highly financed executive department gives it all power over every activity of the citizen as well as decisive control over the judicial system and the final direction of the legislative department. It will not do to say that America is going the way of all the republics and to let it go at that. America has the brains and should have the will to reevaluate its three branches of government. Modern history clinches the argument for this necessary step.

Another important consideration is the welfare of the Nation after this emergency is over. It is not unreasonable to suppose that a cessation of defense activities after the emergency will slump our national income as much as ten to twenty-five billions of dollars. With the return of soldiers to civilian pursuits and the loss of defense employment to others, we can visualize vast unemployment. Then, for the first time in the history of our country, we will come into a depression with a monumental public debt staring us in the face. I may emphasize its possibility when I tell you that Leon Henderson said before the Ways and Means Committee the other day that by May 1942 we would be spending $2,000,000,000 per month for defense.

If we do have a debt of $90,000,000,000, as Secretary Jones has said, the interest on that debt would range around $3,000,000,000 a year. From 1923 to 1932, our total national expenses had a range of about that same figure. In those equally serious days to come, where will we turn for financial relief if we are not wise enough to economize now to the extent of one or two billion dollars per year on altogether nondefense items? Do we not have the wisdom to look that far ahead? Will not the thinking people of America awaken?

With the necessity of vast sums then for relief, where will the money come from? In what shape will the Government's credit be? Will not some string-band statesman suggest the devaluation of the gold content of the dollar, holding out to the people as a prize the twenty-two billions of gold we have stored, and convince them that by proper manipulation it could be made to represent eighty or one hundred billion dollars in Government credit and spending power? When he has succeeded in those blandishments, what will be the value of the savings of the people, their investments in things of value, their years of thrift in accumulating life insurance?

The press says that England looks forward to a "social readjustment" after the war. We have seen all values wiped out in Germany, France, Italy, and Russia, or, at least, reduced to a fraction of their original value. France devaluated the franc and Germany the mark. They all moved into some form of socialism, where individual initiative, private ownership, the stirring of ambition through financial incentive went down the road of modern barbarism in those countries. Those inflationary movements in our sister nations were preceded by, or accompanied with, various forms of socialism.

I hope and trust that through Government control we will be able to prevent a destructive inflation, but is the hope realistic when we see a system of priorities that will so scarcen the people's goods that consumer demand will outrun production; when we observe that every strike is settled on the basis of increased wages, with no apparent thought of its ultimate effect; when we see scarcity and increased prices in all manner of manufactured and raw materials arising on every hand; when we see production held down by penalty under a wage-hour system; and when we see the possibility that individuals and corporations may follow the "business as usual" attitude of the Government instead of thrift, economy, and the paring to the bone of nonessentials? If we do have such inflation, the inevitable drift is toward the socialism England so complacently contemplates—the socialism that made the people, in their sweat of agony in France, in Germany, in Russia, and in Italy, turn away from their legally constituted authorities, yearn for and finally demand a dictatorship which ultimately took charge of them, their families, their religion, their private fortunes, and their very future hopes and aspirations. Are not the seeds we are sowing those of home-grown fascism and nazi-ism, which we so much fear and despise?

The ancient civilizations of the world in turn flourished, gradually declined, and disintegrated. If there is one thing that history teaches in unmistakable terms, it is that nations, like individuals, prosper according to their right thinking, and that the idolatrous exaltation of a material sense of power and intelligence inevitably leads to decay and downfall. Dictatorship is that idolatrous exaltation of the material sense of power.

This day will pass. Moral might is stronger than all the guns and ships fashioned by the hand of man.

Disappointed with all his worldly achievements, Napoleon in his solitude, in deep contemplation, said, "Alexander, Caesar, Charlemagne, and myself have founded empires. But upon what did we rest the creation of our genius? Upon force. Jesus Christ alone founded His empire upon love; and at this moment millions of men would die for Him." Pitted against an alert, free, active world public opinion, the rampage of the present-day forces of evil cannot endure. Their

predecessors failed upon the rock of the unseen spiritual forces asserted by mankind.

Democracy is the highest spiritual idea of mankind as related to Government. True democracy is alert, active, and awake. True democracy rests in the bosom of the individual citizen. He is king in his own right if he but assert it. From his activity comes the strength of his Government, the symbol of his concept of democracy.

In the insane asylums it is an accepted scientific fact that one of the first signs of returning sanity on the part of an inmate, is his expressed ability to cooperate with other inmates and attendants. Those that are completely insane think only of their personal welfare, and do not cooperate. In our own country there has been too much of each community looking out for its own interest, in making its demands upon the Federal Government. This is because the individuals who compose the communities have each thought only of their own interest. The individuals and the communities seemed to have had a slogan "Every other community is getting what it can, so let's make certain we get ours." This is exactly the attitude of the inmates of the asylum who are completely insane, having no thought for anything but themselves. If the various individuals and communities that comprise this great Nation can be educated and influenced to cooperate for the common good, which would, of course, include economy in government, would it not be a welcome sign of returning sanity? Marshal Petain, after the French debacle, said, "After our victory in 1918 we became a comfortable, pleasure seeking nation. We asked for more than we were willing to give. We refused to accept responsibility. Now we are in distress."

Pennsylvania Turnpike Succeeding as Toll-Road Experiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

LETTER FROM HON. WALTER A. JONES, CHAIRMAN, PENNSYLVANIA TURNPIKE COMMISSION

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Hon. Walter A. Jones, chairman of the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, which contains an interesting report on the operation of the great Pennsylvania Turnpike between Harrisburg and Pittsburgh as a toll facility.

The letter referred to is as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
PENNSYLVANIA TURNPIKE COMMISSION,
Harrisburg, August 12, 1941.

Hon. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT,
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Confirming my conversation with you this morning about the results of the operation of the Pennsylvania Turnpike for July, I beg to repeat that we actually collected and put in the bank from tolls $359,368.70. To this amount must be added approximately $30,000, which will be received from the oil and food concessions for the month, making a total of approximately $390,000 for 1 month.

The point I wish to stress is that, contrary to all other statements, this piece of superhighway through the mountains of Pennsylvania, which begins 15 miles from Pittsburgh and ends the same distance from Harrisburg, has been accepted by the motoring public and proves that they will gladly pay for the use of highways that will provide such safety features as elimination of grade crossings and interference of red lights.

In addition, I repeat that the bonds with which this project was financed have been accepted by the public and today are selling at a very decided premium, and it is my opinion that other defense highways could be built by the sale of revenue bonds.

With very kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

WALTER A. JONES, *Chairman.*

William Edgar Borah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

ADDRESSES BY HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, OF ILLINOIS, AND HON. DWIGHT H. GREEN, GOVERNOR OF ILLINOIS

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, the late Senator William E. Borah, of Idaho, was born and reared on a farm near Fairfield, Wayne County, Ill. Sunday, the 29th day of June last, was the seventy-sixth anniversary of his birth, and on that afternoon several thousand people of Wayne and adjoining counties assembled in the courthouse yard in Fairfield to do honor to the memory of this great American.

Two tributes were delivered to William Edgar Borah on this occasion, one by the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Member of Congress from the Sixteenth Illinois District, and the other by the Honorable Dwight H. Green, Governor of the State of Illinois.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include these two addresses:

ADDRESS BY HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, OF ILLINOIS

Today we gather for remembrance. It is one of the divine and ennobling attributes of life.

What tragedy it would be if humankind were not endowed with the gift of remembrance. What a dismal world it would be if each moment were to be blacked out forever and forever as quickly as it was spent. What a thing of frustration all human existence would be were it impossible to exercise this divine gift and recall some lilting song or the refrain of some vigorous and stirring hymn. How empty life would be were it impossible to recall from the recesses of the mind the caress of some precious hand now cold and lifeless or the beauty of a soft whisper. How futile all life would be if it were impossible to reconstruct the inspiration of a gentle voice, or act of kindness, the encouragement of a golden smile, or of a noble deed. How empty, indeed, would be each life were it impossible to conjure up in remembrance some great and good person whose soul is now marching in that shadowy procession in the bivouac of the dead.

Life would be a thing of futility and frustration were we devoid of that enriching power to reach into the inexhaustible storehouse of memory and bring forth in remembrance an old friend, an old neighbor, an illustrious son of Fairfield, of Wayne County, of Illinois, to do him honor, to live again with him in the fellowship of the spirit and to reappraise his work. Today we are assembled not only in tribute to his memory but in thanksgiving for this God-given attribute which brings luster and hope to the whole design of living.

Time brings perspective. The fleeting years temper the severity of human judgment and help to impart accuracy to our appraisal of human achievement. Somehow as we march up the ladder of time, rung by rung, its mellow judgment enables us to brush away the superfluous and the inconsequential and to see more clearly the broad and substantial pattern by which a human personality made a deep impression upon the affairs of mankind.

Perspective teaches the unimportance of death. Who will care to remember the day on which his noble spirit took its flight from this earthly domain? Who remembers or cares to remember the day on which the living genius of Lincoln was terminated by an assassin's bullet? Who remembers or cares to remember the day when the living grandeur of Washington was converted into the imperishable marble of eternity?

What is important is that like other men of vision, wisdom, and courage William Edgar Borah lived. To us it is important that he labored with head and hands; that he gave of a generous talent to mankind; that he was a living and vibrant instrument of human progress; that he assisted nobly in directing the chariot of human progress into the sun-bathed valleys of a better living. Truly time serves well as it gives quality to our judgments.

Here in this humble town it was ordained that he should come to the Republic and become a creature of destiny.

Let us climb aboard the transport of fancy and go back to the winter of 1865 when the family of William Edgar Borah was humbly tilling the soil of Wayne County.

The whole Nation was bleeding from a bloody war.

Our own beloved Lincoln, out of a troubled soul, was beseeching God for guidance in that anxious hour.

In February of that year the shackles were for all time stricken from the slaves.

As the resurrection of spring came upon the land in April and all was green and still, Richmond fell.

In the second week of that same month and same year Lee surrendered his sword to Grant.

But 5 days later the awful tragedy of assassination stilled the genius of Lincoln and gave him to the ages.

But a few months later Borah was born on the same soil that fostered and nurtured the deathless Emancipator.

He was born in that era when a great issue involving the life and destiny of the Republic was being disposed, and somehow the inspiration of that rugged and historic era was born in his veins. Through his lifetime he faced the great issues confronting the Nation without a substitute or compromise.

In those days which followed the World War, when the United States Senate was fighting every effort to place this country in the League of Nations, even a foe so bitter and implacable as Henry Cabot Lodge, then serving as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, was in a mood to consider a substitute proposal. To Borah, it was a fight which involved high pinciple and there could be neither compromise nor substitute.

In a later generation when another President attempted to affect the composition of the Supreme Court by a legislative proposal, the foes of this measure began to weaken and to seriously consider a substitute measure. It was the resolution and determination of Borah which not only discouraged that effort but kept the fight on high ground and made it one of the outstanding controversies in the history of the Republic.

His education in Fairfield and at Enfield Academy was but the beginning of 40 years of preparatory effort and training for the fruitful career which was to follow.

I think of his early years in this humble and quiet country and of the elementary preparation which he here received as not unlike that of David of old. When David was upbraided by his brothers for coming to camp to engage in combat with Goliath, he calmly announced that he slew a lion and a bear which had raided the father's flock. It was his preparation for the great encounter which was to follow. It was here that Borah made preparation for the encounters which were to mark several generations of our national life.

Here close to the soil he builded a physique, a resiliency, and a vigor which was as durable as the soil itself.

From the ineffable and majestic symmetry and harmony of Nature with which he was surrounded, he found the inspiration for his matchless eloquence.

Here as on the prairies of Kansas and the plains of Idaho, on the very frontier of democracy, was fashioned his deep affection for the common people and their problems.

In the innate righteousness and simplicity of the people in whose midst he was born, in the fundamental equities which he absorbed as a student of the law, in the disposition of controversies both in and out of court, he laid the foundation for an abiding reverence for the law and the Constitution which became the lodestar of his life. It was his design for living. It was his code of human progress; and in later years we see him again and again in his impassioned defenses of law and order.

Here he early learned that life without a cause is like a vessel without a rudder. Yea, more like a vessel without motive power. He learned that a deep and abiding cause generates zeal and becomes the design for a vigorous life. He learned that a cause provides strength and that it becomes Nature's best antidote for the gospel of defeatism and despair. Truly he was a man of many causes.

After two generations of preparation dealing in basic and elemental values, he sprang like a warrior, full-panoplied to the people's forum and for a third of a century thereafter addressed himself with vigor, with determination, with courage, with faith and high hope to the common welfare of the land he so passionately loved.

Permeating it all was his great spiritual devotion and the depth of his religious conviction.

On one occasion with almost explosive force he observed to a well-known member of the press who had called at his office, "Of course, there is a God. This would be truly a hell of a place to live in if there were no God."

He gestured toward the majesty of the Capitol, to its verdant lawn and to the trees as they awakened to the resurrection of the springtime and then demanded, "How could you explain all this if there is no God?" I am not certain about this manifestation but I am certain that a divine conscience rules humanity—rules all this.

It was no inept appelation that he should become known as the Lion of Idaho. To see him in action on a momentous issue with eyes flashing fire, with rich and resonant cadences carrying truth and conviction, with shaggy hair which flowed back from his forehead, with superb courage and zeal—truly he was the great Lion of Idaho.

Today, as we lift our eyes and see a world that is alight with the flames of conflict, it is peculiarly fitting that we should memorialize one who was so long preeminent in the field of foreign relations.

His consuming hope was for peace and disarmament for the entire world and for freedom from alliances by this country.

In 1920 he was the first to launch a vigorous attack upon the Treaty of Versailles. He pointed out that dictators are the spawn of a treaty filled with inequities. He said it was cruel and would bring sorrow in its wake. Over and over he reaffirmed that its inequities would awaken the reckoning power of retribution. Again and again he proclaimed, "You will not get disarmament in Europe until those conditions are corrected."

Truly he was the Lion of Idaho as he resisted every effort to enroll this Nation in the League of Nations. When Woodrow Wilson appealed to the people for support for his League program and swung through the Nation on a speaking tour to enlist national interest, Borah was one of three Members of the United States Senate to tour the same areas.

Borah spoke everywhere and portrayed to the people the danger of becoming embroiled in the affairs of Europe. Like a crusader fired with holy zeal, he carried his gospel to the people. Everywhere he hurled his clarion warning that entry into the League meant injustice, slavery, and war. Then came the ringing challenge, "And to this you ask the Republic to become a party." The record of that controversy is writ in large and indelible letters upon the pages of our history. The effort to project the United States of America into the League failed.

I recall the personal thrill of sitting close to him as he opened the argument in opposition to the amending of the Neutrality Act. It was in the autumn of 1938. Age had robbed the voice of some of its richness. His hair was thinning, but he was still the ancient Borah, the great crusader fighting in the holy cause of keeping this Nation free from the entanglements of Europe. Even today as the way is dark and confusion abounds on every hand the wisdom of Borah still offers the brightest hope of saving this representative democracy and our civilization.

Under seven Presidents he was a defender of the ancient faith and never waivered in his espousal of those causes which were for the benefit of the common man. He fought valiantly for a more abundant life and for the forgotten man long before those words became catch phrases in the lexicon of American politics.

Having had to carry his senatorial cause to the people in 1907 because of the situation which prevailed in the legislature of his adopted State, it was but natural that he should be in the forefront of a movement to elect Members of the Senate by a direct vote of the people.

He was ever wedded to the principle that taxes should be paid in accordance with ability to pay and after a generation of effort saw that principle incorporated in the organic law of the Nation.

In those days immediately preceding the World War he took an active part in the creation of the Federal Reserve System and never lost interest in the fascinating subject of monetary reform and fiscal policy.

One need but read the record of the last 40 years to observe that the name of Borah looms large in the unceasing fight to curb monopolistic practices.

Labor will be ever indebted to him for the support which he rendered in the creation of a separate Department of Labor and in the creation of a Children's Bureau.

For two generations his praises have been sung by the farmers who till the lush and fertile acres of this land because they counted him as a steadfast and loyal friend.

It was so eminently fitting that his strenuous life should close shortly after the greatest controversy of his career as he gave direction to the struggle to save the Supreme Court of the United States.

He saw in the high tribunal the salvation of our whole system of representative government.

He looked upon it with its tempered wisdom as a check on the Executive and the Congress.

He regarded it as an indispensable part of the system of constitutional government.

Not since Daniel Webster has there been an apostle of the Constitution and a defender of our system to equal his passionate defense of the Constitution and all that it implies for the American way.

It was he who kept the opposition to the President's proposal on high and nonpartisan ground and made it an American issue.

It was he who insisted that every party advantage be sacrificed in the fight.

It was he who rejected the blandishment of a substitute in the form of a constitutional amendment and vigorously insisted that there could be no compromise. It was he who encouraged the retirement of one of the sitting Justices in order to ease the tension and improve the prospect of winning this great battle for the preservation of the American Constitution.

It was he who insisted that the report to be filed in connection with this measure should stand as a complete repository for the students of American government who in generations to come might examine it with pride and pay tribute to those who stood as defenders of constitutional government.

It was he who felt the great swell of patriotic pride in a job well done for the common man and for every citizen of the land when by a vote of 70 to 20 the bill was recommitted to the committee.

In this epochal American struggle we behold Borah as a defender of the ancient faith.

His greatest attribute was the zeal and the earnestness with which he crusaded for causes which he deemed to be in the interest of America but with it all he was a consummate political strategist.

Theodore Roosevelt as President of the United States caustically criticized him on occasion. President Taft had his name removed from the social list of the White House. He was often at odds with the seven Presidents under whom he served and each respected his integrity and his formidable qualities as an adversary.

On numerous occasions candidates for the Presidency undertook to give him assurances concerning great issues before the country but always he insisted that the only forthright policy for them to pursue was to make their promises and their pledges openly to the people. It was this simplicity and faith and this devotion to the people which made him a political strategist whose influence dots the pages of history.

Today we pay our humble tribute to his memory and raise our voices in thanksgiving because he lived and made a great contribution that mankind should have life more abundantly.

It is so eminently fitting that we should meet at the scene of his birth on a Sabbath afternoon and ask the age-old question, "If a man die, shall he live again?"

We dip into the pages of Holy Writ and see Job, the patriarch, in all his affliction, surrounded with his friends, Zophar, Eliphaz, and Bildad, and out of the agony of spirit we catch the echo of Job's question, "If a man die, shall he live again?"

For countless generations that question has arisen from the minds and the hearts of men who seek an answer.

For countless generations a great and ennobling faith has chorused the affirmative while cynicism answered in the negative.

We need but lift our eyes like Ishmael of old and find the answer everywhere about us.

We see it in the continuity of the trees and flowers. We see it in the resurrection of every vernal spring.

It is an axiom of Nature that nothing shall be added to the creation and nothing shall be destroyed.

Man but takes the material provided by a generous providence and transmutes it into a multitude of different forms. He cannot create neither can he destroy, and, from the evidences of continuity which press upon our every sence, we find both reassurance and that "if a man die, he shall live again."

The spirit of William Edgar Borah still lives and points the way to an unfinished work. His soul has moved on to a higher plane of duty and bids the living to carry on.

We can find inspiration in that New Hampshire soldier who passed to his reward in 1862 before the destiny of an undivided nation had been determined. He was a soldier in that struggle. On the humble marker of his last resting place one will find this epitath: "This side of my monument I dedicate to the sacred cause of liberty and union. May they be preserved forever." Truly here is encouragement and inspiration for us to carry on in those larger causes for human happiness which may not be determined in our lifetime.

Today, as we reverently memorialize the life and achievements of a great soldier in the cause of human welfare and reach out for hope and for substance to sustain a faith which sometimes weakens from the impact of confusion and despair, we can do no better than to echo the spirit of that great message from the ninth verse of the first chapter of Joshua: "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the Lord thy God am with thee withersoever thou goest."

ADDRESS BY GOV. DWIGHT H. GREEN

This is indeed a notable occasion in which we have joined today, and I am more than happy to have been invited to share the pride which must be that of every citizen of Fairfield. In fact, not only should Fairfield be proud, but entire Wayne County can well pay tribute to a statesman who reflected glory upon his birthplace. In the late Senator William E. Borah, whose seventy-sixth birthday anniversary we have gathered to commemorate, the entire Nation found its greatest champion of true Americanism. Senator Borah represented Idaho, the State of his adoption, but Fairfield and Wayne County never relinquished their claim on him as favorite son.

In Senator Borah was reflected the indomitable courage of the pioneers of Illinois. Back of his many battles on the floor of the Senate for the preservation of American principles and ideals, was the spirit which fired his ancestors to hew a great empire out of waste and wilderness. All Illinois can well exult in the success that made Senator Borah an outstanding and unforgettable figure in American history.

The story of the life of William E. Borah is a magnificient story of Americanism. One of the greatest constitutional lawyers in the annals of bench and bar, he devoted his entire public career to safeguarding the Constitution of the United States, which he believed to be the greatest human document ever written for the welfare and protection of man. Any encroachment upon the Constitution was a challenge which brought Senator Borah into the battle, regardless of party or politics. Great orator that he was, he stands forth with the men in earlier American history, and with Abraham Lincoln, that other great son of Illinois, as a statesman who could not be swerved from his beliefs.

Imbued with devotion to the concepts of liberty left to us as a heritage from our forefathers, his faith in America as the imperishable home of freedom involved him in bitter battles which at times threatened his political prestige. Throughout the controversies over the League of Nations, the World Court, and the packing of the Supreme Court, Senator Borah led the fight to keep his country out of foreign entanglements and away from violations of constitutional traditions. No promises of political rewards could weaken the sincerity of his patriotic purpose.

I would liken Senator Borah to those great men in American history who shaped the destiny of a new-born Nation. A short time ago, I was reading James Madison's Journal of the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, at which our Government was created, and I know that Senator Borah must have read it too. Running like a golden thread through every meeting of that historic gathering, was the conviction that ours would be a Government in which all men would share its duties. Great thinkers in that body based their plea for free government upon the assumption that the ablest and best-qualified men should be chosen for public office, and that each citizen should recognize that he had the personal privilege and duty of putting his talent and his effort back of those whom he had elected. That was the concept of government by the people, as the founders of our Nation saw it with remarkable clarity, and that was the concept of government by the people which William E. Borah carried in his heart and soul. That is the concept upon which the very existence of our Nation depends, and from which there must be no deviation now.

The great son of Illinois, and Senator from Idaho, possessed those cardinal articles of faith which form the faith of all liberty-loving Americans. The greatest of these articles was his belief in basic human rights. The ringing declaration of the founders of our Nation that "all men are created free and equal" to him was a living principle, as fundamental as any law of Nature. His whole career was based on the firm belief that government is free and that it belongs to the people, and that it is the people who must make that free government work. His life was a living sermon that government is the people's servant and that theirs is the right of freedom and opportunity upon which no agency dares encroach.

The man whose memory we honor today held to one inviolable principle. So that our republican form of government shall not die, he believed that no elected official should place himself above the fundamental law. He saw that the end of such a road would be dangerous, for he knew that the placing of all the power within the reach of the Executive could bring dictatorship.

He was the prototype of another immortal American, Benjamin Franklin. It was Franklin who said that a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessing of liberty and keep a government free. This great patriot, whose principles were reflected upon the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Idaho, believed that it is not only necessary to recur frequently to these principles but at all times to defend them. They must be defended, he said, not only against the avowed enemies of liberty but against those who in their zeal for some particular advantage forget and abandon the convictions without which there can be no liberty. It might have been the voice of Franklin—and of all the other founders of our Nation rolled into one—when Senator Borah declared his belief that there is no conviction so vital to the American people as the conviction that no one, anywhere, or at any time, shall have a monopoly on unlimited power. We Americans know that it is upon this conviction that the Republic rests.

Later this week we shall observe another anniversary of the birth of our Republic. It is the deepest regret of all of us that Senator Borah could not be among us to join in celebrating the birthday of the Nation he loved so dearly. But in the same spirit that he would show were he with us, we can renew our own faith in the American form of government and again declare our allegiance to the Constitution which has made American citizenship the most priceless heritage in the world. If, in these days of uncertainty and fear, we need strength and courage, let us do as Senator Borah would do, and turn to the Constitution for protection for our birthright of freedom. Its ideals are as sacred now as they were when they were written. They guarantee that government shall represent the will of the people, and they assure each person the just fruits of his labor. They are the supreme defender of men's rights, liberties, and property. They protect any government which is humane and incorruptible. They are timeless and eternal.

Senator Borah, in the many years he devoted to unselfish public service, saw our Nation become the mightiest and most glorious on earth. This is so because he, and others who followed his precepts, never forget those principles of representative government which are the sinews of our national life.

The problems which he helped to solve still confront our Government, and these problems demand, and must receive, the participation of our ablest citizens. In this peacetime crisis, we must summon every loyal heart and mind into service. The call for unselfish devotion to the needs of good government is as imperative today as the call to arms has been at any time in our Nation's history. Our lives and futures, and those of generations yet unborn, depend upon retention of government by the people. It is only in this manner that we can preserve our republican form of government.

Government by the people has died before in history, and is dying now in other lands. This shall never happen on this continent in our generation, or in those to come. I beg you to believe that no price we have to pay to prevent this would be too high.

Treatment of Canadian Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

LETTER FROM CANADIAN MILITARY ATTACHÉ

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing this letter to show the comparative situation in the treatment of Canadian soliders and the American soldiers:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 25, 1941.*

Mr. JOSEPH LEIB,
National Press Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEIB: Your letter of the 22d instant addressed to the Minister has been referred to this office for reply.

The basic pay of a Canadian soldier is $1.30 per day.

In addition to this, there is provision made for a soldier's dependents. If a soldier makes an assignment of $20 per month to his wife or dependent, the Canadian Government will

provide an additional dependent's allowance of $35, making a total of $55 per month. Provision is also made for a dependents' allowance of $12 per month for each child up to and including two.

I trust this is the information required and would ask you to please advise me if I can be of any further assistance.

Yours very truly,

H. F. G. LETSON,
Brigadier, Military Attaché,
Canadian Legation.

Can There Be Labor Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the following editorial entitled "Can There Be Labor Peace?" appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, August 12, which I consider a very simple and straightforward presentation of the issue.

The necessity for unity within the ranks of labor has increased a hundredfold with the increasing needs of our national-defense program. It has therefore been a matter of growing concern to those of us who have watched the schism separating the ranks of 8,000,000 organized workers grow ever wider. It would be a great catastrophe for organized labor, through internal dissension, to lose any of the tremendous gains that have been made within the last 25 years. The working men and women of this country are certainly entitled to look to the leaders of both factions of the labor movement for peace and a friendly spirit, which would contribute so much to the happiness and contentment of all members of organized labor. The eradication of communism and racketeering in the ranks of the labor movement in America could be eliminated very easily by harmonious leadership. With the eradication of these two evils the future success of labor would be assured. The editorial follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of August 12, 1941]

CAN THERE BE LABOR PEACE?

Peace between the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. is so much to be desired from every point of view that one is inclined to put aside rumors of renewed efforts to that end as being in the realms of wishful thinking. That we should see the end of jurisdictional labor disputes, of divided representation for labor on every board and commission on which labor is entitled to representation, has seemed in the last 4 years a more and more distant possibility. Yet now added to the fact that unity is in the interests of labor itself is the imperative need for national unity. Unity is, indeed, essential to the cause of labor because of public impatience with interruptions of defense production by jurisdictional strikes, an impatience that can easily develop into uncompromising reaction. The report is that William Green expects to resign in October from the A. F. of L. presidency, possibly to be succeeded by Daniel J. Tobin, and that if Philip Murray should consent, in the interests of peace, to remove himself as C. I. O. head, efforts would be made by a mediator respected by both sides—Senator JAMES M. MEAD is mentioned—to bring about a compromise of the differences between the two factions.

There are factors which make for the possible success of such efforts. There is Tobin himself, an outstanding proponent of reunion. He has defied the A. F. of L. leadership to call for a rank-and-file revolt in both great unions to compel peace between them In January 1940 he wrote: "Less than one dozen men on both sides are responsible for the division of 8,000,000 organized workers Let the workers ask themselves why 8,000,000 organized workers should allow a few men to keep them separated." John L. Lewis, the most unbending foe of compromise, has at least ostensibly stepped down, and has, moreover, through his stand on the election and on defense cooperation, lost most of his former prestige. If Mr. Green actually intends to resign, then the two most important of the dozen men who stand in the way of peace will be out of the way. The next most important man is Mr. Murray, who is so closely associated with Lewis policies that his succession to the C. I. O. presidency is considered to cancel the effect of Lewis' resignation. Any reasonable effort to end the labor feud has the backing of the administration and, there is little doubt, of the most intelligent of the union rank and file. The public, discouraged by the bitterness of the schism, has its fingers crossed, but there is nothing it would like better than to uncross them.

Army Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MADISON (IND.) COURIER

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Madison (Ind.) Courier of August 11, 1941:

[From the Madison (Ind.) Courier of August 11, 1941]

ARMY MORALE

Observers of America's new draft army report that there is a lack of fighting spirit among the men recently sent to camp under the Selective Service Act, and a seeming ignorance of what the war is all about.

The Army is criticized for failure to instill in the young men a desire for conquest and a determination to win regardless of the costs.

Probably the hunt for the reasons for this condition should not be confined to the Army but an investigation should be made of the conditions under which the embryo soldiers were reared and under which they have lived for the past 10 years.

Until the World War American Armies were made up of volunteers and the units formed from the several States, and those forming them were in the ranks because they were convinced that it was a duty to give their service.

A pride of organization grew up and a rivalry existed between the various units and that, together with a continuity which is lacking in the present-day Army, made for efficiency.

The spirit of former years which encouraged men to do for themselves rather than appeal to the Government is now lacking in civil life and the multitude of State and Federal regulations which hamper individual efforts has done much to break down initiative and encourage a condition which is far from the best for a fighting army.

As more and more restrictions are placed upon American life there seems to be less and less difference between conditions in the New and Old Worlds and boys and men can see but little use in the struggle.

Breaking down of morale comes from closed shops, a third-term draft which many believe phony, and from the lack of efficiency in the national administration.

Before young America can be aroused to a fighting spirit there must be an end to broken promises in Washington, and a return to the former beliefs that an individual makes his own bed and should be content to lie in it.

Reception Given by the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg to Consul George P. Waller, Friday, August 8, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

ADDRESSES BY HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE GRAND DUCHESS OF LUXEMBOURG; THE HONORABLE ADOLF A. BERLE, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE; AND GEORGE PLATT WALLER, CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES AND UNITED STATES CONSUL TO LUXEMBOURG

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein addresses by Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg; the Honorable Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State; and Mr. George Platt Waller, Chargé d'Affaires and United States consul to Luxembourg, at a reception at the Luxembourg Legation, Friday, August 8, 1941, in honor of Mr. Waller, who returned to the United States on the steamship *West Point:*

INTRODUCTION BY THE HONORABLE HUGUES LE GALLAIS, MINISTER OF LUXEMBOURG

As Minister of Luxembourg to the United States, I have the high privilege and honor to introduce my most gracious sovereign, Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg.

ADDRESS BY HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE GRAND DUCHESS OF LUXEMBOURG

On the occasion of this reception for Mr. George Platt Waller, Chargé d'Affaires and consul of the United States to Luxembourg from 1931 to 1941, I am happy to be able to tell the American people that this official of their Government has won the devotion

and the admiration of the entire population of the country in which he was stationed. Mr. Waller succeeded not only because he represented a great friendly power, but because he is a man of stout heart and strong character who with unrelentless will did what he could for the people amongst whom he lived for 10 years. He liked them, and they liked him; he was their friend and protector. Mr. Waller was also an impartial and clear-seeing witness, not only of the crimes committed by the German invader against the liberties and sacred rights of the Luxembourg people, but also of their unanimously courageous attitude against the oppressor. I thank Mr. Waller with all my heart for this testimony given before American public opinion and the entire civilized world. It gives me a legitimate right to be proud of my people, who heroically are enduring a terrible fate whilst awaiting the hour of liberation. Mr. Waller has won the eternal gratitude of the Luxembourgers, and they are waiting to tell him so themselves—and how impatiently. They are fully convinced and have absolute faith that with the help of Almighty God, Great Britain and her allies will win this war and a just peace.

INTRODUCTION BY THE HONORABLE HUGUES LE GALLAIS, MINISTER OF LUXEMBOURG

Our next speaker will be the Honorable Adolf A. Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, whom I now have the honor to introduce.

ADDRESS BY HON. ADOLF A. BERLE, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

We meet today in the hospitality of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, a state which, through the endless changes of European history, has given an example of devotion to freedom and independence. Let it stand as a symbol of the many small nations which have mightily contributed to the life of Europe.

Though this small country is today submerged by irresistible force, we know beyond question that the processes of force can create no lasting result. Though its civilian population is literally enslaved, its mind and heart will not and cannot be broken.

An invading army has seized its territory. A conqueror, claiming to establish a "new order," has put its young men to work at forced labor; and has taken its girls from their homes, has forced them into German industry, and proposes to make them, if possible, mothers of alien children. This is the grim reality behind fine phrases about a "new order."

Yet there is no shadow of doubt that the nations of Europe and the people of Europe, great and small, wait only for the opportunity to break the chains of this temporary barbarism and to reestablish the laws and customs of civilization.

My Government is happy in the knowledge that the lot of the people of Luxembourg has been in some slight degree alleviated by the representative there of the Foreign Service of the United States, Consul Waller.

It is the plan of this Government, when the tide of barbarity shall be rolled back, to turn the full measure of its economic strength to bringing help, relief, and sustenance to the tens of millions of families in many countries who are now hungry, cold, homeless, sick, separated, or in prison by the ruthless act of a group of tyrants.

Out of the shadows there emerge the outlines of the world to come.

In it, small nations will be able to live in freedom and in peace, in a family of nations ruled by law which respects the right of the weak as well as the strong. The basis of existence must be national. But a necessary condition must be a general accord under which all countries are assured of participation in the economic life of the world, and under which all races are assured the right to live in conditions of equality and self-respect.

Modern life has provided the tools, the capacity, and the transport which can assure freedom from want. It has created the communications which can guarantee freedom of information and of science. It can and must create the law which gives freedom from fear.

In the day of reconstruction the voices of those who suffer now will not be forgotten. We are bold to think that the sorrow of the present is the prelude to a coming age more secure, more brilliant, more gracious, and more free than any we have yet seen.

INTRODUCTION BY THE HONORABLE HUGHES LE GALLAIS, MINISTER OF LUXEMBOURG

I have the honor to present my dear colleague and friend, Mr. George Platt Waller.

ADDRESS BY GEORGE PLATT WALLER, CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES AND UNITED STATES CONSUL TO LUXEMBOURG

Royal Highnesses, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, and my beloved friends in Luxembourg, coming out of the "valley of the shadow" into the sunshine of freedom, breathing again the air of that liberty which Luxembourg has lost for a time, I am almost blinded by the radiance and serenity which still—thank God—illuminate my beloved country. I lack words adequately to express the emotion with which I am stirred by the gracious and touching welcome which Your Royal Highnesses, your Minister, and the Grand Ducal Government have bestowed upon me. In great truth and deep humility I can only say "Non sum dignus." What little I have been privileged to do for my country and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg has been done with all my heart, and oh, how little it has been in comparison with all that I would have done had I been able. Was it not Browning who said "But a man's reach should exceed his grasp, or what's a Heaven for?" And yet, when I recall the glories of the soul which have blossomed under the plowshare of adversity, I am uplifted and edified by the example of the patriotism burning in each Luxembourg breast, and I feel that this suffering has not been in vain, and that your subjects always loving you and cherishing Your Royal Highness's sacred person as the symbol of their independence and the incarnation of their national unity, now feel for their sovereign a passionate affection verging on the mystical, a dynamic devotion such as has never before animated a people. I need but cite the message which I was entrusted to bring to you: "Tell our sovereign that we remain steadfast; tell her that we thank God that she is safe and is guarding the flame of our independence on a national altar across the seas. Tell her that we will not allow her foot to touch the ground when she returns with our liberty and happiness. Say unto her that we will carry her on our shoulders from Rodange to Luxembourg."

Another message, delivered to me at great peril scarce 3 weeks ago, says textually, "Before quitting our dear country, I beseech Your Excellency in the name of all Luxembourgers true to their democracy, and above all, loyal unto death to Her Royal Highness, her family, and her government, that in spite of all vicissitudes and the persecutions wreaked upon us by the oppressor, we will ever remain faithful and true. Be our interpreter near your great President, to thank him for the moral support with which he has armed us and fortified us in unstinted measure up to this day. Thank him, whom we consider our liberator-to-be. To this great man, and to the American Nation, all our thanks, all our sympathy. Useless to talk here of our sufferings. Your Excellency knows them better than anyone else."

My task has not been hard, because I loved it. I shared the love and trust of a noble people, their sorrows were my sorrows, and their hopes and fears were mine. I come forth inestimably richer for the experience. If the people of Luxembourg are in the valley of the shadow; if the sunlight of liberty and independence has been taken from them, nevertheless, Ma'm, like our blessed dead, they wait in sure and certain hope of a glorious resurrection.

St. Lawrence Waterway and Power Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 1941

STATEMENT OF JOHN L. LEWIS, PRESIDENT, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by John L. Lewis before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors:

I represent the United Mine Workers of America, an industrial trade union, devoted to the advancement of the economic welfare of the men who mine the Nation's coal. While primarily concerned with the development of the bituminous and anthracite industries, our union is also dedicated to the preservation of American ideals and American enterprise; all of our efforts being confined to true democratic processes.

Long ago, the United Mine Workers publicly declared its acceptance of a democratic form of government embracing capitalism. This acceptance was made in good faith. The United Mine Workers have since, on occasion, been forced to assume the lead in insisting that government and industrialists act in intelligent concert—behave like statesmen and industrialists should in the conduct of our American way of life. We are proud of the fact that the United Mine Workers have, on numerous occasions, been able to demonstrate the practicality of trade-union participation in formulating policies for the common good of all Americans.

We believe that all economic planning should be predicated on an honest appraisal of all undertakings, and the decisions eventually rendered designed to reflect the greatest good to the greatest number.

It is such common-sense reasoning that prompts the United Mine Workers at this time to register its united opposition against the present proposed development of the St. Lawrence project, for any and all the purposes that its proponents assert are based on the necessities of the times.

It is common gossip in the congressional halls, and admitted in editorial comment, that the proposed St. Lawrence project, would be "kicked out the window," without ceremony, if a sane appraisal and simple economic yardstick could be utilized to determine its merits.

Rejected in 1934 as being totally unnecessary for either power or commerce, it is here again in a new dress—patriotism, war-time defense. It is being propelled by all the adjectives known to the seasoned campaigner, plus all of the war-time facilities of an over-recruited, high-powered publicity staff.

The waterway is being paraded as a war-time defense "must project."

The methods of intimidation being employed by its sponsors, are designed to enlist and force patriotic pressure, to wilt the opponents, alleging that our foreign foes,

real or imaginary, must not learn of any disunity in the great preparedness program. The new dress of defense necessity is calculated to lift the proposal from the mire of the monstrous and uneconomic and make those, who know better, accept it as an essential arm of national defense.

The United Mine Workers do not propose to be taken in by political pitchmen operating under the cloak of defense needs.

Frankly we do not believe this project has any economic warrant in fact.

The United Mine Workers have a combined membership of 600,000 members employed in anthracite, bituminous and the by-product processing coke plants.

In 1929 the bituminous industry produced 534,000,000 tons of coal; in 1940, 453,000,000 tons, a decrease of 81,000,000, or 15 percent. The anthracite produced in 1929, 65,000,000 tons, which decreased to 51,000,000 tons in 1940, or 21 percent.

COAL EFFICIENCY

American industry enjoys the cheapest coal free on board the mines of any nation in the world.

No other American industry has had its product so thoroughly and so skillfully tested by combustion engineers, chemistry and scientific research to determine economical usage to the extent that coal has been examined.

Fuel consuming efficiency reduced from 170 pounds in 1920 to 115 pounds in 1939 the coal required to haul 1,000 gross tons of railroad freight a car-mile. American coal-burning roads saved in actual pocket cash on the proportionate freight hauled, comparable with 1920 costs, during the 14 years ending with 1939, the huge sum of $704,000,000, more than $50,000,000 the year due solely to improved fuel efficiency.

Kilowatt-hour coal consumption was reduced in the same period from 3.2 pounds to 1.4 pounds—56.2 percent. Modern steam plants generate a kilowatt-hour on 1 pound of coal.

In the manufacture of steel the amount of coking coal necessary to produce a ton of pig iron has been reduced since 1918 from 3,577 pounds to 2,865, or 20 percent. At the same time byproduct coke plants have increased the recovery of byproducts 18.2 percent.

Industrial plants and households, through the adoption and installation of improved equipment—stokers for the most part—have likewise recorded savings from 15 to 50 percent. In the 4 years 1937-40, the labor cost of bituminous production decreased, on the same wage rates, 18 cents the ton. The economies registered in improved combustion of coal usage, plus the fact that the man-day production of the American coal miner has been steadily increasing, due to improved mechanized mining methods, constitute an impressive march of progress—a noteworthy contribution to lessening the cost problems of fuel and power of American industry and domestic households.

In the light of these outstanding achievements, we do not believe that the coal industry should be singled out and penalized by foolhardy and unnecessary uneconomic competition, fostered by either the Federal or State Governments, and financed without warrant from the scant ready money held by the taxpayers of the Nation.

During the past 15 years, the pathway of the coal industry has been rather difficult. It was a strong breed of determined men who found new capital, and kept the industry going, despite the fact that the industry could not show the loan pattern—3 years' earning record—required by the banking fraternity as a prerequisite to plant loans.

The industry is prepared today to do its part in meeting all of the fuel requirements of the Nation. The courage that was required to keep the industry financed and developed during the lean days is ready, willing, and anxious in fact to prove that coal is geared to meet the needs of the Nation, even on a greatly expanded wartime basis.

I do not wish to burden the committee with the manifold problems of coal. I do want to impress upon the committee the fact that following the last World War the coal industry paid a terrific price for its efficiency. The overdevelopment resulting to meet wartime needs was of such magnitude that competition ruinous in scope developed in the early twenties and continued through 1927-30 when the Nation was enjoying its alleged greatest period of prosperity. Simply stated, the coal industry was in economic chaos when the Nation was wallowing in prosperity.

We have succeeded in restoring economic order in the industry. Under the Guffey Coal Act we are making great progress toward the elimination of cutthroat competition, that in the past bankrupted stockholders, impoverished mine workers, and entire mining communities. We are hopeful that under the regulatory arrangement between the Government, the coal operators, and mine workers, in which the public is protected by a consumer counsel, financed by a tax on the industry, the industry will achieve stabilized conditions.

It is with a full realization of the poverty and misery that beset the coal miners of the Nation through the long depression period, and which extended in coal from 1925 until now, that we are prompted to be alert and opposed to any unnecessary displacement of coal for production of power and heat.

What good? What benefits can we hope for if the Government joins with us on the one hand to stabilize the industry and then immediately sets about to displace coal for the generation of electricity and builds a waterway as an inducement to foreign coals? Foreign production enjoys subsidies from European governments, both as regards production and transportation. There can be no question but that the eventualities of this war as regards international trade and finance will be such that bigger and better subventions will be the rule in many foreign coal-producing nations. The Canadian market is made to order for such an uneconomic onslaught.

Canada is geographically linked to American coal. It is a natural American market. American coals used by Canada are, for the most part, transported in part or full by water transport.

A deepening of the St. Lawrence Channel cannot possibly help American coal in lowered transportation costs. It will help foreign coal delivery to additional Canadian ports and save connecting rail hauls.

I want to point out to the committee that following the last war it was the great hope of the American coal industry that we would be able to develop markets in Central and South America to which we had shipped coal for the first time during the emergency.

What a lesson in coal marketing American coal operators learned.

The discovery was made that British and German diplomacy had in its grip all of the influential business leaders and socialites in these nations. They owned the docks and the lighters, and, despite the fact that under normal freight charges American coal could be delivered cheaper, we could not meet the exorbitant docking and lighter charges, commissions of cliques, and return loads, all of which spelled finis to American coal-selling efforts. These conditions have not been removed, regardless of what our "Pollyanna" trade emissaries report.

It is a paradox that it is at times cheaper to run a coal mine at a measured loss than to close it down. A factory can be locked up, a watchman employed, and all expenses pared down to taxes and the watchman's salary. It is different with a coal mine. Steam must be maintained. Water must be pumped daily. Roadways and roof must be kept in good condition. Rock and slate falls must be cleared.

These maintenance costs mount into a sizable cost per ton. Foreign mines, especially English, have higher maintenance costs based on comparable wage rates. Add the advantages of waived royalties, subventions on production and transportation, and you have the answer as to why it will be possible for foreign coals to be marketed at a loss in the Canadian markets. Especially so, when return loads of wheat, and manufactured articles are to be had, and on a basis that borders on barter.

We may as well get another fact fixed in our minds, now as well as later. From the present outlook, Canada will emerge from this war period better equipped to compete with the United States in many new fields of manufacture. We have already lost our wheat and other grain markets to Canada, Australia, and the Argentine. Canadian wheat is now selling for 30 cents the bushel under American wheat; Argentine wheat 50 cents under, while Argentine corn is going at 26 cents the bushel, against our price of 73 cents. All of the wheat-growing countries are burdened with heavy carry-overs. The Rome Institute, world-wide wheat authority, asserts that European crops, after 2 years of war, will be normal and meet all requirements in 1941.

The only future hope we have of selling wheat and grains to other nations lies in our continued export subsidies, which must be upped and upped beyond the point of reasonableness. Otherwise we are out. The same will be true of lard, edible oils from cottonseed and soybeans, meat and canned goods, and all other commodities.

The St. Lawrence waterway will be an invitation, a new peril, in the barter game for other countries to unload whatever they have for whatever price or trade arrangement that can be negotiated, in order to maintain exchange money and rates. Let's not mistake this certainty.

THE TAX TAKE

While other nations waive royalties, grant subventions to their coal industries, American coal stands on its own resources, and pays from 75 cents to $1.26 the ton in direct and hidden taxes, varying with the point of delivery, and on industrial and domestic sizes. In the Chicago market, the greatest coal-consuming area in the world, domestic coals pay an average in direct and hidden taxes of $1.26 the ton. All of the above taxes are exclusive of income taxes on the part of the producing company, distributing agency, retail dealer, and employees. These taxes are based on the 1940 tax rates, levied by all the taxing authorities, ranging from property tax to sales tax. You gentlemen of the committee are quite aware that 1941 will register tax-rate increases and that the take will grow bigger and bigger in the immediate future.

Reduced to kilowatt-hours, the tax take means that on a basis of from 1 pound to 1.40 pounds of coal being required to generate a kilowatt-hour, that each kilowatt-hour produced by coal nets in tax revenue from one-thirtieth to one-twelfth of a cent in taxes for some tax agency.

The tax alone from the railroad freight-dollar on coal ranges from 20 to 30 cents the ton.

Public utilities consumed 53,000,000 tons of coal in 1941, which netted a minimum of $39,000,000 in taxes. The total tax for bituminous coal in 1940 was at least $475,000,000, which includes domestic sizes and sales taxes levied thereon.

Instead of creating another billion-dollar obligation upon which the already overburdened taxpayers will have to pay interest charges—an investment upon which they will receive no taxes in return, and which will

never be self-liquidating—why not use coal to provide whatever additional electric power may be required?

You gentlemen of the committee will undoubtedly agree that we are going to need more and more taxes to pay the carrying charges on the debt that is piling up.

The hidden and direct taxes levied on coal produced and sold are by no means all the taxes derived from the industry. For let it be known that the strong arm of the tax collector stretches out to "pluck"—again by direct and hidden taxes—at least one-fifth of all the wages paid mine workers, supervisory and clerical forces, as well as all other salaries necessary to the operating and distribution set-up, that must be met out of the moneys received from coal sales.

The wage load for all parties to the pay roll in coal, except the retailers, will average around $1.75 the ton. Roughly, this would mean that in the spending of their wages the men employed in the coal industry would supply the tax collectors with approximately 35 cents the ton. On 453,000,000 tons of coal the outgo wage-spending taxes would total $175,000,000, which added to the four hundred and seventy-five million of other direct and hidden taxes makes a grand total of $632,50,000.

American tax coffers benefit by the levy of all these taxes on all coal exported to Canada. From the ten to fourteen million tons shipped to Canada annually, our tax agencies are enriched from eighteen to twenty-two million dollars.

Right here I would like to make an inquiry. Why is it that public officials, hell-bent on fighting public utilities, seldom, if ever, think in terms of municipal or Government steam-power generating plants—with coal as the basic fuel—when they launch these sporadic attacks on utility rates?

Is there something about the political proposal of using coal to generate electricity that makes the proposition of Government ownership and operation lose its appeal?

Certainly there is at hand sufficient engineering opinion to warrant the installation of coal-powered steam plants, as against all other fuels, as well as most water-power developments, as being the most economical of operation and the least expensive of construction. There can be no question as to coal being the most economical north of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi Rivers.

SPENDING HAS A LIMITATION SOMEWHERE

Somewhere along the line of endeavor we must face the sad realities of present-day spending. The unthinking may be misled by propaganda that attempts to convey the notion of our never-ending ability to keep up our spending spree. But the history of the world, the history of this Nation, belies such a fallacy. Our Federal Government is now spending one-fourth of the national income.

Spending great sums of money—borrowed money—will increase employment, but it will not produce stability, nothing self-liquidating. In the end, the workingman will pay the cost. There will be no fooling as to where the pay-off will come from.

There is no use deceiving ourselves about fiscal miracles. Especially when they are touted as the "real McCoy" by war-production sponsors to salve the public of newly discovered economic protective measures, based upon an additional grant of legislative authority.

The aftermath of the present war may find the whole world on a semibarter basis, which might last for many years to come. We may be forced into an international gypsy horse-trading economy—who knows?

EMPLOYMENT

For every ton of coal displaced by water power, one man loses a day's work. Such are the findings of those who have ferreted the economic loss in employment. The finding is based on research by coal associations tracing the employment involved in producing, transporting, and distributing coal to the ultimate consumer. The ratio is higher in anthracite.

There is a great hue and cry at present about the 2,000,000 man-days alleged to have been lost in defense industries during the first 6 months of 1941. What about the loss of 13,000,000 man-days if our Canadian coal markets are lost for good? Will those same anxious folks, who publicly criticize now, these same folks whose concern about the public welfare lies dormant for the most part between wars, be as insistent and appealing in the cause of employment for the men who stand to lose from five to fifty million man-days the year, if the St. Lawrence turns out to be all that its sponsors prophesy?

Shall we purposely plan to increase unemployment? Shall we provide the makings to multiply the woes of the workingman when the war is terminated?

Properly and thoroughly unmasked, the pending St. Lawrence project will not stand the light of careful and penetrating examination.

Nobody seems to know whether Canada is going to ante or not. Canada can renege without impairing its honor. There is nothing in the proposal that makes it compulsory, forcing Canada to take part, or to spend any money. In fact, those who should be in the know assert that Canada is just a party to the proposal at this time as a wartime favor—window dressing in order that the project's sponsors might be better fortified to befuddle the American people.

Furthermore no one seems to know what the ultimate cost will be. There cannot be at this time a rigid control of prices on materials and services. We cannot halt for the building time required the inflationary trend in prices. Prices are steadily mounting and will continue upward gyrations. Engineering dreams and fancies recognize no boundaries or limitations when they hook the public purse as a backlog angel.

COST OF COAL IN MANUFACTURE

Political discussion of water-power developments and the general attack on utilities have confused the public mind as regards the cost of coal in the production of electricity, as well as all other American manufacture. Industrialists and railroads always emitted a loud yelp about coal prices being increased a few cents the ton. Generally speaking, the public has been misled into believing that a 10-cent-the-ton increase free on board the mine on coal means many dollars increase in the selling price of an automobile and proportionate price advances on all other manufactured articles.

Ten years ago, the Edison Institute admitted that if all the coal consumed in the generation of electricity, plus freight rates averaging around $4.50 the ton delivered, were eliminated as a cost factor on household consumers' electric bills, that the annual savings to the average householder would not be more than $1.20 annually.

The cost of coal, to coal-burning railroads, is only 3.8 percent of gross revenue. In automobile manufacture, the cost is .0019 percent to the wholesale selling price; agricultural implements, .0038 percent, and in steel, less than 4 percent of the selling price. Eliminating steel and cement, the composite cost of coal for all manufactured products for the Nation as a whole is only .0054 percent of the average wholesale selling prices.

This showing of infinitesimal cost of coal for fuel and power utilized in manufacture and in heating, lighting, and transportation, should, in our opinion, invite far-visioned statesmen and industrialists to aid in the development and enlarged use of coal. Certainly, the basic industry of coal offers to American transportation, to American working men, directly and indirectly, so much employment, and tax revenue to the multiple tax collecting agencies, that American economy can ill afford to do anything which will stymie its progress.

PROPAGANDA AND PRESSURE

The stupidity of Government-agency propaganda in support of the St. Lawrence project, and the method of presentment, is almost unbelievable.

I want to take this occasion to partially analyze the silly statement introduced by Chairman Olds, of the United States Power Commission, just as Secretary Kennedy, of the United Mine Workers, began to testify before this committee. It was well-timed and in line with all other propaganda attempts of certain Government branches to discredit all persons offering unfavorable testimony against the waterway project.

The United Mine Workers insist that electricity generated by the St Lawrence project will displace coal. We contend that for every 2,000 kilowatt-hours produced by this project, 1 ton of coal will be displaced.

We further insist that the power to be generated by this project can be produced more cheaply by coal in steam plants.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, boys in camp, if you cannot write your Congressman, be sure to write your mother.

The House nearly saved the country, even if the country did not want to be saved.

The one-fifth who are for war call the four-fifths who are against war the "fifth column."—Lindbergh.

The Japs fail to get Mr. Hull's idea of aggression after seeing our extension to the Northeast and the West and our threat to the Southeast.

The 202 is a hint to the world that we have the semblance of a democracy yet, and that George Washington still lives in the hearts of many.

I give this promise to Kansas First District people: That if Willkie heads the Republican ticket in '44 my name will not be on it. I can slop hogs again.

Our bowing out gives the freezing in of cotton and wheat and gives back to the grower without penalty the average yield and the right to feed the surplus.

The fact that a third of the opposition to the extension of Army service was from the east side of the center aisle should be an answer to the charge of partisanship.

The 15-year-old, unshaven son of Congressman ERYSON speaks with the Governor and an ex-Governor of South Carolina in behalf of his father at joint meetings for the senatorial election September 3.

It comes from good authority that 60 chaplains are to be sent to Iceland. Regulations now call for 1,200 men per chaplain. Do you suppose the Crown Prince or any of his brothers will winter there?

The Canada Parliament has adjourned and gone home. They have only a 4-

months' conscription and only for home duty, and they have declared war. England is praying for the prodigal son down here to return and do some fighting.

The United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle.

THE UNITED STATES

Here's to the North—the imperial North—
Rich in resources of wonderful worth—
Out from whose ports pass perpetually forth
Ships to all parts of the civilized earth,
Bearing our multiplied products afar—
Widening business and furthering trade—
And bringing back, free from perils of war,
Earth's foreign treasures in endless parade.

Long has the North, 'neath Old Glory unfurled,
Fondly been favored, indeed, by the fates—
Thru her the foreign commerce of the world
Follows the lead of the United States;
For she, responsive, with millions untold,
From her secure, inexhaustible chest,
Thru her own Wall Street, has largely controlled
Trade in the East and the South and the West.

Here's to the North—the imperial North—
When peace is threatened by rumors of wars,
Bravely, but cautiously, rushes she forth
Under the gleam of the Stripes and the Stars;
Yet, at the feet of the Goddess of Peace,
Humbly and meekly she watches and waits—
For, all her power and prestige would cease,
Should peace depart from the United States.

Here's to the East—to the cultural East—
Loveland of learning, and Eden of art—
Pride of the preacher and prophet and priest—
Made for the mind, and designed for the heart—
Here, through the years, have America's youth,
Treading the trails that the masters have trod,
Drunk from the unfailing fountains of truth—
Fed from the eternal tables of God.

Here education's flag first was unfurled,
Laughing illiterate folly to scorn—
Here in the wilds of the young western world
Young education's school system was born.
Though intellectual progress advanced
Slowly at first, her advancement was sure,
For her high standards were richly enhanced
By her life motto, "Live, learn, and endure."

Here's to the East—to the cultural East—
Intellect rules in this wonderful realm—
Wisdom through knowledge is greatly increased,
Always, when character's hand holds the helm.
When universities learn to put, first,
Character's charm—the true fixer of fates—
Crime in high places, despised and dispersed,
Will cease to be in the United States.

Here's to the West—to the great boundless West—
Wonderful section, too vast to be known—
Richly endowed, and abundantly blessed
With Nature's choicest creations in stone—
Here fruits and flowers, trees, grasses, and grains—
Animals, reptiles, fish, insects, and birds—
Prairies and deserts, and mountains and plains—
Are too sublime to be pictures in words.

Civilization has barely begun
This wonder region of wealth to explore—
All she is doing, like all she has done,
Leaves the big problem unsolved, as of yore.
Whole generations have sprung up, and passed,
Going the way all the others have gone,
Since the great West—inconceivably vast—
To the first pioneers came to be known.

Here's to the West—to the great boundless West—
Measureless in her prospective advance—
Wonderful bargain, the biggest and best—
Most of it bought for a pittance from France.
Long as continues mankind to increase—
Long as posterity's seed propagates—
There will be room for more lovers of peace
In the great West of the United States.

Here's to the South—to the sweet sunny South—
Known as the Union's insep'rable child—
Home of the songs from prosperity's mouth,
On which the fates have so frequently smiled—
Land where the voice of variety speaks
Into existence all shades of design,
Purposed by Nature, which anxiously seeks,
Through each creation, to please Divine.

Fanned by the breath of the simmering breeze,
Sifting along through the sun's silver gleam,
Tremolingly whispering songs to the trees,
Soft as the silence of memory's dream—
Sure as the ebb and the flow of the tide—
Smoothly the South in her majesty moves
On toward eternity's time-end divide,
Led by the spirit which justice approves.

Here's to the South—to the sweet sunny South—
Section where summer instinctively dwells;
Where kindly words flow from many a mouth,
Fresh from the heart's inexhaustible wells;
Where, truly, faith, hope, and charity rest;
Where hospitality opens her gates;
Where all is brightest and sweetest and best—
This is the South of the United States.

Here's to the States—to the United States—
Greatest Republic existent on earth,
On whom the world in expectancy waits
For safety signals and counsels of worth.
Long may she live as the safeguard of peace,
Leading the fight for suppression of wars,
Over the world may her prestige increase
As she lifts higher the Stripes and the Stars.

Until the grave claims its last lonesome guest,
Buried, unseen, without prophet or priest,
Until the sun sinks at last in the west,
Never again to arise in the east,
Until the moon has been changed into blood,
Until the ocean has scattered his bars,
Until the sky has collapsed with a thud,
May we be true to the Stripes and the Stars.

Here's to the States—to the United States—
Half of whose greatness will never be told.
Time, in her station, apparently, waits,
That she may never, no never, grow old.
On past the better, and up toward the best,
Is her one slogan, approved by the Fates,
Sung through the North and the East and the West—
And through the South of the United States.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Three South Dakota Editors Have Their Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, well over 50 percent of America live on the farm or in communities of 5,000 people or less. To understand the true heart of America and to keep in tune with the sound thinking of people who form the real backbone of this great Republic, therefore it is necessary to know what is in the hearts and minds of the vast majority of Americans who are not city dwellers. Probably the best way to know what these Americans are thinking and feeling these days is to examine the hometown papers which they read.

For the information of the Congress and the country, Mr. Speaker, I call attention herewith to three editorials on the international situation published by the able editors of three of our typical weekly newspapers of South Dakota. The first is from the pen of Al J. Adams, of Sisseton, S. Dak., who presents a thought-provoking editorial on the four freedoms:

[From the Sisseton (S. Dak.) Courier]

THE FOUR FREEDOMS

There has been a great deal said about the "four freedoms" outlined by President Roosevelt some time ago, freedoms which embrace privileges for which every intelligent human being must long. These four freedoms include freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. They are freedoms which all of us must endorse, although there has yet no way been found by which all of them may be enjoyed by every person, even in the freest country in the world. Freedom of speech and freedom of religion we all have. Freedom from want and freedom from fear have not yet come to all of us. The economic state of the Nation during the past dozen years indicates how true is this statement.

But the discussion of the four freedoms has become so general that they bid fair to take the place of President Wilson's Fourteen Points enunciated during the last World War—and forgotten as soon as the Armistice was signed.

The four freedoms are eminently desirable for everyone, everywhere. But they cannot be put over by a crusade of knights in shining armor. They cannot be assured for people everywhere through the droning of bombers and the booming of cannon.

War always brings, not the four freedoms but the four destroyers—death, famine, pestilence, and collapse.

The four freedoms have never been forced upon any people by force of arms. We fought the last war to preserve democracy for the world. The result was communism in Russia, nazi-ism in Germany, fascism in Italy, and a dozen or more little dictator-

ships scattered over the continent of Europe. Our involvement in the war did not destroy the freedom of speech and the freedom of worship which our Constitution guarantees, but it certainly, in the long run, contributed nothing to our freedom from fear.

Joining in a crusade to enforce the four freedoms on a continent where human life and material wealth are now being destroyed day after day, would not establish the four freedoms over there but would endanger them in America. Freedom of speech and freedom of religion might survive unless we forgot the reverence due our Constitution, but certainly freedom from want and freedom from fear would be assured us by joining in European military adventure.

Mr. Speaker, the second editorial is written by J. G. Nordseth, editor and publisher of the Emery Enterprise. Like other South Dakota editors, Mr. Nordseth has no liking for nazi-ism, fascism, or communism, and like most editors of the State he disapproves of any program or subterfuge which would again cause our boys to fight and die on foreign battle fronts.

[From the Emery (S. Dak.) Enterprise]

A NEW A. E. F.?

It is becoming more and more evident that despite preelection pledges, we are drifting nearer and nearer to a shooting war. The United States, with Great Britain, has assumed joint control of Iceland. It is revealed that American workmen are busy helping to construct bases in northern Ireland. Our patrol boats are said, on good authority, to have dropped depth bombs of warning to German submarines.

It has been recommended by our military authorities that the law be repealed limiting the service of draftees to the Western Hemisphere. It is said that the circumstances may suddenly arise when it will be necessary to send these boys to foreign lands. In view of all this it may be well to recall an address made by President Roosevelt on October 26, 1939. He is quoted as stating:

"In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That, I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fakes in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogeyman. The simple truth is that no person in any responsible place in the national administration in Washington, or in any State government, or in any city goverment, or in any county government, has ever suggested in any shape, manner, or form the remoteat possibility of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That is why I label that argument a shameless and dishonest fake."

Since the address from which this paragraph was taken was delivered at the New York Herald Tribune forum, a year before the 1940 election, it cannot be dismissed as campaign oratory, and we are not inferring that the President would desire this to be done. And in a fireside chat delivered December 29, 1940, the President was quoted in press releases as stating:

"There is no demand for sending an American expeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth."

We take the President at his word.

The third editorial is from the Hamlin County Herald-Enterprise, owned and edited by Casper Nohner, of Hayti, S. Dak. Like most South Dakota editors, Mr. Nohner owns and operates his own newspaper and has to answer only to his own conscience and conform with his own convictions in determining his editorial policy. Mr. Nohner is a true American with courage to speak his convictions and with a background of information which gives weight to his opinions.

[From the Hamlin County (S. Dak.) Herald-Enterprise]

President Roosevelt, in his plea for retention of selective-service men beyond their 12-month training period, declared Monday that the danger to the United States today was infinitely greater than it was a year ago. He did not say how the danger had become aggravated over the year, but he had no need to. All who heard him or read his statement knew that the situation can be laid at the door of a foreign policy that has done nothing to keep the Nation out of Europe's embroglio and instead has done everything to put us in. Nor did the President indicate in his speech the extent of the Nation's progress in preparedness. He did not say how much of the newly produced defense equipment was going to our own defense and how much was being diverted to Britain, or whether any real effort was being made to arm ourselves adequately to meet any threatened invasion.

It would seem that if the emergency is so acute as to require us to break our pledge to the service men then also it should be our primary effort to look to our own immediate preparedness first. The truth is that contrary to American desires or interests the Nation has been edged inch by inch into war the while our people have been kept in the dark or deluged as to the administration intentions, until now we stand upon the threshold of war, confused, disorganized, and largely unprepared but nontheless committed to contribute American manpower and resources to another futile effort to swing the balance in Europe's age-old economic struggle. When the full story of our undercover activity to involve the Nation is finally told, it will prove a sordid, disillusioning tale, indeed.

Mr. Speaker, no board of directors or business policies determine the editorial content of the weekly newspaper of America. Mostly owned by the men who edit them, they reflect the sentiments of their communities and of their editors with candor and clarity. It is a good practice for all of us these days to read the home-town newspapers which circulate in the homes of well over half the citizens of America. They may not be as sensational or as famous as the great metropolitan newspapers but in the aggregate they are read by a great many more people and their editorial influence is undoubtedly greater than that of the impersonal papers of metropolitan areas.

Germany Improving Danube for Military Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

LETTER FROM S. WILLSON RICHARDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE MARINE NEWS,
New York, N. Y., July 7, 1941.

The Honorable JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You will be interested, we are sure, in this further information with respect to the great value the efficient Germans place in waterways.

In the April 30 issue of the Scandinavian Shipping Gazette, which reached us almost 6 weeks late, it is stated that—

"The port of Vienna is to be made a center of greater shipping activity. Before the war only about 1,000,000 tons of cargo was handled via the port of Vienna, but now large quays are under construction. The requirements caused by the war and future plans have given rise to the great Danube projects. Next to the Volga River, the Danube is the longest river of Europe, its length being 2,900 kilometers (the Rhine being 1,320 kilometers). The Government of the Reich has purchased 3 Danubian shipping companies, so that they now dispose of about one-sixth of the total Danubian lighter fleet of 1,500,000 tons. Many lighters are under construction, only 2 types being used—one of 1,000 tons, the other an oil lighter of 800 tons. The river is being regulated, its smallest depth being only 2 meters, where it will be dredged, and rocks are to be blasted away so that the depth will be 2½ meters. The most dangerous point in the Dan be is the fall through the Iron Gate—the pass in the Transylvanian Alps between Vienna and the Black Sea. Here an enormous lock will take the speed off the fall and at the same time the current will be utilized by an electric-power station to produce 75,000,000 kilowatts. Another project is for a waterway to the coal fields of upper Silesia, so that the lighters can go up the Danube with grain from the Balkans and return with coal. The new canal is to go from the upper Oder in upper Silesia almost to Vienna, and it is to be finished in 3 or 4 years."

We reaffirm that America has the greatest potential inland and intracoastal waterway system on earth; development and expansion could make it a priceless national asset.

Yours very truly,

S. WILLSON RICHARDS, *Editor.*

Tolerance and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE L. HERRING

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

ADDRESS BY CHAPLAIN MAURICE S. SHEEHY

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address by Lt. Comdr. Maurice S. Sheehy, chaplain of the Naval Air Station at Jacksonville, Fla., delivered over the Columbia network on August 9, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My apology for speaking at a moment when feelings are at a high pitch, when people who love peace are called either pro-Nazis or warmongers, depending upon the means by which peace is to be assured, is simply

this: Five times during the course of a few weeks it was my duty, as their chaplain, to assist young men terribly injured face the possibility of death. It is not a pleasant thing to see a young man die, even when he dies in the noblest of all endeavors. When his concern in dying is chiefly for his loved ones and his country, then death is not such a dreadful visitor. Two of these young men did not die. Undaunted by their broken bones, they now eagerly await the hour when they may return to their squadrons. Dorothy Thompson a few days ago wrote a panegyric of the youth of England in the R. A. F. May I recall in passing that we have the same heroic mold in our own backyard.

Loyalty to these young men and to the cause they serve impels me to speak tonight. If the spirit of the young men of the naval air station at Jacksonville is typical, as I believe it is, our youth will not fail America.

But the question which disturbs me is: Are the American people loyal to those who are risking their lives for its security?

There is no need to circulate inane questionnaires among these young men asking such questions as "Do you want peace or war?" They all want peace. But they all have read of the march of Nazi legions closer and closer to this hemisphere, and they have heard that almost 20 nations have lost their sovereignty within 2 years. The words of Vice President Wallace uttered at Burlington, Iowa, 10 days ago find an echo in most of us:

"Only by developing our might to the utmost; only by demonstrating through every action and attitude that we are completely willing to go to war if necessary, is there any chance for that peace which we so earnestly desire. * * * The preservation of liberty depends upon us. We must not fail."

The greatest threat to our defense program is not now the obstruction of production lines or strikes or the possible sabotage of ships or planes. More important than these is what is going on in the minds and hearts of our youth. The great threat to their morale lies in the confusion and the indifference of certain segments of our people. This condition recalls the words of Pope Pius XII in his Easter message of 1939:

"How can there be real and solid peace while even men with a common nationality, heedless of their common stock or their common fatherland, are torn apart and kept asunder by intrigues and dissensions and the interests of factions?"

A few days ago that brilliant journalist, Walter Lippmann, wrote an article on Colliding Opinions. In it he recognizes the fact that the present world conflict is a war not only of force but of ideas. He roughly divides the conflicting parties of our country into two categories; first, those who point the finger of suspicion at the leaders of our Government as if they were tricking us into war, and, second, those who interpret the march of aggressor nations as the real threat to the security of this Nation.

I am not entirely free to choose as between these two schools of thought. I am a member of the faculty of the Catholic University of America. Recently the rector of the university proclaimed a policy to which I give wholehearted assent:

"In civil affairs, the university is pledged to fullest cooperation with the Federal authorities set up by the people for their constitutional government. * * * Those in authority, executive, legislative, and judicial, are charged with the most grave responsibility. We can have no part with those who doubt that this grave responsibility is carried by those in power with conscientious and untiring effort to fulfill their mandate from the people."

May I recall that it was the duly elected legislators who, after long and serious debate, summoned from their homes and loved ones almost 2,000,000 young men? Had not the conscription law been passed, we would have no voice in world affairs, no obstacle to impede the dagger aimed at our very life. And our Nation would be as a house built upon sand.

May I go a bit further than did Bishop Corrigan in his admirable statement. Ours is one of the few decent governments left in the world. True, in our past history there have been some ugly pages, our treatment of the Indian and the Negro, our seizure of territory by force almost a century ago, our hasty involvement in the Spanish-American War. But today this country has no plan of territorial thievery, no lust for conquest, no desire to execute the suggestion made recently that we ape Hitler in setting up puppet governments.

Our decency as a nation is mirrored in our condemnation of the international piracy of Japan, Italy, and Germany. The same held for Russia, whose illicit alliance with Hitler begot the war, as I recalled over this network in November 1939. Communism is a stench to those who love freedom. The people of Russia have been ignorant of those fundamental truths on which lasting civilization is built. But they are now, at this moment, defending their homes and their children. Communism has been given a rebirth in the world by Hitler who has given unity of effort to a nation fast falling into decay.

Our national leaders in their effort to protect America have had a foreign policy thrust upon them not of their own choosing. We Americans abhor the thought of clasping a bloody hand. But we can and do sympathize with the purpose of those defending their native land.

I repeat that ours is a decent Government. Our national conscience has never been more sensitive than it is at present. We have been honest. We make no pretense of neutrality. We have been generous to a fault. We have been courageous. Our youth will give more than years if necessary to protect those freedoms which are dearer than life.

One of those freedoms was stressed by President Roosevelt on January 4, 1939, in his message to Congress:

"Storms from abroad directly challenge three institutions indispensable to Americans, now as always. The first is religion. It is the source of the other two—democracy and international good faith. Religion, by teaching man his relationship to God, gives the individual a sense of his own dignity and teaches him to respect himself by respecting his neighbors."

Are these words idle oratory? If you think so, read The Persecution of the Church Under the Third Reich, or the series of articles appearing recently in the Florida Catholic on the brutal suppression of religion by the Nazis in Poland. More inhuman bestiality has never been recorded than that perpetrated by Hitler's legions, whom he suddenly calls to a so-called holy war with communism. Let him who is without sin cast the first stone.

Within our camps men of all faiths—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—are working side by side in their consecration of duty. Is it too much to ask that those not in the service do likewise?

The finest example of interfaith unity begotten by this war has been manifest in England. Dare I recall, without being called a warmonger, the five points outlined by Pope Pius XII for a just and honorable peace on Christmas Eve 1939?

The first is the right to life and independence of all nations, great and small.

The second is the cessation of the race for armaments.

The third is a juridical institution to guarantee the fulfillment of treaties.

The fourth is respect for the rights of racial minorities.

The fifth is acceptance of the law of God, and of the spirit of justice and universal charity as the basis for international relations.

Needless to state, Germany ignored—nay, even refused—to permit these conditions of peace to be printed. "The right to life and independence of all nations." Why, that would mean that Poland must be free, and Denmark, and Norway, and Albania, and Greece. So the Nazis suppressed this message.

In England, this message did appear. There Protestant leaders, recognizing its merit, initiated, along with that great prelate, Cardinal Hinsley, the organization known as the Sword of the Spirit. The Established Church of England, the Free Churches, and the Catholic Church joined in proclaiming the principles of a true and lasting peace.

Has not the day come for all Americans—Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Lutheran—for all, Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic to declare publicly their allegiance to these principles? United in the Sword of the Spirit, under the God from whom comes all freedom, we can do two things: We shall give the dictators pause for meditation; and we shall give the young men in our camps the inspiration of a united and devoted support.

As a Catholic, I am saddened by those organs of hate which have enrolled themselves under the leadership of anti-American forces. Some so-called religious papers are so bitterly opposed to our Government that it is incredible that they should long be allowed to vomit their spleen upon the youth of our land. One paper, stealthily and furtively, has begun a campaign to besmirch the good name of a bishop, among the priests of his own diocese. Recently a group of allegedly Catholic laymen publicized a message sent to all the bishops, impugning the good faith of one who also sustained the proposition that our foreign policy was based firmly on moral law. I wonder why that committee did not dare to publish the responses of the members of the hierarchy?

We Catholics have been taught to render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's. I do not pretend to be an official spokesman for the church in this country but I do say most emphatically that the rank and file of both the leadership and the followership of the Catholic church is solidly behind our Government in its effort to stop the onrushing tide of Nazi tyranny. Catholic loyalty is not expressed merely in words. Secretary of War Baker pointed out in the last war that the number of Catholic volunteers was far greater than the proportion of Catholic numbers. In the naval station where I am privileged to serve as chaplain, the same holds true. In behalf of these young men, and as their pastor, I wish, since he is getting many messages, to address a few words to our Commander in Chief:

"Mr. President, receive from us the tribute of our prayers and our loyalty. In your hands today may lie the hopes of the human race. We know that you, who have consecrated from the moment of its inception your Presidency to the God of justice will not fail us. We are but a handful of the millions who give you richly deserved support. In this critical hour, we believe that no hearts are more loyal to our country than Catholic hearts, that no tongues speak more sincerely its praises than Catholic tongues and we Catholics who love our country next to our God, with strong and willing hands, under your leadership, will protect by our lives if necessary, its laws, its institutions, its liberties. God be with you in this hour."

Joint Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much confusion and false propaganda on the proposal to require husband and wife to file joint tax returns that I believe a restatement of the proposition for the record may be useful. To state it quite simply, the issue is that of tax payment as against tax avoidance—tax favoritism for a few as against tax equality for the many.

The substance and much of the form of my speech on the floor of the House on August 1 is contained in these remarks.

The problem is not technical or hard to understand. Stated quite simply, it is this:

In any of the 48 States husbands and wives can give income-producing property, like real estate, stocks and bonds, and so forth, to each other, thus dividing their property between them for the avoidance of surtaxes.

In the community-property States, 8 in number, husband and wife may divide their salaries and personal earnings and thus avoid surtaxes. In the other 40 States this cannot be done.

In no State does the proposal affect an income of less than $4,000.

The practical effect in figures is this: Suppose a husband is earning $5,000 in a community-property State and gives his wife one-half of his salary. The tax on the $5,000 would be $308 and the tax on the two $2,500 items would be $275, thus accomplishing an avoidance of $33, which the other taxpayers have to take up—both income-tax payers and excise-tax payers. This cannot be done in the other 40 States.

If a man's salary is $10,000, there is a tax of $1,166. Divided equally with his wife into two $5,000 items, the tax is $880, a tax avoidance of $286, which the other taxpayers have to take up.

If his income is $50,000, the tax is approximately $20,000. Divided equally with his wife the tax is about $13,000, leaving a tax avoidance of $7,000, which the other taxpayers have to take up.

As I said, this can be accomplished on salaries and personal earnings in community-property States, but not in the other 40 States.

But in all the States the income-producing property can be transferred between the spouses, a gift tax paid only once, and thereafter the legal avoidance of taxes goes on each year. To use the same examples, if the husband with the $50,000 income from real estate, stocks, and bonds, and so forth, decides to avoid surtaxes, he can give half of it to his wife, pay the gift tax only once, and avoid $7,000 per year in taxes.

Another phase of this situation, making for tax favoritism and legal tax avoidance, is this:

If husband and wife have income, say, of equal amount of $25,000 each and the husband—or wife—takes a net loss of $25,000 for a given year, they may make a joint return, and the one spouses's loss of $25,000 may be offset against the other spouse's income of $25,000 and they pay no tax whatever. The proposal for joint returns for all husbands and wives would close this tax-avoidance loophole.

The Secretary of the Treasury has stated that since 1932 gifts to the amount of at least $7,500,000,000 have been made in the United States. People do not give their money or income to strangers, so, obviously, this $7,500,000,000 in gifts is chiefly composed of family transfers, making possible tax avoidance. The Treasury estimates that the tax avoidance is $323,000,000 annually.

Who gets the benefit of this tax avoidance? The figures show that 5.77 percent of the people make separate returns, so this small percentage benefits. Who takes up the slack? Who stands the loss? Of course, the other 94.23 percent of income-tax payers, as well as the vast army of excise-tax payers, pay the taxes which the 5.77 percent legally avoid under the present law. The proposal for joint returns for husband and wife cures this situation.

I share the view expressed in this debate on the subject of nondefense appropriations. In my opinion, Secretary Morgenthau's advice to cut out a billion dollars on nondefense was sound. If this had been done, many rates could have been made substantially lower and some excise taxes on the people's goods left off. No one in a position of powerful authority made the slightest effort to put the advice of the chief fiscal officer of the Nation into action. I made such a motion in the Ways and Means Committee, but since the Ways and Means Committee has no jurisdiction on such appropriations a point of order was properly sustained. Under the rules of the House, amendments for cuts in appropriations cannot be offered in this bill in the National Congress, even in the case of an emergency as great as war. The whole Budget is not intelligently considered. The Appropriations Committee spends the money as it pleases without regard to the Ways and Means Committee, which is required to raise it. The two committees are poles apart. As has been said by the press on the subject of the point of order, it appears that "saving is not germane to spending."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has yielded to me, and I want to direct the attention of the Committee to the fact that the gentleman is speaking of the fact that there is not a proper coordination between the committee that raises the revenue and the committees that have to do with the expenditure of the money. I beg my colleagues to pay attention.

Mr. DISNEY. My other remarks on this subject will be very brief, because I want to go into the subject of mandatory returns by husband and wife.

Congress appears to be the only place on the face of the earth where the spending organization is completely divorced from the tax-raising or income-producing organization. Up to the time of the War between the States the Ways and Means Committee raised the money and spent the money. Since that time we have had the Appropriations Committee, on the one hand, spending the money, and the Ways and Means Committee, on the other hand, raising the money, and the composite brain of the Congress has nothing to do with any intelligent coordination between these two committees under the rules of the House and the rules of the Senate. Something ought to be done about it.

I remember quite well when the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] offered an amendment to cut the W. P. A. appropriation to $500,000,000. Seven of us out of 435 in this House stood up to support him on it. Likewise, many other instances which we all know about.

Now, coming back to this subject of mandatory joint returns. There has been such a welter of confusion engendered with all the propaganda spread that I feel the proposal should be restated. I hope the Members have read this report. It is enlightening, and it is specifically definite on this subject. I think I can explain it.

Succinctly the issue involved is: Shall 5.77 percent of the people filing tax returns be permitted to file separate returns, thereby defeating surtaxes, and shall the remaining 94.23 percent of the people filing tax returns continue to be required to take up the slack and pay the taxes—along with the other taxpayers—which the 5.77 percent avoid? This is the sole issue in this controversy. The issue is the age-old issue between tax-paying and tax avoidance, between those who pay their taxes and those who legally avoid a portion of the general taxation.

To understand this problem clearly you must know the facts. In 8 States—1 of them my own—earned income, such as salaries and wages, may be divided between husband and wife, and surtax thereby avoided. In the remaining 40 States assignments or gifts of salary or wages—even by antenuptial agreement—cannot be legally recognized for the avoidance of the surtax under the Federal statutes. This arises by reason of the community-property laws of 8 States; but in all 48 of the States division of income-producing property, like land, stocks, and bonds and royalties, and so forth, are and must be under the present law accepted by the Federal Treasury, even though the specific purpose of division of the property is for legal tax avoidance. To state it concretely, in community-property States a single individual with a $10,000 salary would pay a tax of $1,166, but in the community-property States the husband may divide this $10,000 salary with his wife, or the wife divide hers with the husband, and they each pay a tax on $5,000, or both pay a total of $880. thus avoiding

$286 in taxes, while just across the State line in a non-community-property State a husband and wife similarly situated cannot divide the husband's salary and cannot legally avoid paying the $1,186; but in all States income-producing property may be divided and similar tax avoidance be accomplished.

The process of the division of property for the avoidance of surtaxes is simple. Husband or wife gives to the other spouse income-producing property, pays the gift tax, and the income may then be separately reported and high surtaxes avoided. Since 1932 taxable gifts and tax-free gifts have amounted to about $7,500,000,000, and the committee feels that a great portion of this amount involves family transfers.

Who takes up the slack? Who pays the bill? Who pays the taxes thus avoided? Who, if this measure fails, will pay the $323,000,000 involved? Who will pay the taxes avoided by the 5.77 percent of the folks filing tax returns? Reason becomes arithmetic, and we are confronted with the bald injustice that the 94 percent of the taxpayers take up the slack, they pay the taxes for the tax avoiders. They, and the folks who have hidden taxes upon hidden taxes heaped upon them, such folks who do not take advantage of separate returns and the people who do not file returns, the smaller taxpayers who pay the excise taxes, will pay the bill for the 5 percent.

Now we must inquire whether or not this proposition is morally right. I urge upon you, if you have not already read them, the nine reasons stated on pages 13 and 14 of this report, where it is stated:

It is the opinion of your committee that division of income between husband and wife as a tax-saving device has no equitable basis. It results in an unequal distribution of the tax burden as between families similarly situated. The joint-return proposal will overcome the inequities referred to and will result in a more equitable distribution of the tax burden. It appears proper to treat husbands and wives as taxable units for purposes of the Federal income tax.

I recall that in the discussion of the social-security bill, our distinguished floor leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] many times referred to the family as a unit. That is the principle upon which depends the Social Security Act under which we are now operating—that the family is the unit.

Let me cite you an instance. Your attention was distracted from this first paragraph in the committee's nine suggestions why this should be the law, referring to the differentiation in the tax burden as between families similarly situated.

A certain gentleman upon hearing this proposal said to me—and this is directed to the special attention of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]—"I make $40,000 a year. I earn it. My wife has a $6,000 income from investments which she inherited. Are you going to make me pay her taxes?"

I said, "The proposal is not that. She pays her own taxes and you pay your own taxes in proportion to the total income. That is the basis upon which it is figured."

"Won't my wife have to pay more taxes?"

"Yes; some," I replied. "We are going to calculate both of your taxes on the basis of your total income of $46,000."

He replied, "That is unfair and unjust."

I said, "What about the gentleman who lives down the street from you, in the next block, whose wife has no independent income, but who himself earns $46,000 a year? He pays on a $46,000 base. Does he not have to pay his taxes, both normal and surtax, on the $46,000 base, while you and your wife, by your divided returns, avoid some surtaxes?"

Finally he said to me, "I see the justice and the propriety of this proposal. My wife's income certainly adds to the family income. To do as we have been doing is unfair to the man with the $46,000 income down the street, whose wife has no independent income."

Let us go to the other extreme. About the same time I had an interview with a marine sergeant from Tulsa stationed out here at Quantico. He told me that out of his salary of $66 a month, $6 went to the support of his widowed mother, $25 was the lowest rent he could find for a place to keep his wife and two babies, and the milk bill for his little family amounted to about $10 a month.

I asked him what he got out of his salary, and he as pleasantly as the rich man replied, "Cigarette money; but I have my wife and babies."

We have a precedent for this proposal, a precedent that is based on our form of civilization, a precedent springing from another Anglo-Saxon nation, a nation of the same language, with like customs, a democratic nation, a nation with laws like ours in most respects. England has had this provision since 1914 and has found its practical effect is to prevent legal tax avoidance and to make for tax equality, that it prevents a small number of people from having a tax advantage over the larger portion.

The report of the Royal Commission appointed to investigate this subject in 1920 reads in part as follows:

The aggregation for income-tax purposes of the income of husband and wife is not dependent upon any medieval conception of the subordination of women, nor is it a question of sex disability, since either partner can claim separate assessment and separate collection. The incomes are aggregated because the law of taxable capacity is the supreme law in matters of taxation, and taxable capacity is, in fact, found to depend upon the amount of the income that accrues to the married pair, and not upon the way in which that income happens fortuitously to be owned by the members of the union. It is beyond question that in the immense majority of cases where the wife has separate means she contributes to the common purse, either by actual merger of her income with her husband's, or by bearing expenses which in less fortunate households fall upon the husband.

We have given a great deal of time and attention to this subject and have considered with the utmost care all the arguments that have been put before us, and we have been forced to the conclusion that the grievance complained of is more vocal than real, in other words, that it is a grievance rather than a hardship. We therefore recommend that the aggregation of the incomes of wife and husband should continue to be the rule.

With reference to this twaddle about loss of women's rights and that this provision will put a premium upon divorce and a penalty on marriage, that it would cut down the birth rate and so forth, the Royal Commission dignifies that argument by one sentence as follows:

The statement is also made that the method of assessment imposes a penalty on marriage.

Of course, we are not bound by what England and Canada do, but we should be impelled by the dictators of common sense, fair play, and justice between man and man, between taxpayer and taxpayer, rich and poor alike.

It may be claimed that the civil law gives certain rights. This is the law in France and I think in Spain.

I do not want to be tedious, but I do want to redirect your attention to these nine points raised by the committee. Surely you will not overlook reading them.

The second point is—

It removes the discrimination under the present law against earned income in favor of investment income.

That is what it is, a discrimination when in 40 States you cannot divide your income with your wife and in 8 States you can.

Our distinguished friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] yesterday took the side of the 5-percent group. but on page 6469 in Chairman DOUGHTON'S address you will find that in Mr. JENKINS' great State of Ohio, out of 330,967 tax returns, 12,565 filed separate returns. In other words, 3.7 percent in Ohio got the tax advantage, the 12,000 are enjoying a special tax privilege that the other folks are paying for, the others who filed returns and those who are paying only excise taxes. Ninety-six and three-tenths percent of the 330,000 in Ohio had to contribute more taxes in order that the 12,000 might enjoy their privilege of tax avoidance.

I wonder now why our good friend from Ohio, and others similarly situated, will not heed the warning that is contained in these figures and in the figures shown at page 16 of the report, which gives the information to you with respect to every State of the Union. You only have to look at the table to find it.

In my own State of Oklahoma these are the figures: Out of 32,542 returns filed by income-tax payers in 1938, 1,680 filed separate returns. In other words, 5 percent got a tax advantage against the other 95 percent, and against the payers of Federal excise taxes and State sales taxes.

As another specific instance, Chairman DOUGHTON received a letter from a widow that teems with the personal element. I take the privilege granted by him to read it. This ought to interest you ladies, as well as you men, and it ought to interest everyone who is interested in plain, square, fair justice between taxpayers. I will read the letter:

I am a widow—I have been for 2 years. The income that was "ours" and returned separately, at my husband's death became "my" income and was shot immediately into the higher bracket. This, although there was no longer any earning capacity in our family. Both my children are minors. I note that probably I can expect exemption for only one

child in the tax scheme. This, too, although there is not any longer any earning capacity or prospect of any better income or living by virtue of the fact that my husband is dead. It seems to me that if a widow can accept, without complaint, and gladly because of the necessity, such increase in her taxes, two people spared each other's love and companionship can adjust their living to the necessity of their country. If they were not fortunate in having a much more than average living, they would not have the tax to pay.

As for those couples who threaten divorce if their incomes are combined for tax purposes, I hope the Government in all sincerity will tell them to get their divorces. Neither their children nor the spirituality of their country will be served by the continued mating of two people held together by such ignoble motives. The satisfaction will be small should they admit it, or the spending of the dollars saved to themselves by failing their country in this, its hour of need.

As for the poor man who dreads his wife knowing what his real income is—and there have been some instances like that suggested to the committee—he must be pretty miserable already and much as a humane Congressman would like to keep from increasing his misery by forcing an exposé of his valiant efforts to provide for his family's future, I should think his plight would have to be his sacrifice to his country.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion is made by the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] about two sisters. Each acquired by inheritance or gift from their father a certain amount of money. One of them is married to a husband who is making a large income. The other is single. The single daughter will be taxed only upon the income from the $20,000 which she inherited, while the married daughter will pay an income tax on the income from the $20,000 she received plus the earnings of her husband. Has not the married sister a greater ability to pay than the single sister? She not only has the income from the $20,000 but she also has that of her husband, who is earning a substantial income. The taxable capacity of that family is much greater as compared with the taxable capacity of the single sister, whose only income is from the $20,000. I can well understand that the single sister would be willing to assume a greater tax burden, if she could be placed in the same status with her married sister. Suppose her husband has millions. Furthermore, why should a family of that taxability be favored over a family where all of the income is earned by the husband? To go back to the illustration about the $46,000 man, why should that family be favored in that manner? Existing law places the other family in a much less favorable status. Yet each family has the same tax-paying ability. We certainly should not treat families differently because of the way the income happens to be happily or fortuitously obtained by the members of this union.

Mr. Speaker, I have more material than I shall be able to use in the time allotted to me. The gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, whose opinion we all rely upon on legal matters, inquires as to the constitutionality of this proposal.

He wants to know, has the Federal Government the power to pass this kind of a statute?

Do the State constitutions and statutes prevent and make unconstitutional this proposed exercise of power by the Federal Government?

It has been pointed out that the constitution of some of the community-property States make provision for the community-property system and declare that that system is forever the law by the basis of property laws regarding husband and wife within that State. It is urged, further, that any Federal enactment which does not give proper weight to the provisions of such State constitutions and laws under the Federal Constitution would be unconstitutional.

Now, have any of you recently read the sixth article to the Federal Constitution? It reads like this:

> This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

An illustration of the supremacy of the Federal Constitution and the revenue laws and under which particularly pertains in this regard, as a parallel, may be found in the Burk-Waggoner case, a Texas case.

Now, it was said yesterday that to pass this upsets all the law in the community-property States; the law of wills, and so forth. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] rather amplified on that subject. But it does not do that. This is only for Federal tax purposes. It disrupts no other rule of law. For Federal tax purposes the Federal law, in my judgment, is supreme.

For instance, in the Hamel case, involving the sale of oil under royalty contract, under the law of Texas that was a sale of the oil in place. The taxpayer took the view that the capital-gains tax was all he was required to pay. The department took the view that this was in the nature of royalty income and subject to income tax. The Supreme Court held with the department's view, to the effect that this was income. It did not have to set aside the law of Texas, holding that this was a sale of oil in place. It remained the law for State purposes, and still is the law; but for Federal income-tax purposes the law of Texas was superseded by the Federal income-tax law.

The Supreme Court in another case made this discussion:

> The power of Congress so to tax associations is not affected by the fact that, under the law of a particular State, the association cannot hold title to property, or that its shareholders are individually liable for the association's debts, or that it is not recognized as a legal entity. Neither the conception of unincorporated associations providing under the local law, nor the relation under the law of the association to its shareholders, nor their relation to each other and to outsiders, is of legal significance as bearing upon the power of Congress to determine how and at what rate the income of the joint enterprise shall be taxed.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman incorporate the citation in his remarks?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes. That is Two Hundred and Sixty-ninth United States Reports, at page 110.

This decision demonstrates in like fashion that community-property laws of the various States cannot in any fashion restrict the Congress of the United States from determining the rate at which a married couple should be taxed.

The Supreme Court, in an increasing variety of cases, has called attention to the fact that the unity of family may be recognized by Congress as such in Federal revenue acts. The Supreme Court has gone further than is proposed in this bill, for it taxes the husband's income which belonged to his wife, merely because he possessed some control over the property from which that income was derived, although such control would not permit him to obtain that income.

After the Robbins case in California, holding that a wife did not have a vested right in the community property, but only a mere expectancy, the legislature passed the law giving the spouse a vested right.

Let us go further on that suggestion. Let us suppose that New York passes a community-property law. Oklahoma passed it in self-defense, because wealthy people were leaving and going to Texas to avoid paying taxes. She passed it in self-defense, avowedly. It was so discussed in the legislature. Let us suppose that New York, the richest State in the Union, then Pennsylvania, and on down the line, Ohio, Illinois—let us suppose they passed community-property laws; then you would not be getting enough Federal income tax to run this Government 6 weeks.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion.

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I think we would all like to have in continuity the gentleman's discussion of the constitutionality of this legislation, which he was engaged in. We have great respect for his opinion, and I hope the gentleman will state it without interruption.

Mr. DISNEY. Apparently, I am not able to proceed that way.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The gentleman is just too polite, that is all; do not yield to us.

Mr. DISNEY. Keep in mind this, please: This proposal does not tax the husband on the wife's income; it merely joins the income of both to measure the rate of taxation. The only Supreme Court case that bears out any contention that this tax is unconstitutional is the so-called Hooper case, *Hooper* v. *The Tax Commission* (284 U. S. 206). Read the report, and you will find this case thoroughly dissected. This case did not turn upon a Federal constitutional question; it turned upon the question of the constitutionality of a statute passed by a State legislature attempting to lay a tax upon the husband for the wife's income. That is what was involved, but that is not involved here. The Hooper case was squarely upon the question whether the State could make you pay your wife's taxes. That is the turning point in that case, and the report thoroughly discusses that feature. The attempt of the Wisconsin law was to make the husband pay the wife's taxes, and vice versa. This proposal does not in any way, shape, or form make that attempt.

Generically, the sixteenth amendment puts into effect an excise tax. That is what the income tax is in substance, an

excise tax, because it is generically an excise tax doing away with geographical and proportionate distributions. When it becomes an excise tax, then becomes involved the right of Congress to classify taxpayers, and if it is done in a reasonable manner without discrimination, it does not violate either State or Federal constitutions or Federal processes. We can tax lawyers under the excise process in one way, tax doctors in another way. We can tax one businessman in one way and a different type of business in a wholly different way, provided, as between the men, women, and corporations of the class, we do not discriminate between members of the class. That is the test, and the very widest range is given to legislatures and the Congress in their determinations how they shall classify taxpayers.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Does the gentleman want us to understand that the Congress can levy a different income tax on doctors from the tax they levy on lawyers?

Mr. DISNEY. The illustration, maybe, is unfortunate, but the gentleman will agree that we have the right to classify taxpayers so long as we do not discriminate between the individuals of a class. Is not this the general rule, I ask the gentleman: That so long as the legislature, the council, or the Congress does not discriminate between the individuals of a class, it is not violative of the constitutional prohibition against discrimination?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DISNEY. But we may discriminate between classes. I do not think any lawyer will disagree on that proposal.

There is no attempt in this provision to interfere with the property laws of any State. This bill merely takes the husband and wife together as a taxable unit for Federal tax purposes. In my opinion it does not interfere with the property rights of the States at all.

The question as to whether or not the Congress may make its Federal income-tax laws turn upon State laws is a question for the Congress to decide. In the community-property case of Poe against Seaborn, which will be relied upon by opponents of this measure, the Supreme Court held that the present Federal income-tax statute was not specific enough to permit the taxation of all the community property to the husband because the wife had a vested interest in half of the community property. The court interpreted the present Federal statute as taxing income only to the owner thereof and its ownership was fixed by law. In other words, the Court substantially said in Poe against Seaborn that Congress had not gone as far as it could go. But the Court has pointed out in any number of cases that the Congress may or may not follow the State law in determining whether or not a person is liable for an income tax. In fact, the Supreme Court in the Harmel case, cited in the community-property case of Poe against Seaborn, is authority for the statement that State laws may control only when the operation of the Federal taxing act, by express language or by necessary implication makes its own operation dependent upon State law. In this proposal we are treating the husband and wife as a taxable unit, exactly like the Federal law treats some partnerships as corporations for Federal tax purposes, although they are recognized only as partnerships under State law.

Mr. Chairman, let me read this citation from the case of Poe against Seaborn:

> The case requires us to construe sections 210 (a) and 211 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1926 and apply them, as construed, to the interests of husband and wife in community property under the law of Washington. These sections lay a tax upon the net income of every individual. The act goes no further, and furnishes no other standard of definition of what constitutes an individual's income. The use of the word "of" denotes ownership. It would be a strained construction which, in the absence of further definition by Congress, should impute a broader significance to the phrase.

In other words, in my judgment, this paragraph is tantamount to the Court saying that if the Congress had gone further it would have been sustained.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the practical effect of this proposal. I wash the Members would look at page 17 of the report. You will find this very practical thing confronting you. We might not be compelled to go to the personal income-tax schedule to take up the slack of $323,000,000, but there is where we would most likely have to go. We might be compelled to go there. If you look at page 17 of the report, you will find that on this $10,000 income at $1,166, if we have to go over to schedule B, then the tax on the $10,000 income would be $1,628.

On the $2,500 income, which under the present tax law would be $30.50, under the new bill it would be $71.50. The $3,000 income tax would jump from $85 to $151. The $4,000 income jumps up to $312. The $5,000 income from 308 to $506. That is what confronts you. You are not going to add additional excise taxes when we have already levied excise taxes to the extent of a billion dollars. We have gone apparently as far as we possibly can on corporate taxes.

The only place we can go is to additional income taxes. The best illustration I can cite to you is that taxes on your own income will jump from $1,166 to $1,628, and all down the line the situation will be proportionate. You are not going to do that. You are going to make the 5.77 percent of the people do like the 94 percent of the people, make them file their tax returns as the 94 percent of the people do, and not give them the tax advantage over this vast array, this vast army of other taxpayers less able to pay. Justice and right demand that we pass this provision in this language.

Go with us in our hunt for $323,000,000 lost by this tax avoidance. Any member of the committee will tell you that the consideration invariably leads to higher personal income taxes, with a proportionate jump, as I have suggested, from $1,166 on a $10,000 income to $1,628, and maybe even higher taxes than that, with a new tax bill next year. You are not going to be able to avoid this thing.

Do I need to say more in a demand for equality of taxation, for right between taxpayer and taxpayer? You can take this list of States and see that the very few who have been so insistent in opposition and conjuring up this propaganda against this proposal are inevitably those who are seeking an advantage, who are legally entitled to an advantage under existing law, and who have been getting an advantage that 5.77 percent as against the 94 percent. They have an advantage not only over the 94 percent of those who make returns, but they have an advantage over those who are paying hidden taxes, that vast army of small excise-tax payers, in addition to the 94 percent of those who make tax returns.

Mr. BUCK. Does not the gentleman realize that we can pick up $160,000,000 of taxes, or half of what this proposition would bring in, from a tax on gasoline, and that there are a good many other taxes which could be imposed?

Mr. DISNEY. You try to pass a gasoline tax through this House and put the burden on the gasoline users. Is not that a fine argument to bring before the House? Put the burden on the people who are already paying gasoline taxes almost as high as 10 cents per gallon in some States—splendid, unselfish suggestion.

The gentleman is trying to leave the implication that I am for this proposition in order to avoid increased gasoline taxes. Gasoline taxes are not any more important to me than to any other Member of the House, although I am from an oil-producing State.

You go hunting through the avenues of taxation for more revenue and you simply wreak more injustice on the persons who have been paying hidden taxes to the amount of millions of dollars a year. One pack of cigarettes a day costs the taxpayer $21.60 a year in taxes.

Let us talk about gasoline taxes. Down in Tennessee, when you buy 10 gallons of gas, you have to leave at the filling station almost a dollar bill in addition, for taxes. You are not going to do any such silly thing as put an additional tax on gasoline. It could not pass the House. You are going to have to go to personal income taxes, lowering the exemptions and creating additional hardship, but where you are going to hit hardest is on the average—the middle-class—incomes; and all for the benefit of whom? A small group—5.77 percent—who want an advantage over the 94 percent and an advantage over those who do not file any tax returns.

Not only do the income-tax payers have to stand the gaff with this tax avoidance by this small group, but this group takes its toll from every citizen who pays Federal excise taxes on his automobile, his tires and tubes, his jewelry, refrigerators, sporting goods, matches. The toll is taken from the excise taxes he pays on his tobacco, his liquor, his radio, his phonograph, musical instruments, electrical appliances, business machines, rubber products, and his furs. The housewife pays excise taxes on washing machines and on her toilet preparations. Telephone and telegraph bills carry an excise tax. In most States the citizen is confronted with a myriad of sales taxes. This huge tax largess is extracted from the average citizen and the $323,000,000 of the amount collected is a toll taken

from the 95 percent of the taxpayers in favor of the small group of 5 percent who avoided taxes by filing separate returns.

This service of self-interest cannot be justified on moral grounds. Tax favoritism is becoming increasingly unpopular. This proposal rectifies a gross inequity.

The Churchill-Roosevelt Peace Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, as stated in the short speech I made at the beginning of today's session, I feel that the Churchill-Roosevelt statement of peace aims which was released to the public this morning should be encouraging to those in America who oppose our entrance into the wars of Europe, Africa, and Asia but who believe the vast influence of our position should be used to end this war on terms of equity and justice to all peoples of all lands. Our influence in helping to point the path toward a just and ordered world after the war is likely to be more effective and permanent as a nonbelligerent than it would become were we to be actually engaged in the shooting and destruction of the war.

HAVE LONG FAVORED STATEMENT OF AIMS

It is obviously still too soon after the publication of the Churchill-Roosevelt statement to evaluate properly the respective merits of its separate proposals. But it is not too early to consider the possibilities which might grow out of this statement of objectives, stated in generalities as they are and necessarily must be at this early stage, in the thinking toward peace, which has been so tardy in getting under way in both this country and Britain. Either this statement will be used as a back drop before which to consider our future activities with regard to the international situation, or it will presently sink into obscurity again except for occasional reference material for public speakers, editors, columnists, and radio commentators In the former case there is much for which to hope and also much against which we must be on guard. In the latter case the statement will not be significant enough to have much effect, if any, on the destiny of human affairs.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee who has frequently advocated in public speeches, dating back as far as one entitled "America, Wake Up and Live," delivered in New York City May 18, 1940, that it is important that serious thinking and public discussion be devoted to the question, "What would you have follow the fighting?" I am encouraged by the fact that this preliminary, albeit highly generalized, statement of objectives has been set up for consideration by the peoples of the world. It is at least a first authoritative proposal for a basis for bringing order out of bloody chaos; it will doubtless lead to other proposals from other belligerent or nonbelligerent authorities. All of which leads to constructive thinking and world progress, and out of which may well come a meeting of minds which can do vastly more to rehabilitate the world and lead to permanent peace than any possible clashing of armies.

In discussing the desirability of thinking and acting toward peace and America's responsibility to do its utmost to end the war equitably rather than to expand the war endlessly, on Wednesday, May 21, of this year, over the Columbia Broadcasting System, I stated in part in my radio address on America's Rendezvous With Destiny:

> With something less than total war and something more than just our private peace, we can help restore order to a war-torn world. Not by a peace of appeasement or defeat. Not a peace between a bloody victor and a bleeding victim. Not a peace of mutual exhaustion and despair, nor a peace based on the fickle promises of any men or set of men. We can, however, help to set in motion the machinery for a planned and permanent peace based on reason and justice, on common sense, and sound economy.

Again on Sunday night, June 8, of this year, in an American Forum of the Air program broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting System, in a debate between Congressman VORYS, of Ohio, and myself, of the Republican minority on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in opposition to Congressman GORE, of Tennessee, and Congressman ELLIS, of Arkansas, on the question, Should the United States, while continuing its preparedness program, take the leadership in an effort to bring about peace? I said:

> We believe that America can best serve God and humanity—as well as self—by doing its level best to end this war before the war expands so that it threatens to bring an end to Christian civilization itself. We hold that the United States, while continuing its all-out defense drive, should also make an effort to set in motion, while it can, the machinery to bring about a just and permanent peace.

Mr. Speaker, I am more firmly convinced of the validity of these arguments in behalf of this country's lending its great potency for good to the development of a just and equitable peace than I was more than a year ago when I began publicly to advocate that we not only prepare our own defenses and give aid short of war to our foreign friends but that we also devote ourselves to trying to bring an end to this war which will come soon enough to save freedom and civilization from destruction and which will be sound enough to be as permanent as it should be just.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it was with real satisfaction and renewed hope that I heard the Churchill-Roosevelt statement on peace aims this morning. I can remember the bitter denunciations which I received at times from overzealous war advocates for even daring to propose that America should give a thought to what we would have follow the fighting until the fighting was over and a full and total victory won. It is not pleasant to be called an appeaser or a defeatist simply because one dares to suggest that an America at peace can better serve humanity than an America at war. But excitable people sometimes cannot refrain from excessive criticisms. In all events, it is now refreshing to know that both Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt are among those who realize that perhaps a peace offensive can bring a victory sooner and more satisfying than sole reliance upon a war offensive. I do not believe that even the most intemperate members of the war-now crowd will accuse either Mr. Churchill or Mr. Roosevelt of being appeasers or defeatists. It is hoped their joint statement will, therefore, also have the effect of stimulating more serious thinking and less scurrilous talking in America.

Mr. Speaker, I have said earlier in this speech that if the Churchill-Roosevelt statement is to be used as a back drop before which to consider our future activities with regard to the international situation, it provides much for which to hope and also much against which we must be on guard. Let me briefly elaborate upon what I have in mind in this connection.

There is, indeed, much to hope for from such a statement. Pursued and developed as a peace objective and as the basis for establishing considerations to end this war, it may offer humanity an unprecedented opportunity for ending its quarrels and its bitterness and for working out a program of international goodwill and amity which will mark a new high in international human conduct. I hope America will unite in considering this statement on such a basis and in pursuing its implementation through peaceful methods. On such a basis this statement can become an additional silver thread to help weave America together in a unity of purpose and of understanding. Along these lines lies a great hope for America and for all the world.

BUT AMERICANS MUST REMAIN ON GUARD

Mr. Speaker, it must not be overlooked, however, that there is in this statement the possibilities of perversion by warminded groups which can present great danger to this country. It is important, therefore, that Americans remain on guard, lest what might be a great instrument for betterment become a device for plunging us into the greatest catyclysm of war the world has ever seen. Some impatient people with better idealism than judgment, and some selfish interests who seek some advantage for themselves through war may now be tempted to use this Churchill-Roosevelt statement of peace aims as an enumeration of war objectives. They may now try to urge Americans to send their sons and their treasure to foreign wars, to risk their own security and gamble their liberties and independence by putting this country into a two-ocean war on three foreign continents in order to project the objectives of this statement upon the entire world at the point of the sword after a great and exhausting war. Along these lines of thought and action lies a great danger to America and to all the world.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want America to enter another war on foreign fighting fronts to project its methods, its ideals, or its political philosophy upon the rest of the world by the futile system of emerging victorious from a long and bloody

war. I do not want it to assume that entering a ruinous war is an essential prerequisite to having influence at the final peace table. I do want my country, however, to use its influence and its potency, in methods other than participation in an outright war to the end that a victory without vengeance and a peace without passion may serve to grace the peace terms which will finally terminate this awful war. I believe that the joint Churchill-Roosevelt statement points a path, however vaguely, toward such a destination. Let us not permit them to be perverted by war makers and zealots into becoming the battle front behind which interventionists might push this country closer to involvement in the war. Let us remain united as we now are in our opposition to war and in our support of any sound program to supplement the material assistance we are now giving Britain and China by adding our great will for peace to that of the millions of people of every land who desire this war to end and thus helping to bring about a just and early peace while we continue our preparedness program without abatement. While preparing for the worst, Mr. Speaker, let us hope, and pray, and work for the best.

Mr. Speaker, one other point. I believe it important to emphasize, today, that the three best informed men in America on European conditions are united in their opinion that this country should not enter the war. I refer to our three former Ambassadors to the respective posts of Great Britain, France, and Belgium. Former Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy to Great Britain, former Ambassador William C. Bullitt to France, and former Ambassador John Cudahy to Belgium have each one stated definitely and separately, beyond all peradventure of question or doubt, that he is positively and completely opposed to this country's entrance into the present war.

Mr. Speaker, let us remember who these former ambassadors actually are. They are first of all great Americans. They are oustanding members of the Democratic Party. They are the personal selections of President Roosevelt, himself, to serve these foreign posts and to keep this country informed about what is actually going on behind the scenes in Europe. They are, in fact, the three best informed men in this country to speak on European conditions. They have seen with their own eyes the evidence upon which they base their conclusions. Theirs is no witch's gossip or common hearsay—these three men speak with the voice of authority since they and they alone have been in position to know all the facts from first-hand knowledge. America paid for the services of these men to represent us in Europe, and to give us honest and intelligent advice concerning European affairs. We would now do well to ponder carefully the conclusions of these three eminent authorities on world affairs.

Speaking before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, as reported in the printed House hearings on the lend-lease bill, Mr. Kennedy repeatedly stated his opposition to our joining in the fighting of this war. On page 294 of the printed hearings, I asked Mr. Kennedy whether he thought we should keep out of the war. His reply was, and I quote his words:

> We should not go in. Therefore we must stay out.

He stressed his opposition to our joining the war again and again during the hearings. On page 297, I asked him whether he thought that our entrance into the war would change our democracy to some more centralized form. He replied:

> Yes, sir. There are lots of reasons why I do not think we want to get into war, and that comes down on the list.

On page 298, Mr. Kennedy said:

> I said Saturday if you have war we are either all the way in or we are all the way out, and the idea that you can be in the war and not use your manpower I admit is a very, very thin reed to hang onto. If you get into war, you can make up your mind that the boys are going sooner or later.

Now let us turn to the testimony of former Ambassador Bullitt, who represented the United States both in France and in Russia. On page 626 of the same set of House hearings on the lend-lease bill, I asked Mr. Bullitt, who was appearing as a voluntary witness before our committee, the following question:

> Now, Mr. Ambassador, may I ask you this: Even with the aid to England contemplated in our present program of the passage of H. R. 1776, in the event even then England should show signs of collapse, would you still say America should stay out of the war?

Mr. Bullitt's reply was definite, positive, and unevasive. He said:

> I should.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night over the radio former Ambassador John Cudahy to Belgium spoke to the Nation from Milwaukee. I quote a portion of his remarks as reported by the press on August 10. Mr. Cudahy said:

> The time is ripe for a feasible peace proposal. * * * I was one of those who advocated the election of President Roosevelt, and I was convinced then, as I am convinced now, that President Roosevelt can and will keep this country out of war. He promised to keep us out of war. I am certain President Roosevelt will never forget that promise. I believe he can and will keep that promise if you, the people, will keep your heads—

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that remark was addressed to certain well-known interventionists who mostly operate out of the city of New York—

> if you will stand by him against the war party; if you will but counsel and sustain him in the cause of peace.

Mr. Speaker, there you have the unanimous testimony of the three best-informed Americans on foreign affairs, the three men the President himself selected to find out the facts and to counsel us in our foreign relations. Surely no man can honestly claim, in the face of this evidence, that it is only the uninformed or the ill-advised who unite in a determined crusade to keep America out of the fighting.

I might add that Hanson Baldwin, military analyst of the New York Times, the Nation's largest Democratic newspaper, adds his opinion to that of our three former Ambassadors. In his new book, United We Stand, he, too, stresses again and again the important fact that America must remain out of this war.

Mr. Speaker, we all join in the prayer and the hope that Britain will succeed in her gallant fight against those who threaten her shores. We all want to see Hitler defeated and his methodology denied. We want freedom to spread as rapidly and as widely as it can, and we want tyranny in every land to vanish as completely and as quickly as possible. But our entrance into a fighting war on distant continents is likely to do much more to spread totalitarianism by adding America to the countries practicing its futile philosophies of supercentralization than to spread freedom throughout the world. However, a peace offensive directed to the peoples of Europe and Asia has vast possibilities of accomplishing the goal which we unite in coveting. A peace offensive, honestly stated and sincerely supported, can give new hope to the conquered peoples of Europe which will stiffen their already admirably stubborn resistance to aggression. A peace offensive based on what would be a just and equitable peace will do more to drive a wedge between the Axis governments and the Axis peoples than all the bombing planes in Christendom. Hitler has a great military machine with which to fight opposing armies, but he is ill-prepared to fight the invasion of eternal truths and great ideals. Once the people of Germany and Italy and Japan can be made to understand that they have more to hope for and to live for from the early ending of this war and the adoption of decent rules of international human behavior than they have to hope for from fighting increasingly costly battles, all the propaganda machines of Europe cannot drive their armies to successful combat. Thus a peace offensive may well do for the world what a war offensive, if this country were to join it, might seriously retard—a sincere peace offensive might break the morale of the dictated peoples and give them cause to hope for peace without vengeance and for a future free from slavery imposed by their own leaders or superimposed by their conquerors.

"By something less than total war and something more than just our private peace," America has a challenge today to come to the rescue of a stricken humanity. I pray God the Churchill-Roosevelt statement may be used as an instrument to work toward that exalted goal.

Address of Dean Manion on World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

ADDRESS OF DEAN CLARENCE MANION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME LAW SCHOOL

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Clarence Manion, dean of the University

of Notre Dame Law School, a distinguished citizen and scholar, speaking at a meeting at the World War Memorial in Indianapolis on August 5, delivered an address on foreign affairs that is attracting widespread attention. By unanimous consent of the House I present his address for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

If it were not for its stark, tragical consequences for the American people, our present hysterically wild waltz to war would be one of the most comical transactions of world history. Because the gyrations of their own delirious war dance have made them dizzy, the interventionists apparently think that the walls of the world are really caving in upon them and that those of us who have refused to join their "crisis carousal" are both deaf and blind. A strong dose of fact and logic would clear the hotheads of the war party, but unfortunately, they have no taste for such a realistic cure. Here are some of the high lights in the contest between the facts of the situation and the fancy of the interventionists:

We are asked to fancy that Finland is the enemy of the United States, when the fact is that Finland is the only European country that has persisted in fulfilling all of its financial obligations to this country.

We are asked to fancy that Finland is an aggressor nation, when the fact is that she is merely recapturing her own territory, the Russian theft of which we denounced from every American platform and through every American printing press 2 years ago.

We are asked to fancy Russia as an enemy of aggression, when the fact is that Russia gladly split every acre of German territorial swag and up to 2 months ago was a treaty-bound member of the Rome-Berlin-Tokio Axis.

We are asked to fancy that our peril of invasion is greater now than it was a year ago, when the fact is that the Axis has been broken across the middle in the last 12 months and Hitler is now mired to his waist in the invasion of a country with whom he was closly allied 1 year ago.

We are asked to fancy that Iceland, Dakar, Cape Verde Islands, and Ireland are outposts of American defense, when the fact is that the occupation of such places by the United States has no more justification than the get-there-first policy that we have condemned Hitler for employing.

We are asked to fancy that our aid-to-Britain program demands our steel, our entire factory capacity, our gasoline, and complete foreclosure of our normal South American trade, when the fact is that, war or no war, British manufacturers are now taking over our South American customers, supplying them with British-made copies of American machinery, and censoring our mail at Trinidad in order to determine just what orders American manufacturers are now unable to fill. This fact was disclosed to the American press last June 30 by James S. Kemper, of Chicago, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

We are asked to fancy that in taking over ports in French Indo-China with the consent of the recognized French Government, Japan was guilty of unjustifiable aggression against the peace of the United States, when the fact is that if our occupation of Iceland was justified in the interests of American defense, then certainly the occupation of French Indo-China was justified in the interest of Japanese defense.

We are asked to fancy that our hate and fear of communism is in no way compromised by our present all-out aid to Russia, when the fact is that if Hitler loses the Russian War, Russian communism must necessarily win it, and millions of Communist saboteurs all over the world, including the United States, will come out of their rat holes with red flags of revolution in their hands.

Our Communist "hate-and-help" policy is perhaps the most intricate of all the involved and dizzy whirls now called for by the leaders of the American war dance. If it means anything, it means simply that we must help communism win its war with Germany so that we may then be free to fight communism to the death without the embarrassment of having to make common cause with Adolf Hitler. It means that when we start battling communism after we have helped communism to eliminate Hitler, we will be much better prepared for the battle by reason of our $100,000,000,000 debt and the presence of thousands of Communists here whom we will have coddled, financed, and encouraged in the meantime.

The interventionists tell us that appeasement is a horrid word. They would have us believe that appeasement to end a war is wrong, but appeasement to keep a war going is perfectly all right. For instance, we are now told that in order to save British and Dutch possessions in the Pacific, we were justified in appeasing Japan for 2 years by furnishing American gasoline for bombers that brought death and destruction to our valiant and democratic friends, the Chinese. In other words, so that a Japanese war might not begin against British Singapore and the Dutch West Indies, it was necessary that the Japanese war against our friends, the Chinese, should be made to continue.

The war partisans have had 2 years in which to educate the American people to the interventionist point of view. During that time, they have had the radio commentators, 90 percent of the newspaper columnists, the movies, newsreels, and thousands of paid British propaganda experts to help them, but at least 75 percent—and probably 85 percent—of the American people are still unconvinced. In spite of the most sustained and most adroit propaganda barrage ever laid down upon a people anywhere, the American public—east, west, north, and south, continues to be emphatically against our involvement in this war. Regardless of the merits of the respective sides of the war against peace argument, all admit that the American people want this country to stay at peace. If we really believe in democracy, then let us demonstrate the sincerity of our belief by respecting the democratic priaciple of majority rule and obey the people's mandate to stay out of this war.

For years, LOUIS LUDLOW, the distinguished Congressman from this Indiana district, has advocated a constitutional amendment giving the people the right to vote upon the question of war or peace for the United States. If that amendment had been passed when the Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW first introduced it, we would not be trembling uncertainly on the brink of war today. If our young American manhood can be sent to die on foreign battlefields against the wishes of 75 percent of our people, then what right have we to praise democracy and condemn dictatorship?

When the European war began, we had the choice of three courses of action—the first, second, and third gear of the American war machine:

1. We could remain neutral and prepare to defend ourselves against anybody.

2. We could resolve to save England and so keep an independent Britain between us and a possible German invasion.

3. We could resolve to smash and destroy Hitler and Hitlerism at whatever cost.

Officially, we adopted the first course by the passage of the Neutrality Act. From that point we were deliberately eased into position No. 2. We were led to believe that the defense of Britain was the defense of America. That No. 2 policy was later implemented and abetted by the Lease Lend Act. Up to a few weeks ago, that is as far as we were asked to go. If our job was to keep an independent Britain in the Atlantic, our job is done. Even the wildest interventionists now admit that Britain is saved. If Hitler couldn't destroy Britain last spring, he certainly cannot do so now.

It would seem, therefore, that we could now think once more of ourselves alone and prepare our own defense as such. But no; the interventionists now clamor for a shift into the high gear of our war policy—the destruction of Hitler and Hitlerism. They want to be there for the kill. They want to enjoy the peace feast and watch Joe Stalin take back the four freedoms from the aggressor, Finland.

In order to save Britain as a bulwark of American defense, we have appropriated $40,000,000,000, dislocated American industry, threatened the country with a rigid dictatorship of priorities and prices, and conscripted 900,000 American young men from their jobs and their homes. This should be enough. Nevertheless, we are now asked not merely to guarantee the independence of Britain and the British Empire but to underwrite the complete destruction of Hitler and Hitlerism. We are asked to pledge ourselves to follow that purpose through the length and breadth of Europe and Asia—across the Alps, through Suez, at Gibraltar, wherever the opportunity for foreign war and foreign death for American boys offers itself.

In the current issue of the rabidly interventionist Life magazine, Hanson Baldwin, military expert for the New York Times, says that this Hitler-destroying excursion will cost us $300,000,000,000, but, he says: "The monetary sacrifice is the smallest evil. The burden of victory would be largely American. Victory would cost heavily in blood. We cannot conquer a continent without wholesale death. We probably could not keep, except in rough outline, the American way of life. We would be a harder, tougher but more regimented and less free people. Our standards of living would be depressed. Inevitable economic and political dislocation might confront us. These are the costs."

These are not the words of Colonel Lindbergh or Senator WHEELER. These are the words of the military expert of the interventionist New York Times, the same man who said in the August and July numbers of the Reader's Digest that we can achieve realistic hemisphere defense without foreign bases and without stealing the so-called stepping stones from Europe, such as Iceland, the Cape Verde Islands, and this regardless of whether Hitler captures the British Fleet or not.

But I solemnly charge that those cunning leaders who are calling the turns for the American war dance have another objective beyond the destruction of Hitler and Hitlerism. When we reach the end of the bloody, bankrupting, demoralizing trail which leads to the grave of Hitlerism, we shall be asked to surrender the independence and sovereignty of the United States. The last objective of the interventionist program is the establishment of a world state. They hope to merge our now solvent, free American Republic with the bankrupt political structures of the Old World and substitute for The Star-Spangled Banner an international anthem, perhaps the Russian Internationale.

When we shall have let our blood and spent our substance in the world conquest of Hitlerism, we shall be too weak to resist the final push. A shooting war will be the beginning of the end of the United States. If you are interested in preserving this, the last citadel of freedom on earth, if you want life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in the full God-given measure set out in the American Declaration of Independence, then keep America independent by keeping the United States out of the pitfall of involvement in this foreign war.

Roosevelt-Churchill Statement on War Aims

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, for some time a great many of us have been asking for an expression of the war aims of the democratic countries. Today a joint statement was issued signed by the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, and the Prime Minister of England, Mr. Churchill, representing the United Kingdom.

For myself I welcome this statement of aims. It makes history. It points away from war and toward peace. I ask unanimous consent that the Roosevelt-Churchill statement as released today may follow these remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

JOINT ROOSEVELT-CHURCHILL STATEMENT ON WAR AIMS

The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, have met at sea.

They have been accompanied by officials of their two Governments, including high-ranking officers of their military, naval, and air service.

The whole problem of the supply of munitions of war, as provided by the Lease Lend Act, for the armed forces of the United States and for those countries actively engaged in resisting aggression has been further examined.

Lord Beaverbrook, the Minister of Supply of the British Government, has joined in these conferences. He is going to proceed to Washington to discuss further details with appropriate officials of the United States Government. These conferences will also cover the supply problems of the Soviet Union.

The President and the Prime Minister have had several conferences. They have considered the dangers to world civilization arising from the policies of military dominaton by conquest upon which the Hitlerite Government of Germany and other governments associated therewith have embarked, and have made clear the stress (steps) which their countries are respectively taking for their safety in the face of these dangers.

They have agreed upon the following joint declaration:

"Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

"First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

"Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

"Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

"Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

"Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

"Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

"Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
"WINSTON S. CHURCHILL."

Suits for Violations of Federal Antitrust Laws by the Petroleum Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

COMPILATION BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I have before me a compilation of suits which have been commenced by the Department of Justice for violation of the anti-monopoly and antitrust acts, with a list of the defendants. The matter exceeds the space limitation for printing such matter in the RECORD under the rule, and it is accompanied by a statement of the Public Printer showing that it will require 4⅔ pages. I offer the statement, together with the estimate of the Public Printer, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since the termination of the N. I. R. A. in May 1935, 13 separate actions have been brought by the Federal Government against several hundred individuals and corporations of the petroleum industry for alleged violations of the Federal antitrust laws.

Chronological order follows:

Date of filing return	Action	Court	Parties
July 28, 1936	Criminal No. 11296	U. S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin	*United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. (Ind.) et al.*
Nov. 6, 1936	Criminal No. 11342	do	*United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., et al.*
Dec. 22, 1936	Criminal No. 11364	do	*United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., et al.*
Do	Criminal No. 11365	do	*United States* v. *Standard Oil (Ind.) et al.*
Nov. 14, 1939	Criminal No. 14149-M	U. S. District Court for the Southern District of California	*United States* v. *Gen. Pet. Corp. of Cal. et al.*
Feb. 19, 1937	In Equity No. E. 84-321	U. S. District Court for the Southern District of New York	*United States* v. *Ethyl Gasoline Corp. et al.*
May 30, 1940	Indictment No. 16205	U. S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, Rome Division.	*United States* v. *Hiram W. Evans et al.*
Sept. 30, 1940	Civil Action No. 182	U. S. District Court for the District of Delaware	*United States* v. *Phillips Petroleum et al.*
Do	Civil Action No. 183	do	*United States* v. *Great Lakes Pipe Line Co.*
Do	Civil Action No. 201	U. S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, Hammond Division.	*United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. (Ind.).*
Do	Civil Action No. 8524	U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia	*United States* v. *American Petroleum Institute.*
Jan. 31, 1941	Criminal No. 32597	U. S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.	*United States* v. *The Wayne Pump Co. et al.*

Department of the Interior news release of July 12, 1941, announced appointment to membership on district committees of 204 persons to "advise and consult * * * on matters relating to the proper coordination of the activities of the petroleum industry for national defense."

Of the 205 persons appointed to positions on these oil committees, 134 or 65.4 percent are persons individually who either have been found to be violators of the Federal antitrust laws or are now being sued as violators of those laws and their advice will be effective if not controlling, in determining the disposition of suits now pending against some of these very men.

Following is a list as to position, and past record and affiliation with corporations.

SUMMARY OF FOLLOWING LIST

Total number of persons named to committees, 205; 100 percent.

Persons individually, and persons connected with corporations or associations having been found violators or now being sued as alleged violators of Federal antitrust laws, 134; 65.4 percent.

ANTITRUST RECORD OF PERSONS NAMED TO COMMITTEES FUNCTIONING UNDER PETROLEUM COORDINATOR JULY 12, 1941

Adams, K. S.:	
Positions under Petroleum Coordinator: District 2.	Member, Production Committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Director.
Phillips Petroleum Co	President and director.
Alco Royalties Corporation	Vice president and director.
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co.	
Phillips Pipe Line Co.	
Southern Phillips Corporation	Director.
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Phillips Petroleum Co	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (June 2, 1938); fined $15,000. Criminal 11365; guilty verdict (July 19, 1938); fined $5,000. Civil 182 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Alco Royalties Co	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co	Civil 183 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Phillips Pipe Line Co	Civil 182 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Southern Phillips Co	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Adams, K. S.	Do.
Ball, Amos:	
Position under Petroleum Coordinator: District 2.	Member, marketing committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Member, marketing committee
Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)	Vice president and director.
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (June 2, 1938); fined $15,000. Criminal 11365; nolo contendere (June 2, 1941); fined $5,000. Civil 182 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Ball, Amos	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (June 2, 1938); fined $15,000. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Brown, J. A.:	
Position under Petroleum Coordinator: District 1.	Chairman, General Committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Director and member executive committee.
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc	President, director, and member executive committee.
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (June 2, 1938); fined $15,000. Criminal 11365; guilty verdict (July 19, 1938); fined $5,000. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Brown, J. A	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
General Petroleum Co. of Calif	Criminal 14149-M; nolo contendere (Aug. 1, 1940); fined $4,500. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
General Petroleum Co. of Nebr	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
General Pipe Line Co	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Gilmore Oil Co	Criminal 14149-M; nolo contendere (Aug. 19, 1940); fined $4,500. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Weil, A. L	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Carnes, J. W.:	
Position under Petroleum Coordinator: District 1.	Member, marketing committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Do.
Consolidated Oil Corporation	Vice president.
Richfield Oil Corporation of New York.	Director and chairman of board.
Richfield Oil Corporation.	
Rio Grande Oil Co., Inc.	
Sinclair Refining Co	Vice president and director.
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co.	
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Consolidated Oil Corporation	Do.
Carnes, J. W	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (June 2, 1938); fined $15,000. Criminal 11365; nolo contendere (Dec. 12, 1940); fined $5,000. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Richfield Oil Corporation of New York.	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Richfield Oil Corporation	Criminal 14149-M; nolo contendere (Aug. 1940); fined $4,500. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Rio Grande Oil Co., Inc	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Sinclair Refining Co	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (June 2, 1938); fined $15,000. Criminal 11365; guilty verdict (July 19, 1939); fined $5,000. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co	Civil 183 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Colley, R. H.:	
Positions under Petroleum Coordinator: District 1.	Member, general committee, chairman, refining committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Director and member executive committee.
Atlantic Pipe Line Co	Vice president.
Atlantic Oil Shipping Co	Vice president and director.
Buffalo Pipe Line Corporation	Do.
Keystone Pipe Line Co	Do.
Atlantic Refining Co	President and director.
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Colley, R. H	Do.
Atlantic Refining Co., The	Do.
Keystone Pipe Line Co	Do.
Atlantic Oil Shipping Co	Do.
Buffalo Pipe Line Co	Do.
Currey, Peter:	
Position under Petroleum Coordinator: District 1.	Member, production committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Director.
South Penn Oil Co	President and director.
Tide Water Associated Oil Co	
Antitrust record:	
Currey, Peter	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
South Penn Oil Co	Do.
Tide Water Association Oil Co	Do.
American Petroleum Institute	Do.
Dodge, H. W.:	
Positions under Petroleum Coordinator: District 1.	Member, General Committee; chairman, Marketing Committee.
Private positions:	
The Texas Corporation	Vice president.
The Texas Co. (Delaware).	
The Texas Co. (California).	
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co.	
Goodyear-Wende Oil Corporation.	Director.
Indian Refining Co	Vice president and director.
The Texas Co. (Delaware)	Vice president and general sales manager.
American Petroleum Institute	Member, marketing committee.
Antitrust record:	
Dodge, H. W	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (Jan. 6, 1941); fined $1,000. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Texas Corporation, The	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co	Civil 183 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Texas Co., The (California)	Criminal 14149-M; nolo contendere (Jan. 15, 1941); fined $4,500. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Texas Co., The (Delaware)	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (Jan. 6, 1941); fined $14,000. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Goodyear-Wende Oil Corporation.	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Indian Refining Co	Do.
American Petroleum Institute	Do.
Donnell, O. D.:	
Positions under Petroleum Coordinator: District 2.	Member, General Committee; chairman, Production Committee.
Private positions:	
The Ohio Oil Co	President.
American Petroleum Institute	Director, treasurer, and member, executive and production committees.
Antitrust record:	
Donnell, O. D	Civil 8524; defendant; pending.
Ohio Oil Co., The	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (June 2, 1938); fined $15,000. Civil 8524; defendant; pending.
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524; defendant; pending.
Ferguson, W. H.:	
Position under Petroleum Coordinator: District 4.	Member, General Committee
Private positions:	
Continental Oil Co	Executive vice president.
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co.	
Rocky Mountain Pipe Line Co	President and director.
The Boston-Wyoming Oil Co	Vice president and director.
Chappell Oil Co	Do.
Continental Pipe Line Co	Vice president.
Fort Collins Producing Co	Vice president and director.
Merrico Royalties Co	President and director.
New Mexico Pipe Line Co	Do.
The Standard Shale Products Co	Vice president and director.
American Petroleum Institute	Director and member of marketing committee.
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Continental Oil Co	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (June 2, 1938); fined $15,000. Criminal 11365; guilty verdict (July 19, 1938); fined $5,000. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Rocky Mountain Pipe Line Co	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Boston, Wyoming Oil Co., The	Do.
Chappell Oil Co	Do.
Continental Pipe Line Co	Do.
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co	Do.
Merritt Oil Corporation	Do.
Fort Collins Producing Co	Do.
Merrico Royalties Co	Do.
New Mexico Pipe Line Co	Do.
Standard Shale Products Co	Do.
Ferguson, W. H	Do.
Hanks, G. J.:	
Positions under Petroleum Coordinator: District 1.	Member, Production Committee.
Private positions:	
Tide Water Associated Oil Co	Vice president and director.
Bradford Transit Co	President and director.
Tidal Pipe Line Co	Vice president and director.
Antitrust record:	
Hanks, G. J	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Tide Water Associated Oil Co	Do.
Bradford Transit Co	Do.
Tidal Pipe Line Co	Do.
Hill, George A.:	
Positions under Petroleum Coordinator: District 3.	Member, General Committee; chairman, Production Committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Director, vice president (for production), member of executive committee, and chairman of production committee; committee on well spacing.
Houston Oil Co	
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Hill, G. A	Do.
Jones, C. S.:	
Positions under Petroleum Coordinator: District 5.	Member, general committee; chairman, transportation committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Director.
Richfield Oil Corporation	President and director.

Jones, C. S.—Continued.	
Private positions—Continued.	
Reservoir Hill Gasoline Co	President and director.
Rio Grande Oil Co., Inc	Do.
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Jones, C. S	Do.
Richfield Oil Corporation	Criminal 14149-M; nolo contendere (Oct. 14, 1940); fined $4,500. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Reservoir Hill Gasoline Co	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Rio Grande Oil Co., Inc	Do.
Kennedy, H. J.:	
Positions under Petroleum Coordinator: District 2.	Member, marketing committee.
Private positions: Continental Oil Co.	President.
Antitrust record:	
Continental Oil Co	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (June 2, 1938); fined $15,000. Criminal 11365; guilty verdict (July 19, 1938); fined $5,000. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940), defendant; pending.
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co	Civil 183 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Kennedy, H. J	Criminal 11365; nolo contendere (June 2, 1941); fined $1,500.
Klein, H. T.:	
Positions under Petroleum Coordinator: District 1.	Member, Transportation Committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Director and member, American Petroleum Industries Committee.
The Texas Corporation	Executive vice president and director.
Texas Production Co. of Nebraska	Director.
Goodyear-Wende Oil Corporation	Do.
The Texas Co. (Delaware)	Vice president and director.
Indian Refining Co	Director.
Seaboard Oil Co. of Delaware	Do.
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Klein, H. T	Do.
Texas Corporation, The	Do.
Texas Co., The	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (Jan. 6, 1941); fined $14,000. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Texas Co. (California), The	Criminal 14149-M; nolo contendere (Jan. 15, 1941); fined $4,500. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940) defendant; pending.
Texas Production Co. of Nebraska.	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Goodyear-Wende Oil Corporation.	Do.
Indian Refining Co	Do.
Seaboard Oil Co. of Delaware	Do.
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending. Civil 183 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
McDowell, R. W.:	
Positions under Petroleum Coordinator: District 2.	Member, Marketing Committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Director and member of marketing committee.
Mid-Continent Petroleum Corporation.	Vice president in charge of sales.
Baron-Huot Oil Co	Vice president and director.
Genessee-Diamond Oil Co	President and director.
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
McDowell, R. W	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (June 2, 1938); fined $15,000. Criminal 11365; guilty verdict (July 19, 1938); fined $1,000. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Mid-Continent Petroleum Corporation.	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (June 2, 1938); fined $15,000. Criminal 11365; guilty verdict (July 19, 1938); fined $5,000. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Baron-Huot Oil Co	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Genessee-Diamond Oil Co	Do.
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co	Civil 183 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Moreland, Harry:	
Position under Petroleum Coordinator: District 2.	Member, Transportation Committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Director.
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co	Vice president and general manager.
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending. Civil 183 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Moreland, Harry	Civil 183 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
O'Shaugnessy, I. A.:	
Position under Petroleum Coordinator: District 2.	Member, Refining Committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Director.
Globe Oil & Refining Co	President.
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending
Globe Oil & Refining Co. (Oklahoma).	Criminal 11365; guilty verdict (July 19, 1938), fined, $5,000.
O'Shaugnessy, I. A	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (Dec. 12, 1940); fined $2,500. Criminal 11365; nolo contendere (Dec. 12, 1940); fined $4,000.
Phillips, Frank:	
Position under Petroleum Coordinator: District 2.	Chairman, General Committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Director and member executive committee.
Phillips Petroleum Corporation	Chairman of board and director.
Alco Royalty Corporation	President and director.
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co.	

Phillips, Frank—Continued.	
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Phillips, Frank	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (June 2, 1938); fined $15,000. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Phillips Petroleum Corporation	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (June 2, 1938); fined $15,000. Criminal 11365; guilty verdict (July 19, 1938); fined $5,000. Civil 182 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co	Civil 183 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Stewart, W. L.:	
Positions under Petroleum Coordinator: District 5.	Member, General Committee; Chairman, Refining Committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Director and member refining committee.
Union Oil Co. of California	Vice president and director.
Claremont Oil Co	Director.
Lake View Oil Co	Vice president and director.
Los Angeles Oil Co	Director.
Union Steamship Co	Vice president and director.
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Stewart, W. L., Jr	Do.
Union Oil Co. of California	Criminal 14149-M; nolo contendere (Aug. 2, 1940); fined $4,500. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Claremont Oil Co	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Lake View Oil Co	Do.
Los Angeles Oil Co	Do.
Union Steamship Co	Do.
St. Clair, L. P.:	
Position under Petroleum Coordinator: District 5.	Member, Production Committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Director; former president and director, California Coast Oil Co.; former director, Claremont Oil Co.
California Conservation Committee.	Oil administrator.
Union Oil Co. of California	Director and former president and chairman of board.
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
St. Clair, L. P	Do.
Union Oil Co. of California	Criminal 14149-M; nolo contendere (Aug. 2, 1940), fined $4,500. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
California Coast Oil Co	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Claremont Oil Co	Do.
Seubert, E. G.:	
Positions under Petroleum Coordinator: District 2.	Member, general committee; chairman, transportation committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Director and member executive committee.
Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)	President and director.
Pan American Petroleum & Transportation Co.	Vice president and director.
Pan American Refining Corporation.	Do.
Pan American Production Co	Director.
Pan American Southern Corporation.	Do.
Stanolind Oil Purchasing Co	Vice president and director.
Stanolind Pipe Line Co	Do.
Pan American Petroleum Corporation.	Director.
Mexican Petroleum Corporation of Georgia.	Vice president and director.
Antitrust record:	
Seubert, E. G	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (June 2, 1938); fined $15,000. Criminal 11365; nolo contendere (June 2, 1941); fined $5,000. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending. Civil 182 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Mexican Petroleum Co. of Georgia.	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Pan American Petroleum Corporation.	Do.
Pan American Petroleum & Transportation Co.	Do.
Pan American Production Co	Do.
Pan American Refining Corporation.	Do.
Pan American Southern Corporation.	Do.
Stanolind Oil Purchasing Co	Do.
Stanolind Pipe Line Co	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending. Civil 182 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Swensrud, S. A.:	
Position under Petroleum Coordinator: District 2.	Member, Transportation Committee.
Private positions:	
Standard Oil Co. (Ohio)	Vice president.
Berea Engineering Co	Director.
Commercial Oil Co	Do.
Eagleroe Oil Co	Do.
Fleet-Wing Corporation	Do.
Fordsville Gathering Line, Inc.	Director and assistant secretary.
Michigan-Toledo Pipe Line Co.	Do.
Ohio Independent Oil Co	Director.
Ohio River Pipe Line Co	Director and vice president.
Ridge Oil Co	Director.
Simrall Corporation	Director and assistant secretary.
Sohio Corporation	Assistant secretary.
Sohio Pipe Line Co	Vice president and assistant secretary.

Swensrud, S. A.—Continued.	
Antitrust record:	
Standard Oil Co. (Ohio)	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Berea Engineering Co	Do.
Commercial Oil Co	Do.
Eagleroc Oil Co	Do.
Fleet Wing Corporation	Do.
Fordsville Gathering Line, Inc.	Do.
Michigan-Toledo Pipe Line Co.	Do.
Ohio Independent Oil Co	Do.
Ohio River Pipe Line Co	Do.
Ridge Oil Co	Do.
Simrall Corporation	Do.
Sohio Corporation	Do.
Sohio Pipe Line Co	Do.
Swensrud, S. A	Do.
Watson, C. B.:	
Position under Petroleum Coordinator: District 2.	Member, Marketing Committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Member, refining and marketing committees.
Pure Oil Co	Vice president and director.
Detroit Southern Pipe Line Co.	President and director.
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co	Director.
Hickok Oil Corporation	Do.
Pure Transportation Co	President and director
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Pure Oil Co	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (June 2, 1938); fined $15,000. Criminal 11365; guilty verdict (July 19, 1938); fined $5,000. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30 1940); defendant; pending.
Detroit Southern Pipe Line Co.	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Great Lakes Pipe Line Co	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending. Civil 183 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Hickok Oil Corporation	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Pure Transportation Co	Do.
Watson, C. B	Criminal 11365; nolo contendere (Dec. 12, 1940); fined $5,000. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Weil, A. L.:	
Position under Petroleum Coordinator: District 5.	Chairman, General Committee.
Private positions:	
Socony-Vacuum Oil Corporation	
General Petroleum Corporation of California.	President and director.
General Petroleum Corporation of Nevada.	President.
General Pipe Line Co	President and director.
Gilmore Oil Co	
Antitrust record:	
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc	Criminal 11364; nolo contendere (June 2, 1938); fined $15,000. Criminal 11365; guilty verdict (July 19, 1938); fined $5,000. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
General Petroleum Corporation of California.	Criminal 14149-M; nolo contendere (Aug. 1, 1940); fined $4,500. Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
General Pipe Line Co	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Gilmore Oil Co	Criminal 14149-M; nolo contendere (Aug. 19, 1940); fined $4,500.
Weil, A. L	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Weiss, H. C.:	
Position under Petroleum Coordinator: District 3.	Member, General Committee; Chairman, Transportation Committee.
Private positions:	
American Petroleum Institute	Director.
Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey).	
Gilbert and Barker Manufacturing Co.	
Humble Oil Refining Co	President and director.
Antitrust record:	
American Petroleum Institute	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey)	Do.
Ethyl Gasoline Corporation	Equity E. 84-321.
Gilbert and Barker Manufacturing Co.	Criminal 32597 (Jan. 31, 1941); defendant; pending.
Humble Oil & Refining Co	Civil 8524 (Sept. 30, 1940); defendant; pending.
Weiss, H. C	Do.

A Threat to Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM JACKSON (MICH.) CITIZEN-PATRIOT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Patriot. This newspaper stands out among the other newspapers in Michigan for the straightforward and understandable character of its editorials.

There has been considerable discussion on the floor today about the St. Lawrence seaway project. The people in the section of Michigan from which I come are divided upon the advisability of authorizing this project at this time. However, I feel sure that this newspaper has correctly appraised the public sentiment in its editorial, which is as follows:

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot]

A THREAT TO DEFENSE

There perhaps may be honest doubt as to the value of the St. Lawrence seaway. High authority speaks on both sides of that issue. But there is no such doubt about the Florida ship canal which was first proposed as a made-work project to give the unemployed and idle something to do. That made-work need has long since passed.

Even after the digging had started on the big ditch, Senator VANDENBERG was able to defeat the plan by demonstrating how useless and impractical such a waterway could be, and by pointing out the real damage it would do to that section.

It was thought that the Florida ship canal was deader than a smoked mackerel; but here it is back again, a very lively corpse in our national-defense program.

With the St. Lawrence seaway, it is tied into the rivers and harbors bill, the most outrageous pork bill on any recent congressional calendar. There are other doubtful projects in this bill, including the Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal, which has been defeated for years on the same grounds as the Florida Canal. But of them all the $200,000,000 Florida ditch is probably the worst, because of the actual facts and arguments that already have been produced against its completion.

The really serious feature of its reappearance now is that the huge spending project comes at a time when the Nation is urged to make sacrifices in civilian production to promote war efforts, to invest money in Government securities, and to think of the country's needs ahead of selfish interests.

Such requests are right and proper in the face of world conditions; but appearance of this Florida project will cause many citizens to question the sincerity if not the honesty of those Members of Congress who would foist such a useless expense on the Nation when the country's best informed economists are at a loss to invent ways and means to raise the money to pay for our actual defense needs.

Bill To Curb and Prevent Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill proposing to separate manufacturing from retailing in order to curb and prevent monopoly. It is as follows:

[In the House of Representatives. Mr. PATMAN introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed. A bill to prevent manufacturers of products from offering for sale and selling the same at retail in certain cases, and for other purposes]

Be it enacted, etc. That for the purposes of this act the word "manufacturer" shall be deemed to include a person partnership, association, or corporation engaged in the production or manufacture of commodities, which commodities such person, partnership, association, or corporation is also engaged in offering for sale and selling in commerce, as commerce is defined in section 4 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, to wit, an act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes, approved September 26, 1914, to wholesalers, jobbers, or retail dealers.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act the words "customer of such manufacturer" shall be deemed to include only a retail dealer who at any time already is established in the business of offering for sale and selling to consumers commodities produced or manufactured by such "manufacturer" as hereinabove defined.

SEC 3. It shall be deemed to be an unfair method of competition in commerce, within the intent and meaning of section 5 of said Federal Trade Commission Act, for a manufacturer, as defined hereinabove, to offer for sale and sell at retail to consumers any of the commodities produced or manufactured by such manufacturer, where the effect of so offering for sale and selling such commodities at retail to consumers may be substantially to lessen competition between such manufacturer and his customers or tend to create a monopoly in such line of commerce or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition by a customer or customers of such manufacturer, as customer is hereinabove defined.

SEC. 4. The Federal Trade Commission is hereby empowered and directed to prevent manufacturers, as hereinabove defined, from using such unfair method of competition, as hereinabove defined, in commerce.

SEC. 5. Whenever the Commission shall have reason to believe that any manufacturer is using such unfair method of competition, as hereinabove defined, and it shall appear to the Commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be to the interest of the public, it shall proceed to prevent the same in the same manner and by the same procedure as provided by section 5 of an act of Congress approved September 26, 1914, entitled "An act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes," as amended. The provisions of said section 5 and of sections 9 and 10 of said act, as amended, shall apply, for purposes of enforcement of the provisions of this section, as fully and with the same effect in law as though said sections were fully and literally incorporated herein. The circuit courts of appeals shall have the same jurisdiction to review the orders of the Commission and to enforce the same and shall review and enforce the same, as provided by said section 5. All courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to carry out the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of said Federal Trade Commission Act.

SEC. 6. This act shall take effect immediately after its approval.

The Sinking of the "Robin Moor"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

OPINION BY JAMES W. RYAN

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a legal opinion by James W. Ryan on the Sinking of the *Robin Moor*. I have obtained an estimate of the cost of printing the opinion, which is $236.25.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SINKING OF THE "ROBIN MOOR"

The action of German submarines in sinking the *Robin Moor* and drowning the six American Red Cross nurses on the British ship, and the *Maasdam*,[1] has revived the issue on which the United States entered the World War. It has also raised a broader and more serious issue, because up to the time the United States entered the World War there had been no sinking by a submarine of an American or other neutral vessel (like the *Robin Moor*) on the high seas outside a publicly declared submarine zone or blockade area. The *Robin Moor*, which was unarmed, was sunk on May 21, 1941, in the South Atlantic about half way between Africa and South America. Eleven survivors, after spending 18 days in an open lifeboat, were picked up by a Brazilian steamer and landed at Pernambuco. The remaining 35, after spending 13 days in lifeboats, were picked up by a British vessel and landed at Capetown. The vessel's cargo contained no implements of war, munitions, or other absolute contraband as defined by international law. The principal part of the cargo was destined to civilian British purchasers in British South Africa, and the remainder to civilians in Portuguese East Africa. Some of it was potential "conditional contraband" under international law, that is, it would have been contraband if it had been "destined for the use of the armed forces or of a government department of the enemy state."[2]

When the chief officer of the *Robin Moor* protested against her being sunk, the commander of the submarine replied that there were supplies on board the *Robin Moor* "for my country's enemy, and, therefore, I must sink you."[3]

The manifest listed 459 motorcars and trucks, 959 50-gallon drums of lubricating oil, 30 15-gallon drums of lubricating oil, 141 cases of shotgun shells, 4 cases of metallic cartridges, 12 .22-caliber sports rifles, and 6 gas masks for workers in refrigeration plants.[4]

Other materials carried were steel rails and bars, cotton piece goods, women's silk dresses, leather, candy, overalls, medicines, safety razors and blades, mechanical hand tools, lawn mowers, garters, toys, ready-mixed paints, flashlights and batteries, galvanized barbed wire, soap, fly swatters, canned beer, rubber bathing caps, storage batteries, roasted coffee, bar solder, radio receiving sets, preserves in glass and tin, fountain pens, women's underwear, refrigerating machinery, fishing tackle, insulated copper wire, cereals, zippers, cigarettes, pictures, smoking pipes, shoe polish, petroleum jelly, typewriters, knives, radio parts, radio tubes, rubber tires and tubes, and cough drops.[5]

On the German contraband list, clothing, foodstuffs, fodder, beverages, tobacco, and materials used in their manufacture, are conditional contraband. Arms, ammunition, warships, military aircraft, tanks, chemical substances for military purposes, military clothing, means of communication, fuels, lubricating oils, gold, silver, machine tools, and means of transportation and their component parts destined for enemy territory or the enemy forces, are absolute contraband.[6]

1. PROVISION FOR SAFETY OF SURVIVORS—TREATY WITH GERMANY OF NOVEMBER 23, 1936; AND ARTICLE 74, GERMAN PRIZE LAW CODE, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 3, 1939

The London Naval Treaty of 1930, part IV, Rules of Submarine Warfare, article 22, requires warships to "not sink or render incapable of navigation a merchant vessel without having first placed passengers, crew, and ship's papers in a place of safety. For this purpose the ship's boats are not regarded as a place of safety unless the safety of the passengers and crew is assured, in the existing sea and weather conditions, by the proximity of land, or the presence of another vessel which is in a position to take them on board." This is an absolute prohibition, applicable to every type of merchant vessel, enemy as well as neutral, under all possible circumstances. Forty-four countries, including all of the leading naval powers, are parties to this treaty. The United States signed on April 22, 1930, and Germany adhered on November 23, 1936.[7]

The German Prize Law Code of August 28, 1939,[8] provides in article 73 that captured neutral vessels may be destroyed if they have made forcible resistance, were aiding the enemy, were proceeding in convoy, or cannot safely or expediently be brought to port. Other neutral vessels may be destroyed if their condemnation would be expected as a certainty, or if to bring them to port would expose the capturing vessel to danger or might prejudice the success of its enterprises. But (art. 74–1) "The destruction of vessels in accordance with articles 72 and 73 is admissible only if the passengers, crew, and papers of the vessel have been brought to a place of safety before destruction. * * * Ship's boats are not to be regarded as a place of safety unless the safety of passengers and crew under the existing conditions of the sea and weather is assured by the proximity of land or the presence of another vessel which is able to take them on board."

When the *Lusitania* was sunk, on May 7, 1915, without proper provision having been made for the safety of the American citizens on board, the United States Government protested to the German Government that "it was contending for nothing less high and sacred than the rights of humanity," and that only the "actual resistance (of the *Lusitania*) to capture or refusal to stop when ordered to do so for the purpose of visit could have afforded the commander of the submarine any justification for so much as putting the lives of those on board the ship in jeopardy."[9] In *The Lusitania* (251 Fed. 715), the court held that the owners of the vessel were not liable for the loss of life and property because they were due to the "illegal act" of the German Government.

On November 29, 1915, Germany promised, with respect to neutral vessels captured as prize, that all possible care would be taken for the safety of the crews and passengers. "Consequently, the persons found on board of a vessel may not be ordered into her lifeboats except when the general conditions—that is to say, the weather, the condition of the sea, and the neighborhood of the coasts—afford absolute certainty that the boats will reach the nearest port."[10]

On May 6, 1916, Germany agreed not to sink either enemy or neutral merchant vessels "without warning and without saving human lives, unless those ships attempt to escape or offer resistance."[11]

"The untenable excuse put forward was that these ships were carrying contraband. But this begged the question by assuming, first, that there was contraband on board without making any search, and secondly, that the exceptional circumstances existed which alone justify sinking a ship for the carriage of contraband; nor would it in the smallest degree answer the charge of killing innocent persons. We need not repeat the emphatic condemnation of such practices by the Conference of Washington, 1921–22."[12]

At the Naval Conference at Washington in 1921–22, the five naval powers signed a treaty which reaffirmed the rules of international law in regard to the search and seizure of vessels by warships, including submarines, and the making of proper provision for the safety of those on board, and declared that "any person in the service of any power who shall violate any of those rules, whether or not such person is under orders of a govern-

[1] New York Times, July 10, 1941, p. 10.

[2] Viscount Tiverton, Prize Law (London, 1914), pp. 13–14.

[3] Weekly Underwriter (N. Y.), July 5, 1941, p. 24.

[4] Ibid., p. 24.

[5] Ibid., p. 24; New York Times, June 14, 1941.

[6] Commerce Clearing House War Law Service, foreign supplement, pp. 65, 553.

[7] U. S. Department of State Information Bulletin No. 114, p. 45; Deak & Jessup, Collection Neutrality Laws, pt. II, No. 36, pp. 1397–1398; United States Treaty Series No. 830; 112 League of Nations Treaty Series, p. 66; American Journal International Law, v. 31, supplement, p. 137, and. v. 35, p. 496; 132 Br. & For. State Papers, p. 603.

[8] Reichsgesetzblatt, pt. I, No. 161, September 3, 1939 (tr. Comp. Law Series, U. S. Department of Commerce, vol. 3, No. 1, January 1940).

[9] American White Book, vol. 2, pp. 171, 178.

[10] German Note to United States, November 29, 1915, American White Book, vol. 3, p. 316.

[11] German Note to United States, May 6, 1916, American White Book, vol. 3, p. 302 ff.

[12] T. J. Lawrence, International Law (7th ed., London, 1925), pp. 469–470.

mental superior, shall be deemed to have violated the laws of war and shall be liable to trial and punishment as if for an act of piracy and may be brought to trial before the civil or military authorities of any power within the jurisdiction of which he may be found."[13]

"It should be added, in connection with the World War practice, that Germany never seriously asserted a general right to destroy neutral vessels without placing all the persons on board in safety; the indiscriminate sinkings in war zones and elsewhere were said to be justified on the grounds of retaliation and self-preservation."[14]

During the World War the United States emphasized that measures of reprisal put into effect by belligerents must not affect injuriously the rights of neutrals.[15]

Discussing the legality of submarine warfare as retaliation, the United States had said that "a belligerent act of retaliation is per se an act beyond the law, and the defense of an act as retaliatory is an admission that it is illegal."[16] The United States "cannot for a moment entertain, much less discuss, a suggestion that respect by German naval authorities for the rights of citizens of the United States upon the high seas should in any way or in the slightest degree be made contingent upon the conduct of any other government affecting the rights of neutrals and noncombatants. Responsibility in such matters is single, not joint; absolute, not relative."[17]

2. DESTRUCTION OF NEUTRAL PRIZES, TREATIES WITH PRUSSIA OF 1799 AND 1828, ARTICLE 2 OF DECLARATION OF PARIS OF 1856, AND CAPTURE BECAUSE OF CARRIAGE OF CONTRABAND

The *Robin Moor* case is much like that of the *Knight Commander*. The *Knight Commander* was a neutral (British) vessel which was sunk on the high seas near the entrance to Tokyo Gulf by a Russian cruiser on July 24, 1904, during the Russian-Japanese War because the commander of the cruiser believed that some of her cargo was contraband.[18] She was under charter to an American company and was bound to Japan with a cargo of railroad material, bridge material, machinery, and various articles. Before the sinking all persons on board had been removed. Her destruction was described by Mr. Balfour in the House of Commons as "entirely contrary to the practice of nations."[19] In the House of Lords, Lord Lansdowne said that the sinking was an "outrage" and that "a very serious breach of international law had been committed by the captors. * * * Under no hypothesis can the Government conceive that a neutral ship could be sunk on the mere fiat of a cruiser's commanding officer, who assumed that the cargo of the vessel included articles which were contraband of war."[20] The Russian Government gave assurances that the practice would be discontinued, but refused to pay a pecuniary indemnity and also refused to submit the matter to the Hague tribunal for arbitration. Another instance of the same kind occurred afterward, however, when a Russian warship sank the British vessel, *St. Kilda*, while carrying cotton to Japan.[21] In answer to the British protest the Russian Government said that the previous assurances still held good and that "the present case was an isolated one, probably due to misunderstanding and the disorganization of the Russian naval forces in the Far East," and promised to order the offending cruisers home. A Russian court also awarded compensation to the vessel and cargo owners. The United States Government sent a note to the Russian Government with respect to the sinking of the *Knight Commander*, stating that the carriage of contraband did not in itself justify the sinking of the vessel, but that it was not prepared to maintain that a prize might not be legitimately destroyed in case of "imperative necessity." It further said that it would "view with the gravest concern the application of similar treatment to American vessels and cargoes."[22]

On January 28, 1915, an American vessel, the *William P. Frye*, bound from Seattle to Queenstown with a cargo of wheat, was captured and sunk on the high seas by a German cruiser. The United States protested that this was a violation of the treaties with Germany of 1799 and 1828. Germany denied that it was a violation and further contended that the capture was justified because the cargo, being destined to fortified ports, was conditional contraband.[23] Apparently the wheat cargo on the *William P. Frye* was destined to a naval base in an area in which active naval operations between the armed forces were in progress or was to be controlled in distribution by a government department of the enemy state. The United States therefore preferred to base its protest against her sinking on the Prussian-American treaties rather than on the general international law rule on the subject.[24] Germany disagreed with the American interpretation of the treaties.[25] The United States declared that it regarded the Declaration of London as not in force.[26] It said, however: "On the other hand, if we assume that the cargo was noncontraband, the destruction either of the cargo or the vessel could not be justified in the circumstances of this case under any accepted rule of international law."[27] Germany asserted that the Declaration of London was declaratory of international law, and said: "It is not disputed by the American Government that, according to general principles of international law, a belligerent is authorized in sinking neutral vessels under almost any conditions for carrying contraband,"[28] but declared that orders were given not to destroy American ships with conditional contraband, reserving "the right to destroy vessels carrying absolute contraband wherever such destruction is permissible according to the provisions of the Declaration of London."[29] In reply to the latter note, the United States declared: "Without admitting that the Declaration of London is in force, and on the understanding that the requirement in article 50 of the declaration that 'before the vessel is destroyed all persons on board must be placed in safety' is not satisfied by merely giving them an opportunity to escape in lifeboats, the Government of the United States is willing, pending the arbitral award in the case, to accept the Declaration of London as the rule governing the conduct of the German Government in relation to the treatment of American vessels carrying cargoes of absolute contraband."[30]

In regard to the sinking of the American vessel *Leelanaw* carrying absolute contraband (flax), Germany explained that the commander was unable to take it in "without exposing the submarine to danger or impairing the success of the operations in which he was engaged," but that he placed all persons and ship's papers in safety and "therefore acted in conformity with the principles of international law."[31] In a later note Germany declared that she shared the view that all possible care must be taken for the security of persons on board the vessel destroyed who "may not be ordered into her lifeboats except when the general conditions—that is to say, the weather, the condition of the sea, and the neighborhood of the coast—afford absolute certainty that the boats will reach the nearest port."[32]

The treaty of July 11, 1799, between Prussia and the United States,[33] provides, in articles 12 and 13 that as the principle of free ships make free goods has not been sufficiently respected, the parties agree to cooperate in obtaining agreement to it by all of the other maritime powers, and in case either engages in war with a third power "to prevent all the difficulties and misunderstandings that usually arise respecting merchandise of contraband, such as arms, ammunition, and military stores of every kind, no such articles, carried in the vessels, or by the subjects or citizens of either party to the enemies of the other, shall be deemed contraband so as to induce confiscation or condemnation and a loss of property to individuals. Nevertheless, it shall be lawful to stop such vessels and articles, and to detain them for such length of time as the captors may think necessary to prevent the inconvenience or damage that might ensue from their proceeding, paying, however, a reasonable compensation for the loss such arrest s all occasion to the proprietors, and it shall further be allowed to use in the service of the captors the whole or any part of the military stores so detained, paying the owners the full value of the same, to be ascertained by the current price at the place of its destination."

The treaty of May 1, 1828, between Prussia and the United States,[34] provides, in articles 12 and 13, that articles 12 to 24 of the treaty of 1799 are revived, and that the parties also engage to treat again in the future "to insure just protection and freedom to neutral navigation and commerce" and "at the same time advance the cause of civilization and humanity." The German prize court held that, in view of these treaty provisions, Germany must indemnify the American owners of the *William P. Frye* and her cargo.[35]

German warships captured and sank the Dutch merchant vessels *Medea* and *Maria* during the World War, and in reply to the Netherlands protest of April 3, 1915, that "the

---

[13] W. M. Malloy, Treaties of United States, vol. III, p. 3118; J. H. Latane, American Foreign Policy (New York, 1927), pp. 687–688.

[14] American Journal International Law, supplement (1939), vol. 33, No. 3, p. 575.

[15] Correspondence between United States and Great Britain re blockade decree March 1, 1915, American White Book, vol. 1, pp. 61 ff., and vol. 3, p. 25; E. Richards, British Prize Courts and the War, British Year Book, 1920–21, pp. 29 ff.; Stowell and Munro, Cases on International Law, vol. 2, pp. 559, 608.

[16] Lansing to Gerard, July 21, 1915, United States Foreign Relations, 1915 supplement, p. 480.

[17] Lansing to Gerard, May 8, 1916, United States Foreign Relations, 1916 supplement, p. 263.

[18] Hurst and Bray, Russian and Japanese Prize Cases (London, 1912), vol. 1, p. 54; T. J. Lawrence, War and Neutrality in the Far East (2d ed.), pp. 250–289.

[19] T. Hansard Parl. Deb., vol. 138, 4th ser., p. 1481.

[20] Ibid., p. 1436.

[21] (1908) Hurst and Bray, Russian and Japanese Prize Cases, vol. 1, p. 188.

[22] For. Rels. U. S., 1904, pp. 333, 337, 734.

[23] Am. White Book, vol. 2, p. 185 ff., and vol. 3, p. 311 ff.; J. W. Garner, Prize Law During World War, p. 3 ff., 68.

[24] U. S. For. Rels., 1915, Suppl., pp. 376, 450, 505.

[25] Ibid., pp. 435, 493.

[26] Ibid., p. 376.

[27] Ibid., p. 450.

[28] Ibid., p. 493.

[29] Ibid., p. 552.

[30] Ibid., p. 570, American note, Oct. 12, 1915.

[31] Ibid., p. 607.

[32] Ibid., p. 644.

[33] Treaty Series, No 293; 8 U. S. Stats. at L. 162–177; H. Miller, Treaties of U. S., vol. 2, pp. 441–443.

[34] Treaty Series, No. 294; 8 Stats. at L. 378–387; 18 Stats. at L., vol. 2, pp. 656–660; H. Miller, Treaties of the U. S., vol. 3, pp 435–437.

[35] Wheaton, International Law, 6th Eng. Edn., p. 1148.

destruction of a neutral prize is an act that international law has never sanctioned," took the position that the vessels were carrying conditional contraband, and were, therefore, authorized to be captured and sunk by the Declaration of London, which corresponds "in substance with the generally recognized principles of law," although not formally ratified.[36]

On April 2, 1916, on the high seas, a German submarine captured and sank a neutral (Norwegian) vessel, the *Arena*, and contended in justification that she was carrying contraband of war, and that her proximity to enemy forces at the time of capture made recapture possible and, therefore, required that she be sunk. The supreme prize court at Berlin awarded damages, however, to the owners of the noncontraband part of the cargo, consisting of paper, title to which had not passed to the English consignees.[37]

In the case of the *Cyzne*, the German-Portuguese arbitral tribunal held Germany liable for the sinking of a neutral Portuguese ship whose cargo consisted of pit props, which, although destined to an enemy country, was not absolute contraband.

After the Russian-Japanese War, a proposal was made for the adoption by agreement of a new rule of international law authorizing the destruction of neutral prizes when found carrying such contraband goods as arms and munitions in very large quantities, and it is impossible to take her into port, so that to release her would be tantamount to allowing the fighting resources of the adversary to be increased.[38] This proposal was made by Russia [39] and Germany [40] at The Hague Conference of 1907, but was opposed by Great Britain [41] and the United States,[42] who supported on grounds of humanity and justice the existing rule that neutral prizes which cannot be taken in for adjudication must be released, the United States pointing out [43] that the present construction of warships offered little accommodation for persons removed from captured vessels, and exposed them—noncombatants—to the dangers of battle.

At the London Naval Conference (1908–09) the Russian and German proposal was renewed but was strongly opposed by Great Britain and Japan who urged the absolute immunity of neutral prizes from destruction.[44] A compromise proposal was finally arrived at and embodied in a series of rules in articles 48 to 53 (fourth chapter) of the so-called Declaration of London of February 26, 1909.[45] It recognized the general rule of nondestruction and the duty of bringing in for adjudication, and the fundamental right of the neutral to a trial before a prize court, but also recognized that in exceptional cases a captor may destroy the neutral prize if he can prove that she was confiscable, and that she could not have been brought in without "danger to the safety of the warship or to the success of the operations in which she is engaged at the time"; [46] but before destroying her provision must be made for the safety of all persons on board and the ship's papers "which the parties interested consider relevant for deciding on the validity of the capture" (art. 50); and the owner of the destroyed innocent neutral goods on board must be paid compensation (art. 53).

Owing to the nonratification of the Declaration of London, however, it does not have binding force.[47] The compromise rules in the Declaration of London have been criticized as having no basis in the practice of nations in the past, and on the grounds that danger to the capturing warship and interference with the success of its operations are words of perilous ambiguity; that liability to condemnation for carrying contraband is a fact which can only be ascertained by a judicial inquiry; and that publicists speaking of destruction for carrying contraband had in mind only cargoes of absolute contraband such as arms and ammunition and never meant to justify destruction for carrying other cargoes which are not contraband under international law but are only contended to be contraband by a unilateral and unlawful extension by a belligerent of the categories of contraband.[48]

At the outset of the World War both Great Britain and France refused to recognize the Declaration of London as stating either international law or a working rule to be observed temporarily by agreement, and the other nations followed their lead. Accordingly, the rules of international law or customary law as they existed before the Declaration of London alone remain applicable, but the declaration agrees with them in certain respects.

Under settled international law as it exists at the present time, therefore, military necessity and readiness to pay compensation, although they may be pleaded in extenuation when a neutral prize is destroyed, cannot be considered a legal justification. If military necessity alone is pleaded, without offering to pay compensation, the aggrieved neutral would be warranted in taking most drastic action against the offending belligerent; indeed, if repetition of the offense were threatened, it would be compelled to do so as a matter of self-preservation in order to maintain the safety of its crews, passengers, vessels, and cargoes engaged in lawful commerce on the high seas outside areas in which naval or military engagements are in progress.

The carriage of contraband is not unlawful, and therefore the *Robin Moor* legal situation is not affected by the fact (which evidently from the American shipowner's records does not exist) that she may have had on board some contraband. It has been settled international law for centuries, and was recognized by the Hague Convention of 1907, that the carriage of contraband by a private merchant vessel is neither unlawful nor a breach of neutrality by the neutral government whose flag the vessel flies.

The fact that part of the cargo on the *Robin Moor* was destined to a belligerent port and was therefore owned by nationals of the belligerent or by non-Americans because of the requirements of the Neutrality Act, 1939, does not affect the matter.

"The modern rule of the law of nations is, certainly, that the ship (a neutral) shall not be subject to condemnation for carrying contraband articles. The ancient practice was otherwise. * * * But this rule is liable to exceptions: Where a ship belongs to the owner of the cargo, or where the ship is going on such service, under a false destination or false papers, these circumstances of aggravation have been held to constitute excepted cases out of the modern rule, and to continue them under the ancient one." Under the modern rule "the carriage of contraband works a forfeiture of freight and expenses, but not of the ship." [49]

"In the case of absolute contraband it is necessary to prove only that the goods have a destination for the enemy country or territory occupied by the enemy. In the case of conditional contraband, however, there must be proof that the goods are destined not only for the enemy territory but for the use of the armed forces or of a government department of the enemy state. For example, munitions of war or army uniforms (being of the nature of absolute contraband) would be liable to condemnation as good prize if it were shown that they had a destination for the enemy territory. But railway material or fuel (being of the nature of conditional contraband) could not be condemned merely upon proof that they were destined for such territory. Being only conditionally contraband, they could be condemned only if a further destination for the use of the armed forces or government of the enemy could be proved.[50] The distinction between combatants and noncombatants is the basis for this distinction between absolute and conditional contraband." [51] The distinction between conditional and absolute contraband represented a compromise between belligerent claims to stop trade and neutral claims to carry it on, "either of which, if carried to its logical conclusion, would have destroyed the other, being in this particular like most other legal rules." [52]

In the year 1918 in the case of the *Pomona*, II Entsch. 147, the Supreme Prize Court of Germany held that carriage of conditional contraband on a neutral ship did not justify capture unless there was ground for believing that it was destined for use by the enemy's Government or military forces.[53] It further held in the cases of the *Villareal*, II Entsch. 317, and the *Papelera*, I Entsch. 334, that the owners of noncontraband enemy goods on board a neutral ship which was illegally sunk by a German warship were entitled to indemnity; and in the case of the *Draupner*, II. Entsch. 162, that damages were recoverable for illegal destruction of a captured neutral vessel.[54] But Germany asserted the right of attack by submarine without visit and search if the neutral vessel was believed to be carrying contraband.[55]

"As regards the sinking of neutral prizes, Great Britain has always maintained that the right to destroy is confined to enemy vessels only, and this view is favored by other powers. Concerning the right to destroy captured neutral vessels, the view hitherto taken by the greater naval powers has been that, in the event of it being impossible to bring in a vessel for adjudication, she must be released." [56]

The prize courts in Great Britain have said that this is the settled rule of international law.[57]

---

[36] Overzicht der Voornaamste, July 1914–15, Netherlands, pp. 19–21; J. W. Garner, International Law and World War, vol. 2, p 271; and Am Jour. Internat. Law, Suppl. (1939), vol. 33, No. 3, pp. 574–575.

[37] Entscheidungen des Oberprisengerichts, Berlin, 1918, No. 343 (1917).

[38] J. B. Moore, Dig. Internat. Law, vol. 7, p. 528.

[39] Deuxieme Conference Internationale de la Paix: Actes et Documents (1907), vol. 3, pp. 900, 991–992.

[40] Ibid., pp. 992, 993.

[41] Ibid., pp. 903–907.

[42] Ibid., pp. 1050, 1141.

[43] Ibid., pp. 1051, 1141; cf pp. 750–755, 776–779, 795–808.

[44] Parl. Papers, Miscel. No. 5 (1909), p. 38.

[45] A. P. Higgins, Hague Peace Conferences, pp. 557–559.

[46] Arts. 49, 51; Parl. Papers, Miscel. (1909) No. 5.

[47] *The Hakan* (1916), 2 Prize Cases 210.

[48] J. B. Moore, Dig. Int. Law, v. 7, p. 527; W. E. Hall, International Law (8th ed., Oxford, 1924), pp. 899–900.

[49] *The Neutralitet* (1801), 3 C. Rob. 295.

[50] Cf. J. H. W. Verzihl, Le Droit des prises de la grande guerre, pp. 756–767.

[51] H. W. Briggs, Law of Nations (New York, 1938), pp. 938–939.

[52] J. B. Moore, International Law and Some Current Illusions, p. 32.

[53] See, also, Tiverton's Prize Law (London, 1914), pp. 13–14.

[54] Cf. *The Davanger*, II. Entsch. 232.

[55] *The Berkelstroom*, I. Entsch. 318; cf. *The Maria*, I. Entsch. 45; and *The Medea*, I. Entsch. 131.

[56] Sir Edward Grey, British Foreign Minister, to Sir Edward Fry, June 12, 1907; Parl. Papers, Miscel. No. 1 (1908), pp. 17, 18.

[57] *The Acteon* (1815), 2 Dods. 48; *The Zee Star* (1801), 4 C. Rob 71; *The Felicity* (1819), 2 Dods. 381; *The Leucade* (1856), Spinks, 217; W. E. Hall, International Law (8th ed., Oxford, 1924), p. 898; and T. J. Lawrence, Principles of International Law (7th ed., London, 1925), pp. 467–470. Contra, J. B. Moore, Digest, Int. Law, vol. 7, pp. 522–523.

"The majority of jurists and publicists who have dealt with the subject regard the prohibition as absolute, and consequently hold that where the suspected or offending vessel cannot be taken into port, she must be released whatever may happen to any contraband cargo on board." [58]

"This practice had been adopted by certain other countries, for example, Holland and Japan, but adoption in time of peace has sometimes been followed by a different regime in time of war. (Cf. Japanese Regulations governing Captures. * * *) The majority of the great maritime powers—e. g., France, Germany, Russia, the United States—are in favor of the more rigorous course of destroying neutral prizes at sea if they cannot be brought in without risk to the captor." [59] But although they (including our own Government on a few occasions) may have favored such a rule, the fact is that "There is * * * no clear record of destruction of a seaworthy neutral vessel not alleged to be guilty of unneutral service prior to the Russo-Japanese War. Moreover, many treaties prescribed treatment of neutral vessels inconsistent with their destruction * * *." [60] And although Russia sank five British, one Danish, and two German neutral prizes during the Russo-Japanese War, it paid damages for doing so with respect to five of them, and the others were strongly protested, and our Government made one of the protests.[60] Since the Russo-Japanese War the only destruction of neutral vessels has been the clearly unlawful destruction by Germany during the World War and in the present war,[61] allegedly based on a right of retaliation because the other belligerent had also been acting unlawfully.

On October 9, 1914, the Acting Secretary of State said: "The practice of nations in the past, stated generally, has been to sink prizes of war taken on the seas if either the ship or any part of her cargo was neutral property only when military necessity made this course imperative. * * * It is not to be presumed, however, that the German Government will refuse to grant indemnity for neutral property which has been lost in such manner and which would otherwise have been restored by a court of prize." [62]

In the memorandum on armed merchantmen of March 25, 1916, the Department of State declared: "In the case of a neutral merchantman, the right to sink it in any circumstances is doubtful." [63]

The United States Naval Instructions Governing Maritime Warfare, of June 30, 1917, article 94, authorized the destruction of neutral vessels captured as prize in case of "imperative necessity." [64] Those instructions terminated on the signing of the Armistice and peace treaty; and on November 23, 1936, the United States and Germany agreed by treaty that there should be no right under any circumstances to destroy a neutral prize when the lives of the civilians on board would be endangered or destroyed.

The German Prize Law Code of August 28, 1939 [65] provides: "Article 73. (1) Captured neutral vessels may be destroyed if: 1. They were captured because of proceeding under enemy convoy, forcible resistance, or aid to the enemy, and, 2. It appears to be inexpedient or unsafe to bring them to port. (2) By way of exception neutral vessels which were captured for reasons other than those named in paragraph 1, No. 1, may likewise be destroyed if: 1. Their condemnation would be expected as a certainty, and, 2. To bring them to port would expose the vessel which captured them to danger or might prejudice the success of the enterprises on which it is engaged." See, also, article 74, quoted above.

Such codes are merely orders by one nation to its own naval officers.

"It may be that destruction of neutral prizes is excusable in exceptional cases as between the captor and his own government, but compensation should always be forthcoming except when the neutral ship has become impressed with an enemy character as by incorporation into the service of the belligerent." [66] "To a neutral, on the other hand, destruction can only be justified under any circumstances by a full restitution in value. *The Felicity* (2 Dods, 381); and see *The John* (2 Dods, 336); *The Leucade* (Spinks, 221); *The Thea* (1 H. and B. 96); *The Tetartos* (1 H. and B. 166)." [67]

JAMES W. RYAN.

Grand Coulee Dam Eighth Wonder of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, for centuries the people have been more or less familiar with the seven wonders of the world. There has even been some dispute as to what the seventh wonder actually is. The seven wonders of the world are listed as follows:

First. Pyramids of Egypt.

Second. Garden of Semiramis at Babylon.

Third. Statue of Zeus at Olympia.

Fourth. Temple of Artemis at Ephesus.

Fifth. Mausoleum at Halicarnassus.

Sixth. Colossus of Rhodes.

Seventh. The Pharos lighthouse of Alexandria or Walls of Babylon.

This year the United States Government is completing Grand Coulee Dam, which has been frequently and appropriately referred to as the eighth wonder of the world. As the years go by it will attract the attention of millions of people, and millions will stop to view it and marvel at its size and beauty. Grand Coulee Dam will be distinguished from the other seven wonders of the world by reason of the fact that it will serve mankind through the years upon a scale far surpassing any service gotten from structures previously erected by man. It will be not merely something great to look upon but its usefulness for constructive human happiness will result in creating a vast new electrical empire in a region that has heretofore been but sparsely populated, and in earlier days looked upon as a place of little promise.

Just now the installation of the first of the 18 giant generators is being completed. Each generator will be of the same size and capacity, and each, like the dam itself, will be the greatest of its kind ever designed and built by man. The dam and the generators were conceived, planned, and built for the purpose of making this a better world to live in, and for the production of those things that add to human welfare and happiness. It is undertakings such as this that convince the rest of the world that the United States is truly a great Nation.

Recently there appeared in the Seattle Post Intelligencer, under date of August 3, an article written by Dan B. Markel, special writer, giving a graphic description of what this first giant generator is and means, and I take pleasure in making it a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article follows:

[From the Seattle Post Intelligencer of August 3, 1941]

COULEE WILL START GIANT GENERATORS—108,000 KILOWATTS OF POWER TO BE UNLEASHED SOON

(By Dan B. Markel)

Picture 150,000 wild horses stampeding down a steep 18-foot lane, plunging faster than a mile a minute in a headlong furious mass.

Suddenly the lane narrows and curves in an increasingly tightening spiral, but the foaming wild horses rage on and on until they lunge against a 1,500-ton obstruction.

Under the impact the obstruction moves, revolves, trapping the wild horses, and robbing them of their energy as the giant wheel whirls faster and faster, 120 revolutions per minute, 130 miles an hour.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND HORSEPOWER

The equivalent of the 150,000 wild horses will roar down a lane of concrete and steel, inside Coulee Dam, some time next month. They will crash against the largest turbine wheel ever built, turn the largest shaft ever constructed, set in motion the largest rotor ever assembled, spin it against the largest stator ever designed, and turn the 150,000 horsepower into the greatest amount of electricity ever produced in one generator, itself a third larger than any heretofore built.

The 150,000 wild horses will become 108,000 kilowatts of power.

COULD SUPPLY SEATTLE

That is more power than is used by all the homes, shops, mills, stores, and factories combined in the industrial, electrically minded city of Tacoma.

It approximates the power that City Light normally pours into Seattle.

The 108,000 kilowatts is the power that one giant generator at Coulee will produce next month.

A month later another generator that would supply another Tacoma will go into operation, another 150,000 wild horses tamed and put to work.

And a month after that another generator, capable of powering a third Tacoma, will go on duty. Then more and more until in all 18 generators, with a power supply for 18 Tacomas, with the strength of 2,700,000 stampeding horses, will be in action for Washington industry and, incidentally, for national defense.

FIVE DNIEPROSTROYS

With one generator completed progress on two others is well along. The three alone will produce as much power as all the American plants at Niagara.

---

[58] Sir Frederick Smith (Attorney General of Great Britain), Destruction of Merchant Ships Under International Law (London, 1917), p. 79.

[59] Wheaton's International Law, 6th English ed. by A. B. Keith, London, 1929, p. 1145.

[60] Wheaton, International Law, 6th Eng. ed., p. 1145.

[61] Ibid., p. 1148.

[62] U. S. For. Rels., 1914, Suppl., p. 319.

[63] U. S. For. Rels., 1916, Suppl., p. 248.

[64] U. S. Naval War College, Regulation of Maritime Warfare (1925).

[65] Reichsgesetzblatt, Part 1, No. 161, Sept. 3, 1939 (tr. Comp. Law Series. U. S. Dept. Commerce, vol. 3, No. 1, Jan. 4, 1940).

[66] W. E. Hall, International Law (8th ed., Oxford, 1924), p. 900.

[67] Viscount Tiverton, Prize Law (London, 1914), p. 21.

A fourth will bring the total to an equal of the maximum output at Muscle Shoals. And five will produce more power than the largest hydroelectric project outside America, the famed Dnieprostroy plant in Russia.

When complete with its 18 generators, Coulee will equal five Dnieprostroys.

Everything at Coulee is the biggest in the world, from the single generator finished now that appears like a colossal red cheese above the powerhouse floor, its turbine that will trap and harness the wild horses buried in 60 feet of concrete, to the giant cranes that flip 350 tons of metal through the air with the easiest of grace.

TEST GIVEN

The finished generator was tested recently, in anticipation of formal inauguration of its operation. But the great 1,500-ton monster suffered initial misfortune.

Maj. S. E. Hutton described that misfortune with a nontechnical analogy.

"When you buy a new car the dealer cautions you not to drive it too fast," he commented. "The dealer knows that, like any complicated piece of machinery, it has to be broken in gradually. If you took your new car and drove it 60 or 80 miles an hour the first few miles, you'd have bad luck. Something inside would go or be damaged.

"That's what happened here. The young fellows who put the generator through its first test simply let it out a little too fast. And, as a result, a bearing burned out."

A SLIGHT DELAY

Major Hutton said that the damaged generator would be remedied and the generator will perform as efficiently as though no accident has happened, and that the only real harm was in the delay the mishap caused.

A veteran will be put in charge of the next test, he indicated.

The Westinghouse Electric Co. is building the generators and its oldest veteran is on the job at Coulee. He is Edward Hartmuss.

In his overalls, his tousled gray hair falling over steely blue eyes, Hartmuss appears just another workman as he leans over the rail of an 8-foot turbine pit, puffing at a stubby briar which is probably, and fittingly at Coulee, the strongest in the world.

Next month Hartmuss will have put in half a century with the Westinghouse Co. in various parts of the world. Boulder, Niagara, Wilson—wherever great power projects have been built and his company has done the job, there has been Hartmuss and his pipe.

"I had kind of counted on retiring next month," he said. "I'm a Pennsylvania Dutchman, and I sort of planned to go back to my old home there and relax. But this job's so big I hate to quit, so I'm going right on working."

Hartmuss climbed down a ladder and clambered sprightly around a rotor his crew is assembling.

"There are 12,632 sheets of lamination, each sheet weighing 35½ pounds, and an eighth of an inch thick, bolted together with 1,080 bolts, each 83 7/8 inches long," he explained.

"To these are fastened 60 magnetic pole pieces with alternating north and south poles. It is 576 inches from pole piece to pole piece, each weighing 2¼ tons. Traveling 130 miles an hour and passing in front of the stator, magnetic current in the iron and electricity in the windings of the stator."

Hartmuss could have added that every piece comes separately and the rotor is built from the ground up.

Assembled, these giant rotors, largest in the world, weigh 597 tons each.

But putting the fourteen-thousand-odd rotor parts together is child's work compared to assembling the stator. The stator has 175,000 laminations. A lamination is a thin metal sheet. Coulee stators are 37 feet in diameter, weigh 274 tons, and are worth $300,000 apiece.

Over the revolving rotor and the stationary stator will go a 160,000-ton end bracket and casing.

To summarize, 150,000 wild horses will plunge into a 294-ton turbine costing half a million dollars. This will turn a 200-ton shaft 74 feet long and nearly 44 inches wide 120 revolutions a minute.

TWO HUNDRED-TON TRANSFORMERS

This will turn the 597-ton rotor inside the 274-ton stator at a speed of 130 miles an hour, and electricity will be born, 108,000 kilowatts of power.

For each generator there must be constructed three 36,000-kilowatt transformers. The tanks of each weigh 24 tons, the core and coil 47 tons, and the 14,500 gallons of insulating oil that goes into each tank weighs 54 tons.

Twelve feet wide, 19 feet 10 inches long, and 29 feet 5 inches tall, the transformers, like everything else at Coulee, are the biggest in the world.

Mr. Speaker, in the foregoing article a graphic word picture has been given of the new giant, to serve mankind, that has just come into being. There are 17 additional giants of the same type, kind, and character that will come into being to render continuous service for 24 hours in every day and 365 days in every year for scores of years yet to come, providing always, that we can keep America a free Nation of free men. In fact, in actual service to humanity, both present and future, this new "eighth wonder of the world," Grand Coulee Dam can and will give constructive, useful service to this generation and generations yet to come, far surpassing the combined service of all the so-called seven wonders of the world.

In contrast to the seven enumerated wonders of the world, Grand Coulee Dam was not erected by unwilling hands driven by the lash of the conqueror's whip or the slave driver, but is a monument of construction, to free American labor, where 6,000 men toiled willingly and gladly for 6 years, under the most ideal working conditions and receiving as their reward a fair and just wage. The men who built this giant were all members of the American Federation of Labor, and from its very beginning down until this day there never was the slightest difficulty between the workmen and their employer.

Already hundreds of thousands of tourists are coming to view Grand Coulee Dam and doubtless through the years the number of those who travel the beautiful highways that lead into the dam will far exceed the aggregate of those going to visit the ancient seven wonders of the world, because people much prefer to view that which is vibrant, living, and useful, rather than that which is dead, or a selfish monument to mark the existence of some conceited, selfish human being, whose foolish vanity prompted the erection of most of the seven wonders of the world.

Preachers and Perils of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

TALK BY W. B. RILEY

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a talk delivered in the pulpit of the First Baptist Church, Minneapolis, Minn., July 20, 1941, by W. B. Riley, on the subject, Preachers and Perils of War.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Some of us believe that it is still true; as true as it was in Ezekiel's day, that in times like these there rests upon the prophet of God—

THE OBLIGATION OF WARNING

"If the watchman hear the sword and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come, and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at the watchman's hand" (v. 6).

This Scripture clearly suggests at least three matters of moment:

First. "At the approach of the sword the watchman should speak."

That is why I am here this morning. That is why this text is taken. That is why I will probably say before I have finished this discourse things with which all will not agree, but things on which I shall strive, at least, to voice what seems to me to be God's will.

In 1914 I saw rise, from practically the same source, a war that deluged the world in blood. I witnessed then the political performance of employing a catch phrase in vote control. It was Wilson's candidacy for the second term, and the slogan was "He kept us out of war." Then when in his second term he led us into it, the slogan changed—it was a war to "make the world safe for democracy" and a "war to end war." Look at those slogans now.

Such propaganda influenced our people sufficiently to draw America into the swirl, and when the war was ended thousands of our boys were buried to the profit of nobody, hundreds of thousands of others of them were languishing in the hospitals, where to this good hour many still suffer and groan, dying daily; and the billions of money that we loaned to the participants were lost forever to America but had to be recouped from the lean pockets of taxpayers. The result was that by the time of 1929 America entered upon a period of depression that wiped out thousands of firms, 10,000 bankers, reduced to the point of need millions of businessmen, and flung the flotsam and jetsam of society upon the benevolence of the Federal Treasury.

Meantime, the nations that involved us and borrowed from us prospered as never before in their history.

I visited England in 1929, and visited her again in 1936, and I never dreamed that any nation could pass from need to luxury in so short a time.

As for Germany, the other great contestant, she has amazed the world by the amassed fortune invested in war machines—the like of which 60 centuries have not known.

To me experience is a teacher. I am not biting on the propaganda bait that would put my Nation again into this Old World conflict; I am not in sympathy with the President's proposition to defend democracy in every quarter of the world, while neglecting its proper defense on the soil of the United States. I am against permitting gangsters to capture controlling positions in labor unions, dictate to the Government itself, while retaining as Secretary of Labor an individual known to be sympathetic with "pinks" and "reds."

The recent turn in the tilt between Germany and Russia has swept instantly away the last vestige of argument left to our hospitably inclined spendthrift, for if ever there was a nation which stands against the four liberties for which he was fighting only a fortnight ago, that nation is the present Russia and its Bolsheviki reign. And yet we are informed daily by the press that there is a growing disposition to make good on past compliments to that government, and cultivate closer fellowship with this murderous Philistine, this outlaw among nations, whose rulers have not even had compassion upon their own people but have slaughtered them by the millions for the crime of insubordination to Bolsheviki will.

To many of the most thoughtful men in America it was bad enough to propose by the lease-lend bill to back any needy government in the world that laid the least claim to democracy; but how on earth that backing can be readily extended to the most outstanding enemy of individual freedom the world has ever seen, to the sworn opposer of Christ, to the nation that not only denies God but brazenly defies Him, is past the comprehension of some of us and so contrary to our love for Christ that no national law nor individual threat could keep us silent.

It was bad enough to know that during the year of 1940, at which time Russia was threatening to communize the world, having its eyes upon America as its chief country of conquest, and was even directing organizing forces in our land to the end of bloody revolution, that our Government should have sold to that country $8,000,000 worth of cotton for the manufacture of explosives, $14,000,000 worth of copper to be converted into war materials, and enough leather to make shoes for more than a million men of her army.

Mark you, this was at a time when Russia was yet flirting with Germany, all of which makes it appear that the sudden reversal (which was not according at all to their plan, but which has been forced upon them by German attack) becomes the first semblance of excuse that our President, or any warmonger, could present for their behavior.

Second. The safety of his people should be the prophet's first concern.

The text says: "I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel" (v. 7).

We had to wait the twentieth century to find an egotist who thought he had been set as a watchman for the wide world. It may sound very narrow in these days of loose thinking and boastful speech about "the brotherhood of man" to say that one is more interested in his own nation than he is in those across the sea, or more concerned for the members of his own family than he is in the houses of the Hottentots; but some of us are personally willing to lay ourselves open to that very charge, and even claim Scriptural backing for the same (1 Tim. 1:8).

I haven't a drop of German blood in my veins. I have never set foot on German soil, and never even had a German sweetheart, or crony companion; I have closed my eyes to every line of German propaganda preaching of today; every single close relative that I have, living outside of America, is on English soil; some of the most delightful visits of my life and some of the dearest friends I have made are on British soil; and yet I say frankly to you that I am more solicitous to see my own land safe than I am to save even Britain. If that is not patriotism, then my dictionary will have to be rewritten.

It is not yet 25 years since we aided her in the last victory and were politely dismissed with criticism of our delayed arrival and left in the lurch to the tune of $6,000,000,000, promised and unpaid; and we were but slightly consulted on that "world adjustment" that is now confessedly the occasion of the new revolution.

I pray daily for the final and effective defeat of Germany and her allies; but I think daily of my children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren—at night in my waking hours I think of the millions of young men who are not prepared to meet God, and the blood of their unsaved souls might be upon my skirts if I warned not against war. So far as lies within my power, I would leave to present youth of my day an inheritance something akin to that which was bestowed upon me by my forefathers—peace instead of war, national prosperity instead of national bankruptcy, incident to the fool endeavor fight at the world ends all appointments and thereby unfit ourselves absolutely for that defense of our own country, for which we are completely sufficient, if we but consulted home interests first.

Mud slinging at people who do not speak our shibboleth nor go our exact path in politics is common now and according to the protocol plan. Here is an instance. My preferred candidate for mayor was elected. One writes: "Now that you got your underworld man Kline in, you and the underworld can rejoice. You will, no doubt, crawl back into your den and be satisfied."

Another one says: "Don't you know anything about all the racketeering, gambling, and houses of ill fame that are running wide-open day and night? We all know those bad places would not or could not exist without protection; big moneys are being spent for their protection. Who gets that money? Doubtless you must get your share, otherwise you would not be so willing to uphold this dirty system that now exists." On local and national questions dare to think and act your convictions and you become the mud slinger's target. But let them shoot. Some of us will speak on.

A recent America First speaker, who is, in my judgment, one of the noblest of patriots, said: "A refugee who steps from the gangplank and advocates war is acclaimed as a defender of freedom. A native-born American who opposes war is called a "fifth columnist.'"

In my judgment, the list of noble Americans that might be justly put into Who's Who in America would contain no greater names than those of ex-President Hoover; ex-Presidential Candidate Landon; ex officio friend of Roosevelt, Hugh Johnson; and the ex-idol of America, Charles Lindbergh.

If the day does not again come when these men and their logical advice is appreciated, it will be because America will be so far lost in her former ideals that the very mention of a democracy will meet with mockery only.

I yield to no man in my sympathy for Chamberlain, who, peace loving as he was, thought that, by placating Hitler, he could get by the German enemy without war. My warmest sympathy has gone out to him as mistaken but well-meaning.

I yield to no man in admiration of Churchill. I think he took over a task that seemed hopeless, and, by his very determination and tenacity, has exhibited a courage that is all too rare in this age of cowards; but I am not at all in line with those who believe that when the European war is over Germany will have strength enough left, after whipping all others, to cross the thousand miles of sea and make short work of my America.

To me such a thought belittles my land; and such an argument is born of propaganda and nurtured from the bottle of hysteria.

I can readily conceive that hundreds of thousands of the fair youth of my country could be slaughtered on foreign shores, thousands of miles from the home base; and for a cause in which their country is but slightly involved; but I cannot conceive that Hitler, or any other European potentate, could cross the seas, land armies on our shores, and conquer those lads at home base.

I am not in the least disposed to call by black names the men who so believe; many of them are doubtless my equal; and some of them my mental superiors; but I have a mind that simply does not function that way. Exactly opposite to what Will Rogers used to say, "All I know is what I read in the newspapers." If it were, I should still have some reliable information. I should still know that "Britannia rules the waves"; I should still know that she owns India, Australia, New Zealand, a great portion of Egypt, large sections of Africa, all of Canada and islands many.

Now that Russia has added her land and people to this conflict, nearly one-half the earth's surface and a population of many hundreds of millions are subject to England's call and cooperation. Why not let them use their own millions of men and money?

What a strange situation when America, who had nothing to do with this war, and has no business in it, to be conscripting men by the millions and voting money by the billions, when Canada, a part of the Dominion of England, conscripts nobody and boasts to tourists, "Our land has plenty; come feast and enjoy yourselves."

I do not deem it my obligation as a minister to correct the thinking of even my own auditors; but I do accept the prophet's obligation of sounding the alarm against war, into which we are being sucked as a chip in a whirlpool.

It would be useless to speak after the affair is over. There are thousands of men now who can tell us where we made our mistakes in 1914–18. Such information is worth nothing. It is not after the war is past but while it is coming that God's prophet must lift up his voice. William Jennings Bryan dared to do it and took the contempt of many in 1917. But now, his sanity is esteemed and his Christian testimony is untarred.

Treatment of Italians Detained by the American Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

ARTICLES FROM IL PROGRESSO ITALO-AMERICANO

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, on numerous occasions I have commented on propaganda and activities designed to promote disunity among our people. In

this connection, there has been called to my attention a most significant and praiseworthy example of how such efforts are being thwarted within the ranks of a large group of foreign-born citizens.

A short time ago a dispatch from Rome, Italy, to the New York Times told of the harrowing tales brought to Rome with regard to the persecution of Italians in the United States. Obviously, such dispatches create adverse feeling abroad and dissatisfaction among native-born Italians at home. Immediately following this dispatch, the Il Progresso Italo-Americano, published by Generoso Pope, an Italian-born citizen of this country who has won universal respect for his strong adherence to American ideals, undertook to demonstrate to Italian readers that the facts do not warrant such tales as those being told in Italy for the purpose of promoting disunity here at home. In other words, here we have an example of a foreign-language newspaper utilizing its columns to promote Americanism, unity, and solidarity among one segment of our population which might be particularly susceptible to such propaganda unless it were discredited, as it has been so well done.

No one has been more alert to the need for national unity than I have. I have consistently opposed and will continue to oppose the harboring of criminal aliens and a break-down of our immigration system. But by the same token, I am most sympathetic to foreign-born who accept and follow American ideals. Thus I would like to take this opportunity to commend Publisher Pope for his public service in discounting misstatements of fact from abroad and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD brief excerpts from the findings of the Il Progresso Italo-Americano.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(The following is a story which appeared in Italian in Il Progresso Italo-Americano and the Corriere d'America today. It is a personal investigation of the treatment being given to Italians now detained by the American Government. Mr. Pope sent Reporter Gene Rea to Ellis Island to prove that a story which appeared in Italian newspapers in Italy was false. We think you may be interested in publishing the findings of this investigation. Il Progresso Italo-Americano.)

A special dispatch to the New York Times appeared in yesterday's newspaper stating a report from Rome purporting to explain the conditions of Italians in America. According to this report, Italians were treated "bestially" and "with lack of any feeling of humanity on the part of Americans."

Mr. Generoso Pope immediately instructed your staff writer to investigate the conditions of those Italians stranded here in America.

The following report is an eye-witness account of the conditions existing at Ellis Island, where more than 50 Italians are being detained:

"Your staff writer visited Ellis Island this morning. He made no arrangements with any authorities, nor did anyone know that he was going to visit the island. No preparations were made to meet him, and no functioning authority had any inkling that he was going to investigate the conditions of Italians being detained there.

"It was a surprise visit and the conditions existing at the Island at all times were found exactly as they are. He had no difficulty obtaining permission to visit the rooms, recreation centers, dining room, and sleeping headquarters. When he appeared at the office of the District Director of Immigration, Mr. Byron Uhl greeted him warmly and said that he could investigate any part of Ellis Island he chose. Though there is a strict rule against photographers taking pictures, Mr. Uhl waived the ruling aside and permitted our staff photographer to take pictures of the men being held. Mr. Uhl assigned Mr. Forman, deputy in charge of inspection, to show the writer around. At no time did Mr. Forman interfere with the work of investigation.

"There is no persecution of Italians at Ellis Island. There is no bestial treatment of Italians at Ellis Island. There is no concentration camp and no whip or guns or rough guards. The Italians who are being detained are treated with respect and with utmost consideration. No one seeks to punish them. No one has orders to abuse them. Ellis Island is not a jail. There are no criminals at Ellis Island. The men who have been brought to Ellis Island have not been brought here indiscriminately. They are men who have entered the country illegally and are being detained until their status is ascertained. The Government of the United States is not seeking to put anyone in concentration camps. The Government of the United States is treating all those detained at Ellis Island—there are some 450 of them—with the utmost care and regard for their human rights. All the officials at Ellis Island sympathize with those detained. They are doing everything in their power to help them. All social welfare agencies are contributing to the well being of those detained. They get good food and healthy, sanitary quarters. They are allowed to have as many visitors as they want, and it is important to note that the Italians are given the greatest liberty of all groups—as the days of visit are Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, while those of other groups are only on Tuesday and Thursday. The Government of the United States bears no ill feelings toward these Italians. And this is proven by the facts.

"Your writer spoke freely with most of the men held at Ellis Island. No burly guard stood by to overhear the conversation. No officer told any of the men what they could say and what they could not say. The men said exactly what they felt. All of them wanted to become citizens of the United States. No one showed any desire to return.

"Giacomo Cirri, one of those detained said: 'I like this country. I want to live here. I have spent more than 10 years in America and I would like to become an American citizen. But I have no money to pay for the bond that would set me free, and so I must stay here.'

"Did they talk of politics at Ellis Island?

" 'Politics?' he asked. 'I know nothing of politics. We are workers, not politicians.'

"We asked him a pertinent question: 'Are you treated like prisoners?'

"He shook his head emphatically: 'Absolutely not. We have all the freedom we want. They're good to us here. They listen to our problems and they try to help us. No, we're treated very fairly and honestly. But, of course, we'd like to be at home.'

"Another man we spoke to was Oliviero Ciero, who is 50 years old and comes from the Province of Naples. He has been in America for more than 14 years, having come here in 1927 on the *Duilio*. He has never returned to Italy, and worked at the railroad exhibition at the New York World's Fair of 1940. He has been confined at Ellis Island for 8 weeks.

" 'We are treated all right,' he says. 'But most of us would like to return to our homes. We haven't got the money to pay for the bonds that would set us free.'

"What did he do to pass the time away?

" 'Well, we take walks outside and we play cards and talk. The officials treat us good.'

"Augusto Ricina, who is 29 years old and who came to this country illegally 2½ years ago, said that he had been working as an electrician.

" 'I want to be an American citizen,' he said. 'And I wish there was some way I could be a citizen. If there were an opportunity of my becoming a citizen, I would gladly do anything to get my papers. But they say that there is no law that can make me a citizen.'

"Felice Vercelli, said that he has lived 30 years in America, that he had been deported and then had come back. He said that there was no maltreatment of the Italians at Ellis Island and that the officials tried their best to help them. He has a wife and two children living in America and he would like to become a citizen. He said that he would have become a citizen, but that he was afraid he would be deported again because he came here illegally and that is the reason he could not apply for citizenship.

"The youngest to be held at Ellis Island is Sallustro Del'Re, a 17-year-old boy. He was a bus boy on the *Brennero* when the men were taken in custody by the Government. All his family is in Italy, but he expressed a desire to remain in America because he likes it.

"Rinaldo Celli, 32-year-old barber of Hempstead, L. I., said that he had given himself up to the authorities because he had come here illegally. He had gone to Canada and then entered the United States. He, too, would like to become a citizen. He said that he was treated fairly and without prejudice.

"Fioreggio Sabatini, a 21-year-old waiter on the *Ado-O* arrived just the other day at Ellis Island from New Orleans. He was full of smiles and said that there wasn't anything wrong with the treatment being given him. He said that he had broken his leg at New Orleans while playing soccer and that he would like to get some medical treatment. Your staff writer immediately spoke to Mr. Forman, who sent the young man without a moment's delay to the hospital, where he is now being taken care of.

"And every single man that your staff writer interviewed had the same story to say. Each one disproved the lie that was published in the Rome, Italy, newspapers pertaining to 'criminal treatment' of those detained. Each one stated that they would like to become American citizens if they could. Each one said that they were being treated with courtesy and care.

"We visited the sleeping headquarters of everyone. They have showers and group bathrooms. They have a recreation porch that measures 100 feet by 80 feet which overlooks the bay. They get excellent food and get more than one extra portion if they want it. Here is a sample of what they eat—this is the menu for today, Friday. For breakfast, boiled cream of wheat with milk, fresh peaches, bread and butter, and coffee. For lunch, clam chowder, baked codfish with butter sauce, boiled potatoes, green peas, bread and butter, iced sponge cake and coffee. For the evening supper. Swiss cheese with cole slaw, stewed apricots, bread and butter and tea.

"They receive expert medical care. The D. A. R. supplies them with material with which the men occupy their time in making ornamental wallets, belts, sweaters etc. The officials have given them a boccie alley to play during the afternoon hours.

"And so, after a thorough inspection, there was nothing to prove the story that these men are being maltreated. Instead, we went away, confident that the Government of the United States is treating them with every consideration possible."

Following the story of the investigation of Ellis Island by Il Progresso Italo-Americano,

we are now sending you the first of a series of articles by our especially assigned reporter on the condition existing at Fort Missoula, Mont. These investigations were prompted by a statement made in Italy and sent to the New York Times by their Rome correspondent in which it was stated that the Italians are being mistreated in America.

"Your staff correspondent has found no concentration camps here in this beautiful setting in the mountains of Montana, where 993 Italian seamen and world's fair employees are being detained by the Government of the United States.

"For the past 4 days, after making an airplane flight from New York, your correspondent has investigated all the conditions of the camp and found no case where any one of the men was treated other than with human consideration and sympathy.

"Fort Missoula, situated 3,200 feet above sea level, is not a prison camp. There are no criminals here. Consisting of some 10,000 acres of Government land, it has all the characteristics of a summer resort. There are no machine guns to guard the men, nor more than a mere handful of immigration officials to patrol the huge camp. So beautiful is the setting that the Italians have named it Bella Vista. Fort Missoula has turned into a regular Italian city. It is probably the first time in the history of any nation that a completely foreign city has sprung within its borders.

"The 993 men are governed by their own officials Capt. Alessandro De Luca, former chief purser on the steamship *Conte Biancamano*, is the mayor of Bella Vista.

"He has a staff of 20 men, former officials of the various Italian ships, who are helping him. They have a consul representing each group from all the ships—1 man represents a hundred or less.

"There is a church, with Father Bruno, also a member of the ship, who is their chaplain.

"They have a hospital here, also, which is cared for by three doctors, Dr. Cuomo, Dr. Venturini, and Dr. Borbika. They have their own cooking system, their own sanitation system, and their own recreational group.

"In other words, this town which has sprung up since May 1941 is composed entirely of Italians. They have their own work and serve their own selves. Speaking with the men, they have stated that they are treated very well, although it is their wish that they can return to their families. Speaking with Mr. N. D. Collaer, who is the chief inspector at Fort Missoula, he said, 'On the whole the men are very good; they try to cooperate wholeheartedly with us. We have had no occasion to find fault with them. they are a very nice bunch of people.'

"The camp here has about 30 buildings. Each man is given a sanitary bed to sleep in. They have well-kept recreational grounds.

"When your correspondent was here many of the men were playing boccie, soccer, and tennis. A number of them were taking long walks around the enclosed area.

"On Sunday the whole camp paid tribute to the memory of Bruno Mussolini who was recently killed in an airplane crash, by refraining from participating in any form of activity. In the morning they went to mass in a newly constructed recreational center which has been called Bella Vista Ship. Father Bruno said the mass.

"The United States Government is doing everything in its power to make the stay of these men here a pleasant one. Mr. Collaer has already requisitioned for some $10,000 worth and more of clothing to supply the men for the winter months. Much money has already been spent to buy them small things, such as cigarettes, etc.

"It is estimated that each man will receive $15 worth of clothing just for the next few months.

"The men try to forget that they are being detained here by applying themselves to various forms of recreation, artistic work, and concert playing. They scheduled to have a city concert on the 16th of August. All social organizations in Missoula are cooperating to make this concert a huge success. The money that will be realized from this concert will be given to the men here.

"They are having a craft display in Missoula where the immigration officials have helped them open a store, at which they can sell whatever they make. The money from this will go to the welfare fund of Bella Vista.

"As your correspondent has investigated all these conditions, he has found that the guards are appreciative of the men. Mr. Collaer himself is trying to make the stay of the men as pleasant as possible. The men are cooperating with the Government program.

"These are but a few of the findings your correspondent has investigated.

"In further articles we will publish the lives of these men in camp, their various activities, and the government and the city they have built here in Missoula, which they call Bella Vista. We will have a photograph depicting their stay."

Lindbergh Gets Worse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM LAKELAND (FLA.) LEDGER

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Lakeland Ledger, of Lakeland, Fla., of August 11.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lakeland (Fla.) Ledger of August 11, 1941]

LINDBERGH GETS WORSE

Charles Lindbergh's smug tirade Saturday night against the administration drew teutonically guttural cheers from the hopelessly biased Cleveland audience and served more emphatic notice upon believers in Americanism that an expert in aviation is uttering some lamentably inexpert views on affairs international.

His voice had the usual ring of sincerity, and his reasoning had its usual half-fascinating appeal to individuals who are not analytical thinkers, but all his argument, as usual, was based on a false premise.

He is making the tragic mistake that people in a dozen countries have made. He is assuming with pontifical self-assurance that Hitler is not interested in us. He is assuming that what happens in Europe is of no concern to the United States, and his preposterous assumption is based on conditions that existed 100 years ago. He is overlooking entirely the speed and proximity which modernity has given to international intercourse. He has failed to take cognizance of the fact that what affects one major nation today affects all nations. All the nations are a neighborhood today. The so-called splendid isolation of the sixteenth century remained with the sixteenth century.

Lindbergh seems to be gaining more followers, and that is an alarmingly bad sign of division which sows the seeds of revolution. How can supposedly sane people fall under the spell of Lindbergh's superficial thinking, when a malicious Hitler, who has broken promise after promise, continues to extend his choking grasp across the world?

It is a matter to be seriously pondered.

Lindbergh asks with puerile eloquence what has happened to freedom, and in the very asking imposes upon the freedom which this incomparably free democracy allows.

Lindbergh asks what has happened to representative government in the United States.

He ought to ask what will happen to this democracy if its constituents continue to tolerate such unpatriotic talk in these crucial times when utmost unity is needed to prepare for the wave of Hitlerism which so plainly threatens these shores and all the decencies of modern civilization.

Why doesn't Lindbergh have something to say about Hitler's record?

Why doesn't Lindbergh reveal at least a spark of indignation over the wholesale death, destruction, poverty, disease, and suffering Hitler has spread over country after country?

Why doesn't Lindbergh take note of the fact that Hitler is a lone aggressor, with no clearly enunciated program of peace and reconstruction?

Why must Lindbergh's speeches be only a continuous harangue against the people of his own democracy?

Why doesn't he offer something positive at this moment when positive thinking and positive action are essential?

He states what he is against but consistently fails to state what he is for.

He says he is against war.

So is every sane human being.

He says he is opposed to United States participation in the war.

Most Americans are opposed to participation now, because they do not believe that this country is adequately prepared for a shooting war.

But that does not mean that alert Americans are ready to adopt Lindbergh's smug, and complacent attitude and wait for Hitler to bring the war to these shores.

Lindbergh makes the specious charge that representative government has disappeared in the United States, because this country is sending supplies to England and Russia.

Those supplies are being sent with the high hope that the representative government which exists in this democracy may not perish.

Lindbergh prates grandiloquently of the constitutional guaranty of free speech but he blandly overlooks the fact that the right of free speech imposes the obligation of intelligent speech.

Free speech within itself is nothing. Children speak freely. The citizen who exercises his right to speak freely must pay deference to the government which safeguards his right to speak freely.

If Lindbergh still is sincere, he is taxing the patience of Americans who still would like to be charitable in their attitude toward him. If he still is sincere, he is basing his thinking on premises impossibly remote from reality.

Lindbergh talks about the "war party."

It is possible that he still is mired in the Presidential campaign of a year ago? Is it possible that he is looking toward the next Presidential campaign?

His use of the word "party" is incriminating; it strongly indicates that his thinking is restricted by political boundaries.

If Lindbergh is merely trying to make the minority heard, he is proceeding in a manner entirely unacceptable to Americans who are intelligently interested in the security of democracy.

The Republican Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a most interesting editorial entitled "The Republican Record," which appeared in this morning's issue of the New York Times:

[From the New York Times of August 14, 1941]

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD

Since the beginning of the war there have been four votes in Congress on questions of critical importance. These votes came on repeal of the arms embargo, on passage of the lease-lend bill, on adoption of the Selective Service Act, and on the proposal to extend the period of training under that legislation. Every one of these measures was of vital importance to the defense of the United States. Every one of them was of intense interest to our friends and enemies abroad: To the Latin-American nations which count on our assistance in case of trouble; to the democracies of Europe and Asia which are fighting in defense of their own freedom; to the dictators who believe that democracy is out-of-date—bewildered, disunited, and ripe for plucking.

The record shows that every one of these four measures was adopted solely because the President received the support of a large majority of his own party. Not one of them would be law today if the decision had been left to the Republicans in Congress. The tally of Republican votes runs as follows:

On repeal of the arms embargo—
Senate: 8 in favor, 15 against.
House: 21 in favor, 143 against.
On the passage of the lease-lend bill—
Senate: 10 in favor, 17 against.
House: 24 in favor, 135 against.
On adoption of the Selective Service Act—
Senate: 7 in favor, 10 against.
House: 46 in favor, 88 against.
On extension of the period of training—
Senate: 7 in favor, 13 against.
House: 21 in favor, 133 against.

The Republicans in Congress have achieved, in short, a perfect record of opposition to these measures recommended by the President, by the Secretary of State, and by the Army's Chief of Staff.

It is true that the Republicans in Congress have received less cooperation from the President than they were entitled to receive. He has failed to take them into his confidence as fully as he should. He has made the enormous mistake of not consulting their leaders in advance of the submission of such important measures as the lease-lend bill. It is also true that it is the duty of the Republicans to vote according to their convictions and their own best judgment, and no doubt some of them have been sincerely opposed on principle to the adoption of these measures.

But when all this has been said it is impossible to dismiss the element of plain party politics from votes so heavily one-sided as these. Crisis or no crisis, the Republicans in Congress are still fighting Roosevelt, still jockeying for position, still trying to write a record which they can turn to profit if and when there occurs that long-delayed reaction on which they have built their political hopes.

This may be legitimate strategy in time of peace. But in time of crisis the record they are actually writing is one that will help them only if the Lindbergh-Wheeler version of the war is right and the Lindbergh-Wheeler prophecies come true. This is a fact which a great many rank-and-file Republicans throughout the country must find distasteful.

Alaska International Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

TELEGRAM FROM CITIZENS OF ALASKA

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, one of the best statements which I have seen concerning the immediate and pressing need of the construction of a highway to connect the States with Alaska is embraced in a telegram dated July 25, 1941, addressed to the President by the Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce of Fairbanks, Alaska, and endorsed by the Fairbanks Post of the American Legion, the Fairbanks Igloo of the Pioneers of Alaska, and the Juneau Chamber of Commerce, Juneau, Alaska.

Copy of the telegram follows:

Alaska only continental possession United States that cannot be reached by rail or road. Except by sea or air completely isolated. Absolutely dependent upon vulnerable sea lanes for all needs either for peace or war. In event of successful blockade would be forced to surrender in 60 days. War situation more menacing daily to Alaska. Alaskans hourly more apprehensive. Alaska so strategically vital that expenditures to defend it have necessarily been out of all proportion to population significance. Therefore feel we are living in area that may well become battlefield for initial invasion of America. With fall of Russia seemingly imminent, control of northeast passage and Siberia in danger seizure by Japan or Germany, we must have alternative supply line for Alaska. Effect of destruction of shipping already felt here. Current expenditures for transportation within Alaska useless as solution to isolation. Apparently nothing being done to solve basic military requirement of supply. Without such solution roads, railroads, and air bases within Alaska will merely facilitate conquest by enemy if Alaska cut off by sea. Dangerous inconsistency construct roads within Alaska and ignore potential route of supply to Alaska. Sea only present means sending heavy ordnance, tanks, mechanized military equipment to Alaska. Three commercial ships ran aground Alaskan waters last year, one Government transport, *Kvichak*, complete loss ship cargo three lives.

Alaskan highway provides solution. Would permit supplies reach Alaskan interior in 60 hours. Automotive transport fill gap created by withdrawal ships from Alaskan waters. Route parallels line of flight, rendering possible construction, maintenance, and supply air bases and emergency fields. Only 125 miles from coast would enable protection coast by land-based planes.

We informed your attitude negation based on four points. First, other more important needs. Second, difficult terrain require eighty millions expense 5 years time complete. Third, impracticable keep highway open year around. Fourth, Canadian cooperation uncertain.

We submit following:

No current project more basically important to Alaska than Alaska Highway. Highway no longer conjectural. Previous opinions based on airplane reconnaissance disproved. Official engineers representing Canadian and American commissions traversed length of project afoot. Made detailed estimates and gathered scientific meteorological information. Their reports show route lies in simple terrain, with no considerable obstacles. First 600 miles this end furnish cheapest construction conditions in history Alaskan road building. Exacting military specifications place cost 24-foot graveled surface road at $25,000,000 maximum. Snow conditions more favorable than in any northern United States. Highway easily kept open year around. In authoritative opinion Canadian and American engineers project can be completed in 2 years without economic loss account haste, or 1 year, if critical emergency necessitates.

Premier British Columbia active supporter project. Premier of Canada recently voiced earnest desire see highway built.

General Buckner, in charge all military affairs Alaska, endorsed project thus: "With this highway, we would not be thrown out of Alaska."

Understand State Department has endorsed project.

In view foregoing cannot understand delay year after year. Need too critical, possible consequences delay too terrible permit further postponement.

If known to hostile powers Alaska had efficient alternative means transportation, incentive to invade Alaska largely removed.

Isolation of Alaska is invitation to invasion.

Can you assure us detailed surveys will start this year so that construction will begin?

Extension of Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

TELEGRAMS FROM MASSACHUSETTS CITIZENS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams:

BOSTON, MASS., *August 12, 1941.*
HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned officers of the Massachusetts State C. I. O. Industrial Union Council, urge your vote for extension of military service for a minimum of 12 months. We are convinced the safety of the Nation is involved,

and we would regard failure to extend service as a national disaster.

Joseph Salerno, president; Albert J. Fitzgerald, secretary-treasurer; Mariano S. Bishop, Joseph J. Kelleher, Jesse Prosten, Fred Pezzini, Daniel F. Gallagher, John Chupka, William Burton, Frank Lerman, vice presidents.

BOSTON, MASS., *August 12, 1941.*
Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

General Marshall's advice and warning should be heeded. Urge your vote for extension of military service. Its defeat would constitute a national menace. The Army should be maintained at maximum efficiency during the national emergency.

CHESTER GRANT,
Commander, Massachusetts Division,
American Legion.

Extension of Military Service of Selectees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. FOLGER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, everyone regrets the necessity of keeping our men in camp in training beyond the 1 year we had desired, if not hoped, would see substantial improvements in the status of the democracies of the world. But, alas, it has not been so. It is not so. What has taken place? It is not what we think has happened or will happen. We know what has happened. We ought to know what is happening and be fairly well able to prophesy what is likely to take place.

What countries are left save England and the Western Hemisphere? Where is France? Where is Greece? Where is Poland? Where are the Lowland Countries? Where are Belgium and Holland? Show me any country not now, in one way or another, overrun by the Nazi power or defending itself against Nazi attack. Only the Western Hemisphere; and here we find definite steps taken by the Nazis to overthrow governments to the south of us, looking to the time when Spain and Portugal will be by them occupied as springboards to pounce upon our South American neighbors with the further certain plan already laid to possess our own land. Why should we think they have not this in mind as part of their program? I ask, What business is it of theirs that Peru and Ecuador should spring at each other's throats? It is not denied that this was the Nazi propaganda. Why should the Nazi power interest itself in the overthrow of the Government of Bolivia? Their designs on the Western Hemisphere are just as plain as the daylight is plain. And by the Western Hemisphere I mean our own United States of America, as well as Canada, Mexico, and the South American countries.

Take our boys out of training? What a thought at a time like this! I would like to see them home; you would, their fathers and mothers, of course, would. But what can they do at home for their fathers and mothers and their country compared with the security furnished by their remaining in training against invasion of our own land? They can most likely furnish to the objects of their love and devotion greater evidence of the genuineness of such love and devotion by equipping themselves to defend their loved ones and their homes. Indeed, they are themselves American citizens of the highest type, and it is true that they defend themselves against not possible but probable danger by conceding the wisdom of their continued training under the authority of their country's order. This is to them, perhaps—yea, indeed, no doubt a secondary consideration, for it is for their country and their loved ones they most surely prepare.

One has recently written: "To govern is to foresee." And, in that, made this very true observation: "We live in a world in which aggressors have abandoned international law, disregard all treaties, and strike out if and when it pleases them, counting complete secrecy and total surprise as the first essentials of success in total war."

Contemplate Adolf Hitler. What other than a superior power can cause him to desist or even keep him from our own shores? Will considerations of right do so? Can we put faith in his word that he will not or that he does not intend to do so? You know what the answer is.

What do the exigencies of the times and the occasion require of everyone of us? I answer, our utmost, our all. We cannot—and I mean we Congressmen, we soldiers, we fathers, mothers, or sons—take any steps to demobilize, interrupt, or disintegrate our Army, our Navy, or air forces. This would be foolhardy and a distinct disservice to our soldiers themselves as well as to our country. I believe that the greatest guaranty against actual war is thorough preparedness.

Another thought occurs to me: What consideration should we give to the man in the White House who hates war? Pity the man who would say that in sarcastic vein. I shall not be one to add to his sorrow or intensify his suffering. This is one of the considerations for my position on the extension of the Selective Service Act, for I believe that he knows, I believe the Secretary of War knows, I believe the Secretary of the Navy knows, I believe the Secretary of State knows, and I believe General Marshall knows. And, indeed, it is not hard for each one of us to know.

It will never be laid at my door that I have neglected or refused to do anything in my power to aid in the defense of our country or our country's freedom. To me, political expediency, in this crisis, is a hateful thought. And, moreover, I do feel that he who shall be deemed entitled to commendation will be he who spares nothing in the defense of our freedom and democracy, now so violently threatened.

Air Mail Pick-Up Service—A Necessity and a Convenience

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a long road that leads from the day of the horseback mail carrier to rural free delivery, and now comes the end of the first year of the air mail pick-up service which is no longer in an experimental stage. It has come to stay. It has demonstrated its usefulness, practicability, and feasibility as a means and method of transporting mail with expedition.

The air mail pick-up service recently completed its first year of operation on a permanent basis as a regular part of the country's domestic air-transportation system. Over 92 percent of the regular schedules completed, approximately 693,727 flying miles with over 32,000 pick-ups, was the record without a serious accident and with the loss of not a single piece of mail or express. That is some record.

Can they fly in the winter? My friend David W. Howe, of Burlington, Vt., calls my attention to the fact that the Postmaster General said at the end of the first year of experimental flying:

> The operation has been carried on during one of the worst winters in recent years. Notwithstanding that fact, a very high percentage of performance has been maintained. * * * It is the recommendation of the Post Office Department that permanent service of this type be established.

A NATIONAL ASSET

Richard Dupont has been a pioneer in endeavoring to interest the Government in the expansion of the service. Mr. Howe has cooperated with him. They are thinking of the service not only from a business standpoint but also from a standpoint of national defense.

Mr. Dupont recently said:

> If all these routes were in operation, they could provide advanced training and invaluable flying experience for at least 1,700 men a year—fledglings from the civilian-pilot-training program. It is exactly the kind of flying that will make these youngsters better military pilots. You don't get anywhere in the air just by wishing, you know. You have to do it.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration is to be congratulated and complimented for its cooperation with the United States Post Office officials who have made the experiment a success.

AN UNLIMITED FIELD

It is difficult to appreciate just what and how much this useful service will be made to mean as it is gradually extended to cover the Nation. It is already recognized as one of the most notable achievements in modern air transportation, and

the field for further development is almost unlimited.

VERMONT'S NEEDS

Every section of Vermont eventually should be served. It should be made possible for every one of the counties to enjoy the facilities afforded. At first it is to be expected the needs of the business centers will be attended to and looked after. Especially during these days those areas contributing to national defense or involved in it directly or indirectly should be included.

I have urged the Department to make some arrangement to accomplish that purpose. White River Junction, Newport, St. Johnsbury, Montpelier, Barre, Burlington, Rutland, Springfield, Windsor, Brattleboro, and other places in Vermont should immediately be included in the schedule.

VERMONT'S CONTRIBUTION

While it is not my purpose to enlarge upon the subject at any great length, I happen to have been reading a recent issue of the Fortune magazine covering the activities of the Nation's machine-tool industry in the Springfield, Vt., area. While I knew something of the amount of work being done, I was surprised to learn that out of Springfield, Vt., last year came some twenty-two millions worth of machine tools or about one-twentieth of the entire output of the United States. Fortune goes on to say—

There are three main shops in Springfield making these tools. One is the Fellows Gear Shaper Co., rising like a fortress at the northern end of town at the edge of the Black River; one is the Bryant Chucking Grinder Co.; the third and the oldest is the Jones & Lamson Machine Co., maker of turret lathes, Fay automatic lathes, and thread grinders. All are high-speed production tools of modern industry. J. & L. turret lathes compete with Warner & Swasey and Gisholt as the handy men of United States mass production; the Fay has a virtual monopoly on finning the cylinder barrels for Wright and Pratt & Whitney aircraft engines; the thread grinder, among other jobs, threads the ends of those barrels to tolerances that go down to .0005 of an inch.

SIXTEEN MILLION DOLLARS' WORTH OF MACHINES

Last year Jones & Lamson sold $9,000,000 worth of these exquisite, massive machines, which weigh from 3 to 14 tons, which cost from $4,000 to $16,000. This year its sales will probably be over the $16,000,000 mark. For a company that lost money in every year from 1930 through 1934, emerged from that period with surplus depleted by $1,000,000 and with only $6,000 of borrowed cash in the bank, such a recovery is pleasant indeed. Yet it is a boom that the management and the owners of Jones & Lamson regard with certain legitimate misgivings. Looking out at night from their homes on Cherry Hill on the brightly lighted shops, they recall the days of 1933 when these same shops were dark, when employment was down to 120 men as against the 1,600 employed today. They know that wars can generate a worse debacle. Yet Jones & Lamson has definitely taken the plunge. Not only is it running on overtime shifts, getting 161 hours of work per week out of a possible 168 hours from every vital machine on its floors, but it has also increased floor area by 55 percent since 1939, is at present pouring the concrete for a further 25-percent expansion under a $1,300,000 facilities contract with the Government. And in doing so it becomes a fair case history of how one of the medium-sized toolmakers has adjusted itself to the larger demands of defense.

And the air pick-up service is a contributing factor to national defense to the extent that it helps them get the vital, confidential, and necessary correspondence to the addressee at the earliest possible moment.

AIRPORTS NOT NECESSARY

It is not necessary that any town or city to be served shall have an airport or have to establish an airport in order to get the service. The service does not need an airport in order to function and operate.

I am advised that in order to do the best they can at present to cooperate with the Government, the mail is transported from Springfield to and from Albany, N. Y., by auto in order to take advantage of the pick-up system. This fact should be an argument for the establishment and installation of the system in Vermont at the earliest possible date.

It has been demonstrated that sufficient postal revenue is produced to defray the out-of-the-pocket cost of the service to the Government.

Those responsible for expanding this service to its *n*th degree are entitled to and should have the support of Congress—and now.

Intervention for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of August 12, 1941:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of August 12, 1941]

INTERVENTION FOR PEACE

The radio plea of John Cudahy for a peace proposal from President Roosevelt well illustrates the difficulties of aloofness. For while the former American Ambassador to Belgium attacks "the war party" and "interventionists" with one breath, in the next he urges the United States to intervene to obtain peace, and says it should be in the language Hitler understands—the "language of force."

The fact is that the war has shown most Americans that there is no such things as comfortable isolationism. Many who formerly thought America could wash its hands of Europe now urge action to restore order in the world. There might be less bitterness in the discussion of America's relation to the war if it were recognized that the real issue is whether the United States shall act alone or with Britain.

Mr. Cudahy urges intervention to bring about peace. That is the aim also of those who advocate more active resistance to Hitlerism—using men as well as materials if necessary. Mr. Cudahy apparently means that the United States should propose a peace settlement and—since "you tell me the word of Hitler is worthless"—enforce it. Isn't that a larger role than the interventionists or "cooperationists" urge for America? Isn't it the logical result of "isolationist" thinking when faced by the fact that America cannot live unto itself?

America may well ponder what kind of peace it wants and what it should do to obtain peace. Events are proving that the United States must take some share in obtaining and maintaining peace.

Roosevelt's Peace Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD a rather remarkable anticipation of the declarations which were announced today from President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, appearing in the September issue of the magazine Click under the title "Roosevelt's Peace Program." The author of the article is Mr. Jay Franklin.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Click of September 1941]

ROOSEVELT'S PEACE PROGRAM

(By Jay Franklin)

(Editor's note: Jay Franklin, the noted political writer, credited with creating the phrase "New Deal," has written this authoritative article for Click with knowledge gained from long work in Government circles, as well as from his studies of the speeches of President Roosevelt. He has usually been phenomenally accurate in his predictions of administration moves.)

The world may or may not find it possible to finish World War II without America's taking part in the fighting, but the world will find it impossible to establish a world peace without America's having a leading role at the peace conference. This is partly because President Roosevelt is the acknowledged leader of the democratic forces of mankind, but also because the peace will find the United States the greatest single industrial and economic force left in the world. In 1919 the world tried to make peace on political terms. Woodrow Wilson went to the Paris Peace Conference with a program based on his famous though now forgotten Fourteen Points, and, as is also forgotten, was very successful in imposing these points on both victors and vanquished. This second World War or world revolution—and it is both—can only be settled along social and economic lines. This means that, whatever the outcome of the fighting, the world will need America's consent before any settlement can be regarded as binding or durable. As both the arsenal and granary of the democracies, and as the greatest single group of free people supporting democratic ideals, the United States must be either the turkey or the carver

at the international thanksgiving dinner which will follow this bitter harvest of the grapes of wrath.

So, when, as, and if President Franklin D. Roosevelt sits down at the peace conference to redesign the world, he will have no 14 points up his sleeve. The President himself has pointed out that during the last war we not only learned what to do but learned what not to do. Among the things not to do was the attempt by Woodrow Wilson to rearrange political boundaries in order to cure a situation which was basically social and economic.

Mr. Roosevelt is primarily concerned with the economic and social and moral contents of a world order: Territorial and political demands will be considered as incidental details.

His object is to achieve the sort of world order in which America can live and prosper in peace. For that, he relies upon freedom and democracy both between and within nations.

As early as January of 1939, he warned of the need to "ward off sudden attack against strategic positions and key facilities" and as the menace grew has named some of these strategic points: Greenland, Newfoundland, Iceland, Canada, the Azores, Bermuda, the West Indies, the Cape Verde Islands, Brazil, Cuba, Panama, Mexico, Alaska, Ireland, Great Britain, Dakar. But he has emphasized that the object is to keep Hitlerism "away from any point in the world which could be used and would be used as a base of attack against the Americas."

In speech after speech he has emphasized that a world-wide system is needed to preserve the peace. And he asked: "Can we continue our peaceful construction if all the other continents embrace by preference or by compulsion a wholly different principle of life?"

The basis for self-respect is internal freedom. Perhaps the best brief statement of what this means was given by Roosevelt in his January 6, 1941, message to Congress: "Equality of opportunity for youth and others. Jobs for those who can work. Security for those who need it. The ending of special privileges for the few. The preservation of civil liberties for all. The enjoyment of the fruits of scientific progress in a wider and constantly rising standard of living." That this theory was a basic part of his foreign policy had been indicated when he remarked: "I would ask no one to defend a democracy which, in turn, would not defend everyone in the Nation against want and privation."

Resolute announcements that America's object was peace were accompanied by proposals to "quarantine" the aggressors and of American willingness to lay down our lives for our liberties. This in turn led to the policy of aiding the victims of aggression, of which the lend-lease law is the latest expression.

The end itself is most clearly stated in the message to Congress of January 6, 1941, but was foreshadowed as far back as December 1935, when Roosevelt said at Notre Dame University, "There can be no true national life either within a nation itself or between that nation and other nations unless there be the specific acknowledgment of, and the support of organic law to, the rights of man. Supreme among these rights we * * * hold to be * * * freedom of religious worship." In December of 1940 he said that Hitler's proposed "new order" is "not a union of ordinary, self-respecting men and women to protect themselves and their freedom and their dignity from oppression."

Then came the "four freedoms," which are the heart of Roosevelt's peace program:

(1) Freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world.

(2) Freedom of every person to worship God in his own way everywhere in the world.

(3) Freedom from want everywhere in the world.

(4) Freedom from fear anywhere in the world.

Five months later the President added one more freedom. On May 27, 1941, he said, "Yes; all freedom—meaning freedom to live and not freedom to conquer and subjugate other peoples—depends on freedom of the seas. All of the American history—North, Central, and South American history—has been inevitably tied up with those words 'freedom of the seas.'"

ROOSEVELT'S FIVE POINTS

1. The Atlantic and Pacific approaches to the Americas shall not be in hands unfriendly to the Americas.

2. A world-wide system for maintaining peace, embodying automatic aid to the victims of aggression, shall be established in order to rid the nations of fear and threats of violence.

3. All nations shall guarantee, to the best of their ability, civil liberties, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion, to their peoples.

4. World-wide economic pacts shall be promoted to aid in the redistribution of wealth and opportunity in order to rid the world of want.

5. The seas must be kept free for peaceful commerce under the guaranty of the navies of the democratic nations.

Extension of Service of Selectees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE WASHINGTON POST AND PHILADELPHIA ENQUIRER

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "National Insurance" and an editorial from the Philadelphia Enquirer entitled "Our Armed Forces Kept Intact," having to do with the passage by both branches of Congress of the joint resolution extending service under the Draft Act.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of August 14, 1941]

NATIONAL INSURANCE

Now that the Army service-extension bill has been passed by both Houses of Congress, the controversy which it aroused cannot be too quickly forgotten. The wide differences of opinion as to the necessity of keeping selectees in the Army after their first year of training were dramatically emphasized by the 203 to 202 vote of the House in accepting the bill. That almost even division largely explains why Congress wasted so much time in disposing of a simple measure. But the decision has now been made. Congress has acted wisely, even though the margin of wisdom was dangerously thin on the House side. Our problem now is to drop the controversy completely and get on with the essential work of strengthening our defenses.

Fear was often expressed in the course of the debate that enactment of the bill would seriously affect the morale of the new Army of selectees. Now that the issue has been decided this argument appears particularly unfortunate, for it is a slur upon the patriotism of the young men who have been drafted for military service. No doubt many of these young men will be disappointed at the prospect of spending 30 months instead of 12 in the Army. But they will not shrink from the obligation which their Government has placed upon them. Their loyalty, their willingness to sacrifice for the national security, and their acceptance of the decision of Congress as to what our defense requirements are may be taken for granted. For the decision has been made in the traditional American way and hearty compliance with it is the first step toward the defense of democracy.

It is worthy of note, too, that in acting to protect our national interests Congress did not ignore the welfare of the individual selectee. As Chairman MAY, of the Military Affairs Committee explained to the House, the bill merely fixes a higher ceiling upon the period during which citizen soldiers may be called upon to serve. In the past, he pointed out, "the Army has followed a policy of discharging men as soon as they are fully trained to make way for others." There is every reason to believe that a similar policy will be followed in the coming months, unless the United States is drawn into "shooting war." It must be recognized, of course, that actual participation in the war would cut off all exit from the Army and at the same time greatly accelerate the induction of new recruits.

The House bill also makes it mandatory for the Secretary of War to release all soldiers whose retention would, in his judgment, subject them or their wives or dependents to "undue hardships." That safety valve appears to leave the Army ample discretion as to what selectees shall be retained, while at the same time putting it under definite obligation to make adjustments in case of real hardship. Then, too, men serving for more than a year will receive an extra $10 a month as partial compensation for their extra sacrifice. So it should not be made to appear that Congress has acted unreasonably. Obviously it did consider the interests of the men who are training to defend their country, but it was compelled by the very nature of its responsibility to give greater weight to the safety of the Nation. The same consideration will undoubtedly sustain the high morale of the Army and it may well be emphasized to bring about more unity of purpose among civilians.

[From the Philadelphia Enquirer]

OUR ARMED FORCES KEPT INTACT

House approval of the service extension bill, though gained by the hair-line margin of one vote, insures the Nation against the disastrous breaking up of its new Army at a crucial time.

As the measure in its final form differs from the Senate-passed bill only in minor details, there is hope that the upper Chamber will accept the House changes, thus avoiding possible conference conflicts and another vote in the House. The measure then could be placed before the President for his approval.

Main features of the bill, as amended, are these: It would keep National Guard men, drafted men, and Reserve officers in service for 18 months beyond the 12 months provided by existing law; it would lift the limit of 900,000 on the number of draftees who may be in training in 1 year; it provides means for the release of service men with dependents; it adds $10 a month to the basic pay after 1 year.

To many the fixing of a specific time limit for service will seem a mistake. However, the extension as agreed to keeps our present forces intact and removes from our military

authorities the nightmare of an army suddenly dispersed at a critical time. To send these troops home, their training incomplete, and start over again from scratch trying to build up a military machine from fresh inductions would impose an impossible handicap upon our Army heads.

Had extension been ruled out, America's prestige inevitably would have suffered. Aggressors abroad would have gloated over our self-inflicted weakening. Our neighbor republics to the south, to whom we have been preaching the necessity of joint defense against outside aggression, would have felt discouraged and disillusioned.

By maintaining and reinforcing our young Army, we prove to the world that in the vital matter of safeguarding our liberty we are in deadly earnest.

The Churchill-Roosevelt Statement

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, we Republicans and others who are opposing the entrance of this country into war have frequently been attacked by the most active and acrimonious interventionists in America—of whom I am glad to say we have very few if any in this House—for our stand, and we have been charged with being defeatists and obstructionists who offer nothing but a negative policy to America.

The war crowd supports the bizarre theory that it is necessary to engage in destructive warfare as a prelude to constructive world planning, and they have held that to plan for peace while war is on is to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

On Sunday night, June 8, Congressman VORYS of Ohio and I debated two eminent Democratic Members of this House on the American Forum of the Air on the subject Should the United States, While Continuing Its Preparedness Program, Take the Leadership in an Effort To Bring About Peace? Mr. VORYS and I said "Yes." We believed then and do now a peace offensive aimed at driving a wedge between the Axis Governments and the Axis people is an effective device for both shortening and winning the war. On May 21, I made a similar proposal in an address over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Consequently, I want to say I am encouraged by the joint statement issued by Winston Churchill and President Roosevelt today. While it is too early to make a considered statement about the full impact of their joint suggestions, I do want to say that the general objectives of victory without vengeance and peace without passion are highly commendable and constructive. The manner in which the goals set forth in this statement are pursued will determine in large part whether it serves to enhance or impair our national interests. If it is used as a means for ending this war on an equitable basis without involving this country in the fighting, it will go down in history as an epochal event; if it is used as a lever to pry this country into the war, it will rise up to plague its authors. I think we should all unite in making the former alternative the goal of America.

I do not want this country to enter the war to project its peace aims on the world, but I do want this country to encourage by other means the acceptance of a peace treaty which will be just enough to be workable and strong enough to be permanent. As a partner in a peace offensive, this country can better serve the world than as a partner in a war offensive on any foreign battle front.

Shall We Have Another A. E. F.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT A. GRANT, OF INDIANA

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a radio address which I delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Sunday evening, August 10, 1941:

My fellow Americans, the proposal before the House of Representatives to extend the compulsory service of the Army selectees presents a great issue of American life for prompt decision: Is there to be another American expeditionary force?

As a Member of the Congress, charged with the responsibility for this historic decision, I want to discuss with you the elements of the problem before us. Every American home is involved, for the fundamental question at issue is this: What is the obligation of representative government in regard to a promise made to the people? Is the pledge to be honored when due, or may other considerations absolve the Government of full responsibility for its public promises and commitments?

We are indebted to the Columbia Broadcasting System for this opportunity to survey the issue in the American way.

I speak to you, not as an old man, nor even a veteran of former wars, but as a young man just past 36, who registered under the Selective Service Act on the 16th day of last October.

A leading Washington newspaper yesterday carried a story from London saying:

"Whatever is happening in Anglo-American relations, the conviction appears to be growing here that the United States is now nearer to becoming directly involved in the conflict than at any time since the war broke out."

It was only a few days ago that Prime Minister Winston Churchill told the House of Commons that the United States "Is advancing in rising wrath and conviction to the very verge of war."

On the 8th of last April Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE said in a public address in New York City: "The United States now has her second opportunity to make the world safe for democracy."

And 3 months later, on July 4, we had the declaration of General Wavell, the retiring British commander in chief in the Middle East, who, commenting upon America's part in the war, said: "We shall have to have airplanes, tanks, munitions, transport, and finally men."

And a few days after that came the statement of General Auchinlech, the new British Middle East commander, to the effect that American manpower eventually would become just as necessary in this war as it had been in the first World War.

A year ago the people of this country were debating the original selective-service law. The congressional debates and the news reports of the time referred repeatedly to the fact that the system contemplated a period of 1 year's training. The bill did provide that selectees could be kept for an additional period if Congress should find that the national interest was imperiled, but this part of the bill was not stressed in the public debate of the time.

The American people, especially the young men and their families, understood the training period would be 1 year, unless, of course, the United States should become involved in war in the meantime. Five different polls by the American Institute of Public Opinion mentioned 1 year of service.

We are now faced with the President's proposal to extend the period of service of the selectees. The Senate version of the bill would hold them for an additional 18 months. The House bill proposes that they be held for an indefinite period. Of what value is the 18-month limitation? For, if the proposal to train them for 1 year can be violated, then why may not the 2½-year period be violated? In fact, may it not be 5 years or even more? Senator PEPPER, of Florida, one of the recognized spokesmen of the administration, said only a few days ago in the Senate:

"Talking about these boys going home? They will be in the Army for at least 5 years, and maybe 10, and this war will last at least 5 years and maybe 10, and maybe a generation."

If there be facts that greatly increase our danger today, the American people, whose job it would be to do the fighting, are entitled to have them. They are not yet in the record.

I know of not one responsible military authority who says that the United States is in danger of invasion.

The House bill also provides that we should remove the present limitation which says that no more than 900,000 selectees may be in training at any one time. Just what does this proposal mean?

General Marshall, our Chief of Staff, whose integrity is beyond question, testified during the hearings on the pending bill that an Army of 1,700,000 men, when properly equipped, would be adequate to defend the Western Hemisphere.

We have at the present time, roughly, a military force of a million and a half, including more than 600,000 selectees. Thus the limitations in the present law would permit the calling of almost 300,000 additional men if we but had shelter for them and the equipment with which to train them. This would give us a force of 1,800,000 men, considerably more than the number needed for the defense of this hemisphere. What, then, are we to think of the proposals to lift this lid, to permit mustering of a much larger Army?

My able colleague, the Honorable ROSS A. COLLINS, of Mississippi, chairman of the War Department Appropriations Subcommittee, told us in the June issue of the Readers Digest that we are failing to profit by the lessons of the present war, that we are building another old-style mass army. "We need," he writes, "a highly motorized and mech-

anized Army with more fire power, greater mobility, greater armor protection, and a more paralyzing punch."

He points out that in the spring of 1941 the Chief of Staff requested funds for the initial equipment of an eventual Army of 4,318,000 men. This is more than two and one-half times the number of men, according to General Marshall's judgment, that we need for the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

What, then, are we building toward? Why do we seek an army in such numbers, if it is not to make them a part of another A. E. F.?

The advocates of the pending resolution claim that unless the draft year is extended our Army will rapidly disintegrate. It is true that the rotation of trainees, such as the law contemplates, might work some inconvenience. It is also true that it would be a serious blow to our Army if all of these 600,000 selectees were to be released on the same day. But what are the facts? The demobilization of the selectees would be staggered over a period of time in the same numbers in which they entered the service. There would be no mass exodus. Testimony before the House Military Affairs Committee shows that the draftees entered the Army in the following groups:

November	13,806
December	5,521
January	73,633
February	90,238
March	153,437
April	124,982
May	62,456
June	79,523

You will note that the largest number of draftees who would leave the Army in any one month, would be about 153,000, or, roughly, 10 percent of our present Army. These are scheduled to go home next March, and between now and then we have more than 7 months to induct and give preliminary training to the necessary men to replace them. Only 19,327 selectees will have completed their year of training by the end of 1941.

One reason given for the enactment of this law a year ago was that the rotation of selectees through this period of service would provide a large reserve of trained men. With the limited amount of equipment that we now have available, we would have a static condition in our Army if we were to freeze the present draftees in the service. The release of these men, at the expiration of their year of training, and the substitution of new men, therefore, would actually strengthen rather than weaken our military position.

The vote in the House of Representatives tomorrow or Tuesday is expected to be very close. As one opposed to extension of the year's service, I shall work 'till the final roll call for the maintenance of that position by the entire House. Representative government requires that the people make their wishes known, and, if the opinion of the people on this question is made known to Congress, I can assure you the verdict will be in accord with the majority opinion.

Mr. Paul Patterson, the distinguished publisher of the Baltimore Sun, who is now in London, also brings us up-to-the-minute news on this topic. As an influential American publisher, it may be assumed that he has access to the highest official sources of information. In a signed dispatch published last Friday, Mr. Patterson relates that British policy now contemplates a vigorous offensive calculated to bring the war to a successful conclusion in 1942.

He goes on to say—and I now quote his exact words: "The active participation of America is now argued to be essential if this is to be accomplished."

Here we have the whole picture. America's active military involvement is not merely desirable. London says it is essential.

This supports the earlier statement of General Wavell, when he said that victory must be won, not on the high seas, but on the soil of the European continent. He went on to say: "And if this is the way it is to turn out, we certainly are going to need American manpower, just as we did in the last war."

Mr. Patterson's London report continues: "The deadweight opposition of public opinion in America to active warfare is fully measured," but that "An extraordinary program seems to be unfolding designed to stimulate a reversal of American opinion."

He adds that "Measures wholly contrary to conservative British methods are now receiving consideration. The full extent of these efforts is not announced, but there is no question that when they are made effective American interests will be stirred."

In other words, London has decided there is urgent need of another A. E. F. and has set about the task of converting American public opinion to war.

In the language of the street, America is going to "get the works."

The objective is a new A. E. F. to fight on Europe's blood-soaked soil.

Such is the demand made upon this country on the eve of our vote in the House to extend the period of draft service.

Those who support the extension of service remind us that the draft law forbids the use of these men beyond the Western Hemisphere. But it should be remembered that the original proposal for the extension of draft service was coupled with the demand that this prohibition against foreign expeditions be stricken from the law. That request has been silenced for the moment. Yet the fact remains that on July 10 there was introduced Senate Joint Resolution No. 91, which would give the President power to use any members of the armed forces outside the Western Hemisphere.

That resolution still is before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

In his fireside chat of December 2, 1940, outlining the lend-lease program, President Roosevelt uttered this solemn pledge:

"There is no demand for sending an American expeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as a deliberate untruth."

The President could give renewed emphasis and vitality to this pledge today by publicly requesting his leaders in the Senate to bring Senate Resolution No. 91 to a roll call promptly and having it voted down with the thundering support of the administration forces. Why has this not been done?

Such action would clear the air before a final vote is taken in the House on the bill to extend the draft year. But so long as Resolution No. 91 is alive in the Senate there are substantial grounds for fears that a new A. E. F. is in the making.

I feel that no danger confronts the Nation that could justify the violation of the solemn pledge uttered by President Roosevelt in his campaign address at Philadelphia on October 23 1940, when he said in measured words:

"To every man, woman, and child in the Nation, I say this: Your President and your Secretary of State are following the road to peace. We are arming ourselves not for any foreign war; we are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes." I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: "We will not participate in foreign wars, will not send our Army, naval or air forces in foreign lands outside the Americas, except in case of attack."

That promise is now presented for redemption.

I shall vote to redeem it in full.

America tonight awaits the answer to her anxious question: Are we to have another A. E. F.?

Rural Electrification and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, the serious shortage of essential materials, especially copper and zinc, threatens to impede the development of rural electrification at a time when the need for this development is most important. Accordingly, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture on June 28, 1941, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 28, 1941.*

Hon. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my notice that there is a serious shortage of certain metals which are essential to construction of distribution lines in the rural electrification program. The latest figures which I have obtained from the Rural Electrification Administration indicate large shortages of both copper and zinc.

Quoting from a statement furnished at my request by the Rural Electrification Administration, which statement is based on the raw materials requirements for distribution-line construction under the proposed $100,000,000 loan program for the fiscal year 1942 plus the carry-over from the fiscal year 1941, the following are needed:

Steel	tons	85,000
Copper	do	75,554
Zinc	do	3,500
Porcelain	do	4,844
Poles		1,905,610
Cross arms		366,666
Aluminum	tons	160

It should be noted that these figures take no account of the quantities needed by municipally owned or privately owned utilities.

Two abnormal forces over which the farmer has no control are operating simultaneously to increase mechanization of agriculture:

(1) The Selective Service Act drafts labor off the farm.

(2) Employment in national-defense industries lures labor off the farm.

As a result, the farmer must get along with less labor; he must shift to greater use of machinery. This forced shift makes electric power immensely important, especially since the farmer has been asked to produce more of certain commodities which are essential to the defense program which the Federal Government has embarked upon.

Keeping in mind, then, the place which food holds in our national-defense program, I submit that it is the part of wisdom to consider well the need for metals in rural electrification in the event that the shortage which prevails at the present time makes it necessary to establish priorities in these metals.

I have discussed this serious matter with the Rural Electrification Administration and with the Priorities Division of the Office of Production Management. The former agency expressed grave concern over the shortage; the latter agency lent a sympathetic ear to my plea.

This message is addressed to you, Mr. Secretary, in the hope that you will impress upon

the Priorities Division of the Office of Production Management—in the event that priorities are declared—the urgent need for these metals in rural electrification. I urge that these requirements be placed as high on the schedule of priorities as other demands on these metals for national-defense purposes will permit.

Respectfully submitted.

HENRY O. TALLE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am interested in constructive results. Government departments have mighty tasks to perform at the present time. I do not, therefore, criticize the Secretary for the fact that a month passed before I received a reply to my letter, nor the further fact that the reply was too general to be a satisfactory response to a specific request. I may state also that repeated oral assurances given me by O. P. M. and R. E. A. officials in the meantime were satisfactory. I trust that in keeping with these assurances rural electrification requirements may continue to occupy first place on the schedule of so-called nondefense uses for these materials.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the ordinary pursuits of the American people must not be discouraged or even allowed to languish because it is from these pursuits that most of the money must come to pay the stupendous cost of national defense. And to those pursuits it is hoped many of our men in military service may return when the insanity of war has passed.

Nearly every day there come to my desk copies of mimeographed statements issued by Government officials to the effect that business as usual must stop. On the other hand, the revenue bill passed by the House on August 4 and now pending in the Senate reaches out for taxes more than usual. If the goose that is expected to lay so many additional golden eggs is killed, from what source can the expected revenue come?

The Aluminum Shortage—Profits Versus Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. PIERCE
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, issues of great daily papers in New York and in Washington, D. C., have recently given space to news and editorials about the suspicion which clouds the defense activities in our National Capital. It has been frequently stated that commissions must be paid to inside "favorites" and "fixers" in order to secure defense contracts. I know defense officials have issued statements to the contrary, but ugly rumors are not contradicted by many facts and incidents, some of which have come to my attention in connection with the location of the great aluminum plants demanded by the defense program. Since these plants are dependent upon an abundant supply of cheap power, some of them have, very necessarily, been located in the Columbia Basin. I have been extremely impatient with the delays in the location and building of these plants because it means that production of an essential material has been long withheld.

It appears to me that delay of production is of no significance to certain groups when private profits are at stake. It seems ironical, even tragic, that we should have so hotly debated the question of extending the terms of service of selectees, Reservists, and National Guardsmen when the most essential necessities to supplement their personal sacrifices cannot be manufactured because of the greed of highly privileged and highly placed citizens who are presumably to be protected by these chosen young men.

Certainly the spectacle of piles of aluminum pots and pans collected from the housewives of the Nation is bitterly ludicrous when we think of the terrible waste of aluminum through neglect in putting plants into operation and in the construction of unnecessary power facilities. We have one group considering measures for the salvaging of small business and for the dividing of contracts, when we know that the profits from the contracts resulting from this unfortunate emergency have created an atmosphere laden with suspicion for small businessmen.

UNITY BASED ON CONFIDENCE

Leaders on both sides of this aisle have called for national unity, in these critical days, but I warn you that unless we secure early unity of action instead of the disgraceful spectacle of an internal struggle over profits, position, and personal power we shall march over roads of deep discouragement. This is the time and place to speak of these matters with the utmost candor. Unless we can put a stop to the evil practices, defense preparation will be paralyzed by greed, guilt, and suspicion. "No free republic can fight off tyranny unless its citizens love justice more than their cut," says a college president in his last report. In sober, rational moments all these men who are betraying our country must themselves know, and must know that others know, that they are not actuated by regard for the public welfare.

No one can look with complete indifference upon this shameful situation. Whether a believer in public power or in private monopoly of an admittedly essential public utility, all decent and safe citizens do believe that every public servant and every man who influences governmental action should be actually and honestly acting in the interests of the Government. We cannot tolerate, in peace or in war, a man of influence and power in public counsels who wears a uniform which he betrays by private or secret action. This is a time when men within and without the Government must be compelled to show their true colors.

The perpetuation of our form of Government depends upon public confidence. Everyone whose conduct in public office, or as a trusted public adviser, shows that he is not really motivated by the public welfare should be driven from position of public trust in days of peace, which become days of danger under threat of war, when such men are in high position.

We propose to keep nearly a million and a half men in service while our bureaucrats and dollar-a-year experts play the profit-and-privilege game with supply and production, failing to realize that service morale depends upon supply of proper equipment.

National safety demands that I relate my experience with some officeholders dominated by the profit motive, while holding responsible public position or influencing public action. I shall later set forth other facts from which accurate conclusions may be drawn.

THE LIGHT-METAL SITUATION

Since July 13, 1940, I have continually called attention of this House to the light-metal situation and have offered constructive suggestions. I now desire to bring the story to date.

About 90 days ago, responsible officials of O. P. M. acknowledged the true situation as to aluminum and promised that 400,000 kilowatts of Columbia River power would be immediately put to work in new plants for aluminum production. Work has not yet started on these proposed projects. I am informed that all the locations have not even been selected, and, due to differences of opinion, a new group of engineers is just now sent to the field to pass, once more, upon proposed sites. Bonneville engineers had already made this study and filed results, but, even though power facilities are the prime factor in such location, their advice has been rejected.

WASTE OF ALUMINUM

I have previously pointed out that one kilowatt of power working for a year will produce 1,000 pounds of basic aluminum. This 90 days' delay applied to the proposed 400,000 kilowatts is equivalent to 100,000,000 pounds of aluminum, or about one-quarter of our total 1940 production. These delays in one plant alone amount to 133 largest bombers and over 800 average fighting planes per month.

In addition to such costly delays, consideration must be given to the excess first cost of the transmission facilities necessitated by the juggling and favoritism program. This will amount to at least $1,500,000 on one aluminum plant. This excess cost must be assumed by all the rate payers on the Bonneville project. At least $5,000,000 will be the total unjustifiable excess cost for all the announced Columbia River aluminum plants. These mistakes will also add $500,000 a year to the power bill of the manufacturers of aluminum and will undoubtedly be added to defense costs.

CANADIAN LOSSES THROUGH SABOTAGE

This extravagance, however, is not the whole story. In a release, O. P. M. has told us that earmarking of Canadian aluminum would keep us out of our difficulties until these new Federal plants were started. Unfortunately, we now see, as the veil of censorship is lifted, that the large Arvida plant of the Canadian

Aluminum Co. on the Saguenay River has been put out of business by organized sabotage. This is verified by a declaration of the Canadian Minister of Munitions and Supply. From what has been published, it appears that, as the result of labor trouble, the switches were pulled and the furnaces or pots were allowed to solidify. It will take nearly a month to chip out the furnaces, and another two weeks to put them in operation. The loss of production is equivalent to about 2,000 American and British planes. This Canadian situation will necessarily cause us to increase our aluminum and critical metal commitments to England under the Lend Lease Act.

DEFENSE REORGANIZATION NEEDED

We now find ourselves faced with an accelerated aluminum shortage, and, in spite of this, we see our experts trying to locate these new plants at considerable distances from the generating stations. This is done at the expense of thousands of tons of critical metals used in the lines and facilities. It is time to call a halt to such tactics.

The men who are playing this game belong to the same group who overestimated our production capacity, and stores and supplies, and grossly underestimated our requirements. The crying need of the times is a complete defense reorganization whereby square plugs will be fitted into square holes and round pegs into round holes. There has been some reorganization, but only mere gestures, and there is complete lack of candor. Kellogg, for example, was moved out of O. P. M. as power adviser. Now, under the guise of liberal leadership, other private power agents have been moved in. It is natural for them to suggest remote plant locations, when the extra bill will have to be met by the smaller rate payer.

F. P. C. WANTS STEAM PLANTS

We find the same situation in electric-power planning. The struggle for authority has resulted in the recent ill-conceived, hastily drawn steam plant press release of the Federal Power Commission. This would upset the application of the holding-company legislation and, under the guise of defense, attempt to bail out manipulated private electric companies. That action of the F. P. C. was fraudulently publicized, and it was made to appear that the private-utility trick so sponsored also had the blessing and sponsorship of well-known public-power advocates.

The Federal Power Commission release was headed "Federal Power Commission gives President Roosevelt plan for adequate power supply for defense program in 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946: Urges new R. F. C. subsidiary to place and finance orders for additional generating capacity upon recommendation of the Federal Power Commission." It thereupon sets forth a list of proposed steam plants, several of them located in the Pacific Northwest, which has the greatest available hydro power of any section in our part of the world.

We are a great distance from the coal which would be used for steam plants. We have only one transcontinental railway, already overtaxed, which could carry the coal to the steam plants, and we now have several steam plants idle in the Pacific Northwest because of lack of fuel and cheapness of water power. If coal and transportation are important to the defense program, the Government should not initiate a program of building steam plants for private utilities.

Immediately following that astonishing release was another of July 21, which stated that "the Commission (F. P. C.) and O. P. M. will be welded into a coordinated effort to place and execute all phases of the defense power program." Secretary Ickes soon told a press conference that the F. P. C. 5-year program "was ill-advised and carelessly prepared" and that he proposed to pay no attention to it. Those familiar with the Bonneville basic legislation felt that the project might be legally protected from the inroads of the private utilities via F. P. C. and O. P. M., but we are not now so fully assured in regard to our situation.

THE CURE FOR THESE EVILS

There is a cure for these cited errors, and that is for Congress to exercise a greater restraint through its power of the purse. I propose also that simple legislation be enacted prohibiting R. F. C. from advancing funds for steam plants to be located within economic transmission distances of low-cost Federal water-power plants without a full congressional hearing.

A simple amendment should be added to any of the proposed Columbia Valley Authority bills, requiring that the excess costs of emergency plant locations be removed from the Bonneville rate base. Hearings on such proposals will open up the mistakes that have been or are being made and will afford Congress an opportunity to exercise more stringently its power of the purse. We need to investigate immediately and stop such mistakes, made evidently by the abuse of authority.

PLANT LOCATIONS AND GRIDS

Four years ago, while the Bonneville bill was under consideration in the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, prompted by messages sent to me from the area, I pointed out the adverse effect on the public interest of certain transmission-line proposals. At that time it was suggested by certain private utility interests that two sets of intermediate voltage lines be constructed so as to have termini on the two sides of Portland, one adjacent to the focal point of Portland General Electric private utility and the other adjacent to the concentration point of the other local private company.

Such a proposal would have strategically placed Bonneville's output in the hands of the private companies to distribute. One other intermediate voltage line was also then proposed from Bonneville to Yakima, to tie into the private lines, with no thought of grid lines adaptable to the distances in order to connect Bonneville and Coulee.

It was fortunate for the defense program that such subversive proposals did not mature. The present suggested change of aluminum plant location from a point near the Bonneville generating station to a point near the 1937 proposed eastern focal point looks as if this is a revival of the old subterfuge, intended to concentrate power outlets at points which will place bulk energy in the hands of the private companies when this emergency is terminated. The whole procedure used by O. P. M. and R. F. C. suggests that either Alcoa or the private power companies or real-estate owners had some hand in this shift.

MONEY AND MATERIAL COSTS OF PLANT LOCATIONS FOR PRIVATE BENEFIT

I venture a prediction that this whole matter is going to be carefully searched before Congress votes any additional Bonneville deficiency funds to make these connections. At that time I intend to press for disclosures of factual information on the exact additional costs and excess critical materials used by locating these emergency plants remote from the generating stations.

I have made my own estimates based on distances, loads, and costs per mile, and feel that the proposed shift of the aluminum plant from the bus bar to the Portland focal point will cost $1,500,000 and that the Longview location of the Reynolds aluminum plant represents over $3,000,000 of excess vital materials and capacity, which will require further appropriations to replace.

This statement gives the background for a sharp remark I made on this floor on June 6 on Power and Aluminum Shortages in Relation to National Defense. That led certain Oregon papers to ask that the full story be told. Over two weeks ago I placed these details before O. P. M.

I asked why it was necessary to spend a million dollars of Government money to build a Bonneville transmission line in order to locate a pressingly needed aluminum plant with an eye to salvaging a real-estate investment rather than for the purpose of rescuing our air program, which is definitely in jeopardy.

OUR STAVISKYS

Between 1927 and 1933, the French plunger, Stavisky, defrauded investors of $10,000,000. When his crimes and the losses were made known, there were riots in the streets of Paris. People were slain and a judge was assassinated. When the long trial was brought to an end, the London Times said editorially:

> There is a warning for all countries in the Stavisky affair. Sentences on culprits can do little or nothing to remedy the national harm done when the wicked are allowed to prey on the unwary.

Senator LA FOLLETTE, writing in the Progressive May 31, this year, said:

> More recently, the so-called Truman committee of the Senate, investigating defense expenditures, disclosed to the public through its hearings, the shocking story of how the monopolists have hindered the defense program, and the even more serious disclosure that the Office of Production Management condoned policies which would have the effect of fostering a bigger and better monopoly in the production of aluminum.
>
> The story of the international monopoly in aluminum is replete with all the elements of international intrigue, profit greediness, lack of social consciousness and public welfare, and plain, downright skullduggery in business operation. As pointed out by the T. N. E. C., it is by no means a unique situation, but typical of a large number of other industries.

"CASHING IN" VERSUS BOMBERS

The Office of Production Management, in a release of July 21 sent to Members of Congress, reviewed the pressing need for aluminum, magnesium, and other defense materials for huge quantities of continuous power. One paragraph ended on a noble strain.

No sacrifice can be too great to assure this goal.

Just as these releases were being issued, a Washington paper carried a New York dispatch stating that—

The Committee of Utility Executives, organized in 1935 to combat New Deal public-power policies, has quietly disbanded. No explanation of its disbandment has been made public, but persons close to it indicated last night that the utilities executives had decided that the current situation left the organization little to do.

I can vouch for the truth of that statement.

NEW ORGANIZATION NEEDED

If the O. P. M., F. P. C., R. F. C., and other alphabetical agencies were actually interested in aluminum production and the resulting airplane manufacture, they would have located the aluminum plants promptly and most advantageously close to the bus bars. They would not have insisted upon the building of long, expensive lines, which use great quantities of aluminum. They would have saved time and costs and materials incidental to the building of every transmission line.

Exactly the opposite course has been taken in the Pacific Northwest. Months will be consumed in building lines unnecessarily at huge costs. It appears that some of these lines have been located with an eye to present and future profits of our Staviskys. I fear that some of those who have been allowed to make these decisions have been more interested in profits than in production. They have succeeded in diverting the public by the quick and slick stunt of collecting pots and pans.

As I reread the brief paragraphs quoted above, I reflect with anxiety upon the fact that some who are unfit, by training, experience, and character, hold high and responsible positions in this defense program. If our production lags, or is further halted under such circumstances as I have suggested, I believe there should be a commission set up by Congress to bring order and proper administration out of the maze of confusion and poor organization which has resulted so scandalously.

DANSE MACABRE

The picture in my mind as I think of the whole situation in regard to power, aluminum, and magnesium, so important in our defense program, is the classic Dance of Death. I fear it is literally a dance of death for public confidence and for our defense program. The agents of the special interests and big businesses weave in and out of this dance. One day they are liberals formulating Government policies. The next day they are attorneys serving private utilities or handing out Government contracts, and their places in the official ranks have been taken by similar groups. If we can help to correct the abuses which always creep into emergency affairs we shall be doing a real service for the morale of the country.

What Next in the Pacific?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a very interesting, enlightening, and informing editorial from the pen of Capt. Joe Patterson, the editor of the New York Daily News, which was reprinted in the editorial column of the Washington Times-Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

WHAT NEXT IN THE PACIFIC?

On July 25, President Roosevelt by Executive order froze Japanese assets in the United States—about $130,000,000 all told.

"MUSTN'T TOUCH"

This was in retaliation for Japan's announcement that France's Vichy government had invited the Japanese to move in and police French Indo-China, which the Japs said they were only too glad to do.

Of course it was a territorial grab by Japan, at a time when France couldn't prevent it and Hitler was insisting that his Vichy stooges be nice to Japan. This grab, as we understand the proceedings, our administration hoped to prevent by its economic crack-down on Japanese assets in this country, plus the threat of a 100-percent embargo on commerce between Japan and the United States.

WHAT'S OUR NEXT MOVE?

The crack-down did not stop the Japanese.

Japanese fighting ships were hovering off Indo-China's chief port, Saigon, when the Vichy invitation was announced. On July 31 the Associated Press reported from Saigon that a "fully equipped Japanese army of crack troops, obviously ready for action and taking nothing for granted," had formally occupied Saigon that day. Camranh Bay, big French naval base farther north in Indochina, is also reported in Japanese hands, just as if our Government had never thundered against it.

On August 1, it was reported from London that the Japanese had capped their Indo-China coup by demanding military bases in Thailand—formerly Siam, and what inspired idiot changed the name we don't know.

Well, what do we do now?

ONE WORD FROM US

One word from us, and the Japs have done as they pleased about Indo-China. They have also placed themselves within 750 miles of Singapore, 700 miles of North Borneo, and 850 miles of the Philippine Islands.

Are we supposed to fight, to keep Singapore safe for the British, or the Dutch East Indies safe for the resident Dutch, or the Philippines safe for the Filipinos—all of whom love us only when they are as scared as they are at present?

JAPAN NO PUSH-OVER

If we do fight Japan, it promises to be a long and tragic fight, and we are by no means sure of winning it.

At best, our fighting ships would have to travel some 6,500 miles west of our big naval base at Hawaii to come to grips with a Japanese Navy waiting near its own bases. With sufficient ship strength we might overcome that handicap; but how strong is our Pacific Fleet?

We don't know. Fleet movements nowadays are screened by censorship. But it is known that our Atlantic Fleet has been considerably strengthened of late—meaning our Pacific Fleet has been considerably weakened.

Japan is no push-over; and, by venturing into the far Pacific for a fight, we would be letting Japan choose the battleground.

WHY SHOULD WE FIGHT?

All this seems unnecessary to us. We are convinced of two things: That Japan is sick of its war in China and that Japan would be willing to settle its Pacific differences with us peaceably.

Japan and the United States ought to divide Pacific hegemony between them, the dividing line corresponding roughly with the international date line. The Philippines, under such an agreement, would fall in the Japanese sphere, true; but we think that would be fine, and that we ought to seize with glad cries this chance to cut them adrift before 1948.

We can see no use, and we can see a likelihood of national grief and humiliation, in a United States-Japanese war at this time.

Why not at least sound out the Japanese on the chances of a settlement which would save their face in China while getting them out of most of China, and permitting them a reasonable degree of expansion from their cramped, overpopulated islands?

Our present Far East policy is heading us into war with Japan—and for what? And, by the way, has it ever occurred to the assembled brethren that nothing could please Hitler more?

Rivers and Harbors Bill

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the preceding speaker, the able and distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. I want to assure him that he is just as mistaken about this proposed bill being a "pork-barrel bill" as anybody can be. This rivers and harbors bill which I hope will be presented to this Congress is the regular type of river and harbor bill, where the projects are endorsed by the War Department engineers.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And does not the gentleman want to point out to the gentleman from Kansas also what he already knows—that every Member of the House has the right to vote on every single paragraph in that bill?

Mr. PITTENGER. That is true.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Can the gentleman explain to the House how it occurs that this Congress cannot find $300,000,000 to build highways in this country, but can find over a billion dollars in a bankrupt Treasury to attempt to build projects that will not be completed for at least 4 more years? How in the world do you relate those things?

Mr. PITTENGER. Now, please do not make a speech in my time. The gentleman from Kansas is wrong about that. The St. Lawrence is a $285,000,000 project and not a $1,000,000,000 project, as some of the railroads and utility interests would have you people believe.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Kansas that I was in favor of the bill to which he refers which had for its purpose the building of highways in this country and I voted to override the Presidential veto on that measure. In my opinion, that measure was meritorious. We need internal improvements, or if you want to call them that, we need domestic projects which ought to be planned for and many of them started even during this national emergency. So I have supported and shall support, projects which will build up America and develop its highways and transportation systems.

That is one reason why I am vigorously supporting the St. Lawrence seaway project, and the other projects in the rivers and harbors omnibus bill. This includes, so there may be no mistake, an authorization for the Florida ship canal. Let us keep the records straight and note that an omnibus rivers and harbors bill is nothing new in the Congress of the United States. It is the regular procedure for the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to have hearings on all requests and on all rivers and harbors projects and the War Department engineers appear and testify in connection with these projects. It is the rule for the committee to act favorably only on such projects as are recommended by the War Department engineers. We have no more efficient or able group of men than those same engineers. They do not recommend projects unless they can justify the same.

This ought to be sufficient comment to silence the cries of the enemies of the St. Lawrence seaway project to the effect that its friends are indulging in what is commonly known as pork-barrel legislation.

So that the gentleman and others interested may be properly informed, I will say that the St. Lawrence seaway project was before the Rivers and Harbors Committee for 8 weeks and witnesses from all over the world appeared before the committee. War Department engineers estimated our share of the cost at $285,000,000 and it was voted by 17 to 8 to include it in the rivers and harbors bill.

I have heard testimony since becoming a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, in connection with the so-called Florida ship-canal project. Everyone who adopts a national viewpoint and who believes what will help one section of America will help the people in the country as a whole, need have no hesitation in support of that project.

I expect at some other time to discuss it at length. Let me say, however, that from the standpoint of a national-defense project, it is sound and desirable. From the standpoint of commerce and other advantages, facts will justify its support.

It is about time, while we are spending billions of dollars for national defense and for aid to Britain, that we prepare to utilize the great river and harbor and transportation facilities of the United States. Such a program is far behind in the United States and the sums of money which Congress will be asked to appropriate for these purposes are very small in comparison with the billions that are now being spent and when the national and international emergency is over, will leave no tangible results. In our national economy, the rivers and harbors bill to be reported out of the committee by distinguished members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee to this Congress is one of the most valuable types of legislation which it will be the privilege of this Congress to enact when the committee brings the measure on for a vote.

The Democratic Party Is Not a War Party

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, several days ago our Republican friends held a conference in this hall in which they adopted a resolution charging the Democratic Party with being a war party. I deny that statement. If a declaration of war were brought before this House today I do not believe there would be 10 Democrats vote for it on a roll call in the absence of some overt act against us. I make that statement advisedly, after discussing the matter with Members on the Democratic side.

The Republicans also attacked President Roosevelt. The President has never said that he was going to plunge this country into the European war. He did say he would not send American boys to fight on foreign soil. That promise has been kept.

I know there are a few agitators on the outside who want us to send an army to Europe. But where would we land an army? Suppose we attempted it. There is not a place in Europe we could land an army even if we wanted to. Do you not suppose the authorities of this Government know that?

I agree with the gentlemen who have spoken here today on this subject. I hope this movement on the part of the President will result in bringing this futile, senseless, destructive war to a close, and that peace will soon be reestablished among the nations of the earth.

Hon. George W. Norris

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday the House was not in session or I would have taken occasion at that time to felicitate one of the greatest authorities the common people ever had on passing his eightieth milestone. I refer to Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS, of Nebraska.

For more than 10 years—yes, for more than 15 years—I have fought with him on the greatest economic issue confronting the American people. That is the power question. I am prepared to say now that in his devotion to the masses of the American people, to the cause of the common man, he has been as "consistent as the northern star of whose true fixed and resting quality there is no fellow in the firmament." His name will go down through the centuries for the service he has rendered to the power consumers of America.

America's Obligations and Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

ADDRESS BY WALLACE McCLURE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Wallace McClure, Assistant Chief, Treaty Division, Department of State, on the occasion of "I Am An American Day" before the Massanetta Springs Summer Bible Conference Encampment, Synod of Virginia, Massanetta Springs, Harrisonburg, Va., Wednesday evening, August 13, 1941:

Speaking at Denver in 1911 at the tercentenary celebration of the King James translation of the Bible into English, the former president of Princeton, then Governor of New Jersey, pointedly asserted that "not a little of the history of liberty lies in the circumstance that the moving sentences of

this book were made familiar to the ears and the understandings of those peoples who have led mankind in exhibiting the forms of government and the impulses of reform which have made for freedom and for self-government among mankind."

If Woodrow Wilson was right in so asserting, it surely follows that this English-speaking nation of ours, and particularly you and other groups like yours who, as special students of the Bible, must be considered leaders in your corporate capacity and as individuals in your separate communities, have opportunities for service to mankind and obligations to live up to them which are not universally possessed and the possession of which must be accounted a privilege and a responsibility of the first order in human affairs.

It is of importance that you should be keenly alive to this responsibility as you turn aside momentarily from your general purpose of Bible study to celebrate I Am An American Day, and to invoke the patriotic impulse which it implies. It is uniquely fortunate for us that the scene of our assembly, acutely conscious as we are of the lengthening shadow of the current world cataclysm, should be in what we may not inaccurately think of as the locality of Woodrow Wilson's birth, the place of the nativity of the Commander in Chief of the American Army and Navy in the most recent of his country's ordeals at arms. For, as you are poignantly aware, it is hardly half an hour's drive from this spot where we hold our evening's discourse that, 85 years ago, this great American President and great world statesman of the first World War was born. He was born, moreover, into the household of a man of the church, a man who knew and who taught the Bible and who was prepared to educate his son in public service according to Christian precept.

Some of you, doubtless, were present in May of this year when he who is President of the United States in these multiplying months of the second World War, the Commander in Chief's trusted lieutenant in the first, dedicated the old manse at Staunton as a permanent memorial, saying of Woodrow Wilson, "We applaud his judgment and his faith."

That judgment and that faith touching the needs of humanity in days which many of us yet vividly remember can hardly be a false guide to us today who, here in the Valley of Virginia, are seeking to understand a book that teaches us to serve our fellow men, teaches us that the pursuit of happiness is most successful when we follow the precept, "Even as ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

Patriotism claims service as its essence, service flowing from love of country, service that genuinely contributes to the public welfare. He is the greatest patriot who is the stanchest practioner of the Golden Rule. He is the greatest statesman who so leads his people that in the great world neighborhood they love their neighbors as themselves. Wilson was such a statesman. As was said of him at the time by a distinguished Japanese minister of the gospel, he seemed to rise above the imbecilities of war and to know no hatreds.

I

The thoughts of the Chief of the American State were centered upon the construction of peace; and, indeed, as the Acting Secretary of State said a few weeks ago, he "gave his life in the struggle to further the realization of the splendid vision which he had held up to the eyes of suffering humanity—the vision of an ordered world governed by law."

"The League of Nations, as he conceived it," Mr. Welles continued, "failed in part because of the blind selfishness of men here in the United States." To patriots gathered in any community of our country to ponder upon the implications of the phrase, "I am an American," this truth is of supreme concern. Blind selfishness is the nemesis of patriotism. We can no more serve country at the same time giving ear to greed than we can serve both God and Mammon. But to build for our country and our people an ordered and law-governed world in which to be and live is to rise to patriotic heights unparalleled save by those who, in its early beginnings, gave this country being and created for it national life. They did their part; it is for us of this day and time, if we would worthily carry on their work, to lend our influence to the end that the whole human neighborhood shall be for all of us a place in which our children can abide in peace and happiness.

To this end let those who now aimlessly cry "Peace, peace," when there is no peace, rather give the full tide of their energy to preparing for a just peace when the time for peace arrives. Their noncooperation now serves only to build up an antipathy for them that will render them impotent when the time of their matchless opportunity comes—their opportunity to thwart the greed and reactionism that will as surely endeavor to assert itself on the morrow of the second as it did in the wake of the first World War. The supreme test of patriotism now is and will be the exhibition of unshakable determination that the old myopia, the old stubborn self-seeking that has made of the world a battlefield, will not succeed in making the kind of a peace that can only lead to broken peace again, and, in endless vicious spirals, to fast-moving preparation for a third world war.

The League of Nations failed for other reasons in addition to the selfishness of some of our fellow citizens here in the United States, chief among them that "it was forced to operate, by those who dominated its councils, as a means of maintaining the status quo." It was never enabled to operate, Mr. Welles continued, in the way that Wilson had intended, "as an elastic and impartial instrument in bringing about peaceful and equitable adjustments between nations as time and circumstance proved necessary."

The patriot who is also a student of affairs well knows that no human institution stands and moves not. All things human change, and where there is no progress there is sure to be backsliding. The patriotism of the future will therefore be prepared at whatever sacrifice to see that the world's peace machinery is kept diligently in steady motion forward, "stretching itself to the measure of the times," as Wilson said was essential in the Federal Constitution, and vigorously eliminating all disruptive influences, whether springing from stupidity or greed, before they develop into the malignancy of war. The patriotism of the future cannot confine itself to national frontiers—for the peoples' pursuit of happiness cannot be carried on altogether within the physical confines of their respective territorial boundaries.

Yet it remains true, of course, that within those frontiers the need for completely self-forgetful service is as great as ever, for there are those who continually seek to blind us with false contentions that the supposed demands of their tiny group, or money-making endeavor, or restricted community are the needs of the Nation, and that failure to support special legislation for the fulfillment of those demands is unpatriotic and un-American. Precisely the reverse is more often true. Patriotism has no connection with all of us doing without in order that a few of us may have a disproportionate share of a diminishing national income.

Every man who would in good conscience take part in the celebration of future I Am An American Days must always take his stand unalterably against all forms of special privilege and must seek the maximum of production of the good things of life to be distributed as widely as possible toward meeting every individual's legitimate needs and reasonable wishes. That this shall be true is the most obvious prerequisite of economic security, and economic security is a fundamental condition of contentment, respect for law, local, national, and world order, and the maintenance of peace.

II

It is therefore a matter of prime importance as we prepare for the reconstruction of our affairs as human beings after the present World War that we think in terms of reducing and eliminating barriers to trade, well knowing that such barriers are likewise barriers to the creation and enjoyment of material goods, and well knowing that to neglect this basic phase of our national life is to neglect alike our opportunities and our obligations.

Inaugurating the Foreign Trade Week in May of the present year, Secretary Hull, in a radio address beamed to reach well-nigh all the world, remarked that:

"It is none too early to lay down at least some of the principles by which policies must be guided at the conclusion of the war, to press for a broad program of world economic reconstruction, and to consider tentative plans for the application of those policies.

"The main principles, as proven by experience, are few and simple:

"1. Extreme nationalism must not again be permitted to express itself in excessive trade restrictions.

"2. Nondiscrimination in international commercial relations must be the rule, so that international trade may grow and prosper.

"3. Raw-material supplies must be available to all nations without discrimination.

"4. International agreements regulating the supply of commodities must be so handled as to protect fully the interests of the consuming countries and their people.

"5. The institutions and arrangements of international finance must be so set up that they lend aid to the essential enterprises and the continuous development of all countries and permit the payment through processes of trade consonant with the welfare of all countries."

This is a program of enlightenment. It lays the foundation for plenty. "Too many human relationships, within and among nations," Mr. Hull had said on a former occasion, "rest upon the shifting sands of selfish search for immediate advantage."

Now, immediate or special advantage for some is all but invariably at the expense of the more important long-term welfare not only of the public generally, but even of the supposed beneficiaries. For the curtailment of production and distribution, reducing as it does the common wealth, must shortly threaten the very privileges that are carved out of it and bring down together, whether in war or economic depression, both the favored few and the underprivileged many. "Barbarism rather than civilized existence becomes the scheme of life" when such counsels are in the ascendancy.

The desire for wealth, if it is wisely directed is a desire for a world community in which all are prosperous, not one in which the wealthy must constantly be on guard against the machinations, sometimes real, sometimes imaginary, of those who have been deprived of opportunity to be wealthy, also. It seems incontestable that protection against the pauper labor of the rest of the world has cost American labor far more than would ever have been given up through reasonable collaboration with their fellow workers elsewhere, evidenced by more encouragement of the exchange of the respective national products than has heretofore been vouchsafed. We who are Americans, celebrating today that fact, can hardly be proud of our lack of judgment to say nothing of our selfishness. After all, liberality and equality are matters of common sense even more than of right and wrong Self-interest that is not enlightened defeats its own purpose. With enlightenment, under the scarcely to be challenged

rule that in the little world that ours has become what is best for all is best for each, it ceases to be selfish.

A liberal economic basis for a world organized for peace is the objective of every patriot who has learned the lesson that the years have taught, who has seen how economic strife leads to poverty, poverty to anger, anger to war.

III

It is war we have—shooting war all around the world. We in the United States have not ceased to strive to put out the fire that has crept steadily nearer with the months of our current years We may do well to pause for a few moments in order to remind ourselves of the cumulative events of the decade now coming to an end.

In his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs in January of this year when the bill that has become an act further to promote the defense of the United States was under consideration Secretary Hull outlined the steps by which international relations had deteriorated since the present reign of lawlessness began

The first of the steps in this fatal direction occurred in 1931 with the forceful occupation of Manchuria in contravention of the provisions of the Nine Power Treaty and of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, upsetting the order created by the Washington Conference of 1921–22, and the setting up of a part of China of the Manchukuo regime under Japanese control established and maintained by force of arms. In July 1937, Japan embarked upon the present phase of its large-scale military operations against China, employing invading forces of more than a million men and setting up new puppet regimes where deemed expedient. Japanese spokesmen have left no doubt of an intention to obtain forceful mastery of an area containing almost one-half of the entire population of the earth, with consequent arbitrary control of the sea and trade routes in that region—a matter of immense significance, importance, and concern to every other nation wherever located. "Previous experience and current developments," Secretary Hull reminded his former colleagues in the House of Representatives, "indicated that the proposed new order in the Pacific area means, politically, domination by one country. It means, economically, employment of the resources of the area concerned for the benefit of that country and to the ultimate impoverishment of other parts of the area and exclusion of the interests of other countries. It means, socially, the destruction of personal liberties and the reduction of the conquered peoples to the role of inferiors."

Italy made the first overt breach of world order to be charged to a European country. This occurred with the conquest of Ethiopia in 1935, "in direct contravention of the solemnly accepted obligations under the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Briand-Kellogg Pact." This was followed in 1939 by the seizure of Albania, "in violation of unequivocal treaty obligations," and in 1940 by the Italian entry into the war being waged by Germany for a "new order" based upon "unlimited and unrestricted use of armed force," and by the attack upon Greece.

From the time Hitler and his associates came into power in 1933, Germany began the feverish construction of vast armaments—accompanied by an accumulating array of broken promises. Continuing his testimony, Mr. Hull said: "After employing for several months in the Disarmament Conference in Geneva tactics which have since become a distinct pattern of German policy—further demands as previous demands are met—Germany, in October 1933, rendered impossible any effective international agreement for limitation of armaments by withdrawing from the Disarmament Conference. There then followed nearly 6 years during which Germany, having determined upon a policy of unlimited conquest, moved inevitably toward the catastrophe of war." The entire German economy became harnessed to belligerent preparation. More than half of the national income was expended for military purposes.

Contemporaneously occurred a series of movements for strengthening the German strategic position, the occupation and fortification of the Rhineland in direct violation of the Locarno Treaty; the absorption of Austria, in direct violation of pledges given by Hitler to respect its sovereignty and independence; the dismemberment and eventual seizure of Czechoslovakia, in direct contravention of the most solemn assurances; the annexation of Memel. Then came, in quick succession, beginning 2 years ago, the brutal devastation of Poland, and, despite neutrality on their part scrupulously observed, the invasion and occupation of Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg; the defeat of France, with augmenting pressure to violate the armistice agreed upon with that country; and subsequently the seizure of Rumania, the disruption of Yugoslavia, and the overthrow of Greece. And now, in climax, a treaty notoriously entered into as a part of this wild plunge into destiny is itself accorded the fruits of the same contemptuous attitude and Russia becomes the scene of what has been described as the greatest battle in human history.

In the face of such a record, dare anyone say that there exists no danger to the American republics? Replying to allegations that, since Germany has not been able to cross the English Channel, its armed forces cannot cross the Atlantic, Secretary Hull said:

"German forces could cross the channel in an hour's time were it not for the fact that Britain, now thoroughly prepared and well armed, is fighting every hour of the day to prevent that crossing, and is fortified with every known device to repel a landing. The 20 miles of water between continental Europe and Britain are under British, not German, control. Were Britain defeated, and were she to lose command of the seas, Germany could easily cross the Atlantic—especially the South Atlantic—unless we were ready and able to do what Britain is doing now. Were the Atlantic to fall into German control, the Atlantic would offer little or no assurance of security.

"Under these conditions our national security would require the continuous devotion of a very great part of all our work and wealth for defense production, prolonged universal military service, extremely burdensome taxation, unending vigilance against enemies within our borders, and complete involvement in power diplomacy. These would be the necessities of a condition as exposed as ours would be."

That is why, throughout this lengthening crisis, your Government by both word and deed has constantly endeavored to stay the hand of the aggressor and to encourage the utilization of procedure within the bounds of law and order. It continues to do so.

In the conduct of your international relations it has directed its efforts to the following objectives:

"* * * (1) Peace and security for the United States with advocacy of peace and limitation and reduction of armament as universal international objectives; (2) support of law, order, justice, and morality and the principle of nonintervention; (3) restoration and cultivation of sound economic methods and relations based on equality of treatment; (4) development in the promotion of these objectives of the fullest practicable measure of international cooperation; (5) promotion of the security, solidarity, and general welfare of the Western Hemisphere."

In proceeding by whatever legitimate means have been available toward the attainment of these objectives, the United States has not turned its back upon pre-war peace machinery. Only this morning the old system of treaties for the advancement of peace, inaugurated by Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan prior to the first World War was confirmed by the exchange of ratifications of treaties between this country and three members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand.

We cannot tell what expenditure of our strength and our substance will be required of us that the task of consolidating our safety through the restoration and preservation of order may be completed, but after the force of the aggressor has been met by superior force in defense, after the method of unification by the sword has been outlawed and rendered ridiculous by an accomplished unification through intelligence we shall come to realize that more basic than the power of armed might is the power of persuaded and convinced collaboration. We shall then realize the essential truth of Secretary Hull's words with which he addressed on Christmas Eve 1938, the Eighth International Conference of American States at Lima:

"There are those who think the world is based on force. Here, within this continent we can confidently deny this And the course of history shows that noble ideas and spiritual forces in the end have a greater triumph. Tonight, especially, we can say this, for on this night nearly 2,000 years ago there was born a Son of God who declined force and kingdoms and proclaimed the great lesson of universal love. Without force His kingdom lives today after a lapse of 19 centuries. It is the principality of peace—the peace which we here hope in humble measure to help to give by His grace to the continents of America."

The peace that we hope may be given to the continents of America we likewise hope may be given to the world. "We of America," as Woodrow Wilson once said "long since learned that intellectual development and moral fitness are the most powerful elements of national advancements" Just after Christmas, 1918, standing in his grandfather's church at Carlisle, close by the Scotch border, and in the midst of a country from which so much of religious inspiration has been brought into the valley of Virginia, Wilson uttered his belief that while the first World War, concluded by the armistice of a few weeks previous, had "brought the nations temporarily together in a combination of physical force, we shall now be drawn together in a combination of moral force that will be irresistible.

"It is moral force that is irresistible. It is moral force as much as physical that has defeated the effort to subdue the world. Words have cut as deep as the sword. The knowledge that wrong was being attempted has aroused the nations. They have gone out like men upon a crusade. No other cause could have drawn so many nations together. They knew that an outlaw was abroad who proposed unspeakable things. It is quiet places like this all over the world that the forces accumulate which presently will overbear any attempt to accomplish evil on a large scale. Like the rivulets gathering into the river and the river into the seas there come from communities like this streams that fertilize the consciences of men, and it is the conscience of the world that we are trying to place upon the throne which others would usurp."

May it not be that from quiet places such as Massanetta Springs, where patriots are assembled to celebrate "I am an American Day," patriots who have learned the "stern lessons of duty" which Wilson learned from his Carlisle grandfather, there is growing irresistibly in these days the universal pledge that this war against force as the primary method of conducting human affairs shall be won and that there shall be established and faithfully maintained an order of human affairs that is hospitable to the enjoyment of life by human begins whose personal worth, individual dignity, and pursuit of happiness is the foundation of government.

For the Nation's Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA EVENING BULLETIN

Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of August 13, 1941:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of August 13, 1941]

FOR THE NATION'S SAFETY

By the narrow margin of one vote the House of Representatives has accepted the 18-month extension of service of the men drafted or otherwise at present in the armed forces of the United States.

While the closeness of the vote gives cause for anxiety in its evidence that the gravity of the national emergency is not appreciated—or, what is worse, in many cases ignored for reasons of supposed political advantage—the essential thing is that weakening of the armed forces of the Nation, against which General Marshall warned, has been averted.

The attitude of those who resisted extension is irreconcilable with the action of Congress itself in voting conscription and passing the lend-lease bill. It cannot logically be squared with the manifest intention of Congress to tax the American people as they have never been taxed before, and to ask the country to submit to economic controls which can be justified only by the existence of a national emergency of the gravest sort.

If the country is in such grave peril that such measures are necessary, weakening of the defensive power of the Nation's armed forces through the disruption of Army units which the withdrawal of so many men this fall would bring about cannot be justified. The safety of the men themselves demands that they be more adequately trained for the task which they may face.

The country's gratitude is due to those in Congress who by their votes have placed the Nation's safety before all other considerations.

The Crime Against China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. U. S. GUYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

NEWS LETTER OF THE INTERNATIONAL REFORM FEDERATION, CAPITOL HILL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news letter of the International Reform Federation, of Washington, D. C.

The letter referred to is as follows:

[News letter of the International Reform Federation, Capitol Hill, Washington, D. C. Advance release from Progress Magazine for September 1941 by the editor, Clinton N. Howard]

Despite the heart-rending appeals for mercy from the long suffering people of China, and the protests of religious and civic bodies at home, the slaughter of millions in China, and the bombing of undefended cities, has continued for 4 years with the aid and cooperation of the Roosevelt administration until the hands of Uncle Sam are red with the blood of its victims.

But for American supplies of scrap iron, steel, copper, gasoline, petroleum, bombing-plane accessories, and machinery, the war in China would have ended in victory for the invaded country at least 2 years ago. At least Japan could not have continued the slaughter without our help.

UNRESTRICTED DESOLATION

Madame Chiang Kai-Shek declared at that time, "We can win the war against Japan, but we cannot win a war against Japan and America at the same time." In a scathing article in Liberty Magazine, December 21, 1940, she pointed out that her unarmed and defenseless people "were mowed down in their millions by the most ferocious and inhumane type of warfare that had even been let loose upon human beings in unrestricted desolation."

AMERICAN "GUARANTIES"

Speaking of international covenants, guaranties of territorial integrity and the open-door policy to which the United States is a signatory she continues "Treaties, agreements, and understandings have gone with the wind of self-interest, and so far as we of China are concerned, we have been virtually abandoned, and even victimized, by those whom we had been taught we could regard with unshaken confidence as our friends. * * * To our people it is unutterably sad that for three weary, heartbroken years of heroic resistance we have been left without help to combat a savage aggressor in a war which is not ours alone, but which is that of all democracies."

THE GOOD SAMARITAN

Not only did China receive no help "but the American Governm nt threatened its technical instructors working with the Chinese Air Force with loss of citizenship. * * * The American Government ordered airplanes bought by China before the opening of hostilities, to be removed from an American steamer then at a port on the west coast of the United States. * * * America amassed profits by selling to Japan the necessities of warfare. Eighty percent of Japan's war supplies and 95 percent of the aviation gasoline which was used by Japan in her ruthless bombing came from America. * * * China will remember never to believe in any international promises, no matter how many imposing seals adorn the documents. * * *. China was strangled to death by an economic noose fashioned out of British appeasement, American profiteering, and French fear. * * * The democracies have sown the wind and are now reaping the remorseless whirlwind."

DEAF, DUMB, AND BLIND

This was written 8 months ago, but to all of these appeals, at home and from China, the President turned a deaf ear. He has not deigned to offer any palliation or explanation to the appeals of church bodies, Federation of Churches, patriotic organizations, and organizations like the International Reform Federation, which has maintained a mission in opposition to the cultivation and sale of opium in China for 12 years, with a resident foreign secretary who was decorated by Sun Yat Sen, the first President of the Republic, for the success of our campaign in China.

One protest was recognized by our very able Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, which stated that any embargo imposed against Japan would have to operate likewise against China, at a time when Japan had closed every port of entry into China, and the paltry $25,000,000 American credit voted China provided that no part of it was to be used for military defense against Japan. It was an extension of credit for domestic purchases in the United States, while we were selling Japan military supplies to be used against China without condition or limitation.

EMBARGO AGAINST CHINA

One other protest addressed to the President brought an acknowledgment sidestepping the issue by stating that no action could be taken in imposing an embargo against such shipments to Japan without congressional legislation. Why then an embargo against the purchase of defensive weapons with the credit advanced to China? Why then this sudden embargo now placed against shipments of oil to Japan? Similar action could have been taken at any time since this undeclared war began, without waiting to lock the stable after the horse was stolen.

The President has allowed Japan to strip this country of scrap iron, steel, and oil for her undeclared war to bring China to her knees, or bomb her out of existence, until we find ourselves in the pot-and-pan stage of mendicant nations, with black-outs from 7 p. m. to 7 a. m., gasless Sundays, rationed gasoline, and an announced shortage of scrap iron and steel that will send junkman Harold Ickes into the garret and cellar of every home and the dump of every town and city. If this is our tragic situation while we are still at peace, what will it be if we become actively involved in a world war?

ARMING OUR ENEMIES

Why should this country, at peace for a quarter of a century, be short on raw material to prepare her for a defensive war? Because the administration has certified it for shipment to foreign countries, principally Japan, for use in her war against China. In the 5 years 1935–40 there was shipped from the United States 16,473,000 tons of scrap iron and steel of which 8,387,700 tons, 51 percent, went to Japan, against 16 percent to the United Kingdom, every ton of which is now sorely needed for the defense of the United States, possibly in a war with Japan, threatened for the last 2 years.

UNITED STATES NOW IMPORTING SCRAP

The shortage is so great that the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, which requires 300,000 tons of scrap per month to fill the Government defense orders is now obliged to import scrap from Mexico, Cuba, and South America at a price above that paid by Japan, according to the statement of Eugene G. Grace, president of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, who further states, "It will require from 1 to 2 years to overcome the scrap shortage due to the heavy rate of exports over the last 5 years." A Nation-wide drive for the collection of iron and steel scrap, similar to the recent drive for scrap aluminum, is expected to begin in August, with another to follow for copper as the result of Japan obtaining 90 percent of her total importations from the United States.

SUBVERSIVE ACTION

These acts of sedition on the part of the administration "come very near the line of subversive action, if not treason," as Secretary Stimson charged against Senator WHEELER when three of his post cards against war inadvertently reached selectees by forward to the camps.

The President now gives as his excuse for this indefinite delay in placing an embargo upon oil shipments to Japan his desire to keep Japan out of French Indo-China and the

oil and rubber resources of the Dutch East Indies. Well, despite his appeasement policy, Japan is there without asking his leave—there with a full military, naval, and air equipment, with 40,000 armed men, within striking distance of the Netherlands Indies, Singapore, and the Philippines, with Hawaii and the Panama Canal in the offing, in the prospective battle of the Pacific.

After 4 years of sparring with the Yellow Peril, the President makes a feeble confession and goes down for the count. The President has been wasting American substance in riotous living and finds himself in the far country eating husks out of the yellow man's hand.

After 4 years' dependence on its American arsenal, on July 30 Japan sends another bombing fleet of 130 planes, probably made from American scrap and propelled by American gasoline, to blast what remains of Chungking, and takes a pot shot at the American gunboat *Tutuila*, at anchor on the opposite side of the Yangtze River, as a warning to America to keep her hands off of French Indo-China and the oil, rubber, and tin resources of the Dutch East Indies.

"A CLOSED INCIDENT"—LIKE "PANAY"

True to form, the yellow man apologizes and explains it was a foul hit. And foul it was. The whole seamy story is the foulest chapter that has been written since the outbreak of the war. Not against Japan, an acknowledged enemy, but against China, a country to whom we have constantly proclaimed ourselves to be a protector and friend. As foul as anything done by Hitler in Poland, Holland, and France, or Mussolini in Greece or Ethiopia, because they proclaimed themselves enemies while we have constantly proclaimed our good-neighbor policy toward China. We talked about "the more abundant life" and supplied the weapons for Japan to impose upon them the most abundant death suffered by any nation in history.

TESTIMONY OF AMERICANS

Julian Arnold, for many years a commercial attaché in the Far East, quoted on the floor of the United States Senate, said: "If one were to follow the Japanese armies in China and witnessed all the American mechanized equipment, he might think, except for the personnel, that he was following the American armies." Dr. Walter A. Judd, the American medical missionery, says that half the graves in China could be labeled "Made in America." Thus this administration has continued its heartless, soulless, brainless, criminal policy since the war against China began until this day.

Well might our Lord ask, "Which now thinkest thou was neighbor to him that fell among the thieves?" Our good-neighbor proclamations are "as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal."

ADDING INSULT TO INJURY

The excuse of the President only adds insult to injury. Employing the same kind of logic, he should have been supplying Hitler with gasoline on the ground that if he did not do so it would drive Hitler through the Balkans to appropriate the oil fields of Rumania and Iraq. The two are analogous. And while the President has been sacrificing our oil supplies to keep Japan out of the Dutch East Indies, as he says, the Dutch East Indies, belonging to the Netherlands, whose government is now headquartered in London, made a 1940 treaty with Japan to supply her with 1,800,000 tons of oil per year, triple the shipment going to Japan previous to 1940—enough to fuel Japan's entire fleet, and much of its army, supplied by England's ally to Japan.

And to protect this oil supply, and keep it out of the hands of Japan, the President has continued to deplete the American oil reserves by keeping up our shipments to Japan. With the result, as stated by Secretary of the Navy Knox, "Japan has built up a war reserve of oil sufficient for 1 to 2 years of naval and military requirements."

If we go to war with Japan, now only "a spark away," as stated by Premier Konoye, she will fight us with American scrap and oil.

Contrast the basis for the charge of subversive action if not treason, made against a Senator with this diversion of the military resources of the country by the administration on the threshhold of war.

"LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD"

The facts justify the implication a thousandfold more than the castigation of Senator WHEELER for his post-card campaign for peace. The administration has previously led the country to believe that an embargo had been placed against shipments of American gasoline to Japan.

On September 26, the fatal day when the alliance of Germany, Italy, and Japan, aimed at the United States, was officially proclaimed, our procrastinating President employed a power which his department chiefs denied he possessed, and put a ban upon gasoline to Japan. Later it was discovered that these shipments were not only continued, but increased and officially certified by our Department of State. Not a single order is known to have been rejected under this moral embargo plan.

The exports for March 1941 included 306,206 barrels of motor fuel, 103,372 barrels of aviation gas, 244,633 barrels of gas, oil, and distillates, 82,325 barrels of residual fuel, 84,207 barrels of lubricating oil. So it has been going month after month since the moral embargo of September 1940 was announced.

ALWAYS AN EXCEPTION

Since that time another embargo was declared against all shipments of oil to Japan, "except from Gulf and Pacific coast points." This was when we began to feel the shortage of gasoline on the Atlantic coast. Instead of shipping the surplus supply from the Gulf ports in the 50,000 oil cars said to be available for use to relieve the shortage on the Atlantic coast, shipments to Japan have continued up to this present date.

A MORAL BLACK-OUT

Secretary Ickes, "petrol peddler for defense," now estimates "Japan is importing 60,000 to 70,000 barrels of oil daily from the west coast of the United States." The last embargo applies only to such shipments of oil as are not sanctioned or licensed by the Government. But this did not operate as a restriction but resulted in an increase for 1940 as compared with 1939. For the first 6 months of 1941 the oil shipments with "official sanction," have averaged $4,000,000 per month, all of which has been used or will continue to be used to bomb the civilian population, massacre old men, kill women and children, and burn alive the babies of China, or fight the United States.

This policy of appeasement has proven a failure for the last 4 years and will for the next 4 years, should the war continue that long. It has not and will not restrain Japan from carrying out her plans to establish her greater Asia empire. Japan's occupation of French Indo-China in heralded by the official Japanese press as "the greatest victory and most splendid achievement of our history. * * * We are prepared to defend our lifeline to the last, as America and Britain are supposed to be prepared to defend theirs to the last." This is the challenge of Japan to the United States and Great Britain.

JAPAN'S OBJECTIVE

No military-minded man on three continents was surprised at this move by Japan except the Commander in Chief of the American Army and Navy, the President of the United States. The late Senator Sheppard, chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, saw it coming, and confidentially predicted it a year ago. It is no betrayal of confidence now that Japan is on the march, and the President has acknowledged it.

It was the undeclared objective of Japan in every movement she has made since the annexation of Manchuria, indicated by the invasion of China proper, followed by the seizure of the coastal islands, ports of entry, Formosa and Hainan, and climaxed by the occupation of Saigon, the coastal base of French Indochina, with her covetous eyes on the Dutch East Indies, as her next objective, which any military-minded man could have foreseen 2 years ago, and prevented entirely if American military supplies had been cut off.

It is to be hoped that the American people will escape the merited punishment of this short-sighted policy of the administration and the Chinese massacre by the bloody hands of Uncle Sam.

We have found no pleasure in telling the story again, but since every other public man is to be held up to public scorn and charged with "subversive activity against the United States, if not treason," for exercising the right of petition and free speech, then the administration must be held to a strict accountability for surrendering the military resources of the country to its potential enemies.

BEAM AND MOTE

One million post cards mailed to American citizens, with no attempt at concealment, and open to the knowledge of every postmaster and mail carrier in the country, is a million times less subversive and treasonable, than 10,000,000 tons of scrap iron, and $400,000,000 worth of American gasoline, petroleum, and military supplies, sold under cover of Government license to our potential enemy, to be used to complete the destruction of China or begin the destruction of the United States.

EXTRA! EXTRA! EXTRA!

Since the above article was written the President has taken summary action against Japan, with the approval and acclaim of the entire Nation. In retaliation for the entry of Japan into French Indochina the President has issued an order, exercising the power under the Constitution which he has always possessed, of freezing all Japanese assets in the United States and placing (another) embargo upon all petroleum products from the United States. It also puts an end to the $100,000,000 silk purchases from Japan by the United States, which is about 80 percent of her entire silk industry. As stated previously, her trade in this country in gold credits during the last 3 years amounted to over $450,000,000.

If Great Britain and the Dutch Indies join the United States in this new embargo, as is now indicated, it is difficult to see how Japan can recover from the blow, unless it comes too late to stop her military progress beyond Indochina, and there are no leaks provided in the order of the President for shipment by special licenses, as heretofore.

The long hoped for action has at last been taken, which we pray will bring new hope to shattered China and promote the peace of the world. The President is to be thanked, despite the delay, and all America will close ranks to stand by the action in defense of justice for China and the security of the United States of America.

Let Us Keep Faith With Young America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a solemn occasion in this Chamber.

A departed Member was beautifully and appropriately eulogized. His virtues were those of a true American. I join with his friends in saying: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

This is another solemn hour. We have met to consider a proposal which affects the lives of our young people. We have met to decide whether faith shall be kept with young America. The proposal has its roots in the frailty of human nature and can be defended only on the ground that "All the ways of a man are clean in his own eyes."

In the old copybooks used in the little country schoolhouse away back in the horse-and-buggy days, some gems of truth were set for boys and girls to copy as they learned the now almost forgotten art of good penmanship. Here are some of them from the pen of Benjamin Franklin:

Haste makes waste.
A penny saved is a penny earned.
He who goes a-borrowing goes a-sorrowing.
Honesty is the best policy.

The shades of these friends of my childhood days are still with me, and that is why I have so often been amazed and astounded at the proposals which have come before the Congress during the past 8 years. More is the pity that so many of them have been enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, there is something vital and fundamental at stake in this issue. It touches the moral fiber, the very character of the American people. It is an issue which involves the good name of the United States. That is why I voice my gratitude to our able and esteemed Speaker for his frank and clear-cut statement quoted in the Washington Post under date of July 10, 1941:

We have made a contract with selectees that they stay in the service for only 1 year * * * I am definitely not in favor of amending the law to require their retention on active duty after their 1-year term has been served.

When our Nation was born and the Thirteen Colonies were united under the Constitution, faith was kept with the creditors who had claims against the several parts then welded into the Union. That was honesty; that was wise finance; that was statesmanship. The American people have never had occasion to regret it. The Nation's credit sprang into life. Confidence was established. Faith had been kept.

Shall we today, a century and a half later, be less faithful in a matter which touches the lives of our young people? I pray you, let not the good name of the United States be tarnished.

Mr. Speaker, I am among those old-fashioned people who believe that a government, like an individual, will be better off by keeping its word than by breaking it. For 8 years promises have been broken. The breaking of promises has cost our people much money; it has upset our economy; it has well-nigh destroyed our Republic. There is but one hope left now—good faith among men.

Over the portals to his Inferno Dante inscribed the words, "Leave hope behind, all ye who enter here." Let us not promise our young men that they shall get their jobs back after 1 year of military training, and then proceed to destroy our economy so that there will be no jobs for them when they return. Let us not promise them a definite term of service and then proceed to make that term indefinite. Good faith, my countrymen, is the foundation stone of civilized society.

What is the purpose of it all? Are we preparing for another A. E. F.? Are we embarking upon a crusade to press down upon the brow of all the peoples of the earth the so-called "four freedoms," whether they want them or not? Is there to be another unknown soldier so soon?

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to quote from memory a few lines from the poem, The Unknown Soldier, by Carl Sandburg:

And so today we lay him away,
The boy nobody knows the name of,
The buck private, the Unknown Soldier,
The doughboy who dug under and died,
Because they told him to—that's him!

Is that the purpose? Shall the doughboy be told to dig under and die as a victim of another crusade into far countries?

Mr. Speaker, Singapore is not a suburb of San Diego and it is still a long way to Tipperary. Our young people are not craven or cowardly. They are as patriotic, as courageous, and as ready to defend their country as were the farmers who fought by the rude bridge that arched the flood in colonial Massachusetts. But like those embattled farmers, their hearts are not in foreign lands. They are right here, right here in the United States. And that is as it should be.

America's Protection First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. HAROLD CLUETT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. CLUETT. Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that this House is divided on the principles involved in House Joint Resolution 222. Although the measure as amended has passed, an impression must be left with the American people that the vote was not decisive and that unity, which the country is so earnestly demanding, has not been found in the Halls of Congress. It is not now too late to have that unity and a tolerance for the opinions of those opposed to our views, which will bring us closer together in an effort for our common purpose. In the heat of debate so many statements are made which I wish might be struck from the RECORD. Our differences are not, and must not be, insurmountable. The fact of such a sharp division between the Republican and Democratic Representatives must call for a sharp protest and inquiry into the fact that, in spite of protestations from each side of the aisle, that this was not a partisan matter, we find only 20 Republicans voting for the bill. I still claim that this bill and all its wide implications are not partisan matters and that the vote recorded will not bring cheer to our men in uniform nor to our people generally because of its indecisiveness and partisan aspects.

One does not need to be an economist or expert on army or naval affairs, or a diplomat, to form some judgment on the course of our national and international path; and as a Member of this Congress I feel, as every Member must feel, an obligation and solemn duty to express himself on these problems. The times are too serious to quibble over the dots and dashes of parliamentary debate. Literally hours are wasted in unfair attack and meaningless argument. Today every hour and every minute of the day may mean the loss of a precious advantage in our defense effort. I have weighed in my own mind, as all of you have, the evidence of the press, the radio, the spoken word, to determine at this very dark hour what is best for America.

We can be certain that we are not spending billions and arming and training a million and a half men just for fun. I am in favor thus far of the President's foreign policy, as I have been unalterably opposed to most of the New Deal. We can continue our opposition to these policies, but let us not tie those problems to the far more dangerous ones of foreign policy and our efforts for national defense. Such an attitude is useless and unpatriotic. It is without doubt true that 80 percent of our people wish to keep out of war. We can all say "Amen" to that, but to withdraw our aid and shut our eyes to the possibilities of a complete German victory over the entire Continent of Europe is cowardly and unthinkable. We must take the risk of involvement. We do not want and there is no present need of another A. E. F. The possibility of some land and naval forces at some strategic points may be a necessity. Let us stop the cry of whether Iceland is on the twentieth degree or the twenty-first and a half degree of longitude. It is a tremendously important port if we are to help win the battle of the Atlantic and get supplies to Britain. Who can decide best the location of these critical bases but our Army and Navy experts.

This war will not be won if this Nation is unwilling to assume risks. We have done so for a year. How loud a cry was raised when destroyers were ordered overseas. How big a rumpus was raised at our allowing the repair of friendly vessels in our harbors. How loud was and is the protest against fleets of bombers rushing each day across the Atlantic, some reported carrying explosives. How disturbing to the isolationists the fleets of patrol vessels engaged in a most dangerous mission in guarding our sea lanes. Let us argue and delay all aspects of international law and the rights of Congress, and then send Hitler a blueprint of our intended operations. If we are to have this much-wanted unity, let us stop this criticism of the President, of every step he takes. I cannot and will not believe he nor any true American would deliberately take us into war unless every other means of protecting America were exhausted. I am unwilling now and have been unwilling to

follow the advice of ex-air colonels, rabid and politically minded Senators, of groups of Republican have-beens in determining my opinions of domestic and foreign policy. I have voted for the lend-lease bill and all appropriations in aid of national defense because I wanted this Nation and those fighting for us to be so strong that no nation or group of nations could overcome us. That record is clear, and the district I have the honor to represent has with remarkably few exceptions approved of my position.

Does it not suggest itself that the people of my district, one-quarter of a million strong, a thrifty, intelligent, patriotic community of men and women, are not unaware of the critical times we are passing through, but that they have confidence in those who are directing them from the high offices to which they have been chosen, and have not shown by word or letter that they disapprove the policies of this administration in its conduct of foreign affairs, and I shall proceed to act with that assumption.

I believe a majority of our people would today approve the steps taken, and be willing to take extreme risks in our operations on land and sea if they realized our peril. Our opponents will ask, "What peril? Who is planning to attack us, and where and when?" Can anyone who has read Mein Kampf, John Gunther on South America, Van Paason, or Douglass Miller, fail to understand the distinct and unanswerable conclusion there drawn of America's danger, economic as well as military?

Proofs of this kind fall on deaf ears as meaningless, visionary, war hysteria, and propaganda. More interest in the sales of their books than in facts. No danger from Alaska. No danger from Mexico or South America. No danger in the fall of Britain, in the capture and destruction of their fleet. All is well with the world. Let us go about our business as usual. Ah, yes; another cry. Let us look after our troubles at home. We have enough to worry about here without bothering about Russia, or China, or the Dutch East Indies. Indeed we have these troubles, and here I part with the New Deal and their coddling of labor, the National Labor Relations Act, and the protection afforded these many years to Communists.

What a national disgrace, these strikes against vital defense industries. Strikes and disorders of a contemptible character by racketeers and agitators and Communists against the free will of honest, intelligent American labor. Strikes so violent and so criminally organized that the orders of the United States Government are flaunted and ridiculed. Any discussion we may have regarding the length of service of our citizen army must be coupled with the continuing strikes against defense industries. The old maxim, "You can't strike against the Government," seems meaningless, and while the Congress wrangles about holding intact our present force, we appear helpless in the face of these difficulties. The War Department states that between January 1 and May 15 of this year strikes in Army projects and armament orders alone caused the loss of 1,675,773 man-days of production. Unless this situation is corrected, and quickly, we will have the men without the guns. Nothing more unfair and serious can well be imagined. Yes; we are fighting on two fronts, and we intend to win on both of them, because that is the will of honest, free-thinking, loyal Americans.

Perhaps some of the above reasons can be cited for the retention of our selectees, National Guard men and reservists. For years we have neglected to train even a respectable peacetime army, and now is the time, if ever, to let this Nation and every nation know that we intend to make America strong for any eventuality. Do not let us gamble longer with security. Let us tell our selectees plainly that their Commander in Chief believes their continued service necessary in the interest of their country's protection. What do these men think of the utterances on the floor of the House; that they are being held by subterfuge, unfair dealing, broken pledges, warmongering? Talk about weakening the morale of these men. What could dishearten and disrupt them more than to proclaim publicly that their Commander in Chief and Chief of Staff are playing politics with their difficult and dangerous duties? Our wish is to send them home at the earliest moment, to restore them to industry and peaceful pursuits, but the demands of these critical times urge us to pause and consider well all the serious results involved in such a wish. An officer commands, a soldier obeys, and I cannot believe—and I have noted no evidence in support of any gossip—that the men in our camps, or wherever they are serving, will not accept as good soldiers any order retaining them in the service of their country. Just recently the following remarks were made by the national commander of the Disabled Veterans of the World War. I quote:

> We who served in the World War know of the unfortunate consequences of the inadequate training of many of the men who were under fire then. It is the opinion of this organization (the D. A. V.) that, while the service extension may be a temporary hardship in some cases, it would be an unfortunate thing to send men again to conflict without adequate training.

I regret that a letter which I presume all Members of this House received, arrived too late for incorporation in the debate. Signed by the director of the national legislative committee of the American Legion, I assume it has the support of that body. I quote:

> For 20 years the American Legion has advocated and presented to the Congress a program for universal military training in order that the young manhood of our country would be prepared to serve efficiently in the event of an emergency.
>
> On September 16, 1940, the Congress enacted the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. Congress did this because of the emergency threatening the country. Certainly, the crisis confronting us is more serious today than it was at that time.
>
> The national commander, Milo J. Warner, has repeatedly stated to the country that the American Legion feels the situation demands the enactment of necessary legislation to insure keeping intact, during the emergency, troop units already trained, and retention of selectees in service.
>
> The American Legion supports unqualifiedly legislation extending the training period for an additional 18 months, and we request your support of this legislation.

Many people criticize the polls gathered by the American Institute of Public Opinion under the directorship of Dr. George Gallup, an honest, able investigator, rendering a most useful service to the American people. In a letter addressed to me under date of August 7, 1941, he states:

> "Which of these two things do you think is more important for the United States to try to do—to keep out of war ourselves or to help England win even at the risk of getting into war?" Before the fall of France we found voters 2 to 1 in saying it was more important to keep out of war ourselves. But by the late summer of 1940 this picture had almost exactly reversed itself; the institute found voters 2 to 1 for helping England even at the risk of getting into war.
>
> From this fundamental revaluation of the European conflict has sprung a whole series of specific new attitudes. Since that time we have found the following:
>
> A majority for the lend-lease bill.
>
> A majority for vast defense appropriations.
>
> A majority approving the occupation of Iceland.
>
> A rather slim majority in favor of convoys.
>
> A very large majority willing to fight if any part of the Western Hemisphere is attacked.
>
> And we found 68 percent saying they would rather have America go into the war than see Britain forced to surrender.

These statements are most interesting, and indicate that a majority of the American people are fully conscious of their danger, and thus far are not opposed to the existing policies of our Government. Conscious of these facts, our Nation will not now turn aside, but face the future with its untold sacrifices bravely and resolutely until our safety is secure.

The American People do not Want Another A. E. F.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ROSS RIZLEY, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I made last Sunday night over the radio:

> The question foremost in the minds of the vast majority of the American people is, "Are we to have another A. E. F.?" As the war progresses in Europe, Asia, and Africa, when considered in connection with our own foreign policy, the American people are constantly asking this question, "What is our objective?" Or perhaps better said, "What is the ultimate intention of those in charge of the administration of our foreign affairs? Just how far do we intend to go? Do we intend to send an army to Europe, Asia, or Africa to assist Britain and Russia if that is necessary in order to defeat the Axis Powers?"

I am thoroughly convinced that the opposition to the present program, if it may be termed such, and certainly much of the opposition to the extension of the time of the selectees from those who are not isolationists in any sense of the word, but who are unalterably opposed to an American expeditionary force, comes from the fact that they have no assurance whatever of the ultimate intention of our Government in this respect. From the outset much of our dealing with the European nations has pointed in one direction. It is not a question of whether we agree or do not agree with the foreign policy of the administration, if we merely intend to lend our aid short of war to the democracies—that is one thing. If, however, we intend to go all of the way and again send our soldiers to fight and die in Europe, Asia, and Africa, that is another thing.

It is interesting to review from our own standpoint the events of the past 3 years, which are now history, and from this chapter of events try to ascertain just what is the ultimate aim and intention of our Government, and I am indebted in part to a recent feature story appearing in one of the papers for a portion of this review.

Prior to the actual outbreak of hostilities in Europe, among the very first things that happened so far as we are concerned was our summarily recalling of Mr. Hugh R. Wilson, our Ambassador to Germany. That was in the fall of 1938. It was a barbed gesture on our part, and Berlin clearly demonstrated its irritation by shortly thereafter recalling its ambassador from Washington.

Through the "era of the Munich delusion," as someone has put it, we played our cards pretty close to our bosom, sharing the hopes of most of the world that lasting peace might grow from this fantastic planting of shark's teeth. It did not, and when in 1939 the war came and German armies had swarmed into Poland, less than 18 hours thereafter the President again sounded the keynote for the continuing attitude of our Government by taking the radio and saying, "I cannot ask that every American remain neutral in thought. Even a neutral cannot be asked or expected to close his mind or his conscience." This certainly was notice to Germany of the direction that American thinking was going to be guided.

Continuing at least the mental pressure on Germany, the administration continued its goading of the Nazis by pushing through the Congress an amendment of the neutrality law permitting the purchasing and importing of munitions and war supplies—a step of great benefit to Britain, but of no help to Germany. Also, the so-called neutrality patrol in our Atlantic waters, apparently under orders from the beginning to give out information pertaining to any Nazi shipping or raiders in this half of the world. A system which had for its purpose protection for Britain's carriers and guaranteed danger to German vessels. Then in the spring of 1940 came the big blitzkrieg. One by one the hordes of the German Army occupied Denmark, Belgium, Holland, and Norway. Then came the crack-up of France, and it was then that the Italian dictator, thinking he could see the end in sight, got busy, and we verbally slapped him down by referring to the fact that he had stabbed in the back a swooning France. And that went down in the books against us in both Berlin and Rome.

While we have been sticking our necks out and courting trouble, we had not up to that date done very much of anything toward preparing as a nation to back up our position, and it was then that undoubtedly someone must have said, "Mr. President, I don't think that we can keep up this name calling and this taking sides and this policy of aid to one group as against the other without getting in trouble ourselves, and we are not too well prepared."

And so on May 16, 1940, the President asked Congress for $1,182,000,000 for defense authorizations and appropriations. Two weeks later, on May 31, he further called for $1,270,740,000 more. On July 10, for an additional $4,848,000,000, and obviously the Congress realized that what had been going on was likely to result in more than just a word battle and in response to the President's request for these huge appropriations, the Congress said, "Yes, Mr. President, we realize we are either going to have to put up or shut up." It takes money and lots of it to build planes, tanks, guns, bombers, and battleships, and the appropriations were made, and that Congress and the present Congress have continued to make these appropriations until we have now authorized and appropriated for what we term national defense, including aid to England, more than $52,000,000,000. This is more money than we expended fighting World War No. 1. These huge appropriations for armament were implemented by the Congress when it passed the Selective Service Act assembling and calling into service the largest peacetime army of all time in the history of this country. And we might go on.

Of course, a lot of things have transpired that are pretty hard for the common, ordinary folks to exactly understand. Notwithstanding all of this belligerency by us in favor of one side as against the other and notwithstanding all of the huge preparations that were in the making to build up a large fighting force, when the national election came along both of the great political parties met in convention and solemnly promised the American people that we were not going to war. It is a fact, however, that before the ink was hardly dry on these solemn pledges, we gave the Nazis another uppercut by the so-called trade to Britain of 50 American destroyers for the right to occupy 8 Atlantic naval bases. It was an aggressive step on our part and showed the Nazi Government that we were a potential foe who did not choose to sit and wait for each unfolding of Hitler's strategy.

Following the destroyer incident, plus all that had preceded, notwithstanding the solemn pledges of party platforms that we would stay out of war, many of the American people, in view of all that we were doing, which looked warlike to them, were still skeptical and uncertain as to the genuine intention of our Government. Many of the things that we were saying and doing didn't appeal to their common sense as the best method to be used if we were sincere in our statements that we intended to stay out of a shooting war. Even our candidate for the Presidency on the Republican ticket became quite voluble in his denunciation of the administration and went so far as to say on many occasions that the policy we were pursuing would certainly lead us into a shooting war, and that the reelection of President Roosevelt would mean our active participation in the war. It was after this challenge that Mr. Roosevelt gave his positive assurance to the fathers and mothers of this country that their sons would never be called upon to fight upon a foreign battlefield, and in no event would we actively participate in the war except in the case of actual attack. This further solemn promise of the President came as a reassurance to those who do not want to go to war. And for the time, at least, their apprehensions were somewhat allayed.

In November came the election, the battle of ballots was over, and the President came before the American Congress and indicated in no uncertain terms what he was thinking about so far as our future policy is concerned. He said, and I quote: "I ask this Congress for authority and for funds sufficient to manufacture additional munitions and war supplies of many kinds to be turned over to those nations which are now in actual war with aggressor nations. Our most useful and immediate role is to act as an arsenal for them as well as for ourselves. They need billions of dollars' worth of weapons of defense * * * Let us say to the democracies, 'We Americans are vitally concerned in your defense of freedom. We are putting forth our energies, our resources, and our organizing powers to give you the strength to regain and maintain a free world. We shall send you in ever-increasing numbers, ships, planes, tanks, and guns. This is our purpose and our pledge.'"

And in that memorable address he finally concluded by saying, "In the future days which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear—which translated into world terms means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world."

With these noble sentiments and concepts, of course, no one can find fault, but the question which was uppermost in the mind of everyone at that time who heard or read those utterances, and is still uppermost in the minds of the American people is just how far and to what extent will this country go to establish these four freedoms everywhere in the world. Subsequent utterances of our President on many occasions since that time again present to our people the burning question of ultimate intention "How far will we go?" Will it be aid short of war in order to accomplish these objectives, or will we go the whole way if that is what it takes? Did we mean it when we promised that our aid should be short of war, or do we intend with the full strength of our military might to plant our flag everywhere in the world to carry out these objectives? This is the thing that has brought confusion to the vast majority of the American people and the tragedy of the whole thing seem to me to be this—that those who attempt to direct the thinking of this country and more particularly the press and a vast majority of the commentators, leave no room for a middle ground. They make their own division of the country and classify the people as either isolationists or interventionists. I believe that there is a middle ground that can rightfully be occupied and I firmly believe that the vast majority of the people in this country belong to that middle-ground class. They are neither interventionists or isolationists. They want to build and make our own defenses so impregnable on the ground, at sea, and in the air that no aggressor nation or group of aggressor nations will ever dare attack us. They sympathize with every nation in Europe that has been crushed by the aggressor and are willing to lend or give, if necessary, all aid short of war to those who are fighting to regain their freedom.

Yes, my fellow Americans, they are willing to go in for an all-out sacrifice if needs be to make our country safe and strong. They may wonder just a little bit sometimes, just how much some of those who are talking the loudest about all these sacrifices we are to make, intend to make themselves.

On the other hand they do not want to send our sons to Europe, Asia, or Africa to engage in foreign wars for the purpose of attempting to try to solve and settle the problems of the warring nations. They do not want and will not have another A. E. F. This I am sure is the way that 80 percent or more of the American people feel about

this war picture and the sooner the President of the United States can give some positive assurance to the American people that we will not have another A. E. F. the sooner we can expect to have unity in this country.

As I have suggested both of the great political parties promised the American people that such was and would be the case and nothing has transpired or can transpire to warrant a violation of that solemn promise. I realize that human affairs, national and international, viewed from the standpoint of a nation, are complex and dominate factors that often are neither ascertainable nor predictable. I come from the great Middle West and I realize that our people in Oklahoma are not as directly affected by the European war and the Asiatic war, either economically or emotionally as the people who live in some other parts of the country. Very few of us have near kinfolk in foreign countries, investments abroad, or interests in international organizations. Probably we feel safer because of our inland situation. It seems to me that in this great Middle West area that the people are inclined to a relatively dispassionate view of the international situation. Possibly chiefly because of the reasons that I have heretofore mentioned. Be that as it may, I sincerely believe that more than 80 percent of the people throughout the entire Middle West, sizing up the whole picture, are pretty much in accord with the following policies:

First. They believe the United States should continue with our preparedness program continuing to increase our naval, land, and air forces to such a degree of efficiency that we can successfully defend the whole of the Western Hemisphere, if needs be, against any aggressor or combination of aggressor nations.

Second. That aid to the democracies should be continued in order to enable them to obtain their needed supplies from us, but that we should not enter into methods of warfare in order to deliver goods to them, and that we should not underwrite their success in their present struggle.

Third. That our frontiers are not on the English Channel, the Rhine, the Mediterranean, the Yangtze, or the East Indies, unless we enter the war and make such a choice of frontiers. That the choice of these frontiers when we are at peace implies an intention to dominate the world through our naval, air, and military might.

Fourth. That entry into this war by us will result in impoverishment of the American people, and when complete victory is gained, the economic power flowing from the victory will not be sufficient to pay us for the costs of the war in dollars and cents, to say nothing of the suffering, sorrow, and tears that war would bring.

Fifth. That after having entered the war and after having won the war, we would have to assume the role of an international policeman for an indefinite time and would have to support this position by maintaining indefinitely great naval, air, and military forces throughout the world. That we would have to remain so prepared so as to maintain in all of the countries of the world such a huge army so as to be in a position at all times to support our judgment against the judgment of the people whose order we had undertaken to preserve and whose territorial integrity we had agreed to maintain.

Sixth. That if we do not enter the war, we will, after the war is ended, be able to meet our economic competitors in the international field successfully.

This I believe fairly sums up the thoughts, the wishes, and the hopes of the great majority of our people. They hate Hitlerism and everything it advocates. They hate communism with all of its undermining influences and characteristics. Both are contrary to every conception of American ideals and our free institutions. They resent being called Nazi sympathizers simply because they oppose sending our sons to again fight and die and rot on European and Asiatic battlefields. They know that war is wholesale violence. It is not glorious. It is not magnificent. It is cruel. It is sordid. It is the destroyer of life and of property. It unleashes the most violent passions in the breasts of men. It empties homes of loved ones. Most of the war pictures in historical textbooks and on the walls of museums are a fraud and a deceit. They show a few men flushed with victory marching into a conquered town. They do not show the dead and rotting bodies upon the battlefields. They do not show the bitter tears of womanhood and the tons of youthful blood that incarnadine the ground. They do not show the pestilence of disease ravishing a conquered territory.

War is not blown bugles. War means blackouts and the silent thrust of frenzied bayonets and the shrieking of shells and the speeding of vulture bombing planes across the sky and the blood foaming from the mouths of the wounded and the unheeded rattle of the dying. There is only one real museum of war—the hospitals where armless, legless, and blinded, butchered men wait the reveille of eternity.

There is only one true monument to war—the white crosses on unnamed graves in national cemeteries. Yes, our people hate war. They will give their all in the defense of this country, but they do not want and they will not have another American Expeditionary Force.

State Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

LETTER FROM A. S. ANDERSON, PHILIP, S. DAK.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, I offer for the RECORD a terse letter which I have received from Mr. A. S. Anderson of Philip, S. Dak.:

PHILIP, S. DAK., *July 25, 1941.*

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A farmer brings a load of wheat to the grain elevator but before he can market it he must produce his wheat-marketing card. If he belongs to the A. A. A., well and good, if not, he pays a penalty of 49 cents per bushel for noncompliance.

A workingman applies to a defense plant for a job. Before he can get on the pay roll he has to get a union card.

I ask you if this is free enterprise? I should call it regimentation, state socialism, planned economy. It is the philosophy of the dictators.

There is no escape even in death. Our social security number is placed on our death certificate.

Yours truly,

A. S. ANDERSON.

Priorities In Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, August 14), 1941

ADDRESS BY HENRY M. WRISTON

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able speech made by Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president of Brown University, and chairman of the Citizens' Emergency Committee on Nondefense Expenditures. This speech merits the attention of all citizens of our country.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST HAVE PRIORITIES IN SPENDING

American public opinion must by this time be fully alert to the fact that great sacrifices are to be demanded for the citizens of the United States. When, on July 10, the President asked for $4,770,000,000 more in appropriations for the War Department, he gave notice that he was going to ask for further billions for the Navy and lease-lend program—doubtless well over seven billions. Upon hearing that news, even the Secretary of the Treasury remarked that it would require a restudy of the whole fiscal position of the United States, and intimated broadly that additional new taxes would be demanded. "We have got to take a new look at the picture. * * * The new figures give us an entirely new situation." Congress is now considering a bill designed to raise $3,500,000,000 more than the tax bills of previous years.

On July 14, Leon Henderson, Price Control Administrator, said: "Every person will be touched, and many will be touched harshly, by the defense program. The first year of this program to protect democracy here and abroad brought little change in our ways of life. * * * It becomes my disagreeable duty to tell you that the party is over. Not that you didn't sense it before, but it needs to be brought home to housewives and businessmen so that, in true American fashion, we can stir our stumps and get busy handling the situation."

To put it, perhaps, in the shortest possible terms, in the present fiscal year the United States is intending to spend through the Federal Government alone, omitting completely from consideration State and county, municipal, and other local expenditures, about one-fourth of the total national income. Such figures ought to challenge the attention of every American citizen.

PRIORITIES IN SPENDING

There is a second fact which is of like fundamental importance. We are hearing a great deal, and necessarily so, of priorities. That is to say, certain kinds of things are held to be more essential than other things which are desirable but not indispensable. Those items which are given priority must be produced and distributed whether other goods, which are equally desirable or even more useful in normal times, are available or not. For example, we are all aware of the

drive to collect aluminum and of the severe restrictions upon the use of aluminum in manufacture, except for defense purposes. That is only the most widely advertised instance, but it is typical of many, many others not so well publicized. Everyone recognizes that a system of priorities is essential, that it is inescapable, and that it would be a great mistake to try to get along without it.

Now, the striking thing is that these two ideas, the idea of enormous and sacrificial expenditure for defense and the idea of priorities, have not been effectively brought into contact in the mind of Congress. We can see this when we look at recent appropriations. The Citizens Emergency Committee is designed specifically to demand of Congress that it establish priorities in the field of expenditure precisely as the Office of Production Management is establishing priorities in the fields of production and consumption.

In making appropriations, Congress has been going on the principle of "business as usual." If, in past years, there have been Federal appropriations for an agency or any other purpose, they are continued as usual and often even expanded. That body has passed defense appropriations promptly, but has given defense no priority at the public till over other expenditures. Defense and nondefense items, essentials and nonessentials, have been treated substantially upon the same basis by the Government of the United States; and all the new demands upon the Public Treasury occasioned by the international crisis have been pyramided on top of an already staggering load.

LABOR SHORTAGES

Everyone knows that many of the huge appropriations in recent years have been designed, in the President's words, to "prime the pump," to bring relief to the unemployed, to take care of young people who were neither in school nor at work—in short, they have been antidepression measures. Yet here we are in the midst of what may fairly be described as a war boom. In many fields there is no longer any unemployment; there is a scarcity of labor. Over the radio on July 12, I heard reports from State after State as to the shortage of farm labor, for example. Yet the appropriations of an emergency kind for antidepression purposes are continued, though the occasion for them has disappeared in the intense military, industrial, commercial, and agricultural activity we have today. The shrinkage in the need for appropriations has not been reflected in corresponding reductions in Federal expenditures. That is just one instance of the failure upon the part of the Government of the United States to establish priorities in expenditures. It is a threat to the success of the defense effort itself.

The people of the United States have given more hostages to fortune, have committed themselves more heavily upon the presumption of a stable future than any other people at any time in the history of the world. To begin with, our agricultural investment is the heaviest investment of money and labor ever made by any people anywhere in the world. Our industrial investment and our communications investment, measured by bonds and stocks and other securities, or by fixed assets, are the heaviest investments in those forms of activity ever undertaken by any people anywhere in the history of the world.

INVESTMENT IN STABILITY

Our investments in life insurance, and more recently in social security and unemployment insurance, dwarf into pygmy size any other like commitments made by any other nation in the history of the world. The savings of the people of the United States in banks of one kind or another are larger than the entire savings of any other people anywhere in the world. The endowments of our hospitals and orphanages and homes for the aged, of our universities and colleges, of our schools, public and private, run so far beyond the philanthropic endowments of other nations that they are not comparable to them. I suppose the endowments of institutions in the United States alone are larger than those of all the rest of the world put together.

All those commitments of every kind are based upon the assumption that we will remain solvent, that those hostages to fortune are safe. And yet, as Mr. Henderson said "before long now there will be more purchasing power running around hunting something to buy than there are goods available. If that occurs to a substantial degree, no power on earth can prevent inflation." Inflation would wipe out the endowments of hospitals and homes, universities and colleges, would make insurance payments and savings accounts lose their purchasing power and carry only the form of money, having lost its substance. We would be in the tragic situation described in one of Rudyard Kipling's poems—

"Though there was plenty of money
There was nothing the money would buy."

Whatever the present World War may mean elsewhere, its meaning for America is perfectly clear. It is a test whether "this Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure." With the international phase of that challenge this committee is not directly concerned. We operate upon the presumption, which is shared, I believe, by an almost unanimout Nation, that the defense of the United States in a military sense must be made secure at whatever cost. There should be no extravagance, there should be no reckless waste, even in national defense. But with the specific problem of national defense this committee is not concerned. We are assuming that appropriations will be staggering great and we are assuming that Congress under the pressure of public opinion, will be more and more careful in making those appropriations.

DOMESTIC SAFETY

But equally important with, and perhaps more important than, the international challenge to the American way of life is the domestic problem. Democracy can be destroyed at home by recklessness, by bankruptcy; even the defense effort would be hamstrung by inflation. But democracy can be destroyed in another way, by the failure of public opinion to control the Government. For the essence of democracy is simply this, that the Government is a reflection of public opinion, and when the Government escapes from the control of public opinion, whether by force or by the decay of alert citizenship, democracy has gone.

When you struggle to save something, you want some assurance that it is going to remain when the struggle is over. The domestic security of the things we treasure must be guarded all the time the foreign effort is being made. It will be no use saving America from external threats if it becomes insolvent and at the mercy of some other evil. We must not only put down the present evil but remain strong to face new ones.

No one has expressed the paramount need for thrift and solvency more pointedly or more pungently than President Roosevelt, who said: "Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors, because they are a burden on production and are paid through production. * * * Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they pay. * * * What I am talking about are the taxes which go to the ordinary costs of conducting government year in and year out. That is where the question of extravagance comes in. * * * Upon the financial stability of the United States Government depends the stability of trade and employment and of the entire banking, savings, and insurance system of the Nation."

THE CITIZENS EMERGENCY COMMITTEE

The Citizens Emergency Committee is organized to make that statement of the President of the United States effective, to call insistently to the attention of the public and the Congress the need for establishing priorities in national expenditures. Defense comes first, the essential services come second, and other things should come a poor third or be dropped entirely. In short, there must be a system of priorities in Federal expenditure. To that end, this committee will shortly begin to make specific suggestions. In carrying forward this work, we appeal to all the citizens of the United States for their help. We serve no interest but that of the public.

The Independence of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, August 14), 1941

ADDRESS BY CUBAN AMBASSADOR

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Cuban Ambassador to the United States, speaking of the independence of Cuba and what a great privilege it is for a small nation to live in such proximity to the United States of America, that, regardless of its size and strength in comparison to those of its neighbors, it can enjoy unquestioned freedom and liberty.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INDEPENDENCE OF CUBA—SYMPTOM OF A CULTURE

Today, the 20th of May, the people of Cuba celebrate a glorious anniversary which has a profound philosophical and historical significance for all the nations of our continents and of the Caribbean, for on such a day they inaugurated their democratic and independent republic, after well-nigh a century of war against the discovering metropolis.

Thirty-nine years have gone by since the 20th of May 1902, when the United States of America, in fulfilling the international obligation born of the joint resolution of the Congress and sealed in the Treaty of Paris after the common sacrifice of Cubans and Americans put an end to Spanish domination, delivered to the Cubans the responsibility of self-government, for which entire generations of illustrious patriots had fought in wars without precedent in the history of the efforts for independence of our sister republics of the Americas. And in the years that have elapsed the progress, the political education, the culture, and civilization of our people have made evident before America and the world the right which our liberators had to aspire to an ideal of redemption for which our country was already prepared in full development and maturity.

The fact of Cuba's independence constitutes unquestionably a symbol and a symptom which characterizes our American culture.

At no time as today has the celebration of this anniversary attained a deeper meaning. If on other occasions the countries of this hemisphere have celebrated the date of their glorious independences, today, when international law, which had succeeded in obtaining by steady progress an extraordinary development, seems to be disappearing, the celebration of the anniversary for the independence of an American nation needs must constitute for the others a motive for special rejoicing and to draw from the historical fact the inevitable philosophical consequences that will determine the sole international conduct possible to them in these anxious hours through which humanity is passing.

Our human society of today is met in a terrible and transcendental struggle. It can be asserted without fear of contradiction that if at other times the great wars fought by nations were motivated by insane desires for territorial expansion or economic domination, the great battle which the world is fighting today has a deeper character and wider and greater consequences, since it is not fought to impose a religious creed or to win supremacy in this or that market in the economic field, but it is a struggle between the two strongest tendencies that influence the human spirit in their antithetical conceptions of the world and life; on the one hand the tendency that represents the progressive moral improvement of humanity, in ascending spiral, a tendency that wishes to win days of happiness, of justice, and of freedom for man, and on the other hand, that which aspires to subdue humanity by violence and terror, to reestablish the slavery of man to man, and of one people to another.

And it is in this tragic hour which is being lived by humanity and in which the world is thus divided, that the celebration of the independence of a nation acquires extraordinary importance, for although our country may be small in size and limited in population, it has been, and continues to be great before the eyes of that part of the world which professes the cult of democracy and respect for the self-determination of nations, the fundamental basis on which up to now international law has been built, in contrast with the beliefs of those that pretend to destroy the sacred right of the smaller countries by proclaiming the brutal reign of force over and above the civilizing postulates of order, law, and justice.

The international crisis suffered by Europe and Asia has made of America the only safe haven, not only for liberty, justice, and law, but for that which is more consubstantial among ourselves—the right to independence of the several peoples, large or small, but whose nationalities, respected and deserving of respect, represent cultural, geographic and historical attainments, integrating the continent which, under the generic name of America, represents today, in indestructable ties of continental solidarity, the sole unconquerable fortress for liberty and the dignity of man. A continent which is prepared to fight with faith and with energy to keep this patrimony of western civilization and culture from perishing in the infernal conflagration which, destroying all the conquests of progress in the field of morality, would carry humanity back to an epoch already surpassed by effective advancement.

The independence of the Republic of Cuba is a living example of a constructive and fertile Americanism and is in agreement with the conception of our far-sighted compatriot, Don Manuel Sanguily, who, back in 1890 thus defined it in clear and definite words: "Americanism is not an effort toward racial approximation such as Germanism and Slavism; it is a system of ideas as was, for example, Hellenism; it is a social tendency; an ideal of life and of government, whose end is federation, whose basis is autonomy, whose form is the Republic, and whose essence is democracy."

It is not then an exaggeration to assert that all of America can justly be proud to have always tendered homage to the ideas of democracy and freedom. Examine, if you will, the peculiar nature of its international law, and you shall verify that this has been built with comprehension, tolerance, respect for the weak, and with the application of the most equitable manner of creating the rules of law—the democratic way.

Democracy, which is the most progressive and broadest political formula to which the highest degree of moral perfection of man has reached—democracy, which is the political system that makes possible the consecration of those human rights which because they belong to the very nature of man must be considered inalienable and permanent in any political system that deems itself cultured and civilized as well as essential for the orderly and peaceful life in the community of nations. Human rights, which in 1916 the American Institute of International Law, in moments also decisive for the ascending march of humanity, recognized as fundamental and necessary for the stability of international comity, consecrating them in the famous declaration which has embraced the essential thought of the Americas in this matter—namely, the right of every nation to its own existence and the condemnation of any act of aggression; the right of every nation to its independence and to its free determination; the right of equality among all nations and that of assuming, according to the Declaration of Independence of the United States, among all the powers of the earth, the separate and equal position to which it is entitled according to the laws of God and of nature; the right to a territory within definite boundaries and the obligation which all nations have to protect the rights of others and to fulfill the duties which international law establishes.

What a magnificent sight, gentlemen, this which in a constant and renewed manner is offered by America to the world, with celebrations such as ours for the independence of one of the republics of the glorious constellation of Washington, Bolivar, and Marti. Confronted with the grave disequilibrium of other continents because of the reign of ideologies which deny the right to independence of the small or weak nations, and which are proof of the decadence of cultures that were at one time examples of human greatness and progress, the Western Hemisphere shows a profound unity which is eloquent proof of social cooperation, of collective fraternity, or mutual and reciprocal friendship and collaboration to achieve together the progress of civilization.

May the Almighty continue to bestow upon our peoples the creative and fruitful ideas of fraternity and equality so that even through the most difficult, darkest, and dangerous moments of the history of today, America shall continue to be the forum of right and unconquerable rampart of liberty.

The Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLISON D. SMITH

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, August 14), 1941

STATEMENT BY H. V DANIEL

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by H. V. Daniel on the gasoline tax.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GASOLINE TAX THE MOST BURDENSOME BORNE BY ANY NECESSITY

(Statement by H. V. Daniel)

The tax burden of the American people is becoming increasingly more imposing. Accordingly it becomes more and more imperative that specific tax measures be sound and equitable. The desire for sound tax policy, for example, should overrule any tendency to increase the rates of certain existing taxes simply because they have proven to be good revenue producers.

Last year, during 1940, the taxes levied on the sale of gasoline produced 1 out of every 11 tax dollars collected by all the taxing jurisdictions in this country. The aggregate tax revenue collected by all these governmental units amounted to $12,756,000,000—exclusive of pay-roll payments for social security. Of that amount, $1,155,000,000 represented Federal, State, and local taxes on gasoline sales.

It must be remembered that more than 180,000 governmental units in this country exercise the sovereign right to tax the citizen, his properties, and his income. It must be remembered, too, that these taxing jurisdictions impose a great variety of taxes of every nature. Then it is significant that the single tax on gasoline produced nearly 10 percent of all governmental tax revenue in 1940.

Because the gasoline tax has proved to be such a dependable producer of revenue, public administrators repeatedly have tapped this tax source as a matter of expedience with very little consideration for tax justice. The result is that today the Federal Government collects a gasoline tax at the rate of 1½ cents a gallon, all the States tax gasoline at rates ranging to 7 cents a gallon, and the counties and municipalities of certain States also levy their own gasoline taxes at rates as high as 3 cents a gallon. In some localities in Mississippi and Alabama the combined taxes on gasoline total 10½ cents a gallon.

With the 50-percent increase in rate enacted by the Revenue Act of 1940, the Federal gasoline tax now costs consumers of gasoline approximately $343,000,000 annually. In view of the fact that greater amounts of Federal revenue are derived from tobacco and liquor taxes, it may appear that the Federal gasoline tax could be increased without imposing an unreasonable burden on gasoline consumers. Such a viewpoint, however, overlooks the degree to which gasoline is taxed by State and local governments.

Before the loan of petroleum tankers to nations overseas made necessary a campaign to curtail the consumption of gasoline in the more populous Eastern States, tax authorities predicted that State gasoline tax revenues for the year 1941 would cost consumers more than $900,000,000. Consequently, when proposals are made to increase further the Federal gasoline tax rate, it must be remembered that the State gasoline tax burden alone normally approaches $1,000,000,000. The Federal and State gasoline taxes together already represent a most burdensome penalty on gasoline consumers.

That the taxation of gasoline is primarily a State tax field also should be remembered. The gasoline tax was originated by the States, and each of the States now has come to rely heavily on this impost. Some States depend on it for half their revenue. It is well known that the gasoline tax most properly should be used as a "benefit tax" for financing highway construction and maintenance. Since the provision of highways still is primarily a State function, the continued and successful use of the gasoline tax by the States should not be jeopardized by an excessive duplicating Federal gasoline tax rate.

Recognition must also be given to the fact that gasoline, tobacco, and alcoholic beverages differ basically as consumer goods. The consumption of tobacco and alcoholic beverages represents nonessential consumption; many would call it socially undesirable consumption. The consumption of gasoline, however, represents the consumption of a necessity fundamental to our national economy. Of this adequate evidence was presented to the House Ways and Means Committee. No grounds exist, therefore, for a comparison of the relative excise tax burden on the consumers of gasoline and the consumers of alcoholic beverages and tobacco.

The consumption of gasoline nevertheless is taxed more heavily than the consumption of any other necessity. At the present time Federal, State, and local gasoline taxes—averaged for 50 representative cities throughout the Nation—represent a special sales tax of 47 percent on the price of the commodity. A comparably severe rate on any other necessity cannot be found.

Evidence of the severity of gasoline tax rates is the fact that the Federal gasoline tax alone provides the Federal Treasury with 14 percent of all Federal excise tax collections. Of the $2,491,530,000 collected from all Federal excise taxes during the fiscal year 1941, $343,000,000 represent collections from the Federal tax on gasoline. Certainly the consumers of this single necessity—gasoline—already are more than paying their share.

With the increasing necessity for imposing sound and equitable taxes, serious consideration should be given to the special burden of taxation which the consumers of gasoline now bear. Possibly too much emphasis is being placed on all excise taxes in the rapidly changing Federal fiscal structure. Although an increase in the rate of any excise tax may not appear unreasonable in itself, the accumulation of the small and seemingly reasonable increases eventually results in a top-heavy and disproportionately burdensome tax system.

Draft Vote Political Gamble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, August 14), 1941

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of August 14, 1941, entitled "Draft Vote Political Gamble."

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 14, 1941]

DRAFT VOTE POLITICAL GAMBLE

(By David Lawrence)

1942 ELECTIONS MAY TELL HOW CITIZENS REGARD HOUSE ACTION

The biggest political gamble of a decade was taken by Members of the House of Representatives in their vote on the extension of the term of military service for the drafted troops.

The Democratic Party, by a vote of 182 to 65, voted to extend the term of service by 18 months, while the Republican Party voted, 133 to 21, against the measure. Which will prove to have been the better vote when the November 1942 congressional elections are held?

While politics was rarely mentioned in the debate, it was in the background of the House voting. For obvious threats from constituents that they would take reprisals at the polls were clearly present, either by letters from back home or through the pressure of the organizations which lobbied for or against the proposal.

Broadly speaking, the Republican vote may prove to have been the more dangerous, especially if the Nation is at war or if the present emergency continues beyond November 1942. Clearly, the Democratic Party will seek the support of independents in the electorate on the ground that the Republican Party is an obstructionist party and cannot be counted on to defend the Nation, even when the leading military experts of the Government call for action to preserve the safety of the Republic.

But if the war emergency has passed, the Republican stump speakers will expect the reaction of the country to be one of indifference to the congressional voting on such questions as draft extension. Other issues relating to reconstruction or the return of power to the people may be more influential in the voters' minds.

ALMOST SOLID OPPOSITION

So if one believes that the war will be over by November 1942, the Republicans will have taken little risk. If it isn't over, the Republican Party may face an annihilating defeat at the polls. There will be sections of the country, such as the Middle West, where isolationist sentiment is strong and some Republicans will benefit by that attitude, but in the main, with the Nation all out for the defense program and possibly for war, in November 1942, the Democrats will naturally seek to make a clean sweep for their party on the ground that divided counsels and obstruction are dangerous to the successful prosecution of the then existing program.

The Republican Party has consistently voted against the President's foreign policy ever since the outbreak of the war in September 1939. At a time when partisanship is supposed to be eliminated, the Republicans voted almost as solidly on foreign policy as on domestic questions. Though claiming to be in favor of national defense to the uttermost, the Republicans have failed to uphold the War Department in its vehement plea for draft extension and have endeavored to override the wishes of the military authorities.

There were some Democrats, too, who voted against the administration, but they represent a minority of the party, whereas the Republican Party threw the bulk of its strength—more than 80 percent—against the War Department's recommendations.

It will be contended, and plausibly, too, that without the 21 Republican votes cast in favor of draft extension the measure would have been lost, so that a certain amount of credit is due the 21 Republicans. But when it comes to an appraisal of what the party as a whole did, the 133 votes against the measure out of a total of 154 Republicans voting will be used impressively against the Republicans on the stump to bolster the charge that the Republican Party could not be trusted with full power in both Houses and that a vote for the Republican Party in the congressional elections may be a vote for chaos and division at a time of international crisis.

GAMBLING ASPECTS OF VOTE

The Republicans would try through their spokesmen and leaders to claim they would support the Government in its national defense, but the Democrats will point to the record, not only on the draft extension but on arms-embargo repeal and on the lend-and-lease bill in the House, as proof of the fact that the Republicans have lined up partisanly rather than on broad grounds of national policy.

One of the gambling aspects of the vote was related to the expectation of a House defeat of the 18-month extension and a subsequent rewriting of the measure in conference between the two Houses. Had the House voted down the 18-month proposal and had it adopted a 6-month or a 12-month extension, or some other amendment, many opponents of draft extension would have had an opportunity to record themselves in favor of the milder measure. Then, if the conference report had accepted the Senate version, namely, the 18 months' extension, the rewritten measure would have been adopted in the House either by a voice vote or by a record vote. This would have been defended on the customary grounds that it was all or none and that those who favored some extension had no opportunity to vote on any change in the conference report. This sort of thing had been talked about in the Capitol corridors and may account for the large record vote cast against the 18 months' proposal, which many Members really thought would be defeated and then restored in the conference committee. The administration, however, took no chances and rallied its forces to win. Had greater pressure been exerted by the administration the majority for the bill would have been larger. But since the administration leaders saw the political aspects and desired to avoid embarrassments to Members hailing from isolationist sections of the country, the final vote was closer than it otherwise would have been. The close vote does not by any means reflect the sentiment of the House on any concrete issue relating to the emergency, but merely reflects the domestic politics of the draft and a bet that in November 1942 the war will be over or that the issue will have been superseded by other issues far more controlling in the voters' minds.

The Agricultural Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns today we will have completed consideration of all defense, emergency, and other necessary legislation pending before the Congress. As I understand, it is your intention to order a recess for 2 or 3 weeks, in order that you and the other Members of the House may get away for a few days and have a much-needed rest. The past 8 months have been a very trying period for every Member of Congress physically, mentally, and spiritually, and I am sure that this short vacation will prove helpful to everyone.

We will all go home with much concern over the international situation and the future security and welfare of our own Nation. No doubt it will prove helpful to all of us to get away from this scene of tense action, make a quiet study and summary of the conditions today and the problems which may soon face us.

On the other hand, there has never been a time when I could return to my district with as much satisfaction from the standpoint of our agricultural problems. While the reports come to me that crops are not so good, for which certainly no one can hold Congress responsible, yet the returns from the sale of farm commodities are certainly much improved since this Congress convened on January third. No fair mind can doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the actions taken by the present Congress have contributed in large measure to the improvement in price of farm commodities.

Let us take for example the four great crops in which my State is particularly interested, cotton, wheat, peanuts, and tobacco.

On August 1, the beginning of the current season, we had on hand 10,600,000 bales of American cotton. We are now gathering another crop which is estimated to total 10,800,000 bales, giving us a total present supply of about 21,500,000 bales of cotton. With our exports down to around only 1,000,000 bales per year, this means that we have in the warehouses and in the fields more than twice as much cotton as can possibly be sold or disposed of during the year. Ordinarily this would mean that cotton would bring only between 8 and 10 cents per pound, due to the enormous surplus on hand and yet today cotton is selling around the parity price of 16.49 cents per pound. At the same time, Indian cotton at Bombay is selling at 8½ cents and Brizilian cotton at Sao Paulo is selling for 8 cents. This shows conclusively, Mr. Speaker, that with a world price around 8 cents per pound, with more than a 2-year supply on hand, the only thing that is holding American cotton around parity is the cotton program enacted by Congress.

The same can be said of wheat. At the beginning of the season we had on hand a surplus of about 400,000,000 bushels of wheat. This year we are making an enormous crop, now estimated at 950,000,000 bushels of wheat. The most wheat we can possibly consume is about 750,000,000 bushels, which, like cotton, gives us about a 2-year supply or an enormous surplus. About the same condition exists in Canada, where they have an enormous surplus. While Canadian wheat and Australian wheat and wheat produced in Argentina is bringing from 40 to 52 cents per bushel, our own wheat is selling between 90 cents and $1 per bushel.

What about tobacco? All the reports show a good crop this year. The Commodity Credit Corporation now holds about 360,000,000 pounds of flue-cured tobacco from the 1939 and 1940 crops. Yet reports come to me indicating that the Georgia crop of tobacco, which is now going to market, is bringing an average price of around 25 cents per pound and the best grades are being sold at from 35 to 50 cents per pound. The present parity price on flue-cured tobacco is 22 cents per pound, and I am delighted with the price being received by the Georgia producers, notwithstanding the size of the crop and the large surplus which the Government has in storage. I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, what the situation would be without the legislation enacted by Congress.

Now, as to peanuts, present indications are that we will have a yield for the edible trade—that is, peanuts grown on the allotted acreage—of around 650,000 tons, with prospects of consumption by the edible trade of between 400,000 and 500,000 tons. In spite of this surplus and after weeks of effort, we have gotten the Secretary of Agriculture to peg the price of peanuts at $90 per ton. While I urged and insisted that the price should be pegged at at least $100, it is very gratifying to me to know that the peanut producers of my State are assured a reasonable price on the peanuts grown on their allotted acreage. For the peanuts grown for oil, in excess of the allotment, present indications are that we should be able to maintain an oil price of at least between 10 and 12 cents per pound, giving oil peanuts a market at between $70 and $80 per ton.

It was only a few weeks ago that my committee had before it a bill to make some minor changes in the law for wheat and corn. It was this bill which we amended, as to loans on farm commodities, that brought about the present law making mandatory a loan of 85 percent on the five basic commodities. It is this law more than anything else that is bringing to the American farmer today a better price for his crops, far above the world price. We now intend to ask the Congress to continue this 85-percent loan provision for several more years and I hope that it can be made permanent. In addition this Congress has appropriated $500,000,000 for soil benefit payments and an additional $200,000,000 for parity payments. This loan provision and these appropriations absolutely insure at least parity prices for the five basic commodities.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will start home tomorrow feeling much better over the situation with regard to those who toil from daylight to dark to produce the food and fiber to feed and clothe this Nation. We must continue our efforts until the farmer realizes, not only parity prices, but parity income and a fair share of the national income of the Nation.

Ceremonies Incident to Conferring Degree on Col. Raymond Robins by University of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, August 14), 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE BROOKSVILLE (FLA.) JOURNAL

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD a description of ceremonies in which the honorary degree of doctor of laws was conferred on Col. Raymond Robins, a distinguished American, at Chinsegut Hill, Fla., on June 6.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Brooksville (Fla.) Journal of June 12, 1941]

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA BESTOWS DEGREE ON COLONEL ROBINS—HONOR CONFERRED BY PRESIDENT JOHN J. TIGERT AT CHINSEGUT HILL

The University of Florida conferred upon Col. Raymond Robins the honorary degree of doctor of laws, June 6; and in so doing, also honored itself, according to expressed views of spokesmen for the university and a host of friends and admirers of Colonel Robins all over the country.

The impressive ceremony, the first ever given in absentia by the university, was conducted on the lawn of Colonel and Mrs. Robins' home, Chinsegut Hill, under the spreading limbs of the Altar Oak, a huge old live oak tree. Dr. John J. Tigert, president, in the regalia of a Rhodes scholar, and Dr. Wilmon Newell, provost of agriculture, also in cap and gown, officiated, in the presence of six members of the university faculty all in caps and gowns and colorful stoles. The audience of about 80 persons included political and educational leaders of Hernando County and a number of intimate friends from far and near in the State.

In his citation, Dr. Tigert called Colonel Robins among other things a leading protagonist of peace among the nations and an earnest evangel of the Christian way of life, especially among college men and women. He said, "One of the first conspicuous figures in political liberalism of our day, you have championed many worthy causes, not the least of which has been your effort to promote the economic and agricultural development of your adopted State. You have explored well-nigh every path of service." At the end, "For these distinguished achievements, we salute you and recognize you as one of the leading citizens of our country today."

Dr. Newell, in presenting the recipient to Dr. Tigert for the honorary degree, said he

felt he was honoring the University of Florida, and then gave a brief biography of the candidate.

At high points in the ceremony the audience applauded with enthusiasm. It was a far cry from the days when the Seminole Indians used the old hilltop to signal messages to each other in the language of smoke. A place of ordered but natural beauty, it looked out on far blue space where vistas had been cut among the trees with spectacular effect. Chinsegut Hill Sanctuary had become reality from a boyhood dream of the Colonel's—dedicated to the threefold purposes of a forest reserve, a wildlife refuge, and an experiment station to work out in all future years the conservation of natural resources, and the development of better breeds and seeds and methods of culture for the farmer and stockman, all under ownership and direction of the Federal Government and the agricultural college of the University of Florida, cooperating in the great venture. Mr. W. F. Ward, superintendent of Chinsegut Hill Sanctuary, appeared in cap and gown as a member of the agricultural college faculty. (As is well known, Colonel and Mrs. Robins in 1932 donated their 2,082-acre estate to the Government for exploitation in behalf of this county, the State, and the Nation.)

When he had donned his stole, Colonel Robins, an able interpreter of world affairs, made his response. He said he would rather have an honorary degree from the University of Florida than from any other institution of learning. And he challenged the university, along with other universities in the country, to lead the coming new birth of freedom by establishing groups on the following subjects: Reconstruction After the War; Freedom of Religion; Social Control of Government by Self-Government—That Is, Democracy; Freedom in Scientific Research and Demonstration; Industrial Freedom, Wherein We Throw Off the "Isms," Ideologies, and Revolutionary Dogmas of the Old World and Embrace the American Way of Life; and Outlawry of War, to Abolish the War System of the Ages. Educational leaders should let us know why we, the upholders of democracy, believe in what we are doing.

First, though, Colonel Robins said we must win this war—and we will win it. Then we must make war illegal, a crime, and must seek to unite all nonaggressor nations in support of any nation that is attacked. For war has grown more destructive and more costly, and has become national and international suicide, a threat to civilization itself. He said he would like to see all State universities form the above-mentioned groups, with Florida leading, particularly because such educational institutions are made possible and maintained by taxpayers of the country and are thereby obligated as well as privileged to seek to work out answers to problems in these chaotic times.

From his wheelchair Colonel Robins said fervently, "I would rather be alive in this great hour than at any time in the last 1,000 years." For he thinks these are great, if disturbing times. He discussed at some length the address of Robert H. Jackson, Attorney General of the United States, at the first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association, in Habana, Cuba, in March of this year.

One of the strong statements of the address was: "We are haunted by the greatest unfinished task of civilization, which is to create a just and peaceful international order." Legal process is the only practical alternative to force. Another telling declaration was: "The Kellogg-Briand Treaty for renunciation of war as an instrument of policy, and the Argentine Antiwar Treaty, swept away the nineteenth-century basis for contending that all wars are alike, and all warriors entitled to like treatment, and this adoption in our time of a discriminating attitude toward warring states is really a return to earlier and more healthy precepts."

(Attorney General Jackson, addressing representatives of all 22 South American republics, made the Kellogg-Briand tract the basis of reconstruction after the war, when new freedoms will be added to old freedoms we must preserve.)

Colonel Robins concluded his talk with a tribute to Christianity, the vitalizing force of the world, without which the human spirit has no dignity and the word "democracy" has no meaning.

Colonel Robins, one of the State's most distinguishd residents, received the degree of Bachelor of Laws from Columbia University in 1896. In 1923, the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws was conferred upon him by Hillsdale College. On the advent of his recent recognition by the University of Florida, he received letters and telegrams from many distinguished friends, including Cabinet members and under secretaries in Washington, D. C.

Among many prominent Floridians attending the ceremony were Dr. Roy B. Guild, executive secretary of the Men and Religion Forward Movement, for which Colonel Robins was once world lecturer, and Mrs. Guild, now of Winter Park; Dr. W. M. Rowlett, Dr. F. L. Adams, and Mrs. R. A. Ellis, Tampa; Judge F. R. Hocker, of this judicial district; and Ex-Mayor Jake Gerig, of Ocala; and many others. Miss Mary E. Dreier, of New York, sister of Mrs. Robins, came down from Maine for the event.

Colonel and Mrs. Robins were hosts to the assembled guests at a beautifully appointed luncheon following the activities of the morning. Tables were arranged in living room, dining room, and solarium, and flowers were used from the Chinsegut gardens, now in their full glory of summer blooms. The affair will be a lasting memory to those privileged to be present.

Criticism of Votes Against Draft Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, August 14), 1941

ARTICLE BY GOULD LINCOLN

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday, written by the well-known, able, and fair-minded political writer, Mr. Gould Lincoln. The article, appearing in the column The Political Mill, is entitled "Republicans Criticized for Playing Politics in Voting Against Draft Extension."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Washington Evening Star of August 14, 1941]

THE POLITICAL MILL—REPUBLICANS CRITICIZED FOR PLAYING POLITICS IN VOTING AGAINST DRAFT EXTENSION

(By Gould Lincoln)

G. O. P. in this year 1941 stands for grand old politics. The Republican party in Congress is making a sorry record as the Nation faces grave dangers. One hundred and thirty-three Republican Members of the House voted on Tuesday against the Army service extension bill. Twenty-one Republicans had the vision and the patriotism to support the measure. Had there been two less votes for the bill it would been defeated. It is a safe bet that had that happened, the Republicans who thought they were playing smart politics would have been very, very ill. It is an old axiom in politics—legislative politics—that it is safe to vote against a measure which is unpopular in some quarters, but which is sure to carry, despite the negative votes. It is quite another thing, however, to vote against a measure tied up so intimately with national welfare as the service extension bill and defeat it.

Had the measure been defeated, the blame would have gone to the Republican party. And those Republicans in the House who opposed it would have been holding the bag. They would have been on a hot spot. They would have succeeded in turning back a measure which the President and the Army's highest officers have repeatedly said is essential for the safety of the country. They would have succeeded in making this country look like 30 cents in the eyes of its potential enemies—the Axis Powers. What the Latin American peoples would have thought would have been that the United States, preaching so greatly about the defense of the Western Hemisphere, had no serious intention of going through with hemisphere defense.

Here was no question of entrance of the United States into the wars in Europe and in Asia. Here was only a question of adequate national defense, and the great majority of the Republicans in the House, under Republican leadership, turned their backs squarely on the measure. Gen. George C. Marshall had testified that unless the draftees and National Guard men and Reservists were retained in the service two-thirds of the American Army would have been demobilized. This is no joking matter, with the country threatened from both the East and the West. The Republicans knew, or should have known, that Japan is so moving in the Far East as to become more and more of a menace to this country and its interest. They should have known that Nazi Germany is driving ever westward, and has forced the present French Government into a new declaration of "collaboration," which means, in all probability, that the Nazis will get naval and air bases in Dakar—that part of Africa nearest the Western Hemisphere. Yet they stuck to their opposition to retaining the Army intact—an army that is still only partially trained. Either they were dumb or worse.

TIME FOR UNITY

If ever there was a period in the history of the United States when politics in international affairs should be absent, this is the period. If ever there was a period when every step looking to adequate national defense should be taken, this is it. For any political party, under such circumstances, to deliberately cast its votes in opposition to a national-defense measure is inexcusable. It may think that it is laying up treasures in heaven, for the future—such as public resentment against heavy taxes and against retention of men in military life. It may even realize on these issues at some later election. But it certainly was not thinking of the safety of this country, nor of its real interest at this time.

Specious arguments were advanced by opponents of the bill, arguments that to keep the draftees beyond a year would be in violation of a pledge contained in the original Draft Act. The act contains no such pledge. The most cursory reading of the law shows that Congress clearly said that if the national interest was imperiled, Congress, by so saying, could authorize the President to keep the draftees in service indefinitely. The argument was made, too, that if the Army was

kept intact, it would be a clear indication that this country was preparing to enter the European war. Nothing of the kind. For nearly 2 years these Republican leaders have been insisting that the present administration was doing its best to drag the country into war. The proof of any pudding is in the eating. The country is not at war, but it certainly is better prepared than it was to face any attack that is made against it.

Sixty-five Democrats joined the Republicans in voting against the service extension bill. They, too, must bear the blame of the big vote which was cast in opposition. But the Democratic Party generally and its leadership staunchly supported the measure. When the vote was announced it showed that 182 Democrats voted for the bill

BLACK SPOT ON ESCUTCHEON

The Republicans not only voted against any extension of the period of military service. They also voted against removing the limitation of 900,000 placed on the number of draftees who may be taken into the service at any one time. The Army at present has something less than 1,500,000 men. If the full number of draftees under the 900,000 limitation were taken into the service, it would have less than 1,800,000. Considering the size of the armies which are mobilized in the Axis nations, this is a ridiculously small number if this country is to be called upon to defend not only the American people but also the Western Hemisphere. The Republican leadership has not yet declared itself opposed to the defense of the Western Hemisphere—to an abrogation of the Monroe Doctrine. It might as well have done so, however, as to join in the attack against a larger Army

True, this country is not yet at war nor has the Western Hemisphere yet been attacked. The Republicans doubtless will say that if war comes they will quickly support measures to enlarge the military forces. Soldiers are not made in a day, or a month, or even a year. Not in these days of warfare, with modern weapons. Preparations that are made too late are as bad or worse than making no preparations at all.

Maybe the Republican Party will garner votes in the congressional elections next year because of its stand in Congress on this defense measure, although that is still doubtful. But whether they do or not, its representatives have left a black spot on the party's escutcheon.

Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, August 14), 1941

POEM BY HERBERT B. ALLEN

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem entitled "Mississippi" by Herbert B. Allen, editor of the Grenada County (Miss.) Weekly.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSISSIPPI

(By Herbert B. Allen, Grenada County, Miss., Weekly)

Down by the Yalobusha,
Where magnolias shade the lawn;
The bobwhites call each evening,
And the mockingbirds at dawn.

There flowers bright and fragrant,
All the gardens glorify;
And gorgeous sunsets introduce
The night's majestic sky.

The folks all speak in accents soft
And pleasing to the ear;
They grip my hand in friendship,
And revere traditions dear.

Grand melodies in choral tones,
Sung by familiar faces,
Accompany sermons by my friends,
Exhorting Christian graces.

The fragrance of young chicken,
Fried with artistry and skill,
Combines with good, hot cornbread
In a rhapsody to thrill.

The spirit of the old deep South
Lends dignity to life;
A haven from confusion
In a world so torn by strife.

So now to pack my other shirt
And don my gayest tie;
Treat my good Chrysler to some gas—
Then to the North, "Good-bye"!

The Roosevelt-Churchill Joint Declaration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, August 14), 1941

ARTICLE BY LUDWELL DENNY

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent statement and analysis of the Roosevelt-Churchill joint declaration, written by Mr. Ludwell Denny and published in the Washington Daily News of today. The statement sets forth the implications and the possible consequences of the meeting of the two distinguished gentlemen and of their statement.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of August 15, 1941]

F. D. LACKS POWER TO EFFECT SECURITY AIMS

(By Ludwell Denny)

An Anglo-American alliance to defeat Hitler, followed by an Anglo-American armed peace for world freedom and economic security, is the essence of the Roosevelt-Churchill joint declaration.

The announced aim to defeat Hitler, and the secret agreements on how to do that necessary job, are much more important than the generalized peace program. Like political platforms, official peace programs never have been faithfully observed by the victors.

Neither Mr. Roosevelt nor Mr. Churchill, with all their great powers, has authority to commit the United States or the British Empire to the basic political and economic changes involved in their joint pledges. Such authority exists only in Congress, as restricted by the Constitution, and in Parliament—not to mention the Dominion parliaments.

CONGRESS LIKELY TO BALK

On the basis of past performance, there is no reason to believe that Congress will consent to the kind of American participation in world responsibilities contained in the Roosevelt declaration, or that Congress will reverse the tariff, monetary, and other economic policies which have helped to prevent the proposed equality in trade and raw materials.

Nor is there any evidence that the British Parliament and British capital would be quicker than the American Congress and capital to relinquish their present Anglo-American monopoly or semimonopoly on most of the world's strategic raw materials, trade routes, markets, credit, and gold.

The Roosevelt-Churchill desire for international economic equality is no more definite than the forgotten No. 3 of Wilson's 14 points for "the removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions." Such Anglo-American barriers are much higher under Roosevelt and Churchill than those which the Wilson peace failed to destroy.

STRONG POINTS LACKING

The territorial and colonial pledges which made the Wilson Points the most powerful propaganda of the last war are lacking in the Roosevelt-Churchill statement. It is limited to the generalization that they seek no territorial aggrandizement, and "desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

It could not be specific on territory, as Wilson was, because Britain may need to make secret territorial deals to pry away some of Germany's allies or to hold her own. Hence only Nazi tyranny is named. For the same reason Mr. Churchill could not agree to "the open covenants, openly arrived at," which made No. 1 of Wilson's 14 points so popular with the people.

Nor could Mr. Churchill be expected to mention, much less have authority to pledge, freedom for colonial peoples.

REPEATS MAJOR BLUNDER

But, since the exiled governments of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and others are part of the present British alliance, it was necessary for yesterday's declaration to include a "wish to see sovereign right and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Although this seems natural enough, it underwrites the major blunder of the Wilsonian program as demonstrated by experience—the division of Europe into many small sovereign states, which multiplied political conflicts, trade barriers, economic chaos, and minority problems. Mr. Wilson hoped to control these obvious evils, which cause wars, by the unity and regulatory powers of a League of Nations.

Therein is the vast difference between the entire Wilson plan and the entire Roosevelt-Churchill plan. The essence of any peace plan is this: Who is going to enforce it—who will be judge and police? The two general alternatives are some kind of superstate, or the victors. The Versailles Peace provided the League, in name, but a victor's control in fact, because the victors ran the League and had the guns.

BETTER THAN VERSAILLES

The Roosevelt-Churchill declaration is more honest than the Versailles Treaty, which disarmed the vanquished in order to disarm the victors—but never did the latter. The present plan is to disarm "nations which threaten or may threaten, aggression"—with America and Britain the judges, apparently, since nobody else is mentioned—pending some indefinite and unspecified "permanent

system of general security." As for "peace-loving people," Britain and America will aid any "practicable measures" to "lighten" armaments.

Perhaps Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill would prefer an international organization as guardian of world peace, protector of freedom, and provider of prosperity, rather than assuming that Anglo-American victors and their associates would be equal to such responsibilities or capable of achieving such a millenium. A pax Anglo-Americana would be heaven compared to Nazi slavery. But they know that many neutral nations, no less than enemy nations and colonial peoples, distrust Anglo-American power.

But Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill cannot be blamed for failing to pledge the alternative of an international organization, when a majority of the American Congress and public apparently are opposed. Thus many of the inconsistencies, evasions, and inadequacies of the Roosevelt-Churchill declaration are more inherent in existing international chaos and domestic prejudices than representative of the statesmanship of its authors.

Morals Versus Health of the Men in the Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, August 14), 1941

ARTICLE BY PAUL L. BLAKELY, S. J.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President the influential Catholic weekly America has given study and publicity to conditions in the Army camps, particularly the importance of maintaining moral standards. Rev. Francis X. Talbot, S. J., editor of America, writes me suggesting that an article by Rev. Paul L. Blakely, S. J., entitled "Morals Versus Health of the Men in the Camps" be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In his letter he states:

> These statements treat of a very delicate topic but one that is tremendously important for the protection of the young men in the camps. I decided to open the topic only after consultation with the responsible authorities. It is hoped that the matter may be taken up in the Senate and the House and that some action may be secured from the authorities.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From America of August 1941]

MORALS VERSUS HEALTH OF THE MEN IN THE CAMPS

(By Paul L. Blakely, S. J.)

In an editorial published last week under the heading "Protected camp immorality," this review directed attention to an Army practice which is causing much uneasiness to thousands of American fathers and mothers. The editorial was written under a grave sense of duty. No decent man cares to mention this immoral Army practice, still less to discuss it. But in this case silence is not a virtue but vicious cowardice.

Not parents alone but all of us want our young men to come back to us improved—physically, mentally, and morally. We are eager to support any movement which can help these young men to make their months of service a period in which they will not sink in the moral scale but rise. For this very reason we feel obliged to protest any military regulation which can lead the young soldier to conclude that sexual immorality does not matter much provided that mechanical and chemical means are taken to avoid the diseases which commonly follow promiscuity. And it seems to me that some at least among the young recruits will reach exactly that conclusion, if the Army continues to hand out to them "practical mechanical protection against venereal infection" and to erect prophylactic stations open to them at all hours of the day and night.

Most of us know by heart the reasons which have been alleged for the course made mandatory by the Army regulations. Despite all that can be said by the officers, including the chaplain, some of the men, it is argued, are going to expose themselves to infection. This is regrettable, of course, but they say they can keep a bad matter from getting worse by providing, first, a mechanical protective device; and next, a place in which the man who has run the risk of disease can be aided. With this man's morals, they claim they have no direct concern, but what can be done to keep down the incidence of infection, will be done.

It is quite obvious that these Army regulations do not take morals into account. If they did, they would not prescribe methods which, to not a few of the young men, far removed from the moral and social restraints of home, are a direct incitement to vicious courses.

Let us turn to the Basic Field Manual: Military Sanitation and First Aid, published last year by order of the Secretary of War. There, under the head of control measures, we read that all "post exchanges are required to stock condoms of approved quality," and that "some one of these (prophylactic tubes) will be stocked by the post exchange." This gives us no exalted idea of moral standards in our new Army. But that is not all. In addition, "the medical department is responsible for operating sufficient prophylatic stations to serve adequately each command," and at these stations "any soldier may apply for treatment regardless of the hour." Evidently, the Government is not quite sure of the efficacy of its mechanical and prophylactic devices.

The psychological effect on the young soldier of this elaborate set-up cannot but be bad. It conveys, almost irresistibly, the impression that the Government expects him to indulge in riotous courses from time to time, and has no objection, provided that precautions are taken against disease.

It is no justification to say that these "precautions" are taken in all armies. At least, the contention is no stronger than the rejoinder that they should be taken in none. But our position is that we are unable to approve the theory that it is lawful to do evil that some good may result. This position was so well explained by the Most Reverend J. B. Simonds, D. D., archbishop of Hobart, Australia, in a public address on November 28, 1940, that I am presuming his excellency's permission to quote liberally.

"I have the unpleasant duty of speaking plainly in criticism of the action of our public authorities in sanctioning a regulation which cannot fail to have a subversive effect on the moral tone of the community. It has come as an unpleasant shock to many people to learn that contraceptive devices are regularly issued to the soldiers of the A. I. F. and militia camps of Australia. In Tasmania, public tenders were recently called for the wholesale supply of rubber contraceptives to the military authorities, and they are now regularly handed out in great numbers to all the men who request them. This sordid matter has been made the subject of complaint to me by parents of young soldiers, who are distressed to find that their sons have been corrupted by the easy road to vice which officialdom has opened to them.

"The demoralizing effect which this action of the Government will have on the youth of Australia is incalculable, and the regulation which empowered it is a disgraceful one with which no decent Government should be associated. The distribution of these things to men in camp is stated to have been undertaken in order to protect them from the danger of infection from venereal disease.

"Does the Federal Government, then, accept as a principle the vicious theory that the end justifies the means, no matter how immoral these means may be?

"Under the pretext of protecting the physical health of a relatively small and undisciplined minority, our leaders have chosen the depraved course of handing out to the young men of Australia hundreds of thousands of instruments of immorality. Surely it is not too much to expect that, as they are rightly solicitous for the physical health of the troops, they would be equally solicitous for the moral health of the youth of the country, and would refrain from spending the people's money to provide them with incentives to sin.

"We cheerfully resign ourselves to the oppressive burden of taxation which is imposed to carry the present war to a victorious issue. But it is a most depressing thing to learn that any of the money wrung from the people or begged from the poor in war-savings, is allocated for purposes of immorality.

"The religious leaders in the various States are doing their best to maintain the spiritual and moral standards of the men in uniform. Their people have made splendid sacrifices to build, equip, and maintain many church huts where the spiritual needs of the men can be met, and their recreation taken in a clean and healthy atmosphere. The Federal Government has no money with which to assist this fine uplifting work, but it does not scruple to spend the public money to break down the moral standards of the youths whom it invites or conscripts to defend the ideals of the Nation. It is little wonder that cynicism so often greets the assertion that we are fighting to uphold the Christian standards of life.

"We Catholics have a clearly defined principle to guide us in judging this action of the Government. It is a principle given to us by the Holy Spirit through the pen of St. Paul, who strongly reprobated the theory that we may do evil that some good may result (Romans iii: 8). On this principle we must take our stand, even though it should prove to be as unpalatable to modern paganism as St. Paul's insistence on justice and chastity was to the Roman Governor, Felix."

I do not see how anyone who respects the principles of Christian morality can dissent from the views so frankly and bravely stated by Archbishop Simonds. It is certainly the duty of the Government to take every possible precaution to guard the health of these young men, but, unless we go all-out totalitarian and assert that the Government is not bound by any law, it is also obliged to do what lies within its province to safeguard their morals. When it fails in this important duty, then, as the archbishop says, its assertion that it is fighting to uphold the Christian standards of life is apt to fall on cynical ears.

It is clear from the Government manual from which I have quoted, that the military authorities realize the difficulty inherent in the age-old problem of keeping an army free from venereal disease. Yet it is impossible to escape the conclusion, after studying the manual, that in the military scheme too much reliance is placed on prophylaxis and upon mechanical devices, and too little on the influence of factors which are of another nature. A military observer has recently said

that probably seven-eighths of the drafted men in a given camp are amenable at all times to military discipline. The remainder constitute the dregs of the camp. In spite of the wisest administration of discipline, they will break through, and can be controlled only when sent to prison. Archbishop Simonds probably had some such conclusion in mind when he said that the Government had provided an immoral and disgraceful plan "of protecting the health of a relatively small and undisciplined minority." The American military regulations apparently assume that this plan must be applied to all the men.

The sixth chapter of the Basic Field Manual ends by prescribing methods which can be used whenever an excessively high venereal rate is found in a command. Were these precautions taken from the beginning, the alleged need of mechanical devices in this fight against disease would probably disappear. "Stringent control measures may be necessary. These may include all or any part of the following: (1) Placing red-light districts and all places selling liquor out of bounds. (2) Patrolling of restricted districts by military police. (3) Limiting passes to 4 hours; granting no passes after 9 p. m. (4) Classifying passes. (5) Routine bed checking." These regulations, but especially the first two, ought to be applied from the outset, and enforced consistently, instead of being held back until the camp is rotten with disease. Military police, properly trained, can search out places of evil resort as often as they are reopened in another district, and again put them out of bounds. That degree of supervision, surely, should be found possible.

Only a tyro in the knowledge of human nature will think that the solution of this problem can be easily reached. But it must be held for certain that no solution can be found in a method which is itself a violation of the moral law. When a government distributes contraceptives in its military camps, it acts on the immoral principle that evil may be done for a good end, helps to break down the soldier's moral sense, and, as Archbishop Simonds has said, engages in a disgraceful business with which no decent government should be associated.

Every approach to a solution must be controlled by moral and religious principles. If these principles are held to be of secondary importance to the mechanical devices recommended in the Army regulations, a decrease in the incidence of venereal disease may be secured, but at the cost of undermining moral standards. The Army practice may produce healthy animals, but the ideal which we are entitled to demand of the Government is the soldier who is a Christian gentleman, faithful to his country, because he is faithful to his God.

No Declaration of War and No American Expeditionary Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

ARTICLE AND TABLE FROM THE NEW YORK SUN

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article and table from the New York Sun:

[From the New York Sun of August 14, 1941]

VOTE ON LONG ARMY SERVICE IS ANALYZED—SLIM ROOSEVELT VICTORY MAY ACT AS BRAKE ON FOREIGN POLICY—IS SEEN AS SIGNIFICANT—SECOND REBUFF BY HOUSE IN 2 DAYS FOLLOWS ACTION ON DRAFT PROPERTY BILL

WASHINGTON, August 14.—The skin-of-the-teeth victory by which the President won an 18-month extension in the term of service of National Guard men and selectees from a reluctant House of Representatives on Tuesday, promised today to act as a brake upon the rapidly accelerating interventionist trend of administration foreign policy.

Twice in the last 2 days the House has flashed the red light of warning squarely in the face of the administration leadership as it passed upon measures vital to the defense program and intimately linked with international policy.

Yesterday it defeated by a majority of 5 to 1 the President's "draft property" bill because a number of restrictions upon the Government, designed to safeguard the rights of individual citizens, were deleted by a conference committee of the two Houses of Congress after the House of Representatives had inserted them in the legislation.

SIGNIFICANT BALLOT

Twenty-four hours earlier an even more ominous warning was flashed when the House passed by the margin of a single vote the bill extending the service of draftees. Widely regarded here as the most significant ballot which has been taken in either branch of Congress this year, the vote on that question has been carefully tabulated and analyzed by administration leaders who find it in grave cause for concern.

No issue which has been presented to the Congress since the outbreak of the European war, probably, has effected a more clear-cut test of isolationist and interventionist sentiment. The administration's entire foreign policy is based on the belief that the United States stands in great peril and must defend itself now by forestalling future attack.

Isolationists on the contrary have contended that the danger envisioned by the President is largely imaginary.

In the test which took place in the House the advantage lay definitely with the interventionist elements. General Marshall, Chief of Staff, had testified that failure to pass the bill would decimate the United States Army and destroy its effectiveness for defense; and there was no one in or out of Congress who successfully disputed that statement.

Every ounce of pressure that could be exerted upon the top-heavy Democratic majority in Congress was applied by the administration, and in spite of all this, disaster was averted by one vote out of a total of 419 which were cast or announced as pairs on the issue.

WAR DECLARATION IMPOSSIBLE

That vote, analyzed by States and major geographical sections, indicates that the Nation today is divided sharply against itself on the major questions of American foreign policy. It indicated conclusively that any attempt by the President to win authority to use American military forces outside the Western Hemisphere would be brusquely rejected in Congress by the representatives of the American people.

Likewise, it revealed that any declaration of war under existing circumstances would be impossible.

As reflected by the congressional vote, the sentiment in 20 of the 48 States today is predominantly isolationist, while 24 States lean toward intervention. Four States divided their vote on the issue equally.

In the isolationist group four States voted solidly against the draft extension. These were Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Idaho. In the interventionist group seven voted solidly in favor of the measure: Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

INTERVENTIONIST STRENGTH

For his victory President Roosevelt must thank the solid South and the Southwest for their all but unanimous support. The South is overwhelmingly interventionist, as is the Southwest. The border States, and, on the Atlantic coast, Maryland and Delaware feel the same way about it.

To the north, where New England touches upon the Canadian border, and where Canadian influence and sympathy is strong, interventionist sentiment likewise predominates, as it does in Japan-conscious California, and in the Pacific Slope States of Nevada and Utah.

Seldom has either branch of Congress shown such disregard of party lines as was shown in the vote on the draft-extension bill. While a substantial majority of Democrats voted for the measure and an even more imposing majority of Republicans voted against it, the evidence indicates conclusively that the membership was motivated rather by sectional than by political interest in recording its decision.

DIVISION IN NEW ENGLAND

Striking example of this is New England, where seven Democrats and seven Republicans favored the bill, while seven Democrats and seven Republicans opposed it.

In New York, which also swung into the isolationist column, Mrs. CAROLINE O'DAY, personal friend of Mrs. Roosevelt and unfailing supporter of the President's policies, was paired against the bill, while such old-line administration supporters as CULLEN, of Brooklyn, likewise deserted the President on the issue. Only three members of Tammany—BLOOM, DICKSTEIN, and KLEIN—voted for the measure.

Most surprising thing about the entire vote, probably, is the fact that north of the Mason and Dixon's line a majority of the members of the President's own party voted against him on the issue.

Most important evidence to be gleaned from the vote, however, is that labor and agriculture are wholeheartedly antagonistic to the administration's foreign policy, as indicated by the fact that in every State where labor is strongly concentrated the congressional membership opposed the draft extension. Every State in the North Central group went against the bill, and in the entire Ohio delegation, for example, only two votes for the measure could be found. In the Western group, primarily agricultural in character, no State went in favor of the bill, and in the North Atlantic section only Maryland and Delaware dissented from the isolationist trend.

REGIONAL SENTIMENT REFLECTED IN HOUSE VOTE ON ARMY SERVICE

WASHINGTON, August 14.—Of the 433 Members now sitting in the House of Representatives, 419 either voted or were paired for or against the bill which extends the military service of selectees for another 18 months.

Cutting across party lines so widely as virtually to erase them, the issue presented is construed in Washington as the most conclusive test of isolationist-versus-interventionist sentiment yet taken in Congress, and the following tabular analysis shows how the members of each party for the seven major geographical sections of the country divided on that issue.

States in each section of the country

	For the bill		Against the bill		
	Democrats	Republicans	Democrats	Republicans	Others
NEW ENGLAND					
Maine	------	2	------	1	------
New Hampshire	------	1	------	------	------
Vermont	------	1	------	------	------
Massachusetts	3	3	3	6	------
Rhode Island	1	------	1	------	------
Connecticut	3	------	3	------	------
Total	7	7	7	7	------
NORTH ATLANTIC					
New York	12	9	11	11	1
New Jersey	2	------	1	8	------
Pennsylvania	10	------	9	14	------
Delaware	1	------	------	------	------
Maryland	4	------	2	------	------
Total	29	9	23	33	1
SOUTH AND BORDER					
Virginia	9	------	------	------	------
North Carolina	11	------	------	------	------
South Carolina	5	------	1	------	------
Georgia	10	------	------	------	------
Florida	4	------	1	------	------
Alabama	9	------	------	------	------
Louisiana	8	------	------	------	------
Mississippi	5	------	------	------	------
Tennessee	7	------	------	2	------
Kentucky	8	------	------	1	------
West Virginia	5	------	1	------	------
Total	81	------	3	3	------
NORTH CENTRAL					
Ohio	2	------	10	12	------
Indiana	1	------	3	8	------
Illinois	8	------	3	16	------
Michigan	2	------	4	11	------
Wisconsin	1	------	------	5	3
Iowa	------	------	1	7	------
Missouri	4	------	5	3	------
Minnesota	------	1	------	6	------
Total	18	1	26	68	3
WEST					
South Dakota	------	------	------	2	------
North Dakota	------	------	------	2	------
Montana	1	------	------	1	------
Nebraska	1	------	1	3	------
Kansas	1	------	------	6	------
Wyoming	------	------	1	------	------
Colorado	2	------	------	2	------
Total	5	------	2	16	------
SOUTHWEST					
New Mexico	1	------	------	------	------
Arizona	1	------	------	------	------
Oklahoma	8	------	------	1	------
Texas	20	------	------	------	------
Arkansas	6	------	1	------	------
Total	36	------	1	1	------
FAR WEST					
Nevada	1	------	------	------	------
Utah	1	------	------	------	------
Idaho	------	------	1	1	------
Washington	2	------	4	------	------
Oregon	1	------	------	2	------
California	8	4	3	4	------
Total	13	4	8	7	------
Grand total	189	21	70	135	4

Recapitulation

Section	For the bill	Against the bill
New England	14	14
North Atlantic	38	57
South and border	81	6
North Central	19	97
West	5	18
Southwest	36	2
Far West	17	15
Total	210	209

I Am Going To Keep Faith With the Draftees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. LOUIS LUDLOW, OF INDIANA

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I gave to the press on July 20, 1941, in regard to the draft extension bill which proposes to hold our draftees in service beyond the agreed 12 months' limit. The statement is as follows:

It pays to be honest. I hope that Congress will remember that honesty is the best policy when it decides whether or not our draftees shall be pressed into service beyond the period of 1 year.

Every man who entered the military service under the Conscription Act did so with the understanding and belief that he would be released at the end of a year unless the United States meanwhile should enter the war. That was the promise generally made to our young men at every drafting and recruiting center in the country, and on that promise they have relied. The compact was that they were to give 1 year of their lives to the service of their country, after which they were to be free to plan their own future. I believe that in good faith and conscience that contract should be recognized and lived up to by our Government. To force them now to remain in the service indefinitely will cut a canyon clear across their lives and will disrupt and becloud their entire future by making it impossible for them to plan for school work, for business and professional connections, for marriage, or for any of the other objectives that normally engage the attention of intelligent and healthy young Americans.

Canada has never required any such sacrifice of its young men. Canada has not even passed a conscription law. The Government and the people of Canada will not stand for conscription, although Canada is deeper in the war than we are and is a member of the British Empire.

Undoubtedly important readjustments will have to be made in our Military Establishment unless the draft is extended, but the entire problem could be solved, I think, by calling for voluntary enlistments. Some of the young men like the Army, and they have no commitments or prospects in private life that would prevent them from continuing in service on a voluntary basis, and I believe there would be more than enough volunteers to take the places of those who would drop out. Our militarists do not want volunteers. They want a conscripted army, but Congress, representing the people, has not only the right but the duty to make this decision.

The Government made a moral, if not a legal, contract with the boys under the terms of which they would be in the Army only for a year. From the standpoint of the Government itself this contract should be sacredly kept, for a boy who has a feeling that his Government has lied to him will never be as good a soldier as if he had confidence in his Government's good faith.

The whole issue, it seems to me, resolves itself into a question of honesty, just plain, common honesty. Brushing aside all of the cobwebs the fact remains that the boys were told that they would be in the Army only for a year, and they implicitly believed that promise would be kept. As far as I am concerned, speaking as one Member of Congress, I am going to be honest with them. I am going to keep faith with them.

Labor Opposes St. Lawrence Waterway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the unqualified opposition to the ratification of the agreement between the United States and Canada for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project by the many thousands of organized workers, whose interests will be adversely affected should the project be completed, was forcibly set forth in the testimony of labor spokesmen during the hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. So that there may be no doubt in the minds of the Members of the House as to the unequivocal position taken by these labor leaders, I call attention to the following excerpts from the testimony:

Mr. John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, representing 600,000 workers in the anthracite and bituminous coal fields, said in part:

Properly and thoroughly unmasked, the St. Lawrence project will not stand the light of a penetrating examination. * * * The stupidity of Government agency propaganda in support of the project and the method of presentment is almost unbelievable. * * * The new dress of defense necessity is calculated to lift the proposal from the mire of the monstrous and uneconomic and make those who know better, accept it as an essential arm of national defense.

The United Mine Workers do not propose to be taken in by political pitchmen operating under the cloak of defense needs. We do not believe that the coal industry should be singled out and penalized by foolhardy and unnecessary economic competition fostered by either the Federal or State governments and financed without warrant from the scant ready money held by the taxpayers of the Nation. * * *

Deepening of the St. Lawrence channel cannot possibly help American coal in lowered transportation costs. It will help foreign coal delivered to additional Canadian ports and save connecting rail hauls. * * * The St. Lawrence waterway will be an invitation and new peril in the barter game of other countries to unload whatever they have for whatever price or trade arrangement that can be negotiated in order to maintain exchange money and rates. Let us not mistake this certainty. * * * This waterway will touch the principal coal markets of the United States where the bulk of our coal production lies and has its outlet. * * * We have no import duties on coal in the United States. About 95,000,000 tons of American coal

touches those waters, the St. Lawrence area, and that is a market of tremendous value to any foreign country or countries that want to come into it, and the seaway would make it possible for the entire market to be taken away for the dumping of foreign coal. * * * So here is the mining industry of the United States being stripped naked in the economic coal market of the world by this proposal because a tramp steamer can come into Buffalo, Cleveland, Chicago, and dump coal at any price under the Government's subsidized barter system.

Mr. Thomas Kennedy, international secretary-treasurer of the United Mine Workers of America, stressing the disastrously distressing effect that the project would have on the miners engaged in the production of anthracite coal, stated:

Reduced to figures which the average layman may grasp, it, the St. Lawrence project, will mean the loss of something approximating 3,000,000 man-days of production in the anthracite industry. It is a loss which the people, the industry, and business interests in this section of our country cannot afford to lose. * * *

Development of the St. Lawrence seaway is only going to mean the end of our Canadian business. * * * If the St. Lawrence is made navigable to ocean liners, it just means we will lose this business completely, because foreign coals will come right into our back yard and undersell our American products. * * *

These foreign coals coming into the head of the Great Lakes through the St. Lawrence would not only ruin our Canadian business but would be a distinct menace to our American markets along the southern border of the St. Lawrence River.

Mr. J. G. Luhrsen, executive secretary of the Railway Labor Executives Association, speaking on behalf of the members of the 20 standard railway labor organizations, said:

We know that this waterway project will divert business from the rails in very substantial tonnage, so that railroad employees will be deprived of thousands of positions and without a livelihood to follow in any substitute vocation. * * *

We, of course, are certain that all such exports and imports as go through the ports of New York or Philadelphia get a substantial rail haul. If you construct this St Lawrence waterway, the vast majority of the rail haul will be lost to this new waterway. * * * There can be but one wholesome national answer to the St. Lawrence waterway project and that is that it should and ought to be voted down. It has every element of preponderance of evil rather than good for the American people as a whole. It will concentrate and centralize and defeat the avenue of decentralization when the emergency is over. * * * It will harm one of the most important arms of inland national defense we have today * * * the railroads. It will curtail, rather than increase, employment. * * * It will give every advantage to foreign vessels. * * * It adds to the danger of attack. * * * It does everyeverything that can possibly be imagined to make more vulnerable all of our national defense.

The following excerpts are also taken from the hearings:

W. D. Johnson, vice president and national legislative representative, Order of Railway Conductors:

Railway employees have pledged to the President their unqualified support in carrying forward our national-defense program. Railway employees can be depended upon to make their pledge good in every respect. Our opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project supports that pledge, because it is our honest judgment that the manpower that will be required and the several hundred million dollars necessary to carry on the improvement work can be and should be converted to a more profitable program of production of national-defense material that could be made available for effective service before the work on the St. Lawrence project could be started.

John T. Corbett, national legislative representative and assistant grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers:

This brotherhood has contracts with all railroads of the United States and Canada. * * * Railroad labor has been reduced nearly half during the last 20 years. Construction of this proposed waterway must result in diversion of transportation now handled by the railroads and additional loss of jobs to additional railroad employees. The attention of the committee is called to the fact that the estimate of costs of the project fails to express any definite estimates of the loss of positions that citizens of the United States must suffer. These surely are costs that railroad employees must pay for through unemployment and less desirable working conditions. * * * It is the position of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers that there is no present necessity for this project, and remarks made by officers of the Government indicated their hesitancy in expressing the statement that the project was either a necessity or vital for national-defense purposes.

S. C. Lush, deputy president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen:

This organization has a membership of 157,000 in the United States and Canada, of workers engaged in train, yard, and dining-car service upon the railroads of the two countries. If the deepening of this channel is not necessary for defense, and we do not believe it is, American labor, particularly labor engaged in railroad transportation, is a victim of attack in this bill authorizing construction of the St. Lawrence waterway project. * * * It is a subsidy to water transportation which will bring about reduction in hours of railroad workers and workers in allied industries. * * * The discriminatory character of the project will require labor in all sections of the country to contribute to the tax levy constituting the subsidy. The extent to which railroad labor is required to finance this tax burden will in effect cause it to contribute to the reduction of man-hours of employment and reduction of wages in the railroad industry. * * * Our Government has thus far subsidized inland waterways amounting to approximately $2,176,000,000. * * * If we add an additional half billion dollars or more to such subsidies to the St. Lawrence project, it will be done at the expense of labor and taxation, loss of employment, and reduced earning capacity.

J. A. Nesbitt, secretary, International Railway Association, an organization composed of employees who have retired under the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act:

Today we are faced with another threatening arm of heavily subsidized waterway improvement, reaching out to divert even to a greater and more alarming degree, what is left of value to the railroad mode of transportation through the proposed improvement of the St. Lawrence basin. * * * Railroad employees are much disturbed over the diversion of the enormous tonnage of traffic from land transportation through the seaway, thereby reducing employment pay rolls, purchasing power, and revenues of the railroads and endangering the future status of the vast army of retired railroad employees.

Mr. John R. Owens, secretary-treasurer of the International Longshoremen's Association, an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor, representing organized workers on the water fronts of our ocean, gulf, and lake ports, appeared in opposition to the bill accompanied by four union officials representing longshoremen of the New York Harbor district. These men pointed out in clear and forcible statements the immeasurable harm that the completion of the waterway would do to maritime labor in our Atlantic and Gulf ports; stressing the baneful effect that the diversion of traffic from existing ports to the waterway would have upon the maritime industry and its employees.

During the course of the hearings representatives of union longshoremen, employed in the Great Lakes district, representatives of the organized grain shovelers union and of the tugboat employees, appeared in opposition to the measure.

One of these witnesses, Mr. August A. Wolf, president of the Tug Firemen and Linemen, said:

We are opposing the St. Lawrence seaway, and so went on record during our convention at Detroit, starting March 11 of this year. On the various trips I have made from one port to another, I found opposition to this seaway construction quite definite among those engaged in marine work. Not only will it harm the tugmen, but all Great Lakes sailors who now make their livelihood sailing on the Great Lakes who will be replaced by foreign sailors. This should have a direct effect on the tugmen who, after following this line of business for years, will find their activities cut in half. * * * As a representative of labor, I voice my objections to this plan, not only because it is detrimental to the men in my particular union, but because on my trips through the Great Lakes area, covering almost every port, I found no general sentiment in favor of this project.

So far as labor's attitude concerning the St. Lawrence project is concerned and as reflected by what transpired during the course of the hearings on the bill, it may be properly and truthfully stated that organized labor is overwhelmingly against the St. Lawrence project.

Extension of Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore Sun of Monday, August 11:

[From the Baltimore Sun of August 11, 1941]

COMPLETE THE TRAINING

Among the Members of the House who oppose the bill to extend the period of military

service are some who would count the noses of pressure groups in any emergency and would vote with an eye single to political safety. Some others are so ruled by political passion as to be blind to reason. But others opposed to the bill, or hesitant over it, are decent men disturbed by the sacrifice required of the soldiers who will be kept in the service for a longer period.

These decent men among Members who oppose or who hesitate ought to put to themselves one solemn question: Can any sacrifice required of the young men of America be more serious, more terrible, than to send them into modern war untrained to protect themselves, or only half-trained? It would be superfluous to restate the nature of mechanized war. Everyone knows. It would be superfluous to restate the art and science now employed in war, or the striking power and the killing power of new weapons. Everyone knows. It must be obvious to the dullest mind that untrained or half-trained men will be slaughtered in battle. Can the Congress exact any sacrifice of American youth equal to that?

There is no doubt that to extend the service of young men now in uniform or to be put into uniform will, in many cases, involve hardship upon them and upon their parents. The original induction in many cases involved hardship. But Hitler has made hardship the lot of all men. We do not have choice between ease and hardship. We have choice between different kinds of hardship. In this case the choice is simply stated. Do the people, do the Members of Congress, prefer that our sons shall have the hardship of an extension of service which will permit them to be thoroughly trained Or do the people, the Members of Congress prefer to risk the ultimate, terrible hardship of unnecessary slaughter of our sons?

Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, has clearly illuminated the whole question in his testimony before the House Committee on Military Affairs. At one place in that testimony he said:

"We have had some tragic examples in our history of good men, sound men, being involved in humiliating reactions on the battlefield and the very same men performing magnificently at a later date, when they had been thoroughly organized and trained. We had such situations in the Civil War. In fact, most of the Union Army ran into the arms of Congress, I think, after the first battle of Bull Run. And yet later on those same men did some of the heaviest fighting and took the heaviest punishment in the history of the world. But it took years to develop that state of discipline."

Into that professional military testimony must be read the human elements with which decent Members of the House are concerned. Those armies of the past not only failed when fighting as untrained men and succeeded after being trained. They also left in their graves great numbers of men whose lives might have been spared had the training been given before, and not after, initial battles. If that was so in the relatively simple military operations of the past, no great imagination, only simple common sense, is necessary to foreshadow the horrors which will follow the use of untrained or half-trained men against trained armies of today possessed of modern weapons of death and destruction.

Responsible men cannot take refuge in the assertion that there is no real danger that our Army will be engaged in battle. There is danger. An overwhelming preponderance of opinion in the country has declared that there is danger. What else is the meaning of the whole vast armament program which is quickly revolutionizing the social and economic life of the Nation? What else is the meaning of the great lease-lend program? What else is the meaning of the unprecedented enactment of compulsory service in peacetime—an enactment which no one seriously proposes to repeal?

There is danger that the men in our Army will be engaged in battle. While that danger stands before our eyes, it will be a sin against American youth to fail in any steps which will assure their thorough training to engage in battle on even terms. It will be a sin against American youth to ease the hardship of extended training and expose them to the vastly worse hardship—the horror—of battle without adequate training. It will be a sin against the youth who are now directly affected by the proposed legislation, for in emergency they may have to return to the ranks only half trained. It will be a sin against their present comrades in arms, for they will be left to face the future with depleted and enfeebled units. It will be a sin against the youth who are yet to be called, for they will begin their service, in this time of danger, in a weakened and unprepared Army.

To the decent men in the House who oppose this bill of extension, or who hesitate, we say: Think solemnly of your responsibility. For every boy whom you relieve of the hardship of extended service, you may consign another boy to unnecessary slaughter on some field of battle where he will face a trained foe.

Denver's Public Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, citizens of Denver take great satisfaction and considerable modest pride in our public library, which for 17 years has been under the able direction of its librarian, Dr. Malcolm G. Wyer. With its 13 branches in all parts of the city, the library has greatly extended its usefulness by making easily accessible to citizens in all parts of Denver and to visiting students its rich and extensive collection of books, periodicals, and documents.

In addition to the general collection such as is found in every first-class library of the larger American cities, the Denver Public Library has large and constantly growing collections on specialized subjects, notably on western history, especially the history of Colorado, and on many technical subjects. As our people, old and young, are distinctly air-minded, and as we have in Denver, Lowry Field, one of the United States Army's large Air Corps technical schools, there has arisen of late years an ever-increasing demand by citizens, and especially by students at Lowry Field for popular and technical works on aeronautics. This demand has been met by a noteworthy collection on aeronautical subjects.

The following article, printed in a recent edition of Denver, the publication of the Denver Chamber of Commerce, is pertinent:

DENVER HAS FAMED TECHNICAL LIBRARY

Within the Denver Public Library functions the unique science and engineering department known as the engineers' library which is the largest technical library between Chicago and the Pacific coast. It is famed throughout the United States and has been described by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology as the best practical technical library in the country.

The technical library is of such excellence that at least one engineer is known to have made his residence in Denver in order to have access to it. Another engineer came from New York City to devote 10 days in research on metals and metallurgy.

The engineers' library is made possible through the cooperation of the State board of engineers and land surveyors, Colorado Scientific Society, and the Denver Public Library. It had its inception when the Colorado Engineering Council, composed of delegates from 14 engineering and scientific societies, sponsored legislation authorizing the State board to appropriate library funds from fees. The engineers' library is in charge of Miss Margery Bedinger, chief, science and engineering department, Denver Public Library.

National recognition has been extended to this library unit as an aid in defense work. Its coverage of aeronautical subjects is especially complete. An outstanding aeronautical collection from England was recently acquired. It consists of 1,400 items in 7 languages and dates from the year 1600. Modern books on aeronautical subjects are being continuously added. These are used extensively by soldiers from Lowry Field, and through cooperation with the Civil Aeronautics Board a deposit station has been established at the municipal airport.

Technical subjects also include photography, which is covered by the best books and magazines on the subject.

The library works closely with the Bureau of Reclamation, which maintains field headquarters in Denver, and with other Government technical units. Lists of new books are sent every 3 months to members of the Colorado Scientific Society, Colorado Engineering Council, and the Colorado section of the American Institute of Architects. The library serves the entire State of Colorado in the technical field.

Sudden impetus in use of the engineers' library sometimes gives an inkling that something is about to happen. Such was the case in 1939, when many strangers to Denver used the library for reference on mining and metals. Within 1 or 2 months World War No. 2 started.

Extension of Military Training—Money Spent in Defense Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker—

In the close vote on the draft bill—

According to Representative Cox, Democrat, of Georgia—

is to be found that deep truth which most refuse to write, that there is a lack of confidence in too many of those who have been appointed to conduct public affairs. The people of this country are beginning to resent what they believe to be the fact that their Government has, in large part, been taken away from them and delivered into the keeping of an alien and alien-minded group, wholly unfit for the work they have been assigned to

do and for the office to which they have been appointed.

The draft-extension bill as passed by the House extends the period of service of all Army men by 18 months. It provides an increase in the basic pay of all men in the Army, except commissioned officers, by $10 for each month they serve beyond 1 year. The bill further provides that the 18 months' additional service shall be credited against the 10 years draftees are required to serve as members of the Reserve forces. The House version of the bill also requires the Secretary of War to discharge those men whose continued service would result in hardship to them or their families, but the discretion as to whether or not individuals come within this hardship rule is left to the Department.

The bill passed the House by a slim majority of one vote. Press reports of the fight on the floor of the House cannot possibly give a true picture of all of the pressure that was exerted behind the scenes. The changes made in the bill were accepted by the Senate, thus it was possible to avoid another vote in the House such as would have followed had the different versions of the House and the Senate bills gone to a joint conference.

Some of the most belligerent ones have referred to the opposition to the draft-extension bill as political. On that point, the three best-informed men in America today on conditions in Europe are united in their opinion that this country should not become an active participant in the European war. They are Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Great Britain; John Cudahy, former Ambassador to Belgium; and even William C. Bullitt, former Ambassador to France.

These three great Americans are outstanding members of the Democratic Party. They were personally selected by President Roosevelt to represent our Government in these respective countries and to keep us informed of happenings there. Certainly no one in our country today is better informed nor has a wider experience from which to speak on this question of our entrance into the war.

Their experiences do not depend upon hearsay. They have watched the changing scene with their own eyes. They did not visit Europe with a passport in one hand and a lunch basket in the other and then hurry back home to pose as experts on international affairs.

Do we understand the implications of the tremendous sums of money being poured into the defense effort? All of us favor a strong national defense, second to none; but, at the same time, we must realize that there will be a day of reckoning. Expenditures of nondefense items should be pared to the bone and waste and extravagance in the defense program itself should not be countenanced.

The public debt passed the $50,000,000,000 mark this week and the pending tax bill is still expected to leave us with a deficit of some ten billion dollars for the current fiscal year. I am enclosing herewith a most interesting compilation of figures touching upon the subject of national expenditures and national debt. I hope you will find time to give them careful consideration and seriously consider the implications of this present-day program.

The following table shows total Federal appropriations and authorizations for the 2 fiscal years, 1941 and 1942—a total of $67,559,885,510. The compilation includes all Presidential recommendations before Congress as of August 1, 1941. Complete details on these appropriations and authorizations may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 24, 1941, page 6298 et seq.:

Department	Fiscal year— Ended June 30, 1941	Ending June 30, 1942
Army	$13,283,577,072	$11,987,179,831
Navy	4,466,286,457	[1] 12,391,918,072
Other national defense	1,336,671,908	2,460,970,250
Total defense	19,086,535,437	26,840,068,153
Lend-lease fund		7,000,000,000
Civil functions	7,487,971,964	7,145,309,956
Total, all Federal	26,574,507,401	40,985,378,109
Grand total for 2 years	$67,559,885,510	

RECAPITULATION

Cash expenditures for—	
Fiscal year 1941	$12,710,000,000
Fiscal year 1942 to date	1,000,000,000
Civil functions, balance, fiscal year 1942	6,500,000,000
Defense contract commitments unpaid	23,684,585,982
Defense authorizations still to be contracted	[1] 23,065,299,528
Total	67,559,885,510
Average annual Federal expenditures, 7 years (1927–33)	4,057,000,000
Average annual deficit, 7 years (1927–33)	657,000,000
Average annual Federal expenditures, 7 years (1934–40)	7,843,000,000
Average annual deficit, 7 years (1934–40)	3,457,000,000
Annual deficit for fiscal year ended June 30, 1941	5,103,000,000
National debt, July 1, 1941 ($371.21 per capita)	48,961,487,962
Budgeted deficit, fiscal year 1942	10,900,000,000
Estimated debt, as of July 1, 1942 ($454.25 per capita)	59,861,487,962
National debt, June 30, 1933 ($179.21 per capita)	22,538,672,164

[1] These items include, between them, $8,095,173,256 in appropriations and authorizations for the fiscal year 1942 still in various phases of the legislative process; plus $7,297,000,000 needed after 1942 to complete the 2-ocean Navy and other long-term defense projects as now authorized.

[2] Does not include annual average of $670,000,000 postal expenditures paid directly from postal receipts.

The House Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that the Senate has acted upon the House amendments to the service-extension bill, same having been agreed to by a vote of 35 to 19. By this action it will not be necessary for the bill to go to conference and will be transmitted directly to the President for signature. In that connection I desire to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial appearing in today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune, a Republican newspaper, and which I have only hurriedly glanced over, which expresses the opinion that in times like these the press of the country cannot help but approve the action of Congress in taking steps to strengthen our defense. The editorial reads:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of August 14, 1941]

THE HOUSE VOTES

The House, like the Senate, has recognized the gravity of the international situation. It has performed its plain, if arduous and unpleasant, duty of voting to extend the inadequate 1-year service term; and the country will not have to face the disbandment of its new Army—still only half-trained, and on which colossal amounts of energy, time, and money are being invested—just as the desperate issues which led to its creation are reaching their most critical months. The main point has been happily carried. But it would be quite useless to deny that the extreme narrowness of the vote has seriously diminished the value of the action. All around the world it can only be read as a sign of disunity, political factionalism, frivolous inability in the United States to face and understand the hard conditions of contemporary international life.

This vote was certainly rendering no service to the young men whose term of duty is to be extended. At a time when it has been demonstrated over and over again that the best security is in strength, this is creating an appearance of weakness, the only effect of which will be to invite the very dangers that may summon these young men to battle. The appearance is doubtless deceptive. The much larger majorities obtained by the proponents of the bill on the earlier test votes, which were not a matter of record, strongly suggest that many Members, on the final vote, were not recording their convictions but, assuming that the bill would pass anyway, were trying to play politics.

Unfortunately one cannot rely on the general staffs in Berlin and Tokyo, the hard-pressed people in Britain, or the Latin Americans who are seeking to gage our strength, to grasp such nuances of the American political scene. And one can only ask again, quite soberly, whether there is a sufficient realization in Washington and elsewhere of just how grave the international situation really is or of what bad politics it may prove to be to attempt to play politics with it—or in any other way to take a passive, narrow and short-range view of problems that are quite certain, however they may be answered, to be decisive for the history of the United States, as of the rest of the world, over a very long time to come. Many people in the United States in recent times have been obsessed with the dangers of action, of a positive stand, of doing anything that may lead to war. How many of them have considered the dangers of inaction, of a negative stand, of doing nothing, even if the inaction leads not only to war but to defeat? How many of them, in reading Marshal Petain's abject and extraordinary confession of utter helplessness and defeat, have realized that here is nothing else than the end product of partisan politics, of inaction, of obstruction, of doing nothing that may lead to war or anything else?

This newspaper does not believe that any such document will ever come from a head of the American State. It does not believe

that the United States has frittered its strength away in fear and partisan narrowness and division; it does not believe that this country will ever do so. It is concerned for those, of whatever group or whatever the party they profess to represent, who risk by shortsightedness the terrible retribution which the people of this country would bring down on anyone who sought to lead them with obstruction, inertia, and timidity into such an irremediable disaster as has overtaken France and the other subject peoples of Europe.

Hon. Elmer L. Irey and Intelligence Division Praised by Secretary Morgenthau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1941

PRESS RELEASE OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions I have called attention to the House and to the people of the country of the work performed by the Division of Intelligence of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. This outstanding Government agency brings into the Treasury of the United States, on an average, 30 times as much additional revenue annually as it costs to operate the Division. Every day its personnel is active, either in the field or in prosecuting income-tax evaders in the Federal courts. So outstanding was a recent case that the Secretary of the Treasury took it upon himself to write a personal letter to Hon. Elmer L. Irey, Chief of this Division.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, especially during this period when so many critical statements are made in reference to the administration and to those who are in charge of our various Government agencies, that the release from the Treasury Department together with a report of the Treasury letter should be printed in the RECORD, and under the permission granted me I include them as part of my remarks. They follow:

Commending the Intelligence Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue on the successful conclusion of its case against Enoch L. "Nucky" Johnson, Atlantic City political leader, Secretary Morgenthau today directed letters of appreciation to Elmer L. Irey, Chief of the Unit and coordinator of the law enforcement agencies of the Treasury, to Guy T. Helvering, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and to Francis Biddle, Acting Attorney General.

Johnson last Friday was sentenced to a 10-year prison term and fined $20,000 after a Camden, N. J., Federal jury found him guilty of evading income-tax payments for 1936 and 1937.

"Culmination of the Johnson case," Secretary Morgenthau wrote Chief Irey, "in a period of heavy armament expenditures will, it seems to me, cause the public generally to regard even more seriously than they have heretofore the offense of the individual who attempts to evade payment of his full share of the cost of Government. It is for that reason that I believe the successful prosecution of the charges in this indictment is an important contribution to national unity and good government. We have no time today for shirkers, and good citizens are likely to have little patience with those who want to share the privilege of citizenship without meeting the responsibilities that go with that privilege."

The Atlantic City boss was found guilty of cheating the Government in 1936 and 1937 of $38,707.40 in income taxes. In addition to the prison term and the fine, he faces a fraud penalty of 50 percent of the taxes he was found guilty of evading. For 20 years Johnson held sway over politics and rackets in his domain, much the same as Thomas Pendergast had done at Kansas City, Mo., before his income-tax evasions came to light.

"In addition to a number of rackets, including gambling, vice, and horse-race betting, corruption in city and county contracting also contributed to the income on which the defendant failed to pay a Federal tax," Mr. Morgenthau's letter concluded. "In the series of cases stemming from this investigation 37 other persons already have been convicted on various charges. As a byproduct of your 4-year effort to carry out your own responsibility, therefore, you should be pleased that you have benefited local government in another community of the United States."

Promotions to Special Agent William E. Frank, of New York City, who supervised the investigation; and to Special Agents Paul F. Snyder, Boston; Edward A. Hill, Philadelphia; and John C. Cheasty, New York City, who participated, have been ordered.

The text of the Secretary's letter to Chief Irey follows:

AUGUST 5, 1941.

DEAR ELMER: The successful termination of the difficult investigation into violations of the income-tax laws by Enoch L. Johnson, of Atlantic City, prompts me to tell you again of my gratification and pride in the perseverance and painstaking efforts in this case of the intelligence unit and of coworkers in the income-tax unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

I want you especially to know that, in these days when all of us must give our first thoughts to the requirements of the national defense, we are not overlooking the day-to-day fulfillment of assignments which might seem more noteworthy in calmer times. Culmination of the Johnson case in a period of heavy armament expenditures will, it seems to me, cause the public generally to regard even more seriously than they have heretofore the offense of the individual who attempts to evade payment of his full share of the cost of Government. It is for that reason that I believe the successful prosecution of the charges in this indictment is an important contribution to national unity and good government. We have no time today for shirkers, and good citizens are likely to have little patience with those who want to share the privilege of citizenship without meeting the responsibilities that go with that privilege.

I shall appreciate it if you will express my congratulations and thanks to Special Agent William E. Frank, of New York, who had immediate supervision of the investigation, and to Special Agents Paul F. Snyder, of Boston, Edward A. Hill, of Philadelphia, and John C. Cheasty, of New York, the latter two of whom have been called to active duty in the military service.

I should also like to congratulate and commend the two revenue agents of the income tax unit, Walter Boxon, Jr., and John F. Williams, of Newark, and the several agents of the alcohol tax unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue who aided you in this investigation. Such teamwork is an additional excellent example of the value derived from coordination of the Treasury's enforcement activities, which we began together more than 7 years ago.

The ability of your men to cooperate effectively with other departments of the Government is reflected in their relations during the investigation and trial with Attorney Joseph W. Burns, of the Tax Division of the Department of Justice, who served as a special assistant to the Attorney General and as chief Government counsel. All of us are indebted to him for his share in the effort that came to a conclusion with the imposition of sentence on August 1.

In addition to a number of rackets, including gambling, vice, and horse-race betting, corruption in city and county contracting also contributed to the income on which the defendant failed to pay a Federal tax. In the series of cases stemming from this investigation, 37 other persons already have been convicted on various charges. As a by-product of your 4-year effort to carry out your own responsibility, therefore, you should be pleased that you have benefited local government in another community of the United States.

Sincerely,

HENRY MORGENTHAU, JR.,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Open Letter to the President on Entrance of the United States in European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT BY ALFRED J. LINK, LAPORTE, IND.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an open letter from a constituent, a distinguished lawyer and jurist, Alfred J. Link, of LaPorte, Ind., to the Chief Executive:

JUNE 4, 1941.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

SIR: This is an open letter from a citizen of the United States of America to his President.

On October 23, 1940, I heard you over the radio. This is what you said:

"We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conflict or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party; we will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack.

"It is for peace that I have labored, and it is for peace that I shall labor all the days of my life."

On October 30, 1940, I again heard you over the radio. This is what you said then:

"The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war.

"And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

"They are going into training to form a force so strong that by its very existence it will keep the threat of war far away from our

shores. Yes, the purpose of our defense is defense."

On November 1, 1940, I heard you again over the radio. This is what you said:

"I am fighting to keep this Nation prosperous and at peace. I am fighting to keep our people out of foreign wars and to keep foreign conceptions of government out of our own United States."

Mr. President, you made those promises to me, to my wife, to my daughter, and to my three sons.

You made those promises to millions of other American fathers, mothers, sons, and daughters. They believed your promises, as you asked them to do. They voted for you, as you wanted them to do. They re-elected you, because you promised them defense and peace.

Mr. President, we have not been attacked. If you will honestly and realistically devote yourself to our own defense, no enemy will attack us; no enemy would dare to attack us; and no combination of enemies could defeat us.

If you send our planes, or ships, or men, into foreign danger zones to commit unneutral acts, you will invite, yes, you will provoke, attack. You will be leading and taking us into the very war which you promised to keep from us. You will not be keeping your word; you will be breaking your promises.

Mr. President, you made your promises freely and clearly, without conditions or reservations. Millions of American citizens heard what you said. They understood what you said. The vast majority of them believed what you said.

Mr. President, there were and there are American citizens who heard and understood your promises, but did not believe them. They said that you did not intend to keep your promises when you made them, and that you made them with intent to deceive your fellow countrymen; that previously you had made secret commitments to foreign nations and that these secret commitments conflicted with your public promises to the citizens of your own country. These same people say now that your conduct of this Nation's affairs justifies their lack of faith in your promises.

Your conduct and decisions within the very near future will determine whether the faith and confidence of the majority, or the mistrust and disbelief of the minority, were justified.

I cannot reconcile the promises you made to me and to my family in the fall of 1940 with the policies outlined in your radio address of May 28, 1941.

Will you keep the faith with those millions who heard and understood you in October and November of 1940, who believed what you said then, and who relied and acted upon your promises?

They expect you to keep your word.

Respectfully yours,

ALFRED J. LINK.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK SUN

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Sun of August 12, 1941:

[From the New York Sun of August 12, 1941]

THE GAZETTE WAS RIGHT

It is painful to have to record that our esteemed neighbor, the Montreal Gazette, was justified in some of the doubt it expressed on July 18 about that little junket of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of our House of Representatives. Members of this committee went to Canada to look over some of the territory affected by the proposed St. Lawrence seaway scheme. Although it felt that "presumably" the visitors had come with more or less open mind, the Gazette went on to say:

"It is unlikely that the committee will find itself in a better position to judge between the arguments of promoters of the waterway and those of the opponents merely by looking at the flowing water, but the splendid spectacle which the St. Lawrence affords should give them a more accurate idea of the magnitude and the ultimate cost of the project than they have been able to obtain in Washington. This should be some help in determining whether the work ought to be undertaken in time of war or deferred until a period when it will not interfere with the winning of the war."

Fancy beholds an editorial finger hovering over that word "should," in uncertainty whether to italicize it or not. The visit should have afforded the help mentioned, but apparently it did not. Politeness stayed the editorial hand, but politeness did not keep it from writing a suggestion that the committee would be much better off if it were not certain to be "shepherded" in such manner that its members would fail to come into contact "with those leading Canadian engineers, transportation experts, economists, and businessmen who are convinced that the seaway cannot be made to serve its intended purpose, who regard the navigation facilities and power development as unnecessary and, therefore, unnecessarily costly, and who see in the project a very serious diversion of men and materials from this country's war effort and from the United States defense program." What the committee ultimately decided is now history. It is to plump this project and the Florida ship canal project into a general pork-barrel rivers and harbors authorization bill.

Government Control of Monetary System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL MONEY LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to request granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks the following letter from the Constitutional Money League of America, written by the president of the St. Petersburg chapter:

CONSTITUTIONAL MONEY
LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
St. Petersburg, Fla., December 28, 1940.

Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PETERSON: The country faces a situation today similar to that which existed in the early days of the Civil War. Except for the fact that we are not as yet actually at war, we have the same war expenditures to meet proportionately. To meet these expenditures Congress has the same constitutional resources as President Lincoln had—to issue Treasury notes.

The time is ripe for a change in our monetary system from private to Government control. Conditions within the country are favorable to create an informed public mind, such as Lincoln did not have and could not get.

We realize that the National Bank Act of 1863 and later, the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, legalized the use of national credit by a favored few and this has created complications in our national economy. To quote the elder Morgan: "You can't unscramble eggs"—but the Congress can prevent more eggs from being scrambled.

On March 4, 1933, the President uttered inspiring words: "The money changers have fled from their high seats in the temple of our civilization. We may now restore the temple to the ancient truths." Since then he has proved the sincerity of his purpose. All of the New Deal measures in the public interest prove it. His recall of the delegates from the London Monetary Conference and his historic message of July 4, 1933, serving notice on the gold bloc of Europe of the independence of the United States and of our intention to establish an honest dollar, ranks with the other Fourth of July declaration. That date was well chosen and full of meaning. Hence the Roosevelt hate. That hate, based as it is on public ignorance of the monetary situation, has been carefully fostered. Such words as inflation, fiat money, reckless spending, and vast public debt have been given a wrong meaning in the public mind. It is opportune now to enlighten the public. The people should right now be told the truth about money. This the President can do as no one else can. The people trust him.

When he does this the public will be enlightened overnight. Such pressure will then be brought to bear that Congress will have to pass such legislation as may be proposed. This can well be: Issue United States money debt-free at the source, sufficient to cover Government spending in excess of revenue. Government control is the only safe control.

The deliberate measures of the Federal Reserve System in 1920, followed by their measures in 1929–33, inflicted greater suffering, misery, and loss upon the people than resulted in our participation in World War No. 1. Recovery, so well on its way in 1936, was deliberately sabotaged by the Board in the fall of 1936 and 1937.

Give the facts to the country.

The great among our Presidents have all advocated Government control—Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson. We believe that the President has been steadfastly working toward this end. We believe the time is now to "restore the temple to the ancient truth" by giving back to the people control of credit and currency free from usury.

In the language of Senator Owen, "Permanent prosperity depends upon an adequate supply of money issued under the authority of Congress and regulated by legislative mandate." When our Government has done this it will have lighted the torch of liberty for all the nations. Prosperity and usury can never go hand in hand.

In conclusion, we desire to thank you for your interest and to assure you we shall appreciate in full measure your further

cooperation. This is a copy of the letter we sent to the President on December 2, 1940.

Cordially,

M. YOWELL,
President, Constitutional Money League of Florida.

Extension of Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Congress will do something gravely wrong if it passes this bill to hold the selectees and the National Guard in training more than a year, as was provided for in the Selective Service Act of September 1940.

This, in my opinion, will be breaking one of the most sacred pledges any government can enter into. A contract by a government with the people and the soldiers which involves the forthright and unequivocable agreement to draft into the army men for training only, and for a specified time, should be kept inviolate.

Our Government made a promise to our soldiers a year ago that they were being sent into military camps for 1 year. I will never vote to break this promise, particularly when we are no nearer a conflict in our hemisphere than we were when the promise was made.

Preparation for Peace Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE UNITED STATES BAPTIST

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from the United States Baptist:

[From the United States Baptist]

Action by our recent conventions in adopting resolutions looking to a study of peace plans which will result in a just and righteous and lasting peace after the conclusion of the present war, was of more than passing significance. It was recognized that such a peace must be based on Christian principles and ideals.

The southern Baptist convention in its session at Birmingham appointed the officers of the convention as a special committee to "lend itself to the advancement of such Christian ideals as would lead to the establishment and maintenance of a just and righteous peace"; while the northern convention, meeting at Wichita, expressing its disapproval of totalitarianism declared that "the principles and spirit of Jesus form the foundation on which any just and lasting peace must rest," and recommended cooperation with other religious bodies in studying various proposals for a just and enduring peace.

There must be preparation for peace, just as there has been preparation for war. Not only must there be deep and thoughtful study of the measures which should be adopted in the international agreements to be reached on the conclusion of the war. There must also be the creation of a widespread public sentiment in favor of just and lasting measures, and this public sentiment must be impressed upon the minds of those who will be responsible for drafting the peace treaties. If these terms are not based in their fundamental concepts on the eternally grounded principles of truth and justice and fair dealing as taught by Christ, there will be no lasting peace.

It is essential, therefore, that Christian bodies begin to make their voices heard now. It is vitally important to the future welfare of the world that Christian forces make known their belief that any peace which is to be enduring must be based on Christian ideals. They must study the problems involved in the numerous and complicated issues which will be discussed at the council table on the conclusion of the war; and they must make their views known. Christian forces must have a part in this settlement.

Here is presented a great challenge and a great opportunity. It is a challenge to our courage and our faith: an opportunity to perform one of the greatest services for the cause of Christianity and the future good of man that has ever been presented to us.

If the Christians of this Nation, uniting with Christians of other lands, succeed in making their voices and their influence felt to the extent of bringing into being peace terms that will be "just and righteous," peace terms that will be based not merely on selfish and mundane national considerations but on the unselfish and charitable principles of Christianity as revealed in the teachings of Christ, they will have accomplished something for which all "future generations will rise and call them blessed."

It may be said that it is too early as yet to consider what peace terms may be adopted after the war, and that it is impossible now to foresee what conditions may prevail when the time comes for final discussion of these terms. It is true that these future events are not entirely clear. Nevertheless it is our duty as Christians to make a thorough study and analysis of the many problems with their ramifications and connotations which will be presented to the statesmen and the leaders of the nations when they sit down at the conference table at the close of the war, prepared to draft terms by which the future destinies of nations and of peoples will be guided. In this conference the Christian forces of the world can make themselves felt, if they will begin now to study and to think seriously and constructively about the problems and the issues which will come before that conference.

It will not do to wait until the peace conference is ready to meet or is already in session. There must be advance preparation, with certain broad principles outlined so that they can be presented at the proper time to the authorities and to the governments responsible for drafting the peace treaties. These principles must be presented in such a manner that they can be applied in a constructive and practical way to the various issues—political, economic, and social—which will have to be considered by the makers of the peace terms.

This is a task worthy of the Christians everywhere. Our denomination, through its conventions, has taken a stand in favor of such study. The work should be started now, in order that all light possible may be thrown upon the subject. It is no easy task; but it is one that should challenge our utmost Christian endeavors.

Nondefense Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a statement which my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New Jersey, ALBERT L. VREELAND, desired to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

At the present time the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. VREELAND] is serving with the United States Army in New York State under leave of absence previously granted to him by unanimous consent of the House of Representatives. He requested the inclusion of the following resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood on August 7, 1941, mentioning at the same time his approval of the purpose expressed in the said resolution. The resolution is as follows:

The board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood unanimously urges that, in view of the magnitude of the appropriations necessary for national defense, and with the utmost being demanded of our economic and financial resources, Congress and the administration pursue the most rigid economy in nonmandatory expenditures.

The Nation has readily undertaken the greatest tax burden in its history, placing the national defense before all else, and properly all costs other than defense costs now should be kept closely in hand. With steadily rising employment, the decreasing need for public assistance should be taken into account, and certainly subsidy programs should be greatly curtailed. Public-works and work-relief projects should be examined in the light of nonmandatory expenditures, especially in those many cases where the projects are in direct competition as regards construction labor and materials with vital defense production.

The Unjust 49-Cent Wheat Penalty

REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, at page A3654 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be found remarks which I made on the floor of the House

on July 29, pertinent to the 49-cent wheat-quota penalty

In those remarks I quoted an Associated Press dispatch appearing in the Detroit Free Press and many other papers, purporting to quote a radio speech made by Mr. Harry N. Schooler, North Central Regional Director of the A. A. A.

I sent a copy of my remarks to the Secretary of Agriculture on July 31, protesting against the alleged speech made by Mr. Schooler. On August 8, I received a reply from Mr. Paul H. Appleby, Under Secretary of Agriculture.

On August 11, I addressed a letter to the Detroit Free Press and on August 13 I received a reply.

The Associated Press dispatch referred to, indirectly if not directly, imputed to thousands of farmers of the country, including many in my own congressional district, unpatriotic motives because of their German ancestry. Therefore, this whole matter is of vital importance.

The Department of Agriculture states that Mr. Schooler did not make the remarks credited to him in the radio address referred to in the dispatch, and asks me to give publicity to the reply of the Department of Agriculture.

The Detroit Free Press admits that this reference made by Mr. Schooler to farmers of German ancestry was not included in his broadcast speech but was included in an interview given by Mr. Schooler.

Mr. Speaker, in fairness to all, and in order to keep the record straight, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of these remarks this correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. The correspondence is as follows:

JULY 31, 1941.

Hon. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR SECRETARY: Enclosed please find some remarks I made in reference to the 49 cent wheat-quota penalty.

Particular reference is made to the marked portions on pages A3655 and A3656. Possibly you have already taken notice of this statement made by Mr Schooler This Schooler broadcast was given extensive coverage under an Associated Press head in Michigan and is at least most unfortunate.

Sincerely yours,

EARL C. MICHENER,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, August 8, 1941.

Hon. EARL C. MICHENER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MICHENER: This is in reply to your letter of July 31 enclosing copy of your speech of Tuesday, July 29, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 30, in which you refer to an Associated Press Dispatch from Detroit attributing to Mr. Harry N. Schooler, Director, North Central Division, A. A. A., the charge in a radio broadcast that protests on wheat-marketing quotas were originating "wherever there is a concentration of farmers of German ancestry." You are, of course, correct in supposing that notice of this statement has already been taken.

This is to inform you that Mr. Schooler made no such statement in his broadcast at Detroit and that he authorized no such statement. This fact has been called to the attention of the Detroit radio station over which the talk was broadcast, as well as to that of several newspapers which carried similar misinformation.

Mr. Schooler appeared on the Detroit station by request. He has received the following statement from Mr. Duncan Moore of station WJR in Detroit regarding this broadcast:

"I deeply regret the embarrassment you, apparently, have been caused by the story carried in the Detroit Free Press following your appearance on WJR.

"The Free Press story was in error, of course, because you made no mention whatsoever, on your broadcast about the motives behind the 'farmer revolt' against wheat control."

It may interest you to know that, although Mr. Schooler spoke extemporaneously, a recording was made of the broadcast in which he spoke. In this recording there are no statements regarding farmers of German ancestry, as you may see from the enclosed transcription made from the recording of the broadcast.

In your article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you state that you "cannot find language too strong to condemn such unjustified course on the part of any official or representative of our Government," and you call upon the Department of Agriculture "to take proper action in the Schooler case."

I appreciate your interest in calling this matter to my personal attention. In view of the fact that the whole attack on Mr. Schooler is based upon an untrue statement, may I suggest that, in all fairness, you make public the truth regarding his radio appearance in your State.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. APPLEBY,
Under Secretary.

AUGUST 11, 1941.

DETROIT FREE PRESS,
Detroit, Mich.

GENTLEMEN: Enclosed you will find copy of speech made by me in Congress on July 29 Your attention is called to an Associated Press dispatch which was carried in your paper, and which is quoted in my speech.

I submitted this quotation to the Department of Agriculture and asked that disciplinary action be taken against Mr. Schooler who purportedly made the statement carried in the Associated Press dispatch.

I am in receipt of a reply from the Department of Agriculture, copy of which I enclose for your information.

It is difficult for me to believe that this dispatch was the figment of the imagination of an Associated Press reporter.

Inasmuch as the dispatch was carried in your paper, may I ask if you can give me any information as to its authenticity?

Thanking you, I am

Sincerely yours,

EARL C. MICHENER,
Member of Congress.

AUGUST 11, 1941.

Hon. PAUL H. APPLEBY,
Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. APPLEBY: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of August 8 in reply to mine of July 31 wherein I protested against the alleged statement made by Harry N. Schooler, director, North Central Division, A. A. A., which was given extensive coverage through the medium of an Associated Press dispatch.

I note your statement that the Associated Press dispatch was incorrect, and your suggestion that I give publicity to your letter.

I have this day sent a copy of your letter to the Detroit Free Press, one of the papers carrying the dispatch, and have asked them to advise me of its origin.

Just as soon as a reply is received from the Detroit Free Press, I shall insert your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If Mr. Schooler did not make the alleged statement, he should be vindicated. On the other hand, if he made the statement, he is unfit for the office which he now holds. I think you will agree with me.

Sincerely yours,

EARL C. MICHENER,
Member of Congress.

THE DETROIT FREE PRESS,
Detroit, August 13, 1941.

Hon. EARL C. MICHENER,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter of August 11 concerning the story carried by this paper on Mr. Harry Schooler, of the Department of Agriculture, has been brought to my attention.

Our investigation of this matter discloses that Mr. Schooler did not make the statement attributed by us to him in his broadcast over radio station WJR. Our investigation further discloses, however, that this statement was made to WJR representatives at a breakfast meeting following the broadcast.

The release prepared by the publicity department of radio station WJR contained both the broadcast remarks and those statements made by Mr. Schooler at the breakfast table. We were not informed that the remarks were not contained in the broadcast, nor were we informed that they were made off the record. Hence, our story which was based on the WJR release, credited Mr. Schooler with making the statements in his broadcast.

Should you desire further information, I suggest you contact Mr. Duncan Moore, of radio station WJR, or Mr. Mark Haas, also of radio station WJR. These gentlemen were present at the breakfast meeting with Mr. Schooler, and are in a position to elaborate on this matter.

Assuring you of our desire to be of service at any time, I am

Sincerely yours,

EDGAR A. GUEST, JR.,
Assistant City Editor.

The Congressional Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

BREACH OF FAITH

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, suppose that in those warm days of early September 1940, when the original draft bill was being debated in the House of Representatives, the people of the Nation and the young men particularly, had known that there was a likelihood that they would be retained in service after the first 12 months, would the measure have been enacted? It is reasonably certain that it would not. Those who urge and favor an extension, however, insist that the country was fully aware of the provision that they might be retained in service if Congress declared it in the interest of national defense. That in turn raises the question of how and from what source the public formed its impressions of the original Selective Service Act.

First, let us mention the debates. Instances can be multiplied from the

debates of last year to show that emphasis was placed on the 1-year provision and little said about the proviso under which the men might be retained for longer service.

Secondly, there are the newspaper reports. Evidence was offered that Associated Press and Time magazine in a summary of the bill, fully acquainted the country with the proviso under which service might be longer than 12 months. An examination of dates, however, discloses that these summaries did not reach the public until after the measure had been approved. Most persuasive of all, perhaps, is the Gallup poll. It is widely read, is concise, and definitely serves to create impressions in the public mind. An examination discloses that in December of 1938, October 1939, June 2, 1940, June 23, 1940, July 9, 1940, July 28, 1940, and August 11, 1940, the Gallup poll question was, Do you think every able-bodied young man 20 years old should be made to serve in the Army or Navy for 1 year? Note that it mentioned 1 year, and that last poll was taken about 3 weeks before Congress voted on conscription. On August 11, 1940, another Gallup poll question was, Do you favor increasing the size of our Army and Navy by drafting men between the ages of 18 and 32 to serve in the armed forces for 1 year? Once more note that this poll says 1 year. On August 29, 1940, just a week before Congress voted, the poll question was, If the draft law is passed, will you personally have any objection to spending a year in some branch of military service? Once more note that it said 1 year. What impression did this convey?

HAND OVER TO UNCLE SAM

Luminous mountains of aluminum from the kitchens and pantries of the United States stand in mute but eloquent testimony to the willing and cooperative spirit of American citizens when Government calls on them to yield materials in the interest of national defense. There is every reason to believe that American business and industry, made up of the same people who surrendered their aluminum, will surrender their machines and materials if the need is shown, but Government does not think so. Thus, a bill was introduced in Congress to authorize the Government to requisition property. War Department officials who came before congressional committees to urge this legislation pointed out that machines, materials, patents, and airplanes might have to be requisitioned. The only weakness in their case was that all private airplanes with any military usefulness have virtually all been taken over; that patents and patent rights in the hands of unfriendly foreigners can already be taken under a law enacted in 1910; and that raw materials of value are already on the priority list. The only thing left in their case was machines, and with respect to them, they had no inventory to indicate what these machines were or where they were. On this thin basis Congress passed a broad requisitioning statute which delegates enormous powers to the Chief Executive.

DISTURBING SITUATION

There are 210,000 industrial plants in the United States; of this total, 145,000 are classified in the category of "small business." They employ 16,250,000 persons. The continued operation of these small businesses are vital not only to the employees employed therein but to lawyers, doctors, engineers, advertising men, consultants, and a host of other professions whose livelihood depends upon such business. Now comes Government to impose priorities on steel, iron, aluminum, rubber, tin, copper, brass, and a host of other materials which are regarded as indispensable to national defense. What shall these small businesses do for materials if they are now manufacturing goods and commodities that are not used in defense such as electrical equipment, washing machines, and similar items. A recent survey of small business indicates that 64 percent of those polled have indicated that they must go out of business unless they can procure defense contracts. Members of Congress and officials of the executive agencies are now meeting with delegations of small businessmen in the hope of meeting this very disturbing problem.

UNCLE SAM, MOVIE MAGNATE

Government deals in but one commodity. That is service to the people. Sometimes, as it undertakes a new service, Government deems it necessary to sell the idea to the people. In other years this was done by the written word in the form of press releases, and pamphlets, and by the spoken word over the radio. Little by little, Government has ventured into another medium of information. It is the movie. It has eye appeal and conveys a message. In the fiscal years 1940 and 1941, the executive agencies will spend $3,895,000 for movies. This will provide, when all expended, for 1,464 reels and 23,877 copies. Some are silent and some equipped with sound. A large number of agencies now use movies to sell their service and their ideas to the public. The Army and Navy are using movie shorts for instruction purposes. Titles are almost as intriguing as the thrillers which issue out of Hollywood. Some of them are Plows, Planes and Peace, Democracy in Action, Green Acres, Dangerous Dusts, Trumpeter Swan, Day at the Zoo, Trees to Tame the Wind, Germ Quiz, and a host of others. Thus Uncle Sam gradually becomes a movie magnate.

Shades of Gen. Billy Mitchell's Separate Unified Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

STATEMENT OF COL. J. E. MYERS, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED, PRESIDENT OF THE AVIATION DEFENSE ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Col. J. E. Myers, United States Army, Retired:

The Aviation Defense Association was formed in 1938 for the purpose of securing a state of air mindedness and air appreciation throughout the nations in the Western Hemisphere and we find that it will be necessary to establish a unified independent pan-American air command before there can be any real effort to sustain a great bureau of propaganda for air preparedness.

It is evident that German propaganda leading to their air superiority was largely obtained through hundreds of thousands of young glider pilots, trained from 12 years of age up, who were to become the backbone of the German air force. These young men insured the supremacy of the air which allowed some 200,000 German fighting troops to overthrow 4,000,000 Frenchmen.

Russia in 1926 had a semiofficial glider club named Aviakin with 4,000,000 members, each paying $9 annual dues. (See House Naval Affairs subcommittee report, May 27, 1941.) Their power machines tow 10 to 12 gliders, each one of which is capable of transporting from 15 to 20 fully equipped parachutists, but still they started their aviation activities too late.

Extensive gliding operations have not been encouraged by the Army or Navy. We possibly have in this country about 400 or 500 qualified glider operators, and I quote from the above Naval Affairs Subcommittee report the following extract of a letter it received from the Navy Department: "It was definitely concluded that the training of glider students was not worth while."

We know or should know by this time that air superiority means victory on land or sea and that no boat can long float against any such superior air attack. Therefore the first attempt to correct this 20-year delayed action must be to create an intense desire for aviation among the people of the Nation through such propaganda as the celebration of our national and pan-American aviation days.

In 1938 our association made an attempt to advance enthusiasm for youth education in aviation by sponsoring the annual celebration of National Aviation Day on Dr. Orville Wright's birthday. To this end we prepared a bill, which was placed by Senator PEPPER, Representative J. H. PETERSON, and others, and in due course of time was passed in the Congress and proclaimed by the President as National Aviation Day in spite of the opposition of Secretary of War Woodring and the officers of the National Aeronautical Association.

Few persons in the Americas realize that 2 days for the celebration of aeronautical achievements have been set aside by Congress and proclaimed by the President to honor the Wright brothers. They are August 19 and December 17 of each year. August 19, Wright's birthday; and December 17, the date of the first flight by the Wright brothers' machine. Neither of these dates has ever been properly observed by the Army and Navy.

On the first annual celebration of Dr. Wright's birthdate on August 19, 1939, the Navy sent a few planes to St. Petersburg, Fla., at the request of Senator ANDREWS, but the War Department wired to ground all the Army planes at the airport on that day. They were accordingly assembled and cowled on the edge of the field during the exercises and speech made by Representative PETERSON in honor of our pioneer aviator, Dr. Orville Wright.

This insult, you can call dumbness if you wish, but I call it a direct insult to the President of the United States and the people of America, meant the loss in propaganda and youth enthusiasm for aviation beyond any calculation. To me it is perfectly evident that there has been an organized effort for

repression of aviation celebrations in the past, to the great detriment of our national air preparedness.

Of the many bills introduced in Congress to further aviation, practically all are tabled or allowed to drop and we should all fervently hope that the bill to establish a separate unified air force under a single Department of National Defense will not meet with the same cold reception. Representative BEITER's separate air-force bill (H. R. 4790) does not change the permanent set-up of our present units of air force in the Army and Navy but the Secretary of the Air would make these assignments as well as the control of the huge long-distance land-based air operations, which would permit the switching of tremendous air power to any threatened point in the world, whether on land or sea.

It is high time to check up on our present organization concerning modern warfare. Old tradition must be scrapped as old junk. It is certain that our main air force must be divorced from land and sea units. It can no longer serve as a vassal and slave to the War and Navy Departments. Initiativeness and fearlessness in the Army and Navy can no longer be repressed. Youngsters should be encouraged to stick their necks out and express their views without the cruel necessity of chopping them off on every occasion.

Had a secretary of the air been appointed in Gen. "Billy" Mitchell's time we would have had men who were experts in aviation in charge of affairs. The chances are that there would have been no shortage of aluminum or other essential materials, and the chances are that we would have had the largest aviation force in our history, built "up to snuff" right now, and a civilian air reserve trained by expert Army aviators as an auxiliary air force of several hundred thousand men, paid for part-time voluntary war practice on light armored planes.

A secretary of the air might have envisioned many other requisites such as the construction of great superdefense highways connecting the Americas and between all strategical bases, the construction of thousands of airfields and underground air bases, the training of millions of young glider pilots and lightplane operators in a civilian air reserve as provided for by a congressional bill introduced at our request. Such a reserve would give expert aviation training to hundreds of thousands of glider operators, private flyers, mechanics, and others. It would provide for the construction of thousands of light plane ships and the installation of the necessary war equipment on them. It would establish a huge pool of mechanically inclined persons capable of resisting any invasion.

The shortage of pilots in Europe is appalling; the reserve could help remove the bottleneck which is sure to come to America. Many of the reserves might be well qualified to fly our regular superpowered airplanes. They would constitute our infantry of the air. They could repel invaders with light bombs and machine-gun fire. They could act as messengers, or for the transportation of glider parachutists, as they could be launched from fields or roadsides immediately in rear of our armies.

But, I am informed, our regular service does not want to train these civilian air reserves. Already the program provided for by our bill or some form of it is being taken over by Mayor LaGuardia's Civilian Defense, which, of course, defeats the entire program outlined for the reserve and would render it an entirely ineffective air-combat force.

It is ever the same old army-game policy played by the same clique which sent our boys to Cuba with inferior rifles and black powder in 1898. The same crowd which refused to see the Wright airplane, the Lewis machine gun, Christie tank, the horizontal smoke-screen bomb, and the lethal steel-wire (barrage) projectile which I devised and offered to the service over 2 years ago, and which was promptly rejected without test, although its adoption might be the solution of raids over London.

It is the same old navy that advocated the return to sailing vessels after the advent of steam—the same navy that is still building battleship death traps and had to be forced to build torpedo speedboats. The same old navy that does not want to train glider troops, even in the face of German and Russian successes and the Battle of Crete.

Shades of Billy Mitchell—look, listen, and be impressed. Had his ideas been accepted we would be the most powerful aviation nation in the entire world. We have the mechanically inclined population, the initiativeness, and inventive ability to keep abreast of and ahead of all other nations, provided we use these qualifications. We need officers who have vision, who can produce, and who can appreciate the fact that General Mitchell sank a battleship over 20 years ago, apparently with three 2,000-pound bombs, in 10 minutes. (See House Naval Affairs Committee report on H. R. 9218, 75th Cong.)

There is an unwritten law in the Army which refuses to retract even when it is proved to be wrong. It is the operation of this law that refuses to recognize Billy Mitchell and other progressive officers, which is now in full operation to defeat congressional legislation which must pass if we are to win the war. It is this policy which stands in the way of progress in the Army and which must be entirely eliminated before it is too late to save our Nation from disaster.

Let us act to divorce our air force from the Army and Navy. We can no longer hide our heads in the sands of tradition. We must talk bravely without fear of having our heads chopped off, and listen to the advice of the men in civil and military aviation who know what they are talking about. General Arnold has said we should have this separation, as well as such men as Col. Harold Hartney, Col. Roscoe Turner, Capt. Casey Jones, C. T. Malone, and other members of our Board of Aeronautical Advisers. Ordinary common sense will tell anyone that anything traveling in the air 350 miles per hour carrying bombs, machine guns, and cannon, will defeat anything going 50 or 60 miles per hour on land or sea.

We must stop the idea to let well enough alone, or that is too late to change horses in the middle of the stream. The fact of the matter is that it is not too late to shout the "cry of freedom" of the air from abject slavery.

Act now—save our Nation. Delay now is ruination.

Nondefense Territories May Come in for Rough Sledding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

EDITORIAL WRITTEN BY W. R. RUTHERFORD, EDITOR OF THE MOORE COUNTY (TEX.) NEWS

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to call to the attention of the membership of the House an editorial written by Mr. W. R. Rutherford, editor of the Moore County News, Dumas, Tex., which I consider very timely:

[From the Moore County (Tex.) News]

NONDEFENSE TERRITORIES MAY COME IN FOR ROUGH SLEDDING

Evidence that Americans have not yet fully grasped the import of the foreign situation may be found in the fact that they are searching the vistas of their economic future more avidly than they are war news.

A true economic chart and compass is almost as difficult to obtain as is the truth about Russo-German war. This is due in large measure to weird discrepancies in the administration's attitude toward prices and profits.

Various Government agencies are constantly making headlines by their purported efforts to avoid inflation, and even now legislation is being drafted to give the President power to regulate prices.

The trouble, however, is that any Presidential regulation is always colored with those peculiar political hues that shade the President's attitude toward various groups.

No ceiling on inflation can come without a ceiling on both wages and taxes. Wages are constantly advancing, and no one in the Government today will even attempt to place a ceiling on taxes.

Moreover, President Roosevelt has shown no tendency to curtail the millions being spent on nondefense subsidies. We still have hordes of Farm Security Administration and Soil Conservation pie-county customers and few of the soft Federal job agencies have been abolished.

Inflation became a certainty along with legislation for parity payments to farmers, renewal of all types of agricultural loans, and all of that sort of thing.

Admitting, then, that the inflation era has set in, we are still at loss to determine exactly how it will affect us. Ordinarily it carries with it mass production of all kinds of goods, high prices, a mad orgy of spending, and then a God-awful headache.

So far as defense activities, mechanical wages, machine shops, boiler works, the steel industry, and all that sort of thing is concerned, inflation will probably again take its normal course.

In other words the communities and cities situated in the midst of heavy defense production, will get about the usual reaction, for more men will work, wages will be higher, and prices will advance.

In the Southwest where we buy more than we sell, we may take more of the rap and see less of the profits. With automobiles, refrigeration, heating, and house-appliance production already cut and more to come, workers in the heavy industrial section will make and spend just as much money, working on something else.

But in the Southwest automobile agencies, salesmen, dealers, and all those people may have rough sledding. It is a known fact that Government ownership stagnates community business, except for the amount of wages that goes into the nearby community.

It now looks as though farm prices will be steady to higher, wages higher, property and real estate seem to be due to have some advance, and the general mercantile dealer may have a whole lot less to sell, and white-collar workers that cannot be employed in the defense industries, very probably will get the short end of the deal.

Aluminum ware, automobiles, silk hose, radios, luxurious household and kitchen gadgets, toys, and even gasoline and tires may fast get to be things, which we shall learn to do without, or at least do with a very little.

Registration of Firearms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

LETTER FROM C. B. LISTER, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter addressed to me by Mr. C. B. Lister, secretary-treasurer of the National Rifle Association of America. This letter expresses in very forceful manner the objections of sportsmen in the United States to any law which would require the registration of firearms or permit the requisition of the firearms of any individual. A careful study of this letter will impress many of the Members with the importance of the amendment placed in the property-requisition bill to prohibit such an infringement of the right to keep and bear arms.

The letter follows:

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., August 13, 1941.

The Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN KILDAY: On behalf of the sportsmen of Texas and the millions of others throughout the United States, I thank you for your consistent stand with regard to the registration of firearms under the so-called Draft Property Act.

As I have studied the discussions in committee and on the floor with regard to the amendment which you persuaded the Military Affairs Committee to attach to this bill, it seems to me that Judge Patterson and many Members of the House completely miss the basic danger involved in general firearms registration.

Sportsmen do not object to the registration of their firearms because of any fear of being shabbily treated by Colonel Stimson, Judge Patterson, or General Marshall. What the sportsman fears are the elements which now exist or which in the future may come into being in this country who would mark these three outstanding gentlemen as being among their first victims.

The sportsman's objection to registration of his arms is shared by many nonshooting citizens who have witnessed the operating methods of revolutionary elements abroad since the first World War. Communists, Fascists, Nazis, and "fifth columnists" have all taken advantage of convenient central registration lists of firearms owned by reputable citizens to seize such arms and to thereby break the power to resist on the part of the nonrevolutionary majority. When the Germans succeeded in placing Prince Paul on the throne of Yugoslavia, the Associated Press reported that one of their first acts was to send Gestapo agents with Yugoslavia police to collect all the arms owned by private citizens.

A part of the program of the Communist Party in this country, as reported by Senator LEE, of Oklahoma, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 23, 1941, is to "break up groups of loyal fighting workmen; destroy, where unable to capture, all tanks, cannon, machine guns, and other weapons which loyal proletarians might use." In other words, the objections of American sportsmen to firearms registration are not based on any unwillingness to donate their guns whenever and wherever they may be needed for the national defense, but the objection is based on the lessons of contemporary history as to the dangers to national defense and to the American form of government which are inherent in a general registration of firearms possessed by loyal citizens.

The sportsmen of this country, through their various national organizations, have already offered their services, their arms, and their shooting ranges to the Governors of the several States in connection with the organization of State guard units and to the National Director of Civil Defense for such use as he might desire to make of them in connection with his national program. Mayor LaGuardia has advised this office that he has no plans for such utilization of civilian marksmen and that the matter is being left up to the State governments. In many of the States these sportsmen are now being utilized in the State Guard and in connection with the formation of auxiliary police units. Neither the registration of personally owned firearms nor the requisitioning of such arms is required in order to make them fully available for proper national-defense or civil-defense activities. In this connection it seems to me to be worthy of note that Judge Patterson, in his testimony before your committee, said "there is no possibility of a shortage of rifles. In fact, a shortage would be almost inconceivable." Accepting this as a true statement, it would appear to be equally inconceivable that there could be any objection to the inclusion in the bill of your amendment.

We cannot escape the belief that if the Members of the Senate and House, with particular reference at the moment, of course, to the conferees, understood these facts, they would promptly agree to the wisdom of incorporating your entire amendment in its original form into S. 1579.

Sincerely yours,

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION,
C. B. LISTER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

We Should Preserve the Morale of Our Army and Sanctity of Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, a year ago Russia and Germany were in alliance. Now Josef Stalin, an international bandit, is fighting desperately to defend himself against the double-cross of Adolf Hitler, a stronger international cutthroat. I am a supporter of the foreign and domestic policies of the Roosevelt administration. It is my wish to support administration measures when in good conscience I can do so. It is my belief that this administration, by its strong attitude against Hitler and by our tremendous efforts to mechanize our Army, increase our military and naval aviation, and strengthen our already mighty Navy, has saved us from dictatorship aggression.

Our first line of defense is alert, ready, and able. Our Navy is the most powerful in the world; our naval aviation is superb. My view is that was is farther away from the Western Hemisphere now than it was before Hitler attacked Stalin. Believing as I do in a compact, mobile, and thoroughly mechanized Army, and fearing as I do an unnecessarily large standing Army in time of peace, I cannot support this measure. I hope and believe that the European war will end within a year and that representatives of this Nation will participate in the peace conference intent upon making sure that there will not be another peace crushing any nation, great or small, so that another world war will follow as a matter of course. In fact, President Roosevelt will at the proper time, I am sure, take the lead in a peace offensive. The common people of the world want peace, and our President will achieve world leadership for this Nation when he plays a major part in bringing an end to this senseless slaughter. President Roosevelt said:

> We will not accept a world like the postwar world of the 1920's, in which the seeds of Hitlerism can again be planted and allowed to grow.

In other words, in the day of reconstruction, peoples now oppressed and downtrodden and nations now nonexistent will be reestablished on national lines.

At this time we should profit by the misfortune that befell France and concentrate our efforts upon the building of a powerful military aviation and creating 20 panzer divisions of armored and mechanized soldiers. We should disregard the pleas of Army officers whose feet are nailed to the floor, who are looking toward the past, and who still go by the old manual of arms.

If an exceedingly large army is of such transcendent importance, why does not Great Britain at this time make some use of the two and a half million Englishmen in arms in England? It is not enough to say the reason Britain does not use part of this tremendous army as an expeditionary force to compel Hitler to fight on another front in Norway, Holland, or France, is that these two and one-half million soldiers are Englishmen and not Canadians, Australians, or New Zealanders. Doubtless, the compelling reason British leaders are not taking the offensive by landing troops on the Continent is that their Army lacks mechanized divisions, with tanks, field artillery, antiaircraft and antitank guns.

Selective-service soldiers have told me that in 6 or 8 months they have learned what should have been taught to them in 4 weeks. Fortunately, our Army now has the equipment and probably has the trained officers to do a much better job in creating trained divisions.

The men selected for service who have been taken from their homes and loved ones in response to a grave national duty should be permitted to go into the Reserves at the end of 1 year's training. Furthermore, Congress should not arbitrarily add 18 months to the enlistment period of those who volunteered. An

enlistment is a contract between a young man and his Government. In time of peace that contract should not be disregarded or changed. Let us preserve the morale of our Army and the sanctity of contract. After all, our Government is dependent upon the faith and confidence of its citizens. A great many of the 600,000 men now constituting our selective-service soldiers have spent years of training for the professions of peace. Others should be called to take their places. In doing this we create a greater trained Reserve. Even under the present law nearly 300,000 more young men can be inducted into the service. The fact that they have not been inducted is evidence that our General Staff officers know there is a lack of equipment for proper training and of housing facilities for proper maintenance.

I voted for the Healey amendment to add $10 per month to the soldiers' pay following 1 year in the service. In fact, I supported the Voorhis amendment to give $30 per month. Legislation is frequently a matter of compromise and the adoption of the Healey amendment is one good act of the House of Representatives this day. Study and examination of the testimony convinces me the claim is without foundation that our Army would be disintegrated were these selective-service soldiers to be returned to their homes after 1 year's training. If 50,000 men were returned to their homes each month how can it be claimed that the Army would be disintegrated when the places are at once filled by new selective-service soldiers?

If General Marshall and his officers cannot complete the training of selective-service soldiers in 1 year then a woeful error was made a year ago and these officers should admit their error and tell the youth of the Nation just how long it does take to train them. In the first place, they should not have taken the young men from their homes unless they were prepared to give them intensive training. Nearly every young man now in the service went into the Army from civil life with the very definite expectation of returning home in 1 year. In fact, they believed they had the word of their Government to that effect. They were not informed about the fine print nor the exceptions. Now, I fear the destruction of the faith that these young men have in their Government—that they had in the sanctity of a promise which they felt was solemnly made by men whom they could trust.

To this good hour the young men in our armed forces and their families are the only individuals who have made sacrifices in this national emergency. At the time these young men were ordered from their homes and peacetime pursuits there was an implied agreement, if not a direct contract, that they would be permitted to return at the end of a year's training unless this Nation was actually at war. This Nation is at peace. We are providing necessary defense measures for Western Hemisphere protection, and I voted for the lend-lease bill, and have consistently supported all measures for Western Hemisphere defense.

Our need is for a compact, mobile, thoroughly mechanized Army notwithstanding the plea of professional officers who apparently desire that our armed forces be expanded to about 3,000,000 men. Hitler conquered France with 12 panzer divisions of thoroughly mechanized soldiers; 120,000 men plus a couple thousand pilots. The bulk of his great army of 2,000,000 was useful only in occupying captured territory. Of course, American professional army officers will receive quick promotions in a rapidly expanding army.

Some advocates of this plan to keep selective-service men for a further period of training say the American soldier is the best paid in the world. They know not whereof they speak. Canada, though poor compared to the wealth of this Nation, pays its privates $1.30 per day. Canadian non-coms receive as much as $100 per month. In addition, the Canadian Government makes dependent allowance to families of men in the service. For example, a dependent wife of an army private or noncommissioned officer receives $35 per month and $12 additional each per month for 2 children. Thus, the Canadian Government pays the Canadian soldier and wife and two children $99.30 per month. Also in Canada skilled workers in the army receive extra pay. Certainly our soldiers should receive as much as unskilled labor in private industry.

America Must Unite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, about 4 years ago the President, realizing the dangers of the Nazi aims, called attention to the then-prevailing world-wide conditions which, in his opinion, made it necessary to increase our Army and Navy for defense purposes. Upon informing the country of the dangerous situation, he was assailed as a warmonger who was bound to involve us in war. These war-making charges against our President were made, firstly, by Republicans and a few Democrats, due to personal animosity; and, secondly, by those carrying on Nazi-Fascist propaganda in this country.

These attacks continued unabated, despite the President's oft-repeated assurances and pledges to the country that the defense program he advocated was purely for defense purposes. Unfortunately, those factions and individuals behind these attacks continue to assail him, completely ignoring the self-evident fact that the war is being brought closer and closer to our country. The America-First Committee, Mr Lindbergh, and others of the Nazi-decorated coterie, together with others who are trying to bring about disunity and division in our Nation, are following in the footsteps of the Quislings who have admittedly furthered Nazi-Fascist activities in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France, thereby causing them to become easy prey for the forces of Hitler.

Mr. Speaker, I have just been handed the latest issue of the Washington Evening Star, which carries the following front-page headline: "Petain pledges full Nazi cooperation." This action, together with the activities of Japan, must be conceded as bringing the danger of war very close to us.

The question before us is not a question of Roosevelt, the Democratic Party, Secretary of War Stimson, Secretary of the Navy Knox, Mr. Willkie, or Russia. This is a question of America—its political and economic freedom and its democratic form of government.

The fight against this service extension bill reminds me of the determined fight against the League of Nations which was both unjustified and ill-advised. The fight against the League of Nations was based on purely political grounds. Those who scuttled the League in later years deplored it. It is now believed that our entry into the League would have prevented this war and would have made unnecessary the expenditure of billions of dollars on our part.

For weeks Nazi propaganda leaders have been using the radio for the dissemination of false information not only in Germany, Italy, and Japan, but in all of the subjugated countries. Just last Sunday I heard one of these foreign broadcasts. To my amazement I heard several speakers assuring the people in those countries that they had succeeded in stopping the United States from giving aid to Great Britain, Russia, and China as contemplated by the passage of the lend-lease bill and quoted the speeches of the leading appeasers in proof. A refusal today to strengthen our military and naval position will be heralded by Hitler and the Japanese war lords as their victory. As Americans, are we not in honor bound and sworn to do our duty "to protect our country against foreign and domestic enemies" as we repeated so solemnly when we took the oath of office?

Mr. Speaker, during the debate last week many Members unjustifiably asserted that we are violating the agreement entered into with the draftees. These statements are erroneous as anyone reading the Selective Training Act must concede that they are, because the particular provision reads—

for 12 months, which may be extended if the national interests are imperiled.

I hold in my hand various letters from outstanding organizations and State bodies, endorsing this extension. From the American Legion comes this communication:

For 20 years the American Legion has advocated and presented to the Congress a program for universal military training in order that the young manhood of our country should be prepared to serve efficiently in the event of an emergency.

On September 16, 1940, the Congress enacted the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. Congress did this because of the emergency threatening the country.

Certainly, the crisis confronting us is more serious today than it was at that time.

The national commander, Milo J. Warner, has repeatedly stated to the country that the American Legion feels the situation demands the enactment of necessary legislation to insure keeping intact, during the emergency, troop units already trained, and retention of selectees in service.

The American Legion supports unqualifiedly legislation extending the training period for an additional 18 months, and we request your support of this legislation.

From the resolution of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor unanimously adopted in fifty-sixth annual convention in Boston on August 8, comes this forthright statement:

Whereas a victory of the Axis Powers in the present war would constitute a fatal blow to democracy all over the world; and

Whereas, from their internal actions, the German and Italian Governments have demonstrated they are savage enemies of organized labor; and

Whereas only with a defeat of the Axis can there be any hope that various social gains, painfully established since the last war, can be maintained: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention call on the National Government to take any steps thought wise by the administration, with the advice and consent of the Congress, acting on the advice of the United States Army Chief of Staff, the Secretary of the Navy, and other responsible agencies, to keep at its maximum efficiency the United States Army, Navy, and defense program; and be it further

Resolved, That this convention urge and will support whatever action is deemed necessary by the administration to make sure that American aid reaches its intended destination; and be it further

Resolved, That this convention pledge itself to the moral unity demanded by an unlimited national emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the American Federation of Labor, to the constituent members of the Massachusets State Federation of Labor and to the President and Members of the Congress of the United States.

The citizens of the groups mentioned are aware of the danger and Members of Congress here assembled would indeed be insensitive to the world about them if they could sit calm and secure in their seats, without a qualm of conscience to trouble them while they allowed themselves to be lulled to inactivity on this momentous measure by the deadly opiate of Nazi-Fascist emanating propaganda.

Can anyone justly deny that our interests are not imperiled when Japan, under Hitler pressure, is gradually coming closer and closer to the Western Hemisphere? When Hitler, who has conquered nearly all of Europe with the exception of Turkey, Spain, and Portugal, is now forcing France to cooperate and to give up Dakar, which is only 1,400 miles from Brazil. When Hitler is coveting other territories in Africa, and even Spain, using these possessions to force us into an exceedingly precarious position should Great Britain and Russia be defeated. With his present hammering of Russia, driving deep into the Ukraine, and gradually but firmly carrying out his plans not only for the control of Europe but also of Africa, how can anyone, in the face of his accomplishments to date under his planned program, declare that our national safety is not imperiled?

As we daily read in the press of the Nazi "fifth column" activities in South and Central America, and particularly in Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Bolivia, and Mexico, it becomes self-evident that Hitler's ulterior object in fomenting unrest in these countries is but to intensify his propaganda in the United States to bring about discord and disunity. Every man or woman not blinded by prejudice or not controlled by Nazi influences must be impressed by the fact that our military position as well as our commercial interests are imperiled, because the war is, as I stated before, moving ever closer and closer to our country.

The close vote on this bill is being heralded by Hitler and Japan as a great victory, and to some extent will justify their statements that Hitler is growing strong enough in our country and in Latin America to tie the hands of the administration. I am satisfied that he is misled by the reports of his thousands of Gestapo agents, the Bund members, and the subversive organizations in our own country.

Mr. Speaker, the activities of the misguided Mr. Lindbergh and the speeches of some of the Members of this House, as broadcast by the Nazi radio commentators, merely bloat up the morale of the Germans, and act as the best propaganda agent in the world in the 14 countries which are Nazi controlled, thereby damaging severely the cause of Great Britain, Russia, and China.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the attacks on the President are strengthening the Axis Powers. For this reason I hope that every Member from now on will exercise more caution and consider the duty he owes to his country, to its free institutions, and to its democratic form of government. I feel that political self-interest should be and must be relegated in the interest of our permanent independence.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that a vast majority of our people are against war. So is the President, and so am I. Unfortunately, they do not realize the seriousness of the situation which confronts us today. I am satisfied that if they possessed the information which the President and all those who are in close touch with the plans of the Axis do possess, they would approve the action of the President who, notwithstanding the charges on the part of the Nazi-Fascist-minded leaders that he has been trying to involve us in war, has actually kept us out of war. Contrary to these charges, the President has done everything humanly possible by appealing to Hitler and Mussolini and by trying to appease Japan so that he could keep the promise which he has given to keep us out of war. Every fair-minded man must deplore the unfair accusations which are heaped upon him, but I appreciate that George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln were attacked and assailed, because, like Roosevelt, they tried to make secure our freedom and independence to insure a strong and united nation.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has been continuously in session for nearly 8 months and will take a recess extending up to September 15. It is my hope that the membership of this House during this interim will try to enlighten the people at home as to the danger confronting our country.

In conclusion, I will quote from an inspiring editorial which recently appeared in the Clovis (N. Mex.) Free Press:

Mr. Roosevelt is using all of his intelligence and effort in trying to lead this Nation along the course which he believes best. He is a real humanitarian, a real flesh and blood man, and he has had to meet more serious difficulties than any President in the history of the United States.

He took office during the depths of the darkest domestic period in our history in 1933 when banks closed, when industry was at a standstill, and when millions were tramping up and down the land, ragged and hungry.

Now he has the international crisis through which to guide this Nation. No American who is informed on the approaching crisis will doubt Mr. Roosevelt's ability and sincerity in leading this Nation along the wisest and safest course. We do not believe that there is another man in America who is better qualified than President Roosevelt to guide this Nation in the present emergency.

Survey of the Des Moines River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

RESOLUTIONS OF THE OTTUMWA TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a set of resolutions adopted by the Ottumwa, Iowa, Trades and Labor Assembly on the subject of the proposed comprehensive survey of the Des Moines River by the United States Army engineer:

Whereas the city of Ottumwa and vicinity have on frequent occasions experienced devastating floods resulting in the loss of life, a tremendous loss in property, large financial losses in the conduct of business, and unemployment during flood periods; and

Whereas the reoccurrence of similar floods is a constant threat to the city of Ottumwa; and

Whereas the city of Ottumwa has been able to provide only a limited amount of protection by the construction of river walls, levees, straightening of channel; and

Whereas the city of Ottumwa is financially unable to provide adequate protection to our city in the control of floods; and

Whereas a shortage in the water supply for the city of Ottumwa is a constant threat; and

Whereas a constant supply of good water can be maintained only through the construction of adequate reservoirs above our city on the Des Moines River; and

Whereas the underground water table is constantly receding with the resultant drying up of wells, thus proving injurious to farmers and their livestock; and

Whereas Ottumwa, because of an inadequate water supply, is unable to attract certain industries and factories; and

Whereas unemployment in the city of Ottumwa is resulting in distress to the taxpayers, business and labor interests; and

Whereas the citizens of Ottumwa are deprived of many of the healthful, invigorating out-of-door sports, such as boating, fishing, hunting, and other summer lake sports, also winter sports, which can be provided only by the construction of a big dam with multiple-purpose reservoir; and

Whereas Ottumwa, although known as a splendid trading center with some fine factories, actually loses many lines of trade because of the lack of proper lake facilities; and

Whereas the construction of a large dam on the Des Moines River at Red Rock, also another dam at Saylorville, by the United States Army engineers will assure the control of floods, with the resultant protection of life and property; will guarantee an inexhaustible supply of water at all times; will result in the raising of the underground water table; will provide employment; and will bring great economic benefits to Ottumwa and central Iowa; and

Whereas Mr. A. A. Couch, president of the Iowa State Federation of Labor, is a member of the Des Moines Defense Industrial Committee and a director of the Des Moines River Valley project, which places him in close touch with the comprehensive survey of the Des Moines River economic and labor conditions; and

Whereas the undersigned labor organization has the greatest respect and admiration for the judgment of Mr. A. A. Couch, our State president; we do hereby empower him to support for us the Red Rock Dam and the Saylorville Dam for first and second choice as our endorsement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Ottumwa Trades and Labor Assembly, in regular session, do hereby heartily endorse the $100,000 comprehensive survey now in its final stages by the United States Army engineers, brought about through the efforts of the Des Moines River Valley project, interested citizens, and public officials, and do hereby urge upon the United States Army engineers, State and Federal Governments, that they further expedite the legal and engineering processes to enable the people of this area, and particularly Ottumwa, to enjoy the protection, economic and recreational benefits that will accrue to our citizens by the construction of the great dams in the Des Moines River Valley at Red Rock and Saylorville.

The Service Extension Act of 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. HANCOCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, according to the latest figures published by the War Department, the Army today consists of 1,545,400 officers and enlisted men. Of this total 517,000 are Regular Army troops, 281,900 are in the National Guard, 681,500 are inducted men, and 65,000 are Reserve officers called to active duty.

If the National Guard men, the selectees, and the Reserve officers should all be relieved from active service upon completion of 12 months' duty and training, as contemplated by the Selective Service Act of 1940, the Army we have been building up since last fall and which in these perilous days we must have, could in the space of a few months be thoroughly disrupted and disorganized, and the national-defense program for our land forces completely wrecked.

We now have 14 Regular Army and 18 National Guard divisions in the field. The Reserve officers and the selectees are divided among these 32 divisions, so that each unit has a nucleus of experienced officers and men. It is a far better plan than was followed in the World War when whole divisions were made up of raw recruits, and the training of new men will be better and speedier even though it is more difficult and more technical. The program has scarcely begun. Many units have not yet received their equipment, and if the entire Military Establishment except the Regulars is shortly to be demobilized the frame-work of the Army will be destroyed and we will have a Reserve of untrained or partially trained men. This would be tragic folly not only from the standpoint of the Army but for the men themselves. Many thousands of lives were lost in the last war because neither the officers nor the men knew how to handle themselves and their weapons.

It is argued by the opponents of this measure that under the present law each selectee shall be transferred to a reserve component upon completion of his training period of 12 months, that the President has the power to call the reserve back into active service, and that therefore the pending bill is not necessary to hold the selectees in active service. That is true, but if such a course were followed it would be regarded as sharp practice by the men affected, it would be deeply resented and would cause confusion, disorganization, and unnecessary expense. I think the Congress should have the fortitude to face the issue of extending the period of service and do it now. It would be cowardly to place the entire responsibility on the President.

A great many misleading statements have been made regarding this bill and there is widespread misunderstanding as to its effect. It does not create another A. E. F. or authorize our entrance into the wars of Europe, Asia, and Africa. I would not vote for such a bill. The limitation of the Selective Service Act restricting the use of selectees to the Western Hemisphere remains in the law. It does not contain a declaration that a national emergency exists or make the unqualified declaration that the national interest is imperiled. It merely uses such language as will enable the President to extend the period of training and service beyond 12 months in conformity with the Selective Service Act of 1940. It does not violate any pledge that the service of the inducted men would terminate in 1 year. That was the hope and expectation of everyone but the possibility of longer service was known and discussed when the original bill was passed. This is a bill for adequate national defense and nothing else.

I would like the bill better if the authorized training period were extended for 6 months or a year rather than 18 months, because I believe the shorter period would stimulate the Army's effort to work out a schedule whereby a definite number of men would be inducted each month and a like number of trained men discharged. I do not see how a reserve force of any value can be created in any other way. This will undoubtedly be accomplished in the months to come, and in the meantime the men in service and their families should disabuse their minds of the fear that the period of service is extended from 12 months to 30 months by this bill. Men over 28 years of age will be released, as will those whose retention in service involves hardship at home, and the others as rapidly as possible after 12 months' training.

We are fortunate to have a Chief of Staff of the character and ability of General Marshall. He is not a warmonger or an interventionist and he is not "pro" any country except our own. He fully understands the necessity for high morale in the Army and is striving to promote it. Nothing is worse for the morale of a man than a feeling that he is the victim of injustice. The arguments of many of the opponents of this bill have fostered that feeling among the selectees. Now that the bill is passed, the debate should cease, and General Marshall should have the support and the cooperation of the 203 who voted for it and the 202 who voted against it in his gigantic task of building an efficient army for our common defense.

The citizens of this country differ as to the details, but they are almost unanimously in agreement on the general program of developing invincible forces for defense on land and sea. The movements of the Japs in the Far East, the advance of the Nazis in Russia, the capitulation of the Vichy Government to the demands of Hitler cannot be ignored or regarded with complacency. The menace to this country and this hemisphere grows more ominous day by day, and we know that with ruthless aggressors on the march our safety is measured by our military strength. There is very little opposition in or out of Congress to the huge appropriations we are making for ships, airplanes, and guns, and yet there is strong opposition to a bill providing for the training of men to use those ships, airplanes, and guns. Obviously the people of this country recognize the national danger. Many are unwilling to accept the unpleasant truth that service and sacrifice are essential.

The fact that the Service Extension Act was passed by the House on August 12 by the narrowest possible margin gives each one of us who voted for it a keen sense of responsibility for its passage. If any one of us had voted in the negative, it would have been defeated.

I did not relish the duty of casting a vote which would be disappointing to many of our young soldiers and their families, but I am convinced that my vote was in the interest of the peace and security of America. No other consideration matters.

Maritime Training Station, St. Petersburg, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1941

ADDRESSES BY CAPT. EDWARD MACAULEY, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED, AND HON. TELFAIR KNIGHT

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, 1941, at St. Petersburg, Fla., in my district, the new maritime training station was dedicated.

The main address of the occasion was the address of Capt. Edward Macauley, United States Navy, retired, now a member of the United States Maritime Commission.

Captain Macauley's address was preceded by an address by Hon. Telfair Knight, Director of the Training Division of the United States Maritime Commission, who also introduced Captain Macauley.

It is my pleasure, pursuant to permission granted, to include the following fine addresses made by Director Knight and Commissioner Macauley:

ADDRESS OF TELFAIR KNIGHT, DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF TRAINING OF THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, this is a particularly happy occasion for me. I have been closely associated with the Maritime Commission's program for training personnel for our merchant marine ever since its inauguration. I wish here and now to pay tribute to that grand gentleman and real sailor, Admiral H. A. Wiley, who made this program possible. He it was who saw the need for training, and it was his indomitable courage that saw it through. Admiral Wiley retired from the Commission at the end of his term of office on September 25, 1940, but his influence remains and those of us to whom he has left the task of carrying on the work so brilliantly inaugurated by him are inspired by the memory of his outstanding leadership and accomplishments.

Our first training station was established at Hoffman Island in New York Harbor on September 1, 1938. About that time we conducted a survey to find a suitable site for a station on the Gulf of Mexico. When we approached the city officials of St. Petersburg, through your most efficient liaison officer, Lt. Comdr. F. R. Francke, on the subject of a site, we were met with cordial cooperation from the start. The city has presented this splendid location to the Maritime Commission and at its own cost has filled in the lowland and built the excellent bulkhead which we now see here giving us ample docking facilities for our three training ships attached to this station, the *American Seaman*, the *Joseph Conrad*, and the *Tusitala*. I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the city officials who have made this station possible.

The Maritime Service, which will operate this station, is an agency of the Maritime Commission, administered for it by the United States Coast Guard, which is doing a first-rate job, as all can see. Our hats are off to Admiral R. R. Waesche, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and to his aides who are conducting the Maritime Service for us.

It is not necessary to say much about the station itself. It speaks for itself. The enrollment of trainees will begin immediately, and in a short time there will be approximately 500 young men in training here housed in this splendid building and on the training ship *Tusitala*. To this number will be added 300 trainees on the *American Seaman*, frequently in port. Thus, with the administrative staff, there will be approximately 1,000 men added to the population of your fair city.

May I also thank your citizens for the warm-hearted way in which they have taken our young men into their homes and made them a part of their civic life. This is a valuable contribution to the success of the training program.

The Maritime Commission regards its training program as of so much importance that it has placed one of the members of the Commission in charge of it to carry on the work so well begun by Admiral Wiley. This is Commissioner Edward Macauley, who is here today and who will address you. Captain Macauley is a seafaring man from seafaring forebears. His entire life has been devoted to the sea. As a naval officer he was in command of the U. S. S *George Washington*, which carried President Wilson to the peace conference after World War I. I take pleasure in introducing my boss, Captain Macauley.

AN ADDRESS BY CAPT. EDWARD MACAULEY, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED, MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

On the part of the members of the United States Maritime Commission I wish to convey to his honor, Mayor McCutcheon, the city officials, and the citizens of the city of St. Petersburg our deep gratitude for the inspiring generosity which has made possible the establishment of the maritime service training station here at St. Petersburg.

The Maritime Commission wishes also and particularly to express its recognition of and commendation for the important services and invaluable assistance rendered by Lieutenant Commander Francke.

The maritime service is to be congratulated on obtaining such an ideal location for a training station. This is my initial visit to this beautiful place, and from what I have seen of it, I am hoping that my duties may require frequent trips of inspection here. In case you should be inclined to regard those words as the natural courtesy of a visitor and a guest, let me say also that I am a Californian, and that when a Californian says anything like that about Florida, or even the most beautiful spot in Florida, as I am sure this must be, he is saying a mouthful. I cannot but face the facts and ungrudgingly state that it is impossible to imagine, even in California, a better site, a lovelier setting, or a more perfect climate. I will even go so far as to say that I have tasted your grapefruit and found them quite good.

But perhaps most of all I should congratulate and envy you who are to have the privilege of working and training in these surroundings. With the last word in plant and equipment at your disposal, you are about to play a major part in the development of the United States merchant marine and through the merchant marine, in securing the defense and well-being of your native land. This station and you men represent a vital addition to our national assets at a time when all our resources are needed as never before. But doubly important as this occasion is today, it is not so only because of the emergency. You happen to be in a service that is of unique importance both in war and in peace. In time of peace the Army and the Navy are inactive; it is their unused strength and efficiency that is important. But in the merchant marine, both in peace and in war, the daily active use of your skill and ability is vital to the welfare of our country. In peace your work is constructive and civilizing as perhaps no other active occupation is. In war you take your place as worthy partners of the Army and the Navy in the first line of defense.

It is a service with a proud heritage and a magnificent tradition, from the early days of the American Colonies, up through the years when the American clipper ships led the world in speed and beauty and in the skill and daring of their crews, to the last war when the crews of our merchant ships made for themselves a record as glorious as either of the armed services. It was our greatest naval leader of the World War, Admiral Sims, who in speaking of the officers and crews of the American merchant ships who transported supplies across the Atlantic for the American Expeditionary Force said:

"The skill and seamanship of these sailors was something that amazed naval officers, and they proved themselves to be seamen in a sense that naval officers never have the opportunity to become. The courage, initiative, and sense of responsibility, skill in handling ships of all types, and noteworthy seamanship characterized the merchantmen. * * * Without the merchantmen's skill, courage, and loyalty the war could not have been won."

And this brings me to the point I want most to impress on you. Magnificent as all this plant and equipment are, none of it is worth more than you make it. The best ship is just a tub in the hands of an ill-trained, slack crew, but in the hands of a smart, keen crew, many an old tub has done honor to the men who sailed her.

For seamanship is an art. It is the art by which vessels are handled under varying conditions of weather, circumstances, and geographical surroundings. The principles of seamanship may be printed in books or stated orally, but its mastery depends wholly on experience on board ship and at sea. It is an art whose rudiments are written in wind and water and only through contact with those elements can it be learned.

There have been great changes in the tools with which this art is carried on, changes from wood to steel, from hemp to wire, from sails to engines and motors, from crude implements to the fine precision instruments of today. In no profession are the responsibilities greater than in handling ships. Values involved are great—the material values of a vessel and of her cargo and the greater value of the human lives on board. Carelessness, ignorance, or inexperience can never be condoned. Whether in engine room or on deck, the real seaman still is the handy man. He rises to the emergency, on sea or on shore; be it storm, shipwreck, damage to machinery or the necessity of saving life.

It is said the beauty of ships and the romance of the sea and seamen are fast fading into the past never to return. A full-rigged ship, with all her white sails set and drawing is undoubtedly a more beautiful sight than a blunt-nosed freighter ploughing her way through the dark sea, belching black smoke from her funnels.

But there is beauty of another kind; the beauty of strength and power, of science; the accomplishments of man's brain and hand. There is the romance of machinery and invention, of successful work and progress against obstacles and odds, and final victory achieved. And always there is the vision, the striving for and approach to perfection.

In this day of mechanized ships, conquest of the sea is no less adventurous because the weapons have changed; the profit and pleasure to be gained in our commerce with foreign lands no less exciting. Civilization is based on the sea, for what is it but the interchange of ideas and culture between nations? History shows that the inception of such interchanges is trade, and trade between nations and continents must follow the waterways of the world.

With the passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and with the establishment in 1938 of the United States Maritime Service, a new era began. A long-range program of building 500 fast, modern vessels over a period of 10 years was commenced. Then with the coming of the world crisis an emergency program involving the construction of 422 additional vessels was adopted and within the last few days you have read of the President's request for almost $1,700 000,000 to add 566 more vessels to those already provided for. Five years ago the original long-range program which involved $125,000,000 was thought by many to be too big. Today, many times that sum is being spent and the only doubt is whether it is big enough.

In spite of the losses that may occur there can be no doubt that when the war ends, the United States will be the dominant maritime Nation of the world. And it is proper that we should be. During the many years from before the Civil War up until very recently most of the energies of the country were expended in developing the frontier, so to speak; in filling up our own great spaces, and there was comparatively little left over for the sea. Only in the last few years have our thoughts turned to the sea again, and it is clear that the whole trend of events is making sea-borne commerce more and more important in the life of the country. In making the sea your career you are carrying on the tradition that has made America great; you are the frontiersmen of the future.

In this career of national usefulness and commendable adventure on which you are about to embark I wish for the Maritime Service training station at St. Petersburg and for you all, many important, happy, and successful voyages.

Poll on Entrance of United States Into European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF]:

My fellow Americans, I have been conducting a poll in my district by mail to ascertain the views of my people in regard to our entrance into the present World War. The results have been astounding. To date we have received 67,633 ballots of which 3,911 were in favor of our entrance into the present World War, while 63,722 were opposed. In terms of percentages 94.2 percent were against while 5.8 percent were for.

Some of the interventionist newspapers have objected to the poll and sought to discredit it by ridicule. The amazing response of the people is the best answer to their criticism.

These newspapers have also protested my use of the franking privilege to conduct this poll. May I remind my listeners that in the campaign last fall, under the franking privilege, the Democratic National Committee sent out 13,500,000 pieces of literature, while the Republican National Committee sent out fully an equal amount, one Congressman alone franking out 7,000,000 pieces of literature in behalf of Mr. Willkie for President. While these newspapers find fault with my sending out 157,000 pieces of literature to get an expression of the people on the most important matter touching their lives, they at the same time, swallowed hook, line, and sinker the franking of 27,000,000 pieces of literature in behalf of the Democratic and Republican candidates for President. How can they justify their stand denying to the people the right to be heard?

Surely the referendum has been recognized in nearly every city, county, and State in the Union as the right of the people to express their sentiments regarding matters affecting their lives. The present administration has recognized that right in the case of the farmers under the A. A. A. and in the case of the farmers under crop control. Surely if the farmers of the Nation had the right to vote on whether or not they would plow under little pigs, the fathers and mothers of our boys have the right to vote on whether they want their sons plowed under in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

When the mother gave birth to that son and the father toiled from morning to night to give him an education; when both parents made sacrifices in every way possible to insure him a place of honor in the future, no one should have the right to deny them a chance to express their wishes to their representatives in Congress. For Congress, under the Constitution, has the sole right to declare war. To rob an entire generation of its hopes and aspirations, to sacrifice it to greed for money and lust for power in the game of world politics is not the divine right of any one man. It must be the considered judgment of those whom the people have entrusted with that right, namely, the Congress of the United States. God has anointed no single individual with the divine right of underwriting the British Empire with the life of your son.

I agree with the statement of the Republican leaders who recently said:

1. That American lives should be sacrificed only for American defense;

2. That warlike steps taken thus far have undermined the constitutional powers of Congress and the fundamental principles of democratic government;

3. That Congress has not only the sole power to declare war but the responsibility to keep the country out of war;

4. That freedom in America does not depend on the outcome of struggles for material power upon other nations.

The myth that Hitler can invade America and conquer us has been utterly exploded. There are not enough ships in the world to transport 1,000,000 men and all the armaments and equipment necessary to properly safeguard them and undertake our invasion. It has been estimated that it takes 23½ tons of supplies and equipment for each soldier for a period of 30 days. Where could the ships ever be secured to transport that many men and that much equipment and supplies to our coast against our Navy, our air force, and our Infantry? And, even if it were possible to land them, how could they be maintained over here?

This Hitler fear has been cleverly built up to create a war psychology. Sword rattling has been done repeatedly by three outstanding members of the Cabinet—Secretaries Stimson, Knox, and Ickes. In addition to the speeches of these men we have had a drive by agents of the Department of Agriculture to incite war hysteria among the farmers by scaring them with an invasion of the Western Hemisphere and also by holding out the lure of a market for agricultural products.

In addition to the efforts of these Cabinet members to create a war psychology, we have had repeated acts of war committed by this country, as Joseph Alsop says, with a private hope that the Atlantic patrol will produce an incident that will give cause for the United States' declaring war. I have not time nor space to go into all the details, but may I remind you of the fact that we scrapped the Neutrality Act, which was passed when we were in our sober senses; we gave away part of our Navy; we opened our ports to the repair of vessels of one of the belligerents; we boasted of the fact that we sent observers to locate the submarines of one belligerent and we advised another belligerent of that information; we voted $7,000,000,000 as a gift to one of the belligerents; we encourage enlistments of our citizens in the armed forces of one of the belligerents, removing the loss of citizenship which in the past has always been a restriction against such enlistments; we have, in violation of our word and our good faith, enlarged the term of the draft under the Selective Service Act, although Canada has a draft of only 4 months' duration, with a positive prohibition against service overseas, and Canada is in the war and we are not.

And last, but not least, we have relieved one of the belligerents in the safeguarding of an air and naval base in Iceland, which is 2,650 nautical miles from New York City but only 600 miles from the British Isles. The danger in our taking over was the fact, as Senator BONE pointed out, that not only had these places been bombed, but as long as British troops were mingled with American troops at that point, Germany would be justified to fire upon that base.

In a story this week, Paul Patterson, publisher of the Baltimore Sun, stated that Britain was now ready to take the initiative in this war, and that she was satisfied that she could win by 1943, but if the United States would become an active participant, the war could be ended by 1942. In order to make America an active participant, a new, dynamic program has been set up to change public opinion in this country. So, now, the drive is on for American manpower. It worked in 1917, perhaps it will work again in 1941.

But the most serious story that has come out recently in regard to the occupation of distant points in foreign lands has been developed since the debate on the extension of the draft period of the selectees was begun in the Senate just recently. That story is to the effect that we are going to build up an Army of about 3,000,000 men, and that the first place that we shall ship our men will be to Freetown, a splendid port located in Sierra Leone, a British possession on the West Coast of Africa, 500 miles south of Dakar. Of course, all these moves mean an undeclared war, and we shall be in this war without Congress having had one single, solitary thing to say about it.

What is Hitler's position today? The best battleship that Hitler had has been sunk, and the rest of them are being blasted almost daily in their hiding places in German harbors by the R. A. F. His air force, which created havoc at the outset of his invasion of peaceful and unprepared nations, is now inferior to that of Great Britain, and in addition to the R. A. F. he has taken on the powerful air force of Russia. His army, which is still of great power, has not been able to blast through Russia in the 3 or 4 weeks as was expected and asserted by most of the experts. If Hitler cannot finish the job by the time the rains come in September, his mechanized ground forces will be useless in the mud, and when the September rains are followed by the snows, his real problem will begin. It is not the first time that the snows and the cold of Russia have decimated armies more than shot and shell nor is it the first time that a madman with delusions of grandeur has found his hopes and his ambitions buried in the vast steppes of Russia.

Great Britain and the United States are infinitely more powerful than they were a year ago while Hitler has been considerably weakened and his problems are increasing with the passing of time.

I now come to what I consider the real problem of the United States and by far the most serious one. When Hitler and his band of outlaws are wiped out and when Germany collapses, will communism take over? If communism wins in Germany, it will win in central Europe generally, in the Balkans, in Austria and Hungary, perhaps in Italy and undoubtedly in France. What then will become of the British Empire and particularly its ruling classes? They, of course, must fight communism or they will perish together with all their possessions. Will the United States, in case it has entered this World War before that time by being either dragged in through the front door or shoved in through the back door, turn its resources, its money, and its manpower to the defeat of communism and the preservation of the British Empire? We cannot lightly disregard any such contingency for anything can happen in this crazy world. Allies today are enemies tomorrow and enemies today may be allies tomorrow. Who can tell? To me by far the safer course is for us to so strengthen our defenses that no matter that the final eventuality in Europe may be, the United States of America will be safe, the youth of the country will be thoroughly trained, our Army, our Navy, and our air force will be ready and we shall be in a position so strong and so powerful that no nation or combination of nations will dare to attack us.

Of course, I appreciate that efforts may be made to reach us through other lands. If Canada should be invaded, which I don't think possible, or if Mexico should have a ruler over it friendly to a foreign enemy and should permit an invasion through its lands, then, of course, it would become necessary for us to take up arms as we could not tolerate an enemy in our backyard, but when it is said that we must take and occupy Dakar, land troops at Singapore and Hong Kong, concentrate our forces in the eastern Mediterranean for the defense of the Suez Canal, then I am opposed. I know of no reason why any American boy should be dedicated to the proposition of policing the world for the benefit of someone else.

Many people believe that with Hitler defeated, the world's troubles will come to an end. That is not the fact. This is a world-wide economic revolution and it will not subside until the underprivileged are given their just share in the wealth which they produce. The United States can perform a great service to the nations of the world by preserving a representative form of government here, by preserving our fundamental guaranties here, by showing the people everywhere that democracy can and does work here, and when the end of the war finally comes, by aiding the broken, disillusioned, and hopeless people everywhere with food, supplies, money, and credit to take up the task of healing war's wounds and reestablishing themselves in their restored home lands.

This Deluded Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

THIS DELUDED LAND

Presently Mr. Marriner Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, will be telling the householder how much he will have to pay down on any appliance he wants to buy and how quickly he will have to pay the balance. Mr. Roosevelt has made use of his own self-proclaimed unlimited national emergency and of the Trading With the Enemy Act, a war measure of 1917 never repealed, to put control of installment buying in the hands of Mr. Eccles and his Board. The commissar thus steps between the American citizen who has something to sell and the citizen who wants to buy it. Terms which might be satisfactory to them will not be sufficient in this new American way of life. They must be approved by the Federal Reserve Board.

Nothing in Mr Roosevelt's edict is to touch the installment paying for houses as arranged by the Federal Housing Authority. Although the new edict is to check buying, to accumulate a large, unsatisfied demand for consumer goods for later uses, and to lay a restraining hand on prices, there is to be no restriction on the easy borrowing for installment buying of homes financed by Government guaranty. There is to be no accumulation of a backlog in the building industry. And, although Mr. Eccles has these powers conferred on him by Mr. Roosevelt to prevent inflation, so it is said, Mr. Roosevelt will not surrender his power to devaluate the dollar or to print paper money, both inflationary possibilities.

Presently, if you want a used car, you will ask Leon Henderson, the Price Administrator and civilian supplier, how much you can pay for it. Mr. Henderson says this will be a large job and a tough one, but he thinks he can attend to it. He is saying how many new cars there are to be built and he is around putting price tags on one commodity after another. Mr. Roosevelt gave him the authority to do that having given himself, under his proclamation of unlimited national emergency, the authority to give it.

An edict stopped the processing of silk, and the women are wondering what their new stockings will be like. Mr Ickes' gasoline ukase in the East, limiting the hours of sale, was a flop, and he is expected to issue another rationing the automobile owner. He will tell you that you don't get 10 gallons, you get 5. The commissars also are approaching the use of electricity and of fuel. You are to set the thermostat at 65° and not exceed that heat. Mr. Wickard, of the Agricultural Department, has suggested that the American people quit eating cheese.

The priorities and the allocations of material have produced a confusion in American industry which leaves big and little businessmen staring at a future in which they can see only governmental control and in which many of them see ruin. These things have all been in the view of the perceptive eye for years. The approach to them began when the world was at peace for the most part and when there could be no pretenses of national emergency. The only excuse then was the depression, nourished as the best friend of the collectivists who were trying to gain control of American life. They could see that they would fail unless they got a great emergency.

The war abroad revived their hopes. If war conditions could be brought here, their position would be strengthened and their program could be presented as imperative. It was a favorite reflection of some of these people—and they gave it voice—that only in the requirements of a great war could the country be brought to sacrifice itself to the social and economic and political objectives of the program for a communistic state, and most of these people are now at work in the war program which has entered American life in the manner observable at every point.

Step by step we have gone farther than we dreamed possible toward government by edict, proclamation, Executive order, and administrative regulation. This autocratic state is already in full flesh and the citizens are obeying it. Initiative has been taken out of their hands and their enterprises are passing under the will of the Government official. Further evidences of this increase day by day. Liberties once thought safe are dissolving under attack.

The trouble with the American people has been that they were too little suspicious. They were incredulous. They had never before encountered in their government forces determined to delude them into surrendering their way of living. They couldn't believe their political system was in any danger. They couldn't imagine that anyone would take away from them things they thought were inviolably theirs.

They had always felt that their politicians could be made to obey when the occasion arose. They didn't think that their masters would arise and attain positions where they could not be touched. As it proves, the American people were ripe for just what has happened to them. They have lost control of their Government, and they can't do anything with it. They have lost control of Congress. They can't stop government by edict. They simply submit

When an order issues forth from Washington, however strange and extraordinary it may be, the people find themselves obeying it, regardless of the violence it does their system of government and regardless of the injury it does them. The imaginary war which assails them is thrown at them to smother their rebellious instincts, and they have become bewildered and pliable.

When they voted to destroy the limitation of tenure in the White House, they voted the probability of their own destruction. They didn't know the tenant in the White House when they gave him title to the premises and dominion over them.

This Week in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. ED GOSSETT, OF TEXAS

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I am delivering over the radio:

This week in Washington is one your speaker will never forget. Our Nation's Capital has rocked with important national and international action, action of which the full import will never be known, action the wisdom of which may long be debated, action for the consequences of which one can only guess and hope. Certainly this administration cannot be accused of inaction; sins of omission have been and will be few. The appropriation of additional billions for defense, the final approval of the largest tax bill in history, the extension of the draft, the President's historic pronouncement of the peace aims of the democracies, all form parts of an almost terrifying drama by which our Nation seeks through courageous action to avoid slavery, on the one hand, and war on

the other. Little wonder Members of Congress are now straggling out of Washington, weary and worn with the stress and strain of important decisions.

But let's get down to a brief discussion of a few of these events. All are familiar with the 1-vote margin by which the House of Representatives this week approved an extension of the draft. Never before in the history of our country has such drastic peacetime action been necessary. Never, we hope, will it again become necessary. If you could read your Congressman's mind and his mail on this important issue, you would understand why he is today a very tired individual. Many letters were touching, eloquent, heart-rending appeals by good fathers and mothers who want their sons back home. Some were bitter threats of reprisal if one should vote for an extension of the draft. One letter from an old friend says, "If you vote to extend the draft, you will never go back to Congress." Another from a boy in camp says, "Please send me the RECORD of the vote on this extension bill. A number of us fellows want it for future reference."

Your Congressman has no desire to conceal his action in this matter. He, with every Congressman from Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana, as well as the vast majority of other Southern Representatives, voted with a heavy heart for this extension of service because he felt it to be necessary. Certainly in such times as these, when our President, our Department of State, and the commanding officers of our Army and Navy say this thing must be done, a Congressman who is supporting a program of full and adequate national defense could not in good conscience say no. Most Congressmen well know that those who threaten political reprisal will keep their words. Those who study these situations know that political strength in a democracy lies more in an absence of enemies than it does in the presence of friends. Yet one who would put political considerations above his country's welfare in such hours of peril would be unworthy of even his own respect. Most Members of Congress have approached these problems prayerfully and have acted upon principle in the light of what they thought to be for the very best interest of America.

Since the beginning of this Republic, the Napoleonic wars are about the only major ones in which we have not participated. We have got into practically every war without anticipation and without preparation. Our situation now differs in both these particulars—there is both anticipation and preparation. Perhaps our different approach to this crisis forbodes a different result. Certainly the majority of thoughtful persons in this country feel that along the road of anticipation and preparation lies our best chance of escape. In the past our potential enemies have usually provoked or declared war upon us because of one of two errors: (1) thinking they could whip us, or (2) thinking they could bluff us. For the sake of all concerned, it is hoped that no such mistakes will be made in the future.

Of course, overshadowing all other events of the week, if not of the year, was the joint statement of Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt. For the last several days our papers and radios have been filled with volumes of news, views, and comment upon this momentous and historic meeting between the leaders of the democracies. Around the world, in all camps, comparisons are being made between the 8 points of Churchill and Roosevelt and the 14 points of Woodrow Wilson. On January 8 of this year, your Congressman, ED GOSSETT, placed in the Appendix of the RECORD, on page A50, the speech made by Woodrow Wilson to the Sixty-fifth Congress on January 8, 1918. In placing President Wilson's speech in the RECORD, the following statement was made by me:

"Mr. Speaker, on last Monday President Roosevelt spoke for the American people in a time of world crisis. Twenty-three years ago today Woodrow Wilson spoke for the American people in a time of world crisis. Both speeches were clear and honest statements of American ideals and objectives. Both speeches will go down in history as magnificent expressions of the high principles and purposes of a great democracy. Both spoke to the moral conscience of mankind, both committed America to responsible action in the pursuit and in the preservation of peace.

"Twenty-three years ago today Woodrow Wilson set forth in clear and unmistakable language the war aims of the American people. The 14 points enumerated in this address as a basis for peace are said to have contributed as much as did the force of American arms to the crushing of the supposedly impregnable Hindenburg line and to the end of the war.

"We were to witness shortly thereafter the tragic failure of his dreams. In ideals and objectives Woodrow Wilson was said to have lived 100 years ahead of his time. Let us hope it was only 23 years ahead of his time. His was a voice crying in the wilderness of international hate and confusion. His solicitude for the rights and liberties of small nations, his abhorrence of aggression, his hope for peace based upon international justice, quickened the heartbeats of despairing people everywhere.

"The problems of 1941 are the same as were the problems of 1918. Mr. Roosevelt speaks now as Mr. Wilson spoke then for the great masses of humanity who want to live together in peace. Had Woodrow Wilson received the support of the American people following the armistice of 1918, the present world crisis would not have occurred. The appeasers of Munich were no more responsible for the present World War than were those first isolationists who stymied and destroyed Woodrow Wilson in 1918–19. We could not escape then, we cannot escape now, as the richest and most powerful nation in the world, our responsibility for world leadership, for world peace.

"Let us resolve our honest differences of opinion into harmonious action. Let us not permit selfish, sordid, partisan politics to again destroy America's leadership in a time of peril. If we do civilization is doomed.

"Lest we forget, and in hopes that history will not repeat itself in the tragic errors of 1918, I want to place in the RECORD that memorable speech delivered 23 years ago today by President Wilson."

Nazi statesmen have sneered and accused Messrs Roosevelt and Churchill of plagiarizing Woodrow Wilson. Principles of truth and justice cannot be plagiarized. The parallels between the stated objectives in the 14 points and in the 8 points are striking. Let me remind you of at least one difference, however. The peace aims of America declared by Mr. Roosevelt are made during peace. Mr. Wilson's declaration was made in the midst of war. Mr. Roosevelt's aims are joined in and adopted by the British Empire. Mr. Wilson's statement fell upon the deaf ears of the British, was over their heads and wholly misunderstood by them. This very important distinction in the time and acceptance of this declaration of peace aims seems to me of historic and hopeful significance.

Wars will not be lessened among the nations until the causes for wars are lessened. The striking similarities between the 8 points and the 14 points in their efforts to remove causes for war have been declared generally as follows:

First. Both documents state that economic barriers shall be removed insofar as possible, and that all nations shall have access to the markets of the world.

Second. Both documents proclaim the right of small nations and oppressed national minorities to choose their rulers and the form of their governments.

Third. Both documents seek a scaling down of armaments.

Fourth. Both documents condemn secret compacts and balance-of-power alliances as a means of preserving peace.

Fifth. Finally, and most important, both documents proclaim the necessity for an association of nations to promote mutual good will, and to afford mutual guaranties of political and territorial integrity. Woodrow Wilson's dream of a League of Nations begins to reappear.

Already, however, the so-called isolationists have begun to attack this concept. Men will always have honest differences of opinion, but those who play politics with international affairs, those whose actions may be governed in this crisis by their hate of or love for any individual, are almost guilty of treason.

Just as America has participated in most all the wars since the foundation of this Republic, she has also participated in, in fact has been the leader of, most peace efforts. It is well known that Americans were active in the formation of the first Hague Convention in 1899. But here is a fact known to but few Americans, and forgotten by most statesmen. In 1910 the following Public Resolution No. 47 was passed by the American Congress without a dissenting vote and signed by President Taft. Now listen closely to its reading:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a commission of five members be appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement, and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war."

In 1919 President Wilson created the League of Nations—a new dream of a New World to be ruled by justice and right. In a bitter attack upon President Wilson, America turned her back upon the League, and, in his own words, "broke the heart of the world." In 1922 America took the lead in the Washington Naval Limitations Agreement, under which world naval building was restricted for many years. In 1928 Secretary Kellogg negotiated the Briand-Kellogg Peace Pact outlawing war "as an instrument of national policy." This pact was eventually signed by 63 nations, and has subsequently been disregarded by most of them.

For the sake of peace and world order it is hoped that politicians will not again defeat American participation in some form of world peace organization. The League of Nations had faults. It should not have been a part of the Treaty of Versailles. Faulty and imperfect as it was, America should have joined the League, and should have occupied the chair left vacant at the head of the council table of the world.

Soon America will again be confronted with the proposition of joining a new and a better league. Nineteen years ago your Speaker participated in a debate with the University of Oklahoma on the subject *Resolved*, That America Should Join the League of Nations. In reference to the new association of nations, we borrow the concluding statement of the affirmative in that debate. The Speaker declared that "unless America joins the League of Nations, and participates in a world organization for peace, you might as well inscribe across the pages of this civilization that inscription which Dante wrote across the gates of hell, 'Abandon all hope, ye who enter here.'"

Amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

RADIO BROADCAST OF HON. FRED BRADLEY, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address to be delivered by me this week:

I wish all of my listeners could have been privileged to sit in the gallery of the House of Representatives last Tuesday evening during the final vote on the draft-extension bill. Here was being made possibly one of the most momentous decisions in our entire history as a nation. It was the most dramatic spectacle that I have ever witnessed and one which never will erase itself from my memory.

I do not pretend to be a dramatist or an artist with words, but may I attempt to give you some bit of a verbal picture of what transpired.

This was the setting: There were 405 Members on the floor. Our galleries normally hold 600 people, but on this occasion every aisle was full, people were standing in the rear, and certainly there must have been at least 800 people crowded into those galleries. The corridors outside were jammed. Many people had been sitting in the galleries—some had been standing in the halls—since early in the morning. Many boys in khaki were spotted around the gallery, all intently awaiting the final vote. We had gone into session at 10 o'clock in the morning in order to endeavor to arrive at a final vote the same day. Normally we meet at noon, occasionally at 11 o'clock, but never before in these eventful 3 years had we met at 10. Our general debate ended about noon and then for about 7 hours amendment after amendment was offered to the bill, and all were quickly defeated, with the exception of one which granted a $10-a-month increase in pay to the enlisted men who had served 1 year. But each amendment brought forth rapid fiery debate, pro and con, on the various parts of the bill. There had been a general agreement on the part of practically everybody that the Nat onal Guard, the Regular Army Reserves, and all officers should be retained in service, and hence the fight centered almost entirely on the question of whether or not the selectees should be retained beyond the 1 year as specified in the original act. And throughout this whole tense day Member after Member had been called off the floor time after time and pleaded with, cajoled, or frequently threatened to change his vote for or against.

Then sometime after 7:30 in the evening there came the dramatic anticlimax when Representative HARNESS, of Indiana, offered his motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs with instructions to report it back with certain changes. These embodied the suggestions advanced by all those, both Republicans and Democrats, who had been standing in opposition to the bill. His motion would have provided that all selectees who desired to do so at the end of their year's training could volunteer for further service. That was the principal point. The second point was that the number of selectees who might be called into service at any time would still remain at 900,000. Both of these provisions would, of course, be null and void if we later go to war or if the Congress declares that a national emergency exists.

A roll-call vote was taken on this motion to recommit and it was defeated by 190 to 215. A motion to recommit is generally offered on all important legislation, and the vote recorded on it is generally of such significance that frequently a final roll-call vote is not demanded, because of the general feeling that very few votes are changed on the question of final passage.

But in this instance, however, Chairman MAY, of the Military Affairs Committee, demanded a roll-call vote on final passage and then there began the enactment of a real drama. There is always some confusion at the start of any roll call, and very often considerable noise and scuffling in the Chamber. That was true in this instance. Also there was considerable restlessness in the gallery as the tally clerk started to call each Member's name in turn. In various spots over the floor, one could see little huddled groups of men, which meant that somebody in that group was carefully tallying the ayes and nays as they were being recorded. And whenever it was noted that a Member had switched his vote, the situation became more tense. Finally the Clerk ended his first roll call, which means that every Member's name had been called once; and then, as is our custom, the Speaker announced that the Clerk would again call the names of all those who failed to answer on the first roll call.

At the end of the first roll call, there had been a difference variously recorded by individual checkers of from one to five votes in favor of the extension; and so when the second roll call started, one could have heard a pin drop in that immense Chamber of the House of Representatives. The galleries were tense. Many Members stirred uneasily in their seats, a few of us were quietly pacing the floor in the rear of the Chamber. Finally, the second roll call was ended. Then one Member stepped down into the well of the House and asked that his vote recorded as "aye" be changed to "nay." Representative SHORT of Missouri asked that the vote be recapitulated to be certain that every Member was recorded correctly. This, by the rules of the House, the Speaker denied, before announcing the vote, and then came his dramatic words: "On this roll call 203 Members have voted aye, 202 Members have voted nay, and the bill is passed." Thus was history made in the House of Representatives. What the future holds for us and the Nation as the result of that decision, one hesitates to predict.

All our Michigan Members with the exception of two from the metropolitan Detroit area had voted in opposition to the extension.

I have often wondered just what must have been the individual reactions on board His Majesty's ship, *The Prince of Wales*, when the result of that vote came over the radio.

Over the week-end, we had suspected more and more that a momentous conference between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill was unquestionably in progress on the high seas, and we knew pretty generally who must have been present at that conference by reason of their unannounced and mysterious absence from Washington. You will recall that our American newspaper correspondents had been denied all privilege whatsoever to accompany the President on this momentous fishing trip, in order, that he could have complete rest. Hence all we could do in official Washington was to conjecture on possibilities. We have since learned, however, that Winston Churchill did not ban the English news writers, because, as usual, whatever information we did get came from the London press, and since has been proven authentic even though at the time it was denied by the White House. We found in Washington last Friday that the pictures of the momentous conference released from the White House had been taken by English press photographers. Thus does Churchill keep his people informed while we remain in the dark; and so when this bill passed many of us then wondered just what effect that close vote must have had on the final decisions arrived at during the conference. Surely it must have given them plenty of food for thought, because certainly here was no mandate that the American people were ready for war. Surely, here was a mandate that the American people still insisted that there must not be another American expeditionary force; hence that vote may have had a distinctly sobering effect on whatever military plans may have been conceived in the conferences between our General Marshall and England's Sir John Dill. For after all, the people of this continent—both in our country and in Canada—are chiefly concerned about what decisions may have been arrived at in these military strategy conferences between our Army chieftains and our naval chieftains as well.

Toward the close of the debate on the draft extension, the majority leader of the House, Mr. MCCORMACK, had made this statement: "President Roosevelt has consistently said that he is taking steps for the defense of America and for the purpose of keeping us out of war, and he has kept up out of war to date, August 12, 1941." The thing that has kept America out of war to date—and the only thing—has been the voice of you, the people of America, and especially the voice of the mothers of America. What we are all concerned about is whether the statement issued on August 14, 1941, and signed by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill may not have definitely marked the turning point in our future program. Apparently now our first aim will no longer be the defense of America but an offensive to bring about the final destruction of Nazi tyranny and to free the conquered peoples of Europe In the words of the present and recent past commander of the English forces in the Near East, this can never be brought about without the complete and active participation of American manpower.

The famous eight-point statement signed by President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill is not entirely a statement of any new post-war policy; but what principally concerns us on this continent is not so much what we are going to do after the war is won, but just how far we may have to go in winning this war and in bringing about the final destruction of Nazi tyranny. Our friends up in Canada, who are active belligerents in this war, who have been making many sacrifices in the past, want to know—and justly so—why their Premier, Mr. Mackenzie King, was not invited to participate in that conference. They want to know why he was not invited, especially in view of the fact that it is noted in those dramatic English press pictures issued from the White House on last Friday that two of the President's sons—Capt. Elliott Roosevelt and Ensign Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.—were both present at that historic meeting.

And we in the United States want to know just what new and perhaps immediate commitments may have been made for our Navy or for our air force, or for the possibility of another American expeditionary force. Are we henceforth to forego "keeping the war away from our shores" by seeking war on foreign shores? We want to know just how much further we may be expected to go in providing the manpower to carry out those strategic military moves which were started in the occupation of Iceland, and more of which were predicted by the President in his speech of May 27, in order to encircle the Axis Powers through the future occupation of the so-called jumping-off bases—those in the Azores, in the Cape Verde Islands, in the Canary Islands, and

possibly also in the sending of an American expeditionary force to Freetown in South Africa to offset the threat to Nazi occupation of Dakar. The American people will wonder just how far we will have to go in the Pacific to bring about the encirclement of Japan and to remove her as a threat in the Pacific. These are the military moves which undoubtedly are in the offing and in which we want to know just how far we will have to participate with our own manpower. This may not be very far off, particularly when we realize that we have for some time been carrying out large-scale landing operations with a large fleet of transports supported by smaller craft off the coast of the Carolinas. We have been carrying out these training maneuvers recently on a large scale; not only with our marines but, I am told, also with some of our Regular Army and many selectees as well. Undoubtedly, some of our Coast Guard men from the Great Lakes are helping to man, and instruct in the manning, of the small boats being used for these landing operations and in training our men for possible similar landing operations on those islands far out in the Atlantic. Yes; we are more concerned about what we may be expected to do in the immediate future than we are in what is going to happen after the war is over, and which no one dare predict at this moment. Yet the eight-point statement definitely commits us to a role of policing the world, presumably with England furnishing the brains and we furnishing the money and brawn.

And now in conclusion, I have a brief announcement that I wish to make. As you have undoubtedly read in the papers, the Congress has decided to take a vacation until September 15, unless a crisis develops in the international situation by reason of which the Speaker can call us back into session immediately. I expect to return to the district and remain until about September 10. I have learned that it is unwise to rely too much on the press or radio for accurate information about just what is actually going on in Washington—and I say this, not in any spirit of criticism—but because of the fact that I have learned it is necessary for us to keep in touch with congressional committees in order to get the complete story on the various subjects which I have wished to discuss with you and which I think may be of interest to you. Consequently, in view of the fact that in these broadcasts I try to give you facts from Washington, I know that you will agree with me that it would be unwise for me to endeavor to continue these broadcasts during our recess period and, therefore, I ask you to give me a leave of absence from the air until September 17, at which time I expect to be back with you again.

New War Department Building in Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the opposition of President Roosevelt and that of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the Fine Arts Commission, the hastily considered amendment tacked on to the $8,000,000,000 defense bill in this House, providing $35,000,000 for a new War Department building on the Virginia side of the Potomac River, seems about to become a law. The Senate, with a large number of its Members absent, refused by a vote of 27 to 30 to reduce the amount and the bill passed without a record vote.

The unusual procedure of making such an appropriation by this House without previous authorization was brought out in my protest against it when the measure came up on July 28. The Washington press has published many columns in opposition to the project of erecting "the largest office building in the world" at a time when our national defense is demanding billions for its program, and when the use of steel, copper, and many other commodities which will be required for such a structure are being otherwise restricted in order to protect the manufacture and construction of planes, ships, guns, ammunition, and so forth, so badly needed for national defense.

Without going further into a matter which now seems to have been determined upon by both House and Senate, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Washington Evening Star which outlines the course of this War Department project. I would call particular attention to its ultimate cost when to the $35,000,000 there will be added the expense of new roads and streets, alterations of present driveways, and probably not less than two more bridges across the Potomac River.

The article from the Evening Star is as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star]

WAR BUILDING "BLITZ" LEAVES CAPITAL STUNNED AND CONFUSED—PROPOSAL FOR WORLD'S BIGGEST OFFICE WOULD VITALLY AFFECT WASHINGTON

"Senator ADAMS. It will be perhaps the biggest building in the world?

"Mr. BERGSTROM (a consulting architect). The largest one I know of." (From the Senate hearings on the War Department Building.)

The Army's blitzkrieg attack on Congress and Washington, with the largest office building in the world as its immediate objective, has been so sudden and so overwhelming that effective resistance has been scattered and left in total confusion. Nothing quite like it has ever happened in Washington before.

Within a few days the House and the Senate Appropriations Committees have approved not merely a $35,000,000 building at the very gates of Arlington National Cemetery; they have approved a scheme so revolutionary in its ramifications and effect on Washington—as a city and as a Capital—that no one has had time even to attempt any careful appraisal of their full significance.

For the first time, however, there is about to be approved by Congress, through the questionable procedure of legislation in an appropriation bill, the transfer of a major Government department beyond the boundaries of the seat of Government.

The step is being taken in complete defiance of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

The Bureau of the Budget has been wholly ignored along with the Senate's own Building and Grounds Committee.

The President's hurriedly expressed admonition for caution, written just before he left Washington for a vacation, has been disregarded.

MANY TRANSFERS LIKELY LATER

And it is not only possible but probable that if the scheme is carried out the end of this war emergency—and all emergencies eventually end—will see the transfer out of Washington to Arlington County of offices for about 25 percent of all the executive employees in the Capital. Such transfer would be necessary to fill up the huge building planned for 40,000 War Department employees, more than half of whom doubtless would be dispensed with after the war.

The story of a decision reached in the course of a few days but vitally affecting the future of Washington—esthetically, economically, and perhaps politically—is almost incredibly full of surprising contradictions, confusion, and unsettled differences of opinion among the experts.

A subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, on July 17, was listening to W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings, describe the lack of space for the Government agencies. His Commission had asked for $15,000,000 for temporary buildings and "fringe" buildings on the outskirts of Washington where some of the agencies could be located—moving to make room in Washington for others. The Budget Bureau had cut this item to about $6,000,000. Representative WOODRUM, Democrat, of Virginia, asked Mr. Reynolds if $6,000,000 was enough. Conversation turned to the land acquired by the War Department on the old Arlington experimental farm across the river as the site for relatively small, temporary buildings for the War Department.

GENERAL HAD PLANS READY

Mr. Reynolds suggested that Brig. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Office of Chief of Staff, might say something about War Department needs, and the general was asked to look into the availability of the old Hoover Airport as site for an office building. General Reybold returned a few days later, accompanied by Brig. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, an engineer officer assigned to the Quartermaster General's Department.

General Somervell was ready, and must have been for some time. For he unrolled his maps and plans and displayed to the committee the site and architect's drawings of a building to be erected near the entrance to Arlington Memorial Cemetery.

It would cost $35,000,000. It would cover 34 acres. It would be three stories high. It would provide about 4,000,000 square feet of office space. It could take care of 40,000 people, "but at the present time we do not think we will use it for more than 30,000." There would be additional space for War Department records. It could be built in a year.

Would the $35,000,000 cover everything? Representative WOODRUM asked. "Will that complete the job, covering everything, including the utilities?"

Yes, sir," said General Somervell.

SPECIAL RULE OBTAINED

It is an unusual thing for Congress to approve a $35,000,000 item for an office building even after years of consideration and delay. But this plan went through like greased lightning. When it came up in the House a point of order was made against it, as legislation in an appropriation bill. The House was adjourned and a special rule hurriedly obtained from the Rules Committee waiving all rules and the bill was passed. It was impossible to get a separate vote on the War Department building, for the bill was appropriating some $6,000,000,000 for national defense, of which the War Department building was a small part.

News of the House approval of the plans stunned the Capital planning agencies. They had not been consulted. They knew nothing about it. Even high officials of the War Department, approached by reporters on the day the bill was reported out, said they had never heard of the project.

The Park and Planning Commission called a hurried meeting of traffic and highway authorities. The President dispatched a letter to Senator ADAMS, chairman of the Senate subcommittee which had the bill in charge. He said:

"MY DEAR SENATOR ADAMS: There is included in the first supplemental national-defense appropriation bill (H. R. 5412) 1942, now before your committee, an item of $35,000,000 for the construction of an office building across the Potomac on the site of the former Department of Agriculture Experimental Farm to house all of the activities of the War Department. When this project was first brought to my attention, I agreed that it should be explored. Since then I have had an oportunity to look into the matter personally and have some reservations which I would like to impart to your committee.

"It is gratifying to know that the Congress is willing to provide the necessary funds at this time to construct sufficient office space of a permanent character to meet the expanding needs of the Government and to permit a material reduction in the rental bill in the District of Columbia.

"While I am in full accord with this general objective of providing additional permanent space and have no objection to the use of the Arlington farm site for an office building for the War Department, I do question the advisability of constructing the entire 4,000,000 square feet on the proposed site without first being reasonably sure that the present and proposed traffic and transportation facilities can accommodate the 45,000 employees who will be employed in this immediate area and that the necessary adjustments in Arlington and the District of Columbia can be accomplished without undue burden upon either community. In this connection, I invite your attention to the report of the National Park and Planning Commission. * * *

OBJECTION TO PHASE OF PLAN

"My attention was also called to that part of the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House on the bill wherein it was suggested that the proposed project would permit the War Department to vacate all space in the District of Columbia including the permanent building for that department on the site bounded by Twenty-first, Twenty-third, C and E streets NW., the first unit of which has been recently completed and occupied, and the reassignment of this building to the Navy Department. I trust this suggestion will receive further consideration. It has been my thought that after the present emergency the Congress would provide the necessary appropriations to complete the planned development of that section lying between Constitution Avenue, E Street, and west of Twenty-first Street, wherein it is proposed to locate the permanent home of the War and Navy Departments. Congress has authorized the acquisition of all land within this area and a large portion is now Government owned. To defer the completion of this plan indefinitely would constitute a severe setback to the development of this section and result in improved real-estate values which will materially increase the cost of acquisition of land.

"In view of the above, I believe it would be unwise to provide office space on the Arlington farm site for more than 20,000 War Department employees until some experience shall have been acquired as to the effect of concentrating so many employees in this location. It may be that upon completion of this smaller building all interested parties would recommend against further expansion. On the other hand, a more complete survey at that time might warrant the construction of additional units. In the circumstances, I believe it wise to proceed with a first unit, and upon its completion to resurvey the situation and carefully determine the extent to which further expansion at this location may be justified.

"I am presenting these comments to you in order that your committee may have the benefit of my review of the proposed project at Arlington farms as well as my hopes regarding the final development of the area west of Twenty-first Street between Constitution Avenue and E Street.

"Sincerely yours,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

CONTRADICTIONS IN TESTIMONY

In reference to the President's proposal for a building to house 20,000 instead of 40,000 people, General Somervell told the committee that such a building would not "meet the needs for the War Department." In addition, he said that it would not save 50 percent of the cost of the building twice as large.

Some curious contradictions appear in the testimony. Chairman SNYDER, of the House Subcommittee on Army Appropriations, testifying before the Senate committee, said that he believed the building, if it costs $35,000,000, would probably pay for itself in 7 years by increased efficiency in the War Department and saving rent in the District of Columbia. But Chairman ADAMS, after hearing all the testimony, said that "I am not sold at all on this thing as a measure of economy. * * * I doubt very much that you can justify it on the ground of saving money. * * * I question very much the extent of saving in dollars, but I don't think that is the big item." The big item, he thought, was the increased efficiency resulting from having the employees all under one roof.

General Somervell did not believe that staggered hours for employees in the new building would be necessary. But the Park and Planning Commission, after consultation with traffic authorities, found that it would be necessary to stagger working hours over a 2-hour period in the morning and a like period in the afternoon.

STILL LARGER FUND NEEDED

General Somervell said that $35,000,000 would "cover everything." But that statement is contested by other estimates, still in the process of formulation and running as high as $10,000,000, to cover new roadways and approaches and facilities. The Park and Planning Commission estimated that roads and approaches would cost between seven and eight million dollars.

Part of this might come from highway funds—not yet available—which the War Department has said "informally" it would be willing to certify for defense highways. This money, it has been said, might have to be spent anyway, and the War Department Building would merely expedite the expenditures. If the War Department Building is approved, however, it would have to be spent immediately in order to make the building accessible to the employees when it is completed.

For the District of Columbia, the new approaches and highway projects—many of which have been planned for construction over a period of years—would have to be rushed to completion immediately. If these improvements are to be available in time to serve the new building within a year or so, no money is available now. That money will have to be provided either through increased local taxes or by Federal grants. The amount is in doubt. No estimates have been made. But many millions will be required. The so-called Whitehurst program, containing many items that would be necessary now if the building is constructed, was to be spread out over 8 to 16 years, depending on the money available.

AGENCIES ARE SPLIT

Opposition to the building developed a curious split between the agencies charged with the esthetic development and planning of the Capital. Chairman Clarke of the Commission of Fine Arts flatly opposed the site. It was reserved, he said, as far back as 1901, as open territory, to be used either as a park or as an extension of Arlington Cemetery. It was inconceivable to the Fine Arts Commission that the plans of 30 years would be upset by the War Department's sudden conclusion that the Arlington site is the only one available.

The Park and Planning Commission, and the President, found no objection to the site itself, but both questioned the wisdom of using it for so large a building.

The Senate committee sought to develop thought as to other available sites. But those testifying were stymied by not being able to point out any place in Washington immediately available for so large a building. No one previously has advocated the necessity for housing 30,000 or 40,000 employees under one roof and no one had ever mentioned the possibility of a $35,000,000 building. And the War Department's sudden decision that this was absolutely necessary caught the planners unprepared. It must be remembered that the Park and Planning Commission has been trying to purchase land, according to carefully laid plans, with a few million dollars spread over many years. The thought that Congress was actually trying to find a site for a 34-acre building, parking space for 10,000 automobiles, and 40,000 employees naturally took them off their feet and left them gasping.

SWITCH ON SITES CURIOUS

Both the spokesmen for the Fine Arts Commission and the Park and Planning Commission advocated, as did the President, the so-called Northwest Rectangle, in which there already has been completed the first unit of a new War Department Building. But the War Department, which previously had approved the Northwest Rectangle plans, suddenly switched against them. General Somervell's chief objection seemed to be that there was not enough land to provide parking space for the employees as well as an office building for 40,000 employees in that area.

Here, however, another curious angle developed. The recent highway and traffic survey of Washington, known as the Whitehurst report, reached the definite conclusion that it was economically impossible to provide off-street parking space for large buildings in Washington. The proposal was made that the search for such space be abandoned, and that "fringe parking lots" be established on the outskirts of the city, connected with the various office buildings by direct bus routes. The decision now to go out of Washington to build a large enough building to house 30,000 or 40,000 employees, with parking facilities for 10,000 automobiles, upsets the basic philosophy of the fringe-parking idea and creates new traffic problems not contemplated in the Whitehurst report. An idea of what this traffic problem will mean can be gained from a realization that from the Department of Commerce Building to the Apex Building the whole Avenue Triangle development houses a third less employees than would be housed on the other side of the river in the War Department Building. There was conflict in the testimony before the Senate committee as to the capacity of the bridges and the approaches. And this conflict, still undecided, leaves also undecided the question whether another bridge across the Potomac will be immediately necessary.

TRAFFIC DATA GIVEN

A traffic survey in the fall of 1939 showed that 75 percent of the War Department employees live in Washington, the remaining 25 percent being about evenly divided between Maryland and Virginia. It also showed that about 18 percent of the employees walked to work. With the sudden expansion of War Department personnel, the percentage of those living in Washington has in-

creased. A large proportion of them are housed in rooms, and such facilities are not available outside the city.

An important consideration, not touched on in the hearings, affects the future of Washington—after the war.

In April 1917 there were 2,816 War Department employees in Washington. The war brought on the sharp fluctuations shown in the following tabulation:

1918	37,406
1919	27,416
1920 (March)	18,985
1920 (June)	12,212
1921	6,429
1922	4,921

As shown, the number of employees after the war decreased in less than 4 years by 33,000.

On July 1, 1933, the number of employees had dropped still further to 3,744. In 1940 the number had risen to 6,694; in May 1941 it had jumped to 21,620. The number now is about 24,000. By the first of next year the anticipated employment is 30,000—still 7,000 less than the peak of employment during the first World War.

ONE-HUNDRED-YEAR NEED IS SURPRISE

One surprising angle of the War Department plan is the scheme to build a building that will last 100 years, the largest office building in the world, to accommodate what obviously is a temporary emergency force of employees. After the emergency has passed, the number of employees will rapidly decrease. Perhaps 4 years after the emergency has passed, the number of employees will drop from 40,000 to less than 20,000; perhaps to 10,000.

The huge building at Arlington will, of course, be in excess of the needs of the War Department then.

What will happen? Government agencies have some interesting statistical computations in the process of formulation. As the War Department and other agencies are cut down after the war and space in the War Department Building becomes available, other agencies in Washington, occupying rented or temporary quarters, will be shifted across the river. And space computations now indicate that as many as 29 percent of the entire executive department personnel might be so shifted.

If the shift did not take place, the excess space at the Arlington building, even counting 1,000,000 feet for storage of department records, would be wasted.

If the shift did take place, it would precipitate a serious economic problem in the sudden vacating of about 60 percent of Government-rented space in Washington office buildings. Incidentally, the R. F. C., through its subsidiary, the R. F. C. Mortgage Co., has invested almost $10,000,000 in Washington office building construction. About 25 percent of all office space in privately owned buildings in Washington is rented to the Government.

There is, of course, no question about the great demand for office space now—not only by the War Department, but by almost every other agency. By July of 1942, provided the present emergency continues, the Government will own about 19,500,000 square feet of office space; will be renting about 6,000,000, and still will be short 2,000,000 square feet for which provision must be made. This does not count the space contemplated in the new War Department Building. If that is built, 4,000,000 additional square feet will be available, which would mean a surplus, instead of a shortage, of about 2,000,000 feet.

The War Department, housed in about 17 different buildings in Washington, now needs about 734,000 square feet of office space. By constructing the new building, with 4,000,000 square feet available, the War Department would release about 2,140,000 square feet of space it is occupying. Principal beneficiary of this additional space would be the Navy, which would take over the Munitions Building, which it now shares with the War Department. This, apparently, would mean that a temporary building, now under construction in Arlington County, would not be needed for the Navy but would be utilized by some other Government agency.

As the War Department plan took nearly everybody in Washington by surprise, many of the points hurriedly raised in objection remain unsettled. General Somervell, who has a fine reputation as an officer, is dead sure he is right. Others are dead sure he is wrong.

Congress is expected to approve the building within a few days, and it is believed that new objections, not voiced as yet, will develop as fast as the promised construction. It is to be doubted if any single act of Congress ever changed, quite so radically, the future picture of Washington or caught so many people, supposedly concerned with planning for the city, completely off guard.

Appropriations and Obligations Incurred by Congress — Seventy-seventh Congress, First Session, to August 18, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 15, 1941

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement of the total amount which will come directly out of the Treasury in one way or another as a result of the bills that have been passed so far in the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress. These figures include, in addition to direct appropriations, permanent appropriations, contract authorizations, R. F. C. war loans which will either not be paid back or will have to be paid through Government contracts, and reappropriation of funds which without this action would remain in the Treasury.

TABLE I

Direct appropriations	$39,897,767,138.63
Reappropriations	29,749,775.20
Permanent appropriations	5,009,674,586.00
Total cash appropriations	44,937,191,499.83
R. F. C. loans	2,760,000,000.00
Contract authorizations	3,698,481,291.00
Total available in all ways	51,395,672,790.83

This is the largest sum ever made available for the Federal Government.

The following table shows a breakdown of the amounts made available by bills for each Department in the last two sessions of Congress:

TABLE II.—*Appropriations*

Title	76th Cong., 3d sess.	77th Cong., 1st sess.
Agriculture	$1,189,960,963.00	$1,184,516,385.00
District of Columbia	53,256,901.00	60,778,564.44
Independent offices	1,409,409,314.00	1,986,577,372.76
Interior	$175,313,170.00	$222,675,113.00
Labor-Federal Security	1,188,920,569.00	1,203,941,940.00
Legislative	24,279,820.00	25,726,737.00
Military	1,522,571,757.00	10,567,986,098.00
Navy	1,493,342,750.00	3,449,878,416.00
State, Justice and Commerce	111,934,280.00	279,142,477.00
Treasury-Post Office	4,461,798,310.00	5,663,651,791.00
War Department civil functions	328,642,417.00	230,899,173.00
First deficiency	92,035,408.52	197,272,544.88
Second deficiency	139,466,777.23	1,041,444,529.75
Urgent deficiency	57,541,300.00	393,687,775.00
Additional urgent deficiency		174,409,630.00
Supplemental deficiency	254,790,776.00	
Relief, Work Projects Administration	1,282,711,357.00	910,905,000.00
First supplemental national defense, 1941	1,768,913,908.00	
Second supplemental national defense, 1941	4,045,102,532.00	
Third supplemental national defense, 1941	1,450,483,928.00	
Fourth supplemental national defense, 1941		1,533,567,102.00
Fifth supplemental national defense, 1941		4,383,221,174.00
First supplemental national defense, 1942		7,586,896,948.00
Lend-lease defense aid		7,000,000,000.00
First supplemental civil functions, 1941	287,990,014.35	
Housing	338,263,902.00	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans to South America	500,000,000.00	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans to industry	1,000,000,000.00	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation defense housing insurance		10,000,000.00
Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchase strategic materials		1,500,000,000.00
Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Commodity Credit Corporation		1,250,000,000.00
Army clothing		175,000,000.00
Merchant ships		313,500,000.00
Tennessee Valley Authority		40,000,000.00
Total	23,476,330,154.10	51,395,672,790.83

Of this grand total, not more than $2,500,000,000 was spent before July 1, 1941, and a very large percentage of it will be expended during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

Expenditures for military purposes are now running at the rate of nearly one and a half billion a month; I expect that figure to reach two billion a month by January 1, two and one-half billion by April 1, and three billion by June 30, 1942.

Even allowing for the reduction which will be occasioned by the tax money which will come in, the expenditures for the fiscal year 1942 will, in my opinion, run between twenty-seven and thirty billion dollars, and the deficit will be from fifteen to seventeen billion dollars.

The national debt on June 30, 1941, was $48,961,443,535.71, in addition to approximately $6,500,000,000 of guaranteed Government obligations, or a total of approximately $55,461,443,535.71.

By June 30, 1942, it will be in the neighborhood of $65,000,000,000 direct and $8,000,000,000 indirect, without any further changes in legislation.

The following table shows a breakdown of the appropriations of this Congress into regular, permanent reappropriations, contract authorizations, and special funds for each Department of the Government:

TABLE III

Agriculture:	
Regular	$1,060,500,063.00
Permanent	112,697,638.00
Reappropriation	11,318,684.00
	1,184,516,385.00
District of Columbia:	
Regular	54,183,106.00
Permanent	3,818,685.00
Reappropriation	45,845.44
Contract authorization	2,730,948.00
	60,778,584.44
Independent offices:	
Regular	1,414,626,838.00
Permanent	356,276,039.00
Contract authorization	208,452,000.00
Reappropriation	7,222,495.76
	1,986,577,372.76
Interior:	
Regular	188,325,923.00
Permanent	14,591,440.00
Reappropriation	3,082,750.00
Contract authorization	16,675,000.00
	222,675,113.00
Labor-Federal Security:	
Regular	1,195,861,940.00
Reappropriation	8,080,000.00
	1,203,941,940.00
Legislative:	
Regular	25,002,256.00
Permanent	718,481.00
	25,720,737.00
Military:	
Regular	10,384,821,624.00
Permanent	18,779.00
Contract authorization	183,145,695.00
	10,567,986,098.00
Navy:	
Regular	3,415,521,750.00
Permanent	3,228,772.00
Contract authorization	31,127,894.00
	3,449,878,416.00
State, Justice, and Commerce: Regular	279,142,477.00
Treasury-Post Office:	
Regular	1,147,624,384.00
Permanent	4,516,027,407.00
	5,663,651,791.00
War (civil functions):	
Regular	228,601,828.00
Permanent	2,297,345.00
	230,899,173.00
Urgent deficiency: Regular	393,687,775.00
First deficiency:	
Regular	191,478,544.88
Contract authorization	5,794,000.00
	197,272,544.88

TABLE III—Continued

Second deficiency: Regular	$1,041,444,529.75
Fourth supplemental national defense, 1941:	
Regular	1,376,464,602.00
Contract authorization	157,102,500.00
	1,533,567,102.00
Fifth supplemental national defense, 1941:	
Regular	2,299,767,920.00
Contract authorization	2,093,453,254.00
	4,393,221,174.00
Lend-lease defense aid: Regular	7,000,000,000.00
Additional urgent deficiency: Regular	174,409,630.00
Relief, W. P. A.: Regular	910,905,000.00
Army clothing	175,000,000.00
Merchant ships	313,500,000.00
Tennessee Valley Authority	40,000,000.00
First supplemental national defense, 1942:	
Regular	6,586,896,948.00
Contract authorization	1,000,000,000.00
	7,586,896,948.00
Reconstruction Finance Corporation:	
Defense housing insurance	10,000,000.00
Purchase strategic materials	1,500,000,000.00
Commodity Credit Corporation	1,250,000,000.00
	2,760,000,000.00
Total	51,395,672,790.83

The following table gives the number of employees in the Federal Government beginning June 30, 1930. These figures indicate a steady increase, and it must stop. There has been an increase of 787,839 since the Roosevelt administration came in, an increase of over 100 percent.

TABLE IV

1930	560,456
1931	571,368
1932	570,000
1933	577,170
1934	580,181
1935	751,269
1936	810,418
1937	871,236
1938	855,210
1939	925,260
1940	1,011,066
1941	1,365,000

The Roosevelt administration has succeeded in putting out of business hundreds of manufacturers and businessmen, especially in the smaller organizations. It has thrown out of work millions of men. It has prevented the successful operations of farming, mining, and business. It has endeavored to make more acute and more direct the distress of the people of the United States by what it calls social legislation, but which in fact has lowered the standard of living of the American people, reduced employment, and thrown millions on relief.

The debt limit has been raised to $65,000,000,000, which will be reached by the end of the fiscal year.

I have no criticism of the appropriations which have been made this session for national-defense purposes, totaling aproximately $36,000,000,000. I only wish that we had a Secretary of War and a Secretary of the Navy in charge of their Departments and competent to see that the defense money was honestly and efficiently spent. The worst part of the story is that defense money is being spent for other purposes than defense, and our expenditures for relief are still going on in spite of the fact that unemployment is on the decrease because of war preparations.

Upward of $2,000,000,000 of the funds appropriated for nondefense items should have been saved. We have the spectacle of the W. P. A. the C. C. C., and the N. Y. A. out soliciting people to go on relief and be paid by their organizations. It is the most disgusting spectacle that any administration has ever put on. Even now the administration is trying to put through enormous projects costing billions of dollars that have nothing whatever to do with defense and are a menace to the people of this country. Our national defense is being jeopardized by the dissipation of our resources by unprincipled spenders, whose only object seems to be to wreck the financial and business structure of the United States.

Is it not about time for the American people to wake up and realize how the Roosevelt administration has been swindling them?

Is Decentralization of Industry a Myth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, several months ago those in charge of our national-defense program announced that industry would be decentralized and that the Midwest would share in contracts for war materials and other national-defense purposes. To an infinitesimal extent, this promise has been kept. It is being observed more in the breach than in the observance.

Instead of approaching this problem from the standpoint of those communities with large numbers of unemployed people, the Government has kept right on expanding industries on the Atlantic seaboard and more and more has centralized the production of national-defense articles in certain localities.

In the Eighth Congressional District of Minnesota, which I have the honor to represent, no national-defense industries of any kind have been located. The Army could well afford to train men in our northern climate and establish an Army base in our locality, but nothing of that kind has been done. When they

decided to train ski troops, they passed by our territory, which in the wintertime is ideally located for such purposes. Up the shores of Lake Superior at Port Arthur and Fort William, the Canadian Government is building airplanes and its shipyards are building boats. But in northern Minnesota no such constructive work is being done and there are still thousands of unemployed people.

I just received a letter this morning from a resident of Duluth, Minn., and this is what he says to me:

It seems proper to inform you that conditions here at home are still deplorable and thousands of people around here are unable to find work so they can earn a living in spite of all these defense contracts being let all over this country. In considering the billions of wealth which are dished out every month to foreign countries, we, at times, are wondering if our representatives in Washington are representing foreign lands and their interests or the American people who elected them to office.

This constituent expresses my views exactly on the present policy of Government departments in furnishing our people with employment in connection with our national-defense program and the spending of money to aid foreign governments.

Administration officials, in their desire to develop a strong foreign policy, should not overlook the needs of American citizens.

In an editorial in this morning's Washington Post the whole problem is admirably summed up, and I quote a portion of the editorial, which reads as follows:

No secret has been made of the fact that Army and Navy procurement officials prefer to deal with prime contractors, while the latter—often for good reason—are reluctant to farm out defense work to other concerns. As a result the subcontracting program so far has been a failure. Defense orders have been concentrated in a comparatively few hands, and a vast amount of equipment that could be employed on defense work remains idle, or is being used for less essential purposes. Now that many smaller concerns engaged on nondefense orders face shut-downs because of raw-material shortages, vigorous and prompt action is called for to spread defense orders over a larger area. So it is encouraging to hear that O. P. M.'s Defense Contract Service will shortly be empowered to make subcontracting mandatory and to adapt defense orders to the facilities of the smaller companies.

The Selective Training and Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, because I feel I should not prolong the debate with regard to the extension of the service period of the selectees as provided for in House Joint Resolution 222, I shall avail myself of the customary privilege of extending my own remarks and the inclusion of an editorial printed in the Detroit News on Monday, August 4, which is a clear-cut and unchallengeable statement of fact, indicating that there was no 1-year agreement.

The editorial is as lucid as it is brief. On the points which it covers it is unanswerable and reflects my opinion on that score. Over and above that, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I had no choice but to vote for the bill. I had not made up my mind definitely until virtually all of the debate was exhausted. Now I am convinced that a grave national emergency exists, that my country is in danger, and that I have no right to trifle or take chances with my country's safety. If I am to make an error, it must necessarily and preferably be on the side of safety and security. I could not in conscience do less and enjoy peace of mind.

What would my answer be to my people in the event that I voted wrong and my country and its people became subject to a foreign despotic and tyrannous master? No excuse, no subterfuge, no explanation could be given that would satisfy, that would begin to compensate for the everlasting enslavement and for the cost in blood and treasure. If the Congress, on the advice of experts, ordains and declares that a grave national emergency exists and that training and preparation must be made at maximum and at top speed and it should be found that the preparations were more abundant than necessary, then the people will understand that the action was typically American and that it was intended that we shall be safe rather than sorry. No amount of explanation or regret will ever satisfy a defeated and enslaved American people. I include the editorial so ably written and captioned "No Flat Agreement for One Year Only."

[From the Detroit News of August 4, 1941]

NO FLAT AGREEMENT FOR ONE YEAR ONLY

In letters to the editor, as well as in private discussion of the term of service for selectees, there occurs repeatedly the idea that 12 months was the service "agreed on" in the "bargain" with the Government.

In truth there was no bargain. A government that had to bargain with the country's young men for its defense would be no government at all. The obligation to render military service, as to pay taxes, is absolute and not to be qualified by the individual citizen.

But citizens do misunderstand laws or fail to read or remember, which evidently is the case with the selective-service law. Its language is plain enough on the question of the length of service. In subsection (b) of section 2 it says:

"Each man inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) shall serve for a training and service period of 12 consecutive months unless sooner discharged, except that whenever the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled, such 12-month period may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interest of national defense."

Some political opponents of extending the period of service now speak of the law's provision on that head as something hidden, like the fine print in a snide contract. But there was no fine print. Nor was there a need to hide anything, for the plainly stated purpose of this law was to create an Army "for the common defense."

It was plain the training provided for was not just for training's sake; that it was for service of the country in time of need. Surely no one expected a new army would be trained every 12 months, and that thereafter the last trainees would be free to let the country take care of itself.

Subsection (C) of section 2 says:

"Each such man, after the completion of his period of training and service under subsection (B) shall be transferred to a reserve component of the land or naval forces of the United States and until he attains the age of 45, or until the expiration of a period of 10 years after such transfer he shall be deemed a member of such reserve component and shall be subject to such additional training and service as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law."

There remains the question whether "the national interest is imperiled" now, as subsection (B) says, in a way to justify extending the service of present selectees. No "bargain" is involved there, yet every citizen does have the right to his own opinion of the emergency. As to that, however, if the country is not prepared to rely on the President as Commander in Chief to tell it what is needed for defense, we do not know whom it can rely on.

Amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, after considerable hesitation I have decided to support this bill and because many people feel so strongly about it, both those in favor of its passage and those opposed to it, I think that it is only fair that I should discuss the reasons which have influenced me in arriving at my position.

I have a great amount of sympathy for the humane point of view which has inclined many people to vote against the bill. I feel that a mistake was made originally in the passage of the Selective Service Act. Too much emphasis was undoubtedly placed upon the provisions of this act which restricted the term of service to 1 year, and too little emphasis upon the provisions as to national emergency which would prolong the service for a greater period of time. Regardless of the wording of the act, which if read carefully indicated that a period of service beyond the year probably would be required, I know full well that the public generally and the selectees in particular contemplated a period of service of but 12 months. It was unfortunate that this impression should have been generally given, and I think that when the original act was passed, the public should have clearly understood the length of time that it would be necessary to keep our young men in camps. The mistake has been made. Now the question confronting the Congress is, keeping these facts in mind, Should they vote to release the men in camp and expose the country to peril?

This first mistake after all can be corrected. The men can be kept in camp. We must decide whether we will do so. If this bill passes and the course of world events later shows that we have been unduly alarmed about the possibility of war, the men can later be released. If we err in retaining the soldiers, we err on the side of safety. This again is a mistake which can be corrected.

On the other hand, if we are in imminent danger of war, as has been attested by the leaders of our Army and by our Department of State, then certainly it would be folly, perhaps even national suicide if we weakened our armed forces. Our self-preservation as a people may be at stake. Granted this, the personal disappointment or inconvenience or hardship of any portion of our population cannot influence our action. It would be unthinkable to disarm at the moment of danger. This would be a mistake unlike the two other possible mistakes that we have considered, in that it could never be corrected. It would be the most tragic mistake that we could make as a nation. We would place in jeopardy those liberties which are our proud inheritance and which are the very spiritual life of our Nation. We would admit our impotence to defend our national welfare. We should be convicted before all history as a generation of cowards who dare not preserve for ourselves and our descendants that way of life which our predecessors, even those within our own memories, have won with their sacrifice and blood.

I have always thought that in time of crisis our country had the right, in order to secure its national welfare, to call upon any of its citizens to bear arms in its defense. The period of service is properly measured not by any agreement or contract but by the duration of the national emergency. The duty of service and sacrifice is the primary thing. Any bill which might be passed by Congress is merely the formal enactment, the mechanics by which this duty of service is expressed. No law has permanent force. It may be repealed or a different law substituted the day after its passage. The Congress may, therefore, and must if the public safety demands it, call upon the citizens to rally to the colors. It may call back those men in service whose period has expired, may retain those who are already in service for a longer period of time than that contemplated, or call others who have not yet served. The test is the national interest, and it is the obligation of Congress as the elected representatives of the people to weigh all considerations carefully and to make its choice as to what course will best serve the national interest.

Now for a brief consideration of some of the other aspects of this bill. Are we in danger of war? I do not believe that any human knows what course the present struggle will take nor how far it will spread. We see Japan threatening to advance southward and to cut off supplies which are vital to us as a nation. We know that in the South American countries propaganda is rife, seeking to alienate those people from us and to incline them toward the Axis philosophy. We know that Britain has been fighting valiantly against the greatest armed forces of history, and that if her fight be unsuccessful we would be the last large democracy in the world. We know that everywhere that Hitler has conquered the most brutal and abject slavery has been imposed upon the people. We know that peaceful relations cannot be permanently maintained with such a government as that now dominating Europe; that former periods of peace have been used only as a period of respite and preparation for further conquest. We know that with cynical cunning they use our own disinclination to war and our own love for democracy as a weapon against us. They seek to corrupt and confuse us from within before they attack from without. No one knows when they might find it to their interest to move against the United States, either by economic pressure or military attack. I feel that we are in grave peril, and I do not propose to lend my efforts to weakening our Army.

Many arguments have been advanced to the effect that a substitution of one group of selectees for another will not weaken the Army. The testimony of our Chief of Staff, General Marshall, conversations which I have had with many students of military affairs, both in and out of the Army, as well as common sense would negative this argument. There are no distinct divisions, regiments, or even companies of men made up entirely of selectees. They are trained side by side with soldiers of our Regular Army and with members of our National Guard and with Reserve officers. More than ever today the unit is the division; the individual is unimportant. Present wars are fought not by guerrilla tactics or by citizenry armed with rifles and lying behind fences and stone walls. Wars are won today with highly organized and highly mobile mechanized units in which the individual must learn to subordinate himself and to do his duty with the utmost efficiency and dispatch. Units like these are not trained in a short time. It took only 150,000 mobile, highly organized German soldiers to conquer the Low Countries and France and disorganize and destroy millions of Allied soldiers. They had been trained for 8 years.

There is just one more thought. The entire world is looking toward the United States. We must not falter in the resolute position we have taken. Where would England be today without our aid? What course would South American politics have taken had we weakened in our stand and showed a willingness to appease? In what direction would Japan have moved had it not been faced by a certain conflict with our powerful Navy? It is our national duty to present to the world a united front. We cannot have a division between our executive and our legislative arms of the Government. We cannot show the world that we are divided as a nation. It is only by concentrated action that we can hope to avert this war from ourselves and at the same time to confound the enemies of our civilization.

The Selective Service Extension Act of 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. MEYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1941

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, following my vote against the bill extending the service of draftees, National Guards men, and Reservists from 1 year to 2½ years there have been some press statements and comments relative to my stand. Despite these, however, there are some essential considerations which dictated my action that have not appeared.

First, I should like to state that I voted against the service-extension bill simply because I believed, and still believe, that a better bill could have been and should have been enacted. I believe that such a long and indiscriminate extension period does not serve our best interest, all considered, at a time when this Nation is not at war.

The measure which would have received my support would have provided for a shorter extension period. It would have provided for some system of progressive discharge of the older draftees and others upon whom the present indiscriminate extension works particular hardship. Consider that there are in the Army thousands of men of relatively high age who were brought into service under the terms of the original Draft Act. Consider also that there are many patriotic young men in service who, thinking that 1 year's training only would be required of them unless the Nation should actually find itself at war, did not wait to be drafted but willingly applied for voluntary induction.

While the bill was under consideration there was offered an amendment providing for a 6 months' extension and progressive discharge of selectees based so far as possible in seniority. Together with the majority of the Maryland delegation, I voted for the amendment. I do not contend that it would have been a perfect measure, but it would have done something toward alleviating some of the hardships which the bill enacted makes certain.

I should like here to emphasize several points. The first is that this Nation is not now at war. It is true that a war of nearly world proportions is in progress and that we must be prepared for the most serious eventualities. I have supported and voted for every defense meas-

ure with a full understanding of such facts. But the facts of our situation at any given time determine what measures should be passed by the Congress and what action is proper for the Nation to take with reference to the conflict.

When the Service Extension Act was first put forward, I issued a statement which was reported in the press. In it I expressed the firm belief that citizens of this country, civilians, and service men alike, would approve any action, however drastic, once it was understood that such action was necessary. But I pointed out that such understanding would have to be based on information supplied by those highest in military and administrative positions. In view of this, I asked for a clearer statement of our situation and our military necessities than had up until that time been given the people. The result of the vote on the service-extension bill in the House of Representatives should demonstrate with utmost clarity that such a picture of our situation and our military necessities was not presented as would justify such a flat extension of service as two and one-half times the period originally specified. It was not shown, for instance, why a 6 months' extension would not serve our needs nor why it would not be possible and proper at the end of such period to take action calling for further extension if circumstances then made it advisable.

When the original draft act was made law it could, of course, not be told with any degree of certainty what the world situation would be at any time in the future and it cannot be told now. The point is that I believe the Congress and the citizens of this Nation stand ready at any time to take any action which existing circumstances demand where the interest or safety of the country is involved. Keep in mind that this Nation is not now at war and that it is important that we maintain the democratic way of doing things. A shorter extension period, progressive discharge of our present service men, and progressive induction of others eligible is the more democratic way as compared to the flat, indiscriminate and long-time extension which the bill I opposed provides. This particular point, and others related to it, could well be discussed with profit at much greater length than space here permits.

Another important consideration dictating my action on the measure is that of national unity. In these times I believe true national unity to be one of our greatest assets. The measure such as I would have favored I believe would have promoted national unity to a degree far outweighing any defects it might have been contended the measure possessed.

When I voted against the service-extension bill, that was enacted by so slender a margin, I was registering my opposition to its specific provisions. I believe that had it failed to pass that a better bill would have been enacted as a result. I believe that the resulting measure would have been one such as would have received far greater support from Members of Congress and much more general support from citizens throughout the country. And, furthermore, I believe that the real necessities of our national defense need not have been sacrificed thereby.

I think that it is foolish to contend that the measure as passed is the best possible one in the circumstances we find ourselves. But I freely admit that there can be honest differences of opinion on any subject. Were this not so there would be no court cases, nor would there be a division of opinion on this matter among Members of Congress and people throughout the country. It is my desire to cooperate to the fullest extent with the administration in all essential defense measures and to respect and to reflect the views of the citizens of this country. However, I feel that it is my sworn duty to study and weigh all defense measures and to determine them upon their merits, not to accept blindly every proposal put forth and labeled a defense measure. For instance, it has been urged by the administration, high military officials, and experts testifying before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors that the authorization of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is absolutely essential for our national defense. It so happens that I have examined this proposal over a long period and have reached the conclusion, together with many others, that the St. Lawrence survey fails to justify such expenditure as necessary to national defense, and, in my judgment, it is clear that the enormous sum of money required could be invested to much better advantage in other directions, for more pressing and immediate objectives, such as the necessary defense requirements of the great ports along the Atlantic seaboard. Can it be said that because its proponents urge this project upon us as a necessity to national defense that it should be accepted as such blindly, and that Members of Congress are impeding defense by opposing this project? I say, rather, that such opposition is in every sense in the interest of real national defense.

It is interesting to note that there are those who are heartily in accord with my exercise of independent judgment and criticism of this proposed seaway as a defense project, who, nevertheless, are critical of the use of the same independent judgment exercised in connection with the extension of the Selective Service Act. My estimate of what a proper bill would have been was based on evidence submitted to Congress during hearings held on the bill, coupled with my belief, as emphasized above, that the Congress and the people will at any time approve any action and make any sacrifice the country's welfare demands.

But now that the case is closed and the decision reached the controversy should end and those who cast their vote against this measure should stand foursquare behind General Marshall, giving him their full support and complete cooperation in the tremendous task of providing an adequate army for the common defense.

Defense by Aggression—The First American Expeditionary Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of August 16, 1941:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of August 16, 1941]

HISTORICAL FRAGMENT

Through all that devious pattern of getting into the war by staying out of it there were certain constant thoughts, like threads that appeared and vanished and came suddenly to view again, running always against the supposed design, no matter what the weavers said they were thinking or thought they were doing. Trace backward the one that was leading all the time to the first American expeditionary force—that is, to Iceland, where the armed forces of the United States now stand side by side with the British and where the United States Navy and His Majesty's Navy are acting together against the aggressor.

At any time last year, and especially during the campaign, anyone who asked who was going to reconquer Europe, or who suggested that Great Britain would be unable to put Hitler back without American manpower, was called a defeatist, a "fifth columnist," or a pro-Nazi. Did not Winston Churchill say Great Britain wanted from us only the tools to do the job, not our manpower? You might suppose he had political and strategic reasons for saying that. But if you had any doubt you could take the word of the President for it. During the campaign, October 23, 1940, the President said: "We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes * * *. We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands except in case of attack."

The thread is there. But you would have needed a cynical glass to see it. Almost no one did see it. The entire country understood the words "except in case of attack" to mean except in case of attack upon American territory, or, by the widest interpretation, upon this hemisphere. Congress so understood it, and with no word of dissent from the administration wrote it into the draft law, saying the Army it was about to raise was not to be sent out of this hemisphere.

The next appearance of the thread was on April 25 this year, when the Secretary of War, appearing before a special committee of the United States Senate, said: "Our forces must be prepared for the possibilities of war in many and varied terrains, it being quite uncertain in what part of North or South or Central America, or even possibly other regions, it may ultimately be necessary to use them." That was but a glimpse of it in two words—"other regions."

Meanwhile the Congress had passed the lend-lease law. Its anxieties and misgivings were quieted by the most solemn assurances that the administration's one idea was to push the war farther away. Those who said it was a law that released the President to conduct undeclared war against Hitler and would lead to an expeditionary force were confronted with the pledges that had been made to the contrary and then overwhelmed with a question. Did they doubt the word of their own Government?

On May 27 the President delivered the fireside chat in which he proclaimed an unlimited emergency. The constant thread now makes a startling reappearance, and you can see how it was there all the time. In this fireside chat the President said: "I have said on many occasions that the United States is mustering its men and its resources only for purposes of defense—only to repel attack. But we must be realistic when we use the word 'attack'; we have to relate it to the lightning speed of modern warfare. * * * We * * * will decide for ourselves whether and when and where our interests are attacked." * * * That was the speech in which he spoke of Greenland, Iceland, the Azores, the Cape Verde Islands, and the coast of west Africa as points that might have to be regarded as outposts of American defense.

From this point on there is a very shapely arrangement of events with dates.

June 10: The President makes his first 90-day report of the operations of the lend-lease law. This 39-page document is a formal statement of the American Government's participation in the war. The President says: "Allied ships are being repaired by us. Allied ships are being equipped by us * * * and are being armed by us. * * * Naval vessels of Great Britain are being repaired by us so that they can return quickly to their naval tasks. * * * We will help Britain to outstrip the Axis in munitions of war, and we will see to it that these munitions get to the places where they can be effectively used to weaken and defeat the aggressors."

June 11–28: Senator WHEELER, the America First Committee, and all last ditchers continue to support the fiction that the country is not in the war and cannot be until the Congress declares war. * * * Rumors of expeditionary forces preparing.

June 27: Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, says: "The way to national unity is to give our people assurances that when we are called upon to move into the actual range of fire and send our men there, whether on board naval vessels or aircraft, the American people themselves will have some opportunity to pass upon the question, in other words, that they will have the ultimate decision." * * * By a secret understanding with the British Government the first American Expeditionary Force is then about to set forth.

June 30: The Secretary of the Navy, speaking in Boston, declares the time has come to send in the Navy and rid the Atlantic of Germans. * * * The first American Expeditionary Force is then on its way.

July 1: At his press conference the President declines to comment on the declaration made by his Secretary of the Navy. He tells the reporters he still hopes the country can avoid fighting, but he cannot be very confident about it. He derides private polls showing public opinion to be against war. Of course people are against war, but that, he says, is like being against sin.

July 3: The War Department makes public a report from the Chief of Staff, saying the military arm is hamstrung by the law which forbids sending the new draft Army off this hemisphere; he urgently recommends that it be repealed. * * * Senator WHEELER says he hears that an expeditionary force is going to Iceland.

July 4: In Cairo, Gen. Sir Archibald P. Wavell, retiring British commander in chief in the Middle East, gives an interview in which he says the outcome will have to be decided in Europe by manpower, and that the war cannot be won without American manpower.

July 7: The President notifies Congress that the first expeditionary force has arrived in Iceland to take over from the British; also that he has ordered the Navy to clear the Atlantic Ocean between the United States and Iceland. * * * In Cairo, Gen. Sir Claude Auchinleck, succeeding Wavell as British commander in chief in the Middle East, gives an interview saying the war will have to be won in Europe, and that it will take American manpower to do it.

July 8: At a White House press conference the President tells the reporters the lines of the Western Hemisphere are geographically dim. Anyhow, the Government will act beyond them when and if necessary. He declines to comment on the report of the Chief of Staff. * * * The military critic of the New York Times says the occupation of Iceland means that the Government intends to help Britain with military means and the beginning of our definite participation in a shooting war.

July 9: Winston Churchill says that instead of the American forces taking over in Iceland, as the President told Congress, the American and British forces and the two navies will act together there, "with the same object in view." * * * At his press conference the Secretary of the Navy is asked if the United States Navy will shoot if necessary to keep the North Atlantic clear, and he answers that the reporters ought to be able to answer that one for themselves.

July 10: Congress receives from the War Department the draft of two bills—one to extend all enlistments for the duration of the emergency, the other to authorize the President to send the Army anywhere, "within or beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere, as he shall deem necessary in the interests of national defense." * * * The Senate Committee on Naval Affairs resolves to have the Secretary of the Navy before it and to ask him if the United States Navy has done any shooting.

We believe this marks the point in time when the weavers themselves had lost, or were about to lose, control of their own design. They had released the forces of defense by aggression in the new fashion of the world. You may say their thread was spun on the wheel of fate. That may be. Nevertheless, although it could tow a hemisphere, it could not tie us to the British Empire nor drag American manpower in until one end had been made fast in the European war zone. Fate itself could not have done that. It was an act of will.

A Plea for Tolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. LEWIS D. THILL, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following address, which I delivered at the Washington Memorial Chapel, at Valley Forge, Pa., on Sunday, August 17, 1941. The seventeenth annual Wisconsin State Sunday service was held at Valley Forge, under the auspices of the Daughters of the American Revolution of Wisconsin.

Today most of the civilized world is engaged in bloody battle. The baser emotions of certain leaders in the world have created chaos, confusion, starvation, and destruction. We in America fortunately are still situated away from the actual conflict. We are still free to do our own thinking. Still free to do our daily pursuits. Still free to talk openly and express our convictions. Those fellow men caught within the boundaries of nations now at war must envy us, our liberty, and our system of government.

Americans sometimes fail to realize the blessings they enjoy—blessings which they have received without exerting any effort whatsoever. The freedom which we take for granted was not so easily won. I need not recount to you the trials and suffering endured by those who preceded us, especially those brave men under the command of General Washington and those political figures of his day who embellished the records of our great country.

The right of freedom of speech guaranteed to us under the Constitution carries with it the principle of tolerance. Certainly we may speak freely and argue as we see fit in private gatherings or in public forums but we should also exercise restraint in our utterances. As we listen to the radio we are subjected daily to conflicting views and opinions relative to the position of the United States in international affairs. The views of most Americans with regard to whether this country should enter the war or stay out of the war are taking definite shape. People are inclined to feel so strongly one way or another on this issue that they permit their emotions to run away with reason and they are all too likely to permit their tempers to flare up and their tongues to become unrestrained.

Perhaps we can find in the writings of George Washington some principles to direct us in the conduct of international affairs at the present time. About 150 years have passed since the time when Washington's guidance protected our new Nation. During that period our country has prospered and grown to a position where it is the greatest Nation on the face of the globe. Other countries, particularly in Europe, have undergone changes in government. Monarchies have been replaced by republics and dictatorships have in turn come into power. The pages of European history during a century and a half recount war after war. Some of us living today may consider the war in Europe as resulting from tyrannical passion; others as a creation of national hatreds running for generations; some believe the war was caused by diametrically opposed financial and economic systems; others declare the war arose from a desire on the part of one nation for world trade; some individuals interpret the writings and conquests of one of the dictators as a bid for world domination; others can see only destruction arising out of the aggression of a dictator whose legions and whose philosophies, they claim, will collapse because they are spread over such vast territory and encompass so many different nationalities.

Let me read the following excerpt from Washington's Farewell Address, which to some may sound as words of wisdom, while to others perhaps it might be thought of as the language of an appeaser:

"The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray

from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy."

Can it be that today these words of Washington take on particular significance? Can it be that we are showing excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another to such an extent that we are endangering our own freedom and peace? Can it be that real patriots who dare speak out against war are unfairly looked upon with suspicion and are the unfortunate victims of hatred? Can it be that there are certain individuals in this country who are now gaining the applause and confidence of the people but who are surrendering their interests?

Let me read further: "Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

"Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

"Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?"

Is Washington telling us through the years that we should not engage in the present foreign war? Is he telling us that we have reached that stage in governmental efficiency where we may defy material injury from any outside source? Is he telling us that we may choose peace or war as our interest guided by justice shall tell us? Yes; the words of Washington carry added significance today when many think this country is on the verge of entering a foreign war. This Nation is now so powerful that it may choose peace or war. Justice and our interest should guide the action of this country in making this grave decision. Throughout the land arguments of those who favor war and of those who are opposed to war become sharper and more bitter. Tempers are flaring up and intolerance is being exhibited on every hand. Name calling, resentment, racial and religious prejudice should be suppressed. In these trying days for our Republic I make this plea: That we permit our judgment and reason to control our actions and speech rather than our emotions and our passions. If we are to guard our heritage of liberty it must be done by clear thinking and tolerance.

The Present Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KNUTE HILL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. KNUTE HILL OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me yesterday afternoon:

Dear friends, I have time and again, both in private and in public, declared that the national emergency, the danger of invasion by a foreign foe, is not greater today than it was a year ago. I will go further than that—it is not as great as it was a year ago. Any activity without cessation or rest must necessarily result in fatigue and distress. This is especially true of destructive warfare. The war dogs, like hunting hounds, are fresh at the start but begin to falter at the close of the day. Hitler's troops have without pause traveled at a furious pace for several years. It is true that many of the smaller nations yielded without much of a struggle. It was comparatively easy for a mechanized army to overrun these weaker countries because only an imaginary line—somewhat like a State line in these United States—separated them from Germany. Nevertheless, these victories took their toll from Hitler in funds, in equipment, in soldiers. It is, of course, clear that the wealth of these nations both in money and natural resources have been an asset to Germany. This can hardly be said of the conquered armies. Unwilling soldiers are poor soldiers—and this is equally true of sailors.

In my opinion Hitler at the height of his power and victories could never have successfully invaded the Western Hemisphere. He has been unable to cross the 20-mile English Channel—how could he possibly transport troops across 3,000 miles of ocean? If we use the immense appropriations for the defense program for strictly defense of the Western Hemisphere, especially building up a powerful and separate air force, we could defy any navy carrying troops to come within 500 miles of our shores. (See Al Williams' article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 29, 1941, p. A3858.) Then, too, the armies in conquered European countries would mutiny against Hitler and the people therein would rise in rebellion. Moreover, if we cultivated the South American republics as assiduously as have the Germans, Hitler could gain no foothold there. So, the threat from Hitler has at all times been negligible. And now that he has undertaken to subdue the Russian Bear he certainly is finding his match, and this distracts his attention from us even if he had such designs. He is and will be occupied for months to come.

As for Japan, there can be no threat to the United States from that source. All she wants is "Asia for the Asiatics." Is not that their version of the Monroe Doctrine when we insist on America for the Americans? For myself, I never condoned the acquisition of the Philippines, and the sooner we let them go, the better for us. The desire to hold them and the itch for the trade of the East Indies is the cause for our trouble with Japan.

The crisis today rises from several sources. First of all, we are joining hands with Stalin and communism to crush Hitler and nazi-ism. We are in league with one dictator to destroy another. Beware that Stalin does not make good his plan to internationalize the whole world. To appease him the Roosevelt-Churchill eight-point program completely omitted one of the four freedoms—freedom of religion. Another element of the present crisis is the lack of morale in our hastily formed Army. Taking young men from civilian life, forcing them to leave good positions to serve at $21 per month, while common laborers are getting increased wages and industrialists are profiteering; extending this enforced enlistment by 18 months, in violation of all fairness and clear understandings at the time of the conscription bill—all this has broken down the morale. It is reported that many of them are committing suicide since the extension was voted. Read Life for August 18 and also one article by Pearson and Allen in the Merry-go-Round to know how a very large majority of the selectees feel about the matter.

Still another element is the danger of secret diplomacy—secret commitments by our leadership with the leadership of the British Empire. The Congress as a coordinate branch of the Government is entitled to know all the facts and commitments and have a part in them when so grave an issue as participation in a war on foreign soil is concerned. We, as the chosen representatives of the people of these United States are entitled to know the truth and the whole truth so we can act accordingly. I, for my part, absolutely refuse to be kept in the dark and then merely concur in or approve the acts of this administration or any other administration.

Again an element in the present crisis is the encroachment on our civil liberties. If we were actually at war there might be occasion for some of the petty regulations and rules imposed upon a free people. But we are not at war—and until Congress so declares—we will not be. Therefore, I, as every other citizen has a right to do, resent the sending of officials of the Federal Government's agencies into our homes to spy on our activities or threaten us with dire results if we express our honest opinions and convictions. This is not democracy—it borders on dictatorship. Nor is it in conformance with our democratic institutions and a spirit of tolerance for those who differ with us as to the best methods of keeping out of war to call us names and charge us with being in league with Hitler. We despise and hate Hitlerism as much as the interventionists do, and I challenge any one of them to furnish one scintilla of evidence that we have any communication with or the least regard for Hitler or Hitlerism. I repeat what I have so often emphasized; we want none of Stalin with his communism, Mussolini with his fascism, nor Hitler with his nazi-ism. We must preserve and protect this country of ours for Americanism, which means equal opportunities for all, justice for all, the right to the four freedoms for all.

Lastly, the most serious, the most dangerous element in this crisis is the threat of fascism as the outcome of the present program. We have without stint voted billions upon billions for a defense program. Unusual and heavy taxes must necessarily be levied to

pay the "fiddler"—the war god. Do you remember the aftermath of the first World War? Well, that will be a Sunday-school picnic compared to what the aftermath of this World War will be if we enter into active participation. The people were long suffering in 1918 and 1919 and in 1933 they took new hope and courage.

But 1942 and 1943 will find a people ready for open rebellion because of broken promises and broken faith and broken homes. They will be ready for a real dictator. He will appear and have ready at hand an army and navy—always so subservient to the purposes of command and dictatorship.

To my mind there is only one way in which to prevent this catastrophe. Let us build up our stupendous defense program, but keep our Army and Navy subject to civilian authority at all times. Let this defense be for the Western Hemisphere alone, so that we may use our chief efforts to solve our own domestic problems and thereby have a contented people, an invincible protection against all aggressors, while at the same time setting a splendid example for the whole world to follow.

Lastly, let Congress respectfully but firmly insist on its prerogatives as well as duty to know all the facts and be an active partner in this world drama. Thus will democracy function and the dream of the founders of this Nation become a practical and blessed reality. We can and must continue to make this splendid country of ours the great experiment of democracy—of free government, of laws and not of men. Let us inscribe in letters of living light on our banner as we march along the fine words of Theodore Roosevelt, who said: "This country of ours will not be a good place for any one of us to live in unless and until it is a good place for all of us to live in." When we shall have accomplished this worth-while purpose, the world will listen to our reasoning and profit by our example along the pathways of peace. To this end, let us pledge and proclaim our own America first.

Dairy Farmers Up In Arms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, much is being said about unity these days, and I agree we need unity, but that unity cannot be forced upon people without applying the principle of the Golden Rule, which is, "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you." That is not practiced by some of our Government departments, and especially do our dairy farmers object to the unfair treatment they are being subjected to. They are compelled to pay present high prices for everything they buy and are told that prices will be frozen at not to exceed 10 percent above the 1909–14 period. How can we expect to create unity under those circumstances? That is not only my opinion, but it is the conviction of all the dairy farmers in every section of the country. The newspapers in my State carry headlines of protest meetings being held everywhere and the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation called a meeting, which is held in Chicago today and tomorrow, August 18 and 19, to protest against what has been done and what is proposed to be done.

The first thing that caused our dairy farmers to protest was the unwarranted and unprecedented broadcast by a division of the Department of Agriculture advising people how to prepare butter substitutes so as to make them look like butter and, incidentally, avoid a violation of the law which compels a tax of 10 cents per pound on colored oleo. The dairy farmers are paying large sums of money to advertise their God-given natural product, while public money is being used to advertise an imitation, much of which is not even produced in this country. Three recent counts make it impossible to expect unity and cooperation from our dairy farmers.

First. The new proposed standard for oleo promulgated by Mr. McNutt, Federal Security Administration, which, beginning September 6, permits the oleo interest to color and flavor oleo like butter, permits addition of vitamin A equal to butter, and permits use of benzoate of soda as a preservative.

Second. The recent broadcast by the Consumer Division of the United States Department of Agriculture advising people to use oleo instead of butter.

Third. The statement of the Secretary of Agriculture suggesting that Americans decrease consumption of American or cheddar cheese for the duration of the emergency.

Then the next thing which will affect all the farmers is the proposed price fixing or freezing upon which hearings have started before the Banking and Currency Committee. It is proposed to freeze farm-commodity prices at not more than 10 percent above parity. Parity as figured by the Department as of July 15 is less than 34 cents; that would make the top at which it would be frozen a trifle over 37 cents. The 1909–14 period that is being used to figure parity shows that butter averaged 26 cents for those 5 years. In figuring price advances on the major items the farmer must buy, outside of labor costs, I find that they are 92 percent higher now than they were then. So in fairness, the farmers' prices should be 92 percent above that so-called parity period. If we add 92 percent to the price the farmer received for butter in that period, it will be found that 50 cents would be the real and honest parity price at present. I placed a very comprehensive table, prepared by Mr. Linder, Georgia State commissioner of agriculture, in the RECORD a few days ago that will give the same comparison on other major farm commodities. You will find it on page A3873 of the Appendix of the RECORD. Save it, because it will come in handy in the future when the farmers are ridiculed because they ask for the same treatment that any individual, firm, or corporation is entitled to—in fact, must have to stay in business—and that is at least parity, which is always less than cost of production.

Evidently it is assumed that the farmer who is largely an individual and does not seem to believe in organization, can be satisfied with anything. The Department of Agriculture about a month ago was all set to make a drive to organize the farmers in every agricultural county of the State, without using the existing organizations, the State departments, or the colleges of agriculture. Their intention at that time was to start in the dairy States, and Wisconsin was to be the first State on the list. There is no question but that a two-way pledge was to be prepared, and every farmer was to be asked to sign it. Because of the adverse publicity that this proposal received, at least the loyalty pledge evidently has been dropped. A representative of the Department in a press release stated that—

> There is no intention of asking the farmers to sign a loyalty pledge to the United States.

I quote further from that statement:

> However, the Department of Agriculture has worked out a tentative plan, the official declared, whereby individual farmers will be asked to sign a pledge agreeing to step up their productions

Second—

> There is no intent on the part of the Department to ask farmers to sign a pledge of loyalty to the United States, though this may have been discussed at one time.

I do know that a couple of months ago a letter did go out from the Department to their men in every county which had for its purpose the making of the farmers more inclined to go along with the foreign policy by telling them by word of mouth that the farmers would benefit greatly because of the demand for farm commodities across the ocean. Mr. Wickard admitted to the entire Wisconsin delegation that this letter had gone out. I mention these things simply to show how impossible it is to get the farmers into a frame of mind to cooperate with these actions by a department that should really be their friend, vividly before them. Maybe the farmers will realize what I have said for many years is true, namely, that the day when a farmer could class himself with the capitalists and continue as an individual is past. If you can expect to get your fair share of the Nation's income, you, as farmers, must be organized as every other group is organized. Not until you do will you get justice. The farmers' share of the national income has decreased each year until in 1939 it was just about 8 percent, including all the Government subsidies and grants. I believe it will be even less than that the next few years of so-called prosperity. Only the farmers themselves can change this.

Magnesium: Magic Metal of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, on August 9, Hon. Richard L. Neuberger, of

Portland, Oreg., wrote an interesting and instructive article which appeared in the Progressive, a publication in Oregon, giving a brief history of the unusual progress that has been made at the State College of Washington School of Mines, cooperating with the United States Bureau of Mines, in connection with newly discovered processes for treating magnesite ore and reducing it to magnesium by electrothermic methods.

The article follows:

[From the Progressive of August 9, 1941]

MAGNESIUM: MAGIC METAL OF THE FUTURE

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Probably you never have heard of magnesium. But you will in the near future. Light metal is in high demand today and magnesium is 30 percent lighter than aluminum. While the country holds parades and drives to collect old pots and kettles and other aluminum utensils, a little group of scientists is working in the Pacific Northwest to perfect a metal which may supplement and eventually be a substitute for aluminum.

It is a long story and an exciting one.

In 1937 A. E. Drucker, director of the Washington State College School of Mines, noticed that Germany was manufacturing 80,000,000 pounds of magnesium annually. This could mean only one thing—a vast military air force. In America little magnesium was produced. It was made from salt water and sea water and corroded speedily.

At Pullman, site of Washington State College, a remarkable experiment began The experiment was financed by the United States Bureau of Mines and by the State of Washington. In this little town in the Palouse wheat hills, technicians and scientists constructed a pilot plant for the manufacture of magnesium from a mineral found in huge quantities near Spokane. The name of this mineral is magnesite. One of the largest deposits on earth is in Stevens County of Washington, due north of Spokane.

SOLVING THE ALUMINUM RIDDLE

In the pilot plant at Pullman Dean Drucker and H. A. Deorner, of the Bureau of Mines, began experiments and tests with magnesite. Using electricity, the basic factor in all light metals, they worked ceaselessly. At last, only 2 weaks ago, they announced success. After a long test run the pilot plant produced magnesium of high quality, magnesium which does not corrode, and will stand the most severe conditions and strain.

This magnesium can be manufactured for 10 cents a pound. At present aluminum costs about 14 cents a pound, and the salt-brine inferior grade of magnesium approximately 18 cents.

This is all extremely significant, especially with the Nation collecting all spare aluminum for the air force. At present aluminum is manufactured mainly from bauxite ore. This is obtained largely from British and Dutch Guiana, and some from the East Indies. It must be brought to the United States in ships. With the present shortage of shipping, many of these vessels are desperately needed for the sea route to the British Isles.

"MAGIC METAL OF THE FUTURE"

The Pullman magnesium process is entirely within the borders of the United States. Material from beyond our borders is not necessary. In the Pullman process only two ingredients are essential—magnesite and electricity. Magnesite is found in huge quantities in Stevens County, and 88 miles away is the greatest single source of electricity in the world, Grand Coulee Dam.

In this power age Grand Coulee is a fabulous edifice. Each of its generators will be the largest electric machinery ever built, capable of producing 108,000 kilowatts apiece.

Today Germany holds first place among the nations in the production of magnesium. Scientists in this country believe that magnesium has been a factor of vital importance in the air armada with which Goering has demolished cities and terrified countries as old as civilization. Congressman CHARLES H. LEAVY, New Dealer from Spokane, calls magnesium "the magic metal of the future." He believes that some day it will be as important as aluminum.

AFTER THE WAR IS ENDED

Congressman LEAVY also points out that the Aluminum Co. of America, which held a monopoly of light metals for more than a generation, has tried to thwart the manufacture of magnesium and the development on a wide scale of new methods of producing aluminum. It is significant that if magnesium becomes an essential material in both civilian and military life, the Federal Government and the State of Washington will merit most of the credit.

Along with the magnesium experiments in Pullman, work has been advanced on the possibility of manufacturing aluminum from alunite. This is a clay-like substance found in considerable abundance in the Pacific Northwest. A process has been developed by which high-grade aluminum can be extracted from it, using electricity as the basic reducing factor.

The Kalunite Corporation has been working on this idea for a long time. If it ever is perfected, America can manufacture aluminum with materials entirely in its own borders. That alunite is deposited in the hills near Bonneville Dam and constitutes an added helpful circumstance.

One can only hope that after the war is ended, these new discoveries and advances will be put at work to raise living standards and increase the comfort of every man, woman, and child.

"We Are Satisfied"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM FORTY ROUNDS, WRITTEN BY CORP. W. W. VAN PELT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial written by Corp. W. W. Van Pelt, for a camp paper, Forty Rounds, published at Camp Jackson, S. C.:

[From Forty Rounds, Camp Jackson, S. C.]

OUT OF THE FRYING PAN

As far as we have been able to determine, our outfit has clean hands in respect to this "write a letter to your Congressman" activity about which so much is being said and done. However, while we so smoothly slide out from under this heavy hand, we confess that we do plenty of grumbling.

Learning to live under military rule and discipline without a civilian's full share of personal liberties and individual rights has not been easy. Collectively we growl about chow, drill, uniforms, fatigue details, and most everything that forms our life here. We, as the Southerners say it, "kick up a storm" about the labor strikes, the lawmakers, the Democrats (or Republicans), and the lack of some of our favorite funnies in the local papers. In short, we complain as much as would an armless man with a hide full of red bugs but we're not to be taken seriously.

For the most part, it is rather evident that it is fun being in the Army in some respects. Our comfort, entertainment, and living conditions have increased rapidly since our induction with an efficiency not often found in such large-scale operations. In general, we like our noncoms, respect our executive officers, and think most highly of our company commanders. As time goes on we find ourselves discovering that our regimental commander is more than just a name, and that we get quite a bang out of saluting him and receiving his salute in return.

We want to go home, nevertheless. We want to go back and work for those objectives, those plans for the future for which we have spent so much time to prepare ourselves. However, since our plans are based on the proposition that the American way of living will not change, we have a sober realization of the dead seriousness of our mission and of our own responsibility. We are in here to see it through.

Now legislation to keep us in the Army will undoubtedly disturb many of us. It will pack a punch of the kind we got with our first induction notice. There will be the usual barracks reverberation but it will soon pass. It boils down to the fact that we knew all the time we would be in the Army for the "duration" and that we will not be demobilized until all threats to the life we left, the life to which we will return, have been dissolved. Under these circumstances we are satisfied.

National Old-Age Pension Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, of paramount importance to America is, of course, our national-defense program, because every American who has given thought and study to world developments knows that the Army and the Navy and the air forces of this country should be built up to meet any challenge which a foreign aggressor might make.

At the same time we should not and must not overlook our domestic problems, and there are many of them. The plight of our aged people should challenge consideration by Congress. Our present social-security legislation is wholly inadequate to meet the situation. There should be enacted a national old-age pension plan which will provide a pension for those men and women who have been pioneers in the work of building up our country and our institutions. From time to time I have called to the attention of Congress some of these cases, and in this morning's mail I received another letter which prompts me to again point out the need of congressional action.

I have a letter from one of my aged constituents who tells me that she is 78

years of age and that she is now sick and has no means with which to pay doctor bills. I quote from her letter:

I, for one, have done more for this country than many others have. I sent four boys to the Army 23 years ago. All served in the Marine Corps. Some of them married when they came back, and now have families to look after. * * * I have not received any support from the boys, and I can't take any more from them because they have sickness in their families, too. I don't call old-age assistance a pension. I think it is the Government's place to look after the aged. I think I am entitled to something for the little time I have to live, and I do not wish to die a pauper.

Mr. Speaker, this letter is one of many which I have received from various parts of the district, and it tells its own story. In my opinion, the proper committee of this House should heed the requests from the people of the United States, and hearings should be held and favorable action taken so that a person, such as I have described above, may be entitled to receive a pension payment from this Government.

Longevity Pay for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DETROIT FREE PRESS

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of August 15, 1941, on the subject of longevity pay for post-office employees:

[From the Detroit Press of August 15, 1941]

AS WE SEE IT

THEY DESERVE IT

A bill has passed the House raising the maximum pay for carriers in first- and second-class post offices from $2,100 to $2,200 at the end of 10 years' service and $2,300 at the end of 15 years' service. The present pay schedule has been in effect since 1925. Compared with pay increases obtained in the last 16 years in private industry, these proposed increases for faithful and hard-working public servants are extremely modest.

Yet the Senate is understood to be considering trimming the proposed increases to $60 a year at the end of 10 and 15 years. That is cheap business for a body that added hundreds of millions of dollars to the administration's farm subsidies propcsal this year and has just voted to override Mr. Roosevelt's veto of a $125,000,000 pork-barrel bill for "defense highways."

The carriers deserve these raises. The total involved would be between $16,000,000 and $20,000,000 a year—not an awesome sum when you consider that the Government is spending at the rate of $277 a second for other purposes.

The Senate should adopt the House bill and put the pay of post-office employees more in line with the rising cost of living.

Definite Program Should Be Put Into Motion at Once To Correct Physical Defects of Draftees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the RECORD, under date of May 29, I discussed the need for corrective measures being put in force immediately to remedy physical disabilities discovered during examination of draftees in our selective-service system.

In a communication to Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, under date of May 19, I said:

It would seem to me that a definite program should and must be undertaken to correct these physical shortcomings just as soon as possible. It is not enough to find the trouble, but attempts should certainly be made to improve the physical condition of these refused men. That procedure would seem to me to be the part of a good national policy, vital to our continued preparedness program.

I received word from General Hershey in person and by letter from Captain Keesling, Jr., legislative officer of the Selective Service System, to the effect that they were greatly concerned about the situation and were giving careful consideration toward the end of developing a satisfactory and workable plan.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a splendid editorial from this morning's Washington Post entitled "Unfit For Service."

[From the Washington Post of August 18, 1941]

UNFIT FOR SERVICE

It is an interesting and disturbing commentary on the health of the Nation that nearly half the men examined under the Selective Service Act are being classified as unfit for military duty. Since the great majority of these men are in the early twenties, an age at which the human organism is normally most efficient, the figures suggest an even larger proportion of handicaps or chronic deficiencies among the population at large. Thus in describing the state of our national health as "alarming" the Baehr Commission on Physical Rehabilitation is not exaggerating.

Of course, physical requirements for active military service are still relatively high, but the Army shows no disposition to lower them. In the light of the Baehr commission's report to Federal Security Administrator McNutt, therefore, it will be necessary to make a radical revision of estimates of our reserves of manpower as regards both military and industrial service, unless some national program of physical rehabilitation is attempted.

The Baehr commission has recommended just such a program "in all the States and local areas" under the joint auspices of the Federal Security Administration and the Selective Service authorities. Local medical, dental, and hospital resources would be mobilized for the purpose. Dr. Baehr and his colleagues point out that such a program will be possible, however, only if financed and supported by congressional appropriations.

Whether Congress will be willing to make this rather considerable addition to the tax burden is difficult to say. Yet, as Mr. McNutt has pointed out, this is one form of defense spending that will bring great, if intangible, returns long after the war has ended. In any event, the report serves to point the tremendous problem of public health confronting this country and its inseparable relationship to the economic problem. For the most common physical causes for which draft registrants are rejected—excessive dental caries, orthopedic weakness, pulmonary and heart disorders—are traceable for the most part to such factors as early malnutrition or infections from controllable diseases.

Closer to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the great majority of the American people are today hoping and praying that President Roosevelt was right when he told newspapermen on his return to Washington Sunday that the United States is no closer to actual participation in war as the result of the recent Anglo-American declaration.

A study of the declaration makes it difficult for many to understand how the President can justify such a statement. Certainly the defense phase of our armament and mobilization program was definitely terminated the moment the declaration was signed. The language of the declaration immediately changed this Nation's previous defensive relations into an all-out offensive alliance with Great Britain. The war aims of the United States and Great Britain were jointly defined in the declaration, including the restoration of territories taken by the aggressor nations, a more equitable distribution of essential raw materials, freedom of the seas, social security, and a stable peace economy throughout the world.

Then, most significant, is the declaration that Nazi tyranny must be destroyed. Pro-war spokesmen have often said this, but it is now said jointly and officially by the United States and Great Britain. The Anglo-American alliance, pronounced in the declaration, states that aggressor nations must be disarmed as a prerequisite to peace. The only way to disarm the aggressor nations is to do it with a superior force. President Roosevelt, in signing the Anglo-American agreement, pledged the cooperation of the United States in disarming the aggressor nations—and to do so immediately. The manner in which this is to be accomplished, the cost, and the military implications are obvious.

Replies to Questionnaire on Participation by United States in the European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

LETTERS BY HON. FLETCHER RILEY AND HON. A. G. C. BIERER

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters written by Hon. Fletcher Riley, judge of the Oklahoma Supreme Court, and Hon. A. G. C. Bierer, a former member of that court:

SUPREME COURT OF OKLAHOMA,
August 13, 1941.

Hon. STEPHEN A. DAY,
Congressman at Large,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter and enclosed ballot concerning the war situation reached me at the State capitol on yesterday, its having been mailed to my home at Lawton and delayed. I am this day marking, signing, and transmitting my ballot. I hope it will serve your purpose. The ballot as marked represents the consensus of opinion of those in and around my office. In considering this question, it is contemplated that the issue is whether the United States should immediately enter the war; and as you may observe, the vote is negative. All agree that preparedness is imperative. By it the ultimate arbiter in disputes between nations may be avoided.

On the last occasion when this issue arose, so to speak, we got the cart before the horse. In fact, we did not get much horse; for, if you will pardon the personal reference, I never saw a 75-millimeter field piece until 2 weeks before I went to the front. While there I never saw any aircraft of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps.

While now France has fallen, it is thought France was of a mind to stop Hitler when he made his first move into the Ruhr. England, under Chamberlain's appeasement program, procrastinated. And while procrastination has been said to be the thief of time, it is not so in event time is well employed. It was critically said by the Germans that England would fight, but only to the last drop of the Frenchman's blood. This was not so. England fights manfully in extremis.

We all favor assistance to England under the Lend Lease Act. And if to preserve this democracy that issue must be won again on the field of battle, I for one favor it and am ready, able, and willing to serve in the armed forces, trusting and praying that fruits of victory shall not again be lost diplomatically or politically. If it be necessary to the issue not only to contribute material things but also our lives, this we are willing to do. To do this we pledge our sacred honor.

Withal, patience with determination applied may achieve the issue well stated by the immortal Woodrow Wilson, so that this time armed conflict on the part of the United States Government may be avoided. If in the unfoldment of the drama, war may not be avoided, it may as well be declared on the morrow.

Sincerely,

FLETCHER RILEY, *Justice.*

GUTHRIE, OKLA., *August 12, 1941.*

Hon. STEPHEN A. DAY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your ballot card calling for a vote on whether the United States should enter the war or stay out of the war, with your circular letter in connection with the matter.

Neither I nor anybody can vote intelligently for either alternative put in that absurdly unfair manner. Of course, anybody in his right mind would rather stay out of the war than enter it, if that can be done consistently with national honor, integrity, and safety, but those who purport to believe in a program of peace at any price, and expect to meet the present situation by emulating the ostrich who sticketh his head in the sand, exposeth his rear and deemeth himself secure, are, in my opinion, very badly misguided. Assuming that the United States could, under any and all circumstances, stay out of the war, it would be very unwise to do so at the cost of living in a world dominated by Nazi tyranny and brutality, and filled with the brigandage and piracy of unrestrained brute force. That prospect is not attractive to many Americans. This Nation must and will proceed with all its capacity to place itself in a state of preparedness for the defense of its territory and its principles, and an absolutely essential part of that defense is to give, primarily to Great Britain and secondarily to the other nations resisting aggression, absolutely all of the help of which we are capable, at the same time bringing our own military force and domestic economy to war strength, ready for full, active participation in the war if that must be, and every thinking American knows that the course of events may compel our entrance into the war at any time.

Yours very truly,

A. G. C. BIERER, Jr.

Let Us Have Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KNUTE HILL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON KNUTE HILL, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio last Saturday night:

Fellow Americans, I come to you tonight as an advocate of peace. I sincerely believe that I am practical as well as idealistic in this matter. I was charged the other day, after my speech on the floor of the House, with being a visionary, a dreamer, a man with too much faith in human nature. My good friends, the greatest visionary of all time, the Great Master, was the most practical of men. If His way of life was practiced throughout the world today there could be no war. His method of overcoming evil prevailed in His day. It will prevail today and through all tomorrows. It was not using force against force. It was using the simple formula of faith, hope, and love. In spite of all the wars of the past 19 centuries, only because of His method has the world made the progress that it has in civilization. And shall we abandon it now in the face of the worst crisis in the world's history and wholly adopt its antithesis—force and war? God forbid. We will not—we cannot, we simply cannot. The forces of evil may for decades to come continue at periodic intervals to pour their vials of wrath upon helpless men, women, and children, causing misery, poverty, and suffering where there should be gladness, plenty, and contentment. But, eventually the sunshine of peace will prevail and the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man will become a reality. It cannot be otherwise in a world created by a kind and wise and omnipotent Providence.

It is my honest conviction, and I firmly maintain that the constructive forces of the world are far superior to and will conquer the destructive forces. The ancient world had its Alexander the Great. The medieval world had its Caesar. The modern world had its Napoleon. But where are they? Where are they? Their memory lives only to be despised and shunned. Today we have Hitler. But he will soon—very soon—go the way of his predecessors. The pathways of peace are more pregnant with power, more vital with strength, more imbued with permanency than all the waging of war.

You are all familiar with the story of the contest between the wild wind and smiling sun in an attempt to compel the traveler to shed his cloak. The more furiously the wind lashed at him the closer the traveler wrapped his cloak about him, while the warm smile of the sun soon made the traveler take off his cloak and carry it on his arm. The wrath and fury of the storm brings only wreckage and destruction. It is only when the storm has abated that Mother Nature can again heal the gaping wounds that sear the beautiful landscape. When old Neptune opens up the sluices of the heavens to pour torrents into our Potomacs and our Mississippis, terrible destruction and devastation follow in their wake. Only when the fierce waters recede can Nature, with the help of her ally, man, repair the damage done and again start the march of progress toward the recovery and upbuilding of the wasted countryside. So with war; not until the hatred and fury and carnage of the battlefields are forever a thing of the past can we start our march of progress toward a better and fairer world in which to live. This is conceded even by those who now oppose present peace negotiations. The issue then is: When is the most acceptable time to press for peace? Let us be practical. Let us dispassionately and diligently study the pages of history. Did ever in all history a victorious army and nation show magnanimity or give concessions to the vanquished—or did it, rather, dictate terms of peace that were merely germs for a future war? No; with but one exception—when Grant told Lee to go in peace and gave the boys in gray their horses and guns. That resulted in a lasting peace and a united people.

But as to world wars let us only revert to World War No. 1. The completely victorious Allies imposed impossible peace terms on a conquered foe. Clemenceau and Lloyd George completely outwitted Wilson and scuttled his splendid 14 points, now advanced again in an 8-point program Thursday by Roosevelt and Churchill. Versailles was the basis for Hitlerism, and the duplicity of both France and England during the following decade was the beginning of World War No. 2. The war-torn and war-weary world was ready for a real peace then. Had we not participated in that first war, there would have been no victorious Allies to dictate impossible terms, grab unlimited territory, and repudiate both their debts and obligations of friendship for the United States. Neither would there have been a victorious Germany to dictate equally objectionable

terms of peace which inevitably lead to future wars. The leadership of the British Empire today is the same—uncompromising, relentless, and autocratic. I regret it, but I do not, I cannot, trust the British leadership today any more than I did in 1918. It is the same domineering leadership that now sends us an ultimatum to declare war and send our boys across or they will make a separate peace with Hitler. One can fully understand this of a British leadership which joins hands with one dictator, Stalin, and his despicable communism to fight another dictator, Hitler, and his equally despicable nazi-ism. Our purpose should be, our aim must be, to crush communism, fascism, and nazi-ism—to dethrone the three dictators who instigate and promote these "isms"—Stalin, Mussolini, and Hitler. We can best do this by staying out of the affray, build up our own national and hemispheric defense so that by our power and wealth and neutrality we can compel a just and lasting peace. Hitler and Stalin, like the Kilkenny cats, are destroying each other—and Lord God hasten their demise. The peoples of Europe—yes, the common people of Japan itself—are ready and anxious for peace. In my own pathetic little ancestral country, Norway, the people are revolting against Hitlerism. The madman of Europe is riding for a fall. He must know it, and should be ready to negotiate on terms acceptable to the British people. In any case, we will be far more effective in insisting on just and lasting peace terms if we keep ourselves out of active participation.

Let President Roosevelt dismiss his warlike advisers like Stimson and Knox and Marshall and join with Pope Pius in urging a cessation of hostilities, calling a peace parley which would have for its purpose justice to all the nations of the world. No, my good friends, I am not a Catholic. I am a Mason. But I am practical enough to realize that Pope Pius is sincere and will have a tremendous influence with the Catholic peoples throughout the world. As for President Roosevelt, he still has the golden opportunity of leaving a name and a heritage to posterity wherein his name will be inscribed in letters of living light on the scroll of history by using his exalted position and splendid talents in promoting a lasting peace which will make way for a real democracy throughout the world, not by force, but by example and persuasion. God grant him the vision, the wisdom, and the courage to do this one great act to crown his career. May a kind Providence so guide the American people that they may assist him in this worth-while task.

"AMERICA FIRST

"Not merely in matters material, but in things of the spirit.

"Not merely in science, inventions, motors, and skyscrapers, but also in ideals, principles, character.

"Not merely in the calm assertion of rights, but in the glad assumption of duties.

"Not flaunting her strength as a giant, but bending in helpfulness over a sick and wounded world like a good samaritan.

"Not in splendid isolation, but in courageous cooperation (for world peace).

"Not in pride, arrogance, and disdain of other races and peoples, but in sympathy, love, and understanding.

"Not in treading again the old, worn, bloody pathway which ends inevitably in chaos and disaster, but in blazing a new trail, along which, please God, other nations will follow, into the New Jerusalem where wars shall be no more.

"Some day some nation must take that path—unless we are to lapse once again into utter barbarism—and that honor I covet for my beloved America.

"And so, in that spirit and with these hopes, I say with all my heart and soul, 'America first.'"—Bishop G. Ashton Oldham.

American Way of Life Disappears—National Socialism and Communism Substituted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

ARTICLE BY SAMUEL CROWTHER

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article by Samuel Crowther:

THE OUTLOOK—FREE ENTERPRISE IN UNITED STATES SEEN GIVING WAY TO SOCIAL REVOLUTION OF CONTROLLED ECONOMY

(By Samuel Crowther, economist and author)

Calvin Coolidge, discussing taxes, once remarked that a dollar primarily belonged to the man who earned it. Thus with exquisite simplicity he defined free enterprise. For, if a dollar does not primarily belong to the man who earns it, enterprise cannot be free. Today the Federal Government asserts a prior right to every earned dollar, and in addition the labor unions, to the extent to which they can establish the check-off, claim a right to share in every wage-earner's dollar.

And it has come about that, while we keep the nomenclature of the American way of life, actually that way of life has all but disappeared. In its place has been substituted a new kind of economy which no one fully understands but which would be a controlled economy of a type somewhere between national socialism and communism if anyone had the knowledge and the power to manage the controls.

We have had a social revolution which differs from the foreign revolutions only in that no one knows how it got here or what it is, but it is just as much a revolution as though it had been brought about by men wearing black shirts or brown shirts or wild whiskers. Our revolution arrived gradually, without flags or parade. It has been effected by men who would not or could not think through the measures which they advocated only to meet temporary situations.

The process continues. For instance, today certain businessmen in the O. P. M. are talking astronomical figures of all-out production without ever a thought that if armament production entirely displaces civilian production our whole economic structure will fall, unless at the same time a system of pure communism be introduced—and made to work. It may be noted that, whatever the virtues or the vices of pure communism, no one has ever found a way of making it work. The Russians, although they talked a great deal about communism, never got around to trying it.

Let us see where our country now stands. Let us call things by their right names:

(1) Money is on its way to being destroyed as a medium of exchange and has been practically destroyed as a storage of value. It is now merely a means by which the Government commandeers goods and services. The banking system, revolving about the Federal Reserve System, has become merely a bookkeeping utility for converting governmental promises to pay into bank deposit and hand money. Bank deposits have changed their character. They are no longer representing a section of the process of exchanging goods and services for other goods and services but are inert masses representing unpaid governmental obligations. The banking system is thus no longer a division of private enterprise but a governmental convenience operating inside the shell of private banking.

(2) The function of money has changed without changing the nomenclature, and hence the nature of institutions which depend on money as an expression of value has changed—but without a change in nomenclature. That is, the purchasing power of the assets of life-insurance companies, savings funds, building societies, and the like, depends not on private economic activity but upon the amount of money which the Government chooses to issue. Thus a factor of unknown power has been introduced into every investment—which means that ultimate, managerial discretion has been taken over by the Government and that private management in the investment field is limited to an area of glorified bookkeeping

(3) Since money is now a governmental commandeering utility—the Government just issues tickets for the goods and services it needs—it follows that private enterprise which depends for its existence on the production and exchange of goods and services has ceased to exist in other than form. For a producing mechanism which must earn money cannot survive as against a system which, for the time being, can issue money.

Some of these changes have been brought about to meet emergencies—war or otherwise—on the ground that the Government must take charge when big things need quickly to be done. This is another way of saying that politicians unskilled in management are inherently the best production managers. That may be true. But it has never been demonstrated.

Pork-Barrel Legislation Versus St. Lawrence Waterway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, in the early twenties I made numerous speeches in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent in Congress favoring the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. At that time this development had very nearly the unanimous support of the residents of that congressional district. Indeed, the Federal Government contributed to the making of a harbor at Monroe, Mich., largely in contemplation of this proposed deep-sea lane. The people of the city of Monroe formed a port district and, by their own vote, taxed themselves 50 percent of the cost of the harbor.

The project at that time was considered almost entirely on the basis of an outlet to the sea, with better and more reasonable transportation for that land-locked territory surrounding the Great Lakes. It was not then thought of as a national-defense adjunct.

This has not been a partisan proposal. It has had the endorsement of all Presi-

dents from Taft to Roosevelt and should not be placed in the political category.

During the present session of Congress the Rivers and Harbors Committee has held extensive hearings to determine the advisability of proceeding with the St. Lawrence development at this particular time. The national-defense aspect has been advanced by the administration, the O. P. M., and those primarily charged with the job of furnishing the materials for our national defense. A majority of the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee favored the project, and, indeed, it seemed a certainty that consideration and a vote would be had by the House at this session of Congress.

Now the President has directed that this project be tied up with the Florida ship canal, the Tombigbee River proposition, as well as many other projects throughout the United States, many of which are of most doubtful validity. We should be thankful that Passamaquoddy Bay has not as yet been included. Let us hope that the President will not add that monstrosity to the bill.

In short, a genuine, old-fashioned political pork-barrel rivers and harbors bill has been prepared, and, in accordance with Presidential direction, an effort will be made to railroad it through Congress—the good projects carrying the unsound ones.

I have rebelled against pork-barrel legislation and have taken the position that at this particular time nonessential—even though desirable—expenditures by the Federal Government should be eliminated. We are all-out for national defense. We have a national debt of $50,000,000,000 now, in addition to several billions of contingent liability. If we continue the present rate of spending the national debt within the next year will be $100,000,000,000. The Congress has already appropriated $7,000,000,000 under the lease-lend law, and within the next 60 days the President will ask for an additional lend-lease appropriation of $10,000,000,000. We are told that much of this last appropriation will go to assist Russia and China. Just the other day the House passed a bill carrying $3,000,000,000 in new taxes. Note that is less than one-half the first $7,000,000,000 lend-lease appropriation. There must be a stop somewhere and the best place to begin is with useless pork-barrel legislation.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission given to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Telegram of August 16. This paper has been an ardent advocate of the St. Lawrence deep-water project, and the views expressed in the editorial are in the main my views regarding this project at this time. The editorial is as follows:

[From the Adrian (Mich.) Telegram of August 16, 1941]

MORE PORK

Congressmen who like pork—the kind presented by large expenditures of public funds in their districts—generally find a chance to get it in the rivers and harbors bill. The Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House is on the way this session to setting a new record. Hearings on this year's bill have not been finished yet and probably won't be for another month, but up to last Friday the committee had approved $281,000,000 worth of projects. Then it decided to include in the bill the St. Lawrence seaway, estimated to cost two hundred and eighty-five millions—and then the Florida ship canal at an estimated cost of one hundred and sixty millions. It is predicted that the bill's final total will be close to a billion dollars.

The committee's action in including the St. Lawrence seaway project in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill is regrettable. That it was voted in along with the controversial Florida ship canal is still more unfortunate. The seaway is encountering tough enough opposition as it is. But when it is put in company with such brain children of the blind spenders as the Florida ship canal—twice exposed and defeated in the Senate, thanks to Michigan's Senator VANDENBERG—it is too much. If the seaway cannot win approval on its own merits, but has to get through Congress by coming up for consideration with indefensible pork-barrel proposals and draw votes through logrolling, then it better be defeated.

Representative MANSFIELD, of Texas, chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, said last Wednesday that President Roosevelt wanted the seaway included in the omnibus bill. He added that he had a letter to that effect from the President, but he did not disclose the text until the last of the week. In the letter President Roosevelt wrote of his anxiety to get the seaway started this year "in order to get power as soon as possible for the defense program," and said the best way to expedite it seemed to be to include it as one of the projects of the rivers and harbors bill.

But he also wrote to Representative MANSFIELD that river and harbor projects fell into two classifications: Those that will serve in the post-war reconstruction period, and others—"notably the St. Lawrence"—that are needed immediately. Then he added, "There is no reason why both groups should not be considered in the present bill with the understanding that when it comes to appropriations the defense needs shall be the controlling."

Clearly the President is not backing away from his designation of the seaway as a defense project, and just as clearly he does not consider it a pork-barrel undertaking. He wants to get it considered at once, and the quickest way to bring it before Congress is to have it included in a forthcoming bill. The thought is inescapable, too, that he thinks a little logrolling will not harm the seaway's chances and may help them. The President is a past master at practical politics.

But, nevertheless, the omnibus bill is loaded with pork. In addition to the Florida ship canal to cost one hundred and sixty millions, are a number of other projects, some of them indefensible from the standpoint of public need. For instance, there is the Tombigbee project for a waterway in Tennessee and Alabama. It was defeated a year ago after a slashing attack by Senator VANDENBERG. There are other projects; some of them may be desirable, but none of them are necessary. They may be desirable as post-war reconstruction jobs. If so, they should be considered when that time arrives. Right now the Nation is preparing for the war. The individual is asked to get along without some things he thinks desirable, so must the Nation.

Putting the St. Lawrence seaway project into the omnibus bill along with the Florida canal and other dubious proposals is bound to embarrass some of the seaway's advocates. They may be able to get amendments through in the House and Senate to eliminate the pork projects. More likely they will be subjected to demands for vote trading. The bill as a whole will, and should, draw the determined fire of that small group in Congress that is really striving to hold down nondefense spending. The trouble is that group is entirely too small.

Beneficial as the St. Lawrence seaway will be, it should go down to defeat if it can win only at the expense of having unneeded and unsound projects like the preposterous Florida ship canal forced onto the Nation along with it. The St. Lawrence seaway has faced a rocky road for years. It has overcome obstacles and is nearer to adoption than ever before. It needs no pork to aid it along now.

Draft Extension Vital to the Defense Plans of Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

TELEGRAM TO HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AND REPLY THERETO

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, during debate on the legislation to retain selectees in the service I did not take the floor to participate in debate. I voted for extension that we might better keep intact during the emergency the troops already intact and trained.

In this connection, I include copy of a telegram and my reply:

HUNTINGTON, W. VA., *August 12, 1941.*

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The organization endorsed an indefinite period of service for selective-service trainees and respectfully request your support.

C. A. WILCUS, *Commander,*
Department of West Virginia,
Veterans of Foreign Wars.

AUGUST 12, 1941.

Mr. C. A. WILGUS,
Commander, Department of West Virginia,
Veterans of Foreign Wars,
Huntington, W. Va.

DEAR COMMANDER WILGUS: I have just received your telegram dated August 12 and note that your organization favors an indefinite period of service for selective-service trainees. As you know, the House is considering the bill today.

You may be assured of my whole-hearted support. I am in agreement with the President that it is dangerous to demobilize our armed forces in this increasingly critical period. Congress will, I believe, act courageously and formulate a fair basis for continuing our troops in service beyond the original intended enlistment. A plan should be evolved to take care of so-called hardship cases which naturally would occur in the ranks of the National Guard men and Reservists. It is my feeling that Senators and Representatives forming the isolationist bloc will be unable to defeat this further vital phase of our preparedenss effort.

As pointed out by military experts, to demobilize the drafted men who are at far corners of the United States and our possessions and to prepare for new untrained men just

at a time when there is a new crisis looming in the Pacific would be suicidal to American defense.

Let me again thank you for wiring and with kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

Mr. Speaker, these are difficult days and decisions are not easy to make. This is especially true when one considers the human element. I feel that the constituency I represent believes somewhat as did a father who wrote me on August 4 relative to the extended service bill. He said:

My only son, Charles, 19, is at Chanute Field. It is my wish that he remain on the job until all danger to our country is past. That is his attitude also. In fact, I would be embarrassed to death if he was not in the service. An education in a dictator-ruled country would not be of any value to the boy anyway. If he, or any of the rest of them, has the stuff in them they will quickly gain time spent in the service of their country.

Douglas Miller's Book, You Can't Do Business With Hitler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

ANALYSIS BY SAMUEL CROWTHER

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, many students, writers, commentators, and others have been recently impressed by Douglas Miller's book You Can't Do Business With Hitler. Because of the supposed standing and experience of Mr. Miller, few people have had the temerity to challenge his conclusions. However, recently I read a review of this book by a man whose experience and ability properly equip him to pass judgment upon anything touching economic conditions of the past, present, or future, so far as this is possible.

I refer to Mr. Samuel Crowther, the famous writer and economist. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein this analysis of You Can't Do Business With Hitler:

A NOTE BY SAMUEL CROWTHER ON YOU CAN'T DO BUSINESS WITH HITLER, BY DOUGLAS MILLER

This is an extraordinarily dishonest book, in that the author purports to write of Nazi business methods from first-hand experience as a commercial attaché at Berlin, 1925–39, but almost nothing in his book is drawn from experience except a few trivial and well-known incidents. Instead, most of the book has to do with events after 1939, and it is almost wholly a rewrite of the regular anti-Nazi propaganda. It is only slightly factual, and most of these "facts" are wrong. The book bears every evidence of having been written by a propagandist and planted on the supposed author, who is an assistant professor of economics in the University of Denver. It would be interesting to trace this book to its origins.

The theme is now standard. Hitler will encompass the earth, encircle the United States, and crush our foreign trade. That will crush us. Therefore we must, as a plain matter of self-preservation, go out and defeat Hitler and then reorganize the world with the money we are supposed to have and get the trade we so desperately need—even if we pay both ends of it—and keep the world prosperous and peaceful. In other words, the book attempts to appeal to business people whose concepts are too low to grasp the "four freedoms"—that defeating Hitler is just good business because Nazi ethics are bad for business.

The whole approach is juvenile. For instance, the author complains that Germany aims to be self-sufficient, which means a minimum of imports, while talking of Nazi plans to capture world trade, which, of course, means a maximum of imports and is wholly incompatible with self-sufficiency. He has a notion that a defeated Hitler will restore the British economy to the pre-1910 basis, with never a notion that the world has changed. He points to two-thirds of our trade being with the British Empire and seems to have the impression that this trade is with the British Isles, when, in fact, it is largely with Canada and Malaya. He also thinks that our foodstuffs and cotton exports can be revived by demolishing Hitler. Our foodstuffs went out of the market long ago, while the A. A. A. killed our cotton exports by holding our cotton above the world price. But the curious point is that he does not comprehend that what we buy from the world is more important to the world's economy than what we sell to the world is to our economy. So, if Hitler should control the world, we would not have to do business with him, but he would have to do business with us. The conclusions of the book are wholly maudlin.

A good deal of the book could be written about any country—if one chose to take the slant. For instance (p. 67), "Lawyers in Germany have very largely ceased to function as interpreters of the law, because, as I said earlier, courts are instructed to render decisions according 'to healthy public opinion.'" The African stuff is fantastic, the financial operations of post-war Germany are misstated—there is no mention that the President was an officer of a concern selling marks for speculation or that American bankers toured Germany to stir up borrowers. There is no mention of the events leading up to the moratorium or the standstill agreements, that the whole world put in exchange agreements after Britain went off gold in 1931, nor the action of France in precipitating the Credit Anstalt collapse or that our bankers have gotten most of their short-term money out of Germany.

There are some curious misconceptions. For instance, the author thinks our reciprocal trade agreements form a system and that the other party refrains from bilateral agreements. In fact nearly every country with which we made agreements also entered into bilateral agreements. And some, as Brazil, actually blocked our exchange and freed the British. The author is the first man who never understood that Hull, Sayre, and Grady played a great practical joke. Everything that could be done to us under the trade agreements has been done. Also he speaks of the vast store of gold owned by the Government. Nearly every dollar of that gold secures a gold certificate issued to the F. R. B., and taking that gold would be an utter breach of trust which would destroy what is left of our currency.

The book is not unlike several that were published during the last war "exposing" the Kaiser's world plans. This book differs from those in being more credulous and having a larger chamber of horrors. Considering the fact that most American corporations with property in Germany have long since charged it off, the terrible effects of confiscation are quite funny. It is also noteworthy that there is no mention of the fact that, although Russia in 1933 had at least the intentions of Germany today, our Government recognized her for trade purposes.

The big point in my mind is who planted this book on this fresh-water college imbecile. And how did he get into the service and why did he leave it?

Overcharges for Electricity in Mississippi

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Jackson Daily News, a daily paper published in Jackson, Miss., which is constantly attacking me for some reason or other, contains an editorial entitled "JOHN RANKIN's Socialism," in which it says:

If Congressman JOHN RANKIN could have his way about it, he would establish complete Federal ownership of the power industry.

That is what Mr. Fred Sullins, the editor of this paper, calls socialism. He is constantly nagging me about the T. V. A. and about my efforts to electrify the farm homes of the State. He seems to be afraid I will spread T. V. A. rates over south Mississippi and relieve those people of the enormous overcharges they now have to pay for their electric lights and power.

Then, too, the farmers in south Mississippi are begging for cheap electricity and appealing to me to help them get it. But that would be socialism in the opinion of Fred Sullins and the Jackson Daily News.

The editor seems to fear that I will run for the Senate and get elected. He knows that if I should, I would make a drive not only to spread T. V. A. rates all over the State but to provide cheap electricity for every farmhouse in Mississippi.

Cheap electricity is the greatest economic blessing that could come to the people of the southern and western parts of the State, and especially to the farmers in those areas.

The people of Mississippi outside the T. V. A. area were overcharged $5,600,000 for their electricity last year. That was an average of more than $100,000 to the county, or the value of 2,000 bales of cotton to the county at 10 cents a pound, which is more than cotton brought last year. If the people in every single county in Mississippi outside of the T. V. A. area had been required to bring in 2,000 bales of cotton, or 400 bales for each supervisor's district, and pile it upon the courthouse yard, it would not have brought enough money to pay their overcharges for electricity for that one year.

The farmers in those counties pay more than twice the rates for their electricity that our farmers have to pay in the First Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. Yes; I helped to get cheap T. V. A. power for the people I represent and for the farmers through-

out the district, and I expect to continue my efforts in that respect until we get these T. V. A. rates to the people all over the State and until we electrify every farm home in the State at those rates, whether it suits Fred Sullins and the Jackson Daily News or not.

That is not socialism, either. It is just plain, common honesty and justice for the people of the entire State of Mississippi.

Wages of Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 19, 1941

EDITORIAL AND ARTICLES FROM PM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, when the Selective Service Extension Act was under consideration I moved that the pay of soldiers after they had served a year be increased to $100 a month. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial and two brief articles published by PM in its issue of Monday, August 18, 1941.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From PM of August 18, 1941]

IS $30 OR $40 A MONTH DECENT PAY FOR OUR SOLDIERS?

When you stop to think about it, the strange thing about our Army is that it doesn't offer just about the best-paid jobs in the country. If our democracy is going to survive in a world stormed by armed fascism, it is going to be because our soldiers are better than the Germans, and because our Army is able to destroy their soldiers more effectively than they can destroy ours. But you'd never guess it from the pay.

Because we think it is important to the country and to the 1,443,500 men who make up the enlisted ranks, which include 681,000 draftees, we on PM have been looking into the subject recently. The first thing we found out is that if you're going to consider Army wages on a reasonable basis, you've got to get straight on a couple of angles that enter into Army service.

First is good, old-fashioned patriotism. It doesn't have a thing in the world to do with the question of how much a soldier should be paid, for the simple reason that you can't buy patriotism, and this country will inspire whatever patriotism it deserves whether or not it pays its soldiers well. But, because a man is patriotic, should he have to hitch-hike when he goes to town for an evening?

Second is the matter of sacrifice. Every man in the Army makes a real sacrifice to be there, and some will pay with their lives You can't pay for that. You can't measure it in money. But should a man who is willing to sacrifice in the larger sense be called on for smaller sacrifice as a special penalty? Isn't he still entitled to smoke tailor-made cigarettes the same as before he joined the Army?

In our check-up of the pay question we found it does have a very real bearing on the matter of morale, we'll discuss that at greater length later. We found it does bring up the same questions of decency and fair play and human dignity and security that come up in private enterprises when it comes to fixing a wage scale.

On the soldier's side, we found it centers around small but very real things, like the lack of the price of a bus ride to town, lack of money to take a girl out for an evening, lack of wherewithal to do the things that young people work for, to say nothing of the hopeless prospect of laying by enough to get married, or sending a few dollars home to the folks, or putting something away against the day the Germans are licked and the Army won't need men.

What is Army pay, that it won't do these things? Well, it is $21 a month for the first 4 months, $30 a month up to 1 year, and after that, due to a change just voted, it will be $40 a month. Which isn't a complete picture, because the enlisted man gets his food, clothes, and a place to sleep. The story on the next pages goes into that. It estimates that if you figure those in on a cash basis, the $30 soldier is getting about the equivalent of a man paid $90 a month or less in New York City.

And how does this theoretical $90 a month compare with pay in other Government jobs or for similar work? The postmen get $150 to $166 a month. Here in New York we pay our policemen and firemen $100 a month the first 6 months, then $166 a month, and by the third year they're getting over $200. Even the uniformed custodians you see around Government buildings get $112 to $116 a month.

Which is pretty good evidence that the soldier isn't in line, and brings us around to a very reasonable question:

Assume our soldiers are underpaid, can we afford to pay them more?

The obvious answer, of course, is another question:

Can we afford not to pay them what they're worth and what they should be getting?

But dismiss that and take a look at the story at the bottom of this page. It isn't easy reading, because it deals with big figures, but it does give you a basis to compare the cost of an Army pay increase with some other expenditures. That is probably the only way you can get at it, unless you can comprehend the boxcar figures of Government finances.

Maybe an item that runs into the hundreds of millions is hard to understand, but a $10 a month raise for soldiers that comes out to less than we spend for spare engines and spare parts for bombers can be understood. Evidence that raises—even substantial raises—would not disturb the defense program or Government finances is found in the fact that casually, during debate on the draft-extension bill, a $10 raise for 1-year men was put in without the question even being raised, so far as we could find out.

All this is just part of the story, but it does show that we could and should pay our soldiers more. How much is something else—certainly enough to give them something comparable to a decent living wage outside the Army.

On the next four pages we tell something of what we have been able to learn on the subject. On succeeding days we will complete the picture as we have been able to get it.—JOHN P. LEWIS.

WHAT IT WOULD COST TO UP PAY

Exclusive of officers, America's Army totaled 1,443,500 men on August 14. To increase the pay of every one of those soldiers $10 a month would cost the Nation only $14,435,000 a month, or $173,220,000 a year.

To the boys in uniform that's a lot of dough, but to the Nation as a whole it is of little or no significance.

It is only a fraction of 1 percent of the $17,981,000,000 appropriated for our military forces ($13,487,000,000 for the Army and $4,494,000,000 for the Navy) in the fiscal year that ended last June. And the comparable sum for this fiscal year is already $17,000,000,000.

The appropriation for military pay in the fiscal year we're in now (1942) is $1,208,000,000. A $10-a-month raise for every soldier would only make it $1,381,000,000, and a $20-a-month raise would only send it up to $1,554,000,000.

SOME COMPARISONS

This year's appropriation for clothing the Army, $175,000,000, is more than the sum required to give the men $10 a month more, and the 1942 appropriation for spare engines and spare parts for bombers is vastly more—$245,000,000.

If the soldiers' pay were raised only as they became better soldiers—at the end of a year's training, say—it would be even less of a drain on the Treasury. There is talk of an Army of 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 men as the defense program continues, but it is estimated that only about three-fifths of them would be eligible at any one time for raises taking effect at the end of the first year's training.

About 120,000 men will be released this year at the end of a year of service because they have reached 28 or for other special reasons.

NO OUTCRIES IN CONGRESS

When the selectees' service recently was extended from a year to 2½ years, Congress included a $10-a-month increase in the men's pay with scarcely any hesitation. Even the legislators who yell most loudly for economy kept silent.

Some newspapers and commentators instantly pointed out, however, that it was going to cost the Government more money. Those were the newspapers and commentators that worry more about what's happening to the Budget than they do about what's happening to the country.

They rarely point out that Government financing is not like private financing. When an individual goes in debt, he has to make sacrifices in the future to pay that debt. When a government goes in debt, it goes in debt to its people, and when it repays that debt later it repays it to the very people whom it taxes to raise the money to repay them.

The American people have not been afraid to go in debt to themselves to pull this country out of an economic slump and build up its ramparts against fascism.

POOR MORALE IN ARMY LAID TO COOLIE WAGES OF SOLDIERS

(By Joseph Cummiskey)

The way I figure it, the United States Army takes care of a draftee to the extent of $81 to $90 a month. That is made up of the pay they give him in cash after he gets the equivalent of $20 worth of shelter, $30 worth of food, and $10 worth of clothing at New York prices each month.

I went over to Fort Dix with the idea of finding out whether today's soldier is paid too little, enough, or too much. I found out—and fast.

He's vastly underpaid if he wants—and they all do want—to live anywhere near the scale they did before they were tapped for the national emergency and tossed into the front line of national defense.

Without exception, the men I talked to were counting the days until they'd be returned to civilian life. These fellows in the blue fatigue clothes were Uncle Sam's first-line Army. There are men who not many months ago were holding jobs that sometimes paid up to twice as much in 1 week what they get now for 1 month.

Before I break down their positions on the basis of dollars and cents, I want to make it clear that the talk from these men was sincere and in no way could their answers be construed as unpatriotic.

They were quick to say that they have no complaints about how they are treated.

None of them beefed about being overworked. While I was talking to one draftee another one pulled a very bad pun which escapes me. When I said "Owww," he made a crack that really sums up the whole situation. Said he:

"What do you expect for $21 a month—a Broadway production?"

If one thing is certain in their minds, it's this: $21 a month (pay for the first 4 months) is almost nothing. And $30 a month (pay after that period) is more of the same. And $40 a month (pay after 1 year, just voted by Congress) will be an improvement but not much.

They are given shelter, food, and clothing. I figure these three items plus salary breakdown over 30 days something like this:

Shelter (bed, barrack room, bathroom)	$20
Food (average about $1 a day)	30
Clothing (about $120 worth a year)	10
Salary (paid in cash once a month)	30
Total	90

In other words, a soldier getting $30 a month is about as well off as $90 cash without board, room, and clothing.

That's what they get. But beyond there, here's where that $30 a month is used. How far it will go you'll see for yourself. This is a kind of composite estimate drawn from talks with scores of soldiers:

Smoking (pipe or cigarettes), about 20 cents daily	$6.00
Shoe polish (a can a week)	.40
Stamps (they haven't much else to do, so soldiers write a lot)	.84
Pressing (coat, 25 cents; pants, 20 cents) once weekly	1.80
Laundry (flat rate per month)	2.10
Haircut (every 10 days) at 30 cents	.90
Razor blades (issued 3, must buy rest)	.35
Tooth paste (depending on brands)	.25
Shave cream (ditto)	.40
Mirror (buy it once)	.35
Shave brush (buy it once)	1.00
Shoe brush (buy once, use plenty)	.50
Button board (to keep polish off clothes)	1.00
Housewife kit (buttons, needles, thread, scissors, safety pins)	1.75
Blitz powder (to clean metal)	.50
Face soap	.30
Candy, sweet cakes, soft drinks, gum (big items, buddy, particularly the sweets)	5.00

Let's add up what we have right here before we even start thinking of getting the soldier out of camp for a night, even once a month.

The total right now is $23.44.

Subtract $5 for the items he has to buy only once, and to allow for savings, through skimping, and it still comes to about $18.

We haven't got him paying for a bus ride to, say, Trenton, the closest city. When he gets there, or anywhere away from camp, he might want a beer. At 10 cents a glass. Or see a movie at 24 cents.

He has 8 days off a month—Saturday and Sunday four times—and there are also those Friday nights after 5:30 retreat. What's he going to use for money if he wants to go places?

We haven't even mentioned newspapers, books, and magazines. They cost him just what they cost you.

I followed hundreds of them into Trenton the other night. This was a midweek night, not Friday when they didn't have to be back. They were walking the streets by the hundreds.

One group of five, about midnight, approached a cab driver at South Warren and State Streets and tried to bargain for a ride back to camp. Cost, $2.50. They couldn't raise the dough, 9 days after pay day.

An hour later I stopped three soldiers at random and started to talk to them about the Army.

"Don't ask us what we think of it, Buddy, because we can't tell you," they said.

"Never mind that," I said, "how much money have you got right now?"

Among them, they had exactly one nickel. They had been given a lift into Trenton by a buddy with a car. They got the ride because they promised to buy him gas next pay day. What could they do with a nickel? I asked.

"What are you trying to do, be funny, Bud?"

No. I wasn't trying to be funny. I asked them how far their monthly pay checks went. They said:

"Just this far."

I asked them about dates. They said it's tough to get dates because you have to spend money—even if it's just a few beers and a show. You just can't ask a girl to go for a walk. And besides (which is more down-to-earth), the girls won't go walking.

That's what got me thinking about where they were before they were in the Army. How they were making enough to get married. To live the way they want to live. And I thought the Army certainly hasn't sold them a bill of goods that the Army life is a fine way of life. I thought these fellows think their lives are at a standstill, that this Army business is just a phase which will pass away—and the sooner the better.

I know you can't buy patriotism. But I think we can give these soldiers of ours a better break. Now—when they need it. We'll be damn glad to give them everything we have when the blue chips are down and they're out in front protecting this democracy from the chiselers.

I'm certain that the question of morale—which can't be good this way—is tightly bound up with the question of money. And I think there are few things wrong with this man's Army that a good, sizable pay boost won't help.

Service Extension Act of 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 19, 1941

RADIO INTERVIEW WITH HON. HAROLD H. BURTON, OF OHIO

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio interview which I recently gave on the Service Extension Act of 1941.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Question. Senator BURTON, there is much interest in the Service Extension Act that recently passed the Senate by a vote of 45 to 30 and the House of Representatives by 203 to 202. Would you be willing to answer questions about it?

Answer. Yes; it is important that the country understand it fully.

Question. First, Senator, did you vote for the bill?

Answer. Yes; in its amended form. As introduced it provided for additional service beyond the original 12 months, limited only by the discretion of the President or of Congress. I moved to amend it by reducing this additional period to 12 months, but this was defeated. I then supported the committee amendment to reduce the unlimited service to 18 months. This was agreed to.

Question. What is the general effect of the bill?

Answer. Briefly, it permits the retention in the military service for longer than 12 months of such men as are needed. It applies to selectees, National Guard men, Reserve officers, and Regular Army men. It also authorizes an additional $10 per month for each enlisted man for active service beyond his original 12 months until the end of the present emergency.

Question. Are there limitations on this additional service?

Answer. Yes. There shall be released from service at any time all "whose retention in active military service would, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, subject them or their wives or other dependents to undue hardship." Second, under another act just passed, provision is made for the release of selectees requesting it and who had become 28 years old before July 1, 1941, and had become 28 before they were inducted into the service. Third, the additional service itself shall not exceed 18 months beyond the original 12, except that if Congress again declares that it is in the interest of national defense to extend such period of service, the President may then do so. Fourth, the President may limit the extra service to less than 18 months. Fifth, the authority of the President to extend service may be revoked at any time by a concurrent resolution of Congress.

Question. What about the statement that this extra service is a breach of a contract?

Answer. That is not correct. The contract of the Government is clearly set forth in the only place it could be, that is in the law itself. Many boys whom I knew said when they entered the service, that they were afraid that they were going in for more than a year but they hoped that it might be over in 1 year. The law was written with that hope. It, however, was written also with an appreciation of the seriousness of the international situation and with the realization that the serious peril might continue for more than 12 months. Accordingly, in the same sentence that provided for the 12 months of service, it also provided for extension of that service.

Question. Just how does that sentence read?

Answer. I have it here, it reads: "Each man inducted * * * shall serve a training and service period of 12 consecutive months, unless sooner discharged, except that whenever the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled, such 12-month period may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interest of national defense." The act also provides that in any event when a selectee is released from active service he remains subject to call for additional training or service at any time during the next 10 years or until he is 45 years old, whichever occurs first.

Question. Why is there this need for additional period of service?

Answer. Because those whom we have charged with responsibility for our Army have shown that it is now a necessary and vital part of any real defense program in which our Army is made up of civilian soldiers. Today only the strong can be safe. America is united on a program to make whatever sacrifice is necessary for the defense of America's security and that of our possessions and of the Western Hemisphere, which for more than 100 years, has been a part of our responsibility under the Monroe Doctrine. However willing our men may be, they cannot familiarize themselves with specialized modern equipment, they cannot become trained in modern tactical requirements, they cannot distribute themselves over our defense bases throughout the world or familiarize

themselves with the needs of service in those places and they cannot obtain training in large-scale troop movements of all appropriate branches of the service unless some men outside the Regular Army serve more than 1 year on active duty and unless their release from service be upon some flexible basis which can be related to the needs of the special units to which they may be assigned.

Question. Then you regard this extension of service as a natural and essential part of the defense program in which we are engaged?

Answer. That is exactly what it is. It is the express recommendation of the Chief of Staff of the Army, made in his regular biennial report on the strictly military needs of the country. It is just as much his recommendation as is the amount and kind of ammunition that is needed. As for contracts and obligations, the people at large and the men in the service have placed upon their elected officials a clear obligation to provide a plan to protect the safety of this Nation. The people have a right to expect that the leaders of the Army and the Members of Congress will make sure that an adequate plan of defense is authorized and maintained. The extension of service is just as vital a part of our present plan of preparedness as are the appropriations, the airplanes, the rifles, the ammunition, the new factories, the ships, and the training camps. To provide all this, but fail to provide the trained manpower to use it, would double the tragedy and might later inflict great penalties in the loss of life, if not in the ultimate loss of freedom itself. We must not gamble with such stakes.

Question. What does General Marshall say about the necessity for this?

Answer. Among other things, he points out that 2 years ago we had an Army of only 175,000 men. Now it is 9 or 10 times that size. The original men are needed in many services, and they must have some help in training new men. They also need new men to fill up new units, and these new units also need the leadership of men with at least 1 year's recent active training. In fairness to General Marshall, it also should be recalled that before the Draft Act was passed he recommended that the normal training period be set at 18 instead of 12 months.

Question. How many men are there now in the Regular Army?

Answer. There are now about 500,000. Many of these, of course, are comparatively new recruits. This is about one-third of the total Army today. There are 270,000 men in the National Guard, most of whom have had some previous training, and there are about 630,000 selectees. If the Service Extension Act had not been passed, the National Guard men, selectees, and Reserve officers were all subject to the 1-year limitation. This meant that about 60 percent of the enlisted men and about 85 percent of the officers would be subject to release at the end of their first year of service now rapidly approaching. General Marshall said to permit this would mean the disintegration of the Army.

Question. How are these men assigned?

Answer. In Alaska and Newfoundland; in our harbor defenses; in operating 550 posts, stations, supply depots, and ports of embarkation; in the Air Corps; and in the specialized armed force, 536,000. It is obvious that in such work there must be many trained men familiar with special duties required. If only Regular Army men were used here, there would not be quite enough then leaving not a single one for the combat divisions. The rest of the Army is divided as follows: In the Field Artillery, Antiaircraft Artillery, Engineer Corps, Signal Corps, and other specialized combat units and in the 29 divisions of combat troops, 758,000. In the basic preliminary 13-week training course for new men, 200,000. General Marshall shows that it is not possible, to say nothing of efficient, to handle the requirements of this comparatively small Army of about 1,500,000 men, containing about 900,000 1-year men, if the 1-year limitation were to be strictly observed. It needs a flexible system adapted to the actual needs of the respective units of the service.

Question. Did General Marshall give any examples of the difficulties which the 1-year rule had presented to him?

Answer. He gave many. I quote from one in which he said: "I had to authorize the sending of a National Guard antiaircraft regiment to Hawaii. * * * Relief must be provided for that regiment, sailing from San Francisco by August 1 in order to start the other on its way home by August 15. That will allow it 10 days or 2 weeks for the complicated procedure of demobilization in accordance with the terms of present law. We have a further complication in that the National Guard regiment has in its ranks selectees who have a longer period of service. Just what is to be done with them if the guard unit is demobilized, I cannot tell you at the moment. * * * It is probable that the selectees will be left in Hawaii and assigned to other units, but they will have to be brought home 3 or 4 months later." This is just a small sample of the self-imposed hardship that tends to make the whole Army unstable.

Question. In authorizing the extension of service under the Draft Act, Congress declared that the national interest is imperiled. Do you agree with that statement?

Answer. Yes; there can be no question whatever that the national interest is imperiled. Otherwise we would not be in the midst of a national-defense program exceeding anything heretofore done or imagined in the history of the Nation. It is not necessary for Congress to find that the national interest is more imperiled now than it was last September, when the Draft Act was passed, although, personally, it seems clear that the need for our national defense is greater now than then. It certainly is as great as it was then, and we are here merely carrying out the national-defense program then ordered and started on its way. If the war in Europe had ended and the national interest had ceased to be imperiled, then there might well be reason for limiting our defense program and for letting most of the men go home. On the other hand, if the national peril which brought about the enactment of the Draft Act and which is the basis for our tremendous appropriations and defense activity has not substantially diminished, then Congress owes it to the country to recognize that fact and to take whatever steps are necessary, in the judgment of the trusted leaders of our Army and our Navy, to make effective the program of defense upon which this Nation relies for its safety. We cannot change our program with every day's news from the front. The aggressor nations of the world already are fully armed and trained by years of service. We owe it to America to prepare for all possibilities, including instigated uprisings within the Western Hemisphere. Many people do not realize how important the relation is between our defense organization and conditions in Central and South America. The 20 countries south of us, which make up the Pan-American Union, are, all of them, under governments now friendly with the United States. They, however, are directly interested in exports and imports and in the control of the seas, which for the past generation has been in the hands of Britain and the United States. If it seemed likely that the Axis Powers were to gain control of the seas, or if we were to demonstrate our inability to carry out our announced program of defense, we might quickly find that in 8 or 10 of the countries south of us trouble would arise. This would come from the strong opposition parties which are friendly to Nazi control and which, if successful in taking control of their local governments, would put the "new order" of Europe in control of territory and of important air bases and air lines within our own hemisphere.

We must not hesitate to go the full length of our own training program. We must demonstrate the capacity of a self-governing people to mobilize themselves and to accept the discipline and leadership of their own military officials who are entrusted with the defense program upon which the safety of the Nation depends. Our peace and our security depend upon our strength of purpose. America's example of determined effectiveness should continue to be her best defensive weapon.

America's Duty To Remain American and Lead the Way to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. LOUIS LUDLOW, OF INDIANA

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following address, delivered by me over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co., Saturday evening, August 16, 1941:

I am proud to speak tonight under auspices of the Citizens' Peace Petition Committee, which is doing such noble work for humanity.

It is time for us to reexamine our status in world affairs in the light of our traditional policy of freedom and independence. How vitally important this may be, is evident from the fact that with an overwhelming proportion of our people unalterably and inflexibly opposed to our participation in alien quarrels and foreign conflicts we have, nevertheless, been edged closer and closer to war and unless something is done to prevent it a few more shoves will put us in. Then we will be in danger of losing our freedom and independence, forever. How close we are to the chasm of war was frankly stated on the floor of the Senate just recently by Senator PEPPER, who often claims to speak for the Government, when he said that our men now in the camps "will be in the Army for at least 5 years and maybe 10 and maybe a generation."

Before we go farther on the dangerous road toward intervention we should reread American history and allow our thoughts to dwell once more on the travail in which this Nation was born out of the oppressions of the Old World and the tears and suffering out of which came the establishment of the greatest institution of freedom ever known in the history of the world—the Government of the United States. We should try to visualize Valley Forge and the ragged soldiers making bloody imprints with their shoeless feet and Washington's agonized prayer on bended knees in the snow. We should review again the train of events by which the hard-fought victories won by the patriots of the Revolution ripened into fruition in the Constitution of the United States and its Bill of Rights—described by Gladstone as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

And then we should ask ourselves whether we are willing to risk this sacred and priceless heritage of liberty on an intervention gamble.

If we re-examine the genesis of America and seek by rereading history to grasp the spirit and purpose of our being as a nation, we will conclude, I think, that we have wandered far from base in projecting ourselves into affairs all around the world and that we need to retrace our steps to sounder and safer ground. We certainly have departed from the teachings of Washington, who did so much to win our freedom. The Father of our Country did not believe in isolation from the world. Oh, no. He wanted America to be a good neighbor to all of the world, but he did believe in isolation from the eternal wars of Europe and with the infallible wisdom for which he was noted he pointed out how America was protected by Nature from invasion by vast expanses of ocean, adding:

"Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground?"

Today 95 percent of Americans are isolationists in the sense that Washington was an isolationist. If Washington's immortal soul is looking down upon us from the Valhalla of fame I wonder what he thinks about our perilous adventures all around the globe; about the inclination of our State Department to try to regulate things 10,000 miles away, from Timbuctoo to Singapore. If he is conscious of what is going on, I will venture to say he is the saddest soul in the Valhalla.

For nearly a century and a half America functioned in its orbit of complete independence, and in that time it became known as the most prosperous, the strongest, the most respected, and the best Nation on the globe. The oppressed of all countries thronged to our gates, regarding America as heaven on earth. That was before our statesmen became inoculated with the messianic idea that it is America's duty to regulate the world. Those in positions of authority were extremely careful in their speeches and state papers not to offend other governments and peoples. They construed it as their paramount duty "to cultivate friendly relations with all nations; entangling alliances with none." They, of course, read about many unconscionable and inhuman acts committed by foreign rulers as, for instance, by Napoleon and the bloody Czars of Russia, but they never conceived it to be our duty to equip and send over armies to wipe up Napoleon and the Czars. They conceded that job to the Almighty who, in the long run, applied the rule of justice fairly well.

This reminds me of an incident of my boyhood. When I was a lad trying to eke out a living as a reporter on an Indianapolis newspaper, I supplemented my meager salary by serving as Indianapolis correspondent of the New York World. One day a telegram came from the World instructing me to interview Benjamin Harrison in reference to some imbroglio on the other side of the ocean. The particular question I was directed to ask the ex-President was whether he thought America should intervene.

General Harrison read the telegram and then gave me an answer that will ring in my ears until I die. His answer was:

"We have no commission from God to police the world."

I have always believed, and still do believe, that that statement of 10 words ranks with Washington's Farewell Address as an utterance of inspired patriotism.

I would like to ask two questions: First, if we plunge into the World War, what will lie before us? Second what will we leave behind? The weakness of words prevents me from answering either question adequately, but I will tackle the last one first.

We certainly will leave behind the America we have known and to which all generations of Americans have clung with hope and love up until this time. Inevitably a dictatorship will take charge and the precious guaranties of the Bill of Rights—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, trial by jury, freedom to worship God according to one's conscience—will be subordinate to the will of the dictator, whoever he may be. Personal liberty will survive only to the extent that it is the dictator's will it shall survive.

What will lie before us? God only knows. Perhaps Senator PEPPER was not far wrong when he said that men in the camps may be in the Army for a generation. It is not necessary for me to depict the horrors, the surprises, the cruelties the "fifth column" devilries of modern war. All of us are only too familiar with them. I have sworn to high heaven that I will not vote to subject any American boy to these savage brutalities unless America is attacked, and God helping me, I never will. If America is attacked, our manpower will arise en masse in defense. There is no doubt about that. If we are drawn in, we will virtually take over a war we had no part in starting and our pitifully equipped forces will be pitted against the most highly trained and equipped mechanized armies in the world. Is it any wonder that Senator PEPPER sees our men in uniform for a generation?

I am thinking now not only of death in awful forms for our precious young men, but I am thinking also of the living death of our civilian population at home who will have to bear the awful griefs and burdens and costs of war.

Do you know that, without a shot having been fired, at a time when we are supposed to be at peace with the entire world, we have appropriated $52,900,000,000 for national defense last year and this, or the equivalent of more than one-sixth of the total wealth of our country? The latest statistics on wealth are contained in a report of the National Industrial Conference Board, which places the total national wealth at $294,481,000,000.

It is an astounding fact that the astronomical national-defense appropriations already made, without a declaration of war and without a shot being fired, exceed by more that a billion dollars the total combined wealth of 27 States of the American Union, as follows:

Nevada	$651,000,000
Delaware	662,000,000
New Mexico	698,000,000
Wyoming	833,000,000
Vermont	858,000,000
Arizona	975,000,000
Utah	1,152,000,000
New Hampshire	1,197,000,000
Idaho	1,273,000,000
Mississippi	1,478,000,000
North Dakota	1,539,000,000
Arkansas	1,558,000,000
South Dakota	1,711,000,000
Rhode Island	1,903,000,000
Maine	1,981,000,000
Florida	2,052,000,000
Colorado	2,093,000,000
South Carolina	2,166,000,000
District of Columbia	2,552,000,000
Oregon	2,627,000,000
Louisiana	2,659,000,000
West Virginia	2,811,000,000
Alabama	2,831,000,000
Georgia	2,962,000,000
Montana	2,988,000,000
Nebraska	3,089,000,000
Kentucky	3,454,000,000
Total	51,723,000,000

The $52,900,000,000 appropriated to date does not include another estimated $10,000,000,000 lease-lend appropriation which is just around the corner, and which will equal the total wealth of several more American States.

I am not criticizing necessary military appropriations, and I have willingly supported them, because I believe it is our duty to build up America's defenses to the highest point of perfection against the possibility of an attempted invasion which, pray God, may never come. No man on earth hates and abhors Hitlerism and all it stands for more than I do, but I am thinking in terms of what is best for America. If we have spent or obligated more than one-sixth of our national wealth, or the equivalent of the wealth of 27 States merely to prepare for war, what will be the strain on our finances if we get into a shooting war? The backwash of depression, poverty, and economic collapse that inevitably must follow such a venture would be simply indescribable.

If you who hear my voice want to save America, now is the time to get into action. There is one way you can make your influence felt and that is to telegraph or write to the Member of Congress from your district and the Senators from your State. I know something about Members of Congress and how they react, and I know that letters from constituents have a powerful appeal. I am not speaking now of form letters but of letters written in the constituent's own way, coming direct from the heart. Spelling and grammar do not matter. With the country trembling on the verge of war, a million letters to Congressmen protesting our entrance might mean the difference between future peace and our involvement in the most horrible and destructive war of all time.

We are at the threshold of a great and epochal decision. We must decide soon whether we will yield to war hysteria and pressures and enlarge the madhouse that already encompasses a large part of the world by joining the belligerents, or whether we will hold the line for the preservation of our traditional freedom and independence and for our right and opportunity to serve the world as a good neighbor. God grant that we may hold the line!

If we enter the war we will be just one more belligerent. If we stay out our leadership will be of inestimable value to mankind in helping to create a new and better world out of the ashes of the present conflict.

Never before was there such an opportunity for statesmanship. Of all the outstanding characters on the world's stage our President is the one best qualified to lead the world out of its wilderness of sorrows.

If he would call a conference of American republics, as proposed in my House Concurrent Resolution No. 20, and would tender the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator, proposing as a basis for permanent world peace the eight points of fundamental right and justice agreed to by himself and Prime Minister Churchill, at their conference on the ocean, he might be the means of ending the war. The belligerents will have to come to the peace table some time in any event; why not now and save the lives of millions? England, having already indorsed these peace aims, would inevitably concur, and I believe the world's psychology has developed to a point where the war-weary people of Germany, Italy, Russia, and Japan would drive the dictators to the peace table.

To denounce such a movement in advance as impractical is to discount the extent of the war sickness that is taking hold of people's hearts everywhere. The people all around the world are weary of war. They are weary of its horrors, of its griefs, and of the pain it puts in the hearts of wives and mothers. The world is crying for leadership, not for war, but for peace. If the President could see the signal to service that beckons from the homes of the common people—the cannon fodder—of every land on earth, and would lead a movement to stop the age of butchery he would, in my opinion, achieve the greatest triumph for humanity since first the morning stars sang together.

Away up among the snow-crowned heights of the Andes the face of Christ shines brightly. The colossal statue, the Christ of the Andes, was erected to commemorate a

concord reached by Argentina and Chile after a century of bitter strife. The inscription on the statue is as follows:

"These mountains must crumble to dust before the Argentines and the Chileans shall break the peace which they have sworn to maintain at the feet of Christ, the Redeemer."

Would it not be a grand thing if the moving hand of history were to write into the record of civilization this memorandum:

"In the year 1941 a great Christian President of the United States, with the assistance of the 21 American republics, brought a warring world to the feet of Christ the Redeemer."

Is it not worth trying?

Madison Square Garden Rally of Council for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

ADDRESS BY REAR ADMIRAL BYRD

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the very admirable address delivered by Rear Amiral Richard E. Byrd at the mass meeting of the Council for Democracy in the city of New York, Tuesday, August 19, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Not very many months ago I was in the waters of the Antarctic, near the South Pole, on the Navy's ice breaker, the *Bear*. We were fighting a full gale during the polar night. There were icebergs around us, and rocks and shoals uncharted on our maps. The night was black and long and there was no lighthouse to show the way. We sailed alone, with none to rescue us should we hit the rocks.

Not a man on that ship had any thought but of the safety of all. On the bridge Captain Cruzen and his staff of navigators guided the vessel through the dangerous seas. Each member of the crew manned his station with courage and faith.

We knew that we had a common destiny that night, and in that knowledge we did not stop to quarrel about petty differences. We set no personal interests above the interests of all of us.

On a much greater scale we, as a nation, today face the same kind of crisis that the crew of the *Bear* faced in the icy South Polar waters. We, as a nation, will survive this crisis or we will perish; we will come out of it with freedom and self-respect or we will come out of it as slaves—the outcome depends on us. And if we hit the rocks, there will be none to rescue us.

Like the crew of that ship, I have no personal ax to grind tonight. There are no strings tied to me. I speak for no group, no party, no public official. I have no political ambitions. I have not consulted with the administration about what I shall say. I speak under the auspices of the Council for Democracy, whose only partisanship is for democracy. I have but one interest—to tell, as an American, the truth as I see it, with neither malice nor mud slinging.

Let us face the first truth boldly.

A WAR BETWEEN TWO IDEAS

This is a war between two ideas. This is the age-old struggle between democracy and tyranny, between freedom and slavery, between good and evil. This is everybody's war. This time the fight is to the death. And so far, as we all know, tyranny has won. Fifteen nations have gone down like torpedoed ships and the first to be invaded by Hitler's slave idea was Germany itself. The score is going very heavily against the free peoples of the world.

Adolf Hitler has declared that the world is not large enough for both nazi-ism and democracy. He believes that the easy-going people of a free nation cannot compete with the force of a superefficient dictatorship. He considers citizens of the democracies too selfish, too ignorant, too willful to be able to govern themselves. He substitutes might for right, force for freedom. For God he has substituted himself and the worship of a soulless mechanical efficiency. That is the picture of one of the two worlds in conflict as we see it tonight. What of the other?

Well, we of the democracies believe in the dignity and equality of man. We believe that reason and truth and compassion can be, in the end, weapons mightier than any bombing plane. We know that even from the purely mechanical standpoint, we are more efficient than the Nazi system, but in the direction of peace and freedom. It was our peacetime efficiency that invented and developed the very machines that Hitler has turned into hideous mechanized units to destroy free men. Our citizens are equal to those of any dictatorship in intellect, knowledge, and potentialities. If this Nation had worked for 9 years with no idea other than that of wholesale conquest of its neighbors, no one could have equaled in destructiveness our mechanized units, our airplanes, and war machines. No, there is no Nazi superiority other than a temporary capacity to destroy human beings. Only Hitler himself and a few thousand of his more fanatical followers believe in this exploded myth of a German superrace.

That is the difference between us—the free world and the slave world.

WORLD HAS SHRUNK IN SIZE

But there is a second great truth that we must face with equal courage. In comparatively recent times the world has shrunk in size. No one realizes that more than I do. In our own day there are Americans who don't realize what this high-speed transportation and communication mean. They deny that on this planet 2,000,000,000 human beings hurtle through space together. They deny that catastrophe, or disease, or war, erupting in one region, affects all other regions. They believe we can hide in our own little cabin in the wilderness and let the forest fire rage around us. They do not face the truth that the Atlantic Ocean, even with Hitler bitterly engaged, is not wide enough to isolate the Nazi "fifth column" from South America. Even our founding fathers realized, back in those sailing-ship days, that the Atlantic Ocean would not isolate us from Europe.

A false feeling of security may play into the hands of Hitler's agents, whose master dreams not only of European conquest but of world conquest, whose master is as interested in the wheatfields of Iowa as he is in the oil of Baku, for which he has invaded Russia.

If Hitler won, those of us who still dream of security in isolation would experience a rude awakening.

Unless we recognize the dangers that lie before us, unless we move immediately to cope with them before they close in upon us, we face so tremendous a dislocation of the trade structure of this Nation and the rest of the world that economic chaos will settle upon all humanity, whether we have war or not. Chaos is poisonous soil for the democracies, but the most fertile of all soils for the growth of tyranny. Therefore, no matter what may be the outcome of this war, we are headed straight for dictatorship unless we wake up before it is too late.

WE CANNOT STAND ASIDE

Let us review the facts that now stand out. First of all, we know that in this world-wide war of ideas we cannot stand aside. We may find ourselves forced into war with the whole dictator world.

Secondly, we know that America faces the grave threat of economic chaos whether we have war or not.

Thirdly, we know that complete economic chaos would inevitably result, as it did in Italy, Germany, and Spain, in dictatorship for a dis-United States of America.

We know these things. Why, in God's name, is this country unwilling to face them? What are we going to do about them? We are potentially the strongest nation on earth. But today we are soft, still unprepared for the tough kind of crisis we face. We have our democracy, the greatest workable idea any nation ever had. But today we still quarrel among ourselves, we are smug and lethargic, we take our freedom for granted, we suffer from the enfeebling disease of apathy.

I tell you the blunt truth because I want to awaken you.

We must bestir ourselves now, at once, before it is too late, to a spontaneous reawakening of all the people, determined on dynamic unity and sweat and sacrifice, exactly as if we were fighting a shooting war for our national self-preservation against the dictator world.

Since we have voluntarily assumed the responsibilities of a nation at war, I, for one, believe that we should live up to those responsibilities.

That is, I submit, the best and only possible way to prevent a shooting war.

Battles, whether they be economic or shooting, are won by planning and preparation in time of peace, not by a "business as usual" attitude. Let us make no mistake about this. The destiny of this Nation will be decided by what we do in the next 8 months. Either we become the citadel of liberty or we lose the last hope of liberty.

If we rise today in all our might, with the single purpose of doing our utmost to save our freedom, what on the face of the earth would we need fear? What dictator would dare to fight us? What economic disaster could possibly lick us? We would be doing today what most democracies put off till too late. We would expose the lie that freemen cannot equal the efficiency of Hitler's slaves. We would once again prove to the world that democracy, backed by unity and sweat and sacrifice, is the most potent idea in the history of mankind.

Surely the bitterest opponents of our involvement in this war should be the strongest backers of this proposal. Surely every loyal citizen will agee with this effort to build a mighty defense machine. We may disagree on the proper strategy to defend democracy against tyranny as personified by Hitler, but we cannot disagree that democracy must be defended.

Thus, be you an interventionist or a noninterventionist; be you for peace or for war; be you of English descent or German or Italian or French or Irish; be you a Republican or Democrat, a Catholic or Jew or Protestant, or nonbeliever; a rich man or a poor man; whether you like Roosevelt or whether you don't; whether you are a farmer, laborer, or businessman; whether you are a white man or a Negro—you are, if you still think

freedom is better than slavery, if you still believe in our way of life, an American first.

OUR COMMON DENOMINATOR

There lies our common denominator. There lies our kinship of brotherhood that, in the face of national danger, puts aside bitterness and family quarrels. There lies the common bond of faith in an idea that stands above our place of birth, or ancestry, our varying creeds, the color of our skins, the amount of money we make each year—an idea that makes the United States more important than any part of it.

On this brotherhood depends our Nation's potential strength and unity, a challenge to all who hate our way of life. As a democracy counts unity, we have achieved under our strong and courageous President even more unity than could ordinarily be expected. But, in a world that has changed so quickly and incredibly, our usual unity is not enough. It is under attack. The agents of Adolf Hitler are trying to divide the people of America, to set us one against the other, to foster and exploit religious and class suspicions, to set labor against capital, Protestant against Catholic, Christian against Jew, the Middle West against the East. They have used this method of divide and conquer because they have seen it work as a prelude to easy military victory in Europe. But it will not, it shall not, work here.

We must never see repeated in America the tragic story of schools and churches made a mockery, women dishonored—of spies everywhere in our midst, of firing squads, of that ultimate in degradation—fathers denounced to a Gestapo by their own sons—all the ancient earmarks of the so-called New Order that the Nazi tyranny would force upon a horrified world.

It is not enough to demand unity, sweat, and sacrifice. We must know what to unite on, what work to undertake, what sacrifice to make.

I say to you very frankly that, to meet the needs of the hour, we must modify our way of life, at least for the moment. Some of us have not allowed this crisis to change our habits of unrestricted speech and action. Except for the draftees and some of the defense industrial workers and a few dollar-a-year men, we have not changed from our usual routine.

STRIKES LIKENED TO LOST BATTLES

We still work short hours, riding the turtle, while Hitler lashes his subjects into a furious blitz tempo. Labor and business quarrel between themselves as though they did not realize that both would be ruthlessly smashed under a tyrant. Five million man-hours have been lost by strikes. Every plant closed is a battle lost. Prices and rents—even in the vicinity of the Army camps—are forced up steadily; certainly that is the opposite of sacrifice. Some politicians are still playing at politics at the expense of our defense effort. Can we be proud of the fact that the recent congressional vote on extension of military service was divided more along partisan lines than anything else? The philosophy of ease and comfort and pleasure has not changed.

Can we compete with nazi-ism that way? Nazi-ism, that has for years bludgeoned sacrifice and discipline out of the German people? Do we deserve freedom that way?

Let us be honest with ourselves and recognize that, to deserve liberty, we must adjust our concept of it to the realities of 1941. This means that the people of America will have to subject themselves to voluntary self-restraint in the exercise of their cherished rights. It means that we must create a new and long-overdue feeling of individual and group responsibility and accept those responsibilities quickly and willingly. It means that we must end the disgraceful time lag between our knowledge of crisis and our willingness to do something about it.

If there be those who will cry that such a program involves the destruction of democracy in the effort to preserve it, I say that there is a difference between the spirit of democracy and the institutional gadgets by which it works. When a foreign power threatens America, whether by military attack or by propaganda invasion, this democracy is elastic enough to adjust the gadgets to fit the crisis. Are we any the less democratic because we have taken realistic steps to cope with impending danger by adopting the selective-service law? Are we less democratic because we are ready to defend democracy? Are we less democratic because we choose to observe self-restraint in time of peril?

ROLE OF PUBLIC OPINION

The restraints are simple. They must not be enforced by law. That would be dictatorship. Therefore they must be enforced by public opinion. Let us agree that free speech shall not be exploited by those who prefer other political systems in which all our civil liberties would be destroyed. Let us agree that we shall not do anything, by word or deed, to comfort Hitler or to interfere with our defense effort.

That effort is the will of the majority. If we must criticize a course decided upon by the majority, let us agree to do so with fairness and moderation. Democracy guarantees debate, yes; but after the debate comes the decision by the will of the majority—and, as such, it should be respected and immediately acted upon.

Nor does this mean that we must stifle the honest debate and loyal constructive criticism that springs from the rights of freedom. No man, whether he be President of the United States, Member of Congress, or private citizen, is ever infallible, any more than unity is a one-way street. That mistakes must be made in every department of our activities is in the very nature of human affairs.

I do not merely affirm this fact. I urge you to do your part in criticizing, suggesting, expressing your opinion to our legislators and executives. That is the way of free people. Honest debate of many minds arrives in the end at more accurate judgment than is possible for one mind. Therein lies the superiority of democracies over the Nazi idea.

As an American, I affirm the right of any man to say that he does not want to see this country go to war. But we must never again point our finger at one patriotic group and say "warmonger" or at another sincere group and say "traitor." When our neighbor's home is threatened, we will defend it whether he be Jew or Christian, Democrat or Republican, worker or businessman, isolationist or interventionist. That was the principle on which we worked that night on the ice breaker *Bear*. Because the principle is sound I am alive to speak to you now.

And, incidentally, Captain Cruzsen, of the *Bear*, is of German descent, and his second in command, Lieutenant Niemo, is of Italian descent, both good Americans. There are millions of Cruzsens and Niemos in this country who, like Wendell Willkie, are anxious to do their part to help preserve American democracy if they are given the chance. Because this is true, we must guard against the injustice of distrusting fellow Americans simply because their names have a foreign quality, or because they speak with a foreign accent, or their customs are different from ours.

DANGER OF INDECISION

I have said that the ordinary habits of individuals and groups in normal times are inadequate to meet this crisis. It is true of the citizenry of America, and it is true of our Government. American democracy has always met dangers with leadership. At such moments quick, decisive action must be taken by the Commander in Chief on matters that ordinarily would be decided through slower processes. Our danger does not lie in action but in indecision.

And as I discuss leadership from this platform I find myself again back in spirit near the South Pole standing on the bridge of that polar ship in the darkness and the storm with the rocks around us.

Without a leader this Republic would be like that ship without the captain on the bridge. Just as the captain on that ship must be able to act quickly to avoid the rocks, our Commander in Chief often must act quickly to steer our ship of state safely through the storm that has hit the world.

I believe that history will say that President Roosevelt has had to contend with graver responsibilities than ever before faced a Chief Executive of this Nation. Lincoln was faced with the threat of losing a dozen States from the Union. Roosevelt is faced with the threat of losing all 48. Lincoln had the task of abolishing the enslavement of 5 percent of the population. This administration has the task of preventing the enslavement of all the people—and again let me remind you that this can come to pass without invasion by a foreign power.

By the orderly process of a free people, we have placed a great burden on the shoulders of the President and his associates, including especially that great statesman, Cordell Hull; on the shoulders of our representatives in Congress. The Government cannot bear this burden alone. It is the solemn duty of every loyal American to share that burden with our President and the rest of the Government.

The President has been accused of trying to get this Nation into war. I can give you my personal word that Roosevelt, the man, has a deep hatred for war—deeper perhaps than many who have made this criticism. Roosevelt, the President, has the task of carrying American democracy forward under God against any resistance, and it is his duty to do that above all things. If he can do it without war he will do it. But there are things infinitely worse than war, and the worst of these is slavery.

CALLS FOR COURAGE AND STRENGTH

Firmness, courage, strength, and more strength—that is the need of the hour. Our President has demonstrated all of these qualities in this emergency. This is a world half of which has already been driven back to a primitive state; a world where the weak and the timid are quickly wiped out; where animal eats animal; where betrayal, ambush, and murder are the rule.

Defeatism, appeasement, timidity—these have no place in our defense against this savage kind of world. There can be no division of opinion about that. But there is, as I have said, division of opinion as to how we shall defend ourselves. Some believe in positive action and others in passive defense. This is partly a military matter, and certainly it is a military fallacy to think it possible to defend ourselves by standing guard at our frontiers and waiting for the attack, with the enemy free to choose his own time and our weakest point.

In all history nothing but disaster has come from a passive attitude toward organized violence.

I have tried to tell you our duty in hard-boiled, realistic terms. I rest my case on those terms. But there is something in this crisis which transcends hard-boiled realism. I am thinking of the "terrible silence of the gagged millions of Europe." Isn't there a moral issue here, an issue that I cannot help but believe means something to most of us? It is the issue between human decency, common kindness, and sympathy, on the one side, and inhuman brutality on the other.

We know that the lust for world conquest, the brutal persecution of innocent human beings, the degradation of the human spirit, we know that these things are wrong. We know that we stand on trial today before the eyes of our Maker and before the generations of the years ahead, with this greatest of all choices. At the end of one choice lies hell.

At the end of the other lies the peace and freedom in which all men may repeat with the Psalmist: "Behold how good and pleasant it is for brethren to live together in unity."

Here at Madison Square Garden tonight we are enjoying the four freedoms of our Bill of Rights. There is your free press. Here on this platform is your free speech. You who listen to me worship as you please. And here in this meeting place is your free assembly.

What are we going to do to repay democracy for these freedoms? Are we going to sit back and enjoy them as though no one had ever fought and died for them, or are we going to make our personal sacrifices every day so that our defense effort may be furthered? Are we going to divide our national house against itself through dissension, or are we going to stand united behind the President as if at war with an unconquerable morale? Americans, what is your answer?

The Gas Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. MALONEY. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of August 20, 1941, entitled "Is the Gas Crisis Real?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 20, 1941]

IS THE GAS CRISIS REAL?

Confusion grows worst confounded up and down the Atlantic seaboard as Petroleum Coordinator Harold L. Ickes strives to cut down gasoline consumption.

The 7 p. m. to 7 a. m. curfew seems only to stimulate motorists to tank up with gas shortly before 7 p. m. Some results may be had from the new ruling that gas stations are to have per month only 90 percent of the amount of gas each one sold in July—though the bookkeeping and kindred difficulties involved look enormous.

Meanwhile, charges are being bruited about that the gas crisis is a phony anyway; that there isn't any shortage, either of gasoline or gasoline transportation, for the Eastern States, or shouldn't be.

The Wall Street Journal sometime ago estimated that Great Britain requires not more than 250 tankers for war purposes. At the outset of the war, said the Wall Street Journal—

"She had 498. She later acquired 400 from Belgium, Norway, Holland, and France giving her a total of 798 ships, not counting the new tankers she has launched since the war began. This leaves her with more than 500 tankers in addition to those she has for her wartime requirements."

We haven't seen these statements denied. If they are true, what is Britain doing with those extra 500 tankers; and why was it necessary for us to give the British 50 tankers last May 1, with a gift of 100 more of them planned for the near future?

For one thing, according to at least one prominent oil man, the British are saving on dollar exchange by buying South American oil and shipping it to Britain. This trip is two and one-half times as long as the trip between Britain and the United States.

For another thing, according to rumors which go on circulating, the British are using a lot of tankers for ordinary commercial shipments of assorted export goods.

Britain's wartime oil needs are estimated at 91,000,000 barrels a year. Even under war conditions, it is alleged that no more than 200 10,000-ton tankers would be needed to carry 91,000,000 barrels of oil in a year from the United States or the Dutch East Indies to Great Britain.

IS IT WAR MEDICINE?

We doubt that a newspaper could get to the bottom of this matter and report the whole truth on it to the public. Obstacles would probably be thrown in the way by the British Government, and perhaps by our own Government.

But a congressional committee could get to the bottom of it, and could tell the truth about the gas crisis, if Congress had a mind to name such a committee and give it full powers.

Is the eastern gas shortage real? Is the present hysterical though half-hearted rationing necessary? Will strict rationing be essential sometime after Labor Day, as predicted by numerous persons?

Or it is all a big and disagreeable show, put on for the purpose of making people war-conscious?

It might conceivably be the latter, we think. There is a theory that you come to love anything for which you make sacrifices. Meatless days in the previous war steamed up a lot of people's love for that conflict. The recent aluminum-pot collection looked like a drive to bring home the war to the American housewife's mind and soul as much as to collect scrap aluminum. The U. S. O. drive for funds for soldier entertainment, though a worthy cause, had the same war-medicine flavor.

If a genuine tanker shortage exists, then the eastern seaboard States will just have to bear up under the resulting gasoline shortage as best they can. But up to now, we have only Mr. Ickes' say-so that the shortage is a real one; and these circumstantial reports that it is a "phony" keep on batting around.

Under such conditions, we do not think Mr. Ickes' say-so is enough. We do think Congress ought to have the whole question investigated by a competent committee, and the whole truth about the gasoline crisis told to the American people.

Why Buy Defense Bonds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

ARTICLE BY REV. FRANK TRAVIS, OF CHILDRESS, TEX.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in submitting for the consideration of the membership of the House an article written by Rev. Frank Travis, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Childress, Tex., which appeared in the August 12 issue of the Childress Index. This presents some very good reasons for buying defense bonds now.

[From the Childress (Tex.) Index of August 12, 1941]

WHY BUY DEFENSE BONDS?

Even from its inception, America has always been a peculiar land. The Pilgrim Fathers, the members of the Boston Tea Party, the creators and signers of the Declaration of Independence all were possessors of a peculiar spirit of freedom that startled the world by its daring courage that was sustained by a peculiar unanimity of sacrifice. The history of our country has had a peculiar slant and in turn it has produced a people who have developed a peculiar reaction to any philosophy of life that threatens any phase of personal or national freedom.

Today we have come to a period when such a philosophy has definitely appeared on the horizon. All that we have cherished in the past seems to be challenged today. The crys of a people who were once free ring in our ears as never before, they call to us for they feel that as long as we stand there is still a ray of hope for them. As long as America stands they are right.

This is your chance and my chance to help America stand. Every bond and stamp that you purchase is another star in the flag of freedom, and likewise, it is another thorn in the path of the tyrant.

Yes, America must stand.

FRANK TRAVIS,
Pastor, First Presbyterian Church.

The Congressional Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

GEE AND HAW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, for many days Mr. Leon Henderson, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, commonly referred to as OPACS, has been testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee in behalf of a bill to confer authority upon the President to place ceilings upon prices and place a limit upon rents. It is one of the most all-inclusive measures ever proposed to the Congress and carries with it the power of complete control over our economic system. The idea, of course, is to head off inflation. While this measure was being discussed, the Senate was busy writing amendments into a bill passed by the House whereby cotton and wheat now in storage under loan would be frozen for the period of the war and thereafter until the Congress should release these commodities. They could be withdrawn only for relief, national defense, or exchange purposes. The announced purpose of this proposal was to increase the price of these commodities. Thus, while one branch of the Government seeks power to curb price rises, another branch provides legislation to increase prices—all of which is a bit of geeing and hawing.

THE IRREPRESSIBLE DITCH

Several years ago the President approved and the War Department engineers endorsed a proposal to construct a canal across the northern portion of Florida to shorten the route between the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico. In fact, the canal began as a W. P. A. project and about $5,000,000 was expended on preliminary construction. Thereupon the United States Senate took the matter in hand and literally blew the canal out of the water. Other attempts were made to revive the canal, but every attempt failed. Now comes a bill to authorize the improvement of rivers and harbors and after the committee had finished its labors it included the St. Lawrence waterway and also the Florida ship canal. Thus the irrepressible ditch bobs up once more and will be defended on the ground of national defense. How much will it cost? It is estimated at about ninety-seven millions. There is still a good prospect that Congress will either blow this ditch out of the water or will blow the water out of the ditch.

THE GENTLE ART OF BOOTLEGGING

Notwithstanding the fact that there are 127 registered distilleries in the country and that there are 485,000,000 gallons of spirits in warehouses, the gentle, or not-so-gentle, art of bootlegging continues to thrive. In the fiscal year 1940 the Treasury Department seized 10,663 stills and about six and one-half million gallons of mash. It is rather interesting to note that about 82 percent of all stills seized came from 14 Southern States where the traditions of mountain dew and the fragrance of the julep still persist. The new tax bill now pending before the Senate increases the tax on spirits by $1 per gallon, making the total Federal tax $4 per gallon. It is frankly expected that increased taxes on spirits will stimulate bootlegging and that additional enforcement personnel will be required to meet this problem. Thus the bitter fruit of prohibition is still with us.

COTTON HOSE

Several years ago, Dr. Louise Stanley, Chief of the Bureau of Home Economics in the Department of Agriculture, and Miss Ruth O'Brien, Chief of the Textiles and Clothing Division of the Bureau, appeared before a committee of Congress and recited their efforts to make American women cotton-stocking conscious. It was something of an uphill job. It was difficult to persuade the fair sex that the joy and pride of silk-encased legs should submit to a kind of economic patriotism so that we might use more surplus cotton. It was equally difficult to convince manufacturers to pioneer in the field of cotton hose. But the patient ladies in the Bureau stuck to their task. Not only did they have to contend with silk and rayon but with nylon as well. They worked on durability. They worked on attractive designs. They worked on new chemical finishes for cotton hose. But so long as anywhere from 200,000 to 350,000 bales of silk continued to flow to the United States from Japan every year persuading the ladies of our land that a calf in cotton was as attractive as a calf in silk made little real progress. Then came the war. Then came the imposition of priorities on silk. Then came the problem of supplying an adequate number of pairs of hose for the ladies. Thus under the impetus of war and diplomacy, Dr. Stanley and Miss O'Brien may suddenly find an ally in selling to American women the new designs in cotton hose. About one and one-third billion pairs of hose of all kinds are produced in the United States annually.

What Have We Got To Sell?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

ARTICLE BY SAMUEL CROWTHER

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial written by Mr. Samuel Crowther entitled "What Have We Got To Sell?" appearing in the Made in America monthly of April of this year.

In view of the rapidly changing economic conditions throughout the world and the strides being made in almost every country toward becoming self-sufficient, the opinions of Mr. Crowther, who is one of the greatest authorities in this or any other country on domestic and foreign trade, are timely. I commend to the Members of the House and the Senate a careful reading of this editorial:

[From the Made in America monthly of April 1941]

WHAT HAVE WE GOT TO SELL?

(Guest editorial by Samuel Crowther)

This is now the silly season for projecting blueprints for a brave new world which we are to enter, once the carnage of war has ceased. The most popular plan is for some sort of British-American alliance which will establish free trade and democracy throughout the world, financed with Fort Knox gold and with a police force to keep al' trade free and everyone democratic. The least popular plan is Herr Hitler's. He would have the world trade on a Nazi plan, using Nazi tokens instead of gold, and with a police force to prevent trade from being free and people from going democratic.

There is no harm in anyone sketching Utopias. It is an ancient and entertaining pastime. But there is no reason to believe that this war, unlike all previous wars, will re-create lives and property as it destroys them and be a prelude to peace and good will. That is not the way of war. We can more reasonably accept as facts that when this war ends the people of the world will have lost their savings as represented by money or money instruments and that productive machinery for the goods of peace will be either worn out or smashed and the pall of hunger and poverty will descend on everyone but the politicians. Our own Nation will escape the physical destruction of its plant, but undoubtedly that plant will be worn out and, just as undoubtedly, our financial system will either collapse, as did all the European systems, or be kept in a state of suspended animation for a while through a system of insulation and isolation such as those of us who are proud to be called "isolationists" never dreamed of. Let us therefore keep our feet squarely on the ground, no matter where our heads may wander.

Nothing new is being said. I am not surprised to hear that the policy of our Nation in trying to collect its debts after the last war, while at the same time preserving its tariff barriers, brought on the present war, and hence it is up to us to do penance and to rearrange the world. That is the old debt-cancelationist stuff. The fact is that after the last war and the Hawley-Smoot tariff of 1930, our Nation still had the lowest average duties and the largest free list in the world. The imports under that free list and our tourist spendings were great enough to service both the war debts and the private loans. During this period—and this is usually forgotten—the exchange of instruments of payment was more important than the exchange of goods and hence the goods column is only part of the picture. It is also a fact that our private loans paid all the reparations moneys in Europe and also all the payments made upon our war debts. Those are facts which it is useful to remember, although there is no reason to believe that the facts can have any influence upon the internationalists' patter which is now urging a "union now"—which is just the old League of Nations on a more exclusive basis.

Trade, let us remember, is not some kind of quasi-religious rite. It is just trade. International trade is not more holy than domestic trade. International trade is not an affair of exchanging surpluses. The goods in international trade are made or grown for that trade, and surpluses can occur only in agricultural products. The world is no longer divided between raw material and manufacturing nations. That species of economy—on which the British Empire was founded—long since spent its course. A raw material exporting nation soon begins to manufacture at least part of its own goods, either with its own or with foreign capital. Then its economy changes. Our own automobile people, while backing free trade for the United States so that they could sell more automobiles abroad, were at the same time being compelled to erect factories in foreign lands to make the kind of cars the foreigners wanted. Events forced them to violate every principle they advocated.

We have seen our own country pass from the raw material to the manufacturing stage. So also have Japan, Canada, Australia, and now Brazil. Great Britain, the United States, Japan, and Germany were, before the war, trying to sell pretty much the same type of goods to pretty much the same peoples and were resorting to all kinds of trick financial methods to make a futile trade pay. All sorts of barter and exchange agreements, including our Hull treaties, added to the mess and put the politicians in charge. "Planned economy" in world trade has had its trial and failed. What is now being proposed is only a variation on what has failed.

This world some day is bound to settle itse'f into a series of comparatively self-contained economic areas. I sketched this progression back in 1934 in my book America Self-Contained. Since then it would appear that South America is developing into such an area, for the industrialization of Brazil is complementary to that of the Argentine. These world areas will have a natural trade amongst them in specialties. The areas may arise out of world poverty and exhaustion. That is a point of hope.

But in the meantime what will America have to sell after the war? We have lost our trade in cotton and the foodstuffs. That leaves machinery as our only large export. But only when nations are preparing for war do they need our machinery in considerable

quantities. We must either stop importing or pay in gold—while our workers remain idle.

So it would appear that our fanciful flights into an international utopia may be brought down to hard earth by the stark fact that we shall, after the war, have nothing to sell which the world cannot better buy somewhere else. It would seem the part of wisdom to study the facts of our economy before it is too late.

The Bald Battalion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. U. S. GUYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, last autumn a foresighted Kansas community, anticipating the need for civilian participation in the defense activities of our country, brought into being one of the most unique civilian defense organizations in the country.

"Colonel" J. All Evans, organizer and general overseer of this unique defense unit, holds to the opinion that a man who has lost his hair has reached the age of discretion and has given up whatever of radical ideas he may have held in his youth. On this considered opinion, baldness was made an absolute and primary requirement for membership in the Bald Battalion, of Olathe, Kans.

The administrative officer of the battalion is "Major" Chauncey B. Little, a Member of this House in the Sixty-eighth Congress. Under him are captains in charge of recruiting, publicity, medical corps, quartermaster, and other functions. In miniature there is a complete military organization, but in organization only, for its functions are not military and the members are not subjected to drill or military training.

Adhering strictly to the requirement that baldness is a requisite qualification, the membership includes representation from all activities in the community—professional men, businessmen, newspapermen, construction men, public officials, men retired from the hustle and bustle of life's activities, the clergy, and, last but not least, the tax collector.

The aims of the Bald Battalion are service to its community, its State, and its Nation. Its scope is unlimited. Locally it is active in promoting an interest in athletics among the youth of its community. Recently, when recruiting for a State guard unit was lagging in this community, Governor Ratner and Brig. Gen. M. R. McLean, Kansas adjutant general, sought the cooperation of the Bald Battalion. Recruits for the guard, to replace at home the National Guard now in training, had been coming slowly until the Bald Battalion took to the streets. It did not take long to turn the tide.

An offer of services has been made to Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia, as Director of Civilian Defense, and I assure him that if he has occasion to call for assistance in carrying out the functions of his office in Johnson County, Kans., he need give the matter no further thought if he turns it over to the Bald Battalion.

Besides Colonel Evans and Major Little, the officers are Capt J. Arthur Robinson, Capt. Charles S. Hoge, Capt. W. R. Pearce, and Capt. George W. Norris. The infant of the outfit is 25-year-old Wallace V. Nicholson, recruiting sergeant.

The roster of this unique organization now contains upward of 50 names, among which are those of Hon. George H. Hodges, former Governor of Kansas; the Reverend H. R Beers, pastor of the Presbyterian Church; Cecil C. Pember, postmaster; S. L. Daniel, vice president of the Patrons Cooperative Bank; C. F. Broadhurst, deputy sheriff and tax collector; H. B. Foster, an old United States Army man, now a barber; D. M. Alden, road patrolman; Dr. J. A. Knoop; Dr. D. E. Bronson; and the patriarch of the organization, H. G. De Merritt, retired, of the "spit and argue' club, which meets regularly in the public square to settle the questions of the universe.

All colors in the political spectrum are here represented, but all are united for community, for State, and for the United States of America. The Bald Battalion is at your service.

Awake to the Crisis—What Crisis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington scene is full of talk and portentous rumors. America is in danger, the administration says. Spokesmen of the White House from the President on down have reminded the people of our country that the seriousness of the international situation cannot be exaggerated. We stand in imminent peril.

All the talk reminds us of the classic line from Hamlet, "The lady doth protest too much, methinks." We have heard all this so many times in the last few years that everyone is beginning to wonder.

And we wonder all the more because every report from London, in the midst of the storm, burned down and partially destroyed, tells of overoptimism. London is warning against the feeling of confidence which is sweeping over the British Isles. No wonder Americans are asking, "Crisis, crisis, what crisis?" When England in the thick of the fight feels that the danger is diminishing, how can Americans, strong and secure, far from the conflict, feel that they are in peril?

Opinions of the Nation's Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

EXCERPTS FROM EDITORIALS OF 22 AMERICAN NEWSPAPERS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because the compilation of editorial opinion which the editorial staff of the San Francisco Chronicle has collected reveals comprehensively the reaction of millions of American people to the recent historic meeting on the high seas of President Roosevelt and Premier Churchill, I ask the unanimous consent of the membership of this body that it be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of this day's proceedings.

The compilation follows:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of August 16, 1941]

OPINIONS OF THE NATION'S PRESS

Chicago Tribune (Independent, Isolationist): "For Mr. Churchill the event would be, he could hope, that last step which would bring him what he has awaited as his salvation—the final delivery of Mr. Roosevelt's commitments, the delivery of the United States with all its manpower into the war at all points. As head of a nation at peace he (Roosevelt) had no right to discuss war aims with the ruler of a country at war. He not only likes to shatter traditions, he likes to shatter the checks and restraints which were put on his office. He is thoroughly un-American."

Chicago Daily News: "The eight points of the declaration are in line with the best American tradition. These words * * * mean that those who need arms will get arms. They are an added assurance of final victory."

St. Louis Star-Times: "The meeting is a declaration that the great democracies of Britain and the United States are indissolubly united in self-defense against the evil 'new order' which Hitler and the Axis seek to impose by fire and death and violence."

St. Louis Post Dispatch: "Have we heard all there is to hear from this * * * meeting? Is a statement of aims all the President and the Prime Minister drew up? If they talked about peace, did they not also talk about the war and its conduct? What precisely is the present state of American relations with the British and their struggle against Hitler? These graver questions remain unanswered."

Des Moines Tribune: "There has been absolute need of presenting the world a chart of purposes that will stand as an alternative—a more tolerable and finer alternative—to the "new order" proposed by Hitler. The presenting of it, even in this general form, will be important both as a part of war strategy and as a guide to what must follow the war."

Minneapolis Star-Journal: "In the first place it takes the initiative away from Hitler who had planned a 'peace conference' of his 'unified Europe' within the next 2 weeks * * * in the second place, the declaration answers a long and rising demand * * * for a statement of war aims."

Springfield (Ill.) Register: "Suffice in this tense moment to say that this declaration should bring more positive cooperation of liberty-loving peoples everywhere to crush the monstrous foe of human liberty * * * this declaration takes the United States no closer to war. It is a momentous peace offensive."

New York Sun (Independent): "It is implicit, in everything the joint announcement said, that that is no outline of a peace through present negotiation but an outline of a peace that can come only after the downfall of militant Hitlerism. Far more important than the things Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill actually say are the things about which for the present they are keeping silent."

Milwaukee Journal (Independent): "The Roosevelt-Churchill statement is notice to Hitler that peace can come only on recognition of the rights of humanity and of groups of human beings called nations. The meaning to the United States is that the President has pledged all we have and are to defeat Hitler."

Indianapolis Star (Independent, Republican): "Few will deny that the United States would be remiss in its duty to humanity if such a program were permitted to fail because we evaded our responsibility as the world's most powerful democracy and champion of human rights."

Dallas (Tex.) News (Independent, Democratic): "There is nothing new in the eight-point program. Embodied therein are the essential ideals of democracy. More important than the program is the inference that the United States ranges itself alongside Great Britain to fight for the preservation of democracy."

Kansas City Star (Independent): "The Roosevelt-Churchill statement presents noble aspirations on which there will be general agreement. It fails to present a program because a program would at once arouse dissensions and to that extent weaken the war effort."

New York Daily News (Isolationist): "It appears * * * that Mr. Roosevelt, who suggested the meeting, has sold Mr. Churchill on the 'four freedoms,' but with a notable omission. Nothing is said about the freedom of religion * * * there remain only freedom of speech and freedom from fear and want. This neglect to say nothing about freedom of religion is in deference, we take it, to our new ally, Joe Stalin. We have small doubt that Mr. Roosevelt * * * envisions * * * a world * * * with himself as President of the whole layout and Mr. Churchill as his Prime Minister."

Wall Street Journal (Independent): "Mr. Roosevelt has joined with the head of a warring nation in a statement of post-war aims, a performance which has always been the role of an active belligerent and which is bound to raise the question of how we can share in a peace if we do not share in the fighting."

New York Daily Mirror (Independent): "Unless President Roosevelt takes immediate and drastic steps to untangle the shocking muddle that has hog-tied this Nation's defense effort, his deeds will have committed America to a course of action that will exhaust both the wealth and the democracy of this last refuge of free men."

New York Herald Tribune (Independent, Republican): "The result (of the conference) is a powerful statement of a plan for democratic victory, the announcement of a hope around which all men may rally and the implication that behind this plan and this hope there is the joint economic and military power capable of realizing them with whatever action circumstances may demand."

New York Times (Independent, Democrat): "Hitler will denounce this assurance as a perfidious promise. But to the extent that British and American statesmanship can make the good faith of their promise apparent to the German people, they will rob Hitler of his greatest weapon—the present belief of the German people that the outcome of this war means life or death for the German nation. It is the beginning of a new era in which the United States assumes the responsibilities which fall naturally to a great world power."

Buffalo Evening News (Independent, Republican): "The overwhelming majority of the world will heartily approve and sincerely support the declaration of principles. These war and peace aims afford the outline for a better world. The world now knows not only what Britain and the United States are fighting and working against but also what they are fighting and working for."

Buffalo Courier-Express (Independent): "No one who believes in the democratic principles which Americans have professed for a century and a half can find fault with the basic philosophy of the Roosevelt-Churchill declaration. The paramount motive undoubtedly was this: To give new heart to free men resisting Nazi aggression and to those temporarily robbed of their freedom by Nazi invaders."

New York World-Telegram (Independent): "Mr. Roosevelt has great resourcefulness and great daring. Under his leadership, the country has been committed to a degree of participation in the affairs of the other hemisphere. At the same time he is pledged also to keep American troops out of the wars of that hemisphere. The immediate future may determine whether those two commitments can function side by side."

Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader (Independent): "It is interesting to note that no penalties are to be imposed such as those which followed the World War. This feature may do something to allay the fears on the part of some of the German people who have been told by Hitler and his associates that they must fight to victory now because defeat would mean their enslavement."

Oregon Journal: "Churchill and Roosevelt have whacked away underbrush that obscured the site on which democracy hopes to erect a structure of permanent international justice and peace. Now, the world must see—America, especially—the blueprints, and where the stakes are to be driven, where the foundation is to be laid."

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Production Management has recommended to the Maritime Commission the construction of an emergency fleet of 25 ore vessels with a capacity of 12,000 to 13,000 tons each at a total cost of $50,000,000.

The necessity for these ships is emphasized by the intention of the Office of Production Management to increase its steel-production program by 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 tons. A few days ago the Office of Production Management recommended that pig-iron production be increased by 6,508,950 tons.

In submitting its recommendation the Office of Production Management informed the Maritime Commission that it was essential construction of the ore ships be completed at the earliest possible moment. It was suggested that they should be in operation by the beginning of the 1943 navigation season.

This program for the construction of additional ore ships for operation in the Great Lakes is not only a primary essential of our defense program but it strongly supports the position of those Members of the Congress who see in the opening of the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes to foreign ocean ships the threat of a death blow to our ore fleet which in its present limited capacity is playing an important part in maintaining an unceasing flow of ore to the blast furnaces for the manufacture of steel.

Furthermore, the program emphasizes the value of the Great Lakes shipbuilding capacity for the construction of vessels for use in the Great Lakes, and the grave error it would be to attempt to transform those yards to the purposes of major naval construction. Proponents of the St. Lawrence waterway assert the Lakes shipyards could contribute greatly to national defense by construction of naval craft. These yards can contribute vitally to national defense by the building of smaller naval vessels for which they are now equipped.

It is utterly futile to argue their value in the construction of 10,000-ton cruisers when their facilities are required to turn out vessels to carry ore needed in unmeasured quantities for the manufacture of steel.

It is pertinent in this connection to note that the Office of Production Management, in authorizing the construction of the additional ore vessels, said that in case it approves a major over-all expansion of the steel industry, such as it now has under consideration, an additional and larger ore-boat program will be necessary.

President Roosevelt and other proponents argue completion of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project is "vital to the defense of the North American Continent." They do not support this argument by any facts or figures as pertinent as the decision of the Office of Production Management to engage the Great Lakes shipyards in the construction of ore vessels to expedite the manufacture of steel.

The Great Lakes area is vital to the defense of the continent, and it is playing its part now to the limit of its capacity. That capacity should and will be increased to any requisite extent. The type of vessels needed to convey the products of that great section of the country to the furnaces and factories can and will be built in the Great Lakes shipyards.

Such defense advantages as the President and his supporters see in the completion of the St. Lawrence project is predicated upon its operation 4, 5, or 6 years hence at the cost of probably more than a billion dollars to the hard-pressed taxpayers of the United States and Canada. It is an undertaking that would open the lake region and the territory bordering the route of the St. Lawrence to the competition of cheap foreign products carried as ballast cargo in foreign tramp ships. This would be competition that might drive from the Lakes the ore

vessels which are now and will, if properly protected, feed our steel mills with an increasing flow of ore.

The lake region has natural barriers to foreign competition, which would be destroyed by construction of the St. Lawrence project. These defensives against the output of foreign mines and factories constitute today contributions to our defense program. In its present natural situation the Great Lakes area is a storehouse of the primary necessities of defense. They require protection and further development. It is to these last we should set our hand, not to the business of contributing to their possible destruction.

I think it pertinent in this connection to place before the Congress an editorial from the New York Journal of Commerce in which the danger to our existing and projected ore fleet from foreign competition is realistically discussed. It would be well for Members of Congress to note the warning that if we permit foreign competition to reduce our lake-ship reservoir, future emergencies will find us in a precarious position.

The editorial follows:

THE LAKE FLEET AND THE SEAWAY

The value of the St. Lawrence seaway project as a defense measure has been stressed by advocates of the plan since it was revived last October. Hearings before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee centered upon this phase of the development. Proponents have stressed the need of the electrical power for defense production, the larger output of seagoing vessels that would be possible if the waterway is completed, and the benefits that would accrue to industry from the deep waterway. Opponents have contended that the project cannot be completed in time to be of help in the present emergency. The validity of this latter argument, of course, is debatable; but there are other reasons why the seaway might not be in the best interests of defense over the longer term.

Practical observers are convinced that opening of the Lakes to larger ocean-going foreign ships will deal a vital blow to the Great Lakes ore fleet, which is playing such an important role now. This season this fleet of some 300 vessels of nearly 3,000,000 gross tons capacity per trip, expects to carry about 75,000,000 tons of iron ore from the mining areas of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin to the steel plants in the lower Lakes area.

Without this fleet, or with a less-efficient fleet, steel production would be seriously crippled. If the waterway were completed, many believe that foreign ocean-going ships would move large quantities of foreign ore to American steel mills. Already some 15 percent of the ore consumed by American mills is coming from foreign mines. Movement of such supplies has been particularly heavy from Chile and Brazil to the eastern seaboard.

Currently, the necessarily high cost of shipping ore from the seaboard to inland steel mills affords natural barriers to the imported ore, but completion of the seaway would alter this situation. Fleets plying in inland waters would be reduced and in the future emergencies these ships would not be available to meet greatly increased iron-ore requirements such as have developed in the present national emergency. Further, if ocean-going vessels should win a larger share of the traffic in various commodities in the inland waters, the lake-ship reservoir that could be drawn upon in a future emergency would be much smaller.

Current defense consideration must be proven to outweigh by far such longer-term possibilities before Congress votes in favor of the St. Lawrence development.

During July ore shipments on the Great Lakes reached a new high record of 12,007,723 tons. It is estimated that the steadily expanding steel program will require the transportation of 75,000,000 tons of ore this season. It is now necessary to include 8 or 10 Canadian vessels in delivery to American ports.

No section of the country contributes more vitally to the national defense than the Great Lakes area. Anything that would limit its productivity or the means of transporting its products would be calamitous. As one prominent engineer has said:

As long as the iron mines on Lake Superior and the coal mines last, and as long as wars are still possible, the transportation system built around water carriage on the Great Lakes will be one of the greatest elements of military and naval strength. No area in the world the size of the Great Lakes has available for low economical movement of its commodities more shipping facilities. To disrupt, impair, or curtail the Great Lakes fleet, so imperative for transportation, particularly of ore and grain for domestic use and so vital to the national defense, deserves the most serious consideration.

During the World War No. 1 the Great Lakes fleet contributed valiantly to national defense. Then every available ship and barge was employed in the transportation of ore. Canadian vessels were pressed into service, carrying ore to American ports. During the present emergency the fleet of 300 vessels, with the addition of Canadian vessels, is engaged to capacity, and in the current season will, it is estimated, carry tonnage in excess of the high mark of 1917. The proposal to increase the fleet by 25 ships is an evidence of the necessity of a large lake fleet to national defense and any undertaking that would limit its capacity or through foreign competition reduce the number of vessels in lake trade would weaken our defense position in future emergencies. There is little doubt that the importation of foreign ore through the St. Lawrence seaway would have that effect upon the lake fleet.

According to figures recently compiled by the Lake Carriers Association and the Great Lakes Protective Association, and published in their August bulletin, the lake fleet in 1917 moved approximately 62,500,000 tons of ore. The operating companies used 193 steel steamers and 20 steel barges, with a total capacity of 1,787,000 tons per trip. Independent interests had 208 vessels and 1 steel barge in operation, with a trip capacity of 1,374,000 tons. After June 26, 1917, Canadian vessels were permitted to move ore to the United States ports, and a total of 26 such vessels and 1 steel barge with a trip capacity of 153,400 tons were engaged.

The movement of ore is dependent upon lake vessels. The railroads could not possibly furnish sufficient cars to feed the blast furnaces. The constant production of steel requires expansion of the ore fleet and the national defense requires protection of that fleet from foreign competition of every sort now and in the future.

It is pertinent to the national interest that millions be spent on new ore-carrying vessels rather than that we should expend millions on a project that threatens a death blow to existing production and the means of distribution.

But Strikes Continue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LUTHER PATRICK

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BIRMINGHAM NEWS

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, anyone taking pains enough to examine will find that in Congress I vote to sustain the rights of labor. It has been my belief that the workers in this country are, as a rule, patriotic, sincere, and farsighted enough to hold out ultimately for the general good of the Nation, and I have openly defended them against attacks charging selfishness. But I am becoming worried about the behavior of organized labor in some parts of our country. In that connection I hope Members of Congress who have been taking the course I have will read this editorial which appeared this week in the Birmingham News:

[From the Birmingham News]

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE NOW?

Strikes in this country's defense industries are just about as numerous as they were before Germany attacked Russia. Airplane plants, shipyards, and munitions factories are being shut down by labor troubles as they were before June 22.

This fact must be a severe shock to some persons, those who so readily ascribed all strikes in defense industries to the work of Communists. It must be difficult for them to explain the strikes since the Moscow-inspired Communists now have every reason to want production speeded up.

Undoubtedly some labor trouble was fomented before June 22 by Communists clinging to the old Marxist hope of a proletarian revolution. But if there were many such we should now be noting a pronounced decrease in labor troubles. That no particular decrease is observed should be proof that an unthinking need for a scapegoat was responsible for much of the talk about Communists in labor troubles.

This observation, of course, is no defense of communism but simply cites evidence of the fact that some persons were guilty of gross exaggeration of the power and influence of Communists in this country.

Much has been said also about German "fifth columnists" in this country, and some of them have been discovered working in industrial plants, but the general supposition seems to have been that they were more intent on sabotage and espionage than on fomenting discord. Possibly Nazi "fifth columnists" have been more active than Communists in agitating for strikes. It has been established that some Nazi agents have posed as Communists, and certainly, before Germany invaded Russia, German "fifth columnists" and "red" agitators sometimes

worked together. Of course, these Nazis would be subtle enough in stirring up discord to keep most workers from recognizing the source of the agitation. We still have the German "fifth columnists" to reckon with in defense industries.

The fact is, of course, that most strikes arise out of differences between employers and employees, and have no connection with foreign influences. Such influences, however, constitute enough of a danger not to be neglected.

The Destiny of the Four Freedoms in the Light of Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, in his address on the state of the Union, the President coined the phrase, "four essential human freedoms." With that phrase came the positive assertion that freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear, "everywhere in the world," is "no vision of a distant millennium." According to the President, "it is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our time and generation." The reports of the recent rendezvous of the President and the British Prime Minister would indicate that a new world order based primarily on the illusory "four freedoms" was decided upon as an adventure for the American people. For the most part a veil of obscurity has been thrown around the part we are to play in, and the price we are to pay for, our participation. The haze of uncertainty hangs heavy.

If ever there were a time when the American people should be realistic in their thinking, that time is now. It is one thing to say that the four freedoms are "a definite basis for a kind of world order attainable in our own time and generation." It is quite another thing to make the vision a thing of flesh and blood. Obstinate facts must be dealt with. We have been inclined to disregard them. Emotion rather than reason has prevailed.

Hard-headed common sense has been discounted. Experience has been thrown on the bargain table. The sales tag on facts has been lost in the shuffle. What it is hoped conditions may be in the future, regardless of what they are now or what they were in the past, has dictated our policies. Instead of thinking our way through our problems—thinking clearly and coldly and dispassionately—we are urged to let our feelings fashion our future. An idealistic "on order" rather than a practical "on hand" appraisal is advocated. Our philosophy has been idealistic rather than realistic.

The President has made much of the four freedoms. The conference with the Prime Minister dramatized them. What their destiny is, and what our destiny is to be in our search for them, are problems which should prompt practical thinking. Past experiences should be invaluable if this approach is to be made. Obviously, those experiences can be valuable today only as we are willing to subject the records of yesterday to an unemotional, exhaustive, and pitiless examination. I realize that this suggestion will invite the displeasure of those who are persuaded that our destiny should again be committed to an intrepid knight errant. They were so persuaded when we were bent on making the world safe for democracy. I wish that I too might be so persuaded. But I cannot lightly dismiss my deep disappointment over the futility of our lofty altruism when it clashed before with practical problems in Europe. Out of that duel, I believe, lessons can be learned. Time will tell.

The American people were filled with high hopes at the armistice that the time had now come when a peace would be made which would be enduring, which would end all war and which would establish democracy over the earth. It was that hope which had inspired them to join in the battle. It was that hope for which they had sacrificed and suffered. The wars which endangered the peace of the world had always come out of Europe. The Americans were confident the New World would bring to the Old World a formula and a plan by which men could be saved from the futility of continually recurring conflicts. We had fought a war to end wars. The defeat of Germany was to be a means to that end. But, as the means is always secondary to the end which is sought, so the defeat of Germany was not the primary purpose of our engagement. The battles which had beset Europe for centuries were to be ended. President Wilson represented that idealism of the American people. He was convinced, and he had convinced many other that his plans would prove to be "a definite basis for a kind of world attainable" in his time and generation. Undoubtedly Wilson and his ardent associates were enthusiastic enough to believe that the kind of world which they envisioned was not a vision of a distant millennium. Events proved otherwise.

The President's ideas were set out in the 14 points announced on January 8, 1918. They were expanded by the 4 principles on February 11, the 4 ends on July 4, and particularly the 5 particulars stated by him on September 27 and his elaboration of self-determination. Then, as now, great stress was laid on words and phrases.

The American program was received enthusiastically by all of the Allies. It was at once acclaimed as the genesis of a new era for mankind. It was hailed by all of them as the plot plan for the long-hoped-for utopia. It was so inspiring that the ideas caused weakening division among the people of enemy countries. Friends and foes seemed sensitive to the appeal for Samaritan neighborliness.

Taken in combination, President Wilson's ideas represented a clearance of all injustice, all oppression; an assurance of the healing of age-old hates, of the control of power politics; a guaranty of a dissolution of malevolent military alliances of armament burdens; a basis for the establishment of law and equity in international relations. Democratic ideals, self-determination, collective security against aggression were incorporated in the President's plan which was to bring peace at last to war-torn Europe and to a war-worried world. It is not too much to say that the idealism out of which the 14 points, the 4 principles, the 4 ends, and the 5 particulars grew led us to violate the 140 years of American traditions by a military intervention outside our hemisphere.

The Allies left no room for doubt of their endorsement of Wilson's idealism. They avowed that it had become the heart of their gospel. At a review of the American Army near Paris on July 5, 1918, Lloyd George made common cause with the President as to the purposes for which the Allies were contending.

President Wilson yesterday made it clear—

Lloyd George declared—

what we are fighting for. If the Kaiser and his advisers will accept the conditions voiced by the President, they can have peace with America, peace with France, peace with Great Britain tomorrow. But he has given no indication of an intention to do so. Because he will not do so is the very reason we all are fighting. What are we fighting for? Not because we covet a single yard of German soil, not because we desire to deprive the German people of their legitimate rights. We are fighting for the great principles laid down by President Wilson.

Could a more complete or a more comprehensive commitment have been made? The Peace Conference had not convened.

In September of 1918 Lloyd George reaffirmed his unequivocal endorsement of the Wilson position which he had made previously in Paris. Discussing possible peace terms in an address at Manchester on September 12, the British statesman declared:

There have been other terms indicated. I have stated them repeatedly on behalf of the British Nation. They were so moderate that they commanded even the support of the whole of the labor representatives of this country. President Wilson has stated them from time to time and we stand by them.

The Germans had proposed the armistice on October 6, on the condition that the basis of peace would be the 14 points and the "particulars." In his note of October 23 Mr. Wilson confirmed this, referring at that time to the—

explicit assurances of the German Government that it unreservedly accepts the terms of peace laid down in his address to the Congress of the United States of the 8th of January 1918, and the principles of settlement enunciated in his subsequent addresses, particularly the address of the 27th of September.

Having succeeded with the Germans, the President submitted these bases of peace negotiations to the Allied Governments. The fortunes of war compelled German acceptance in toto. The Allies, no longer desperate for assistance, indicated that some reservations might be expected to all our idealism by accepting the proposals, except the second—freedom of the seas. Shortly the armistice was signed. American aid was no longer needed to stem the tide. Diplomacy,

the studied art of European career men, could now feel free to disown the insecurity of idealism.

The attitude of Allied statesmen toward America changed at once with the armistice. The amazing promptness of the change made it all the more bold and brazen. It was immediately crystal clear that they were jealous and fearful of the part America might play in the peace. Lloyd George, Clemenceau, and Orlando, resenting the possible power of the President, determined that they would make the peace. After all, the war was over. The American Army no longer needed the inspiration of a lofty altruism with which to time its drumbeats.

There could be no misunderstanding of the attitude of the three masters toward Mr. Wilson and the United States as soon as the armistice was signed. The United States had really had but a little part in the war; the American people had made no comparable blood sacrifice; the Americans were a foolish people, pliable to Allied propaganda; President Wilson was a visionary idealist, wholly out of tune with European realities; winning the war was the warrant for sharing the spoils; Europe could be saved only as they established once and for all their power over it. The 14 points, the 4 principles, the 4 ends, and the 5 particulars were brought down from the lofty pillars of idealism to the sordid level of power politics. Still hopeful that further economic benefits could be gotten out of the United States, the master map makers of Europe continued for a time a lip service and the propaganda of flattery, and set themselves to the practical problem of devising ways and means of escaping the repayment of the war loans. Instead of accepting the Wilson creed as the fundamentals of a faith for a new world order, the Allied diplomats assumed the role of deft surgeons and proceeded to place the idealism of the President on the operating table for the purpose of performing a skilful surgical operation. As a living organism, it had no value to them. As a dismembered thing, it might have some use in their future experiments. The Allied statesmen were eager to do a complete clinical dissection of the 14 points and the various particulars. The merits and demerits as such of the proposals were brushed aside as inconsequential. The vivisectionists were concerned lest the idealism became a living thing.

The 14 points were really never skillfully dissected. They were hacked at. Point 1:

> Open covenants openly arrived at * * * no private international understandings * * * diplomacy * * * frankly in public view—

Was eliminated by private understanding among the Allies before the President reached Paris.

Point 2—that is, "freedom of the seas," a fundamental of Wilson's concept of freedom at large—was, as I have said, still-born before the armistice. The Germans had accepted the 14 points as the basis of peace. For 10 months after the pronouncement the Allies made no protest. On October 29, a few days before the armistice, the Allied statesmen met in London, at which time the British declared flatly that they would not subscribe to the "freedom of the seas" doctrine. Wilson was helpless. To resume a war that was already won could not be justified. Instead of seeing his idealism take form, as he had every reason to believe it would, Wilson, disillusioned, was compelled to agree to the feeble compromise that this vital point "would be discussed" at the peace table. The discussion proved to be as feeble as the compromise. One of the primary purposes of our entry into the war was thus defeated.

The third point, on the removal of international barriers to commerce, never became a part of the vision of any one of the 21 nations of Europe. Anxious opportunists refused to reckon lofty altruism as of any value in the market place.

Disarmament, the subject of the fourth point, was construed as an approval of a military domination of Europe by the Allies, and not as a goal for the peaceful adjustment of differences between the nations, toward the attainment of which the energies of all men might be directed.

Mr. Wilson had developed in his "Particulars" an idea of international trusteeship under the League of Nations. He had incorporated this idea in his fifth point:

> Impartial adjustments of colonial claims * * * in the interest of the populations concerned.

The proposal was advanced a notch further by the suggestion of General Smuts that this trusteeship of former colonies should be administered by mandates to the different powers. As difficult as this nut appeared to be to crack, the spoilsmen were equal to the task. They skillfully managed it through a prior agreement as to who was to be the "mandate" for what. On this point a joint memorandum by Lloyd George and Clemenceau is illuminating. In it this pertinent passage appears:

> Surely the victors, if they want it, are entitled to some more solid reward than the theoretical map makers working in the void may on abstract principles feel disposed to give them.

It is painfully apparent that idealism had become "abstract principles" to those who now insisted on the adoption of the old doctrine, that rich "rewards" were the rightful spoils of the victor. It should be noted, however, that the mandate method was resorted to for the dismemberment of Turkey.

The sixth point sought to assure to Russia—

> the unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy.

To implement the "independent determination" five different armies were subsidized to attack her with arms and men furnished by British, French, and Japanese.

As to Mr. Wilson's further "Principles" and "Particulars"—such as "self-determination," "provinces are not to bartered about"—they were clothed with flesh and blood by the unblushing cession of Shantung to Japan, and the transfer of great groups of Hungarians, Russians, and Serbs to Rumania, of Russians to Poland, and Germans to Poland and Czechoslovakia. Bartering took on a wholesale form.

The important thesis that military alliances and the balance of power were now to be thrown overboard as medieval junk was destined to receive the same treatment that was accorded to other lofty sentiments. It is doubtful if the spirit of this proposal ever registered seriously in the minds of the European diplomats. It was a language they had never learned or, for that matter, ever tried to learn. Here was a storm center of intrigue and machinations that had raged for centuries. Clemenceau had accepted the suggestion that "the great game now discredited of the balance of power" should come to an end. Yet, 6 weeks after his acceptance, he repudiated the proposal in a declaration to the French Chamber. This repudiation takes on added significance when it is recalled that the disavowal by Clemenceau was made 2 days after Mr. Wilson had, in no uncertain terms, denounced the whole doctrine of balance of power in a speech at Manchester. In the end Clemenceau, with customary adroitness, was successful.

The propaganda eulogies of American idealism and the fulsome flattery of President Wilson were studied efforts of Allied statesmen long before our entry into the war. They continued until the practical problems of the peace table presented themselves. Then came the change.

As I have said, the Allied statesmen had accepted Mr. Wilson's principles openly, fully, and freely prior to the armistice. Treaties, of course, were still in existence. The President had insisted that the acclaim and acceptance by the spokesmen for the Allies were tantamount to a dissolution of these treaties, since they violated every word of his "points." Not so. Every beneficiary demanded his pound of flesh. The New World Order was an ideal—a millennium. But the old order of things persisted, despite the idealism and the hoped-for millennium. Agreements, understandings, commitments, treaties must never be forgotten. They are the proof of the implacable forces which dominate Europe. They are factors which must be taken into account as "a kind of world attainable in our time and generation" is held out as an incentive to the American people. As long as they stood uppermost in the minds of the Allied statesmen, the acceptance of the 14 points could be nothing more than lip service.

The important part played by these treaties prompts a reference to some of them at this time. In the main, they consisted of—

First. An Allied treaty with Rumania in 1916 by which she was to receive large masses of Hungarians and Russians. She was even to have a part of Serbia, even though that nation was then fighting on the side of the Allies. Of this, Serbia was not informed until the war was over.

Second. Various treaties between Great Britain, Russia, France, and Italy, from

1915 to 1917, providing for the division of Persia, a neutral state, as well as of all Turkey. Turkey was to be carved up piecemeal—Russia was to have the Dardenelles and the northeast provinces; France was to have Syria; Italy was to have Smyrna and its hinterland; while Britain was to have most of the rest which included the oil.

Third. A treaty with Italy in 1915 by which she was to have slices of Serbia, of Turkey, of Africa, and a multitude of islands.

Fourth. A treaty between Great Britain, France, and Japan in 1917 by which Shantung, an integral part of China, went to Japan, while Germany's Pacific islands were divided between Japan and Great Britain. China was not informed of this arrangement when she subsequently joined the war.

Fifth. A treaty between France and Russia giving the left bank of the Rhine to France and a part of Poland to Russia. Apparently the British were not aware of this agreement which had been made by her closest ally.

Sixth. A treaty between the British and the Arabs of which the French claimed ignorance—tit-for-tat on the Rhine-Poland arrangement between France and Russia.

With a patchwork of agreements of this kind to deal with, a patchwork interwoven with intriguing understandings, Wilson must have soon realized that his points and principles had little chance to survive. Suave sentences might describe a millennium, but they could not hope to be a foundation sturdy enough to withstand the shock of power politics of Europe.

Despite the difficulties encountered by Wilson's proposals as a result of the treaties, the proposals might have fared better had the attitude of the Allied statesmen been favorable to them. On this point there has been little room left for doubt. British and French leaders have not been hesitant to voice their opinions which give a clear-cut picture of their attitudes. In his War Memoirs, Lloyd George, in referring to the 14 points, makes this pertinent observation:

> We never formally accepted them, and they constituted no part of the official policy of the alliance.

Again, at a subsequent page, we find this reference:

> As for Wilson's 14 points, they might be, and in the main were, in harmony with our desired terms, but they were in places phrased in the language of vague idealism, which, in the absence of practical application, "made them capable of more than one interpretation."

Interpretations count.

In his memoirs of the peace conference the British statesman describes Clemenceau following Wilson's movements—

> like an old watchdog keeping an eye on a strange and unwelcome dog who has visited the farmyard and of whose intentions he is more than doubtful.

Continuing, Lloyd George says:

> I really think that at first the idealistic President regarded himself as a missionary whose function it was to rescue the poor European heathen from their age-long worship of false and fiery gods.

In the same work Lloyd George sets forth the attitude of Mr. Churchill by referring to a meeting of the British Cabinet and the Dominions Premiers in December 1918, at which time Churchill—

> considered that the only point of substance was to induce the United States to let us off the debt we had contracted with them and return us the bullion and scrip we had paid over on the understanding we should do the same to the Allies to whom we had made advances. If President Wilson were prepared to do that, we might go some way toward meeting his views. * * * For the rest we should be civil and insist on our essential points.

Has time mellowed the Premier? Has he grown less practical with the years? Are age and experience an ally of idealism?

Quotations from the observations of Mr. Hughes, member of the British Cabinet and Dominion Premiers, indicate a brutal frankness when he suggests that Lloyd George and Clemenceau—

> could settle the peace of the world as they liked. * * * It was intolerable, however, for President Wilson to dictate to us how the world was to be governed. * * * Speaking for Australia, he wanted to know what Australia was to get for the sacrifices she had made.

Idealism had not dispelled the pound of flesh idea.

Clemenceau, in his book Grandeur and Misery of Victory, does not hesitate to give his reactions to the idealistic endeavors of the United States. In discussing the American Expeditionary Force the French leader says:

> Mr. Wilson, when he sent us the American Army, had put to us the famous 14 points. Were we prepared to cease fighting on the day when the Germans accepted these various points? If I had refused to reply in the affirmative, it would have been nothing less than a breach of faith, and the country would have denounced me with one voice, while our soldiers would have disowned me, and with good reason.

Neither the British nor the Americans were flattered by the observation of the French diplomat:

> England, in various guises, has gone back to her old policy of strife on the continent, and America, prodigiously enriched by the war, is presenting us with a tradesman's account that does more honor to her greed than to her self-respect.

Resorting to a satirical style, Clemenceau discloses his attitude when he says:

> Mr. Wilson had produced a marvelous effort of ideology when he proposed systematically and in accordance with their interdependence, to solve a mass of European problems which had long been the source of disturbance in the civilized world. At the word of the President-savior, the old injustices were to be redressed.

It need not be argued that the idealism of America went for naught when it met face to face the age-old hates, the historic disagreements, and the merciless intrigues of the Old World. That is painfully apparent. Neither the praise nor the censure of Wilson can explain away the hopelessness of the effort from the very beginning. I doubt whether any man could have done better on a mission such as he selected. The fault was not primarily in the methods of the man but in the mistaken notions he entertained. Forces were then in existence—as they always had been and which, I fear, are still present—which made it humanly impossible to make of his ideals a thing of flesh and blood. It had a spirit, but the form could not be fashioned. It is because I have grave doubt whether the Old World has progressed to the point where such ideals can take on form and substance that I am apprehensive of the destiny of the "four freedoms."

World conditions become more involved and more complex day by day. The future is a blank. We have no prophet in our midst. Only an estimate can be made. If in the making of that estimate any value is to be given to past experiences, we cannot ignore the fact that the 14 points and the principles involved were "more honored in the breach than in the observance." Have we any reason to suppose that it would be otherwise today? What new and dependable factors can be counted on to implement the efforts which proved so feeble before?

Aside, however, from the apparent impotency of the instruments in our hands is the fact, which we cannot disregard, that the task to be done is much more difficult and more intricate than it was when the previous attempt was made. Ours is a vastly more disturbed and unstable world. And yet there are those who urge that what we attempted then we should try to do now—draw the plans, prepare the specifications, select the materials, supervise the work—and pay the price for the building of a new world order. Sufficient time has elapsed since our former failure to enable us to adjudge the circumstances and the condition deliberately and dispassionately. The frailties of human nature are plain in retrospection. Our nearness to the present problems makes the same impartial adjudication difficult. To do this means that we must be practical and realistic.

That the four freedoms spring essentially from the same rootstock as Mr. Wilson's points and principles will not be disputed. The similarity of the stem and the foliage is too apparent. Nor should anyone deny the seed of idealism from which both were grown. But to bring the plants into flower is another matter. Admitting that both proposals have much merit, they are of little value unless they can be put into practice. That is the rub. How this can be done we have not been told. In this respect, the striking similarity of the four freedoms and the measures which have been adopted to solve our domestic problems do need emphasis. We may legislate idealistically, but as many of us know only too well, the machinery for enforcement is in the hands of men. Try as we will, the obstinate fact persistently obtrudes that the how of such proposals is vastly more important than the why of them. An emotional appeal may be intriguing but its value should be measured in terms of its possible practical application.

A part of our course has already been charted for us. If the striking parallel between the four freedoms and the Wilson idealism is understood impulsive and imprudent jerks of the wheel may be avoided. To weigh the parallel may at least have a steadying value. To disre-

gard it, or to refuse to recognize it, is not, in itself, as I see it, a badge of patriotism. The converse I also believe to be true.

We dare not ignore the destructive forces of aggression which have been let loose in the world. Every ounce of our energy and every atom of our resources should be available and usable to give us a strength superior to these forces. The ties of a common tongue and of a common tradition with one in adversity make a natural claim on us. That claim has been recognized.

Some would have us do more. That test is still to be made. We may grope our way blindly through the haze of obscure and impractical idealism. Or we may avail ourselves of the light of experience.

Parallel With France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE NEWS-POST

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, that all of the editors do not agree with the present policies of our Government is evidenced by the editorial appearing in the Baltimore News-Post of Wednesday, August 20. The editorial points out the dangers that lie ahead in both our state and financial policies.

The editorial follows:

[From the Baltimore News-Post of August 20, 1941]

PARALLEL WITH FRANCE

Is the communistic administration at Washington heading toward the abyss in which France finds herself?

The parallel between the two countries becomes more striking every day, now that the Roosevelt regime has allied itself actively and ideologically with "red" Russia.

The decay of France began with an alliance between the government of Leon Blum (often called the Roosevelt of a New Deal France) and Josef Stalin.

This was a military alliance as well as a trade alliance.

Today the administration of President Roosevelt is involved in both a military and a trade alliance with Soviet Russia.

When Blum made the Soviet alliance which spelled the political and moral death of the French Republic it set in motion every subversive element in the country.

The parallel in this respect between the Blum government and the communistic administration in the National Capital is made manifest in the new lease of life that all the "reds" and radicals in America have taken on.

They are now 100 percent behind the Roosevelt administration, just as the "reds" and radicals of France were 100 percent behind the Blum administration.

The parallel goes still further

When France was sold down the river to Moscow by her government, the great majority of the French people were not communistic and wanted no truck with Stalin.

The alliance of the Roosevelt administration with Communist Russia is likewise opposed by an overwhelming majority of the American people.

But we, too, have been sold down the river to an enemy that has plotted for 20 years to destroy our form of government.

That which weakened France and put the "red fifth column" on its feet is precisely that which will weaken the United States whether Stalin wins or loses.

That force is communism which the New Deal Government is supporting abroad and encouraging at home.

For 8 years the New Deal Government has shown its communistic proclivities by its constant appeasement of Soviet Russia.

It has recognized Russia as a legitimate government, although it is nothing but a cabal of murderous tyrants which was never selected or elected by the Russian people.

The New Deal administration has appointed time and again "reds" and their fellow travelers to office.

One of them, Thomas Amlie, of Wisconsin, nominated as Interstate Commerce Commissioner, was rejected by the Senate, so strong was the left-wing-radical odor that emanated from him. He was then made an Assistant Attorney General.

This communistic administration has never shown any real antagonism to the "reds" at home or abroad.

The alliance with Russia was, then, the most consistent thing this administration can brag of.

Step by step, our diplomacy in regard to Russia is following Blum's France.

France today is an enslaved state because she made an alliance with her natural enemy—Russia.

We have done the same thing.

Home Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, men and women throughout the world are pretty much alike. They thrive on excitement. When their elected representatives disagree on any important issue, that disagreement makes the headlines. When they agree, their agreement is often buried in the want ads.

Here in our own country, one of the greatest debates in our history has been going on for 2 years. That debate furnishes perfect illustrations of the point I am making. On every major problem where there has been disagreement, the Nation's press has featured the story from Maine to California. Where there has been agreement, it is next to impossible to find it.

Yet this tremendous discussion of American foreign policy has many more elements of absolute agreement than most people recognize. Let me remind you of them.

First and foremost, we are agreed on the urgent need for strengthening our own defenses. To achieve this purpose, billions of dollars have been voted by Congress with scarcely a dissenting vote. There have been absolutely no partisan divisions on these issues. Funds intended to fortify outlying possessions of the United States as far away as Guam and Wake Island have been voted. Both Houses have completely disregarded party lines. Appropriations to equip the territory leased from Great Britain in our own hemisphere have been sanctioned by Congress irrespective of political differences.

Let there be no mistake about this fundamental basis of agreement. Let those totalitarian nations which seek to emphasize what they call "internal dissension" understand that American disagreement is part of our republican tradition. Let them take warning that we are the most strongly united people in the world, in spite of the headlines.

We are in agreement on still other fundamental matters of national policy. Almost unanimously Congressmen from every section of the Nation look upon Japanese aggression in the Far East with complete abhorrence. The entire Nation is united in the belief that nothing can possibly justify the Japanese invasion of China and the ruthless slaughter of unprotected men, women, and children. More than this, Republican Members of Congress have been protesting for 7 years against the administration's policy in the Far East. We have protested against the shipment of oil and metals to Japan to strengthen her aggression while we were simultaneously lending every assistance possible to China to keep Japan at bay. Only this last month the President conceded the failure of his policy in Japan. Today, the administration, its supporters, and its opposition in Congress are in complete agreement on this vital element of our foreign policy.

But there are still other matters of the utmost importance on which all of us agree. Americans have always hated aggression. We have condemned it wherever it has occurred. Nazi Germany's assault upon her smaller neighbors is regarded with abhorrence by all Americans. We sometimes forget this in the heat of argument. But even those men and women who urge our Government to consider its own needs as paramount—subordinating aid to Great Britain to a minor place—never for 1 minute forgive the German destruction of Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Norway, Belgium, Holland, France, and Greece. We are united in our opposition to Nazi conquest and Nazi purposes.

Of course, there have been violent cleavages of public opinion on the question of our aid to Britain. There are people in our country who regard the British Empire with grave suspicion. They point to its history as the world's greatest imperialism and tell us to make haste slowly in our dealings with England. But faced with the specific issue of a German victory with a Nazi-dominated world or a successful defense against such an outcome, the American people have certainly made up their minds—we are convinced that only the end of dictatorship can bring peace to our troubled world.

The steps which we must take to assure this objective have given rise to the most significant discussion in the last

generation. The issues of aid to Britain, conscription, convoys, and property seizure have all grown out of this debate. But it should be observed—and observed carefully—that each of these problems concerns itself with method. Americans have disagreed on methods before. Go back through our history. We had almost unbelievable differences of opinion during the Revolutionary War. The Tories and the Liberty Boys, the Friends of Great Britain and the Friends of Independence, rioted on our streets. A few years later we had violent arguments over the Embargo Act passed during the Napoleonic Wars. The Civil War is, of course, a perfect illustration. Our people have fought each other over our national policy in China during the Boxer Rebellion, over the Platt Act for Cuba, over our position in the World War of 1914.

Yet in everyone of these separate instances, our country has emerged from the controversy without the slightest impairment of its strength. I submit that our strength as a nation lies in our ability to disagree violently during our discussions, and to battle side by side for the majority decision once the conclusion has been reached. On this score, there remains much to be said. There are many issues ahead which have been scarcely considered.

The No. 1 item on any American discussion these days must be the progress we are making in building American defense. No matter what you may call yourself, interventionist or noninterventionist, isolationist or internationalist, the paramount interest of our country is today, as it always must be, American defense. It is our job to build the strongest military, naval, and air defense in the world. We have good reason to believe that the productive capacity of our country can do this without dislocating our entire national economy.

But we are not doing the job. I say that you owe it to yourselves to understand that we are lagging behind. Take the most important single weapon produced by the present war in Europe—heavy aviation. The difference between victory and defeat for any nation today may lie in its ability to produce flying fortresses. Great Britain needs them at its huge base in Singapore. It needs them for the protection of its islands. We need them at Manila and at Pearl Harbor. Only a month ago the President told us that by the end of next year we should be turning out 500 four-engined bombers a month.

Now we learn that it will take at least another year before we begin to approximate this goal. A few months ago we heard talk of an air fleet of 50,000 fighting planes to defend our country. No one in Washington can tell you today when we shall have this fleet. We have heard optimistic but obviously uninformed leaders of our National Government saying that American aviation is the finest in the world. But no aviation expert will tell you this. On the contrary, what they say is far from comforting. We should have the best air force on the globe, but we decidedly do not have it. Other countries are turning out war planes that are faster, more maneuverable, better protected than ours.

Well, then, what is the reason for all this? The basic reason is exactly the same as it has been for the last 2 years. We have not had the plans on hand. Our Government has imagined wonderful schemes. It has dreamed up a military system which sounds well-nigh invulnerable. But it has failed completely at the job of translating these ideas into action, because it has no one in Washington to handle the job of putting all these schemes into effect It was only a few months ago that the decision to manufacture our new flying fortresses on a large scale came through. You thought that such a decision was reached a year ago.

Here is one example of delay which hurts American defense.

I believe that there are other problems which are no less important to the safety of our country. One of these crucial issues is the issue of defense unemployment. Three months ago, in a talk which I made on the floor of the House of Representatives and which I repeated over the air, I called the attention of the administration to the unemployment problem being created by our defense boom. On that occasion I discussed the specific difficulty confronting the automobile industry. There are 400,000 men engaged in the selling, repairing, and maintenance of American autos. Dealers and their salesmen, garage owners and their mechanics, advertising agencies and their employees will inevitably feel the pinch of a reduced automobile output. In the factories that turn out new cars, 215,000 men are expected to lose their jobs if Leon Henderson is permitted to cut down auto production by 50 percent.

What about the silk-stocking industry? We have 175,000 men and women who earn their livelihoods in the Nation's silk mills. Our Government has ordered a complete shut-down of the silk-processing industry. So far we have had a few promises by the Government to offer some assistance to the factories and their employees. Substitute materials are to be made available. My point is that this kind of problem was foreseeable. It should have been anticipated just exactly as the automobile curtailment should have been anticipated. Planning for this eventuality might have done much to ease the shock.

Those of our people who are engaged in the home-building industry, in the manufacture of household equipment, washing machines, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, in selling gasoline, will find themselves on reduced pay rolls. Where are they to go?

I believe that these problems are definitely related to the defense of America. They arise directly from the rearmament program of our Government, and every one of them should have been met with a definite plan by our Government.

This problem of defense unemployment is only one more instance of our national administration's failure to plan ahead. The recurring epidemic of strikes after a brief interlude of peace in industry points to still another important Government failure. By this time, after 8 years of N. R. A., N. L. R. B., and anti-injunction legislation, you would imagine that our Government would have evolved some kind of definite national labor policy. Today we are reaping the harvest of our indecision. We have suddenly become aware of a new type of industrial difficulty, the "jurisdictional dispute." Employers who are ready, willing, and frequently eager to cooperate with labor organizations now find themselves shut down because two contending organizations claim to be the proper "bargaining unit" for the entire establishment. Certainly this kind of argument ought to be easy enough to decide. Let the employees vote. Clear up the issue and then let the work go on.

Under our present Government policy it doesn't work out this way at all. The National Defense Mediation Board has done a good job with many of the cases that have come to its attention. But it has stopped short of determining the fundamental shop issue in many others. No one can blame the Board. It is waiting for the national administration to enunciate a clear policy which will serve as a guide to the solution of these problems. At the present rate, we shall have to wait a long time.

In France a few brief years ago conflicts between labor and management helped to paralyze all resistance to the invading Nazi armies. The so-called popular front played a large part in creating the frictions, the stoppages of production, the bitter attitude of labor toward employers, which were sources of endless comfort to the enemies of France. We are not willing to see America torn apart by the same antagonisms. And one sure way to prevent this from happening is by the establishment of a firm, clearly stated, fixed policy toward labor and management. What that policy should be must be determined by the honest, intelligent discussion of business, labor, and Government leaders. But once the policy is fixed, let it be observed. Let there be a thorough understanding that we have agreed upon the strongest possible defense for America in the shortest possible time. With that understanding there can be no compromise. There can be no talk of subordinating the interests of one group to those of another when we have agreed upon the ultimate goal. All private interests must be directed toward the achievement of our objectives, the building of a home defense for America.

You will observe that I have concerned myself in this talk with many matters. Some of them may seem to be unrelated to the subject of American defense. Yet I believe that every area of our daily lives which is affected by the policies of our Government is intimately connected with the defense of America.

We have watched nations which were proud of their freedom going down to slavery. Some of them resisted bitterly. Others were betrayed. Still others yielded without a struggle because they did not understand what they had. In many a European nation working men and women regarded their freedom and their liberty as worthless possessions. They shrugged their shoulders and told

their friends that they would be just as well off under Hitler as they were under a government of their own choosing. They have discovered how far wrong they were.

In our own country, too, there has been discontent and real suffering during the depression of the last 10 years. We know that men and women have been sick at heart. But we shall not make the mistake of those nations which surrendered.

Our people are united in their determination on a national defense.

I am a member of the minority party in Congress. We are sometimes accused of obstructionism and partisanship. I recognize these terms as part of the language of America. The party in opposition is always abused by the majority. Occasionally we forget the fundamentals in our bitterness over the incidentals. I am firmly convinced that all those who make these accusations are emphasizing the background and forgetting the picture.

We have agreed upon the course which America must pursue. A strong defense, a people protected in their relations with nations abroad, secure at home, eager to protect their basic and fundamental liberties because they understand and cherish them—these are the elements upon which American greatness today must rest. Whatever may be the course of history in the trying and troubled days ahead, I am certain that our country will stand fast.

Today, as always, the United States of America is preparing to rely upon its own sure source of help—the men and women of America. Aid to one country or to another may serve as a means of defense. The record of history shows unmistakably that those nations which relied for their survival upon others have done so at their own risk. Today, as always, we are preparing to rely upon ourselves.

There, in the long run, is where our real security lies. In the shops and factories of America, on the fertile farms of the world's richest land, in the homes of a stalwart, self-reliant people—here is where our defense lies. Here is where it will continue to lie, no matter what may be our policy, no matter who may be our administrators.

The Greatest Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

ADDRESS BY ASSOCIATE JUSTICE FRANK MURPHY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Associate Justice Frank Murphy, delivered before the Knights of Columbus Supreme Convention at Atlantic City and published in the Washington Post of August 20, 1941:

THE GREATEST DANGER—THE UNITED STATES AND THE RUSSO-GERMAN WAR

(Address by Associate Justice Frank Murphy)

The world today is engaged in the most titanic conflict of all history. Two-thirds of mankind is in battle array and the other third is tremendously concerned with the outcome. This is a conflict which is straining not alone the spiritual and material resources, the manpower and armament, of the nations involved; far more than that, it is straining the capacity of all peoples, including our own, for clear thinking and firm decision.

We, the United States, so recently arrived at our national adulthood, find ourselves in a position of leadership in the family of nations. Upon us the war has placed a heavy responsibility to all civilization. It is a responsibility which we can hope to fulfill only if we are sound and realistic in charting our course along the confusing paths of national interest and foreign policy.

Before the fall of France a year ago it was still possible to assume that what happened in Europe and Asia could not seriously affect or menace our national security. Our concern with the principles and practices of national socialism was more academic than real. We might fulminate against them, but it was difficult to believe or imagine that we were face to face with a crisis in world history, the outcome of which might profoundly affect and eventually determine our own future position in the world and safety of our institutions and way of life.

Not until we became aware of the tremendous power of the German military machine and the world-wide reach of Nazi aims and political machinations did we find it necessary to think of this crisis in terms of similar crises in the past, as when the free nations of Europe were called upon to resist the onrushing power of the Ottoman Turks in the fifteenth century, or oppose the grandiose ambitions of Napoleon Bonaparte in the early nineteenth century.

In the face of this new challenge to world peace and a free international order, we have been obliged to reconsider the comfortable assumptions which have previously conditioned our thinking—assumptions of hemispheric detachment and security of freedom from outside interference and safety from attack, even the basic assumption of an orderly world in which nations respect each other's integrity and conduct their national affairs according to law and morality and elementary decency.

For a nation whose thinking and foreign policy have long been conducted on the basis of such assumptions and an honest desire to live at peace with the world it has been difficult to become reoriented and think in terms of a different order of things requiring the use of economic and military sanctions for the protection of our interests. We are coming to see, nevertheless, that as things are, with powerful nations resorting to military action in support of a program which threatens to isolate us from the rest of the world and eventually challenge our position and freedom of action as a strong and independent state, we, too, must give practical consideration to military interests in the conduct of our foreign affairs and to the adoption of suitable tactics, both military and economic, to neutralize and offset the dangers that threaten us.

We are at one of the crossroads of history. In the light of what we have seen and the evidence already available, there can be little doubt that a complete German victory would mean a profound reshaping of the world. Not only Europe and Africa but South Africa as well would conceivably fall under the sway of the Nazi economic and political philosophy, directed and upheld from Berlin by a thoroughly ruthless government, supported by a military juggernaut of matchless power and skill, and dedicated to political doctrines which are the very antithesis of principes we hold sacred and fundamental to individual freedom and happiness. Large areas of the Asiatic Continent, with its teeming millions, would be exposed to a similar fate.

Whatever you or I may think as individuals, as a nation we have in effect committed ourselves to the policy of aiding those countries which are offering resistance to the aggressions of Nazi Germany and her associates. As formally expressed in the terms of the Lend Lease Act, these are countries whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States. If we like to think of ourselves as an arsenal of the democracies, the truth of the matter is that our Government and our people, the great majority of them, are convinced that our position in the world and our very safety as a strong and independent Nation, enjoying the freedom of intercourse with other peoples and an equal voice in world affairs, would be compromised and endangered by a complete Nazi victory. We of the present generation, as prudent and responsible men and women, having the welfare and the destiny of the Nation temporarily in our charge, cannot afford to let it happen.

At a time like the present it is of crucial importance that we keep our minds on the main issue and not allow ourselves to be diverted or confused with respect to our real interests and the fundamentals of our policy. Knowing what we do, therefore, of the methods and aims of the Nazi Government, its utter disregard for the rights and aspirations of other nations, and, above all, the vast striking power of its military organization, we must not allow ourselves to be confused and misled by its latest maneuver, the attack on Russia.

In ordinary circumstances we could afford to be indifferent to such a conflict. For men and women who cherish freedom of religion and the other fundamentals of democratic rule, there is little to choose from between the communism of Soviet Russia and the nazi-ism of Germany. We want neither in this country. But we know that nazi-ism, with its superior competence and perverted intelligence, its extraordinary energy and missionary zeal, its profound belief in racial superiority and destiny, its fanatical intolerance, and, above all, its tremendous military power and skill, is by far the greater menace to free nations and free institutions. It is at present the real menace.

In thus defining our attitude toward war between communism and nazi-ism, it is not a question of allying ourselves with the philosophy of communism. We know that with only negligible exceptions the American people are unequivocally and unalterably opposed to communism. We reject it for its denial and contradiction of elemental human wants. We reject it for its desertion of religion and its suppression of religious bodies. We reject and oppose the communism of Soviet Russia for its opportunism in resorting to the aggression which in others it has so stringently condemned. We know from the records of our courts of law that its agents have sought with premeditation to undermine our democratic form of government.

On this point there can be no doubt. We stand against communism as a thing that is completely out of accord with our freely chosen way of life. But we should not permit this to blind us to our own interest and to the major fact that the great and immediate threat to our position and standing as a great Nation, commanding the respect of the world

and dealing with other nations on terms of peace and equality, is Nazi Germany with its inordinate ambitions, its hated philosophy, and its superb military organization.

With a fire raging in the neighborhood which threatens to take your house, or with a dangerous animal loose in the streets, you aren't too concerned about the religion or politics of those who join in the effort to put it down. In present circumstances any nation resisting the might and aggression of Nazi Germany is, whether intentionally or not, advancing our interest as well as its own.

In launching the attack on Russia the Nazi leaders piously proclaimed that they were fighting the battle of western Christian civilization against the godlessness of Soviet Russia.

In doing this it was doubtless their hope to divide and confuse opinion in this country, especially among the people of the Catholic faith, who are notoriously abhorrent of the tenets and practices of communism. But a glance at the record will remove any doubt about the hypocrisy of this claim.

In that singular prophetic volume Mein Kampf, Adolf Hitler wrote as follows of the Christian faith: "The individual may realize with pain that with the appearance of Christianity there came into the much freer world of the ancients the first instance of spiritual terrorism. He cannot, however, dispute the fact that thenceforth the world was oppressed and dominated by this force; force can only be broken by force and terrorism by terrorism. Only by these methods can a new condition of affairs be brought about."

Very evidently at the time of the writing of these observations the Nazi leadership did not regard itself as a defender of "western Christian civilization." On the contrary, the implication is clear that it considered itself obliged to bring about, by force and terrorism, a new condition of affairs. But this was in the early years.

What has been the Nazi Party's view in more recent times when it has wielded the power of government? One answer is provided by the words of Reichsbishop Mueller, speaking with reference to a German Christian meeting in 1934. "The time will come," said Bishop Mueller, "when only Nazis will conduct services and when only Nazis will occupy the pews. We want one people, one state, and one church."

Two years later, at a party congress in Nuremburg, the philosopher of the party, Dr. Alfred Rosenberg, reaffirmed this policy in more specific terms: "That the Catholic Church, and with it the Protestant Church in its present form, must disappear from the life of our people is clearly evident to me and, I believe I can assert, also to our Fuehrer."

In 1936 the Voelkischer Beobachter, personal journalistic organ of Herr Hitler, served notice that "we are armed and prepared to continue the battle against Catholicism until the final frightful decision, until the point of total annihilation."

But let us not judge by words alone, however damning they may be. Let us consider deeds. On the 8th day of July 1933 a concordat was solemnly entered into between the Vatican and the German Reich. It was signed for the church by Cardinal Pacelli, now Pope Pius XII, and for Germany by Ambassador Franz von Papen. In this treaty Chancellor Hitler pledged freedom of worship for the Catholics of Germany, and the respective function of the church and state were carefully described. As to the manner in which the agreement was carried out, I shall quote from the encyclical letter issued by Pope Pius XII on March 14, 1939:

"In the difficult and eventful years which followed the concordat, every word and every action of ours was ruled by loyalty to the terms of the agreement; the unwritten law of the other party has been arbitrary misinterpretation of agreements, evasion of agreements, evacuation of the meaning of agreements, and, finally, more or less open violation of agreements. In the furrows in which we labored to sow the seeds of true peace others * * * sowed the tares of suspicion, discord, hatred, calumny, of secret and open fundamental hostility to Christ and His church, fed from a thousand different sources and making use of every available means.

"On them, and on them alone, and on their silent and vocal protectors, rests the responsibility that now on the horizon of Germany there is to be seen not the rainbow of peace but the threatening storm clouds of destructive religious wars."

Enough of the facts have emerged to provide a clean-cut picture of the conditions referred to in the Pope's late encyclical. It is a picture of a systematic and sustained endeavor to drive a wedge between the Catholics of Germany and their traditional faith. It is a picture of the closing of churches, monasteries, convents and schools on invented accusations and flimsy pretexts; of the regimentation of Catholic youth and the abolition of their youth organizations; of the elimination of Catholic action societies and publishing houses, the surveillance and supervision of priests, and the destruction of business establishments through boycotts and blacklists. It is a picture of stealthy and demoralizing persecution.

That this program of suppression has continued to this day there seems little doubt. On July 6, 1941—2 weeks after the start of the alleged German "holy war" against communism—the archbishops and bishops of greater Germany protested bitterly against the actions of the Government in a joint pastoral letter. Specifically, they charged that all diocesan publications have been completely suppressed; that numerous convents had been closed without reason; that all Catholic schools have been suppressed; and that all religious instruction has been stopped in other schools.

From Poland the news has been vastly more shocking. In a report published under the authorization of the Vatican, Cardinal Hlond last year told of the murder of hundreds of priests, the imprisonment and brutal persecution of thousands of others—clergy and laymen alike—and the defilement and destruction of hundreds of churches and other homes of religion.

The people of Poland are tragically aware that it is no champion of the cross who occupies their land. That knowledge is shared by the people of Norway, of Holland, of Austria, and, above all, by the Christian people of Germany itself. They know that the Nazi regime is a Christian regime only when it is good military strategy.

In citing evidences of Nazi opposition to the Catholic Church and its communicants, I do not wish to imply that people of other faiths have not also suffered persecution. The sad plight of the unfortunate members of the Jewish faith under Nazi rule is only too well known. Fresh in our minds also is the recent declaration of the Lutheran bishops of Norway, crying out against the systematic rule of terror by the Nazi storm troopers and continued interference in the affairs of the church. And the prayers of the whole Christian world go out to that brave and gallant figure of German Protestantism, Pastor Niemoeller, who has been subjected to the privation and terrors of the concentration camp for opposing publicly the politics of the Nazi Government. I am addressing this appeal to members of every religious faith not to be confused or deceived by the recent turn of events in Europe.

Such, in part, is the record of those who now ask us to accept them as crusaders for Christianity against the godlessness of communism. It is a record which shows beyond doubt the futility of looking to the Nazi leaders of Germany as allies in the defense of the Christian faith. Not only have they proved by word and deed their hatred of Christianity, but they have shown the folly of placing trust in their pledged word.

From this record and from other evidence it should be abundantly clear to anyone that under Nazi rule no religion would remain free. Any concessions thus far made to religious bodies have been made solely for reasons of convenience and opportunism. The only religion acceptable to the Nazi Party would be under the direction and control of the Nazi state.

While the Communist philosophy remains a danger to the Christian religion, it is not today the greatest danger. The overshadowing menace—and the one from which we must not let ourselves be distracted—is the philosophy of nazi-ism embodied in the present German military regime. In that philosophy and that regime we face not merely godlessness but godlessness which even now is in grave danger of carrying out its ruthless program—a program for which history may have no adequate parallel since the days of Nero and his successor tyrants on the throne of ancient Rome.

We shall not therefore be deceived by this sham crusade in behalf of Christianity and Western civilization. Our hope and our safety lie not in a triumph of Nazi arms and the Nazi creed. We want no part of this or any other form of totalitarian doctrine. Our hope lies in the triumph of democracy. Our democracy will not fail us if we are willing to act together as one nation with a single policy, determined to preserve and safeguard the heritage that has been bequeathed to us by our fathers.

Today, no less than in the beginning of our national life, the religious faith of our people is the chief source and pattern of our morality. Wisely did the framers of our fundamental laws provide against any interference with the free exercise of religion. This is a right which has been jealously safeguarded by the courts, but in the exercise too much neglected, I fear, by many of our citizens. Let us hope that in the stress and strain of the unhappy period through which the world is now passing the people of this Nation will remember what they owe to their religious inheritance and be willing to make whatever sacrifice may be needed for its preservation.

It is from the simple precepts imparted to us by Holy Writ, impressed upon us from day to day and week to week by our religious exercises, that we as a people have derived the qualities of sobriety and honest and moral integrity that make democracy possible. Under the benign protection of the great document of government which defines and safeguards our basic liberties, religion has been free to grow and flourish throughout the land. It ministers to our needs in many forms, whether in the sacrifice of the mass or the sacred books of Jew and Mormon. It finds noble expression in the hymns and prayers of the great Protestant communions and provides spiritual manna in the simple devotions of the Quaker.

In that historic meeting at Philadelphia which produced our charter of government, no statesman or delegate of that day thought it necessary or meet to propose the adoption of an ersatz religion under the control of the state as a means of insuring national unity among the several elements of the new Republic. Their concern was that religion should be free and untrammeled. For whether we hearken to the great prophets of Israel or follow the Star of Bethlehem, whether we turn for spiritual guidance to other creeds and symbols, let us never forget that we are members of a common brotherhood searching and striving for the ideal of peace on earth, with charity and justice for all men. God speed the day.

A Tariffless World?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MADE IN AMERICA MONTHLY

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein an editorial appearing in a recent edition of the Made in America monthly and written by Mr. F. X. A. Eble, managing editor.

Mr. Speaker, the Made in America monthly is a splendid publication and is devoted to the development of our domestic economy. The editor and publishers of this publication recognize the fact that all other nations are endeavoring to make themselves self-sufficient as rapidly as possible. The opinions expressed in this editorial are those of a man who has spent many years of his life in the study of world economic developments. Because of the inexorable working of economic law, assisted by the scientists of the world, many of the nations are approaching their objective in the not-distant future. I commend to the Members of the House and the Senate the opinions of Mr. Eble as expressed in this editorial:

[From the Made in America monthly]

A TARIFFLESS WORLD?

Now that Europe is again in the throes of a great war, a new crop of self-appointed world saviors is in the making. Vying with one another for the headlines in the daily press they also compete with one another with their balderdash. Various plans and programs, designed to save the world from going completely to the "bow-wows" are offered. Some of them are merely dusted off blue prints resurrected from the morgue of fantastic philosophies rejected 23 years ago. Reintroduced by new sponsors, usually individuals who are outstanding in their respective fields of endeavor, whose honesty and sincerity of purpose are above reproach, these new plans and ideologies, shorn of their whiskers, are dressed up with renewed dignity and are given respectful and even sympathetic attention by an ever credulous public.

A new world with international free trade, free credit, an international police force, and with unemployment a thing of the past all over the world was predicted by a noted industrialist in a Nation-wide speech over the radio 2 weeks ago. Higher standards of living and better wages for all peoples developed through world abolition of tariffs were major features of a plan proposed as this country's objective by the editor of an outstanding monthly publication, before the consumers conference held in the Pennsylvania Hotel, February 18, under the sponsorship of the Advertising Women of New York.

The greatest losers under such a fantastic scheme would be the American workers, American farmers, and American producers, especially those who have but one market in which to sell their wares because of their high-production costs in keeping with our American standards.

Take the two individuals referred to above, one a manufacturer of a popular 5-cent beverage, the other a member of the staff of a successful monthly magazine. Neither of these eminent gentlemen ever sat behind a desk in a factory or mill and burned midnight oil while worrying and grappling over the problem of meeting the weekly pay roll when threatened with the loss of their home markets because of the inroads of competing foreign products that displaced their wares on the shelves and counters of the retail establishments throughout the Nation.

Another manifestation of the shortsightedness of these quasi-economists who believe that tariffs are the cause of the ills of the world and therefore must be abolished is that they do not differentiate between buying power and selling power. The buying power of any nation is the gage or yardstick of its standard of living. Not alone has the United States the highest standard of living in the world, but the buying power of our Nation is greater than that of any other nation, and no nation in the world has such an attractive market for its own products.

The buying power of our country is created and sustained by the wages paid to the workers in every commercial, industrial, professional, agricultural, and scientific endeavor throughout the Nation. In short, the buying power of a nation depends upon the amount of money earned by its citizens, whether such money be earned through labor, capital invested, or services rendered. Our buying power is also reflected in our ability to pay decent wages. For instance, $1 is paid per hour to certain workers in the United States pottery industry. That same dollar will buy 14 hours' labor in the Japanese pottery industry in the same class of work.

It is this displacement of American man-hours of labor by the cheaply manufactured foreign products—not alone of Japan but from all parts of the world—that plays havoc with our national economic life.

Now what is selling power? This is the ability to sell at prices that are lower than all other competitors; yes; even without sacrifice of quality of the products involved. The United States, with its high standards of living, higher costs of production, and higher wage rates, has many instances wherein it successfully competes with nations with lower wage rates and lower living standards because of highly mechanized equipment, mass production, and the use of scientific methods of manufacture. The American automobile industry is an outstanding example. It does not need any tariff protection, but industries in this class are limited.

Low wages, low standards of living, and low production costs create and sustain high selling power and nations unable to compete must protect themselves in their home markets against the influx of competitive products through tariffs. The United States is in this class, for anything that displaces and competes with that which we produce ourselves curtails employment, and the incidental distribution of wages reduces buying power, lessens consumption, and eventually curtails production, which is the very essence and life of American business.

Now, as to standards of living, take Japan, for instance. Japanese industrialists do not want any change in the living standards of their people. They even resent the idea or thought that the living standards of their people are low. Let us read from a letter written by a Japanese industrialist to a friend of his in France. The letter was published in the Bulletin Des Soies et Des Soieries under date of August 25, 1934.

"You English and Europeans think of your profits and of the high standard of living of your labor while we think of the necessity to find work for our labor and to the vital needs of the millions of Asiatics, Africans, and South Americans, our customers, who live quite modestly. You reproach us with paying our labor what you term starvation wages. We protest. If our labor dies of hunger, it cannot continue to produce, and we have proven that the Japanese worker produces more per hour than his European competitor.

"The difference lies herein. The standard of living of our Japanese labor is not lower than yours; it is a different standard of living. Our labor lives on rice and fish, yours on cereals and meat. Our climate permits us to live in wooden houses with little furnishings, while your labor requires houses of solid construction and high building costs and more furnishings. Can we help it if our manner of living is less costly than yours?

"Don't think that because of our manner of living that our people are more unhappy than yours. If we offered them your houses and your food, they would certainly reject them, for they are attached to their time-honored customs. We must also tell you that our workers are able, with their average wage of 30 yen ($9) per month, to build savings as evidenced by their deposits in savings banks."

So you see this Japanese manufacturer rejected the idea of even adopting a European standard of living for his people. Perhaps our American economic missionaries would be more successful. Wouldn't the traditional American ham and eggs for breakfast, and a sirloin steak with onions, topped off with strawberries and cream for dinner, be more alluring to the Japanese than their present diet of rice, fish, and soya beans? I wonder?

F. X. A. E.

British Flood American Markets While Businessmen of United States Beg for Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

ARTICLE FROM CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, because the Government has come in to impose priorities on steel, iron, aluminum, and many other materials regarded as indispensable in the national defense and aid-to-Britain programs, hundreds of small industries manufacturing nondefense products are threatened with extinction and their employees are facing economic ruin. A recent survey indicated that 64 percent of the small industries of America will have to suspend operations unless they are given defense contracts or materials with which to manufacture their usual products.

During the past 3 weeks hundreds of operators of so-called small business concerns have flocked to Washington in an effort to find a solution to their disturbing problems. All tell the same story—to the effect that they must close their factories unless materials or Government defense contracts are obtainable. In the meantime reports reaching Washington from England indicate there are no shortages of materials there, and the importation of English goods in the "buy British" campaign is rapidly increasing. It appears to me that the

American manufacturer and his employees are being "sold down the river." It is about time that steps should be taken to protect America against the pilfering of our markets by a nation whose war we are subsidizing.

In this connection, I ask permission to insert a newspaper article showing the increase of British imports under the campaign now being conducted by the nation we are aiding. The article follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of August 19, 1941]

ENGLAND SELLS GOODS HERE AS UNITED STATES CUTS OUTPUT—ALUMINUM PRODUCTS ARE AMONG METALS SENT IN

NEW YORK, August 18.—Importers here still are able to obtain British goods made in whole or in part of metal, despite the fact that American manufacturers already have been forced to curtail production in many similar lines.

In some instances importers have insured against future shortages by smart forward buying in America. One such case is that of Alfred Dunhill of London, Inc. This Fifth Avenue importer of pipes, lighters, gifts, and a variety of smokers' accessories for a luxury trade also features a line of Habana cigars encased in individual aluminum cartons—at 25 cents and up per cigar.

Although American housewives were asked to give up pots and pans in a 20,000,000-pound aluminum-collection campaign, Dunhill confidently expects to be selling its exclusive aluminum-carton product for at least 2 years through stocks bought here. The American-made cartons are filled in Cuba.

DELIVERIES BEING MADE

At Dunhill's it was said that the situation is becoming "very tight" on imports from Britain of metal cigarette cases and some similar accessories, but that deliveries still are being made. Although saying "We're afraid it can't last much longer," officials cited only one instance of cutting down so far. This is that smokers no longer are provided with a spare aluminum filter tube when they buy a Dunhill pipe.

The absence of any slackening in the "buy something British" campaign to maintain English exports to the United States is illustrated in the August buyers' index of importers, published by the British Empire Chamber of Commerce in America.

More than 250 listings are included of companies with stocks of British goods on hand, compared with less than 100 in the first issue last April. The 8-page gloss paper job with a big red V on its first page is going to 10,000 department-store buyers and merchandise managers, compared with the initial circulation of less than 5,000 copies.

REPORT STEADY FLOW OF GOODS

The British Chamber of Commerce reported a steady flow of goods from Britain, with increased sales in the United States. It said Britain apparently still is allotting sufficient material—including metals—to permit manufacturers to supply the trade here.

One exception is that no food listing is included in the index, it being explained that continued export of luxury foods "made a bad impression when so many shortages exist in England." A Fifth Avenue shop, however, is featuring fancy tin packs of English biscuits and cookies at 85 cents, $1.10, and up for a package.

Spices and both India and Chinese teas, packaged in tin in England to keep them fresh, are listed in the index and are in higher priced stores.

AN OUTSTANDING SUCCESS

The chamber of commerce also noted that the "buy something British week" promoted here last month by the Committee to Aid Britain by Reciprocal Trade, was such an outstanding success that there is every reason to anticipate similar promotions in other cities throughout the United States this fall and winter.

Almost no British substitution or curtailment of metals has been found by Abercrombie & Fitch, exclusive sporting goods store, catering to the Long Island trade. Aside from tax questions, which have caused more trouble than all other matters arising from war conditions, its chief trouble has been delays. But forward buying has fixed that.

Almost 20 percent of all the store's sales are British imports and no more than a minor reduction has occurred in shipments. Illustrative of the British view, an instance was cited of a manufacturer who wrote there would be a slight further delay in obtaining a product in which aluminum normally is used. He said he could substitute another metal and make immediate delivery, but that he was sure his customer would prefer the slight additional delay to have the product right.

Extension of Military Service—the Hard Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 18, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on the day following the passage of the bill to extend the period of the service of selectees, National Guard men, and reservists beyond the 12-month period of training fixed by existing statutes by the startlingly close vote of 203 for to 202 against, there appeared in the Washington Daily News a brief editorial which, because of its timely comment upon what will come to be regarded as an historical event, should, in my opinion, be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In order that that may be accomplished, I include it herein, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News]

THE HARD CHOICE

The Congressmen who voted by a whisker to extend Army service will have a hard time explaining to the families of soldiers back in the home districts.

It may be well that some of the Representatives have risked their political lives.

They could have taken an easy way out. They could have voted to let the young men go home—and saved themselves the political anguish of explaining. But they knew that the easy thing to do was not the right thing to do.

They had listened to the testimony of the Army's Chief of Staff, General Marshall, that demobilization might prove a "national disaster." They had heard him say that at the end of a year in service the men would still be only partly trained. They knew that if these partly trained men were sent home they would be placed in the Reserves, subject to immediate call if America became involved in war. They knew that while our entry into war is not inevitable, it is possible. And they knew, what all military experience has demonstrated, that when untrained or partly trained men are sent into modern warfare they are killed off like flies.

The Congressmen may have risked their political lives by voting to require the young men to complete their military training. That was far better than casting a vote which might have meant heedlessly risking the physical lives of these same young Americans.

Taught To Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of August 18, 1941:

[From the Washington Daily News of August 18, 1941]

TAUGHT TO THINK

Two freshmen on the House District Committee, each, in fact, serving his first term in Congress, did a swell job for the people of Washington last week. They are OREN HARRIS (Democrat, Arkansas) and SAM RUSSELL (Democrat, Texas).

For several weeks a subcommittee cat-hauled the police department. Certain of its members went in with preconceived notions of why Washington was wallowing in a stew of unsolved crimes. Witnesses were summoned but not permitted freely to testify. With leading questions subcommittee members testified for them. Recommendations that the police rule the District with an iron hand resulted.

Among the recommended changes was an amended habitual criminal act. When this measure reached the full committee it was harsh and inelastic. On a second conviction of felony the judge was required to impose the maximum penalty: on a third conviction one and a half times; and on the fourth conviction, twice the maximum penalty. The judge was given no discretion.

At the outset of debate it looked as if the bill would meet no opposition. Then Representative HARRIS spoke up quietly. He had been a prosecutor back home. He suggested mildly that if a poor man were driven by hunger to enter another's house and steal a piece of bread it would be a felony. He said the judge, even in a second offense, should have discretion and not be required to send a man to prison for 15 years, the maximum penalty.

Representative RUSSELL, also a mild-mannered debater, then spoke up. He had been not only a prosecutor but a judge in Texas. He told a story to support his thesis that statutory penalties could be made so severe that juries would not convict men of minor felonies.

For half an hour the two endured a verbal hammering by the strong-arm advocates. Then, one by one, beginning with Representative EVERETT M. DIRKSEN (Republican, Illi-

nois), committee members joined them until, finally, the bill was sent back to its draftsmen to be made not more lenient but more flexible for second offenders. So, on this basis, it has been redrafted, passed by the House, and awaits action in the Senate.

The two southern Democrats, without gestures or loud words, had prevented enactment of intolerances. Of equal importance, they had arrested the ordinary course of its meetings and made the House District Committee think.

Philippine Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOAQUIN M. ELIZALDE
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. JOAQUIN M. ELIZALDE, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. ELIZALDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System national hook-up on August 13, 1941:

In the southwestern Pacific lie a group of small countries encircling the China Sea. Today that area is of tremendous importance to American policy and to the future of the American people. Surrender of this area to control by imperialistic powers, by appeasement or as the result of war, would have a permanently crippling effect upon the efforts of the United States and other democracies to preserve a free world. Freedom of trade routes in every part of the world and the accessibility of essential raw materials for American industry are among the immediate interests at stake.

The Philippine Islands comprise the remotest American outpost in the Pacific, and they form the final American link to the lands of continental Asia, the Dutch East Indies, Singapore, Burma, and India. More than that, the Philippines possess the best strategic location of all countries bordering on the China Sea. It is detached from continental Asia, and it lies exactly at the crossroads of important ocean routes connecting Japan, the United States, China, southeastern Asia, and Oceania.

Moreover, in the Philippines there are 16,000,000 people who personify American culture and American form of government in the Orient.

Forty-three years ago today, on August 13, 1898, American forces under Commodore Dewey, General Merritt, and General Arthur MacArthur, occupied Manila. Subsequently these troops extended their occupation to all parts of the Philippines.

They found a Christian nation, with 300 years of Christian history and a wealth of western culture. They found schools and colleges, including the Santo Tomas University, which is even older than Harvard. They found an abundance of tropical products, many not available in the United States. Among them were manila hemp, coconuts, hardwood trees, sugar, and tobacco. Since then, large mineral resources have been unearthed, including gold, manganese, iron, chromite, and copper, which, incidentally, are particularly appreciated today.

But, over and above this, Americans found a vigorous people who for many years had been fighting for freedom and self-government. Time and again they had revolted against their foreign rulers. They continued this fight under Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo for a considerable time after American occupation.

The four decades which have followed have been full of spiritual and material blessings for the Philippines. We have made astounding progress in every field. The years of the United States tutelage in our country are recognized by all today as a blessing to our people. For that reason we now revere the 13th of August as the beginning of our association with a great benefactor.

Surely it was inevitable that in the years intervening there should have been some dissensions and difficulties between two progressive peoples such as yours and ours. In the process of development and adjustment there were many plans, policies, and ideals which had to be reconciled. This collection of differences in the past is now popularly referred to as the "Philippine problem."

Actually, there have been no controversies of importance. In the long run we have been able to meet each other half way. It is true, of course, that in the past 40 years we have had to adjust a great many problems. There was, for instance, the political matter of independence aspirations—the desire of the Filipinos to run their own local affairs. The regulation of our trades with the United States was another.

Meanwhile, during this same period the Filipinos were passing from the conservative Spanish atmosphere and educational system to the modern American way of life. Today most of our leaders in government and business are products of the American system. Many of them have graduated from schools on the American mainland, bringing us a much closer understanding of America.

In this span of years we shared with the United States the difficulties of the first World War and the unprecedented world economic depression which manifested itself in the United States and had its corresponding repercussions in the Philippines. This brought us a realization—if realization were needed—that our economy was becoming more and more dependent upon that of the United States.

Today, all of us are involved in a titanic world struggle to uphold freedom, liberty, and tolerance. This is a struggle in which none can stand aside. The whole world is in its grip, divided into two hostile camps. In this division we in the Philippines have unstintingly pledged our whole support and loyalty to the democratic cause proclaimed by the United States.

I have the most solid conviction that unless democratic ideals survive in this world struggle, and unless individual freedom is finally triumphant, there will be no possible life for small countries, nor place for them in the world of the future.

Our own interests involved in the victory of democracy are twofold:

First, to uphold the ideals which we share with America; and

Second, to help make possible a world in which our aspirations may be realized.

To this great task the Filipino people, under the leadership of President Manuel Quezon, have dedicated themselves with their whole spirit, their full manpower, and all their resources.

I am hopeful that the assistance which we can offer will now be of value to the United States. Militarily, we have turned over to the United States 140,000 of our finest young men, who have received their basic military training under the supervision of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, former United States Chief of Staff and son of the General MacArthur who led one wing of the American forces into Manila 43 years ago today. All our military facilities and preparations, carefully worked out by the Philippine Commonwealth in the past 6 years, have now been turned over to the newly created United States armed forces of the Far East.

The American Navy, which maintains its far eastern base of operations in Manila Bay, has also been given every assistance and cooperation.

In the economic field we have submitted ourselves to a rigorous system of export control which has drastically curtailed our export trade and imperiled a number of our industries.

Meanwhile the war-born shortage of shipping in the Pacific is bringing us an economic depression of the greatest gravity. Our produce will have to be stored, with no immediate prospect of marketing. This spells the blackest disaster for Philippine economy. And, unfortunately, no immediate relief appears likely in the midst of the prevailing world-wide confusion.

From a civilian standpoint we are actively preparing for all eventualities. Manila has undergone air-raid precaution practices and repeated black-outs. In fact, our entire population is conscious of a closeness to the danger of war.

Let me now refer to the Philippine independence movement, about which there has been so much misunderstanding in this country. This movement has often been misrepresented as one of ingratitude and unfriendliness toward the American people. Nothing is further from the truth.

An easy way to understand the Philippine desire for independence is by analogy. The youth who reaches maturity and longs to leave the family home for a life in which he must depend on himself is a close parallel to our situation. In his father's house the boy may enjoy great comfort and protection from want; going out into the world may be uncertain and fraught with terrible hardships. From the standpoint of his immediate well-being the son would be well advised to stay close to the family table. Nevertheless, he is ready—even determined—to take all the knocks and set-backs necessary to make him finally an upstanding citizen and member of the community.

The Filipinos are that youth. They have been taught by their parent country—the United States—the virtue and desirability of freedom and self-determination. The Filipino people would be unworthy in their own minds, and certainly by the measure of American standards, if they did not have that urge toward self-government. I am sure that the American people understand a trait which is so thoroughly characteristic of the American himself.

Yet this aspiration interferes in no way with our friendship and devotion to the United States; nor does it detract from our present desire to be of utmost service to America in the critical times which face us.

All of us are preparing to meet increasingly serious and difficult problems. Hence it is no light undertaking when I say that I am proud to take advantage of this anniversary of the date when the American flag was first raised in my country to pledge in the name of my countrymen complete loyalty and service to the objectives and ideals of the United States.

National Debt—One-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, nobody observed it, but this week there occurred

a notable event in American history, the day when our national debt passed the $50,000,000,000 mark. We are now spending more than $16,500 a minute. And if you think these figures are staggering, ponder a moment on the observation of Price Administrator Leon Henderson. He told us last week that if we are to exceed Germany's war production, we shall have to treble our spending.

The one obvious and clear-cut way in which we might easily lop off a fair chunk of our expenditures, the reduction of nondefense items, has been simply sidetracked by the administration. It obviously wants no part of any reduced spending. Apart from defense items, the old saw attributed to Harry Hopkins still holds good, "We shall spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect."

Borough of Tyrone, Pa., Endorses Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

RESOLUTION OF TYRONE (PA.) BOROUGH COUNCIL

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Borough Council of Tyrone, Blair County, Pa., on June 24 passed a resolution approving the Townsend plan.

Tyrone, Pa., is a typical thriving central Pennsylvania community, and the population of this community, through the members of their borough council, are of the opinion that something must be done to provide adequate pensions for the deserving senior citizens of the country.

The resolution is as follows:

BOROUGH OF TYRONE, PA.,
June 24, 1941.

We, the undersigned members of the Borough Council of Tyrone, Blair County, Pa., believe something must be done to provide adequate pensions for our deserving senior citizens, and at our regular meeting have adopted this resolution:

"Whereas the members here assembled endorse the Townsend movement as being both patriotic and economic; and

"Whereas the Townsend plan will restore a purchasing power in the hands of the 42,000,000 people that this administration claim are undernourished and give employment to six and one-half millions of people that are unable to secure a position so far in this rearmament program; and

"Whereas it will act as a cushion toward warding off any further man-made depressions in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we most respectfully urge upon Congress of the United States of America to consider the basic principles of the Townsend bill (H. R. 1036) now in committee; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That one copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the following: The President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt; the Honorable Robert L. Doughton, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee; the Honorable James E. Van Zandt, Congressman."

RAYMOND A. HAGERMAN,
Burgess of Tyrone Borough.

Attested:

J. H. HARKLEROAD,
Secretary, Tyrone Borough Council.

James W. Cole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, in the death on Sunday last of James W. Cole, Deputy Second Assistant Postmaster General, all of us, Democrats and Republicans, have sustained the loss of one of our best friends, and the country has lost one of its most loyal and faithful servants.

His career of 43 years in the Postal Service of the United States is a model of distinguished service and devotion to duty.

He believed in working, and his example in the Department where he spent his life is most outstanding. Born in my own home county of Coweta, in the State of Georgia, on a modest farm, he struggled until he qualified himself for a job in the Railway Mail Service, from which position he arose to one of the most important desks in the Post Office Department. He knew human nature perhaps better than any man I have ever known, which accounts for his eminent success as a post-office inspector. To him were assigned many of the most difficult cases, including the one involving theft of mail from the late ship *Leviathan*, and it was only after Jim Cole took hold of that case that it was solved. He concealed himself in that great vessel until he found who was stealing the securities from the mails to Europe. His career is well summed up in the following editorial from the Atlanta Constitution of August 19, 1941:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution of August 19, 1941]

JAMES W. COLE

One of the most efficient departments of the United States Government lost one of its soundest thinkers and workers in the death Sunday of James W. Cole, the Deputy Second Assistant Postmaster General, who came out of the rural regions of Coweta County to win recognition in Washington.

Critics here and there delight in leveling their guns at various departments of the Federal Government, but all citizens speak respectfully of the operations of the Post Office Department and its thousands of employees. This is particularly amazing because, of all Federal departments, the Post Office Department alone handles a difficult, personal job every day for most of the citizens of the United States. The average citizen merely hears about the work of the other departments; he sees for himself what the Post Office Department is doing.

In this field of skilled organization, James W. Cole rose from a job as railway mail clerk between New Orleans and Atlanta, 43 years ago, to a desk in Washington, where he has been for 5 years handling some of the most difficult problems of the Department for the Nation. He has spent a number of years in Atlanta as chief inspector of the Atlanta and Chattanooga divisions. He had handled involved assignments in Cuba, South America, and Europe. Two years ago he headed a deputation of postal officials from this country at a conference of postal representatives of Pan America.

"Jim" Cole won recognition for his sound judgment and his deep-rooted loyalty to his job. One of the best-posted men in the Postal Service, he moved quietly upward through his every-day exercise of those reliable traits that made him the leaning post of those around him.

St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

EXCERPTS FROM A LETTER TO HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT, OF MICHIGAN, FROM A. C. CARTON

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from a letter addressed to the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT from Mr. A. C. Carton, chairman of the Michigan Great Lakes Tidewater Commission:

MICHIGAN GREAT LAKES
TIDEWATER COMMISSION,
August 14, 1941.

Hon. LOUIS RABAUT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RABAUT: As chairman of the Michigan Great Lakes Tidewater Commission, I want to congratulate you for the contribution which you have made to the deep-waterway connection between the Atlantic Ocean and the Great Lakes through the little publication entitled "Pertinent Questions and Answers Concerning the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project."

In view of the statements made by the opponents of this project, it was not strange that a great many matters pertaining to this proposed improvement should be somewhat mystifying to the average individual, but your publication answers clearly and unequivocally practically every adverse criticism made by the opponents of the seaway.

* * * * *

Other countries and other localities have battled long and contributed much to obtain deep-waterway connections with oceans so that they would not be handicapped with an uneconomic transportation system, but a portion of our people seems to have lost sight of the great importance of an adequate transportation lane, and have even joined with the selfish interests in an effort to delay, if not completely prevent, the improvement of the St. Lawrence River so that ocean-going boats can reach the heart of this great country of ours.

* * * * *

A cheaper transportation system has always been looked upon as an advantage to the producer, because what the producer gets is

the market price less the handling charges and the transportation costs of getting his goods to that market. A statement that the producer would not benefit by a cheaper transportation cost is silly in the extreme, and even the men who make such statements know better.

Cheap transportation from the head of the Great Lakes down has made the Northwest and West possible, and has developed the agricultural resources and the mining industry as nothing else could have done.

The Great Lakes and connecting waters have 4,500 miles of shore line, and Michigan alone has 1,624 miles of shore line and from 30 to 50 harbors that would become ocean ports.

I think there is one thing that has been somewhat overlooked, although I emphasized this in my statement to the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and that is after this war is over we are going to live in a highly competitive marketing world, and the 40,000,000 people in the interior of this United States should be given all of the advantages from a transportation standpoint that naturally belong to them.

Another point which I emphasized was the fact that the Michigan farmers have had to attune their agricultural program to the local needs of our country. One-third of the Michigan farmers' income is from dairy products, 10 percent from the poultry industry, and about the same percent from the production of small fruits. In addition, we are becoming a great truck-crop State and are going to continue along that line until we are the leader among all of our sister States.

With the improvement of the St. Lawrence River it is reasonable to expect that shipbuilding and other industries of all kinds will find a place along the shores of these Great Lakes on account of their remoteness from damage in case of war.

We have in the heart of this great country the iron, the copper, the limestone, and easy access to the coal; and, above all, we have a food supply that could adequately take care of 100,000,000 industrial workers that might gather on the shores of these Great Lakes. The men who work in the shipyards, the factories, the quarries, and the mines would furnish a market for the produce of the fields, the herds, the orchards, and the vineyards of this great agricultural section.

I have no desire to go into the matter of national defense and the contribution which this proposed power and transportation development would make to the security of our country any more than to say that any man of ordinary intelligence, such as I hope I possess, should appreciate the fact that a protected deep-water lane 2,000 miles long from the Atlantic seaboard to the heart of the Middle West, the granary and the workshop of the world, would add to the welfare of our people; neither would I be presumptuous enough to discuss the value of the power development to our national defense, and the contribution which it would make to the economic advancement of our people after the World War is over.

There is so much reliable information available for all those who care to have it, in regard to the cost and need for this power development, that the advantages which would accrue can properly be left to those who are in a position to speak intelligently in regard to its importance and necessity. Suffice for me to say that we all should know that cheap and abundant power is necessary in the production of aluminum for our planes and for power to manufacture tanks, guns, and a hundred other instruments.

* * * * *

Please accept my congratulations for the splendid work which you have done in connection with this proposed improvement, and rest assured that when this deep-water lane is completed, and the flags of all nations are flying from the mastheads of ships plying our Great Lakes and connecting waters, the men and women who represent the true spirit of Michigan will arise and call you blessed.

Very respectfully yours,

A. C. CARTON,
Chairman, the Michigan-Great Lakes Tidewater Commission.

Churchill-Roosevelt Alliance Means War for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of August 21, 1941:

[From the New York Times of August 21, 1941]

EIGHT POINTS DECRIED AT PEACE RALLY—PLEDGE TO DESTROY NAZI-ISM MEANS WAR, DR. MACCRACKEN TELLS AMERICA FIRST GROUP

Dr. Henry Noble MacCracken, president of Vassar College, told an America First Committee rally at Carnegie Hall last night that if America really committed itself to the destruction of Nazi tyranny, as pledged by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, it meant war for us.

"We cannot destroy it by diplomacy, or just by aid to Britain; no amount of aid can do that," he declared.

Dr. MacCracken envisaged the consequences of such a war, and came to the conclusion that even if we won we would lose more than we gained. He spoke on the same program as former Governor Philip F. La Follette, of Wisconsin; Michael Strange, author; and John T. Flynn, who presided.

FIVE HUNDRED POLICEMEN ON DUTY

A capacity crowd of 3,000 inside the hall repeatedly booed references to Winston Churchill, aid to Britain, and leading interventionists here. An overflow crowd, estimated by the police at 1,500, listened through loudspeakers on Fifty-sixth Street. Elaborate police arrangements, with 500 men on duty around the hall and inside, ruled out even minor disorders. The Fight for Freedom Committee was permitted to distribute handbills outside the hall without interference.

Mr. Flynn characterized the Council for Democracy rally in Madison Square Garden on Tuesday night as a "Communist meeting addressed by a Justice of the United States Supreme Court and an admiral in the United States Navy."

Apparently referring to Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd, who spoke there, he said: "They've been looking for a hero, preferably a flier, and they got one, a trans-Atlantic flier who fell into the ocean."

Former Governor La Follette declared that "The Tory government in England, always opposed to our interests," was still really in control, despite cabinet shifts; Ernest Bevin and Morrison are functioning there like Sidney Hillman, a front for Stettinius and Knudsen.

"If you really want to knock the props out from under Hitler and Stalin," he continued, "the best way to do it is to put on a living example here to show that Hitler's challenge of either dictatorship or starvation for the people is a lie; let us take off our coats and work and show that men can be free and still have economic security."

DR. MAC CRACKEN'S VIEWS

Dr. MacCracken, in discussing obstructionism, declared that "the real obstructionists" were "those who want to block the true road and want to force us off the road into a detour by way of Suez, Singapore, and Vladivostok before we get back again to the true road, which is the American road, the Washington-Jefferson road, of honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none."

"Why quit our own to stand on foreign shores?" he asked. "That is the American question. Washington asked that question a long time ago, and we ask it now."

The eight-point program announced by President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, Dr. MacCracken called a treaty, adding that since President Roosevelt had no power to sign any such treaty it must be regarded as a Churchill treaty. He said it represented wishful thinking for world improvement, and continued:

"But the commitment to the final destruction of Nazi tyranny and permanent disarmament of all aggressor nations in the future, as well as the respect for existing obligations, which are all mentioned in the treaty, what about these? Are we to be committed to these aims by accepting the idealism of the other aims?

"Are we to be so completely committed to the integrity of the British Empire by scrambling our Wilsonian idealism with that integrity so completely that it can never be unscrambled again? That is the real question before all American citizens. That is what gives us pause as we contemplate the treaty of the sea in its entirety.

A PLEA AGAINST WAR

"If we really were to commit ourselves to the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, that certainly would be war. We cannot destroy it by diplomacy, or just by aid to Britain. No amount of aid can do that. On that point both the war party and the peace party in the United States are agreed. The war party insists that we must make war, and make it now, in order to crush Germany. The peace party has no hope of crushing the Nazi rule at this time. It looks for democratic regeneration of Europe from within after the fury of war shall have spent itself.

"But if we go to war now, what kind of war would it be? About that question the war party has left us in no doubt. Three hundred billions of dollars, 10,000,000 men under arms, 100,000 airplanes, thousands of ships, and an equipment so vast that we could not make it before 1945. But that is the least of the cost. It will cost millions of American lives; the total starvation of Europe so far as blockade can accomplish it, with no doubt 40,000,000 deaths from starvation; the total destruction of European cities by bombing; the exhaustion of world resources in oil and metals to accomplish this.

"And in the meantime, what of us? How much democracy will be left in these United States when for 5 years we have, like Germany, become a militarized state? How much credit, how much financial stability, how much private enterprise will be left? How much freedom of trade unions to bargain with employers? How much freedom of our business to sell to the American public? How many ships and railroads and utilities and banks and factories will be left in private hands? These are questions that must be answered before our Senate sanctions this treaty of the sea by its two-thirds vote. Democracy and total war seem to us to be incompatible terms.

THE QUESTION OF VICTORY

"Can we win such a war? Is it disloyal to ask such a question? We do not doubt the courage of our soldiers, of their tactical skill. But many of us do question the Army organization, the genius of our General Staff, the composition of the personnel of our senior officers.

"We question the nature of our equipment, our ability to land in Europe, to maintain supplies both to Britain and to such an Army at the same time that our Navy is fighting a two-ocean war. We question also the ability to sustain the morale of our people in a war that is to be fought in the East Indies, in Egypt, in Morocco, and Iran, as well as in Europe.

"We do not know of any authoritative military man who has told us how Germany can land in America, or how we can conquer Europe and Asia. Can a military equipment, which is admittedly built to match Germany's, overtake and destroy that of which it is an imitation? We are not mere defeatists. We believe that perhaps it can. But we must ask the question and are entitled to an answer.

"If we can win such a war, is it well that we should win it? We had a President once who prayed for peace without victory. I confess myself to be of Wilson's mind. For I do not see how such a victory could leave us with any idealism to carry out the points of the sea treaty. Instead we should be an empire, either a part of the British Empire, as some would have us be, or an American world empire, the old independent United States forever gone. We should have garrisons in Germany, Japan, and Italy, commissars of raw materials all over the world imposing an Anglo-American peace on the world, with one indispensable condition as its basis, the integrity of the British Empire.

"The imperialistic temptation to be lord of all the kingdoms of the earth is the greatest of all temptations to a rich and powerful democracy. We know what happened to Athens when she maintained such a peace; what happened to Rome when she went the imperialistic way; and what a dilemma now confronts Britain as she tries to develop democracy at home and empire abroad. You cannot evade that issue. Democracy and empire are incompatible terms. What our country needs is not empire abroad, but a new birth of freedom at home if government by the people is not to perish from the earth."

NEWSPAPERS ARE ASSAILED

Both Mr. La Follette and Mr. Flynn devoted a good part of their addresses to attacking the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune as the principal interventionist organs in the country. Mr. La Follette declared that Hanson W. Baldwin, the Times military expert, believed that if the United States stayed out of the war it would be the most powerful Nation in the world and absolute mistress of the seas at the end of the war.

"Times editorial page, see your own military correspondent," Mr. La Follette shouted.

Mr. Flynn declared, while ushers took up a collection from the audience, that both the Times and the Herald Tribune had expressed great curiosity as to where the America First Committee funds came from and added that they came mostly in small contributions. There were, however, at least a dozen prowar committees whose source of income might be investigated, he said, adding:

"I challenge the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune and the Fight for Freedom Committee to go down to Washington with me and demand an investigation of all the groups—prowar and antiwar. The 80 percent of the people in this country who oppose war are entitled to know who wants to get us in, and who wants to keep us out."

Mr. Flynn said his group had 35,000 contributors in New York City alone and that the number was growing rapidly. The collection taken last night included five $100 notes and hundreds of smaller contributions. The exact total was not announced.

The Bloody Jigsaw Puzzle That the War Crowd Seeks to Sell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, an old copy-book axiom has it, "Be sure you are right—then make full speed ahead." That is good advice. But in these days when even the best-informed in Washington have so few facts with which to be sure they are right, it is always possible that full speed ahead might take us most rapidly in the worst possible direction. Wise direction is of even more importance than speedy action in getting to the place where a person wants to go in the shortest time.

For example, even the reports reaching our military staff these days make little sense out of the confusion in the Russo-German war in which both sides censor so fully and claim so freely that one side would long ago have completely wiped out the other if the reports of either were altogether accurate. Unless a decision is reached on that front in the near future there is a grave danger that each side will have claimed more casualties for the other than full strength of the respective armies.

CONFUSING ACTION WITH DIRECTION

For a more specific test of the difficulty of determining direction before calling for action these days, try this one on your own stationery. Now, while censorship so effectively cloaks Japan, try writing a logical description which will at least satisfy your own sense of logic of American policy toward such countries as France, Finland, Russia, and Japan. Solving jigsaw puzzles becomes child's play compared with the job of weaving together such facts as the following in defining the logic of American attitudes. David Lasser is cut off the Federal pay roll by a congressional roll call because he is charged with helping Russia while being paid $4,800 per year of taxpayers' money as a Federal official. But Stalin is offered millions of dollars of taxpayers' money at the same time for use in helping Russia. If the part is bad, how can the whole be good? And if all of us are to help Russia by paying higher taxes to supply her with encouragement and armaments, why crack down on David Lasser for his individual crusade; to say nothing of Earl Browder, former head of the Communist Party in America, who now languishes in a Federal penitentiary for trying to do 12 months ago what has become a popular project now?

And, while we ponder about that, poor, little, honest Finland, oldest democracy in Europe and only foreign state to pay her war debts, finds herself now denied either credit or supplies in this country as she struggles to rid her territories of Russia, while we actually help enemy Russia hurt friend Finland, whereas we already admire Finland and abominate Stalin with the same repugnance that we feel toward Hitler and Mussolini.

THE PUZZLE GROWS MORE PERPLEXING

But the puzzle grows more perplexing as we switch from consideration of "dictatorial" Finland and "democratic" Russia to the problems presented by France, China, and Japan. About a year ago we were supplying airplanes and armaments to France to help her defeat Hitler whom we all abhor, and, until a few days ago, we were supplying aviation gasoline and other war materials to Japan to help her whip China whom we all admire. But we also loan millions of dollars to China and lend-lease her both planes and pilots to help her defeat the Japan which we in turn have helped. Confounding our complexity, we find ourselves now aiding those who would hinder the French whom we have previously helped, while the French whom we sought to help seem to be helping Germany whom we seek to hinder and to be aiding Japan whom we seek to both help and hinder.

Out of such a confusion of pronouns and policies, America struggles to bring the four freedoms to a warring world which does not want them by not fighting a war for which we have already spent over $50,000,000,000 getting ready to fight. And as one cynic said yesterday, "If we do succeed in imposing the four freedoms on Russia it will simply mean that the hammer and sickle will fly over more liberty than the stars and stripes because that will give Russia five freedoms, since they already have free love over there."

WHERE THE WAR CROWD WOULD HAVE LED US

One sometimes wonders what would now be the status of America had we followed the impatient urgings of the war crowd in this country who have been calling for "action now" almost from the very beginning of this war. When Russia was invading Finland the war crowd was urging the United States to send our ships, sell our planes, loan our resources, and deploy our fighting men to help the Finns beat back the communistic aggressors. Today, the same war crowd urges the United States to take the same steps and make the same sacrifices to help the Russians beat the Finns. Apparently if the interventionists had imposed their policies upon this country they would now have our armies standing up to their arm pits in the mud of some Russian bog, midway between Helsinki and Moscow, shooting in both directions with first one volley poured into the manpower of Finland to protect the democracy of Russia, sic, and next a volley fired into the armies of Russia to protect the democracy of Finland. Fighting on both sides of such a war might be quite a job for even Uncle Sam to undertake.

The war crowd has shown more enthusiasm for pushing us into war on other fronts as well than it has exactitude in determining whom we should

fight and for what cause. We now have a hundred American fighting planes on the French island of Martinique. They were sent there because interventionists had argued that Uncle Sam should help the French help the British.

Today, however, the same crowd is urging that this country get all the way into a war to help the British defeat the French who are to all intents and purposes aiding and abetting Hitler. Had we followed the impatient advice of those who always cry for war, our A. E. F. might have had to fight from rafts in the English Channel with guns trained on both coasts and alternating broadsides fired first toward England to "help the French" and then toward France to "help the British."

INTO ALL THE WARS—BOTH SIDES OF HALF OF THEM

Constantly changing events in Europe, Africa, and Asia indicate that had we followed the careless and confusing advice of the crowd now asking for war they would by this time have had our American fighting men involved in all the wars in the world, and we would have been fighting on both sides of about half of them. Obviously, either the early or the present advice of the war crowd was very, very bad advice for America to follow. And it seems just possible that both the early and the present advice of those who want us to mix up in the shooting and the killing overseas is much more impetuous than it is intelligent.

All of which is not intended to accuse anybody of anything nor to criticize any of my countrymen. It simply is recorded here to emphasize the difficulties of the situation and to point out to those who simply cry for action now how hard it is to be sure one is right these days. There is real significance for Uncle Sam today in the philosophy of the ancient Chinese proverb which says "Wise man make haste slowly when walking in a circle."

Maybe we Americans should determine carefully and completely which way and why before demanding full speed ahead.

Still Wanted—A National Labor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, after 8 years and more than 8,000 decisions, the national labor policy of the present administration remains as obscure as it was before 1933. Last week more than 1,500,000 man-hours of labor were lost because of strikes. The construction of ships valued at almost $500,000,000 was delayed. Tank factories, aircraft-engine production, gun manufacture, ammunition turn-out—every one of these highly important elements of our national-defense program stopped at least momentarily because of disputes.

For at least 2 years it has been apparent that something must be done to see to it that production of essential equipment for our armed forces continues, no matter what may be the nature of labor disputes in any plant. What point there may be to a defense program which operated at the whim of either labor or management no one has yet been able to discover.

A national labor policy is still in the making, we are told. It has been in the making for a long time. While it is being formed, our Army is drilling with brooms.

Why I Voted for the Service-Extension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, my reasons for voting in favor of the service-extension bill are as follows:

First. Because it will release all married men whose wives are not employed from active training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940;

Second. Because it will release all those who have attained on or before July 1, 1941, their twenty-eighth birthday;

Third. Because it will release from military service those persons or those whose families would suffer undue hardship if retained on active duty;

Fourth. Because I feel it will not be necessary for trainees to be in service for the additional 18 months and most of whom will be released long before, in corroboration of which in the recent announcement that over 200,000 draftees will be released before Christmas 1941;

Fifth. Because the American Legion has advocated preparedness and military training and, in this instance, the extension of time of service for those in our armed forces;

Sixth. Because the American Federation of Labor and all other labor organizations have urged defense, preparedness and training;

Seventh. Because I am interested in the future safety and well-being of America, its democratic institutions and its people; and

Eighth. Because I would rather have my country prepared to fight and not fight, than to be forced to fight without being prepared.

The war is moving closer and closer to us. And we are in danger not alone from military attack but also in peril on the economic front which endangers our freedom and our American standard of living.

In 1920 I strongly advocated our entrance into the League of Nations in the hope that our participation therein would be a vast force for good in the ending of all wars. In brief, my whole life until 1938 had been motivated by a deadly antipathy to everything which smacked of militarism.

In March 1938, however, on the basis of knowledge and information that I had obtained, I stated on the floor of the House:

Hitler is ready to take Czechoslovakia, the Polish Corridor, Poland, Rumania, and other small adjacent countries. Due to the division in France he may be able to defeat and crush that country, to take the Ukraine, and by then may be strong enough to defeat and dismember Great Britain, to move on South America, and to take Canada, with the result that we may have Mr. Hitler right at our door.

At that time I was attacked by the Nazi-Fascist appeasers, but, unfortunately, all came to pass, and more. Two years ago I pointed out that millions of dollars were being expended by Hitler propagandists in our country, as well as in Central and South America, in an effort to bring discord and disunity—the same pattern of action he had practiced and accomplished in 14 other countries whose freedom and liberty Hitler crushed. According to the pan-German method, a country is first divided against itself, its powers of resistance thus broken, after which panic is spread in the civilian population by means of bombing and machine gunning from the air, thereby rendering conquest easy, with a Quisling or Laval on hand ready to collaborate. We have had plenty of evidence of this insidious type of invasion.

It is to be regretted that some of our citizens do not realize the actual danger confronting them and are being misled by the tricky Nazi-Fascist propaganda. I have been combating this propaganda and the Hitler false charge that a democracy cannot function and must be destroyed.

I appreciate and realize that a majority of our people are opposed to war. So am I. So is President Roosevelt. And it is for the reason that I am opposed to war that I feel we must prepare and demonstrate our readiness to defend our country and the principles near and dear to us. By building up a strong defense, I feel that Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese war lords will hesitate to carry out their threats against us.

I have voted to give all possible aid short of war to Great Britain. I have stated on the floor of the House many times that I am opposed to sending a single one of our boys to foreign lands, as the Roosevelt and New Deal enemies within both the Democratic and Republican Parties have been charging our President of planning. By the aid we are giving Great Britain it may be possible to stop Hitler's grandiose dream of controlling not only the continents of Europe and Africa but also Central America, South America, and, eventually, our own country.

When Russia was attacked, as I prophesied, I felt that we should, in order to reduce our danger from Hitlerism, aid not only Great Britain but also Russia by selling her needed supplies which we possess to enable her to defend not only herself, her land, and her homes, but also

to aid Great Britain and, indirectly, our country.

Unfortunately, no one can foretell today whether or how long Great Britain and Russia can withstand Hitler's combined forces, consisting of the Axis Powers, reenforced by France, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and Finland, and further strengthened by the millions of subjugated peoples whom he has enslaved in the production of his implements of war. Today's newspaper headlines reveal that Nikolaiev, Russia's great Black Sea naval base, and Krivoi Rog, iron-ore center, have fallen; that Hitler's forces are about to take Leningrad and Odessa; that they have advanced hundreds of miles into the Ukraine; that most of Russia's tanks and air force have been destroyed; that the Japanese war machine is waiting to attack Vladivostok. With France's cooperation with Hitler and the close proximity of the French possession of Dakar to Brazil, we are in danger of attack from both the north and the south.

To creat prejudice the unscrupulous Nazi-Fascist propagandists and appeasers are now assailing Russia in an effort to make us forget the Nazi atrocities against religious leaders who have been imprisoned or thrown into concentration camps. In short, the Nazi-Fascist propagandists are devoting themselves in attacks upon Russia for causes that the Nazis themselves are trebly guilty of. But they cannot blind many of the American people to the fact that Hitler has been guilty of religious persecution and atrocities, where, on the other hand, Russia, months ago, granted and guaranteed freedom of religious worship. In this connection let us read what Mr. Justice Murphy of the United States Supreme Court has to say as to this situation. I quote from an editorial appearing in today's issue of the Washington Post. It reads, in part:

PROPAGANDA AND FACT

Fortunately, the great majority of Americans are well aware of the realities of the situation. While regarding communism with the same abhorrence as nazi-ism, they recognize, as Associate Justice Frank Murphy, of the United States Supreme Court, pointed out in an address to the Knights of Columbus meeting in Atlantic City Tuesday, that nazi-ism constitutes "by far the greater menace to free nations and free institutions."

Mr. Justice Murphy made it very clear how utterly fraudulent are the Nazi claims that the war on Russia is a crusade. For, from the very beginning, Hitler and his cohorts have proved themselves enemies of religion. Jews, Protestants, and Catholics have been mercilessly persecuted. Speaking as a Catholic to Catholics, Mr. Justice Murphy reminded his listeners that Nazi treatment of the Catholic Church in Germany is "a picture of systematic and sustained endeavor to drive a wedge between the Catholics of Germany and their traditional faith." "It is a picture," he said, "of the closing of churches, monasteries, convents, and schools on invented accusations and flimsy pretexts; of the regimentation of Catholic youth and the abolition of their youth organizations; of the elimination of Catholic-action societies and publishing houses, the surveillance and supervision of priests, and the destruction of business establishments through boycotts and blacklists. It is a picture of stealthy and demoralizing persecution."

In yesterday's Washington Times-Herald, under the column Voice of the People, I read a most effective answer to the Nazi appeasers. This article, written by E. F. Strand and headed "Roosevelt Can Stop the War if He Wants to," reads as follows:

The President could stop the war if he were a traitor to the principles of freedom and international decency—causes which it has taken the race thousands of years to place in constitutions and international law.

In light of what Hitler has repeatedly declared in his interviews and speeches and Mein Kampf with respect to the democracies, it is rank stupidity to think of a negotiated peace with the Axis Powers now or at any time.

This war must be fought to but one conclusion, and without compromise—the victory of the democracies—no matter the cost. Better for the race to go forward from where it is to higher levels of democracy than to experience a black-out only to ultimately resume the bloody climb up again to the present social and political levels.

I read with satisfaction another news item in yesterday's paper, which quoted extracts from a radio address given by Col. Robert McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune, who opposed the service-extension bill and who assailed those who had the courage to vote for the extension to give our boys the proper training. The news release follows:

Col. Robert R. McCormick said in a speech prepared for broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting System that German private soldiers have had "vastly more instruction than our Regular soldiers, than our National Guard officers, than our Reserve officers."

Terming it "the most momentous statement of my life," McCormick asserted:

"With all the billions we are spending on armament, we have not yet begun a system of training which would allow our boys to stand up for a day against these educated German soldiers."

"The valor of our soldiers has been shown in every war and on every field. But valor without military education means only suicide."

Mr. McCormick's statement shows very forcefully and clearly the dire necessity of an extension of training for our boys, for which I voted, and I congratulate Colonel McCormick upon coming to the conclusion that training is vital and necessary and upon making the fact plainly clear that sufficient training must be given to those who may be called upon—though I pray God they may not—to defend with their lives the most sacred and precious possessions we possess—our freedom and liberty.

I fully appreciate that no mother and father desires their boy to go to war, but I do know and I am satisfied that 99 percent of the American people value the freedom and liberty which this country affords them, and I know that they are willing and ready to defend it at any cost.

I regret that most of the communications I have received which contained sentiments opposed to my vote on this bill were signed by German-Americans, but I do know that they did not represent the 98 percent of old-line German-Americans who appreciate the freedom and liberty which they and their children enjoy. I am sure that these communications came from those who were permitted to enter our country within the last few years, in whom the foolhardy Nazi ideology has been inculcated, who became members of the bund and other Fascist and Nazi organizations, and who are guilty of unwarranted and unjustified subversive activities. Such activities would not be tolerated for an instant in the Nazi-controlled countries; and persons carrying on such activities, if apprehended, would be thrown into concentration camps and subjected to all the inhuman tortures and punishment, and even death, as only the Gestapo can inflict. Just today I noted in the press an article in which the writer reports that the death penalty is decreed for those persons who criticize the Nazis. The headline and article reads:

DEATH PENALTY DECREED FOR CRITICIZING NAZIS

"Anyone speaking against Germany will be hanged," says an order issued by the gauleiter of Alsace-Lorraine. The order also states that "anyone who speaks French, although he knows the German tongue, will be arrested and punished by 1 year in a concentration camp."

This same order is also in force in Poland, Holland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and other subjugated countries, and should bring home to the American people the cruel, inhuman, and un-Christian treatment to which the unfortunate peoples of those countries are subjected under Nazi rule and domination.

Mr. Speaker, in contrast to the world-wide prevailing conditions, no one can justly deny that this is the freest and best country in the world and one which deserves to be defended and will be defended against any and all enemies, regardless of whom they might be.

These have been and are my reasons for voting in behalf of the recommendations of our military and naval experts. And I am satisfied that if the American people would clearly understand the situation confronting our country, they would not be misled in the slightest by the high-powered Nazi propaganda by the Quislings, and so forth, which has been going on in our country. The majority of our people, according to the Gallup poll, are in full sympathy with President Roosevelt and the Congress in aid to Great Britain and in our own preparedness program, which proves that the deadly policy of appeasement—the ruination of so many European countries—has not yet fastened its death-dealing grip upon this country's throat. Appeasers in Great Britain believed they could not be attacked, but they know better today. The will to be free and to live, not like slaves and serfs, but as a free and independent people, is, please God, still burning in the hearts and minds of most of our people. In casting my vote in favor of the service-extension bill I have kept the faith with these loyal and true Americans, with their children and their children's children yet unborn, and with my beloved country—the United States of America.

Iowa Newspapers Call St. Lawrence Project a Fanciful Dream and a Presidential Hobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM IOWA NEWSPAPERS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that advocates of the St. Lawrence project have laid down a barrage of statements that the people of Iowa and her sister States in the great Midwest are jubilant over the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project, the editorial comment of leading Iowa newspapers expose such manufactured exuberancy as a skillful part of the torrent of propaganda now flooding the Nation in an effort to win support for what is termed the President's hobby ever since he was Governor of New York

The editorials give the Canadian viewpoint, deride the preposterous claim that the St. Lawrence project is necessary for national defense, urge steam plants to cope with any possible shortage of electric power, and expose the fallacy of diverting billions of dollars and much needed manpower to a project that is only a Presidential hobby.

The editorials referred to are as follows:

[From the Marshalltown (Iowa) Times Republican of June 21, 1941]

WATERWAY CAMPAIGN OPENED

President Roosevelt has turned loose all his available batteries in his efforts to induce, inveigle, or force support in Congress and in administrative circles of his pet hobby, the St. Lawrence waterway. The national-defense plea is being stressed, and it is a potent weapon in influencing timid Members of Congress and those who follow the New Deal leadership blindly.

Arthur Krock, Washington correspondent of the New York Times, asks a timely question which comes very near to answering itself in the negative. The question is, Can a long-range defense program be executed at the same time an immediate one—all aid to Britain—is taxing all the resources of the United States?

Further, Mr. Krock questions the wisdom, from the standpoints of Britain and our own rearmament program, of diverting men, money, and materials to a project which cannot be functioning for several years—probably not within a period of 4 to 5 years. There is sharp division of sentiment in administration circles in Washington, including the Congress, and a determined effort to override the strong arguments of the opposition. Although there are differences of opinion among those constituting the Office of Production Management, the services of the big chiefs in that department have gone on the verbal firing line, inclusive of Secretary of War Stimson. Even that ordinarily level-headed Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, has been induced to lend his support to the waterway project.

To the opposition it seems incredible that a Government which, by the confession of the President's first report on lease-lend shipments, has hardly begun to furnish essential aid to Great Britain in its time of growing exigency, should insist on diverting any effort or resources to a long-range project. Already there is a labor shortage for work in hand, and the strikes have delayed important armament construction. There are present and approaching shortages in arms materials. While the requested initial sum of $200,000,000 is mentioned almost contemptuously by the spenders of the tens of defense billions, it would build many airplanes and ships, the prime requisites of the British.

Efforts are being made in Washington to induce Canada to lend its moral and financial support to the proposal. Power shortage is a reality in Canada because of war demands of the mother country, but this handicap could be overcome by the building of steam power plants along the border with the aid of United States capital. The administration brushes aside such suggestions.

[From the Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil of March 24, 1941]

SEAWAY INEXPEDIENT

An agreement to start the perennially discussed St. Lawrence seaway has been signed by the United States and Canada, but there is still hope that this highly inexpedient project can be postponed again and indefinitely. The agreement is subject to approval by our Congress and the Canadian Parliament, and both should go thumbs down on it.

Impractical and unnecessary at any time, the St. Lawrence seaway is almost ludicrously so now when every financial resource and every ounce of manpower in both nations is being called into play on the war-emergency defense effort. It could not be completed in less than 4 or 5 years and would divert labor badly needed in more immediate ways. If power is desired, steam plants will produce it far more speedily and economically than the seaway. It is likewise true that railroad lines are more than able to take care of all the traffic in the area and that they represent a great established investment that needs business to make it profitable.

Incidentally, under the proposed set-up the United States would pay most of the cost while Canada would reap a major share of any benefits from either construction or operation of the seaway. The seaway would be bad business for us from every angle, and Congress should put its foot down hard. It really isn't as though we needed heavy additional appropriations on the American taxprayer, even if the feasibility of the project were as sure as it is doubtful.

[From the Boone (Iowa) New Republican of March 25, 1941]

THE SEAWAY AT LAST

Probably no public project has been subject to so much controversy as the St. Lawrence seaway. Not even the Panama Canal nor the World Court provoked so much discussion. It started way back in 1909. All the Presidents are said to have been for it, although we distinctly remember that when this paper advocated it as a help to farmers, Mr. Coolidge was against it.

It is hard to determine whether the St. Lawrence seaway is a potential asset or a plaything. The general opinion is that it is a New York State project. There has been a good deal of argument over it even in New York. Al Smith was for it. The New York Harbor heads are opposed to it. The present New York Assembly is against it, one chamber having passed a resolution against its construction, with the other chamber about to follow suit. Of course, all the proponents of the Great Lakes to Gulf waterway are against it.

Nevertheless, the probabilities are that the seaway will be constructed. It is now a national-defense measure. Mr. Roosevelt has arranged an agreement between the United States and Canada under which a simple majority in Congress is sufficient to get the measure through. A treaty making the seaway possible would probably not get the necessary Senate ratification. It never has and making two-thirds of the Senators see the project as a defense measure and thus justifying the expenditure of many millions would be no easy task. But a majority vote can do it now.

The fact of the impracticability of the seaway was demonstrated by the way it went into limbo after its last defeat in the Senate. The only thing that could possibly resuscitate it was defense. But how much a canal which will not be finished for 5 years, and maybe not then, is going to help our national defense is hard to see. The 300 millions and more could be better spent on other things.

The 27-foot St. Lawrence channel planned will not permit the construction of vessels of any size in Great Lakes shipyards. Big ships could not use it, only coastwise vessels and tramp steamers. It would be closed to navigation by ice for half the year. Its benefit to the Western farmers has become extremely doubtful. Even Canada, as can be seen by Prime Minister King's note of March 5, 1941, is not convinced of the need of the St. Lawrence project.

Just the same we'll probably get it.

[From the Atlantic (Iowa) News Telegraph of March 22, 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

The St. Lawrence River power project is again before the public, this time as a defense measure. As a matter of fact, this power project is about as essential to the national defense as a dam across the Nishnabotna, but the President wants it, and sees in the current defense crisis an opportunity to force his favorite project down the throats of a Nation which has once already rejected the scheme.

This characteristic in the President is one which creates grave doubts concerning his sincerity in the minds of many people. He has his favorite schemes, which is natural, but his willingness to use any emergency which arises as a means of furthering his pets, makes his constituents feel that he is not acting fairly with them. No doubt the St. Lawrence project is a fine thing. However, it will cost a tremendous sum, it is not essential to the defense program and is not necessary to the welfare of the country in any other connection, therefore its construction should be deferred until such time as it is needed, or until the Nation is in a better position to afford it.

[From the Atlantic (Iowa) News Telegraph of March 27, 1941]

PRESIDENT'S THINKING

President Roosevelt has long been recognized as a man of dreams but lacking in organization ability and a knowledge of management. Even now the Nation is littered with the remains of dozens of his dreams which were too ethereal in quality to stand the test of everyday life. The Passamaquoddy tidal-power project in Maine and the Florida ship canal are two notable and expensive examples of Presidential dreams which turned into nightmares for the taxpayers and were finally abandoned partially completed.

The St. Lawrence waterway promises to develop into another of these white elephants unless Congress has the stiffness of spine to stop the Presidential plans in this direction. Typical expressions of the President's careless thinking concerning such matters are his comments on the necessity for this waterways project. He says he desires the project so that it may furnish power for defense industries, but engineers state that no power could be made available before 1947 at the very earliest. They point out further that Canada is now exporting surplus power and

that this country has tremendous quantities of power available and at present unused in the Fort Peck, the Grand Coulee, and other dams over the country. They also argue that if power becomes an immediate necessity, steam plants can be built much more easily and speedily than any such project as the St. Lawrence waterway. To this the President replies that the building of such plants would require skilled labor, which is not available, ignoring the fact that the water project would also require skilled labor in large and unavailable quantities.

Another argument which the President is fond of advancing in favor of this his latest pet project is that, once it is finished, seagoing vessels could be built in Great Lakes shipyards. What advantage there would be in this is hard to see, because in times of peace most of those shipyards already in service along the coast stand idle, while surplus ships rot at their docks. If the ships of which he speaks are needed in this present war, he has started too late on this project to do much good. In this argument he also overlooks the fact that before seagoing vessels could be accommodated in Great Lakes ports these ports would have to be deepened and their facilities rebuilt. This would cost millions.

Another incidental which the President has overlooked, but which engineers are worrying about, is the matter of handling the ice in the river. In the spring 500,000 tons of ice an hour swirl down the great stream. Obviously some provision must be made for caring for this load. (We might suggest a housing project for Eskimos.)

Finally, this dream will cost the hard-pressed taxpayers about half a billion dollars, and the Nation just cannot afford it at this time. Of course, these details make little difference to the happy dreamer in the White House, who sees only the fancied need for this waterway as a defense measure. He is working hard for this project, so do not be surprised to hear that it has been inaugurated one of these days.

We cite the above as a classic example of the way in which the President's mind operates. It is nothing against him that he is not as practical as he should be in matters of so great moment, but it is something to be held against him that he does not recognize this weakness in his make-up and compensate for it by listening to the advice of practical men, men who know and understand the costs and difficulties involved in making the Chief Executive's dreams come true.

[From the Maquoketa (Iowa) Community Press of April 17, 1941]

OUR NATION HAS NO USE FOR THE ST. LAWRENCE POWER PROJECT

Like the perennial dandelion, the St. Lawrence River project is again before the public, this time as a defense measure. In our opinion this power project is about as essential to the national defense as a dam across the Maquoketa River in Jones County to produce electricity on a national scale. The real reason that this matter is being pushed now is that "the President wants it," and sees in the current defense crisis an opportunity to force his favorite project down the necks of a nation which has already rejected the visionary idea. It is a project that should be given thumbs down by our National Congress.—Monticello Express.

[From the Oskaloosa (Iowa) Herald of April 7, 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE—NEW STYLE

Seven years ago President Roosevelt submitted the St. Lawrence River seaway and power project to the Senate in the form of a treaty that required a two-thirds vote of approval to make it effective. The Senate failed to approve it. Now the President returns to the same subject, this time with an agreement—signed at Ottawa—which will not require a two-thirds vote of approval but merely a majority vote to provide the necessary money.

For this method of whipping the devil around the stump some justification might perhaps be found if the St. Lawrence project could be described as an imperatively needed defense measure. But how can this be said of a project which, by Mr. Roosevelt's own definition, cannot be completed until 1945? The President offers the explanation that we are today appropriating money for the construction of warships, which also will not be completed until 1945. But this comparison is less an argument for supporting the St. Lawrence project than it is a reason for doubting the wisdom of clogging our shipways by laying down battleships that cannot be completed for 5 years when our shipbuilding facilities are so urgently needed for merchant ships and destroyers that can be turned out quickly to meet the threat of Hitler's all-out attack on sea.

The plain facts are (1) that the St. Lawrence project cannot possibly be of the slightest use, either to Canada or the United States in a crisis, this year or next year or the year after that or the year after that; (2) that if Canada and the United States need more power for defense work they can get it much more quickly, either at Niagara Falls or by building steam-electric plants; (3) that instead of promoting defense the St. Lawrence project promises to get squarely in the way of it by diverting an army of men, colossal amounts of material, and whole trains of railway cars to the St. Lawrence at a time when there is crying need for planes, tanks, guns, and ships.

The President has chosen an unfortunate method of reviving a favorite project. On grounds of defense efficiency his request for appropriations to support it ought to be rejected.—New York Times.

[From the Dubuque (Iowa) Telegraph-Herald of April 9, 1941]

NO PRICE BENEFITS

Proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway have argued that lower-cost transportation by this proposed route will mean higher prices for shippers of grain.

But the Food Research Institute of Stanford University, after a study of the subject, says:

"We conclude, therefore, that even from the standpoint of the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway a good case cannot be made out for benefit to American wheat growers; and the opinion prevails in Europe that 'so long as the initiative of importing rests with the importer, and the exporters press abundant supplies upon Europe the importing continent will receive the benefits of improvements in transportation resulting in lower costs from distant farms in exporting countries.'"

The European buyer, in other words, will fix the price. The American farmer cannot dictate prices when he is carrying tremendous surpluses. And the European price will be the lowest obtainable; the advantages, therefore, of a lower-cost transportation system will go to the buyer, not the seller.

The only possible advantage to the seller will be the opportunity to offer a lower price and get a market. But whether that will be offset by the subsidy Uncle Sam will have to carry will depend on how much Uncle Sam pays for the seaway.

[From the Ottumwa (Iowa) Courier of March 28, 1941]

UNWISELY TIMED

Late last spring a comprehensive report came out on the St. Lawrence seaway, which completely showed the project to be economically unsound. It was issued by the Niagara Frontier Planning Board, Buffalo.

This survey is of renewed importance now, the St. Lawrence project having been presented to Congress. It is not the first time it has been sent to the lawmakers by the President. The New York Times, in a recent issue, sketched the project and legislation sought for it.

The St. Lawrence River seaway and power proposal was submitted to the Senate by Mr. Roosevelt 7 years ago. Then it was in the form of a treaty. Treaties require a two-thirds majority to be approved. This one failed to get it. Now the project has been sent to the Senate again. This time it is in the form of an agreement, and an agreement only requires a majority vote to get an O. K. and the necessary money.

If the St. Lawrence project were an imperative defense measure, its staggering cost would have a better chance of being overlooked. But it is not vital to this Nation's protection against war or enemy.

In the first place, by the President's admission, it can't be completed for 4 years. So how can it be of any benefit to the United States or Canada until 1945? If the two nations must have more power for defense, they can get it at Niagara Falls or by building steam-electric plants. It seems to us the Roosevelt administration has gone crazy on power plants, as it is. We certainly can't need many more, for defense or anything else.

Even for normal times, the cost of the proposed waterway is tremendous. In times like these, when we are spending money so lavishly for needed defense projects, it would be nothing short of tragic to enter on any such unnecessary project as this. Our country needs all its money, men, and materials for defense programs. Proponents claim the St. Lawrence project would do just the opposite. It would get in the way of defense because it would divert men, colossal amounts of materials and transportation facilities to the St. Lawrence just when there is a crying need for planes, tanks, guns, and ships; together with men to make them, and railroad facilities to transport them.

The St. Lawrence seaway proposition is uneconomical, extravagant, and untenable at this time. The President chose unwisely when he selected the present to revive a favorite project. The Senate should reject his request on the grounds of efficiency in defense, if for no other.

[From the Storm Lake (Iowa) Pilot Tribune of April 17, 1941]

WONDER IF IT'S NEEDED

About every so often the proposed St. Lawrence River canal and the even more famous proposed Florida canal break into the news.

The Florida project isn't quite so moth eaten as the St. Lawrence River proposal. We've been hearing about the St. Lawrence canal years and even recall once 12 or 15 years ago when the late Governor "Bill" Harding made a speech in Storm Lake in favor of its immediate construction. Of course, Ex-Governor Harding was being paid to boost for the canal but at that, he advanced some pretty good arguments.

Nothing came of it at that time and the project went into a coma for years. Then along rolls the war. The St. Lawrence Canal comes to life again. This time it is being promoted in the name of national defense.

Observers of conditions say, however, that it is a 5-year job to get the St. Lawrence project to working. Even the worst pessimists believe the war will be over before then.

It is estimated that it will cost a billion dollars to complete the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Certainly, we can use a billion dollars to better advantage than in the construction of something that seems to

have little bearing upon our future prosperity.

While boosters are putting out arguments that it will be possible to save 3 cents per bushel in carrying charges on grain, that's quite problematical. It reminds us of arguments for the Missouri River dredging project that we've been dreaming about for so many years. If northwest Iowa farmers have benefited from the millions that have been spent to make the old Mizzoo navigable, we'd like a specific statement as to how, when, or where.

Looks more as though the taxpayers of the United States are being asked to subsidize a hydroelectric power development along the St. Lawrence that is of no special benefit to the Midwest and in reality will give Canada an opportunity to compete with our industry and labor later. We're fornenst it, whether it is disguised as a defense move or out in the open.

[From the Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil of March 24, 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CANAL

The St. Lawrence ship canal will soon be before Congress again as a result of the agreement signed between the United States and Canadian Governments to cooperate in the construction. It is to be pushed as a defense measure.

An engineering report on the cost estimates the over-all total as $266,170,000, of which $38,578,000 would be for works solely for navigation, $96,804,000 for works primarily for power, and $130,788,000 for works common to navigation and power.

Immediate objectives are an outlet for shipbuilding facilities on the Great Lakes and an increase in the power derived from the St. Lawrence.

The President insists that additional power will be needed as the defense program expands. He recently declared that one of the most serious handicaps to rapid expansion of airplane production was the difficulty of finding the large supplies of high-load factory power required for aluminum production.

Despite the present expansion of electric facilities, he said that by the time the new St. Lawrence power becomes available other sources of cheap power will have been largely allocated.

On the deep waterway phase of the project Mr. Roosevelt said a great expansion of shipyards would be necessary for defense; that if the war were protracted, the number of shipyards required would be several times those now available; and that many of these can be had most readily and economically in the Great Lakes area.

It is difficult to see how the proposed development can have any great effect on the defense program. It cannot possibly be completed for 5 years. It looks like just another of the President's schemes to get Congress to approve a pet project rejected in the past.

The St. Lawrence Canal would be of little or no benefit to the Middle West. Our grain export markets are lost, perhaps forever. The canal might even hurt the farmers. Not so long ago a number of small ocean-going boats from South America came through the circuitous St. Lawrence route and unloaded their cargoes of grain in the Midwest. This raised havoc with grain markets in the area.

A completed St. Lawrence Canal would enable South American countries to dump vast quantities of corn and wheat and other products on the very doorsteps of midwestern farmers.

If western Senators and Congressmen are awake, they will vote against any appropriation for this project at this time.

[From the Sheldon (Iowa) Mail of June 11, 1941]

With the prophecy and warning that at least 3 or 4 years of unlimited emergency and European war may well be in prospect, still President Roosevelt urges spending $285,000,000 upon the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Just why he urges this vast expenditure, which cannot be accepted as a defense measure, is difficult to explain.

Imperative National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 25, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. TOM CONNALLY, OF TEXAS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, on Saturday last delivered over the radio an address which cogently and ably sets forth the imperative need of national defense. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Government of the United States is making heroic efforts to provide for the national defense. Flanked by two oceans, I have always felt that we should build a navy superior to any afloat. If we dominate the Atlantic and the Pacific, no enemy, either from Europe or Asia, could ever land on American soil. We are now building a navy which will excel any in existence. It will include aircraft and auxiliary arms.

Armies still require infantry, artillery, and auxiliary services. The United States has adopted a program under which an army of 1,400,000 men, consisting of the Regular Army, the National Guard, and selectees shall be trained and equipped in the most modern manner. The gallant young manhood of the Nation has responded with patriotic ardor and training camps are now functioning in many States.

An army requires food, clothing, housing, modern equipment, arms, munitions, and a great variety of supplies. The integration of industrial plants for the production of defense articles has been organized.

The most vital instrument of warfare is the airplane. For our own armed forces and for lease-lend purposes the production of airplanes has been vastly increased.

During the World War the modern tank first appeared on the battlefield, though it did not prove a dominant factor in that war. The tank has become of high importance. We are now building small and medium tanks in substantial volume.

For military reasons exact statistics as to airplanes, tanks, artillery, and other equipment should not be divulged, but the country is entitled to know that the War and Navy Departments are vigorously prosecuting the increased production of these essential weapons.

The new Garand rifle is being manufactured in increased volume. The Army has on hand 3,000,000 of Springfield rifles. The Ordnance Department has established plants for the manufacture of powder and explosives, shell loading, and other ordnance plants.

Why is the United States making herculean efforts to arm the Nation? We are not a warlike Nation. History proves that we do not covet nor plan the conquest of our neighbors' soil. Free Cuba is a denial of imperialistic ambitions. The independence of the Philippines is our witness that we do not harbor schemes of empire. Why, then, do we arm?

We arm to defend our liberties against the poisonous Nazi philosophy, the ruthless Nazi tyranny, the frenzied Nazi ambition, to conquer by arms, at the sword's point, by the shock and concussion of the bomb, and by the deadly thrust of the lurking and covert submarine peaceful and inoffensive nations. Nazi ambition is not confined within geographic boundaries. It pauses at no frontier. It acknowledges no limit, either upon land, or upon the sea, or in the air to the sweep of its arms. Like the Count of Monte Cristo, it exclaims, "The world is mine."

The world is familiar with the withering march of Nazi legions—Austria, at a single sword thrust, collapsed. Czechoslovakia, by a single stroke of the mailed fist, was subjugated. Poland, resisting, was manacled and, upon war's operating table, dissected in a fashion more cruel than her three dismemberments more than a century ago. Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, engaged in peaceful pursuits, innocent of aggression, were brutally bludgeoned into servitude. Bulgaria and Rumania, seduced by flattery and assailed by threats, succumbed. Jugoslavia and Greece were harried, machine-gunned, and bombed into submission.

Turning upon his supposed ally, Hitler suddenly and without apparent provocation, thrust his armies into Russia. However much we may disagree with Russia's theories and economic concepts, the Russian people have an undeniable right to live upon their own soil, in their own homes without being butchered by a cruel conqueror. The Russians have gallantly resisted the invasion of their homeland. Notwithstanding losses, they continue to fight valiantly.

Events speak a language more clearly than do words. Transactions carry a meaning which do not dissemble. Deeds are more revealing than cryptic or ambiguous phrases. What has happened in Europe, battles, conquests, the bombing of women and children more clearly reveal the schemes of Nazi Germany than any diplomatic note or speeches of the Fuehrer.

What we have already witnessed is proof that if Russia collapses, the engines of death and destruction will be turned upon Great Britain in a desperate design to conquer and enslave that historic land. It is proof that Spain and Portugal may fall before the Nazi march. The action of the Vichy Government of France and its servitude to Hitler may render it easy for him to master northern Africa, and to acquire the French Fleet. France arouses a deep sense of pity. Marshal Petain and Admiral Darlan have broken with a great and glorious past. In 1918 American soldiers shed their blood in the defense of French liberty. Now the Vichy Government embraces the former enemy and her recent conqueror and, deserting the historic fight of a century and a half of democracy, plunges into dark and hopeless totalitarianism under foreign tyranny. Americans, revering the memory of Lafayette weep for France amid her tragedies and humiliation.

The United States has pledged to defend the Western Hemisphere against foreign aggression. We have reaffirmed the pronouncement of President Monroe. We have declared that no non-American nation shall set up any part of its system in the Western Hemisphere. Already sporadic incidents in Latin America reveal Nazi infiltration and plotting to saturate Latin America with Nazi philosophy.

It requires no penetrating vision to foresee that, if Nazi armies master the Continents of Europe and Africa, their ambitions may soon leap across the seas to the Western Hemisphere. Modern aircraft and modern warfare can span the Atlantic in far less time that it took Columbus to reach the shores of the New World. We arm to resist the tide of conquest. We arm to challenge the defiance of international law, and the denial of the freedom of the seas. We arm to resist the enthronement of the sword as the ruler of the world.

The Congress, under its constitutional powers and with the sanction of the people of the United States, has adopted a policy of aid to Great Britain and the democracies resisting aggression. Within itself this was a national-defense measure. It was for defense that we acquired Atlantic naval and air bases, stretching from Newfoundland to Trinidad. In the national defense and at the invitation of its Government, our armed forces have occupied Iceland. For the national defense, if Vichy undertakes to permit German control of Martinique or any territory in the Western Hemisphere, we shall seize that island or any such territory, and hold it by armed force. Aid to the democracies, maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine, and our own safety and defense require that the Nation continue the gigantic program of national defense until we shall be so well armed and so strongly fortified that no foreign aggressor shall ever undertake an attack upon any point in the Western Hemisphere.

America has already, with a generosity unparalleled, given of her resources toward the achievement of these objectives. Stupendous sums have been expended. Congress is about to enact a tax bill which will require new sacrifices and heavier burdens.

These heroic measures are all dedicated to insure the safety and the lives and the liberty of our people. More than a century and a half ago the Colonies, moved by a conception of independence and free government, dared to fling defiance at the foot of a throne. Ragged continental armies suffered and starved and struggled through 7 years of blood and anguish under Gen. George Washington. By their fortitude, their courage, and unflagging faith independence was won. On the battlefield the royal standard was pulled down and in its place were lifted the banners of a free people. We have grown and prospered and expanded under constitutional institutions and under the processes of democratic government. We do not propose to surrender one item in all the shining catalog of American achievement. We refuse to erase a single line from the Constitution, ordaining free government. We refuse to bow our necks to any foreign yoke. We shall yield not an inch of territory nor yet an atom of our freedom to any conqueror, or totalitarian dictator, whether he comes from Europe or from the far reaches of Asia. We shall continue to arm. We shall continue to build an impregnable defense. We shall lift higher the ramparts of our freedom. We shall strengthen and fortify the citadel of our liberty. This is our America. It was our fathers' America. By all the sacred pledges that flow in our blood it shall be the America of our sons and their sons.

The Freedom of the Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 25, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] on August 22, 1941, on the subject of freedom of the seas.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Freedom of the seas is not a new idea for America. The navigation acts under King George III first restricted our commerce, and every schoolboy knows they were one of the causes of the Revolution. "Freedom of the seas" was the battle cry of the War of 1812. It was a factor in the War between the States, when the Alabama claims incident arose between the United States and Great Britain. It was involved in the Battle of Manila Bay, when the British Fleet stood by to prevent German warships from intervening against Admiral Dewey. In the last World War it was a vital part of the democratic system we fought to preserve.

A great President, who has handled the foreign affairs of our Nation brilliantly throughout the years, that saw the rise of Hitler in Europe, and the growth of Japanese militarism in the Orient, now warns us that freedom of the seas is again threatened. He speaks from his own experience as the head of our Nation, with full knowledge of the facts and their background. I cannot think of any man in the world as well qualified, by ability, experience, and true regard for the interests of America, to advise us on such matters.

Yet there are many who will not listen. No hostile fleets have opened fire on our shores—yet. No flights of enemy bombers have spread death and desolation across America—yet. We do not yet see war; we do not yet hear it. The Atlantic lies across the path of the conqueror, and all too many feel it is our moat, protecting the castle of our supposed "splendid isolation."

Can this be true? Can we depend upon the Atlantic on the one side, the Pacific on the other, to protect us from the wave of barbarism that has swept across Europe, washed against the shores of the British Isles and rolled alarmingly onward toward the rest of the civilized world?

The isolationists tell us it is true. They ask why should we "meddle" in the affairs of nations far away, why should we concern ourselves over the fate of Britain, why, in effect, should we not just stay at home minding our own business? It sounds plausible. Many are deceived by it, including not a few of the isolationists themselves. Many believe because they want to believe. It is inconceivable to them that the world we have known can end, and because it is inconceivable, because in so many ways it is utterly fantastic, they simply reject it. I say fantastic, for who would have dreamed that so much of the face of the world would be changed in the months since September 1939, when Hitler invaded Poland?

We all long for isolation from the brutal ruthlessness, the savage barbarity, of the conflict abroad. But there is no isolation. There cannot be, in a world of long-range bombers, a world of conquest by propaganda and "fifth columns," a world of economic warfare. Were the Axis to win we would not be isolated; we would be surrounded. We would be blockaded. We would be imprisoned on the North American Continent. We would be starved out economically, the lifeblood of our trade shut off, the vital materials for our industrial machine bottlenecked by foreign dictators.

The isolationists tell our people, and tell each other hopefully, that America is economically self-sufficient, that we can build a fence of guns and warships around our continent and live in peace and prosperity inside it. This is a tragic delusion, for we would soon find ourselves in a vast Nation-wide concentration camp.

I want to tell you why this is so. Those of you who live in the great seaport cities of America—Boston and New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore, New Orleans and Galveston, San Francisco and Seattle—and in the other large and small seaports which dot our shores, have watched the ships loading and unloading. Others, in midland cities, on the farms of the great Middle West, have not seen the cargoes pouring into America from the seven seas. But every American, young or old, has enjoyed the fruits of that commerce.

We cannot doubt that, if Hitler and the Japanese militarists were to control the seas, they would waste no time in shutting off not only our exports but also our imports of vital raw materials. They would unquestionably launch an economic war against us, for their own dictatorships would never be safe so long as one citadel of democracy still remained standing anywhere in the world.

Let us see just what would happen to us, assuming for the moment that they would not turn their military machine against us—in other words, that they would leave us to our so-called isolation.

We need manganese and cannot produce enough of it at home to run our steel mills. Most of it comes from Russia, India, Africa, and the Philippines. If the Axis controlled the seas, how would we get manganese?

We have a chromium shortage also. Ore reserves of manganese and chromium are being developed here, in Brazil, and in Cuba, but only in limited quantities. We have enough chromium to carry us for only a brief period after our present stocks are gone, and they may be gone in 6 months at our present and prospective production rate. If the British Fleet were to fall and Japan were to control the great eastern gateway of Singapore and the Indian Ocean, our steel mills would have to shut down.

Manganese is a real vital defense material. The Office of Production Management production schedule calls for a consumption of 1,300,000 tons this year and 1,500,000 tons in 1942. This year we will produce only 40,000 tons of manganese in the United States, and without greatly increased Government assistance we will be able to produce a maximum of only 150,000 tons next year, with little if any increase the following year. I am in favor of encouraging manganese production at home, and will work and vote to

achieve that objective. Tungsten, antimony and tung oil are vital defense materials and a great quantity comes to us over the Burma Road, indicating the practical necessity for immediate aid to China.

When we speak of Singapore we think of it as the protector of the sea lanes for our supplies of tin and rubber, as well as quinine and other drugs. We know how important tin and rubber are. If they were cut off, we would have only a small supply on hand. We are preparing to manufacture rubber substitutes, but present plans provide for only 80,000 tons a year, and we normally use 600,000 tons of rubber. Were we cut off from the Dutch East Indies and the Malay States, as Japan is now threatening by its moves in Indo-China and Thailand, we would be forced to depend upon substitutes and reclaimed rubber. For inner tubes and side walls of tires, crude rubber is essential. This would mean drastic curtailment of every industry, defense or otherwise, which uses rubber—not least among them the automobile industry. Japan would simply have us throttled.

Tin is another vital metal that would be shut off. Stock piles are being built up, substitutes are encouraged, conservation measures have been taken, but we would still be in a desperate situation if our sea lanes to the East could not be kept open. Some think we could salvage tin cans, but out of 80,000 or 90,000 tons of tin needed each year less than 1,000 tons can be salvaged from tin can scrap. During the last war, in spite of maximum efforts, only 400 tons of tin from cans and containers were salvaged in 1918. We have contracted for about 20,000 tons of tin a year from Bolivia, and are building a smelter for it in Texas, but this accounts for less than one-fourth of our normal needs, to say nothing of defense requirements, and even to transport this we must keep our sea lanes open.

There are other materials for which no adequate substitutes have been found. Graphite is one of them. It is used in crucibles, and crucibles are the backbone of defense production. It comes from Madagascar and Ceylon, although we have a supply of an inferior grade being developed in Alabama. The stock pile of this material is virtually nonexistent, and even now our industrial machines are consuming it as fast as the boats arrive.

Mica is another important material. We get a fairly good grade from South America, and we have a great deal in our own country that is satisfactory for electrical work, but we have to go to India for the mica in the spark plugs that keep our own air force flying and for the vast bulk of all strategic uses. Our supplies on hand are only enough for less than a year's reserve. The Malay States furnish us kapok, used in Navy life preservers, and extracts of essential barks used in the tanning of leather. Palm oil, an essential element in the steel industry's tinning process, comes from the East Indies. Burlap and jute, necessary for sacking and electrical cables, come from India.

All of these materials, and many more, are transported from the far corners of the earth, under the protection of the guns of the British and American Fleets, to make our industrial life possible—to say nothing of our defense production. They depend on free access to the Indian Ocean and that depends on Singapore.

If the British were to be conquered, and the protection of their Navy removed—if Singapore and the other great British bases were to fall—if the Empire were to be divided and conquered—if the Axis navies were to control the seas—how could America get these materials?

We have a magnificent Navy, and will have an even stronger one in the near future, but it would be utter folly to plan, cold-bloodedly, to match it against the combined navies of Germany, Italy, and Japan. It would be insanity to expect it to patrol and guard the tens of thousands of miles of sea lanes which must be kept open. Yet that is what the isolationists apparently expect us to do.

It may be argued that a negotiated peace with Hitler would solve all our problems. We should remember that Russia negotiated a peace with Hitler before he invaded Poland. Your daily newspaper will tell you what happened to that peace if you do not feel sufficiently warned already by the fate of Belgium, France, the Netherlands, Greece, and the other countries which now lie prostrate under the swastika.

The very materials which make possible our great production of consumers' goods, giving us our high standard of living, are also essential to armaments. If Hitler controls the seas, you may be sure he will take care that we do not get them. Without them, we would lack the means of defending even our "isolation," to say nothing of our world trade and sources of supply.

The impossible dream of isolation breaks down in the face of such realities as our need for tin and rubber, tungsten, manganese, antimony, graphite, mica, and the other imported articles without which our mills and factories cannot operate.

Both our defense effort and our normal economic life depend upon the outcome of the battle of the Atlantic and the battle of the Pacific. Our future is at stake, as well as Britain's. Our bread and butter is just as much involved as our ideal of democracy is involved. Once the Axis controls the seas, we become at once a have-not nation, rich in resources but lacking the essentials to make these resources useful.

All this means but one thing: We could be conquered economically, reduced to a second-rate power, our industry disorganized, our standard of living lowered, our mills and factories shut down or forced to work on inferior and even unusable substitutes, all without firing a shot, all by the simple but rigid enforcement of that "isolation" some well-meaning people look upon as a goal to be achieved.

I can only repeat that it would not be isolation but imprisonment; not freedom but stagnation. We have seen what the "isolation" of European countries has meant—Hitler has isolated them so that he might conquer them individually where he could not conquer them collectively. God help America if it is ever so isolated, for such isolation brings "not peace, but a sword."

Preservation of Basic Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 25, 1941

ADDRESS BY MR. JUSTICE BLACK

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on August 23 last our former colleague, Hon. Hugo Black, now Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, was the recipient of the honorary degree of doctor of laws, conferred upon him by the University of Alabama, at Tuscaloosa, Ala. On that occasion Mr. Justice Black, whom I had the honor of succeeding as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate, delivered an inspiring address, replete with real Americanism and clearly depicting the danger now confronting America. I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by him may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, I am genuinely happy to be with you on this occasion—happy because I am in Alabama, because I am at the university, and because of the honor the university has seen fit to bestow upon me. It has been 35 years—half the normal span of life—since I stepped upon this stage to receive a degree from President Abercrombie. That you, Mr. President, and those who act with you have chosen to call me back to this stage today is a pleasant instance of an alma mater's partiality to her sons, one for which I, always proud to be a member of her splendid family, am deeply grateful.

And I appreciate also the opportunity to speak at this summer-school commencement, particularly now. This is not one of those relatively comfortable times when the greatest issues of the day are in the arena of political controversy—where free people, all accepting liberty, justice, and happiness as their goals, contend among themselves only over the means by which these may best be achieved. To be sure, those relatively comfortable times are troublous enough. No graduating class has ever left this stage, or the stage of any American university, not confronted with a present and future full of problems that challenge the mind and heart. Every American generation has had its measure of blood, sweat, and tears, and has felt the defeat of seeing changes passionately wanted rejected and changes stubbornly opposed made. But each has been able to start out bravely, knowing that the sacred right to seek change is its heritage. And at no time since 1776 has that right been a mere image preserved with decent reverence. It has been given life and vigor by the constitutional guaranties that people may freely exchange their views in their homes, on their streets and places of assembly, at their jobs and in their churches, in their schools and in their universities. And we have learned over and over again the wisdom of John Milton, who said 300 years ago: "Give me liberty to know, to utter, to argue freely, according to conscience, above all liberties."

Political disagreement, nourished by liberty of expression, has been a staple of American history. But however much disagreement there may have been upon particular issues of governmental policy, Americans have always agreed that the basic freedoms on which our Government rests must be preserved. Today the very premises of a people's government—premises accepted as indispensable for civilized life even by those of most diverse beliefs and faiths—are challenged, and I believe, threatened with forceful destruction. It is not a time for any American with this belief complacently to close his eyes, insulate his mind, and seal his lips.

Specifically I refer to the threat of Hitler and his Axis underlings in Germany and elsewhere. Were Hitler satisfied to plant his guns and his philosophy only on German land and in German minds, even were he satisfied to conquer the bodies and souls of the peoples of Europe, Asia, and Africa, it might be asked with some plausibility, "What has an American to fear?" But where is there any basis for the belief that Hitler's ambition is so limited? Certainly not because Hitler has recently thought it in his interest to deny aims against the United States. For both before and after Munich we have heard his similar denials with respect to other countries, followed by ludicrous pretexts for breaking his word. Aesop tells of a wolf, of

ancient times, who used the same technique. Once upon a time, Aesop says, a wolf drinking at a stream saw a lamb drinking a little lower down. "There's my supper," he said. "Now for an excuse." "How dare you," he called to the lamb, "muddy the water from which I drink?" The lamb meekly answered: "If the water is muddy up there, I cannot be the cause, as the stream runs down from you to me." "Well," said the wolf, "why did you call me bad names this time last year?" "I could not have called you bad names last year," said the lamb, "since I'm only 6 months old." "I don't care," snarled the wolf, "if it wasn't you, it was your father," and leaped upon the lamb and began to tear it to pieces. All the lamb could do was say with its last expiring breath: "Any excuse will serve a tyrant."

On no more convincing pretexts, almost while the sound of his promises was still in the air, Hitler has broken his word to nation after nation. One by one, they have been invaded, pillaged, and enslaved. Comparing Hitler's talk with Hitler's deeds, this country can conclude only that his word to us is worth no more than it was to the others.

I believe there is, however, a book which, although unreliable in other respects, can be taken as an authentic statement of Hitler's philosophy, ambition, and objectives. I rely on it not because it is written in Hitler's words over his own name, nor because, written in 1926, it may have preceded the development of his skill, perhaps the most expert in world history, in spreading falsehood. I rely upon it principally because the credibility of its expressed intentions has been tragically proved by subsequent events. Nothing is more important at this time than making all our people fully aware of what those intentions are and of the possibilities of carrying them out. For any complacency and indifference that remain in this country would disappear with a Nation-wide understanding that Hitler's intentions and acts threaten our lives and safety. The best means I know of reaching such an understanding is the reading of Mein Kampf. Indeed, Mr. President, were I here as a hard-working member of your faculty instead of as the beneficiary of your gracious kindness, I should request your permission to conduct a seminar on this revolting and frightfully revealing book. If such a seminar did nothing more than cause students to read the text, it would convince them of the world-wide scope of Hitler's ambition. For in this book, amidst a torrent of hooting and hate, there appears in clear terms a comprehensive plan for world conquest and enslavement. The partial fruition of that plan is the great tragedy of our times; accomplishment of the remainder would suffocate every breath of true happiness on this continent. For, taking a hypothesis that Germans are a superior race destined by God and designed by Nature to rule the world, Hitler announces as his objective that Germany shall put shackles on the minds and bodies of every other people on earth.

In outlining the particularities of the clash of Hitler's principles and beliefs with our own, we can begin close to home. This university, for example, dedicated to the diffusion of knowledge, came into existence under a State statute passed by a popularly elected assembly. Its first assets were land given it by the United States Government pursuant to a policy first expressed in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, as follows: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." In willing and complete harmony with that policy, the original Alabama Act authorizing the creation of this university declared that "no person shall be excluded from any liberty, liberties, immunity, office, or situation in said university on account of his religious persuasion * * *." And throughout its history the University of Alabama, like all other great American universities, has held the primary purpose of education to be the preparation of men and women for citizenship in a country at peace.

Contrast German education under Hitler. German schools admit students as we admit cattle to a fair. Only those of approved stock, that is, of pedigrees prescribed by Reich leaders, many of whose own pedigrees incidentally, are carefully guarded state secrets, can hope to be accepted in any German educational institution. Unapproved religious beliefs are, of course, a further disqualification. If the tests of blood and religion are satisfied, German children are admitted to the benefits of an education whose primary aim for males is preparation for war; for females, preparation to bear children to fight in more wars. To quote the language of Mein Kampf, "military service has to be considered * * * the education of the average German" and "the training of the mental abilities * * * of secondary importance." Hitler despises the educational system which educates "engineers, technicians, chemists, lawyers, journalists, and professors," instead of preparing soldiers. And he would imbue and unfortunately has imbued German youth with a "fanatical, even hysterical passion" for German superiority and world conquest as opposed to what he terms the "bourgeois virtues of peace and order." In passionate words he demands that "everything, beginning with the child's primer down to the last newspaper, every theater and every movie, every billboard and every bare wall be (used to place) in the mind of the smallest child * * * the burning plea: '* * * God, bless our arms; * * * Lord, bless our battle.'" Thus is the educational system described by Hitler in the present-day German bible the exact antithesis of ours. Ours is built upon the basis that the people, all of them, are to be prepared for the enjoyment of a full life in a peaceful world. Hitler's purpose is to train those of German blood to be warriors and masters of non-German slaves.

And so it is with every other privilege and liberty without which we think peaceful society would be impossible and life intolerable. Freedom of speech, press, and religion; trial by jury and habeas corpus; representative government; the protections of the American Bill of Rights—each of these comes under Hitler's avalanche of epithets, and on all he has declared eternal warfare.

Parliamentary democracy, with all its facets, is the object of his most venomous hatred. He refers to it as "a witches' cauldron," "a world plague," "one of the most serious symptoms of mankind's decay." With the servicer of German soldiers hardened to ruthlessness he would stamp it out wherever it exists. Hitler's Reich conceives of its primary function as putting the world—and I am quoting Hitler's language—"into the service of a higher (German) culture." "By the victorious sword of a people of overlords," Germany will establish, Hitler says, "a revolutionary new order on this globe."

And this so-called new order, which utterly disregards the dignity of man, which holds that might alone makes right, that the enslavement of a people merely proves the right of the conqueror and the weakness of the victim; which, ignoring religious, humanitarian points of view, glorifies brutal attack—this new order clearly includes the United States within its compass. Mein Kampf specifically refers to us as the "gigantic American state colossus" and speaks with a tone of envy of our "enormous wealth of virgin soil." Significantly, Hitler also extols the "blood which a man spills for this earth" as the "most sacred sacrifice" a man can make, and remarks that "only the might of a triumphant sword will in the future assign us territory." It is equally significant, in the light of subsequent Japanese collaboration with Germany, that even in 1926 he placed great value upon the aid that Japan could give to a possible enemy of what he called the aspiring American Continent. Whether Hitler intends immediately to attempt to deprive Americans of their sacred privileges or not, his book leaves no possible doubt that he wants to, that he will try as soon as he thinks he can, and that he expects his so-called master race to enslave the Americas along with the rest of the world.

Had Mein Kampf been but the arrogant boasting of one destined to remain a powerless dreamer, we could pass it by. But Hitler's armies, pouring out death and destruction on a large part of the earth's surface, are frightful proof of his satanic capabilities. Today he seeks to win control of Europe, Asia, Africa, and the islands of the sea. If successful there, he would have the vast wealth of three continents and the labor of hundreds of millions of subjugated people entirely at his disposal for the continuation of the world conquest he envisions for tomorrow. The Western Hemisphere would become the last free area in a globe of Hitlerian slavocracy, and the western nations' spirit and resources would then inevitably be tested against the forces that could be raised against us from all the rest of the world. I say inevitably not alone because the desire for conquest and more conquest is an incurable disease of the Nazi system, nor because the wealth and land of this hemisphere and the forced labor of its people would be an irresistible prize to habitual plunderers; nor because a people whose life is war cannot take up peace while there is still someone left to attack. Even on the impossible assumptions that world domination would willingly be abandoned as an Axis aim, and that greed, fed by the spoils of three continents, would be sated, and that the conditioned reflex of fighting could be unlearned, a mortal clash with this hemisphere would be inevitable. For Hitler or his successor could not afford to allow a voice of freedom to remain on earth. He could not run the risk that such a voice might be even faintly heard by his enslaved millions, or that the indignation of outraged humanity might rise against him. Any realist, and Hitler is nothing if not that, would do everything in his power to remove this last possible danger that might upset his empire. In such a last mortal clash, we should be surrounded by a prodigious and constantly growing Axis arsenal, separated only by oceans constantly narrowing as better and speedier hostile ships and airplanes were produced in greater numbers.

We cannot stand by and wait until the Americas stand alone against the rest of the world, molded into one vast, unified instrument of warfare by Axis tyranny. Whatever the cost may be, we must avoid that. We can avoid it, but only through the victory of those millions of brave men and women on the western and eastern borders of the present German Empire who now gallantly face death in order to stop Hitler. Hitler's enemies we should gladly and gratefully accept as our friends. Having placed their fortunes and their lives on our side in the common defense against world-wide Nazi domination, they deserve every possible aid that our country can supply. Without stint, they should have it.

The task of selecting the particular means of aiding the enemies of Hitler is appallingly difficult. In the nature of things it has to be delegated to our legislative and executive representatives, each acting in proper constitutional sphere. These representatives may properly ask, as President Jefferson did, for that measure of confidence which may give firmness and effect to the legal administration of affairs. That a realistic respect by the electorate of their officials' better ability to command a view of the whole ground need not diminish the vitality of democracy has been superbly demonstrated in England for the past 2 years. We cannot with safety permit ourselves in this country to view every swift move of our selected officials with a

suspicion that breeds resentment, inefficiency, and disunion.

Many centuries ago Aristotle said that good governments "should have for their object rest and peace" and that "rendering a people fit for war that they may enslave their inferiors" ought not to be an aim of the good state. He recognized, however, that even a peace-loving government should render its people fit for war "that they may not themselves be reduced to slavery by others." We are a people of peace. We hate the wars that Hitler loves. But for our way of life Hitler would substitute brutality, deceit, intolerance, inhumanity, goose-step, and Gestapo, and—most odious of all—he would make us slaves. More than peace we love freedom. That we shall spare no effort to preserve—peaceably, if we can; forcibly, if we must.

The American Dairyman's Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 25, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. HUGH A. BUTLER, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, there were recently issued some regulations by the Food and Drug Administration which I feel will seriously affect the domestic market for dairy products. Some of the provisions contained in the new "definition and standard of identity" for oleomargarine seem to me rather extraordinary. For example, preservatives, and other chemicals may be added to oleomargarine, although the use of the same items is expressly forbidden in the manufacture of butter. In a recent issue of the Nebraska Farmer, published by Samuel R. McKelvie at Lincoln, Nebr., there appears an article prepared by me covering this threat to the American farmer's right to supply his home market. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nebraska Farmer of August 9, 1941]

THE AMERICAN DAIRYMAN'S MARKET

(By Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska)

A new threat to the American farmer's right to supply his home market has appeared in the form of regulations issued by the Food and Drug Administration, specifically giving oleomargarine manufacturers the privilege of adding all the ingredients necessary to make their lower-priced butter substitute taste, feel, and behave as much as possible like butter, plus even elements which are forbidden in butter manufacture. Any expansion of the oleomargarine market will necessarily curtail sales of butter, thus adding to the butterfat surplus and depressing the price, while the increase in margarine sales will not materially expand markets for American-grown products, since most of the additional fats and oils will have to be imported.

Some of the provisions contained in the new "definition and standard of identity" for oleomargarine seem rather extraordinary. For example, preservatives (sodium benzoate and benzoic acid) may be added to oleomargarine, although use of such preservatives is expressly forbidden in butter manufacture. Another fact that comes as a shock to friends of the American dairy industry is that the new standard goes even beyond the very liberal regulations enforced until recently by the Bureau of Animal Industry for oleomargarine made from animal fats, and that the Bureau has further relaxed its rules to conform with the new definition and standard. For example, the Bureau of Animal Industry has always forbidden use of benzoic acid and the flavoring diacetyl in margarine, but will now permit them to be incorporated.

Some of the specific ingredients which will be permitted in margarine under the new regulation, issued over protests of American dairymen, are as follows:

Benzoic acid and sodium benzoate as preservatives. Preservatives may not be used in butter.

Diacetyl, a flavoring which gives a butter taste. The sole purpose of adding this substance is to make consumers think and feel that they are getting butter or its equivalent. It has been expressly forbidden under Bureau of Animal Industry regulations until the new order by the Food and Drug Administration.

Lecithin or glycerin derivatives, which prevent "splattering" and make oleomargarine suitable for cooking purposes. Through addition of these substances oleomargarine hopes to displace butter in the kitchen as well as on the dining table.

Vitamin A, an essential dietary ingredient which is naturally present in butter and all dairy products. Oleomargarine manufacturers want to add this vitamin in order to imitate butter more closely. Until a few months ago the Bureau of Animal Industry did not permit use of this ingredient.

The total effect of all these regulations is to permit oleomargarine to imitate butter as closely as possible. Only the tax on yellow margarine prevents it from being colored, in which case this substitute would generally be made to look like butter, as well as imitating it in other respects. As it is, the coloring is commonly sold with the margarine, so that the purchaser can color it himself and then pass it off as butter as he sees fit.

The intent of such practices is to permit margarine to be substituted for butter. There can be no other purpose. If oleomargarine manufacturers merely wanted to make their product more palatable to the taste, they would not have to use diacetyl, the flavoring which tastes just like butter. There are plenty of other flavorings, each with a distinctive, pleasant taste. Why don't they use vanilla? Evidently they want to make their customers think they are getting something just like butter, or something "just as good." Likewise, there are other dietary constituents, such as vitamins C and D, that are just as important as the vitamin A naturally found in butter. Clearly margarine manufacturers want to add vitamin A in order to make their customers think of their product as a close substitute for butter.

The result of this policy of imitation of butter and substitution for it can only be to deprive butter of a part of its natural market, to add to the butter surplus, and to depress its price and the prices of all other dairy products.

Spokesmen of the oleomargarine industry like to pretend that sales of that product will not infringe on the butter market nor replace butter sales. The experience of recent years does not support this contention. The official figures on butter and oleomargarine indicate that during the past 18 years per capita consumption of the two table fats combined has been almost exactly 20 pounds and that this figure has not varied as much as 3 percent in any year from the average. In general, whenever butter consumption has expanded oleomargarine consumption has contracted; and as margarine consumption has increased, butter consumption has declined. Although the size of the combined market has, of course, expanded with the rise in population, and presumably will continue to expand, this market is definitely limited by the size of the population. There can be no doubt, therefore, that butter and oleomargarine are directly competitive and that any expansion in the market for margarine will cut directly into the market for butter.

The price premium which butter has been able to command over margarine has varied widely, according to the amount of the butter surplus. We have found in recent years that the only way to get rid of even a slight surplus of butter is to let the price of butter fall so drastically that butter can cut into the low-price market usually supplied by margarine. The extent of the price decline necessary to bring about this expansion of sales may be realized when it is recalled that during the late twenties butter ordinarily sold at a premium of about 20 cents over margarine. In the early thirties butter fell to a point only about 10 or 12 cents above oleomargarine in order to dispose of a surplus of only about 5 percent. In recent years, with the spread of the practice of adding various artificial ingredients to margarine to enable it more effectively to masquerade as butter, it has been increasingly difficult to maintain a reasonable price premium for butter, even though butter supplies have not been as excessive as they were 8 or 10 years ago. During the last 3 years butter prices have averaged only about 12 cents above equivalent prices on vegetable margarine, although butter has had no larger a share of the combined market than during the late twenties, when the premium was 20 cents. It is apparent that the possibility of substituting for butter the present-day type of oleomargarine with all these artificial ingredients sets a virtual ceiling on the price of butter at a point not much above the price of oleomargarine. It is this type of competition which is to be continued and intensified by the new ruling.

We know by experience that dairy farmers and creameries cannot easily adjust their production according to the demands of the market. Time and again, a relatively slight butter surplus has knocked the bottom out of prices. Under present conditions and with the present production capacity of dairy farms and creameries, it appears probable that the intensified competition from oleomargarine will result in disastrously low butter prices, as creameries attempt to get rid of their surplus in the only way they can. Indeed, it seems likely that the harm resulting to butter will be much greater than the improvement felt by oleomargarine and its constituent raw materials. Oleomargarine sales can hardly be expanded very much since, as a normal thing, the butter produced is sold at whatever price it will bring, the balance of the market being supplied by oleomargarine. The chief effect of the stiffer competition will be to continually narrow the price difference between butter and its substitute, and these prices for butter will inevitably be reflected in the prices of other manufactured dairy products and back to the price the farmer receives for his whole milk.

The joke of the whole affair is that the new regulations do not seem likely to benefit even the cottonseed crushers or the cotton farmers, who have been the chief exponents of oleomargarine. In recent years, and in all probability in the years to come, domestic food industries have supplied and will supply a market for all the cottonseed

oil that could be produced and a bit more besides, which had to be imported. Production of cottonseed oil cannot be increased, because it is a byproduct, and the amount produced annually is dependent on the market for lint cotton, which has been steadily dwindling. This year, for example, the Department of Agriculture estimates only 23,102,000 acres of cotton will be harvested, which will likely supply barely 1,100,000,000 pounds of cottonseed oil, over 400,000,000 pounds less than the normal domestic consumption of the oil. Only if we return to an annual cotton crop of thirteen and one-half million bales will there be sufficient domestic cottonseed oil to supply the domestic market as it has averaged during recent years. Any expansion in sales of a product made from cottonseed oil, therefore, will merely result in the importation of more cottonseed oil, which will effectively keep down the American price of the oil to a point equal to the world price, plus the amount of the duty and the cost of transporting it. Foreigners will get most of the benefit.

Southern farmers, then, cannot expect any substantial increase in the quantity of oil sold, since they cannot increase production; nor in the price they will receive, since that is determined by world prices of cottonseed and other vegetable oils. The recent increase in the price of cottonseed has been due purely to the shipping shortage, which has prevented competing vegetable oils from being imported. Dairymen have no quarrel with the cotton farmers of the South. They are willing to do anything within reason to assist another branch of agriculture—for example, by protecting domestic cottonseed oil with higher duties against foreign competing oils. But we cannot be expected to sit quietly by while our markets are taken away from us and we are replaced, not by American cottonseed oil, but by Brazilian cottonseed and babassu nut oil and coconut oil from the Philippines

American dairymen believe in preserving the American market for the American farmer to the extent of his ability to supply it. They expect this for themselves, and they are willing and anxious to accord it to other groups. They also believe that all branches of agriculture should be treated fairly and equally, but they do not believe that an established market should be taken away from one branch of agriculture and given to another through subterfuge and imitation, particularly when that other branch does not even supply the market it already has, and when the net result of the whole process will be, not assistance to any domestic crop or livestock product, but an increase in the importation of competitive agricultural commodities.

Defense Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 25, 1941

ARTICLES FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN AND THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Baltimore Sun entitled "Mr. Byrd versus Mr. Roosevelt," and an article by Walter Lippmann entitled "The Underlying Mistake."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of August 24, 1941]

MR. BYRD VERSUS MR. ROOSEVELT

In his impressive speech in the Senate on Wednesday, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, one of the solidest and most conscientious Members of the Upper House, made public certain figures as to the production of ships and munitions.

So far in the defense emergency we have been given very few production figures. The theory has been that making such figures public would be of advantage to Hitler. For the most part, what we have received have been so-called percentage figures, which, Mr. BYRD said, really don't tell anything. Moreover, though Mr. BYRD did not say this, it is obvious to everyone that a smoke screen set up to deceive Herr Hitler could be equally efficacious as a screen behind which the failures of the defense effort were hidden from our own people.

Mr. Roosevelt himself saw fit to take issue with Senator BYRD. In a carefully prepared interview with the correspondents, he made the general point that the Senator had been "sold down the river" on his figures and substituted for them some figures of his own which, he said, were the true figures. But—and this is an important point—the President did not deny the approximate accuracy of the BYRD figures on airplane production. He made no comment on the BYRD figures with reference to shipbuilding, which was just as well, for the Senator was able to show that he had received these figures from Admiral Land himself. Admiral Land is the Chairman of the Maritime Commission.

Thus the situation is this: Mr. Roosevelt has admitted that airplane production, which is surely basic in the present situation, is precisely as unsatisfactory as Senator BYRD says it is. He has not criticized the figures on ships, for the obvious reason that the Senator got them from the highest source available. And ships, as we know without being told, are second only to airplanes as the prime essential for the national defense.

As for the other figures—those concerning tanks, anti-aircraft guns, anti-tank guns and howitzers—there is this to be said. We know that Senator BYRD marshaled his facts for this speech with his usual care. We know, from the examples given, that he went to the best sources for them. We know, moreover, on the basis of the Senator's record in the Senate, that he is one of the men in that body best qualified to handle facts and figures. It may be possible, on occasion, to say that he does not always draw the only possible deduction from the facts and figures which he assembles. But it has rarely been possible to accuse him of using figures carelessly.

On the other hand, it is equally well known that whatever virtues as a political and national leader he may have, Mr. Roosevelt has little head for figures or taste for them, and that he is capable, through incapacity or distaste, of using figures in such a way that they confuse rather than inform the public. The famous speech of last year, in which he listed the goods of war on hand or "on order" is still fresh in the national memory. It is necessary to bear this shortcoming of Mr. Roosevelt in mind in judging the merits of his argument over figures with Senator BYRD.

But when Senator BYRD produced his figures he did not produce them with the sole idea of breaking through the veil of secrecy which has so far surrounded this vital subject. He was concerned not primarily with the figures, as figures, but rather with the situation which underlies our failure, to date, to get ourselves geared to the production rate of which we are surely capable. The suggested causes for the situation in which we find ourselves constituted the real meat in Senator BYRD's speech. Here the Senator made two charges.

The first of these charges was based on unimpeachable figures gotten from the Navy and War Departments. They showed that since the first of the year strikes in defense plants have cost the Nation no less than 5,000,000 man-days. Mr. Roosevelt did not discuss the significance of this figure.

He did not discuss it, we believe, because it throws into relief one of Mr. Roosevelt's most serious shortcomings. Save in half-hearted words, he has done almost nothing to make organized labor conscious of its responsibilities in the present crisis. Instead, he has temporized either personally or through his Mediation Board with most of the issues which grasping labor leaders have seen fit to bring up. His pro-labor record in the past, which surely gave him the right and the authority to speak firmly to the unions about the national need and their duty to make sacrifices for it, has somehow seemed to paralyze his ability to act in the present. His one direct intervention—in the case of the outrageous strike at the North American Aviation plant in California—was drastic in its sweep, perhaps too drastic. But it has not been followed up by the steady and inflexible insistence on duty which alone can prove to the labor leaders that he means what he says.

But, most of all, in his speech Mr. BYRD stressed the shortcomings in the defense organization at the very top. "The first and most important thing to do," he said, "is to eliminate the conflicting authority that now exists between the different officials and the different agencies at Washington. Anyone observing the situation first hand * * * must be greatly alarmed at the great delay occasioned by the very apparent inability of our different governmental agencies to function in coordination and cooperation to produce these materials without unreasonable delay. There must be one head of our defense program, and this head should have the power and authority to give orders and enforce his decisions."

This is not the opinion of Senator BYRD alone. It is the opinion of competent men within the administration. It is the opinion of competent industrialists who are seeking to work as diligently and efficiently as they can for the national good. It is the opinion of high-ranking Army officers concerned at our laggard progress.

It may even be the opinion of Mr. Roosevelt himself. For only recently he appointed his intimate friend and adviser, Judge Rosenman, to go into the situation and make recommendations about the all too obvious conflict between the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply (O. P. A. C. S.) and the Office of Production Management (O. P. M.). These are two of the key agencies in the defense set-up. If they are in conflict—and Mr. Roosevelt has tacitly admitted that they are in conflict—then the fundamental criticisms of Senator BYRD are proved.

Therefore he has done a patriotic thing in bringing forth his figures, both the accurate ones and those in which he was slightly in error. For no industrial organization can long be efficient, or can produce its products in increasing numbers, if there is friction and conflict at the top. The time to cure such evils is to get at them before they corrupt the whole structure.

It is difficult, of course, for a man in a position like that of Mr. Roosevelt to admit he has made errors in administration and in personnel. It is especially difficult for a man with a temperament like that of Mr. Roosevelt, who has a habit, attractive enough in some of its aspects, of making intimate personal friends of those with whom he works.

But the national need takes precedence over Mr. Roosevelt's personal biases and personal amiabilities. Senator BYRD has courageously disclosed a situation which may yet paralyze our whole defense effort. Thanks to his speech, the dangers in the situation are no longer the private concern of Mr. Roose-

velt and his intimates. They are now the inescapable concern of the whole country. Mr. BYRD has already accomplished that much. May he keep up the fight until it is won.

[From the Washington Post of August 23, 1941]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE UNDERLYING MISTAKE

Commenting on Senator BYRD's recital of the figures showing the meager output of tanks, guns, and airplanes, the New York Times says that "such figures form a startling contrast with the huge sums that Congress has appropriated for defense. The causes for that contrast deserve the country's serious study." They do indeed. Almost everyone must have asked himself how one can reconcile the dark picture painted by Senator BYRD with the much brighter picture which has so often been painted by defense officials and supported by the President's remarks.

No doubt the outlook is not quite so bad as one might gather from the Senator's speech. But it is not nearly so good as one might infer from the President's remarks. For while Senator BYRD has not quite got there yet, he is on his way to uncovering a basic misconception in the planning of the defense program.

To make the thing clear to ourselves, let us consider the planning of a program for the production of apple pies. You make an estimate that you need 30 apple pies. If you ask the cook to bake 1 pie a day for 30 days, you will have produced 30 pies. That is one way to get a lot of pies. But there is another way, and that is to hire 30 cooks to bake 30 pies in 1 day. If you follow the first method—1 cook making 1 pie a day—you do not have to bother the other 29 cooks. If you follow the second method—30 cooks making 30 pies in 1 day—you get the pies quickly. If your first guess was wrong and you really need 60 pies, you can get them quickly, and you finish with the pie-making business quickly.

Speaking very, very roughly and broadly, the O. P. M., with the President and the War Department agreeing, decided last year to have 1 cook make 1 pie a day for 30 days, leaving the 29 other cooks free to fry their own fish. That is why Senator BYRD can now say truthfully that there are as yet very few pies and why the defense officials have been able to say truthfully that there are going to be many pies.

The broad figures tell the story. There are about fifty billions to be spent. Less than two billions were spent in 1940, and seventeen billions are to be spent in 1941, twenty-three billions in 1942, and nine billions in 1943 and after. In the long run this will mean a lot of equipment. But the long run may be too long, and, anyhow, what counts is not whether we accumulate, say, 50,000 planes eventually but how soon we can reach the point where we produce planes at the rate of three or four thousand a month. We needed not an order for 30 pies in 30 days but a program for being able to bake 30 pies in 1 day. Then we could produce such an avalanche of pies that no one near it could bear to think of apple pies for years to come.

The reason we adopted the wrong method is that a year ago neither the President and the new dealers nor the businessmen in O. P. M. were willing to place defense ahead of business as usual. The administration was afraid of temporary unemployment, due to the change-over from civilian to military production, and it was afraid of labor, and it was afraid to ask the people to accept a reduction in their standard of life. And the businessmen were for the most part in agreement with Mr. Knudsen, who believed all last summer that the defense program should be superimposed on normal business.

That in substance is why the defense program is moving slowly and is inadequate. It has been planned as a kind of annex and superstructure to an immense boom in private business. That is why we have just produced more private automobiles than have ever been produced and sold anywhere at any time. That is why the raw materials, the skilled labor, the managerial ability, and the machine tools needed to produce this record-breaking output have not been enlisted for national defense.

It has often been said that we need centralization of authority in Washington. That is true. But most of all we need a central authority with a true conception of the task, which is that is massive output eventually will do us no good but that by a massive capacity to product in the near future, this war can be won. And then we need to realize that the only, way to get quickly a massive capacity to produce is to cut drastically into civilian consumption and force the productive capacity, which now serves civilians to work for defense.

The time has come to put on forced draft—to make up our minds to produce this year what under our leisurely plans we do not expect to produce until the spring of next year—to make up our minds to produce in the first half of 1942 what we now plan to produce in the whole of 1942. This can be done. The British, when they were at last aroused after Dunkerque, did just that kind of thing. We can do it if we have the will and the courage to do it.

If we could really make up our minds to do that at no matter what sacrifice of our convenience and of business as usual, we could acquire a power in the world which would give substance to our words; with our whole industrial energy mobilized, we should be irresistible and invincible. The outcome would not be in doubt nor too long delayed. For if the American people will really work like the very devil for the next 12 months, they will have won—and at no tragic cost—the second American war of independence.

That war cannot be won except after long years of waste and suffering as long as we lack the character to choke this fantastic and disgraceful boom, and go all out for defense.

Address by Senator Barkley at Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 25, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, OF KENTUCKY

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the very able address delivered by our distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], under the auspices of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at Philadelphia, Pa., August 24, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, I am deeply grateful to the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the committee in charge of this great gathering for the honor conferred upon me by the invitation to address you at this time.

It is a source of great inspiration to look into the faces of this great audience who have assembled here for no mercenary or selfish purposes, but to demonstrate their loyalty to American institutions and give proof of their determination that these institutions shall not perish.

I stand today before the great Hall of Independence, in which Thomas Jefferson and his colaborers wrote the Declaration of Independence. In all the course of human history no document was ever conceived by the mind or penned by the hand of man which gave greater hopes to the masses of humanity than did this Declaration.

Those who wrote this immortal document were not cowards. They realized when they promulgated it that they must hang together or hang separately. They realized that if the cause of American liberty should not survive, those who instigated the American Revolution would suffer the penalties inflicted upon the sponsors of an unsuccessful war.

They were not afraid to take the risks. They did not count the cost in dollars or in blood or in human life. As Patrick Henry had said in the Virginia Convention, "I know not what course others may pursue, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

The great cause of American liberty, sponsored by these immortal men and epitomized in the Declaration of Independence, was successful. But before it succeeded and before the American Republic was established, 8 years of sacrifice, of bloodshed, and of incredible hardships were suffered by the Revolutionary patriots, and the fight was made harder and longer because there were among the 3,000,000 people who then inhabited the colonies those who were not in sympathy with the cause of liberty or who, for mercenary, social, or political reasons, withheld their support to the cause of the new Republic.

It is a glorious and inspiring fact that today the Nation which was created by this Declaration of Independence and the nations from which our forefathers declared their independence are today standing shoulder to shoulder and heart to heart for the preservation and perpetuation of the very doctrines and principles for which our forefathers labored, fought, and died.

It is a glorious and inspiring fact that today these two great nations—the United States of America and the Kingdom of Great Britain and her vast associated dominions—stand across the pathway over which Adolf Hitler and his brutal satellites are attempting to obliterate human freedom and the great fundamentals of human liberty and Christianity.

It is because of this that the people of the United States and the people of Great Britain, and the people of every other self-governing nation, most of which have in the past 2 years been the victims of a ruthless invasion at the hands of the barbarian, applaud the magnificent fight for self-defense which is now being waged by the people of Russia against this same ruthless invader.

In sympathizing with the fight to defend their homes and their country now being made by the Russian people, neither the United States nor Great Britain thereby espouses the internal policies or the political philosophy which since the World War has guided the Soviet Republic. But they recognize the right of the Russian people to adopt and live under any form of government which they may prefer. They recognize the right of all nations to adopt and live under any form of government which they may prefer. But they also recognize that whatever may have been the shortcomings or the distastefulness of the theories of the Government of Soviet Russia, the Russian people

and their rulers have not constituted and do not now constitute a world menace comparable to the insidious and diabolical program of Adolf Hitler and his puny little human hand plants, who, in their automatic echoings of Hitler's philosophy, make Charlie McCarthy look like an original thinker.

It is in the midst of a world like this that the American people and the American Government are confronted by a crisis which has not been exceeded in importance and far-reaching influence since the Declaration of Independence was adopted here in 1776.

This world in which we stand today is not of our making. We did not contribute to the causes of the first World War in 1914 nor to any of the wars which preceded it in all human history outside the Western Hemisphere. We did not contribute to the causes of the present war, unless perchance we stopped fighting too soon in 1918.

From the day of the armistice on November 11, 1918, until the outbreak of the present world conflict, the American people worked and prayed that enduring peace might settle down upon the earth. Disarmament treaties almost without number were signed by us and other nations, all of them culminating finally in the Briand-Kellogg Peace Pact, by which practically all the nations in the world, including Germany, agreed to banish war as a means of national policy.

Lulled into a sense of false security, practically all of the peace-loving nations who signed these treaties in honor and in good faith settled down to the reconstruction of their domestic and international relationships and relied upon these solemn commitments to preserve the peace of the world and save humanity from further slaughter.

But as soon as Adolf Hitler came into power in Germany in 1933 he began to conspire against all his neighbors and all the peace-loving nations which men had set up and hoped to preserve. He violated his agreement with his neighboring nations as soon as he came into power and felt that he was strong enough to take the risks. You may trace his entire course in his dealings with other nations from 1933 until this hour and you will find that it has constituted an unbroken record of perfidy and dishonor. The pettiest thief who sneaks into the back alleys of our cities possesses a higher sense of human integrity and honorable purposes than does this mad bandit whose vile footsteps have brought suffering to mankind which even Alexander the Great, Genghis Khan, and Napoleon Bonepart never conceived of in their wildest dreams of conquest.

If any American believes that I am overdrawing this picture, let him look at Austria. Hitler told Austria, through her Premier, Dollfuss, that he had no designs upon the Austrian people. Then he had Dollfuss murdered and devoured Austria like a lion would devour a mouse.

He told the people of Czechoslovakia that he had no territorial designs upon them at first. Then he told them he only wanted the Sudeten Germans to have the right of self-determination. Then he sent his armies into Czechoslovakia and drove out the constituted government and added all their territory to the German Reich.

He told Poland that he only wanted a correction of the Polish Corridor and some readjustment in the free city of Danzig, and he told Chamberlain at Munich and announced to the world when the Sudeten Germans had been added to the Reich that he had no further territorial ambitions in all of Europe. But he invaded Poland and drove out her constituted government and has murdered probably more than 3,000,000 Poles, whose only offense had been their love of their homes and of their country.

He told Denmark that he had no designs upon her. But one morning, before the sun had arisen, his Nazi legions were in possession of Denmark. He told Norway the same. He told Holland the same. He told Belgium the same. And the strange thing is that these small nations either believed him or had waited too late to prepare to resist him. He told the people of France and England that he had no designs upon them and no intention of invading them, that what he really wanted was to extend his boundaries eastward into the territory of Russia, but he invaded France and the French Government, because of lack of preparation and because of internal dissension, collapsed like a house of cards, and while the indomitable spirit of the French people still burns within their bosoms, they are now in the clutches of a puppet government which has announced its collaboration with Hitler and Mussolini and all those who seek to destroy the very things for which France has stood since the French Revolution, liberty, equality, and fraternity.

Hitler told Rumania that he had no designs upon her. He told Hungary the same. He told Bulgaria the same. He told Yugoslavia the same. He told Greece the same. But when Greece resisted the efforts of Italy, under the strutting caricature known as Mussolini to lay impious hands upon her people and were driving the Italian Army back across the land over which they had marched, Hitler sent his panzer divisions into heroic Greece and drove her government out of the country and devastated her historic land and cities.

And in all these conquered countries, the right of free speech, the right of free assembly, the right of free worship, the right of a free press have been buried in the conquered soil. Nowhere in all this vast region can more than three men assemble on a street corner without being dispersed by the mailed hand of the military authorities and cowardly suspicion. In all these vast overridden regions, the social and economic and intellectual life of the people have been subverted to the predatory designs of the Nazi juggernaut. And all through these devastated and humiliated regions, millions of men, women, and children who cannot speak or understand the English language, are praying that some power somewhere may stop the ruthless conqueror in his tracks and that they themselves may be revived as nations, dedicated to the moral, intellectual, and economic advancement of their people and to nations of self-respect and decency among the people of the earth.

Not only have these things happened to Europe, not only are they happening in Africa or will happen if Hitler wins, not only are they occurring in Asia where Japan is crawling like some monstrous dragon out over the territories of China but over the seas and the islands of the seas and all that portion of the Pacific. For 10 years we have seen this dragon encroach upon the innocent and unhappy people of China for no reason except that Japan desires what China has and thought she might obtain it without war, if possible, but through war if necessary.

There is no fundamental difference between the immoral and despicable philosophy of Hitler and Mussolini and the military clique that now dominates Japan and seeks to drive her on.

In the midst of these world conditions we are asked by a little coterie of American ostrichs to trust Hitler and to believe him when he has once or twice stated that he has no designs upon the American people or upon the Western Hemisphere. If the American people are lulled into a feeling of security; if they are unwilling or unable to profit by the lessons of countries throughout the world, under the pagan influence of Hitlerism; if they are so naive or unsuspecting as to listen to the insidious advice of the serpents in our Garden of Eden; if they are so unimpressed by this array of indisputable evidence, created in all parts of the world by the slimy trail which Hitler has followed; then we may wonder whether after all the sacrifices made by our forefathers from 1776 to 1941 mean to us what we claim they mean to us.

Regardless of all pretenses to the contrary, this is not a war to readjust a few international boundaries. It is not a war to adjust inequalities brought about by the Treaty of Versailles. It is not a war to eliminate corridors. It is not a war to relieve minorities of some injustice inflicted upon them by boundary lines.

This may have been the pretext upon which it was begun. But its genesis lies deeper than mere physical delineations upon a map. It is a war of ideas, a war of philosophies, a war of conquest, a war to impose upon the world a system of moral, economic, and political controls to which it has never been subjected in all its history. These controls and these ideals are diametrically opposed to the theory of freedom and democracy. They are opposed to the doctrine of self-government. They are avowedly antagonistic to Christianity or any form of religion except worship of the state, that state to be under the autocratic domination of authoritarian theories and processes which deny the people any voice in their government or in the fashioning of their society. The result is economic bondage. It is religious bondage. It is political bondage. And it is intellectual bondage. You cannot have intellectual freedom where the soul of man is enslaved. You cannot have economic freedom where the political rights of man are trampled under foot.

If any American, conscious of what in going on in the world and familiar with the threats which have been made by Hitler and his spokesmen, has any doubt of the intentions of Hitler to impose this revolutionary system upon the whole world, then let such an American take note of what he and they have said about it when they were not seeking to deceive anybody.

Although Hitler calls it a revolution of young nations and young peoples against old and decadent nations, we have already recognized it for what it is, an inhuman and bestial revolution against every freedom for which men have striven and fought and died through centuries of hardships.

If any American doubts the purpose of the Nazi juggernaut, let him read the speech of Hitler's Reichminister of Agriculture given in May 1940, a speech made at Hitler's instigation to a group of leading Nazis called together for that purpose.

In that speech he forecast the invasion of the Low Countries and the penetration of the Balkans. In that speech he predicted the economic organization of all the territories which were to be overrun by and for the benefit of the German Reich. In that speech he predicted the mastery of two continents. He predicted that they would inaugurate a system of slavery by which he took pains to explain that he did not mean slavery in any sense except the sense of absolute subjection to the will and power of the conqueror. He stated that slavery was not to be understood as a parable or as a rhetorical term but that he had in mind a modern form of medieval slavery which they would introduce because they urgently needed it to fulfill their purposes and he predicted that they would be denied the blessings of education or literacy but that this boon would be reserved for the German population. After expatiating at length upon what they were going to do to Europe he expressed his opinion as to their objectives in the United States. He referred to the United States as a pseudo-democratic republic. He stated that they had accounts to settle with the United States. He referred to the fact that the United States holds a large portion of the gold of the world to which he said the Nazis were entitled because most of it had been dug out of the ground since conquered by Germany.

He predicted in that speech that the United States would be forced by Germany to complete and final capitulation, and that instead of having 7,000,000 unemployed as a result of German conquest we would have 40,000,000 unemployed.

He predicted that President Roosevelt would beg Hitler on his knees to purchase not manufactured goods but raw materials from the United States at prices which Hitler would dictate. And he stated that the United States was so demoralized and corrupted that, like France and England, it need not be taken into consideration as a military adversary.

In another speech delivered by Walter Funk, president of the Reichsbank of Berlin, he made predictions of the same character and in a later speech made by Hitler himself, he stated, "We shall soon have an S. A. in America. We shall train our youth. We shall have men which degenerate Yankeedom will not be able to challenge. National Socialism alone is destined to liberate the American people from their ruling clique."

"I shall undertake this task simultaneously with the restoration of Germany to her leading position in America. The German component of the American people will be the source of its political and mental resurrection."

This is an offensive insult to millions of American citizens of German ancestry who are as loyal to the principles of American democracy as are any other class of our people.

Again quoting Hitler, "I guarantee that at the right moment a new America will exist as our strongest supporter when we are ready to take the stride into overseas space. We have the means of awakening this Nation in good time. There will be no Wilson arising to stir up America against us."

There may be no new Wilson to speak for America and in defense of her undying principles as he spoke for them a quarter of a century ago, but there is a new Roosevelt who has risen up to be the spokesman and the leader of the indomitable and unconquerable people of a free and mighty nation, and he is supported in that leadership by men and women of all political parties, of all religious faiths, of all colors, and all nationalities.

In the light of these prophecies and threats by Hitler and his trusted satellites, can we doubt that one of the motives of this war is economic domination of the world? Can we doubt that economic domination will be followed by political intrigue and infiltration; and that economic and political domination will produce a prodigious effort at military domination in all the countries upon which this system shall be imposed?

If Hitler wins, we shall face a hostile world. If he wins, he will control all of Europe. And if Mussolini should survive, through him, or over him, or under him, they will control all of Africa. If he wins in Europe and in Africa, we must presuppose that Japan as one of the Axis Powers, will control, if she does not occupy all of China and the entire Pacific west of Hawaii, including Malaya and the Dutch East Indies, and possibly the vast stretches of the South Pacific, including all the British possessions in that region of the world. Should the Axis Powers win, they will have a naval strength two and a half times that of the United States at present, including the Japanese, the Italian, and the German Navies, and the French Navy which they will control, leaving out of consideration the British Navy, and this strength would be still further augmented by the capture of all or any considerable part of that navy.

Can we doubt that with such a situation existing in Europe, Africa, and Asia, the American continent, including North and South America, would be the immediate objective of these aggressive dictators? Already we have seen in portions of South America the efforts of the Nazis to gain a foothold. Bolivia was compelled to declare a state of national siege a few weeks ago in order to protect herself against Nazi designs. These designs have been manifested in other parts of South America and it is to the incalculable credit of the Latin-American republics that they have joined with the United States in the concerted effort to avert such disaster as control of their economic, social and political life by so ruthless a group of gangsters as are now seeking to dominate 2,000,000,000 human beings throughout the world.

It is because of these things that the Government of the United States has been compelled to concentrate its huge efforts in the defense of our own country and the defense of the entire Western Hemisphere to which we are committed.

One hundred and eighteen years ago James Monroe announced the Monroe Doctrine, by which he stated that any effort on the part of any European nation to gain a foothold in America would be regarded by the United States as an unfriendly act. The Monroe Doctrine was at that time made applicable to Europe because it was Europe alone then which sought to recapture much of the territory lost by the South American revolutionists which established their own independence. But the same doctrine which then applied to Europe now applies to Asia with equal force. We have maintained this doctrine for nearly a century and a quarter, and we shall continue to maintain it, not only because we desire to see the republics of the Western Hemisphere maintain their own independence, but because we know that if any European or Asiatic power should now gain a foothold anywhere in the western world it would constitute an active and perpetual threat to the independence, the sovereignty, and the interests of the people of the United States.

This is the sort of world in which we find ourselves today. It is a world that threatens everything for which the United States of America has stood. It is a world that threatens all the things for which the Declaration of Independence was promulgated. It is a world that threatens a return of barbarism and paganism that millions of men and women have given their lives to destroy. It is a world in which our way and method of living are grievously involved; and it is a world in which we cannot afford pretended ignorance, no matter what the sacrifice may be to preserve our traditions.

It is because of these things that we have been compelled to increase our national debt to unprecedented figures. It is because of these things that we are now compelled feverishly to build a two-ocean Navy. It is because of these things that we are now compelled to train our young men for military service in the event such service should become imperative. It is because of these things that we have levied unprecedented taxes upon our people and must levy still further burdens upon them. It is because of these things that the American people are willing to submit themselves to whatever restrictions and restraints may be necessary in order that we may preserve this country and hand it down to the generations yet unborn free and strong and proud.

We are told that if we do these things we will surrender our democracy and our liberty. During the Revolutionary War, George Washington pleaded with Congress to give him more soldiers and greater power, although at the very time he pleaded for these things he was fighting for the establishment of liberty and democracy.

During the War between the States, Abraham Lincoln pleaded with Congress for greater power and secured it, and so did Jefferson Davis, president of the Confederacy. These powers were granted, but as soon as the war had ended they were again returned to the people.

During the Spanish-American War, President McKinley had powers conferred upon him necessary in the conduct of that war. During the World War, unprecedented powers were asked by and conferred upon President Wilson—powers that no democracy would confer upon any President except in a period of great emergency. These powers were necessary in order that the momentum of American efforts might be concentrated at the point of greatest importance. But when the war was over and peace had returned to the world, these powers were returned to the people by the Government of the United States.

We are not at war. We are not engaged in military operations. We are not fighting an invading army, nor are we sending out of this country an invading army, but we are in the midst of this war because we cannot escape its consequences. We are in the midst of it because we cannot assure ourselves that the conflagration that is burning elsewhere may not scorch our own shores and our own institutions. Under these circumstances we are compelled to confer unprecedented authority and power upon the head of our Government. We are willing to surrender some of these liberties and some of these freedoms temporarily to the Government of the United States in order that we may not be compelled to surrender them permanently to Hitler and nazi-ism.

I would rather surrender a few of our liberties for a short while in the preservation of our defense than to surrender them permanently to Hitler and his crew of nation wreckers.

We probably have not been called upon yet to make all the sacrifices which will be required of us, but the American people know how to make sacrifices when they are convinced of the necessity. A century and a half ago, 3,000,000 people fringing the Atlantic seaboard took the risks. Again, in 1812, they took the risks. In 1848 they took the risks. In 1861 to 1865 they took the risks. In 1898 they took the risks. In 1917 they took the risks. We do not want war. We abhor war. We believe and hope that our material aid to the nations now fighting aggression will be all that we need to put forth to preserve the things which are dear to America; but if, as a last resort, the American people are compelled to fight to defend their country and their freedom and their way of living, they will not prove less responsive to this call in the future than they have proven in the past. God grant that this last resort may not have to be faced, but whether it is or not, we beseech the American people to believe that their President and the Congress and their responsible Government are putting forth every possible effort with the light which God has given them to protect and preserve and perpetuate American ideals, American standards, American democracy, and American civilization.

Americans All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 25, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA EVENING WORLD-HERALD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Evening World-Herald, published at Omaha, Nebr., by a former distinguished Member of this body. The editorial is entitled "Americans All."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Omaha Evening World-Herald of August 19, 1941]

AMERICANS ALL

Republicans are American citizens, too.

Democrats and independents who are in disagreement either with the President's war policies or his methods of imposing them are American citizens, too.

These citizens pay their full share of taxes. They carry their share of the debt load. They must endure the hardships and losses incident to war priorities, price and credit limitations, dislocations of industry, and all other unpleasant features of a regimented and controlled economy. When it comes to fighting their manpower will figure in the casualty lists in full proportion to their numbers—and those numbers are very large.

These groups are represented, as it is imperative they should be, in the Congress.

Yet often—too often—when the President deems it necessary to confer with members of the House and Senate on matters of vital concern to all the people, no representatives of these groups are admitted to the conference.

On his return from the historic deep-sea conference with Prime Minister Churchill, the President decided to give to certain Congressmen an accounting of the international situation. Unquestionably that was proper. For Congress is a coordinate branch of our Government. It alone has the power to declare war. It controls the purse strings. The Executive can spend no money it does not authorize and appropriate. And if it is to exercise these duties intelligently it needs to be informed.

So Mr. Roosevelt called a few "key men" into his study to tell them, confidentially, some things he thinks they should know.

But he invited only Democrats. And, of the Democrats, he invited only such as are in agreement with him on foreign issues and affairs. Even with these, says the Associated Press report, he "continued to keep his own counsel on the broad world strategy worked out with Churchill, and the belief was he would use deeds—not words to disclose it when the time is ripe."

Probably, if this be an accurate statement, the conference did not amount to much. Probably there was little or no opportunity for a free exchange of opinions, for a serious discussion. The President was simply "telling them"—within the careful limits of his own discretion.

All the more reason, it would seem, why some unconvinced Congressman, some "unreconstructed rebel," some member of what the wise British value as "the loyal opposition," might have been permitted to be present. At the very least some one Republican—and there are a good many of them in Congress—who goes along with the President on war policies.

There is a constant plea for unity, for loyal support of our Government in an hour of great peril. But how is this to be expected unless unity is invited and met half way? Ours is still a two-party country. There is still a two-party Congress. If ever this ceased to be true we should have, under whatever name, a one-man government. Unity then might be compelled, as in Germany and Russia. But among a free people whatever degree of unity it is possible for any leader to secure must be won, earned, deserved.

If Mr. Roosevelt were not so addicted to "conferring" only with his "yes" men, so intolerant of opposing opinion, he would get along better with the country. And the country would get along better, too.

On the field of battle no "plunging cannon shot" will distinguish Republicans from Democrats.

Address by Senator Bunker at Reno, Nev.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 25, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER, OF NEVADA

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered over KOH radio station, at Reno, Nev., by the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very happy to be back in Nevada again. It is like a tonic to come home, if only for a few days, after experiencing the turmoil of Washington in these past months of such vital importance in our national life.

Since September 1939, when Hitler charged upon democracy, the civilized world has been living under a Damocles sword of armed might.

Every day a new assault is made upon civilization. Let us look back at the headlines that have marked before us reflecting the various chapters of the war. We read that Austria was commanded to join the Reich. Her Government refused, and German soldiers overwhelmed her. Then Czechoslovakia; next Poland was devastated. Then Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and finally France, possessing lands which Hitler coveted and liberties which he abhorred, fell befor the German military force. Bulgaria and Rumania were defeated. Next it was Yugoslavia's turn to be bombed into submission, and then Greece, after a courageous fight, felt the ax of the conqueror.

And for the past 3 weeks the headlines carried to us the news of Germany's war on Russia. We hold no brief for the dictatorship of Russia. We uphold only the democratic ideals of liberty and the pursuit of happiness—ideals impossible under the regime of any dictator, whether Hitler or Stalin. But it is provident that Germany has diverted a part of her war machine from the pathway, temporarily at least, of Britain. We are grateful for two reasons. One, that Hitler's partial preoccupation with Russia gives us time, badly needed time, to carry on our own program of national defense. And two, it teaches us, if it has not already been made clear, that Hitler will allow nothing to stand in the way of his goal of world domination.

Perhaps in the end Germany's invasion of Russia will work to the disadvantage of Britain. It is yet too early to tell how the pendulum will swing. In Washington, it is the belief that Germany will defeat Russia and that Hitler will have Russia's raw materials and other resources at her disposal. Hitler was driven to attack Russia by a mixture of worry and confidence. Worry over his inability to conquer Britain, the economic shortcomings of his European domain, and America's aid to Britain. Confidence in his ability to smash Russian resistance and thereby gain the resources needed to sustain a long war against the English-speaking powers. But no matter what the outcome, Germany's attack on Russia is an admission of failure. The German armies have now a glittering succession of victories on a dozen battlefields. But the final victory which loomed so close a year ago, at the time of the fall of France, is still beyond his reach. So Hitler has found it necessary to strike out once more and this time seek to draw from Soviet lands the wheat, the minerals, and the oil which the Reich desperately needs. But the price Hitler may find it necessary to pay for these supplies may prove a heavy one.

In the meantime, we must make full use of this breathing spell to further our own defense.

The United States set out on a very well-defined and, I am happy to say, realistic course. By an overwhelming vote of their representatives in Congress the American people have pledged all-out aid to Britain. I have every sympathy for the cause of England and the ideals for which she is so valiantly fighting. But the reason I favor our foreign policy is not because of my sympathy for England but rather it is because of love for my country. Hitler undoubtedly hopes that by putting himself forward in the guise of a St. George fighting the dragon of bolshevism to confuse public opinion and swing our sympathy away from Britain. Perhaps he might have had some chance for success on this score if our policy was one built on sympathy. But it is not. It is a policy built on absolute realism. It is a policy most pragmatic and practical—that of defending the United States of America. Our policy is built upon the realization that who helps England helps the United States. I reiterate that I am opposed to sending American boys to fight abroad. But I reiterate also that I favor sending to Britain every implement of warfare that we can spare without endangering our national defense. For our own defense is our single objective.

It has been said frequently that Hitler will not invade the United States. He has announced that he has no intention of invading America. But it will be remembered that after the invasion of Czechoslovakia he declared: "This is the last territorial readjustment I will seek." There were people in many European countries who believed that. Today those people live in slavery. It has become clear to us—and we need no further proof than the invasion of Russia—that Hitler's aim is world domination. We have Hitler's own word for it in Mein Kampf that his aims include the Americas, and his promises in that book are the only ones he has ever kept. Furthermore, no conqueror in history, from Xerxes of ancient Persia to the Kaiser in this century, ever stopped his conquests until he was stopped by force. Shall we sit back and try to stop Hitler at Buenos Aires and Brazil, or shall we help to stop him at the cliffs of Dover?

Thus, it becomes obvious that for our own defense the position of the United States in the present war is that of serving as arsenal for Great Britain and those who assist her. The American problem is a problem purely of production. Our purpose and our aim is to stay behind the lines, and through laws that have been passed by great majorities to supply the Allies and to supply our own defense warehouses with guns, ships, planes, and munitions. This means unity of purpose, of total effort—an effort on the part of each of us, on the part of all groups, to do everything within our power toward the goal of producing.

And we are doing a fine job of producing. As for actual production records, we are now producing some 1,600 planes per month—double the number put out last November. We are engaged in the biggest shipbuilding program ever undertaken.

But we must not become overly optimistic about these figures. We must remember that we have had to revise our schedule of plane production downward on three occasions. It is true that Germany has had from the beginning—and still has—a great superiority in bombing strength.

So it becomes apparent that while our production has increased by leaps and bounds, and while our record is one of which we can well be proud, the task before us is one of great magnitude. Given time, given unity of purpose and the spirit of sacrifice, the job ahead can be done, but, so far, we have just begun.

In our concentration on the great needs of our defense program we must ever bear in mind, and never lose sight of, the basic objective of all our effort. That objective is the protection and preservation of the freedom and the institutions of the present and future citizens of the United States

But to protect these institutions we must put our shoulder to the wheel. We must devote every possible ounce of strength to the job before us. It means sacrifice on the part of all. The surest guaranty that none of us will have to die for democracy tomorrow is that all of us will live for democracy today.

The question now on the tongues and in the hearts of every good American is, What can I do to help? The Government has provided an answer to this question for every man, woman, and child in the Nation. We can invest in democracy, invest in America, by purchasing United States defense savings bonds and stamps. These bonds are not for a few Americans, they are for all Americans. Even children can save their pennies to buy stamps exchangeable for defense savings bonds. There is no other single way in which so many people can become partners of their Government in facing this emergency. It is the hope of the collector of internal revenue, Mr Robert L. Douglass under whose leadership this campaign will go forward in Nevada, that every loyal citizen of our State will join the Nation and the President of the Nation in demonstrating anew our faith in America by purchasing savings bonds and stamps for national defense.

We in Nevada have a right to be proud of our contributions and our potential contributions to the defense program. We are a wealthy State, sound in financial structure and rich in natural resources. We have vast resources to offer to our Nation in this time of emergency—our minerals, our farm and ranch products, our vast expanses of land, especially valuable for military purposes. It has been my privilege to discuss with the President the place of Nevada in the defense program and he is cognizant of our great potentialities.

The Nation well remembers that in the Civil War it was the stores of Nevada silver and gold that saved the Union. We are proud that in this present crisis, Nevada will again come through and hold up more than her share of the burden of defense.

Not so very long ago we celebrated throughout the United States, I Am An American Day. At this time, thousands of our adopted American citizens and millions of American-born citizens affirmed their allegiance to our flag and to our country. It was well for us to reexamine then, and to reexamine often, what it means to be able to use that coveted phrase: "I am an American."

It has been said that America is God's last chance to make a world. And it is right that we should be the people chosen to carry on the spirit of democracy. The revolving wheel of destiny has made our leadership a necessity in one of the great crises of civilization.

Despite all that has been said by the Lindberghs and other administration critics, America's position in this international crisis will secure the future safety of our people. The decisions that have been made by our President and the position taken by our Government is worthy of America.

In this crisis the American people will rededicate themselves to Americanism. I have confidence in the future of America because I have confidence in the people of America. We whose Government was founded to ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, will, through mutual trust and mutual sacrifice, lead the world from this darkness into a brighter day of a nobler and finer civilization.

Radio Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 25, 1941

STATEMENT BY JIMMIE FIDLER

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, those who are at all conversant with the radio know who is Jimmie Fidler, a radio commentator of wide renown, who, with his sponsors, has recently seen fit to transfer his program from one chain to another because of what appears very obviously to be a control in some manner over radio broadcasting by the moving-picture industry. Mr. Fidler issued a statement for release on August 18, 1941, entitled "Radio Censorship Unbearable." I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Due to a policy of censorship of speech imposed by the Columbia Broadcasting Co. on me and which has proved oppressive to me, I have asked my radio sponsor (the Tayton Co., manufacturer and distributor of cosmetics) to cancel its contract, or obtain a release of its contract, with that network and permit me to carry on my program over another broadcasting system.

In accordance with this request, and with a full understanding of the difficulties with which I have been confronted in my effort to compile and deliver to the public an unbiased, frank, interesting, and constructively critical discussion of motion pictures and the industry's personnel, my sponsor has canceled its contract with C. B. S.

Consequently, my broadcast of Friday, August 15, marks the end of my association with Columbia. On the Friday following, August 22, my programs will be carried over the facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Such a drastic move, right in the middle of a new series and just as my programs have begun to establish a steady listening audience, was to my mind necessary, else it would never have been made, since it entails considerable loss of time, money, effort.

During the 6 weeks of my current series over Columbia, their censorship policy has hampered and worried me to the point that I have felt and feel that I have been denied the right of free speech. I consider the fetters that have been imposed by Columbia officials as resulting in my carrying on a program so "old ladyish" as to constitute a slap in the face of this right of free speech so long recognized as the inalienable privilege of a citizen of this country.

Despite the fact that I am a recognized motion-picture authority and critic with 21 years' experience, the Columbia Broadcasting Co. insisted that I must give a "favorable" notice (three or more bells) to all so-called "big pictures reviewed by me, and no less than two bells and favorable notice to any "B" product reviewed by me.

In other words, even though a picture was downright bad, I was not permitted to say so. If I reviewed it at all, I had to give it good bell ratings and praising reviews. In such case I chose the only other path left open; I refused to review bad films.

The only motion pictures the Columbia network would permit me to review honestly (if they deserved panning) were movies produced by independent or small companies, or in other countries. Obviously, then, Columbia was censoring me not because officials of the broadcasting chain believed my reviews biased or inaccurate but for reasons best known to themselves and at variance with a frank, unbiased review of motion pictures on my part.

Had I been willing to compromise my own honest opinion by telling listeners that pictures I deemed bad were good and had I been willing to speak only praise of the film industry, I might have continued my Columbia Broadcasting System association. But I would have moved about with a hanging head, ashamed of my own deceit.

My Hollywood column is published in well over a hundred daily and Sunday newspapers from coast to coast. These newspapers are decent, honest, fair, and American. Certainly they are not going to jeopardize their good reputations by publishing editorial matter that is dishonest, malicious, or unfair. Yet these newspapers have on many occasions published material that the Columbia Broadcasting Co., in its "righteousness," has censored "for policy reasons."

I have never made a statement on the air which was prompted by any malicious motive any more than I would do so in my column. As a motion-picture authority, I have fairly criticized certain people and customs of the studios. The criticisms have often incurred the wrath of studio executives, and I know for a fact that some heads of the film industry, unable to "take it," have gone to my sponsors and Columbia in protest and have tried to "get my job."

In my opinion, it is largely because of these studio protests that I was forced to bear such rigid censorship—a censorship that caused me to beg my sponsors for relief.

I am sending a copy of this statement to the Federal Communications Commission. It seems to me members of that Commission will be interested in Columbia's attitude concerning the rights of fair comment and free speech. Broadcasting systems are not a public utility, but they certainly must owe their public a reasonable responsibility.

It seems to me that there is a serious question whether a network discharges its public duty when it restricts a commentator who is a recognized authority, and who had been broadcasting along established lines for 7 years, so that he cannot continue to speak as an authority and as he has always spoken, but instead must submit to censor and editing of his material to a point making fair and frank comment almost impossible.

I once stated publicly: "Freedom of speech will always exist in the United States. If ever an American Hitler arises, and, by dictatorial methods, succeeds in stifling the right to speak freely, that will be a sorry day for our people; and if ever the time comes when I cannot be honest with myself, my listeners, and my readers, I will cease broadcasting and writing."

That is still my opinion.

Opposing Involvement in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 25, 1941

LETTERS FROM MOTHERS OF LOS ANGELES

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two letters from the Mothers of Los Angeles, signed by Lany Lewis Renard, chairman, one addressed to the President of the United States and the other addressed to the President of the Senate. The letters, which were flown to Washington by Miss Laura Ingalls, the noted aviatrix, oppose the entrance of the United States into war.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

To THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the Mothers of Los Angeles, solemnly ask you to remember and hold sacred the pledges you made the American people during your campaign of 1940. Those pledges clearly committed you not to take our sons to fight in foreign wars.

We, the American people, want unity; but in order to achieve this unity, the President of the United States must keep the promises which he makes.

You were elected on the promise to keep the country out of war. That promise must not be violated. Its threatened violation has already disrupted unity in America and its continued violation will create wider dissension and destroy the confidence which the people should give to the President.

At least 80 percent of the American people concur in this view.

We think it our duty to notify you that to obtain the unity which we all desire, your efforts should be confined to arming America, in the full knowledge, which should be communicated by you to the American people, that they are entirely capable of defending themselves.

We further respectfully state it is our unalterable conviction that this free land must not be committed to military alliances with other power, but shall maintain through progressive national defense, our independent destiny.

Faithfully yours,
LANY LEWIS RENARD,
Chairman, Mothers of Los Angeles.
ANNE GFELLER, *Secretary.*

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the Mothers of Los Angeles, have requested Miss Laura Ingalls to fly to Washington as our representative to deliver a letter to the President of the United States and also to the House of Representatives, together with this letter to the Senate of the United States, stating our unalterable opposition to engaging this Nation in a foreign war.

We rely upon you to keep us out of war. Under our Constitution, Congress alone has the right to declare war, and we believe it to be your solemn duty not to permit any undeclared war to be fought.

We demand that you live up to the position and power which the Constitution has conferred upon you.

We pray you not to declare war, and to stop by your authoritative action the carrying on of any undeclared war.

Faithfully yours,
LANY LEWIS RENARD,
Chairman, Mothers of Los Angeles.
ANNE GFELLER, *Secretary.*

Alleged Gag on Letter Writers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 25, 1941

ARTICLE FROM SPOKESMAN-REVIEW

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Letter Writers' Gag Is Charged," appearing in the Spokesman-Review, of Spokane, Wash., under date of August 21.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Spokesman-Review, of Spokane, Wash., August 21, 1941]

LETTER WRITER'S GAG IS CHARGED—SPOKANE MAN SENDS PRESIDENT CRITICISM AND HAS SECRET SERVICE MAN CALL

Writing letters to the editor is a harmless diversion which gives readers an opportunity to blow off steam and furnishes entertainment and possibly edification to other readers. But when writers attack the President of the United States—particularly if they send him copies of their letters to the editor—they may find themselves waited upon by a representative of the United States Secret Service. Part of their duties is to safeguard the President from attacks of all kinds.

James A. Tozeland, E3129 Sixteenth, recently found this out. Many of his letters have appeared in the Spokesman-Review Forum on many subjects over several years. He sent a recent letter to the White House. In it he said, among other things:

RAPS AMERICAN TORIES

"What right has this madman (President Roosevelt) to claim he has a united people behind him in such a traitorous attack on democracy? Will this American Tory be permitted to give America back to Tory England and send American youth to rot in jungle slaughter pens defending British pound sterling? * * * Where do English or American Tories get the authority to claim that their total war has the sanction of Christianity? Only hypocrites or madmen claim that Christianity can be saved by acts of total war, deeds which are too vicious and vile for beasts of the jungle, where greed is a virtue. This is indeed a national emergency, a testing time to see if Americans are dumb, driven cattle or freemen worthy to have a true democracy to live in. Make no mistake, it takes more courage to defy a dictator at home than one across the sea."

SECRET SERVICE CALL

The receipt of this letter at Washington brought a Secret Service man to the door of the Tozeland home. Mr. Tozeland explains it:

"The Secret Service man asked me to identify it as my work. He also had a post card I had addressed to the President. I have been sending a great many of these cards with clippings pasted on them with comments by me.

"If I had a guilty conscience, I would be scared stiff by a visit from a Secret Service agent. My record, evidence of which may be found in the forum, is proof I am opposed to the use of force to settle anything.

"The Secret Service agent told me every letter of a threatening or obscene nature addressed to the President is turned over to them. I pointed to my post card and said, 'Is there anything threatening in that?' He grinned and replied 'To tell the truth, I haven't read it.' So he proceeded to read it. He admitted he could find nothing of that nature in it.

"I do not know what their definition of obscene is. They—the warmongers—act as if the truth is obscene and not to be considered by the public."

WRITES PRESIDENT AGAIN

Mr. Tozeland wrote the President again after the Secret Service man interviewed him, protesting against any attempt to curtail free speech. In his second letter, Mr. Tozeland wrote the President as follows:

"I have no complaint to make against the man from the Secret Service who was sent to investigate me because I have been writing post cards to you objecting to the unconstitutional, provocative acts of war by your administration in defense of the British pound sterling. However, I consider his last question most significant.

"He asked me if I intended to continue writing such cards. I hope I made it plain to him that I consider the exercise of free speech most essential in times of crisis and that if your administration succeeds in creating an incident to push America into undeclared war against the will of the people, you will find there are still free men who are prepared to face a firing squad if necessary in defiance of those dictators who are most dangerous to democracy, namely, the home-grown kind."

CHARGES INTIMIDATION

In a note to the Spokesman-Review, Mr. Tozeland adds:

"If there was anything unlawful in what I write, they would not hesitate to send me up for trial. It is quite clear they are trying to intimidate those of us who are outspoken in our criticism of warmongers."

America's State of Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 25, 1941

ARTICLES FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several articles dealing with America's state of preparedness, published in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of August 20, 1941]

GUNS FOR SOLDIERS

An officer at Fort Meade pointed at 29 dummy antitank guns lined up in a row.

"Look at them," he beamed. "They look almost like the real thing. We called in all the welders in the outfit and went to work and made them ourselves."

The officer noted the cynical smiles that greeted his enthusiasm.

"We've got to do something to keep the boys' chins up," he concluded apologetically.

This incident is being duplicated every day in practically every training camp in the United States.

American soldiers simply haven't got the guns, the tanks, the planes, the equipment to make them thoroughly trained combat troops.

No official in Washington denies this condition. From every source the answer is the same: Sufficient time has not elapsed for quantity production. Plants are being built. Tools are being made. Plans are being changed and expanded.

Army and Government officials proudly point to the accomplishments of the past year. They call attention to the miles of cantonments, to a million and a half men in uniform, to hundreds of acres of munitions plants building.

But every current production chart today gives the lie to optimism over the progress of national defense.

There are leaders no man can call defeatists, who say that unless America throws herself into this picture as only America can, this country faces a defense Dunkerque.

They say that if this Nation is lagging now, the arms deficit next year, when the program is to be expanded to staggering proportions, will be appalling.

They say there is no coordinated plan and no man with the authority to execute it; that envisions the American defense and domestic scene as an entity. In discussing this matter, practically every official in Washington concludes by pointing to reasons outside his own sphere of influence.

They say that, too often, the familiar chant, "In September we will have; in December we will have; in January we will have" is whistling in the dark.

They say that aid to Britain and the lend-lease bill cannot be blamed for present deficiencies. Much so-called "aid to Britain," they say, coming from America today, originates in plants in this country, paid for by England with English money, before the lend-lease bill was drawn.

They have considerable sympathy for the veteran sergeant who told a Post reporter: "The whole thing smells of France. Every politician after his bit; every brass hat looking for more red tape; every labor leader getting his cut; everybody making something, after easy money; the newspapers saying everything is lovely; and all the soldier knows is that he is in for the duration; that he hasn't got the stuff and that, in the end, he will hold the bag. When in hell are they going to get going and give us some guns? You can't lick Hitler with Boy Scouts."

There is enough truth in this colorful and exaggerated outburst to make any patriotic citizen pause.

With all due credit to the thousands of able, experienced men in the service and the allied branches of defense, who are working day and night for a properly prepared America, the Post has been exploring the detours on the defense road.

There are several very rocky detours.

The Post hopes that they can be blasted out so our soldiers may have guns and planes and tanks in an unending stream. Miracles will be required in some cases. But America is capable of miracles.

One thing is certain: When history appraises our effort to protect this hemisphere, the desolate, blood-chilling phrase "too little and too late" must not appear.

Soldiers must have guns.

[From the Washington Post of August 21, 1941]

GUNS FOR SOLDIERS—WE OUTPRODUCE THE WORLD IN GLITTERING LUXURY GADGETS

"If we get the spirit, I don't see anybody on God's earth that can outproduce the United States of America."

These were the words, yesterday, of William S. Knudsen, Director General of the O. P. M. He referred to the production of weapons for defense.

The last 14 months prove Knudsen partially correct. We have outproduced the world—but not in armaments. Instead, we have turned out more glittering luxury gadgets than this comfort-mad Nation has ever seen.

America needs guns. In answer, it has been given automobiles—beautiful things and 20 percent more than any year since 1929.

America needs planes. In answer, an industrial cornucopia has poured out a deluge of washing machines, vacuum cleaners, air-conditioning equipment, electric refrigerators, and radios.

If these handsome objects are not quite like guns and planes, they at least have used up the same raw materials.

America needs munitions and ships. In answer, it has a spending boom with an appetite for copper, steel, zinc, and brass every whit as rapacious as the defense industry.

To get the guns and planes and munitions, America needed military planners to prepare the buying list; industrial experts to mobilize the world's greatest, most modern, most efficient factory; a central economic body to secure raw materials, machines, labor, management.

Instead, America got military planners who started to prepare in terms of a cavalry skirmish on the Mexican border; industrial experts who were looking out the window on the job of getting supplies and complacently watching industry mobilize itself for civilian production, not guns; a military and economic high command which consistently shot behind a moving target, failing to sketch the job to be done, failing to delegate the authority to do it.

EACH BLAMES THE OTHER

In this picture, the White House, the Army, and the Office of Production Management (along with its predecessor, the National Defense Advisory Commission) have been like a bad outfield.

The ball was a high fly.

Each fielder screamed, "Yours."

The ball fell between them.

Ever since, each has been blaming the other.

The Army declares it was never told what sort of a war to prepare for, whether to defend the United States, to defend the Western Hemisphere, or to lick Hitler.

The O. P. M. declares it never had authority to challenge the puny Army estimates of materials needed, or to step up the dribbling, piecemeal pace of appropriation requests; that it had equally little authority to force the Army to place its contracts with an eye for future needs.

The rest of the administration, voicing private White House sentiment, declares that anyone with eyes in his head could see the huge extent of the job; that there was no mistaking the task of O. P. M.; that O. P. M. could have had all the authority it wanted had it ever asked for it.

WE'LL BE LAGGING NEXT YEAR

The result:

Confidential figures, which cannot be disclosed in detail, show, in general, that not only has production to date been woefully inadequate but that 1 year from now—2 years after the defense program was launched—production of military planes, artillery, and tanks will be less than one-half of the amount required for adequate defense and real aid to Britain.

Today, 14 months after the program began, the great reservoir of military production facilities—the durable goods industries, the pride of American civilization—has scarcely been tapped. Its wheels are turning busily, busier than at any time since 1929, but not sufficiently on guns, planes, or tanks.

As of the 1st of June, this year, the size of the defense program, as measured in appropriations, was almost $50,000,000,000.

Yet of this amount, only twenty-eight billions, or less than 58 percent, had been placed under contract by that date. The supplies for which the remaining twenty-two billions are to be spent had not even been ordered.

On top of this, another $30,000,000,000 will soon be appropriated for defense purposes.

Of airplane appropriations of $11,728,000,000, contracts have been issued for only $6,829,000,000.

Of appropriations for ordnance and combat vehicles, totaling $8,225,000,000, not quite five billions have been contracted for.

Of $5,880,000,000 appropriations for new industrial facilities, which themselves take 1 or 2 years to build before they can produce the items for a shooting war, contracts have been issued for less than half the amount.

CRUCIAL SHORTAGES ALREADY

The figures above refer only to contracts—contracts for deliveries expected some time in the future. Actual deliveries are military secrets and may not be printed.

This is just as well. They do not make happy reading.

With military production a full year away from the date of peak rate of output, there are already crucial shortages in raw materials. There is barely enough nickel and aluminum for military needs, and none at all for the rest of American industry. There is a deficiency in magnesium which utterly precludes the production of certain armament items in the amount desired. The greatest difficulty is being experienced in getting steel plate for ships—naval and merchant marine—and for railroad freight cars, which are necessary if another inevitable shortage, that of transportation, is to be alleviated, much less averted.

And if—as is by no means improbable—commerce ends with the Orient and East Indies, the situation in tin, rubber, manganese, chromite, tungsten, manila fiber, and mica, to name only a few of the items of which inadequate stock piles have been accumulated, will be equally serious.

What is the answer?

The answer is that there are a thousand answers. It simply depends on with whom you talk. There are a thousand suave, passionately earnest good answers. But, paradoxically, most of them are bad.

The truth seems to be that our ball club needs a Jimmy Dykes—a tough, battling, two-fisted guy from across the tracks who will be thrown out of the game now and then for protesting too strenuously, but who, in the game of getting guns for soldiers, will win—come hell or high water.

[From the Washington Post of August 22, 1941]

GUNS FOR SOLDIERS—THEY TRIED TO PUT MUSCLE ON UNITED STATES BUT NOT LOSE FAT

With superb disregard of the facts of economics, the President, the National Defense Advisory Commission, and its successor, the Office of Production Management, attempted to pile a thirty of forty billion dollar annual

defense load on top of a phenomenal, prosperity peacetime production load of about $100,000,000,000.

In effect, the defense program administrators said, not "business as usual," but "better business than ever before, plus 40 percent additional defense business."

This Nation has not done it.

No nation has ever done it.

Actually, the second half of the program—the defense half—has failed to jell. We are not spending for defense at the rate of three or four billions a month, as we must to achieve real armament production to match the Axis. Instead, we are spending less than $1,000,000,000. And even this rate was not achieved until June and July, more than a year after we started.

DEPRESSION APPEARS AMID THE BOOM

Second, although there has been, indeed, much better civilian business than ever before, a considerable segment of it is about to come to a sickening halt—a depression in the midst of a boom—with thousands of factories made idle, millions of men out of work.

This impending depression is the result of a slight oversight. The N. D. A. C.-O. P. M. neglected to provide sufficient raw materials for both a $100,000,000,000 civilian production and a defense program of even small proportions—at present only $9,000,000,000.

The fact that 5,000 or 6,000 shut-down factories and one or two million jobless men will not be immediately put to work to step up a lagging defense output is the result of another slight oversight. The N. D. A. C.-O. P. M. neglected to plan for the conversion of those factories and men to armament work.

The failure to convert—the failure to even plan for conversion—is basic.

It was admitted as late as Wednesday by William S. Knudsen, O. P. M. Director General, who told a press conference that the impending curtailment of auto production was dictated by a shortage in raw materials and not by necessity to convert the factories and tools to defense purposes.

WHICH EXPLAINS SOME OTHER FAILURES

It underlines and explains—but in no way excuses—the now obvious bogging down of defense production.

It makes understandable a whole series of failures to be discussed at more length in subsequent articles in this series—failure to build stock piles, failure to expand raw-material production, failure to force three-shift operations, failure to subcontract, failure to spread orders, failure to use the full production potentialities of the Nation, failure to control strikes, failure to achieve in fact "all out" defense production.

The tone was set at the White House, which for month after month, through a slight oversight, failed to face reality and let the Nation know that the defense program was going to hurt. It should be remembered that the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of production, as well as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

The tone was not challenged by N. D. A. C.-O. P. M. Instead it was embraced with fervor It was a convenient path of least resistance; a happy excuse for avoiding an unpleasant chore, namely telling American industry it would have to quit its enormously profitable production of autos, zippers, gadgets, and thingumbobs and go to work for Uncle Sam.

Instead of calling on these existing great factories to convert to military production, the defense agencies busily helped industry build new plants and acquire new machine tools.

These new plants and new tools were relied on almost exclusively to produce the great armament stores that are needed, while most of the already existing ones happily went on making gadgets.

ONLY HEAVY INDUSTRY CAN DO THE JOB

There were two deficiencies in this reliance on new and projected plants, both of them all too visible now in terms of actual results. First, it takes time to build a new plant, and still more time to build new machine tools.

Second, to turn out thirty or forty billions of dollars' worth of military material, a heavy industry must be created even larger than America's present civilian heavy industry.

To duplicate—even to exceed—what America has been building since the Civil War is a sizable chore—too sizable to be done in a year or two or even three. But the production happens to be needed in a year or two, or at most three.

This is not to say that no new plants should have been built. Obviously, an enormous number of new factories and a still larger number of new machine tools were necessary. An airplane cannot be assembled except in a plant with vast floor space. A candy factory cannot be made over into a powder plant.

But to start the great bulk of defense production from scratch, in new plants, with new tools, was to do things the long way when time was desperately short, the insufficient way when volume was to count.

Scores of the plants have been built and perhaps three quarters of a billion dollars' worth of new machine tools have been constructed. If they, and the others still building, were adequate for America's defense needs, there would be no purpose in complaining. America could kiss off the lost 12 months, and we could thank our lucky stars that England and Russia are giving us the grace period, and forget it.

But these plants, as delivery expectancy schedules show—are not adequate, not if we are to give Germany's foes what they need this year, next year, or even the year after that, much less if we ourselves are to fight.

What is adequate, obviously, is nothing less than the great existing bulk of America's heavy goods industries. That great bulk in the main is still at work on civilian items. Even worse, the very plans for its conversion to armament production are only now beginning, 14 months late.

Why?

The military services and the O. P. M. had two answers.

The first was that the conversion wasn't necessary; that the new facilities planned, plus the expansion of other factories, were adequate to meet our defense needs.

The second answer was that conversion wasn't possible. The great mass of the durable-goods industries, it was argued, did not have the managerial skill, the trained labor, the adaptable plants or machine tools to undertake the incredibly difficult and demanding defense work.

This second answer, because it has been so widely argued, because it has become the subject of so much controversy, demands separate discussion and will be the subject of a future article.

Meantime, at the risk of laboring a point made obvious by the visible lack of production to date, the first answer—that new production facilities will be adequate—is worth further examination.

Is expected production of about half of our defense requirements by 1 year from now, adequate?

More important, are those defense requirements themselves adequate?

Are not the sights still set too low?

Consider for a moment that in 6 weeks of fighting the Russians admit losing 5,000 tanks, 4,000 planes, and 7,000 pieces of field artillery. Actual losses, it can be assumed, are much higher.

Set this against a hoped-for British invasion of Germany in 1943.

Assume Russia is still holding an army at the Urals, that England has rearmed manfully.

The invasion campaign would probably be 30 weeks long, a full summer. Multiplying the Russian losses to fit this period, the conclusion is reached that the anti-Axis invaders must expect to lose 25,000 tanks, 20,000 planes, 35,000 pieces of artillery.

Although the figures are secret, there is strong ground for belief that our armament deliveries by 1943 would not permit such a struggle—particularly in face of a probable conflict at the same time or before with Japan.

Consider the problem of adequacy from another angle. Machine tools are the key to armament production. The machine-tool building industry is running at high speed. In the absence of concerted effort to bring other potential machine-tool makers into the picture—captive machine shops in every durable goods industry, back-alley shops, small metal-working plants—O. P. M. must believe that the machine-tool builders alone can do the job.

Or was this also a slight oversight?

Because:

As of midsummer, the machine-tool industry had between five hundred and six hundred million dollars of unfilled orders, a backlog that will take from 6 to 8 months to saw through.

To be placed, in addition, are orders for about $300,000,000 more tools for the bomber program, and perhaps $400,000,000 for other tools, adding another 9 or 10 months to the backlog.

Not even thought about yet are still further machine-tool orders deriving from pending military appropriations of $10,000,000,000.

Still another appropriation of $10,000,000,000, more or less—the new lease-lend bill—is under consideration. A great volume of the armaments to be bought with these funds must be made with new machine tools.

Adolf Hitler has stated repeatedly that America cannot produce enough, nor in time, to have any effect on the war's outcome.

He was not talking about two-tone sedans with fluid drive and white-wall tires.

He was talking about guns—on planes, on tanks, on battleships, and in the hands of soldiers.

It's Still Far Too Little

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 25, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of August 23, 1941:

[From the Washington Daily News of August 23, 1941]

IT'S STILL FAR TOO LITTLE

President Roosevelt has now challenged some of the dismal figures on defense production that Senator BYRD, of Virginia, recited the other day.

We are glad to hear from such an authority that the situation is not quite so bad as Mr. BYRD had been given to believe. Still the

President's statistics won't make many Americans feels like throwing out their chests.

He concedes that the production of military planes only held steady in May, June, July, due to changing designs Including training planes, the monthly figure was below 1,500. And this, of course, was not only for the Army, Navy and Marine Corps; not only for our mainland defenses plus Panama, plus Puerto Rico, plus Alaska, plus the Philippines, plus Guam, plus Hawaii, plus Iceland, plus Greenland, plus the leaseholds on British possessions in the Atlantic and Caribbean; but also for England, for the British forces in Africa, and the Middle East, for Singapore and Java and Sumatra and Australia, for Russia and China. At 1,500 a month—including trainers—the arsenal of democracy has hardly made a beginning toward meeting the enormous demands upon it.

The same thing is true in other categories — antiaircraft guns, antitank guns, mortars, tanks. The President's figures are bigger than Mr. BYRD's and his forecasts for increased output in the next few months are encouraging. If we were arming only ourselves, the prospect might be considered at least hopeful. But that is not the case. We are undertaking to deal out weapons for every continent on the globe. And the raw fact is that we have not got going fast enough. That is not the fault of any one man; but in the distribution of the blame Mr Roosevelt can hardly escape a share, especially in the light of his persistent refusal to name an over-all boss of defense production with the vision and authority to get things done much faster and bigger than they are being done.

Regardless of the inaccuracy which the President attributes to some of Senator BYRD's statistics, we still think that the Senator—who has been a faithful supporter of aid to England and of other foreign policies of the President—was dead right when he said:

"In my judgment, it would be an act of utter folly to become a voluntary shooting participant in the European conflict in our present state of unpreparedness."

We suspect that the President agrees with that, in spite of his recent avoidance of the subject.

"Before we fight, face the facts."

Pulp Timber in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 25, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE KETCHIKAN (ALASKA) DAILY CHRONICLE

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, because the subject is of such importance, I offer for incorporation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an informative and well-written editorial taken from the Ketchikan Daily Chronicle, of Ketchikan, Alaska, able Roy C. Anderson, editor, pointing out the availability of newsprint now in much demand

Careful investigation by Forest Service officials reveals that Alaska can furnish at least 1,000,000 tons of newsprint, on a sustained-yield basis, in perpetuity. It would be to the advantage of the Nation, as well as to the advantage of the Territory of Alaska, if this source of renewable wealth were brought into use. At present prices the output of the Alaska forests would yield an annual $50,000,000 to be continued without any limit in time.

The editorial follows:

[From the Ketchikan (Alaska) Daily Chronicle of August 15, 1941]

NEWSPRINT MILLS

Recently we brought up the matter of a can factory for Ketchikan Its need is demonstrated forcibly by the present acute shortage in both cans and shipping space for them out of Seattle. There is no good reason, we believe, why there shouldn't be a can factory here for the good of Alaska, the good of the can companies themselves, the good of the salmon industry.

Those of you with not so long memories still will remember that a can factory was definitely announced for Ketchikan little more than a decade ago

And if you remember that you will remember also that a newsprint mill was definitely promised for Ketchikan, too, and another for Juneau. In fact, the newsprint mills were even farther along than the can factory. Los Angeles and San Francisco interests spent thousands and thousands of dollars on surveys They had everything ready to go, along with assurance of a mill in operation by about 1932, when old man depression knocked down the newsprint price and frightened capital away.

Then for a while nobody wanted newsprint. It tumbled from about $75 a ton to $40 a ton. Mills operated only at partial capacity. Nobody wanted a newsprint mill, and nobody would talk of one for Alaska.

Now the price has crept back up to $50 a ton. But even at that price those approached with respect to building a newsprint mill in Alaska have pointed to (1) plenty of newsprint capacity in existing mills, (2) high taxes, (3) lack of capital

There are still high taxes, and they're going higher. But the bogey of overcapacity is now proved a myth. There is need for more newsprint mills, and their very need would mean there would be no lack of capital to establish them

We base our belief of the need for more mills partly on what we read; more emphatically on our own experience.

A few weeks ago the United States mill from which we have been buying newsprint informed us that it could no longer guarantee delivery of even the comparatively small need we have for newsprint. This mill also, in view of its need for all its products to supply previous contracts, emphasized its desire to get rid of our business by boosting the price f. o. b. Seattle.

Simultaneously, we were informed from Seattle that other United States mills had already begun contracting with some Canadian mills that had a little tonnage to spare. The United States mills had to buy up the Canadian surplus in order to supply contracts entered into by the United States mills—in other words, capacity is not great enough to meet the demand.

Of course, now it may be a little late. The horse is stolen. Defense needs mean that the matter of getting machinery for new newsprint mills would be a stupendous job. In normal times it would take 1½ or 2 years. Now it might take 10. Building costs are up. Taxes are up.

Nevertheless, if the need goes up apace it may be that someone will remember again that Alaska can supply a quarter of the United States newsprint need in perpetuity.

And, of course, Alaska would benefit tremendously. As the Juneau Empire pointed out recently, "Paper mills operating to capacity in the Ketchikan and Admiralty Island sections would find some 3,000 men at work. Loggers, tugboat men, pulp and paper makers—they would be permanent, year-round Alaska residents, drawing weekly pay checks that would be spent in Alaska."

Address of Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of the British Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 25, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS FROM ENGLAND

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I insert in the RECORD herewith the address of Winston Churchill. Prime Minister of the British Empire, delivered yesterday to the world over the radio. It graphically describes his impressions of the historic conference which he recently held with President Roosevelt in the North Atlantic. That was one of the most important meetings ever held between the heads of two great nations in the history of the world, and I feel that it should be preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with the statement of President Roosevelt, as a permanent historical document, as follows:

I thought you would like me to tell you something about the voyage which I made across the ocean to meet our great friend, the President of the United States.

Exactly where we met is a secret, but I don't think I shall be indiscreet if I go so far as to say that it was somewhere in the Atlantic. In a spacious, landlocked bay which reminded me of the west coast of Scotland, powerful American warships, protected by strong flotillas and far-ranging aircraft, awaited our arrival and, as it were, stretched out a hand to help us in.

Our party arrived in the newest, or almost the newest, British battleship, the *Prince of Wales*, with a modest escort of British and Canadian destroyers. And there for 3 days I spent my time in company, and I think I may say in comradeship, with Mr. Roosevelt, while all the time the Chiefs of the Staff and naval and military commanders, both of the British Empire and of the United States, sat together in continual council.

President Roosevelt is the thrice-chosen head of the most powerful state and community in the world. I am the servant of King and Parliament, at present charged with the principal direction of our affairs in these fateful times. And it is my duty also to make sure, as I have made sure, that anything I say or do in the exercise of my office is approved and sustained by the whole British Commonwealth of Nations. Therefore, this meeting was bound to be important because of the enormous forces, at present only partially mobilized but steadily mobilizing, which are at the dispcsal of these two major groupings of the human family, the British Empire and the United States, who, fortunately for the progress of mankind, happened to speak the same language and very largely think the same thoughts, or anyhow, think a lot of the same thoughts.

MEETING WAS SYMBOLIC

The meeting was, therefore, symbolic. That is its prime importance. It symbolizes in a form and manner which everyone can understand in every land and in every clime the deep underlying unities which stir and, at decisive moments, rule the English-speaking peoples throughout the world.

Would it be presumptuous for me to say that it symbolizes something even more majestic, namely, the marshaling of the good forces of the world against the evil forces which are now so formidable and triumphant and which have cast their cruel spell over the whole of Europe and a large part of Asia.

This was a meeting which marks forever in the pages of history the taking up by the English-speaking nations, amid all this peril, tumult, and confusion, of the guidance of the fortunes of the broad toiling masses in all the continents, and our loyal effort, without any clog of selfish interest, to lead them forward out of the miseries into which they have enplunged, back to the broad highroad of freedom and justice. This is the highest honor and the most glorious opportunity which could ever have come to any branch of the human race.

When one beholds how many currents of extraordinary and terrible events have flowed together to make this harmony, even the most skeptical person must have the feeling that we all have the chance to play our part and do our duty in some great design, the end of which no mortal can foresee. Awful and horrible things I have seen in these days.

BARBARISM PLUS SCIENCE

The whole of Europe has been wrecked and trampled down by the mechanical weapons and barbaric fury of the Nazis. The most deadly instruments of war science have been joined to the extreme refinements of treachery and the most brutal exhibitions of ruthlessness and thus have formed a combine of aggression, the like of which has never been known, before which the rights, the traditions, the characteristics, and the structure of many ancient, honored states and peoples have been laid prostrate and are now ground down under the heel and terror of a monster.

The Austrians, the Czechs, the Poles, the Norwegians, the Danes, the Belgians, the Dutch, the Greeks, the Croats, and the Serbs, above all, the great French Nation, have been stunned and pinioned. Italy, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria have bought a shameful respite by becoming the jackals of the tiger. But their situation is very little different and will presently be indistinguishable from that of his victims. Sweden, Spain and Turkey stand appalled, wondering which will be struck down next. Here, then, is the vast pit into which all the most famous states and races of Europe have been flung and from which, unaided, they can never climb.

But all this did not satiate Adolf Hitler. He made a treaty of nonaggression with Soviet Russia, just as he made one with Turkey, in order to keep them quiet until he was ready to attack them.

And then, 9 weeks ago today, without a vestige of provocation, he hurled millions of soldiers with all their apparatus upon the neighbor he had called his friend, with the avowed object of destroying Russia and tearing her in pieces.

This frightful business is now unfolding day by day before our eyes. Here is a devil who, in a mere spasm of his pride and lust for domination, can condemn two or three millions, perhaps it may be many more, of human beings to speedy and violent death. Let Russia be blotted out. Let Russia be destroyed. Order the armies to advance. Such were his decrees. Accordingly, from the Arctic Ocean to the Black Sea, six or seven millions of soldiers are locked in mortal struggle.

RUSSIA NOT SO EASY

Ah, but this time it was not so easy. This time it was not all one way. The Russian Armies and all the peoples of the Russian Republic have rallied to the defense of their hearths and homes. For the first time Nazi blood has flowed in a fearful flood. Certainly a million and a half, perhaps two millions of Nazi cannon-fodder, have bit the dust of the endless plains of Russia. The tremendous battle rages along nearly 2,000 miles of front. The Russians fight with magnificient devotion. Not only that, our generals who have visited the Russian front line report with admiration the efficiency of their military organization and the excellence of their equipment.

The aggressor is surprised, startled, staggered. For the first time in his experience mass murder has become unprofitable. He retaliates by the most frightful cruelties. As his armies advance, whole districts are being exterminated. Scores of thousands, literally scores of thousands of executions in cold blood are being perpetrated by the German police troops upon the Russian patriots who defend their native soil. Since the Mongol invasions of Europe in the sixteenth century there has never been methodical, merciless butchery on such a scale or approaching such a scale. And, this is but the beginning. Famine and pestilence have yet to follow in the bloody ruts of Hitler's tanks.

We are in the presence of a crime without a name.

But Europe is not the only continent to be tormented and devastated by aggression. For 5 long years the Japanese military factions, seeking to emulate the style of Hitler and Mussolini, taking all their posturing as if it were a new European revelation have been invading and harrying the 500,000,000 inhabitants of China. Japanese armies have been wandering about that vast land in futile excursions, carrying with them carnage, ruin, and corruption, and calling it the Chinese incident. Now they stretch a grasping hand into the southern seas of China. They snatch Indochina from the wretched Vichy French. They menace by their movements Siam, menace Singapore, the British link with Australasia, and menace the Philippine Islands under the protection of the United States.

JAPAN MUST BE HALTED

It is certain that this has got to stop. Every effort will be made to secure a peaceful settlement. The United States are laboring with infinite patience to arrive at a fair and amicable settlement which will give Japan the utmost reassurance for her legitimate interests. We earnestly hope these negotiations will succeed. But this I must say: That if these hopes should fail, we shall, of course, range ourselves unhesitatingly at the side of the United States.

And thus we come back to the quiet bay, somewhere in the Atlantic, where misty sunshine plays on great ships which carry the White Ensign or the Stars and Stripes.

We had the idea when we met there, the President and I, that without attempting to draw final and formal peace aims or war aims, it was necessary to give all peoples, and especially the oppressed and conquered peoples, a simple, rough-and-ready wartime statement of the goal toward which the British Commonwealth and the United States mean to make their way and thus make a way for others to march with them on a road which will certainly be painful and may be long.

There are, however, two distinct and marked differences in this joint declaration from the attitude adopted by the Allies during the latter part of the last war, and no one should overlook them.

The United States and Great Britain do not now assume that there will never be any more war again. On the contrary, we intend to take ample precaution to prevent its renewal in any period we can foresee by effectively disarming the guilty nations while remaining suitably protected ourselves.

The second difference is this: That instead of trying to ruin German trade by all kinds of additional trade barriers and bindrances, as was the mood of 1917, we have definitely adopted the view that it is not in the interests of the world and of our two countries that any large nation should be unprosperous or shut out from the means of making a decent living for itself and its people by its industry and enterprise.

FAR-REACHING CHANGES

These are far-reaching changes of principle upon which all countries should ponder.

Above all, it was necessary to give hope and the assurance of final victory to those many scores of millions of men and women who are battling for life and freedom or who are already bent down under the Nazi yoke.

Hitler and his confederates have for some time past been adjuring and beseeching the populations whom they have wronged and injured to bow to their fate, to resign themselves to their servitude, and, for the sake of some mitigation and indulgences, to collaborate—that is the word—in what is called the new order in Europe.

What is this new order which they seek to fasten first upon Europe and, if possible—for their ambitions are boundless—upon all the continents of the globe? It is the rule of the Herrenvolk—the master race—who are to put an end to democracy, to parliaments, to the fundamental freedoms and decencies of ordinary men and women, to the historic rights of nations, and give them in exchange the iron rule of Prussia, the universal goose-step and the strict, efficient discipline, enforced upon the working classes by the political police, with the German concentration camps and firing parties, now so busy in a dozen lands, always handy in the background. There is the new order.

Napoleon in his glory and genius spread his empire far and wide. There was a time when only the snows of Russia and the white cliffs of Dover, with their guardian fleets, stood between him and the dominion of the world. Napoleon's armies had a theme. They carried with them the surges of the French Revolution—liberty, equality, and fraternity. That was the cry. There was a sweeping away of out-worn, medieval systems and aristocratic privilege. There was the land for the people, a new code of law. Nevertheless, Napoleon's empire vanished like a dream.

But Hitler—Hitler has no theme, naught but mania, appetite, and exploitation. He has, however, weapons and machinery for grinding down and for holding down conquered countries which are the product, the sadly perverted product, of modern science.

HOPE FOR THE CONQUERED

The ordeals, therefore, of the conquered peoples will be hard. We must give them hope. We must give them the conviction that their sufferings and their resistances will not be in vain. The tunnel may be dark and long, but at the end there is light. That is the symbolism and that is the message of the Atlantic meeting.

Do not despair, brave Norwegians; your land shall be cleansed not only from the invader but from the filthy Quislings who are his tools.

Be strong in your souls, Czechs; your independence shall be restored.

Poles, the heroism of your people, standing up to cruel oppressors, the courage of your soldiers, sailors, and airmen shall not be forgotten. Your country shall live again and resume its rightful part in the new organization of Europe.

Lift up your heads, gallant Frenchmen. Not all the infamies of Darlan and of Laval shall stand between you and the restoration of your birthright.

Stout-hearted Dutch, Belgians, Luxemburgers, tormented, mishandled, shamefully cast away peoples of Yugoslavia, glorious Greece, now subjected to the crowning insult of the rule of the Italian jackanapes, yield not an inch. Keep your souls clean from all contact with the Nazis. Make them feel, even in their fleeting hour of brutish triumph, that they are the moral outcasts of mankind. Help is coming. Mighty forces are arming in your behalf. Have faith, have hope, deliverance is sure.

There is the signal which we have flashed across the waters and if it reaches the hearts of those to whom it is sent they will endure with fortitude and tenacity their present misfortune in the sure faith that they, too, are still serving the common cause and that our efforts will not be in vain.

You will, perhaps, have noticed that the President of the United States and the British representative, in what is aptly called the Atlantic charter, have jointly pledged their countries to the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny. That is a solemn and grave undertaking. It must be made good. It will be made good. And, of course, many practical arrangements to fulfill that purpose have been and are being organized and set in motion.

"HOW NEAR IS UNITED STATES TO WAR?"

The question has been asked: "How near is the United States to war?" There is certainly one man who knows the answer to that question. If Hitler has not yet declared war upon the United States, it is surely not out of his love for American institutions. It is certainly not because he could not find a pretext. He has murdered half a dozen countries for far less. Fear—fear of immediately redoubling the tremendous energies now being employed against him is, no doubt, the restraining influence. But the real reason is, I am sure, to be found in the method to which he has so faithfully adhered and by which he has gained so much.

What is that method? It is a very simple method. One by one—that is his plan. That is his guiding rule. That is the trick by which he has enslaved so large a portion of the world.

Three and a half years ago I appealed to my fellow countrymen to take the lead in weaving together a strong defensive union within the principles of the League of Nations, a union of all the countries who felt themselves in ever-growing danger. But none would listen. All stood idle while Germany rearmed.

ONE BY ONE

Czechoslovakia was subjugated. A French Government deserted their faithful ally and broke a plighted word in that ally's hour of need. Russia was cajoled and deceived into a kind of neutrality or partnership while the French Army was being annihilated. The Low Countries and the Scandinavian countries, acting with France and Great Britain in good time even after the war had begun, might have altered its course and would have had, at any rate, a fighting chance. The Balkan states had only to stand together to save themselves from the ruin by which they are now engulfed. But, one by one, they were undermined and overwhelmed. Never was the career of crime made more smooth.

Now Hitler is striking at Russia with all his might, well knowing the difficulties of geography which stand between Russia and the aid which the western democracies are trying to bring. We shall strive our utmost to overcome all difficulties and to bring this aid. We have arranged for a conference in Moscow between the United States, British, and Russian authorities to settle the whole plan. No barrier must stand in the way. But why is Hitler striking at Russia and inflicting this suffering on himself, or rather making his soldiers suffer this frightful slaughter?

It is with the declared object of turning his whole force upon the British Islands and, if he can succeed in beating the life and strength out of us, which is not so easy, then is the moment when he will settle his account—and it is already a long one—with the people of the United States and generally with the Western Hemisphere.

One by one—there is the process. There is the simple dismal plan which has served Hitler so well. It needs but one final successful application to make him the master of the world.

I am devoutly thankful that some eyes at least are fully opened to it while time remains. I rejoice to find that the President saw in their true light and proportion the extreme dangers by which the American people, as well as the British people, are now beset.

IMPORTANCE OF UNITED STATES FLEET

It was, indeed, by the mercy of God that he began 8 years ago that revival of the strength of the American Navy, without which the New World today would have to take its orders from the European dictators, but with which the United States still retains the power to marshal her gigantic strength and, in saving herself, render an incomparable service to mankind.

We had a church parade on the Sunday in our Atlantic bay. The President came onto the quarterdeck of the *Prince of Wales*, where there were mingled together many hundreds of American and British sailors and marines.

The sun shone bright and warm while we all sang the old hymns which are our common inheritance and which we learned as children in our homes. We sang the hymn founded on the psalm which John Hampden's soldiers sang when they bore his body to the grave and in which the brief precarious span of human life is contrasted with the immutability of Him to whom a thousand ages are but as yesterday and as a watch that is passed in the night.

We sang the sailors' hymn For Those in Peril, and there are very many in peril on the sea. We sang Onward, Christian Soldiers, and, indeed, I felt that this was no vain presumption but that we had the right to feel that we were serving a cause for the sake of which a trumpet has sounded from on high.

When I looked upon that densely packed congregation of the fighting men of the same language, of the same faith, of the same fundamental laws, of the same ideals, and to a large extent of the same interests, and certainly in different degrees facing the same dangers, it swept across me that here was the only hope but also the sure hope of saving the world from merciless degradation.

And so we came back across the ocean waves uplifted in spirit, fortified in resolve. Some American destroyers, which were carrying mails to the United States marines in Iceland, happened to be going the same way, too, so we made a goodly company at sea together.

And when we were right out in midpassage one afternoon a noble sight broke on the view. We overtook one of the convoys which carry the munitions and supplies of the New World to sustain the champions of freedom in the Old. The whole horizon, the whole broad horizon, seemed filled with ships. Seventy or eighty ships of all kinds, sizes, arrayed in 14 lines, each of which could have been drawn with a ruler hardly a wisp of smoke, not a straggler, but all bristling with cannon and other precautions on which I will not dwell, and all surrounded by their British escorting vessels, while overhead the far-ranging Catalina airboats soared, vigilant, protecting eagles in the sky.

And then I felt that, hard and terrible and long-drawn-out as this struggle may be, we shall not be denied the strength to do our duty to the end.

Maj. Gen. Adna R. Chaffee—A Great Soldier of the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 25, 1941

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Maj. Gen. Adna R. Chaffee, United States Army, until recently Chief of the Armored Force with headquarters at Camp Knox, Ky., died last Friday morning, August 22, at Phillips House of Massachusetts General Hospital, in Boston, after a physical break-down.

He was only 56 years old. After services last Saturday at Fort Meyer Chapel, his body was interred in Arlington National Cemetery beside the remains of his distinguished father.

His father, another great soldier of the Republic—also named Adna R. Chaffee—as a boy, when President Lincoln called for volunteers, walked for 2 or 3 days to reach a recruiting station in order to enlist in answer to his country's call. Step by step, by outstanding merit, he rose to the rank of lieutenant general and Chief of Staff.

The son was born and spent his entire life in the Army. He served with distinction wherever our flag flew—from the Philippines to France and Germany, as well as in the United States. Most of us in the Congress came to know him best when he was Chief of the Budget and Legislative Division of the General Staff from 1934 to 1938. In this position he won the admiration and respect of all Members of the House who came in contact with him, and the affectionate regard of those who knew him well.

Long before Hitler came to power in the Reich and organized his panzer divisions, General Chaffee was urging our Army to develop heavily armored automotive divisions with overwhelming fire power. In an address at the Army War College in 1930, Chaffee predicted that "in the next war" these supertanks would be a deciding factor. Most appropriately he was assigned to organize and develop the first of our armored divisions. In this, as in all previous assignments, he was eminently successful—but in its performance he sacrificed his health and his life.

He deserved well of the Republic. Recently the President nominated him for promotion to lieutenant general—the rank which his father ultimately attained—but he died before the Senate had opportunity to confirm the nomination.

He was a great soldier and a really great man.

Among numerous tributes to the life and services of General Chaffee are the following:

[From the New York Times of August 23, 1941]

GENERAL CHAFFEE DIES; LED TANK FORCES—THE CREATOR AND COMMANDER OF ARMY'S ARMORED DIVISIONS—HONORED ON DEATHBED—IN 1930 PREDICTED "BLITZ"—CAVALRY OFFICER MANY YEARS WITH DISTINGUISHED WORLD WAR RECORD GOT LAST POST IN 1940

BOSTON, August 22.—Maj. Gen. Adna R. Chaffee, creator of the Army's new Armored Force and its commander until his retirement was necessitated last month because of illness, died this morning at Phillips House of Massachusetts General Hospital after suffering a physical break-down. His age was 56.

At the bedside in Phillips House were General Chaffee's wife, the former Ethel Warren Huff, of Leavenworth, Kans., whom he married in 1908; his son, Adna R. 3d; and two sisters, Mrs. Alcott Farrar Elwell, of Boston, and Mrs. George Hamilton, of California.

A funeral service will be held at Fort Myer Chapel, near Washington, tomorrow afternoon, with burial in Arlington National Cemetery. The body, accompanied by Mrs. Chaffee, left here tonight on the Federal Express.

NOMINATED FOR HIGHER RANK

WASHINGTON, August 22.—Major General Chaffee was nominated a few days ago by President Roosevelt for promotion to lieutenant general, but the nomination had not gone through the routine of senatorial confirmation. Thus General Chaffee missed closing his career with the rank held by his father, the late Adna R. Chaffee, a former Chief of Staff of the Army.

On August 2 the former commander of the Armored Force received, while at the Massachusetts General Hospital, an oak-leaf cluster for his Distinguished Service Medal. Three days later he was too ill to be informed that the Senate had confirmed his nomination to the permanent rank of major general. He had held temporary rank since September 1939.

General Chaffee became the Army's first commander of tank forces after long service in the Cavalry and broad staff experience.

Only a few hours after his death this morning the War Department announced creation of a fifth division of the Armored Force, now commanded by Maj. Gen. Jacob L. Devers.

During service in the World War, General Chaffee served on the staffs, in turn, of the fourth, seventh, and third Army corps. He was sent to Fort Knox in 1938 to command the Seventh Cavalry Brigade. In July 1940, when the Army established its first independent tank command, he was assigned to command the First Armored Corps and designated as chief of the Armored Force, with headquarters at Fort Knox.

Establishment of this command resulted in large measure from planning in which General Chaffee had a prominent part.

Despite critical illness which gave him great discomfort during the last year of his life, General Chaffee personally trained his rapidly growing organization, except for sick leave last January, until ill health finally forced his retirement.

FATHER AN ARMY OFFICER

Tall, wiry, and tanned, General Chaffee was the perfect picture of an Army officer. He came naturally by his military bearing, for he was the son of a lieutenant general, who spent his entire career in the armed service of this country. His mother was Anna Frances Rockwell Chaffee. He was born at Junction City, Kans., September 23, 1884.

When a boy he went to China to be with his father, who then was in command of United States troops during the Boxer Rebellion. After the trouble was over young Chaffee returned home and prepared for West Point.

He was graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1906 and immediately was assigned to the Fifteenth Cavalry and sent to Santa Clara, Cuba. After his tour of duty there he entered the Mounted Service School at Fort Riley, Kans., from which he was graduated in 1908. He was selected for further schooling and finished the advanced course there the following year.

General Chaffee then rejoined the Fifteenth Cavalry at Fort Myer, where his first task was to organize the Army War College detachment, which he commanded. Recognized as one of the outstanding horsemen in the Army, he was one of the officers chosen in 1911 to be a member of the United States Army team, which participated in the international horse show in London that year.

BECAME CAVALRY INSTRUCTOR

From England he went to France, where he studied at the Ecole d'Application de Cavalrie at Samur. He was graduated from that leading French cavalry school in 1912. He then returned to the United States to become an instructor at the Mounted Service School.

There followed a tour of duty in the Philippines with the Seventh Cavalry, after which he returned to the United States Military Academy as an instructor of cavalry.

Shortly after the declaration of war with Germany he was made a major of infantry of the National Army and assigned as adjutant of the Eighty-first Division, stationed at Camp Jackson, N. C. He later was acting chief of staff of the division.

General Chaffee, then a major, was sent to France, where he was immediately chosen to attend the General Staff College at Langres. After his graduation he was retained at the college as an instructor.

During the San Mihiel offensive, however, he was relieved of his teaching duties with the college to become G–3 (operations officer) of the Fourth Army. Later he was assigned to the Eighty-first Division in the St. Die sector.

Early in October 1918 Major Chaffee was promoted to lieutenant colonel of infantry and made assistant chief of staff of the Eighth Army Corps, stationed at Remiremont, France.

That same month he was again promoted, becoming a colonel of cavalry. In this position he was assigned to the Third Army Corps. He occupied this position during the Meuse-Argonne offensive and during the occupation of the Rhineland after the war.

Upon his arrival in Germany, Colonel Chaffee received command of the Ninth Infantry. For his services in France the Distinguished Service Medal was awarded to him.

After the World War, Colonel Chaffee served several tours of duty on the General Staff.

HIS IDEAS FINALLY ACCEPTED

In 1930 he predicted that tank-powered armies could do virtually what the Nazis accomplished 10 years later in their blitzkrieg of the Low Countries and France. Some officers considered his prediction too visionary and impractical. It wasn't long, however, before the War Department began putting the ideas of Chaffee and other mechanization-minded officers into something more tangible than paper plans.

Col. Daniel Van Voorhis (later advanced to a lieutenant general), also a strong advocate of modernizing the Army, was assigned in 1931 to organize the first mechanized cavalry force at Fort Knox, Ky. Colonel Chaffee served under Van Voorhis as executive officer of the mechanized cavalry organization until he was ordered back to Washington for duty with the General Staff's Budget and Legislative Planning Bureau. He was Chief of the Bureau from 1934 to 1938.

The latter assignment gave him a better opportunity to seek increased appropriations to carry on experiments in mechanization. He also helped fight for increased funds for the Air Corps.

In 1938 Chaffee was returned to Fort Knox to command the First Cavalry of the Seventh Cavalry Brigade, mechanized, the only such organization in the Army at that time. He succeeded Van Voorhis as brigade commander when the latter was made commander of the Fifth Corps Area. Colonel Chaffee then was promoted to brigadier general.

[From the New York Times of August 23, 1941]

GENERAL CHAFFEE

Maj. Gen. Adna R. Chaffee was the worthy son and namesake of a brilliant soldier. Like his father a cavalryman, he served with distinction in the first World War. Not long after its close he began, with the help of certain other selected officers, experiments in the use of armored force. This was years before the immense effectiveness of such a force with its coordinate units was so memorably and cruelly illustrated in the Nazi assault on Poland.

First commander of the mechanized cavalry brigade and then of the newly created armored corps, his genius for mechanics and tireless energy have helped to realize for the United States this swift and far-striking force. He may fairly be said to have given his health and his life to this, his last and greatest service to his country. His promotion to major general and the award to him of the Oak-Leaf Cluster citation came to him when he was near his end, but it is pleasant to remember that his devotion to duty was recognized while there was yet time.

It is only a few days less than 2 years that we saw him in this town and at the fair, the ideal cavalry officer, tall, incredibly lean.

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 23, 1941]

GENERAL CHAFFEE

The whole life of Maj. Gen. Adna R. Chaffee was devoted to the Army. A son of a distinguished soldier, he was born in the service and glorified in the circumstance throughout his career. Part of his boyhood was spent in China, where his father was in command of American troops operating against the Boxer rebels. He returned home convinced of his vocation, made an excellent record at West Point, gained his first commission in 1908. By nature fearless and confident, he was a brave and skillful horseman from the start. Riding as a member of the American Army team at the International Horse Show in London in 1911 and studying at the Saumer School in France in 1912, he qualified for promotion in the Cavalry. When the United States entered the first World War he was a captain and a West Point instructor. Keen energy and wise discernment in the discharge of grave responsibilities in the Meuse-Argonne campaign gained him the Distinguished Service Medal, to which only 3 weeks ago was added the Oak-Leaf Cluster.

General Chaffee, however, was something more than a successful officer. His most notable characteristic was an active, yet disciplined, imagination. Few, if any, of his contemporaries appreciated in 1918 that a new era of military science was dawning; but he visioned an army which should be strong in attack, yet also sturdy in resistance to a degree hitherto unknown. Long before the panzer divisions of the Germany Army had been organized he was urging the development of mobile fortresses. Speaking at the Army War College in 1930, he predicted that the decisive factor in the next war would be heavily armored automotive divisions of overwhelming firepower. He was

named executive officer of the pioneer mechanized cavalry unit at Fort Knox in 1931. The beginning of the present conflict in Europe found him prepared for the command of the first American armored division deserving of the name. He labored tirelessly to anticipate the inevitable crisis which he had foreseen.

In personal appearance General Chaffee, like Vachel Lindsay's General Booth, "looked the chief." His profile was eagle-sharp. When thoroughly aroused, he could flash lightning from his eyes. But he was a lovable man despite the stern aspect of his countenance.

His country regrets that General Chaffee should have died so young. It is no exaggeration to say that he was a martyr to his work. The new defense organization which he helped to create is his monument. He departs with the thanks of a nation made safer by his sacrifices.

Britishers Make Whoopee With Lease-Lend Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Walter Trohan, which appeared recently in the Washington Times-Herald. The article well illustrates the attitude of many of the British Government representatives now crowding Washington to tell us how to spend our money. It indicates that we are still "Uncle Saps" to those we are aiding. No further comment is necessary. The article follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 22, 1941]

BRITONS HERE MAKE WHOOPEE AS UNITED STATES PAYS—THIRTY THOUSAND DOLLARS IN WINE, FOOD REPORTED CHARGED TO LEASE-LEND BILL

(By Walter Trohan)

Britishers of military age in the National Capital are doing their bit for England by spending American dollars on everything from guns to whoopee.

The theme song of the British Purchasing Mission is a parody of There'll Always Be an England. It runs:

"There'll always be a dollar
As long as we are here."

MEALS, WINES CHARGED

The song was the hit of the evening at a recent mission party in a fashionable Washington restaurant, which has been taken over by the Britishers.

The checks are being paid by the American people. It is reported in reliable congressional circles that the mission has already charged over $30,000 worth of meals and rare wines in this restaurant alone to the lend-lease bill.

Individual items of the lend-lease program can only be made public by the President. He is empowered to withhold anything he regards as a military secret or which may be inimicable to British-American interests.

It is understood that the commission has contracted other bills for whisky, wines, and food at hotels and restaurants which are to be charged to the $7,000,000,000 lend-lease bill and to the anticipated new lend-lease appropriation which Mr. Roosevelt is to ask of Congress, which is expected to run between $6,000,000,000 and $10,000,000,000.

PERSONAL PHONE CALLS, TOO

In addition to charging whoopee against American dollars, the British are charging personal phone calls to American taxpayers.

One recent British arrival spent 45 minutes chatting with an acquaintance in Canada and charged the bill, tax and all, to lend-lease.

"Charge it to lend-lease" is the byword at the British headquarters. Members of the various missions number about 3,000 Britishers, or more than a full-strength regiment.

The Britishers found the heat of Washington intolerable in their suites in the Willard Hotel and clamored for air conditioning at a time when their fellow countrymen were dismissing German bombs with callous contempt.

Almost 100 portable air-conditioning units were purchased by the commission and charged to lend-lease.

At the British Purchasing Mission this story was denied along with other stories of use of lend-lease funds over and above actual war needs.

Only one stop order has been issued recently against the carte blanche use of American funds by the British. This involved the attempt of officers of a British vessel being repaired in an American port to secure new uniforms at American expense.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 25, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the most important part of the Atlantic conference is the thing not given out.

If it is a long war, then it is ours. Possibly Franklin, Jr., has a real commission.

Raymond Clapper says from London that the one-vote escape of the President from defeat has stunned England.

Leon Henderson and our Harry Colmery discovered in conversation that they were once members of the same faculty.

After the ocean conference Mrs. Churchill was overjoyed to get her Winston back—he narrowly missed being placed in our Cabinet.

Since planning on five billion and up at sea for Soviet aid, the President returns to find a Russian strike in progress here.

The Army will now half do what Congress wanted done with selectees. Our defense is not imperiled now. Poor Congress never gets any credit.

"President quotes Lincoln and draws a parallel" is the Chief's own suggestion for a headline. A week ago the one-vote margin compelled a comparison to Washington and the unfaithful Continental Congress.

The one who writes this column is bitterly opposed to sending our men into foreign wars. You might have guessed it. While our leaders are dragging us to the verge, we think no other subject is important.

Our hats are off again to the unswerved American public who have not fallen for the warmakers. Dr. Gallup said last Sunday, "Where the American public does draw the line today—as in preceding months—is at sending another A. E. F. abroad."

To my big brothers who stayed in the Capital: It is great to be home among protestors and compliers, interventionists, and those for isolation in war, Townsends, and those who disdain public help. We never did like to row on a placid lake.

The Plow Did Well That Broke the Plains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 25, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago the Government did a great disservice to the Great Plains States, stretching from Canada to the Gulf, by using taxpayers' money to develop a highly fictitious and fantastical moving picture titled "The Plow That Broke the Plains." The great wave of protests which swept in upon Washington from all of the 9 or 10 States which had been slandered by their Central Government in this dishonest and deceptive film finally caused the Department of Agriculture to withdraw the picture from circulation.

The attached editorial from a small South Dakota newspaper, Mr. Speaker, gives the world more truth and accuracy about the Great Plains area of America than was to be found in the thousands of expensive feet of inaccurate film which comprised the late but not lamented governmental monstrosity known as The Plow That Broke the Plains. The editorial follows:

THE PLOW THAT BROKE THE PLAINS

South Dakota should have a dozen motion-picture cameras in action this week. They should be scattered throughout the length and breadth of the State, obtaining pictures in technicolor, of the thousands of acres of bounteous crops that are being harvested in every section.

These pictures should be made into one large reel and should be entitled "The Plow That Broke the Plains." The picture should be shown in every community where the original picture of that name was shown.

The picture should be complete with sound and in the place of having a gruesome voice moaning, "High winds and little rain," a harvest queen should explain that this is South Dakota—this is the Dust Bowl of today.

She should tell how this is the result of man's faith in a "God given" land, coupled with normal rains and bounteous sunshine.

Some of the picture should be taken from the tops of our high buttes, showing a vast landscape of deep green ranges, checkerboarded with ripe and ripening crops. It should show close-up shots of wheat standing waist high with heavy golden heads waving like a vast ocean in the breeze.

It should show acres of grain in shocks. Hundreds of stacks of headed crops that are dotting the prairies. It should show combines wallowing over the fields, reaping the harvest in one operation.

It should show herds of white-faced cattle wading deep in native grass. It should show calves resting lazily on the slopes, jumping out of tall grass to join their mothers as the camera man rides up. It should show grass-fat steers that look almost as though they had come out of feed lots.

This is the picture the Nation should see of the Dust Bowl of today. This is the full picture of man's faith in a land that has no equal—when the plow, the rain, and the sun work together.—McLaughlin Messenger.

Will History Repeat Itself?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. U. S. GUYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 25, 1941

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Edward J. Flynn, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, is already calling for the election of a Democratic House of Representatives in 1942. He makes his appeal in the name of national defense and unity, so that we will still have a Congress that will swallow whole anything the New Deal brain trusters offer.

This is precisely what President Wilson demanded in 1918, and the response of the country was a Republican House, which remained that way for a dozen years. Mr. Flynn complains that Republicans do not accept every point and part of the New Deal foreign policy. He wants Republican Congressmen to shut their eyes and accept every sort of legislation extending the powers of the President and still more centralizing and concentrating powers and prerogatives to arbitrary and irresponsible bureaus and commissions.

When a Republican Congressman dares to oppose some such dictatorial legislation he becomes an obstructionist, and Flynn wants him defeated and replaced by some rubber-stamp Democrat—or he might compromise on a Roosevelt Republican—who has been trained to dance to the music that emanates from the brain-trust orchestra in the White House. Flynn speaks of adjourning politics and creating unity, but he insists that the Republicans do all the disbanding and adjourning. He wants just one nice big family of rubber stamps in the name of unity and national defense so that when the President crooks his finger the boys understand and obey. In other words, a one-party country like they have in Nazi Germany, where everyone heils the administration or else. That is what the arbitrary and impatient schoolmaster, Woodrow Wilson, demanded in the congressional elections of 1918, and that was the beginning of his tragic exit from public life. It was undemocratic and un-American and contrary to the fundamental elements of representative government.

There are other instances in which the Wilson and Roosevelt administrations follow parallel lines. Both were elected upon most solemn pledges to keep the country out of war and to maintain peace. In 1916, in the Presidential campaign it was charged that the Democratic Party, if supported at the election, would plunge the country into war to cover up its miserable failures—its soup kitchens, its bread lines, and its depression. To answer that charge the Democratic publicity manager, George Creel, the Charley Michaelson of his day, came forward with the most effective political advertisement since Caesar wrote the political pamphlet about his war in Gaul.

Creel proposed this slogan: "Wilson kept you out of war." On the eve of the election of 1916 this smooth political prestidigitator issued this most unparalleled example of stereotyped mendacity that ever graced the advertising columns of the American press:

> You are working, not fighting. You are living, not cannon fodder.
> Wilson kept you out of war.

Upon the strength of that advertisement, which blanketed the press of the State, Wilson carried Kansas. That saved the Democratic Party from defeat in 1916. A little more than 100 days after that election, and 32 days after his inauguration for a second term, Woodrow Wilson went before a joint session of the House and Senate and asked for a declaration of war against the Imperial German Government.

The question that intrudes is, Will history repeat? If we got into war with a President who honestly boasted that he was too proud to fight, one who in the early stages of the last war asked the people to even think neutral, who asked the public when war pictures were shown on the screen to refrain from applause, lest some belligerent think we were not neutral, we naturally wonder where we are going with a President who retains in his Cabinet three members who openly advocate our participation in this second World War.

We wonder if with Woodrow Wilson, obsessed with a consuming passion for peace, we were catapulted into the greatest war in history, up to that time, where we are going to land when led by a blustering, bellicose, and brutally frank Franklin D. Roosevelt, assailing nations with which we maintain relations of profound peace with threats of "quarantine" and "steps short of war."

If with William Jennings Bryan, one of the most eloquent and vociferous advocates of peace, as Secretary of State during the last World War, we plunged into a blood bath on another continent to make the world safe for democracy, wither are we rushing with a Secretary of State who irritates a jittery world with querulous warnings and a sensitive potential rival in the Orient with peevish admonitions and caustic insinuations.

There is this difference: In the case of Woodrow Wilson, his pledges of peace were personally based on his well-known ideas about war and peace, buttressed with what a cagy publicity agent spread over the newspapers of the country. But in the case of Franklin D. Roosevelt, he is bound by the most solemn and reiterated promises to the fathers and mothers that their sons would not be sent to fight in foreign wars nor to die on foreign soil. Not once, but "again, and again, and again." He also is bound by the declaration of his party's platform and its pledge to keep out of foreign wars. The whole matter is up to him, and whether he will keep his word sacred and make it good. The question of war or peace is in the hands of the President. If he keeps the country out of war, he will deserve the good will of the people. If he leads us into war, then the blood of many thousands will be on his head, and he will deserve the anathema of a people which elected him upon the sacred promise that he would keep them out of foreign wars. The momentous question is up to him.

Every vote I have cast relative to our foreign relations has been cast solely on the question of peace and war. I voted against those matters that I deemed opened the gates for the United States to enter the war. I voted for fifty-two billions for national defense and for aid to Britain, which I believed would be effective for our own defense. I have done all this solely on the ground and in the belief that if I could do anything that would keep this country out of war it would be the greatest service I ever have had the opportunity to perform for my country. I have done this, because I know that when the shooting once begins we will all say with Decatur, "My country, may she always be right, but right or wrong, my country."

The tragedy of such a war is too horrible to contemplate with all its death and debts. Let that American tremble who by ambition or for selfish purpose promotes or permits it.

Protest Against 49-Cent Wheat Penalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 25, 1941

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, 1941, I addressed the House in protest against the unjust 49-cent wheat penalty imposed on the 1941 crop. At that time I presented to the House, and had printed in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the

petition of more than 1,000 Lenawee County, Mich., farmers objecting to this 49-cent penalty.

I am today in receipt of an additional petition, signed by more than 1,000 dirt farmers of Lenawee County, protesting against this penalty. I am presenting this petition to the Congress, as requested by my constituents.

I regret, however, that because of the attitude of the Department of Agriculture, I must tell these farmers that in my judgment all of these petitions and protests will avail them nothing so far as any modification of the 49-cent wheat penalty regulations for 1941 are concerned. I make this assertion for the following reasons:

First. After much persuasion, the New Deal dominated House Committee on Agriculture favorably reported a bill that would permit the farmer to use on the farm where grown, for the purpose of feeding his own livestock and poultry and for seed wheat, any or all of the quota surplus wheat without paying the 49-cent wheat penalty.

Second. The House of Representatives passed this bill and it went to the Senate.

Third. The Senate struck out this provision which gave some little relief to the excess-wheat grower.

Fourth. The conference committee between the House and Senate agreed to a compromise wheat provision reading as follows:

Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions, the penalty upon wheat during the marketing year beginning July 1, 1941, shall not apply to that portion of the farm-marketing excess for any farm which the producer establishes in accordance with the regulations of the Secretary was or will be used as feed on the farm where grown for livestock or poultry or was or will be consumed by the farmer's family or household. The amount of any penalty paid on that portion of the farm-marketing excess of wheat which was or will be used as feed on the farm where grown for livestock or poultry or which was or will be consumed by the farmer's family or household shall be returned or allowed the producer.

Fifth. The bill so agreed upon by a majority of the Congress went to the President for his approval or disapproval. A few minutes ago, the Clerk read to the House the President's message vetoing the bill. That part of the message wherein the President gave his reasons for his veto is as follows:

It is my conviction that approval of the measure would seriously and adversely affect the agricultural-adjustment program and the attendant policies which have been so beneficial to our farmers during the past few years.

One provision of this act would permit the farmers to dispose of as feed, without penalty, an indefinite amount of wheat produced in excess of their farm-acreage allotments for 1941. This provision would place a premium on noncompliance with the wheat program, constitute a breach of faith with the large majority of farmers who complied with the program, and so relax the control features of the farm program as to adversely affect future participation therein.

In short, the bill, as the Congress finally approved it, would have made it possible for the farmer to use his own wheat as feed on the farm where grown for livestock or poultry, or for family consumption. That was the only crumb of relief which even the Congress granted to these farmers who have been so unjustly penalized by a law and regulations made between planting time and harvesting time.

The President's veto kills the bill unless two-thirds of the New Deal dominated House and two-thirds of the New Deal dominated Senate vote to override the veto. Candor compels me to tell my constituents that, in my judgment, this will not happen. I hope I am wrong.

To summarize, the 49-cent wheat penalty must be paid on all wheat beyond the allotment allocated; that is, no wheat grown on excess acreage can be fed or used on the farmer's own farm, or used for seed wheat on his own farm, or otherwise disposed of, without paying the 49-cent penalty.

A Moral Sense With Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. U. S. GUYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 25, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE TABLET

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House, I present the following for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Tablet, Catholic weekly, Brooklyn]

A MORAL SENSE WITH US

Religious publications in their attitude toward involving the United States in war never overlook the morality of the question. There is almost a unanimity of viewpoint on the topic. These publications assert there must be a justification for entrance into war. Once there is a sufficient reason for conflict there must first be exhausted every attempt at arbitration. War is always a last resort.

The fact that a person says someone else is going to attack us at some distant time if he defeats someone is not a sufficient reason for conflict. Neither does the economic argument, which is usually based on power politics or economic determinism, justify spilling the blood of innocent people.

As far as can be seen in the present situation affecting the United States' entrance into war, there is no moral reason or justification. Moreover, there is every moral reason for our country remaining out of the suicidal conflict. Assuredly our leaders have promised us over and over again we would not enter any foreign conflict. They would not send our Army, Navy, or marines to engage in a distant strife, and this pledge is morally binding. All the moves which are said to have led us close to our entrance were enacted to keep us out of war—here we have another moral obligation.

Secretary Knox, who demands we enter war now, less than a year ago asserted he was against sending American youths to graves in distant places. He has gone back on his word. Of course, he has not the right, constitutionally or otherwise, to send Americans down the hell holes of catastrophe. It is unfortunate that the majority of the American people—those who want peace and see no reason to go to war—do not seem to be represented in the President's Cabinet.

Perhaps the worst offender of all in relation to the moral side of war is Wendell Willkie, for whom millions voted, thinking he was antiwar, but who turned his back on them to engage in warmongering. It was bad enough for Mr. Willkie to deceive the American people, but it is even worse for him to attempt to fool the foreign nations as he did in his July 4 broadcast abroad. Then Mr. Willkie said:

"And, despite the occasional hesitation and doubts, the American people will reach out, will give their utmost to see that this precious thing we call liberty shall not disappear from the world, either in Europe or in Asia or in America."

That is untrue. Russia and other nations have been in slavery for centuries and Americans never objected to their role. And today, contrary to Mr. Willkie Americans will not and could not give their utmost to safeguard liberty all over the world—including places where liberty is not wanted. The vast majority of Americans are overwhelmingly against being used as cannon fodder to establish liberty in Russia, Germany, Africa, and dozens of other countries.

One report on Monday called for a repudiation of the United States Constitution, together with a repudiation of the wishes of the people. This article quoted a radio speaker as asserting the President of the United States should alone decide when, where, and how our country should go to war. Notwithstanding that the Constitution specifically asserts that Congress, as the representative of the people, alone can declare war, this speaker would violate the Constitution and thereby destroy popular government. It follows that if the reigning President can contravene one part of the Constitution, he can contravene any part, including the guaranty of religious liberty. The suggestion is so absurd that it hardly needs rebuttal. Destroying the Constitution, prohibiting the people or their representatives from voting on an issue that affects them and their children, so smacks of nazi-ism that one can only feel sorry for the person making such a proposal.

This is the United States of America, not totalitarian Germany or Russia. Here we have "government of the people, by the people, and for the people"—not by one individual. Our Government rules with the consent of the governed. "But the people do not fully understand; they have not all the knowledge," say newcomers to our shores and chauvinists. That's it. The people cannot decide. They are only supposed to fight and die.

Moralists have long decided expediency or popularity is not the rule for good conduct. Again, that sounds just like Hitler. Here, too, we have another moral argument, for it is said the Nazis are worse enemies of the United States than the "reds." Perhaps arguments can be used on both sides, but what difference does it make? Would you prefer cancer or creeping paralysis? You would answer "Neither." And Americans who love their country are not making any choice between Nazi and the Soviet. They hate both. They want nothing to do with either. They hold no brief for any totalitarians. And they would consider it immoral and indecent, treacherous and hypocritical to send American boys, American wealth, or American goods to either Hitler or Stalin—both enemies of God and man—not more, not less, but both exemplars of international thuggery.

Morality demands the United States to keep out of this war. Patriotism which casts aside the fearmongers insists we stay out of war. The people to the tune of three and four to one, are opposed to entering the war. Oh, yes; they have experience, they have the facts—they got both in 1917 and 1918 and so did their parents. The minority, the warmongers, who themselves will not fight, have

taken one defeat after another. They planned to lead the country into war long ago. Unable to get the people to go to war, they now want to invite it. Let us keep defeating them. Every day we stay out saves hundreds of more American lives and keeps back the tears of American mothers. Hold fast to the Constitution. Permit Congress to, in fact, demand that the people decide. Away with mass suicide. Let us think of peace for the masses. Make morality and principle the rule and do not follow the line of broken pledges which has made Europe and Asia places to keep away from.

Justice for Investors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. PADDOCK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 25, 1941

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States, with its almost complete control over the property of its citizens, owes them a high degree of fairness and honesty in exercising these great powers. In recent cases now before the courts our Treasury Department has attempted to tax as "profitable" transactions where actual losses were plainly evident, and conceded by the Department. Because of these attempts to collect taxes without any justification except a technical and arbitrary interpretation of the law, I have introduced H. R. 5617.

In brief, my bill prevents the attempt to collect profits taxes on transactions involving actual losses, following reorganizations by bondholders. It directly protects hundreds of thousands of individuals and corporations, former purchasers of bonds, who took over in reorganization the property their securities covered. It clarifies the present law which our Treasury Department interprets to authorize profit taxes on differences between reorganization values and later resales, even though this resale value was actually less than the original cost to the taxpayers.

For a concrete case illustrating the injustice which H. R. 5617 will correct, I cite the Federal Land Bank of Milwaukee, which issued bonds for which it secured about $15,000,000, mostly from small investors. It loaned this money on farm mortgages. In 1926 it was declared insolvent, and in 1932 the Farm Loan Board approved the transfer of its assets to a new corporation organized by the bondholders. This transfer was by means of a public sale at which the bondholders were the only bidders, and the nominal upset bid price was $2,351,000. No money passed. The bondholders might just as well have bid $15,000,000. It would have cost them no more, and would have eliminated the controversy.

Eventually the reorganized company liquidated the mortgages for about $10,000,000, so there was an actual loss of over $4,000,000. If the transfer of the assets of the land bank to the new company be treated as a reorganization, this loss will be given effect. Otherwise, a tax will be due on an alleged profit of $7,649,000. The bondholders were in control before and after the transfer.

In 1932 the Treasury ruled that there was a "reorganization," and the bondholder could deduct no loss. Now that the statute of limitations has run against the bondholders, the Treasury has reversed its position, and claims its former ruling was wrong, that a deductible loss was realized in 1932, and a new base for the computation of profit and loss and the calculation of depreciation was then established.

The decision depends on the definition of reorganization. If there is a reorganization, the new company assumes the old company's base, and the transaction is not considered completed as to bondholders and stockholders. They retain the original cost as a basis of computing profit or loss when they dispose of the substituted securities they receive in the reorganization.

The Board of Tax Appeals has denied the Treasury's present contention. So have the Circuit Courts of Appeals for the Second, Fifth, and Tenth Circuits. However, it has been sustained by the Circuit Courts of Appeals for the Ninth and Eighth Circuits, and the decision of the ninth circuit in the case of Marlborough House is now pending in the Supreme Court.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we ought not to subject taxpayers to the hazard of what the Supreme Court may decide, but should put the question at rest now by adopting this amendment to settle the matter beyond doubt.

I do not know how many people, poor and rich, will be protected against unjust taxation by this bill. To calculate the number would involve a tabulation of the countless reorganizations which followed the crash of 1929. If we include the policyholders of the insurance companies, which invested many millions in these bonds, almost every American family will benefit somewhat by its provision.

Best of all, by enacting this bill, we will prevent the force of our Government from being used, under color of law, to attempt unjust transactions at the expense of its own citizens.

Why Squawk? You Had It Coming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 25, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for many months, yes, since the sit-down strikes of '37, some Detroit newspapers have coddled certain union leaders, condoned their lawlessness, praised them immoderately when they acted as the ordinary, decent, law-abiding citizen usually acted.

Over the same period of time, the same newspapers patted on the back public officials who disregarded their oath of office, praised them for settling strikes when the settlements overlooked coercion, intimidation, beatings, and an utter disregard of the law.

The same newspapers condemned as labor baiters many of those who insisted upon what these same newspapers now stress—the unqualified right of an American citizen to earn a livelihood regardless of his membership in a union.

The inevitable has happened. Certain union leaders have pulled a strike, which even the Detroit public and the newspapers of Detroit cannot stomach. The Detroit Free Press of August 21, in a front-page editorial, labels as "a disgraceful strike" the action of the unions in tying up the transportation system of Detroit. It comments:

> The citizens of Detroit are justified in feeling outraged over a streetcar strike that has paralyzed this community's transportation system.

But the citizens of Detroit did not feel outraged when John Doe, in 1917, going to work in Flint, or at any time since, on his way to his job in Detroit or nearby communities, was cracked on the head and sent to a hospital.

The citizens of Detroit paid no attention when farmers, seeking to deliver their products to the Detroit market, were compelled to pay tribute to a union or take a beating.

The citizens of Detroit and the Detroit newspapers and the officials of the State of Michigan did not seem to care very much when thousands of workers in Flint and, later, other thousands in Detroit were kept from their jobs by armed picket lines, by goon squads which came in, armed to the teeth, from other cities and took possession first of Flint and later of the streets surrounding the Chrysler plants.

There was money behind those strikes. Not that the newspapers got any of it, but it bought publicity. There was influence behind those strikes. Yes; and in some of the newspaper offices men belonging to the union were a potential threat to anything the newspapers might say condemning the unjust and unlawful acts of the strikers.

The citizens of Detroit did not seem greatly concerned, nor did the newspapers of Detroit feel called upon to comment courageously and plainly on the fact that the United States Navy was unable, for 42 days in one instance, for twenty-odd days in another, to get its own patterns and plans out of the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation plant.

Newspapers throughout the country and public officials throughout the Nation have failed time and time again to do their part when the unions assailed the management of industrial plants, compelled employees to pay tribute in order that they might earn a livelihood.

But just because the present strike in Detroit inconveniences thousands of people and is unpopular, the newspapers are on the warpath. Let us thank the good Lord that at last the long-suffering pub-

lic has found a spokesman. Says the Detroit Free Press:

The bald effrontery of two rival unions, fighting over memberships, making an entire municipality a victim of their controversy is without parallel in union history.

Well, well. Because the controversy is between the two unions it may be without parallel, but the assault of the C. I. O. on the city of Flint made the citizens of that city its victims and strike after strike throughout the Nation has had a like effect, and many of the strikes have been because of jurisdictional disputes, as the Detroit Free Press should know.

Not long ago, several thousand men were thrown out of work, the Government was denied production of essential defense machinery, for some seventy-odd days at the Allis-Chalmers plant in Milwaukee, because two A. F. of L. men were working there. During a portion of that same period, at Dayton, Ohio, the A. F. of L. tied up another Government project just because four C. I. O. men were working on electrical equipment.

At the present time, warships ready for launching remain on the ways at Kearny, N. J., because a union wants the men who launch them to belong to that certain union.

The Detroit Free Press is greatly exercised and says that the union attitude, its utter disregard for the rights of the people, is exemplified by the shouted words of James P. McGinnity, A. F. of L. business agent, who shouted:

Let's show them what a real strike is. We'll tie up the whole town. No cars will move.

Why get exercised over that? Way back in '37, John L. Lewis and Richard T. Frankensteen, or was it Reuther, were yelling that, if Henry Ford made cars, he would join the union. The Detroit newspapers didn't sob over that. The principle was the same.

But the chickens are coming home to roost and Detroit is getting just what it asked for, as will every other city and State which condones lawlessness. The editorial now praises Mayor Jeffries because he told Frank X. Martel, president of the Detroit and Wayne A. F. of L.:

We have city and State laws which you have ignored. You are not bigger than the Government yet though your conduct seems to indicate that you think so.

Phooey! Do you not remember that, back in 1937, when the C. I. O. had General Motors down in the mud, rubbing its face in the dirt; when it was defying ordinances, State and Federal laws, the Honorable Frank Murphy, then Governor of Michigan, day after day violated his oath of office; refused to punish violence and lawlessness; called in the State troops to prevent the local authorities and decent citizens from throwing the strikers out of the General Motors plants? Do you not remember that he condoned the commission of felonies day after day, from the 1st of January way down to June?

Sure, we had city and State laws then, but the Governor, charged with their enforcement, took no notice of them. The Detroit Free Press and other papers praised Governor Murphy for the settlement of that strike, and the settlement was a reward to the C. I. O. for its violence.

Still later, in the recent Ford strike, when possession of the streets and highways was taken over by the C. I. O.; when the State police stood idly by while innocent citizens were beaten by Communists and members of Briggs local—and I have the pictures and the sworn testimony to that effect—was Governor Van Wagoner censured? Oh, no! He was praised for the speedy settlement, which compelled every Ford worker to join the C. I. O.

The unions have some forty-odd million dollars income, on which they pay no tax. They have defied city ordinances and State laws. They have broken Federal laws. But so far they have gone unwhipped of justice. Perhaps this Detroit strike is an angel in disguise. Perhaps it will awaken the citizens of Detroit and of the State to the fact that here in America we should have freedom from fear, which Roosevelt says must be carried to the four corners of the earth.

It may be that, while we are sending millions of dollars' worth of material and getting ready to send men to help Comrade "Bloody Joe" Stalin maintain himself so that hereafter he can follow his course of executing ministers and priests, destroying churches, and preventing the teaching of religion, this little strike in Detroit will have its influence in restoring to the American worker freedom from union boss domination.

I noticed, too, on the editorial page of the Grand Rapids Press of August 20, under the head of The Shipyard Strike Issue, that the editorial writer, commenting on the shipbuilding strike at Kearny, N. J., now states, referring to labor legislation that—

Nothing is said to the effect that labor organizations shall be given the right to deny freedom of action to a worker.

That is old doctrine. In Congress and throughout the Nation, it has been proclaimed time and time again by those who have sought the amendment of the Wagner Act and fair play on the part of the unions.

The truth is that the unions have been coddled by newspapers and by politicians, by public officials; actively aided by this administration, until they have reached a position where they now deny the proposition enunciated by Mayor Jeffries when he said to a union official:

You are not bigger than the Government yet, though your conduct seems to indicate that you think so.

As a matter of cold, hard fact, the unions and their bosses have, ever since 1937, in all too many instances, been bigger than the Government and their conduct has indicated that they realized that fact.

Let us hope that when Congress gets back on September 15, it will have the inclination and the courage to amend the Wagner Act; put the N. L. R. B. and the National Defense Mediation Board over the woodshed barrel; insist that the American workman be given protection from union racketeers and bosses and that the national-defense program be no longer impeded either by selfishness or political ambition.

The People Would Like To Know in the President's Own Words What He Thinks. They Do Not Want To Guess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ADRIAN (MICH.) TELEGRAM

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, when a newspaper which has editorially consistently supported the President's foreign policy pauses to question the President, then that is news.

The Adrian (Mich.) Telegram, one of the leading small-town dailies in the country, has definitely supported the President's foreign program from the beginning of the present World War. Therefore, a critical editorial in this paper hardly stands in the same position as critical editorials appearing in the press hostile to the President's foreign program.

Pursuant to permission given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

[From the Adrian (Mich.) Telegram]

SPEAK OUT, MR. PRESIDENT

President Roosevelt called on the Nation to do some serious thinking about America's war effort at his press conference and he made it plain that he believes the people are not yet awake to the enormous task they face. But by speaking indirectly and quoting words that Abraham Lincoln spoke back in 1862, Mr. Roosevelt did not help clarify confusion of thought when clarity is so imperatively needed. The people would like to know in the President's own words what he thinks. They do not want to guess.

But by reading to the reporters passages from Carl Sandburg's account of an interview Lincoln had with a delegation of Chicago women who were seeking encouragement for preservation of the Union, Mr. Roosevelt left it to the Nation to judge what he really thinks the situation in the United States is now.

Probably the most significant passage Mr. Roosevelt read was that in which Mr. Lincoln said: "The fact is the people have not yet made up their minds that we are at war with the South. They have not buckled down to the determination to fight this war through; for they have got the idea into their heads that we are going to get out of this fix somehow by strategy. * * * They have no idea that the war is to be carried on and put through by hard, tough fighting, that it will hurt somebody; and no headway is going to be made while this delusion lasts."

When he had finished reading, Mr. Roosevelt authorized the reporters to quote him directly as saying "President quotes Lincoln and draws parallel." Lincoln's words were plain enough, but President Roosevelt did not make his meaning entirely clear by saying he drew a parallel. The time has come for straight from the shoulder talk and the people would like to hear it from their President.

They would like to know just how serious is the situation of the country. There are

varying shades of opinion on that point. The close margin by which the Army service extension bill passed the House of Representatives shows how divided opinion is. The President, better than anyone else, knows the actual situation. He, better than anyone else, is able to unite the Nation's thinking. Speak plainly, Mr. President.

A Great American and a Great Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 25, 1941

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday morning last, Maj. Gen. Adna R. Chaffee, United States Army, was called into the Great Beyond.

Thus, there was lost to the Nation a truly great military genius and a truly great man, and thus have many of us been deprived of a valued friendship and a wise counselor.

Nothing that I might say could add to the luster of this great soldier who has gone from us. His record is replete with signal accomplishments, climaxed by his foresight and leadership in the development of motor propelled and drawn striking forces. He logically became the first commander of our armored force, the billet which he held when his fatal illness made necessary his relief.

For 4 years General Chaffee was the counselor of my subcommittee during the consideration of military budgets. He was handpicked for such duty by that former great Chief of Staff, Gen. Malin Craig, who knew his man and his unusual attainments.

The close association occasioned by this detail grew into warm personal friendships between General Chaffee and my colleagues and myself, and all of us deeply mourn his death.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star of last Saturday contained a very excellent editorial upon General Chaffee, which I should like to include as a part of these remarks. I shall read the concluding paragraph:

His country regrets that General Chaffee should have died so young. It is no exaggeration to say that he was a martyr to his work. The new defense organization which he helped to create is his monument. He departs with the thanks of a Nation made safer by his sacrifices.

To those expressions I know the entire membership of this body will say, "Amen."

The following editorial appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, August 23, 1941:

GENERAL CHAFFEE

The whole life of Maj. Gen. Adna R. Chaffee was devoted to the Army. A son of a distinguished soldier, he was born in the service and gloried in the circumstance throughout his career. Part of his boyhood was spent in China, where his father was in command of American troops operating against the Boxer rebels. He returned home convinced of his vocation, made an excellent record at West Point, gained his first commission in 1908. By nature fearless and confident, he was a brave and skillful horseman from the start. Riding as a member of the American Army team at the International Horse Show in London in 1911 and studying at the Saumer School in France in 1912, he qualified for promotion in the Cavalry. When the United States entered the first World War he was a captain and a West Point instructor. "Keen energy and wise discernment" in the discharge of "grave responsibilities" in the Meuse-Argonne campaign gained him the Distinguished Service Medal, to which only 3 weeks ago was added the Oak-Leaf Cluster.

General Chaffee, however, was something more than a successful officer. His most notable characteristic was an active yet disciplined imagination. Few, if any, of his contemporaries appreciated in 1918 that a new era of military science was dawning; but he visioned an army which should be strong in attack yet also sturdy in resistance to a degree hitherto unknown. Long before the panzer divisions of the German Army had been organized he was urging the development of mobile fortresses. Speaking at the Army War College in 1930, he predicted that the decisive factor in the next war would be heavily armored automotive divisions of overwhelming firepower. He was named executive officer of the pioneer mechanized cavalry unit at Fort Knox in 1931. The beginning of the present conflict in Europe found him prepared for the command of the first American armored division deserving of the name. He labored tirelessly to anticipate the inevitable crisis which he had foreseen.

In personal appearance General Chaffee, like Vachel Lindsay's General Booth, "looked the chief." His profile was eagle-sharp. When thoroughly aroused, he could flash lightning from his eyes. But he was a lovable man despite the stern aspect of his countenance.

His country regrets that General Chaffee should have died so young. It is no exaggeration to say that he was a martyr to his work. The new defense organization which he helped to create is his monument. He departs with the thanks of a nation made safer by his sacrifices.

Steps Taken Toward Participation by United States in European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KNUTE HILL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 25, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. KNUTE HILL, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include therein an address delivered over WWDC Sunday evening, August 24, 1941, may I say that President Roosevelt, in his letter last week to the Young Democrats of the United States, evidently has forgotten the following paragraphs in the 1940 Democratic platform and the paragraphs from his own speeches just prior to election on November 3, 1940:

And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again: Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

They are going into training to form a force so strong that by its very existence it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores.

Yes; the purpose of our defense is defense. (Boston, October 30, 1940.)

I am fighting to keep this Nation prosperous and at peace. I am fighting to keep our people out of foreign wars and to keep foreign conceptions of government out of our own United States. (Brooklyn, November 1, 1940.)

WE MUST STRENGTHEN DEMOCRACY AGAINST AGGRESSION

The American people are determined that war, raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa, shall not come to America.

We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack. We favor and shall rigorously enforce and defend the Monroe Doctrine.

The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been, and will continue to be, the security and defense of our own land and the maintenance of its peace.

The President has also forgotten the results of his efforts to purge certain Senators in 1936. In 1942 and 1944 let the American voters decide who are following the Democratic platform and the pledges of its leader at that time.

The radio address follows:

Dear radio friends, it is a privilege, indeed, to speak to you tonight over WWDC, and I am deeply grateful to the Veterans of Foreign Wars to have them sponsor my talk. Especially am I indebted to Mr. Elon R. Burton, who so kindly has arranged for me to express my sentiments and convictions to the people who listen in on WWDC.

It is my purpose tonight to briefly discuss the different steps taken which have tended to involve us in the present European war. First of all, the present so-called neutrality law was enacted because of the default of European nations in the payment of their indebtedness to the United States incurred during the first World War. There was such a strong sentiment against loans to the defaulting nations that the Johnson Act was passed prohibiting any loans to such nations. This, of course, included England. The Neutrality Act was passed by a substantial majority because we were definitely and distinctly promised that the cash-and-carry provision would be adhered to. No nation was to receive any goods of any kind unless it paid cash and came to our ports for them. This law has not been repealed and is in force today, notwithstanding the lend-lease legislation giving "all aid short of war" to England. The administration is today violating that law enacted by the Congress and signed by the President. By convoying these tanks and airplanes and other materials and using our fleet to protect them it is not only violating present law but seeking an excuse to get us involved in the war across the Atlantic. In Thursday's Evening Star, August 21, Elliot Roosevelt is reported to have said in London: "War entry may not be determined by the United States. One of our ships might be fired on." Where and how? In foreign waters supplying England with equipment in violation of our neutrality law. It is true that this act would not be determined by the United States Congress, which alone has the power to declare war, but it would be due to

the provocation on the part of the administration beyond any authority contained in the Constitution or granted by the Congress. I repeat it: The lend-lease legislation, broad as it is, gives no authority to convoy goods to England or any belligerent nation.

Much is said today about freedom of the seas and of our right to have our ships sail the seven seas. To my mind, it is not a question of right. We still have, and always will have, a right to use the high seas for commerce and travel purposes. But today it is a question of the wisdom of insistence on that right. Is it the wisest policy to defend that right by expending billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money for dreadnaughts and superdreadnaughts, to risk the lives of our sailors and marines in danger zones, or is it the better plan to forego the profits of our foreign trade for a time until the storm clouds of war have passed and the waves of danger have subsided? Is it not the part of wisdom to restrict our activities for the present to peaceful waters surrounding the Western Hemisphere? Especially so since we had nothing to do with the disturbance of the waters abroad.

Another most serious step leading to the present crisis was the peacetime conscription bill. Never before in our history has this occurred. It is not unfair to term it undemocratic and un-American. To be democratic it should apply to all alike. It does not when it permits the President's sons and other favored sons to become commissioned officers with good salaries To be American it should provide for remuneration for a private soldier in the same proportion as laborers in civilian pursuits. It is true that patriotism is without price. But patriotism demands service and sacrifice on the part of all—including industry and the so-called $1-a-year men, men who not only continue to receive their annual salaries from their former employers but who secure for these employers preferred Federal contracts resulting in huge profits. May I quote an old saying: "Patriotism—what crimes have been committed in thy name"

This injustice just referred to is one of the main causes for the low ebb of morale among our conscripts. Other causes are lack of equipment for proper training, the attitude of noncommissioned and regular officers—and above all, a total lack of a frank statement of the purposes for which they were drafted and are being trained. In 1917 morale was high. The boys thought that they were going across to "make the world safe for democracy." They were sadly disillusioned, it is true, and their sons today, thank God, are not anxious or willing to go across in a futile effort to guarantee the four freedoms throughout the world. They say so and they mean it. They are willing to risk their all to guarantee those four freedoms in the Western Hemisphere. One selectee was in my office the other day. I know him personally to be a fine young American—a consistent attendant at one of the city churches. He said there was a real riot at camp following the vote on the extention act. He said there had been several suicides as a result of that vote. He said most of them would have been willing to volunteer and serve 6 months longer. But that on a poll taken in his company of 130, 129 voted against service beyond the original year, and only 1 voted to continue—and he was a nephew of the commanding officer and due for a promotion. He said they were both bitter and very outspoken in their denunciation of those who voted to break faith with them on this vital issue. To check this ever-increasing discontent among the soldier boys one commentator in the Evening Star of date above referred to suggests that it is "time to use power." Power across the Pacific to fight Japan and power across the Atlantic to fight Germany. To combat these nations on their own ground will not only require the transfer of our equipment and soldiers and sailors to the continents of Asia and Europe but we will have to use the same methods and the same technique that those two militarized and mechanized nations are using. We must enforce the same dictatorial discipline, require the same blind obedience, and imitate the same goose-stepping which we as Americans have so long despised. If it were in actual defense of home and country and our splendid institutions, no force would be necessary. Americans have ever been known and are known today as brave and courageous defenders of their country, when they feel that this country is threatened by any aggressor. But they are not willing to go—and by the grace of God, they are not going to Asia, Africa, or Europe to fight other nation's wars for them. The intelligence, the will, the intense patriotism of these men and the people themselves throughout the United States will not consent to such a travesty on the integrity and purposes for which our democracy was founded.

The most recent step taken toward our participation in the European war was the secret meeting of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill on the high seas last week. There were several outstanding features of that meeting which it would be well for Americans to ponder. The mystery surrounding its very inception and throughout to its conclusion should give every true American cause for anxiety and to pause to reflect on what it means. Why all this secrecy in a democracy where the people elect one of their own as their leader? Is he not responsible to them? Is it not his duty to let them know where he, their servant, is at all times, and just what he is doing? Especially in such momentous times and in so serious a matter and in a discussion of such a tremendous issue. He had no credentials at that meeting to make any commitments. Churchill had. Note also that the meeting was aboard a British ship, and thus our Executive was on foreign soil when he made these unauthorized commitments. It was also rather strange that no American reporters or camera men were permitted to be present. It was all a British drama and democratic America was left out of the picture. No wonder the British chuckle; but to me the great wonder is that many American newspapers still continue to lick the boots of British royalty and fill their pages with British propaganda. Do they not realize that Britain's aim and game is the same today as it was in 1917 and 1918 and as it always has been? Why did she do her utmost in the War between the States to disrupt our Union? Because she envied and feared this growing Nation. Why does she now use every means to involve us in her wars? To save democracy? No; she had better practice that in India and Ireland. She wants to involve us so as to prevent us at the close of this world cataclysm from being the most powerful, the most wealthy, and the most influential nation in the world because of our neutrality and our insistence on living our own lives and pursuing the pathways of peace until and unless some aggressors might be foolish enough to make a futile attack on our impregnable ramparts and fortifications. She cannot brook a rival, let alone a superior. It should and must be our policy—and this is the solemn verdict of our American people, and the only course which will bring complete unity in our ranks—that we build up the greatest defense possible, that it be distinctly and definitely and solely for the Western Hemisphere, and that as a powerful neutral unscathed by the horrors and ravages of war we can assist in the final outcome in shaping a just and lasting peace. We can and will be called on to be the arbiter in this matter if we show the whole world that our purposes are unselfish, our aims are to be helpful to those who are ready to cooperate for the good of all nations, and that although we absolutely refuse to join them in their wars we are willing and anxious to join them in their peace parleys, which alone can guarantee the four freedoms throughout the world.

These have been the policies and practices of our greatest statesmen since the foundation of our Republic until the last two decades. Let me quote from Washington's Farewell Address: "Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other." The first President and Father of his Country did not believe in entangling alliances with any foreign countries. Then let me quote to you from that other great first American, Thomas Jefferson: "I have ever deemed it fundamental for the United States never to take part in the quarrels of Europe. Their political interests are entirely distinct from ours. Their mutual jealousies, their balance of power, their complicated alliances, their forms, and principles of government are all foreign to us. They are nations of eternal war. All their energies are expended in the destruction of the labor, property, and lives of their people.

"On our part, never had a people so favorable a chance of trying the opposite system, of peace and fraternity with mankind, and the direction of all our means and faculties to the purposes of improvement instead of destruction.

"I hope for a cordial fraternization among all the American nations and their coalescing in an American system of policy totally independent of and unconnected with that of Europe.

"The day is not distant when we may formally require a meridian of partition through the ocean which separates the two hemispheres, on the hither side of which no European gun shall ever be heard, nor an American on the other; and when, during the rage of the eternal wars of Europe, the lion and the lamb within our regions shall lie down together in peace.

"I hope no American patriot will ever lose sight of the essential policy of interdicting in the seas and territories of both Americas, the ferocious and sanguinary contests of Europe. I should rejoice to see the fleets of Brazil and the United States riding together as brethren of the same family and having the same interests." Is not the wisdom and foresight and splendid patriotism of these two great Americans as true in these eventful days as it was in those trying days of our early history? Are their ideals and ideas not as worth while to us now as they were to the people of that day and generation? Who will you, my good friends, follow today—the ones who knew full well the dangers that lurked in alliances with European aristocracies or the ones today who hold secret conferences on foreign vessels with the same type of royalists as of 1776 and 1812? Be not deceived by propaganda. Be not imbued with the fear which President Roosevelt himself in his first inaugural warned us against when he said: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Now we are taught to fear Hitler but to embrace Stalin. We are taught to fear our own lack of proper defense so as to build up the defenses of Europe. We are urged to fear our own ability, our own integrity, our own will to defeat any and all aggressors who may be foolhardy enough to attack the Western Hemisphere. I will repeat what I have before so often said, President Roosevelt still has the golden opportunity not only to have his name go down in history as the greatest American President but also to make this glorious country of ours safe for democracy and the leader of all nations along the pathways of peace and progress. I regret that he saw fit the other day in his letter to the Young Democrats of America, to read us who disagree with him in this matter out of his

party. Be it so, if he wishes. But so surely as democracy can live and function, so surely if he persists in his present foreign policies will the people of these United States read him and his ill-advised counselors out of office and into political oblivion. He should not forget Wilson and the election of 1918. He should not forget that in America the people are still the sovereigns and that unless we heed their wishes and their pleas they will repudiate us when their turn comes to speak and act. President Roosevelt, as an admirer and friend, I sincerely urge you to listen to the voice of the people and to turn away from the intrigues of war propagandists and royalists. Even your astuteness cannot escape the just wrath of an aroused and disillusioned people. Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln had an abiding faith in the common people. They trusted these common people and shaped their policies and actions in accordance with their wishes for the common good. The names of these two great Americans shine with an undimmed, increasing luster on the scroll of history. Franklin D. Roosevelt, go thou and do likewise, and your name will be greatest among the three.

The Administration's Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able address on the subject of the administration's foreign policy, delivered on August 25, 1941, by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] before the American Legion Convention at Springfield, Ill.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Commander, fellow Legionnaires, and friends, it is a genuine pleasure for me to return to Springfield as one of the speakers at this the twenty-third annual convention of the Department of Illinois of the American Legion. It was in this city that I had the high honor as your department commander to preside over the deliberations of the delegates selected to attend the convention in 1926.

You who were present will never forget the spirit of national unity which prevailed as we, with pride in our hearts, watched Capt. John Inman, commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, and Gen. Hugh Vance, commander of the Confederate Veterans, march down the aisle, arm in arm, and later shared equal honor as convention speakers.

You will also remember that epoch-making and soul-stirring event in Oak Ridge Cemetery, when these two national heroes, one of the blue and one of the gray, jointly laid a wreath of flowers on hallowed ground in the tomb of our own Abraham Lincoln.

What record is kept of the floral pieces strewn over that inn of immortality I am not advised. Yet I know that in the years gone by people in every walk of life have made a pilgrimage to Lincoln's last resting place, paying homage and tribute to his memory with the fragrance of flowers.

Mr. Commander, no wreath was ever laid in that tomb which so symbolized the beauty, the strength, the character, and the unity of a free people as did the one tendered by the patriotic hands of Captain Inman and General Vance.

That my comrades, was the type of unity that Abraham Lincoln prayed would come to a nation that was divided over the question of human rights. To achieve that unity for the benefit of future generations, Abraham Lincoln, along with thousands upon thousands of American boys, gave up their lives in mortal combat.

Today, my comrades, America again faces a crisis. It is not merely national in its scope, but encompasses the entire universe. The Lincoln doctrine that no nation can live half slave and half free can today be applied to the world. When we see the dictators of tyranny and oppression enslave innocent peoples of one nation after another in Europe, and knowing what the totalitarian ideology seeks to do—well, can we seriously ask, "Can this world continue half slave and half free?"

My comrades, if Abraham Lincoln were alive, he would challenge, tooth and nail, the European and Asiatic enemies of democracy. He had experience with a military despot during the Civil War. He saw Napoleon the Third, Emperor of France, send, through Maximilian, the puppet Emperor of Spain, ships and soldiers to Mexico ready to strike at this Nation at the psychological moment.

But Abraham Lincoln was equal to the occasion. He massed a huge army on the Mexican border. He demonstrated a show of real military force, and thanks to that strategy, the greedy foreigners returned to Europe without firing a shot, and America won that battle without losing a man.

If Lincoln were alive today, he would be striving for national unity. He would be telling the people of this Nation how Stephen A. Douglas, the little giant, but the long political enemy of Lincoln, took up the cudgel for him and his administration, speaking everywhere on the preservation of the Union. It is said by Beveridge in his life of Lincoln that the persuasive powers of Douglas probably raised 50,000 soldiers from Illinois and 200,000 from all the Northern States. Douglas the patriot submerged all political phobias for the sake of a united nation. A near parallel to the Lincoln-Douglas teamwork in a crisis can be found in Wendell Willkie's strong approval, by words and deeds, of the administration's foreign policy.

At this juncture of my address I turn to our own American Legion of Illinois for further support upon the question of unity. One of the finest editorials I have read can be found in the first issue of the Illini Legionnaire. In discussing the foreign policy this editorial said, among other things:

"In order that the play may work successfully, those charged with the responsibility for carrying it out must have the united support of all our citizens. Failure to support them in their endeavors cannot alter the plan, but may hamper them in their efforts by giving aid and comfort to our enemies.

"It is our duty to lead the fight against the enemies of democracy through the promotion of national unity. We cannot hope to supply that leadership unless we are united within our own ranks. Let us put patriotism and the welfare and security of our country above every other consideration in determining the course which we are to follow."

My comrades, those are the words of one of the most forcible and patriotic veterans to ever occupy the high and exalted position of Department Commander of Illinois, and I refer to the Honorable William Waugh. It may be well in passing to say that this editorial was approved by the publication board.

Mr. Commander, why do I discuss unity of thought, unity of purpose, and unity of action in this great emergency? Well, I happen to be the senior United States Senator from this great State, and I firmly believe that nazi-ism, with its cruel intolerance, its perverted notion of racial superiority, its so-called rendezvous with destiny, all backed by the most powerful military machine the world has ever known, is the greatest menace to democracies and their ideals since the cruel reign of Napoleon Bonaparte. I am convinced that Hitler and his fanatical followers hope some day to dominate the world.

My friends, there are a number of honest people in this country who feel that America is in no danger as a result of the war in Europe. But I merely call your attention to the fact that during the last 12 months the United States Senate has appropriated and authorized some $20,000,000,000 for defense purposes. It is significant that not a single Senator voted against these appropriations. As lawmakers entrusted with the security of this Nation, whom do we fear as we feverishly plan our national defense? Is it Mexico? Is it Sweden? Is it England? Is it Russia? No, my comrades; there is only one menace; there is only one possibility of attack, and that can be found in the ruthless philosophy of Hitler, the madman. These 96 Senators voted these billions of dollars to keep the totalitarian poison from the shores of the Western Hemisphere.

I undertake to say that the American slogan should be, "Beat Hitler." That is why I have supported one defense measure after another in this United States Senate. That is why Roosevelt and Churchill met at sea. That is why at this moment we are willing to aid communistic Russia.

My friends, no one has been more bitter in the denunciation of the communistic theory of government than I. What I have said in the past I do not retract. But today we are confronted with a condition and not a theory.

I hear it said that a free democracy like ours cannot in this crisis form any alliance with an autocracy, and especially Russia. I hear it argued that the United States ought not keep Russia in the field just to slow down the Hitler war machine. To persons who say that, I would like to ask this: Whom did George Washington make his military ally when this young democracy of ours was fighting for its freedom? And Thomas Jefferson, with his fingers still black with the ink of the Declaration of Independence, whose help did Jefferson welcome in our great Revolutionary crisis? Why, it was the help of the greatest autocracy, the most tyrannical despots of that day—the Bourbon kings of France.

Did Washington and Jefferson let their dream of democracy die rather than accept the aid of a most antidemocratic foreign power? They were no such fools. They knew that the ideals of liberty were so strong in our people that no alliance with a foreign ideology could endanger us.

Who was it in the 1860's that welcomed the fleet of the Russian Czar in the New York Harbor as a threat to foreign nations which then wished to see the United States fall? Why, my comrades, it was the immortal Abraham Lincoln, who certainly had no sympathy whatsoever with czarism. He knew that the Czar had utterly foreign ideas as to what the words "liberty" and "freedom" meant; but so long as that Czar's fleet could be helpful to the great Republic of the United States, Lincoln would use that help and be grateful.

Suppose a Communist was your next-door neighbor and you had been responsible for his arrest on a half-dozen occasions because of overt acts against the Government. And then suppose your house got on fire and the Communist came over and grabbed the hose to help put it out. Would you attempt to chop the arm off the Communist under those

circumstances? I undertake to say that you would permit him to help you save your home.

My comrades, this is no time for political partisanship or for academic hairsplitting. Hitler's time clock is grinding on, and the hour for us is later than many of us think. Only one thing now can stop that clock before that zero hour sounds in our own ears, and that one thing is a unified spirit—unity in thought; unity in producing the guns, the tanks, the planes with which England and Russia can stop Hitler. Because when and if they fall, war is inevitable for America.

With aid to these countries, I think Hitler can be stopped. We can succeed so long as we hold in check the petty carpers and obstructionists who for picayune and personal reasons would interrupt the national effort. The time for personal ambitions is past.

Let me say to you at this point, my comrades, that in this emergency, I am duty bound to follow the legislative path which I believe will make secure the American way of life for the oncoming generation of Americans. I cannot, under any circumstances, permit the question of my continuance in public office to influence my vote. It is utterly immaterial to the continuance of free government that I should continue in office, but it is basic and fundamental that I conscientiously attempt as a public officer to hand on to the next generation the same heritage which was handed to me.

Senators come and Senators go and are sometimes soon forgotten, but the principles upon which this Republic rests must continue to remain inviolate notwithstanding the Hitler-Mussolini theory to the contrary. This Republic of free men and women must continue to be the citadel of life, liberty, and happiness throughout the world.

My only hope is that in all of my acts I perform as your Senator that I am right, and my prayer is that God will give me the power to see the right. I say this with the utmost sincerity.

I submit that we must clear the road for Uncle Sam. We all must work so that the President of the United States can keep on saying as he said the other day when he returned from the historical meeting with Churchill, "We are no nearer to war."

My comrades, without attempting to speak in the way of politics, let me say I personally know Franklin D. Roosevelt, and I am willing to testify that in my opinion, he is a man of peace and not of war. I know Col. Frank Knox, I know Colonel Stimson, I know Gen. George Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, I know Admiral Stark, head of the Navy, and what is true of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy is true of these men. Nobody wants war. The polls showing 80 percent of the people not wanting war can be increased, I think, to 100 percent.

But I submit that these men in Washington, some Democrats and some Republicans in that Cabinet, are working with all the tools we will give them—they are using all the brains God gave them to keep the war from our unbombed and unscorched shores. They are using statecraft, wits, and steel, and all their ingenuity, not only to keep us out of this war, but to keep us out of possible wars to come.

Notwithstanding this, we hear men high in public office condemn every defense move that is made, boldly charging that it is another step to war, or repeating that old hackneyed phrase, "We are on the road to war."

Well, are we? I challenge that statement. Secretary Knox told the Naval Affairs Committee in executive session not 2 weeks ago that not a single American merchant vessel, or an English vessel, has been convoyed across the Atlantic, yet the press and radio have been full of convoy hullabaloo.

We have a Neutrality Act; we have combat zones which American merchant ships are prevented from entering, and not once has that Neutrality Act been violated. During this great emergency we have lost only 1 ship, and that was the *Robin Moor*, which was sunk some 600 miles off the coast of Brazil, where some 30 lives were lost. Contrast that, if you will, to 1915 and 1916, prior to our entry in the war. Do you know that we lost 21 American ships? Do you know that 8 others were fired upon in that time? Do you know that we lost the lives of 155 Americans at sea before a declaration of war was made in April 1917, and that came only after Germany had declared an unrestricted submarine warfare on the high seas of the world.

My friends, I would not vote for a declaration of war today, and I think there are few men in the Senate who would; but what tomorrow will bring forth no man dare foretell. What Hitler and his planes and submarines may do or try to do to American peoples that have the right of freedom of the seas is a question that has yet to be answered.

Mr. Commander, I am happy to have been here.

I have been criticized for not taking a more active part in Legion affairs, but I saw politicians out of Washington come to national conventions when I was the national judge advocate of the Legion, and I helped to defeat those individuals who attempt to use the Legion to further their own selfish and political ends. And I remember distinctly how the national officers felt about Washington politicians. So perhaps as a result of that experience I have leaned backward in keeping myself free from the Legion activity in Illinois and in the Nation during the last 7 years.

But there is one thing, Mr. Commander, that I am proud of, and that is my record in Congress as far as legislation affecting the ex-servicemen, their widows and dependents, is concerned. The only time that I have ever been a "yes man" in the Congress of the United States has been upon veterans' legislation, most of which was inaugurated by the American Legion.

In conclusion, I have hoped that when the history of these tremendous times is written there may shine on the pages for future generations to see the fact that the American Legion rose to the emergency and voted to stand like a rock behind the chosen President of our beloved Republic.

The American Market for the American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. JOHN THOMAS, OF IDAHO, BEFORE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made on August 22 to the Committee for Reciprocity Information relative to the proposed negotiations with Cuba for a supplemental trade agreement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Department of State on July 26, 1941, gave formal notice of its intention to negotiate with Cuba a supplemental trade agreement, in which the United States will consider the granting of concessions on sugar and molasses, tobacco, veal, beef, grapefruit, and certain stone compositions.

I desire to discuss just how further concessions to Cuba will affect the farmers and stockmen of Idaho and of the Nation. The sugar and livestock industries are the basis, either partially or entirely, for the livelihood of many thousands of citizens in Idaho and numerous other States, and I shall concern myself with paragraphs 501, relating to sugar, and 701, relating to beef and veal.

The announcement by the Department marks the third time in 8 years that the administration has undertaken to improve the position of Cuban sugar producers, and the second time in 3 years that it has undertaken to amend in Cuba's favor the original trade agreement between the two countries, which became effective on August 24, 1934.

In the case of sugar the original trade agreement of 1934, coupled with the establishment of a quota system, extended to Cuba a number of definite and highly valuable concessions. Chief among them were:

1. The rate of duty on Cuban raw sugar was reduced from $1.50 to 90 cents a hundred pounds. (Shortly before that concession had been granted, the President ordered a reduction in the duty on Cuban raw sugar from $2 to $1.50 a hundred pounds.)

2. Cuba's position in the American market, which was being undermined by Philippine competition, was protected through the imposition of quotas on all areas supplying sugar to the United States, domestic as well as foreign.

The effect of these arrangements was to give Cuba advantages in the United States which were not shared by any other foreign sugar-producing country. Not only was Cuba's volume of sales in the United States enlarged and protected, but the price she received for her sugar was significantly increased. The only assurance which the agreement gave to the domestic producers of sugar was that, in case quotas were suspended or otherwise became inoperative, the duty to be paid on Cuban raw sugar would automatically be restored to $1.50 a hundred pounds.

In the 4 years from 1934 to 1937, Cuba's sugar quotas increased from 1,866,482 short tons to 2,148,951 short tons, and the value of the produce increased from $55,217,000 in 1934 to $103,808,000 in 1937. In the face of this highly favorable position of the Cuban producer, the Department of State on November 30, 1938, gave notice that it intended to negotiate a supplemental trade agreement with Cuba, and listed sugar as one of the commodities upon which it was prepared to discuss possible concessions. But the day before the State Department deigned to give domestic producers notice of the fact that it intended to negotiate a supplemental agreement, Col. Fulgencio Batista, the president of Cuba, gave a newspaper interview in which he said that an oral agreement had already been reached to reduce the tariff to 75 cents a hundred pounds. The interview, as published in the New York Times on the morning of November 30, 1938, follows:

"HABANA, November 29.—Col. Fulgencio Batista, Cuban chief of staff, said in an interview today that an oral agreement had been reached for reduction of the tariff on Cuban sugar entering the United States. In return, he said, Cuba would throw open her market for Louisiana rice and other North American products, manufactured and agricultural, and grant certain exemptions under her nationalistic labor laws.

"Formal negotiations for modifications of the present reciprocal trade treaty between the United States and Cuba will be started in a few days, he said. Reduction of the United States tariff on Cuban sugar will not affect the United States import quotas but will benefit Cuban growers by giving them a better price.

"Colonel Batista said the present tariff on Cuban sugar of 90 cents a hundredweight would be reduced to 75 cents, the maximum reduction President Roosevelt is permitted to make under his reciprocal trade powers.

"'And we expect a further reduction when the United States Congress meets again,' said Colonel Batista."

The State Department denied that it had given any such assurances to Cuba, but 10 skeptical United States Senators joined in support of a resolution instructing the Senate Finance Committee to determine whether any prior commitments had been made by the State Department in violation of the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of June 12, 1934. That act, which authorizes trade agreements without Senate ratification, requires that "before any foreign trade agreement is concluded with any foreign government * * * reasonable public notice of the intention to negotiate any agreement * * * shall be given, in order that any interested person may have an opportunity to present his views to the President or to such agency as the President may designate."

When the negotiation of the supplemental agreement was completed late in 1939, it did not contain a reduction in the rate of duty, but it did nevertheless take away from domestic producers virtually the only protection contained in the original agreement—that is, the provision which automatically restored the duty to $1.50 whenever quotas were suspended or otherwise became inoperative. The supplemental agreement provided instead that at any time quotas were suspended the rate of tariff would remain at 90 cents if the powers of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Sugar Act of 1937 had not expired. Thus, if quotas were to be suspended today, domestic producers would be subjected to the full weight of Cuban competition with only a 90-cent rate of duty, which does not even remotely represent the differences in the cost of production of sugar in the United States and Cuba.

More recently the United States, through the Export-Import Bank, loaned Cuba $11,200,000 to finance the production of 400,000 tons of sugar, which would not have been produced without the financial encouragement of this country. This subsidy to stimulate production, incidentally, came shortly after the Department of Agriculture insisted that the production of beet sugar this year be reduced by 17 percent.

What further concessions the United States is prepared to offer to Cuban sugar producers is something known only to the Department of State—and possibly to Cuba. Domestic producers can do no better than to make guesses founded on their own fears and the Department's past performances. In any event, the total effects upon the domestic industry of any additional concessions to Cuba cannot be measured until it is determined whether the quota system is to be continued after December 31, 1941. And that remains in doubt.

First among the possibilities involved in the negotiation of a supplemental agreement is that the United States will agree to reduce the duty on Cuban raw sugar to $0.75 a hundred pounds, which is $0.15 below the prevailing rate, and the very lowest to which the tariff can be cut under the provisions of the Foreign Trade Agreements Act. If there was no reason for making that reduction in 1934 or in 1939, there is even less reason for making it now. At the present level of prices Cuba is getting more for her sugar than she has at any time since the control programs have been in effect, and her quota is 2,374,852 short tons, raw value—the highest on record. Cuba needs no reduction in duty, and the only effect of a reduction would be to protect her against any possible price reactions.

If the tariff be reduced and quotas discontinued on December 31, the results are certain to be devastating to the domestic industry, and we should keep in mind at all times that dependent upon the domestic sugar industry are some 70,000 sugar-beet growers of the West, 18,000 sugarcane growers in Louisiana and Florida, 190,000 field workers, 10,000 factory employees, and their families. The extinction of the domestic sugar industry means the destruction of the livelihoods of these tens of thousands of Americans.

The proposal to negotiate a supplemental agreement with Cuba without regard to the continuance or discontinuance of the general sugar program is fundamentally unsound and unfair to the domestic industry. The original Cuban agreement of 1934, which reduced the duty on Cuban sugar from $1.50 to $0.90, was negotiated after quotas and a tax-and-payment system had been enacted by Congress, and, as mentioned above, that agreement provided that the rate of duty would be automatically restored to $1.50 if quotas became ineffective. If adequate protection is to be given domestic producers, that provision should once more be made a part of the agreement, and no further concessions granted to foreign producers, whether they be in Cuba or some other tropical area, at the direct expense of the Federal Treasury.

Cuba today is getting $0.75 a hundred pounds more for her sugar in the United States market than she can get anywhere else in the world, which amounts to a bounty of more than $30,000,000 a year which American consumers pay to Cuban sugar producers. A reduction of $0.15 in the duty would add another $6,000,000 to this subsidy, and this is at a time when Congress is faced with the prospect of imposing ever higher taxes on its own citizens. There can be no doubt that the tax revenue is needed, and if it be lost by extravagant gestures to foreign sugar producers it inevitably means that the burdens to be assumed by American taxpayers must be so much greater.

There is another consideration which should not be overlooked. For the purpose of the national defense we should be doing everything possible to encourage, rather than to discourage, the domestic sugar industry. We should profit by our experience in the last war. Because we were so largely dependent upon foreign production during the first World War, we were forced to ration sugar, and we saw the price skyrocket to an excessively high level. The national interest today demands that such a vital industry be protected, and I think that we will be doing a real disservice to the well-being of the Nation if we take steps which undermine the stability of the domestic sugar producer.

Paragraph 701 refers to beef and veal, fresh, chilled, or frozen.

It has been argued by some that the amount involved in these negotiations is very small, and that the concession, if granted, would not materially affect the economic welfare of beef producers in this country. The real point, however, is that the concessions we have been making to foreign countries add up to what very nearly represents the difference between profit and loss for the American producer.

Imports of beef from Cuba during the last year have increased more than 2,000 percent, from 507,000 pounds in 1939 to 11,000,000 pounds in 1940. Since the first of 1941, from 500 to 1,000 carcasses, running about 300 pounds each, and cut into quarters, have been imported per week. The imported beef is usually of low grade and sells at a discount of 5 cents per pound. The normal tariff duty on beef is 6 cents per pound; but since Cuba has already been granted a 20-percent preferential treatment, she is able to bring beef to our shores with only a 4.8-cents-per-pound duty. It is not difficult to see that already Cuban importation has had a depressing effect upon the prices which the American producer is able to command, and that any further reduction in the tariff duty would be of additional disadvantage to the domestic stockman.

The American producer has for the past decade suffered great hardships, and for the first time in many years has an opportunity to overcome them by securing his appropriate share of the American market, the best market in the world. He is entitled to that opportunity, and it is the duty of the Government to help him to regain his economic feet and to permit him to participate in the years of plenty after the years of despair.

Domestic stockmen are faced with the largest cattle population in history. Figures show that the population has increased from 68,801,000 in 1940 to 71,666,000 in 1941. By January 1, 1942, it is conservatively estimated that the total cattle population may reach 74,000,000 head. The Department of Agriculture publication Livestock, Meats, and Wool Market Reviews and Statistics, dated August 13, gives some interesting figures on the number of cattle on feed on August 1 of this year:

"There were 17 percent more cattle on feed for market in the 11 Corn Belt States on August 1 this year than a year earlier, according to the August cattle feeding report of the United States Department of Agriculture. This was the largest relative increase in the number on feed August 1 compared with the number a year earlier shown by these reports going back to 1928. The actual number of cattle on feed August 1 this year was undoubtedly the largest since the beginning of the drought period in 1934 and probably was among the largest for this date for all years.

"Increased numbers on feed are shown for all States, ranging from 6 and 5 percent in Ohio and Kansas, respectively, to 25 percent in Iowa and Nebraska and 35 percent in South Dakota. The increase in the eastern Corn Belt is 11 percent and in the western Corn Belt 21 percent. This estimated increase in cattle feeding of 17 percent on August 1, compares with the estimates of 16 percent increase on April 1 and of 11 percent increase on January 1.

"Reports received by the Agricultural Marketing Service from a large number of Corn Belt feeders indicate that most of the increase in the number on feed on August 1 this year is in relatively long-fed cattle—cattle that have been on feed over 7 months, or since before January 1. These reports show that about 40 percent of the cattle on feed August 1 this year had been on feed over 7 months compared with about 31 percent reported in August last year; that about 33 percent had been on feed from 4 to 7 months this year as against 29 percent last year; and that the number of short-fed cattle—on feed less than 4 months—was only 26 percent this year compared with 40 percent last year.

"These reports check fairly well with reports received from cattle feeders earlier in the year. In January these reports showed that feeder calves made up a larger proportion of the cattle on feed than a year earlier and most feeder calves are fed beyond August 1. In April these reports showed that a larger proportion of the cattle on feed April 1 would be marketed after July 1 than was shown by reports in April a year earlier.

"Shipments of stocker and feeder cattle—from stockyards and direct—into the Corn Belt, which were of record size for the period during the first quarter of this year, tended to drop off somewhat in the second quarter. However, shipments into the Corn Belt States through stockyard markets during the second quarter were the largest since 1930, and the

total of all shipments during the first half of 1941 were probably the largest for all years."

It is evident there is no danger of shortage that necessitates making concessions to foreign nations. The livestock producers of the United States have produced cattle in unprecedented numbers, and there is no reason why they should not be allowed to dispose of their produce in their own country without undue competition from foreign nations.

The price situation itself is still uncertain. The prices received for beef cattle since January 1 generally have been below the cost of production. Prices on heavy, well-finished steers have followed the normal downward trend since the first of the year, whereas prices of the lightest weights and lower grades of slaughter cattle have held about steady. Well-finished steers are now low in relation to other grades and classes of slaughter and feeder cattle. Marketings of slaughter cattle have been of record proportions during recent months, apparently reflecting a heavy movement of grain-fed steers and heifers, and it is hoped that this may reduce somewhat the expected large increase in supply during the late summer and early fall. Marketing of grain-fed cattle, however, will increase seasonally during the next few months, and total slaughter supplies of cattle are expected to continue larger than a year earlier. It is hoped that the general level for cattle prices will continue at least as high as a year earlier during the remainder of 1941, and it seems likely that the price on well-finished cattle will advance considerably over the last half of 1940.

It should be borne in mind that the position of the American stockman has been a hazardous one. During the drought year, 1934, nearly 10,000,000 head of cattle had to be sacrificed to the elements. Cattle worth from fifty to one hundred dollars or more were sold at an average price of fifteen or twenty dollars per head. It would take many, many years of favorable prices to enable the domestic stockman to regain the losses sustained during those awful years, and it has been only in recent months that prices for beef cattle have been adequate. It is, in my opinion, absolutely unfair to snatch this opportunity from the American stockman just as he is beginning to reestablish himself financially.

The danger of the present must not make us overlook the future, and I am convinced that wise planning for the post-war period forbids further decrease in the tariffs. When the war is ended, when the nations of the world must return to a peacetime economy, it will be all the more important that we have adequate protection for the American producer. Surely, appropriate concern for the future demands opposition to all moves which tend to destroy tariff protection!

Some will insist that we must make further concessions to Cuba because of our good-neighbor policy. I, however, do not believe that the good-neighbor program is involved in these discussions. Our relations with Cuba have been satisfactory. Our Government has made many concessions to her. We have been extremely careful to protect her interests and her economy. Cuba is in better shape now than she has been in for some time, and there is no reason why the farmers and stockmen of the United States, who have suffered for so many years, should be asked to make further concessions in the name of the good-neighbor policy.

Since the American farmer realizes the great desirability of cementing a friendship between all the nations of the Western Hemisphere, he is willing to make sacrifices for an honest good-neighbor policy. But when such a policy means ruin to him instead of a 50–50 proposition whereby there are benefits to be received in return for the concessions which he makes, then he has the right to wonder whether he is being sold down the river. As the good-neighbor policy has unfolded itself, the American farmer has found that he is making all the sacrifices while somebody else is securing all the benefits. Any fair-minded person can readily see that the policy has become discriminatory, inequitable, and manifestly unfair as far as American agriculture is concerned.

For the reasons embodied herein, I am firmly opposed to granting further concessions to Cuba, and I am quite confident that objective consideration of the facts will bring the Committee for Reciprocity Information to the same conclusion. Those of us who are concerned with the welfare of the American farmer and of the Nation as a whole see the danger and the injustice which lie in further destruction of the American farmer's tariff protection.

Supplemental Trade Agreement With Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

BRIEF FILED BY HON. HUGH BUTLER, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief filed by me on August 25, 1941, with the Committee for Reciprocity Information in connection with the negotiation of a proposed supplemental trade agreement with Cuba.

I have obtained from the Government Printing Office an estimate of the cost of printing this brief in the RECORD, which is $157.50.

There being no objection, the brief was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL TRADE AGREEMENT WITH CUBA

In connection with negotiation of the proposed supplemental trade agreement with Cuba, it may be of assistance to recall the language of the act authorizing such negotiations.

The Trade Agreements Act, amending the Tariff Act of 1930, reads in part as follows:

"SEC. 350. (a) For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States (as a means of assisting in the present emergency in restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic unemployment and the present economic depression, in increasing the purchasing power of the American public, and in establishing and maintaining a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce) by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production so that foreign markets will be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets by affording corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States."

It will be noted that the purpose of the trade-agreements program, as set forth in the language of the act, is to expand our export markets. The act says nothing about the necessity of helping Latin American nations dispose of their surpluses by dumping them in the American market. It does not suggest that this policy is to be undertaken for the purpose of controlling the foreign policies of other nations. There is not even an implication in the language cited or elsewhere in the act that the purpose is to bail out American banks and other corporations that have invested their capital abroad. The good-neighbor policy is not even mentioned. All it talks about is exports. With this clearly in mind, it may be well to consider just what are our prospects for expanding exports to Cuba through reciprocal trade agreements or otherwise.

In this connection two important factors distinguish the present situation from that which existed at the time the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934—the shipping shortage and the domestic rearmament program.

As regards shipping, at the present time there is what amounts to a world-wide shortage of bottoms for ocean commerce. There is no need to cite figures to prove that fact to this committee; undoubtedly the members are as familiar with the facts of the case as I am. The United States is suffering at the present time from a shortage of essential materials, simply because the shipping is not available to bring them in. Rubber processors have been notified that they must begin to cut down their use of rubber below customary levels. The tin shortage is so acute that only recently the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply found it necessary to establish a price ceiling for that commodity. Somewhat the same thing could be said of burlap. It is even rumored that no copper will be available to civilian use during coming months, simply because the shipping is not available to bring in enough of the metal to meet our expanded needs. Every important industrial export commodity is finding all the markets it can supply in view of the lack of shipping. How, then, can our exports to Cuba be expanded by a trade agreement?

The second major factor to consider is the heavy drain in our domestic supplies of raw materials and manufactured goods, incident to the national-defense program. Shortages of goods are appearing in all lines. Consumers in the southeast are being rationed on electricity and those along the eastern seaboard on gasoline, and manufacturers in all lines are being rationed on practically all the major metals and on such materials as rubber, silk and rayon, and numerous chemical products. Have we got anything to spare for Cuba?

Just to emphasize this point, let us take a look at some of the major items which have entered into our export trade with Cuba in the past, on the assumption that these are the products of which we might naturally expect to increase sales. Nineteen hundred and thirty-nine may be taken as the most recent normal year and is fairly typical of other years. In that year we shipped to Cuba 1,140,859 barrels of crude petroleum, 530,218 barrels of gasoline and other petroleum motor fuel, 55,398 barrels of lubricating oils, and 322,362 barrels of residual fuel oil, with a total value of over $3,500,000. At a time when consumers on the eastern coast are being asked to curtail their use of gasoline and other petroleum products because of the shortage of shipping space, are we to divert needed tankers to the Cuba trade? In the present crisis, is there any sense in trying to expand sales of petroleum products to Cuba? Can we even afford to try to maintain the present volume of sales?

Another group of exports is made up of the following items: Iron and steel sheets, galvanized, 11,094,690 pounds; tin plate and taggers' tin, 23,406,921 pounds; tubular products and fittings, 21,963,192 pounds; bars and rods, 31,281,545 pounds; and wire and manufactures, 22,332,412 pounds; with a total

value of well over $4,000,000. Is it proposed to open up greater export markets for these products on the heels of the news that steel has been placed under mandatory priority control and that there will be an estimated 11,000,000-ton shortage of civilian and national-defense needs this year? The shortage situation with regard to most of the other metals is, of course, much worse than in steel.

In 1939 we also exported the following commodities to the values stated (in most cases quantity figures are not available for these items): Sugar-mill machinery, $324,713; other industrial machinery, $1,671,067; electric refrigerators, $701,818; radio apparatus, $585,371; motor trucks, busses, and chassis, new, $737,066; passenger cars and chassis, new, $1,410,328; and automobile parts for replacement, $649,818; a total of over $6,000,000. Is there a single item listed here of which we have a surplus for export? Discussions are already proceeding on the question of how much more than 26 percent the production of passenger cars must be cut this year. A reduction of at least 40 percent seems certain, and higher figures are suggested on all sides. Refrigerators are another industry that is slated for a drastic reduction, and by present indications the production of private radios will be practically wiped out. There is a shortage of practically all kinds of machinery and further shortage of the materials of which they are made.

As a final example of the goods we cannot sell, may I mention rubber-tire casings, auto, of which we exported 94,089 in 1939, with a value of $1,002,237. Tire manufacturers have already been told that they must expect to have their supplies of rubber cut because of the extreme difficulties of securing sufficient supplies of crude rubber from the Far East. In view of the expanded consumer demand and the pressure of military requirements on our rubber supplies, it is a certainty that there will not be enough rubber and rubber goods to go around. Are we then to sell the Cubans tires made from rubber we have not got, brought long distances in ships we cannot spare, for them to use on the automobiles we cannot supply them and which they can get nowhere else?

I have not dealt with every industrial commodity that we customarily export to Cuba, but only with a few of the more important ones. Many of the minor items which I have not mentioned, but which, taken together, amount to a considerable total, fall into the same categories as those listed above. Furthermore I have mentioned only some of the products in which a shortage is known to exist. I have not touched on a long range of commodities in which a shortage is possible or probable. Bituminous coal, for example, of which we shipped 260,885 tons to Cuba in 1939, at a value of $1,293,740, may not be as abundant as we could wish this winter because of the strike last spring and the rising demand for it for defense purposes, and it is unlikely that there will be any supply for expansion of sales to Cuba, even assuming our railroads can carry the increased quantities, which, again, is doubtful. Jute bags, of which we shipped the value of $551,787, and southern pine, of which we sold $1,065,770 to Cuba in 1939, are commodities for which the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply has found it necessary to set price ceilings, which implies at least a possible shortage. Altogether, there are practically no major industrial commodities, with a few minor exceptions, such as glass containers, paper and paperboards, and cotton cloth, of which we are not already pressed to maintain adequate supplies for our own industrial and consumer needs, to say nothing of expanding our exports. In short, whether this agreement is negotiated or not, the Cubans are likely shortly to find themselves in the same position as the Americans—their pockets full of money, but nothing to spend it on. I submit that to negotiate a trade agreement with the purpose of expanding exports under such conditions is the most foolish procedure imaginable; and yet let me emphasize again the purpose of the trade-agreements program, as set forth in the preamble of the act, is to expand exports, and no other purpose is mentioned.

It may be observed that I have thus far made no mention of exports of agricultural products. This has been for two reasons: First, because agricultural exports to Cuba are so small compared with agricultural imports from Cuba that no friend of American agriculture could possibly justify a trade agreement with Cuba on the ground that agricultural exports will be aided; and, second, because American farmers have learned from sad experience that the promised benefits to be gained from wider export markets have not always materialized.

A striking case to prove this latter point is provided by the story of our exports of wheat flour. A table is here given to show, in barrels, our exports of wheat flour to Cuba:

	Wheat flour, total	Wheat flour, wholly of United States wheat	Other wheat flour	Percent, United States wheat
1932	779,058	----------	----------	----------
1933	745,661	----------	----------	----------
1934	884,893	----------	----------	----------
1935	1,009,374	220,060	789,314	21.8
1936	1,023,417	162,932	860,485	15.9
1937	1,052,967	310,160	742,807	29.5
1938	989,191	543,592	445,599	55.0
1939	1,045,078	519,851	525,227	49.7
1940	1,015,059	482,324	532,735	47.5
1941 (3 months)	293,444	221,764	71,680	75.6

It will be noted that in only one full year was as much as half of the American flour shipped to Cuba, ground wholly from American wheat. It may be pointed out, by way of emphasis, that the flour listed as "not wholly of United States wheat" is, in fact, wholly of foreign wheat, as is shown by the following table giving imports of wheat for milling in bond and export to Cuba, with the flour equivalent of such wheat:

	Imports of wheat [1]	Flour equivalent
	Bushels	*Barrels*
1939	2,597,500	552,660
1940	2,456,827	522,729
1941 (3 months)	382,622	81,409

[1] For milling in bond and export to Cuba

It will be seen that the amounts of wheat imported for milling into flour for shipment to Cuba would produce almost exactly the amounts of flour to correlate with the figures for wheat flour, not wholly of United States wheat shipped to Cuba, given in the preceding table.

In addition, it should be remembered that our exports to Cuba of flour from American wheat were made possible only through a subsidy under the export diversion program of the Surplus Marketing Administration. From September 7, 1938 (the date of the beginning of the program) to August 4, 1941, diversion payments were made on 1,781,163 barrels of flour for export to Cuba, or the equivalent of 8,193,348 bushels of wheat. It will be observed that these figures agree roughly with the figures on exports of flour from American wheat given above, when allowance is made for the overlapping of the time periods, indicating that all or substantially all of the flour from American wheat exported received subsidy. It should further be noted that prior to 1938, the date of the beginning of the subsidy program, flour from American wheat had only a small share of the Cuban market. Total diversion payments during the same period have been $1,870,347, or at an average rate of about $1.05 per barrel, equivalent to 22.83 cents per bushel. Evidently we cannot depend on a preferential agreement with Cuba to sell our wheat flour, but must pay an extra bribe. No criticism of the Surplus Marketing Administration's program is implied here, on the contrary, it is evident on the basis of the record that it was the important factor which enabled us to expand our sales of flour from American wheat, which logically leads to the conclusion that we could sell more flour if we junked the trade-agreements program but increased the subsidy payments per barrel of flour.

The other agricultural product to which free traders are fond of pointing as a commodity which should be benefited by the trade-agreements program is lard, and it is, of course, true that Cuba annually purchases small quantities But recent events have fully borne out the contentions of those who have advocated preserving the American market for the American farmer to the full extent of his ability to supply it, by excluding competitive imports of foreign oils and fats. Lard prices are at present at the best level in 4 years, but not because of exports to Cuba. Lard production last year was the heaviest in a number of years, stocks are at or near record levels, exports are at the lowest figure since 1936–37, the last drought year, but prices are good. The only possible explanation is that the exclusion, because of the shipping shortage, of low-priced competitive imported oils has created an additional domestic demand for lard which has pulled prices up to their present satisfactory level. It is evident that the domestic market can absorb all the lard produced at satisfactory prices provided these foreign tropical oils are kept out.

A few other agricultural products are exported to Cuba to some extent, but on the whole their importance is practically infinitesimal compared with the sugar, molasses, tobacco, cattle, and other competitive agricultural imports—and every important import from Cuba is both agricultural and competitive. In the case of every one of our agricultural exports to Cuba, the crop in question is grown on the same land as would be used to grow sugar, and by farmers who ask only the right to be permitted to shift to sugar. Ask Louisiana which is more important to its economy, sugar or rice. Speaking for Nebraska alone, I can say without qualification that Nebraska farmers would gladly give up their minor markets for such products as beans and potatoes if in turn the restrictions on their sugar acreage were abandoned. Agriculture knows that it can expect no benefit from trade agreements negotiated with tropical countries producing the same products as are grown in the United States, and will not sell out its birthright—the American market—in exchange for a relatively slight expansion in the markets for a couple of its minor crops.

One other argument for trade agreements with Latin American countries which has featured prominently in discussions recently relates to the necessity of providing markets for the surpluses of nations which can no longer sell to Europe. There is no warrant for a trade agreement negotiated for such a reason, as I have pointed out. Congress never authorized the Committee for Reciprocity Information, the State Department, or any other administrative agency to give away American markets in order to help foreigners with their problems. But even assuming such a policy should be adopted, there is no need for an agreement with Cuba under present circumstances.

In the first place, it may be pointed out that Latin America is not the only part of the

world troubled with surpluses arising from lost foreign markets. The American farmer has been hit in precisely the same way and to at least as great an extent as has the Cuban colono. The table below summarizes just what the war has done to those important branches of American agriculture which are dependent on foreign markets for outlets for a portion of their production.

United States exports

	Monthly average, fiscal years—		
	1938–39	1939–40	1940–41 [1]
Lard, 1,000 lbs.	19,956	21,400	15,182
Bacon and sides, do	1,105	1,884	407
Hams and shoulders, do	4,894	3,071	702
Cotton, upland, 500-lb. bales, thousands	297	531	105
Leaf tobacco:			
Bright flue-cured, 1,000 lbs.	30,208	21,026	11,115
Dark-fired, Kentucky and Tennessee, 1,000 lbs.	3,970	2,925	1,025
Wheat, grain, 1,000 bu.	7,049	1,970	973
Apples, fresh, do	1,006	268	76
Pears, fresh, 1,000 lbs.	14,248	7,755	2,135
Oranges, 1,000 boxes	632	321	349
Raisins, 1,000 lbs.	12,770	10,564	7,120
Prunes, dried, do	17,836	9,920	3,232

[1] 11 months.

The above list includes practically every important American agricultural product which is dependent on foreign markets to any important extent, as reported regularly by the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations in the latest monthly supplement to Foreign Crops and Markets. It will be seen at once that for every commodity exports have declined from the levels of the last pre-war year—1938–39—levels which in most cases were far from satisfactory. In many cases exports have declined drastically or been practically wiped out. There is no prospect that exports of these products will materially improve unless the wars come to an end. Cuba and other Latin American countries cannot offer us any significant expansion of markets for any of these products, with a few minor exceptions. Evidently the American farmer has surplus problems of his own without worrying about those of Latin America. No doubt we shall be told that Cuba is more dependent on agriculture than is the United States. This is true, of course, but is of little significance. The average middle-western wheat farmer (who might like to grow some sugar) is just as dependent on wheat as the Cuban sugar grower is on sugar. It is no comfort to the Nebraska wheat producer to learn that some other fellow has gotten a job in a gunpowder factory, and it is still just as difficult for him to see why the Cuban surplus problem should be solved by transferring it to the United States.

Before we allow ourselves to become too sentimental about the sad plight of the great American sugar corporations operating in Cuba it might be as well to evaulate Cuba's present position with respect to foreign markets and attempt to determine the sales prospects for her sugar in the near future. One thing is certain: If Cuba is suffering from a lack of foreign outlets, it is not the fault of the United States. Under the most recent quota allocation of the Sugar Division of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Cuba is permitted to ship the tremendous total of 2,374,852 short tons, raw-sugar basis, to this country—far more than in any year since the sugar-control program was first instituted and about 625,000 tons more than her quota of last year.

At an average price of $2 a hundred (which is below the prices prevailing for the past few months), this increase in quota alone will net Cuba about $25,000,000 more than her sales to this market last year. But such a computation fails to take into account the increase in Cuban receipts arising from the substantial advance in prices over those of last year. It is impossible, of course, to predict what prices Cuba will receive for her sugar during the remainder of this year. It will surely be ultra-conservative to say that prices at Habana for quota sugar this year should average at least 25 cents per hundred higher than last year. On the basis of such an assumption, Cuba will receive an additional increase of better than $10,000,000 in receipts on account of price advance, making at least $35,000,000 more from sales of sugar to the United States market alone. Since Cuba's normal sales of sugar to us during the past 2 or 3 years have averaged only about $70,000,000 per year, it is clear that she may expect an increase in total receipts from this source of about 50 percent at the minimum. Thus it may be said that if it was necessary to "do something for Cuba," it has already been done. Why is it necessary to make still further concessions? Why not "do something for America" for a change?

The other major factor in Cuba's foreign-trade position is her sales of sugar on the world market. In recent years this source of income has been relatively minor. Exports of sugar to countries other than the United States, according to the Cuban Stabilization Institute, were 811,000 short tons, English in 1937; 920,000 in 1938; 855,000 in 1939; while in 1940, of course, they dropped to 571,000. It is apparent that the first full year of war resulted in a loss to Cuba of foreign markets outside the United States of less than 300,000 tons. This loss has already been more than made up by the increased quota granted in the United States market, and sales in the American market take place at a higher price than those in world markets.

Secondly, it may be mentioned that Cuban prospects for expanded sales to markets other than the United States are far from unfavorable. It is, of course, extremely difficult to get accurate information on international movements of sugar. The United Kingdom, the chief buyer of world sugar, naturally does not publish statistics on its operations. But there are many indications that Britain, having substantially depleted the stocks accumulated before the war and during its early months, is buying again. In view of the shipping shortage, it is unlikely that Britain will be able to draw to any great extent on her normal suppliers in the Far East and Africa. The Caribbean, as the nearest source of supply, seems slated to become again, as in the last war, the sugar supplier for Britain's fighting forces. And if Canada's requirements and those of other Latin American countries, such as Mexico, absorb all the surplus from the British Caribbean colonies and other minor suppliers in that area, it is not only possible, but probable, that Britain will be depending on Cuba for something like 1,000,000 tons of sugar a year.

During last year and the first 6 months of this year British purchases of Cuban sugar were not particularly heavy. This may be attributed to the large British stocks built up before 1940, to British purchases from distant sources before the shipping shortage became so acute, and, early this year, to the sale of practically the entire Dominican surplus to Britain. In recent weeks, however, the British have again entered the market. Willett & Gray's Weekly Statistical Sugar Trade Journal of August 14 announces total Cuban exports to markets outside the United States, up to August 9, of 196,000 Spanish long tons, an increase of 82,000 over export figures for the first 6 months of the year, or better than 15,000 tons a week. Lamborn reports, according to the Journal of Commerce, Cuban exports to world markets during the week ended August 17 of nearly 40,000 tons. And the following day the same paper reported British purchases for September-October delivery of between sixty and seventy-five thousand tons of Cuban at $1.75 f. o. b. Cuba, with further interest manifested at that price.

But if Cuba should sell anywhere near 1,000,000 tons to world markets this year, it would take up all her carry-over and make it doubtful that she could even fill her United States quota; while if her sales to Britain and other countries are no more than half a million tons, she will still be selling as much as or more than normal, and at a better price. Before the Committee for Reciprocity Information takes steps to "do something for Cuba" it might be well to undertake an investigation to see whether Cuba is not doing something for herself and is not in fact "making a killing" out of this war.

I have not burdened members of the Committee for Reciprocity Information with extensive tables of statistics and do not propose to do so now. The committee is, of course, familiar with the course of sugar prices during the last war, when the average price of raw sugar, c. i. f. New York, advanced from 2.28 during the last month before the war to 20.58 in May 1920, after rationing and other restrictions on consumption had been abandoned. This particular incident has been the subject of much controversy and the cause of much bitterness. Probably the weight of evidence indicates that since Cuba was the dominant supplier of our sugar requirements, Cuba must accept the major share of the blame for the high prices. But be that as it may, one thing is certain: If there had been more sugar available, no such speculative price advance would have been possible. Certainly the prices of 1920 had no relation to cost, but were purely a reflection of temporary shortage. The best way to avoid a recurrence of such an incident, therefore, is to increase supplies of sugar, laying up reserve stocks, if necessary, against such temporary shortages, and to encourage production in dependable sources, which means in the United States. But this cannot be done by cutting the duty on Cuban sugar.

The present duty is no bar to importation of all the sugar that Cuba has to spare. The only limitations of any importance on imports of Cuban sugar are the quota, which can be raised if necessary, and the shipping shortage, which may operate to make even Cuban supplies uncertain. A reduction of the duty, on the other hand, will be taken as clear evidence by the domestic industry that their Government is not interested in the welfare of their industry, that they cannot expect to have their interests consulted, that even if they do their part in meeting the prospective shortage of sugar by expanding production their increased investment will not be protected, and that they may expect to write off as total loss, after the end of the present emergency, any investment in expansion of production equipment. Under such conditions, what sane man will expand the productive capacity of his factory or his sugar mill or go to the expense of preparing new land or buying new equipment for increased sugar cultivation? Since domestic sugar production is our only dependable source of sugar, encouragement of the domestic industry to expand, rather than discouragement, would seem to be called for. Just in the last few months we have had further evidence that foreign sources of supply depending on marine transportation are not reliable. Let us do everything in our power to avoid a recurrence of the shortage prices of 1920.

I have not gone into the question of specific commodities or specific rates of duty to any great extent. I have no doubt that representatives of the various industries involved will present their own cases ably. Personally, I am opposed to reductions on all the major items listed, and I should like to

mention some of them briefly. I have discussed sugar at some length

Molasses is another item which should have a higher duty, not a lower one.

The present duty is nominal. Cuba's exports of molasses to this market have expanded phenomenally during the past 2 years in response to the defense demand for industrial alcohol. The volume of demand has been so great that recently Secretary Wickard offered 20,000,000 bushels of corn for use in the manufacture of alcohol. In the statement making this announcement, it is pointed out that "using corn in the manufacture of industrial alcohol will further the national-defense effort by making available more alcohol and by freeing tanker space needed for the shipment of strategic materials, and will also aid the agricultural situation by removing surplus corn and making increased corn storage space available for the 1941 crop. Feed grain supplies are more than sufficient to meet the requirements for the increases in livestock, dairy, and poultry production sought under the food-for-defense program." If the present duty on molasses is no bar to greatly increased imports, if part of the corn surplus can be used for the same purpose while still leaving plenty of feed for our livestock industry, and if present imports of molasses are hindering the defense program because of their demands on the limited supply of tanker space, why, then, should the duty be reduced?

Another item listed is beef and veal—fresh, chilled, or frozen. I would not be true to Nebraska or American agriculture if I did not raise my voice in protest against any reduction in the duty on beef. During the past 2 years beef has been coming in from Cuba in quantity, and, in fact, during the first 5 months of this year over 13,000,000 pounds entered at the present rate of duty. Prior to 1940 Cuba was on an import basis, but as soon as their livestock industry developed even a slight surplus they apparently had no trouble in shipping it in here over the present rate of duty. In view of this fact, how can the present rate of duty be burdensome? As a matter of fact, recent developments in Cuba would seem to cast doubt on the existence of a Cuban surplus of beef. A news bulletin from Habana of barely 2 weeks ago reads as follows:

"CUBA BANS MEAT EXPORTS IN SHORTAGE

"HABANA.—A threatened meat shortage in Habana brought a presidential ban today on exports of livestock or dressed meat from Cuba. Cuban cattlemen have been reluctant to sell beef at the Government-fixed price of 3.20 cents a pound, saying they had a better market abroad. The result was a meat shortage, which began here last week."

I understand that since that time the ban on exports of Cuban beef has been taken off, but it is evident that exports of beef to this market can only be made at the expense of the Cuban consumer. While we are speaking of "doing something for Cuba," we might think of that. If American consumers need cheaper beef (which is doubtful), surely Cuban consumers need it worse and are less able to pay higher prices for it. At least, it appears that Cuba is not entirely sure whether she wants to sell us her beef, and it would be only the part of prudence for us to insist that she make up her mind before we give her the market to which American cattlemen are entitled.

I cannot close without pointing out the position of American agriculture in the present emergency and the effects of the trade-agreements program upon the agricultural situation. For many years it has been recognized by the Congress and the people that a pronounced disparity exists between the rewards received by agriculture and those paid to labor and industry. This recognition has been embodied in many separate acts of legislation, even including the act under which the trade-agreements program operates, as evidenced by the language of the first paragraph "as a means of assisting * * * in establishing and maintaining a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce." That the various remedial measures undertaken to assist agriculture and overcome this disparity have not been markedly successful is shown by the figures for national income for last year, when the 22.9 percent of the population on farms received only 7.2 percent of the national income, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

At the present time we are engaged in a great national effort to repair our defenses and assist our friends abroad. This policy is calling for and will call for greater and greater sacrifices, higher and higher taxes. Agriculture will bear its fair share of these burdens without complaint. On the other hand, the economic boom resulting from our defense expenditures has enabled some groups—those receiving defense jobs or contracts and those located in defense-boom areas—to compensate for their added burdens with additional income. Not so with agriculture. Expenditures on defense mean an industrial boom, not an agricultural boom. The defense program, therefore, is likely to increase the disparity between agriculture and industry, rather than to lessen it. Even this agriculture can bear without protest, on the assumption and the hope that it will be but temporary.

But now a drive seems to be under way to cut import duties on all Latin American products on the plea of hemispheric solidarity, and since practically all the other nations of this hemisphere are predominantly agricultural, this simply means destroying agriculture's protection for the supposed benefit of industry and placing agriculture permanently on an inferior basis, with no hope of relief. If we have been unable to control our own surpluses and maintain decent prices for just our own products, how can we possibly raise world prices to the levels necessary to give American farmers a standard of living commensurate with that enjoyed by other groups of the economy? Agriculture cannot sit idly by while the basis of its economic position is swept away through administrative decisions rushed through under the excuse of an emergency. Farmers cannot be persuaded to support a national-defense program if it carries with it not only the added burdens naturally associated with such a program and shared by all groups, not only the temporary disparities against agriculture and in favor of industry resulting from the placement of defense contracts, but a program of bartering away our only remaining market—the American market—with the calculated intent of placing agriculture permanently in a colonial status. Agriculture cannot support the defense program wholeheartedly if that is the certain outcome, and without the wholehearted support of agriculture this program will not succeed.

One other factor I should like to call to this committee's attention in connection with agriculture's role in the defense emergency. American agriculture can produce bountifully all the foods and raw materials adapted to a temperate-zone climate and likely to be required by the Nation during this critical period. There is plenty of idle land, improved and ready for the plow, plenty of feed for livestock, enough equipment, and the farmers' own labor to be drawn upon. All these resources will be willingly devoted to production of the Nation's needs, provided that a reasonable time is given for readjustment to changed demand and a fair price is assured. But farmers cannot make the maximum contribution to defense needs if there is constantly hanging over them the destruction of their markets and the repeated evidence that their Government is not interested in their long-time welfare.

In conclusion I can summarize my position as follows:

1. No authority is given in the Trade Agreements Act for negotiation of trade treaties for any purpose other than the expansion of exports. There is no prospect whatever that exports to Cuba be expanded by this agreement, and we do not desire, nor can we fill, broader export markets for the products we customarily ship to Cuba at the present time.

2. Cuban agriculture does not need any more help in her problems than has already been given by the United States. American agriculture is far more troubled with surpluses than is Cuba.

3. American agriculture is the only dependable source of raw materials and goods for American needs. The shipping shortage will become more, not less, acute and it is therefore essential that American agriculture be encouraged to produce more, not less.

4. This treaty appears to be a part of a calculated program to destroy agriculture's protection against the dumping of the surpluses of foreign nations and to place agriculture in a permanently inferior status to that of industry.

Address by Senator Capper to the People of Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

ADDRESS BROADCAST FROM STATION WRUL, BOSTON

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a talk to Norway by the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], on August 10, 1941, which was sent by short-wave broadcast from station WRUL, Boston, on a regular program of the Norwegian Broadcasting Service. I believe this talk expresses the sentiments of most of the people of our Nation toward the courageous citizens of Norway.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My listeners in Norway, may I, first of all, tell you how glad I am to have this opportunity to speak directly to you, the brave people of Norway, who are setting before the whole world an example of steadfast and whole-hearted national unity.

As Senator from the State of Kansas—a State which I have represented in Washington for the past 22 years—I should like, first of all, to express my respect and admiration for the men and women who came from Norway to settle in Kansas. You have heard such phrases before, as I understand that other American speakers on these short-wave programs have also begun by praising the Norwegian elements in our population, but even so, I insist that this is worth repeating. We have a considerable number of Norwegians of the first, second, and third generations in my State, and I want to go on record

as saying emphatically that they are among the very best of our citizens. Progressive, industrious, and law abiding, these Norwegian-Americans have made a contribution to good citizenship which all of us admire. Indeed, they have set up a standard of citizenship which many of us might well strive to equal.

Knowing these relatives and compatriots of yours in my own home State as I do, I am not surprised by the developments in Norway during these dark 15 months since the mechanized hordes of nazi-ism broke into your peaceful and civilized land. I am not surprised that you chose to fight for your homes and your dearly won economic progress and spiritual freedom. For that is what your descendants in Kansas would have done; and that is what every true American would do today—fight to defend his home and his democratic way of life against any aggressor.

There is, however, one thing that has astonished me as I have read the news from your country during these past months; and this is the nation-wide extent, the inexhaustible variety, and the bold nature of your continued and your ever-increasing resistance to the Nazi invaders. Perhaps we Americans are too prone to think that once a military victory has been won, then everything is over for the nation thus defeated. If so, the example of Norway is a most valuable lesson to us. For although you, a nonmilitary and almost entirely unprepared nation, were beaten on the field of battle by a juggernaut a thousand times as strong, you were beaten only after 2 months of brave resistance which cost the enemy dearly. But more than this—and here is the most amazing part of it to me—you, the unarmed farmers and fishermen, children and old folks, the workmen and teachers, the clergymen and doctors—you Norwegians have since defeated with spiritual weapons that German army of occupation which I understand is half a million strong.

You can be sure of this, that when you perform those deeds of resistance, those exploits on behalf of freedom of body and soul, that when you defiantly cling to the civilization which is rightfully yours, we in America hear about it and we thrill with admiration. Sometimes we learn of your actions only many days or weeks later. Thus when your bishops threw the whole weight of the Church of Norway against Nazi barbarism last winter, it required some time before we learned the significance of their deed. But now, you may be sure, in religious and lay circles alike in the United States everyone realizes that in Norway's pastors and bishops there is the same stuff out of which martyrs were made in earlier times.

More recently something happened in Norway which became known throughout practically the whole United States a few days later, something which thrilled every true American heart. On the Fourth of July—America's sacred Independence Day—a number of Norwegian patriots in Oslo gathered around the statute of Abraham Lincoln and on it reverently laid wreaths in honor of the Great Emancipator. Then came the Nazi storm troopers—those symbols of the evil, the destruction, and the misery which Hitler has brought upon the world—and attempted to remove the flowers. But that unarmed crowd of free Norwegians rushed to the defense of Lincoln and battled the storm troopers with such vigor and success that these detestable creatures of nazidom took to their heels.

This deed echoed from one coast to the other in America, and the effect it had on us can be understood from this phrase, which I quote from an editorial in the Birmingham (Ala.) Age-Herald of July 16: "This incident places some kind of a moral responsibility upon the American people. They cannot, in all honor, fail the hopes of all the Nazi-subjugated nations. They cannot let these people down."

Let me say right here and now that we shall not let these people down. We Americans are not going to abandon the brave people of Norway, of Denmark, of Holland, and the other occupied countries. There may be differences of opinion here in the United States; there may be doubt as to ways and means; but of one thing we are all certain: The people of the small, peace-loving democracies deserve our help, and they shall have it at the earliest possible opportunity.

I myself have from the start been an advocate of sending food to those populations in Europe which are threatened with undernourishment and starvation. I realize, of course, the difficulties involved, and I certainly do not want to see any aid go to your enemies; but sooner or later it will be possible to get food to the right people and places in Europe, and then America will do her part in feeding all who are hungry.

In this connection I want to tell you people of Norway how heartily I agree with what our Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Claude Wickard, said to you exactly 1 week ago over this same radio station: "We are mobilizing food as well as guns," declared the Secretary on that occasion. "On the farms of America we are increasing production of essential foods without stint. Food is strength, and our objective is food for all defenders of freedom."

The news from Norway these past several days has not been pleasant. It appears that everywhere the Nazis, whether because fearful of external attack or nervous over internal resistance, have been taking measures of repression and reprisal. Martial law has been threatened for the whole of your country, and we read with pain and with anger the news in our daily papers telling about the forced evacuation of whole populations from their villages, the driving of farmers from lands their families have tilled for generations, and the seizing of homes that you yourselves have built and lived in happily until just over 1 year ago.

For the moment the hordes of Hitler seem to have the upper hand in Norway and in Europe; and as long as this is true, life cannot be genuine, civilized life, either for you or for the rest of Europe. But I, for one, am convinced that through your own brave and steadfast resistance on the home front and through the help which the outside world, and especially America, is more and more bringing to you—I am convinced that Norway once more will be free and independent, and will again pursue her role as one of the leading civilized nations in this world.

I can think of no more appropriate ending for these words of mine than to quote again two phrases which you in Norway heard last week from the United States Secretary of Agriculture. I repeat them because they express, not only my sentiments but those of the whole American people:

"We are with you in spirit as you carry on in the great tradition of a free people. Your battle is an inspiration to us and to free people all over the world. Long live Norway."

Inland Waterways Improved by France for Military Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at my request the Chief of Engineers has furnished me with information on the waterway improvements by France for military preparedness.

The inland waterways of France extend over a total length of 8,000 miles, of which 3,000 miles are canals. The canals link the rivers together to provide a waterway system that serves the greater part of the country. Ten thousand ships, of which 1,500 are motor barges, move between forty-five and fifty million metric tons of freight annually over these waterways.

As in other European countries where the needs of transportation for military purposes are matters of prime importance, careful consideration has been given to the strategic values as well as to the peacetime economy of waterborne commerce. Employed as tactical obstacles to the enemy as well as for the movement of supplies and troops to the front, the use of the inland waterways of France has been conspicuous in her wars. The Minister of National Defense and War must be consulted in connection with all proposed improvements of waterways. After the close of the Franco-Prussian War, national leaders became more than ever convinced of the indispensability of inland waterways to the welfare of the French Nation and the principles set forth in 1878 by De Freycinct, one of France's most distinguished statesmen, have been followed to this day.

The French canal system is based on the Seine, Loire, Garonne, and Rhone Rivers with connections to the upper reaches of the Rhine, Sambre, Meuse, and smaller streams. Connections for foreign commerce have also been made. For example, the Seine and its tributaries are connected with Germany and Holland by way of the Rhine and with Switzerland by way of the Saone.

Of the larger rivers, the most important commercially is the Seine, which rises in the plateau of Langres in east-central France and flows northwesterly across the country to enter the English Channel at Havre. The Loire has its source in east central France also, and flows westerly across the country to enter the Bay of Biscay. The Garonne flows in a circuitous route from the Pyrenees Mountains on the Spanish border to the Bay of Biscay. The Rhone rises in east central France and flows due south to the Gulf of Lion in the Mediterranean Sea. On the larger rivers, navigation by sea-going vessels is possible; for example, on the Seine extending up to Rouen, on the Loire to Nantes, and on the Garonne to Bordeaux. Above these limits these rivers are navigable by smaller vessels and barges for long distances and the network of rivers and canals is such that large traffic may easily be shifted from one to another of the major river basins and to and from many of the smaller streams.

The military and economic advantage of having the Rhone waterway into the Mediterranean connected with the three major rivers flowing into the Atlantic on the west coast of France is obvious. The route around the coasts of Portugal and Spain is several times longer and of course less safe from a military standpoint as well as for small boats and

barges. Some time after the fall of France last summer the Germans moved light draft naval craft from the channel ports to the Mediterranean by way of this short protected route. Of course these connected waterways are not large enough for battleships, a deficiency that in December 1938 the French Government was planning to improve by constructing a $500,000,000 canal to extend from the Atlantic port of Bordeaux to the Mediterranean port of La Nouvelle via the Garonne and Aude Rivers. Plans for such a canal that would accommodate the largest battleships were given impetus by Italy's growing territorial aspirations but the project was conceived too late. As much as we dislike to think of France making war against Great Britain, there appears to be a possibility of this happening. If this does happen, France will regret not having constructed a canal through which the French Fleet could be moved back and forth from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, thus bypassing the British Navy and Gibraltar in much the same way that the German Navy uses the Kiel Canal between the Baltic and North Seas.

Paris, the nerve center of France, is the focal point of a large portion of the domestic and foreign commerce of the country. In addition to being connected by waterways with domestic interior points such as Nancy on the Moselle, Strasbourg on the Rhine, Besançon on a tributary of the Saône, and Nevers on the Loire, the capital city is connectd by navigable channels with the industrial areas of Belgium, Germany, and Switzerland and with the foreign trade of the Mediterranean and Atlantic ports. Due to France's well planned inland waterway system Paris, based on the criterion of total tonnage handled in normal times, ranks as the most important port of the country. Rouen, Marseille, and Strasbourg follow in the order named.

In the old countries waterway developments are much more extensive than in this country. Developments of this character throughout the civilized world generally are dependent upon popular demand for such transportation and the ability of the public affected to bear the cost of improvements. Both of these factors are affected by density of population. Density produces demand and density produces the labor to effect improvements, or, what is the same thing, taxes from great numbers with which to pay for improvements. In Europe densities of population are from 4 to 16 times those in the United States. As time goes on, increased populations in this country will surely demand more and more waterway transportation facilities. Possibly the distance and heights of divides between natural waterways will delay improvements between river basins, but, sooner or later, we will improve our rivers upstream and connect their basins, just as the Russians, the Germans, and the French have done. We cannot predict the exact time, but it requires little imagination to visualize greatly increased improvement of the Red, the Arkansas, the Missouri, and other such streams in the United States, and many, if not all, of our contiguous river basins will some day be connected with each other, just as is the case in Europe. Let us have the vision and foresight to do the things now that need to be done now and to be sure that we do not fall behind in the planning and prosecution of waterway improvements.

Talk of Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me to extend my remarks, I include herein a powerful, constructive, timely, and correct editorial on the question of the morale of our civilian soldiers, which editorial appeared in the Boston Post on August 26, 1941:

[From the Boston Post of August 26, 1941]

TALK OF "MORALE"

This business of morale has become the biggest topic of conversation in our Army. There is no question of it in the Navy. There is no question of it in the Marine Corps. So what is the matter with the Army?

A veteran Post reporter said the other day, after visiting the Yankee Division, that the trouble with morale in the Army is that there is too much talk of morale.

He pointed out that the young men making up the Army have never been so fit in their lives. They are hardening up and each one of them is brimming with health and energy. Soft, fat boys are now turning out lean and muscular. Lean youngsters are putting on flesh.

And in common with finely trained prize fighters and football players, they are alert and quick and on the edge of action at all times. Their nerves are functioning like high-tension wires. Their eyes flash with energy. Thus much of their grousing and complaining is the normal reaction of healthy minds to prime physical condition.

Trainers of competitive athletes tell us that this near irascibility of temper is caused by a man's fitness. When a championship football team takes the field, its members are in this condition. When a great boxer steps into the ring for the contest, his temper is generally on edge.

At the begining of this rearming process, the Army decided that it would run its own recreation projects. In the last war there was too much criticism by outsiders.

But any attempt to keep the uplifters and the social-service people out of the Army is useless. They want to fuss over the boys and they will have their way because they can pull some powerful political strings, and these strings are the reins of power in this country.

All of a sudden everyone started to talk about morale, as if that was the chief function of the Army, rather than fighting. Morale became the moot question, the subject of conversation, idle and otherwise, and all sorts of people were running around bolstering up morale. Or so they thought.

Amusement buildings, clubs, and recreation areas are planned for the whole ccuntry. Patriotic people are doing their utmost to help their construction and outfitting.

The net result has been that the average soldier has become morale-conscious and he is beginning to worry more about his morale than the psychologists and the experts, who are doing their utmost to please him.

Yet all this time the Navy and Marine Corps are going quietly about their business, and, in such matters as Atlantic patrol and occupation of Iceland, are engaged in fairly dangerous work. Nobody worries about the morale of these two services. They are getting along quite nicely. At least, they have had no delegations in the congressional galleries to see how defense legislation is going on.

There are a lot of things wrong with the Army, and there will be until someone shows us how we can defend a nation without one. There are a lot of college striplings serving as officers in this Army who should be back in the fraternity houses.

There are a lot of old-time colonels and higher officers who never amounted to a row of beans in civilian life and now cannot get the respect of their men. But these are matters which can be ironed out. The best thing to forget is morale. It is an overworked word.

President's Veto of Bill Relating to Wheat-Marketing Quotas To Provide for Withholding From Normal Channels of Trade and Commerce Government-Owned Cotton and Wheat, and for Other Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, it is evident from the number of telephone, telegraph, and mail requests for information that Members of the House are very much interested in securing information regarding the situation that confronts the bill vetoed by the President relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for withholding from the normal channels of trade and commerce Government-owned cotton and wheat of the 1940 and previous crops, and to provide 85 percent of parity with respect to peanuts of the 1941 crop, and for other purposes.

When this veto message was received Monday and read at the desk, by unanimous consent, action thereon was deferred until the present unanimous-consent agreement relative to business expires, which is September 15.

In other words, the veto message, having been read, will remain on the Speaker's desk until at least September 15, when it will be in order either for the chairman of the committee to ask unanimous consent to refer the message to the Committee on Agriculture, where the bill originated, or to demand the regular order, which would, as provided by the Constitution, require a yea-and-nay vote on the question as to whether or not the

bill should become a law, the veto of the President notwithstanding.

What action will be taken on September 15, of course, no one can say definitely, but one thing is certain, and that is Members can rest assured until September 15, at least, the veto message will remain on the Speaker's desk.

I make this statement in answer to the many inquiries that have been received for information.

Effect of National Emergency Upon Utility Rate Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. BASIL MANLY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by Commissioner Basil Manly, of the Federal Power Commission, before the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, August 26, 1941, at St. Paul, Minn.:

We have been asked to discuss the effect of the national emergency upon utility-rate regulation with particular reference to two problems: First, amortization of plant expansions resulting from the national emergency; and, second, the relation of emergency increases in revenues due to emergency demands to rate adjustments. These are both important subjects, but it is important to emphasize that they are by no means the only problems in connection with utility regulation which will be created or intensified by the emergency.

It is obvious that there will be many other problems such, for example, as the increases in fuel costs, wages, and taxes, which may reasonably be anticipated; the shift in volume of consumption as between the different classes of customers, due either to official curtailment to meet defense needs or to the play of extraordinary economic forces; the possible pooling of utility operations to secure higher efficiency; and a host of other similar problems growing directly or indirectly out of the emergency.

It is clear that some of these factors may tend to counterbalance each other and to offset the effects which may arise in connection with the two particular topics now under discussion. The growth of revenues resulting from extraordinary defense demands and increased purchasing power of consumers may well be accompanied by such increases in the cost of labor, money, and materials as to leave net income substantially unchanged. The shift of consumption as between the different classes of customers may either increase or decrease net revenues.

It is clear, therefore, that anything that may be said regarding the two topics now under discussion must be understood to be contingent upon the effect which cannot now be anticipated of other factors.

One thing, however, is certain. There should be no suspension of effective regulation of utilities during the emergency. In the public interest there can be no moratorium on the responsibilities of either the utilities or the agencies created to regulate their activities. The rapid changes in economic and financial conditions resulting from the emergency will unquestionably call for greater vigilance and more effective regulation than during what we are pleased to call normal periods, but, by the same token regulatory bodies will be successful in meeting emergency conditions only by speeding up the processes by which they determine the adjustments that should be made in the public interest. The leisurely procedure of reproduction-cost valuation will be even less effective during the emergency than it has been in the past. There will be greater need for accurate up-to-date information upon which sound and prompt decisions can be made.

AMORTIZATION OF EMERGENCY FACILITIES

In the light of this preliminary discussion it would seem to be clear that investments in facilities which have a useful life limited to the emergency period should be amortized during that period. But it is equally clear that most of the extensions of plant facilities during the emergency period will not fall in this category. With rare exceptions new generating plants, substations, and transmission lines will have a useful life extending for many years beyond the emergency period. We may anticipate that such facilities will be used to capacity or even beyond that point during the emergency and that when the emergency ends there may well be a considerable period during which there may be a decrease in the intensity of their use. The public interest it would seem would not justify any attempt to amortize completely during the emergency the investment in such facilities which will have a continuing use after the emergency is ended.

The problem is essentially one of depreciation. We recognize today that all investments in plant facilities must be charged off during their respective service lives. If the useful life of a facility is limited to the emergency, the full cost should, of course, be charged off during that period. If the useful life extends beyond the emergency, an estimate of the full service life must necessarily be made. Where it is anticipated that capacity operation will be followed by a period of slackened operation, there may well be justification for charging a higher rate of depreciation during the time of greatest production and lowering the rate when the slack period comes.

The answer to this problem may perhaps lie in giving some recognition to the so-called production method of computing depreciation expense, which relates the rate of depreciation to the intensity of operations of the facilities. Some of the utilities, for example, are now overloading their generating facilities, and all of them may have occasion to do so over considerable periods during the continuance of the emergency. We all know that such overloads increase depreciation, and consequently it would be sound and reasonable to charge higher rates of depreciation during the emergency and lower the rates during any slack period that may follow the emergency.

The setting aside of larger amounts for depreciation during the period when facilitise are loaded to capacity would also have a very desirable effect upon the financial condition of the utilities. While the majority of them now appear to be charging reasonably adequate depreciation as a result of the activities of the State and Federal regulatory commissions, it is no secret that many of them did not make adequate charges in the past, and as a result now have inadequate depreciation reserves. An increase in such reserves during the period of capacity operations will, of course, increase the financial stability of such companies. It is difficult to imagine a better use of increased profits resulting from capacity operations than to increase inadequate depreciation reserves. It may well be an anchor to windward against whatever financial and industrial storms may hereafter arise.

RELATION OF EMERGENCY REVENUE INCREASES TO RATE ADJUSTMENTS

Turning to the problem of revenue increases resulting from capacity operations of utilities in connection with meeting the extraordinary demands for power during the emergency, it would appear that the principal question here involved is—How long may such increases be expected to continue? Obviously rate reductions would not be justified where a utility may be receiving large revenues during a brief, temporary period with the expectation of suffering a serious decline when the emergency demand is ended. Just as obviously basic rates should not be increased to take care of a merely temporary increase in expenses.

We are now entering a period in which no individual or corporation can reasonably or properly expect to maintain unabated the economic status to which it has become accustomed. Everybody will sooner or later have to make sacrifices for the common good. Adjustments from time to time will necessarily have to be made to meet changing conditions and to assure a continuation of maximum service. But this does not mean, in my opinion, that the Nation should underwrite perpetual prosperity for any industry or economic group. We are all in the same boat and should sink or swim together.

THE NIAGARA FALLS CASE

The attitude of the Federal Power Commission toward the problems here under discussion can best be illustrated by a concrete case arising in connection with the national defense. Late this spring it became clear that a large amount of additional electric energy would be necessary to supply power to electrochemical, electrometallurgical, and other essential defense industries in the Buffalo-Niagara Falls area of New York State. It was also evident that such power could best be secured by the additional diversion of water from Niagara Falls through the existing facilities of the Niagara Falls Power Co., which are now operated under a license of the Federal Power Commission. The Federal Power Commission therefore recommended, with the concurrence of the National Advisory Defense Committee, that the Department of State negotiate an agreement with Canada permitting the additional diversion of 5,000 cubic feet per second during the emergency from the Niagara River. This was effected by an exchange of notes approved by the Senate on June 12, 1941. Immediately thereafter temporary authorization to use this water was granted to the Niagara Falls Power Co. conditioned upon the acceptance by the company of a license containing the necessary provisions to protect the public interest and prevent the enjoyment by the company of excess profits from the emergency diversion. The latter condition was necessary because it was possible for the company to utilize this water with little additional expenses through existing facilities which were not operating to capacity. The sale of the power thus generated under current rates would have produced additional net profits in excess of $1,000,000 a year.

The company signified its acceptance of these conditions and, as a result, it is agreed that, after deducting its out-of-pocket expenses, including New York State fees and taxes incident to the diversion, and providing for the amortization during the emergency period of the relatively small capital expenditures necessary to utilize the diversion, with a 6-percent return on the net amount of such capital expenditures, the balance of the revenues shall be applied to reducing the net investment in the Niagara Falls project. This net investment constitutes the rate base under the terms of the Federal Power Act. This

reduction in the net investment will also be effective if the United States should recapture the project for public use at the end of the license period.

In this case the Commission would appear to have established, with the concurrence of the company, two essential principles: First, that there should be no excess profits in meeting the requirements of national defense; and second, that the investment in facilities useful only during the emergency should be amortized during that period.

It is important, I believe, to emphasize the fact that this agreement was reached with the concurrence of the utility involved in the transaction. The executives of American utilities do not, in my opinion, desire or expect to earn excess profits from their activities in meeting the enormous demands for power arising out of the requirements of national defense. With rare exceptions they have cooperated wholeheartedly with the Government in meeting those demands. And, in those cases where efforts may be made to convert the Nation's power requirements into additional dollars of excess profits, the regulatory processes of the State and Federal commissions should be, and will be, exerted effectively to restrain them.

President Roosevelt Walks to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, coming as it does from one who admits that he has strenuously opposed President Roosevelt in three campaigns and publicly stated in the last election that he felt a third term would be a public calamity, it seems to me that an article written by William Allen White, of Emporia, Kans., is of more than ordinary interest.

Under permission granted me I include that article as part of my remarks:

F. D. WALKS STEADFAST WAY TO PEACE WITH SEA PARLEY THAT RIVALS MAGNA CARTA

(By William Allen White)

EMPORIA, KANS., August 19.—That was a historic conference, probably one of the momentous gatherings of the thousand years since the Magna Carta between the Government of Great Britain and the head of the administration of the United States.

It is curious how events in the last thousand years have gradually pointed to the evolution of freedom in western Europe, in the South American countries, and in the English-speaking world. Consider the Magna Carta, the Cromwellian rebellion, the Declaration of Independence, the fall of the Bastille in Paris, Napoleon's Waterloo, the revolts of South Americans under Simon Bolivar, the Gettysburg speech, the League of Nations, and the conference of the powers on the sea the other day.

A ZIG-ZAG MARCH

Common men are vastly freer than the barons were who challenged King John. It has not been a straight line, this march of freedom. It has zigged and zagged and curved. It has bent up and away from and back to freedom, but always the line of liberty has moved on.

The twentieth century is drawing to an end. The new century is about to open the third thousand years since Golgotha. Man in this epoch has climbed a long upward way. But in every struggle in this era man has been trying to free himself from toil and the fear of war. But he has gained much. He has stored up knowledge with the invention of printing. He has harnessed steam, begun the use of electricity, invented the percussion engine. With each of these expressions of widening knowledge man has broadened his liberty.

BREAKING DOWN BARRIERS

The allies of liberty are fighting this great war, this war of machines to free men from machines by breaking down high barriers which slow down machines and threaten men with idleness and starvation. To break down tariff walls will mark the next step in human evolution.

Today the conference in the Atlantic is in the stage of "what we shall do if we can do it when we are able to do it." It is written in the potential of the future. History is engraved finally only in the past indicative. But this great conference of the English-speaking powers promises freedom to lovers of freedom everywhere. It heralds the guaranty of nations to live as they will, under their own form of government, and giving all—victors and vanquished alike—access to the world's raw materials.

This is a momentous occasion. This is proclamation of a new era in the development of civilization in the twentieth century and in a new millennium of the third thousand years of our epoch. A place in human progress will be marked somewhat by this conference of the powers.

Remember it and tell your children that you lived in this day and how you heard the news.

POLICY HAS DEVELOPED

Gradually the foreign policy of the United States has developed. As the war went from phase to phase it has become evident that the President is leading his country along the road to peace—the road to sure peace that follows international justice. A good neighbor cannot live safely and justly, even armed to the teeth, in a mean neighborhood. A decent nation cannot thrive even behind ships and guns and planes in a world of aggressors. Only as human relations are fair and equitable can decent men prosper happily. Only as international relations are founded upon international justice can democracy survive anywhere in the world. Justice itself is set up only after discussion and compromise—never by arbitrary force, under proclamation or by ukase.

Step by step for 4 years, beginning with his demand that the aggressors be quarantined, back in 1937, President Roosevelt has hewn his pathway to that conference in the Atlantic. In the light of that conference, his policies are clearly revealed.

Look at the pathway: The repeal of the Embargo Act, the shipment of arms to Britain after Dunkirk, the swap of destroyers for island bases to protect our continent and to enforce the Monroe Doctrine, the lease-lend bill, the defense program, the occupation of Newfoundland, the establishment of naval bases in Iceland—all these, taken a step at a time, mark the straight course to permanent peace.

The President's peace aims were announced Thursday from the conference in the Atlantic. Any deviation in the last 2 years of war from the course he has kept would have led us quickly into war, for any other policy than this would have let Great Britain go down in defeat. It would have left us facing the totalitarian tyrants alone.

STEADFAST WAY TO PEACE

President Roosevelt has remained silent with simple courage while he has walked his steadfast way to peace. His enemies, the isolationists, have abused him by clamoring with incessant indecency he was leading America to war. He has let events speak for themselves. Now his deeds, ringing down the corridor of the years, are clarion notes. Now the country knows that the President has been walking the only way to peace which America can follow. Ours is the way to peace through justice, offering liberty as the basis of peace, holding up freedom to all rulers and to all people as the way of life in a modern world.

These lines are written by one who has opposed President Roosevelt in three campaigns and felt his election for a third term would be a public calamity. Yet today we ask all American citizens to look back over the course he has charted in the last 4 years; aren't you proud of your President? Why should partisanship cloud the glory of this day?

The tyrants were afraid to let their people read the eight peace points which President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill offered to the world as the war aims of the democracies. If the tyrants were sure of their ground, they would be sure of their people. The tyrants would be sure that their people would reject these aims or, if not reject them, doubt the sincerity of those who offered the new peace.

But fear is the tyrant's poison. He drinks it to his death. Some way, despite the censorship, despite all the barriers erected around continental Europe, the people there will learn the truth and the truth will make them free. When any man, any nation, any tyrant, fears the truth, he is doomed. The clinching proof that the tyrants are scared is found today in the boasting, taunting, arrogant reply of the Hitlerites to democracy's peace aims. Getting tough is a sign of rough going.

Social-Security Taxes Should Be Reduced Instead of Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, after careful perusal of Secretary Morgenthau's recent statement that the Treasury was studying the question of higher social-security taxes and a "dismissal" wage, it is my opinion that the social-security taxes should be reduced instead of increased.

Treasury figures show that at the end of the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941, the reserves in both the old-age-benefits fund and the unemployment-insurance fund are more than ample to take care of any broadening of the benefits under the act.

The Ways and Means Committee in May 1939 voted unanimously to defer for 3 years the scheduled increases in social-security taxes for old-age pensions which would go into effect on January

1, 1940. The postponement of these automatic increases for 3 years placed in the pockets of employers and workers of the United States approximately $825,000,000 more to spend, which otherwise would have been taken from them in taxes. In spite of this postponement of increase in the social-security taxes the reserves have steadily piled up each year until now there is approximately $5,000,000,000 in both funds.

Furthermore the unemployed compensation program of the social security act calls for immediate revision. A 5-year test period of operation which ended June 30, 1941, has proved that the objective of this law is admirable but that its present basis of taxation and benefit payments is unfair to the employers of the Nation, to the workers themselves, and to the general public.

The law should be changed at once in the light of experience obtained over the past 5 years.

The basic 3 percent pay-roll tax on employers is far too high. Even with local reductions allowed by States, employers have been taxed twice as heavily as necessary.

Benefit payments to workers are too low and the period over which they are paid is, in many cases, too short.

As a consequence, we have piled up a surplus in the Treasury which amounted to more than $2,283,000,000 on June 30. This surplus is known as the unemployment trust fund. It represents nearly 60 percent of all the pay-roll tax collected under the unemployment provisions of the social security act and is more than ample to meet any conceivable demands upon it in the future.

Congress need make no apology for setting the tax rate high and the benefit payments low in the first place. When this law was passed, Congress traveled an unblazed trail. The financial safety of the unemployment compensation program was one of the first considerations.

It is better, of course, to be safe than sorry. The test period of five years has shown that the program is financially safe for many years to come. It has proved that the tax rate was set too high in the first place. It has proved that much higher benefits could be paid unemployed workers. Having this proof, Congress should act without delay to correct both of these inequities.

The present pay-roll tax should be cut one-third. If that were done, an unnecessary tax burden on employers amounting to about $300,000,000 a year—nearly $1,000,000 for every working day—would be lifted.

At the same time, benefit payments to unemployed workers under the law could be increased substantially. This could be done by making higher weekly payments or by extending the time over which payments are made, or by both. Treasury figures indicate benefit payments could be increased one-third, making due allowance, of course, for liberalized payments already approved in some States, without any risk whatever of dipping into the huge Treasury trust fund. This could be done at the same time the tax is lowered.

There is no reason on earth for continuing the senseless practice of piling up a mountainous unemployment trust fund beyond what common sense tells us we shall need in the future. And it should be remembered that every dollar we put in this fund increases the public debt by a dollar, because the Treasury must invest the fund in interest-bearing bonds of the United States.

On the other hand, there is every reason why we should stop this practice now.

Employers, as well as employees, are paying the highest peacetime taxes ever levied in the United States. They are willing to pay these taxes to insure national safety through the defense program. They are willingly and patriotically facing the prospect of another mammoth tax increase for national defense. They will pay whatever is necessary to insure the national defense, and pay it, I know, without a whimper.

They should not be made to pay a dollar more than is needed, however.

Yet they are being made to pay twice as much as is needed under the unemployment provisions of the Social Security Act. This pay-roll tax, it should be understood, raises not a thin dime for financing the national-defense program. It has no more to do with financing the defense program than has the man in the moon.

It is a special tax, imposed for one purpose and one purpose only: To finance the unemployment compensation program.

It should be a just tax, yielding only what is needed for that purpose. Instead, it is an unjust tax that yielded, over the past 5 years, more than twice as much as was needed for that purpose.

The injustice should be corrected now.

Here are some figures, gathered by the American Taxpayers' Association of Washington, D. C.—which has made an exhaustive study of the subject—showing how the law has operated over the past 4 years. The 4-year period is selected because the full effects of the law, which went on the books as of February 1, 1936, have been felt over only the 4-year period. In the first year, little was paid in benefits.

Disregarding the first year, when only partial effects were felt, here is the showing:

In fiscal 1938, the pay-roll tax yielded $747,660,497, and workers received $190,975,000 in benefit payments.

In fiscal 1939, the tax was $811,250,508, and benefit payments were $441,795,000.

In fiscal 1940, the tax was $859,863,884, and benefit payments were $482,963,000.

In fiscal 1941, the tax was $892,023,224, and benefit payments were $433,242,841.

Two of those years were years when employment was on the rise. Two of them were years when unemployment was on the fall. The 4 years include periods of both better business and poorer business. Yet in the worst of the 4 years—fiscal 1939, ended June 30, 1939—the amount collected in taxes was 81 percent greater than the amount paid out in benefits.

In the past fiscal year the tax levy produced nearly 206 percent of the total benefit payments.

During the entire 4-year period, says the American Taxpayers' Association, whose figures are taken from official Treasury statements, employers were taxed an aggregate of $3,310,808,000.

During the same period workers received benefits which aggregated only $1,548,975,000.

That, I submit, is not the sort of justice we have a right to expect under the Social Security program. It is not justice to the employers, to the workers, or to the general public, which in the long run stands the burden of the tax.

Social-security taxes should have no relation whatsoever with the matter of inflation. Social-security taxes are special taxes, and are not, therefore, of general application. Those who are primarily the beneficiaries of social security should not pay any penalties by increased taxes for the purpose of decreasing inflation. No additional burden should fall upon the wage earner.

If the tax over that period had been one-third lower than it was, the Government would have collected $2,208,000,000 and the employers of the country would have been saved $1,102,000,000.

If the benefit payments had been one-third higher over the same period, the workers would have received $2,065,000,000, or $516,000,000 more than they actually received.

And the program still would have been adequately financed, though this huge reserve fund would not have accumulated. Collections totaling $2,208,000,000 would have been $140,000,000 in excess of payments totaling $2,065,000,000.

That is water over the dam. We cannot change that picture for 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941. But we can change it for fiscal 1942. And we ought to change it. In the name of simple justice to the American employer, the American worker, and the American public, Congress should lose no time in lowering this tax one-third as a minimum measure of relief and increasing benefit payments substantially.

Address of Lt. Gen. Walter Krueger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. WALTER KRUEGER

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by Lt. Gen. Walter Krueger, commander of the Third Army, at Lake Charles, La., on August 24, following recent maneuvers in the South:

The Third Army is deeply indebted to the people of Louisiana. The Governor of your great State, other State officers, and city and county officials, landowners, school authorities, highway organizations, and a host of others have cooperated cheerfully and effectively with us to make the Third Army

maneuvers a success. We feel with special keenness our debt of gratitude to the city of Lake Charles. Here are located important parts of our headquarters, while in and about the city are situated many of our base and service elements. This is really the maneuver home of Third Army headquarters. Consequently, I was particularly happy to have the Third Army cooperate with Lake Charles tonight to make more effective and realistic the city's test black-out. I do not wish to imply that the Third Army can, in this simple way, balance its debt of appreciation to the city; but it was, nevertheless, most pleasant to have the opportunity to express in a practical way some small measure of that appreciation.

The Lake Charles black-out has for me a very deep significance. Such a test cannot be successful unless every individual in the community devotes himself promptly and effectively to his own part therein. It is extremely gratifying in these troublous times to observe such an example of unity—unity of purpose and unity of execution.

In unity there is strength. A people is strong as it is united; it is weak and a prey to predatory force as it allows petty selfishness and partisan discord to wreck its resources and dissipate its power. As Woodrow Wilson said, "The highe t form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people."

Unity is imperatively necessary to the success of any undertaking. An army has unity of organization; but it is a great army only if it is animated by spiritual unity, that is by love of country, by belief in its leaders and by belief in itself. It may be fully armed, its equipment may be excellent, it may be well housed, clothed, and fed, and well trained, but if it lacks spiritual unity, it cannot be a formidable fighting force.

The citizens of Lake Charles have had brought home to them, dramatically, tonight, an example of what can be accomplished when all individuals work toward a common end. Watching the black-out, it is difficult to escape the feeling that if a similar demonstration could be held on a gigantic scale, so as to include simultaneously every city and hamlet in an entire section of the country, the effect upon all our citizens would be electrical! If the world were made to understand that we—to the last man, woman, and child—stand squarely behind and are ready to defend with our lives the basic principles of democracy, it would be a bold nation indeed that would dare to challenge our position.

When war engulfs a nation, the Army represents only a small portion of the multitudinous forces brought into play. It is but the cutting edge of a gigantic weapon, a weapon that in its complete forging comprehends every person, dollar, thing, and moral force of the country. Everything must be devoted to the common cause, otherwise disaster threatens.

Disaster in war is terrible in itself; but it is intensified a thousandfold by the bitterness of defeat. No nation can suffer military disaster and limit the consequences to payment of a money indemnity or the surrender of a slice of territory. Degradation, dismemberment, slavery may and nowadays probably would be the price of defeat.

It is to insure that such will never happen to our beloved country that the Third Army is sweating and marching and maneuvering and working in the State of Louisiana. We are trying to perfect the technical proficiency that an army must have to be a true shield and buckler of the Nation in its hour of need.

Our men are doing just this. They are doing it uncomplainingly, earnestly, effectively.

Of course, much of our work is not particularly pleasant. Dust, bad weather, chiggers, ticks, and long tiresome marches are, to be sure, harder to endure than the comforts of home. Here and there we find a man that cannot take it! A few—a very few—have taken French leave and so escaped these discomforts, but they've forfeited the respect, the faith, and the comradeship of the finest body of men on this planet. For that's just what the Third Army is. We have 250,000 toughened, bronzed, willing, patriotic Americans—men who are developing day by day into a single, unified force that will equal, and surpass, in fighting effectiveness and devotion to country any other army the United States has ever before put into the field.

In other States the First, the Second, and the Fourth Armies are doing the same. The four of them, with the Air Corps and the armored force make up the Army of the United States—a body that, we hope, will shield us effectively from the impact of war. This is your army, your army and mine! It will be as efficient technically as its leaders can make it, as well equipped as American industry can assure, and as strong spiritually as the people it represents. To reach the goal of real security, each of us has a part to play—may all of us meet our obligations as true Americans! That is what the Third Army proposes to do!

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the horse has been largely replaced, but what will we substitute for horse sense?

The interventionists are those who want us to go over there; the interventional lice are those who want to come over here.

Two Republican ex-Congressmen in Kansas are still with Wendell. Not 1 of the 160 serving minority Members rises in a party caucus to defend him.

The President has slipped; he got the Prime Minister only part way over, while 2 years ago he was successful in bringing the King and Queen all the way.

The Kansas City Star is alarmed at the multiplying Federal bureaucracy, while being a little content with the expanding war program. Both have the same sire, Roy.

The plan to spend $50,000 with Kansas newspapers for Navy advertising is typical of how the warmakers are trying to create war support. Editors, take their money, but—.

Mr. Churchill says Britain would join the United States in action against Japan. First thing we know she will be telling us how she will back us on an invasion of Europe.

The greatest celebration Labor Day has in Kansas is the opening of all schools outside first- and second-class cities. Parents work, too, so they can pay for time and one-half for overtime.

Mr. Rosenman has been brought in to settle differences between the set-ups of Hillman and Henderson. They should come to a common understanding, for they all speak some English.

While seeking with amendments to soften the blow to noncompliers, some fool friends of the farmers in the Senate tacked on a rider freezing cotton and wheat in the same bill, causing the veto.

The Bigger, Hidden Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of August 27, 1941:

[From the Washington Daily News of August 27, 1941]

THE BIGGER, HIDDEN BURDEN

There will be twice as many Federal income-tax payers, if the Senate Finance Committee's version of the revenue bill becomes law. There will be twice as many citizens with a conscious pocket interest in economy.

Instead of one-sixth of the total number of Americans, two-sixths will be eagerly concerned with getting a dollar's worth of defense and good government for each dollar they have plucked from their purses.

But that doesn't mean that the other four-sixths of the people won't have a stake in the Government's fiscal policies. To the contrary they will continue to have a very real interest. Though they may not be touched by direct income taxation—for their incomes are below even the proposed new taxable levels—they will continue to carry a major share of the burden through indirect taxation, hidden levies added to the prices they pay for everyday goods and services.

Even if the income-tax exemptions are reduced to $750 for single persons and $1,500 for married couples, and even after the much stiffer income rates are imposed, the Government will still be getting most of its revenues from invisible taxes—the taxes to which President Roosevelt referred when he said they are "paid in the sweat of every man who labors." The most unfair thing about hidden taxation is that it falls heaviest upon those who are least able to pay.

Somehow, though, most people who pay only the indirect taxes which are picked from their pockets—and make no direct and conscious contribution to the Federal Treasury—seem to believe that the money the Government spends is somebody else's money.

Ever since it became evident that the Government had to get more revenue, and in tremendous volume, a fight has raged in Congress over whether to get it by stiffer income taxation or by an invisible levy, such as a general sales tax. We who believe that taxes should be proportioned to ability to pay should rejoice that the Senate committee has chosen to broaden the income rather than the sales-tax base. We should support Members of Congress who are fighting for this fairer method.

And when the next tax bill comes up—which probably will be sometime next year—we should insist on more of the same. For the only alternative, in raising such a volume

of money as war spending calls for, is taxation which falls heavier on the lower four-sixths than it does on the upper two-sixths. No matter how far down it reaches, the income tax graduates the burden according to ability to bear it, while the other kind of tax increases living costs and lowers living standards.

Another thing to remember is this: Whenever the income-tax base is broadened, the bulk of the additional revenue comes from the people who are already in the taxable brackets. For instance, the base broadening which the Senate committee proposes, will yield some $300,000,000, but only about one-tenth of that will come from the pockets of the new taxpayers. The rest will be paid by those who are already on the income-tax rolls. And the higher a man's income, the larger his share of the increase. That's fair.

The long-haul fiscal policy of our Government should be to get rid of all hidden taxes, and raise all revenue by visible levies proportioned to ability to pay.

Armored Forces and Our Armored Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. ADNA R. CHAFFEE, UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the following statement was prepared by the late Maj. Gen. Adna R. Chaffee, United States Army, and presented to the War Department Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations during the consideration of the Military Establishment appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1942.

Certain parts of the original statement have been deleted because of their confidential nature, but the matter here presented will be found to be an admirable treatise upon armored forces and upon our Armored Force, the new defense organization in the creation of which General Chaffee had such a large part and of which he was the first commander.

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. ADNA R. CHAFFEE, THE COMMANDING GENERAL OF THE ARMORED FORCE, UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, having been called upon by the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I have the honor to submit the following prepared remarks relative to armored forces and our armored force.

For many years I have been an advocate of the development of armored means of warfare. I have watched and assisted in whatever way seemed proper and feasible the development of these methods in our service, and I am glad to see and to believe that real progress is being made

As you know, the tank is not a new weapon; the Roman legionnaire with his shield, the armored elephants of Hannibal, and the chariots of Alexander were in reality tanks using the best motive power then available. The modern tank has been made possible by the development of the internal combustion engine, both gasoline and Diesel.

In World War I the increasing strength of the machine gun prevented either side from reaching a quick decision and led to position warfare. The engine-powered tank then made its first appearance. Its invention, as usual, was mothered by necessity. The introduction of the tank was an attempt to endow the offensive with new and superior strength, an attempt to keep the attack in motion, an attempt to defeat the machine gun.

On November 20, 1917, at Cambrai, the British made a surprise attack with 360 tanks on a front of about 10,000 yards. This was the first use of the modern tank This tank attack gained initial success, but as an operation was a failure due to the method of employment and other reasons. Thereafter in World War I, the tank was employed in limited numbers and achieved some success.

In that war the method of employment of tanks was to launch them, accompanied by infantry, in surprise attack against the enemy fortified position.

There were two great weaknesses in this type of use:

First. Either the tanks would outrun their support (infantry and artillery) and thus become vulnerable to concentrated fire attack.

Second. Or the tanks held to the speed of their accompanying infantry and artillery support lost their most important characteristic mobility, and thus became victims of carefully planned defensive measures.

The speed of these World War tanks was about 3 miles per hour, and often after a few miles running the tanks were ready for overhaul.

During the post World War period France, Great Britain, and the United States experimented with tank design and developed by spasmodic efforts various types of tanks and armored vehicles.

Due to costs, to differences of opinions, to branch consciousness, to pacifist tendencies, and to many other reasons, no nation developed a unified program of armored study or construction. However, valuable thought and progress was gradually contributed to the idea of tank and armored units during this period. A review of the progress of this development in France, Great Britain, Germany, and the United States is necessary to a proper understanding of our armored problems of today.

France: Every country looks at the problem of the application of the mechanics of war in the light of its own particular needs. In the defense of continental France the problem was visualized with a definite enemy, a definite ally, and a definite battlefield in view. The military attitude of France was defensive and this defense was based upon fixed fortifications of the Maginot Line. The cavalry divisions were given added mobility and fire power, and light cavalry armored divisions were created. In these divisions armored-car elements were added. In France mechanization was developed independently by the infantry and cavalry along parallel lines, with little or no relation between the two, and it was not until the winter of 1939–40 that their separate efforts began to merge into a common conception of the tactical employment of armored troops.

Tank development in the French Army was entrusted to the infantry in the post-war period. Tank tactics were based entirely upon the use of the tank as a close support weapon of the infantry. In the immediate post-war period French tank doctrines envisaged the employment of light tank battalions immediately preceding and accompanying the infantry assault of an enemy position, to overcome the hostile automatic weapons on a specific objective. As antitank defense measures increased and particularly as a result of the war in Spain, the medium and heavy tanks made their appearance. These were grouped into mixed battalions loosely organized in time of peace into regiments for training purposes. The basic combat unit was the battalion. In 1939 the French doctrine for the employment of tanks did not visualize the use of large armored units. Tanks were classified as accompanying tanks, maneuver tanks, and heavy tanks, and were to be employed in battalions or occasionally in groupments of two battalions. It recognized the fact that tanks could not be used against prepared positions and stated that only when the defensive system had been disorganized could a tank attack be counted upon for decisive results. Tanks should be employed only in the exploitation of an initial success or where an enemy was unprepared. Units of fast tanks could be held in the hands of a commander of a large unit for use in battle as a flexible and powerful reserve. The French did not envisage the employment of large bodies of tanks in independent movements where they would not be supported by artillery already in position.

The French cavalry developed mechanization along quite different lines. Between 1931–33 the French cavalry experimented with a combined horse and motorized division having a reconnaissance element of armored cars. In 1935 the first light mechanized division was organized with armored cars, dragoon portée artillery, and services. Thus, at the outbreak of war in 1939, France had only 2 light mechanized divisions within the cavalry arm and 11 tank regiments, 22 battalions in the infantry arm. Up to this time the French Army had made no attempt to coordinate tank development and tank tactics between the cavalry and infantry. French doctrine made no provision for the employment of more than 1 mechanized unit habitually employed within the cadre of a larger normal unit.

Two months before the German offensive, May 10, 1940, the French doctrine as announced by General Gamelin was as follows:

"Generally speaking, a large armored unit cannot cover its own movement nor carry out the reconnaissance of an insufficiently determined enemy. It must always act within the cadre of a corps or of a mechanized groupment, under the orders of a cavalry or motorized corps commander."

As can be seen from the above even after the experiences of the Polish campaign were available for study, the French had no concept of the unified tactical action of the combined arms grouped in the armored division. Further, they failed to grasp the obvious lessons of that campaign as to the supreme importance of the role of combat aviation combined with the armored force.

Great Britain: British tank development under the Royal Tank Corps proceeded along lines similar to the French tank development under the infantry. The tank tactics of the Royal Tank Corps were those of the infantry-accompanied tank. British experiments resulted in the organization of the army tank battalion and the army tank brigade. The former was a light tank unit; the latter a medium tank unit. Both organizations were designed as infantry tank units to reinforce normal infantry formations.

The course of development of mechanization in Great Britain was stormy in the immediate post-war period. Bitter controversies retarded progress.

In 1926, as a result of General Fuller's ideas an experimental armored force was created which contained, organically, armored cars, tanks, motorized machine guns, artillery, and engineers, but no infantry. The purpose of this force was to test the possibilities of a self-contained armored fighting force independent of existing formations. The lessons learned from this experiment proved that infantry was indispensible to an armored formation. This force continued in operation until 1929, when it was finally abandoned.

This experiment can probably be regarded as the father of the German armored division.

In 1935 Great Britain commenced the mechanization of her horse cavalry, and in 1936 created a mechanized mobile division by combining units of mechanized cavalry with tanks. In 1939 Great Britain organized an armored corps consisting of a corps headquarters, two armored divisions, a support group of two motorized infantry battalions, two artillery regiments, and a mixed antitank, antiaircraft regiment. All armored vehicles in the armored divisions were tanks, while all unarmored vehicles were in the support group. This organization of an armored corps was abandoned by the British in January 1940.

At the outbreak of World War No. 2, Great Britain had three types of mechanized units—the mechanized divisional cavalry regiment, the army tank brigade, and the armored division. The tactical role of the army tank brigade was, with the assistance of the infantry, to break through enemy defenses. The role of the armored division was to penetrate beyond defensive positions in order to complete the victory. In defense the tank brigade would assist the counterattack.

Thus, although in the early days the British had conceived of an armored force, this idea had been abandoned. Development of mechanization had followed the lines of armored units organized to act within the cadre of larger normal forces.

A consideration of the British development prior to the present war shows that they, too, failed to evaluate properly the importance of the combined arms in armored units. Especially did they fail to appreciate the importance of specialist infantry and combat aviation support. They had not clearly determined the proper operational role for large armored units.

Germany: Following the World War, the German Army set up a section of their war-ministry staff to study in detail the causes of successes and failures of their armies during the past war. This section of the staff functioned during the 14 years prior to the 1933 reorganization of the German Army and was continued as a general staff section of the new army.

One of the principal problems studied by this staff section was the use of and defense against armored action.

A second important problem studied was the fact that Germany had been uniformly successful in breaking her enemies' front position, but had also never been able to exploit the initial success.

The solution to both of these problems was eventually found in the armored force of combined arms.

During the period immediately prior to the expansion of the German Army, selected officers were sent to the armies of the principal powers—the United States, England, France, and Russia—to get data and ideas as to the construction and employment of armored vehicles. To the United States came Warlemcut, Bechtoldsheim, and Von Schell, the latter now chief of motorization of the German State.

The data procured by the above-mentioned officers, together with that developed by the staff section of the ministry, was used in the organization of the first armored units during 1934.

Among the initial concepts with which the Germans began their armored divisional organization were the following:

(a) The armored division must utilize the combined arms in combat.

(b) Armored units must be used in sufficient mass to permit sustained driving power.

(c) Armored vehicles must be simple and rugged of construction and design and must be suitable for mass production.

(d) The mobility of all elements of the armored division must be such as to maintain a unity of action in all phases of open warfare.

(e) One hundred percent replacement of tanks and tank crews must be available during periods of active operations.

During late 1933 and 1934 extensive experiments on extremely varied terrain in a large area known as Luneburger Heide in northern Prussia were conducted. These tests were carried out in all types of weather. During these tests tactical procedures were determined upon. The organization of the units was then based on the tactical methods of their employment. Late in 1934 and 1935 the armored types determined upon were put into mass production and the organization of three armored divisions was begun. In the fall of 1935 the Germans gave a demonstration of the use of several elements of the armored division. In 1936 Von Schell made the statement that the "German general staff was satisfied that they had developed an effective method of armored attack." In 1936 the Germans officially stated that the war in Spain would be used as a laboratory in which to test their armored units.

The initial armored divisional organization consisted of a reconnaissance battalion.

Tank brigade of 2 tank regiments, each regiment consisting of 2 tank battalions, each tank battalion consisting of 79 light and 18 medium tanks.

Motorized infantry brigade, consisting of two motorized rifle regiments and one motorcycle rifle battalion.

Artillery regiment armed with 105-millimeter gun howitzers.

Supply echelon, consisting of medical, quartermaster, and other service elements.

At the beginning of the Polish campaign (September 1939) the Germans had organized about 10 armored divisions in general similar in organization to the one described above.

The major items of arms and equipment of each of these divisions were as follows:

Tanks, 416 (344 light and 72 medium).

Artillery, 36 (105-millimeter gun howitzers).

Antitank guns, 66 (36 in division artillery battalion; 15 in reconnaissance battalion; 12 in armored infantry regiment; and 3 in motorcycle battalion).

Armored cars, 50.

Total strength, approximately 15,000.

Operations: During the Polish campaign the armored divisions were not held together and fought as a complete armored unit. One group of these divisions was used with the Silesian Army, another group with the army attacking from east Prussia. The armored divisions were held in rear of the attacking armies and inserted after a break in the enemy front had been made by the army. The armored divisions were then utilized to exploit the initial success by disrupting and cutting into fragments the Polish armies. The operations of these armored divisions in Poland were closely supported by attack and bombardment aviation.

When the Germans began their campaign on the west front May 10, we find an entirely different tactical employment of the German armored divisions. It is reasonable to assume that this change in their tactical employment was indicated by the experience gained in the Polish campaign. In the attack against the western front, we find the armored divisions now, 12 to 14 in number, organized into corps and into an armored army. This army had no covering force other than the border guards and that furnished by itself. This armored army made the strategic main effort of the German combat forces. From all indications, there was attached to this army motorized divisions which were used defensively to cover the flank of the armored army, which in its drive first rested on the Aisne, then the Aisne-Oise Canal, the Oise-Somme Canal, and finally on the Somme River. The right flank of the armored army was covered by the attack of the advancing German XII Army, and by means of other motorized divisions probably attached to the armored army.

Later in the French campaign the armored army was again used as an independent battle unit. On June 10, 1940, this armored army crossed the Aisne River from a small bridgehead established by the XII army, quickly destroyed the French IV army, drove across the Langres Plateau, through Besançon, and to the Swiss border. By this maneuver the entire Maginot line was cut off from remainder of France.

Tactical methods: The important lesson in the French campaign is the use of an armored force as an independent army. This armored army, supported by combat aviation, made the main strategic and tactical effort of the German field forces. Its attack was made through an extremely rugged terrain zone, using only the combined arms of its component elements.

This armored army not only broke the border fortifications of Luxemburg and the Libramont-Neufchateau-Virton position, which is the defensive line of the Belgian frontier, but it crossed the Semois River, a most difficult terrain barrier. This armored army finally crossed the Meuse River and penetrated the French defensive position which constituted a continuation of the Maginot line. "In this break-through of the Allied defensive position, for the first time in history, exclusive use was made of an armored army in executing a large-scale strategic movement." The above is an official statement issued by the German War Ministry. Some conception of the magnitude of the armored operation may be gained by saying that 46,000 vehicles took part, and the armored army was echeloned to a depth of approximately 125 miles.

Although there are only meager reports available on the recent Balkan operations, every indication points to the use by the Germans of similarly organized armored armies in their destruction of the Yugoslavian and Grecian Armies.

The tactical action of the armored divisions is based on fire and movement of the component armored units of the combined arms. This tactical action is not comparable to the cavalry charge, as so many erroneously believe. It is the mutual use of armored and air fire power to assist and cover the movement of a maneuvering element. This German concept was not fully understood or accepted at the beginning of the present war by the French and British. It is at entire variance with the idea of independent tank or mechanized action and with the idea underlying the use of accompanying tanks.

The success of the German armored tactics has as we know been great and has rendered obsolete the tactical procedures of World War No. 1.

The great German victories in France and in the Balkans were won by offensive operations of armored armies supported by combat aviation. Former defensive methods cannot be successfully used against these armored operations. Defense against such operations can be made only by armored units of equal or superior power.

United States: At home, the Chief of Staff, General Summerall, early realized the value of the tank as an independent and mobile weapon and preached the importance of its employment. The War Department was, however, hampered by lack of understanding and funds, and further by the fact that the National Defense Act of 1920 prescribed that the Infantry should operate tanks.

Despite the experiments going on abroad, it was not until 1928 tat the Secretary of War approved in principle the initial plans for the organization and development, over a period of 4 years, of a mechanized force. This force, according to paper estimates, would cost $4,000,000. This was not considered prohibitive at that time, in view of the cost of mechanization abroad and the cost of material for our own Air Corps at home.

For the next 2 years the subject of mechanization lay dormant so far as appropriations

were concerned. In 1930 the Congress inserted in the Army appropriation bill the $284,000 previously requested for development work. Although this was a very meager amount, it did provide a start.

Accordingly, the War Department utilized this money to make possible the assembly of the mechanized force at Fort Eustis, Va., with the thought that the organization of an actual force, no matter how small or restricted in equipment, would take the development out of the realm of theory and give it a practical beginning. To the normal equipment of the selected units were added some experimental vehicles newly constructed.

This original mechanized force totaled 640 enlisted men. Every branch of the service was represented in it.

The first conception of this mechanized command was that it would be purely a striking force. Starting with one regiment, it would later be built up into a highly mobile armored force, with motorized fire power to strike an organized position. It was contemplated that this experiment would at least start thought along the lines of the development of the tactics of the combined mechanized or motorized arms.

In 1931 it was decided that the infantry would continue under the National Defense Act to operate tanks for the close support of foot soldiers and that the mechanized mission should be given to the cavalry. To permit the cavalry to operate tanks under this mission they were called combat cars.

That year, 159 men from various branches in the original mechanized forces were transferred to the cavalry, with station at Fort Knox. As an initial start one reinforced regiment of cavalry was to be mechanized.

However, it was not until 1933 that the War Department issued orders for the First Cavalry, stationed at Marfa, Tex., to be moved to Knox and mechanized.

From that time forward, the force of mechanized cavalry was gradually increased, until last year it consisted of two regiments of mechanized cavalry, a regiment of mechanized field artillery, a company of engineers, an attached regiment of infantry, an Air Corps squadron, and the necessary supply and service troops. With increased experience each year in maneuvers, it developed mobile mechanization on an apparently sound basis. During this period our companies of infantry tanks were removed from the infantry division and consolidated into battalions, and the Louisiana maneuvers of 1940 brought forth the combined effort of an infantry tank group and the mechanized cavalry.

During this period both the Infantry Board and the Mechanized Cavalry Board did considerable research in connection with the development of tanks and their related matériel and vehicles and weapons. This work has been of great value in the later development of our Mechanized Force.

Our present medium tank was projected in design by the Infantry Board. When the Armored Force was created experimentally for service test, the medium tank developed by the Infantry Board formed the basic design upon which, with few modifications, we were able to enter into the development of rapid production facilities.

A careful analysis of the armored operations during the present war leads to several definite conclusions.

(a) Armored forces of the combined arms are at present the most powerful means of offensive action.

(b) Given a suitable terrain for operations, the most effective defense against such armored forces would seem to lie in more numerous and more powerful similarly organized armored force.

(c) Armored units must be organized into large formations (corps and armies) to give tactical and strategical unity to their operations.

(d) A definite trend toward more complex combination of arms and toward heavier calibers and equipment has been shown during the war.

(e) To be successful in combat armored units must be manned and led by thoroughly and specially trained personnel. Such training requires much time and cannot be thoroughly accomplished with the turn-over of the mass of personnel each year.

OUR DEVELOPMENTS SINCE JULY 10, 1940

During part of May and June 1940 a major world power with an army conceded by many to be one of the finest in the world, backed by the manpower and equipment of powerful allies, was completely overrun and reduced to a state of comparative impotence by a military machine of astounding efficiency. Before this relatively short operation was completed, which is one of the greatest military phenomena of all times, the Chief of Staff acted promptly and decisively in effecting what I believe to be one of the foremost steps taken during my military service to increase the combat effectiveness of the Army High commanders from the field who had been working for years with our small mechanized cavalry and tank units were immediately assembled in Washington and participated in conference with members of the General Staff. It was the unanimous opinion of the conferees:

That the recent German successes proved the value, efficiency, and economy of armored units when properly used in adequate numbers on the modern battlefield.

That our tactical conception and technical development have been proceeding along sound lines, although on a most modest scale, since prior to the rearmament of Germany.

That our available mechanized resources must be brought together under one head to obtain the maximum value from our limited personnel and matériel, to further tactical development and employment and to eliminate duplication of technical development.

That an expansion of this component of our Army was imperative if we were to successfully engage a modern first-class army.

The recommendations of the above meeting were in a matter of days translated into action. A War Department directive was published July 10, 1940, which created, for service test, an armored force to include all armored corps and General Headquarters Reserve tank units, and prescribed the duties of the Chief of the Armored Force, combining the command functions of a commander of a large tactical unit and many of the responsibilities of a chief of a combatant arm; this included the development of tactical and training doctrines for all units of the Armored Force and research and advisory functions pertaining to development and procurement of all special transportation, armament, and equipment used primarily for armored units.

The small mechanized cavalry brigade, a few scattered infantry tank units, the Sixth Infantry, and 9,500 enlisted men were made available or authorized to implement this organization. From the foregoing, the following units and agencies were organized: The I Armored Corps, consisting of the First and Second Armored Divisions and the Seventieth General Headquarters Reserve Tank Battalion; the Armored Force Board, charged primarily with giving proper direction to the development of special transportation, armament, and equipment, and to the preparation of training manuals; and the Armored Force School, to provide the highly trained technicians to operate and maintain the many types of complicated and expensive equipment of armored units.

The Armored Force, as constituted above met its initial training objective as laid down by the Chief of the Armored Force "* * * To be prepared to take the field with available personnel and matériel by October 1, 1940 * * *."

The foregoing accomplishments, notwithstanding sympathetic cooperation received from the War Department, were carried out in the face of many difficulties, among which were supply and personnel which I will discuss later.

The role of a unit determines its organization. The role of an armored division is the conduct of highly mobile ground warfare, primarily offensive in character, by a self-sustained unit of great power and mobility, composed of specially equipped troops of the required arms and services. It should be employed on missions either strategical or tactical, whose accomplishment will effect to the maximum the total destruction of the enemy.

Armored division: The armored division of 12,700 officers and enlisted men has a tremendous fire power in its authorized allotment of over 19,000 weapons, including pistols; rifles; sub, light, and heavy machine guns; mortars; 37-millimeter guns; 75-millimeter guns; 105-millimeter howitzers; and over 3,000 caliber .30 machine guns. The armored division consists of five echelons: Command, reconnaissance, striking, support, and service. These echelons must operate together as a team if the division is to function efficiently.

Command echelon: The command echelon consists of the division headquarters and headquarters company which directs the operations of the armored division and a signal company that provides facilities for transmitting orders and information to all echelons.

Reconnaissance echelon: The reconnaissance echelon consists of a reconnaissance battalion and an attached observation squadron. The two, working in close coordination, constitute the eyes of the commander. The picture painted from the information gathered by these two reconnaissance agencies forms the basis of the commander's plan of execution of the division mission.

Striking echelon: The striking echelon consists of the armored brigade, with its headquarters and headquarters company, two light-armored regiments, one medium-armored regiment, and a field-artillery regiment. The entire division is built around the striking echelon and its principal weapon, the tank. While the tank is the principal weapon of the light-armored regiment, it is not the only one. This regiment also is equipped with its own reconnaissance, its own mobile machine-gun units, and a specially equipped mortar platoon. All other elements of the division are intent on maneuvering the striking echelon into position from which it can deliver the decisive blow.

Support echelon: The support echelon consists of an infantry regiment, a field-artillery battalion, and an engineer battalion. The support echelon assists the striking echelon by attacking to clarify the situation, seizing ground unfavorable for tank action, holding ground which the tanks have captured, neutralizing threats, and protecting the tanks during periods of refueling, reorganization, and rest. The engineers insure the uninterrupted advance of the division by the construction and repairs of crossings, by operating assault boats and ferries, by the use of their bridging equipment, and by improvised means. They assist in the all-around defense of the division in the establishment of antitank areas by preparing road blocks, obstacles, mine fields, and demolitions.

Service echelon: The service echelon consists of an ordnance battalion, quartermaster battalion, and a medical battalion. It furnishes the skilled mechanics and spare parts required to maintain weapons, fighting vehicles, and wheeled vehicles in operation. It supplies the division with gasoline, oil, and

rations. It collects and evacuates the wounded personnel of all units of the division.

Combat aviation must always support and frequently may be attached to an armored division during operations. In principle, combat aviation augments the power and extends the range of artillery.

Armored corps: Armored units are employed against vital objectives in rear of the hostile main battle position usually reached by a penetration of a weak position of the hostile front or an encirclement of an open flank. Such operations are premised on surprise, on rapidity of action, and on ability to sustain this action until the objective is gained. Therefore, it is apparent that armored units must be employed in mass, not hundreds but thousands of tanks, with adequate aviation, engineer, infantry, artillery, maintenance, and logistical support, with local superiority of the air assured. To train, fight, and supply these larger formations, armored divisions must be grouped into corps, consisting of an essential command echelon, two armored divisions, and necessary corps troops, organic or attached.

* * * * *

Group headquarters tank units: Group headquarters tank battalions, organized quite similarly to the battalions of the armored regiments, are provided to give added striking power to the infantry and cavalry divisions and for attachment to armored divisions as additional battalions. These units are organized into light and medium battalions, the former primarily for inclusion in special-task forces where landing operations must be initially accomplished in secondary harbors. The development of the heavy tank should be continued so as to insure its availability if and when needed.

As with the armored divisions, these tank battalions should be grouped under tank group headquarters. These headquarters are essential to supervise, coordinate, and further the training, and to assist in developing the technique and tactics of group headquarters tank battalion and group employment as well as being available as trained command agencies for field operations.

Organization will change with experience, and with changes in the supply and the strategical situation. With the introduction of the 75-millimeter gun in the medium tank, it is probable that the artillery regiment will be taken away from the armored brigade and become a divisional unit for general support. The division may easily be made lighter or stronger by adding or subtracting an integral part thereof to meet the needs of any theater of operation. We have seen the German Army vary its organization in this manner to suit the immediate tactical situation.

It is true that the organization of our armored division is very similar in principle to that of the German panzer division, but it is not a question of us blindly following the latter. Rather it proves the soundness of our own development, since the Germans in general followed the principles of our own mechanized cavalry organizations which existed prior to the development of the present German organization.

It is not desired to convey the idea that armored units will win a war by themselves. I do not believe that the swift successes of the German Army in Holland, Belgium, and France were due to the action of any one particular branch of service. Rather, I believe that they were primarily due to the close coordination and cooperation of the swift-striking dive bombers with the powerful panzer divisions, closely supported by well-trained, highly mobile infantry formations.

However, much of the German success may be credited to the panzer divisions, and it is not strange that the American public has shown an interest in this modern type of ground warfare, because we as a nation have a natural aptitude for the manufacture and operation of automotive equipment. So natural is this aptitude that the great mass of our public has wondered that foreign powers apparently had passed us in the utilization of mechanization for combat purposes. That this condition existed is only due to the fact that peacetime appropriations for our Army would not permit the establishment of an armored force of the magnitude employed by a nation committed to a period of rapid military expansion.

As matériel and supply have dominated recent battlefields, so have they dominated the development of the armored force. Its initial organization was governed by the type and quantity available; its future organization and rapidity of expansion will be dictated by timely execution of adequate manufacturing programs. It is essential that we manufacture the most modern type of fighting equipment for today and, concurrently, develop more efficient types for tomorrow. We are all too familiar with the long and precious time required to develop, tool for, and manufacture new types of critical items of equipment. We are also familiar with the uselessness of an army which is second best in matériel.

As at present organized, an armored division is equipped with 3,243 vehicles of all types. One thousand one hundred and forty of these are combat vehicles pure and simple, including scout cars, reconnaissance cars, tanks of all categories, personnel carriers and prime movers, machine-gun and other weapon carriers; 2,103 are motorcycles, engineer vehicles, ambulances, and trucks of every variety. Many of these have combat purposes, but the majority enter into the supply of food, ammunition, and fuel. The so-called bantam car is replacing the motorcycle in many instances.

* * * * *

The scout car, which is largely used as a reconnaissance and machine-gun vehicle in the armored divisions, has met all the requirements of expansion thus far.

* * * * *

Man will always remain master of matériel. Matériel must be conceived, moved, fought, and maintained by man.

Only an extremely small reservoir of Regular officers with mechanized cavalry and tank experience was available for the initial organization and immediate expansion of the Armored Force. All of the Regular officers now being assigned, as well as Reserve officers, must pass through intense orientation training courses on armored operation before assuming command of units commensurate with their rank from second lieutenants to generals. Many must then be given extensive schooling to qualify as motor and communications officers—armored units cannot roll, be controlled, or fought without the greatest proficiency on the part of these officers in all echelons.

In no other component of the Army are enlisted men charged with heavier responsibilities of command, operation, and maintenance duties. A large percentage of enlisted men comprise small vehicular combat teams whose success is dependent upon the instant, correct, and continuous operations of these teams. The men who operate the complicated and expensive tank with its airplane engine might better be called tank engineers than tank drivers.

Highly skilled mechanical and technical experts in large numbers are required to maintain the great amount of motor and radio equipment. Development of the potentialities of an armored unit is dependent in an unusual degree to the decentralization of command, operation, and maintenance to the enlisted man, coupled with his initiative, judgment, and degree of training to meet each situation. Experience has proved that it takes a minimum of 4 months to train an enlisted man to participate as a junior member of his team in field service. An additional 3 months' instruction is required in the Armored Force School as the first step in qualifying numbers of these men as technical experts. Fifty percent of all enlisted men in an armored division are classified as occupational specialists; it is highly desirable that a greater percentage be so qualified to provide essential replacements. Many enlisted men now assigned to the Armored Force have not the capacity to assimilate the instruction given in the Armored Force School.

* * * * *

The following units have been activated since the Armored Force was initially created:

Headquarters and Headquarters Company, Armored Force.

Third and Fourth Armored Divisions.

Headquarters, First Tank Group.

One Hundred and Ninety-first, One Hundred and Ninety-second, One Hundred and Ninety-third, and One Hundred and Ninety-fourth Tank Battalions.

Fifty-ninth Signal Battalion (armored).

The Armored Force replacement training center, with a capacity of 9,000, is now busily engaged in training selective-service men from all walks of life.

The Armored Force School has been expanded and, working on a two-shift daily basis with approximately 400 students entering each week, graduates 300 officers and 5,000 enlisted technicians every 5 months.

Housing, utilities, and hospitalization have been ready in every instance to meet the scheduled flow of personnel; sites had to be located and purchased and complete construction provided in practically all cases.

Commissioned and enlisted cadres, technical specialists, and selectees are now completing their training for 10 additional tank battalions to be activated next month.

* * * * *

I have attempted to bring out the magnitude of the task of expanding our small peacetime laboratory of mechanization to our present size. If I have done that, I know you will appreciate the fact that to expand the Armored Force so that it will be capable of defeating a skillfully led modern army possessing powerful air, mechanized, and motorized units requires timely, positive, and additional effort from all of us.

With world conditions existing as they are today, our Nation is confronted with the most important problem of national defense that has arisen in its history. However, the effectiveness of our national defense of tomorrow must be in proportion to our decisions and actions of today.

Distribution of Milk to the Children of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. PETE JARMAN, OF ALABAMA

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on August 15, 1941:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am very grateful to that excellent organization, the Mutual Broadcasting System, for this opportunity to

briefly discuss with you the bill I recently introduced which provides for the distribution of milk to the children of America.

It is very simple and the administration of it is equally so. Its purpose is to make available, absolutely free, a quart of milk a day to each child in the United States who is 14 years of age or less. Your first impression may be, as mine was, that this is wishful thinking or toying with a utopian idea. but think it over and the more seriously you do so, the more probable do I believe it is that you will agree with my conclusion that this first impression is an erroneous one.

This milk is to be distributed under a white-stamp or coupon system which operates as follows: When the bill becomes law, the Secretary of Agriculture will fix the price which the Federal Government will pay for the milk to be distributed. Naturally this price will vary as the cost of production varies throughout the country, but to protect the farmers and milk distributors, it provides that the Secretary shall fix such price within a margin of 10 percent of the average price which has prevailed in each locality during the 6 months next preceding its enactment. Also, that at least 50 percent of the price must be paid by the distributor to the farmer who produced it.

When the Secretary has fixed these prices, he shall cause to be issued white stamps or coupons, the face value of each of which will be the price of a quart of milk in the locality where it is to be used. Any dairyman, dairy farmer, or milk dealer will be eligible to supply this milk to your child and to receive therefor the price fixed by the Secretary for milk in his locality. It will only be necessary for him to certify his willingness to the Secretary to accept these stamps in exchange for his milk. You will note that he is not compelled to sell at the price fixed unless he wishes to do so, and he may withdraw his consent by giving 30 days' notice of such a desire. If you have children 14 years of age or less, an adequate supply of wholesome milk will become available to them by the simple process of your making application each 30 days for these stamps. Upon proof that your children are not more than 14 years old, the Secretary will issue you 30 stamps per month for each child. Each month thereafter he will, upon a like application, issue you an additional month's supply.

If your dairyman has certified his willingness to accept these stamps in exchange for his milk—and you may rest assured that practically all of them will do so—you may exchange them at the rate of 1 quart of milk a day for each such child. Your dairyman will cash his stamps in a local place provided for that purpose, just as he would a money order. In rural localities where there are no commercial dairymen and no dairy health inspection, anyone having a cow may furnish this milk just as the commercial dairies do elsewhere.

I wish to make it clear that this is not a bill to place the Federal Government in the milk business. There will be no Government-owned dairies and no Government distribution of milk.

Should the Secretary find an insufficient quantity of milk in any locality to afford all the children a quart a day, he may commence by issuing pint stamps, and change to quarts as soon thereafter as he ascertains that enough milk has become available for each child to receive the full amount.

This plan was originated by W. D. Dobbins, a very successful businessman of Alabama, who was born and reared in the great congressional district it is my privilege to represent. He does not reside there now, nor is he connected with the milk industry in any way, but he has devoted years of study to American nutritional problems. It resulted in this plan, which will both aid the farmers and tend to alleviate and prevent malnutrition among our children and future generations at a cost of only a part of our present farm aid.

After several months of careful investigation and mature consideration, during which I explored the reasons advanced for it, and considered all possible objections to it, I reached the conclusion that, with the alarming number of 40 percent of our boys, and I presume girls, suffering from malnutrition or defects directly attributable thereto, we cannot afford to longer ignore this deplorable condition. Convinced that this plan offered the best solution of the problem I decided to introduce and sponsor it, with certain changes and modifications, as a bill in the Congress.

It is my firm conviction that this bill will prove a good investment to the taxpayers of America with very little or no cost to them in the final analysis. I am confident that when you and the Members of Congress understand the reasons behind it you and they will agree with me that we cannot afford to permit its failure to pass.

Luther Burbank, the great horticulturist, once said: "Had we paid no more attention to our plants than we have to our children, we would now be living in a jungle of weeds." These words are just as tragically true today as when he uttered them. We, the richest people on earth, living in a land of plenty, where crop surpluses are so great that finding storage space for some of them has become a major problem, suddenly learn that 40 percent of our boys are unfit for military duty, that most of these are suffering from malnutrition or defects attributable thereto.

Surely it is as important to build the man to man the gun as it is to build the gun with which to defend our country. The great war raging in Europe, which threatens to also engulf us, creates the necessity that we spend vast sums for national defense. As I said when advocating the lease-lend bill, all of this money cannot be repaid in our generation, probably in the next several generations. This fact, and the uncertainty of the future, will place enormous burdens and responsibilities on the children of today and the generations of tomorrow. Since we must bequeath them these heavy burdens and responsibilities, we should, and we must, provide, even in these trying times, for their normal growth and development, both physically and mentally. We cannot afford not to indulge in some organized effort to safeguard this development and prevent the deplorable condition of 40 percent of our people reaching maturity as sufferers from malnutrition.

My bill will aid the farmer, who constitutes the very backbone of this country, as well as the children, by greatly contributing toward a stable and profitable agriculture. It will provide him with a cash market for this essential product of diversified farming. It will help the farmer not directly connected with milk production. To produce the additional quantity of milk made necessary by this bill will require a vast amount of additional feed. This requirement will consume much, if not all, of the surplus grain which has depressed the farmers' market and which has necessitated the appropriation of vast sums for farm aid to prevent ruinous prices.

Much of the land now being used in the production of surplus grain and cotton can, and will be diverted to pastures for the production of this additional milk. This will tend to further decrease the surplus of crops that we do not need in favor of milk which is so sorely needed. Then, instead of paying the farmers for not producing more of these crops, as the Federal Government now does, it will pay him for producing milk for our future soldiers, statesmen, businessmen, and women. Necessary though these present payments be, the farmer would much prefer to be adequately compensated for producing than to receive a pittance for not doing so.

There is no better soil conservation known to science than dairying. The cover crops used for pastures protect the soil while the waste of the dairy herd fertilizes the land. Returning this land to pasturage will very naturally contribute to soil conservation, thereby greatly reducing the present very appropriate appropriations of the Congress for that purpose.

All of this will cause the farmers to become more self-supporting and will, not only save much of the cost of future Federal farm aid, but will avoid the necessity of many a farmer appearing on the W. P. A. rolls, with a consequent saving in that appropriation.

Another great saving will occur, which cannot be measured altogether in dollars and cents. I refer to the effect on our future crime bill. Crime is reliably estimated to cost the people of America more than $15,000,000,000 annually. The criminal of today was the child of yesterday. The child who steals today because he is hungry and discontented, becomes the bank robber and public enemy No. 1 of tomorrow. There is no better way to keep a child out of trouble than to keep it well fed and healthy.

It is quite probable that these savings will prove adequate to defray the entire cost of this humanitarian program, which will conserve American youth while conserving American soil.

Though you may never have heard the cry of hunger of your child, you know that millions of children in this great land crawl into their beds experiencing the actual pangs of hunger to haunt their little dreams. Though you may be able to provide for the wants of your child, it enjoys no security in the absence of security for its schoolmates and playmates. It matters not that you have well fed and clothed your own child. If it must go to school and play with, or sit next to, a child who has contracted tuberculosis because of the weakened condition caused by malnutrition, it, too, is in danger.

Malnutrition may well be compared with an insidious Nazi propaganda. It affords no warning of its danger. You may not realize its presence, but it dulls your mind and finally robs you of your strength and will to resist.

We have devoted much time to, and spent much money on, soil conservation; the development of fine flowers, cattle, hogs, bird dogs, and race horses. Is not the health of our children as important as either of these? I think so, and for that reason, I am resolved to indulge in a vigorous fight for the passage of this bill which will conserve the health of our children while conserving the soil of our farms. With the help of the American public, my efforts will be crowned with success.

A quart of milk a day per child will make the cheeks of American children rosy, the pastures green, and the farmers prosperous.

Is There Any Wonder That Confusion of Public Mind Continues To Grow?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, just what is the status of this country in its

relationship to the World War now raging? We are not officially at war, provided the constitutional limitation still holds good, because the President has not asked the Congress for a declaration of war, and no such action has been taken by the Congress. Just how far is the President going by virtue of his lease-lend authority? Does this undeclared war mean troops in foreign countries?

The recent conference between President Roosevelt and Premier Churchill sheds no definite light on the subject, yet it is difficult to read the eight-point agreement, the President's press conference quoting the Lincoln statement, the Churchill speech, and the President's message to Congress and escape the conclusion that there is a definite expectation on the part of the President and at least a tacit understanding between the President and Churchill that our country will fight as one of the Allies before the desires, wishes, and determinations expressed in the eight-point statement of policy are accomplished. Why should there be any misunderstanding? For months and months some of us have been calling upon the President to talk straight from the shoulder, to take the people into his confidence, to use direct language that the people can understand and that was not susceptible of so many interpretations. The President knows how to use such language. Why does he not give us an example?

This matter was called to my attention this morning when I read an editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, and pursuant to the permission given to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include that editorial, which is as follows:

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot]

THE SOURCE OF CONFUSION

Saturday, while traveling to Washington on his special train, fresh from his sea voyage, the President said no to the direct question, "Are we any closer to entering the war?" That was a proper question and one to which the people could expect an honest answer after serious consideration of all the facts. The President said no.

Then on Wednesday at his press conference the President went to some length to quote from statements made by Abraham Lincoln in the most serious and dark days of the War between the States and said they applied to our situation today.

"I have no word of encouragement to give," President Roosevelt quoted his predecessor in office. "The military situation is far from bright; and the country knows it as well as I do. The fact is that the people have not yet made up their minds that we are at war with the South. They have not buckled down to the determination to fight this war through; for they have got the idea into their heads that we are going to get out of this fix by strategy. That's the word—strategy. General McClellan thinks he is going to whip the rebels by strategy, and the Army has got the same notion. They have no idea that the war is to be carried on and put through by hard, tough fighting; that it will hurt somebody; and no headway is going to be made while this delusion lasts."

Last Sunday morning the Citizen Patriot top headline across page 1 read, "'Nation No Nearer War'—Roosevelt." On Wednesday morning the Detroit Free Press headline across page 1 read, "F. D. R. Indicates United States Must Fight to Win War." Both headlines reflected accurately the President's position in the news at that moment. Yet they are in direct contradiction.

Here are two statements from the White House in less than a week pointing in different directions. When we include the frequently made promise that no American soldier will be sent abroad to fight on foreign soil, there is no wonder that the public mind is confused, or, as was said, under "delusion."

There is both confusion and perhaps delusion, but that condition stems from the failure of the head of the Government to be frank and consistent in his statements and his unwillingness to take Congress and the American public into his full confidence. One day he says we are no nearer to actual war than before, and another he deplores the fact that the American public has not yet made up its mind to fight and get hurt. Thursday's statement to Congress contributed nothing to clarification of the situation.

Is there any wonder that confusion of public mind continues to grow? The White House is the chief source of confusion.

Flood Control of Cherry Creek, Colo., for the Protection of Denver and Adjacent Territory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most meritorious projects in the flood-control authorization bill recently approved by the President—Public, No. 228, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved August 18, 1941, being an enactment of H. R. 4911—is the project for flood control of Cherry Creek in Colorado for the protection of the city of Denver and nearby agricultural developments. Indeed, the Engineer Corps of the Army, after several years of careful study, believes this Cherry Creek project to be "of major importance" and "one of the most important" authorized in the recent act. When completely constructed in accordance with the plan set forth in the report of the Army engineers—House Document No. 426, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session—this project will protect from an ever-imminent major tragedy not only Denver, a city of 322,412, and its contiguous suburbs, with a population of about 62,000 more, but also the nearby agricultural developments. Although the entire comprehensive plan as set forth in the report of the Engineer Corps is expressly approved in the recently enacted statute, an immediate appropriation of only $3,000,000, out of the estimated total cost of $10,500,000, is presently authorized.

The item concerning the Cherry Creek project is printed at page 10 of the statute, Public Law No. 228, Seventy-seventh Congress, under the subheading "Missouri River Basin." It is as follows:

The comprehensive plan for the improvement of Cherry Creek and tributaries, Colorado, for flood control and other purposes in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 426, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, is approved, and there is hereby authorized $3,000,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

During the debate on June 20, 1941, when the bill recently enacted was before the House for consideration, I made some remarks in which I included some extracts from the favorable report by the Corps of Engineers on the Cherry Creek project, House Document No. 426, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session. These remarks are printed at pages 5441–5443 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 20, 1941.

The statement in the unanimous report by the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives—Report No. 759, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session—filed June 9, 1941, is as follows:

CHERRY CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, COLORADO

(H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.)

The possibility of a major flood on Cherry Creek threatens the city of Denver, Colo., with a major catastrophe. Cherry Creek rises in El Paso County, Colo., flows northerly to join the South Platte River in Denver. The topography of Cherry Creek Basin is such as to cause large floods of great intensity which may descend on Denver with little warning. For the lower 5½ miles of its course, Cherry Creek flows through industrial and residential sections of the city. The great flows which would result from major floods on Cherry Creek would submerge a large part of the central portion of Denver, including important business districts, railroad yards, industrial establishments, and extensive residential areas. Denver is the most important industrial center between the Missouri River and the Pacific coast, and any disruption of the normal activities of that city would be detrimental to the whole country. The need for flood control on Cherry Creek has been investigated by the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1937, and a report has been submitted to Congress.

The plan of protection recommended by the Chief of Engineers provides for the construction of two reservoirs on Cherry Creek at the Cherry Creek No. 1 site and at the Castlewood site, both above Denver, at an estimated cost to the United States of $10,500,000.

Construction of the recommended project would protect Denver against any flood reasonably to be expected and would eliminate practically all further damages from Cherry Creek floods in the agricultural valley above that city. In addition, water for irrigation is to be stored in the Castlewood Reservoir. Unquestionably the benefits of the improvement would greatly exceed its cost. The Flood Control Committee reaffirms its previous recommendation that the plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers should be approved by Congress, and because of the need for the contemplated flood protection at Denver $3,000,000 should be authorized at this time to provide for the construction of the Castlewood Reservoir and the completion of the detailed plans and other necessary preliminary work for the Cherry Creek Reservoir No. 1.

Provision for this Cherry Creek project, in the same form as in the recently enacted statute, was also embodied in the flood-control bill favorably reported to the House last year during the Seventy-sixth Congress, House bill 9640. Because of the preoccupation of the House with other matters, this bill was never considered on the floor of the House before the expiration of the Seventy-sixth

Congress. Consequently, H. R. 9640 died last January with all other bills which had been introduced in the Seventy-sixth Congress, and which had not been enacted into law. In unanimously and favorably reporting last year's bill the Committee on Flood Control of the House made the following statement, at pages 23–24, Report No. 2103, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, filed May 7, 1940:

CHERRY CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, COLORADO

(H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.)

Cherry Creek rises in El Paso County, Colo., and flows north to join the South Platte River in the city of Denver. The valley of Cherry Creek for over 20 miles above Denver is a rich farming area and for its lower 5.5 miles Cherry Creek flows through the residential and industrial sections of the city. The need for flood control on Cherry Creek has been investigated by the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1937, and his report has been transmitted to Congress. This report indicates that the Cherry Creek Valley lies in a cloudburst zone and has suffered damaging floods since its earliest settlement. Major floods of Cherry Creek have caused extensive damages at Denver and the flood of 1933 destroyed the old Castlewood irrigation dam above the city. It has been estimated that the maximum probable flood on Cherry Creek would cause damages in Denver of from forty to fifty million dollars, and might cause large loss of life.

The plan of protection recommended by the Chief of Engineers provides for construction of two reservoirs on Cherry Creek, at the Cherry Creek No. 1 and Castlewood sites above Denver, at an estimated cost to the United States of $10,500,000.

The recommended reservoirs would protect the city of Denver against any flood reasonably to be anticipated and would largely eliminate flood damage in the valley above the city. In addition, it is proposed to reserve water for irrigation in the proposed Castlewood Reservoir. The benefits of the improvement would be greatly in excess of its cost. The Flood Control Committee therefore believes that the project merits approval by Congress and that it is of such an urgent nature that $3,000,000 should be authorized at this time so that the necessary lands can be secured and detailed plans can be initiated as soon as funds are appropriated by Congress.

At the outset of the hearings held this year before the House Committee on Flood Control, it was decided in the interest of saving time and money, not to repeat the exhaustive hearings on projects which had been carefully considered and unanimously and favorably reported in 1940 and embodied in last year's bill, House bill 9640, Seventy-sixth Congress. Accordingly no hearings were had in 1941 on the Cherry Creek project; but on March 18, 1940, at the opening of the hearings during the Seventy-sixth Congress on H. R. 9640, page 11, Maj. Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, made the following statement concerning floods in so-called flash streams in the West and the necessity for flood control of Cherry Creek for the protection of Denver:

General SCHLEY. Those are in the semiarid sections, where the river channels have very small capacities and where the rains come like cloudbursts. As the cities grow larger and become more important, the destruction by these cloudbursts is very much greater.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WHITTINGTON of Mississippi). You have also submitted a report and recommendation for the protection of the city of Denver, Colo., have you not?

General SCHLEY. That is right

The CHAIRMAN. That is a rather populous area?

General SCHLEY. The possibilities of danger there are very great. It has been simply a matter of great luck that Denver has not had a great catastrophe since it has been a large city. The floods, according to the historic record, have not been anything like as great as they might be.

On April 4, 1940, extensive hearings were held by the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives on the Cherry Creek project, 1940 hearings, pages 551–607, 624–625, portions of which I quote as follows:

CHERRY CREEK PROJECT, DENVER

The committee met, pursuant to adjournment at 10:30 a. m., Hon. WILL M. WHITTINGTON (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order, please.

Gentlemen, we have under consideration the projects in Colorado and western areas for today, and we have with us as witnesses representatives from the Army engineers, and others interested in those projects.

The first project we have under consideration is a report published as Document No. 426, Seventy-sixth Congress, First Session, Cherry Creek and its tributaries in Colorado. Mr. LEWIS, of Colorado, is author of the bill and he has furnished me the name of Mr. McQuaid.

Mr. LEWIS, of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Dan J. McQuaid, an eminent engineer of Denver, Colo., is recuperating from an accident and is unable to be present. I greatly regret his absence. However, his statement would really be cumulative of that which will be made by the Army engineers of the situation which I wish very briefly to outline, and of the facts set forth in the favorable report of the Corps of Engineers, which is printed as House Document No. 426, Seventy-sixth Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. We will identify the project first.

* * * * *

STATEMENT OF COL. CLARENCE L. STURDEVANT, DIVISION ENGINEER, MISSOURI RIVER DIVISION

The CHAIRMAN. Colonel Sturdevant, you are the engineer in charge of the division in which Denver is located?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes; the Missouri River division.

The CHAIRMAN. In which Denver, Colo., is located?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And did you submit the report on this project for your division?

Colonel STURDEVANT. The district engineer at Omaha prepared the basic report and I submitted a recommendation on his report.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like for you to tell the committee generally what this project consists of.

Colonel STURDEVANT. Cherry Creek is a tributary of the South Platte River which flows through the city of Denver, Colo.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a map if you wish to use it to indicate the locations.

Colonel STURDEVANT. The map showing the drainage area is back of you. The shape of that drainage area is leaf like.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the dimensions?

Colonel STURDEVANT. The total length is about 57 miles and the average width is approximately 15 miles.

The total drainage area is 416 square miles.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt you with a question? This Cherry Creek has its source where with respect to the city of Denver?

Colonel STURDEVANT. About 57 miles south of Denver.

The CHAIRMAN. And flows north?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Flows north into the city of Denver and right at this point [indicating] the creek joins with South Platte River.

The CHAIRMAN. And the creek takes its source down here [indicating]?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And flows north.

Colonel STURDEVANT. Goes right through the middle of Denver.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Platte River flows through Denver also?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, along what cities does that pass in that valley?

Colonel STURDEVANT. There are no cities. There are one or two small towns of about 200 population, one of which is somewhat subject to flood and one of the small towns is not subject to flood.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, this creek passes through the city of Denver?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the population of Denver?

Colonel STURDEVANT. About 290,000, according to the 1930 census.

NOTE.—According to the final figures on the 1940 census, the population of Denver, not including contiguous and adjacent suburbs, was 322,412.

The CHAIRMAN. Cherry Creek passes around the city?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Right through the city.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the normal discharge of that creek in Denver?

Colonel STURDEVANT. It has a very small, ordinary discharge. It is a very flashy stream, and is just a small creek at times, but the area is subject to very violent cloudburst storms. The peak discharge of record at Denver is 20,000 cubic feet per second.

The CHAIRMAN. That is up in the mountains?

Colonel STURDEVANT. The foothills of the Rocky Mountains. The elevation here [indicating] is about 7,700 feet above sea level, and the city of Denver is approximately 5,200 feet elevation, so there is a drop of about 2,500 feet in that 57 miles, and of course there are some tributaries; it has several tributaries.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the flood problem in Denver and the vicinity of Denver?

Colonel STURDEVANT. The problem is that the watershed of Cherry Creek is located in an area subject to frequent storms of cloudburst intensity, giving the stream a long record of damaging overflow in the city of Denver.

The most damaging flood of record was in 1933, and did a great deal of damage to the city of Denver. On the map just behind you, Mr. Chairman, is shown in blue the area in the city of Denver inundated by the 1933 flood. That flood did physical damage of something over a million dollars.

Just to illustrate the danger, will you look at the small map on the wall [indicating]? There is, we think, a possibility—a very strong possibility—of a flood much more severe than any flood they have ever had in the past. That is illustrated by this chart here, which shows the area in blue where they had an actual rainfall of from 5 to 15 inches in a period of 8 hours, and if that particular flood had been moved over to where the red plot is shown it would have covered—almost fully covered—the drainage of Cherry Creek and would have produced a flood some 10 to 14 times greater than any flood of record.

So we feel that there is quite a dangerous situation in view of what could happen to the city of Denver.

We have proposed to protect the city by means of two detention reservoirs. One of them is located about here [indicating] in the middle of the drainage area at the site of a previous dam that failed during the 1933

flood, and another up here 6¾ miles above the city limits of Denver [indicating on map].

The CHAIRMAN. What is the estimated cost of that project?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Ten million five hundred thousand dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. And what sort of reservoir will it be—earthen or concrete?

Colonel STURDEVANT. They are earth-filled dams—both of them. The upper dam we call the Castlewood Reservoir, which has a height of 212 feet and will store 42,500 acre-feet of water. The lower dam has a height of 104 feet and is to store 69,000 acre-feet of water.

The CHAIRMAN. The largest will store how much, please?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Sixty-nine thousand acre-feet of water.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the estimated cost of the dam in the larger reservoir, and will you give the name of that reservoir for the record again?

Colonel STURDEVANT. The upper one is the Castlewood, and the lower one is designated in the report as Cherry Creek No. 1.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the largest one to cost—the estimated cost?

Colonel STURDEVANT. The upper one, $2,300,000; and the lower one, $8,200,000.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the cost of the rights-of-way in the upper one—the Castlewood Reservoir?

Colonel STURDEVANT. The cost of lands, damages, and rights-of-way is estimated to be about $45,000.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the character of lands that are required at the reservoir site?

Colonel STURDEVANT. They are farm lands.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any highways or railroads to be removed in the valley to be covered by the projects?

Colonel STURDEVANT. There are no railroads or major highways to be relocated. However, above the upper dam site there is about 1 mile of county road that will have to be relocated and a few county roads above the lower site.

The CHAIRMAN. And that reservoir has a storage capacity of about 43,000 acre-feet?

Colonel STURDEVANT. The upper one has a capacity of about 43,000 acre-feet.

The CHAIRMAN. And the lower one, Cherry Creek No. 1, has how much?

Colonel STURDEVANT. About 69,000.

The CHAIRMAN. And yet it is going to cost four times as much as the one that has 43,000 capacity?

Colonel STURDEVANT. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Why the difference in cost?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Due to the conditions at the site. We have a much better site for the upper dam, as the location is in a canyon. The lower dam is necessarily very wide across the valley and is really not a very good dam site, but it is the best we can find.

The CHAIRMAN. The water that is to be accumulated in the lower reservoir has got to pass the Castlewood Reservoir?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Not entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, there are tributaries?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes; there are many tributaries.

The CHAIRMAN. I am talking about the two dams in between the two reservoirs. What is the distance from the one to the other?

Colonel STURDEVANT. About 24 miles.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-four miles. Now, will the Castlewood Reservoir accumulate the water which comes down above that reservoir?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And the reservoir at Cherry Creek No. 1 accumulates largely the water which empties into the creek between the Castlewood Reservoir and the lower reservoir?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes; largely. Of course, it also receives the regulated flow from the upper reservoir as well.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any power developments to be installed at either of these reservoirs?

Colonel STURDEVANT. None is contemplated.

The CHAIRMAN. Any penstocks to be installed?

Colonel STURDEVANT. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it open, or what is the provision made for the ordinary flow of the water in here between the two reservoirs?

Colonel STURDEVANT. The maximum regulated flow from the upper reservoir will be 2,500 second-feet and from the lower one about 7,500 second-feet.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that continuous at both reservoirs?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. They are left open?

Colonel STURDEVANT. They are left open.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any highways or railways or towns above the lower reservoir?

Colonel STURDEVANT. No railroads or major highways will have to be relocated. Some county roads and a small community of a few houses (Melvin) will have to be relocated.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the estimated cost of the lands and the damages for Cherry Creek No. 1?

Colonel STURDEVANT. The estimated cost of lands, damages, and rights-of-way is approximately $150,000.

The CHAIRMAN. In the report here you show the total estimated cost of both these reservoirs up around $10,500,000?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, how far is it from the city of Denver to the mouth of Cherry Creek?

Colonel STURDEVANT. The mouth of the creek is in Denver.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I wanted to find out. How far is it from Denver to the mouth?

Colonel STURDEVANT. It flows into the Platte River in Denver.

The CHAIRMAN. And what happens to the Platte River from there?

Colonel STURDEVANT. It flows east into Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any flood problem by reason of the Platte River flowing through the city of Denver?

Colonel STURDEVANT. No; no great flood problem on the Platte itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there ever been any danger to the city or community from that river?

Colonel STURDEVANT. From the Platte?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Colonel STURDEVANT. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it go through as much of the city as Cherry Creek?

Colonel STURDEVANT. I think more, but it does not have the flood problem.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. About where does Cherry Creek empty into Platte River with respect to the city of Denver?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Very close to the center of the business section. On the map you will see that it is near the railroad station.

The CHAIRMAN. But the flood problem is largely from Cherry Creek and not the Platte?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes. There is no record of a serious flood at the same time as a flood in the creek, nor of a serious flood caused by the Platte alone.

The CHAIRMAN. What local protective works have been constructed along the Platte River or along Cherry Creek?

Colonel STURDEVANT. The entire length of Cherry Creek within the city limits has been improved by the city; that is, the banks have been smoothed up and concreted so that it has a carrying capacity now of about 10,000 second-feet.

In addition to that the local interests have built a dam about 5½ miles above the city, called the Kenwood Dam. That is a detention reservoir which limits the flow to about 7,500 cubic feet per second and it is satisfactory for the protection against such floods as have occurred in the past, but it is obvious that Denver should have a much larger degree of flood protection. If Kenwood Dam should be overtopped and destroyed, the resulting damage to Denver would be greater than if the dam had not existed.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is that located with respect to Cherry Creek Reservoir No. 1 and Castlewood Reservoir?

Colonel STURDEVANT. The Kenwood Dam is right on Cherry Creek just about a mile and a quarter below No. 1, and Castlewood is here [indicating].

The CHAIRMAN. About 20 miles above?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Twenty-four miles.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the capacity of the Kenwood Reservoir?

Colonel STURDEVANT. The original capacity was about 10,000 acre-feet at spillway-crest elevation. Of course, this capacity has been decreased somewhat by sedimentation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that reservoir still being maintained?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. When was it constructed?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Shortly after the flood of 1933.

The CHAIRMAN. And when were the improved channels and bank facilities constructed?

Colonel STURDEVANT. I think they have largely been constructed since that time also.

The CHAIRMAN. Prior to the year 1933 what local protective works have been constructed in the city of Denver and about the city of Denver for protection by the local interests?

Colonel STURDEVANT. I cannot answer that.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there levees in the city?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes; they have not only done bank-protective work but have built levees. I cannot say how much.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the existing valuation of the property that will be protected by these two dams you referred to?

Colonel STURDEVANT. About $23,000,000 in the city of Denver.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other property to be protected?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Of course, they will protect the whole valley, but there will not be a great deal of property involved compared to that in Denver.

The CHAIRMAN. And how far is it from the city; when you say the valley, you mean from the city of Denver to the first reservoir?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes; and in between the two reservoirs. Between the two reservoirs property would be protected. Farm lands and ranches would be protected, and that amounts to something, but protection of Denver is the main purpose of the reservoirs.

The CHAIRMAN. What local protection works have the farm landowners ever constructed for their own protection?

Colonel STURDEVANT. None so far as I know.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. Now, the river flows through the city 5 or 6 miles?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. This creek, I mean?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Five or six miles?

Colonel STURDVANT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Outside the city limits how far is it to Cherry Creek Reservoir No. 1?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Six and three-quarter miles.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions, Mr. Curtis?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. During what months of the year are there heavy rains in the Cherry Creek Basin?

Colonel STURDEVANT. The big floods usually come in May, June, and July.

Mr. CURTIS. What do you propose to do with the water in the reservoir; will it be held and released immediately when the flood danger is passed?

Colonel STURDEVANT. At the upper reservoir a small amount will be held, about 8,000 acre-feet out of 43,000 feet will be held there for such other uses as may be desired, possibly irrigation or any other purpose. But the remainder of any floodwater caught would be released immediately, as fast as it could safely be done. At the Cherry Creek No. 1, water would be held no longer than necessary.

Mr. CURTIS. That is the one closest to town?

Colonel STURDEVANT. That is the one closest to Denver.

Mr. CURTIS. And you say about 8,000 acre-feet will be held at the upper one?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Will be held at the upper site; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. What effect will that have upon the water released into the Platte Basin that flows on through Colorado into Nebraska for irrigation; will it affect the amount of water?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Not very appreciably; no. The capacity of those reservoirs is very small, and even if filled by flood they will be emptied in a very few days. They will not greatly change any low-water stage in the lower Platte region.

Mr. CURTIS. It will not interfere with water they are getting for irrigation in that section?

Colonel STURDEVANT. No.

Mr. CURTIS. How much land could be irrigated by this 8,000 acre-feet?

Colonel STURDEVANT. About 4,300 acres.

Mr. CURTIS. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there a reservoir formerly at Castlewood?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. About when was that destroyed?

Colonel STURDEVANT. It was destroyed in the 1933 flood.

The CHAIRMAN. Who constructed it?

Colonel STURDEVANT. A private irrigation company.

The CHAIRMAN. It was built by some private irrigation company?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. At the same location where the present Castlewood Reservoir is to be located?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the private irrigation company still own the reservoir site?

Colonel STURDEVANT. It is my impression they have abandoned it.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been abandoned?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes; I have been so informed.

The CHAIRMAN. Was any flood protection afforded by that reservoir?

Colonel STURDEVANT. Yes; but evidently it was too small for flood protection, as indicated by the fact it was overtopped and destroyed.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very glad to have had your statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, at the outset I wish to say that the entire Colorado delegation is interested in this project. All would be here this morning to evidence their interest were it not that they are obliged to attend meetings of other committees.

The CHAIRMAN. They will have opportunity to appear along with other Members of Congress next Tuesday.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Yes; I do not know that they will all be able to come even then.

Congressman CUMMINGS was here a few minutes ago, but he had another committee meeting and was obliged to leave.

Congressman EDWARD T. TAYLOR, the beloved dean of our delegation, also asked me to say to you and to your committee that he should like to be here. As you know, he has not been well, but he asked me to express to you, Mr. Chairman, and to this committee his very great interest in this project for the flood control of Cherry Creek for the protection of Denver, the capital city of Colorado.

Senators ADAMS and JOHNSON of Colorado sent word to me that they are obliged to attend Senate committee meetings; but they charged me to say that they also are deeply interested in this project.

You referred at the outset to the fact that I had expected to have here as a witness Mr. Dan J. McQuaid, the engineer and executive secretary for the Denver Flood Control Association, which is an informal organization of prominent businessmen of Denver. But Mr. McQuaid has been detained in Denver by illness.

Judge Clifford H. Stone, director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board, and Mr. J. M. Dille, also of that board, are here to manifest their interest in this project. But they tell me that, in order to save the time of this committee, they do not care to make any statement, but wish to have the record show their presence and that they favor the project.

Mr. William P. Redding, a representative of the Denver Chamber of Commerce, also expected to be here, but he was obliged to be in New York City today. He has, however, sent me a letter in which he asks me to say that the Denver Chamber of Commerce wishes to go on record as earnestly requesting your committee to give most serious consideration to the Cherry Creek flood-control project for the protection of Denver. I have also received letters from public officials, various organizations, prominent businessmen, and other citizens strongly urging the approval of this project.

However, I believe your committee is more interested in the technical side of this project, as set out in the Army engineers' report, and in the statement by Colonel Sturdevant.

First of all, I wish to cover one or two points. In the basin of Cherry Creek, upstream from Denver, are a few small towns and other settlements—for example, Franktown, Parker, Melvin, and Sullivan. Of these comparatively small places, Parker, with a population of 200, would suffer the most—including some loss of life—from a major flood. But, except at Parker, most of the loss from a major flood upstream from Denver would be to the farms and ranches—to the agricultural and grazing interests in the Cherry Creek Valley to the south of Denver, and to the highways, including bridges.

As Colonel Sturdevant has said, this stream rises 57 miles south of Denver, and, on reaching the city, it flows between two tree-lined boulevards, first through one of the finest residential districts, known as the Country Club district, then through the business, wholesale, and industrial districts, and through the railroad yards to its confluence with the South Platte.

There is a drop of 2,500 feet in the 57 miles from the source of Cherry Creek to the point where it empties into the South Platte River in the heart of the city. As shown by that long topographic map [indicating map], the entire drainage area of Cherry Creek is about 57 miles long and only about 15 miles wide. The total area of the watershed is about 416 square miles. The main channel is located in about the middle of the watershed and extends slightly northwest downstream. The main channel is fed by almost innumerable tributaries, which are all very steep and comparatively short. Ordinarily they are mere dry gulches.

The site of the new Castlewood Dam recommended by the Army engineers is about 200 feet downstream from the site of the old Castlewood Dam, which failed during the flood of August 2–3, 1933. This new dam site is about 4 miles south of Franktown and about 27 miles south of the corporate limits of Denver.

When reference is made to a flood which threatens the safety of a city, doubtless there comes to the minds of most Members of Congress a picture of the comparatively slowly rising waters of a great river swollen by melting snows or by heavy rains at the headwaters. Of the approach of such a flood there is usually a period of a day or two or several days—sometimes as much as 10 days or 2 weeks—within which the menaced city can make preparations to safeguard life and property before the arrival of the crest of the flood. During such interval, emergency dikes or levees can be erected to supplement permanent flood-control works and inhabitants can be warned to get out of the lowlands.

Denver's "Sleeping Tiger"

In Colorado and elsewhere in the so-called semiarid regions of the West, cities are menaced by floods with entirely different characteristics, by floods from insignificant-looking "flash streams," floods which come almost with the suddenness and lack of warning of a stroke of lightning and which, after wreaking terrible damage, quickly subside. Although such floods rarely last more than 24 hours, nevertheless, because of their sudden incidence and the lack of time to make emergency preparations against their attack, they are more disastrous to the city so inundated than are floods in the great rivers. The only sure safeguard for a city so menaced is the provision of permanent works adequate to control any flood which is likely to occur.

Such is the type of flood which, every year, from the last of April until the first of October, is an hourly menace to Denver, from the usually insignificant appearing and seemingly harmless stream known as Cherry Creek.

Since Denver was first settled, floods from this stream have, in the aggregate, caused the loss of millions of dollars of property and about 100 lives. So treacherous is Cherry Creek and so dangerous when aroused that I have often referred to it as "Denver's sleeping tiger."

Denver is a comparatively young city. It is only 82 years old. It was founded in 1858 when some gold seekers from Georgia who had been to California looking for gold found a few Indians who were camped near the confluence of Cherry Creek and the South Platte River in what is now the heart of Denver. That was the first group of white men that had come in there, except a few trappers and a few explorers who had gone through the country some years before.

These Georgians panned for gold in Cherry Creek. They found "color" of gold in the stream and they followed it down to the South Platte on to Clear Creek, which is another tributary of the South Platte, and then up Clear Creek, where later were discovered lode deposits in place. These discoveries started the so-called "Pike's Peak or bust" gold rush in 1859 and 1860. It was so called because the entire region north of the Arkansas River and east of the Rocky mountains in what is now Colorado, was then known as "the Pike's Peak region."

Denver was settled as a result of that gold rush. There are men living today, one or two of them Members of the Congress of the United States, whose span of life is equal to the entire age of the city of Denver.

When the white men first came in there, the Indians warned them not to build in the Cherry Creek Valley. "No build tepees down there. Big flood come some day."

The Indians undoubtedly knew from experience and tradition of the dangers of which they warned the white men. Indeed, the topography of the Cherry Creek Valley clearly indicates that there have been in the past few centuries larger floods than have been experienced since Denver was first settled.

It is perfectly clear that, in all probability amounting to a practical certainty, far greater floods may be expected in the future than have come since the arrival of the white men. Eighty-two years is but a moment in the life of a stream—a mere "cat nap" in the life of "Denver's sleeping tiger."

Denver has experienced 14 major floods from Cherry Creek since the first settlement in 1858–59 and several smaller ones.

Probably the largest flood was that of May 19–20, 1864, of which the records are very meager, but which did a tremendous amount of damage even to the little pioneer village. As Colonel Sturdevant has indicated, the flood of August 2–3, 1933, covered the portion of the city which is colored in green on this map [indicating map]. That was the second largest flood. After this 1933 flood there was constructed, at a cost of about $880,000, the so-called Kenwood Dam, about 5½ miles above the city limits. Cherry Creek Dam No. 1—one of the two dams, construction of which is recommended by the Corps of Engineers—would be about 1¼ miles upstream from the present Kenwood Dam and about 6¾ miles upstream from the corporate limits of Denver. This Cherry Creek Dam No. 1 is, in addition to the proposed Castlewood Dam, already mentioned. The Engineer Corps of the Army in their report emphasize that the construction of both of these dams is essential for the protection of Denver from a ghastly major catastrophe.

Mr. TIBBOTT. May I interrupt you?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. TIBBOTT. What flood on Cherry Creek was it that took away the courthouse and the records?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. That was the flood of 1864. Furthermore, as this map indicates during the flood of 1933, much of the downtown area—colored green on the map—was covered, and in the basement of the old city hall there were a large number of records which were damaged or destroyed.

Referring further to this map: This area—beyond the area colored green but enclosed within the red and black broken lines—is above the area inundated by the 1933 flood [indicating]. But that entire area within the red and black broken lines would be inundated by the major flood which the Army engineers predict is threatened. It is the additional area to be protected by the two dams recommended by the Army engineers in their report.

The South Platte River flows through Denver as appears on this map. Beginning at a point some distance beyond the city limits to the south, continuing throughout its entire course through the city and for some distance downstream beyond the corporate limits to the north, the channel of the South Platte has been widened, deepened, and the banks have been raised and riprapped with stone.

I am not an engineer, but studies indicate that, since these widenings and straightenings of the river through the city and the levee work, there is no danger of flood from the South Platte. The greatest menace to our city comes from this insignificant and harmless appearing stream called Cherry Creek.

The CHAIRMAN. Has other protective work been done on Cherry Creek?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. It has been walled and straightened and the channel has been deepened; but, as Colonel Sturdevant indicated, it is very clear that that work is not sufficient to take care of this flood which is apprehended. I dare say there has been enough said here about the character of these flash floods to acquaint the members of this committee with them. I think the average man, and probably the average Member of Congress, has in mind floods brought about by slowly rising waters of the great rivers.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we have a pretty fair understanding of the situation.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. It is much different in our State. They come like a flash of lightning.

The CHAIRMAN. We have heard all about them.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. And there is no time to prepare for them or to get out of their way. And there is no possibility of determining when they will come or how big they will be. I think the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. CURTIS, understands that situation.

As a consequence, our only protection is to erect permanent works of sufficient size and capacity to take care of any flood which will probably come. Perhaps you would like to know why we say this danger is imminent and—imminent all the time, every day and every night, between the last of April and the following October. First of all, we have the experience of adjoining watersheds. Colonel Sturdevant has referred to the fact that this area here [indicating on the map] which is marked in blue is the watershed of Kiowa Creek. Right adjacent thereto is the watershed of Bijou Creek. The storm of May 30–31, 1935, covered the entire drainage areas of these two creeks. Walls of water, literally walls, like waves in the ocean 11 feet high, came down Bijou Creek and Kiowa Creek and did immense damage. A number of lives were lost as a result of that flood.

Now, I wish to emphasize this point particularly: All of the floods in Cherry Creek from which Denver has suffered since its settlement were caused by storms the intensity of which prevailed over only a part of the entire Cherry Creek watershed or drainage area. During the last 82 years, there has been no intense rainstorm or cloudburst which has covered at one time the entire Cherry Creek drainage area and its innumerable tributaries.

But, as Colonel Sturdevant has pointed out, if the storm of May 30–31, 1935, which visited the entire drainage areas of Kiowa and Bijou Creeks, had moved westward only 10 or 15 miles and had covered all the drainage area of Cherry Creek, Denver would have experienced a flood 14 times as great as any that has been experienced since 1858 when Denver was first settled.

Ordinarily, the water in Cherry Creek amounts to nothing more than an amount of water that could be supplied by three or four fire hydrants turned into the bed of the creek. These floods come with great suddenness. They pass off within 24 or 48 hours. They come with lightning-like suddenness and then this treacherous stream, if you may call it such, returns in a short time to its normal state of quiescence.

If I may draw the committee's attention, Mr. Chairman, to this aerial mosaic map over here, I can answer some of the questions which the chairman was asking.

This is the boundary of the city limits here and this is Cherry Creek. This is the South Platte River. [Indicating mosaic map.] The confluence is here just in the heart of Denver.

In the heart of the city, damage has been suffered from the 14 floods Denver has experienced. These are the railroads, and in entering the city limits you come to Cherry Creek. This creek goes through a very fine residential district—the Denver Country Club is there [indicating] and then down on into the business and wholesale and industrial district and down into the railroad yards.

This anticipated flood to which I refer—the limits of the flood which would occur if a major storm moved over 10 or 15 miles and covered the entire Cherry Creek watershed—the limits of it are indicated by this broken red and black line on the map.

I wish to refer to some of the Government buildings which would be flooded. This is all a very closely built section, as shown by this mosaic map [indicating]. The business district and wholesale and industrial district is down here, and over here is the city and county building, which is a new building, costing two or three million dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that above the flood area?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. No, sir; it is within the area of the predicted flood.

The CHAIRMAN. This is the flood area here, is it?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. This green area is the area which the 1933 flood covered.

The CHAIRMAN. That is your maximum flood according to your report?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Of record?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Of record; yes. The predicted flood would cover the area included within the broken red and black line. Here is the United States Mint [indicating]. Something just under $4,000,000,000 in gold bars is stored in the vaults in this building. There is also stored there about a billion and a half of silver. A few years ago nearly all the gold and silver stored on the Pacific coast was, for obvious reasons, moved to Denver for storage—far from the seacoast. This bullion would not be destroyed by water; but if it was covered with silt-laden water, the loss in cleaning would be considerable, because the mere handling of fine gold bars always causes considerable loss.

The CHAIRMAN. All of this area in here is where major floods have occurred and the red lines indicate where the predicted floods will take place?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the buildings you mention are within the limits of the predicted floods?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Yes. And there are a great many other important buildings within the limits of the predicted flood, including hospitals, streetcar barns, electric power and light substations, factories, industrial and manufacturing buildings, and so forth.

I do wish, however, to call your particular attention to the loss of life which would come with the predicted flood. We have already lost about 100 lives from floods in the past and some millions of dollars of property damage. But when this predicted flood comes, it is the considered opinion of the Army engineers, who are not alarmists, that "the flood would arrive with little warning and velocities would be sufficient to prevent rescue work. * * * Numbers of people would probably also be trapped in the area between Cherry Creek and the South Platte, as there would be a heavy flow over the divide between the two streams. It is quite possible that a loss of several hundred lives might occur." And such a flood is sure to come, in my judgment, and, more important, in the judgment of the Army engineers. Not this year, we hope and pray, perhaps not next, maybe not in the next 5. But we may be sure that the "big flood" the Indians warned against and that careful meteorological calculations demonstrate continually impends is coming sooner or later. We have no means of protecting ourselves against it except by the erection of permanent works.

Now, in the district here [indicating], if I may again call the attention of the chairman and members of the committee to the map, there undoubtedly would be an overflow right across this area between Cherry Creek and the South Platte River. This area is very closely built up with comparatively modest residences. If that major flood came and went in through here [indicating], it would seem inevitable that the loss of life would be terrific.

I emphasize again, there is no time when one of these floods comes for the people to get out of the inundated area; there is no time or chance for warning. It comes like a stroke of lightning. It comes in a wall of water, literally like a tidal wave in the ocean. I was not in Denver during the flood of August 2–3, 1933, but I have been told about it by those who watched it from high ground. There was a low, rumbling roar, and down the creek came a wall of water 10 feet high, which, of course, was heightened by the failure of the Castlewood Dam. It carried

dead cows and horses, outhouses, logs, even good-sized trees and debris of wooden bridges. It swept everything before it.

Cherry Creek is in the cloudburst zone. It may reasonably be anticipated that, any spring or summer, another storm of intensity equal to that which visited the entire drainage area of Bijou and Kiowa Creeks in May of 1935 will occur 10 or 15 miles to the west and will cover the entire drainage area of Cherry Creek and cause a flood, the effect of which upon Denver would be that of a first-class catastrophe. As Maj. Gen. J. L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, stated in his testimony before this committee on March 18, 1940:

"The possibilities of danger there are very great. It has been simply a matter of great luck that Denver has not had a great catastrophe since it has been a large city. The floods, according to the historic record, have not been anything like as great as they might be."

The CHAIRMAN. Was there any actual loss of life in that flood?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I understand there was in the flood of 1933; but I do not have the figures at hand and dare not trust my recollection.

The CHAIRMAN. Prior to 1933, what improvements had the local people made along Cherry Creek in the city of Denver?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Prior to 1933 they had widened and straightened the channel of the creek through the city here [indicating on map] and lowered the bed of the channel and also raised the levees through there [indicating]. It cost one or two million dollars, as I recall.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, what works have been built since 1933?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Since that they have erected this Kenwood Dam that Colonel Sturdevant referred to. The experience of the Kiowa flood in 1935, May 30 and 31 of 1935, has changed the estimates——

The CHAIRMAN. Did the Federal Government contribute to the cost of the Kenwood Dam?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I think the P. W. A.; yes, sir; I am quite sure they made some sort of a grant. I don't know how much, or it may have been a loan.

The CHAIRMAN. Did W. P. A. or any other Government organization assist in improving these works along the stream here since 1933?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Up above here [indicating], above the city limits—the city limits are right here [indicating], which does not show on this map. They have done some levee work there; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it work of any consequence or was it just minor protection?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Well, relative to these dams which the engineers have recommended, they are minor.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you say the various relief agencies, emergency agencies, and employment and unemployment agencies have spent during the present administration on this project?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. You mean during the Roosevelt administration?

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. They have done a good deal of W. P. A. work. I can't tell you exactly, but I can procure those figures for you.

The CHAIRMAN. You may insert them in your remarks when you revise them.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I would say, and this is subject to revision, that the Public Works Administration contributed perhaps several hundred thousand dollars. Then the W. P. A. labor on the levee construction, which was carried on by the city engineers, has been considerable. But I haven't that definite information here at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN. These two reservoirs are primarily for flood control?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. They are absolutely for flood control.

The CHAIRMAN. With all deference, according to the report here, the Castlewood Reservoir is also for irrigation purposes and expects an income of something like $11,000 annually.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I might say that the two Federal agencies other than the Corps of Engineers that have examined this problem, namely, the Department of Agriculture and the Reclamation Bureau, have agreed with the Army engineers as to the character of the flood which is coming. For reclamation in the Castlewood Reservoir they estimate or contemplate about 8,000 acre-feet of storage. * * *

The reclamation feature is relatively so unimportant when compared to the great importance of the protection of our city against this ghastly tragedy which impends that it is not worth considering. The total income that would be derived from that, as estimated, is only about $11,000 a year, and it is doubtful as to whether that could be secured.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. If this project is approved as reported by the Chief of Engineers will it provide for reclamation features?

Colonel STURDEVANT. It simply provides for the possibility of future development for irrigation if it is desired, but the estimate here includes nothing for irrigation. The control works will be so located that 8,000 acre-feet will be available for any use that may be desired, but the estimates do not contemplate any expenditures whatever for the development of irrigation.

General ROBINS. What he means is that provision is made, and the reservoir's capacity is sufficient, to permit of irrigation if they need it.

The CHAIRMAN. And what he further means is that the income from that would be around $11,000 a year.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Possibly.

General ROBINS. Possibly.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further statement, Mr. LEWIS?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I think I have pretty well covered the situation. I could talk for hours on it. I have pictures and I have graphs, but I don't know that the committee is interested in those. In conclusion, I wish to call attention, briefly, to some important facts:

Including the contiguous suburbs not in the corporate limits, Denver's population is now about 350,000. [NOTE.—In the so-called Denver metropolitan district, including the adjacent suburbs, which are outside the corporate limits of the municipality known as the city and county of Denver, the population, according to the final figures on the 1940 census, which were not available at the time of these hearings, was 384,372. Of this number, 322,412 were within the corporate limits of the municipality.] It is the commercial and financial center of the entire Rocky Mountain region. A glance at the map shows that on the main stem of the Ohio River, from Louisville, Ky., down to Cairo, Ill., and on the main stem of the Mississippi from St. Louis to New Orleans, there is no city as great in population or in wealth as Denver, and no city which is as vulnerable to floods from those great rivers as Denver is vulnerable to attack by floods from the comparatively insignificant Cherry Creek.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions by Mr. Ball or by Mr. Curtis or by Mr. Lewis [Ohio]?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. No; I think no.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. LEWIS [Colorado], we are glad to have your statement, sir. If you have any other witnesses we will be glad to hear them at this time.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. None at this time. I simply want to repeat that the Senators and Representatives of our entire Colorado delegation are unanimously in favor of this project.

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to have had your statement.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT OF COL. CLARENCE L. STURDEVANT, DIVISION ENGINEER, MISSOURI RIVER DIVISION

Now, Colonel Sturdevant, as I understand the Chief of Engineers recommends Castlewood Reservoir and I read from this report that the proposed dam at Castlewood Reservoir would have 8,000 acre-feet of storage for irrigation works and that the sale of irrigation water should yield a revenue estimated at $11,000 annually. And you recommend the construction of the Castlewood Reservoir and the Cherry Creek Reservoir at an estimated cost of $10,500,000, and at present no provision is made for irrigation?

Colonel STURDEVANT. No, sir. The only provision is for the location of outlet works in order to retain the 8,000 acre-feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Platte River into which Cherry Creek empties is a tributary of what stream?

Colonel STURDEVANT. It joins the North Platte River near the city of North Platte, Nebr., and then flows into the Missouri River a short distance below Omaha at a small town called Plattsmouth.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. At this time the Senate is in session, and they have a very important matter pending. I notice Senator JOHNSON is here, and I wonder, Mr LEWIS [Colorado], if the Senator desires to make a statement at this time.

We have a day set aside for Senators and Representatives next Tuesday, but we shall be glad to extend the privilege to you now, Senator.

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO

Senator JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I thank you for your courtesy.

I understand that Congressman LEWIS [Colorado] has presented the Cherry Creek matter to you, and I know when he presents a matter to you it is exhaustively done and it doesn't leave very much for anyone else to say.

I am simply here to show my interest in the Cherry Creek flood-control project. Senator ADAMS had to attend a meeting of the Appropriations Committee or he would have attended this meeting with me to show his interest, as I am showing mine.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you feel that the public welfare would be promoted and that this project as reported by the Chief of Engineers is justified?

Senator JOHNSON. I certainly do.

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to have your statement, Senator.

Senator JOHNSON. It is a very, very necessary project, because great damage may ensue from a flood unless the project is undertaken.

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to have your statement.

Mr. Speaker, at the time the President signed the flood control authorization bill, he made a statement as follows:

The flood-control bill (H. R. 4911) authorizes the construction of new flood-control projects, but it does not make any appropriations for that purpose. The projects are to be undertaken "as speedily as may be consistent with budgetary requirements" from whatever funds may be appropriated.

In approving this bill I wish to make it clear that during the present emergency I do not intend to submit estimates of appropriation or approve allocations of funds for any project which does not have important value in the national defense.

Since the bill was approved I have received a letter from Maj. Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, which is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, August 22, 1941.

Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LEWIS: As a result of your recent conference with this office, I am pleased to give you the following information with respect to the proposed project for flood control on Cherry Creek at and in the vicinity of Denver, Colo.:

The Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, approves the comprehensive plan for the improvement of Cherry Creek and its tributaries for flood control, and other purposes, in accordance with the recommendations of this Department as set forth in House Document No. 426, Seventy-sixth Congress, 1st session, and authorizes the amount of $3,000,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of the project. The plan of the Department, as presented in House Document No. 426, consists of two reservoirs on Cherry Creek above Denver, to be located at the Castlewood site and at a site known as Cherry Creek No. 1, which is located near the upper limit of the existing Kenwood Reservoir. The entire project is estimated to cost about $10,500,000.

As the authorization contained in the Flood Control Act of 1941 will not cover the entire cost of both reservoirs, the Department must select the work to be undertaken pursuant to the partial authority made available by that act. Since the Flood Control Act provides authorization only and does not make funds available for the projects authorized, the start of the actual construction work is dependent upon the provision by Congress of funds applicable to that work in a subsequent appropriation act. In this connection I may mention that the President, in his communication of July 3, 1941, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives regarding the flood-control bill (H. R. 4911), stated that until the end of the present international emergency the initiation of new construction work should be restricted to projects having important defense values. In approving the flood-control bill the President reaffirmed this statement of policy with respect to the initiation of new flood-control projects.

In the development of the comprehensive plan for flood control on Cherry Creek the Department made very extensive investigations of the flood problem on that stream including surveys of the areas subject to flooding and detailed analyses of the meteorological and hydrological conditions which cause flood-producing storms in the Cherry Creek Basin. Cherry Creek lies in the cloudburst zone of eastern Colorado and has suffered damaging floods since the earliest development of that region. It was found that it would be entirely possible for a flood much larger than any previous flood to occur on Cherry Creek and that such a flood would result in enormous damages to property at Denver and might cause loss of life. The project proposed by the Department, which has now been approved by Congress, will control adequately the largest flood which can reasonably be expected on Cherry Creek at Denver and will also elminate nearly all damages to the agricultural lands along Cherry Creek upstream from that city. In addition to the flood-control features of the project, water can be stored in the Castlewood Reservoir to provide a water supply for irrigation when development for irrigation is feasible.

As is clearly brought out in the report of the Department in House Document No. 426, and in the testimony of the Department's representative before the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives, the Department considers the Cherry Creek project to be of major importance for the protection of the City of Denver and nearby agricultural developments. It believes that that project is one of the most important projects authorized in the recent act from the standpoint of flood control, because of the seriousness of the potential flood hazards in that area and the tremendous damage which would result from major floods which may occur at any time in that watershed. You may be assured that the Department is fully prepared to initiate the construction of the approved dams on Cherry Creek without delay when funds for that purpose become available.

Very truly yours,
J. L. SCHLEY,
Major General,
Chief of Engineers.

Resolution of Young Democratic Clubs of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the resolutions committee of the Young Democratic Clubs of America, in convention assembled at Louisville, Ky., August 21, 1941, met and considered many resolutions that were submitted on various subjects. It was the consensus of the committee membership that all resolutions should be tabled with the exception of a resolution dealing entirely with the present world crisis. It was further decided that seriousness of the hour demanded that no other subject be permitted to detract from the importance of bringing to the attention of the American public that the young Democrats of America, representing 4,000,000 of the cream of American youth, stood solidly behind the national administration and President Roosevelt in all present foreign and domestic policies.

The following resolution was adopted by the Young Democratic Clubs of America in convention assembled, Louisville, Ky., August 23, 1941:

In the past 2 years since our last convention, the wave of aggression has grown. Today it threatens to engulf the entire world. If it succeeds, it will force mankind to live in a state of servility to godless and brutal overlords.

The wave is Nazi Germany, accompanied by its twin jackals, Japan and Italy. Against this menace the nations of Europe were divided in their councils. They failed to take the measures necessary to protect themselves. Some tried to appease Hitler. Others were too frightened to act or were beguiled by insidious propaganda and lies. And, one by one, the nations of Europe paid in blood and indescribable suffering. We know now that any nation which tries to ride the wave will inevitably be engulfed. Continental Europe lies prostrate under the heel of the Nazis. Only Great Britain and Russia are left and they are fighting for their lives.

The wave of nazi-ism has reached other continents and threatens the Western Hemisphere. Its armies are marching in Africa. Its marauders are raiding the seas. Its ally, Japan, seeks hegemony over the Orient. Its agents and saboteurs are in America. We believe that the Nazis will try to attack America as they have invaded other continents. The United States must heed the danger it faces. We must be united in our councils. We must aid in every way the nations and peoples who are resisting aggression. We must fight to safeguard our security and our freedom. The United States can never be assured peace and security unless the wave of aggression is swept back and defeated.

Now, therefore, we commend our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, for their courageous and astute conduct of our foreign affairs, and we stand with them in their titanic fight against the armed might of Nazi Germany.

We approve of the policy of full and complete aid to the people of Great Britain who are today serving in the front line of the war.

We approve of the policy of full and complete aid to China, which for 4 terrible years has battled to a standstill the militaristic overlords of Japan and has helped us protect our interests in the Pacific.

We approve of the policy of full and complete aid to Russia, believing that our hatred of communism and our determination to destroy its roots in this country should not blind us to the fact that Russia is battling our common enemy.

We further believe that to aid nations and peoples resisting aggression the policy must be implemented by the effective measures to insure delivery of materials utilizing every facility at our disposal.

We are in complete accord with the President that those obstructionists who still wear the Democratic label are in the wrong party.

We believe that Democrats must follow the leadership of President Roosevelt in the conduct of our foreign affairs. Those Democrats who have consistently opposed the foreign policies of the President have no place in the Democratic Party.

We believe most Democratic Members of Congress do not doubt the authenticity of the statements of the President, the Secretary of War, and the Chief of Staff of the United States Army that our country is in dire peril.

We condemn irresponsible persons who are trying to sow the seeds of disunity by their reckless statements, incompetent opinions, and irresponsible utterances which have gone so far as to disclose vital military information.

We believe that our military leaders should be authorized to use our armed forces to occupy and defend such strategic areas and bases as such leaders deem essential to the security of our country.

It is the declared national policy of the United States to furnish material aid to all countries resisting aggression until aggressor nations are rendered impotent ever again to disturb the peace of the world.

Over a million young men have been called into the armed forces of the Nation and today are making many sacrifices.

If we turn all of the Nation's resources and manpower at once to the production of arms for the destruction of nazi-ism, we shall soon reach the peak of our powers and bring a speedy end to this threat to our security: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we heartily support the efforts of our President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, as stated on many occasions, including the monumental eight-point program agreed upon with Winston Churchill, to spread throughout the world freedom of thought, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want; and be it further

Resolved, That the production of commodities not essential to our national defense be curtailed where necessary to cope with the requirements of national defense, and that the citizenry of the country, especially the young men not in the armed forces, are will-

ing and glad to sacrifice their comforts, and even necessities, to divert to the men in the camps any products required for their training or comfort.

September in American History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

HISTORICAL HIGH LIGHTS COMPILED BY HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am herewith submitting historical high lights for the month of September:

SEPTEMBER IN AMERICAN HISTORY

September 1: The Herald of Gospel Liberty, America's first religious review, published in 1808; first trip of the first Pullman sleeping car, from Bloomington, Ill., to Chicago, 1859; first settlement established in northern Oregon by Rev. Marcus Whitman in 1836.

September 2: Treasury Department organized in 1789; Eugene Field, noted poet and essayist, born in 1850; schooner *Hannah*, first regularly commissioned warship by American Colonies, takes the sea in 1775.

September 3: Treaty of Versailles ending Revolutionary War signed in 1783.

September 4: United States flag first flown on high seas in 1777; Los Angeles founded in 1781; world's first electric power station opened in New York City in 1882.

September 5: First Continental Congress met in Philadelphia in 1774; Gen. Sam Houston elected first President of Republic of Texas in 1836.

September 6: Puritans sail from Plymouth, England in *Mayflower* in 1620.

September 7: Boston settled in 1630.

September 8: First permanent white settlement in America established at St. Augustine, Fla., in 1565; Harvard University, first college in America, opened in 1636; cornerstone of first American synagogue, Congregation Shearith Israel, laid in New York City in 1729.

September 9: Continental Congress agrees on term United States of America as name of new Nation in 1776; California admitted to the Union in 1850.

September 10: Lt. O. H. Perry wins Battle of Lake Erie during War of 1812 in 1813; Elias Howe patents first sewing machine in 1846.

September 11: Battle of Brandywine fought during Revolutionary War in 1777; first World's Parliament of Religions met at Chicago Fair in 1893.

September 12: First national prohibition society organized at Chicago in 1869.

September 13: Siege of Fort McHenry, Baltimore, during War of 1812 in 1814; Northern Pacific Railroad completed in 1883; Battle of Chapultepec won by Americas during Mexican War in 1847.

September 14: Francis Scott Key writes Star-Spangled Banner in 1814; President William McKinley died in 1901.

September 15: James Fenimore Cooper, greatest American novelist of first half of nineteenth century, born in 1789; President William Howard Taft born in 1857; patent for gasoline-driven automobile granted to George B. Selden in 1895.

September 16: Francis Parkman, great American historian, born in 1823; Battle of Antietam during War between the States fought in 1862; Congress incorporated American Legion in 1919; United States Mint created in 1786.

September 17: Constitution of United States completed and signed by Constitutional Convention in 1787; Baron von Steuben, hero of Revolutionary War, born in 1730.

September 18: George Washington lays cornerstone of Capitol of United States in 1793.

September 19: George Washington makes Farewell Address to Nation, refusing public office again; Battle of Chickamauga in War between the States fought in 1863; song Dixie sung for first time by Don Emmett, minstrel, in New York City, in 1859; President James A. Garfield died in 1881.

September 20: American Association for the Advancement of Science organized in 1848; Congress bans slave trade in the District of Columbia in 1850.

September 21: Pennsylvania Packet and Daily Advertiser, first daily newspaper in United States, published in 1784.

September 22: Nathan Hale hanged as spy during Revolutionary War in 1776; Abraham Lincoln issued preliminary Emancipation Proclamation freeing the slaves in 1862.

September 23: John Paul Jones, in the *Bonhomme Richard*, captures the British *Serapis* in greatest naval victory of American Revolution; William H. McGuffey, author of famous McGuffey readers, born in 1800; first baseball club organized in New York City in 1845.

September 24: John Marshall, great Chief Justice of United States Supreme Court, born in 1755; Office of Attorney General created in 1789.

September 25: Congress adopted first 10 amendments to Constitution, known as Bill of Rights, in 1789; Vasco Nunez Balboa discovers Pacific Ocean in 1513; Publick Occurrences, Forreign and Domestick, first American newspaper, published in 1690.

September 26: First political nominating convention for President and Vice President held by Anti-Masonic Party at Baltimore in 1831; Federal Trade Commission established in 1914.

September 27: National Catholic Welfare Council organized in 1919.

September 28: Frances E. Willard, founder of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, born in 1839.

September 29: Cotton spinning introduced into United States at Providence, R. I., in 1790.

September 30: Dr. William Morton makes first successful use of ether as anesthetic in 1846.

Letter From Carl Vrooman to Dr. E. Stanley Jones and National Ministers' No-War Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 29, 1941

EXCERPTS FROM LETTER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter addressed to Dr. E. Stanley Jones and the National Ministers' No-War Committee by Hon. Carl Vrooman, former Secretary of Agriculture. The letter discusses a subject which was injected into the RECORD on April 22 by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who had a letter of Dr. Jones printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.

EXCERPTS FROM AN OPEN LETTER TO DR. E. STANLEY JONES AND THE NATIONAL MINISTERS NO-WAR COMMITTEE

DEAR DR. JONES: I express the hope and fervent prayer that you may speedily segregate yourself, not only in your heart, as you undoubtedly have done, but also in the public mind, from those subversive propagandists who, echoing Cain's guilty and cowardly alibi, "Am I my brother's keeper?" openly scorn the transforming truth for men and nations taught in the parable of the Good Samaritan and deride the vitalizing principle that he that saveth his life shall lose it and he that loseth his life for the sake of Christ and His kingdom shall save it.

Our appeasers and isolationists have been disseminating actively the poisonous fallacy that national selfishness, shortsightedness, and fear, rather than self-sacrifice, foresight, and courage are the best safeguards of America. Of course, you are endorsing no such monstrous doctrine, but subversive elements are using your statement among ministers and church members throughout the United States, in order to convey the erroneous impression that you and they are fighting the same unholy fight.

I must reveal to you my conviction that your present campaign, if persisted in, will do irreparable harm to the cause of Christ and His kingdom, which both of us have so deeply at heart. If there is even a remote possibility of this being true, should you not stop, reconsider, and wait for an unmistakable gleam of light from the Almighty before saying or doing anything further that may give aid and comfort to the most gigantic concentration of evil the world has ever seen?

I wonder if you realize that your proposal that in the present struggle America refuse to participate, even to the extent of throwing "her resources, short of war, to the side of right," probably has been acclaimed and publicized by Hitler, Goebbels, and Goering? As a logical climax to your insistence on "peace, peace, when there is no peace," you refuse, and are exerting your influence to persuade Americans generally to refuse, not only to use reason or conscience, but even to invoke Divine guidance to determine the relative right and wrong in this world conflict.

I quote from your own words, "The large majority of people think that this is the role of America—namely, to stay out of the conflict but to decide the right and wrong of the dispute and then throw in her resources, short of war, on the side of right." You conclude, "I disagree, for that presupposes that right is on one side and wrong is on the other. The facts seem to point otherwise. * * * I do not decide the relative right and the relative wrong—that remains for a later stage." Does this "later stage" mean a time when the United States of America, if the isolationists should have their way, would be called upon, alone and unaided, to defeat the mechanized military might of five Nazi-controlled continents or to take its place as a fellow victim, alongside the "united slaves of Europe," Asia, Africa, South America, and Australia? Or is your later stage when totaliterrorism has overrun the world, and no recourse or recovery apparently

would be possible for an indefinite future of tears and torture and slavery?

I do not think you feel what your readers may be led to believe, that a decision of the relative right or wrong on the greatest moral issue of our generation should be postponed until it is too late to do any good. Surely, with your admiration for the efforts of the great Christian leaders to eradicate intolerable moral evils, you cannot feel that.

No court of justice, even in a semicivilized land, would refuse to determine the relative guilt of two men, one of whom had shot down the other in cold blood to avenge some minor offense. And yet because Britain, like all other countries, has been guilty of some selfish policies, you apparently feel justified in ignoring the abysmal difference between the sadly human sins and shortcomings of Britain and satanic drive of the Axis powers to conquer the world and herd the entire human race into military and economic chain gangs, with every man's activities, thoughts, loves, hates, and religion either dictated or forbidden by a godless and merciless egomaniac. Unquestionably British imperialism, like American commercialism, has its sordid and brutal features. If our boasted Anglo-Saxon civilization is to endure it will have to be not only reformed but transformed. But in spite of all the obvious faults of the British, few unbiased students of history will deny the statement of James Truslow Adams that no other people "during so long a period or so consistently has done so much for the increase of law, order, and liberty in the entire world, wherever the race has penetrated."

It seems incredible that on this plane of the relative on which we all live, anyone should refuse to decide which is the more guilty, the murderers or their peaceable victims, whose chief faults were that they believed the Nazi propaganda that nobody would attack them; that they didn't raise their boys to be soldiers; and that too many of them hated their political opponents or Britain more than they loved their native lands.

How can any Christian forget for a single hour the Czechs and the Poles, the Danes and the Dutch, the Belgians and the French, and the citizens of a dozen other countries overrun or endangered?

I do not believe you intend to give the impression that such injustices as are found in the Treaty of Versailles can excuse the savagery and lust for power, the blasphemy, torture, and mass murder of the most sinister forces in world history. Although you say that "drunk with victory we laid the foundations of this war in the Versailles Treaty," you surely are aware that the Versailles Treaty was not usually vindictive as treaties of peace go, and was comparatively mild when compared with the treaties forced by Germany on France in 1871, and on Russia in 1918.

Unquestionably, as you imply, if the victors had made a more Christian treaty at Versailles, the results would have been vastly better for all concerned. But could not a similar criticism truthfully be made of practically every human transaction carried on, in peace or war, in church or state? While Hitler's emissaries, and even many well-meaning folk who unconsciously have become impregnated by totaliterrorist propaganda, still continue to talk of the Treaty of Versailles as the cause of the present war, Hitler while at first using his grievances against that treaty as a temporary pretext for his program of unlimited mass murder and conquest, afterward repeatedly and emphatically declared that this is a war of ideologies, of races, and of a new order founded on force, fighting to destroy our free civilization and replace it by the rule of Nazi force. Our present problem is not how we could have written a better treaty at Versailles in 1919, but how we can in 1941 safeguard and promote the Christian future of the world. Your emphasis on the Treaty of Versailles as a primary cause of the Nazi terror clearly seems to me to be one element of propaganda which has unconsciously crept into your thinking and writing.

I think your comments on our participation in the World War can also lead astray some of your less-informed readers. Speaking of the first World War, you say: "Our participation last time was disastrous to everyone concerned." Would it not be more in accord with the facts to say that in going into the first World War we chose the lesser of two evils, since our participation resulted in the defeat of the Kaiser's attempt to conquer the world, and at least the temporary defeat of that worship of force from which Hitlerism stemmed? Can any patriot or Christian characterize our victory then as a disaster now?

Indeed, will not future historians say that while the first World War was as successful as such a destructive conflict could ever be, the post-war multitude of evils they call peace proved both a failure and a tragedy—a tragedy for which our publicists, politicians, and clergy were more responsible than our soldiers? Our military leaders won their war but in the years that followed the so-called moral leaders of the Nation lost theirs—lost the opportunity to hold the dominant national motive up to the wartime level of service and sacrifice. Indeed, did they not also lose an unparalleled opportunity to bring about a spiritual awakening that would have enabled America to lift its way of life up to something approximating the Christian standard? Frank Buchman once said, "If the church had given Russia adequate spiritual leadership there would have been no red revolution and if the church had given Germany adequate spiritual leadership there would have been no Nazi revolution." Is it not equally true that if during the years immediately following the first World War, the church had given America adequate spiritual leadership, we might have been qualified spiritually to act then in the role you suggest now, as mediator between the peace-loving countries and the nations which for the past 2 years have been deliberately destroying civilization? During those plastic years, before the aggressor nations so completely had sold their souls to the gods of force, might they not have been more capable than now of listening sympathetically to the proposal of a permanent world peace based on a Christian world order?

Your antiparticipation campaign and your opposition to our national-defense policy apparently are based on the fatally false assumption that has lured many peace-loving nations to their doom, namely, that a desire for peace and a decision to "keep out of war" guarantees immunity from a Nazi attack. These attitudes have immobilized nation after nation until Hitler was ready to devour them. There is no division in America opinion as to the desirability of staying out of war, but an ever-increasing majority of our people are coming to realize that the decision as to peace or war rests not with us but with the aggressor. Except for his broken promises, Hitler never has offered peace to any nation except under conditions equivalent to slavery. Ask the people of any of the 16 nations that have been savagely overrun.

How many more unmistakable proofs will our isolationists require before they acknowledge this grim fact—to ignore which means inevitable attack at Hitler's convenience. To question that Hitler will make new moves toward world conquest, with or without our attempted mediation, is as absurd as to question whether a player standing on third base will make a dash for the home plate on the first base hit. Your problem, and that of all earnest Christians, is to decide how the wave of international-gangster terrorism can best be stopped.

You said that you did not consider the function of war analagous to that of a police system, because of the lack of any established tribunal before which to hale the aggressor nations. Is not the lack of such a tribunal chiefly due to America's selfish and short-sighted decision, after the first World War, to "let Europe stew in its own juice"? Indeed, in the present World War is not the isolationist movement dominated and inspired by the same suicidal spirit which a score of years ago made America refuse to join the League of Nations and participate in the most promising constructive effort ever launched in the direction of world peace?

Handicapped, as unfortunately we are, by a lack of any established tribunal to deal with the gangster nations, does not the present generation find itself forced to do as did the western-frontier communities before they were able to provide themselves legally with courts of justice and officers of the law? They improvised the nearest possible approximation to such legally constituted authorities. Out of those crude but determined efforts to achieve some degree of order and security, civilized methods of procedure gradually were developed. But the one thing they did not do was to ignore the distinction between bandits and peaceful citizens and thus allow robbery and murder a free hand until a better system could be established. They never talked about mediating between a criminal and his victim, even though the criminal could prove that the victim was not as good as he should have been.

So far as we are able, we should utilize the entire armory of the Spirit not only to free ourselves and the rest of the world from the deadly and imminent menace of nazi-ism but also to free the German Nation from its present baleful subjection to the "powers of darkness," which, working in and through it, literally have made the Continent of Europe a hell on earth. But this positive Christian effort has nothing in common with your attempt to induce church members in particular and the American people in general to refuse to use the only weapons the majority of them are capable of wielding in defense of their blood-bought freedom to think, speak, vote, work, and worship. In Bible history I find no precedent for such a policy. After David had slain Goliath with a sling and pebble neither he nor anyone else suggested that the other Hebrew soldiers should throw away their arms and equip themselves with slingshots. Similarly, it would seem that even if you or any one of your associates could qualify as a modern David, it would hardly justify you in demanding that the rest of our defensive forces should break ranks, stack their arms, and attempt to follow suit. In our present stage of spiritual unpreparedness the adoption of such a suicidal policy could only result in permitting the devil to take possession of our Nation and the world. It constitutes no part of the message to our age of Christ, the coming King, who will "smite the nations" and "rule them with a rod of iron." "Who in righteousness doth judge and make war," "to destroy them that destroy the earth."

When the Jews under Nehemiah rebuilt the wall of Jerusalem a part of their men stood guard as soldiers armed to the teeth, and as for the rest, "everyone with one of his hands wrought the work and with the other hand held a weapon." Would it not be an equally good plan for Americans, in the present crisis, to spend a part of each day on their knees and the rest of each day on their toes, helping to carry out our dangerously belated program of national defense?

It seems incredible that people, in the name of religion, should renounce and denounce the use of material means of defense against unprovoked aggression, mass murder, and attempted world conquest, when they are not sufficiently developed spiritually to be able to dispense with material means when dealing with most of their personal and family difficulties and dangers. A vast majority of them in the case of a toothache rush to a dentist; when suffering from other

physical disabilities they consult a doctor; when financially embarrassed they apply to a banker; and when involved in legal complications they employ a lawyer.

If most of us are unable to overcome by purely spiritual means most of the minor trials and tribulations of life, how can we as a nation gamble all that is most priceless and sacred in civilization on being able to stop the present Nazi tidal wave of conquest without the use of material weapons? Would it not be the part of wisdom, for those who are tempted to adopt and advocate such a policy, first to prove its soundness by moving a few molehills, or even molecules, by purely spiritual means before attempting by faith and prayer alone to move vast volcanic mountains in full eruption from the fires of the nethermost hell? Had David acted on such an irrational assumption in dealing with the rebellion of his son Absalom, the Hebrew people would have become subject to an arch criminal who, like Hitler, worshipped at the twin shrines of unscrupulousness and force. Had Charles Martel and the Franks at the Battle of Tours acted on such an assumption, Christians in the eighth century would have been conquered and forced to renounce Christianity and slavishly "Heil" Mohammed and Allah or die. Had the British at the Battle of Waterloo acted on such an assumption Napoleon would have conquered the world.

You urge America to act as "mediator," although the sincere attempt of the British at mediation for "peace in our time" eventually only helped the aggressor to prepare for his next victims. Do you imagine that if Hitler, owing to our refusal to help block his program of world domination, should be enabled to plant the swastika above the cross throughout the length and breadth of Europe, there would be the smallest chance for us to play that role? If Hitler wins, manifestly, we shall be victims, not mediators. Moreover, if in Britain's extremity we ignore her cry for help do you think that, if later by some miraculous intervention of God she finally should win without our help, America could expect to exert any spiritual influence or speak with any moral authority, either to Britain or to the enslaved neutral nations whose only hope of freedom so obviously is dependent on a British victory?

Similarly, if Christian ministers, acting in accordance with the policy outlined in your statement, consciously or unconsciously, allow their influence as spiritual leaders to be used to camouflage the objectives and reinforce the power of subversive groups now feverishly striving to betray America into Hitler's hands, as during the past few months similar subversive elements succeeded in betraying nearly every one of the 16 conquered and enslaved neutral nations, can you imagine that the counsel of these ministers would be sought, or even considered by the statesmen who, during the sweat and tears and blood of war, were required not only to defeat the massed might of the kingdom of hell on earth but also to overcome the unconsciously sinister influence of such tragically misguided "men of God"?

Surely Christians unanimously will endorse your statements that you want God to conquer both Britain and Germany, that you "do not want any existing national spirit to be dominant in the world," and that you "want a 'new' spirit." You also strike a responsive chord when you quote Paul's great phrase describing Christ's way of "making peace by the creation in Himself of a new man out of both parties." But do you really think that our acquiescence in the Nazis keeping their plunder will lead them to repent? For myself, I cannot see that Hitler, flushed with victory and soiled with sin would feel any such urge.

Is it not the duty of Christian leaders in this crisis to try to lift the present struggle above the plane of national self-interest to that of a Christian mobilization with a full arsenal in defense of freedom, justice, and a righteous peace, as a prelude to the coming of the kingdom of God on earth? Such a challenge necessarily would have to be positive, not negative, and surgical rather than sentimental. Presumably it could only be made by a Christian warrior who worships not only Christ the Saviour whose first coming was in material weakness to die, but also Christ the Judge and King, whose second coming is to be in power—to destroy the impenitent and relentless enemies of God and man and to rule not only in men's hearts but also in their bodies, laws, institutions, and even in the sin-cursed earth we till and tread upon.

Your seven Steps Toward Mediation are worthy of most careful and prayerful consideration. In the compass of this letter I cannot undertake to discuss all of the momentous and complicated political, psychological, and economic world problems involved in them. But I am in full agreement with you that as rapidly as possible we should begin to work out a Christian program of world-wide reconstruction. The first step in such a program must necessarily be the decisive defeat of the forces of aggression, mass murder, and tyranny. Another vitally important provision should be an offer to the German people not only of terms devoid of the brutal, crushing injustices now being imposed by the Nazis on their conquered neighbor states but of even more favorable conditions than the Germans themselves would receive from their present power-mad warlords if the Axis dreams of world conquest were to be realized. In short, the defeated Germans should be offered every conceivable opportunity to utilize to their own advantage and that of the world their splendid abilities as scholars, scientists, musicians, organizers, and administrators. The final provision must make it forever impossible for the spirit of conquest again to erupt in a holocaust of death and destruction upon the peace-loving peoples of the world.

A spiritual awakening for America long has been overdue. But if that awakening from our present sleeping sickness of the soul is to be at all adequate to this cosmic crisis, it will have to be whole-souled, wholehearted, and militant. A recently published booklet entitled "You Can Defend America" stresses the need for the development of that spirit in our country and challenges every civilian to put into his every-day duties the same quality of Christian heroism that will be required to hold the line of battle against the steadily advancing hosts of evil.

We should all know that there is a desperate need for that spirit as we face the realization that we must win with Britain or fight alone at Armageddon.

May we not yet look for a similar militant Christian message from your heart and pen?

Very sincerely yours,

CARL VROOMAN.

America's State of Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 29, 1941

ARTICLES FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on August 25, I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of articles dealing with America's state of preparedness, which had been published in the Washington Post under the title "Guns for Soldiers." Because of the fact that the printing of all these articles would exceed two pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD only three of the articles were printed in the RECORD at that time, and the remainder were returned to me. I now ask that the remaining articles be printed in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of August 23, 1941]

GUNS FOR SOLDIERS—O. P. M. LACKED FAITH, SO PLANTS WAITED YEAR FOR CONVERSION

At a meeting June 18 of the O. P. M. defense contract service, attended by representatives of scores of large and small businesses, the idea was driven home that civilian concerns must undertake defense work.

The businessmen were willing. They asked, only, "Where are the orders?"

Whereat Col. A. B. Quinton, an Ordnance Department field officer, arose. He announced, flatly, that of all the companies known to the Ordnance Department as suitable for and capable of supplying ordnance items, only 20 percent would be needed. He explained why.

That 20 percent, Colonel Quinton said, were considered adequate to meet this year's demands and those of the next.

But the figures are these as of the end of June:

Of some $5,000,000,000 appropriated for Army ordnance items—"shooting stuff," not plant construction—contracts for only 55 percent had been let. The other 45 percent, mainly for ammunition and lease-lend materials, had not even been started on its work; no orders had been placed to translate it from money to guns.

THE FIGURES HAVE ANOTHER STORY TO TELL

Of about $8,000,000,000 appropriated for Army and Navy ordnance and combat vehicles, only $5,000,000,000 worth of contracts had been made.

And how are we doing with the three billions of Army ordnance funds that had been placed under contract? The Army expects less than half of it to come back in the form of guns and shells and tanks by the end of the year.

A better gage of progress than the numerical totals cited by Senator BYRD and the President at another place in this paper are these data relating to requirements and the extent to which they have been met and will be met:

Of tanks and trucks and jeeps and scout cars, we had, as of July 1, between 9 and 10 percent of ultimate requirements for ourselves and export to Germany's foes. Not until early next year shall we have more than half of the total requirements.

We had from 6 to 10 percent of total requirements of field artillery. By the end of the year we shall still have less than one-third of the amounts required. By the middle of 1942—a year from now—we shall be half supplied.

We were similarly situated with respect to antiaircraft guns. By the end of the year we shall still have only one-fourth of total requirements, according to Army expectations.

Finally, a full year from now, the Army expects deliveries on less than three-fourths of even the relatively small amounts now under contract.

To cap the climax, with $3,000,000,000 of existing appropriations still not under contract, the Ordnance Department is about to be deluged with three billions more from an appropriation bill now pending, and another four or five billions from a new lease-lend bill.

WHEREIN O. P. M. ACTIONS BELIE O. P. M. WORDS

Are 20 percent of the "suitable" ordnance suppliers adequate, in the light of these figures?

As yesterday's article in this series showed, "adequacy" for the gigantic armament effort that is required of America can be nothing less than full utilization of, and "all out" production by, every metal-working shop, durable-goods factory, and machine works in the country which can possibly be converted to defense production.

But the National Defense Advisory Commission and the Office of Production Management, despite the sententious motto of their Tools Division, "Nothing is impossible," have long and loudly insisted that such conversion is possible only to a very limited degree.

The contention is so important, and the problem of conversion is so basic, that it deserves a little discussion.

The only thing wrong with the O. P. M. contention is that it is simply not true.

NECESSITY SHOWS THAT IT CAN BE DONE

For proof, one needs only observe that now, after 14 months of saying "It can't be done," the O. P. M. is holding meeting after meeting with industry after industry, discussing with them what new defense work they undertake.

O. P. M. Chief William S. Knudsen recently declared he was leaving to the "ingenuity" of the auto industry the problem of how to compensate for curtailed civilian production, cut by raw-material shortages, with armament work.

Apparently it can be done.

Or, for an even simpler proof, there is the convincing fact that many individual firms from the durable-goods industries are already making defense items—in their existing plants, with their existing equipment, machine tools and labor.

Packard and General Motors machine shops are making some defense-destined machine tools. A carpet company, using machines once devoted to the manufacture of looms, is turning out what an O. P. M. expert describes "one of the sweetest" machine tools he ever saw.

Even the Dictaphone Co. is making machine tools.

One firm which makes excavating equipment is processing military items for the British.

A textile machinery company in New England is using its machine tools on a Dutch order to such effect that an O. P. M. technician says: "It can give cards and spades to its competitors and still beat the socks off them in making automatic rifles."

It can't be done? It is being done, but at nowhere near the volume and extent necessary and possible if the woefully low armament production schedules are to be upped in a period when time is short.

One O. P. M. Production Division technician estimates that a year has been lost, both in the production of machine tools and in actual armament production itself, through failure to force orders on the auto, refrigerator, washing machine, stocking, textile, and shoe machinery, road-building, earth-excavating machinery, and printing-machinery builders.

Another Production Division official, immersed in the most difficult and technical of all the Army ordnance jobs, has been trying for 8 months to have orders awarded to outsiders, to dozens and dozens of firms not now included in the defense program, so that many hands can join in the work.

IF THEY'D JUST DIVERT, SAYS ONE OFFICIAL

" 'Convert' isn't even the word," he shouts. "It isn't even as difficult as that. All they have to do is 'divert.' Just divert their machine tools from civilian production, just change their jigs and fixtures. But the Army doesn't ask them to, doesn't place orders with them, and they keep right on making nondefense gadgets. Meantime we sit around waiting for brand new plants to be built and brand new machine tools to be constructed."

From one end of Washington to the other, and even in the O. P. M. Production Division itself, can be heard the comment that "the greatest crime in the defense program" has been to allow the auto industry to produce more than 5,261,000 vehicles, of which 4,297,000 were passenger cars, in the year ended last August 1, a production greater by 20 percent than any other year in history except 1929.

In the manufacture of those 5,261,000 vehicles the industry used, and thus took away from defense uses, these amounts of the following scarce and strategic raw materials:

Steel: 7,730,000 tons, or about half the additional annual output which now must be added to the steel industry.

Aluminum: 48,700,000 pounds, equivalent to about 1 month's production of the aluminum industry, or enough to build more than 2,400 heavy, four-engine bombers.

Nickel: 16,000,000 pounds of a metal of which there is now an acute shortage even for military purposes.

Nickel steel: 430,000,000 pounds.

Zinc: 203,000,000 pounds.

Chromium: 23,000,000 pounds of a metal of which present stockpiles are woefully inadequate.

Copper: 244,000,000 pounds of a metal so much in demand that stockpiles of it cannot now be accumulated.

Tin: 17,500,000 pounds.

Tungsten: 220,000 pounds.

Rubber: 578,000,000 pounds, more than two-thirds the annual consumption of a material the future supply of which is gravely threatened; an amount considerably larger than our present stockpile.

USE IS LOST OF 600,000 SKILLED MEN

And while the auto industry was turning out passenger cars, the Engineer Corps is still deficient in trucks.

During the process, the defense program was denied the services of America's finest production and technical engineers and the work of 600,000 skilled production employees.

When the proposal was first made, a year ago, that the auto industry convert its equipment to defense work rather than, for the most part, do its $2,000,000,000 of defense work in new plants with new equipment, the old cry went up, "It can't be done." The tools were specialized, unconvertible.

At best, the industry estimated, only 15 percent of its tools could be adapted to defense work. Even this, be it noted, is no mean battery of equipment. However, now that the industry knows that its supply of raw materials for passenger cars will be drastically cut, and that it must convert to defense work or starve, the estimates have suddenly been revised upward.

O. P. M. technicians believe that from 40 to 60 percent of the industry's machine tools are convertible.

It is a very heartening prospect, this conversion of a $3,000,000,000 industry into an arsenal for the United States. It would have been more heartening, and would have been accompanied by much less tragic unemployment of men and machines during the change-over period, had it been begun in volume a year ago. Or even if plans were now prepared, which they are not, for placing defense orders in the auto plants.

MATERIALS SHORTAGE ENDS THE FOLLY

This impending shift, belated as it is, reveals the most cheering ray of hope on the defense horizon.

Against a background of failure to convert civilian industry to defense production—of fantastic attempts to pile the Ossa of defense production on top of the Pelion of civilian production—there is finally the grim fact that a shortage in raw materials is about to make an end to the folly.

Civilian durable-goods industries, like automobile manufacturing, see the writing on the wall. Their representatives, aware that the end has come to their raw-material supplies, are in Washington by the hundreds seeking defense orders. American industry can and will do what O. P. M. and Army never asked it to do—never forced it to do.

Thus, ironically, a shortage of materials for civilian purposes may beget, finally, "all out" military production by forcing erstwhile nondefense industries to take armament orders if they are to work at all.

The O. P. M. and the administration can take no credit for it.

The best they can do to redeem themselves somewhat is to hasten plans for conversion—plans still unmade—but which an imperiled nation might reasonably have expected to have been prepared a year ago.

[From the Washington Post of August 24, 1941]

GUNS FOR SOLDIERS—ARMY'S LARGELY "ON ORDER," AND ITS MEN ARE ON EDGE

Last Thursday at A. P. Hill Military Reservation in Virginia you could see a column of trucks stream across a rutted field with grim little guns in tow.

Whistles shrill and the trucks scatter and halt, and the men clinging to them leap to the ground and unlimber the guns, and the trucks scamper off to cover. Machine guns appear, flanking the guns, and almost before they are settled in place tanks rumble out from the fringing woods.

A machine gunner stoops, applies the end of his cigarette to something in his hand, and suddenly flings what he holds toward the tank. It trails a thin wisp of smoke.

Where it strikes the ground an unearthly popping breaks out and little red sticks dance among the flame and smoke.

It is a package of firecrackers.

Over at the guns men hurl somewhat larger firecrackers, while their mates go through the motions of loading and firing the gun considerably faster than its rated 20 rounds a minute. Back toward the rear other guns, big 75-millimeter fellows, point long snouts toward the tanks, and still bigger firecrackers, which the gunners treat with much respect, boom at intervals.

Still farther back, where 3-inch antiaircraft guns are set up, flashes appear at intervals, flashes without sound or smoke. The battle is joined and the serious business of stopping tanks is under way.

IT LOOKS LIKE A GUN—BUT IT WON'T SHOOT

When it is ended, walk up to the little antitank gun whose crew sits back aimlessly waiting for directions. It appears strangely incomplete and you ask the gunner about it.

"It's a dummy, sir," he tells you, and there is an unaccountable light of pride in his eye. "Ain't it a honey, sir? You can't tell the difference at a hundred feet."

He twists a wheel and the muzzle rises. "You see. It elevates." He spins another wheel and the gun's long nose smells across the horizon. "And it traverses. It's just like a real gun, sir."

But it won't shoot. And if it would your gunner still would fling firecrackers at tanks on maneuvers. There isn't any blank ammunition to give point and zest to the business of clinging to a truck careening across old plowed fields, of placing, aiming, and loading the piece.

Defense against mechanized attack is a matter so terribly important that it may place in the hands of a few men the lives and liberties of millions. It is so pressing that the Army has been in unending labor since the summer of 1940, shaping a succession of organizations and ideas to meet it.

AND THE RECORD ON HOWITZERS IS FAR WORSE

The basic weapon of the antitank unit is the 37-millimeter gun, designed for great mobility, to be rushed to the threat of tanks on time, and high muzzle velocity, to stop tanks when it hits them.

The square Infantry division is entitled to 84 of these little guns. Of the 18 square divisions now in Federal service, the first 4, inducted in September, are high on the "priority list." Of their 84 antitank guns, each has 24.

The other 14 square divisions have none at all. They train with dummies.

To back up the 37, the square Infantry division is entitled to 16 antitank guns of 75 millimeters. So far, most have 4 each.

One of the first two antitank battalions organized in the Regular Army, an organization that has been in being since last September, is entitled to 36 of the 37-millimeter weapons. It has 6, while 30 gun crews still train on dummies.

More than a year ago, all the light Field Artillery regiments of the Army were reorganized around the 105-millimeter howitzer. It was made clear to them that the present 75-millimeter gun is inadequate against the field howitzer of the German Army.

Not a regiment is equipped today with the 105 howitzer, though a few are in the hands of troops here and there. Meanwhile, Field Artillery men are training on guns they have been told can be outshot and outranged in battle. And they know that sooner or later they must unlearn what they know about the 75 and learn all over again on the 105.

You can tell a soldier the richest nation in the world is unable to provide him with equipment. But you can't always make him believe it.

Part of an ordnance unit was given a 155-millimeter howitzer to repair. These ordnance men are highly skilled mechanics; many of them earned $75, $85, $100 a week in civil life. Now they make $21 a month and upward.

They took this 155 howitzer and worked on it until suppertime. Then they went back to the shop and worked until midnight to put the weapon back in service.

They had to stop at midnight. They lacked one small piece of equipment, which cost $2.75, to repair the howitzer.

It couldn't be found anywhere. The big gun lay in the ordnance park for days and weeks, out of service, its crew idle. One of the ordnance men asked his commanding officer about that.

"Captain," he said, "why can't we get that little piece of metal? You'd think, sir, the Army could find $2.75 for a gun part with all these millions being collected for shows and dances and stuff like that."

Quartermaster men tell you it's cheaper to buy a new truck than to tie up those with major ailments while waiting for parts to repair them.

Coast Artillery men, who will be responsible for defense of harbors, for ground defense against air attack, for manning the great railway and tractor-drawn guns that go after the enemy's communications, are not learning to handle the guns they will be expected to fire in battle.

Every piece of equipment they've got, except a few antiaircraft weapons, is of World War vintage. They learn to load and point 155-millimeter guns built for service in France. They drill on 8-inch railway guns that never will be fired in battle except under frantic necessity. They man coast-defense guns new when America girded itself to grapple with Spain.

Because antiaircraft defense is more or less new, their antiaircraft guns are somewhat new. But * * *

The 3-inch gun they now fire is to be superseded by a more powerful, longer ranged 90-millimeter gun. There aren't any of the latter, and the whisper goes around among the men that the first built were so badly designed they were liable to take off a man's arm should he try to load one.

The antiaircraft gunner will be equipped some day, he hopes, with a lot of terrific little 37-millimeter guns which fire 120 rounds a minute at planes or tanks. There are some of these in service, after an extensive job of redesigning the aiming mechanism. But they can't be fired 120 rounds a minute for any length of time. The barrels get so hot they bend.

IN THE MANUAL, BUT IT'S NOT IN REASON

In its Field Manual 100–5, the Army's new summation of combat doctrine, the use of antiaircraft weapons in antimechanized defense is stressed. But FM 100–5 does not explain how a gun designed to be fired at a target 5 miles away and 20,000 feet high is to be aimed at a target on the ground 400 yards off and coming in fast.

Word goes round that the antiaircraft-fire directors can be changed to aim accurately at close targets on the ground and that they will be changed. But the antiaircraft gunner is skeptical. He is still waiting for his 90-millimeter guns and his 37-millimeter quick-firers.

In one respect, engineers are better off than most of their brothers in arms. A great part of their equipment is commercial stuff painted olive drab. All of their earth-moving machinery comes from the same production lines that supply the civilian contractor. In the matter of pontoon bridges, foot bridges, and the like, the Corps of Engineers seems to have done well by itself.

But when it comes to weapons, the engineers are no better off than anybody else.

They are learning to fire Springfield rifles which they will be expected to discard some day in favor of Garands. They are short of light machine guns, caliber .50 machine guns, and mortars.

Everybody is short of mortars. And the troops can't understand why.

"A mortar is just a piece of pipe on a slab of iron," the soldier says. "I could make one myself."

It is not as simple as that, but he does make mortars. He makes 60-millimeter mortars of iron pipe and he makes 81-millimeter mortars of discarded gutters. And he lugs them faithfully through maneuvers while he learns nothing at all about how mortars are aimed and served.

ONE REASON FOR THE WORRY OVER MORALE

The soldier who has spent 6 to 10 months training without weapons, without ammunition, without other necessary equipment, or has seen it come to him in driblets, is discouraged. It is not what he was promised would come from the most productive Nation on earth.

There is scarcely an artilleryman in the Army who has seen the 105 howitzer he may use in battle. Thousands of National Guard men and selectees charged with defending their fellows against tanks and armored cars have never seen an antitank gun.

Tens of thousands are becoming proficient with rifles they will soon discard. Men in heavy-weapons companies are wondering what a real mortar will do, how it sounds when it goes off, and what results it will achieve in destruction.

Meanwhile, they train. They train in the din of popping firecrackers and the flash of mirrors simulating gunfire. They race across the country with dummy guns and spend hours loading dummy shells in the heavy artillery of 1918.

Dairy Day Meeting Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 29, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered before the Dairy Day meeting at the Barron County Fair, Rice Lake, Wis., August 12, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, fellow citizens, we are met today to discuss the place of dairying in the national-defense program. Each of us here today is interested directly or indirectly in the problems of the dairy farmer.

I myself feel that I can qualify as one of the dairy farmers—and I am proud to be classified with that group. I own and operate a dairy farm in Barron County—the same farm which my father owned before me.

Those of us who are dairy farmers, those of us who have tried to balance our milk checks against our expenses, know that the dairy farmer hasn't been getting the cost of production. At the present time it is true that the return of the dairy farmer is rising. That, however, is not a permanent answer to our problems.

One immediate problem which confronts the dairy industry in connection with defense is the possibility of Government limiting domestic consumption of dairy products. According to Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard, Americans may have to curtail their consumption of cheese and dairy products in order to supply enough of these products for Britain.

That does not make sense. For years Wisconsin producers have sought to build up a market for their products and there is no logic in destroying that market overnight. In recent years the administration has urged the farmer to curtail production in order to cut down the surplus. Today the farmer is urged to increase production of exportable foods such as cheese, canned milk, and eggs. In other words, he is urged to increase production and cut domestic consumption.

British purchases thus far have included cheese, evaporated milk, dry eggs, and powdered milk. At the present time the question is whether the dairy farmer can stretch his production to meet the British needs and also meet the needs of a domestic market which has been steadily increasing.

I believe the dairy farmer can meet these needs with intelligent effort. I do not believe that there is any necessity to tell Americans that they will have to eat fewer dairy products. Surveys of the agricultural college show that in our State we could increase cheese production 30 percent.

Wisconsin farmers have increased their herds 4 percent. We now have 2,350,000 milk cows and a record milk production of 12,665,000,000 pounds. That is about 11 percent of the national supply. Wisconsin

cows are now turning out an average of 25 pounds of milk a day. That is 2 pounds more than a year ago.

Dairy herds throughout the State have increased their production on an average of 57 pounds a day. Our milk production in Wisconsin has been increased fully 10 percent according to recent estimates. Nationally milk production has been increased about 6 percent.

This increased production will probably amount to 1,266,000,000 pounds. It takes about 10½ pounds of whole milk to make a pound of American cheddar cheese, and consequently this increase could produce about 120,000,000 pounds of cheese. That is about half of the British demands.

In our State alone we can produce 350,000,000 pounds of American-type cheese. That is an increase of 11 percent over last year's production. If we were to divert our production from butter to cheese, it might be possible to increase our cheese production 3t percent. Experts have stated that almost every cheese factory equipped for American-type cheese could handle from 15,000 to 30,000 pounds more milk per day without more equipment.

This is a time for the Federal Government to do a constructive job so that America and England can have all the dairy produce they need. This is not a time to cripple the domestic markt.

A few moments ago I said I was a dairy farmer and proud to be one. The reason I am proud to be a dairy farmer is that the dairy farmer is part of our front line of defense. He has been given a job to do, and he is doing it. He is doing an excellent job, and he is a good soldier.

The requirements of our national defense for dairy products have presented a distinct challenge to the dairy industry. The dairy industry is meeting that challenge and will continue to meet it.

The sudden demands and new requirements on many of our industries have always created havoc in many of our industries, but the great dairy industry has rolled up its sleeves and is meeting the challenge.

Milk production on our Nation's farms showed an increase of 7 percent in May. In June milk production was up still further. In the first 6 months of 1941 the records disclosed a total of 59,318 000,000 pounds or 5 percent more than the first half of 1940. That is an all-time record.

Our own military forces recognize the value of milk in the defense program. At the present time our own soldiers are being supplied with fresh milk in their daily diet for the first time in American history.

It has been estimated that our armed forces are using more than 350,000 quarts of fresh fluid milk per day. In addition to that they are using 175,000 pounds of butter, 22,000 pounds of cheese, and large quantities of other dairy products each day.

I am advised that the Army ration (that is the food provided for one man for 1 day) specifies, among other things, 8 ounces of fresh milk, 2 ounces of butter, 1 ounce of evaporated milk, and one-fourth ounce of cheese.

Incidentally, during the American Revolutionary days the ration list called for 1 pint of milk for soldiers each day. I believe that that was the only time fresh milk appeared on the ration list until the present time. From the historical records, however, it is somewhat doubtful whether Washington's soldiers ever got that milk allowance unless they succeeded in corralling a stray cow occasionally.

The Army nutritionists in the Surgeon General's Office decided that 1 pint of milk and its equivalent was a safe minimum amount in the soldier's daily diet to protect them against deficiencies in calcium and vitamin B2.

It is difficult to get exact figures on the consumption of milk by the armed forces, but it has been reported that the Army purchases of dairy products in 1 year will probably total about $30,000,000.

During the last World War the Government made many appeals to the farmers—the farmers responded to those appeals. They produced more food per man than had ever before been grown in the history of the world in a similar length of time. When the post-war period came, the farmers, however, were the very first group to be deflated.

In the fall of 1919 the Attorney General's office launched a crusade against high food prices. The Government owned certain stocks of food and these stocks were advertised at bargain prices in post offices all over the land.

These supplies were thrown on the home markets and retailers were requested to handle them without profit. These supplies were accumulated for war purposes. They dropped like a bomb on a market that was already collapsing.

All of us believed in a reduction of the costs of living. All of us believed in a return to normalcy after the war, but none of us believed that the price of farm products should be blasted to bits overnight.

That was not the case with other materials * * * there the surpluses were dribbled into the market slowly so that prices did not break overnight.

The Federal Reserve System after the last World War adopted certain credit policies designed to break certain farm commodity prices. The Federal Reserve System jacked up its rediscount rates to such a level that the farmers could not get funds. As a consequence they were forced to throw their crops and livestock upon the market, and it was a falling market.

We know that the Government repaid manufacturers for certain losses which they sustained after their contracts were canceled in the post-war period, but they did not give a similar treatment to the farmers.

Our job now is to insist that there must be no repetition of the rank injustices which confronted the farmer after the last World War. After the present armament period our condition may be much worse than it was in 1918, because our debt will be proportionately larger.

The answer to this problem is not that Government should take over all of the means of production and distribution. The answer must be found in a revitalized system of free enterprise, and I am in fervent agreement with the purposes of proposed legislation to establish a post-emergency economic advisory commission so that we can anticipate the problems of the future and do something about them now.

Where there is no vision the people perish. We need vision today; we need leadership. The time to meet these problems is before they come into existence.

After the last war farm and dairy prices skidded down from wartime boom levels. We know that after the war our foods will be needed to feed a hungry world. Our problem today is to plan intelligently to protect farm markets for several years after the crisis has passed.

At the present time, if it is necessary, milk can be diverted to the cheese factories and the condenseries in line with the administration's request.

We can do these things but we have a right to demand the same treatment and protection which government gives industry. The prices of butter must not be permitted to skid down to such levels that the farmer's standard of living is shot to pieces by Government sniping.

Government purchases of dairy products are essential to defense, but there is no reason why there should not be an adequate differential over butter and other competitive dairy products.

I can see no reason for establishing maximum price ceilings for dairy products unless similar price ceilings are imposed on other segments of our economy, and in that case it would also be necessary to establish a floor price.

While I have never subscribed to the administration's program of a bureaucratic, swivel-chair farmer regulation of American agriculture, I feel that at this time it is necessary for us to merge our cooperative efforts with the Federal bureaus wherever it is possible.

However, I can see no reason for dictatorial Federal farm regulations to encourage manufacturers to use low-price vegetable oils and animal fats for synthetic products to compete with our dairy products—particularly when these dairy producers are not permitted to use these same synthetic elements.

I might add that I recently made a protest directly to the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with the efforts of the Department to popularize synthetic products competing with butter. I feel that it is extremely undesirable for the Department of Agriculture (which should be concerned primarily with protecting the American farmer just as the Department of Labor protects the American laborer) to spend its time and the people's money propagandizing the American people into using synthetic products. That is not only undesirable from an economic standpoint because it affects the dairy farmer adversely, but it is also undesirable from a health standpoint where it adversely affects the health standards of the American people. I might say that the Secretary of Agriculture himself as late as July 1941 admitted this fact when he stated that we need to produce more products if we are going to give everyone in the United States a satisfactory diet. To do that the Secretary said we needed 15 percent more butter and 20 percent more milk as protective foods, rich in minerals and vitamins for our American diet.

Dr. Thomas Parran, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, confirmed that fact. He said, "In the weeks and months to come we shall need not only planes and munitions, a growing Army and Navy, but also rugged health and courage."

I agree with the Surgeon General when he says we need a nation of people who are more fit, more vigorous, and with higher standards of health. That means we have to put to work our scientific knowledge for the nutrition of all our people. We have the capacity, the fertility of the soil, the equipment, the facilities for distribution; in fact, every element which we need to raise the standards of public health through better nutrition, which certainly means an increased rather than a decreased use of dairy products.

It has been said that less than one-fourth of our people are on a "good diet" even when measured by the old standards. The Surgeon General has admitted that our deficiency in diet will require at least a 50-percent increase in our national production of milk and milk products. I believe fervently that every drop of milk and every pound of butter which we can convert into human protein foods represents a substantial advance in the front lines of our health defense. We need to build a stronger and healthier people through a more complete diet.

The emergency today instead of lowering our standards should stimulate us to raise them and should serve as a foundation for our post-armament economy and our post-armament health standards. We need to raise our people to the highest possible level of health and vigor, and I hope that the Washington agencies, such as the Coordinator

of Health, Welfare, and Nutrition, will operate to achieve this objective.

We know that when the European holocaust is over, we in America will need all the strength and courage which we can muster to continue to give the American people the highest standard of living of any people on the face of the globe.

The dairy farmer is entitled to have something to say about agricultural-defense policies.

Wisconsin produces half the cheese, one-third of the evaporated milk and much of the powdered skimmed milk, and we are increasing our production rapidly.

We are producing ample milk for rising domestic consumption, and we will do everything possible to produce sufficient milk for 250,000,000 pounds of Cheddar cheese, 15,000,000 cases of canned milk, and 200,000,000 pounds of dry-skimmed milk for the allied forces overseas.

At the present time we know that there is an elevator and storage space shortage. I can see no reason why the dairyman should not be permitted to use the carry-over grains to increase the production of milk, poultry supplies, and meats.

I cannot subscribe to the logic of the administration's priority program which has denied priorities to farm-machinery companies.

If the dairy industry is going to be required to divert its production to cheese for shipment to England, it must be an orderly plan of diversion so that we do not have a post-emergency crisis.

I cannot subscribe to any federally inspired, haphazard patchwork plans which do not seek to anticipate the problems which will result for the dairy farmer when his market is curtailed.

In connection with our discussion on the place that the dairy industry has in the national-defense program, it is interesting for us to note that Public Law 147 (which was passed by the present 77th Cong.), to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, establishes a policy for nonbasic agricultural commodities.

Under the program the price of these nonbasic commodities is pegged and it is always done with reference to some percentage of the parity value or price of that specific commodity. I do not say that we should do less for the so-called basic commodities. I do favor doing more for the so-called nonbasic commodities.

In order to participate in any of the provisions of this legislation it is necessary for the nonbasic agricultural commodity to be brought under a control program, under which production could be controlled. After the nonbasic commodity has been brought under such a control policy, it has been possible for it to receive benefits under the terms of the program.

Now, let us consider the possible application of this idea to the dairy industry. If the milk producers desired to submit themselves to a control program, if they desired to give the Department of Agriculture power to regulate them and to regulate the marketing of their product, then there could be no reason why that commodity should not have equal treatment along with the so-called basic commodity with corn, rice, cotton, wheat, and tobacco.

Public Law 147 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, states:

"(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the lending and purchase operations of the Department of Agriculture (other than those referred to in subsection (a)) shall be carried out so as to bring the price and income of the producers of nonbasic commodities not covered by any such public announcement to a fair-parity relationship with other commodities, to the extent that funds for such operations are available after taking into account the operations with respect to the basic commodities and the commodities listed in any such public announcement and the ability of producers to bring supplies into line with demand."

I believe there are a great many serious objections to our program for the basic commodities, but as long as the administration majority retains this plan for the basic commodities, then I say there is no reason why nonbasic commodities should not be permitted to receive similar benefits, if they desire to subject themselves to the same control, and if they desire to stay within substantially the same limitations of production.

If the idea behind the Surplus Commodities Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation is fair for the basic commodities, then it should also be fair for the nonbasic commodities.

As a matter of fact, the production of our dairy industry, which is not considered a basic commodity, is just as great as some of the so-called basic commodities. It is a further fact that the dairy industry is an extremely vital part of our economy, and is certainly more basic than rice.

If there is anything at all to this theory of protecting the agricultural producer, according to the terms of the Surplus Commodities Corporation or the Commodity Credit Corporation, then that protection should be extended to agricultural products not included in the so-called basic commodities.

In this very year the present Congress voted for a guaranty of 85 percent of parity price for the basic agricultural products. The reason for that was that the farmer had been limited in his production, he had complied with the Government demands and he felt that he was entitled to parity. Congress gave him 85 percent of the parity price for the basic commodities.

Again I ask: How does the price of rice, which is a basic commodity, compare with milk and butter prices?

I have never completely agreed with the idea that farm benefits must be based on a voluntary reduction in production by the farmer, but as long as the administration follows this policy and as long as no better policy is accepted, I believe that nonbasic commodities should receive the same protection if they desire to submit themselves to the same control provision and limited production.

In other words, just because Congress says rice is a basic commodity, that is no reason for discriminating against another important product which has not been considered as a basic commodity.

I submit this point merely for our long-range consideration. In a post-armament period the dairy industry may need this protection.

I realize that it would be impracticable for many of the nonbasic commodities to submit to control programs. I realize further that the Secretary of Agriculture is not required to take in all perishable crops.

It is true, however, that whenever there is a crop which can be treated under a diversion program or a loan program, and when similar or identical provisions restricting production, price control, or marketing-control provisions can be adopted with reference to such a crop, there is no reason why that general policy should not prevail even with respect to perishable crops.

The reason I have discussed the possibility of the dairy industry participating in the various programs of the Government is that I feel the dairy farmer is entitled to expect something of Government. At the present time we have a tremendous tax bill. Now, the farmers are ready to do their share in relation to the tax bill, but they expect that the Government will use its head.

For over 8 years now about 80 percent of the farmers have been losing ground because they have not gotten the cost of production out of their milk. The Government has been taking over farms. Insurance companies have acquired multitudes of them.

Now, when there is $500,000,000 available in the Lease-Lend Act for farm products to give to Britain, the farmers expect that this Government will see to it that they get at least the cost of production for the products that the Government gives away; for the products which the Treasury of the United States buys with the people's money.

The Surplus Marketing Administration advises me that from mid-March through July purchases of dairy products under the Lease Lend Act included 48,000,000 pounds of cheese, 3,620,000 cases of evaporated milk, and 16,000,000 pounds of dry skimmed milk. We are gratified to learn of these purchases, but we must insist that these purchases must be made at a fair price to the farmer and must not be made with the thought of closing off the domestic market.

Wisconsin's cheese is selling in London for $1 a pound. If it costs the Wisconsin farmer $1.85 a hundred pounds to produce his milk in this period, when wages and everything else are going up, he does not want the Government he is now asked to support, to chisel in and take from him the opportunity to get the cost of production out of his product.

This brings us to the question, What should the dairy farmer do during this defense period?

First. The dairy farmer should, of course, continue to do everything he can to raise his production, as he has already done.

Second. The dairy farmer should not permit his domestic market to slip away from him while we are sending dairy products abroad. If we lose these foreign markets, we would then have a tremendous problem in reeducating the American people to the consumption of dairy products, and we would have a tremendous job in recapturing the American market. This is no time for a curtailment of American consumption of dairy products.

Third. The dairy industry should work with the Army in accumulating information on the effects of including dairy products in the Army rations.

The use of dairy products in the Army rations gives us a large-scale laboratory in which to prove the value of dairy products in our diets. The use of dairy products in the Army rations can stimulate a greater consumption of dairy products when these men are returned to civilian life.

We must begin now to anticipate the post-armament problem which will confront the farmer. We must begin now to insure against the collapsing farm market which followed the last World War. We must make certain that government gives fair treatment to the farmer in the post-armament period rather than deliberately collapsing their legitimate prices and battering the farmer down to a hand-to-mouth economic level.

Fourth. The dairy farmer must continue to oppose the establishment of maximum price ceilings for dairy products unless similar price ceilings and floors are imposed on other segments of our economy.

Fifth. The dairy farmer must investigate the use of low-price vegetable oils and animal fats in making synthetic products competing with dairy products.

Sixth. The dairy farmer should see to it that government permits him to use the carry-over grains to increase the production of milk, poultry supplies, and meats.

Seventh. The dairy farmer must insist that the administration give priorities to concerns which produce farm machinery.

Eighth. If the Government requires any diversion of the milk production, the dairy farmer must insist that it is an orderly diversion according to a plan rather than a haphazard day-to-day scheme. This will do much to eliminate the post-armament prices.

Ninth. The dairy farmer must at some future date consider the wisdom of further

participating in Government programs with the Surplus Commodities Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Tenth. The dairy farmer can continue to insist that he be given the fair cost of production. He is entitled to insist that his fair price be maintained by some kind of a differential of butter or other competitive dairy products.

Eleventh. The Wisconsin dairy farmer can seize on the present market as an opportunity to put his financial house in order rather than to make financial commitments which may be difficult to meet in a post-armament period.

Twelfth. The dairy industry should insist that the administration should not enact legislation which would remove all tariff safeguards for dairy products.

At the present time, for example, there is a bill pending which would provide that commodities or articles for defense could be imported free of duty or tax. That would mean that Government could decide that any product which they believed was a defense product could be imported free of all existing tariff duties.

We know that dairy products are playing an important role in the Government defense program. As a consequence, dairy products might be declared commodities or articles for defense. That might mean a complete removal of the tariff on casein. Whole milk and cream and butter and cheese might be declared defense articles and all existing tariff duties removed. Similarly, the milk and cream importation restrictions contained in the Lenroot-Tabe law might be eliminated.

In other words, such legislation might be practically a blanket repeal of existing tariff laws and import restrictions on dairy products.

The dairy industry may have to fight legislation of this sort which might eventually mean that the farmer would again have to pay the freight.

I do not believe that appropriations alone will solve the farm problem. We will not solve the farm problem by dealing with special appropriations from year to year.

I believe, however, that such appropriations are necessary in order to at least enable the farmer to exist until such time as he gets his legitimate and fair share of the national income.

I am willing to support any workable plan or legislation for the farmer but thus far we of the minority have not been able to get favorable consideration for those plans which have been suggested.

It cannot be denied that the rise in the price of manufactured goods has been more rapid than the rise in the price of agricultural commodities.

Some 25 percent of the American people live on farms and last year they received only 9 percent of the national income, and that 9 percent included the food that the farmer's family itself consumed.

If we consider cash income the farmer's share in our national income is cut down still further to approximately 6 or 7 percent.

The farm program deals with 32,000,000 people—probably the most underprivileged people in the land. Yet all of the payments which have been made to the farmer are far less than half of the sums which have been appropriated for relief. I am not complaining of that. I am making the comparison so that we can see the necessity for effecting some small measure of justice to the American farmers.

Sooner or later this defense program will be over. When that period comes I do not want to see the buying power of the American farmer absolutely dried up so that industry and labor will have no market whatever for their products. It is true that the farmer produced so much food and fiber that if he were to be out of business it wouldn't hurt the rest of the people immediately, because there has been a reserve of food and clothing sufficient for 2 or 3 years.

When this period is over, however, and we again look for a market for the products of industry geared to peacetime, we may be faced with a dried-up farm buying power. That will bring about an economic collapse in this country—an economic collapse infinitely worse than 1932 and 1933.

The defense program has assisted industry, and in some cases has built their factories. It has given them cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts so that they couldn't lose a dime on their activities. Legislation has been passed to protect the labor interests of this country. We have a National Labor Relations Act.

Congress has placed a floor under wages and a ceiling on hours. Congress passed a Social Security Act, and that Social Security Act raises the prices of everything the farmer uses. Yet the farmer cannot share by so much as one dime in the distribution of the funds collected under the social-security program.

Congress has enacted artificial devices safeguarding every segment of American economy except the farmer, who produces the clothes we wear and the food we eat.

I do not advocate the repeal of these laws. I know that the farmer is not opposed to higher wages for labor and reasonable profits for industry, but I know also that he is entitled to a reasonable share of the national income. He is entitled to have legislation enacted which will give him a fair share of that income.

I feel that no farm program will ever be satisfactory as long as it neglects to consider the dairy farmer. However, that does not mean that in the interval we should neglect to do what we can for farmers as a group.

Incidentally, I myself have introduced a number of bills directed at assisting the farm problem, and I regret keenly that because of administration opposition they have not received favorable consideration.

I feel today that it would be more sound from an economic standpoint to advocate payments for specialized production rather than a curtailed production. In other words, I can see considerable merit in the idea of making an incentive payment.

These would be payments made to farmers for growing crops which are not now grown. They could be paid to farmers for growing specialty crops needed in the national-defense program. They could also be paid to farmers for following certain types of agriculture which would benefit the Nation. They would put men and acres to work.

I believe that the Government today should do a great deal more in research designed to use casein and dairy byproducts. However, in the meantime we cannot afford to neglect the depressed economic condition of the farmer in general.

Today we talk about sacrifice to make the defense program a reality. I contend, however, that the farmer alone should not be singled out to be that sacrifice.

The farmer has never had a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. We never had to pass any laws limiting his profits, because in most communities he has been selling far below the cost of production. He never had any National Labor Relations Board to protect him against speculation and a decrease in income and unfair trade policies. The farmer has never gone on a strike in an effort to force the consumer to pay higher prices. He doesn't have a wage and hour law. He works from daybreak until nightfall.

He has the lowest income of any group of workers in the United States, but he has never gone communistic. He and his products are still the backbone of the Nation, and I will support any legislation designed to safeguard the buying power of the American farmer until such a time when the farmer will receive a more just proportion of the national income.

Bankhead-Eastland Bill (S. 1815)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES OLIVER EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 29, 1941

ARTICLE BY W. C. NEILL

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relative to Senate bill 1815, written by Mr. W. C. Neill, a prominent banker and farm leader of Mississippi.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BE BANKHEAD-EASTLAND BILL, S. 1815, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

Enactment of legislation having the main import of this bill is vital to the security of the United States, because:

1. A policy of economic isolation and restricted production purposed to maintain artificial prices will certainly be cracked, either by the adoption of totalitarianism, or by internal revolution, or by external military pressure. A foreign military machine backed by an economy allowing unlimited production, with attendant abundance of materials and supplies, will overwhelm an American military machine backed by an economy of restriction, restraint, and regimentation, with attendant scarcity, disunity, depressed morale, and pressure-group paternalism.

2. Such legislation opens this country's only avenue of escape from totalitarian dictatorship developed from within, or imposed from without, because: (a) World trade hereafter must be on a basis of commodity exchange since no other basis exists (the United States has approximately all the gold); (b) American agriculture, geared to export trade, must disemploy vast multitudes if exports cease; these multitudes cannot be absorbed by manufacturing industry geared to supplying a constricted and stifled domestic market at the usual juicy profits. (c) Totalitarianism will be necessary to victual and to discipline the unemployed, disemployed, and dispossessed multitude, or else a recurrence of 1929–33 conditions will so weaken and disrupt the United States that it will be an easy prey for totalitarianism from without.

To whomsoever may be impressed by fact rather than by propaganda it is submitted that totalitarianism did not spring, full armed, from the brow of Hitler, but from economic restriction of the German people.

It can happen here.

W. C. NEILL.

NORTH CARROLLTON, MISS., *August 20, 1941.*

Defense Strikes and Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 29, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE OMAHA EVENING WORLD-HERALD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Omaha Evening World-Herald of August 21, 1941, and an editorial from the same newspaper of August 22, 1941, both on subjects of current interest.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Omaha Evening World-Herald of August 21, 1941]

NOW, AS IN '62

"The military situation is far from bright, and the country knows it as well as I do. They have no idea that the war is to be carried on and put through by hard, tough fighting, that it will hurt somebody; and no headway is going to be made while this delusion lasts."

The words are Abraham Lincoln's, spoken in the dark days of 1862, but Franklin D. Roosevelt, by quoting them, made them his own.

And a remarkably accurate parallel it is, Mr. President.

For now as then there are people who "have not buckled down to the determination to fight this war through, for they have got the idea into their heads that we are going to get out of this fix somehow by strategy."

There are people who believe we "can get out of this fix" by passing a conscription law or holding a conference at sea.

There are people who believe this war can be "carried on and put through" on a closed-shop basis and a 40-hour week.

There are people who have got it into their heads that we can win a war with social workers.

Who are they?

Look around you, Mr. President. You will see them on your left hand and your right. You will see them in front of you at the conference table, or perhaps lecturing learnedly to rubber-stamp Congressmen.

The same papers which related the story of Mr. Roosevelt's parallel also told the story of the tram strike in Detroit.

Detroit. The key city of the defense program. Its public transportation tied up by a labor dispute.

And what is the argument about in Detroit? About whether the transportation workers shall pay their dues to a C. I. O. union or an A. F. of L. union. The type of bitter, senseless controversy which became common in America under the rule of left-wing N. L. R. B.

The same papers also told of the continuing strike at the Kearny, N. J., shipyards, where Mr. Roosevelt's agencies have demanded that the employer grant closed-shop privileges to a certain union. And they told of perhaps a half dozen other jurisdictional or ideological disputes which were holding back defense work in other areas.

And they also told of the progress being made by the administration's left-wingers in their campaign to bring American industry and the American standard of living fully under the Government's management.

And perhaps they also told something of the President's plan to revive the St. Lawrence seaway project, and his friends' plans to revive the Florida ship-canal project, and his congressional leaders' many small plans for making Government pap available for "boondoggling" projects in every congressional district.

Yes, Mr. President; it is a truly deplorable situation.

By the formal, considered action of our Government we are a partisan and to a considerable extent a participant in the cruelest war the world has ever known. Probably our Nation was never in greater jeopardy, even in the dark days of 1862.

And yet there is a feeling in some circles that the war need not interfere with politics as usual.

Sound the alarums, Mr. President; but sound them first in Washington, where the bureaucrats sleep and reformers dream.

The American people, we believe now as always, would respond quickly and happily to alert, tough, fighting leadership.

[From the Omaha Evening World-Herald of August 22, 1941]

HOPE DEFERRED

When "hope springs exulting on triumphant wing," that, like peace, is wonderful. One feels good all over.

Thursday morning there came advance announcement that President Roosevelt would address a message to Congress on his historic Atlantic Ocean conference with Prime Minister Churchill.

And hope exulted. Now, at last, hope whispered, it could and would be told. Told whether, in this world of war, our own country and its Government is fish, flesh, or fowl. Where, as a matter of fact, we "are at." In the words the President was to use very shortly, "freedom of information," without which, as he was to say, no society organized along the lines of the eight points could survive.

This was what was needed. Information, free and candid. It was about all that was required to banish bewilderment and confusion, and so restore the dangerously shaken morale of the people and of the Army.

In the morning paper General Marshall had been quoted:

"Morale is vital to an army; far more important than the character of equipment. It depends in a large measure on the morale of the people behind the army and their unity of purpose."

True as gospel.

Then came the message. Only to recall the gospel truth that "hope deferred maketh the heart sick."

For Mr. Roosevelt told the Congress and the people exactly nothing at all that was new.

He repeated the eight points—his and the Prime Minister's hopes and plans for a better world that will assure "freedom from fear and want" to "all men in all the lands."

He told again why the Lend-Lease Act was adopted.

He told again that he and the Prime Minister are arranging for a conference with the soviets to provide them with aid for their defense.

He reiterated his stand against peace with the Nazis.

He added a postscript to the eight points to include "freedom of information" and freedom of religion as essentials of the new world order.

And this was all. Unless it was to embalm the eight points in the formal record the message might as well have gone undelivered.

The disappointment is great. The President and Commander in Chief, of course, has his reasons. He is using his best judgment as to what may and may not be told the American people and their representatives in Congress.

But however weighty the reasons for withholding information, the policy of the Government weakens morale. It does not make for unity.

Nor is it fair or wise to draw an indictment against the American people because morale is weak and unity is lacking.

Repeatedly they have been assured that it is the purpose and hope of their Government to keep this country out of the World War. That means we should be kept out. It is difficult, then, for the people to unite enthusiastically in support of policies and acts and words tending certainly to involve us. Many of their leaders insist we are already in; others assert that the policy still is to keep us out.

What are the people to believe? How can they understand?

What really was the purpose of the Atlantic meeting? Was it for war or was it for peace; or was it merely to proclaim what kind of world this ought to be, and to decide how much help should go to the "reds," and from whom—and how far the "reds" may be trusted in the establishment of a good earth?

At the best there is mystery—mystery all along the line—and mystery confuses.

So with the Army—the selectees. They were to serve for 12 months. Then Congress was asked to extend their term of service without limit. Then a "compromise" extension of 18 months reluctantly was accepted. When Senator TAFT proposed only a 6-month extension that was strongly opposed and denounced as menacing to our national security. Yet now, a few days later, the 6-month extension seems about right.

A while ago it was contended that no training of 12 or 18 months would be nearly sufficient for a dependable Army. Today the trainees of from 12 to 18 months are to be released and replaced by new draftees. Meanwhile the army of defense is still without arms and equipment, while in the kindergarten stage of training.

Whom and what to believe? What is it all about? For what must there be unity? For what, in high purpose, must we be sternly resolved?

We say it is not the fault of the people if their morale is low. We say they are entitled to voice their bewilderment, to be critical of leadership that leaves them groping in the dark and then complains of their lack of enthusiasm.

The Government can trust the people. Americans are a mighty fine people, good citizens as they are good soldiers. But as gropers-in-the-dark they don't belong. They are not the material of which robots are made. They want to know. If not all the whys and hows, anyhow the direction in which they are going.

Until they are informed—much better informed than now—as to the ultimate purposes of their leadership in domestic as well as foreign affairs, unity will be impossible and the national morale will continue to be a matter for concern.

A Simple Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM NEBRASKA DAILY NEWS-PRESS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Simple Procedure," appearing in a recent issue of the Nebraska Daily News-Press. The editorial was written by a former Member of the House of Representatives, Mr. J. H. Sweet.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nebraska Daily News-Press]

A SIMPLE PROCEDURE

In his Tuesday press conference, the President very aptly quoted Mr. Lincoln who, at the beginning of the Civil War, found his toughest job was convincing the people they were at war.

It was appropriate for the President to mention that, but as he did so he added to the confusion.

According to his own statements, we are not yet in a shooting war. Mr. Lincoln definitely was commanding an army when he remarked on the complacency of a republic in direst travail.

Mr. Lincoln took the people into his confidence. He called to his Cabinet a group of men who represented all types of thought. His Secretary of War was a man of ability; his Secretary of the Navy was a man trained in organization. He had no Secretary of the Interior, glory be, and there were no Sister Perkinses to throw monkey wrenches into the machinery.

When Mr. Lincoln conferred he did not assume his new-hatched Republican Party represented all that was good and holy in the land. He knew his military forces must be made up of Republicans, Democrats, and what not. There were no conniving politicians to proclaim that only Republicans should have defense jobs in Des Moines et al.

Eventually, but only after Bull Run, Fredericksburg, and Antietam, the people awoke to the fact that if they were to win they must stand behind Lincoln and see to it that he got some generals. After a while, but at a terrible cost, Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan came to the fore and the issue was resolved.

F. D. R. need not go back to Lincoln to find a text for a sermon on unity, disunion, or what have you.

He need go back only so far as Woodrow Wilson, that other war President. Wilson was reluctant, deliberate, and aware of popular resentment against war. But he did keep his people informed. His Cabinet for the most part was made up of intelligent, patriotic, able men. He sold the people on unity through the simplest device known to man—complete and open-minded conferences with them and, what's more, confidence in their ability and willingness to take it. Also, he was willing and eager to delegate authority to others.

The trouble in Washington today, according to our best authority, is that this seems to be a one-man show.

The President has his finger in every pie. He must dabble in every detail of the defense program. He must be Secretary of State when he isn't dictating to Congress what sort of a tax bill it should enact to relieve rich women from paying a fair share of the defense costs. It is too bad, when you think of it, that he does not supervise the Department of the Interior and the Labor Department.

When Mr. Roosevelt plainly tells the people, as he should, that they are entirely too complacent, let him also tell them he intends to delegate authority to good men and hold them responsible for what has been done.

When he goes on a fishing trip, let the people be told what sort of "fish" are to be caught, and what sort of bait is to be used. He might also tell us that since British members of the fishing party are to be accompanied by responsible and authoritative men of the press he, too, will permit representatives of public opinion to accompany him.

Above all, let Mr. Roosevelt indicate he has confidence in the people of the United States. He is fond of saying we are a democracy. Sometimes the people wonder about that, too.

Keeping America Safe and at Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 29, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by me over station WISN, Milwaukee, Wis., on August 11, 1941, the subject being Keep America Safe and at Peace.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, these times demand plain talk. As a nation, we are now in a twilight zone where facts count—where reason and common sense must come into play. We owe it to ourselves and to the Nation to be calm and speak plainly.

All America agrees that there is a great need for a reasonable, sensible defense program. All America is ready to dig down to pay its share of that defense program. The need is apparent because the world is aflame with the madness of war.

It is apparent to everyone that the need for this defense program grows out of the war madness abroad. It is apparent that the totalitarian powers are out to slice up the world.

But this defense program calls for the sanest kind of thinking and planning so that we do not wreck our American economy and do not, contrary to the wishes of the great majority of the American people, precipitate this Nation into war by the overt acts of our leaders. It is well that we pause a moment to understand the situation.

We are a peculiarly blessed people. We are blessed because of our geographic position, being 3,000 miles off from Europe and 7,000 miles off from Asia.

But we are also blessed in our form of government. We are a republic, peculiarly formed. Our Executive, according to the Supreme Court, has plenary powers in dealing with foreign affairs, but the Congress alone has the power to declare war.

The Executive is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, but the Congress has to vote the money to support that Army and Navy.

The Executive and the Members of Congress are elected by the people.

Now, you ask—what has that got to do with the present situation? Just this: Between 80 and 85 percent of our people have indicated clearly that they do not want the managers of government to commit any overt act that would precipitate this country into this war. The elected representatives of the people are aware of that fact. It would be a serious tragedy at this time for either the Executive, or any of his officers, or the Congress to disregard the wishes of the people.

In my opinion, there isn't over 1 percent of the people of this country who can be classified as interventionists, and probably there isn't over 5 percent of the people who could be classified as strict isolationists. In between these two groups are found the great mass of the American people who are calmly appraising the international situation; who are aware of the terrible tragedies and the cost of war; who realize that this Nation has been set apart for a great and noble purpose.

Now, are these people lulled into false security on this great issue today? Not at all. They are in favor of an adequate defense. They are standing back of the national policy of aid to Britain, recognizing that as long as the war is confined to Europe there is little or no possibility of it coming to America.

Is this group downhearted or filled with the spirit of defeatism? Not at all. They are conscious of the power of 131,000,000 people. They are also conscious of the obligations which they owe to the present and to the future generations of America and of the earth. They want this country to remain safe, and free, and at peace.

They are also conscious of the fact that other nations wanted to remain safe, free, and at peace, and have been overrun and conquered, and they know that if any other nation commits an overt act of war against this people that 131,000,000 people will respond as one man to the defense of this Nation and the principles for which this Nation stands.

Everyone is aware of the fact that great waves of propaganda are being poured out over America. By being aware of this situation—not being asleep—the American people are becoming more and more discriminating in their thinking. They are weighing everything and they are casting out the dross. We are resisting propaganda, because we want to do everything that is right to avoid involvement in this war. We want to avoid the bankruptcy of a great people, and we want to avoid the needless waste of life and property, and we want to keep intact the great institutions which are called American, the institutions which have been minted out of the struggles of a thousand years. Of course, we shall be ready for any emergency. We will be strong, and if any one people or group of people challenges our way of life, we will be ready to defend it. But we do not want foreign influences to determine the course we shall take.

Yes; we Americans are thinking things through with courage and vision. We know we have enough to do to love America without hating any other people. Of course, we hate wrong. We Americans stem from all the national roots of Europe, but when our forebears came over here they uprooted themselves from the hates and the strifes and the limitations and the "isms" of Europe. So

now we are thinking more and more about American values, the American way of life.

For years we have been accepting all the privileges that result from being an American—now we are awakened to the fact that there are obligations which we must fulfill, and we are meeting those obligations head-on by willingly sacrificing our material means to sustain government in this great emergency. But we want our Government managers to sustain America also.

We do not believe in meddling in foreign affairs. We realize, of course, that a great international poker game is on, but we Americans want to stay out of that game. Why? Because we feel that the hour is coming when we shall, indeed, have an opportunity to serve tired, hungry, dying humanity, and we feel we can best serve America by keeping out of the European holocaust.

The hour is probably nearer than we think when hungry, exhausted Europe will want a helping hand, when they will need food and clothing and succor.

I am continually asked, Will America get involved in this war? In my opinion, we are further away from it now than we were 6 months ago. I do not say that war is inevitable. It is my fervent conviction that American involvement, if our leaders keep their heads, is not necessary.

We have heard a great deal said about unity. America is unified on defense, on keeping out of this war, but not for involvement. I repeat what I said before—that if we are attacked, if any other nation strikes at the Western Hemisphere, there will be 131,000,000 people back of the Commander in Chief.

In the bewildered, confused, chaotic thinking and loose statements which have sometimes characterized the discussions of our foreign affairs one thing is certain—we are not prepared for a European war.

We do not have 50,000 mechanized troops. We do not have a two-ocean Navy. We could fight a defensive war on our side of the Atlantic, but we are not prepared to send an expeditionary force abroad.

I am wholeheartedly for every measure which will bulwark America's defenses. I believe we should arm to the teeth. I believe in an independent air arm, a great fleet, and mobile, fast-moving, synchronized, mechanized units.

I want to see the Nazi machine and everything it represents completely annihilated—and, consequently, I believe in aid to Britain, but not to such a degree that it impairs our defenses or leads us to commit an overt act of war.

I believe in the four freedoms, and I believe in anything and everything which will keep them alive here at home.

In these days, which try men's souls, I believe in sacrifice to build our defenses strong. I believe in sacrifices for labor, management, the consumer, the taxpayer, and also for a government which must cut out its expensive nondefense frills.

I believe fervently that Congress must not surrender its powers; that the Executive must not usurp the congressional power to declare war by committing an overt act which would rob Congress of any alternatives.

Above all, in these dark hours, in the twilight zone of world decency, I believe in the American people. I believe in the average American citizen who keeps his head and maintains his mental balance. I believe in the American people who, without bias or prejudice, without hatred or malice, are providing the mental ferment which will cleanse America of any sectionalism, bigotry, or hate.

I repeat, when our fathers came to this country they left the other country because of economic, political, social, religious, or other reasons; but they left it, and when they came here they dug their roots deep down in the soil of America, and they became a peculiar breed. Whether they stem from Ireland or Poland or England or Germany or Scandinavia or France, they became not German-Americans, Irish-Americans, or Scandinavian-Americans, but they became Americans. In doing that they severed their connections with all the hatreds of Europe and all the limitations of Europe, with all the viciousness and all the barriers that the centuries had built up in Europe. They cast out those things, and when they came here they became a peculiar people. We call ourselves Americans. We as a people—and that is history—do not believe in meddling in foreign affairs.

I have faith in the American people who believe we have enough to do to love, preserve, and protect things American—the American way of life and the great freedoms. We hate the ideologies of the dictators of Europe, but we are realistic, and we recognize the significant fact we have a great job to do here in the Western Hemisphere. Because I have faith in the American people I believe we will keep America safe, free, and at peace.

President Roosevelt's Labor Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 1, 1941

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD was included the privilege of including the Labor Day address of the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, delivered today at Hyde Park, N. Y., over a national hook-up. Mr. Speaker, this timely and appropriate address follows:

On this day—this American holiday—we celebrate the rights of free laboring men and women.

The preservation of these rights is now vitally important, not only to us who enjoy them but to the whole future of Christian civilization.

American labor now bears a tremendous responsibility in the winning of this most brutal, most terrible of all wars.

In our factories and shops and arsenals we are building weapons on a scale great in its magnitude. To all the battle fronts of the world these weapons are being dispatched, by day and by night, over the seas and through the air. And this Nation is now devising and developing new weapons of unprecedented power toward the maintenance of democracy.

WE DO NOT COVET TERRITORY

Why are we doing this—why are we determined to devote our entire industrial front to the prosecution of a war which has not yet actually touched our own shores?

We are not a warlike people. We have never sought glory as a nation of warriors. We are not interested in aggression. We are not interested—as the dictators are—in looting. We do not covet one square inch of the territory of any other nation.

Our vast effort and the unity of purpose which inspires that effort are due solely to our recognition of the fact that our fundamental rights—including the rights of labor—are threatened by Hitler's violent attempt to rule the world.

These rights were established by our forefathers on the field of battle. They have been defended—at great cost but with great success—on the field of battle, here on our own soil, and in foreign land and all the seas all over the world.

RIGHTS INTERDEPENDENT

There has never been a moment in our history when Americans were not ready to stand up as freemen and fight for their rights.

In times of national emergency one fact is brought home to us clearly and decisively—the fact that all of our rights are interdependent.

The right of freedom of worship would mean nothing without freedom of speech. And the rights of free labor as we know them today could not survive without the rights of free enterprise.

That is the indestructible bond that is between us all—all of us Americans—interdependence of interest, privileges, opportunities, responsibilities, interdependence of rights.

That is what unites us—men and women of all sections, of all races, of all faiths, of all occupations, of all political beliefs. That is why we have been able to defy and frustrate the enemies who believed they could divide us and conquer us from within.

ENORMOUS PRODUCTION GAINS

These enemies all know that we possess a strong Navy—gaining in strength. They know that that Navy—as long as the Navies of the British Empire and the Netherlands and Norway and Russia exist—can together guarantee the freedom of the seas. These enemies know that if these other navies are destroyed, the American Navy cannot now or in the future maintain the freedom of the seas against all the rest of the world.

These enemies know that our Army is increasing daily in its all-round strength.

These enemies know that today the chief American fighters in the battles now raging are those engaged in American industry, employers and employees alike.

These enemies know that the course of American production in the past years has shown enormous gains and that the product of these industries is moving to the battle fronts against Hitlerism in increasing volume each day.

But these enemies also know that our American effort is not yet enough—and that unless we step up the total of our production and more greatly safeguard it on its journeys to the battlefields, these enemies will take heart in pushing their attack in old fields and new.

HITLER NOT YET STOPPED

I give solemn warning to those who think that Hitler has been blocked and halted that they are making a very dangerous assumption; when in any way your enemy seems to be making slower progress than he did the year before, that is the very moment to strike with redoubled force—to throw more energy into the job of defeating him—to end for all time the menace of world conquest and thereby end all talk or thought of any peace founded on a compromise with evil itself.

And we know that a free labor system is the very foundation of a functioning democracy. We know that one of the first acts of the Axis dictatorships has been to wipe out all the principles and standards which labor has been able to establish for its own preservation and advancement.

Trade-unionism is a forbidden philosophy under these rule-or-ruin dictators. For trade-unionism demands full freedom of expression and peaceful assembly. Trade unionism has helped to give to everyone who toils the position of dignity which is his due.

The present position of labor in the United States as an interdependent unit in the life

of the Nation has not come about by chance. It has been an evolutionary process of a healthy democracy at work.

Hitler has not worked that way. He will not; he cannot work that way. Just as he denies all rights to individuals, he must deny all rights to groups—of labor, of business, of learning, of the church. He has abolished trade unions as ruthlessly as he has persecuted religion.

LABOR HAS STAKE IN VICTORY

No group of Americans has realized more clearly what Nazi domination of the world means than has organized labor, what it means to their standard of living, their freedom, their lives. No group has a greater stake in the defeat of nazi-ism, in the preservation of the fundamental freedoms, in the continuance of democracy throughout the world.

We have already achieved much; it is imperative that we achieve infinitely more.

The single-mindedness and sacrifice with which we jointly dedicate ourselves to the production of the weapons of freedom will determine in no small part the length of the ordeal through which humanity must pass.

PRECEDENCE FOR DEFENSE

We cannot hesitate, we cannot equivocate in the great task before us. The defense of America's freedom must take precedence over every private aim and over every private interest.

We are engaged on a grim and perilous task. Forces of insane violence have been let loose by Hitler upon this earth. We must do our full part in conquering them. For these forces may be unleashed on this Nation as we go about our business of protecting the proper interests of our country.

The task of defeating Hitler may be long and arduous. There are a few appeasers and Nazi sympathizers who say it cannot be done. They even ask me to negotiate with Hitler—to pray for crumbs from his victorious table. They do, in fact, ask me to become the modern Benedict Arnold and betray all I hold dear—my devotion to our freedom—to our churches—to our country. This course I have rejected—I reject it again.

PLEDGES DEFEAT OF HITLER

Instead, I know that I speak the conscience and determination of the American people when I say that we shall do everything in our power to crush Hitler and his Nazi forces.

American workers and American farmers, American businessmen, and American churchmen—all of us together—have the great responsibility and the great privilege of laboring to build a democratic world on enduring foundations.

May it be said on some future Labor Day by some future President of the United States that we did our work faithfully and well.

Election of Representative in First Wisconsin District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 2, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me at Kenosha, Wis., on August 27 entitled "Why I Would Vote for Mr. Smith."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I WOULD VOTE FOR MR. SMITH

I am happy to be in Kenosha to speak to my many friends here. We are engaged in a very important political campaign. The eyes of the Nation are centered upon the First Congressional District of Wisconsin.

I am happy to be here to endorse the Republican nominee for the high office of Congressman of this district.

In the discussion that I shall carry on this evening I shall not engage in any personalities; I shall not attempt to tell the voters of this district how they shall vote; that is their personal right. I shall, however, present the important issues involved in this congressional fight. I said the eyes of the Nation are on this contest. The results may act as a barometer showing the pulse of the Nation.

The former incumbent of this high office, Stephen Bolles, was a personal friend of mine. He was a very able public official. This district honored itself in sending a man of his character and ability to Washington. This district is a sane-thinking district. Its voters are people of judgment. By and large, there isn't any hysteria here. The people are looking the world situation square in the face.

If I were a voter in this district, I would support Mr. Smith for the following reasons:

First. He is a man of experience, trustworthy and fearless.

Second. He is a clear thinker—a sound thinker.

Third. He is a lawyer of high standing—a student of government.

His work for years has trained him in the art of sensing the issue. It is very important now in Washington that we have clear thinkers—men who will not be swept off their feet.

I have been told that pressure is being brought to bear on certain groups in this district.

Just as I would not attempt to tell any man how he should vote, so as long as this country remains free I feel each man and woman should be free from any group pressure—free to determine how he or she shall vote. I am told that there is an attempt to interject into the present situation an element of labor or anti-labor. I don't believe that that will work. Why? Because there is no place for such an argument in this contest. If Mr. Smith goes to Washington he will go there representing all the people of this district, the same as I represent all the people of the State of Wisconsin in the Senate of the United States.

When I was elected as your Senator certain labor unions were told to vote against me. I spoke to labor in the mills, in the shops. I told them how I had labored in the mills, in the sawmills of the North. I told them how, if we were going to keep America strong, we had to keep out of our politics and our economy the racketeers and those who stand for disintegrating our country. I drew the picture how in Germany the leaders without vision had created classes who hated each other, who got to fighting each other, who would not work with each other. There was no unity, no cohesion, and the result was that a Hitler arose.

Unionism has its place. Management has its place in our economy. Communism, nazi-ism, and fascism, however, have no place in our free America.

There are those in our land who are working for a post-war period which will give them the opportunity to become a Hitler or a Mussolini or a Stalin. It is for you and me to do our part to see that they don't get that opportunity.

We are all in the same boat, labor, farmer, merchant, and management. That boat is called America. If it goes down, we all go down. It won't go down, if we pull together. If we do not work together the consequences may be dire.

Now, Mr. Smith is sympathetic toward labor, he is sympathetic toward the man who has to meet the pay roll. He wants an ordered society. He wants this Nation to grow and develop. He does not want buccaneers in capital, in labor; he wants sane men, calm men, honest men to work out the destiny of this country.

I understand that another issue which has been interjected into this picture is that of "support the President." I think the real issue should be phrased, "Will the leaders follow the will of the people?" Let me draw a picture for you. Except for a very few people, the American people want to stay out of this war. Probably 1 percent of the people could be called interventionists. Probably 5 percent could be called strict isolationists. In between is the common mass of American people who are calmly thinking this world situation through. They know that other nations desired peace and got war and slavery. Therefore all America is in favor of a defense program—a defense program which will be adequate, effective to accomplish the purpose in mind. Where then is the difference that exists? It is very simple.

We are a republic. A peculiarly formed government. The President is given certain powers. He is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He is in full control of foreign affairs, except as the Constitution limits his authority.

But the Congress alone has the power to declare war. If 80 to 90 percent of the people are against involvement in a foreign war unless we are precipitated into it by the overt act of some other nation then the constitutional power to declare war by the Congress should not in any manner be invaded by the Executive. Now, Mr. Smith takes his stand on good constitutional ground. He recognizes the authority of the President in relation to handling foreign affairs, but he insists also that neither the President nor any Army or Navy officer must be guilty of an overt act which would precipitate this country into war.

Now let's make one situation clear. Mr. Smith, because he takes this stand, in no way indicates any approval of the philosophy for the acts of Hitler. Mr. Smith is a realistic man. He senses the imperative need of getting this country prepared on land and sea and in the air. I need not tell this audience who read the newspapers that we are not prepared on the land or in the air to wage any war. In spite of the columnists and all those who insist that we should get into a fighting war it is just common sense that we do not involve ourselves in war. If you are going to take a tiger by the tail you have got to have something to knock his head off with. And we are not prepared after 2 years of this administration's preparedness.

As to aid to Britain, Mr. Smith has said that this is a national policy declared by the Congress. Even without the lease-lend bill we were sending England all the aid possible. Today she is getting 90 percent of our airplane production in bombers and fighters. Churchill, in his recent speech Sunday, told of a convoy of 70 ships sailing toward Britain from America. You don't have to worry about Mr. Smith backing up the President if the President is right. The real rub is, Will the President back up the people? Mr. Smith will back the President in all matters where he has the authority to act, but he will not be back of the President if he exceeds his constitutional authority or if, without the act of Congress, he attempts to precipitate this country into war.

This war situation requires common sense. While the sympathies of all America are with

Britain; while we here in this land stem from all the blood streams of Europe, we must remember that we are not British-Americans, German-Americans, or Polish-Americans. We are a peculiar breed called the American. We owe a primary obligation to America, and that involves this responsibility that we must not lose our head by an emotional spree. Just stop and think; if you were a Britisher you would do everything you could to bring America into the fight on the side of Britain. If you were a Nazi follower you would do everything you could to stop it. Now, if that is true, we must be very careful in our reactions in what way re read here, what we read in the papers, and what we hear over the radio. How much of it is propaganda? How much of it is truth?

In my opinion it is all-important that you send men to Washington who will think things through, who will not simply be "yes men."

I don't want to become partisan in this argument, yet I think it is imperatively necessary that you have men in Washington to represent you who have a little financial sense, who know what a dollar is because they have sweated for it, who know the obligation of a trustee, and who will not spend our money foolishly. In the last 8 years your Government has run into the red $3,500,000,000 a year. This year we will run $10,000,000,000 into the red. Next year it is estimated we will run into the red somewhere between ten and fifteen billion. Does labor or management believe that their big business of government can carry on indefinitely that way? There are some so-called liberal thinkers and communistic thinkers in Washington who want this Government to smash up. Mr. Smith is not that sort of a chap.

Now, Mr. Smith does not want war, and neither do you; but if anyone attacks this country or this hemisphere, he will be, like all of you, for a total defense of America and what she stands for.

There is another phase of this matter that I think should appeal to you. Mr. Smith is not a crackpot artist. He has no notion that 2 times 2 by legislation can be made to equal 5. He knows that government is just as good and just as sound as the people who constitute it.

As I understand, there is an appeal by the President and his group that Smith be defeated, and I think the people of this district will resent these tactics. Even in the South, which is solidly Democratic, they resented interference of this kind.

In speaking for Mr. Smith you notice I have said nothing about his opponent. You people have to judge; you people have to determine what kind of a man you want to represent you in Washington. As I stated before, it is all-important now that we have men who think straight, who act straight, and who live straight—men like Mr. Smith, who devotedly love their country and its institutions; men who have courage and vision.

There is another reason why Mr. Smith should be sent to Washington, as I see it:

It is not a healthy thing for government, for the general welfare of its people, that one party remain in power over any extended time. It is not a healthy thing that the Democrats constantly maintain the control of the House and the Senate. These sentiments have been expressed from the earliest period of our history down to the present time by great political observers.

Power entrusted in one man's hands or a group of men's hands over an extended period of time becomes autocratic.

In my opinion, it would be a healthy thing to turn out all the bureaucrats in Washington. When we got into this war situation, Roosevelt turned to the practical men in the Nation. He got rid of his "brain trusters," most of them, and his theorists.

If you send Mr. Smith to Washington, it will be equivalent to saying that you people here in this district would like to have the administration cut out a lot of unnecessary spending. You would be saying, "Get an adequate defense, but don't waste our money in getting it; cut down the disbursements made for a lot of nondefense items; when you spend the people's money, see that you get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar spent."

When Hoover went out of office he was called a bureaucrat. On June 30 of 1941, there were almost three times as many executive civil service employees in Washington as there were on June 30, 1932, and since that time the number of civil service employees in Washington has been tremendously increased along with increases in noncivil service Federal employment, and that makes the present powers dangerously near autocratic.

Send Mr. Smith to Washington, and his very going will operate as a check on the excesses of this administration.

After all, you and I cannot pass the buck. We are custodians of America. We are the builders of the present. What America is going to be will be determined by our acts.

I am not a fearist or a defeatist. I am aware of the fact that the international war situations has relegated to the background the mistakes of the last 8 years. The people of this country elected Mr. Roosevelt as President in 1940, but they didn't elect him to become the Congress of the United States or to become the Supreme Court. He has his functions to perform.

Now we want a man to go from this district to Washington who will recognize that as a legislator he has functions to perform independent of the White House. That does not mean that he has to disagree with the President's ideas on all fronts. It does mean that he will be independent and judicial and patriotic.

In perilous times it is imperatively necessary that the legislative branch of government and the executive branch cooperate and yet operate as a check on each other. In Germany, Italy, and Russia the executive branch of government obliterated the legislative branch. That must not happen here. That it shall not happen here, it is necessary that we elect independent Representatives to represent us in Washington.

Comment on Appointment of Mr. Biddle as Attorney General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 2, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM LEADING NEWSPAPERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, recently the President of the United States appointed Mr. Francis Biddle Attorney General. Mr. Biddle's appointment to this high office comes as a recognition of his qualifications and is a natural promotion to a high an honorable office, a promotion which is well deserved and with which I am in hearty accord.

In this connection it gives me pleasure at this time to ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD certain editorials from leading newspapers of the United States concerning Mr. Biddle's appointment. These editorials speak for themselves.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 26, 1941]

NEW ATTORNEY GENERAL

The promotion of Solicitor General Francis Biddle to be Attorney General brings into the Cabinet one of the earliest and stanchest members of the New Deal, but withal, one of the least conspicuous of those who have been prominent in the inner circles of the Roosevelt administration.

Scion of the famous Philadelphia family whose name he bears, and a descendant on his mother's side of Edmund Randolph, first Attorney General under Washington, Mr. Biddle, one-time Bull Mooser, was named chairman of the old Labor Relations Board in N. R. A. days, after a successful law practice in which he battled with equal vigor on behalf of well-entrenched corporations and not-so-well-entrenched citizens whose cause was appealing. Later, he was special counsel for the congressional committee investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority, and then a member of the Third Circuit United States Court of Appeals, relinquishing this life appointment to the bench to become Solicitor General.

In the Department of Justice, he enjoyed a sympathetic association with Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, whom he now succeeds, and in consequence assumed much of the administrative detail that ordinarily falls to the Attorney General, while also carrying on his regular duties as chief counsel for the Government. He successfully argued the constitutionality of the Wages and Hours Act and the Federal Power Act in the Supreme Court, while at the same time directing the administration of the Alien Registration Act under which approximately 5,000,000 noncitizens were listed and fingerprinted by the Department without a hitch.

To each task, Mr. Biddle has brought thoroughness and intensity of purpose, and his new responsibilities no doubt will be discharged in the same spirit.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of August 27, 1941]

IN PRAISE OF MR. BIDDLE

To the New York Herald Tribune:

A consistent reader of your always lively and stimulating editorial page, I was shocked this morning to see your unfair editorial on the nomination of Mr. Francis Biddle as Attorney General of the United States.

It is true that Mr. Biddle has been loyal to the President. But does loyalty disqualify a man for a high post?

It is not true that Mr. Biddle's career in public office has been undistinguished. His brilliant record at the Harvard Law School, his successful career at the bar in Philadelphia, his record as judge of the circout court of appeals, and his excellent handling of the heavy responsibilities in the Department of Justice both before and since the elevation of his former chief, Mr. Jackson, to the Supreme Court are all ignored in your analysis.

And, what is perhaps most important, your editorial writer forgot, apparently in his haste to make the deadline, the vital significance at this critical time of having as Attorney General a man whose whole record, both private and public, gives assurance that, no matter how inflamed public opinion might become in the event the United States were drawn into war, hysteria and witch hunting

would find no support in the office of the Attorney General.

JAMES G. MCDONALD.

BROOKLYN, *August 26, 1941.*

[It is a pleasure to be able to agree heartily with Mr. McDonald's final point.—Editor.]

[From the New York Times of August 27, 1941]

ATTORNEY GENERAL BIDDLE

Mr. Roosevelt has been a little slow to appoint Francis Biddle, who has been Solicitor General, Assistant Attorney General, and Acting Attorney General, to the office for which he has had so much experience and high qualifications. He has been a member of the bar for almost 30 years. Lawyers who have been counsel with or against him speak with respect of his talent and his learning. As Chairman of the National Labor Board, chief counsel of the committee that investigated the Tennessee Valley Authority, and Federal judge, he has shown, most of all, a certain moderation and flexibility of mind. As a judge, according to the circumstances of the case, he has supported the closed shop and the company union, and he has held that an employer cannot be compelled to reinstate a striker for whom there is no work and who has not been replaced by another.

Of his work in the Department of Justice, one remembers particularly his good sense about the registration of aliens and his defense of civil liberties. He is no timeserver. He has no itch for popularity. He was one of Mr. Justice Holmes' private secretaries. We like to think that from that noblest liberal of them all he learned to have a clear, open, and independent mind. Men on the left side of the street say he is too conservative. On the right side they say he is too radical. That is a pretty good sort of reputation. We may differ with him more than occassionally, but always with the regard due to an accomplished, thoughtful, courageous man.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Record of August 27, 1941]

THE BIDDLE APPOINTMENT

Some appointments are "naturals." One such is President Roosevelt's nomination of Solicitor General Francis Biddle as Attorney General of the United States.

Biddle's whole career; his exceptionally broad experience in Government administration as well as law; his temperament and sheer ability—all these fit him eminently for the Nation's highest legal office.

That Biddle's manifold qualities are recognized generally is evident in the widespread and hearty approval of his appointment—approval from conservative as well as liberal sources.

In the Senate the accolade has been so pronounced as to suggest unanimous as well as swift confirmation. Even conservative leaders who fought Biddle in the old days, when he was Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, hail his advancement because they know he is as sincere as he is able; that he will not permit partisanship to warp his sense of justice.

To the Record, this warm support of an outstanding liberal is encouraging indeed. It betokens, we believe, a gradual but steady closing of that rift in American ranks which New Deal reforms necessarily and inevitably engendered.

Major change is always a difficult dose for the opposition to down. But recognition of Francis Biddle's record in both private and public affairs overrides partisanship. So has the willingness of many Republican leaders to put political prejudice aside to stand behind President Roosevelt in the task of arming and defending this Nation.

Philadelphians naturally are proud that Francis Biddle is chosen to join the President's Cabinet. They have watched his career with interest and affection. They remember his early days as secretary to Supreme Court Justices Holmes, his private legal career in Philadelphia, and the recent period in which he has been one of the keymen of the Roosevelt New Deal, serving not only as N. L. R. B. Chairman but as counsel for the congressional investigation of T. V. A., judge of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, and as Solicitor General.

Yet, amid these manifold activities, Biddle took an active interest in Pennsylvania affairs, also. He served on the committee on special policing in industry named by Gifford Pinchot. He drafted major changes in State laws during the Earle administration, organized the Philadelphia branch of the Foreign Policy Association, fought notable cases for the Civil Liberties Union—and, in his spare time, wrote a novel, short stories, reviews, and legal articles.

This brief summary is enough to show the breadth of viewpoint and agility of mind of our Attorney General-designate. We have not the slightest doubt he will more than uphold the record of his 57 predecessors in the office.

In extending our own congratulations to Francis Biddle, we feel, too, that we are offering the every good wish of all his friends and neighbors here in the home town. He has, indeed, made good.

Sugar Act Administered to Detriment of American Sugar Beet Farmers and Processors

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 1, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, sugar-beet farmers and processors, as well as all others having knowledge of the importance of this valuable industry to our national economy, must be bewildered indeed by the gyrations of the administration in attempting, on the one hand, to convince our beet-growing farmers that it at all times acts solely in their interests and, on the other, takes advantage of every opportunity to so administer the Sugar Act as to increase the sugar allotment of the Cuban sugar companies to the detriment of our American farmers who desire to grow more beets, and to the embarrassment and disgust of the processors when, for month after month, they are prevented from marketing their stocks on hand.

The latest Agricultural Department press release on sugar, dated August 29, 1941, announced an increase of approximately 1,000,000 tons allotment to the various areas supplying the United States market, thus bringing the "presumed" consumption for the year up to the staggering figure of 9,002,976 tons, a figure utterly fantastic, provided it represents the best judgment of those in the Department whose duty and responsibility it is to prophesy the probable consumption.

Actual consumption will not even approach this figure. To make this possible, the people of this country must increase their consumption of this commodity approximately two and one-quarter million tons over that of last year, or almost exactly 33 percent. Fantastic? It is worse than fantastic. These figures indicate that somewhere, lurking in the vicinity of the wood pile, will be found the proverbial Ethiopian.

While our continental producers still have on hand small quantities of last year's sugar crop, they by no means have enough, even though they were permitted to dump it all on the market at one time, to disturb or to interfere with the program of the Agriculture Department to open our market to the Cubans for an additional 375,609 tons of sugar. To quote from the release:

> While it is not known at the present time whether the continental beet Puerto Rico and foreign countries other than Cuba will deliver this year as a result of their increased quotas, the present revision will enable Cuba to market in this country 375,609 tons more.

Let me again remind the folks that the money invested in Cuban sugar activities is very largely American money; that the benefits to the Cuban peon resulting from our sugar policy are meager, indeed, while the benefits to the owners are most generous. Consequently, the ordinary Cuban people, the farmers, the workers, and others in modest circumstances have not realized an increase in their purchasing power sufficient to enable them to buy more American products to a noticeable degree, this being the assumed objective of the administration in establishing this policy.

Let me again remind the people also that the only time the American housewife is compelled to pay an exorbitant price for her sugar is when the Cubans can control the price by withholding their imports to this country. This occurred in 1920 and again in 1939.

On August 12 last Mr. Leon Henderson, Price Administrator, because of the rapidly rising price of raw sugar—which controls the price of the refined product—fixed a maximum price of $3.50 per hundred pounds. The price had risen to $3.80. Under ordinary circumstances $3.50 would be considered a handsome price by those with raw sugar to sell. Not so at this time, however.

It is a well-known fact that Cuba's surplus is a large one. Under normal conditions she would jump at the chance to dispose of that surplus or any part of it at a price less than that fixed by Mr. Henderson. Strangely since that action was taken Cuban offerings have become scarcer than hens' teeth. It remains to be seen whether Mr. Henderson will keep the price where it is or whether the administration solicitude for those Cuban interests and the good-neighbor policy will bring about a modification of the mandate and an increase in the maximum price. Of course, the same objective can be reached by a reduction of the duty on Cuban sugar, and already we have heard rumblings of that.

All this is a matter of interesting speculation. The questions which arise in the minds of those of us who have been

informed about these matters are "Will the American housewife again be soaked for the sugar she buys; and, if so, how much and how long is this administration going to cooperate to that end?

Youth and American Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 2, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me on August 13 at Eau Claire, Wis., entitled "Youth and American Ideals."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, my friends, there are many reasons why I am particularly gratified to be with you this evening.

First of all, I appreciate the opportunity of visiting with so many old and valued friends and neighbors. Secondly, I agree wholeheartedly with the objectives of Kiwanis and of the 4-H Club movement; and, consequently, I want to do everything I can to advance these objectives.

It is fitting that Kiwanis and the 4-H organization should hold this joint meeting. The Kiwanis motto is "We build," and the 4-H organization is also concerned with building.

The 4-H organization has pledged its head to clearer thinking, its heart to greater loyalty, its hands to greater service, and its health to better living—for its organization, its community, and its country.

Today a large part of the world is at war. America has recognized certain dangers to our institutions, our great freedoms, and our way of life.

Each of us has a stake in the preservation and defense of our land. It is heartening, therefore, to know that a splendid group of young American citizens such as this group is concerned with the grave problems which confront our country today.

The front line of American defense will always be found in the hearts and minds of its people, particularly its young people.

The hopes, the aspirations, and the ideals of America are bound up inextricably with the lives of our youth. As long as American youth has the ideals and the spirit which groups such as this one evidence, just so long is our American heritage secure and our destiny assured.

I have read with great interest the seven-point program of the 4-H organization for national defense, and I can endorse its objectives.

First. Interpretation of the total national-defense program to the community.

Your 4-H organization reaches approximately 60 percent of all the farm youth, and in interpreting the problems of the day to these rural communities, you can perform a great constructive task.

In your pledge you pledge your head to clearer thinking. We need clear thinking today. We need mental balance and poise. We need the judicial appraisal and the perspective that a group like yours can give to our national thought.

We need thinking not only in terms of material values but in terms of the great spiritual values with which your group has always been concerned.

Everyone is aware of the fact that great waves of propaganda are being poured over our country. How important this is. If I could speak to every American, I would say: Be discriminatory. Put yourself in such a position that you can discriminate between what is false and what is fact. Put yourself in such a position that you realize that if you were an Englishman you would do all that you could to aid Britain by getting the United States into the war on Britain's side; and if you were a Nazi, you would probably do all you could to stop it, including sabotage and "fifth column" activities.

As Americans we must be realistic to that fact. We must recognize once and for all that there are great waves of propaganda going over the ether, through the motion pictures, through the newspapers, trying to influence our thinking, trying to unbalance us.

Today there is a great need for proceeding rationally and reasonably to find the issue and apply the truth to it.

Groups like this can resist propaganda and can play an important educational role in these trying times. A group such as this, without bias or prejudice, without hatred or malice, without racial rancor, can provide the mental ferment which will cleanse America of any sectionalism, bigotry, or hate.

A group such as this can call Americans up to the mount of vision, first showing them the greatness of America and the value of being an American, and shooting them through with a flame of patriotic fervor which will keep America safe, free, and at peace.

A group such as this, when it pledges its heart to greater loyalty, reaffirms its allegiance to this land, rekindles a patriotic flame, and recovenants our devotion to the American ideals.

In the defense of America, no force is greater than morale. Your group can make a great contribution to American morale.

Second. Production of food, clothing, and home equipment for better family living.

In the weeks and months that are up ahead, we will need not only planes and munitions and an army and a navy, but we will need rugged health and courage to face the problems of a war-torn world. We need a nation of people who are more fit, more vigorous, and with higher standards of health.

That means that we will have to put to work our scientific knowledge for the nutrition of all of our people. We have the capacity, the fertility of the soil, the equipment, the facilities for distribution—in fact, every element which we need to raise the standard of public health through better nutrition.

We need a strong people—a virile people. Your home-defense organizations can play an effective part in this field. The farmers are an integral part of our defense. They have been given a job to do, and they are doing it.

Third. Conservation of human and natural resources on the home farm and in the local community.

In a world of destruction it seems almost paradoxical to speak of conservation, and yet, oddly enough, it is in times of destruction that we most need sane, intelligent conservation. Our heritage is both physical and spiritual. A group such as this group is, in a sense, a trustee of this heritage.

It is our job not only to preserve this heritage to hand on to yet other generations but it is also our obligation to increase it for those who follow.

Fourth. Development of the health of the individual and the community.

The Surgeon General of the United States recently made the statement that we need higher standards of health for our people.

It has been said that less than one-fourth of our people are on a good diet, even when measured by the old standards.

These deficiencies in diet will require an increase in the production of farm products. I believe fervently that every drop of milk and every pound of butter which we convert into human protein foods represents a substantial advance in the front lines of our health defense.

The emergency today, instead of lowering our standards, should stimulate us to raise them and should serve as a foundation for our post-armament economy and our post-armament health standards.

We need to raise our people to the highest possible level of health and vigor, and we can find no finer examples of healthy young manhood and young womanhood than this group tonight.

Fifth. Acquirement of useful, technical, and mechanical skills.

For years I have urged the creation of a scientific laboratory of human skills and human initiative. We have become a great people. We have carved cities from the wilderness, and we have in the last half century seen more material progress than any race has ever seen since the beginning of time.

These things have resulted from great ideals, great arts, and great skills. Today, as never before, we need a reservoir of these skills so that in a battered and disillusioned world we can supply leadership and a progress directed not to the creation of more terrible war machines but an ever-improved social order bounded on the bedrock of American principles.

Sixth. Practice in an appreciation of the democratic way of life.

Your organization is well grounded in democratic procedures because it is conducted along democratic lines. Moreover, living as you do in close contact with the soil, you have a God-given sense of the fitness and the eternal rightness of our pattern of life—a pattern in which the far-flung threads of rural life throughout the Nation are an important part.

Seventh. Development of an understanding of the social and economic forces at work, particularly in the Western Hemisphere, and steps to take.

Destructive forces are at work today, not only in this land but throughout the world. It is well that you understand not only these destructive forces, these liabilities, but also the great values, the great assets, with which we can antidote subversive forces.

The American mind is stable and is not going to be swung off its balance by any form of propaganda or loose thinking.

Yes; we are thinking things through. We know that we have enough to do to love America without spending our time hating other peoples. Of course, we hate wrong. We have no time for the international marauder; we have no time for the international privateer, or the international rapist; but we have enough to do to think in terms of loving America.

When our fathers came to this country they left the other country because of economic, political, social, religious, or other reasons; but they left it, and when they came here they dug their roots deep down in the soil of America, and they became a peculiar breed. Whether they stem from Ireland or Poland or England or Germany or Scandinavia or France, they became not German-Americans, Irish-Americans, or Scandinavian-Americans, but they became Americans. In doing that they severed their connections with all the hatreds of Europe and all the limitations of Europe, with all the viciousness and all the barriers that the centuries had built up in Europe. They cast out those things, and when they came here they became a peculiar people. We call ourselves

Americans. We as a people—and that is history—do not believe in meddling in foreign affairs.

I have faith in the American people, and I have faith in the youth of America. Because I have faith in the American people, I believe we will keep America safe, free, and at peace.

Address by Hon. Alf M. Landon at Sparks, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 2, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by former Governor Alf M. Landon, at Sparks, Kans., on August 30, 1941.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, whose speech is it the Senator from Kansas desires to have printed in the RECORD?

Mr. CAPPER. A speech delivered by former Governor Alf M. Landon, of Kansas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, Governor Landon; I have no objection.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROOSEVELT-WILLKIE POLITICAL PROGRAM

There is an obvious attempt being made these days to smother political debate in this country. The national administration accuses the minority of playing partisan politics when it fulfills its duty of questioning and exposing, for discussion and debate, the record of that administration. This attempt to eliminate all opposition has reached the point that the row now is not over the question of whether the administration is doing wrong but that we who think the administration is making mistakes may not even debate it.

Always every administration tries to hurl the charge of cheap partisan politics at its critics. This is true whether national, State, or local.

Right now the administration is joined in this traditional political strategy by all those who think our country should be enlisted as an active belligerent in another foreign crusade to "save the world for democracy." This war party desires to encourage Mr. Roosevelt in his belligerent moves. Therefore they attribute to the opponents of going to war the meanest kind of partisan politics and the most unworthy motives.

It makes no difference to this war group that the opponents to war policies are standing on the platform pledges of both parties to the American people in the last campaign. Mr. Roosevelt himself, since the election, has abandoned all pretense of neutrality, and 's in the process of abandoning all pretense of "business as usual," which was one of his campaign slogans.

As I have said repeatedly in the past year, we shall not be able to conduct business as usual. We shall not be able to keep our social gains and high standard of living. It will be a long, tough fight.

I am glad to see the President showing some inclination toward a realistic view of this situation. Obviously, business as usual was impossible if we were to be the "arsenal of democracy" and the apostle of the "four freedoms" to all the world. Last week the President for the first time got close enough to brass tacks to tell the American people it was going to be a long, tough war. The American people are not weaklings. They are not laggards in defense of their country. They are not now seeking any "'fraid hole." So I welcome the President's belated recognition of the long, tough fight ahead of us, because "forewarned is forearmed."

Another important policy which the President announced was that he would cut normal expenditures—and they were far from normal to begin with—to offset the increase in appropriations necessary for national defense. But this has proven another forgotten promise.

The fact is that the President has made practically no attempt to cut what he calls normal expenditures. Despite our high taxes, our expenditures are exceeding our income, and we are adding to the national debt at the rate of $277.50 per second. That's not the total of our expenditures. It's what we are adding to our national debt. The national debt is now almost double what it was at the end of the last war. The World War debt reached a total of $26,596,701,648, and on August 13, 1941, our national debt reached $50,000,000,000, or almost double the World War debt. Yet the President says we must do more for the English and the Russians and the Chinese. In fact, he now agrees with some of the rest of us who have been saying that this is only the beginning, and yet there is not the slightest attempt by the President to reduce the current normal expenditures. Our breath-taking tax bill is only the beginning—a drop in the bucket—of what we will have to pay. Already investigating committees of the House and Senate have revealed startling waste and extravagance in national-defense preparations.

I agree with Senator BENNETT CLARK, of Missouri, who yesterday suggested that before we were through we would have a capital levy.

The criticism of the President's foreign policy has not come entirely from the Republicans. Neither has criticism of the President's handling of defense preparations come entirely from Republicans. As a matter of fact, the leaders of the criticism in both the issues have been distinguished members of the President's own party. They are not always the same ones. Some of the President's fellow Democrats in the Congress have been most vigorous in their criticism of the progress of our defense measures, and the President has answered them only with his usual wisecracks, and by the appointment of another board.

But the good administrator does not ignore the charges of responsible men, or answer them with wisecracks, as the President did the recent bill of particulars of Senator BYRD, of Virginia, regarding the failures of our defense program. We know we do not have sufficient modern equipment to train the draftees properly. We have confused and indefinite information as to the amount of material aid available at our ports for England, and the amount that is being lost and destroyed at sea.

It was bad enough before the war, when no one could be sure regarding the President's domestic policies; but it is tragic now, when we do need national unity, not to have a labor policy; not to know definitely what the administration's policy is toward private business; to have a vague but threatening authority, acting without authority of Congress, in the complex and difficult field of price control; to have the boys in camp describe our Army in letters home as "the finest unequipped army in the world."

The average American would like to see the Army situation straightened out. They would like to see the production snarls untangled. They would like to see us equipped for whatever war emergency arises. They are willing now, as they always have been, to give freely of their money and blood for the defense of America. But they would like to be better informed and, insofar as possible, taken into the confidence of their Government. We are not asking that important military secrets be revealed. But we wish the President had spoken for himself instead of quoting Mr. Lincoln. And I believe that you feel, just as I feel, that serious questions being asked by responsible persons are not being adequately answered. You would feel better, and I would feel better, if Mr. Roosevelt would answer these questions and stop his "wisecracking." This war situation is not a joke.

Another evidence of the real nonpartisan, instead of the partisan, position on these major questions of money and blood of the American people is the fact that a good majority of the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives north of the Mason and Dixon line voted against the extension of the Draft Act.

I personally was for the extension, because, as I have said, no one can question the fact that the President since the election has abandoned for the American people all pretense of neutrality. The ordinary ultimate result of such a policy is war. In the face of this obvious fact, I felt the President had maneuvered us into a position where we could not disband the only land defense we have.

I have said from the first that 1917 and 1918 would seem a picnic compared to this war. But once in it, we must fight through to a victorious end.

I have not indulged in any wishful thinking of "business as usual," of telling the American people that we would not have to sacrifice any of our social gains, as the President did up to and including his last "fireside chat," May 27. Or that we could win the war simply by naval and air forces. I have said from the beginning that it would take another A. E. F., and that is the recent view of the two highest field commanding British officers, Generals Wavell and Auchinleck.

As a matter of fact, I supported the President's foreign policy until he abandoned all pretense of neutrality and proposed making all the world safe from want and fear. It became not simply a case of stopping Hitler, but the President proposed to lick want and fear for every race in the world. And I did not feel that it was within our power to be a big brother to all the world.

Furthermore, when it became evident that the President was going further all the time in abandoning any pretense of neutrality, I felt that it was not a policy that all the American people should take on faith.

I am perfectly aware that a good majority of the American people do have faith in the President's repeated specific promises to keep us out of war. Therefore they are not disturbed by his belligerent foreign policy.

But always in our history in similar situations we have had the beneficial restraining effect of a minority who do not accept on faith all the policies or the claims of accomplishment of the administration in power. This is true of the Democrats when the Republicans are in power. It is true in every State and in every city and county administration. Yes; in every township.

Yet we are commencing to hear the demand of half-baked liberals that the time has come to suppress the right of free speech and the Bill of Rights. That demand was recently made on the Chicago University Round Table by a member of that faculty. It is strange that this attack on freedom would come from the self-styled liberal academic-freedom group itself.

For months we have witnessed the attempt to discourage the right of the nonpartisan minority to question and interpret the claims of the national administration, not only as to the dangers of its war policies but also its claim of satisfactory progress in national defense.

Let me read to you the latest, from the Topeka State Journal of August 28:

"WILLKIE-F. D. R. IN TWO-PARTY PURGE IN '42 ELECTION? OPPOSITION FOR OBSTRUCTIONISTS IN CONGRESS IS FORECAST

"(By Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen)

"WASHINGTON, August 28.—There was real political dynamite behind that letter President Roosevelt sent the Young Democrats' convention in Louisville blasting Democratic isolationists as 'obstructionists who are in the wrong party.'

"The scorching attack was a tip-off on undercover plans which may make next year's congressional elections the hottest in years.

"Nothing has been said about it, but certain administration and Republican leaders have discussed united Democratic and Republican forces to oppose all congressional isolationists regardless of party label.

"Under the proposed plan administration-G. O. P. backing would be thrown behind incumbent anti-isolationist Congressmen whether they are Democrats or Republicans. Furthermore, strong coalition candidates would be entered against isolationist Congressmen seeking reelection.

"One of the significant things about the plan is that it has the hearty approval of Wendell Willkie.

"Discussing it with a group of friends, the G. O. P. standard bearer declared: 'The people should have the opportunity in every senatorial and congressional election next year for a clear-cut expression of opinion on this all-important issue of foreign policy. This referendum should not be cluttered up with phony or inconsequential issues.

" 'In districts represented by isolationists we should put the strongest candidate in the field we can get, regardless of his party label or economic views. I'd like to see young men and women brought into this campaign. Let's get away from the old political hacks. Let's bring youth into this fight. It's theirs primarily, and they should be in the lead in it.

" 'Personally, I am prepared to support anti-isolationist candidates regardless of their party affiliation or economic views. If they are right on the foreign issue, then I will be for them and will take the stump for them.' "

My first thought was that this was too ridiculous to treat seriously. But my second thought was that here is a serious matter, not only for the Republicans but for all those opposed to the one-party system of Germany and Russia, and that dictated thought has no place in America.

Of course, we will have a referendum on the major question of foreign policy. But we will also have a referendum on the management of our national-defense preparations. If we are engaged in actual combat, the people are more apt to be interested in that than in who got us into it. That will come later. It is to be hoped that those engaged in the debate will not indulge in "mere campaign oratory," to quote Mr. Willkie's description of some of his own most serious charges in the last campaign. And it is to be hoped that everyone will state his policies definitely and forthrightly, in a way that is understandable to the average observant citizen. That, I think, time will prove the President has not done.

I want to say, right here and now, if Mr. Roosevelt keeps his specific promises, in view of his belligerent policies and abandonment of neutrality, of not sending another armed expeditionary force of American boys abroad, I will be the first to yield him credit for a job of masterly statesmanship.

But the course this new firm of Roosevelt and Willkie favors really means personal loyalty to the President. It means the attempt to eliminate from public life all who disagree with the President's policy. That is exactly the course Hitler and Mussolini and Stalin followed in building their power and maintaining it.

A healthy situation in popular government, whether it be in a municipality, State, or the Nation, requires the benefit of criticisms by the minority. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie would destroy this situation and deprive the country of the benefit of debate by its representatives in Congress, regardless of party. This carried to its logical conclusion, would mean the elimination of Congress as a constitutional check on the President, and set up an absolute dictatorship of one man.

Mr. Willkie is attempting to use the high position the Republican Party gave him to accomplish that end. Thus, fighting to preserve democracy in the world, we lose it at home. However, the Republican Party still belongs to the people, and as long as that is the case I do not think we will have a successful political pogrom.

We must let people talk and express their opinions in Congress, as well as elsewhere, regardless of whether we agree with them. That is the basis of Republicanism. If I am on one side of a question, and my neighbor is on the other side, no one on my side, as far as I am concerned, is going to tell my neighbor he can't express his political and religious opinions. Even if I do not agree with my neighbor, we are both American citizens.

I have said repeatedly since the election that if Mr. Roosevelt wishes to change the policies which he favored in that referendum, he should submit them to the people's representatives in the Congress. I supported Mr. Roosevelt in his opposition to the Ludlow bill calling for a referendum on war, on that ground. That is, that the people's representatives in the Congress should pass on the question of war or peace. And that was the way of a representative form of government. But the proposal of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie means, if it prevails, that we no longer have representative government.

What Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie do in the Democratic Party is not any Republican's business. But what Mr. Roosevelt attempts to do in the Republican Party, through the agency of Mr. Willkie, is every Republican's business.

Mr. Roosevelt has tried before to eliminate from his party many of its distinguished leaders, because they differed with him. In this he shows the same traits of demanding personal loyalty that Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin demand. The attempted purge by Mr. Roosevelt was unsuccessful in the Democratic Party. After the primary contests were over all the Democrats abided by the decision of the majority.

But Mr. Willkie proposes that the minority Republicans refuse to abide by the decision of the majority, and vote for the Democrats. Of course, that is highly satisfactory to Mr. Roosevelt.

Even in the midst of the stress and strain of war, the Parliament of Great Britain insists the Government's actions can be and they are reviewed. Even occasionally there has been held a vote of confidence for or against the policies. Certainly in this country neither Mr. Roosevelt nor Mr. Willkie should be permitted to take away from us this inherent right, granted by our Constitution, of reviewing in discussion and debate the policies of the United States Government.

Now, by this attempt we realize what the "iron hand in the velvet glove" means. Now we are witnessing the concrete effects of the repeated blank checks asked for and received by the national administration.

Now we are witnessing the concrete effect of centralization of too much personal power in the Nation's Chief Executive.

Now we are witnessing the concrete effects of what was meant when Republicans and some Democrats protested against a government of men instead of laws.

As far as I am concerned, I am going to continue to speak my mind; and I am going to insist on the freedom of others to speak their minds, whether on all points or no points I agree with them. While a declaration of war means that we will close ranks behind the flag, as we always do, it does not extinguish the rights of citizens to discuss the war and its prosecution. But the last one of us will fight for America, under any kind of leadership.

Duty on Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 2, 1941

STATEMENT OF NEBRASKA NON-STOCK COOPERATIVE BEET GROWERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a statement opposing a reduction in the duty on sugar filed by the Nebraska Non-Stock Cooperative Beet Growers' Association before the Committee for Reciprocity Information in connection with the forthcoming negotiations of a supplemental trade agreement with Cuba.

In the last few days the American refiners and the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply have been faced with a dilemma because of the refusal of Cuban sugar interests to sell their sugar in this market at the ceiling price of $3.50 a hundred pounds set by Mr. Henderson. This price nets them a higher return than they have received from sales to us for some time, and a much higher return than they receive from sales to Britain.

Last Friday Cuba received another favor in the form of a further increase in quota to 2,750,000 tons, an increase of over 1,000,000 tons over their last year's quota, or more than a 50-percent increase. Of course, domestic beet production also received a quota increase, but that does not mean anything, since we have not the sugar to sell because of the curtailment in acreage forced on us last spring in spite of the protests made by myself and other Senators in this Chamber and with the Department of Agriculture. One of our beet factories in Nebraska, that at Minatare, was forced to close down, as well as others in some of the other States, because of the cut in beet acreage, while Cuban sugar production was being financed by the Export-Import Bank.

Nevertheless, in spite of the favors already given to Cuba, it appears likely that the present administration, rather than hurt Cuban feelings, is willing to go still further and make whatever concessions may be necessary in order to satisfy Cuba, regardless of the cost to the American sugar farmer, and that, therefore, the duty on sugar will be reduced, freight rates will be reduced, and possibly even, as has been rumored, Cuban sugar will be bought by some agency of this Government at an advanced price. For this reason I do not expect that such representations as this will do any good, but I ask that this statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCOTTSBLUFF, NEBR.,
August 21, 1941.

CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION,
United States Tariff Commission Building, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The Nonstock Cooperative Beet Growers Association of Scottsbluff, Nebr., is a member of the National Beet Growers Association and represents some 4,000 sugar-beet growers of the North Platte and the South Platte River Valleys and the Lodgepole Creek Valley of western Nebraska, who grow the raw material (sugar beets) for six beet-sugar-factories located in this territory.

This great industry of producing and processing sugar beets into refined sugar has, within the last 30 years, become an enormous factor in the development of a community of many thousands of good industrious and honest people who through the encouragement of their Government built this splendid industry that now, in this territory alone, represents the investment of many millions of dollars in farm lands and factories and supports thousands of laborers in both the field and the factories. These lands and factories provide a large part of the tax money by which splendid schools and churches are maintained, contribute vastly to the support of our transportation systems, both railroads and public highways. And not the least of these contributions is our full quota of young men and money for defense of our country in this awful hour of dire necessity.

We are confirmed in the belief that we have an inherent right to the pursuit of this industry upon these lands, at a return for our product that assures the status of a respectable American citizenry. Any arbitrary action that lowers this standard will be met with the stern disapproval of our people.

We know of no just reason why an old and established as well as efficient domestic industry should be destroyed that foreign interests may be served, and that at the hands of our own Department of State.

This same Department of State has already in recent years unjustly and unwisely favored the sugar interests of Cuba in ways similar to the present proposed action. These have taken the form of Presidential orders reducing existing tariff rates, suspending quotas, as well as the manner of quota reinstatement.

Following closely Presidential action in lowering the tariff on Cuban sugar from $2 per hundred pounds to $1.50 per hundred pounds. The Department of State by trade agreement in 1934 further reduced the Cuban sugar tariff from $1.50 to 90 cents. This, together with the establishment of sales quotas gave Cuba an advantage in the American sugar market not shared by any other foreign sugar-producing area. Not only was Cuba's sales increased but the cash returns were greatly enhanced. The American producer received but one assurance in this agreement which was, that in case quotas were suspended or otherwise became inoperative the duty on Cuban raw sugar would automatically be restored to $1.50 per hundred pounds, as noted below this assurance was later lost.

During the period between 1934 and 1937 the amount of sugar Cuba might sell in the United States increased from 1,836,482 short tons to 2,148,951 short tons, the value of these sales increased from $55,217,000 to $103,808,000. Notwithstanding this highly favorable position of the Cuban producer, the Department of State gave notice on November 3, 1938, that it would negotiate a supplemental trade agreement with the Government of Cuba, and indicated sugar would be an item under consideration. The day before the Department gave domestic producers notice that it intended to negotiate the supplemental agreement, the Cuban dictator, Col. Fulgencio Batista, gave to the newspapers a story in which he set forth that an oral agreement had already been reached to reduce the tariff to 75 cents a hundred pounds. This interview was published in the New York Times, November 30, 1938.

"HABANA, November 29.—Col. Fulgencio Batista, Cuban chief of staff, said in an interview today that an oral agreement had been reached for reduction of the tariff on Cuban sugar entering the United States. In return, he said, Cuba would throw open her market for Louisiana rice and other North American products, manufactured and agricultural, and grant certain exemptions under her nationalistic labor laws.

"Formal negotiations for modifications of the present reciprocal trade treaty between the United States and Cuba will be started in a few days, he said. Reduction of the United States tariff on Cuban sugar will not affect the United States import quotas but will benefit Cuban growers by giving them a better price.

"Colonel Batista said the present tariff on Cuban sugar of 90 cents a hundredweight would be reduced to 75 cents, the maximum reduction President Roosevelt is permitted to make under his reciprocal trade powers.

"And we expect a further reduction when the United States Congress meets again, says Colonel Batista."

Batista's statement was denied by the State Department. Unfortunately, the incident created a grave doubt in the minds of not only our American industry but in the minds of certain legislative leaders as to whether the Department of State had not inadvertently exceeded its authority under the act to negotiate trade agreements before due notice had been given all parties at interest.

The supplemental agreement, when completed in late 1939, showed no reduction in the tariff. However, the agreement did take away from domestic producers virtually the only protection we were accorded in the first agreement, the provision which automatically restored the duty to $1.50 in case quotas were suspended or became inoperative for some other reason. The agreement did, however, contain a provision whereby the tariff would remain at 90 cents in case of a suspension of quotas. Thus, if the quotas were suspended now, the domestic producer would be subjected to the full weight of Cuban competition with but a 90-cent rate of duty, which is ridiculously inadequate to absorb the difference in cost of producing sugar in the United States as compared to costs in Cuba.

Only recently, through the Export-Import Bank, our Government provided the Cuban sugar industry with a loan of $11,200,000 to finance a production of 400,000 tons of sugar which could not have been produced without the financial assistance of this country. Our Government had thus placed itself in the position of furnishing assistance to an already overindulged foreign competitor of its own people while its Department of Agriculture had but recently compelled these same people to reduce the production of this identical commodity—sugar.

What further concessions the Department of State may contemplate granting to the sugar industry of Cuba is beyond the power of our imagination to conceive. However, the fact that the Department has announced its intention to negotiate is ample evidence that the Department has in mind some further concessions to that country.

It is our contention that by all rules of fairness and justice this Government has already seriously overindulged an impulse to befriend this foreign industry to the injury of its own domestic producers, and that rather than continue this unfair course in granting further concessions to a foreigner it should recall some of those favors already granted and bestow them upon its own people.

The statement of the National Beet Growers Association and the United States Beet Growers Association has been read, fully considered, and approved by representatives of our association.

We hereby include it as a part of our statement and request that it be so considered.

Yours very truly,

NEBRASKA NONSTOCK COOPERATIVE BEET GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
By CHAS. E. FRANKLIN, *President*.

National-Defense Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. BUELL SNYDER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 1, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. J. BUELL SNYDER, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, including a statement I made about 1 year and 3 months ago relative to what I thought the Nation's national-defense equipment should consist of, I have been reminded by some of my friends that my estimates were not far wrong.

When I made this statement July 11, 1940, some of my real friends spoke to me confidentially that I was too visionary. These same friends now come to me and tell me that they believe that my estimates were about right. The statement that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 11, 1940, follows. Since we did not start to build my superhighway system in 1936 or 1937, it now seems advisable that we stand by with that program till after this emergency, when we will have to find other employment for five or six million men who will be dropped from national-defense pay rolls.

Mr. Speaker, the statement I refer to as appearing in the RECORD of July 11, 1940, was as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, July 11, 1940]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to

include what I think is a conservative estimate for national-defense equipment and installations if we are to think in terms of protecting our country and the Western Hemisphere against foreign foes during the years to come. It goes without saying that the Government and industry must, and I feel sure will, speed up production at a rapid rate such as was never attempted or accomplished in this country. I hope I am wrong, but I am compelled to take into account recent acts and achievements of foreign powers who could and might be knocking on our back door, demanding admission to disturb our freedom and liberty-loving institutions as well as our very lives. I say I hope I am wrong, but taking these factors into consideration we must be prepared and keep prepared until such time that the war lords and conquerors across the water show us by their actions over a space of years that they no longer desire to disturb us. It will take at least five decades for them to show us this. Therefore we must prepare in a big way. I recommend that we equip the Nation with at least the following:

A. That we manufacture and have on hand by July 1, 1943, 100,000 airplanes of different types and kinds.

B. By July 1, 1943, we should have manufacturing facilities and plants in perfect maintenance and upkeep in order to be able to manufacture 1,000 airplanes a day if an emergency would arise.

C. We should have manufactured by July 1, 1943, 4,000,000 rifles, and facilities to manufacture 2,000 of them a day.

D. We should have by July 1, 1943, 4,000,000 machine guns of different types and kinds, with facilities to manufacture 2,000 a day.

E. We should have on hand by July 1, 1943, 75,000 tanks and armored cars of different types and description, with manufacturing facilities to produce 500 a day if necessary in an emergency.

F. We should have on hand by July 1, 1943, 2,000,000 antiaircraft guns of the finest and best type, with facilities to manufacture 1,000 a day.

G. We should have on hand by July 1, 1943, 100,000 antitank guns, with a certain percent of them capable of piercing 3-inch armor plate, with facilities to manufacture 500 a day.

H. We should have on hand by July 1, 1943, clothing, tentage, shoes, and full field-service equipment for 4,000,000 men.

I. We should have by July 1, 1943, manufacturing facilities scattered throughout the Nation to manufacture sufficient replacements for all these commodities at a speed necessary to assure equipment on hand in case of an emergency invasion of our shores or institutions.

J. By July 1, 1943, we should have completed at least three transcontinental superhighways, as outlined in my bill, H. R. 8503; that is, an eight-lane highway, following the general route of the Old National Pike, or Route 40, across the Nation, built as straight as possible, and with a grade of not more than 4 percent at any one place. The same type of highway should be built up and down each coast, some 30 to 60 miles from each coast. Of course, the other six highways embodied in my bill should be and will be built in time; but these three should be built without fail, to be used for the transportation of the commodities of commerce as well as a military road in case of necessity. Experts think this would be the cheapest national-defense installation, looking to the conservation of our whole Nation, that we could build. These three highways would cost about $4,000,000,000 to build them eight lanes, or 100 feet wide, with proper facilities along the highways.

K. We should have by July 1, 1943, about 2,000 air bases or air fields developed. In the interim the United States Army engineers should select throughout the Nation about 15,000 landing fields; that is, fields that, if an emergency day came, could be put into condition for landing planes within 48 or 120 or 168 hours. These should be circled within a radius of so many miles outside of each city that is considered a large industrial and manufacturing center.

L. By July 1, 1943, we should have several scores of underground hangers along our main highways, as well as underground storage facilities for our munitions. The hangars in time of battle are very essential, as discovered in the war now going on across the sea.

M. And, finally, we should have by July 1, 1943, sufficient munitions of all kinds in storage to use these guns and weapons for months, if necessary, without running out of munitions. The two things that hampered the French the most were traitors within her own ranks and, second, a shortage of munitions.

I have no doubt that some who read this will think that my estimates are exaggerated; that the program is too ambitious. Some will think it is not necessary to make such provisions. Others will think it is too expensive, and so forth.

But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that all of us are convinced that our way of life is worth preserving. We are convinced that our schools, our churches, and our homes are worth preserving.

We are convinced that this blessed endowment that we received from our forefathers called freedom of speech, freedom of press, and religious freedom, is worth fighting for. Yes, we are convinced that if we wish our children and our children's children to enjoy these blessings, we will have to build up a national defense that will insure their preservation. The partial recommendations that I enumerated above, I think we will find absolutely essential within the next score of years to defend our precious institutions. Yes, Mr. Speaker; we will have to eat fewer ice-cream cones, chew less chewing gum, burn less gasoline, deprive ourselves of a lot more things we classify as semiessential or pleasure and recreational adjustments, to provide this equipment. But it is better to have no equipment at all than to be one-fourth, one-half prepared.

We learned the lesson over and over again in the last year. We saw nation after nation in Europe that was one-fourth or one-half or one-tenth perpared, being ruthlessly run over—and, my fellow citizens, whenever a barbarous ruler directs his forces to run over a peaceful, God-fearing people like the people of Holland, Belgium, or similar nations, then it is time for us to prepare in a big way to see to it that no force will be able to run over us or to fly over us and destroy us.

The trouble is, my friends, that we here in America do not realize the horrors and hardships that result when a dictator takes over a country such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and so forth. We do not seem to realize that they kill off the educated and intelligent people. We do not seem to be aroused over the fact that they close all of the schools except the very elementary schools. We do not seem to understand that all the precious things that are near and dear to us would be wiped out under a dictatorship such as now reigns over Poland, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, and so forth. We do not seem to realize that our Negro slavery was heaven compared with the slavery that these conquered people have to endure.

Yes, my friends, I believe if you were in possession of the facts and background that I have as chairman of the appropriations subcommittee for national defense, you would agree with me that my suggestions or recommendations, if you please, enumerated above are moderate compared with the value of our liberties and our free country.

Price Fixing on Lumber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 1, 1941

STATEMENT BY M. L. SIGMON

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement made by Mr. M. L. Sigmon, of Monticello, Ark., at a meeting of citizens held in the office of the Governor of Arkansas on August 27, 1941, to protest the action of Mr. Leon Henderson in fixing prices for southern pine lumber. The statement of Mr. Sigmon clearly and concisely evidences the demoralizing effect on the lumber industry of the unwarranted action of O. P. A. C. S. Certainly neither the consumer or any other group is benefited or protected when an industry upon which a large part of our people are dependent for a livelihood is arbitrarily and unnecessarily strangled. The statement referred to is as follows:

I am a timber owner, and as such am very much interested in this meeting with you. I have gone into this question of pine price ceiling and from what I know of it, I have already determined I cannot afford to sell my timber on the basis lumber producers will be able to pay me, if Mr. Henderson's ceiling prices prevail.

I want to congratulate you, Mr. Governor, on the success you have had, not only in refinancing the State's indebtedness, but also on your success in securing additional new industry, as well as Arkansas' share of defense. However, as a timber owner, I am concerned less in your zeal to secure new industries in view of the fact that we say, perhaps, lose the oldest and biggest and most important industry of all—namely, the lumber industry.

In the first place, Mr. Governor, we want you to understand that we believe in the principle of price control during this emergency. We, however, would like to have this control exercised legally and intelligently by a commission or board which is familiar with the lumber business. President Roosevelt, himself, has recommended some legislation to legalize price control. His bill suggests that the price to be used is the market price prevailing on July 29, 1941, the day of his message to Congress. On that very day, the Government, itself, bought in Memphis millions of feet of lumber at public auction, attended by 80 mills, in open competition, at approximately $31 mill, net, for items which Mr. Henderson has set at $25. On August 13 and 14, only 2 days before Mr. Henderson established his ceiling prices on yellow pine, the Government again bought millions of feet of lumber for which it paid $31, mill, net, for items, again, on which Mr. Henderson fixed a ceiling of $25 per thousand.

These ceiling prices on yellow-pine lumber are the only ceiling prices that have been established up to date, so far as we know, that have not frozen the current market prices. On Arkansas soft pine, the ceiling prices have reduced the current market prices 25 percent. In the face of this, there has been approved a new minimum wage rate for

the southern lumber industry, which will shortly advance the minimum wage from 30 cents to 35 cents per hour. This is an increase of 16⅔ percent in wage costs, to say nothing of the tremendous advances in costs brought about by increases in the price of supplies.

These ceiling prices rate Arkansas soft pine along with North Carolina roofers. Whereas, through the years, Arkansas pine has continuously sold for a differential of $5 and up per thousand feet. Buyers for two generations have recognized this superiority in quality by the prices they willingly pay. It involves, among other things, substantially higher production costs. The ceiling price list has disregarded differentials in price as between grades, sizes, and lengths, which the trade has recognized for 40 years. Mr. Henderson brushes these natural differentials aside and writes his own ticket, establishing differentials that are simply ridiculous.

Dealing particularly with Arkansas soft pine, we quote from the Commercial Bulletin of Boston, dated August 23, 1941, the following:

"Worst blunders of the southern pine ceiling prices are two in number: Failure to recognize the wholesaler, who must get his profit by subterfuge or by a mill surrendering part of his ceiling price; second big blunder, failure to recognize superiority of lumber and higher costs of certain Southwestern and Gulf mills.

"Failure to recognize superiority and higher value of, let us say, Arkansas soft pine, is plain stupid. Buyers for two generations have recognized this superiority in the prices they willingly paid. And this superiority involves among other things, substantially greater production costs. For example, $58, mill, for 1 by 4 inch B rift flooring in both North Carolina and Arkansas, is just a bit screwy."

Now, this Commercial Bulletin of Boston is recognized throughout the country as one of the most trustworthy sources of information with reference to the markets on various commodities. They have no financial interest in lumber and their opinion is entirely disinterested and unprejudiced.

Again quoting from the Commercial Bulletin, we refer you to their issue of August 16, the day that Mr. Henderson published his price list, which issue shows the relative value of Arkansas soft pine as compared with pine from other southern territories. This authentic report of the New England market on that day shows Arkansas pine as carrying a premium in the upper grades averaging $25 to $30 per thousand feet. It also shows in the lower grades, such as 1 by 6 inches and 8 inches No. 2 common, a difference, delivered Boston, as between North Carolina and Arkansas pine, of $8 per thousand feet. A copy of this paper is here.

Looking at this situation from another angle, and dividing the yellow-pine producing area by the Mississippi River, records show that the sales of 8 representative east-of-the-Mississippi-River mills for the first 7 months of this year average $32.07 per thousand feet. Whereas for 11 identical mills west of the river for the first 7 months of 1941 a price of $37.32 prevailed.

If the ceiling prices as established by Mr. Henderson are permitted to prevail, in our opinion the effect on the State of Arkansas will be disastrous. Estimating the production of pine lumber at present in Arkansas at 950,000,000 feet per year means an annual income at today's market, averaging $32 per thousand, of $30,400,000. The cut occasioned by Mr. Henderson's prices averages $6 per thousand feet, or $5,700,000 yearly, assuming the same production were maintained, which, however, will not be the case. As a matter of fact, many mills have been operating 2 shifts, and all of them, on a basis of 50 hours or more per week, paying time and a half for overtime for hours worked over 40 hours per week. The only reason the mills have maintained these expensive schedules is that there has been a reasonable profit, which is now about to be wiped out by Mr. Henderson's ceiling prices. In our opinion, if these ceiling prices are permitted to remain in effect, the Arkansas production of yellow-pine lumber will be reduced 40 percent. If this comes about, it will reduce Arkansas' yearly production to approximately 600,000,000 feet at a price of approximately $26 per thousand feet, or a little better than $15,000,000 yearly—half of what it is now. Certainly no mills will, on this basis, operate more than 40 hours per week, which immediately cuts production a minimum of 20 percent. This will have the effect of reducing the weekly income of the wage earners in the lumber industry in the State of Arkansas a minimum of 27½ percent.

What has been said heretofore deals with the general and almost positive effects of Mr. Henderson's ceiling prices. The picture is not complete without considering the predicament in which this ruling, if permitted to become effective, puts the small yellow-pine sawmill operator, particularly those who have bought stumpage recently at prices predicated upon the existing lumber market.

The small mills, in our opinion, make approximately 50 percent of the Arkansas soft pine. These small mills—several hundred in number—employ an average of 20 to 25 men apiece. These smaller mills, by reason of their very size, are unable to market their own product, and so sell it green, rough, to the larger mills with sales organizations. These larger mills dry it, machine and refine it, and sell it.

Up until now the bigger mills have been able to pay a fairly satisfactory price for this rough green pine. However, with this drastic cut, they will no longer be able to do so and many, if not all, of the smaller mills will immediately have to cease operations, since they cannot legally continue at the prices that could be paid them in view of the radical reduction which the finished product has suffered through fixing these ceiling prices.

A considerable number of the smaller mills referred to have already received notices from the bigger mills they have been supplying to the effect that after August 30 the bigger mills will be unable to take any more of their lumber.

Another angle to be considered is that the United States Forest Department is selling Government timber each year in order to maintain their Forest Service. A few mills are located in these forests and are buying Government timber along with timber owned by them. The ceiling prices set by Mr. Henderson are based something near the 1938 prices, and at that time the Government timber was selling around $7.50 per thousand, log scale. At the present market price of lumber the Government is selling their timber around $11.50 per thousand. If the prices set by Mr. Henderson are put into effect for all lumbermen, they will be unable to buy any Government timber, and this should be an important factor in the Forest Service, as it is our understanding that this Government timber is sold to maintain the Forest Service.

Since the beginning of the lumber industry, a very large percentage of its production has been sold through wholesalers and commission lumber salesmen. Many firms have found it to their advantage to sell their output through wholesalers, who, in turn, employ commission salesmen rather than salaried salesmen. The customary wholesale discount allowed wholesalers is 8 percent of the net f. o. b. mill price. At the level of prices established by this order, there would be no margin between cost of production and the selling prices to permit mills to protect their wholesale and commission connections. Mills who have for years depended upon wholesalers and commission men to sell their output will be forced to attempt to sell their entire output directly to the retail trade, eliminating both wholesaler and commission man. This can result only in destruction of the entire wholesale and commission lumber business of the South, and will affect thousands of wholesalers and commission salesmen located in the larger consuming centers throughout the Middle West and the East, who deal almost exclusively in southern yellow pine, although having their headquarters outside of this area. In this connection, and again quoting the Commercial Bulletin of Boston:

"If these ceiling prices on southern pine prove workable, it will be the biggest surprise of 1941. The relationships proposed between 1- by 4-inch, 6-inch, 8-inch, and 10-inch boards are absurd. There seems also a very observable disposition to deprive the wholesaler of the means of livelihood. Leaving out the injustice of this, such a move would make orphans of a lot of retailers."

The effects of all this on labor are almost too obvious to call for much discussion. Probably all that is necessary to say is to repeat that the minimum reduction in production—20 percent—will reduce the weekly income of the wage earners in Arkansas' lumber industry a minimum of 27½ percent. If this price schedule should stay in effect, labor would lose most of the gains made during the past few years. The foregoing has to do with the men who continue to work, but at lesser weekly incomes, and says nothing about the thousands of men who will be thrown completely out of work by the shut-down of the smaller mills referred to previously.

The effect of this ceiling is just as obvious on Main Street, the merchant and bankers, of every sawmill community in the State, because the success of their business is in the lumber communities directly in proportion to the pay rolls of those communities, and likewise will be reduced in proportion, as formerly stated.

The lumber industry is desirous of furnishing to the Government in this emergency all the lumber for defense purposes that they will require. It is feared that through the proposed reduction in prices the over-all production of lumber will be reduced to such an extent that the Government will not be able to secure promptly the tremendous amounts of lumber which it presently needs.

Some weeks ago Mr. Henderson set ceiling prices on the products of the textile industry. He arbitrarily fixed those prices too low. When he found that out, through the inability of the manufacturers to supply the demand, on Saturday, the 23d, he adjusted the price upward. However, this did not come about until the Governors and Members of Congress of the Southern States offered violent opposition.

All the Southern States producing yellow pine are vitally interested and very much exercised over this action. I am reliably informed that the Louisiana yellow-pine industry is having a State-wide indignation meeting Thursday of this week. We also understand that Governor Jones, of Louisiana, has telegraphed the Louisiana congressional delegation that this action by Mr. Henderson is, in his opinion, disastrous to his State, and further that he has telegraphed the Governors of seven other Southern States of his feelings in the matter and asking them to take similar action.

It is my sincere belief, in view of the foregoing, that you will be vitally interested in helping us have these prices adjusted to some basis somewhat nearer the natural value of the product as currently determined by the law of supply and demand. Something will have to be done quickly, as Mr. Henderson's order is effective September 5.

Views of Hon. L. Ert Slack on the War Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

LETTER TO HON. STEPHEN A. DAY, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted by the House of Representatives, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter written by Hon. L. Ert Slack, former mayor of Indianapolis, a distinguished statesman, lawyer, and publicist, to our colleague, Representative STEPHEN A. DAY. The letter is as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND. *August 13, 1941.*

Hon. STEPHEN A. DAY,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter and your card, which is a ballot for persons to make a decision whether we should enter the war or stay out of the war, and as an American citizen, having been in public life quite a lot, and you can read about my record in different books if you want to, I am not going to sign that we enter the war or that we stay out of the war because of the following opinions that I have in regard to many world and local matters:

1. I do not believe that any citizen of this country can make a decision at this time that this Nation enter the war or that we should stay out of the war. Of course, we all should want to stay out of the war if possible, but we also should enter the war if conditions are not changed.

2. This Nation at this time ought to be considered by all other nations in the whole world to have the best form of government, and the best possibilities of God's children to get education and proper religious training, and to be successful and happy during their entire lives.

3. This Nation should now give great publicity to all other nations, advising them that their nation should also build up and promote proper education for their children, as they grow up, and also recognizing that religion is absolutely necessary, because all of the people, regardless of their nationality, are God's children, and we should have a better chance for every individual to be living comfortably and happy.

4. This Nation should also get a very much closer connection with all of our Western Hemisphere nations, and we should now send representatives to all of the Western Hemisphere nations and let them stay there and promote better governments in these Western Hemisphere nations, also to give them assistance in building up their nations by turning over to them quite a lot of our products, so that these nations can be improved and built up, as this Nation was improved and built up by our forefathers, and also give all of these Western Hemisphere nations an absolute promise and understanding that this Nation wants to cooperate with all of the Western Hemisphere nations, regardless of what happens in this terrible, bad situation that is now going on in practically all of the Eastern Hemisphere nations.

5. I personally would like to stay out of the war, but we should get our Western Hemisphere organized together, and if this Hitler stuff or the Mussolini stuff or any other part of that very bad and dangerous Eastern Hemisphere conditions, should try to get in control of any of the Western Hemisphere, or should try to get control of the majority of the world affairs, then I want our Nation and the Western Hemisphere nations to get together by the largest amount of war preparations possible, and then go into those bad nations in the Eastern Hemisphere, and get rid of those individuals like Hitler and Mussolini and get rid of this world war trouble that should not occur at all or be continued very much longer.

6. My conclusion is that we must have in our country a fine and proper government, so that all of our individuals, regardless of their nationality will be not only loyal to our nation, but they will be sensible, religious and handle all public and private matters involving business in a proper way. We must be promoting religion and loyalty and also proper public and private affairs of all kinds in this Nation, and as a nation, we should also try to do something in all the other nations of the world. In other words, the other nations of the world would be in better shape today, if they had adopted and promoted the form of government and business affairs of all kinds, promoted religion, had followed the wonderful promotions of every kind and character involving God's children that our forefathers did when this Nation was inaugurated and started out in affairs of the world.

Very truly yours,

L. ERT SLACK.

The Congressional Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 1, 1941

RECESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the middle of August 1941 found the Congress preparing for a 30-day recess after an almost uninterrupted session of 8½ months. It recessed on a high note, with many controversial things still ahead. The echoes of the Roosevelt-Churchill conference were still in the air. The House had just completed action on the Draft Extension Act by the slender margin of one vote. A bill to seize materials and machines had been twice rejected by the House and was sent back to a conference committee of the two Houses. The huge three-and-one-half-billion-dollar tax bill had already been passed by the House and was now receiving the careful scrutiny of the Senate Finance Committee. Lodged in the Banking Committee of the House was the highly controversial bill to fix price ceilings, fix rents in defense-housing areas, and give the President power to license industries. Still to come were additional billions for lease-lend aid to countries whose defense is deemed vital to the defense of the United States. Doubtless, there will also be additional funds for the Army and Navy. Much, therefore, still remains to be done by the Nation's lawmakers.

THE RECORD

But what has Congress contrived during the last 8½ months? First it might be said that the Appropriations Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the Committee on Military Affairs handled the bulk of the legislation since the major emphasis was on national defense. Perhaps the Committee on Foreign Affairs should be included because of its work on the lease-lend measure. A vast amount of testimony was taken before the major measures were reported to the floor for action and most of the time devoted to a major measure is taken up with this work of preparation. Let us then list some of the measures which have been passed and inscribed upon the statute books.

DEFENSE AND DEFENSE AID

(1) The Lease-Lend Act provides for such aid to foreign countries as the President may direct; (2) the personnel strength of the Navy was expanded to 232,000 with emergency authority in the President to lift it to 300,000; (3) authority was given the Maritime Commission to build hundreds of cargo vessels; (4) pay of parachute troops was placed at a maximum of $100; (5) the draft act was amended to include certain exemptions which were omitted from the original act; (6) provision was made for the construction of housing in congested defense areas; (7) the Navy was authorized to construct necessary auxiliary vessels; (8) the Priorities Act was extended to apply to lease-lend operations so that materials and supplies can be placed under priority if needed to aid foreign countries now resisting aggression; (9) the President was authorized to take over title or to take over the use of certain foreign merchant vessels in our ports; (10) payments on the debt owed this country by Finland were postponed; (11) the Navy was authorized to carry out a very substantial program of public works, including yards, docks, training facilities, etc.; (12) training and service of draftees was extended to 30 months.

MEASURES OF STATE

To safeguard the sovereignty of this hemisphere, Congress implemented the historic doctrine of President Monroe by declaring invalid any transfer of territory in this hemisphere from one non-American power to another. This was designed to prevent Axis Powers from transferring or securing territory in this hemisphere. Certain passport restrictions were imposed in addition to those now provided by law to better control the movements of persons who might be unfriendly to this country. Consulates were also empowered to refuse the issuance of passport visas of certain persons who might prove inimical to the welfare of the United States.

AGRICULTURE

(1) For practical purposes, peanuts were made a basic crop under the provisions of the Farm Act of 1938 and made subject to certain marketing provisions and quotas; (2) the benefit of crop insurance was extended to cotton so that

wheat and cotton production is now insured against weather hazards; (3) the original Farm Act of 1938 was further amended with respect to marketing quotas on wheat and corn and the penalties for excess production substantially increased.

BILLS IN PROCESS

Several measures have passed the House or the Senate, or both Houses, and are either in conference or in a state of disagreement, or awaiting action by one of the two bodies. The 1941 Revenue Act, to provide about three and one-half billions in new income, estate, gift, and excise taxes is awaiting Senate action after having passed the House. A bill to authorize the President, through the War Department, to commandeer machinery, materials, or supplies deemed indispensable to national defense has passed both Houses and was subsequently rejected by the House of Representatives in the form of a conference report.

THE VETO

By overwhelming majorities both House and Senate enacted a measure to expand the strategic network of highways, improve access roads, provide for airplane landing strips along highways, and for other purposes. This bill authorized the appropriation of more than $250,000,000. It was vetoed by the President. The Senate overrode the veto but by a few votes the House sustained the veto. Both House and Senate passed a measure to freeze stocks of cotton and wheat in which the Commodity Credit Corporation has an interest and keep these commodities from the market for the duration of the war and thereafter until released by Congress. Only method of releasing them for consumption would be for relief or national defense. This measure passed the House by a narrow vote and has been vetoed by the President. It is unlikely that Congress will reenact this measure over the veto.

APPROPRIATIONS AND BUDGET MEASURES

This Congress authorized an increase in the statutory debt limit from $49,000,000,000 to $65,000,000,000. Present annual interest outlay is $1,275,000,000. Appropriations for general governmental purposes other than national defense for the year which began on July 1, 1941, were approximately $7,145,000,000. Army appropriations for this fiscal year were $12,000,000,000 and Navy $5,000,000,000. Seven billion dollars was appropriated for lease-lend aid to other countries. This will be increased by an amount ranging between five and ten billion dollars. Total defense appropriations for the 2 fiscal years of 1941 and 1942, including completion of the two-ocean Navy and $7,000,000,000 for lease-lend aid, will total $53,000,000,000.

RESULTS

Total active strength of Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, including officers and enlisted men, 1,872,731. Defense-plant expansion totals 2,023 projects as of June 30, 1941. Total number of persons enrolled in all forms of defense training totals 1,500,000. Number of defense housing units allocated to August 3 totals 123,433 dwellings and trailers. Plane production of all types, including trainers, combat, interceptors, service, and bombing planes, is presently on a basis of about 18,000 per year. Powder and shell-loading plants are going into production. Quantity production of tanks is about to begin. Small-arms production is speeding up. The program is moving.

Hon. Joseph E. Davies Addresses National Encampment of Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 2, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH E. DAVIES, FORMER AMBASSADOR TO BELGIUM

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Joseph E. Davies, former Ambassador to Russia and Belgium, on the occasion of the forty-second national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, at Philadelphia, Pa., on August 25, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Commander in Chief and Veterans of Foreign Wars, it is a privilege and an honor to address this great convention of citizens, whose devotion to our country and to our freedoms has been tested by the fire of war.

You, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, have a peculiar and exceptional basis for sound judgments in connection with America's paramount problem of today.

Many of us Americans, generally speaking, have been fortunate enough for generations to have been isolated from the rest of the world both in our security and in our prosperity. As a result many of us have developed "hat brim horizons" and have not seen how closely our lives and liberties are tied in with world conditions.

You, who have served in foreign wars, know from personal experience those forces in world affairs which have brought about the shrinking of the earth and have made us a part of a very small world community wherein the existence of an outlaw threatens very immediately our lives and our freedom.

This great organization has never failed to live up to its highest duties and fullest responsibilities. It will not fail in this time of new danger. It is typical of the soundness of your judgment and the farsightedness of your patriotism that you during these times should have chosen for your slogan one which should become the rallying cry for the Nation—Unity for victory.

Our country is today not engaged in a shooting war. It is, however, engaged in a debating war. Voices are resounding over the radio; words, and still more words, are flooding the press. Some honest, some misinformed, some criminal and traitorous, are trying to lull the people of this country into a sense of false security when the world is on fire. It is urged, first, that Hitler has no purpose or intention of attacking our country or continent; and, second, that even if he had, he couldn't do it.

RECORD OF HITLER'S BROKEN PROMISES

To support the first, Hitler's benevolent intentions and direct statements, amazing as that may be, are still cited as proof. And still some people seem to be willing to place reliance on the promise of this man.

Lies are a part of the technique of dictators of all times. With that horrible Nazi philosophy which denies the principles of every ethical system the world has known, Hitler has made a specialty of false promises to break down and destroy one nation after another. He openly proclaims the morality of such technique when employed for his purposes.

To assume that our people would place reliance upon any such statements is an insult to American intelligence. Yankee common sense applies to these promises the test of what this man has said and has done in the past. We will not rely upon the word of a proven liar. Mark Twain has said: "Even a cat will not sit on a red-hot stove—the second time."

We all know the record. But it is well to recall it, to see the sheer, callous brutality of Hitler technique. Under the Austro-German accord of July 11, 1936—a formal treaty—Hitler recognized the full sovereignty of Austria and most solemnly promised to keep hands off the internal affairs of that country. The fears of Chancelor Schuschnigg were lulled by expressions of reassurance and brotherly love. And what happened? Within 18 months Hitler and his strong-arm men marched into Austria and took over the country. Austrian leaders, among them Schuschnigg, disappeared. The reign of terror in Vienna which followed was too horrible for words. Austria was destroyed.

Again, in Czechoslovakia, President Benes was again and again reassured by Hitler that he had no designs upon that country's sovereignty. At Munich he solemnly agreed with Great Britain and France that no territorial change as to Czechoslovakia would be made, except after full conference with them. But this was not all. Hitler gave to the whole world the explicit promise that the Sudetenland was his last "territorial claim in Europe," and "Ich will kein mehr Czech haben."

But within 2 weeks after the "peaceful" occupation of the Sudetenland by Hitler's forces, the President of Czechoslovakia was forced into exile. As the Czech troops withdrew from the ceded area brutality was given full rein—plundering, beating, destruction of property, and insults, injury, or death to minority or dissenting groups. In March 1939, without notice, and in the night, Hitler marched into Prague and destroyed the Czech state. The solemn pledges, thrice given, made not only to the Czechs but to Britain and France and to the entire world, were ruthlessly, cynically thrown onto the ash heap of dishonor.

In 1934 the German Reich and Hitler entered into another formal treaty, this time with Poland, that the Polish Corridor and Danzig would not be disturbed for 10 years. Pledges of nonaggression and friendship were repeatedly made.

As late as 1939, in response to a plea for peace directed to him by President Roosevelt, Hitler replied: "As far as Germany is concerned, I know nothing of * * * (a) * * * threat to other nations." Even then his plans were being projected to invade Poland; and within a few months his bombers and his mechanized land forces invaded his neighbor's land. Hitler took Danzig, the Polish Corridor, and destroyed the Polish state.

Not once, but repeatedly; not casually, but with greatest solemnity, Hitler promised to sustain his sacred pact with France, to respect and to maintain intact existing French frontiers. Alas, poor France.

On October 13, 1937, Hitler, by formal note, pledged German honor to respect the territorial integrity of Belgium and to "grant assistance to Belgium in case she should become the object of aggression or invasion." That assurance was given again and again thereafter. But brave Belgium was overrun and her Government destroyed.

On August 24, 1939, Hitler entered into a formal treaty whereby he promised not to attack Russia for 10 years. German Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop, who negotiated the treaty, pledged fullest friendship and profuse professions of good neighborly relations. He struck at Russia in the night and without notice.

What were these promises which Hitler made? They were simply lies.

On April 28, 1939, in reply to President Roosevelt's note, Hitler disclaimed any threat on the part of Germany to any nation, including the United States, in what he called a solemn declaration.

Since then he has violated his word again and again. Since then he has attacked and conquered Poland, Denmark, Norway, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, France, Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary, with Yugoslavia subjected to economic and at least partial military domination, and with Great Britain and Russia besieged.

Even more conclusive than the record of Hitler's broken promises, so far as what America may expect from him, is the published record of what he and his advisers have openly said and written of what is in fact their real purpose and the Nazi plan.

Such statements cannot now be recalled. They are a matter of public record. They constitute direct threats, not only to those who are vanquished but to those of us who still must withstand the test.

In Mein Kampf, Hitler wrote: "Germany will be either a world power or will not be at all."

On December 6, 1940, Richard-Walther Darre, a member of Hitler's cabinet, predicted that Germany "is predestined to rule the whole world," and outlined the plan of attack to dominate all countries, including the United States.

Which are we to believe, the lying assurances of peace and protestations of good will of Hitler and his spokesmen—the same sort of assurances and protestations of good will with which nation after nation was beguiled, and then destroyed—or the open threats, which recent history proves are the guide and compass with which he pursues his course in the conquest of the world to secure "Deutschland uber alles"?

PHYSICAL THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES

This brings us to the second contention of the reassurers—that Hitler couldn't invade this country even if he wanted to. Suffice it to say that the highest opinion of military and naval authorities is that there is not only the possibility but the imminent probability of physical invasion of the United States in the event of totalitarian success abroad.

As a matter of simple sense, I need not ask you what would be the situation if Russia and Britain should fall. You Veterans of Foreign Wars know, better than many of us know, that then the Mediterranean, the oil fields of Persia and Russia, the Suez Canal, and the Dutch East Indies all would be within the control of the dictator aggressors, with all that this would mean. You know that then Africa and South America would be within the hollow of Hitler's hand.

Such a situation envisages the possibility of the fleet of the United States alone standing between the aggressors and our liberties with the combined war fleets of Italy, Japan, Germany, and France, and possibly that of conquered Russia and Britain, under the command of the aggressors dominating the Seven Seas. The shipyards and the labor of the world, under slave conditions, despite all our capacity would insure a continuation of such mastery of the seas and constant threat to our coasts.

This is not an exaggeration. It is a simple statement of fact which you soldiers of other wars can testify to as to what our condition would be if Hitler's armies do to Britain and Russia what they have done to the rest of Europe.

Do we dare assume this risk to our precious liberties? If we follow the counsel of the isolationists—the appeasers—the reassurers—we will underwrite this terrible risk. We will be taking a terrible gamble. It is common sense to resolve all doubt in favor of our own safety. No step which we can take now to insure that no such catastrophe shall confront us, can we refuse to take for our own safety and that of our children.

PEACE WITH HITLER IMPOSSIBLE

There are those among us who have another suggestion which, whether intended or not, is simply to play Hitler's game. It is the suggestion that the United States sponsor a peace with Hitler now. What would such a peace mean? We would have to make a peace on the terms that Hitler would accept. Every well-informed man in international affairs today knows that for a year and a half Hitler has been doing his utmost to project a peace, and an appeasement peace. The Nazi textbooks on political and military strategy set forth cold-bloodedly that this is the classic Nazi formula to secure most easily ultimate conquest and total victory.

And what good would be such a peace? You cannot make peace with an evil thing that does not talk your language. A contract is no better than the man behind it. You cannot either make or maintain peace with a madman who conceives himself to be the divine fuehrer destined to rule the earth. Of what value would such a peace be? Your answer is nothing; absolutely nothing; for Hitler's peace, like his promise, would not be worth the paper it is written on.

OPERATIONS OF THE QUISLINGS

There is a new word in the world vocabulary, my friends. The word is "Quisling." I am sure there are no Quislings here, but, unfortunately, there are some—too many—throughout the country. The man who contributed this word to the world vocabulary was a major in the Norwegian Army. His name was Quisling. He has had a counterpart, sometimes many of them, in every country which Hitler has conquered. The Quislings betrayed their country to the Nazis consciously and willingly. They did everything they could to break down the morale of the country, to make the going soft for the aggressor. Hitler failed to keep his promises to many of them after they had contributed to the downfall of their respective countries.

But scarcely less dangerous than the Quislings who sold out their countries for a price—either money or promised power—were the appeasers, who were duped by Nazi promises that their countries would escape through reliance upon Nazi good faith. Every European country which was conquered by Hitler had its appeasers of this kind. Czechoslovakia had its Rudolf Barens and its Schvalkovisky; Yugoslavia had its Circar Babornic, who preached reliance upon Hitler's promise; Rumania had its Antonescu and its Gafencu, who preached reliance upon their ability to prevent Hitler domination through their superior intelligence and capacity; France had its Laval; Belgium had its DeGrelle; Slovakia had its Tiso; and Bulgaria, its Tsankoff. In the long halls of time, they will be unhonored and unsung.

These men raised their voices, either in good or bad faith, even as voices in our land are raised today, and preached the same doctrine of credulous optimism. The American people will not gamble their security in childish reliance upon the professions of a proven liar and in direct contradiction to the experience of all nations who trusted and were betrayed.

UNHEEDED WARNINGS

Unfortunately we are more prone to listen to the reassurers than to those who warn for our own good. I want to read you a brief warning which might well have been heeded:

"The political situation in the world, which of late has been growing progressively worse, is such as to cause grave concern to all the peoples and the nations who wish to live in peace and amity with their neighbors. The present reign of terror and international lawlessness began a few years ago * * * through unjustified interference in the internal affairs of other nations or the invasion of alien territory in violation of treaties, and has now reached a stage where the very foundations of civilization are seriously threatened. * * * The peace-loving nations must make a concerted effort in opposition to those violations of treaties and those ignorings of humane instincts which today are creating a state of international anarchy and instability."

These prophetic words were spoken 4 years ago. They were spoken by the President of the United States.

Again and again has he anticipated the trend of events and called the turn months ahead of the fact. Again and again has the event proven him right and his critics wrong. His information and his uncanny judgment of future developments has commanded the admiration of the free world and the hate of the dictators of the earth. Quislings, appeasers, and reassurers mistake the spirit of America when they challenge the good faith or high purposes of this greatest of Americans.

REAL ISSUE OF THIS WAR

The President of the United States has said that we are no nearer to war. He has not said that war is no nearer to us. But of one thing the American people are sure: They know that the devoted purpose of the President of the United States is to prevent the United States from being at Hitler's mercy and conquered by aggression, and that he also is doing his gallant and strongest utmost to prevent the spilling of the blood of our young men on foreign fields if it can possibly be avoided.

You and I know that the President's farsighted and devoted purpose is to make this country not only an arsenal for war against aggression but, if it is humanly possible and still assure victory, to keep it also as a storehouse for peace to heal a stricken civilization, a weakened manpower, and a scorched earth. If the war were to end tomorrow, the world as never before would need a good Samaritan to save itself and civilization. Unless stricken lands and stricken people can be restored, anarchy will surely stalk over the earth and threaten to engulf us all.

No one can lift the veil of the future. But if, under the guidance of the President, our youth may be spared the spilling of their blood, and if our contribution can be made through things and money and the mechanisms of war, and if, in the providence of God, victory may still be won and liberties preserved, surely then countless generations yet to come will rise up and call the President of the United States thrice blessed. For there will still be preserved here the manhood and second and third generations to carry on the burdens of peace; there will be no lost generation. That is the prayer and the hope of those who see in the farsighted purposes of the President, one of the greatest services which any political leader in the world today could possibly achieve.

Still I am sure the people of this country know, just as you and I, my friends, know,

that victory must come no matter what the cost, for the issue is supremely vital to us all. It is not whether Britain survives; it is not the kind of material world that we might save out of the wreck; it is far more important than either.

The simple issue is whether the world is going to be governed by a rule of law or a rule of might; the rule of Christ or the rule of Mars.

Upon this issue will depend the survival not only of our economic well-being but our spiritual freedoms as well.

The question is this: Could we hope to remain freemen in a world otherwise enslaved by a group of war-mad Nazi supermen? Do you believe that, under such conditions, we would be permitted to follow the precepts of Christ's teachings in a world dominated by a man who has said: "We are not against the hundred and one different kinds of Christianity, but against Christianity itself"?

We are freemen. We believe in the Sermon on the Mount and the Ten Commandments. We believe in law, justice, charity, and decency. We believe that the state was created to serve mankind and that men were not created to serve a thing called a government. We believe that the closest thing to God on earth is man. It is because of Him that we have fought for our ideals. In full faith in Him, if need be we will fight again. These are the precious things, beyond all price, which demand unity for victory and victory for unity.

We Must Save Our Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 1, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. STEPHEN A. DAY, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address I delivered on August 29 over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co.:

The actions of this hour are aimed, not so much at an actual shooting war as they are designed to break down the spirit of the American people. Slowly but surely our constitutional liberties and our Christian faith are being choked to death in the very temple consecrated to their preservation.

In 1934 Dr. William A. Wirt, of Gary, Ind., testified that the radicals in Washington proposed to overthrow the established American way of life. He stated:

"I was told that they believe they would be able to prolong the country's destitution until they had demonstrated to the American people that the Government must operate industry and commerce. * * * We believe that we have Mr. Roosevelt in the middle of a swift stream and that the current is so strong that he cannot turn back or escape from it. We believe that we can keep Mr. Roosevelt there until we are ready to supplant him with a Stalin."

On the other side of the Atlantic, Prof. Harold J. Laski, English radical and close friend of Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, is reported to have said in 1935:

"In the United States, because of the success of a political democracy, it would be extraordinarily difficult to impose a dictatorship. Only a long period of distress which broke the spirit of America would offer the temper of acquiescence it requires to be successful."

On October 23, 1933, the New York Sun published the following editorial:

"President Roosevelt's invitation to Soviet Russia is a shock as well as a surprise. If Moscow, instead of Washington, had suggested a preliminary conference on recognition, the approach would have seemed natural, although few would have accepted immediately that recognition was certain to come. But instead of waiting for the Soviet Government to appear cap in hand, repentant of its sins of omission and commission, we find President Roosevelt taking the initial step toward rapprochement, applying the word 'abnormal' to the situation that has existed for 15 years, and creating the impression throughout the world that recognition is practically assured."

President Roosevelt on July 8, 1941, after the alliance between Britain and the Soviet Union had been consummated, sent the following message to Kalinin, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet:

"The American people abhor aggression. They are bound with strong ties of historic friendship to the Russian people. * * * I extend best wishes for yourself and for the welfare and success of the Russian people."

Mr. David Lawrence, in an article in the Washington Evening Star on August 20, 1941, reviewing our present critical situation, observed:

"The administration must be prepared to look at unpleasant factors if it expects to carry through successfully a grave international emergency that affects the United States. It must recognize that many of its arguments about the danger that faces America have fallen on deaf ears in the Middle West and this is largely because there exists a deep-seated distrust of the President and his advisers.

"This distrust arises from the fact that misuse of public power exists in Washington and reaches out into the Nation. The distrust springs largely from the fear that the war situation is being used as a camouflage to put over a scheme of state socialism, and there are millions of citizens in America who do not believe in either fascism or communism or state socialism or New Dealism. * * *

"The men in power control in key agencies are mostly radicals. Conservatives have been brought in for window dressing here and there, but it is common gossip in Washington that they have no power or authority, and the moment the President essays to give them a real position, the sniping against them begins from New Deal quarters."

The declaration of principles announced by President Roosevelt as the result of his agreement with Churchill furnishes the foundation for black discouragement. My reason for saying this is easily stated. The President has pledged this Nation to the triumph of the Soviet Union. He is so intent upon this object that he is compelled to state in his message to the Congress of August 21, 1941, in speaking of this declaration of principles:

"It is so clear-cut that it is difficult to oppose in any major particular without automatically admitting a willingness to accept compromise with nazi-ism; or to agree to a world peace which would give to nazi-ism domination over large numbers of conquered nations."

Has the hatred of Hitler grown so strong that it shuts out the love of America? Has the desire to uphold Stalin grown so powerful that it would blind us to the teachings of Christ? Dare we admit that there is no hope of peace?

While expressing friendship for the Russian people, the declaration of principles is an abject confession that the German people are irredeemable except by the use of force—force employed in the cruelest way by blowing innocent women and children to pieces by high explosives dropped from the sky far beyond the reach of human vision. Roosevelt and Churchill have turned their back on Christian leadership. When they gathered on the seas to do their best for the future of mankind they thought of empire, economic gains and said not a word of spiritual leadership. This is the most discouraging statement of principles since the birth of Christ.

This means that the United States will be engaged for long years to come wallowing in the mire of President Roosevelt's statement of "matching destruction with more destruction, slaughter with greater slaughter."

When the President speaks in the sixth point of the declaration of principles of the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, does he mean that the Nazi Government can be overthrown on land without an American expeditionary force? When he states in the eighth point of the declaration of principles that no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers and that pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, the disarmament of such nations is essential, what part will the Government of the United States play in compelling such disarmament?

The conclusion is irresistible that the President is waging war, but the Congress is not. I speak not for myself alone but for the Congress of the United States. The war today in America is a war between the Congress and the President. Supporting the Congress are 83 percent of the American people. When the history of this period is recorded, it will be said that the representative form of government was vindicated through the triumph of the people's representatives in the Congress who successfully preserved the Constitution of the United States against usurpation by the President. The vote of 203 to 202 on the extension of the draft shows that the fight will be won.

I have been called a Nazi. My enemies are mistaken. I am not a Nazi; I am a Nazarene. Those who turn their backs on Christ will have to fight me to the finish. I proclaim here and now that it is impossible to redeem a world sunk in the blood-soaked fields of battle except we follow the Prince of Peace. To those who have abused me, I answer with Christian fortitude, Father forgive them; they know not what they do.

Reverting again to the testimony of Dr. Wirt, it is well to recall that he stated over 7 years ago, in speaking of the radicals surrounding the President:

"They insist that the America of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln must first be destroyed and then on the ruins they will reconstruct an America after their own pattern."

As a part of this scheme I have been accused of being a "fifth columnist," and that my efforts are directed at the overthrow of our Government. Pearson and Allen, who have recently smeared me, wrote the book The Nine Old Men, which was a filthy attack upon the Justices of the United States Supreme Court, the same Court upon which my father sat for over 23 years, appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt. It was the curtain raiser for the packing of the Supreme Court of the United States. This dastardly plan was branded in the official report of the Senate of the United States:

"It is a measure which should be so emphatically rejected that its parallel will never again be presented to the free representatives of the free people of America."

In my broadcast of June 15, 1941, I charged that our form of government under the Con-

stitution and our American independence would be overthrown not by a foreign invasion using military force but by a treasonable betrayal which was already in the making. I charged that there was a powerful movement thoroughly financed throughout the British Empire and in all parts of the United States to surrender great, free America into a permanent confederation or union which will cancel the Declaration of Independence written by Thomas Jefferson in 1776 and completely undermine the Constitution of the United States; that it had been publicly stated in London that the plans had been worked out, and it only awaited a word from Winston Churchill and President Roosevelt to complete the colossal surrender of all time.

Surrounded with great secrecy, there was a meeting last week at sea between these two leaders. Why was the conference at sea between Winston Churchill and President Roosevelt veiled in such secrecy? Why could not Harry Hopkins carry the word to Winston Churchill? Here is the answer:

Under section 4 of the Lend-Lease Act, Great Britain had to pledge that it would not transfer title or possession of the defense articles or defense information by gift, sale, or otherwise, or permit the use of such defense articles and defense information by anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of Great Britain. But, there was an exception inserted in the Lend-Lease Act. These transfers could be made only on one condition, and that condition is this—the consent of the President. This means that Winston Churchill had to see the President of the United States face to face to get his consent in order to transfer our American defense articles to Stalin. Was that consent given?

If the President feels that he is justified in his present course of action under the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act, I feel safe in stating that there is no justification in constitutional law for his position. In my book, We Must Save the Republic, published by the Shaw Publishing Co., of Washington, D. C., I state, on page 86, as follows:

"No matter what may be the true extent of the powers of the President as Commander in Chief, these powers stop short of an authorization for aggressive acts. In this connection we wish to quote Senator WALTER GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

" 'Nor have I held the view that American armed forces, military or naval, could be sent anywhere in the world for any purpose. That has not been my view of the Constitution, and it is not now. My view of it has been, without any attempt to indicate all the limitations that must be kept in mind, that, generally speaking, the President may send the Army and Navy to protect American rights, American property, and the lives of American citizens. That contemplates, in my judgment, primarily defensive action and not offensive action.' "

In the alliance recently made between Great Britain and the Soviet Union it was provided that "the contracting parties have agreed that the aforesaid agreement enters into force immediately upon signature and is not subject to ratification." That may be good law so far as the British Empire and the Soviet Union are concerned. Under our Constitution the signature of the President is of no value to bind the Government of the United States until that signature is confirmed by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate. Woodrow Wilson found this out when he brought back his covenant of the League of Nations. His signature was never ratified by our American Senate and we were saved the tragedy of membership in the League of Nations with all of its sorrowful history and humiliation.

No further lend-lease funds can be given to Britain because of the alliance with the Soviet Union. House Concurrent Resolution No. 51 which I introduced on August 5, 1941, has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This would revoke the powers of the President under the Lend Lease Act so that no gift could be made to the Soviet Union. We will win this fight with your help.

Forty-seventh Annual Meeting of Pennsylvania Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1941

ADDRESS OF WILLIAM M. HARGEST, PRESIDENT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address to the Pennsylvania Bar Association by William M. Hargest, president, at the forty-seventh annual meeting held at Bedford Springs, Pa., June 24–27, 1941:

Ladies and gentlemen of the association, this is a solemn year.

The disturbed condition of the world and the defense activities of our own country have created obligations and opportunities for service, to which patriotic American lawyers everywhere have responded, and nowhere with more loyalty and ability than in Pennsylvania.

While these conditions have increased the work and responsibilities of all our officers and committees, we shall refer only to a part of the work more directly connected with war activities.

Throughout the whole State the members of the bar and of this association are serving on selective-service boards, appeal boards, as legal advisers to registrants, Government appeal agents, and masters, to pass upon the claims of conscientious objectors.

The Pennsylvania Bar Association committee on civil rights, of which D. Barlow Burke, of Philadelphia, is chairman, and the committee on legal aid, of which John S. Bradway is chairman, have cooperated with the very active committee on national defense of the American Bar Association, of which Edmund R. Beckwith is chairman.

In addition to that, your president has been asked to name a committee of this Association on National Defense, and appointed the following committee to cooperate with the corresponding American Bar Association committee: Joseph W. Henderson, D. Barlow Burke, John S. Bradway, George Scott Stewart, Jr., John S. Laughlin, Paul Bedford, Robert M. Fisher, and Douglass D. Storey.

The president of the American Bar Association initiated a movement to have the lawyers of the country become interested in and cooperate with any efforts to properly celebrate "I Am An American Day," otherwise known as New Citizens' Day. At the request of Joseph P. Gaffney, of Philadelphia, chairman of the American Bar Association committee on American citizenship, I communicated with the president of each local bar association and the chairman of the Junior Bar Conference, urging that the local associations contribute as far as possible to making any celebration of that day a success, or initiating a celebration if none was being arranged in any particular community.

During the year we have also been requested by the presiding judge of the third circuit of the United States district to appoint delegates of this association to attend the judicial conference of that district, and the following were appointed: Robert T. McCracken, Frederic L. Clark, Arthur B. Van Buskirk, and Douglass D. Storey.

We were also requested to appoint delegates to attend the meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science which met in Philadelphia, and the following were appointed: Bernard J. Myers, W. W. Montgomery, Jr., and William Clarke Mason.

We were asked to appoint an advisory committee of this association to cooperate with the Committee on Rules of Criminal Procedure of the Supreme Court of the United States, and we designated Frank P. Slattery, John H. Fertig, Carl B. Shelley, Thomas L. Anderson, Charles H. Bruner, Jr., and John W. Murphy.

Fred B. Gernerd, William S. Culbertson, M. Louise Rutherford, James S. Benn, Prof. William G. Masterson, and Miss Ella Graubert were appointed delegates to the Inter-American Bar Association meeting held at Habana, Cuba, in March.

However, with all this special activity and the great volume of regular work, we have still maintained and perhaps increased our routine work.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

I desire to discuss the outstanding single legal problem, which, during the past year, has necessarily awakened the attention and stirred the interest of every patriotic lawyer devoted to the preservation of our constitutional liberties and guaranties. It is the subject of the administration of justice through administrative tribunals. At this moment there is no subject in the whole domain of American law that carries greater responsibilities for the American lawyer.

The complexities of our modern life have tremendously complicated and multiplied the functions of the executive department of our Government. This complication and multiplication has found expression in the creation of administrative agencies to discharge these executive and legislative functions. There are more than 150 of such agencies in the Federal Government alone. Every State has them, and in Pennsylvania we have more than 40, issuing powerful adjudications and decisions not only affecting individual and property rights of citizens but also valuable public privileges and functions. It is utterly useless to criticize the necessity for these tribunals, but their growth has been abnormal, aberrant, and alphabetical. Intricate, interwoven relationships necessarily require regulation but not regimentation. The State must regulate economic life. Neither the courts nor the legislature can effectively furnish such regulation combining, as it does, executive and judicial as well as legislative functions. In order to properly provide such governmental control over economic life the administrative tribunal is essential.

Administrative agencies exercise threefold functions: They are legislative in making their own rules; they are executive in instituting their own prosecutions; and they are judicial in judging the cases that they themselves bring.

Men, even in high positions, cannot always resist the temptation to exercise unwarranted power. Too often they extend it beyond the law. When officers of administrative agencies do this, somebody is the victim. Each such step is a step toward regimentation, and the sum of such efforts has made a serious situation. To be at once legislator, executive, and judge is not far removed from a dictator. So paternalism that regiments is not far removed from totalitarianism that dictates. Shakespeare said: "Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed that he is grown so great." To the extent that one

sitting in judgment is controlled by his inclinations, to that extent justice is endangered. Persons who sit in administrative positions as prosecutors and judges, determining findings of fact and of law, are tempted to find both the law and the facts either according to their own preconceived notions or according to the interests of their employers. The frequency with which they yield to this temptation is appalling. Perhaps it may be regarded sensational to go into specific instances, but the seriousness of administrative problems confronting this country justifies some reference to them.

MULTIPLICATION OF AGENCIES

The multiplication of administrative agencies has been startling. In the last 140 years our national population has multiplied 25 times. Measured by administrative personnel, the machinery of Federal Government has multiplied by the astounding figure of 17,950 times, more than 700 times faster than the population. Ten departments; 134 subsidiary bureaus, divisions, authorities, and agencies; and 58 tax establishments employ altogether over a million persons. In 1939 there were returned to the Federal bureaus 135,500,000 reports, questionnaires, accounting forms, tax schedules, and inspection sheets in which there was a substantial amount of duplication. Twenty-one agencies now require reports from farmers, 11 from railroads, 8 from communications companies, 19 from food processors, 12 from textile mills, 17 from banks, 12 from construction industries, and 26 from retail stores. These do not include State reports. With approximately 150 administrative units of the Government grinding out rules and regulations, orders and decisions—often conflicting, overlapping, and contradictory—deriving their powers from 965 statutory provisions and perhaps 75 Presidential orders, it is entirely beyond the human grasp of the unwitting citizen, and often of his lawyer, to know when he is not violating the law. The Federal Government has now some 13,000 more or less intelligent agents checking citizens' private accounts. They may commandeer books and records; they have tapped telephone wires and intercepted mails, and bureaucracy's power to harass has, in scores of cases, kept citizens from extending their work or business to the benefit of the whole community. Congressional inquiries have shown that coercion and intimidation exist on a large scale, and yet a bill to provide reasonable judicial review has been vetoed.

So much for the national situation. Before we discuss it further let us take a glimpse at the situation in our own State. Pennsylvania is little better. The profession and every other person interested in the subject is indebted to Gilbert Nurick, Esq., of the Dauphin County bar, a member of this association and secretary of our administrative law committee, for a comprehensive study contained in an article entitled "Much Ado About Something—The Story of Administrative Chaos in Pennsylvania." Mr. Nurick supplemented his article by a survey prepared for the procedural rules committee. He points out the chaotic condition resulting from a total lack of system in the writing of the statutes creating the 40 or more separate agencies in Pennsylvania. His résumé deserves to be quoted. He says:

"Specific examples will illustrate the point. If the license or registration of an accountant, investment banker, airport operator, architect, physician, barber, optometrist, osteopath, or pharmacist is revoked or suspended by the officer or agency regulating his particular profession or occupation, there is no right of direct appeal to the courts. On the other hand, if a pawnbroker, real-estate agent, beautician, insurance agent, milk dealer, dealer in securities, nurse, undertaker, teacher, dentist, or engineer is similarly aggrieved, he has a right of direct appeal.

"If the department of agriculture revokes a registration under the Carbonated Beverage Act or revokes a cold-storage warehouse license, ice-cream plant license, a license as a dealer or broker in domestic animals, or a license under the Farm Standards Act or the Plant Pest Act, the aggrieved person has no right of direct appeal. If, however, the same Department should take similar action with regard to a license to operate a bakery or a license as a dealer in farm produce, a direct appeal is authorized.

"If the department of welfare should revoke a license to operate a maternity home or hospital or a private hospital or private nursing home, no direct appeal is available. If, however, the same department should take similar action with reference to licenses of institutions for the care of mental patients, an appeal is authorized in certain cases.

"If the insurance commissioner should revoke or suspend a certificate of authority for underwriters, no appeal is provided. If, however, the same official should revoke an agent's, broker's, or adjuster's license, or other types of certificates of authority, an appeal is authorized.

"If the Pennsylvania Securities Commission should refuse to issue a license or should revoke a license authorizing an investment business, there is no direct appeal available. If the same commission should revoke a dealer's license or agent's license, an appeal may be taken.

"If the department of health should revoke or suspend a permit to operate a public bathing place, there is no appeal. If the same department should take similar action with regard to a permit to sell milk or milk products, an appeal is available.

"Many of the statutes are entirely silent on the procedure before the administrative tribunal. Others prescribe procedure in careful detail, and in such instances there are almost as many differences as there are statutes.

"With regard to those administrative determinations from which a direct appeal to the courts is provided by statute, the various statutes are consistent only in their utter lack of uniformity. In many cases the time within which the appeal must be taken is not prescribed. In others, the appeal limitations are 5 days, 20 days, 30 days, and 60 days. Some of the statutes provide for supersedeas on appeal; most of them are utterly silent on this point, while others expressly provide that the appeal shall not act as a supersedeas. Some statutes provide for the filing of security on the appeal, but most of the existing laws either overlooked or ignored this phase of appeal procedure. Some of the acts describe the procedure on appeal in great detail. A large number of them, however, provide no light on this point.

"The scope of review on appeal is variously stated without sound basis for distinction. Some appeals are limited to questions of law. In others the facts may be challenged and reviewed. On some appeals the case is heard solely upon the record certified. In others, the hearing is de novo, while in many cases the statutes fail to state on what basis the appeal must be considered by the court. Some statutes provide that the findings of fact by the agency are conclusive if supported by evidence. Others prescribe that the findings shall have the same weight as findings of a referee under the act of May 14, 1874. Most do not furnish any indication as to the weight to be accorded to the findings of the administrative agency.

"In some instances the statutes expressly provide for the right of further appeal from the order of the court to which the appeal was originally taken. Others prescribe that the action of the court shall be final, while in most intances the statutes are mute on this point."

OVERREACHING FOR POWER

In addition to the statutory confusion, there is confusion as to their interpretation. In the court in which I have the honor to preside, we find repeated attempts by misguided administrative officers of the State to assert illegal powers. Not long ago the attorney general of the State suggested that in the decision of a case then before us we should, in open court, advise the administrative officer of the limits of his authority, because that officer felt disinclined to take the attorney general's advice, although bound by law to do so. On another occasion in a hearing involving an administrative tribunal, the court felt it necessary to criticize the unlawful action of a board and to suggest the limits of its authority, whereupon a deputy attorney general, also in open court, said he was glad that the court had so advised the board.

In the case of *Green et al* v. *Milk Control Commission* (340 Pa. 1) the chief justice said, with reference to the power of administrative tribunals:

"The principle guiding to decision is this: The power and authority to be exercised by administrative commissions must be conferred by legislative language clear and unmistakable. A doubtful power does not exist. Such tribunals are extrajudicial. They should act within the strict and exact limits defined."

The tendency, however, of administrative officers is to reach for all power not expressly prohibited. To illustrate: In the case of *Fire Association of Philadelphia* v. *Insurance Commissioner* (40 Dauphin 386), that official issued a regulation on September 19, 1939, to the effect that "all funds which represent capital stock as well as reserves or liabilities must be invested" in accordance with the provisions of two sections of the insurance law, "even though the word 'capital' alone is used in such sections." The insurance law referred to had been on the statute books since 1911. From that time until the date of the regulation in 1939 the word "capital" had not been construed to include "reserves," and every insurance commissioner during that whole period, including the insurance commissioner who issued the regulation, during a prior term of office, had so construed the law. The regulation would have required the great insurance companies of this State to have put upon the market approximately $85,000,000 of securities and reinvest the funds at a much lower interest rate, to the loss and prejudice of not only the companies but of their insured.

This is an illustration of the violation of the principle which I have quoted from the chief justice.

In 1940 the State board of pharmacy refused to issue a permit to conduct a pharmacy. It found no facts; it simply said that it deemed the concern "not qualified to receive a pharmacy permit." Upon a preliminary proceeding the court filed an opinion outlining the rights of the board. A new application was filed, and, notwithstanding our opinion, the board again, without a hearing upon the facts, determined that "for the protection of the public health and welfare, we deem Nevins, Inc., not qualified to conduct pharmacies in this Commonwealth." After further resistance by the board, we were required to write a third opinion directing the mandamus to issue. This is the same board whose representative at the hearing held by the joint State government commission opposed any court review of its findings.

The extent to which some administrative processes have gone surprises and shocks the citizen who values constitutional freedom. While it is now settled that the Government may fix prices in a wholesale way, and that industry cannot, it is at least interesting to

find an administrative agency prosecuting an individual for selling a better product than the price structure permitted. That happened in my county. A milk dealer was prosecuted for selling milk with a higher butterfat content than the regulation permitted. Another rather astounding illustration appeared in the public press this year showing the extent to which we are being regimented. The report indicated it was necessary that the Public Utility Commission give truckers authority to carry, without charge, dolls, toys, and other Christmas packages from public and parochial schools to charitable institutions at Christmas time.

Let us now look briefly at some Federal instances. Last year a congressional committee investigating the National Labor Relations Board discovered some startling facts. The ordinary proceeding when a charge of unfair labor practice is lodged against an employer is to refer it to one of the Board's regional directors, of whom there are 25 scattered throughout the Nation, with attorneys, investigators, and clerks to assist them. These trial examiners hear the evidence, make findings of fact and conclusions of law, which are incorporated into a report and sent to the Chief Trial Examiner at Washington. The trial examiners are mostly men of maturity, with experience in the practice of the law. If a finding is made of unfair practices the Review Section assumes control of the dispute, and here is a startling revelation. There were at the time of the testimony before the congressional committee 105 attorneys in this Review Section, whose average ages were 29 years and whose average experience was practically nothing. The evidence disclosed that a number of them were appointed before they were actually admitted to the bar. A number had never practiced law after being admitted to the bar. According to the evidence before the congressional committee, one 27-year-old applicant for appointment of review attorney, with important political affiliations, appeared before an experienced regional director who was required to consider his capabilities. The director reported him "inexperienced in all matters relating to labor and labor problems and strongly advised against his employment," suggesting that he would fear to turn the applicant "loose on even our simplest case." He was appointed.

One of these review attorneys, a young woman, had never represented a client, yet she reviewed the records of an imposing list of corporations charged with unfair labor practices, such as the Ford Motor Co., Columbia Broadcasting Co., American Radiator Co., and many others of national importance, and boldly told the committee that she felt at liberty "to comply with or ignore the supervisor's suggestions." Another young woman, appointed because "she was unusually able, with a liberal point of view," whose recommenders said that her liberal point of view had turned "left," reviewed many cases of importance, such as the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Republic Steel Corporation, and others. In one instance, according to the committee's report, she received instructions from the Board to draft a certain decision, but "calmly proceeded to substitute her own independent judgment for that of the Board" and drafted a different decision. In still another case, the trial examiner, a man of wide legal experience, had excluded the testimony of a certain witness, but, in reviewing the case, a young lady who was appointed before she was admitted to the bar, wrote the Board's legal representative and sternly demanded to be informed concerning "what Mr. Mellon would have testified to had he been permitted to answer." A regional director complained of one attorney, whose private practice had consisted of only one uncontested divorce case before his appointment, in this language: "Your office assigned him to this region as an attorney absolutely inexperienced in our line of work and with little if any experience in private practice behind him." Another Board attorney complained of the same young man, yet notwithstanding these complaints he was transferred to the position of review attorney and had handled at the time of the committee investigation 43 cases, some of great importance. With a record such as this, is it any wonder that those summoned before an administrative tribunal and trial in such a manner, as well as the members of the bar trained to respect constitutional safeguards and liberties, should cry out for some effective method of regulation and review?

Still another startling exercise of administrative control happened in reference to an order of the National Railroad Adjustment Board requiring the Pennsylvania Railroad to rehire a locomotive engineer. The man in question was dismissed for intoxication in 1935 and again for another serious infraction of the rules in 1937. He was reinstated following his 1937 dismissal upon the self-imposed condition that any further failure "will be sufficient cause for my being immediately dropped from the service." A third dismissal came in February 1939 when he was reported by other trainmen and a physician to have been intoxicated when he came on duty. Notwithstanding the testimony of the fireman, conductor, and doctor, all of whom reported him unfit for duty, and the fact that the lives of many people would be in his hands, the board decided the case on a technicality affecting the dates when the order dismissing him occurred, and, instead of giving an opportunity to correct the record in that respect, categorically ordered his reinstatement. And yet we are told that it would shackle the function of government to have a n impartial judicial review of actions of this character.

LANDMARKS OF CONSTITUTIONAL SECURITY

In the case of *Railroad Commission* v. *Rowman & Nichols Oil Co.* ((1940) 310 U. S. 573, 581), it is said:

"Courts must not substitute their notions of expediency and fairness for those which have guided the agencies to whom the formulation and execution of policy have been entrusted."

On the other hand, Mr. Justice Brandeis said, in *St. Joseph Stock Yard Co.* v. *United States* (298 U. S. 38, 72):

"The inexorable safeguard which the due-process clause assures us * * * that there will be opportunity for a court to determine whether the applicable rules of law * * * are observed. * * * The order of an administrative tribunal may be set aside for any error of law, substantive or procedural. * * * There must be the opportunity of presenting in an appropriate proceeding at some time to some court every question of law raised, whatever the nature of the right invoked or the status of him who claims it."

With the right vested in administrative agencies to initiate complaints, thereby to become the prosecutor, and the right to make the rules of procedure by which the defendant is to be judged, it is unthinkable that such an administrative tribunal should be able to enter any judgment without provision for an appeal to an impartial judicial tribunal. Such a situation gives the rules of an administrative agency greater sanctity than the laws of the legislature, the administration of which can be reviewed by judicial processes. It is no wonder that those who love the liberties which our forefathers have established should be appalled at the administrative absolutism which does not provide a day in court. It is no wonder that the situation aroused the attention of Congress. It is no wonder that the Attorney General of the United States constituted a committee for a thorough examination of the whole subject. The wonder is that when Congress did finally act by the passage of the Walter-Logan bill, that bill should receive a Presidential veto.

This important bill was the result of years of study and effort by able and farsighted lawyers. As far back as 1916 Elihu Root, the outstanding statesman of his time, in his annual address as president of the American Bar Association, invited attention to the need for reform in administrative procedure so that "the regulators might themselves be regulated by law."

In 1933 the American Bar Association created a special committee on administrative law, the direct result of whose work was the Walter-Logan bill, approved by the American Bar Association's board of governors and house of delegates, and urged for passage.

In 1939 the Attorney General of the United States created a committee of six, to which six more were subsequently added, which committee prepared a 474-page report. That this report would not be unanimous was to have been expected since the original committee consisted of three representatives of the United States Department of Justice, the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, a former president of the American Bar Association, and a former Under Secretary of the Treasury then in private practice in Washington, and the six added consisted of the Solicitor General and five law-school professors.

Two bills have been prepared by that committee. The majority favors one of the liberal type; the minority a much more comprehensive bill recommended by Arthur T. Vanderbilt, a former president of the American Bar Association, a practicing lawyer; Carl MacFarland, former Assistant Attorney General, and now a practicing lawyer, and Prof. E. Blythe Stason, of the University of Michigan Law School.

Both bills happily agreed on the creation of an office of Federal administrative procedure, somewhat analogous to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, which would be given supervision of the agencies and their procedure.

All of the members of the Attorney General's committee agreed to the statement of Dean Acheson, chairman, quoted in the March 1941 issue of the American Bar Association Journal, that the hearing commissioners "should be men of ability, stature, and prestige, should be appointed for definite terms of 7 years, and should be paid substantial salaries fixed by law. * * * They should have no functions other than those of presiding at hearings or prehearing negotiations and of initially deciding cases that fall within the agency's jurisdiction."

The fundamental difference between the majority and the minority seems to rest upon (1) the need for separation of the judicial function from other activities of the administrative agencies, (2) the necessity of more effective judicial review of the decisions of administrative agencies, and (3) the high desirability of a code of legislative standards of fair procedure.

Chief Justice Groner, not fully agreeing with either bill, submitted four basic principles to be obtained: First, that the administrative official should be separate and distinct from the official charged with the duty of passing judgment upon alleged violations; second, assuming the complete separation of the functions of prosecutor and judge, the findings of fact of the administrative officer, if supported by substantial evidence, should be conclusive in any judicial review, except where a constitutional right is in issue; third, where, from the nature of the subject matter, separation of the functions of the administrative officer or tribunal, including findings of prosecutor and judge, would be impracticable, the decision of fact should be subject to review by an independent body; and, fourth, in cases where a constitutional right or privilege is asserted, the power of

judicial review should be as extensive as may be necessary, in the opinion of the reviewing court, to decide the issue.

The committee on administrative law of the American Bar Association reported to the meeting of the house of delegates, March 17, 1941, a statement of principles which should properly govern administrative processes. That meeting was largely devoted to the consideration of the two bills prepared by the attorney general's committee.

With reference to them, Mr. Lloyd Garrison said, for the committee:

"All 11 members of the Attorney General's committee were agreed:

"First. The creation of a so-called Office of Federal Administrative Procedure.

"Second. Provisions looking toward increasing the independence, tenure, salary, and quality of trial examiners called hearing commissioners."

The house of delegates, after thorough discussion, adopted the following:

"The house of delegates expresses the opinion that Senate bill 674 (which was drafted by the minority of the Attorney General's committee) is the bill which up to this time best embodies the above statement of principles."

The bill approved by the house of delegates has also been introduced in the House of Representatives, H. R. 4238. I recommend that unless this association desires to take action at this session the two proposed acts be referred to the committee on Federal law for study and report at the January 1942 session.

May we again refer to the fate of the Walter-Logan bill. This bill, while it stopped short of fully covering the obvious abuses, opened the way for attack upon them. It sought uniformity in procedure so far as practicable; it aimed to create standards of inherent fairness and justice and canons to guide the conduct of impartial judges and right-minded lawyers; and it provided for modified judicial review.

The veto message of the President was a peculiar document. It contained a statement which seems far from the fact. It says: "A large part of the legal profession has never reconciled itself to the existence of administrative tribunals." I venture to say that it would be hard to find a lawyer who has the slightest acquaintance with governmental functions, State or Federal, who would assert that we can get along without administrative tribunals. Lawyers do assert that we can and ought to get along without a multiplication of them on the slightest pretext or on no pretext.

The veto also said: "The bill would turn the clock backward." Is depriving a citizen of a fair, impartial hearing before a competent tribunal turning the clock backward? If so, it would only turn it back to the time when every man had a fair and impartial adjudication of his rights. Subjecting a citizen to trial by a tribunal which is not only the prosecutor but also the judge, under rules which the prosecutor itself has made and from which there is no appeal, may be turning the clock forward, but it is turning it toward Germany, Italy, and Russia. It certainly is obliterating the hands which have heretofore pointed with unerring accuracy to constitutional guarantees. If to preserve constitutional liberties by providing a review of a prosecutor's own prosecution, hearing, and judgment is turning the clock backward, then the Walter-Logan bill did it. The veto also said: "The bill strikes at modern reforms by sterilizing the administrative tribunal which administers them." If the sterilization destroys the bacteria which multiplies such agencies ad infinitum and which produces the character of judgments disclosed by the congresisonal committee to which I have referred, then such sterilization should be administered.

This veto has received a rather scathing review by so liberal an exponent of the law as Roscoe Pound in the March 1941 issue of the American Bar Association Journal. Among other things, he said:

"No one urges that an administrative hearing or investigation be conducted in all respects as a trial at law. No one has objected to any reasonable informality or application of common sense to the ascertainment of facts. But the abuses, well known to the profession and ignored by the message, to which the measure in question was directed go much deeper. To a less degree in some but to an alarming degree in other of our administrative agencies, there has been a disposition to ignore two maxims which have long been held fundamental in justice: (1) That no one is to be judge in his own case, and (2) that both sides of a controversy shall be heard and that no one shall be prejudiced by an adverse determination without an opportunity of being fully heard and fully apprized of what may be used against him in reaching a decision and allowed to argue with respect to it, if he desires to take advantage of the opportunity. To say that these elementary requirements of justice are 'technical legalism' and that seeking to make available to all who are adversely affected the constitutional guarantee that a decision against them shall have a basis in evidence of rational probative force and not in prejudice, preformed opinions without hearing the other side, gossip, and made to order interviews under the name of investigation, is insistence on applying 'technical rules of evidence,' is simply to say that all rights are to be at the mercy of administrative agencies. * * * It is legalism to require such tribunals to keep within the limits of the jurisdiction and powers given them by the statute creating them. It is legalism to require them to take the policies they apply from the act of Congress under which they sit and not from their own ideas of particular cases. It is legalism to require them to apply the standard provided by statute instead of making one of their own or acting on no standard. It is legalism to require them to find the facts upon which they base their orders, as all other tribunals are required to do, so as to have some minimum of check upon them. * * * If thes tribunals can only act effectively by acting without law, we shall have to remake our whole policy. * * * What lawyers do object to is the proposition that these agencies, alone of all the agencies of government, shall act without any substantial check, shall be free to ignore rights, to act in the teeth of evidence, or upon no real evidence, shall be free to keep the basis of their action concealed and cut off all opportunity for refuting or disputing it, and shall be at liberty to make rules of highly serious import, with none of the checks which are imposed on legislative and judicial rule making."

THE EXTENT OF JUDICIAL REVIEW

In *Edison Co.* v. *National Labor Relations Board* (305 U. S. 197, 229), Chief Justice Hughes said:

"The statute, in providing that 'the findings of the Board as to the facts, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive,' means supported by substantial evidence. Substantial evidence is more than a mere scintilla. It means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. * * * Desirable flexibility in administrative procedure does not go so far as to justify orders without a basis in evidence having rational probative force."

During all the discussions which have been anywhere had upon the subject of judicial review, the question has always revolved around the extent and scope of such judicial review, and the discussion in the house of delegates of the American Bar Association was no exception, but it was there stated by Mr. Arthur T. Vanderbilt, an exponent of the minority bill, whose inclinations would be for a wider judicial review, as follows:

"In our opinion the best we could get would be to provide for review where the findings were contrary to the substantial evidence upon the whole record. By the phrase upon the whole record we were aiming to get away from the habit which has grown up within the last 5, 10, or 15 years of imposing on or importing into the word 'substantial' a meaning which it did not formerly have."

Perhaps I should not close this review without referring to the decision of *Federal Communications Commission* v. *Pottsville Broadcasting Co.* (309 U. S. 134), decided January 29, 1940, in which the Supreme Court of the United States, in an opinion by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, declared for the first time that there was a different philosophy involved and different principles to be applied in the review by a court of the action of an administrative agency than that to be applied in the review by an appellate court of the action of an inferior court. I urge all students of administrative law to study this decision.

While many leaders of the bar have been active nationally, we in Pennsylvania have made much progress toward an ultimate solution of the administrative-law problem as related to State agencies.

The committee on administrative law first made a detailed survey to ascertain the facts so that it might be informed as to the actual names and functions of Pennsylvania administrative agencies, the law creating them, the existing procedure before them, and the situations which urgently required improvement. Representatives of the committee attended all of the hearings of the joint State government commission when that commission was inquiring into the practice and procedure before all boards. Our committee has studied hundreds of pages of reports, speeches, essays, articles, and tabulations. Its work has had the sympathetic interest of 123 lawyers who have taken the trouble to write their views to the committee and, of course, many others are interested who have not taken this trouble.

We are now ready to work out in detail the best cure for the disease which might be called administratum chaotica. The administrative law committee proposes the creation of a section on administrative law, and in confidence that you will at this session adopt the necessary bylaw for that purpose it has already set up its first section meeting for 1 o'clock today. We are attempting to convert our theoretical efforts into practical results.

I look with confidence to the continued efforts of the American lawyers, notwithstanding the castigation they sometimes receive from high sources, to wage an unending fight for the preservation of those ideals of constitutional liberty and freedom so that in this respect we shall "destroy not the ancient landmarks that our fathers have set."

National Defense Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, September 2), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD a speech delivered by me over the radio on September 1, during the National Radio Forum program, on the subject National Defense Now.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As one among the great radio audiences listening on Monday evenings to the Star Forum, I express to the Washington Evening Star my profound gratitude for its patriotic and informative public service. I appreciate as an honor and a privilege the opportunity to participate tonight in the forum. I trust what I shall say will equal its high standards of endeavor.

The assigned subject of national defense now is one directly vital to the lives and even the souls of every individual among us.

Tonight I want all of those who hear me to know I speak on the failures of our national-defense program and of the delays in giving expeditious and effective aid to England as one who has supported, up to this time, all—every single one—of the foreign policies of the President of the United States, as one who is anxious to be helpful and to make these policies fully and quickly effective, as one who believes that the American people are entitled to know the truth respecting the progress of our defense program; that a free and frank discussion of the inefficiencies of disorganization and the unwarranted delays that have occurred will act as an incentive to remove the obstacles that now exist in the great effort our country is making.

If democracy means anything, it means that in times of great crisis the people should know the true facts upon which they must make vital decisions. Events in recent days make it more imperative than ever that the American people know the truth about the progress of our defense program and aid to England.

From the beginning of the European conflict I have believed that the surest way for America to avoid war is to be ready to repel any attack made upon us and to be prepared to conquer and destroy any nation or nations making that attack. I believe unstinted aid to England in war equipment and supplies is clearly to the interest of America, and that this assistance should be given today—now—and not further delayed. Already avoidable delays have diminished seriously the effectiveness of our assistance. We have done more in talking than in effective action.

The avoidance of war, except to repel attack by our own strong defense and by giving aid to England has been and will be the controlling influence in my official acts. In any event, in my judgment, it would be an act of utter folly to become a voluntary shooting belligerent in the European conflict in our present state of unpreparedness.

I am not an isolationist. I am not a pacifist. As a Member of the Senate of the United States my concern is first and last the protection and security of our own Republic—to preserve our freedoms and our American way of living—to cast my vote and act as an official of the United States Government solely to promote the best interests of America. I believe firmly that our safety lies in total preparedess for ourselves and giving aid to England in equipment and military supplies.

Winston Churchill said to America: "Give us the tools and we will finish the job." Anthony Eden, speaking for the English Government, only 2 days ago, said that the struggle will finally be decided in the quantity of production of mechanized war equipment, and he called for further efforts and further sacrifices in the immense task that lies ahead in the field of production. Speaking directly to America, Mr. Eden said: "All over the world we need your weapons—in Russia, in the Far East, in Libya, and over Germany."

So far we have failed woefully in sending to England the fighting planes—the long-range, four-engine bombers—the heavy tanks, the antiaircraft guns, the merchant ships, the powder and the shells, all of which she must have.

The conservative London Sunday Times said in its leading editorial published in London yesterday, "Only a fraction of American industry is harnessed to war production," and then this English paper continued, "Is it asking too much of the comfortable New World to devote some more millions of man-days to salvation?" The London Times said further, "'Let it roll,' said Mr. Churchill of Anglo-American cooperation. But it doesn't. There is a stream but no river. Poor glorious Greece," the Times continued, "got literally nothing."

America is the greatest industrial nation in the world. We have the greatest resources of any nation in the world. Our most effective aid to England is to mobilize the productive capacity of this country so as to produce, and produce quickly, the bombing planes, the huge tanks, the vessels, and those other implements of war England needs so desperately. Our job in America is a production job, and if we do this job well, America will save the world for democracy.

On March 11 last the distinguished Secretary of War, the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, said in a public address:

"A free government does not go to war until its people are convinced that such a course is necessary and that they have a just and necessary cause for going to war. They, the people," said Mr. Stimson, "are not afraid of the real news. What they want to be sure of is that there is no ballyhoo on one side and no sensational knocking on the other." Then Mr. Stimson made this very pertinent observation: "It is vital," he said, "that both the Army and the people behind it must know the real basic facts, free from any false exaggeration, either one way or the other."

The people of America are, as Secretary Stimson says, entitled to know the facts. They must know the facts if this Nation is to unite in an all-out preparedness effort for ourselves and for England, which means all-out sacrifice on the part of all our citizens. So long as our defense progress is measured in official statements by percentages of some previous production period, the people, of course, will never know the facts. We are told from time to time by our officials that the production now of tanks, for example, is 900 percent over the production last December, and the production of other equipment is expressed in similar language. As not a single modern effective tank of the design now approved was produced last December, a production figure of 800 percent of zero still remains zero, and such statements are likely to be misleading to the public.

Just 2 years ago the war in Europe began. In this period Germany has conquered and now occupies 14 nations. The conquests were made by the effective use of superior military equipment; the coordination of huge tanks on the land and dive bombers in the air—complemented by all types of offensive and defensive equipment, adequately manned by trained personnel and with ample reserves to meet any reverses.

At the end of these 2 long years of ruthless and desperate struggle, with the whole world engulfed in war, save only the Western Hemisphere, you and I and every other American citizen has the right—in fact, in this free country, it is our duty—to ask of those in authority for an accounting of what has been done to prepare our country for defense and to give to England quick aid so vital for our own protection.

Let us not duplicate here the errors made in France and England. It is a gigantic task to which we have set our hands. What have we undertaken? We have undertaken to arm the United States of America to an extent greater than any other nation or group of hostile nations in the world. We have undertaken to protect the Western Hemisphere. We recognize that our safety lies only in our strength. Then we have agreed to provide to the democracies, especially England, the arms these nations need—to become an arsenal for the democracies of the world.

The magnitude of this task is emphasized by the fact that Congress has so far appropriated and authorized the colossal sum of $53,000,000,000 to pay for this undertaking. This sum will be greatly increased, as even now the administration contemplates asking for $5,000,000,000 more for lend-lease purposes. It is possible and probable that even without our fighting participation in the war the cost of the program we have assumed will reach $100,000,000,000 for military purposes alone. In fact, this is the cost General Marshall estimated to be the military effort of Germany up to the beginning of the war.

The sum of $53,000,000,000, which has already been appropriated and authorized, is equal to about one-seventh of the total actual wealth of America, according to the most reliable estimate—a wealth the citizens of America have been accumulating by industry and frugality throughout the many years since our Republic was founded. The anticipated ultimate cost of $100,000,000,000 is more than one-fourth of this estimated wealth, and, remember, these new costs must be pyramided upon an already top-heavy and burdensome public indebtedness incurred by profligate peacetime spending.

Speed in the achievement of the program is its greatest and most important factor. Speed in sending vital military equipment to England will shorten the war. The delays that have occurred, and are occurring, will lengthen the war. Speed in our own production for defense means our own security. Hitler does not wait for his adversaries to prepare. He strikes when they are unprepared, and this accounts for his phenomenal victories.

This is a mechanized war of great tanks, huge bombing planes, and all implements of war so coordinated as to be more effective in destruction than in any other war in the world's history.

Andre Maurois, renowned French author, said after the fall of France: "It is no mystery, but as a tragically simple explanation, the battle of France was not lost in the spring of 1940 but between 1935 and 1939 in the factories of France. It is not so much a military defeat as an industrial defeat. France worked 40 hours a week and Germany 60 hours."

The failure of France to do the work and make the sacrifices essential for her defense destroyed her nation as a democracy. It gave England the closest call in the long and great history of that nation. Should we not profit by these examples?

The overwhelming sentiment of a majority of the American people demands that America be prepared so as to be impregnable to any attack, whether it comes from the Atlantic, the Pacific, or both; that we have the greatest and most effective air force in the world, the greatest navy in the world, and all defense equipment essential in modern warfare.

At least two-thirds of all Americans are in favor of giving to England quickly the war materials and equipment she needs, and then a large majority desire that we keep out of the European war as a fighting belligerent.

Many eloquent speeches have been made by the leaders of our country in the crisis, but let us remember that the only effective language today in dealing with Hitler and other ruthless dictators is language translated into real action in producing actual fighting planes, warships, great guns, tanks, and other military equipment, adequately manned with trained and efficient personnel. Wars are not won by planes on order. Wars are not won by appropriations unspent. Wars are not won by materials yet undelivered.

Tonight I speak as an advocate of our American defense policy adopted by Congress, which has been implemented by granting so far every single executive request. I have voted for the policy and all that has been described as required to carry it out.

All-out sacrifice and effort on the part of government, business, and private citizens—by all—is required for its earliest and fullest consummation. The facts, figures, and conclusions presented to you are intended to embarrass no one. It is information which I know the American people are entitled to have. Those of us in public life can, I hope, discuss vital matters from the standpoint of high patriotism. It is vital, I think, for us to realize the facts as they are, and to blast ourselves out of the sixth column of deadly apathy. The sooner our national leadership provides the effective administrative machinery to do the job and convinces the country that we are not getting prepared as we should; that we are not sending the aid to England as quickly as England needs it; that we can only accomplish successfully the great task we have undertaken by all-out sacrifice and self-denial, the better our safety will be assured.

Sacrifice now, today, is infinitely better than a much greater sacrifice we shall have to make should we be involved in the war.

In a speech in the United States Senate I discussed facts as to the production of defense equipment in the hope that the delays now existing would be remedied. In a democracy you and I and every other American citizen have the privilege of free speech and the benefits of a free press, as such are the bulwarks and foundation stones of our liberties.

The figures on production which I presented to the Senate were secured from one of the very highest responsible Government sources, and, as I said in the Senate, are accurate in all essentials, though, of course, may be approximate in some minor details. The fact that the President received somewhat conflicting figures from another source, no higher than mine, as to certain guns and tanks, indicates again the confusion that now exists in Washington with respect to our preparedness program.

The President admitted the accuracy of the plane-production figures I used. Our low production of combat planes is the most glaring and conspicuous failure of our Government in our own preparedness program and aid to England.

The President did not question the small output of cargo ships and tankers so vitally needed by England in the war of the Atlantic. Neither was any question raised as to my statements on the construction of naval vessels. Planes and ships are the most effective and important aid that we can render England and are the most imperative need in our own defense.

As the production figures on military planes are agreed upon, the public has definite information and can decide whether or not our great Nation has failed or succeeded in the production of these—the most vital equipment of all. It is, I think, the No. 1 failure.

It was 2 years ago when the war began. We have had 2 years for preparation. From September 1, 1939, to September 1, 1941, our Government has actually spent in cash for defense the great sum of $10,000,000,000. After all, it is only the facts that really count in the production of military equipment.

What are the facts with respect to our plane production? We recall that the President, on May 15, 1940, asked for 50,000 military planes. We recall that he has more recently asked for 500 bombers per month. In July, this year, 1,460 planes were produced. Of this number about 700 were training planes, which are comparatively simple to produce, and can be built quickly in mass production from standard designs. What we are primarily concerned about are combat planes. England needs only combat planes, not trainers. Little more than 700 combat planes were produced in July, 16 less than in the previous month of June, and the total production was 200 less than the schedule. But more significant than this was the number of the most effective types of fighting planes produced. The great need of England today is 4-engine, heavy bombers. Heavy bombers can be flown to England and avoid the perils of boat shipment as is the case of other planes. Heavy bombers in quantities in England today in the hands of the Royal Air Force would permit the wholesale bombing of Germany while Germany is engaged in her struggle with Russia. Only 14 4-engine, heavy bombers were produced in the United States in July. Fourteen heavy bombers per month is a far cry from the 500 the President asked for. It is a production failure of the first magnitude. Only 12 were produced in June, while 21 were produced in April, so the production has actually declined. In July only 95 medium bombers were produced and 243 light bombers.

In my Senate speech I stated that 60 heavy bombers were produced in July, but now I have positive and indisputable proof of the production of only 12 in June and only 14 in July.

I say again, and I say it on the record, that 2 years after the war began and 14 months after the President called for 50,000 planes, the state of our production of combat planes, and especially heavy bombers, is one of the most discouraging chapters in our national-defense program, and one that calls for such drastic action as may be necessary to remedy this failure. Combat planes are the first line of defense of America. If heavy bombers could be sent to England now at the rate of hundreds each month to bomb Germany, as Germany bombed England, the trend of the war would be infinitely more optimistic from our standpoint.

For the entire year 1940 only 43 merchant ships and tankers were constructed in America, and for the entire year 1941 only 105 merchant ships and tankers are expected to be built. This production for the whole year of 1941 is hardly more than the gross sinkings by the Germans in one of the heaviest casualty months. This I have in writing and is not denied.

The American Navy is equal to or better than any other navy in the world. We have the best one-ocean navy in the world, but now we need desperately a two-ocean navy of at least 700 major vessels. This we will not have until 1946, 5 years hence, unless extraordinary means are taken to speed production. For the year 1941 only 29 major naval vessels will be added—2 battleships, 17 destroyers, 9 submarines, no aircraft carriers, and no cruisers. This I have in writing and it has not been denied.

In my Senate speech I made the statement—and I repeat it now—that after 2 years of effort we have not produced a sufficient number of long-range antiaircraft guns to protect one single city in America. At the present rate of production, as estimated by the President to be sixty-one 90-mm. antiaircraft guns per month for the next 4 months, it will be several months before we will have sufficient long-range antiaircraft guns to protect the city of New York, alone, which it is said would require 800. Not a single long-range 90-mm. antiaircraft gun has been sent to England.

In speaking of the lag in American defense production, the London New Statesman and Nation said in London yesterday: "The President's own figures of some 61 antiaircraft guns, 72 antitank guns, and less than 700 operational aircraft, in addition to 1,000 trainers, are almost as shocking as the charges of Senator BYRD."

I want to assure my listeners that no one has "sold me down the river" on these figures. They come from the most authoritative sources and tell the true facts.

I want you to know of a letter I have seen from a boy who was drafted to go to the camps. He is no dissenter from our foreign policies. He is not complaining about the officers or about the Army. This letter reads:

"Get us some equipment to work with. We can't learn our coast artillery out of textbooks. We've got to have practice firing. And what have we got? We've finally acquired one 37-mm. gun for our battery, and we're supposed to have eight. No ammunition, and we have never been out on the range with it. Give the men the equipment," he said, "give them something with which to work, and they'll turn into a swell outfit. But until you do, the men might just as well be back at their civilian jobs."

Unfortunately, this situation is not a singular case. We have 1,545,000 officers and men in training, but mostly lacking the huge quantities of specialized and complicated equipment, without which any army today would be helpless and hopeless.

Is there any wonder that the boys in the camps who are being trained with wooden guns and trucks camouflaged as tanks feel that the sacrifice they are making is not being utilized to the best advantage?

If speed in our defense program and aid to England is the controlling guide for our efforts, it becomes very obvious that fundamental replanning and basic reorganization of the defense program must be effected immediately. For 2 years we have been attempting to superimpose this $50,000,000,000 defense effort, which may later be doubled, on doing business as usual. No better illustration of defense superimposed on normal business is given than in the automobile industry. For the year ending August 1, 5,261,000 automobiles were produced. This is 20 percent more than were produced in any period in our history, excepting the boom year of 1929, and consumed huge quantities of steel, aluminum, copper, and other materials required in the defense program. We cannot build the planes we need and all the automobiles our manufacturers can sell at the same time.

A new planning of our defense effort in relation to civilian needs is imperative immediately and must be successfully accomplished before we can produce military equipment with the speed essential for our own safety and aid to England. We have the choice of a shorter European war providing we speed up our defense production. We have to make the sacrifices sooner or later. Why not make them now when the most good will result?

Today is Labor Day, and I well know the average workingman is among the most patriotic of American citizens, but a short-sighted minority should not be allowed to delay our program of preparedness by strikes in defense industries. Since January, nearly 6,000,000 man-days have been lost by strikes in Army and Navy defense contracts. This number of man-days applied to the construction of heavy, 4-engine bombers would produce 1,000. For the emergency, the 40-hour workweek in defense work should be suspended and every defense plant placed on a full workweek.

The administrative machinery still requires further reorganization. The new board just appointed by the President serves the useful purpose of defining the duties between Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Henderson, both able men, but who have been attempting to function under an almost unbelievable overlapping of authority and conflicting efforts. Yet, after all, the job of spending billions for defense is an executive one. One man, and we should have the ablest citizen in America, can do a better job in executive management than a seven-man board superimposed on other boards. Let us have a procurement director for all military supplies with the power to act.

In this hour of national peril there has never been a time more important than now

to remind ourselves of the blessings that have come to us from our form of representative democracy which has given to the American people greater happiness, greater peace, greater contentment, and greater progress than ever enjoyed by any people in the history of the world. By the same token there has never been a time in our history when we should think more in terms of our duty to our Government; the sacrifices we must make to preserve the freedoms of our institutions.

We have before us the tragic example of conquered people who were once free and are now slaves, because they did not recognize their dangers, because they were unwilling to change their accustomed mode of living, because they would not give up their luxuries, because they preferred the soft and easy life to that of sacrifice and self-denial.

In America, the greatest of all democracies, we must demonstrate that a democracy can be efficient and effective, that a democracy can be strong and hard, if need be, that a democracy can act firmly, wisely, and expeditiously.

This is our obligation—yours and mine—we must not fail.

Dairying and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, September 2), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered over station WEAU, at Eau Claire, Wis., on August 14, 1941, entitled "Dairying and Defense."

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, when the common people of earth are dying by the millions, when nations are striving for mastery, when our own President is out in the mid-Atlantic meeting with the leader of one of the combatant nations, it may seem prosaic to discuss the subject Dairying and Defense, yet the situation, national and international, is focused more and more on national defense.

Our Wisconsin dairying interests are making a valuable contribution to that national defense, and it is about that contribution that I speak today.

DAIRY FARMER HASN'T BEEN GIVEN COST OF PRODUCTION

Those of you who are listening who are dairy farmers—those of you who have, in the past years, tried to balance your milk checks against your expenses—know that the dairy farmer (that is, about 85 percent of them) hasn't been getting the cost of production. At the present time it is true that the return of the dairy farmer is rising. That, however, is not a permanent answer to our problems.

CURTAILMENT OF CONSUMPTION OF DAIRY PRODUCTS UNNECESSARY

One immediate problem which confronts the dairy industry in connection with defense is the possibility of Government limiting domestic consumption of dairy products. According to Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard, Americans may have to curtail their consumption of cheese and dairy products in order to supply enough of these products for Britain.

That does not make sense. For years Wisconsin producers have sought to build up a market for their products, and there is no logic in destroying that market overnight. In recent years the administration has urged the farmer to curtail production in order to cut down the surplus. Today the farmer is urged to increase production of exportable foods such as cheese, canned milk, and eggs. In other words, he is urged to increase production and cut domestic consumption.

I do not believe that there is any necessity to tell Americans that they will have to eat fewer dairy products.

Surveys of the agricultural college show that in our State we could increase cheese production 30 percent.

WISCONSIN HAS ALREADY INCREASED ITS PRODUCTION

Wisconsin farmers have increased their herds 4 percent. We now have 2,350,000 milk cows and a record milk production of 12,665,000,000 pounds. That is about 11 percent of the national supply. Wisconsin cows are now turning out an average of 25 pounds of milk a day. That is 2 pounds more per day than a year ago.

Dairy herds throughout the State have increased their production on an average of 57 pounds a day. Our milk production in Wisconsin has been increased fully 10 percent, according to recent estimates. Nationally, milk production has been increased about 6 percent.

This is a time for the Federal Government to do a constructive job so that America and England can have all the dairy produce they need. This is not a time to cripple the domestic market.

DAIRY INDUSTRY IS MEETING CHALLENGE OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

The dairy farmer is part of our front line of defense. He has been given a job to do—and he is doing it. He is doing an excellent job, and he is a good soldier.

The requirements of our national defense for dairy products have presented a distinct challenge to the dairy industry. The dairy industry is meeting that challenge and will continue to meet it.

WE MUST ANTICIPATE THE FARMER'S POST-ARMAMENT PROBLEMS

During the last World War the Government made many appeals to the farmers—the farmers responded to those appeals. They produced more food per man than had ever before been grown in the history of the world in a similar length of time. When the post-war period came, the farmers, however, were the very first group to be deflated.

In the fall of 1919 the Government owned certain stocks of food, and these stocks were advertised at bargain prices in post offices all over the land.

These supplies were thrown on the home markets and retailers were requested to handle them without profit. These supplies were accumulated for war purposes. They dropped like a bomb on a market that was already collapsing.

All of us believed in a reduction of the costs of living. All of us believed in a return to normalcy after the war, but none of us believed that the price of farm products should be blasted to bits overnight.

That was not the case with other materials. There the surpluses were dribbled into the market slowly so that prices did not break overnight.

THERE MUST BE NO REPETITION OF INJUSTICES WHICH CONFRONTED FARMERS AFTER LAST WAR

Our job now is to insist that there must be no repetition of the rank injustices which confronted the farmer after the last World War. After the present armament period our condition may be much worse than it was in 1918 because our debt will be proportionately larger.

The answer to this problem is not that government should take over all of the means of production and distribution. The answer must be found in a revitalized system of free enterprise, and I am in fervent agreement with the purposes of proposed legislation to establish a post-emergency economic advisory commission so that we can anticipate the problems of the future and do something about them now.

Where there is no vision the people perish. We need vision today—we need leadership. The time to meet these problems is before they come into existence.

WE MUST PROTECT DAIRY PRODUCTS AND THEIR DOMESTIC MARKET

We know that after the war our foods will be needed to feed a hungry world. Our problem today is to plan intelligently to protect farm markets for several years after the crisis has passed.

Government purchases of dairy products are essential to defense, but there is no reason why there should not be an adequate differential over butter and other competitive dairy products.

While I have never subscribed to the administration's program of a bureaucratic, swivel-chair farmer regulation of American agriculture, I feel that at this time it is necessary for us to merge our cooperative efforts with the Federal bureaus wherever it is possible.

However, I can see no reason for dictatorial Federal farm regulations to encourage manufacturers to use low-price vegetable oils and animal fats for synthetic products to compete with our dairy products—particularly when these dairy producers are not permitted to use these same synthetic elements.

AMERICA NEEDS GREATER USE OF DAIRY PRODUCTS TO CREATE BETTER DIET SO WE HAVE HIGHER STANDARDS OF HEALTH AND VIGOR

Dr. Thomas Parran, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, recently said, "In the weeks and months to come, we shall need not only planes, and munitions, a growing Army and Navy, but also rugged health and courage."

I agree with the Surgeon General when he says we need a nation of people who are more fit, more vigorous, and with higher standards of health. That means we have to put to work our scientific knowledge for the nutrition of all our people. We have the capacity, the fertility of the soil, the equipment, the facilities for distribution—in fact, every element which we need to raise the standards of public health through better nutrition, which certainly means an increased rather than a decreased use of dairy products.

I believe fervently that every drop of milk and every pound of butter which we can convert into human protein foods represents a substantial advance in the front lines of our health defense. We need to build a stronger and healthier people through a more complete diet.

The emergency today instead of lowering our standards should stimulate us to raise them and should serve as a foundation for our post-armament economy and our post-armament health standards. We need to raise our people to the highest possible level of health and vigor.

WHAT THE FARMER HAS A RIGHT TO EXPECT OF GOVERNMENT DURING THIS DEFENSE PERIOD

For over 8 years now about 80 percent of the farmers have been losing ground because they have not gotten the cost of production out of their milk. The Government has been taking over farms. Insurance companies have acquired multitudes of them.

Now, when there is $500,000,000 available in the Lease Lend Act for farm products to give to Britain, the farmers expect that this

Government will see to it that they get at least the cost of producion for the products that the Government gives away—for the products which the Treasury of the United States buys with the people's money.

BUYING POWER OF FARMER MUST NOT BE DRIED UP IF WE ARE TO AVERT COLLAPSE

Sooner or later this defense program will be over. When that period comes, I do not want to see the buying power of the American farmer absolutely dried up so that industry and labor will have no market whatever for their products.

The defense program has assisted industry and in some cases has built their factories. It has given them cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. Legislation has been passed to protect the labor interests of this country.

Congress has placed a floor under wages and a ceiling on hours. Congress passed a Social Security Act and that Social Security Act raises the prices of everything the farmer uses. Yet the farmer cannot share by so much as one dime in the distribution of the funds collected under the social-security program.

Congress has enacted artificial devices safeguarding every segment of American economy except the farmer, who produces the clothes we wear and the food we eat.

I do not advocate the repeal of these laws. I know that the farmer is not opposed to higher wages for labor and reasonable profits for industry, but I know also that he is entitled to a reasonable share of the national income. He is entitled to have legislation enacted which will give him a fair share of that income.

FARMER HAS NEVER GONE COMMUNISTIC

The farmer has never had a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. We never had to pass any laws limiting his profits, because in most communities he has been selling far below the cost of production. He never had any National Labor Relations Board to protect him against speculation and a decrease in income and unfair trade policies. The farmer has never gone on a strike in an effort to force the consumer to pay higher prices. He doesn't have a wage and hour law. He works from daybreak until nightfall.

He has the lowest income of any group of workers in the United States, but he has never gone communistic. He and his products are still the backbone of the Nation, and today he stands as a valuable soldier in the food lifeline of our front-line defenses.

WHAT SHOULD THE DAIRY FARMER DO DURING THIS DEFENSE PERIOD?

(a) He should do everything to increase his production.

(b) He should fight for his domestic market and not let it slip away.

We should constantly keep on educating the American people to the value of dairy products, and not have the post-armament task of reeducating the American people and recapturing the American market.

(c) We should insist that more and more dairy products go into the Army rations.

(d) We must now anticipate the post-armament problem which will confront the farmer and insure against a collapse in farm market similar to what followed the last World War.

(e) We must make certain that government does not sell the farmer down river now and during the post-armament or post-war period.

If there is a ceiling placed on dairy products there should be a floor also placed. Not only that, government should not injure the local dairy market by boosting synthetic products.

(f) The farmer must insist that carry-over grains can be used to increase the production of milk, poultry, and meats.

(g) The farmer must insist that the administration give priority to concerns which produce farm machinery.

(h) We milk farmers must now give thought to the idea that in the post-armament period we may have to participate in Government programs with the Surplus Commodities Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

(i) We dairy farmers must continue to insist that we who produce the food be given a fair cost of production.

(j) The dairy farmer should now seize on the present market as an opportunity to put his financial house in order and not get into debt.

(k) The dairy farmer should insist that he have all necessary tariff safeguards now and in the future.

America in this great emergency can count on the dairy farmers of the Nation. The dairy farmers want to make sure that they can count on America. In other words, the dairy farmers issue a challenge to every other segment of our national economy. Can such segment show the equivalent in production that the dairy farmer has shown?

France went down because she would work only 40 hours a week during the critical period from '36 to '39. Germany worked 80 hours.

The farmers of America are awake to the challenge of the hour; they are producing. What does the record show in relation to our production of airplanes, of antiaircraft guns, antitank guns, tanks, etc.? The answer is: There is a woeful lag in the production of these things.

The farmers of America are awake; they are at work; they are producing. Can that be said of our managers of government? Can that be said of those who are supposed to get production for defense?

The farmers have answered the challenge by longer hours by their wives and children working in the fields (in many places they cannot get labor because nondefense Government agencies use that labor), by more intensive work, by cutting corners, by thrift and industry. And they know, because life has taught them that lesson, that there is no other way to get results; there is no magic remedy.

And so the farmer of America, singing at his work, goes forward. Pray God the other segments of our society may catch the same spirit and do likewise.

American Defense Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, September 2), 1941

ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by one of the best of American writers, Mr. Arthur Krock, entitled "American Defense Production in War's Third Year," published in the New York Times of September 2.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of September 2, 1941]

IN THE NATION—AMERICAN DEFENSE PRODUCTION IN WAR'S THIRD YEAR

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 1.—When he addressed labor today and called for a speed-up in armament production, the President once more conceded that "our American effort is not enough," that "our enemies know it," and "unless we step up the total of our production and more greatly safeguard it on its journeys to the battlefields these enemies will take heart in pushing their attacks in old fields and new."

Inasmuch as this candid statement was made at the beginning of the third year of the war in Europe by the chief of the American defense effort which began under his direction at the opening of that war, it calls for complete acceptance of the fact that our rearmament and aid to Great Britain have measured up neither to the needs of Great Britain nor our own. The admission is official, on the highest authority. And although British policy has excluded any public statement of disappointment from that Government, the fact is mournfully admitted in private over there.

A logical assumption would be that the President, conceding the unsatisfactory state of rearmament and British aid and calling earnestly for acceleration, would welcome any criticism calculated to reveal graphically to the American people the lag of production. A second logical conclusion would be that, short of giving to the enemy information of value, administration officials would be encouraged to make their public reports in such form as to explain why armament production is as yet insufficient. How, otherwise, can the American people be made to understand the need which the President stressed once again today?

MR. BYRD'S DATA

Yet the nature of the President's recent comment on Senator BYRD's rearmament statistics, and speeches lately made by some of the chief defense aides, fail to support that logic. Mr. Roosevelt, finding errors in some sections of Mr. BYRD's data—not the most important—said the Senator had been "sold down the river," a remark which must have been designed to cast discredit on all that Mr. BYRD reported. And high officials, in the same period, spoke of our armament production in terms of percentages, which does not give the true account at all. For, as Mr. BYRD pointed out, "if the production of modern, effective tanks last December was zero, a production of 8 in July would be an increase of 800 percent."

The Senator, with figures he obtained from official sources, opened the way to the following opinions:

We have not by any means enough armament and other defense units to show for the $10,000,000,000 which the Government has spent since Hitler invaded Poland 2 years ago today.

We could have produced much more with better administration of manufactures and a more effective labor policy.

The statistics on hand, the continuation of strikes, and the exemption of wages from the pending price-controls bill strongly indicate that the unsatisfactory state of production, which the President again conceded today, may not be cured in time to give to Great Britain the aid that nation requires and to the United States the defenses it will need in any event.

Many perfectly sincere citizens, in full agreement with the President's war policy, hold these opinions. The administration shows willingness from time to time to admit the first conclusion drawn from Mr. BYRD's reports. But, because it is unwilling to admit the others, it has steadily quarreled with the sustaining data and by picking flaws has

sought to discredit the entire exhibits. In so doing the administration attacks its own accuracy, for, of course, no citizen could have produced Mr. BYRD's data without resort to official sources.

THE VITAL CATEGORIES

From these sources, and from industry, Mr. BYRD obtained the following statistics concerning the three articles most needed by the British and a fourth vital to our own defense:

Airplanes: The July output of combat ships was 700, or 200 less than the program requirement and 16 less than were finished in June. (Another 760 were trainers.) Of the 700 combat planes only 14 were the 4-engined heavy bombers for which the British stand in dire need, 95 were mediums, somewhat less essential, and 243 were the 2- and 1-motored ships which are of little present use in attack. A total of only 3,850 combat planes will be produced this year.

Tanks: Our main output is of light 12-ton tanks, about 1,500 in ——— (of which 500 have gone to Africa. The British, for larger action, desperately need the 32-ton (Chrysler) tanks, of which none had appeared by May 15 last. Not even a model of the 52-ton tanks has yet been finished.

Ships: This year's total will be 105 cargo ships and tankers, some as light as 2,000 tons, and 78 of them merchantmen.

Antiaircraft guns: We have about a dozen of the 90 mm., vital to the protection of our cities and the Panama Canal, of which thousands are needed.

The Government should welcome reports of this kind as assistance to the President's call for a speed-up, or, even better, should make them unnecessary by itself issuing data regularly and with full accuracy.

Churchill's Message to Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, September 2), 1941

POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem by Mr. Carlisle entitled "Churchill's Message to Mankind," referring to the recent meeting between the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCHILL'S MESSAGE TO MANKIND

Out somewhere on the friendly Atlantic,
Hid away from the gossiping world,
President Roosevelt watched and waited,
'Neath the Stars and Stripes meekly unfurled,
For his guest, the Prime Minister Churchill,
Of the British Empire, from afar,
That they might, face to face, plan together
To stop tyranny, and end the war.

The United States speaks the same language
That Great Britain speaks, and they both think
The same thoughts, touching freedom and justice,
Whose defeat has brought peace to the brink
Of extinction in every free country,
And is threat'ning with danger and dearth
Every government now in existence
Throughout all of the civilized earth.

This planned meeting was, therefore, symbolic
Of the unities which underlie
These two peoples, which led them together
To resolve to denounce and defy,
And to end, yea, without fear or favor,
The worst tyrannies ever designed
For the purposely planned devastation
Of the freedoms and hopes of mankind.

These two great English-speaking defenders
Of the freedoms bequeathed to mankind
Are determined to never give over
To the dictators who have combined,
Under Hitler, to Germanize Europe,
Yes, and Asia and Africa—for
The American and English peoples
Will not stop, short of winning this war.

The Czechs, Austrians, Poles, and Norwegians,
The Danes, Belgians, Dutch, Greeks, Croats, and Serbs,
And, above all, the noble French nation,
Have been stunned by this despot who curbs
Every instinct of honor and justice
In the peoples whose rights he has trod
Under foot, and has laid waste their churches
In which they met to worship their God.

Surely, Italy—through Mussolini—
And the Balkan States bought a respite,
By becoming the most shameful jackals
Of the tiger, for fear of his might;
But they, too, like Spain, Sweden, and Turkey,
Soon will be just as greatly perplexed—
With experiences like that of Russia—
Wond'ring which one will be stricken next.

Into this pit have Europe's famed races
Been adroitly flung, one at a time,
Out from whose deathly terrors and tortures
They, unaided, cannot hope to climb—
But all this could not satiate Hitler—
Though with Russia and Turkey he'd made
Nonaggression agreements, with Russia
He's at war now, and Turkey's afraid.

Here's a devil who, in a mere spasm
Of his lust for more power will blot
From the face of the earth helpless millions
Of just people, who have harmed him not.
More than six million soldiers are fighting,
From the Atlantic to the Black Sea,
To enforce daring Russia's destruction,
And to satisfy Hitler's decree.

Ah, but this time it was not so easy—
Nay—this time it was not all one way—
For the armies and people in Russia
Are defending their homes, while we pray.
Nearly two millions of Hitler's soldiers
Have created a merciless flood
On the battlefields of dauntless Russia
With their own irreplaceable blood.

The aggressor, stunned, startled, and staggered,
In the worst of ways, retaliates,
By first torturing those in whole districts,
Whom he afterwards exterminates.
Since the Mongol invasions of Europe,
There has never been, on such a scale,
Such methodical, merciless slaughters
As in Hitler's mass murders prevail.

This is but the beginning of sorrows,
Overflowing mad tyranny's banks—
There will famine and pestilence follow
In the bloody ruts of Hitler's tanks.
We are in the unbearable presence
Of crimes that are too cruel to name—
For the Japanese rank close to Hitler
In the brutal invasions they claim.

Japanese armies now are invading
China's domain, with wicked intent,
Spreading carnage, corruption, and ruin,
Calling it the "Chinese incident."
Every effort we'll make for a peaceful
Settlement, but this has got to stop,
For the United States and Great Britain
Think the underdog should be on top.

In those talks somewhere in the Atlantic,
Where the Stars and the Stripes were unfurled,
Plans were laid with the purposed intention
To end tyranny throughout the world;
And to give to all peoples a simple
Statement of how to right what is wrong,
Tho the march for our nations and others
To the goal might be painful and long.

Not the United States nor Great Britain
Would assume that there'll be no more war,
But intend to take ample precaution
To prevent what they so much abhor,
By effectively disarming nations,
That "preparedness" rumors may cease,
But by keeping prepared to prevent them
From renewing their wars against peace.

The new order which Hitler would fasten
Upon Europe and all the whole earth
Would destroy all the national freedoms,
And enslave every child at its birth,
And enforce upon all working classes,
By devices inhumanly rude,
'Neath the lash of unmerciful masters,
Unrelenting, abject servitude.

Far and wide in his glory Napoleon
Spread his empire of conquest and blood—
Like a dream, tho, his empire has vanished,
And is drowned in oblivion's flood—
As he widened his warring horizon,
In his covetous wisdom, he saw
That, to win what he craved, he must promise
To the people a new code of law.

Naught but mania and exploitation
Has been promised by Hitler, whose theme
Is destruction to all those that hinder
The fulfillment of his bloody dream.
He has all the machin'ry and weapons
To grind down and hold down those whom he
Has subdued, who, as captives, are helping
To enforce his barbaric decree.

Hard will be the ordeals of the peoples
That this tyrant has conquered in war—
We must show them that we'll break the shackles
That now bind them—for such we abhor—
We must give them the certain conviction
That their sufferings, which we disdain,
And resistances 'gainst his atrocious
Usurpations, will not be in vain.

Altho dark and long may be the tunnel,
At the end of the tunnel is light—
That's the theme of the Atlantic meeting—
There is day at the end of the night.
Don't despair, brave, courageous Norwegians,
For your land, which the despot now rules,
Shall be cleansed from tyrannic invaders
And the Quislings, who're his filthy tools.

Czechs, be strong in your hopes and your spirits,
Your late lost independence will yet
Be restored, through the triumphs of justice,
Whose demands, in the end, must be met.
Poles, the courage of your brave defenders
Who for love's sake have crimsoned your sod,
Through the ages, will not be forgotten
By humanity's merciful God.

Lift your heads up again, gallant Frenchmen;
All the infamies at the command
Of your traitors can't stand long between you
And your birthright, your own native land.
Yugoslavians, Luxemburgers, Dutch, Belgians,
Tho endowed with the spirit of Greece,
Like the Greeks, you've been shamefully conquered
By the tyrannic hater of peace.

In the aptly called Atlantic charter
Of Great Britain and United States,
They are pledged to destroy the destroyers
Of world peace, wrecked to gratify hates.
One by one, Hitler pushes his conquests,
Always, in countries weaker than his—
That explains why his every invasion
Is the wondrous success that it is.

If the nations that Hitler has conquered
At the start all together had fought,
His succession of mass devastations
Could have not been effectively wrought.
"Let George do it" has been the sad slogan
When weak nations were pleading for aid,
And today the whole world is endangered
By a world war that Hitler has made.

Now, in heart, all the peace-loving nations
Are united 'gainst one deadly foe,
And the United States and Great Britain,
Under God, from whom all blessings flow,
Are resolved to destroy the war tyrants,
And regain all their ill-gotten pelf,
And restore every country that Hitler
Has subdued back to its former self.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Young Democratic Clubs of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, September 2), 1941

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO HOMER MAT ADAMS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter addressed by the President on the 18th of August, 1941, to Hon. Homer Mat Adams, President of the Young Democratic Clubs of America, which were in session at Louisville, Ky.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 18, 1941.

HON. HOMER MAT ADAMS,
President, Young Democratic Clubs of America, Louisville, Ky.

MY DEAR HOMER MAT ADAMS: Democracy has a new significance these days, for the word, whether spelled with a capital or a small "d" has merged the meaning of both.

In its world-wide application it means the defense of the great freedoms against the encroachments and attacks of the dark forces of despotism which would reenslave the globe by turning back the clock of progress half a thousand years. Domestically, democracy represents the effort to continue and improve the condition of the individual, to protect the gains for liberty—social and economic—that we have attained through the century and a half of the life of our Republic. Though the definitions differ in phrase, the objectives in the two fields are identical.

Across both oceans, on the oceans, and above the oceans the struggle is one of armed forces with the ghastly results of destruction and slaughter on a scale not paralleled in modern history. It had to be so. Against naked force the only possible defense is naked force. The aggressor makes the rules for such a war; the defenders have not alternative but matching destruction with more destruction, slaughter with greater slaughter.

At home, for a time we cherished the vain hope that the war would let us alone; inexorable events abroad taught us that there could be no safety in passivity, no sanctuary in isolation. So we were forced to disrupt our industrial fabric, not only to arm ourselves to the teeth but to become the armory of the democracies, for it soon became evident that only by the defeat of the sinister powers of cynical conquest, before they reached our shores, could we even have the slightest chance of staying out of actual war.

Unfortunately here as abroad there were and are appeasers and compromisers who contend for treaties with forces that make a mock of treaties, for agreements with forces that foreswear promises and pledges at their convenience. Granted that there are some who are making the progress of our national defense difficult, who are sincere in their belief that in some mysterious way peace may come of inaction, or inadequate action, what they advocate is nonetheless perilous to our national security. Their horror of war is not more intense than that of those of us who are convinced that only by having the brigand nations stopped abroad is there safety for the Americas.

As to what steps are required to stop the Nazis, I certainly am more inclined to accept the judgment of our Army and Navy experts who have devoted a lifetime to the study of defending America than I am to consider the judgment of even the most sincere exponent of the idea that we can occupy a war-tight compartment in a world flooded with war.

I, like the rest of you, hoped that domestic politics would play no part in our defense measures. To some extent our hopes are realized—a multitude of the opposition party is serving the cause zealously and efficiently—but, on the other hand, the votes in Congress on the various steps in our preparedness, show that partisan politics is still rampant. True, there are a very few who still wear a Democratic label who have joined the obstructionists. I think these are in the wrong party.

I would be the last person to dispute or limit the right of every citizen to have his own opinion and to express it, and I know you are with me as to the preservation of that most important freedom. But whether an individual who campaigns against the principles and policies of a political party retains the right of membership in that party is a different question.

Patriotism is immensely more important than party loyalty, but when party loyalty goes hand in hand with devotion to our country, and a determination to keep that country free and safe there is no division of allegiance. I have implicit faith in the youth of this Nation; I have no doubts of where you stand. I only ask you to keep your ranks clear and clean of whatever subversive influence may add to our country's peril or make more difficult its protection.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, September 2), 1941

LETTER BY CHARLES MORRIS MILLS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter on the St. Lawrence seaway written by Mr. Charles Morris Mills, of Jaffrey, N. H., which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on August 17, 1941.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of August 17, 1941]

SEAWAY NOW FOR "DEFENSE"—IT IS REVIVED AS PART OF OMNIBUS BILL IN SPITE OF OPPOSITION

To the New York Herald Tribune:

A review of the records of State legislatures in session in 1941 reveals that 10 States have passed resolutions or memorials to Congress condemning the building of the St. Lawrence seaway, while no State has taken a favorable stand. A survey of Congress made a short while ago showed more than a hundred Members opposed to the project. A review of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for 1941 estimates that one-tenth of all material contained in the Appendix concerned the seaway and that a large proportion were composed of unfavorable resolutions adopted by leading business, commercial, and labor groups. Who, then, wants the seaway? First, sectional interests who think they would be benefited by its construction; second, a Federal Power Commission headed by a radical chairman who believes in the public ownership of all utilities; and, finally, the President of the United States, who under the guise of national defense is seeking to win out in a final victory for one of his pet projects after 10 years of defeats.

Last winter, as a member of the New Hampshire House of Representatives, I sponsored a resolution opposing the construction of the seaway. With a house almost evenly divided politically, the resolution was adopted by a vote of 173 to 73 and went through the senate without a record vote. The people of the Granite State put themselves on record against this extravagant, impractical, and unconstitutional project.

The main objection lay in the fact that the St. Lawrence seaway offers one of the most defenseless developments from a military point of view. Less than 200 miles from an unguarded Atlantic coast and open to enemy attack from the wilds of northern Canada and Labrador, the entire lock and dam system could be put out of business within a few minutes at the most. The Yankees of New Hampshire, whose boundaries lie within a few minutes' flying time of the site chosen for deep-seaway development, refused to allow the possibility of enemy planes dropping a few bombs by mistake on towns and villages that lie above the general contour of the international boundary.

They did not want another Suez Canal blocked by hulks sunk by enemy dive bombers. They did not choose to have New England made into an island. They reckoned that while ships might be built under the dream-like proposal in the Great Lakes region and steam out to sea, at the same time enemy ships through the same facilities might invade the heart of America. With their usual sense of economy, these Yankees did not want to share in the new billion-dollar outlay for the construction of the seaway, as estimated by expert engineers like Col. H. L. Cooper and E. P. Goodrich. The Granite Staters could not see where any direct benefit would come to local farmers and businessmen. They were close enough to Canada to know firsthand that the proposed agreement is being accepted across the border under pressure rather than through free will. Finally, they were shocked that an agreement, ratified by a simple majority vote of Congress, would displace a customary constitutional international treaty, approved by two-thirds vote of the representatives of the people.

A recent survey of Congress conducted by the Propeller Club of the United States revealed that the Senate and the House of Representatives were no more in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway than the State legislatures.

If the St. Lawrence is deepened to 27 feet, it would be necessary to dredge 13 American and 2 Canadian harbors from 4 to 8 feet. In addition, water-front facilities and equipment would have to be changed at large costs. The waterway would accommodate only about 5 percent of the passenger-cargo traffic, which would usually require 33 feet depth in the channel. Large warships, therefore, could not be built in the Great Lakes, contrary to the rosy dreams of the promoters. The waterway would be available only about 7 months of the year, as the average open season for the last 20 years has been from April 26 to December 9. The potential tonnage would be composed of only about 43 percent American tonnage, while the cost per bushel of wheat would be 11 cents, with an estimated net loss of 7 cents per bushel. At the same time an improved waterway would open the gates to the importation of foreign agricultural products to the midwestern market.

For 8 years the President of the United States has carried on an unremitting campaign for the Federal control of all the waterways of the Nation. With the aid of the Supreme Court, the victory was won through recent decisions, but the memory of the defeat of the flood-control compacts in 1938 has not been forgotten by New England. The result of the campaign was to hamstring public utilities from making capital investments for expansion. The Nation today is paying dearly for this guerrilla warfare in favor of the public-ownership school of the New Deal. In January 1938 Wendell Willkie submitted a comprehensive plan of expansion to the President, which was pigeonholed. Now the President wants to cap the climax with the St. Lawrence waterway under the sheep's clothing of national defense.

CHARLES MORRIS MILLS.

JAFFREY, N. H., *August 10, 1941.*

America and the Union Label

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, September 2), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY I. M. ORNBURN

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "America and the Union Label," delivered over the network of the Mutual Broadcasting System on Labor Day, September 1, by I. M. Ornburn, secretary-treasurer of the union label trades department of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Ornburn is one of America's outstanding labor leaders. He was formerly a member of the United States Tariff Commission. At that time and now he stands for the protection of American industry as well as American workers. At the present time he is endeavoring to help spread defense contracts so that the little fellow in industry will have a chance to continue in business.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Each year the American labor movement adds a new page to the history of its achievements. In the rich experience of the past 60 years, the American Federation of Labor not only has recorded what it has accomplished for American workers but it has noted all pitfalls so that they can be avoided in future years. Through this careful consideration of labor's problems and the spirited action of officials and members, organized labor has been able to obtain definite results for all workers.

Time does not permit a complete review of the outstanding accomplishments of the American Federation of Labor. Among the more important achievements are higher wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions. In addition to these definite gains, labor has made great strides in political and educational fields. Labor has also placed on the statute books of both State and Nation, laws to protect toilers in all industries. Organized labor has been in the front ranks of every movement for old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, and workmen's compensation. These progressive steps have been made in peacetime. Organized labor has also had an enviable record in wartime, not only in protecting the rights of labor but also by making steady gains in membership with its accompanying patriotic influence and organized support of our defense program.

Today I wish that it were possible for me to visit the home of each organized worker in America. After gathering together all the members of his family and their friends, I should like to impress as powerfully as I am able, upon each and every one of this little group, that his future welfare is dependent upon buying union-label goods and using union services. All the benefits that have been obtained through 60 years of fighting and sacrifice will be lost if every member of each family unit does not buy collectively the things that are union. If I could talk to each labor unionist and his wife, I would ask this question: "How do you expect to maintain union-made wages if you do not buy union-made goods?" Then I would add: "It is ridiculous for a union man to bring union-earned money home and then have his wife spend it for unfair products." You cannot buy sweatshop products, made by men and women workers who receive slave wages, and at the same time continue to draw union wages. It does not add up right. Union-earned dollars form the principal support for union conditions. Failure to buy union-label goods will mean loss of jobs by union labor, and it will also mean the loss of American union-labor standards.

This is not the idle boast of some cheap politician who, through his promises and platitudes, wishes to gain your support. I am not running for office. I have been a worker at a bench, and I grew up in the American labor movement beside the illustrious Samuel Gompers. I am urging your patronage of union firms because it will help you. I desire to see definite performances rather than hear the fantastical promises of phonies and demagogs. I know from experience that members of labor unions and their friends can accomplish miraculous results. This great army of labor-union-conscious consumers can place any union-label product at the top of sales in its category. Likewise, it can cause any unfair product to be a flop on the market.

Each member of the family should learn the trade-marks and brand names of all union products. He should make up a list of business firms that employ union services. This is the best way to make progress in the organized-labor movement.

Labor Day is a good day for each individual unionist to ask himself a few questions:

First. Have I, by my lack of interest, my inaction, my neglect, retarded the labor movement of which I am a part?

Second. Have I failed to pay my dues promptly and have I neglected to attend all meetings of my union?

Third. Have I consistently patronized only union services, and have I demanded only goods which bear the union label?

When each of us fully realizes that the standards of all the toilers can be raised by individual action, the personal importance of each member as a vital part of the entire labor movement can be realized. When we take this view we may look into the future and see the tremendous possibilities which lie ahead, provided we join wholeheartedly with our fellow unionists in concerted action.

During the coming year let each one of us devote more thought, more energy, and more spirit toward the goal of making the organized labor movement a more militant and powerful American institution. If we do, each Labor Day will be a milestone of progress of the American Federation of Labor.

Our Nation is now facing most revolutionary changes in our economic system. They are caused by the conversion of our skilled workers, machinery, and industrial plants from a peacetime footing to production for war and defense purposes. Total preparedness requires the Nation to draw on all its manpower and materials. The "V" that stands for victory will be determined in the workshop, but it must be supplemented by the three "M's"—men, money, and material. These resources of democratic nations must be used in this gigantic struggle.

If labor unions had not existed in the past, many of the skilled workers who are now actually doing the work of building our ships, our airplanes, our tanks, our guns, our coastal defenses, and all other material necessary to place the Nation in a position to meet any attack from its foes would not be available to tackle this gigantic task of preparedness. It was through the protection of their labor unions that these skilled workers were able to secure their jobs and thereby obtain the necessary experience and education so important where efficient craftsmen are required. So it is upon union workers that the principal task of building up the defenses of our Republic mainly rests.

When the United States Government finds that it is short of men or materials it will draw on peacetime industries and supplies for defense purposes. These demands are known as priorities, which create a very grave situation for all workers. Defense production will displace the production on which workers are normally employed.

The American Federation of Labor, through its committee on national defense, of which I am a member, is planning in advance to safeguard the jobs and other rights of workers in this serious emergency. Just as soon as a certain industry is closed down or its production decreased on account of priorities, the local A. F. of L. defense committees should instruct the workers to get in touch with the local employment agency and report all facts to the A. F. of L. national defense committee. We must direct workers to defense jobs as soon as possible after normal industries are curtailed or closed down. The American Federation of Labor urges local defense committees to offer their services in finding substitutes for materials restricted by priorities. It offers union cooperation to union manufacturers in obtaining defense contracts and subcontracts.

A great responsibility now rests upon organized labor to guard employment, working conditions, seniority, and other rights of workers for the duration of this emergency.

Just as the present world conflict will be won in the workshop, so will victory come to the union forces in American industry. It is necessary to keep pounding away with every union-earned dollar and every union-earned penny until the great union-labor army drives into oblivion autocratic industrialists who would readily fasten the chains of industrial dictatorship upon American workers.

In the same degree that we require weapons of defense to protect the sacred principles of democracy in government, so do labor unions find it necessary to have available weapons to secure their rights and maintain the benefits gained by labor unions over a long period of years. Union-earned money when directed in union channels is the best weapon for the defense of American labor standards. Members of labor unions, their families and friends, form this union-label-conscious battalion. Like bombs in an air raid, union labels, shop cards, and service buttons are the greatest weapons to drive out unfair bosses and open-shoppers from the consumer market. Through the use of the union label, workers do not find it necessary to strike or to even throw out a picket line in front of an unfair industry. The union label, shop card, and service button are weapons that can be used in a silent and peaceable manner. They are continuous boycotts against sweatshoppers, chiselers, and unfair employess. The union label is the best guaranty that products are made in America. It is the only assurance that goods are made under humane and sanitary conditions. The union label is the highest insurance of quality.

Union labels, shop cards, and service buttons stand for industrial democracy and economic security. They are emblems on the banner of the allied forces which are combating industrial dictators in America. These trade-marks of American Federation of Labor unions are the very antithesis of the emblems of totalitarianism. This great army of union-label-conscious consumers is pitted against the Axis forces composed of sweatshop employers and low-wage chiselers. These official insignia which are displayed on union-label goods and designate union services are symbols of a mobilized consumer army which, with union-earned money, patronize only those firms that display the union label, shop card, and service button.

Union-label activities are increasing in every community. There has been a great growth in union-label committees of local unions, central labor unions, State federations, and national and international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. These union-label committees, in conjunction with the State federations, central labor unions, label leagues, and women's auxiliaries, have persuaded mayors of cities or Governors of States to set aside 6-day periods to be known as union-label weeks. They have also held extensive union-label exhibits. In other cities union-label parades, concerts, dances, and banquets have been arranged by the live-wire union-label advocates in the community. Any of these methods of promoting the union labels, shop cards, and service buttons is commendable.

In closing, I can think of no more appropriate words than those of the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, who, in 1854, had this to say about labor and America: "All that serves labor serves the Nation. All that harms labor is treason to America. No line can be drawn between these two. If any man tells you he loves America, yet hates labor, he is a liar. If any man tells you he trusts America, yet fears labor, he is a fool. There is no America without labor, and to fleece the one is to rob the other."

Lincoln's advice was sound then and it is just as sound on this Labor Day in 1941.

The Road to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, September 2), 1941

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able and well-considered article written by William Allen White and published in the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette of August 21, 1941, entitled "The Road to Peace."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette of August 21, 1941]

THE ROAD TO PEACE

That was a historic conference, probably one of the momentous gatherings of the thousand years since the Magna Carta, between the Government of Great Britain and the head of the administration of the United States. It is curious how events in the last thousand years have gradually pointed to the evolution of freedom in western Europe, in the South American countries, and in the English-speaking world. Consider the Magna Carta, the Cromwellian rebellion, the Declaration of Independence, the fall of the Bastille in Paris, Napoleon's Waterloo, the revolts of South America under Simon Bólivar, the Gettysburg speech, the League of Nations and the conference of the powers on the sea yesterday.

Common men are vastly freer than the barons were who challenged King John. It has not been a straight line, this march of freedom. It has zigged and zagged and curved. It has bent up and away from and back to freedom, but always the line of liberty has moved on.

The twentieth century is drawing to an end. The new century is about to open the third thousand years since Golgotha. Man in this epoch has climbed a long upward way. But in every struggle in this era man has been trying to free himself from toil and the fear of war. But he has gained much. He has stored up knowledge with invention of printing. He has harnessed steam, begun the use of electricity, invented the percussion engine. With each of these expressions of widening knowledge, man has broadened his liberty.

The allies of liberty are fighting this great war, this war of machines to free men from machines by breaking down high barriers which slow down machines and threaten men with idleness and starvation. To break down tariff walls will mark the next step in human evolution.

Today the conference in the Atlantic is in the stage of "what we shall do if we can do it when we are able to do it." It is written in the potential of the future. History is engraved finally only in the past indicative. But this great conference of the English-speaking powers promises freedom to lovers of freedom everywhere. It heralds the guaranty of nations to live as they will, under their own form of government and giving all—victors and vanquished alike—access to the world's raw materials.

This is a momentous occasion. This is a proclamation of a new era in the development of civilization in the twentieth century and in a new millenium of the third thousand year of our epoch. A place in human progress will be marked somewhat by this conference of the powers.

Remember it and tell your children that you lived in this day and how you heard the news.

Gradually, the foreign policy of the United States has developed. As the war went from phase to phase, it has become evident that the President is leading his country along the road to peace—the road to sure peace that follows international justice. A good neighbor cannot live safely and justly, even armed to the teeth, in a mean neighborhood. A decent nation cannot thrive even behind ships and guns and planes in a world of aggressors. Only as human relations are fair and equitable can decent men prosper happily. Only as international relations are founded upon international justice can democracy survive anywhere in the world. Justice itself is set up only after discussion and compromise—never by arbitrary force under proclamation or by ukase.

Step by step, for 4 years, beginning with his demand that the aggressors be quarantined, back in 1937, President Roosevelt has hewn his pathway to that conference in the Atlantic. In the light of that conference, his policies are clearly revealed. Look at the pathway: The repeal of the Embargo Act, the shipment of arms to Britain after Dunkerque, the swap of destroyers for island bases to protect our continent and to enforce the Monroe Doctrine, the lease-lend bill, the defense program, the occupation of Newfoundland, the establishment of naval bases in Iceland—all these, taken a step at a time, mark the straight course to permanent peace.

The President's peace aims were announced Thursday from the conference in the Atlantic. Any deviation in the past 2 years of war from the course he has kept, would have led us quickly into war. For any other policy than his would have let Great Britain go down in defeat. It would have left us facing the totalitarian tyrants alone.

President Roosevelt has remained silent with simple courage while he has walked his steadfast way to peace. His enemies, the isolationists, have abused him by clamoring with incessant indecency he was leading America to war. He has let events speak for themselves. Now his deeds, ringing down the corridor of the years, are clarion notes. Now the country knows that the President has been walking the only way to peace which America can follow. Ours is the way of peace through justice, offering liberty as the basis of peace, holding up freedom to all rulers and to all people as the way of life in a modern world.

These lines are written by one who has opposed President Roosevelt in three campaigns and felt his election for a third term would be a public calamity. Yet today we ask all American citizens to look back over the course he has charted in the last 4 years. Aren't you proud of your President? Why should partisanship cloud the glory of this day?

The tyrants were afraid to let their people read the eight peace points which President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill offered to the world as the war aims of the democracies. If the tyrants were sure of their ground, they would be sure of their people. The tyrants would be sure that their people would reject these aims, or, if not reject them, doubt the sincerity of those who offered the new peace.

But fear is the tyrants' poison. He drinks it to his death. Some way, despite the censorship, despite all the barriers erected around continental Europe, the peoples there will learn the truth, and the truth will make them free. When any man, any nation, any tyrant fears the truth, he is doomed.

The clinching proof that the tyrants are scared is found today in the boasting, taunting, arrogant reply of the Hitlerite to democracy's peace aims. Getting tough is a sign of rough going.—W. A. W.

Retrenching Nonessential Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, September 2), 1941

ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column written by a very able author, Mr. Frank R. Kent, in the Baltimore Sun, September 3, on the necessity of retrenching nonessential spending.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of September 3, 1941]

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—LAST CHANCE TO RETRENCH

(By Frank R. Kent)

WASHINGTON, September 2.—There is considerable cynical comment accompanying the appearance in the Senate of a new bill by which an additional $4,000,000,000 will be extracted in taxes of one kind or another. For example, it is being said in some quarters that when, in 1942, the taxes provided in this bill are collected, most of the zest for—and most of the indifference to—this war will evaporate in America. And when, in 1943, it is added, we come to pay the even more painful taxes to be imposed by the inevitable second bill of next year, all interest in the war will disappear and our participation become vastly unpopular.

In brief, this is a prediction that, if it depends upon us, the war will not last long after the second income tax begins fully to operate, thus pinching many millions of citizens who never were pinched before. This is an exceedingly low view to take of the American people. It is equivalent to saying that they lack stamina and are devoid of character; that they are a rancid lot whose principles and protestations wither and fade when real sacrifice is involved. These thoughts emanate from the isolationist type of Washington politician. They are a libel upon the Nation and there is slight basis for the suggestion.

Nevertheless, it may as well be conceded that a vast number of men and women heretofore lightly touched—if directly touched at all—by taxes are going to be affected by these two bills far more seriously than they have any idea now. Full appreciation will not come until the collection of the new taxes actually has begun. But when that time arrives the shock will be severe and the pain much more acute, as well as more widely distributed, than ever before. And it will not be the wealthy who will be most painfully squeezed, nor from whom the loudest squeals will come.

They will be squeezed all right, and properly so. But they have become somewhat inured to that, know better what is coming and how to prepare. This time many millions who never before paid any form of direct tax will be brought in under the new bills, and at the same time the indirect taxes, which hit everybody, will be heavily increased. For these new millions, tax-conscious for the first time, the experience, coupled with the high cost of living, is going to be extremely unpleasant. There is no doubt of that.

Of course, it is wicked to suggest that by reason of the tough times ahead, our national fortitude will vanish and the people generally lose taste for the basic foreign policy to which the Nation is committed—to wit, that there shall be no peace negotiations until and unless Hitler is finally and completely crushed. If that is the kind of country this is, then civilization is indeed in a bad way. One can thoroughly disbelieve in the idea and yet appreciate that when a tax burden such as that in prospect is laid upon this peace-loving people it is not going to be easy to bear.

In such a situation, wisdom and high-mindedness upon the part of our selected rulers is the vital essential. If they fail in these qualities, if they are partisan, political, incompetent, and insincere, then the sort of cynical prophecy above-mentioned cannot be dismissed with the contempt it deserves. Those who run the Government in a crisis such as this cannot, without danger, neglect at least the effort to afford the obvious protections to which the people, called upon for sacrifices, are entitled. To fail in that is to invite disaster.

For this reason attention is once again drawn to the pregnant question of retrenchment, which, though it has seemed dead almost beyond hope of resurrection, suddenly has been revived by that indomitable champion of common sense, Senator BYRD, of Virginia. Almost single-handed he succeeded in having the Senate Finance Committee incorporate in the pending bill an amendment and a resolution which, if adopted, may prove not only the longest step we have taken in 8 years toward a restoration of financial sanity but a more effective defense move than has yet been made. The Byrd proposals not only require the Budget Director to point out to Congress how $2,000,000,000 can be cut from nondefense costs but name a committee of 14, on which for the first time the spending and taxing committees of House and Senate are brought into cooperation with the Treasury officials in an economy effort.

The importance of Congress adopting the Byrd amendment and resolution is hard to exaggerate; in all probability they present the last real chance the country will have of recovering its financial equilibrium. The effect of adoption would be salutary in a good many ways. For one thing, it would be the best means of insuring against such a popular reaction to the coming tax burdens as is above suggested. There need be no fear of such reaction, no matter how painfully pinched millions may be by these forthcoming bills, unless the conviction is driven home that their sacrifices are needlessly great and that they are being victimized by the incompetency and insincerity of their leaders. Certainly it is an outrageous, indefensible, and dangerous thing to lay upon the citizens the burden of these two enormous tax bills without at least one genuine all-out effort to retrench. Again let it be said that these Byrd proposals look like the last chance to avert a national calamity as great as war itself.

Artemus L. Gates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. JACOBSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WORLD'S WORK

Mr. JACOBSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the World's Work of January 1932:

The appointment of Artemus L. Gates to the office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Aeronautics by President Roosevelt adds another to the roster of illustrious names of native Iowans who have contributed so much to the Navy. The new Assistant Secretary was born in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and grew to manhood in my home town of Clinton, Iowa. That a better insight may be had of the character of this remarkable young executive, I cannot do better than to quote an article from the World's Work for January of 1932:

On a crisp November afternoon 15 years ago the Yale and Harvard football teams were fighting it out in the bowl at New Haven. It was in the heyday of the late Percy Haughton, who had put the Indian sign on the Elis for 7 long years.

Suddenly a Harvard man fumbled, and "Di" Gates, the Yale tackle, picked up the ball and beat it for the goal line. He was brought down just short of a touchdown, but in a moment Yale had pushed it over and won her first Harvard victory since 1909. After the game Gates was chosen captain for the next season.

His team never took the field, however, for long before the following fall we were at war and Artemus L. Gates was flying with the famous Yale unit founded by F. Trubee Davison.

Sent abroad as a lieutenant commander, he was put in charge of the naval air station at Dunkerque, a post closer to the enemy than any other on the North Sea. For his feat in pulling a British bomber's crew out of the sea under withering German fire he was decorated by the French and British. The deed also won from Admiral Sims a recommendation for the Congressional Medal of Honor—one of three recommendations made by Sims for his force of 80,000. A little later Gates was brought down and taken prisoner, only an instant after he had flung a cigarette into his plane's gas tank to keep it out of the enemy hands.

Trying time and again to escape, he finally succeeded in getting within exactly three paces of the Swiss border when he was caught once more "just short of a touchdown."

But this time the armistice delivered the final punch, and he came home to enter the banking field and marry Alice Davison (Trubee's sister), who had done her own bit by organizing a woman's wireless unit in 1916.

Before he was 34 Gates was president of the New York Trust Co., one of the most important of New York's all-important banks.

Who Best Serves America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, who best serves America is a question that the American people must soon answer intelligently and finally.

Up to this time the question of national defense and aid to Great Britain, including the sending of an A. E. F., have been so interwoven that many people have failed to think clearly, judge accurately.

On the question of national defense there is no lack of unity. As practically everyone knows, on the question of another A. E. F., the vast majority of our people are against it.

Mr. Roosevelt and his spokesmen, warmongers and profiteers, those who would harvest "fool's gold," even though it means national bankruptcy and the plowing under of millions of American lives, have seen fit to characterize those who think of America first—and I am one of them—as traitors or as lacking in patriotism.

The shoe is on the other foot. Mr. Roosevelt, in the judgment of many of us, is the one who is betraying the interests of the American people. The turn is called so accurately, so concisely, in an editorial in the Chicago Tribune of September 3 that I quote it. It is as follows:

OF BENEDICT ARNOLD AND ENEMIES

Mr. Roosevelt, in his Labor Day address, remarked that he did not intend to become a "modern Benedict Arnold." So far as we are aware, this is the first time that an American President has felt called upon to disclaim this purpose. Perhaps Mr. Roosevelt is a bit sensitive about his revolutionary ancestor, or, to put it more accurately, his ancestor, James Roosevelt, who lived in New York at the time of the American Revolution and Arnold, and took the oath of allegiance to George III rather than place his extensive properties in jeopardy. In comparison, Benedict Arnold's record, while certainly a black one, has some redeeming aspects. True, Arnold sold out in the end, but before that he fought with conspicuous gallantry and success on behalf of his country. So far as known, none of the Franklin Roosevelt line has ever borne arms for his country.

The reference to Benedict Arnold came in a passage of the speech in which Mr. Roosevelt said some Nazi sympathizers and appeasers are asking him "to negotiate with Hitler, to pray for crumbs from his victorious table." These phrases were, no doubt, intended to smear the America First Committee, but the charge is groundless. The opponents of intervention can imagine no reason for peace negotiations between Mr. Roosevelt and Herr Hitler. Congress has not declared war and neither have the Nazis. There is nothing to negotiate about.

Mr. Roosevelt assumes the contrary. He repeatedly referred to the "enemies." The phrase occurs a half dozen times in the course of the speech. "These enemies all know that we possess a strong Navy * * *." "These enemies know that our Army is increasing daily * * *." These enemies know a great many things, said Mr. Roosevelt with rhetorical repetition. It is to be hoped that the American people also know a few things, including the salient fact that this country has no enemies in the sense in which he used the word unless we are at war, and only Congress can declare war. Mr. Roosevelt is once again attempting to break down the constitutional structure of the country by usurping the power of Congress to start wars.

The man who is determined not to become a Benedict Arnold—he has said as much—has come to this use of the word "enemy" by a gradual process. Four years ago, at the dedicatory speech in Chicago, he discovered aggressors who were to be quarantined. Next we were to take action against these aggressors. It was to be nonbelligerent, but it was to be more effective than mere words. Then we were to aid the Allies, short of war. Step by step Mr. Roosevelt has pushed for war. It is only a few weeks since he and Mr. Churchill, who is at war and has enemies, agreed on a statement of war aims. And now Mr. Roosevelt talks of this country's enemies, to accustom the people to the idea that they have no choice but to send their sons to the slaughter in Europe.

In view of this record of deviousness it is gratifying to learn from the highest authority that Mr. Roosevelt does not mean to become, like Benedict Arnold, a betrayer of the confidence reposed in him.

War or Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HAMILTON FISH

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech delivered by me over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network, Monday evening, August 25, 1941:

The most important issue ever to confront the American people since the birth of the Republic is whether to become involved in foreign wars or to stay out unless attacked. This vital issue far transcends all party lines; it is greater than the Republican or Democratic Party or both combined. It is a great American issue affecting the security, safety, and destiny of America and its people and can only be decided by one yardstick, and that is what is best for America and its destiny and not what is best for Europe, Africa, and Asia.

Every American has a right to his or her views on this question of war or peace and to express them openly and freely. The 10 or 15 percent who are for participation in the war represented by the Fight for Freedom Committee have an absolute right to urge an immediate declaration of war without being called names or being denounced as placing the interests of the British Empire before that of America. By the same token, the 85 percent of the American people who want to stay out of war unless attacked and believe it to the best interest of our country to stay out have the same right to say so without having their motives attacked or impugned.

I am grateful to the National Broadcasting Co. for an opportunity to give the radio audience my reasons why I believe America must stay out of European or Asiatic wars unless attacked. I am convinced that our entry would mean bankruptcy, ruin, disaster, loss of our liberties, the creation of a dictatorship, loss of millions of lives, and at the end communism abroad and chaos, poverty, revolution, or national socialism at home.

I repeat that I am grateful to the National Broadcasting Co. for this time, as it is about the only way to reach the American people since the interventionist and pro-war press of the East and South will not carry a line if they can help it, giving the views of 85 percent of our people who want to stay out of war.

I am quite sure that such interventionist and war-propaganda newspapers as the New York Times and Herald Tribune will studiously ignore publishing any of my remarks. The American people have long since seen through the conspiracy of the eastern press, columnists and pro-war commentators, and the moving-picture industry to drive 85 percent of our people into the war against their will. This inspired and reckless propaganda is beginning to leave the American public cold, even in the summertime.

The present war in Europe, Soviet Russia, and China is entirely different from the last war in which I served for 16 months overseas in a combat infantry regiment. In that war we had 21 Allies and 4 powerful Navies—the English, French, Italian, and Japanese—to help us control the seas and transport our Army of 2,000,000 to France. At that time the German Army was war-weary and exhausted from 3 years of fighting, with heavy casualties. Today we would only have the British, Communists, and Chinese and no one knows how long the last two will be able to continue to fight.

I agree with Senator PEPPER that if we entered the war, it might last 5, 10, or maybe 20 years and cost $100,000,000,000 a year. Such a war would mean a bankrupt and impoverished America within 1 year to say nothing of 20 years. Senator PEPPER said nothing about the loss of American lives. If we go to war by a vote of Congress, I believe the American people will support a total war waged in China, Africa, Soviet Russia, and Europe. Such a war would take an army of ten or twelve million soldiers if we were eventually to be victorious and probably 3,000,000 of whom would be killed on foreign battlefields, and another 3,000,000 come back disabled, maimed, and blinded. No American household or family would escape blood, death, and tears. I do not believe that many American mothers want their sons to die in darkest Africa, in the vastness of China or fighting in Soviet Russia to make Europe safe for communism.

On the other hand, every American mother would willingly give the life of her boy in defense of the United States and the American Continent.

Every American is in favor of making America invincible on land, sea, and air so that we can meet and defeat any attack by any group of aggressor nations upon us or on South America.

Our Navy, the largest and finest in the world, and seven times greater than the German Navy, guarantees that there could be no successful attack made on us for at least 5 years. By that time our two-ocean Navy will be completed, and within a year our Army will be fully equipped with artillery, tanks, airplanes, and antitanks and antiaircraft guns sufficient to repel any possible invasion of this continent.

A modern war is down our alley, in an industrial sense. If the Germans can build modern guns, tanks, and airplanes, we can build them bigger and better and more of them. I have no patience with those Americans who tremble every time Hitler sneezes or get jittery every time he opens his mouth. I am convinced that the American youth of

today, given modern equipment and training, is just as brave and efficient as any German soldier and would be a darn sight better in defense of the United States.

America is the one country that Hitler is afraid of, as he knows our potential military, naval, and industrial power. Unless he is completely crazy, he will never attack us or attempt to invade South America because he cannot win. It just does not make sense to compare Denmark, Belgium, Poland, and France with the United States, across 3,000 miles of ocean and possessing the largest and strongest Navy in the world, an Army of 1,500,000 which is being rapidly trained, an air force of 152,000, and a marine corps of 55,000.

We are living in the midst of an inspired and gigantic campaign of hysteria and fear that seeks to break down the will of 85 percent of American people against involvement in foreign war by depicting us as being defenseless like Norway and Holland, and that in self-defense we should go to war now or become a victim of Hitler later on.

We are told that we might be attacked from Dakar in darkest Africa surrounded by jungles and deserts, and that Hitler will either fly himself or his panzer divisions to Brazil in order to invade us. In other words, he will attack us by going backward. Dakar is twice as far as Germany from the United States, and Brazil is again twice as far from Germany. Why, the panzer divisions would get lost in the impenetrable jungles of Brazil or be swallowed up by crocodiles on the Amazon. Why, even Theodore Roosevelt, that mighty hunter, got lost on a tributary of the Amazon. Let us stop this cowardly and craven talk and fear of Hitler invading the American Continent. What in the name of heaven would our Navy, our Army, and air force be doing when Hitler discovered America?

Let us have an end to this conspiracy and propaganda of hysteria, fear, and emotionalism that seeks to drag the American people into wars all over the world against their expressed and overwhelming will.

My ancestors came over here from England more than 300 years ago to get away from the religious, civil, and eternal wars of Europe, and so did the ancestors of every other American. Now it is proposed by the Fight for Freedom Committee, Field Marshal Hopkins and those other war makers, Secretaries Ickes, Wickard, and Senator Pepper, all of whom are invincible in peace but invisible in war, to send your sons back into the eternal wars of Europe and Asia. I have much more respect for Secretaries Stimson and Knox, our two leading interventionists and war makers, because they served in the armed forces of the United States in the last war.

I have no quarrel with any American who served his country in the World War who now advocates our entrance into this war; but I have nothing but contempt for those who failed to serve or those of this generation who have evaded the draft or have not volunteered and want to send other American boys to do the fighting for them.

In the past week I have made a study of the oil situation in the East and have had the benefit of the advice of some of the best-informed oil men in America, including the representatives of the American Petroleum Institute, regarded as the highest authority. I have not the time to discuss the details over the radio, but I have reached the definite conclusion that the shortage of oil in the East is phony and is being used as part of the program to create further war hysteria. I accuse the administration of deceiving the American public by the use of misleading and fantastic statements. The American Petroleum Institute's public figures state that there were more gasoline stocks on hand in the East on August 9 than there were at a comparable date for the previous 2 years. It further states that the gasoline on hand could last about 1 month. This is quite different from the 10 days recently reported by the administration. If there is to be a shortage in the future, why does not the administration insist that the oil companies use the 15,000 idle tank cars which could supply 10,000,000 gallons of gasoline a day for eastern consumption?

I voted against the extension of the draft for 18 months because I know that a soldier can be trained in less than a year. It would be a reflection upon the Army of the United States if that were not a fact. In Canada the draft is for 4 months, and only for home defense, although she has been in war for 2 years. Evidently Canada believes 4 months is sufficient to train a soldier, and so does Switzerland. The 18 months' extension of the draft was contrary to the very purpose of the law, which was to establish a reserve each year, and it also broke an implied promise to the selectees.

I recently returned from 4 weeks' military training as a Reserve colonel at Fort Bragg, N. C., a fine training center. I am convinced that the 18-month extension would have undermined and seriously impaired the morale of the selectees, and I commend the War Department for announcing that the selectees would only be kept from 2 to 6 months longer—not a year and a half. Those who voted for the extension must feel as if they have been double-crossed by the War Department. All the power, patronage, and political influence of the administration could muster only 1 majority. It is interesting to note that of the 120 Democrats from the South and Southwest, where the 2-party system does not exist, all but 3 voted for the bill.

The Republican Members of the House of Representatives recently adopted a resolution by practically a unanimous vote that "the Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign wars. We condemn all Executive acts and proceedings which might lead to war without authority of the Congress of the United States. Our national defense must be so strong that no unfriendly power shall ever set foot on American soil. The lend-lease policy was presented to the American people as a measure short of war. We insist that it be administered as a short-of-war measure." That is our emphatic declaration on foreign policy, and we will fulfill that pledge.

President Roosevelt in a letter to the Young Democratic Clubs of America, had advised and urged all isolationists to leave the Democratic Party. Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the party, would turn in his grave. Jefferson was the leading isolationist in American history. He repeatedly urged that we keep out of "the eternal wars of Europe." It can no longer be disputed that Thomas Jefferson founded the Democratic Party and Franklin D. Roosevelt dumbfounded it. Now President Roosevelt wants to purge and read out of the Democratic Party such able and courageous Senators as WHEELER, of Montana, CLARK of Missouri, CLARK of Idaho, WALSH, of Massachusetts, MCCARRAN, of Nevada, and half a dozen others for wanting to keep America out of war unless attacked.

If President Roosevelt succeeds in reading the noninterventionists out of the Democratic Party north of the Mason-Dixon Line, he would not have anything left but the officeholders and the Fight for Freedom Committee. As long as President Roosevelt has injected partisanship into the greatest single issue before the American people, that of our involvement in foreign wars, I am sure the noninterventionists in both parties will accept the challenge. We Republicans would welcome a mass migration of Democrats into our party temporarily or permanently in order to stop Field Marshal Hopkins and his war-making colleagues from sending American boys into the shambles of Africa, Soviet Russia, and China to make these countries safe for the four freedoms. Noninterventionists in both the Democratic and Republican Parties representing 85 percent of the American people are just as strong for real national defense as the interventionists. The difference is that the noninterventionists want to protect and safeguard the United States and the American Continent and not go out looking for wars all over the world. The American people will decide their own destiny and need no help from refugees from Europe, or alien Communists in doing so. If the President should send in a war declaration to the Congress, it would be defeated by a 3-to-1 vote.

America's Opposition to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I have just completed a poll of persons listed in Who's Who in America, totaling 32,000. The result reveals that those who favor "enter the war" are in the minority by the percentage of 42.8 to 57.2 percent. The Gallup poll was 45 to 55 percent from a partial sampling of the same list. Dr. George Gallup wrote me on August 19 that he covered the period of the first 2 weeks in July and that "since that time we have found a slight decline in war sentiment throughout the country." My tabulation bears out this statement.

This decline in war sentiment is doubtless due to the involvement with the Soviet Union and the vote in the House of Representatives on the draft extension. The vote in the House of 203 to 202 proved positively that the Congress would never approve a second A. E. F. Leaders in the House of Representatives realize that there are not more than 26 votes for war out of the total membership of 435.

A tabulation of the ballots returned shows that there were 4,587 persons who voted that the United States should enter the war and 6,145 who voted that the United States should stay out. There were some who returned their ballots with comments to the effect that they could not answer yes or no. An illustration, which is a fair example of the tenor of these replies, was a letter from Miss Joan Bennett, the movie actress. This is particularly cited because of the attempt of the Fight for Freedom Committee to publicize Miss Bennett's letter into war propaganda. She states:

> Any citizen of the United States must feel the full import of such a question and the responsibility of answering it. I am sure none of us—the citizens of the United States—want war, but if it is a question of our national security being menaced in any way we would not hesitate to defend this country.

That, in my opinion, is a clear-cut expression of the views of practically 90 percent—all but the pacifists and Axis sympathizers—of the American citizens

who voted against war and of every Member of Congress who is opposing the administration's march to war. No matter what our position may be now, or how strongly we are opposed to any A. E. F., all of us will be for war if America is attacked; and those who voted their convictions in this poll—that this country should stay out of war—required no specific qualification on this question; they did not have to be told that if any nation should attack America, or even Canada or South America, the situation would be immediately changed to a question of national defense, and their views were expressed subject to any such eventuality.

I received a signed ballot from Mary Pickford, "America's Sweetheart," who voted unqualifiedly against war.

Another conscientious objector to answering my clear-cut question, who unlike Miss Bennett, contended that "no intelligent person could possibly give true expressions of his opinion" as to whether the United States should enter the war, or stay out, was one John Boettiger, of Seattle, Wash., the President's son-in-law. Mr. Boettiger's classic comment was, "I am in favor of supporting the policies so ably enunciated by our Commander in Chief." How nice. That should entitle Mr. Boettiger to at least a captaincy in the Coast Guard, since there should now be a commission available in that branch of the service for those who have worked so hard to earn them and with the Roosevelt family so well represented in the other branches of the service at home and abroad.

This poll, offered to a group who have been reported to be the most vociferous interventionists—the wealthy and privileged—a chance to be counted, although acknowledged to be in a minority. If they have not been merely sounding off in their ardent support of the President's interventionist policies while clamoring equally as loud against his domestic New Deal program as fanatical and ruinous, here was their chance to go on record to back up their bluster and war propaganda-supporting policy. I want it clearly understood, however, that I believe practically all the real war makers and warmongers contacted in the poll did vote for war unequivocally and that any such person who voted his convictions has a right to his opinion as has any other free American citizen, and I provided him with that opportunity.

But there were 809 persons who evaded a direct answer and declined to meet the issue squarely by proposing some counter questions to confuse the issue or who tried to qualify their votes. My conviction is that any person who is not willing to vote in support of his warlike effusions and go on record for active participation in a shooting war is actually against America's involvement in war. Perhaps this may be conditioned on some future development—as in all probability were most of the direct ballots against war—as most of them stated that "if America is attacked," or "if necessary to preserve our free institutions and freedom," or "if it becomes necessary to stop Hitler," they would favor war, which is an admission that they are not now for war and will actually oppose war until these conditions materialize.

While these persons were not willing to vote for war, some of them did not hesitate to propagandize the war movement and add to the war hysteria by sending copies of their replies to the Fight for Freedom Committee or some other such agency for use as grist in its propaganda machine.

These hesitant and qualified replies are the direct result of confusion in the minds of the people and reflect the effect of interventionist propaganda which has that as its aim.

The only yardstick to use is what is best for America. These qualified ballots indicate some assumption on the part of the voter that we will be attacked at some future date. If such an attack is impending, the administration has failed to notify the people or their representatives in Congress, as provided under the Constitution, except by vague and hysterical allegations hinting at some such attack. The President has not even condescended to inform the Congress as to the necessity for the warlike assertions and steps he has taken, with the evident intent of alarming us into accepting his avowed program of "awakening the American people to the danger that confronts them," without in any way taking the people into his confidence. Certainly the Axis Powers are aware of any impending threat to America of their own making, and if the President knows about it, then the American people are the only ones who have been kept in the dark.

In 1940 the President promised the American people he would keep them out of war and that no A. E. F would be sent to Europe, Africa, or Asia. Until we have been furnished with concrete and conclusive proofs that the situation has so changed whereby the people themselves may be willing to change their existing opposition to war, the President should be compelled to abide by his contract with the people. Congress is still the instrument through which the people speak, and if the President has any reason for feeling that the Nation's welfare and safety is involved he must be made to abide by his oath of office and recognize that this is still a republican form of government.

The sentiment of the people was recently ascertained in several congressional districts in various sections of the country by individual Members of Congress who initiated polls of their own. In each case ballots were submitted to every enrolled voter in the respective districts, regardless of party affiliations, financial status, or the social standing of the voters. As a matter of public interest, the poll results of these districts and newspaper polls in our two largest metropolitan districts are compared as follows:

	The United States should—	
	Stay out of war	Enter the war
New York:		
26th Congressional District, poll conducted by Representative Hamilton Fish, including President Roosevelt's home county of Dutchess, June 1941	*Percent* 90.1	*Percent* 9.9
New York Daily News, July 1941 (approximate)	70.0	30.0
Michigan:		
Third Congressional District, poll by Representative Paul W. Shafer, July 1941	*Percent* 93.1	*Percent* 6.9
Wisconsin:		
Second Congressional District, poll by Representative Harry Sauthoff, August 1941	94.2	5.8
Washington:		
Fourth Congressional District, poll by Representative Knute Hill August 1941	82.5	17.5
Illinois:		
Chicago Tribune poll, July 1941 (approximate)	80.0	20.0
Who's Who poll, enumerated herewith, August 1941	57.2	42.8

As will be seen, the Who's Who poll represents the highest percentage for war, running on an average of from 15 to 25 percent above the general polls covering all elements of our population where detailed polls have been made.

The following letter from a native-born English lady, who knows all about war, speaks forcefully for those who have cast their ballots against the United States being involved in war and gives from experience a clear picture of what war would mean to America:

RHINEBECK, DUTCHESS COUNTY, N. Y.,
August 15, 1941.

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed your poll card answered. It is the first I have ever received.

May I elucidate the reasons why I am absolutely against our entry into this war:

1. Background: I am of English birth and descent. During the last war my father was assistant censor and deputy admiralty marshal, British Government. My brother was captain, Second West Yorkshire Regiment, killed on the Somme. My second brother was interned, Ruhleben, Germany. He is now mentally unbalanced. My cousin, Bertie, was aide de camp to Gen. Birdwood Saloniki, torpedoed and drowned at sea. My fiancé was colonel, Twenty-first London Regiment, killed before Amiens, March 1918. My eventual husband, wounded in France, captain Medical Corps, A. E. F., unbalanced later by wounds, etc. My two cousins, Georges Stainforth, head of Wagons Lit Transiberian, and his son, Marcel, cadet-officer Belgian Army, shot by Bolsheviks Petrograd 1919. My uncle, Lucien Roulin, railroad man, Belgian Ardennes, shot by German court-martial order, exact date unknown, charge sabotage. I served British Red Cross 1915–17, A. E. F., 1917–19. Was prisoner in Belgian Ardennes from August 4, 1914, to late December 1914. I was in Paris during most of the peace treaty, knew many French and Russian generals well, also British diplomats, also American Jewish delegation, etc.

Experience since then may in part be seen in Who's Who. Have traveled constantly in Eurcpe and was last there in 1939—Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Italy. Am specialist in history, economics, and international affairs.

My brother received Military Cross for bravery under fire. My father distinguished mention and a French decoration. I received honorary commission Russian Guards, and in 1930 French decoration; in 1929 robe of honor from King Ibn Saud, Arabia.

2. I am against American entry into this war because I am certain that such involvement not only entails financial ruin, but also social and moral chaos.

3. I am against any active alliance or help to Soviet Russia because I have seen some of the deeds of Soviet Russian Kommissars, and while nazi-ism is bad enough, bolshevism is unspeakably worse.

4. Experience of war and its aftermath, and I have seen more than one war and more than one revolution at first hand, convinces me that noble as the eight points may be, they cannot be carried out and will not be carried out in practice owing to the conditions that must exist if this war is not shortly concluded.

5. I insist that not inherent wickedness but social and economic conditions resulting from the last war, the peace policies, and, above all, the Russian threat, have produced the totalitarian conditions we all deplore. I insist that not more war, but more peace is the only thing that can alter the frame of mind prevalent not only in Germany and Italy but all through Europe prior to this war.

6. I insist that neither the American people nor the American President, nor the advisers to the American President have the psychological or instinctive knowledge of Europe, and certainly not the actual knowledge to enable us to intervene successfully in European affairs.

7. I insist that the hardships caused here by such attempts at intervention will inevitably bring about disorder in this country and the final destruction of American liberties and the American system.

8. I insist that the true policy of the United States of America must be pan-Americanism, and that such a policy must demand certain sacrifices from us, in order to preserve this continent for ourselves, but that such sacrifices will be productive rather than futile whereas the reverse will be true if we intervene in Europe or in Asia.

9. I insist that the President of the United States, as Executive, has no right at all to usurp the policy-making and law-making functions of Congress. He has no right to come to agreements with the heads of foreign nations secretly, or to engage upon secret meetings with the heads of belligerent nations. I insist also upon one glaring fact:

Unless Congress takes up its burden and convinces the American people that it will not permit usurpation of its rights and duties, Congress is going to find itself abolished without resistance from the people.

Sir, thank you for desiring to consult my opinion. I know that I am in a minority as far as my class is concerned. I know that I am in a majority as far as the people are concerned. I also know that the day is coming when my class, and the rich easterners among whom I move, will be made to pay heavily by an enraged and unhappy people for their attitude. I am a loyal American citizen, and I believe that the last hope of democracy lies in the preservation of peace by this country.

Views of a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

LETTER FROM EDWARD S. CLARK

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BAY CITY, MICH., *August 25, 1941.*

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOODRUFF: Various complaints are being made of public apathy in regard to the European situation, and the administration's warnings, exhortations, and plans concerning it. The explanation seems very simple. It is the old story of "wolf, wolf."

Ever since the time when the first imaginary submarine was reported off the Florida coast, the administration has sought results by frightening the public and Congress. Each department has its publicity agents who give out propaganda, rather than information. Consistency is not regarded. Before Congress extended the period of military service, an extension of at least 3 years was essential to save the country. After the bill was passed, we were told that most of the men would be released after 14 or 16 months. Mr. Ickes' gasoline shortage may exist, but there are inconsistencies in his department's publicity releases and there is a feeling that the facts are being distorted, or only half disclosed.

The President's character and disposition intensify this feeling. He apparently enjoys secrecy and strategic indirectness and would rather accomplish any object by those means than by simple frankness. I have formed the impression that his success as a strategist in deceiving political opponents has encouraged a general policy of secrecy and insincerity, possibly more correctly described as "strategic sham."

There must, of course, be governmental and military secrets, but confidence is destroyed by the feeling that any lack of frankness and directness originates in something else than real necessity. The process of fooling the people for their own good is progressively ineffective.

I think there is a strong and widespread feeling of fear and caution—fear of undisclosed purposes and caution at accepting any statement or promise at its face value. This makes it difficult to stimulate enthusiasm. If it is necessary for us to take bitter medicine in the form of demoralized business and heavy taxation, we will take it, but with the feeling that much of it has been made necessary by the doctor's past mistakes and that we haven't much faith in what he now tells us.

The failure to demand any real sacrifice or unselfish effort on the part of labor is inconsistent with an honest belief in the overwhelming gravity of the emergency or in the necessity for unlimited armament production.

Another reason for hesitation is the feeling that some persons in high authority would like to use the war emergency to socialize industry. I am not an isolationist, but am strongly pro-British, and approve active help to the Allies. A Hitlerized world or even a Hitlerized Europe would be a horrible thing, but so would an Ickes-ized or Frankfurter-ized United States, and in view of the present drain on German resources, it looks as if we may be more likely to stop Hitler than Frankfurter. Our help to the Allies should be limited to the most that can be given without too great dislocation of our economy. It should stop short of such dislocation, and I fear it is already passing that point, because of the hysterical overemphasis on "one hundred percent armament effort" at the cost of closed factories and the socialization of our institutions. The utmost possible expansion of our defense activities is not the only thing to consider, regardless of what may be said by the President, by Mr Churchill, or by the representatives of the Army and Navy. The most important thing is to preserve our liberties and our traditional institutions. Something less than a supreme war effort which will preserve them is better than a greater effort, which would destroy them. We might better take the risk of being killed than commit suicide. Moreover, the risk of national bankruptcy must not be ignored. We are forced to take some risks in that direction, but they should not be taken lightly or for unnecessary objects. Mere administrative pride in the making of a supreme effort cannot excuse the unnecessary spending of billions of dollars. All of the present spending may be necessary, but no one appears to consider the question of necessity. It is taken for granted. After the war, we will no doubt find that much of the effort was misdirected, and much of the money wasted. Somebody high in authority ought to be thinking about that now.

Yours very truly,

EDWARD S. CLARK.

United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, September 2), 1941

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an article from the gifted pen and agile and vigorous mind of William Allen White, which appeared in the Washington Star of Sunday, August 31, 1941, entitled "U. S. Foreign Policy Held Peaceful."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of August 31, 1941]

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY HELD PEACEFUL—CONTENDING FACTIONS HAVE SAME GOAL—ROOSEVELT PROGRAM IS TRACED—WRITER UPHOLDS PRESIDENT'S METHODS

(By William Allen White)

The first week of September marks the second anniversary of World War No. 2. Also, it marks the fourth year of a definite foreign policy outlined by President Roosevelt in his Chicago speech in the early autumn of 1937, when he declared that free people should "quarantine against the aggressor."

Even then, and, indeed, since the beginning of our Republic, two definite groups or schools of thought have grown side by side, but, sadly enough, they have grown with a sort of malevolent neutrality toward each other. Yet both desire peace; the isolationist group, seeking peace by ignoring the war, and the group which holds that this country's road to peace is to support with our industrial strength the cause of any free country that is fighting a ruthless aggressor who is marching our way.

Neither group can guarantee peace for the United States in a world in flames. Only demagogues promise peace—unconditionally.

The Monroe Doctrine was the traditional expression of the so-called interventionist group in American politics. It was limited to peace in this hemisphere, but Kossuth and Kosciusko in Europe a hundred years ago, defending the rights of a free people in Europe, attracted American sympathy almost universally, but not, of course, to the point of armed intervention.

America sympathized with the German revolution of 1848 and American opinion stood

largely with France when Germany overwhelmed her in 1870. The country followed President Wilson when he led us into the first World War "to make the world safe for democracy." Right or wrong, futile or effective, that was the slogan of the interventionists after our national peace policy had failed in 1917. We could have swallowed our pride when our ships were sunk, but we could not repress our moral indignation when the Central Powers began to overwhelm and oppress the free peoples of Europe. Fools? Maybe, but still Americans.

In 1930 and 1931, President Hoover joined the interventionists when his administration demanded that civilization stop the Japanese aggressors in Manchuria. But Great Britain played politics; Germany was not interested; France turned a cold shoulder to the Hoover plea. So the League of Nations hemmed and hawed our plea off the table. When President Hoover went out of office, his foreign policy was, continued by President Roosevelt after the rise of Adolf Hitler.

By 1935 it was obvious that Hitler aimed at the domination of Europe, that he was arming for a great war. And slowly, in the 2 years that followed, American opinion again began to divide. The isolationists, who had risen to defeat the League of Nations, were beginning to cry: "Let Hitler alone!" And the international interventionists were beginning to feel that Hitler's aggression menaced free people everywhere, eventually even in the United States.

By 1937 the two ancient groups in American politics, the isolationists and the internationalists, began to line up again. When the President declared in 1937 that the "aggressors should be quarantined," a great outcry rose that he was dragging us into war. But it was evident then that President Roosevelt accepted the Hoover policy to oppose international aggression. He rallied by his "quarantine"' speech in Chicago in the autumn of 1937 the remnants of the forces which went into battle around President Wilson in his struggle for the League of Nations.

A year later, in August 1938, at Kingston, Ontario, President Roosevelt declared in a public speech: "The people of the United States will not stand idly by if the domination of Canadian soil is threatened by any other empire." That speech was made when Chamberlain and the British Tories were trying to appease Hitler. That speech, also, aroused the isolationists and cheered up the internationalists. Again it was "Roosevelt is leading us into war." Old lines were forming again. Six months later, after Chamberlain had surrendered, when Czechoslovakia had fallen, when Austria was conquered, when the Poles were threatened, again President Roosevelt declared that "our frontier is on the Rhine." The isolationist answer to that war cry was the passage of the arms embargo bill by a vote of 200 to 188 in the House, which President Roosevelt declared promoted the spirit of war in Europe.

It was evident even that long ago that he was trying to establish peace by using the force of American diplomatic power to check Hitler's aggression, while the isolationists were seeking peace by economic isolation. That Embargo Act would have tied our hands. While it was law, we could ship no implements of war to Europe, even to aid Great Britain. Yet the Embargo Act would have placed us in jeopardy when European war broke out by allowing our ships to carry to either belligerent contraband of war, the unassembled parts of guns and planes, the raw materials of war, wheat and oil. That law represented the drastic isolationist position: Let Great Britain fight alone, but let us risk actual entrance into belligerency when our ships, carrying not the implements of war but contraband of war were sunk by either belligerent in the conflict that was gathering. We were back in 1914—Wilson's bewildered days.

The second World War opened September 3, 1939. Then, under the danger of war and under the pressure to keep out of belligerency, the President's foreign policy relating to the European conflict was definitely formed and formally announced in Congress; in a thousand newspapers. The Roosevelt foreign policy frankly was to aid Great Britain short of war, to send her all the war materials she could buy and pay for, and to give her every aid and encouragement short of belligerent cooperation. That policy the President and the interventionist group felt was the only policy which would keep America at peace.

They took that position as a peace party; certainly not as a war party. The Embargo Act was repealed at the President's suggestion. In a score of ways the President and the internationalist group made it plain that we had no desire to deceive Hitler about our national antagonism to his ruthless plans to conquer Europe

As the war developed, after the fall of Poland, step by step, as the war changed the European picture, the President, as the leader of the interventionist peace party, of course had to shift the expression of our American foreign policy to meet the exigencies of the second World War. Hence the fall of Poland was answered by the repeal of the isolationist Embargo Act in the early winter of 1939, after the President proclaimed an emergency for the observance of American belligerent neutrality and after he issued orders increasing our armed forces. The President summoned Congress in special session to repeal the Embargo Act. Again his isolationist opponents instinctively reacted with an uproar that he was leading us into war. They appealed to the people in vain. Congress followed the President. The Embargo Act was repealed. In early November the President signed the Neutrality Act.

The foreign policy of the international group, which splits fairly even both the old parties, was made evident as the war opened in Norway, Holland, and Belgium in 1940. Then in the late spring, after France fell, the United States Navy Department traded back 50 of its planes to the manufacturers for reshipment to the Allies. President Roosevelt announced a national policy of trading in obsolete Army and Navy weapons to make them available for immediate resale to the Allies. His isolationist adversaries tried to rally Congress against the President. They failed. Public opinion supported him and he sent hundreds of thousands of old guns, which could not be used for training American soldiers, to Great Britain after Dunkerque; also he sold to Great Britain for cash thousands of tons of cannon and all sorts of implements and munitions of war. They were shipped on British ships. It was evident that the people were with Mr. Roosevelt. It was all a part of the foreign policy of the United States—to stop aggression and help to keep or to restore peace in the world.

On June 10, 1940, President Roosevelt delivered his "stab in the back" speech, directed at Mussolini after the Italians entered the war. It was evident then that American opinion was forming around the thesis that if we could keep England fighting while the United States armed we could maintain peace in this hemisphere. That spring Wendell Willkie, before he received the Republican nomination, announced publicly in three different speeches his belief in the policy that aid to Britain was the only policy that would maintain American peace. He was nominated with those speeches still echoing in the ears of the delegates.

He was nominated by the support of the international groups in the convention and in the country. Moreover, he was opposed by the isolationists who controlled the organization of the Republican National Committee because Willkie was an avowed interventionist. It was a public dogfight. Willkie was the only Republican candidate who took the internationalist, interventionist position boldly and unequivocally before the Republican national convention met.

During the whole campaign, time and again, vociferously, in plain words, Mr. Willkie declared that the way to peace was to keep Britain fighting while we armed. The public response to this attitude gave the Republicans the largest vote they had cast for a dozen years. The only voices raised against this policy, in the campaign of aid to Britain as a way to peace, were raised by Norman Thomas, Socialist candidate, and by Earl Browder, Communist candidate.

In June, after the two nominations were made, Senator BURKE, Democrat, of Nebraska, introduced the conscription bill in the Senate and Congressman WADSWORTH, Republican, of New York, introduced the bill into the House. The Pan American Conference opened in Habana, which lined up the governments of this hemisphere against the totalitarian powers. Secretary Stimson and Secretary Knox were called to the Cabinet in a gesture of coalition that would present a solid front of the international interventionists against the isolationist policy and line up the country against Hitler and Mussolini.

Immediately after Dunkerque, the President began negotiating to trade 50 obsolete destroyers to Britain for naval bases in the Atlantic, ranging from Newfoundland to the South American coast. The trade received the unqualified approval of the American people. Wendell Willkie, the Republican candidate, endorsed the destroyer deal, saving his party's face by grumbling because the deal was not conducted publicly—an obvious impossibility.

In September, in the midst of the campaign, again the President took our foreign policy to Congress. After full and hot debate, with Mr. Willkie supporting the measure, the Selective Service Act was passed. By passage of that act, the United States, with Congress concurring, advertised to the world that it was arming against the menace of Hitler and the totalitarian powers in Europe. We had already, for 3 years, formulated the policy that we would oppose Hitler, whose aggressions in Europe paralleled those of Japan in China, which the Hoover administration had so roundly denounced.

After the election the President, still maintaining his policy that peace could be maintained only by keeping Britain fighting, declared we would share our armaments with Britain, 50–50. Two weeks later, General Marshall, head of the Army, announced that the United States would turn over 56 flying fortresses to Great Britain.

By this time the clamor of the isolationists that we were being led into war rose to a roar. At every step of the progress of our foreign policy to maintain peace by keeping Britain fighting while we armed, the isolationists contended that the President was leading us headlong into war. That he was offending Hitler there can be no doubt. That Hitler did not dare to make the United States a belligerent also was obvious. Yet it was clear that if Hitler won and Britain was defeated, our turn was next. It was, therefore, imperative, in order to preserve the peace, that we give to Britain every possible aid. The interventionist policy was proving itself as a practical peace policy. It was keeping us out of war. It had won at the polls. Twice it had been endorsed in Congress by sound majorities.

In late December 1940, with these three victories back of him, the President, in a speech internationally broadcast, gave his country and the world a slogan defining the national policy: "We must be the arsenal of democracy. For us this is an emergency as serious as war itself." Again a cry went up that the President was heading us into war. A week later he asked Congress for authority and for funds "sufficient to manufacture additional munitions and war supplies of many kinds, to be turned over to those nations which are now in actual war with aggressor nations. Our most useful and immediate

role is to act as the arsenal for them as well as for ourselves." There the peace policy of the President found its first ringing slogan, and his peace policy was bringing us peace.

In mid-March the lend-lease bill was passed by Congress. The national foreign policy had a victory at the polls and three sustaining votes in Congress to support it. The following April we extended our bases into Greenland, and again the isolationists accused the President of leading us into war. But war did not come. We still had peace. Then came the occupation of Iceland, and another outcry followed, still wildly denouncing the President for leading us step by step into war. And, finally, came the demand of the heads of the Army that the time of the draftees and the militiamen be extended. Once more a futile isolationist indictment was drafted. Again the American foreign policy triumphed in Congress—but by a squeak.

It had been four times submitted to Congress and four times it had won. It had gone to the people and it had been endorsed by a tremendous majority of the voters. It has been established as the settled peace policy of the United States.

It has guaranteed peace for 2 terrible years in a time of war. Without that policy no one can deny that Britain would have been defeated before now. The peace policy of intervention and international alliance with those who are fighting Hitler has been tried and tested.

The meeting on the cruiser *Augusta* in the Atlantic, when Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt outlined the democratic objectives of the war, furnished again a new slogan around which free men could rally. But again the whoop of impotent wrath arose from the defeated isolationists. Again it died in vain reverberations. As a peace policy, international intervention for the United States has won. It has proved its worth. More than that, the isolationists, enemies of that policy, would not today denounce the eight-point program. They would not go back and withdraw our soldiers from Iceland. They would not pull out of Newfoundland. They would not, if they could, take back the destroyers, the planes, and the guns that we have sold to the British for Atlantic island bases. Certainly they would not take away those tons of armament that rearmed Britain after Dunkerque and kept Britain fighting.

The step-by-step policy by which his enemies have claimed Roosevelt is leading us into war has been proved a step-by-step policy that has preserved peace. If ever this country needed the proof of the value of its peace policy, the foreign policy of the country for the last 4 years has proved itself. It is still not strong enough to guarantee peace. No foreign policy will insure peace, and yet if the proof of the pudding is the eating thereof and not the chewing of the rag, the foreign policy of our country, after 2 years of World War, is a pudding of peace.

Presidential Declaration of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly clear to the Members of Congress and other Washington observers that President Roosevelt, in his Labor Day speech, made a personal declaration of war against the Axis Powers when he hurled his personal defiance at Germany's Adolf Hitler, and called upon his fellow Americans to "do everything in our power to crush Hitler and his Nazi forces."

In his Labor Day world-wide broadcast, President Roosevelt tossed overboard the Nation's last shred of technical neutrality and declared that "there has never been a moment in our history when Americans were not ready to stand up as free men and fight for their rights." It appears clear that this belligerent address by the President will bring about one of the most violent clashes between the White House and the Congress in the Nation's history.

No one can read President Roosevelt's address, remembering that it was a carefully prepared and considered utterance, without realizing that not only was Mr. Roosevelt declaring war against the Axis Powers—or attempting to do so—without the sanction of the Congress, but that he was endeavoring, by sarcasm and satire, to discourage any opposition to his course of action.

Meanwhile, after 2 years of war, and after a year of so-called intensive national-defense activities, the Nation has awakened to the fact that confusion, chaos, clashes between petty bureaucrats, and bottlenecks in the White House have practically paralyzed the national preparedness effort. Officials of the various bureaus, including Army and Navy Departments, are busily accusing each other of the short-sightedness, lack of energy, mistaken estimates, and lack of foresight which have resulted in charges by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, that the administration has failed miserably to meet the issue properly and to carry out its functions in providing a national preparedness.

Senator BYRD produces figures which are not denied by the administration. The spectacle of buck-passing between the various officials and departments, however, is a disgrace to the Nation. What has been needed all along, and what is still needed, is the appointment by the President of some individual equipped by knowledge and experience to have full control over the national preparedness activities. Such an individual should not be a Harry Hopkins, or a Sidney Hillman, or a Leon Henderson. He should be a man whose experience, talents, energies, and policies are Nation-wide in their breadth, and who can divorce himself from class prejudices, sectional suspicions, petty politics, and lust for power, and devote himself single-mindedly and wholeheartedly to the now vital task of building up the national preparedness.

It has been the favorite cover-up of the administration to charge that Congress has not cooperated with appropriations. The administration cannot make any such assertions now after having asked for and received from Congress more than fifty-three billions in appropriations and contract authorizations in the past year.

Another favorite stunt of the New Deal is to accuse business and industry of not ccoperating. The administration can make no such excuse now. The President has had ample power and control through the power of commandeer of priorities, and in other ways, to compel cooperation on the part of business. The fact is there has never been a case in which the administration has been able to prove that business or industry has been recalcitrant or unwilling to cooperate. The responsibility for this perilous state of affairs, in which the President is declaring a personal war against a group of foreign nations at a time when our own national preparedness is far from satisfactory, lies squarely on President Roosevelt's doorstep. He has had the money; he has had the power; he has had the authority; he has had the advice of experts; he has had every conceivable advantage, and he can no longer dodge the responsibility for the failure of the administration properly to coordinate and man the national-preparedness organization and to produce results.

Everybody has recognized that if labor and industry did not settle on a common ground of endeavor in the interest of the national safety and security that dire disaster would overtake the Nation. Everybody has realized that if labor organizations did not make peace among themselves the national-preparedness program must suffer tragically for such failure.

In his defiance of the Axis Powers, and in his warnings to labor that labor unions do not exist any more in Germany and Italy, Mr. Roosevelt carefully avoided any reference to Russia. In fact, throughout the whole Labor Day program, there was a careful avoidance of any reference to the Stalin dictatorship in Russia. The fact remains, nevertheless, that there are no more labor unions in Russia than there are in Germany or Italy. The workers in Russia do what the dictator and his henchmen tell them—or else.

There is no question but that the President's Labor Day address may produce repercussions which may involve the United States in a shooting war. It is not too much to say that that is what is hoped for by a good many of the President's advisers. This in the face of the tragic fact that the United States is far from adequately prepared for any kind of a shooting war, either offensive or defensive. It is sheer foolhardiness for this Nation to court a shooting war before it is even partially ready. Nevertheless, the conclusion is now inescapable that the Nation is headed that way fast, and that the President has declared that he personally and his administration now consider themselves at war with the Axis Powers. Under such circumstances and conditions as these it would appear that it is up to the people to realize the danger into which the Nation has been plunged, and to bring influence to bear on their representatives in the Congress to do something about it.

If America's preparedness fails, as France's preparedness failed, the tragic part of the business will be that no punishment of the few men responsible could possibly be adequate for the destruction of our form of government and

the loss of our American liberties and way of life.

This Nation must not go the way France went. The American people must wake up and demand of their representatives in Congress that the Congress fulfill its constitutional function and responsibilities in seeing that the national preparedness is adequate before those yearning for world adventures and world power do succeed in plunging us into a shooting conflict.

The Congressional Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

HISTORY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, "History," said Napoleon, "is a fable agreed upon." Perhaps he was correct. Perhaps the record of the past becomes so ornamented with the dust and the interpretations of time that it takes on the quality of fable. When this happens, the stark and brutal facts of history lose their severity and potency as instructors to the present. They are not dished up often enough, free from all comment, to carry the lesson which only stubborn facts can convey. Cold facts of the past in authentic form, standing naked and alone, can be so brutal and disturbing. Let us take a look.

THE SOURCE

In the year of our Lord 1930, the American Legion rendered a constructive service to the Nation and mankind when it officially presented through the National Source Record Commission, a seven-volume history of the World War which is titled "Source Records of the Great War." Skilled historians set themselves to the task of examining accurate data of the war and putting it in readable form. They began with causes, carried the narrative through the Treaty of Versailles. In the last volume were included a chronology of the war, a bibliography, a statistical summary, diagrams, maps, and international comparisons. The statistical summary was prepared by Col. Leonard P. Ayres, a colonel on the general staff whose title was chief of the statistics branch of the general staff. He is the same Colonel Ayres who today occupies an office in the War Department and twice monthly, presents to Members of Congress a statistical picture of defense progress.

DURATION

For the little country of Serbia, the World War raged for 1,564 days. Austria declared war on Serbia on July 28, 1914. Thereafter in rapid succession came similar declarations until both sides to the conflict had made 32 separate declarations of war between July 28, 1914, and July 19, 1918. Query: How long may the present conflict endure?

THE HUMAN EQUATION

Total population of the nations involved was 1,031,502,000, of which 60,339,106 were mobilized for war. Of this number 8,163,518 were killed, 20,203,653 were wounded, and 6,383,757 were taken prisoners. Civilian deaths totaled 8,000,000 and permanent human wrecks were set at 6,000,000, making a total human loss of 22,000,000. This factual account describes this as the total human loss chiefly of vigorous males. Twenty-two million vigorous males. That is really something.

PROPERTY AND MONEY COST

The total direct property loss consisting of ships, cargoes, factories, farms, churches, dwellings, public works, and so forth, was $56,000,000,000. The total direct money loss through expenditure, relief, and bankruptcy was set at two hundred and two billion. The indirect loss because of lack of peacetime production was set at one hundred and fifty billion. The money loss of human life on the basis of life-insurance figures was set at seventy billion. Final total estimated cost of that war, $478,000,000,000. The estimated wealth of the United States in 1916 in the form of money, securities, farms, home, factories, machines, farm products, personal property, and everything was two hundred and twenty billion. The cost of the World War was therefore the equivalent of the destruction of every dollar of wealth in two nations the size of the United States.

SHIPS SUNK

Total loss of merchant ships was 14,710,000 tons. This is the equivalent of 1471 vessels with a displacement of 10,000 tons. Total number of warships lost or sunk was 1,218,000 tons. This is the equal of 34 of the largest battleships afloat.

IRONIES OF HISTORY

The ironies and vagaries of a quarter century of history are many and varied.

Back in 1914–17

Germany declares war on Russia.
Germany declares war on France.
Turkey declares war on Russia.
Britain declares war on Turkey.
Japan declares war on Germany.
Italy declares war on Turkey.
Italy declares war on Austria.
Rumania declares war on Austria.
Germany declares war on Portugal.
Italy declares war on Germany.
China declares war on Germany.

In 1940–41

Nazis war on Communists.
Vichy France aids Nazis.
Turkey under pressure from both sides.
Britain wooing Turkey.
Japan and Nazis in alliance.
Italy wooing Turkey.
Fascists, Nazis, and Austria together.
Austria, Rumania, and Nazis allied.
Portugal sympathetic to Nazis.
Fascists and Nazis allied.
Japan, allied with Nazis, invading China.

COMMENT

Such are the brutal facts of history.

The Townsend Clubs of America Are Blazing the Trail for Adequate Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the recent action taken by the Special Senate Committee on Old-Age pensions in recommending to the Senate Finance Committee that minimum pensions of $30 monthly be given to all citizens is a heartening sign to those of us who have repeatedly tried to convince Congress of the crying need for a system of adequate pensions for the deserving senior citizens of this great Republic. Although the recommendation was not given favorable consideration and while $30 monthly is recognized as being below the amount necessary, the fact still remains that after extensive hearings the special Senate committee found a definite need for pension legislation affecting persons reaching the age of 60 years.

Then, too, it is significant that the nationally known Gallup poll discloses that 91 percent of the men and women interviewed favored Government old-age pensions, while 7 percent were recorded as being opposed, and the remaining 2 percent were undecided on the question. The poll was taken from a cross section of the American public, 47 percent of which felt that age 60 was the most feasible age to begin the pension benefits; 36 percent favored pensions after age 60, and 17 percent before the age of 60.

The survey reveals that an average of $42 monthly for single persons and $73 monthly for married couples was decided upon as the minimum figures. Care was taken in recording the voting to ascertain the age of those polled, and it is interesting to note that persons under 45 years of age were more liberal in the amount regarded as an average pension benefit, while those 60 years or over preferred a more modest pension sum.

The action of the special Senate Committee on Old Age Pensions, and the result of the Gallup poll is conclusive evidence that the country is pension-minded and realizes the great need for a system of adequate old-age pensions. This national sentiment is attributed to the persistent efforts of the Townsend national recovery plan through its thousands of Townsend Clubs to arouse the Nation to the consciousness that an adequate old-age pension system is the salvation of America.

Throughout the length and breadth of America—in hamlets, towns, and cities—the gospel of the Townsend plan has been preached the past several years in an effort to rescue thousands of our elderly citizens from the gaunt spectre of want and privation. Driving miles through all kinds of weather to organize clubs and

conduct meetings, and faced with lack of financial assistance because their membership to a great extent is comprised of elderly citizens with little or no income, Townsend members refused to accept defeat and have persevered to such a degree that even the most bitter critic must salute their sincerity of purpose and their avowed determination that the appalling situation confronting the elderly citizens of the Nation presents as vital a problem to the country as any other issue involving the welfare and security of our people.

To those of us who are carrying the torch for the Townsend organization in Congress, the sincerity and loyalty to country of the thousands of Townsend members has never been questioned. As a result, during the Seventy-sixth Congress 101 Members of the House voted for the Townsend bill despite ridicule and criticism from those who were skeptical of the plan. Today many of the most bitter opponents have joined forces with us in recognizing the plight of those men and women who are approaching the twilight of life and who, after years of productive effort in building this great Nation, now face old age with fear and trembling. For many of them the coming of winter is a cruel hardship as they journey toward the setting sun desolate and alone after a lifetime of work and sacrifice.

Among the vast number of persons over 60 years of age there are thousands of men and women with children who are unable to properly support their aging parents, yet do so, depriving their own children of the bare necessities of life. And this distressing condition exists in America—the land of plenty.

Mr. Speaker, our aged citizens are not asking charity. They have raised families, paid taxes, built our schools, and provided the brawn and brains that have been instrumental in molding this great Nation. Are we going to be so ungrateful as to abandon our elderly neighbors in their declining years?

The Townsend plan shines forth as a beacon light guiding this Nation to the shores of safety from the storm of economic upheaval. Critics are continually harping that the Townsend plan will bankrupt the United States Treasury by its proposal to pay every person 60 years of age $200 a month. Such criticism is lacking in truth, because those who utter such idle talk are grossly misinformed. The $200 figure is merely the ceiling and is used as a maximum amount. In truth, the Townsend plan is expected to make possible at the beginning a monthly pension of approximately $50 monthly with the possibility of a greater increase depending upon the revenue produced. Therefore, the erroneous idea that the Townsend plan guarantees $200 monthly to every person attaining the age of 60 years is too absurd an assertion to warrant correction. However, in fairness to the thousands of Townsend members in the United States, such an explanation is deemed necessary if for no other reason than to keep the record straight.

During the next few weeks, while Congress is observing a series of 3-day recesses, many of the Members will have an opportunity to return to their respective districts. It is my fervent hope that each and every one of us will take the time to acquaint ourselves with the crying need for old-age-pension legislation. The present old-age-pension system is inadequate and injust and is putting the United States Government in the real-estate business in asking deserving American citizens who are approaching the sunset of life to take a pauper's oath and if they have a home of their own to sign it over in return for a paltry monthly pension that is not sufficient to keep body and soul together.

This practice of heaping ridicule and abuse on our deserving senior citizens by robbing them of their self-respect is a colossal insult and an act of base ingratitude. So repugnant have conditions become that thousands of fraternal and civic organizations, notably various chambers of commerce in the United States, have petitioned Congress, urging that the Townsend Plan be enacted into law and the present barbaric system discarded. In addition, thousands of borough councils have adopted like resolutions praying Congress to alleviate such a disagreeable and distressing condition.

At the present time we have 156 signatures on the discharge petition now being circulated in behalf of the Townsend Club.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that it is earnestly hoped that each Member of this House will seriously consider the immediate need for an adequate old-age-pension system, using his own congressional district as a sounding board. I am certain that if a survey is made of every congressional district in the United States conditions will reveal the intense suffering of our elderly citizens and will likewise serve to convince every Member of Congress of the pressing need for immediate passage of the Townsend bill.

The Honorable Albert G. Rutherford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker—

Leaves have their time to fall,
And flowers to wither
At the north wind's breath, and
Stars to set; but all
Thou hast all seasons for thine own,
O Death!

The passing from this earthly scene of our beloved colleague, the Honorable ALBERT G. RUTHERFORD, has given me a keen sense of personal loss. My association with our departed friend gave me a deep insight and a grateful appreciation of the many splendid qualities of his richly gifted soul.

As a freshman Member of Congress during the seventy-sixth session, I found it necessary on several occasions to seek his counsel. His willingness to assist at all times with his kindly admonitions was of immeasurable aid to me.

Colonel RUTHERFORD was an able legislator and a fine statesman, serving the Fifteenth District of Pennsylvania with honor and distinction. His military record bespeaks his intense love of country and devotion to its flag.

Honorable and upright, to use the oft-repeated phrase, Colonel RUTHERFORD was in truth "one of God's noblemen." His unfailing truthfulness, his rugged honesty and integrity, his courage, and with all of these his gentleness, bound us to him with bands of steel. By his death the State of Pennsylvania has lost a noble son, this House of Representatives one of its most manly Members, and we a valued friend.

Colonel RUTHERFORD'S noble character may be summed up in the words of Byron:

He had kept
The whiteness of his soul, and thus, men over him wept.

We shall miss our departed colleague more than tongue can tell; yet his sterling character and lovable traits have enshrined him in our memory. He has been bidden by the Master to pass through the gates of death and they have been closed upon him as he embarked on his journey home. Our last wish, our fond hope, our enduring trust, and our fervent prayer is that a radiant celestial light may be his beacon and may illumine his way to everlasting and never-ending glory, peace, and repose.

Lead kindly light, 'mid the encircling gloom.
Lead Thou me on;
The night is dark, and I am far from home;
Lead Thou me on.
Keep Thou my feet, I do not ask to see
The distant scene—one step enough for me.

So long Thy power hath blest me,
Sure it still will lead me on
O'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent till
The night is gone;
And with the morn those angel faces smile
Which I have loved long since, and lost awhile.

Fourth Armored Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, through the cooperation of my colleagues in granting me a leave of absence, I have had the opportunity of serving in my capacity as a Reserve officer with the Fourth Armored Division, United States Army, at Pine Camp, N. Y.

I had many reasons for desiring to serve a tour of duty. Foremost, however, was the desire to further qualify myself in the military, so that I might be in a position to do my small part in the defense of this great country of ours,

and, secondly, through actual service with the armored troops, our first and fast-striking force, to familiarize myself with the functions, equipment, and objective of that unit, so that I might better represent my people and my country when questions of national defense come before the House.

The Fourth Armored Division is the youngest of the four divisions of this type we have in the Army as against 20 such divisions in the German Army. At the outset I want to commend Maj. Gen. Henry Baird, his staff, the officers, and men of the Fourth Armored Division for the energetic, enthusiastic, and determined effort each and everyone has made to organize a unified fighting machine in spite of many obstacles in the terrain and sand of Pine Camp, and the disappointments caused by slow construction and lack of equipment for training. Their spirit and cooperation are an example to the rest of the armed forces of what can be done in spite of seemingly insurmountable obstacles. The men are being well fed, well clothed, and well housed, and in spite of a critical shortage in weapons, vehicles, and ammunition, well trained. A homogeneous, hard-hitting, hard-fighting team America can be well proud of.

Upon arrival at Pine Camp, N. Y., I was allocated to the office of the Division G–2, and then at my request, to familiarize myself with the organization and equipment, was assigned to the Division Officers' Training Corps, and there joined the class of 90 newly assigned officers, remaining with them for 3 weeks, while in the fourth week, I was reassigned to the G–2 office to learn the operation of the higher headquarters. During the Division Officers' Training Corps it was my privilege to operate every type of vehicle assigned to the armored forces, from the motorcycle, "Jeep," half-ton reconnaissance car, 2½-ton half-track and scout car, to the new M–3 light tank. The operation of these vehicles was not only on the road but over rough terrain of scrub oak, pine trees, and deep ravines with sand over the hubs, both in daylight and at night, with and without lights. In every case the vehicles stood up and performed without apparent difficulty or strain. The American manufacturers have met the need of the new type of mechanized warfare in an admirable manner. The vehicles are fine—all we need now is production.

On the range I fired every weapon of the armored force excepting the 37-millimeter antitank gun, which we lacked, and the 75-millimeter gun, because we had no ammunition. In my humble judgment and based on some years experience as a collector of firearms, the American weapons are as fine, if not superior, to any in the world.

With the engineers, I helped construct a 10-ton steel bridge, an 8-ton suspension bridge, and a pontoon bridge—a dangerous job under any circumstances, in peace or war. The engineers deserve a lot of credit. While there is always room for improvement, the equipment is very fine and should prove most efficient in the transporting of troops and material across any unfordable stream.

There were many things which I was impressed with. Foremost among these was the deplorable lack of equipment, although the quality of the equipment given to the Army by our manufacturers was superb. The division—and bear in mind this is the fourth as against Germany's 20—should have 274 M–3 light tanks, it has 50; it should have 108 medium tanks, it has none. The percentage of other equipment on hand for the unit, as compared with the requirements, is about the same, namely 20 percent of full complement.

Let us consider for example a tank crew. Each man must be trained and must possess the ability to operate the tank under all circumstances and must, with limited or no vision, react instantly to every order of the commander. Each must be able to make minor repairs to the tank, operate and make minor repairs to the radio and the guns. They must be a trained, coordinated team that act together with confidence in one another. This takes time and equipment. One cannot stand without the other.

So it is throughout the Army, in all its branches, and, considering the tenseness of the foreign situation and nearness of this country to actual war, it is well for our own protection and safety that we keep our varsity team made up of first-string men until the new substitutes can be trained. It is also vital that the varsity and scrub teams be given the equipment to train with, else when the time arrives for their test, they may be found lacking through no fault of their own. Wars today are not fought with bare hands or swords. The mechanized monsters are not dealt a fatal blow merely from a spear. War is a science. The Army is your team for which you desire victory. If it loses, you lose and if it wins, you win. Let us get behind our team, the Army, and give it all the encouragement, cooperation, and matériel possible so that it may obtain the training and spirit to accomplish the victory.

I want to publicly thank Maj. Gen. Henry Baird, the commanding general of the Fourth Armored Division; Lt. Col. Y. D. Vesely, the G–2, and the many officers I came in contact with for their kindness, patience, and consideration extended to me.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the war will start when the rank and file have been won over.

All the belligerent speeches at the Legion meet came from the East.

What the patriots from Washington want is unity for a foreign war.

There was one consolation at the Legion convention—no British Jack was in sight.

There will be a final show-down before Christmas on whether or not Congress is a jellyfish.

Little was said on Labor Day of the wicked waste of defense funds caused by un-American labor leadership.

The President's plea for national safety from road accidents should have included our staying on this side.

The greatest applause Governor Ratner received at the convention was when he condemned the recent intolerance at Oklahoma City.

Our full part to beat Hitler means another American Army to Europe, and do not be fooled. This column is agin' it. Are you for it?

The most amazing thing we find at picnics is that some few smart and conscientious people believe the President will not lead us into war.

My friend and double, Judge C. W. Ryan, would give little attention in his court to a plea of self-defense of a farmer who went across the river to whip a Dutchman.

Just 2 years ago this week we told Rotary at Marysville, Kans., there were two things we knew for sure—that F. D. R. wanted a third term and that he wanted us in this war.

In grasshopper years the East sent their old clothes to our pioneers in their emergency; in the English emergency they want our old clothes, the clothes we are wearing, and the hide and bone that are inside of them.

Mr. Marshall's Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF S. L. A. MARSHALL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by S. L. A. Marshall over station WWJ:

This morning I was reading an interview given by Lt. Gen. Ben Lear in which the commander of the Second Army said: "Perhaps there is something wrong with the military system of this Nation but that isn't all that's wrong. Many of our people have become soft and weak-minded. They are not willing to put out. They are willing to get but not to give."

It was at about the moment I had finished the reading of that statement that my colleague, W. K. Kelsey, pointed to it and said: "The trouble with that bird is that he is absolutely right but he shouldn't have said it." That took the words right out of my mouth. I had been reflecting on how General Lear had probably set himself once again to receive a first-class boot from certain classes of citizens—politicians and publicists particularly—who think that any time an

Army man speaks his mind even on such a matter, as directly related to national defense as is the popular morale, he should be condemned to 10 days in the electric chair.

But I second the motion. There is something wrong with the spirit of a very considerable portion of this country. If it were not so, the tenor of popular criticism would not swing so heedlessly and recklessly from all-out praise of the Army to the most incompetent and snivelling condemnation of it. The Army in its best moments was never as good nor as militarily robust as it was made to appear last winter when the country at large had a new cramp of apprehension about Britain's hold on the future, and the great majority in this country became suddenly strong for defense. It was never so bad as it has been made to appear during the last few weeks, when giving the Army a black eye became the popular thing to do in some quarters because of the reaction here to the Russian defense, and an accompanying dissatisfaction over the extension of the draft.

Every nitwit who deludes himself that he has some special insight into the military mind is now engaged in writing about morale in the Army camps. It matters not if he is so ignorant about Army matters that he doesn't know a Pelham bit from a general's mustache. He visits a few Army camps. He hears soldiers grouse and cuss out the Army and he returns to his typewriter and carries this message to Garcia: "The morale is terribly, terribly bad." To prove his point, he interpolates a few cuss words, which seems to give his review an air of authenticity.

I hardly need call your attention to the currency of this kind of flap-doodle reporting. It bobs up every time you turn a page. There must be an appetite for it or it would be stopped at its source. But the appalling thing about it is the very stress placed upon it can have only the effect of making malignant this core of unrest.

Once soldiers come to take their grievances seriously, once they become persuaded that they can strike out in any direction and the public will give them a sympathetic hearing, all discipline goes and the habits instilled by months of training are cast off. I tell you that it can happen. The greater the degree of freedom that a soldiery has experienced in civil life, the more unruly it becomes when confronted by a real or a fancied injustice in military life.

The Army will have enough of a problem with morale without agencies from the outside taking a course which is designed only to aggravate the problem. If we do these things and make the excuse that we have the right of free speech, we simply make point of the fact that we have enjoyed our freedoms only to learn how to abuse them and to contrive toward their undoing.

There has never been a time when grousing and "cussing out" the service was not an accepted part of the business of soldiering. In my years I have had some association with the troops of Britain, France, Italy, Canada, Spain, Portugal, Mexico, Cuba, and the United States, and I have yet to find an army which was contented with its lot and in which the voices of the malcontents did not echo from the guardhouse to the rear. That is true in war or in peace. But what of it? Currently I hear people say that all would be different if war were to come; that, then, every man would do his duty quietly and efficiently.

That is another great delusion. Soldiers will kick back any time. During the World War I went from a Regular Army outfit to a National Army regiment and was at first dismayed by the fierce spirit of resentment against the service in many of these men. Later I saw them in battle, and they fought like lions—still "cussing" the Army. In that kind of mill, one comes to realize that simple protest or the nursing of a grouse has nothing to do with the basic loyalty of the individual.

All armies reflect the spirits of the peoples from which they come. Turn the spotlight on civil America today—on the very business organization with which you work, for that matter—and ask if the majority of individuals would candidly say that life is a sweet dream and work a bed of roses, and they are perfectly contented with what they have. If you can answer that question in the affirmative, then your experience is not like mine.

It is not my task to appear as a special pleader for the Army, and what is said here is not any blanket endorsement of its policies. Nothing of the kind is called for, and it would be presumptuous to take such an attitude. Mistakes have occurred and others will be made, for that is the nature of the problem.

But unless we can begin to weigh our defense situation according to a sensible scale of values, and cut out this namby-pamby treatment of everything pertaining to the fighting services, we won't have to worry about our Military Establishment for very long, because we won't have any. The men are in for another 18 months. That's the way it is. It's the law. The terms of that law work a hardship on a great number of people. Many of them have to make a disproportionate sacrifice.

As regrettable as that is, it could only be made more so if the end of it should be that these men are deprived of their civil privileges only to become second-rate soldiers because the spirit of the Army is wilted by an unhealthy climate of opinion over the country.

It is quite possible for us to spend billions of dollars for defense and come up with a defensive machinery that is about as useful as a sieve. Certainly no thinking American—whether he be an isolationist or an interventionist—wants anything of the kind.

Why I Voted for the Extension of the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over the National Broadcasting Co. hook-up on August 27, 1941:

The responsibility of extending the Selective Service Act was one of the gravest problems which confronted Congress in the history of the United States.

I found it very difficult, as a Member of the House of Representatives, to determine the course which I was to pursue with reference to this proposed legislation. I spent many days and weeks in deliberating about this question, and when my vote was finally cast it was the result of mature and considered opinion.

Congress is a coordinate branch of the Government. It has its duties and responsibilities, and under our Constitution it is completely independent from the Executive. Every Member of Congress has the right and the duty to vote in accordance with his convictions. If his judgment does not agree with yours or with mine, well, it is his judgment and should be respected. I therefore feel that those of my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, who voted against the extension of the draft, voted in accordance with their own convictions and their own conscience.

There is no question that the sentiment of the public in this country does not favor long military service for the sons of the Nation. We are not a warlike people, and we have no aggressive desires to attack any country or to fight anyone in the world.

Many years ago, Woodrow Wilson proclaimed the principle that America seeks no new territory, and that we do not wish to add 1 inch to our national domains. The aim of our Government has always been peace, and we have proclaimed peace to the world by the many treaties which were made during the 20 years following the end of the last World War. In all of these treaties and conferences we have aimed at an organization of the world where wars will be unknown, and where all disputes among nations would be settled by peaceful methods.

The Bryan treaties, the Kellogg treaties, the treaties between the various powers composing the Washington Conference of 1922, and all the other international agreements to which the United States was a party, proclaimed the theory of peaceful settlement of all international disputes.

It seemed for a rather long period that the peace of the world was secure, but then the bolt came in 1939 when Germany invaded Poland. Our peace-loving country, in its earnest desire to avoid an expansion of the German-Polish conflict, was not immediately concerned with the course of events at that time, and thus refrained from becoming immediately involved. In fact, as evidence of President Roosevelt's desire to end the European conflict, you will recall the tour of European countries by the Under Secretary of State, Sumner H. Welles, in the fall of 1939. Unfortunately, the world at large had an entirely new type of war lord to contend with, and when Germany's rulers embarked on a campaign to enslave the whole world, it became an unavoidable American problem as well as a European problem.

Because of 7 years of preparedness the German war power was able to gain control over Central Europe, and the only way left to combat those evil powers, whose sole aim is the destruction of democracy, was by our national preparedness.

In consequence to these unusual circumstances, Congress, for the first time in our history, in times of peace, found it necessary to enact a Selective Service Training Act, calling for a draft of 900,000 young men to train in the cause of justice and freedom. These young men were to be trained, not for an offensive program, not to fight wars outside of the United States, but to be prepared to meet the challenge of aggressors and dictators in order to protect and preserve the liberties of the people of the United States. It was an army which was to serve only 1 year, since it was believed that training such soldiers for 1 year's service would be sufficient to enable them to become an army for defense, and the basis for our military preparedness.

So the matter rested a year ago, and it was the belief of the Members of Congress, that by following the recommendation of the War Department, and by providing for selective-service training, we had advanced the cause of national preparedness, and adequately provided for the defense of the United States. But the events of the world have a tendency to disrupt "the best-laid plans of mice and men." In spite of the fact that a year ago it was deemed that 1 year's training would be sufficient to create a defensive army for this country, experience has shown that the men who were called into service required more than a

year's training in order to become effective soldiers and guardians of our liberty.

The Chief of Staff of the United States Army appeared before Congress and told us that the national defense required an extension of the period of service; that if these men were released at the end of 1 year, we would have but a poorly trained and an inadequately prepared Army and would be unable to organize our military forces for true national defense.

A modern army differs a great deal from the type of military service for which previous armies have been trained. The new armies are completely mechanized and new methods must be taught the young recruits, in order to prepare them adequately to become modern soldiers. Experience has shown in the opinion of the Chief of Staff of the Army, that a much longer training period will be necessary than the 1 year provided for by the Selective Service Act.

Following this recommendation of the Chief of Staff, bills were introduced in both Houses of Congress to extend the service and training period and it was to carry out this recommendation of the Chief of Staff, that I saw fit to vote in favor of the extension of the draft. In doing so, I was well aware of the fact that many fathers and mothers, members of my constituency, and throughout the country, would have to make a real sacrifice by having their sons remain in training for a longer period than originally intended. I know, and feel deeply the extent of this great demand made on our people, but I am sure that the patriotic men and women of America, who love their country and are eager to preserve it for the present and future generations, will gladly make this sacrifice if they know, as I am convinced, that by doing so, they are promoting the well-being of this country.

We are at peace, and this additional period of training is a protection and a measure to safeguard this peace, and in the great words of the father of our country, George Washington, "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." Thus, by the additional training which our young men will receive under the act of Congress, they will not only become more adequately prepared to meet any challenge to our way of life, but will become trained for peace-time pursuits, and better enabled to earn a living when their term of service is over.

The Army trains its men for many peace-time occupations, and a good many of the men will have had for the first time in their lives the opportunity of becoming experts in new methods of industrial activities, useful in peacetime, for which the Army will have provided the training. These men will also have learned the value of discipline, and will have acquired the ability of adapting themselves to the changes which are unavoidable after a war. With full appreciation for the disappointment felt by some of our boys in the service, I am sure that the discharged soldiers will feel that the time they spent in the Army was well spent, and will in fact become an asset to them when they resume the normal routine of their daily lives upon returning to civilian pursuits. And for those who were previously unoccupied this training will be very helpful to them in obtaining private employment.

In voting as I did for the extension of the draft, I did so with the full conviction that I was furthering the interests of this country above any personal ambitions, and above any desire to please any particular individual or individuals, who by this extension of the draft would be called upon to make a further sacrifice. These are times when all of us should realize our duty to make some sacrifice, some in money, some in time, some in being torn from our ordinary pursuits, and giving of ourselves to the cause of national defense. There is no greater gift to man than democracy and the four freedoms. The cause is sacred, and anyone who contributes to the preservation of our great form of government will find full reward in the knowledge that his sacrifice will not have been in vain.

My vote is in line with my 20 years of public service, in which I have always considered the interests of the community against any personal wishes. This is another instance of a national effort which should bring about national unity. The cause of national unity is sacred to my heart, and in working against dictatorship and all the alien philosophies which have crept into the American public life we are fighting for the maintenance of our national unity. National unity is particularly important in times of stress and in times of a world upheaval, and in the words of the great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, "United we stand, divided we fall." By preserving and protecting the American commonwealth we will be able to help restore to those countries whose liberties have been taken away from them by brutal force their sovereign rights to which all mankind is justly entitled.

Our American democracy, fortified and strengthened by military preparedness, and hardened by the splendid young men who are preparing to become good soldiers, will gain in importance, and will exhibit to a doubting world that democracy still lives, and will live as long as there are men and women who are willing to make sacrifices for its defense.

This is our only hope for the preservation of our peace and of our great international integrity. We must live not for today but for a better tomorrow, and, my friends, there will be better days ahead—wars never last forever, and neither will Hitler and his evil followers.

I thank you.

Inland Waterways and Harbors Improved By England For Military Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at my request the Chief of Engineers has furnished me with information on the waterway improvements by England for military preparedness.

Ever conscious of both the strategic importance of inland waterways and their valuable function in the national economic sphere, the Governments of England, Scotland, and Wales have criss-crossed their island empire, from the rock-bound firths of northern Scotland to the chalk coasts of the English Channel, with waterways that are an essential element in the military preparedness of the nation. The British Isles, exclusive of Ireland, have a total area of only 68,000 square miles, about equal to the six New England States, or less than the single State of Missouri, yet they have a 2,500-mile network of improved waterways and canals. The burdens which the railways are called upon to bear in time of war, and the handicaps imposed upon highway transport by gasoline rationing, tend to focus attention upon this waterway system as a means of supplementing overtaxed land transportation in the general pursuit of the nation's war aims.

Early in this war the British Government gave recognition to the importance of inland waterways in the national transport system by forming a canal—defense—advisory committee upon which are represented the canal association and the national association of canal carriers. Full benefits are thus derived from the experience gained during the World War, when costly mistakes were made due to the lack of effective coordination of railway, road, and water transportation. Compared with the conditions obtaining in 1916, the English harbors and waterways of today are generally recognized to be operating with increased efficiency. Improvements in warehousing facilities, in handling equipment as well as in watercourses, made in peacetime, have eliminated unnecessary delays and accidents. Large sums have been spent on dredging, restoration, and modernization of locks. And through old canals, retired modestly behind concealing hedgerows, runs a quickened new life, stimulated by the armament program. Every day long, narrow canal boats are being feverishly loaded at Limehouse and other docks with scrap iron, steel, and copper destined for the mills and foundries of the Midlands.

The important inland waterways of Britain radiate from the Midlands like spokes of a wheel to four great ocean ports. Canals have been constructed northwest to Liverpool, the Trent River flows northeast to Hull on the Humber River, the Thames River flows southeast to London, and the Severn River flows southwest to Bristol. By means of artificial connections water-borne traffic may be moved from one to another of these principal waterways and thus the four great import and export harbors are connected with each other and with the industrial Midlands. Direct navigable connections also cross the island from Bristol to London and from Liverpool to Hull. Farther north in Scotland the island is again crossed by navigable channels from Glasgow to Leith and from the Firth of Lorne on the Atlantic Ocean to Moray Firth on the North Sea.

The British canals include many unusual features such as tunnels, bridge-aqueducts, and elevators, both vertical and inclined. There are 45 canal tunnels in England and Wales, each having a length exceeding 300 feet. Of these, the longest is over 16,000 feet. The first and most famous canal tunnel, the Harecastle Tunnel, constructed in 1776 on the summit level of the Trent and Mercy Canal, is over a mile and a half long. Canal bridge-aqueducts of masonry or steel are commonly used to cross railways, highways, rivers, and other canals. Near Manchester the Bridgewater Canal is carried over the Manchester Canal by a swing aqueduct.

The waterways and particularly their termini at coastal ports have become centers of great activity. British rearmament skyrocketed the demand for transporting metals and bulk freight for which waterways are excellently suited and now the all-out war production spurs this activity. Foreign barkentines, schooners, steel freighters, Thames barges, and heavy canal boats, crowded

together like ice floes, move to moorings under large electric cranes which handle cargoes promptly and efficiently. With Yankee emphasis on speed, Diesel engines propel the reloaded canal boats known as "quick boats" or "fly boats" from London ports to Birmingham in 60 hours, a trip that once took 7 days.

It has been so long since the British Isles have contemplated any defense other than at her coast lines that plans have probably never been formulated for using her interior waterways as lines of defense. The primary use of England's waterways in military preparedness is therefore to alleviate the transportation demands upon the railways and highways that invariably become overloaded. Mr. Ernest Bevin, Britain's powerful Minister of Labor and Transport, who heads the transport and general workers' unions, stressed the importance of this use of waterways in a speech on transport in wartime. He indicated the advisability of distributing the enormous reserves of raw materials and nonperishable foods at numerous points throughout the country rather than to permit these reserves to accumulate to such an extent that one air raid might cause irreparable damage. The inland waterways which traverse regions of the interior country are the logical means of accomplishing this objective. Numerous boats can take imports as they are received and distribute them to local reserve depots located in the open country adjacent to canal routes. In this manner supplies can be removed in large quantities from ports, subject to frequent air attacks, and cached at so many separated locations that a bombing attack will be unable to deliver a knock-out blow to supply.

The two-century-old waterway system of the British Isles has been steadily improved and modernized at a tremendous cost, but now, in Britain's time of need, the waterways are more capable of bearing the burden placed upon them. Coordinated transport may mean the difference between success and failure in a grave national crisis. During the World War we in the United States found it expedient to make use of everything that would float, from a bateau to a battleship. Britain is finding the same to be true today, and she appreciates that the inland waterways, now so indispensable to her cause, are ready only because her statesmen had the vision to prepare them in times of peace.

What We Defend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON PAUL V. McNUTT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by the Honorable Paul V. McNutt:

In 1939, at Omaha, Nebr., I was privileged to address your order at a testimonial dinner given in honor of a great humanitarian and a great American, Supreme Knight Francis P. Matthews.

In the 2 years that have elapsed since that happy occasion fateful things have come to pass.

The world has turned into chaos. Not for generations have the values and the ideals for which men live been subjected to such devastating attack. From a cloud, at first no larger than a man's hand, has broken a storm so furious as to shake the very foundations of Christian civilization.

From the evil forces thus loosened upon the world no nation and no people are safe. And woe unto the nation and people who fail to prepare adequate defenses against this rushing flood of pagan violence.

Rudely were the American people awakened to the danger. Heroically are they responding to it.

They are determined to build a citadel where the principles of decency and humanity may be forever secure. Without fear or panic they are throwing their energies into a mighty effort to strengthen the Nation on every hand. With quiet courage and a firm will they are arming it physically against attack from without and morally against deterioration from within.

They are preparing defenses against the threat of an invading army. But they also seek to avoid that spiritual corrosion and internal decay which is the invariable prelude to national disaster. They are improving their democracy as well as extending their military defenses.

The Nation hopes to avoid war, but if war comes, our instruments for defense will be stronger and the things defended will be more worthy of our efforts.

We know full well that ours is not the most perfect of possible nations.

There are black spots in our past—blots on the pages of our history.

There are still bottlenecks to our democracy. There are bottlenecks to production; to consumer distribution; to individual opportunity. We know that for some great minorities there are bottlenecks to liberty; people among us who are too poor for their own health and for the health of the Nation. Others who become rich to a point which is not in proportion to their contribution to the public welfare or their concern for the common interest.

But we know, too, the kind of society we want to build and the kind we can build.

The blueprint is clear. The foundation already laid.

How firm that foundation is will be measured by the courage and unselfishness of us all in fortifying it against the stresses and strains of a world gone mad with fear and confusion.

Without our choosing it, we are caught in a death struggle between two conflicting ideologies—two totally different and mutually exclusive ways of life.

In such a struggle we dare not rely alone upon the weakness of the opposing philosophy or our hatred for that way of life. We must rely as well upon the validity of our own.

A reconsecration to the tenets of democracy and a better understanding of its significance for mankind is as necessary as the will to repel an invader from our shores.

We have seen how fatal is the neglect of this phase of a nation's life. We have seen it in the fall of France.

Here was a great nation with the best-trained army in the world. Only a few short years ago it was one of the richest in the world. It had great industrial resources and a vast colonial empire. It had a great tradition for courage and resourcefulness, both in peace and in war.

But France fell, within the incredible period of a few short days.

A nation so strong and so confident could not have been destroyed in so brief a moment had it not been weakened down to the very foundation of its national life. The war, for France, was lost before it had begun.

History is a stern teacher but her lessons cannot be ignored.

Disquieting and revealing facts are gradually throwing light upon this tragic mystery.

When the Nazi legions were rolling close to Paris and the diving Stukas were roaring overhead, it is reported that the French Government issued an official order to all young men from 18 to 20 years of age to leave the city at once. They were literally told by their government to run away. A once mighty and glorious nation, the cradle of liberalism, where flourished a fierce and noble patriotism, had prepared its youth for nothing but flight when the enemy reached its gates.

In a democracy untouched by dry rot and decay, the flower of young manhood could never be compelled to flee when the nation was caught in deadly peril.

We see, too, the manner of men who have come to leadership since the bleeding nation has been beaten to its knees. Men who can tolerate and collaborate with fascism, repudiating the spirit of the Bastille and the traditions of liberty, embracing the evil forces which have dismembered the land of their nativity. Men with craven souls, who for the sake of personal power and gain, sell their nation's honor and their own.

France, indeed, was stabbed in the back.

And history will some day record that the assassin was the enemy within that struck the fatal thrust.

It is noteworthy that the France which could produce the men of Vichy almost completely repudiated those great social reforms which made the nation the outstanding democracy of Europe. Its warm concern for the common man had vanished. The drive for greater social and economic liberty had been abandoned. The social conscience was dead. The nation had become hard and callous. Liberty, equality, fraternity, the cry that once inspired the world, had become a faint and hollow sound, heard but dimly down the long corridors of time.

The Bastille was once more locked, and the spirit of French democracy imprisoned.

On the other hand, look at Britain.

Even under the impact of total war, England has rededicated herself to the democratic way of life.

Here, too, an historic tragedy was barely averted. The liberal England of the twenties had given away to a selfish, hardboiled land of appeasement. Men who thought little of national honor but much of self brought their country to the very brink of disaster.

But when catastrophe was imminent, the reaction was immediate. Unlike unhappy France, altogether paralyzed by the death grip of reaction, English liberalism and English patriotism rallied nobly, and England once more began to look after her democracy and put it into action.

Democracy is concerned with people—with what they eat and how they are housed and whether they are sick or well, miserable or happy.

England is looking after her housing problem, her food problem, and her health problem. Doing it right now, even as merciless death rains from the skies.

Here are some specific results.

A Personal Injuries Act has been passed which pays benefits to civilian defense volunteers and to all gainfully employed injured by enemy action. After 10 months of experiment, Britain has recently revised the scale of these benefits upward.

Disablement pensions are provided. Survivorship benefits not unlike those in our own social-security program are paid to widows, children, dependent parents, and even to dependent brothers and sisters.

Unemployment and workmen's compensation benefits have been increased. Health insurance has been extended and the Government has assumed an additional responsibility for that program. The machinery of British health protection is an effective organization through which to administer protection both for the families of men mobilized in the military and in the civilian services.

It is not only the international relations of the Baldwin-Chamberlain gang that the war has forced overboard. Their reactionary home policies have also been abandoned.

That is what Britain has found necessary to her defense. There is no talk of cutting social services in Britain. And as we watch British resistance, the thing we mark most carefully is the miracle of British morale, the adequacy of her food supply, the continued ability of British men and women to "take it."

Men do not fight by guns alone. They fight by faith. That is why those who serve the needs of soldiers or civilians cannot limit themselves to an interest in what goes on inside the boundaries of a military reservation or a munitions works.

Food must be good. Recreation must be available to every soldier. The chaplain who ministers to the spiritual needs, is an integral part of the staff of the Army itself.

But the soldier must also find that the community which he visits on leave is worth defending. The industrial workers must live in a community that is really worth working for.

This is a part of my own work as Coordinator of Health, Welfare, and Recreation. And it is a part of the work of your order. In contemplating our problems I have been vastly encouraged by the naming of your supreme knight as the executive of the National Catholic Community Service. There could be no greater guaranty that the job will be well done.

With other groups you led the way a quarter of a century ago. The torch of fellowship is now the responsibility of many. In the United Service Organizations we all join in our efforts to promote the spirit and comfort of those who defend America.

We will have tough problems. Many American communities are having tough problems. It is not easy for a community to expand its social services to accommodate thousands of additional workers and transients overnight. It is not easy to create new community services in churches and schools. It is not easy for families to adjust their circle of hospitality to include new neighbors and visitors from distant States.

But it must be done, and it will be done. In this achievement your organization will play an important role as it did a quarter of a century ago in a similar crisis.

The future is obscure. We can see through the glass but darkly.

Many black days are undoubtedly ahead, many severe tests.

But I believe the American people will meet squarely and without flinching every test to which they may be put in this pitiless world, steadfast in their faith that the principles of righteousness and justice and decency will prevail. Resolutely determined that whatever happens in other lands, the flame of liberty and the light of truth will remain here for all to see. One place, at least, in all the world where men are free, where their families are secure, where each may sit beneath his own vine and fig tree.

And there shall be none to make him afraid.

Friendly association, mutual aid and mutual protection, charity, and human sympathy—these are experiences which have enobled mankind and afforded to him deep-rooted satisfaction as far as the eye can penetrate into the misty past. They were valued experiences, whether man was organized in primitive agricultural communities, in nomad shepherd tribes, in clans, or in the city states of ancient Greece.

Methods of promoting these values must have been discussed long before the dawn of history. By the flickering fires of Mediterranean caves when hairy men rested after the hunt; under the stars of central Asia when the flocks were bedded down for the night; on the slopes of Mount Olympus; in the halls of the Saxon and the Viking—wherever men gathered together, drawn by the common bond, the principles of sacrifice for the common good emerged as the only basis upon which they could build a society which would satisfy the profoundest instincts of the human soul.

God indeed made man in his own image.

We recognize it when we observe the long but steady assent from barbarism until the emergence of a society which, in truth, is founded upon justice and Christian love.

We recognize it, too, when we see the highest achievement of these centuries of effort—an orderly system of institutions and a philosophy of government vesting power in the ranks of the governed and dedicated to the dignity and worth of the individual.

We have, through work and hardship, built in this land the greatest cooperative society that has ever existed. It is a society in which there is neither master nor slave; neither tyrant nor victim. Where members of every race on earth are gathered into one great fellowship, each sharing in the pleasure and the pain. A society in which there is some realization in fact of the ideal of equality and freedom. A society where the meek have indeed inherited the earth. One which, for all its defects, is man's crowning glory on this planet.

But the path has been long and the travail great.

Great masses of people have been bound by the shackles of despotism. From the Babylonians laboring in slavery for kings, and the Egyptians for Pharaohs, tyranny has survived side by side with liberty and democracy. Sometimes it has almost seemed to have crushed out the spark of freedom from the human soul.

Democracy is not a law of nature, notwithstanding its divine origin.

And no benign mystic force will protect it.

It must be defended by those who love and cherish it—by men and women who are stirred deeply when it is in peril and who will sacrifice all to preserve it.

It is this inner strength which must be expanded, for it is here that we find the measure of our ability to resist the forces that would destroy us.

And if, despite the efforts of all, the Nation is drawn into the clash of arms, if we are compelled to fight for this way of life which we have built for ourselves, it is this spirit in the hearts of the men behind the guns and in the hearts of the men and women behind them that will, in the end, bring victory.

With a full understanding of the perils ahead, let us face the future with calm courage and quiet confidence in the right, as God has given us to see it.

Generoso Pope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the fact that Generoso Pope, editor and publisher of Il Progresso Italo-Americano, a newspaper circulated very largely throughout the city of New York and other places among Italian-speaking Americans, is truly a devoted and loyal citizen of the United States, I wish to publish the translation of an article which appeared in Il Grido Della Stirpe under date of August 23, 1941, an Italian newspaper sponsored by official Italian sources.

This article criticizes Mr. Pope for the stand he had taken on the question of the internment of Italian sailors. Incidentally, the New York Times of August 14 published an editorial in which Mr. Pope's stand is praised and exalted. The two articles are as follows:

[From Il Grido Della Stirpe, New York, of August 23, 1941]

LET'S PUT THINGS IN PLACE—THE ITALIAN SAILORS IN THE CONCENTRATION CAMP ARE PRISONERS AND NOT GUESTS—THE INTERNEES OF MISSOULA DESIRE THAT THEIR SUFFERING BE TREATED WITH SILENCE RATHER THAN THEIR SITUATION BE ALTERED OR MYSTIFIED

We also ask to be concentrated.

This idea seems to be crazy, but if one reads the articles which have been published in the nawspapers of Mr. Pope during these days on the life at Fort Missoula, in the heavenly concentration camp, it becomes, instead very much justified. Isn't it a natural desire to abandon bad for good? Good exists, according to the description of Il Progresso and the Corriere, in this concentration camp.

We get, therefore, a crazy desire to ask the Government at Washington to hurry the day in which we also can reach this camp of marvels and insuperable vacation.

In a place where one works little or not at all, where one eats well and three times a day, where the food is rich with necessary vitamins necessary for good health, where hygiene and culture are not lacking, where recreation of every sort is at the disposition of anyone who wants to profit by it, where no material preoccupation (because the spiritual cannot be controlled) disturbs the good life of the detainees, where everything is rosy—in fact, who would not want to go? If this is so, then we also ask for the pleasure of being able to enjoy these many privileges in a concentration camp, instead of being so worried daily, of preoccupying ourselves by hard work and sacrifices with our miserable existence.

But is all this that the correspondent of Mr. Pope writes true? The answer to this question is given by the prisoners of the above-mentioned camp which we herewith publish voluntarily.

Herewith is reproduced the document of the detainees in the camp at Fort Missoula, with their respective autographed signatures which repudiates all the fantastic exaggerations of the author of the articles in the Progresso and the Corriere.

We do not like to start polemics with the author of the above-mentioned writings which exalt the comfortable life of the interned, such polemics would be antipathy, and would serve to greatly harm the material and moral interest of the Italians of America, but certain falsities, published for some hidden purpose, should be repudiated and the most eloquent repudiation is that which has been sent by those interested, and which we publish faithfully in this same page. From this documents one can get the exact version of the moral and material suffering which torment the interned Italian seamen, who do not find themselves on a vacation, nor are they guests who enjoy the heavenly beauty of prison. If we wanted to publish all the letters that have reached us from these prisoners, we would have greatly clarified the lies

and the fantastic exaggerations of the special correspondent sent by Il Progresso to Fort Missoula, but charity of pacifism prohibits us.

Certain exaggerations, fantastic inexactness, which have the facility of passing for happiness the suffering, are really deplorable and can be explained only by the increasing war hysteria.

This is a sickness that has not reached and cannot reach us, because we enjoy complete immunity.

DOMENICO TROMBETTA.

[From the New York Times of August 14, 1941]

"BELLA VISTA"

A little more than a week ago the Tribuna, published in Italy, printed an interview with Armando Tosi, manager of the Italian Restaurant at the world's fair, in which Signor Tosi charged that panicky fears entertained here over the "fifth column" menace had resulted in "bestial treatment" of Italian nationals detained in the United States. They had been rounded up and jailed with "thieves and robbers," Signor Tosi said, charging that several hundred in the camp at Fort Missoula, Mont., were watched over by policemen, the "majority of whom were Jews."

Such balderdash may have been dished out to the Tribuna's readers to increase their animosity toward this country. There is nothing that can be done about that for in Mussolini's corporative state the press publishes only what the Government thinks it is good for the people to know. Cabled back and published here, as this one was in the Times of August 6, such stories make little if any impression on most Americans. Among the Italian community, however, tales of mistreatment might, if unanswered, cause misgivings.

Realizing this, Il Progresso, the Italian language newspaper published in this city, sent reporters to interview 50 Italians being held at Ellis Island and to investigate the conditions at Fort Missoula. As was to be expected, the survey showed that Signor Tosi's statement was baseless. Those detained at Ellis Island are persons who entered the United States illegally and who are being held pending determination of their legal status. There are no criminals there.

At Fort Missoula, where 993 Italian seamen and world-fair employees who overstayed and cannot be deported under war conditions, are detained, Il Progresso's reporter found neither criminals nor a prison atmosphere, but 10,000 acres of land with "all the characteristics of a summer resort." Only a handful of immigration officials patrol the camp, he said, and there were no machine guns to be seen. So beautiful is the setting, he reported, that the Italians themselves have named the camp "Bella Vista."

The articles now appearing in Il Progresso provide an excellent example of the way in which a newspaper can perform a service to its readers by refuting the fanciful tales of propagandists with facts gathered by competent reporters. Il Progresso is to be congratulated on its enterprise.

Any unprejudiced observer will, therefore reach the same conclusion which all true Americans have reached, and that is, that Generoso Pope is a loyal and true citizen of the United States, and any criticism of Mr. Pope can only be traced to sources which are un-American, or not devoted to the best interest of this country.

Labor Faces Real Responsibility—Loyal Workers Will Not Fail in Their Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM VARIOUS NEWSPAPERS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege Labor Day to address West Virginians gathered at Morgantown. United States Senators KILGORE and ROSIER were speakers also, as well as active mine union leaders in that section. Prior to the program we listened to the solemn words of President Roosevelt, as he spoke by radio. Hearing his words, I was increasingly conscious of the solemn obligation which all loyal Americans face during the defense efforts.

In this connection I include at this point newspaper editorials especially pertinent to this year's observance of Labor Day:

[From the Pittsburgh Press of September 1, 1941]

A SOLEMN DAY FOR LABOR

Labor Day is the traditional occasion for union men and women to parade, congregate, and otherwise show their strength.

They have never before had so much strength to demonstrate as today.

More Americans are organized into unions of all kinds than ever before, the best estimate being about 16,000,000. With their families and dependents that makes a sizable chunk of the whole people.

Organized labor has always fought to win from society the things to which it felt entitled. Often it was a bitter and discouraging battle.

But on this Labor Day the unions must realize that they also owe a great deal to society. The high state of organization which is being achieved is due in large measure to the favoring climate established by the Federal Government. The Government—which means the people—has actively helped labor to attain its present position.

Labor is undeniably powerful today. Therefore lack of strength is no longer its biggest problem.

Its biggest problem now is that of recognizing and carrying out the obligations which go with power. Many sincere friends of collective bargaining are deeply concerned today because too many labor leaders have not recognized those obligations—have talked only about labor's gains and have forgotten that society is entitled to gains also.

And unless society—which paved the way for labor's present strength—also makes gains as a result of the help it has given, labor will not long keep the power it possesses.

It is a significant fact that while unionism stands at an all-time high in the United States on this Labor Day, it has sunk to the lowest depths across the ocean. Workers of all Europe are either bound to the iron wheel of nazi-ism, without freedom to organize or have a voice in their own conditions, or else have had to make great sacrifices in a desperate battle to prevent the further spread of industrial slavery.

Yet, here in the United States, labor stands widely accused of hampering the defense industries upon which its own self-preservation depends, and without which Europe cannot be freed from its shackles.

In previous war crises, popular clamor has been directed chiefly against business profiteering. Today this clamor is mostly directed at union profiteering.

Polls of public opinion show increasing bitterness over the actions of some labor leaders. They show that labor is being held chiefly responsible for the failure of our defense machinery to function up to expectations, and that there is relatively little blame of business.

The Government which gave unionism its present strength can take that strength away. The power which comes from the people can be taken back by the people.

We fear that the unions may not be as strong next Labor Day as they are this Labor Day unless there is a recognition of their social obligations and an acceptance of the responsibilities and duties that go with power.

The unions must clean their ranks of false leaders, of those who have seized office for selfish gain, for political advancement, and, in some cases, for outright criminal objectives. Union men and women are, we believe, as patriotic as any other Americans. And many of them are disgusted when they see our boys deprived of the weapons with which to train, and our Allies crying for the tools to carry on the fight against Hitlerism—deprived of this essential equipment by an epidemic of strikes caused by all sorts of reasons, including violations of contracts, jurisdictional disputes, and warfare between rival unions.

On this Labor Day there is a solemn obligation confronting the unions—the obligation of realizing social obligations, of living up to contracts, and of providing the national defenses without which labor in America may suffer the fate of unionism in Europe.

The following editorial in part is from the Baltimore Sun:

Although labor's material blessings have multiplied and although its position before official agencies is still highly advantageous, its standing in the court of public opinion is more and more challenged. There is discontent over the attitude of labor in the defense industries. There is dissatisfaction over the complacency with which official boards, particularly the Defense Mediation Board, subordinate the public welfare to labor's demands. All can see that labor has power and is reaping the fruits of power, but there is a growing question as to whether labor is disposed to use its power in responsible fashion in a period of national emergency. Labor's leaders need to address themselves to this problem during the next few months. Labor's political friends ought to address themselves to this problem, especially the President, whose tolerance of partisanship in the Defense Mediation Board is in sharp contrast with the call for an all-out national effort.

Developments affecting labor in the next 12 months will hinge in no small measure on the way in which the leaders and friends of the unions react to this challenge.

The Washington Post had the following to say:

LABOR DAY

President Roosevelt's Labor Day message is not addressed exclusively to the Nation's

wage earners. It is rather an appeal to all Americans of every class and calling to make sacrifices in the cause of democracy. Optimistically the President affirms his belief that labor and management realize "that there must be full and uninterrupted production of the weapons and materials needed for our protection and needed also by the nations engaged in opposing those who would do away with the liberty and happiness of free peoples all over the world." The plague of strikes and other labor disturbances that have held up and continue to hold up production introduces a jarring note to Mr. Roosevelt's confidence in the national unity of purpose. However, his words express sentiments that thoughtful and patriotic men and women will heartily endorse and obstructionists cannot afford to ignore.

A year ago we were just embarking upon the preparedness program, and very few people appreciated the magnitude of the undertaking ahead. The experiences of the past 12 months have given the public a better understanding of the challenging and exacting character of the task to which this country is dedicated. Viewed in retrospect, it seemed likely that Labor Day, 1941, will be seen to mark our entry upon a grimmer phase of our defense program. During the past year the gains to labor of the defense spending program have greatly outweighed the losses. Several million persons have been added to industrial pay rolls, while earnings have risen even faster than employment. Furthermore, wage increases have outstripped rising living costs. As was to be expected under such conditions, labor troubles have multiplied and have become a serious drag upon defense work.

The New York Herald Tribune comments as follows:

LABOR DAY, 1941

Labor Day has become so integral a part of American life that it is too often taken for granted; considered only as part of a 3-day week end, a climax to the summer. To be sure, this holiday mood is significant in itself. Labor Day is not May Day; it is not a day for muttering mobs, red flags, and portents of revolution. It is a day to celebrate, to take joyful cognizance of the fact that American labor has greater freedom, a happier way of life, more reason to look hopefully to the future, than the workers of any other nation in the world. This position labor enjoys because it is part of a free society in a land of great natural wealth; because, under the Constitution of the Republic, it is entitled to shape its own destiny, a voluntary partner in a great community enterprise; because it shares with all members of that community in the fundamental freedoms that enable men to speak their minds, to worship God, each after his own fashion, to know the truth and to use that truth to guide the policy of the Nation.

These are inestimable privileges, and it is well, in dark days, to proclaim them to the world, for they are the hope of the world, the antithesis of that brute system which Hitler and his gang would enforce to turn men into soulless cogs of a soulless state. But privileges won must be maintained, and that can only be done by remembering the responsibilities of privilege—responsibilities which were never greater than today. If labor is to rule itself, that rule must be wise. If labor permits itself to be exploited by scoundrelly leaders, labor is to blame and labor will suffer. If labor permits itself to be ruled by greed, the national interest will suffer, and that cannot be permitted. Already the errors of self-seeking leaders have cost labor much, and cost the country much. The narrow view that rates some slight advantage gained for a few thousand workers higher than the safety of the community at large—that view must go. If not, at best, labor will suffer curtailment of its privileges and the whole structure of freedom in this Nation may be fatally impaired if that curtailment is pressed to excess. At worst, these United States may become another slave colony of the Herrenvolk; then the light of human liberty will indeed be extinguished.

The word lies with the workers of America. They have it within their power to make such a convincing demonstration of their productive strength that no one will be able to question the health and vigor of the American way; that no barbarian force may dare measure its power against that of an aroused free people.

Mr. Speaker, these comments which I have placed in the Appendix give a cross-section of what our people are thinking during this critical period. It is noteworthy that President Roosevelt in his Labor Day statement said that management and labor "realize now, and I am sure will continue to realize, that there must be full and uninterrupted production" of defense materials.

While we are aware of the obligation facing labor we must readily recognize that the preparedness program can be hampered by selfish management and greedy employer action. We must courageously determine that no group, however small, is to cripple defense production and the national effort.

Financing Our Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, September 2), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ARTHUR CAPPER, OF KANSAS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the able senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] over stations of the National Broadcasting Co. on the National Grange Hour from Washington, D. C., on August 16, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate very much the invitation of Mr. Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, to talk to you over the National Grange Hour. I have known Mr. Brenckman for many years, though not quite as many years as I have been a Granger myself. I want to say for him that he represents the Grange in Washington very ably and very conscientiously; he has the respect and liking, I think, of practically every member of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

In the few minutes we have this morning, I intend to discuss, very briefly, some of the problems connected with the national-defense program. I am very much afraid that it is only in the past few months that the great majority of Americans have begun to realize that sacrifices are going to be demanded of all, and made by all, and not just by that comparatively small segment of our population drafted for service in the armed forces of the United States.

The United States today is now almost on a war footing; we are fast approaching what might be termed an "all out" war economy. Whether that means a "shooting war" will be determined in the near future; I regret to say it seems to me we have been edging, then stepping, now striding, and soon may be marching into another World War, though I am still hoping we can keep out of it.

I am not going to discuss the pros or cons of United States intervention with you today. I do not profess to know where we are going in the realm of international politics; what we are going to do when we get there; or what we are going to have when we get back—if we do get back.

I am interested and strongly in favor of an adequate national defense. I believe in a strong and impregnable defense not only against possible or prospective enemies from across the seas but also in constructing an adequate defense against those things which threaten the peace and security of our own people, our American way of life, and even our American form of government.

My friends, I happen to be serving in the Senate on three committees dealing, I might say, at first hand, with the most important problems connected with this all-out national-defense program—or war program, if you prefer to call it that. I have been a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture for more than 22 years; on the Foreign Relations Committee nearly 20 years; on the Finance Committee for 7 years. So I believe I have some idea of the magnitude and multiplicity of the problems incident to this stupendous undertaking in which we are engaged at the present time.

CONGRESS APPROPRIATES HUGE SUMS

In less than 2 years the Congress of the United States has appropriated and authorized the expenditure of some $52,000,000,000 for national-defense purposes, including $7,000,000,000 for Britain, through the Lease Lend (really the lease-give) Act. And in Washington it is expected that another $7,000,000,000—perhaps ten billions—will be appropriated in a few weeks for Britain, Russia, China, and other nations opposing the Axis Powers.

I don't know whether any of us have a real idea as to what the appropriation of $52,000,000,000 from the Federal Treasury means. Well, here is one thing it means that perhaps we can grasp: It means that the Congress has assessed $400 annually against every man, woman, and child in the United States—$2,000 for a family of five—for national defense and for the defense of Britain, Russia, and other nations, all this in less than 2 years' time. And it may be the effort has just started.

Let me state that again. The cost of national defense contracted to date amounts to $400 per capita, or $2,000 per family of five persons. If Senator PEPPER, of Florida is correct in his prediction that the ultimate war cost to the United States will be over $300,000,000,000, that will be $12,000 per family of five. The national debt before the program started was about $375 per capita, or around $1,800 per family of five.

How much of this $52,000,000,000 will be raised by taxes, and how much of it will be borrowed, is one of the problems for the Finance Committee to attack in the coming months. Of course, every dollar borrowed is about the same as a $2 charge against the

taxpayer, as the interest in the course of a generation or so will be as large as the principal charge.

Total governmental expenditures this year will, in my judgment, pass the $25,000,000,000 mark; how much it exceeds $25,000,000,000 will depend upon two things: (1) How far we get into a shooting war ourselves, and (2) how many billions Britain and Russia and smaller nations require from the United States Treasury to finance their war efforts.

THE NEW REVENUE BILL

The Senate will be working this month and next on a tax bill sent from the House which increases taxes some $3,200,000,000 a year. The most enthusiastic of the war crowd in Washington hope to be spending for defense at the rate of $3,000,000,000 a month by the end of 1944. So you can see the present tax proposal is entirely inadequate, which means taxes will increase.

Very few of us, I fear, have a real conception of what is ahead, in the way of taxes alone, to say nothing of the waste of lives, the suffering, and the stark human misery that accompanies and follows in the wake of war.

The burden surely will be great. I believe it will be more readily accepted, and more cheerfully borne, if the Federal Government will show a real desire and purpose to cut down on nondefense spending during these times. I wish I could be more hopeful along this line, but the fact the administration in this time of emergency has insisted upon including a half-billion dollar St. Lawrence seaways project and the thoroughly discredited Florida ship canal project—which will cost at least $400,000,000—as defense projects in a rivers and harbors bill, does not give much encouragement to the hope that this administration will begin practicing economy after its 9 years of reckless spending. I like the fine stand the Grange has always taken for economy in spending of public funds.

I say we must keep a tight rein on the fiscal policy of the Government, and see that every dollar appropriated for national defense goes for that purpose. I wish I could tell you that is being done. Candor compels me to say I cannot give you that assurance.

Most of you will pay from three to four times as much income tax next year as you did this year. Congress will not enact a general sales tax this year; but I regret to say it is very likely to come next year, under the dire need for raising revenue.

THE MENACE OF INFLATION

The bill is going to be large. And as has been wisely said, "There is no way by which we can skip out on the bill." I say to you now, unless we are bold in our defense financing program, unless we levy higher and much higher taxes now, we will have a mountain-high inflation followed by a depression the like of which we have never known.

The hard way, but the safest way, to meet the fiscal problem of these huge national-defense expenditures is to levy heavy taxes. Not only to protect the credit of the Government, but also to protect the people of the Nation against terrifically high prices for all commodities.

The cash income of the American people will be some $20,000,000,000 more this fiscal year than last. Because the Government will be taking products of industry to the tune of twenty to twenty-five billion dollars, there will be at least $15,000,000,000 worth less of goods for civilians to buy. Twenty billions more purchasing power, fifteen billions less in goods to be purchased—inflation is inevitable. The more is collected in taxes and the more people put into savings, the more nearly will there be a balance between supply and demand in the market and the less steep the rise in prices. That is one reason I am advocating and working for a pay-as-you-go policy as nearly as possible.

Price-fixing legislation is in sight. In my judgment, it will be passed in some form. I am going to insist that price fixing of farm products—of which there will be surpluses rather than shortages, with few exceptions—be prohibited until farm prices are well above parity. Agriculture needs a floor, not a ceiling, on prices for farm products at the farm.

PROTECTING OUR WAY OF LIFE

I say we must protect our own way of life, our own domestic economy, our own people and their rights under the Constitution. I say these things are as much a part of any real national-defense program as are the defense of the British Empire and the Russian Soviet. I want to keep the four freedoms for our own people before we start on a crusade to carry them to everyone everywhere in the world

The meeting of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill at sea was dramatic; the joint statement they issued was a masterpiece—though I am a little bit vague in my mind as to exactly what it said. By implication I could deduce that by its terms President Roosevelt, without consulting or advising with Congress or the Senate, committed the United States to destroy the Nazi power in Germany; to disarm Germany; then to help Britain police the world under a new order with highly idealistic objectives. That is a pretty large order. Before any such program is made effective by the armed forces as well as the arsenal resources of the United States, I think the chosen representatives of the people, the Congress of the United States, ought to be consulted, as the Constitution provides.

After the decision is made in the American way and in a constitutional way, I say then it will be the duty—and there will be no quibbling about it—it will be the duty of every American to support the foreign policy so decided. We must, we will, have national unity, but I do not believe we will get it by Executive order or Executive proclamations that ignore the Congress.

I make this statement as one who has great respect for President Roosevelt, as one who has supported many of the President's policies, and will continue to do so every time I believe he is right. But I shall also continue to do everything in my power to keep us out of foreign wars.

PRESERVING AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS

I sincerely hope that in the near future the President, the Congress, and the people will all get together for the defense of America and for the preservation of American institutions, for American traditions, stand by the Constitution of the United States and the welfare of the American people. I am for America first. I say the essence of good Americanism is to stand for America first. I am today appealing to you to let it be known that the people of this Nation are against going into a shooting war in Europe—or Asia, or Africa, or in the seven seas—that will be the greatest service you can render our country today, if you insist on America's interests being considered first.

All my life I have been fighting against war. And, beyond that, I am opposed to allowing one man to decide whether or not, and when, the United States goes to war.

I maintain it is the duty of Congress to see that no one but Congress takes us into war.

I am doing my best to stop any program which aims to send American boys 3,000 miles across the seas to fight and die on foreign battlefields.

I am opposed to any program which sends our Kansas boys to fight alongside Stalin's Communists in Russia or any other foreign group.

I say the blood of American boys belongs to America and should not be spilled on the battlefields of Europe.

Entry Into the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, September 2), 1941

ADDRESS BY L. B. ALEXANDER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by Hon. L. B. Alexander, president of the Kentucky State Bar Association, in Los Angeles, Calif., and carried in the edition of the Los Angeles Daily Journal of August 18, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Daily Journal of August 18, 1941]

UNITED STATES ENTRY INTO WAR IS FORESEEN BY PRESIDENT OF KENTUCKY BAR—SOUTHERN LEADER OF LEGAL PROFESSION SAYS NATION MAY BE FORCED INTO STRUGGLE, IN BROADCAST OVER LAWYERS' CLUB PROGRAM

Entry of the United States into the present war was foreseen by Attorney L. B. Alexander, president of the Kentucky bar, in an address Friday night on the radio Bill of Rights program of the Los Angeles Lawyers' Club. The program was heard over station KMTR. Alexander was interviewed by Attorney Jay Moidel, chairman of the lawyers' club committee.

Alexander declared that the national-defense program must be supported, regardless of personal feelings, and that we must continue all-out aid to Britain.

"It now looks as though we may be forced into the war, notwithstanding the efforts of our officials to keep us out of the world conflict," he declared. "I believe that England is our first line of defense, and I am reasonably sure she cannot succeed without the aid of the United States, and the fall of England would mean that we must fight alone."

AID KENTUCKY DRAFTEES

The Kentucky bar president revealed that the legal profession of his State is taking a major hand in the national-defense effort. He said he had appointed a State-wide committee of 400 lawyers to assist the Government in national defense. This step was disclosed to be similar to that taken by President Loyd Wright of the California bar.

"We propose to look after the problems of the men in service whether they be legal or otherwise free of cost to them," Alexander told Moidel. "We believe that the men in service and their families as well should be afforded every possible protection. In many Kentucky counties, enlistments are so high that few draftees are called."

LAWYERS ASSIST GOVERNMENT

"It is only natural for the legal profession to take the leadership in supporting our national-defense program because they realize that individual liberty and personal freedom will exist in this country only so long as the Bill of Rights and the Constitution survive," Alexander continued. "A strong national-defense program is our best guaranty of the survival of the Constitution which contains our Bill of Rights.

"The welfare and safety of our Nation requires national unity in times of national emergency. Without national unity our Government may collapse and our Nation fall. It is necessary, therefore," Alexander told Moidel, "that each person surrender, temporarily or for the duration of the crisis, the exercise of such individual rights as will interfere with the rights of the people as a whole. Patriotism necessitates that each person do his share in the interest of our country, and there is no place in our country for the man who doesn't believe in our form of government. The bar associations will exert every effort possible to have our liberties restored immediately after the emergency is passed, if any of them are temporarily suspended.

LAWYERS' CONTRIBUTION

"It is more important that we preserve our national liberties than we have the full, uninterrupted enjoyment of our individual rights, because individual rights are products of national liberties, and if national liberties are destroyed, our personal rights will likewise be destroyed," Alexander added.

"Lawyers, being students of government, unhesitatingly approve our form of government, largely because of the many rights which are guaranteed to the people. Under no other form of government are the people secure in the enjoyment of these liberties. Since the President declared that an unlimited national emergency exists, the lawyers, as a profession, will continue to support the national-defense program.

WELFARE OF NATION

"The Bill of Rights became a part of the law of the land to insure the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to every person living in this country. We must not permit these rights to be exercised to the detriment of the welfare of our Nation, nor should we tolerate any subversive activities under the guise of the enjoyment of any one of these same rights.

"No one has a right to advocate the overthrow of our form of government by force, violence, or otherwise. No American has any right to associate himself with any movement which would bring about the destruction of our Constitution and Bill of Rights. With these thoughts in mind, I urge every loyal American to stand by our Government in this crisis, and do his full share in support of our national-defense program."

The Cradle of Liberty and Arsenal of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, September 2), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. CLYDE L. HERRING, OF IOWA

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] before the League of Iowa Municipalities on August 20, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Members of the Iowa League of Municipalities and friends: You are gathered in convention this year under more trying conditions than have probably ever surrounded a similar meeting of your league. As the municipal executives in your various communities you are beset with unusual problems.

My purpose in speaking to you on this occasion is to endeavor to make as clear as possible the unique position into which we have been forced by the tyranny of Hitler, in spite of our most earnest desire to remain aloof from the conflict.

Although we are thousands of miles distant from the scene of war and a world torn by violence and revolution, there is, nevertheless, not a town, hamlet, or farm that is not directly feeling the effects of this "world upside down."

From cradle of liberty to arsenal of democracy the United States of America has moved in the course of 165 years of national destiny.

The founding fathers chose to establish upon these shores that cradle of liberty.

Forces from outside the United States have compelled this generation to assume the responsibility for making this Nation an arsenal of democracy.

The adoption of the Declaration of Independence and the establishment of this Nation as the cradle of liberty in 1776 was a voluntary as well as an inspired act.

The conversion of this Nation into a vast production machine and a supplier of the sinews of deadly war is a regretful and an involuntary process.

The 23 years of peace, which we have enjoyed since the last great war, were purchased by the sacrifices of those courageous Americans, who gave up their lives that this Nation might preserve the priceless heritage of freedom. Their brilliant and unselfish display of patriotism made secure for that brief period not alone the rights of American citizens, but the rights of all humanity.

Nor was this all that humanity had gained as a result of the World War.

Out of the crucible of that titanic struggle had emerged a new morality and a new social consciousness.

The people of every nation, more particularly our own, extended sympathy and material aid to the very people, whose ambitious scheme for world domination had visited the awful consequence of war upon the whole of mankind.

We undertook to promote and maintain peace by every possible means.

Billions of American dollars found their way to Central Europe, especially Germany, to be invested in social and economic rehabilitation. Hundreds of millions more were outright gifts, distributed through the Red Cross and other charitable agencies.

In 1921 in pursuance of our peace policy, the United States of America, under the leadership of Charles Evans Hughes, called the Washington Disarmament Conference. As a result, the United States voluntarily surrendered the position which it had won as a first-rate naval power.

Out of that conference came an agreement whereby we voluntarily, and as viewed today foolishly, scrapped not only our biggest and best battleship, the *Washington*, but we sunk 16 other vessels, among them the *Virginia* and the *Alabama*.

In 1932, we joined with 29 other nations in a conference for the further reduction and limitation of armament and reaffirmed an agreement not to resort to force.

We joined with these nations in condemning aerial bombardment as inhuman. The use of chemical, incendiary or bacterial weapons was prohibited. A permanent disarmament commission was to be set up, on which each government was to have one representative.

On May 16, 1933, President Roosevelt cabled to the Sovereigns and Presidents of 54 nations the following earnest appeal for world peace:

"If all nations will agree wholly to eliminate from possession and use the weapons which make possible a successful attack, defenses automatically will become impregnable, and the frontiers and independence of every nation will become secure."

Hitler countered with a request for "defensive weapons forbidden to Germany by the Treaty of Versailles—tanks, heavy field artillery, and tank guns, heavy machine guns, and observationn airplanes," when his demands were rejected as unreasonable, he announced his withdrawal from the disarmament conference and the resignation of Germany from the League of Nations and the World Court.

That action put the world on notice that Adolf Hitler was the enemy of world peace. Thenceforward, in complete violation of existing covenants, he began the building of the diabolical war machine, which has already conquered Europe and much of Asia, and which, with the passing of each day, becomes an increasingly greater threat to the safety of this nation.

While Hitler was building his war machine in defiance of numerous covenants and treaty obligations, the Congress of the United States passed the Neutrality Act of 1935 which prevented our selling to a belligerent nation, materials essential to the conduct of a war.

We believed that the establishment of a restrictive policy, relinquishing our right to sell to belligerents the arms, ammunition, and supplies necessary to wage war, would inspire other nations to take similar action, a part of the new morality concept we hoped the world was ready to accept.

We now know that the certain knowledge that the Neutrality Act would prevent the United States from selling arms and munitions to unprepared and peace-loving nations put a potent weapon in Hitler's hands.

The date upon which Hitler became Chancellor—January 30, 1933—marked the death knell of justice, liberty, and morality in human relations within the confines of Germany. The immorality incubated in the home of the Nazi infiltrated itself by devious means throughout the whole of Europe, undermining the morale of the people and reducing to ineffectiveness their respective governments.

There was not a single country which did not sense that mischief was afoot. But the leadership in the various chancelleries of the world divided themselves between those who were opposed to the Hitler regime, those who were sympathetic, and those who, while opposed, believed that they must necessarily appease and work with it.

Unfortunately for all of us, the latter group was the larger and had many powerful advocates.

Who knows the price which humanity will have to pay for this policy of appeasement.

This much is certain. Once more within the lifetime of hundreds of millions of us the peace-loving peoples of the earth must undertake a world-wide mobilization of physical, moral, and spiritual resources in a courageous and determined effort to get the wild beast, marauding through Europe and Asia, back into his cage with a lock on the door.

Distasteful as is this mobilization, we are compelled to realize we no longer have any choice in the matter.

The people of the United States of America are required to face the facts and prepare to defend themselves.

We can no longer delay. It is with extreme reluctance that we recognize the complete failure of our peace efforts, under the Neutrality Act and otherwise, to secure the peace of the world. We agreed to give up many vital and important interests, the carrying out of which involved chiefly a moral commitment to do nothing. The time is definitely over when we can pursue with any degree of safety or impunity a "do-nothing" policy.

We hear much about interventionists and isolationists.

If by "intervention" is meant to intervene by providing all material aid to the nations now resisting aggression, I believe there are many interventionists.

If by "isolation" is meant those who desire to retain our historic policy of aloofness from the purely internal wrangles of foreign countries, I believe most of us are isolantionists.

But bear in mind, the greatest isolationist in the world today is Adolf Hitler. He has, one by one, isolated 12 neutral, peace-loving countries, and one by one, he has destroyed them by the most inhuman, and uncivilized methods of war ever employed. He is continuing his systematic isolation. Russia is now isolated, and slated for annihilation, and on the Hitler timetable she is long past due.

When, and if, this is finally accomplished and the possible threat from the east is thereby removed, it will again be all-out for the destruction of Britain. If Hitler then succeeds, the conquest of Africa and India will follow.

The Vichy Government has turned toward new and greater collaboration with Nazi Germany, perhaps not so much through desire, or by its own will, as because it is too weak to resist further aggression and fears the possibility of wholesale murders within the territory of France, now occupied by Nazi soldiers.

Soon, unless prevented, the Nazi will have a force similar to that which has crushed France and a dozen other countries, poised for action, directly opposite the eastern coast of South America, and with the further possibility that efforts will be made to occupy other French possessions.

His ambition will then be to cross to South America, where numerous "fifth columnists," most of whom are trained soldiers, are already working.

This is not merely my personal opinion. Read Mein Kampf wherein Hitler himself declares for world domination and Nordic racial supremacy, and compare his boastings in his book with his program so far executed.

As much as anyone, I wish to stay out of this war. And I firmly believe the only way we can stay out is by assisting in every way possible, short of actual participation, those resisting the aggressions of Hitler. I am for stopping Hitler before we may be required to face him single-handed and alone.

And, I may add, my sentiments and beliefs are shared by the vast majority of men and women with whom I come in contact. We are far better off rendering "all out" aid to Britain, and thus enabling her to stand, than we would be in a world wherein she is reduced to impotency, and her Navy taken over by Hitler and his war machine to jeopardize our safety and independence.

We now know that Hitler's ultimate objective is not the golden grain fields of the Ukraine for the starving millions of Germany, or even oil for fuel and power. His scheme is complete Nazi domination of the world and the enslavement of the free peoples of the earth.

With the appalling proof which we have before us as to Hitler's real designs, there is, nevertheless, an articulate minority within our great country which tend to destroy our national unity, and to thwart our Government's policy with respect to preparation for complete and adequate defense against this menace.

The Congress has been loath to believe that the conflict now raging in Europe would assume world-wide proportions, and that it is, in reality, not war alone but more, a tremendous globe-encircling social revolution, wherein the institutions and ideals in which we believe are endangered and but for our courage and strength and that of Britain might be destroyed.

In the consideration of every measure providing for national defense, I have been motivated by but one purpose.

Can we protect the institutions of free government which are ours?

Can we keep war away from these shores?

Can we guarantee to our children and posterity the benefits of free government and the fruits of free enterprise which have been our inheritance and our privilege to enjoy?

Thyssen, the great German industrialist, whose wealth and influence made Hitler Chancelor, wrote him in December 1939, as follows:

"Your new policy, Herr Hitler, is pushing Germany into the abyss and the German people into ruin. Reverse the machine while there is still time. Give the Reich a free parliament, give the German people freedom of conscience, thought, and speech. Provide the necessary guaranties for the reinstatement of law and order, so that treaties and pacts can once again be built up in faith and confidence."

With a price upon his head, his property confiscated, and members of his family cruelly murdered in concentration camps, Thyssen dared plead with Hitler himself to restore to the German people that of which Hitler had robbed them—the same free institutions and individual rights which we possess and will defend.

There is no prophet so wise and so farseeing as to be able to tell what the future holds. We may be required to make the most tremendous sacrifices in the ensuing months and years. We may be obliged to convert this Nation not only into an arsenal of democracy but into an armed camp wherein every citizen will be required to listen for the "alert" and to perform physical labors and duties not yet contemplated.

We look with anxious eyes, fearful that Great Britain may not be able to hold the line long enough for us to become prepared.

The picture is changing so rapidly that no one knows from one day to the next what may be required of this Government. This much seems clear: The situation will continue to be grave for a considerable period of time to come.

If Hitler should be successful in liquidating Great Britain, there may be a temporary cessation of hostilities, while he consolidates his gains and inventories his plunder. In such event, the people of the United States of America will be faced by an even greater problem than that with which we are now confronted.

With the invasion of Poland on September 1, 1939, many of us realized that there could be no peace in the world until the force which had unleased itself against humanity was spent or was reduced to impotency.

We have been reluctant to assume the obligation of forging the weapons and supplying the materials necessary to that end, but we have been compelled to recognize there is no other course open to us, and while we deplore the necessity, grim-faced we have set about the task of accomplishing it.

The time has come when we must abandon all thought of "business as usual." We cannot complete the building of this vast arsenal of material supply and spiritual and moral strength without the reorganization of our daily lives, and a rededication of ourselves to liberty and all that it means.

When I decided it was necessary to repeal the arms embargo, the die was cast so far as my attitude and judgment were concerned. With each succeeding event I have become more and more certain that I was right.

I have supported each and every one of the appropriations for defense, with the complete conviction that the very life of this Nation is at stake.

Under the terms of the Lend-Lease Act, we undertook to supply Great Britain and her Allies with every weapon possible and necessary to the prosecution of the war, not because we wish to fight Great Britain's battles, but because we are defending our own shores by enabling Great Britain and her Allies to stand.

The call for "all-out defense" has sounded.

The Congress has appropriated and authorized the stupendous sum of $50,000,000,000.

Some conception of the immensity of these appropriations and the burden which they entail is gained from considering the deliberations now in the Senate Finance Committee, wherein we are exploring every possible form of taxation, including excise taxes on almost everything our citizens will wish to buy, and still, with all these burdensome levies, it appears that only three and one-half billion dollars of additional revenue will be obtained thereby.

There is no question as to the prior right of the defense program to strategic and critical defense materials as well as labor. Business cannot be as usual; nevertheless, there are in each community private demands which must be met.

Priorities for defense are essential, but it is also essential that they be imposed in an orderly, systematic way, so as not to disrupt and dislocate the industries whose success is vital to the sustaining of the defense program.

Despite our boasted "planned" economy, we find ourselves now in this emergency curtailing, if not completely stopping, the use in private industry of various metals and other basic materials which we had a right to believe our immense industries would be prepared to supply in abundance.

I know the appeals which must come to you as mayors of your cities from employers and owners of industries which have been built up through long years of hard work and struggle. They ask your help in securing supplies to keep your citizens employed and their bank accounts adequate for the immense tax levies which are certain to come.

Somehow I have a feeling that the reported shortages are more apparent than real, and that when order is once brought into the handling of priorities, our private industry will not be penalized to the extent recently forecast.

As you know, priorities are now regulated by fiat, not by legislation. My hope is that when legislation now pending is enacted and a more accurate inventory of supplies and sources of supply is provided the dislocation in private industry will be materially relieved.

It is a tremendous undertaking to divert this Nation from the paths of normal industry into a program of defense preparation. But in spite of all the difficulties encountered in making this transformation, we are encouraged by the progress we have made, and we are justly proud of our accomplishments.

By January 1 next we will be building 2,000 planes per month (1,500 last month, 500 a month a year ago), and by July 1 we will meet the full program of 3,000 per month. We are just finishing the tooling-up stage and are entering the production state of this immense program. We are now manufacturing 1,000,000 pounds of powder per day. This is more than we were producing at the end of the last World War. Tanks are beginning to rumble out of plants that were without even foundations last October. A $20,000,000 plant now in operation will deliver its first 70 tanks this month.

Down at Burlington, Iowa, the first conveyor one-half mile long is carrying shells, thousands per day, to the point where they are loaded. The production of small arms has been trebled.

The first ship came off the ways yesterday from an immense shipbuilding yard in San Francisco in which construction was started but 6 months ago. Another will follow next week. And from our combined shipbuilding facilities a ship is being launched almost daily. By January 1 one-half of our program objective will be met, and by July 1 we will have met every item upon the program.

In Washington there are hundreds of the ablest industrialists of the Nation giving their time without one penny of compensation, and at the head of this immense activity and more responsible for the marvelous performance already a matter of record is a Danish immigrant, who proudly states: "This country has been good to me. I want to do something for it." And William S. Knudsen is doing just that and in a big way.

When will we become involved in a shooting war? is the question most often asked of all of us in Washington.

Never, I hope, and never I believe, provided we can supply those now resisting Hitler with the necessary tools.

Our desire for peace is no less ardent today than when we declared a policy of neutrality.

We search for peace, but we find increasing dangers threatening us from all sides.

Should Japan continue as a member of the Axis, as now appears certain, and persevere in her aggression in the Far East, the situation will become even worse.

If a recently defeated Germany could do to Europe what Germany has done in the past 2 years, what would a victorious Hitler impose and be able to impose upon the other countries of the earth?

Can you picture a world today without the United States of America?

Would life be worth living, not only for ourselves but for those unfortunates in other lands who live on the hope that some day they may be welcomed here?

We must not permit the same errors, neglect, and lack of realistic thinking which caused the fall of France and other nations.

In 165 years of our national existence, we have built here a nation which has never been equaled, and largely because of the courage and sacrifices of our forefathers, who gave us a charter of human freedom securing to each life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; freedom of conscience, freedom to study and to pursue a career of one's own choosing; and, above and beyond all else, the right to be freemen, with civil, political, and religious rights which cannot be abridged.

As I looked today upon the tranquil Iowa landscape with its fields rich with the promise of harvest and saw the industrious farmers moving back and forth in the performance of their peaceful tasks, I felt an increased appreciation of all that it means to me to be a citizen of this great Republic and to reside in Iowa. How benevolent has been the Providence which has cared for us—how much we owe to God, whose watchful care has attended with worthiness and success our constant progress as a nation.

I feel better for having returned here at this season. I appreciate very much the opportunity to meet with you. I believe I understand the sentiments in the hearts of the fathers and mothers of this country a little more clearly for having renewed my personal contact with the people of this great producing section. It restores one's faith and brings peace to one's soul.

The solemn obligation rests with each and every one of us that this Republic shall survive.

As gallant defenders of the cradle of liberty, as guardians of the arsenal of democracy, every citizen must be prepared to do his part.

You, as mayors of our cities and towns, great and small, are charged with the mobilization of our Nation's courage for the mighty task which we have barely begun.

With singleness of purpose we unite. With faith, honor, and courage we march forward.

And with a prayer in our hearts we raise our eyes to the Stars and Stripes, symbol of equality and freedom. May it remain forever unfurled.

To this Republic we pledge our lives and fortunes—one haven, one refuge, one sanctuary—whole and undefiled.

Outing of Democratic State Committee of Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 8, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the very able junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] at a meeting of the Young Democrats of Rhode Island at Providence, R. I., September 7, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I consider it a privilege to have this opportunity to pay tribute to Rhode Island's distinguished son, my colleague, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

Only those who have worked side by side with him, as I have done, can appreciate the magnificent work he is doing in Washington, not only for his State but also for his country.

Since those early days when he and I worked together for the nomination of Woodrow Wilson at the Baltimore convention of 1912, through the years when both of us labored in behalf of President Wilson and the noble idealism of his administration; then again in the thick of the battle for President Roosevelt's New Deal, I have known Senator GREEN as one of the truly great Democratic leaders of our Nation.

You know him best for his labor here at home, as Governor of Rhode Island. You are even now reaping the benefits of his program of labor legislation, which established this State as one of the most progressive and enlightened in the Nation. You know what that has meant, because for generations a socially backward Republican rule hamstrung the efforts of your great industrial population to obtain justice for labor.

It would be well to recall those achievements of Governor GREEN, lest in the enjoyment of them we forget that they would not have existed but for his labors. I think of your unified department of labor, your minimum-wage and maximum-hour laws, your model child labor act, your prevailing-wage law for public works, your special women's and children's division in the department of labor, your liberalized workmen's compensation law, and, not least of all, your unemployment compensation and old-age benefit laws.

These benefits are only in part a measure of the advantages gained by the people of Rhode Island during THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN'S term as Governor. They are the outward and lasting symbols of an administration guided by the historic precept of the Democratic Party, first enunciated by Thomas Jefferson himself—"equal rights for all, special privileges for none."

You have reason to be proud that this great work is now being carried forward brilliantly by America's youngest Democratic chief executive, your own Gov. J. Howard McGrath, who has so fully justified the confidence President Roosevelt placed in him, as far back as 1933, when he named him United States attorney for Rhode Island. His notable record in the prosecutor's office—I believe all of you recall his exposure of Governor Vanderbilt's famous wire-tapping affair—made him the logical man for the post he now holds. Senator GREEN could have found no better Democratic successor anywhere.

I need not speak at length of the gains Rhode Island has made under Democratic administration, for they are even today contributing to the enrichment of the lives of people who live and work here. But I feel it appropriate to point out that it was the fighting spirit, the courage, the determination, and the unfailing liberalism of THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN which made all that possible. When the cause was hopeless, when a triumphant Republican machine again and again hurled his forces back, when it seemed that Rhode Island would never obtain deliverance from the special privileged interests which exploited its people, he kept on fighting, and never stopped fighting short of ultimate victory. He knew what it was to be defeated, but he never knew what it was to be licked. He lost battle after battle in the dark days, when only the will to win and devotion to Democratic ideals kept his forces together, but he won his war.

We in Washington who have been fighting all these years for the Roosevelt program—first the domestic, social, and labor reforms of the New Deal, now the program of national defense and aid to the democracies—have found good reason to feel thankful to Rhode Island for giving us Senator GREEN. His great abilities and his sincere liberalism have been a tower of strength in many a pitched battle on the Senate floor, in many a heated debate behind the closed doors of committee rooms. With Senator GREEN as one of its representatives, the State of Rhode Island speaks with a strong, clear, potent voice in the deliberations of the United States Senate and the councils of the national administration.

He has been particularly active and influential as a member of the Committee on Navy Department Appropriations, and it is through his efforts that naval defense activity in Rhode Island has reached its present unprecedented proportions.

Senator Green has brought vast benefits to the people of this State in the face of the bitterest opposition from small privileged groups which have attempted to block him at every turn. For many years this group has looked upon Rhode Island as its own special preserve, clinging to the Hamiltonian theory that only the aristocracy should govern. If they could, they would forget momentarily their professed devotion to the Constitution of the United States, at least insofar as the rights of the people were concerned. I have this on no less an authority than your Republican National Committeewoman from this State, the eastern vice president of the Republican Party, Mrs. Paul Fitzsimons, mother of your former Governor Vanderbilt. I refer specifically to her statement in the United States News of November 29, 1940, in which she was asked the question, Does your experience in the recent campaign indicate to you that the Hatch Act should be revised? I quote her answer:

"My personal opinion is that the Hatch Act should most definitely be revised. Its objectives may have been sincere, but under existing circumstances it is a farce. No one on the Federal pay roll should be allowed to vote. The beneficiaries of a lavish administration have now reached the staggering total of many millions; quite sufficient to perpetuate any administration indefinitely—naturally these beneficiaries vote to retain Santa Claus. Any election today is consequently playing a game with loaded dice."

I have been very careful to quote this statement in full, so that no one may say I distorted it by taking it from its context. I call your particular attention to

the one sentence which gives the game away. "No one on the Federal pay roll should be allowed to vote."

This would mean the thousands of trained mechanics employed in defending America at the naval torpedo station in Newport, the other thousands who are rushing America's defenses in the construction of the new North Atlantic air base at Wickford, the many thousands in the Federal work relief agencies, the entire Rhode Island representation in the armed forces of the United States, Army, Navy, and Marines; and in addition to all these the entire staffs of post offices, customs houses, Federal courts, State and local offices of all Federal departments, not to mention public officials and servants paid partially from Federal funds.

With one stroke of the pen this Republican spokesman for Rhode Island's Republican machine would deny the greatest privilege and most sacred right of citizenship to the loyal American men and women who are in the forefront of America's defense. Our soldiers and sailors, upon whose courage and devotion we depend for the safety of our democratic institutions, would be told, in effect—you may die for your country, but you may not have a vote in its Government. I wonder if she would include her own son, the former governor, who is now serving as a Reserve officer in the Navy? Possibly, she would make an exception for Republicans in their Government's service.

This spokesman undoubtedly represents the sentiment of the small group which controls the Republican machine in Rhode Island. I cannot believe, and I do not believe, that she speaks the sentiment of a people whose heroes died in the Revolution that America might have liberty, democracy, self-government.

Such cynical disregard of fundamental American principles by Republican spokesmen is not restricted to Rhode Island. I assure you that in my own State of Pennsylvania we have our share. I recall that during last year's campaign one of our most prominent reactionary lawyers told a Republican audience that only paupers would vote for Roosevelt. The result on election day seemed to indicate that my State was one vast poorhouse, because the President carried it by an overwhelming majority.

That kind of talk is popular at the "best" clubs and over the cocktails in select circles, but it is only occasionally that it slips out in public meetings. We should be glad that it does, because it indicates better than anything else the bitter opposition to rule by the people which lies at the basis of the Republican philosophy. It is a dangerous attitude at any time; it is particularly dangerous now, when the principles of democracy are under fire in all parts of the world. Democracy today is fighting for its life with its back to the wall on the battlefields abroad. Enslaved peoples in once free nations, bearing the yoke of a tyrannical conqueror, are only now beginning to appreciate, too late, the benefits and blessings of democracy and human liberty. And, to my mind, the most dangerous "fifth column" in our own country is not the paid agents of foreign powers but those people who have so far strayed from the true principles of Americanism that they would deny the constitutional right of suffrage to loyal American citizens engaged in the service and defense of their country.

I shall not discuss this Republican spokesman's comments on the Hatch Act, except to say that one of the principal reasons for its failure at its first test last year was the widespread evasion by the Republican leadership of its prohibition against vast campaign contributions by special interests. It is true, as the statement says, that the "dice were loaded" last year—loaded with millions of dollars in Republican slush funds, but there just wasn't enough money in America to buy the election away from President Roosevelt. There were too many honorable citizens who could not be bought. That was true last year, it is true this year, and it will be true next year.

I am fully confident that the Democratic Party in Rhode Island will demonstrate that fact at the polls. I am confident that you are going forward to victory. I assure you it means a great deal, not only to all the citizens of Rhode Island, but also in upholding the hand of the President in a time of grave crisis, and in turning back those forces which, lacking faith in American democracy, represent the real danger to our democracy. And I can assure you, from what I have seen of him in Washington, that wherever the fighting is thickest you will find my friend and colleague, one of the real leaders of our American democracy today—Theodore Francis Green.

National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 8, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT A. TAFT OF OHIO

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "National Unity," delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Friday evening, September 5.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American Nation today is not united. Lack of unity would be a serious danger if the Nation is forced into war. It may be a partial cause of delay in the defense program, although the failures of that program up to date have resulted far more from lack of organization and lack of administrative ability than from lack of unity. Congress has been united in appropriating all the money asked for and in giving the President the free hand which he demanded to carry out his program.

The country is disunited for the reason that the majority of the people disagree with the President's foreign policy insofar as it implies—and it does now imply—an active intervention in war, and because the President has made no effort to secure the support of those who disagree with him in either foreign or domestic matters.

The interventionist newspapers are horrified at the vote of 203 to 202 in the House of Representatives on the question of the extension of the draft. They attribute it to politics, to the Republicans, and even to German propaganda, but they deliberately ignore the obvious reason that a majority of the people were opposed to this extension, and the Congressmen voted as their constituents wished them to vote, except where they were subjected to heavy pressure from the administration. Without that pressure the bill would have been overwhelmingly defeated. Last Friday a congressional bielection was held in Wisconsin. The Republican running on the issue of opposition to the President's foreign policy defeated Mr. Amlie by 29,000 votes to 16,000. Mr. Amlie was running as a Democrat, and ran on the issue of 100 percent support of the President's foreign policy, but had formerly been a Progressive and presumably got all the Progressive votes which were not actively opposed to war. The position of those shouting loudest for unity is that the majority must give up their views and blindly approve any measure, any power, that the President or any subordinate of the President says is necessary for defense. It makes no difference to them that the reasons may be wholly inadequate and the power demanded dangerous to the safety of American democracy.

The disunity in the United States springs from the policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt himself. In the first place his methods and his policies have become secretive and dictatorial. He no longer takes the people or the press into his confidence, and the result is that even his own followers disagree as to what his real intentions are. In the second place, the defense policies are being used to advance New Deal economic theories under the guise of defense necessities, and only New Dealers are appointed to positions of economic power. Thirdly, the President is utterly intolerant of those who disagree with him and encourages intolerance from his supporters. Above all, he insists on pursuing a policy of active intervention in the European war without any apparent intention of consulting Congress or the people until we are hopelessly involved. In short, the President has no desire to secure unity unless it is 100 percent unity with his individual views. While he persists in these policies there is no hope for national unity.

These are serious charges, but I believe that every well-informed man in Washington will privately agree with them in substance.

FIRST. THE PRESIDENT NO LONGER TAKES THE PEOPLE OR THE PRESS INTO HIS CONFIDENCE

The most striking incident illustrating this secretiveness is the Roosevelt-Churchill conference at sea. The American press rightly resented the treatment which it received. Mr. Roosevelt slipped away from the entire American press. Mr. Churchill took British writers along. So the American public has been dependent upon British writers for news about its own President. When he returned, he set up a complete gag on the press about the conference; frankly told American newspapermen that they should write what he wanted written, and if he was displeased, he would go on the radio himself. Inexperienced British newsmen took moving pictures, and they were so poor that most of them had to be thrown away when they arrived in this country. The first word of the conference came from a British broadcast. I know of no instance in which an American President has disappeared for a week to engage in a secret conference with another ruler. We have gone a long way since the day of "open covenants openly arrived at."

The President did not consult Congress, perhaps did not even consult his Cabinet, before signing the joint declaration. Winston Churchill submitted the statement back to his War Council before he signed, but as far as we know, Mr. Roosevelt consulted no one but Mr. Harry Hopkins and perhaps Elliott Roosevelt and Franklin, Jr. The joint declaration itself refers to Churchill as representing His Majesty's Government, but the President speaks for himself alone to make known certain principles in the national policy of his country. Mr. Churchill must himself have been impressed by the President's attitude, for in his speech interpreting the agreement he said:

"President Roosevelt is the thrice chosen head of the most powerful state and community in the world. I am the servant of the King and Parliament, at present charged with the principal direction of our affairs in these fateful times."

Evidently the President made it clear to Mr. Churchill that he was not even consulting Congress, and he couldn't have said much about being the servant of the people.

No American newsmen went to Iceland, although the British were already there and able to report the facts. The claim that the expedition had to be kept secret to protect it from the Germans is completely disputed by the fact that only a very small proportion of the total American forces had been landed when publicity was given to the fact that 80,000 others were to traverse the Atlantic. No; it was the people of America and Congress from whom the occupation of Iceland had to be kept secret. In a nation of 130,000,000 people, the press is the day to day representative of those people in dealing with the President. If he is not frank with the press, if he enjoys fooling the correspondents and springing surprises on them, then he is treating the people as no President has the right to treat them. The American press has been a free press. It is the principal characteristic of Americanism. Its great power has been used with discretion and judgment. It cannot be whittled down by Presidential restrictions and pressure without endangering democracy itself.

Mr. Roosevelt continually denies that he seeks censorship, but he repeatedly shows his irritation with the free press, originally with the editors, and now more and more with the correspondents. Without rebuke he permits Mr. Ickes to blackguard the press and constant proposals from inner New Deal circles indicate a desire to find some means of bringing pressure to bear on newspaper editors to make them behave. The eight-point declaration significantly omitted any reference to that particular freedom known as freedom of the press.

The eight-point declaration itself is ambiguous and uncertain, because it was conceived in secret and handed to the American people without discussion. It means different things to different people. Mr. Roosevelt says that it brings us no closer to war. William Allen White says it is all intended for peace. Senator BARKLEY stated in the Senate that, in his judgment, it was a general statement of policy and not the assumption of an obligation. On the other hand, Mr. Churchill says in so many words:

"The President of the United States and the British representative, in what is aptly called the Atlantic Charter, have jointly pledged their countries to the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny. That is a solemn and grave undertaking. It must be made good. It will be made good."

According to Mr. Churchill, the United States has pledged itself to destroy the Nazi tyranny and to disarm Germany, Italy, and Japan. Of course, if he is right—and he was at the conference—then the President has pledged the United States to go to war.

This view is borne out by the President's Labor Day speech. He said:

"I know that I speak the conscience and determination of the American people when I say that we shall do everything in our power to crush Hitler and his Nazi forces."

How can we crush Hitler except by sending our soldiers to Berlin? Yet the President must know that a vote for war today would be overwhelmingly defeated, and the President's supporters still talk peace. The President promised the American people before election:

"We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack."

If he is intending to violate that promise and change that policy, why not frankly state it? How can we hope to secure unity for a foreign policy absolutely contrary to the promises of both parties last November without at least frankly stating that the policy has been abandoned? Certainly no one is going to disarm Japan except the United States.

Others of the eight points mean different things to different people. Thus the fourth clause reads:

"They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victors or vanquished, on access of equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world."

To the Germans and to the European nations this probably sounds as if we were going to reduce our tariffs and give access to all of them on equal terms to the rich domestic trade of the United States. On the other hand, our people certainly have not the slightest intention of opening our domestic trade to the products of the world in competition with our own higher costs and wages.

The policies declared by the President mean different things to different people. They are not frank. Maybe Russian peasants will follow a leader without understanding him, but Americans want to know where they are going.

Take the defense and lease-lend program itself. The President talks constantly of the tremendous assistance which is being sent abroad. He attacked Senator BYRD when the Senator gave figures to show the complete inadequacy of accomplishments to date. When the President talks of the program, he talks largely of tanks and planes on order and to be delivered in the future. He has not kept the public constantly informed of the real result. The best way to get results in the future is to know accurately how you have failed to accomplish your present goal, and why.

Take the whole story of the extension of the term of the draftees. We were told first in dramatic tones that the country was in infinitely greater peril than it had been a year ago when 12 months' training was considered enough. Any fool could see that on the surface we were infinitely better off than a year ago, with a much stronger Army and Navy and airplane capacity, and Hitler entangled in Russia instead of threatening England with invasion as he was in July 1940. But it was implied that there were great dangers of which we knew nothing and which were so secret that they could not be revealed. Then it was said that if the term was not extended indefinitely, the Army would immediately disintegrate, although only a few thousand draftees had to be released before 1942, and the power to draft as many others as might be needed to replace them was in the President's hands.

Early in the hearings I presented a definite plan showing that a total term of 18 months for the draftees and 2 years for the National Guard would permit the Army to be maintained at full strength with completely adequate training and the creation of a reserve. My plan was summarily rejected and the bill forced through with an extension to 2½ years. Why were there 202 votes against the bill? Simply because no sound reasons were given for making it longer than 18 months.

Later developments showed that again the administration had not been frank with Congress or the people. No sooner had the bill passed than Mr. Stimson announced that even those draftees who had no special claims of age or dependency would be released from active duty after an average of about 18 months' service, some as early as 14 months. His announcement made it clear that there was no immediate emergency such as had been testified to, but only the possibility of one arising in the future. On August 29 it was announced that 200,000 men would be released before the 1st of January, far more than were to be released under my plan. Had the War Department's announcements been made before the passage of the bill by Congress, there could have been substantial unity on that program. Those who voted with the President are naturally indignant that they were deceived. You can't get national unity unless you lay the cards on the table and tell the people the truth.

Take the tremendous excitement about the shortage of gasoline. No one has been able to find out until the investigation of the Senate committee what the actual facts are about the supply of gas. No one could understand why if there was a shortage something was not done about it months ago. No one has any confidence in Mr. Ickes and now the Senate committee investigation shows that there is no shortage whatever which cannot be met by the use of idle tank cars. So most people have come to the conclusion that the whole excitement was merely for the purpose of stirring the people up to a warlike frame of mind.

Those of us who are in Congress are told no more about the real facts of the situation than the people back home. There is no more frankness with us than there is with the press, rather less of it. If Mr. Roosevelt wants unity, he will have to give up the "hush hush" policy and take the people into his confidence. They have reached the point that when no reasons are given, they suspect there are no reasons to give.

SECOND. THE DEFENSE PROGRAM IS BEING USED TO PROMOTE NEW DEAL POLICY AND CONTROL

When the defense program began, I had some hope that it would not be used as a means to advance the New Deal. Mr. Stimson and Mr. Knox were appointed to the heads of the War Department and Navy Department. There has been no politics in those Departments. But gradually the New Dealers are securing more and more power over the economic problems arising out of the defense program, and are looking forward to even more power in the emergency after the war. From the beginning I and many others have urged that the Government create a War Resources Administration with a single head to boss the job of producing war materials. Such a recommendation was contained in the mobilization plan approved for years by the War and Navy Departments. It has met with general approval, but the President and his New Deal advisers are determined that no considerable power shall be delegated to any one man, particularly a man who has had experience in business. All the lines of power must be retained in the President's own hands so that every act of the Government is subject to his veto at the suggestion of the New Deal coterie. These advisers are still imbued with antagonism to the business system and to the business man, big or little, who does not adopt with them a policy of appeasement, or turn himself into a New Dealer.

First, we had the National Advisory Council, seven independent advisers without a chairman, each reporting direct to the President. Then we had the O. P. M., with Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Hillman as joint heads. But their power has been steadily curtailed by the creation of one bureau after another directly under the President, often overlapping, as in the case of Mr. Hopkins' lease-lend administration and Mr. Henderson's O. P. A. C. S.

The last reorganization has simply created another board, the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board of seven men. The set-up is even more confused than it was before, and the power is more divided. In some respects the O. P. M. is under this Board, in other respects it is independent. But the key to the whole plan is that out of the new Board of seven, four are confirmed New Dealers, Messrs. Wallace, Henderson, Hopkins, and Hillman. No one of them is a businessman and no one of them knows anything about the problems of the production of war materials. Knox, Stimson, and Knudson are in the minority. Henderson occupies three positions, one on the Board, one on the O. P. M., and a third as Price Administrator, independent of anybody except the President. According to gloating New Deal columnists, it has been found desirable to get Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Biggers out of all positions of importance and reduce Mr. Knudsen to a job where he has nothing to say about policy. For months the New Dealers have been sniping at every important businessman in the defense set-up, and now they have their way. In production policies, wage policies, price policies, profit policies, in the regula-

tions of all the business transactions of the ordinary man, the New Deal has all the power which it has long sought in time of peace.

Every industry must have a boss, and when it comes to appointing that boss, he must be a New Dealer. Mr. Ickes and the Federal Power Commission are trying to be czars over electricity. Mr. Ickes has been made czar over oil and gas. Mr. Henderson controls prices. Mayor LaGuardia is head of home defense. Mr. Tugwell is sent to represent American ideals in Puerto Rico.

The truth is that of all the apostles of disunity, Roosevelt is the chief. Unity to him means agreeing with his opinions. There are Democratic Senators who differed with him on some policy in the past who have never been invited to consult with him again, and have never seen him for the last 4 years. Contrast the situation with that in Great Britain. There is a coalition Cabinet with men of all parties and radically different views on many nondefense matters really representing the majority of their parties, but willing to postpone all activities on domestic matters until after the war. The President only coalesces with those who already agree with him

Look at the Supreme Court. Most Presidents have appointed judges of the opposition party as well as those of their own, but the President has appointed seven men, every one of them in intimate agreement with his views. Only the elevation of Chief Justice Stone departed from this rule, and of course, since he was already on the Court, the New Deal votes were not reduced.

The President is still insisting on the St. Lawrence waterway and the Florida ship canal, and has tied them up together in a great pork barrel with a defense label on it, though every well-informed man in Washington knows that neither of them have the slightest value for defense today.

It would be completely possible today to turn back W. P. A. to the States and combine the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration in one organization to train men for defense work. But the officials of all three of these organizations are busy trying to find some work for their organizations so they may keep their jobs, though the need for relieef agencies has largely disappeared, and the President will not recommend their abolition. All out for defense does not mean to him the giving up of things that are unnecessary for defense, if they are Presidential favorites or New Deal agencies.

The labor policy is the same story. In the World War there was a National War Labor Board with a representative of labor and a representative of employers, who suspended all labor strife, froze the open- and closed-shop situation, and agreed on wage increases when they were justified. But one of the policies of the present administration in the past has been a deliberate encouragement of strikes to secure a complete unionization of all businesses even if the employees didn't want to be unionized. That policy has not been radically changed. The National Mediation Board has insisted on strike settlements which grant a check-off system, even in industries where it did not exist, leading inevitably to a closed shop.

Hardly a bill is requested from Congress which does not seek twice as much power for the President as is necessary for the particular task. Power is sought for power's sake. A new theory of emergency has been adopted and Congress is asked to pass laws granting indefinite powers for the emergency period. Everyone knows that during the present administration that emergency will never be permitted to come to an end.

Vast unnecessary powers were sought in the Lease-Lend Act. I have referred to the unnecessary demand for indefinite extension of the draftees' terms. Power was demanded to authorize the requisition of every kind of property, railroads, utilities, manufacturing plants, even homes, furniture, and clothing. Congress modified the bill to cover only materials really needed for defense. The present demand for price-fixing legislation is an example. Price-fixing may be necessary, but the bill submitted by the President gives all power to the President, individually, to be delegated to the favorite of the moment, certainly some New Dealer. The power is to extend for an indefinite period. It covers not only commodities but every kind of service. If the bill were passed in this form, it would result in giving to Mr Leon Henderson complete and arbitrary power over the entire business of the Nation—retail, wholesale, manufacturing, repair shops, utilities, warehouses, even doctors and lawyers.

In short, there is every evidence today that the President has not abated one iota his interest in imposing on the United States a complete planned economy similar to the state socialism of Europe. There are plenty of New Dealers in Washington who are far more interested in putting across their policies within the United States than they are in crushing Hitler, and the President is appointing many of these men to key positions in the Government. He cannot secure national unity by any such policy.

THIRD. INTOLERANCE DESTROYS UNITY

The President himself is utterly intolerant of those who disagree with him. It is a fact well known in Washington. It can be easily confirmed by an examination of his own writings. Any who disagree with him are designated by him as either corrupt knaves or complete fools. Those who oppose his foreign policy are copperheads or tools of Hitler. In his most recent message he says that the joint declaration with Churchill is so clear-cut that it cannot be opposed by anybody in any major particular without automatically admitting a willingness to accept a compromise with nazi-ism. In his Labor Day speech he refers to those who differ with his foreign policies as appeasers and Nazi sympathizers.

Of course, his attack has encouraged the intolerance of his supporters, like the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. Only last week a full-page ad appeared in the eastern papers proclaiming in effect that every man who is not for an Atlantic war ought to be in a German uniform. The view that America should not intervene in Europe is perfectly consistent with the most intense love of America and an intense desire that Hitler be defeated. It is a reasonable view which can be just as patriotic as the President's own views. While the President encourages this kind of attack, there is no necessity to find any other cause for national disunity. You cannot secure unity by name-calling and intolerance.

FINALLY, THE PRESIDENT PURSUES POLICIES OF WHICH THE MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE DISAPPROVE

If unity is to be achieved in a truly democratic nation, there must be unity on that policy with which the majority of the people agree. No leader who insists on going his own way in opposing the wishes of the people can reasonably ask for unity in support of his policies. He can persuade the people if they will be persuaded. He can put the problem up to their Representatives in Congress and secure their approval, but he cannot go his own way against them unless he imposes an effective dictatorship on the people.

The people today are opposed to intervention in Europe. Yet it is difficult to interpret the joint declaration with Churchill except as a definite policy to enter the war. How else can Nazi tyranny be destroyed? How else can Germany, Italy, and Japan be disarmed? Certainly Mr. Churchill regarded this declaration as a pledge on the part of the United States. It is impossible to perform that pledge except by war. The President has no constitutional right under our form of government to commit the United States to war, and, therefore, Mr. Churchill was probably deceived.

It is frequently said that Congress in the Lease-Lend Act has committed the United States to war, and that the President is merely carrying out that policy. This is utterly unfounded. The Lease-Lend Act expressly negatives the idea of convoys and of sending troops to Europe.

The policy of intervention in the war has never been approved by Congress, and to it this country is not committed. Under the Constitution the President has no right so to commit it. If he desires to carry out such a policy, he should submit it to Congress, as the representatives of the people, who alone can declare war. He can do that even without asking for a declaration of war by asking Congress for authority to authorize the sending of troops to Europe and Africa. He does not dare do so because the majority of the people are opposed to any such action. Once Congress has acted, I certainly shall cooperate 100 percent in an all-out war policy. But until Congress has acted I do not propose to surrender my own carefully considered opinions.

To me, a policy of intervention in Europe seems futile and utterly dangerous. It leads inevitably to tremendous losses of men; to tremendous outpouring of money. Assuming it to be successful, it leads to joint control of the world by England and ourselves. If we are going to disarm Germany, we are going to have to see that Germany will remain disarmed. We are going to have to police the world and determine the territory and the powers which other nations shall have. If we admit that our interests require an intervention in Europe, then our interest requires a perpetual control of Europe. I do not believe it can be done without wrecking and impoverishing the United States. It implies an imperialism which is absolutely contrary to democratic principles, and to the nature of the American people. They could not and would not make the success of imperialism which the British have made in the last two centuries. It is not their manifest destiny. Above all, it is impossible to proceed with such a policy, probably under any government, certainly under the present administration, without imposing on this country a complete system of state socialism. The point of view opposed to intervention in Europe is reasonable. It is held by a majority of the people. No national unity can be secured until Mr. Roosevelt accepts their view or persuades them to accept his.

I believe it is desirable when all the world is in flames that there should be a unified opinion in America as to its own course. I am certain that it can be secured if Mr. Roosevelt is really interested in securing it. Here is the eight-point program I suggest:

First, let Mr. Roosevelt and his administration take the country into their confidence and state in clear terms what policy he wishes the country to adopt. Treat us like Americans and not like Russian peasants. Second, encourage the press to perform its traditional job of keeping the public informed and checking the abuses of Government. Third, let all legislation dealing with national defense be limited solely to the definite purposes of national defense and not include all kinds of power which may easily be used to carry out New Deal economic objectives. Fourth, let the President turn from the Hopkinses and the Hendersons and the Ickes in whom Congress and the public have no confidence, to administrators chosen for their ability, regardless of their politics, ideologies, or devotion to New Dealism. Fifth, let the President consult with those who disagree with him instead of denouncing them and discourage intolerance against those who disagree with his policies, as well as against those who support them. Sixth, let Mr. Roosevelt publicly assure the country that he has made no secret commitments with Churchill or Stalin and that he will follow the letter of the Constitution by submitting any proposed understanding immediately to Congress for approval. Seventh, let Mr. Roosevelt again restate for the mothers and fathers and draftees of America his preelection pledge that no American boys will be

sent to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas. Eighth, let Mr. Roosevelt unite the country on a policy agreed to by both political parties and 80 percent of the people on impregnable defense and all material aid to England—short of war unless this continent is attacked.

Along these eight points lies America's road to unity and peace and the permanence of our democracy.

Tribute to the Late Representative Edward T. Taylor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, September 2), 1941

POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a beautiful tribute to the late Representative from Colorado, Hon. EDWARD T. TAYLOR, penned by his devoted friend Mr. Horace C. Carlisle.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for the end of that man is peace.—Psalms 37: 37.

A GOOD MAN GONE

E-very man that ever knew him,
D-own unto the day he died,
W-ould ascribe most freely to him
A-ll the virtues, which abide
R-ichly in the noblest life
D-welling in this age of strife.

T-ime alone will tell, in story,
H-ow he ranked among his peers—
O-n his noble life a glory,
M-ellowed by the breath of years,
A-ged him—few will live to be
S-o much missed so long as he.

T-actful in pursuit of duty,
A-s he daily did his part—
Y-es, life was "a thing of beauty,"
L-ong enjoyed, with all his heart.
O-ver, past the Great Divide,
R-ests he, on the other side.

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 8, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. STYLES BRIDGES, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article prepared by me on the St. Lawrence waterway.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Littell Digest of April 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

(By United States Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire)

The proposal to build the St. Lawrence waterway will undoubtedly be one of the outstanding issues before this Congress. The St. Lawrence waterway is no new issue. It has been up before with Presidential recommendation by Mr. Roosevelt and has been defeated. It is a project international in character which will cost, according to preliminary estimates, over $550,000,000, and based upon the experience of previous projects, particularly if a deeper channel is built, the cost might run to over $1,000,000,000. As a project, it is a sort of combination of the Florida ship canal and T. V. A.

The country and Congress have over the years heard all the arguments pro and con and have decided decisively against it. Now it is being dragged forth under the guise of national defense. I have consistently supported all sound defense measures before the American Congress, and I shall continue, but I do not want to see this ruse used and an unsound and unjustifiable project put through. The President recently took $1,000,000 from the national-defense fund, without the authorization of Congress and with this is having an engineering survey made of the project.

The St. Lawrence waterway is not in the interests of national defense, in my judgment; it is the reverse. If this continent is ever invaded, the valley of the St. Lawrence is one of the easiest routes. By building the seaway we would be building an aggressive nation a highway to the heart of America.

The building of this project would be a serious blow to the coastal cities and towns of the Northeast and would greatly injure the principal ports. It would greatly damage the railroads of the country that are having a real struggle to get by today. It would throw thousands of persons employed by the railroads out of employment. The project always has been and is today opposed by railroad labor. It would be hundreds of millions more of Government money spent for the development of electric power when we have a surplus of electric power in this area at present and unlimited possibilities wholly within our country for future development.

Among the arguments heard by its proponents in the interests of national defense is that by having this seaway we could develop shipyards and navy yards in the Great Lakes. Of course, this would be a blow to the States on the Atlantic and the Pacific coast where the navy yards and the shipyards are now located. Such a seaway would be vulnerable for attack, and it is easily conceivable that a few well-placed bombs might so destroy the seaway that such vessels as were being built inland would be bottled up in the Great Lakes.

It would take a period of years to build the seaway, and by that time certainly the present national emergency will be over.

The seaway, by the admission of experts, would be frozen up several months of the year and not navigable, which would make it unattractive from a year-round commercial viewpoint.

Most of the people of Canada view the project suspiciously even though the United States would pay most of the bills and Canada would get most of the benefits.

The Montreal Gazette recently said: "The Canadian people are not interested in any seaway development whether for navigation or for power purposes. They are concerned mostly with the war, upon which depends their survival as a nation. Canada has no money for such a project now, nor will she have for many years to come."

The world is in a critical situation today, and our defense program is lagging. To adequately defend this country, large sums of money must be raised. We need the money we have available to spend for planes, for tanks, for antiaircraft guns, for battleships; and we cannot, with our finances already strained, as a nation afford to dump money into a dubious project with no assured advantages merely because it will serve as a vehicle for further New Deal spending.

Plight of Small Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 8, 1941

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of Sunday, September 7, and written by John M. Fisher.

This article points to the great danger to a great number of the country's small industrialists because of the fact that they may be unable to obtain raw materials and equipment, and, in part, because they are not able to obtain defense work.

I offer this article for the RECORD, partially in connection with Senate Resolution 157, which I introduced on August 19 and which would provide for a committee to investigate priorities.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 7, 1941]

NON-DEFENSE PLANTS FEAR WIDE CLOSING—90 PERCENT COMPLAIN TO UNITED STATES CHAMBER THEY LACK MATERIAL

(By John M. Fisher)

Ninety percent of the Nation's small nonarmament manufactureers feel they will soon be forced to reduce operations drastically, or even shut down, because of raw material or equipment shortages caused by the arms program.

This is the major conclusion drawn from a survey of 6,000 manufacturers, just completed by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the results of which were announced yesterday.

MATERIALS DIVERTED

The Roosevelt administration has been diverting materials and commodities to the armament industries almost to the exclusion of civilian industries, many of which have been overlooked in the award of arms contracts.

This situation brought such protests that the President was forced last week to establish a new division within the Office of Production Management—the division of contract distribution—to farm out contracts to small businesses and help convert them to arms production.

There was no assurance in the move, however, that purely civilian industries would be maintained.

FEAR FOR NEAR FUTURE

The chamber reported that fear for the immediate future seems to be the chief concern of the average small manufacturer and that curtailment of production, disemployment, even complete shut-downs are inevitable unless the situation is changed.

While aware of the Government's problems under the stress of rearmament, the little manufacturers (really the backbone of the Nation's industry) generally said they should have received more advance warning of material shortages for their industries.

DIFFICULTIES MOUNTING

Typical of the replies received in the chamber's survey is this from a Chicago manufacturer of screw-machine products:

"While we are presently running along with reasonable satisfaction, considering the times, we anticipate ever-increasing difficulties in obtaining our necessary raw materials. In the case of raw materials required for nondefense items, it seems to us that the near future will bring about an almost complete cessation of deliveries."

This Chicago manufacturer's armament work now represents, approximately, 60 percent of his total business.

SOME SHUT-DOWNS ALREADY

Shut-downs have occurred already here and there, and in many instances production has been halved. Many manufacturers are dubious about their ability to convert facilities to arms production. Their specialized machinery is designed only for the fabrication of a specialized product.

A letter from a Pennsylvania manufacturer of radio tubes illustrates this point. He writes, in part:

"Our problem, basically, is that our equipment for the manufacture of any of our products—radio receiving tubes, incandescent lamp bulbs, and fluorescent lamps—is very highly specialized. We probably have received our proportionate share of defense business in orders for those items we are equipped to produce. But defense business will not come close to making up for our loss of normal business."

SUBSTITUTES SCARCE, TOO

Although a relatively few manufacturers have achieved notable success in the development of substitutes, the great majority are discovering that substitutes are as difficult to obtain as the original material. Production experts who think they have the answer in substitutes are swiftly disillusioned when they find that the new material is also on O. P. M.'s priorities critical list.

From New York comes a report from a manufacturer of bracelets for wrist watches. He has successfully developed several substitute materials, but stainless steel wire is essential to the manufacture of his product. In order to continue operations, he must have 20 pounds of this wire. Its value is about $40.

Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 8, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, one of the departments of the Government which I believe is worthy of commendation for the very excellent job it is doing is the office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, supervised by Mr. Nelson Rockefeller. There appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of September 5 last an article entitled "Good Neighborliness Without Fanfare," written by Mr. Joseph G. Harrison. I ask unanimous consent to have the article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of September 5, 1941]

GOOD NEIGHBORLINESS WITHOUT FANFARE

(By Joseph G. Harrison)

Among the emergency defense measures fully deserving to be carried on and expanded after the crisis is over is the work being done by Nelson A. Rockefeller as Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. Simply put, Mr. Rockefeller's office is giving the good-neighbor policy a practical twist which no amount of speeches and resolutions have succeeded in doing.

Designed to draw the United States and Latin America closer together culturally, politically, and economically, and to strengthen common pan-American defense efforts against totalitarian aggression, the Coordinator's office has, so far, accomplished a great deal with a minimum of publicity.

One wouldn't be far wrong in saying that Mr. Rockefeller was appointed to keep the United States from repeating past and making new mistakes in regard to Latin America. There are few precedents for such a job in the history of this or any other country, although the time may well come when such a position will be one of the most important posts in the Government.

In the face of all that has been said about good neighbors, pan-Americanism and the community of interests between Anglo Saxons and Latin America, it is encouraging to find someone in Washington actually doing something about them. Since fact rather than fancy usually lies at the bottom of friendship between two nations, Mr. Rockefeller intends to see to it that good relations between this country and its neighbors to the south have a tangible and mutually beneficial basis.

FULL COOPERATION REQUIRED

The past decade has shown that if the United States doesn't make a substantial effort to woo and win Latin America, a number of other nations—some of which Washington has no desire to see become too strong in the New World—are more than eager to do so. Since the war cannot be reasonably expected to put an end to the attempts of certain Old World nations to gain undue influence south of the Rio Grande, it seems imperative that the work of the Coordinator's Office be expanded and that it receive full cooperation from all American agencies and officials.

If the United States is farsighted enough, there is little reason why this country should not maintain the distinct improvement in its relations with Latin America which the war has made possible. A little wisdom and tolerance, solidified by good, sound commercial considerations, could open a new era in inter-American relations.

The Office's work can be divided roughly into two sections. One is to aid the economic development of such Latin American countries as ask for it, thereby adding to their political and social security, which, in turn, will aid trade relations with the United States. The other is to gear Latin American production of raw materials to the immediate defense needs of this country.

At the same time, the Rockefeller group has successfully waged a quiet campaign to weaken German and Italian influence in Latin America. The recent blacklisting of a large number of firms and individuals in Latin America wh'h were suspected of aiding the Axis war effort is an example of this effort.

The Rockefeller task has been facilitated by the extent to which it has attempted to explain the Americas to each other. It has lent immediate and strong support to all cultural projects helping to bridge the very ignorance which exists in both the United States and Latin America regarding the other's life, intellectual achievements, and civilization.

FACTS AND FIGURES READY

The particular success of the Inter-American Office stems from the fact that it has been willing to work on preliminaries and to lay the groundwork for a substantial bettering of inter-American commercial relations. If an American businessman wants to operate in Latin America, or if a Latin American wants to trade with this country, the Coordinator's Office not only has the facts and figures around which to build such trade, but it is also ready to throw its considerable influence behind any legitimate commercial scheme.

Of unusual significance is that fact that Mr. Rockefeller is expected to conduct his work in such a way as "to represent the interests of the other American Republics," according to an official summary of the Office's activities.

This is a very far cry from the days when the principal concern of Washington, so far as Latin America went, was to protect the interests of American enterprises—some of which were only too frequently engaged in a ruthless exploitation of Latin American resources and population.

It is common knowledge that most of America's troubles south of the Rio Grande are an outgrowth of a not entirely unfounded suspicion of "Yankee imperialism." When such a feeling has once grown up, unusually strong measures are needed to counteract it, and the Rockefeller committee is apparently aware of this. For that reason it has subordinated promises and after-dinner eulogies to concrete action with the result that Latin America is giving this country an unwonted measure of cooperation.

Having proved what is possible in war, it would be doubly tragic if even greater advances in inter-American harmony are not made in the peaceful days to follow. The Rockefeller groups give promise that such advances will be made. The result will be well worth the patient effort.

Testimony of Carl H. Mote on Bill to Authorize President to Requisition Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 1, 1941

STATEMENT BY CARL H. MOTE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1941, Mr. Carl H. Mote, a citizen of Indianapolis, widely known throughout the country as an attorney, businessman, and publicist, gave interesting testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate in the hearing conducted

on S. 1579, the bill to authorize the President of the United States to requisition certain property for the use of, or disposition by, the United States. Mr. Mote, who is president of the Northern Indiana Telephone Co. and the Commonwealth Telephone Corporation, testified as follows:

STATEMENT OF CARL H. MOTE, PRESIDENT, NORTHERN INDIANA TELEPHONE CO.; PRESIDENT, COMMONWEALTH TELEPHONE CORPORATION

The CHAIRMAN. I believe, Mr. Mote, that you are the president of the Northern Indiana Telephone Co. What is your residence?

Mr. MOTE. 5685 Central Avenue, Indianapolis.

After coming to Washington, I have been able over the week end to read a bit of the testimony that was given here. I read the examination of Judge Patterson.

I may say that I was struck in reading his testimony by the emphasis that was placed upon the details—with which, of course, this committee is concerned—the details of this bill, of this bill or a similar measure, if enacted and recommended for passage, such as machine tools in southern California, in which Senator DOWNEY was deeply interested, and rightly interested. I have read a bit of the evidence and have heard the last two witnesses on the subject of patents.

It has seemed to me that there is involved in this proposed legislation issues that far transcend the matters which the committee has considered heretofore.

As a citizen, as a taxpayer, as a corporation executive and manager, I ask, What were the reasons for urging Congress to enact S. 1579?

Such a measure has never been necessary in the history of this country during any war it has ever fought. In our last war "to make the world safe for democracy" and "to end all wars," the President was empowered during the war to operate certain privately owned property, especially transportation and communication; but that, I believe, is as far as his power went. He did take over the railroads and communication facilities; and it was years after the war before these properties recovered from the disasters inflicted upon them during the period of Government management. Moreover, in 1941 we are not yet in war.

What, I ask, are the special circumstances or conditions today which make such a measure as S. 1579 necessary?

I understand the original bill was introduced June 2 at the instance of the War Department with the approval of the Navy Department, the Office of Production Management, and the President. I understand a substitute bill has come from the War Department since these hearings began.

Just why is it believed in 1941 by anybody in America that the confiscation of privately owned property is necessary or proper? Is it because the ruling oligarchy wants to engage in a foreign war that is known to be unpopular and that this ruling oligarchy believes it necessary first to strip our citizens of all their property in order to crush their resistance and eliminate their opposition? Or, is it because the prospect of a foreign war offers the ruling oligarchy a mask behind which this oligarchy can accomplish the collectivization of all privately owned property and introduce America to the Marxian state?

I suspect both these reasons are motivating our bureaucrats in Washington. I have been told that bureaucrats already have told your committee that this measure is necessary for defense and necessary to obtain the proper response from labor. These are reasons stated in such general terms that they are difficult to analyze or answer, and it ought to be obvious that they are quite insincere and hypocritical, else there would be more particularity, more revealing facts given to the members of this committee.

I don't believe the confiscation of any privately owned property is necessary for the defense of the country and I do not believe labor demands any such un-American measure. I don't believe labor is wholly without knowledge of what happens finally to labor when the state undertakes to stamp out the rights of private property. At the beginning of the French Revolution there were new dealers who wanted to confiscate all privately owned property and change everything, including human nature. The French trade-unionists who cheered such proposals lived to see their unions dissolved, after which they were compelled to walk the streets without work and in deep despair.

Certainly, the Government has the right to use all our property in times of common peril but there are methods by which the use of such property can be acquired without giving the President any more arbitrary power over the lives of our citizens.

I have long been amazed at the lack of courage exhibited in America by its foremost business executives and managers to resist the aggressions of political bureaucrats and revolutionists in Washington. I think the foremost business executives and managers of America have betrayed their stockholders, their bondholders, and their employees and that individually and collectively they ought to be discharged for their indifference. I say this partially because of the allegation which I understand has been made to this committee that the President already has the power which this bill in its original form undertook to give him. I say it also because such a measure as this ought to have brought every business executive in America to Washington with monkey wrenches and lead pipe, and it would if they were worth their pay as trustees for their stockholders, their bondholders, and their employees.

The only defeatism in America which I consider important is the defeatism of the American businessman who has seemed to be resigned to the oblivion which has been prepared for us if we engage in a shooting foreign war and if we do not soon begin to wrest the political controls from Washington bureaucrats.

This measure, or any measure now a law, if applied and administered by the President, marks the end of the world so far as I am concerned and, I believe, so far as the members of this committee are concerned. None of us will live to see a return of the America we have so deeply loved.

A week ago I spent 2 hours in New York City with the president of the National Industrial Conference Board, Dr. Virgil Jordan. I consider him not only the foremost American economist but, above all, a citizen of great patriotism and courage. I had talked with him a little more than a year ago. A speech which he made at Philadelphia on February 24, 1940, had given me goose pimples when I read it. On September 1, 1940, Dr. Jordan wrote a foreword to the Twenty-fourth Annual Report of the National Industrial Conference Board. I never heard it referred to in the Presidential campaign when we had the candidates of the two major political parties running in tandem. But this is what Dr. Jordan wrote on September 1, 1940:

"To many men of insight and integrity in the American community it seems that after 7 years of persistent dissipation and demoralization of its resources by a subtle, comprehensive, and carefully planned political conspiracy, the American Republic, like the French, has been destroyed and replaced by military dictatorship, and after little more than five generations the great American experiment in free, creative community life has been ended for an indefinite period.

"To many such men, however, hopeful that they may prove mistaken, the application of 'emergency' legislation of conscription and confiscation of the community resources by the State immediately preceding a national election sounds ominously like the death rattle of the American Republic. They must see in it the symptoms of advanced political degeneration and social disintegration, signifying the collapse of personal independence, self-discipline, and capacity for voluntary cooperation in the American community."

Dr. Jordan used a label. He labeled the Government in Washington, D. C., as a "comprehensive and carefully planned political conspiracy."

With the candidates of the two major political parties in America running in tandem in 1940, it is apparent now why the Republican National Committee did not use Dr. Jordan's penetrating language as a deciding weapon against the New Deal. With a thousand-ton tank available for a blitzkrieg on the New Deal, the Republican National Committee used popguns instead, and these popguns annoyed Mr. Willkie more than Mr. Roosevelt, because Mr. Willkie was right behind Mr. Roosevelt and on the same bicycle.

I cannot improve upon the language Dr. Jordan has used—"comprehensive and carefully planned political conspiracy." This language explains what I think and explains why I am opposed to such legislation as S. 1579, both the original bill and the substitute. What, I ask, has become of security? What has become of the "due process of law" in America?

As long ago as September 1, 1940, "many men of insight and integrity," according to Dr. Jordan, believed the American Republic had been destroyed and replaced by "military dictatorship."

I respect and honor the soldiers, sailors, and air force of America, but I object to a "military dictatorship" as much as I object to any other, if we are to be robbed of our property and shorn of our liberty. There is not now, and there never has been, any necessity in America to compel our citizens to defend themselves. What we are threatened with, however, is force that seeks to compel our citizens to engage in the wars of other countries. In such wars force would not be necessary if this country were united on the wisdom of such a course. But the facts are that a large majority of our citizens are being driven by a small but persistent and powerful minority of our citizens into war. That is why S. 1579 was sent to Congress for enactment. That is why more money and more power is being continually demanded. Shades of "democracy"! I should think the word would choke the Pharisees who misuse it.

Their pretense that these foreign wars are our wars is equally insolent.

Of course, it is not really important whether we become an impoverished people and a collectivist state by the process of outright confiscation, which is quick and certain, or through the process of extortionate taxation. By the latter process we will shortly reach the point where privately owned property is unable to bear the increasing burden of a public debt that is approaching the magnitude of our total national wealth.

Early in 1941 Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution, in a pamphlet which he wrote, said the country would be able to carry the public debt and escape inflation if defense appropriations for the period of 1941–43 were limited to $20,000,000,000, which he believed would be the maximum. I am advised that Congress already has appropriated $42,000,000,000.

I am against a foreign war, of course, but I am in favor of reasonable appropriations for defense. I am opposed to any hoax inflicted on a long-suffering people in the name of and behind the cruel mask of "defense." As an American, I renounce any share in the "comprehensive and carefully planned political conspiracy" which is preparing America for a bloody revolution. As an American, I denounce the conspirators—all of them—and wherever they are—in the White House, in the Congress of the United States, or in any

of the departments and bureaus of the Federal Government.

In the New York Times Magazine of Sunday, June 22, Mr. Morgenthau, who was called "Treasurer to the democracies," was quoted regarding American objectives in the immediate future.

"There is just one job that faces the world today. That job is to lick Hitler," he said. To this I say, as a realist, if Hitler smashes Stalin and his cutthroats of Red Russia, the job of licking Hitler is going to be rather difficult.

After Hitler is licked, according to Mr. Morgenthau, we are going to have "complete disarmament," an "international police force," and "redistribute our gold * * * to help rebuild the world."

If these are our peacetime objectives, after we have licked Hitler, then I say candidly, I am without enthusiasm for licking Hitler. I did not like the treaty Hitler made with Stalin, just before Hitler invaded Poland, though I was realist enough to recognize the military purpose of the treaty from Hitler's standpoint. I am glad that treaty has been scrapped and I hope Germany will be able to destroy the last vestige of communism in Europe. I have always mistrusted the coddling of Communists and communism here in America and I still do.

I don't believe in disarmament, because disarmament always necessitates and leads to rearmament on an increasing and ever vaster scale. I don't believe in an "international police force" because that would result inevitably in more wars rather than fewer wars. I am opposed to "union now" with Britain, or with the bloody Stalin, or with Nazi Germany, or with anybody else.

To redistribute the gold we own, as Mr. Morgenthau advocates, means that we would return to gold as a national and international monetary standard and to that I am bitterly opposed. It is to the manipulation of money, and I include bank-deposit money, and especially gold, that this country is indebted, in the main, for every industrial depression in our history from 1837 to this moment. Naturally, I am opposed to the gold standard because I am opposed to every racket which enables a few to prey on the many. No one who is without an understanding of money and banking can have the slightest knowledge of what this European war is about, and why this administration is itching, or was itching, to get into it.

In a preface to the second edition of The Servile State, written in 1913, Hilaire Belloc defined "socialism" as "vesting in trust with politicians what is now private property." This, he said, could be accomplished only by "confiscation." It makes no difference whether it is the lust for power or the pretense of promoting "defense," or the two combined, that motivate the bureaucrats who ask you to enact this legislation. The result is socialism.

It is beside the point to argue that the power to confiscate private property will not be used, or that it will be used sparingly. The history of this administration for 9 long years is a history of continuous pressure on Congress for greater executive power. This is always true when a nation is being catapulted into Caesarism. Most of the power surrendered to the executive department by Congres in the last 9 years has been used, and there is no reason to believe any of it will be unused in due course.

If the patriotism of the country is questionable, if the voluntary behavior of American citizens is doubtful, Congress had better inquire into this state of affairs.

Of course, this bill is not lacking in timeliness. In the past 2 years the administration in Washington has made this country the virtual ally of England, which has lately committed itself, and so has Mr. Roosevelt, to aid "red" Russia. It is certainly significant that Congress is asked to provide for the confiscation of private property in America at a time when the President is promising to aid Stalinism in Russia.

Such an alliance is in complete harmony with everything charged against this administration as early as 1934 by the late Dr. William A. Wirt, of Gary, Ind.; namely, the socialization of all privately owned property. Finally, we have from the administration itself a measure which undertakes to accomplish what Dr. Wirt said was its objective 7 years ago.

If we are permitted to hold an election next year, it is my opinion a Congress will be chosen that will undertake to recover some of the power heretofore abjectly surrendered. I don't believe Mr. Willkie and his secret sponsors can prevent it. I am sure this is true of Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator GURNEY, have you any questions?

Senator GURNEY. No questions.

Anniversary of Birth of Jane Addams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 8, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Post of August 31 entitled "Jane Addams' Anniversary Is on Saturday." It contains in some measure a summary of the life of one of Illinois' great women, whose life was dedicated to the betterment of mankind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of August 31, 1941]

JANE ADDAMS' ANNIVERSARY IS ON SATURDAY

The birthday anniversary of Jane Addams, humanitarian, founder of Hull House, and leader in the movement for world peace will be observed throughout the United States next Saturday.

Groups of women of wide social interests, many of whom knew Miss Addams and worked in close cooperation with her, will unite in paying honor to her memory and her service to humanity. Prominent among these groups is the People's Mandate Committee, which was the last project Miss Addams approved. At the headquarters of the committee in the Hay-Adams House yesterday, Miss Mabel Vernon, director of the mandate, told something of the story of this great American whose unselfish work for social betterment won praise and admiration throughout the world.

Jane Addams was born in the little town of Cedarville, Ill., in 1860. Her lineage was entirely American and her ancestry was Quaker. It is interesting to know that as a child Abraham Lincoln was her ideal. He was a friend of her father and used to address him in his letters as "My dear double-D Addams."

After she was graduated from Rockford College she went to England, where she discovered Toynbee Hall, the great settlement in the heart of London's slums. She determined to fight poverty in this country in a similar way and returned to Chicago to found Hull House, the first social settlement in this country. Miss Addams had the conviction that people, however unlike in habits and traditions, could live in peace and social intercourse. At Hull House she worked out on a small scale what she hoped for in a world community.

In 1915, when Europe was torn with war, representatives of 11 nations held an International Congress of Women at The Hague to protest against the futility of the conflict. Miss Addams led the group from the United States and was chosen as the president of the congress. She headed the delegation which was sent to the warring nations to urge the submission of the issues to a conference of neutrals.

Later the platform adopted by the congress was taken to President Wilson. Some of its principles are to be found in the famous 14 points. It is interesting to note that the eight issues set forth by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill as the result of their recent conference are all contained in the platform adopted by the Women's Congress at The Hague.

In the midst of the ever-expanding work of Hull House which Miss Addams developed into a social settlement known throughout the world, she never ceased her efforts to "substitute law for war and political processes for brute force."

In 1931 she was one of the recipients of the Nobel Peace Prize, the only woman to whom that honor has been given. When the twentieth anniversary of the Women's International League, of which she was international president, was celebrated in Washington in 1935, she received tributes from leaders of all the great nations.

As a part of the observance of Miss Addams' birthday, the following letter from Dr. Mary E. Woolley, president emerita of Mount Holyoke, who is the chairman of the People's Mandate, is being sent to all members of the committee:

"It was my good fortune to know Jane Addams for many years, and as I have thought of our meetings have been impressed by the vividness with which I recall them.

"The first was at Wellesley College in the late nineties, when Miss Addams came to speak for the College Settlement Association and I, a young instructor, was asked by the student officers to help entertain her at an informal tea. One of the lasting impressions of that first meeting was that simplicity and sincerity are the hallmarks of the great.

"I recall breakfasting with Jane Addams at a Washington hotel early in the first World War and her deep concern over the situation then. As I look upon the world tragedy of today I am profoundly grateful that she is spared the anguish of this experience.

"I recall vividly her all too few visits and talks at Mount Holyoke College; her address on peace at a great gathering at Carnegie Hall after she had been in Europe; above all, an unforgettable visit with her at Hull House.

"One form of immortality is the immortality of influence. We know that Jane Addams 'yet speaketh.'"

In the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1941

ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the

following article by Arthur Krock in the New York Times:

[From the New York Times of September 4, 1941]

IN THE NATION

MR. WILLKIE, MR. LANDON, AND THE REPUBLICANS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 3.—An important and challenging radio speech by ex-Governor Landon at Sparks, Kans., last Saturday, and reprinted in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, failed to attract the attention in the East which its subject matter and treatment merited. The address dealt with two topics of moment and deep interest—the attitude of the Republican Party toward the President's foreign policy and the degree to which critical free speech should continue to be exercised in this country.

Governor Landon, who preceded Mr. Willkie as the Presidential candidate of the Republican Party, is a noninterventionist; and it is agreed that he expresses the views of the sincere, moderate group of that persuasion which is not influenced by like or dislike of any of the belligerents in the present war. His reasons for his position seem, among others, to be these. A conviction that this country is unready to run the risk, with its present and prospective military equipment, of war on two-ocean fronts, and a belief that the United States has not the power, inclination, or obligation "to make all the world safe from want and fear" and to impress the four freedoms upon the world.

But, like some of the radical isolationists who insist that the United States regardless of the outcome of the war in Europe, will face no dangers to its independence and security, Mr. Landon is a strong backer of American rearmament. This has ranged him among the critics of the rate and efficiency of defense production, and it was the right and duty of such citizens to criticize that he was in part discussing last Saturday Because of his character and sincerity and the unquestioned fact that Mr. Landon speaks for many Americans concerning wartime policy, the speech is worth the consideration of those who take the other view.

Benefit of criticism

He said that:

He welcomes the President's concession that "business as usual" is out, that "the fight ahead will be long and tough"; also Mr. Roosevelt's endorsement of a reduction in normal expenditures of government. But no attempt has been made by the Executive to do this. Also, the charges of agging armament production made by "responsible men" should not be "answered with wisecracks." "The situation is not a joke."

He said further that a demand is arising from "half-baked liberals that the time has come to suppress free speech and the Bill of Rights. We have witnessed the attempt to discourage the nonpartisan minority to question and interpret the claims of the national administration, not only as to the dangers of its war policies but also its claim of satisfactory progress in national defense." A government to be healthy requires the benefit of minority criticism, and he for one (said Mr. Landon) would urge Republicans as well as others so minded to continue this criticism, which goes on in Great Britain "even in the midst of the stress and strain of war."

Mr. Landon then discussed a determination attributed to Mr. Willkie "to support [in the 1942 elections] anti-isolationist candidates regardless of their party affiliation or economic views. If they are right on the foreign issue [the reputed Willkie quotation continued], then I will be for them and will take the stump for them."

Mr. Willkie's position

The Republican standard bearer of 1936 interpreted these words, ascribed to the Republican standard bearer of 1940, to mean that the President and Mr. Willkie will have a bipartisan slate in the congressional primaries on a platform of foreign affairs. He attacked this as an attempt to impose the one-party system of Germany and Russia, and dictated thought among the representatives of the people in Congress—a misuse by Mr. Willkie of his titular leadership of the Republican Party with which, thought Mr. Landon, his successor should labor from within or altogether leave. He predicted a referendum in the 1942 elections, both as to foreign policy and the management of the defense program. But he said that the requirement of the "new firm of Roosevelt & Willkie" was merely personal loyalty to the President.

This correspondent today asked Mr. Willkie if he has determined on any such position; if, for instance, he would simultaneously urge the nomination of a Senator PEPPER over a Senator GEORGE by Democrats, and of a Treasury-raiding Republican who supported the President's foreign policy over such a Republican as Minority Leader MARTIN. "Of course not," he replied. "The foreign policy issue should definitely be fought out in both parties, but it should be fought within the parties. Independents, if so minded, can make the fight all along the line and across it. But party leaders must first labor with their own."

Thus, the "new firm of Roosevelt & Willkie," on the terms reported to Mr. Landon, appears not to have been formed and not to be in process of formation. That each will pursue a parallel course on foreign policy—war not intervening—seems certain. But Mr. Landon, it appears, can meet Mr. Willkie in intramural debate in the 1942 primaries.

War Department Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ILLINOIS STATE JOURNAL

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the August 19 issue of the Illinois State Journal of Springfield, Ill.:

[From the Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill.]

WAR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

The War Department has upset Washington by a proposal to build a $35,000,000, 35-acre structure across the Potomac in Virginia. Objectors say it would spoil a fine vista, would not conform to the city plan, and would require new roads, new utilities, and new housing across the river.

From reports of crowded conditions in Washington, it would probably be wiser to build the new Army headquarters somewhere in the Middle West. Major L'Enfant laid out a city on a broad scale, but Washington has grown beyond what was planned for it. Today it is too large for itself; it does not have the facilities to move traffic speedily.

But perhaps the most important consideration is that of national defense. If there is any danger of air attack from Europe, Washington is as vulnerable as an Atlantic coast city. A raid on the Capitol could paralyze the machinery of National Government, which is already badly twisted up with red tape.

Decision of the War Department to transfer many of its activities inland would insure that this vital section of the Government would not be caught in whatever might happen to Washington. It would insure that the defense of the Nation would go forward unhampered, and even in times of peace and preparation, as at present, the War Department might find it could accomplish more away from Washington.

At present, all that our Government has moved to the interior is the principal portion of its stock of gold bullion, which is safeguarded at Fort Knox, Ky. If it is considered the part of wisdom to move the gold, which is imperishable, to a safe place, why not move the important personnel of vital departments? The War Department could do far worse than transfer many of its divisions, now in Washington, to such a place as Fort Knox.

Byrd Plan To Reduce Nondefense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 8, 1941

ARTICLE FROM UNITED STATES NEWS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the United States News of September 12, 1941, entitled "Byrd Plan to Reduce Nondefense Spending by Government Generally Favored by Press."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the United States News of September 12, 1941]

BYRD PLAN TO REDUCE NONDEFENSE SPENDING BY GOVERNMENT GENERALLY FAVORED BY PRESS

The commenting press generally favors the proposal for creation of a joint congressional committee to seek reduction in governmental nondefense expenditures. The proposal is embodied in an amendment to the tax bill now before Congress offered by Senator BYRD (Democrat), of Virginia. Many of the editors, however, feel that nondefense expenditures are still a long way from actually being cut, and urge Congress to follow up the amendment's recommendations vigorously.

"Last spring," reports the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette (Independent Republican), "Secretary Morgenthau told Congress he thought a billion dollars should be cut from nondefense expenditures. Asked where these cuts should be made, the Secretary indignantly responded that this was the duty of Congress. And President Roosevelt also said that it was the responsibility of Senate and House to decide where reductions should be made. Senator BYRD agrees the job of cutting the Budget is that of Congress, but adds that it can be done 'only when there is sympathetic cooperation by the executive branch of the Government.' Congress, of course, holds the purse strings, but the executive branch, which has used all sorts of pressure in the past to loosen them, should not be permitted to dodge the respon-

sibility when the need arises for pulling them a little tighter."

"Nobody was surprised," says the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal (Independent), "that the tax bill under discussion the past few weeks developed into the biggest one in history, but it will make increased taxes much easier to take if our statesmen will evidence on their part an effective desire to reduce unessential expenses at the same time they are hiking our taxes. Senator BYRD and his bloc of economy-minded colleagues in both Houses represent the only hope the Nation has of avoiding, at the end of the present spending orgy, a depression that will make the 7 lean years of Joseph seem like a dream of plenty."

"All other lines of business," remarks the Williamsport (Pa.) Sun (Independent), "are being forced to forget about 'business as usual' during the emergency period. Yet in matters of Government, departments not concerned with defense are going ahead on an 'as usual' basis, without reduced funds, as though there were no emergency Why shouldn't the Government set a national example in adjustment of affairs to an emergency schedule?"

In the same spirit, the Syracuse (N. Y.) Herald-Journal (Independent) comments: "Once more the word 'saving' is being heard in the halls of Congress. It is about time. But between the word and the reality a long wait may supervene. It takes courage and backbone to cut budgets, but men who assume to govern a nation are presumed to have those qualities. Evidence of a sense of financial responsibility would be as refreshing a relief amid today's hectic financing as a cooling breeze in the Sahara Desert."

As pointed out by the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator (Independent Democrat), "Under this proposal Congress or the first time would have a Senate-House, spending-taxing committee which could make a comprehensive survey of all phases of Government finance, with particular attention to methods of saving money."

Approving the same feature of the amendment, the Washington (D. C.) Post (Independent) holds: "If congressional committees appropriating funds were brought into closer touch with those that have to find revenue, there would be much less excuse for failure to cut out nonessential expenditures. Senator Byrd's proposal would not only make for more systematic procedure; it would enable Congressmen to point to the record as a reason for refusing to yield to spending pressure."

"The great majority of Americans," contends the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram (Republican), "recognize the vital necessity of providing huge sums for national defense, and to that end they are reconciled to payment of greatly increased taxes. However, it is axiomatic that economy in nondefense spending is as effective a method of financing defense activity as raising additional revenue."

The American Majority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. STEPHEN A. DAY, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station WWDC, Washington, D. C.:

I speak tonight in answer to Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, spokesman for the administration, who recently addressed the Veterans of Foreign Wars in front of Independence Hall in Philadelphia, and especially to that part of his address in which he characterized 80 percent of the American people as "a little coterie of American ostriches." Senator BARKLEY also referred to the vast majority of the American people as "serpents in our garden of Eden." These intemperate and intolerant statements clearly demonstrate one of the main reasons why the morale of the American people is at such a low point that one of the leading commentators for the administration is forced to admit:

"The most perplexing problem before the American high command is how to make the American people as a whole feel the urgency needed both to speed up arms production and to enable the President to take further steps in aid of the British and their allies. That there has been a let-down during the last 3 months is generally conceded. * * * A declaration of war, admittedly, is at present politically impracticable The best substitute, in the view of those who are eager to take advantage of the opportunity, would be such specific steps as sending a small expeditionary force to the West Coast of Africa and protecting the North Atlantic sea lane all the way to the tip of Scotland, or perhaps all the way into British ports."

What has caused Senator BARKLEY to characterize the American people as ostriches and serpents? The answer is plain. It is due to the close alliance of the administration with the Soviet Union. The American people are unalterably opposed to having their sons fight and die to perpetuate the cruel dictatorship of Stalin. They know that in the last few years 30,000,000 innocent victims have been murdered in cold blood in Soviet Russia and that today 10 percent hold in subjection the other 90 percent in furtherance of a program designed and administered to utterly destroy human personality and to kill all religion in the hearts and breasts of the Russian people. Senator BARKLEY in his address at Philadelphia takes pains to state:

"Neither the United States nor Great Britain thereby espouses the internal policies or the political philosophy which since the World War has guided the Soviet Republic."

Senator BARKLEY knows that he cannot control the mad forces which are now let loose upon the world. He must recognize the change in events that have taken place since he addressed the Senate in February 1941, when the Lend-Lease Act was up for consideration by the Senate. He stated then—

"The importance of the subject, the consequences which may flow from its enactment and administration, the anxiety and suspense with which the American people are today tiptoeing to catch the latest word concerning events over which they now have no control, but which may for generations and centuries determine the fate of America and the world, require of us the utmost sincerity, calmness, frankness, and courage in our approach to and our discussion of this tremendous subject."

Exercising this type of sincerity and frankness, I state with confidence that when the permanent record of history is written of the period through which we are now passing, it will be stated that Hitler misjudged the strength of the Soviet armed forces, and the world underestimated the power of communism. It is now 11 weeks since Hitler invaded the land of the Soviets, and it will be many long months before he can expect anything approaching a victory. The siege of Leningrad resembles the siege of Madrid. With winter months approaching, his panzer units must be supplanted by heavy artillery to lay siege to what was once the mighty city of St. Petersburg. The front is 1,800 miles in length, and no part of this vast line dare be unprotected against a counterattack from the Soviet forces. This means that the whole stage of the war has been altered. The threat of an invasion by Hitler of our own soil or any part of the Western Hemisphere has vanished into thin air. When the vast majority of the American people recognize this and say it, they are not "ostriches" or "serpents." I can appreciate the disappointment of the learned Senator when he realizes that Hitler is not coming, but he need not lose his temper. He need not join in the general abuse heaped upon all those who are opposed to war. He gains nothing by indicting his own people. It is cruel to charge such a lack of patriotism and loyalty to the American people who have been long suffering during the many disappointments of that era which was ushered in on March 4, 1933.

The old arguments—the ones we heard at the time of the passage of the Lend-Lease Act—are badly shopworn and obviously threadbare. New arguments must be contrived. But where to find them? The administration is nettled and peevish because the people have become too complacent. The big question at the White House and among the "brain trust" is, Who has a good scare which can really get results?

Senator BARKLEY is embarrassed. He knows that the American people have no enthusiasm for a triumph of communism. He knows that there is not a veteran of the World War in the whole United States that does not despise Stalin and all his works. He knows that he cannot control Stalin if victory shall come to his standards. He holds a brief for a cause which has failed, but, loyal to the President, he must continue on. At Philadelphia, in his recent address, he stated:

"I would rather surrender a few of our liberties for a short time in the preservation of our defense than to surrender them permanently to Hitler and his crew of nation wreckers."

What liberties, Senator, would you surrender? How do you know, Senator, that the American people would ever get them back?

Speaking in the United States Senate on February 17, 1941, of the Lend-Lease Act, Senator BARKLEY said:

"This measure does not surrender the right of Congress to declare war. It not only preserves that constitutional right, which cannot be abrogated, but it requires the President to come to Congress for the appropriations necessary to administer it, and also the authority to make contracts for future execution.

"This measure does not confer upon the President the right to convoy ships across the ocean.

"It does not confer upon him the right to send American troops to Europe.

"It does not confer upon him the authority to send American ships into war zones.

"It does not confer upon him the power to sieze foreign ships in the ports of the United States.

"It does not confer upon him the power to impose a censorship, or to restrict the freedom of speech or of the press or of worship or of assembly. These rights have been abolished in the dictator nations, but they have not been restricted in any respect in the United States, and will not be under the terms of this measure."

May I ask you, Senator BARKLEY, under what authority did the President send American troops to Iceland where they are now brigaded with British troops? Under what authority have we built strategic defenses in Freetown, Africa? Under what authority did the American Navy drop depth bombs on German submarines? Under what authority did Secretary Knox on September 4, 1941, stop two press boats at Sand Point Naval Station for approaching nearer than 100 yards of two Russian flying boats bringing 47

Soviet technicians to this country and fire four shots at a reporter and photographer of the Seattle Times carrying American citizens exercising their constitutional right of freedom of the press in one boat and another boat carrying a Post-Intelligencer reporter and photographer was stopped, although no shots were fired? Under what authority did Secretary Knox on June 30, 1941, state:

"An all-out offensive that will destroy Hitlerism can only be undertaken if the products of the huge war industry which we are completing find their destination on the British Isles promptly and safely. * * * The time to use our Navy to clear the Atlantic of the German menace is at hand."

Senator BARKLEY, in the same remarks in the Senate of the United States stated:

"We do not want war. We hate war. Most of us here have seen the ravages of war, and we have seen the devastation and the suffering which it has always entailed. We do not want these ravages and this suffering to come to our shores. We believe that this measure (the Lend Lease Act) offers the surest method by which we can avoid participation actively in this war and at the same time help those nations which are heroically grappling with a universal enemy to preserve the doctrines of our fathers and the aspirations of our own hearts."

I ask you, Senator BARKLEY, Are we actively in this war? You may answer that Congress has not declared war, but you cannot deny that the President is waging war, claiming authority from the Lend-Lease Act which you sponsored in the United States Senate. Knowing these facts and disillusioned as you must be, Senator BARKLEY, would you "surrender a few of our liberties for a short time"?

We must face ugly facts. Nothing can be gained by name calling. I charge here tonight that President Roosevelt and Secretary Knox are usurping constitutional powers that belong only to the Congress and the American people. What security have we if we surrender our liberties to them that we will ever get them back? Senator BARKLEY was sincere when he stated in the Senate what the Lend-Lease Act provided. His views were shared by other Senators who supported that measure. But look at the result. That law has been violated both in spirit and in letter.

The President is coming to the Congress in the near future for additional lend-lease moneys. In the name of God, after this record, is it asking too much to urge that the Congress be on guard? Is it asking too much that the Congress have a full accounting of what has been done under the first authorization of $7,000,000,000? Is it asking too much that the President and Secretary Knox take the American people into their confidence and make known their real intentions?

In response to the urgent prayers of the people from all over the Nation, on August 5, 1941, I introduced in the House of Representatives, Concurrent Resolution No. 51 revoking the powers of the President under the Lend-Lease Act to give any of our moneys to the Soviet Union. No real American desires the triumph of Stalin. No real American would like to see the cruel Communist dictatorship spread over the small nations of Europe. I know of no better way to prevent such a triumph and no better way by which the American people can express their repudiation of communism than the passage of this concurrent resolution. Under the terms of the Lend-Lease Act, merely a majority vote of both Houses of Congress is required to this end. The signature of the President is not required. No one can foretell or control what will happen in Europe. We have in our command the power to state emphatically that we assume no responsibility for the triumph of communism.

The declaration of principles announced by President Roosevelt as the result of his agreement with Winston Churchill furnishes the foundation for black discouragement. The President has pledged this Nation to the triumph of the Soviet Union. He is so intent upon this object that he is compelled to state in his message to the Congress of August 21, 1941, in speaking of this declaration of principles:

"It is so clear-cut that it is difficult to oppose in any major particular without automatically admitting a willingness to accept compromise with nazi-ism; or to agree to a world peace which would give to nazi-ism domination over large numbers of conquered nations."

Dare we admit that there is no hope of peace? Must the United States be engaged for long years to come, following the leadership of President Roosevelt of "matching destruction with more destruction, slaughter with greater slaughter"? What will be left of the United States? How can we meet the demands of the people for economic security and constitutional freedom?

The conclusion is irresistible that the President and Secretary Knox are waging war, but the Congress is not. The war today in America is a war between the Congress and the President. Supporting the Congress are 83 percent of the American people. The President is opposed by the American majority. I proclaim here and now that it is impossible to redeem a world sunk in the blood-soaked fields of battle except we follow the Prince of Peace.

I stated at the outset that it was generally recognized that there is a marked let-down in the morale of the American people. This is putting it mildly. In the last few months I have appeared before many thousands of our American citizens and have received letters from countless other thousands. The message which they confide has always been the same. Those in authority have usurped constitutional authority and there is fear in the hearts of the American people that this great Republic is being undermined and destroyed by those whom they trusted and placed in power. Symptomatic of this is the recent article of President Roosevelt in Collier's weekly in which he exults over the change that has come to our Supreme Court. Under the Constitution, the judicial department is one of the three great coordinate branches of the Government. In former times, it was possible to go to the courts to obtain an interpretation of legislation and to ask for a check upon illegal measures and actions. Today, there is no great independent tribunal of justice. It is packed with New Deal sympathizers.

Little did we think that when we heard President Roosevelt say (March 9, 1937):

"Last Thursday I described the American form of government as a three-horse team provided by the Constitution to the American people so that their field might be plowed. The three horses are, of course, the three branches of Government—the Congress, the Executive, and the courts. Two of the horses are pulling in unison today; the third is not"; that within a few short years the third horse would exist in form only. Less did we think that the President would pat himself on the back for the destruction which he has inflicted on the courts.

We are in grave danger. Our form of government is gradually being taken apart. Each day presents new evidences of this process, whether it be price fixing, seizure of private industry, elimination of small business, smearing and purging of opponents, disregard of constitutional limitations, and even waging war with no authority.

The Congress voted 203 to 202 on the issue of the extension of the draft. It must still pass on price fixing. It must still pass on additional lend-lease moneys. The American people must make known their emphatic determination to prevent the undermining of this Republic. This is not a partisan appeal. I know that the great patriotic Veterans of Foreign Wars will do their utmost to preserve the Constitution of the United States which they love and for which they were willing to give the full measure of devotion.

A Message to Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1941

LABOR DAY ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I made on Labor Day:

Mr. Chairman, today the uppermost questions in the mind of the average laboring man is, "Will we be able to keep out of the World War" and "Will the laboring man be able to hold fast to the great gains labor has made since 1933?"

The first question can only be answered by Hitler and his Axis companions. The second can only be answered by labor itself—by its patriotism and determination to fight for its rights, by sending men to Congress and public office who have proven true to the interests of labor, and who have shown that they are interested and concerned about the general welfare of the whole people.

Isolationists tell us we can whip Hitler unaided and alone, and then argue we should do nothing to prepare ourselves to do the job, even if it should become necessary. Where would these two different positions get us?

When we get to the point where we talk of war in hushed tones, we are close to the point of losing our freedom forever.

The most fortunate man in the world today is the American.

He hears an airplane overhead, and—if he looks up at all—does so in curiosity, neither in fear nor in the hope of seeing a protector.

His wife goes marketing, and her purchases are limited by her needs, her tastes, her budgets, but not by decree.

He comes home of an evening through streets which are well lighted, not dimly in blue.

He reads his newspaper and knows what it says is not concocted by a bureau, but an honest, untrammeled effort to present the truth. He has never had on a gas mask. Has never been in a bombproof shelter. His military training, an R. O. T. C. course in college, he took because it excused him from the gym course, and it was not compulsory.

He belongs to such fraternal organizations and clubs as he wishes.

He adheres to a political party to the extent that he desires—the dominant one, if that be his choice, but with the distinct reservation that he may criticize any of its policies with all the vigor which to him seems proper—any other as his convictions dictate, even, if it be his decision, one which holds that the theory of government of the country is wrong and should be scrapped.

He does not believe, if his party is out of power, that the only way in which it can come into power is through a bloody revolution.

He converses with friends, even with chance acquaintances, expressing freely his opinion on any subject, without fear.

He does not expect his mail to be opened between posting and receipt, nor his telephone to be tapped.

He changes his place of dwelling and does not report so doing to the police. He has not registered with the police. He carries an identification card only in case he should be the victim of a traffic accident.

He thinks of his neighbors across international borders—of those to the north, as though they were across a State line, rather than as foreigners; of those to the south more as strangers since they speak a language different from him, and with the knowledge that there are now matters of difference between his government and theirs, but of neither with an expectancy of war.

He worships God in the fashion of his choice.

His children are with him in his home, neither removed to a place of greater safety, if young, nor, if older, ordered ready to serve the State with sacrifices of limb or life.

He has his problems, his troubles, his uncertainties, but all others are not overshadowed by the imminence of battle and sudden death.

He should struggle to preserve his Americanism with its priceless privileges. He is a fortunate man. He is an American.

But America must awake to the dangers that confront us; and, as Burns said of America:

"But come, ye sons of liberty
Columbia's offspring, brave and free,
In danger's hour still flaming in the van
Ye know and dare maintain the royalty of man."

It seems to be the fashion nowadays to characterize as stooges and tools of John L. Lewis and William L. Green all those who oppose legislative attacks upon the N. L. R. A. and the Wage and Hour Act.

Speaking for myself, I can say that during the last campaign I did not have the endorsement by resolution of any labor union, either national or State. However, I did have the support of thousands of loyal union men who believed I could and would legislate fairly, so far as their interests were concerned.

Therefore, in approaching legislation that will affect every workingman Congress must consider all such legislation with great care and caution, so as not to bring loss to the American workmen who have fought so valiently for a better standard of living and the extension of liberty and freedom to the American workmen in their efforts to secure these rights for themselves.

After listening to those who attempt to amend labor laws declare they are only seeking to promote the interests of the poor, deluded workingman who has been so foolish as to join either the A. F of L. or the C. I. O., I am reminded of a Mose Jordan, an old Ohio River darkey who spent most of his time fishing. One day Mose was fortunate enough to catch a large channel catfish, and if there is anything an Ohio River darky loves more than a channel cat no one has ever heard of it. Upon landing his fish, Mose proceeded at once to prepare it for the griddle. Of course, the catfish objected and tried to horn him.

Mose held the fish, as only an expert can, and exclaimed, "What's the matter with you all catfish; what's yuh tryin' to hawn me foah? I'se not gwine to do nothin' to you, only cut off your haid, skin yuh, and eat yuh."

I believe the most important principle in the maintenance of free government is free enterprise and free labor. Therefore legislation looking toward the restriction of labor and industry in making agreements for the so-called closed shops can only prevent the freedom of contract and upset the general good labor relations that now exist in this country between labor and industry.

The labor bills now pending before Congress seeking to prevent labor from exercising its rights to strike—as a last resort against what it believes to be unjust burdens—is only aimed at labor's one safeguard against unjust and intolerable conditions that have in our Nation's history, cropped up from time to time.

The right to organize, bargain collectively, and strike is a fundamental bulwark of American democracy. Long before there were any Federal statutes guaranteeing the right of labor organizations to exist, or a roof and floor protecting the hours of labor and wages received therefor, our highest Court in 1911, by Justice Lamar, in the case of *Gompers* v. *Bucks Stove & R. Co. said*, "Society itself is an organization and does not object to organization for social, religious, business, and legal purposes. The law therefore recognizes the right of the workingmen to unite and invite others to join their ranks, thereby making available the strength, influence, and power that comes from such association."

Recently our court, again discussing the subject, said, "It is recognized now that satisfactory hours and wages, and working conditions in industry, and bargaining position which makes these possible, have an importance which is not less than the interests of those in business or industry directly concerned. Free discussion concerning the conditions in industry of the causes of labor disputes appears to us indispensable to the effective and intelligent use of the process of popular government to shape the destiny of modern industrial society."

Union labor readily grants the right to strike should be used sparingly and as a last resort to settle labor disputes, but without it labor organizations, recognized by our laws passed by Congress itself, would be an idle gesture, and would soon become obsolete, and as a result, chaos, strikes, lock-outs, and sweatshops would again paralyze American industry, as in the days when injunctions and yellow-dog contracts reigned in the American labor world.

Is anyone in America so unsophisticated as to believe that American labor will submit tamely to the loss of all restraints against the turning back of the pages of American history to the open shop in times of peace?

In response to all these efforts to cripple the right to strike or organize, let me mention that in the democratic countries it is impossible to prevent strikes simply by legislation. Both peacetime and wartime experience in Canada and Australia show that strikes actually increased under compulsory arbitration laws. An increase likewise occurred during the World War, when Great Britain attempted to outlaw as illegal all strikes and lock-outs. Even the slightest study of this subject will convince the open-minded student that great bodies of organized labor cannot be forced to work against their will. Industrial peace is most often found in unionized industries that have had a long experience at collective bargaining, while strikes and labor troubles occur most frequently among the disorganized rather than among those who are under the leadership and advice of their own class.

The latest report from the Department of Labor bears out this statement. It states that "Strike activities in 1940 were lower than each of the 3 previous years and below the national emergency period of 1916 and 1917. The total number of strikes in 1940 was 6.6 percent less than 1919. The number of workers involved dropped more than one-half."

Year	Strikes	Workers involved
1916	3,799	1,599,917
1917	4,450	1,227,254
1937	4,470	1,860,621
1938	2,772	688,376
1939	2,611	1,170,962
1940	2,450	575,000

Only the other day, Sidney Hillman, Director General of the Office of Production Management, said: "None of the handful of work stoppages have been of a serious nature," adding, "there is no need now for additional legislation covering labor problems in defense." Commenting further, Mr. Hillman states, "When a situation is in good condition, don't meddle with it."

This is certainly sage advice, and Congress should be more careful than ever, lest they may by precipitated action, bring down upon us the resentment of labor that will surely cost us vastly more trouble than now exists in the labor world.

Not only do the friends of labor view with alarm the efforts of those whose sole purpose is to restrict labor, but just recently the Committee on Manufacture of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States—who certainly cannot be charged with playing politics to secure votes—voiced opposition to the enactment of Federal antistrike legislation, on the grounds it would "prove ineffective and deny fundamental rights to our citizens." And continuing further, "The chamber believes public interest will be best served by voluntary cooperation."

In the face of these strong statements, from both capital and labor, how can any statesman—without becoming liable to the charge of prejudice against labor—seek to prevent them from the exercise of rights that are not only legal and constitutional, but are inherent in every workingman; the right to live; the right to work; the right to contract; and the right to better his condition in life, not only for himself, but for his family and future generations.

Gasoline Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, once again the administration has so bungled what was originally an inept and ill-advised effort to regiment the people a little more and in a new direction as to arouse the country.

The whole Nation has resounded with the dire predictions of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, about the alleged gasoline shortage and the pretended necessity for rationing the eastern seaboard in its gasoline consumption. Mr. Ickes went so far as to brand as unpatriotic, if not active aides of Hitler, any Americans, Members of Congress or otherwise, who dared to criticize Ickes' sudden and startling effort to ration the East in its gasoline consumption.

It now develops that the rumors of the last 3 weeks concerning a supply of idle oil-tank cars were correct. Despite the administration's most intense efforts to hush the rumor, the report persisted that there are plenty of tank cars to carry an adequate supply of gasoline to the East. J. J. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads, last week testified before a Senate committee investigating the alleged gasoline shortage that there are 20,000 railroad tank cars available to carry 200,000 barrels of gasoline and fuel oil from the west coast to the east coast, which is some 25,000 barrels a day more than the shortage alleged to exist. Mr. Pelley assured the Senate committee that the

railroads could, without any trouble, transport this 200,000 barrels of gasoline and oil each day to the eastern seaboard without interfering with any other phase of the national-preparedness program.

Later the officials of the railway companies and the oil companies got together to arrange for a reduced rate on gasoline transportation and the alleged shortage blew up in Harold Ickes' face.

Even Mr. Ickes never had the temerity to allege that there was any shortage in gasoline production. It was, he said, a shortage of transportation facilities, due to the fact that the United States had given to England and Russia so many oil tankers which formerly had been used to bring oil from the Pacific coast to the eastern seaboard.

It has been stated by some English source that Britain had enough surplus tankers to relieve our need, but this was beside the question in view of the fact that at the very time Mr. Ickes, with the approval of the administration, was gravely upsetting the whole economic balance in the East by these threats of gasoline rationing, there was an ample supply of railroad tank cars and locomotives to transport all the gasoline needed in the East to the Eastern States. Further than that the railroads need this business.

This spectacular attempt on the part of the Secretary of the Interior to impose a dictatorial restriction on the people of the East was so inept, ill-considered and unnecessary as to cause a good deal of speculation in Washington as to whether or not the thing was sprung in order to condition American thinking to more dictatorial and stringent methods of regimentation than the country has been accustomed to in the last 8 years even under the New Deal Administration. The suspicion that this is so is heightened by the fact that instead of welcoming the information that these tank cars are available, some high administration officials seem to resent the fact that the information was made public. Apparently for some reason that cannot now be fathomed, the administration wanted the people of the eastern seaboard to accustom themselves to being summarily deprived of the irregular supply of an essential of American everyday life. The only possible reason anybody in the administration should want to so condition the American mind seems to be to prepare it for some kind of dictatorship. If this is not the case, then this sudden furor about a gasoline shortage and the threat to ration citizens must have been the act of an official who was so wholly irresponsible in his thinking on the subject as to make him unfit to be the petroleum administrator of this Nation.

Michigan has a special interest in this matter because we produce a great deal of oil in our own State. If we are coming to the point where some bureaucrat can summarily set in motion plans to restrict the people of a great section of the country in their use of an everyday essential commodity merely because that bureaucrat thinks it might help to create a more pronounced war psychology on the part of the people, it is time the Congress took some action to curb these bureaucrats.

Unfortunately there are always those who, when clothed with such powers as have been given the President for redelegation to his subordinates, will abuse them and attempt to regiment the people merely because the bureaucracts love to exercise power. Also all of these regulations tend to give the bureaucrats more power to achieve such political ends as they desire, or to be able to punish those who criticize them.

The gasoline shortage bugaboo is a glaring example of irresponsible administration gone wild.

The Pending Federal Revenue Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1941

LETTER FROM DR. NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter written by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of the Columbia University in the city of New York, to Mr. John G. Jackson, of 15 Broad Street, New York City, president of the New York State Bar Association, on the subject of the pending Federal revenue bill.

The letter follows:

SOUTHAMPTON, N. Y., *July 25, 1941.*

JOHN G. JACKSON, Esq.,
15 Broad Street, New York.

MY DEAR MR. JACKSON: Following our conversation of yesterday, I am glad to respond to your suggestion that I write you the statement which I then made relative to the revenue bill which the Committee on Ways and Means is reporting today to the House of Representatives.

The provision which this bill contains for a mandatory joint income-tax return on the part of husbands and wive is not only indefensible in itself but it is in flat contradiction to our fundamental principles of public law and of social order. That the women of the country will permit the enactment of such a law, which would strike a severe blow at those women's rights which have been established with so much difficulty and delay, is to me unbelievable.

It is plain to me that the reasons for drafting and reporting this provision, with all its dangers, are not primarily financial, but they are distinctly political. The advisers of the Ways and Means Committee have apparently told them that a huge sum—perhaps as much as $300,000,000—would be raised by this form of tax, and that only about 160,000 tax returns would be affected. Put into coldly practical language, this means that they believe that not more than some 300,000 votes for Senators and Congressmen would be alienated.

The statement that no alternative form of tax is available is ridiculous. We are administering our income-tax system not in the democratic spirit but as a class tax. This can only lead to one end, and that a disastrous one. It would do grave damage to our political as well as to our economic system.

As a matter of fact, it is estimated that we are now exempting from the Federal income tax some 65 or 70 percent of the whole national income received in small amounts by some 90 percent of our population. Despite the many votes which these very small taxpayers would have, they should be required to pay something, however little, toward the cost of maintaining the Federal Government and its program of national defense. If they paid but $5 a year each, our income-tax system would be put upon a democratic basis and almost every household in the land would come to know how colossal the cost of our Government now is.

There is a fantastic notion abroad that the Government has money of its own and that it is this money which Congress appropriates. It does not appear to enter the heads of many of our fellow citizens that the Government has no money whatsoever, and can have none, and can appropriate none which it does not take from our citizens now or later, directly or indirectly.

The Government of Great Britain has pursued a more democratic policy than has the Congress of the United States. In that country more than 12,000,000 persons are qualifying this year as payers of income tax. This is about one-fourth of the whole population of Great Britain, including men, women, and children.

Under no circumstances should this dangerous provision be enacted into law.

There remains, of course, the question of economy, in which the Congress appears to take no interest whatsoever. It is nearly 35 years since Senator Aldrich, of Rhode Island, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, stated in debate that if he had authority to revise the administration of the Federal Government, he could reduce its cost by at least $200,000,000 a year and greatly increase its efficiency. Today that sum could be multiplied several times. It is more than 20 years since, in the hearings on the bill to provide a National Budget before the Senate Committee of which Senator McCormick, of Illinois, was chairman, Senator Smoot interrupted my argument in support of the budget bill to point out that there were then 37 engineering organizations in the Government where there should be only 1, and that there were 46 administrative agencies in the Public Health Service all "doing exactly the same work."

How much worse present-day conditions may be, I do not know.

Faithfully yours,

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER.

Arkansas Valley Authority Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1941

PETITION OF CITIZENS OF SPRINGFIELD, MO.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition:

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Member of the United States House of Representatives, Member of Appropriations Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned citizens of Springfield, Greene County, Mo., and members

of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Springfield, Mo., are opposed to the Arkansas Valley Authority project in the proposed construction of Table Rock Dam and Bull Shoals Dam and would appreciate your presenting this petition to the Appropriations Committee of the United States Congress so that it will be on record of our opposition to this project.

A. W. Brasse, Medley Motor Co.; D. S. Forts, Sedgwick Form Co.; John Owen, Campbell 60 Express, Inc.; J. L. Sierk, Machinery Service Co.; J. A. Stewart General Motors Acceptance Corporation; P. H. Anderson, Anderson Used Car Market; Ira C. Hentschel, Hentschel Construction Co.; L. E. Coffman, Jr., insurance manager, Sears, Roebuck; R. H. Green, Green Finance Co.; M. O. Ruluceh, dairy industry; Glenn Thomason, Plimmer's D. G. Co.; John Kirby, Springfield High School faculty; F. M Latem, collector; H. L Palodna, Smith Hotel.

Views of a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1941

LETTER FROM EDWARD S. CLARK, BAY CITY, MICH.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CLARK & HENRY,
Bay City, Mich., September 3, 1941.

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOODRUFF: I would like to amplify some of the points made in our recent correspondence.

The matter has been in my mind for a long time, but, so far as I know, has never been emphasized by anyone until a statement was made yesterday by Senator ADAMS, of Colorado.

I can clarify my ideas by a series of propositions. In respect to those numbered 1 to 4, I agree with the administration. Those numbered 5, 6, and 7 represent points of difference or dissent, and those numbered 8 to 11 involve some new suggestions.

1. A Hitlerized world, or even a Hitlerized Europe, would be intolerable.

2. Britain is therefore fighting our battle as well as her own.

3. We should therefore give her all the help that we can reasonably spare.

4. We should also increase our own Army and armament to a reasonable degree.

5. Germany has no reasonable chance of defeating the British Empire, even without our help.

6. Even a stalemate would not be necessarily disastrous to us. In that case, Hitlerism would probably go to pieces internally. Hitler could make us very little trouble without a complete victory.

7. It therefore is not absolutely essential for our own safety that we make the utmost possible war effort, at the expense of all of our peacetime standards.

8. There can be no unselfishness in international relations. No government has a right to sacrifice the interests of its citizens to satisfy the noble impulses of its executive officers. Self-sacrifice is a personal virtue. What Britain is doing is being done selfishly and is only incidentally for our benefit.

9. Our intense rearmament drive involves serious dangers, especially those growing out of—

(a) The dislocation of normal and wholesome business;

(b) The curtailment of personal liberty;

(c) The gradual increase of governmental control approaching socialism;

(d) The risk of national bankruptcy.

10. There must obviously be some point at which 9 outweighs 8. To build the strongest defense possible we would be compelled to live and work as the Germans do, and to surrender our liberties to the same extent.

11. Unless I am right with respect to 5, 6, 7, and 9, we ought to be in the war now with our Army and Navy.

If I am right with regard to 7 and 9, the latter—No. 9—is the most important of all of the considerations involved. Nothing else can be so important to all of us as the unnecessary destruction of our so-called American way of life, involving the destruction of hundreds of peacetime industries and thousands of useful corporations, the virtual confiscation of their stockholders' investments, and the exaggeration of governmental control over our liberty and property to a degree which approaches national socialism. Mr. Wallace's new board is apparently seizing broad powers without any congressional authority. This approaches dictatorship.

Why should Germany and Central Europe, more or less disorganized, and subject to the heavy drains of the Russian campaign, be able to manufacture war material more rapidly than the entire British Empire, plus so much of American productive capacity as can be applied without the complete dislocation of our domestic economy? The Germans may have superhuman industry and organizing ability, but the great British Empire is not idle, and even a part of our total capacity ought to more than make up any difference. Those who say that they must turn America upside down in order to make up for the difference between the productive capacity of Central Europe and that of the British Empire must be consciously or unconsciously exaggerating, and in some cases, the exaggeration may be deliberately used for the purpose of bringing about Government control of American life and industry, to an extent that ought not to be tolerated. If the situation is as bad as is claimed, and if there is to be no limit to our industrial effort, regardless of its effect upon our traditional institutions, then our Army and Navy should also be in the war. If it is important enough to turn the country upside down industrially, it is certainly important enough to fight for. It seems to me that those who take the other view are those who would rather enjoy accomplishing the result which I so much fear, viz, the destruction of our traditional rights and liberties.

There is some point in the defense program at which we should stop for the purpose of retaining what used to be considered our reasonable constitutional rights, and I believe that we have already reached that point. We should transform our peace economy into a war economy, not recklessly and emotionally, but grudgingly, and only so far as is plainly necessary to supplement the production of the British Empire, and to provide reasonable insurance against the very unlikely chance of future war on this continent. We should not pay too high a price, even for this insurance, because the danger is far from imminent. It is not our war yet. If it is, our Army and Navy should be in it now.

Yours very truly,

EDWARD S. CLARK.

P. S.—I might very well add that the first step in increasing our defense production ought to be in the direction of eliminating governmental inefficiency and confusion. If that were done, the output might be greatly increased without economic dislocation. A farmer-politician and a social worker-politician should not have high positions of authority in an organization controlling industrial production.

The Vital Importance of Our Civilian National Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. MARTIN F. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the radio address which I delivered over local station WWDC, under the auspices of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, on the subject The Vital Importance of Our Civilian National Defense Program.

The address reads as follows:

Comrade E. R. Burton and friends of the radio audience, I am glad to have this privilege of speaking on the subject of The Vital Importance of Our Civilian National Defense Program, under the auspices of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, an organization devoted to our national defense against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and also appreciate the courtesy of station WWDC in making this broadcast possible.

Spontaneous offers of voluntary assistance for the protection of the civil population from all sections of the country have been received by Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia since he assumed his new office as Director of the Office of Civilian Defense. The offers to help have come from private citizens and public officials of all ranks, from organizations of every kind, including men and women in all walks of life.

Mayor LaGuardia has taken over his new duties after receiving his commission from President Roosevelt at the White House. He has stated that his administrative organization will be small and that the Office of Civilian Defense will depend at least 80 percent upon volunteers. The indications, he said, are that this is a conservative estimate. In these days of total war and total defense, civilians as well as soldiers must employ all the resources at their command to avert disaster or to prepare to overcome a common enemy.

Preparation for our national defense requires cooperative effort with unity of purpose throughout the country. The Nation must have strong military and naval forces, adequately trained and equipped; it must assure the economic, physical, and social fitness of the people as a whole; it must refresh and make more firm their loyalty to the national interest by affording opportunity for officials and citizens alike to gain a clear understanding of programs and objectives and give fruitful expression to their desire to serve. Fortunately, a vast network of organized effort, both public and private, may be enlisted to achieve these ends.

Public agencies exercise constitutional and legal powers vital to total defense. These

powers are distributed among Federal, State, and local governments. Each jurisdiction has its own policies, programs, and administrative machinery. In addition, certain national programs are executed cooperatively by Federal, State, and local jurisdictions. In some the Federal Government exercises substantial administrative control. In others its participation is limited to the prescription of minimum standards and administrative guidance. In still others, only cooperative working relationships exist.

In the interests of national defense new national programs are being devised and existing programs are undergoing changes in scope or emphasis. These new or changed streams of activity flow out from the Federal Government into State and local communities. Furthermore, governmental programs are being initiated at State and local levels, which supplement or buttress Federal activities at many points.

Although defense is primarily the responsibility of government, quasi-public organizations of governmental units and of public officials for cooperative effort and improvement of administrative methods and private agencies which direct or influence the voluntary action of individuals also have important potentialities for useful service. These private agencies are organized in labor, trade, industrial, scientific, professional, civic, religious, or fraternal bodies, many of which have programs and administrative machinery operating on a National, State, and local basis. Some of them maintain a close liaison with various governmental jurisdictions and agencies. Others foster activities which affect the social, physical, and economic well-being of their members. Many of these quasi-public and private agencies have both a desire to cooperate and an ability to contribute. Together they constitute a pool of knowledge, skill, power, and influence flowing through organized machinery into group action. This may be drawn upon advantageously to facilitate and supplement governmental activity and to promote that common understanding of defense measures and objectives which is essential to self-disciplined unity of effort.

Widespread interest is already being manifested in the defense program. Evidence of an active desire to participate is abundant. Forty-six States have set up councils or committees of defense and the governors of the other States have similar action under consideration but are awaiting suggestions from the Council of National Defense and its Advisory Commission. Private organizations and over 1,000 local committees are undertaking various types of activity—some meritorious, some ill-conceived, some untimely—and many groups and individuals are proffering facilities, services, and ideas of varying degrees of usefulness.

The problem, then, is to provide means for full utilization of the powers and administrative organizations of Federal, State, and local governments and for adjusting and coordinating programs and procedures in order that closely integrated administrative machinery may function with the maximum speed and effectiveness. At the same time, private agencies should be afforded opportunity to put their knowledge, skill, and organized facilities at the service of the Nation, and individual offers of aid should be properly appraised and their constructive values assimilated. Through such blending of powers and harmonious collaboration, public and private organizations, groups and individuals may participate effectively in preparation for our mutual protection against any threat of danger from within or without.

Thomas Paine's stirring words, written at Valley Forge to instill hope and confidence in Washington's despairing soldiers, are just as true today as when he first penned them. Liberty is now being hunted around the world as it was when Paine first wrote his Common Sense. The United States of America should not only "prepare an asylum for her," but also an arsenal for her deliverance from the brutality of a fanatical tyrant. Paine's immortal words:

"These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that serves it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly; it is dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated * * *."

These immortal words should be the clarion call for all liberty-loving people today as they were during the crisis for American independence.

Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BAYARD CLARK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1941

ADDRESS BY REAR ADMIRAL CLARK H. WOODWARD

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Rear Admiral Clark H. Woodward, at a meeting of the Robeson County Club, Lumberton, N. C.:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Robeson County Club, ladies, and gentlemen, it is with great pleasure that I am with you this evening, as representative of the Office of Civilian Defense, to give you an outline of the duties and purposes of our organization.

In the light of world conditions, it is well to remind ourselves that one of the strongest guaranties of a democracy against war is adequate preparedness on land, on sea, in the air, and on the home front.

Our national leaders are now exerting every effort to meet these objectives, including the recent provision for civilian defense. The importance of this latter cannot be overestimated, for unless the home front is a pulsating, effective, life-giving organization, the efforts of our military services may fail.

As in every other activity, particularly one of national scope, sound organization is an essential element of success. This is of outstanding importance when an organization for harnessing mass effort—such as we are now building up—is based upon the principle of cordial cooperation and mutual assistance in order to avoid confusion and overduplication.

The President of the United States established the Office of Civilian Defense by Executive order on May 20, 1941. Its duties and responsibilities include:

First. Coordination of Federal, State, and local civilian-defense relationships.

Second. Plan and carry out programs designed to protect civilian life and property in event of emergency.

Third. Promote activities designed to sustain the national morale and to create opportunities for constructive civilian participation in the defense program.

Thus the Office of Civilian Defense provides the means for a nationally organized effort, working through the structure of government, by which citizens and organizations of citizens, State and municipal governments, and organizations both national and local in scope, together with corporations, manufacturers, and public-utility companies may aid the national-defense effort in a systematically organized manner.

To help in the performance of the manifold duties and responsibilities of the Office of Civilian Defense, two advisory bodies were created. A Board of Civilian Protection was established to advise on methods of providing physical protection for the civilian population. This consists of the Director (Mayor LaGuardia), as Chairman, and representatives of interested Federal and other agencies—War and Navy Departments, Federal Security Agency, Council of State Governments, American Municipal Association, the United States Conference of Mayors, American Red Cross, and such others as the President may appoint. In addition, the Volunteer Participation Committee, composed of 45 persons appointed by the President (5 from each regional area), was established to help with the civilian participation program.

The purpose of the Office of Civilian Defense is not to supplant the work of State or local defense commissions but to coordinate their efforts and bring about uniformity and standards of training throughout the country and provide such assistance as the Federal Government can provide. The responsibility, however, remains with the State and municipal offices.

The work of the Office of Civilian Defense has been decentralized among nine regional offices, similar in character to that of the National Office. Their boundaries are coterminous with those of the Army corps areas. A regional director, in charge in each area, is in direct contact with the State and local governments, and is the coordinating influence as between States and adjacent regional defense areas. The location of each regional office is in the vicinity of the headquarters of the appropriate corps areas—Boston, New York, Baltimore, Atlanta, Columbus, Chicago, Omaha, San Antonio, and San Francisco.

It is necessary fully to visualize the basic requirement that national defense is the ultimate aim. This connotes that the Office of Civilian Defense supports the national effort of the Army and the Navy, and therefore requires the closest liaison with them in order not to run counter to national-defense needs.

The total aspect of modern warfare and the danger to morale that results from long-drawn-out conflict make the task of the Office of Civilian Defense a basic necessity in the national-defense effort. It is necessary to visualize the vulnerability of our towns and communities to hostile air attack with consequent conflagration, and also the possibilities of subversive activity under such conditions, in order properly to appreciate the amount of civilian defense effort to be made. Equally important is the task of not permitting the situation to be overdeveloped.

It is realized that because of our geographical position an air attack may never be launched against us, and hence, according to Mayor LaGuardia, "there is probably a 94-percent chance that the preparations for protection on which we shall be spending so much effort may never be needed. But," he adds, "We cannot afford to take even the 6-percent chance in view of the experiences of European cities and the proven capacity of modern bombers to fly great distances and to penetrate any defense."

It is also realized that all parts of the Nation are not equally vulnerable to such an attack. However, these are not valid reasons to adopt a do-nothing policy. Moreover, the suggested organization, when perfected, may prove highly useful for meeting other types

of emergency where unity of effort, perfectly coordinated, will prove to be a protective shield to the citizens of our State and local communities.

This plan provides for protective measures involving fire prevention, fire fighting, police protection, rescue, first aid, temporary housing, warden service, emergency feeding, building repairs, demolition of unsafe buildings, clearance of debris in highways, streets, etc., repair of such utilities as water and gas mains and wire conduits, decontamination of gas areas, evacuation, etc. Most of these activities require the organization and training of personnel—the greater number of whom will be volunteers—and all must be covered by instructional data, brief as possible but sufficiently comprehensive for intelligent development and coordinated application by State and local governments.

The psychological effects of the British air-raid precautions set-up in 1938 are important. There is no question that this movement contributed greatly to the "we can take it" attitude of the British people. It also tended to prepare their mentalities for visualizing a war situation involving air attacks which did come a year later.

The people of this country must be made to know that the entire technique of war has changed. There is no such thing as holding an enemy at a given point or even in a particular zone. War is no longer localized and distance is no longer a protection, as the plane and the submarine, each with increased radius of action and improved maneuvering ability, makes every city—particularly those along the coast—and every industrial community a target for sudden surprise attack

Civilians are now subjected to the dangers of war which heretofore were limited to the Army and Navy, and must be protected. This is due to the German strategy of terrorization of enemy territory in an effort to break down civilian morale. That is where the Office of Civilian Defense comes into the picture—protection against the dangers to which civilian populations are exposed by taking certain precautions and seeing that the necessary training and campaign of education of the people are undertaken without delay.

Since the civilian-defense program must be varied greatly to meet the needs of the various parts of the country, every program must be thought of in terms of its usefulness in a given community. The local government, acting through its local defense council and in consultation with State agencies and the Office of Civilian Defense, must determine the program for each community.

Our task on the coasts, for instance, is greater than west of the Alleghenies or east of the Rockies. It is not necessary for interior towns to train and prepare their citizens with the same speed or in as much detail as coastal communities or congested centers of population and industrial centers where all the sinews of war are manufactured.

We know that many hundreds of thousands of bombs have been dropped in similar towns in England which spread and set fire to buildings covering large areas—frequently as many as 200 to 530 fires started in different places in London, for instance, at the same time. One can see how impossible it would be for the regular permanent fire department to handle such a situation, and how necessary it was to train large auxiliary forces to assist the fire departments, and even to get aid from adjoining unscathed areas always ready to help in the realization that they might be the next victim and look for the same cooperation

Detailed plans and instructional data on these and other important points in connection with protective features, based on the experience of English cities, are now being formulated by the Office of Civilian Defense. They will be brief, clear, concise, and specific, and will be issued as soon as ready.

Let us now take a brief look at the world situation. What do we find beyond our two-ocean frontiers? Across the Atlantic, during the past 2 years, 14 sovereign nations have been ground under the iron heel of ruthless dictators who brazenly assert they are defending themselves against the malicious assaults of their weaker neighbors. Another nation is now engaged in a life and death struggle. Across the Pacific we find one ambitious nation tyranically engaged for the past 4 years in what we call war, but which they rhetorically call "cooperative attempt to maintain order and spread peace" in the Orient.

History, even in the Dark Ages, cannot produce a more tragic demonstration of how quickly unprepared nations can be subjected to the will of unscrupulous force—in total disregard of written treaties, law, justice, and morality—than the startling and rapidly moving events of the past 2 years.

The United States cannot be accused of being militaristic today, under existing world conditions, just because we are making preparation to defend our country and our children from another war, such as is now overrunning Europe, Asia, and Africa, and headed toward the Western Hemisphere. On the contrary, we are sentinels of peace, simply making ourselves ready to ward off any prospective aggression.

We are living today as interested spectators in a chaotic world seething with international strife; a world in which the law of the jungle takes precedence over solemn diplomatic agreements; a world in which totalitarian war supplants ideas of peace; a world in which despotic and greedy dictators marshal their legions for unwarranted aggression and unlimited destruction; a world in which conquered peoples are governed by tyranny, savagery, and barbarism.

In such a world we, in this country, must have for our own security an adequate and properly equipped army, and a navy of such strength and efficiency that no nation or combination of nations dare attack us, remembering that a nation's independence is secure only as long as its defense power is strong.

Moreover, we must have absolute unity among our people. "A nation divided against itself cannot survive." It is our duty to throw all our efforts and resources into the struggle to defend our freedom and fight every destructive effort to sabotage our American democracy—that theory of government so magnificent in design, built up through the supreme sacrifice of our immortal forefathers, and developed and maintained through succeeding generations by the indefatigable labor of love of our patriots. With an all-out effort and ever-increasing production for defense, a successful resistance to the present totalitarian movement can and will be made.

This is not a war between rival imperialisms but a fight to the finish between Hitlerism and democracy. The real issue is whether we are going to live in the future as freemen under our present form of government or as slaves under a tyrannical despot. If Hitler wins, he means to enslave this country economically, politically, and culturally. He has plainly told us so.

Therefore we must not wait for Hitler to strike, but be prepared to act swiftly and suddenly to prevent him from waging war on us. This is not seeking to make war as the isolationists, misled pacifists, and pro-Nazi propagandists charge, but a sensible and patriotic measure in preparation for the day we may have to defend our freedom and independence by fighting. As loyal Americans we are determined to help win this battle against the doctrines of evil and build a peace forever repudiating brute force, a peace based on justice, equality, and freedom for mankind.

Let us not lose faith in our destinies nor forget that we must fight to preserve our democratic form of government and the rights and privileges it embraces with that same intrepid and inexorable resolution by which they were won by our forefathers, pledging our physical powers, our moral strength, or material resources, and, if need be, our lives.

Our heritage is a glory that has never yet been tarnished and a national honor that has never yet been stained. In order to pass these along unsullied to future generations we must keep faith with the living and with the dead by keeping our country from Hitlerism and other similar corrosive alien theories.

One of our most effective weapons against this challenge to the golden rule of democracy is to instill into the younger generation that brand of Americanism which was kindled by Washington at Valley Forge, reproclaimed by Lincoln at Gettysburg and followed conscientiously by each succeeding generation.

What we need today is more of that good, old-fashioned, honest-to-goodness patriotism—the kind that gives a tug at the heartstrings and makes a person feel proud to be a citizen of these United States the greatest country on earth; the kind that gives us an internal glow when we see our flag waving on high; the kind that inspires us when we hear the national anthem.

Our glorious Stars and Stripes—that beloved flag which floats over our country—is the symbol of our liberty and freedom from tyranny; a symbol of that for which patriots, holding it most dear, freely gave their lives. We cannot break faith with them. We must keep those Stars and Stripes flying high in the sky—emblematic of true Americanism—by swearing renewed allegiance to all those imponderables the flag implies. He who does not reverence that flag and the principles for which it stands is a traitor to his country and it were better that he go to a country whose flag he can respect.

With the Stars and Stripes at our head 100-percent Americanism in our hearts, and the love of God in our souls let us as patriotic American citizens, pledge ourselves to work, militantly and aggressively 365 days in every year in order that we may look to the future with faith and confidence in the preservation of our American heritage.

The Gasoline Shortage on our Eastern Seaboard Can Be Eliminated Without Increasing the Price by Using the Intracoastal Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1941

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Washington newspapers have been giving much publicity to the shortage of gasoline on the eastern seaboard of the United States and the railroads appear to be proposing to eliminate this shortage by using 20,000 tank cars to deliver 200,000 barrels of gasoline per day. The proposal is said to involve an increase in the cost of the transportation of gasoline and oil which has formerly been carried by seagoing tankers. It is assumed that the hauling of tank cars will result in an increased retail price for gasoline.

The problem could be solved without increasing the price of gasoline by transporting oil or gasoline from the Gulf coast by way of the intracoastal waterway. I quote below a letter that I have written to Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission:

SEPTEMBER 3, 1941.

Rear Admiral EMORY S. LAND,
Chairman, Maritime Commission,
Commerce Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ADMIRAL LAND: I have been much interested in the newspaper accounts of your testimony with reference to transporting gasoline to the eastern seaboard of the country given before the Senate Special Committee Investigating Shortage of Gasoline.

Apparently you advocate transporting oil in seagoing concrete barges towed by tankers, this in order to conserve for defense purposes the steel that would be required for a pipe line from the Oklahoma oil fields to Greensboro, N. C. Have you given consideration to moving gasoline from the Texas Gulf coast and from Baton Rouge, La., via the intracoastal canal?

There are gasoline refineries at Brownsville, Corpus Christi, Beaumont, Port Arthur, and Houston, Tex. The oil reserves stored in Texas, aggregating 52 percent of the oil reserves of the entire country, feed oil by pipe lines into the refineries on the coast of Texas. A pipe line from Oklahoma feeds oil into the refineries of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey at Baton Rouge, La.

There is now an intracoastal waterway with depths from 9 to 12 feet from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Apalachicola, Fla., and from Jacksonville, Fla., up our eastern coast to Trenton, N. J. From Philadelphia and the Delaware River barge traffic can go outside up to New York and Boston. Baton Rouge, La., is, of course, connected to the Gulf and to the Intracoastal Waterway by the Mississippi River. Gasoline could be transported in canal barges from Texas and Baton Rouge to the eastern end of the Gulf Coast Intracoastal Canal near Apalachicola, Fla., transferred there to a new pipe line or to railroad tank cars for transportation to Jacksonville, Fla., and be carried in canal barges from Jacksonville north up the eastern seaboard of the United States. There is a railroad from the terminus of the Gulf Coast Waterway to Jacksonville, or a relatively short pipe line could be constructed. The cities along the intracoastal canals are Galveston, New Orleans, Mobile, Jacksonville, Savannah, Charleston, Wilmington (N. C.), Norfolk, Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Trenton.

Cities in the Mississippi Valley that can now be supplied by means of its waterways are Vicksburg, Memphis, St. Louis, Rock Island, Minneapolis, Chicago, Cairo, Nashville, Chattanooga, Louisville, Cincinnati, and Pittsburgh.

The inland waterways referred to above with a depth of 9 feet or more have an almost unlimited capacity for carrying barges. A considerable quantity of gasoline is now carried north from Baton Rouge by barges on the Mississippi River, but a great deal more could be carried on this river, on its tributaries, and on the intracoastal waterways mentioned. I suggest that you consider building barges and towboats for our inland waterways. In many respects inland-waterway transportation has advantages over seagoing transportation for defense purposes, and an almost unlimited number of depots could be located along our inland waterways.

I enclose herewith a map showing the principal inland waterways of the eastern half of the United States.

Yours sincerely,

J. J. MANSFIELD, *Chairman.*

President Delays Filling 12 Judicial Vacancies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1941

ARTICLE AND EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following brief news article and an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 6, 1941]

PRESIDENT DELAYS FILLING 12 JUDICIAL VACANCIES—FAILURE TO COMPLETE EIGHTH CIRCUIT BENCH APPARENTLY DUE TO EXECUTIVE'S INSISTENCE ON NAMING S. E. C. MEMBER FOR PLACE

(By Marquis W. Childs)

WASHINGTON, September 5.—President Roosevelt, who, 4 years ago, stirred a political tempest over his charge of delay in the Federal courts, has allowed 12 Federal judgeships to be vacant, 2 of them since 1939, 5 of them since 1940

The President's failure to fill the judicial vacancies has caused criticism not only here but among lawyers everywhere.

Since April 12, 1939, a United States district judgeship in Connecticut has been vacant. Since November 3, 1939, a similar judgeship in the western district of the State of Washington has been unfilled.

The President has on his desk two judicial nominations, which presumably he will send to the Senate within a few days. But neither of these is to fill the judgeships that have been vacant so many months.

On May 24, 1940, Congress authorized the creation of two additional judgeships for the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals in St. Louis. One of them was filled just before the election with the appointment last fall of Harvey M. Johnson, of Nebraska.

PETITION FROM JUDGE STONE

The other vacancy has been unfilled despite the petition of Judge Kimbrough Stone, senior judge of the circuit, that the addition was greatly needed because of the press of business before the court.

The petition was sent to Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, who filed it with the Senate Judiciary Committee.

There have been reports that CLARK and Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, his colleague, have been unable to agree on a candidate, which has held up the appointment. Senator CLARK said this was untrue. He added that he believed he and TRUMAN could agree rather easily on a candidate if it were not for President Roosevelt's insistence on naming Edward S. Eicher, of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to the vacancy.

The President told TRUMAN he was determined to appoint Eicher. Presumably this is as a reward for Eicher's loyalty in supporting Otha Wearin, whom the new dealers put up in Iowa to defeat Senator GUY C. GILLETTE. But GILLETTE and his Iowa colleague, Senator CLYDE L. HERRING, have let the President know that they would oppose Eicher on the floor of the Senate.

CLARK said he had been informed of a report on Eicher's legal capacity, made by the Department of Justice when the Iowan was under consideration for a district judgeship. It was his understanding, CLARK said, that the report was adverse.

Apparently it is Roosevelt's determination to reward Eicher that has held up the appointment to the vacancy in the eighth circuit, which has gone unfilled now for more than a year and a half. Protests have come to the two Missouri Senators from judges, lawyers, and others interested because of delay in litigation.

CLARK FOR ANOTHER JUDGESHIP

As soon as the tax bill and other pressing legislation is out of the way, CLARK said he intends to seek passage of a measure he introduced some time ago creating another judgeship for the eastern district of Missouri. Judge Charles B. Davis, in that district, is opposed to the creation of an additional judgeship and has informed Representative PHILIP A. BENNETT (Republican), Springfield, of his opposition. CLARK said this would make no difference in his plan to seek another judge for the district, as he was convinced of the need for such an addition.

Possibly in other States, too, it is a political impasse similar to that in the eighth circuit that has delayed judicial appointments. In the western district of Oklahoma a district judgeship was created at the same time as the two judges were added to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, May 24, 1940. It has not yet been filled.

A district judgeship has been vacant in the eastern district of South Carolina since August 2, 1940, and in the southern district of California since September 1, 1940. There has been a vacancy on the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico since November 15, 1940. In Puerto Rico, Secretary of the Interior Ickes, who has jurisdiction over the island, wants the right to exercise the veto power on suggested candidates.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 7, 1941]

MR. ROOSEVELT RAKES OLD COALS

The President's first of a series of five articles for Collier's Weekly is an astounding and a very unfortunate thing. At a time when the country needs to be united above all else, Mr. Roosevelt has chosen to rake over the old coals of one of the bitterest controversies in the Nation's century and a half.

In this defense emergency he takes for his subject—of all themes—the fight over reorganizing the United States Supreme Court 4 years ago. Now, when democracy is under assault by war-mad dictators, the President goes back to that unhappy battle which put Americans at one another's throats.

It is true, as the President recalls, that a series of measures introduced by the administration to achieve economic recovery were rejected as unconstitutional. It is also true that, in the midst of the fight over the Court bill, the Supreme Bench altered its direction and that from then on no major act of Congress has been declared unconstitutional.

But Mr. Roosevelt claims too much when he says, in effect, that the court bill, even though it failed to pass, eliminated the possible adoption by the United States of "an alien form of government." It is going pretty far to say that our system was saved by a measure which was designed to break down the historic plan of democratic checks and balances with three separate branches of the Federal Government—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. In fact, it is going so far that the statement is little more than mere balderdash.

If the President is concerned about the United States judiciary today, let him address himself to a most disturbing condition, de-

scribed by one of our Washington correspondents Friday. For although one of Mr. Roosevelt's arguments for the court bill was that justice often was too long delayed, Mr. Roosevelt is allowing 12 Federal judgeships to remain vacant. Two of these vacancies date back to 1939, 5 to 1940.

It soon will be a year and half since Congress, responding to the needs of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, which includes Missouri, created two new seats on that court. Yet because the President apparently is determined to appoint Edward C. Eicher, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, as a personal reward for his support in the New Deal-Gillette primary fight in Iowa, one of these seats remains unfilled. The Iowa Senators oppose Mr. Eicher. The Missouri Senators, CLARK and TRUMAN, who, because of the predominance of Missouri litigation, should be working together for an outstanding Missourian, are reputedly at loggerheads. So a needed appointment, asked for by Presiding Judge Kimbrough Stone, waits while the work of the court piles up.

Mr. Roosevelt might have written an important article on the judiciary. He might have announced his intention to abandon his policy of personal appointments. He might have said that more attention would be paid to lower court Federal judges who merit promotion. Instead, he deliberately made the mistake of trotting out something which had better be left in the past—the court-packing fight.

That is no way to achieve unity.

An Independent Destiny for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. STEPHEN A. DAY, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered at Case Technical High School, Detroit, Mich.:

On August 17, 1858, Abraham Lincoln, speaking at Lewistown, Ill., chose as his subject Back to the Declaration and said, in part, as follows:

"These communities by their representatives in old Independence Hall, said to the whole world of men: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' This was their majestic interpretation of the economy of the universe. This was their lofty and wise and noble understanding of the justice of the Creator to his creatures. Yes, gentlemen, to all His creatures, to the whole great family of man. In their enlightened belief, nothing stamped with the Divine Image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on and degraded and imbruted by its fellows. They grasped not only the whole race of men then living, but they reached forward and seized upon the furthest posterity. They erected a beacon to guide their children, and children's children, and the countless myriads who should inhabit the earth in other ages. Wise statesmen as they were, they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great self-evident truths, that when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, or none but white men, or none but Anglo-Saxon white men were entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began, so that truth and justice and mercy and all the humane and Christian virtues might not be extinguished from the land; so that no man would hereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the great principles on which the temple of liberty was being built. * * * Think nothing of me—take no thought for the political fate of any man whomsoever—but come back to the truths that are in the Declaration of Independence. You may do anything with me you choose if you will but heed these sacred principles. You may not only defeat me for the Senate, but you may take me and put me to death. While pretending no indifference to earthly honors, I do claim to be actuated in this contest by something higher than an anxiety for office. I charge you to drop every paltry and insignificant thought for any man's success. It is nothing; I am nothing; Judge Douglas is nothing. But do not destroy that immortal emblem of humanity—the Declaration of American Independence."

I am here tonight in Detroit to keep faith with Abraham Lincoln. The great declaration is in grave danger of being overthrown by a movement known as Union Now With Britain. This movement would ask us to surrender a part of our sovereignty to join in a permanent federation with the British Empire. It would take down the Stars and Stripes and run up in its place a mongrel flag, emblem of a citizenship common to all of the subjects of the British Empire and ourselves with good Americans forsaking that citizenship which for over 150 years has made us proud to be called Americans.

The purpose of the scheme was stated by the late Lord Lothian, former Ambassador to the United States from Great Britain. Lamenting the failure of the League of Nations and desirous of forming an actual union with his own Britain, he stated:

"But the reason why cooperation failed after 1918, as all earlier attempts to create an international cooperative system have failed, is precisely because they have left national sovereignty intact and because that element operates continuously and inexorably against the success of cooperation itself. That is why Federal Unionists are convinced that only by going a step beyond the covenant and pooling some part of the national sovereignty in a common organism which represents, not the national units or the governments, but the people of all the member nations as a whole, can the true ends of the League be attained."

In my recent debate with Clarence Streit, author of Union Now With Britain, and the leader of Federal Union, Inc., on the American Forum of the Air, I stated:

"At the outset I want to make it perfectly clear that Mr. Streit is not advocating merely aid to Britain. Mr. Streit is not advocating an alliance with Britain. He is advocating a union of the people now living under the British flag and the people living under the American flag into one permanent government, supreme over all, with a common flag. Furthermore, this union of the two peoples is to take place now—not after the war—no matter what may be the outcome of the war."

In that debate, I informed Mr. Streit that the people of the United States are not all of British origin. We have here a great melting pot made up of people from all the nations of the world. American citizens have forgotten the nations of the Old World and have given their allegiance to America first, last, and always. They have not asked for union now with Britain any more than they have asked for union now with Germany, France, Italy, or Russia. They are content to remain all American. I called his attention to the fact that his union now would split America asunder into groups and factions who, at first heartbroken, would then become sullen.

True to the immortal words of Thomas Jefferson and true to the glorious example of Abraham Lincoln, I turned to Mr. Streit and said to him in words that I repeat here tonight and shall repeat so long as there shall be breath in my body:

"If you want to see another 1776 and a war for independence, just succeed in fastening the chains of your Union Now upon the wrists and ankles of the American people! No, Mr. Streit, we do not want Union Now with Britain and you shall not impose it upon us!"

The success of the United States has been due to the triumph of two factors both intensely American—and nothing else. These two factors are: 1. American independence; 2. absence of class domination. Keeping these two great factors vital and paramount, this Nation under God has grown to be the most prosperous and the most powerful.

Internationalism has become bolder and bolder. Like a serpent it has crawled into our midst. By the recent actions of our President, we have been brought face to face with the most dangerous attack that has ever been made upon the welfare of the American people and their continued right to live under the blessings of our American Constitution. This serpent of internationalism is known as communism. It is the established political and economic philosophy of the Soviet Union—that same Soviet Union which has recently formed an active alliance with Britain. We shall be asked to extend that alliance to include the United States of America, at least to the extent of providing billions of dollars of the money of American taxpayers to make gifts to this same Soviet Union. Appreciating the grave danger that confronts us at this hour, I want to explain to you in a few words just what communism really means.

Before I left Washington I consulted the Dies committee for authentic information as to the aims and objects of the Communists in the United States and was handed an official report wherein the manifesto of the Communist Party states:

"The Communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas. * * * These measures will, of course, be different in different countries. Nevertheless, in the most advanced countries the following will be pretty generally applicable:

"1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.

"2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

"3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

"4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.

"5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.

"6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state.

"7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.

"8. Equal obligation of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture."

Bear in mind, my friends, I am reading from the official book of the Communists in America and not from the New Deal program. Can you see any difference?

There are those who have said that Stalin has softened up and is becoming a great democrat; that he will accept the "four freedoms" enunciated by President Roosevelt. Let us see. Again I read from the official book of the Communists in America and in Moscow, for there is no difference:

"The following is now clear to the workers and peasants: The party of the Communists not only allows no freedom (such as liberty of the press, speech, meetings, unions, etc.) for the bourgeois enemies of the people, but goes still further and demands of the Government to be always ready to close the bourgeois press, to break up gatherings of the enemies of the people to forbid their lying and libeling, and sowing panic; the party must mercilessly suppress all attempts of the bourgeoisie to return to power. And this is what is meant by dictatorship of the proletariat."

When the Communist uses the word "bourgeois" he means the middle class. That is the big idea. What they want to do is to destroy our American middle class, which includes most of us. Coming, now, to another of the "four freedoms," let us see what the official Communist book says of religion. I quote again as follows:

"If we analyze these ideas and try to understand the origin of religion and why it is so strongly supported by the bourgeoisie, it will become clear that the real significance of religion is that it is a poison which is still being instilled into the people. It will also become clear why the party of the Communists is a strong antagonist of religion. * * * There is a poison called opium; when that is smoked, sweet visions appear; you feel as if you were in paradise. But its action tells on the health of the smoker. His health is gradually ruined, and little by little he becomes a meek idiot. The same applies to religion."

What are the objects of the Communists in the United States? This is their great desire, and I quote again from the official book:

"A Soviet government in the United States, following the example of the first Soviet Republic, would make it clear to the whole world that it breaks fundamentally and forever with the imperialist policies and territorial aggrandizements of the overthrown bourgeoisie, abrogating all imperialist privileges enjoyed now by this bourgeoisie. At the same time the Soviet government of the United States would organize all the forces of the country for the defense of the Soviet power against imperialist intervention. For then, and only then, for the first time in the history of this country, will the United States have become a fatherland for the proletariat and all toilers."

In this great center of the automobile industry I want to speak plainly. Plans are under way in Washington which would cripple the great manufacturing industries built up by William S. Knudsen and Henry Ford. There are big men connected with the New Deal war machine in Washington but recent efforts have been exerted to make capable industrial leaders merely window dressing for a group of radicals who exercise the real power. Mr. Stettinius has been made an understudy for Lease-Lend Administrator Harry Hopkins. Your own William S. Knudsen will hereafter find himself surrounded and perhaps overwhelmed by such men as Leon Henderson, Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox, and Vice President Wallace, none of whom ever ran a manufacturing industry or had the responsibility of meeting an industrial pay roll. You need not take my word for this; I quote from an article by Mr. David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of August 20, in which he stated:

"The administration must be prepared to look at unpleasant factors if it expects to carry through successfully a grave international emergency that affects the United States. It must recognize that many of its arguments about the danger that faces America have fallen on deaf ears in the Middle West, and this is largely because there exists a deep-seated distrust of the President and his advisers. * * * The distrust springs largely from the fear that the war situation is being used as a camouflage to put over a scheme of State socialism and there are millions of citizens in America who do not believe in either fascism or communism or State socialism or New Dealism."

Every day I receive letters from men who will be taken from their jobs by the orders of the New Deal machine. Plans are being considered to cut automobile production by 50 percent. There will be millions walking the streets if this thing is no better administered than other activities of the New Deal. There is pending before the Congress a bill to give autocratic powers to Leon Henderson to fix all prices. If he gets this power, he must also fix wages. What will become of organized labor? Who is this man Henderson? What is his record? Congressman MARTIN DIES called attention to his affiliations with "red" organizations. Henderson replied that DIES is not a reliable Member of Congress. I shall never vote to give to this man autocratic power to control American industry and American labor by fixing prices. The bill exempts labor organizations and farmers from the operation of the act, but that is just more camouflage. No one can fix prices without also fixing wages and the prices the farmers will receive for their food products, which determine the cost of living. The great automobile industry is the backbone of American prosperity, and I for one will never consent to the hamstringing of that great industry.

In a national broadcast on June 15, 1941, I charged that our form of government under the Constitution and our American independence would be overthrown not by a foreign invasion using military force but by a treasonable betrayal which was already in the making. As a part of that betrayal, all laws protecting the wages of American labor and the great social gains which have been made were to be scrapped for a system of free trade. This means that the products manufactured in the British Empire, where wages are notoriously low, would be brought into the United States without paying any tariff or duty, to compete with the manufactured products made by American labor receiving the high standard of American wages. If this happens there will be unrest and labor strife all over the Nation, and I call upon American labor to do their utmost to prevent this sellout of great free America to Great Britain. On Labor Day, President Roosevelt called upon American labor to do its utmost to overthrow Hitler, but he said nothing about this scheme of "union now" with Britain. What will it profit American labor to do its utmost to defeat Hitler if the result will be the low wages of European and Asiatic countries? Suppose Stalin defeats Hitler and spreads his slave labor of communism all over Europe. The Soviet Union is in alliance with Britain. In the near future we will be urged to join in an alliance with Churchill and Stalin. What assurance has American labor that they will ever again receive good American wages when we have forfeited our citizenship and entered this new world order?

No narrow or circumscribed ideology can ever receive the sanction and approval of the Declaration of Independence. This of necessity excludes communism, nazi-ism, fascism, and British imperialism. The Declaration of Independence was proclaimed by Americans for Americans and can have no meaning, force, or virtue beyond its native soil. Clarence Streit and his Union Now with Britain asks for a "declaration of interdependence"; Hitler demands only Aryan superiority; Stalin commands only class superiority; Mussolini decrees only Italian superiority. Only in free America do we proclaim the equal rights of all men and guarantee it in the permanent covenants of a written Constitution. Our Bill of Rights is like tablets of stone, placed far beyond the contaminating influence of the Executive, the changing currents of legislative procedures, and the decisions of our courts. For these are the covenants of the people made for their protection and are charged upon the integrity and the conscience of all public officers before they can enter into the administration of their various functions. The task of this hour is to preserve the purity of the well springs of our national existence. We must keep faith with our American institutions and traditions. This faith must become the living word and serve to enkindle in the hearts and minds of the youth of this generation the same loyalty and enthusiasm as fired the very souls of those great patriots that gave us the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

Surrounded with great secrecy recently there was a meeting at sea between two leaders. Why was the conference at sea between Winston Churchill and President Roosevelt veiled in such secrecy? Why could not Harry Hopkins carry the word to Winston Churchill? Here is the answer:

Under section 4 of the Lend Lease Act, Great Britain had to pledge that it would not transfer title or possession of the defense articles or defense information by gift, sale, or otherwise, or permit the use of such defense articles and defense information by anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of Great Britain. But there was an exception inserted in the Lend Lease Act. Those transfers could be made only on one condition, and that condition is this, the consent of the President. This means that Winston Churchill had to see the President of the United States face to face to get his consent in order to transfer our American defense articles to Stalin. Was that consent given?

In the 8 points of the declaration of principles contained in the message which the President sent to the Congress on August 21, it is stated that the Nazi tyranny must be destroyed. By whom? Did he mean that the Nazi Government can be overthrown on land without an American expeditionary force? No matter what he told Churchill, I say to you here and now that the Congress of the United States will never vote to send the son of an American father or American mother to fight and die on foreign soil in any war to preserve the British Empire or the Soviet Union. I made that pledge to the American people and I intend to keep it. The leaders in Congress know that there are not over 26 Members in the House of Representatives who would vote for war unless the United States is attacked. Why continue to strike fear into the hearts of our American people by the threat of war when it is known that the Congress will never vote for war and that under the Constitution there is no other lawful way to get us into war?

I insist upon a defense for the United States second to none and have voted favorably in the Congress for every appropriation for national defense. We must make this Nation so strong that no foreign foe can ever gain a foothold on American soil. We are united in our defense program and our production for our own protection must be stepped up with our best loyalty and devotion to duty. This does not mean that we should forfeit our independence, our American destiny, by becoming embroiled in the age-old wars of Europe, Asia, or Africa. It is conceded that we must yield some part of our own national sovereignty if we enter into an alliance or union with foreign nations

to enforce submission to the eight points proclaimed by Winston Churchill and President Roosevelt. The great test of American loyalty is in the offing. Thwarted by the failure of the League of Nations, the internationalists are now determined to go beyond a league and demand a permanent federation directly binding upon the people so that the world superstate will be in a position to demand first, obedience and loyalty from its citizens irrespective of where they live. We already witness the counterpart of this new superstate in the British Commonwealth of the World and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics of the World. The United States is being groomed for world participation. There is no hope for fulfillment of this scheme until the devotion of the American people to their Declaration of Independence and their Constitution has been broken down. We are in the midst of that campaign and all leaders who speak of an independent American destiny must be discredited.

That accounts for the "smear" inflicted upon Charles A. Lindbergh, Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, Senator GERALD NYE, and myself who are upholding the American position against great odds. May I assure you that the price we Americans would have to pay for the surrender of our standard of living would be so severe that the American people would never tolerate this surrender. It cannot be accomplished without the approval of the Congress under our present form of government. This makes it of first importance that we elect the right kind of representatives in the Senate and the House of Representatives. The voters in 1942 will be asked to make a choice and it is the part of wisdom and foresight for all those who love America to demand a clear expression from those seeking office that they will be true to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and will refuse to support any dilution of 100-percent loyalty to fundamental American institutions. We must prepare now for the fight that is coming next year. The opposition is strong and powerfully financed. If the opposition can succeed in defeating those who have stood for America first, the way will be open to take away from us not only our American independence but all private enterprise and the guaranties of our Bill of Rights, including the priceless possession of American citizenship itself. Can those advocating such a base surrender accuse us of being disloyal and subversive?

This brings me to the discussion of the greatest issue that now confronts the American people.

The Congress of the United States must soon face the responsibility of providing additional lend-lease moneys, running into billions of dollars, to be given away to Britain, China, and Soviet Russia. I want to have a clear-cut vote on the question of providing any lend-lease moneys as a gift to the Soviet Union and to that end I have introduced in the Congress my Concurrent Resolution No. 51, submitted on August 5, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, where it is now pending. Under that resolution the power of the President would be revoked with respect to the Soviet Union. If that resolution passes, then the President would not dare to consent to the transfer of defense articles or defense information given to Britain or China so that such articles could ultimately be given to the Soviet Union. The passage of my resolution will be a second Declaration of Independence. It will furnish an expression of the unalterable opposition of the American people to any union with godless Russia. Is this asking too much?

Recalling the words of Abraham Lincoln, I say: "Think nothing of me—take no thought for the political fate of any man whomsoever—but come back to the truths that are in the Declaration of Independence." We have reached a critical stage in the affairs of the Republic. We must emphatically insist that the Constitution of the United States is above the ambitions or the schemes of any man. The issue is now clearly drawn as between the New Deal and the Constitution and there can be but one outcome. The centuries have witnessed similar conflicts and the answer has always been the same. We want no other union in America than the Union for which we fought and died and the Union which Daniel Webster saw with his clear vision when he proclaimed "Liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

Unless we act immediately and a vigorous protest from all loyal citizens reaches Washington at once, our form of government under the Constitution and our American independence will be overthrown. I said this on June 15, and the American people heard me. Over 300,000 copies of this message have been published or reprinted already and requests were still coming in as I left Washington to come here.

Men and women of Detroit, we have been waiting for the time to arrive when we could rally in support of a great issue. I give it to you tonight. It is American independence. Washington said it, Jefferson wrote it, and Abraham Lincoln died for it. It was good enough for them and it is good enough for us. This great organization represented here tonight is fearless. We have no need for any apologists or appeasers. We want 100 percent loyalty to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. We are entitled to that kind of leadership and we shall gain it when the American people rise up in their strength and might and insist upon it. What did Britain ever do for the United States? What did the Soviet Union ever do for the United States? What did China ever do for the United States? We are losing our patience with those who would bring false creeds into our midst and I know that you will agree with me that the serpent of internationalism must be destroyed before its poison destroys the beauty and integrity of the greatest free government which has ever existed on the face of the globe.

In closing, may I read to you the following words from a great American, James Russell Lowell:

"Oft to every man and nation
Comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of Truth with falsehood,
For the good or evil side,
A great cause, God's new Messiah,
Shows to each the bloom or blight,
So can choice be made by all men
'Twixt the darkness and the light.

"New occasions teach new duties,
Time makes ancient creeds uncouth;
They must upward still and onward
Who would keep abreast of Truth,
And serenely down the future
See the thought of men incline
To the side of perfect justice
And to God's supreme design.

"Though the cause of evil prosper,
Yet 'tis Truth alone is strong;
Though her portion be the scaffold,
And upon the throne be wrong,
Yet that scaffold sways the future,
And behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow
Keeping watch above His own."

National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of Saturday, September 6, 1941:

[From the Washington Post of September 6, 1941]

FORGETTING UNIT

Thousands of citizens must have blinked and looked again when they first saw the announcement of President Roosevelt's article in Collier's Weekly, which rehashes the famous Supreme Court fight of 1937. For it is difficult to imagine a more untimely moment to rekindle the antagonisms which grew out of that contest. With the country facing an international crisis, national unity is no less important than the speedy production of weapons for defense. The people must pull together in a singleness of purpose to accomplish the truly gigantic task which has been undertaken through the President's leadership. Yet he has interjected into this situation an extremely controversial defense of his efforts to reorganize the Supreme Court.

Mr. Roosevelt accuses the old Court of erecting "athwart the path of progress" a barrier "which it was impossible to climb over, under, or around." He ignores the fact that several pieces of legislation invalidated by the Court were later upheld when their unconstitutional elements had been eliminated. He skips over the failure of the administration to propose constitutional amendments when it wished to exercise powers the Court believed it did not possess. In declaring that the road to solution of economic and social problems seemed to be "completely blocked" he goes so far as to write: "For a dead hand was being laid upon this whole program of progress—to stay it all. It was the hand of the Supreme Court of the United States."

In general, the President's barbs are aimed at the "old Court," but not all the present jurists escape unscathed. The President complains with special emphasis about the decision which invalidated the N. R. A. But that unanimous opinion, along with several others which the President condemns, was sustained by Justice Stone, whom the President recently elevated to the Chief Justiceship. Many jurists, as well as laymen interested in genuine court reforms, keenly regret such reflections upon judges who consistently take a broad view of the Constitution but are not willing to abandon completely its restraining influence.

Mr. Roosevelt's article, which is part of his introduction to forthcoming volumes of his state papers, bristles with arguments and statements that scholars and historians will some day challenge. But for the moment its unfortunate timing overshadows all other considerations. At a time when vast powers

must be concentrated in the Presidency for the safety of the Nation he has unnecessarily reopened old wounds and referred back to a controversy which, more than any other, weakened his leadership. Surely the President was not thinking in terms of national unity to meet the problem at hand when he permitted this injudicious article to go out under his name.

Iowa State Barkers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE L. HERRING

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, OF KENTUCKY

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech delivered by the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] at the Iowa State Bankers Association convention at Des Moines, Iowa, on September 9, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I deeply appreciate the honor of being invited to address the annual convention of the Iowa Bankers Association. I appreciate it because it gives me an opportunity to visit briefly the State which is the home of the Vice President of the United States, HENRY A. WALLACE, and of the two distinguished Senators GUY M. GILLETTE and CLYDE L. HERRING, with all three of whom I enjoy a strong personal friendship.

I appreciate this opportunity because it brings me into one of the typical States of the Middle West and it gives me an opportunity to discuss some of our pressing problems before a group of men and women who enjoy intimate contacts and confidential relationships with most all of the people in your State.

You have asked me to speak on the subject What the United States Faces Today.

In discussing this subject, I assume you expect me to deal with the problems that face our people growing out of the present international situation.

Time prohibits any detailed discussion of all the problems which have arisen out of world conditions.

Some of these problems are military and naval. Some of them are social. Some of them are moral. Some of them are economic.

Any one of these phases of our present situation would be an ample foundation for an address of some length.

I shall, therefore, be able only to deal with them in a broad way, touching upon all of them to such extent as time and the proprieties may permit.

Let me say in the outset that these problems are not primarily of our making or of our choosing.

We have for 150 years been content to engage in the development of our part of the American continent and the development of a genuine friendship for all the nations of the world.

In that 150 years we have grown from a population of 3,000,000 people fringing the Atlantic seaboard to 130,000,000 people. We have expanded from 13 weak, disjointed colonies to 48 great States, which, in my judgment, are more firmly united today under the flag and Constitution of our country than they have ever been before.

We have taken in the body of the midcontinent between the two oceans and between the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico, and we have added to our territory and jurisdiction islands of the sea where our interests or our destiny have seemed to require it.

We have grown from a pauper nation, without credit in the markets of the world and without financial standing, to the richest nation that now exists or has ever existed in the history of mankind.

We have grown in the enjoyment of individual and collective liberty more rapidly and more completely than any other nation in the history of the world; and, notwithstanding the restrictions which a complex society have required for the orderly development of our people, we enjoy a greater degree of liberty today than is enjoyed by any other nation. We have grown from a small nation, without influence among the nations of the world, to an outstanding position of influence and power among the nations of the world. We have cultivated and enjoyed the respect of every self-governing nation in all the earth and we enjoy the fear of every dictator who has sought and is seeking to destroy the liberties and the conceptions of society to which we have dedicated ourselves.

All these things have made us a peace-loving nation and, in the minds of many of our people, a self-sufficient nation.

We had no part in the causes which produced the World War of 1914–18. We had not been a party to nor contributed to the fears or jealousies or selfish interests which produced that war, but we were drawn into it against our will and against our desires because it was necessary for us to enter it to defend our rights and the welfare of our people in a world of conflicting and antagonistic forces.

We did not contribute to the causes which produced the present World War. I describe it as a "world war" because it is essentially and in every sense a world war.

We did not contribute to the causes which have produced it. Unless, indeed, it may be said that we stopped fighting too soon in 1918 at the conclusion of the first World War.

When that war had been concluded billions of people throughout the earth rejoiced. The President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, pushed forward a great program, conceived in the mind of a great humanitarian and great statesman, which, if adopted at Versailles, might have guaranteed a long era of peace and might have made this terrible contest utterly impossible.

For a brief period people of the world believed that a long era of peace had been ushered in. Billions of people thought they saw a new light arise above the horizon, and for the first time in generations they stood erect and got a glimpse of that light, believing it to be permanent and benign.

In the light of that hope peace treaties were sacredly contracted. Disarmament conferences were held. Navies were reduced—some of them were sunk—construction of others was suspended, and it looked for a time as if those who had been lifted to positions of power and authority in all the nations of the world had set their feet upon the pathway of a long and constructive peace among the peoples of the earth.

Nine-power pacts were entered into; and these various treaties, from Versailles on, culminated in the Briand-Kellogg Pact, by which practically every nation of the world, including Germany and Russia and all the nations of Europe and of Asia and America, solemnly bound themselves to forego war as an instrument of national policy.

On January 30, 1933, Adolf Hitler came into power in the German Reich. From that day until this he has made international honor and good faith a byword and a hiss among the nations of the world, and today no self-respecting nation can enter upon any contract or agreement with him on any subject with any justifiable hope that he would keep his word. The vilest and most despicable petty thief among the most criminal and irresponsible elements in any nation, civilized or uncivilized, has a higher conception of honor than he possesses.

And the tragedy of it all is that he now enjoys the temporary power to bring upon all mankind the most diabolical catastrophe ever conceived by a satanic mind or executed by a demon's prowess.

I am not required to give you a bill of particulars in order to demonstrate that what America faces today and what the whole world faces is traceable to Adolf Hitler and his Nazi juggernaut. It is always difficult to know what might have happened in the world if something else had happened that did not occur. But I have believed that if his course had been barricaded at the very beginning of his marauding career, the world would not now be faced with a titanic struggle to preserve democracy or civilization or a decent way of living.

It has been my reliable information that when Hitler sent his troops into the Ruhr Valley he sent them substantially with a round-trip ticket and with instructions that if there was opposition they should return from the venture. There was no opposition, and he construed this lack of opposition into supine cowardice on the part of those with whom his country had entered into solemn agreements. From the Ruhr Valley it was but a short step to Austria, and then to Czechoslovakia, and then to Poland, and then to Denmark and Norway and Holland and Belgium and France and Bulgaria and Rumania and Yugoslavia and Greece.

From these conquests, some of which were made in spite of desperate opposition on the part of England and France and some of the other nations, it was easy for him to conceive of a final domination by him and his organized international bandits of the entire world.

In fact, no one could read his book Mein Kampf without reaching the undeniable conclusion that before he had made even the initial conquest among those I have mentioned he was dreaming of world conquest. Although he found in most of these nations helpless victims upon which he has superimposed a brutality more malignant than that imposed by any other conqueror since the dawn of history, we yet rejoice that the light of human liberty still burns in millions of hearts whose voices are made silent and whose souls are being crushed by the iron heel of the ruthless conqueror.

We yet rejoice that the people of the British Commonwealth of Nations are imposing their militant resources, human and material, across the pathway of Hitler.

And, notwithstanding the fact that we disagree with the policies of the Soviet Republic in the solution of its domestic problems as well as its outlook and methods in some phases of our international relation-

ships, we rejoice that the people of Russia have displayed the courage and fortitude to defend their homes and their native land against this base caricature of a man.

Although we do not endorse nor approve nor remotely accept the theories which have been adopted by the Russian people, we recognize their right to their own Government according to their own will, and we recognize their right to defend themselves against the same menace that we ourselves are facing and that is being faced by every civilized nation of the world.

It is because of these things that the sympathies of the American people and their gigantic material assistance are being mobilized to help these nations defend themselves.

And we are doing this not primarily because we desire to take part in conflicts in other parts of the world; not because we desire to participate in disputes arising out of boundaries or minorities in Europe or Asia or Africa, but we are mobilizing our resources and making them available to the victims of aggression because we know, if we know anything, that the greater Hitler's success may be in dominating the rest of the world the greater will be the menace to our institutions and to our commitments, and the more certain it will be that ultimately we shall have to meet this dragon without assistance from any other nation that may become a victim of his military machine.

There was a time when the two oceans may have been regarded as a protection to our Nation and our continent against aggression, but even then an army of a nation with which we were at war landed upon our shores, burned our Capitol, and charred the Executive Mansion.

Even then it was necessary for James Monroe to announce the Monroe Doctrine, which is essentially a doctrine of self-defense, by proclaiming that the effort of any European nation to gain a foothold anywhere in America would be regarded by the United States as an unfriendly act, by which he meant an act justifying war.

At the time that doctrine was announced Japan was a hermit. It was not until the middle of the last century that an American naval officer lifted the screen from the Japanese islands and introduced them to the civilized world. If James Monroe could have foreseen the history of Asia during the last century, he would have announced that any effort on the part of a European or Asiatic nation to gain a foothold in America would be regarded as an unfriendly act.

So for 118 years the United States has been committed to the defense of all the Americas from foreign aggression, and we have modified the doctrine to the extent that we will oppose the effort on the part of any non-American nation to take over, secure title to, or invade any part of the Western Hemisphere.

During the period when the world was seeking peace, and thought it had secured it, and in the belief that we would aid in perpetuating that peace, the Congress of the United States enacted what was known as the Embargo Act. This act was based upon the deluded belief that we were curbing the munition makers and that by prohibiting them from selling arms to any nation of the world we would make it more difficult for wars to begin or to spread.

We did not realize then, as we have come to realize since, that that law gave an additional weapon to every military dictator who concentrated the energies of his own people in the manufacture of implements of war while his neighbors were pursuing innocently the reconstruction of their social, economic, and industrial life.

When we realized the real effect of this shortsighted enactment, we repealed it. But even in its repeal we acted with hesitation and equivocation. We passed what is known as the Neutrality Act, by which we made it impossible for American citizens and American ships and American cargoes to go into any belligerent waters during the existence of war. We withdrew our flag from the high seas to that extent and made a greater sacrifice to avoid American involvement in war than was ever made before by any great nation in the history of the world. This is still the law, and we are scrupulously observing and enforcing it. But we are coming more and more to realize that no nation can completely insulate itself from the shock of electric currents that are flashing in all the heavens that surround the world. We are rapidly coming to the knowledge that we cannot completely or substantially or effectively barricade ourselves against the conflagration that is sweeping the world before it merely because we are surrounded by water.

The inventive mind of man has brought about the effacement of barriers, natural or artificial. Neither high mountains nor deep waters can any longer protect innocent and peace-loving nations from the physical devastation of war, nor even from its effects, which are today complicating and paralyzing the normal energies and aspirations of mankind in every civilized nation.

This incredible holocaust, these incredible events, have colored and now color every thought that we entertain. They fashion and mold our obligations and our requirements; and they will affect for good or ill the life and welfare of every man, woman, and child in America, as well as throughout the world, for generations if not for centuries to come.

It is because of these things that we have been compelled temporarily to step aside from the reconstruction of our own domestic fabric, which had not yet recovered from the first World War, and concentrate our efforts in a huge and unaccustomed preparation to defend ourselves and everything we cherish.

It is because of these things that we have been compelled and are now compelled to train millions of our young men to fight and, if necessary, to suffer and even to die to preserve the heritage of our democracy. We found no pleasure in reaching the strong arm of the Government into the peaceful homes of our land to take from the fireside and the hearthstone the strong and the vigorous and put them through a course of training in the military arts. But, looking across the narrow seas into other peaceful homes and peaceful lands, we could not afford to take any chance. So we are training an army.

It is because of these things that we have been compelled to levy taxes almost unheard of and unbelievable upon the American people during a time of theoretical peace in order that we may pay in part for the enormous expenses Hitler is compelling us to undertake.

We find no pleasure in the levying of burdensome taxes. We are not unconscious of the reactions the average man may have toward the increased taxes which his Government exacts of him. But we realize that we cannot pass this burden entirely on to future generations and that we must raise a very substantial portion of these expenses through new taxes. I am happy to believe—yea, I know, from my contacts with the people—that they are willing and ready to undergo any burden or endure any sacrifice that may be required of them in order that we may preserve this Nation, free and strong and independent, for those of us who live today and pass it on to the generations yet unborn in all of its strength, pride, and glory.

It is because of these things that we have been compelled to appropriate between forty and fifty billions of dollars to strengthen our land and naval forces and guard our Nation and our continent against the evil designs of any world conqueror.

It is because of these things that we have been compelled to double the debt of the National Treasury and even to authorize that it be trebled, if necessary, to accomplish the purposes of our defense.

We find no pleasure in increasing the expenses of our Government or in the multiplication of our national debt. We cannot but view with some apprehension the prospect of its further increase in order that our Nation may not be completely under the domination of an alien foe. But we have been compelled to increase our appropriations, our debt, and our taxes in order that we may be prepared to repel every effort from whatever quarter it might emanate to dominate or influence or restrain people of this continent in the evolution of their social, economic, and moral welfare to the point where every citizen may feel that within the confines of his abilities and his opportunities he may enjoy to the fullest extent the bounties with which God has blessed him and his country.

These are some of the things which we face in the United States. These are some of the reasons why we face them. And I am sure that I am not overstating it when I express the feeling that, without regard to geographical location, financial or social standing, without regard to politics or religion, without regard to race or color, without regard to origin or ancestry, the American people overwhelmingly support their Government and their representatives in that Government in their efforts to fortify our Nation from every standpoint against the things which have made it necessary for us to converge all our energies in this program of national defense.

The things which we face as a Nation are even more far-reaching than our effort now to prepare for national defense. We cannot overlook anything necessary to our defense. We cannot tolerate inefficiency or indifference among those charged with this responsibility. It is not an easy thing to transform a peaceful, law-abiding, Christian people, who love to pursue the ways of civilization and Christianity, into a people bent upon military preparation. It has never heretofore been necessary for us to do it. It has never been desired. But we are doing it and we must continue to do it until those nations now defying despotism can, with our aid banish the danger, the imminence and the threat from the doors and the shrines and the farms and the homes and the business of men, women, and children everywhere.

In the accomplishment of these ends, military preparation alone will not be sufficient. We must make additional sacrifices. We must conform our lives temporarily to the new duty which faces us as a nation. Not only must we tax ourselves, build up our armed and naval forces; not only must we endure increased debt and appropriations, but we must make personal sacrifices which as yet we have not known. We must submit to regulations and restrictions which we would prefer not to incur, but this is our part of the program. We must do without some things which ordinarily we would like to have. We must divert insofar as is necessary the materials at our disposal to the uses of defense, keeping in mind always a fair and equitable distribution of these materials to the industries which are the life of many of our communities.

We must put a curb upon unjustifiable increases in the cost of living to millions of our people who depend upon meager wages and salaries to support their families.

We must put a barrier in the highway of unregulated and unjustifiable inflation, not only for the welfare of men, women, and children during the emergency, but in order to avoid a perpendicular collapse and reaction when the emergency is over.

We must learn something from our previous experience in a similar though not as extensive a world situation. At the end of the World War in 1918 millions of men throughout the nations engaged in war were returned to civil life. The readjustments which followed the peace of November 11, 1918, brought calamity and suffering to millions of our own people and the people of the world, whether they were farmers, merchants, manufacturers, or laborers. We recall that in the years following the Treaty of Versailles many of our great financial geniuses advocated a rather sudden deflation of the values and the prices which had been pyramided during the World War. I recall that, operating under the hypnotic influence of the mirage of perpetual high prices and perpetual prosperity, whether genuine or spurious, many a well-to-do farmer traded in an old farm upon which he had been reasonably satisfied in exchange for a larger and more expensive farm, which he later lost to his creditors.

Following the World War these reactions of various kinds in various parts of the world are said to have made a substantial contribution to the terrific depression which overtook this Natior in 1928, 1929, and 1930, and has continued in some measure from that time until now.

Therefore, while we are feverishly preparing to defend ourselves from a military, naval, and political standpoint, we will be foolish indeed if we are not foresighted enough to prepare against the reactions and readjustments that must inevitably follow the termination of this great emergency.

To that end we must ask the support of all our people, and especially of the banking world, in attempting to curb avarice and cupidity and selfishness during the emergency. We have the right to call upon our great financial interests as well as every class of our people to help see to it that no one grows unjustly rich out of the sacrifices made by the American people, or, as for that, any people.

We have the right to call upon those who are expert in the handling of financial matters which affect all of us to help see to it that as men prosper under the stimulus of a great emergency, they shall contribute in paying the expenses incident to that emergency.

The total income of the American people in 1940 was about $72,000,000,000. It is estimated that the total income of the American people for 1941 will be in the neighborhood of $95,000,000,000.

This is an increase in 1 year of more than $20,000,000,000. We have just passed a tax bill through the Senate and it will soon be signed by the President, which will raise between three and one-half and four billion dollars per annum.

This seems to be a burdensome amount added to our present taxes, but, in all seriousness, may I not ask you and the American people whether we ought not out of the increased total income of $23,000,000,000 per year to take more than three and one-half billions to help pay for the program which, at least in part, has made this increase in income possible?

Therefore, if I may answer concretely what the United States faces today, I would epitomize by saying it faces a world whose domination is sought by a brutal and ruthless conqueror, who has exceeded every other conqueror in the form and method of cruelty. We face the possibility of encirclement by every continent outside of America. For if Hitler wins in Europe, he wins in Africa and in Asia, and already he is seeking to undermine the independence of South American republics, to say nothing of his diabolical undercover efforts in the United States.

We face the possibility in that event of a continuous and perpetual Military Establishment as a part of our regular program in the United States in order that we may never be caught unprepared for a possible hostile world. In this event we are faced with complete change in the methods of our life and the objectives which have made our Nation glorious. We will face burdens never dreamed of and restraints never conceived in the development of our national life. We will face the possibility that our own free institutions, under which we have enjoyed freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, freedom of thought, and freedom of lawful pursuit of happiness shall be crushed, and that we shall be compelled to indulge in physical, moral, and mental regimentation.

We face now, in view of all these things, the responsibility of giving all the aid that we can give to those nations fighting desperately to preserve human liberty. We hope we may do this without entering into the war now raging throughout the world. We love peace and we abhor war. But, while we abhor war and love peace and while we have done everything humanly possible as a nation to avoid the necessity of actual war, and while the great President of the United States in all his efforts has sought to avoid the necessity for our entrance into the war, in which program Congress and the people have supported him, I am not afraid to assert that in any commonwealth of this Nation or in any community of it, if the time arrives when we must lay aside temporarily the peaceful habits which we love, we shall not be afraid to assume the responsibility which our forefathers assumed when they established, and for 150 years have defended, our liberty, our rights, our homes, and our institutions.

They were not afraid in 1776; they were not afraid in 1812; they were not afraid in 1848; they were not afraid in 1861; they were not afraid in 1898; they were not afraid in 1917; they are not afraid today.

God grant that we may not be compelled to unsheathe our sword; God grant that we may not be compelled to use this Army that we are training; God grant that we may not be compelled to use the Navy which we are building for the defense of two oceans; God grant that all of our liberties and our rights and our concepts that our belief in democracy and our belief in the freedoms we enjoy may be preserved without our entering into actual warfare. But if it cannot be done otherwise than by actual conflict, if all the prayers of millions of our people should prove futile in the face of the satanic onslaught inspired by the devil and conducted by his outstanding agent on this earth, Adolf Hitler, then we shall be ready to accept our responsibility and do our duty as God may give us the light to see it and the courage to perform it.

In facing these difficulties, in the solution of these problems, in the unification of our people under the impact of a great obligation, we know we shall receive the full cooperation of the groups which you represent here today and all the groups which make up the citizenship of this Republic.

Should the United States Give Lend-Lease Aid to Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT F. JONES, OF OHIO

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on August 29, 1941, over station WHIO, the Columbia Broadcasting System:

Ladies and gentlemen, the subject of my discussion is Should the United States Give Lease-Lend Aid to Russia? At the time I proposed to discuss this question, Lease-Lend Administrator Harry Hopkins was breaking bread with bloody-fingered Joe Stalin in Moscow. President Wilson had his Colonel House. President Roosevelt has his Harry Hopkins. Both have been star boarders at the White House. Colonel House and Harry Hopkins both have had a curious influence on Presidents of the United States. Both have had their private rendezvous with the rulers of war-torn Europe. Colonel House delivered the A. E. F. to the Allies in World War No. 1. I point to the similarity of these two international figures, House and Hopkins, because their roles in international intrigue have a deadly parallel.

You people, especially in the Middle West and on the great western plains have been quick to detect this similarity. Your letters to the newspapers, your speeches, your letters to the President, and your Senators and Representatives express your resentment against another American Expeditionary Force. The President knows you demand that no secret alliance be made with foreign powers.

Your letters, your influence and yours alone, made the President announce that the United States would not give guns, ships, planes, oil, and tanks to Russia under the lease-lend law. You remember he did not make this decision until pictures of Hopkins and Comrade Joe had been circulated through the Nation. If Roosevelt did not intend to give lease-lend aid to Russia, why did he send Hopkins, the Lease Lend Administrator? The giant propaganda agencies of our own Government made no explanation to the American people that Hopkins was not promising gifts to Russia. You could not embrace communism, and your voices were picked up by Lowell Mellett's million-and-a-half-dollar press-clipping service. Your overwhelming disapproval was reported to the President. Then, and no sooner, your President and mine gave us assurance that Hopkins bore no gifts of our toil and sweat for Russia.

You may rightly ask then, why I discuss the question, "Should the United States Give Lease-Lend Aid to Russia?" My answer to you is that the question is not settled.

In the first place, President Roosevelt says Russia has credits in the United States. That is not a valid reason. Last February England

had $14,000,000,000 worth of credits in the Western Hemisphere which she should have liquidated before we passed a lease-lend give-away bill. Since $7,000,000,000 was appropriated by your Congress there has not been the least effort on the part of our President, Harry Hopkins or any other official of the White House to determine England's ability to pay. I charge now that England's position and ability to pay is the same as Russia's.

I tell you now that Secretary Morgenthau has purchased $4,000,000,000 worth of gold directly and indirectly from Russia. Russia produced this gold at $7 an ounce with slave labor and sold it to your country at $35 per ounce. This is the Roosevelt folly or "gold brick" policy. England has benefited similarly with our gold-buying program, but we gave her a $7,000,000,000 lease-lend give-away bill. Congress in September will consider another $5,000,000,000 give-away for her. I repeat, credits of Russia is not the real reason President Roosevelt promises you Russia will not get lease-lend give-away funds or material.

When you discuss British credits with blind supporters of the President's Anglophile foreign policy, they tell you we must not think of such things now. In February they said we must give England morale. Should the President want to give Comrade Joe a little morale between now and September, let's look at the record of morale in America and in England. The morning after the lease-lend was enacted, your papers and radio commentators headlined the news with startling generalities of tankers and ocean liners full of material for all-out aid to England. They made you believe goods and guns were molding and rusting on the docks until the instant President Roosevelt signed the lease-lend appropriation. I gained the impression $7,000,000,000 worth of guns, tanks, ammunition, and supplies were on their way to England within 48 hours. You heard President Roosevelt, Ickes, Stimson, and Knox call lease-lend opponents "obstructionists." The opponents were not vindicated until the President revealed only $85,000,000 worth of this material went to England in the first 90 days.

Some part of this $85,000,000 worth of material went in the form of raw steel. We had expected every ounce to go into guns, tanks, jeeps, and ordnance; but Americans learned that parts of it were manufactured for South American British orders. Big business and little business in England—thanks to lease-lend—have no rationing system of materials and no priorities. A British statesman admits they are filling commercial contracts with South American countries.

What is the morale of our people before the full impact of lease-lend had hit us? The raw material of small factories is running low. Many factories can't get any priority. Their doors are about to close. Some have already shut down. In defense industries businessmen frantically write the O. P. M., the President, and any bureau they can think of to get a priority rating. Their letters are buried. Two weeks, 6 weeks, and 12 weeks pass without reply. They go to Washington only to be pushed from one office to another. If they don't happen to find the right man out of the thousands of offices, they go home disillusioned and disheartened.

Factory buildings and machine tools lie idle because no one has comprehensive knowledge of what might be used.

Our Government transfers 50 tankers to Great Britain for give-away Columbian and Venezuelan oil. Secretary Ickes claims a shortage of oil in the seaboard States and closes filling stations as far west as Pittsburgh from 7 p. m. to 7 a. m. Along the road, after Icke's curfew tolled, I stopped at several of these filling stations. I saw some pathetic cases and extreme hardship. One widow just a few miles from Pittsburgh, where there is no actual shortage, with tears streaming down her face, reported her business ruined by the order.

All along the eastern seaboard gas prices are rising. Ickes' oil administration is headed by a consistent violator of the antitrust laws. Thurman Arnold's antitrust cases and files are in Ickes' hands. I have no doubt that the small independent oil producer will be squeezed out by the Oil Coordinator.

All of this time Comrade Joseph Stalin sat in Moscow with his German nonaggression pact in one hand and a report from his American Communists in the other. He must have laughed as he read the New Deal Supreme Court decision that an employer could not fire a man if he knew he was a Communist. Can't you hear him giggle when Communists delayed our two-ocean Navy? Can't you see him predicting bloodshed in the defense plants of America if our President attempted to keep ships, planes, tanks, and guns on the assembly line after his fellow travelers put lids over the smokestack? Yes; Joe Stalin laughed at American morale.

One day Communists stopped picketing the White House. Five hours later Russia was in the war against Germany. The Communist Daily Worker turned a flip-flop over night—Churchill accepted ruthless and murderous Joe Stalin, dictator of godless Russia, as a partner.

British statesmen in America said to us that British partnership with Russia had solved our defense strikes and sabotage of defense industries.

What all of this has done to American morale you know as well as I. You have seen and you recognize that the 1941 war crowd has rattled all of the bones of the 1916 war crowd. First, we changed the neutrality law so England could buy supplies. Next we gave it to her.

Now our relation to Russia is in the paying status. Before Russian credits are exhausted you may be asked to give lease-lend aid to Russia or some Attorney General of the United States may give one of those historic destroyer-deal opinions proving that dictatorship Russia is a democracy. Or the appeal may be made for the American people to give Comrade Joe a morale builder with a lease-lend law for Russian dictatorship.

I warn you now that the United States has been building Joe Stalin's morale.

1. Everyone knows that Communists are on the Federal pay roll even in the heart of national defense.

2. As Harry Hopkins sat in the Kremlin with Comrade Joe Stalin I remembered my inquiry about Commerce Department employees on the Dies list. Hopkins was recently Secretary of Commerce. One after another as I read the names to the present Commerce Department I was told Harry Hopkins had hired them.

3. Some of your Federal employees attended meetings of these Communist front organizations and listened to speakers who have sought public office on the Communist ticket. Money collected for the relief of China in one of these organizations was later appropriated for the use of other Communist front organizations in America. Before the deadline for shipments of scrap iron to Japan there was a marathon among eastern junk dealers to get the last shipment of available scrap for the rape of China. As late as February export licenses were issued by the administration in Washington for four-fifths as much oil and gasoline for Japan as we gave to Britain under the lease-lend law. Only after Russia was in the war did the administration admit that it had been appeasing Japan. Since Russia came into the war, war clouds hang over the Far East. If we war with Japan, the boys who bare their breasts for our country will meet bullets made with our own scrap, and our ships will be bombed by Japanese airplanes burning our own gasoline.

I would have more confidence in the administration in Washington if men were placed in high positions of authority who had a fundamental love for the American way of life, steeped in the traditions of liberty of our people and the freedoms we cherish, instead of men who are constantly reported to have leanings to the left.

If we gain the whole world and lose our own soul for the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution, we will have paid a dear price.

Throwing millions of men out of work in the small factories that can't get defense contracts or priorities for material is dangerous to our morale.

Forcing A. A. A land use for wheat upon States where the majority of the farmers reject it endangers the morale of farmers in those States. In its ultimate end the philosophy will reach every crop and the farmers in America will have to get a license to sell a cow as peasants in France did before that Government fell. I think such a program is born in communistic philosophy and nurtured in totalitarianism. Continued to its end, it will break the backbone of America.

In '39 we were told America cannot build a Chinese wall around itself without complete regimentation of our people. Now, while we are still at peace, we are faced with proclamations, Executive orders, and a legislative program which regiments Americans faster than that which the administration pledged the country had escaped.

Power and more power for a power-mad administration is the watchword of the day. Behind a false cloak of patriotism they clip the wings of the American eagle to feather their own nests.

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope you will keep eternally vigilant for the way of life you know. Let the President know you want our morale builded to higher and loftier planes of freedom.

Each of you can do a little. Write to your editors. Speak on the radio. Talk to your clubs. We must not follow our British pattern: First sell to Russia, then give to Russia.

Let the administration in Washington know there can be no compromise with the godless. The best defense against dictatorship 3,000 miles away is to escape dictatorship in America.

Address to Soldiers of Second Army in the Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. BEN LEAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who is unavoidably absent, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Lt. Gen. Ben Lear, commanding general, Second Army, to the soldiers of the Second Army in the field on August 28, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Army phase of maneuvers is about to begin. There will be plenty of work for

everybody in this command. By perseverance, by work, by correction of mistakes, by learning team-play, we will make progress.

After that phase is completed, we will enter the maneuvers between the Second Army and the Third Army. This will be the biggest and most important Army undertaking in our peacetime history. It will be a test of our training up to this point. Again every man will do his best, learn by his mistakes one day so that he may do better the next. That is what we are here for. That is why in rain or in heat, under forced marches and long nights on the road, every man will put out his best effort. Remember, each soldier is important, each squad is important. The individual contribution of the soldier, the collective contribution of squads, platoons, companies, regiments, and divisions will make this Army more fit to fight, more fit to serve the Republic. To do less than that would be to deny our country our best services.

I am confident that you will do well—each and every one of you. I am confident that you will answer those critics who have belittled the American Army.

Just like you, I read the newspapers and magazines and take note of what they say about the Army. Like you, I read and discussed with my associates articles that are critical. There have been some I haven't liked at all. I don't like it when it is said or inferred that the American soldier is afraid of his weapons, that he is a potential quitter, that he is too selfish to give his time and efforts ungrudgingly to his country when his national leaders tell him solemnly and gravely that the Nation faces a crisis.

We aren't that kind of men. We are not represented by the disgusting quotations that reflect on the spirit, the manhood, the character, and the patriotism of the young American. We are not the kind of men that any foreign dictator would prefer to have as enemy troops. I resent all such inferences and allusions. I am confident that you join me in that resentment.

I am being very frank with you. We are all on the same team. A general officer's job is a combination job of player and coach. But we are all in playing the game—the most honorable game in life—service to our country. That calls on us to put out—unstintingly.

We will never get paid for that service what it is worth. We will make sacrifices and have hardships that others will not share. We will know labor and sweat and fatigue at a time when we know there are plenty of others who are taking it easy.

But that's the soldier's life in a time of emergency. And if war is brought to this Nation, you will suffer hardships and deprivations that will make your period of training and of field work look like child's play. And that, too, is the life of the soldier when his country is threatened. It is a real man's life.

Well, young men of the Second Army, can you take it?

I'll answer for you, from my most profound conviction: You can; and if called upon on the battlefield, you will.

That's what I think.

Now I don't feel a bit sorry for the American soldier.

He is treated as no other soldier in the world is treated. He eats the best and most nourishing food. He wears the best clothes. He is given the best medical attention. And while his pay is small by some standards, it is the biggest pay received by any soldier under the sun. And the hospitality of America toward the soldier is unrivaled anywhere.

I am not sorry for you, either, because you are giving your time for the period of the emergency to your country—even this additional time about which there has been so much talk. I know that most of you have left jobs. I know most of you would be home earning high wages if you were not in the Army. I know you would like to be back in the affectionate atmosphere of your family, in the company of your wives and sweethearts. A soldier always thinks of home. That is perfectly natural. It was natural in 1776, in 1861, in 1917.

I know from long experience how a soldier will growl and grumble and enjoy having an audience to hear his hard-luck stories. I've done it myself, and I've listened to it for more than 40 years. It is an American trait, and as old as the Army. But it is too bad that so many civilians don't understand it. It is too bad, too, that there are those who are trying to provoke this grumbling. There are forces at work constantly, day and night, that are trying to destroy the fitness and preparation of the American Army. That is one way the dictator nations have made war—to undermine the spirit and confidence of those they would strike. They did it to France. You saw it.

We know there are agents of enemy forces and enemy powers within our country, trying to spread dissatisfaction and suspicion, trying to bewilder us, trying to fill us full of confusion.

That also is an old game of those that fear us. They have done it in other countries. In the armies of other countries they have succeeded. Great armies have been destroyed and the will of peoples has been shattered by this war from within to kill the spirits of men.

Watch out for these activities. You may suspect some of those persons who cry on your shoulders and ask you to cry on theirs. Your best friends are men who expect the most of you—that demand of you your utmost efforts.

There are a great number of people that think of their Government only as an institution that will give them a hand-out. The soldier can entertain no such thought. It is he that must give to his country—his time, his labor, his endurance, and perhaps even his life. His reward? To have served his country. There is no other reward.

The soldiers that established this Nation and won freedom for all of us knew but few victories but experienced much of defeat, disaster, destitution, hunger, and rags. They were 8 long years doing the work that created for you this Republic that you, in your turn, may be called upon to defend. You have inherited this land and its blessings because of the blood and sacrifice of men of preceding generations. Because it is your turn now, because your generation may have to carry its load and be called to make its sacrifices, would you fail? I think not. I know you would not fail.

By act of Congress, on the recommendation of the President of the United States and the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, your term of service has been extended. It was a grave and thoughtful decision of the leaders of the Nation, that your services are needed for a longer period, that you are named to give that much more to your country. You are not 1-year patriots. Nor can we afford in this crisis to have a 1-year Army. If we were at war, you would not hesitate, no matter how much you longed for home. If you held back then, the days of this Republic as a proud and free nation would be numbered.

I agree with my superiors that we are in a period of grave national emergency. That emergency has been declared by our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. Its seriousness has been pointed out by the Secretary of War and by the Chief of Staff of the United States Army. The Congress has acted to prevent the disintegration of this new American Army, of which you are a part.

Those are our leaders and we are soldiers. It is our place and solemn duty to make good; it is our obligation to stand in unbreakable unity behind our leaders; it is our place to trust and believe in them. They will be judged, not by one generation but by posterity, and so will we be judged—by the America we make safe for our children and children's children. Whatever happens to us, we must make sure that our country goes on—greater and more secure in the liberties and pride of our people.

I am concerned about everything affecting your welfare and your fitness; I am concerned about all influences that are brought to bear upon you; I am responsible to my superiors for the Second Army, and, in turn, every one of you is responsible to his superiors in rank.

I have held a high ideal for the soldiers of the Second Army. I hold that each and every one of you should improve in character, courage, and ability as a result of his Army service, and return to his home a better citizen. I am interested in your moral behavior, your mental improvement, your physical hardening, and the progress of your instruction.

But no matter what I order or your officers instruct, you soldiers, as individuals, can and should do much for yourselves. You can help yourselves make progress as soldiers and as men; you can train your powers of observation and your understanding of character and human nature; you can hold, individually, the highest standards of personal conduct before yourselves; you can make that pride of country, of uniform, of the unit to which you belong, a vital, living thing in your lives; and you can always learn. All of us have much to learn. That is what I expect of you—never less, always the most.

And now we have our work to do. We move into another phase of our combat exercises in order to improve our skill.

You have done well. Perhaps you have done better than you think.

Those of you who were in the Tennessee maneuvers conducted yourselves with credit and learned, I am sure, a great deal. Every day seek to learn more, until you have a passion for perfecting yourself as a soldier.

I want all of you to know what every movement, exercise, and tactical disposition means. I want the chain of command to work from the top down to every squad. I want the soldier to ask questions and seek the answer. We have an army of highly intelligent men. I want that intelligence put to use.

And now—if anyone is to ask you what your objective is—what our objective is—tell him this: An army fit to fight—an army fit to meet veterans in the field and take the field away from them, and suffer the least losses.

That's our objective; and individually and collectively let everyone put out his greatest effort to attain it.

And now, soldiers of the Second Army, I call on you for an all-out effort, day by day and month by month, to make this Army fulfill that objective—to make the men and commands of the Second Army fit to fight. And I wish you good luck.

Post-Office Cancelations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

ARTICLE BY LEO F. RAHILL

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in

the Appendix of the RECORD an article headed "Post-Office Cancelations," written by Mr. Leo F. Rahill and published in the Dispatch, Camp Roberts, Calif., of August 15, 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Dispatch, Camp Roberts, Calif., of August 15, 1941]

POST-OFFICE CANCELATIONS

(By Leo F. Rahill, post-office clerk)

The biggest problem confronting the post office is the attempted delivery of improperly addressed mail. The primary aim of your post office is to deliver all classes of mail matter into your hands. However, there seems to be some misunderstanding regarding the validity of the above statement.

This mail problem is one which has been annoying to your parents and friends, as well as your respective Senator, Congressman, company commander, and the mail orderlies. Yet, all have tried desperately to cooperate in your behalf. The question, "Who is at fault?" naturally arises to challenge the Army and the post office.

The answer, "Neither the Army nor the post office is definitely at fault and, therefore, cannot accept direct responsibility," is an answer which may stir up a controversy but we feel that the interested parties who will study the problem will give us a vote of confidence. Basically, the problem seems to be "just one of those things," which happen in spite of all precautions. However, we offer the following as a means by which we may be able to lessen the number of complaints.

Each one of you is acquainted with a boy at home who may be drafted. Write this boy, your friends, and your relations, and advise them against writing to a draftee while he is in transit. Advise them further to wait until you write your definite Army address, viz, Pvt. John Doe, Company A, Eighty-second Infantry, Camp Roberts, Calif. This is your correct address—not John Doe, Camp Roberts, Calif.

The primary mistake is made where one's friends and relatives try to pile up mail for a soldier in advance of his arrival in camp. This is the outstanding cause of undeliverable mail. When such mail arrives it is run through the locator system by the Army. If the man's name is not found, the mail is filed for a period of 10 days; then search is again made in an attempt to deliver the mail. If the man's name is not found, the mail is then returned to the sender with a statement as to why it was not delivered.

Hence the best advice we can offer is: Tell your friends at home to spread the word, "Do not write Joe until you get his company address and the correct camp name."

Thank you.

Hitler and Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE WASHINGTON POST AND THE ATLANTIC CITY PRESS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of yesterday morning there is a very interesting and pleasing editorial written under the subject, Where McFarland Is. The editorial that precedes it, under the heading "Next moves," also deals with the same subject matter—Hitler and propaganda. I also have before me an editorial on the same subject, taken from my home-town newspaper, the Atlantic City Press, under the heading "Of wasting time."

I ask unanimous consent to have all three editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of September 10, 1941]

WHERE M'FARLAND IS—

When Senator WHEELER, as chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, appointed a five-man subcommittee to hold hearings on a resolution calling for an investigation of war propaganda in films, he was careful not to lay himself open to the charge of making the subcommittee 100-percent isolationist. To be sure, four of the members, Senators CLARK, BONE, TOBEY, and BROOKS, voted against the Lend-Lease Act and for reduction of draftees' service. But the fifth, Senator MCFARLAND, who is serving his first term, was on the other side of the fence on both those issues. Presumably his weight was expected to have little influence on the direction or conduct of the hearings.

If this was the assumption on the part of the isolationists, it was a serious tactical error. For, as the hearings began yesterday, Senator MCFARLAND was in there pitching for all he was worth—much to the discomfort of Senator NYE. Hardly had Senator NYE begun his attack on "four or five" moving picture executives than Senator MCFARLAND interrupted: "I should like to ask Senator NYE what he expects to accomplish through this resolution."

To this, of course, there was no clearcut answer. Again and again the gentleman from Arizona cut short Senator NYE's statement of "the case against the movie industry" with pointed and extremely embarrassing questions. Did Senator NYE want legislation against propaganda? Did he want legislation to control propaganda? Did he contend that pictures showing conditions abroad are untrue? Throughout his own little inquisition Senator MCFARLAND made it quite clear that he was after facts and straight answers, but for the most part he got neither.

In short, it was—and will doubtless remain—an unequal battle. When Senator MCFARLAND asked that Mr. Willkie, the counsel for the movie industry, be permitted to ask questions, he was suavely complimented by Chairman CLARK—and overruled. As the proceedings continue, the isolationists may be depended on to trot out formidable charges of warmongering which Mr. Willkie will have to deal with as best he can. It will be a good bet that if the hearings go on in the present vein, it looks as if the isolationists responsible for the resolution will wish they had never thought of it.

[From the Washington Post of September 10, 1941]

NEXT MOVES

That Hitler must soon seek a diversion from the campaign in Russia seems to be the opinion of many military experts. The season is so far advanced that even those who are convinced that the conquest of Russia is inevitable have postponed the final clean-up till spring. Thus the Nazi time schedule will be thrown completely awry. It was doubtless the aim, as Winston Churchill said in the House of Commons yesterday, to finish off Russia in quick order and then to turn on Britain and the United States. The vigor of the British air offensive and the knowledge that our arsenal is constantly growing may now compel Hitler to leave his Russian job half finished while he devotes some of his attention to new adventures.

Premier Churchill forecasts an effort to halt United States supplies to Britain. He spoke on the heels of the sinking of the American freighter, the *Steel Seafarer*, in the Red Sea, and the speech itself was succeeded by the report of the sinking in the North Atlantic of a freighter operated by an American company under Panama registry. Certainly the news seems to bear out the British Premier's forecast. For over 3 weeks now the losses on the Atlantic are said to have been infinitesimal. This is due less to the combined patrol work of the British and American Navies than to Hitler's concentration on the job in Russia and Hitler's fear of inciting America into sterner anti-Hitler measures. But the sands are running out of the hourglass. And the spectacle may at any time persuade the Nazi leaders to make the same desperate gamble that was made in 1916 in the hope that they can win the war before the industrial and military might of America sends all their chances of victory glimmering.

Thus the United States may be called upon to succeed Soviet Russia in bearing the brunt of the Hitler assault. It would be altogether a different test. Russia had to meet Hitler on its own territory; we must deal with Hitler on the sea lanes of the broad Atlantic. The issue is transcendentally important to our destinies. If Hitler should succeed in sweeping the Anglo-American commerce off the high seas, he would be the titan of the modern world. Britain would be strangled into submission. And with her shipping and shipbuilding facilities at his disposal Hitler could then dictate the submission of half our continent and reduce our own great Nation to industrial and military subordination.

That Hitler in a position astride two continents and the mighty Atlantic would allow the United States any equality in the world is absurd on its face. He himself has said that there is no room for our sort of world in his cosmogony. He did not mean Britain or the British Empire. He referred to the "capitalistic-liberal" system, or our American way of life. To this system he would oppose a world tyranny managed by his Nazi lieutenants, and "one of the two must succumb." In the face of this bold assumption Senator NYE, in his statement before the movie inquiry, says that those who want to see the downfall of this cosmic menace must have a financial stake in the downfall. He is right. The entire United States, let alone the movie producers, have a vested interest in the obliteration of Hitlerism. If Hitler wins, we shall all be the poorer, but we shall be the poorer in political independence as well as in material power.

On Thursday the President will make a companion talk to Premier Churchill's on the newest developments in the world conflict. He would be untrue to his record if he did not meet the latest challenge on the high seas with vigor and forthrightness. Our Navy owes its origin to our insistence on freedom of the seas. Now we must give our Navy, which is at its magnificent best in both equipment and morale, the fullest opportunity to insure our freedom against the marauder who has never disguised his ambition to establish himself at the head of the historical list of would-be world conquerors. The job is safe in its hands. Hitler will live to regret his contempt for the United States as "degenerate Yankeedom" only if we meet force with force and beat him to all the approaches to our great ocean which, till he interrupted, was our insurance of independence.

[From the Atlantic City Press]

OF WASTING TIME

Senatorial inquiry into the motion picture industry looks like utter nonsense. Might as well have an investigation to discover if newspapers or radio or magazines are in a conspiracy for or against the Administration's foreign policy. Common sense dictates that motion picture men, like newspapermen and others, run their business to satisfy the customer for a profit. This cannot be done by satisfying somebody else—some propagandist or other special leader. The movie business could not have reached the prosperous heights it enjoys if it had been so dumb as to ignore popular intelligence and regard for fair dealing and honesty. Occasionally one studio or one producer may go astray, just as one newspaper or one magazine may fall for the propagandist's allurements. But you don't find it as a group or an industry or calling. Business isn't so clubby as to conspire to ruin itself. However, the inquiry in Washington will serve one purpose: it will keep burning slightly fading limelight on a handful of isolationists and return the spotlight to Wendell Willkie. Both seemed in need of this treatment if they were not to fade out of the political picture altogether and very soon.

Importation of Cuban Tomatoes and Other Vegetables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. ANDREWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

LETTER FROM S. J. SLIGH, OF ORLANDO, FLA.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from S. J. Sligh, of Orlando, Fla., giving a very precise analysis of the interest which the tomato growers in Florida have in the hearing held this week on the reciprocal trade agreement with Cuba. The letter deals with the importation of Cuban tomatoes and other vegetables. It is a very serious matter. We know that tomatoes form a part of our daily diet. I ask that Mr. Sligh's letter, together with the accompanying table, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. J. SLIGH & CO.,
Orlando, Fla., September 9, 1941.

Hon. C. O. ANDREWS,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDREWS: It is my understanding a determined effort will be made by importers of Cuban tomatoes and other vegetables, with the assistance of the Cuban Government, to extend the period during which these products can come into this country under the lower rate of duty, and also to try to get the Tariff Commission to lower existing tariffs. Believe a formal hearing was held in Washington yesterday to consider the tariff on lima beans and possibly on tomatoes. The concession period on tomatoes now is from December 1 through February when Cuba pays a duty of 1.8 cents per pound, and during the remainder of the year the duty is 2.4 cents. It is being requested that the concession period start in November and continue through April, and it was also requested that the duty be reduced to 1.2 cents per pound all year, or less if possible. One of the arguments to be used will be the need in this country during the months mentioned when very few vegetables are produced in this country. You well know this argument has no foundation, for it is during these months Florida produces her vegetable crops. We will admit during the past 2 years, due to weather conditions Florida production was light, particularly February and March 1940, due to the freeze, and March and April 1941 due to the excessive rains. For your information, we are attaching memo showing the number of cars of tomatoes shipped each month from the various producing sections during the years 1937 through 1941, and from this you will readily see if conditions are normal Florida can produce and needs the present tariff protection. No doubt if the tariff is reduced on Cuban tomatoes, it would also be reduced on Mexican produce, and you will note from the attached memo just what that would mean to Florida.

No one knows better than you what the produce business means to our State, under what handicaps the grower of this State has worked, the cost of raising produce here compared to Cuba and Mexico, and I am confident you will use your efforts to protect our interests.

I know these are trying days, and sometimes action must be taken which works a hardship on some of the people but is beneficial to the country as a whole, and I would be glad to hear from you fully as soon as you can give this matter your attention.

With kindest personal regards.

Yours very truly,

S. J. SLIGH.

Carloads of tomatoes shipped to markets of United States

	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941
JANUARY					
From—					
Florida	548	175	764	334	962
Cuba	468	508	637	334	317
Mexico	242	309	151	185	571
Texas	----	----	----	95	----
FEBRUARY					
From—					
Florida	1,124	1,076	1,273	30	658
Cuba	417	631	424	610	397
Mexico	135	305	83	270	561
MARCH					
From—					
Florida	1,349	3,599	2,208	1	308
Cuba	397	251	212	594	449
Mexico	476	358	247	465	1,031
Texas	----	----	----	----	----
APRIL					
From—					
Florida	1,302	4,471	2,557	595	373
Cuba	30	22	29	274	218
Mexico	1,521	578	525	376	1,500
Texas	72	----	131	----	----
California [1]	----	----	----	83	140

[1] 1940 California started shipping spring tomatoes large terminals which sold well due to general good markets account supplies light. Note increase 1941, and it is our understanding California will continue spring tomato deal.

NOTE.—Florida shipments 1938 and 1939 which clearly shows Florida can produce adequate supplies.

Former Senator Burke, of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

ARTICLE FROM OMAHA WORLD-HERALD

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Omaha World-Herald of September 4, relating to a former colleague of ours in the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Morning World-Herald of September 4, 1941]

BURKE SENATE RACE UNLIKELY—WON'T RUN UNLESS THE "OFFICE SEEKS ME"

(By Marr McGaffin)

This may or may not be comforting news to Nebraska Republicans who have been doing considerable jockeying around lately for positions at the gate in next year's senatorial election.

First, Former Senator Edward R. Burke is not pulling any strings, building any fences, or laying any plans to become a candidate for the Republican nomination.

Secondly, he frankly admits that if he should ever again hold public office, a seat in the United States Senate is the only one that would really entice him into abandoning the practice of law.

Months ago, when Burke carried through on his statement that if President Roosevelt were nominated for a third term he would quit the Democratic Party and become a Republican, it was more or less taken for granted that he would seek the Republican nomination in 1942.

DIDN'T JIBE

Then, instead of hiking right back to Nebraska, resuming his law practice there, and taking advantage of every opportunity to get such a campaign under way, Burke set up a branch office here in Washington and settled down to practicing law. That didn't jibe with the assumption that he had switched parties for the sole purpose of seeking reelection to the Senate.

He's noted for being probably the poorest politician who ever went out after votes in Nebraska, but even the rankest of amateurs would hardly pass up 8 months of casual handshaking and speech making if he had any serious intentions of facing the voters at an approaching election.

That's why I put the question up to him point-blank today.

"What about it? Are you through with politics? Have you given any thought to being a candidate for the Senate in 1942?"

ANSWER IS FRANK

The answer was frank and straight to the point.

"Of ourse," Burke replied. "It would be ridiculous to say I have no desire to return to the Senate.

"My experience in the Senate was intensely interesting. I feel I am well qualified by reason of that experience to represent the people of Nebraska. But I have no intention whatever of asking the voters to send me

back to the Senate simply because I might personally welcome having that opportunity again."

Burke said he recognizes that as a "newcomer" he has no claim to the support of Republicans who have been lifelong party members and have carried water for the party organization for years.

BACKS TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

"I believe in the two-party system of government. I believe those parties must be strong and made up of men and women who are sincere in their beliefs, rather than opportunists who may be seeking public office to satisfy their own personal desires," he said.

"If I had not believed that, I would not have severed my affiliation with the Democratic Party and registered as a member of the Republican Party."

In very blunt language, Burke's attitude toward next year's senatorial race might be interpreted like this:

If by any turn of fate he should get an encouraging nod from Republican leaders, or an overwhelming majority of the rank and file voters, he wouldn't turn a cold, unappreciative shoulder.

On the other hand, he's not butting into party affairs and has no intention of seeking the Republican nomination. Neither has he any thought of back tracking and renewing his former Democratic Party ties.

As things stand today, I'd say the odds are pretty much onesided that Burke's name will not be on the 1942 ballot

Resolutions of Representatives of Iowa A. A. A. Farmers, Committeemen, and Corn Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

LETTER TO HON. CLAUDE R. WICKARD, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, AND HON. HENRY A. WALLACE, VICE PRESIDENT, AND CHAIRMAN, ECONOMIC DEFENSE BOARD

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a set of resolutions adopted by representatives of farm interests in my State, and embodied in a letter addressed by them to Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, and Hon. Henry A. Wallace, Vice President, and Chairman, Economic Defense Board.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the A. A. A. farmers, committeemen, and corn growers of Iowa, are seriously disturbed by the attacks on our ever-normal granary by economists and officials high in the administration of the farm program.

After studying the questions involved in the proposal to establish corn-loan rates based on location differentials and learning of the various arguments and questionable conclusions presented to justify them, we are reminded of the statement of Thomas Edison, "There is no expedient that man will not resort to in order to avoid the real labor of thinking."

We are fearful that it will destroy the soundness of our ever-normal granary, destroy the morale of the farmers, build area class consciousness, and undermine the unity and solidarity of agricultural thinking.

Farmers generally are not favorable to an inflated parity and seriously object to loan rates for agricultural commodities based on unsound, inflated prices. We are desirous of stability of price levels over a long period; for only through such stability can we hope to permanently rehabilitate the rank and file of agriculturalists.

We object to any differential in the 1941 or any future corn-loan rate for the commercial corn area as being unsound, discriminatory, and calculated to favor and encourage marginal corn production areas to the disadvantage of the surplus producing areas.

Inasmuch as Congress has provided that our loan be 85 percent of parity, we insist that this rate be uniform throughout the commercial corn area.

We, therefore, present our plea, based on the following premises, to Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Honorable Henry A. Wallace, Vice President of these United States of America, through whose untiring effort and vision the foundation for an effective ever-normal granary was established.

1. Has livestock production shifted to the east part of the commercial corn area and decreased in the west part because of the uniform corn loan rate during this needed accumulation?

It is so contended by economists from some Midwest land-grant colleges. In order to establish evidence that such changes were being effected they used 1927, 1928, and 1929 in comparison with 1937, 1938, and 1939. This was a premeditated comparison; using three high hog-production years against 3 years, one of which followed the drought of 1936. Yet, 1939 taken alone was the second highest Iowa hog production year of record.

Here are the facts on hog production according to Agricultural Marketing Service figures. Instead of hog production in the western Corn Belt decreasing and shifting eastward, we find that practically the reverse is true. During the period when greatest stocks of corn accumulated, for example, from January 1, 1937, to January 1, 1940, the eastern Corn Belt increased hog production 32 percent. The western Corn Belt increased 52 percent, the United States average increase was 36 percent, Ohio increased only 25 percent, Iowa increased 47 percent, and South Dakota increased 100 percent.

Taken home to a typical Corn Belt county in Iowa, Pocahontas, with a 10-year (1927–36) average hog production of 56,000 head, produced 68,000 head in 1937, 77,000 head in 1938, and 78,000 head in 1939. This same ratio holds throughout the cash corn counties in the north half of Iowa. Even Story County, seat of Iowa State College at Ames, home of learned economists, increased from 62,000 hogs in 1935 to 85,000 head for 1939, an increase of 37 percent.

2. Is the flat corn loan rate more attractive to corn growers in the west half of the commercial corn area than in the east half?

We find that the widest spread between market price and loan rate was in Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas, but these States do not have excessive supplies of corn. The large supplies of corn are located in Iowa, Illinois, and Minnesota, and according to A. M. S figures the average farm price of corn during 1938 and 1939 was higher than in the three eastern Corn Belt States, and the situation was changed only by the drought in these States during 1940.

It should be quite clear that the accumulation of large reserves of corn is due to continuous high yields for 4 years and not due to the flat corn loan rate. If we are to change the loan rate because of current droughts or crop failure every year to fit crop yields, we will always be in a mess.

It is well to remember that the west half of the commercial corn area is a high-risk area which needs large reserves in the ever-normal granary to make safe and practical maintenance of livestock production.

One other point that should be made in answering the criticism of piling up corn in the western Corn Belt is that this is partially due t- the fact that farmers in the five Western States accepted the resealing program and complied with the request of the Government to hold their corn on the farms. In the summer of 1939, when high corn supplies threatened to ruin both corn prices and livestock prices, you, Claude, as director of the north central region, came to the heart of the Corn Belt at Fort Dodge, Iowa, and issued your "challenge to the Corn Belt." You urged farmers to reseal their corn in order to keep it off the market, and thereby avoid low corn prices and lower hog prices the following year.

The five Western States responded by resealing from 70 to 80 percent of their corn. The eastern Corn Belt did not accept the resealing program, although they had the same opportunity.

These five eastern States resealed less than one-third of their corn. We have, therefore, some reason to believe that eastern Corn Belt farmers would have done the same thing with the 1940 resealing program if it had not been for a short crop for 1940.

We insist that an ever-normal granary committee be appointed of representative farmers in the affected corn area to make further study and discuss in the field the future corn loans, as was recommended by the National A. A. A. Conference.

We are now prepared and anxious to respond to your call for increased livestock production for defense and future peace. This increased production is under way, with the prospect of an all-time high production of hogs in Iowa and cattle on feed in Iowa at the present time being 135 percent of 1940.

These resolutions being adopted by 600 representatives from 64 counties in Iowa of farmers, businessmen, and others interested in the welfare of agriculture assembled at Storm Lake, Iowa, this 5th day of September 1941, are respectfully submitted for your serious consideration.

Townsend Pension Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

ARTICLE BY GEORGE MURRAY

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Federation News of July 5, 1941, written by George Murray, relating to certain views held by Thomas Paine on pensions. Mr. Murray is an authority on Thomas Paine and has developed some very interesting data relating to the subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Federation News of July 5, 1941]

TOWNSEND PENSION PLAN—ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE TRUTH OF THE ANCIENT PROVERB, "THERE IS NOTHING NEW UNDER THE SUN"

(By George Murray)

Basic principles of the Townsend plan had been advocated by an early patriot and American thinker more than a century and a half before Dr. Francis E. Townsend's program caught the Nation's eye in 1933, it was discovered in Washington, D. C., through perusal of rare pamphlets at the Congressional Library.

Thomas Paine, literary father and spark plug of the American War for Independence, who served as secretary for foreign Affairs to the Congress of the United States during that war, proposed the Townsend plan in a pamphlet entitled "Agrarian Justice as Opposed to Agrarian Law and to Agrarian Monopoly."

In this pamphlet he proposed:

"A plan for ameliorating the condition of man by creating in every nation a national fund to pay to every person, when arrived at the age of 21 years, the sum of 15 pounds sterling (about $75) to enable him or her to begin the world; and also 10 pounds sterling per annum during life to every person now living of the age of 50 years, and to all others when they shall arrive at that age, to enable them to live in old age without wretchedness, and go decently out of the world."

TAX FOR FUNDS

Paine proposed to raise funds for such a pension through an inheritance tax of 10 percent. It was his contention that in the course of 30 years—1 generation—the bulk of the real and personal property of the entire Nation would have become subject to the tax. In discussing eligibility for such a pension, he wrote:

"It is a right, and not a charity, that I am pleading for. It is proposed that the payments, as already stated, be made to every person, rich or poor. Such persons as do not choose to receive it can throw it into the common fund."

Paine estimated that at the time his pamphlet was written, in 1795, only one-eighteenth of America's population was past the age of 50. Experts today estimate that 10 percent of the Nation's population is past 60 and eligible for pensions under the Townsend bill. Paine set forth the reasons for his proposal:

"The contrast of affluence and wretchedness continually meeting the eye is like dead and living bodies chained together. Though I care as little about riches as any man, I am a friend to riches because they are capable of good. I care not how affluent some may be, provided that none is miserable in consequence of it."

MULTIPLY RESOURCES

Prosperity through spending had been envisioned by this great thinker even in a day when most of his contemporaries were thinking in terms of scarcity, Paine reveals in declaring his program "would multiply also the national resources; for property, like vegetation, increases by off-sets."

In justification of his proposed tax, Paine wrote that all land, in the beginning, had been common property but that, in enhancing its value through cultivation, certain industrious men had acquired what society recognized as a claim upon it. But that such landowners were indebted to society, Paine insisted in a passage:

"Property is the effect of society; and it is as impossible for an individual to acquire personal property without the aid of society as it is for him to make land originally. Separate an individual from society and give him an island or a continent to possess, and he cannot acquire personal property. He cannot become rich.

"All accumulation of personal property, beyond what a man's own hands produce, is derived to him by living in society."

This unusual treatise, written so long ago, was uncovered during research for a drama on Tom Paine, the American patriot who authored Common Sense, The Rights of Man, and The American Crisis, pamphlets which Gen. George Washington credited, in great part, with aiding in the birth of America.

What Farm Power Means to Food and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LLOYD SPENCER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON PAUL V. McNUTT

Mr. SPENCER. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator, before a banquet meeting of the Rural Electrification Administration and Food for Defense Conference, at the Washington Hotel, Washington, D C., September 5, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Half a dozen years ago, while I was Governor of Indiana, the Rural Electrification Administration got under way.

We had in Indiana at that time some rural electrification. Eleven percent of our farms were electrified—one farm in nine.

Indiana's electrified farms were for the most part near cities. Or they were in concentrated prosperous farming areas. Or they were farms that happened to be along some main transmission lines which led to such urban or concentrated areas.

But the great majority of Indiana's farmers still depended upon the windmill or the chugging gasoline pump for their water supply. They still read by the flicker of the coal-oil lamp. Wheezing engines cut their ensilage. A few farmers had installed home generator systems, but this was no substitute for the heavy-duty possibilities of 110-volt main-line current.

The tractor, the truck, and the harvester had brought some mechanization to the job of the farmer in the field. But in the kitchen and in the barns the farm job had not changed much. Electricity had not made its contribution to the farmer's home.

So your program appealed to the farmers of Indiana. They felt themselves able to take advantage of the opportunity which the Rural Electrification Administration was extending to them.

They were better able to take advantage of this opportunity than they might have been in other times—better able than the farmers of many States. Through the Indiana Farm Bureau, the Grange, the Farmers' Union, and other organizations they had joined to market their products. They were purchasing their fertilizer, gasoline, and oil cooperatively, by specifications. In league with other farm organizations, even tractors were among the products which farmers, through cooperation, were selling to themselves on their own terms.

Yes; Indiana farmers were organized. Large-scale management was not unknown to them. Indiana farmers knew how.

So, Mr. Slattery, when your program came along they were ready for it. There was nothing esoteric about a pole or insulator. Transformers were certainly less awe-inspiring than tractors and gasoline engines. If farmers could market their products to the very doorstep of the consumer, certainly they could run a power-distribution system.

So the farmers of Indiana reasoned half a dozen years ago.

Today they have worked with you for 5 years. Many cooperatives have been established. I can give you the result of their mature judgment: There probably won't be any more rural electrification cooperatives in the State of Indiana.

Why? Well, I will have to tell you. But I wish some of our good down-to-earth farmers from around Reelsville, Ind., were here to tell you. The Tri-County Electric Cooperative Association is having its first pole setting this month. Its Clay, Putnam, and Owen County territory, Mr. Slattery tells me, probably preempts the last area in the State of Indiana which affords the possibility for cooperative power development.

That's why there won't be any more rural electrification cooperatives in the State of Indiana. All the hitherto unserved areas have enlisted 100 percent under the banner of rural electrification or have been served through the extension of private lines.

That does not mean, I am sorry to say, that all our farmers now have electricity. Lines are still in the process of building. Some cooperatives, like the Tri-County Co-op, are just beginning to set their poles. The job is not finished. But with the Rural Electrification principle of "area service" established, with cooperative claims laid out all over Indiana, the job will be finished. Save perhaps for a few isolated farms in the hill regions and forest areas, Indiana will attain some day the better than 90-percent farm electrification already reached by one or two of our States.

You, Mr. Slattery, who have devoted your life and distinguished public service to the conservation and wise use of America's natural resources, must find in this record a great satisfaction.

And the farmers who have taken part in the development of this program must feel similar satisfaction. They take their place with the pioneers of America's industrial and commercial development.

Nearly 50 percent of Indiana's farms are electrified today. More farms have been electrified in the past 5 years than in all the 40 years' previous history of the electric industry. Over 30 percent of all America's farms are electrified today, as contrasted to 10.9 percent at the end of 1934. That is achievement.

It is, moreover, being done on a sound financial basis. It has been done within half a dozen years after the leading old-line spokesmen of the industry declared that it could not be done. It was impossible.

So American farmers and farm organizations take their place with the Wright brothers who did not know that heavier-than-air transportation was impossible. You take your place with the Henry Ford of 1910 who did not believe that automobiles must remain forever outside the reach of the ordinary man. You take your place with the pioneers on every front of geography, industry, and agriculture who have been willing to doubt authority and try their hand at doing the impossible.

Your success stems indeed from an old American tradition. America itself is a triumph of the amateur. All the best au-

thorities of 1776 knew that democracy itself could not be done—that it was an impossible dream. American farmers helped crack that superstition, too.

In achieving this broad success you have applied the methods of agricultural cooperation to a new field. You have streamlined the construction of rural transmission lines. You have, in the words of Dave Lilienthal's immortal pun, "made two globes of glass glow where only one glew before." You have made contribution not merely to policy. You have made a contribution to the technical problems of rural power distribution. You have passed from journeyman to master.

This is no mean contribution. But you as irrepressible amateurs have made another contribution—a contribution made by every American workman. You have contributed to the strength and unity of the American Republic itself. An old constitutional principle has found a new application.

One hundred and fifty-four years ago that little band of patriots who met through the sweltering summer at Philadelphia wrote into the Constitution of the United States a provision for the establishment of post offices and post roads Theirs was no commercial concern. Theirs was a concern for the unity of the country.

There must be no part of that United States which stretched from the Bay of Passamaquoddy on the north to the St. Mary's River on the south, from the Atlantic to the Mississippi, which should not be served by communication, i. e., in 1787, the post system. The letter and the printed page were the instruments they knew.

This land had free speech, free press, free religion. It must also have clear and open channels for translating them into reality.

Post offices and postal service are not to be measured by the standard of profit. They were to be measured by the standard of national interest. And national interest demanded unity. National interest in a democracy demanded information—the exchange of opinion.

Those principles have grown with the growth of our American industrial technology. Freedom of the air. Local service for every State and community. Those principles govern radio. Not commercial standards, but public standards set the postal rates for newspapers and magazines.

You may have noted, too, that postal service—like the electric service of the R. E. A.—is an area service. It would be possible to create huge profits out of the postal system by cutting off distant rural communities. One nineteenth-century zealot indeed established a postal service—an express service between Boston and New York. He wanted to prove that he could handle mail cheaper than the Post Office Department. He did. Certainly he could between such towns. He recognized no obligation to serve the semiprofitable villages in between which were the bedrock of the American way.

I speak with feeling on this criterion of service—a criterion which was present in the fundamental American community of our fathers. It was unhappily lost in the days when unit cost accounting began to replace common sense in the administration of our human affairs.

It is an evil present in many fields. In my final message to the Legislature of Indiana in 1937, I said:

"In our zeal and anxiety to balance the budget we have come dangerously close to forgetting some of the human values and social responsibilities which lie behind the budget and for which, indeed, the budget exists. Unless the interests which have to do with the bodies, minds, and spirits of men, women, and children are safeguarded, economic recovery will prove a barren achievement. It is quite as important to prevent social deficits for the future as it is to prevent financial deficits for the present."

"Cream-separator distribution" is another expression of that same danger. Skimming the cream of a market, as some companies habitually have done, is not a unique evil of the power-distribution industry. In my address to the National Nutrition Conference, I said:

"I would not want any representative of industry to feel happy about the whole thing until the American system of distribution—with the skill and leadership that only the food distribution industries are now equipped to offer us—can work out a pattern of distribution that reaches everybody.

"Some industrial policies aim to skim off the cream of a market. Under such a policy, advertising is aimed at the 30 percent of the market that has the most money to spend. Costs and prices may be geared to that selected market. The result may be a residual market that can't be developed economically by anybody. 'Cream-separator distribution' that selects only adequate-income groups may pay money dividends. But it can be a bottleneck to national health."

In distributing electric power it is not only new areas that must be served. Present users must be better served. Increased normal consumption on the part of each householder is a vital element in any forward-looking power policy.

In the year 1939, the latest year for which figures are available, the average Ontario, Canada, farmer taking his power from a public system consumed 1,687 kilowatt-hours annually at an average cost of 2.5 cents per kilowatt-hour. In that same year consumption among farm customers of American companies averaged 1,127 kilowatt-hours annually and the cost averaged 4.4 cents. So for 43 percent less money per kilowatt-hour our Canadian farm neighbors used 50 percent more magic kilowatts.

There is no reason why the American household should not surpass the Ontario load. Means must be found and you are helping create those means.

The way is pragmatic. I come to you with no doctrinaire support of any type of development—public, private, or cooperative. There is no eternal a priori that demands this public function be chartered to private companies under regulation. There is no eternal a priori that dictates its retention under public management. The test must be the test of practical experience.

But let success be not measured by the height to which stock quotations can climb above actual investment. Let success be not measured by the height to which dividends can climb above a fair and reasonable return.

Let the test be a consumer test: That system which can soundly serve the most people in the broadest area, with the most kilowatts at the lowest cost is the most successful system of power distribution.

That, I believe, is essentially the test you apply in developing R. E. A. projects. In "area service," in load building, that is your objective.

Where do these things fit into nutrition? What relation do they have to the full fruition of America's freedom? What conceivable relation do they have to defense?

The answer is not difficult. Anything which helps make American farm life more vital contributes to the strength of America.

The American farmer is no believer in isolationism — personally speaking. Good roads have put him in touch with markets. Good cars have given his family new mobility. And with the lines of rural electrification come better roads, running water, well-lighted yards and barns and houses. Radios that put the news, drama, music of the whole world at his fingertips. New equipment that brings the level of life on the farm to the essential standards of city life.

In the past few years we have teamed up agriculture and health as never before. Through the food-stamp plan, through school lunches, through the development by the distribution industries of cheaper and better mass-distribution methods, headway is being made toward that goal.

Farmers have another problem. Farmers have first the problem of fitting their production to their own needs. Transportation and communication were blessings, but a society, like a man, is apt to become intoxicated by new possessions. We began to produce for distant markets. Farmers produced cotton or corn or hogs for folks that lived thousands of miles away, and bought string beans and peas and tomatoes that had been canned at the far corners of the continent.

So, one job is to give the modern farm that four-square self-sufficiency of the old-fashioned farm. And electricity can help. Electricity can make it possible for farmers singly or in groups to replace the tedious methods of conserving foods with methods that match the standard of the best commercial canneries. Joint action and planning can see to it that those methods conserve the food values which might otherwise be lost.

Farmers' organizations, with their long-time skill in education, can stimulate the production of protective foods. They can make a real contribution by helping to bring such foods within the reach of low-income families.

Farmers' organizations can help to carry on these programs in every farm community. Every farmer and his wife can participate. The reserves of home-grown, home-consumed foodstuffs will insure a better fed rural America. They will release distant workers and transportation facilities for the service of the defense program.

The Rural Electrification nutrition centers recently outlined by your Administrator, Harry Slattery, provide a constructive and workable plan for achieving these ends. You are familiar with that plan. Many of you no doubt contributed to its creation. In many of your communities there are probably already electric food-processing centers set up on that pattern.

Your cooperatives are today serving some 20,000 rural schools. The 3,000,000 people who live on Rural Electrification Administration financed power lines and the additional millions of coming customers will be the winners.

Don't think that because this isn't guns, tanks, and planes it isn't important.

Don't think that food is an unimportant part of the defense program. "An army," said Napoleon, "travels on its stomach." It does, indeed. But there is a vast difference in America's approach to food conservation in the last war than in its approach today.

Then the demand was not merely to save food through conservation. Eat less. Drop from the diet or reduce to a minimum your consumption of vital food. Twenty-five years ago there was an idea that everything should be saved for those at the front.

Today our battle cry is production. But it is also consumption. Better consumption. Consumption which will provide the best possible nutrition not only for the soldier at the front but for the man and woman at home.

We have learned that the vitality of a nation—yes, down to the last humble worker or the most solitary farm—is important to the Nation.

This is total defense. It is not merely those in the front lines who fight it. We all fight it. We all have to be tuned to defense.

For every man in the front line there are 30 behind the line directly serving him. Equipping him. Supplying him with food,

munitions, clothing, materials that will tune his mind and body; make him a reliable front-line man.

There was no error—no then known error—in the emphasis on the last war. Vitamins were unheard of in those days. So were other important elements of satisfactory diet. The knowledge of nutrition, like the knowledge of military science, has changed our approach.

We have learned just how many of our poor have had unbalanced diets. We have learned the consequences of the "hidden hungers" which arise from improperly balanced diets. We know that not only obvious physical health, but morale, mental stability, efficiency may depend upon good food.

Along those thin lines of wire that carry power to the farm is moving a whole agricultural revolution. It is as fundamental a revolution as that which electricity brought to the cities.

We talk here about canning, processing, conserving vital foods. But that is only one element in the decentralization electricity makes possible.

You have in your hands an instrument which will not only keep farmers on the farms; it may reverse the trend of industrial centralization and start the march of industry back to the villages. Yes, even to the farm itself.

Industry need no longer go to power. Power can come to industry. "Megalopolis"—as Lewis Mumford has dubbed our frenzied and congested cities — "Megalopolis" is doomed.

Hitler has pushed rural electrification and founded rural industries upon rural electrification. Little plants, widely scattered. Country population. These are not easy targets for bombs.

What many have recommended as a social measure Nazis adopted for its strategical importance.

Britain has its vast system of subcontracting "bits and pieces" of tanks and planes and other defense equipment. Thus, not just the great factories but the full productive resources of Britain serve its defense effort.

And along your lines in the next few years may grow the far-flung and invulnerable little industries of America. Along those lines we may in times of peace see again the modern counterpart of the little industry of the New England village.

In the days to come, in many a rural schoolhouse and community center you will take this first step in our effort—the conservation of the total food resources of America.

And on your wall, on the walls of those who must subcontract our defense production, on the walls of every factory in America might well go these words. Carlyle wrote them apropos of the desperate situation of the young French Republic—of a France that forgot them nearly a hundred and fifty years later:

"In this humour * * * then, since no other serves, will France rush against its enemies. Headlong, reckoning no cost or consequence; heeding no law or rule but that supreme law, salvation of the people! The weapons are, all the iron that is in France; the strength is, that of all the men, women, and children that are in France. There, in their 250 shedsmithies, in garden of Luxembourg or Tuileries, let them forge gun barrels, in sight of heaven and earth."

Above the clang of forges and the din of machinery—in small towns and at country crossroads, in garages, and in factories the size of cities—will be heard the singing and shouting of citizens—men, women, and children—given a chance to feel that they are part and parcel of a noble enterprise—the defense and the continuance of the American dream.

Racial Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

LETTER FROM REV. A. WENDELL ROSS

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated July 25, 1941, written by Rev. A. Wendell Ross, pastor of the Pleasant Hill Baptist Church, of Los Angeles, Calif.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLEASANT HILL BAPTIST CHURCH,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 25, 1941.

To the Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

YOUR HONORS: It is with humble approach that I take this God-given privilege to address you, who stand at the head of our great Nation as one of the lawmaking bodies to govern a great nation and to perpetuate its welfare and prosperity.

For 31 years I have been a leader of my race with but one desire—to direct my people to be true Christians and patriotic citizens. We know no land or country as our own but the United States of America, and we want no other. We love our land and Nation. We have been ready to answer every call, and on all battlefields on which we have had the opportunity to serve our bravery and loyalty is attested by blood.

But, now, Your Honors, I feel that you should know the true spirit of the American Negro. That spirit is that as a true patriotic and loyal citizen we feel that the time is now when the Negro should be given all constitutional, civil, legal, political, and economic rights that all other Americans enjoy and exercise.

I feel that the 750,000 Negro boys that have been drafted to the Army or to the call of the Nation have the right to say to their Government, "We are ready"; but not until the Nation has moved all national and State Jim Crow laws, all national and State segregation conditions, can we take up training for a defense of that which is not our own to enjoy and exercise.

Your Honors, I am calling upon you in the name of Almighty God to speak to the Congress of our Nation, to the States of our Nation, to the peoples of our great Nation, requesting that the disgraceful laws (Jim Crow laws), separate railroad cars, denial of civil rights, accommodations, public services, public schools, accommodations, and all segregation legislations be abolished now and forever.

God will bring national destruction on our Nation if this disgraceful, ungodly, undemocratic condition is not immediately corrected.

We are made the mockery of the world. It is invoking the curse of Almighty God upon the American people. Your Honors, if you will lead us in this timely demand and just procedure, liberty and freedom will be reborn to mankind here and everywhere. God Almighty will have an opportunity to champion our cause, and no power on earth can withstand God.

Your Honors, the Negroes of America are not defeatist, not subversive. He is not guilty of treason. He is not a slacker. He is loyal and patriotic and true to his country.

The Nation cannot endure much longer and retain its place of honor in the world as leaders of true democracy when 12,000,000 or more citizens are denied the privileges of America's program of full democracy.

As a representative of God Almighty I call your attention to this condition. Now is the time for action.

Prayerfully yours,
Rev. A. WENDELL ROSS.

The Petroleum Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. ANDREWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

STATEMENT BY RUSSELL E. SINGER

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I desire to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of Russell E. Singer, general manager of the American Automobile Association, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce investigating the petroleum situation. The statement was made last Monday.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On behalf of the American Automobile Association and its 750 affiliated motor clubs and branches throughout the country, I want to express to this committee our very great appreciation for the opportunity afforded us to appear before you today.

As you know, we favored this investigation. We did so because conditions involving gasoline had reached the point of almost hysteria among the 8,000,000 owners of passenger cars in the Atlantic Seaboard States. Conflicting statements were coming from a variety of sources. The average car owner was unable to know whether to take the threatened shortage seriously and plan to curtail the use of his vehicle or to ignore the situation and proceed with normal travel. Therefore, we believed that a congressional committee would be in a position to perform a great public service if it could clarify the facts regarding the threatened oil shortage and dispel the confusion that afflicted the public mind.

Already we feel that this committee has done much toward the fulfillment of these basic objectives. Already machinery has been set in motion and there has been an all-round quickening of the effort to relieve the threatened shortage through all available means.

We fully appreciate that yours is a fact-finding body. We recognize that you are desirous of bringing order out of what had become chaotic conditions. Naturally, as a consumer organization of private passenger-car owners, we are not in a position to throw any light on petroleum statistics or tank-car surpluses or movements. The viewpoints we present here today pertain wholly to some of the conditions which are of vital concern to the millions of motorists along the Atlantic

seaboard and to other millions planning to come into this area.

We would like to submit recommendations to the committee, with supporting evidence on the basis of available facts, as follows:

1. That this committee continue its functions with such interim reports as it may deem desirable, to assure a carrying-through of the steps already taken to relieve the oil shortage and also to guarantee to the public that all concerned meet their responsibility to the users of petroleum products.

2. That this committee find that the present night closing of gasoline filling stations is not in the public interest and is not justified as a means of gasoline conservation. It is already evident that none of the savings by retail outlets in the form of lower operating costs are being passed along to consumers.

3. That the committee recognize that the passenger automobile is no longer a vehicle of pleasure, as emphasized by Federal and private agencies concerned with the petroleum problem, but is an important utility of the home, office, and factory. Our whole defense effort would be seriously impaired if workers were denied the use of their automobiles for transportation.

4. That the committee use the full weight of its great influence to see that any threatened gasoline shortage is not used as a means of boosting prices. Figures already submitted to this committee by the Price Administrator and Director of Civilian Supply clearly show that2 profits of the petroleum industry by reason of the increased volume of business are more than enough to absorb any additional expense to date.

5. That the committee definitely recognize that automobile travel has become an integral part of our economic and social system and any serious disruption would have a far-reaching effect on the $5,000,000,000 travel industry, including resort and hotel interests.

Before going into detail on our recommendations, we believe that it is in order to review some of the conditions leading up to this investigation. We recognize that you have been given the viewpoints of those directly concerned with the control, transportation, and distribution of petroleum products. However, we believe that a brief summarization will be helpful to the committee.

Early in June the Petroleum Coordinator for National Defense warned the people in Eastern States that due to the diversion of tankers a shortage of petroleum products, particularly gasoline, was in the offing. The term "gasless Sundays" was widely thrown about as a warning. We promptly informed motorists that conservation of motor fuel through care of the automobile and better driving practices might avert drastic restrictions.

On June 7 our president, Thomas P. Henry, addressed a letter to the Petroleum Coordinator urging that gasoline conservation on a basis of voluntary cooperation be tried before any restrictions were imposed. The facilities of our organization and its affiliated motor clubs were offered in such a campaign. Mr. Ickes generously accepted this offer and expressed the hope that "we can work out this whole difficult problem by good, old-fashioned American cooperation, but we shall all have to help." We immediately began tests to show that proper mechanical adjustment of the car would mean motor-fuel savings of 15 percent with additional savings in gasoline by better driving. Many of our clubs, particularly those in populous States, joined wholeheartedly in this campaign and undertook to arouse public support.

On July 31 the Petroleum Coordinator, on the basis of a resolution adopted by the industry's marketing committee, recommended the closing of all retail outlets in 12 Atlantic Coast States and the District of Columbia and in parts of 5 other States from 7 o'clock at night until 7 o'clock in the morning, 7 days weekly, and effective Sunday, August 3. It was generally recognized that this was done for the psychological effect in bringing home to motorists that the threatened shortage was real. It resulted in a daytime rush to keep gasoline tanks full, and consumption moved upward.

On August 15, at the instance of the Petroleum Coordinator, the then Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply issued an order calling for a curtailment of 10 percent in the delivery of motor fuel by suppliers to resellers. In effect, this was a rationing of gasoline to retail outlets. The burden of satisfying consumers was placed on the shoulders of filling-station operators. Confusion was rampant.

Then, on August 20, the Acting Petroleum Coordinator issued a press statement to the effect that in the previous week there had been a drop in stocks of gasoline on the east coast of 893,000 barrels. This release further stated that 20,476,000 barrels of gasoline were in storage, but of this amount, roughly 14,000,000 barrels were unavailable for use because of being at the bottom of tanks full of sledge, in technical process in refineries, and so forth. We are advised that this was the first time any such breakdown in figures pertaining to gasoline stocks had been used. The public was told that it meant that only 6,476,000 barrels of gasoline were actually available for use, equivalent to a 10-day supply. This "10-day" statement was left hanging without qualifying explanation that there was day-to-day replenishment of stocks. Headlines in newspapers screamed of a gasoline famine within 10 days. An already confused public became more confused. The railroads were claiming that an ample number of tank cars were available and the Petroleum Coordinator's office was claiming they could not be found.

Unable to advise motorists as regards the true situation, the American Automobile Association on August 24 asked Congress to investigate the gasoline situation and if Federal control of supplies is necessary to set up the machinery for an orderly handling and apportionment of available motor fuel with due regard for the rights of all users. And, as I have already said, this investigation has to date had a wholesome influence on the whole situation.

Now, as regards our recommendations: The easing of the public mind and the actual steps taken to relieve the threatened gasoline shortage, notably the agreement between railroad and petroleum interests to utilize available tank cars, is evidence enough that this committee is achieving results. On the basis of the facts already developed, you are undoubtedly prepared to make preliminary recommendations to Congress. But, from all indications, the threat of a petroleum shortage still exists. Experts have testified that it will continue to exist so long as the international situation remains acute. They have advised that even weather conditions will have an influence on available petroleum. In other words, if we have a severe winter, the requirements for household fuel will tax the transportation facilities for petroleum products. This would, of course, mean less transportation facilities for gasoline.

As a result, we very strongly believe that your committee should enlist for the "duration." The mere fact that you would be ready to continue hearings at a moment's notice would have a heartening effect on users of petroleum products. It would undoubtedly provide a guaranty that railroads and petroleum interests would "make good" on the things they say they can do to relieve the present situation. It is our earnest hope that the committee will find that the public service requires the continuation of its functions.

It is our studied opinion that the night closing of gasoline stations has no real effect in the present situation. The recommendation for closing of stations from 7 p. m. to 7 a. m. was made by the Petroleum Coordinator prior to the curtailment of deliveries to retailers. Gasoline consumption figures are concrete evidence that the night closing of stations has not had the effect of reducing consumption. Motorists who normally purchased motor fuel as it was needed now keep more gasoline in the tanks, and stations are crowded just before the curfew hour. Over a period of years, filling stations have been built up in the public mind as a great service utility. Many large operators have established the reputation for having service available at all hours. As a result, retail gasoline stations have virtually the same place in the American scene as the police and fire stations.

There has been no uniform system devised whereby motorists can secure emergency supplies of gasoline at night. As a general rule, the practice is for motorists to secure permission from police departments to purchase motor fuel for emergency use. This is placing an unwarranted burden on police officers and is not justified by the present situation. Bootlegging of gasoline from pumps under cover has been reported from widely scattered sections.

While the night closing has lowered operating costs for retail outlets, there has been no evidence that any of this reduction has been passed on to consumers in the form of lower prices. Therefore, as night closing of stations has not proven practical as a conservation step, as it is an unnecessary inconvenience to motorists generally, and as filling stations are virtually a public utility, we strongly urge that the committee find that the present night closing is unnecessary.

From the very beginning of the program to reduce gasoline consumption emphasis has been placed upon the automobile as a pleasure vehicle. Although owners of private passenger cars use only 30 percent of all petroleum products, they, and they alone, are asked to bear the whole brunt of conservation of gasoline. In fact, all motor vehicles—trucks, busses, and passenger cars—use only 40 percent of all petroleum products and 89 percent of all gasoline. Passenger cars use 66 percent of all motor fuel.

What are the facts as regards automobile use? Surveys have shown that 77 percent of all trips by automobile are for necessary purposes, such as in connection with earning a livelihood or closely related business pursuits. Fifty-five percent of the total mileage of automobile travel can be labeled as necessary. More than 2,300 cities with a population in excess of twelve and one-half million depend upon private cars for transportation, being without local mass-transportation systems. Members of the committee will recall that when the great industrial city of Detroit was recently without any form of mass transportation for 5 days due to a strike private passenger cars were used, with the result that there was no great break-down in the normal activities of a great American city. So far as automobile-owning families are concerned, the picture of workers' homes clustered about mill or factory is obsolete. On the contrary, 70 percent of workers in car-owning families go to work by automobile. Automobiles are now owned by 76 percent of American farmers, and 78 percent of farm-car trips are for necessity use. Certainly, these figures do not jibe with the generalization of automobiles as pleasure vehicles.

For the information of the committee, I would like to furnish copies of an exhaustive factual survey of automobile use issued by the Automobile Manufacturers' Association, and based upon questionnaires by State highway departments and the United States Public Roads Administration.

The part of the automobile in defense production cannot be overestimated. Plants and training centers vital to the defense program are in the main well off of mass transportation lines. Due to housing conditions, hundreds of thousands of defense workers are traveling from fifty to seventy-five miles twice daily. Traffic figures alone indicate the important part of the automobile in defense production. For example, establishment of a large plant at Charlestown, Ind., increased traffic over one State route from 700 to 14,000 vehicles per day. At the Consolidated Aircraft plant in California, located on a heavily traveled highway, 15,000 employees park 5,500 cars daily in a lot across the highway from the plant. At times the congestion completely ties up traffic on this main artery. Traffic volumes on highways in the important Norfolk, Va., area show increases so far this year ranging from 50 percent to 242 percent as compared with 1940. These tremendous movements are defense workers going about their daily job and it is evident that if they were denied the use of their automobiles defense activities would most seriously be retarded.

The motorists of this country are ready to respond to any demands upon them due to the national emergency. If curtailed gasoline consumption is necessary, car owners should be given the true facts and true reasons why they should cooperate. If the situation becomes so that gasoline supplies demand a drastic cut in motor-vehicle use, then an orderly system should be worked out with due regard for the interests of all. The mere statement that supplies will be cut for pleasure cars is not enough.

The same condition holds true as regards gasoline prices. As between a shortage and boosts in prices due to higher transportation costs, there is no doubt that motorists prefer the latter. We are fortunate that Leon Henderson, Price Administrator, is on top of this situation. He has posted fair prices for 40 key cities. We are cooperating fully with the price administrator in advising motorists as regards these prices and through our affiliated motor clubs in checking on fair-price variations. On last Saturday, through telegraphic reports from our clubs, we found widespread disregard by gasoline retailers of the fair-price schedule. We immediately dispatched the following letter to Mr. Henderson.

"The American Automobile Association has asked its affiliated clubs along the Atlantic seaboard to send us every week on Friday a telegraphic report on the extent to which the retail price for regular gasoline conforms to the fair-price schedule posted by you for 40 cities.

"While our coverage is not complete, the reports this week clearly indicate that there is a widespread disregard by retailers of the schedule you have set up. Out of 18 cities reporting to us as of September 5, the retailers in 11 of them were charging the motorists more than the fair prices, the differences ranging as high as 1.6 cents in Burlington, Vt., and 1.5 cents in Philadelphia and Norfolk. It should be pointed out, of course, that not all retailers in these cities are charging higher prices, but at the same time it is significant that comparatively few retailers are selling below the fair-price level.

"We realize, of course, that you are dealing with an extremely difficult problem with limited powers. What more can be done than you are doing to protect the motorists against profiteering it is difficult to say, but it would seem in order to consider the feasibility of suppliers, withholding gasoline from retailers who persistently refuse to conform to the schedule. Aside from the question of public policy involved, I know you will agree with us that profiteering at the expense of the motorist is all the more reprehensible in view of the high profits made by every element in the oil industry this year.

"We take pleasure in enclosing for you, herewith, copies of telegrams received by us and a tabulation showing the prevailing price as compared with those you listed."

We believe that the activities of the Price Administrator's Office, with the full backing of this committee, will do much to see that any threatened gasoline shortage is not used as a means of price boosting and profiteering. It is our earnest belief that the price situation is an added reason for the continued functioning of this committee.

We are fully alert to the threatened shortage. We heartily agree with the Government's position that everything that is humanly possible should be done to build up a safe reservoir of gasoline. We also agree that this problem is so all important that there are so many national and international contingencies, so many unknown factors, that we feel that this committee should continue to watch over the situation.

We are hopeful that this committee will take definite action to place the responsibility for failure of the oil industry and railroads to get together earlier on steps to relieve the oil shortage. The following facts stand out:

As early as June 25 the Petroleum Coordinator urged that oil companies on the Atlantic seaboard "give immediate attention to possibilities of this greater use of tank cars and proceed as rapidly as possible with such plans as you are able to develop in view of cumulative effect of lost time." On August 23 another appeal was made by the same governmental agency to the oil companies suggesting—

"That the companies responsible for distribution on the Atlantic seaboard place actual orders for more tank cars than they are now using, and so place suppliers under the necessity of either delivering cars or acknowledging inability to do so."

However, it was not until September 4, 1941—2 months and 10 days after—that the oil companies publicly acknowledged their willingness to utilize "all available tank cars as rapidly as they can be supplied by the tank-car companies and moved by the railroads * * * regardless of whether this proved to be 20,000 [tank cars] * * * or some other figure."

It is further significant that it was not until your hearings were started that representatives of the oil and railroad companies met to discuss rate revisions for movement of petroleum products during the national emergency and that it only took 1 day to reach an agreement on new rates involving cuts from 25 to 50 percent under prevailing rates.

In conclusion, we believe that the conflicting statements which have been made as regards the availability and nonavailability of transportation facilities and other phases of the petroleum situation have resulted in a great deal of scepticism on the part of many concerned. This is particularly true with reference to those who have undertaken the job of working out State conservation programs. Thus we strongly urge that the findings of this committee set forth clearly the true situation for the guidance of everyone.

We believe it appropriate to suggest that this committee insist that great care be exercised by all governmental and private agencies concerned with this problem in the type of public statements issued, to the end that there may be an avoidance of scare headlines and hysteria, which is bound to affect public morale and confidence.

To quote the words of a former President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge: "Faith in the American people means a faith in their ability to form sound judgments when once the facts have been presented to them clearly and without prejudice."

Dr. Witold Putkowski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the House will recall my remarks on June 28, when I discussed the tragic case of Dr. Witold Putkowski, native-born American citizen of Passaic, N. J., who had been a virtual prisoner of the Russian Government in Soviet Poland for almost 2 years following the day when Warsaw was blitzkrieged by the Nazi armies. He had been serving in the Warsaw Hospital, and he had tried to get his wife, a Polish national, and his 4-year-old daughter, the latter an American citizen, away from the area being bombed and blasted. They were separated in the panic, but wife and child were later located in the Polish capital while the doctor was in Lwow under the dominion of the Soviets and was unable to cross the Nazi frontier.

For close on to 2 years the American Government has been asking the Soviet Government to permit Dr. Putkowski's release so that he could return to the United States, join his ill and long-suffering mother, Mrs. Sophie Putkowska, in Passaic, and proceed to effect the return of his wife and child. During this period I have made frequent visits to the State Department and I have been in constant touch with its officers, always hoping and praying with Mrs. Putkowska that the Soviets would cooperate and a reunion of this family would soon be brought about. Our Embassy at Moscow was given the proverbial run-around. Finally, on June 28, 1941, when I read that Mr. Constantine Oumansky, the Soviet Ambassador in Washington, had called on our Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles, to inform him of the Nazi invasion of his country and had been assured his every request for aid would be given prompt and friendly attention, I took the floor to tell the story. Why, I asked, could not prompt and friendly consideration be given our Government's repeated requests for the release of this American citizen?

Some action followed for on July 10 the State Department phoned me Mr. Oumansky was getting action from his home government in Moscow. Mr. Welles confirmed this on July 16, writing me in part as follows:

> The Soviet Ambassador advised me on July 9 that Dr. Putkowski had been released by the Soviet authorities and that he would be issued an exit permit.

Many of my colleagues, who had become interested in this most appealing case, have asked me to keep them posted. Today, I am sorry to have to advise them as well as the mother and friends of Dr. Putkowski, the Soviets did not effect Dr. Putkowski's release nor did they accord

him an exit permit to leave Russia and return to America.

Our Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, now writes me, in part:

In a telegram dated August 15, the American Ambassador at Moscow advised the State Department that the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs had informed him on that date it had been unable to obtain any information regarding the present whereabouts of Dr. Putkowski, that the Commissariat assumes that he was located at Lwow at the outbreak of the Soviet-German war, but that due to the occupation of that city by German military forces during the first few days of hostilities it is no longer under the control of the Soviet authorities.

In the circumstances a telegram has been dispatched to the American Embassy at Berlin requesting it to endeavor to obtain and to report information with respect to the present whereabouts and welfare of Dr. Putkowski and concerning the possibility of him proceeding to the United States. You and Mrs. Putkowska will readily appreciate that a considerable delay will be experienced.

I appreciate what Mr. Hull means, and I understand our Embassy at Berlin finds it practically impossible to make investigations of this nature.

The Soviets did not produce, and their failure in the Putkowski case is a distinct loss to them.

While the mother of this man of medicine feels she may never see him again, sometimes holds that he no longer lives, I cling to the faith justice will be wrought, and this family will be reunited in our land.

All America Salutes the Postman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House will be interested in the following editorial in last Monday's issue of the New York Times and will concur in its conclusion:

[From the New York Times of September 8, 1941]

CONSIDER THE POSTMAN

A citizen of this town has been in felony court on a charge of assaulting a postman. The case seems to be unique. Why should anyone wish to molest a carrier of the mails? Once a month, true, he stuffs our mailboxes with bills; nevertheless, he deserves tender treatment, for doesn't he bring us checks, now and then, to pay them with?

He is democracy incarnate, the servant of great and small alike. He is service in person, footsore yet faithful, climbing all stairs, out in all weathers, stayed from his duty by neither rain nor anything else. He is a living catalyst assuring a healthful working society, making the whole world kin. Though we remove to the uttermost parts of town, or dwell in some vast wilderness, or manufacture mousetraps of the better sorts on remote mountain tops, he finds our door and links us with our kind.

To those who venerate the swiftly fading past he has high sentimental value; he is almost the last pedestrian. Moreover, he is the least self-seeking of toilers; he walks much, but never walks out. And though he wears a uniform, he goes unarmed, his defenselessness made the greater by the heavy mailsack on his shoulder. If any man on earth should be everlastingly safe from felonious assault, surely that man is the postman.

Commendation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

ARTICLE FROM PITTSBURGH (PA.) PRESS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am inserting an article taken from the Pittsburgh Press of June 1, 1941, commenting on our colleague the Honorable J. BUELL SNYDER, of Pennsylvania:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of June 1, 1941]

TEN BILLION DOLLARS

(By Fred W. Perkins, Press Washington correspondent)

WASHINGTON.—The House is working on next fiscal year's Army appropriation bill of almost $10,000,000,000—the largest sum that ever has been proposed to Congress in a single measure except just once before, in the World War.

In charge of this epochal appropriation is a western Pennsylvanian, Representative J. BUELL SNYDER, Democrat, of Perryopolis, who is chairman of the War Department subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. He is, therefore, a key man in national defense, and his policy is to give whatever the Army chieftains say is necessary for the unprecedented peacetime support and development of the Military Establishment.

But he appreciates the meaning of this tremendous spending, and its effect for many years on the individual taxpayer. It may be encouraging to the taxpayer to know that Mr. SNYDER is not doing his job casually.

"I confess to being disturbed about its magnitude," said Mr. SNYDER of this big spending bill, "and to being disturbed by the enormity of the amounts we have been appropriating ever since we were admonished by the President early in January 1939 that we should look to the adequacy of our defenses. But I am more disturbed about seeing that we provide beyond a doubt for everything essential for our defense in this emergency."

When that has been attended to, continued Mr. SNYDER, "we then may turn our talents and energies to reconstructing and reordering our domestic affairs. I have faith that though the way may be fraught with hardships for us all, a way will be worked out which will give to our people just cause to give thanks that they are privileged to be citizens of this great and glorious land."

The former school teacher from Upper Turkeyfoot in Somerset County has developed during his 8 years in the House to where he is looked upon as one of the solid men of that body.

He has developed parliamentary and legislative finesse that now qualifies him for pilotage of the huge appropriation bills for the Army.

Railroad Workers Are Entitled to Requested Wage Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

STATEMENT BY MR. A. F. WHITNEY, PRESIDENT OF THE BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the railroad workers have made out a very meritorious case in support of their request for wage increases to meet the increased cost of food, clothing, rentals, taxes, and the rising spiral of all living costs. The railroad companies are doing the largest volume of business in their history, and Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, has issued a statement setting forth pertinent facts and figures which are unanswerable. In the view of the widespread interest in this matter, by the unanimous consent granted by my colleagues, I insert at this point Mr. Whitney's statement, reading as follows:

REPLY BY A. F. WHITNEY

I feel it would not be appropriate to permit Mr. Gurley's statement to go into the record without demurring. In other words, as I interpret it, his remarks were a sort of diplomatic appeal to these railway workers to give consideration to some of the factors that have been entering into the railway picture, and I want to merely suggest that some of the people that the railways represent, or at least who are interested in the securities of the railways, do not agree with Mr. Gurley.

I have before me the address of a man who is very well posted in railroad securities—Patrick B. McGinnis—who delivered an address in Cleveland, Ohio, July 18, 1941, at the Mid-Day Club.

Mr. McGinnis is probably as well posted as any man on the question of railroad finances, and I read from his statement:

"Well, after I get through with this part of the speech in most places they say, 'Everything you say is fine, but labor is walking away with the railroads.' So I have had to develop the facts and figures on labor. I went to Washington and talked with the A. A. R. and saw the headquarters of the brotherhood and the rest of the unions got exactly the same figures, but their interpretations were different.

"You pick up the newspaper and you read about wage increases going to wipe out all the net. Some of the newspapers got so high they wiped almost all the gross. You will find if you read between the lines there is a lot of propaganda in a lot of newspapers. Anyway, here are the figures:

"Last year, 1940, the railroads did 97½ percent of the business that they did in 1930

in ton-miles. That is what labor does, moves freight. How many miles did you carry that ton of freight? That is the business of a railroad. Last year they did about the same as in 1930 with a half million less men; and the wage bill was down $600,000,000; over a 10-year period, the same business, a half million less men, the wage bill down $600,000,000. You can look those up in the January 4 issue of Railway Age of 1941, and that certainly is not a labor mouthpiece.

"The other figures are relatively important, too. The next important one, however, is this: That the total wage bill of a railroad, of all the railroads, is almost always in exact percentage proportion and a constant percentage proportion of the gross revenue, and that figure is 47 percent. In only 1 year out of 23 years has the percentage of gross paid out in wages fluctuated over 1 percentage point, from 47 percent, so that in the best year the railroads ever had, 1926, their gross was $6,300,000,000. Their wage bill was $2,900,000,000, or exactly 46 percent. Take the depression year 1932, their gross had dropped to $3,100,000,000 Their wage bill was $1,500,000,000, or exactly 48 percent. In 1937, a little better, up to $4,100,000,000. The wage bill is $1,900,000,000, or exactly 48 percent, and last year, 1940, the gross was $4,300,000,000, the wage about $2,000,000,000, or exactly 46½ percent.

"Now the third statistic to explain this wage thing: My conception is that wages are academic. They are always a percentage of gross and all this stuff you hear about them is so much ignorance There are reasons. I will explain. I am not making a speech for management or labor I am making a speech for bondholders, and they want to know the facts so they can determine what to do with their securities, both bonds and stocks.

"Getting down to the third, the ton-miles per dollar, how many units does the man do for each dollar he gets? In 1921 he did 111 ton-miles per dollar wages. In 1930, 145; in 1939, 178; in 1940, 190; and the first quarter this year—I just got the figures today—220 units of work for each dollar.

"In other words, as we learned in our second year of college, the railroads are a business of increasing and decreasing returns. In other words, the engineer gets the same money, and plenty, to take 70 cars filled with 40 tons of freight as he does 20 cars filled with 10 tons.

"Now, this is a tremendously startling thing when you stop to analyze it. It was accomplished because in the last 10 years and 18 years the average freight-car capacity has been increased from 42 tons to 50 tons. The speed has been increased from over 50 percent, from 10 up to 17, more than 50 percent. The train load has been increased 25 percent, from 600 tons to around 840 tons. The freight cars in the train have been increased from 38 to 50, or about 31 percent, and the ton-miles per train-hours about 100 percent up to 14,000, as against 7,000 in the old days. Fuel cost has come down."

The railroads agree with that. I was reading a statement on that this morning.

"They have been able to do this because of heavier rails and heavier ballast and elimination of curves and grades; better equipment. All the equipment has been turned over in the last 12 years. You have mass shopwork, you have treated ties. You have maintenance-of-way crews motorized, and one of the big things, if you know, going on among railroads is spot welding. The joints get worn, the rail ends wear. In the old days you had to take them out, cut them off, put them on a branch. In 1935 spot welding was developed to where the weld could be bordered. You go along with a machine and fix it up. In other words, they replace the worn rail ends with welding machinery.

"Then the switches in the wintertime are heated by oil and electricity, all those efficiency factors that you never heard about because everybody in the statistical field has left the railroad. You don't hear any other side of the wage problem. You sit down and read the paper, and you say, 'I don't want any railroad bonds.' You don't sit down and look up the other side. There is more knowledge in Louisville, Ky., I think, than New York City, at least judged by the bond purchases they have made in the last 18 months."

Now, I want to show you railroads that this distinguished gentleman at least disagrees with you to the tune of 10 percent:

"Now, I think the railroads ought to give them a 10-percent increase for the duration. I think everybody does. I think we all need it, judging by the price of commodities * * *.

"Going back to income last year, $4,300,000,000 gross, this year probably $5,100,000,000, so that they are taking on an additional $800,000,000 worth of gross. They can take most of that down into net, and it could absorb easily a 10-percent increase, which is $200,000,000 a year. I am not worried about the wage thing at all."

The picture that was drawn by Mr. Gurley here this morning with reference to what would happen to the Atchison, the New York Central, the Burlington, and the Pennsylvania Railways, of course, is a speculative picture, and I say that, Mr. Gurley, with all due respect to your compilations, because there is no living man, with all due respect to the economists and statisticians and the operators and the rest of us, who can forecast what will take place in the way of rearrangements of operations and reductions in expenses in the event of a wage increase or in the event of any other change taking place that would be to the benefit of the railway workers.

Apparently stockholders of the Burlington were not worrying about the red when in 1921 they issued a stock dividend of $60,000,000.

Or the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western apparently were not considering the question of reducing the tariffs when they pyramided their capitalization by stock dividends in 1921 to the tune of $42,220,550.

And we note down here that the little Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railway in 1923 issued stock dividends to the tune of $5,417,400.

The Pittsburgh & Lake Erie in 1928 issued stock dividends to the tune of $7,197,120.

The Nickel Plate issued stock dividends in 1927 to the tune of $16,667,800.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis issued stock dividends in 1930 in the amount of $7,600,000.

And the Oregon Short Line issued stock dividends in 1935 in the amount of $62,527,087.

Just a handful of railroads—12 in number—that issued during this period, 1921–35, in stock dividends a total of $261,137,837.

Now, that is only part of the picture. That was a gratuity to the stockholders. They pyramided the capital stock on their properties and now appear before the public in sackcloth and ashes, with tears rolling down their cheeks, talking about the hard-boiled brakemen and switchmen, enginemen and conductors who have the effrontery to ask for an increase in wages which might interfere to some extent with the payment of dividends upon blue-sky or watered stock. Dividends paid on stock dividends; on excess value in 1921 to date, the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western paid in stock dividends in 1921, $61,642,003; or, in other words, more than 130 percent of the total gratuity.

The Burlington—and we hear a lot about the agricultural railroads, the grange railroads, and their desire to be helpful to the farmer, about the handicaps they are under because they are not operating in the manufacturing districts and because the territory which they serve is not as densely populated as the eastern territory; but the Burlington stockholders apparently with great satisfaction to themselves took down a total of $88,851,453 in dividends paid on stock dividends. In other words, they were able, through the action of their board of directors, to lure themselves into issuing stock dividends to a total of $60,000,000 in 1921, upon which they have collected over $88,000,000 in dividends since that time.

And the Louisville & Nashville stockholders collected $34,650,000 on the $45,000,000 stock dividends issued in 1923.

The Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac stockholders have collected $5,714,953 in dividends on the stock dividends of $5,417,400 issued in 1923.

The Cincinnati & New Orleans and Texas Pacific stockholders have received cash dividends on stock dividends in the amount of $11,332,100 on the gratuity of $5,180,000 which they received in 1926, and the poor Pittsburgh & Lake Erie, a subsidiary of the New York Central System, has paid cash dividends of $11,659,334 on the stock dividend of $7,197,120 issued in 1928.

The Nickel Plate has paid a cash dividend of $25,997,710 on the stock dividend of $16,667,680 issued in 1927.

In other words, and I am not reading them all, but the total amount in cash dividends paid on this blue-sky stock, dignified by the directors of these carriers as stock dividends since 1921, brings us to the staggering figure of $249,605,845.

Now, when we combine these two figures, stock dividends and dividends paid on stock dividends equal $510,743,682 paid out unnecessarily and at the expense of the resources of the railroad companies involved.

It is not my purpose to take up very much more time. I believe these figures will apply on practically all railroads, and when I take you back into history and point out where bond issue after bond issue has been floated by certain railroads, you will realize it has been a most expensive experiment insofar as the industry is concerned.

I don't mean by that there were times when the railroads did not need money, but I mean that in order to borrow money the extravagant commissions paid that were grafted by the bankers were so staggering that an industry, unless it was a powerful industry and was fortunate enough to secure a lot of business, could not long stand up under that racket.

I am not blaming the railroads for that because they possibly had to go to the banks to get the money, but there is a picture that can be drawn in connection with the financial affairs of these carriers that was reflected in the statement I made the other day when I advised you gentlemen that, according to Standard Statistics, the worth of class I railroads in America today is not over $11,000,000,000. Their stocks and bonds can be bought on the market today at approximately that figure, and you can't laugh that off.

I agree with Mr. Gurley that no one knows what will happen with reference to the several matters that he so intelligently discussed this morning. As a matter of fact, we are just human beings, and clamoring, if you please, in the dark; we don't know what the afternoon of today may have in store for us. Everything that we approach, even to life, is so uncertain that if we would stop to reflect or if we were the type of people who were inclined to worry, we would not enjoy many minutes of the day. But we hope for the better, and not knowing what may overtake us, we carry on. But we do know that at this time the tendencies are to increase wages. We know that the whole country is permeated with that feeling; we know, as we said the other day, that just as sure as we are here this morning, the wage structure is bound to be increased. What may happen a year from today or 10 years from today will have to be met at that time. We hope that we

are all here to meet it, although some of us are growing gray and some of us are growing weary of this thing of constantly trying to keep our heads up and to keep the wages of the men we represent high enough to enable them to live respectably.

I am not concerned about the stockholders of the American railroads. When I purchase 100 shares of stock in the Great Western, or even one of the richer railroads of the country, I do it willfully, maliciously, with malice aforethought, as a gambler, and if I cannot make a profit on that purchase, I will just mark myself up as a sucker as far as that transaction is concerned. Some of us have done some gambling, and the stock market, as far as the railroads are concerned, especially the common and even the preferred, does not hold out very many attractions to the investor, but it does to the gambler at times during these periods of fluctuation if men guess right.

Your interest bill has stood about the same for 20 years, running around $535,000,000 a year. The railroads just won't get out of debt. They don't want to get out of debt. The people that have money and have money invested in your securities want the interest. They don't want the railroads to pay off the debt. I noticed in the papers the other day that the New York Central tried to pay something like $16,000,000 on some debt, and they had to plead with the bank to take the money; of course, the bank didn't want it. The vaults of the banks are bulging over with money. Money is cheap at this time.

Now, gentlemen, as we said the other day, I presume that every gentleman on the other side of the table is fully familiar with this question of productivity and these other matters we have mentioned, the question of what constitutes loyal service and good service and all those things, and the question of serving the people so that you will get the business and keep the business, and it appears that there is nothing that could be added at this time that would change the picture.

As a matter of fact, we have your answer, and, as Mr. Johnson so aptly said, we appreciate the fact that you gave us your answer promptly.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, remember, when thinking of aggressors, that Poland was invaded from two sides.

My last pain-in-the-neck is to hear the fightless British leaders talk about our duty.

Those who accuse us as partisan because we oppose war should run on independent tickets in '42.

The late chairman often said, "If the House Appropriations Committee does not zealously protect the Public Treasury, who will?"

Wish there were nothing worse to face than the purge by a leader whose lifetime batting average as a standard-bearer is zero.

My colleague, FRANK CARLSON, and his flood-control friends pulled a banquet in Concordia while all their rivers were running brim full.

Gratitude was deified by the youthful Leah Vaira who took part of her annual leave and paid all of her expenses to attend the funeral of her sponsor, Congressman Taylor.

We have attended 25 picnics and fairs in 3 weeks. My nearest competitor is an all-out aid beneficiary of Farm Security in Marshall County who had made 18 out of 19 in his area.

Sara Delano Roosevelt was a strong woman and no doubt acted as a governor after the father was gone. How tragic, immediately after her death, to have an uncontrolled declaration of participation in Europe's war.

Floods on the plains delayed the funeral train causing the burial of Edward T. Taylor to be after dark; a rock slide near The Divide held up his returning friends 6 hours and a heavy pre-season snow fell. Such were the difficulties he met and surmounted from the grasshopper days in Rooks County in the early seventies to the end of over 50 years of distinguished public service.

Secretary Morgenthau on Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, next to war, in my opinion, the most important subject confronting this country is the question of inflation. Nothing would be more disastrous.

The Secretary of the Treasury's address on this subject Tuesday evening at Boston contains a great deal of sound logic. Mr. Morgenthau is well qualified to approach this subject. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include the speech referred to. It follows:

Mr. Chairman, only 20 miles from here, at Lexington and Concord, the men of New England first proved that Americans could defend their homes and their freedom. Today, the people of these States are proving that they are still New Englanders. In army camps and naval stations, in hundreds of factories and shipyards from Connecticut to Maine, the men and women of New England are responding magnificently to their country's needs. I am glad to be here tonight to pay my tribute to the great work that New England is doing, like all other sections of the country, to arm America.

I am glad also that my host tonight is the Advertising Club of Boston, for the advertising profession is a mighty force in creating public understanding. We cannot make ourselves the arsenal of democracy and the defender of freedom unless our people understand the tremendous issues involved in this battle for the world. In the same way, we at the Treasury shall find it more difficult to accomplish our task of financing the defense program unless the public sees clearly the need for greater sacrifice and for greater effort.

In particular, I think that clear understanding is needed if we are to avoid the economic evils that might otherwise spring from a defense program as great as ours, a program that is making such enormous demands upon our productive resources. The worst of those economic evils has been constantly uppermost in my mind as Secretary of the Treasury. That is the evil of inflation and that is the subject which I should like to discuss with you tonight.

We have been talking about inflation for a long time as if it were a threat remote from our daily lives. It is a distant threat no longer. We are facing it now and we must deal with it at once.

If we are selfish or shortsighted in facing this issue, the consequences may haunt us and our children for years. But if we look at the problem with clear vision and firm resolve, we can beat this thing. If we keep always in mind the interests of our country as a whole, if we provide promptly the appropriate means and use them vigorously whenever necessary, we can prevent inflation from fastening its grip upon us.

That task calls for alertness and mental toughness on the part of every one in the executive departments of the Government, every one in the Halls of Congress, every one of us here in this room, and every one who may be listening to me tonight.

The word "inflation" is cold and lifeless, so cold that even you advertising men here tonight might have difficulty in making it real, but the thing it describes is treacherous and cruel. Memories are so short that I suppose many of us have forgotten what happened the last time a price inflation struck us 25 years ago. The effects of that inflation, however, lasted for many years and brought untold heartbreak and misery in their train.

Let us look at the record to see what happened a generation ago. In 1916 the cost of living began to rise sharply but there were few who saw its significance. It was only when prices had risen by 70 percent that President Wilson recommended any steps to prevent inflation. In fact, the country was so blind to its dangers that as late as June 1917, Congress actually hastened the rise in prices by reducing the reserve requirements for member banks of the Federal Reserve System.

The consequences were so serious for every American that there must be many housewives even today who can remember them. By 1920, a 10-pound bag of sugar cost $2.67, a dozen eggs cost 92 cents, a 10-pound bag of flour cost 88 cents, a pound of butter cost 76 cents and a pound of pork chops cost 50 cents. By that year prices had skyrocketed to twice the level of 5 years earlier. The money the housewife paid for one loaf of bread in 1914 bought only half a loaf in 1920. The money she paid for a pound of bacon in 1914 bought only half a pound in 1920. The money she paid for a yard of cotton cloth was enough to buy only one-third of a yard in 1920. The consumer found that food, fuel, shelter, and clothing which cost a dollar in April 1916, had risen to almost two dollars by 1920. The family with no increase in income found its purchasing power cut in half.

We have now, as we had then in 1916, a moderate rise in the cost of living, a great rise in wholesale prices, and a still greater rise in the prices of basic commodities like wheat, hogs, cotton, and lumber. It is the rise in the prices of basic commodities that constitutes our red light, our warning signal, today, for such a rise is always the advance guard of an increase in the cost of living.

If we fail to use the controls at our disposal now; if we fail to do the specific things which are in our power to check inflation now; if we allow prices to go on rising as they

did from 1916 to 1920, we may find that food, fuel, shelter, and clothing which now cost a dollar will once more cost almost twice as much before the process has ended.

The rise in prices is by no means confined to foodstuffs and clothing. I have before me, for instance, the actual figures on the cost of constructing a standard six-room frame house in one of our typical cities. This home that could have been built a year ago for $6,000 now costs $7,140 to build. Here we have an increase in prices of nearly 20 percent; and if it goes along the 1916 pattern, we are only at the beginning of the story.

Not only is the cost of building homes rising but higher rentals are also on the way for the millions who do not own their homes. In scores of areas where industrial expansion has first taken hold rents have already risen 10, 20, 30 percent, and even higher.

I have brought with me tonight a pictorial chart which I wish the radio audience could see, because it shows so plainly the road we traveled once, and the road which we must not travel again. The chart shows how the buying power of your dollar shrank from 1914 to 1920, how your dollar bought less food, less clothing, less shelter, less heat and light because prices were allowed to run away. It shows how your dollar is already buying less in 1941 than in 1939, and it leaves a big question mark for the space showing what your dollar may buy in 1942. The answer to that question is in our keeping as Americans, whether we are officials of the Government or private citizens. And I have written on the chart, alongside the question mark, the words: "Answer depends on us." We must decide now, this year, we in Washington and you in the country at large, whether we shall have the common sense and determination to avoid what we went through 25 years ago.

Let it not be said of us, as David Lloyd George said of his people in 1915, that we were "too late in moving here, too late in arriving there, too late in coming to this decision, too late in starting with enterprises, too late in preparing."

There is no excuse for us to be too late in meeting this threat of inflation that faces us. We now know, or ought to know, what is going on; that is perhaps the greatest difference between conditions today and in 1916. This time our eyes are open to the dangers that lie ahead of us. We now know that the time to do something about inflation is before it occurs, not after it has gathered momentum. We should profit by our greater knowledge and take prompt and effective action now.

There is no need for me to remind this audience in detail of the reasons why prices have already risen. The reasons are plain for everyone to see. Our economy today resembles an overloaded steam boiler. The fire under the boiler is being fed by billions of additional purchasing power in the hands of the public. The fire is growing hotter and is generating more steam than the boiler can safely hold. If we are to prevent the boiler from bursting, we must damp down the fires by diverting spending away from those articles or commodities in which there is a shortage, actual or potential. We must damp down the fires also by increasing the flow of supplies of goods available to the consumer.

We can, as I have said before, defeat this threat of inflation, just as we can defeat and destroy the forces of evil that have been let loose upon this earth. But we need to understand the issues, and we need to see clearly the consequences of inaction or delay. I should like, therefore, to point out, first, what we have done, and then, what we need to do, in order to stop prices from rising further.

In the first place, Congress is on the point of passing a huge tax bill designed to raise almost $4,000,000,000 in additional revenue, thus withdrawing a great amount of purchasing power that competes with the defense effort.

Secondly, the Treasury in its borrowing program is trying to obtain as large a portion of its funds as possible from current consumers' income.

Through a new form of note—the tax anticipation note—it is seeking to increase the effectiveness of the income tax as a check on current purchasing power, and I am happy to report to you that more than a billion dollars' worth of these notes were sold in the month of August.

The Treasury has also begun a program of selling defense savings bonds and stamps to people of moderate and low incomes. The people have responded to a tune of a billion and a quarter dollars in 4 months, without coercion of any kind; and in making that response possible the advertising profession has been of truly invaluable help.

The President has recently issued an order authorizing the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to control consumers' installment credit.

The Congress is considering, and I hope will pass without undue delay, a bill to limit price rises, and to supplement the efforts of the Office of Price Administration to limit those rises by voluntary cooperation.

All these are useful steps to a necessary end, but they are not enough.

We shall have to tax ourselves much more heavily next year than this year, great and far-reaching as the present tax bill will be.

We shall have to invest much more widely and systematically in defense savings bonds and stamps. In particular, the rising pay rolls of the past year have been a clear call to the wage earners of America to set aside a portion of their earnings each week for their own good and their country's good.

We may have to extend general controls over bank credit and create controls over selected capital expenditures.

I hope that we may extend the social-security program so as to increase the flow of funds to the Treasury from current income during the emergency and increase the outflow of funds when needed in the post-defense period. In addition, I have already suggested the creation of what I have called a separation wage—that is, an entirely new form of contribution out of which a worker may draw a regular wage for a stated period in case he loses his job. These measures would be good and desirable in themselves, but they are especially necessary at this time, for they should help us to decrease certain forms of purchasing now, and increase them in the future when they may be needed.

We must, as I have said many times, reduce nonessential Federal expenditures. We must also appeal for economy in State and local government expenditure and a curtailment of their borrowing for nondefense purposes. The President pointed the way a month ago when he vetoed a bill calling for $320,000,000 worth of highway construction. By this action he demonstrated that there is a clear distinction nowadays between the spending that is necessary for defense and the spending than can be postponed until a later day.

The country should congratulate itself on the President's veto of this measure, and also upon the Senate's action only last week in approving the creation of a joint committee of the taxing and the appropriating agencies of Congress to study the possibilities of economy all along the line in nondefense activities. I have several times suggested the creation of such a committee, and I am very happy that my suggestion has been adopted by the Senate at last. I hope now that the House will also approve the idea because it seems to me that such joint action is the only sensible way to proceed if we are to cut the costs of government and clear the decks for defense spending.

All of the measures I have so far suggested for combatting inflation would attack the problem by reducing the demand for goods now and by helping to build up a backlog of purchasing power for the post-war world.

But we should also attack the problem from the opposite direction. We must make every effort to increase the supply of goods available to the consumer wh rever this can be done without encroaching upon the defense program. Above all, we must make full use of those supplies that are available, not only in defense production but in the provision of civilian goods which do not compete with defense output.

This is a time when we must flatten the peaks and fill up the valleys in our economic picture. If we reduce undesirable purchasing now and keep prices down now, we shall be helping to provide for the day when these vast defense expenditures will end and when our defense workers will take up the work of peace again.

The most effective way to prevent a damaging rise in prices is, quite simply, to release surpluses from storage.

I wonder if the housewife knows, when she pays 15 percent more than she did a year ago for a bag of flour, that our supply of wheat is the largest on record, and that 498,000,000 bushels of several years' crops are available in our neighbor democracy of Canada. It is true that only 3 months ago a rigid quota was applied to the importation of wheat from Canada, with the ultimate objective of keeping up the price of wheat in this country. But it is also true that only the other day the quota on sugar from Cuba was enlarged so substantially as to absorb most of the reserve stocks in that country. It seems to me desirable and necessary that we now follow the example set in the case of Cuban sugar and permit the entry of Canadian wheat in larger volume.

Here in this country we have large reserve stocks of farm products of many kinds which should be released for consumption as fast as necessary to prevent unreasonable price rises.

The Government now holds or controls 7,000,000 bales of cotton in reserve, and cotton prices have risen from 9½ cents a pound on August 1, 1939, to over 17 cents a pound at the present time. In spite of this rise of not far from 100 percent in 2 years, Congress recently send to the President a bill to freeze Government stocks of cotton and wheat for the duration of the war, and thus to prevent the Government from disposing of any of the surplus wheat and cotton it had acquired. The President promptly vetoed the bill, because this measure would have aggravated the danger of inflation and might have frustrated our efforts to fight it.

We ought not to withhold cotton surpluses, or any surpluses, from the market in times like these. The housewife ought not to be made to pay a tribute to profiteers and speculators when she buys a cotton sheet for her home or a shirt for her husband or a suit for her child.

Millions of people still go without the milk, butter, and eggs which, according to the testimony of food experts and the dictates of plain common sense, are necessary to good health and good morale. Yet the reserve stocks of butter, cheese, beef, and pork now held in this country are far higher than they were a year ago and far higher than the average of the past 5 years.

This has been historically a land of milk and honey. There is still plenty of milk and honey, but too much of it is in the warehouses. Let's make it flow. If we were to let it flow to the public, we would not only help in keeping prices stable but we would be doing something even more important—

we would be helping to make our people healthier and happier.

It is sheer folly from the farmer's point of view to push prices up by creating scarcities in times like these. The farmers suffered cruelly for 12 long years after the collapse of the inflation of 1920 and 1921; they should not be made to suffer again.

It is sheer folly in the same way for labor leaders to seek new increases in wages every few months—new increases which, in turn, produce higher manufacturing costs, higher prices, and a higher cost of living.

It is short-sighted for a landlord to charge all that the traffic will bear in defense centers, where housing space is at a premium.

It is poor business, in the long run, for any businessman to seek exorbitant profits in this period of defense spending.

It is bad banking, in the long run, for any banker to exploit the present demand for funds by seeking to charge unreasonable interest rates.

There are always selfish groups in any country which think they can profit from inflation. They are wrong.

Inflation does more than merely to rob the wage earner of a portion of his earnings. It does more than saddle the farmer with a load of debt which he cannot repay. It is more destructive of morale than any other single force. Inflation divides the country. It sets up producers against consumers, workers against employers, the people who owe money against the people to whom the money is owed.

No group in a community profits from inflation in the long run except the "three horsemen"—the speculator, the profiteer, and the hoarder.

These are truths that should be self-evident. They should be especially so now, in view of the fact that rising prices will only add to the cost of our defense program and make the arming of our country steadily more difficult. They should be self-evident now in the light of the experience that we suffered only 25 years ago.

We Americans have more than 150 years of self-government behind us. We are a mature Nation, and we should be able to face up to our responsibilities as mature men and women. My plea to you tonight is that we should learn from bitter experience My hope and my belief is that no group among us—whether farmers, workingmen, or businessmen—shall be tempted by the illusion of selfish gain into allowing prices to rise unchecked.

The cost of inflation is too ruinous to producer and consumer alike for anyone in authority to tolerate it now. I can give you only this pledge: That this administration will do everything humanly possible to prevent inflation. But in this fight the administration must have the firm support and the clear understanding of 130,000,000 Americans behind it. If we have that support and that understanding, I know that we shall not fail.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I shall insert the text of the chart Secretary Morgenthau displayed in his speech:

COST OF LIVING—CHANGES IN BUYING POWER OF YOUR DOLLAR, WORLD WAR AND NOW

TOTAL COST OF LIVING

(What Your Dollar Would Buy—1914 Base) World War—	Percent	(What Your Dollar Would Buy—1939 Base) Now—	Percent
June 1914	100	June 1939	100
June 1916	92	June 1941	94
June 1920	48	June 1942	Answer depends on us.

COST OF LIVING—CHANGES IN BUYING POWER OF YOUR DOLLAR, WORLD WAR AND NOW—Con.

FOOD

(What Your Dollar Would Buy—1914 Base) World War—	Percent	(What Your Dollar Would Buy—1939 Base) Now—	Percent
June 1914	100	June 1939	100
June 1916	90	June 1941	88
June 1920	44	June 1942	Answer depends on us.

CLOTHING

(What Your Dollar Would Buy—1914 Base) World War—	Percent	(What Your Dollar Would Buy—1939 Base) Now—	Percent
June 1914	100	June 1939	100
June 1916	89	June 1941	97
June 1920	33	June 1942	Answer depends on us.

SHELTER

(What Your Dollar Would Buy—1914 Base) World War—	Percent	(What Your Dollar Would Buy—1939 Base) Now—	Percent
June 1914	100	June 1939	100
June 1916	98	June 1941	99
June 1920	77	June 1942	Answer depends on us.

HEAT AND LIGHT

(What Your Dollar Would Buy—1914 Base) World War—	Percent	(What Your Dollar Would Buy—1939 Base) Now—	Percent
June 1914	100	June 1939	100
June 1916	96	June 1941	96
June 1920	59	June 1942	Answer depends on us.

NOTE.—All other items of cost of living included in total.

Morale Wins Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE ARMY AND NAVY JOURNAL

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article I placed in the Army and Navy Journal under date of March 29, 1941.

The reason I am including this article at this time is that according to all the information we can get from different sources in Germany and in the countries that Germany has conquered during this war, we find that in spirit, if not in fact, the statement that I made in the following article is coming true.

The article is as follows:

[From the Army and Navy Journal of March 29, 1941]

Recording history shows that the morale of the people and soldiers of a nation wins wars in the end. Of course, they must have food and munitions, but as in the case of the Italian troops in northern Africa for the last 3 or 4 months, where they had men, munitions, and equipment equivalent to or stronger than the English, they were conquered without much effort because their morale was gone.

We only succeed when we fall in love with our job. The Italian soldiers did not like their job. They lost their morale. They said what is the use. They said we lose all if we continue to fight. We may have a chance in some avenue in life if we quit fighting.

No nation can keep up the morale of its people and soldiers if that nation's motives are to destroy the rights of others.

Might rules only till right is ready. Our colonial forefathers won against the French and the English of that day because our forefathers were fighting for the things that preserve civilization; freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom to worship God according to the dictates of our conscience. Napoleon lost because his motives were to destroy those liberties. Hitler will lose for the same reason.

The morale of the people, the common people, the workers, the mothers, and soldiers, of the 10 or 12 conquered nations that Hitler has under his iron heel, is breaking down. It will continue to break, not only as it did in Italy, but in Hitler's other conquered countries. Every succeeding day it will take more soldiers and more force to rule and guide the people in the conquered nations and it follows that every day that such force is used, the morale of the people is weakened.

The $7,000,000,000, plus the $4,000,000,000 appropriation by Congress this week was the straw that broke the camel's back. Hitler and his cohorts are now convinced that the United States of America is going to not only be the arsenal for material equipment to bring about the preservation of our sacred institutions and liberties, but the morale arsenal for all those nations who believe in the principles and the practices of our way of life.

Hoskins Attacks Douglas Dam as Unfair to Section

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE KNOXVILLE (TENN.) JOURNAL

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the

Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal of September 7, 1941:

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal of September 7, 1941]

HOSKINS ATTACKS DOUGLAS DAM AS UNFAIR TO SECTION

The proposed construction of Douglas Dam, part of the T. V. A. chain, is a threat to the social and economic structure of a large section of east Tennessee, President James D. Hoskins said last night in an open letter.

Drawing on sources available through departments of the university, President Hoskins in an outline replete with statistical data voiced his objection to the construction of the French Broad River Dam (near the Jefferson and Sevier County lines) and warned that with the construction of Douglas Dam "we are ruined utterly."

Hoskins' report said the 31,000-acre reservoir of the proposed dam would cover some of the finest agricultural land in east Tennessee and would ruin the annual production of about $1,250,000 worth of crops, livestock, and fruit now produced in the area. The reservoir also would necessitate the relocation of 5 canning plants and 3 flour mills employing more than 2,000 persons and would dispossess 3,251 people, the statement said.

Hoskins, a native of Jefferson County, pointed out that the University of Tennessee always had cooperated with T. V. A. and that no objection had been raised at the construction of hitherto approved dams. The University of Tennessee president called attention to the T. V. A.'s purpose to "develop the region" and "to preserve democracy" and raised the question whether the construction of the Douglas Dam would serve either purpose. President Hoskins' statement:

"The proposed construction of the Douglas Dam on the French Broad River above Knoxville and near the Jefferson and Sevier County lines raises an important, even a critical, question involving the welfare of a large section of Tennessee.

"Should this dam be constructed?

"I address myself to this question as a lifelong resident of east Tennessee, thoroughly in accord with our defense efforts, and as a friend and supporter of T. V. A. and its great program. Also, I should note that I have no personal interest at stake and that I am approaching the matter from a disinterested viewpoint.

"Let us observe the immediate factual results that will arise from the construction of this dam. Immediately flooded will be some 31,000 acres of land and an equal amount will be directly affected. Some 3,000 and more persons will be removed from their homes. Several large industries, including 5 canning plants and 3 flour mills, will be eliminated.

"These are but the rough outlines of damage that will reflect a serious illness of the community, as an abscess may be but the simple and visible evidence of cancer. May I illustrate how deeply the statistical wounds cut into the vitals of a whole area.

"The 31,000 acres of land to be flooded is not merely land. It is the best land in Jefferson and Cocke Counties that is capable of supporting a culture and a government. Throughout east Tennessee the river bottoms afford almost our sole agricultural resource. Blessed with forests, minerals, and power, we are nonetheless dependent upon the soil—and the soil of the river bottoms—for our standard of living. It is not pleasant to contemplate the permanent impoverishment of a region that must begin to import its vegetables and truck crops—to say nothing of the disruption itself. Yet throughout east Tennessee the following areas have already been flooded or now await the rising water:

	Acres
Chickamauga	39,400
Fort Loudoun	14,900
Norris	40,200
Cherokee	31,100
Watts Bar	41,600
Hales Bar	5,760
Total	172,960

"While I do not presume to say that every acre flooded in these areas was a 10-barrel-corn acre, it is obvious that most of them were river-bottom acres. It is now proposed to add 31,000 additional acres to this amount.

ACTUAL SOIL LOST

"The actual soil lost to these dams—as significant as this loss is—is perhaps less tragic than the removal of families from their homes. East Tennessee, even in its lush river bottoms has no corner on soil. Good soil exists elsewhere and for a price it can be had. When a home is destroyed, however, the loss may be irretrievable. People do not easily build new homes, founded upon the soil. If one thinks in terms of moving-day in the city, the loss of a given dwelling may seem insignificant. But farm homes thrust their roots deep within the soil. Above ground grow the habits and traditions and social affiliations that constitute culture. I am speaking not in terms of happiness or trifling comforts for a few individuals or families. I mean that east Tennessee and its culture, and its political institutions, are built upon the family, and the family is rooted in the soil.

"What provision can be made for these dispossessed? Is a Government check or ready cash any solution of their problem or of the community problem? What wounds will this money heal? What new community, and where, can be founded upon cash? Even if the Government should survey America from one end to the other in search of a whole area to be carefully planned as a community it would achieve only a poor substitute for a community of growth and tradition. Yet no such survey is feasible or possible. The flooding of these lands destroys a community, breaks it into bits of flotsam and jetsam humanity, and makes no adequate provision even for them—for families or for individuals. There is more than damage here. There is destruction, irreparable destruction, irretrievable loss for some 3,000 persons.

WHAT OF OTHERS?

"And what of those that remain, the main stock from which the stem is broken? Upon them falls the burden of government. The assessed valuation of Jefferson County alone is $7,450,929.23, that to be flooded some 16 percent of this amount. Under the present tax rate there would be lost to the annual revenues of Jefferson County some $26,000 annually. This, mind you, is not the total loss but the annual loss from this time henceforth. And will these lands removed from the taxable wealth of these counties result in any economies for the county government and its institutions? Rather, the contrary is true. The economic dislocations and upheavals will be expensive in themselves even if they bring no added institutional burdens in care of the dispossessed.

"And why speak of the assessed value of land alone? The industries to be removed represent a large assessed value. When you consider that the weekly or monthly pay rolls of these industries go to some 2,000 workers, thence to the merchants, thence to transportation, banks, and appear in all the factors of exchange, we wonder what will hereafter flow through the veins of commerce. It is not to the people of the flooded lands that these benefits go—but to all the people of the communities—the counties and the wider areas. Will these industries relocate on the banks of the new lake? Can any sort of contract enforce their continuance in the county? The answers are obvious.

CONSIDERABLE SLICE

"Altogether, this proposed dam will cut a considerable slice from east Tennessee—from its body politic, from its body social, from its body economic. And altogether, too, let us observe, it is a seizure of common wealth for special purposes.

"And what is all this for? What are the benefits to accrue that would make this social and economic destruction worth while? What is our democracy contemplating in thus altering the face of nature and the course of human affairs?

"There are many advantages, of course. Otherwise, the proposal would be an absurdity on the face of it. The French Broad is a contributary to the Tennessee River system. It is a power potential—a defense potential. And it lies within the purposes of the Tennessee Valley Authority to develop this region.

"Here let us pause before a most critical question. Let us be careful of our words. If it is the purpose of the T. V. A. to develop this region, what is the meaning of the word 'develop'? If it is democracy we are to defend, what is the meaning of 'democracy'?

IS THIS THE WAY?

"Can we achieve development—can we preserve democracy—by destroying the homes, the common wealth and community life of our people? And is it a democratic principle that the most good for the most people (even if it could be established that more people would be thus benefited) justifies the total destruction of minority interests? Is it a democratic principle that one section of the country should be totally destroyed in order that a thin benefit can accrue to the whole? Let us suppose that an additional dam is needed. Shall we then conclude that east Tennessee which has already contributed more land to national defense than any other equal section of the country—shall be the only contributor?

"Why then have we not objected to the flooding of other lands? Why raise this question now? For the very democratic reason that our people of east Tennessee can be expected to make equal—even greater—sacrifices than others. They can give much but they cannot give all. To surrender its richest land to one dam is a hardship that we can expect to bear. With a second and a third dam we are impoverished. With now another dam—the Douglas Dam—we are ruined utterly.

APPEAL MADE

"I appeal to the Tennessee Valley Authority and to the Federal Government for a proper development of this region—for a development that leads to a fuller life for our people—to the welfare and security and defense of our democracy. I submit that democracy has deeper and more enduring purposes than the immediate manufacture of powder and shot. I submit that democracy should defend itself by nurturing its own inner strength. Our country is more than an aggregate of separate parts. It is a living organism and its members are not separable and destructible at will. The hand cannot say to the foot, "I have no need of

you." The function of east Tennessee is that of a democratic community essential to the welfare of the whole. I beg of you preserve it in this right."

Products sold from farms affected by proposed Douglas Dam Reservoir

GENERAL CROPS SOLD

Corn, 107,770 bushels, at 90 cents	$96,993.00
Small grain, 33,247 bushels, at $1.10	36,571.00
Hay, 1,177 tons, at $20	23,540.00
Tobacco, 496,000 pounds, at 20 cents	99,200.00

VEGETABLES SOLD

Sweet corn, 4,750 tons, at $12	53,000.00
Cabbage, 4,079 tons, at $9	36,711.00
Peas, 1,059,840 pounds, at 3 cents	31,795.20
Lima Beans, 552,755 pounds, at 3 cents	16,581.65
Green beans, 15,127 bushels, at 65 cents	9,832.55
Other vegetables, 3,574,000 pounds, at 1 cent	35,740.00

LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS SOLD

Hogs, 1,503,619 pounds, at 10 cents	$150,361.90
Cattle, 2,433,283 pounds, at 9½ cents	231,161.88
Lambs, 78,635 pounds, at 12 cents	9,436.20
Poultry, 98,589 pounds, at 14 cents	12,802.46
Eggs, 339,966 dozen, at 28 cents	95,180.48
Milk, 3,767,136 pounds, at 2 cents	75,342.72

FRUITS SOLD

Total number pounds food products	42,449,373
Grapes, 120,000 pounds, at 2½ cents	$3,000.00
Apples, 30,000 bushels, at 90 cents	27,000.00
Peaches, 1,000 bushels, at $1.10	1,100.00
Total, 44,019,373 pounds	1,045,350.04
Value of farm products consumed by families living on farms in reservoir	226,100.00
Total value of all products sold and consumed	1,271,450.04

INFORMATION PERTAINING TO DOUGLAS RESERVOIR

Total number of farms	324
Total number of acres	60,742
Total number of families living on farms	757
Total number of people living on farms	3,251
Total number of people employed:	
Full time	997
Part time	1,139
Total time	2,136

INDUSTRIES AFFECTED

Stokely Bros. & Co	(1)
Bush Bros. & Co	(1)
Alfred Swann	(2)
Flour mills	(3)
Total number of workers employed in plants affected	2,002

[1] 2 canning plants.
[2] 1 canning and food-processing plant.
[3] 3 plants.

COMPARATIVE QUALITY OF LAND—3 RESERVOIRS

	Norris	Cherokee	Douglas
No. I land, percent	2	6	26
No. V land, do	22	11	2

Class I land is the best agricultural land—produces high yields of a wide variety of crops and can be cropped almost every year.

Class V land is adapted only to the production of timber.

Assessed valuation, Jefferson County	$7,450,929.23
Total land tax, Jefferson County	159,032.99
Tax on farms in proposed reservoir or 16.23 percent of total	25,817.77

WHERE DOES DOUGLAS DAM GET NAME?

How did the proposed T. V. A. dam on the French Broad River nead Dandridge get to be known as the Douglas Dam?

President James D. Hoskins, of the University of Tennessee, who is protesting building of the dam—and a native of Jefferson County—said he didn't know the origin.

Maurice Henle, brass collar of the T. V. A. information staff, likewise couldn't comment on the derivation.

Came James Myers, Knoxville photographer and a Jefferson Countian, to the rescue:

"Ho," said James, "they don't know? It's because there's a Douglas settlement there."

Letter From Congressman Hall to Justice Deyo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

LETTER FROM HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, OF NEW YORK

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. MARTIN W. DEYO,
Supreme Court Chambers,
Binghamton, N. Y.

MY DEAR JUDGE DEYO: You have permitted my libel suit against the Binghamton Press for injury to my good name and reputation to stand.

As Congressman, I have always welcomed legitimate and constructive criticism of my every public act from the people of this district. You have drawn the line distinctly between fair comment, with which most citizens scrutinize my record in Congress, and the deliberately organized smear campaign leveled by certain politicos last February against me. You reestablish justice by defending a duly elected official from blasphemy launched by ruthless political foes, whose inability to dictate to me left them frustrated to the point of seeking vengeance.

By your action you approve the right of a Representative to carry out his constitutional duties such as voting on great issues without undue interference from those even in high places, who, for their own good, ought to be strengthening instead of weakening constitutional procedure.

In reaching your conclusion in this whole unpleasant occurrence, it is obvious you have given heed to a famous passage which reads:

"He that stealeth my purse stealeth trash, but he that stealeth my good name stealeth that which enricheth him not at all but maketh me poor indeed."

Your Congressman,

EDWIN A. HALL.

The National Committee for Agriculture—Washington Farm Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

LETTER FROM F. L. ROBINSON, CHAIRMAN

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter written by the National Committee for Agriculture giving a brief analysis of the 1941 farm-credit bill, H. R. 5336, along with some additional information about the operation of the wheat program.

The Agricultural Committee of the House, of which I am chairman, will hold hearings on this very important bill during the early part of the fall, at which time notice of the actual dates of the hearings will be given to the press.

The letter follows:

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE
FOR AGRICULTURE,
WASHINGTON FARM LETTER.
Washington, D. C., August 25, 1941.

DEAR FRIEND: Introduced in Congress is a bill for the reorganization of the farm-credit system—H. R. 5336, by FULMER, of the House. Write your Congressman if you want a copy of this important bill, which probably will come up for consideration this session

Announced basic objectives of the bill are: (1) Obtain for farmers the lowest interest rates possible "consistent with sound financing and operating practices"; (2) permit land banks and farm-mortgage corporation to adjust certain of their loans to the true ability of the borrower to pay; and (3) to provide a method for farmers to repurchase farms at their real value, which they are now unable to repurchase for want of adequate credit facilities.

Federal land-bank system would be reorganized on a membership and patronage basis instead of present stock basis Borrowers would become members of national farm-loan associations; farm-loan associations would become members of Federal land banks. All outstanding stock of banks and associations would be retired at par. New memberships would be acquired by payment of a fee equal to 2 percent of the unmatured principal of their obligations held by the bank.

Bill would not become effective until at least 75 percent of borrowers had paid or agreed to pay the fee. Then land bank and loan associations would operate as a cooperative system of membership corporations. Stock now held by land banks, plus amount contributed by the Government as paid-in surplus of the banks, would be converted into a single, flexible, revolving fund of Government capital available for allocation within the system at those points most needed.

Former borrowers who have not received par value for their stock in the past would be paid the difference between what they received and par value.

Loan associations would have three major sources of income: (1) Preference distributions up to one-eighth of 1 percent of the unmatured principal of the obligations of their members to the bank (associations would also have authority to issue additional preferential distributions out of net earnings with approval of F. C. A.); (2) patronage dividends from net earnings of the system; (3) compensations for services to land banks and mortgage corporations.

Losses previously falling upon local associations would be limited in future to 50 percent of the losses incurred.

Idea is to spread costs and losses on a broader cooperative membership basis. F. C. A. analysis of bill claims new plan would eliminate the concentration of losses, which in the past has wrecked more than 60 percent of associations. Hope is "to provide reasonable assurance that local losses resulting from uncontrollable local causes cannot wreck the local units as they have in the past, and to permit the system's profits to be shared more evenly among its members."

New bill provides loan rate of 3½ percent up to July 1, 1946. After that loan rate would be computed on average cost of funds, banks and corporations get through sale of bonds to finance loans plus 1½ percent charge to cover operating costs and losses. Farm Mortgage Corporation would charge an additional rate sufficient to maintain the rate on land-bank Commissioner loans one-half of 1 percent above rate on land-bank loans.

Loans made between time act goes into effect and July 1, 1946, would be computed on similar basis after 1946, but would be subject to a top limit of 4 percent.

Important provision of bill is one on refinancing excessive indebtedness. Bill limits this authority to cases in which land bank or mortgage corporation is a creditor. However, authority is granted in such cases to refinance a borrower's whole indebtedness up to, but not beyond, the appraised value of the land.

Bill also provides that committees selected by the local national farm-loan associations have responsibility of reviewing applications for refinancing. "They are to determine and to certify to the bank or the corporation," says F. C. A. analysis, "whether the farmer has any reasonable expectation of being rehabilitated through adjustment of the terms of payment of the amount he owes, and whether he would be able to carry out the obligations required of him if he should be refinanced on the basis of his application.

"If the application is granted, the farmer would be required to transfer title to his property to the bank or to the corporation and operate it under a lease for a period of 5 years, at the end of which, if he has carried out the requirements of the lease and demonstrated his ability to carry on with the obligation, the property would be retransferred to him subject to a mortgage for the balance remaining after crediting an appropriate part of the amount he has paid as rent during the lease period."

Similar refinancing method would be followed with persons whose debts have been scaled down by the courts under Bankruptcy Act, and who had established the right to refinance or repurchase their farms.

National Committee for Agriculture sponsored good-will tour of 450 western wheat farmers riding on two special trains into eastern Ohio and western Indiana early this month. Object was to get low-down on eastern protests to wheat marketing quotas, to give easterners views of western growers who depend almost entirely on wheat for livelihood.

First stop was at Dayton, Ohio, where more than 400 Buckeye farmers met special trains, toured them through Army Air Corps' Wright Field, then drove them in individual cars into some 15 surrounding counties to talk with farmers. Next stop was at Anderson, Ind., where Hoosier farmers were hosts in similar manner.

Westerners found opposition to quotas dying out; volume of opposition much smaller than indicated by press reports of quota protest meetings; heard numerous comments of quota flames being fanned by disgruntled politicians wanting opportunity to regain spotlight by discrediting farm program.

Touring farmers found Hoosiers and Buckeyes excellent hosts; crashed front pages with news and pictures all along the route. Both eastern and western farmers felt tour contributed much to greater understanding of wheat problem and need for maintaining quotas.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR AGRICULTURE,
F. L. ROBINSON, *Chairman*.

Generoso Pope Turns Against Mussolini

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK POST

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to extend my remark in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by publishing an article contained in the issue of the New York Post on Monday, September 8, 1941, concerning Generoso Pope.

I am making this request particularly because so much controversy has been stirred up by my previous remarks concerning the patriotism and the public services of Mr. Pope, that it gives me great pleasure to see a newspaper making a round-about-face and acknowledge in no uncertain terms that Mr. Pope is no Fascist but, on the contrary, a true, loyal, and distinguished American.

The article follows:

[From the New York Post]

GENEROSO POPE TURNS AGAINST MUSSOLINI

Generoso Pope, publisher of Il Progresso and in past years generally regarded as a stanch supporter of the Mussolini government, said today that "my attitude has changed."

"The quicker Hitler and the Axis Powers are destroyed the better off the world will be," he told a New York Post reporter. "And when I say Axis Powers that includes Mussolini."

Pope's statement followed the publication yesterday in Il Progresso of an interview with Laird Archer, foreign director of the Near East Foundation, in which Archer said that Italian forces occupying Greece share the Greeks' hatred of the Nazis. In forwarding copies of the interview to other New York newspapers, Pope commented that "Italy is today as much a victim of the Axis as a member of it."

NOTHING IN COMMON

Asked today if this indicated a change in his viewpoint, Pope said in his offices, 30 Rockefeller Plaza:

"The Italian people have nothing in common with the Germans. My attitude toward the Italian people has not changed. My attitude toward the Government has changed."

Il Progresso's interview with Archer, who was in Greece during the invasion and afterward, quoted him as picturing a "total job of destruction" by the Nazis both in Greece and Crete.

FAUCETS TAKEN AWAY

"When the Italian authorities started to take over the duties of patrolling the occupied areas in Greece after the Nazi blitzkrieg they found conditions deplorable," he said. "Furniture, food, war material, industrial equipment, and even faucets from public and private places were taken away by the departing Nazis.

"Women and children were underfed. The monetary situation favored the Nazi soldiers in the ratio of about three to one as compared to the Italian soldiers. Germans bought up everything at bargain rates in relation to the value of Greek money. They stripped the country bare.

"The Italians, appalled, voluntarily helped the Greek people in their recovery efforts."

THE BARBARIANS

"They shipped 48,000 tins of milk to feed the women and children. The Italian ship left Brindisi with this supply, but the Germans had got news of the arrangements. The Nazis were bitter against the Greek people because the latter referred to them as barbarians. They thought that if the milk supply reached the Greeks the Italians would be looked upon as great humanitarians and the Nazis as beasts. So, when the ship reached the Greek port, the Nazis immediately confiscated the supply for themselves."

The Greeks, he said, learned about this, and appreciate the fact that the Italians are trying to help them

"VICTIMS OF CIRCUMSTANCES"

"The Greeks consider the Italians to be victims of circumstances," Archer said. "One gets the impression that both the Italians and the Greeks mistrust all German moves."

He said he had been informed that the Italian soldiers when they invaded Greece had been told that the Greek authorities would submit to occupation.

"There does not seem to be any doubt that the Italian soldiers were deceived," he said. "All the talk that has been going on about the lack of bravery of the Italian soldiers is not true. They lacked the proper equipment and the proper organization for a war against Greece. They were ready only for a military parade."

Transcontinental or Super Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. BUELL SNYDER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am once again calling attention to the necessity of transcontinental or super highways. Public sentiment has reached a place now where the vast majority of our people, regardless of where they live or what they do, are in favor of such highways. The super highway in Pennsylvania, running from Pittsburgh to Harrisburg, has demonstrated to all that a highway system, such as my bill H. R. 3461 calls for, is not only advisable, but would be an economic procedure, as well as a big factor, in national defense.

Mr. Speaker, if we go down to the railroad station and hook a well-steamed engine to a thousand cars, we find it takes only a few seconds to get up speed and be off toward Baltimore at a rapid rate. But if we hook the same engine to a hundred well-filled and weighted-down

cars, we find it takes a lot of puffing—taking up the slack—and it takes many minutes before we get up full cruising speed.

We find the same thing true in Congress. If we introduce a worth-while measure of magnitude, it takes time to get momentum to carry on.

I introduced in 1936 a bill calling for super highways across the Nation. My bill called for 3 highways running east and west and 6 running north and south—each about 8 lanes wide. It called for these highways to bypass all cities, to be as straight as possible, to be cut down at either side level with the surface of the highway a distance of 250 feet. It is estimated that the roads in my bill would make a total mileage of 16,000 miles, and the average cost would be $500,000 a mile.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that I advocated that we start building such roads in 1936, and I again advocated it in 1937, and again in 1938, and each year since. I said that it would put a million men to work each year, and that if and when an emergency would come, these roads would add 25 percent to our national-defense efficiency and economy, and at all times would benefit the Nation's producers and consumers in a like manner.

The measure was not adopted, but I am happy to say that more than half the Members of this House, believe in a system of highways, such as my bill calls for. They believe, with me, that it should have been done before this time. But now is not the time to start building these roads. The time to start to build them will be immediately after the mills and factories that are now turning out national-defense equipment will be shut down, after this emergency. We must expect that at least four or five million men will be out of work when national-defense emergency equipment is no longer needed. That will be the time that we should have this engineering and surveying work completed, so that we can turn these men right over to building these roads.

Mr. Speaker, I am revising my bill so that it will incorporate the necessary language that will enable the survey to be made, the engineering work done, and the blue prints ready to start work on such highways when Hitler says "nuff."

Mill-Town Miracle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE READER'S DIGEST

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the district I have the privilege to represent in the Congress. I am proud of the men and women I have the privilege to serve in this greatest legislative body in the world. The men and women of my congressional district, true to the traditions of the South, are a great and hospitable people.

Many of you have already read the September issue of the Reader's Digest, but this morning I rise to invite the attention of all to the article entitled "Mill-Town Miracle," which concerns the work and achievements of a distinguished educator of my own home town. I want every Member of Congress to read about L. P. "Pete" Hollis, of Greenville, S. C., because he is one of those leaders with vision and capacity who has helped the South march to new milestones of progress in education and social welfare. In Greenville we are all proud of "Pete" Hollis and I am sure you will understand why after you have read the article which I ask be printed in the permanent RECORD of Congress.

The article follows:

[From the Reader's Digest of September 1941]

MILL-TOWN MIRACLE

(Condensed from School and Society)

(By George Kent)

Not many years ago the 14 mill towns around Greenville, S. C., were as dismal as their names, such names as Union Bleachery or American Spinning. The houses were clapboard boxes standing bleakly at attention within earshot of the factory whistle. Company police kept order; company schools purveyed perfunctory education which ended abruptly in the fifth grade.

Then a man named L. P. Hollis was appointed district school superintendent and things began to brighten up. Hollis, called Pete by everybody, set out to educate each one of the 25,000 inhabitants. "It is not enough to teach children," he said. "You must also teach the parents." To do this he created a school system which is the center of all community life and has made the dreary towns attractive and happy places to live in, changed a listless people into self-respecting, purposeful citizens. The schools now are wholly independent of the mills.

Hollis' community education may be seen at work any day in the 14 towns. It may be the library on wheels, which rolls from door to door. It may be a schoolmobile with a woman inside baking biscuits to show women the value of electrical appliances. A full-time psychiatrist goes through the district giving parents expert advice on the management of their children. A few years ago illiteracy was a problem: Hollis sent 9 teachers to hold classes in homes, schools, and factories. At the end of that year 435 adults had learned to read and write.

Broken bottles and tin cans once disfigured the front yards of the towns. Pigpens added reek and ugliness. Today, although family incomes average less than $1,000 a year, you see pleasant lawns, gay and individual with shrubbery, lily pools, and home-made garden furniture. Of their own accord the mill-workers laid sidewalks, created public rose parks. The cost of these improvements came out of their pockets voluntarily.

Pete Hollis, who started all this, had never taught school a day in his life. He is a tall 200-pounder now in his middle fifties, the son of a cotton farmer. He came to the neighborhood as a welfare worker. It was not long after his arrival that everybody realized he was the man to go to in time of trouble. If a house burned down, Hollis pledged his personal credit for new furniture and clothing. If expensive sickness came, he helped out. His secretary complains, "He never has a dime, because he is always lending money." But in all that concerns the schools and the community he is a careful, farsighted planner.

Hollis' appointment as head of the school system was virtually forced on him. When the schools of the 14 towns consolidated as the Parker School District in 1923 no educator could be found to take the job of superintendent. The buildings were run down, the budget meager. In desperation the job was given to Hollis, the community wheel horse.

The new superintendent first set about to clean the old buildings within an inch of their creaky lives. He ripped out the seats. In the carpenter shop the boys knocked together a lot of plain tables and chairs. These were easily moved, could be stacked in a corner, or arranged in a circle informally about the teacher. On these cheap tables no child was afraid to spill paint or smear clay. Small, low-cost improvements, they made a big difference in the attitude of the children.

Before Hollis took charge the youngsters threw stones at the schoolhouse windows. Today they linger long after dismissal, reluctant to leave their reading, hammering, and research work. Scores arrive in the morning before their teachers to get in a lick on some treasured project.

In much the same spirit Hollis overhauled the teaching system. He begged the use of a vacant summer camp and invited his entire staff to spend 6 weeks there working out plans for improvement. The cost was so low and the possibilities for fun so enticing that 160 teachers came. Mornings were given to study; afternoons and evenings to sport. In this atmosphere most of the 160 became fired with Hollis' enthusiasm for community education.

Hollis pays salaries above the State average, lends teachers money when they are broke, organizes picnics when they go stale. On these occasions Hollis is chef, boyishly proud of his skill with a steak and an open fire. A few years ago he took 26 teachers to New York for the summer session at Teachers College. They all lived at one apartment house, meeting over home-cooked meals to discuss their discoveries. The school paid half the expense and was amply repaid by the ideas that emerged.

One afternoon Hollis was stopped on a Greenville street by a wealthy merchant. "Pete," said the man, "what would you do with $1,000?" Hollis mentally checked down his list of necessities and remembered the babies born on kitchen tables, the large number of mother and infant deaths due to ignorance and poverty, and replied, "I would do something for women who were going to have babies."

The merchant wrote out a check for $1,000; this enabled Hollis to take over a 5-room frame dwelling, put in beds, engage nurses and start in a small way the now famous maternity shelter. Later, funds from the Duke Foundation and the American Woman's Hospital enabled him to expand its facilities.

In 10 years some 2,400 babies have been delivered in this school hospital. Foundlings and ailing infants born elsewhere have been taken care of, and several thousand women have come to its clinics for prenatal attention and birth-control advice.

Senior high-school girls go to the shelter each morning to bathe babies, make up formulas and help mothers. If their parents consent, the girls may watch a delivery. They study nutrition and physiology. In this atmosphere facts of sex and reproduction are learned naturally and wholesomely. After 20 hours at the shelter the girls earn coif and apron, become health couriers. Armed with mask and thermometer they go from house to house preaching the importance of proper screening and eating, reporting any illness that needs attention.

Second only to the shelter in interest is the People's College, whose slogan is "All sorts of classes for all sorts of people." Some 3,200

men and women attended last year, learning everything from how to sing in a choir to the art of setting a table. One class arrived to find quarters of beef hanging from the ceiling and a local meat cutter ready to lecture—as he cut and sawed—on what to look for in a butcher shop. The school lights blaze until past midnight. There is a complete textile plant and machine shop to which mill hands come after work to learn skills that will mean advancement.

In the schools the Hollis system is to supply materials, opportunity, and incentive. The rest is up to the boys and girls. Science study begins with some personal interest—an enthusiasm for airplanes or a desire to repair the family electric iron. Whatever it is, it becomes the student's private door opening into the vast world of science. Three boys bought a model T Ford for a dollar, brought it to the schoolyard, dismantled it, carried the parts one by one to their third-floor shop. There it was reassembled with the aid of blueprints and a visit to an assembly plant. Then the car was again taken apart, again reassembled in the yard, and driven off.

Some years ago a group of boys, after visiting the children's museum at Washington, N. C., proposed to build a museum of their own. It was to be a log-cabin museum; a campaign to sell logs at a dollar each was successful, the museum was built and, in the course of time, filled with treasures that only curious, ferreting youngsters can find.

One feature of the Parker School District is the year-end science fair. Everything is there from windmills which actually pump water to tomatoes grown in chemical solution. At the last fair, visitors were welcomed by a 24-foot-long electric sign, student-built, which spelled out "Parker" in letters 4 feet high.

When older students quit school, Hollis gets them half-time jobs in the careers they wish to pursue. The rest of the day they spend studying subjects tied in with their main interest. At present, there are 16 classes meeting in the factories, under working foremen with a gift for teaching. Hollis' young people wait on you in department stores and beauty parlors. They straighten your fenders, print your visiting cards, work in offices.

The whole program of community education in the Parker district is carried out through funds raised by local taxation supplemented by some State support. And Hollis spends each year only $54.05 per pupil, whereas education throughout South Carolina costs $67.21 per pupil.

Here is education without frills at low cost, producing fine citizens and restoring family life. The Hollis achievement can be duplicated in any community. All that is needed is a shoestring for capital and a belief in the willingness of men and women to help themselves.

Six Years of the National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

ARTICLE BY H. A. MILLIS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Dr. H. A. Millis, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, entitled "Six Years of the National Labor Relations Act," published in the August number of the Labor Information Bulletin.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Labor Information Bulletin of August 1941]

SIX YEARS OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

(By H. A. Millis, Chairman, National Labor Relations Board)

The beginning of the year 1941 marked two significant changes in the activities of the National Labor Relations Board. The number of new cases coming to the Board, which had been declining during 1940, began to increase abruptly. Second, the hitherto normal predominance of cases containing charges of unfair labor practices by employers was shifted to a predominance of petitions for employee elections. More than anything else, the reversal of two such important trends in the activities of the Board signifies the value and accomplishments of the National Labor Relations Act in the field of labor relations.

In the nearly 6 years of the existence of the N. L. R. B. there were only two periods in which the Board received more than 1,000 new cases a month. The first time this occurred was in May 1937, immediately after the act had been upheld by the Supreme Court. The second period began 4 years later, in May of this year, when 1,075 new charges and petitions were filed with the Board.

It will be remembered that in 1937 complaints against antiunion activities were uppermost in the minds of American workers. Two-thirds of the issues presented to the Board in May of that year concerned unfair labor practices. In May of this year, however, the workers filed more election petitions than they did charges and were apparently principally concerned with the problem of establishing majority claims for representation at the bargaining table with their employers.

What causes underlie this shift? The answer lies in the growth of collective bargaining as an accepted and living practice in industrial relations. Unfair labor practices are not a part of collective bargaining. On the contrary, they impede and retard the normal processes of collective bargaining. Worker elections, on the other hand, are an integral part and a necessary first step in collective bargaining. The rapid displacement of unfair labor practice cases by petitions for elections thus reflects a fundamental change toward sound labor relations during the course of the past 4 years. All the other operations of the National Labor Relations Act seem to buttress that conclusion.

The act has emerged from its testing period as a seasoned instrument. The Board's interpretations of the act have been largely clarified by the courts. Employers now know their responsibilities under the law, and workers can define the scope and limits of protection which the act affords them. More and more employers have therefore come to accept the act, not only as a matter of compliance with law but in the affirmative belief that collective bargaining alone can maintain fair and stable relations between American workmen and management.

CLARIFICATION BY COURTS

The National Labor Relations Act has probably undergone more legal interpretation during the 4 years since it was declared valid than any other national law during the same period of time. The Supreme Court has passed on 34 of its cases and the circuit courts of appeals on 191. The procedure of the Board has been reviewed and declared fair and proper by the Supreme Court. Its jurisdiction has been thoroughly tested. Upon each of the unfair labor practices specified by the Board has been built a body of legal precedent covering many detailed situations and serving as a guide to proper observance of the act.

The field is too vast for extended treatment here. A few examples will illustrate the new code of labor relations, including the rights and duties imposed by the act and enforced by the courts.

Workers now know through court rulings that they lose the protection of the act if they seize their employer's plant or if they deliberately attack fellow workers during a strike. On the other hand, they also know that picketing and a minor brawl on the picket line need not of themselves deprive them of their rights. Workers likewise know that they may claim reinstatement if union activity was the cause for their discharge, but that discharge for ordinary breach of plant discipline lies within the rights of their employers and will not be handled by the Board.

Unfair practices: Employers for their part are informed by court precedent that connivance with some of their workers to enter into illegal employment contracts will not be permitted. Employers are now aware that the words of the act saying that the employer may not "interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees" mean concretely that he must not hire labor spies, must not close down his plant as a means of discouraging workers' organizations, show favoritism toward one of several competing labor organizations, hastily grant concessions to forestall organization, give direct financial support to an employee organization, or refuse to hire a worker for the sole reason that he is on a blacklist.

These and many other unfair labor practices found by the Board and approved by the courts fall under the general category of "interference" and are subjected to testimony, rebuttal, and cross-examination in open hearing. Six years ago many employers opposed the act on the ground that its definition of unfair labor practices were too general. Today the precedents are specific, and no employer need unwittingly break the law.

The provisions in the act which makes it unfair for an employer to refuse to bargain collectively with the representative of the majority of his employees was at first thought by many to be too vague for legal definition. The courts, however, have had no difficulty in setting up guideposts, for ascertaining whether or not an employer is attempting to negotiate in good faith. A point-blank refusal to bargain, conscious procrastination, reluctance in offering counter proposals, and a refusal to sign a written contract when its terms are mutually acceptable—these have all been found to be in violation of the collective-bargaining clause. The act, however, has no concern with the terms of an agreement, and an employer who bargains in good faith is not compelled to accept or reject particular demands made on him.

While stress is laid on the employer's duty to bargain collectively, it must not be forgotten that the individual worker must pursue a long and regularized course of action before he may enjoy the benefits of collective bargaining. Under the National Labor Relations Act the worker must find enough of his fellow workers to make a majority in his bargaining unit; he must abstain from illegal conduct in obtaining recognition of that majority; his representatives must offer their terms and weigh counter proposals offered by the employer. The Labor Board has ruled on these situations, and the courts have interpreted and applied these rulings in sufficient detail to make their meaning clear to all parties.

Compliance: While the constitutionality of the National Labor Relations Act remained in

doubt during the first 2 years, employers as a rule refused to comply with decisions of the Board. After the law was upheld by the Supreme Court in the spring of 1937, compliance became a necessity in cases where Board rulings were upheld by the courts. The number of consent decrees whereby the employer agreed to have a Board ruling entered in a circuit court of appeals without contesting it before the Court has also greatly increased.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937 (the end of the fiscal year in which the act was upheld), there were 17 court decisions and 2 consent decrees. During 1938 there were 27 court decisions and 11 consent decrees, showing that compliance was still grudging and had to be enforced by litigation. A year later there were 45 court decisions but the number of consent decrees had risen to 147. During the fiscal year ending June 1940, there were 69 court decisions and 173 consent decrees, and preliminary figures for the fiscal year of 1941 show a continuance of the trend which has made the entry of Board orders by consent numerically of far more importance than cases enforced by court decisions.

It should also be noted that many of the unfair labor practice decisions of the past 2 years cover events which actually occurred in 1937 and 1938 and have required that long to proceed through the regular channels of hearings, decisions, and litigation. The relative decrease in the numbers of unfair labor practice cases coming to the Board, and the increasing willingness of employers to end cases by consent decrees, combine to form the conclusion that the Board may hope to expend less and less effort on enforcing the unfair labor practice provisions of the act and more time in conducting employee elections.

Unfair labor practice cases which run the whole course of formal procedure amount to only 10 percent of all Board cases. Any analysis of the services rendered to labor and to employers by the N. L. R. B. must therefore place major emphasis on the compliance with the act obtained by the Board through informal negotiation. About 40 percent of all the 28,000 cases the Board has closed during 5 years represent issues either dismissed by the Board or withdrawn by originators of the case. Another 50 percent has been settled in the field informally and with the agreement of all parties concerned.

The enforcement of the unfair labor practice provisions of the act, whether through court decisions or informal discussion under the supervision of a Board field representative, represents the negative side of the Board's work. It is a clearing away of obstructions which hinder both parties of the industrial relationship from getting together, Those obstructions removed, workers are free if they wish to express their choice for bargaining representatives through the secret ballot.

EMPLOYEE ELECTIONS

Defense production has vastly increased the use of the Board's election machinery. Even though employers and unions are showing an increasing disposition to arrange elections by consent, the number of the representation cases which have gone to formal hearing has doubled during the past year. This makes for industrial peace, not only because it offers the ballot box as a substitute for an otherwise contentious dispute, but also because it advances the collective bargaining procedure that much further on its way to establish sound and peaceful relations between labor and management.

The essence of a successful solution of a representation dispute is speed. When the consent of all parties can be obtained, the Board is able on the average to conduct an election 3 weeks after the petition is filed. To speed proceedings where consent cannot be obtained, the Board announced last March that it would give priority to cases involving defense industries. Among the cases so advanced were, for instance, those of the Ford Motor Co. and the Bethlehem Steel Corporation.

The Ford case is a foremost example of the beneficial results which follow the free choice of representatives in a secret election. On May 21, 1941, Board agents conducted elections at the River Rouge and Lincoln plants of the Ford Co. in which a total of 77,000 valid votes were cast. At that time there were 9 outstanding cases of unfair labor practices pending against the company. In 2 of these the Board's ruling had been upheld by the courts, the other 7 being in various stages of hearing and litigation. Less than a month later the Ford Motor Co. signed a contract with the United Automobile Workers of America, which was chosen by an overwhelming vote to represent the workers. At the same time all 9 cases against the company were written off the books upon terms acceptable to the Board, the company, and the automobile workers' union.

The Bethlehem Steel Corporation had agreed, as one of the terms of a strike settlement covering its Lackawanna plant, that it would cooperate in the holding of a Board election. That, likewise, resulted in a company agreement with the union chosen by the majority, and within a few weeks elections were held at six more Bethlehem plants upon mutual consent.

WRITTEN AGREEMENTS

In enacting the National Labor Relations Act in 1935 the Congress of the United States expressed the expectation that the act would result in mutual benefits to employers, workers, and the general public. The expected benefits were stability of plant operation, employment terms reached by negotiation and established for a definite period ahead, and open channels for the adjustment of grievances without fear of retaliation. All these are now generally included in most written collective agreements. It is not the worker alone who benefits through submission of all shop problems to a signed document. Employers with long experience under contracts rarely desire to return to the uncertainties of a shop kept in a state of worker restlessness because of the absence of a written document embodying the pledge of mutual responsibility.

The written contract has the virtue of including within itself the cure of many problems which otherwise might have to find their solution on the picket line. There is a growing disposition to write into them a mutual understanding that there shall be neither strikes nor lock-outs during the life of the contract and that all disputed points shall be settled by peaceful means, with voluntary arbitration when a settlement can be reached in no other way. Contracts often provide for continuous dealing between worker and employer representatives. Wage scales, seniority regulations, vacations, and other contentious matters are put down in black and white. The flexibility of written contracts to meet new conditions is shown by the fact that many now contain provisions for reemployment and seniority in case a worker is called to military service.

While the National Labor Relations Act does not specifically mention the written contract, its statement of findings and policy cites the public necessity to achieve "the stabilization of competitive wage rates and working conditions." The Supreme Court has interpreted the act to mean that the terms of any labor contract, provided it is mutually agreeable to the employer and to the union, should be reduced to writing and signed by both parties.

Protected Camp Immorality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I believe the statements contained in the editorials which appeared in the well-known Catholic periodical America, entitled "Protected Camp Immorality" are of sufficient importance to warrant the attention and active interest of the membership of the Senate and the House.

The conditions existing in our Army camps as revealed in this article come to me as a great shock as it must to the entire membership of this House. It is our plain duty to demand that the military authorities take prompt action to end this vicious practice which tends to destroy the morals of our young men.

The editorial follows:

[From America of August 2, 1941]

PROTECTED CAMP IMMORALITY

When a million young men are gathered from all parts of the country and put in military camps, social problems of the most difficult nature at once arise. The average man at home has his job, his hobbies, and his recreations. He is a clerk, student, a beginner at a trade, a businessman. His hobby may be music or stamp collecting or work as an amateur carpenter. For recreation he occasionally visits a moving-picture theater, attends a dance now and then, and sits in at a baseball game as often as he can find the time.

All these activities are forcibly set aside by the necessary discipline of a camp. The soldier lives with companions whom he has not chosen and is taken up with occupations which, at best, he may barely tolerate. The old self-chosen life has ended, and he finds himself in a life of which 12 months ago he never dreamed. Obviously, the situation demands an adjustment which in some cases will be reached only with considerable difficulty.

No doubt the military authorities are even more keenly aware of these difficulties than any civilian can be. They know that men are not a herd of brutes who can be trained, at least in some fashion, by a show of force. Their problem here is to ease the young recruits into their new life, with only the degree of compulsion which military experience has shown to be useful. A new recruit is not exactly paralleled by a new boy at a preparatory school, but the conditions of the two have much in common.

One approach to a solution of this difficult problem is through a program which provides the recruits with facilities for athletic games and with such amusements as moving pictures and dances. To many of the newly fledged soldiers these devices are very helpful. Occasionally the men are granted leave to amuse themselves outside the military camps, and the authorities try to keep the immediate neighborhood free from resorts which furnish opportunities for the intemperate use of alcohol and especially for sexual irregularities. In taking this desirable precaution, the authorities do not profess to act as censors of moral conduct. Their sole purpose is to keep disease out of the Army.

With that purpose we do not quarrel, for it undoubtedly prevents much disorder. What we do protest, however, and vigorously, is the apparent belief of the authorities that to prevent disease they are at liberty to use means and methods which are themselves immoral, and which, at least in some cases, even suggest that immoral practices may be indulged in provided that precautions against disease are taken.

It is decidedly shocking to know that, under Army regulations, quartermasters are required to have on hand at all times a stock of mechanical devices which are supposed to protect the user against disease arising from sexual promiscuity. The new recruit is warned against immoral courses, not only by the chaplains but also by the Army regulations. Should he contract a disease in consequence of violation of these regulations, he is subject to severe punishment. What is banned by the regulations is not, then, immorality but the disease which frequently follows it. In this respect the recruit may lead as immoral a life as he can manage, in view of the restrictions upon his liberty, but if, with the aid of devices furnished him by the Army, he escapes disease, he incurs no censure.

How many parents know of this practice? With sorrow and fear they watched their sons march away, but they were willing to give them to protect and defend their country. What do they think of the protection given their sons by the Army?

The arguments urged for this vile practice are not new. They were urged 24 years ago, when the armies were recruited for the first World War. They shocked the Christian conscience then, and they shock the Christian conscience today.

But it is a worthless shock unless it stimulates us to action. We suggest, therefore, that you write your protest at once to your Senators and to the Congressman from your district. Let him know that you approve the action of the military authorities in putting all evil resorts out of bounds for soldiers, but that you object vigorously to the practice of furnishing these young men with devices which may lessen their fear of sexual immorality by protecting them against disease. Congress can change the regulation which requires the quartermasters to purchase these devices, and Congress must change it.

Should there be any doubt in the minds of anybody as to the bad effect this policy of our military authorities may have on the morals of our young men, I suggest the reading of our article entitled "Morals Versus Health of the Men in the Camps," by Rev. Paul L. Blakely, S. J.:

[From America of August 9, 1941]

MORALS VERSUS HEALTH OF THE MEN IN THE CAMPS

(By Paul L. Blakely, S. J.)

In an editorial published last week under the heading "Protected Camp Immorality," this Review directed attention to an Army practice which is causing much uneasiness to thousands of American fathers and mothers. The editorial was written under a grave sense of duty. No decent man cares to mention this immoral Army practice, still less to discuss it. But in this case silence is not a virtue but vicious cowardice.

Not parents alone, but all of us want our young men to come back to us improved physically, mentally, and morally. We are eager to support any movement which can help these young men to make their months of service a period in which they will not sink in the moral scale but rise. For this very reason we feel obliged to protest any military regulation which can lead the young soldier to conclude that sexual immorality does not matter much provided that mechanical and chemical means are taken to avoid the diseases which commonly follow promiscuity. And it seems to me that some, at least, among the young recruits will reach exactly that conclusion if the Army continues to hand out to them "practical mechanical protection against venereal infection" and to erect prophylactic stations open to them at all hours of the day and night.

Most of us know by heart the reasons which have been alleged for the course made mandatory by the Army Regulations. Despite all that can be said by the officers, including the chaplain, some of the men, it is argued, are going to expose themselves to infection. This is regrettable, of course, but they say they can keep a bad matter from getting worse by providing, first, a mechanical protective device, and, next, a place in which the man who has run the risk of disease can be aided. With this man's morals, they claim they have no direct concern, but what can be done to keep down the incidence of infection will be done.

It is quite obvious that these Army Regulations do not take morals into account. If they did, they would not prescribe methods which to not a few of the young men far removed from the moral and social restraints of home are a direct incitement to vicious courses.

Let us turn to the Basic Field Manual: Military Sanitation and First Aid, published last year by order of the Secretary of War. There, under the head of "Control measures," we read that all "post exchanges are required to stock condoms of approved quality" and that "some one of these (prophylactic tubes) will be stocked by the post exchange." This gives us no exalted idea of moral standards in our new Army. But that is not all. In addition, "the Medical Department is responsible for operating sufficient prophylactic stations to serve adequately each command," and at these stations "any soldier may apply for treatment regardless of the hour." Evidently the Government is not quite sure of the efficacy of its mechanical and prophylactic devices.

The psychological effect on the young soldier of this elaborate set-up cannot but be bad. It conveys, almost irresistibly, the impression that the Government expects him to indulge in riotous courses from time to time, and has no objection, provided that precautions are taken against disease.

It is no justification to say that these "precautions" are taken in all armies. At least, the contention is no stronger than the rejoinder that they should be taken in none. But our position is that we are unable to approve the theory that it is lawful to do evil that some good may result. This position was so well explained by the Most Reverend J. B. Simonds, D. D., archbishop of Hobart, Australia, in a public address on November 28, 1940, that I am presuming His Excellency's permission to quote liberally.

"I have the unpleasant duty of speaking plainly in criticism of the action of our public authorities in sanctioning a regulation which cannot fail to have a subversive effect on the moral tone of the community. It has come as an unpleasant shock to many people to learn that contraceptive devices are regularly issued to the soldiers of the A. I. F. and militia camps of Australia. In Tasmania, public tenders were recently called for the wholesale supply of rubber contraceptives to the military authorities, and they are now regularly handed out in great numbers to all the men who request them. This sordid matter has been made the subject of complaint to me by parents of young soldiers, who are distressed to find that their sons have been corrupted by the easy road to vice which officialdom has opened to them.

"The demoralizing effect which this action of the Government will have on the youth of Australia is incalculable, and the regulation which empowered it is a disgraceful one with which no decent government should be associated. The distribution of these things to men in camp is stated to have been undertaken in order to protect them from the danger of infection from venereal disease.

"Does the Federal Government, then, accept as a principle the vicious theory that the end justifies the means, no matter how immoral these means may be?

"Under the pretext of protecting the physical health of a relatively small and undisciplined minority, our leaders have chosen the depraved course of handing out to the young men of Australia hundreds of thousands of instruments of immorality. Surely it is not too much to expect that as they are rightly solicitous for the physical health of the troops, they would be equally solicitous for the moral health of the youth of the country, and would refrain from spending the people's money to provide them with incentives to sin.

"We cheerfully resign ourselves to the oppressive burden of taxation which is imposed to carry the present war to a victorious issue. But it is a most depressing thing to learn that any of the money wrung from the people or begged from the poor in war savings, is allocated for purposes of immorality.

"The religious leaders in the various States are doing their best to maintain the spiritual and moral standards of the men in uniform. Their people have made splendid sacrifices to build, equip, and maintain many church huts where the spiritual needs of the men can be met, and their recreation taken in a clean and healthy atmosphere. The Federal Government has no money with which to assist this fine uplifting work, but it does not scruple to spend the public money to break down the moral standards of the youths whom it invites or conscripts to defend the ideals of the Nation. It is little wonder that cynicism so often greets the assertion that we are fighting to uphold the Christian standards of life.

"We Catholics have a clearly defined principle to guide us in judging this action of the Government. It is a principle given to us by the Holy Spirit through the pen of Saint Paul, who strongly reprobated the theory that we may do evil that some good may result (Romans iii: 8). On this principle we must take our stand, even though it should prove to be as unpalatable to modern paganism as Saint Paul's insistence on justice and chastity was to the Roman governor Felix."

I do not see how anyone who respects the principles of Christian morality can dissent from the views so frankly and bravely stated by Archbishop Simonds. It is certainly the duty of the Government to take every possible precaution to guard the health of these young men, but—unless we go all-out totalitarian and assert that the Government is not bound by any law—it is also obliged to do what lies within its province to safeguard their morals. When it fails in this important duty, then, as the archbishop says, its assertion that it is fighting to uphold the Christian standards of life is apt to fall on cynical ears.

It is clear from the Government manual from which I have quoted, that the military authorities realize the difficulty inherent in the age-old problem of keeping an army free from venereal disease. Yet it is impossible to escape the conclusion, after studying the manual, that in the military scheme too much reliance is placed on prophylaxis and upon mechanical devices, and too little on the influence of factors which are of another nature. A military observer has recently said that probably seven-eighths of the drafted men in a given camp are amenable at all times to military discipline. The remainder constitute the dregs of the camp. In spite of the wisest administration of discipline, they will break through, and can be controlled only when sent to prison.

Archbishop Simonds probably had some such conclusion in mind when he said that the Government had provided an immoral and disgraceful plan "of protecting the health of a relatively small and undisciplined minority." The American military regulations apparently assume that this plan must be applied to all the men.

The sixth chapter of the Basic Field Manual ends by prescribing methods which can be used whenever an excessively high venereal rate is found in a command. Were these precautions taken from the beginning, the alleged need of mechanical devices in this fight against disease would probably disappear. "Stringent control measures may be necessary. These may include all or any part of the following: (1) Placing red-light districts and all places selling liquor out of bounds. (2) Patrolling of restricted districts by military police. (3) Limiting passes to 4 hours; granting no passes after 9 p. m. (4) Classifying passes. (5) Routine bed checking." These regulations, but especially the first two, ought to be applied from the outset, and enforced consistently, instead of being held back until the camp is rotten with disease. Military police, properly trained, can search out places of evil resort as often as they are reopened in another district, and again put them out of bounds. That degree of supervision, surely, should be found possible.

Only a tyro in the knowledge of human nature will think that the solution of this problem can be easily reached. But it must be held for certain that no solution can be found in a method which is itself a violation of the moral law. When a government distributes contraceptives in its military camps, it acts on the immoral principle that evil may be done for a good end, helps to break down the soldier's moral sense and, as Archbishop Simonds has said, engages in a disgraceful business with which no decent government should be associated.

Every approach to a solution must be controlled by moral and religious principles. If these principles are held to be of secondary importance to the mechanical devices recommended in the Army regulations, a decrease in the incidence of venereal disease may be secured, but at the cost of undermining moral standards. The Army practice may produce healthy animals, but the ideal which we are entitled to demand of the Government is the soldier who is a Christian gentleman, faithful to his country, because he is faithful to his God.

I wish to thank the House for the unanimous consent which makes it possible for me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this timely article on a most serious condition now existing in our camps which must be and should be stopped at once.

So Casey Was Struck Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE CONSUMERS UNION REPORTS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the August issue of Consumers Union Reports:

SO CASEY WAS STRUCK OUT

"One of the great problems facing the American people today is to retain for the American workingman the benefits which should flow from the vast industrial program of the present emergency, and to see to it that the present boom, if it may be called that, is not a boomerang.

"Millions of dollars a day are being expended in the national-defense program. The unemployment list is dropping, and I think that this body is duty bound to see to it that the money which goes into the pockets of the workingman, whether he be a laborer in industry or a farmer, shall not be snatched from his pockets by inexcusable and artificial rises in price."

With these words Representative JOSEPH E. CASEY, of Massachusetts, asked the House last April to set up a five-man committee to investigate the rising cost of necessities and, if need be, propose remedial legislation to Congress.

Mr. CASEY didn't minimize the importance of the work of existing administrative agencies in regulating prices—Leon Henderson's office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply and Thurman Arnold's Antitrust Division. But, said he:

"* * * regardless of how many agencies in the executive departments are interested in prices, a committee in the legislative branch should make it its duty to act as a watchdog in the interest of decent prices for vital goods—particularly those necessities of life, such as food, and clothing, and medicine."

We agreed with Mr. CASEY when he introduced his resolution. Through Bread & Butter we urged members to write to their Representatives and call upon them to vote for the resolution.

We were all for it, but we didn't get it.

Consumers—who certainly would have benefited from a responsible inquiry into price rises—weren't strongly enough organized to force the passage of the resolution against the strong opposition that developed. The measure was defeated last month by a vote of 200 to 100.

Where did the strong opposition come from? Well, in part it came from that group of legislative hacks ("one eye on the vote and the other eye closed") whose stand on anything in the national interest is so invariably opposed that their words on one issue are much the same as on any other.

But any decent proposal runs up against opposition from that source. It took more to kill the Casey resolution. Most of all, an apparently predetermined campaign to misrepresent the whole purpose of the resolution was responsible for its defeat.

Such tactics are ancient and familiar: You set up a straw man and then you point at him with alarm and then you knock him down. And then, if you're a legislator, you tell the homefolks how valiantly you've battled to protect them.

The straw man this time was the charge that the Casey resolution was aimed at the farmer. Mr. CASEY was accused of wanting to father a committee which would take money away from the farmer by urging cuts in agricultural prices.

We have read the debate and we wish to note both admiration and sympathy for Mr. CASEY's hard fight to make the boys talk to the point. Alas, it was no use. Mr. CASEY had expressed an interest in "decent prices for vital goods." And that is a delicate subject in these days of profiteering. So Mr. CASEY had to be struck out.

Here's how he was struck out. We quote a few passages from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"Mr. COX (Georgia). * * * There are lots of us * * * who have a suspicion that this is something of a drive against the people who stir the soil and make it produce the food that feeds the people. * * *

"Mr. COFFEE (Nebraska). * * * I am convinced that this is no time to investigate agricultural or livestock commodity prices, for markets are jittery. Everybody is jittery. The markets are so sensitive that an investigation of this nature would be reflected in lower prices to the farmers and livestock producers of the country. * * *

"Mr. CASEY. * * * The idea that I am advancing a resolution like this to hurt the farmer is ridiculous. * * * There is nothing in this resolution that will hurt the farmer, but on the contrary there is a lot about the work of this committee that will help the farmer. * * * The farmer is the consumer, we are all consumers. * * *

"How * * * can the farmer be hurt by a publication of the truth as to the difference between the cost of production and the price paid by the ultimate purchaser * * *?

"Mr. COOLEY (North Carolina). * * * We have been trying to advance the price of farm commodities and have been appropriating millions of dollars for parity payments, but the very moment it is indicated that the price of farm commodities might advance somewhat, some people are getting excited about it.

"Mr. CASEY. This is going to help the farmer to get more of the purchasers' dollars into the hands of the farmers. * * * I do not see how the gentleman can be greatly concerned about an investigation of the spread between the cost of production and the price that the consumer pays. How can that hurt the farmer? It will surely help him.

"* * * What I want to do is to have this information as to actual costs go before the consumers of this country so that they can know what it is all about and stop all attempts to gouge the people with unconscionably high prices.

"* * * we have no legislative branch of this Government that seems to care * * * about the consumer or the price that he pays, and we want to find out the reasons for the spread and what it is between the price paid to the producer and the price paid by the consumer.

"Mr. TABER (New York). I think we are making things ridiculous by passing such a resolution, putting everybody who is trying to do a legitimate business in the wholesale or retail trade on the spot all the time by * * * investigations.

"Mr. KNUTSON (Minnesota). This is clearly an attempt to pound down the prices of food products. * * * I hope all who have the best interests of the farmer at heart will vote against its passage, because it may upset the market if we delve into it at this particular time.

"Mr. MURRAY (Wisconsin). * * * The merits of this legislation are not being properly considered."

And so it went. And so it will go again when, as, and if any other proposal to check up on runaway prices comes along. The honorable gentlemen of the lower House react strongest to the pressure that's hardest, and the people who profit from runaway prices have proved over the years that they know how to apply the pressure.

Consumers had better learn. A flood of letters for the Casey resolution would have changed the vote. Since the flood didn't come, one modest weapon in the fight against the high cost of living was lost, and consumers will pay for the lack of it.

The President's Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 15, 1941

ADDRESS DELIVERED OVER NATION-WIDE BROADCAST THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1941

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President over a Nation-wide broadcast on last Thursday evening, September 11.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDENT. My fellow Americans, the Navy Department of the United States has reported to me that on the morning of September 4 the U. S. destroyer *Greer*, proceeding in full daylight toward Iceland, had reached a point southeast of Greenland. She was carrying American mail to Iceland. She was flying the American flag. Her identity as an American ship was unmistakable.

She was then and there attacked by a submarine. Germany admits that it was a German submarine. The submarine deliberately fired a torpedo at the *Greer*, followed later by another torpedo attack. In spite of what Hitler's propaganda bureau has invented, and in spite of what any American obstructionist organization may prefer to believe, I tell you the blunt fact that the German submarine fired first upon this American destroyer without warning, and with deliberate design to sink her.

Our destroyer, at the time, was in waters which the Government of the United States had declared to be waters of self-defense—surrounding outposts of American protection in the Atlantic.

In the north, outposts have been established by us in Iceland, Greenland, Labrador, and Newfoundland. Through these waters there pass many ships of many flags. They bear food and other supplies to civilians and they bear matériel of war, for which the people of the United States are spending billions of dollars, and which, by congressional action, they have declared to be essential for the defense of their own land.

The United States destroyer, when attacked, was proceeding on a legitimate mission.

If the destroyer was visible to the submarine when the torpedo was fired, then the attack was a deliberate attempt by the Nazis to sink a clearly identified American warship. On the other hand, if the submarine was beneath the surface and, with the aid of its listening devices, fired in the direction of the sound of the American destroyer without even taking the trouble to learn its identity—as the official German communique would indicate—then the attack was even more outrageous. For it indicates a policy of indiscriminate violence against any vessel sailing the seas, belligerent or nonbelligerent.

This was piracy—legally and morally. It was not the first nor the last act of piracy which the Nazi government has committed against the American flag in this war. Attack has followed attack.

A few months ago an American-flag merchant ship, the *Robin Moor*, was sunk by a Nazi submarine in the middle of the South Atlantic under circumstances violating long-established international law and every principle of humanity. The passengers and the crew were forced into open boats hundreds of miles from land, in direct violation of international agreements signed by the Government of Germany. No apology, no allegation of mistake, no offer of reparations has come from the Nazi government.

In July 1941 an American battleship in North American waters was followed by a submarine, which for a long time sought to maneuver itself into a position of attack. The periscope of the submarine was clearly seen. No British or American submarines were within hundreds of miles of this spot at the time, so the nationality of the submarine is clear.

Five days ago a United States Navy ship on patrol picked up three survivors of an American-owned ship operating under the flag of our sister Republic of Panama—the steamship *Sessa*. On August 17 she had been first torpedoed without warning, and then shelled, near Greenland, while carrying civilian supplies to Iceland. It is feared that the other members of her crew have been drowned. In view of the established presence of German submarines in this vicinity, there can be no reasonable doubt as to the identity of the attacker.

Five days ago another United States merchant ship, the *Steel Seafarer*, was sunk by a German aircraft in the Red Sea 220 miles south of Suez. She was bound for an Egyptian port.

Four of the vessels sunk or attacked flew the American flag and were clearly identifiable. Two of these ships were warships of the American Navy. In the fifth case, the vessel sunk clearly carried the flag of Panama.

In the face of all this, we Americans are keeping our feet on the ground. Our type of democratic civilization has outgrown the thought of feeling compelled to fight some other nation by reason of any single piratical attack on one of our ships. We are not becoming hysterical or losing our sense of proportion. Therefore, what I am thinking and saying does not relate to any isolated episode.

Instead, we Americans are taking a long-range point of view in regard to certain fundamentals and to a series of events on land and on sea which must be considered as a whole—as a part of a world pattern.

It would be unworthy of a great nation to exaggerate an isolated incident, or to become inflamed by some one act of violence. But it would be inexcusable folly to minimize such incidents in the face of evidence which makes it clear that the incident is not isolated, but part of a general plan.

The important truth is that these acts of international lawlessness are a manifestation of a design which has been made clear to the American people for a long time. It is the Nazi design to abolish the freedom of the seas, and to acquire absolute control and domination of the seas for themselves.

For with control of the seas in their own hands, the way can become clear for their next step—domination of the United States and the Western Hemisphere by force. Under Nazi control of the seas, no merchant ship of the United States or of any other American republic would be free to carry on any peaceful commerce, except by the condescending grace of this foreign and tyrannical power. The Atlantic Ocean which has been, and which should always be, a free and friendly highway for us would then become a deadly menace to the commerce of the United States, to the coasts of the United States, and to the inland cities of the United States.

The Hitler government, in defiance of the laws of the sea and of the recognized rights of all other nations, has presumed to declare, on paper, that great areas of the seas—even including a vast expanse lying in the Western Hemisphere—are to be closed, and that no ships may enter them for any purpose, except at peril of being sunk. Actually they are sinking ships at will and without warning in widely separated areas both within and far outside of these far-flung pretended zones.

This Nazi attempt to seize control of the oceans is but a counterpart of the Nazi plots now being carried on throughout the Western Hemisphere, all designed toward the same end. For Hitler's advance guards—not only his avowed agents but also his dupes among us—have sought to make ready for him footholds and bridgeheads in the New World, to be used as soon as he has gained control of the oceans.

His intrigues, his plots, his machinations, his sabotage in this New World are all known to the Government of the United States. Conspiracy has followed conspiracy.

Last year a plot to seize the Government of Uruguay was smashed by the prompt action of that country, which was supported in full by her American neighbors. A like plot was then hatching in Argentina, and that Government has carefully and wisely blocked it at every point. More recently an endeavor was made to subvert the Government of Bolivia. Within the past few weeks the discovery was made of secret air landing fields in Colombia within easy range of the Panama Canal. I could multiply instances.

To be ultimately successful in world mastery Hitler knows that he must get control of the seas. He must first destroy the bridge of ships which we are building across the Atlantic, over which we shall continue to roll the implements of war to help destroy him and all his works in the end. He must wipe out our patrol on sea and in the air. He must silence the British Navy.

It must be explained again and again to people who like to think of the United States Navy as an invincible protection that this can be true only if the British Navy survives. That is simple arithmetic.

For if the world outside the Americas falls under Axis domination, the shipbuilding facilities which the Axis Powers would then possess in all of Europe, in the British Isles, and in the Far East would be much greater than all the shipbuilding facilities and potentialities of all the Americas—not only greater but two or three times greater. Even if the United States threw all its resources into such a situation, seeking to double and even redouble the size of our Navy, the Axis Powers, in control of the rest of the world, would have the manpower and the physical resources to outbuild us several times over.

It is time for all Americans of all the Americas to stop being deluded by the romantic notion that the Americas can go on living happily and peacefully in a Nazi-dominated world.

Generation after generation America has battled for the general policy of the freedom of the seas. That policy is a very simple one, but a basic, fundamental one. It means that no nation has the right to make the broad oceans of the world at great distances from the actual theater of land war unsafe for the commerce of others.

That has been our policy, proved time and time again, in all our history.

Our policy has applied from time immemorial—and still applies—not merely to the Atlantic but to the Pacific and to all other oceans as well.

Unrestricted submarine warfare in 1941 constitutes a defiance—an act of aggression—against that historic American policy.

It is now clear that Hitler has begun his campaign to control the seas by ruthless force and by wiping out every vestige of international law and humanity.

His intention has been made clear. The American people can have no further illusions about it.

No tender whisperings of appeasers that Hitler is not interested in the Western Hemisphere, no soporific lullabies that a wide ocean protects us from him ca· long have any effect on the hard-headed, farsighted, and realistic American people.

Because of these episodes, because of the movements and operations of German warships, and because of the clear repeated proof that the present Government of Germany has no respect for treaties or for international law, that it has no decent attitude toward neutral nations or human life, we Americans are now face to face, not with abstract theories, but with cruel, relentless facts.

This attack on the *Greer* was no localized military operation in the North Atlantic. This was no mere episode in a struggle between two nations. This was one determined step toward creating a permanent world system based on force, terror, and murder.

And I am sure that even now the Nazis are waiting to see whether the United States will by silence give them the green light to go ahead on this path of destruction.

The Nazi danger to our western world has long ceased to be a mere possibility. The danger is here now—not only from a military enemy but from an enemy of all law, all liberty, all morality, all religion.

There has now come a time when you and I must see the cold, inexorable necessity of saying to these inhuman, unrestrained seekers of world conquest and permanent world domination by the sword, "You seek to throw our children and our children's children into your form of terrorism and slavery. You have now attacked our own safety. You shall go no further."

Normal practices of diplomacy—note writing—are of no possible use in dealing with international outlaws who sink our ships and kill our citizens.

One peaceful nation after another has met disaster because each refused to look the Nazi danger squarely in the eye until it actually had them by the throat.

The United States will not make that fatal mistake.

No act of violence or intimidation will keep us from maintaining intact two bulwarks of defense—first, our line of supply of matériel to the enemies of Hitler; and, second, the freedom of our shipping on the high seas.

No matter what it takes, no matter what it costs, we will keep open the line of legitimate commerce in these defensive waters.

We have sought no shooting war with Hitler. We do not seek it now. But neither do we want peace so much that we are willing to pay for it by permitting him to attack our naval and merchant ships while they are on legitimate business.

I assume that the German leaders are not deeply concerned by what we Americans say or publish about them. We cannot bring about the downfall of nazi-ism by the use of long-range invectives.

But when you see a rattlesnake poised to strike you do not wait until he has struck before you crush him.

These Nazi submarines and raiders are the rattlesnakes of the Atlantic. They are a menace to the free pathways of the high seas. They are a challenge to our sovereignty. They hammer at our most precious rights when they attack ships of the American flag—symbols of our independence, our freedom, our very life.

It is clear to all Americans that the time has come when the Americas themselves must now be defended. A continuation of attacks in our own waters, or in waters which could be used for further and greater attacks on us, will inevitably weaken American ability to repel Hitlerism.

Do not let us split hairs. Let us not ask ourselves whether the Americas should begin to defend themselves after the fifth attack, or the tenth attack, or the twentieth attack.

The time for active defense is now.

Do not let us split hairs. Let us not say, "We will only defend ourselves if the torpedo succeeds in getting home, or if the crew and the passengers are drowned."

This is the time for prevention of attack.

If submarines or raiders attack in distant waters, they can attack equally well within sight of our own shores. Their very presence in any waters which America deems vital to its defense constitutes an attack.

In the waters which we deem necessary for our defense American naval vessels and American planes will no longer wait until Axis submarines lurking under the water, or Axis raiders on the surface of the sea, strike their deadly blow—first.

Upon our naval and air patrol—now operating in large numbers over a vast expanse of the Atlantic Ocean—falls the duty of maintaining the American policy of freedom of the seas—now. That means, very simply and clearly, that our patrolling vessels and planes will protect all merchant ships—not only American ships but ships of any flag—engaged in commerce in our defensive waters. They will protect them from submarines; they will protect them from surface raiders.

This situation is not new. The second President of the United States, John Adams, ordered the United States Navy to clean out European privateers and European ships of war which were infesting the Caribbean and South American waters, destroying American commerce.

The third President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson, ordered the United States Navy to end the attacks being made upon American ships by the corsairs of the nations of North Africa.

My obligation as President is historic; it is clear; it is inescapable.

It is no act of war on our part when we decide to protect the seas which are vital to American defense. The aggression is not ours. Ours is solely defense.

But let this warning be clear. From now on, if German or Italian vessels of war enter the waters, the protection of which is necessary for American defense, they do so at their own peril.

The orders which I have given as Commander in Chief to the United States Army and Navy are to carry out that policy—at once.

The sole responsibility rests upon Germany. There will be no shooting unless Germany continues to seek it.

That is my obvious duty in this crisis. That is the clear right of this sovereign Nation. That is the only step possible, if we would keep tight the wall of defense which we are pledged to maintain around this Western Hemisphere.

I have no illusions about the gravity of this step. I have not taken it hurriedly or lightly. It is the result of months and months of constant thought and anxiety and prayer. In the protection of your Nation and mine it cannot be avoided.

The American people have faced other grave crises in their history—with American courage and American resolution. They will do no less today.

They know the actualities of the attacks upon us. They know the necessities of a bold defense against these attacks. They know that the times call for clear heads and fearless hearts.

And with that inner strength that comes to a free people conscious of their duty and of the righteousness of what they do, they will—with Divine help and guidance—stand their ground against this latest assault upon their democracy, their sovereignty, and their freedom.

Editorial Comment on President's Address on September 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. SCHWARTZ

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 15, 1941

COMMENT FROM LEADING UNITED STATES NEWSPAPERS

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD editorial comment by leading United States newspapers on the President's radio address of Thursday, September 11. These expressions from newspapers of every political faith are taken from the Washington Star of September 12.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

New York Times (Independent-Democrat): "We believe that the course which the President has chosen to follow * * * will have the support of a great majority of the people of the United States. For we believe that this great majority, now recognizing clearly that we shall have no peace and no security, no respite from alarms, and no return to normal life until Nazi Germany is defeated, is prepared to accept any necessary risk to accomplish that defeat."

New York Herald Tribune (Independent Republican): "There will be * * * no doubt about the overwhelming relief, the new confidence, the new purpose and unity with which the people of the United States will see the evasions thus cleared away, the plain facts announced, the situation crystallized as it actually exists, and their Nation's policy placed upon that firm foundation which is the best—the only possible—answer to the horror and menace into which Hitlerism has plunged our world."

Syracuse (N. Y.) Post-Standard (Republican): "A step of incalculable aid to Britain was announced last night by President Roosevelt. It is stated in these few words in his speech: '* * * Our patrolling vessels and planes will protect all merchant ships—not only American ships but ships of any flag—engaged in commerce in our defensive waters.' The lines can be interpreted in only one way. President Roosevelt said he had no illusions about the gravity of this step. It is, in truth, one of the most serious the Nation has ever taken."

Douglas (Ariz.) Daily Dispatch (Republican): "The American people will support

firmly and gladly the policy President Roosevelt has enunciated of protecting our ships, even by 'shooting first,' as should have been the rule earlier. The great majority of loyal Americans will say 'Amen' to the policy the President has enunciated. We are for it."

Idaho Daily Statesman (Republican): "The subtle phrases with which Mr. Roosevelt drove home some points immediately arouses speculation as to the full meaning. Hitler, not we, should puzzle and fret over the answers. We may stand assured that the American Navy knows them and will act accordingly. Our Commander in Chief has issued to his forces a determined order. Our duty as Americans is to stand by the Commander in Chief."

Los Angeles Times (Republican): "Many, not all of them isolationists, will say the President's address * * * amounts to a declaration of war on Germany and Italy, so far as it lies within the Executive power to declare war. It does not. It is a declaration of intent to defend * * * our safety and our rights against a proven and already undertaken program of wanton assault upon both. * * * A show of righteous force more often than not tends to discourage gangster bullets."

Portland Oregonian (Independent Republican): "If Hitler's war craft, wherever they are found, are agents of piracy, and if the British Navy must be supported in order to prevent these pirates from ultimately overpowering us, then our defensive zone properly extends to the ends of the oceans. It remains for the President to say whether he still feels our defensive zone stops at a pencil mark down from Iceland."

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Independent Democrat): "This rather halting step * * * fails short of what the Nation had a right to expect. * * * The menace to supplies going to Britain is not in the American 'defensive zones' but in the stretch from Iceland to the British Isles. * * * The President may still ask for repeal of the Neutrality Act when the House of Representatives reconvenes next Monday. It would be the logical follow-up on this address, and one which the President would be fully justified in requesting."

Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger (Independent): "Clearly the President is not looking for war. Just as clearly he is unwilling to subscribe to the doctrine that Hitler is entitled to deprive us of freedom of the seas merely because he cannot win the war without doing so. If we are on the way to war it is because we were placed in the path of war the very moment that Hitler acquired power in Germany and turned the resources of that aggressive country on the road to world conquest."

Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle (Republican): "It must be said that the President's order follows logically on the declaration of the wide defensive zone, on the occupation of Iceland and Greenland to forestall threats to that zone, and on the authorization of the lease-lend policy by Congress. The country must expect to take whatever further risks these decisions imply. But the implication of further risk still is subject to prudent vigilance and reasonable restraint. The limitation the President himself implied in the careful language describing his order should be maintained in the execution of the policy decreed."

Providence Journal-Bulletin (Independent): "Surely Nebraska, Montana, Arizona have for their particular interests as vital a stake as has Rhode Island, or any Atlantic seaboard State, in supporting the President's policy to shoot when necessary to keep the seas free for the American flag. It is an American declaration, essential to our economy and security. As a nation we live, we thrive, not by land alone but by sea as well. We are not seeing because we are at the water's edge some fantastic nightmare of invasion. But we live where we see what goes out over the seas and what comes in, and we know that all America cannot exist as America unless it shoots, if it must, to keep the seas free for our flag."

Knoxville Journal (Republican): "This is the first day of America's shooting war. * * * At long last, our backing and filling, our moving sidewise, our progressing toward a fixed point by following a curve; these things are at an end. * * * We have been sidled into this conflict on the theory that by putting up enough money we could avoid the killing of millions of our men. All signs now point to our paying for the war and fighting it, too."

Boston Globe (Independent): "The difficulty in writing about the President's address is that no interpretation is required. From beginning to end it is clear. * * * Mr. Roosevelt has done what two of his predecessors in the Presidency did. John Adams, without consent of Congress, gave orders for the United States Navy to sink, capture, or seize all armed French ships. * * * Thomas Jefferson, without Congress, also gave an order to the Navy as its Commander in Chief when he ordered the fleet to end the attacks on American ships by the pirates of North Africa."

Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle (Independent-Democrat): "Hitler now has a clear understanding of the nature of the provocation which will lead this country into active war against him. He knows the exact point at which the green light changes to red. If with his customary cynicism he decides to force us into a shooting war, the responsibility will be his, not ours."

St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times (Democrat): "Public reaction, we believe, will fully sustain Mr. Roosevelt in the bare-fisted manner with which he dealt with the totalitarian menace to the United States vessels on the high seas. * * * Thus Germany and Italy are put on notice * * * henceforth we shoot first."

Boston Post (Democrat-Independent): "One matter which the Congress might well consider is an investigation of the *Greer* incident since the President made it the outstanding cause of his address and the resultant shooting order to the Navy."

Boston Herald (Republican): "The United States is no nearer this morning than it was yesterday to participation as a belligerent in an all-out war against Germany. Indeed, the probability that we shall become involved in unrestrained hostilities against her seems less than it was. The President did little more than to issue a stern caveat to Germany. He did not go nearly so far as it was thought he would."

Worcester (Mass.) Telegram (Republican): "Whether or not one is disappointed in the speech, one must approve his order to keep German and Italian warships out—that order is inevitable. The preservation of our national safety and national honor demands it. If the Germans and Italians disregard this warning—it means war with the United States."

Baltimore Sun (Independent-Democrat): "Mr. Roosevelt's speech last night was a grave and stern definition of American policy which will compel Herr Hitler to bow to the United States in the North Atlantic—and in other areas—or to face us in a naval battle. The Sun believes this declaration of American policy to have been justified. We believe it to be wise."

Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch (Independent-Democrat): "Mr. Roosevelt carried the United States to the very brink of all-out shooting war with the Axis last night, for he apparently has ordered the American Navy to fire on any German or Italian warship found in the North Atlantic between this country and Iceland or in the South Atlantic between South America and Agrica. Obviously, the Navy now will shoot, if it sees an Axis warship in any waters which America deems vital to its defense, for the mere presence of such a vessel constitutes an attack. It is high time that such orders were issued."

Nashville Tennessean (Democrat): "In the face of unrestricted naval warfare by the enemy of freedom the policy laid down by Mr. Roosevelt is in the American tradition. It reflects the convictions of realistic and patriotic citizens. * * * Instead of writing notes America will use that medium of expression by which the totalitarians have torn the world asunder—force."

Hartford Courant (Republican): "The long road down which the Nation has traveled since the repeal of the embargo nearly 2 years ago is coming to an end. When the Lease-Lend Act was adopted, the Nation declared its purpose to accomplish the defeat of Hitlerism, and the orders now given to the Navy to shoot the warships of the Axis on sight simply constitute means to make the intention good. That such a purpose could hardly be carried out without shooting was pointed out at the time, and the correctness of the prophecies then made is now borne out. The shooting is at hand."

San Diego (Calif.) Union (Republican): "In warning Hitler that he can have war with the United States if he wants it, and that his desire will be indicated by his continued invasions of Western Hemisphere waters, Mr. Roosevelt has stated a position which Americans must approve. If Hitler wants to see history repeated, let him continue the course he evidently has chosen."

San Francisco Chronicle (Independent-Republican): "The President's declaration that any German or Italian warships will enter American defensive waters at its own peril is our recognition of the fact that there is no peace for us in a Nazi-dominated world. This means the Navy has been ordered to shoot at sight. This is an American declaration, an American warning to the Axis desperadoes. * * * We approve this action. We believe the President could do not less. We believe he should do more."

Dallas (Tex.) News (Independent-Democrat): "With legalistic precision he (the President) has moved for the defense of American shipping and American trade on the historic principle of freedom of the seas. * * * Clear-thinking Americans endowed with the courage that made this country free and great will echo the ringing defiance of Nazi-Fascist piracy. * * * If the aggressor nations of Europe desire to keep the peace, there is no challenge of their security."

New Orleans Times Picayune (Democrat): "President Roosevelt announced in terms of unassailable clarity an American policy. * * * The consequences of any decision on Hitler's part to resist the United States purpose of clearing the sea lanes of sea raiders would resolve into a general warfare of the seas. The choice is with Hitler and Mussolini."

Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Dispatch (Republican): "By his affirmation of a naval policy of positive action to rid the sea lanes in the American defensive area of the menace of the U-boat, President Roosevelt has resolved the battle of the Atlantic. Hitler is the loser. When the history of his defeat is compiled the chapter written last night by the President will mark the real turning point in the battle of the forces of democracy to defeat the forces of totalitarianism."

Memphis Commercial Appeal (Independent-Democrat): "This issue is defined and the decks cleared for action. We will not be intimidated by Nazi threats, torpedoes, or bombs. * * * The die has been cast and

the forthrightness of the decision is in the American tradition * * *."

Cincinnati Times Star (Republican): "Mr. Roosevelt's last two speeches came very close to being personal declarations of war. Thursday's address, for all practical purposes, was exactly that. Congress and the people apparently are to have no part in the final decision."

Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch (Independent): "The President's address last night takes the Nation another long step toward actual participation in the European war, without the formal consent of Congress or the people. * * * Neither Congress nor the public has been willing to follow the President into the war. * * * His speech * * * lays the groundwork for further future incidents and developments which probably will result in open and formal warfare for the United States."

Indianapolis News (Independent Republican): "The President's speech * * * is a plain warning that he is ready to take the final step into war. * * * There will be general regret that the President did not lay this question before Congress. * * * The President, however, elected to take this bold and decisive step on his own responsibility. This course is in line with his record. He has consistently asserted the power of the Executive in fields hitherto regarded as the province of Congress and the courts."

Montgomery Advertiser (Democrat): "President Roosevelt was properly conscious of the gravity of his responsibility when he pointed the clear, if dangerous, course which the American people must pursue if they are to meet that rendezvous of honor with their ancestors."

Tampa Tribune (Democrat): "There can be no misinterpretation of the President's language. He reasserts, with all the emphasis of an ultimatum, the historic American principle of free seas for free nations. Thus is an arrogant, aggressive power warned that it assails that principle at its peril. The United States Navy is at war * * * for the maintenance of the American idea, the preservation of world freedom."

Albany (N. Y.) Knickerbocker News (Independent Republican): "The serious step taken by the President * * * is predicated upon his opinion that Germany has challenged us. That opinion might not be shared by Congress. And Congress, under the Constitution, is the only power that can commit us to war and, logically, to the acts inducing war. In this step, Mr. Roosevelt, by Executive leadership, has declared a policy that many will think should be defined by Congress. That policy of defending our supplies would be logical if it were positive Germany is challenging us."

Rochester Times-Union (Independent): "The President was on firm ground when he reasserted the historic American doctrine of freedom of the seas, and our determination to maintain it. * * * Nevertheless, we are forced to view with serious misgivings the manner in which our Chief Executive has gone about serving notice on Hitler and the Nazis that, having gone thus far, they shall go no further. * * * In acting without the prior sanction of the Senate and the House, the President has assumed a grave responsibility."

New York World-Telegram (Independent): "'The speech was a little more than pessimists had expected, yet a little less than optimists had anticipated.' That, from the London point of view, isn't a bad size-up of the reaction here, as between the interventionists and the non. * * * The President in this latest move does not declare war, technically. But actually he comes so close to shooting—and in his own phrase 'shooting means war'—that Congress should speak on the policy the President has expressed."

New York Sun (Independent): "* * * For the average American citizen it (the speech) means just two things: (1) That in the judgment of the President * * * certain acts of Axis submarines and surface craft constitute shooting warfare against American naval and mercantile ships on the high seas; and (2) that by fiat of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy the American Navy is actually entering into shooting warfare against armed vessels of Germany and Italy found in waters deemed by the Government of the United States to be vital to the defense of the United States. * * * Assuming its premises to be correct, the speech must be set down as one of the ablest Mr. Roosevelt has ever made."

Philadelphia Inquirer (Independent Republican): "This is not a policy of aggression on the part of the United States. It is as surely a factor in the defense of the Americas as the billions of dollars' worth of weapons which our mills are turning out for the British, and which we, with the means available to us as a nonbelligerent, are resolved shall have safe transport across the sea."

Chicago Times (Independent): "We assume that President Roosevelt means—now, at least—that our Navy is going to keep the western half of the Atlantic, up to and including Iceland and perhaps most of the way between South America and Africa, swept clean of Nazi raiders. For that step we believe the American people have long been ready and will fully support the President."

Newark (N. J.) Evening News (Independent): "The *Greer* episode was the first in the actual shooting war. Orders to our warships and planes to clear American defensive waters of Axis submarines and raiders mean that a shooting war will now be intensified. There is just one act that can prevent it—Hitler's withdrawal from waters considered vital to our defense; in particular from the German-declared war zone around Iceland."

New York Post (Independent): "Democracy spoke last night; it spoke the fact that its opposition to nazi-ism is not based on incidents but on a fundamental distinction between the moral and the immoral. * * * Many of us, not limited by the great but confining horizons of office, free to adventure in our own minds as no President of all the people can be, will not be content. We seek more than was offered last night. We ask instant action to destroy the Nazi menace once and for all; a final joining in the world issue for a settlement."

St. Paul Pioneer Press (Independent): "The conclusion to be drawn * * * is that President Roosevelt believes the United States need not enter actively into the war to accomplish the objective of the defeat of Hitlerism, but that he will not shrink from any shooting that may ensue from standing firm on * * * aid to Britain."

Kansas City Star (Independent): "It was a great speech the President made last night, moderate, reasoned, and restrained. The speech did not invite war. It put the decision up to Hitler. * * * Certainly it is a decision that involves risks. A decision to do nothing would involve greater risks."

Cleveland News (Republican): "The United States today has reassumed its true character as a Nation of 130,000,000 people of independence and dignity, with enough foresight to deserve survival in a quaking world and enough courage to assure it. The policy enunciated last night by President Roosevelt is the least that this Nation may undertake in today's circumstances. The alternative is to begin a gradual surrender of all that we have built in a century and a half, and all that we have dreamed of building."

St. Louis Globe-Democrat (Independent): "The President's declaration was an inevitable expression of American policy, made necessary by the recent manifestations of the Axis decision to engage in unrestricted submarine warfare. Hitler and his satellites * * * have started a shooting war and the United States accepts the challenge. In an informal way, we may now be regarded as at war in the Atlantic with Germany and Italy."

St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Independent): "Does the President's speech mean that shooting will actually occur? It is entirely up to Hitler. * * * If Hitler continues to attack American shipping, shooting will follow, and when shooting occurs, the temper of this Nation will no doubt rise to a demand for total war."

Labor Day Address by Senator Rosier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 15, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH ROSIER, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by my colleague [Mr. ROSIER], on Labor Day last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is most fitting that 1 day a year should be set aside to be known as Labor Day. The labor movement in the United States has been one of the most distinctive developments of the last 50 years. This movement has grown out of the creation of large industrial organizations with many thousands of stockholders whose interests have been represented by managers. In the early stages of our industrial development, and even down to the present time, management has seemingly been more anxious to earn large dividends for its stockholders than it has been to improve the conditions of living for labor. The modern labor organization grows out of the fact that an individual worker cannot protect his interests in dealing with corporate management. There have been throughout this period of industrial expansion always a few large industries that have recognized in a generous way the rights of labor by paying wages commensurate with plant prosperity and by various profit-sharing plans which accorded to their workers a just recognition of their services in industry. In this period conservative management has been slow to recognize the rights of labor to combine for the purpose of raising wages and improving the standards of living.

After years of struggle the Federal Government has finally incorporated in the laws of the Nation the right of labor to organize and to bargain collectively with the employer. The act of Congress, known as the National Labor Relations Act, has finally been sustained by the Supreme Court, and industry is now gradually recognizing and putting into practice the provisions of this law. It is not my purpose today to review the history of the labor movement in this country. It is sufficient to say that labor in the last half century, through its organizations, has become conscious of its rights and privileges. No one

would claim that this labor movement has been free from friction and strife. Throughout history it has always been true that any advancement of the welfare of the masses of the people has come about through struggles that are sometimes attended by violence.

Charges of injustice cannot fairly be lodged against either management or labor. It has been a clash of ideas and different theories concerning the relation of management to its employees. In the early days, when the owner of the plant was the employer, he sustained an intimate and personal relation to those who worked in his plant. In sustaining that personal relation, he necessarily had a direct interest in the welfare of those who worked for him. In that period there was a certain fluidity in the movement of labor that made it easy for the workers to go from one plant or community to another. As the large industrial plants came into existence, and corporations were created with thousands of stockholders who were interested only in the dividends from their investment, there developed the board of directors and the various forms of corporate management. In this development the previous personal relations of the employer-owner with his employees ceased to exist. The relation of labor then became an extremely impersonal one. I think it will be agreed that the creation of collective bargaining for large groups of laborers in dealing with their employers was an eminent and just plan for protecting the interest of labor. It is interesting and inspiring to note that in recent years many great industries have finally recognized the principle of collective bargaining and the rights of labor to deal in a collective way with management which represents the collective interests of those who have invested their capital in industry.

We have some students of industrial and economic problems in our country who deplore what they call the class struggle. As I study the history of social and economical development in the countries of the world, I find that progress has always come out of the struggles of certain groups for a larger share in the satisfactions of life and a greater security in the social and industrial world. It has become a dominant point of our present-day life for all classes and professions to organize for the purpose of promoting their own welfare and the advancing of their own interests. The organization of the medical fraternity in a great national association, for the upholding of the standards of their profession and the advancement of their professional interests, is just as much of a class movement as the organization of any great industrial group.

As I observe the great organizations of various groups in industries and professions, and businesses, I am convinced that all such movements have had a distinctive effect upon the progress of all of our people. So, today, we celebrate in a national holiday the advancement of labor in its progressive efforts for improvement of the standards of living and for a greater participation in all of the benefits of modern civilization. Labor, today, has a recognition and a dignity that it has never had before in our history. This has grown out of the fact that, through its organizations and its own efforts, it has set up standards of living that give the laboring people self-respect and a feeling of independence. I am among those who believe that the prosperity and security of our Nation depend upon a wide distribution among all of our people of the benefits and satisfactions of our modern progress. The laborer in his home and in his social contacts is entitled to those pleasures and enjoyments which are acepted as their right by the most-favored people in our communities.

We have founded and developed in this country a great system of public education which opens the doors to culture and opportunity for all of the children of our people. There was a time when such privileges were limited to the children of the favored and the rich. It required a long struggle on the part of those who believed in the rights of our people to establish the advantages of public education to all of the people at public expense. Even now on occasion large taxpayers, who represent the privileged classes, protest against a system of education that provides for the training and development of all of our young people. If our institutions are to endure, it is just as important for the children of our laboring people to have a modern education as it is for the children of the well-to-do. The critics sometimes declare that when laboring people draw large wages they act foolishly in spending their income. Just the other day I heard such a criticism of a group of men who are now drawing large pay. It may be true that there are occasional individuals in our laboring groups who do not have a sense of thrift and of responsibility in handling their incomes.

Those of us who believe in fair wages and equal opportunity for all of our people would not deny this fact. However, when we observe the conduct of our so-called wealthy classes, we would find it to be true that there is just as great a lack of sense and responsibility of many in those groups. What we need in this country, more than anything else, is a sense of values among all of our peoples—both those who labor and those who invest capital in the management of industry. No one has any envy for the capitalist or industrial manager who lives in a fine mansion on the avenue. But those who believe in social justice think there should be some of the modern standards of living set up in the homes of the cross streets and those beyond the railroad tracks. Labor, today, has a right to take pride in the achievements of the last half century. The labor organization has great responsibility resting upon it.

In the years just ahead of us, these organizations will be tested by the leadership which they create. No movement will rise above the intellectual ability and the character of the men who lead it. The labor movement has produced some great humanitarian leaders, leaders of whom we may be proud. It must continue to develop and recognize such leadership. Government itself, in the future, will rise or fall with the men who direct its affairs. The greatest need of our Nation and of the world today is human character. We need in government, in the labor movement, and in the struggles of mankind for better things, men and women of great wisdom, of unswerving integrity, and of outstanding character.

We are engaged, today, in a great program for the defense of our Nation. We are called upon for a united effort in building up our defenses to protect ourselves against a great world danger. We have here a test of our patriotism and our willingness to make sacrifices for the preservation of our rights in a democratic country. There are two conflicting ideas of government and social progress contending for supremacy in the world today. If the Hitler idea of social and economic control should prevail throughout the world, not only labor but industrial management as well will become the serfs of some dictator.

There were those in Germany who, in the early stages, encouraged the Hitler movement because they had some vague idea that that movement would bring the masses of the people under some sort of control. They have found out to their sorrow that the same dictatorial powers, which are now making slaves of the people of that country, are also enslaving them. The Government of the United States of America was established by people who fled from the oppression and tyrannies of the European countries of 3 centuries ago. Here in our country we have established the most advanced civilization in the world. We have created here a government which is under the control of the people under it. From the formation and adoption of our Constitution, down to the present time, the citizens of this country have determined by their choice who shall rule them. We are told by some people that a democracy will not work. We need only look at the history of our Nation to find that our Federal Government has provided greater protection and freedom for its people than any other government. We are confronted, today, with a movement which would set up an authoritarian control of all of the masses of our people. No one should minimize the fact that this movement is a direct threat to our Nation. If the Hitler movement should bring all of the countries of Europe, including Great Britain, under its heel, it will only be a short time until that power reaches into the Western Hemisphere. Our program of defense in this country has in mind not only every possible aid to those nations that are fighting Hitlerism, but it has in mind the freedom of the seas of both the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. We are being called upon to put forth our utmost for the development of those material forces and powers that will enable us to repel this power which threatens us. This will require sacrifices on the part of both labor and industry in our country. This is no time for any agency to seek any selfish end. Selfishness and greed must be brought under subjection in this country. The same sacrifices which are being made by our great Army in training should be required back home from those who labor in our industries and those who manage them. The United States of America was created by men with great ideas. If we are worthy of our heritage, we must be willing to make the same sacrifices which our forefathers made in establishing this land of the free.

There are those who say that we have no interest in the struggle that is raging in the world today, that the contest on the European Continent and in the East is no affair of ours. These are the people who are known as the isolationists. They overlook the fact that modern communication and transportation have brought all nations into close relation and association. We cannot separate ourselves from the rest of the world now. We are too close to it. When this Government was founded, crossing the Atlantic Ocean was a journey of weeks; now it is a hop of a few hours. In a large measure the outcome of the present world struggle will depend upon a clash of material forces; but in a still greater measure, in my opinion, it will depend upon contesting theories of society and government.

In our schools and on our public forums we should give more time than ever before to the history and growth of our American institutions and our Government. We need more than ever a deep appreciation of what American freedom and the American way of life mean. The ideals of American freedom must not fail the world in this crisis. We are holding, and must continue to hold, the torch of freedom that will be the beacon light for the oppressed peoples of the world. On this Labor Day I appeal to all of our people for loyalty, devotion, and sacrifices for the ideals of American freedom and opportunity. There must be no compromise with Hitlerism and the ideals for which it stands. We have no stock in the so-called new order which Hitler proposes for Europe and the world. It smacks too much of tyranny and dictatorship. We still believe that the American type of government can be made effective. We still believe that the individual rights of men can be preserved. In that belief we must have 100 percent of national unity not only in upholding our American ideals but in the development of those material forces in the way of national defense that will be necessary to protect and preserve those ideals in the world.

Col. Charles A. Lindbergh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE L. HERRING

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 15, 1941

ARTICLE BY HARLAN MILLER

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Harlan Miller in connection with the recent visit of Charles A. Lindbergh to Iowa.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OVER THE COFFEE

(By Harlan Miller)

DEAR MR. LINDBERGH: When you were here in 1927 I wrote an enthusiastic story about you which sounds rather naive today. I met you, and even supplied, in a minor crisis which arose, some refreshment for you and the flyers of the Eighteenth Squadron. May I presume on this slight acquaintance to ask you a few questions?

First let me say that, despite harsh things said, I still confess a certain regard for you. You were once a candid, reticent, clean-cut young man. You flew the Atlantic, as one of our Iowa boys did the same month. I believe that in a peculiar way you regard yourself as a patriot.

You keep saying that you represent 80 percent of the American people. But 4 months ago, when you began to say that, accurate surveys by Gallup, an Iowan, showed 71 percent of the American people favor convoys to prevent a British defeat, 68 percent favor going to war if it's the only way to beat the Axis. Knowing that, can you continue truthfully to say you represent 80 percent of the American people?

How much were you unconsciously influenced by Dr. Alexis Carrel, the notorious French Fascist, your mentor in the mechanical-heart experiments, whose views helped bring ruin to France? Were you a victim of his foreign "isms"? Have you been influenced or helped on your speeches by Sylvester Viereck, Lothrop Stoddard, or Lawrence Dennis, the pro-Nazi propagandists?

What do you mean by your veiled, subtle cries for an immediate change of government, before the 1944 elections, apparently by some method not provided in our Constitution? Who are your backers? Are they old-guard politicians like Mr. Hoover's Bill Castle, who is so fond of Japan? You were frank about your backers in 1927. Will you be frank about them tonight?

You blundered about the numbers and invincibility of the Luftwaffe. You blundered in June 1940, when you told Senators England would last only 30 to 60 days. You blundered about the weakness of the Russian air force. You blundered when you urged no sale of offensive weapons (bombers) to England, but only defensive weapons (pursuit planes), while Army flyers laughed at you, because both types are both offensive and defensive. Do you still think yourself infallible?

A man who has accused the President of "deception" cannot expect to be handled with gloves, must accept some mild criticism of himself. Why have you said so much to hurt the British, but nothing to help them? Why have you said so much to help the Nazis, but nothing to hurt them? Did you denounce the Russians as Nazi allies? Then why do you denounce them as Britain's allies?

What makes you so positive we are safe from Nazi aggression? In 1917-18 we sent 2,000,000 men to Europe. Why are you so certain the Nazis couldn't send 2,000,000 men to this hemisphere, especially if they had the British, French, Italian, Russian, and Japanese Fleets and shipyards? Is there something in the Nazi ideology that appeals to you? Aren't you horrified by any of it?

Since Germany invaded Poland, you have made 19 radio speeches, 2 in the first 45 days of the war, all helpful to Hitler, all hurtful to England. Why didn't you make any radio speeches in the 3 years after 1936, when you discovered Germany's air strength, to urge America to build an air force? Why were you silent then?

Are you politically ambitious? If so, why not admit it in your speech here tonight? Are your speeches merely an all-out political attack on the President? Where did you acquire your ethnic and strategic data? On what meat hath this our Caesar fed that he hath grown so wise? Have you read Mein Kampf?

Even your severest critics, Mr. Lindbergh, once your admirers, are honestly curious about your position and mystified by it. If some of these questions seem harsh, it is because they reflect the degree of their mystification, their disillusion.

I don't believe the petty, stupid, little stories told against you. I'm unwilling to dismiss you as a wrong-way Corrigan, headed toward Berlin when you think you're headed toward Washington. For good reasons, would you change your mind? Will you answer these questions? Or will this be another Coughlin, Moseley, Pelley, silver-shirt speech? If you are truly patriotic, you will answer them or at least ask them of yourself, when you are alone with your conscience.

SHOCKED EX-ADMIRER.

War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 15, 1941

EDITORIAL BY JAMES M. LANGLEY

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "War," written by James M. Langley, and published in the Concord Monitor of September 12, 1941.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Concord Monitor and New Hampshire Patriot of September 12, 1941]

WAR

The President last night declared war in sea areas of his own choice, for he is the one who decides by proclamation what and where our defense areas are. His declaration was against Germany and Italy. That is the clear intent of what he told the world:

"From now on, if German or Italian vessels of war enter the waters, the protection of which is necessary for American defense, they do so at their own peril."

It was the President's extension of the limits of waters considered essential by him to American defense which resulted in the incidents (the President calls them episodes) which made his announced action of last night inevitable. Having done the one thing he could not long expect not to have to do the other. It has become necessary perhaps sooner than the President expected.

We do not believe that the President's declaration of limited war came as very much of a surprise to the American people, whether they are isolationists or interventionists, or somewhere in between. When the President said the Red Sea was open to American freighters, despite the Neutrality Act, and when he announced the occupation of Iceland, the action he has now taken necessarily became only a matter of time.

Having declared limited war, it now is only a question of time until the President asks Congress to declare unlimited war. The miracle is that with such complete control over this Nation's destiny the President has been prevented so long from making even his limited declaration of war. That he has been is to the credit of the American people. Their refusal to be stampeded by events has already saved many lives.

The President did not define the limits of waters considered by him essential to American defense. Does he intend to stand upon previous definitions? Will the Navy be expected to keep the Red Sea free of Axis submarines, surface warcraft, and aircraft? Will the declaration of unlimited war result in convoying within "defense waters" and abandonment of the "patrol" quibble? Just when did the President issue his orders to the Navy to shoot first? Did he do so last week when he had expected to address the world sooner? Or has the order been of longer standing? Will an incident or incidents in the Far East result in defining the Sea of Japan, through which we are shipping oil in American ships to Russia, as essential to the defense of this country? Are we to understand that if we shoot first that is defense, but if Germany shoots first then it is piracy, even though the shots are fired in the eastern Atlantic?

The answers to these questions somehow reflect upon our self-righteousness, as voiced by the President in his address last evening. For that reason the questions, which came to mind as we listened to him, went unanswered. The explanation which the address was, or justification, was not complete. We wonder whether stark announcement of the President's order to the Navy, without an attempted explanation or justification, might not have been more dramatic and also more effective as notice to the Axis that the United States means business? It would have been less embarrassing to this country than the incomplete explanation the President did make.

Of course, the Axis nations will now do what we have said we will do, shoot first. Long ago Germany defined sea areas necessary to the defense of Germany. She was less ambitious in this respect than our own President has been. As he has repeatedly pushed our definition of areas eastward in the Atlantic they have come to overlap the German areas. From the German point of view United States shipping in the North Atlantic, if east bound, is definitely legitimate war prey, especially following the President's latest action. We have entered the shooting war, and no mistake.

Having declared limited war, the President must not expect the American people to wish to go the rest of the way with the enemy. We cannot as a nation longer make any false pretenses that our shipping is sacred in the North Atlantic. It is not, by reason of the President's action. It is there for defense, but it is there also offensively. An order to shoot first can be described as active defense, but actually it is an offensive action.

When a nation takes the step this country is now committed to by its President it must and does expect to take the consequences. It will expect the limited war to remain a limited war for the simple reason that even limited war means liability to casualties. We have placed our reliance now in the ability of our Navy to outwit and outfight the Axis in the North Atlantic, and in doing so we have abandoned our claim to further indignation if we get hurt.

The Petroleum Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 15, 1941

ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting column from the New York Times by the able writer, Mr. Arthur Krock.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of September 11, 1941]

HOW A WOLF TURNED OUT TO BE OLD DOG TRAY

(By Arthur Krock)

An inspection of the public history of the petroleum-shortage scare in the East leads to one of these conclusions:

Secretary Ickes, the Oil Coordinator, and his aides produced the scare on the basis of an exaggerated view of what the eastern surplus should be and without troubling to check all possible sources of supply.

Or Secretary Ickes and his aides deliberately magnified what they knew to be the facts in an effort to bring home to the wasteful American people a useful lesson in conservation.

For a third, and more unkind, conclusion that the hullabaloo was a piece of strategy in an effort to stimulate war psychology there is no support in the record.

The history of the case, as related in the press dispatches, does not, however, reflect credit on the manner in which it was conducted by the Government authorities. There is more than a suggestion that many elephant guns went off half-cocked and at small deer.

There is strong evidence that if Mr. Ickes, Mr. Davies, and the petroleum control agency had thoroughly canvassed the situation in advance with the railroads and other branches of the Government, the matter would have been handled more intelligently and effectively.

The result of the methods used has been to arouse a widespread public feeling that an attempt was made to sell motorists a gold brick, which is unfortunate because there really is a serious transportation problem and because, in the great strain the defense effort has put on national resources frugality in their use is both patriotic and necessary.

The following are the highlights in the record:

May 28: Gasoline consumption up 6.2 percent over 1939. May 30: Mr. Ickes forecasts gasless Sundays and "dim white ways" in the East because of a transportation shortage, accounted for in part by the impending transfer of 50 tankers to the Atlantic service. June 3: American Petroleum Institute recommends reduced Sunday driving and lowering of home temperatures by 5 degrees giving the transfer of 50 tankers as an important reason. June 10: The American Automobile Association suggests that slower driving and starting would save 20 percent in motor-gasoline consumption and avoid any need of rationing in the East. June 11: President Farish, of the Standard of New Jersey, says that proper Washington planning and cooperation with the trade should make eastern gasless Sundays unnecessary.

June 13: Mr. Ickes expresses fear that, partly because of the transfer of 50 tankers, eastern curbs are inevitable. The pinch will make itself felt about the time cold weather arrives. June 30: Government experts tell vacationists not to worry over rationing for the next 2 months. July 4: Mr. Ickes asks police authorities to arrest "wasters." "The shortage may become acute by September," he said. July 22: Oil-company executives meet with Mr. Ickes to discuss the diversion of more tankers to Great Britain.

July 28: Mr. Ickes says voluntary curtailment does not seem to be working. August 1: Oil companies asked to close filling stations from 7 p. m. to 7 a. m. and say they will comply. August 7: Mr. Ickes asks trucks to ration their use of gas by cutting down deliveries. August 14: Consumption goes up. August 15; Leon Henderson, at Mr. Ickes' request, cuts supply to retail trade 10 percent in 17 Eastern States. Filling stations are bewildered.

August 21: Mr Davies says stocks are at 10-day reserve level, "a perilous stage." August 22: Oil executives insist eastern stocks are ample unless more tankers are to be transferred. * * * Mr. Davies, at this late date, asks for a survey of idle tank cars. August 29: Mr. Davies says "sinister interests" seek to conceal the shortage.

September 4: Mr. Pelley, of the railroads, says there are enough idle tank cars to supply 200,000 more barrels daily to the East, and that Mr. Davies never asked him for information concerning them. September 5: Oil companies agree to use the cars. September 6: Eastern gasoline stocks increased 167,000 barrels between August 23 and 30. September 8: Mayor LaGuardia predicts early rescinding of curfew law for lack of need of it.

In the course of these developments it was indicated by testimony before Senator MALONEY's committee of inquiry that what Mr. Ickes, Mr. Davies, and Mr. Henderson sought was a huge "odeal" eastern gasoline reserve; that the daily shortage claimed of 174,000 barrels cut down on their own figures to 120,000 barrels, and then revised to 175,000, would be more than overcome by the use of the idle tank cars, whether 20,000, as claimed by Mr. Pelley, or less; that the British never took 50 tankers; and that the shortage represents merely the difference between what Mr. Ickes et al. thought the surplus ought to be at all times and what it will be until the tank cars are put in service.

In other words, Mr. Ickes' wolf, when the spotlight was turned on him, began to whine and wag his tail in the friendliest fashion.

The Congressional Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

AMUSEMENT AND GAMING DEVICES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, for the first time, Congress has officially recognized the existence of coin-operated machines which are designed either for amusement or gaming and has provided for a tax on such machines. This provision does not in any way nullify the validity of local ordinances or State laws which make such devices illegal, but merely undertakes to impose a tax on them if and when and where they might exist. The new taxing act divided such devices into two classes. On the first class, which are operated solely for amusement and are known as pin-ball machines, the tax is $10 per year and is payable by the person who maintains such a machine for use or permits its use on his premises. The second class as defined by the bill itself includes "so-called slot machines which operate by means of the insertion of a coin, token, or other similar object, and which by the application of the element of chance may deliver or entitle the person playing or operating the machine to receive cash, premiums, merchandise, or tokens." The tax on these devices is $50 per year and payable by the person who maintains the machine for use or permits his premises to be used for its use and operation. The Senate Finance Committee originally proposed a tax of $200 per year on so-called slot machines. This was reduced to $50 when Senators from a certain far western State assailed this tax as ruinous to a well-known town called Reno.

JOBS IN DEFENSE

Many persons, actuated by sincere and patriotic motives, would like to devote their talents to the Government service at a time when the world is in crisis. Perhaps a note of explanation might prove helpful. All civilian workers in any defense agency, whether it be the War or Navy Department, the Office of Production Management, the Civilian Defense Administration, or others, are recruited from civil-service rolls. Only in rare instances, where some type of highly specialized service is required, are persons directly hired by such agencies. When persons are needed, these agencies send a requisition to the United States Civil Service Commission stating the number of persons needed, the type of work to be done, and the qualifications for such work. The Civil Service Commission maintains registers of various classifications of work. To get on these registers one of two kinds of an examination is necessary. The one is called competitive and consists of a written examination which is held at a designated time and place. This type of examination applies to such services as typist, clerk, stenographer, and so forth. The other is known as an unassembled examination. It consists of a statement filed with the Commission showing the experience, education, and training of the applicant for a certain type of work. It applies to such classification as architect, engineer, chemists, and so forth. Complete information can be obtained by addressing a letter to the United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C.

WAR CASUALTIES

There have been very few comprehensive figures on casualties in the present war. Foreign governments have been rather secretive about this matter, and

figures have been hard to obtain. However, a survey was made recently based on figures obtained from foreign embassies in the United States, from the War and Navy Departments, the Congressional Library, and other sources. Total casualties for the first 2 years of the present struggle total 10,324,000. Of this number, 2,520,000 have been killed. The remainder constitute wounded and missing. Greatest tragedy is that 1,052,000 of these casualties were civilians and innocent bystanders in bombed cities. Of this number, 232,000 were killed. Thus does death rain from the skies.

DISCHARGE FROM THE ARMY

Every congressional office receives many inquiries concerning the discharge of young men from the Army, and we believe it will be informative to summarize the essential facts contained in a statement released by the War Department on August 29, 1941. If the foreign situation shows no material change, about 200,000 enlisted men will be released from active duty before January 1. Releases will be made in the following order of priority: First, dependency and hardship cases; second, enlisted men who have served their terms of enlistment; third, selectees and guardsmen requesting release who attained age 28 on or before July 1, 1941, and before their induction into service; fourth, enlisted men other than in the Regular Army who have served a year, who are married, and who request release; fifth, any enlisted man who has served normal term of Federal service. This last class, however, will be released in order of length of service beyond 12 months. The formula for securing release from active duty is simple. The soldier merely states in writing to his company commander that he desires a release and sets forth the reason. It may be a case where the father died, leaving a soldier as the sole support of the family. It may be that the soldier has a family of his own. This request is forwarded to the commander of the division. If the case is meritorious, the division commander orders the soldier's release. One so released is then transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps. He remains a member of the Reserve until he reaches age 45 or until he has served 10 years or until he is discharged therefrom.

People of the United States Must Protect Themselves Against Doctrines Which Undermine Our Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF JAMES W. WEIR

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, recently at the State convention of the West Virginia Department of the American Legion there was an address delivered which I believe should be read by as many persons as possible who are concerned these days with the strange doctrines which are being taught in America and which threaten our institutions.

The speech was given by James W. Weir, prominent publisher and newspaperman. He is my fellow townsman. I quote portions of his remarks with the firm feeling that we need to renew our allegiance to the faith of our fathers. He said:

If these United States have survived the vicissitudes of the struggles of their people for independence of thought and action and the right to enjoy liberty and the pursuit of happiness; if this country has survived the wars and the struggles from within and without since it asserted and gained its independence, and if today we are a free people, it is because of five great American institutions which you of the Legion and your fathers and forefathers by distinguished service to your country in time of war and in time of peace helped to build and to cherish. These institutions are:

The church: Citadel of Christianity.

The home: The citizen's castle.

The Constitution: Charter of our freedom.

The press: Palladium of our liberties.

The school: Crucible of character in which plastic youth is molded to meet his destiny and his obligations to home and country, about which I am to speak to you today under the title of "Educating Our Youth in Americanism."

If these institutions and our Government are to be perpetuated for the common welfare and for a permanent defense against strange doctrines and indoctrination of American youth which will, unless curbed, eventually undermine faith and confidence in the Republic and its founders, it is to you of the Legion we must look for inspiration, guidance, and action—to you as parents, as teachers, as citizens, and as soldiers, who have rendered such great and unselfish devotion to your country in war and in peace.

In accepting the assignment of State Commander A. C. Hall to speak to you on the subject of educating our youth in Americanism, my role cannot be much more than that of a sentry who sounds this call to arms to you: Men of the Legion, be on guard against the danger to Americanism and all that it means and implies in the form of such texts, textbooks, and reference books as tend to impair the child's faith and confidence in America and its institutions.

After all, it is the obligation of the newspaper to act as a sentry and to be constantly on guard against anything which tends to undermine public confidence in the institutions we hold dear, and against any influence which may tend to destroy "the highest values God has given man," for anything which affects or impairs the faith of American youth in this country's institutions tends to undermine the foundations of the Republic and robs youth of his visions.

* * * * *

It is my very great privilege to convey to you, upon this occasion, and for all time, a special message from your Assistant National Americanism director, Mr. Shumaker, in which he says:

"No phase of community service will return a higher dividend in citizenship than the intelligent, active, continued interest of the Legion post in its school affairs.

* * * * *

"A large number of public school and college textbooks have been submitted to the Americanism commission for analysis. A vast majority of the books surveyed teach in the American way and were written by patriotic Americans. However, an extended and critical analysis of the Harold O. Rugg social science series of junior high school textbooks recently completed shows that the Rugg books minimize American values and tend to destroy the child's faith and confidence in the American way of life. The Rugg junior high school books have been withdrawn from many schools, while a critical study of them is in progress in a large number of other communities.

"The National Education Association has adopted a stand that is in line with our longtime efforts. At its most recent Boston convention it adopted a report authorizing the creation of a commission 'to investigate alleged subversive teaching and to expose any teacher whose attitude is found to be inimical to the best interests of our country.' The commission will have other functions meeting with American Legion approval. One of these covers a movement to investigate criticisms of teachers' colleges and textbooks. We commend these authorizations on the part of the National Education Association. But they emphasize, they do not lessen, the need for every American Legion post to check the schools in its community. Only hurt for our future citizens can come because of such a neglect."

Inasmuch as it has been repeatedly charged that there are in use school textbooks and books available in school reference libraries which might create doubt in the minds of the children of the soundness of "democractic and constitutional ideals" on which our country and our American life and liberty have been reared, a few abstracts from the books of Prof. Harold Rugg will suffice to show whether that is true or not and will at least disclose the nature of the things that are being taught in the schools or else used to influence the thinking of the boys and girls in their more tender years.

"Nothing about this story of degradation is clearer than that in any of these decades a fairly decent standard of living could have been had by the people of the expanding West. That it was not and is not today can be traced primarily to the theory and practice of government set up by our fathers." That is a part of Professor Rugg's philosophy.

In another place in the same volume, page 270, the substitution of many foreign practices is advocated in the following language:

"Second, that every form of government on earth today must be regarded frankly as an experiment, tentative, and to be changed as new social and economic conditions develop. The trend has revealed scores of experiments, a great variety of forms and methods of collective living. The danger is that the young nationals of each of the 60 countries will grow up with the conviction that the form peculiar to his country is of proved superiority, rather than that it is one of the many experiments and could very likely be greatly improved by the substitutions of many foreign practices."

After all these years of existence, after all the struggles we have gone through and at a time when other nations have been seeking to impose their so-called "culture" upon this Nation, observe that Professor Rugg says that young nationals are apt to grow up with the conviction that the form peculiar to his country is superior, such as the form in this country—and discourages that by saying that it is likely that our form of government could very likely be improved by the substitution of many foreign practices, thus creating doubt in the mind of our own youth as to whether the American form of government is such a good form after all.

Legionnaires—citizens and parents—what effect must it have on you when you hear this quotation from Rugg's The Great Technology, pages 259 and 260:

"The unthinking acquiescence of educational workers * * * it is this which compels the formal unthinking salute to the flag, and the mumbling of an oath of allegiance which means absolutely nothing to

the young people making it. It is this which, in hundreds of communities, compels teachers to sign oaths of allegiance, to swear that they will protect the written constitution of the United States." And that in the face of the fact that American teachers are loyal and patriotic.

Just what effect is the teaching of such sentiments as those I have quoted likely to have among your children and other people's children and on their respect for our country, our Constitution, our laws, and our flag, which sybolizes all that our country means to us?

What effect does it have on the young people when they read the following on page 479 of the History of American Government and Culture, in Professor Rugg's Social Science Series?

"It was a difficult task indeed that confronted Mann, Barnard, and the other leaders. They faced indifference on the part of the people generally and a great opposition from the churches. Until about 1800 young people were taught to read principally that they might be able to read the Bible, the catechism and other religious books."

It was in protest against such strange doctrines as these and against such attempt at indoctrination of the young that your State commander in the June issue of the West Virginia Legionnaire sounded a call for action and pointed the way in the following message to you all:

"Storms of protest against the Rugg textbooks have arisen in all parts of the country. In scores of communities these books have been eliminated. The voice of patriotic Americans is at last heard.

"As a result some passages have been revised in the Rugg courses. Even titles have been changed. Indeed some laudatory comments on our country and its Founders have been inserted in the books. All of which is a bit encouraging, as it proves the case against the Rugg books. If the charges are not true, why the change?"

* * * * *

Protests such as your State commander has made are by no means confined to West Virginia but are Nation-wide in their scope since the Rugg Social Science Series are in use in approximately 5,000 school systems of the country, including some of the country school systems of West Virginia, either as textbooks for children between 11 and 15 years of age or as reference books.

* * * *

There are what is known as the Rugg and Kreuger books (not in the social-science series) which have been adopted by the State board for supplemental reading. A committee, it is only fair to say, of Kanawha County teachers, headed by Mr. M. R. Dodd, post Americanism officer of John Brawley Post, went over these particular books, and it is understood that nothing in them as such was found to be what is commonly designated as of a subversive nature. But as to the nature of other books or literature in use in the public schools generally throughout the State, there has been no general investigation and no definite information is so far available, so far as known, though it is known that the Rugg Social Science Series are in use in some and perhaps many of the counties of West Virginia at least.

* * * * *

There must be some authority somewhere to eliminate from the public schools textbooks, reference books, and literature which foster disrespect for the constitutions and the institutions we revere but if there be no other remedy, then certainly an aroused public opinion should lead to legislation as a means of guarding in the future against promiscuous admission of textbooks which contain subversive matter or subtle propaganda that the existing social and economic order in this country has failed and that we must follow the pattern of other nations merely for the sake of a change.

* * * * *

Deep beneath the surface, as we have in this country by this time found, is the war of clashing philosophies of life and of government, to shape and bend the life of youth as it has been bended and shaped in Germany, and the effort to inoculate our children with the virus of doctrines, which, measured by standards old or new, are not American, as you and I know it, and are utterly repugnant to every conception of Americanism, as exemplified by you.

Of special importance to the American people—youth and adult alike, here and throughout the land, now and for all times as a permanent defense—is the Nation-wide movement of the American Legion and the press to enlighten the public as to the insidious things which may creep in unaware in the textbooks or otherwise.

What is going on and what has been going on only goes to show the imperative need for sentry service such as the Americanism commission of the Legion and the press are performing, if we are to avert death, destruction, and despair such as has followed in the wake of 20 years of molding the youth of totalitarian countries.

But to check the undermining process in our schools and elsewhere and to revitalize the spirit of patriotism there must be a rebirth of interest in what the children of America are being taught—an insistence on the part of every parent on knowing what his child or her child is being taught—for, as your assistant nationalism director said in his magazine article—

"A great responsibility rests on the American parent in safeguarding that character of freedom which, since the days of Washington and Jefferson, has been perpetuated through an effective program of education. Each parent is charged with the sacred obligation of actively supporting and defending the first line of defense in America—our great public-school system."

In our great public-school system—and it is one of America's greatest institutions—our children are being educated and there is ingrained in the hearts of these young people great love of their own country, from which springs a spirit of patriotism not to be blighted unless at an early age their faith and their confidence in this country and all that it means and may mean to them as individuals is shaken and shattered by such sentiments as these:

"Question. Is the United States today a land of opportunity for all our people? Why? (Rugg's Pupil's Workbook, Our Country and Our People, p. 76.)

"Answer. The United States is not a land of opportunity for all our people; for one-fifth of the people do not earn any money at all. There are great differences in the standards of living of the different classes of people. The majority do not have any real security." (Teacher's Guide and Key, 1938 ed., p. 38, id.)

"Ours is a widespread culture of hypocrisy. A vast hiatus exists between what we are and what we do; what we want and what we say; how we vote and what we believe; what we fear and what we protest. In politics this lack of integrity shows itself in the divergence between party affiliations and inner belief. In business it rationalizes itself in the 'service' and 'community' slogans of chambers of commerce, rotary clubs, and the like. Legal relations are established through patriotism exchange of favor rather than on the merits of impartial judicial decision. The disintegrated character of our culture reveals itself in the conduct of the press and pulpit, in the gap between the program of the national school system and American life." (Rugg's Culture and Education in America, Self and Society: New Objects of Allegiance, p. 240.)

* * * * *

To keep alive the soul of American youth there must be more teaching of patriotism instead of skepticism and greater emphasis laid on the personal duty of the youth of the land to observe the laws, to maintain our constitutional form of government, and, so far as possible preserve our individual liberties.

Lindbergh's Attack on the Jews Unfair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK JOURNAL-AMERICAN

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Journal-American under date of Sunday, September 14, 1941, entitled "Lindbergh's Attack on the Jews Unfair":

[From the New York Journal-American of September 14, 1941]

LINDBERGH'S ATTACK ON THE JEWS UNFAIR

The raising of the racial issue by Charles A. Lindbergh in his Des Moines, Iowa, speech is the most unfortunate happening that has occurred in the United States since the present tense international situation developed.

Mr. Lindbergh said that "the three most important groups which have been pressing this country toward war are the British, the Jewish, and the Roosevelt administration."

The assertion that the Jews are pressing this country into war is unwise, unpatriotic, and un-American.

This astonishing statement, at total variance with the facts, is in nowise softened by Mr. Lindbergh's condemnation further on in his speech of the atrocities committed against the Jews by the Nazis in Germany.

Mr. Lindbergh made another great mistake in stressing "the large ownership and influence [of the Jews] in our motion pictures, our press, our radio, and our Government."

The Jews are an integral and legitimate part of our American business, social, and political life, and have been so since the days of the Revolution.

There has been no more peaceful-minded group in this country than the Jews.

There has been no group more enterprising, more law abiding, and more patriotic than the Jews of America.

From Haym Salomon, who financed the American Revolution, to Bernard Baruch and the late Supreme Court Justice Cardozo, they have been filled with the flame of our democratic ideals.

Mr. Lindbergh in his amazing statement did not adduce one single proof that any noted Jew or group of Jews has been urging this country to go to war.

Mr. Lindbergh makes a still graver charge when he says that the greatest danger to this country lies in the ownership and influence of the Jews in radio, motion pictures, and our Government.

This sounds exactly like things that Hitler said in the early days of his regime, followed by the brutal and incredible treatment of German Jewish citizens, which Mr. Lindbergh himself condemns.

Among Americans who are truly and traditionally American in ideals there are not—and must never be—religious or racial divisions.

Mr. Lindbergh in previous speeches has said he is opposed to hatred, bitterness, and mutual distrust.

But in his Des Moines speech he has done more to incite to hatred, bitterness, and mutual distrust than any other person on either side of this war-or-no-war controversy.

What he said should have no place in the mouth—or mind—of any American.

The Jews of America are loyal, patriotic, and do not want war.

Mr. Lindbergh has made a fool of himself and has alienated many of those well-meaning persons who have sincerely admired him.

Against the American Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune under date of Saturday, September 13, 1941, entitled "Against the American Spirit":

[From the New York Herald Tribune of September 13, 1941]

AGAINST THE AMERICAN SPIRIT

On Tuesday night at Des Moines Mr. Charles A. Lindbergh departed from the American way. For all his circumlocutions, for all his tardy admission that the Nazis' treatment of the Jews could not be condoned, Mr. Lindbergh made an unmistakable appeal to anti-Semitism, to those dark forces of prejudice and intolerance which, dangerous at any time, can be fatal in hours of national emergency

This newspaper has consistently upheld the right of Mr. Lindbergh and those of his way of thinking to speak their minds freely and publicly. It has sustained Mr. Lindbergh against attacks upon his patriotism which it believed were unwarranted by the facts. This it has done in the conviction that the discussion of America's relation to the great world conflict was an American debate, conducted by Americans firmly resolved to maintain the American system and differing only in their concept of how that is to be accomplished. But the Des Moines speech, marking the climax of a series of innuendoes and covert allusions by isolationist leaders, opens new and ugly vistas and seeks to inject into open debate subjects which all good Americans should pray might be confined to the pages of the Voelkischer Beobachter and the addresses of one Adolf Hitler.

To be sure, Mr. Lindbergh did not counsel anti-Semitism. He warned the Jews that they may suffer from it in the event of war—and provided anti-Semites with fuel for their anti-Semitism. He asserted, after the fashion of anti-Semites everywhere, that the Jews were dangerous to the United States because of their "large ownership and influence in our motion pictures, our press, our radio, and our Government." To state that Jews exert an influence in this country out of proportion to their numbers is to state what is unproved and unprovable; to state that their influence is exerted as Jews and not as American citizens is to libel not only the Jews but the whole American system.

The type of prejudice that judges men by the color of their skin, the land of their ancestors or the creed they profess rather than by their individual acts and opinions is not an unfamiliar phenomenon in the United States. The Native American movement, the A. P. A., the Ku Klux Klan have been manifestations of it. Many stocks, many religious groups, have experienced the social ostracism, the economic discrimination, the actual violence that accompany it. But always the great current of American life and thought has in the end swept aside the exponents of intolerance and group hatred.

Mr. Lindbergh, the man who speaks in the name of "America First," presumes to oppose this mighty current. It will sweep him aside with his predecessors. But unless all Americans realize the danger of such sentiments as Mr. Lindbergh has expressed, whatever their source, and resolutely set their faces against them, great miseries may ensue. Those isolationists who have whistled up Old World racial hatreds here, in an effort to attain their professed objective of keeping America aloof from the Old World, have sinned against the American spirit. Let that spirit rebuke them.

Military Demonstration of New War Equipment for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, on June 28 last I suggested to the Military Affairs Committee during the pending of the Army appropriation bill before the House of Representatives that Members of Congress be given a demonstration of new Army equipment at some place near Washington, and I reinforced this with a letter to Gen. George Marshall, Chief of Staff, on the same subject.

Members of the Congress have received letters announcing that such a military show has been arranged to take place at Fort Belvoir, Va., October 2, in the following letter over the signature of Hon. Henry Stimson, Secretary of War:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, September 13, 1941.

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. THOM: The War Department has scheduled a special demonstration of new Army equipment and training for Members of the Congress to take place at Fort Belvoir, Va., October 2. I wish to take this opportunity to extend to you a most cordial invitation to be present on this occasion.

The First Army will present a combat problem under simulated battle conditions, and the Chief of Ordnance has arranged for the exhibition of ordnance from the Aberdeen Proving Ground, including the latest model tanks. The program will also include a visit to the engineer replacement training center during regular training periods and other special events. Lunch will be served in the field and transportation will be furnished to and from Fort Belvoir by the War Department.

Due to the nature of the demonstration, it will be necessary that a transportation schedule be followed. Cars will leave from Capitol Hill promptly at 9 a. m., October 2, and return by 5 p. m. that afternoon.

In order that necessary arrangements may be made, it will be appreciated if you will advise the office of Brig. Gen. A. D. Surles, Director, Bureau of Public Relations, War Department, by September 25, whether or not you desire to attend.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

The President, Not Lindbergh, Speaks for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WATERLOO (IOWA) DAILY COURIER

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Waterloo Daily Courier, Waterloo, Iowa, of September 12, 1941:

[From the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier of September 12, 1941]

THE PRESIDENT, NOT LINDBERGH, SPEAKS FOR AMERICA

President Roosevelt in Washington Thursday night declared that the United States will take firm steps to determine that Hitler shall not succeed in his plan to conquer the world.

Charles Lindbergh in Des Moines on the same night urged that Britain be forced to accept what he called a negotiated peace so that Hitler would be one step closer to world domination.

Both declared that they spoke for the overwhelming majority of the American people. In a dramatic way, the people are confronted with the opportunity to compare these speeches, study their own thoughts, and make their choice.

There is no doubt what their decision will be. Lindbergh spoke hysterically of this country as if we lived on a distant planet, as if we could lazily decide to send a rocket ship to Europe or forget that Europe existed. The President, in a mood of calm decision, showed by conclusive example how Hitler's ambitions are at this very moment conflicting with our desire for security and how a German victory will result in domination of the seas and eventually all lands bordering on the seas.

Lindbergh, conjuring up the absurd fantasy of a gigantic plot by the British, the Jews, and the administration to draw us into war,

refused to admit the simple fact that every act the administration has taken on foreign policy has been supported overwhelmingly by the American people.

He spoke of aid to England which keeps the aggressor battling on a distant continent as if it did not serve to defend America. He spoke of this policy as if it were adopted over the protests of the people, whereas as a matter of simple record it was adopted by the people's representatives in Congress and with the approval of the people themselves according to every poll taken then or later.

The President said that when our security depends upon maintaining freedom of the seas and free communication between the mainland and our bases, we will not hesitate to maintain that freedom by force if necessary. There is a cold and irrefutable logic to this argument, as we have said before. Just because there is danger in standing fast in the best strategic position, it were foolish to retire to a position which is strategically vulnerable. This, Lindbergh would have us do.

The flyer serves ideally the purposes of the Nazis. Not only would he have us sit meekly by until Germany is in the most favorable position to attack us, but he also sourly attempts to create bitter internal feuds by his cruel attack on the Jews.

He insults the intelligence of the American people by asserting that they could be drawn into war by British propaganda. He attempts to weaken faith in this administration not only by asserting that it is wrong, which is his privilege, but also by screaming that the President is dominated by the British, which is a malignant falsehood.

He makes the ridiculous charge that newspapers and magazines dare not oppose the administration foreign policy because they are being blackmailed by warmongering advertisers. There isn't an advertiser who ever tried to influence the policy of this paper on that basis who wouldn't testify to the error of that charge.

Thursday night's addresses were a dramatic example of America in action. On the same evening the President outlined a new development in his foreign policy, and his leading critic severely criticized that policy. That is America. It is good.

And it is typical of American democracy that this opposition and criticism does not confuse us, does not stun us, does not immobilize us. With the din of argument sounding blatantly in their ears, the American people are rallying behind the President. He and not Lindbergh speaks for them. He and not Lindbergh is right.

H. R. 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, upon the calendar of the House is H. R. 10, favorably reported by the unanimous report of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House, giving jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to reinstate the cases heretofore dismissed by them on the ground of lack of jurisdiction in the act of April 25, 1932.

I wish to submit to the attention of the House several items which bear upon this case and which do not appear to have been set forth in the report. The items are as follows:

First. An opinion of Attorney General Knox that the Slade-Bender award, so-called, could not be construed as res judicata against the Eastern Cherokees.

Second. A statement of a series of cases in which the Congress under the present administration had authorized appeals in Indian cases to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Third. A statement by Mr. Justice Holmes, representing the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Carver against United States, that the denial of an application for a writ of certiorari could not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case in controversy.

Resolved, That the Attorney General of the United States is hereby requested to advise the House of Representatives with all convenient speed in the case of the Eastern Cherokees against the United States whether or not the award rendered under the Cherokee agreement of December 19, 1891, ratified by act of Congress approved March 3, 1893, as set forth in House Executive Document No. 182 of the Fifty-third Congress, third session, and the findings of fact of the Court of Claims of April 28, 1902, is res adjudicata; to review the opinion of the Department of Justice of December 2, 1895, and advise the House of Representatives whether the reasons set forth in that opinion now constitute a valid defense to the payment of said award. (Resolution of December 16, 1902 (H. Doc. No. 309, 57th Cong., 2d sess.).)

Under this resolution, the Attorney General, on January 22, 1903, reporting to the House of Representatives, said:

Neither the agreement nor the provision appropriating money to meet the expense of the accounting authorized an accounting with the Eastern Cherokees or between parties other than the United States and the Cherokee Nation; and if the accounting as had extended to matters outside of the authorization, it is surely in that respect not obligatory upon the United States. Nor is there anything in the findings of the Court of Claims which changes or enlarges the effect of this accounting or makes it res adjudicata between the United States and the Eastern Cherokees. (See p. 2, H. Doc. No. 309, 57th Cong., 2d sess.—Opinion of Attorney General P. C. Knox.)

The right of appeal to the Supreme Court has been granted by the Congress and approved by the President on many occasions, since the adoption of the Judicial Code in 1925, where the constitutional rights of Indian tribes and substantial amounts were involved, for example, under the Roosevelt administration:

Public Resolution No. 49, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 15, 1935:

"* * * shall be reviewed on the whole record by the Supreme Court of the United States on appeal from the Court of Claims, anything in the Judicial Code or amendments thereto notwithstanding: * * *." (The Crow Indians of Montana.)

Public Resolution No. 121, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 22, 1936:

"* * * shall be reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States on appeal from the Court of Claims, anything in the Judicial Code, or amendments thereto, notwithstanding: * * *." (Chippewa Indians of Minnesota.)

Public, No. 152, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 19, 1935:

"* * * that from the decision of the Court of Claims in any suit or suits prosecuted under the authority of this act an appeal may be taken by either party, as in other cases, to the Supreme Court of the United States." (Various tribes in Alaska.)

Public, No. 410, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 30, 1935:

"* * * with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States by either party, anything in the Judicial Code of the United States or amendments thereto to the contrary notwithstanding, * * *." (Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin.)

Public, No. 413, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved September 3, 1935:

"SEC. 5. Either party shall have the absolute right of appeal (not by writ of certiorari) from any final judgment entered by the Court of Claims to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Supreme Court of the United States is hereby invested with jurisdiction of such appeals." (Menominee Indians of Wisconsin.)

Public, No. 592, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 15, 1936:

"* * * with the right of appeal rather than by certiorari, to the Supreme Court of the United States by either party: * * *." (Klamath and Modoc Tribes and a band of Snake Indians, Oregon and Washington.)

Public, No. 755, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved June 28, 1938:

"* * * with the right of appeal by either party to the Supreme Court of the United States, anything in the Judicial Code of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding * * *." (The Red Lake Band of Chippewas in Minnesota.)

MEMORANDUM WITH REGARD TO THE EFFECT OF A DENIAL OF A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI BY SUPREME COURT

In *United States* v. *Carver* (260 U. S. 482, 490), Mr. Justice Holmes for the Court said:

"The denial of a writ of certiorari imports no expression of opinion upon the merits of the case, as the bar has been told many times. Therefore it is unnecessary to consider whether the libelants' argument is supported by the decisions to which they refer. *The Yankee sub nom. Rivers & Harbors Improvement Company* v. *Latta* (243 U. S. 649); *The Oceana, sub nom. Morse Dry Dock & Repair Co.* v. *Conron Brothers Co.* (245 U. S. 656)."

Shall Agricultural Prices Be Administered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the introduction of H. R. 5479 to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes together with the hearings thereon and the testimony submitted by Mr. Leon Henderson has created great interest over the country. Farmers in particular, who have been forced to carry such a heavy debt burden and to sell their labor in the form of the goods which they have placed on the market in recent years below cost of production, are greatly concerned about

some of the statements made by Mr. Henderson. Illustrative of the concern of farmers and farm leaders about this approach and other activities of Government agencies we find in a resolution passed by representatives of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation at Chicago at a meeting held August 18–19, 1941. This resolution has been endorsed by certain members of the Farm Bureau Federation and I submit the same for the RECORD:

RESOLUTIONS ON FARM PRICES ADOPTED BY NATIONAL EMERGENCY FARM MEETING—FIVE HUNDRED FARM LEADERS REVIEW POSITION OF AGRICULTURE IN DEFENSE PROGRAM AND MAKE SUGGESTIONS ON WHAT SHOULD BE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY

In the present crisis, precipitated by the national-defense program, farmers of America find themselves facing an uncertain future.

Reopening of world hostilities has had its first effect upon agriculture in America by producing a shortage of available experienced labor. Drawn first into industrial plants and then into the Army, not only are the farm people short-handed but practically all of the farmer-owned and farmer-operated cooperative business enterprises are also feeling the labor pinch. They are unable to compete with defense industries in wage rates, unable in many communities even to compete with public employment agencies such as the W. P. A. and P. W. A.

American farmers in this crisis see others in villages, towns, and cities experiencing the influence of increasingly bountiful incomes, wrought in many instances by force and violence, but always accompanied by rising wage scales and a shorter working week.

Fearful of a future embodying this disparity of opportunity, this inequality of economic position, they are made more distrustful by their knowledge of great changes impending in the administration of government as the national-defense program advances. Some of these changes in Federal policy have come about under existing laws; others, fraught with more dire consequence to agriculture, are in prospect.

For that reason, this, the second national emergency conference of farm leaders to be called this year by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation now proposes additional policies to be adopted and acted upon severally or collectively through the respective farm organizations and to be recommended as additional suggestion in regard to what should be the Government's policy:

FARM PRICES

We oppose any Federal policy by the Executive or by congressional enactment which may place maximum prices upon commodities, particularly those of agriculture, until such time as agriculture is on an equal footing with industry and labor. Even under such conditions we oppose rigid price fixing, but suggest a policy of flexible price stabilization rather than price pegging.

Under no conditions should agricultural price parity interpretations be made or be authorized to be made in any so-called price-ceiling legislation unless a relatively perfect balance is established and maintained between the prices of agricultural products and the rates of industrial wages.

Recently Senator GLASS, of Virginia, and Representative STEAGALL, of Alabama, introduced companion bills (S. 1810 and H. R. 5479) whose object is to freeze the prices of all commodities and the rates of rent in many localities. This bill, while offered as a defense measure, specifically states that it is not necessarily a defense measure. Its language clearly implies that its authors intended it to be permanent in character unless terminated by an Executive order of the President or a concurrent resolution of the Congress. Moreover, in the process of freezing, the bill authorizes the Executive to make his choice in the case of agricultural commodities between the prices in effect on July 29, 1941, or a figure to be computed by officials in the Department of Agriculture and to be known as 110 percent of parity.

Trouble for farmers

No new concept of parity is advanced in the bill. No limitation of authority or a legislative "yardstick" is provided the Secretary except that in existing law. And the full flow of imagination is to be permitted the Department's economists in defining interpretations of this interesting, if misleading, method of determining farmer income.

We are firmly convinced that, when under parity rule, a farmer in this day is tied down to the purchase of an equivalent amount of products to that which the commodities he raised could buy in the pre-war period, he is shackled definitely to a lower standard of living than that which other groups are permitted now to enjoy.

We are further convinced that nothing but disaster can come from pinning down the commodity price rates and specifically exempting any control over the rates of wages.

Such a bill carrying with it dictatorial powers cannot but result in further dislocations, further distress, and speed the way to total break-down of our national life.

A flexible formula for agriculture

We consider the present methods used by Government officials to determine parity antiquated and unfitted to meet the present needs of farmers. We resent the very conception that what an American farmer had 10 years before the World War is good enough for him in 1941. We insist that if any program of fixing ceiling prices be adopted over our protest and opposition, it should specifically include in the legislation a formula directly relating agricultural prices to industrial wages. Under such a formula, if wage rates rise or fall agricultural prices will follow along, thus preserving more nearly an equitable relationship between the incomes of the respective producing groups.

DOUGHTON TARIFF BILL

We oppose the enactment by the Congress of the Doughton tariff-control bill (H. R. 5032). This bill would permit various governmental agencies to determine for themselves what commodities are essential to the national defense and authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of such agencies, to suspend the collection of all import duties on such commodities and further to remove any import restriction of a sanitary protective character or otherwise. Under its terms this bill would remain permanent on our statutes.

It is a far-reaching, almost unheard-of grant of power wresting from Congress functions specifically designated to it by the Constitution of the United States.

While not giving to the governmental agencies the power to collect revenue, it gives them a veto power over the will of the Congress and opens the way to misuse and abuse which is bound to be detrimental to the interests of the farmers. It will particularly injure that great group of producers depending almost entirely on the domestic market who face competition from the low-wage, cheap-land areas of South America, China, Africa, and other far parts of the world.

ARGENTINA

We oppose the ratification by the United States Senate of the sanitary convention with Argentina. It is intended to break down the severity of the present quarantine established to protect this country from the ravages of rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease. We oppose what we believe to be the intention of the Federal Government to conclude in the forthcoming trade agreement with Argentina, or otherwise, an arrangement whereby fresh, frozen, and chilled mutton and lamb from Tierra del Fuego may be imported into this country as such action would constitute only another device to weaken sanitary protection against the spread of rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease from this vast territory under the joint control of the Argentine Government and Chile.

ANDRESEN BILL

We endorse the principles of and urge the passage by the Congress of H. R. 5531, a bill recently introduced by Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, for the purpose of establishing a permanent system of sanitary inspection and control over importations of animals and their products from foreign countries when there is danger of spreading (in this country) diseases communicable to animals and to humans.

This bill is of the greatest importance to the producers of livestock, including beef cattle, hogs, sheep, goats, and dairy cattle. It is of infinite importance to the consuming public. If passed, it will protect the already high standards in force with respect to our domestic production and interstate commerce in livestock, animal products, milk, and its products. It will take away the power of foreign countries to control the progress of our sanitary programs. This power they now enjoy by virtue of provisos inserted into more than a score of trade agreements executed under the Trade Agreement Act of 1934. We urge widespread nonpartisan support of this bill in both town and country.

SYNTHETIC FOODS

We oppose the practice of permitting Federal Government officials to lend their aid to the producers of synthetic foods as compared with natural foods by attempting to influence consumption trends.

We believe that the function of government with respect to such matters is to protect the public health, to require proper and adequate labeling, to prevent fraud wherever possible, to ascertain and publish the results of scientific research, but not to take sides.

Recently the Consumer's Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, aided and abetted by others in the Federal Government, has conducted a campaign in behalf of the consumption of oleomargarine in preference to butter.

They have even gone so far as to take time on national radio networks. In this way they have incensed the dairy farmers of the Nation and aroused them to protest.

For millions of farm families their major income rests upon the foundation of butterfat prices and sales. For more than half a century makers of oleomargarine have attempted to foist their products upon the public by devious ways of imitation. In earlier days these practices were so nearly fraudulent that the Congress of the United States enacted legislation designed to regulate the making and control of this product and imposed a tax which was then considered prohibitive upon the making and sale of colored oleomargarine. This act in later years has been strengthened, but the problem of control over this industry has not yet been solved.

Cleverly they have evaded, or avoided, in many instances the intent of control laws.

Sell oleo as oleo

We believe firmly that if oleomargarine is to be made and sold in the United States, that it should be required to be sold for exactly what it is, and in no wise be produced and marketed in imitation of or semblance of butter. We urge the Congress of the United States to pass legislation which, among other things, will prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of any oleomargarine containing any ingredient causing it to taste or look like butter, or containing any milk or milk product.

We further believe that truthful advertising legislation on our Federal statutes should be strengthened to prohibit oleomargarine manufacturers from using butter color

in their advertisements and prohibiting publishers from receiving or printing such types of advertising, printing books or pamphlets containing such types of illustrations and intended to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce.

In this connection we call attention to what we believe to be grave misuses of power by the Food and Drug Administration now lodged in the Federal Security Agency with respect to promulgation of unwise and unworkable standards of identity for natural foods. We therefore urge the Congress immediately to inaugurate an investigation of the activities of this agency with a view completely to overhauling the powers of the agency and the possibility of Congress itself establishing definitions of standards of identity.

MILK SHORTAGES

We are deeply alarmed over serious disturbances which are occurring within the dairy industry as a result of the effort to supply the Allies with great quantities of dry milk solids, evaporated milk, and cheese. The program in its present uncoordinated stages is causing shortages of cream supply in some dairy plants, particularly in local creameries owned by farmers, and is even bringing up serious problems of milk scarcity in urban milksheds. This problem of interindustry diversion is one which demands prompt and intelligent action by the Federal Government to avert serious losses and even the closing down of many dairy plants.

CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

We are increasingly disturbed by the activities of persons in government who are unfriendly to agricultural interests, and we urge the President to institute immediately a method by which their activities may be revealed and to remove them from all parts of the Federal establishment. We particularly urge the removal from the United States Department of Agriculture of the Consumers' Counsel.

AGRICULTURE

We reiterate the statement of the condition and outlines of a proposed Federal policy to meet this emergency which was presented to the public on May 2, following the first emergency conference on the condition of agriculture called by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. We particularly reiterate the following resolutions which were adopted at that meeting:

(a) We ask that agriculture be given equal representation with industry and labor, satisfactory to agriculture, on all Federal agencies having to do with the national defense.

(b) We urge a Federal policy to restore economic equality as between agriculture, industry, and labor.

(c) Since industry has received a cost-plus guaranty in its production for national defense and the farm groups now being called upon to increase production have received no such guaranty, we insist that such farmers should immediately have prices which will compensate both for current production and increased capital outlay.

(d) We ask for a discontinuance of Federal governmental propaganda designed to mislead the public into believing that farm prices are satisfactory and remunerative to producers.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

The subject matter on which this conference is acting is of such vital concern to every farm family in this Nation that we urge those attending this conference, and farm leaders everywhere, to lose no time acquainting the people in their respective communities with the issues involved, the results of our deliberations, and to institute demands for action by their congressional delegations in harmony with the views of this conference. We urge them to spare no worthy effort in carrying out this task of spreading information.

Employment Situation Due to Curtailment of Production—Automotive Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

RESOLUTION OF PONTIAC (MICH.) LOCAL UNION NO. 653 OF THE UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the Pontiac Michigan Local Union No. 653 of the United Automobile Workers of America of the C. I. O., having to do with the sharp curtailment in production in the automobile industry, which will bring about much unemployment and untold suffering to the workers and their families and dependents unless something is done to offset the same.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION RE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION DUE TO CURTAILMENT OF PRODUCTION

Whereas a sharp curtailment in production in auto industry has been ordered by the Federal Government, and this reduction in production is not the result of reduced consumption; and

Whereas this curtailment will cause thousands of workers to be without a job, and this loss of job cannot be construed as the fault of the workers; and

Whereas these workers have in the past either not been working long enough or making enough wages to lay away for a rainy day or have purchased homes, furniture, cars, and other necessities of life on the time-payment plan; and

Whereas any break in employment will cause these people to lose said homes, furniture, cars; and

Whereas it is necessary that the morale of the workers and the people in general of the United States be kept at a high peak in order to insure the greatest effort for national defense; and

Whereas workers losing their equity in their homes, furniture, or cars does contribute toward the breaking down of their morale; and

Whereas these workers should not be made the objects of charity; and

Whereas the Federal Government has been spending billions of dollars in aid to Britain, Russia, and China in order to preserve democracy; and

Whereas provision must be made to employ these workers in other plants, and it will require time for the retooling of these plants, and during that period these workers will have no visible means of support: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Local Union No. 653, I. U. U. A. W. A., C. I. O., go on record as demanding that the Federal Government make some provision to protect the interests of these workers, either by paying them enough wages to take care of their obligations or by declaring a moratorium on their obligations without interest or penalty during said period of unemployment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the International Union, the National C. I. O., Leon Henderson, Sidney Hillman, William S. Knudsen, the President of the United States, to Michigan Senators, Congressmen, and Representatives and to the press.

JAMES F. LUCAS,
President.
EUGENE G. HILL,
Recording Secretary,
Local 653, U. A. W., C. I. O.

Curb of Installment Buying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 15, 1941

ADDRESSES ON AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, on Thursday last I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain addresses delivered on the American Forum of the Air at the Hotel Willard, on August 31 on the subject How Far Should We Curb Installment Buying? I am now informed that it is estimated that to print the matter will cost $180. With that statement, I renew the request.

Mr. Theodore Granik presided and introduced the speakers who were: Chester C. Davis, president, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis; E. A. Mattison, vice president of the Bank of America and a nationally known credit authority; Boris Shishkin, economist, American Federation of Labor; J. Hudson Huffard, chairman of the board of directors of the National Retail Furniture Association and spokesman for the United States Chamber of Commerce; Mrs. Esther Cole Franklin, representative of American Association of University Women on the National Consumer-Retailer Council; and Rolf Nugent, consultant to the Office of Price Administration.

I also ask that Mr. Granik's remarks when introducing these speakers be printed as a part of this radio program.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As America's vast defense program gains momentum, as first one then another phase of our economic system is affected, the real significance of arming a nation on an all-out scale becomes more apparent to the average citizen. And tomorrow we will awaken to find new signs along our economic highway—important signs, which bring our defense efforts to the direct attention of every wage earner in the country.

The signs tell of new rules in the field of installment buying.

Under date of August 9, President Roosevelt issued an Executive order empowering the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to regulate consumer credit, in order to promote national defense and to protect national economy.

The regulation adopted by the Board will take effect tomorrow. It prescribes installment credit terms for a list of 24 consumers' durable goods. It contains provisions covering modernization loans, installment cash lending, and related activities.

What does this credit regulation mean to you? How far should we curb installment buying? And in curbing it, will we prevent inflation? Will we increase unemployment? Will this curb impair our standard of living? More importantly, will it help our defense program?

Americans are asking those and similar questions. And tonight the American Forum of the Air, as a further contribution to national defense, has invited six noted authorities to discuss the questions.

Our guests, representing Government, business, labor, banking, and consumer interests, are: Chester C. Davis, president, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis; E. A. Mattison, vice president of the Bank of America and nationally known credit authority; Boris Shishkin, economist, American Federation of Labor; J. Hudson Huffard, chairman of the board of directors of the National Retail Furniture Association, and spokesman tonight for the United States Chamber of Commerce; Mrs. Esther Cole Franklin, representative of the American Association of University Women on the National Consumer-Retailer Council; and Rolf Nugent, consultant to the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply.

We invite your letters and comments on tonight's presentation. And now our opening speaker, Chester C. Davis.

ADDRESS BY CHESTER C. DAVIS

I hope Mr. Granik intends us to take plenty of latitude under the announced topic. I am willing to talk about how far installment buying should be curbed, but some of the listeners are probably asking why it has to be curbed at all.

External developments have forced the United States to arm on an unprecedented scale. To that end the Government is spending money for materials and men at the swiftest possible rate. Wages are going up. The number of unemployed is falling. National income and consumers' purchasing power are rapidly rising. But the supply of many things is diminishing as men and factories and materials are diverted to make implements for war. Now if this rising income is spent for a diminishing supply of goods, and on top of that we continue to expand consumer credit, this country faces ruinous price inflation.

If that develops, it is the great mass of working men and women who will be hardest hit. We can agree, I think, that the Government isn't going to abate its defense efforts just because of this prospect of inflation. But every future move in the fields of taxation, Treasury financing, direct price controls or credit policy should seek, as one objective, to prevent a runaway price situation. Certainly a balanced program to check inflation must make use of all of them. We are concerned tonight with credit policy. The volume of long-term installment debt is ballooning right on top of swiftly rising incomes. The new regulation of installment credit is a part, and relatively not the most important part, of a broader program aimed to prevent these forces from driving prices out of reach. A further specific purpose is to slow down demand for articles which compete directly with defense for materials, labor, and factory capacity.

Some people fear that regulation of installment terms may take away the poor man's chance to buy the good things of life. It is not installment terms but defense needs that will determine how many automobiles, refrigerators, and other specified articles are actually going to be produced for civilian use. Fewer people, whether rich or poor, will be able to get new cars, for example, regardless of whether installment terms are regulated or not. What the low-income worker really needs to fear—and what installment regulation may help to protect him from—is skyrocketing prices which dip into his pocketbook and cut his real wages.

In order not to pass over tonight's direct question, I suggest that installment terms should be strict enough to bring about during the next year a substantial reduction in the present volume of installment credit extended on articles that compete largely for defense materials. As for credit on articles not so directly competitive, the restraints should be sufficient to prevent a bulge in the volume now outstanding. I would start that way and watch it.

Finally, when the time comes that these civilian goods can be produced again in quantity, the brakes now being placed on consumer credit can be loosened or taken off. This will help to make more jobs and to keep the business machine running in the post-defense period.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Davis. And now I am happy to present E. A. Mattison, vice president of the Bank of America.

ADDRESS BY E. A. MATTISON

The question which Mr. Granik offers for discussion tonight, "How far should we curb installment buying?" should command the most serious attention of every wage earner in the United States. In the past 6 years our bank alone, the Bank of America, with its 495 branches, has granted over 2,300,000 individual installment loans for a grand total of more than $700,000,000, an average of less than $300 per loan. Multiply those figures by several hundred and you will have some idea of the far-reaching effect of the new Government regulations on installment buying. And it is my hope tonight that our discussion will serve to dispel some confusion surrounding the purpose of this curb. Is it to aid defense production or to control inflation?

If to control inflation, why was one of the smallest segments of installment debt in dollar volume regulated the most drastically?

I doubt if the curb is any aid to defense production, because priorities take care of that.

Further, cash lending has been left uncurbed, and a person with qualifying income and credit rating can get a loan from a loan company or modern bank, without security, for the full purchase price of an article and avoid a down payment or installment contract which uses the article as security.

But my chief concern is the new terms on household appliances, requiring 20 percent down and installments limited to 18 months. This shuts out many credit-worthy persons who have just found steady employment but have had no time to accumulate substantial down payments. Household appliance buyers are not in the minority. It may surprise you to learn that their number is greater than those buying automobiles.

We hear of ceilings on wages as well as on other things, yet these small wage earners are expected to buy defense bonds and meet tax bills they have never paid before. We should be fair and shape our regulations to conserve their remaining buying power. Installment credit has long been the basis of wage-earner buying power and will long remain so. Upon it America's mass-production industry, so useful today, has been built.

These regulations merely shift buying power away from the masses to higher-income groups. Even a dollar or two added to each installment makes a big difference to people of small income, and means to the $1,500-a-year man the denial of articles still available to the $2,500-a-year man.

Bankers feel the Federal Reserve is to be congratulated on the reasonableness of most of the initial regulations. Reaction of dealers, too, on the whole has been good. Provision for local administration, permitting adjustment to local problems, is to be commended.

But, getting back to the question of "How far should we curb installment buying?" I say we have gone far enough, perhaps too far in certain fields. No additional curb should be imposed until consideration has been given to the present effect of denying credit to a group of already limited buying power and leaving it open to others.

With regard to the regulations which go into effect tomorrow, whether they prove good or bad, the Bank of America is pledged to continue its wholehearted cooperation with the Nation's vast defense program and our facilities will be utilized to the fullest extent in making the regulations effective. It is my sincere hope that the general public will accept the regulations issued by the Federal Reserve Board in the same spirit.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Mattison. And now we present Boris Shishkin, economist, American Federation of Labor.

ADDRESS BY BORIS SHISHKIN

The real measure of worker's income is the buying power of his pay envelope. A rise in the price of any commodity needed in a wage-earner's household takes that commodity out of the reach of the worker's family. Rising prices reduce the standard of living of workers. That is why inflation is labor's deadly enemy. That is why labor is giving its support to measures designed to prevent inflation.

The major cause of inflation is shortage of materials. If we could expand production to meet the increased demand for goods, prices would remain stable. But defense comes first. There are fewer automobiles and radios with more people to buy them. Prices go up unless they are checked.

To prevent inflation it is not enough to put ceilings on prices by Government order. When the supply of goods runs short, pressure is created to circumvent the fixed prices. Immediate use of consumer's buying power must therefore be deferred or diverted. Increased savings through the purchase of defense bonds is a means of deferring consumer's buying power. Increased taxation is a means of diverting it. There are other devices we can use to discourage price increases and to dampen buying power. Some of them are sound and constructive. Others are destructive and therefore objectionable.

One such device is the recent order curtailing installment sales. This order is not drastic. Its purpose was not so much to curb installment buying as to get the public used to the idea. In issuing it the Government was acting like a dentist who tries to convince the patient that when the tooth is pulled it isn't going to hurt.

Is further curtailment of installment buying going to hurt, and how badly? The answer is that it is not going to hurt those who can afford to pay in cash the full price of the automobile, the washing machine, or the radio. Most of us, workers and farmers, do not have the full price of a car or a washing machine. Most of us do not even have enough to buy these things on a hard payment plan of only three or six payments.

This means that the few of us who do have ready cash will be able to buy new automobiles and new furniture, while most of us whose incomes are small and who are compelled to pay as they earn will have to do without these things.

If we knew that this plan, no matter how inequitable, would really check inflation, we might be wise in accepting it, even though it hurt. But will it work? Of this we are not so sure.

The regulations are necessarily such that they will drive much of the consumer borrowing from legitimate credit channels into

the hands of loan sharks. This makes the attempted control ineffective. And ineffective regulation may be worse than no regulation at all. For it will only serve to give an economic advantage to the man with a ready roll of cash against the man with the small pay envelope. In addition, it will place upon the low-income families the further burden of paying out to the unregulated lenders a large portion of their meager income in interest charges.

Even the initial regulation will displace a large number of workers from the jobs they now hold. A more rigid curb will create substantial unemployment. Dislocations resulting from further restriction of installment buying may do much damage to our economy and to the morale of our labor without contributing a great deal to the prevention of inflation. Before we take another step, let us stop to work out a different method of curbing inflation which would achieve economic stability and yet leave the spirit of our people undaunted.

America's war strength is as great as the output of its industry, and of its labor. It is clear today that America is going to fight out and win this war, not on the firing line but on the production line of its industry. In the last count, the defense of democracy depends on the productive strength of our workers. The welfare of our workers and their morale are of paramount importance.

Let us unite in an intelligent defense effort, not a short-sighted one. In carrying out the task let us not destroy the standard of living and the very way of life we have set out to defend.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Shishkin. And now we present J. Hudson Huffard, chairman of the board of directors of the National Retail Furniture Association.

ADDRESS BY J. HUDSON HUFFARD

As a retailer of furniture and household appliances I have had direct experience with installment credit for a long time. Installment credit is not a new thing. It is a device that has long been used to enable consumers to obtain durable goods having high unit value by making regular payments over a definite period of time. Through installment credit, persons having low incomes can have the advantage of the most modern facilities, both to aid them in their work and for use by their families. Without access to installment financing plans they would necessarily have to do without many present-day conveniences.

It is axiomatic that businessmen must constantly be on the alert to adjust their policies and operations to the times. Without such adjustment no business would long endure. Those who are in the business of selling goods on the installment plan have recognized the need for adjusting their policies as economic conditions change.

In a recent report of a committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, it was aptly stated that "businessmen who regularly grant credit to consumers are aware of the adverse consequences which follow upon unsound credit practices. Whatever form consumer credit may take—open account or installment—those who grant it are most directly concerned that consumers be in a position to meet their obligations promptly."

Long before the recent action of the Governors of the Federal Reserve System to regulate terms of installment contracts, retailers had taken steps to increase down payments and shorten the periods of contracts where it seemed that too liberal terms were being offered. So far as I have had opportunity to discuss the matter with others, there is every intention to keep installment credit within reasonable bounds.

Retailers have already experienced difficulty in procuring such items as refrigerators, ranges, radios, washing machines, and other durable goods. We all recognize that requirements for defense come first, and that in meeting defense requirements, especially for metals, there will be curtailment in the supply of many kinds of consumer goods. Of course, when the retailer has a limited number of articles to sell he will naturally restrict his terms of sale because there would be no logic in extending liberal credit terms to promote sales when the supply is short.

The retailers of the country will abide by the rules which the Federal Reserve Board has recently made to supplement the previous action of retailers in seeking to prevent unsound expansion of installment credit. In thus cooperating, retailers are continuing to support policies considered essential for promoting defense. Already in connection with present defense efforts, retailers have demonstrated their determination and ability to cooperate effectively with national-defense officials in preventing unjustified price increases of available merchandise. I am convinced that they can be depended upon to perform an equally effective job in keeping consumer credit on a sound basis during the emergency period, and they will expect no extension of regulatory measures which the seriousness of the emergency does not logically demand of them. We are determined to proceed with the solution of our economic problem upon a fair and patriotic basis.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Huffard. And now we present Mrs. Esther Cole Franklin, representative of the American Association of University Women on the National Consumer-Retailer Council.

ADDRESS BY MRS. ESTHER COLE FRANKLIN

It is my function, I presume, to speak for consumers.

May I say at the outset that although I have been dealing with various consumer problems in the past few years, I am in no sense an expert on consumer installment credit. I have, however, some very definite convictions and a number of questions pertinent to our subject this evening. First, I am firmly convinced—after very extensive observation—that the vast majority of American consumers, in their capacity of free persons and loyal citizens, have placed a priority on defeating Hitlerism; and that they recognize the importance of pushing defense production into high gear, even if this means a decrease here and there of civilian supply. My second conviction is that a far greater majority of American consumers than ever before in our history are concerned with the problem of keeping our economy on an even keel through the crisis. It is amazing how many so-called little men and little women are these days saying, "What can we do to prevent inflation?"

We as a people, whatever our interests, are therefore agreed on the general national purposes at this critical period. We know we must cut down the consumption of certain types of consumer goods because the raw materials and production facilities are needed for defense. We know that we must, as far as possible, pay as we go to avoid a post-emergency depression.

But consumers have a right to ask whether the methods used to restrict consumer purchases are effective, whether they are fair, and whether they represent the most desirable methods of preventing inflation while shifting production to defense materials. First, will the installment buying curbs be effective? The answer is, "Nobody knows—but everybody hopes."

Secondly, are the installment curbs fair? The answer here is "Yes and no." All consumers will welcome them insofar as they discourage certain well-known high-pressure merchandising practices which intelligent consumers have long disliked. And consumers like myself, who prefer to pay cash or go without, are happy to be respectable again. Yet if these installment limitations are effective, they will discriminate against the mass of consumers in the low-economic brackets who for the first time have a regular wage and can begin to think about buying that much-needed sewing machine or refrigerator or mattress; and cash customers, fearing what may happen to the supply, may rush in and buy whatever is available whether they need it or not, pushing up prices at a rapid rate, and thereby promoting inflation. The very large group of consumers who have no choice but to buy on credit may justly view with real concern the whole policy of curbing installment credit as discriminatory, seeing in it an indirect and unscientific method of rationing.

This leads to our third and most important question, Are there not other methods to achieve our major purposes which are more effective, more equitable, and more direct in their operation? I should like to phrase my answer to this question by asking other questions of the experts on the panel: If defense production is our goal, why should we not place priorities on any and all materials needed for defense which are likely to be scarce in this emergency period, and supplement these priorities with a direct rationing of consumer purchases determined, so far as possible, by varying consumer needs? If prevention of further inflation is our goal, why should we not immediately institute an effective system of price controls? Give us a chance to participate in a balanced and effective program.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mrs. Franklin. And now we continue with our informal extemporaneous roundtable panel discussion, "How far shall we curb installment buying?" Mr. Nugent, will you open our panel tonight?

Mr. NUGENT. The participants in this discussion have generally indicated approval of the idea of curtailing installment credit. They represent Government, business, labor, and the consumer. The very fact that they find some degree of agreement on the principle of control indicates that all of these groups that they represent have somewhat of a stake in the objectives to which the control is being directed, namely, to provide defense materials, to restrict civilian demand for defense materials, and to curb inflationary tendencies.

However, I detect in the business representative's comments some suggestion that business doesn't like the restriction of such a control; in the comment of Mr. Shishkin, representing labor, that some laborers may be unemployed if the restraints are imposed too heavily; and on the part of Mrs. Franklin that consumers may be made the goat of the emergency that has led to the introduction of this control.

I would like, first of all, to put a question to the representative of business. Mr. Mattison, hasn't business a great deal to gain from the control of consumer credit? For instance, isn't it highly desirable that we build up, so far as we can now, a backlog of demand that can be turned on after this defense spending splurge is over?

Mr. MATTISON. Well, speaking for the interests of banking rather than the interests of business, as I presume you mean manufacers, I can agree with the objective, and certainly it is worth every possible effort to attain it. It has a number of very difficult problems that must be solved before I think you can safely say that we can bank a certain amount of orders for a certain and definite time when we will be able to turn them on. In my personal opinion, it is difficult to regulate the natural laws of supply and demand so completely.

Mr. NUGENT. But haven't we been through the very strange situation of producing more cars than we have ever produced before and at the same time we have also had to produce more weapons than we have ever produced before? It seems to me to be a rather silly economic situation that produces a very in-

tense demand for both types of steel-bearing and metal-bearing goods at the same time. Isn't it only sensible to try to dampen the demand for the one type of goods?

Mr. MATTISON. I agree with that heartily, but not with the method of dampening the demand, because I don't think you can regulate human desires by any installment regulations. If the steel is necessary for guns, the priorities situation, at least as I understand it, is effective, and the recently announced cut in production of automobiles would seem to bear out the statement that priorities should take care of the defense needs.

Mr. SHISHKIN. That is right, Mr. Mattison. I think you are quite correct there. We have the machinery. It may not be working right, but we are improving it, and we hope it is going to work. I think that in the slow approach to this regulation, we have to bear in mind one thing that is fundamental to this machinery. After all, one thing that we don't realize is that America's war strength is as great as the output of its industry and its labor. We are going to win this war not on the firing line—we are going to win it on the production line, and this adds an unnecessary dislocation. It is a crude instrumentality. It is not going to work out these relationships harmoniously to assure employment and to curtail inflation. It is not going to curtail inflation.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to break in just a moment to try to set this thing in perspective, if I can. I don't know of anybody who has proposed this as a sole means or a main means of allocating supplies as between defense and civilian purposes on the one hand, or as a sole means or a main means of checking production. It is a part of the whole thing. We don't want to set up a bunch of straw men here tonight and keep fighting with them, such as the implication that this is intended to put an end to installment purchases. Nobody has intended anything of the sort or proposed it, so far as I know.

But I will submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is no use moving on the tax front, on the savings front, or on any of these other means to dampen down consumer buying at this time, leaving the credit avenue completely open to go just as far as you like. I could say a lot more, but I am taking too much time.

Mr. HUFFARD. In answer to Mr. Nugent's question, I am thinking of the defense worker who is jingling dollars in his pocket for the first time in years and is able to acquire some good, second-hand merchandise that he has always wanted and hasn't been able to acquire, that will not have much use value over the period of the emergency. If he is inhibited from procuring what he has wanted during that period, when the day of readjustment comes, the use value of the merchandise which he has wanted will be gone. With the possibility of a depreciated dollar, he will not have the money to buy at that time, and he will be foiled in his attempt right through the whole picture, in obtaining the many things which he has wanted.

Mr. SHISHKIN. Can't we do two things, one, to expand as much as possible production of the civilian goods which are not in competition? For example, the order applies to all furniture. Wood furniture is not in competition.

Mr. HUFFARD. I agree with you there, Mr. Shishkin.

Mr. SHISHKIN. But the regulation of necessity has to be crude, and it isn't going to accomplish the purpose. If we can expand as much as possible this device—it isn't a social-minded piece of legislation because it is regressive. It robs Peter and doesn't give Paul anything. In that sense its effect is going to be bad.

Mr. DAVIS. I want to get in on this regressive business. I want to say that it is not regressive in the same sense that taxation is regressive. It doesn't take anything away from the incomes of the lower-paid groups at all. I want to get this in: You must weigh the present inconvenience to the low-income purchaser of waiting and saving until he can acquire this thing against what will happen to that same wage earner who is extended, as I assume Mr. Huffard and Mr. Mattison would like to see him extended, at a time when incomes fall off.

Mr. SHISHKIN. How are you going to prevent him from going to a loan shark when you exclude him from the ordinary channels, Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. The same regulations apply to a loan man who asks that his loans be repaid on an installment basis.

Mr. SHISHKIN. I thought the loan sharks weren't regulated.

Mr. DAVIS. Oh, yes; they are regulated.

Mr. MATTISON. Except for this item of considerable confusion to me with respect to cash lending, that the terms are for 18 months, but no down payment is required as long as they don't take security of the article itself, which is the normal procedure on a conditional-sales contract. How, then, do you reconcile the fact that the regulations permit the purchase of those same items, which you are seeking to conserve for defense, on terms that are more favorable than are normally extended by the retail stores? The whole point that I tried to bring forth was that the purchasing power of the individual should be conserved; that the one with limited power should not be discriminated against by such a high down payment. Furniture is only 10 percent, stokers are 15, but these small items of great convenience to the housewife and to the health of the Nation—refrigeration—have been penalized the strongest, and I can't quite reconcile it with cash lending being available with the attractive terms of no down payment.

Mr. DAVIS. I am not going to be drawn into an argument for pokers on the one hand against crankshafts on the other on this thing. I want to say that it is strange to hear Mr. Mattison putting up such a plea on behalf of the retail seller as against the lender when he represents the lender.

Mr. MATTISON. Well, I might say, in defense of that, that I represent both, because about 50 percent of our business that I am particularly interested in derives from dealers discounting their obligations on installment credit, and the other 50 percent is direct lending to the individual.

Mr. DAVIS. Now, Mr. Mattison, I just want to say one thing, and then I am through. My former associates on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are growing with this thing, just as we all are. They have to learn from the reaction to the different features of this regulation how to work. I am sure that they are willing to amend at any time as these things go along in order to make it workable, with the cooperation of the affected industry.

Mrs. FRANKLIN. Mr. Davis, with respect to the effect of this on prices, the consumers, although they are perfectly willing to participate in a program which does guarantee some prevention of inflation, would like to have some assurance that this is going to keep down prices, or they would like to have something, certainly, to accompany it which would guarantee keeping down prices. I think that consumers feel about this very much that it is putting the cart before the horse when the cart this time happens to be a huge vehicle which should be drawn by six or seven horses.

Mr. DAVIS. I agree with you, but if every cart waits until another one starts, nobody ever makes the start. You can't get direct control legislation, of course, until Congress acts.

Mr. SHISHKIN. Of course, on this point that the regulation could be improved and modified, my only objection to that is that there is such a tremendous hole in the whole structure of the legislation that you can drive a panzer division through it, and I don't think that hole can be patched by any amendment.

Mr. DAVIS. I don't think you have shown that yet.

Mr. NUGENT. In what respect?

Mr. SHISHKIN. In that if the regulation is going to be effective, we are going to curtail automobile production, and we are probably going to have, as Leon Henderson says—multiplying my figure by 2—2,000,000 unemployed by December. Well, 2,000,000 unemployed at this time is going to be quite a big deterrent, and the reduction of wages due to that is going to be probably more of a check on inflationary influence than anything that this regulation can provide.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Shishkin, I don't think that 2,000,000 men will be unemployed as a result of the consumer-credit control.

Mr. SHISHKIN. No, no, no. I am not saying that. I said that because of the defense priorities, because of shortages, there are going to be that many; and lowering employment is going to curtail the increase in purchasing power that we had anticipated, as we did not anticipate that unemployment 2 months ago.

Mr. NUGENT. It might be said that we will have a smaller rise of purchasing power than otherwise might have happened, but certainly we are going to have an increase in purchasing power in consumers as a result of defense spending.

Mr. HUFFARD. I would like to ask Mr. Davis a question or two. I take it, Mr. Davis, that in the imposition of these regulations, a good sense of timing is of the very essence. Someone has said that the reason the British do not see the point of our funny stories is due to the 5 hours' difference in time between our country and theirs.

I would like to ask you, is it to be expected that these regulations will continue in force after the period of emergency has passed, on the theory held in some quarters that this type of selling should always have been regulated?

Mr. DAVIS. I can't answer that question. I mean I can't look that far ahead. I said in the concluding sentence that I hoped the time would come when all of the restrictions could be released, and when these goods are available for civilian production, purchase could be encouraged in every possible way.

Mr. HUFFARD. Let me ask you this question in the interest of retailers listening in. Will the 125,000 registered retailers who sell on the installment plan have their records regularly subjected to examination?

Mr. DAVIS. I don't think so. I don't see any reason why they should.

Mr. NUGENT. I would like to go back to a couple of questions that were thrown out and have not been satisfactorily dealt with in my opinion. First of all, as to the social consequences of the control of consumer credit, I think Mrs. Franklin will agree with me that the absence of down payments and the presence of extremely long terms of payment have given rise to a great deal of high-pressure selling which it is strongly in the consumers' interest to curtail.

Going back to Mr. Mattison's comment, I don't believe for a minute that the down-payment requirements under this regulation are so severe in themselves as to prevent people who want goods very badly from buying them.

Mr. MATTISON. Unfortunately, that doesn't happen to be the experience that we have had in dealing with this problem from a practical standpoint. We know, going back to 1934, when the Government-sponsored F. H. A.

regulations, with no down payment, were instituted, that that was the greatest sales-motivating factor that had come along. You can't lightly dismiss the down payment, particularly when you jump from practically nothing to 20 percent, and shorten it from 36 months to 18.

I would like to conclude with just a constructive suggestion for the Reserve Board to consider, if that would be in order. I would suggest that it would be better to liberalize these regulations to permit retailers to sell with smaller or no down payment, because they, like the banks making such loans, extend the credit at approximately $6 a hundred, while for the same type of accommodation the loan companies charge from $17 to $20. That type of accommodation can be extended by the retailer in the normal course of his business, as he has heretofore, if he is competitive on the down payment as against the loan companies with no down payment.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Mattison, even at present it is characteristic and inherent in the nature of loan companies that there is no down payment. At the present time you can go to an automobile finance company, and it will require 33⅓ percent or some other similarly large figure for down payment, and you can also go to the Bank of America and borrow without any down payment. You are describing a situation that is inherent in the present situation.

Mr. SHISHKIN. Well, I was just going to say that Mr. Nugent fails to distinguish between the two entirely separate things when he talks about a practice in the industry that is subject to long-term reform and is a matter for policement and inflation control with which we are dealing here. How are we going to curb installment buying, an institution which has developed over the past 20 years, which is just as vital to American life and just as much a part of it as mass production is, and inseparable from it?

Mr. NUGENT. I am a little bit confused by the fact that some of the discussants appear to believe that the limitation will not curtail buying power, and others fear that it will curtail it too much. I am certainly sure that the regulations that have been drafted and are going into effect tomorrow will curtail demand.

Another thing that I think is being overlooked is the fact that we must curtail demand. The fact that public spending for armaments is booming incomes and continually pouring out funds into consumers' hands requires some degree of curtailment.

Mrs. FRANKLIN. But, Mr. Nugent, will this curtailing of demand through the installment curbs offset the tremendous buying power of the cash consumers at present? You see, that is the thing we are particularly interested in in general.

Mr. NUGENT: It will in its secondary effects, because the money that is spent as a result of borrowing from the credit market becomes the incomes of other people, and to the extent that you can prevent the expansion of consumer credit, you will prevent some expansion of incomes.

Mr. HUFFARD. I would like to ask Mr. Davis why furniture was singled out for regulation among the many retail lines which don't involve defense materials.

Mr. DAVIS. I wasn't there when it was done, Mr. Huffard, and I am probably not an authority on that question. I would say that as a general thing, while there are important parts of furniture that do not use metals and do not compete particularly with defense articles, it is one of the important fields in which installment credit has developed proportionate to its interests.

Mr. SHISHKIN. There are a host of questions that may be asked about the regulations, not only about furniture, but about the modernization and repair loans and the limitation of $1,000. It seems that the man with small repairs or who wants to do any modernizing that doesn't compete with defense—it may be just lumber or paint or something of that sort, involving no metal—isn't going to be able to do it except on stringent terms, and the man doing $2,000 worth is going to do it without regulation at all.

Mr. DAVIS. I would suggest that in the time here we cannot take all the details and iron them out.

Mr. NUGENT. You have a practical difficulty, that you want to exclude from your regulation business loans, and the best way to do that seemed to be to draw an amount limitation.

Mr. HUFFARD. I wonder if I could ask Mr. Nugent a question? When Congress had the power to enact the necessary legislation, why was it found necessary to fall back upon the statutory authority which never contemplated the purpose for which it is now being invoked?

Mr. NUGENT. I think the matter of time is one of the things involved. This is an emergency. The inflationary price spiral is already under way, and we want all the forces we can bring to bear to prevent rising prices.

Mr. HUFFARD. In other words, there wasn't time to submit it to Congress.

Mrs. FRANKLIN. Consumers still want to know why, in a time of a seller's market—made so because Uncle Sam made it so—Uncle Sam must pick on the one method which seems to discriminate against the great mass of consumers first, rather than pick the methods which will protect the consumers.

Mr. SHISHKIN. Right, and I think I can say the same for labor.

Mr. DAVIS. Let me say again what I said at the beginning. You simply cannot regard this thing as one act alone. It is a part of a whole program.

Mrs. FRANKLIN. We hope so.

Mr. DAVIS. If you depend on this alone to curb inflation, it wouldn't be successful.

Mr. SHISHKIN. On your question of consultation, I would like to say only one thing—that we would have been delighted to have gone over and advise and counsel with the Federal Reserve Board, but we weren't invited.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Shishkin, we published the regulations in the paper; and if you didn't have enough chance after that to express yourself, there was something wrong.

Mr. SHISHKIN. There were conferences with other groups, but not with labor.

Mr. DAVIS. All the distributing groups and all the financial groups were consulted.

Mr. NUGENT. Mrs. Franklin, would you rather impose an income tax on very low income groups than restrain their installment purchases?

Mrs. FRANKLIN. That is an extremely difficult problem which would involve a great many questions.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mrs. Franklin and gentlemen.

Wolf Creek Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

ADDRESS OF MAJ. GEN. J. L. SCHLEY

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Maj. Gen. J. L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, at the ground-breaking ceremony for the Wolf Creek Dam, September 1, 1941:

It is a great pleasure for me to be with this large gathering of Kentucky and Tennessee people to witness the ground breaking for the construction of the Wolf Creek Dam. It was but little more than a year ago that I authorized the district engineer at Nashville to prepare a definite project report on this dam, hoping that your Senators and Representatives in Congress could help you obtain money for it this year—and here we are, gathered today to see the first construction work begin.

During this past year the details of the project have been worked out, plans and specifications have been prepared, bids invited, and the contract awarded. To those of you who are not familiar with the amount of work required in preparing plans for such a project, I may say that to accomplish this much work in a year's time has required careful organization, skilled executive and technical supervision, and many thousand man-hours of work by competent, trained men.

A power project in this section of the Cumberland River has been considered by private utility companies for many years, and applications for permits have been under consideration by the Federal Power Commission at numerous times. Provision for a large flood-control reservoir on the upper Cumberland River has been considered ever since the disastrous flood of 1927 on the lower Mississippi River, and the report to Congress on the need for reservoirs for flood control within the Ohio River Basin after the record-breaking flood throughout that basin in 1937 included this dam. As the result of that calamitous flood and the recommendations made by the Army engineers, Congress authorized in the Food Control Act of 1938 a large number of reservoirs throughout the entire Ohio River Basin, of which the Wolf Creek project is one of the most important and one which will produce the greatest beneficial effect—beneficial effect not only in the Cumberland Basin but also on the lower Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers.

The total estimated cost of this project, complete with power installation, is $55,000,000. The estimate covers all construction costs including necessary relocations of highways, railroads, bridges, transmission and telephone lines, the moving of cemeteries, and the acquisition of all lands needed for the complete project. Congress will be asked to grant authority for the construction of the powerhouse and machinery in ample time for their installation when the construction of the dam reaches the proper stage.

The Wolf Creek project will provide one of the largest dams and reservoirs east of the Mississippi River. The structure itself will be approximately 1 mile long, will contain about 1,250,000 cubic yards of concrete, about 9,000,000 cubic yards of rolled-earth embankment, and machinery for about 250,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric generating capacity.

Across that portion of the valley now occupied by the river there will be a concrete structure which will include the spillway and powerhouse sections, together with the abutment section which will tie into the high left bank on the one hand and the earth portion of the dam on the other hand. That portion will cover most of the valley floor from the river bank into those hills. The concrete section of the dam will have a maximum height of 242 feet above the river bottom, and the maximum height of the earth portion of the dam will be 191 feet. As I have said, the total length of the dam along the highway which will cross it is more than a mile.

The normal lake will extend back up the Cumberland River almost 100 miles, nearly to the foot of Cumberland Falls. I may state

here that the project was designed so that no adverse effects would be caused to Cumberland Falls under any conditions. The reservoir will have about 6,000,000 acre-feet of capacity, of which about one-third will be for flood control, one-third for power production, and one-third for dead storage, which will always be available for recreational purposes.

From this brief description you can see that the dam will create a very large body of water in a portion of the Cumberland River which is noted for its scenic grandeur. It will really be a lake, unsurpassed for its beauty in this section of the United States.

A project of this nature naturally brings some hardships to those people who have to move from the reservoir area, but it brings vastly greater benefits to the people of the surrounding country as a whole. To those who have to move our Department wishes to give every aid that is permissible under existing law. I can assure you that very careful appraisals will be made of your lands in order that you may receive full and just compensation, and every effort will be made to make your problem of relocation as easy as possible. It is hoped that all land acquisition will be accomplished by negotiation and that resort to condemnation will only be necessary in those cases where lack of adequate title requires that procedure.

The city of Burnside is the only community which will be partially inundated as a result of this project. I wish to assure the citizens of that community that their problem is being given careful and sympathetic consideration and that the district engineer will keep them fully advised on all matters pertaining to that problem.

As you all probably know, Wolf Creek is the key reservoir in any comprehensive system of reservoirs which may be devised for the Cumberland River Basin. The work which you now see before you is the beginning of a comprehensive plan for the entire Cumberland River Basin—an over-all plan to secure the best uses of its natural water resources. Congress has already authorized a navigation project consisting of a system of 24 locks and dams on this river, investigated and adopted at a time when Congress was authorizing the improvement of streams at Government expense for navigation only. Fifteen of these dams have been built, and there now exists a 6-foot navigation channel from the mouth to a point about 23 miles upstream from Carthage. In the Flood Control Act of 1938 Congress approved, in addition to the Wolf Creek project, five other dams and reservoirs in the Cumberland Basin for flood-control and allied uses, namely, Center Hill on the Caney Fork River, Dale Hollow on the Obey River, Stewarts Ferry on the Stones River, Rossview on the Red River, and Three Islands on the Harpeth River. Under existing authority the basic engineering plans for these five reservoirs, which we call definite project reports, are now being pushed to completion by our district engineer at Nashville, Major Walsh, and money has recently been allotted to enable him to go ahead with the preparation of detailed construction plans and specifications on two of these reservoirs so that they may be ready for construction when Congress can be persuaded by your Congressmen to provide the necessary funds for that purpose.

It should not be necessary for me to dwell at this point on the need for additional power for the national-defense effort, because that problem has been fully presented in the last few months in the public press and in numerous statements from Washington. It is sufficient to say that the electric power from these additional multiple purpose projects now approved by Congress could be easily fitted into any major power net which is finally developed in this important region of our country.

For many years now the engineer department has had broad experience in studying and preparing comprehensive plans for river basins. Under authority given us by Congress in the River and Harbor Act of 1927, the department prepared comprehensive reports on practically all of the major streams of this country. These studies, known as the 308 reports, cover possible plans for the development of navigation, flood control, electric power, irrigation, and allied purposes in those basins. The primary object of these reports was to present scientific information on our river basins to be available for the formulation of specific construction programs when the need for them arose. As an example, the initial basin plan for the Tennessee Valley was prepared by the Corps of Engineers of the Army The program now under way in that basin is based in large part on those original studies.

From time to time Congress calls upon the Army engineers to review these 308 reports in designated river basins and to preprepare specific construction programs therein. In 1936 a general flood-control policy was adopted and announced by the Congress and specific construction programs were authorized for prosecution under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. Before that time, the Federal Government had undertaken flood control at its own expense only on the lower Mississippi River and the Sacramento River. Since 1936 the engineer department has undertaken and prosecuted vigorously a flood-control program throughout the entire United States involving nearly $700,000,000 worth of new work, in which there were included works for allied water uses, such as hydroelectric power, municipal water supply, irrigation, and pollution abatement. On the 18th of last month the President signed a new flood-control bill adding an authorization of $275,000,000 to that amount for similar purposes. It might be mentioned in passing that the department has been engaged in flood-control operations in the great alluvial valley of the Mississippi—i. e., from the mouth of the Ohio River to the Gulf of Mexico—for practically 100 years, and has carried its program in that valley to the point where, in a short time now, that great basin will have a very high degree of protection from disastrous floods.

I am very glad to be able to tell you that the district engineer at Nashville, in accordance with specific congressional directives, completed just a few days ago a thorough study of the entire Cumberland Basin and has forwarded his report to the division engineer, Ohio River division, at Cincinnati. That report, presenting plans for the comprehensive development of this basin, will come into my office in the very near future for further review, and it will soon be submitted to Congress so that that body will shortly have available specific recommendations for projects which will fully develop the Cumberland Valley. These projects can be fitted into the national program for the development of our great river basins when and as rapidly as Congress desires.

I can say that that report on the Cumberland Valley is truly comprehensive in scope. It contains full references to all the work that has been accomplished to date in this great valley, including the project which you now see before you, and it thoroughly covers a specific plan for the further development of this basin to secure the best over-all uses of its water resources. By these I mean the further development of navigation, the control of floods, the generation of hydroelectric power, the abatement of pollution, provisions for recreation, and other allied uses of water. Perhaps some of you do not know that our multiple-purpose reports when they reach Washington are thoroughly coordinated with all other interested Federal agencies, so that the final plan recommended to Congress may be said to represent the best scientific thought of the present day for the future use of the water resources of the valley.

We who are present today are witnessing a very historical event. We are witnessing the beginning not only of one of the great dams of the country but also of the truly comprehensive development of the entire Cumberland Basin. Plans have already been prepared by the district engineer, as I have said, for that development, so that in the future under our representative form of government Congress can authorize the works and provide the funds for their construction when it deems appropriate. You farseeing citizens of this valley are to be congratulated in that you have been successful in having this comprehensive study made by the well-established agencies of the Federal Government and that you can now look forward to the time when the extensive resources of the Cumberland Basin will be developed in a coordinated, scientific, and economic manner for the ultimate prosperity and well-being of its inhabitants and in turn for the well-being of the Nation. I can assure you that the Army engineers are fully prepared to execute the extensive construction in this basin under such laws and regulations as Congress prescribes.

Labor Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES F. McLAUGHLIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES F. McLAUGHLIN, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me on Labor Day at the celebration of the Central Labor Union at Omaha, Nebr.:

It is an honor and a pleasure to be able to accept the Central Labor Union's invitation to be a participant in these ceremonies and to have this opportunity of addressing the splendid gathering which is here assembled. I have most satisfactory recollections of the former occasions when I have been privileged to take part in the programs sponsored by the Central Labor Union of Omaha and the auxiliary on Labor Day. On those occasions I have joined with other speakers in pointing out the inspiring history and development of the labor movement; in citing the great strides that have been made in the improvement of the status of those who labor. Only on the last occasion of my appearance on a program sponsored by the Omaha Central Labor Union on this day you may remember that I called attention to the tremendous progress which has been made in organized labor in only a relatively short period of time. Perhaps some who attended that meeting will recall the citation of the case of the group of farm workers, in a country fortunately not our own but nevertheless under an established and well-organized government, less than 150 years ago, who joined together in a concerted effort to secure an increase in wages for the work which they were doing. You may recall the circumstances and the facts surrounding that case; how under the laws of that country at that time such conduct constituted conspiracy which carried with it a heavy penalty, and how, in that particular case, those men were tried on the charge of conspiracy and were found guilty and were sentenced to

expulsion from their native country and to imprisonment under the most revolting circumstances; how the survivors of that little band came back at the conclusion of their prison term, again took up the fight which led to the final success of the labor movement.

The history of unionism in this country is marked by difficulties which were overcome only after tremendous sacrifice and effort. This fight has resulted in the legalization of labor's right to organize, the right of collective bargaining, through representatives of labor's own choosing, minimum wages and maximum hours of employment, workmen's compensation, social security, unemployment insurance, the right of employed persons to work under decent working conditions, the recognition of the fact, which should have been recognized from the beginning, that labor is not a commodity and that the relation between employer and employee is a human relation and not a cold, mercenary one.

Normally this day should be spent in recalling the trials which have beset those who have engaged in the labor movement and the celebration of the victory which they have won. But this day and this time call for something more than a mere expression of satisfaction over goals which have been attained. Earnest and patriotic American citizens everywhere have reason to pause and ponder upon the state of the world and of our own beloved Nation and its future welfare. This is a time that calls for unity on the part of men and women in this country for the common good of the Nation. The world is in a foment, the spirit of ruthlessness and aggression has progressed to such a startling point within a short period of a few months, a period only today to be calculated in terms of years, that no thinking man or woman can disregard the dangers which confront the world as a result of this situation. No serious minded citizen of the United States of America will be so careless of the welfare of his Nation or the welfare of the men and women of his Nation as to close his eyes to the dangers or to fail to recognize the necessity of taking adequate steps to protect against them. The United States of America is the greatest country in the world. Its citizens enjoy the priceless privilege of self-government, a privilege so precious that it should be guarded, if necessary, by the very lives of those who possess it.

It is imperatively essential that all peoples in this country unite for the common welfare of the Nation. Our first job is national defense and we have got to realize it and act accordingly if we are to succeed. Men and women of our country, regardless of calling, regardless of race, of religion, of national backgrounds, regardless of place of residence in this country, must coordinate their efforts to present a solid front for adequate national defense of the United States of America. Adequate national defense means adequate production; production of the things upon which we are dependent for defense. The men and women engaged in labor have not failed their country in the past. They will not fail now. They will produce the goods. They will do the job. It is to their productive effort today that the Nation looks for security and protection. It is essential to the welfare of our land that employee and employer, labor and capital, shall cooperate wholeheartedly for the success of our national-defense program. There is not in this country, strictly speaking, any class of men or women who can be said to be distinctly labor in classification as contrasted to any class which can be said to be distinctly capitalistic in classification. The great mass of people in this country who labor also possess property. Yes; our people own property in greater average amounts than in any nation on earth. The laboring man who possesses a home, an automobile, a radio—who owns some of the many other things so widely and generally owned in this country and which are so much a part of American life, who out of his earnings has bought or is now paying for the defense bonds of his country—that man continues to consider himself proudly as a laboring man, which he is, but to the extent of his ownership of property he is likewise an owner of capital, a capitalist. And by the same token men and women who own property, whether large or small in amount and at the same time continue to work, as the great mass of people in this country do, are not only capitalists, but are likewise laborers. Therefore the interests of capital and labor in the United States cannot be said to be separate, distinct, and antagonistic as they may be in the countries where the mass of those who labor own little, if any, property. This fusion of interest between labor and capital should contribute tremendously to the strength and the greatness of our land. It is a circumstance which should cause mutual tolerance and forbearance on the part of those who work for wages and those who take part in the ownership or management of business enterprises.

Despite the growth and development of the United States under our representative governmental system, there have been in our country groups who would substitute other forms of government for that laid down by the framers of the Constitution. Alluring promises have been made by those who seek this change. The great mass of men and women engaged in labor have not been misled by these false promises. They know what has happened to labor in countries operating under other governmental systems. The best guaranty which labor has for the preservation of her rights lies in a sound adherence to the principles of our form of Government as laid down in the Constitution of the United States and in the Bill of Rights.

In this hour of our country's history, when the future of the nations of the world and, indeed, the future of civilization itself is being weighed in the balance, there is no place in our land for any man or woman who is antagonistic to our form of Government or who is interested in the destruction of our form of Government. There is no place in the United States of America for any "ism" but Americanism—I care not what other form or type of government any man in this country may advocate as against our own constitutional form of Government, that man is not a true friend of his country who at this time is unwilling to put his shoulder behind the wheel and to exert his influence under the American form of Government to push forward our American defense effort to a successful conclusion. Nor is such a man a friend of labor, for if ever our form of Government is destroyed all of labor's gains will be destroyed.

There has been much discussion about labor and labor's activities in the defense program. It is essential to the welfare of the Nation and to the welfare of labor that nothing shall be done to interfere with defense production. Labor has made great gains in the last decade The people now look with hope and confidence to labor. The great body of labor is 100 percent back of our Nation's effort. The responsible heads of organized labor of this country owe a duty to the men and women in the ranks of labor whom they represent, to guard against any movement on the part of any small number of members or groups of members of any labor organization which is subversive in character or calculated to interfere with our national-defense program. The responsible, patriotic men and women in labor do not defend those who may engage in subversive activity or in any activity which may impede national defense and react unfavorably on labor and cause it to incur the danger of the loss of gains which labor has won only after a long, hard battle.

We in the Middle West, we in Nebraska stand ready to make our contribution to national defense in every conceivable way. Two essentials in the success of the defense program are food and the production of defense materials. The farmers of Nebraska will produce the food. The farmer will do his part in the defense program. Labor will do its part. Labor in Omaha and Nebraska will continue to demonstrate its patriotism and its determination to go through to the end, to cooperate to the fullest extent for all-out national defense. We have in our community a project which will shortly be opened for production which will turn out bombing aeroplanes to be assembled by the labor recruited from our own State and surrounding regions. It is one of the only actual war material plants in our immediate area and we are proud of the part that it will play and the part that the men and women there employed will play in our defense program and in our solemn determination to cope with those forces which threaten our Nation's security.

Today the war in Europe has been raging for exactly 2 years. There were those at the beginning who counselled us to pay no attention to it. They said it was not a real war—that it was a "phony" war that never would reach shooting stage. As nation after nation has fallen the awful realization has come to all of us that it was not only a real war but a war of horrors beyond description. The people of this country hate war. They want peace. We have adopted a policy of giving aid to nations resisting aggression, a policy designed to keep our country out of war by keeping war away from our country.

The question has been raised as to whether this country can be successfully invaded. Some have said that because of that doubt we should not give aid to those who are seeking to put down aggression abroad. But the question we face is, Can we take a chance? When the fire roars all about us is it not wiser to help those who are trying to put it out than to wait till it reaches us, or even to just hope that it never will reach us? In the face of varying opinions, in the light of the unbelievable military exploits abroad which seemed fantastic before they happened, but which resulted in the fall of nation after nation, who among us will be so bold as to insist that our country can take the chance that it will never be invaded? In matters of health we call on the doctor. In matters involving his civil rights, the sensible citizen consults a lawyer. Does not prudence dictate that in matters of national defense we should follow the counsel and advice of the wisest men in our military establishments? We are committed to a policy of national defense and have appropriated billions of dollars to make that policy effective. With all respect to those who may disagree, I submit that it would be folly to disregard the recommendations of the trained and experienced heads of our Military Establishment on matters vitally affecting adequate national defense. Although I am an overseas veteran of the last war, I am not a militarist and I came with reluctance to support the program of conscription of men in peacetime, but I am a realist and I cannot close my eyes to dangers which are pointed out in the fate of the other nations which were as peaceable and as peace loving as we and who were as anxious to remain peaceable as we. We have formally adopted the Monroe Doctrine. For sound reasons we have guaranteed the territorial integrity of the nations of this hemisphere. Whether we are invaded or not does not the course of recent developments already make it apparent to every one of us that our liberties will be adversely affected whenever all the countries of the world except our own hemisphere or our own continent come to be controlled by a totalitarian form of government? It is, then, against that possibility that we must defend ourselves, and it is against the dangers of that possibility that the citizenship of the United States should

unite behind the foreign policy of this country under the leadership of our President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Today every man and woman engaged in labor production is contributing to the welfare of our Nation in its national defense. I congratulate labor in Nebraska for its progress and for its record and for the standing which it enjoys through its own efforts. And I join today with the men and women engaged in labor in their pledge, which is shown by the results which they are producing, that our Nation will continue to fight the fight of defense and will cooperate with those nations which are fighting a similar fight.

Let us pray God that our Nation shall not be called upon to engage in any war. At the same time let us solemnly resolve that we shall leave no stone unturned completely and adequately to defend our Nation, to preserve and protect the people and the Government of the United States of America.

Spanish-American War Veterans' Legislation—National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent granted by my colleagues, I insert the address delivered by me before the forty-third annual encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, at Omaha, Nebr., August 18, 1941, as published in the National Tribune, Washington, D. C., August 28, 1941.

The address reads as follows:

Comrade Commander in Chief, my comrades and sisters of the auxiliary, may I express the deep appreciation of Mrs. Smith and myself for the happy privilege of being your guests at this great national encampment. This is the first year my official duties at Washington, D. C., have permitted me to accept the kind invitations which you have so graciously extended since we attended the memorable encampment at San Antonio, Tex., in 1935. We have many pleasant recollections of the delightful time we spent at San Antonio, and we consider ourselves fortunate indeed that we are again able to be with you here at Omaha at what, from all appearances, is going to be one of the most successful national encampments the U. S. W. V. and auxiliary have ever held. We know that we are going to carry away with us many happy and inspiring memories of this fine meeting of Spanish-American War veterans and their wives from every section of our great country.

VALUED FRIENDSHIPS

It has been a real personal pleasure for me to work in close association with your national officers and national headquarters in our National Capital ever since I came to Congress in 1933 and succeeded in being assigned to the House Committee on Pensions, having jurisdiction over the legislation affecting the veterans of the Spanish-American War, their widows, and children. We passed through some rather dark and trying days back in the period following the enactment of the Economy Act, which I opposed and voted against. I made some valued and lasting friendships with many of the national leaders of your organization and the comrades at national headquarters during the fight to gain restoration of the benefits which were temporarily lost as a result of the Economy Act. In 1935 that fight was won and whatever small part I had in the contest has brought me many compensations during the years which have followed. Among those who were particularly active in achieving our victory were Senator Rice W. Means, Judge E. S. Matthias, Judge Leon McCord, Q. M. Gen. Pat Callan at national headquarters, Capt. Bill Mattocks of the National Tribune, Senator Al. Kennedy of New York, Guy Groff of my own State of Washington, our late lamented comrade, Gen. Billy Grayson, of Savannah, Ga., whose recent passing we sincerely mourn, and all the members of the national legislative committee, and many comrades throughout the country.

I also wish to include Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans Affairs, who has just addressed you. General Hines has a distinction enjoyed by no other Federal officeholder, of having been appointed and reappointed to his present high position by four Presidents of the United States—Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. He is a gallant soldier, a great American, and has always, in my contacts with him, proven himself to be a true friend of the veterans of the Spanish-American War, their widows and dependents.

It has become generally recognized that we were right in the stand we took and subsequent events have justified our original position on the repeal of the Economy Act as affecting the Spanish War veterans. We are still correcting some of the minor inequalities and injustices which resulted from the Economy Act.

TRAVEL PAY

Last year we succeeded in having enacted my bill to pay the so-called Philippine travel pay, which had been pending before every Congress in the past 40 years. Many veterans have been receiving their belated checks. There still are some cases which are apparently not covered which will have to be included in future legislation, but approximately $2,500,000 are being paid to those veterans who have substantiated their claims. This is a belated redemption of the promise which our Government made to those veterans who remained in the service.

Two weeks ago we passed in the House by unanimous consent four bills which were endorsed by your national legislative committee. These bills were brought before the House upon the special recognition granted to me as chairman of the Pensions Committee by Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, who recognized me for that purpose, following my conference with him and our majority leader, Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. I also conferred with Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, leader of the minority, and Congressman EARL C. MICHENER, of Michigan, assistant Republican floor leader, and they collaborated with us in passing the bills without any opposition. The members of the Pensions Committee who have labored earnestly and faithfully with me in support of these bills are as follows: CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, New York; NAT PATTON, Texas; JAMES A. O'LEARY, New York; JOHN F. HUNTER, Ohio; JOHN L. MCMILLAN, South Carolina; FRANCIS J. MYERS, Pennsylvania; WILLIAM H. LARRABEE, Indiana; ANTON F. MACIEJEWSKI, Illinois; WILLIAM J. FITZGERALD, Connecticut; JAMES A. WRIGHT, Pennsylvania; WALTER K. GRANGER, Utah; JOHN S. GIBSON, Georgia; F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Louisiana; FRED J. DOUGLAS, New York; CHARLES L. GERLACH, Pennsylvania; A. D. BAUMHART, JR., Ohio; WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, Wisconsin; EVAN HOWELL, Illinois; CHARLES R. ROBERTSON, North Dakota; and JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN, New York.

WIDOWS BILL

The most important is probably H. R. 2310, which moves up the marriage date of widows for eligibility for pensions from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938, legislation which has been sought by the ladies of the auxiliary for several years. This legislation recognizes the principle which we succeeded in having established in 1935 that veterans of the Spanish-American War are to be treated the same as veterans of the Civil War. Figuring that the Civil War ended in 1865 and widows marrying a veteran within 40 years, the delimitation date was fixed at 1905. Considering 1898 as the basis for Spanish War veterans, the same 40-year period ends in 1938, the delimitation date prescribed in the bill which has just passed the House. It is estimated that 8,300 widows will be benefited at a possible ultimate cost of $3,067,000.

OTHER MEASURES

We also passed H. R. 5339 increasing the rate of pay to widows and dependents of Spanish War veterans, approximately 1,000 in number, at a cost of $116,000 for the first year, in service-connected cases.

We also passed H. R. 2096, which increases the age from 16 to 18 years, and 21 years when attending an accredited school, for children of deceased Spanish War veterans to receive the benefits primarily intended for their education. It is believed that 5,900 children will be benefited at an annual cost of $794,000.

H. R. 1782, which also was passed by the House, will provide full wartime rates for those Spanish War veterans who served outside the continental boundaries of the United States in Guam, Cuba, or Puerto Rico, and their dependents, in service-connected disability cases, who are now receiving only 75 percent of the rates provided for wartime veterans. It is estimated that there are about 240 Spanish War veterans who will come within the purview of this bill and the cost will be approximately $62,000 in the first year.

These four bills have now gone to the Senate and we have already made a good start in that body. Last Monday the Senate passed H. R. 5339, increasing the rate of pay to widows and dependents. I believe that letters from each local camp and individual comrades to their Senators will have the desired effect in expediting favorable action on the remaining three bills in this Congress, in backing up the endeavors of the National Legislative Committee and national headquarters. We passed all three of these bills in the House in the last Congress and the Senate failed to act upon them, due, no doubt, to the large volume of national-defense legislation which engrossed the efforts of the Senate last year. In this Congress we have sent the bills over there in ample time to make possible their passage before the adjournment of the Seventy-seventh Congress next year. Senator H. H. SCHWARTZ, of Wyoming, is chairman of the Pensions Committee in the Senate, and has indicated that he is sympathetic with these bills, but he will have to have the cooperation and support of his colleagues in order to secure their passage.

NEED FOR OUTPOSTS

My friends, historians are agreed as to the importance of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, the significance of our winning the war with Spain and its effect upon our

destiny as a world power. However, the present war with its far-flung battlefronts stretching thousands of miles and reaching from one continent to the other, have emphasized in striking fashion the value and strategic importance, for purposes of national defense, of outlying and far-distant possessions as bases for both naval and aerial defense. Indeed, President Roosevelt has said that the Bunker Hill of today may be several thousands of miles away from the continental United States. Therefore, the Philippines which we acquired as a result of our war with Spain, is now our defense outpost in the Pacific which may well serve to keep war away from the United States, and enable us to engage in conflict an attacking enemy far removed from our own country and long before our country is directly under attack. This would be true in both naval and aerial combat. Consequently, of the Spanish-American War veterans it may truly be said, in the words of the poet, "That they labored better than they knew."

SUPPORTS NATIONAL DEFENSE

My friends, world events of the past 2 years have compelled us to undertake the greatest and most costly national-defense program in our entire history. We have had to look some very grim facts in the face and become realistic in regard to the menace which threatens our own future as a democracy and a free people. We have come to realize that aid to Britain and the other democracies is an insurance policy to insure our own safety and security and, if possible, to keep war away from the shores of America.

The Axis dictators' plans, blue prints, and timetables are being rapidly, relentlessly, and ruthlessly translated into actuality. They have proclaimed that the world cannot exist part totalitarian and part democratic and that they intend to make it all totalitarian. It remains to be seen how long Russia can withstand the onslaught of the Nazi war machine.

President Roosevelt and Congress have put forth every possible effort to keep our country out of war and how well we have succeeded is proven by the fact th t we are practically the only nation in the world which has not suffered any loss of life or property. In view of all the threats and dangers to which we have been exposed and the difficulties with which we have had to contend, this is a remarkable achievement. How thoughtless and unreasonable are those who, in the face of this record, can find it in their minds and hearts to accuse President Roosevelt and those who have supported our national-defense program of seeking to thrust us into war. President Roosevelt and Congress have shown more patience and toleration and submitted to greater threats and danger to our safety and future as a free nation than all the war administrations in our history combined, including those of Washington, Lincoln, McKinley, and Woodrow Wilson. Let us reread our histories. I have supported every national-defense measure and aid to Britain because, as I have stated, that is aid to America.

During this national emergency I consider it unpatriotic and thoroughly unwise for us to adopt a policy of indifference to the social and economic welfare of our people. Instead let us continue our program of social justice and economic security and thereby strengthen our national defense by increasing the "stake" which our people have in the preservation of our democracy. Our people then will again prove their loyalty, devotion, and sacrifice as they have always done in the past, and in the vanguard of those who will save and preserve America will again be found the veterans of the Spanish-American War and the first World War and their sons and daughters. Under God, America will continue to live on because America will deserve to live.

Reply of William S. Bennet to Attack Upon Reed Smoot and Willis G. Hawley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

LETTER WRITTEN TO TIME MAGAZINE BY HON. WILLIAM S. BENNET, OF NEW YORK

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House I desire to insert in the RECORD a letter written by Hon. William S. Bennet, of New York, addressed to Time Magazine, in protest against an unwarranted article which appeared in that publication on August 4 assailing the memory of two distinguished Americans, Reed Smoot and Willis C. Hawley. I feel that Judge Bennet's letter should appear in the RECORD because Time Magazine has not, to date, seen fit to print it.

The letter follows:

BENNET, HOUSE & COUTS,
New York, August 12, 1941.

TIME,
Time and Life Building,
Rockefeller Center, New York City.

GENTLEMEN: Your article Death of a Woodcutter in your issue of August 4, is a completely untrue attack on two men who gave years of effort to the United States and both of whom are now dead and defenseless—Reed Smoot and Willis C. Hawley.

You say the least personally about Smoot, merely applying the term "a Mormon apostle" in evident derision. Senator Smoot was an apostle of the Church of the Latter Day Saints of Jesus Christ, and very proud of it, and the members of that church have contributed many able men to government, industry, and agriculture.

In the case of Hawley, you ignore the facts easily accessible in Who's Who, that he was, at different times, president of the Oregon State Normal School; professor of mathematics, head professor of history, economics, and constitutional law in Willamette University and, at different times, its president, vice president, and dean. Willamette University is an educational institution of high scholastic standing, and Congressman Hawley was one of the leading scholars of the country. He had distinct attainments in many branches of learning, he was a devout Methodist, he read his Testament daily, in Greek—so you call him a woodcutter. That kind of cheap, impish journalism is one of the things that keeps many men from going into public life. I doubt if Hawley ever swung an ax for pay. He was the principal of Umpqua Academy at 20, and thereafter was continually in educational work or in the Congress until 1933. He also was admitted to the bar, but never practiced.

The woodcutter episode was this: As you intimate, he had mighty muscles. In the methodical, analytical way which characterized him and which has caused others than yourself to believe him slow witted, he deliberately studied the best way of cutting a log with a two-bitted ax. After theory had been made perfect by practice, he entered a contest; his theories applied by his mighty muscles made him successful and he held the championship for a considerable number of years. Log cutting is a sporting contest for strong men as are, for example, hammer throwing and boxing. They are not commercial.

I have not been able to find, in your article, a single statement concerning the Tariff Act of 1930 which is true, except the implied statement that it became a law in June 1930; the length of time it was in preparation; the amount of data submitted to the committee; the number of witnesses, 2,363 in all who were heard; and the number of pages, 2,800, which the debate on the bill consumed. These sound as if they might be true. I do not believe Cordell Hull wept. He is not the crying kind. It is also true that the Republicans lost their House majority in 1930 for the first time in 14 years. These things have some relation to the Tariff Act of 1930.

Your statement of what happened in Europe in 1931 and thereafter is also substantially correct, but you do not relate it in any way to the United States Tariff Act of 1930, and I shall briefly demonstrate that you could not. It is a clear case of post hoc sed non propter hoc. Let us take your statements seriatim: The description of the bill as "One of the most enormous acts of isolationism in United States history" is mere words. You do not support it by any facts, and there are none. You then say 'Its purpose was to give United States producers a noncompetitive monopoly of the United States market, regardless of the consequences abroad. It was the brain child of Utah's Senator Reed Smoot, * * * and of Oregon's Willis Chatman Hawley." First, it was not their brain child. On June 15, 1930, President Hoover made a public detailed analysis of the tariff bill. It is accessible in many places. In it he pointed out that the bill was undertaken as the result of pledges given by the Republican Party at Kansas City; that to the special session of the Congress he had sent a message on April 16, 1929, recommending an increase in agricultural protection, a limited revision of other schedules, and a reorganization both of the Tariff Commission and of the method of executing the flexible provisions. So the bill was not the brain child of Senator Smoot and Representative Hawley. One was the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, on which there were probably 20 other Members; the other, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, on which there were 14 other Republicans and 10 Democrats. Most of the committee members worked on the bill and this was particularly true in the Senate where Democrats sat with Republicans on the subcommittees.

Your phrase, "a noncompetitive monopoly of the United States market," implies that the average duties were high. In the preceding 50 years we had the McKinley law with average duties of 23 percent; the Wilson law of 20.9 percent; the Dingley law of 25.8 percent; the Payne-Aldrich law of 19.3 percent; the Fordney-McCumber law of 13.83 percent; the Underwood law (disturbed by war conditions and in full effect only about 10 months), varying from 6 percent to 14.8 percent; the Hawley-Smoot bill percentage was estimated by the Tariff Commission at 16 percent.

You will find these figures in Mr. Hoover's statement, and they are the figures which all economists use. One of the important things about a modern tariff bill is the scope of the free list. The averages of the same bills already quoted were:

	Percent
McKinley	52.4
Wilson	49.4
Dingley	45.2
Payne-Aldrich	52.5
Fordney-McCumber	63.8
Underwood	66.3
Hawley-Smoot	61 to 63

Therefore its free list was one of the broadest in scope, exceeded only by the Un-

derwood law, of brief duration. The Tariff Commission stated that 93.73 percent of the increases of the bill were upon products of agricultural origin measured in values, as distinguished from 6.25 percent upon commodities of strictly nonagricultural origin. Franklin D. Roosevelt, as a candidate for the Presidency, stated in a speech at Baltimore in 1932 that if he were elected the agricultural rates would not be decreased. Evidently he did not regard them as very bad. The average rate upon agricultural raw materials showed an increase from 38.10 percent to 45.92 percent, while the increases on articles of nonagricultural origin were from 31.02 percent to 34.31 percent. Many of these increases were compensatory duties on products manufactured from agricultural raw materials and protective rates added to these in some instances. There were about 3,300 dutiable items mentioned in the bill, of which 2,170 were unchanged, 890 increased, and 235 decreased from the then existing law. It is impossible to base on these unchallenged figures your statement that the purpose of the bill was to give United States producers "a noncompetitive monopoly of the United States market." A bill which leaves two-thirds of the imports on the free list certainly does not do that. President Hoover's contribution to the bill was insistence on a workable, flexible tariff provision. He said in his statement, "With it (the Tariff Commission) the country should be free from further general revision for many years so come." So far that prophecy has proved true. The Democrats in their 1932 platform pledged themselves to repeal the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. They are in their ninth year of power and have not done so. They did not repeat their promise in either their 1936 or 1940 platform.

You do not mention the Tariff Commission at all, nor do you state that during the remainder of the Hoover administration 250 industrial items were reviewed upon request by the Commission, the rates in 75 cases found not to be in accordance with the declaration of principle stated in the bill itself, and, therefore, changes were recommended by the Commission in those cases and put into effect by President Hoover.

Not only did the Hawley-Smoot bill have nothing whatever to do with the dire European happenings you list, but what did cause them is known to all men, including, unquestionably, yourselves. They are as follows: As early as 1927, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and some countries of South America, both governments and citizens, commenced borrowing vast sums on short-term paper. This paper was placed abroad on the assumption that it represented advances upon goods in the export trade. The fact was that a good deal of it had been invested in capital improvements. You will find this all discussed in the report of the Bank for International Settlements made May 10, 1932, after the facts had been ascertained. This report states the amount of such unsound financing as more than $10,000,000,000 at the beginning of 1931, and that "at that time the magnitude of this indebtedness was not known." When this short-term paper commenced to be called, it resulted, so the bank says, in a break-down of confidence. The liquidation in a single year of this short-term indebtedness was more than $6,000,000,000, and a large part of the balance was blocked. As the bank says: "It is unnecessary to emphasize the havoc wrought." In July 1931 over 100 banks in the United States held some of these uncollectible European short-term bills. Mr. Hoover, after the matter was over, discussed it interestingly in a speech in Des Moines, Iowa, on October 4, 1932. Undoubtedly this speech is in your files and you are familiar with it. So existing facts known to you prove conclusively not only that the Hawley-Smoot Act had nothing to do with European happenings but also prove conclusively their immediate cause.

For some reason you do not list in European happenings of that period the message received by President Hoover from President Von Hindenburg on June 19, 1931, pleading for help to keep Germany from collapsing; nor President Hoover's moratorium proposal of June 21, 1931, approved publicly that day by many Republican Senators and the following Democrats: Henry F. Ashurst, James F. Byrnes, Duncan U. Fletcher, Carter Glass, William J. Harris, Pat Harrison, Cordell Hull, William H. King, Claude A. Swanson, Robert F. Wagner, David I. Walsh, Thomas J. Walsh; and by Democratic Representatives Joseph W. Byrns, James W. Collier, Charles R. Crisp, Thomas H. Cullen.

Within a few days a majority of the Members of the House and the Senate wired President Hoover their support, and when Congress reconvened the necessary legislation was passed.

You have a right to your own views on the tariff and world relations, but no right to try to advance them by slandering dead men, misstating facts, and omitting generally known facts known to you to exist, but the statement of which would negative your assertions and conclusions.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM S. BENNET.

P. S.: Incidentally a Conservative government then in power in England commenced putting tariffs on strategic industries there in 1916; the Labor Party came in and took them off. The Conservative Party ousted the Labor Party and put them on again. This all happened before the Hawley-Smoot bill, so that your statement that England abandoned the traditional free-trade policy because of the Hawley-Smoot bill is false.

W. S. B.

A Sign of the Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

LETTER FROM FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF ENGLEWOOD, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, New Dealers as well as some others may be interested in the result of the administration's domestic policy. Read the following letter, which is but one sign pointing down the road to the destination toward which we have been traveling:

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF ENGLEWOOD,
Chicago.

STATEMENT OF CONDITION AT THE CLOSE OF BUSINESS AUGUST 20, 1941

Confronted, as we are today, with the spectacle of a nation betrayed by its own public officials, a people divided as never before, not even in Civil War days, and on all sides a resorting to nature's first law of self-preservation, I do not care to continue as the custodian of other people's money. Under these conditions this country could be split wide open. It awaits only a face-saving "incident."

We have, therefore, returned all but $39,000 of a one-time high deposit of over $7,000,000, and we urge the immediate withdrawal of this small balance to enable us to close our books on 52 years of successful banking, at least for the duration of the Roosevelt-concocted emergency.

Whether or not we step out of the picture completely, wreck the building, and make a cash distribution to our stockholders of better than $500 a share will, of course, depend on coming events. Certainly, with a capital structure of over a million dollars and a building entirely written off, we sit in an enviable position to reenter the banking business when, as, and if financial and political conditions warrant it.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF ENGLEWOOD,
J. M. NICHOLS, *President.*

Laws Pertaining to the Civil Service Enacted Under the Roosevelt Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I was glad, indeed, to support the deficiency bill reported by the Appropriations Committee, particularly that phase serving as an "enabling act" for the so-called Ramspeck-Mead bill, Public, No. 200.

This bill, evolved by the Bureau of the Budget, upon request of the House Appropriations committee, developed a scientific, fair, and long-over-due system of promotions for Government employees. It cannot be gainsaid but that in these days of rapidly rising costs of living these merited increases in pay will be received by the employees with heartfelt gratitude.

As one long interested in the welfare of those in Uncle Sam's service, I pause here to pay my respects to them. In my many years of business experience I came into contact with representatives of various departments and establishments who contacted me, officially. I learned to respect the judgment of these individuals and as a class it seemed to me that they were most conscientious, painstaking, and utterly honest in their devotion to their respective duties.

Since having been elected to Congress and having thus come into more intimate contact and greater knowledge, my respect and admiration for these employees, the true servants of all our people, have continually increased. My duties in the Appropriations Committee have enabled me, perhaps, to gain a perspective not enjoyed by the average Member in some respects, and I am today confident that one of the great pillars upon which the foundations of our free Government rest is its loyal, patriotic, and able employees.

We on the Democratic side may well take great pride in the fact that during the regime of the present administration, or from March 3, 1933, down to the present day, more legislation strengthening civil service and improving the merit system has been placed upon the statutes

than in all time in previous history. The record proves that this is true, because of the laws pertaining to civil service enacted since, say, 1919, 120 of these, with various amendments—out of a total of 155—have been passed since Franklin D. Roosevelt assumed the Presidency.

I am confident that the basic enactments thus passed bearing upon the important problems of Federal retirement, annual vacation, and sick leave, extension of civil-service status, and so forth, have proven and will continue to be needed modernizations and streamlining, which will not only improve the conditions of employees within the service but, through increasing efficiency, raise the standards of the whole Federal establishment so as to give the taxpayer the maximum service benefits.

Under leadership of the able gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable ROBERT RAMSPECK, chairman of the House Civil Service Committee since 1935, and of various other committee chairmen whose committees have reported measures or amendments bearing upon civil service, we have steadily marched forward toward the desired goal of an ideal Federal employment system, with high standards of ability, education, and experience as essential qualifications for admittance thereto, and equitable pay and working conditions, and a reasonable retirement for the superannuated.

Among other laws thus passed during this period are the following:

March 21, 1935, Public, No. 21, H. R. 6644: An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and prior fiscal years, and so forth.

April 8, 1935, Public Resolution No. 11: Making appropriations for relief purposes.

April 27, 1935, Public, No. 46: An act to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes.

July 5, 1935, Public, No. 198: An act to establish the cases of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board; and so forth.

July 25, 1935, Public, No. 219: An act to create a Central Statistical Committee and a Central Statistical Board, and for other purposes.

August 7, 1935, Public, No. 249: An act to provide for adjusting the compensation of post-office inspectors and inspectors in charge to correspond with the rates established by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

August 12, 1935, Public, No. 260: An act to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and so forth.

August 14, 1935, Public, No. 271: An act to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged persons, blind persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment compensation laws; to establish a Social Security Board; to raise revenues; and for other purposes.

August 14, 1935, Public, No. 275: To fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and so forth.

August 23, 1935, Public, No. 305: An act to provide for the sound, effective, and uninterrupted operation of the banking system, and for other purposes.

August 23, 1935, Public, No. 308: An act relating to the compensation of certain charwomen.

August 26, 1935, Public, No. 333: An act to provide for control and regulation of public-utility holding companies, and so forth.

August 27, 1935, Public, No. 366: An act to provide time credits for substitute laborers in the post office when appointed as regular laborers.

August 28, 1935, Public, No. 383: An act relative to the retirement of certain officers and employees.

August 28, 1935, Public, No. 387: An act to provide for the compiling and publishing of the Official Register of the United States.

August 29, 1935, Public, No. 399: An act to establish a retirement system for employees of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, and so forth.

August 30, 1935, Public, No. 402: An act to stabilize the bituminous coal-mining industry and promote its interstate commerce; to provide for cooperative marketing of bituminous coal; to levy a tax on bituminous coal and provide for a draw-back under certain conditions; to declare the production, distribution, and use of bituminous coal to be affected with a national public interest; to conserve the bituminous-coal resources of the United States; to provide for the general welfare, and so forth.

February 29, 1936, Public, No. 461: An act to promote the conservation and profitable use of agricultural land resources by temporary Federal aid to farmers, and so forth.

March 14, 1936, Public, No. 471: To provide for vacations to Government employees, and so forth.

March 14, 1936, Public, No. 472: To standardize sick leave and extend it to all civilian employees.

May 7, 1936, Public, No. 575: An act to amend the act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees.

May 20, 1936, Public, No. 605: An act to provide for rural electrification, and so forth.

May 26, 1936, Public, No. 619: An act to provide for adjusting the compensation of division superintendents, assistant division superintendents, and others, in the Railway Mail Service, to correspond to the rates established by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

June 4, 1936, Public, No. 641: An act to provide for the appointment of substitute postal employees, and for other purposes.

June 22, 1936, Public, No. 739: An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and so forth.

June 22, 1936, Public, No. 740: An act to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and so forth.

June 23, 1936, Public, No. 764: An act to extend the retirement privilege to the Director, assistant directors, inspectors and special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

June 26, 1936, Public, No. 815: An act to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, and so forth.

June 26, 1936, Public, No. 817: An act to amend section 23 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1935, to adjust the hourly compensation of employees, and so forth.

June 29, 1936, Public, No. 936: An act to provide for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States.

June 30, 1936, Public, No. 846: An act to provide conditions for the purpose of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and so forth.

February 3, 1937, Public Resolution No. 4: To create a joint congressional committee on Government reorganization.

March 29, 1937, Public Resolution No. 18: For the payment of certain employees of the United States Government in the District of Columbia, and employees of the District of Columbia for January 20, 1937.

April 14, 1937, Public, No. 29: An act to amend an act to extend commissary privileges to widows of officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard and also to officers of the Foreign Service of the United States, and so forth.

April 26, 1937, Public, No. 48: To regulate interstate commerce in bituminous coal, and so forth.

May 14, 1937, Public, No. 84: An act authorizing allotment of pay by civilian personnel stationed abroad.

May 15, 1937, Public, No. 88: An act to amend the law relating to residence requirements of applicants for examinations before the Civil Service Commission.

May 18, 1937, Public, No. 91: An act to create the office of Counselor of the Department of State.

June 24, 1937, Public, No. 162: An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a retirement system for employees of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act," and so forth.

June 28, 1937, Public, No. 163: An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and so forth.

June 28, 1937, Public, No. 171: An act making appropriations for the Executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and so forth.

July 1, 1937, Public, No. 176: An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and so forth.

July 8, 1937, Public, No. 191: An act authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Panama Canal not coming within the provisions of the Canal Zone Retirement Act.

July 13, 1937, Public, No. 206: An act to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended to certain employees in the legislative and judicial branches of the Government.

July 22, 1937, Public No. 210: An act to create the Farmers' Home Corporation,

to promote more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes, to correct the economic instability resulting from some present forms of farm tenancy, and so forth.

July 26, 1937, Public, No. 212: An act to amend the Civil Service Act approved January 16, 1883, providing no person shall be discriminated against in any case because of his or her marital status in examination, appointment, reappointment, reinstatement, reemployment, promotion, transfer, retransfer, demotion, removal, or retirement, and so forth.

August 10, 1937: An act to provide retirement annuities for certain former employees of the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad Co. on the Isthmus of Panama.

August 11, 1937: An act authorizing credits to disbursing officers for expenses incident to the creation of subsistence homesteads corporations.

August 12, 1937: An act to authorize and direct the Comptroller General to allow credit for all outstanding disallowances and suspensions in the accounts of disbursing officers or agents of the Government for payments made pursuant to certain adjustments and increases in compensation of Government officers and employees.

August 14, 1937, Public, No. 294: An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments.

August 16, 1937, Public, No. 298: An act to extend the provisions of the 40-hour law for postal employees to watchmen and messengers in the Postal Service.

August 25, 1937, Public, No. 363: An act authorizing the Comptroller General to allow credits in the accounts of disbursing officers for overpayments on Civil Works Administration projects, and so forth.

August 28, 1937, Public, No. 401: An act for the relief of former employees of the Federal Subsistence Homesteads Corporations.

September 1, 1937: An act to provide financial assistance to the States and political subdivisions thereof for the elimination of unsafe and insanitary housing conditions; for the eradication of slums, for the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families in low income, and for the reduction of unemployment and the stimulation of business activity, to create a United States Housing Authority, and so forth.

September 1, 1937: An act to regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries to protect the welfare of consumers of sugars and those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States; to raise revenue, and so forth.

May 23, 1938, Public, No. 534: An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and so forth.

June 23, 1938, Public, No. 701: An act to amend section 9 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended.

June 25, 1938, Public, No. 720: An act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and so forth.

June 25, 1938, Public, No. 740: An act to amend an act to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to certain employees in the executive and judicial branches of the Government, and so forth.

June 29, 1938, Public Resolution 127: Providing compensation for certain employees whose compensation is fixed at a rate per day, per hour, or on a piece-work basis, and so forth.

April 3, 1939, Public, No. 19: Reorganization Act of 1939.

June 7, 1939, Public Resolution 20: Providing that reorganization plans I and II shall take effect on July 1, 1939.

June 4, 1940, Public Resolution 75: Providing for the taking effect of Reorganization Plan V.

April 12, 1939, Public, No. 31: An act to amend the Canal Zone Act, relating to retirement.

May 12, 1939, Public, No. 73: An act to provide for substitutes in the pneumatic-tube service.

May 12, 1939, Public, No. 74: An act to provide a differential in pay for night work to pneumatic-tube-system employees in the Postal Service.

May 12, 1939, Public, No. 75: An act to extend the provisions of the 40-hour law to pneumatic-tube-system employees of the Postal Service.

May 15, 1939, Public, No. 78: An act granting postal employees credit for Saturday in annual and sick leave law, and so forth.

May 15, 1939, Public, No. 79: An act limiting working hours of pneumatic-tube-system employees to 8, in 10 hours a day.

July 18, 1939, Public, No. 194: An act granting annual and sick leave with pay to substitutes in the Postal Service.

April 30, 1940, Public, No. 492: An act providing for sick leave for substitute postal employees.

June 25, 1940, Public, No. 662: An act to allow moving expenses to empoyees in the Railway Mail Service.

October 9, 1940, Pubic, No. 823: An act to provide an 8-hour workday and payment for overtime for dispatchers and mechanics-in-charge in the motor-vehicle service of the Postal Service.

June 6, 1939: An act to authorize certain officers and employees to administer oaths to expense accounts.

Juy 15, 1939: An act to authorize the payment of burial expense and expenses in connection with last illness and death of native employees who die while serving in offices abroad, and so forth.

August 2, 1939, Pubic, No. 252: An act to prevent pernicious political activities.

July 19, 1940, Public, No. 753: An act to extend to certain officers and employees in the several States and the District of Columbia the provisions of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," and so forth.

August 4, 1939, Public, No. 263: An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, and so forth.

August 7, 1939, Public, No. 320: An act to amend the act for retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, and so forth.

June 29, 1940, Public, No. 680: An act to amend the act for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, and so forth.

August 7, 1939, Public, No. 323: An act to amend the act for retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, and so forth.

August 10, 1939, Public, No. 369: An act to amend the acts granting increased compensation to civilian employees for the period July 1, 1917, to June 30, 1924.

March 2, 1940, Public, No. 419: An act to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Acts, and so forth.

April 18, 1940, Public, No. 459: An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and so forth.

April 25, 1940, Public, No. 485: To amend the provision of law relating to the use of private vehicles for official travel in order to effect economy and better administration.

April 30, 1940, Public, No. 499: An act to amend the Subsistence Expense Acts of 1926, and so forth.

June 8, 1940, Public, No. 570: An act to provide for the conservation and transfer of accumulated sick leave and vacation time due classified civil-service employees who succeed to the position of postmaster, and so forth.

June 28, 1940, Public, No. 671: An act to expedite national defense, and so forth.

July 2, 1940, Public, No. 703: An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense.

July 8, 1940, Public, No. 729: An act to defray the cost of returning to the United States the remains, families, and effects of officers and employees dying abroad, and so forth.

June 29, 1940, Public, No. 676: An act to provide for leave of absence, with pay, for any employee of the United States or of the District of Columbia who may be called for jury service, and so forth.

October 10, 1940, Public, No. 839: An act to provide for uniformity of allowances for the transportation of household goods of civilian officers and employees when transferred from one official station to another for permanent duty.

October 14, 1940, Public, No. 846: An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act and other retirement acts.

October 21, 1940, Public, No. 873: An act establishing overtime rates for compensation for employees of the field services of the War Department, and the field services of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes.

November 26, 1940, Public, No. 880: Extension of Civil Service and Retirement Acts.

August 1, 1941, Public, No. 200: Ramspeck-Mead Budget Bureau pay bill.

Nutrition Value of Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

CORRESPONDENCE WITH FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY BY PROF. A. W. RUDNICK, OF IOWA STATE COLLEGE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I desire to insert in the RECORD a communication from Mr. W. A. Gordon, secretary of the National Association of Local Creameries, St. Paul, Minn.; an interchange of correspondence between Prof. A. W. Rudnick, of Iowa State College, and Miss Helen S. Mitchell, nutrition director of the Federal Security Agency, with reference to the nutrition value of oleomargarine as compared with butter; also a letter from the Algona Cooperative Creamery Co. at Algona, Iowa:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL CREAMERIES,
St. Paul, Minn., September 12, 1941.

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KNUTSON: If you will read the enclosed photostatic copies of an interchange of correspondence between Prof. A. W. Rudnick, of Iowa State College, and Miss Helen S. Mitchell, Nutrition Director of the Federal Security Agency, you will probably be as surprised as I was to learn that she is unable to provide any authoritative confirmation of F. S. A.'s premise that oleomargarine made under the new regulation is as equally nutritious as butter.

Probably you will be even more surprised at the frankness with which she makes this known.

I have no doubt but that, after reading the exchange of correspondence you will agree with the sentiments expressed by Mr. M. P. Christiansen, secretary of the Algona Cooperative Creamery Co., in a letter to Mr. Rudnick. A photostatic copy of that letter is also enclosed.

Yours very truly,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL CREAMERIES,
W. A. GORDON, *Secretary.*

AUGUST 14, 1941.

HELEN S. MITCHELL,
Director of Nutrition,
Federal Security Agency,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DIRECTOR MITCHELL: I would like to have several copies of the booklet entitled "Recommended Dietary Allowances" put out by the Federal Security Agency. I do not know whether these come under the regular order of public documents or not. Will you direct this part of the letter to the right office, and I will appreciate it very much?

Since your Department has put out this recommended dietary allowance booklet, we have been swamped with inquiries as to whether butter and oleomargarine with vitamin A added are of equal value. Naturally, the dairymen are interested and many of their wives are interested in this matter. Can you cite to me any experimental data along this line so that I can answer these questions intelligently? So far as I know, I cannot find any references of any experimental work along this line and naturally I am hesitant in saying "yes" or "no" to the questions; but since this matter is put out by your department, you, no doubt, have the material on hand and can supply us with these references.

Thanking you for any information you have along this line which might be of use in answering these questions, I am

Yours very truly,
A. W. RUDNICK,
Extension Dairyman.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, August 21, 1941.

Mr. A. W. RUDNICK,
Extension Dairyman, Extension Service,
Iowa State College of Agriculture,
Ames, Iowa.

DEAR MR. RUDNICK: This will acknowledge your letter of August 14, requesting several copies of the bulletin Recommended Dietary Allowances. I regret to say that our supply of these is exhausted temporarily, but we shall be glad to send you some when they are available. In the meantime, we are forwarding to you reprints of an article which appeared in the Survey Graphic and which gives these dietary allowances as a part of the discussion.

I am interested in the inquiries which you have been receiving regarding butter and oleomargarine. It is my understanding that some ninety-odd percent of the oleomargarine now on the market for table use is reinforced with vitamin A to the extent of 9,000 International Units per pound. This level was chosen as approximately equivalent to average butter, although it is conceded that the vitamin A content of butter varies markedly according to the region and the season. The reinforced oleomargarine would be equivalent in vitamin A, but it may not be equivalent in certain other factors such as the proportion of specific fatty acids present. The physiological significance of these fatty acids is not well understood and until recently no question had been raised as to the difference between oleomargarine and butter except for the vitamin A.

I cannot cite you specific references or give you as detailed information as you may wish, but I suggest that you write to the Dairy Division of the United States Department of Agriculture if you wish further information.

Sincerely yours,
HELEN S. MITCHELL,
Director of Nutrition.

ALGONA COOPERATIVE CREAMERY CO.,
Algona, Iowa, August 25, 1941.

Prof. A. W. RUDNICK,
Agricultural Extension Service,
Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

DEAR PROFESSOR RUDNICK: I wish to thank you for the answer to my telephone request. It is evident to me from our conversation and your reply from Helen S. Mitchell, Director of Nutrition, Federal Security Administration, that she is recommending a model pattern diet, for which there is no experimental evidence that it is adequate.

I am under the impression that feeding practices for our farm animals put out by State or Federal agencies are carefully checked by scientific investigations, but the F. S. A. Director of Nutrition does not follow such a rule when putting out feeding practices for our children.

It seems very strange that the F. S. A. Director of Nutrition would make a recommendation of substituting oleomargarine for butter, a practice, for which she has no scientific experimental data to justify her recommendation. That she does not even understand the situation is found in the phrase, "I suggest you write to the Dairy Division, United States Department of Agriculture, if you wish further information." In other words, it looks to me as if our children are not as important as our farm animals to the F. S. A. Director of Nutrition.

Again I wish to thank you for the information.

Yours very truly,
ALGONA COOPERATIVE CREAMERY CO.,
M. P. CHRISTIANSEN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

A Special War Economy Analysis by the Wall Street Journal's Capital Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an article appearing in the Wall Street Journal under date of September 13, 1941. The present tax measure, H. R. 5417, will soon be followed by others, each more drastic than the 13 revenue acts that have preceded this, the largest ever enacted by a legislative body in the history of the world.

In the light of the analysis that follows, why not build up our own national defense instead of loaning, leasing, wasting, boondoggling away our national credit to foreign nations? Why not give attention to the defense of our own United States, its credit, its security, instead of rushing unprepared hither and yon throughout the world in a frenzied effort to get into a foreign war?

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of September 13, 1941]

A SPECIAL WAR ECONOMY ANALYSIS BY THE WALL STREET JOURNAL'S CAPITAL BUREAU

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The United States is at war.

So far it is a little war. President Roosevelt likens it to the little wars against Caribbean and Mediterranean pirates. Only the American Navy is fighting and only in defensive waters.

In the long run, we believe, the little war will be swallowed up by the big war in Europe, Asia, Africa. America will be all the way in. Deep down, Washington expects that to happen, has been preparing for it.

Total war isn't certain. It isn't imminent. It's the long-run probability. We will try to tell you what will happen if that probability becomes actuality, what your personal and business lives would have to adjust to.

Men fight wars. The United States can muster 13,000,000 fighters. They would be chosen from the 29,000,000 men between the war-time draft ages of 18 and 45.

Germany has an Army of 6,000,000 men, nearly her theoretical maximum. For the traditional margin of superiority, the opposing army must number 10 to 12 million men, must force a landing in Iberia or the Middle East. The coast of France is a death trap.

Of this attacking army Britain can furnish less than half. Unless Russia can stand

for 2 years, the United States must furnish six or seven millions.

America has never raised, transported, and supplied an army of 6,000,000 men. To do so would bring an acute labor shortage. Nondefense civilian employment would be lower than in 1933.

Wars are fought with munitions. America's munitions program, huge as it is, still is too small to win a war. O. P. M. thinks Germany spends $25,000,000,000 annually on war. Victory means spending $40,000,000,000 or $50,000,000,000 annually. England cannot better $15,000,000,000 a year. The rest must come from America, even if Russia stands. American munitions production must be at an annual rate at least 5 percent higher than its planned maximum.

The size of the program must increase even faster than its rate of output. The quantity of bombers must triple, tanks double, guns and ammunition triple, chemicals double—at least.

The bigger, faster program must be wrought in factories now built or building. Waiting for new machine tools takes time. Old machines must do, perhaps clumsily and expensively, war work for which they were not intended. The peacetime goods these machines used to make will disappear.

Production of raw materials must expand enormously. Particularly, the United States must pay the price necessary to utilize its low-grade high-cost deposits of strategic minerals.

Wars are paid for with money. No tax bill ever devised would yield the Government revenue enough to pay for an all-out war. Taxes now in force and being enacted will collect only $15,000,000,000 a year. Already surtaxes on small personal incomes are higher than those proposed in Senator CONNALLY'S war-profits tax bill of 1939. So is the normal tax on corporation incomes.

But taxes would go higher incomes would go down. Senator CONNALLY'S bill would take 80 percent of personal incomes over $50,000, 65 percent of all corporation profits exceeding a 25-percent return on capital.

What taxes won't yield, the Government must borrow. It plans to borrow about $10,000,000,000 from wage earners by pay-roll deductions, promising in return to pay them 2 months' salary when they lose their jobs. It plans to borrow still more from them by increasing deductions for old-age insurance.

Already Federal and State taxes take 25 percent of national income. Taxes and borrowing will push this percentage steadily higher.

Nevertheless, all-out expenditures would exceed all this taxation and enforced saving by billions of dollars annually. The rest of the money must be borrowed from banks. Down that road lies inflation.

Because of the Government's voracious need to borrow, the glut of idle money would disappear. Capital would have to be rationed. Companies could borrow money only with Government permission. An Executive order establishing a capital-control committee is already drafted. It is based on the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Wars across the sea depend on ships. America has a merchant marine of 10,000,000 tons. With Britains' aid it cannot feed the factories of the United States and transport and supply an army of six or seven million men. If the men must be transported by this fleet, America must go without essentials from abroad.

Railroads say each soldier in the field requires 35 pounds of supplies a day. To sustain an army of 6,000,000 men abroad would require 300 of the "ugly ducklings"—assuming they could make the round trip within a month.

By next year optimists hope two new ships will hit the water each day. O. P. M. says one ship. To support such an army would require 6 months or a year of shipbuilding, depending on whose guess is right. Maritime officials think they will have the necessary ships before the United States has the expeditionary force.

About some things America hopes it wouldn't have to worry. There will be food enough. Will there be trains and trucks enough to haul the food, the fuel, the munitions, and the troops? You can get into a terrific argument about that. Probably not. In war nothing is as easy as you think it will be.

Important Issues Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR., OF LOUISIANA

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over stations WJBO and KWKH on September 2, 1941:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am in Louisiana for a few days while the House is in recess and I want to talk to you about some of the issues before Congress. I wish that I could come and see each one of you individually and talk over with you some of the issues facing us. But that will be impossible, and this radio talk is the next best thing.

Let me say right here that this is no time for hysterics. This is no time for Americans to lose their tempers with each other. We all love this great country of ours, and we all want to do all we can to protect it. And today, this country is faced with the greatest danger that has ever confronted it, and it is going to take all of us pulling together, coolly, calmly, and dispassionately, to work out the answer.

PRICE CONTROL

One of the things I want to talk to you about tonight is price-control legislation now before Congress. The purpose of this measure is to control inflation and prevent prices from going so high that economic destruction will follow. This happens when prices get so high that money loses its value. Price Administrator Henderson has stated "before long now there will be more purchasing power running around hunting something to buy than there are goods available. If that occurs * * * no power on earth can prevent inflation. For that reason the Government must sop up some of this extra purchasing power * * * increase taxes—thus helping to pay for defense * * * stimulate savings—thus providing a backlog for the future."

The bill now before Congress is aimed to put some kind of control on this inflationary spiral. Everybody agrees that there must be a ceiling somewhere, but the difficulty is how to put that ceiling on so as not to work a hardship on any one group. I personally doubt that the bill in its present form will do what it is supposed to do. But this is one of the big problems now before the Congress. And the patience and best judgment of the American people, including the Members of Congress, is needed to try and work it out.

TAX BILL

Another thing I want to talk to you about is the tax bill. We have just voted for a tax bill that is supposed to raise some $3,000,000,000 in revenue. This is the stiffest peacetime tax bill in the history of the Nation. In my opinion, this tax bill is just the beginning. We are going to have to pay more and more taxes. The people in every nation in the world are making incomparably greater sacrifices than ours. The people of this country are going to have to make sacrifices, too, if we expect to maintain our independence and freedom of action. The world has gone mad. War and conquest and destruction are rampant. The rulers of Germany, Italy, and Japan set out upon a mad career of conquest. Then what happened? The people of this country looked over the destruction being wrought in the rest of the world, and they, the people, decided upon two fundamental policies. The first was they decided to rearm, to make this Nation the strongest military power in the world for national defense; and the second was they decided that it was in the interest of national defense that the British Empire should not be defeated. So they decided on all-out aid to Britain.

PEOPLE'S DECISION

Make no mistake about it, this was not merely the decision of Congress, or of the President—it was the decision of the American people, and that decision has merely been expressed through the Congress and the President. Well, these decisions are momentous and world-shaking decisions. We, all of us, have decided to resist the German military might and the German passion for world conquest; and in order to do that effectively, we, the people—you who are listening to me, and I, who am talking to you—all of us have decided that in order to make this decision definite and effective we had to do two things, as I have just stated—that is, make our national defense the strongest on earth and give sufficient aid to Great Britain to prevent that Empire from being defeated and dismembered. This Government is now engaged in doing these two things—helping Great Britain and rearming to defeat Germany's purpose of world conquest. And these decisions cost money. They will cost more money. In order to make these decisions effective, the people of America must pay, pay, not alone in terms of money, in dollars and cents, but in terms of sacrifice and self-discipline.

If we are to come through this crisis unshaken, we must quit playing politics. It is impossible to do what we have set out to do unless everyone of us—the President, the Members of Congress, and the people of America, place the well-being of the country above self-interest. We cannot favor one group over another. We cannot play politics with one group because they have the votes, and we cannot promise to protect one set of our people to the disadvantage of another. Capital and labor, industry and agriculture, rich man and poor man, city dweller and countryman alike, we all must pull together and gird ourselves for the struggle that lies ahead if we are to preserve this America of ours. So I repeat to you, the tax bill just passed will be distasteful, but it is just a foretaste of the sacrifice that lies ahead for all of us. For myself, I believe—and I am confident that you believe—that the America that we have known and loved is worth whatever sacrifice it takes to preserve it. We received this splendid heritage from our fathers. This glorious dream that is America was not come by easily. Men have fought and died that we might experience that priceless privilege of human freedom that is synonomous with the name American. This heritage was not the fruit of peace and indolence and selfishness. It was purchased with the blood of heroes and the tragic sorrows of Americans who died that liberty might be preserved, and preserved by self-sacrifice and suffering. We received it intact from our fathers. It is not too much to ask of our generation that we preserve it and pass it on,

unsullied, to those who come after us—to our children and to our children's children.

Yes; the tax bill is just a foretaste of the price we will have to pay for the privilege of being Americans. I doubt not that all of us are willing to pay that price.

JOINT RETURNS

One part of the tax bill I opposed vigorously, and that was the part compelling husband and wives to make joint returns. Some people tell you that this affected only the rich. But do not make any mistake about it. Once that rule is fixed, it is going to stay in the law and every one of you will be affected by this provision of the bill. Thousands upon thousands of people of small means will be included in the tax bills to come. The reason that I objected to that provision of the tax bill was that it was a denial of the rights of womanhood. Under the old common law, the man and the woman were considered as one—and the man was the one. The woman had no rights—her separate property that she had before she married became her husband's, and everything the husband had was still his. For centuries, woman has struggled to achieve the right to be considered as an individual in her own right. In the United States, in election after election, the women of our Nation have made steady gains to be considered on equality with the men in the eyes of the law. Here is Louisiana, ever since our State was a State—yes, and well before when we were still a colony—the property rights of a married woman were recognized, and under our law here in Louisiana, the married woman is recognized as the owner of her own separate property and of one-half of the property acquired after marriage.

RIGHTS OF WOMEN

This recognition of the rights of a married woman has contributed to the dignity and sancity of the marriage tie and is in keeping with the fundamentals of American tradition. My position is that we will make the tax burden as large as may be necessary upon the individual, but we will not surrender 1 inch of the principle that a woman is just as much of an individual as is a man—that the rights of a woman are just as sacred in the eyes of the law as the rights of a man—that a married woman is an individual and should be considered as an individual taxpayer in her own right. I am glad that we were able to strike this medieval provision from our tax law. This proposal smacked of the Dark Ages when it was seriously disputed in certain schools of theology as to whether women had souls or not. I helped to defeat this provision in the bill and I hope that it has been returned to the dust of archaic superstition from which it sprang.

TAXATION AND SAVINGS

While I am speaking of the tax bill, and especially of future tax bills, I have this suggestion to offer. It seems to be inevitable that the tax base must be broadened and that people now exempt must be brought into the tax structure. I do not doubt the willingness of these small wage earners to chip in to match their share of the national debt, but I do doubt their ability to do so. Especially is this true when we consider that many of these people are now beginning to receive a living income for the first time in months, or even years, and that old debts—to pay the mortgage, to pay for doctors' bills, and grocery bills—must be met. Under these circumstances, it is almost impossible for the people in the lower-income classes to pay taxes and save.

It seems to me that an examination of this question should be made by the Treasury Department and the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and that if the tax base is broadened so as to bring lower-income groups into the tax structure, that the payments by these people should go into a special type of savings fund that would help to finance our national-defense program today and that would be paid back to the taxpayer in the future. For the day may well come when the small wage earner's wages will drop. When the defense program has come to an end and the national income begins to fall away, such special Treasury bonds, properly prepared and wisely liquidated, would serve as savings to help tide these wage earners over possible bad times ahead—would serve as a cushion against individual distress, and at the same time, help to spread purchasing power when it might be falling off.

SELECTIVE SERVICE EXTENSION

I want also to talk to you about the extension of the terms for selective service. One thing seems to me to be certain and that is we are in a very dangerous situation. There may be grounds for asking whether or not our situation is more dangerous today than it was a year ago. President Roosevelt says that it is more serious, and he has sources of information that the rest of us have not got. But I do not think that anyone in their proper senses thinks there is no danger at all. Unless this situation is dangerous, how can we possibly justify the extraordinary measures we are taking for national defense? Let's compare our armed forces with those of other nations:

	Men
Germany	8,000,000
Russia	5,000,000
Japan	2,000,000
Italy	2,000,000
China	3,000,000

On this same date the United States had 1,506,000, composed of 508,700 in the Regular Army, 55,000 Reserve officers, 287,800 National Guard men, and 654,500 selective-service trainees.

Of course, our Navy is our first line of defense, and we have the finest Navy in the world. As long as the British Navy remains in friendly hands, we will never have to use any of our Army, but Great Britain is at war—at war with the Nazi war machine that has conquered more territory, defeated more armies in a quicker space of time than any conquering empire in history. Norway was conquered in 24 days. Belgium and Holland were overrun in 24 days. The great Empire of France was defeated—the supposedly unconquerable Maginot line pierced and the Empire of France vanquished in the space of 6 weeks. The German war machine overran the Balkans, completed their conquest of Europe outside of Russia in a campaign that lasted only 4 weeks. Now the German Armies are locked in a death grapple with the Russian Armies of Stalin. Will the Russians stop the Germans? We hope so, but it is too soon to tell, and one thing is certain, we Americans have no right to take anything for granted. France and Great Britain took too much for granted, and France paid the penalty with complete defeat and Great Britain is now locked in a death grapple with the outcome still in doubt.

And one thing I say—and you must remember—we do not have a two-ocean Navy and will not have one for some 3 years. Under these conditions, with every nation in the world at war except us, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, General Marshall, sent a report to the Secretary of War and asked that the selectees be retained in the service. The law under which the selectees were inducted into the service reads as follows—and I want you to listen to this language closely. I quote the law:

"Each man inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) shall serve for a training and service period of 12 consecutive months, unless sooner discharged, except that whenever the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled such 12-month period may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense."

Now, General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, recommends that these selectees be kept in the service. The very words of his report are these—and I quote his exact language: "In the light of the situation, it is believed that our interests are imperiled and that a grave national emergency exists." I do not know of any combination of words that could be any stronger expression of a national emergency than the language used by the Chief of Staff.

The President of the United States on July 21, 1941, sent a message to Congress stating that it was his official opinion that the selectees should be kept in the service. In his message to Congress the President stated—and I quote his exact language:

"The international situation is not less grave, but is far more grave than it was a year ago. It is so grave that the Army should be maintained in effective strength and without diminution of its effective numbers in a complete state of readiness. It is obvious that if two-thirds of our present Army return to civilian life it will be almost a year before the effective Army strength again reaches 1,000,000 men. We Americans cannot afford to speculate with the security of America."

THE ISSUE

The question before the House when the selectees' service extension was up was a simple one. The language of the act under which the trainees were serving states that if the national interest is imperiled the 12-month training period may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense. The Chief of Staff of the Army, on behalf of our Military Establishment, in an official message to the Secretary of War and in his testimony before the Military Affairs Committee gave it as his considered opinion that our national interests are imperiled. The President of the United States, in measured words, endorses this statement by the Chief of Staff, and requested Congress to give him authority to prevent our Army from demobilizing. A world in arms—millions of men under arms marching and countermarching. Nations who were allies yesterday now locked in a death grapple. The nations of the world have gone mad. The red demons of carnage and destruction are abroad. The four horsemen of the apocalypse are riding headlong over all of the world. The Chief of Staff of the Army and the President of the United States asked Congress to vote on the simple question, Are our national interests imperiled?

Of course, I voted to keep our Army mobilized and in arms, and I am confident that most of you feel as I do. I voted in accordance with the testimony of the Chief of Staff of the Army and the President of the United States and in accordance with my own judgment and common sense that our Nation is in peril.

NATIONAL PERIL

Oh, as much as any man, I wish that I could tell you that there is no danger. These boys who are in the Army—these selectees, they are my friends and the sons of my friends, and I would not cause them 1 day of unnecessary hardship, but in my official position as a Member of the Congress I occupy a position like that of a sentinel on a watchtower. From the thirty-third chapter of Ezekiel, I find my duties in the present emergency pretty well described. And right here let me say that if all of us will read the Bible more and stick closer to its teachings than we have in the past, this will prove the greatest safeguard to the American way of living that can be found. Let me read you what the old Hebrew prophet said and I feel sure he may have been speaking about some public official of his day. Ezekiel may have had in mind one of these smooth-tongued demagogues who promise impossibilities, who cry "Peace, peace," when there is no peace. Said the Prophet Ezekiel:

"Son of man, speak to the children of thy people, and say unto them when I bring the sword upon a land, if the people of the land take a man of their coasts, and set him for their watchman:

"If when he seeth the sword come upon the land, he blow the trumpet, and warn the people;

"Then, whosoever heareth the sound of the trumpet, and taketh not warning; if the sword come and take him away, his blood shall be upon his own head.

"But if the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at the watchman's hand."

Well, I think these are dangerous times. I told you when you elected me to Congress that I would tell you the truth about conditions as God gave me the light to see the truth, and that is what I have done and this is what I propose to do.

DEFENSE OF PRESIDENT

And now just one word about President Roosevelt. There are people going up and down this land telling you that he is a warmonger, and that he is trying to get this country into war. There never was a greater slander. The fact is that the world has been ablaze with war for nearly 2 years, and at any time during this period the President of the United States could have gotten us into this war. I do not know that he or any man can keep us out of it. I think the question as to whether we keep out of war depends a good deal on what other people do. I think a good deal depends on what Hitler does. I think a good deal depends upon what the Japanese do. The idea of public men in this country trying to create the impression that President Roosevelt is responsible for the dangerous situation in which we find ourselves today is outrageous. President Roosevelt did not invade Austria. President Roosevelt did not invade Czechoslovakia. President Roosevelt did not invade Poland. President Roosevelt did not invade Holland, Norway, and Belgium. President Roosevelt did not make an alliance with the Japanese obligating them to attack this country whenever the opportune time presented itself. It was Hitler and the piratical crew that has seized power in Germany who have done all this, and they have organized the greatest resurgence of paganism the world has seen since the fall of the Roman Empire. Hitler and his godless crew have organized the greatest anti-Christian movement in 2,000 years—Hitler, who, in his mad ambition, has set the world ablaze, and jealous political would-be competitors of the President in this country seek to fasten the blame on our President.

The fact speaks for itself. The United States is not at war, and it is the only great nation in the world that is not at war. The overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress place the interests of this country and the welfare of our people above anything else in the world. No one whom I have talked to in Washington desires to see this country plunged into war. There are a great many people in Washington who feel that war may come to us in spite of anything we can do, and that we should follow the advice of George Washington and in time of peace prepare for war. But the fact remains that during 2 years of the worst carnage and destruction the world has ever seen, President Roosevelt and the Congress of the United States have kept this country at peace and yet have preserved the vital interests of our Nation.

With a skill and boldness that will undoubtedly amaze the historians of the future and excite the admiration of statesmen in generations yet unborn, our President, with the cooperation of the Congress, in 2 years, time has brought us from the verge of disaster and unpreparedness to a place where we have every reason to view the future with confidence. He has led us from the barren desert of unpreparedness to a condition where, given a few months longer, we shall be prepared to say, with the old Briton: "Come the three corners of the world in arms and we shall shock them," and it seems to me during these trying times, when so much is at stake, that the President of the United States is entitled to receive not carping criticism but cooperation from loyal and patriotic citizens of our country.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. HAINES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE TOWNSEND NATIONAL WEEKLY

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, the signatures of more than 150 Members of the House upon a petition to bring the Townsend plan to the floor for discussion by discharging H. R. 1036 from committee indicates widespread interest in a national pay-as-you-go program for maintaining aged Americans in decency and dignity. The desire for such a program was not born with our generation but is handed down to us by some of those most active in the 1776 fight for American independence. In this connection, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article written in Townsend National Weekly by George Murray, newspaperman and playwright, now engaged in writing a biographical drama on Thomas Paine, early American patriot:

[From the Townsend National Weekly of June 21, 1941]

AMERICAN HERO FOR PLAN—EARLY PATRIOT ADVOCATED NATIONAL PENSION AT 50

(By George Murray)

WASHINGTON.—Basic principles of the Townsend plan had been advocated by an early patriot and American thinker more than a century and a half before Dr. Francis E. Townsend's program caught the Nation's eye in 1932. It was discovered here in perusal of rare pamphlets at the Congressional Library.

Thomas Paine, literary father and spark plug of the American war for independence, who served as Secretary for Foreign Affairs to the Congress of the United States during that war, proposed the Townsend plan in a pamphlet entitled "Agrarian Justice as Opposed to Agrarian Law and to Agrarian Monopoly." In this pamphlet he proposed:

"A plan for ameliorating the condition of man by creating in every nation a national fund to pay to every person, when arrived at the age of 21 years, the sum of £15 (about $75) to enable him or her to begin the world; and also £10 per annum during life to every person now living of the age of 50 years, and to all others when they shall arrive at that age, to enable them to live in old age without wretchedness and go decently out of the world."

TAX FOR FUNDS

Paine proposed to raise funds for such a pension through an inheritance tax of 10 percent. It was his contention that in the course of 30 years—1 generation—the bulk of the real and personal property of the entire Nation would have become subject to the tax. In discussing eligibility for such a pension, he wrote:

"It is a right, and not a charity, that I am pleading for. It is proposed that the payments, as already stated, be made to every person, rich or poor. Such persons as do not choose to receive it, can throw it into the common fund."

Paine estimated that at the time his pamphlet was written, in 1795, only one-eighteenth of America's population was past the age of 50. Experts today estimate that 10 percent of the Nation's population is past 60 and eligible for pensions under the Townsend bill. Paine set forth the reasons for his proposal:

"The contrast of affluence and wretchedness continually meeting the eye is like dead and living bodies chained together. Though I care as little about riches as any man, I am a friend to riches because they are capable of good. I care not how affluent some may be, provided that none is miserable in consequence of it."

MULTIPLY RESOURCES

Prosperity through spending had been envisioned by this great thinker even in a day when most of his contemporaries were thinking in terms of scarcity, Paine reveals in declaring his program "would multiply also the national resources; for property, like vegetation, increases by offsets."

In justification of his proposed tax, Paine wrote that all land, in the beginning, had been common property but that, in enhancing its value through cultivation, certain industrious men had acquired what society recognized as a claim upon it. But that such landowners were indebted to society. Paine insisted in a passage:

"Property is the effect of society; and it is as impossible for an individual to acquire personal property without the aid of society as it is for him to make land originally. Separate an individual from society and give him an island or a continent to possess and he cannot acquire personal property. He cannot become rich.

"All accumulation of personal property, beyond what a man's own hands produce, is derived to him by living in society."

This unusual treatise, written so long ago, was uncovered during research for a drama on Tom Paine, the American patriot who authored Common Sense, The Rights of Man, and The American Crisis, pamphlets which Gen. George Washington credited, in great part, with aiding in the birth of America.

A New Wyoming Arrival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McINTYRE

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. McIntyre and I have a new son, John Francis, who was born Saturday at 2:47 a. m., September 13, 1941, at Doctors Hospital in Washington, D. C.

From an initial size of 20½ inches in length and 7 pounds 14 ounces in weight, we expect him to become, in time, a man of credit to the great State of Wyoming and to our Nation.

Speech of Abraham Lincoln on War With Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KNUTE HILL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

ADDRESS BY ABRAHAM LINCOLN IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES JANUARY 12, 1848

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include therein a speech made by Abraham Lincoln on the floor of this House on January 12, 1848, I will make a few brief observations. Mr. Lincoln was at that time a mere inconspicuous Congressman, but he was as patriotic then and as clearly logical as he was later as President of the United States. He did not hesitate to criticize the President of the United States when he considered him in the wrong even when a war was on. On this point let me quote him:

> There is an important sense in which the Government is distinct from the administration. One is perpetual, the other temporary and changeable. A man may be loyal to his Government and yet oppose the peculiar principles and methods of the administration.—Abraham Lincoln.

This is one reason for my inserting the Lincoln speech. He saw fit to criticize his President during war. We are denounced for criticizing our President before any war has been declared. Another reason for calling the attention to Members of Congress and the public to Lincoln's speech at this time is the similarity of the situations. President Polk was provoking incidents on foreign soil. President Roosevelt is provoking incidents in foreign waters—Iceland and the Red Sea—in direct violation of the present neutrality law, which clearly and definitely provides that foreign nations must pay cash for their purchase and come to our ports for their material—"cash and carry," as it was popularly termed during the debate—in order to secure the support of many of us who hesitated to support the change in our neutrality law.

Let those, including the President, who so often quote Lincoln read this speech of his in full and profit thereby.

[From the Congressional Globe]

THE WAR WITH MEXICO

Speech of Mr. A. Lincoln, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, January 12, 1848, on the resolutions referring the President's message to the various standing committees

Mr. Lincoln addressed the committee as follows:

Mr. Chairman, some, if not all, the gentlemen on the other side of the House, who have addressed the committee within the last 2 days, have spoken rather complainingly, if I have rightly understood them, of the vote given a week or 10 days ago, declaring that the war with Mexico was unnecessary and unconstitutionally commenced by the President. I admit that such a vote should not be given in mere party wantonness, and that the one given is justly censurable, if it have no other o. better foundation. I am one of those who joined in that vote, and I did so under my best impression of the truth of the case. How I got this impression, and how it may possibly be removed, I will now try to show. When the war began, it was my opinion that all those who, because of knowing too li tle, or because of knowing too much, could not conscientiously approve the conduct of the President (in the beginning of it), should, nevertheless, as good citizens and patriots, remain silent on that point, at least till the war should be ended. Some leading Democrats, including ex-President Van Buren, have taken this same view, as I understand them; and I adhered to it and acted upon it, until since I took my seat here, and I think I should still adhere to it, were it not that the President and his friends will not allow it to be so. Besides, the continual effort of the President to argue every silent vote given for supplies into an endorsement of the justice and wisdom of his conduct; besides that singularly candid paragraph in his late message, in which he tells us that Congress, with great una imity (only two in the the Senate and 14 'n the House dissenting) and declared that "by the act of the Republic of Mexico a state of war exists between that Government and the United States"; when the same journals that informed him of this, also informed him that, when that declaration stood disconnected from the question of supplies, 67 in the House, and not 14, merely, voted against it, besides this open attempt to prove by telling the truth, what he could not prove by telling the whole truth, demanding of all who will not submit to be misrepresented, in justice to themselves, to speak out; besides all this, one of my colleagues [Mr. Richardson] at a very early day in the session, brought in a set of resolutions, expressly endorsing the original justice of the war on the part of the President. Upon these resolutions, when they shall be put on their passage, I shall be compelled to vote; so that I cannot be silent if I would. Seeing this, I went about preparing myself to give the vote understandingly, when it should come. I carefully examined the President's messages, to ascertain what he himself had said and proved upon the point. The result of this examination was to make the impression, that, taking for true all the President states as facts, he falls far short of proving his justification, and that the President would have gone further with his proof, if it had not been for the small matter that the truth would not permit him. Under the impression thus made, I gave the vote before mentioned. I propose now to give, concisely, the process of the examination I made, and how I reached the conclusion I did.

The President, in his first message of May 1846 declares that the soil was ours on which hostilities were commenced by Mexico; and he repeats that declaration, almost in the same language, in each successive annual message—thus showing that he esteems that point a highly essential one. In the importance of that point, I entirely agree with the President. To my judgment, it is the very point upon which he should be justified or condemned. In his message of December 1846 it seems to have occurred to him, as is certainly true, that title, ownership to soil, or anything else, is not a simple fact, but is a conclusion following one or more simple facts; and that it was incumbent upon him to present the facts from which he concluded the soil was ours on which the first blood of the war was shed.

Accordingly, a little below the middle of page 12, in the message last referred to, he enters upon that task; forming an issue and introducing testimony, extending the whole to a little below the middle of page 14. Now, I propose to try to show that the whole of this—issue and evidence—is, from beginning to end, the sheerest deception. The issue, as he presents it, is in these words: "But there are those who, conceding all this to be true, assume the ground that the true western boundary of Texas is the Nueces, instead of the Rio Grande; and that, therefore, in marching our Army to the east bank of the latter river, we passed the Texan line, and invaded the territory of Mexico." Now, this issue is made up of two affirmatives and no negative. The main deception of it is, that it assumes as true that one river or the other is necessarily the boundary, and cheats the superficial thinker entirely out of the idea that possibly the boundary is somewhere between the two, and not actually at either. A further deception is, that it will let in evidence which a true issue would exclude. A true issue made by the President would be about as follows: "I say the soil was ours on which the first blood was shed; there are those who say it was not."

I now proceed to examine the President's evidence, as applicable to such an issue. When that evidence is analyzed, it is all included in the following propositions:

1. That the Rio Grande was the western boundary of Louisiana, as we purchased it of France in 1803.

2. That the Republic of Texas always claimed the Rio Grande as her western boundary.

3. That, by various acts, she had claimed it on paper.

4. That Santa Anna, in his treaty with Texas, recognized the Rio Grande as her boundary.

5. That Texas before, and the United States after annexation, had exercised jurisdiction beyond the Nueces, between the two rivers.

6. That our Congress understood the boundary of Texas to extend beyond the Nueces.

Now, for each of these in its turn:

His first item is, that the Rio Grande was the western boundary of Louisiana, as we purchased it of France in 1803; and, seeming to expect this to be disputed, he argues over the amount of nearly a page to prove it true; at the end of which, he lets us know that, by the treaty of 1819, we sold to Spain the whole country, from the Rio Grande eastward to the Sabine. Now, admitting, for the present, that the Rio Grande was the boundary of Louisiana, what, under heaven, had that to do with the present boundary between us and Mexico? How, Mr. Chairman, the line that once divided your land from mine can still be the boundary between us after I have sold my land to you, is, to me, beyond all comprehension. And how any man, with an honest purpose only of proving the truth, could ever have thought of introducing such a fact to prove such an issue, is equally incomprehensible. The outrage upon common right, of seizing as our own what we have once sold, merely because it was ours before we sold it, is only equalled by the outrage on common sense of any attempt to justify it.

The President's next piece of evidence is, that "the Republic of Texas always claimed this river (Rio Grande) as her western boundary." That is not true, in fact. Texas has claimed it, but she has not always claimed it. There is, at least, one distinguished exception. Her State constitution—the Republic's most solemn and well-considered act; that which may, without impropriety, be called her last will and testament, revoking all others—makes no such claim. But suppose she had always claimed it. Has not Mexico always claimed the contrary? So that there is but claim against claim, leaving nothing proved

until we get back of the claims, and find which has the better foundation.

Though not in the order in which the President presents his evidence, I now consider that class of his statements, which are, in substance, nothing more than that Texas has, by various acts of her convention and congress, claimed the Rio Grande as her boundary—on paper. I mean here what he says about the fixing of the Rio Grande as her boundary, in her old constitution (not her State constitution), about forming congressional districts, counties, etc. Now, all of this is but naked claim, and what I have already said about claims is strictly applicable to this. If I should claim your land by word of mouth, that certainly would not make it mine; and if I were to claim it by a deed which I had made myself, and with which you had had nothing to do, the claim would be quite the same in substance, or rather in utter nothingness.

I next consider the President's statement that Santa Anna, in his treaty with Texas, recognized the Rio Grande as the western boundary of Texas. Besides the position so often taken that Santa Anna, while a prisoner of war—a captive—could not bind Mexico by a treaty, which I deem conclusive; besides this, I wish to say something in relation to this treaty, so called by the President, with Santa Anna. If any man would like to be amused by a sight at that little thing, which the President calls by that big name, he can have it by turning to Niles' Register, volume 50, page 336. And if anyone should suppose that Niles' Register is a curious repository of so mighty a document as a solemn treaty between nations, I can only say that I learned, to a tolerable degree of certainty, by inquiry at the State Department, that the President himself never saw it anywhere else. By the way, I believe I should not err if I were to declare that during the first 10 years of the existence of that document it was never by anybody called a treaty; that it was never so called till the President, in his extremity, attempted, by so calling it, to wring something from it in justification of himself in connection with the Mexican War. It has none of the distinguishing features of a treaty. It does not call itself a treaty. Santa Anna does not therein assume to bind Mexico; he assumes only to act as the President, commander in chief of the Mexican Army and Navy; stipulates that the then present hostilities should cease; and that he would not himself take up arms, nor influence the Mexican people to take up arms, against Texas, during the existence of the war of Independence. He did not recognize the independence of Texas; he did not assume to put an end to the war, but clearly indicated his expectation of its continuance; he did not say one word about boundary, and most probably never thought of it. It is stipulated therein that the Mexican forces should evacuate the Territory of Texas, passing to the other side of the Rio Grande; and in another article it is stipulated that to prevent collisions between the armies the Texan army should not approach nearer than within 5 leagues—of what is not said—but clearly, from the object stated, it is of the Rio Grande. Now, if this is a treaty recognizing the Rio Grande as the boundary of Texas, it contains the singular feature of stipulating that Texas shall not go within 5 leagues of her own boundary.

Next comes the evidence of Texas before annexation, and the United States afterward, exercising jurisdiction beyond the Nueces and between the two rivers. This actual exercise of jurisdiction is the very class or quality of evidence we want. It is excellent so far as it goes; but does it go far enough? He tells us it went beyond the Nueces, but he does not tell us it went to the Rio Grande. He tells us jurisdiction was exercised between the two rivers, but he does not tell us it was exercised over all the territory between them. Some simple-minded people think it possible to cross one river and go beyond it without going all the way to the next; that jurisdiction may be exercised between two rivers without covering all the country between them. I know a man, not very unlike myself, who exercises jurisdiction over a piece of land between the Wabash and the Mississippi; and yet so far is this from being all there is between those rivers that it is just 152 feet long by 50 wide and no part of it much within a hundred miles of either. He has a neighbor between him and the Mississippi—that is, just across the street, in that direction—whom, I am sure, he could neither persuade nor force to give up his habitation, but which, nevertheless, he could certainly annex, if it were to be done, by merely standing on his own side of the street and claiming it or even sitting down and writing a deed for it.

But next the President tells us the Congress of the United States understood the State of Texas they admitted into the Union to extend beyond the Nueces. Well, I suppose they did—I certainly so understand it—but how far beyond? That Congress did not understand it to extend clear to the Rio Grande is quite certain by the fact of their joint resolutions for admission expressly leaving all questions of boundary to future adjustment. And, it may be added, that Texas herself is proved to have had the same understanding of it that our Congress had by the fact of the exact conformity of her new constitution to those resolutions.

I am now through the whole of the President's evidence; and it is a singular fact, that if anyone should declare the President sent the Army into the midst of a settlement of Mexican people, who had never submitted, by consent or by force, to the authority of Texas or of the United States, and that there, and thereby, the first blood of the war was shed, there is not one word in all the President has said which would either admit or deny the declaration. In this strange omission chiefly consists the deception of the President's evidence—an omission which, it does seem to me, could scarcely have occurred, but by design. My way of living leads me to be about the courts of justice; and there I have sometimes seen a good lawyer struggling for his client's neck, in a desperate case, employing every artifice to work round, befog, and cover up with many words some position pressed upon him by the prosecution, which he dared not admit, and yet could not deny. Party bias may help to make it appear so; but, with all the allowance I can make for such bias, it still does appear to me that just such, and from just such necessity, is the President's struggles in this case.

Sometime after my colleague, Mr. Richardson, introduced the resolutions I have mentioned, I introduced a preamble, resolution, and interrogatories,[1] intended to draw the President out, if possible, on this hitherto untrodden ground. To show their relevancy, I propose to state my understanding of the true rule for ascertaining the boundary between Texas and Mexico. It is that wherever Texas was exercising jurisdiction was hers; and wherever Mexico was exercising jurisdiction was hers; and that whatever separated the actual exercise of jurisdiction of the one from that of the other, was the true boundary between them. If, as is probably true, Texas was exercising jurisdiction along the western bank of the Nueces, and Mexico was exercising it along the eastern bank of the Rio Grande, then neither river was the boundary, but the uninhabited country between the two was. The extent of our territory in that region depended not on any treaty-fixed boundary (for no treaty had attempted it) but on revolution. Any people anywhere, being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off the existing government, and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable, a most sacred right—a right which, we hope and believe, is to liberate the world. Nor is this right confined to cases in which the whole people of an existing government may choose to exercise it. Any portion of such people that can, may revolutionize and make their own of so much of the territory as they inhabit. More than this, a majority of any portion of such people may revolutionize, putting down a minority, intermingled with, or near about them, who may oppose their movements. Such minority was precisely the case of the Tories of our own Revolution. It is a quality of revolutions not to go by old lines or old laws, but to break up both and make new ones. As to the country now in question, we bought it of France in 1803 and sold it to Spain in 1819, according to the President's statement. After this all Mexico, including Texas, revolutionized against Spain; and still later Texas revolutionized against Mexico. In my view, just so far as she carried her revolution, by obtaining the actual, willing, or unwilling submission of the people, so far the country was hers, and no further.

Now, sir, for the purpose of obtaining the very best evidence as to whether Texas had actually carried her revolution to the place where the hostilities of the present war commenced, let the President answer the interrogatories I proposed, as before mentioned, or some other similar ones. Let him answer fully, fairly, and candidly. Let him answer with facts, and not with arguments. Let him remember he sits where Washington sat; and, so remembering, let him answer as Washington would answer. As a nation should not, and the Almighty will not, be evaded, so let him attempt no evasion, no equivocation. And if, so answering, he can show that the soil was ours where the first blood of the war was shed—that it was not within an inhabited country, or, if within such, that the inhabitants had submitted themselves to the civil authority of Texas, or of the United States, and that the same is true of the site of Fort Brown—then I am with him for his justification. In that case I shall be most happy to reverse the vote I gave the other day. I have a selfish motive for desiring that the President may do this; I expect to give some votes, in connection with the war, which, without his so doing, will be of doubtful propriety, in my own judgment, but which will be free from the doubt, if he does so. But if he cannot or will not do this—if, on any pretense, or no pretense, he shall refuse or omit it—then I shall be fully convinced, of what I more than suspect already, that he is deeply conscious of being in the wrong; that he feels the blood of this war, like the blood of Abel, is crying to heaven against him; that he ordered General Taylor into the midst of a peaceful Mexican settlement, purposely to bring on a war; that originally having some strong motive—what I will not stop now to give my opinion concerning—to involve the two countries in a war, and trusting to escape scrutiny by fixing the public gaze upon the exceeding brightness of military glory—that attractive rainbow that rises in showers of blood—that serpent's eye that charms to destroy—he plunged into it, and has swept on and on, till, disappointed in his calculation of the ease with which Mexico might be subdued, he now finds himself he knows not where. How like the half insane mumbling of a fever dream is the whole war part of the late message. At one time telling us that Mexico has nothing whatever that we can get but territory; at another, showing us how we can support the war by levying contributions on Mexico. At one time urging the national honor, the security of the future, the prevention of foreign interference, and even the good of Mexico herself, as among the objects of the war; at another, telling us that, "to reject indemnity by refusing to accept a cession of territory would be to abandon all our just demands, and to wage the war, bearing all its expenses, without a purpose or definite

[1] See Congressional Globe, 1st sess., 30th Cong., p. 64.

object." So, then, the national honor, security of the future, and everything but territorial indemnity, may be considered the no-purposes and indefinite objects of the war. But, having it now settled that territorial indemnity is the only object, we are urged to seize, by legislation here, all that he was content to take a few months ago, and the whole province of Lower California to boot, and to still carry on the war—to take all we are fighting for, and still fight on. Again, the President is resolved, under all circumstances, to have full territorial indemnity for the expenses of the war; but he forgets to tell us how we are to get the excess after those expenses shall have surpassed the value of the whole of the Mexican territory. So, again, he insists that the separate national existence of Mexico shall be maintained; but he does not tell us how this can be done after we shall have taken all her territory. Lest the questions I here suggest be considered speculative merely, let me be indulged a moment in trying to show they are not.

The war has gone on some 20 months; for the expenses of which, together with an inconsiderable old score, the President now claims about one-half of the Mexican territory, and that by far the better half, so far as concerns our ability to make anything out of it. It is comparatively uninhabited; so that we could establish land offices in it, and raise some money in that way. But the other half is already inhabited, as I understand it, tolerably densely for the nature of the country; and all its lands, or all that are valuable, already appropriated as private property. How, then, are we to make anything out of these lands with this encumbrance on them, or how remove the encumbrance? I suppose no one will say we should kill the people, or drive them out, or make slaves of them, or even confiscate their property? How, then, can we make much out of this part of the territory? If the prosecution of the war has, in expenses, already equaled the better half of the country, how long its future prosecution will be in equaling the less valuable half is not a speculative, but a practical question, pressing closely upon us; and yet it is a question which the President seems never to have thought of.

As to the mode of terminating the war and securing peace, the President is equally wandering and indefinite. First, it is to be done by a more vigorous prosecution of the war in the vital parts of the enemy's country; and, after apparently talking himself tired on this point, the President drops down into a half despairing tone, and tells us, that "with a people distracted and divided by contending factions, and a Government subject to constant changes by successive revolutions, the continued success of our arms may fail to obtain a satisfactory peace." Then he suggests the propriety of wheedling the Mexican people to desert the counsels of their own leaders, and, trusting in our protection, to set up a government from which we can secure a satisfactory peace, telling us that "this may become the only mode of obtaining such a peace." But soon he falls into doubt of this too, and then drops back onto the already half-abandoned ground of "more vigorous prosecution." All this shows that the President is in no wise satisfied with his own positions. First, he takes up one, and, in attempting to argue us into it, he argues himself out of it; then seizes another, and goes through the same process; and then, confused at being able to think of nothing new, he snatches up the old one again, which he has sometime before cast off. His mind, tasked beyond its power, is running hither and thither, like some tortured creature on a burning surface, finding no position on which it can settle down and be at ease.

Again, it is a singular omission in this message, that it nowhere intimates when the President expects the war to terminate. At its beginning, General Scott was, by this same President, driven into disfavor, if not disgrace, for intimating that peace could not be conquered in less than 3 or 4 months. But now, at the end of about 20 months, during which time our arms have given us the most splendid successes—every department, and every part, land and water, officers and privates, regulars and volunteers, doing all that men could do, and hundreds of things which it had ever before been thought men could not do; after all this, this same President gives us a long message without showing us that, as to the end, he has himself even an imaginary conception. As I have before said, he knows not where he is. He is a bewildered, confounded, and miserably perplexed man. God grant he may be able to show there is not something about his conscience more painful than all his mental perplexity.

APPENDIX

Articles of an agreement entered into between His Excellency David G. Burnet, President of the Republic of Texas, of the one part, and His Excellency General Santa Ana President General in Chief of the Mexican Army, of the other part

ARTICLE 1. General Antonio Lopez de Santa Ana agrees that he will not take up arms, nor will he exercise his influence to cause them to be taken up, against the people of Texas, during the present war of independence.

ART. 2. All hostilities between the Mexican and Texan troops will cease immediately, both by land and water.

ART. 3. The Mexican troops will evacuate the territory of Texas, passing to the other side of the Rio Grande del Norte.

ART. 4. The Mexican Army, in its retreat, shall not take the property of any person without his consent and just indemnification, using only such articles as may be necessary for its subsistence, in cases when the owner may not be present, and remitting to the commander of the army of Texas, or to the commissioners to be appointed for the adjustment of such matters, an account of the value of the property consumed, the place where taken, and the name of the owner, if it can be ascertained.

ART. 5. That all private property, including cattle, horses, Negro slaves, or indentured persons, of whatever denomination, that may have been captured by any portion of the Mexican Army, or may have taken refuge in the said Army, since the commencement of the late invasion, shall be restored to the commander of the Texan Army, or to such other persons as may be appointed by the Government of Texas to receive them.

ART. 6. The troops of both armies will refrain from coming into contact with each other; and to this end, the commander of the Army of Texas will be careful not to approach within a shorter distance than five leagues.

ART. 7. The Mexican Army shall not make any other delay, on its march, than that which is necessary to take up their hospitals, baggage, etc., and to cross the rivers; any delay not necessary to these purposes to be considered an infraction of this agreement.

ART. 8. By an express to be immediately dispatched, this agreement shall be sent to Gen. Vincente Filisola, and to Gen. T. J. Rusk, commander of the Texan Army, in order that they may be apprized of its stipulations; and to this end, they will exchange engagements to comply with the same.

ART. 9. That all Texan prisoners now in the possession of the Mexican Army, or its authorities, be forthwith released, and furnished with free passports to return to their homes; in consideration of which, a corresponding number of Mexican prisoners, rank and file, now in possession of the Government of Texas, shall be immediately released—the remainder of the Mexican prisoners that continue in the possession of the Government of Texas to be treated with due humanity; any extraordinary comforts that may be furnished them to be at the charge of the Government of Mexico.

ART. 10. General Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna will be sent to Vera Cruz as soon as it shall be deemed proper.

The contracting parties sign this instrument for the above-mentioned purposes, in duplicate, at the port of Velasco, this 14th day of May 1836.

DAVID G. BURNET,
President.

JAS. COLLINGSWORTH,
Secretary of State.

ANTONIO LOPEZ DE SANTA ANNA,

B. HARDIMAN,
Secretary of the Treasury.

P. W. GRAYSON,
Attorney General.

Operators View of Railroad Workers Wage Demands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

STATEMENT BY F. G. GURLEY, VICE PRESIDENT, A. T. & S. F. RAILWAY AND SPOKESMAN FOR THE CARRIERS' JOINT CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the statement by Mr. F. G. Gurley, vice president, A. T. & S. F. Railway, and spokesman for the Carriers' Joint Conference Committee. On September 11, I placed in the RECORD the reply of Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, to this statement by Mr. Gurley. Mr. Whitney has requested that in fairness to Mr. Gurley, and also in order to clarify Mr. Whitney's statement, that I also place in the RECORD the statement by Mr. Gurley to which Mr. Whitney's statement was a reply, so that both sides will be presented. I am very glad to do this.

Mr. Gurley's statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF F. G. GURLEY TO OPERATING ORGANIZATIONS, AUGUST 5, 1941

Mr. Gurley stated, as he advised the other day, he has a few things he wants to say concerning the financial aspects of this situation. He remarked he could not qualify as a financier, that he came up "the hard way" through the operating department. He said his experience with bankers has always been on the side of the desk where arrangements are made to borrow money, but he would like the employees to keep in mind that it does not make a great deal of difference whether you are planning the budget of the family or planning the budget of a good-sized company, the same over-all principles must apply. The "over-all principles" are the way we go about things, and which in the final analysis decides our course of action in given circum-

stances. He said a man sits down with his wife and goes over his budget and decides whether they can buy this or that, and it is perfectly proper. He stated that has been his experience with railroad expenses. He remarked he "grew up" on the Burlington railroad, and some 2 years ago, following the death of Mr. Bledsoe and the elevation of Mr. Engel, the board of directors of the Santa Fe elected him to the position of vice president of the executive department of that railroad. He said his experiences therefore had been with the Burlington and Santa Fe railroads, which certainly cannot be classed as "downtrodden" or "poor" railroads, nor are either "rich" railroads. He stated it has been very interesting to come from the family discussion at breakfast time as to what the family could afford, down to the office and there participate in the discussions as to the wisdom of purchasing new material—whether the railroad could afford to buy 131-pound rail or 150-pound rail or continue to use 112-pound rail. Could the railroad afford to buy new cars to be used on the San Diego run due to the increase in population there by reason of defense work. He stated the question of what one can afford runs through the whole structure of business. He stated his railroad had borrowed money for some cars, and are rather proud of the fact they secured the lowest rate ever received by any railroad on equipment certificates.

Mr. Gurley called attention to the radio discussion Sunday evening by Mr. Robertson and himself of the respective sides of the question here being considered, and said he [Mr. Gurley] spoke about stockholders. He recalled it was said the other day the thing we are here considering has to do with human beings; in fact, all the theories and problems of the world have to do with that—it is these human beings that make the world what it is, either good or bad, and, of course, much more good than bad

But, he said getting back to the question of stockholders, on quite a number of railroads there are more stockholders than there are employees, but, of course, that is not true of the United States as a whole. He said it just so happens the Santa Fe has from 8,000 to 10,000 more stockholders than employees, and they are just human beings. In fact, he remarked, quite a number of Santa Fe employees are stockholders, and therefore he is working for them.

Mr. Gurley recalled there has been some discussion that one of the difficulties of the railroad situation is the lack of merchandising on the part of the people who have to do that particular part of the railroad work. He said there is no doubt there are many things that should, and can, be done to improve the merchandising technique, but, of course, one outstanding thing is the difficulties the railroads have in merchandising their product. Some of the employee relations have bothered in that regard. He stated that while the railroads are striving, that no doubt they were making some mistakes, that it is a trial-and-error procedure, and there are a lot of things they would like to do which they can't do. He expressed the thought it is a fair statement there is no business in America that is so circumscribed by other forces than true business principles as are the railroads, so, he said, he asks the organizations' support in the railroads' merchandising efforts and indulgence when they think things might be done in a better and more efficient way.

Mr. Gurley said he thinks it a splendid thing that as the railroads consider matters of such importance as this they have an opportunity to discuss them with representatives of the employees. He stated one of the undesirable parts of the railroads' managerial technique is the fact, because of the very nature of things, the managers of the property cannot get more closely in touch with their employees. He pointed out that it is inherent in a business that stretches from one end of the country to the other. He remarked there are industries here in Chicago which have under one big roof as many employees as there are in many western railroads. The president of that concern could walk from his office to see any employee within 5 or 10 minutes. He compared that situation with that of the president of a railroad running from here to the coast and it can readily be understood why that difficult situation does exist for the railroads. He thought it really remarkable, all things considered, that we have the splendid relations that do exist between men and management.

Mr. Gurley stated recently he had participated in a conference with citrus growers in California who claimed something drastic must be done about lowered freight rates to relieve the difficult situation of their people; he participated in the discussion about the manner of changing the freight-rate structure on lumber; and he listened to the same story of the flour manufacturers, and many others. Even the Government itself in connection with some of its shipments is now trying to get the railroads to reduce rates.

He pointed out, so far as this moot question of employees' wages is concerned, it is like all other similar relationships. He explained that the railroads not only had to discuss the question of value of services rendered by their employees, but that they had to discuss with the shippers what it was proper for them to charge the shippers for the services rendered for the railroad He explained that the collections the railroads make from the public are very vital to this question of merchandising. He expressed doubt that he is qualified to define merchandising accurately, but he would describe it as the method of treating the customers, the manner of approaching them, the manner of being fair with them, a matter of service, and then the all-important question of charges for the services. As to the latter, the charges now are 25 percent lower than they were in 1921, and the charges we now make per passenger mile are 43 percent lower than in 1921. He stated the year 1921 is used because that was the peak.

Mr. Gurley remarked he had an interesting experience a few years ago in connection with one phase of merchandising. Starting in 1920, the passenger reveneues fell down year after year until 1932. In that year he was assigned the task of seeing what might be done about it; he explained that was the start of what has become known as the streamline train. He thought it well for the employees to consider the millions of dollars that have gone into new equipment, improved track structure, straightening of curves, and all those things that make a venture of this kind a success. He said, frankly he does not know that it has been a success from the financial standpoint, but that it has brought a lot more people back to the rails, and the carriers are running more passenger train miles. Thus the employees were benefited. He pointed out one of the things the railroads had to do was make a very definite reduction in fares. In other words, the railroads had to "put that little sugar on the apple."

Mr. Gurley said at the present moment we are going through an experience that might be described as a 1941 counterpart of the Mississippi Bubble. He thought a number of us knew that. He said that basically it springs from the manifestation of how little we know about human relations; it springs from the terrible mess of international affairs; it springs from the interpretation our administration makes of the international affair. But the question is what we should do about it. He thought it no reflection upon anyone to say that no one in Washington really knows what it is all about; that all they can do is apply their ability and make the best decision they know how. He said this effort had an effect on the economic situation by stimulating railroad freight traffic and also has some effect on the volume of passenger traffic, but no one in this room, or in the United States, knows how long it will last. If there should be a sudden collapse on the Continent of Europe, what the reactions will be here no one knows. No one knows whether there will be a collapse in Europe. He referred to the so-called V campaign of the British, an attempt to shatter the nerves of the Germans, and stated it cannot be determined how effective it will be. He pointed out Germany collapsed in the last war, not in the lines, but behind the lines; that what is taking place among those oppressed people, how soon it will develop, what its effect will be on the possibility of another collapse, and what the effect of that will be on our economic structure is not known. He stated we should all approach the problem rather carefully, that we should "strive to guide our ship so that we will do the best we can whichever way it goes." He expressed the thought all of us feel when this terrible war situation quiets down there will be a very sudden and very appropriate change with reference to our over-all situation. He stated he does not believe Congress will continue spending through taxation the millions and billions of dollars they are now spending if there should be a collapse in the international situation.

Mr. Gurley stated he was at Los Angeles sometime last February having luncheon with the officers of the Chamber of Commerce, and just before luncheon the Chamber of Commerce members had had a meeting with the airplane people. They advised the airplane companies already were beginning to make plans for what they will do to protect the airplane industry when the curtain goes down on the war; that they were not completely sure when that will come, but they were getting ready for it. He stated that as an officer of a railroad which enjoys a trainload of mail out of Chicago every night to California, he was not at all enthused about their figures as to how much mail can be put in a plane of the bomber type, but, he added, it is one of the things the railroads face. He said he thought all present realize the tremendous amount of money that has been paid in the past to these railroads, the tremendous number of jobs brought to the employees by reason of coal traffic, and he doubted whether it is realized the full effect of the new power plants which resulted in more energy going over the wires and less energy in the form of coal we transport. He pointed out he is not saying he is entirely correct, but he believes he is correct in saying probably no one thing will take as much actual traffic away from the railroads as that transportation of energy through wires instead of coal cars.

Mr. Gurley stated the requests the organizations have made are quite staggering in their proportion. He said he is going to address himself to the results of the wage requests that have been made upon the carriers; that he is not going to discuss at the moment the vacation requests, the Diesel requests, or the reclassification requests, or anything else except the wage movement of June 10. But before doing so, he wanted to say he was impressed with Mr. Johnston's statement the other day about train limit. He (Mr. Gurley) made the request that the employee representatives think that over very carefully, and very calmly, in the future. He asked them to study out very carefully its effect upon what might be termed "production"; to remember we do have to support ourselves in this country upon a production basis. He remarked we might discuss that more completely at some future date, but not at this time. He stated he did not really intend to discuss it today, but moved on the

impulse of the moment. He said he does want to discuss the effect of this wage movement. He stated it is realized business is better now than it was in 1940, and he realizes that the request was not asked for in 1940, but nevertheless the year 1940 is the last calendar year for which statistics are available compiled on a calendar-year basis.

Now, he said, it so happens there are 30 railroads in the United States that represent about 80 percent of the total pay rolls of the railroad industry, and yet, in 1940, had this wage request been effective these 30 railroads would have failed to make their net railway operating income to the extent of approximately $30,000,000. In other words, they would have failed by $30,000,000 to pay operating expenses. He pointed out, the first 5 months of this year are the only complete figures we have at the moment, but if these wage requests had been effective during the first 5 months of this year, such railroads as the New York Central, the Pennsylvania, the Union Pacific, Santa Fe, and Burlington Railroads, which, it is fair to say, are pretty good railroads, would not have made their operating expenses. According to calculations, the New York Central would have failed by over $7,000,000, the Pennsylvania by $3,000,000, and the Santa Fe by $3,000,000. He said when the question is considered where they would have wound up after paying their fixed charges, or how much is represented by the accounting expression "net income," it would have been much worse; the New York Central would get a red figure of about $40,000,000, the Pennsylvania a red figure of about $24,000,000, the Santa Fe a red figure of about $9,000,000, the Burlington a red figure of about $5,000,000, the Union Pacific a red figure of about $9,000,000.

Mr. Gurley concluded with the statement the carriers are not unaware of what might be termed the atmosphere reflected at the last meeting, or the difficulties we have had here; they are not unaware of the necessity of taking a realistic view of this thing Mr. Cashen talked about the other day; they are not unaware of the statement made that the employees do not want to be asked a lot of questions which they apparently think are designed for delay purposes, but which were not so intended. He stated there were other things they would like to ask about but perhaps that would not have changed what he now had to say. He stated he has something to say here which he is certain will be a disappointment to the employees from a personal standpoint this morning because he has no doubt that, being human, they do have certain desires for money. He stated he had discussed this situation very carefully with his associates, and they have analyzed it thoroughly and to the best of their abilities. He quoted Abraham Lincoln, when he said, "With charity to all, with malice to none, with courage to do the right as God gives us to see the right," and he stated, in that spirit the carriers' committees "most respectfully declines the tremendous wage demands you have made upon us."

It's All Over But the Shooting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt in his radio address last Thursday night initiated an undeclared naval war without the consent of Congress. While every red-blooded American believes in maintaining the freedom of the seas under well-recognized principals of international and existing law, most of us believe this doctrine should not be extended beyond those limits.

While under the preamble of the Neutrality Act passed November 4, 1939, the United States waives none of its own rights or privileges under international law, nevertheless the Congress did make restrictions by providing:

First. No American ships are permitted to enter danger zones as prescribed by the President.

Second. No American citizen is permitted to be a passenger on a belligerent ship.

Third. Title to all goods must be transferred to a belligerent nation before it leaves our shores.

How far these restrictions on the freedom of the seas have been abrogated by the passage of the lease-lend bill is questionable. Certainly it is true that the President has reduced the war zones by removing these restrictions in the Red Sea which action indirectly was responsible for the sinking of the American ship *Steel Seafarer*, carrying contraband of war to a belligerent nation. By the press we are informed that the State Department is now ready to permit American citizens to return to this country on belligerent ships. It is almost certain that no longer is it necessary to transfer title to material going to belligerents before it leaves our shores.

Under international law there are certain restrictions upon the freedom of the seas so far as trading with belligerent nations is concerned. It has always been a well-established and recognized principle of international law that a ship carrying contraband of war to a belligerent nation is subject to search and seizure; and since the World War and the development of the submarine it is recognized by all nations that vessels carrying contraband are subject to being sunk if, as far as possible, provisions are made for the safety of their crews.

Under international law the right of a belligerent nation to maintain an effective blockade has always been recognized during wartime. Both Germany and England are today insisting upon this right. The President has taken upon himself the sole responsibility to determine whether there is an effective blockade in the area surrounding Iceland. His policy of shooting on sight any German or Italian raider or submarine in what he describes as defensive waters violates not only international law but the laws of our land.

First. With the sole discretion resting in the hands of the President to determine the limits of defensive waters the President could carry his shooting war into danger zones which he had formerly declared to be forbidden to American shipping, under the Neutrality Act.

Second. The doctrine of freedom of the seas has never been extended by any nation beyond the protection of its own vessels. The President has declared he intends to extend this doctrine to all shipping of all countries within the areas he determines as defensive.

It cannot be considered as anything but an act of war when we attempt to protect belligerent ships carrying contraband between North America and England. This is convoying although the Lend-Lease Act contains the specific provision that: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or to permit the authorization of convoying vessels by naval vessels of the United States." Secretary Knox has publicly stated that convoying is an act of war; and even the President has said that convoying means shooting and shooting means war.

Third. It is well known that the Congress passed a law that permitted the seizure of foreign ships in our ports. These are placed under American ownership and then under a subterfuge registered under a foreign flag such as the Republic of Panama, and then permitted to violate our Neutrality Act by going into danger zones. The President's policy clearly violates the intent of the Neutrality Act by permitting American-owned ships, under foreign registry, to trade with belligerent nations no matter what the destination of these ships, and extends the doctrine of freedom of the seas to protect vessels flying foreign flags.

Taking into his own hands the decision as to what seas are necessary to constitute our defense, the President may well reach a decision that is a strategic absurdity.

It is all over but the shooting.

Maj. Gen. Julien L. Schley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, after wearing a United States Army uniform for 42 years, Julien L. Schley will soon retire from the service, having completed his term as Chief of Army Engineers. He entered the service as a cadet at West Point in 1899 and concludes his service as a major general in charge of the Corps of Engineers. During the period that he has been in the Army he has occupied almost every outstanding position where an officer of the Engineer Corps can be recognized. Following his graduation from West Point he saw service in the Philippines and Cuba and also spent 4 years as an instructor in engineering at the Military Academy. During the period of his career he has been Assistant Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia; commandant of the Engineer School at Belvoir, Va; and was Governor of the Panama Canal Zone. The World War found him in command of the Three Hundred and Seventh Engineers overseas, and he was promoted to Chief Engineer of the Fifth Army Corps. His overseas service was recognized when

he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for his activities in the Meuse-Argonne and St. Mihiel offensives.

Major General Schley has been in charge of the Army engineers since the present emergency arose. Heretofore the Army engineers have confined their work mostly to flood control, river and harbor, and navigation projects. So great was the task assigned to the Quartermaster Corps in charge of military construction that the President issued an order assigning part of these duties to the Army engineers. As a result of that order the engineers of the Army have been handling nearly a billion dollars in construction projects, many of which are now active. This duty imposes upon the Chief of Engineers the obligation of carrying out Air Corps building projects, as well as other Army expansion projects, and housing, and the construction of our outlying island bases. It seems to me Mr. Speaker, that we should pause for a moment to pay tribute to this outstanding Army officer who is about to leave the service.

The engineers of the Army is one organization of which it is commonly said, "brings to the Government 100 cents of value for every dollar that is expended." It has carried out the duties assigned to it without criticism and has always been considered one of the most important branches of our national defense.

I am sure I express the sentiments of many Members of this body, who during their official career have had occasion to do business with Major General Schley, when I say that he will be missed, and I know all of them join me in extending to him our best wishes for a long and happy life and a well-deserved rest.

To Keep Boom From Becoming Boomerang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. TOLAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE OAKLAND (CALIF.) POST-ENQUIRER

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take unusual pleasure in placing in the RECORD an editorial from the Oakland (Calif.) Post-Enquirer under date of September 8, 1941. As chairman of the Select Committee of the House on National Defense Migration, I deem this editorial one of the most timely and intelligent expressions I have read.

Our committee consists of Congressmen SPARKMAN, of Alabama; OSMERS, of New Jersey; CURTIS, of Nebraska; ARNOLD, of Illinois, and myself. We will hold hearings in Detroit, Mich., on September 23, 24, and 25, where we will explore the effect of the new national-defense economy upon the heart of the Nation's industrial development. Among the witnesses to be heard are the Governor of the State of Michigan and State and Federal officials. The particular subject for examination will be the extent of present and future unemployment because of the shift from nondefense to defense industries and particularly because of the limitation in automobile production.

We expect that many of the witnesses will discuss plans looking toward cushions for the post-war unemployment shock.

Following the Detroit hearings we intend to visit other parts of the country, as we have done already in southern California, New England, New Jersey, and in Maryland, where migration from States to defense-production centers has proved great, following the mandate of the House to investigate this great interstate movement of human beings looking for jobs.

Unless we can find some plan to cushion the economic shock after the war is over, the peril to our Nation, in my opinion, is as great as any possible attack by any foreign power.

The editorial follows:

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Post-Enquirer of September 8, 1941]

TO KEEP BOOM FROM BECOMING A BOOMERANG

Congressman JOHN H. TOLAN, of Oakland, has been making an intelligent study of the defense industry boom and the likelihood of the boom turning into an economic boomerang after the emergency is past.

This kind of a survey deserves attention and support.

The Nation is aware of the good work done by the Tolan committee in Congress in investigating interstate migration.

Even more valuable should be a coordinated study of the defense-industry situation and a scientific appraisal of methods to prevent a dangerous dislocation after the boom.

California has reason to be specially interested in such a survey.

For this State leads in defense-industry contracts. Its margin over the runner-up for the leadership in defense industry is more than $200,000,000 worth of contracts.

This means that California is becoming an industrialized State; that industry is competing with agriculture at last for economic supremacy in California.

In many other States, on a somewhat smaller scale, the same thing is happening.

Also there is a common assumption that when peace comes, when the necessity for building gigantic armaments is over, there will be an economic crash that will make the late depression seem like a runaway bull market in the palmiest days of 1929.

Congressman TOLAN believes that all possible measures should be taken to prevent such an assumption from becoming a reality.

Undoubtedly there are such measures to be taken.

In some overindustrialized areas of the East, for instance, decentralization is being considered, and business management itself is one of the sponsors of this movement.

The shock of economic readjustment can be absorbed much more easily by workers who have a few acres in the country than by workers who are huddled in hundreds of thousands in vast industrial centers.

But California is underindustrialized.

Until now agriculture has been the really big industry here. There have been no industrial plants to compare with many of the great plants in the East.

We will need such plants to take care of the scores of thousands of workers that we have trained for our defense industries; and after the war there should be a market for the products of such plants.

An awakening China, at peace and with the tremendous job of building a new life for one-quarter of the world's population, will itself provide a market unimaginably vast—and California industries should have a preferred opportunity for taking advantage of it.

One big industry needed here is a first-class steel mill, complete with blast furnaces, built on a scale that would enable it to supply the western demand for steel and to compete with steel mills anywhere.

This need was brought out recently before the Truman Senate Committee on Defense Contracts.

It was shown that western industry is handicapped by the necessity of procuring steel in the East—and that this handicap is unnecessary, since there are vast quantities of coal and iron ore here in the West.

The defense-industry boom is creating automatically new problems in housing, schools, hospital facilities, sewage, police and fire protection.

It has intensified the interstate migration that began years ago with the uprooting of tens of thousands of American farm families by drought and farm mechanization—only now the migrants are looking for defense factory jobs, not jobs on farms.

Undoubtedly it would be better if each region could train and supply its own defense workers and, where this is not possible, to plan now for the development of industrial resources that will provide employment when the pressure for guns, tanks, shells, and powder relaxes.

It is a vast job, calling for all the planning resources of the Nation. In calling attention to this problem, and outlining some of the factors involved in it, Congressman TOLAN is making a contribution of first-rate importance.

District of Columbia Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time, and this means of informing every Member of the House of Representatives, how their constituents and how my constituents are being forced to contribute to the maintenance of the District of Columbia, while a privileged class of taxpayers in the District of Columbia are paying a lower tax than do our constituents.

We Members of the House are rendering our constituents a flagrant disservice by permitting this outrage to continue. This condition has prevailed too long in relation to the District of Columbia, and now it must be corrected, or we Members of this Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, must stand the censure which our indignant constituents will heap upon us.

The whole tax situation in the District of Columbia is a disgrace, yet we Members of the Congress do nothing about it but talk and make speeches.

Now we have the chance to vote on this question, and I propose to make my position clear and plain.

The general tax situation is not so glaring, because it is hidden in a maze of figures of tax experts and accountants, but the District of Columbia gasoline tax comparison is easily made and condemns us on its face. Our constituents throughout the United States pay an average gasoline tax of 4.4 cents per gallon, exclusive of the Federal tax. The District of Columbia pays 2 cents.

Through the efficient performance of a high-powered, always on the job, type of lobby, composed of selfish interests, the autoists of the District of Columbia and all those who come into Washington to buy gasoline pay only 2 cents per gallon gasoline tax, exclusive of the Federal tax.

Yet we Members of the House voted the District of Columbia $6,000,000 this year to help run the affairs of Washington, while selfish owners and operators of large fleets of busses, trucks, and private cars in the District of Columbia were and are now enjoying the lowest gasoline tax in the Union with one exception.

The House of Representatives did defeat with an overwhelming majority the infamous Overton formula which would have taken about $9,000,000 per year from the Federal Treasury for the District of Columbia, which our constituents would have provided, while citizens of the District of Columbia were evading their share of their own tax burden, and were avoiding the use of an adequate gasoline tax as a source of revenue for needed road, street, and highway control and other traffic purposes.

This condition prevails because Members of Congress do not know how clever this selfish lobby is.

Now they are out in the open. The president of the Capital Transit Co., which has a monopoly on the streetcar and bus service in the District of Columbia, openly admitted that levying an adequate gasoline tax in the District of Columbia, would cost his company $120,000 per year in additional tax. He prefers that our constituents pay this $120,000 annually rather than collecting it from his monopolistic public utility.

This utterance by the president of the Capital Transit Co. explains the source of the high-powered lobby that has been responsible for the smearing campaign directed against the good intentions of the distinguished chairman of the District of Columbia Committee of this House, Mr. RANDOLPH, when he introduced a bill, in August 1939, to raise the gasoline tax here.

The selfish profiteers of a 2-cent gasoline tax in the District of Columbia tried to create the impression that our honored chairman and colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia, was serving the big oil companies, when he was in truth serving the interests of his own constituents in West Virginia who pay a 5-cent gasoline tax, exclusive of the Federal tax.

This same high-powered lobby seems to be able to set aside and nullify a very fine report by a special subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee, submitted through Mr. POAGE, of Texas; also to disregard a fine report on the gasoline-tax subject submitted by the Streets and Traffic Subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee, of which Mr. SCHULTE, of Indiana, is chairman; and to cast serious reflections upon the official report by Captain Whitehurst, of the Highway Department of the District of Columbia.

All these reports recommended an increase of 2 cents per gallon in the gasoline tax in Washington. These fine reports were discredited by this high-powered lobby which is determined to save $120,000 per year for this transit monopoly which is giving Washington high-priced, low-quality transportation service, and through their high-powered lobby have silenced the fact that the streets of the city of Washington are worn out and torn up by the busses and streetcars operated by this monopoly. It is high time that the Congress looked over the inside workings of the Capital Transit Co. This monopoly had the audacity to recently publish a paid display advertisement in all the Washington press showing how motorists carrying one person "clutter up" the streets while a street car carrying 50 people does not. I invite any Member of this body to go to the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Fourteenth Street, any morning during the week, and look up Fourteenth Street, and see who is monopolizing the use of the streets; then go to Thirteenth Street, just one block east, and look north on this street, and count the busses in sight, and see who is monopolizing this street. Streetcars are lined up bumper to bumper on Fourteenth Street from Pennsylvania Avenue north to H Street, and busses, bumper to bumper, on Thirteenth from Pennsylvania Avenue to I Street.

It is a notorious fact that all vehicular traffic in Washington is geared up to favor the streetcars and busses. This is made possible because this high-powered lobby has been able to hood-wink Congress all these years. It is also a notorious fact that this transit company does more to damage the streets by use of its heavy busses than any other agency in Washington. Of course, they do not want to keep up these streets, and they use the gullible Washington motorist and his District of Columbia association to "pull their chestnuts out of the fire for them."

This same lobby worked against additional traffic police, because it would mean more gasoline taxes for them to pay. For a number of years the Major and Superintendent of Police has begged and pleaded with Congress for more traffic police and police to control crime. Each time he was refused. Why? Because behind the scenes has been this ever-present high-powered lobby, "keeping watch over its own." It did not want anything to happen that would suggest a reason for more gasoline tax in the District of Columbia.

This lobby history may throw some light upon recent developments in this gasoline-tax controversy. The Whitehurst survey was authorized by an act of Congress and paid for by an appropriation of this body. The purpose of this survey was to secure an official determination of the needs of the District of Columbia for the solution of its traffic problem, and to suggest means of adequately financing the needed improvements. This study was an official one, authorized by Congress, and when completed was to be a guide for intelligent congressional action.

The result of this scientific survey, now known as the Whitehurst plan, was to evolve a program of improvements necessary to permit a proper and efficient flow of traffic, and to save human life, which has been so ruthlessly sacrificed in the past few years.

The report called for an expenditure of more than $40,000,000, to be completed in approximately 8 years, and to be financed by an additional gasoline tax of 2 cents. This report was approved by the District Commissioners, and they directed the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia to prepare a bill to carry out the proposed tax program. Accordingly H. R. 5307 was prepared by the Corporation Counsel and introduced by Chairman JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of the District of Columbia Committee.

The Randolph bill, H. R. 5307, provided for an additional gasoline tax of 2 cents and was the same in principle as the bill which I introduced in April of this year, H. R. 4549, so I announced that if the District of Columbia Commissioners desired to reach my objective in this way, that I would support the Randolph bill which he introduced July 14, 1941.

After the introduction of H. R. 5307 as aforesaid, the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee proceeded to hold hearings upon both H. R. 4549, my bill, and H. R. 5307, although they had been advised by the District of Columbia Commissioners that they favored the passage of the Randolph bill, H. R. 5307.

This last hearing of the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee was conducted for the purpose of talking the District Commissioners and Captain Whitehurst out of raising the gasoline tax to 4 cents as proposed by these two bills, which said Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee suggested that the gasoline tax be only raised to 3 cents, or an added tax of 1 cent instead of 2 cents.

During the course of this hearing Captain Whitehurst was asked to advise the subcommittee what improvements could be made with an additional 1-cent tax, and what could be done with 2 cents.

He accordingly advised them that the program would be delayed in its completion from an estimated 8 years by using an additional 2-cent gasoline tax, to an estimated 12 years or more by using an additional 1-cent gasoline tax. That is with the 1-cent additional gasoline tax, traffic murder and mayhem would continue for 12 years, instead of levying a 2-cent additional tax and ending it in 8 years.

At this hearing before the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee, to which I have referred, the Capital Transit Co. had its representative who again officially advised the subcommittee that an additional tax of 2 cents would cost Capital Transit Co. $120,000 per year, and that if they had to raise the tax, that the Capital Transit Co. preferred that it be raised only 1 cent, and thus pass the other $60,000, repre-

sented by 1-cent tax, on to our constituents.

Long prior to the Whitehurst report, the Bureau of Efficiency in 1932, as shown at page 8 of the Poage report, recommended that the District of Columbia gasoline tax rate be raised to 4 cents.

Mr. Speaker, I give you this brief history of the gasoline-tax controversy to show Members of this House what has been happening in the consideration of this subject. I want Members of this body to know what interests they have been serving instead of looking after the interests of their own constituents; I do not believe that it makes much difference to the average motorist in the District of Columbia whether he pays a 2-cent gasoline tax or a 4-cent gasoline tax. I notice they travel over the United States considerably and when they get away from Washington, D. C., in any direction, they pay from 4 to 7 cents per gallon State gasoline tax. I have not heard them murmur about it.

However, these transportation monopolies that live off the public, and do more to destroy the streets of Washington than any other agency, through use of their heavy busses are vitally interested in this question, and do not, hesitate to appear before the Fiscal Affairs subcommittee or any other congressional committee considering the subject, and voice their selfish objections.

They induce citizens' associations to join them by going out to their meetings and telling them that they will have to curtail traffic accommodations if there are added gasoline taxes.

The big oil companies are, as a matter of principle, vigorously opposed to any increase in gasoline taxes in the District of Columbia, and everywhere else. They have actively opposed every increase in the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia, openly and above board. Their representatives have appeared before committees of Congress upon numerous occasions. An examination of the records of those hearings will disclose this fact. Their association recently put out a bulletin to its members in which the increase in the gasoline tax was opposed.

It was stated that an increase of 2 cents per gallon in the gasoline tax in Washington would be a Christmas present of millions of dollars to the big oil companies, because they are secretly rebating a kick-back of all or part of the excess gasoline tax to their dealers in Maryland and Virginia in the Washington price area. We have not seen any of the big oil companies in here asking for this Christmas present.

I do not know that the big oil companies are doing this. I do know that the differential in gasoline tax as between the District of Columbia, and Maryland and Virginia gasoline tax has permitted the Washington gasoline dealers to engage in a venomous price war from time to time, which has been ruinous to the Maryland and Virginia dealers. I do know that this group of Washington gasoline dealers organized themselves into a combination which caused the Attorney General of the United States to demand its immediate dissolution. I also know that this differential has resulted in adulteration of gasoline to such an extent that the District of Columbia prosecuted certain Washington dealers for such adulteration and short measure. This same group opposes a legitimate 4-cent gasoline tax in the District of Columbia so as to equalize it with the gasoline tax paid by the constituents of every Member of Congress with one exception.

Adulteration and "bootleg" gasoline and fraudulent practices of gasoline dealers was the subject for a demand for corrective legislation for the District of Columbia by the Commissioner of Weights and Measures.

I know this also, and I speak as a lawyer, too, that if any large oil company is granting to a Maryland dealer in the Washington price area, a 1-cent rebate, and charging another dealer within 2 miles of him, but outside the Washington price area, the full price, that such company is violating the Robinson-Patman Act, which forbids sales of the same class and kind of article to like purchasers at different prices.

This is a proper subject for the Attorney General of the United States, and the Federal Trade Commission to study. Of course, if this practice is stopped by legal proceedings by the Attorney General, dealers in the Washington area in Virginia and Maryland, who have their life's savings invested in the real estate and buildings in which they conduct their business, will be ruined and they can thank Congress for their unhappy plight.

This condition is permitted simply because a high-powered lobby is against paying any tax it can avoid, even when the money is needed to improve streets to save human life. This is an evidence of the "soulless corporation" of which we have heard so much.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Members of this Congress to think of the interests of their own constituents, and not of how much money they can save in gasoline taxes for some Washington, D. C., public utility. It is also time for us to give some consideration to the subject of traffic control, and traffic murder as we know it in Washington, D. C.

We have a twofold duty to perform here; on the one hand, we must protect human life in the District of Columbia from traffic murder. We must provide adequate police protection so that we will not have to divert police from ordinary police duty to traffic duty to the detriment of the safety of citizens of Washington. This city is notorious for its record of unsolved crimes. The history of one crime recently indicates that it was perpetrated in the daytime, downtown, in a thickly populated area, yet no policeman was near enough to even see the automobile used for this purpose, or to see the criminal dispose of the body in broad daylight. These things are a disgrace and are the result of trying to protect a monopoly against a reasonable gasoline tax; to protect it against a gasoline tax comparable to that paid by our own constituents.

I said we have a twofold duty to perform; we must protect the citizens of Washington, D. C., and we must be fair to the Federal taxpayer who is our own constituent. Is it fair to this Federal taxpayer to ask him to help Washington, and at the same time allow Washington a much lower gasoline tax rate than our Federal taxpayer constituent pays? The answer to that question is with you.

In the consideration of this present traffic problem, two conclusions are inevitable. We must have the Whitehurst program executed, or some other equally as expensive; and Washington must pay for that program. Congress cannot justify its position to its constituents, if it appropriates a large sum of money from the Federal Treasury to pay for any part of this improvement, and at the same time permit the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia to be fixed at a point lower than the average of the States. There is another certainty that has to do with saving human life, and that is this program must be completed as speedily as possible, having in mind a reasonable gasoline tax program. There is no excuse for delay; there must be no such unreasonable excuse for delay as saving a large public utility $60,000 a year gasoline tax.

If a 2-cent additional gasoline tax will provide a completed Whitehurst plan in 8 years, and the present bill provides for a completed Whitehurst plan in 12 years, the present record of traffic murder should dictate to us that we should immediately amend the present pending bill, H. R. 5558, to read 2 cents instead of 1 cent. It should be completed much sooner than 8 years if it can be done without laying too heavy a burden in taxes. It is not too heavy a tax burden to collect from Washington motorists what our own constituents pay in gasoline taxes. There is certainly no justification for delaying the completion of this Whitehurst plan 4 years longer just to save the Capital Transit Co. $60,000 a year. How many lives can you buy for $60,000? If the life of my loved one was involved in the transaction, I would not trade it for the whole Capital Transit Co. investment.

Why this sudden change from H. R. 5307, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH at the suggestion of the District of Columbia Commissioners, to H. R. 5558, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH at a later date? Whose interest does it serve?

Certainly not the unfortunate people of Washington who will go to their graves as a result of traffic accidents, which the Whitehurst plan is designed to save or lessen the possibility thereof. Certainly not the Washington motorist who may be involved in a traffic accident that will take his life or involve him in an accident which may subject him to a large damage judgment. The Washington motorist is not complaining about this tax, if he gets value received for his money. It is only a false leadership of the Washington motorist that wants to shift his tax liability to the motorist in your congressional district and mine. One interest served is the large utility interest that always wants to avoid tax without regard to human safety. If this improvement is needed—and everyone admits it is—then why not provide the money and complete it at the earliest

possible moment and stop this traffic murder in Washington?

Why not provide an adequate supply of traffic police, so that ordinary police can be released to look after the safety and well-being of Washington citizens, so that our disgraceful civic record, of rapings, murder, and other major crimes will decrease? Is it worth the money an additional 2-cent gasoline tax will produce to make Washington a safe place in which to live? Or shall we save $60,000 a year for a public utility?

Mr. Speaker, I am a crusader for low taxes. I wish that I could now wave a magic wand and reduce the tax burdens of the Federal taxpayer. I do not see how this can now be done in view of the present state of the National Budget. However, we can save the Federal taxpayer whenever the opportunity presents itself. We certainly do not want to add to his tax burden the burden of some other group of taxpayers. It is not the local tax burden which will ruin this country; if it is ever ruined by overtaxation, it is the Federal tax which will produce this result. Local taxes are near to the taxpayer, and the local taxpayer has the opportunity to adjust expenditures to tax ability, but the Federal tax in its source of enactment, as well as the appropriating power, is far removed from him and not easily recognized, and I might add not so easily controlled. The burden of protecting the Federal taxpayer is your job and mine.

However, the bill which I am discussing is not a bill to raise taxes, it is a bill to place the tax where it belongs, and equalize the tax burden as between the District of Columbia taxpayer and the Federal taxpayer. It is a bill to relieve my constituents and yours of a tax burden belonging to the citizens of the District of Columbia. If we do not now provide the tax money to make this Whitehurst improvement, sooner or later Congress will be called upon to accelerate this improvement, and of necessity we will have to donate Federal funds to do it.

That has been the history of the past, and have we any right to expect the future will be any different? Whenever an improvement was needed in Washington, and there were no funds in the District of Columbia account, the Federal Government has donated the money. Attached to this address is a list of Federal donations to the District of Columbia from 1925 to 1941 which Members of Congress could study with profit, in the light of the low gasoline tax rate in Washington, D. C., as compared with your States, and the ridiculously low gasoline tax rate in Washington.

I appeal to the citizens of the Nation to arouse themselves to a realization that Washington, D. C., has had an abnormal increase in population, and one of the largest pay-rolls in the world; that merchants and businessmen of the District of Columbia are waxing fat on their profitable business and low taxes, at your expense.

These people are in Washington because the Government has provided them with good jobs and they are making plenty of money. They would not stay here if that were not true, and when they do not like it here they can leave. You citizens of Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, Texas, and other States do not owe anything to Washington, D. C., that you do not owe to yourselves. You certainly do not owe Washington from $6,000,000 a year or more, and have Congress permit them to enjoy the cheapest gasoline tax rates in the country, as evidenced by this gasoline sales tax. Washington citizens should bear their just share of gasoline tax burden, and if they do not they "mooch" on you, because of large Federal gifts of money by Congress. This may be a small item in the annual Budget, but these small items make the sum total of your ever-increasing Federal tax bill. Ask your Congressman to stop this inequality now, by increasing the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia 2 cents.

I call upon the taxpayers' associations all over America to rise up in righteous indignation, and look after your own interests.

Your tax burden is increasing year after year, and is destined to increase if we do not watch every expenditure. Certainly you cannot afford to permit Washington to have the lowest gasoline tax rate in the Union, and still contribute to their expenses through large Federal gifts. Your tax money helps to provide these gifts. Your Federal tax would be less if Congress required the District of Columbia to bear its share of the gasoline-tax burden. If you are told that there is nothing to this statement, and that Washington taxes are not low, ask the person with whom you are discoursing, how about the 2-cent gasoline tax in Washington, D. C., as compared with the 5-cent West Virginia, the 4-cent Ohio, and the 4-cent Indiana tax, and the 4.4 average for the United States? They may distort the general tax ratio, but they cannot distort the comparison I have just stated. Your immediate action is required; write and telegraph your Congressman and Senator now.

In closing, let me say again, to the Members of this Congress, if we put off to a 12-year or more finishing date the completion of the Whitehurst plan, we are indirectly responsible for every case of traffic murder in the meantime. If we limit the number of police because of inadequate traffic officers, we are indirectly contributing to the continued high criminal record of the Nation's Capital. We are prolonging a national disgrace in crime. If we should have this Whitehurst plan at all, we should have it as quickly as possible. If we do not need it, then quit talking about it. If the present traffic situation is a satisfactory one, then let us go on with our traffic congestion, high traffic murder record, and save tax money for public utilities in Washington. If we do need it, and the District of Columbia Commissioners have said we do, and recommended that it be completed in 8 years, then why try to talk them out of it, in favor of a continued distressful situation?

Members of Congress, who are we serving? The constituents out in our congressional districts, the people of Washington, D. C., who need the Whitehurst plan completed quickly, or public-utility interests, who ask us to delay this program? The vote on this bill will answer the question.

H. R. 5558 should be amended to read "2 cents" instead of "1 cent," and thus level the gasoline tax rate near to the average of the States. Then give Washington the completed Whitehurst plan in 8 years or less, instead of delaying it to 12 years.

Federal contribution to the District of Columbia by years and amounts per year

1925	$9,000,000
1926	9,000,000
1927	9,000,000
1928	9,000,000
1929	9,000,000
1930	9,000,000
1931	9,500,000
1932	9,500,000
1933	7,775,000
1934	5,700,000
1935	5,700,000
1936	5,700,000
1937	5,000,000
1938	5,000,000
1939	5,000,000
1940	6,000,000
Total contributed	118,875,000

Canada Does Not Want the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MONTREAL GAZETTE

Mr. BEITER. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial from the Montreal Gazette of September 5 1941, on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway, entitled "We Learn About Ourselves."

This is further proof that Canada does not want the seaway. When the issue is brought before the House for consideration let there be no mistake about that.

The editorial follows:

[From the Montreal Gazette]

WE LEARN ABOUT OURSELVES

Promoters of the St. Lawrence seaway project at Washington are supplying some interesting information about Canada, interesting and surprising, all the more so in that it emanates from an official source. A booklet has been issued containing certain remarks by Congressman L. C. RABAUT, Democrat, of Detroit, who asked a number of questions. Answers to these questions are supplied by M. J. Danielian, director of the St. Lawrence survey, in the United States Department of Commerce. Says Mr. Danielian: "The St. Lawrence project would strengthen our defenses in the northeastern corner of the North American continent by giving us a protected inland water route to our new military base at Newfoundland. At present, because there are no rail connections east of Quebec, all supplies and equip-

ment for our Newfoundland base must be sent through the Atlantic sea lanes. In time of war this route might be hazardous, but with completion of the seaway defense materials could be sent down the St. Lawrence River to Newfoundland without fear of interference from enemy naval units."

There is so much wrong with this statement, particularly as made by a Government official and used for propaganda purposes, that any Canadian reader must be inclined to question the accuracy of his own reading. So far as water facilities are concerned, these are present now and can be used for the purpose which Mr. Danielian has conjured up. There is a 14-foot all-water route from the foot of Lake Ontario to Montreal and a route of a minimum depth of 35 feet from Montreal to Newfoundland. Ships of 14-foot draft can transport supplies from any point on the Great Lakes to the head of ocean navigation, and vessels of 35-foot draft can operate between Montreal and Newfoundland, or from Sorel, Three Rivers, or Quebec, all ports with modern equipment and connected by rail with all parts of the United States. So much for that.

Mr. Danielian asserts that "there are no rail connections east of Quebec." He has not so much as glanced at a Canadian railway map, assuming, of course, that he has made his statement in good faith, that he is honestly ignorant of the facts. The main line of the Canadian National Railways, extending down into the Maritime Provinces, reaches the port of North Sydney, Nova Scotia, a point within 100 miles of the Newfoundland railway terminus at Port Aux Basques. Materials for the United States base in Newfoundland can be sent to Sydney by rail from any place in the United States. It is an extraordinary thing that the director of the St. Lawrence survey, speaking and acting for the United States Department of Commerce, should make himself responsible, and the Department responsible, for a statement so widely at variance with the facts, that he did not even take the elementary precaution of ascertaining what the facts are. The information was easily available, probably in Mr. Danielian's own office, but it was not obtained and apparently not sought.

The trouble is that this kind of propaganda is likely to influence congressional and other opinion in the United States and to have a bearing upon congressional judgment. An assertion from a presumably authoritative source is always likely to be accepted because of its origin. In this instance acceptance is certain wherever knowledge of the truth does not exceed Mr. Danielian's understanding of it. If the St. Lawrence waterway issue is to be decided on its merit, well and good, but it should not be determined on misstatements and misinformation.

A Yank From Oxford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE GOSHEN (N. Y.) DEMOCRAT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Goshen Democrat, Goshen, N. Y.

I believe that the distinguished war record of Hon. HAMILTON FISH during the World War should be a passport to the hearts and minds and confidence of those whom he has the honor to represent. There is no doubt that his experience in the European conflict of 24 years ago should qualify him to speak with some authority with reference to the plots and intrigues of foreign nations that gave rise to the present turmoil in Europe.

No man is better able to appreciate the danger of sending an A. E. F. to Europe, totally unequipped, than my distinguished colleague whose record of patriotism and military service stands high in the thoughts and appreciation of every true American.

The editorial follows:

[From the Goshen (N. Y.) Democrat of September 12, 1941]

A YANK FROM OXFORD

Orange County's interventionist faction, revolting against the no-war policies of Congressman FISH, went out of the county, region, and State to get an opponent to debate the Congressman on his policies in Warwick next week. It reached into the very heart of the so-called lunatic fringe to select as the defender of its beliefs one of the typical Roosevelt theorists who've been doing their best to hurl this Government on the rocks of destruction. The interventionists' oral gladiator will be Prof. William Yandell Elliott, industrial consultant in the Office of Production Management and a member of the faculty of the School of Public Administration at Harvard University.

It would seem to us that the obvious necessity of going outside its own group to secure a debater places our country's interventionist clan in the blank-cartridge category—noisy but impotent. It seems like a confession on the part of our interventionists that they have no member in their ranks possessed of sufficient pro-war ammunition to stand up in a verbal duel against the antiwar pellets of Congressman FISH.

That's enough to deprive the interventionists of much of their smoke before the debate even takes place. But what, we would say, delivers a very damaging blow to the interventionists' cause is the fact they selected a Yank from Oxford to do their shooting.

Professor Elliott, although undoubtedly a brilliant and able gentleman and a fine upstanding citizen, was nevertheless educated abroad. He attended the Sorbonne in Paris and Balliol College at Oxford. He thus spent a number of his formulative years in England and on the Continent, lived their ways, was part and parcel of their thoughts and viewpoints.

The ways of Europe are not our ways. The philosophies of the peoples of Europe, raised amidst international intrigues, hates, and jealousies, are not our philosophies. Their inherent beliefs that war is eternally necessary to settle their disputes are not our beliefs.

Because of his early associations with the British, it may be presumed that Professor Elliott has a considerable affection for them and their ideas. We wouldn't say that he is a dispenser of British propaganda for war in this country, but we would say that our interventionists reached out a little too far in obtaining a champion for their cause.

Why didn't they choose a typical American, one who hasn't lived in England and doesn't possess British leanings? They could not have done much better at getting a true British sympathizer—one who would like to see us in the war to aid our European cousins—unless they had reached out and snared Winston Churchill himself.

Retailers for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1941

ADDRESS OF DONALD M. NELSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE SUPPLY PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS BOARD AND DIRECTOR OF PRIORITIES, OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a speech by Hon. Donald M. Nelson, Executive Director of the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board and Director of Priorities, Office of Production Management, at the Retailers for Defense dinner given by the National Retail Dry Goods Association at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., Monday evening, September 15, 1941:

I am happy to take part in helping launch the Retailers for Defense Week.

It is not only because I am a retailer myself and feel at home in this group. There is another reason. The retailer touches the public—directly, intimately, daily—as no Government organization can hope to do. And this defense program is a public program; it symbolizes an aroused public arming, standing up to defend its fundamental American rights against any threat the world can offer.

I want to congratulate you retailers on your excellent cooperation with Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau on the sale of defense bonds and stamps. Under the chairmanship of Major Namm you are doing an important job. At this moment you are performing a genuine service to the defense program by offering the public a chance to invest in the country's defense and in the country's future.

I do not believe that at this date I need spend much time describing that threat or explaining the terrible urgency of our task. For 2 years we have seen the menace to our freedom slashing its way toward world mastery. For 2 years we have had to live with the realization that the blessings we enjoy—freedom, plenty, the right to speak and worship and act as we please—are blessings we can keep only so long as we stand ready and able to defend them vigorously. The time for talking about how and why we are threatened is past.

But it is vitally important for us to talk in some detail about the things we propose to do to save our freedom.

Hitler has boasted that he has allies in every country that opposes him. His greatest allies, he has said, are doubt and confusion. Now doubt and confusion can came from several sources. They can come from uninformed or designing persons who deliberately play Hitler's game by preaching disunity, stirring racial or religious hatreds and suspicions, arguing that our perils are imaginary, and that this emergency is synthetic.

You are familiar with their line. It is designed to confuse you. They want to create doubts in your mind as to the wisdom of our whole defense program. They don't seek to convert you to nazi-ism. All they need as a weapon is the doubt they can create in your mind.

They want you to think that there is no danger of military action against the Western Hemisphere. They would like you to believe that a Hitler victory in Europe and over Britain would not affect us adversely. We would trade with Hitler after the war, they say, and everyone would be happy.

I might point out right here that any such trade would be on Hitler's terms, exclusively. We could offer no economic resistance.

That is the line they follow. Beware of their words, their doubt-inspiring phrases. Seek the facts and base your conclusions on the facts alone. Then we may be sure that the good sense and the aroused determination of the American people can deal effectively with the authors of such sentiments.

More dangerous are the doubt and confusion which arise when the public does not understand what is being done. We who are responsible for planning and directing this defense program must take the public into our confidence. We must not only see that the proper things are done and done promptly: We must also see that the public understands why those things are being done, so that the will of the entire Nation can be united and made effective.

In other words, the American people have a right to know what is ahead of them. They have a right to know what this defense program is going to mean to them in its effect on their everyday lives. We are going to demand much of them: We can do no less than explain factually what is going to be demanded and why it is necessary.

I must begin by saying frankly that we have only begun to feel the effects of this defense program. In a sense, everything that has been done so far is preliminary. Much has been accomplished: We are today, for example, producing finished defense goods at a rate of $1,250,000,000 a month. When you consider the immensity of the task of converting a peaceful nation into a great arsenal, that is a remarkable achievement. Yet it is not nearly enough.

Take everything we have done so far—the effort we have made, the energy and determination we have summoned—and then double it. Our slogan henceforth might well be "Double or nothing." If we don't double our present effort, and pile still more on top of that, we face the fate that has overtaken a dozen other nations who gave too little and gave it too late.

What does that mean to us, in terms of everyday life?

Broadly speaking, it means that in every area of national life we have got to work off the fat and harden the muscle. We cannot waste anything—not the labor of one man, not the use of one pound of needed material, not the service of one useful bit of machinery. I mean that literally. Strong as we are and rich as we are, this job is going to take everything we have. We can no longer afford to waste anything.

Let me explain, as simply as I can, why that is so.

To begin with, we must greatly increase our defense production. Military-requirement schedules must and will be stepped up. In every conceivable way we must turn our matchless productive plant to the job of stocking the arsenal of democracy. We must outdo everything we have yet planned.

At the same time we must provide the things which our civilian economy needs. Notice—I said the things that it needs. Everything that it does not really need is, in a sense, and for the duration of this emergency, sheer waste. But the things that our civilian population really needs must be produced. The military program is only part of our defense effort. It rests basically upon the civilian economy; if that economy is not kept strong the entire effort collapses. Fully as important as stepping up military production is the job of keeping our civilian economy in good running order. But by good running order I mean providing for the civilian economy only those things which are absolutely essential to keep it on a maintenance basis. I do not mean business as usual. Business as usual is out: It has been out for some time, although many have not yet realized it. Protection of our country against danger from any quarter has first call on our resources. While we are providing that protection, we must also see that those things which are necessary to the daily life of the American people are provided in adequate volume.

Obviously, that double task is going to impose a tremendous strain on all of us. It is going to require some very great readjustments. It is going to mean, for instance, that the production of things we do not really need will be very sharply upset. If there is a factory which takes needed materials, needed manpower, and needed machinery to produce things which we can get along without, it must be converted to the production of things that we cannot get along without. In every way possible, we are compelled to use all of our materials, all of our men and all of our factories for the production of essentials. Whether they are military essentials or civilian essentials makes little difference. We draw the line, not between military and civilian production, but between the things we have to have and the things we can temporarily get along without.

That means—for the duration of the emergency—a somewhat lower standard of living for all of us, particularly as to the luxuries we practically take for granted. We might just as well face that fact without trying to disguise it. A high living standard involves the production of a great many frills and trimmings. In our present condition, frills and trimmings are waste. And we cannot—for our country's life, for the sake of our freedom, for the sake of everything we live by—afford to waste anything these days.

So we are going to give up the frills and the trimmings. We are going to give them up because we have counted the cost of this tremendous effort and know that it is worth it. We are going to give them up because we are determined, above everything else, to make this a world in which freemen can live—a world in which the pleasant, comfortable extras of daily life need not be blotted out by the permanent demands of a great war machine, a world in which our sacrifices are temporary rather than permanent.

This is going to reach down into our homes and touch us where we live. Yet, just because we have resolved to look unpleasant facts in the eye without disguising them is no reason why we should make them look worse than they really are. In many ways this business of giving up the frills and trimmings is not going to be a real hardship at all. In one very broad and important field, which is of immediate interest both to the retailer and to the consumer, it will actually be a blessing in disguise.

I am referring to the simplification of lines and styles of the goods which are produced for retail trade. Notice that I said "simplification," not "standardization." There is a world of difference. We do not propose to standardize styles. We do not propose to tell the American people that they must all sit in standardized chairs, wear standardized shirts, get up to the tune of standardized radios, and crawl dejectedly into standardized beds at the end of dull, standardized days. Simplification is much different.

Every retailer knows that he does most of his business on a small part of his stock. If he could carry fewer styles and sizes of things—fewer styles of shoes, fewer styles of washing machines, fewer styles of overcoats and dressers and kitchen utensils and vacuum cleaners—he would be better off, provided that the elimination of the abandoned styles was performed wisely, with the best interest of consumer, retailer, manufacturer, and national economy in mind. Nor would the consumer feel any particular hardship. After all, we are not exactly asking the American people to bear a great load if we ask them to select their winter blankets from among half a dozen sizes and colors instead of from among 30 or 40. No one suffers much if he has only four new car styles to choose between instead of having a dozen, provided that the cars which are offered are just as good.

In the same way that styles and lines can be reduced, the frills and trimmings that go on things can be cut down. The best illustration I can think of is that familiar object, the city fire engine. Your city's fire engine will be just as useful—it will go just as fast and put out fires just as efficiently and speedily—if it is made without the shiny brass and nickel trimming, if aluminum and copper are cut to a minimum, if that imposing brass bell in front of the driver is replaced by an ordinary siren. It won't win any prizes in parades, to be sure, but it will provide just as much fire protection. And during this emergency we can give up some of our glitter without suffering very much.

I have gone into a good deal of detail about all of this, because this is one of the most important fields in which we can reduce waste. Those extra styles, those frills and trimmings, those decorations and ornaments which are made from the critical materials needed for defense—for the duration of this emergency they are waste and we are going to get along without them. Within a day or so the Office of Production Management will announce a broad, detailed campaign to bring those savings into effect. The job will be done the democratic way. Everyone who is interested will have a chance to be heard. But it will be done just as speedily and effectively as we know how to do it. And we are not going to miss anything.

You have heard a great deal about priorities in the last few months. You are going to hear much more about them in the near future. Priorities orders, as you know, are the means by which we try to make certain that needed materials go to the places where the defense need is greatest. I would like to spend just a moment discussing the general principles by which we are going to administer these orders.

As I understand priorities, it is simply a process of putting first things first. You and all other businessmen have a right to expect us to simplify it as much as possible. You have a right to expect our organization to give you quick, intelligent, unprejudiced, and accurate service. You will get such service. And we, in our turn, have a right to expect from you an understanding of the importance of these controls and the assumption that we are working for the common good.

We will give you decisions on all priorities matters the minute we can make them.

We do not have any favors to give or any favorities to give them to.

None of us in this organization will "put in a good word" for anybody or any company at any time.

A representative of a little business will get exactly the same consideration as a representative of a big business.

In other words, we are going to handle this priorities business as swiftly, as smoothly, and as efficiently as it can possibly be handled. We will issue priority orders only when they are absolutely necessary, and when they are issued we will enforce them rigorously and without hesitancy. The im-

mense majority of American businessmen, of course, play the game fairly on these priorities rulings. The percentage which chisels and evades is very, very small; yet as you all know, a few chiselers and evaders can spoil things for the honest majority. I want to assure you now that the chiselers and evaders will be taken care of. The willing cooperation of the many is not going to be spoiled by the evasiveness of the few.

All of this talk of controls, of rules and regulations, of converting business from one line of activity to another—all of this, of course, is unpleasant. I don't like controls and restraints any more than any of you like them. But I think it is all-important for us to realize that we are either going to accept a great many temporary controls now or live in a world where permanent, iron-tight controls are the order of the day.

For that, after all, is what is at stake in this whole world struggle.

We believe in freedom. We live by it. We have been used to it for generations. It is almost impossible for us to imagine life without it. Yet what is going on now is nothing less than a life-or-death struggle between a way of life which is based on freedom and a way of life which is based on the denial of freedom. If this war is lost freedom is gone—everywhere. It will vanish here just as surely as it has vanished already in the lands which are under the iron heels of the dictators' storm troops. It will vanish because freedom and slavery cannot go on inhabiting the same world. And if it vanishes, the era of free men, free business, free economies is ended. Controls piled under controls will govern every commercial activity. Every businessman will be a pawn in the hands of a superorganization; every workingman will toil under conditions which he cannot lift a finger to alter.

So these emergency controls, irksome though they may be, are things we must accept for our own sakes. We will accept them gladly—as long as we realize that they are in fact emergency controls, and hence temporary controls.

For in this great struggle we are not thinking at all of the present moment. We are thinking of the future. This profound effort of ours would not be worth making if it were not the only way of making sure that we can be free in the future as we have been in the past.

What we do in this emergency must be planned carefully. It must not merely insure the mustering of the greatest possible strength—the individual controls and actions by which we muster that strength must be planned and put together in such a way that they can be dismantled after the emergency is over. We are defending our free economy—free, in every meaning of that glorious word—and we must so defend it that when the peril is beaten back, as it will be beaten back, our economy and our Nation can be truly free. The real wave of the future does not carry with it an elaborate set of controls and restrictions—by our strength and with God's help, it carries instead an era in which all of us can be our own masters, submitting only to those controls which we agree are in the common good.

The immediate future is dark; not dark with uncertainty and confusion, but dark simply because we have a great number of hard things which must be done quickly. But the point of it all is that by the long view the future is bright. Our country, our America, our freedom—they will come out of this ready to go forward again. This dark hour is but an incident in the great history of a free people who are determined at all costs to be forever free.

Readjustment of American Soldiers in Civilian Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 1941

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the conclusion that the economy of any given people inevitably dictates the ultimate form of government of that people. Since the discovery of America, the world has recognized it as a land of economic opportunity, which gives its inhabitants not only economic existence, but also that right to develop political thought and democratic principles. Wealth has been produced, wealth on the scale that raised the standards of living to heights never before known to a human family.

The Congress of the United States has voted and is continuing to vote billions of dollars as taxes upon the American citizens, for their protection, that these economic and democratic principles may be perpetuated.

Four-fifths of the world's population are now engaged in war, and with this destructive existing world condition it seems to be generally conceded that it is absolutely necessary for our very existence to expend these large sums of money, and not only that but to call in from every walk of life the finest of our American young men to build a stronger Army, Navy, and air force for our national defense.

This brings up the most serious problem that any nation ever faces—that is a reconstruction period, or the period of readjustment which necessitates the placing of these young men in positions where they can earn a decent living, build an adequate American home, and take their place in society in their respective communities alongside of the man who was not called to service.

Human society itself recognizes the general welfare of the people, and that means to give them a chance for livelihood, to provide economic opportunity at least for their bare existence, and beyond that to prosper, if possible. There can be no freedom, there can be no liberty, nothing else, if this requisite is not present in the government of man. Therefore let us as individuals join our minds and hearts and give our best thoughts in an effort to work out plans and policies, both national and State, that will afford these young men, who have been called away from their respective jobs and are now working for us at $21 per month, an opportunity on their return from the service to take up where they left off and continue to develop into finer and better community builders that the democracy of America may continue to live. If the American people do not prepare such a system whereby these young men will have an opportunity in life on their return from the service, the economic existence, American democracy, and most precious of all things, the American home itself, are in danger of being destroyed.

What's Wrong With the Isolationists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER PATRICK

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

ADDRESS OF AUGUSTUS F. LINDBERGH, OF BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, Augustus Lindbergh did not ask that I have his speech included in the RECORD. I heard it and requested of him that privilege, and I hope you may read and digest what Gus Lindbergh has to say and has said. Please let me specially call your attention to his statement regarding the fact that our isolationists in this country are fighting Hitler's battle in America. Please also study what Mr. Lindbergh has to offer regarding the difference between the right of a minority to be heard—heard to advance its ideas—and that minority's fighting to the bitter end to overthrow the already established wish and program of the democratic majority.

The address follows:

Fellow Americans, we face the greatest crisis of our entire history. The time for dissension and division of opinion has long since passed. We are at war.

The time for united action is here and now.

For days, for weeks, for months, end on end, the greatest battle of America's part in this war has been going on. Wittingly or unwittingly, knowingly or unknowingly, there are a few in this country—commonly called isolationists—who have been fighting Hitler's battle. As to whether or not they know that they are fighting Hitler's battle I cannot say; but I say that they do know—as they go about this country sowing seed of dissension and disunion, distrust, and inevitable disaster, that Hitler's best weapon is his ability to divide his enemies.

These people are not only trying to isolate us from Europe, they would isolate you from your own Government.

What is wrong with these so-called isolationists? There seems to be but one answer, and that is quest for power. In my studied opinion, the burning ambition of many of the isolationist leaders is to be elevated to positions of power in the Government. Some who are already in the Government want higher places. Some who do not hold places in the Government want any place they can get. A large number have their eyes turned toward the White House. Frankly and fearlessly I say that their ambitions are such that they would gamble the very existence of the

United States in their hope to attain their goal. They play politics in its lowest form.

To these men I have this to say: That any Congressman, any Senator, any isolationist who puts his political ambition above his country may find that he has misjudged the temper of the American people. They are better informed today than they have been at any other time in American history. The demand for aggressive leadership on the part of our elected leaders is greater than ever before.

The man who recognizes the danger to America today, and faces that danger courageously, is likely to be remembered longer and to stay in office longer than the fellow who does not.

To this group of so-called isolationists I would say further that the foreign policy of our Government has been fixed, lo, these many months. It is now too late to quibble over policies. And, again, I would say to this group that the average American seems to have a better understanding of his Government than do the leaders of the isolationists. We understand our Government to be a representative democracy. Our Americanism demands that we bow to the will of the majority in our Government. Once a policy is decided upon it is not the idea of us average Americans that mere individuals should go about the country saying, "Such may be the policy of the country, but I am not for it, and I intend to fight it to the bitter end." Such is not democracy. It is anarchy. It is nothing, more or less, than mob rule, and unless certain so-called leaders clear up their understanding of our Government, they are driving us head-on into disaster. The policy of these isolationists comes very, very close to being treason.

I would again say to these isolationists that by far the great majority of the American people are behind the President of the United States. We average Americans had our say in November last year, we will have our say again in 1944. That is the American way, the democratic way of doing things. We, like Stephen Decatur, are for our country, right or wrong. We do not appreciate any attempt to incite rebellion against the legally elected administration in Washington.

I am for the foreign policy of my Government. I am willing for the National Government to make and to execute whatever plan may, in its judgment, be necessary for the preservation of these United States, and for obtaining and securing to us an everlasting free peace. But, as for me, I want no part of a peace negotiated with that gangster, Hitler. And, I say, there can be no peace as long as Hitler and his horde of heathens run loose upon this world.

To offset, to counteract, the poison propaganda of these isolationists—who would negotiate a peace with Hitler—is the duty of every true American; and, I ask of you Americans who hear me tonight to read the history of Europe and decide for yourselves whether or not we can make a peace with Hitler. Hitler has had treaties with every nation of Europe. I ask you simply, has he kept his written word? Has he kept the peace when it suited him to make war? You know that he has not!

Since I have mentioned true Americans, I might pause here to define a true American. The test of a true American is whether or not he or she can subordinate his or her will to that of the Government in times of national emergency. I have said, and I say again, that BURTON K. WHEELER and Charles Augustus Lindbergh have failed to meet that test.

But, you say: Who are you to question these men? I am just a southern-born, southern-reared, country boy from Alabama. I do not pretend to have occult powers. I'm just a lawyer, a plain ordinary American citizen. Some of us Lindberghs are like that—ordinary, plain citizens.

I haven't flown an airplane across the Atlantic and I haven't been elected to the United States Senate, but, in my opinion, neither of these accomplishments has any particular qualities for brain-building.

Like most Americans, I don't hesitate to say what I think, and so, just as an ordinary American citizen, I am having my say, and as such, I have a right to say that no man has a right to obstruct his government during a national crisis—and that is exactly what some of those on Capitol Hill in Washington, and one member of the family of Lindbergh are trying to do now.

In my opinion, and the opinion of the people of Alabama, and of the Nation as shown by Dr. George Gallup's poll and the one in Fortune Magazine, Hitler must be beaten. We average Americans say that the time is here for aggressive, determined, decisive, united action. We say that the time for dissension and division of opinion has long since passed; that no man has a right to put his party above his country; that no man has a right to be a Democrat before he is an American; that no man has a right to put the Republican Party and his own personal ambition above his Americanism.

It seems to me I can remember a place in my sixth-grade history where there was a picture of a disjointed snake. There were 13 pieces, each with the name of one of the original Colonies. Under the picture were written these words: "Join, or die." At another place in my history book I found these words: "United we stand—divided we fall." No truer statements can be made of our position today.

I am sure that Hitler must smack his bloody lips in glee each time one of these isolationists suggests that there is no need for alarm; for has it not been his boast that America will be an inside job? Hitler counted on disunity. Dividing our people is part of the Nazi plan. In Hitler's book he writes: "It will be a simple matter for me to produce unrest and revolts in the United States."

Except for their attempt to create disunity, I can't even tell you what most of the isolationists stand for. They say that they are for a strong defense—yet they vote against every defense measure. Now, I do not accuse these isolationists of being Hitler's paid agents in this country; I simply say that whether these men are deliberate Quislings or unconscious ones, they are Hitler's greatest allies. Through exactly their kind of tactics in other countries Adolf Hitler has been able to forge his ring of enslavement.

There are a few things that I would like for these isolationists to explain. I would like for Charles Augustus Lindbergh to explain why it would be disastrous for Europe if the United States started shooting? We are already in the war. Does he not mean that it would be disastrous for Hitler and Hitler's ambition to enslave the world? And, may we ask, what could be more disastrous for France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Poland, Greece, and all the rest, than to have Hitler's iron heel on their necks. We would like for all of them to explain just what makes them think Hitler would keep a negotiated peace? Do they have private assurances? We would like for them to explain just how they chose the name "America First"?

How does it happen that in England the friends of Hitler had as their slogan "Britain First"? How does it happen that in certain South American countries that the Nazi revolutionists were using the same slogan? Why is it that many of their statements follow the pattern, and are often in the exact words, of that lying propagandist, Dr. Goebbels? Tell us why you would have us stand by like sheep to be slaughtered?

No, gentlemen, your opposition comes too late. The foreign policy of the United States is fixed. You can accomplish nothing other than to give aid and comfort to Hitler. You are sowing a whirlwind, and you shall reap a storm; a storm of protest and resentment. You have misjudged the American people. I tell you now, that you will not, as you hope, ride to power on the seed of dissension and distrust, division and disunity which you sow.

I have faith in the American people. They have always been able to think through—and to take straightforward action. They can and will do this again.

Yes; the great majority, the overwhelming majority, of the American people are looking to Franklin D. Roosevelt for leadership and action. We average Americans are grateful that in this trying time he has the courage to face the issue squarely. Our President has a job somewhat similar to the one the immortal Lincoln had—the Lincoln that we southerners love, not because he had the power and the might to crush the South, but because he had the courage to save the Nation. Lincoln did not want war. No one wants war now. But, war in its shooting stage may come; and when it does, we want to be fully prepared. We want the ships and the guns, and the tanks, and the planes; we want the best and the strongest Army. We want the help of the men in the plants; but in order that we may have all of these, and in order that we may be prepared, we want, and must have, unity now.

America has no choice to make today. Hitler made that choice for us months ago. He decided that there was no room on this world for nazi-ism and democracy. We cannot decide whether or not we shall fight, but only when we shall fight; and delay may deprive us of that choice. I am not in favor of waiting for Hitler to come over here; nor even until he is able to set up bases from whence he can strike. I am not in favor of waiting until Hitler's jumping jack—Japan—decides to jump. The only thing Hitler can understand is a shooting war. Let's give it to him, and sink Japan's fleet now. And then, in the oriental custom, send them a note saying that we are very, very sorry; yes, very, very sorry—that we didn't do it sooner.

Well, folks, remember there is one Lindbergh, Augustus Franklin Lindbergh, the country boy from Alabama, who is no appeaser; and who is not afraid of what the future holds for the United States of America under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Unite behind our Government now; follow it wholeheartedly; and when the dark clouds of these trying times have passed, Old Glory will still proudly wave, over the land of the free and the home of the brave. Good night.

Opportunities Which the United States Has Missed to Engage in Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1941

RECORD OF WARS 1800–1941

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, what a glorious opportunity the United

States has missed during the years that have intervened since George Washington advised against entering entangling alliances abroad, except when the United States departed from its traditional foreign policy in 1917 and again in this year of our Lord 1941.

Think of the dead, the blind, the crippled, the insane who might have been heroes of foreign conflicts, plots, and intrigues during the past 140 years. I insert a list of the lost opportunities for participation by this Government in the quarrels and wars abroad during that period:

THE RECORD, 1800–1941

1801 The old German Empire broke up, and all territory on the left bank of the Rhine was ceded to France.
1802 French aggressions in Holland, Italy, and Switzerland.
1805 England declares war on Spain. France fights Austria.
1806 Napoleon enters Berlin.
1807 Napoleon defeats Russia.
1808 Napoleon invades Spain.
1809 Napoleon is excommunicated by Pope and puts Pope in jail.
1810 France annexes Holland. Turks driven out of Balkans.
1811 War starts between United States and England.
1812 Napoleon declares war on Russia.
1814 France invaded from all sides. Napoleon to Elba. British sieze and burn Washington.
1815 Napoleon leaves Elba, is defeated by British and Germans at Waterloo, then sent to St. Helena for life.
1816 Holland annexes Belgium.
1817 British wars in India.
1822 Greeks and Turks at war. Civil war in Spain.
1823 French Army enters Spain.
1824 British battle for Burma.
1825 Russia wars on Turkey.
1826 Russia invades Persia.
1827 Turks driven from Greece.
1828 Russia overruns Rumania.
1829 England and Austria intervene against Russia.
1830 Revolution in Poland and France. Belgium revolts from Holland.
1831 Prussia and Austria aid Russia against Poland.
1832 Egypt revolts against Turkey.
1838 French bombard Mexican ports. Debt collection, old style.
1839 Britain wars on China.
1846 War between United States and Mexico.
1848 Schleswig-Holstein fights Danish annexation
1849 Danish-Russian war.
1850 Britain blockades Greece. Prussia and Austria war.
1854 France and England war against Russia.
1856 British war on China and Persia.
1861 Civil War in United States.
1864 Germans defeat Danes.
1866 War between several German states. Austria wars on Italy.
1867 Civil war in Japan.
1868 Britain invades Abyssinia. Spanish revolution.
1870 Franco-German War.
1871 Alsace-Lorraine goes to Germany. Back to France in 1918 and back to Germany in 1940.
1874 Spanish civil war.
1876 Balkan wars.
1877 Civil war in Japan. Russia wars on Turks.
1879 British war on Zulus.
1880 Boers and British battle.
1881 France wars on Tunis.
1882 Britain wars on Egypt.
1884 Japan wars on Korea.
1885 Russia wars on Afghanistan.
1887 Balkan wars. Italy wars on Abyssinia.
1894 Japan wars on China.
1895 Belgium seizes Congo state.
1898 Spanish-American War.
1899 Britain wars on Boers.
1900 Boxer War in China.
1904 Russian-Japanese War.
1910 Japan takes Korea.
1912 Balkan Wars.
1914–18 Russia, France, Britain, Italy, United States, Japan, Rumania, Serbia, Belgium, Greece, Portugal, and Montenegro, 12 nations, battle Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria.
1917–18 The United States of America participated in the above war.
1920 to 1930 A breathing spell and period of disarmament conferences, which obviously disarmed no nation except he United States.
1931 Japan seizes Manchukuo.
1934 Italy takes Abyssinia.
1937 Japan develops an "incident" in China.
1939 Germany takes Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. France and England declare war on Germany.
1940 Russia takes part of Finland. Germany seizes Denmark and defeats Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France.
1941 Germany and England at war; Italy, Rumania, and Japan, against Germany in 1914, like the figures of the year, they have reversed their positions and are with her in 1941.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a radio address delivered by me over station WJR, of Detroit, Mich., on September 13, 1941, on the subject of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project.

I sought to rectify many misunderstandings and exaggerations of this project. It is the only project in the United States comparable with the Panama Canal. It is the master project of the North American Continent. Those in opposition to the seaway have made statements and claims which do not square with the facts.

There are three elements outlined in the address which should have the attention of every thoughtful person—its possibility to navigation, its power expectancy made possible and incident to the navigation feature, and the element of national defense. This includes the shipbuilding facilities of the Great Lakes. The opening of this waterway will add another ocean to the commerce of the world—the Great Lakes, which contain one-third of the fresh water of the earth.

The address follows:

ANNOUNCER. At this time we introduce the Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO, Member of Congress for the Seventeenth District of Michigan and high ranking member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the United States House of Representatives, who will discuss with us some of the various phases of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and the situation with reference to the bill authorizing its construction, which was recently favorably reported by the committee.

Congressman DONDERO, the St. Lawrence seaway is a project for which the people of Michigan and other States in the Great Lakes region have worked for over a long period of years. Just what work would be involved in the completion of this project?

Mr. DONDERO. The amount of work involved is not nearly as extensive as many believe. The entire seaway system consists of the Great Lakes, the Soo channels, the St. Clair and Detroit Rivers, the Welland Canal, and the St. Lawrence River. Most of the necessary work in the Great Lakes and the connecting channels has now been completed Canada completed the Welland Canal in 1932. The major portion of the work will be devoted to opening up a 48-mile bottleneck which now exists in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River and the harnessing of 2,200,000 horsepower of electric energy developed incidental to the river improvement. This is a logical step. If a section of track 48 miles in length in one of our transcontinental railroads were obstructed by rock, or if a similar section of the Lincoln Highway were washed out by flood, a way would be quickly found to remove the rock from the railroad or replace the concrete in the highway so that traffic might be resumed. That is substantially the situation that exists relative to the St. Lawrence seaway. When it is completed, a 2,400-mile deep-water route with 27-foot channels, capable of accommodating nearly 70 percent of the freight cargo ships of the world, will be provided and ports on the Great Lakes will then have direct access to the ports of the world.

ANNOUNCER. Statements have been made to the effect that the St. Lawrence seaway would cost as much as a billion dollars to complete. Since the work necessary to complete this project is limited to that which you have outlined, it would seem that this figure is greatly exaggerated. Just what would be the cost to the United States?

Mr. DONDERO. The figure you mention indicates that the statement came from an opponent of the seaway, for it is more than five times the official net estimate. According to Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, of the United States Army Engineers, a member of the Joint Board of Engineers appointed by the United States and Canada to make a complete survey, it will cost the United States $285,000,000, and nearly one-third of this total will be returned to the United States through the sale of power to the State of New York. When the project is completed the United States will have expended about $302,000,000, less $93,000,000 from power sales, and Canada about $277,000,000. Because of Brigadier General Robin's knowledge of rivers and harbors problems, his statement on this phase of the seaway project is entitled to the utmost weight.

ANNOUNCER. Congressman DONDERO, what factors make the seaway of such vital importance to the Great Lakes region?

Mr. DONDERO. The potential economic advantages of the seaway are numerous. Every survey of this phase of the project indicates that the great Middle West, which has almost one-third of our total population, would enjoy greatly reduced transportation costs, which would be reflected in lower living costs and in a higher net return from the exported products of our farms, our factories, and our mines. Not only would it provide direct water transportation to foreign ports, but to the coastal ports of the United States, enabling our agriculture and industry to

successfully meet world competition. This would result in expansion of our industry and afford added volume to rail and motor transportation systems, and this in turn would provide greater opportunity for employment in the great Middle West. The effect of the seaway would be to create a new frontier for America and open up vast channels of trade not now enjoyed by the great inland empire surrounding the Great Lakes. Cheaper transportation costs will make it possible for this country to compete with cheap labor costs of other countries without reducing the standard of living of our workers.

ANNOUNCER. The President has asked for the seaway as a defense project. In what way would our defense be strengthened by the availability of the seaway?

Mr. DONDERO. The President has sound reasons for wanting the St. Lawrence seaway as part of our national-defense program, and I concur in the President's viewpoint. First, the seaway would make possible the building of naval and cargo vessels in Great Lakes shipyards which are beyond the range of bomber attack by any power on earth. Second, the assurance that the seaway would be promptly completed would enable the Government to immediately spread more than a billion dollars in ship contracts among Great Lakes shipyards; this would greatly relieve the pressure on coastal shipyards and provide an additional source of employment in this section. Third, United States Army engineers state that the project can definitely be completed within 3 to 4 years, and this means that construction of cruisers could be commenced at once, as the seaway would be ready to carry them to the sea as soon as they are ready to join our Navy.

ANNOUNCER. It is frequently said that the defense value of the St. Lawrence seaway is of little importance because the present emergency will be over before its completion.

Mr. DONDERO. That argument is advanced by opponents of the seaway, but unfortunately there is nothing on the horizon which justifies this conclusion. The recent turn of events in Europe indicates that the present conflict will be of long duration. So long as this condition prevails in the world the United States must be fully prepared to meet any eventuality. Even should the war clouds suddenly part and the sun once more shine through, the United States will need the seaway more than ever in the competition for world trade that is certain to follow, regardless of the outcome of this war. It is agreed by traffic experts that after the war competition among nations for world trade will be intense and low transportation costs will be a vital factor. This will be particularly important in such markets as the Latin-American countries. The seaway is one of the most vital phases of our present national-defense program.

ANNOUNCER. What is labor's attitude toward the seaway? Mr. John L. Lewis contends that it will displace coal miners and has placed his union, the United Mine Workers of America, on record as opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. John L. Lewis did appear before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in opposition to the seaway, and it was my privilege to question him at some length. His contention, however, was quite thoroughly disproved by Mr. N. R. Danielian, director of the St. Lawrence survey, Department of Commerce, in his report on the effect of the seaway on the coal industry. According to this survey, the claims of the coal operators and the mine workers concerning the disastrous effects of the seaway upon the coal industry are unfounded in fact, unsupported by past experience, and definitely erroneous. The facts supporting this conclusion are set forth in Mr. Danielian's report. Both the American Federation of Labor and the C. I. O. in Michigan have announced their support of the seaway. The statements of Mr. Frank X. Martel, of the American Federation of Labor, and of Mr. Tracy M. Doll, of the Wayne County Industrial Union Council, favoring the St. Lawrence project are included in the record of the committee's hearings.

ANNOUNCER. Congressman DONDERO, as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, you actively participated in the hearings on the seaway and conducted much of the cross-examination of opposition witnesses. Would you say that the project was approached in a partisan manner?

Mr. DONDERO. Representative JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, of Texas, the chairman of the committee, a Democrat, afforded a fair opportunity to both proponents and opponents of the seaway to present their respective cases, and in some instances called upon Republicans, your speaker included, to preside over the hearings. At no time during the hearings, which covered a period of 2 months, was there any evidence of a partisan attitude in the conduct of its sessions. It was my privilege to work with Assistant Secretary of State Adolf A. Berle, Jr., who negotiated the agreement between the United States and Canada, and I believe that every Member of Congress would do well to follow the example set by the committee and give first consideration to the welfare of the great Middle West and of the Nation as a whole in determining his attitude toward this master project of the North American Continent. Henry Clay once took a very antagonistic attitude toward a project which was of vital importance to this section and a part of the seaway system we are now discussing. The Kentuckian, in opposing the canal on the Sault Ste Marie, said that it was—I quote—"a work beyond the remotest settlement in the United States, if not in the moon" and that to build it "would permit Ojibway Indians to paddle down in birchbark canoes in order to see the folly of the white man." That canal has since become a teeming water thoroughfare, moving this year more than 100,000,000 tons of iron ore and other materials essential to our national defense. This tonnage exceeds the combined total of the Panama and Suez Canals, both channels open for commerce throughout the year, as compared to the 7-month period of ship movement through the Soo.

ANNOUNCER. The seaway project has now been reported favorably, and I am sure that your comments on the action of your committee would be of interest at this time.

Mr. DONDERO. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors, after nearly 2 months of hearings, voted 17 to 8 to include the seaway in what is known as an omnibus bill. This omnibus bill is an authorization bill and not an appropriation bill. It will authorize the President to start work on only those projects with a definite defense value. Since the President himself pleaded for the seaway as a defense measure, it is apparent that we will get started immediately if the omnibus bill passes. The Florida ship canal and other projects which I have consistently opposed, and still oppose, are embodied in this same bill. These, however, cannot be justified as defense measures and there is nothing in the bill to indicate when their construction may be undertaken. I personally would very much have preferred that the St. Lawrence seaway be considered on its own merits, entirely divorced from any other project. It was introduced originally in that form; but, as committee hearings progressed, and as pressure was applied by the opposition, a favorable report from the committee appeared doubtful. It was then included in the omnibus bill at the suggestion of the President.

ANNOUNCER. Now that the seaway has been reported, what will be the opposition strategy?

Mr. DONDERO. It is possible that every single project in the omnibus bill, except the seaway, might be retained. You may be sure that a determined effort will be made to strike the seaway from the bill when it reaches the floor of the House. If this attempt succeeds—and it will be backed by a well-organized and effective lobby—the omnibus bill will be passed without the seaway. For this reason it is imperative that every Senator and every Representative from every State in the Midwest rise above party politics and above persuasion by selfish groups and support this section's right to an outlet to the seven seas and access to the ports of the world. When debate starts in the House, around the first week in October, the same opposition we heard in committee—an opposition presenting the strange spectacle of coal miners teaming up with utility and railroad representatives and operating with unlimited funds—will redouble their efforts to strike the seaway from the bill.

ANNOUNCER. Congressman DONDERO, what can the people do to aid you in your fight to make the seaway a reality?

Mr. DONDERO. Opponents of the seaway have an excellent chance of succeeding unless the people of Michigan and other States in the Great Lakes region stand solidly behind their Senators and Representatives and urge their united support of the seaway. Some of these Congressmen who have supported the seaway for 20 years are now in doubt. Some have been cajoled and threatened by the opposition and have heard very little from the home folks who want the seaway project completed as soon as possible. The Detroit seaway committee has taken the initiative in organizing support for the seaway and friends of the project will help materially by offering their cooperation and assistance to this committee.

ANNOUNCER. Apparently the time has arrived for the people to take a hand in the fight to get the seaway started.

Mr. DONDERO. It is either now or never. Powerful opposition kept it from passage when it was previously considered on the basis of its economic value alone. Today it has that same value, plus the vital extra advantage of bolstering the defense program through added power and shipbuilding facilities. If it cannot be passed with all these favoring factors, and with the backing of a President who has a majority in both Houses of Congress, its chances of ever passing are very remote. But it can and will be passed if an aroused electorate instructs its Washington representatives to support this project which will permanently benefit the great Middle West and its 40,000,000 people. It is the only project on the North American Continent comparable to the Panama Canal. This land-locked empire of ours has a right to go down to the sea in ships and participate in the trade of the world.

ANNOUNCER. You have just listened to an interview with the Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO, the only Michigan member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the United States House of Representatives, who has long advocated the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway, a project which he has termed "the master project of the North American Continent."

Inflation!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1941

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include an editorial appearing on August 12, 1941, in the Evening Observer, Dunkirk, N. Y.

It has taken a long time for the administration to realize that the boondoggling of billions, the creation of an overwhelming national debt, the lending, leasing, wasting, and squandering of billions of dollars bring an inevitable pay day, as evidenced by the tax bill now before the House for final action.

The officials of the Government at last admit that inflation is here; that another tax bill, more drastic than the present one, will soon be necessary; and that the specter of further tax bills to follow stands in the door of every home in the land. I have warned against this very condition from time to time during the last 8 years, and I shall still resist the expenditure of nondefense billions and all expenditures not strictly for our own national defense.

The editorial follows:

[From the Dunkirk (N. Y.) Evening Observer of August 12, 1941]

A DANGER GREATER THAN WAR

It is not certain that price control alone can stop a run-away inflation. It undoubtedly would help but it now appears that it will not be applied with sufficient force to do much good. By the time Congress gets through with the exceptions (i. e., wages and farm prices) the teeth will be pretty well extracted.

Obviously the Nation wants price control as a safeguard against the disaster of inflation—but for the other fellow, just as we think the other fellow ought to do all the conserving of gasoline. Labor is entirely willing that prices should be controlled unless the control hits wages unmindful apparently of the obvious fact that wages are the largest single factor in total price. Farmers take the same point of view in respect to farm products. Politicians pander to these numerically large elements.

People are helpless in the face of groups powerful enough to influence politicians and we are clearly headed for trouble unless groups and individuals recognize their responsibilities. We can and should buy defense bonds as one safeguard against inflation. We can and should curtail buying and be thrifty, but there is a serious question of whether we will or not before it is too late. The Nation needs every possible governmental aid against so terrible a danger.

Inflation is no idle threat. It is not a danger to be scoffed at. The German people who lived through the inflationary period of the early twenties fear inflation more than they do war. It can be much more terrible as a human disaster. If we hope to prevent it we must not only act personally and individually but we must lend our collective cooperation to the Government. The defense against this threat calls for quite as much patriotism and sacrifice as the defense against foreign invasion.

THERE ARE MANY TO PROTECT

Why this sudden furore about inflation, anyway?

Who cares?

You care, for one.

You care if you are one of the 45,000,000 Americans who hold social-security cards, or the wife or child of such a holder. You care if you are one of the nearly 40,000,000 Americans who are beneficiaries of ordinary life insurance, or of the 20,000,000 industrial policies, or the 25,000 group policies.

And that begins to get along to almost everybody.

The spectacular losses in a period of inflation come to those who have money. But, on the other hand, such people usually manage to wangle through it somehow. It is the little fellow, the fellow on a small and inelastic salary or wage, the fellow with the small savings account or insurance nest egg who is swept down into the depths of unspectacular misery in a run-away inflation.

Many more people have a stake in preserving some kind of stability in the relationship between money and the prices of things than ever before. Forty-five millions of people now have social-security accounts who did not have them a few years ago. Such of them as have made over $250 a month, for instance, for a period of 10 years will, when they reach 65 years of age, begin to receive $44 a month until they die. Such a man's widow, his unmarried children under 18, are also in line for benefits.

So every man and woman working under Social Security has a stake in preventing inflation even though many of them are apparently not conscious of it. For if, by the time they reach age 65, that $44 a month won't buy cigarettes, the whole elaborate scheme for their protection and security collapses just when the power to earn is also gone.

That is why every effort must be made now to restrain the rising price-wage cycle. That is why the Government is trying to sell defense bonds. In buying defense bonds, you lend your actual money to the Government, which will pay it back after 10 years with interest. If the Government does not get enough money that way, it will borrow it from banks, which simply create the credit where no money existed before, thus expanding the currency without adding correspondingly to production. That is inflation.

The prospect of inflation is not something that concerns only the rich. It concerns every man, woman, and child in the United States, and the children, perhaps, most of all.

Mr. Speaker, the devastating consequences of inflation are not new. An eminent English lawyer and economist, writing in 1850, warned his countrymen of the perils of inflation caused from excessive debt and waste and extravagance in these words:

As long as we can contrive to pay the interest of the debt, we postpone the fatal consequences of our past extravagance.

But who can contemplate, without a shudder, the dawn of that morning when it shall be announced that the dividends [interest on the Nation's debt] can no longer be paid.

Every banker, every merchant, every insurance company is at once insolvent. No checks, no banknotes are of any value. Even specie disappears. Every man hides or clutches with a death grip his sovereign or shilling. There are no funds to pay wages. None to support the poor, none to carry on the government, or preserve the peace. * * * What was yesterday the most valuable property, today exists not. The just title to all other property is gone, too.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished author whose observations in the light of subsequent events have proved so prophetic, makes this further comment:

Debts are the most disagreeable subject to which the attention of debtors can be solicited. The public, deluded by fallacius hopes of benefit, sometimes from commercial changes, pursues its favorite theory, till the pursuit is given up as hopeless, or experience undeceives it. It then chases some fresh phantom. Persons of more reflection are apt to silence apprehension by the selfish hope that things will last their time.

Governments, all the while, are too happy if, by temporary expedients, they can make ends meet or, at the very best, secure a small margin of receipt above expenditure; and have no notion of such a degree of political virtue as would lead them to make any sacrifice to insure the financial prosperity of their successors.

Mr. Speaker, the tax bill—H. R. 5417—it is estimated, will yield $3,553,400,000 and it is heralded as a measure to prevent inflation. The fact is that it will yield in revenue during the fiscal year 1942 only $1,900,000,000, while of this $1,200,000,000 will be required to pay the interest on the national debt. The balance of $700,000,000 for national defense to meet commitments of $52,000,000,000 for such purpose cannot but emphasize to what extent the people must eventually be taxed to preserve the credit of the Government.

The Pending Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. LARRABEE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1941

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement concerning my position on the Revenue Act of 1941:

During my legislative experience I have stated frequently that I would always make every effort within my power to advance and defend the theory of an equitable distribution of the tax load, taking into consideration both the ability of the taxpayer to pay and his obligation to his Government resulting from the benefits he has received therefrom.

For many days I have considered the various phases of the bill in question, the so-called Revenue Act of 1941, and I cannot feel that I would be justified in supporting it. Accordingly I am opposed to its passage, and had there been a record vote on the bill I would have been recorded against it.

Many weeks ago, in letters to leaders of the Congress who are primarily concerned with the task of drafting tax bills and in personal interviews with them, I proposed and urged enactment of a gross profits tax to defray the cost of national defense. At the same time I proposed that such a bill be so written as to provide revenue for both national defense and for the payment of the cost of establishing a reasonable, direct, Federal old-age pension system to replace our present unsatisfactory State-Federal cooperative pension plan under the Social Security Act.

At a time when there are some who are certain of making vast profits from national-defense production while others are unfortunately and unavoidably suffering from economic maladjustment, I feel that my gross profits tax plan is fully justified. It would have taxed most those who are most able to pay and in so doing would have placed the defense tax on an entirely equitable basis. Those who make the most profit can afford and should be willing to pay for that privilege.

These facts would not be true of the present bill.

My opposition is in the nature of a friendly protest and in support of my frequently stated tax policy. I am convinced that the time is near when Congress will be required to adopt the gross-profits tax.

Character Is Essential in All of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 28, 1941

LETTER PUBLISHED IN THE POINTER, WEST POINT MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, at the request of friends of West Point Military Academy, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which was published in The Pointer for May 9, 1941. The Pointer is a magazine published by the cadets at West Point. The letter was written by an unknown American Army officer in France to his son, who was about to graduate at West Point. The letter as published in the Pointer was as follows:

MY DEAR SON JIM

The Corps is indeed fortunate to be able to read at this time one of the most remarkable documents ever printed in the Pointer. Twenty-two years have passed since these words were penned; yet they might well have been written yesterday.

HEADQUARTERS FIFTH ARTILLERY BRIGADE,
Dudelange, Grand Duchy of Luxemberg,
January 26, 1919.

MY DEAR SON JIM: For one reason at least, or one of many I hasten to add, I was very glad the war ended when it did, for you would have doubtless been expecting on your graduation from West Point some sort of "Letter from father to son on starting in life," or "Advice from an old soldier to a young one."

And having knowledge of our work over here you may have looked for something very helpful, some sort of solution of the difficulties; or possibly some rules of procedure and conduct in your own work.

It was precisely because I knew my inability to help you as I felt the desire to, son, that I was rejoiced in a measure that you had to go back for a time to West Point, and that, therefore, I did not have to make the attempt. For I have been unable to discover or to formulate any such general rules, any easy solution of the difficulties of life either on the field of battle or in general; any sort of ever-ready "slide rule" you might have taken out of your dispatch case and found applicable for every, or even any, problem.

The men I have seen succeed here appear to me to be generally the ones I saw doing well before the war, and for the same reasons as to character, energy, and application. It has seemed to me, therefore, that the old rules of conduct and preparation are the only ones that I know about yet.

I have seen men work in different manners, of course, as is natural for people with different temperaments. Some are in a great hurry when things are moving quickly and get those around them pretty nervous. Others are steady and calm when the crisis comes and are a great help to the rest. Some of those who seem to be of a phlegmatic disposition appear to get excited; and some men of nervous temperament are very calm when the decisions have to be made that affect not only themselves but also the lives and fortunes of others; and so it goes, very difficult to sum up.

Some pray in danger, even at times when others feel that all ought to sleep and get strength for the next task; some get very wrought up and swear a bit, though in time of danger even those who are accustomed to use profanity are liable to be cleaner in speech and word.

Some are able, it seems, to get the whole world out of their minds save the "mission" for the moment, and thus to concentrate the whole value of their minds on the proper solution of the problem with which they are then confronted. This is very helpful, for even the hardest problems usually come to you phase by phase, and if each is successfully handled, the next is made easier, of course.

1919, 1941—WHAT DIFFERENCE THE DATE WHEN ETERNAL TRUTHS ARE BEING SPOKEN?

So if I were to try to give you any rules I know I would make poor ones. In a general way, I can only say it is the old, old rule of the book: Character and diligence and industry—always industry and zeal and speed; speed unconnected with flurry or confusion, though, and so that others may be carried along without making them nervous or getting them confused. Everything has to be watched and double checked, especially the first days and weeks of battle—work with new officers and men. If you have all the plans well made and it seems that nothing can go amiss, yet you must still take other precautions to see that it does go right.

As to prayer, my idea is that like most precautions for war, it is helpful indeed, but like the others it may—yes, must—have to be done in the years before the war or the emergency. (The French officer with my brigade says General Foch rarely misses a chance to attend mass.)

One or two old and well-known maxims still seem new to me: "If you are in doubt in a tactical way, the best thing is to go forward"; "without any specific orders move toward the sound of the guns"; "the more you can arrange to go personally among your men the better they will feel and the better they will do."

All this involves the steady effort to think as little as you can do of your own fortunes and your own comfort of course; it necessitates so far as you are concerned a surrender—or as near to it as you can come.

While the tasks are difficult at times and the results demanded—and remember always it is the result and not the means or the difficulties that must first of all concern you—are not always easy to accomplish, yet even when in command you are not left alone or without many aids. The cheerfulness and loyalty and bravery and clear judgment of comrades and assistants are a great help.

Then there are often audible voices—even in the din of battle—some welcome and some unwelcome. The Old Devil naturally likes to have a say at times. The Voice of the Spirit of Duty and the Spirit of Honor—the two old fellows who travel so much together and who are such great chums—can be heard at times too, and they always like to be clear and brief, even though they are shy and not given to intruding if not wanted. The voice of ambition some hear very clearly, and to some it appears to be a great aid; others may not be helped so much by this spirit—it may be that this old fellow's advice ought to be examined closely before being followed too quickly.

Then you will never be where the spirit of the past is not close, and the voice of helpful people who love you accompany it. Among those that are potent I agree with the testimony of the many who have before said the same thing, that the voice of counsel of good women who seem to be near you is of great value and aid. You would have been fortunate in having that of two of such judgment and vision as your mother and "dear grandmother"—who was to me so good a second mother, while I had also the advantage of the clear memory of my own mother's ideals and splendid powers.

So you see I have done a good deal of writing and have been unable—as I knew would be the case—to formulate any new things for you, son, or to make any easy rules.

With lots of love,

Affectionately,

DAD.

Conditions in Milk-Producing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1941

STATEMENT OF A FARMER TO A CINCINNATI TIMES-STAR REPORTER

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, recently we have been hearing much regarding increased farm income, agricultural prosperity, and the high prices that are being received by tillers of the soil for products from the farm. Most of such reports emanate from those having no real knowledge of farm conditions.

I represent a rural district. As a publisher of a number of newspapers it has been my business for many years to record farm conditions and happenings. I am also the owner and operator of several farms. Both as a newspaper publisher and as a farm operator, I know there is no great prosperity in the agricultural sections of the Central West. Of course, the industrial boom in the cities, that has come from war expenditures, has brought about a better market for some agricultural products. As a result some of the farmers of the Middle West are better off today than they were a year or so ago, for prices of some farm products have risen a little more rapidly than the cost of things the farmer is required to purchase.

However, such a condition does not prevail as far as the milk producers are concerned. Today in my section of Ohio, in the Cincinnati milkshed, most of the farmers are receiving less for their milk than they were paid 6 or 8 months ago. This in spite of ever-increasing costs. Recently a number of the newspapers in the Cincinnati milkshed area made a careful survey of the entire milk-producing and distribution situation. Officials of the Department of Agriculture have conducted investigations and hearings. For the benefit of the Congress, and for the enlightenment of those not informed as to actual conditions on the milk-

producing farms of this country, I am herewith including a statement given by a farmer in my area by a Cincinnati Times-Star reporter. I believe this statement paints a true word picture that graphically describes the present situation on many of the farms of America, and is worthy of careful study and consideration. It is as follows:

[From the Cincinnati Times-Star]

(By Joseph Lashly)

I have been a farmer in Hamilton County for 24 years. I work hard and according to the other farmers in this district, I am a good operator. It might surprise you to know then, that during the next month or so, I plan to close up my farming operations and go into the city to look for a job in one of these defense plants. The way things stand now, my 18-year-old daughter makes more money working 40 hours a week in an office than I do, working 76 hours a week on a farm.

Now there's nothing very unusual about a farmer quitting business. I don't mind telling you though, that there's a lot of farmers in this neighborhood who feel the same way I do. They are willing to give up the land they love for a few solid dollars in a pay envelope. I can't tell you about all their difficulties but I can tell you about mine. So here goes:

OWNS 100 ACRES

I am 46 years old. My farm includes 100 acres and is in a district that has the reputation of being one of the best farming lands in the State. My one daughter works in the city and the other two, one 21 and the other 16, help my wife in keeping up the house and doing chores around the farm. I have no sons.

This farm I work has been in the family for 75 years. My father-in-law is the owner. Each year I give him one-half of the grain—wheat and corn—that I produce. During the past several years he has just about gotten enough out of this to pay the taxes and insurance. In other words, he got about $400 last year out of a farm that is worth $20,000.

I am not the kind of a farmer who keeps lots of records. I do know this, however. Last year I worked as hard as I have ever worked in my life. When I sat down and figured out what all this work had brought me, I found that I had taken $400 out of the bank to keep living. In other words, instead of being ahead, I was behind $400.

ALL DAIRY FARMERS

Let me give you a few examples of what I have to put up with. All the members of my family have been dairy farmers. About 5 years ago, I had 16 of the finest Holstein cows you could find in this part of the State. In some months I shipped as much as 12,000 pounds of milk. I was working hard but I was making money.

Then, several things began to happen. The cost of dairy feed started to climb, the drought burned my pastures but my milk checks became smaller and smaller—although I was turning out just as much milk. The price of beef went up so I started selling my cows. Now I turn out only a half can of milk a day and the cattle I have are nothing but scrubs.

You might ask, "Why don't you go back into the milk business? Prices are going up."

Here's the answer. A decent milk cow now sells for about $100. There was a day, though back in 1930, when I could get all I wanted for $35. I would need at least six cows to start back in business. That would be $600.

HASN'T GOT $600

I haven't got $600, and even if I did, I doubt if I would spend it on cows. The chances are that I would work hard all winter with those animals and then find out that I lost money. If I go into the city and work for $20 a week, I'm sure that I'm adding to the breadbasket, and that's something.

If you think it's just the milk business that's bad, listen to what happened to me last year: I decided that I would raise hogs. In addition to buying the pigs, I also spent about $250 fixing up the pigpen. I worked like a draft horse. Every day I went into the city and bought skim milk to feed the hogs. They blossomed like sunflowers. I thought I was sitting on the top of the world. Finally I took them to yards—the fattest hogs you've ever seen. They paid me $6.15 per hundred pounds. That was just enough to pay for the skim milk and the transportation. I lost my shirt on that deal.

ONLY EMPTY CANS

I have never been one to oppose Government regulations. Several years ago the Government man told me that I would have to build a new milk house. According to the regulations, it had to be built out of concrete. I went into the city and hired a union bricklayer. I worked with him every day—in fact, I worked much harder and longer than he did, because my day starts at 5 a. m. and I am never finished until about 8 p. m. The result was that my milk house cost me about $200. The only thing in that milk house now is a bunch of empty cans.

Most city people who talk to us farmers seem to think that we're rolling in clover. One man asked me why I didn't get the bank to lend me $2,000 to put me back into the business. Frankly, I don't think I'd ever get the $2,000 back. The reason is simply that things cost too much—that is, everything but the things I sell. For instance, you can't get a farm hand now for less than $50 to $60 a month, plus his keep, of course. I did my thrashing this year with a couple of 15-year-old boys. They were worth $1 a day, but I had to pay them $1.75.

Now, I don't want you to misunderstand me. I know that I am a farmer, and I know that my place is on the farm. I don't want to go into the city to work, but I'll have to. I have to eat, just like anybody else. If I can't eat and pay my bills working the earth, then I'll go into the city and work in a defense plant. You say that's bad, because my farm is also a defense plant. I agree with you, but I'm dern quick to add that there's no boom on my farm.

If you say that my present tough luck is just temporary, I'll agree with you on that in general principle, but that's all. I have been having tough luck now for 4 or 5 years, and I just can't take it any more. There was a day—for instance, back in 1927 when I cleared $1,000 out of this farm. That was money in the bank. In addition to that I bought about $1,200 worth of new equipment and paid cash for all of it. In that year housewives could buy a quart of milk for 13 cents. I was getting $3.45 a hundredweight for my milk. Now the housewife still pays 13 cents for her bottled milk, but my milk checks show that I'm not getting much more than a $2 blend price for the milk I sell.

NOT MAKING MONEY

During the past few years they've made the business of buying and selling milk so complicated that most farmers can't understand it. All we know is that we're not making money and that we can't continue under this present set-up. I don't know if the Government, the dealers, the cooperative milk associations, or us farmers are to blame. Some say the consumers have brought this situation about because they won't pay a decent price for the things they eat. No matter who's to blame, I think something should be done about it right quick.

Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1941

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, September 17 is Constitution Day. We celebrate the signing of our Constitution in Philadelphia 154 years ago by the Delegates who had labored through the sultry summer of 1787. Today we have the oldest constitutional government on earth. In a time of world-wide war and revolution, our Constitution is once more on trial. Our celebration this year should be more than a perfunctory ceremony. We should study what our Constitution means to us and determine how to preserve it.

Our Constitution was a part of the American Revolution. The Declaration of Independence was not only an announcement of the freedom of the North American colonies from British rule, but a declaration of the inherent freedom of all men from interference of all government with life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This is why it was of eternal and universal significance. The American Constitution furnished the machinery by which these freedoms were assured to the American people.

A constitution is—what constitutes a government—the way it works. We are all familiar with the broad provisions of our Constitution; an executive, a legislative body, and a judiciary all with limited powers; a Congress consisting of a Senate and a House of Representatives, so that large and small States may have fair representation. The powers of the central government over the States are limited.

We have a Bill of Rights guaranteeing the fundamental freedoms of individual citizens against all branches of their government.

We speak of the Constitution as the bulwark of our liberties. We must remember that it does not operate in a vacuum or in general. It either affects individual men in their daily lives or it is of no effect at all. It gives individual men who are temporarily holding public office power to do things that they could not do without the Constitution. It puts limits upon the activities of men who temporarily hold public office which would not exist without the Constitution. It gives the individual citizen certain rights and certain duties which otherwise he would not have.

THE REAL CONSTITUTION

The parchment bearing the words of the original Constitution with the original signatures of the men who made it rests in a beautiful shrine in the Library of Congress in Washington. No American can look upon it without deep feelings of awe and reverence. The real Constitution of our country, however, is either impressed in the minds of our citizens and

guides and controls and limits what we do, or else it is not a constitution at all, because only in this way does it "constitute" our Government and our way of life. It is either alive or it is dead. It is not enough that we should know the provisions of the Constitution and give them lip service. We must not only have it, we must not only know it, but it must guide and control the activities of those among us who are in temporary positions of power in order to serve the individual citizen.

OUR CONSTITUTION NOT AN INVENTION

We think of our Constitution as an invention of the founding fathers, but no single provision of it was new to the Revolutionary veterans who labored to form a more perfect union. They simply combined principles which had been tested by their own experience in local government, colonial government, continental government. The perfect combination was new; the elements which composed it were old.

OUR CONSTITUTION APPLIES IN EMERGENCIES

We are sometimes told that our old "horse and buggy" Constitution was not intended to apply in emergencies. We should never forget what Chief Justice Hughes pointed out, that our Constitution was evolved in an emergency with the very purpose of controlling, guiding, and limiting our Government and our citizens in emergencies.

OUR CONSTITUTION MAKES REVOLUTION UNNECESSARY

The Constitution was formed in a revolutionary era by men who understood revolutions, who knew what made revolutions come and the terrible cost of revolutions. Therefore they provided, not a rigid code, but a broad set of basic principles which had been tested by experience so that changes in the details of government could take place within the framework of the Constitution. They provided machinery for amending it, so that there would be no reason for violent revolution in order to make necessary changes in our form of government. Twenty-one times the people have changed their Constitution by amendment. The people have no reason for revolution in our country in order to change their government.

The only revolution which will come is a change made in our living Constitution by our Government itself without amendment and without consent of the people.

THE PRESENT CRISIS

We face such a danger now. Our President is exercising war powers which he does not have under our Constitution, which are without precedent in our history and in conflict with recent acts of Congress.

WAR POWERS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

What does our Constitution say about war, acts of war, acts leading toward war?

Article II, section 8, says:

The Congress shall have power * * * to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations; to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water; to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years; to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions.

These are the powers given to Congress.

What are the Presidential powers regarding war: Article III, section 2, provides:

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.

That is all.

The framers of the Constitution knew about war. Most of them were war veterans. Eighteen of them had been officers in the Continental Army. Forty-six of them had been legislators; 16 were Governors or presidents of States. They knew about the military and legislative and executive problems involved in war as soldiers and as civilians. They knew that for carrying on a war, for directing the actual fighting, there should be one single head, a combination President and Commander in Chief. They also knew that no single individual, wise as he might be, should have the power to decide when or under what circumstances we should fight or do things that lead to fighting. George Washington, their great commander in chief, the man they knew would be first President, was present and yet with his advice and consent, they gave not to the President, but to the Congress, the power to define and punish piracies and offenses against the laws of nations, to declare war, to make rules governing the land and naval forces, to repel invasions.

In the Constitutional Convention, when someone suggested that the war-making power be given the President, Elbridge Gerry said he "never expected to hear, in a republic, a motion to empower the Executive alone to make war."

Today, 154 years later, the Executive alone is making war. Is this still a republic?

NO PRECEDENT FOR PRESIDENT'S ACTION

President Roosevelt, in announcing his "shoot-on-sight" order to the Navy, said: "This situation is not new" and "My obligation as President is historic."

He based this on our naval action against the French under President Adams and against the Barbary pirates under President Jefferson.

Neither of these justifies the President's action. Both were fully authorized by Congress. Both were wars, for Congress can exercise its war powers without formally declaring war.

In 1798 Congress passed a whole series of acts creating our Navy, building up our Army, mentioning the Republic of France by name, and on July 9 passed an act specifically authorizing the President to "subdue, seize, and take" French armed vessels.

Our Supreme Court held that this was war. Chief Justice John Marshall held this in the case of *Talbot* v. *Seeman* (1 Cranch 28), stating:

The whole powers of war being, by the Constitution of the United States, vested in Congress, the acts of that body can alone be resorted to as our guides in this inquiry.

In another case, deciding that our action against France was war, Justice Chase said (*Bas* v. *Tingy*, 4 Dallas, 35):

Congress is empowered to declare a general war, or Congress may wage a limited war; limited in place, in objects, and in time.

Justice Washington said:

Every contention by force between two nations in external matters, under the authority of their respective governments, is not only war, but public war.

On February 6, 1802, Congress passed an act specifically providing:

It shall be lawful for the President to instruct our Navy "to subdue, seize, and make prize of" vessels of Tripoli, on the coast of Barbary.

Both of these wars were to protect our peaceful commerce. Neither was to protect arms going to a belligerent in American-owned ships, in spite of a neutrality law recently enacted, which forbids American vessels to go to belligerent states, and forbids American citizens to travel on belligerent vessels or through combat areas. The lease-lend bill did not provide for "maintaining intact * * * our line of supply of material to the enemies of Hitler"; instead the lease-lend bill not only specifically provided that it did not authorize convoying, but the word "transfer," as applied to lease-lend materials, was stricken from the bill before it was enacted, to make clear the intent of Congress that we were not agreeing to maintain a line of supply.

THE ISSUE

The gravest threat to our constitutional government today comes not from without but from within and not from below but from above. We are not united on the questions of whether we should fight and when and where. The determination of these questions by Congress in the American way, the constitutional way, will unite us, whatever the decision may be. Our present course of evading the constitutional way of settling these questions is destroying our way of government. We, the people of the United States, in order to insure domestic tranquillity and provide for the common defense must hold fast to the Constitution our forefathers ordained and established.

National Catholic Community Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON F. MACIEJEWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1941

RESOLUTION BY STUDENTS OF NAZARETH ACADEMY, LA GRANGE, ILL.

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

In general assembly the students of Nazareth Academy voted unanimously the following resolution:

"Whereas owing to general world conditions the Congress and the President of the United States deemed it advisable to conscript certain classes of young men into military service; and

"Whereas such conscripts need every spiritual and material support that the civilian population can offer; and

"Whereas in recognition of such need there has been ordered and established an authorized organization known as the United Service Organization, whose responsibility is to afford or supply means of alleviating, insofar as possible, the hardships and inconveniences of conscripted and enlisted men serving in the United States armed services; and

"Whereas one of the officially designated organizations of the United Service Organization is the National Catholic Community Service, whose duty is to take care more especially of the needs of Catholic conscripts and enlisted men: Be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the students of Nazareth Academy, actuated by the highest motives of Christian charity, desire to participate in the meritorious work of the National Catholic Community Service. We therefore pledge our aid and assistance to Rev. William O'Connor, D. D., the duly authorized representative of the National Catholic Community Service, in any and all ways that we may be of service. In doing this we realize we are only doing our patriotic duty, as also performing a distinct service in Catholic action."

VIVIENNE FIALKA,
General Chairman.
GENEVIEVE STALZER,
General Secretary.

LA GRANGE, ILL., *September 12, 1941.*

They're Asking for Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of September 14, 1941:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of September 14, 1941]

THEY'RE ASKING FOR DISASTER

An excellent argument for selective service training and for making the training system permanent in this country comes out of the meeting at Baldwin, Kans., of the Methodist Youth Fellowship, a new organization that aims to enroll 2,000,000 young Methodists between the ages of 15 and 23.

This group starts out by demanding repeal of the Selective Service Act. It wants complete free speech in the Army camps, including the right to agitate for anything the young men think up. It wants conscientious objectors exempt from any kind of service, even that semicivilian training that they can now be given in lieu of direct Army duty.

So here we have youth meeting under the guaranteed freedom of America, saying what it pleases, doing what it pleases, but not willing to turn a hand to aid America in maintaining that freedom. In fact, it wants to make the task of those who are willing to defend America harder by agitating among trainees, among conscientious objectors, and among those who are trying to split the country wide open on foreign policies.

These young people know, they must know, that they are living in a world of aggressor nations where youth is being regimented—the German Nazi phalanx, the Italian Fascist phalanx, the Japanese phalanx—to take away all freedom from young people. And here they undercut the effort of the freest nation on earth to maintain its position. They would break up its Army and send the young men home. Pending that, they would break up the discipline of the Army. In short, their program is to leave America defenseless.

If such movements as this ever succeed, America will be defenseless. And these same misguided young Methodists will be heiling a Hitler. What this country needs as much as anything else is the discipline that selective service gives youth, a discipline and a sense of duty to society that our homes, our schools, and our churches failed to give when we all grew soft and flabby in the lush twenties and whiny in the depression thirties.

Conditions in the Small-Loan Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1941

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, on June 27, 1941, I filed House Resolution 251, which is now pending before the Rules Committee; and in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A3301, under title "The Consumer Credit Loan Condition," it is stated—

That a $15,000,000 loan-shark racket got its start in World War No. 1. If by its intriguish implementing processes of systematic oppression indulged in by the operators in taking advantage of the needy, grew to the unwieldy and unbelievable volume of $2,000,000,000 in such a relatively short time, how long would it be before the same identical operators would be in control of the Nation's credit?

At the time of the statement it was inferentially said that unless some checks were taken and the brakes set, the control would be the natural result of the accretion of interest accumulations.

The loaning agencies fearing that there would be some practical steps taken in the way of investigations and national legislation took the bit in their teeth, and by an apparent sincere looking master stroke of intrigue they are temporarily in control.

You may ask, "How are they in control?"

A man who is the reputed national authority on consumer credit in all of its ramifications, but particularly small loans, has been the virtual dictator of the drafting of the rules on consumer credit regulation and the fixing of the policies of the Federal Reserve Board. In other words, the Board deferred to what they assumed was authority. This authority was the reflected influence of an attorney, admitted by Dr. Nugent, the dean of the attorneys for the licensed loan sharks, as was his father, also admitted by Dr. Nugent, the dean of the attorneys for the earlier loan sharks. For a record of Dr. Nugent's recognition of this attorney's talents one need look no further than his introduction to the attorney's book, Annotations of Small Loan Laws.

No disciple ever spoke with more reverence than does Dr. Nugent; he literally fawns encomiums over this attorney. He is a good attorney, but for whom?

In the light of the facts that are revealed in the following short paper, how does Dr. Nugent reconcile his trusted position in the Federal Government, his position as director of the Remedial Loans Division of the Russell Sage Foundation, his honored degree as a doctor of economics with this attorney's influence that is reflected in the Board's regulations of consumer credit? The attorney's ethics are explained by his interest in the Household Finance Co.

The foregoing is a grave charge, but it and other cumulative events are so overwhelmingly convincing that I feel that it is my duty to be of record.

The States now regulate installment loans. The social theory upon which the States have undertaken this regulation is: That the loans are made to meet the pressing needs of those who, due to their circumstances, are unable to bargain prudently with those that have money to lend. It is upon this theory that small-loan companies are licensed to engage in the business. Originally there were no institutions that would make such loans to the oppressed. To induce reputable capital to engage in the business the rate of interest that a licensee charged was fixed by a compromise between the Russell Sage Foundation and a group of leading loan sharks, at 3½ percent per month on remaining unpaid balances, on amounts of $300 and less. Providing a loan of $100 is paid off in equal monthly installments in 1 year, the cost to the borrower is $22.75.

The ceiling rate of charge in the various States now is from 2½ percent per month, to 3½ percent per month. In many of the States the principal amount to which these rates may apply has been raised to $500. Space does not permit a rate table, but the average gross rate allowed is 3 percent per month, or 36 percent a year.

The law permitting this charge was conceived a generation ago. Conditions were entirely different. There was all told invested in the small-loan business, only $15,000,000, in annual turnover.

Today in which is termed personal-loan companies, that is to say, those that operate under the Uniform Small Loans Act, there is an annual investment turnover of $1,000,000,000. This is exclusive of the billion or so outstanding in the hands of commercial and industrial banks, credit unions, and others. Excluded also is the one hundred and fifty million in the hands of 240-percent loan sharks hereinafter referred to.

This billion-dollar bonanza, with all of its attendant machinations, has been placed under the Federal Reserve Board, including the scheme of systematic oppression perpetrated on between seven

and eight million families, at an average annual cost to them of between three hundred and fifty to four hundred million dollars. It is being demonstrated every day that it can be done at one-tenth of this cost, and still net, to properly supervised and administered agencies, a comfortable margin of profit, and one comparable to other businesses which are clothed with a public interest. An approximate $300,000,000 in defense savings among the most needy is not a small governmental objective.

The perpetrators of this open and notorious financial scandal and scheme to mulct needy borrowers of this excessive sum of money are wolves in sheeps' clothing parading under the banner of reform. Their stock is being sold on the stock exchanges of the Nation; their insidious propaganda is spread upon all the financial pages. They have literally thousands of lobbyists and fixers at work. They employ hundreds of writers to write subtle maudlin sob-sister tales reciting the virtues of the friendly licensed loan companies. Their executives are paid salaries of seventy-five to one hundred twenty-five thousand dollars per year. Their executive offices are moved to Florida during the winter months. Trips across the continent are made by groups of five and six executives by airplane and luxury trains with no more economic restraint than a subway ride. Hotel suites are maintained at daily costs of from twenty-five to one hundred dollars. Long-distance tolls, telegraph, and other expensive communications are employed at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. Inspired surveys by colleges and universities and the publication of books, pamphlets, and reports setting forth half truth and statistical lies manufactured out of whole cloth—all under the guise of helping out the small borrower, but in fact at the expense of the needy borrower.

The Federal Reserve Board has, along with the regulation of installment selling, inherited the condition that surrounds this billion-dollar bonanza.

The Chairman of the Board has announced that it does not essay to reform. It has issued its regulations. A careful analysis of them confirms this statement.

Other than to make some ridiculous exemptions and limit the term on a loan of $1,000 and less to 18 months—which is far too long a term for necessitous small loans as they are being mishandled today—the regulations are innocuous-looking camouflage.

In the light of the oppressive condition that is affecting the economic existence of one-sixth of the population of the Nation's most needy, the express language of the Executive order, the declared policy in the preamble to the regulations, "that the uncontrolled use of credit tends toward inflation," and "in the public interest for defense savings," the statement by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board anent nonreform when applied to the loan business is both shocking and alarming. The power to regulate carries with it the duty to act in the public interest.

Let us get specific now and direct our attention to the treatment of the borrowers who borrow from the national chain loan companies. At the invitation of glaring and deceptive newspaper advertising, blaring radio announcement, and incessant pounding by direct mail, he applies for a loan to meet what to him is a pressing and anxious need. The advertising invited him to borrow any amount from $25 to $500 and repay it the easy way. He applies for a loan of $50. After he has been allowed to sit on the anxious seat long enough to become flexible and pliant, he is given a high-pressure selling grill to borrow $150 or $200. He takes not what he needs but the amount that he is directed to take. An anxious person is a literal slave to the greedy wishes of a money lender.

You may ask why the lender loans the borrower more than he needs. When they first started in the 240-percent loan-shark business the lenders learned that the money lending business is a business of marketing averages and all they needed was a specified number of customers paying them a given amount each month. The plan used in the days before they became legal loan sharks was to loan an amount, that the lender knew the borrower would be unable to repay, usually the amount of the borrower's weekly salary, from fifteen to thirty dollars for a period of 2 weeks or so, and charge him at the rate of 20 percent a month, or $1 for $5, $2 for $10, and so on up. Seldom did they allow a borrower to make a loan over $50. The average time that a borrower stays on the books of lenders doing this type of business is 2 years.

There is approximately $150,000,000 being loaned to borrowers under this plan at the present time. A great portion of it is under the control of lenders that are also lending under the Uniform Small Loans Act, as sponsored by the Russell Sage Foundation.

Pause a moment and consider the borrower who has applied to a licensed loan shark for a loan of $50 for a needy purpose and has been maneuvered into borrowing a sum greatly in excess of that amount in order that the lender can keep his lending business on a profitable basis and thus retain his license to mulct and maintain his position in society as one who is helping out the little fellow. This cruel treatment of these seven or eight million borrowers is implemented by the lenders under the Uniform Small Loans Act, to bring about an economic condition in the borrower's life that renders him easy prey to debt enslavement for a period on the average of 6 years. It is the same old wolf, the small short-term 240-percent lender dressed in sheep's clothing, with his howl ingeniously tuned to resemble the bleat of the lamb.

In passing it is well to observe that a license to engage in a business carries with it the duty to conduct the business on an ethical and fair basis.

During the 6 years that the needy borrower stays on the books of the legal loan sharks, he is what is called by the sharks refunded on the general average every 7 months. "Refunding" means loaned more money, a sufficient amount, not to serve his pressing needs, but one to keep the average individual loan balance of the loan office at a figure that will be profitable to the lender. You may ask how this can be done; it is a simple problem when one observes that the borrower was loaned an excessive amount in the first place in order to weaken his future condition. Again it is made more simple due to the fact that the lenders agree among themselves that they will allow from two to four separate and distinct loans to any borrower. Such agreements have the dual effect of weakening the borrower as a result of which the wily and wealthy lenders pay off all the others and hold the borrower in bondage much longer. It is by these and many other confidence schemes that the individual loan balance average is kept to a figure of great profit.

There is a definite pattern upon which to calculate what this great gross profit is. A local Washington, D. C., bank, engaged in the small-loan business, with a volume running into the millions of dollars, has a cost per customer per month of 70 cents. A large western bank doing a State-wide small-loan business has a monthly cost per customer of approximately 55 cents. These costs include imputed interest, loss reserve, supervision, executive salaries, rent and all other items of expense that are attendant to operating a legal small-loan business on a moral basis. The western bank charges the borrowers at the rate of 6 percent per annum on remaining unpaid balances. The Washington bank charges a slightly higher rate, that on the average is 8 percent per annum.

A comparison of the per dollar cost between the banks' gross costs per month per customer reveals that the legal loan sharks are making several hundred percent monthly profit.

To simplify the calculation we shall choose a $150 marginal-loan balance that a borrower is kept owing to a legal loan shark year in and year out. If the rate is 3½ percent per month on remaining balances, as it is in Virginia and Maryland, the borrower pays $5.25 a month. Over a period of a year he pays $63. After the first year he has in his possession only $97 and at the end of 6 years he has paid $378 for the use of $97, the money two-thirds of which he had no pressing need. At this point a cogent observation is: That in the States where the gross ceiling rate is cut to 2½ percent per month, the lender simply requires the borrower to borrow a greater amount—and thus keeps his perfidious scheme as profitable as ever; and more enslaving to the needy borrower.

The fact that a system of loan shark operation is costing needy borrowers 700 to 1,000 percent more than the normal cost of handling, is an economic and social monstrosity that cannot be shushed down by the insipid casual remark that conditions are better than they used to be in the old days.

The only loan-shark condition that this Nation has ever had—and the one that is so patently un-American today has been brought about by the knavish intrigue of the wolves in sheep's clothing, now in control of the billion-dollar loan-shark racket.

Banks, credit unions, nor any reputable lenders will not and cannot compete with these immoral and unsound practices. These institutions follow a policy, that

loans must be conservative. Hence they loan less than the borrower thinks he needs.

By their omission to take affirmative remedial action the Federal Reserve Board's regulations impliedly ratify the foregoing conditions.

This condition is known to Congress as it has been spread upon the pages of the RECORD. Likewise, it is known to others holding responsible positions, as those in agencies regulating inflation. The social and economic need for business enterprises that justly serve needy borrowers is essential to the public welfare.

Such a criticism and charge as the foregoing calls for constructive suggestions as to a remedy; it is as follows:

A relentless and vigorous congressional fact-finding committee, the cost of which would be nominal in comparison to what would be recovered in funds heretofore erroneously exempted from taxation.

Why Not Let the Rich Pay It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of September 14, 1941:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of September 14, 1941]

WHY NOT LET THE RICH PAY IT?

Some of the tables presented to the House Ways and Means Committee in its hearings of the revenue bill are worthy of general attention. Among these is the table showing the distribution of income to families and single individuals in 1935–36.

This table shows that 17 percent of American families and single individuals in that year had gross individual incomes of less than $250. It shows that 31 percent had incomes of less than $750 and that 59 percent had incomes of less than $1,250. In fact, less than 5 percent had incomes in excess of $3,500 and less than 1 percent had incomes in excess of $10,000. Only 87 families and individuals out of the country's 39,458,300 had incomes in excess of $1,000,000.

These figures indicate clearly enough why it is impossible for the Government to sustain its activities only by high taxes on the wealthy—there just are not enough of the wealthy to begin to foot the bills, even though every cent of their income were taken from them.

The table shows that, if every cent of income of all persons having more than $100,000 a year were taken, only a billion dollars would be realized. If all the income of persons having more than $50,000 a year were taken, the yield would be only two billions. We would have to confiscate all income above $6,000 to get ten billions. To meet this fiscal year's expenditures of some nineteen billions we would have to confiscate all income above $2,800.

The fact is that there are so many persons of small income that the total income of these persons is enormous. More than 50 percent of total earnings of people of the country go to persons and families with incomes of less than $2,000. Eighty percent of the total income is in the hands of those getting less than $5,000 each. It is thus obvious that, no matter how heavily we tax the top, a considerable part of tax income must come from those earning less than $5,000. The total income of those getting less than $250 a year in cash is almost double the income received by those having annual resources of more than $1,000,000 each. The reason is that in the first category there are 2,123,534 families and individuals, while in the second there are only 87.

Liberty—Equality—Fraternity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

ADDRESS BY NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the request of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], who are absent, an address entitled "Liberty—Equality—Fraternity," delivered by Nicholas Murray Butler at the Parrish Memorial Art Museum, Southampton, Long Island, August 31, 1941. I have obtained an estimate of the cost of printing the address. The estimate is $135.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What has happened? This question is being pressed throughout the world by a startled and perplexed generation. It is asked not only by philosophers and intellectual leaders but by millions of men and women of every sort and type who are not scholars and who make no claim to scholarship. It is being asked in every land. Interest in this question is profound, alike in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, and in the Americas.

It was no less an authority than Gibbon who said of Tacitus that he was the first of historians who applied the science of philosophy to the study of facts.[1] The time has come to do whatever may lie in our power to learn the lessons taught by Tacitus and by Gibbon. The one outstanding philosopher in the world of today, the Italian Benedetto Croce, has just now published a volume of absorbing interest which offers the best possible approach to an understanding of what is really going on in this twentieth-century world.[2] A reading of this remarkable book will go far toward giving to men and women of today an insight into the forces which are at work in the world and a comprehension of their significance and of how, if at all, they may be controlled.

The shock of these happenings has been so great that vast numbers have been stunned by it. What they had supposed to be well-founded faith in controlling principles of thought and of morals, of social, of economic, and of political organization is treated with disdain and contempt. The rule of reason has been displaced by that of cruel and merciless brute force, while the precepts of morals and the ideals of religious faith are disregarded entirely. The great religions of the world are despised and assailed for the reason that they, each and all, call for faith in a God, an overruling Providence, who does not happen to come under the jurisdiction of any present-day despot but must, if He exists at all, be that despot's rival and competitor. Moreover, the ruling agency of these relentless despots is irrational and violent emotion. It uses as its battle-cry: "We do not know where we are going—come along!" It has been clever enough to take possession of ardent and ambitious youth by its absolute control of the schools and the process of education and by the elimination of a score of the world's historic universities with that freedom of thought and of expression which is now more than 200 years old. By powerful and most ingenious military organization and equipment these new animal forces have conquered one civilized and free people after another. These conquered peoples, being deprived of the instruments of war and of the capacity to produce them, are helpless to resist the armed forces which serve not only as their police but as their rulers, both local and national. In short, we are learning how easy it may be to conquer and to rule the world if religion and morals are thrown to the winds and if the whole of the world's instrumentalities in the making and use of armed force are confined to the governments of the ruling despots.

Had it been predicted that the rapid development of liberal thought and policy which became so obvious in the seventeenth century, which reached its age of enlightenment in the eighteenth and which could record the achievements of the English, the American, and the French revolutions, would be followed in another century or two by the appalling reaction which now everywhere confronts us, the prophet would have found himself without believers and without honor in his own country. Of all the manifestations of this reaction, none has been more startling or more ominous than the formal renunciation and denunciation of that truly great motto, Liberté Égalité Fraternité, by those who for the time being are in position to speak for the French people. One might think that it would have seemed sufficient to offer new interpretation to these words, but to disavow them completely and to have them removed from the hundreds of public buildings on which they had so long been carved, simply passes comprehension. Incidentally, it reveals an obvious lack of a sense of humor.

What is it which has made possible and caused these literally preposterous acts? The only answer can be that they are the result of acceptance, willing or unwilling, of a doctrine of social organization which would substitute permanent class groups and distinctions for that form of free and orderly social, economic, and political organization which represents and reflects the spirit and the ideals of a true liberalism. Since it is plainly impossible to go back, either in France or elsewhere, to a ruling class of landowners or inherited nobility, this can only mean the intention to set up by force a state of fixed and permanent economic, social, and political classes to displace a state of free men to whom every opportunity for improvement, for distinction and for service would be open. It is grotesque to call this a new order. In all essentials it is one of the oldest orders that human history records. This indicates, once more, how important it is for

[1] Gibbon, Edward—History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. London: Methuen & Co., 1896. Vol. I, p. 121.

[2] Croce, Benedetto—History as the Story of Liberty. New York: Norton & Co., 1941.

those who would guide their fellow men, to be in possession both of a map and a compass.

In their present form these doctrines reflect and would apply the teachings which were pressed upon the world nearly a century ago by Karl Marx and the group of which he was a ruling member. One has only to read the story of the life of Marx at Cologne, in Paris, in Brussels, and in London to see to how great an extent what he said and wrote was the outcome of that spirit of envy, hatred, and malice by which he was surrounded throughout his life. Indeed, all attempts and plans to suppress or to limit individual accomplishment on other than moral grounds have this same foundation. It may be communism, it may be nazi-ism, or it may be the less extreme fascism, but each and all reflect and embody that spirit of envy which is the unworthy result of observing the rise in the world of others than one's self.

Of course, these attempts at restriction, compulsion, and despotism are all advanced on grounds of public interest and public advantage. It is the common man, so-called, the ordinary man, who is to be protected by them. The fact is, however, that what is being attempted would have just the opposite effect. It would sentence the individual, however talented, however ambitious, or however competent, to remain in the group or class into which he was born. It would stop all true progress and substitute mechanical mass production for individual originality, achievement, and high human service.

It is moral principles and moral ideals, and those alone, by which an individual's work in the world should be limited. Any limitation imposed by sheer force without regard to moral principles is reactionary in the extreme, as well as destructive of all excellence. Instead of being in the interest of the great mass of the people, it is distinctly and violently against that interest. It would destroy the very foundations upon which free institutions rest and would substitute some one of the many forms of despotism for that free government through public opinion which we have come to know as democracy. Under such a system of social, economic, and political organization and government liberty, equality, and fraternity would all disappear. When Voltaire wrote that "It is inevitable that mankind should be divided into two classes, with many subdivisions—the oppressors and the oppressed," he turned his back upon the rule of moral principle and assumed a world where selfishness and force alone were in control.

Croce points out that the German philosopher Hegel was the author of the famous statement that history is the history of liberty.[2] The story is a long and fascinating one, since it reveals the power of the wish for liberty and the skill with which, in one form or another, the rule of liberty was strengthened through the centuries. It makes it plain that, as was said by Montesquieu, "Liberty does not consist in doing what one pleases * * * Liberty can only consist in being able to do what one ought to do." This great struggle reached its victorious climax as the eighteenth century drew to its close, when the people of what was to become the United States of America formulated the Bill of Rights and incorporated it in the newly adopted Federal Constitution, and when shortly thereafter the French people, acting through their Constituent Assembly at Versailles in 1789, drew up as their guiding principles the Declaration of the Rights of Man. The English people had begun still earlier, although with less formality, to write modern history in this field of thought and action.

Today probably no word, unless it be "democracy," is used so carelessly and often with so little understanding as the word "liberty." It is fundamental that liberty is not a grant by government, but that government is a delegation of power by people who have liberty, and that this government must always be subject to their control. It is the chief business of a free people, and their greatest responsibility, to see to it that the government which they have set up does not, under one pretense or another, invade the reserved field of liberty and restrict it in a manner which the free people themselves have never authorized or contemplated. In a democracy the state and government are wholly distinct. The state is the field of reserved liberty plus the field of government. State and government can only be identical when liberty has wholly disappeared. The constant struggle of those who are, consciously or unconsciously, enemies of liberty is to increase, even to multiply, the function and authority of government. Education, on the other hand, is the instrumentality by which the people are to be taught and trained to use so wisely their opportunities in the field of liberty that the public interest is constantly carried forward constructively and helpfully, without inviting or permitting government to invade the field of reserved liberty. The notion that all governments in what we call democracies are truly representative of the whole people and that their every act is to be accepted by the people without discussion is most unreasonable. Theoretically, in a democratically organized state, government represents the will of the majority of the people, but, in fact, as very little study of election statistics will show, what government too often represents is really the influence of small, well-organized, persistent and frequently self-seeking minority groups. The political history of the American people abounds in illustrations of this fact. Some of them are familiar, but many of them, having taken place beneath the surface, have been known but to the few. Actually, in our Federal system of government the one and only representative of the whole people and the only one chosen by them is the President of the United States. Senators chosen from and by the several States and Representatives in Congress chosen from and by the various congressional districts are in many cases brought forward by very small but stubborn and ambitious groups and carried through to election by a vote of only some 10 percent to 30 percent of the entire possible vote of the State or district which they then claim to represent. This is one reason why calm, dispassionate, and nonpartisan consideration of problems of outstanding public interest and importance is so often impossible, since the attention of members of the Federal Legislature is almost wholly fixed on those matters which are urged upon them persistently—and often with threats—by highly organized and self-seeking minorities. It is this habit which throws light on what Jefferson called the morbid rage of debate.

The chief problem which confronts the lover of liberty is the preservation of that liberty. It faces two dangers—on the one hand, regimentation and despotism, and on the other hand, license. Free men have long since drawn a clear line between liberty and license. It was Burke who asked, "What is liberty without wisdom and without virtue? It is the greatest of all possible evils." What he meant was that without those two limitations liberty becomes license.

The Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Commandments which Moses brought down from Mount Sinai were written into the moral law and then into the statute law of one people after another. Violation of any one of these four commandments is not an act of liberty, but of license, and this violation has long since been made a crime, punishable as such. There are many other misuses of liberty which have not risen to the height of being defined as criminal, but which are unreasonable, improper, and even dangerous acts of license.

The line between liberty and license can never be drawn with mathematical accuracy, but the wise man instinctively knows where that line is. Unbalanced and confused imaginations lose sight of any distinction whatever between liberty and license. There are organizations for the defense of civil liberty whose energies and exhortations are often directed to the defense of what are plainly uncivil liberties, namely, license. Those who are victims of such states of mind become not only a public nuisance, but often a public danger. Moreover, they bring about undeserved criticisms of liberty itself, and are pointed to by those who prefer despotism as evidence of the folly of trying to establish and preserve liberty for mankind in general. Probably liberty has no more powerful enemy than license. Men are often deceived by what is license, when they would be quick to understand and to resent an attack on liberty by despotism. In the present-day economic organization of the world, it is of vital importance that the free man preserve his freedom, both from invasion by government under the guise of advancing the public interest and from undermining by license with all its dangers. The words of Madame Roland still echo across the years, "O liberty! how many crimes are committed in thy name!"

The fundamental liberties of the individual are those defined in our own national Bill of Rights. They are freedom of religion, freedom of speech and of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom to petition the Government for a redress of grievances, and those other forms of freedom which are defined in the first 10 amendments to the Federal Constitution. When that Constitution was under consideration, the opinion was expressed by many that the primary principles of civil liberty might well be taken for granted and need not be written into the new Constitution. The years which have followed afford abundant proof of the wisdom of those founding fathers who would take nothing of this kind for granted, but who insisted that a definition of the fundamental rights of the citizen be formally incorporated in the Constitution. Had this not been done, the history of the American people would have been very different from that which it now is. We have this clear-cut, fortunate, and philosophically sound definition of our liberty, and it is our highest duty to see to it that that liberty be preserved and protected and not weakened, undermined, or lost by careless indifference to attacks upon it, often well disguised and highly mischievous, from within. This means everything, not only to the people of the United States, but to the whole world of tomorrow.

Fundamentally, equality means the equality of all in respect to civil, economic, and political rights and equality before the law. It does not mean, and could not possibly mean, equality of individual ability, of individual capacity for achievement or in value of individual service to one's fellow men. Considerations of physical strength and health, of mental inheritance and equipment, and of environment, from all of which difference of opportunity arises, make such equality wholly impossible. No two individuals are ever exactly alike, and unless they were exactly alike, they could not possibly be equal in this mechanical sense. We see something which approaches mechanical equality among those confined in prison or those compelled to work either with hands or with brain under conditions rigorously imposed by a dominant power. Among a people which enjoys liberty, equality quickly reveals itself by the rise to positions and opportunities of steadily increasing importance

[2] Op. cit. p. 59.

of those men and women who exhibit exceptional ability and capacity for achievement. In the industrial history of the American people there are illustrations without number of the capacity of the individual, given his opportunity, to rise to positions of high administrative power and responsibility solely by use of that equality of opportunity which our free institutions offer to him. Of those who are at the present time the chief administrative officers of 12 of our greatest railway systems, 5 began their service as clerks, 2 as office boys, and 1 each as fireman and engineman, as track laborer, as stenographer, as telegraph operator, and as rodman. This record tells its own story of the opportunity which is open to excellence. Many other similar instances could be found by an examination of our industrial and commercial organizations.

All those schemes of social, economic, and political organization which would mechanically impose equality of service, of reward and of opportunity upon all, would invent a kind of equality wholly out of consonance with liberty. If that sort of equality is to come first, then there will be no liberty. The right to work, to earn and to save, and to use one's savings to increase production and to meet human needs, is fundamental to democracy. This right cannot be limited by any doctrine of permanent social and economic classes which are engaged in perpetual struggle for gain at each other's expense. Nor can it be limited by enforced membership in any group or organization—religious, political, social, economic, or industrial. Any such enforced limitation is not only undemocratic but it is antidemocratic. It is only equality based upon liberty, and which is liberty's companion, that is real and which can carry civilization forward, generation after generation, through the efforts and the leadership of the most competent.

It is many years since I first had occasion to point out in a public address that a chief business of democracy is to produce its own aristocracy. That is the way in which democracy discovers those who are most competent to render it important and responsible service. It does this through the establishment of equality of opportunity in the field of liberty. This democratic aristocracy will not be one based upon birth or inheritance. It will not be one based upon wealth or artificial advantage or upon that type of advantage which is known as privilege, but it will be one based only upon ability and capacity for achievement. That democracy will be most secure and most likely to last which can and does produce this aristocracy of its own and is guided by it.

Today the democracies, including our own, are subject to grave and in many ways deserved criticism because of the fact that they so often allow differences of opinion on minor matters and the passion for long-continued debate to postpone action at a time when their own prosperity, and indeed their own safety, depend upon their acceptance and support of a sound public policy adjusted to the needs of the moment. It is this characteristic, so often revealed in the recent history of the British, the French, and the American democracies, which has led to the taunts, the cynicism, and the sneers directed at them by the world's present-day despots and their groups of blindly devoted followers. It is for a democracy quickly to make it plain that it can be and is an efficient form of government, and that neither liberty nor equality need be or will be weakened or sacrificed in order to attain efficiency of the highest order. We Americans can learn much from a study of the world's history during the past 30 years, as well as from a study of the problems which faced Abraham Lincoln and of those which face the President of the United States today. Quick and wise efficiency is the secret of their fortunate solution. One of Woodrow Wilson's wisest remarks was that "the highest and best form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people."

Given liberty and equality, there remains fraternity. That is a state of mind and of conduct which is the outgrowth of liberty and equality working successfully together to guide an orderly, a progressive, and a liberal society. Fraternity reveals itself in those hundred and one acts of kindly thoughtfulness and care which are in so large a degree characteristic of present-day America. It is the spirit of fraternity which leads to great benefactions, made in the public interest by those who by reason of ability or good fortune have honestly acquired large wealth. Those who are really moved and guided by the fraternal spirit do not keep these vast fortunes for the members of their immediate families, but they bestow them in the public interest upon those institutions and undertakings which represent and reflect the fraternal spirit at its best. These are colleges and universities. They are hospital and art museums. They are undertakings in the field of music and the fine arts. They are institutions to promote scientific discovery and application of new knowledge to the wants and needs of man. They are institutions for the care and guidance of the dependent and of those who by reason of personal deficiency or disease are unable to care for themselves. Were there no fraternal spirit, all such helpless individuals would be told to care for themselves, and if they could not do so, to pass out of existence and let Nature take its course. That is the barbaric but not the civilized method of dealing with one's fellow men.

What is called capital is civilization's greatest achievement. Capital is what has been gained by work. It is earnings and savings used to increase future production and to cooperate with others in multiplying that production. The mother of Karl Marx was a very wise woman, for she wrote: "If Karl had made a lot of capital instead of writing a lot about capital, it would have been much better."[4] If one will read the story of the life of Andrew Carnegie and of John D. Rockefeller and see how, as unprecedented success attended their life work, they had in mind from the very beginning the service of their fellow men through the use of the fortunes, however large, which they might acquire, he will see the working at its best of what is contemptuously called the capitalistic system. Both liberty and equality would be far less efficient and far less deserving of enthusiastic and devoted support were they not accompanied by fraternity. It is fraternity which learns the lessons that liberty and equality have to teach and that characterizes a social order made up of civilized human beings who will not willingly let their fellow men suffer or be in want.

Where, then, could we find for the guidance of tomorrow a motto more abundant in promise and more sound in principle than Liberty Equality Fraternity? To think that after receiving for a century and a half the approval and the applause of civilized men, this noble motto is now attacked and even ridiculed is the best possible evidence of the backward character of the world-wide revolution which is under way and which has, for the time being, conquered France. If men were really civilized and if their word, formally and authoritatively given, could be depended upon, this backward revolution might have been much more speedily met and checked. It is only thirteen years since the governments of almost every nation in the world united with their fellow governments to renounce war as an instrument of national policy and to proceed to the settlement of international differences and disputes in a spirit of peaceful discussion and judicial determination. The ink was hardly dry upon this great treaty, known as the Pact of Paris, when some of the governments which had signed it began to prepare for war more vigorously than ever before in history. Their men of science were set to the invention and perfection of new instruments for military use. The children in their schools were disciplined and trained not to enjoy and to understand liberty, but to do as they were told, to obey without question and to submit to the emotional guidance of formulas and phrases, every one of which meant war and preparation for war. It was those nations which accepted the Pact of Paris in the spirit in which they signed it that did not engage in these preparations and that, therefore, were the first subject of attack when the new despots undertook to take over the rule of the world for the establishment of their new order. The democracies lagged in military preparation, and they lagged because their peoples believed what their governments had said and were innocent enough to take it for granted that all other signatory powers were honest and faith keeping. Such is the explanation of much which is now going on all about us, of the undermining of national spirit and national unity of purpose by every sort and kind of public enemy, and which has led to the pathetic downfall of France and the literally appalling attack upon Great Britain and its people. This is neither the time nor the place to attempt a forecast of what the immediate future has in store. If, by any fortunate chance, the chief enemies of liberty, equality, and fraternity, which are now carrying on a stupendous military contest between themselves, should wreck and ruin each other, the door would be open to a new era of progress, provided the democracies have the insight, the courage, and the intellectual capacity to take the lead in organizing a truly new world on those principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity which must rule if prosperity and peace are to return and to endure. The federal principle has now established itself in so many forms and over so many different areas that there can be no question but that it will afford the key to the solution of the chief political problems which world organization has to offer. That economic nationalism which has had so much to do with promoting world confusion, world competition, and world war, must give way to that international trade system which great seers like Adam Smith and Richard Cobden, John Bright and Gladstone long ago saw to be as necessary as it is sound. There is no more reason why every independent sovereign nation should supply all of the physical wants of its own people from territory under its own flag than there is that it should supply all of their intellectual wants and needs from men of science, men of letters and intellectual leaders who speak that language and who owe that allegiance. Ideas go about the world with instant speed and without obstruction. Why should not men's economic needs be satisfied in like fashion? All that is required to answer this question is high intelligence, insight, courage, and adherence to the motto, Liberty Equality Fraternity.

For the time being the people of France have been compelled, officially at least, to turn their back upon those noble words. They have been flatly told that their system of free, democratic government has broken down and that there is no way by which it can be reestablished. Government by decree, through the agency of definite and fixed economic or social groups or classes, is hailed as the substitute for democracy and its hopeful successor. What is called "this reformation" is to be brought about by selection of the elite from all rungs of the social ladder. This selection, however, is not to be made

[4] Beer, M.—The Life and Writings of Karl Marx. New York: International Publishers, (no date), p. 31.

through equality of opportunity for all, but by the definite act of a higher and controlling power. In other words, "by decree" is to take the place of democratic legislation. Surely, as great a people as the French will not permit so reactionary a condition as this to remain forever. The intellectual history of the French people is so superb that their intellectual life cannot die. It may be for the time being in a state of coma or it may be held in chains, but it will return to its self-control, to its freedom and then, sobered and disciplined by the experiences of this generation, it will write those words "Liberty Equality Fraternity" upon hundreds of walls, this time to remain for ages to come.

The opportunity of world leadership, now offered to the American people, is so unprecedented that our responsibility is too great to be measured in ordinary words. When world leadership was with Greece and then with Rome, civilization, however, magnificent in its intellectual manifestations, was so simple and so undeveloped in the economic and industrial fields that what the Greeks and Romans were able to accomplish was quickly made plain and written into history. Conditions today are not only different, but wholly new. This twentieth-century world of nearly one hundred separate national units has cherished the hope and the belief that each national unit, whether large or small, might be made secure and protected in its national independence by international cooperation, international law, and the judicial settlement of international disputes. The American people have been committed to these principles from the very beginning of their history. They have cherished them, they have hailed them, and time and time again they have given vigorous and emphatic illustration of their faith in them. Unless the small national group can be protected by its fellow national units, there can be neither liberty nor equality nor fraternity in the national and international life of the world. It is idle to use these words as applicable only to individual life and thought and conduct. They must also be applicable to national policy and to international life and thought and conduct. If the American people can lead the thought of the world to turn its back upon any system of social, economic, or political organization which rests upon fixed and definite classes or groups with a resulting spirit of class consciousness, then indeed will the door be open to the progress of a truly liberal philosophy of life and of government. The call of today and tomorrow is to the people of the United States. Will they hear that call? And will they answer it in the spirit of their great forefathers—of Washington and of Franklin, of Hamilton and of Jefferson, of Madison and of Marshall, of Webster and of Lincoln? If they will, the future peace and prosperity of this now torn and broken world will be as secure as human thought and human power can make it.

Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

ADDRESS BY PAUL GARRETT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, on August 14 I requested unanimous consent, which was granted, to place in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an interesting and illuminating address by Paul Garrett, vice president and director of public relations of the General Motors Corporation, dealing with the part played by advertising in the development of our American formula. It is an address well worth perusal and study by everyone interested in the preparation and publication of the printed word. It was delivered as the keynote address at the Advertising Federation of America convention at Boston, Mass., on May 26, 1941. Mr. Garrett is chairman of the board of this organization.

I have learned from the Government Printing Office that printing this material in the RECORD will exceed the amount of space allotted, that being two pages. I was at the same time advised by the Government Printing Office that the address will occupy two and one-third pages of the RECORD, and will cost $105. I now resubmit my request, and ask unanimous consent that this very excellent address be published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVERTISING—AN INTEGRAL PART OF OUR AMERICAN FORMULA

(By Paul Garrett, vice president and director of public relations, General Motors Corporation)

I would like to feel that in keynoting this convention I have the honor to voice a philosophy of advertising that reflects the beliefs and hopes of a far vaster audience than is here present.

I do not know how many men and women in this country live by work in this great field. They make up a large group. But I desire to go beyond them. For, more than ever the things that concern us in this convention are of concern to the whole people. The future of all depends upon what is done in 1941, and in the years ahead, to groove a course that will keep this Nation strong.

The flow of events has forcibly directed our attention to the problem of defense. To stimulate the flow of materials, to speed the production of mechanized equipment, to apply without stint our energies and skills to the business of defense—these are the vital tasks before us, the urgent responsibility of every individual.

However, our views may vary as to method, all agree we must at any cost make our country and its institutions impregnably secure. The most sacred of these institutions have to do with individual freedoms. The great struggle under way in the world is for the preservation of these. Freedoms which over centuries men fought to acquire now have been brought into peril. These freedoms have been the bulwark of our American way of life. Freedom to think. Freedom to speak. Freedom to worship. Freedom to achieve. And, present as a result of all these, freedom of individual initiative—the opportunity for every individual inspired by some worthy incentive to work out his own destiny.

ADVERTISERS HAVE PARALLEL RESPONSIBILITY

Every man and woman in this room is eager to help. On the shoulders of industry falls a heavy part of the defense job. But on the shoulders of advertisers falls a parallel responsibility. I would like to explore with you some of the ways we may make a contribution.

But what specifically can the advertiser do? All sorts of questions come up. Is advertising needless effort in case the demand for goods exceeds the supply? Is advertising at a time like the present patriotic? Should consumer demand at a time like this be stimulated? Should advertising be cut in the interests of economy? Should advertising be prepared by the same formula as before? To what extent should copy be themed to the emergency? What are the obligations of advertising today and tomorrow?

The history of America is the history of stout and serviceable men. Everything accomplished here traces back to some individual who, possessing the freedom to do so, was spurred on to initiate something new. It is this opportunity for man to pioneer his way up that we have always fought for. It is basic in our character to keep man free to do what he wants.

In our own case these freedoms have found important expression in the development of things that make for a full life. I do not need to enumerate all of the cultural and spiritual benefits. I would like to enumerate a few of the material benefits. It is an appropriate occasion to examine them in relation to their source, for they have set America apart. They support the broad foundations upon which our institutions rest. They result from the freedom of men in this country to create new projects as nowhere else in the world.

Look back not many years ago to a time when we had no radios, no electrical household appliances, no automobiles, no moving pictures, no plastics, no wireless communication, no telephones, no electric refrigerators, no air-conditioning, no rayon, no incandescent lamps, no canned foods, no bathtubs, no air travel, and no streamliners.

IT IS NO ORTHODOX CONCEPT

We cite these things commonly as products of mass production. And so they are. But who would say they have come to be necessities of American life solely because we learned earlier than the rest of the world the art of mass production? Of what value would mass production be without mass consumption? How could we stimulate mass consumption without mass merchandising? And how could we have mass merchandising without mass advertising?

You and I have been remiss in failing to establish in the public mind a clear knowledge of the part advertising plays in this peculiarly American mass-production formula. It is no orthodox concept, but I would like to see more widely understood the fact that advertising basically is a vital part of our economy, equally important with designing, engineering, and production.

PRODUCTS MUST GO TO MARKET

People understand the elemental forms of merchandising. One of the earliest bits of homely wisdom was "not to buy a pig in a poke." People like to window-shop—and, certainly, window displays are one form of selling. They like to see goods offered for their choice on counters in a retail store. You could not run a modern drug store without observing this simple principle of selling. They like to look at a mail-order catalog—which does with paper and printer's ink what the retail store does with counters.

But when it comes to advertising—which is simply a time-saving and money-saving method of putting show windows or counters or catalogs before thousands and millions—they question whether it is economic. What people have consistently failed to understand is something pointed out by Prof. F. W. Taussig in one of his books on economics, which is that production is not complete until goods come to market. Unless they get to market production is futile.

Failure to understand the importance of distribution has cropped up many times in history. During the first years of the Russian revolution the distributors of goods—salesmen, jobbers, and retailers—were pretty thoroughly liquidated. According to the phi-

losophy of Karl Marx, as interpreted by Lenin, these middlemen were exploiters, taking their cut of the wealth produced by labor.

But it was found too late that some machinery of distribution was essential, so the Soviet state had to improvise a system of its own. There is every evidence that the economic cost under this system of distributing goods to consumers has not been reduced. Certainly standards of living as reported from Russia today do not indicate that any Utopia in distribution has been attained. On this same point a recent volume on economics points out: "The Falacy is that produced wealth has the same value when and where it is produced as when and where it is finally exchanged for consumption."

IS PART OF A LARGER PROCESS

Advertising is the use of a controlled message to make more people acquainted with a product, a service, a company. It is the use of a controlled message to spread an idea. The advertiser may register his message through paid space in publications, time on the air, space on boards, presentations through motion pictures or approaches by direct mail. But the essential is that he controls the message. He fixes the direction of its thought. He pays money to give the message position.

Advertising is really a form of public relations. It requires the same careful analysis as any other public approach. It requires more. The very fact that the advertiser can enforce his advertisement upon people makes it doubly important that he shape the approach with the utmost care. We need advertising written with a better understanding of people. Editorial news copy gets publication only when it attains a high standard of projected public acceptance. Should not we in the business impose upon ourselves a sort of advertising editorship to scrutinize our advertising copy to make it ever meet the same rigid tests?

Advertising, then, is an integral part of a larger process. Once the product is created, advertising multiplies its exposure. It opens to the customer new ways of attaining things he wants. Through a fractional charge it saves him dollars in the long run by making possible lower unit production costs.

Theories of planned distribution are built on standardization of the buying habits of people. What more fallacious program could be proposed in the name of progress? American living standards have risen, and the American horizon has lifted precisely for the reason that we have never limited even in our own minds the number of possible things we might secure for ourselves tomorrow.

COMPETITION PLOTECTS FREEDOM OF CHOICE

Freedom of choice in the market place induces that competition which is a source of progress and a protection of the customer's pocketbook. The competitive struggle accompanied by the use of advertising to present ever greater customer benefits than are offered by any competitor becomes an effective means of insuring over the years steadily growing customer satisfaction. Advertising by carrying news of products and services extends to the buyer an ever-widening freedom of choice. And it is this freedom of choice which is so basic an element in our modern economy. Advertising thus is a vital instrument in maintaining open the channels through which products and ideas flow to help create an integrated and self-reliant nation.

I am well aware that in a recent survey of popular attitudes it came out that 69 percent of the people believe advertising increases the cost to them of things they buy. Forty-three percent even believe that a 15-cent package of cigarettes carries an advertising load of 5 to 9 cents or more. You and I know that such a concept of advertising costs is absurd. The cost of advertising a package of cigarettes actually is not 9 cents or even 5 cents. It is not 1 cent. It is a fraction of a cent. But people formulate their opinions about advertising costs not on facts but on what they understand to be facts.

ADVERTISING POLICIES FOLLOW INDUSTRY

Nothing is to be gained by refusing to recognize that advertising has been under attack. It has been labeled as uneconomic, misleading, wasteful. But is it too much to suggest that the case against advertising has largely been built up from specific advertisement rather than from consideration of the principle of advertising as an economic force? This confusion between advertisements and advertising has made it easy to prove a plausible case by citing poor or wasteful advertisements to demonstrate that advertising is wrong. It is like condemning water when a poor swimmer drowns What ought to concern the consuming public is that advertising provides an instrument fundamental to economic growth under the American formula.

Without mass advertising of goods we could never have produced at so small a cost for so many people so many luxuries they have come to regard as necessities. Lacking it what country has done so? It is the integration of mass designing, mass engineering, mass producing, and mass advertising that has created our mass-consuming society.

Looked at soberly, most of the questions asked nowadays about advertising are really not questions that should be directed to the advertiser as such at all. They pertain in a more realistic sense to industry itself. For advertising in the emergency as out of it must follow industry. Policy for business must always determine policy for advertising.

Production is the task of industry, and in the give-and-take of enterprise we have developed a productive capacity surpassing any other. Production today is vital to defense. Unlike the past, war today is a war of materials. It is more than that. It is a war of techniques—techniques of warfare—techniques of living in a wartime world. So people are turning to American industry to meet their very great need in time of crisis.

INDUSTRY MEETS A CHANGING SCENE

Apparently it has taken a defense emergency to impress upon many people their own reliance upon industry. Its functions to some are becoming clear for the first time. The very qualities once criticized are now seen as basic to national strength. It is a matter of significance that industry again stands high in public esteem. It is important that industry so conduct itself as to hold that esteem steadfast.

As defense production takes an increasingly greater share of national effort, the new problems of industry will take an increasingly greater share of advertising thought. In this rapidly changing scene industry needs the guidance of advertising counsel sensitive to public attitudes. Advertising's task of smoothing the way all along the channels of distribution between factory and market will become infinitely more intricate as defense requirements extend the area of dislocation. Many familiar products, familiar packages, accustomed buying habits are likely to become disturbed. Advertising must lead the customer through this labyrinth of change by careful and continuous explanation of whys and wherefores. It is not inconvenience but unexplained inconvenience that will break down public confidence.

DEFENSE WORK WIDELY SPREAD

In the first stages of defense, to get the program under way, it was essential that large initial orders be placed with organizations in a position to take complete responsibility for them. The Government thus could start jobs off quickly and gain the advantage of centralized management skilled in large-scale production in speeding the program to full bloom. The concerns themselves undertook the difficult tasks represented by these big defense contracts in full recognition of a public responsibility. The second stage, which we have already entered upon, permits of a multitude of supplementary contracts of great variety calling for the facilities of thousands of smaller shops and plants throughout the country. But even a big defense contract given for execution to a big company does not mean that the big organization is hogging the work.

Whatever benefits of increased employment there may be in a defense job are diffused far and wide through the usual production procedures. For example, the Allison airplane engine is not made in Indianapolis alone. Its materials, parts, and supplies are drawn from 65 different communities extending from Iowa to Connecticut. All kinds of things from carburetors to cotter pins are made by men who never saw an Allison engine. But each of these men plays in his community just as important a role in defense as the men who man the machines in the great Allison plant itself.

Similarly the G. M. Diesel engines that drive the new Navy boats are not as people suppose solely the product of Cleveland, but involve the work of many men in many places. From 178 different communities spread over 25 States from California to Vermont come parts, materials, and supplies for those engines.

In like manner, an order for a tank or truck or machine gun gets reflected in jobs and materials and services that reach into a thousand communities.

SOUND INTERPRETATION REQUIRED

As a public-relations man I am sorry it is common practice to refer to defense business in terms of dollars. For it is not like other business. The company with which I am associated has been asked to produce defense materials—which is to say Army trucks, machine guns, marine Diesel engines, shells, aviation engines, bomber parts, and many other items of a technical nature—in a volume approaching $800,000,000. But a defense volume of $800,000,000 would be better understood if put another way. Expressed differently this represents roughly 200,000,000 man-hours of work. A man-hour is a man at work for an hour. You cannot put them all to work at once but it multiplies out into enough defense assignments for the company to keep 100,000 men busy a year. And even that does not take into account all of the work of supervising, engineering, designing, and executive employees. Nor does it take into account all of the man-hours going into raw materials, finished and semifinished parts, transportation, and all the rest which would multiply the figure I have given you.

I cite this example to impress upon you that the phases of a company's business expanded by defense work present a very different set of public attitudes with which to reckon than do the phases curtailed by defense work.

This company, for instance, already has announced the suspension of its new model introductions applicable to 1943, work on which would normally begin at this time. In other words, the 1942 models, on which work was started more than a year ago and is now largely completed up to the production stage, will continue through 1943. Furthermore, with respect to the 1942 models shortly going into production, the automobile industry cooperating with the Office of Production Management has already agreed to a cut in production amounting to 1,000,000 units.

Such adjustments occurring in any field put up to the advertiser the problem of meeting a whole new set of questions people will

be asking. Will there be enough products next year to go around? Will they be inferior as a result of substitute materials? What about prices? Profiteering is linked in the public mind to war. Buyers of merchandise become skeptical. Accordingly—whether we wish it or not—product advertising by its implications will convey an institutional impression.

Everywhere defense and nondefense activities are intermingled. They mix and merge. Influences overlap. No clean-cut lines can be drawn. Directly or indirectly our whole industrial structure is coming to be affected by the driving efforts for production. The expression "peacetime goods" becomes a relative term in our economy So closely are the various units of our industrial network tied together that the consequences of every action are telegraphed throughout the whole fabric.

AN INFORMED PUBLIC ESSENTIAL

In explaining the processes of defense advertising performs the task of explaining the processes of industry. That in itself is important. But it does more. It helps build an informed public opinion on defense. This is indispensable to national confidence and cooperation, as witness the consequences of the lack of it in France. We are just beginning through company advertising to develop themes helpful to government to industry, and to labor in working toward greater unity for a strong defense.

And so, like industry, advertising is inseparably linked with certain things worth preserving. Industry and advertising have evolved together over the years. Advertising as we know it does not exist in Germany, Russia, Italy, and other dictator nations. In those countries business has lost its right to interpretation.

BROAD POLICIES ANSWER QUESTIONS

Drawing to a close I submit that the very concept of advertising as an integral part of our American formula suggests by implication the answers to most questions that confront us.

First. Is advertising needless effort in case the demand for goods exceeds the supply?

In answer to this question, posed at the beginning, I say that advertising, even in case the demand for goods exceeds the supply, is not needless but needful effort in the same way that designing, engineering, production, and merchandising are needful. In England they have maintained their advertising of established business institutions as well as of goods and services available to people. Regardless of any momentary position of supply and demand it is important to the economy to maintain the product in public consciousness against a time when the demand may not exceed the supply.

Second. Is advertising at a time like the present patriotic?

I say that advertising at a time like the present is patriotic in the same sense that production, except as it interferes with defense, and merchandising, except as it disrupts the defense flow, are patriotic. It is patriotic unless it is put to an unpatriotic use. You have heard it said we do not want business as usual. No; we need something better and more vigorous than that. We need business as unusual—in lines and places where it does not interfere with defense. How else can we support defense? How else can we bring to bear our full superiority?

Third. Should consumer demand at a time like this be stimulated?

I say that, except in those clear cases where defense would suffer loss of a particular material or service, consumer demand helps defense by strengthening the economy to meet the burdens of defense. No consumer should be stimulated to demand something needed for defense, but production for defense, which comes first always, needs to be backed by a strong people. In an all-out effort for defense a reliant civilian helps the reliant soldier.

PRESERVING THE FUNCTION OF ADVERTISING

Fourth. Should advertising be cut in the interest of economy?

This question springs from the assumption that advertising is an extravagance or an indulgence. I say it should not be cut just because it is advertising. Policy in advertising must follow policy in production and merchandising. As the flow of goods in particular industries is cut, the advertising of those goods will be affected. But the function of advertising must be judiciously preserved as an integral part of the formula upon which our economic strength is based.

Fifth. Should advertising be prepared by the same formula as before?

Advertising should never be prepared by the same formula as before. It needs persistent refinement to keep it sensitive to public impulse. The advertiser to get the desired result must learn to penetrate but not offend a defense psychology.

Sixth. To what extent should copy be themed to the emergency?

To the extent that the theme is genuine and performs a service. It depends upon factual and emotional phases. It depends upon the manner of use. Here is a question that every advertiser will have to answer for himself and that some are learning how to answer in relation to their own positions with great skill.

MORE UNDERSTANDING THROUGH ADVERTISING

Seventh. What are the obligations of advertising today and tomorrow?

I say that the greatest obligation of all is to strive for ever better understanding through advertising. Years ago we strove for more honesty in advertising. I would like to see us fight now for more understanding through advertising. We have learned how to be honest, but we have not learned how to be understood. Most of the world's troubles grow from lack of understanding. What a power for good it would be if this most powerful of public relations instruments could turn its great talent to the creation of a better understanding among our people of their own institutions.

It is not popularly understood who benefits most from the American formula. It is the worker who with a machine can make a dollar an hour as against a previous dollar a day without a machine. It is the customer who could not even hope otherwise to own the things this mass economy brings to his doorstep.

Our inherent strength lies in the processes that have served individuals. Efforts of the individual produce more here than anywhere else. Our technique of mass production has prepared the way for that.

But mass production is not self-perpetuating. It is through individual enterprise and initiative that we produce wares. It is through individual enterprise and initiative that we distribute them. It is the customer that makes the choice.

A VITAL INSTRUMENT IN A FREE ECONOMY

Unparalleled freedom of choice in the market place is what our freedom of the right to advertise inescapably supports. Advertising thus viewed becomes a vital instrument in a free economy keeping open the flow of products and ideas.

Freedom of choice in the market place is of itself a symbol of those other freedoms of choice which are the essence of our democracy. Did you ever stop to consider how one of these great freedoms grows in a sense from freedom to advertise? I mean freedom of the press and, if you please, freedom of the radio. It is their independence—economic as well as political—which keeps the press and the air free.

Looking beyond the emergency we will be confronted with the all-important problem of finding ways to offer jobs to men returning to civil life, to help restore and rebuild our normal processes. In anticipation industry must direct researches to create new products and new services. Is not advertising in a favored position to contribute something? You are sensitive to public desires. You are skilled in the art of anticipating wants. You are skilled in the art of developing new markets. With all the matters you have immediately at hand I plead with you to keep one eye on these burning problems that will confront us as the emergency passes.

BROADER RESPONSIBILITIES

I would like to end on a note of constructive warning. Advertising is at the most important stage of its career. Its practitioners can do it more harm than in normal times, or they can do it more good through exceptional service when the country needs it. We are living in emotional times. People will be swayed by emotion as well as reason on issues connected even indirectly with defense or war. It is no time to think of advertising only in advertising terms. We must think of it now, if ever, in public-relations terms. We need to watch what we say and how we say it for its effect on people, not merely as customers but as citizens of a country bending great efforts to produce materials for its own defense and for its own future existence.

In all things let us strive to build for tomorrow a better understanding of those principles and institutions vital to our national strength. That is a task ahead for us in advertising—a responsibility that is ours in helping to work out the great American formula.

American Legion Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. HAROLD H. BURTON, OF OHIO

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, last Monday the American Legion met in national convention in Milwaukee. The fact developed that in the Senate there are 24 members of the American Legion, exactly one-fourth of the Senate. In the House of Representatives there are 145 members of the American Legion, exactly one-third of the House. That being the case, I was requested by the Legion to make a statement to the national convention from the point of view of a Legionnaire in Congress. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the statement which I made under those circumstances.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the American Legion I bring greetings and a call to mutual helpfulness from your

24 Legionnaire Senators who are exactly one-fourth of the United States Senate and your 145 Legionnaire Representatives, who are exactly one-third of the United States House of Representatives.

The Nation thanks you for the generation of service you have given to it in your early years. I congratulate you and our National Commander Milo J. Warner upon the record of this year. Today, I bring a new and personal call to each of you as a man of mature years, a man proven in loyalty and experienced in the value of preparedness. I bring it to you as men who have felt the strength of organized manpower, guided by practical experience and driven by the irresistible power of united free men.

Recently there has appeared an effective pamphlet entitled "You Can Defend America." "Black Jack" Pershing says of it: "I commend its message to every American."

It tells of the Chinese Wall and how secure China felt behind it. Then the invader came and three times China found her enemies inside her gates. They did not storm the wall. They simply bribed the gatekeepers.

It tells of the Maginot line of France and how secure the French felt behind it. Yet France fell. There was a gap through which the invader came. That gap was in the spirit of the people.

Today we are building a wall. It is called "total defense." There must be no gap in the character of those who man this wall.

This pamphlet then says in simple soldier language: "America needs guts as well as guns. National character is the core of national defense. Congress can't vote it. Dollars won't buy it." It is our job to build it. It means the building of sound homes, team work in industry and a united nation. I call you to that work. Now!

Looking to the distant future I have great hope for America and for the world, if the people are but permitted to develop their opportunities in peace. I see practically no limit to the horizons of improved standards of living for the men and women of tomorrow, if they but have the chance to develop them.

Unfortunately, before we reach the happy future we must face the unhappy present.

In 1917 we were in the front line. We followed the policies of those who directed our Nation. Today, all of us are at G. H. Q. Today our generation must set the pace and make the plans that will uphold, defend, and develop this Nation.

It is time to think clearly on the fundamentals, call no names and rise above all parties and prejudices. America is greater than any of its parts. We must make sure of the survival of America's freedom and ideals at all costs. We must not fail. We must not falter. We must not even flinch. At the same time, knowing the suffering, waste, and folly of war, we owe it to America to win this war, if possible, without fighting it. Gen. Chiang Kai-shek has said, "The more we sweat in peace, the less we bleed in war."

To preserve America's freedom means to preserve our 48 States, our insular possessions, the Western Hemisphere, and our ideals. This does not mean that we will fight someone else's war. It does mean, however, that we will unite in keeping secure, at all costs, all of the territory and all of the principles for which our fathers and our comrades have sacrificed so much. For this we must now work, as once we fought, side and side. No matter what the obstacles may be, we must, now, as then, overcome them all.

We must do it on whatever scale the task demands and with whatever sacrifice of time, money, and comfort it takes. Congress has appropriated the necessary dollars but appropriations are not guns. Our Nation has made a good start, but, as yet, our production of modern antiaircraft guns is negligible. We have made a good start, but, as yet, our production of heavy tanks is negligible. We have a good one-ocean navy of about 325 major naval vessels. We have made a good start on a two-ocean navy of at least 700 major vessels, but it will take 4 or 5 years to complete it. We have made a good start, but, as yet, our production of combat planes is about 700 a month, while the Nazis, production is between 2,000 and 3,000 a month. Our ammunition is not ready, and this time there are no loaded French 75's to be borrowed.

Our lend-lease law has been the key to gaining time while we continued to prepare. Let us understand that law clearly. It involves no alliances with any government. It implies no support of the internal policy of any nation. America's duty under it is to America. It authorizes the President to supply materials and supplies to any nation, if, but only if and when, the President deems the defense of that nation vital to the defense of the United States.

Today only the strong can be safe. The Nazis are waging a relentless, lawless, boldly announced campaign to conquer the world. Their Army sings: "Today Europe is ours, tomorrow the whole world." They follow no rules but the rules of force. We cannot gamble at all with the safety of our Nation, our children, or our principles. It is the inescapable responsibility of our generation to make America safe, from without and from within. That means both within our frontiers and within our own hearts and minds.

We could choose no more favorable place for the test, than on our own famous industrial assembly lines. Agriculture, labor, industry, capital, and government share the obligation. It is to unite, work, produce, play a little, laugh a little, grouch and kick a little, but put the work through faster and better than can anyone else in the world. We must make ourselves too strong to justify the risk of an attack upon us. If attacked, we must win. We must live up to our own possibilities.

This calls for what?

It calls for a united faith in God and man, stronger, higher, and broader than the world has ever known. It calls for a vigorous, invincible civilian, as well as military, defense.

It calls for a deep faith in the people of America. It calls for faith in the soundness of representative government, and in the freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly, and opportunity.

It calls for devotion to the spirit, as well as the letter, of our Constitution and our laws. It calls for voluntary governmental efficiency, economy, and financial responsibility, and for popular support of it.

It calls for sound homes, teamwork in industry and a united Nation.

Most of all it calls for men and women who will put mutual helpfulness above selfishness, in every form, at home and in the community. It calls upon us to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State and Nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy, to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.

America's strongest weapon is her example.

America's greatest strength is the unshakable devotion of every American to his home, his country, and his God.

Lead on, men of the Legion, lead on.

Wisdom's Warning to a War-Weary World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a poem written by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle entitled "Wisdom's Warning to a War-Weary World."

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISDOM'S WARNING TO A WAR-WEARY WORLD

Our great President wisely has spoken
The plain truth, without favor or fear—
The disastrous news had to be broken
To the nations of this hemisphere,
That some power has got to crush Hitler,
Or else he will subdue the whole world—
But this never shall be,
In the land of the free,
Where the Stars and the Stripes are unfurled.

These piratical dictators, drunken
From excessive success on the sea,
Have illegally, brutally sunken
Ships of commerce, by Hitler's decree
Some of them in the western-world waters,
Some of these by the United States
Operated and owned,
Or in sympathy loaned,
In this war against covetous hates.

In the few individual losses
Of American-owned ships, we see
Naught to fear; but when Hitler's mob crosses
Over into the realm of the free,
The free nations on this side the water
Read the writing on destiny's wall,
That they've got to prepare,
On the land, sea, and air,
For their own self-defense, lest they fall.

The plain truth is that these acts of brutal
International lawlessness are
But the manifestations of futile,
Groundless hopes to abolish, by war,
Freedom of the high seas to all nations—
But, unless Hitler's forces subdue
England's forces and ours,
And all Western World powers,
His tyrannical dream can't come true.

Hitler's government, in plain defiance
Of the laws of the sea, and the rights
Of all nations, has placed its reliance
On his power to rule by affrights—
His unmerciful pirates are sinking
Ships at will, without warning, as they
Seek to gain the control
Of the sea, as a whole,
To which they claim the sole right-of-way.

With control of the seas, their next motion,
Undeterred by the frowns of the fates,
Would be then to cross over the ocean,
And drop bombs on the United States;
For, if we should let England surrender,
And her Navy falls into his hands,
Sure as night follows day,
For our folly we'll pay,
When his pirates rain bombs on our lands.

Hitler's plots, intrigues, and machinations,
And his sabotage in the New World,
All are known, for their great devastations,
'Neath the Stars and the Stripes high unfurled—
They've obstructed industrial progress,
And, of late, have become so intense,
That they're holding at bay
Our great program, today,
Of preparing for our own defense.

To succeed in world mastery, surely,
Hitler must get control of the seas,
But the Great British Navy, securely,
Guards them still, with comparative ease—
And it's plainly America's duty
To regard England's fight as her own;
For if England should fall,
At the end of it all,
We'd be forced to fight Hitler alone.

It must oft be explained to the peoples
That, while England's great Navy survives,
Will our church bells ring out from their steeples,
To our parents and children and wives,
Invitations to worship together
The Almighty—who overrules all—
But our freedom to praise
The great Ancient of Days
Would end if England's Navy should fall.

It is time for American statesmen,
Everywhere 'twixt the North and South Poles,
To stop being deluded by hate's men,
That are seeking, by conquest, controls
Of the rest of the whole world's resources,
To the one end that they may enslave,
In conquest's bloody name,
All the victims they claim,
That were one time so proud and so brave.

Not the whispers of passive appeasers
Will keep Hitler from this hemisphere—
No sporific, soft, lullaby easers
Will cause him not to conquer through fear;
Hitler has no more heart than the ocean,
But treads under all things in his path,
And the nations of earth
Are fast driven to dearth,
Who've encountered his satanic wrath.

There were no war-inspired operations
When the *Greer* was so foully attacked,
This was no struggle 'twixt warring nations:
It was just a vile villainous act,
Just another step forward, creating
A world system on force alone based,
To see if we would fight,
Or give them the green light,
To go on their mad way in post haste.

Many nations have met with disasters,
Some of them nations of special note,
But they would not look into their master's
Eye until he had them by the throat—
The great United States and Great Britain,
In the presence of all the wide world,
Vow that they'll never make
This tremendous mistake,
While the Stars and the Stripes are unfurled.

We have sought and we now seek no shooting
War with Hitler, but we will defend
Our land boldly 'gainst his wholesale looting
And destruction, on through to the end.
Nazi submarines and flying raiders,
Menace to peaceful ships on the sea,
Are, like rattlesnakes there,
Sent to strike and not spare
Any ship, matters not whose it be.

In the waters which we deem essential
For our peace-loving Nation's defense,
We'll construe it to be providential
To strike first, ere the foe can commence.
Hitler's mad air and submarine raiders,
Over here, are not here for their health,
But are here to destroy
What we so much enjoy,
Our great Government and our great wealth.

Other Presidents had problems, surely,
Much like these that are vexing us now,
But they rested their hearts' hopes securely
Upon Him before whom all must bow—
While it's right to fight with all our powers
Such an inhuman, world-wrecking foe,
We're aware that we must,
For divine power trust,
In the God from whom all blessings flow.

Our great people have faced other crises,
And have triumphed always in the end,
And stand ready to make sacrifices—
On their loyalty God can depend—
With American courage we'll conquer,
With American tact we will win,
With American prayers
We'll plow under despairs,
And grow stronger than we've ever been.

And, with that inner strength that comes ever
To a free people who know they must
Pray "Thy will be done," and whose endeavor,
Without question, proves "In God we trust,"
Who in their daily lives preach and practice
The one golden rule that the Lord taught,
"Do to others as you
Would have them do to you,"
We will win—if we trust as we ought.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

The Weak Links in Our Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I respectfully request unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which I prepared for the American Magazine entitled "The Weak Links in Our Defense." The article was published in the issue of September 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WEAK LINKS IN OUR DEFENSE

(By United States Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Is Uncle Sam's screen of ocean outposts wide open to invasion? The powerful chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee exposes dangerous gaps in the front line of hemisphere defense and proposes ways to repair them.)

For many years I have advocated an iron shield of defensive bases to protect the Western Hemisphere. I have traveled tens of thousands of miles at my own expense, studying prospective bases in the Atlantic and Pacific, from the Arctic to the tip of South America.

Long before this war began I urged acquisition of British and French bases in this hemisphere as payment on the war debts. Months before France fell I introduced such resolutions in the Senate. At last, when we swapped 50 destroyers for certain British base sites, France had fallen under the domination of Hitler, and it was too late to obtain the French sites except by force.

Because of the study I have made of these matters, and because of my responsibility as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, I consider it my duty to point out certain dark spots in our defense base picture. I want to suggest immediate action, and to point out the brighter future prospects if we do what is needed.

As I write, our Nation is still at peace, but most of what I have to say would apply with equal or greater urgency if we should enter the war.

On the dark side I will mention the dreadful health conditions around some of our newly acquired bases; the regrettable attitude of certain British and Canadian officials toward our joint problems; the prompt need for plugging large existing holes in our defense screen; and the slowness of our diplomacy.

I mention health first, because many of our boys sent to these new bases are beginning to write alarming letters home to their parents, and wild rumors, injurious to home morale, are being spread. The facts are bad enough, but we can face them when we know exactly what we are up against.

For example, we have been granted certain areas for bases in Trinidad. This British island, so charming to the eye of the tourist, has a population tragically ravaged by communicable disease. The percentage of venereal infection is probably as high as anywhere in the world. Malignant malaria, spread by the mosquitoes which infest the island, is everywhere. In the schools adjoining our area, from a third to a half of the children were found to have this malaria.

Leprosy is common, and by no means all of the lepers are isolated. There are dysentery and typhoid, tetanus, rabies, and hookworm. There are swarms of rats and some danger of plague. Yellow fever is a possible threat. There are poisonous snakes and deadly scorpions.

A stealthy terror is the blood-lapping vampire bat. Many of these bats carry the infection of paralytic rabies, which is invariably fatal. This sinister animal works so quietly that the victim usually does not know he has been attacked until he wakes up in a pool of blood.

British Guiana, on the coast of South America, where we are building a base, has the same high malarial and venereal dangers as Trinidad, with the additional menace of filariasis, a blood-parasite disease transmitted by mosquitoes. About 25 percent of the population of British Guiana is infected with it. It is incurable, and sometimes results in a disfigurement, sometimes in death.

These things are not pretty to discuss, but it is extremely important for the American people to know about them. One of the greatest things Winston Churchill ever did for British morale was to tell his people the difficulties confronting them, starkly, and honestly. Our people are of the same character.

Americans want to know just what we are up against in health conditions, and then they will not be afraid. We have the finest medical corps in the world, with experience gained in Panama, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. I know they can lick every one of the problems I have mentioned, and the people ought to be told about this, too. They want to be assured that every resource of our medical profession and of our great research foundations is placed at the disposal of our Army in this fight. Only so can we prevent alarmist rumors, which have already begun to circulate.

While on this subject, I urge the fullest possible publicity, consistent with vital military secrecy, for everything concerning these island bases. Trustworthy reporters should be allowed (as they have not been, thus far) to go to the scene and write first-hand ac-

counts. I am moving at once to obtain funds to permit members of the Military Affairs Committee to visit the bases and inspect progress. The American people are paying for these bases, in money and the service of their sons, and they are entitled to know what is going on.

In these island bases, as you see, we shall have to spend vast sums for health protection alone. In addition, we must spend our millions for airports, barracks, fortifications, roads, water supply, utilities, dock and harbor installations.

And yet, as many fail to realize, we don't even own these most important areas where we are sinking millions of dollars. True, we have 99-year leases. That is a long time in the life of a man, but a short time in the life of a nation.

If England, with the passing years, should become unfriendly to us, or should become involved in alliances with other powers, our leases might lapse, our investment and security be lost. I hope and believe this will not happen, but here, where the safety of our children and our children's children is involved, we must be realistic. In the last 150 years Britain has fought beside and against Germany; beside and against France; beside and against Italy; beside and against Russia; beside and against the United States.

History reveals no permanent international friendships. Therefore, we should move at once, while the time is ripe, to make our hold on our outposts more secure.

In his original deal for these bases President Roosevelt swapped 50 of our old but still formidable destroyers. Since that time, however, the United States has granted practically unlimited material aid to Britain, with a $7,000,000,000 fund as a starter.

This opens the way for entire reconsideration of our defense bases. We have given Britain carte blanche on material aid. Why should she not, in return, give us carte blanche in setting up bases to defend this hemisphere?

The leases from Britain, by the way, did not give us the land for the bases. They merely gave us the right to dicker with the private owners of the land, sometimes at fancy prices, sometimes by cumbersome legal process, for the use of land for our bases. Considering that our bases are defending the islands for Britain as well as for our own interest, this was a remarkable procedure. However, that was what we did, and we will let it pass.

But now, with our aid flowing steadily to England, is the time to reopen the question. I suggest that our ownership in the base areas be made complete and direct, at once. I suggest also that a commission be appointed to consider the advisability of taking over the islands themselves.

I am surprised that the suggestion to give us outright ownership in the base areas has not come from the British themselves. I do not criticize the British for defending their own interests. I admire them for it. But, even from their point of view, I question whether their attitude has been wise. They convey the impression always that they are doing us a great favor. We are put in the position of pleading for what they should grant with open arms. And to some extent this applies to the Canadians, in regard to the big gap between New England and our new base in Newfoundland.

Newfoundland is certainly valuable as an advanced base. But, because of its rocky coast line, its harsh climate, its storms, ice, and fogs, its inaccessibility, it is not suitable for a major air and naval base. The ideal place for such a base would be in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, with fine harbors, fair weather, and all-year-round availability.

I understand that the Joint Canadian-American Defense Board have discussed granting us such a base, but that Canadian officials have raised certain "political" objections. I consider any delay in this crucial matter dangerously shortsighted on the part of both our countries.

In criticizing the attitude of the British and Canadians, I do not imply that we ourselves are blameless. Our whole diplomacy, in acquiring defense bases, has been slow, late, and timid. Will Rogers' saying that America never lost a war or won a conference still seems to hold good.

This doesn't mean that I agree with the firebrands who want us to seize Dakar in Africa, and the Azores Islands, two-thirds of the way across the Atlantic I think that would be folly. The prime requisite in an outpost is that you should be able to get to it quicker and reinforce it faster than the enemy. Both Dakar and the Azores are more accessible to European powers than to ourselves.

The argument is that Dakar threatens South America, that Vichy owns Dakar, and that Vichy is under Hitler's thumb. True. True also that it would be madness for us to let Hitler's armies establish themselves in South America.

But the finest base to avert that threat, and to protect all of South America, would be on the bulge of Brazil, say at Natal or Recife.

That is by far the most dangerous gap in our shield of hemisphere defense Failure to plug that hole, in the year following the fall of France, has been our greatest diplomatic error. It should be promptly and firmly repaired.

We have talked a lot about defending South America. We have sent ambassadors of good will there, too many of them. We have made many altruistic statements about neighborliness, and hands-across-the-Caribbean.

But on the one thing really necessary to defend South America, a good base on the bulge, we still have nothing definite at this writing. Meanwhile, there remains one of the chief sources of friction with our southern neighbors, namely, our attitude of superiority toward people with pride and traditions equal to our own.

I urge that our negotiations with Brazil be pressed with the utmost energy, honesty, and realism. The time is now. If the worst should happen—if Hitler should win—it might be too late. The South American nations might refuse us any concessions, for fear of offending the conqueror Furthermore, it takes time to establish such bases, and every day is precious.

All these outpost problems, including those with England and Canada, should be settled at once, while the war is on. When wars end, the whole atmosphere changes suddenly and unpredictably. Strike while the iron is hot.

If we do this, then indeed we shall be able to weld about our country a band of steel, the finest defensive outposts possessed by any country in the world. That is the bright side.

To the north we have the friendly and virile Dominion of Canada and the polar ice cap. To the northwest, beyond Canada, we have Alaska. From Alaska, stretching out like a mighty arm for 1,500 miles in the northern Pacific toward the empires of Russia and Japan, we have the stepping stones of the Aleutian Islands. I think we should build certain small outposts in the more westerly of these islands.

Northwest of Alaska lies Wrangel Island, 80 miles long, 35 miles wide. As aviation progresses into easy Arctic flying, it may become a base of immense importance. Yet our people, and apparently our State Department, don't even know whether it belongs to us or to Russia. Both have claims to it. This should be promptly determined, so that we can lay our defense plans accordingly.

Coming down the Pacific coast, we have the superb fortified bastion of the Hawaiian Islands. Farther south, off the Panama Canal, there are the strategic islands of Cocos, belonging to Costa Rica, and the Galápagos, owned by Ecuador. We need small bases on these islands, and negotiations should be pressed at once, though the urgency here does not compare with that in Brazil.

Coming over to the Atlantic, we are making a small beginning in Greenland and should also have a small seasonal outpost in Labrador. Then the advanced base in Newfoundland. Then, with all speed, we should plug the next gap by a major base in Nova Scotia and/or New Brunswick. Then Bermuda and the chain of islands in the West Indies stretching down to British Guiana. Finally a proper base on the bulge of Brazil and possibly a smaller base down near the River Plate.

These bases will require expense, effort, and unrelaxing vigilance over the years to come. They will be worth it. They will enable us and our descendants to go forward, resolute and secure, to the great task of making our country an even happier place to live in.

Col. Charles A. Lindbergh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM ATLANTIC CITY DAILY WORLD

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Atlantic City Daily World, under the heading "An invitation to laughter."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlantic City Daily World]

AN INVITATION TO LAUGHTER

The proposition of the America First Committee to run its cross-country loud-speaker ex-Col. Charles A. Lindbergh for the United States Senate and then (it is to laugh) for the Presidency indicates that the group's conception of domestic politics is as warped as its program of foreign policy.

The "Loon" Eagle, as he WAS so appropriately called by Senator WILLIAM H. SMATHERS, boasts one of the most amazing downhill popularity records in the history of our country.

Acclaimed as a national hero when he flew the Atlantic in the company of a ham sandwich and a cat, he accepted the homage of an adoring populace with hauteur.

He had an opportunity to recoup the public esteem when his life was blasted by the cruelest tragedy of our generation. When his sorrowing countrymen poured out their hearts in sympathy he ignored their offered solace. Bitterly castigating the country of his birth, he forsook it and took up a residence in an alien land.

Since that time his conduct has been the strutting of an egomaniac across the stage of public life.

Accepting with smirking self-satisfaction the fawning false idolatry of a Goering, he was awarded and proudly wore the military decoration of a barbarian, foreign power.

Returning to America he set himself up as an oracle of wisdom on international

politics and alined himself against the determined course set by his President and Congress.

When his theories were not accepted with the honor due a messiah his bitter nature once again came to the fore and he turned on the best minds of his Government with invective and abuse.

And if "Lindy" ever does try to ride his America First Rah-Rah-Nazi outfit through Jersey, he's going to suddenly find that there are a few people who don't approve of his ideas. One rumor stated he would seek G. O. P. backing. We can't fathom the idea that the Republicans would stoop to backing Lindbergh.

It certainly would be a test—Senator SMATHERS against Lindbergh. It certainly wouldn't be a contest. SMATHERS stands for Roosevelt 100 percent and makes no bones about letting people know it. The vote would be so overwhelming, if there ever were such a contest, that Mr. Lindbergh might suddenly awaken that there are a few people who don't like him or his policies. Personally, we doubt if the vote would awaken him.

Midwest Monetary Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

ADDRESS BY ANDRAE B. NORDSKOG

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the major portion of an address by Andrae B. Nordskog given before the Midwest Monetary Federation, Wednesday, June 18, 1941, at Chicago, Ill.:

"Whoever controls the money of the nation, controls that nation," said President Garfield.

And President Andrew Jackson, in 1832, said: "If Congress has the right under the Constitution to issue paper money, it was given them to be used by themselves, not to be delegated to individuals or corporations."

Most of us would agree that to permit a private individual to usurp the powers of Congress as they relate to the coinage of money would seem inconsistent indeed. For, to vest this sacred congressional prerogative in one individual would be gross discrimination against the rest of our citizens, and would therefore violate the fundamental principles upon which our Government is founded.

This raises another important question: Under what provision of our Federal Constitution is Congress empowered to issue perpetual charters to individuals who form corporations?

I have failed to find such congressional authority in our Constitution. But I do find in article X of the so-called Bill of Rights in our Constitution the following provision:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

Therefore if the power to grant charters to private individuals for the purpose of forming corporations was not delegated to the United States by the Constitution that power is reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

This, then, leaves corporations now operating under purported Federal charters without constitutional authority so to do.

The only authority vested in Congress to regulate commerce among the several States, but not to grant corporate charters, is found in article I, section 8, subsection 3 of our Federal Constitution.

Beginning from that premise, then, our only logical conclusion must be, that banking corporations operating under purported Federal charters are doing so without constitutional authority.

In article I, section 8, subsection 5 of the Constitution, it provides that "Congress shall have power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standards of weights and measures."

There is not a semicolon between those words; it is all in one sentence.

Has Congress delegated its authority to fix the standards of weights and measures to Sears, Roebuck & Co.? Has Congress delegated its power to operate the Army and Navy over to Montgomery Ward & Co.? Has Congress delegated its power to levy taxes to the Metropolitan Life Insurance Corporation?

I hear a negative answer to all of these questions. Congress has not delegated any of those functions to private corporations.

Has Congress delegated its power to coin money and regulate the value thereof to private banking corporations? Yes; it has.

Does Congress have any more right to delegate its powers of coinage to a private corporation than to delegate its powers to operate the Army and Navy to a private corporation? Quite evidently not.

What is the greatest single power which is vested in Congress under the Federal Constitution?

The power to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

Is the power of coinage greater than the power to levy taxes?

Indeed, much greater. Consider, if you will, that during President Hoover's administration, the total Federal tax levy was around $4,000,000,000 a year; while under our prevailing system of coinage we had in checkbook turn-overs in 1 year during the same period, a total of $1,200,000,000,000. And, as the result of manipulation by private corporations who usurped the powers of Congress, by improper regulation of the value of money, such check-book turn-overs dropped in following years to about one-half their former volume.

During the Constitutional Convention certain bankers proposed that Congress should create only the metal coins, leaving the creation of paper money to the private banks. But Benjamin Franklin bitterly opposed such a division of authority, and the proposal was defeated. This, then, left Congress in full control over both metal coins and paper money.

When a 20-year charter was sought for the creation of the Bank of the United States (a private institution), which would permit the private issuance of paper money, President Washington appointed a special committee of three consisting of Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State; Edmund Randolph, Attorney General; and Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury, to make a report as to the constitutionality of the proposed charter.

A minority report was made by Hamilton favoring the charter. Mr. Randolph said it was contrary to the Constitution; while Mr. Jefferson declared it was repugnant to the Constitution.

However, the bill was passed in both Houses of Congress and given approval by President Washington. After the first so-called Bank of the United States came into being in 1791 and began to issue paper money, Thomas Jefferson declared: "I believe that banking corporations are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. Already they have raised up a money aristocracy that has set the Government at defiance. The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the Government and the people to whom it properly belongs."

The charter of the first Bank of the United States came to an end in 1811. The charter for the second Bank of the United States began in 1816. At the hands of President Andrew Jackson its doom was sealed when he refused, in 1832, to sign a bill for the renewal of its charter, and that bank died in 1836.

Taking advantage of a national stress during Lincoln's time, the bankers pushed through Congress a bill which purportedly permitted Congress to grant charters to national banks.

Private corporations were allowed to issue national-bank notes and to circulate them as money. By being permitted to put in reserve only a fractional part of each deposit, these banks, over all, were enabled to loan out many times the sum total of such deposits.

Although Secretary of the Treasury Salmon P. Chase had urged President Lincoln to sign the national-bank law, upon seeing the evil effects of it in actual operation he said: "My agency in procuring the passage of the National Bank Act was the greatest financial mistake of my life. It has built up a monopoly that affects every interest in the country. It should be repealed. But before this can be accomplished the people will be arrayed on one side and the banks on the other in a contest such as we have never seen before in this country."

Depressions recurring with a degree of regularity in the United States over a period of several score years can be traced directly to the manipulation of currency and bank credits at the hands of the bankers.

During the Civil War period President Lincoln approved the bill providing for the Government issue of paper money, commonly called greenbacks. So successfully did these greenbacks circulate that many political leaders favored the creation of more of the same kind of money.

Not so kindly did the bankers take to this competitive idea of Uncle Sam. From 247 Broadway, New York City, Mr. James Bull, Secretary of the Associated Bankers of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia sent a circular letter in 1877 to members of their association, as follows:

"DEAR SIR: It is advisable to do all in your power to sustain such prominent daily and weekly newspapers, especially the agricultural and religious press, as will oppose the greenback or issue of paper money, and that you also withhold patronage from all applicants who are not willing to oppose the Government issue of money.

"Let the Government issue the coin and the banks issue the paper money of the country, for then we can better protect each other. To repeal the act creating bank notes, or to restore to circulation the Government issue of money, will be to provide the people with money and will therefore seriously affect our individual profits as bankers and lenders.

"See your Congressman at once and engage him to support our interests, that we may control legislation."

During the days when gold and silver coins were circulating freely in this country and nearly all types of bank notes were redeemable in specie, gold or silver, the banking fraternity was quick on the trigger in referring to any proposal that the Government should issue its own paper money, that this would be fiat money.

Now, when private bank notes are redeemable only in some other type of paper money, we wonder just what fiat money is. Will the banker please tell us?

The preamble to the Federal Reserve Act says that it was to provide for an elastic currency. Webster defines the word "elastic" as something which can be stretched, and, once stretched, will rebound.

Boys familiar with slingshots know that the stretching process is slow, but when the aim has once been made the rebound is very rapid.

And so it is with currency or credit expansion. That process is slow, but when contraction begins, its speed increases at a terrific rate, wrecking everything it touches.

The Federal Reserve law purportedly was adopted also for the protection of the banks of this Nation—to prevent them from failing. But in the short period between 1921 and 1933 more than 15,000 banks in this country failed, or more than 50 percent of them—this being by far more bank failures than this country had ever seen in any like period in American history.

Following a period of currency and credit expansion, the Federal Reserve Board held a very secret meeting with the class "A" directors of the 12 Federal Reserve banks on May 18, 1920, in Washington, D. C. No one outside of that circle knew at that time just what took place behind those closed and closely guarded doors.

One thing the outside world did know, and that was that shortly after that secret meeting was held, the rediscount rates which, for a long time, had hovered around 2 percent per annum, suddenly were jumped to 4 to 6 to 8 and even 9 percent, with call rates up around 20 percent.

Not even sure-shot gamblers could take chances on such rapidly changing bank rates.

Result? The wholesale calling and cancelation of loans. Refusal of banks to extend credit to many worthy patrons even at those high rates of interest.

Mercantile, wholesale, and manufacturing establishments failed by the thousands; yes, by scores of thousands. Millions of workers were thrown out of employment. Hundreds of thousands of farms were lost by hard-working farmers.

Financial chaos ensued. Banks failed, both large and small. Depositors, unable to get their savings and active cash deposits from the banks, were thrown onto charity.

During the readjustment period from 1924 to 1929 the Federal Reserve banks, under the leadership of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, No. 2, launched another daring expansion of currency and credits.

On that fateful day in October 1929, however, their house of cards again fell. Yes, fell with a crash that resounded all around the world. The stock market cried aloud for hospitalization that was not to be had. Stores closed. Factories closed. Banks closed by the hundreds monthly. Public schools and other educational institutions closed their doors. Crime increased; the unemployed sought State and Federal aid. Taxes were increased because of it; price levels fluctuated wildly and made it almost impossible for going concerns to know what trade policies to adopt.

On June 24, 1935, Mr. Adolph Miller, then a member of the Federal Reserve Board, laid the blame for the crash of 1929 to the vast credit inflation of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. That which was stretched out of proportion had to bounce back, and bounce back it did—with a vengeance, leaving wreckage and waste in its tracks.

Following the major crash of 1920, Gov. W. G. P. Harding of the Federal Reserve Board wrote an article entitled "Why We Cannot Have Another Panic," but it seems that there is need for an amendment to that opinion after seeing what took place in 1929.

The Federal Reserve Board in its annual report in 1919 called attention to the fact that the 12 Reserve banks for 1918 had gross earnings of $67,584,117, the net earnings being $55,446,979, or just about 10 times the amount of the dividends paid. The net earnings were at the rate of 72.6 percent on an average aggregate capital for the year of $76,342,000. And the Board also called attention to the fact that it had reiterated previously that the Federal Reserve banks were not organized for the primary purpose of earning unusual profits.

Notwithstanding this warning the 12 Federal Reserve banks in 1920 showed average net earnings of 160.7 percent, the highest net earnings after payment of 6 percent dividends to member banks, having been earned by the New York Federal Reserve Bank, 211 percent on its paid-in capital, and the lowest net earnings of 53 percent having been earned by the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, Tex., after having paid the 6 percent annual dividend to its member banks. The New York Federal Reserve Bank on its approximate $25,000,000 capital, earned $54,000,000 net in 1920 after having paid its member banks the usual 6-percent dividend.

I point this out in order to show that some unseen force, somewhere, governed the policies of the 12 Federal Reserve banks other than the Federal Reserve Board which frequently had cautioned these banks that they had not been organized primarily for profit, but rather for service to the member banks and to the commercial world.

Following the wreckage left in the trail of two major depressions between 1920 and 1930 the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was formed with about one-half of the capital stock being subscribed for by the Federal Reserve banks with voting power and the balance subscribed for by the United States Treasury without voting power.

The capital stock outstanding is about $290,000,000, with a surplus account of $206,000,000. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation may, in an emergency, expand its capital stock sales in a ratio of 3 to 1 over the amount of the outstanding stock by sales to the R. F. C. or to the United States Treasury together with an additional $250,000,000 to be subscribed by the R. F C. and Treasury if requested to do so.

Roughly, this would provide the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation with a capital and surplus of a little over one and one-half billion dollars. In event of another serious run on our banks, with deposits of about $60,000,000,000, how far would the F. D. I. C. go in liquidating those frozen accounts?

In the event of the purchase of F. D. I. C. stock by the R. F. C. and the Treasury, then more Government bonds would be put on the market to be purchased by whom? With 95 percent of the assets of the F. D. I. C. invested in Government bonds, to whom would these bonds be sold in event of the forced liquidation of all our banks? Is it not time now to think on these things?

The Government has no idle cash with which to buy F. D. I. C. stock. So it would be forced to try to sell bonds to the banks or to the public at a time when no funds were available for such purchases.

Where, I ask you, would this financial merry-go-round stop?

In order to remove any doubt which may exist relating to the dominance of the Federal Reserve System by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, I will quote from a statement made to the United Press at Washington by Adolph C. Miller, member of the Federal Reserve Board, June 24, 1935. "It is abundantly clear," Miller said, "that acceptance by the Board of aggressive [money] easing action proposed by the New York Federal Reserve Bank in 1927 and of complete abandonment of restraining action in the second half of 1928 proves that the Board, under established tradition, was, first, too quick to fall in line with a daring and dangerous proposal and, later, too slow to assume the leadership which was needed and was lacking at the most critical time."

Miller asserted that under the leadership of the New York bank, "discount rates were forced down in other banks and that when the Chicago Reserve Bank refused to follow, its rate was ordered reduced. Cheap credit late in 1927," he said, "expanded stock-market activities and a disastrous speculative situation developed. Government securities were sold by banks and gold exports were allowed to tighten the money market. But the rise in stocks had acquired too much momentum."

To head off what Mr. Miller termed a "daring and dangerous" credit-easing program into which the New York Federal Reserve Bank had drawn the Federal Reserve Board, leading to the 1929 stock-market crash, the Reserve Board, on February 2 of that year, used "direct pressure" for banks to discourage speculative loans.

This caused an acute controversy over a period of months between the Federal Reserve banks and the Reserve Board with reference to the respective merits of the policies of control through discount rate advances and through direct pressure.

Federal Reserve Board Member Miller concluded with the assertion that "the leadership of the Federal Reserve System rested with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York."

Here we have confirmation from the lips of a Reserve Board member that a scarcity of needed money was created artificially by the Federal Reserve banks.

We see from Mr. Miller's statement that Government securities were sold by the banks and gold exports were allowed to tighten the money market. Here then we see the law of self-preservation in operation. The banks just had to save their own hides no matter how other institutions were skinned. However, several thousand banks got caught in this financial "Frankenstein" and closed their doors, as did scores of thousands of other business institutions.

In this major catastrophe we have plenty of evidence that the power to "coin money and regulate the value thereof" is a function so sacred that it should never be entrusted to private individuals or corporations as it now exists for the purpose of selfish and private gain. That function should be exercised by our Congress for the benefit of all of the people as the Constitution plainly provides.

Mr. Miller admits that the New York Federal Reserve Bank (a private institution) actually dominated the Reserve Board and dictated the policies of all of the other 11 Federal Reserve banks.

We have proof-a-plenty, that the so-called elastic currency, fiat, or what have you, was subject to the most wildly inflationary and deflationary tendencies of any type of money this Nation has ever known.

Members of Congress, with their right hands raised, declare, when taking their oaths of office, that they will uphold and enforce the Constitution of the United States of America.

Very well; our Constitution provides that Congress, not the private, Wall Street-controlled banks, shall coin money and regulate the value thereof. I have heretofore shown you from the lips of a Federal Reserve Board member that the private reserve banks dominated by the New York Reserve Bank were responsible for the wild expansion of credits in 1927 and 1928, and for the rapid contraction of same by "direct pressure" in 1929, leading to the greatest financial disaster in American history.

Congress has the sole and exclusive power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof. That function should never be shopped out to speculators who would gamble at the expense of the Public Treasury.

Directly responsible to the electors of this Nation, Congress would be compelled to control this function for the benefit of the people. Honestly administered by Congress, the

coinage of money would be based on the needs of the people instead of on the theory of dollar scarcity for the benefit of the banker. The banker has his rightful place in our commercial wheel, but that place does not include the assumption of a congressional prerogative provided for in our Constitution.

Scientifically controlled for the benefit of all of our people and institutions, Congress could supply all of the money needed to carry the commerce of this Nation to its destination. Unemployment would be unknown. Prosperity would attend our efforts. We would truly become a powerful nation, because we would at last be free from the forces that have heretofore violated our Constitution in coining money primarily for their own private gain.

Tariff on Cuban Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

STATEMENT BY COL. W. F. GILES

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent ruling by Price Administrator Henderson fixing the price of sugar, and the misinformation that has been published in the press in regard to this situation, and the effect of this price regulation upon the consuming public, I ask leave to print in the RECORD, under permission to extend my remarks, a statement made on September 9, 1941, by Col. W. F. Giles, of Louisiana, to the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Colonel Giles is president of the Sugar Cane League of Louisiana and is a practical farmer of outstanding ability.

This statement is so lucid and clear I believe it will be read with interest and benefit by the Members of this House, and will be a valuable contribution to the facts pertaining to this public issue.

Colonel Giles' statement is as follows:

Speaking as the representative of the American Sugar Cane League of New Orleans, La., the brief filed on August 23 asked that the State Department make known to domestic producers the propositions concerning sugar which are to form the basis of negotiations with the Cuban Government. We requested that the State Department make a declaration of its intentions, in order that we might intelligently discuss what is in prospect. Ostensibly, this public hearing is a part of the democratic process of permitting interested parties to express their views and to submit their recommendations; but we find ourselves in a position of uncertainty and helplessness in the absence of any declared intention on the part of the State Department. We are required to argue by assumption.

Our concern is not imaginary but is based upon experience. For instance, in 1939 there was a public hearing, but everyone assumed that the basic relationship should be maintained of a reduction in tariff and the existence of a quota system. Instead, the State Department changed the language of the original Cuban trade agreement, which established a completely new arrangement. The Tariff Commission having reported that the difference in cost of production amounted to a $1.50 tariff rate on Cuban sugar, the President of the United States put the $1.50 rate into effect in 1934. Later in the same year the reduction from $1.50 to 90 cents was justified, in part, by the fact that the Cubans would be restricted in the amount of sugar which they could import under the quota system. Accordingly, when the President suspended quotas in September 1939, the $1.50 rate of duty on Cuban sugar was reinstated; but, in December 1939, the language of the agreement was so changed that, if the quotas are suspended, there would be no restoration of the $1.50 tariff rate. The reinstatement of the higher rate would only occur in case the quota provisions of the Sugar Act should expire.

Such a change has destroyed the concurrence of the reduced duty and quotas, which change was made without notice and without an opportunity for the producers to be heard. We protest strongly against such a procedure and request that the original language of the 1934 Cuban trade agreement be restored.

In the absence of any declared intention on the part of the State Department, we submit that the facts concerning our relations with Cuba, in terms of sugar, fully justify a demand that the tariff on the importation of Cuban sugar be increased. Cuba today has a guaranteed market in the United States for the greatest quantity of sugar that it has imported into the United States in more than 10 years, and the price paid for that sugar is considerably higher than the average price of 10 years. Thus, Cuba is being permitted to market more sugar at a higher price. Therefore, the tariff rate should be increased in proportion to the added benefits enjoyed.

And not only is Cuba permitted to market larger quantities of sugar at higher prices in the United States market but the price paid for Cuban sugar in the so-called world market is today more than double the price which Cuban sugar has commanded in that market for several years. It is well known to anyone who keeps informed about the Cuban marketing of sugar that usually two-thirds of the Cuban production has been marketed in the so-called world market at a lower price. The Cubans have averaged out the total accordingly to get a favorable price for the whole crop. But this year Cuba is marketing more than 85 percent of its production in the United States at the highest price obtained in several years, and even the balance which is being sold to England and other world markets is listed at a doubled price. Thus, any way you take it, Cuban sugars are in an improved position.

The national-defense agency known as O. P. A. C. S. has fixed a price for raw sugar in the United States at 3½ cents, which is claimed to be a fair and reasonable price for raw sugar. The Cubans have disagreed and have withdrawn from the market for almost 30 days. Of course, this is consistent with the usual Cuban practice of taking advantage of every opportunity to force the price of sugar in the United States upward. They did this in 1920 when the consumer paid 25 cents a pound for sugar, and they tried it again in 1939, when the European war was declared, forcing the President to suspend quotas to bring the price down. Now they have made demands involving questions of lowered freight rates to the United States; making available ships; an advance in the price ceiling; and finally, a reduction in the tariff.

The sugar program adopted by the United States Government in 1934 was declared to be for the purpose of alleviating the distressing conditions in the sugar industry. The period referred to was 1931, 1932, and 1933, during which time Cuban raw sugar sold for $1.16, while domestic raws sold for $3.16. At the $3.50 pegged price, with a 90-cent duty, Cuba is getting an increase of 114 percent, while domestic raws are sold at only a 10-percent increase. Should the 75-cent rate of duty be imposed, Cuba would be receiving an increase of 137 percent over the 1931–33 period, while domestic producers are receiving a mere 10-percent improvement over the distressing conditions which the Federal Government sought to alleviate.

In yesterday's paper we read about certain offerings for future delivery, on a basis which includes concessions in the tariff on Cuban sugars. It is reported that the owners of Cuban sugar are making contracts which anticipate a tariff reduction of 15 cents per 100 pounds. What is the basis of such a concession? What information do these Cubans have which is not available to us? The State Department, having refused or failed to respond to our request for a declaration of intention, must we assume that Cuban producers are better informed on the subject than we are? But we do submit the plain fact that if a price of 3½ cents for raw sugar is justified by O. P. A. C. S. as a fair price for domestic producers, then there can be no justification whatsoever for the maintenance of such a price, if another department of the Government would grant to Cuban producers a tariff concession which would, in effect, give them a price of 3.65 cents, while domestic producers are forced to accept 3.50 cents.

If the purpose is to give Cuba a better price for raw sugar, the solution seems fairly simple and plain as far as Government procedure may be concerned. The going price of raw sugar on August 12 was 3.80 cents, when O. P. A. C. S. set a ceiling of 3.50 cents. This was tantamount to reducing the price of raw sugar 30 points. Now, if the Cubans need 15 cents, would it not be simpler and more efficient for O. P. A. C. S. to raise its ceiling to 3.65 cents, so that domestic producers could enjoy the price, as well as foreign producers in Cuba? Why go through all the travail and labor of negotiating a supplemental trade agreement and reducing tariff during an emergency period where consideratıons are not based upon normal conditions? Due to increased costs of production, domestic producers need the 3.80-cents price more than Cuba needs the 3.65 cents.

We ask in complete sincerity that the negotiators who represent the United States Government in the negotiations on a supplemental Cuban trade agreement give first consideration to the interests of the domestic producers in matters concerning sugar. In doing so, the facts will require that the tariff on Cuban sugar be increased. We further recommend that the original language of the Cuban trade agreement be restored, whereby reductions in the tariff on Cuban sugar below $1.50 shall continue in effect only as long as the quota provisions of the Sugar Act are operating, so that such tariff reduction below $1.50 will be concurrent with the operation of quotas.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, September 5, contains a statement by Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, which we feel should be part of the record of these hearings. At a time like this, when the question of national defense is of transcendent importance to all officials of our National Government, the unity of the people of the United States becomes a paramount consideration. The Senator from Wyoming has been a leader in proposing and drafting sugar legislation expressing the intent of Congress. He has interpreted the intent of Congress in congressional debates and in proposing the language of the Sugar Act and the amendments thereto. Therefore, his solemn expression, evidently concurred in by other Members of the United States Senate who participated in the discussion Friday night, is a development which must necessarily re-

ceive the highest consideration of the officials of the State Department and the negotiators on behalf of the United States Government. Quoting from page 7558 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 5, 1941, Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, declared:

"I have no intention of appearing before the Committee for Reciprocity Information because I have lost faith in the value of such appearance. I have lost faith that the presentation of any evidence there will affect the decision to be rendered. So I prefer to make my statement here in this body, which, having considered the facts and the evidence, has on numerous occasions indicated its belief that the domestic production of sugar beets and sugarcane should be encouraged in order that the American consumer of sugar might not be exploited by those who produce sugar in offshore areas."

America's War Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan in the Washington Post of September 17, 1941:

[From the Washington Post of September 17, 1941]

AMERICA'S WAR STATUS—DEFINING "FREEDOM OF THE SEAS"

(By Mark Sullivan)

The new status of the United States with respect to the war is contained in two speeches—that of Secretary Knox to the American Legion September 15 and President Roosevelt's radio address to the people September 11.

In terms of action the new status is this: Our Navy will, on sight, destroy or capture any Axis submarine or surface raider within certain waters.

Within this broad statement are some distinctions. As respects what our Navy will attack, Mr. Roosevelt uses the term "Axis." The term used by Secretary Knox is "Axis controlled."

Probably no distinction between those two terms is intended. Both terms, if interpreted broadly, would include Germany, Italy, and Japan. But no one supposes there is any intention, at this time, to attack Japanese naval vessels. Presumably what is intended is German and Italian vessels—primarily, of course, German ones, since they are the ones practicing widespread aggression.

Again, as to just what we will attack, there is a curious distinction, upon which Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Knox agree. Both say that what we will attack are "submarines or surface raiders." Apparently we do not intend to attack German bombing planes, though these are, in certain waters, as destructive as submarines or surface raiders. One reason for omitting German bombing planes may be that these operate mainly over narrowly restricted waters—that is, waters close to the area of actual war. To include German bombing planes in what we will attack might raise a question about the precise waters in which our new policy applies.

And this is a really important and delicate question. In just what waters will we attack? As defined by Secretary Knox, the waters are "between the American Continent and the waters adjacent to Iceland." As defined by President Roosevelt, the area is broader—Mr. Roosevelt says "in the waters which we deem necessary for our defense."

Mr. Roosevelt's definition is, obviously, the one with the higher authority. In Mr. Roosevelt's mind, just what are "the waters which we deem necessary for our defense"? Once, in an informal conference, Mr. Roosevelt defined the waters we might deem necessary for our defense as anywhere in the seven seas. Probably this is what we mean, or what we will mean and practice as our relation to the war progresses. As we now deem waters around Iceland necessary to our defense, so may we later deem waters around the Azores, or near Dakar in Africa, or practically anywhere in the Pacific—practically anywhere in the world.

Is this new policy of ours justified? The answer is "Yes."

To try to arrive at the answer by careful argument would be futile. The first requirement for argument is agreement upon the meaning of terms. And about the terms involved in the so-called international law of the present situation there is no agreement. "Freedom of the seas" means to Germany what Germany says it means; it means to us what we say it means. Germany declares a "war zone," which includes the waters about Iceland; we declare a "defense zone," which includes the same waters. The "war zone" of one nation overlaps the "defense zone" of the other. Germany defines "contraband" as one thing, we as another. And so as to blockade and the other technical terms of so-called international law. Indeed, the very term "international law" is itself inexact. Hardly can "international law" be said to exist. For there cannot be law unless there are courts to interpret what the law means—and there are no international courts.

From refinements about all this sort of thing we had best get away; we should merely be lost in a fog of words. We can base what we have done upon actions by Germany. One alone, the sinking of the *Robin Moor*, is sufficient.

The *Robin Moor* was an American merchant vessel in the South Atlantic, thousands of miles from any war zone. She was sunk by a German submarine, without provision for safety of crew and passengers. We can omit any discussion about whether her cargo was contraband. The manner of the sinking, standing alone, was contrary to everything that has ever passed as international law, and contrary, as Mr. Roosevelt says, to "every principle of humanity." Besides it was, as Mr. Roosevelt says, "in direct violation of international agreements signed by the Government of Germany" several years ago.

The *Robin Moor* was sunk almost 4 months ago. Had Germany offered explanation or apology or reparations, we might have assumed the sinking was a mistake. As President Roosevelt says, "it would be unworthy of a great Nation to exaggerate an isolated incident." In the absence of explanation by Germany—and in the presence of other sinkings and attacks continuing to this day—we are obliged to assume the sinking of the *Robin Moor* was part of a general attitude of Germany toward us.

That the most powerful Nation in the world should permit a merchant vessel of its citizens to be sunk as the *Robin Moor* was and fail to do what we have now done would be to forfeit the respect of the world and forfeit the confidence of its own people.

A Century of Culture at Fordham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

ADDRESS OF GOV. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, A civic celebration of the centenary of Fordham University, the president's dinner, was held last night at the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria. The president of the University Alumni Association, Mr. Paul T. O'Keefe, acted as toastmaster. At this celebration, officials of the Federal, State, and City governments, delegates from leading colleges and universities, members of the alumni, and thousands of friends paid tribute to Fordham.

President Roosevelt and the Nation were represented by Vice President WALLACE. The Most Reverend Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, apostolic delegate, spoke for the Holy Father; Gov. Herbert H. Lehman for the State of New York; and Dr. Harry Woodburn Chase, chancelor of New York University, for the colleges and universities. The addresses delivered by these distinguished visitors, and by the President of Fordham, Father Robert I. Gannon, S. J., and Archbishop Francis J. Spellman, were broadcast Nation-wide. The address of Governor Lehman is one that should find a ready response in the heart of every citizen of our beloved country. In his characteristic, straight-forward manner Governor Lehman gave expression to a problem which now besets the minds of the leaders of this land, national unity.

I hope every Member of the Congress will read the words of the Governor, because, in his address, he points the way which we may well follow. It offers a solution to the evil of racial and religious intolerance which is now rampant in our country and which is a real and permanent threat to our national unity.

In recognition of his splendid and unselfish record of public service, Fordham University has awarded to Governor Lehman the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

I have great admiration for this metropolitan institution of higher learning and for its large and distinguished student and alumni body. I deem it a privilege to make part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address delivered by Governor Lehman and thus mark this historic centennial celebration of Fordham University.

The address is as follows:

Today the world is faced with dangers which threaten civilization itself. In a great part of the world force has usurped the place of reason, might is triumphant over right. Dictators demand that men obey them blindly and deny the right of men to follow the dictates of their conscience. Moral values, they say, exist only through

the fiat of the State, itself ruled by a dictator. There, indeed, the light of religion is burning dimly. Perhaps more than ever it is the duty of religion to hold high the torch which it has received; to feed the flame until once more it burns so brightly that all the world may see it and again exclaim, "In Thy light we shall see light."

It is our good fortune in this country that freedom of thought and conscience is safeguarded by our fundamental law, and what is perhaps even more important, by the character and spirit of the people. And it is becoming every day more clearly evident that for the solution of the great problems which face mankind, mankind needs freedom of thought and conscience, needs moral values and spiritual ideals. Everywhere thoughtful men are constrained to recognize that we have been prone to apply standards of value which are evanescent rather than standards which remain eternally true.

I rejoice, therefore, that the one-hundredth anniversary of the establishment of this great university is to be made an opportunity to consider the other side of life—the religious and ethical and spiritual aspect of life. This anniversary reminds us that even today there are men and institutions standing firmly for those intangible things without which life is not worth living—the ideals of justice, mercy, and humility.

The past several decades have brought both to poor and to rich comforts, conveniences, even luxuries, undreamed of in the past. Through scientific and mechanical progress we have achieved an age of plenty, and yet in spite of the plenty, and some even say because of that plenty, we have felt during the last years a widespread and acute economic depression. New means of communication have almost wiped out space and distance; but as means of communication have increased, the nations have erected more and more barriers against each other. Almost everywhere we see intolerance and repression and loss of freedom of the individual. Men have lost faith in one another. In the fierce struggle to gain a livelihood or to acquire wealth, modern man gives little heed to the method he uses. Too often he feels that one man's gain necessarily involves another's loss. As in the evil days, described in the Bible, "each man is for himself and against each other."

Individual ruthlessness finds its counterpart in the relationship between the nations of the world. The rule that might makes right now governs wide areas. There the only argument which has been effective during the last years has been force and violence.

To the problems of economic distress and war there has been added a third, intolerance, hatreds, and repressions. Fundamental human rights and liberties which we have thought were inalienable are now completely destroyed in many lands. Even in this country they are now being challenged.

We cannot permit these liberties to be destroyed. We can protect them and American democracy only if we have complete national unity of the spirit.

Division between our people must not be allowed to exist if democracy is to be preserved. Hate begets hate. Intolerance begets intolerance. Oppression of the individual or of groups inevitably leads to the oppression of other individuals and groups. Wherever racial or religious division has raised its ugly head the death knell of human liberties has been sounded.

An attack on one religion weakens all religious faiths, since the basis of all true religion is identical—charity, justice, and tolerance.

Those who would sow the seeds of discord between those of different faiths are dangerous enemies, both of religion and of democracy. They would tear down the pillars of morality and freedom.

The fight against those who would destroy religion and spirituality is a common fight of all churches.

How can religion solve the problems that confront us? What has religion to offer us today? How can religion furnish us with a basis for a happier, nobler society, a just and peaceful world? Fortunately, we of both the Christian and Jewish tradition may find in our Bible a clear statement as to the message and meaning of religion and its relation to problems. Through Moses the world received the two commandments, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy soul, and with all thy heart, and with all thy might," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." In these two commandments are summed up man's duty to his God and to his fellowman. They represent the spirit of all true religion. Again, in those few phrases of the prophet Micah, we find the essence of religion stated so sublimely, so straightforwardly, that none can mistake it: "It hath been told thee, O man, what is good and what the Lord doth require of thee; only to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God." Here are the essentials of all religion, summed up without complication and without omission. Here too, are the essentials of social justice.

It is this combination of justice and mercy and humility before God which the world needs today. Religion, with its belief in a universal Father, religion with its insistence upon the reality of the force working for righteousness in the world—religion, I say, is the natural ally of all those who would bring about a real brotherhood among men, and end for all time man's inhumanity to man. If justice and mercy would supplant selfishness and lust for power which dominates the actions of men, if reverence for God and respect for man created in the image of God motivated our lives, would brutal war and shallow materialism darken the face of the earth? If these fundamentals of religion were truly to rule in the hearts of men, could we not banish poverty, violence, and intolerance from the world?

Once again, religion must come to rescue the world from barbarism and destruction.

Albert G. Rutherford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the death of our colleague, and my good friend, occurred at a time I was unavoidably absent from Washington, with official permission of the House, and, accordingly, I did not then have the opportunity to pay my respects to his memory.

Colonel RUTHERFORD was beloved by his friends; he was not only an able and efficient legislator and public servant who was devoted to duty, but also a considerate and genial companion. I shall never forget the cordial greeting he extended to me when I arrived in Washington as a new Member of Congress; how he made me feel at home, and the many courtesies he showed me. Often I joined him in the section of the House we Pennsylvanians call the "Pennsylvania Main Line," and benefited from his kindly wisdom and helpful advice. I had the greatest respect for his sound judgment and good counsel, and can fully appreciate the great loss sustained by his constituency, our State and Nation. We will miss him sincerely, but the example of his fine record is an inspiration to me, as it must be to many of my colleagues. We have lost, but we shall not forget, our friend and colleague.

Post-War Planning Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

MEMORANDUM BY THE NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, known as H. R. 5638, to amend the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931. The bill is a companion to a Senate measure sponsored by Senator ROBERT WAGNER, of New York.

The National Resources Planning Board advocates the enactment of this legislation as a part of a post-war planning program of public works. Their memorandum on the legislation, prepared at my request, is of wide interest and I submit it to the Congress, together with a copy of the bill, for consideration:

MEMORANDUM ON H. R. 5638, A BILL TO AMEND THE EMPLOYMENT STABILIZATION ACT OF 1931

This bill is proposed to carry out recommendations made by the President in two of his messages to the Congress during this session.

In his annual Budget message on January 3, 1941, the President said:

"During this period of national emergency it seems appropriate to defer construction projects that interfere with the defense program by diverting manpower and materials. Further, it is very wise for us to establish a reservoir of post-defense projects to help absorb labor that later will be released by defense industry. * * * Throughout the Federal service * * * projects are being deferred until a more appropriate time. However, surveys and the planning of new projects will go forward so that construction can be resumed without delay. This will produce a long list of public-work projects, apart from defense construction, arranged according to priorities. Such a list could be submitted to a future Congress for the appropriation of funds to put it into operation."

Again in his message of March 17, 1941, transmitting the annual report of the National Resources Planning Board on the development of resources and the stabilization of employment in the United States

(H. Doc. 142, 77th Cong., 1st sess.) the President said:

"Because of the current national emergency, projects not needed for defense have been temporarily deferred. As a result, we are now in the process of storing up a reservoir of nondefense work which can be loosed when the pace of rearmament slackens. * * * If projects are to be ready at hand for rapid inauguration in times of need, the surveys and investigations, the engineering plans and specifications must be prepared in advance. Authorizations and financial arrangements must be already agreed upon. The planning * * * fund, suggested in the Board's report, would make available a shelf of useful projects without in any way committing the Government to the immediate construction of such works."

The proposal embodied in the bill grows out of the Government's experience during the past 10 years in planning and administering large scale public-improvement programs.

Beginning in 1931, the Congress in enacting the Employment Stabilization Act declared it (sec. 8 (a) of the act) "to be the policy of Congress to arrange the construction of public works so far as practicable in such manner as will assist in the stabilization of industry and employment through the proper timing of such construction, and that to further this object there shall be advance planning, including preparation of detailed construction plans, of public works."

To make effective this declaration of policy, the Congress directed (sec. 8 (b), (c), and (e) of the act) each construction agency of the Federal Government to prepare and keep up to date by means of an annual revision a 6-year advance plan and program of public-works construction with estimates showing projects allotted to each year. Plans for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of advance detailed construction plans "for not less than 1 year in advance" were to be included in the agencies' 6-year programs. The act also provided for the collection of "information concerning advance construction plans and estimates by States, municipalities, and other public and private agencies which may indicate the probable volume of construction within the United States or which may aid the (Federal) construction agencies in formulating their advance plans."

Before the provisions of the act of 1931 had gone into full operation, the Government had embarked on a series of large-scale programs using construction as a means toward employment stabilization. Federal expenditures for, and the financing of, new construction (including grants and loans) increased from less than a half billion dollars during 1931 to more than two and a half billion during 1939. Since then such expenditures and new financing have topped even the latter amount because of the defense program.

From the experience gained since 1931, three points have been particularly outstanding.[1]

1. A coordination of the public-works policies of the Federal, State, and local governments is necessary in order to avoid having the efforts of the Federal Government to expand public-works activities frustrated by the curtailment of expenditures by States and cities. The following table shows the effect on the total volume of public construction of the curtailment of public construction by States and cities during the period 1930 to 1940.

Estimated expenditure of public funds for new public construction, 1930–40 [1]

[Millions of dollars]

Calendar year	Public construction financed by Federal funds	Public construction financed by State and local funds	Total public construction
1930	307	2,469	2,776
1931	422	2,156	2,578
1932	460	1,334	1,794
1933	647	707	1,354
1934	1,380	794	2,174
1935	1,234	616	1,850
1936	2,335	881	3,216
1937	2,043	845	2,888
1938	2,085	1,103	3,188
1939	2,206	1,314	3,520
1940	2,281	[2]1,143	[2]3,424

[1] Including work-relief construction.
[2] Preliminary estimates.

If some means could have been found during the period from 1930 to 1940 to hold State and local public works expenditures steady, then the Federal grants and increased Federal expenditures for public construction would have had the increased employment-creating effect for which they were intended. As it was, Federal grants for non-Federal public construction generally took the place of, rather than added to, construction expenditures by States and cities.

One way of assisting in maintaining a steady volume of State and local public construction is to encourage the formulation of long-term programs of public improvements and financial plans. Long-range programing of State and local public activities, in conformance with the long-range financial resources of the governments involved, would go far toward smoothing out the curve of State and local activity, and also would provide a sound basis of administration for any financial assistance which the Congress might decide to make available during periods of depression. Such State and local public improvement programming is one policy which the Federal Government should encourage in order to assure that future Federal grants for public improvements will provide an addition to, rather than a replacing of, expenditures by the States and local governments.

2. The objectives in using public works and related activities as means for obtaining employment stabilization have been twofold: (1) The building of works and the supplying of services to meet the needs of the country; and (2) providing employment for idle men and resources during any period of depression.

A series of emergency programs of public works may fail to achieve one of these over-all objectives. While it is true that employment creation was the primary purpose of such emergency programs, it is also true that such employment was to be used in building useful needed works and improvements. The consequence of emergency programs was a sort of dead-line type of administration, in which too often projects had to be selected in accordance with their degree of readiness and the quickness with which they would put great numbers of men to work, rather than in accordance with the urgency of need for the works and improvements being undertaken. When these two criteria—immediate employment and urgency of need for the works and improvements—worked together, valuable national, State, and local improvements resulted; when the criteria were in conflict, too often the project values had to take second place.

A continuing planning policy established by the Congress would make it possible to prepare plans considerably in advance for projects that might be included in public improvement programs. Then, if and when the Congress provided appropriations for expanding such programs quickly, projects with high national, State, and local values could be selected to give immediate employment. Administration of the program would be facilitated to the extent that project selection could always be in terms of the two criteria—employment created and urgency of the need for the improvement.

3. It has been amply demonstrated that many months may elapse between the making of appropriations for a large program of public improvements and the actual employment of great numbers of men. This delay is occasioned by the time necessary to carry out the preliminary surveys, studies, and investigations, to make the detailed plans and specifications, to arrange for financing, to acquire land, to advertise for and receive bids and award contracts, and to organize operations. Although problems of great difficulty must first be solved, it is possible to shorten or telescope some of these time elements. For example, current custom delays the surveys and preparation of detailed plans until after funds are appropriated for carrying out a project. These steps in preparation could more logically be taken in advance of decision, so that the legislative body would have more accurate data on which to judge the merits of proposals. But here, too, there are some serious problems to be faced. Such planning would have to be undertaken long before the need for an expanded program becomes apparent, and the key to taking these steps is the advance provision of funds for the preliminary planning work.

To provide funds some years in advance for the survey and engineering work involved on public projects presents, of course, the hazard that costs will be incurred on many projects that may never be undertaken. To the extent that this occurs, the procedure would be a wasteful one. However, the hazard is not particularly great if the financing of this preliminary work is properly administered. Exercise of sound administrative judgment would reduce to minimum the losses involved. In any event, the losses that would come about might quite properly be considered as low-cost insurance against an emergency. The cost would, without question, be far less than the cost of being caught unprepared.

Thus, our experience during the past decade has clearly shown that the policy declared by the Congress in the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931 needs to be implemented further by the advance provision of funds to be made available by administrative allocation to Federal agencies and to State and local governments for preliminary studies and for the plans and specifications for public improvements, works, and related activities, with the clear understanding that such advances would represent in no sense a commitment to undertake such projects at any time. The provisions of H. R. 5638 authorize the appropriation of funds for just such purposes.

Under the proposed legislation, the Employment Stabilization Act is amended by adding a new section authorizing the appropriation of funds to the President "for the making of such examinations, surveys, investigations, legal studies, comprehensive plans and programs, engineering plans and specifications, and forms of legal proceedings, as may be necessary to facilitate and expedite the selection, financing, and inauguration of public improvements, works, and related activities." The President is authorized to allot such funds to agencies of the United States and to make advances to the States, Territories, and island possessions, and their agencies and political subdivisions. The President may use such agencies as he may designate for making such allotments and advances. Provision is also made for the President to make such rules and regulations

[1] See also the reports of the National Resources Planning Board on "Development of Resources and Stabilization of Employment in the United States" and "The Economic Effects of the Federal Public Works Experience, 1933–38."

as may be necessary to cover the allotments and advances, including requirements as to reimbursement, or as to contributions of funds, services, or materials, in connection with advances to States, Territories, and island possessions, and their agencies and political subdivisions.

Primary authority and responsibility for administering the funds are vested in the President, inasmuch as the authority and functions under the Employment Stabilization Act were transferred to the Executive Office of the President by Reorganization Plan No. I and are "administered under the direction and supervision of the President by the National Resources Planning Board" (sec. 4 (a) of Reorganization Plan No. I).

The proposed legislation would enable the appropriation of funds to carry on the following specific activities:

1. Examinations, surveys, and investigations could be undertaken by one or more Federal agencies in cooperation with such State and local governmental agencies as may be concerned, for studying proposals directed toward the preparation of comprehensive plans and programs for the protection and development of the resources of the Nation. These studies could cover a single proposed project or a group of them; the development of a drainage-basin area, a land-use area, a forest or a mining region; in fact, the areas to be covered will be largely determined by the type of problem or resource under consideration. Additional authorizations and funds are needed for the over-all type of surveys and investigations which must be made if the water, land, and forest resources of the Nation are to be developed and put to their best use; if our future highways and airports are to be properly located and of the size necessary to carry the anticipated traffic; if the blighted areas of our cities are to be rebuilt; if the proper kinds and amounts of housing are to be provided; and if our public-health services, our public buildings and our welfare institutions are to be located and designed to provide a maximum service with a minimum outlay.

There is need also for coordinated planning and survey work by Federal, State, and local agencies, so that one agency is not working in ignorance of the proposals of another. For example, if a State agency is planning a road system or studying a school-building program, and a Federal agency is planning a water project which may flood certain areas, or render them unsuitable for use, it is the better part of wisdom to make sure that no new roads or schools are planned for an area which eventually may be flooded. Better yet, the road, school, and water planning should be only segments of a coordinated or joint over-all planning effort for the area involved.

2. Legal studies and forms of legal proceedings could be undertaken in advance of authorization of projects to avoid legal obstacles and the delays now often encountered before public projects can be undertaken. Most local public bodies are subject to strict constitutional and statutory limitations and requirements in the making of loans and contracts involving cumbersome and lengthy procedures and often including the necessity for special elections. Debt and tax limitations sometimes prevent borrowing by public bodies where there is the greatest need for public improvements. Using the experience of the last 7 years it should be possible to suggest new procedures which, upon adoption by State and local governments, might materially reduce the length of time necessary to get projects under way.

3. Comprehensive plans and programs could be developed in order to provide adequate consideration of all the developmental needs of a community or area in appropriate balance and to establish a definite and effective order of undertaking the most needed projects. Such plans and programs could be prepared: (1) by Federal agencies; (2) by joint action of the Federal, State, and local agencies concerned; and (3) by State and local governments covering only their own activities with financial and technical assistance from appropriate Federal agencies.

These comprehensive plans and programs are the means by which individual projects proposed as a result of the surveys and investigations are placed in their proper relationship to each other so that the development of any individual area or region in the Nation follows a well-considered pattern. This procedure makes possible the provision of roads and schools coincidental with the opening of new lands; the building of community facilities in tempo with new industrial developments; and the rehabilitation of cities by removing blighted areas in accordance with long-term plans.

4. Engineering plans and specifications could be prepared by two different procedures:

(a) Allotments could be made to Federal agencies for the preparation of detailed plans for those individual projects in their 6-year advance programs. Over the past 10 years, the Federal Government has spent on the average $500,000,000 annually for "direct" Federal construction projects. Currently it is estimated that such Federal agencies have detailed plans for only about $265,000,000 of projects in their backlog. This would be less than the expenditure in an average year. Further, detailed plans have been prepared for only approximately 10 percent of the total cost of the projects in the advance programs. To carry out the declaration of policy by the Congress in the Employment Stabilization Act, detailed construction plans should be available for not less than 1 year in advance, i. e. they should cover not less than $500,000,000 of Federal direct construction.

(b) Advances could be made through Federal agencies to State and local governments for the preparation of detailed plans for individual projects in the comprehensive advance plans and programs of State and local governments. Prior to 1931 and the decline in the total volume of non-Federal public construction, State and local public construction averaged more than $2,000,000,000 a year, reaching a high of approximately $2,500,000,000 in 1930. Preparation of detailed construction plans should cover not less than 1 year of such construction in advance if the Federal grant-in-aid and loan agencies are to carry out the policy declaration of the Congress.

The Federal Works Agency, in cooperation with the National Resources Planning Board, is sponsoring a project which will operate with Work Projects Administration funds and staff to determine the approximate volume, nature, and distribution of potential public works which may be undertaken by local and State agencies after the reduction of defense activities. But this inventory of need will not be enough, and funds will be required to provide for the investigations, surveys, and preparation of detailed construction plans which are so essential before the "dirt can fly."

Also, it is important to note that there is no reason that advances could not be made to State and local governments for plan preparation and be repaid from funds appropriated by the State and local governments if they decide to undertake an improvement without any financial assistance whatsoever from the Federal Government; or if such financial assistance for carrying out an improvement is made available by the Federal Government, the advances previously made for plan preparation could be deducted from the grant or loan so made.

Finally, five points should be emphasized in connection with the proposed legislation:

1. The authorization of appropriations which the bill proposes supplements existing authorizations of Federal agencies for survey and planning work. The proposed authorization is not intended to supplant any existing authorizations.

2. The intent of the bill is to allot or advance funds for survey or plan preparation only when such preliminary work is in accord with or for the purpose of developing a long-term plan for community, State, regional, or national development.

3. Any allotments or advances from funds appropriated under the proposed authorization would not represent, in any sense, a commitment by the Congress to appropriate funds to undertake at any time the projects covered by plans made under such allotments or advances.

4. The bill provides for advances to State and local governments for plan preparation by their own staffs and consultants. It does not propose Federal domination of the design and planning work of State and local governments; nor does it propose that the Federal agencies should create staffs to replace the staffs of such State and local governments.

5. The bill provides a form of insurance against the time when emergency programs again may be necessary. It assures that if and when such time comes, plans will be ready and, if the Congress so legislates, men and materials can be put to work more quickly and on better undertakings than would be the case otherwise.

[H. R. 5638, 77th Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill to amend the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931

Be it enacted, etc., That the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931 is amended by adding the following section:

"SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually such sums as may be necessary for allotment to agencies of the United States and for advances to the States, Territories, and island possessions, and the agencies and political subdivisions thereof, by the President, through the Federal Works Agency or such agencies as he may designate, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, for the making of such examinations, surveys, investigations, legal studies, comprehensive plans and programs, engineering plans and specifications, and forms of legal proceedings, as may be necessary to facilitate and expedite the selection, financing, and inauguration of public improvements, works, and related activities: *Provided*, That advances to States, Territories, and island possessions, and political subdivisions thereof, shall be subject to such requirements as to reimbursement, or with respect to contribution of funds, services, or materials, as the President may determine."

A United America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT AND ILLINOIS STATE REGISTER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was reprinted by the Illinois State Register of September 15, 1941, having been

previously printed in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, entitled "A United America."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Illinois State Register of September 15, 1941]

"A UNITED AMERICA"

(Today the State Register yields this editorial space to the following editorial which appeared under the above caption in the Sunday St. Louis Globe-Democrat. You are urged to read it carefully, bearing in mind that the Globe-Democrat is a powerful Republican newspaper and foe of the New Deal.)

The time has arrived for plain talk about the grave international situation. The time has come when Americans must forget their bickering and name-calling and inflammatory oratory and face the facts as they should be faced—as a united Nation.

American disunity is precisely what Hitler wants, and his wishes have been gratified too long. We can't afford to play his game any longer.

The American Navy has received orders from its Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, to shoot on sight German and Italian war vessels which enter waters within our defense zone. He reached this decision after a series of attacks on American ships by German submarines and bombers.

He told the Nation and the world last Thursday night that we do not want a "shooting war" with the Axis Powers, but we will defend to the limit of our strength our historic right to freedom of the seas, and we will keep the line of supply open to all nations now fighting Hitler and his satellites.

There never may be a "shooting war"; we prayerfully hope not. But a "shooting war" may start today, tomorrow, or next week, if the Axis Powers force the issue. We are, therefore, in a state of incipient, undeclared war with Germany and Italy which may flame into formal war on a moment's notice. This is the situation, and the Nation never faced a more apprehensive future.

In urging that America stand united against a peril which is real and constantly growing, the Globe-Democrat stands squarely behind President Roosevelt and his foreign policy. If this seems incongruous to some in view of this newspaper's consistent differences with the President over his domestic program—the New Deal—we reiterate that there is no relation between the two programs.

Today we are faced with an international crisis which threatens our national existence, our physical existence as a free and independent entity among the nations of the world. The President, with access to facts not available to most of us, long ago saw the oncoming danger and, with such forces as he could command, took steps to thwart it.

From the start, he has been opposed by individuals and groups which have seen in complete isolation America's only security against war. We will grant that, for the most part, these individuals and groups have been sincere in their bristling challenges. There has been a regrettable excess of harsh words passed between the isolationists and those who champion the administration's program. Last week witnessed a lamentable effort by these die-hard noninterventionists to inject racial intolerance into the debate. We refer to testimony before a Senate subcommittee investigating the motion-picture industry and Colonel Lindbergh's address at Des Moines. In both instances, the Jews were excoriated as warmongers. This base appeal to racial prejudice indicates desperation rather than reasoned argument.

America has arrived at this brink of war by clearly discernible processes. Hitler's expanding Reich has beaten 19 countries to their knees. England alone has stood against his attacks, excepting Russia which has had only 3 months of war. It is Hitler's plain intention to rule the world and he is off to a good start. After Europe is conquered, the Western Hemisphere is next on his agenda. The blueprints of Nazi aggression the world over are written in the blood of victim countries. There can be no mistake as to the German dream of world overlordship.

The frontier of United States defense—of the defense of the Western Hemisphere—has been set in England by the President. The waters of the Atlantic must be free to American shipping if Hitler is to be stopped.

We agree with the President that this is true, and are convinced that this is the solemn and studied judgment of the majority of the American people.

We abandoned formal neutrality with the adoption of the lease-land act. All-out aid to Britain is our program, because by saving England we are saving ourselves. All-out aid can mean but one thing—not only manufacturing planes, and tanks, and other war material, but delivering them in England.

Hitler by at least four unwarranted attacks on American vessels seeks to halt that effort. He has launched a campaign of unrestricted submarine warfare to destroy our bridge of ships across the Atlantic. By so doing he has defied us to proceed with a program which the majority of Americans agree is our first protection against ultimate Nazi attack.

Can he get away with it? The President says "No"—and the echo rings from Maine to California. We seek no war with Hitler, we want no war with any of the Axis Powers. But we will fight if we must—God forbid.

Our course has been set by the President. Right or wrong, it is the course we must follow.

Up to last Thursday night honest doubters could express themselves freely—and did. But the President's defense program, drastic as it is, must not be sabotaged henceforth by the Wheelers and Lindberghs and Nyes. They have spoken their pieces and should retire.

From now on the United States must be a united Nation. To take our stand otherwise is to play Hitler's game under his own rules.

The Constitution's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of September 17, 1941:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, September 17, 1941]

THE CONSTITUTION'S BIRTHDAY

The Constitution which was signed in Philadelphia 155 years ago today was transmuted into the Government of the United States as Europe was on the brink of a great revolution and a world war. It was the product of men who themselves had waged and won a successful revolution. Yet so firm was its foundation, so sound its structure, that this Government has survived through civil strife and new world wars, while only one of those governments which existed in 1787—the Government of Great Britain—has escaped destruction or catastrophic revolution. Today, with the world in the throes of another great revolution—this time a revolution of reaction—and another great world war, the American Constitution stands out more than ever as the impregnable fortress of a free people. The government which has been built up within its sturdy frame is as vigorous and determined as ever. It is engaged in helping to defeat the forces of reaction abroad. It has resisted the efforts of those who have sought to weaken it from within through creating disunity and distrust.

Americans have a right to pride in the fact that the strength of their country today is so much a product of the Constitution. The dominating philosophy of the men who framed this document was that there are certain rights which no Government agent may deny to any citizen. Their own experience had taught them that these rights were precious beyond belief. They knew that these were the pillars of freedom. Therefore they sought to make these rights secure for all time and for all Americans. In the light of what has happened to similar rights under the heel of Europe's dictators their foresight and wisdom stand out with fresh luster. In fact, the war in Europe today is a contest between those peoples who believe in these rights and the Axis dictators, whose entire philosophy is based on the destruction of these rights.

The Constitution is thus symbolical of a cause as well as the embodiment of a philosophy of government for free men. The more it is studied the more its strength is apparent. The longer it has endured the greater has the world's respect for it become. Today more than ever it deserves to be celebrated, for today more than ever it is apparent that the principles which it embodies will prevail and that, to use the famous words of Abraham Lincoln, "government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. SCHWARTZ

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY AUBREY WILLIAMS

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a report on the help the National Youth Administration has extended to 4,000,000 American youth since 1935, as made to the people of the United States by Mr. Aubrey Williams, N. Y. A. Administrator, in an address broadcast last Monday night in the National Radio Forum on a program arranged by the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 16, 1941]

YOUTH FINDING IT HARD TO GET DEFENSE JOBS—N. Y. A. CHIEF DESCRIBES TRAINING PROGRAM IN RADIO FORUM ADDRESS

(The text of Mr. Williams' address follows:)

From the summer of 1935 and up to the present time it has been costing each one

of you in my radio audience about 71 cents a year for operation of the National Youth Administration. In those 6 years that expenditure on the part of each citizen has made it possible for you to provide opportunities for 4,000,000 American young people. Two million of these youth are students whom the N. Y. A. has given the chance to work their way through schools and colleges. The other 2,000,000 are out of school and unemployed youth for whom the N. Y. A. has provided useful work and the background of practical experience essential for jobs in private industry.

That, in summary, is where your 71 cents a year has gone—to provide opportunities for 4,000,000 American youth.

Even in past years—in the days when 6,000,000 young people were looking for jobs and finding none—there were some who questioned the wisdom of your investment in young people. Today, with defense employment—and with thousands of young people in service in the armed forces—there has developed an easy complacency that anyone can get a job who wants one—that we need not worry about youth any longer—and a question is raised whether your investment in the N. Y. A. is still essential.

These are the days of essentials, for young people and for all of us, and jobs are one of the first. How do our young people fare in regard to jobs?

MANY STILL UNEMPLOYED

A year's experience with the defense program has compelled many of us to revise our ideas about employment prospects for youth. A year ago it was widely predicted that the first year of defense would break the back of unemployment by creating 6,000,000 to 7,000,000 jobs. Today we know that the actual increase was less than half the number predicted. Forecasts of the immediate end of unemployment were premature. As the Secretary of Labor has pointed out, "there will still be a reservoir of unused labor in July 1942."

That is one of the most important facts facing American youth today. Despite increased defense employment, large numbers of them are still unemployed. It is unfortunate, but true, that at a time when the Nation is making every exertion to use all its resources for production, one of its best resources—its young people of working age—remains in large part idle and unused.

Why is this true? You and I are concerned because the progress of defense production is vital. We are interested because we have sons and daughters and what happens to any American youth may happen to our own. Young people themselves—at a time when we are calling for speed and still more speed, production and still more production—want to know why they are denied a chance to work.

To date, something like $56,000,000,000 has been appropriated or authorized for defense purposes. To become the arsenal of the democracies we are transforming old industries and creating new ones. Factories and yards which had been producing peacetime articles at a peacetime tempo have been converted into defense plants and are feverishly turning out guns, planes, and tanks, and ships. It has been a tremendous effort. Its effect has been felt in all sections of the country and at all levels of society.

JOBS WENT TO THE SKILLED

But this enormous effort has not yet reached great numbers of young people who are in the labor market trying to find work.

The answer as to why this is so is not an easy one. We know that the needs of defense industry have created thousands of new jobs. We know that large numbers of new plants had to be built, that others had to be expanded. But we know also that much of the demand for the work has been concentrated—concentrated both by geographical location and by specialized occupation.

The lion's share of defense orders naturally had to be awarded to plants which were already in operation at their existing locations—and the labor force had to be drawn from the existing supply of skilled and experienced workers who alone could do the highly specialized work required.

It is well known that prime defense contracts have not been evenly distributed among the several States. During the 13 months ending in June of this year the War and Navy Departments, fighting for speed and economy, awarded almost one-third of all announced major prime contracts to three States. These same three States contain only one-sixth of the Nation's youth population. Six States, with less than one-third of the youth population, obtained more than one-half of all defense contracts. At the other extreme, 24 States, with considerably more than one-fifth of the Nation's youth, were awarded only about one-twentieth of the prime defense contracts I am not here criticizing the War or Navy Departments. I am discussing how these things affect young people.

Defense orders, that is to say, have been concentrated in the large urban and industrial areas where youth make up a smaller proportion of the population than in other areas. The proportion of youth is highest in those agricultural areas which have experienced the smallest pick-up in employment, and in some cases have even experienced decreases. The result is a continued pile-up of unemployed youth.

Efforts to spread the work by farming out orders have not yet been sufficient to correct this basic unevenness. The concentration of defense work in the Northeast, the Pacific coast area, and in the Atlantic and Central States has thus created sharp local or regional demands for workers while leaving other areas almost untouched.

MANY BECOME STRANDED

But the accident of geography alone would not be enough to keep young people out of work. They are the most mobile part of our population. When they hear of a boom somewhere they are only too ready to pack up and migrate to the spot where jobs are available. This brings us to the second of the serious barriers which keep youth out of defense work.

While it is obvious that defense industry needs an enormous number of new workers, it is less understood that these workers must possess some experience or training. They must know how to do certain things. There are some interesting figures on this point which were supplied last June by the Department of Labor. By April 1942 the Department estimated that the basic defense industries—like aircraft, shipbuilding, machine tools, ordnance, and several others of similar importance—would require almost 1,500,000 additional workers. But it was estimated that less than one-sixth of these could be unskilled; the remaining five-sixths had to be professional, subprofessional, skilled, or at least semiskilled.

This is not to deny that unskilled or inexperienced workers have been able to get jobs in defense industries; in some sections, and under extreme pressure, employers have had to hire such labor as was available. But by and large, the young worker without work experience, or without skill, has relatively a slim chance of breaking into defense industry compared with the worker with work experience or skill.

Under such circumstances, when inexperienced youth migrate to defense centers—and I know from personal observation that large numbers of them have—many of them fail to find jobs and are simply stranded, thus adding new difficulties to any already aggravated youth problem, and increasing the strain on the living and health facilities of the defense area.

APPRENTICESHIP DIED OUT

I find it impossible to blame these young people. The Nation was no more prepared for the defense boom than they were. The cold facts are that for the past 30 years we have done about everything we could to take work out of the lives of young people. The moves by which we have done this have for the most part been, in themselves, good. We have extended the ban against child labor—a good thing, but the schooling we substituted left out productive work. Generation after generation of young people have come of age without having gained any experience which would help them make a living. Industry quit training them 12 years ago. Apprenticeship practically died out. We took physical, manual work out of the lives of young people in America. This was as true in other parts of the world as in our own country. This probably is the most important single fact regarding young people of the past quarter of a century. There can be little doubt that this condition had much to do with the rise of youth movements and their later capture and use in the totalitarian nations. In our own country, being more thoroughly established in the democratic form, no such political or industrial organization of the discontent and destitution of young people has arisen. But only those who have worked at the job of providing them with some positive aids know to what extent efforts have been made in this country to capitalize upon idleness and destitution of our young people. The basic trouble is due to the fact that we have taken work out of their lives. With the defense needs now upon us, we now find that one of the weakest spots in our industrial preparedness is the shortage of qualified workers with all the necessarily wide variety of special skills required for defense production.

Even with the great needs of the defense situation facing us, we only gradually woke up to the true state of things. For up to a certain point, while industry was absorbing the unemployed skilled workers on hand, production expanded rapidly. Then expansion became more difficult, in large part because of the scarcity of trained workers. At that point our failure to train young workers became evident and now constitutes a major bottleneck in the defense program.

The quickening tempo of production, resulting either directly or indirectly from the defense program, has boosted total employment to an all-time high. In spite of the difficulties of changing over from peacetime production to defense production, employment by July of this year rose to 39,241,000 in nonagricultural industries, an increase of 1,770,000 over the best month of 1929.

HELPS YOUTHS TO LEARN

Compared with the past decade, the number of unemployed is low. According to the latest data available, there were in August 5,300,000 unemployed workers But 2,200,000 of these were youth. This means that of all the employed those in the narrow age group from 16 to 24 comprised 42 percent. The enormity of this percentage lies in the fact that this age group comprises only 25 percent of all the workers in the labor market.

I dislike figures, but these are necessary: At the end of March 1940, when the last population census was taken, if the unemployment of youth had been in proportion to the unemployment of older workers between 25 and 44, the number of unemployed youth would have been 1,300,000 less than it actually was.

Even with all that has happened in taking work or training out of the lives of young people, there is still a popular notion that young people get hired first. This is not true, for, despite their eagerness to work, despite

their energy and ambition, youth having no training or experience are naturally more liable to unemployment than any other age group. The reason is obvious as soon as we ask ourselves what kind of workers industry—particularly defense industry—requires to do the job. Choosing between a job seeker with work experience and one without previous experience, between a worker who is acquainted with shop practices and one who is not, the employer naturally picks the applicant who has worked before, and who can offer an already developed skill.

Fortunately, at least to some extent, the Government has recognized this problem. It has developed experience-giving work projects to help young people obtain the skills they need for work in industry, particularly in defense industry.

The National Youth Administration was created during the depression to deal primarily with this problem. Established in 1935 to provide work projects for needy unemployed youth, the N. Y A is preparing thousands of young men and women for jobs in defense industry. It does this by giving them practical, on-the-job, productive work. Its flexibility and widespread activities are enabling it to meet preemployment problems that could not be met by any other agency.

In 800 shops and production projects throughout the country, with 3,800 work stations, 70,000 to 80,000 youths are learning the precise skills which defense industry needs. They learn the job by doing it—by handling the same sort of equipment and using the same mechanical processes that will be required of them when they leave N. Y. A. to enter defense industry.

WORK IN MACHINE SHOPS

In machine shops they work on drills, lathes, and milling machines—and they produce machine and equipment parts, hand tools, and dozens of other items. In welding shops youth are working on the same equipment that they will use in building ships. In our radio shops, where they learn how to repair and operate radio equipment, they turn out useful products and at the same time prepare themselves for jobs as radio operators and technicians.

A large number of N. Y. A. projects employ young women, who are well adapted to many kinds of defense work. They learn to use industrial equipment and acquire manual dexterity. On all kinds of N. Y. A. projects—shop work, construction, hospital and health assistance, conservation, clerical projects, sanitation work—youth learn a job by doing it.

On hours arranged not to conflict with their working time, N. Y. A. youth attend classes under the Office of Education for instruction in subjects which are closely related to the actual work they are doing. They take courses in blueprint reading, shop arithmetic, drafting, and other technical studies which supplement and expand the work experience and skills learned on the job.

Each youth is steered into the occupation for which he is best fitted. If possible, square pegs are kept out of round holes. Before assignment to project work, each youth is interviewed to determine the type of work experience that would most nearly fit his interests and abilities. Once he is on the job, his progress is watched and evaluated. Through vocational guidance and job rotation on the subject, each youth is permitted to try his hand at a number of different types of work, so that he may find the activity which best suits his abilities.

A labor migration system has been started. Shops and resident centers are established near defense-work centers. Youth are selected from N. Y. A. shops in the small town far removed from the centers of defense work and sent to these N. Y. A. work centers from which they secure employment in defense industries. At Nepaug, Conn., for example, several hundred were able to get jobs in defense work during the month of August. There are some 70 of these youth labor-supply centers now in operation at places like San Diego, Houston, Wilmington, South Bend, and so forth. The youth work out their maintenance and keep the $10 in cash that they receive per month.

BIG PROBLEMS REMAIN

This is the prosaic account of what the National Youth Administration does with its money. It is not the whole account, for its work includes not only a defense work experience program but also the giving of work to 200,000 other youth on projects varying from building small schoolhouses to making garments for needy people. In addition to this there is the whole student-work program which provides work for 450,000 students in 1,600 colleges and 2,900 high schools to enable them to continue in school.

But all of this leaves youth with two big problems: One is that we are now running at the rate of an annual national income of about $85.000,000,000 and still there are hundreds of thousands of eager, able youngsters to whom the gates of gainful employment are closed; the other difficult situation is that at the time we are desperately trying to give effective aid to those forces struggling to defeat nazi-ism and are in need of every capable hand we possess in this effort there are around about us scores of hundreds of thousands of young people seeking eagerly to find some way to make their young strong hands capable and useful but who are not being used. We simply must find some way to include them in this effort.

This business of being included in the effort for the defense and security of our country has come to be a great privilege. This is especially true in the case of young people. Youth senses that something significant is happening to men and women of good will in all parts of the world. They want to be a part of it. They sense that paralleling the evil loosed upon mankind there has occurred a renaissance of the love of the good, and that men are again proving their willingness to make sacrifices—sacrifices of their means, their time—yes, even of their lives—for the good. They sense that there is a great challenge in the world today, a challenge for the good—an incredible renaissance of the spirit. They, like ourselves, sense it wherever they go. They feel it from the men in the shops, from the crowds on the streets, from the atmosphere on the trains; they hear it in the voice of the President, in the speeches of Churchill—and youth everywhere want to be a vital part of it. They feel in it something akin to a new brotherhood of man bound together by an abhorrence of the bestiality and brutality of the Axis war party. In it they feel a rising hope that means for them a newer and freer world for tomorrow. They know that they must first destroy the evil that now has the world in fear and terror, but they also know that that must not be the end. They know that the forces now mobilizing in the hands of the world's millions of people of good will must not only preserve democratic institutions for which they are now fighting, but that this same power must be exerted to eliminate conditions which are the effective denials of the democracy that has given rise to these forces for its defense. They insist that we must eliminate the denials of the promises of the democratic way of life.

EAGER TO TAKE PART

I have just returned from a visit to 18 States. I have seen the world's most powerful democracy in action—a united people turning to the task of producing the vast quantity of goods needed for the defense of democracy everywhere.

Primarily I went to see what is happening to the young people of this country under the tremendous impact of the defense program. Two convictions, reinforced by everything I saw, now stand out in my mind.

First, there is the conviction that the young people of America are eager to take their part. I feel as if I have seen, talked to, and been part of the future of America, and what I saw was good. Youth are eager to work and eager to make democracy work. If we deny them this opportunity we will make a terrible mistake.

The second conviction grows out of the first. In spite of the progress made, we are not doing all we can to use the services of these young people. If we deny them the opportunity for useful work, if we fail to spread that opportunity, we are denying ourselves the services of a powerful and constructive force. Our programs of giving them a chance are working in the right direction, but they are not extensive enough. Compared with the immense need for qualified workers and with the large number of unemployed youtl still available, our sights still are too low. We have the method, the resources, and the plan. What we need is more determination to stick to it until the job is done.

There is good reason to believe that this is going to be done. It seems to have been necessary for the Nation to have become endangered of its very life for us to restore young people to a participating part in our vital affairs—to allow them to work for its strength and security. I hope this will be true.

Mrs. Sara D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith attach a very pretty poem by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, dedicated to the President's mother:

"She openeth her mouth with wisdom; and in her tongue is the law of kindness."

—*Ecclesiastes xxx: 26.*

MRS. SARAH D. ROOSEVELT

M-other—name that all men love—
R-ev'rently the Nation's Chief,
S-ince his mother's called above,

S-eeks from that source his relief.
A-nd, in his deep sorrow, he
R-ealizes that he must
A-lways bow to God's decree—
H-e has placed in Him his trust.

D-eath is heaven's golden key.

R-ich in graces that abide,
O-f which she'd a doube share,
O-ft, on bended knee, aside,
S-he met God in secret prayer.
E-very day 'twas her intent,
V-erily, to wisely live,
E-arnestly, where'er she went,
L-iving, most of all to give
T-o us such a President.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Prime Minister Mackenzie King Says Canadian Government Approves the Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement of Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada in which he gives reassurance that the Canadian Government approves the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

Of late the impression is being given to the Congress and the American people that Canada is opposed to the project, which is refuted in the statement of her Prime Minister, who calls attention to the fact that Canada has already signed an agreement between the two countries—Canada and the United States—known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin agreement.

The statement follows:

NEW YORK, September 14.—Interest of the Canadian Government in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project has been indicated "in an unmistakable manner," Prime Minister W. L. Mackenzie King wrote in an exchange of correspondence which was made public today (Sunday) by Edward J. Noble, of the Seaway for Defense Committee.

The Prime Minister declared that "the construction of the project would advance the defense measures in which the two Governments were concerned and would promote the social and economic welfare of the peoples of these neighboring countries."

Mr. Noble had written to Mr. Mackenzie King that hearings before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives "have developed certain testimony purporting to indicate a presumed lack of interest on the part of the Canadian Government." Mr. Noble's letter added that "this type of testimony is intended by the opponents of the project to wean away public support" from the project.

Herewith are both letters:

SEAWAY FOR DEFENSE COMMITTEE,
New York, N. Y.

The Right Honorable
W. L. MACKENZIE KING,
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

MY DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: You may be interested to learn of the formation by Americans in public and civic life of the Seaway for Defense Committee. Its purpose is to bring to the American public the true facts concerning the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project, in the belief that an accurate presentation of the facts will result in the development of a favorable public opinion in respect to the project.

The hearings before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives have developed certain testimony purporting to indicate a presumed lack of interest on the part of the Canadian Government in the project. Naturally, this type of testimony is intended by the opponents of the project to wean away public support. Of course, we who favor the project recognize the agreement between Canada and the United States as being constructive evidence of the intentions of both Governments. At the same time, we would be very happy to give currency to any statement on the subject which you might deem appropriate in the circumstances.

Very truly yours,
EDWARD J. NOBLE,
For the Committee.

OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER,
Canada.

EDWARD J. NOBLE, Esq.,
Seaway for Defense Committee,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I was very much interested to learn from your letter that a Seaway for Defense Committee has been formed by Americans in public and civic life, for the purpose of bringing out the true facts concerning the Great Lakes seaway and power project.

I note your statement that the hearings before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives have produced testimony indicating a lack of interest on the part of the Canadian Government in this project.

It would not be appropriate for me to make any formal pronouncement with regard to the merits of the seaway while the matter is before Congress. Further, it would not be possible for the Canadian Government to place before the public all of the considerations which will need to be examined before Parliament. On the other hand, I feel justified in pointing out to you that the interest of the Canadian Government in this project has been indicated in an unmistakable manner. The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin agreement was signed by me in order to carry out a project approved by the Canadian Government as a whole. Under the constitutional system in this country, the signature of an international agreement is of necessity an indication that the agreement has been approved by the members of the Government who are, of course, responsible to Parliament.

The reason for signature is equally clear. The records placed before Parliament in March last show the basis of the action taken by the Government. The conclusion was reached that the construction of the project would advance the defense measures in which the two Governments were concerned and would promote the social and economic welfare of the peoples of these neighboring countries.

When this measure is brought to Parliament for the enactment of the necessary legislation and for parliamentary approval preceding ratification, the views of the Canadian Government will be presented in more detail. Meanwhile, I feel bound to confine myself to the general statement which indeed is a necessary inference from the fact of signature of this agreement by members of the Canadian Government.

Yours sincerely,
W. L. MACKENZIE KING.

Problems of the Small Manufacturer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the small manufacturer in our country is confronted with a crisis that threatens his very existence.

Meetings are being held throughout the country to devise ways and means to prevent the economic dislocations that are inevitable in our present priorities set-up. Thousands of small manufacturers, who are the very backbone of our Nation, are finding it increasingly difficult to maintain operations and employment. The condition is presently acute and serious and should attract the immediate attention of the Congress. Discussions with numerous small and large manufacturers recently indicate their concern for the future.

One of the best contributions to the subject I have received comes from a small paint manufacturer in the district I have the honor to represent. He wrote me under date of September 10, following a personal conference. Because I believe this letter to be indicative of the intelligent thought of the operators of small manufacturing plants throughout the country, I desire to read this letter, as part of these remarks, in the hope that it will stimulate the Congress and the Nation to action on this most important subject. The letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 10, 1941.

MY DEAR FRANK: The small American manufacturer is face to face with a crisis. That crisis is real; it is here now.

It is daily producing unemployment; it will continue to produce more. In an incredibly short time it can produce complete dislocation and economic as well as social ruin and chaos.

The situation is recognized by many and will be felt by many more. It can be remedied, and it must be solved quickly.

The principal contributing factor is a shortage of materials, made acute by the wholesale, and perhaps necessary, diversion of materials to meet the needs of national defense.

The small manufacturer is told by his source of supply that he can no longer expect delivery of raw materials unless he can supply that source with evidence in the form of preference rating certificates indicating that the material purchased is to be used in the preparation of materials for national defense. The necessity for such regulation and restriction is not seriously doubted, and full sympathy and compliance for the most part is much in evidence.

Obviously, the only alternative is to solicit defense business, and this has, and is being done. It is being done with a keen appreciation of the quantities involved, the general absence of credit hazard, and in many cases with a wholesome and sincere desire to help. Competition is expected, and profits beyond a subsistence level are not seriously hoped for.

The point I want to bring out is that most of us know what the score is, and our bids and figures represent prices barely sufficient to keep our plants running, our men employed, and our businesses solvent. Surely that is an ambition which needs no real justification or defense. It is a sad commentary on the administration of our economy that this situation cannot or is not being guaranteed.

When the small businessman bids on defense work, he invariably finds that "his price is out of line," not withstanding the fact that he has been forced to seek this business in desperation, and has gladly foregone hopes of normal profits to insure the securing of this business, without which he cannot hope to exist.

Repeated efforts bring the same results, and there is little evidence to suspect at this time that the future will bring about a change.

For the most part, the small businessman is no stranger to adversity, and happily I predict he will not sit silently by and watch his business vanish, his men and associates impoverished, and his home and community destroyed. They are already consolidating into pressure groups, and will militate against this situation.

I am, as you know, Frank, a small paint manufacturer, specializing in protective coatings for industry. A very large portion of the materials we use in the manufacture of our products are made from chemicals, now placed on the critical list by the Government. Their use has been restricted for defense purposes, and so it is absolutely necessary we secure some of this business. Right here I want to say all of the manufacturers are in the same boat.

In the past 6 months raw materials have raised in price, increases have been paid to labor and management, containers and other factors affecting prices have all produced a condition that have forced an increase in paint prices.

With this in mind, it is bewildering to discover that several large paint concerns have actually reduced prices on Government specification materials, and at the same time have increased prices on materials for civilian consumption.

It is quite obvious that their prices of governmental specification materials for Government use do not represent provision for normal and regular overhead and similar charges consequent to the operation of their business. It may interest you if I quote an official of a very large paint company to whom I complained about this situation. He denied a price quotation of $1.11 per gallon for a certain Government specification material, stating that when they added their necessary charges incident to manufacture and sale, that they could not "sell a gallon of water for that price, let alone paint." Unfortunately, I had seen the invoice.

There is absolutely no good reason for this vicious competition on Government specification paint materials. And there is also no good reason for the same situation prevailing in other commodities.

It is suicide for our national economy to permit this and similar situations to exist, because it is first, the end of small business, and just as surely the beginning of economic collapse for all.

Something, yes, I use the word advisedly, must be done, and it must be done immediately. It should be of major concern.

Now what to do about it? I do not pretend a profound knowledge of economics, or any other science involved in its solution. I'm not even sure its solution will involve academic skill. I've thought about it considerably, discussed it with my colleagues, and have seriously and honestly tried to think out a solution, for I believe at least an effort, however devoid of foundation in science, should accompany the protest.

Naturally, every man thinks of the solution to his problem in terms of what will help him, even though he may have a deep appreciation of the fact that it might not be so valuable to his fellow businessman in its application to his particular business and situation.

I give you below my solution. I do not claim it to be bullet proof, but I ask you to consider and so to respect it as a sincere effort to make a step in the right direction, and failing to do even that, it will provoke some thought, and therein lies the beginning of a successful conclusion.

I suggest that the Government establish a price to be paid on all paints made according to Government formulas and specification and intended for use on Government defense work. Note I have not included paints for civilian use, because that involves considerable complication that can be readily avoided here.

I propose that such a price be based on a cost of raw materials purchased in less than carload quantities which represents the average basis of purchasing of small manufacturers. That labor rates be figured at prevailing union rates, and the price quoted f. o. b. factory. Overhead and factory burden as well as profit be determined after a cross-section survey of small plants, and an average figure adopted. This does not involve any tremendous amount of research, because it will be found after a search that after all details are considered, the selling price for paint products will be within a few percent either way of double the raw material cost.

For example, if the raw material for a certain paint costs $1 after all charges of labor, burden, container, sales expense, depreciation of equipment, etc., are considered, the sales price will be very very close to $2, and the profit will come from 5 to 10 percent depending upon the skill and resources of the particular plant producing the material, and therein lies the spirit of free enterprise. If one plant can be more efficient, they can profit more, as perhaps they should, but here we don't prevent competition by making a price so very low that only one or two could possibly bid and take the business without ruin to themselves.

I am not unmindful that periodically the price may have to be adjusted in the light of some fluctuation, but I do believe that in principle, for the duration of this emergency, and until such a time that normal business conditions are restored, and once more initiative, service, and other qualities that secure business can once again operate, we must of necessity favor a general policy to fix prices to prevent the wild inflation that is sure to attend the skyrocketing of prices.

Surely this picture may have some drawbacks, but I think the way we are headed today is certain ruin if somebody doesn't bring the situation, and similar ones I have mentioned, to light with a view of really trying to do something about it.

I beg of you to realize that the situation I have described to you is typical of business in your district, and all over the country. I ask you to place yourself in the position of the management and the labor in these businesses, to contemplate seriously what this means to the community and our national economy. I am sure the picture you will develop for yourself will move you immediately to the action for which you are so eminently qualified and courageously indulge in.

Thank you very much, Frank, for the courteous reception you gave me this morning. It was most kind of you to give me so much of your time, and believe me to be ever grateful.

Wisdom's Calls From Frescoed Walls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Horace C. Carlisle has written some very appropriate verses on the words of Thomas Jefferson on the walls of the south reading room in the Library of Congress. They are as follows:

WISDOM'S CALLS FROM FRESCOED WALLS

To Jefferson's broad, resourceful brain
These verses owe a debt—
For every wise thought that they contain,
Too wondrous to forget,
At Jefferson's reading room, appeals
To readers, great and small,
Whose loftier vision, there, reveals
His writing on the wall.

The ground of liberty we must gain
By inches—what we get
We must be contented to attain,
From time to time, through sweat.
It takes time, used wisely, to persuade—
Although it never should—
Freemen to do, without being made,
What is for their own good.

Those people who labor in the earth,
The chosen ones of God—
If He has His chosen ones—are worth
Their places on the sod—
With genuine virtue, they've the right
To live, and hold in shape
Life's sacred things which otherwise might
From this free earth escape.

The earth belongs to the living—they
May manage it, therefore,
As they may please, and its proceeds may
Be theirs till they're no more—
The masters of their persons they are,
And consequently these
May govern, led by law's guilding star,
Their persons as they please.

The mass of the people, if made wise,
Will see, and never cease
To know that their own best safety lies
Along the path of peace—
Enlighten the people, everywhere,
And they will find the way—
And tyranny will, in dire despair,
Flee, as night flees from day.

The people of every country are
Its guardians of their rights,
The safest of instruments, by far,
Wherewith to win their fights—
The liberty we love will endure,
Entrusted to the hands
Of trustworthy people, wise and pure,
Who follow God's commands.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Mexico's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of September 16, 1941:

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 16, 1941]

MEXICO'S DAY

Today is the one hundred and thirty-first anniversary of that September 16 when the patriot priest Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla proclaimed the independence of the Mexican

people. His country in 1810 stood in sorry need of the freedom he desired for it. The rule of Spain had been a costly failure, and he long had been conscious of the futility of compromise with alien tyranny. How he was driven to the conclusion that liberty was as necessary as air to breathe is a story which not all North Americans have been privileged to hear. The present moment is an appropriate time for its retelling.

Father Hidalgo in his youth was merely a simple, unpretending student of the Word. It never occurred to him to be interested in politics. But he could not help being concerned about the poverty of the Indians, and in the interest of their prosperity he dared to sponsor an experiment which the royal government resisted. The manufacture of silk, he believed, would add to the wealth of his flock. He imported silkworms to that end, only to have them destroyed by agents of the viceroy. The experience, so the record says, "drove him to rebellion." Several officers of the garrison of Guanajuato joined him in revolt. "His eloquence had a remarkable effect on the multitude, * * * and when, after his oration, he unfurled a rude copy of the picture of Our Lady of Guadalupe, * * * the war assumed the character of a crusade." But a shortage of ammunition obliged him to retreat, and he finally was captured and shot as a traitor, July 27, 1811. So bitter was the hatred of Spain that even the mention of his name was forbidden.

The dream of independence, however, did not die when Father Hidalgo fell. Rather, it was strengthened by his martyrdom. The struggle for the supreme ideal of human emancipation continued. Indeed, it still is carried forward by men and women who love Mexico. What greater immortality could any hero ask?

Mr. Roosevelt Starts the Convoys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE GREEN BAY (WIS.) PRESS-GAZETTE

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette of September 13, 1941:

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette of September 13, 1941]

MR. ROOSEVELT STARTS THE CONVOYS

Those who have been listening to broadcasts by the rulers of the principal powers upon this earth could not fail to be favorably impressed by the President's tone and manner of speech in his fateful address of Thursday night. Absent from it was the roar and bawl consistently employed by Moscow, Berlin, and Rome, as well as some of the turbulent blatancy occasionally used by Mr. Churchill.

If the distinction, which must have been agreeable to our people, could be carried from the manner of delivery to the quality of the thought employed, we might have left the bloody European grapple for power, pride, and position far in the rear. But such is not the case.

There is some very plain merit to the President's indictment of Berlin, although Mr. Roosevelt was stretching the fabric as though it did not cover his limbs when he tried to gather under the folds of the American flag ships that were sailing under foreign registry. The outstanding and inexcusable offense, which involves neither dispute among participants nor possible claim of justification, relates to the *Robin Hood*, the American vessel whose skipper was taken aboard the submarine and explained his cargo only to see his vessel destroyed because it was going to a South African port. Passengers and crew were left upon the swirling tides a thousand miles from shore in direct violation of a compact to which both Germany and this country are signatory. Their escape from death after long and cruel hardship was only through a sustained smile from Heaven. And the President was able to state that Hitler had failed two further duties in respect to this attack, one to apologize for it, which would be tantamount to a promise to avoid future incidents of like character, and the other to make offer of reparation for the loss of the ship and cargo, a written obligation of Germany's under the compact mentioned.

The only other all-clear case of apparently wanton offense by the Germans was that of the *Steel Seafarer*, sent to the bottom 200 miles short of Suez.

The President is not candid when he cites destruction of American-owned vessels sailing under Panama registry. He should have added that they are so sailing because it is contrary to an act of Congress for them to carry what they carry and go where they are going if kept under the American flag.

But Mr. Roosevelt denied a purpose to hasty action or that intemperate attitudes would be taken by this country over isolated instances of piracy or outlawry.

At any rate, with the evidence before our people fairly undisguised, the President has elected to take what he calls "the only step possible," and he has taken it, because, he says, "My obligation as President is clear and inescapable."

It is easy to refute the President by his own language and without reaching far back, either.

Only a short time before this war broke out, and while its clouds were plainly visible upon the hushed horizon, the very same President who is now going to convoy ships of all nations with the American Navy, issued this statement to the same people who listened to his recent broadcast:

"Peace is threatened by those who seek selfish power. The world has witnessed similar eras, as in the days when petty kings and feudal barons were changing the map of Europe every fortnight, or when great emperors and great kings were engaged in a mad scramble for colonial empire

"We hope we are not again at the threshold of such an era. But if face it we must, then the United States and the rest of the Americas can play but one role:

"Through a well-ordered neutrality to do naught to encourage the contest, through adequate defense to save ourselves from embroilment and attack, and through example and all legitimate encouragement to persuade other nations to return to the ways of peace and good will."

That was the most accurate prescription Mr. Roosevelt ever penned. But he abandoned it.

The broadcaster of Thursday night was exactly the same Mr. Roosevelt who, after this war started, asked Congress for an amendment to the neutrality law with this particular representation and promise:

"This Government will insist that American ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zone of conflict. Contraband cargoes are to be carried in the purchasers' own ships at the purchasers' own risk."

Mr. Roosevelt has in different months actually pointed his country to every important direction of the compass and said: "Follow me; this is the way to safety."

At the outset we were going to turn our back upon the war entirely. We would extend no credit. Then we changed to financing a large share of the struggle. Gradually, step by step, we have abandoned every course originally taken, reversed every promise made, swallowed every representation spoken.

Needlessly has the President added personal insults to the German rulers. It was all right for Mr. Churchill to call Hitler a guttersnipe. Their countries were at war. It was a sore breach of international behavior for Mr. Roosevelt to abuse the rulers of any country with which we were at peace. It is this attitude which has helped create a warlike condition between the nations. And, we repeat, it has been wholly unnecessary.

Today the President denounces those who, through firm opinion and clear conviction, refuse to wobble in their courses but adhere to the positions taken by himself earlier in the conflict. They are now close to traitors.

To cap the climax the American Navy is to convoy not only American ships, but the ships of every power on earth. And this convoy will go at least to Iceland, some 2,200 miles from this country.

Mr. Roosevelt was author of the expression: "Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war."

In making his decision the President says that he has given it a lot of thought and devoted to it a lot of prayer. We have no difficulty in believing him. But we would add another element that has influenced him mightily, the rare plea and mystic inducement of Winston Churchill covering several days' congenial conference near Nova Scotia.

We wish the American people could have heard that plea, a marvelous mixture of flattery, pride, fear, awe, peril, and compassion. But since Mr. Roosevelt can still see Nazi legions landing on these shores we rather think that Mr. Churchill sprinkled his presentment generously with tales of Nazi supremacy and how they can easily cross the Atlantic ocean and land here if they should take the idea to head.

And so we are to be cast toward war in a brand new manner—by Presidential direction and in defiance of public opinion and lacking the constitutional requirement of an act of Congress.

Labor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JERRY VOORHIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address delivered by myself on Labor Day to the Labor Day meeting at Pasadena, Calif., on September 1, 1941:

There is no honor that could be given me that I would appreciate more than to be asked by an American labor movement to speak at a Labor Day meeting.

If there is one thing that has made America different from the other nations in the world, it has been that here we have honored the people who did the hard, tough job, and

have looked down on those who didn't, whereas in most other nations it has been quite the opposite. When the man in overalls ceases to be the ideal of the American boy, something fundamentally American and something very important and valuable to our country will have ceased to exist.

Never has there been a time when it was so important to strengthen and protect the free organizations of the American people. The very hope we have of seeing democracy triumph over dictatorship depends in large measure upon those organizations. Every dictator in the world has, as one of his first acts, destroyed the labor movement in that country. Why did they do this? They did it because they knew—and we must know it, too—that in spite of any difficulties or arguments to the contrary, free organizations of labor, as well as other free organizations among the people, are the very heart and sinews of a democratic society.

And so when some misguided or short-sighted or deliberately reactionary people propose that measures be taken that would lead to the destruction of organized labor in America, they are working against democracy and not for it, as they claim so loudly.

Labor in America today has a very great responsibility and labor, I am confident, recognizes this. Repeatedly has labor pledged its very fullest support to the national-defense program and it has not asked the passage of special legislation, the granting of special favors before it would cooperate—as some other groups have done. No; I think American labor sees that there is no other group in all society that has so great a stake in keeping alive a vigorous democracy, as has labor. Were this not the case we should not have found labor working as hard as it has been doing to secure over-all agreements and contracts with employers, which, based on the recognition of the men's right to organization, collective bargaining, and fair wage, provide that strikes and lock-outs shall not be resorted to for the period of the contract or the emergency, as the case may be. But labor wants to enter into such agreements and to sign such contracts freely, as free men. And naturally it is opposed to any move which would, in effect, amount to requiring men, whatever the conditions of their work, to labor against their will for a private employer.

The price of freedom at a time like this is responsibility. The protection of the right to strike will be found to a very great extent in repeated demonstrations on the part of labor that it will not use that right but will instead resort to the machinery of the Conciliation Service and the National Defense Mediation Board. And I think that the main reason we were able to defeat a number of antilabor measures in the House of Representatives has been because Members of that body had come to realize that labor did and would continue to recognize its responsibility to the Nation in this critical time. I think Congress has been saying, "We believe such legislation is unnecessary because we have confidence in the patriotism and sense of responsibility of American labor." I know labor will never take advantage of that confidence.

It has been said repeatedly that the struggle against the European dictators would be decided in the workshops. And Mr. Ernest Bevin, No. 2 man in Britain's cabinet, in speaking to a group of bankers made this significant statement: "Everyone of us here knows that England could better spare every man in this room today than she could spare one man who knows how to manufacture an airplane propeller.

American labor today is asking no special privileges or advantages I am sure. Labor does ask a square deal. Labor asks, and has a right to ask, that the working of priorities on material should not result in the destruction of the businesses of hundreds of small employers or the loss of jobs by thousands of men. This is a problem that has got to be met and dealt with. National defense has got to come first but a part of national defense is to keep all our factories and all our men busily at work, and every time any kind of factory closes it weakens America that much. Our aim must be a national wealth production of upwards of $110,000,000,000 a year so that we shall not only be able to produce the necessary means of defense but so we shall also be able to pay for them, and so that all our reserves and all our men will be taking part in the job of keeping America strong. In working out this problem nothing less than full cooperative action of Government, industry, and labor will be sufficient or effective.

And labor asks too, that this great national effort should not be the occasion for profiteering on the part of anyone. It asks that vigilance be shown in this regard that at least as much be said in the press and by public officials about the profits of Bethlehem Steel, for example, as about a 10-cent-an-hour wage increase for the workers.

Nor does labor seek to avoid the payment of its fair share of taxes. But we do ask that it be remembered that up to date, taking all forms of taxes into account, American families making incomes of less than $1,000 per year have paid as big a percentage of their incomes to Federal, State, and local governments as have families with incomes of $9,000 and $10,000. All we ask after all is that this tax burden be really distributed in accordance with ability to pay.

On the matter of the rising cost of living and so-called inflation, I have a few words to say. I know all will agree that one thing we want is fair and better prices to the farmers of America for their crops. But we don't want to see speculators buying up supplies and holding them off the market waiting for a price to rise and neither do we want to see an inflationary spiral of prices get started. All I have to say on this is that while no doubt something must, can, and should be done about this situation, there is one thing that ought to have been done long long ago which would not only have gone a long way toward preventing inflation now but would also have made unnecessary a great part of the present increase in the public debt, and, most important of all, would have rendered a deflation and unemployment impossible after this thing is all over.

That measure of which I speak is a constructive reform of our monetary and financial system so that Congress and Congress alone would, as the Constitution itself provides, coin, issue, and regulate the value of the money of America. If this had been done—if it could be done now—it would be in greatest part the answer not only to our fear of inflation but to the rise in the public debt and to our future fears of deflation, bankruptcy, and unemployment.

And that brings me to the last thing I want to say. It is not enough for us to prepare simply to defend or preserve democracy. We must make democracy a dynamic force—a hope and spirit in the hearts of our people which will catch hold of them and spread throughout the world. It is not enough to build a great military defense. We must do that but we must do more. We must be about the job of building an American new world—a world in which there will be full production and a full home market for our crops and goods among our people—a world in which as long as there is any so-called farm surplus at all we will determine that there shall be no hungry children in the land—a world in which every cooperative effort of the people to solve their own problems will receive our encouragement and our help.

Because I believe this so earnestly I have introduced House Joint Resolutions Nos. 59 and 76. These resolutions, similar to one by Senator WAGNER in the Senate, would create now a national commission to develop and present to Congress and the President a program which will make sure that when this national-defense period is over we shall not fall into a great depression, that our people's power to buy will not be allowed to collapse, that we shall continue to produce as fully and with as many people employed to meet peacetime needs and to rehabilitate a war-torn world as we are doing now for defense.

America confronts the very greatest crisis in her history. Will we be drawn into the war? I do not know. I doubt if anyone does. But one thing I do know. America has taken her stand for democracy and free government and for defense of our hemisphere against any forces that seek to force any kind of totalitarian government upon us here. From that position we must not retreat a single inch. Our determination to keep our organizations of labor, of business, of government, free of totalitarian agents must not be lessened. Our readiness to stand by our democratic institutions and defend them by whatever means may be necessary—that readiness must not be weakened. America will, I earnestly hope, seek no war nor send men to foreign continents. But let us highly resolve that anyone who interprets the spirit of this great Nation as a hesitant, a disunited, or a weak spirit will find out to his sorrow how wrong he has been.

And as we go forward into the future let us most of all resolve that whatever sacrifices may be demanded shall be equally shared in proportion to the ability of people to bear them and in proportion to what they have left after the sacrifice has been made.

As in no other nation in all the world America's destiny is in her own hands. I believe we will meet that destiny. I believe it because I am sure there is a new spirit growing among us—a spirit of devotion to the Nation and to one another and a spirit of insistence upon justice to our own people as well as the people of other nations with which we have dealings.

Peace Points of the Pope and Peace Points of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY A. WALLACE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, in these critical times I believe that it would be well for the people of our country if they would read the address delivered by Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE at the centenary celebration dinner of Fordham University at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York last night.

Delegates from more than 400 colleges, universities, and learned societies and high representatives of the church, state, and military and naval services were among the 2,000 persons at the dinner who heard the Vice President deliver his nationally broadcast speech which follows:

It is not strange that the great leader of our democracy should again and again recognize the fundamental importance of religion.

He knows, just as you here at Fordham know, that at the very heart of both Christianity and democracy is the proposition that the individual human soul is sacred and that the voluntary relationship of one soul to another is based on the fundamental link which both have to God the Father. And so it happens naturally enough that the political belief in democracy and the religious belief in Christianity should produce somewhat like results. No true Christian can speak bitterly against the Jew, the Negro, or the yellow man. Some individuals may be born with greater ability than others, but this difference in inborn ability does not depend primarily on race, color, or economic status

We have a profound belief in the United States that we are living in a chosen land, in a land chosen to serve the world in the establishment and preservation of the great freedoms; the freedoms which are vital alike to the Christian faith, to political democracy, and to the sacredness of the individual human being. But believing we are living in a land chosen for a high destiny of service is totally different from believing in the inherent superiority of one race over all other races and of one scientific, godless culture over all other cultures. Our faith is humble, profound, and essentially peaceful. The other faith is bloody, boastful, intolerant, superficial, and temporary.

The Hitler house is built upon the sands and the winds are blowing. I predict that behind the walls where lie France and Poland, Belgium and Luxembourg Holland and Norway, Yugoslavia and Greece, the winds are blowing at the foundations of Hitler's house. Force untempered by justice brings the tornado to the house of force itself. No one can predict the day of the fall of the house of Hitler. But all men of keen perception know that this house will fall from within through the falsity of the architect—through the refusal of Hitler himself to believe that the human being and his rightful needs are the bricks and mortar of any permanent house of God and government on this earth.

Speaking of the great freedoms, I remember it was my privilege, the day after the death of Pope Pius XI, who I hope some day will be revered as a saint in the Catholic church, to speak of his contribution to that freedom about which all of us have thought too little—freedom from want. Without freedom from want the dignity of man is too often sacrificed. With regard to this particular freedom, the democratic record has not always been too good, but it has been the best record which man has experienced. By the grace of God and the democratic process, the life of the common man shall be enriched in the days to come.

Fordham University has long been an outstanding exponent of the social doctrines of the Catholic church. This university has always taught that democracy is primarily spiritual and moral and that from these sources spring political and economic democracy.

Time and again President Roosevelt has spoken in language which must seem strangely familiar to the professors of the University of Fordham You will remember that in his message to Congress 9 months before the war broke out he said, "Storms from abroad directly challenge three institutions indispensable to Americans now as always. The first is religion. It is the source of the other two—democracy and good faith. Religion, by teaching man his relationship to God, gives the individual a sense of his own dignity and teaches him to respect himself by respecting his neighbors."

On many subjects will be found almost exactly parallel passages in the President's messages and speeches with the sentiments expressed in the Papal Encyclicals. Nowhere is this likeness more striking than in the statement of peace aims. Shortly after the war broke out, in his Christmas message of 1939, Pope Pius XII stated five peace objectives, the first of which expressed the belief that all nations, large and small, strong and weak, have the right to life and independence.

Paralleling this first objective are the first three points of the eight-point democratic peace aims. You will remember how they read:

"Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise; they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned; they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereignty and self-government restored to those whose have been forcibly deprived of them."

The second of Pope Pius XII's five points deals with freedom from the heavy burden of armaments. This second point of the Pope is in essence identical with the eighth and last of the democratic peace aims.

Pope Pius XII in his third point, which comes out for the establishment of institutions which will serve to guarantee the loyal and faithful fulfillment of the peace terms, parallels the sixth of the democratic peace aims which asks for a peace that will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will give assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

Pope Pius in his various peace messages invariably stresses the spirit of justice and universal charity, the law of God, as vital to peaceful international relations. President Roosevelt stated the close relationship between democracy and religion nearly a year before the war began in his memorable message to Congress, saying: "Where freedom of religion has been attacked, the attack has come from sources opposed to democracy. Where democracy has been overthrown, the spirit of free worship has disappeared. And where religion and democracy have vanished, good faith and reason in international affairs have given way to strident and brute force."

In the little publication entitled "A Centenary Interpretation of What Fordham Means," I read the sentence: "Fordham educates for peace, but not for pacifism." So it is with President Roosevelt. One of his first official acts in early 1933 was to cable the sovereigns and chiefs of 54 nations the following: "If all nations will agree wholly to eliminate from possession and use the weapons which make possible a successful attack, defenses automatically become impregnable and the frontiers and independence of every nation will become more secure." May these prophetic words bear fruit

The President's objective was peace but he was not a pacifist. Hitler answered President Roosevelt's request with a demand for more guns. Fortunately Roosevelt was not a pacifist and began building ships, a fact which will ultimately contribute mightily to the outcome of this war in both the Pacific and the Atlantic.

The American people are tremendously interested in peace today, but they are not pacifists. They would hate to see this war end prematurely in a way which would insure a third and more horrible war in our generation. The American people want to see this war ended justly on the basis of the five points enunciated by the Pope, on the basis of the four freedoms, and on the basis of the eight points agreed to by the two great democracies and approved by all the rest. They want to see peoples impoverished and starved by the Nazis given a chance. They want to see a peace established so just that it will last for our children and our children's children. They want to see recognized an international bill of rights and duties, rights recognizing the sacredness of the individual human soul, the security of small nations, and the possibility of poor people earning enough to remove the fear of want. Into the peace fabric there must be built not only rights but duties—a sense of duty to world humanity. Thus dreamed Christ and the prophets. We can, if we so will, make this dream a reality.

The social teaching of the Catholic Church is especially opposed to Hitler's new order. The way to meet the economic and social challenge of all so-called new orders which deny the sacredness of the human soul in its relationship to God is to present a democratic new order which under God will carry out the four freedoms and the eight peace aims. A free economy and a Christian leadership must remove the fear of war. Only by world organization may this be done.

It so happens that a general European war has always, and will always, shake the United States to the very depths. It is not merely idealism but also sound business sense to take the very deepest interest in the type of world organization which has in it the promise of preventing the outbreak of war on other continents. Pope Benedict XV, writing in 1920, said, "All states should put aside mutual suspicion and unite in one sole society, or rather family of peoples, both to guarantee their own independence and safeguard order in the civil concert of peoples. A special reason, not to mention others, for forming this society among the nations is the need, generally recognized, of reducing, if it is not possible to abolish it entirely, the enormous military expenditures which can no longer be borne by the states."

The present Pope, in his Christmas message of 1939, speaks on behalf of establishing juridical institutions to consider and adjust situations which might otherwise break the peace.

Fordham University has a great challenge placed before it. Christ commanded His Apostles to go and teach all nations. Fordham, as a Christian institution, is tremendously interested in the skill and understanding which the statesmen of the United States demonstrate in handling world affairs. Are we by our actions bringing closer the day of great peace, when all the nations will flow unto the mountain of the Lord? Fordham University, I know, has already contributed toward that day through its teaching and through its distinguished alumni. Especially may I mention Archbishop Spellman, who has given such enlightened leadership both to church and state.

Whether it be the future of Fordham, the future of the United States, or the future of the world itself, we believe with the psalmist, "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." And also from the Psalms, "The stone which the builders refused is become the headstone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvelous in our eyes."

The Lord is building a new order. It is not Hitler's new order built on his alleged superior race, but it is a new order built on justice, charity, and peace. In the building of that new order the United States has been given a unique responsibility, both during the present war and in the peace to come. United States failed, due to lack of prayer- After World War No. 1 the people of the ful understanding. After World War No. 2 we must not fail. With the help of the Almighty we shall not fail in the building of a just and lasting peace—the house of the Lord in which all the nations of the world may live harmoniously, joyously, and fruitfully.

The Morality of Our Entrance Into This War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1941

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming majority of the people in this country oppose our entrance into the present conflict overseas. These Americans are patriotic individuals who place the interests of the United States above those of any other nation. In spite of the determination on the part of sound-thinking citizens to keep out of the war, President Roosevelt, on September 11, 1941, issued orders to the Navy to shoot. Roosevelt knows this means war, for he himself has uttered the words, "Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war."

Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox disclosed that the President's order to shoot went into effect September 16, 1941. There is the sad picture which means, perhaps, the loss of thousands of American lives in naval warfare.

If we look at the moral questions involved in our entrance into this war, we must agree that the warmongers are wrong and the majority of Americans are right. The following article is interesting to read and study:

[From the Tablet, Catholic weekly, Brooklyn]

A MORAL SENSE WITH US

Religious publications in their attitude toward involving the United States in war never overlook the morality of the question. There is almost a unanimity of viewpoint on the topic. These publications assert there must be a justification for entrance into war. Once there is a sufficient reason for conflict there must first be exhausted every attempt at arbitration. War is always a last resort.

The fact that a person says someone else is going to attack us at some distant time if he defeats someone is not a sufficient reason for conflict. Neither does the economic argument, which is usually based on power politics or economic determinism justify spilling the blood of innocent people.

As far as can be seen in the present situation affecting the United States entrance into war, there is no moral reason or justification. Moreover, there is every moral reason for our country remaining out of the suicidal conflict. Assuredly our leaders have promised us over and over again we would not enter any foreign conflict. They would not send our Army, Navy, or marines to engage in a distant strife, and this pledge is morally binding. All the moves which are said to have led us close to our entrance were enacted to keep us out of war; here we have another moral obligation.

Secretary Knox, who demands we enter war now, less than a year ago asserted he was against sending American youths to graves in distant places. He has gone back on his word. Of course, he has not the right, constitutionally or otherwise, to send Americans down the hell holes of catastrophe. It is unfortunate that the majority of the American people—those who want peace and see no reason to go to war—do not seem to be represented in the President's Cabinet.

Perhaps the worst offender of all in relation to the moral side of war is Wendell Willkie, for whom millions voted thinking he was antiwar, but who turned his back on them to engage in warmongering. It was bad enough for Mr. Willkie to deceive the American people, but it is even worse for him to attempt to fool the foreign nations as he did in his July 4 broadcast abroad. Then Mr. Willkie said:

"And despite the occasional hesitation and doubts, the American people will reach out, will give their utmost to see that this precious thing we call 'liberty' shall not disappear from the world, either in Europe or in Asia or in America."

That is untrue. Russia and other nations have been in slavery for centuries and Americans never objected to their role. And today, contrary to Mr. Willkie, Americans will not, and could not, give their utmost to safeguard liberty all over the world—including places where liberty is not wanted. The vast majority of Americans are overwhelmingly against being used as cannon fodder to establish liberty in Russia, Germany, Africa, and dozens of other countries.

One report on Monday called for a repudiation of the United States Constitution, together with a repudiation of the wishes of the people. This article quoted a radio speaker as asserting the President of the United States should alone decide when, where, and how our country should go to war. Notwithstanding that the Constitution specifically asserts that Congress, as the representative of the people, alone can declare war, this speaker would violate the Constitution and thereby destroy popular government. It follows that if the reigning President can contravene one part of the Constitution he can contravene any part, including the guaranty of religious liberty. The suggestion is so absurd that it hardly needs rebuttal. Destroying the Constitution, prohibiting the people or their representatives from voting on an issue that affects them and their children so smacks of nazi-ism that one can only feel sorry for the person making such a proposal.

This is the United States of America, not totalitarian Germany or Russia. Here we have "government of the people, by the people, and for the people"—not by one individual. Our Government rules with the consent of the governed. "But the people do not fully understand; they have not all the knowledge," say newcomers to our shores and chauvinists. That's it. The people cannot decide. They are only supposed to fight and die.

Moralists have long decided expediency or popularity is not the rule for good conduct. Again that sounds just like Hitler. Here, too, we have another moral argument, for it is said the Nazis are worse enemies of the United States than the Reds. Perhaps arguments can be used on both sides, but what difference does it make? Would you prefer cancer or creeping paralysis? You would answer "Neither." And Americans who love their country are not making any choice between Nazis and the Soviet. They hate both. They want nothing to do with either. They hold no brief for any totalitarians. And they would consider it immoral and indecent, treacherous and hypocritical to send American boys, American wealth, or American goods to either Hitler or Stalin—both enemies of God and man—not more, not less, but both exemplars of international thuggery.

Morality demands the United States keep out of this war. Patriotism which casts aside the fear mongers insists we stay out of war. The people to the tune of 3 and 4 to 1, are opposed to entering the war. Oh, yes; they have experience, they have the facts—they got both in 1917 and 1918 and so did their parents. The minority, the warmongers, who themselves will not fight, have taken one defeat after another. They planned to lead the country into war long ago. Unable to get the people to go to war they now want to invite it. Let us keep defeating them. Every day we stay out saves hundreds of more American lives and keeps back the tears of American mothers. Hold fast to the Constitution. Permit Congress to, in fact demand that the people, decide. Away with mass suicide. Let us think of peace for the masses. Make morality and principle the rule and do not follow the line of broken pledges which has made Europe and Asia places to keep away from.

Wage Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

LETTER FROM SOUTHERN COUNTIES GAS CO. OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am glad to include this general letter to employees sent out by the Southern Counties Gas Co. It sets forth a policy which I believe could serve as an example for employers generally.

SOUTHERN COUNTIES GAS CO.
OF CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 9, 1941.

To all regular employees:

Effective August 1, 1941, every regular employee of the Southern Counties Gas Co. whose present salary is less than $300 a month will receive an increase of $7.50 a month as a special defense period wage adjustment. In addition, the company will increase its current rate for temporary laborers from $5 to $5.40 a day.

These increases are made in view of current and prospective increases in the cost of living. They do not permanently alter our agreed schedules for starting, basic or standard salaries as published in appendix A of our Statement of Employee Relations Policy. We hope that better gas weather in coming months will produce sufficient revenue to meet these added pay-roll costs.

There has been a great deal of publicity regarding higher prices. People have been quick to cite instances in which the price of some given article has "soared out of sight." United States Department of Labor figures, however, show that since the beginning of the war (September 1939), through June 1941, food prices in the Los Angeles area have advanced 10.5 percent. All living costs, including food and rent have advanced 4.3 percent. Meanwhile, in the same period, Southern Counties Gas Co.'s average salaries have increased 8.84 percent.

These percentages are quoted not to argue that changes in living costs have been unimportant, or to indicate that changes in the future are unlikely. We merely feel that our employees should have accurate Department of Labor figures. We also feel that the company's salary scale has more than kept pace with such actual changes as have occurred.

The current increase is based upon the desire of the company, so far as possible, to maintain the "real wages" and the living standards of its employees. Due to fixed

rates, and the fact that we expect no unusual war profits, we cannot promise to meet fully a really violent inflation. We do, however, promise that the company will from time to time, examine the trend of living costs, and consider its ability, through actual income from the sale of gas, to assist the employees in meeting higher prices.

Yours truly,

SOUTHERN COUNTIES GAS CO.
OF CALIFORNIA.

Oneida Ethnological Study Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written to me by a constituent:

ONEIDA, WIS., *August 21, 1941.*

Hon. JOSHUA L. JOHNS,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNS: We of the Oneida Ethnological study project have been apprised of the fact that on August 1, 1941, you caused to be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a communication from E. P. Boland, of Green Bay, Wis., to you under date of July 15, 1941.

After serious consideration, we are assuming that you are not very familiar with local conditions. The nature of the letter is such that any self-respecting person would request its correction.

In the first place, you are probably aware that Mr. Boland is not a farm operator, as witnessed by his giving his address as the city of Green Bay. His business is in real-estate transactions. He does have supervision of several small farms on the former Oneida Reservation. On these farms he has operators who operate the farm single-handed like any small farmer, with the exception of haying, threshing, and silo filling, which in no case exceeds a week's time. We see no place where four men can be given constant employment. The result: not much money, not much food, slim Indian.

Mr. Boland is not very well informed as to the activities of the Oneida language and folklore project and its successor, the Oneida Ethnological Study. For that reason, we feel that he is not qualified to pass judgment as to its usefulness to such an extent as for it to be entered into the governmental records of the Nation. Our wages are only $57.60 per month. They are not $70, as Mr. Boland claims

We are satisfied that schools of higher learning desire knowledge of our tongue and former good qualities.

In paragraph 4, sentence 3, Mr. Boland makes a statement, viz, "12 big, fat, lazy Indians." That can and may be considered as slander, liable under the law for character damages. Evidently, Mr. Boland's past activities among the Oneidas make him feel immune to any accounting for any injury he may give to the Oneidas.

We do not concur with Mr. Boland's view that the Episcopal Church has depraved itself when it countenanced the project and offered its facilities.

On July 15, 1941, there were seven men and three women on the Oneida Ethnological Study. The average weight and dimension of the male group is far below that of Mr. Boland. The people on this project are all encumbered with dependents, averaging five dependents to each worker. The monetary demands for food, clothing, and other necessities of life leave very little spare money to be used for recreation, if you care to class drinking as such. And we believe it is so taken by most people throughout the United States.

We believe it would help clarify the first two sentences in paragraph 4 if we add, "It took 25 years to make the Oneidas 90-percent landless." We wonder if Mr. Boland considered the works as useless, worthless W. P. A. projects when the W. P. A. people cleaned out his stone quarry and furnished labor on building new road fences on his farm.

We feel that Mr. Boland's difficulties in getting assistance, in the Army style, is due to the fact that he has incurred the Oneida's animosity by his past dealing. Contrary to Mr. Boland's contention, heretofore, we have not associated our fortunes of life to any political party. We were only thankful to the United States Government for providing a system whereby our living was made possible. Thanks to Mr. Boland, we now know whence cometh our help.

We are greatly grieved at your action in placing such statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without, we believe, first verifying the same, especially after you had condescended to speak to us Oneidas on the aforementioned Episcopal Church grounds on July 4, 1939.

Heretofore, we had gloried in the knowledge that the illustrious George Washington had recognized the efforts of the Oneidas as one of the few Indian tribes to have contributed to the victory of the American Colonies, thus making possible the establishment of these United States of America. In memory of these sacrifices of the Oneidas, the Oneida-United States treaty of 1794 was consummated, giving to us an annuity in commemoration.

Still having trust in you, we believe that you will make some amends to assuage our grief.

Very truly yours,

Andrew Beechtree, correspondent; John A. Skenandore; Guy Elm; David O. Skenandore; Oscar H. Archiquette; Hyson Doxtator; Ida Blackhawk; Alma Thomas; Stadler King; Sherman I. Skenandore.

The Shooting War Is Ordered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEWIS D. THILL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 1941, in a radio speech, President Roosevelt ordered a shooting war. Not the people, not their elected representatives, the Congress, but the President alone, made the decision for war. Some Americans have been stunned by Roosevelt's action; others are apathetic, failing to realize the severity and the full import of the President's order to shoot. The following editorial discusses the question of a shooting war. Although Roosevelt has on previous occasions flouted the Constitution, I cannot believe that any man would be so base that he would order the suspension of elections in our constitutional Republic.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 17, 1941]

SEPTEMBER 16, 1941—MARK IT WELL

Last Thursday evening, September 11, President Roosevelt told the American radio audience that he had given shooting orders to the Navy.

"But let this warning be clear," said the President. "From now on, if German or Italian vessels of war enter the waters the protection of which is necessary for American defense, they do so at their own peril."

Those orders went into effect yesterday, September 16, 1941. Their extent was disclosed by Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox in his Monday speech before the American Legion convention at Milwaukee:

"Beginning tomorrow, the American Navy will provide protection as adequate as we can make it for ships of every flag carrying lend-aid supplies between the American continent and the waters adjacent to Iceland. The Navy is ordered to capture or destroy by every means at its disposal Axis-controlled submarines or surface raiders encountered in these waters."

Those are a lot of waters. Navy shooting patrol over them was assumed by the President and put into effect by the Secretary of the Navy without consulting Congress.

This is an open act of war. As of September 16, 1941, the United States is again at war with the German Government.

It will be a big date in our history—how big most of us will probably begin to realize only after the sinkings begin in earnest.

This act of war was committed in disregard of article 1, section 8, subdivision 11, of the United States Constitution:

"The Congress shall have power * * * to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water."

A revolution has occurred in this country, between last Thursday and today. We are now in the hands of a military dictatorship, which apparently intends to proceed without consulting Congress beforehand as to any major move in this war.

That Congress would have approved a declaration of war at this time is extremely doubtful, in view of the 203–202 House vote by which the service time extension bill squeaked through.

HOW ARE THE PROSPECTS?

Where do we go from here?

We don't know. But we think we go first through the phases of an inconclusive shooting war at sea with the Germans, and that we go eventually to a second A. E. F. and a bloody show-down on the European Continent. We do not believe Germany can be beaten except in such a show-down. It is not certain, either, that Germany can be beaten even by that means, this time.

The pretext that we are suppressing piracy is invalid and so is the plea that President Jefferson once ordered the United States Navy to suppress the Barbary pirates

on Africa's west Mediterranean coast. In the former case, we might lose a gunboat or a frigate. In the present case, we are going up against the world's greatest military power, and may lose our freedom, and are sure to lose our shirts because of the staggering expense in money, matériel, and men of such an effort.

NOT SO BIG—IF

If any congressional elections are held in November 1942, we think the war party is going to be voted out of control of the House of Representatives. We expect most Americans by that time to be even more displeased than they are now with the war party's intermeddling in this latest European war, and more appalled at the possible disastrous consequences of what the war party is doing.

In view of the fact that a shooting war was ordered yesterday without Congress consent, the above "if" is neither idle nor frivolous.

If, however, the war party calls off the 1942 congressional elections, by some executive dictum on the plea of national emergency, we think there will develop some kind of revolutionary activity against the war party.

Power Development and Utilization of Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

STATEMENT BY ACTING COMMISSIONER BASHORE, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, on September 8 last I asked and obtained unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Acting Commissioner H. W. Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation, which he made before the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Surveys under Senate resolution 53. The statement is a remarkable epitome of reclamation and power development in the West. The statement was returned to me with the information that it was in contravention of the rule of the Joint Committee on Printing in that its printing would exceed 2 pages of the RECORD. The estimate furnished by the Government Printing Office indicates that the cost will be $135. I again ask unanimous consent to have the statement of Acting Commissioner Bashore, which I think is invaluable, inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Bureau of Reclamation was born 40 years ago of the imperative need for conservation and economic utilization of the natural resources in land and water in vast areas west of the Mississippi River.

Today it stands prepared to aid this committee in formulating and the Congress in executing an all-out program which will open to the Nation that arsenal of mineral resources which lies beneath the mountains and deserts of the West.

Through its electric power operations, the Bureau of Reclamation has laid the foundation for the most effective development and utilization of these resources so vital to the national defense. Power plants in operation or under construction in 13 States serve areas where airplanes and ships are being built, aluminum produced, and great military establishments are training many thousands of American soldiers to defend their country.

These power plants scattered from the Rio Grande to the Pacific Northwest point the way to what can be achieved in advancing mineral activities through using the latent power resources that abound in this region. With the West facing critical deficiencies in electric energy, the Bureau of Reclamation is ready to begin construction of projects which will avert what otherwise may be catastrophic consequences.

If the mineral resources of the West are to be brought into the service of the Nation in the current emergency, low-cost power must be available to every location where strategic materials are located. Such power is essential in extracting the minerals from the earth as well as in operating, fabricating, and servicing industries, and for the population engaged in these activities.

Secretary Ickes has called your attention to existing and prospective power deficits. On the basis of a $36,000,000,000 annual defense expenditure, there will be material increases in estimates of power deficiencies west of the Mississippi River. Reports are that 1945 requirements will demand an increase in present installations of more than 2,100,000 kilowatts of dependable power By 1946 the need rises to nearly 2,500,000 kilowatts, according to this calculation. The 1945 deficiency now forecast is about twice the estimate of power deficiency we made last June when we were considering all scheduled Federal installations and new aluminum allocations on the west coast and in Arkansas.

To combat the threatened black-outs in mineral developments and the thwarting of other defense efforts, the Secretary cited a list of potential multiple-purpose power projects prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation at his request. The total capacity of approximately 9,000,000 kilowatts which could be provided by these projects include the capacity of half a dozen proposed steam plants to balance the systems, and could be brought in from 1943 to 1947 Of course, the completion of these projects within the period is contingent on the necessary priority authorizations and on funds being made available to begin construction immediately of those for which surveys have been completed. The steam plants will utilize such resources as western coal, oil, and gas. The map which I have had prepared and which I will discuss later, shows the location of about 50 potential projects, in addition to existing Federal developments. These also include possible installations at Grand Coulee and Boulder Dams.

While power for national defense provides the immediate urge for most of these projects, they all will serve one or more other beneficial purposes. Through irrigation they will assure adequate food supplies and opportunities for settlement for thousands of families during the current and post-defense periods. Rural electrification will be advanced, domestic and industrial water supplies will be assured, floods and soil erosion controlled, navigation improved, wildlife refuges maintained, and recreation facilities provided.

Before going into a detailed discussion of the apparent and prospective power deficiencies in the West and the power program of the potential projects which have been listed, I want to call your attention to certain related phases of these reclamation developments. These activities parallel the objectives set forth in Senate Resolution 53 in other than defense contributions. They assure a flow of other permanent peacetime benefits. First, the communities which have sprung up or expanded in the wake of irrigation, stand as what is described in Senate Resolution 53 as monuments to "free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital." This has been made possible by a wise and farsighted national reclamation policy through which natural resources in land and water were made available for home building and agricultural production. Fifty thousand farms and 250 cities and towns with a population of a million persons owe their existence directly to reclamation.

The purchasing power of these communities equaling a quarter of a billion dollars annually to the farms and factories of the Midwest, East and South, illustrates the natural benefits flowing from these developments. The taxable wealth created and maintained runs into high figures—many times the investment the Federal Government has made, principally in reimbursable funds, for the construction of irrigation works.

Reclamation has kept open the Nation's last frontier. It is providing the family-size farms, which are the backbone of the country. It has contributed to the stabilization of the livestock industry of the West and is aiding in the maintenance of a population growing at twice the national rate.

Water conserved for irrigation in many instances serves the additional purpose of producing electric power. Revenue from power has made feasible the irrigation of land which otherwise would have remained desert wastes. A logical extension of the power program will provide for the installation of a few economically located steam plants. These will balance hydro production and make the electric output more valuable.

The combined development of hydro and steam power as outlined in this statement will aid in the objective mentioned in Senate Resolution 53—"the conservation of mineral resources to the fullest extent consistent with their proper development and utilization"—and will also serve the national defense and provide for post-emergency needs.

It has been quite evident that the West was facing a shortage of power which could not be met by the enlarged program of the Bureau of Reclamation as authorized in the winter of 1940–41, even with the speed-up of the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dam schedules. Attention is directed to the fact that one large utility on the Pacific coast, which had deprecated the idea that it could not supply the demand for power, frankly admitted in May of this year that it had had to revise its figures upward to meet new Federal forecasts, demonstrated to be more nearly accurate.

In giving you examples of the rapidly changing picture with respect to power deficiencies in the West, I should explain, perhaps, that for the purposes of this study the lower Arkansas Valley, as well as Oklahoma and all of Texas, are included. The Bureau of Reclamation is conducting basin-wide investigations in these States in cooperation with other agencies. Consequently, in presenting the power situation west of the Mississippi as a whole, these States are included.

Much of this territory west of the Mississippi, which occupies nearly half of the land area of continental United States, is heavily mineralized.

Present estimates of additional dependable capacity desirable based on a $36,000,000,000 annual expenditure for national defense show, for the region west of the Mississippi, an increase in deficits of 100 percent by 1945 over the estimates we previously had made.

These estimates of additional dependable capacity desirable by years are as follows:

	Kilowatts
1943	902,000
1945	2,018,000
1946	2,455,000

(No 1947 estimate is made.)

For the Pacific Northwest alone the studies of the Bonneville Power Administration, which distributes Grand Coulee Power, indicate a deficit in installed capacity, after presently planned installations at Grand Coulee and Bonneville are made, by years, as follows:

	Kilowatts
1943	512,000
1945	901,000
1947	1,200,000

Including all of Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, the Bonneville Administration reports indicate deficits for years as follows:

	Kilowatts
1943	934,000
1945	1,384,000
1947	1,754,000

I present for the record a tabulation of the capacity of hydroelectric installations existing and scheduled by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration, both under the Department of the Interior, by the close of 1946. The Bureau of Reclamation now has in operation 28 plants, with installed capacities totaling 953,962 kilowatts on 17 projects of the Bureau in 11 States. At the end of each year the capacity will total as follows:

	Kilowatts
1941	1,364,962
1942	1,615,462
1943	2,066,062
1944	2,621,062
1945	2,676,062
1946	2,836,062

The entire capacity of Bonneville totaling 518,400 kilowatts will be installed by the end of 1943. This will bring the total installed capacity, including Indian Office plants, under the Department of the Interior, to 3,337,462 kilowatts.

The installed capacities of operating plants and the schedules of installations by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration are as follows:

Bureau of Reclamation—Capacity in Bureau of Reclamation plants in operation July 1, 1941

State	Project	Present kilowatt capacity
Arizona	Salt River	600 15,400 850 5,100 10,400 30,000 1,600 7,000
Do	Yuma	1,600
Arizona-Nevada	Boulder (9 generators)	704,800
Arizona-California	All-American	5,400 9,600
Colorado	Grand Valley	3,000
Idaho	Boise	1,875 8,000
Do	Minidoka	8,400
Nebraska-Wyoming	North Platte	4,800 1,400
Nevada	Newlands	1,500
New Mexico	Rio Grande	24,300
Texas	Colorado River	45,000
Utah	Strawberry Valley	1,150
Washington	Grand Coulee (2 small generators)	20,000
Do	Yakima	2,400 187
Wyoming	Kendrick	32,400
Do	Riverton	1,600
Do	Shoshone	5,600
Total		953,962

Program of Federal installations

SCHEDULED INSTALLATIONS, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

	Kilowatts
Washington, Grand Coulee Dam, August 1941	108,000
Arizona-Nevada, Boulder Dam, August	82,500
Washington, Grand Coulee, December	108,000
Arizona-Nevada, Boulder, December	82,500
Arizona-California, Parker Dam, December	30,000
To be added June-December 1941	411,000
Total by close of 1941	1,364,962
Washington, Grand Coulee, March 1942	108,000
Arizona-Nevada, Boulder, July	82,500
Arizona-California:	
Parker, January	30,000
Parker, February	30,000
To be added during 1942	250,500
Total by close of 1942	1,615,462
Washington, Grand Coulee, June 1943	108,000
Arizona-California, Parker, July	30,000
Washington, Grand Coulee, July	108,000
Colorado, Green Mountain Dam, July	21,600
Washington, Grand Coulee, August	108,000
California, Keswick Dam, October	75,000
To be added during 1943	460,600
Total by close of 1943	2,066,062
California, Shasta Dam, January 1944	375,000
Arizona-Nevada, Davis Dam (Bullshead), June	180,000
Montana, Fort Peck, January	35,000
To be added during 1944	590,000
Total by close of 1944	2,621,062
Idaho-Anderson Ranch (Boise), January 1945	20,000
To be added during 1945	20,000
Total by close of 1945	2,676,062
Colorado Colorado-Big Thompson (6 projects)	160,000
To be added during 1946	2,836,062

BONNEVILLE DAM PROJECT SCHEDULE, (BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR)

Capacity installed July 1, 1941	194,400
Oregon-Washington, August 1941	54,000
Total by close of 1941	248,400
Oregon Washington, January 1942	54,000
Total by close of 1942	302,400
Oregon-Washington:	
January 1943	54,000
July 1943	54,000
September 1943	54,000
December 1943	54,000
Total by close of 1943	518,400
Grand total, Bureau of Reclamation and Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior [1]	3,354,462

[1] The Office of Indian Affairs operates power plants on Indian projects, of which the San Carlos in Arizona with 13,000 kilowatts of hydro and 4,800 Diesel are the largest. The others are small and serve no commercial purposes.

DEFICITS IN POWER IN THE WEST

The rapidly changing picture with respect to power demands in the West, as I have indicated, has led to a series of sharp upward revisions of estimates of the needs for new installations. It has been exceedingly difficult to make forecasts of demands which stand up for as long as a month.

No sooner is an estimate made than some new element is injected to force its revision. In the last week we have revised our estimates, made a month ago, again upward. This was made necessary by new figures related to a $36,000,000,000 per annum defense effort. We are aware, however, of an impending revision already. Active negotiations are in progress looking to a contract calling for 196,000 additional kilowatts of power from Boulder Dam for a magnesium plant. High-grade magnesite from beds in the north central section of Nevada are proposed for use.

Responsible agencies studying the power markets and demands have provided estimates of potential deficiencies in power in western areas as follows:

Pacific Northwest: In addition to present capacity and all that which is now scheduled for installation, a deficiency of 900,000 kilowatts by 1945 and 1,200,000 by 1947.

Southern Oregon: By 1945 a deficiency of 60,000 kilowatts.

Northern California and northern or western Nevada: Even after completion of the Central Valley project and the 150,000-kilowatt steam plant planned in connection with it, as well as other scheduled installations, a deficiency of 183,000 kilowatts will develop by 1945 and of 337,000 kilowatts by 1947.

Pacific Southwest, including southern California, Arizona, and southeastern Nevada: After all scheduled installations at Boulder, Parker, and Davis (Bullshead) Dams on the Colorado River, and other scheduled installations, deficiencies of 250,000 kilowatts by 1945 and 375,000 kilowatts by 1947 are expected.

Utah-Idaho: Deficiencies of 75,000 to 125,000 kilowatts by 1945 and from 150,000 to 200,000 by 1947.

Colorado-Wyoming-western Nebraska: Deficiencies of 50,000 to 75,000 kilowatts by 1945 and 75,000 to 125,000 by 1947.

Montana: Definite figures are unavailable, but shortages are apparently imminent.

Arkansas-Oklahoma-Kansas-southern Missouri: Deficiencies in part due to recent allocations of 240,000 kilowatts for aluminum production of 417,000 kilowatts by 1945 and 516,000 by 1947 are expected.

Texas-New Mexico: Deficiencies of 212,000 kilowatts by 1945 and 295,000 by 1947 are in prospect.

North Dakota-South Dakota: Although indications are that the defense demands will be relatively small, increasing deficits are anticipated ranging from 25,000 kilowatts in 1945 to 50,000 in 1947.

The crises which these estimated deficiencies would represent, if they were permitted to develop, can be averted, of course, by the construction of new projects to provide the desired power and by the installation of additional machinery, as at Boulder and Grand Coulee Dams, where that is practicable. Increasingly it becomes evident that these deficiencies must not be permitted actually to develop. The problem in power production which they represent must be met by action in time.

The Bureau of Reclamation, which has been for many years the principal Federal agency in the construction of power projects in the West, feels its responsibility. Having constructed such projects as Boulder Dam and Grand Coulee, it is prepared to move promptly and effectively in meeting the power problem of the West in this emergency in connection with mineral developments and other industrial uses. At the same time we feel that we can make a permanent contribution to the advancement and stabilization of the West through these multiple-purpose projects.

In making a list of potential multiple-purpose projects through which the deficiencies in power can be met before 1947, the Bureau of Reclamation has considered possible generators for Boulder Dam and Grand Coulee in addition to those scheduled for installation before the end of 1943.

Access has been had to reports of the Office of Indian Affairs of a potential project in the Pacific Northwest and to those of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, which has conducted extensive investigations in the Arkansas Valley and elsewhere.

Steam plants are included where held desirable to balanced proposed hydro installations in California, Utah, Colorado, and Arkansas.

The map we have prepared shows the status of the various Federal projects as follows:

Projects in operation in brown.

Projects under construction in yellow.

Potential hydro projects in red.

Hydro plants are shown in solid colors; steam plants are checkered.

Green spots indicate existing Federal reclamation project areas.

The relative capacities of the existing and potential installations are indicated by the sizes of the blocks, as follows:

The smallest block shows capacities of 25,000 kilowatts or under.

The other sizes range upward to indicate the ultimate capacities of the largest power plants in the world—those at Grand Coulee and Boulder Dams.

Investigations have been practically completed on all projects which probably can be brought into operation by 1943. Investigations on most of the other projects listed can be completed in 3 to 12 months.

By years, the installed capacity in kilowatts which can be made available with adequate appropriations and high priorities in equipment and material appears to be as follows:

	Installed	Firm [1]
1943	673,000	576,000
1944	2,005,500	1,062,000
1945	2,495,000	795,000
1946	2,947,000	1,163,000
1947	895,000	430,000
Total	9,015,500	4,026,000

[1] Firm power is defined as output available continuously 24 hours a day.

In explanation of the symbols on the maps, I shall discuss briefly the relationship of these potential projects, including possible additional installations at Grand Coulee and Boulder Dams. Further studies are being made, and while I do not feel in a position to make suggestions as to the order in which the new projects should be scheduled for construction, recommendations can be made in the near future. But I do feel that from this list selections can be made which will assure sufficient power west of the Mississippi River to meet any demand that may be made for our all-out defense effort.

All of these projects serve purposes other than power. Their peacetime contributions to the development and stabilization of the West will forever make them worthy public undertakings. The list is subject to additions and subtractions as circumstances may determine.

In the same order that I have discussed the deficiencies in power, I will point out what can be done to avert the consequences of neglecting to utilize the resources that are available. I direct your attention to the large map to which I have referred, as well as to the list of projects with their rated and firm capacities which I offer for the record.

Beginning in the Northwest, I will take up each area separately:

Pacific Northwest: The Columbia Basin and its tributaries and other streams in this area are veritable storehouses of unused low-cost power. As an alternative to the installation of all 18 big generators at Grand Coulee, 10 other projects with installed capacities totaling more than 2,500,000 kilowatts are offered for selection.

Southern Oregon: Projects on Rogue River and Scott River (northern California) will meet all presently anticipated needs.

Northern California-western Nevada: I have mentioned a steam plant as desirable in connection with the Bureau's Central Valley project, as well as to aid in averting a power shortage in this area. Hydro developments on the Kings American and Feather Rivers, which are advanced, might well call for two additional steam plants. A plant on Truckee River in Nevada is proposed.

Pacific Southwest: In spite of advanced installations at Boulder Dam and Parker Dam and construction of Davis Dam soon to start, power deficiencies already threaten serious consequences. A hydro plant on the all-American Canal and the development of the Bridge Canyon site on the Colorado in Arizona are suggestions in addition to completing installations at Boulder Dam. A steam plant in this area may be necessary.

Utah-Idaho: Potential developments in both States offer a solution for a growing power shortage that threatens to balk mineral developments in both States. In Idaho, Anderson Ranch project is under construction and two others in the Snake River Valley offer possibilities. The Colorado Basin in Utah presents potential power sites like Split Mountain, Echo Park, and Rattlesnake on the Green, Dark Canyon and Dewey on the main stem of the Colorado. A steam plant in Utah would offer an outlet for its coal deposits and balance the predominant hydro development prevailing in the area.

Colorado-Wyoming-western Nebraska: Extension of the interconnected system of the Bureau of Reclamation in Wyoming and northeastern Colorado to sites of other feasible developments in Colorado is suggested. This would preclude deficits in power that would disastrously affect military establishments and prevent development of mineral resources in Wyoming and Colorado. The Colorado-Big Thompson project under construction will bring in some additional power, but a steam plant near Fort Collins along with other hydro developments would provide a balanced supply.

For instance, the Kortes Power Dam on the North Platte River in Wyoming is a logical expansion of the Kendrick project now in operation. Other power developments listed on the North Platte are farther upstream near the Colorado line. There are other potential projects on the North Platte River and on the Big Horn in northern Wyoming.

Montana: A development on the main stem of the Missouri at Canyon Ferry and one on the Big Horn are listed by the Bureau of Reclamation. A third project in western Montana—Hungry Horse—on the Flathead River, a tributary of the Columbia, is recommended by the Federal Power Commission.

The Dakotas: Four projects on the Missouri in South Dakota are available from which one or more could be selected.

Arkansas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and southern Missouri: In addition to Dennison and Nimrod Dams, which are under construction, eight other potential projects in the lower Arkansas River Basin have been reported on by the Army engineers. A feasible project on the Kansas River at Topeka is also listed.

Two steam plants fired by natural gas have been proposed for the Arkansas area by the Power Division of the Office of Production Management to power aluminum plants which will use raw materials from the bauxite fields of Arkansas. Tentatively, we have designated one plant as Bauxite and the other Aluminum. According to the O. P. M. release of June 27, each of the aluminum plants will require 120,000 kilowatts of power. It has been indicated that 300,000 kilowatts of steam power would provide a proper balance for the proposed hydro developments on the Arkansas and its tributaries.

Texas and New Mexico: The possibilities of power developments on the Guadalupe, lower Colorado, Brazos, Neches, and the lower Rio Grande are listed.

In New Mexico the transfer of water from the Colorado Basin to the upper Rio Grande would provide a head for power.

I offer for the record a list of potential power projects. This list is tentative in that additional projects may be recommended or some which are included may be dropped. It includes possible installations at Grand Coulee and Bonneville in addition to those to be placed in operation by the end of 1943. The approximate year of completion is given, but I wish to emphasize that completion by that time presupposes immediate authorization, adequate funds, and high priorities in equipment and machinery to achieve the necessary periods for investigation and construction. The State, name of the project, the stream on which it is located, and the name of the plant are given, together with the rated or maximum installed capacity, and the estimated firm power which will be available.

The list of potential projects prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation, including projects reported on by the Office of Indian Affairs and the Corps of Engineers, War Department, is as follows:

PACIFIC NORTHWEST (WASHINGTON, NORTHEAST OREGON, NORTHERN IDAHO)

Year [1]	State	Project	Stream	Plant	Rated capacity	Firm capacity
					Kilowatts	*Kilowatts*
1943	Idaho	Cabinet Gorge	Clark		99,000	50,000
1944	Washington	Colorado Basin	Columbia	Grand Coulee (4 units)	432,000	284,600
1944	do	Klickitat [2]	Klickitat	2 plants	70,000	20,000
1944	do	Snoqualmie [2]	Snoqualmie	do	56,000	24,500
1944	do	Sultan River	Sultan		60,000	26,500
1944	Oregon	Stayton [2]	North Santiam	Detroit	50,000	25,000
1945	Washington	Priest Rapids	Columbia		650,000	350,000
1945	do	Stilaquamish [2]	Stilaquamish Deer Creek	4 plants	112,000	42,000
1945	do	Colorado Basin	Columbia	Grand Coulee (5 units)	540,000	183,200
1946	do	do	do	Grand Coulee (3 units)	324,000	10,000
1946	Washington-Oregon	Umatilla Rapids	do		850,000	180,000
1946	do	The Dalles	do	Celilo Falls	420,000	225,000
1946	Washington	Z Canyon	Clark Fork	Z Canyon	200,000	100,000

[1] Completion possible in year indicated.
[2] Investigated by Office of Indian Affairs.
[3] Investigated by Corps of Engineers, War Department.

Year [1]	State	Project	Stream	Plant	Rated capacity	Firm capacity
					Kilowatts	*Kilowatts*
SOUTHERN OREGON, NORTHERN CALIFORNIA						
1944	Oregon	Rogue River	Defense Gap	Rogue River	30,000	15,000
1944	California	Scott Valley	Scott	Scott	50,000	25,000
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, WESTERN NEVADA						
1943	California	Steam plant	Antioch		150,000	150,000
1944	do	American River	American	3 plants	130,000	55,000
1944	do	Kings River	Kings	do	146,500	50,000
1944	Nevada	Truckee Storage	Truckee		18,000	9,000
1944	California	Steam plant	Newark		75,000	75,000
		do	Sacramento		75,000	75,000
1947	do	Feather River [4]	Feather	Oroville	225,000	90,000
PACIFIC SOUTHWEST (SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, NEVADA, ARIZONA)						
1943	California	All-American Canal	All-American Canal	Pilot Knob	33,000	15,000
1944	Arizona-Nevada	Boulder Canyon	Colorado	Boulder (2 units)	165,000	100,000
1945	do	do	do	Boulder (3 units)	205,000	
1946	Arizona	Bridge Canyon	do	Bridge Canyon	400,000	200,000
UTAH, IDAHO [5 6]						
1943	Utah	Steam plant			100,000	100,000
1944	Idaho	Mountain Home	Scriver Creek		60,000	30,000
1945	do	Snake River Storage	Snake	Palisades	30,000	13,500
1945	Utah	Colorado-Green River	Green	Split Mountain	75,000	45,000
1946	do	do	do	Echo Park	125,000	75,000
1946	do	Dewey	Colorado		290,000	130,000
1947	do	Rattlesnake	Green		70,000	40,000
1947	do	Dark Canyon	Colorado		600,000	300,000
COLORADO, WYOMING, NORTHEAST NEBRASKA						
1943	Colorado	Steam plant	Colorado-Big Thompson	Fort Collins	110,000	110,000
1943	do	Montrose	Uncompahgre	3 plants	17,000	7,500
1944	Wyoming	Kendrick	North Platte	Kortes	30,000	12,000
1945	do	North Platte	do	2 plants	26,000	11,500
1945	Colorado	Blue-South Platte	South Platte	3 plants	90,000	25,000
1946	do	Gunnison-Arkansas	Gunnison	Iola Reservoir and others	60,000	30,000
MONTANA [9]						
1944	Montana	Canyon Ferry	Missouri	Canyon Ferry	50,000	30,000
1945	do	Big Horn	Big Horn	Lower Big Horn	100,000	45,000
SOUTH DAKOTA						
1945	South Dakota	Fort Randall, [10] Gavin's Point	Missouri		123,000	30,000
1946	do	Mobridge-Big Bend	do	Mobridge and Big Bend	200,000	75,000
ARKANSAS, OKLAHOMA, KANSAS (MISSOURI) [11 12]						
1943	Arkansas	Nimrod	Arkansas		14,000	1,500
1943	do	First steam plant		"Bauxite"	150,000	150,000
1944	do	Norfolk	White		140,000	12,000
1944	do	Greer's Ferry	do		78,000	11,000
1944	do	Water Valley	do		24,000	6,000
1944	do	Second steam plant	do	"Aluminum"	150,000	150,000
1944	Oklahoma	Fort Gibson	Grand	Fort Gibson	40,000	11,500
1944	do	Ten Killer Ferry	Illinois		30,000	4,500
1945	do	Markhams Ferry	Grand	Markham Ferry	40,000	11,500
1945	Arkansas	Bull Shoals	White		190,000	32,000
1945	Missouri	Table Rock	do		140,000	22,000
1946	Kansas	Topeka	Kansas	Topeka	60,000	27,000
TEXAS, NEW MEXICO						
1944	Texas	Guadalupe	Guadalupe		16,000	6,000
1944	do	Marble Falls [13]	Colorado-Texas		30,000	5,000
1945	do	Neches	Neches and Angeling	4 plants	45,000	15,000
1945	do	Brazos [14]	Brazos	5 plants	59,000	30,000
1945	New Mexico	San Juan-Chama	Transmountain diversion	7 plants	70,000	30,000
1946	Texas	Valley gravity storage, lower Rio Grande.	Los Olmos and Rincon	Los Olmos	18,000	11,000

[1] Completion possible in year indicated.
[4] Reported in California State Bulletin 26.
[5] After upstream storage.
[6] Anderson Ranch, 20,000 kilowatts under construction.
[9] Doesn't include Colorado-Big Thompson hydro plant: under construction with installed capacity of 181,000 kilowatts.
[9] Firm power of 25,000 kilowatts is dependent on completion of entire Blue-South Platte project.
[9] Hungry Horse (Flathead River) with 172,000 installed capacity reported by Corps of Engineers.
[10] Reported by Federal Power Commission Market Survey.
[11] Denison Dam on Red River is under construction and is not included in this tabulation. Ultimate capacity of 175,000 kilowatts installed and 15,000 kilowatts firm possible by 1944.
[12] Based on reports of Corps of Engineers, War Department.
[13] Part of Lower Colorado River Authority development.
[14] Reported by Brazos River conservation and reclamation district.

Revenue Act of 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

LETTER FROM FARMERS' EDUCATIONAL COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Robert Handschin, written on behalf of Mr M. W. Thatcher, chairman of the National Legislative Committee of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America. The letter expresses opposition to certain provisions of the tax bill which was passed on yesterday.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND
COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., September 17, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LA FOLLETTE: The National Farmers Union is vigorously opposed to the major provisions of the Revenue Act of 1941, and respectfully requests you to bring this statement of our opposition to the attention of the Senate.

Representing a third of a million low-income farmers, we agree fully with your indictment of the act, so forcefully expressed in your minority report.

Farmers—including even the poorest among us—are willing to assume a greater burden, if all taxes are first placed on the only fair basis, that of the ability to pay.

But we know, as was conclusively shown in the studies of the Temporary National Economic Committee, that farm people as well as wage earners already are paying far more than their just share of taxes as compared with corporations and persons in the upper and upper-middle income brackets. The growing use of excise, or hidden taxes, together with farm-property taxes, has deprived us of many of the necessities of life, while corporation, income, and inheritance taxes have not in any degree required like sacrifices on the part of those individuals holding large properties or realizing large incomes. This disparity is made much greater by this act, and is all the more indefensible since it now makes the people's pockets the direct source for the major share of those extraordinary profits arising out of the defense program.

The Farmers Union, therefore, considers the failure of the Congress to recapture these exorbitant defense profits as a No. 1 offense against the working and farming people of America. We note also the failure to revise the excess-profits law so that the larger corporations do not continue to strengthen their competitive position because of it. This very unfair provision cannot help but weaken the total defense effort.

We believe that higher income and normal corporation taxes should have been levied, and estate and gift tax exemptions lowered greatly, before placing further excise taxes upon items of common consumption or before lowering income-tax exemptions so drastically. There is no excuse for levying income taxes upon incomes already below the minimum needed for good health until all other possible sources have been exhausted Part of this new tax burden will inevitably reduce the consumption of health-building foods by defense workers, thus injuring farmers' markets as well as defense production itself.

We protest the failure to close the many loopholes in the tax structure, in particular the failure to eliminate even the most glaring of these loopholes—that allowing the filing of separate returns with community-property privileges.

The Farmers Union is opposed to excise and all forms of sales taxes, and therefore we look with strong disfavor upon the provision of the act which makes permanent many such taxes which never should have been levied in the first place. The extension of excise taxes to new items of the farmers' budget is a cause for real concern as to where this form of taxation will end. Especially unfair to farm people is the flat $5 tax upon automobiles, regardless of value or use, and the 6 percent tax upon telephone bills, which provides no exemption for cooperative telephone systems maintained by many farmers.

The interests waxing fat off the defense program certainly have unleashed a financial "blitz" on the common people in this act. It is a wage cut for the wage-earning and low-salaried majority of the Nation, and an increase upon the already heavy tax burdens borne by our farmers. It makes the rich richer, the poor poorer. It strengthens monopoly and hurts many small corporations and small businessmen. It leads to personal aggrandizement through taking advantage of the common misfortune and the common danger. In addition to assisting entrenched wealth, this bill is perhaps a deliberate attempt to provoke discontent and thereby bring about further partisan aims, such as the reduction of those Federal services benefiting the most needy farm and city people.

In spite of the requests of the President and of the Secretary of the Treasury, as well as the pleas of this and other organizations, the Congress has written an "appeasement" tax bill. If this act is an example of the political motto, "Reward your friends and punish your enemies," the farmers certainly need additional friends in Congress.

The Farmers Union agrees with you that the time has come to make a thorough revision of the tax system. The adequate defense of the country will require it. We propose to work with organized labor and other consumer groups during the coming year to this end. We know that we can rely upon you as a champion of progressive taxation, and we desire to thank you again for the battle which you have made in this and in previous years on our behalf.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT HANDSCHIN,
Resident Secretary, on behalf of Mr. M. W. Thatcher, Chairman, National Legislative Committee.

War or Peace—Who Decides?

REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. PIERCE
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Post this morning on the editorial page a letter signed by Mr. Henry E. Colton, of Nashville, Tenn., which is worthy of everyone's reading. It is headed "War or peace—who decides?" I understand Mr. Colton was formerly special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. He gives, in a few words, the historical background of our wars beginning with what took place preliminary to the War of 1812. War had already been going on for some time when Congress was informed of that fact. He gives the background of the Mexican War and of the War between the States, which had been an actuality for many weeks after the firing on Fort Sumter before the Congress was informed thereof.

This article is worthy of our consideration at this time, when we hear so many speeches about who is to decide when we are confronted with war or peace. In my opinion, history will record that the enemies of democracy will make the decision in 1941, and we must be prepared to defend our shores and our way of life.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of September 18, 1941]

WAR OR PEACE—WHO DECIDES?

The power to decide whether there be war or peace is not vested primarily or exclusively in the Congress of the United States, but chiefly in the enemy and, next to the enemy, in the President as the Chief Executive and Commander of our Army and Navy and head of foreign relations.

The enemy usually, almost always, begins the war.

The President then tells Congress about the war after it has begun and asks Congress to declare that "a state of war" exists between the United States and the enemy.

The President, even before telling Congress about it, has usually exercised his constitutional privilege as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief and has struck back at the enemy as you and I would do if hit. Thus the wars of the United States have begun since the foundation of the Republic.

The British began the War of 1812 against the United States. "A state of war against the United States" already existed when Madison called it to the attention of the Congress. Even the peaceful Madison did a little fighting back against the British and the Indians. Congress didn't declare war against Great Britain, but declared "war exists between Great Britain and the United States" by virtue of the acts of war committed by Great Britain.

According to Polk, the American forces were merely reconnoitering in the southern part of Texas, recently annexed by the United States, when the Mexican forces crossed into Texas and thus passed the boundaries of the United States and attacked the forces of the United States; and the President, recognizing that war existed by the acts of Mexico itself, called for volunteers to repel the invaders and asked Congress to recognize and declare "the existence of war" between Mexico and the United States and to take effective measures for war.

According to Lincoln, the Confederates were the aggressors—attacked Fort Sumter, the President called for volunteers, the great Civil War began, and Congress was told about it afterward.

The Spanish-Cuban War, which began a little differently, is merely an exception which proves the rule.

As everybody knows, the Germans began the World War by ruthlessly sinking our ships, and Wilson fought back with armed merchantmen and, finally, when his patience was exhausted, advised Congress that

"a state of war" existed between the United States and Germany as a result of the unlawful attacks made upon our ships by Germany, and Congress then declared that "a state of war" existed and took adequate measures to defeat Germany.

The Germans have already extended World War II to us by sinking and shooting at our ships, and the President, as the Chief Executive and Commander in Chief, has issued the orders to shoot back and eliminate the German submarines and raiders from the seas which we travel—at least, within the broad zones established by us for our commerce.

Thus, the United States has already entered World War II—at least, within the zones prescribed by the President—and in due course Congress will be advised that "a state of war" exists and appropriately so declare.

While in actual practice Congress has little to do with whether there be war or peace, it, nevertheless, has a great function to perform in war—it controls the purse. By voting or withholding billions, it can make the wars of the United States effective or ineffective. To date it has never failed to recognize and declare existing war when requested by the President so to do, nor failed in its fundamental war function to carry the war on by furnishing the means for the successful prosecution thereof.

HENRY E. COLTON,
Formerly Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *September 15.*

Revenue Act of 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the revenue bill becomes a law with the President's signature, the House and the Senate having agreed to the conference report. Never in the history of our country have the people been called upon to contribute the amount that will be collected for the upkeep of the Government during the calendar year 1941, as the changes in the income tax and corporation tax will apply to next year's return based upon earnings during the calendar year 1941.

While the amounts our citizens are asked to pay are unprecedented, still they are minor in comparison with the taxes collected in Great Britain and in Canada. Roughly speaking, on a $2,500 income a married couple with 2 children in this country pay $12, in Great Britain, $530, and in Canada $115. On $5,000 a married couple with 2 children pays $271 under the new law, in Great Britain $1,655, and in Canada $735. On a $10,000 income in this country a married couple with 2 children pays $1,117, $4,305 in Great Britain, and $2,710 in Canada, while on a $25,000 income our new tax is $6,480, Great Britain's $14,817, and Canada's $10,721.

Under ordinary circumstances, I would not have voted for the tax bill, but the vote on agreeing to the conference report under the parliamentary situation placed a Member of Congress in a position to either accept it or leave it. Fully convinced that the country would be absolutely bankrupt if we did not pay part of our bill as we went along, as much as I disliked many features of the new tax bill, I supported it.

Had I been afforded an opportunity to vote directly upon the reduction in exemptions, I would have opposed it even though it would have caused some little delay and the loss of some several million dollars in excise taxes daily. I think it was a mistake to reduce the exemptions.

The cost of handling an income-tax return, where the citizen is forced to make a return but pays no taxes, is 50 cents, while the minimum cost of considering any return, no matter how small, is $1.50. Of course, on large returns where there is an investigation by a special agent, the cost runs into money, but additional amounts collected far offset the cost of administration in such cases.

When the bill was reported to the House by our Committee on Ways and Means it contained a provision which provided for the repeal of the law which enabled the husband and wife to file individual returns. Had that provision been adopted, the husband and wife would have been required to file a joint return. This provision was assailed especially by the Representatives of States having community-property laws and, despite the warning of members of the Ways and Means Committee, as well as many other Members, including myself, as to what would happen if that provision were defeated, the House in its wisdom voted the amendment down, and under the new law separate returns can be filed as heretofore by husband and wife. The only figures available on this subject apply to the taxable year of 1938. The House statistics show that 351,214 people in the United States out of 6,150,776 who filed returns, or a percentage of 5.7, receive a tax advantage. The amount of money that would have been collected, had the recommendation of the Ways and Means Committee prevailed, was estimated at approximately $329,000,000. As a result of this action by the House, when the bill went to the Senate, it was necessary to add provisions that would bring in at least $329,000,000, and this was done. In order to raise such a tremendous amount the Senate reduced the exemptions both for single and married persons and likewise increased and initiated new excise taxes which, in effect, are nothing whatsoever but a sales tax and are paid ultimately by the consuming public.

I say that in enacting a bill of this character, the principle of making those best able to pay contribute the larger amount was lost sight of.

Heretofore revenue bills have always carried administrative features contained in title II of the act. This year, rather than delay enactment of an additional tax bill which would have meant a loss of millions of dollars daily, the House and Senate agreed to bring in a separate measure this fall changing administrative features of the revenue laws as a whole. From time to time in the administration of our revenue laws, attorneys find loopholes through which their clients are able to escape taxation and when this is brought to the attention of the Congress those loopholes are closed. In a short while the Committee on Ways and Means of the House will consider a bill carrying amendments to the administrative features of the act. I want to express the hope now that when that bill is considered our committee will again make provisions that will do away with the joint-return practice and require husband and wife to make separate returns. This will not only affect the community-property States but will also affect the other 40 States of the Union, only 8 having community-property tax laws.

There is no reason why any individuals in this country should not be placed in the same category in filing income-tax returns. No one is entitled to advantage over another citizen. No one can say that it is sound legislation to grant advantages to 351,214 persons not accorded to 5,799,562 persons.

Writing tax bills is not a pleasant duty nor is voting for tax bills a pleasant duty, but necessity demands that we raise a tremendous amount of money to help pay our expenditures as we go along, and like it or not, we must provide the ways and means to raise this money.

I made several speeches in reference to joint returns. I received some letters opposing my attitude upon this subject, but I am happy to say that I answered every one stating my views in detail, and 25 percent of those who criticized my attitude later wrote me and stated that after reading my views they felt I was correct and withdrew their objection.

Mr. Speaker, in order that those interested might have official statistics bearing upon the subject of joint returns I include as part of my remarks the following table:

Total number of individual income-tax returns filed in 1938 by single persons, married couples filing joint and separate returns, nonheads of families, and community property returns, by States

State	Total number of returns filed	Number returns receiving tax advantage [1]	Number returns receiving no tax advantage [2]	Percent of total	
				Receiving tax advantage	Receiving no tax advantage
Alabama	39,010	1,536	37,474	3.9	96.1
Arizona	20,447	2,522	17,925	12.3	87.7
Arkansas	19,627	767	18,860	3.9	96.1
California	523,696	57,161	466,535	10.9	89.1
Colorado	41,701	1,878	39,823	4.5	95.5
Connecticut	130,880	7,065	123,815	5.4	94.6
Delaware	16,557	1,369	15,188	8.3	91.7
Dist. Columbia	113,425	5,004	108,421	4.4	95.6
Florida	55,940	4,267	51,673	7.6	92.4
Georgia	58,003	2,749	55,254	4.7	95.3
Hawaii	18,893	1,017	17,876	5.4	94.6
Idaho	13,223	1,713	11,510	13.0	87.0
Illinois	493,482	20,546	472,936	4.2	95.8
Indiana	121,539	3,964	117,575	3.3	96.7
Iowa	74,900	2,446	72,454	3.3	96.7
Kansas	51,730	2,007	49,723	3.9	96.1
Kentucky	53,453	2,695	50,758	5.0	95.0
Louisiana	59,019	10,399	48,620	17.6	82.4
Maine	26,676	1,331	25,345	5.0	95.0
Maryland	134,637	6,351	128,286	4.7	95.3

[1] Group consists of community property returns and separate returns of husbands and wives living together.

[2] Group consists of joint returns of husbands and wives living together, and single men and women, and married men and women, not living together, who are heads of families, or nonheads of families.

Total number of individual income-tax returns filed in 1938 by single persons, married couples filing joint and separate returns, nonheads of families, and community property returns, by States—Con.

State	Total number of returns filed	Number returns receiving tax advantage	Number returns receiving no tax advantage	Percent of total	
				Receiving tax advantage	Receiving no tax advantage
Massachusetts	297,080	17,183	280,497	5.8	94.2
Michigan	273,678	9,243	264,435	3.4	96.6
Minnesota	107,238	4,066	103,172	3.8	96.2
Mississippi	19,423	925	18,498	4.7	95.3
Missouri	143,662	5,067	37,595	2	95.8
Montana	27,976	551	27,425	2.0	98.0
Nebraska	39,209	1,331	37,878	3.4	96.6
Nevada	8,969	918	8,051	10.2	89.8
N. Hampshire	20,936	1,093	19,843	5.2	94.8
New Jersey	301,186	13,481	287,705	4.5	95.5
New Mexico	13,690	1,900	11,790	13.9	86.1
New York	1,052,402	53,955	998,447	5.1	94.9
North Carolina	50,224	2,993	47,231	6.0	94.0
North Dakota	11,418	312	11,106	2.7	97.3
Ohio	243,532	12,565	230,967	3.7	96.3
Oklahoma	55,762	3,360	52,402	6.0	94.0
Oregon	53,584	1,609	51,975	3.0	97.0
Pennsylvania	499,885	19,036	480,849	3.8	96.2
Rhode Island	40,758	1,744	39,014	4.3	95.7
South Carolina	24,000	1,078	22,922	4.5	95.5
South Dakota	11,757	299	11,458	2.5	97.5
Tennessee	57,861	2,194	55,667	3.8	96.2
Texas	205,254	34,534	170,720	16.8	83.2
Utah	19,177	722	18,455	3.8	96.2
Vermont	13,563	462	13,101	3.4	96.6
Virginia	72,217	2,755	69,462	3.8	96.2
Washington [3]	106,472	11,884	94,588	11.2	88.8
West Virginia	53,744	1,760	51,984	3.3	96.7
Wisconsin	146,565	6,051	140,514	4.1	95.9
Wyoming	11,716	356	11,360	3.0	97.0
Total	6,150,776	351,214	5,799,562	5.7	94.3

[3] Includes Alaska.

Alanson B. Houghton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I announced to the Congress the death of the Honorable Alanson B. Houghton, former Ambassador to Germany, former Ambassador to Great Britain, and former distinguished Member of this House. Pursuant to the permission granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of September 17, 1941:

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 17, 1941]

ALANSON B. HOUGHTON

Those who were privileged to enjoy the friendship of Alanson B. Houghton will remember him always as one of the gentlest and kindliest of men. His diffidence, the measured manner of his speaking, the chivalrous thoughtfulness with which he dealt with all classes of people—those were the qualities which distinguished him among his contemporaries. If ever he was disturbed to the point of energetic resistance, the circumstance was concealed from public notice. His bearing was placidity itself. He was, in fine, a philosopher whom the aggravations of the world could not touch.

Given such a character, Mr. Houghton's success as a diplomatist is easy to understand. As Ambassador to Germany from 1922 to 1925 he earned the appreciation of the whole corps in Berlin. His post was incredibly difficult, but he met its exactions without the slightest complaint. A like observation may be suggested with regard to his services in Great Britain. He was named to the Court of St. James's at a moment when the United States needed a Minister of particular genius for tactful negotiation. To say that he justified the confidence of his country to the fullest extent is but to speak the minimum of truth. The 4 years—1925 to 1929—of his term in London were fruitful of noteworthy achievement.

Mr. Houghton, returning home at 65, was at the apex of his intellectual powers, and it was his choice to devote himself to idealistic labors. The National Industrial Conference, the Academy of Political Science, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Institute for Advanced Study, the Brookings Institution, and Washington Cathedral received his active help. He gave not merely his means but also himself—his time, his strength, his constructive spirit—to the great causes of education and religion.

The Nation to whose high purposes he was devoted is justified in being proud of such a life as that which Mr. Houghton lived. It is a fact worth mentioning that America is rich in citizens competent to appreciate and to seek to emulate his example.

Contradiction of Lindbergh's Claim That Jews Endanger United States by Control of Mediums Molding Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, September 17, 1941, entitled "Contradiction of Lindbergh's Claim That Jews Endanger United States by Control of Mediums Molding Thought":

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 17, 1941]

The remark to end all remarks on the Jewish question was made by Mark Twain, who said, "The Jews are members of the human race—worse I can say of no man."

However, Mr. Lindbergh and the Charlie McCarthys of the America First Committee in the Senate subcommittee "investigating" the movie industry have neither the wit, logic, nor humanity of Mark Twain. Mr. Lindbergh therefore managed in one breath to express his sorrow for the persecution of the Jews in Germany while advocating their persecution here if they exercise the same rights as other citizens.

Following the line taken in Washington against the movies, he says that the "British, Jewish, and administration groups" are the only important interventionists in this country, and that "the greatest danger to this country lies in the large Jewish ownership and influence in our motion pictures, our press, our radio, and our Government."

Leaving Mr. Lindbergh's motives aside, what is the plain factual truth about his statement? Is it a fact that Jews are the leading interventionists in the United States? Is it a fact that they have large ownership or influence in the motion pictures, press, radio, and Government? And if they have ownership, is there any ground for thinking that their racial origin determines the way they use their influence?

THE INFLUENTIAL INTERVENTIONISTS

I have written down a list of the most prominent and influential interventionists in the United States, in Government, radio, journalism, the press, and public life, including the two pro-interventionist organizations, the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies and the Fight for Freedom.

In the Government: President Roosevelt, Cordell Hull, Henry L. Stimson, Frank Knox, and Col. William J. Donovan. In organized public activity: Herbert S. Agar, ex-Senator Ernest Willard Gibson, Bishop Henry Wise Hobson, James B. Conant, Wendell Willkie. Among the more influential radio commentators: Raymond Swing, H. V. Kaltenborn, Elmer Davis, Walter Winchell, William L. Shirer. Among journalists: Leland Stowe, H. R. Knickerbocker, Edward C. Taylor, Edgar Mowrer, John Gunther, Vincent Sheehan, John Whitaker, William Stoneman, Quentin Reynolds, and the editor of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Hamilton Fish Armstrong. Among columnists: Walter Lippmann, Jay Franklin, Raymond Clapper, Samuel Grafton, and myself.

Of these 30 names, who would certainly be the first people to be suppressed, exactly 2 are Jewish. The others are racially of Dutch, British, Irish, and German extraction; there are 3 of pure German extraction to 3 of Jewish; 4 of them—maybe more—Roosevelt, Swing, Hamilton Fish Armstrong, and Edgar Mowrer—are descendants of the oldest American families extant.

Well, are the Government, movies, radio, and press saturated with Jewish influences?

BANKS OWN FILM INDUSTRY

The only Jew in the Cabinet is Mr. Morgenthau. The policy-making bodies in foreign affairs are the President, the State Department, the Army, and the Navy. Jews are almost nonexistent in all these departments.

There are a great many Jewish executives in Hollywood. Jewish enterprise, which has never commanded really great capital in this country, was the first to see a latent big industry in the moving picture; they were the pioneers. But if I am correctly informed, most of the present ownership is in the hands of banks, and there are very few Jewish banks in America. None of the big three is Jewish: Chase National, Guaranty Trust, National City.

Radio is owned by tens of thousands of stockholders in several corporations. Does Mr. Lindbergh want to go over the lists and expropriate the stock in Jewish hands? He's got precedents for it in Fascist countries. Mr. Sarnoff, a young radio wizard, was discovered by Owen D. Young, and became president of R. C. A. N. B. C. has its own president, and he has never been Jewish. Of 26 directors and members of the advisory council, 2 are Jewish. C. B. S. has a Jewish president but not a Jewish majority on the board. Mutual is a cooperative system in which one of the stockholders is the rabidly isolationist Chicago Tribune.

PUBLIC DECIDES ON RADIO

Radio commentators have only one trouble with the broadcasting companies: They are not permitted to editorialize, and they are supposed to avoid controversy. Since the America First Committee considers even facts controversial if the facts don't help the America First Committee, and since the America First Committee organizes boycotts and letter-writing campaigns to sponsors, the lot of the radio commentator is hard. But if the public does not like the commentator, he goes off the air. Here, again, the public decides. And the most influential commentators are not paid by the networks but by sponsors. Does Mr. Lindbergh think no Jewish firms should be allowed to advertise?

Mr. Lindbergh's reference to Jewish influence falls completely wide of the mark when it comes to the press. There is an amazingly small amount of Jewish ownership of newspapers. The big news services—Associated Press, United Press, and International News Service—are not Jewish. The largest chains are Scripps-Howard and Hearst—not Jewish. The New York Times is Jewish-owned, but has an overwhelmingly gentile editorial board. Of the 11 most powerful interventionist newspapers in the country, only 1 is Jewish-owned.

POLICY WOULD CONTINUE

The most powerful interventionist weekly press is the Luce press—not Jewish. The two monthly magazines with the strongest interventionist editorial policy are the Ladies' Home Journal and the Atlantic Monthly—not Jewish.

In fact, if every American Jew died tomorrow, it would make not the slightest difference in the policy of the movies, the radio, the Government, or the press—unless, of course, Mr. Lindbergh and his followers could fill whatever positions were left vacant from the lists of the America First Committee.

There are precedents for that, too, in Fascist countries.

But, first, he would have to deal with some of us who are not Jews.

Some Fundamental Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

ADDRESS BY GEORGE N. PEEK

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George N. Peek, of Moline, Ill., formerly special adviser to President Roosevelt on foreign trade, and President of Export-Import Bank during 1934 and 1935; also the first Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1933, is a man who has devoted the better part of a busy life to bringing about a more equitable return on investment and labor for the American farmer. Many years ago he called attention to the fact that the farmer, when he sells his crop, is at the mercy of the man to whom he sells; that when he buys across the counter the things he must have and which he does not himself produce, he is at the mercy of the man from whom he buys, placing him in a position of disadvantage peculiar only to his particular calling.

Mr. Peek is a man of wide business experience. His experience in the activities outlined above has given him an unusual opportunity to familiarize himself with the technicalities of foreign trade, and certainly no one in this country is better equipped to discuss intelligently the economic problems which now confront us.

On September 11, 1941, at San Diego, Calif., before the Men's Republican League of San Diego County, Mr. Peek addressed himself on the subject, Some Fundamental Problems.

Under unanimous consent, I offer a copy of this speech for the RECORD. A careful reading of the same will disclose the thoughtful and scholarly way in which Mr. Peek has dealt with a subject which looms large in the future welfare of this Nation.

The speech follows:

In times of world crisis and national confusion such as these, we must look straight to fundamentals. We must moreover be able to relate our policies and programs in specific fields to a central core of fundamental national policy. Much of the confusion and danger in which we find ourselves involved springs from the failure of the present administration to define clearly for itself and for the country a central unified national policy in which each field of endeavor would have its component part. Instead, the administration has pursued domestic policies irredeemably in conflict with each other and foreign policies which have conflicted with the domestic policies they should have supplemented.

The war, terrible as it is, has done one thing for this Nation. It has awakened it with a bang. After 8 years we see what the dreamers, schemers, and bunglers have done for us. In spite of the huge expenditures of the past 8 years we see unemployment and lack of social and economic balance; we see also that we are unarmed and unprepared, standing at the brink of war. We shall have an opportunity during the next year to dispense with the bunglers and to follow our natural bent for organization, protection, and defense. To do this, however, we must elect a new Congress which must perform the functions reposed in it by the Constitution. There must be an end to a Congress which will rubber stamp everything the Executive asks; an end to one-man government.

It is the inescapable duty of the Republican Party to identify and define a basic national policy and then to coordinate with it the various domestic policies on which our functioning as a nation depends and to supplement it by a foreign policy and activity which such a unified national domestic policy demands. Our national interest must be the yardstick; to it all other policies must conform.

Every thinking man and woman views with the gravest misgivings the recklessness and emotionalism which characterize the foreign policy of the present administration. It has already affected the abandonment of the safeguard of our neutrality. It is stripping us of military aircraft and supplies, without the prospect of their early replacement, at a most critical juncture in world affairs. It threatens, if not checked, to embroil us in foreign wars, with unforeseeable losses of blood, treasure, and strength; to involve us for generations to come in the politics and intrigues of Europe and Asia; and to facilitate the establishment here of a New Deal dictatorship. This is gambling with our national security and imperiling the very foundations upon which our democracy is laid. The only way we can assist democracy abroad is by preserving and strengthening it here. Whatever our personal sympathies for the people of the British Empire may be, we should conserve our men, money, material, and energies for the sole purpose of insuring and of making effective our own national security and that of this hemisphere.

We must start with the proposition that the national interest of the American people should be the primary concern of those whom we entrust with direction of our Government. We must build for ourselves forthwith a position of military and economic defense, within the field of our potential control, so imposing and so impregnable that no aggressor will dare assail it, either directly or indirectly—a defense which will function effectively to protect us, our economy, and our institutions, regardless of the changes which may come about in other continents as a result of the tragic events now transpiring in Europe and Asia. The present war may be short or it may be long drawn out, but we can be certain that its post-war effects will not pass within our time. Our national policy must be such that it can cope with the vicissitudes of war and peace alike, and must be fashioned with that in view. All that conduces to that end must be retained and strengthened; all that does not accord with that purpose must be thrust away, no matter what its individual appeal or desirability may seem.

If we are substantially in accord on this concept of national interest as the supreme need of national policy, many of the problems with which we deal fall naturally into place and dictate their own solutions:

I. MILITARY DEFENSE

Complete self-dependence for national defense in the air, on the land and sea. A two-ocean Navy or its equivalent to make us independent of the navy of any foreign country in our relations with the rest of the world.

II. ECONOMIC DEFENSE

The immediate gearing of our industry, agriculture, transportation, and labor to wartime requirements, under a Department of Economic Defense clothed with adequate powers and unhampered by political tampering or by bureaucratic or legalistic red tape.

Development of new resources or substitutes for needed essential supplies (tin, rubber, manganese, etc., in the United States and the nations reasonably adjacent to us.

III. DIPLOMATIC DEFENSE

Reorientation of our foreign policies to conform to the paramount objective of national security, military and economic. Reaffirmation of our historic policy of no entangling alliances and that of the Monroe Doctrine. Conservation of our human and material resources to that end.

IV. INTERNAL STABILITY

Reorganization of the long-established protective system as the basis of American prosperity and social stability, and in particular its extension to insure fully the maintenance of a prosperous and self-dependent agriculture as the foundation of our economic system and of our social and political institutions.

V. FARM POLICY

The present agricultural program, as administered by Washington, is a demonstrated failure. We should, by amendment and improvement of existing legislation, make mandatory certain provisions and vigorously prosecute them administratively, so that the following shall be sustained:

The restoration of farm income and purchasing power and the maintenance of a free and self-dependent agriculture, which form the essential basis for industrial and national prosperity, employment, and security. Against the present program of restricted production and increased imports of competitive farm products, we should seek to increase farm income to its proper size

through the medium of improved prices and increased sales for American farm products.

1. The protection and full price benefit of the American market for the American farmer by the limitation to actual requirements (by tariffs, quotas, embargoes, or otherwise) of competitive farm imports or substitutes therefor.

2. The development of new uses for American agricultural products in industry and commerce and the development in the United States of the growth of farm commodities or their substitutes previously imported.

3. An American price for American consumption, independent of export or world prices. To accomplish this in the case of surplus crops on which the tariff is ineffective until such time as the home market is restored and developed, the payment of benefits upon the domestically consumed portion of such crops to compensate for lack of tariff protection and to insure a fair exchange value with the products farmers buy. When this parity price has been attained, we should provide the machinery whereby the farmers may establish a self-sustaining program, without substantial cost to the Government, through the medium of an equalization fee, substantially as provided in the McNary-Haugen bill of 1928.

4. Government assistance in disposing of surpluses in foreign trade for the best prices obtainable, bargaining for foreign markets selectively by countries and otherwise, both as to exports and imports.

5. The adoption of a long-range program for conservation of the soil for its own sake, as distinguished from schemes for production control, such program to be administered by the land-grant colleges or other responsible State agencies with Federal financial and technical assistance.

6. The encouragement of farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative organizations to decrease the price spread between producer and consumer, the extension of commodity loans to farmers on a sound basis to assist in carrying seasonal surpluses and the encouragement of crop insurance under proper auspices.

7. The encouragement of the better financing of farm mortgages on a sound basis through recognized public and private agencies at low rates of interest on an amortization plan, to the end that farm ownership may be more widely distributed in the hands of those who actually work the land.

VI. FOREIGN TRADE AND FINANCIAL POLICIES

These must be shaped to protect and supplement our basic national security, the military and economic policies which that entails, and the internal stability on which national security must rest. We should concentrate control of our foreign trade and financial activities in an economic defense board.

Foreign trade and financial policy should be based upon and conform to the requirements of our domestic economic objectives. These objectives are the protection of the American market for American agriculture, industry, and labor, and the protection of American employment and standards of living. These should not be needlessly exposed to the impact of events abroad over which we have no control, nor should American recovery be sacrificed upon the altar of academic whims or internationalist diplomacy, particularly in the difficult post-war conditions with which we shall surely be confronted when the millions now engaged in warfare and in war production return to peacetime production and trade competition. Specifically, there should be:

1. A reorganization of the Tariff Commission into an Economic Defense Board as the responsible executive authority for the determination of foreign trade and financial policy in the light of American domestic interests and for the coordination of the foreign commercial and financial activities of the Federal Government.

2. The establishment of a comprehensive system of national bookkeeping, expressed in simple arithmetic, covering all our commercial and financial transactions with other nations, as an essential basis for determining questions of foreign trade and financial policy.

3. The adoption of a realistic policy of trading in the national interest under a system of quotas, and of selective imports and exports, granting tariff or other trade concessions only on a quid pro quo basis, thus returning to the traditional American policy of offering to all nations reciprocal treatment on the basis of the conditional most-favored-nation principle.

4. Congressional approval of all general trade agreements which have been or may be negotiated, as an essential to the maintenance of constitutional and responsible government.

A method by which this program may be effected is suggested by bills introduced in the current Congress by Senator VANDENBERG and Congressman ROY O. WOODRUFF, to provide for the economic defense of the United States. Under these bills all imports, agricultural and industrial, would be prohibited whenever prices were less than reasonable American prices in the American market on competing American products or their substitutes.

To summarize, we must make national security the sole criterion of our national policies. We should seek it by direct military, economic, and diplomatic measures such as are outlined above. We must establish it upon a firm basis of internal stability, to attain which a sound solution of the farm problem is indispensable. We must supplement that internal stability by foreign trade and financial policies which will strengthen and insulate that stability against the shocks and strains of wartime and post-war conditions.

We are a warm-hearted and courageous people. We must be cool-headed as well if we are not to dissipate the heritage of our fathers by following the false gods of foreign intervention and war. Our experience in Europe in 1917–19 was a costly and terrible lesson in the futility and folly of intervening in European affairs. Americans should not have to learn that lesson nor pay that price a second time, for the price is the blood and shattered lives of our young men and it may be the permanent loss of our liberties to a New Deal dictatorship.

Our aim should be to make possible to all Americans the fullest benefits of our form of government as granted by our Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The first requisite to this aim is knowledge based on reliable and comprehensive information, so that we may know what the problems are and consider them fairly. The second is a realization of the principle that foreign policies, whether political or economic, must not be permitted to destroy or impair our form of government or our standards of living.

The question boils down to this: Shall we take advantage of our position of geographic and economic security and contribute to world peace and prosperity by developing our own country and by attending to our own affairs, or shall we involve our Nation in foreign wars under the guise of protecting a theory of foreign trade which, as has been shown, is detrimental to our welfare? Shall we dilute our Nation's strength with the world's weakness? There rests our choice. Settle it by ballots, not bullets, and settle it now in the coming elections.

Be Prepared—The Boy Scouts of America Do Their Good Turn for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the motto of the Boy Scouts of America, "Be prepared," might well be the objective of America. Too late we awoke to the fact that for the protection and preservation of our own democracy we must be prepared and that we had neglected to provide the essentials of our own national defense. America is a beehive of activity in putting our productive machine into full activity, turning out the tools and instruments and matériel so essential to protect our own people and at the same time defend the Western Hemisphere.

Active service for 25 years with the Boy Scouts of America has given me an opportunity to learn first hand the growth and achievements of this great youth organization, which has for its purpose the building into the lives of the youth of America ideals of genuine Americanism—the things for which we as a nation have stood throughout the years. If the ideals which motivate this large group of young Americans could be made the dominant characteristic of the men of tomorrow who shall rule the Nation, America indeed would be safe. In the recent drive to collect aluminum from all the households of America with which to overcome a bottleneck in this much-needed material for airplane construction the Boy Scout organization again came to the front and did a masterful job.

As a part of these observations I include the following commendation of the work of the Boy Scouts, which appeared August 1, 1941, in the Jamaica (N. Y.) Long Island Daily Press:

[From the Jamaica (N. Y.) Long Island Daily Press of August 1, 1941]

WELL DONE—THE SCOUTS SHOW RESULTS

It will not be giving away any defense secrets to report that the borough's aluminum drive was heading for a flop until the Boy Scouts stepped in and saved it.

Mobilized overnight, the boys did a remarkable job, a dramatic and convincing demonstration of what the Scouts can do in an emergency.

What they have done they can do again.

We believe that in this time of emergency, the Boy Scouts have proved themselves to be much more than a knot-tying, light-a-fire-without-matches organization.

They have performed a man's job, an important job, and they performed it while their elders were posing in front of patriotic posters, accepting obviously brand-new pots and pans from pretty girls.

In 2 days the Scouts collected more than 150,000 pieces of aluminum. They went on foot, on bicycles, in home-made wagons, in borrowed trucks, the family car, and an array of other conveyances. These they filled up and went back for more.

Literally, they rang every doorbell in the borough.

The result is that Queens has made more than a creditable showing in the aluminum drive.

Of course, other organizations, notably the American Legion and the neighborhood civic associations, did their part, but their performance pales alongside the Boy Scouts.

When the aluminum campaign was still in the discussion stage, it was proposed that it should be handled exclusively by the Scouts, but in a rush of patriotic fervor, their elders climbed on the defense band wagon, and the boys were pushed aside.

Alas, pots and pans cannot be collected with speeches. It requires perserverance and hard work, a patient door-to-door canvass.

Give that job to the grownups, and it would take days and days of committee meetings to get organized. The Scouts did it overnight.

It is comforting to know that the Boy Scouts of Queens live up to their motto: "Be prepared."

Mr. Speaker, I also include a letter from Mayor LaGuardia to Dr. James E. West, chief Scout executive, expressing his appreciation for the excellent service rendered by the Boy Scouts of America in the aluminum campaign:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
September 9, 1941.

DR. JAMES E. WEST,
Chief Scout Executive
Boy Scouts of America,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR DR. WEST: I want you to know how much I appreciate the fine service rendered by the Boy Scouts of America in the recent aluminum campaign. The splendid cooperation of the executives, Scout leaders, and troops in collecting aluminum for defense purposes have been a major contribution to the success of the campaign. Their generous support of this program is another evidence of the fine principles and high standards which identify the Boy Scouts.

Our Nation is indeed fortunate in having an organization such as the Boy Scouts which fosters the principles of democracy in the hearts of our youth, and which is always prepared to help in the defense of our country.

Sincerely yours,
F. LAGUARDIA, *Mayor.*

Mr. Speaker, as one Member of the Congress of the United States, I take this opportunity, publicly, to express my personal appreciation and I am sure the gratitude of the Nation, for this patriotic, unselfish service rendered by the Boy Scouts of America in doing their bit in seeing that the Nation itself is prepared.

The St. Lawrence and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial should be read by the Members of Congress, because it points out a condition which has been passed over by the proponents of the St. Lawrence project:

[From the New York Times of September 18, 1941]

THE ST. LAWRENCE AND LABOR

Does the construction of a huge hydroelectric plant create much work or little? The answer apparently depends on the plant and its purpose. The Grand Coulee enterprise was heralded by the administration as a boon to labor and industry; but when the merits of the St. Lawrence project were presented by the administration's advocates before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the amount of work and material required to develop the power possibilities of the International Rapids and to dig a channel for navigation from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic was treated as if it were almost negligible.

The total expenditures for labor, material, and equipment required in the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam and power plant from 1933 to February 1941 were $128,450,000. Of this amount 35 percent went to labor at the site and of the remainder 90 percent went for wages and salaries in producing raw materials, in processing and fabricating and in transporting finished products. According to the joint board of engineers, the development of the International Rapids for power and the provision of a deep waterway there will cost $266,170,000—an estimate which is less than half that of competent contractors. In the light of comparative costs it is clear that as much labor will be needed at the International Rapids, both at the site and in far-distant mills and factories, as the building of the Grand Coulee plant and its irrigation facilities demanded. An average of 4,600 men worked annually for 5 out of the 7 years that it took to finish Grand Coulee. Hence General Robins' statement before the House committee that not more than 10,000 men would be required at the International Rapids is about right. But these 10,000 must be supported by at least 17,000 producers of materials and equipment. Can we afford to divert 27,000 skilled and semiskilled men from overtaxed industries?

Three years ago the administration would have held up the example of the St. Lawrence as a work maker, but in these days the diversion of 27,000 men for a period of years is regarded as something inconsequential.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by former President Hoover, published in the New York Times of yesterday:

[From the New York Times of September 17, 1941]

TEXT OF HOOVER'S ADDRESS AT CHICAGO ON AMERICAN POLICY

After 10 weeks of observation I wish again to speak to my countrymen upon America's relation to this war. I shall speak analytically and dispassionately, for cool thinking is needed now as never before.

Since 10 weeks ago the military scene in the world has enormously shifted. New objectives for the American people have been advanced. The Navy has been ordered to start shooting. Our people are bewildered and divided.

No one will deny that if we keep up this step-by-step policy it will lead inevitably to sending our sons into this war. Nor will anyone deny that the realization of the objectives set before us leads to that same fate. It is the ultimate end of this road that must be looked at. And that I propose to discuss tonight.

WAR UP TO CONGRESS

But before I proceed let me make certain matters plain.

If we would preserve the very spirit of free institutions American boys must not be sent to death in this war without the specific declaration by the Congress. Congress should not be eliminated. And in the support of free institutions this debate must continue until Congress shall declare war.

Debate on war and peace ought to be lifted above intolerance and accusation. Those who sincerely and openly advocate sending our boys into this war are entitled to respect. And those who oppose it are entitled to like consideration.

I hold, and 99 percent of Americans hold, that totalitarianism, whether nazi-ism or communism, is abominable. Both forms are unmoral because they deny religion, and there is no sanctity of agreement with them. They are abhorrent because of their unspeakable cruelty and their callous slaughter of millions of human beings. I abhor any American compromise or alliance with either of them.

THE WAR SITUATION

A cold survey of this world situation will show that the dangers of ultimate totalitarian success are very much less than even 10 weeks ago. The fratricidal war between Hitler and Stalin is daily weakening both dictators.

Hitler may gain from Russia some supplies, but he now faces all the rest of Europe exhausted of its pre-war stocks of food and material. Although he has won unprecedented military victories, he has kindled behind him a consuming fire of hate.

It is now evident that he has failed to convert to nazi-ism the 200,000,000 people that he has invaded. He cannot recruit a division of dependable soldiers among them. They hate him. If he occupies all Russia it will add another 150,000,000 haters. Of the 160,000,000 people in Germany and its allies, many are becoming weary of war and of death.

The hate of Hitler will be more terrible than the blizzard was to Napoleon. His kingdom cannot live, even though he has no military defeat on the Continent.

We are assured Hitler cannot cross the English Channel with his armies. And England is even more impregnable because of this breathing spell for production of planes, tanks, and ships and our increasing aid in war tools. Her loss of ships and supplies at sea has greatly decreased, largely due to her more effective air patrol. And she daily becomes stronger in air attack on Germany.

DANGERS TO AMERICA LESS

The actual dangers to America are less today than at any time since this war began.

Thoughtful men agree that the revolution in weapons makes the Western Hemisphere impregnable from invasion by Hitler. A statement of mine some time ago was challenged. But it has been more than confirmed by Colonel Phillips, of our United States Army General Staff, who recently wrote:

"The bomber has made the American coast impregnable to invasion. And this still would be true if our Navy were inferior to that of any invading power. It makes it possible for this country to insure not only its own con-

tinental territory * * * but * * * to insure the impregnability of all North and South America."

And I may add that if Hitler had all the shipyards in Europe he could not in 5 years build an armada big enough even to start across the Atlantic.

Hitler is on his way to be crushed by the vicious forces within his regime. Patience for this is far better than spending the lives of our boys.

Under any American policy, whether interventionist or noninterventionist, in either Europe or Japan, if we have common sense we will concentrate upon building our production, give Britain her tools, and await the development of all these forces, both east and west.

FREEDOM OF THE SEAS

Mr. Roosevelt spoke last Thursday night upon the freedom of the seas and the recent incidents.

The President is right in vigorous protest at firing upon American warships. He is right in protest at sinking American merchant ships without adequate protection to the crews, even though they were all carrying contraband.

Any definition of freedom of the seas in wartime is largely academic Britain could not accept the President's definition and carry on an effective blockade.

But the President's policy of edging our warships into danger zones, of sending American merchant ships with contraband raises the most critical of all questions.

These steps to war are unapproved and undeclared by the Congress. That is not in accord with the spirit of representative government, and it should be remembered that these incidents are the consequence of violating the spirit of the Neutrality Act There are other ways than going into this war to secure reparation for transgression of our just rights and respect for them

FREEDOM FOR MANKIND

The basis of argument of those who would have us send our sons into war has greatly shifted in the last 2 months. The increasing emphasis is upon our moral obligation to send our boys to war in order to establish freedom for all men.

President Roosevelt on January 6 of this year stated that we seek "everywhere in the world" freedom of speech and expression, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, freedom from want. He has emphasized this many times since.

On August 12 the President and Prime Minister Churchill issued their Atlantic statement. They expanded these points by 9 more to 13. They are: No annexations, self-determination, self-government, equality of trade, social advancement, some sort of freedom of the seas, abandonment of the use of force, and disarmament of aggressor nations, and permanent peace.

Two weeks ago Mr. Roosevelt again referred to these questions and "our responsibility to build a democratic world."

I believe in the aspirations for freedom and peace in the world. I have myself urged and prayed and worked for them over a quarter of a century. I pray that they may yet come to the world.

But today the realistic questions which confront us are:

Can America impose these four freedoms upon Europe and Asia by sending our sons into this war?

Can America impose the nine new points on the world?

Shall we not lose in America all these freedoms by the very necessities that arise if we send our sons into this war?

VOICE OF EXPERIENCE

Here, my countrymen, you should listen to the stern voice of American experience.

Before the last World War we were indignant as we are now at aggression by dictator governments. Our sense of compassion and justice was aroused on behalf of the victims. We believed the New World could bring to the Old a new order of justice, right, and freedom. We would make the world safe for democracy. We would fight a war to end all war.

I advocated our joining in that war. I occupied highly responsible positions in the war, the peace and its aftermaths. I was part of these events. I can speak from facts, from record, from personal knowledge.

President Wilson 23 years ago in his 14 points and supplementary provisions not only declared every one of all the Churchill and Roosevelt principles and freedoms, but Wilson included still more freedoms and protections. He reflected the whole idealism of America.

We won that war. But we lost the peace. At least so far as our high purpose of freedom and permanent peace was concerned. Europe degenerated into a hell, the brew from which poisons the earth today.

It is the causes of this failure in the last World War that are important for us to examine now.

The causes of that failure of only 23 years ago lie far deeper than the viciousness of the Treaty of Versailles, or the failure of the League of Nations. The causes of that failure lie deep in the invisible forces which dominate and vibrate through the races which comprise the millions of people of Europe.

To most Americans Europe consists of magnificent cities, cathedrals, cafes, art, music, literature, great universities and monuments to heroism and human progress. Men among them have fought and died for liberty, to lift the dignity of man. From them all we have received magnificent heritage of human thought.

But other forces make the fates of these people. Here are 400,000,000 people on the continent divided into 26 races. They are crowded cheek by jowl in an area less than two-thirds of the United States. Suppose each of 26 of our States had its own language, its own racial inheritance, its own economic and political problems.

And suppose through all these races for centuries have surged the forces of nationalism, of imperialism, of religious conflict, memories of deep wrongs, of age-old hates, and bitter fears.

Suppose each had its own army and around each of these states was a periphery of mixed populations that made exact boundaries on racial lines hopeless. The outcries of separated minorities would be implacable and unceasing cause of war Suppose they all had different forms of government and even where it was a democratic form it was class government That would be Europe.

STRUGGLES OF EUROPE

The standards of living of these great masses of people in Europe are at the very base of the struggle for bare existence. Economic rivalry, setting up of barriers to trade, the desire for elbow room in growing nations, and the pressure of low living standards force quarrels and grabs for territory for exploitation of other parts of the earth.

And periodically there boils up among these people some Pied Piper with silver tongue calling some new Utopia. Or the new Man on Horseback calls his race to wars of aggression and ambition. Indeed, with a vicious rhythm these malign forces seem to drive nations, like the Gadarene swine, over the precipice of war.

In contrast, here in America during these 400 years since our beginnings we have grown steadily apart from the ideas of Europe. Every one of our ancestors came here to get away from this dread turmoil. Ours has been a continent of magnificent resources from which we have obtained a greater ease of life. Freed of European hates and fears of great armies on our borders, we have developed new concepts of liberty, of morals, and government.

Mr. Wilson's 14 points and supplementary provisions had before the armistice been formally accepted by both the Allies and the Germans as the basis of world peace. One of the most painful chapters in American history was the antagonism to these ideas by Allied statesmen the moment the war was won

NEW WORLD CONCEPTS

But the whole concepts which the New World brought to the Old were at conflict with the grim forces that faced European statesmanship.

The victorious Allies in Europe were impoverished. They had suffered dreadful butcheries and wrongs. They demanded revenge, punishment, colonies, and money. Their statesmen, representing their peoples, were not free agents to make peace upon President Wilson's basis.

A thousand years of history, fear, and hate demanded and obtained seats at that peace table. They will sit at the next peace table of Europe, and America will be just as foreign at that table again.

President Wilson made a valiant fight for his new order for mankind. But it was the collision of warm idealism born in a New World against the glacial forces of the Old World. The treaty would have been worse but for Wilson.

It was not the League of Nations which brought calamity in the world. It was the eternal malign forces of Europe.

Mr. Churchill himself had, with his usual bluntness, said 3 years ago, "Hitler's success, and, indeed, his survival as a political force, would not have been possible but for the lethargy and folly of the French and British Governments since the war."

AMERICAN IDEAS OF FREEDOM

American ideas of freedom and government are the result of slow growth in the hearts of people. It takes decades and centuries. They cannot be imposed by words, no matter how eloquent. They cannot be imposed by force. They cannot be imposed upon nations by treaties any more than they can be imposed by battle. We tried it once under the most perfect setting of triumphant victory over aggression, and with all the power and prestige of America.

The stern voice of experience says that America cannot impose its freedoms and ideals upon the 26 races of Europe or the world. We should not again sacrifice our sons for that proved will-o'-the-wisp.

Maintaining peace is a separate problem. While we cannot impose freedom, America can and must take part in maintaining peace in the world. We can contribute more to it if we are not exhausted morally, economically, and militarily by sending our boys into this war. I hope to discuss it at some future time.

The first trench in the battle for the four freedoms is to maintain them in America. That rests upon fidelity not only to the letter, but to the spirit, of constitutional government. Failure of Congress to assert its responsibilities or for the Executive to take warlike steps without the approval of the Congress is a direct destruction of the safeguards of freedom. We are on the way to weaken these freedoms in America—not to strengthen them.

Freedom of speech and expression are being stifled by war phobia right now in the United States.

FIFTH FREEDOM ECONOMIC

Incidentally, there is a fifth freedom. That is economic freedom. Freedom for men to

choose their own callings, to accumulate property in protection of their children and old age, freedom of private enterprise that does not injure others. The other four freedoms will not survive without this one.

A large number of the men administering our preparedness program do not believe in this freedom. With a long war—and it will be long if we put our boys into it—then their methods with the inevitable debt, inflation, unemployment, and demoralized agriculture will make us over into state socialism, probably under some other name.

And listen, my countrymen, to another voice of experience. Freedom from want was never won by a war.

The last World War cost us forty billions in debt and taxes in 3 years. Since then we have paid another forty billions in interest and in support of its disabled, its widows, orphans, and veterans. We may assume one-third of our people are today underhoused, underfed, underclothed, and undereducated.

And the last war was largely the cause of that poverty. These people have no freedom from want. But had we used those eighty billions for them instead of war we could have given every family of them a modern five-room house as a gift with all the gadgets. We could have given every person of them as a gift a whole outfit of new clothes once every year since that war. We could have given every family of them as a gift 7 pounds of meat and 7 pounds of bread every week ever since that war. We could have wiped out the one-room schoolhouses. We could have built a modern clinic in every backward county. And we would still have money left.

Freedom from want comes alone from keeping out of war. Underfed, underhoused, underclothed, undereducated people are the inevitable product of war.

POSITION OF RUSSIA

There are certain backgrounds upon which all freedom in America must rest.

Russia is rightly defending herself against aggression. But when it comes to sending our sons into this war we are confronted with something else. We need to take a long look. Russia is also an aggressor nation against democracy. And what happens to the millions of enslaved people of Russia and to all Europe and to our own freedoms if we send our sons to win this war for communism?

Twenty-five years ago and again today are not the only times we have been troubled by these eruptions of dictatorships in Europe.

Some Americans have perhaps forgotten that we had a vigorous interventionist movement in the United States urging us to join England in combat with Napoleon. That interventionist movement was led by Fisher Ames, a journalist of that day, one-time Member of Congress, and said to have been prevented only by illness from becoming president of Harvard University. The leader against joining in war was one Thomas Jefferson.

Fisher Ames thought Jefferson was reactionary and did not realize the modern forces. Ames insisted that Napoleon would dominate the world, including the United States. He was full of pungent phrases.

I give a collection of them: "I am sure we are to be subjugated by Bonaparte." "Let no man in America deceive themselves. If Bonaparte prevails (in Europe) we will be his vassals." "We shall be reduced to slavery." "In case Europe accepts peace and chains we of the United States are ripe and rotten for servitude and tribute." "Britain fights our battles." "One single hope of security is the British Navy." "If Russia is disarmed, how long will it be before England will be done for?" "We are infatuated enough to think America is a hiding place for liberty."

And Ames had some accomplishment in name calling. Generally, he felt Jefferson and Madison and Monroe were the fifth column of that day. He says of them, "Our noisy liberty men are eager for power and indifferent about the fall of our country."

And in those times ours was a puny nation of less people than New York City today. Except for the Fisher Ameses the Americans of that day were not scared.

PROGRAM OF ACTION

As the situation stands today, we can sum up certain bases upon which American policies should be predicated.

1. If we prepare we cannot be invaded nor our economic life be dangerously impaired.

2. England can prevent invasion of her shores if we give her the tools, and even warships, without our sending our boys to death, either on ships or land.

3. Hitler is on the way to be crushed by the vicious forces within his own regime.

4. We have proved by bitter experience that it is a futility for us to try to impose freedom and justice upon the world by war.

5. The ideas and ideals of the west can grow and spread abroad by our demonstration in our own country. They will die in the world if the freedoms shall become weakened or die in America.

6. To send our sons into this war must also be weighed in the scales of future America. Should we not weigh in this scale the dead and maimed? Should we not weigh the one-third of underfed, undernourished, underhoused, undereducated Americans for another generation that will be inevitable? Should we not weigh the loss of our own freedoms?

CONSTRUCTIVE POLICY IDEAS

And where do these facts, reasons, and conclusions point?

What is the constructive policy for America? Is it isolation? Is it intervention? Neither is possible. Neither is wisdom.

We must have impregnable defense. This defense must include the other 20 nations in the Western Hemisphere. That is not isolation.

We must give the tools of defense to the democracies. That is not isolation.

We should reserve our strength that unexhausted we may give real aid to reconstruction and stabilizing of peace when Hitler collapses of his own overreaching. That is neither isolation nor intervention.

We can do our greatest service to civilization by strengthening here in the Western Hemisphere free institutions and free men and women. That is not isolation. It is a service to all mankind.

But to send our boys out to kill. That is intervention.

We hear much urging to national unity. We could easily get unity—

If we stopped calling names.

If we directed our preparedness policies to the minimum interference with economic freedom.

If we gave aid to democracies alone of Europe and Asia, and gave it generously.

If we stopped provocative steps that may take our sons into war.

If no warlike step be taken and no agreement be made that is not submitted to the Congress. If the Congress decides for war, then we accept it.

I believe real unity can be had among the American people in these proposals.

Let us never forget we came over the ocean to the oasis of liberty. We extended this oasis greatly by mighty streams of freedom. They were dug and builded by the toil of our fathers and defended with their blood. Are we now to march out into the desert of European war and see the wells of freedom dried up behind us?

A Loathsome Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, September 17, 1941, entitled "A Loathsome Weapon":

[From the New York Herald Tribune of September 17, 1941]

A LOATHSOME WEAPON

Anti-Semitism was the most contemptible, as it was also the most dangerous, of all the weapons in the armory with which Hitler subverted Germany and set out to enslave the world. And from time immemorial the meanest, the most contemptible, as well as the safest and easiest, excuse of those who have spread this poison—whether Nazis or their sympathizers or their counterparts in other times and places—has been the pretense that the poisoner was really only a great-hearted friend of the Jews, trying to save them from the prejudices which their "unwisdom" or their "excesses" would otherwise arouse. One encountered it, ad nauseam, in the early days of the Hitler movement in Germany; one has met it over and over again elsewhere. Its viciousness is apparent; it is an obvious and despicable device for spreading the bigotry it pretends to combat. Yet this is the precise defense which Senator NYE has raised against the plain inference that the isolationists' precious "investigation" into the motion-picture industry is primarily an attempt to light the fires of Nazi anti-Semitism in aid of a cause already desperate.

Senator NYE, America First, and the other isolationist leaders alone know their own inner motives. Others, endeavoring to assess them, can only look at the evidence. They can only infer that the increasing persistence with which the anti-Semitic poison has appeared in isolationist pronouncements is not an accident. It was hardly an accidental choice of names when Senator WHEELER, in an isolationist speech as long ago as last February, was denouncing "political control by a financial oligarchy, whether it be the Thyssens and Krupps in Germany, the Rothschilds in England and France, the Sassoons in India and China, or the Morgans, the Warburgs, the Kuhn-Loebs, and other international bankers in the United States." One cannot forget Senator NYE's speech on August 1, in St. Louis:

"Who is pushing and hauling America to plunge us into this war? Who are the men? Who is putting up the money for all this propaganda? * * * I haven't the time to name all those contributing to our march to war, but I will tonight name some of them."

Out of thousands he might have selected, he actually gave 17 names of men prominent in the motion-picture industry, all Jewish sounding (that at least two are actually non-Jews was not explained) and carefully omitting the names of non-Jewish executives of

equal importance in some of the very companies to which he referred. The fact that the present "investigation" has been hastily broadened to bring in the names of a few non-Jewish motion-picture people does not remove the impression made by this speech.

One remembers America First's statement, appearing in the Daily News here on September 6, citing those who were attacking it. Among the thousands or hundreds of thousands of non-Jews who might have been used as examples, America First selected, in addition to British-born Dr. Frank Kingdon, three Jews and a speaker before the Jewish War Veterans. After this, Mr. Lindbergh's virtually unconcealed appeal to anti-Semitism 5 days later could not be regarded as an isolated episode; and the motion-picture investigation, beginning with Senator NYE's pronouncement that "four names, each that of one of the Jewish faith, each foreign-born" are "primarily responsible for propaganda in the motion-picture field" could take on, despite all the Senator's protestations, but one interpretation.

Many isolationists are not anti-Semitic, we are glad to concede. But the evidence that their leaders are deliberately taking up this despicable, disruptive, and profoundly inhuman and un-American weapon to bolster a lost cause is too strong to be disregarded; and there is no non-Jewish American deserving the name who will not turn from that business with loathing.

Labor Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH B. SHANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

ADDRESS BY REV. JOHN C. FRIEDL, S. J.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a Labor Day address by Rev. John C. Friedl, S. J., director of the Institute for Social Reconstruction of Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Mo., before a meeting of the Omaha Central Labor Union, Omaha, Nebr., on September 1 of this year, as follows:

I believe we are all alike in this, that we share a certain uneasiness about our impending future. We are uneasy about our foreign affairs; we are uneasy about our domestic affairs. Though with something of a sigh of relief labor tells itself that it is now in the saddle, it, too, is uneasy about its own future because it is uneasy about the very soul of our national existence, our democracy, on which its continued well-being so urgently depends.

The note of emergency about our foreign affairs is but a momentary distraction from those greater long-range problems of our internal national life which clamor for solution. Put off as we may the day of reckoning, come it will. Our only hope is that we will meet it intellectually, spiritually, and psychologically prepared. It is this obligation of preparation for what is to come that I propose to discuss with you.

A NEW ERA FOR LABOR

Before all else we must recognize that we are entering a new era. Things will never again be just as they were. We are moving out of old conditions and old social and economic surroundings. I could cite hundreds of important men the world over who have said this very thing. But at the crossroads of the world, at the world's listening post, there is ever an observer whose vision is not cramped by international boundaries, racial groups, economic interests, and geographic hemispheres; one who surveys events as the world's most objective observer.

We have the late Pope Pius XI to thank for this rapid and very concise analysis of the contemporary scene. "There is no denying," he said 3 years ago, "that the world has entered upon one of those transition periods, of unrest, of questioning, of disorientation, and conflict which have been well described as turning points of history." Let us accept that as a fact, as simply and as categorically as he puts it there, and let labor build its house accordingly.

Does that mean that we must hold with the radicals that our traditional American way of life is on the way out; that our social, economic, and political democratic concepts must yield to some new form, say, of totalitarianism, whether of a class, or of so-called managers and economic coordinators, or of some one strong man speaking for an all-powerful state? Far from it.

We need to save the American way to the extent that it is worth saving. We want to save it as any alert businessman would want to save a going concern, prepared to sacrifice whatever does not contribute to its well-being. We want to save our American democracy not only from the threat of foreign domination but also from the danger of an internal break-up through lazy apathy and half-hearted concern over our domestic problems, and the jittery impulse that prompts so many unthinking people to grasp at any quack social formula that promises a general panacea.

Our problem is to restore human affairs in this country to a satisfactory state without sacrificing the essential framework of our democracy. To save what is good in our present economy of democratic enterprise based on a legitimate profit motive and the natural right of private ownership, we must first get to know and recognize entwining abuses, and then steel ourselves to be willing ruthlessly to cut these abuses away.

What is basically good in this going concern of ours must be thoughtfully and conscientiously preserved in the face of muddled, subversive, or revolutionary thinking. This takes study; and study takes time and sacrifice. Here, precisely, is where the obligation to prepare ourselves intellectually for our new era falls squarely on the employer and employee, on management, white-collar worker, or wage earner, on industry, commerce, and agriculture.

But were you to ask me on what one group falls the greatest responsibility, I would put my finger on him who works for a living in city, town, or village, because he is by far the most numerous, because the men and women, the sons and daughters of labor, have, up to this point, been the solid backbone of our traditional American democracy.

Whereas on Labor's leadership much depends, much more depends on its rank and file, it is an open secret that a local union usually gets only the leadership which it deserves. And if we insist that trade-unionism is good for democracy, that it is social and economic democracy in action, then if there is any democratic value in 10,000,000 trade-unionists standing shoulder to shoulder it is only to the extent that they (1) drop their lazy apathy in things which concern their own local first of all (2) measure carefully the national repercussions to any local action they may take, (3) seek the greater good of the greater number in the whole house of labor, rather in the whole house of democracy, which is substantially the same thing.

A TOWN HALL FOR LABOR

Need I say that this requires intelligent thought and planning? That is why a greater responsibility rests on those who are supposed democratically to elect and instruct their official spokesmen in the very field round which their daily lives revolve, namely, their job. Those who pay their union dues cannot let their obligations stop there. It was a sad commentary on the low ebb of dynamic unionism among the rank and file when local upon local had to inaugurate a system of fines in order to get the membership to attend what might well be labor's own town-hall meeting.

Today labor must sit down at the conference table and match wits and sagacity with the paid representative of its employers and with the spokesmen of its Government. The old hit-and-miss agreements and brass-knuckle decisions presumably are on their way out. The day of this heavy-handed business representative or bullying labor lawyer—old dogs who just won't learn new tricks—is over. The call is for a new type of leadership, highly intelligent, far-sighted and adept in the new approach to settling disputes and carrying on the legitimate business of the brotherhood. The presumption is that these will be younger men, though not necessarily so.

Many of the older leaders have gotten into a rut, or have entrenched themselves in self-perpetuating dynasties which have made truly democratic elections in the unions a farce. Many a local union, too, has sacrificed efficiency in the conduct of its official business and in the formulation of its policies by regarding many of its offices as good pastures in which to "farm out" its deserving old men. Don't misunderstand me: There is always room for fraternal charity among you, but where there is question of the good of the whole group I would much rather see you vote some of them an outright pension, than penalize yourselves by routine-like and inefficient administration.

NEW AND YOUNGER LEADERS

If, then, that leadership is to be new and younger, you, down there in the ranks, are eligible and you must make yourself eligible, for the voice of the future must be the real voice of American labor, intelligent, and trained to be guided by the demands of the common good of all.

If labor has grown in importance and prestige today, it also finds itself more often on the front pages of our newspapers. Although most of us can understand the sudden spotlighting of all and sundry labor disturbances and the superdiligence in reporting isolated instances of short-sighted, selfish, or dishonest policy, yet we would be blind and deaf were we not to realize that quite generally organized labor is losing the sympathetic confidence of the public. Because all of organized labor is blamed for the unthinking acts of one or a few, new notions of public relations must be learned and put into effect. And that takes study and demands time.

True it is that much social legislation of benefit to the mass of labor has been added to our statute books in the last decade, but I fear much of it became the wage earner himself has not kept up with it. There have been too many undemocratic short cuts to the attainment of material objectives without a corresponding understanding on the part of the rank and file.

If this whole thing is not to blow up in one gigantic muddle, the men and women of labor must be willing to go back to school again and put substance behind its temporary gains. There is much to be learned. And some means must be found to afford the wage earner a better opportunity for academic self-improvement.

A CRISIS FOR LABOR

There is no need for me to remind you that these are critical times, not only for the American idea and our existence as a free people, but also critical times for labor, especially organized labor. The small employer, caught between big business and the Nation-wide bargaining of some of the larger crafts, and faced with extinction in the relentless war game of defense priorities; the white-collar worker, envying the wages, hours, and conditions of labor, especially defense labor; people without vision, without insight, jittery and uncertain people, Cassandras and prophets of evil, all these see nothing but the end of things in this country unless some strong man comes along to silence and hogtie one of the parties to what they choose to call the labor combat. It is not hard to guess the identity of that party. It lives on the wrong side of the tracks.

Disheartening days lie ahead. In our history as a nation a war boom has always been the prelude to a seemingly inevitable crash. Must we face it again? With millions in the camps demobilized, the war industries in collapse, the Nation staggering under an immense debt, the nondefense industries unable to take up the slack of unemployment, what then?

Certainly now is the time for some long-range thinking on your part, because the future so intimately concerns you as an individual, let alone as a provider for dependents. Need we resign ourselves to the all too common assumption there must always be an unsolvable unemployment problem, constantly recurring crises, and the deadening fear that millions among us can never hope to be the complete human beings we were designed to be by our Creator, millions who can never for want of honest labor attain the ordinary completions of the good life: Food, home, clothing, medical care, security for old age? Can labor help with this problem in the spirit of citizens still free, or will it just drift into the position of being but voiceless wards of the State?

Now there is not one of us here who would not rise to the defense of the ideals behind craft unionism. But sometimes an uneducated hit-and-miss defense does more harm than good. Labor unions must learn to broaden their vision and extend their program of action. "We shall never solve the problem of industrial peace, justice, and good social order until labor unions assume a larger share of the responsibility for the welfare of the total community."

Far from being a subversive influence union organization can be the strong bulwark of the democracy which today we are being called upon to defend with our best efforts, with our experience and, if need be, with our lives. There is a call for every ounce of our patriotism. It is unlikely that the bulk of you here before me will be called to the camps for active service, but does that absolve you from giving your best in the one way that you can give it? This is not a time to make empty gestures and merely talk American democracy.

As never before, we are called upon to practice it in the only way that is here and now practical for us; not by letting George do it, not by making fancy speeches, or by being satisfied to have your international officers pledge your craft to the defense of our country. You have to begin right here, in your everyday living which revolves around your job and the craft you engage in, and more particularly right in your own local union which is supposed to be the democratic expression of the one common interest which unites you into a fraternal group rooted in justice and charity.

Recklessness of Defense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent, published in the Washington Evening Star of September 17, 1941:

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 17, 1941]

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—RECKLESSNESS OF DEFENSE SPENDING IS DECLARED WITHOUT PARALLEL

(By Frank R. Kent)

In the early excitement of the "unlimited emergency" one of the ideas that got well established was that, no matter what else one did, it was unpatriotic or destructive, or anyhow something pretty terrible, to question any defense expenditure. It was all right to urge reduction in nondefense expenditures, but for defense there should be no limit and no criticism.

This was a perfectly sound conception—up to a point. Nothing could be sillier than to be niggardly in the business of national defense. Nothing could be more stupid than to endorse the necessity for arming the country and aiding England and then to haggle over the cost. Accordingly neither in Congress nor out was there any real opposition to granting the gigantic sums asked for by the President. They were given him without grumbling or delay. So, too, in all probability, will be given his next request to be made this week.

However, once granted, there would seem to be imposed upon the recipients a certain obligation to expend these huge grants of the people's money with a reasonable degree of responsibility and restraint. The truth is that they are not being expended in that way. They are being expended with a recklessness without parallel in public life. No one, not even the spenders themselves, is checking up or keeping tab. No one knows—and apparently no one cares—how huge the machine grows. Already it has become a swollen monstrosity. And it seems to be nobody's business.

UTTER HEEDLESSNESS

Those who still retain a measure of financial sanity insist it is essential that nondefense expenditures be cut to the bone. Those who have a reasonably realistic vision of what is happening under the screen of defense know that, no matter how deeply nondefense expenditures may be cut, unless someone somehow calls a halt on the utter heedlessness with which the defense organization is swelling the effort would be trivial so far as the restoration of financial equilibrium is concerned.

No reasonable person expects a job such as we have undertaken to be done without great waste of money. But the lack of restraint with which these funds are being dissipated, coupled with the wild rush from all parts of the country of the political, labor, and radical parasites to hook in with the defense machinery, is beyond all reason. The manner in which hordes of unnecessary people are being loaded on the bloated defense pay rolls is without precedent. It far exceeds anything that happened during the war 20 years ago. Washington is choked as it never was before. The pay rollers, with no available space left here, are spreading out into nearby cities and towns. And their number grows every week.

In another year there literally will be many thousands more job holders in defense work than there are today. And no one knows how many there are now. Naturally, the President cannot keep track of them or be concerned about them. But no one else is, either. It just isn't anybody's job to check up or say when the limit has been reached, or if there is a limit. There has never been anything quite like this. If the American people were not so dumb and inert; if the days were not so full of world-shaking events; if the Washington confusion were not so thick and the radio speeches so soothing, there might be a real popular protest over what is happening here.

IT JUST ISN'T DONE

As things are, the newspapers find it physically and intellectually impossible adequately to present situations such as this and at the same time even partially to cope with the job of presenting and commenting upon the other greatly accelerated and sensational news with which the" are daily overwhelmed. In addition, there is that idea that in the interests of defense all such things should be overlooked—that to point out these excesses might retard the program; that to stress them is "uncooperative"; even to mention them is in bad taste.

All of which is bosh. If somebody does not mention them—and continuously—our lost sense of proportion will never be regained. If, somehow, restraint is not imposed, this defense organization will be smothered under its own weight. It is rapidly reaching the swollen stage now when so many people are doing the same thing that often everybody has forgotten why and for whom or for what it is being done. Soon or late there will be a congressional investigation, and the resulting smell will be very bad indeed. The reasons there have been no move in this direction to date are: First, because the facts are just beginning to be realized; second, because so many Members of Congress have been busy placing their friends, relatives, and constituents on the defense pay rolls.

Celler Bill To Reduce Unemployment Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today in the House a bill (H. R. 5640) to lower by one-third the pay-roll tax levied under the Social Security Act to raise money for unemployment-compensation benefits.

A study of the law's operation convinces me that the present rate is too high. It should be reduced at once.

It also is quite clear that benefits paid unemployed workers are too low in many States, and the period covered by such payments often is too short. In my judgment, these payments should be increased one-third. That, however, is up to the States themselves. If higher payments could be effected by congressional action, I should be happy to sponsor a measure to bring it about.

My bill concerns only the unemployment-compensation provisions of the act. It does not relate to old-age and survivors benefit payments. I am informed, however, that the Treasury Department is preparing to urge Congress to raise the present 2-percent pay-roll tax for such benefits to 5 percent.

Such a proposal, in my opinion, would be indefensible. If made, it should be voted down.

The claim that such a raise would be helpful in preventing inflation does not hold water. Inflation should not be prevented by juggling trust funds. If still higher taxes are necessary to prevent inflation, some other basis for taxation than trust funds should be found.

The old-age and survivors benefit provisions of the Social Security Act constitute a covenant between the Government and tens of millions of workers, the great majority of whom are wage earners. Millions of these workers are now confronted by new or much higher income taxes for defense. It certainly is not the time to change the covenant so that their tax burden will be made still heavier.

What seems more likely than a genuine desire to check inflation is the Treasury's unannounced hope of finding a ready market annually for another $2,000,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 of special bonds which need not be offered the public. That would be the precise result if the 2-percent rate were increased to 5 percent.

The bill I am offering today is based on analysis of the law's operation since it became effective on February 1, 1936. The basic pay-roll tax is 3 percent. It has been lowered in some States under certain circumstances. With those reductions in effect, however, the tax yielded a total of $3,621,358,523 through the end of the past fiscal year, June 30.

To that sum has been added a total derived from interest and other sources sufficient to swell the amount to nearly $4,000,000,000; to be exact, $3,986,871,081. Such is the amount that has been deposited in the Treasury's unemployed trust fund over the 5½-year period.

During the same period, unemployment compensation payments to covered workers totaled $1,549,975,841. Other charges against the fund have increased withdrawals to $1,703,213,385.

The balance in the fund June 30, 1941, was $2,283,657,696. That is nearly one and one-half times what was paid out in benefits. In other words, this pay-roll tax has yielded nearly 250 percent of actual payments to workers. The excess, now accelerating because of widespread employment under the defense program, is rising very rapidly.

There is no prophesying how large this gigantic fund will become under the present rate. Already it is far larger than necessary to meet any prospective need for many years.

Written in astronomical figures, the record shows more clearly than words that the present pay-roll tax is far too high. Under this showing, it seems to me, there is no justification whatever for continuing to pile up unneeded billions in Treasury vaults. The sensible thing is to reduce the rate and relieve business interests, the workers, and the public of the unnecessary part of this burden. In the long run the burden lies on the shoulders of the workers and the public as much as the employers.

Typical of the attitude of employers is the following excerpt from one letter of hundreds from representative business firms:

Business needs relief from payment of any tax where it can be shown that the rate is too high for actual needs. If the fund is allowed to accumulate beyond needs for benefit payments, means will be sought to divert a large part of it to other use. Ever since enactment of the social security law we have observed that a number of our customers are unable to meet their merchandise bills during the tax-payment periods. This is concrete evidence that many businesses are severely and unnecessarily punished by this tax.

A one-third reduction in the present rate is conservative. Returns then still would be sufficient to increase benefit payments one-third and leave a surplus every year. The bill which I have introduced reads as follows:

A bill to decrease the rate of tax imposed by the Federal Unemployment Tax Act

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1600 of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (prescribing the rate of tax on employers of eight or more) is amended by striking out "3 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "2 percent."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect January 1, 1942.

Common sense calls for the passage of this bill and the proposed reduction.

The Supreme Court Fight and the Purges of 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

LETTER FROM JOHN O'CONNOR

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, written by John O'Connor, former Member of this House, to the editor of Collier's magazine:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 10, 1941.*
EDITOR, COLLIER'S,
The Crowell-Collier Publishing Co.,
250 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR SIR: Like millions of other Collier's readers, I was shocked at President Roosevelt's rehash of his impudent Supreme Court fight of 1937, the first installment of which appeared in your issue of September 13, 1941.

The article, with its misstatements and piecemeal quotations has been sufficiently commented upon throughout the country by our editorial and other writers.

I join with the unanimous sentiment of those writers that it was most unfortunate for unity that this injudicious splurge should be put out at this time, under the President's name—even if he, instead of Sam Rosenman, did in fact write it.

At a more propitious time, statesmen, scholars, and historians will challenge most of the statements in the article and point out the evasions and twistings.

My prime purpose in writing you, however, is in reference to the coming "President's article on the 'purge' of 1938." Being the only victim of that "noble, democratic, American crusade," I naturally will await the article, or alibi, with a great deal of interest. It will probably be as inaccurate as the first Supreme Court article, and, of course, I shall know because "I was there." In addition to his "purge" of me, I had conversations with the President early in 1938 at which he hysterically stated what he "would do" to those "so and so" Senators George, McCarran, Wheeler, Burke, O'Mahoney, Byrd, etc.

I followed all the "purges" of 1938, including my own, and watched, and felt, the participation of Ickes, Hopkins, Corcoran, John L. Lewis, Earl Browder, LaGuardia, "Ben" Smith, Flynn, etc., etc.

In view of my close connection with the "historic purge," I feel I should be permitted to answer or comment upon the President's "purge" article.

Naturally, I am making the offer first to your magazine, and shall appreciate hearing from you promptly, so, if you decline it, I may make other arrangements.

May I suggest one way of handling it which should prove effective—that you send me the President's article, confidentially, sufficiently in advance of its publication, so my answer may be printed in the same issue as the original article.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN O'CONNOR,
Former Chairman of the Rules Committee of the United States House of Representatives.

Prevent Price Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution passed by the Minneapolis City Council on September 12, 1941:

Resolution requesting our Representatives in Congress from Minnesota and the Price Control Administrator of the Federal Government to take such measures as will prevent and avoid an undue rise in the price of supplies, materials, apparatus, and equipment required in essential local governmental functions, more particularly those related to fire, police, water supply, public health, and public hospital services

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis:

Whereas authorized spokesmen for the Federal Government have joined with others

in stressing the importance of reduction in State and local governmental expense as one of the measures necessary to assist in the program of financing Federal defense expenditures; and

Whereas a substantial part of the governmental expenses of the city of Minneapolis is incurred in connection with the purchase of materials, supplies, apparatus, and equipment required in essential local functions of government; and

Whereas experience of recent months indicates a sharp rise in the price the city is called upon to pay for such essential purchase requirements; and

Whereas the Federal Government has undertaken to regulate and restrict commodity prices: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our Representatives in the Congress from Minnesota and the Price Control Administrator of the Federal Government be, and they are hereby, requested to take such measures as will prevent and avoid an undue rise in the price of supplies, materials, apparatus, and equipment required in essential local governmental functions, more particularly those related to fire, police, water supply, public health, and public hospital services.

Passed September 12, 1941.

W. GLEN WALLACE,
President of the Council.

Approved September 12, 1941.

MARVIN L. KLINE,
Mayor.

Attest:

CHAS. C. SWANSON,
City Clerk.

My Fight Before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Courts of the Country for Equal Accommodations for Negro Passengers Traveling Interstate; a Brief History of the Case

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1937, I purchased a first-class round-trip railroad ticket from Chicago, Ill., to and from Hot Springs, Ark., over the Illinois Central and Rock Island Railroads via Memphis, Tenn. While traveling on this ticket between Memphis, Tenn., and Little Rock, Ark., on the morning of April 21, 1937, I was ejected from the first-class car by the conductor of the Rock Island passenger train on which I was then traveling. The reason for ejecting me was that I was riding in the body of a Pullman car in which there were riding several white passengers, the conductor claiming that the law of the State of Arkansas prohibited such an act by statute.

Suit was filed before the Interstate Commerce Commission asking for a cease and desist order, and a second suit was filed—which is now pending—in the civil courts of Illinois, asking damages in the amount of $50,000. Because of the thousands of inquiries which have come to me with reference to this matter, particularly the suit which has already been adjudicated upon the findings and judgment rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States, I am taking this opportunity to bring to the attention of the country at large the findings and judgment of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the United States District Court of the Northern District of Illinois, and the Supreme Court of the United States.

ACTION BEFORE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Complaint filed September 2, 1937. Assigned for hearing December 4, 1937. Hearing held in Chicago, March 7, 1938. Report of Commissioner Disque May 5, 1938. Exception to report filed May 24, 1938. Oral argument before Commission, July 6, 1938. Report of Commission denying relief prayed for in petition November 7, 1938. Petition for rehearing filed January 21, 1939. Petition denied by Commission March 6, 1939.

ACTION BEFORE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Appeal to United States district court April 20, 1939. (Answers were duly filed by defendants.) Oral argument before United States district court, May 27, 1940. Order of United States district court denying relief, June 29, 1940.

ACTION BEFORE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Notice of appeal to United States Supreme Court, August 23, 1940. Appeal to United States Supreme Court, November 18, 1940. Probable jurisdiction taken by United States Supreme Court, December 1940. Argument before United States Supreme Court, March 13, 1941. Decision handed down by Chief Justice Hughes—all Justices concurring—April 28, 1941.

[Supreme Court of the United States, No. 577. October term, 1940. Arthur W. Mitchell, appellant, against the United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, Frank O. Lowden, et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois. April 28, 1941]

Mr. Chief Justice Hughes delivered the opinion of the Court.

Appellant, Arthur W. Mitchell, filed a complaint with the Interstate Commerce Commission alleging an unjust discrimination in the furnishing of accommodations to colored passengers on the line of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. from Chicago to Hot Springs, Ark., in violation of the Interstate Commerce Act. The Commission dismissed the complaint (229 I. C. C. 703) and appellant brought this suit to set aside the Commission's order. Upon a hearing before three judges, the district court found the facts as stated in the Commission's findings and held that the latter were supported by substantial evidence and that the Commission's order was supported by its findings. The court then ruled that it was without jurisdiction, and its dismissal of the complaint was stated to be upon that ground. The case comes here on direct appeal (28 U. S. C. 47a).

The following facts were found by the Commission: Appellant, a Negro resident of Chicago, and a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States, left Chicago for Hot Springs on the evening of April 20, 1937, over the lines of the Illinois Central Railroad Co. to Memphis, Tenn., and the Rock Island beyond, traveling on a round-trip ticket he had purchased at 3 cents per mile. He had requested a bedroom on the Chicago-Hot Springs Pullman sleeping car but none being available he was provided with a compartment as far as Memphis in the sleeper destined to New Orleans. Just before the train reached Memphis, on the morning after leaving Chicago, he had a Pullman porter transfer him to the Chicago-Hot Springs sleeper on the same train. Space was there available and the porter assigned him a particular seat in that car for which he was to pay the established fare of 90 cents. Shortly after leaving Memphis and crossing the Mississippi River into Arkansas, the train conductor took up the Memphis-Hot Springs portion of his ticket but refused to accept payment for the Pullman seat from Memphis and, in accordance with custom, compelled him over his protest and finally under threat of arrest to move into the car provided for colored passengers. This was in purported compliance with an Arkansas statute requiring segregation of colored from white persons by the use of cars or partitioned sections providing "equal, but separate and sufficient accommodations" for both races. Later the conductor returned the portion of the ticket he had taken up and advised appellant that he could get a refund on the basis of the coach fare of 2 cents per mile from Memphis. That refund was not claimed from defendants and was not sought before the Commission, but it was found that the carriers stood ready to make it upon application. Appellant has an action at law pending against defendants in Cook County, Ill., for damages incident to his transfer.

The Commission further found that the Pullman car contained 10 sections of berths and 2 compartment drawing rooms; that the use of one of the drawing rooms would have amounted to segregation under the State law and ordinarily such combinations are available to colored passengers upon demand, the 90-cent fare being applicable. Occasionally they are used by colored passengers but in this instance both drawing rooms were already occupied by white passengers. The Pullman car was of modern design and had all the usual facilities and conveniences found in standard sleeping cars. It was air-conditioned, had hot and cold running water and separate flushable toilets for men and women. It was in excellent condition throughout. First-class white passengers had, in addition to the Pullman sleeper, the exclusive use of the train's only dining car and only observation-parlor car, the latter having somewhat the same accommodations for day use as the Pullman car.

The coach for colored passengers, though of standard size and steel construction, was "an old combination affair," not air-conditioned, divided by partitions into three main parts, one for colored smokers, one for white smokers and one in the center for colored men and women, known as the women's section, in which appellant sat. There was a toilet in each section but only the one in the women's section was equipped for flushing and it was for the exclusive use of colored women. The car was without wash basins, soap, towels, or running water, except in the women's section. The Commission stated that, according to appellant, the car was "filthy and foul smelling," but that the testimony of defendants' witnesses was to the contrary.

The Commission found that in July 1937, about 3 months after complainant's journey above mentioned, the old combination coach was replaced by a modern, all-steel, air-conditioned coach, which was divided by a partition into two sections, one for colored and the other for white passengers, and had comfortable seats. In each section there are wash basins, running hot and cold water, and separate flush toilets for men and women. This coach, the Commission said, was "as fully desirable in all its appointments as the coach used entirely by white passengers traveling at second-class fares."

The Commission also found that the demand of colored passengers for Pullman accommodations over the route in question was shown to have been negligible for many years; that "only about 1 Negro to 20 white passengers rides this train from and to points on the line between Memphis and Hot Springs," and there is hardly ever a demand from a colored passenger for Pullman accommodations. The conductor estimated that this demand did not amount to one per year. What demand there may have been at ticket offices did not appear.

The Commission's conclusion was thus stated: "The present coach properly takes care of colored second-class passengers, and the drawing rooms and compartments in the sleeper provide proper Pullman accommodations for colored first-class passengers, but there are no dining-car nor observation-parlor-car accommodations for the latter, and they cannot lawfully range through the train."

The Commission, though treating the enforcement of the State law as a matter for State authorities, thought that in deciding the case on the facts presented it must recognize that the State law required the defendants to segregate colored passengers; that in these circumstances the present colored-passenger coach and the Pullman drawing rooms met the requirements of the act; and that as there was comparatively little colored traffic and no indication that there was likely to be such demand for dining-car and observation-parlor-car accommodations by colored passangers as to warrant the running of any extra cars or the construction of partitions, the discrimination and prejudice was "plainly not unjust or undue." The Commission observed that it was only differences in treatment of the latter character that were "unlawful and within the power of this Commission to condemn, remove, and prevent."

From the dismissal of the complaint five Commissioners dissented.

The United States as a party to this suit to set aside the Commissioner's order, and one of the appellees, does not support the judgment of the court below and has filed a memorandum stating its reasons. The Government concludes that the Commission erroneously supposed that the Arkansas separate coach law applied to an interstate passenger and erroneously determined that the small number of colored passengers asking for first-class accommodations justified an occasional discrimination against them because of their race.

The other appellees—the Interstate Commerce Commission and the carriers—appear in support of the judgment.

First: The Commission challenges the standing of appellant to bring this suit. We find the objection untenable. This question does not touch the merits of the suit but merely the authority of the district court to entertain it. The fact that the Commission's order was one of dismissal of appellant's complaint did not foreclose the right of review. Appellant was an aggrieved party and the negative form of the order is not controlling (*Rochester Telephone Corporation* v. *United States*, 307 U. S. 125, 143).

Nor is it determinative that it does not appear that appellant intends to make a similar railroad journey. He is an American citizen free to travel, and he is entitled to go by this particular route whenever he chooses to take it, and in that event to have facilities for his journey without any discrimination against him which the Interstate Commerce Act forbids. He presents the question whether the act does forbid the conduct of which he complains.

The question of appellant's right to seek review of the Commission's order thus involves the primary question of administrative authority, that is, whether appellant took an appropriate course in seeking a ruling of the Commission. The established function of the Commission gives the answer. The determination whether a discrimination by an interstate carrier is unjust and unlawful necessitates an inquiry into particular facts and the practice of the carrier in a particular relation, and this underlying inquiry is precisely that which the Commission is authorized to make. As to the duty to seek a determination by the Commission in such a case, we do not see that a passenger would be in any better situation than a shipper (*Texas & Pacific Railway Co.* v. *Abilene Cotton Oil Co.*, 204 U. S. 426; *Robinson* v. *Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.*, 222 U. S. 506; *Mitchell Coal Co.* v. *Pennsylvania R. R. Co.*, 230 U. S. 247; *Morrisdale Coal Co.* v. *Pennsylvania R. R. Co.*, 230 U. S. 304; *General American Tank Car Co.* v. *El Dorado Terminal Co.*, 308 U. S. 422).

The District Court had jurisdiction to review the action of the Commission and the question on that review was whether that action was in accordance with the applicable law.

Second: The case was submitted to the district court upon the evidence taken before the Commission. The undisputed facts showed conclusively that, having paid a first-class fare for the entire journey from Chicago to Hot Springs, and having offered to pay the proper charge for a seat which was available in the Pullman car for the trip from Memphis to Hot Springs, he was compelled, in accordance with custom, to leave that car and to ride in a second-class car and was thus denied the standard conveniences and privileges afforded to first-class passengers. This was manifestly a discrimination against him in the course of his interstate journey and admittedly that discrimination was based solely upon the fact that he was a Negro. The question whether this was a discrimination forbidden by the Interstate Commerce Act is not a question of segregation but one of equality of treatment. The denial to appellant of equality of accommodations because of his race would be an invasion of a fundamental individual right which is guaranteed against State action by the fourteenth amendment (*McCabe* v. *Atchison, T. & S. F. Rwy. Co.*, 235 U. S. 151, 160–162; *Missouri ex rel. Gaines* v. *Canada*, 305 U. S. 337, 344, 345) and in view of the nature of the right and of our constitutional policy it cannot be maintained that the discrimination as it was alleged was not essentially unjust. In that aspect it could not be deemed to lie outside the purview of the sweeping prohibitions of the Interstate Commerce Act.

We have repeatedly said that it is apparent from the legislative history of the act that not only was the evil of discrimination the principal thing aimed at, but that there is no basis for the contention that Congress intended to exempt any discriminatory action or practice of interstate carriers affecting interstate commerce which it had authority to reach. *The Shreveport Case* (234 U. S. 342, 356); *Louisville & Nashville R. Co.* v. *United States* (282 U. S. 749, 750); *Merchants Warehouse Co.* v. *United States* (283 U. S. 501, 512, 513). Paragraph 1 of section 3 of the act says explicitly that it shall be unlawful for any common carrier subject to the act "to subject any particular person * * * to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever" (49 U. S. C. 3). From the inception of its administration the Interstate Commerce Commission has recognized the applicability of this provision to discrimination against colored passengers because of their race and the duty of carriers to provide equality of treatment with respect to transportation facilities; that is, that colored persons who buy first-class tickets must be furnished with accommodations equal in comforts and conveniences to those afforded to first-class white passengers. See *Councill* v. *Western & Atlantic R. R. Co.* (1 I. C. C. 339); *Heard* v. *Georgia R. R. Co.* (1 I. C. C. 428); *Heard* v. *Georgia R. R. Co.* (3 I. C. C. 111); *Edwards* v. *Nashville, C. & St. L. Rwy. Co.* (12 I. C. C. 247); *Cozart* v. *Southern Rwy. Co.* (16 I. C. C. 226); *Gaines* v. *Seaboard Air Line Rwy Co.* (16 I. C. C. 471); *Crosby* v. *St. Louis-San Francisco Rwy. Co.* (112 U. S. 239).[2]

Third. We find no sound reason for the failure to apply this principle by holding the discrimination from which the appellant suffered to be unlawful and by forbidding it in the future.

That there was but a single incident was not a justification of the treatment of the appellant. Moreover, the Commission thought it plain that "the incident was mentioned as representative of an alleged practice that was expected to continue." And the Commission found that the ejection of appellant from the Pullman car and the requirement that he should continue his journey in a second-class car was "in accordance with custom"—that is, as we understand it—according to the custom which obtained in similar circumstances.

Nor does the change in the carrier's practice avail. That did not alter the discrimination to which appellant had been subjected, and as to the future the change was not adequate. It appears that since July 1937 the carrier has put in service a coach for colored passengers which is of equal quality with that used by second-class white passengers. But, as the Government well observes, the question does not end with travel on second-class tickets. It does not appear that colored passengers who have bought first-class tickets for transportation by the carrier are given accommodations which are substantially equal to those afforded to white passengers. The Government puts the matter succinctly: "When a drawing room is available, the carrier practice of allowing colored passengers to use one at Pullman seat rates avoids inequality as between the accommodations specifically assigned to the passenger. But when none is available, as on the trip which occasioned this litigation, the discrimination and inequality of accommodation become self-evident. It is no answer to say that the colored passengers, if sufficiently diligent and forehanded, can make their reservations so far in advance as to be assured of first-class accommodations. So long as white passengers can secure first-class reservations on the day of travel and the colored passengers cannot, the latter are subjected to inequality and discrimination because of their race." And the Commission has recognized that inequality persists with respect to certain other facilities, such as dining-car and observation-parlor car accommodations.

We take it that the chief reason for the Commission's action was the "comparatively little colored traffic." But the comparative volume of traffic cannot justify the denial of a fundamental right of equality of treatment, a right specifically safeguarded by the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. We thought a similar argument with respect to volume of traffic to be untenable in the application of the fourteenth amendment. We said that it made the constitutional right

[1] In this view, we have no occasion to consider the questions discussed by the Attorneys General of several States in their briefs as amici curiae.

[2] In *Edwards* v. *Nashville, C. & St. L. Rwy. Co.* (12 I. C. C. 247, 249) the principle was thus stated: "If a railroad provides certain facilities and accommodations for first-class passengers of the white race, it is commanded by the law that like accommodations shall be provided for colored passengers of the same class. The principle that must govern is that carriers must serve equally well all passengers, whether white or colored, paying the same fare. Failure to do this is discrimination and subjects the passenger to 'undue and unreasonable prejudice and disadvantage.'"

depend upon the number of persons who may be discriminated against, whereas the essence of that right is that it is a personal one (*McCabe* v. *Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Rwy. Co.*, supra). While the supply of particular facilities may be conditioned upon there being a reasonable demand therefor, if facilities are provided, substantial equality of treatment of persons traveling under like conditions cannot be refused. It is the individual, we said, who is entitled to the equal protection of the laws, not merely a group of individuals or a body of persons according to their numbers (*Id.*). See also *Missouri ex rel. Gaines* v. *Canada* (pp. 350, 351.) And the Interstate Commerce Act expressly extends its prohibitions to the subjecting of "any particular person" to unreasonable discriminations.

On the facts here presented there is no room, as the Government properly says, for administrative or expert judgment with respect to practical difficulties. It is enough that the discrimination shown was palpably unjust and forbidden by the act.

The decree of the district court is reversed, and the cause is remanded with directions to set aside the order of the Commission and to remand the case to the Commission for further proceedings in conformity with this opinion.

It is so ordered.

[In the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division. In equity, No. 500. Arthur W. Mitchell, petitioner-plaintiff, against United States of America et al., defendants]

DECREE

This cause, again coming on to be further heard at this term before Hon. William M. Sparks, circuit judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and the Honorable Charles E. Woodward and Honorable Michael L. Igoe, judges of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, at Chicago, in accordance with the statutes in such case made and provided, upon the motion of the plaintiff herein for a decree in accordance with the mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States in the appeal prosecuted from the order and decree entered in the said United States district court, June 27 A. D. 1940, in this cause and recited in said mandate dated June 5 A. D. 1941, and filed herein on the 7th day of June A. D. 1941, due and timely notice of which hearing has been given to the defendant, United States of America, and to all of the defendants and interveners herein.

The court, after hearing evidence and arguments of counsel for the parties of record herein who have desired to be heard, upon consideration thereof and of the opinion and mandate of the United States Supreme Court herein being fully advised in the premises, finds, in accordance with said opinion and mandate of the Supreme Court, that the order and decree of this court entered herein on the 27th day of June A. D. 1940, dismissing this cause for lack of jurisdiction at the costs of the plaintiff, should be vacated, set aside, and annulled and that a decree should be entered herein setting aside the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, remanding the case to the said Interstate Commerce Commission for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States rendered April 28 A. D. 1941.

The court further finds from inspection of the record in this cause that the plaintiff, ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, deposited as an appeal bond in this cause a sum of $300 in cash, and that said sum of $300, deposited with the clerk of this court by the said ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, plaintiff herein, should be forthwith returned to him by the clerk of this court.

The court further finds that the cost herein expended by the said ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, plaintiff, in the prosecution of this cause, and which are allowable by law should be taxed against the individual defendants in this case, in accordance with the statutes, in such case made and provided.

It is therefore ordered, adjudged, and decreed, as follows, viz:

1. That the order and decree of this court entered herein on the 27th day of June A. D. 1940 dismissing this cause for lack of jurisdiction at the costs of the plaintiff, ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, the plaintiff herein, be, and it is hereby, vacated, set aside, and annulled.

2. That the cause is hereby reinstated and the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission entered November 7 A. D. 1938 dismissing the complaint of ARTHUR W. MITCHELL filed with said Commission, as alleged in the petition of ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, plaintiff, filed in this cause April 20, 1939, be, and it is hereby, vacated, set aside, and annulled.

3. That this cause be, and is hereby, remanded to the Interstate Commerce Commission with directions for said Commission to reinstate the said complaint of ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, and the cause in which said complaint was filed and to the end that such other and further proceedings may be had and such other and further orders may be entered by said Commission in conformity with the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States rendered April 28 A. D. 1941 on the appeal decided therein, and to enter any and all other proper orders as are according to right, justice, and the law of the United States.

4. That the clerk of this court is hereby ordered and directed to forthwith return to the said ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, plaintiff and petitioner herein the sum of $3,000 cash, which was deposited by the said ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, plaintiff, under the order of this court, herein entered as an appeal bond in this cause, that a copy of this order shall be sufficient authority for the said clerk to return the said money herein mentioned.

5. That the costs as allowed by law be, and the same are hereby, ordered to be taxed, in accordance with the statutes and laws, in such case made and provided, against the individual defendants in this cause; that said costs are to be pro rated and each of the three individual defendants, in this cause are to pay their proportioned share of said costs, when said costs have been taxed in accordance with the laws, in such case made and provided.

6. That the clerk of this court forthwith enter all orders necessary for the remanding of this cause to the Interstate Commerce Commission, in accordance with the statutes in such case made and provided.

Entered:

WILLIAM M. SPARKS,
Judge, United States Circuit Court of Appeals.
CHARLES E. WOODWARD,
Judge, United States District Court.
M. L. IGOE,
Judge, United States District Court.

Dated, JUNE 20 A. D. 1941.

ORDER

At a general session of the Interstate Commerce Commission, held at its office in Washington, D. C., on the 31st day of July A. D., 1941

No. 27844—ARTHUR W. MITCHELL against Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. et al.

The decree of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, eastern division, dated June 20, 1941, entered under mandate from the Supreme Court of the United States, vacates, sets aside, and annuls the decision and order of the Commission entered herein on November 7, 1938, and remands the case to the Commission with direction to reinstate the complaint to the end that such other and further proceedings may be had and such other and further orders may be entered in conformity with the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States rendered April 28, 1941, on the appeal decided therein and according to right, justice, and law of the United States.

It is therefore ordered, That the decision and order of the Commission entered November 7, 1938, be, and the same is hereby, vacated, set aside, and annulled; that the complaint herein be, and it is hereby, reinstated, and that the case be, and it is hereby reopened for such other and further hearings and proceedings as may be hereafter determined and ordered by the Commission.

By the Commission.

W. P. BARTEL, *Secretary*

This decision of the Supreme Court is perhaps the most important and far-reaching that has been handed down in the interest of citizenship rights of Negroes during the existence of this Government. Among the thousands of congratulatory messages coming to me, the four following telegrams will tell the story of how this decision has been received by America's largest and most oppressed minority group:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *May 2, 1941.*

Congressman MITCHELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Lexington Conference Methodist Church now in session Columbus, Ohio, extend congratulations upon winning for the race the decision of the United States Supreme Court against the public carriers of our country in the practice of Jim Crowism and the unconstitutionality of these laws upon the statutes of the States wherever they exist.

Bishop R. E. JONES, *President.*
S. P. JENKINS, Secretary.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 20, 1941.*

Hon. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL,
Member of United States Congress,
House Office Building:

Congratulations to greatest Negro political leader of century and most practical legal mind today. Pullman porter told me of what he termed our victory early this morning and dining-car waiter handed me newspaper. I cannot resist impulse to wire you as only one of millions who are grateful to you.

Bishop R. R. WRIGHT, JR.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *April 28, 1941.*

Congressman ARTHUR W. MITCHELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Accept my congratulations on the favorable outcome of your case. You have fought and won a great battle for human rights. More than 300,000 adherents of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church felicitate you as the Abou Ben Adhem of a grateful and appreciative race.

C. H. PHILLIPS, Sr., *Bishop.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 30, 1941.*

Congressman ARTHUR W. MITCHELL,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please allow me to congratulate you on the highly significant victory which you have won in the Supreme Court. All thoughtful men and women in the Negro race and in the Nation will be deeply grateful to you.

MORDECAI W. JOHNSON,
President, Howard University.

This fight for the rights of the Negro has been a hard and expensive one, covering a period of more than 4 years. All the expenses incurred in this suit have been borne by me. I think it is well to

note that I, with a Negro lawyer, Richard E. Westbrooks, of Chicago, Ill., have fought the case through all of the courts. We conducted the hearing in Chicago, argued the case before the Interstate Commerce Commission and before the United States district court in Chicago. We also argued the case before the Supreme Court of the United States, this being the first and only instance where a member of our race has argued his own case before that high tribunal.

Attention should be called to the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission divided in its opinion, six holding against me and five in very strong dissenting opinions holding for me. The appeal to the United States District Court of the Northern District of Illinois was heard by three judges sitting en banc. Their decision against me was unanimous. The case before the Supreme Court was heard by the full Court, and their decision was unanimous for me, setting aside in strong language the findings of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the decision of the United States District Court of the Northern District of Illinois.

I think I should also call attention to the fact that the Attorney General's Office, whose duty it was to appear before the Supreme Court in behalf of the Interstate Commerce Commission, not only refused to appear and argue in favor of the findings of that Commission, but through its then Solicitor General—now Attorney General—Francis Biddle, filed with the Supreme Court a very strong memorandum in March 1941, which might be summarized in these words:

> We therefore conclude that the Commission erroneously supposed that the Arkansas separate-coach law applied to an interstate passenger, and erroneously determined that the small number of colored passengers asking for first-class accommodations justified an occasional discrimination against them because of their color. If either of these conclusions is correct, the Commission should be directed to reinstate the appellant's complaint and to proceed in the light of the opinion of this Court.

I say again that the decision in this case is far reaching and should do much to break down the vicious wall of segregation which has been built around the Negro, denying him his citizenship rights in almost every phase and walk of life in this country.

American Participation in the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

ADDRESS BY WALTER E. COSGRIFF

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a very able address entitled "Shall the United States Enter the War?" delivered by Mr. Walter E. Cosgriff, vice president of the Continental National Bank, of Salt Lake City, Utah.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL THE UNITED STATES ENTER THE WAR?

Mr. Chairman, fellow Americans, I am very glad to have the opportunity to speak to you tonight on the subject, Shall the United States Enter the War? I am glad for two reasons: First, because I believe that if we do enter the war, which we may, the opportunity for free speech will be lost, and that, therefore, if anyone has any definite convictions on the subject, he had better present them now. My second reason arises from the fact that in normal times a number of people blame the bankers for starting wars and spreading wars, and I wish to be one banker to go on record publicly as solidly opposing my country's entrance into this or any other foreign war.

Tonight I particularly want to stress some historical and economic arguments against American participation. It is not my purpose to discuss the possibility of a German invasion of the United States in the event Great Britain is defeated. Mr. John T. Flynn in his pamphlet entitled "Can Hitler Invade America?" has analyzed this subject much more capably and thoroughly than I could ever hope to. If you have not read this, I think you would find it very interesting and informative. The committee will be glad to give you a copy if you wish.

I would, however, like to remark in passing that it seems to me to be a shameful thing that so many Americans are openly admitting that they are afraid of Germany, a country which, after all, is less than two-thirds our size in population, less than one-fifth our size in land and natural resources, and is over 3,000 miles away from us. And it is equally disgraceful to say that our safety is dependent on Great Britain, an island not as large as the State of Utah and with only about 40,000,000 people. Certainly George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson, and those other early patriots who led the fight against a nation infinitely larger, richer, and more powerful than theirs until they won a complete victory, would not be proud of such remarks.

But, the interventionists say, "What about the spies, saboteurs, and 'fifth columnists' over here?" "If Germany wins, they will take over this country." Granted that they are a menace, certainly we have means of controlling them. After all, if we can't or won't control the German agents in our own country, we certainly couldn't expect to win a war in order to control the Germans in Germany. It just doesn't make sense.

Now as to the economics of the situation we are told by those in favor of going to war that if the Axis Powers win, our foreign trade will completely disappear, because it will simply be impossible to do business with Hitler or any of his allies because their philosophy of government is different from ours. Can this be true?

When you go down town to do your shopping and you go into a store, you do not stop to inquire whether the owner of the store is a Democrat, Republican, Communist, Fascist, or Nazi. You trade on the basis "the best goods for the lowest price" and political philosophy does not enter into the picture at all. Now this is exactly what happens in international trade. If one country has goods that another country needs and the price is competitive, trade will develop between them. If one country does not have anything another country wants, or if the price is higher than the price quoted elsewhere, no trade can develop. And this is true whether both countries have democratic governments or whether one country is democratic and the other totalitarian.

Let me pursue this subject further. About 4 or 5 months ago the present administration "discovered" that totalitarian Japan was actually too good a customer. She had bought so much (and paid in hard cash, incidentally) that the President became alarmed lest there would be nothing left for American customers. So he promptly told the Japanese they could buy no more steel or scrap iron. Later on the embargo was extended to include practically all oil and metal products as well as many other articles. If further proof is required to prove that trade can and will go on between countries with different political philosophies, then I don't know what it would be. However, there is other proof. Take the case of England and Germany between 1933 and August 1939. I do not intend to bore you with long columns of figures. You can look them up if you care to. It is sufficient to say that with the possible exception of America, the German Government and the British Empire were each other's best customers practically until the day war was declared. Many, many prominent Englishmen—leaders of the democratic cause, including even Chamberlain himself—had invested large sums of money in Germany and Germans had also invested money in England. And yet, Dorothy Thompson and many other so-called economists tell us that trade between a democratic country and Hitler's government is absolutely impossible.

But I'm not through yet. Let's assume that these same economists are right and that if Hitler wins we shall lose all our foreign trade, and see what it would mean. Our foreign trade amounts to about 8 percent of our total trade, both foreign and domestic. Conceivably we would lose that. But if we go to war, certainly a great, great deal more than 8 percent of our total trade is going to have to be used building war machines, and thus will be lost so far as beneficial use is concerned. But, say the interventionists, what about certain essential materials which we shall not be able to obtain? It is true that our chief source of supply of rubber, tin, and various vegetable oils might be cut off, but after all this would not be fatal. Synthetic rubber can be manufactured and has proved very practical, and we can also get rubber from South America and even from our own weed, the goldenrod. It would cost more, it is true, but not nearly so much as a war would cost. The same is true as to tin. There are immense undeveloped deposits of it in Bolivia, and, if necessary, both steel and aluminum can be processed until they have all the qualities of tin. Inconvenient, perhaps, but better than war.

Of course, there are other things we would have to do without if our foreign trade were cut off. We could not get Dresden china or Russian caviar or Irish linen or French champagne. But, after all, my friends, are these things worth the lives of a million men, or a thousand? Are they worth even one human life?

Aside from the matter of human life, is it not true that war would lower our standard of living a great deal, more than would the loss of our foreign trade? Think of the condition of the German people. They have no automobiles, very limited amusement, meat once a week, milk only for the sick and the very young. That's what happens to a nation's standard of living when it goes to war. And if we go to war with Germany we must expect to give up at least many of the things the German people have given up, otherwise we could not expect to win. I leave it up to you. Is it better to go to war with all its loss of life, all its untold suffering and all its dreadful uncertainty than to run the risk of losing our foreign trade?

Now let us consider some of the historic aspects of this war. History teaches us many things. One of them is that nothing is final. Another is that in the long run war does not settle anything.

We who are living at this time, especially when sufficiently influenced by hysteria and

propaganda, believe that the outcome of the present struggle is final and that this war will decide everything. But believe me, my friends, no matter how terrible the Axis Powers may seem to us now, we must remember that scattered throughout the pages of history there are hundreds of Mussolinis and scores of Emperor Hirohitos, and dozens of Hitlers, and every one of them had essentially the same theory of government and they differed from each other only in the degree of their respective abilities. Every one of them seemed as terrible to his contemporaries as his present-day prototype seems to us. Yet none of these dictators was ever able to stamp out democracy for very long. But on the other hand, the armed forces of democracy for the past 2,300 years—at Marathon, at the Metaurus, at Tours, at Orleans, at Waterloo, and at the Marne, have scored stunning military victories over the forces of totalitarianism. Yet today there is more totalitarianism in the world than there has been for centuries. Why? Because the simple truth is that you cannot destroy an idea or a philosophy of government by making war on it, whether you win the war or not.

Many deluded persons believe that by wiping out Adolf Hitler and the German Government we could insure ourselves that democracy would be safe for ever and a day. The Greeks, resting after the Battle of Marathon in 490 B. C., thought they had made the world safe for democracy by turning back the Persian hordes of the East, and Woodrow Wilson thought the same thing on November 11, 1918, except that in this case it was the Kaiser's army that had been vanquished.

Yet here we are today, all ready to begin sacrificing countless thousands of lives and wasting billions of dollars in another futile effort to destroy dictatorship by making war on it. Little do we realize that 2,000 years of warfare in Europe over every imaginable religious, economic, and moral issue have completely failed to settle anything. But at the exhortation of the propagandist we rush blindly along the path that must surely lead us into this war, naively believing that it will settle everything. "What fools these mortals be."

Before concluding this address I should like to take a few moments to discuss the wave of propaganda that is now sweeping the country. We are all conscious of the fact that during the past 6 months public opinion has been changing rapidly, favoring more and more the idea that the United States should guarantee a British victory, even though it is necessary to go to war to do it. Why has sentiment changed? Germany certainly hasn't done anything to us. Germany hasn't won any important victory. We are led to believe that Britain's chances of winning are growing brighter. And yet war sentiment is increasing. The answer is to be found in the ever-increasing waves of propaganda that are sweeping this country. It comes to us on the street, in the newspapers, on the radio, and in moving pictures. Most of this propaganda is so clever and so subtle that we don't recognize it. Perhaps if we did, it would not be so effective.

Let me illustrate. A prominent newspaper columnist has the following sentence in his daily column: "Remember, Colonel Lindbergh, the Atlantic isn't nearly so wide today as it was when you crossed it in 1927." That is all it says, but that is enough. No further explanation is given, no conclusions are drawn. A sentence like this is just enough to arouse fear in the reader, but not enough to induce logical thought. And yet, just such a sentence is apt to make far more converts than a complete and well-worked-out article like that of Mr. John T. Flynn, to which I referred earlier in the evening. As another example, I refer to the recent motion picture Come Live With Me, starring Hedy Lamarr and James Stewart, which just completed a run at the Center Theater. In this picture we see a beautiful immigrant girl, who the story tells us is an orphan. Of course, we soon hear that her father was shot down in cold blood because "he dared tell the truth." Later on it develops that this lovely girl has to be deported to "what used to be Austria." Only two or three lines in a movie, yet, perhaps, more convincing than reams of the most logical argument ever written.

What happens in our minds when we see this picture? We say to ourselves, "Why Hitler killed that girl's father for daring to tell the truth and now he's going to send the girl to a concentration camp. Let's wipe him off the earth and rescue this girl and everyone else who is suffering under his iron heel." After all, who wouldn't like to rescue Hedy Lamarr?

Now, there is no logic to this propaganda. Usually the propagandists are anything but logical. Take the case of Dorothy Thompson, that great example of clear thinking. About 2 weeks ago she wrote a series of articles proving beyond any question of a doubt to herself, at least, that the United States was in mortal danger, both militarily and economically, at the hands of Nazi Germany. Following this she commenced a series of articles proving equally conclusive to herself that Hitler was already beaten and knew it. And last Sunday she returned to the first theme of German world domination. So, from the pen of Dorothy Thompson, we have the ridiculous picture of Hitler, defeated by England, simultaneously invading the United States.

One thing to remember is this: Many persons change their minds. There is nothing wrong about it. You would not expect a child to develop one set of ideas and carry them exactly the same way all through life. But if we do change our minds, we should know the reasons for it and be sure the change came about as a result of facts and logic and not because of lies, innuendo, hysteria, and propaganda. I very much fear, however, that about 99.44 percent of the recent change in public sentiment is due to other causes than truth and clear thinking. All people should learn to recognize propaganda wherever it may appear; otherwise they are bound to fall victims to it.

In conclusion I want to make these points clear:

1. America has nothing to fear from any European power or a group of powers, regardless of the outcome of this war, if we give any reasonable care to our own national defense.

2. Our foreign trade probably would not be seriously menaced by an Axis victory, but at any rate it would be better to lose all of it than to go to war.

3. European warfare is interminable and has never settled anything. It is folly to believe that anything will be settled this time, whether America participates or not.

4. The recent rise in interventionist sentiment is a result of hysteria and propaganda, rather than of clear thinking.

5. America's interests are best served by remaining at peace. Any proposed aid given to Britain should be carefully examined to ascertain whether or not it is likely to involve us and if such aid leads us materially closer to war, then that proposed aid should not be given.

These points sum up my argument. I am fully aware that the majority will not agree with me at this time. I have every confidence, however, that 5 years after the war is over, regardless of the result, the American people will come to understand the fundamental correctness of these principles just as they did after the first World War. And so I rest my case with you, with the public and with the future.

Thank you.

War Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE MAGAZINE AMERICA

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been subjected to a veritable barrage of war propaganda in one form or another. The Roosevelt administration has been the guiding light in the dissemination of much pro-war material. In spite of all the efforts of the warmongers, in spite of the millions of dollars spent in propagandizing the people for war, the American public is still steadfast in its opposition to our entrance into this war.

The following article discusses the question of war propaganda and its effect upon the Nation today:

[From the magazine America of August 23, 1941]

WE ARE NOT SWAYED BY WAR PROPAGANDA

(By John A. Toomey)

One bright morning in the peaceful 1920's two men, seated on a fast-moving train, were discussing a book on war propaganda.

"Propaganda will never be able to do the trick again," one of the men remarked. "The American people won't forget the lesson they have just learned. No more foreign wars for them."

The other gentleman was dubious. "I can't quite agree. When the next world war breaks, I think the propogandists will manage to stir up a war fever here just as they did before. People quickly forget."

The first speaker shook his head. "I don't believe it. At any rate, we'll never know which of us is right. There won't be another world war in our time."

Conversations on this topic were quite common during the 1920's. The period was one of disillusion. The printing presses were pouring forth magazine articles and books which made amazing revelations concerning the misleading nature of the 1915–16 war propaganda. The disclosures startled the American people and set off numerous informal arguments on the question: Will war propaganda ever again produce in the United States the same effects it achieved in the World War days?

The twenties, the thirties could not lift the debate out of the purely speculative realm. But the early forties could because the early forties had World War No. 2 on their hands, the only event capable of vindicating one side or the other in the dispute.

Which side diagnosed the future correctly? Have the American people reacted to the 1939–41 war drive the way they did to the 1915–16 drive, or have they this time presented a totally different phenomenon in mass psychology?

From the evidence at hand thus far, and it is evidence accumulated after 2 years of widespread and systematic attempts at war incitement, it appears that the "propaganda cannot repeat" group was right. In the days of World War No. 1 propaganda itself, on its own power, achieved dynamic, even hysterical, results. By the beginning of 1917, after 2 years of verbal and printed bombardments of

the American people, a war fever had appeared and reached a high pitch. There was no deluge of protests against war entry descending on Congress. There were no national committees staging mass meetings all over the Nation and voicing opposition to war involvement. There was no militant majority against intervention. The great bulk of the people were either for intervention or resigned to it.

Nothing like that meets the eye in the year 1941. Just the opposite, indeed, emerges. No high war fever has been manipulated into being. War paint, war dances, hysteria are minority manifestations. An ocean of antiwar mail flows into Congress. After 2 years of exposure to ceaseless barrages of propaganda, a majority of the American people, a very huge majority, is vehemently opposed to participation in the current foreign war. The mass reaction to war propaganda in 1941 has been altogether dissimilar to the reaction in 1916.

Reference to just a few of the recent public-opinion samplings will furnish some idea of the strenuous opposition to war that is felt by the American public. One poll, the results of which were announced by Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, registered 79.7 percent of the voters against war entry. Another staged by the New York News showed 69.8 percent of New York City, 70.5 percent of the entire State voting "No" to the question, Shall the United States enter the war to help Britain defeat Hitler? Employing the same question, the Chicago Tribune sampled Illinois opinion, announced that 80 79 percent of the voters were opposed to war involvement. The Cantril opinion research project registered 90 percent lined up against intervention. A national Gallup poll taken after the outbreak of the Nazi-Soviet war revealed an increase of antiwar sentiment from 76 percent in June to 79 percent in July. A survey of the Women's National Committee to Keep the United States Out of War reported that 94.9 percent of the Nation's women were opposed to war entry. When Congressman FISH requested his constituents to give him their views on the question, 27,423 voted to stay out of war, 3,038 to go in.

A recent check-up of mail forwarded by the people to Congress supports the results furnished by the opinion samplings. A few examples will suffice to give the general picture. Most of Senator CONNALLY's correspondents urged him "to keep us out of war." Of some 400 letters a day reaching Senator REYNOLDS, only about 10 were prowar. Eighty percent of the mail reaching Senator GILLETTE was antiwar. Ninety-nine and nine-tenths percent of Congressman LUDLOW's correspondence was against "any step that will lead us to war." Of Senator BROOK's mail, "better than 90 percent" was antiwar.

There can be no doubt that in this month of August 1941 a very substantial majority of the American people is strenuously opposed to war entry. Significant in this connection is the fact that the war party has never claimed a majority. The constantly reiterated assertions of the antiwar people that they have the majority, and a big one, have never been seriously disputed. The ceaseless drip, drip, drip of war incitement during the last 2 years from the printed page, the lecture platform, the screen, and radio has not produced results.

The 1939-41 mass resistance to war propaganda is all the more remarkable because the instruments of popaganda today are much more formidable than they were in 1916. In that year the movies and news reels had not commenced to talk or to realize fully their tremendous propagandistic powers. There were no radios in American homes, no commentator voices penetrating to the American mind. Without the aid of movies, news reels, radio, the 1916 propagandists induced the American people to put on the national war paint. With newspapers, magazines, war books, lecture platforms; with movies and news reels that reach 80,000,000 people weekly; with radio commenator voices that enter daily into millions of homes; with all these, the 1939-41 propagandists have not been able to duplicate the 1916 performance.

The fact that not as many newspapers are beating the war drums today as was the case in 1916 does not explain the phenomenon. The defection of some newspapers from the war ranks is more than offset by the addition of movies, news reels, and radio to these ranks.

The movies and news reels have been powerful instruments in the 1939-41 drive. Out of Hollywood has come a succession of feature pictures designed to provoke the hysteria of hatred that leads to war. According to Senator NYE, a Wall Street investment house recently made a study of movie industries and reported that if Britain loses seven of the eight leading companies will be wiped out. He asked the parents of America: "Are you ready to send your boys to bleed and die in Europe to make the world safe for the movie industry and its financial backers?" The 20,000 movie houses in the Nation have been characterized as 20,000 buildings in which, under the guise of entertainment, rallies for war are being frequently held, rallies to which admission is charged. Senator NYE declared he was informed that the movie industry has orders from somewhere requiring the news reels to have a minimum of 70 percent devoted to war pictures. Whether this is true or not, it must be admitted that the news reels have gone in strong for war pictures. A recent survey conducted by the college of men for defense first of New York revealed that of 1,100 stories presented by the 5 American news-reel companies over a 3-month period, 500 were about war, and that of these 1,100 exhibits only 7 showed the existence in the Nation of a public opinion opposed to intervention. That many of the radio commentators have striven to build up the war spirit is undeniable.

And yet, despite the persistent efforts of numerous influential newspapers and of swarms of lecturers; despite the efforts of Hollywood, of many radio commentators, of groups of high-placed officials; despite all these prodigious and well-planned efforts, no war spirit has arisen among the American people. The majority against war is today as large as it was in September 1939. It may, indeed, be even larger. The informal debaters of the 1920's who contended that propaganda for war could not produce again in the United States the same effect it achieved in 1915-16 appear to have been prophets. If the United States enters the war, it will not be because the people have succumbed to war propaganda. The reason will lie elsewhere.

The Hidden Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting herein an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of September 13, 1941:

[From the Chicago Tribune of September 13, 1941]

THE HIDDEN PURPOSE

Mr. Roosevelt's violent pronouncement of Thursday evening must have been intended deliberately to arouse passion. The voice was excited. The words were chosen for their inflammatory values. The speaker, with ulterior purposes in mind, was seeking to create an emotional setting in which half-truths, twisted truths, and untruths would be accepted as the reasoned and reasonable thought of a responsible public official.

Before examining the unspoken motives, a few examples of the method may be cited. In an atmosphere of calm the American people would not today get very much excited over the power of Germany to interrupt ocean commerce. The submarine campaign in recent months has been pretty much of a flop. The British have announced with pride that they are sinking three times as much German shipping as the Germans are sinking of theirs. According to a recent British official statement, new methods of combating submarines have been developed, and are proving moderately successful, yet to hear Mr. Roosevelt tell it, this country, as well as Britain, is in danger of succumbing to the submarine attack. The two greatest navies in the world, he asks us to believe, are barely holding their own against a handful of submarines. With the shipping of almost the whole world in her possession, Britain is yet in danger of being cut off, etc.

This is nonsense when viewed in the light of known facts. So is Mr. Roosevelt's assumption that there is likelihood that Germany's 80,000,000 people can conquer and dominate not only Europe and the British Empire but the rest of the world besides. Against the 80,000,000 are now arrayed Russia's 180,000,000. The British Empire's population is greater than 400,000,000. No matter how well organized for war the 80,000,000 may be, they cannot be expected to overcome such stupendous odds, and the progress of the war in recent weeks only serves to emphasize this fundamental truth.

The inflammatory technique was used again in the reference to the freedom of the seas. Mr. Roosevelt could have used the high-sounding phrase only to gain respectability for a course of action which he could not justify by simple reason and argument. "Freedom of the seas" makes no sense in the context in which he used it. Germany is interfering little with our freedom to carry on peaceful commerce with the world. Britain is interfering every moment of every day in every port and in every ocean. Our farmers and manufacturers cannot export their products to Norway, France, Poland, Belgium, Holland, and a great many other countries for lack of British consent. To talk in the face of these facts of Germany's threat to our freedom of the seas is to talk glib nonsense.

At another point Mr. Roosevelt intimated that we must take our place in the battle of the Atlantic to assure that our supplies reach the British Isles. To hear him tell it, the British Navy is incapable of performing this task. The evidence doesn't show that. There are some British warships undergoing repairs in our navy yards, but few if any of them took their battering in the North Atlantic. They got into trouble in very different waters—in the eastern Mediterranean, for example, where they were engaged in defending not Britain but the British imperial holdings in the Near East. Britain has lost few naval vessels in her own waters.

There was scarcely a point made by Mr. Roosevelt which will stand calm examination. Not even his list of atrocities was impressive. The *Steel Seafarer* was sunk in the Red Sea in an area of danger which,

under the cash-and-carry law, Mr. Roosevelt was required to declare out of bounds to American shipping. He didn't do his duty, but instead, contrary to the law's intent, sent this ship and many others like it into the war zone to carry war supplies for the conquest of peaceful Iran. Likewise the *Sessa* was commandeered from Denmark by Mr. Roosevelt and was sent into the zone of danger under the flag of Panama. The *Robin Moor* was carrying contraband to South Africa—a belligerent. The *Greer* would not have been in Icelandic waters if Mr. Roosevelt had not violated his pledge to the American people to keep our soldiers at home. The other incident, which occurred last July, consisted of nothing more menacing than the chance meeting of an unidentified submarine and an American warship somewhere on the high seas. They looked at each other and that was that.

Mr. Roosevelt put all the high-powered fervor he could command into the telling of these atrocity stories. He may have succeeded in frightening some people, but they may be expected to recover their mental equilibrium before long and to inquire why he made so much of so little, why he twisted so many truths, why he said so many things which obviously aren't so.

The answer is not particularly obscure. His purpose is to confuse and frighten the American people into the belief that they are confronted by stupendous dangers. He will make this artificial crisis serve like all his previous crises as an excuse to impose new totalitarian restraints upon the American people. His aim is a dictatorship which will mean the destruction of the Republic.

Constitutional restraints stand in his way. Only Congress can lawfully declare war. Only Congress can lawfully increase the President's discretionary powers and even Congress has limited powers in this direction. It is Mr. Roosevelt's purpose to create such a hysteria in the country that he can ignore Congress if it doesn't surrender abjectly to his will.

We believe the American people will see through the scheme and thwart it.

Modern War College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR., OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an article written by me which appeared in the October issue of Flying and Popular Aviation on the subject of modernizing our present Army War College.

The article follows:

[From Flying and Popular Aviation]

At this moment of world crisis it is disturbing that the Nation must rely almost solely upon land, sea, and air commanders who, by training and experience, presumably are capable enough in their respective branches, but they remain essentially specialists.

Virtually every venture which it is conceivable we might have to undertake for hemisphere defense would demand the close cooperation of every element of American striking power. As never before, this country's future depends on the readiness of the Navy, the air forces, and the Army to operate as a powerful, unified team. How many officers are qualified to call signals for that defense team—or any substantial element of it?

Before it is too late it would seem imperative to take prompt steps to remedy a weakness which is glaring in the light of the portentous Nazi conquest of Europe.

As much as 6 years ago there was clear recognition in Germany that the war, whose clouds even then were beginning to lower, would be a conflict of three dimensions—land, sea, and air. It could not be fought victoriously by commanders who had no more than a bowing acquaintance with arms other than their own; who thought largely in terms of cavalry, artillery, bombers, or submarines and were inclined to professional jealousy of each other.

In 1935 some 30 or more officers of proven capacity were transferred from the German Army into the Luftwaffe, it is reported, with Adolf Hitler's approval, despite some internal professional grumbling. They were taught to fly all types of planes and grappled with the problems of bombing, parachute attack, and moving large bodies of troops by air transport. Three years later the same group was shifted into the navy to study tactics of sea warfare at first-hand.

They are key generals now—and others are undergoing the same fitting process to fill commands in a fighting team which has overrun Europe and now has the rest of the world at bay.

The results of this scheme of coordination first appeared in the conquest of Poland, where ground and air forces fought as an invincible team. The invasion of Norway brought the third dimension—the navy—into action with the other two elements of striking force, in a dramatization of perfect timing such as never before had been seen.

The quick conquest of the Low Countries and France, the invasion of the Balkans, the aerial capture of Crete, and, most recently, the onslaught on Russia have piled up further frightful evidence of the effectiveness of officers schooled and experienced in unified command.

Meanwhile, in this country, one is made uneasy by the tart testimony of such veterans as Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood, retired, who complained that "the best trained man in the American Army is the private soldier and the worst trained is the general." Only now has the War Department been able to tackle the vital but unpleasant task of weeding out officers.

There is no intention to assert here that the Nazi lesson has been completely lost on the War and Navy Departments. But in the existing state of urgency American measures to achieve such vital coordination of all arms appear timid, indeed, even though the Army particularly has not been loath to borrow other German ideas.

Army officers at the Command and General Staff School and in the specialized training schools of the various branches of the service, devote study to the "combined arms." There have been efforts along the same line in the air forces. A relative handful of Army officers have attended the Naval War College in past years and some sea officers have been admitted to the Army War College. A few Navy and Marine officers too are enrolled in the Army Industrial College, to learn methods of mobilizing industry for the production of munitions.

There is a measure of coordination of Army and Navy affairs through the joint board. Gen. George C. Marshall, chief of staff, said this agency now is in almost continuous operation through its expert committees, whereas until recently it held sessions only about every 6 weeks.

In the hard school of experience, under difficulties attending the mushroom growth of the defense establishment, a Marine Corps general has been widening his outlook as commander of the first amphibious joint Army-Navy task force to be formed on the east coast. In Newfoundland the Army upset tradition by putting Col. Henry W. Harms of the air forces in command of land troops as well as aerial forces and another veteran flyer, Maj. Gen. Frank M. Andrews, was chosen to head up all defenses of Panama.

But there has been no sign of a move toward such an interchange of able officers such as Germany has carried out with significant advantage. If the exchange arrangement were advisable for Nazi Germany, whose war operations have been confined largely to the European Continent, its prompt adoption would appear nothing less than imperative for the United States. We are building a two-ocean navy, a formidable Army, an air force which may ultimately be the world's most powerful, with the proclaimed intention of safeguarding the entire Western Hemisphere and, in conjunction with Great Britain, sweeping both the Atlantic and Pacific of enemies.

Directing the vast operations of the combined German land, air, and naval forces, it should be noted, is the great general staff, which was revived after its enforced abolition following the first World War. Eventually, in the inevitable general overhauling of our own defense establishment, the creation of such an American high command will come.

Just now, in the midst of the hurried national effort to build up all defenses, it might be contended that a sweeping reorganization would be confusing and demoralizing and cause delays which cannot be risked. No such contention would hold against the creation of a general war college as a training school for the high-ranking officers of all three branches. It would be even less valid against a simple interchange of officers.

Out of a corps of more than 100,000 officers on active duty, the War Department certainly can spare 250 or so for service of a year with the Navy, to be preceded or followed by duty with the air forces. A like number from the Navy should be given the same opportunities for training in all phases of defense teamwork, along with a similar group of air force flyers of command caliber.

This is the logical and simple means to provide the commanders for the combined air, sea, and land operations which hemisphere defense demands, and to create as well the nucleus for an eventual American supreme general staff. Both objectives call for action without delay.

The Power of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 19, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE FRANCIS BIDDLE, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, before the annual convention of the California State Bar Association, Yosemite National Park, Calif., Thursday, September 18, 1941, on the subject The Power of Democracy:

The pleasure which I experience in being able to meet with my brethren of the bar of the great State of California in this superb place and upon so important an occasion cannot be expressed in the common clichés of the visiting speaker. Will you, Mr. President, and your board of governors and, indeed, your entire membership accept my most sincere thanks for this opportunity. Permit me, as well, to express my enthusiasm for the splendid program of expanded public service which the State bar of California is inaugurating in this hour of grave national emergency "Making democracy work" is indeed a well-chosen theme for this convention, and one which may be said to epitomize the confidence and the determination which we as lawyers share.

As you well know, there have always been timid souls who doubted that democracy could be made to work when disaster threatened. Their voices have been heard in every great crisis, domestic or international, through which this country has passed during more than 150 years of national life. History has been kind to them and most of their gloomy forecasts have been soon forgotten. At this moment their voices are raised again to express the familiar fear that the very measures essential to defend democracy may in the end prove to be democracy's undoing. If there are those among them who do not believe sincerely in democratic processes, I can only regret that they are not placed elsewhere in associations more congenial to the political paganism which they profess.

My present concern is for the sincere believers who are troubled by the discordant counsels of these tumultuous times. Without minimizing our dangers, I would seek to fortify their faith, for ultimately the vitality of democracy must depend upon the faith of those who would conserve and strengthen its essential principles. For myself I hold firmly to that faith in free institutions which is implicit in the theme of this convention. I am confident that the same vitality of free government which has brought our Nation through 150 years to its present stature will enable it in the future as in the past to

"Meet with Triumph and Disaster
"And treat those two imposters just the same."

It will come as no surprise to this audience that my first article of faith is in the Constitution of the United States. Among their many virtues the draftsmen of this great instrument were masters of a brevity which could be embracing without dissipation in vague generality. The word "emergency" is nowhere used in the Constitution, yet it is elemental law that there are ample powers in the several departments of our National Government to cope with any crisis. As former Chief Justice Hughes observed when addressing the American Bar Association in 1917, "the framers of the Constitution did not contrive an imposing spectacle of impotency. * * * Self-preservation is the first law of national life and the Constitution itself provides the necessary powers in order to defend and preserve the United States." [1]

Whatever doubts may have emerged at one time or another in our history, no lawyer today questions the adequacy of the national legislative power. It is significant that the enumeration of legislative powers granted to the Congress begins with the power "to lay and collect taxes, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." [2] The enumeration includes the power to declare war, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions. Speaking through the late Mr. Justice Cardozo, the Supreme Court has reminded us that the concept of the general welfare is not static but is equal to any emergency. In Justice Cardozo's own words: "Needs that were narrow or parochial a century ago may be interwoven in our day with the well-being of the Nation. What is critical or urgent changes with the times." [3]

It has never been seriously questioned that the efficacy of emergency legislative power depends upon an assurance of prompt and vigorous execution. In recognition of this elemental principle, the Congress throughout our history has repeatedly delegated broad emergency powers to the Executive. Thus, in the first volume of our national statutes we find the President authorized to call forth the militia whenever the United States shall be invaded or in imminent danger of invasion.[4] In sustaining this statute and holding that the President's decision as to the existence of an emergency must be conclusive, the Supreme Court stated tersely some elemental principles concerning free government and its defense. Mr. Justice Story said: "It is no answer that such a power may be abused, for there is no power which is not susceptible of abuse. The remedy for this, if it should occur, is to be found in the Constitution itself." [5] And again: "One of the best means to repel invasions is to provide the requisite force for action before the invader himself has reached the soil." [6]

Having in mind the part which the Executive must always be called upon to take in time of crisis, it is further tribute to the wisdom of those who framed our Constitution that there need never be serious doubt as to the adequacy of national executive power.

Article II begins with the terse statement that "the executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America." [7] It requires an oath or affirmation that he will "faithfully execute the office" and that he will, to the best of his ability, "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States." [8] It provides that he shall be Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States.[9] It makes of the President, as Marshall declared in his famous argument in the House of Representatives on March 7, 1800,[10] "the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations." [11] And finally, in the same terse but dynamic style, it admonishes the President to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." [12] I am here speaking of powers which stem directly from the Constitution, without benefit of legislative interposition, and which constitute the basic charter of the President's responsibility for the defense of the Nation in time of grave national peril. In what is undoubtedly one of the major crises of our history, when the pressure of events must force many vital decisions and when charges of usurpation or dictatorial action are too lightly made, it is essential that we return from time to time to the fundamental charter of our liberties.

My second article of faith is in the constitutional history of the United States. The record of great issues met and resolved by democratic processes is one which inspires an enduring confidence. If those timid Americans who are now saying that it cannot be done, or that if it is done it will prove our undoing, will only look at the record with an open mind, their misgivings may be speedily dissipated. How, or why, or under what tragic circumstances, other less-fortunate peoples may have surrendered to cruel tyranny while still in the kindergarten of democratic experience is of no immediate relevance. Vitally relevant are the venerable roots of our own sacred liberties, the soil in which they have been traditionally nurtured, and the toughness which they have developed in resisting adversity. In the cavalcade of our 150 years we may observe in the sequence of minor and major crises the response of democratic statesmanship to each succeeding challenge. We may witness the tempo of national decision accelerated to cope with situations which have not permitted delay, and retarded to restore the utmost of patience in deliberation when storm clouds passed. Who has read American history and doubted that the passion for liberty under law has emerged more insistent after each period of stress? Who has really shared the American way of life, yet denied the conviction that the ultimate responses of a free people are wiser and more humane than the dictates of a despot, benevolent or otherwise?

In noting the adequacy of national legislative powers and reminding you of the necessity for assurance of prompt and vigorous execution of all emergency laws, I have already called attention to the legislative practice of making broad grants of power to the President to meet emergencies. The necessity for this practice is sufficiently confirmed by its consistent use throughout our national history and its wisdom is demonstrated in our long and varied experience with administration under such legislative grants. Contrary to the somewhat naive assumption which seems to prevail in some quarters, this is neither a new nor a dangerous practice. From the very beginning, Congress has repeatedly granted the President extraordinary powers with which to meet extraordinary situations. In some instances the grant of power has been ephemeral, designed to meet an immediate but temporary need. In others it has passed into the body of our national jurisprudence where it constitutes a reserve of legislative preparedness for the emergencies of national defense.

Among emergencies arising from crises primarily internal or domestic, the Pennsylvania rebellion of 1792 was one of the earliest occasions for resort to this type of legislation. On that occasion Congress promptly empowered the President to call out the militia of the States to enforce the laws "whenever the laws of the United States shall be opposed or the execution thereof obstructed." [13] In 1861, as is well known, new precedents were established for similar delegations of broad emergency powers.[14] Included among our national statutes in force at the present time are many such laws, deriving from different periods in our history, conceived to safeguard against emergencies of various kinds, and granting powers in the broadest terms.[15] With your indulgence, I propose to refer to a few examples, quoting briefly from the statutory definition of executive discretion in each instance.

The Executive may waive or modify the monthly apportionment of appropriations for governmental departments "upon the happening of some extraordinary emergency or unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of making such

[1] War Powers Under the Constitution, 42 American Bar Association Reports, 232 (1917).

[2] Art. II, sec. 8.

[3] *Helvering* v. *Davis* (1937), 301 U. S. 619, 641.

[4] Act of February 28, 1795, ch. 36, 1 Stat. 424.

[5] *Martin* v. *Mott* (1827), 12 Wheat. 19, 32.

[6] Ibid., at p. 29.

[7] Art. II, sec. 1.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Art. II, sec. 2.

[10] 2 Abridgement of Debates of Congress, 466.

[11] Art. II, secs. 2 and 3.

[12] Art. II, sec. 3.

[13] Act of May 2, 1792, ch. 28, 1 Stat. 264.

[14] E. g., act of July 13, 1861, ch. 3, secs. 2 and 5, 12 Stat. 255, 256, 257.

[15] See S. Doc. No. 133, 26th Cong., 2d sess.

apportionment";[16] may take action with respect to credit expansion when "an economic emergency requires an expansion of credit";[17] may regulate or prohibit certain transactions in foreign exchange or with respect to the currency "during time of war or during any other period of national emergency";[18] may regulate the transaction of business by the Federal Reserve banks "during such emergency period as the President * * * by proclamation may prescribe";[19] and may suspend trading in securities when "the public interest so requires."[20] By proclaiming an emergency, the President may make it unlawful to transfer American ships to foreign ownership[21] and authorize the Maritime Commission to requisition American ships.[22] In time of war or threatened war the President's broad powers over transportation,[23] industry,[24] and communication[25] are writ large in our national legislation and are well understood among members of our profession.

In emergencies arising from crises primarily external or international, Congress has always met or anticipated the event with the broadest grants of power and with few departures from an approved pattern of legislative action. Since the President, as the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations long ago observed, is "the constitutional representative of the United States with regard to foreign nations,"[26] the implementing of a foreign policy, whether in emergency or in due course, could hardly be accomplished otherwise. From the earliest enactments concerned with our foreign relations, in the turbulent years which followed the French Revolution[27] to the recent lend-lease statute, there has been an uninterrupted progress of consistent practice. Under the terms of the Lend-Lease Act "the President may, when he deems it in the interest of national defense," authorize the manufacture or procurement of any defense article "for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States." The terms and conditions of aid are to be "those which the President deems satisfactory," and the benefit to the United States may be payment, repayment in kind, "or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory."[28] I refrain from burdening you with samplings from the years intervening between 1789 and 1941.[29]

The wisdom of such action may always be debated when the occasion arises, but its propriety and validity under our form of government is no longer doubted. In 1936, in sustaining a criminal prosecution for violation of the joint resolution of Congress authorizing the President to embargo the sale of arms to belligerents in the Chaco war, the Supreme Court reviewed the practice at length and affirmed its constitutional validity in the case presented in no uncertain terms. Speaking for the Court, Mr Justice Sutherland said: "As a member of the family of nations, the right and power of the United States in that field are equal to the right and power of the other members of the international family. In this vast external realm, with its important, complicated, delicate, and manifold problems, the President alone has the power to speak or listen as a representative of the Nation The principles which justify such legislation find overwhelming support in the unbroken legislative practice which has prevailed almost from the inception of the National Government to the present day."[30]

Needless to say, the summation of all grants of emergency power, both internal and external, occurs in wartime, for modern war is an economic and social struggle as well as a conflict of arms, and the concentration of responsibility must perforce be correspondingly extended. Before the World War ended, our Executive was exercising, among other powers, the power to take over manufacturing plants, to operate transportation systems, to fix charter rates for shipping, to license the distribution of food and fuel, to fix the prices of coal and coke, to control imports and exports, and to redistribute the functions of the executive departments of government as circumstances might require. In the light of World War experience, our legislative preparedness for war has been supplemented and strengthened. The power to apprehend and detain alien enemies derives from legislation first enacted in 1798,[31] the power to control transportation priorities from an enactment of 1920,[32] the power to commandeer manufacturing plants from a statute of 1916 as well as from a statute of 1940,[33] the power to suspend trading in securities from a statute of 1934.[34] More recently our legislative preparedness has been supplemented at vital points.[35] Today, insofar as legislation can effectively anticipate the requirements of a wartime emergency, the Nation is better prepared than ever before in its history.

In reviewing some aspects of our constitutional history, I have dwelt chiefly, up to this point, upon legislative practice in meeting or anticipating emergencies. It remains to say something of the Executive powers which stem directly from the Constitution. I have reminded you that executive power is vested in the President; that he is sworn to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution; that he is made Commander in Chief of the armed forces and our sole spokesman in foreign relations; and that he is responsible for the faithful execution of the laws. Traditionally every President of the United States, from the first to the present, has preferred to discharge his constitutional duties within a pattern formulated in appropriate legislative action. Traditionally every President of the United States, from the first to the present, has been prepared to use his constitutional powers when the Nation or its citizens were endangered in circumstances requiring prompt and vigorous action. There have been differences of opinion with respect to action taken, both before and after the event; but over the years the wisdom of the framers of our organic law has been repeatedly confirmed. If you were to press me for a distillation of principle from the full harvest of our national experience, I would suggest that the magnitude of the threatened disaster is the measure of the President's power and duty to take steps necessary to avert it.

When Abraham Lincoln took the oath of office, the Congress was not in session and rebellion was spreading swiftly throughout the Southern States. The measures which he took to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution in that critical hour are familiar history. I need hardly remind you that it was as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief of the armed forces that President Lincoln, among other emergency measures, called out the militia, issued a call for volunteers, increased the Army and Navy, ordered the blockade of southern ports, and proclaimed the emancipation of the slaves.[36] When strikes flamed into mob violence threatening paralysis of railroad traffic in Chicago in 1894, President Cleveland sent troops to restore order.[37] To the contention that the measures taken were beyond the scope of Executive power, the Supreme Court later replied: "There is no such impotency in the National Government. The entire strength of the Nation may be used to enforce in any part of the land the full and free exercise of all national powers and the security of all rights entrusted by the Constitution to its care. The strong arm of the National Government may be put forth to brush away all obstructions to the freedom of interstate commerce or the transportation of the mails. If the emergency arises, the Army of the Nation, and all its militia, are at the service of the Nation to compel obedience to its laws."[38] Within recent months, here in this State and on the Atlantic seaboard, the same fundamental powers have been invoked to restore strike-bound plants to their necessary place in the program of national defense.[39]

Throughout our history these great reserves of constitutional authority have been drawn upon with courage and vigor in the protection of American lives and property abroad. In 1798 President Adams authorized the arming of American merchantmen to resist the attacks which were being made upon our commerce by the French.[40] In 1801 President Jefferson sent a squadron of frigates into the Mediterranean to protect our commerce against the Barbary raiders.[41] In 1853 one Koszta, a Hungarian who had declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States, was seized in Smyrna by Austrian forces and confined on an Austrian vessel. The commander of an American warship in those waters demanded his release and enforced compliance by training his guns on the Austrian vessel. The commander was voted a gold medal by Congress; and the Supreme Court, in the case of Neagle, which I believe is regarded as a leading case in

---

[16] Act of July 12, 1870, 16 Stat. 251 (R. S. sec. 3679), as amended (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 665).

[17] Act of May 12, 1933, sec. 43, 48 Stat. 31, 51, as amended (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 821).

[18] Act of October 6, 1917, sec. 5 (b), 40 Stat. 411, 415, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 95a).

[19] Act of March 9, 1933, sec. 4, 48 Stat. 1, 2 (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 95).

[20] Act of June 6, 1934, sec. 19, 48 Stat. 881, 898 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 78s (a) (4)).

[21] Act of July 15, 1918, sec. 4, 40 Stat. 900, 901 (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 835).

[22] Act of June 29, 1936, sec. 902 (a), 49 Stat. 1985, 2015, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 1242).

[23] Act of February 28, 1920, sec. 402, 41 Stat. 456, 476 (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 1 (15)).

[24] Act of September 16, 1940, sec. 9, Public, No. 783, 76th Cong.

[25] Act of June 19, 1934, sec. 606, 48 Stat. 1064, 1104 (U. S. C., title 47, sec. 606).

[26] U. S. Senate Reports, Committee on Foreign Relations, vol. 8, p. 24.

[27] See *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation* (1936), 299 U. S. 304, 322–324.

[28] Act of March 11, 1941, Public, No. 11, 77th Cong.

[29] See *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation* (1936), 299 U. S. 304, 322 et seq.

[30] Ibid., at pp. 318, 319, 322.

[31] Act of July 6, 1798 (R. S. sec. 4067), as amended by act of April 16, 1918, 40 Stat. 531 (U. S. C., title 50, sec. 21).

[32] Act of February 28, 1920, sec. 402, 41 Stat. 456, 476 (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 1 (15)).

[33] Act of June 3, 1916, sec. 120, 39 Stat. 166, 213 (U. S. C., title 50, sec. 80); act of September 16, 1940, sec. 9, Public, No. 783, 76th Congress.

[34] Act of June 6, 1934, sec. 19, 48 Stat. 881, 898 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 78s (a) (4)).

[35] E. g., Public, No. 671, 76th Congress, as amended by Public, No. 89, 77th Congress (priorities); Public, No. 703, 76th Congress (control of exports); Public, No. 829, 76th Congress (requisition of exports).

[36] Sec. 12, Stat. 1258, 1259, 1260, 1268.

[37] 9 Richardson, Messages and Papers, 499.

[38] In re Debs (1895) 158 U. S. 564, 582.

[39] 6 Fed. Reg. 2777 (June 10, 1941); 6 ibid. 4349 (Aug. 23, 1941).

[40] 1 Richardson, Messages and Papers, 264–265.

[41] Ibid. 326.

California, referred approvingly to the episode as "an attractive historical incident." [42]

In the following year the United States consul at Greytown, Nicaragua, was attacked by a local mob. When appropriate reparation was not forthcoming the commander of a United States warship bombarded the town. President Pierce referred to the action taken as the only alternative to "submissive acquiescence in national indignity"; [43] and later, when the commander was sued for the value of property destroyed, Associate Justice Nelson, sitting on circuit, upheld what had been done in vigorous language. The duty to act, he declared, "must, of necessity, rest in the discretion of the President." "The great object and duty of government," he concluded, "is the protection of the lives, liberty, and property of the people composing it, whether abroad or at home; and any government failing in the accomplishment of the object, or the performance of the duty, is not worth preserving." [44]

The significance of the record appears in the consistent pattern of national action. Bold Executives and cautious Executives, Presidents avowedly sympathetic with the Hamiltonian philosophy, and Presidents professing a more guarded conception of their powers, have kept the oath as the ever-changing stream of circumstance has challenged them to add present decision to the unfolding page of history. Within the memory of many here present, President McKinley sent naval vessels and a military force of 5,000 men to the Far East to cooperate with other powers in suppressing disorders which had resulted from the Boxer Rebellion.[45] It was nearly a half century earlier that President Buchanan, one of the most cautious of our Executives, when the right was asserted to search American vessels in the Gulf of Mexico, had ordered the dispatch of a naval force with instructions "to protect all vessels of the United States on the high seas from search or detention by the vessels of any other nation." [46] In the same consistent determination to safeguard our heritage, we are today cooperating with friendly powers in the Pacific, and are fortifying new bases and reinforcing the far-flung patrol which guards the vital highways of the Atlantic. Long experience in the democratic way of life has taught us patience; but neither contriving faction within nor hostile force without should ever mistake patience for impotence. In all earnestness, to those here or abroad who may be confused by the swift march of events, I commend the revealing record of our constitutional experience.

My third article of faith is in liberty under law as it has come down to us, conserved and strengthened through a thousand years of Anglo-American institutional history. I need hardly remind this audience of the unique vitality of the rule of law wherever the common law has become firmly established. Nor is it necessary to stress the well-known circumstance that our civil liberties have their roots in and are part and parcel of this venerable heritage. As the Supreme Court has observed, our Bill of Rights was "not intended to lay down any novel principle of government, but simply to embody certain guaranties and immunities which we had inherited from our English ancestors." [47]

Our heritage of liberty under law is guaranteed in terms in our Constitution. It has acquired a richer meaning and a more enduring substance in our constitutional experience. We should remember, however, that all this was possible because we were coheirs to the common-law inheritance; and faint hearts may be fortified once more in recalling the turbulent centuries in which that heritage has been formed and toughened. It is no made-to-order credo of the passing moment which attaches our people so firmly to freedom of religion when such freedom is brutally denied in many lands; to freedom of speech and the press when elsewhere terror stifles utterance and the press has survived only as a servile agent of unscrupulous power; to freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures when a continent languishes under the dread hand of the secret police; to trial by jury, with its ancient safeguards, when uncounted thousands are rushed to the concentration camp or the firing squad after proceedings which make a mockery of justice; or to due process of law when the ideas and the ideals of justice which are implicit in that phrase have been violently repudiated over wide reaches of the earth. These things are a part of us, they belong to our way of life, and they will endure so long as we continue to believe in them and have the will to defend them.

A government with ample power to defend the liberties of its people is a strong government. A government dedicated to the protection of those liberties is a just government. In asserting that our American form of government has traditionally been both strong and just, I would neither minimize the difficulties which confront us nor ignore the dangers to which we are peculiarly vulnerable. When revolutionary forces sweep over the earth, sparing no means and knowing no honor; when there can be no true peace for peoples selected for the sinister softening which precedes destruction; when those who wage total war take pride in the repudiation of conventional restraints upon the brutal incidents of armed conflict, the way of the strong and the just government is a hard one. Abroad it must resist every aggression, however subtle or insidious, while continuing to deserve the confidence and friendship of the distracted peoples of less fortunate countries. At home it must deal firmly yet fairly with those miserable saboteurs who make a mask of the very liberties which they are seeking to destroy. That America will achieve these things in ample measure, with whatever strength the emergency may require and without impairment of our essential liberties I have no doubt.

In support of this confidence I invite you to recall for the moment something of our experience with liberty under law in wartime. It is, of course, axiomatic that no liberty can be absolute. Some things permissible in ordinary times cannot be safely tolerated in a time of grave peril. Thus Mr. Justice Holmes reminded us, in one of the cases arising under the first amendment during the World War, that "when a nation is at war many things that might be said in time of peace are such a hindrance to its effort that their utterance will not be endured so long as men fight and that no court could regard them as protected by any constitutional right." [48] Yet in another of the cases in this group the same great Justice declared that "we do not lose our right to condemn either measures or men because the country is at war." [49]

In other cases arising out of the same wartime emergency, the Supreme Court returned frequently to the theme that "the war power of the United States, like its other powers * * * is subject to applicable constitutional limitations"; [50] and, in denouncing an indictment under one of the wartime statutes as violative of the fifth and sixth amendments, the Court gave emphatic approval to the proposition that "the mere status of war did not of its own force suspend or limit the effect of the Constitution, but only caused limitations, which the Constitution made applicable as the necessary and appropriate result of the status of war, to become operative." [51] It was in the midst of the World War that Attorney General Gregory reported that the Department of Justice was proceeding upon "the general principle that the constitutional right of free speech, free assembly, and petition exist in wartimes as in peacetime and that the right of discussion of governmental policy and the right of political agitation are most fundamental rights in a democracy." [52]

Whatever contempt we may feel for the misguided malcontents who assert liberties only to destroy them, we need have no fear that government founded upon the processes and principles of our common law will cease to be just because the emergency compels it to be strong. I commend to you the homely wisdom of President Lincoln, who wrote on June 12, 1863: "I can no more be persuaded that the Government can constitutionally take no strong measures in time of rebellion, because it could be shown that the same could not be lawfully taken in time of peace than I can be persuaded that a particular drug is not good medicine for a sick man, because it can be shown to not be good for a well one. Nor am I quite able to appreciate the danger, apprehended by the meeting, that the American people will by means of military arrests during the rebellion lose the right of public discussion, the liberty of speech and the press, the law of evidence, trial by jury, and habeas corpus throughout the indefinite peaceful future which I trust lies before them, any more than I am able to believe that a man could contract so strong an appetite for emetics during temporary illness as to persist in feeding upon them during the remainder of his healthful life." [53]

In a more tranquil future, students of government will spell out the contrast between the functioning of free government in time of peril and the techniques which enabled Europe's dictators to strut their little hour. There are obvious differences of underlying principle which they will surely stress. They will have something to say, certainly, of the toughness which free institutions had developed in centuries of sacrifice and struggle. They will point out how free peoples achieved essential unity under constitutional government rather than personal dictate. They will see significance in the rugged persistence of orderly legal processes in democratic countries, as contrasted with the procedures of hypnosis or terror. They will emphasize the innate vitality of governments conceived in a passion for human liberty, yet strong enough to defend their heritage, as distinguished from regimes born in liberty's negation. They will recall a period in which two philosophies of life were in irreconcilable conflict, one exalting the dignity and worth of the human individual, another concerned only with the all-powerful state. Finally, they will record free government triumphant because it was founded ultimately upon the consent of the governed, because of its vast reserves of strength and its immeasurable capacities for self-renewal, and because its legions wore the uniform of the common man.

---

[42] 1 Rhodes, History of the United States, 416-419; In re Neagle (1890) 135 U. S. 1, 64.

[43] 5 Richardson, Messages and Papers, 273, 284.

[44] *Durand* v. *Hollins* (C. C. S. D. N. Y., 1860) 4 Blatchf. 451, 454, 8 Fed Cas. 111, 112 (No. 4, 186).

[45] Foreign Relations, United States (1900), pp. vii, et seq.

[46] 5 Richardson, Messages and Papers, 497, 507.

[47] *Robertson* v. *Baldwin* (1897), 165 U. S. 275, 281.

[48] *Schenck* v. *United States* (1919), 249 U. S. 47, 52.

[49] *Frowerk* v. *United States* (1919), 249 U. S. 204, 206.

[50] *Hamilton* v. *Kentucky Distilleries Co.* (1919), 251 U. S. 146, 156.

[51] *United States* v. *Cohen Grocery Co.* (1921), 255 U. S. 81, 87.

[52] Report (1918), p. 20.

[53] Letter to Erastus Corning and others, June 12, 1863, in Nicolay and Hay, Abraham Lincoln: A History, vol. VII, p. 347.

Improvement at Fort Devens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

ARTICLE BY BILL CUNNINGHAM

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me to extend my remarks, I present an article from the Boston Herald of September 7, 1941, written by the well-known and able commentator, Bill Cunningham. He writes of conditions at Fort Devens, which is in my congressional district, and which I was instrumental in having made a fort. I, too, knew Devens in the early days when it was only a camp, and today when I visit the fort and see the tremendous improvements that have been made I am very proud of it. In the past few years, under the able supervision of Col. William A. Smith, commander of the fort, I have seen it grow from a post of 4,000 men to a fort of 26,000 men. Recently 43,000 men were stationed there, many, to be sure, in tents. I want to thank the Members of this House who helped me secure the very fine development of Fort Devens. The morale there is excellent; in fact, District Attorney Thomas E. Dewey, after visiting there recently, remarked that the morale was the highest of any place he had visited. Mr. Cunningham's article follows:

[From the Boston Herald of September 7, 1941]

DEVENS MEN HAPPY, WELL EQUIPPED, BUSY—ROOKIE OF 25 YEARS AGO FINDS CHANGE FROM SHEETLESS, HEATLESS ARMY

(By Bill Cunningham)

They called it Camp Devens, not Fort Devens, in my time, and my time was the origin of the place. I was part of the origin, being amongst the first of the gangling, gander-eyed recruits hauled in from the Ayer depot in a big Army truck and told to line up and listen to the sergeant. That was, in round numbers, 25 years ago, after President Wilson's celebrated notes hadn't done any good, the *Lusitania* had been sunk, and Congress, in a solemn midnight session, had declared us in.

I was halfway through my sophomore year in college at the time, working my way with everything from playing piano in the movies to changing tires on the professorial young while the mothers were playing bridge on the cook's night out. I was almost 2,000 miles from home, knew no more of New England than that precious portion of it included within the borders of the Hanover Township, but I figured I had jobs and things enough lined up to go the 4-year distance if the world would only hold together—which it didn't.

FEELS KINSHIP WITH SOLDIERS

Because of all that and the detail is unimportant now, I have felt a definite kinship with these soldiers of the present crisis who have seen their little private worlds tumble, their plans and prospects swept aside by a mighty unseen hand over which they have no control, and who've even gone so far as to curse the luck in public, to question the justice and to threaten to quit at the end of their original years, come what may. I don't think they'll do that latter when the showdown comes, even if they honestly think so now. But I think I can understand them better than some. No kid ever worked harder, prayed harder, and sacrificed personal good times more than I with the definite goal of college education in mind, and none ever saw it all knocked for a more complete loop.

I know what it means to stand in the middle of beautiful dreams wrecked and smashed so completely that the pile isn't ankle high, just a soldier, another guy with a rifle, two blankets and a shelter half to place on the ground, a tin dish to eat from, one possible death to die, and no future worth trying to calculate beyond the grisly job of killing more of the other side than they can kill of yours.

I had never been back to Devens until this past week. There's no particular reason. I've just never had any business of any sort in the place. I've been through Ayer and the surrounding towns any number of times, but nothing ever pulled me off the main highways that mile and a half to the site of my original soldiering.

The memory of the days there aren't bitter. In fact, some of them are friendly and even funny. Some of them are indelibly etched, as, for instance, the night when, without warning or preparation, we were suddenly ordered overseas. Even that didn't mean to me what it meant to some. My mother, who was all the family I had, was across all those unreachable miles down in Texas. I'd already told her good-bye at the steps of a train weeks before and had seen her stagger to the wall of the little depot and lean there sobbing as the train pulled away and she figured I couldn't see. And I was sorry I did see, for there'd been none of that. Her smile had been so brave and true and unflinching.

But I was a maverick—a stray—with this New England unit. Their loved ones were here. They had mothers and fathers, wives, children, sweethearts right here in the neighborhood. They had that hard good-bye ahead of them. This was it. This was war. We were going over into it. * * * As I was saying, there are things I remember about Devens, but none of them, somehow, ever pulled me back on a pilgrimage.

There's nothing in that mighty place now an original tenant can remember. There are not even any officers around who remember what the original place looked like. Those old tar-paper shacks we lived in are gone. Most of our type of soldiering has long since gone with them.

If I hadn't seen Edwards and Benning and Blanding and the rest, the shock would have been almost too much to take. Service clubs, sheets, air-conditioned barracks, paved roads, magnificent brick buildings, impressive quarters for the officers and their families, red leather upholstered cocktail lounges in the officers' clubs, radios, motor transportation, ice-cream cones, private telephone booths, and all the long list of the modern rest, including practically unlimited passes for week ends are something my Devens had next to nothing of.

I don't want to be one of those "now in my time" guys, for nothing is more boring and the retort-crippling is obvious, but I'd like to toss this one item in for the benefit of any modern Devensite who figures the present up there isn't as comfortable, perhaps, as the Waldorf-Astoria.

We originals were forced to get along in that place without any heat until, to the best of my memory, well after Thanksgiving Day. Maybe you don't know how close to elementals life can get when just one such item is missing. The camp was new. They were still building it. In fact, great crews of civilians were still stripping those hills and lining the level places with the countless rows of those unpainted plank barracks. In order even to walk in much of the place we soldiers cobbled duckboards together from the planking left over. But there wasn't even a stove in those big draughty squad rooms.

The heat was to be by steam pipes from a central plant in each barracks unit. They couldn't get them built and didn't get them built until well after hard freezes had locked that entire country in. We slept, whole regiments of us, in our full uniforms plus our overcoats, with the blankets on top. We washed up and shaved in cold water.

HEAT BROUGHT THRILL

Despite all the years that have intervened and of all those that went before, one of my most thrilling of all life's memories concerns the hour the heat was turned on in our part of Camp Devens. It was at exactly 11 o'clock of a cold, windless, thinly sun-shot late November morning. I think our lives as soldiers really began from that hour. I've been trying to remember back about the matter of morale.

Of course, the situation was altogether different. We were officially at war. The declaration had been made. I was only a kid and had no comprehensive grasp of international matters, but, as I remember it, and as I since have checked back over it, our entire Nation was pretty well unified on the subject. Contrary to the present situation wherein the President has bottled up all information, made all the moves in secret and has expected the Nation to be just as excited about the matter as he is, President Wilson had proceeded so cautiously and so openly that most of the Nation was urging him to slip the leash and let us go along before he actually did.

The general impression was that he wasn't deliberately and perhaps ill-advisedly throwing us into it so much as holding back overlong after our duty was plain. There were then, as now, some articulate isolationists, but then, unlike now, they received scant public encouragement. There was no "80 percent" in those times, unless it was an 80 percent that wanted to see the Kaiser and his ways blasted forever from the path of mankind.

It's a little ironic now to look back on the public hates of that era.

SITUATION DIFFERENT

Compared to Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, and the rest of those glorified guttersnipes, the poor old Kaiser, with his withered arm, his patent leather helmet, and his "Me und Gott" was practically a gentleman.

But, anyway, the public of that era was not so much behind as ahead of the President, compared to the present situation where much of it is behind and so far behind that it's being dragged against bitterly braced heels.

The issue was clearly defined, the gauntlet had been formally flung, the program was fight it out to a victorious finish, or fail, and surrender to tyranny.

There was at that time none of the current labor situation to form a strangling background. There were a few strikes and arguments, but they were speedily settled. There was no jurisdictional civil war between two armies of labor, complicating the age-old struggle between the workers and the companies. There was no situation such as the current one where the Federal Government had more or less turned industry over to labor, and to a labor strongly flavored with a cancerous thing such as communism openly consecrated to tearing apart the very form of government and way of life we were asked then and are asked now to form ranks to defend.

There had been no depression, comparable to the one of the 1930's. There had been no relief. We had had no Ku Klux Klan and Father Coughlin and John L. Lewis and General Pelley. We had had no 20 years of colleges teaching youth to look at all matters objectively. We had had no writers, publicists, and parsons denouncing sundry phases of what turned out to be a magnificent but futile sacrifice.

We'd had no war debts repudiated, no British journalists boasting how beautifully we took the bait of deliberately flavored propaganda; we hadn't been called Uncle Shylock by the French and English cartoonists, our tourists hadn't been stoned as yet in the streets of Paris for the high crime of being Americans. We had no American Legion as yet to be called a lot of drunken clowns, and no college kids who'd gone "like dumb, driven cattle."

SIDE LIGHT ON MORALE

Maybe morale, under those circumstances, wasn't much of a problem.

Yet I seem to remember that it all wasn't one vast symphony of sweetness and light. I remember a draftee in my own battery who came back from a furlough 3 days late, drunk, ugly, and obviously a murderer at heart. In fact, it later developed that he'd served time for murder and he was dishonorably discharged in view of his criminal record. But he made plenty of trouble this particular night, after giving an oration in no uncertain terms concerning what he thought of the Army and all its ways.

I myself—and I mean the writer—being the top sergeant of this particular outfit by now, finally cracked his skull with a home-made potato masher as big as a baseball bat. He had just lunged at the mess sergeant with a wicked-looking butcher knife in an argument over the food. He said he was speaking for the entire battery. So we had squawking over the chow in that Army, too. I saw it reach a definite attempt to commit murder in that other war. I haven't heard of it's reaching that pass anywhere yet in this one.

In fact, despite all the unity and the solidity of purpose behind that other Army, there were times and places when spirits drooped so low that only the most intelligent officers, resorting to something drastic, almost to the point of brutality, could pull them out of it and get them back on their toes.

I haven't got around to writing it, but it's been my private conviction all along in all the present discussion pro and con concerning this modern army's morale, that, if the football coaches of the Nation were commissioned en masse and turned loose among these soldiers, you'd have a different psychological complexion inside a month. Here are men who're accustomed to prescribing for just that particular ailment.

The greatest morale story I know or ever heard concerns the time the late Maj. Frank Cavanaugh took command of a certain surly outfit in France. I lack the space to tell it in detail here. But, briefly, the famous football coach was sent up into the lines to take over an outfit long overdue for relief, one that had been hammered pretty badly, had been living in the hell of rain, mud, and murder until it had lost all enthusiasm and much of its hope.

Previous officers had commiserated with it.

CAVANAUGH TELLS 'EM

Cav looked it over and started to browbeat it.

"You guys think you've had it tough," he said; "you don't know what tough is. Instead of getting out of here, I'm going to take you in there further. If you think you've been shot at before, you're going to get some real going over now. We're not over here to sit down and feel sorry for ourselves. We're here to fight a war. Some of us have got to get killed. We've got to move up there and knock those Germans loose. Don't tell me how sore your feet are nor how lousy you are. I don't care. We've got a job to do. Get those packs on and those guns in shape to go. We're moving in an hour, and I'm going to show you how tough an officer can be. You guys have really had it too soft.

Cav was promptly written down as "the most-hated man in the Army." Those soldiers cursed his everlasting soul, and some of them even said they hoped to God he got it first. But up they went, and into position they went. Shelter was scarce. In fact, it consisted of abandoned shelters, some of which had been built by the Germans in some previous and more successful phase of that sector's campaign, and which therefore faced the wrong way so far as current protection went.

The soldiers were so blindly angry for awhile that they failed to notice that Cav had assigned them all the best of the shelters and had taken the worst of the lot for himself—one of those open toward the fire of the enemy. It wasn't for some while that they noticed that when a number of their command were asked to expose themselves Cav was always out there with them. It took some time to figure that welcome, heart-warming, and fatigue-chasing rations of brandy coming up somehow from some French origin, since the Americans didn't issue any, had to be paid for by somebody, and that that somebody was unquestionably their hard-boiled major, "the most hated man in the Army," buying it out of his own pay as an officer.

Finally their dread mission was over. They'd done their job faithfully and brilliantly, and were pulled back to a rest area. But they went without Cav. For at last he got it, as some of them originally prayed he would. He got it right out in danger's path where somebody had to go, and he accepted the assignment himself.

BELATED CHEERS

They never saw the major as a unit again until years later here in Boston when they were holding a convention, but they'd had lots of time to think things over and to check up on certain things—those mysterious rations of brandy, for instance.

The indomitable major, wearing in his gruffly handsome face the scars of the shrapnel which eventually killed him, strode into the hall that day amidst an ovation that all but loosened the rafters. The thunder of it grew the closer they pushed him toward the stage.

At last he stood there facing the men who'd been the soldiers of that other bitter hour.

"If you think it made me happy," he said, "to act like a boor and a brute to a bunch of great soldiers up there in that l[illegible], you've got something to learn about what I carry in here," and he touched the jacket over his heart.

"You were sick. You were tired. You were wet. You were cold. You'd done your job like true men and true Americans. It wasn't your fault, nor mine, that the overdue relief hadn't been sent up to take over. You were rightfully angry over the entire situation. Nothing was right. Nothing could be right. And now they were asking you to go farther and do more.

"I felt that the best way to handle the situation was to give you something definite, finite and personal to center your hatred upon. If you could hate some one thing more, I felt you'd hate the whole job less. So I deliberately tried to pull your hatred loose from everything else and concentrate it upon myself.

"It seemed to work. For that I was and am thankful. But I want you to know that even as I abused and bullied, in my heart I saluted you as the heroes you already were and continued to be, and I so doubly salute you now."

That they literally swept the old football coach off the stage and on to their shoulders belongs in the story, perhaps, as part of the story, but the main message is that there were problems of morale that had to be met in that war as well, and that there occasionally was some genius with what it took to give them grace.

So far as this new journey back to Devens is concerned, I seemed to find vindication of a very real sort for what has been said in previous articles in this space concerning morale. My thesis has been that most of the trouble to date has been caused by the positive boredom of pointless camp life. Either because industry, has not been producing, or because what it has been producing has been diverted to foreign hands, our soldiers have been without equipment and our alleged Army without any real training, with the result that the pointlessness of the entire program has caused unrest and even mental rebellion.

From all parts of the country, corroborative letters came in a flood.

But the clinching proof seems to be currently upon display in Fort Devens. There the better part of some 40,000 troops are currently engaging in field maneuvers that come as close to simulating actual war as can be done without shooting and killing. The troops involved, chancing to be high on the Army priority list, are almost completely equipped.

The Twenty-sixth Division, now completely armed except for one type of weapon, is one of the units. The First Division is fully equipped. Others moving in from other camps for the games are outfitted with the type of gear they would use in actual warfare. In these games, they are actually using this equipment. They're studying something, experiencing something, learning something, accomplishing something.

The report from all quarters is that their morale is high, not only that but that it's higher than it's been.

I believe it's high, because I talked with a lot of the young men and watched plenty of others. They seemed to be keen, alert, interested, and in the best of spirits. It's a new experience, for the Twenty-sixth, say, to be living in tents. It breaks the monotony of barracks life. They're getting a kick out of it.

THRILL IN GAMES

It's a new experience to pull out in the middle of the night, to have breakfast at 3:30 a. m., and go stealing through the woods, as they would in a surprise attack, to try to catch a command post or a company of infantry asleep. There's something to do, working those short wave radio sets, camouflaging a gun from the planes overhead, bridging a river, or racing machine gun equipment across some farmer's field to command a road down which some company of "the enemy" is sure to pass.

Naturally, they can't shoot and kill anybody, and umpires have to figure out which side seems to have outsmarted the other, but that's about as close as we can come to training in this country, where we haven't a Spanish revolution convenient enough actually to try the real McCoy.

But here's a bunch of soldiers who really seem to be interested. The guardhouses aren't bulging with prisoners. Nobody's talking about deserting. Every officer from General Truesdell down to the lowliest lieutenant said morale was of the best, and everyone had some incident or incidents to prove it.

They told, for instance, how a detachment of the One Hundred and Eighty-first Cavalry was told by an officer, "We can either make camp here for the night, or we can hitch up and make a flanking attack, away up around this way," and he showed them on the map.

"Let's go," said the soldiers, "we'd rather ride than sit around."

So they hitched up their trucks, loaded their weapons, and made an 80-mile swing around up through the southern edge of New Hampshire that took them most of the night, and they wound up by theoretically capturing a general.

I saw a lot of all branches freshly back in camp or just arriving in camp from 3 and 4 days in the field. They looked hard, lean, healthy, and sunburned. Some were shaving, bathing, even washing their clothes. Others were grabbing an hour's sleep under canvas. Nobody looked mad, nor exhausted, nor down in the dumps.

General Eckfeldt said, so far as he knew, nobody in his outfit ever heard of that alleged organization of 1-year-and-no-more troopers whose slogan and high sign is "Ohio," meaning over the hill in October, until it was written up in that picture magazine.

"OHIO" A GOOD GAG

Now, he said, the word has become slang in the outfit, or possibly a replacement for profanity. If a soldier's girl doesn't write him, his tent falls down, he drops a rock on his toe, or if he just wants to yell something, he lets go with "Ohio." Maybe some brother in distress will answer his yodel from the other end of the camp. But it's handled in the manner of a gag.

Countering "Ohio," however, the One Hundred and First Infantry has come up with the battle cry "Iowa." Iowa is supposed to mean "In October we attack."

General Truesdell told me the Negro troops engaged in the current games at Devens pitched in with such enthusiasm that they had to be piped down a little. It seems part of their chore at one stage was felling trees and dropping them in such a way that the progress of tanks would be blocked. They fell to with such a will and were dropping such whoppers that civilian traffic bade fair to be tied up as far as Quebec. They had to be asked to take it a little easier.

The problem of morale is far from settled. The public has little awareness of any war crisis yet, and General Lear, of yoo-hoo fame, was right when he said the soldier only reflects the morale of the civilian home and group he comes from. But a look at Devens in these times seems to prove that a busy soldier is an interested soldier. Give him something to do and a feeling that he really belongs in a pattern and isn't just a glorified loafer and he'll get in and pitch.

So the cry still is, "Arm this Army."

Give 'em guns or let 'em go.

They're worse than useless doing nothing; they're a pretty handsome looking crowd when they're interested in something.

The Devens of my day is gone with the years, but the Devens of the present hour holds a message for all America. It's too bad that those with the job of trying to get us prepared can't spend even a brief visit with both types of soldiers. The one doing nothing is the Ohio bait.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the other time the British forces invaded our Capitol they burned it.

Strutting with chips on our shoulders near other lands is dangerous, and certainly un-American.

The little business man is looking reverently to W. P. A. as priorities bear down upon him.

The fact that defensive waters is not specific helps prove that we want to run the world.

It is my judgment we are only bluffing yet, and that the Navy has not been ordered to shoot.

The people of my district seriously fear a military dictatorship here more than an invasion by Hitler.

Churchill has been satisfied with half the earth, but there are two others who would each like to rule it all.

Those agreeing with our present foreign policy should be jailed if they complain or flinch at any tax bill.

The lay mind of America knows that freedom of the seas never meant the carrying of contraband to a belligerent.

We actually heard an officer in Quartermasters at Fort Leavenworth reduce a flower bill from $17.50 to $5.

The Supreme Court is a political confession and the Congress a studied avoidance in the plea of a one-man preservation of democracy.

We need a Newell Dwight Hillis depicting Belgian atrocities to make the people really war crazy. Navy paid ads, aluminum piles left in the street, and "rattlesnakes" have not done the job.

The Legion Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 19, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Friday, September 19, 1941, entitled "The Legion Speaks":

[From the New York Times of September 19, 1941]

THE LEGION SPEAKS

The American Legion's 1,000,000 members have not been noted for grinding any ax but their own. Drawn impartially from all the various social and economic strata of the Nation, they are representative of no particular section, political party, or special interest. One thing they have in common—that nearly a quarter of a century ago they all wore their country's uniform. Otherwise the Legion is about as good a cross-section of American opinion, with all its confusion, contradictions, and paradoxes, as can be found. These are facts which should be noted by Axis statesmen trying to weigh from afar the temper of the people of the United States.

Meeting in Chicago in 1939, soon after the present war began, a Legion convention favored strict neutrality but left it to the President and Congress to decide whether the arms embargo should be repealed. That was in the days before the Nazis had shown their contempt for neutral rights. A year later, by the time the second wartime convention of the Legion met at Boston, the neutrality of Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium had been violated; France had fallen before the Nazi onslaught, and Great Britain, fighting alone, was reeling under the brutal blows of Goering's Luftwaffe. To the delegates at Boston it was so clear that neutrality was in itself no guaranty against attack that they declared themselves wholeheartedly in favor of giving Great Britain all possible aid against the aggressor nations, which they outspokenly condemned.

In convention at Milwaukee in this third year of the war the Legion has gone further. Endorsing President Roosevelt's foreign policy, the Legion's delegates declare that the defeat of Adolf Hitler and all he stands for is the primary national objective. In addition, they call for immediate repeal of the outworn but hampering Neutrality Act and the removal of all geographical limitations on the movement of United States troops.

These are old soldiers speaking. They know from first-hand experience the horror and suffering that war brings in its wake. None has greater cause than they to be disillusioned with the victory and the peace they won. Yet they have demonstrated once more their ability to see the issue clearly and unflinchingly. They insist that the country be strong enough, and its President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, free enough to "meet any possible attack before it arrives and turn the enemy back so that our homes remain intact and our families secure." That is realistic thinking, and it reflects the growing conviction of people everywhere in this broad land that active rather than passive defense is essential to our national safety and well-being.

Are Citizens for Economy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 19, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE JANESVILLE (WIS.) GAZETTE

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, the most important thing before the American people at the present time is the subject of taxation and the most important subject before Congress is to cut down the appropriations for nondefense spending in the United States. One of the daily newspapers in Wisconsin, the Janesville Gazette, in its issue of September 17, carried an editorial entitled "Are Citizens for Economy?" Under leave to extend my remarks I include it, as follows:

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette of September 17, 1941]

ARE CITIZENS FOR ECONOMY?

Senator BYRD's resolution calling for submission by the Bureau of the Budget of revised estimates calling for savings of (a) $1,000,000,000; (b) one and one-half billion dollars; and (c) $2,000,000,000, in nondefense expenditures, has won widespread public acclaim.

Thus far, however, the economy movement is only a noble gesture. Whether it will become anything more depends entirely upon citizens, and this means the citizens of Janesville and southern Wisconsin as well as those elsewhere.

Congress will not economize unless or until there is a public demand for economy, voiced loudly and vigorously.

What is the next step? And what can you do?

Here is the answer: Tell your Congressman you want him to support the tax-bill amendment proposing appointment of a committee of 14 members from House and

Senate standing committees, calling for an investigation of public expenditures.

Experience warns that Congress is wary of Budget probes. The House blocked an exploratory proposal in January 1940, after it had been approved by the Senate, arguing that it infringed constitutional rights of House Members. Some similar subterfuge can be expected to block the economy group this session unless public demand shows Congress the wisdom of digging deeply and sincerely in the field of economies.

The most skillful, determined management of Federal finances is as essential as price fixing, consumer credit control, and priorities regulation, to check inflation. Only by effecting every possible economy in public expenditures can Congress do its full part. A thorough investigation of Federal expenditures is the necessary first step.

Resolution of Kiwanis District of Minnesota and the Dakotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 19, 1941

LETTER FROM SECRETARY OF THE KIWANIS DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA AND THE DAKOTAS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

DULUTH, MINN., *September 5, 1941.*

To the Members of Congress representing the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

HONORED SIRS: As secretary of the Kiwanis District of Minnesota and the Dakotas, Kiwanis International, I have been instructed to forward to you the following resolution approved and adopted by the delegates of Kiwanis Clubs in the above-named States in convention assembled at Mitchell, S. Dak., August 19, 1941:

RESOLUTION

"This highly instructive, entertaining, and inspiring convention—the twenty-fourth annual convention of the Minnesota-Dakotas district of Kiwanis International—has been held during a great national emergency, in the midst of a world torn with the chaos of war, the repercussions of which have shaken the earth and threatened the peace, security, and freedom of every land. In this dangerous and tragic period our convention theme has been, 'Citizenship responsibility and international understanding,' two fundamentals of Kiwanis International, and our entire program has been wisely attuned to these basic Kiwanis principles.

"Keenly aware that the needs of the times present a stern challenge to the loyalty, usefulness, and patriotism of our citizens, and to the capacity of our democracy to successfully meet and overthrow those forces of destruction which strike at its foundations it is resolved that as Kiwanians we have a solemn obligation to actively, aggressively, and effectively support and assist our Government in providing an adequate national defense, in protecting and securing our constitutional processes and in guaranteeing the safety of the North American Continent, and we appeal to our fellow Americans everywhere to place service to our country above every other consideration in order that this patriotic objective may be accomplished.

"As a primary aspect of our citizenship responsibility we recognize the growing importance of a broader understanding of our international relations and of the grave responsibility which result from these relationships in this world crisis. Realizing that fateful decisions are impending, which will profoundly affect our country's relations with other nations—decisions which may mean war or peace—we urge our citizens to take an increased interest in and develop a deeper understanding of those problems which arise from and are involved in our international relations—that through a correct and sympathetic understanding of such problems we may aid our Government in adopting and carrying out sound and constructive policies in the field of international relations.

"Kiwanis International is a form of international citizenship, a fraternal union of American and Canadian citizenship, conceived in a spirit of international friendship and mutual understanding and dedicated to the protection and advancement of those ideals of human liberty common to Americans and Canadians alike. Conscious as we are of the great burdens which have been placed on our Canadian brothers through the exigencies of war and of the gallant effort daily being made by them to sustain their national ideals and to preserve their free institution, we welcome this opportunity to renew our expressions of friendship for them and extend to them our sincere and cordial greetings.

"In this connection we have observed with satisfaction the policy of our Government to make its plans for defense on a continental rather than on a national scale, and to cooperate with the Dominion of Canada in the joint defense of the North American Continent. We note with approval that the President of the United States has recently made an agreement with Canada, subject to the ratification of Congress, for the joint development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway—a great navigation and power project, which, for more than 20 years, has had the unwavering support of the people of Minnesota and the Dakotas. We recognize that the early completion of this great navigation and power project will not only bring ocean commerce to the Northwest, make the city of Duluth an ocean port, open the Great Lakes area to shipbuilding and other essential defense industries, but it will also add immeasurably to the economic strength of the entire continent and will produce a spirit of unity between the United States and Canada heretofore unattainable: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we recommend the early adoption by Congress of the necessary enabling legislation to carry this international project to completion, and that the secretary transmit copies of this resolution to the Members of Congress and Senators in this Kiwanis district."

Very truly yours,

R. ARMISTEAD GRADY,
Secretary, District of Minnesota and the Dakotas Kiwanis International.

What of the Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in order that Members of Congress may be informed as to how the priorities program is affecting small business, I desire to submit for the RECORD a communication recently received from a prominent small business man in Minneapolis. The experience of this gentleman has been the experience of many other American small businessmen. Those who have not already been put out of business are apprehensive over what the immediate future may have in store for them.

Is the Government requisitioning material in larger quantities than is actually needed for defense purposes? It is daily being charged that such is the case, hence it would seem that the time is opportune for the appointment of a congressional fact-finding committee.

The communication above referred to follows:

AUGUST 26, 1941.

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have just returned from a trip through the East, visiting several of the manufacturers who supply us with the office and school furniture and equipment that we sell. The purpose of my trip was to obtain merchandise in order that we may continue in business and make it possible for our salesmen to have something to sell next year and our customers to be able to operate their businesses and their schools efficiently.

You know the conditions that I found in practically every factory I called on, particularly those who use steel and other metals in the fabrication of their products.

Personally, I am very much in sympathy with any reasonable plan to render all of the support in the way of materials and supplies that are needed to help England and her allies come out of this war victorious. On the other hand, who is going to pay these expenses if it isn't the businessmen of the country, whether they are operating large, medium, or small businesses? We can't make any money with which to pay our taxes if our source of supply shuts down on us because the Government selfishly controls the raw-materials markets. It is just as important that our people remain employed by a stable, going business as it is that England and Russia get our machinery and materials along with the requirements of our own Navy and War Departments in such exclusive amounts.

I am of that group that believes that there are sufficient raw materials and resources in this country to take care of defense demands and the demands of private industry as well, if the proper allocations are made. I also believe that it is quite as important to have somebody in Washington with the knowledge and ability to check up on the requisitions made by the Navy and War Departments and to determine their actual needs as to have a lot of our best-informed businessmen making use of their experience in aiding the Government to obtain these things through the O. P. M. I have never felt that the demands made by the various governmental departments in time of war were soundly estimated and I don't believe that any businessman could afford to allow his purchasing department to spend his money without having a much more accurate check on the requirements than I have seen evidenced by the Government.

After all, we are not at war, nevertheless, we are spending many times what we did when we were at war the last time and we didn't experience the trouble that we are already up against now even though we were confronted with the matter of sending an expeditionary force out of the country.

Why can't Congress be sane about this situation and look at it through the eyes of the people who have to pay the bills and of the businessmen who have to keep the country on a going basis? It would seem to

me that it is pretty sound reasoning to give consideration to those people who you know pay their bills rather than these foreign purchasing commissions who look down their noses at America with little or no prospect of paying their old accounts or their new ones either.

The all-determining factor as to whether you can get products made from metals seems to be that you have a defense contract. Only a limited number of businesses can qualify and under this plan a much larger number of persons will be injured than aided.

I should be very glad to have an expression as to your attitude on the subject of allocation of the materials used in the defense program.

Yours very truly.

The Legion Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 19, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Friday, September 19, 1941, entitled "The Legion Speaks":

[From the New York Herald Tribune of September 19, 1941]

THE LEGION SPEAKS

The American Legion's unequivocal declaration for the defeat of Hitler, its endorsement of present foreign policy, its call for the repeal of the Neutrality Act and the puerile geographical restrictions upon the employment of the armed forces, and its rejection of a report opposing lend-lease aid to Russia are strikingly indicative not of any change of heart among Americans but of the new conclusions to which they are being driven by the inescapable impact of events.

The Legionnaires' memories of the last war had given a great many of them, through the peacetime years, a strongly isolationist attitude toward any new one. At the annual convention 2 years ago, held just after the outbreak of the new struggle and while Congress was debating the repeal of the Neutrality Act arms embargo, there was so strong a sentiment against repeal of the embargo that the Legion sidestepped the question altogether. It gave thunderous cheers to a rip-roaring speech from Gen. Hugh Johnson on the "never again" theme and voted a resolution calling for a strict neutrality.

General Johnson is still ringing the changes on the same theme. But even a year ago the Legion was already realizing its inadequacy to the realities of the times, and the 1940 convention went on record as believing that sound national defense demanded the giving of "all practicable aid to Great Britain and those allied with her in their fight for freedom." Today the Legion fully recognizes the logic both of facts and of its own position. Between the call for strict neutrality in 1939 and the demand in 1941 for the repeal of the Neutrality Act and the defeat of Hitler there yawns a wide chasm. But it is not a chasm of principle, purpose, or patriotic devotion; in these things the Legion remains constant. It is the irrefutable evidence of events which has changed the application of the principles and made policies which could seem appropriate in 1939 no longer tenable. The Legion is to be congratulated on the realism with which it has met the actual facts of 1941.

We Defend Our Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 22, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able and patriotic address delivered by the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] on September 20, before the convention of North Carolina Young Democratic Clubs at Winston-Salem, N. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two years ago, at the instance of the President, the Congress was setting about to define the position of our country in view of the war in Europe. We did not then consider that it was a world war. We determined upon a position of absolute neutrality. We demanded that such munitions of war as should be bought here for account of nations at war should be paid for in cash, that title be vested here in the purchasers, and we should assume no risk of delivery; that no ship of our registry or flag should enter any belligerent port, or even any zone of combat or danger, to be defined by the President. Taking our lesson from the events that involved us in the World War, we solemnly resolved upon a course calculated to save us from a second such experience.

In June 1940—10 months after the war began—the President solemnly warned the Congress and the country that the security of the New World, of this country and its people, was in peril, and we began with all possible haste the preparation of our defenses upon the greatest scale in our history—the building of a two-ocean navy, the acquisition and fortification of island and coastal ramparts, the conversion of our industrial institutions into munitions factories, the training of armed forces, and the building of merchant ships. This was the second phase of our reaction to Hitler's proposed world revolution, and to the amazing progress he had made.

Sixteen months after the war began, that is, in March 1941, we authorized, again under the President's leadership, and instituted the program of all-out aid to Britain and other nations resisting the Axis Powers, under the Lease-Lend Act, a plain policy of intervention, but not war.

Altogether we have set up a program calling for the expenditure of $50,000,000,000—about one-seventh of the total wealth of this country—for home defense and foreign aid.

And now, just 2 years after the war began, the President has announced his orders to the Navy to fire upon craft of the Axis Powers operating in waters considered strategic to our defense, not a shooting war if the Axis keeps off, but a shooting war otherwise. This he solemnly declares to be necessary to the defense of the security of our country.

Our policy of October 1939 was a policy of strict neutrality. Our policy of 1940 was strictly a home-defense preparation policy. Our policy of March 1941 was a policy of intervention for defense. Our policy of September 1941 is a policy of conditional action on our own part as necessary to our defense, let the consequences be whatever the Axis Powers by action may determine.

A review of the facts of the history of these 2 years is necessary to explain, first, the reversal of the policy of neutrality, then the adoption of the policy of intense preparation for defense, thereafter intervention for defense, and now active shooting defense in strategic zones—four progressive phases of one policy—the policy of preserving the security of the American people, their homes, their personal safety, their Republic, their standards of life.

There was excellent prospect that the United States would be able to escape responsibility in the war until the German Army overran Norway, Denmark, and Holland, took control of the Baltic Sea, conquered Belgium, and occupied the eastern coasts of the English Channel, less than 30 miles from the ports of England, took the Maginot line, and crushed France and her great army. But those events not only gave the Axis, at that time in league with Russia, the control of Europe; they not only placed the Axis in position to conquer England and control the Atlantic and Mediterranean Sea; they also placed the Germans in position to take over Africa and to enable Japan to take China and southern Asia and the Pacific Ocean from Hawaii west. There was at the same time amazing demonstration of the might of the German armies. All that stood between the Germans and this conquest without parallel in human history was the British Isles, the British Commonwealth of Nations, and the British Fleet. And Britain was in no condition to defend or prolong the war without material aid from us. Hitler had declared that such conquest was his purpose; he aimed at nothing less than world dominion; and under world dominion, a world slavery under the German conception of the state as everything, the individual nothing, and amongst states the German state over all by force.

The United States could not take the risk of such circumstances. The odds were that without our aid Hitler would triumph over Britain within 5 months, and that we would be left to resist him and his allies alone, unready and probably unable to resist.

It may be granted for the argument's sake that we could even under the circumstances of a year ago, have successfully resisted invasion; but it cannot be argued that without Britain and the British Fleet we could have prevented Germany and Japan from taking over all the world other than our North American Continent. Nor may it be contended that in this event the security of the United States and every man and women here would not be gravely involved. For neither the United States nor its people could hope to exist encircled by the totalitarian powers. Under such conditions national disintegration would be inevitable, and the threat of invasion would hang over us day and night, not for months, but for unnumbered decades. We would deal with the rest of the world on Axis terms. We would inevitably become a subordinate nation. Nor may it be contended, that any sort of peace could be made;

for both Germany and Japan had not only given notice of their design to divide the world between themselves but had demonstrated that their treaties mean nothing to them, and that the only power they recognize is the power of superior force.

It was necessary, therefore, not only that the United States should arm and prepare her defenses but also that she should intervene with material aid before it was too late—that she should arm and intervene even though the Axis Powers should make war upon us. The new policy was nothing more nor less than the policy of prudence, of necessity, of defending and preserving the security of our country and its people, dictated by events. Critics of the President have not deterred him, and notwithstanding a general American aversion to war and love of peace, he has the support and gratitude of the vast majority of the people—and richly does he deserve it. A weaker leadership would have put this Republic in jeopardy in the gravest degree.

We have come in recent weeks to a new phase of the war and a new stage in our policy. Since Hitler has invaded Russia there is new hope that he may be defeated on the continent, for to avoid defeat he must crush the great Russian Army within a year. For him a stalemate is defeat. That Russia may have every encouragement and every advantage we may give ought to go without question. The Russian resistance is a deterrent to Japan and an encouragement to the invaded peoples. It holds the possibility of ending the menace of our involvement as a belligerent, for unless Hitler shall destroy the Russian Army there will be no need of armed intervention by the United States; there will be no chance of an invasion of England—he will have either on his front or at his back the innumerable army of a great continental country. Assistance to Russia with planes, guns, tanks, and explosives is likely to be worth 10 times all it may cost, whatever the price.

In this aid we will not be condoning communism but defending the security of the democracy of our Republic. We aid Britain, we aid China, we aid Russia, not on their account but as the means of keeping war out of the New World, if possible, as the means of gaining time for our defenses, when and if necessary, in building a two-ocean Navy, of fortifying our island ramparts, of expanding our Army and increasing our productive power as the means of breaking down the Axis scheme of world-wide totalitarian dominion, and as the means of victory if in the will of God we must undergo the ordeal of battle.

We must suppress the Communist in our land, but we have no concern as to the character of the Russian Government. When I see a Russian shooting a mad dog I raise no question as to his culture or his politics. I wish him to kill the mad dog and am glad to give him a gun.

We have reached the stage in which we must, in the interest of our own security, not only freely supply the means of resistance to the nations resisting Hitler and his allies, but also must see to it that that aid reaches its destination. There are open to us yet ways and means of doing this without inviting attack upon us as a belligerent. But if the Axis threatens us with war on this account, the threat, or its execution, will not deter us; and we will then not stop short until the submarines of the Axis are all rotting on the ocean floor, and all the seas are free for the flag of our country and the forces of civilization. If the Axis shall invite this, then this is what the Axis will get. For the United States will defend her people in her own way, as necessity may demand, let the consequences be whatever they may.

It was an ancient Roman who gave the watchword to his people, Carthago delenda est—Carthage must be destroyed. Two thousand years later we have a similar watchword, given to us by our President—Hitler must be destroyed. There can be no security, there can be no peace, there can be no treaties, there can be no progress, there can be no civilization, there can be no democracy, so long as he is at large in the earth. Germany may have him; but when Germany is led by him to attack all that is dear to mankind, and to jeopardize the security of our Republic, then Germany must pay the price of the civilized world's resistance, including our Republic, to the uttermost.

At the moment, we may say that the Axis has received solemn warning to keep out of all waters and air from Greenland and Iceland to the South Arctic—all waters and air on the western side of the Atlantic Ocean; and it has received notice that if it fails to heed this warning there will be shooting, and shooting to kill with all its implications. At the same time it has received notice of the purpose of the United States to aid to the extent of its power with arms, explosives, ships, guns, food, tanks, and planes the nations attacked by and resisting the Axis, with the avowed purpose of defeating its leader, destroying his power, and ending the menace of his proposed world order to ourselves and all nations.

The theory of our course is simply stated. We regard Hitler and the totalitarian Axis as a threat to the security of the people of the United States. We propose, therefore, two courses, one to prepare to defend at home, the other to help, with all material means, other nations to defeat and destroy Germany and her allies wherever there may be opportunity We deliverately calculate that should Hitler win in Europe, this country would be next. And therefore, while preparing against that event, we propose to do all we can to delay and, if possible, to stop him where he is. To those who advise that we prepare and do no more until we have to resist him alone, we answer that we shall not only prepare but will help prepare any other who stands in Hitler's way—that this is the only safe policy to pursue; that this policy, risky as it is, is far more calculated to preserve peace than any other, and if it shall fail to preserve peace it is the only policy that will make possible our victory in war, if and when war shall come. We are taking two chances instead of one—the first, the chance of stopping him where he is, the second, the chance of finishing him when and if he shall come this way.

Before the President announced the new policy September 11, Hitler might have brought on a state of war any time by attacking ships under our flag. He had attacked two—one a merchantman in the South Atlantic, the other a naval destroyer. Such attacks must, he knew, lead to open hostilities. The difference now is only that he has formal notice—a broad and general line is drawn, and if beyond that line an Axis war vessel or plane shall be seen by a United States Navy vessel or bomber, it will at once be attacked. But if the Axis shall confine its operations to other portions of the seas, there is at least negative assurance that immediate attack will not be made. It is notice to Hitler to stay out of the orbit of our Republic's necessray defense. What he shall do is for him to decide. He knows precisely what we will do. He must stay out of our yard—front and back.

Such is the situation. But it may be asked, if the Axis is induced by this necessary course for the defense of our security to declare war or to proceed to disregard this warning, will not our young men have to go? Millions of Americans are willing to give material aid, millions are willing to support measures necessary to deliver that aid in the ports of the resisting powers, some are willing even now that our Navy shall make war, but none of us can look with less than horror upon the possibility of sending our young men into foreign lands as soldiers in battle line.

I must resist the temptation to say that this is not within the possibilities. I must frankly concede that war is not an engagement of limited liability. I must concede that once in a war, we must do whatever may be necessary to win it, and that the counsels of the military authorities will outweigh civilian preferences. For defeat in war is worse than war. But I do not think that it is likely, if we shall do our duty by way of delivering all necessary material aid to nations resisting the Axis Powers, that we will be called upon to send forth expeditionary armies to the Old World. We have engaged in the Selective Service Act that those trained under it shall not be sent beyond the Western Hemisphere. The Congress will not lightly repeal that provision. It is not likely that ships sufficient to send a million men abroad will be available within 18 months, if then. It is far more reasonable to assume that every ton of cargo space will be needed for food and arms. It is well within the possibilities that the great supplies we are soon to have ready will be needed far more than our soldiers, and it is not beyond possibility that within 18 months the Germans will realize that Hitler's ambitious designs were beyond him and them, and that his sun will set in some abandoned isle, if not in a fate far worse. Sooner or later morale will crack somewhere—and it must not be in Britain, nor shall it be in the United States of America.

I know that eminent British generals have said that our young men are needed in Europe, Asia, and Africa; that the Prime Minister of England has recently said that the United States ought to come into the war in all fields. I do not question their judgment or their right to speak to their peoples; but I do question their right to say what the policy of our country should be. American citizens must frame and determine the American policy, and in the interest of America that policy must derive from the plain necessities of our own security. We will not encourage Japan or Germany with assurances that once in the war we will not fight with all we have and never cease until the victory is ours. For so to encourage them is only to invite them to proceed to war on us. Nor would I encourage British, Chinese, or Russians to think that our policy is more for their interest than it is for ours, or that they have the right directly or indirectly to affect our policy. Our Republic acts solely for its people, in their interest and by their will.

Let us hope that we may yet escape the ordeal of war, that at worst we shall not send our sons beyond our New World. And in the interest of this hope let us see to it that the nations under the attack of the Axis and at war shall receive al ithe aid in guns, tanks, planes, explosives, and food of which we are capable, cost what it may. Until this policy shall have been proved insufficient, we can well afford to defer further alteration until we have the light of events yet to come. Germany and Japan desire to keep our Republic out of the war as long as possible. Britain and Russia would, it sometimes seems, have us in at once. Let us give notice to all concerned, to friends and enemies, that our Republic will act solely in its own interest and of its own counsel, and further that when we act it will be the act of a great united people, sure of their cause and of themselves—ready to pay the price of victory, whatsoever it may be.

To those who may inquire as to the reason for our policy, now or in the future, the answer is that the course our Government has pursued was and is necessary to the

preservation of the security of the people of the United States.

To those who complain of the cost of this policy, of the hardship and impoverishment it implies, the answer is, "Security comes before prosperity."

To those who complain that this policy may mean war we answer, "Security comes before peace."

To those who suggest that we are giving too much power to our Government, we reply, "It is better to give power to our own Republic than to yield to the power of a foreign nation and an alien dictator."

To those who are fearful that we may surrender our liberties, we answer, "It is better to waive for a season our liberties to our own Government than to risk the permanent loss of them to foreign powers."

The safety of the people is the supreme law. That safety we have preserved, and we will preserve it by means of our own Government, in our own hands, and responsible to us. It is strong, thank God, and we will make it stronger as necessity may demand. We propose to take every step necessary to the safety of our Republic, of constitutional democracy, and the 140,000,000 people in whom and for whom and by whose will it exists.

We may safely say that our policy has so far been fully justified and is approved by the vast majority of our people. We have been spared for 2 years the ordeal of war. We have prepared our defenses to an extent sufficient greatly to increase our assurances of security. We have prevented the crushing of Great Britain, and we may argue that our course has been calculated to turn Hitler eastward, where now winter and snow and a great army await him, and destruction may overtake him. We have done much to improve the solidarity of the New World opposition to the Axis. And there is evidence that Japan is reconsidering her course, and the theatening situation in the Far East is visibly improved. Altogether we may give the President what he deserves—full credit for a wise, an alert, a bold, and a successful leadership and conduct of our affairs through one of the most difficult situations in our history.

As for those who have opposed this program, we may suggest that they consider what would have been our country's plight, had we yielded to their demands and declined to build up our defenses, declined to assure Britain when her funds were exhausted and her back to the wall, declined to notify the Axis that we were resisting and would resist to the uttermost. Men do not aprpeciate what they escape, but it is not saying too much to suggest that if the pacifists and isolationists could have had their way, this Republic might have been in war months ago, and at this moment struggling desperately and against terrible odds with the Axis Powers, and struggling singlehanded and alone, unready and unarmed.

We are far more prepared now than when we entered the World War, and our preparations are only at the end of the introductory stage. From now on equipment of all sorts will be produced at an amazing rate. Plants, machines, and workers are ready to go forward in intense production. We needed time, and time has been gained. Britain needed time, and time has been provided. Hitler had no time to lose, but he has lost a year in time and at least 2 years in men and arms. These facts further attest the wisdom of the American policy, for the time lost by Hitler and gained by Britain and the United States may be attributed in no small degree to the American policy as led by the President.

We have had our divisions and discussions, as well becomes a Republic of free men. We have had our confusions and delays, which are necessary manifestations of governments in the democratic form. We are yet to have similar manifestations.

The interruptions of necessary defense production by strikes notwithstanding sound provisions made for just arbitration has discouraged us. But over against this the general rank and file of the workers has made a record worthy of their country. The misguided leaders responsible for strikes against the defense of the country and its workers will yet realize that their stake and labor's stake in this historic world revolution is greater than that of any others. Let them but consider that Hitler recently put an end to a strike in Norway by standing the labor leaders before a firing squad.

We may be well assured that as the tests come, the American Republic, its institutions and its people, will meet those tests. We are here to prove to all men everywhere that freedom is better than slavery; that our constitutional democracy is stronger than any sort of totalitarianism; that men live better, behave better and fight better under liberty than under force; and when we shall have finished we will have demonstrated to mankind our worthiness to lead the race for 1,000 years to come—not after the manner of the dictators, but after the manner of and by reason of the inspiration of a republic of free men working out their destiny under constitutional democracy. The light of our liberty will be brighter than ever, and the place of our Republic amongst the nations will be higher than that of any nation in all the story of mankind.

Addresses Fifty-fifth Annual Convention of Iowa Bankers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 22, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, several days ago I had the privilege and pleasure and honor of delivering an address before the fifty-fifth annual convention of the Iowa Bankers' Association. It was a great pleasure and a great privilege to find myself in the State which gave birth to one of our great Americans, the Vice President of the United States, Mr. HENRY A. WALLACE. I ask unanimous consent to have this address published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Iowa Bankers' Association, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am indeed delighted to be afforded the opportunity of appearing before your organization this morning on the occasion of your fifty-fifth annual convention. I am always happy when I am permitted to visit that section of our great country which we in the South refer to as the West because I feel that the people of the West and those of the South have more in common, in all probability, than other sections of the United States. The South is noted for its hospitality. I have always found that hospitality as warm and as genuine in the West as it is in the South.

Yours is a great State. I have visited it before. Fact is, I spoke in Des Moines several years ago before the Moose, of which organization I was national commander of the Legion. I was tremendously impressed with your Commonwealth. I am told that you breed here more Belgian horses than are bred in Belgium, and more percheron horses than are raised in France; that you produce more poultry than any other State, and that pork is one of your main products, in fact, that you lead in its production. But, above all, you have the highest percentage of literacy attained by any State of the Union.

Iowa is fortunate in being so ably represented in the Government of this country. I speak particularly of my intimates, your very fine senior Senator GUY GILLETTE, and that excellent gentleman, CLYDE HERRING. Both are unusually fine men. Both are popular in the upper House of the Congress of the United States. Then there is your own HENRY WALLACE, our smiling Vice President. He is indeed, with the Members of the United States Senate, a most popular individual. Everybody likes him. He is making an unusually fine President of the Senate. In WALLACE, GILLETTE, and HERRING you have three men of outstanding character and of whom, I am sure, you are proud. I like them all immensely, and am deeply appreciative of their friendship.

There are times when we differ, but we respect one another's difference of opinion, and may I add that we should hope for a continuation of these clashings of ideas, based upon sincere convictions, because debates pertaining to national questions really go to strengthen a democracy rather than to weaken it. There is just one thing in reference to this that I should like to mention, and that is the suggestion that we should, as American citizens, all interested in the same final objectives, learn to differ in a more friendly and tolerant manner.

I am indeed glad to be here this morning and to have the opportunity to address this distinguished gathering on the question, What is going to happen to business at the end of the war?

This is indeed a momentous question and I only wish I had the psychic power to be able to foretell today as to just what is in store for business at the end of the war, in fact, for our country at the conclusion of this World War No. 2, in which I pray we shall not become physically involved.

While I am not possessed of any psychic powers, I do feel that we are in a position to make certain statements and predictions as to what the future holds in store for us, basing the same on events, situations, and circumstances surrounding us today.

Any discussion of a subject or subjects having to do with the future of our Government or the future of business, our future, the future of the American people, would have to be approached from the angle of national debt, taxation, and unemployment; and for the present at least, in speaking of national debt and taxes, one must also refer to our national-defense program.

First, as to our national debt and taxes. At this time our national debt has passed the $50,000,000,000 mark of actual expenditures, while vast sums in addition have been appropriated, to be paid out of the Treasury later as defense work is completed.

Recent figures show that the lend-lease cost, plus other appropriations and authorizations, will raise the expenditure for national

defense alone to $53,000,000,000 in round numbers.

The major part of this fifty-three billions must be added to the existing national debt of $50,000,000,000. Thus very shortly, if the war goes on another year without our becoming physically involved, we will be confronted with a national debt of approximately $100,000,000,000. In addition to this national debt, the people must pay the State debts, county and city debts, debts of other political subdivisions, as well as their own personal obligations.

This $100,000,000,000 national debt means a first mortgage of around $3,000 against every family in America, or approximately $700 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. To show the enormity of this national debt, let me illustrate. There is deposited by all our people in the 15,000 banks of the United States, both State and national, $76,000,000,000. Thus the national debt alone will be about $25,000,000,000 more than all the money of all the people in all the banks of the entire United States.

Already the Federal Government has borrowed nearly 30 percent of the deposits in all these banks, and, of course, it is borrowing more and more every day from the banks and the investors of the Nation.

The Census Bureau reports that in 1938 the assessed value of all real estate in the United States was $110,000,000,000. Thus the national debt alone, when the authorizations now made are expended, will practically equal the value of all the land with improvements in this country.

When the debt stands at the $100,000,000,000 mark it will be two and a half times as great as the value of all the stocks listed on the New York Stock Exchange. This shows the burden of Federal taxes which soon must fall on all the people of this country if national solvency is to be retained.

Part of this condition is due to the fact that since June 30, 1930, the United States Government has been spending more than it took in. It has averaged an expenditure of $2,800,000,000 a year greater than its receipts for every year since 1930. Now you gentlemen, as bankers, know what it means to spend more than you receive, to put out more than you take in. It's not a pleasant or comfortable experience to observe your "incomings" to be less than your "outgoings."

In other words, even before the preparedness program began for this country, the national debt had been increased $28,000,000,000, commencing with the year 1930 and down to the middle of 1940.

This debt of twenty-eight billions was incurred, not because of national defense, but was due largely to expenditures made for other things, quite apart from the Army and Navy.

For these 10 years, 1930 to 1940, the Army and Navy together cost an average of one billion, one hundred million a year. But the Government was spending $2,800,000,000 a year more than it had. It borrowed the remainder. So you can see, my friends, that the Government has been spending each year, from 1930 to 1940, without counting anything for the Army and Navy, $1,700,000,000 more than it took in. This in a large measure explains how the national debt has been increasing yearly without counting any expenditures for national defense at all.

The Senate on last Friday passed by almost a unanimous vote the $3,580,000,000 tax bill, and this bill will become a law within the next few days. This indeed is a tremendous tax bill and may have a tendency to slow down the speed with which the national debt is pyramiding. It will, however, be but a drop in the bucket.

We have for the past 10 years been following in this country a policy of unlimited spending, with very little thought being given to the day when the debt must be paid by the American taxpayers. The American people, in my opinion, will find for the first time, when the new tax bill becomes effective, that pay day has finally arrived. Perhaps then they will wake up and realize just what is happening to them and what is going to happen to their children and their children's children. This bill will compel millions upon millions of persons to pay income taxes next year who have until this time never paid a single dollar of income tax. This has been brought about by the lowering of personal exemptions. The income-tax schedule has been raised until in the highest brackets it will tax a man up to 75 percent, or three-quarters of his income, and will catch those whose income are as low as $750 per year for individuals and $1,500 for married couples.

The American people are going to be made more tax conscious than ever before. On every hand they will be confronted with the proposition of taxes, taxes, taxes, and more taxes. There will be taxes on box seats, taxes on tickets sold outside the box office, more taxes on cigarettes, pistols and revolvers, malt liquors, breweries, gasoline, lubricating oils, safe deposit boxes, playing cards, wines, tires and tubes, admissions to all kinds of amusements, trucks, busses and parts, radios, phonographs and all types of musical instruments, refrigerators, matches, telephone, telegraph, sporting goods, traveling bags, and in fact almost every article that is used in the pursuit of everyday life. These taxes will touch the very bread and butter of every person in the country, and will eliminate a lot of butter from some bread. They will be severe, but, mind you, they will not be as severe as those that must eventually be inflicted if our national debt keeps on soaring.

And this is only the beginning. Next year there will be another tax bill. Some say there will be another tax bill this year. These heavy taxes will have to continue through the present generation, for the next generation, and even for children yet unborn.

Yes; that is indeed a dark picture, but that picture is painted from facts that are indisputable.

What is going to happen to business at the end of the war? Many businesses that are now flourishing will cease to exist overnight. The depression of the early thirties will be but a mere dull period in business as compared to what the depression will be when the present ghastly conflict ceases and the representatives of the warring powers find themselves once more seated around the peace table.

At the height of the depression of 1932 I think the peak of the unemployed amounted to between twelve and thirteen millions. We are now told that the unemployed in this country is somewhere in the neighborhood of 6,000,000, but that this figure is being somewhat reduced as the national-defense program constantly expands and the unemployed are being assimilated in defense industry and lend-lease products to make our country more and more the world's arsenal of democracy.

What about this? Have we only 6,000,000 unemployed? One labor union asserts there are more than 9,000,000 out of employment now; a rival union says 7,000,000. The Department of Commerce recently stated that at this hour we have in this country 6,305,000 out of work. For argument let's take their figures, the minimum, as a basis.

Today we have under way the largest defense program ever undertaken by any nation upon the face of the earth, costing more money and employing more people than ever before in the history of the world in an instance of this sort. Bear that in mind.

We have 1,000,000 on the W. P. A. rolls today; we have 169,000 in the C. C. C. camps; we have 1,580,000 men in our Army now and 340,000 in our Navy. It is estimated that we have in the service of the Federal Government, the 48 State governments, the District of Columbia, county governments, municipal governments, and the governments of various political subdivisions about 4,000,000 civilian employees. Think of it.

Now today, despite our great national-defense program, the personnel of our armed forces, Army and Navy, the W. P. A., the C. C. C., and the millions on the pay rolls of our regular peacetime administrative forces, we still have today more than 6,000,000 people out of work.

But wait a minute. Now comes the O. P. M., an abbreviation for Office of Production Management. This branch of your Government only a few weeks ago issued a statement to the effect that between now and the 1st of January between five and six thousand additional plants and factories would be closed for one reason or another, and that 1,000,000 employees would be thrown out of employment.

Think of it. Seven million out of employment between now and January 1, despite the millions employed by the Government in various capacities and the billions upon billions being spent by the Federal Government alone.

What will happen when the thousands upon thousands of plants that are now employing hundreds of thousands, millions of men and women in the manufacture of national-defense products and products under the Lend-Lease Act, find that they are no longer receiving governmental orders, and that there is no longer the need for the market for the products which are now so imperative and for which billions of dollars are being paid to these industrial plants in the form of Government contracts. Will these employers be willing or be able to continue the employment of the millions of people that are now working for them 24 hours per day, in the filling of national-defense orders and the production of lend-lease orders paid for by the taxpayers of America? Of course they won't. The law of supply and demand will take care of that and these workers will find themselves overnight without jobs, and I say to you gentlemen that the great danger to our country today is not only our becoming involved in the present conflict in Europe and Asia, but the real test of our democratic form of government will come when this war ends, when once again we find millions of homeless, unemployed men and women tramping the streets of our great metropolitan areas, seeking work and food. Then, I say to you, the real test will come as to unemployment after the war.

Many persons here at home, and doubtless those of other countries, are also doing a lot of serious thinking about what will happen after the war. What will happen to business after the war? Will there be jobs? What kind of jobs? And how soon? These latter questions are important ones, serious ones because business depends upon the purchasing power of the people. When all are employed business is good. When millions are unemployed, millions are supported by the Government at the expense of others, there is no real health in business.

The subject is truly a grave one. Those who are now devoting their thoughts to the subject are not all bankers like yourselves, social planners, or professors of economics. Many of them are our young men now in uniform, homemakers, wage earners, teachers, and farmers, those very people who will be most intimately affected by the answer to your question.

Those who are thinking in terms of the future estimate that if the war should end

in 1944 industry in America would be called upon then to demobilize 23,000,000 workers in addition to about 3,500,000 of the armed forces, and, to transfer such a vast number to normal living production will require a lot of advance thinking and planning.

To properly accomplish the change-over from military to peacetime production will certainly require financial reserves which some firms may not be able to accumulate under present rates of taxation.

Certainly the whole subject deserves the utmost possible study. Many say a vast reservoir of public works is an undoubted element in the necessary plans, but this would be only a temporary solution rather than a final one. Witness 10 years of public works, and where are we now?

Further, with plants closed, business idle, millions unemployed, tax sources destroyed, just where will your Government secure its funds with which to continue to carry on its present W. P. A., C. C. C., and other employment agencies, with additional burdens?

In 1933 we did not find ourselves saddled with a $100,000,000,000 national debt. We were then able to call upon the credit of our country and were able to provide employment for these destitute and unemployed people through our great relief programs. Will we be able to do this in 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, or 1946? You men who have made a study, many of you a life study, of finance and financial solvency, know only too well that there is a limit to credit. Will our Government be able at that critical time to take care of its citizens, and will it be able to provide them with gainful occupation so that they will be able to furnish their families with the necessities of life? I hope it will, but the outlook is not very encouraging. Unquestionably, we will go through a tremendous period of readjustment, and business will have to play its part during that pericd.

There are many who believe that even after the war is over the United States will maintain a tremendous army and navy, and that this in itself will permit of the continuation of a great deal of the defense work which is now taking place. Of course, as to just what our naval and military policy will be after World War No. 2, no one can tell. The American people have always been a peace-loving people, and it may never be possible to satisfy them with any such military program as is now discussed from time to time with respect to the future.

What is going to happen to business after the war? The answer to that question is going to depend largely upon your answer to these questions. Will we become involved in a shooting war?

How long will that war last, and at what expense to you, the American taxpayers?

What will be the national debt? Will it be one hundred billion, one hundred and fifty billion, or two hundred billion?

After having converted our Nation into an arsenal for the world, will we be able to reconstruct it into peacetime industry so that business can contribute sufficiently to the income of the Government to conduct great public-works agencies to provide employment for its unemployed?

Shall we continue to hold ourselves out as the asylum of the oppressed of the peoples of the world, thus permitting our shores to be flooded with immigrants to compete with our own native-born or naturalized?

Shall we continue to welcome by boatloads the intellectuals of the earth with their foreign isms and ideologies?

Shall we continue to permit aliens, noncitizens, Nazis, Communists, and Fascists to hold key positions in our great labor organizations, in which alien-minded agitators are constantly creating strife between capital and labor?

Shall we become more centralized, more governmentalized, more alienized, and more internationalized, or shall we focus our attention upon our needs and our people here at home?

These are some of the questions to be assumed and answered by the whole American people.

I can well appreciate that every single businessman in America today, regardless of the profit he is making in his business or how successful he is, must from time to time ask himself the question, "What is going to happen to me or to my business when this war is over?"

I cannot answer this question any more than can you. I have endeavored in a short period of time to give you the facts, the barefaced facts as they exist today. You must draw your own conclusions as to what the future holds in store, not only for business, but for our working men, professional men, farmers, merchants, men and women of America, native-born and naturalized, the more than 130,000,000 citizens of the United States of America. What is going to happen to all of us? What is going to happen to America, our country?

Will our American way of life survive? Can we meet the test? Will we meet the test?

My answer is "Yes."

Nevada's Contribution to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. SCHWARTZ

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 22, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER, OF NEVADA

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered on August 19 by the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since 1864 when Nevada's stores of silver and gold helped to save the Union, Nevada has borne her share in every crisis that has confronted the United States.

When our national unity was in grave danger, with brother pitted against brother in the blackest chapter of American history, when materials were so badly needed to end the sectional strife, Nevada came into the Union, bringing her vast reserves of metals and thus helping to put an end to the bitter conflict that might have made us two weak countries rather than one nation, indivisible, undefeatable, the strongest in the world.

Again when our Nation was at war, Nevada gave unstintingly of her resources. Her men, though few, were brave, and many of them saw active service in the range of enemy guns. But in materials she was rich and she gave freely. Lead, zinc, copper—these she poured into the factories that in turn cast them into defense weapons.

And today again Nevada answers the call to serve her country. In this great national emergency she stands ready to do her part.

We of Nevada have a right to be proud of our contributions and our potential contributions to the defense program. We are a wealthy State, sound in financial structure and rich in natural resources.

In the chaos in which the world has been plunged, the United States plays a definite role. She has set out on a very well defined course, the course of national defense. By an overwhelming vote of their representatives in Congress the American people have decreed that this shall be a twofold course, the first step is defense by preparing ourselves with defense arms and munitions and trained men to guard us against invasion. And secondly, to aid our friends in their fight to vanquish our enemies.

The latter of these two steps is an outgrowth of the first, for our only aim is defense of the United States first, last, and always. I have every sympathy for the cause of England and the ideals which she is so valiantly upholding. But I favor our foreign policy not because of my sympathy for Britain but rather because of love for my country. This is a policy built on absolute realism. It is a policy most pragmatic and practical—that of defending the United States of America, not with manpower—we do not want to send American boys to fight abroad—but with planes and munitions, every implement of warfare, that we can spare without endangering our own national defense. For our own defense is our single objective.

Thus our position in the present war is to serve as an arsenal—an arsenal for Britain and an arsenal for America. Our job is to supply the Allies and to supply our own defense warehouses with guns, ships, planes, and munitions.

We are doing a fine job of producing. As for actual production records, we are now producing some 1,600 planes per month—double the number produced last November. We now have reached in the production of shells and powder twice the capacity developed during the last war. The machine-tool industry has expanded production from $200,000,000 in 1939 to $450,000,000 last year, and an estimated $750,000,000 this year. We are engaged in the biggest and costliest shipbuilding program ever undertaken, a program that calls for the building of 4,000,000 tons of ships a year.

And what of Nevada's part in our vast production program? It is Nevada's purpose to pour out the minerals from which are manufactured these planes, shells, power, tools, and ships. Since our defense program began the production of Nevada's mines has increased by leaps and bounds. In 1940 the total value and the total quantity of her five leading metals was greater than any year since 1918, and her 1941 production promises to exceed even that year. She produced almost 15,000,000 pounds of lead, 24,000,000 pounds of zinc; 157,000,000 pounds of copper went from Nevada mines into ammunition, into our shipbuilding program, and other defense industries. She poured greatly increased quantities of other strategic minerals such as tungsten, mercury, and antimony into the defense factories of the United States.

Magnesium is now one of the most vital of the defense metals because of the requirements in the aircraft industry for structural materials of high strength and low-weight characteristics. About 30 percent of all airplane engines are now made of magnesium. This metal is the most important ingredient in incendiary bombing and is needed for flares, night air photography, and tracer bullets. A few days ago contracts were signed to build in Nevada three magnesium plants. When in full capacity these plants will produce some 112,000,000 pounds of this precious defense metal.

Another vital strategic mineral is manganese, and the Government has recently contracted to purchase 150,000 long tons from Nevada mines.

Nevada's recent industrial development is partially possible because of the great quan-

tities of power she has available—power to turn the wheels of industry that will pour out defense weapons.

Then, too, Nevada's vast expanses of land are valuable for military purposes. There was recently established in Nevada a bombing range, a gunnery school, an antiaircraft artillery unit; we have a naval ammunition depot. We have new airports, and I am in hopes that more will be built. More and more of our capacities and capabilities will be made use of.

The Nation now has some 700,000 men in training, besides the Reserves, the National Guard, and our regular military and naval forces. These men must be fed and Nevada is doing her share to give them subsistence. Cattle and sheep graze our mountain districts from the tip of southeastern Nevada to the most northwestern boundary. Our livestock together with our wheat, our truck-garden products, and our dairy products go into the food stores from which our fighting forces gain strength and sustenance.

Thus Nevada is patriotically participating in the emergency with which we are now confronted. As in other States in the Nation, Nevada's slogan is "produce for defense"—production for the defense of our country, for the defense of our freedom, and the institutions placed in sacred trust by our forefathers who have given their lives to defend them.

Our Nation has come far in the defense program. Our production record is one of which we can well be proud. But we are yet far from our objectives. So far we have just begun. Given time, however, given unity of purpose and the spirit of sacrifice the job ahead can be done—and Nevada will continue to pour into the defense factories of America her raw materials to the limits of her capacity. Nevada will continue to go "all-out" for defense.

Chief of Staff of United States Army Addresses American Legion Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 22, 1941

ADDRESS OF GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a most remarkable address delivered at the American Legion convention on September 15 by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This national convention of the Legion finds our country in the midst of a tremendous defense effort. It finds the Army at a momentary climax of the most extensive and strenuous peacetime training program in the history of this or, possibly, any other country.

A great deal of water has gone over the dam since your first convention in 1919. Unfortunately it carried with it, by way of erosion, most of the military power created by your youthful vigor and your willingness to serve the country in those other critical days. Obsolescence had a similar effect on matériel.

Since the transition of you men from the ranks of the Army to the ranks of the Legion, your organization has fathered and has urged, year after year, military policies and appropriations which if they had been accepted by the people and Congress, would have found us in 1938 so strong in being and so powerful in immediate prospect, that the influence of this country might have given a different turn to the tragic history of the past 2 years.

No other group of men and women in this country can render such powerful support to the War Department as yours, and at no other time has this support been so necessary as it is today. In the past you have urged adequate appropriations for defense. Today money is not the acute problem—the Congress has been ready to provide the desired appropriations. What we lack and what we must have is an understanding by every family in America of the gravity of our situation. They should understand what it takes in discipline, in training, and in time to make a dependable army, and they must realize what infinite harm can be done through ignorance of military requirements and unwitting cooperation with agencies working in the interest of potentional enemies.

The problems of preparing our present military forces are quite different from those with which you men were familiar in 1917. In those days the matter of equipment was solved by the tremendous productive capacity which had been developed in England and France after 3 years' concentrated military effort. Our troops were sent overseas barehanded, versed only in the basic training of the soldier. Divisions were equipped in the field, trained within sound of the guns along the lines held by our Allies. Corps and armies were actually organized on the battlefield. Units were placed in the line at our convenience. Tactical errors, the results of faulty leadership, were not fatal, although unnecessary losses resulted, since they were localized by the very nature of the sector warfare of that period.

The technique of 1917 is outmoded today. The specialized training for a particular type of operation gives way to the necessity for perfect teamwork in fast-moving operations over any type of terrain. A high degree of technical and tactical knowledge is necessary, from the individual soldier to the commanders of the highest units. Skilled initiative is a mandatory requirement. The complicated coordination of fire-power, ground and air, must be managed at top speed, and for a surprising variety of weapons, with little or no opportunity to rehearse the procedure or to gain familiarity with the ground.

The training of this modern Army has been steadily progressive in nature. The soldier is given 13 weeks of basic military education, including specialized training for his branch of the service. He is then assigned to a tactical unit where he passes through a period of unit training. The man who entered the Army last fall is now engaged in a final phase of training—that is, field service as a member of large military units. These maneuvers have been in progress all summer, with constantly increasing forces until they are now culminating in the operations of three field armies, involving three-quarters of a million men.

It is difficult to overemphasize the importance of the maneuvers. You veterans who served in France will recall the fog of battle and the utter confusion which often prevails when large military forces come to grips; you probably remember the tremendous difficulties of ammunition and food supply; the great strain placed on field communications and the difficulty of their maintenance; I know you realize the stern necessity of willing obedience and firm discipline. In actual battle these matters are of decisive importance and they cannot be simulated on the parade ground. The present maneuvers are the closest peacetime approximation to actual fighting conditions that has ever been undertaken in this country. But what is of the greatest importance, the mistakes and failures will not imperil the Nation or cost the lives of men. In the past we have jeopardized our future, penalized our leaders, and sacrificed our men by training untrained troops on the battlefield.

The maneuvers also constitute a field laboratory, to accept or discard new methods of applying fundamental tactical principles. They enable us to perfect close liaison between combat aviation and ground units. They permit of test of a possible solution to the secret of defense against tanks. By actual field operations we are determining the proper tactics for the employment of armored units. The development of our mechanized reconnaissance units is being accelerated by experience with the difficulties and uncertainties created by masses of troops operating over wide distances. Opposing divisions are kept in the dark as to the size, equipment, and other capabilities of their immediate opponents.

The results at times have been startling. In some cases divisions would have been annihilated; in others they would have been captured. On the field of battle such events would be tragic. Today they are merely mistakes. We can correct them, replace the ineffective leaders, and go ahead. As an insurance policy against whatever operations our troops might be called upon to perform, the cost of these maneuvers represents a trifling premium to pay. Tremendous sums of money have been spent on our national-defense effort, but I know of no single investment which will give this country a greater return in security and in the saving of lives than the present maneuvers.

Although we have streamlined the Army, blistered feet and aching bones are still the lot of the recruit, and heavy burdens and long marches the role of the majority of the soldiers. Tank and truck travel may be fast but it is far from luxurious, really a severe hardship, which the men must be trained to endure.

Strenuous as the past year has been on the troops, we find that all but a few have gained weight, and that despite the tremendous increase in the size of the Army during the past year, the death rate has actually decreased from three per thousand to two per thousand. Although we moved hundreds of thousands of men from all parts of the United States into tent camps in the middle of winter, the sickness rate in our Army camps was and is generally below that of the average civilian community. Our soldiers probably constitute the healthiest group of individuals in the world today.

Along with the progress of the past year we have encountered problems that have taxed our ingenuity to the extreme, and there is one in particular which I wish to discuss tonight. It is a very serious matter, for it strikes at the tap root of military efficiency.

Although the President has proclaimed a state of emergency, the Army for all practical purposes is still operating under peacetime conditions. Perhaps it is this unusual, unprecedented situation which has resulted in a lack of understanding by the public as well as parents of soldiers and the soldiers themselves regarding fundamental military requirements. The power of an army cannot be measured in mere numbers. It is based on a high state of discipline and training; on a readiness to carry out its mission wherever and whenever the Commander in Chief and Congress decide. Any compromise with those requirements and that purpose not only minimizes our efforts but largely vitiates our development of military power.

This Army belongs to the American people; it is their Army, your Army. What it does, what it is are naturally matters of personal interest to all of our people, not only to those who have relatives in uniform but to every citizen depending on the Army for security. Despite the pros and cons which have attended every issue debated during the past year, whether on the floors of Congress, in the press, or over the radio, I am certain that everyone is in agreement on one point—that is, this country must have the best army in the world.

Now, as veteran soldiers, I submit to you men of the Legion the impossibility of developing an efficient army if decisions which are purely military in nature are continuously subjected to investigation, cross-examination, debate, ridicule, and public discussion by pressure groups or by individuals with only a superficial knowledge of military matters or of the actual facts in the particular case. I submit that there is a clear line of demarcation between the democratic freedom of discussion which we are determined to preserve and a destructive procedure which promotes discontent and destroys confidence in the Army.

As Chief of Staff I am largely responsible for the military program and for the decisions of subordinates. Mistakes have been made, and it is to be expected that more will be made. However, I am certain that we in the Army are the most severe critics and, also, we can best detect deficiencies, and we are better prepared to determine the method for their correction.

Please have these considerations in mind. A sane, a wonderful step has been taken by this country in adopting a policy of preparing its military forces in time of peace as the wisest of precautionary measures in the face of a world crisis. The very fact that we have shown such unprecedented wisdom in the military way presents the most serious difficulty for those responsible for the development of the Army. With a clear-cut task before us well known to the troops, the development of the Army would be comparatively a simple matter. But must we declare war in order to facilitate training and morale; must you burn down the building in order to justify the fire department?

The local posts of the Legion can do much to bring the people at home to a better understanding of the requirements of the situation. Even you veterans probably do not realize the result of appeals of the young man angling for a home-made cake or bragging to his parents or his girl of the hardships he endures, or grousing over the failure of his leaders to recognize his particular ability by immediate promotion. The War Department at times receives a veritable avalanche of criticisms or pressures resulting from such ordinary soldier reactions as these. The incidents in themselves are often amusing, as in the case of the mother who complained that her son wasn't getting enough to eat, and we found her boy had gained 16 pounds in 20 days. But the total effect is really serious. As I read confidential reports from abroad, there is a startling similarity between our present situation in this respect and that which affected the late-lamented Army of France. Criticism, justified or otherwise, is to be expected. In fact, it is as inevitable as a congressional investigation; but when its nature or purpose is to cause disunity within the Army, I say, direct such criticisms at me personally, but leave the Army alone. Don't tear down what you are striving so hard to build up.

Let me cite an example of what I mean. Take the matter of a separate air force. Because we are convinced that the establishment of a separate air force would not only be a grave error, but would completely disrupt the splendid organization now in process of building, we are accused of being unprogressive, jealous of prerogatives, and incredibly short-sighted.

On the basis of a cold-blooded analysis of facts, the matter has been studied in great detail by the War Department during the operations in which foreign nations are now involved. I can assure you that nothing has developed as a result of the present war which indicates that a change should be made in the present set-up in the United States. Comparisons are drawn that two nations whose air forces have attained the greatest success have so-called separate air forces. Here again we encounter a confusion of facts. Consider, for instance, the case of our friends, the British. Except for the gallant and truly remarkable defense of the British Isles, which is a special problem having little application to our problem of hemisphere defense, the lack of unity of command between the air and ground forces has courted disaster in virtually every operation they have undertaken. In the operations in Belgium and France, in Norway, in Greece, in Crete, and in the Middle East this lack of unity of command has remained a continuous, unsolved problem. In fact, the British have found it necessary to modify the separate air arm idea with respect to naval aviation. More recently they have been improvising special groups to operate more closely with ground troops.

The ex-democracy of France had a separate air force which operated on a basis similar to that which some individuals are now proposing that we adopt. France was defeated and reduced to a state of vassalage in a 5-week campaign. The Italian air force, which nurtures the theory of total war from the air and which has so-called independent control, has yet to be effective in the present war. Contrary to popular belief, the German Air Force is not independent of the ground arms in the generally conceived sense, but is closely coordinated by means of a system of command and staff over and above all civil departments, which would not be acceptable to a democracy such as the United States. The German Government is geared throughout for the primary purpose of making war through a superlatively centralized form of control. Hitler is commander in chief, but he operates through a chief of staff of a supreme staff, which plans, directs, and controls the operations of the Army, Navy, and air force, and is responsible only to the head of the Government. Through this machinery a campaign is planned, the organizations—air, ground, and naval—are allotted, and a commander is designated. He organizes and trains this task force and at the appointed time carries out the campaign, with every available resource of Germany in support. He may be a ground officer, an air or a naval officer. But he is in sole charge of every phase of the operation.

It is needless to say that the American people are not likely to establish a military oligarchy for this country. Lacking such an organization, the German system would be ineffective. As a matter of fact, we have adapted to our own use a set-up that approximates that of Germany as closely as is possible under our system of government.

Just a year ago the President gave final approval to the Selective Training and Service Act and to legislation authorizing reserve components to be called into Federal service. The importance of these two measures for the national defense was tremendous. They constituted a reversal of the historic and almost tragic policy that the United States would prepare for war only after becoming involved in war. Our peacetime military force was maintained for minor transactions, not to meet a first-class foe—a perilous policy, and one of extreme extravagance in men and money when the emergency arose. The greatest security which this Nation can possess is a powerful navy, backed by a well-trained army, together so strong that no foreign nation will dare to provoke a war. The Army is now in the making, but it must go through another winter of training under field conditions before it is fully prepared, and it must have the understanding and support of the people at home.

You gentlemen are practical soldiers. You can understand the difficulty of handling large masses of men under conditions of warfare. You recognize the meaning and importance of discipline. You realize how easy it is to tear down and how difficult it is to build it up. During this emergency the sound policies of the Legion have been a tower of strength to the War Department and to commanders in the field, and it is to you that I look for the support necessary to the accomplishment of our objective.

The spirit and determination that were yours 23 years ago, in the Meuse-Argonne, at St. Mihiel, or in a training camp at home, must be instilled in the men of this new Army. You can understand this and I know you will help. There is a further responsibility which I place on you. I look to you to educate the people at home as to the necessities of the times. Without a united country it will be impossible to build the type of army we must have. We cannot build the best army in the world unless the people of this country are behind it.

I am a soldier and I have spoken to you as one soldier to another. I have but one purpose, one mission, and that is to produce the most efficient army in the world. Given the American type of soldier and our war industries operating at top speed, given your aggressive support on the home front, and it can be done, and it will be done in time.

Electric Power on Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 22, 1941

ARTICLE BY HARRY SLATTERY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the subject Electric Power on the Farm Aids National Defense, written by Hon. Harry Slattery and published in the Public Utilities Fortnightly of August 14, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Public Utilities Fortnightly of August 14, 1941]

ELECTRIC POWER ON THE FARMS AIDS NATIONAL DEFENSE—HOW RURAL ELECTRIFICATION INCREASES FARM PRODUCTION WITH LESS LABOR, AND OTHERWISE DIRECTLY SERVES DEFENSE PROJECTS—IMPORTANCE FIRST OBSERVED IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES—PRESENT NEEDS

(By Harry Slattery)

The widespread availability of electric power in rural areas has long been a primary objective of farm organizations and of farm and other national leaders in the United States. Looking toward the long pull for a more stable agriculture and a better balance in the income and welfare of agriculture, industry, finance, and business, they perceived that electric power was no longer a luxury but a necessity to twentieth century needs of living and production for rural as well as urban people.

In advocating the adoption of a Federal rural electrification program—under which already nearly 325,000 miles of line have been constructed—these leaders foresaw that the benefits of rural electrification extended far beyond the farms alone and would have a marked influence in rural life generally, including the revitalizing of rural industry and processing, trade, churches, schools, and other community and village activities. Experience of R. E. A. and the 718 operating power systems which it has financed reveals the basic soundness of this approach.

The adoption of the Federal rural electrification program was, therefore, advocated by farm and public leaders on the basis of peacetime pursuits in order to improve the status and welfare of the rural community; but they builded better than they knew. For with the development of the grave international situation and the outbreak of war abroad, rural electrification took on a new aspect as a real factor in our national-defense program. It came to be recognized that the defense program, particularly total defense, required many varied types of activities throughout the entire Nation in both rural and urban areas, and that electric power was an essential factor to the successful prosecution of many of them. As a consequence, R. E. A. financed rural power systems, located in over 2,300 counties, are today making electric service available not only to defense projects as such but also to many equally essential collateral activities involved in a total preparedness program.

For defense and military purposes the importance of rural electrification was perhaps first observed in the major European countries where the percentage of farms electrified in 1935 was far ahead of this country, ranging from 50 to almost 100 in contrast to about 10 in the United States. The Proceedings of the Third World Power Conference in 1936 indicated that the widespread electrification in some of those countries was due in part to recognition of the importance of rural electrification as a tool of "total war" or "total defense" and therefore was included as a part of the planned program of preparation for defense or war. It has been reported that in Germany the government provided many farms with considerable electrically driven equipment in order to maintain or increase production and thereby release many farm men for military service and factory work. A rather vivid example of how rural electrification has made possible a high degree of decentralization of industry and farming out in Germany was described by Morris L. Cooke, first administrator of R. E. A. and at present consultant on management engineering on the staff of the associate director general of the Office of Production Management, in the following words:

"In 1937 sealed crates were delivered to electrified farms all over the nation. Instructions were given out not to open these crates until further notice. They were said to contain special machinery with which the farmers of Germany would, in their spare time, capture the toy market of the world. The day Nazi legions crossed the border of Poland, word was sent out to open the crates. They turned out to contain not toy machinery but equipment with which to make the thousands of little parts which go into the production of modern weapons of war. The parts made by these machines went into the tanks, guns, and planes which, the following spring, rolled back the armies of Belgium, the Netherlands, and France."

Likewise, in England, one aspect of the importance of rural electrification to defense is indicated by the following quotation from the Electrical Review (London):

"Home food production is very much in the news at the moment, and the nation may well thank those electricity supply authorities which, by their enterprise in providing supplies to sparsely populated and barely remunerative rural areas, are now making it possible for farmers to employ electrical methods to aid food production and storage."

One of the most important contributions that rural electrification offers to our growing national-defense program and to fulfilling our promise of all-out aid to nations fighting for our safety is in supplying power to help American agriculture meet its problems of labor supply and of increased demand for protein and other critical foods essential for proper nutrition. As a result of accelerated industrial production and the requirements of the armed forces, there is developing, particularly in specialized areas producing dairy, poultry, and truck crops, a serious shortage of farm labor. The general index of farm-labor supply declined from 100 in April 1940 to 82.2 in April 1941. As preparedness activities continue to become more widespread and intensified, and the demands of the armed forces continue to increase, it is apparent that more labor will be drained away from farms. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that defense industries will require nearly one and a half million more workers by April 1942 than there were in May 1941. As a consequence, already there is an increasing demand for labor-saving farm equipment, much of it requiring electric power for its operation, such as milking machines, pumps, ensilage cutters, brooders, and other power equipment. Where electricity is available, many farms will be able not only to maintain their production of vital foods with less manpower but many will materially increase their output. It has been estimated that the application of electric power to the activities of an average farm will provide the equivalent of one farm hand at an investment of less than the annual wages of a farm laborer. It is unfortunate indeed that, notwithstanding the substantial progress made during the past 6 years, in this time of national emergency not more than 30 percent of our farms have central-station service.

Without consideration of its labor-saving significance, electricity has become an essential technical factor in the production of many forms of protein foods of which there is a shortage and of which increased production is imperative if the nutritional needs of our people and the requirements of the lend-lease arrangement are to be met. Because of its efficiency as a source of light, heat, and cold as well as of power, electricity has been applied widely to the production of protein foods of which there is immediate need for more production. Electric hatching and brooding produce a larger output of poultry per unit of effort and of expense; lighted poultry houses mean that poultry feed longer, grow faster, and produce more eggs; poultry, milk, and milk products are processed, handled, and marketed with less wastage when electricity is available; a plentiful and automatic water supply for the dairy, poultry yard, stock tank, and irrigation increases production; electric milking machines, cream separators, coolers, and other dairy equipment improve efficiency and maintain quality; electric refrigerators provide proper storage of perishable products, including eggs, milk, and vegetables; and the preparation of feeds for animals is promoted by electrically driven equipment.

The migration of workers from some rural areas to urban defense industries, and the increasing needs for protein foods to meet the nutritional requirements of both our own people and those of foreign countries that we have promised to aid, present growing critical problems to the Nation and agriculture. The alleviation of these problems is dependent primarily on a substantial increase in the use of modern labor-saving equipment. It is, therefore, important that we make every effort to extend electric service into the critical production areas as rapidly as possible.

In addition to its importance in alleviating the problem of farm-labor shortage in critical areas and in promoting the production of certain critical protein foods, rural electric service has been of immediate importance to defense and related projects that have been located in rural areas.

Availability of electric service from rural power systems in areas where many of the new defense projects have been located has proved to be of substantial benefit both to the projects themselves and to the surrounding countryside which has been called on to render many collateral services incident to their construction and operation. R. E. A. financed systems have been called on to serve a great variety of defense projects, including camps, bases, forts, munition depots, and dumps, housing projects, air field beacons, radio beam stations, and many lesser loads related directly to the defense program. As a consequence, defense projects served by the cooperative power systems are enabled to obtain their power at low rates.

In a number of instances, such as at Camp Shelby, Miss., Fort Leonard Wood in Missouri, and Camp Forrest, Tenn., R. E. A. financed cooperatives have been in a position to make service available to Army camps promptly and at low cost. In making service available to Camp Shelby, for instance, the line and substation for the construction load were completed 24 hours after receipt of the order from the War Department; and the large substation and 7½ miles of 110,000-volt transmission line from the power source to the camp were completed within 52 days. Inasmuch as the cooperatives are nonprofit organizations they provide the defense projects with service at cost. Further, they do not require cash contributions toward construction costs inasmuch as the facilities will continue to be used to serve farms and other consumers after the emergency period has passed.

Because of their wide coverage, the cooperative rural power systems are receiving increasing requests to furnish electric service to farms and others located in the vicinity of major defense projects. The location of some of these projects in rural areas of relatively sparse population and limited agricultural productivity has resulted in a tremendous step-up in the demand for perishable foodstuffs With electric power available, nearby farmers are enabled to increase the production of eggs, milk, and other perishables and have refrigeration for proper storage.

The systems also have been called on to meet the power requirements of many collateral activities in the vicinity of defense projects such as for additional housing, commercial establishments, and recreational facilities. In the vicinity of Camp Blanding, Fla., the Clay County Electric Cooperative has constructed numerous short extensions to serve attendant defense loads with a consequent multiplying of its defense load by four times.

In some areas, because of the shortage of firm power, the cooperatives have found it necessary to provide additional generating capacity to meet defense requirements. In order to supply the new marine base at Jacksonville, N. C., for example, the Jones-Onslow Electric Cooperative has started construction of two generating plants and 50 miles of transmission line with an installed capacity of 13,000 kilowatt-amperes. After the emergency this capacity will be available to serve farms and other enterprises in the area at rates somewhat lower than those now in effect.

One of the significant effects of the extension of electric service into rural areas has been the development of a large number and variety of small decentralized industrial enterprises. For normal peacetime operations the value of decentralized industries has long been recognized because of their contribution to the income and stability of rural communities; for defense purposes, such industries make possible the full utilization of facilities and manpower through

"farming out" with the least possible migration of workers. Among the industries served by R. E. A. financed systems at the present time there is a number that are making a direct contribution to the defense program through the production of strategic materials and the processing of farm products of which there is a shortage.

In addition, there are many more of these systems capable of making a valuable contribution if and when it is deemed essential to distribute the production of military material among innumerable small units widely scattered throughout the country. Many of these enterprises sprang up after electric power was made available by the cooperatives and surveys show that the number and variety are increasing rapidly. During 1940 there was a 20-percent increase in the types of industries on R. E. A. financed lines, a 53-percent increase in the number of plants, and an 86-percent increase in the kilowatt demand of such industries. During the first 6 months of 1941 the systems received requests for service each month on the average from 50 additional enterprises with demands exceeding 3,000 kilowatts. Among the industries that are contributing to the total defense program are: Cold-storage plants, hatcheries, dairies, food-processing plants of many types, mines, oil wells, and pipe lines, building-supply plants, machine shops, aluminum plants, textile mills, and chemical industries.

A number of the mines served by the rural power systems are producing extremely important raw materials having direct military significance, and of which there is a scarcity. These include vanadium, cinnabar, lead and zinc, copper, and manganese. The presence of a nearby rural power system played an important part in the opening of certain cinnabar mines in Arkansas. These are marginal mines, closed under normal conditions because not profitable. Military requirements for mercury made it important that these mines be brought back into maximum production, and the increase in price of mercury made this possible, provided relatively cheap power were available. The construction of a tie-in line from a neighboring R. E. A. financed system solved the problem of availability of power at low cost.

It has been highly gratifying to observe the active participation of the rural electric cooperatives in furthering the national-defense program in their communities. Their efforts show a desire to be of the greatest possible service in time of national emergency. The work of the Shenandoah Valley (Va.) Electric Cooperative has attracted Nation-wide attention in this regard. This cooperative sponsored a survey of the resources of the area served by it and was instrumental in the establishment of the Shenandoah Valley Defense Council, which was organized as a cooperative to enable the small industrial plants in the area to assist in the national-defense program.

In the predominantly rural area served by the rural systems the cooperative discovered that there were 375 machine tools adequate for use in the production of defense materials and enough skilled labor to operate these tools for 16 hours per day. These skilled workmen for the most part were not registered with any State or Federal employment agency, and the small industries had not been included in any defense-production plans.

R. E. A. and R. E. A. financed systems are working to alleviate power shortages at critical points in the defense program. As has already been indicated, some of the rural power systems are providing for additional capacity in their areas where there is a shortage of firm power. For emergency purposes some of the systems have organized power reserve cooperatives to own and operate mobile Diesel generating plants that are mounted on trailers for rapid transportation to points where the regular power supply has been disrupted. A number of these units are now in successful operation on R. E. A. financed systems and additional units are on order.

There is accumulating evidence, however, that the increasing demand for power being placed on the systems as a result of both the preparedness program and the normal growth in loads may have to be met with additional generating capacity. If it is found necessary, a large capacity in small generating units can be built on a mass-production basis; and these units could be made to provide a flexible source of power that could be adjusted easily to meet the needs of the systems.

Any capacity added at the present time to meet defense requirements would not constitute surplus capacity after the emergency because it would soon be absorbed by the systems in rendering normal service to an increasing number of farms and other rural users. This indicates that any expenditures made today by the cooperatives for additional generating capacity to alleviate power shortages occasioned by defense requirements would have a 100-percent post-emergency value.

Annual Meeting of American Federation of Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 22, 1941

ADDRESS BY GEORGE S. COUNTS, PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered at the annual meeting of the American Federation of Teachers in Detroit, Mich., on August 22, by the president of the federation, George S. Counts.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A year ago world democracy stood in the shadow of utter catastrophe. The free nations on the continent of Europe had been either destroyed or encircled by the Nazi armies. As we met in Buffalo many of us feared, and with good reason, that within 12 months the islands of Britain would lose their independence and become a part of Hitler's "new order." Indeed, in those days we dreaded to open the morning newspaper lest we read in stark headlines of the cracking of the morale of the British people under the merciless bombing of the Luftwaffe.

I

The year has been kinder to the cause of human freedom than we feared. Although there have been many dark and bitter days, England still stands, a living monument to the courage and heroism of a free people. Although there has been a terrifying succession of disasters and retreats, there have been some magnificent victories. As we look to the future, even though we know that the entire weight of Vichy France and Japan may at any moment be thrown into the balance on the side of the Axis, we have solid grounds for hope. We see the fighting potential of the democracies steadily rising. Our own matchless productive system is rapidly converting America into that "arsenal of democracy" of which the President has spoken. During the coming year the tide of armament production should turn decisively against Hitler and his friends.

A major source of hope derives from a realinement of political and military forces. For reasons not altogether clear Hitler saw fit to break his devil's pact with Stalin—the move which launched the second World War and sealed the fate of the French Republic. For this new act of Nazi aggression the friends of human freedom throughout the world should be profoundly grateful. It means that the vast resources of the Soviet Union, contrary to Stalin's hope and will, are now ranged on the side of the democracies. And in spite of the opinions of practically all the experts, the Soviet soldiers and officers have fought and are fighting with magnificent skill, tenacity, and valor.

II

Some among us perhaps find the thought of cooperating in any way with the Stalin dictatorship deeply repugnant. Such an attitude is easy to understand. This dictatorship is no less a dictatorship merely because the Nazi armies have been turned against it. Yet we must realize that in struggles of this character free peoples cannot always choose their associates. In our own War of Independence we did not hesitate to accept assistance from Bourbon France.

We must realize also that the great threat to the establishment of a regime of peace and freedom on the earth comes at this time from Hitler and his armies. Even though the dictatorship of Stalin may be as ruthless and savage in certain respects as that of his partner in the pact of 1939, it seems not to be equally bent on or capable of conquest and world domination by force of arms. Moreover, we may be justified in hoping that the exigencies of the conflict and the association with the democracies may revive the spirit of freedom which marked the Russian revolution in its early days.

We must realize further that the fortunes of the American people are irrevocably involved in the struggle which is now being waged on the vast plains of western Russia. If the Nazi armies should triumph decisively in this struggle, the course of our history might well be radically changed. Hitler would then bring quickly within the orbit of his rule the whole of Europe, Asia, and Africa. Then with the resources of three continents at his disposal his position would be impregnable. It was doubtless some such grand conception which led him to violate his pact with Stalin and launch his attack upon the Soviet Union.

Victory in Russia, even if not followed by a successful invasion of Britain, would lead to the imposition of the Nazi pattern of life and society upon more than three-fifths of the earth. And that pattern carries with it, as we all know, the destruction not only of the free-labor movement, but also of the great heritage out of which the free-labor movement has come. It would literally involve in destruction all that is best in western culture—the Judaic-Christian doctrine of the brotherhood of man, the humanistic faith in the liberation of the mind, the democratic affirmation that ordinary men and women can and should rule themselves. The Nazi movement is an unexampled effort to arm the ethics of a primitive and pagan tribalism with the might of modern science and technology. It is reaction in the deepest moral sense.

The fate of the people immediately under the Nazi rule is already written plainly on the map of Europe. Wherever Hitler's armies march, human freedom is outlawed and mercy forgotten. If any nations or peoples within the range of his power are permitted to retain their independence, that independence is entirely spurious in character—an independence fully subservient to the Nazi

will. And it should not be forgotten that technology has equipped despotism with the means of ruling continents as easily as it ruled a small state a few generations ago. If conquered peoples should strive to rise against their oppressors in this age of machine guns, tanks, and airplanes, they would rise only to be mowed and blasted down. Let the nations of the old world come fully under the Nazi yoke, and men who love freedom will know despair as they have rarely known it in history. The darkest of all ages will then descend upon mankind.

But we are interested primarily in the impact of a Hitler triumph on American democracy. Even if such a triumph should not lead to a direct military attack upon the United States and the loss of national independence—a concession that no one who loves his country should risk making—the result would be disastrous. Even if Hitler should remain on the other side of the Atlantic, the course of American history would be radically altered. Even if we should continue to cherish ideals of human liberty and equality, we would be compelled to become a great military nation or perish. We would have to arm to the teeth and, in the face of superior natural, technical, and human resources in the possession of the enemy, strive to build unrivaled naval and air fleets. Into the maintenance of the Military Establishment from year to year we would be compelled to pour one-quarter to one-half of our income. The consequence would be a progressive degradation of the standard of living of our entire people. In addition we would be forced to adopt military conscription as a permanent practice and turn schools and all the agencies of education and opinion to the cultivation of the military mind and virtues. The triumph of the Nazi armies, moreover, would place the stamp of success on Nazi ideas. This would give these ideas immeasurably greater prestige and authority than they possess today and would stimulate powerfully the growth of some form of American nazi-ism. Our democracy could not long survive these several conditions and tendencies. Such issues, in my judgment, are being decided on the battlefields of Russia as we sit here in convention. Our people, therefore, if they are to view the present world situation with realism, should give the fullest support to the peoples and armies of the Soviet Union, as well as to those of Britain and China, in their struggle against the Axis. This is only common sense.

III

The year has been a difficult but, I think, a successful year for the American Federation of Teachers. By a vote of the entire membership of the federation we have revoked the charters of three locals. This has been a painful experience to all of us. The executive council took the action it did only after fullest consideration of all sides of the question and only for the purpose of actually saving the union. In no other way could the federation relieve itself of a species of political intrigue and conspiracy that for almost a quarter of a century has bedeviled democracies and democratic organizations on six continents and the islands of the sea—a species of political intrigue and conspiracy that has bedeviled the union, and particularly certain of its locals, for many years. We have had the courage to remove from our ranks the organized influence of the Communist Party.

The revocation of the charters of three locals, however, does not build the American Federation of Teachers. Necessary though this action was, it is negative in character. Though it has literally saved the union, it does not build the union. It has merely cleared the way for positive and constructive work.

A splendid beginning for the job that lies ahead has been made during the past year by the committee on the emergency in education of which Vice President George Axtelle was the chairman. In close collaboration with the executive council this committee prepared a report on education, democracy, and defense which was published in full in the March issue of the American Teacher. In my opinion this report is the most fundamental and comprehensive attack upon the problem of our responsibilities and opportunities ever made by the federation. It begins with a fresh analysis of the social situation and points out clearly both the weaknesses and the promises of our democracy. Repudiating without equivocation the sophistry that America must choose between communism and fascism, it insists that democracy, both as social ends and social means, constitutes the only tolerable road to the future. The report then proceeds to outline a total program for the defense and advance of American democracy during the period ahead. It outlines the role of the school and the teacher, of our federation, and of the various forces which may be counted upon to cooperate in the struggle for human freedom. This report is to be studied, discussed, and criticized at this convention. It should be revised and strengthened in accordance with our best thought and then made the basis for the work of the union.

As we look to the future I see five great tasks confronting the American Federation of Teachers. We must, first, defend public education in the United States; second, continue to fight for the ever more complete democratization of public education; third, prepare for the impact of the return of peace on public education; fourth, develop a positive educational program for the post-war world; and fifth, work for the defense and advance of democracy here at home in the United States.

The defense of public education is our first responsibility. This responsibility assumes two forms. On the one hand, we must conduct a continuous fight to maintain school budgets in the face of powerful and sustained pressures emanating from those who are opposed to expenditures for public education, either because they dislike paying taxes or because they fear a thoroughly enlightened people. On the other hand, we must resist all efforts, from whatever source, to impose a narrow orthodoxy upon the schools. We must oppose not only all totalitarian movements from abroad but also guard against the abuses of legislative committees and the attacks of a National Association of Manufacturers or a Governor Talmadge.

The fight to democratize public education and the public-school system is likewise always before us. We must continue the fight to place on boards of education representatives of organized labor and of the working people generally; to bring equality of opportunity to all of our children regardless of race, nationality, religion, or family circumstance; to lift the status of the profession, to improve and make secure working conditions, to encourage teachers to participate actively in the life of both school and community, to collaborate as equals in the framing of both educational and social policy. Also we must give vigorous and sustained attention to the problem of developing an educational program that is truly and positively democratic, an educational program designed to give to the young the knowledge, the loyalties, the discipline of free men.

At some time, whether early or late we do not know, peace will return to the world. The economic and social dislocations that will attend the closing down of war industries are certain to be great and pervasive. The American Federation of Labor and other forward-looking bodies of citizens are insisting that comprehensive plans be formulated to ease the transition to a peacetime economy. In the formulation of such plans our federation should have a voice. More particularly we should be prepared for a general expansion of educational facilities which should be an integral part of the post-war program of the American people. The full use of our productive energies will require the development and extension of various social services. One of these services must and will be public education.

The post-war world will also place upon the American people heavy international responsibilities. After Hitler and all he represents have been destroyed, the task of building a world order based upon the principles of peace, justice, and mercy for all races and peoples will remain. Our experience during the period between the two great wars has demonstrated fully that as a people we cannot withdraw from the world. The effort to do so has led us to the brink of disaster. We shall participate in the settlement following the conclusion of the struggle. We must also be prepared to bear responsibilities in the process of world reconstruction commensurate with our great power. In order that that power may be wisely used and directed, through cooperation with the teachers of other nations, we should proceed to prepare ourselves and our people to build a world to which no Hitler can return.

Our fifth great task is to work in every possible way for the defense and advance of democracy here in America. We must remember that the threat to human freedom comes today from at home as well as from abroad. We must therefore be prepared to oppose not only the despotism which comes from beyond the seas but also the despotism which grows out of our own soil. In fact, the surest way to build that morale and unity so necessary to meet the threat of foreign aggression is to put our democratic professions to work in the United States, in guarding the democratic process, in achieving a general condition of economic security and abundance, in making all of our institutions serve more fully the interests of all our people.

IV

All of this means a strong American Federation of Teachers—a federation enrolling at least 10 percent of the teachers of the country, a federation enjoying the confidence and respect of the American Federation of Labor, and the entire labor movement, a federation known to the American community for its integrity, courage, and vision. I hope that the year ahead will see us advance noticeably toward each of these goals. In the words of John Dewey, addressed to this convention, I trust that we shall not "be modest in our hopes and ambitions," but, rather, that we shall fit our energies to the bold dreams of the founders of the federation 25 years ago. When we or our successors assemble again a quarter century hence I trust that the American Federation of Teachers will be playing the central role in the organization and conduct of public education in the United States and that it will rank among the first of those forces which will have sustained and advanced the cause of democracy during the intervening years.

A Wyoming Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McINTYRE

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1941

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, in a sincere effort to learn the views of my

friends and fellow citizens in Wyoming relative to the efforts that are being made and should be made to defeat Hitler, I propose to send a copy of this statement to each post office and rural box holder in Wyoming, with a card upon which to register his or her opinion by checking the proper squares.

This information will be invaluable to me and other Members of Congress, and I am sure that nearly every person who receives one of these cards will be sufficiently concerned to mark it, place a 1-cent stamp upon it, and return it to my office.

America at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 19, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF REV. JOHN A. O'BRIEN, PH. D., OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, while interventionists, who comprise a minor but very vocal fraction of our people, are trying by every hook and crook to get us into foreign wars, there occasionally arises some great apostle of peace who has the vision and the courage to stand up and urge that now is the time when America should take the lead in proposing mediation to stop the age of butchery and to lift human relations to a plane of sanity and reason.

Rev. John A. O'Brien, Ph. D., of the University of Notre Dame, is such an apostle. He is a real leader in the cause of peace whose eloquent appeals, reflecting sound Americanism and Christian philosophy applied to present-day world problems, are penetrating the homes and firesides of America and making a profound impression.

Dr. O'Brien is a supporter of House Concurrent Resolution No. 20, which I have introduced, and which proposes that the President shall be requested to take the initiative in offering the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator, to the end that the blessings of peace may be brought to a distraught world.

I present for printing in the RECORD an address entitled "America at the Crossroads," recently delivered by Dr. O'Brien over the coast-to-coast network of the National Broadcasting Co., as follows:

I propose to discuss the subject America at the Crossroads, calmly, dispassionately, with no indulgence in personalities and no appeal to racial animosities. I shall appeal only to the fair-mindedness, to the reason, and to the patriotism of the American people.

I should like to make it clear that I am speaking neither for Notre Dame nor for the Catholic Church, but in my own name as an American citizen. I have abhorrence for Hitlerism, loathing for Stalinism, sympathy for the valiant people of Britain, and for the victims of aggression everywhere. I have sympathy likewise for the common masses in every land, including those of Germany, Italy, and Soviet Russia, because they are the helpless victims of the tragedy of war. But I have devotion to American and to our own people first of all. I believe that patriotism, like charity, begins at home.

America stands today at the crossroads, facing the road to war and the road to peace. Which will she choose? Upon that choice hinge the welfare of our country, the civilization built up by our fathers over two centuries of toil, and the lives of millions of American boys.

CHOOSE PEACE

I am asking my fellow countrymen to build an impregnable defense for America and to choose the road to peace. For it is only by walking along that road that we can effectively assist the distressed peoples of the Old World and preserve our freedom and democracy. The path to war means not only national impoverishment but the loss of our freedom and democracy. It is the unfailing pathway to destruction, agony, and death.

I spent the first year of the war at Oxford University, England. There I heard the British labor leader, Arthur Greenwood, declare: "If this war is fought to mutual exhaustion, the British Empire will experience a degree of impoverishment the like of which we have never known. And at the end of the road of all our bloodshed and sacrifice we shall find not a democracy but an authoritarian regime of the right or of the left."

Uttered during the early months of the war, these words should be placed before the people of America that we, too, might see what awaits us at the end if we take the road to war.

ACCOMPLISHED WHAT?

Now that the nations have been engaged in the titanic struggle for 2 years, let us ask, What have they accomplished? Have the Germans proved by their conquest of Poland that they were right and Poland was wrong? Who can remember precisely what the German-Polish dispute was about? There was something about Danzig, the free state, the corridor, and East Prussia. But does not the original point at issue, whatever it was, seem microscopic in comparison with the enormous expenditures in money and in human lives already made by both sides?

Have the Allies proven nazi-ism and fascism to be wrong? Have the Axis Powers disproven the democratic theory by their conquest of France and their overrunning of the other countries of Europe? If Soviet Russia, with the help of Britain and the United States, should triumph over Germany, would that demonstrate that communism is the better way of life and that Europe and America should, therefore, be bolshevized? What single good result has emerged from these 2 years of bloodshed, slaughter, and unparalleled destruction?

THE REAL VICTORS

If we look at the matter calmly, dispassionately, not through the eyes of emotion but through the eyes of reason, we shall be obliged to say all this orgy of killing and destroying has yielded not one single good result. It has accomplished nothing. It has decided no question of justice or right. It has decided merely which side has the more effective military machine and more human fodder to feed it.

Hundreds of cities have been laid waste. Thousands of works of art, culture, and civilization have been destroyed. Hundreds of thousands of families have been uprooted and their members scattered far and wide. Millions of men, women, and children have been slaughtered like cattle. A whole civilization is in flames.

Who are the victors? Lunacy, destruction, death. The whole stupid, brutal business of seeing which side could destroy the most property and kill the largest number of human beings has pulled Europe back into the caveman stage where might is right.

Stripped of all rhetoric, emotionalism, chauvinism, cant, this is the plain, unvarnished statement of the ugly realities.

EUROPE A DESERT

If America should enter the fray, and the war should last for 5 or 10 years, what would the result be? Even if we sent ten or twelve million men the conquest of an Axis-dominated Europe would be problematic. Let us suppose, however, that by some circumstances, not immediately apparent, we should succeed after 10 years in eking out a military victory. What would we have gained?

Europe would be a desert. Ten to twenty million men would be killed. Centuries of civilization would be in ruins. Disease, famine, and death would stalk the land. Our country would be bankrupt. A debt would weigh like a millstone on the neck of generations yet unborn. A military bureaucracy would regiment our every act. The flower of our manhood would be slain. Every home would be in mourning. Who would the victors be? Once again—lunacy, destruction, death.

A FALLACY

What good would we have achieved? Absolutely none. Would we not, however, have crushed Hitlerism, nazi-ism, fascism? We might have slaughtered millions of Germans and millions of Italians, but we would not have crushed these ideologies. As these are ideas, they are impervious to destruction by tanks, guns, and bombs. They can be conquered only by other ideas assimilated through the free play of the mind. Reason, education, and discussion are the only means by which we can purge the human mind of falsehood and secure the entrance of truth.

The whole argument calling for America to enter the European strife to crush nazi-ism and fascism is vitiated, therefore, by a fundamental fallacy—the naive assumption that ideas can be destroyed by arms and warfare. Instead of dislodging these ideas, force will only drive them deeper. External assault will rally even the foes of Hitlerism to the defense of the fatherland. Peace and the capacity to think dispassionately, which peace affords, offer the best means of enabling persons to free themselves from false ideas and vicious philosophies. Only by the sword of the mind functioning freely in peace can we slay the dragon of totalitarian ideology.

WAR'S FUTILITY

War never decides a moral question, a question of right or wrong, over which it is always allegedly fought. It merely decides which side has more guns, more bombing planes, more instruments of death, more cannon fodder. The common masses in all the war-torn countries are the tragic victims. After millions of human beings are slaughtered like cattle, after cities are destroyed and civilizations laid waste, and both sides are exhausted, a conference is held.

Diplomats wearing spats and boutonnieres and generals and admirals with gold braid assemble. "You take this territory and you take that," they say. Then, putting their papers back into their portmanteaus, they go home. But there are some things they do not put back. Among them are the precious lives of the millions of poor human beings who were butchered to decide a question of right which can be decided only by the reason and the conscience of man. Herein lie the folly and the tragedy of war—it is meaningless, completely, utterly, abysmally meaningless.

Before the outbreak of the war Hitler and Daladier warned each other that the only victors would be destruction and death. President Roosevelt had previously reminded both Hitler and Mussolini that the World War proved that military victory was sterile, that it solved nothing and accomplished nothing.

"Nothing," declares the Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, "is gained by war that cannot be

achieved by peace; in war all is lost." Time after time His Holiness has set forth the ideals of peace which we all cherish. "I shall not relax either my efforts or my prayers," he declares, "for the cause of peace." Every day he is praying and struggling to bring peace to a war-torn world.

MORAL LOSSES

I have spoken of the stupendous losses in property and in human lives which modern war entails. The losses in the moral and spiritual spheres are, however, not less appalling. Mercy, kindliness, justice, truth, patience, humility, meekness, tolerance, and Christ's all-embracing law of love are among the first casualties. War declares a moratorium on morality and prostitutes the findings of science to the dirty business of mass slaughter.

Flouting Christ's teaching concerning the dignity of the human personality, the sanctity of human life, and the law of universal love, which teaches us to regard all men as our brothers, children of the same Father, war converts men into cannon fodder and uses as its explosive the dynamite of hatred. Trampling upon the deepest teachings of religion, which proclaims "Love and save," war sings but one refrain—"Hate and destroy, hate and kill, hate and annihilate." Even in America, at peace, 3,000 miles from Europe's flaming feuds, we feel the repercussions of the fear, hysteria, and hatred disseminated by the party clamoring for war.

While religion and ethics justify a nation in defending itself against unjust attack, let it be remembered that America, in spite of her repeated violations of neutrality, has not been attacked. Before a war can be justified ethics demands that, in addition to a just cause, there must be the exhaustion of all pacific means of settling the dispute, and that the good effects outweigh the evil effects. What have we done to exhaust the possibilities of bringing the warring leaders to the peace table? Precisely nothing. Who would maintain that the good effect, if any at all can be found, will outweigh the monstrous and incalculable evils of modern total war?

NO JUSTIFICATION

Reason compels us to say, therefore, that there is not a shred of ethical justification for America entering the European conflict. The moral obligation not to enter that blitzkrieg of destruction is further deepened by the solemn promises, made time and again, by the President during the election campaign. Thus in Boston on October 30, 1940, speaking with a great depth of feeling, the President said: "And while I am talking to you, mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

No President in all history has given to the American people a more unequivocal, a more deliberate, a more solemn and sacred promise. The violation of that solemn pact between the President and the people would be not merely a grievous breach of fundamental morality but it would blast more effectively than all the armies of Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini all faith, both at home and abroad, in democratic government as well. It would break the heart of the American people and the heart of democracy as well.

I have faith in the President. I am supremely confident that, in spite of the war advocates who seem to surround him on every side, he will keep faith with the American people, who have trusted and honored him as they have honored no other man in all our history. Let us help the President to keep that promise by writing to him and to the Congress each day to keep our American boys out of the raging holocaust now devouring the manhood and the civilization of Europe.

LAUNCH PEACE OFFENSIVE

We must not be content, however, with mere opposition to war. The time has come when we must render an historic contribution to world peace. To continue the present orgy of destruction until Europe is in ruins and mankind is liquidated spells not merely the bankruptcy of statesmanship but stark madness as well. What the people of America want, what the people of all the European countries want is a cessation of the stupid and brutal strife now consuming them.

I join my voice with the noble voice of the venerable dean of the American hierarchy, Cardinal O'Connell, of former Ambassador John Cudahy, of Congressman LOUIS LUDLOW, and of mankind the world over in pleading: "Now is the time, Mr. President, to summon the warring leaders to the conference table to lay the foundations for a just and a lasting peace. That must be done eventually, why not, then, before more millions of people are killed instead of afterward?"

No government will turn a deaf ear to an invitation coming in a spirit of fairness and good will from the greatest moral power in the world. It is not on the battlefield but only at the conference table that fair peace terms can be worked out. For that can be achieved, not by violence, but only by the reason and the conscience of man.

If it be said that Hitler can't be trusted, then let an association of nations establish effective, international sanctions. Ultimately the present anarchy among nations, the worst menace to enduring peace, must be supplanted with judicial machinery to settle disputes and with a world sheriff to enforce the decisions of such an international tribunal. That development is as inescapable as the swing of the stars in their courses, if we are to halt the endless competition in armaments and the ever-erupting flames of war.

ROLE OF PEACEMAKER

If you will take the lead now, Mr. President, and throw all your magnificent talents and the power of your mighty office, with the cooperation of Congress into the Christ-like work of halting the brutal European strife, mankind will acclaim you above all the generals that ever lived. Better than a battle won is a battle prevented. Better than a war won, is a war halted. You will be the benefactor, Mr. President, not only of the valiant people of Britain but of the inarticulate masses in all the war-torn countries as well, not excluding Italy, Germany, and Russia.

You will be putting into practice at the greatest crisis in the world's history the deathless truth voiced by the Prince of Peace when He said: "Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called the children of God." I ask all my readers to write a letter immediately—and to continue to do so each week—to the President, to your Congressman and Senators, to your newspaper editors, radio stations, news columnists, and radio commentators pleading for the launching of a vigorous and incessant peace offensive not after Europe is in ruins but Now! Now! Now!

America Proud of Her Men in Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recesses of the House I crossed continental United States in going to and from my home in Oregon. I took occasion to see and interview many of our men who have been called to the service. I do not share the view held by some that the young men of America today are soft and do not measure up in caliber to the young men of other periods in our history. They are indeed the flower of the youth of our country and they may be depended upon to serve their country well, if occasion arises for them to do so. I predict they will give a fine account of themselves and will equal in morale, effectiveness, and patriotism the men who wore our uniform from the days of 1776 down through the first World War of 1917 and 1918.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article appearing in the National Tribune of September 18, 1941, paying a timely and just tribute to our men in uniform and calling attention to some additional provisions that might be made for their welfare in keeping their service effective. The article is as follows:

[From the National Tribune of September 18, 1941]

THEY PRIZE THEIR HERITAGE

An idea seems to be spreading throughout this country that our youth is growing soft. We pick up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the daily newspapers and read matter which greatly disturbs us. Some of our columnists and commentators are getting off on the wrong foot. A few of our legislators are feeding on the wrong kind of meat. All of this tends to enhance an untruth.

When anyone refers sneeringly to the youth of the land, he is slamming at our boys in uniform. The National Tribune does not like that. We think that the boys now in service and those about to be called to duty come very close to being the salt of the earth. They have their faults, but who hasn't?

A great deal of loose talk is being thrown around to the effect that the morale of the service is low. If it is, there is a definite reason for it. A prominent legislator recently poked fun at the uniform being worn by the new Army. There is a reason for that, too. Only a few days ago a department commander of a great veterans' organization called our selectees "a bunch of spoiled boys." We shall also have something to say about that.

The service men are no different today than they ever were. They are the sons of our World War veterans. They are the same kind of timber that volunteered for service in the Spanish-American War. They are of the same make-up as the men who made the plains safe for the white man. They have not changed a bit from the boys who marched away in the early sixties to preserve our Union of States. They come from the same kind of stock which made possible our "four freedoms" back in early history.

Certainly there is some griping in the ranks. Why not? We who have already done ours know from experience and from history that there will be found in any group of men some few who will bellyache. They were probably nurtured on sour milk.

Thomas Paine at Valley Forge wrote: "The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country, but he who serves it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman." Despite some griping, the great mass of Revolutionary soldiers freed us from tyranny.

During our Civil War there were thin-skinned men who "bought out" and hired others to do their job. In spite of such faithlessness, this Nation remained a united whole. Savage tribes in the western prairies were

tamed and this Nation's development moved to new horizons.

Forty-three years ago there were some who did not believe their country's troubles were their own, but a wholly volunteer army defeated a ruthless Spanish dictator. Many of those men had real reason to gripe then, and still have. There was griping during the World War, too. Those protests are still fresh in memory and need no discussion here. Suffice it to say that loyal service men turned the tide against the Kaiser's legions.

There is reason for protest by our boys in service today. They have had to give up good jobs in exchange for $21 a month. They despair because nobody has had the courage to tell them exactly why they are in uniform and let them squarely face the issues. Some elements are taking advantage of an uncertain future and are getting theirs while the getting is good. The folks at home are doing too much mollycoddling, because we are not actually at war. There is too much ill-founded newspaper talk. Radio addresses make the boys wonder. The Congress itself interferes too much with service discipline.

Those slacks the boys wear are purposed to give them more freedom of movement, if one desires the truth. The boys are "spoiled," if any, only because the relations between enlisted and officer personnel, an internal affair of our services and the very essence of military discipline, is being interfered with.

Social workers with no military experience insist upon show girls displaying their legs to the boys instead of permitting the lads to develop their own. Other new types of recreation are the vogue Experienced soldiers from the "horse and buggy" age have no time for them, but they are outvoted.

If discipline is lacking, it is the fault of the peopole, of the legislators, of the national administration—not of the boys themselves. The morale of our Army can be restored to its customary vigor, but it must be done by old-fashioned methods.

Our boys in uniform do not want to be sissies. They do not want ruffles on their pants. They have the same sentiments as men who have seen service in prior times of distress. They know that if war comes, this country must not wait to have its own lands laid waste and its womenfolk ravaged. They are ready to carry the trouble to any potential enemy. They want to be left alone and not lulled into a sense of false security.

Like other American boys now grown up, they know that this country can knock the tar out of any nation on the face of the earth—or any combination of nations. They have studied history and ingrained in them is the knowledge that when Uncle Sam gets mad the rest of the world had better watch out. These boys know all about patriotism with a capital P, and they like it. They are Americans with a capital A. Our boys have no notion whatever that they or their comrades are softies and they are proceeding to get tough.

There is no pessimism in this group of young men. They know that we are not yet prepared for war, and they also know that we never have been until after an extreme emergency has arisen. They know that this is because we do not like war—we hate it.

But these fellows are the flower of our youth. The time has come to stop all of this fool talk and let the boys and their superiors work out their own means of getting ready for what confronts them. That business is a soldier's occupation. The Army should be permitted to use its own experienced means of creating an army. Discipline will not be lacking. The Navy can handle its own affairs. Keep civilian ideas out and they will get along all right.

Why not be honest? Let us place the blame where it belongs and clean up. The veterans know that, given a real chance, these new young men in uniform will be all ready when the time comes to stick out their chins, and they will be able to take it.

There will always be a few gripers; yes. But the vast numbers of patriotic boys who make up the new services will have a chip on their shoulders like the fighting men of old. They will be daring all comers to knock it off. If the time should come for demonstration, they will have the stuff all right.

Let us give the boys a real chance. Let us leave them alone. They prize their heritage.

Stifling Business Means Unemployment

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1941

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, factories all over the country are being shut down because the Government refuses to permit them to have materials out of which to make goods for their customers.

Seemingly, the most important material of which small concerns are being deprived is steel. For months the steel companies have been filling orders at Washington direction, and a few weeks ago all steel was placed under priority. Taking into consideration the amount of steel used in our defense program, which is at the most 14,000,000 tons, and taking into consideration the fact that 90,000,000 tons of steel is being produced, we wonder what is happening to the other 76,000,000 tons.

There is something very queer about all this priority. All the materials produced and procurable in this country are not by any means needed by the current manufacture of war implements. I am fearful that what is being turned away from manufactures is being piled up in storerooms somewhere and this artificial shortage will some day strike us in the face and have to be destroyed or cause us to shut down again because of oversupply. I fully believe that there is enough material in the United States that if properly allocated every business would be sufficiently supplied and could continue operation and give all employment.

As an example of what is taking place in my district, I am including a letter from one of my constituents:

MANSFIELD, OHIO, *Sepember 18, 1941.*

Hon. J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This week 700 employees at the Westinghouse plant here in Mansfield, Ohio, were given 3-days notice that they would be laid off. This is due to the curtailment that has been put into effect in the refrigeration industry.

The Richland County Industrial Union Council, representing over 9,000 workers in the city has these workers interest at stake, and is desirous of seeing some program planned whereby we can handle this unnecessary unemployment.

Although only 700 have been affected at the present time, the future points to many times this number being laid off in the weeks to come. This will cause a serious hardship upon the community and its citizens.

Therefore this council urges that immediate steps be taken to provide employment for these people in Mansfield or the surrounding vicinity. We are aware that many more defense orders could be easily handled here, and urge that they be granted to employers in the Mansfield area.

Hoping to receive your cooperation concerning this matter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRED SIMON,
Recording Secretary, R. I. U. C.

I certainly feel that something should be done, and at an early date, before we have "starvation in the land of plenty."

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN, OF IOWA

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over the radio on September 21:

The subject of my discussion tonight is the present status of our national-defense effort. With more than one and one-half million of our sons in uniform, this question stands uppermost in our thoughts, both from the national interest and from our direct personal interest in behalf of those serving in the armed forces.

I have recently spent several days traveling about the maneuver area in Louisiana and talked with boys in every type of service, and grade within that service, and I am very greatly pleased and reassured that the American soldiers of today are doing a magnificent job, and I am sure also that they will be fully prepared and fully equal to any task assigned to them, provided we furnish them with adequate armament and ammunition whenever needed.

It has been my good fortune to serve as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives from January 1939 to date, and this period of service more than covers the entire augmentation program in our national-defense effort. It is wellnigh impossible now to carry ourselves back to January 1939 and picture the almost total helplessness of our Nation, defensively speaking, as at that time existed. It is also difficult to realize how completely oblivious our governmental officials then were to the need for bringing our training and armament up to date. Europe was then engaged in a mad race in armament production and extensive military training, but America was sleeping all too soundly in the matter of national defense. Our own Nation was deeply engrossed in far-reaching experiments in social reform and the weakness of our defense bore mute evidence of long neglect.

For 20 years defense appropriations had been cut drastically in the name of economy, notwithstanding the fact that almost every leading ex-service man throughout that 20-year period had cried out in vain against such a drastic policy of neglect. These same ex-service men decried the prevailing policy as

a false effort at economy and large numbers of them vigorously predicted that such neglect would eventually lead to undreamed-of wastefulness through bringing on an excited, inefficient, and hysterical effort to arm overnight. Their predictions have been borne out far more realistically than even predicted by the ex-service men.

But that is now all water over the dam, and we must view the situation as it faces us today. Our Nation slept all too soundly, notwithstanding vigorous individual efforts to arouse her. In fact, no substantial awakening became manifest until the invasion of the Low Countries in the middle of June 1940. Then our national administration became excited almost overnight A fast and far-reaching program was launched and when our Nation reached for its weapons the weapons literally were not there.

Those of us who have given some thought to the problem of rearmament knew full well that in our very weak status it would require at least 2 years to rearm America from the time legislation authorizing the program was enacted into law and appropriations made thereon. We also knew that no program could be launched before it was properly authorized by legislation and that no law could even be considered by Congress until recommended by the Committees on Military Affairs.

When war broke out in Europe September 3, 1939, our Congress was called into special session to consider neutrality legislation and the lifting of the arms embargo. It will no doubt be amazing to many of you that the Committee on Military Affairs was not permitted to meet once all during that session of Congress in the fall of 1939, and consequently no legislation was considered in the field of national defense. That now is also water over the dam, but it served to illustrate very vividly the sound slumber in which America was indulging.

If our defense effort is found to be too little and too late, the real cause therefore can very logically be charged to the time lost in those precious months of 1939 and 1940. Up to June 1940 it was discouraging indeed to witness the lifting of the arms embargo, the very obvious trend toward unneutrality, and the realization that nations can be plunged into armed conflict almost over night, whereas armament and adequate training cannot be acquired in much less than 2 years of extreme effort.

One of the bright rays of hope in our own national picture came with the passage of Public Law No. 117, which was approved and became law June 7, 1939, and which had for its purpose the authorization of the accumulation of reserve supplies of strategic and critical materials. I made a rather extensive study of that legislation while it was under consideration by the Committee on Military Affairs, and I found that its author, Congressman FADDIS, of Pennsylvania, had been struggling for many years to secure its passage. Congressman FADDIS was one of the few leaders in American public life who realized years ahead of the emergency that the 2-year period needed for the acquisition of adequate armament and training must be preceded by some systematic effort to secure adequate stock piles of strategic and critical materials.

Perhaps I should define what is meant by strategic materials. A strategic material is one that is absolutely necessary in our defense program and which is not produced within our own Nation in sufficient quantities, so that we become dependent upon long and dangerous trade routes for our supply thereof. There are only 15 strategic materials in our national-defense program, and we are indeed the most-favored Nation on this earth in that respect, because every other nation is dependent upon dangerous trade routes for far more materials than are we. After our stock-pile program was authorized by Public Law 117 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, it was necessary to follow the usual procedure in securing the appropriations to put the program into effect. The authorization law provided for $100,000,000 over a period of 4 years of time. But appropriations under this law were cut to $10,000,000 until late in the winter of 1939 and 1940 when an additional sixty million was appropriated.

Those of us on the Committee on Military Affairs who were vitally interested in this beginning of our preparedness program watched with even greater interest the progress, or lack of progress, in administering the program. We were not only disappointed but somewhat alarmed at the lack of progress of acquiring adequate stock piles of strategic materials, and our alarm gave rise to a special investigation by a subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee, starting in May 1941. This subcommittee consisted of Mr. FADDIS, of Pennsylvania, who was named chairman; Mr. SMITH of Connecticut; Mr. KILDAY, of Texas; Mr. DURHAM, of North Carolina; Mr. PAGÁN, of Puerto Rico; the late Mr. RUTHERFORD, of Pennsylvania; Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey; and myself. After a long and exhausting investigation and study in this field a report was made to the full Committee on Military Affairs, and this report was duly approved by the full committee and submitted to the House of Representatives on July 21, 1941. The report is No. 982 of the House of Representatives, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session.

I regret that I do not have time on this program to cover this report in detail, but those of you who are interested in reading what I consider a comprehensive and informative discussion of our problem in regard to strategic materials, should secure a copy of House Report No. 982 for your study of this most important matter. The 15 strategic materials are antimony, chromium, coconut shell char, industrial diamonds, manganese, ferrograde, manila fiber, mercury, mica, nickel, quartz crystal, quinine, rubber, silk, tin, tungsten.

If any of you are embarrassed or inconvenienced through priorities of one kind or another due to shortage in these important materials you will join with me, I am sure, in hoping that this committee has effectively pointed out the need for increased efforts in building our stock piles of these materials before it is too late. I, myself, only regret that Mr. FADDIS' bill did not receive congressional approval some few years earlier than it did, but we can now only look ahead hopefully to maintaining a more vigorous effort to secure adequate stock piles of these materials. If we had adequate stock piles of each of these materials to tide over an emergency period of not less than 2 years of time, we would be far safer today, not only in our defense effort, but also in our domestic economy. We have been increasing our stock piles to some extent during recent months, but we are still far short of our desired 2-year supply in almost every strategic material. We have given much attention to the matter of development of substitutes and to the development of our own production, but in most cases, we cannot count on adequate supplies from our own production in time to relieve us of our anxiety in event we plunge into a shooting war within the next several months.

Now let us turn to the matter of armament production. I have stated before that the production of adequate armament will require approximately 2 years from the time legislation and appropriations were first made available, and we have had a little more than 1 year of time since our first serious effort at preparedness. We have heard much discussion in that time of strikes and of the refusal of labor, capital, and industry to cooperate and coordinate their efforts. But it is to the everlasting credit of the American people that, notwithstanding the slow and cumbersome approach of the Government to the matter of our preparedness, and notwithstanding these various distractions that have claimed so much publicity in the course of our defense effort, our Nation has made more progress in defense preparedness during the past year than any other nation has ever done in all history in a like period of time. Notwithstanding that record, we must remember that we cannot expect in 1 year the full accomplishment of other nations that have devoted as much as 8 years to their armament program. So we must look hopefully ahead to continue the superlative effort by all until we have completed our defense effort and brought our armament up to our needs for whatever dangerous possibility lies in waiting for us. It will require approximately 1 more year to do this, but, of course, we will soon attain a fair degree of defense security if we continue our present progress. If we continue our efforts without interruption for another year, I predict you will not recognize this Nation as the same Nation it is today, defensively speaking, and in my opinion it is very sensible and logical to continue our all-out effort in the production of armament and training and at the same time to work as diligently and as vigorously as we can to avoid plunging headlong into armed conflict.

It may be that we are too late in our defense effort to completely arm and train our forces by the time we are plunged into armed conflict, but every month that we devote our energies to our defense effort is bringing closer the achievement of our maximum defense strength. It may be possible for America to successfully engage in a shooting war, using the Navy as a first line of defense until we have completed our armament and training program; but my own opinion is that America can strengthen her position through the completion of her armament and training program before plunging into armed conflict, and that America may by her very strength avoid war through the respect other nations will have for a powerful America. The dyed-in-the-wool warmongers in our land number somewhat less than 1 percent of our population, but they are a noisy lot and they are intent upon our plunging into armed conflict as a means to silence our overwhelming opposition to war. Armed conflict will silence the opposition to war, but it will not enhance our own international prestige, and it will endanger our national security if it comes before we are adequately prepared. No man can tell at what precise date we will be adequately prepared for whatever need we may have, and no one can predict the full extent of the needs that confront us; but we do know one thing, and that is that we should continue to exert every effort to the limit of our ability to complete our armament and training program as quickly as possible, and we know also that this challenge supersedes every other factor in our Nation's life until we have achieved maximum preparedness.

I predict that our armament will be sufficiently complete by January 1 to make us relatively safe from attack, and I predict that by next July 1 we will be almost completely armed and safe from aggression from without, provided we do not become aggressor-minded ourselves in the meantime. At the time we become adequately armed for our defense it will be necessary for us to guard against becoming an international bully ourselves. When we become strong we have, through our greater productive capacity and our aggressive American spirit, the factors that appeal so strongly to the vanity of mankind in its lust for power. We must then resolutely determine to limit the use of our power to avoid armed conflict, or we may travel the same road that all great nations have traveled before us, to our own destruction through our effort to police and dominate and subjugate all the nations of this earth. In other words,

we may face disaster today because of unpreparedness and we may face disaster tomorrow through misuse of the strength that will be ours when our armament and training program has caught up with the other nations.

We can be a united and powerful nation so long as we work harmoniously and efficiently and energetically together in building our defense and at the same time avoid armed conflict.

Conclusions on St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1941

LETTER OF TOM J. McGRATH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT CONFERENCE, REPLY THERETO BY HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, OF IDAHO

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a letter which was received by me from Mr. Tom J. McGrath, executive director, National St. Lawrence Project Conference, and my reply thereto:

NATIONAL ST. LAWRENCE
PROJECT CONFERENCE,
Washington, D. C., September 15, 1941.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The National St. Lawrence Project Conference is a voluntary association of organizations, the members of which believe that their own and the interests of the country will be adversely affected if the St. Lawrence waterway and power project should be completed.

As of this date the conference has a membership of 210 organizations which in turn represent thousands of business institutions throughout the country. It is quite probable that many of them are your constituents. Our latest published list of members consisting of 183 names, is to be found on the opposite side of this letterhead.

Prior to its inclusion in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill, a great many Members of Congress had publicly voiced their convictions with respect to the matter, others had informed their constituents of their intentions regarding support or opposition to the measure.

When it became clear that the project would not be approved by the House if considered solely on its individual merits, the expediency of having it incorporated in the rivers and harbors bill was adopted.

Obviously, this was done with the hope of attracting support that the project otherwise would not have received. The universal condemnation which this method of procedure has provoked, persuades us to the belief that the course pursued will not produce the results its sponsors seek. A somewhat limited survey of the situation indicates that but few Members of Congress have changed their views since the action referred to was taken.

We conceive it to be our function to advise our members of the names of Congressmen whom we know have expressed doubt as to the proper position to take so that information concerning the probable effect of the project on their businesses and their communities may be given to their representatives by constituents.

Believing that many Members of Congress will wish to be relieved of the burden of answering unnecessary correspondence, we are writing to ask if you care to indicate your position regarding the St. Lawrence project to us at this time. If you wish it, we shall be glad to advise our members in your district of your views.

Respectfully yours,
TOM J. McGRATH,
Executive Director.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION
AND RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., September 18, 1941.

Mr. TOM J. McGRATH,
Executive Director, National
St. Lawrence Project Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McGRATH: In response to your letter of September 15, in which you state:

"We conceive it to be our function to advise our members of the names of Congressmen whom we know have expressed doubt as to the proper position to take * * *."

I have taken no definite position for or against the St. Lawrence waterway and power project, but it would appear that the benefits and advantages of opening the shore line of the Great Lakes bordering the United States to deep-sea transportation would be a great forward step in the industrial development of our country, particularly in making available resources and sites for shipyards and industries connected with the shipbuilding industry.

In addition to affording an avenue for ocean-borne transportation to this vast area, it would seem to me the effect of this development on our national economy would outweigh any adverse effect on certain utilities and the rail transportation systems. I am convinced that a review of the industrial and commercial development throughout the world will sustain this conclusion. I shall be pleased to consider any presentation at variance with this idea.

Sincerely yours,
COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Rehoboth Bay to Delaware Bay, Del., Inland Waterway, and Broadkill, Del.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1941

EXTRACT FROM HEARINGS BEFORE RIVERS AND HARBORS COMMITTEE

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extract from recent hearings before the Rivers and Harbors Committee:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
Washington, D. C., September 18, 1941.

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Colonel, the first project this morning is for the inland waterway between Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay, Del., and Broadkill River, Del.

REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, DEL., INLAND WATERWAY, AND BROADKILL RIVER, DEL. (H. DOC. 340, 77TH CONG., 1ST SESS.)

(Here follows testimony of Colonel North relating to this project:)

Mr. PITTENGER. I would like to ask you a question or two. What is the cost of this improvement recommended by the Department?

Colonel NORTH. It is $224,900.

Mr. PITTENGER. As testified to here yesterday, some of the projects are substantially large, but a lot of them are rather small ones. This is a comparatively small project.

Most of these projects have been pending for a number of years, have they not?

Colonel NORTH. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. All of which leads me to make this comment for the record, that it would appear from the testimony given here that a lot of these projects probably would have been just as desirable 8 or 10 years ago as they are at this time, and that the development of our harbors and our shipping facilities in these rivers, comparatively speaking, has been rather neglected; is that correct?

Colonel NORTH. I think that is correct; yes, sir. These resolutions were adopted in 1939.

Mr. PITTENGER. And the situation in 1939 was not much different from the situation in 1929.

Colonel NORTH. That is right.

Mr. PITTENGER. And if it was desirable in 1939 and to the advantage of the United States and its people to make these improvements at that time, it was desirable years before. In the development of our inland waterways and rivers and harbors and water transportation, is it not a fact that the United States is way behind compared to the development of similar facilities by the people in European countries in past years?

Colonel NORTH. That is my understanding.

Mr. SMITH. Is it not a fact, in line with what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] has said, that probably every one of these projects is necessitated by the growth and increase in commerce in those areas?

Colonel NORTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. PITTENGER. That is all the more reason why we should undertake them without delay.

Mr. SMITH. Furthermore, it seems to me that while we are appropriating these vast sums for aid to Britain and aid to the democracies on the theory—which is probably correct—that it is in the interest of our own national defense—while we are doing that, we should not neglect internal improvements in our own country, because the interests of the American people still ought to come first.

Mr. PITTENGER. I agree with you on that.

Mr. SMITH. And we should not curtail expenditures for legitimate flood control, highway and river and harbor projects while we are making these vast donations to foreign countries.

Mr. PITTENGER. I agree with everything the gentleman has said; his argument is a strong argument for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway project.

Mr. ANGELL. I would like to say in connection with this matter, that it seems to me it is a matter of sound judgment and wise statesmanship to provide for carrying forward our internal improvements at this time, making these authorizations for improvements which should be carried on after investigation and report by the Corps of Engineers. These improvements, the construction of them, will be carried on under the supervision of the engineers, which means that we will get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar of expenditure and at the same time afford some relief to the unemployed laboring people in our country.

In my judgment, we are on sound ground when we approve projects of the type now under consideration.

Mr. SMITH. Also, we should not defer actual construction a long time in the future because we are progressing, and this work should not be deferred.

Mr. PITTENGER. I want to make a further comment for the record which has to do with these hearings, and that is this: I do not think the American people realize, or have the information which they should have, which will show them the tremendous importance of the development of these projects which have been under consideration by the War Department engineers. The Corps of Engineers of the Army is a disinterested body of men, highly trained, skilled, and expert, with the welfare of the American people as their only consideration. I think that Congress should give more heed to their suggestions, and that these problems and projects should come before the individual Members of Congress, as well as before the members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, so that they may be able to combat this broadcasting of propaganda going around against what these propagandists call pork-barrel bills because this omnibus bill is not a pork-barrel bill.

Mr. SMITH. Is it not a fact that for many years, during the time when the distinguished chairman of this committee has been a member of the committee, and particularly since he has been chairman of the committee, that it could never be truthfully argued or contended, based upon any facts, that any of these rivers and harbors projects are "pork." in the sense that they might have been 30 or 40 years ago before the present system was adopted in reference to passing on river and harbor projects?

Mr. PITTENGER. That is true. That charge of "pork" is absolutely unjustified.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; it is unjustified.

Mr. PITTENGER. It is false and malicious, circulated by selfish interests, by the railroads, and other people who do not want these improvements.

Mr. SMITH. There is no class of projects authorized by Congress that is subjected to such scrutiny and investigation as river and harbor projects. There is no single type of projects of the Federal Government that receives as thorough consideration and study as river and harbor projects.

The CHAIRMAN. I think sometime I would like to get permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and reprint a speech I heard James R. Mann make 20 or 25 years ago on the floor of the House in reference to this matter. As you know, he was the majority leader of the House at that time, and he gave the whole history of the method of procedure in adopting river and harbor projects, and showed that no other type of legislation was so thoroughly guarded and protected as river and harbor legislation under the present system. The people making these charges know that they are not true; they are deceiving the people who are not familiar with the facts.

Mr. RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, we have had a precedent established in the consideration of the Florida ship canal and the St. Lawrence seaway, considered as separate projects, and after they have been rejected as separate projects they are put into an omnibus bill, they are getting away with it.

Mr. SMITH. Not entirely. It is still in the bill as a separate project, but it will come up under an open rule.

Mr. RODGERS. It is in the bill, and it was put in the bill before——

Mr. SMITH. Any Member could offer an amendment striking out that project, and it can be voted upon separately. That is one reason why this propaganda is entirely misleading. We can get a separate vote on the St. Lawrence project.

Mr. RODGERS. It is in the omnibus bill, but it was not in the omnibus bill when it was put in before.

Mr. PITTENGER. The St. Lawrence project, as such, has never come before this committee on any other occasion except in this Congress. It was before the Senate as a treaty proposition. That project has as much right to a place in this omnibus bill as any other item in the bill. It has never been before this committee at any other time before in the history of the country.

Mr. ANGELL. Every President has recommended it before.

Oregon Among Leaders in Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE PORTLAND OREGONIAN

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note from a news item appearing under date of August 17, 1941, from Milwaukee, Wis., during the session of the national convention of the American Legion, that Fiorello H. LaGuardia, Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, stated that the State of Oregon is among the leaders of civilian defense in the West. I have recently returned from my native State of Oregon and had occasion while there to interview many leaders and workers having to do with our national-defense program, and am happy to confirm from information received on the ground the statement of our national Director of Civilian Defense.

The people of Oregon are 100 percent behind our program to make America impregnable and to leave no stone unturned to perfect our defense at the very earliest possible date. There is unity in our State behind the administration's effort to complete our defense program and to lend all aid possible to Great Britain.

Under leave heretofore granted, I include as a part of my remarks the news item to which I refer:

[From the Portland Oregonian of August 18, 1941]

STATE LAUDED BY LAGUARDIA—OREGON'S DEFENSE EFFORTS APPROVED

MILWAUKEE, WIS., August 17.—The State of Oregon is among the leaders in civilian defense in the West, Fiorello H. LaGuardia, Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, told Joseph K. Carson, Jr., inspector general of civil defense ar Oregon department commander of the American Legion, and Jerrold Owen, Oregon defense coordinator, at a conference in this city, where the mayor of New York was a speaker on the program of the national convention of the Legion.

LaGuardia met with his regional chiefs and also conferred with numerous heads of State civil-defense groups.

Charles R. Page, of San Francisco, regional coordinator, advised LaGuardia that splendid progress had been made in Oregon in its preparatory program and in the actual training of units in first-aid, fire fighting, police technique, and air-raid precautions.

OREGON DELEGATES CAUCUS

To Owen, LaGuardia expressed himself as well pleased with the cooperation being received by his office from Gov. Charles A. Sprague, State director of civilian defense, and declared that the growing pains inevitable in the speedy organization of so vast a program fast were being eliminated, and that there would be no occasion in the future for lack of liaison between the national office and State defense councils.

A final caucus of Oregon delegates to the American Legion convention was held Wednesday night. With more than 900 votes pledged to Lynn Stambaugh, of Fargo, N. Dak., choice of Oregon for national commander, his election Thursday seems assured. Ben F. Dorris, of Springfield, Oreg., is one of his managers.

Andrew Furuseth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. RICHARD J. WELCH, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, the following is an address made by me at the unveiling of a monument erected to honor the memory of the late Andrew Furuseth, in San Francisco, on Labor Day, September 1, 1941:

It is eminently fitting that there should be here on the embarcadero in this great city of San Francisco on the Pacific Ocean a monument to commemorate the memory of the late Andrew Furuseth, who devoted his life to relieve from abject slavery the toilers of the sea.

To dedicate the monument would be an empty and idle thing, if we accompanied it by the abandonment of the patriotic and humanitarian principles for which Andrew Furuseth fought for to the very last. Many of us still live to tell the terrible story of crimping, shanghaiing, the sailor boarding-house runners, and the filthy fo'castles of yesteryears.

Andrew Furuseth was born in Norway in 1854 and died in Washington, D. C., in 1938. He went to sea at a very early age and sailed successively under the flags of nearly all the maritime nations. He came to the United States in 1880 and landed in San Francisco, where he soon became a familiar figure along the water front, starting his long, uphill fight here to secure better living conditions and freedom for seamen.

To the men who bucked the gales of Cape Hatteras or dared dread typhoons in the mid-Pacific, the name of Andrew Furuseth is honored and almost sainted. In Washington he lived in one small, inexpensive room and patiently fought for 20 years in collaboration with the late Senator La Follette to secure the passage of the Seamen's Act, which finally became a law in 1915. It was there that he was often likened to Abraham Lincoln, who freed the black slaves in this country, even as Andrew Furuseth was instrumental in removing the shackles from the white slaves of the seven seas.

I am glad to be home and to be accorded the privilege of participating in the unveiling of a monument erected by the sailors

of the Pacific in honor of a man whose honesty, simplicity, and perseverence brought to him the respect of people in all stations of life.

Long may the statue of Andrew Furuseth stand as a symbol of patriotism and sincerity, to be followed out alike by owners, masters, and the men who man our merchant marine.

"Simple in greatness through the years you've stood,
Great in tasks done in stern simplicity,
High in your unswerving record for good—
Of devotion, sacrifice, integrity."

Merrily We Go Boondoggling Along

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE VALPARAISO (IND.) VIDETTE-MESSENGER

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the August 14, 1941, issue of the Valparaiso (Ind.) Vidette-Messenger:

WHAT SACRIFICES?

One treads on dangerous ground in criticizing projects involving the cultural progress of man, for we have been taught that the better and happier life is possible only through fulfillment of our esthetic and spiritual natures. Just now, however, there seems to be a bigger task facing America, a task that is going to take all the energy and worldly wealth we can scrape together. That, our leaders have assured us, is the situation we face. We must meet force with force, if necessary, and to this end a great preparedness program is now under way. No one knows, of course, how great our sacrifices must be in the days to come. But indications are that life in this country may well be reduced to bare essentials before the issues of war and peace are finally resolved. So far none of us has experienced any great hardship as a result of our defense program. As a matter of fact the opposite has been true. Many of us have found life more pleasant and simple by virtue of increased wages which have enabled us to enjoy worldly possessions long denied because of economic hardships. In other words, we are now in the midst of a boom and thoughts of sacrifice are farthest from our minds.

But warnings have been sounded of darker days to come. We think of this darkness in terms of our pocketbooks, since the dollar, as our medium of exchange, is the greatest symbol of the health our national life is enjoying. We have looked with awe upon the enormous national Budget and the resultant tax bills, greater than ever in history. We know that a day of reckoning is ahead and we have been exhorted to prepare ourselves for the shocks that are bound to come. There have been pleas that in view of the terrific expenditures made necessary by the defense effort, other nonessential spending be curtailed. In all forms of national activity, we have been told, cutting to the bone is necessary. These are not normal times and we have no right to expect normal functioning of our economic system. In the light of such conditions, a recent speech in the House of Representatives by Representative WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER, a New York Republican, is significant. It reveals, in a small measure, how poorly the Government itself is practicing what its administrators have been preaching.

Representative PHEIFFER offered for the thoughtful consideration of his colleagues three projects approved by the W. P. A. The first was a matter of $1,903,927 and here is what it was for, in the words of the Congressman:

"That money is to be expended to assist in organizing and operating library services for public libraries and to assist public museums. The work includes creating, restoring, installing, and controlling museum exhibits; extending educational facilities by conducting research work in connection with the preparation of exhibits and dioramas, and assisting in the care and propagation of experimental plants and cultures; preparing bibliographies in connection with museum activities, and so forth."

Another project, approved June 22, 1941, appropriated $367,942 "to prepare, compute, transcribe, check, and reproduce a series of mathematical tables necessary in various branches of astronomy, mathematics, physics, and engineering." A third, involving $374,000, would provide for inventories of books, pamphlets, and broadsides printed in the United States and its territorial possessions prior to January 1, 1891.

The total represented by these three projects is $2,646,868, and it represents only random examples of W. P. A. projects in a single State. Multiply this by a hundred and one gets a rough idea of the amount of money, all of which must be paid by taxpayers already facing a staggering war preparedness burden, that is going into nondefense coffers.

Of this disclosure, the Congressman from New York says, "It is startling proof of the fact that a great deal of the money which we appropriated for the use of the Office for Emergency Management and the War Department for the building of an unassailable defense for our country is being used to pay for frills and furbelows that have not the slightest relation to national defense."

Americans have never been a penny-pinching people. Rather they have been guilty of spendthrift tendencies, sometimes to their grave detriment. Now one hears little criticism of the spending necessary to build tanks and guns for America and the announcement of the great tax measures now being considered by Congress has been greeted with surprisingly little opposition or resentment. But it does seem that taxpayers have some justification for demanding that Washington go easy on the items that might well be postponed "for the duration." First things should be put first.

Butter or Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW REPUBLIC AND REPLY OF WILLIAM KIRSCH

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Republic of August 11, 1941, and reply thereto by William Kirsch, principal statistician of the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture:

[From the New Republic of August 11, 1941]

BUTTER OR OLEOMARGARINE?

A long-continued American battle flared up in Congress the other day—the one between spokesmen for producers of butter and those who are friendly to manufacturers of oleomargarine. The occasion for the revival of the historic quarrel was a recent radio broadcast by the Consumers' Counsel of the Department of Agriculture. This program told the American people that oleomargarine is not only very much cheaper than butter, but that it is an important food on its own account. By law, butter and oleomargaine are both required to be at least 80 percent fat, are equally digestible and equally rich in fuel value. Under the new standards of the Food and Drug Administration, margarine is now reinforced with vitamin A and therefore equal to butter in nutritive content.

That the Government should point this out caused Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN a mild case of hysterics. Representative ANDRESEN comes from a dairy State, and naturally wants everybody in the country to eat butter despite the fact that we don't produce enough to give everyone the necessary quantity for health, and that a large part of the population could not afford it at last year's prices, to say nothing of this year's that are one-third higher. He objected also to the fact that the Government radio program told the listener that dairy interests in many States have succeeded in jamming through outrageous taxes on oleomargarine in order to force people to eat butter whether they can afford it or not. In this battle we are all on the side of the Department of Agriculture. We hope it will continue to speak out in the interest of the consuming public.

REPLY TO THE EDITORIAL WHICH APPEARED IN THE NEW REPUBLIC, AUGUST 11, 1941

1. The radio broadcast of the Consumers' Counsel Division of the United States Department of Agriculture mentioned in your editorial of August 11, 1941, failed to state that even fortified oleomargarine when made of vegetable oils does not contain certain fatty saturated acids. These acids, according to Prof. C. A. Elvehjem of the University of Wisconsin, one of the outstanding biochemists in the United States, are important to growing individuals. How important they are to children is being tested now. Failure to mention this constitutes a very serious and fundamental omission from the point of view of the problem of food standards.

The primary object of food standardization and government regulation of standards is to give the consuming public accurate information as to a given food product with regard to ingredients contained therein. It would not do, for instance, to say that in case a young child needs certain fatty saturated acids absent in oleomargarine it can obtain them from other foods. If there is no mention of an ingredient absent in a food article, even if the problem is only in an experimental stage, and this is sanctioned by a government agency, then the way is open to similar encroachments in the practice of food standardization with regard to other food products.

The latest available figures on materials used in the manufacture of oleomargarine in the United States show that for the year 1939 there were 172,424,000 pounds of domestic vegetable oils. That means a total of 225,359,000 pounds of vegetable oils used. On the other hand, animal fats used amounted to only 17,399,000 pounds (Agricultural Statistics, 1940. U. S. Department of Agriculture).

In this connection let me point out that the claim of the nutritive value of oleo-

margarine as compared with butter has a peculiar history.

As early as 1881, Prof. C. F. Chandler, of the department of chemistry, Columbia University, was directed by the Board of Health of New York City "to investigate the subject of oleomargarine" (W. T. Mickle's margarine legislation, Journal of Farm Economics, August 1941).

In his report Professor Chandler said, in part:

"I regard it (oleomargarine) as a most valuable article of food and consider it entirely unexceptional in every respect. In this opinion I am supported by the best scientific authorities in the country. * * * I would further say that this question is one on which there is no difference of opinion among scientific investigators familiar with the chemistry of dairy products and fats. I have never seen a statement emanating from any person having any standing among scientific men in which a contrary opinion is advanced." This took place in 1881. Then, decades later, within recent years came the discovery of vitamins, "the agencies in our food which, although they exist in extremely minute quantities—and most of them have been identified only within the past few years—are absolutely essential to the well-being of every living organism, plant and animal, including man." (Quoted from Bruce Bliven's article in the August 18, 1941, issue of the New Republic.) When this was discovered, another fact was also discovered, namely, that oleomargarine lacks the vitamins essential to growth.

Then the oleo interests got out from under the difficulty by fortifying their oleomargarine with vitamins and claiming that oleo is now just as good as butter. But now another fact begins to loom uncomfortably over the horizon, namely, that the vegetable oils even in fortified oleomargarine lack certain elements important to growth.

The comparatively recent research with regard to vitamins as an essential factor in nutrition, and the absence of vitamins in oleomargarine before it began to be fortified shows that "the scientific investigators (of 1881) familiar with the chemistry of dairy products and fats" were not as familiar with this chemistry as they thought, and it also shows that the science of nutrition is not a static but a dynamic subject, and that therefore it is possible that new discoveries will be made which may detect some other deficiency in oleomargarine as compared with butter. So why not rely on a natural product, the usefulness of which to health and growth was proven beyond a shadow of doubt by hundreds of years of experience.

2. The endorsement by the editor of the New Republic of the crusade conducted in behalf of oleomargarine is an expression of an ultrareactionary economic philosophy for the following reasons:

It sidesteps the question of monopoly in food distribution. The reason for the high prices of food products lies primarily in certain defects of our system of distribution, which exact a toll both from the farmer and the consumer. It is true that, so far as butter is concerned, the farmer receives more of the consumers' dollar than in the case of many other food products. If, however, certain defects of our system of food distribution were eliminated, the average consumer's budget would allow for an ample use of a healthy natural product, making it unnecessary to advocate the use of a synthetic substitute which still lacks in elements important to growth, even if it is fortified by vitamins.

I wish to call your attention to the splendid work which is being undertaken by the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice under Thurman Arnold, looking towards the breaking up of monopolistic practices in the food trade. Government agencies anxious to provide the American consumer with cheaper food should, in my opinion, actively cooperate with the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice in its efforts to eliminate certain fundamental defects of our system of distribution.

In this connection let me state that I am rather astonished that the New Republic has not taken this stand on the problem of butter versus oleomargarine in view of its well-known progressive economic philosophy.

There still remains the pressing question of that group of the lowest-income consumers who cannot afford to buy butter. What should be done in their case is what is being done with many families who cannot afford to buy milk for their children or whose youngsters have to be provided with school lunches. Let a public agency, the Federal Government for instance, buy butter and dispense it to the children of these families. This would certainly be justified by considerations of public policy as conducive to the building up of the health of the Nation. As it is now, the plight of the lowest income group of our consumers is used to spread far and wide the gospel of oleomargarine.

Following the adoption of the Federal oleomargarine standards, one of the two most powerful dairy distributing and processing concerns is getting ready to spend $275,000 on a single radio program to advertise its brand of oleomargarine. The industry is about to spend $1,500,000 for oleo advertising. With the help of modern type advertising, backed by financial resources, oleomargarine will eventually replace butter to the same extent that process cheese has replaced natural cheese.

3. The reactionary outlook of the advocates of oleomargarine is further corroborated by the fact that such advocacy works to the detriment of the producers and to the benefit of the oleo interests, and that it renders more expensive the already burdensome food-distribution system. As was noted above, the farmer receives more of the consumer's dollar in the case of butter than in the case of many other food articles. The cotton and soybean producers receive very little for their product; rather a large part of the consumer's dollar goes to the oleo interests.

Proof of this is contained in the following figures furnished by the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation. According to the estimates of this organization, the cash income farmers received per pound for the principal fats in 1940 was:

	Cents per pound
Butter	22.6
Lard	5.2
Vegetable shortening	3.1
Oleomargarine	2.5

These figures show that farmers receive less money per pound from oleomargarine than from any other fat. They contradict the claim of the oleomargarine interests who have been shouting for years about the importance of their product as a source of farm cash income and who have been stressing particularly the income farmers receive from cottonseed and soybean oil used in oleomargarine.

4. This leads to another consideration which brings out prominently the reactionary economic philosophy underlying the crusade in behalf of oleomargarine.

The substance of a progressive economic philosophy lies in the concept of the economic interdependence between farmers and industrial workers, as determined by their respective purchasing power. It is clear that the more money the farmer has, the higher will be his demand for industrial products and vice versa.

There are in the United States over 750,000 farmers producing milk for creamery butter, besides many others who produce butter on the farm for sale. Creamery-butter production in the United States for 1939 amounted to 1,782,000,000 pounds; butter made on the farms in that year amounted to 486,000,000 pounds. There is a tremendous purchasing power embodied in these 750,000 farmers. If their business is ruined, there will be, sooner or later, repercussions on other dairy farmers, with the result that the purchasing power of all the dairy farmers will be decreased. The consequent decrease in demand for manufactured commodities will be detrimental to our working industrial population. Moreover—and this is important—the purchasing power of the dairy farmer is higher than that of farmers engaged in many other branches of American agriculture.

This does not mean, however, that the farmer producing milk for butter is well off. On the contrary, if the farmer's labor is taken into consideration, butter prices as well as prices of other farm products are continually below cost of production. In Wisconsin the prices for 100 pounds of milk that went into butter were as follows: In 1935, $1.23; in 1936, $1.45; in 1937, $1.51; in 1938, $1.21; in 1939, $1.13; in 1940, $1.31. The cost of production per 100 pounds of milk during this period was $1.72; therefore, if his labor is taken into consideration, the butter farmer was receiving prices below cost of operation to the extent of the difference between $1.72 and the prices for the respective years, and that in the admittedly most efficient and foremost dairy State in the Union. Even at that the purchasing power of the butter farmer is normally higher than that of the cotton grower or soybean grower, and his potential purchasing power, provided the industry is not threatened with permanent ruin, is of considerable significance to the national economy.

The facts and figures cited above refer to the so-called normal times. They apply to the butter industry and the dairy industry in general during the entire period between 1930 and up to the present "boom" period. What is happening now is of peculiar significance. In July 1940 Wisconsin farmers received $1.23 for 100 pounds of milk that went into butter; in July of this year these farmers received $1.67. In July 1940 the Wisconsin farmers received $1.21 for 100 pounds of milk that went into cheese; in July 1941 they received $1.82 for such milk. Thus the farmers whose milk goes into cheese received in July 1941, 61 cents more for 100 pounds of milk than last year; while the farmers whose milk goes into butter received only 44 cents more than last year. Recent increases in retail prices do not reflect the fluctuations in prices paid to farmers. It is possible that advantage is being taken of the exceptional conditions connected with the present boom. Would it not be more rational to approach the problem from that point of view rather than attempting to convince the consumer to go over to a lower standard by substituting a synthetic article for the natural product?

It is difficult for an outsider to realize the tremendous purchasing power that is potent in that most diversified of our agricultural industries—dairy farming. Make the dairy farmer prosperous and his purchasing power will be of tremendous significance to industry. It will be important also to the cotton producer of the South because of the demand a prosperous dairy industry can make on southern products for ingredients needed in the feeding of cattle and other items. In the year 1934, for instance, Wisconsin paid $6,396,340 for cottonseed oil, and $1,460,800 for cottonseed meal and cake. This was bought mostly by farmers who are also using more and more cottonseed oil. All this is in addition to the money spent by Wisconsin for cotton goods, which in that year amounted to $23,832,000. Since then these purchases have undoubtedly been on the increase. This offsets easily the illusory benefits which the South would get from selling some of its

products for the manufacture of oleomargarine; illusory because of the fact stated above that the actual cotton producer in the South gets considerably less for his work than the farmer in the most important dairy State in the Union—Wisconsin.

For this very reason the consumption of oleomargine will not be of much benefit to the actual working cotton farmer. The improvement in his economic position depends to a large extent upon the elimination of monopolistic practices in the processing and marketing of his product, and of the forces which affect adversely the city consumer's demand for his crop as well as for farm products in general.

The prosperity of the dairy industry, which builds up the soil, which through its manifold and diversified functions presents the possibility of high purchasing power for industrial products, will be a potent factor in fostering our national economy. On the other hand, the oleomargarine industry with its low returns to farmers for their oil and vegetable and animal fats, and with the consequence of the ruin of the dairy industry, will be a factor in the deterioration of our national economy.

As to the legislation directed against oleomargarine—let me state this: That in view of the powerful financial position of the oleo interests and the indifference exhibited by certain Government authorities toward the problem of the dairy farmer as exemplified by the recent oleomargarine broadcast, what else can the farmer do except use the most accessible weapon at hand, State legislation, to protect his industry from ruin.

As to the supply situation—cold storage holdings of butter in the United States on August 1 of this year amounted to 178,526,000 pounds, or 55,000,000 pounds more than on the same date last year, and 41,000,000 pounds more than for the 5-year average 1936–40. Production for the first 7 months of this year was 76,000,000 pounds higher than for the corresponding period last year, an increase of 6.5 percent. Production of dairy products could still be increased. This would be especially true if the demand and price outlook were favorable for a considerable length of time.

WILLIAM KIRSCH,
Principal Statistician,
Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture.

The American Legion and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE GREEN BAY (WIS.) PRESS-GAZETTE

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Green Bay Press-Gazette, of Green Bay, Wis., entitled "The American Legion and the War." It is one of the best editorials that I have read on this subject, and I have been particularly impressed with the similarity of phrases that were used 130 years ago to get us involved in foreign war to those that are being used today for the same purpose.

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette of September 19, 1941]

THE AMERICAN LEGION AND THE WAR

A man arouses himself after a deep debauch.

His head throbs, his muscles ache, his nerves are racked with pain.

His judgment of heavy indulgence in alcohol at that moment is perfect. He swears, "Never again."

That is a fair statement of the American Legion meeting some twenty-odd years ago when it adopted a policy opposed to American participation in European conflicts. The policy thus formed has been consistently maintained until the Milwaukee convention. That policy was created largely by the efforts of men who were among the 2,000,000 in the American Expeditionary Force and saw service on the bloody fields of France and the cold stretches of northern Russia. To these men had come the great opportunity of studying the European situation personally, both before the armistice and for months thereafter, in France, in Germany, in England, and in Belgium and Italy.

The policy adopted was a deliberate, cool, and sober one. When it was adopted the veterans had learned how empty and shallow were the slogans that led them to battle, how barren was the victory, and how deceitful had been much of the "information" upon which they had formulated their convictions.

The reversal by Legion delegates of this carefully considered program furnishes us with one of the principal reasons why people go to war. They forget. They are misled. On the hot spur of the moment they abandon a course of conduct that all their reflective and considered thoughts over a long period of years, and watered by grim experiences at the front, have shown them to be right.

Supposing that yesterday was 1918, could you ever get the American Legion to talk about another American Expeditionary Force? And supposing that day before yesterday found us at the conclusion of the Napoleonic wars, could we ever find anyone to criticize Washington, Jefferson, or Madison, the Presidents who, in turn, steered away from the conflict and thus not only benefited America but Europe as well?

Today America is back in 1917 and it is back in 1810. Our lands, our mountains, our rivers are the same. Different people walk the earth but they are still Americans. The structures that have been erected are more numerous but, after all, they are but man-made structures.

In 1810, as well as 1917, we had presented exactly the question that confronts us today. We even used the same language.

Mr. Hoover dug up the debates of the earlier period recently to show us how twin it was to today. Fisher Ames, a Member of Congress, and who was only prevented from heading Harvard University by illness, was the leader for participation. He proposed the first American Expeditionary Force. Here are some of the phrases he flung at the people:

"I am sure we are about to be subjugated by Bonaparte.

"Let no man in America decieve himself; if Bonaparte prevails in Europe we will be his vassals.

"We shall be reduced to slavery.

"In case Europe accepts peace and chains we of the United States are ripe and rotten for servitude and tribute.

"Britain fights our battles.

"One single hope of security is the British Navy.

"If Russia is disarmed, how long will it be before England will be done for?

"We are infatuated enough to think America is a hiding place for liberty."

But America stood firm. Its public men resisted the intemperate cup offered to their lips.

England then, as now, used every persuasion, and even added threats, to induce our participation. We were not very great or strong. Indeed, we were small and weak. But English policy has always been built upon securing help of every sort from every corner by reason of every argument that can be produced.

It was a blessing to Europe that we stayed out. For finally that warlike continent adjusted its own ills.

And it was a crime against Europe when we participated in 1917, for by so doing we hatched the rotten eggs of fascism.

One of the singular causes of war has been presented to the people by the about-face of the American Legion. People are persuaded to their disadvantage when their anger is up at some detestable thing, however far away.

But when this war is over and we count our dead and appraise the devastation, and on the profit side see nothing but zeros coupled with the sneers of those we fought to save, we won't mention anything about the human faults that got us into it, but we will begin to talk about the cursed munition makers.

There will be those, we hope, who see clearly enough to understand that with leaders like Jefferson we would have gone straight.

Mrs. Sara Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE IRONWOOD TIMES

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, in these stirring times of unrest and with the world conditions in a turmoil, it is refreshing to know that real Americans rally in a neighborly fashion and with a true sense of real Christian spirit. It was a shock, not only to President Roosevelt and his immediate family but to all Americans, to be informed of the death of the President's mother. I would be truly ungrateful if I did not call to the attention of the Congress and the Nation an editorial written by Mr. H. O. Sonnesyn, editor of the Ironwood Times, a newspaper published in my home town. It shows a true liberal spirit:

I appreciate the permission of this Congress in granting unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial:

In common with other Americans, the Ironwood Times joins the Nation in mourning the death of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's mother, Mrs. Sara Delano Roosevelt.

Mrs. Roosevelt died at the family home in Hyde Park Sunday. Her death was due to her advanced age.

Mrs. Roosevelt's death postponed the important radio address which President Roosevelt was scheduled to have made last Mon-

day. The address will be delivered Thursday night.

The death of the President's mother brings sorrow to every son and daughter in America. All reports indicate she was a wonderful mother. The success attained by her son was slightly greater than that attained by some of the sons of other mothers in this Nation.

Mrs. Roosevelt took that honor as a typical American. There can be no denying that she, in the same manner as other mothers would have been, was proud of "My son, the President."

Yet the honors bestowed on her son did not affect Mrs. Roosevelt. Her old friends remained her friends until her death last Sunday. She lived her own life. That is the way of America.

The Nation in its grief finds comfort in the thought death was kind to her in that she was not forced to suffer, but slept peacefully away.

The United States of America salutes its Commander in Chief in his day of sorrow, and as one nation says, "You have our sympathies, Skipper. Is there anything we can do, neighbor?"

New United States Bureau Created To Lead "War of Words"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have received inquiries from constituents as to the duties to be performed by Col. William J. Donovan, recently appointed Coordinator of Information by President Roosevelt.

The Washington press advises the country that at least 35,000 additional persons are to be brought to Washington during the coming year to work in the war program—this in addition to the many thousands who have been brought to Washington during the last 2 years to work in national-defense activities.

It is difficult for those not familiar with the situation in Washington to realize just what is going on here so far as preparation for war is concerned. Many new bureaus, commissions, and agencies have recently been created and everyone of these activities requires personnel. For instance, when Colonel Donovan was appointed Coordinator of Information, no thought was given by the public to the fact that a bureau would be created and additional persons employed by the Government. When it is known that Colonel Donovan already has a staff of more than 180 persons, and can hardly be said to have started, one can understand how these bureaus grow and how a large number of Federal employees find their way to the National Capital.

The Times-Herald of Washington, in its issue of September 20, 1941, carried an article by the writer, Guy Richards, which contains much interesting and accurate information concerning the Coordinator of Information. Therefore, pursuant to permission granted to me, I quote that article which is as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 20, 1941]

C. O. I., the mysterious new bureau of Coordinator of Information, Col. William J. "Wild Bill" Donovan, completed a 6-week preparation period yesterday and emerged for the first time from the fogs of rumor that have tagged it all the way from a Yankee gestapo to an international spy service.

It's neither. There are no secret police in C. O. I. and no network of espionage agents.

TO SPEED DECISIONS

According to the operating plans which were learned yesterday, C. O. I. stands revealed as a tonic for the Government brain, a mixture of hypo and highball for quickening the reflexes of a dozen departments that sometimes for weeks haven't known what the others knew about mighty atoms of information that later spread into wars, insurrections, and triple alliances.

Every day C. O. I. will tell the executive brain centers in Washington everything considered important by the other brain centers. Where a new development calls for instant action, C. O. I. will provide the means for instant response—over the air waves or through the State Department, F. B. I., Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, police, and various intelligence services.

Six short-wave radio listening posts spreading from coast to coast; a newsroom at 270 Madison Avenue, New York City; and a headquarters here in the marble-lined Apex Building on Pennsylvania Avenue comprise the physical weapons with which C. O. I. is now ready to swing into action.

ERUDITE STAFF

But the mental weapons are the most formidable. They consist of a staff of more than 180 scholars, linguists, economists, broadcasters, newspapermen, and military, naval, marine, and aeronautical experts, and their secretaries.

The inflow of information streams into the Apex Building headquarters from the radio listening posts and from the confidential files of the Government departments. It is carried by special messengers. It must be accounted for day and night. Because of this heavy concentration of secret data in the building, no one is admitted until they have first obtained a badge from a C. O. I. authority. All the corridors of the building are flanked by guards. No one, without a badge, is allowed to walk out of any door or move a foot down the corridors.

The job of the staff is to prepare full-sized pictures from the fragments of paint and canvas that come in. The completed pictures are rushed to all departments, the fragments returned to the department that sent them in.

BREVITY STRESSED

The pictures prepared by C. O. I. may take the form of written reports or graphs alone or pictures with tabloid captions. Colonel Donovan has tried to imbue his staff with his own passion for combining brevity and comprehensiveness.

"Remember the weariness that comes from reading long, windy, typewritten pages," he has repeatedly told his subordinates. "Picture it, condense it, sum it up."

The genesis of C. O. I., it was learned reliably yesterday, sprang from Donovan's long belief in the importance of psychological matters, and trivial irritations, in shaping the affairs of nations. In C. O. I., Donovan has prepared to make a painstaking observation of these factors in other nations of the world through a 24-hour-a-day study; and simultaneously has planned to correct what he believes to be the three major weaknesses of past American governmental machinery:

1. The tendency of departments to collect volumes of specialized information without synthesizing it for the benefit of other departments.

ANSWERING THE NAZIS

2. Their tendency to find out too late what should be acted on instantly.

3. Their tendency to be unable to respond effectively in the modern war of words.

From now on, for example, if a broadcaster in Nazi-run Bucharest makes a striking statement at 4:30 a. m., New York time, which requires an American rebuttal, C. O. I. is equipped to have that rebuttal delivered the same day by an American broadcaster. That is just one of a hundred lines of action now ready.

The 58-year-old colonel has abandoned his Wall Street law practice to boss C. O. I. on an unsalaried basis. A World War hero, Donovan has since made a specialty of armies, visiting the battles in Ethiopia, Spain, and Europe as one followed the other. He has come to the conclusion that an army is only the result of a philosophy, and to fathom one, you have to fathom the other.

NEWSPAPERMEN ASSISTANTS

On his return from his world-wide junket last March, the Presidential advisers had him slated for heading up a super F. B. I., with the problem of national morale thrown in. He held out for the type of outfit he is now running—and he got it.

Among his assistants are Robert E. Sherwood, playwright, who is in charge of the New York office; Nelson P. Poynter, editor of the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times; Dr. James P. Baxter, president of Williams College, who is on leave to head C. O. I.'s research department; Irving Pflamm, radio commissioner; and Wallace Deuel, Edmund Taylor, and Lawrence Beller, all former newspapermen.

PEARSON REVEALS CLASH OVER PROPAGANDA POLICY

Details of the three-cornered fight between Col. William Donovan, the State Department, and the Rockefeller office was revealed last night by Leon Pearson, newspaper correspondent and columnist, in his regular weekly broadcast over station WOL.

The fight concerned which office would have control over dissemination of propaganda for foreign consumption to offset the propaganda of Germany and Italy.

Secret conference

First concrete evidence of Colonel Donovan's plans to control United States propaganda came, Pearson said, when the Coordinator of Information summoned the short-wave broadcasters to Washington for a secret conference.

Donovan explained his plan to them and asked not only for full cooperation but expansion of their facilities. The plan, he said, is to counteract Nazi propaganda by putting out United States propaganda to the contrary effect and doing it right away.

Pearson added that some people in the Government are worried about it.

"They point out that if Colonel Donovan sends out his replies so soon, he puts himself in the position of shaping the policy of the United States single-handedly. He doesn't want to wait for consultation with the White House or the State Department. He wants to get his answer out right away. This means that Colonel Donovan and his brilliant assistants in the C. O. I. will have to determine for themselves what United States policy is."

Donovan lost out

The clash between Donovan's office, the State Department, and the Rockefeller office, Pearson continued, began when the Coordinator said his office would take over short-wave broadcasting to South America.

Heretofore the State Department, cooperating with the Rockefeller office, had been covering the field by short wave, and flatly refused to silence its short-wave activities when a "certain gentleman in the Donovan office called the State Department and said they were taking over," Pearson said.

"The State Department declined to be silenced, however, and pointed out that the President himself had designated Latin America as their field, and they didn't intend to retreat. In the end it was the Donovan boys who retreated."

Catholics and the Nazis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 22, 1941

ARTICLE BY PROFESSOR MAYNARD

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an article by Prof. Theodore Maynard, one of America's most erudite writers on Catholic themes. In this article, which appears in the October issue of the American Mercury, Professor Maynard analyzes the activities of certain noisy pro-Nazi agitators among Catholics and undertakes to point out the correct position of American Catholics in regard to the Nazi menace.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Mercury of October 1941]

CATHOLICS AND THE NAZIS

(By Theodore Maynard)

I write as an American Catholic. This does not mean that I have any commission to speak for those of my faith; they are divided on the political issues of this war. My purpose is to indicate some of the factors which may account for that division. There I may be challenged and there I may be wrong, but at the same time, I challenge anyone to prove me wrong in my statement of principles.

The impression prevails in certain circles in this country that the Catholic Church sympathizes with fascism. Such an impression is no doubt partly due to the circumstance that Rome is the center of both Italian fascism and Catholicism. The impression may have been confirmed in the support given by many (though by no means all) Catholics here and abroad to Franco in the Spanish war. It is further confirmed for some minds by the tinge of anti-Semitism found in Father Coughlin's utterances.

Nevertheless, these impressions are erroneous. While there are Catholics who, like other people, appear eccentric or stupid or inconsistent or illogical, and though they may be (again like other people) swayed unduly by personal or political or nationalistic passions, they do not represent the mind of the church. Fascist Catholics are far more often to be found in Europe than in America. Hitler has his little group of Catholic stooges. But the Belgian Rexists are refused the sacraments when they appear in uniform, and similar ecclesiastical action is taken in Holland. In any case they are only a handful. The European Catholic view was expressed by Monsignor Jan Sramek, a Czech refugee, in the London Tablet:

"We are fighting for the very existence of Christianity. It is the duty of every Catholic in the whole world, whatever nation he belongs to, to realize that nowadays there is no such thing as neutrality. All Catholics must participate in the fight for the preservation of Christian morals. The chief task of Christianity, to be undertaken once the battle is won, is the building up of a lasting peace based on Christian principles and the real ideology of European civilization, national freedom, and economic justice."

Hitler recognizes clearly, as does the church, that Catholicism and totalitarianism are absolutely irreconcilable. American Catholics, with very few exceptions, also recognize this fact. The only real disagreement among them is over what measures may be politically expedient and strategically advisable. Though this disagreement is profound and often bitter, there is, as there must always be, unanimity in opposition to nazi-ism.

The antagonism between communism and catholicism is too well known to need further discussion here. It might, however, be pointed out that the church never issues a "blanket" condemnation; only specific propositions are dealt with. Consequently, the church must condemn the avowed Godlessness and materialism of bolshevism, but it must equally reprobate the unavowed Godlessness and materialism so often prevalent among the defenders of capitalism and it is far from completely identifying the rights of property with our present economic system. Even under present conditions, the Holy See has several times attempted to arrange a concordat, a modus vivendi, with the Kremlin, as it has made concordats with Hitler and Mussolini and Franco. For the church is always ready to make what terms it can with any government. It is not committed to this or that particular political mode, though modern democracy (which is derived from scholastic philosophy) appears to be the system most consonant with its own constitution and the one under which it enjoys most freedom of action.

The mode of operating under concordats therefore does not imply any approval of the political system with which the concordat is made. It is merely the best—sometimes the only—method possible in certain circumstances. This is true of Italy, Germany, and the recent arrangement with Spain. But the church has no illusions—it knows that the concordat will be observed only insofar as it suits the convenience of the state. It also knows that a concordat is better than nothing; at least for a time it may result in peace and a measure of ecclesiastical freedom. In no sense is it an alliance with the state or an imprimatur upon its ideology.

The policy of the church is decided by one man, the Pope, though of course he works in consultation with his advisers. No infallibility attaches to his political decisions, which may be reversed by his successors. Yet, as a matter of practical necessity, his policy has to be accepted by loyal Catholics. Still more—and in this case as a matter of absolute necessity—the principles he lays down have to be accepted. With regard to nazi-ism and fascism (as well as bolshevism), the reigning Pope and his predecessor have spoken in unequivocal language. They have made working arrangements with totalitarian governments for the safeguarding of Catholic interests. At the same time, they have made it plain that it is impossible to reconcile totalitarianism with Catholicism.

Pius XII took his stand on the matter little more than a month after the war. In the only encyclical he has yet issued, titled "The Function of the State in the Modern World," he decried the kind of civil authority which "puts itself in the place of the Almighty and elevates the state or group into the last end of life, the supreme criterion of the moral and juridical order, and therefore forbids every appeal to the principles of natural reason and of the Christian conscience." He went on to declare that the success of such systems could be only material and transitory, and he added: "To consider the state as something ultimate to which everything else should be subordinated and directed, cannot fail to harm the true and lasting prosperity of nations."

Mussolini has been willing to suffer the church in order not to increase his difficulties, as Franco is now trying to use it for his own ends. But Hitler, like Stalin, looks upon it as the enemy to be destroyed. If Hitler has been a shade less murderous than Stalin, his methods are likely in the long run to be more successful because the Nazi program calls for the eradication of Christianity by a process of education which is intended to change the shape of man's mind. If Hitler triumphs, Christianity will virtually disappear in Europe by degrees.

Hitler would, of course, welcome the cooperation of the church, on his own terms. That is, he would be very glad to have the Catholic organization—for which, as an organization, he has often expressed the highest regard—put at his disposal. He has succeeded in deluding a small minority, but even in Germany the Catholic body as a whole has stood out against him. A year ago he produced what purported to be a pronouncement of the German hierarchy in his favor. Possibly his doctoring of documents succeeded in hoodwinking some people, though it was conclusively shown, both by the Roman authorities and by the secular news agencies, that Dr. Goebbels' manipulation of this matter amounted to forgery.

The true attitude of the German hierarchy was expressed this spring by Archbishop Groeber of Friburg, in a pastoral printed in the Osservatore Romano, in which he described the present situation in the Reich as going "beyond the religious ruin of the sixteenth century." As a good German, he protested: "Not only is our faith belittled as a thing of the past but we are rebuked as being anti-German. * * * It is now absolutely certain that the future of the people is being built on an anti-Christian foundation."

The facts are that, despite the concordat, everything possible is done to make the practice of Catholicism as difficult as possible. Mass is permitted at hours allowed by the Gestapo, when its attendance is inconvenient for all and out of the question for many. Sermons are censored. But worst of all, the religious orders suffer wholesale suppression, the monasteries and convents are often taken over for the use of the secret police and Catholic schools and youth organizations are verboten. Instead, the young are indoctrinated from childhood in the pagan German myth. Already, perhaps, the greater part of young men and women are lost to the church because of this propaganda. It might almost be said that the only ones able to resist it are those of mature mind and the little children still too small to be clutched by the Nazi machine, who are sometimes taught in secret by their parents.

What has happened in Poland seems to have surpassed the imagination for horror. We do not need to go to British propaganda for this; it was Cardinal Hlond who gave out the facts about wholesale massacre and of

clerics in concentration camps being obliged to clean the latrines, and of bishops forced to sweep the streets in front of their own cathedrals. But nobody is allowed into Poland to see what is going on. Even the Papal Nuncio has been excluded.

II

Hitler and his Italian gauleiter have given the world a rosy picture. It was announced that the Holy See had recognized the new Croation government, though nothing of the kind happened. The new puppet king was received before and not after his appointment and the murderous Dr. Pavelich was given an audience, which could not be refused, as a private person instead of premier. The so-called apostolic delegate has no diplomatic status. He is an "apostolic visitor," with functions limited to that of an observer for the Holy See. Difficult as the Pope's position has been in Rome, he has been careful to guard against even the appearance of recognizing the conquests of Hitler. The Nazis find it inadvisable to direct their rage openly against the Pope, so they turn it without restraint against the local ecclesiastical authorities.

We come around again to the Nazi concept of peace with the church—or, for that matter, of peace with any nation. It is the peace in which the lion lies down with the lamb, with the lamb inside the lion. Even while trying to extract a momentary advantage by minor concessions to such little Fascist groups so foolish as to trust him, Hitler has no illusions at all as to the irreconcilable nature of Caholicism and his own ideas. The moment these groups have served their purpose—in which so far they have been of very slight and constantly diminishing use—the Nazis intend to absorb them into an absolute uniformity with their own system. It cannot be otherwise. While the church exists, the triumph of totalitarianism remains incomplete. More surely than any other of national socialism's intended victims, Catholicism can never be national socialism's agent.

It might even be argued that Hitlerism is a more dangerous enemy to the church than Stalinism. Only by a historical accident or series of accidents is irreligion tied to bolshevism, and it may conceivably be discarded in time. On the other hand, national socialism is inextricably rooted in the myth of the sacred German blood, which has created a new religion that is perhaps all the more powerful because it is so preposterous. No kind of ascent is possible under the Nazi system. You are either an Aryan or you are not, and all the lesser breeds without the law are disdained in varying degrees. Hitler starts with a comprehensive denial of human equality. As there is only an Aryan God, who is no more than a concept of composite Germanity, there can be no universal fatherhood of God any more than there can be any brotherhood of man. To say that God does not exist, as the Bolshevists do, is bad enough, but it is a proposition that can be met by argument; whereas the Nazi doctrine, being irrational and mystical, cannot be met at all except by a rejection as resolute as its own affirmation.

But the Catholic Church must not necessarily reject a dictatorship considered in its strictly political aspect. Dollfuss attempted a mild Catholic dictatorship in Austria; Salazar is now attempting one in Portugal. Kept within due bounds, a dictatorship of this kind is not oppressive, either to society or the church. But we know from experience how easily it may be transformed into an instrument for oppression. We know that it is, of its very nature, likely to become aggressive. If Hitler had confined himself to Germany with his purges and persecution and the horrors of the Gestapo, we, as Americans, would have no right to interfere, however much we loathed his proceedings. Even then, however, the church would have had to speak, and it did speak while nazi-ism was so confined. As things stand, civil liberties and religion everywhere are threatened and we have reached the point where we must be prepared to die if we wish to live. It is a situation with which the church has often been familiar in the course of its history; for America it is without precedent or parallel.

It is somewhat surprising, therefore, that American Catholics should be infected with isolationism. On the principle of opposition to totalitarianism they are virtually unanimous, but on the question of political action there are factors that tend to confuse them.

Like so many other Americans, they are not always free from that ancestral animosity toward England which still smolders sullenly and which was fanned by the question of war debts. Certain Irish elements, unable to forget Oliver Cromwell, have their ancient grudge. Then, too, there is the German "hybris," which has been stimulated by the German victories and by propaganda. Finally, nearly all are at least to some extent affected by their memories of the last war. They believe they were dragged by British cunning into something which was no concern of theirs; now they like to think they are too cagey to be caught a second time. Above all, because they do not want to fight, they keep telling themselves that what is going on is a European war between rival imperialisms.

This is the stock in trade of all isolationists. Catholic isolationists do no more than repeat the arguments of Senator WHEELER and Mr. Lindbergh. Even Ireland is no longer much of a stick with which to belabor Britain. The original Catholic contribution to the discussion—it is not very original and monstrously un-Catholic—is anti-Semitism. The moronic mob following Father Coughlin has come to think of communism as a Jewish affair, and, of course, the "international bankers" are Jewish. Father Coughlin has been repudiated time after time by responsible Catholic leaders, and Social Justice is not classed as a Catholic magazine. It makes no difference—millions of Americans still believe that Father Coughlin speaks for the church. These people should be reminded of the unequivocal words of Pope Pius XI, who, speaking to a group of Belgian pilgrims on September 6, 1938, said: "Anti-Semitism is inadmissible. We are spiritually Semites."

To make matters worse, Archbishop Beckman, of Dubuque, speaking over the radio last July 28, gave strong anti-Semitic implications to his speech, implications that were made all the more emphatic by the inflection of his voice. Time after time he said he was addressing "American Catholics and Christians in general" or "American Christians", pointedly excluding his Jewish fellowcitizens. He declared the war to be "not a holy war, or a just war, but a conflict of imperialisms to restore the shattered boundaries of international finance." He did not mention Father Coughlin, though his argument was largely Coughlinite, but quoted instead from Father Coughlin's enemy, Cardinal O'Connell, who has been an isolationist of a different stripe. His Grace of Dubuque took the precaution of admitting that he did not speak for the Catholic Church. His obvious purpose was to counteract the radio speeches delivered on April 30 and July 7 by Bishop Hurley, of St. Augustine, who was obliquely referred to as "a cleric recently returned from abroad." The reference might have been more definite: Bishop Hurley had been attached to the Papal Secretariat of State.

The first of Bishop Hurley's speeches (delivered before the Russo-German war) was an attack on the isolationists, "those dyspeptic moralists [who] are the dupes of a few men who have no interest whatever in morals, but who are seeking to divide and discourage us in America." In his second speech, delivered early in July after Hitler had invaded Russia, Bishop Hurley pointed out that though the Holy See and our Government have pursued independent policies, "he who runs may read, nevertheless, a striking parallelism between their attitudes where moral questions were at issue." He urged that "since our problem is primarily a strategic one, it should be left to the Commander in Chief" and then proceeded to castigate Catholic isolationists in particular where previously he had attacked isolationists in the lump:

"Among them is a small but noisy group of Catholics. We have suffered long from their tantrums. We have blushed with shame when they acted up before company as tantrum children will do in every family. Years ago they established the crank school of economics; latterly they have founded the tirade school of journalism; they are now engaged in popularizing the ostrich school of strategy."

III

The question arises as to which of these two eminent ecclesiastics comes nearest to expressing the Catholic point of view. The Bishop's political opinions I leave out of the discussion, as about these there may be legitimate disagreement. But what of his basic

Here there is no room for doubt. Pius XI in a single month (March 1937) published three encyclicals. The first, the Divini Redemptoris, condemned atheistic communism but at the same time advocated the rebuilding of the world of labor on Christian instead of capitalistic foundations. The second, Mit brennender Sorge, protested against the persecution of the church in Germany and condemned Nazi racial theories, as well as the Fascist doctrines that would deify the state. The third, Nos es muy, was addressed to the bishops of Mexico on the rights of Christians as citizens. Together, they covered the ground completely—and this before the war broke out.

The isolationists, and especially some of the Catholic isolationists, took fresh heart with the invasion of Russia. Whatever Hitler's past offenses, was he not now the champion of Christian civilization against atheistic communism? Surely now the Pope would bless the crusade! But on that subject the Pope maintained an eloquent silence. His radio speech to the world, delivered on June 29, was a lofty and moving exposition of the ways of divine providence. "God's hour will come—the hour of liberation" was the burden of his address. To the whole world, the Holy Father gave his blessing.

Now let us consider the attitude of the Catholic press, as expressed by its three chief organs of opinion.

The editors of the Commonweal differ about the war, and have sometimes indicated their differences by signing their editorials. Michael Williams, now only a weekly contributor to its pages, has always been strongly interventionist. Philip Burnham, on the other hand, is somewhat pacifist in his political philosophy. Yet he has admitted into his paper views that are at variance with his own.

Perhaps more representative of general Catholic opinion is the Jesuit review, America. It has been, and still is, moderately isolationist, though one may notice in it, as in other Catholic papers, a gradual change in policy. The Catholic World, while definitely anti-Roosevelt and more belligerently isolationist in policy than either America or the Commonweal, has been equally as definite in its condemnation of all brands of totalitarianism. Father Gillis is by all odds the ablest Catholic editor of our time. I prophesy that he will be the last isolationist die-hard.

Not in these periodicals but in some of the diocesan weeklies one encounters what Bishop Hurley calls "the tirade school of journalism." Though these papers have condemned totalitarianism—and they could not very well do otherwise in view of the Papal pronouncements—I have often had the feeling creep

into my mind that some of them are rather perfunctory in their attacks on nazi-ism and fascism, and it is only when, like Archbishop Beckman, they get on the subject of Britain and bolshevism that they are really able to put heart and soul into it. Of one thing, however, we may be perfectly sure: The moment America gets into the war openly nobody will be more vociferously patriotic than these writers.

Meanwhile, the official attitude of the American hierarchy is explicit in its condemnation of nazi-ism and one may safely assume that this is the attitude of almost all American Catholics. Even Father Coughlin is not a Nazi, although he sometimes sounds like one and he is certainly anti-Semitic. But he represents only himself and his group—a rude minority voice which proves, if it proves anything, the length of the church's forbearance.

When Hitler invaded Russia, a distinguished group of Catholics issued a manifesto as a full-page advertisement in many of the diocesan papers, indicating full approval of Bishop Hurley's speeches. A majority of the names on the list were Irish. Their statement blended sound Catholic principles with political wisdom. It reaffirmed that communism is the enemy of religion, but concluded:

"At present the Nazis alone possess the physical strength necessary to implement their war upon the church and upon every other spiritual aspect of human nature. They must be destroyed if we hope to save Christianity. The murderer of priests, ministers, and Jews does not become the defender of religion just because he attacks another gangster who happens to be an atheist. Hitler's attack on Russia must not be allowed to confuse us. Hitler is still our greatest enemy and he must be stopped even if that means that we and the Soviet are temporarily on one side in the effort to resist a common enemy."

I do not know precisely what proportion of American Catholics would subscribe to all of the unmistakable implications of that statement, nor does anybody else know just how many isolationists there are among them. Even as to how the country as a whole is divided on the question of entering the war we have only the polls to guide us. There is no reason to suppose, however, that American Catholics hold opinions very different from their fellow citizens. It is possible that there may be a somewhat higher percentage of isolationists among them, but, if so, it can be only a slight difference. If you call a man a Fascist because he supported Franco, then there are many American Catholic Fascists. But that would not be just, and I say it as one who did not support Franco. In the Spanish war the issues were clouded; they are now crystal clear. American Catholic Fascists are neither American nor Catholic.

No two ways of thought can be more opposed than Catholicism and totalitarianism.

Address of I. W. Duggan, Director, Southern Division, Agricultural Adjustment Administration—Agricultural Problems

REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1941

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of calling the attention of the Members of the House to an address delivered by I. W. Duggan, Director, Southern Division of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, before the Farm Bureau Training School, Hot Springs, Ark., August 22, 1941.

I am hoping that this address will be read by every Member of the House, as well as by thousands of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This address is frank and constructive, dealing with the problems of agriculture.

Mr. Duggan, an outstanding employee of the Department of Agriculture, is well posted on agricultural matters. He is deeply interested in actually doing things which would definitely solve our agricultural problems.

It is refreshing to me, and it should be to you, to have someone connected with the great Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to represent the farmers of the United States, speak out honestly and frankly, letting the chips fall where they may.

Here is a department loaded with numerous bureaus, divisions, thousands of employees, spending millions of dollars annually from hunting bugs of all types to running a consumers' bureau, but how seldom do we hear of anyone connected with this Department standing up and defending farmers against the open and well-known destruction of farmers by practically every other group?

As the years go by I have had the privilege of observing how the Tariff Commission is taking care of industry, how the Interstate Commerce Commission has requested and secured from time to time legislation placing under their supervision not only the railroads, which they represent, but bus lines, truck and water transportation.

What is happening?

Because of their deep concern in behalf of the railroad interests of the country, the railroads are taking over these lines. They are permitted to operate parallel truck lines to their railroads, and they will now hook up with water lines of shipping.

Bus, truck, and water rates will be so fixed and regulated that the railroads will have a real monopoly at the expense of the shippers of farm products and the traveling public.

Take a look at the Coal Commission in fixing prices under legislation passed by the Congress of the United States.

How about the Wage and Hour Board?

Why, they are daily on their toes demanding that which belongs to labor.

Farmers are being robbed out of their forest products—pulpwood. Everybody, except farmers, are marketing farm products. Many of these middlemen operating between farmers and the legitimate retailer are nothing but parasites, sapping the very lifeblood out of farmers and consumers.

How about the discriminatory freight rates?

Compare freight rates on farm products, which, naturally, are bulky and heavy, with freight rates on manufactured goods.

I can ship a $50 suit of clothes or a pair of shoes which sell for $13.50 a certain distance at a cost of 10 cents each, while a bushel of corn or wheat, which sells for 75 cents and $1.25 per bushel, will cost 30 cents.

I am beginning to wonder if the time has not arrived when we should pass legislation creating an Agricultural Commission, with the hope that this Commission will stand up and defend agriculture, seeing to it that these monopolistic groups are prevented from grazing upon agriculture and that other departments, which, apparently, represent everybody else except agriculture, are not able to intrude on the agricultural interests of this country.

Mr. Duggan's address follows:

It is a pleasure for me to be here this morning as your training school enters the second day of its sessions.

So far we have heard reports of farmers' problems from many parts of the country. We have been told of some of the definite proposals the American Farm Bureau Federation is offering for the solution of these problems.

The total effect of all these discussions should be to enlarge our vision and to broaden our perspective. Certainly we need the larger view of things today. In the brief lifetime of your national organization—21 years—think what has happened to us:

The dizzy tailspin we took in the months following World War No. 1—the quick recovery of industry and labor—the long and painful struggle of agriculture at the bottom of the pit.

Later, the fantastic boom days for city folks—the chicken in every pot, two cars in every garage—with the farmer looking on in wonder, wonder that the more he produced, the poorer he became.

Then, the collapse of the whole business in the early 1930's. Stock and bond holders, factory workers, and white-collar clerks finally joined the farmers as a common calamity struck at the foundation of our whole economic order.

Together we began climbing out of the wreckage, only to run head-on into World War No. 2. The impact of this tragedy is still too close upon us for any intelligent appraisal of the consequences.

One thing is sure: We must keep our heads however rough the going becomes. We must learn to think and plan and act not in terms of this year or next alone but far into the future. We must continue to view our situation not as southerners alone, or even as Americans alone, but as citizens of the world. We must try to see clearly the road over which we have come. We must try to agree among ourselves as to the direction we are to take for years to come, no matter what the fortunes of war may do to us.

We cannot understand the present plight of American agriculture or its future possibilities without reference to certain forces in the past that gave definite character to life on the farm. In the early days of our country agriculture dominated the whole scene—political, social, and economic. More than nine-tenths of our people lived on the land or in small towns. Over 90 percent of the gainfully employed were engaged in agriculture. In those years agricultural products formed the main stream of our commerce.

Beginning in the middle 1820's, and ending with the inauguration of the A. A. A. program in 1933, the story of American agriculture was one of slow but irresistible decline. The industrial revolution was in the air. Powerful new forces were being unloosed. But we cannot say that the decline of agriculture from its high estate was due in any great measure to the operation of natural economic laws. Certain very definite man-made laws were factors in this decline.

Under the heading of such man-made laws, I mention first of all the high protective tariff. This policy has consistently operated against the farmer and to the definite ad-

vantage of industrial groups. The principles involved go to the roots of our whole social order. They are so important that I wish to recall for your special attention and, I hope, for your careful study the long and brilliant struggle John C. Calhoun waged against subsidizing domestic manufactures at the expense of the farmers.

You may detect the ring of the Calhoun style and the power of the Calhoun logic in this extract from a resolution passed by the South Carolina Legislature in December 1828. I quote:

"We are the serfs of the system, out of whose labor is raised not only the money paid into the treasury but the funds out of which are drawn the rich rewards of the manufacturer and his associates in interest. Their encouragement is our discouragement. The duty on imports, which is daily paid out of our labor, gives them the means of selling to us at a higher price; while we cannot, to compensate the loss, dispose of our products at the least advance. It is then, indeed, not a subject of wonder, when understood, that our section of the country, though helped by a kind Providence with a genial sun and prolific soil, from which spring the richest products, should languish in poverty and sink into decay, while the rest of the Union, though less fortunate in natural advantages, is flourishing in unexampled prosperity."

I need not remind you that the passage, written more than 100 years ago, is thoroughly modern in its application. It was true then, it is true today, and it will be true tomorrow, that no democracy can be strong and enduring that does not extend all its advantages equally to all sections and to all vocations.

I have no pet proposal for eliminating the abuses that followed in the train of the protective-tariff system. I do say, however, that the burdens of this system alone outweigh all the advantages put together which government has extended to the farmers from the beginning of our national life down to the present day. The evils of the system are not self-limiting. They cannot be mitigated by turning our eyes away from them. No new order, worthy of the name, can meet the challenge of the future without drastically altering a system that tends to reduce agriculture to the position of a poor relation in the American economic family.

The tariff was not the only factor in the gradual decline of farming life in this country. The domination of large sections of industry by monopolies has also borne heavily on agriculture.

As late as 1933 American farmers were the sole surviving "rugged individualists." There were 6,000,000 of them, each working in competition with the other. They planted as much or as little of what they wanted to plant, brought their produce to market, and took whatever price they could get.

In contrast to these 6,000,000 individual farmers stood a handful of influential men controlling the industrial machine. Again the favored position of industry was due to no sweep of natural forces alone, but to a long series of man-made laws as well. The corporation charter, by virtue of special legislation and favorable court decisions, became the basis of industrial power, both political and economic. A small private group of men in key positions of influence dictated the terms on which the consuming public, including the farmers, might have access to the products of factories and the agencies of credit, of transportation, and of distribution.

Such a concentration of power is a denial of all free enterprise and an artificial damming up of natural economic processes.

What actual bearing does this set-up have on the farm problem today? A few facts will clarify the question. Even in predepression days the behavior of prices went against the farmer. From 1913 to 1929 the prices of farm implements and machines advanced 58.8 percent while farm prices rose only 44.5 percent.

During the depression years, from 1929 to 1933, only slight reductions were made in farm equipment prices. Few items were reduced more than 10 percent. The majority of the reductions ranged from 8 down to less than 1 percent.

During the same depression years you will recall that the price of cotton slumped 67 percent. It may be noted here that cotton growers produced 88 percent as much cotton in 1932 as in 1929. However, the output of cultivators in 1932 was only 10 percent of the production in 1929. You see, cotton brought only one-third as much as in 1929, but the price of cultivators was 97 percent of the 1929 level.

These are only a few out of many examples of the disabilities under which agriculture labors alongside modern industrial organization.

In the field of production and price control industrial monopoly is bound to outdistance the unorganized farmers. The monopolist is in a position to fix the price of his product just as arbitrarily as any totalitarian government. The price is not geared to the needs of the consuming public. It is fixed only with the aim of assuring the greatest volume of profits to the owners of industry.

Along with monopoly practices, corporation legislation, and tariff policy, we must not forget the importance of such factors as the banking system, the freight-rate structure, and the control of patents in the growth of the present-day political and economic power of American industry.

In the framework of this system industrial workers for years suffered the same disadvantages that farmers did. Recently, however, labor has greatly improved its position in relation to management and industry.

For the first time in the Nation's history all three branches of Government are lending a sympathetic ear to the demands of labor. Membership in the ranks of organized labor has more than trebled since the low point of the depression. Hand in hand with striking gains in employment and income have gone the series of permanent remedial measures, dealing with the problems of labor—unemployment compensation, old-age insurance, the Social Security Act, the Wages and Hours Act, placing a floor under wages, a ceiling over hours, and outlawing child labor, the Public Contracts Act, and many other similar measures with which you are familiar.

Farmers have no quarrel with labor as a result of these impressive gains. Nor do farmers have a quarrel with industry for the material rewards that have followed as a result of intelligent planning and management.

In a well-balanced economy the prosperity of each group should contribute to the welfare of every other group. There is a serious question in the minds of many people today whether we have yet achieved such a balance. Tariffs, monopolies, and patent privileges are still operative. The industrial worker continues to narrow the gap between his position and the position of his employer through mass organization, political pressure, far-reaching legal sanctions, and the accustomed weapons of the strike and the boycott.

The farmer is still lagging behind in his race for equality with industry and labor. This is clearly demonstrated by the following fact:

According to the latest available figures supplied by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, industrial profits have advanced 76 percent over the level recorded for August 1939, just 1 month before the outbreak of World War No. 2. During this same period factory pay rolls have advanced 65 percent and the income from farm marketing only 43 percent. The official score, therefore, shows the farmer trailing the factory worker by 23 points and the corporation stockholder by 34 points.

It is well for us at this grave moment in our history to resist the temptation to overplay our hand in pleading the special cause of agriculture. The crisis calls supremely for national unity. Our national existence is endangered. Our basic institutions on which farming, labor, and industry alike depend for their very life are hanging in the balance. This is no time for agriculture, or for industry, or for labor to play class politics and to strive for special advantage. It is a time for economic statesmanship of the highest order.

The American farmers are prepared to go all out for national defense. Their farm program served them and the Nation as a whole during days of business recovery. These programs are just as well adapted to meet the emergency of national defense. Under the ever-normal granary provisions of the program we have already accumulated vast reserves of grains. These grains are being converted into livestock and poultry products to serve our own needs and the needs of nations now resisting aggression.

Farmers may well be proud of their record so far in response to the call for more food and feed production. Our total pig crop for 1941 will be larger than the 1940 crop, instead of much smaller, as seemed likely last winter. The total milk production on July 1 was the largest on record for that date. Our June production of eggs was more than 4,000,000,000, the largest for any month since 1930. The acres planted to the principal vegetable crops, grown for canning and processing, appear to be nearly 20 percent higher than a year ago. This increase in production is going forward at the same time that farmer boys are serving in the Army or entering defense industries.

This splendid record would not have been possible without national programs for agriculture. It is because of these programs, worked out since 1933, that producers were able to build up their soil fertility and to have the organization and resources to step up production quickly when the need came.

Our farm programs are standing up admirably under the stress of the defense emergency. Let us hope that the collective intelligence of the farmers stands up as well. We must be alert to avoid the mistakes of the first World War. We must do all in our power to head off inflation and its attendant disasters. I doubt very much that our democratic form of government can survive another crack-up such as the one we suffered in the 1920's, when inflation swept us to the brink of ruin. Farmers are just as interested as any other group in keeping our price system on an even keel. Farmers have just as big a stake in the national economy as any other workman or businessman. Agriculture is set against run-away prices.

In the effort to avoid inflation, however, the farmer feels that his sacrifices should be no greater than those of other groups. Just now he is being represented in some quarters as "grabbing" for all he can get at a time of national crisis. The farmers are familiar with this type of criticism. They are not disposed to answer their critics in kind. The facts of the farming situation speak for themselves.

In this connection let us take a brief glance at the price situation. The purchasing power of farm products as a whole continues below pre-war parity, despite some sharp rise in recent months. The explanation is that the prices paid out by farmers for the things they buy average 33 percent above pre-war, whereas prices received by farmers for the things they sell average only 25 percent higher than during the 1910–14 base period.

True enough, farmers this year will receive the largest cash income since 1929. Their total for marketing and Government payments will be somewhere around $10,700,000,000. Even so, bear this fact in mind: Their share this year of the national income will be about 9 percent of the total. In 1910 to 1914 their share averaged 12 percent of the total.

The price situation points up even more sharply when we consider the case of the cotton grower. One-half the proceeds from a bale of cotton goes to the person furnishing the labor. Out of this return he must pay for his fertilizer and certain other production costs. It takes on the average about 220 man-hours to produce a bale of cotton. Last year, with cotton selling around 10 cents a pound or $50 a bale, cotton farmers received less than 11½ cents an hour for producing the 1940 crop.

Today cotton is selling much nearer to parity, somewhere around $80 per bale. If this level holds, the cotton farmer will receive about 18 cents per hour for producing the 1941 crop. And he gets no time and a half for overtime. Eighteen cents per hour is about one-half the lowest minimum wage in industry. The southern coal miner today is getting five times the wages the cotton grower receives.

This does not seem like much of "a grab" to me. I can see no peril of inflation arising from the meager income of cotton farmers. Before the present emergency all that agriculture sought was equality with labor and industry. This equality continues to be the goal of American farmers. More than equality farmers have never asked. Less than equality no genuine democracy can withhold.

Cotton farmers today are nearer to equality of price than they have been for a decade. You know today, before the first lock of cotton is picked, what the minimum price will be for this year's crop, and that this price will be the best received since 1929. How often in the past have you known, before you took a bale of cotton to market, even approximately what that bale of cotton would be worth and that its price would be a fair one?

I am sure that you all know full well that the loan at 85 percent of parity is responsible for the present cotton-price level. I know also you realize that because of the large carry-over of American cotton in this country at the present time and the large stocks of cotton in the outside world, the price of American cotton would be exceedingly low in the absence of the A. A. A. program—if there were any market at all.

While we may all rejoice over the present price of cotton and the assurance of conservation and parity payments, there are some dark spots in the cotton picture and we must give consideration to these. Domestic consumption of American cotton is, of course, running at record levels. We consumed approximately nine and three-fourths million bales in this country last season, and world consumption of American cotton amounted to about twelve and four-tenths million bales, or roughly the equivalent of last year's crop. However, because of the war, exports for the crop year just ended did not amount to much more than a million bales, and the prospects for this year and for the duration of the war are not at all encouraging.

Although the passage of the bill providing for loans at 85 percent of parity on cotton and other products has given much needed immediate relief, it has not of itself permanently assured cotton farmers of prosperity. The income from cotton is not determined by the price of cotton alone. This income is determined by multiplying the price by the volume of production—a fact which cotton producers must never lose sight of. This fact is being brought home forcefully just now to cotton farmers in Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, and other States where the boll weevil and other factors have seriously cut the crop.

As long as we are embarked on an all-out defense program, we may be reasonably sure that domestic consumption of cotton will remain at a high level. But it is also probable that production of rayon and other synthetic fibers and competing products will expand to a high degree, and while we have not been aware of the competition from rayon and other substitutes for cotton this year because of the strong domestic demand for cotton products, the competition, nevertheless, exists. Increasing the price of cotton to a fair level may further encourage competition from substitutes unless some action is taken to offset this increase in the price of cotton. Cotton farmers should think about this. In general, they realize that the cost of the raw cotton is a very small percentage of the cost of the finished product. Many are aware, in fact, that there is an average of only about 12 cents worth of raw cotton in the cotton articles costing a dollar which consumers purchase. For that matter the laundryman who launders the shirt you wear receives twice as much each time he launders that shirt as the farmer received for the cotton in the shirt.

Yet we must not forget that the cost of the raw material in many articles is still an important item in the cost of the finished product and may encourage competition from commodities whose prices have not advanced as much as has the price of cotton. Once the war is over and we reach more normal times, we may expect increased competition from factories currently being expanded for the production of rayon and other synthetic products which may be substituted for cotton. At present cotton farmers are enjoying relatively favorable prices—prices which are not out of line with other commodity prices, since the parity principle is aimed at fairness to all. But they should not be lulled into a false sense of security or assume that the cotton problem has been solved.

The loss of export markets because of the war would have been disastrous for the one-third of the farm population which lives on cotton farms, had it not been for the increase in domestic consumption, the cotton-loan program, and the assurance of soil-building and parity payments. In normal times we exported about one-half of the annual cotton crop. In fact, over a 10-year period we exported more than 6,000,000 bales annually, and in 1 year, 1926, we exported almost 11,000,000 bales. Therefore cotton farmers must cooperate in making sure that they have the type of program which will enable them to compete successfully in world cotton markets when the war is over, and during the war they should sell every bale they can in those foreign markets still available to them. They should discuss in groups such as yours the problem of competition from synthetic and other competing fibers as well as the problem of loss of export markets. It is in discussions such as these that programs are developed. Programs are neither developed nor executed in Washington. We in Washington merely represent and express the combined thoughts and desires of the people at home.

No one can say with any degree of certainty just what we must do to maintain our position in world markets after the war, because we don't know in just what condition our former customers will be. It may be that we will have an international agreement between the cotton-producing countries of the world. I think this would be very desirable. It is almost certain that we will have to accept goods in exchange for our cotton to a greater degree than in the past. If so, it may even be necessary for the Government to take a far larger part in the actual bartering and handling of our export trade in order to increase the bargaining power of the American farmer. Our Government might also be forced to renew export subsidies on raw cotton and to take additional steps to increase the relative quality and appearance of American cotton intended for export. And, of course, we must continue and even increase our present efforts to stimulate the domestic consumption of American cotton.

We should be thinking about these things and charting the course we expect to follow. It is only through the concerted action of a well-informed people that we can develop a sound and workable program.

For the solution of problems ahead farmers of the United States are better organized today than ever before. Group organizations are natural and healthy products of democratic society. Just recently Secretary Wickard has selected your own national president, Ed O'Neal, to serve with other farm organization heads on a committee on agricultural production for national defense and related matters. The suggestion for this committee came from President Roosevelt himself. It is a tribute to the value and effectiveness of farm organizations.

Your own Farm Bureau Federation has from its earliest days faced the problems of agriculture in a wholly realistic fashion. You have worked for concrete results to advance the cause of economic justice for the American farmer. Your leaders have been in the forefront of every crucial fight for the advancement of the farmers' interest.

The challenge today that faces your group as well as other farm groups—in fact, all groups—whether of farmers, workers, or industrialists, is whether these groups can subordinate their own special interests to the general welfare. When any special group becomes coercive and selfish it defeats its own purpose.

If you can always stand squarely for the interest of the farmer without forgetting that the consumer, too, has his rights; if you can continue the fight for permanent parity for agriculture and at the same time support the legitimate claims of labor and industry; if you can hold out for a decent American standard of living and security on every American farm and at the same time not begrudge the city worker the privilege of seeking such security and such a standard of living, then you will deserve to become, and I believe you will become, a stronger and a greater organization.

The 1941 Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 19, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I did not vote for the tax bill of 1941 on the final vote on the adoption of the conference report, which completed the action of Congress on the measure.

On that vote we had before us the finished work of many months of consideration by Congress of tax legislation, and we were asked to pass judgment on the final product.

I wish to make it clear that I am in favor of a revision of our tax legislation. We must raise enormous sums in taxes to keep our national finances in safe and sound order. In the present state of our colossal national deficit and our prodigious and continuous spending for national defense, the danger is not that we shall raise too much money but too little money by taxes. It is elemental that there must be a certain relation between revenues and outgo to keep our national financial position in the safety zone; that the Nation cannot forever pile up obligations without substantial revenue to meet them and still remain solvent.

But as I surveyed the final product of the tax bill it seemed to me that it had been very much worsened by the treatment that it had received in the Senate, and that if it were rejected and a fresh start were made it would be possible to write a bill that would bear much more justly and equitably on all of our citizens. As the tax collection under this measure will not begin in any event until next March and as Congress is certain to be in continuous session, perhaps with nothing to do, it seemed to me there was both time and opportunity to write a better tax bill.

I did not like the Senate provision which lowered the income subject to taxation down to $1,500 in the case of a married person and $750 in case of a single person. It seemed to me that with costs of living mounting skyward these earners of low incomes are staggering under as heavy a load as they can reasonably be expected to stand. It seemed to me that heads of families making as low as $1,500 a year, facing mounting costs and wondering where they will ever get money to pay the doctor, the butcher, the baker, and how they will ever get the means to raise and educate their children, might well be exempted from income taxation in this great, rich country of ours.

My chief objection to the bill, briefly stated, was that in my opinion it is not a properly balanced measure. It bears too heavily on those who are least able to pay and not heavily enough on those who are most able to pay. In the latter category of individuals who will escape the taxes which I think they should pay, I refer especially to those who will reap rich profits out of the war emergency. The bill, in my opinion, does not provide a sufficient levy on the profits incident to and tied in with the war situation.

Those profits will be enormous, and I think a way should have been found to plow back a larger percentage of such profits into the revenues necessary to run the Government. To have done this, with a commensurate lightening of the tax burden on the little fellow, would have been, in my judgment, good legislation and good public policy.

To tax heavily the extraordinary and unusual profits of a war situation such as we are now facing is a sound principle of taxation. It is sound because it leaves capital unimpaired and does not in any way affect the income of the same individuals when the emergency which produces such swollen profits is over. On the other hand, when structural changes are made in the tax base affecting small income earners, those earners do not recover their former status when the emergency is over, but they go on paying the heavy rates they paid during the emergency.

I might discuss the conference report in a more detailed, analytical way, but the above statement presents my principal objections. Summarizing my views, I repeat that, in my considered judgment, the bill bears too harshly on those who are least able to pay and not heavily enough on those who are able to pay. Congress should have taken time to write a more equitable bill.

Freedom of the Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. HAMILTON FISH, OF NEW YORK

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech delivered by me over the American Radio Forum of the Air program, Mutual Broadcasting System network, Sunday evening, September 21, 1941:

President Roosevelt, on his own responsibility and without requesting any authority from the Congress, ordered an expeditionary force to Iceland, which was and still is occupied by the British Army. The responsibility for sending an expeditionary force to Iceland, within 800 miles of Europe and within the war zone, rests squarely with the President. If we are involved in war as the result of incidents arising on the high seas in the war zones around Iceland, it will be a war for which President Roosevelt will be solely responsible, in spite of all the promises and pledges he gave the American people that our Army, Navy, and air force would not participate in war outside the Americas.

Iceland is 2,800 miles outside the Americas. Now that we are there, I understand the logic and the need of keeping the sea lanes open to supply our troops while they are in Iceland. However, that does not mean having our warships wandering around the seven seas, looking for Nazi submarines or raiders, in order to bring on a shooting, fighting war. If the statement by Secretary Knox that our Navy is convoying merchant ships is restricted to Iceland, I anticipate that Congress will accept the situation as an accomplished fact. Clearing waters necessary for our own use and defense is one thing, but if it develops that the convoy system goes beyond that and our warships start shooting at German or Italian ships in other waters, that would be an act of war on our part, or, rather, Mr. Roosevelt's.

We must not get into an offensive war of our own making. The whole issue of the freedom of the seas is filled with the rankest kind of hypocrisy, quibbling, and hair splitting. It is enough to make the angels weep.

We are now talking about freedom of the seas and the sacred principles of international law for ourselves, yet we have repeatedly disregarded and violated the rights and privileges of neutrality, upon which the freedom of the seas is anchored.

If the American people want to get into the war, let us say so honestly and in a democratic and American way by a majority vote in Congress. But, for heaven's sake, let us stop being contemptible hypocrites about it. I anticipate some warmaker in the Cabinet, possible one of the warmaking twins—Messrs. Stimson or Knox—will issue a new statement from now on that the Red Sea is an American lake and that Moscow is part of Alaska. Let us be honest with ourselves and stop trying to befuddle, deceive, and hoodwink the American people.

I accuse President Roosevelt in his speech last Thursday of trying to build up a phoney, false, and fraudulent war issue by attempting to make out that we are responsible for the safety of ships flying the Panamanian flag. These ships were put under the Panamanian flag as a subterfuge to get around our own laws, and our Government is in no way responsible—legally or under international law—for them.

I accuse President Roosevelt of having sent American merchant ships into the war zone in the Red Sea, 10,000 miles away, and contrary to the spirit of the Neutrality Act.

I challenge President Roosevelt to state on what occasion, outside of the *Robin Moor*, which was held up by a submarine and the crew and passengers given time to get off, that a single American ship has been torpedoed or a single American life has been lost, and when and where a German raider, as distinguished from a submarine, has ever attacked an American ship.

The fact is that we have scores of times violated the principles of international law and the customs and usages connected with the freedom of the seas. We have seized belligerent ships in our ports and turned them over to enemy nations. We have repaired and outfitted belligerent warships in our own harbors.

We as a government and with governmental funds have built ships and furnished war materials for belligerents. We have transferred 50 destroyers and other naval units to a belligerent nation. We have committed innumerable unneutral acts. In fact we do not claim to be neutral but have assumed a status of nonbelligerency.

I am merely relating a few facts and asking for an end to the pious and hypocritical pronouncements about international law and the freedom of the seas. We have been a party to undermining, if not destroying both, and we do not appear with clean hands when we now talk of insisting on our neutral rights on the high seas. Let us stop looking for an excuse to enter the war through repealing the Neutrality Act or chatter about nonexisting freedom of the seas. If we are to enter the war let us do so with our head up, and for the best interest of the American people and not by subterfuge or through fake issues.

I denounce as utterly untenable and un-American the argument that Congress turn over to one voice and one man the formation of our foreign policies even to involvement in war. If that were true, it would mean that the end of constitutional government in America and the substitution of the very essence of nazi-ism and dictatorship in its place.

Americans are united in support of war in defense of the United States and the American Continent but only a small minority favor putting this country into an offensive war and very few into an undeclared war in defiance of the Constitution, the Congress, and 80 percent or more of the American people.

Patterns for Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

ADDRESS OF W. ARTHUR SIMPSON, OF VERMONT

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by the Honorable W. Arthur

Simpson, of Vermont, which address deserves and should have the careful attention of the largest possible number of people that may be reached by means of the insertion in the RECORD.

"Patterns for Tomorrow" it is entitled, and whether one agrees in entirety with the suggestions contained therein, it must be agreed by all that this speech stands out beaconlike among the clouds of empty words that have come from so many lips, befogging and beclouding a situation that needs to be lighted instead of darkened.

The address follows:

In the city of Philadelphia stands a shrine to the principles of democracy and the freedom born out of the achievements of our forebears who bequeathed us a priceless heritage. Here Washington became the commander in chief of the American Army; here Benjamin Franklin brought wise experience and council to a group of earnest patriots, and here in Independence Hall, Thomas Jefferson uttered those immortal words which have been a beacon light to liberty-loving people in all lands for more than 150 years. On the walls of this plain colonial room is this sign, "Americans walk proudly here." We have a right to be proud of American philosophies and proud of Americans who gave them expression and validity. We are proud of those whose blood was shed that liberty and justice might live and grow and that freedom might not perish from the earth. Enjoying as we do the highest standards of living in the world and a form of government more calculated to preserve them, freedom more tangible than any existing elsewhere, and the precious right to transmit it to our posterity, it is not too much to ask that we take time from our business and pleasure to soberly consider the matter of national defense and national unity.

The historian will find in those things happening in the world today a familiar pattern to what has heretofore happened, but the implications and impact of this conflict are the greatest in the history of civilization because the world has grown very small. What happened in the days of Old World conquerors like Alexander the Great, Genghis Khan and Tamerlane were terrible enough, but they had little effect in the world at large.

Even Napoleon's conquest held little menace for the New World democracy because Napoleon rose out of revolution stimulated by the philosophies of Jefferson and the achievements of Washington.

This is not just "another war." This is a world revolution swept by forces and philosophies of terrible portent because they will determine whether force or reason shall rule the world. Hitler gave the situation proper clarification when he announced that events would determine the destiny of the German people for a thousand years. Unfortunately, the destinies of the German people are not the only ones at stake; they involve all the people of all the earth. We shall either be slaves or remain free. The world cannot be half slave and half free. It is not written in the book of destiny that America will be able to escape the tests which in these days are coming to the nations of the earth.

The terrible experience of other nations who did not desire war offer these inescapable facts for the guidance of the American people, appeasement will not help us, isolation will not save us. The rich and comfortable New World must make a real contribution to the salvation of civilization and we are not going to be very proud of ourselves, highly regarded by the rest of the world or build a strong nation, if we buy ourselves out of the difficulties which have engulfed the world.

To be an isolationist is the easy way of life. Of course, we do not want to shed American blood. All the sympathy is on the side of America first. None of the little nations of Europe wanted war but today they are chained to the chariot of the conqueror. They hung separately because they would not hang together.

With the fall of Denmark, Norway, and Holland, and the encirclement of Sweden there perished the finest cooperative society in the world, the finest forms of social security, the finest types of health insurance, and the ideals of great peace-loving peoples. Finland has no heart in the struggle except to regain and preserve its own territories. Rumania does not want to fight for Nazi overlords and the good Italian peasants have no desire to perish on the steppes or in the marshes of Russia.

A lot of very nice people want to emulate the early martyrs and delude themselves into thinking that love will stop the German wave of conquest. Of course, few of them really expect to be thrown to the lions or to perish under the wheels of the modern juggernaut. The wishful thinking of really sincere men and women and the skillful maneuvering of politicians who are afraid to face facts or fear loss of votes have little validity in the face of grim realities which must be faced without soft concealment. Liberty is fighting for its life. Only by heroic and self-sacrificing exertions can we hope to save ourselves. It will require of us such fortitude and self-denial as we have almost forgotten. We must arm for a generation not only to protect ourselves but to police the world. Such a course—and we seem to have no alternative—will be hard and expensive. The maintenance of a great standing army, a two-ocean navy, and a great air and tank fleet will tremendously change the social and economic fabric of the Nation. It will lower our high standard of living. It may shatter some of our preconceived notions of the inherent strength of our country. Liberty cannot be saved in its holiday clothes.

We must put iron into our democracy. Democracy creating its own world was hard and grim and poor. Democracy in a year of national peril is rich and soft and quarrelsome. Our output of planes and tanks and munitions has been disappointingly inadequate. Had it not been for the respite afforded by the heroic exertions of the Red Army of the United Soviet Republic our efforts might have been too late. Instead of a spirit of unity and sacrifice each group in our country is seeking greater self-advantage. Can we build morale in a great American army when the boys in training see the stay at homes living in luxury and blocking the wheels of industry to obtain greater privileges and pay? Organized labor has secured tremendous advantages in better wages, shorter hours, better working conditions, unemployment compensation, and a guaranty against the hazards and vicissitudes of old age. No other group has a greater stake in the preservation of democracy. Labor should not allow selfishness and greed to sabotage national defense.

The American farmer should be satisfied with a parity price for his products. He is entitled to that fair return. Hundreds of millions are being paid from the Federal Treasury in subsidies to these producers. Extravagant farm prices in the first World War put the farmer on the road to economic bankruptcy in the post-war period.

During a time of national peril the Government has appeared unwilling to strengthen its credit or husband its resources. Sound democratic government is in danger unless its liberal and essential social programs are kept practical, soundly financed, and economically administered. We have cultivated and indulged the easy way of life. We are selfish, undisciplined, and terribly extravagant. We owe billions for things we did not need and could not afford.

Our financial fantasy has permeated the whole body politic of our country. With a colossal and ever-increasing national debt we continue to indulge our extravagant notions, and we do this because, as we say, if we did not someone else would get the money.

From the expenditure of billions of dollars for national defense and as a gift to other nations there is again arising the delusions of prosperity. Inflation is a grave and imminent danger. Our Government, which seeks to curtail installment buying, has been the most prodigal installment buyer the world has ever known.

We need to be on guard as never before to protect our rights to free speech and a free press. Bureaucratic centralized authority and government by decree is growing by leaps and bounds. The citadel of liberty is threatened from within as well as from without.

We need a revival of religion and religious impulse. People should live simply, humbly, and resolutely. Religion first kindled the fires of political freedom and made vital man's dignity and kinship with his Creator. When this is destroyed we extinguish the light of liberty in the earth.

We need to catch some of the spark and spiritual unity of the first World War. It may be that participation in this war is the only means to make us a strong, resolute, and united people.

Woodrow Wilson led this country to war in 1917 because he had reached the conclusion that participation in the war was justifiable and might lead to the creation of safeguards against a repetition of the disaster.

It was Woodrow Wilson who first saw and predicted that if dictators were not stopped early by the combined powers of free nations they would eventually imperil, if they did not completely wreck, civilization. He it was who declared, "The day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles which gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured." We failed to understand his gift of prophecy when he said, "I am seeking only to face realities and face them without soft concealment." His League of Nations might have averted this life-and-death struggle for the survival of civilization.

A world system of international police, a world league dominated by no single nation, "not a balance of power but a community of power, not organized rivalries but an organized common peace" is the single hopeful pattern of the shape of things to come.

It is given to any individual to participate only the tiniest fraction in the great upward struggle of the human race, but we have each a responsibility as a part of that generation which, if it is to survive, must be the greatest generation that ever stood on this earth, because its difficulties are greatest. We have before us the tragic example of conquered people who were once free and are now slaves because they did not recognize their dangers, because they were unwilling to change their accustomed mode of living, because they would not give up their luxuries, and because they preferred the soft and easy life to that of sacrifice and self-denial.

In America, the greatest of all democracies, we must demonstrate that a democracy can be efficient and effective, that a democracy can be strong and hard, if need be and can act firmly, wisely, and expeditiously. This is our obligation—yours and mine—God helping us we can do no less.

"To what new fates my country, far
And unforseen of foe or friend
Beneath what unexpected star
Compelled to what unchosen end.

"Across the sea that has no beach
The Admiral of Nations guides
Thy blind obedient keels to reach
The harbor where thy future rides.

"I do not know beneath what sky
Or on what seas shall be thy fate
I only know it shall be high
I only know it shall be great."

The Power To Declare War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

TELEGRAM FROM GEORGE N. PEEK

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

RANCHO SANTA FE, CALIF.,
September 13, 1941.

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

People are confused over the discussion arising out of the word "authority" in connection with the President's activities in his dual position of President and Commander in Chief. Does the President assume that there is no law governing his actions? If so, is he not assuming dictatorial powers, thus openly and flagrantly brushing aside the Congress, the Constitution, the people, and international law? Under our form of government, is not the Congress alone, representing the people and responsible to them, the only authority empowered to declare war? A policeman may have authority to shoot to kill but he may not have that right. Members of Congress can clarify this point by discussion.

GEORGE N. PEEK.

A Survey of the National and Local Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN F. SMITH
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent granted by my colleagues, I insert the radio address delivered by me on August 17, 1941, over radio stations KGY, Olympia, Wash.; KELA, Centralia, Wash.; KWLK, Longview, Wash.; and KXRO, Aberdeen, Wash.

The radio address referred to reads as follows:

My friends in southwest Washington, I am very glad to have this opportunity of talking to you and deeply appreciate the privilege accorded me by station KGY to participate in the ceremony celebrating the inauguration of its increased broadcasting facilities, particularly marking its first Sunday on the air. Through the magic of radio we are entertained and instructed, and we are kept informed as to the swiftly moving events in the great drama of life and history which is now being enacted in the world. Radio has become an essential part of our daily lives and through its added facilities station KGY will more than ever play an important role in the community life and affairs of southwest Washington. We are fortunate and exceptionally favored in our section of the State in having five radio-broadcasting stations which are splendidly serving our citizens. I wish them all continued success and still further progress.

The Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses are setting a new record for duration of continuous sessions. The Seventy-seventh Congress has now completed over 7 months of steady and arduous labor since we convened on January 3. Congress has been in constant session now for 592 days, 566 days remaining of the Seventy-sixth Congress last year, the longest continuous session in our history and 226 days of the Seventy-seventh Congress this year. The physical and mental strain is proving too much for many of our colleagues who are dying heroically at their post of duty in the most crucial period of our national history, perhaps the most crucial period in the world's history. The number of deaths has been the highest in the history of Congress.

My friends, world events of the past 2 years have compelled us to undertake the greatest and most costly national-defense program in our entire history. We have had to look some very grim facts in the face and become realistic in regard to the menace which threatens our own future as a democracy and a free people. We have come to realize that aid to Britain and the other democracies is an insurance policy to insure our own safety and security and, if possible, to keep war away from the shores of America.

The Axis dictators' plans, blueprints, and timetables are being rapidly, relentlessly, and ruthlessly translated into actuality. They have proclaimed that the world cannot exist part totalitarian and part democratic and that they intend to make it all totalitarian. It remains to be seen how long Russia can withstand the onslaught of the Nazi war machine.

President Roosevelt and Congress have put forth every possible effort to keep our country out of war and how well we have succeeded is proven by the fact that we are practically the only nation in the world which has not suffered any loss of life or property. In view of all the threats and dangers to which we have been exposed, and the difficulties with which we have had to contend, this is a remarkable achievement. How thoughtless and unreasonable are those who, in the face of this record, can find it in their minds and hearts to accuse President Roosevelt and those who have supported our national-defense program of seeking to thrust us into war. President Roosevelt and Congress have shown more patience and toleration and submitted to greater threats and danger to our safety and future as a free nation than all the war administrations in our history combined, including those of Washington, Lincoln, McKinley, Woodrow Wilson. Let us re-read our histories.

I have supported every national-defense measure and aid to Britain, because, as I have stated, that is aid to America. My mail, which has been unusually heavy this session, indicates that my course in so doing is approved by an overwhelming majority of the citizens of our district.

While I favor aid to Britain, I also favor aid to our own people and communities. I cannot agree with those who favor huge appropriations for foreign defense and then want to cut and curtail our appropriations and expenditures for domestic defense. I have opposed reducing our expenditures for the Civilian Conservation Corps, National Youth Administration, Soil Conservation, Federal aid to roads, rivers and harbors, and flood control, rural rehabilitation, food-stamp plan, Work Projects Administration, and farm relief. I have voted against reducing expenditures for these worthy purposes and shall continue to favor liberal appropriations for each and every one of these programs, as I consider them to be essential and desirable to our national defense.

During this national emergency, I consider it unpatriotic and thoroughly unwise for us to adopt a policy of indifference to the social and economic welfare of our people. Instead let us continue our program of social justice and economic security and thereby strengthen our national defense by increasing the stake which our people have in the preservation of our democracy. Our people then will again prove their loyalty, devotion, and sacrifice as they have always done in the past.

I therefore recently opposed and voted against the antilabor legislation which came before Congress and which would have deprived our workers of their hard-won right to bargain collectively in regard to wages, hours, and working conditions, protection to which they are entitled in a period of rising living costs, in order that they may live decently and purchase the products of the farm and the factory.

For the same reasons, we have acted in the House of Representatives upon legislation in the interests of the widows and orphans of the veterans of the World War. The House also passed early this month four important bills reported out by the Committee on Pensions, of which I have the honor to be the chairman, providing benefits to the veterans of the Spanish-American War, their widows and children. Now, more than ever, we should by our deeds prove that we are grateful to those who have served our country in its hours of greatest need.

We also passed in the House longevity-pay legislation for the postal employees, which I vigorously supported. This will result in a larger measure of justice to the employees of this great branch of the Federal Government who serve all of us so faithfully and efficiently.

We are making real progress with the Townsend plan in this Congress, with our discharge petition pending in the House and hearings being held in the Senate. We hope to demonstrate to the American people that we favor providing food, clothing, and shelter for our senior citizens, which would be a credit to them and to our country, which they have helped to build.

As usual, I have been active in this session in behalf of the Bonneville project which is constantly requiring a great deal of my time and effort. Its benefits are flowing out to the people in all the nine counties of my congressional district. Our P. U. D. districts are being enabled to reduce the electric light and power rates to all our people, and our rural-electrification projects are bringing these benefits to our farmers and inhabitants of the outlying communities. The savings to our citizens have already been considerable and will continue to grow. The Bonneville project has caused substantial industrial development and created new employment and new pay rolls in our district which no one would have thought to be possible a few years ago. This industrial development has just started and will gradually increase. It is certain to result in more prosperity and happiness for all our citizens and to have had an important part in this beneficial

program gives me more personal satisfaction than I can express.

I enjoy my work in Congress, for which I have been preparing all my life. I am now attaining the rank and seniority on committees and official contacts which can come only after years of service and experience, and which make it possible for me to serve you more efficiently and effectively.

It is gratifying these days to read the mail from home and to note the activity and steady employment at the highest wages ever received in the lumber, pulp and paper, plywood, fishing, and the new aluminum industries in our congressional district and the development of our electric-power utilities due to Bonneville. Also to observe that our municipal, school district, port district, and county governments are in the best financial condition in their history. According to my official mail, mercantile and retail business is flourishing and business conditions generally are the best they have ever been in all the communities. Farm prices have also risen, and consequently our dairy, poultry, cranberry, fruit, and grain farmers are sharing in our present prosperity. We must, however, realize that post-war problems will confront us, and for that reason I appeared before the Labor Committee of the House recently and strongly urged the appointment of a congressional committee or commission to study these problems and make plans for their solution.

This program is being broadcast on the Sabbath, and I would not be speaking what is uppermost in my mind and heart if I did not say that my experience in public life, my observations, and my reading have convinced me that we need, more than anything else, a moral and spiritual rearmament in our country. We need to return to the Christian faith of our fathers and to the teachings and precepts of the Christian religion in order to solve the social, economic, and political problems of this crucial period in human history.

With this thought I conclude, and wish to again thank my friends of KGY for making this broadcast possible, and I thank you for listening.

Attack on Our Butter?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently returned from my district in Nebraska where farmers who milk cows are worried over recent radio statements from one branch of our Government extolling the virtues of a butter substitute. The cow and the hen mean much to our farming population. The cream check has kept the wolf from many a farm door in the past. Our farmers want the same consideration which is being given to labor and industry, so far as living income is concerned. We know that we cannot solve our domestic economy unless we solve our farm problem. The farmer is entitled to the cost of production and he is also entitled to the American market. The farmers to whom I talked about this broadcast advertising a butter substitute fear that it is a direct attempt to put foreign farm products into competition with American farm products right here in the American market. I hope the Congress can clarify this situation and give the farmers who milk cows a chance to at least get cost of producing this milk and cream.

To give you an idea of the resentment in my State regarding this situation, I include with my remarks a letter recently written to the Nebraska Union Farmer by Mr. James C. Norgaard, general manager of the Farmers Union Cooperative Creamery Co.:

It looks as though war hysteria or something has taken the place of common sense among some of the officials in high Government positions.

For example, McNutt, of the Federal Securities Administration is advocating that Americans use oleo so that we may save our good butter for the British. Are the blue-bloods of Britain that much better than we Americans?

This same McNutt is spending the money farmers earn by milking cows to advertise oleo from Coco "Nutts," and has the unmitigated gall to say it is as good as butter. If he thinks it is, why not send it to the English?

NO SCARCITY OF BUTTER

There is no scarcity of butter. On August 1, 1940, we had 123,000,000 pounds of butter on hand in the United States. This year on August 1, we had 178,000,000 pounds of butter on hand, or 55,000,000 pounds more than a year ago. There is plenty of good butter in the United States to take care of both Britain and this country.

With our Secretary of Agriculture out urging more production of dairy products, it seems to me that dairy farmers should be encouraged, instead of hampered, in developing better markets for their products.

IS PEASANTRY THE AIM?

If the new oleo standards are allowed to go into effect, and the Government sponsors advertising and propaganda campaigns fostering the use of oleo, there is a real danger that the price of butter will drop to the price of oleo, and make dairying very unprofitable.

We sometimes wonder if there is a deliberate attempt in certain quarters to make peasants of American farmers. If not, why all this propaganda for "Cuban sugar," "Argentine beef," and Coco "Nutts" oleo?

Your Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND, OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by me over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co., Monday, September 22, 1941:

Ladies and gentlemen, I greet you from the Nation's Capital after spending 4 weeks in the Fourth Armored Division, United States Army, Pine Camp, N. Y., one of the modern, fast-moving, hard-hitting divisions of our armed forces, comparable to the German panzer division, of which we have all heard so much.

In my capacity of captain in the Organized Reserves assigned to the division, it afforded me an opportunity to work with, live with, and eat with the men who make up our fighting forces. Not only was I in a position to learn, by association with the men, the morale of the unit but, by observation and use, the quality and quantity of equipment that is being furnished by our expensive defense effort.

Since leaving Pine Camp I have also visited Fort Bragg and Fort Lee. National defense today commands the largest appropriation from the Congress of the United States, and without doubt the most important. The moneys spent to date are staggering in amount, with no end in sight. When the bill comes due the citizens and taxpayers will be called upon to sacrifice. Not only will they have to sacrifice in money but already are they beginning to feel the pinch of being denied some of the many conveniences and comforts they have grown used to. Next Sunday you might not be able to take that afternoon drive into the country. You may not be able to purchase parts for the vacuum cleaner if it breaks. You cannot buy any more aluminum pots or pans. Your dealer perhaps cannot supply you with flashlight bulbs for photography. Maybe you won't be able to purchase the building materials for that addition you were going to build. When you try to turn in the old family car you'll find the price is much higher if you can get delivery at all, and if you do, you may find the car is not complete, even though it can be operated. Soon we will feel the effect of the new tax bill. This we, as taxpayers, are doing for the defense of our country. The American people are willing to make these sacrifices if they know their money is being spent for what it is appropriated by their Representatives. The people can't give the time nor are they in a position to find out, so it is up to their Members of Congress to determine this in one way or another. I have taken the time and have given up my vacation to do that in the Army.

Since the speech of the President of the United States on Thursday night, September 11, there is no question in anyone's mind that there is a near possibility of our becoming involved in the present war in Europe. It is obligatory that we now look to our defenses and defensive forces to determine how well we are prepared to meet that eventuality when it arises. It means sacrifice and unity, whether we agree or not with the principle or the causes. The gauntlet has been cast and it is for us as citizens to exert our every effort to the preservation of our country and its freedom.

In my judgment, there are four things necessary in a modern army to have a fighting force able to compare with those of the rest of the world, namely: Morale, equipment, leadership, and training. One cannot stand alone without the others. Make yourselves comfortable in your homes and let's discuss these problems in their order.

Morale, or the will to do and the willingness to carry on in spite of hardship, is the first and main objective and the foundation upon which the services are built. Picture, if you will, as you sit in the comfort of your home or your car with your family grouped around you, the soldier in a far-off camp living in barracks away from his loved ones, lonesome and tired from a hard day's work in the dirt, dust, and sand, having worked from early morning till late at night doing the same thing over and over again. Picture him in a bare barrack with a cot to sleep on or maybe he is sleeping on the ground in the field or in a pup tent, all for $30 per month and the glory of working for his country. This takes courage and sacrifice. But again, we must understand the psychology of the soldier. A good soldier is always "beefing" about something and he always wants to be somewhere

where he isn't, just as the civilians of our country like to complain and criticize. The men in the Army never knew how bad their morale was until they read about it in some of the periodicals and were reminded of it by many articles. A good soldier would never let it be thought that he couldn't take it for fear it would cast a reflection on his courage and manhood. He would consider it an insult to have people think he was a coward enough not to want to do his duty for his country. He is the last to want to give comfort to an enemy by allowing them to believe the morale is low. Being accused of such by some who are not well-informed does not help. He wants encouragement, not sympathy. If left alone, the morale is fine and the men are willing to do their jobs. They feel the people back home are letting them down by belittling their efforts and by their failure to produce the equipment needed.

Closely coupled with morale is equipment. The men, knowing they might be called upon some day to meet an enemy, are most discouraged when every other act is simulated because of the vast shortage of matériel. The men, however, are well clothed, housed, fed, and well equipped with personal needs. I have operated practically every type of vehicle the Army uses and fired every type of weapon, with the exception of the larger-caliber guns. The quality and design of both the vehicles and weapons are a credit to the American manufacturers. I have driven the vehicles through the worst and roughest type of terrain and in all kinds of weather except snow. They are excellent. The guns are easily handled and accurate. The quality is of the best. But what of the quantity? Germany has 20 panzer or armored divisions—that is, they did have before the Russian campaign—and they are fully equipped and manned by well-trained veterans. The United States has 4. The first and second, I understand, are 80 percent equipped and with the medium tanks slowly beginning to come in, but they are still very short on artillery. The third and fourth are 20 percent equipped with controlled items and no medium tanks, no antitank or field artillery as prescribed in the tables of organization. These divisions should be, if they are not, on the first priority list for equipment, as they will be the first striking force to contact the enemy. If these divisions are so poorly equipped, what must be the condition of the rest of the Army? I have not had the time to determine why this shortage exists after the vast expenditure of public funds. I can only guess that it must be one of three reasons: The multiple, expensive, overlapping, interfering red-tape coordinating agencies of the Government spending the money and time with a useless effort in creating obstacles; we are giving too much away; or those civilians charged with the actual production are falling down on the job. Whichever it is, I hope the shoe fits and they put it on, because if we fail, at their door will lie the blame, as the Army is doing its best. Whichever it is, however, the Army has not received the equipment while the money is being spent. I assure you I'm going to find out the place and reason. It's the results that count. Weapons, vehicles, and ammunition in the hands of the men who have to use them will be the deciding factor in conflict, not all of the multiple agencies that can be created or vast sums unproductively spent. It is most discouraging to use a tree trunk for a gun and wave a flag violently to indicate its firing. I'm afraid it would make little impression on an enemy. It's one thing to see a target and another to hit it—you can't simulate a good shot—it takes practice, and you can't practice without a gun or ammunition.

Morale and equipment is valueless, however, without good leadership and well-informed officers. There has been much criticism about the officers and many statements have issued about their lack of ability. We must remember, because of the pacifistic trend of the country over the past few years while Germany was arming, the Army was reduced to a minimum, with only sufficient Regular officers to man a skeleton force. Now that it has become necessary to expand the Army, the Regular Army officers have been too few to adequately officer the expansion and it has been necessary to call in the Reserve officers to augment the regular personnel and to officer the selectee army. These Reserve officers in the past have given of their time and services without cost to the Government to try to prepare for this very emergency. They were realists enough to foresee this critical period. Because of the shortage of funds to the Army during the peace years, the Reserve officer was only afforded training with troops once in every 3 years and had to learn what he could from correspondence courses, a poor substitute at best. Now he is called upon to take active command of troops and expected to be a professional soldier overnight. They're doing a good job and a remarkable one considering the small opportunity afforded to lay a foundation. Shortly after my arrival at Pine Camp, and at my request, I was assigned to the division officers' training center, which is a school every new officer assigned to the division must attend for full time over a period of 7 weeks. In this class I found newly assigned R. O. T. C. graduates who were, in most cases, mustered into the service shortly after graduation from college, officers from other units, medical officers ordered to active duty from civilian life, and four chaplains. The course consisted briefly of basic training in the organization and functions of the armored division, a review of basic military fundamentals, and a general knowledge of the equipment and objectives of the various units making up the division. It was necessary for each student to operate every type of vehicle from the motorcycle to the tank, on roads and rough terrain, with and without lights at night, to fire every type of weapon for record, except the heavy calibre guns, to function in each position in the various vehicles, to assemble each type of gun, to operate the radio and to use personal equipment through gas and over the obstacle course. They personally built two bridges in daylight and one at night without lights, operated assault boats and studied the method of supply.

This course, while not making specialists, nevertheless acquainted each officer with the jobs of the men and the difficulties under which they must operate as well as informing them as to the functions of the various component parts of the division, thereby in a short, intensive course equipping them with the necessary knowledge in addition to their basic training prior to commissioning, so as to enable them to take their places in the various units to which they were assigned.

That leads into the last point, namely, training of the troops. But here again there must be the equipment to train with. Wars of today are not as of years gone by, when the only weapons were the rifle or sword. Today, with the mechanized equipment and scientific methods, it takes time. Might we consider a scout car, for example, which is an armored car carrying six or more men and five different types of weapons. Each man must know his particular job and do it instinctively, with speed and teamwork for the safety to the entire crew. Each man must be able to drive the car, act as car commander, radio operator, or any other position in the car. He must be able to fire each weapon, repair the car, take down and assemble each weapon blindfolded, repair the radio, and operate any other type of vehicle in the division. It can't be done overnight nor in any given period. An untrained man cannot substitute for a trained one and still have the unit function. He must be trained before the trained one can leave if we want an army ready for an emergency.

In conclusion, let us liken the Army to a team. It is your team; if it wins, you win. If it loses, you lose; and all that is dear to you in the way of freedom and comfort and civilization is lost with it. You are the people supporting the team. They are doing their job. They need equipment and time to train with it. Remember a conqueror has no compassion for the conquered, so let's give our men full-hearted support, encouragement, and cooperation; they need and want it.

Thank you.

A Significant Congressional Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln in his Gettysburg address characterized the Government of the United States as a "government of the people, by the people, for the people." Lincoln's description was a true picture of our form of government as it was in his day. But times have changed. The "horse and buggy" days are gone, and a Government expressing the will of the people has also gone. Today we have a government by consent of the people's representatives in Congress. The Congress, during the past few years, has adopted a passive attitude, an acquiescent attitude, a yes-sir attitude—a Congress which in the slang of the street has become known as a "rubber stamp" Congress. Instead of initiating national policies and programs, the Congress now simply approves policies and programs that have been prepared and presented to it for approval. Congress now acts passively or negatively, whereas in former years the Congress always acted positively and in a dynamic manner.

This change on the part of Congress from an active part into a passive part, from a will-to-do policy into a consent-to-have-done policy, a change that has been taking place gradually for about 8 years, unnoticed by the majority of our people, is so well described and illustrated in an editorial in the Saturday Evening Post of September 20, 1941, under the heading "Government by consent" that I include it as a part of my remarks for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of September 20, 1941]

GOVERNMENT BY CONSENT

The change that has taken place in the character of American government—a change within the form—may be studied in the behavior of the parliamentary principle, which was designed by the Constitution to be the creative, lawmaking power. Observe it in action. Observe particularly that eccentric movement of congressional debate, as if it was revolving off center. The appearance is true; it does revolve off center. The explanation of this bewildering phenomenon is that the immediate matter of debate is not the axis upon which the debate turns. Always

there is something else, something that is not there—and what that is, asserted on one side and denied on the other, can be neither proved nor disproved for the time being.

For example, the ostensible subject may be a matter called A. The vote will be upon that. But what the debate really turns upon is whether A is simple or compounded. Does it involve saying B later; and, if so, why is B not there?

It is as if the executive principle were spelling out a word. The consent of the parliamentary principle is necessary in order to preserve the form. The parliamentary principle is Congress. But Congress does not know what the word is. Only the executive principle knows that. If Congress knew, it might not consent. Therefore, what the executive principle does is to submit one letter at a time.

This was perfectly illustrated in the debate on the bill to extend the period of involuntary military service beyond the 1 year for which the draft army was first called up. Granted that all the arguments advanced by the President as Commander in Chief and by his Chief of Staff for extending the period were valid; yet why had they not been foreseen when Congress was asked to consent to the original Draft Act of 1940? Why was it not told then that a term of 12 months was too short, that an army could not be trained in that time, and that to begin releasing the draftees serially at the end of their 1 year's service would be not only disruptive and wasteful but, in the words of the President, a tragic error, and in the words of the Chief of Staff, a fundamental and tragic error, bound to weaken the country's prestige abroad and thereby invite war? Why had none of this been foretold? Had the General Staff foreseen it and said nothing about it?

The Senate Committee on Military Affairs sent for the Chief of Staff and asked him why, if he knew better, he had approved the 1-year draft in the first place. He reminded the committee that, in the first place, he had asked for a period of 18 months, and continued: "I said I would compromise on 15, but certainly we must have at least 12. I admit that is a peculiar way to put it, but I was trying to get the Selective Service Act passed."

The meaning of that naive admission is perfectly clear. The original draft act with the 1-year limitation was the letter A. Letter B, the extension, was bound to follow. The General Staff knew that. If the General Staff knew it, the President knew it. But they were afraid that A and B together would be too much. The Congress might not consent.

So then the immediate matter of debate was B. Ostensibly it was B—this one question of extending the period of service, and on that there should be aye and no. But what everyone was thinking of was C, which was not there. For an interesting reason it was not there. It was visible for a moment, everybody saw it, and then it was suppressed, leaving B to stand alone.

B and C arrived at the Capitol together and were to have been presented together. B was the bill to extend the period of involuntary military service; C was a bill to repeal that provision of the original Draft Act which said that the Army thereby created should not be sent off this hemisphere. B meant an army extended in time; C meant an army to be free in space, one that the Commander in Chief could send anywhere in the world in his own discretion, with no further benefit of congressional opinion. What happened was that the reaction to C was instantly hostile—so hostile that it was immediately withdrawn. Why? Because it was evident that Congress would not consent to B and C together.

In the debate Senator VANDENBERG referred to C, saying: "It was a sinister request. It was an ominous request. I fear it was a prophetic request." Yet C was not there to be either debated or voted upon. It had been withdrawn for the sake of obtaining consent to B alone. Whether C would follow B as B had followed A nobody knew. So the Congress voted upon B alone.

We speak here not of the merits of A, B, or C. We speak of what is happening to government.

You cannot say when it was that Congress ceased to determine public policy. It relinquished that prerogative little by little and unawares, until it had passed to the executive principle—to the President, that is. During the first phase of this change the significance of it was obscured by the happy fact that the executive principle was not yet autocratic. It held fast to the tradition. It submitted its policies to Congress. That was collaboration. But it was not likely to continue forever. It discontinued suddenly with the advent of a President who had neither a reverence for the tradition nor a fear of power.

Since then great matters of national policy, foreign policy especially, have been submitted to Congress never as a whole, but as parts of a rebus, A by itself, B by itself, until the word was spelled out. And since then every important act of Congress has been an act of consent, not an act of will.

You may say, even so, that the power to give or withhold consent is the ultimate power. But this is a veto power, uncreative in itself, able to act only upon what is presented to it.

Read article I, section 1, of the Constitution: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." Imagine it to read: "Such policies as the President may from time to time determine and the laws that may be necessary to carry them into execution shall receive the consent of the Congress of the United States."

In a fine essay on democratic discipline, Dr. C. R. Mann says: "In practicing self-discipline the American citizen is generally confused by no less a pillar of democracy than the Declaration of Independence. * * * Near the beginning it says: 'That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.' This Declaration was issued some 13 years before the Constitution, and few seem to have noticed the misleading implications of the phrase, 'consent of the governed.' Yet mere consent generally is a passive or negative action, not strictly compatible with the positive action called for by 'We, the people * * * ordain and establish this Constitution.' Had the Declaration said, 'governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers by delegation from the people,' would not the two have been more compatible, since both would call for positive action by the people?"

The form survives; but now for the first time we have government by consent of the people, not government by will of the people. For better or worse, that is the change.

Speculating With Insurance Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM LABOR

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's issue of Labor:

[From Labor of September 23, 1941]

SPECULATING WITH INSURANCE FUNDS

Most of us carry some life insurance, and therefore there is general interest in the financial safety of the companies which collect from us once a year, or once a week, as the case may be.

Under the laws of various States, life insurance companies can only invest in approved securities. New York, quite naturally, has taken the lead in that respect, and other States have been inclined to accept its standards.

Now a legislative committee suggests New York permit life-insurance companies to invest in common stock. The excuse is that the companies should be permitted to get higher interest rates. It is pointed out that the return on good bonds is almost as low as on Government paper.

That's true, but it is also true that common stocks are and always have been, highly speculative, and insurance companies should not be permitted to speculate with the funds entrusted to them.

If the scheme is approved, the companies may get larger returns for a time and then lose all or part of the principal.

Selling Short the Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of misunderstanding circulating these days about the proposed rivers and harbors bill. I always have deemed it wise to be charitable, but in this case I believe the rumors to be purposeful and the resulting misleading propaganda conceived and spread by those hostile to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Why all the subterfuge? Why do some people attempt to convey the idea that the money for all of the projects in the rivers and harbors authorization bill is going to be appropriated and spent at once? Such contention is sheer nonsense, and its sponsors are well aware of it.

IT'S LONG-RANGE PLANNING

What the bill amounts to is a long-range planning program for the development of auxiliary water routes to broaden our transportation system to be constructed and paid for when the money is appropriated for that purpose by the Congress. From my own personal experience, let me say that I was fortunate enough to secure an authorization for a much-needed Coast Guard station in my district in 1935. To this very day the Appropriations Committee has never acted favorably in order to make money available for this important work.

It is obvious that bottlenecks are appearing in our present transportation system. The much-publicized alleged shortage of oil on the eastern seaboard is in reality not a shortage of oil, but

the inability to make deliveries here. If the seaway was available, we could free a portion of our equipment for transporting critical material.

Included in the measure is the regular rivers and harbors bill which is considered annually and is in no way affected by this program.

LETTER REFUTES DECEPTION

Returning to my former assertions that the groups who are opposed to the seaway are engaged in a malicious and completely deceptive propaganda effort, let me quote a letter from President Roosevelt which was written early in August to Chairman MANSFIELD, of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, in which he simply stated:

I think you will agree about the bill and the general view that should govern these authorizations in the present emergency. Some of the projects, notably the St. Lawrence, are needed immediately. Others will serve in the post-war reconstruction period. There is no reason why both groups should not be included in the present bill with the understanding that when it comes to appropriations the defense needs will be controlling.

I hope that this will serve to lay at rest at once and for all any question on the matter. The proposed rivers and harbors bill is an authorization bill and not an appropriation bill. Let us be done with tricky tactics and stop selling short a project as important as the seaway.

The Spirit Within

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. PADDOCK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

ADDRESS OF WILLIAM TYLER PAGE

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I insert in the RECORD an address by William Tyler Page before the Professional Business Women's Club of the District of Columbia, September 22, 1941, entitled "The Spirit Within," the theme prescribed by the national organization of professional business women, as follows:

In the Book of Job it is written "there is a spirit in man and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding."

From whence cometh this spirit in man? Man was formed in the image of God who breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, making man a spiritual being and a living soul. Hence, inspiration is literally "the act of breathing in" by which process the divine spirit entered into man.

We express this divine spirit in man by the oft used and oft misused pronoun "I", the living soul or spirit encased in a mortal body. This thing we call "I" is the real spirit of man, is indestructible, and lives on and on through eons of time.

The collective or community spirit in man is expressed in the word "ethos", meaning character of the people. This spirit or character may be developed to a high degree of spiritual attainment or narrowed to the lowest form of degradation, depending upon the exercise of the free will with which men are endowed. It often occurs that responsibility is the test of character. I have seen this exemplified in public service many times. The strong seize the favoring circumstances. The weak either let them slip or are borne down by the weight of responsibility which they impose.

In the Capitol Building is a beautiful fresco painting entitled "Westward the course of empire takes its way," depicting an emigrant train crossing the Rocky Mountains. On a side panel are these words:

"The spirit grows in its allotted spaces,
The mind is narrowed in a narrow sphere."

Man is master of his own destiny. The outward expression of the spirit within charts his course.

Someone has said:

"Sow a thought and reap an action,
Sow an action and reap a habit,
Sow a habit and reap a character,
Sow a character and reap a destiny."

It was the indomitable spirit within Christopher Columbus that surmounted all obstacles and made him cry out, "Sail on! Sail on and on!" And it was that same spirit that dedicated the New World to the King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

It was the spirit within the Pilgrims that wrote the enduring Mayflower Compact enunciating the eternal verities of God and freedom.

It was the spirit within that prompted those same Pilgrims to establish a Thanksgiving Day.

It was the spirit within the little colony at Jamestown which declared that it was their purpose "to erect a free popular state" in the New World, whose people were to have "no government put upon them but by their own consente."

It was the spirit within that inspired the Assembly of the Old Free State of Maryland to enact the first religious toleration act in America.

It was the spirit within that caused Patrick Henry to welcome liberty or death and to depend upon a just God to support the colonists.

It was the spirit within Ethan Allen that demanded the surrender of Ticonderoga in the name of the Great Jehovah and the Continental Congress.

It was the spirit within when the flesh was weak that enabled George Washington and his men at Valley Forge to rise superior to cold and hunger and overcome hardships.

It was the spirit within the mind and heart of Richard Henry Lee that penned the Resolution for American Independence, and it was the spirit within Thomas Jefferson that wrote the immortal Declaration.

It was the spirit within the Lexington Minute Men that fired the first shot for liberty that was heard around the world. It was the indomitable Spirit of '76 which won the independence of the United States.

It was the spirit within the patriot Nathan Hale to defy his executioners and to exclaim, "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

It was the spirit within that gave to George Washington the vision of inland transportation resulting in a "more perfect union" under a written constitution.

It was the spirit within the wise makers of the Constitution that established the Republic of the United States of America with metes and bounds of delegated authority and reserved powers to the States and to the people.

It was the spirit within that inspired Francis Scott Key to write the national anthem, The Star-Spangled Banner, during the British bombardment of Fort McHenry.

It was the spirit within the intrepid Andrew Jackson that declared "The Union, it must and shall be preserved," and likewise it was the spirit within Daniel Webster to declare, "The Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

It was the spirit within the humble and tolerant Abraham Lincoln that preserved the union of the States and welded them into one mighty nation, "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

It was the spirit within the magnanimous General Grant when he said to a worthy foe, General Lee, "Let us have peace."

It was the spirit within the wounded Captain Lawrence gave the order "Never surrender," and whose last words were "Don't give up the ship."

It was the spirit within that gallant young officer, Stephen Decatur, that exclaimed, "Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong."

It was the spirit within the "Father of the American Navy," John Paul Jones, to the enemy's question, "Have you struck, sir?" that undauntedly replied, "Sir, I have not yet begun to fight," and fight he did and conquered.

It was the spirit within Admiral Farragut who, while lashed to the shrouds of his flagship, the *Hartford*, shouted to his captain, "Go ahead; damn the torpedoes."

It was the spirit within the young American color bearer that carried him far in advance to the parapet of the enemy, exposing himself to their fire, who, when commanded to bring back the flag to the men, called back, "Bring the men up to the flag."

It was the spirit within those hardy, fearless, and self-reliant American pioneers that surmounted obstacles and conquered the wilderness.

These and many other operations of the spirit within evidence the spirit of America. It has been the imponderable spirit that has made the American Republic a great nation, a nation with a soul, a nation with character. Its outward and visible signs are its Constitution and Bill of Rights, not their letter but their quickening, invisible, and unquenchable spirit, wrought out and developed by men inspired by the spirit within them in their quest for a stable and permanent government of laws and not of men, founded upon the eternal principles of truth, freedom, and justice. The foundation, therefore, upon which this Republic was erected consists of these imponderables, the things of the spirit, seen only by its master builders through the eyes of the spirit within.

The finest and best things cannot be grasped by the coarse processes of measurement and analysis. Sunbeams cannot be weighed on hay scales, and gorgeously colored bits of cloud cannot be caught in a crucible. We can weigh the new-born baby but not the mother's love for her child. There are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamed of in our philosophy. In our blind materialism we need to have our eyes opened that we may know that this Republic is a thing of the spirit, that it consists of those imponderable things that represent convictions, offspring of the spirit of men who had vision and who were willing to become vicarious sacrifices for the sake of principle.

Human nature has not changed by the introduction of modern inventions. Liberty and justice under law are sublime objectives not to be obtained by physics or chemistry. With all the inventions, discoveries, and researches that have benefited mankind there remains the primeval problem, How can mankind gain and hold liberty, justice, and safety?

Our Republic cries out today for men and women whose spirit is not dead, though sleeping, to rise to the occasion of its dire need to defend and preserve it at all costs. This done, prompted by the spirit within, we shall then take our place with and become fellow citizens with the saints of old.

American history—American achievement of the past shows that there is no emergency so great, no obstacle so big, that it cannot be triumphantly overcome by Americans who have the spirit to sacrifice, if need be, "their lives and fortunes."

Consciousness of what this spirit has made possible for Americans to accomplish in the past fills us with a feeling of confidence that will enable our people to achieve even greater things in the future.

It was in the spirit of my forefathers, one of whom was a signer of the Declaration, another a President of the United States, that I wrote the American's Creed during the World War. In saying this I hope you will not think me immodest.

You already may have observed that this creed was composed of some of the utterances of great Americans, in whom was that spirit which we have used as our theme.

The American's Creed is a summing up in 100 words of the basic principles of American political faith. It is not an expression of individual opinion upon the obligations and duties of American citizenship or with respect to its rights and privileges. It is a summary of the fundamental principles of American political faith as set forth in its greatest documents, its worthiest traditions, and by its greatest leaders. Its writing resulted from a Nation-wide contest in 1917, during the World War, in which there were 3,000 competitors. I happened to be the winner and received the award of $1,000, with which I bought Liberty bonds from Charlie Chaplin, Mary Pickford, Douglas Fairbanks, and Marie Dressler. But never mind about the award, to which I never attached any importance.

I might say that I began unconsciously to write the American's Creed in 1898. For it had been my custom for a long time, in fact ever since the 4th of July 1898, just following our glorious victories in the Spanish-American War, to spend Independence Day in my library reading our American fundamental documents—the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the Constitution of the United States, the Mayflower Compact, speeches of great Americans, such as Webster's and Hayne's, such as Lincoln's and Douglas', and Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. Thus I was fairly familiar with these great fountains of patriotic literature which I called my American bible.

No creed worthy the name could be written in the words of any one man which could express the belief or the faith of many others. A creed, it seemed to me, should contain those things to which its subscribers had believed all along, but which never had been brought together concretely. It must be a composite and so readily recognized as to be accepted without much, if any, controversy.

The American's Creed is not to be interpreted in a provincial or selfish spirit, just as there is nothing provincial or narrow about the principles of our republican form of government, which first saw their fullest development in America.

Every citizen of this Republic therefore, must think and act not in terms of what his Government may do for him, but what he must do to preserve the Republic in its true character and the blessings to him and to his posterity—precisely the spirit which moved the fathers to bring forth the Republic. Then may we say, with one heart and one mind:

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation in many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I realize the importance of the foreign situation. I do not underestimate in any way the changes that we read of daily, nor do I fail to comprehend what it means to spend such a vast amount of money for our own national defense, as well as for the assistance that we are rendering other nations at war with Germany. However, to my mind there is another subject that means more to the people of this country as a whole, a problem that must be solved or nothing but disaster will result. It is the question of inflation that is knocking at our front door at the present time. Efforts to curb, through cooperation, the progress toward inflation, all must agree, judging from the record, have failed and we must embark upon another road if we are to be successful.

For some time this subject has been under consideration by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House. Hearings are being held. That is essential, but I say, the time has now arrived for action. This committee is not in any way to be criticized for the delay in bringing legislation to the floor, but it would be subject to criticism if a bill was reported before it had been thoroughly considered, and the views of those qualified to speak on the subject presented.

We have had experience in this respect. History tells how harmful inflation has been in the past, and we cannot only expect a repetition of what has previously happened, but on an increased scale.

We cannot evade inflation merely by freezing the price of certain commodities.

Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me I include as part of my remarks two editorials taken from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; one of September 15, and the other of September 21, which follow:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

IMPORTANT JOB FOR CONGRESS

Today Members of the House of Representatives return to Washington from a long vacation. They are faced with a national peril, the imminence of price inflation, that demands immediate attention.

The danger was recognized as far back as August 1, when a bill to put a roof over prices was introduced in the House. It was described then as "strictly an emergency measure, designed to meet the threat of inflation and check the rising cost of living." In the meantime, while the bill has languished in the House Banking Committee, the threat has become much more real.

On August 12 retail food prices hit their 10-year peak, and continued upward. Other items contributing to the cost of living—clothing, manufactured products, and the like—are also heading for the stratosphere.

Retail prices, however, have not yet reflected the full force of the inflationary trend. Wholesale costs have risen more rapidly. A good yardstick is the commodities index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, based on wholesale prices of nearly 900 products. It shows that wholesale costs have already soared to their highest level since 1929, and that in a single 30-day period, from mid-July to mid-August, they increased more than in the entire 12 months previous. These price rises are yet to be passed on to the public.

This, of course, is only the beginning. In the coming months more and more defense billions will be poured into circulation—about seventeen and a half billions in 1941; the defense program will absorb greater amounts of raw materials, and less and less consumers' goods will be produced. Then prices will skyrocket.

Persuasion has failed to stop the inflationary spiral. Only the other day, hard-coal producers rejected Price Administrator Leon Henderson's "order" against an increase in the price of anthracite. They, and everyone else, have full right to do so, as Henderson has no statutory power to enforce his "order." If prices are to be held down, Congress must confer on someone the authority to put a roof over them. That is precisely what the legislation before it would do.

It would not, it is true, put a roof over wages. Nevertheless, if price controls were enacted, Federal conciliation and mediation boards, which can help prevent wage increases by recommending against them in disputes they settle, would have a precedent for doing so. Should this practical method of control fail, the administration, because of public opinion, must surely then ask for a similar roof over wages.

Such a bill, considered separately and after enactment of price controls, should have a good chance of passage. Were it included, however, in the present measure affecting prices, both might be defeated by uniting opponents of the two proposals.

Time is running short. "Inflation is no longer a distant threat," Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau warned the other day, as Senator BARKLEY had previously done. "We are facing it now," the Secretary pointed out, "and we must deal with it at once."

Nor is the specter of inflation visible merely to democratic eyes. Weeks ago, Senator MCNARY, of Oregon, an agricultural State whose farmers still remember, no doubt, the calamitous post-World War inflation, called for quick action on price controls.

"Quick action"—that should be the keynote. Congress has just put the finishing touches on the greatest tax bill in the Nation's history. It owes it to the people to protect them against a full-blown inflation that might cost them many more billions than the tax bill itself.

WORDS OF WISDOM

An elder statesman spoke words of wisdom to the House Banking Committee in Washington Friday. Bernard M. Baruch learned well the lessons of the first World War, when he headed the War Industries Board. He has studied the experiences of England during the present war. He is an expert on the management of national economic systems during periods of crisis.

Mr. Baruch's message, not only to the House Banking Committee but to every person in the United States, is simply this: Unless the Government puts a ceiling over all prices—and mark well that under the heading of prices he includes wages and agricultural products—we are going to have an inflation that may prove disastrous.

Next to actual human slaughter, Mr. Baruch classes inflation—which wipes out the savings of the people and causes ghastly and universal hardship—as the "most destructive of the consequences of war." And he predicts that unless this country has a low price structure when the war ends "we may win the war only to lose the peace."

No one needs an economics professor to explain that we are now on the threshold of an inflationary period. Every housewife who goes to a grocery store can detect the signs in the higher prices for food. Everyone who reads the newspapers or listens to the radio knows that prices in nearly all categories are rising and that the demands for defense are making hosts of products scarcer.

It is a perfect set-up for inflation of the most dangerous kind. The Government can stop the trend toward higher prices, rents, and wages, and the reason Mr. Baruch appeared before the House Banking Committee was to urge, in the strongest language of which he is capable, that the Government do so.

The committee is now considering a price-control measure, but Mr. Baruch feels that it is too weak to protect the country. It should be broadened and strengthened. It should include all rents, which always go sky high in an inflationary period, and it should include wages, because wages are one of the most important factors—often the most important—in fixing prices. There should be no jokers in the bill's authority over farm prices.

Let us not repeat England's mistakes in the matter of price and wage control. Let us rather learn a lesson from England's decisive action in the matter of rents. On September 1, 1939, the day war was declared (we quote from an article by A. Wyn Williams in the New Republic), "a Rent Restrictions Act was rushed through Parliament and became immediately effective the next day. It froze solid the rents of all dwellings in the working or lower-middle-class categories at prevailing levels for the duration of the war and for 6 months after. Rents in this war have not been a factor in the rise in the cost of living."

By contrast, England dallied with other anti-inflation measures. It placed controls on wool and on steel, but not on cotton or rubber. The Ministry of Food froze prices only on what were called basic foodstuffs, yet all foodstuffs are basic in time of war. Belatedly price control has been spread to almost everything edible. The Price of Goods Act of November 1939 was a compromise measure that did not stop price rises. Eventually it had to be broadened to cover almost the entire field of retail sales. These compromises and delays have been very costly.

Summarizing England's experience, Mr. Williams says:

"(Price control) cannot be effective if it is a matter of patchwork edicts haphazardly applied to separate segments of the price structure at odd moments as the spirit moves. To be successful, control must be applied to the whole structure, ruthlessly and simultaneously, lest the uncontrolled part vitiate the effort in the controlled and a weak section cause the whole edifice to topple. Wages must also be recognized to be a part of the price structure."

Special interests in this country, of course, are working hard against price control. We refer not only to persons who hope to get rich from soaring prices of this commodity or that, but to large groups, such as the farm and labor blocs, who want to see farm prices and wages go up, lest they be left behind in the procession. Yet a strong over-all attack upon the problem, headed by the President and his congressional leaders, should quiet the fears of one group or another that it would suffer by inflation controls while others would gain.

The President should get into this fight. He should serve warning on all sections, groups, blocs, and selfish interests—not forgetting that evil genius of inflationary periods, the speculator—that the national emergency must not be used as an excuse to pick the pockets of the people and to expose them to the tragedy of inflation.

Without the leadership of the President, we fear that Congress will be unwilling or unable to accept the wise counsel of Mr. Baruch. We fear that it will flounder and compromise and give ear to this group and that until much of the damage will be done. A stable economic structure is as vital to the defense effort as all the guns and planes that are being turned out of our factories.

Morgenthau Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MEDFORD (OREG.) MAIL TRIBUNE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune of August 10, 1941:

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune of August 10, 1941]

MORGENTHAU IS RIGHT

Ten citizens of the United States pay $10,000,000 a year in Federal taxes.

A million citizens pay the same.

Members of the first group pay a million dollars each.

Members of the second group pay $10 each.

The first group, however, has only 10 votes.

The second group has a million votes.

So what?

Figure it out for yourself—particularly with a class-conscious and politically conscious administration.

The rich minority is soaked, of course, because that is popular.

The vast majority is exempt—pays no taxes at all—because that is popular.

And, in between, the fairly well-to-do middle class carry the major tax burden, not because it is popular but because it is necessary.

Now Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, in one of the greatest financial crises in this country's history, comes forward with a new idea.

It is really a mild one, but it does, for the first time in the Roosevelt administration, propose to tax several million people who have never been taxed before.

And it places only a slightly greater burden upon the very rich, not because of any consideration for them, but because a greater tax would really produce less revenue, due to the law of diminishing returns.

And it leaves the middle brackets about where they have been with moderate increases in a few special divisions.

In short, it is a good tax measure, the best that has been proposed to date.

And its great virtue lies in the fact that it is based upon not what is popular but what is right and just; not upon what is politically expedient but what is economically sound and businesslike.

It takes no highbrow tax expert to perceive that in a crisis like the present one a political tax system—a system which exempts 98 percent of the people from paying any Federal income taxes at all—won't work for the very simple reason that 2 percent of the people can't foot the bill.

In other words, all who can pay must pay if the tax bill is to be paid.

It may be only $10 a year, it may be more or less, but, to express it all in a nutshell, there must be mass payment or the bill can't be paid. And failure to pay the bill means national bankruptcy.

The first paragraph above explains why this is true—why "soak the rich," potent as is its popular appeal, is "out" as a valid taxation principle today.

So just as mass production is essential for success in big business, so mass production is essential for success in national taxation.

It doesn't mean the individual in the lower brackets has to pay much. It does mean he must pay something.

With such an extension of the tax base, Uncle Sam's financial house can stand the strain and stress of this supreme crisis. Without it, the house will most certainly fail.

The Defense of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. MARY T. NORTON, OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. MARY T. NORTON at a luncheon under the auspices of the regional conference of Democratic women of 11 Western States held in Los Angeles September 13, 1941:

Madam Chairman, Secretary Wickard, representatives of labor, other distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I have come to you today to attend this regional conference of the far Western States with a heart full of gratitude for what you women of the West have contributed to the building of our great country. My soul has been stirred by what I have seen and heard. I know I shall return to Washington strengthened in courage to face whatever lies ahead.

For 17 years I have worked side by side with many of your own Representatives from the various Western States, and I have learned something of your problems and something of the fine, rugged people they so proudly represent. I wish that time permitted me to speak of them individually and tell you of the many difficult problems they

have had to face and attempt to solve—of the battles we have waged together. JERRY VOORHIS has been very kind in presenting me today, but let me say to you, Jerry has always been a source of great inspiration, not only to me but to every Member of the House who values courage, honesty, and devotion to ideals. If we do not always agree with Jerry, we respect and love him even in disagreement. I have always felt that, had my son lived, I would like to think of him as a man like JERRY VOORHIS. Continue his service—you need him and our country needs him. I wish I could mention all of the good fighting Democrats you have sent to Congress—my dear friend TOM FORD, other than whom you have no better friend; able, conscientious, feet-on-the-ground, grand person. CHARLES KRAMER; CLARENCE LEA; JOHN TOLAN, who is doing such an excellent job on the migrant labor problem; LEE GEYER; and there are others from your several States representing you with much ability and integrity. I sincerely hope you appreciate what they are trying to do in this very critical time, and will not only give them your confidence but also encourage them to continue their service to you and to their country.

There are very serious days ahead for all of us, but for those of us who represent and serve you in Congress they will be doubly serious. Our task will be difficult and may require an unusual amount of courage and honesty. We will need your help. We will need your confidence. We will need all you have to give in the election next year if we shall continue to serve you and uphold the hands of a great President—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. As Chairman Flynn told you last night, failure to return a Democratic Congress in 1942 would be nothing less than a tragedy. Your duty then is plain and your work should begin at once under the able leadership of Helen Gahagan, Mrs. Porter, and the many fine women leaders from all the States represented here today. I know we can depend upon you to continue with a greater majority in the next Congress. I have attended many conferences of women, but I have never attended one that has done more for me than this has. From Helen Gahagan on through you are wonderful and, may I say, you have fired me with a new enthusiasm, a greater courage. I know I will be a better woman for having been here. Thank you very much.

It is my privilege today to address you on a subject in the mind and heart of every right-thinking American—the defense of America. Of necessity, in considering this subject we must ask ourselves, What does the defense of America mean to us as individuals? If we discard wishful thinking and face the question honestly, we know that it means sacrifice and discipline, it means a realization of the great heritage we have had handed down to us by our forefathers who fought and bled to make possible the freedom we enjoy and to perpetuate those freedoms for our children and generations yet unborn. We must decide how much our way of life, as we have lived it, means to us.

When we have considered all of those questions realistically, not one would hesitate to make whatever sacrifice is necessary to guard our freedoms and maintain our American traditions. Indeed, it is safe to say that not even the most arrogant anti-British person in America would hesitate to declare his choice. Why, then, does there seem to be so great a division on how we shall attain our objective? My own theory is propaganda. No real American has ever hesitated to give comfort to those in distress, and surely in all the world history there has never been a time of greater distress than this present period. What we do today may well be the determining influence not only of America but of the world. No human being can hear and read of the horrors experienced by men, women, and children of Europe and Asia without wondering whether or not our turn may come next. Of course, we shall always have the ostrich type of person with us; those who believe in burying their heads in the sands of optimism, who will never face reality. I am not appealing to that group; it would be useless. I am appealing to you, the thoughtful, intelligent men and women who make up the rank and file of the Democratic Party of the West.

You have always been progressives. Your forefathers were brave men and you carry in your veins the blood of generations of heroic women, those pioneers in covered wagons who made possible your glorious West. I have come a long way to greet you and to tell you how we of the East admire your independence, your great love of the Democratic Party, and, above all, your patriotism. We know you will join with us in whatever sacrifice is necessary to preserve our way of life. Many of you served in the canteens and the workrooms of the Red Cross during the World War. We hoped at that time we had reached a solution to the problem of war. We were within sight of the solution, but for the stubborn selfishness of a small group of men whose personal ambitions wrecked the work of a great President in his attempts to solve world problems around a council table. The greatest crime of the ages was committed when a small group of obstructionists in the Senate of the United States, because of political and personal hatred, destroyed the usefulness of the League of Nations. History is being repeated today in the United States Congress. Again a small group is trying to influence America and distort the truth. I am glad to say it is a small group. The majority of the Members of Congress are realizing the importance of building a defense so strong that not even a Hitler will care to challenge us.

It was because we knew the very great necessity for building an impregnable defense that we amended the Selective Service Act. Believe me, no Member of Congress voted to do this without much prayerful thought. It was a tense moment, and we would not have voted to increase the length of service did we not believe it was absolutely necessary to strengthen our defense. Billions were voted to build an Army and Navy—to support the countries fighting for democracy—for the things we believe in. Those billions would be lost if we did not train an army to use the instruments of war, if or when the war came to us. And even an eighth-grade schoolboy knows it is safe to assume it won't come if we build the strongest army in the world.

War is a brutal, useless, hideous thing, and more so today than in the whole history of the world because it is promoted by beasts in the forms of men—playing a ruthless game, not of war, but of extermination. These are the facts whether we like them or not. That being the case, we must be realists, not dreamers. President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull are realists. They are, no doubt, in possession of facts which might be dangerous to disclose. They are responsible for the safeguarding of America. It is their task to lead America in order that we may remain free human beings, not vassals of murdering gangsters. If we value our freedom of religion, of the press, and of speech, it is up to us to see that we support their policies and share their great burden.

My appeal today is directed particularly to the laboring men and women of America. On them falls the great task of producing the implements of war—of placing in the hands of young men of America the tools necessary to win the war. Much criticism has been directed at the great labor organizations of the country. A small part of that criticism has been justified. No Member of Congress has fought harder for labor than I have. Long before I ever thought of being a Member of Congress I understood the problems of labor. I knew as one who had suffered much discrimination that strong labor unions were a necessity if labor was to assume the dignified position in America to which it was entitled. And so, not minimizing the reasons labor has for its actions and believing the fault lies with industry as much and probably much more than it does with labor, nevertheless, I appeal with all the strength at my command for a united front during this great emergency. My appeal is based on two very important reasons.

First. We are in an emergency fighting the greatest battle America has ever faced, the outcome of which will decide whether or not our husbands and sons will face the war machine of a monster, and perhaps for years to come turn our peaceful happy land into a battlefield. Surely to prevent such a possibility is worth everything we have to give.

My second reason is—and to me it is almost as important as the first—that through decades of extraordinary hardship labor has reached its place of dignity and affection in the hearts of nearly every right-thinking American, and that this position is more important to labor now and will be in the years to come than whether or not it wins every skirmish with industry. Of course, there will be inequalities and sacrifices, but if the sacrifices are accepted in the proper spirit, the day will come when labor will be rewarded.

Public opinion is the most potent factor in America today. Public opinion when crystallized, can decide practically any question. Public opinion today, because it does not understand all the questions involved in labor disputes and because there is no way for us to have our case tried fairly in the newspapers, is turning against labor to a great extent. This must not happen. It would be much more detrimental to the cause than the loss of prestige in a strike. I know the heart and mind of the average worker. My own is in accord with theirs. I know the suffering silently endured for generations. I know the great gains labor has achieved in the last decade under the leadership of President Roosevelt—the National Labor Relations Act, the wage-and-hour law and many others—I want to see those gains preserved and continued. I want to be able to say to the enemies of labor, and there are many of them, labor has produced, labor has realized its responsibility and has lived up to its traditions of sacrifice and patriotism.

Do not allow the small group within the labor organizations, who are undermining the foundation upon which our great labor organizations have progressed, to destroy what you have built over a period of more than half a century. This group is not interested in the welfare of labor. It is pledged to destroy unity in the labor field. This group is more detrimental to the welfare of the American worker than is the most anti-labor industrialist in the country.

I am making this appeal to you from a heart full of apprehension for, let me tell you, the friends of labor in Congress this year have been hard put to it to prevent repeal of many hard-won labor laws. Ask your good friend JERRY VOORHIS, other than whom there is no greater friend of labor. Ask TOM FORD, ABE MURDOCK, all the other friends of labor, how difficult it has been. Public opinion was "fed up" with news of every little labor strike in the country and attention has been focused on delay to emergency defense work, regardless of whether or not it was justified. This can be very dangerous and the thing we must keep in our mind is not to allow anything to interfere with the laws we have established to preserve the progressive dignity of labor even though sacrifice may be necessary at this time

You may suffer injustice, but who does not in advancing a worth-while objective? Your injustice will now achieve a greater degree of justice in the years to come if you live up to the traditions established by those leaders

who fought your battle through the past half century and those of this day who have your real interest close to their hearts.

So, Democrats of the west coast, our friends and the friends of our great President, I appeal to you to assume the responsibility which lies ahead. Chairman Flynn and his able assistant, Mrs. Tillett, are giving all their time and conscientious effort to assist you in your problems. Their objective—and, I assume, your objective—is to elect Democrats to carry on the magnificent record of achievement made possible by the administration working with a Democratic Congress. We must continue this record. The enemies of progressive government are using every known weapon to weaken our Government and break down what we have built during the past 8 years. We are engaged in a crusade to strengthen our democracy, to maintain progressive working conditions, to bring about a more enlightened way of life to the millions of our fellow countrymen. These objectives are worth working for, and they cannot be achieved without individual effort, without going "all out" to secure. To you is given the great privilege of following the greatest advocate of democracy the world has ever known—President Roosevelt. Are you going to follow him?

During the next few years we shall probably be called upon to determine the future policy of the world. We are the only people left in the world today completely free—free to worship God in our own way; free to express our thoughts; free to control our homes and children; in short, free to live our lives in our own way. Into our hands may come the task of building a new world when the war clouds so close to us now will have disappeared. We now have an opportunity for great service; to discipline ourselves so that if and when the call comes to us to sit in council when this nightmare is over, and we have done our part and earned the right to be heard, we can demand that war be outlawed, that our children and their children will not be faced 20 years from now with the same problem we are facing today. We have a right to know what we may expect if we do our part now to prevent this horrible thing from happening again. America will cheerfully contribute all it possesses to achieve lasting peace and freedom; the right to live in the kind of world a man wants so badly for himself and his loved ones that he is even willing to die if necessary to secure it. This, as I see it, is the American objective—the thing we are organizing for today; the thing we shall be called upon to sacrifice for; the thing that should be uppermost in the mind and heart of every individual who values our blessings and who believes in the fundamentals laid down by Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, and which, with the help of God and the united effort of every individual in our great land, will be realized in the program of our greatly beloved President Roosevelt.

Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, God bless you and keep you till we meet again.

Resolution passed by labor representatives of California at a special meeting honoring the Honorable MARY NORTON Saturday, September 15, 1941, at which the sentiments expressed in her address were unanimously endorsed by all labor representatives present:

"Resolved, That this group of labor representatives and members of the Democratic Party hereby declare that they will continue to give wholehearted support to both the foreign and domestic policies of President Roosevelt and the Democratic administration; that as representatives from the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the railroad brotherhoods, and independent unions, we do hereby reaffirm our belief that in this hour of crisis the interests of labor will be best served by wholehearted and active support of our President.

"Resolved, That copies of the speech delivered by the Honorable MARY T. NORTON be sent to all labor-union secretaries, and that a copy also be sent to labor unions in Mrs. NORTON'S own congressional district."

Representatives of labor unions present at Norton meeting, Saturday, September 13, 1941:

K. C. Beight, 2027 Andreo Street, Torrance, Calif. Steel Workers Organizing Committee, Columbia Steel Lodge Financial Secretary (1,256 members).

William R. Berry, Steel Workers Organizing Committee, Lodge No. 1502 (Continental Can).

Leonard A. Broderick, 363 Alexander Street, San Bernardino, Calif.

William J. Carsten, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local B-18, 520 Douglas Building, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. N. "Dick" Coleman, former representative, United Automobile Workers of America, personnel manager, Willys-Overland Motors, Inc., Post Office box 1208, Arcade Station, Los Angeles.

John Despol, Steel Workers Organizing Committee, representative for southern California.

James L. Durden, Local No. 2018, Steel Workers Organizing Committee.

George Dulworth, United Shoe Workers of America, Local 122, C. I. O., 617 Venice Boulevard, Los Angeles (secretary-organizer).

Fred Dulworth, United Shoe Workers of America, C. I. O., Local 122, 617 Venice Boulevard, Los Angeles.

R. M. Ely, Oil Workers, Long Beach, Calif.

Carl Fletcher, managing editor, Labor News, 229 East Sixth Street, Long Beach, Calif.

Fred Grissinger, Local 122, United Shoe Workers of America.

J. B. Haines, secretary-treasurer, Southern California Lodge No. 30, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks (representing Southern Pacific, Pacific Electric, and Harbor Belt Line employees), 352 Pacific Electric Building, 610 South Main Street.

Patrick J. Halpin, Local No. 18, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Everett E. Johnston, secretary-treasurer, Glendale Central Labor Union, 411 East Broadway, Glendale, Calif.

R. J. Maguno, legislative representative, Lodge No. 30 Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks.

Jennie Matyas, organizer, educational director, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, 149 Mason Street, San Francisco

L. P. Morgan, financial secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local No. B-18, 520 Douglas Building, Los Angeles.

Hazel Peairs, C. I. O. Miner's Auxiliary, Kellogg, Idaho; A. F. of L. Union Label League, Wallace, Idaho; chairman of North Idaho Democratic Women's Clubs.

Edward F. Pierce, managing editor, San Diego Labor Leader, also secretary-treasurer, San Diego County Federated Trades and Labor Council, San Diego, Calif.

Frank G. Pellett, secretary, California Legislative Board, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; chairman, Railroad Brotherhoods' Joint Legislative Council of Southern California, 3336 Idell Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

Jerome Posner, manager, Los Angeles Joint Board, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 833 South Spring Street, Los Angeles.

Clara Reno, treasurer, Local 122, United Shoe Workers of America, C. I. O.

Byron W. Rogers, State chairman, Denver, Colo.

Earl J. Ruddy, secretary and treasurer, Los Angeles District Council of Carpenters, A. F. of L., 214 Labor Temple, Los Angeles.

William Seligman, personnel manager, Joyce, Inc. (former organizer, United Shoe Workers), 55 North Vernon Avenue, Pasadena, Calif.

E. P. Taylor, president, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, No. 18.

Charles H. Tigar, business representative, Aeronautical Mechanics District Lodge, No. 22 (Lockheed), Burbank, Calif.

George Wishnak, representative, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, 215 East Eighth Street, Los Angeles.

Dan Harris, editor, Kern County Union Labor Journal, Bakersfield, Calif.

Alexander Watchman, president, San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council, Building Trades Temple, San Francisco, Calif.

What Uncle Sam Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

ESSAY BY WARREN BIERMAN

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, not long ago the Benevolent Protective Order of Elks, one of our great fraternal organizations which has been doing such splendid work in the field of Americanism, sponsored a Nation-wide essay contest of high-school students on "What Uncle Sam Means to Me."

A young man from my own congressional district, Warren Bierman, 1213 North Seventeenth Street, Harrisburg, and a student at John Harris High School, won the third prize of $250. His essay would do credit to a person much older. It shows a real appreciation of America and a real vision as to the ideals which we in America seek to maintain. I hope every Member of Congress will take the time to read this very fine essay, which follows:

WHAT UNCLE SAM MEANS TO ME

Countless ages ago when Mother Nature was distributing her gifts she gave of her treasure to this land with a lavish hand. Precious metals and ores were hidden in the snow-capped mountains. Wide stretched the grazing lands; rich and fertile was the soil. Broad rivers and cascading waterfalls hinted at future power. There developed a land of industry, of golden opportunity, where life flourished at its best. Life—that is what Uncle Sam means to me.

A small band of Pilgrims struggling in a wilderness, the Minute Men gallantly making their stand at Concord, a brave Army facing disease and starvation at Valley Forge, gave meaning to this land. They made possible the unfurling of a flag, emblem of a nation dedicated to liberty. Liberty—that is what Uncle Sam means to me.

The founders of this Nation laid the cornerstone for the happiness of future generations when they framed our Constitution. This Constitution is based on the ideas of equality and civil justice for all. We have always believed in tolerance of religion. The advantages of education are available to all. This is a land of brotherhood where all men have an inalienable right to the pursuit of

happiness. The pursuit of happiness—that is what Uncle Sam means to me.

The priceless heritage of our individual rights is secure, yet in more than half of the world today people have traded their rights for security; now they are neither free nor secure. A knock on the door may mean search or seizure, with no warrant but force. Their property can be taken from them without payment by their gangster government. They may be sentenced to death for a minor offense which was not a crime when it was committed. The safeguards of our Constitution protect our lives and property. Such injustice shall not occur in this country.

Liberty is the very breath of our existence. We are free to seek the truth by radio, book, and newspaper. Free speech is even closer to our own lives. It is the right to talk with our friends upon any subject; to express our opinions at home, in school, and on the street without fear of spies, secret police, or informers.

Uncle Sam means education, enterprise, growth, power. He offers opportunity to all. A chance to work and play and live by the highest standards in this world—life as we know it in the American way.

Uncle Sam stands for the highest in national idealism. Always a champion of the oppressed, he is an enemy to the forces of aggression which are now sweeping the world. He is again aiding the cause of freedom.

I am proud to be an American. As a citizen of this Nation, who accepts without question such benefits of freedom as are found in no other country on earth, I will pay back in return respect and loyalty to my Nation's flag. I will do my part that the ideals of democracy for which Uncle Sam stands shall not perish from the earth

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE TIMBERMAN, PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

[From the Timberman, August 1941, Portland, Oreg.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

(By George M. Cornwall)

At the hearings before Rivers and Harbors Committee, House of Representatives, in Washington, regarding the St. Lawrence seaway project, the Governors of North Dakota and Minnesota described the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power development as urgent for national defense and necessary to the economic welfare of the Middle West in peacetime.

Governor John Moses, of North Dakota, told the House Rivers and Harbors Committee that North Dakota had advocated the seaway for 20 years on the ground that it was essential to the development of competitive industry in the Middle West.

Gov Harold E Stassen, of Minnesota, also favored the program and urged the committee to consider it in the light of potential benefits in war as well as peace. Both Governors declared that no partisan issue was involved.

The eastern railroads, power companies, and other interests are fighting the bill with the utmost vigor, supported by certain newspapers.

The St. Lawrence project is one of the greatest engineering projects in American history, more important in some respects than the Panama Canal, T. V. A., Boulder, Bonneville, or Grand Coulee Dams. The project brings the Gulf of St. Lawrence 2,340 miles into the center of North American continent, serving a population of 50,000,000 people. No other continent has this natural advantage which only requires a few millions of dollars to provide a channel depth of 27 feet for the entire distance, making it available to 80 percent of the world's merchant marine. The present depth is 13 feet. A regular service has been maintained to Chicago by a Norwegian line operating light draft vessels, transporting principally European products, returning outward with cargoes of American goods.

It is calculated the revenue to be derived from the development of 2,000,000 horsepower of electric energy one-half belonging to Canada and the balance to the United States, will eventually amortize the undertaking.

Ex-President Hoover, an internationally known engineer, gave his unqualified endorsement to the project, maintaining that a reduction of 5 to 7 cents per bushel in the cost of transporting American grain to the markets of the world could be attained by deepening of the St. Lawrence River. This form of self-help to the farmer is economic sense and immensely better than any artificial subsidy.

The lumber industry of the country should get behind the St. Lawrence waterway as it directly benefits the farmer by increasing his purchasing power, which in turn is reflected in larger purchases of lumber and other building materials.

Take a few minutes and write, urging your Senator and Congressman to support the St. Lawrence waterway project in the interests of defense and the upbuilding of the Nation. W. S. Knudsen, head of O. P. M. gives his unqualified endorsement to the St. Lawrence waterway. He calls it a vital part of our defense effort.

Address of Mayor Trott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER PATRICK

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I got this time to address the House for the purpose of inserting in the RECORD the speech of a good Democrat—not an Alabama Democrat this time but a Montana Democrat.

The gentleman is Charlie T. Trott, mayor of Billings, Mont. The mayor introduced Senator WHEELER at the start of a nationally broadcasted address at which Senator WHEELER was jeered, booed, and it is reported that other unpleasant things occurred—but I wish to say that there is no report of Mayor Trott being booed on this occasion and this is what he said:

You and I are well aware that there are those who feel that the permission for the use of this room should not be permitted by our school board, and that there are those who think that their mayor does not represent the opinion of this community when he consented to perform the simple act of courtesy of extending a welcome of the community to a very distinguished guest. * * *

There are two very definite trends of thought in this United States of ours. One would hope to advance our democratic forms by a type of prohibition—who would circumscribe our public meetings, our press, our commentators, our radio, our moving-picture industry. * * *

And then there are those among us who believe with him who said "I do not agree with a thing you say but I will defend with all the resources I can command your right to say it."

I have every confidence in the intelligence and in the honesty of the people of this community. I know they are well able to judge for themselves any type of propaganda.

America First may mean as many things as there are persons in this room. America First may mean as I think it means—to hell with you, Jack, I'm all right. Or it may mean as I hope it does, that the one man who has always stood for America first is the President of these United States.

He may be compelled to lead us to war—but if such tragedy should come to us it will not be of his making, nor will it be prevented by the America First committee, because it will be ordered by the Nazi thought as directed by Adolf Hitler. Hitler, who has shown by his every act that he is ready to make war on foe or friend alike.

I thank God for a Commander in Chief who has said to you in part, "I will not compromise with the honor of the people of America. I will not consent to a negotiated peace with evil."

The British Commonwealth of Nations may not be waging war for the United States, but the blood of fighting men and the sweat of industry and the tears of little children of our friends and neighbors to the north—the legions of Free French, the yellow man of China and the black man of Abyssinia are being sacrificed upon the altar this rapacious monster has prepared for all of those things that are no more dear to them than they are to us.

Labor—Partner in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. PAUL V. McNUTT

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Federal Security Administrator Paul V. McNutt, Coordinator of Health, Welfare, and Related Defense Activities, at a Labor Day celebration of the Virginia State Federation of Labor, at Buckroe Beach, Va., September 1, 1941:

"It is not needed nor fitting here that a general argument should be made in favor of

popular institutions, but there is one point, with its connections, not so hackneyed as most others, to which I ask a brief attention. It is the effort to place capital on an equal footing with, if not above, labor in the structure of Government."

Those would be bold words for many, even in 1941. But on December 3, 1861, they were bolder still.

They were written by a lean, gaunt man, sitting at his desk in the White House—Abraham Lincoln.

It was a hard day—a hard day, indeed—for Abraham Lincoln to send his first annual message to the Congress of the United States.

It was not easy to think deep into the underlying philosophy of Government. It was not easy to raise, in that message, fundamental questions about the social fabric of American democracy.

The Nation was at war.

State was fighting State. Brother was fighting brother. From the Potomac to the borders of Missouri the Armies of the North and South were on the march.

In 7 months of office Lincoln had exercised such powers as no President had ever wielded. "Arrogation." "Usurpation." "Dictatorship." These were some of the milder words by which his enemies were describing his presidency.

Only the day before he had sent his famous order to General Halleck which authorized suspension of the writ of habeas corpus within the limits of his Missouri command.

A few weeks before an American warship had boarded a British vessel on the high seas and forcibly removed 2 Confederate commissioners. On that very day 3,000 British troops were landing in Canada, in protest against that illegal seizure.

And, while the Nation was divided, the Monroe Doctrine teetered precariously. A Spanish Fleet was on the high seas bound for Mexico—a fleet which 2 weeks later was master of Vera Cruz. French troops were already embarking to overthrow Juarez; Maximilian was being groomed for the little Napoleon's short-lived puppet monarchy of Mexico.

Yes; no President until 1940—not Wilson in 1917, not Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932—ever went to the Congress more plagued by events.

Yet Abraham Lincoln could look behind those events. He could think of fundamentals.

What was the issue? Why did men fight? What objectives must govern any peace?

He saw reaction—North and South—striking at the suffrage of little men. He saw attempts to fix forever a part of labor as a caste of serfs, without votes, without opportunity.

And he remembered the words spoken on the floor of the Senate by a distinguished Senator: "In all social systems there must be a class to do the mean duties. * * * It constitutes the very mudsills of society."

The Senator did not, of course, class himself among the "mudsills." In the self-annointed best circles that simply isn't done.

Behind all the pomposity of his colleagues, behind all the learned legal jargon that was Lincoln's issue—the dignity of man, the creative role of labor.

Valiantly he struck at the theory that labor is a passive pawn, a commodity to be hired or bought, and only thus to be productive.

Lincoln was from the West. In his own lifetime he had seen his labor and the labor of his neighbors turn a land from wilderness to civilization. He had seen communities born, real capital produced.

Not stocks and bonds, not coins and bank notes, but forests and fields, mines and streams. These, when touched by the creative hand and skill of labor, were to Lincoln the wealth of America.

And from the depths of his heart and his experience he set forth his understanding of the "role of labor in the structure of government." His rich voice would have done more justice than the Senate clerk to these stirring words:

"Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration."

These were not accidental phrases. This was thoughtful elaboration of an attack he had made 2 years before upon the class-conscious Senator and his "mudsill theory of labor." They were part of his Milwaukee speech to the Wisconsin State Agricultural Society. And in 1864, when the Workingmen's Association of New York City made him an honorary member, he took those paragraphs from his message to the Congress and made them the foundation of his remarks of acceptance.

There is no question where Abraham Lincoln stood.

Where in all the range of history will one find such a parallel as this?

Again America is faced with the threat of war—total war.

Again the resources of the New World and the independence of American nations are the object of Old World conspiracies.

Again there is talk of a master race, and a small class within that race seeks to arrogate all power to itself. This time they would reduce whole nations to serfdom and to slavery.

Again there are those who would deny the suffrage to the poor. The poll tax and the paupers' oath still bar the ballot to the poor in some parts of this land.

Again there are those who would use national misfortune for special privilege.

Some would use the crisis to destroy the hard-won rights of labor. There are men in industry with the morals of an oriental satrap or Nazi gauleiter.

Some would risk the rights of labor. There are some in labor who would treat the emergency as a vast opportunity for power, prestige, and politics.

Thank God such men are few on both sides of the fence. Their organizations can't afford them on either side.

And again there is a President, whose enemies call him names. But a President who has had the insight to see the issues and the courage to meet them in peace and in defense.

But there the parallel ends.

Today America is united. America, mark you. Not merely the North and the South, the East and the West, of these United States.

Our good neighbors of the whole hemisphere have learned with us the great lesson Lincoln taught.

The world "cannot endure half slave and half free."

Modern transportation, modern communication, modern industrial technology of peace and war have given Lincoln's words new breadth of meaning.

The free labor of democracy cannot remain free if it must compete with the slave economy of a totalitarian order.

The free labor of America cannot remain free if our raw materials and markets are to be doled out—rationed to us—by Axis overlords.

So let us consider the stuff from which our freedom is fashioned. Let us examine the sinews of labor's strength in law and organization and action. Let us examine together the threat that faces us.

Through these past 8 years the traditional American rights of labor have been implemented. They are no longer fine phrases to be used only in oratory. They have been defined and recognized in formal law.

Congress has declared in most specific terms the right to organize. It has set up enforcement machinery to enable that right to be translated into sound collective bargaining.

Collective bargaining is no longer a debatable issue in the United States of America.

The right to strike is recognized. But machinery for sound and orderly mediation has been created to serve the cause of industrial peace.

In war or peace there should be no curbs upon the right to strike—save such as are counterbalanced by curbs upon the management and the owners of industry.

Child labor should have gone years ago. Today it has been reduced to a minimum. And it is definitely and finally on its way out.

Provision has been made for workers in their old age and for their families in the event of the worker's death.

A Nation-wide system of unemployment insurance tides the worker over periods of unemployment.

Both our old-age and survivors' insurance and our unemployment compensation are based upon sound financial principles. No system can bring security to the worker unless that system is itself stable and secure. The benefits are low—too low in many cases. But we have a solid foundation upon which we are able to build for the future.

Social security is here to stay.

And I need not tell any workingman who saw the defense program a quarter of a century ago of the importance of the United States Employment Service. Here for the first time we have a national clearing house to bring together the jobless man and the manless job.

Labor's outlook at the moment is bright.

Today, for the first time in a dozen years, labor is at the top of the heap.

We are in a workers' market.

A decade ago workers haunted factory gates. Today employers swamp the office of the employment service with their demands for trained men.

More people are employed today than have ever been employed before in our history. Excluding agriculture, there are 39,241,000 gainfully employed. Including agriculture there are 50,400,000.

And with this new position labor begins to assume a new responsibility in the industrial process.

It takes its place at the council table, a partner in planning the defense job. It assumes in industrial affairs that cooperative place it has held in our Government.

It is none too soon.

Grave issues lie ahead. There are questions which cannot be solved in terms of general principles and high-sounding phrases. The mere existence of law and administrative machinery is not enough. They must be solved by action.

There are shortages of certain types of skilled labor. Defense production requires a larger proportion of skill than does normal production.

Even before the stimulus of the defense program, vocational education was being extended and improved I am happy to say that through the cooperation of labor, management, and the Federal Security Agency, training is being more closely related to the job.

And I have watched with admiration and enthusiasm the training within industry program. Here one sees a return in spirit to the age-old relationships between skilled craftsman and apprentice. Your cooperation and that of thousands of progressive employers throughout the land has made that program possible.

The conversion of labor from the normal jobs of peace to defense jobs is another task that faces us. In recent weeks the increasing pressure of material priorities has made this issue increasingly acute.

Part of that problem is being handled through the redirection of defense contracts. Under normal conditions the lowest-bidder

rule in the letting of Government contracts is sound. It means economy. It prevents manipulation.

But today it may mean further centralization of American industry. It may mean the destruction of whole communities. For workers it may mean long migration in search of jobs, the loss of homes, the break-up of families.

That does not make sense. That would cost the country more than a few thousand dollars' difference on a contract.

Defense production authorities today are putting on increased pressure for subcontracting. That is good. But as material priorities close whole factories it is not enough.

A differential which may be as much as 15 percent has been provided in the letting of defense contracts to relieve that situation.

One case, that of the aluminum industry in Manitowoc, Wis., may serve to illustrate how labor, industry, the Employment Service can join to negotiate a solution. It may illustrate also the part the United States Employment Service can play in charting these problems in defense. The Manitowoc case serves as the basis for a procedure which we have this week forwarded to all the offices affiliated with the United States Employment Service.

Manitowoc County depended upon aluminum. It manufactured kitchen utensils for the civilian trade. For a time it hoped Army contracts would fill the gap. But in the face of material priorities the Army turned from aluminum. The middle of this year spelled the end of the aluminum-utensil industry in Manitowoc.

Quickly the United States Employment Service made a survey of the skills of the workers. Some it placed in nearby jobs, but many could not go. Employment Service technicians made a plant survey. The industry reported that its equipment could be used for rolling copper and even light steel.

One company indeed had bid on a contract for shell casings—and lost through a differential of a fraction of 1 percent.

Negotiations were begun with contracting authorities. Today the erstwhile aluminum industry of Manitowoc is again on its way to prosperity. This time shell casings are the product.

Manitowoc families are eating again. Rents are being paid. Families have confidence. When peace returns, Manitowoc can return to aluminum. Because America has at last created a method of diagnosing its job problem early, a community has been saved from disaster.

Another problem we face is finding jobs for soldiers. Within the next few months some 200,000 will be released. We laid our plans in advance.

Every man who went into the Army, and who did not have a job to come back to, filed a registration with the United States Employment Service. Today his experience sheet is being brought up to date—filled in with the new skills he may have acquired in the military service. We are examining future job demands in terms of the long-range plans formulated in conferences with progressive employers, large and small.

As those soldiers come from the Army we will know—as our reemployment service could not know 20 years ago—the whole pattern of job needs. Men and jobs may thus be brought together.

Labor's gains, you may have noted, must be measured in terms of specific machinery to do specific jobs. We have, as I suggested, passed the time when we can be satisfied with inspiring general principles.

Democracy's machinery must work.

It may sputter a bit now and then. It isn't a final model—any more than the automobile of 1920 or 1930 or 1941 was a final model.

But it is our machinery. We can fix it.

There are some who will tell you labor has no stake in stemming Nazi tyranny. Some counsel perfection. They say that until we have reached perfection at home, we have no business concerning ourselves with this onrushing wave of the future.

But it isn't a wave of the future. It is the dregs of the past.

It isn't a "new order." It is the "old disorder."

It is absolutism, tyranny, persecution all dressed up in a new suit.

If you don't think labor has a stake—look at the record:

In Nazi Germany a man couldn't pick the place he would work. He couldn't pick his industry. Apprenticeship employment was compulsory and "directed." To move to a new area, a man had to have "special leave."

Note, I said "man." Women couldn't work. Women were raising subsidized families, legitimate or illegitimate. The manner made no difference to Hitler. The Nazi state would provide.

Those not needed for the army were mobilized for munitions and war-equipment industry. The painfully disabled were put to work. Even patients with tuberculosis were segregated into factories where they gave their dying coughs to the manufacture of munitions.

But first of all, the labor unions were "liquidated." On May 2, 1933, Nazi party leaders took over the union headquarters. Non-Nazi party leaders found themselves in concentration camps. During the remainder of the year 1933, the vigorous Dr. Ley applied his own intensive methods to digesting the once strong German unions into the "German Labor Front."

Two May 1934 decrees reduced large groups of labor to serfdom. Male and female youth were conscripted for farm work at wages of $2 to $5 a month. Agricultural workers were required to remain on the farms. Industries which had hired such workers within 3 months were ordered to discharge them and force their return to agriculture.

In February 1935 the "work book" was established for every German worker. In that book is a continuous record of apprenticeship qualification or employment history. While the worker is on the job, the employer keeps it up to date. Its information was on file with the Government. It is every worker's evidence of his conformity to Nazi decrees.

In November 1936 all workers who had ever been trained in sheet-metal working, building, and other vital trades, but who were not now working in them, were labeled "strangers to their occupations." Arrangements were made in that and following years for them to return to "activities of greater purpose." Civil engineers who were "not properly placed" were reassigned to suit state needs.

Then "little business" was wiped out—little business which had been the backbone of earlier Nazi politics—first, peddlers and salesmen; then the journeymen and employees of small artisans; then artisans, shopkeepers in certain fields, bakers, butchers, tailors, and shoemakers. In the smooth words of the Minister of Labor, these were "allocated to other working places." Labor front officials announced the imminent end of "some 500,000 unprosperous small shops." Many were retrained to be metal workers and the training funds were ballyhooed as evidence of the paternal interest of the Nazi state.

In 1936, 1937, and 1938 women, youth, aged, Jews, convicted criminals, the insane, and the infirm were mobilized for designated industries. This was before the attack, which, according to the Nazi fairy story, the "warmonger" democracies so unexpectedly launched.

That's what the "new order" means to German labor. That, gentlemen, is not half what the "new order" means to the free labor of conquered peoples.

No, gentlemen, neither business nor labor can ever "do business with Hitler."

And don't think slave-labor competition is the only threat.

Don't think—as Chamberlain thought of Czechoslovakia—that Dakar is far away; don't discount the Philippines; don't think that Singapore is just "a distant outpost of British imperialism"; don't think that "freedom of the seas" is merely a mouth-filling phrase.

"Freedom of the seas" means jobs.

Well, let us take the most distant theater as a test. Let us look at Singapore and the Philippines.

Let the Philippines fall to the Axis, and there is a barrier reef of islands between us and the whole continent of Asia. Gone is the open door. Gone is our trade. Gone, too, are 17 or more strategic raw materials upon which America's military and industrial strength depends.

We hear a lot about rubber and tin.

We know what rubber means to our car. The workers in half a dozen American industries know what tin means for their jobs. Farmers know what tin means in terms of their markets with the food-preservation industries.

And the rubber worker of Akron knows his job depends upon America's life line to the Indies. It's his life line. And he hasn't the least doubt about the meaning of freedom of the seas.

And what of the steel worker? We need chromium as much as Germany ever needed it. And we are almost as deficient in domestic chromium. We need manganese. And our manganese came from Russia and India and Africa and the Philippines.

Oh, yes; we are developing domestic supplies. We are finding ways to use low-quality ores at higher prices. But the quantity is uncertain; the quality is uncertain.

The steel worker knows freedom of the seas is not a large abstraction of international policy. He knows his job depends on it.

And what of Singapore? What of Malaya? Well, ask the man at the crucible. His job needs graphite, and almost all our graphite must come from Ceylon and Madagascar.

And down dramatic Burma Road comes tungsten for high-speed steels. High quality mica for the spark plugs of fighting planes and tanks from India.

No; don't talk to the American worker of "haves" and "have nots." This peace the Anglo-Saxon nations and their Allies strive for is not an exclusive peace. The democracies never denied the "have nots" access to any of the world's raw materials.

Neither Britain nor the United States ever denied the channels of the seas to the vessels of any nation. Our Panama Canal was open to all. British guns never barked at any ships that passed the Straits of Gibraltar or churned through Suez.

Labor sees the facts. For labor must always raise the fundamental question. Labor is the fundamental.

When labor fails. When family income stops. When income can no longer be translated effectively into housing and food, recreation, clothing, and the education of one's children. When civil liberties are transgressed and workers are barred from the ballot box.

These are times when labor loses faith and nations fall.

What is the issue? Why do men fight? What objectives must govern any peace?

Labor fights for fundamentals.

And the issues of Lincoln come once more to the fore.

The dignity of man.

The creative role of labor.

Where Do We Go From Here?—World War Rookie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1941

LETTER OF H. E. RIVERS, OF WINCHESTER, VA.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, many of us, submerged in the tide of biased propaganda flowing through the channels of publicity in this country, in considering the course our Government should follow in the present world crisis, are disturbed by the past record of the international dealings of Great Britain, who now seeks to make her fight our fight, and we would like to have some of the questions raised by a citizen of Virginia, Mr. H. E Rivers, as printed in the Washington Post, answered.

The letter follows:

[From the Washington Post]

"WHY?"

Why is each and every American to be taxed to give to Britain under our lend-lease plan?

Why worry so much about Japan trying to pull Hitler's chestnuts out of the fire for him when we furnish the chestnuts, cook them, pull them out of the fire, and now Britain is howling for us to deliver them to her gratis?

Why doesn't Britain, with her world's greatest population, after over 2 years of war have an army capable of some offensive action? And if she does have, why doesn't she make some use of it?

Why fool ourselves about Britain ever even trying to pay us for anything that she is receiving from us now when she refused to pay for the goods and supplies that we furnished her in the late World War?

Why does Britain always wait for others to fight and win her wars for her?

Why does Britain, with the world's greatest commercial fleet, keep calling on us to deliver the supplies that we are giving her?

Why is Britain spending millions for propaganda in the United States when she claims she is in such dire circumstances?

Why are we so anxious to stand with Britain on the far eastern issues when less than 4 years ago Britain refused to stand with us on those same issues?

Why not treat Britain as her own dominions are treating her? Let her have all the supplies that she can pay for and haul away on her own ships.

Why not let Britain draft her own dominions' millions to fight her own war instead of drafting our own boys to be sent to Europe to fight another one of Britain's wars, to make the world safe for Britain's commercial dominance?

Why again be placed in the position of having to go to Europe to win a war for the British and then be kicked out and abused because we ask for the money for the just debts that she owes us?

Why not spend our money on our own Army and Navy, making it by far the strongest in the world, and, for a change, let Britain win her own war?

Why not wake up, America? Think American, be American, and American only.

H. E. RIVERS.

WINCHESTER, VA., *September 16.*

Address of Hon. James A. Farley, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1941

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT A TESTIMONIAL DINNER GIVEN MR. FARLEY BY THE DEMOCRATIC RURAL COUNTY CHAIRMEN'S ASSOCIATION, AT SYRACUSE, N. Y.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by our former Postmaster General, the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee, at a testimonial dinner given in his honor by the Democratic Rural County Chairmen's Association, at the Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse, N. Y., Saturday evening, September 20, 1941:

Mr. FARLEY: Mr. Toastmaster, members of the Rural County Chairmen's Association, members of the State committee, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, this really is a great welcome home, one of the greatest in my experience. In the past few months I have traveled widely. I was cordially received everywhere, but nowhere did I feel as happy and contented as I do now on my return to my own State of New York.

I am especially pleased that the welcome is extended by my friends in the rural counties of New York. I have had many occasions to be grateful to you. You bring to the smallest hamlet the message of our party; without you the party in New York State might become a collection of isolated groups. To stand by the party year after year, ever working harder against odds, takes courage, and from personal experience I know that you have that quality. Your loyalty makes you the backbone of the party and your regularity should be taken to heart by fair-weather friends. I am proud of you and very glad to be back among you.

It is a good thing for us to get together to discuss our problems, and I am glad to have this opportunity this year when we do not have a State convention. In these times it is essential that the normal and necessary party functions be continued. It is vital to the democratic form of government that now, more than ever before, the established political parties should fulfill their obligations, the formulation of policies, and the enlistment of public opinion in their support. If the dominant political parties abdicate their functions in a great emergency, the only alternative is the exercise of political power by irresponsible groups, and we already have too much of that.

The genius of our representative democracy is the two-party system—one party entrusted with power to carry out the will of the majority; the other, vigilant in criticism but always loyal in opposition, always loyal to the fundamental principles of the Republic. The alternative to the two-party system is a jumble of special-interest groups who, even in coalition are in disagreement; and in crisis are too disunited to act. To thus weaken our political system would be to destroy the very basis of our democratic government.

The sinews of our party system are found in devotion to the fundamental ideals of the party; in our case, the democratic ideals expounded by Thomas Jefferson. Victory for the principles of the party can be assured only by consistent support of the candidates who represent the party. It has been our aim to make the Democratic Party responsive to the will of the great majority of the people and through our choice of candidates and policies we have generally been successful in attracting the major part of the independent vote. We welcome the support of those who avoid party affiliation; I appreciate their sincerity. But I do criticize those who shun the burden of party responsibilities and seek personal advancement on issues which they are afraid to test out in a party forum.

I want to say a word in defense of the party system of preferment for public office. May I remind its critics that that system has never placed in office men who would use the power of their office to tear down the Government they were appointed to serve. Today, more than ever before, we must keep out of public office men whose appointment would encourage the spread of subversive doctrines.

So long as recommendations for public office are in order I would infinitely rather take the word of one of you county chairmen and other people in similar positions than I would the recommendations of those who hypocritically proclaim their independence of all parties, while through their flunkeys they seek the endorsement of the very organizations they so violently condemn. I have found party leaders trustworthy and frank in their recommendations. And here again, I want to express my wholehearted appreciation to you, your district leaders and election district workers, and to all who have helped in any capacity to bring our party to the people.

The Democratic Party has become the dominant party in this State due to the extraordinary qualifications of three great Democratic Governors, Smith, Roosevelt, and Lehman, and the efforts put forth by you and your predecessors in their support. It is not by chance that since January 1, 1919, with the exception of 2 years, the people have repeatedly returned a Democratic administration to power at Albany. We are particularly fortunate now that we have one of the greatest executives in our State's history in the person of Gov. Herbert H. Lehman. No man has given more unselfishly of his time and efforts, and no man has attained greater success as an exponent of true democratic principles. And in the future we intend to give the State the same type of leadership and service.

As you know, I have traveled widely in the past year. In some of the countries outside the United States I found that many people are preoccupied with two concepts. One concept is fear. They dread the consequences of a German victory, but they say, "What can we do? We are helpless."

The second concept is hope and faith—faith in a higher human destiny and a hope of attaining it—and they find the basis of that hope in America. America is truly the hope of the world today, and we, the people of America, are the living examples of that hope. To us they look for help in man's age-long struggle to establish the dignity of the human race. To us they look to save the freedoms for which man has been making every sacrifice since time began—freedom of religion, freedom of thought, freedom from fear, and freedom from want. From us they hear the message, "Take heart; all is not lost." No matter how hard we Americans might try, we could not avoid leadership in the world today, and that leadership is today embodied in the shining spirit of our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Our system has always been directed toward developing the happy way of life. As a democracy, our citizens have been afforded every opportunity for civilization and culture. We have had free rein in our personal and political differences. We will continue to have such free rein. To have less would be undemocratic.

But no nation can expect to exist without experiencing adversity. We, too, have had our hard times, and the American people have always closed the ranks. Today we are menaced, and we must close our ranks.

Those who use the present emergency to promote false political philosophies and to encourage racial and religious hatreds are the enemies from within against whom Washington warned us. Their efforts are calculated to destroy the unity of our people. Honest criticism of administrative policy is the very life of our democracy. But what shall we say of those who offer no constructive criticism but seek to achieve their nameless purpose by creating prejudice, hatred, and fear?

Let there be no mistake about this—the sooner and better we organize our men and materials and learn to use them effectively the sooner the threat of aggression will recede. As I see it, the major premise of our policy is as follows: The stronger we can make ourselves and the stronger we can make the enemies of Hitler the less likely is it that we will be called upon to do the job ourselves. And I have complete confidence in the astute administration of our foreign affairs by our eminent Secretary of State, Cordell Hull.

However, to effectively aid our Allies we must act. If we have learned anything in the last 2 years, we have learned that mere words will not help us. We must make an honest all-out effort. Anything less will endanger our liberty and our very lives.

We must take to heart the lessons of the European countries now living under the iron heel. In a world where force alone talks it would be folly to rely on words.

We must act; equally important, we must show that we still have the fighting spirit of our ancestors.

In mobilizing ourselves we must not flinch from any sacrifice. There must be a moratorium on easy living. I believe that capital and labor will forego the luxury of unnecessary squabbles lest they wear out the patience of the American public. Defense comes first.

The war has affected every aspect of our life. Certainly the battle of production is not a matter of industry alone. We must feed men as well as machines. The soldier and factory worker must have greater sustenance to equip them for harder work. The farmer is truly an indispensable man.

The greatest industrial machine in history is now geared for its greatest effort. When the war is over new and perhaps more difficult problems will have to be faced. But I have unbounded faith in the American people, and I know that our native courage and common sense will see us through.

It Is Important To Begin Now To Meet Future Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

ARTICLES FROM THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY AND THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is very encouraging to me to find two of the most influential religious journals in America commending to the Nation and the Congress the passage of legislation to provide for a national commission to begin now to deal with the problems our Nation will face when peace is restored.

The articles are as follows:

[From the Christian Century of August 20, 1941]

Few Congressmen seem aware that there are still millions of unemployed people in the United States. Fewer still have the courage candidly to face the fact that "when peace breaks out" the numbers of those out of work will suddenly swell to a total probably greater than this or any other nation has ever known. What can be done about it? A great deal, if we begin in time. This, at least, is the view of Congressman JERRY VOORHIS, of California. At a time when many of his colleagues are wasting their breath in futile condemnation of the men who failed yesterday to prepare for today he is trying to utilize today to get ready for tomorrow. He has introduced a bill (H. J. Res. 59) designed to establish a national unemployment commission. The duty of this commission would be "to develop a program for the permanent elimination of mass unemployment in the United States." It would be composed of 3 representatives from each of the Houses of Congress, 3 from the executive branch of the Government, and 3 each from farmers' organizations, labor unions, business associations, consumer cooperatives, and church organizations, making 24 in all. The commission would be authorized to work out not only legislative measures but also plans for the voluntary cooperation of business, agriculture, finance, labor, consumers, and other segments of our national life. The first mandate given the commission would be "to give special attention to measures to be taken at the time of the return of the Nation to a peacetime economy in order that the reduction of defense expenditures will not result in depression and severely aggravated unemployment." This proposal should have the immediate attention of Congress. It has the support of the Federal Council of Churches, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

[From the Christian Advocate of August 28, 1941]

Congressman JERRY VOORHIS, of California, has introduced a resolution into the National Legislature calling for a commission to study the problem of unemployment and to devise means by which a post-war depression may be prevented.

Government spending just at the present moment is taking up the slack, and hundreds of thousands of men are at work who would be idle except for the war activity. This is an unnatural and abnormal state of affairs. If peace should be declared next week, we would face a complete and disastrous reversal.

No one knows when the break may come, and it is none too early to make a study of the problem for the purpose of preventing a recurrence of the post-war mistakes of 1920–40.

Merit of River and Harbor Projects—Labor Employed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1941

SPEECH OF HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of several of my colleagues serving with me on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I am inserting in the RECORD a speech which I delivered in the House on July 1, 1937, entitled "Merit of River and Harbor Projects—Labor Employed" during consideration of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill of 1937. In the course of my speech I described in detail the painstaking and thorough method of procedure pursued in considerating rivers and harbors projects and also the percentage expended for labor.

I agree with my colleagues that this information is timely and would be of interest to Members of the House in view of the fact that we will soon have before us an omnibus rivers and harbors bill. As published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the speech referred to reads as follows:

MERIT OF RIVER AND HARBOR PROJECTS—LABOR EMPLOYED

(Speech of Hon. MARTIN F. SMITH, of Washington, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, July 1, 1937)

(The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration H. R. 7051, a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.)

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time in order to briefly point out to Congress and to the country the fact that there is probably no type of Federal project, I care not what its nature may be, which receives the thorough, painstaking study and consideration to which a river and harbor project is subjected before it is authorized by Congress and the money is actually appropriated by Congress.

The local community initiates the project for the dredging or improving of the river or harbor in question, to serve the local community by providing low-cost water transportation, and to aid commerce and navigation at that point. The project is discussed in the community, the citizens themselves see the possibilities and advantages which would accrue, and therefore they agitate and advocate the project, and local industries

join with them in favoring it; then their representative in Congress is called upon and introduces a bill for a survey which is essential in the case of every new project. He presents the matter to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, which submits it to the United States Army engineers having jurisdiction of rivers and harbors, who determine whether a survey is necessary and desirable and recommend accordingly. This results in the bill either being passed separately or included in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill, such as the pending measure, which includes numerous surveys. If the project is one for the modification or change of an existing project, then a resolution for review of prior reports is sufficient and the representative sponsors such a resolution, which is submitted to the Army engineers and later to the committee which passes it and refers it back to the Army engineers for the desired report.

The project is then referred to the district engineer, of whom there are 42 in the United States, embracing every section of the country. He calls a hearing in the local community and all those who might be interested are notified and afforded an opportunity to be heard and present testimony and arguments showing the need for the improvement and evidence in support of the merits of the project. It is a public hearing, the public is invited and welcomed, and all those who indicate a desire to be heard, either for or against the project, are heard. It is in the nature of a quasi judicial hearing. The district engineer, after considering all the testimony, makes recommendations and refers the project to the division engineer, of whom there are 10 in all sections of the Nation, the last division engineer's office to be established being at Portland, Oreg., in charge of Col. T. M. Robins, who was transferred from San Francisco on account of the large Bonneville Dam project on the Columbia River, in Oregon and western Washington.

The division engineer reviews the recommendations and report of the district engineer. He then makes his report and recommendations and sends the project on to Washington, D. C., where it is again reviewed and considered by the Board of United States Army Engineers, at which time the Representative in Congress is again heard in behalf of the project. The Board consists of seven members. They have served as district and division engineers in various parts of the Nation and, like them, were honor students at West Point and took the special course at the engineering school at Fort Belvoir, Va., prior to serving as district and division engineers before being promoted to membership on the Board. The members of the Board have no local interest to serve whatsoever; they consider each project from a national viewpoint—how it will affect the navigation and commerce of the United States. They are far removed geographically from each project. These skilled engineers are absolutely divorced from politics. They are nonpolitical and nonpartisan and consider and decide the project solely upon its merits and demerits. The final decision rests with the Chief of the United States Army Engineers, who reviews the report and recommendations of the Board.

After the project has run the gantlet of the district engineer, division engineer, Board of Engineers, and Chief of Engineers, these reports are submitted to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, which hears the project de novo and listens to the presentation made by the local Congressman and representatives of the office of the United States Army Engineers and either approves or rejects the project, preparatory to its inclusion in an omnibus rivers and harbors bill. I repeat the assertion made at the outset that the scrutiny and searching investigation which I have described is probably not equaled or even approached by any other class of projects or expenditures of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, not only are rivers and harbors projects based upon merit, but they also result in a greater proportionate expenditure for labor, direct and indirect, than almost any other class of public-works projects. To substantiate and prove this fact, I call attention to the following statement prepared under the direction of Maj. Gen. E. M. Markham, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, furnished to me under date of June 25, 1937. The total percentage, direct and indirect, of labor costs ranges from 78.5 to 87.9 percent, demonstrating conclusively the soundness and desirability of rivers and harbors projects as labor-employment projects.

The statement of General Markham referred to is as follows:

Percentages of labor costs, direct and indirect, to total cost for work completed with Government plant and hired labor by the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, between September 1933 and June 30, 1936

	Dredging, regular funds	Dredging, N. I. R. A. and P. W. A. funds	Operating and care of canals, regular funds	Dike construction, N. I. R. A. and P. W. A. funds	Revetment construction, N. I. R. A. and P. W. A. funds	Lock and dam construction, regular funds	Levee construction, regular funds
1 Direct labor							
Labor used in construction, including plant operation	29.7	33.5	57.2	31.9	34.6	30.0	34.0
Labor used in plant repairs	12.7	11.3	3.8	4.4	3.8	4.0	10.0
Labor used in surveys, superintendence, and overhead	9.0	6.0	7.2	5.4	6.8	7.2	9.0
Miscellaneous services							3.5
Total, direct labor	51.4	50.8	68.2	41.7	45.2	41.2	56.5
2. Indirect labor:							
Material and supplies used in construction	18.0	19.3	17.5	35.8	33.7	32.9	14.0
Material and supplies used in plant repairs, etc	9.4	9.0	2.2	2.3	2.1	2.8	5.6
Miscellaneous supplies							2.4
Total, indirect labor	27.4	28.3	19.7	38.1	35.8	35.7	22.0
3. Total direct and indirect labor	78.8	79.1	87.9	79.8	81.0	76.9	78.5
4. Other costs:							
Basic materials	13.5	13.3	9.2	17.2	15.7	16.1	10.5
Depreciation	7.7	7.6	2.9	3.0	3.3	7.0	11.0
Total other costs	21.2	20.9	12.1	20.2	19.0	23.1	21.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Rubber in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1941

EXCERPTS FROM BOOKLET BY THE UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the necessity and desirability of establishing a supply of rubber in the United States has been pointed out to the Congress on several occasions. We presently import approximately 97 percent of our annual rubber consumption and almost all of this comes from the Far East. It is obvious that, with world conditions as unsettled as they are at present, this source of supply is apt to be seriously curtailed or cut off at any time.

Members of the House will recall that several months ago I discussed the subject of producing rubber domestically. I tried to point out the advantages of fully developing the possibilities of the guayule rubber shrub, and my remarks and the discussion which followed can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 16, 1941. Following this, I introduced H. R. 5030 on June 11, and this measure, which proposes to plant 45,000 acres of guayule, is now under consideration by the Department of Agriculture.

Yesterday I received a booklet from the United States Tariff Commission dated September 1941 and titled "Rubber—Possibilities of Producing Rubber in the United States." In view of the importance of this subject, I have requested permission to include in my remarks excerpts from this fine review of the rubber situation as seen by the Tariff Commission. May I commend it to your attention.

The excerpts follow:

RUBBER—POSSIBILITIES OF PRODUCING RUBBER IN THE UNITED STATES AND RUBBER CONSERVATION

The great importance of rubber in our civilian national economy is a familiar fact. Defense preparations require large quantities

of rubber which is classified by the Army and Navy Munitions Board as a strategic material. About three-fourths of the rubber consumed in the United States goes into tires and inner tubes, which are indispensable both for civilian and military use. Other highly important uses for rubber are in medical and surgical articles, water hose, electrical insulation, and gas masks.

If a shortage of shipping or other causes should greatly reduce the quantity of rubber obtainable from the Far East, serious problems would at once arise. For this reason the Tariff Commission has just completed a survey as to the feasibility of producing rubber in this country and as to means of conserving supplies. Representatives of the Commission have visited the principal rubber-manufacturing centers of the United States and the principal domestic regions in which guayule rubber has been grown experimentally and have obtained information from the best-informed men in the industry.

* * * * *

SYNTHETIC RUBBER

Synthetic rubber has been widely publicized as a substitute for Hevea rubber. In 1940 the domestic production of synthetic rubber amounted to only about 4,000 long tons. Production in 1941 may be twice that figure, and by the end of the year the total productive capacity may be 20,000 long tons.

Synthetic rubber has been produced only since about 1931, and practically all the output has been made from acetylene obtained from coal and limestone and from hydrochloric acid obtained from salt. This synthetic rubber has been sold at 65 cents to $1 a pound and it has been used only for special purposes, in which resistance to oil, heat, or excessive sunlight is desired. In these uses it is much superior to Hevea rubber.

Authorities on the subject think that if in the future synthetic rubber is produced on a large scale it will be made from butadiene, which in turn is made from petroleum products, in combination with styrene, acrylonitrile, or some of the olefins. If synthetic rubber is produced from butadiene on a large scale, it will be necessary to expand greatly the production of this material. Presumably plants for manufacturing butadiene would be erected near oil refineries or oil fields and the butadiene would be shipped to synthetic rubber plants near rubber-consuming centers. It would also be necessary to construct plants for the production of styrene, acrylonitrile, or olefins. Styrene or acrylonitrile would require chlorine or nitrogen, and both of these are now on the priorities list by reason of the strong demand for them in defense uses. The total cost of constructing plants for the production of butadiene, styrene, acrylonitrile, or olefins, and synthetic rubber would range from $75,000,000 to $100,000,000 for every 100,000 long tons of yearly synthetic rubber capacity. A single synthetic rubber plant having a capacity of 20,000 long tons might be erected and equipped in 18 months, but because of the difficulty in obtaining steel and chemical equipment it appears that from 3 to 5 years would be required to construct and equip a sufficient number of plants to supply the rubber requirements of the United States. Priorities would be necessary on steel and chemical equipment for erecting plants.

After the war there would be serious readjustments if imports of low-priced crude rubber from the Far East were resumed. Members of the trade think that probably synthetic rubber could be produced in quantity from oil products at a cost of about 25 cents a pound, or perhaps less. The cost of producing crude rubber in the Far East, in the absence of controlled output, is reported at 4 to 10 cents a pound, and since 1931 prices in New York have ranged from 2½ to 27 cents a pound. The Government is now purchasing all the crude rubber imported into the United States and is selling it delivered in New York at 22½ cents a pound.

Synthetic rubber of the butadiene type was not produced in the United States until 1940, and it is now produced only in negligible quantities. Tire companies have experimented with this rubber and have had considerable difficulty in using it. They have found, however, that they can make fairly good tires by mixing synthetic rubber in equal parts with natural rubber (Hevea or guayule).

Germany is using large quantities of butadiene synthetic rubber (made from coal and limestone rather than from oil products) in the manufacture of tires, but the Germans were 2 years learning how to use it. The cost of producing synthetic rubber in Germany is reported at about 40 cents a pound. Some passenger-car tires are made exclusively from synthetic rubber in Germany, but the lack of sufficient adhesiveness is understood still to present difficulties in the manufacture of large tires requiring many plies.[1] In the manufacture of some tires the Germans use synthetic rubber in the treads, reclaimed Hevea rubber in the side walls and plies, and Hevea rubber in the inner tubes.[2]

GUAYULE RUBBER

Guayule is a rubber-producing desert shrub which is native to north central Mexico and the Big Bend area of Texas. In 1912, the year of greatest output, Mexico produced 10,000 long tons of guayule rubber. After 1912 the Mexican output declined, and in 1940 amounted to about 4,000 long tons. Production facilities are being increased, and production in 1942 may amount to 7,000 long tons. The entire Mexican production is from wild guayule, and the output is now restricted by the Mexican Government in order to prevent extinction of the shrub. Most of the guayule rubber produced in Mexico is shipped to the United States.

For the past 30 years the Intercontinental Rubber Co., whose principal business is producing rubber in the Far East and importing rubber, has cultivated guayule at its experiment station near Salinas, Calif., and at scattered points in Arizona and Texas. The company has about 1,000 acres under cultivation at Salinas, where it produced about 225 long tons of rubber in 1940. After extensive tests, the firm has selected high-yielding, disease-resistant strains of guayule. Also, it has devised special machinery for planting, cultivating, and harvesting the shrub. One machine with a crew of 14 men plants 15 acres in 1 day of 10 hours, 8,000 plants to the acre.

Guayule requires little cultivation and an annual rainfall of only 8 to 12 inches, depending upon soil and climate. The climatic and soil conditions of the Salinas and nearby valleys in California have been found especially suitable for growing guayule, but other States in the Southwest also have areas suited to guayule cultivation.

The guayule shrub may be harvested at any time between the ages of 1 and 30 years, the general practice being to harvest it at 4 years. If for any reason it is desired not to harvest the plant after 4 years, it may be left in the ground and in that way serve as a continually increasing reserve supply of rubber until the plant is 10 years of age. After growing for 10 years guayule has a tendency to become gnarled. The shrub may be left in the ground for an additional 20 years, but without any increase in rubber content. The entire shrub is taken from the ground at the time of harvest and by a mechanical process the rubber is removed from the roots, stem, and large branches.

The cost of producing guayule rubber depends upon the age at which the plant is harvested. Starting with a cost of about 80 cents per pound of rubber when the plant is harvested at 1 year, the cost decreases for every year that the plant is in the ground until it is 7 years of age. After 7 years the carrying charges, principally interest on investment, exceed the increment in value. It appears that when the plant is harvested at the age of 4 years, guayule rubber may be produced at a cost of 15 to 19 cents a pound, including the cost of land rental, preparing the land for planting, and all other costs incidental to producing the rubber, except interest on investment and the cost of deresinating.

Guayule rubber has a resin content of about 20 percent. For this reason underesinated guayule rubber is suitable only for blending with Hevea rubber or for friction stocks (for use in manufacturing tire fabric plies, transmission belts, friction tape, etc.). It is especially suited to use in rubberizing tire fabric plies, the production of which is very large. Mr. J. H. Doering, of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., has written the most authoritative article on the use of underesinated guayule rubber.[3] After considerable testing, Mr. Doering found that tires made from underesinated guayule rubber give a mileage 60 percent as great as tires made from Hevea ribbed smoked sheet No. 1.

However, when guayule rubber is deresinated it is of the same quality as the lower grades of Hevea rubber and can be used interchangeably with them. It is softer than Hevea ribbed smoked sheet No. 1. Practically all the large tire-manufacturing companies have tested deresinated guayule rubber, and it is reported that tires made from it give approximately 90 percent of the mileage given by tires made from ribbed smoked sheet No. 1. Most of the purchasing agents and research directors of these firms think that the Government should advance funds for the production of guayule rubber.

It appears that if substantial quantities of guayule rubber were deresinated, the cost of deresinating would not exceed 1 or 2 cents a pound. The solvent used in the process can be used several times, and the resins recovered probably could be sold.

The information available indicates that the capital investment for agricultural equipment, nurseries, buildings, maintenance shops, rubber extraction mills, and deresinating factories probably would amount to about $20,000,000 for every 100,000 long tons of yearly productive capacity.

A shortage of planting material limits the quantity of rubber which could be produced from guayule in the next few years. If all the seeds available were planted immediately, there would be only enough seedlings to plant 45,000 acres of guayule shrubs in the spring of 1942. If 45,000 acres were planted in 1942 and harvested in 1943, they would yield a total of only about 1,500 long tons of deresinated rubber. If the 45,000 acres were not harvested until 1944, they would yield approximately 5,400 long tons. If harvested in 1946, they would yield about 21,300 long tons.[4]

In 1943 there could be made available sufficient seedlings to plant 450,000 acres. This acreage might yield 15,000 long tons if harvested in 1944, 54,000 long tons if harvested

---

[1] U. S. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Synthetic Rubbers Hold Unique Place in Industry, June 1941, p. 1.

[2] Germany accumulated a large stock pile of Hevea rubber before the war and has acquired additional supplies from occupied countries.

[3] J. H. Doering, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Guayule Rubber in Tires and Tubes—Service Tests in Which the Rubber Was Exclusively Guayule, Industrial and Engineering Chemistry, 1934, vol. 26, p. 541.

[4] For comparative purposes, about 650,000 long tons of crude rubber were consumed in 1940 in the United States.

in 1945, or 213,000 long tons if harvested in 1947. Further plantings would be possible in 1944 and subsequent years.[5]

The production of guayule rubber would utilize land and migrant labor not now employed; also, its production would not require, as in the case of synthetic rubber, large quantities of steel, chemicals, and chemical equipment, the demands for which are taxing the productive capacity of eastern factories.

Bank of America Assures Reemployment to Employees Called for Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1941

LETTER AND PRESS RELEASE OF THE BANK OF AMERICA, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and press release:

BANK OF AMERICA,
San Francisco, September 16, 1941.

The Honorable LELAND M. FORD,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEE: Since the recent lengthening of the possible period of selective service to 30 months it has become apparent that some apprehension exists among many young men called or likely to be called into service that this longer interruption in their normal careers might cause them to lose out entirely in their private employment.

Our bank believes that it is a part of our proper duty to the Nation and to the young men who have chosen service with the Bank of America as their career to assure them that they will not be penalized because of their response to their country's call, and I am enclosing a copy of a press release given by Mr. L. M. Giannini, president of our bank, which shows that every employee will be taken back into our organization and will be given either his old position or one of equal standing and opportunity.

I thought you might be interested in this information and the attitude of our institution.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

EARL LEE KELLY,
Vice President.

Permanent staff members of the Bank of America who have been called to military service need have no concern about their positions because of the extension of the military service period, according to L. M. Giannini, president of the bank.

Originally all such men were given 1 year leave of absence, with preservation of pension and seniority rights.

In answer to inquiries on the subject, Giannini stated:

"When extension of the service period was legislated we automatically extended the leave of absence, pension, and seniority privileges of the Bank of America employees affected.

"Any young man who has been called to the Nation's service from our permanent staff rolls and who desires to resume his banking career immediately following his release from military service will be welcomed back and given either his old position or one of equal standing and opportunity.

"Thus he will be in a position to pick up his individual career where he left off, with every chance for continued advancement," the banker said.

Giannini pointed out that this policy should cause no apprehension to the hundreds of young men now beginning their careers with the bank.

"California is growing, our bank is growing with it, and there is every indication this growth will continue. It is obvious we will have need of every man trained in Bank of America standards," he declared.

[5] There could be made available in 1944 sufficient seedlings to plant 4,500,000 acres. Theoretically, this acreage might yield 150,000 long tons if harvested in 1945, 540,000 long tons if harvested in 1946, or 2,130,000 long tons if harvested in 1948. For comparative purposes, about 9,000,000 acres are planted in cotton in Texas.

Leading and Reflecting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER STEARNS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE FAIR HAVEN (VT.) ERA

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, in these turbulent days when every man in public life is criticized "whether he does or if he does not," it is a comforting thought that after all republics are not entirely ungrateful to those who give their best to the service of their country.

Because of our mutual agreement with respect to the foreign policy of this country, as announced by the President and confirmed by Congress, it is a pleasure for me to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Far Haven Era, one of Vermont's leading country weekly newspapers, wherein the position of Vermont is well stated, and the attitudes of Senator AUSTIN and Representative PLUMLEY respecting our duty and obligation to ourselves and the world at large are approved and commended.

The editorial follows:

[From the Fair Haven (Vt.) Era of September 4, 1941]

LEADING AND REFLECTING

That was a fine and well-deserved tribute which Wendell Willkie gave to Governor Wills at the sesquicentennial celebration on Saturday, when he said, "I was very happy to see Governor Wills, who represents the finest progressive element of the Republican Party. I admire very much his courageous stand on the international situation. I was also glad to chat with my old friend, Harold Stassen, of Minnesota. He, too, appreciates that we can preserve freedom in the United States only if it survives elsewhere. From all over the country Republicans of the rank and file are rapidly repudiating isolationism. In a few years the isolationists will be explaining that they did not really mean what they said in 1941."

The current Vermont attitude toward the present world-wide struggle between the forces of freedom and tyranny is certainly not that of the isolationists. The overwhelming majority of Vermonters are in favor of all possible aid to Great Britain; and a large body of opinion within our State also favors use of the United States Navy to protect our rights to sail the ocean. In fact, the opinion of Republican Vermont is more favorable to President Roosevelt's foreign policies than some States which voted for Roosevelt in the last three elections. As a political coincidence this may seem strange, but not so strange when one recalls, as we are doing in this sesquicentennial year, that Vermont was founded by courageous men for whom liberty was the breath of life. Our attitude toward the life and death struggle of democracy can doubtless be traced in no small degree to our heritage of freedom. But who can doubt that it is also due in large measure to the leadership of men like Governor Wills, Senator AUSTIN, and Congressman PLUMLEY? To his credit it can be said that Senator AUSTIN was one of the first Senators to realize that "we can preserve freedom in the United States only if it survives elsewhere." In days when national thought about the war is divided, confused, and confusing it is fortunate that three of those representing the State in high office are leading and reflecting Vermont opinion.

Flying Cadet John Anthony Burger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW ROCHELLE (N. Y.) STANDARD-STAR

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Standard-Star, of New Rochelle, N. Y., commenting on the death in line of duty of Flying Cadet John Anthony Burger, United States Naval Reserve. The editorial appeared on August 20, 1941, and is as follows:

[From the New Rochelle (N. Y.) Standard-Star of August 20, 1941]

SUPREME SERVICE

News of the death of John Anthony Burger in the service of his country was received with sincere regret yesterday throughout New Rochelle where the Burger family has lived for many years, and where John had many friends and acquaintances.

The young naval cadet was killed Monday night at Jacksonville, Fla., when two planes collided as they tried to land during night-flying instruction. The pilot of the other plane also lost his life.

It might be said, of course, that accidents happen in all walks of life, military and civilian, and that the air branches of the armed forces are no exception. Although that is true, the death of this young air cadet does emphasize that there is a certain amount of risk to which the youth in the Nation's defending forces must expose themselves even in peacetime efforts. It should intensify beyond all bounds our appreciation of what they are doing for us in this enormous national-defense program.

No amount of words, spoken or written, can accomplish anything toward filling that aching void which John Burger's death has left in the circle of his family and friends. Even a mention of the honor of the supreme sacrifice he made in preparing to defend his country, if need be, is little consolation to a grieving mother and a sorrowing father.

The whole community, however, does accept a share in that grief with a feeling that a heroic son has been taken from us by an untimely and cruel stroke of fate.

Declaration of the Atlantic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of September 27, 1941:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of September 27, 1941]

DECLARATION OF THE ATLANTIC

When the memoirs come to be written, especially the second memoirs of Mr. Churchill, we may find out what happened to the millennium at the meeting of the President of the United States and the British Prime Minister somewhere in the Atlantic.

We have learned to know a good deal about Mr. Roosevelt's tenacity of idea and purpose. Therefore we cannot doubt that he took with him his four freedoms. They were, if you remember—

First. "Freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world."

Second. "Freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world."

Third. "Freedom from want—everywhere in the world."

Fourth. "Freedom from fear—anywhere in the world."

In his famous message to Congress last January he set them out very carefully in that order of value—and this was no vision of a far-distant time, he said, but "a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation."

He must have taken with him also the State Department's annunciation, by Mr. Welles, of the two essential conditions for bringing that world to pass. The conditions were: First, to abolish offensive armament under some power of international control; and, second, to establish "fully and adequately the natural rights of all people to equal economic enjoyment," because, "so long as any one people or any one government possess a monopoly over natural resources or raw materials which are needed by all people, there can be no basis for a world order based on justice and peace."

We have never been able to make sense of such words as the "natural rights of all people to equal economic enjoyment." Suppose the Japanese should insist, as they once did, that for their equal economic enjoyment they must be permitted to settle in California. Certainly the words do not mean that. Then do they become rhetorical and mean only equal access for all people to natural resources? Among our natural resources we count the fertility of Iowa land, and water power at Boulder Dam and Grand Coulee. Shall all people in the world have equal access to these resources? If so, how? Do they mean, perhaps, only raw materials?

In time of peace there is a world market for all raw materials at world prices. How well do our southern farmers know there is a world price for cotton, even though they had a monopoly of it. When they tried to get more than the world price, they lost their monopoly. To whom in time of peace are raw materials denied at the world price? For her war machine Germany bought rubber and copper in London right up to the outbreak of war, and essential raw materials all over the world.

This doctrine of underprivileged nations, that must be appeased for the peace of the world, belongs to a phantasy of international socialism; moreover, it partly concedes the Hitler thesis that because the natural wealth of the world was not equally distributed by the Creator, he is justified to redivide it in favor of Germany by force. Nevertheless, it is idealistic, and Mr. Roosevelt believes it ardently, thinking of it, perhaps, as a New Deal for the whole world; and, as we say, he undoubtedly took it with him to the rendezvous along with the four freedoms.

What did he bring back?

Only two of his freedoms—the lesser two. Only freedom from want and freedom from fear were written into the declaration of the Atlantic, and these not as a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time, but as a desirable feature of a peace which "the President of the United States and the Prime Minister, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom," say they "hope to see established" after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny.

Freedom of speech and freedom of religion were left out. Were they omitted, perhaps, in deference to the sensibilities of the Russian dictator, to whom both freedom of speech and freedom of religion are anathema? If so, we would impute it to Mr. Churchill's magnificent and somewhat impish sense of political realism. He would embrace Satan to save England. Yet Mr. Roosevelt appears to have been somewhat conscious about it, afterward. When he sent the declaration of the Atlantic to Congress for its information and for the record, he said: "It is also unnecessary for me to point out that the declaration of principles includes of necessity the world need for freedom of religion and freedom of information." A slight change there. Not his own "freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world," but "freedom of information." We don't know quite what that is.

Nor was that all.

The "natural rights of all people to equal economic enjoyment," to be fully and adequately established, fared badly in the sea air and came home like this: "They"—again the President of the United States and the Prime Minister, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, announcing certain common principles in the national policies of their respective governments—"will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

The principal "existing obligations" of His Majesty's Government are those of the British Empire to its economic self—and, we say, very rightly and properly so.

As he left the deck of the *Augusta*, United States Navy, Mr. Churchill's person must have bulged with the trifles he got away with. Not the millennium. That was nothing. He probably dropped it overboard. Those Americans! What else had he got?

He had got a formal, irrevocable declaration of purposes in common: First, a purpose to destroy Hitler; second, a purpose to disarm Germany forever; and, third, a purpose to restore the overturned sovereignties of Europe.

He had got his Anglo-American alliance for the duration of the war in writing.

He had got the signature of the United States of America, by its President, to an unlimited undertaking to save the British Empire.

And what did he give for what he got? To what did he pledge His Majesty's Government? Only to forego the thought of aggrandizement, territorial or other, and to share with the United States the job of policing and minding an Anglo-American post-war world.

On his way home Mr. Churchill passed the largest convoy of American aid that had yet been seen. We wonder what he was thinking. Maybe of what he will do with Joseph Stalin at the peace conference and of the old hat he gave to Harry Hopkins, the Lease-Lend Administrator.

Efficiency of Army Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CLAYTON (MO.) WATCHMAN-ADVOCATE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I listened yesterday with interest to the debate on the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

One of the speakers yesterday had much to say about the accuracy of estimates of cost made by engineers of the War Department. I attempted at the time to remind the advocate of the so-called seaway to discrepancies in estimated cost of Army camps and the actual cost of same, but was not recognized.

Mr. Speaker, this is no time for the Congress to support billion-dollar projects that the Nation can safely do without. My friend may want a new residence or a new building to house his business, but if he is already deeply in debt and scarcely able to meet interest charges he will do well if he forgets his want of such buildings.

The proposed seaway is not necessary to national defense. Uncle Sam is not in financial condition to construct new projects that we can do without. Further, the terrible waste of funds at Army camps is sufficient proof that present managers are incompetent to successfully and economically handle large construction projects. As further evidence of administration weakness, I wish to call

attention to an editorial published in the Watchman-Advocate, Clayton, Mo., September 19, 1941:

[From the Clayton (Mo.) Watchman-Advocate of September 19, 1941]

THE SEAWAY QUESTION

One of the chief reasons for a Canadian canal (built at our expense) is that after its construction, all Great Lakes cities become ocean-craft harbors. Those who use that argument are overlooking the fact that it is possible for oceangoing craft to get to Chicago and other lake ports through the Lakes-to-the-Gulf waterway. That it was possible until the Secretary of War in 1936 allowed the construction of a fixed bridge over the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal.

This bridge, which has a clearance of only 22.4 feet at low water, was built over the canal when it was generally understood that Lakes-to-Gulf traffic needed 45-foot clearance. In spite of this and the fact that it is unlawful to sanction fixed bridges over navigable waters in such a way to restrict their complete potential use, the Secretary of War did approve this block to Mississippi River and Great Lakes water traffic.

If this sample of efficiency and foresightedness can be even, by a great stretch of the imagination, considered a fair example of the ability of the War Department, then it's time to investigate our national-defense program and the flood-control problem, both of which are entrusted to the same bunch of swivel-chair engineers. Reading about building a ship canal and then destroying its use with a low bridge makes one wonder if the railroads put their oar (or ore) into the puddle to bottle up water transportation. Did the War Department engineers suffer from administration pressure, and find that by closing the rear gate they could force the ships seeking the ocean to dig a way out through Canada with public money?

A bridge over a canal sounds like small potatoes, but this particular bridge over a canal in Chicago is the block to big-boat travel between the Gulf ports and the Great Lake ports.

Any suggestions that it could be raised, made a drawbridge or a turntable bridge, will be met with enough reasons for not changing it to choke a goat. Meanwhile the administration and the New Deal stooges in the Congress and the War Department keep clamoring for a St. Lawrence seaway. Now the man at the crossroads would like to know how long it would take these same thinkers to low bridge that project out of usefulness if they succeed in putting it over on the American people.

Science Aids Development of Modern Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1941

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS OF HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following parts of an address which I delivered at the laying of the cornerstone for the new science building of Shepherd College, Shepherdstown, W. Va., on September 17:

Most people recognize the fact that science has made possible much of the development of our modern civilization. Born in the depths of ancient philosophy, it was cradled in the arms of alchemy and mysticism. Flouted and crushed by early religious zeal, it has revolutionized man's knowledge and understanding. Neglected and starved in attics and dungeons, it has created a world of untold wealth. Today science stands ready—a Hercules—waiting to perform the tasks we command to be done.

Science has opened a hundred different branches of knowledge in the field of physics, chemistry, and biology. The countless benefits showered upon us as a result have been mainly in the form of means to preserve and protect our health and in the form of strong strides in the march of our economic progress, and now we strengthen our national defense with its power.

Today we are beginning to realize what a great ally we have.

* * * * *

Industries both great and small have profited much by using science and the inventor's skill to reduce production costs. Lower prices and greater profits have resulted from their use of improved methods and labor-saving devices. Aided by this industrial patron, flush with vast resources, science has accomplished miracles.

* * * * *

A miller living in the time of Caesar could make in a day only a barrel and a half of low-grade flour, while our modern flour mills turn out more than 80,000 barrels a day, and much better flour, at that. A good brickmaker, working from sunrise to sunset in the early days, fashioned only 450 bricks, but a modern brick plant produces nearly 1,000 times that many.

Only a hundred years ago 83 percent of the workers were needed to produce food for all of the people. Today only 17 percent are needed. Many of the others have been absorbed into the new industries created by invention.

Industry has not hesitated to command the aid of science. It has been forced to do so. If it still took 83 out of every 100 workers to provide the food for the Nation, there would not be enough workers left to man our great industrial system and at present our vast preparedness effort.

* * * * *

Inventive genius and scientific research have combined to transform the drudgery of household duties or the dreams of a Jules Verne into great industries which provide jobs for millions of workers, and which represent an aggregate of wealth that surpasses the riches of any nation in all recorded history. It is far more profitable to find an industry-making invention than a great gold mine.

Resolutions of the Yankee Division Veterans' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1941

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION, YANKEE DIVISION VETERANS ASSOCIATION, SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1941

We hereby resolve that the Yankee Division Veterans Association go on record with the suggestion that Congress posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to the late Brig. Gen. William Mitchell for his patriotic service and foresight in recommending an adequate air force to function as a separate unit of the armed force of the United States.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION, YANKEE DIVISION VETERANS ASSOCIATION, SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1941

We of the Yankee Division Veterans Association hereby go on record at our twenty-second national convention, being held in Manchester, N. H., as favoring the passing of necessary laws, rules, and regulations governing the transportation of all supplies for Great Britain and all the democracies, with the necessary assurance that these supplies will reach their point of destination: Be it further

Resolved, That we heartily approve and endorse the return to the age-old policy of the United States to the freedom of the seas.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION, YANKEE DIVISION VETERANS ASSOCIATION, SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1941

Be it hereby resolved, That we of the Yankee Division Veterans Association hereby go on record as approving of delegating the necessary powers to the President of the United States in this period of national emergency for any and all programs of national defense which will safeguard the lives, the property, and the security of the citizens of the United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That we of the Yankee Division Veterans Association, assembled in Manchester, N. H., for our twenty-second annual convention, do hereby pledge ourselves to aid, assist, and support the President of the United States of America in fulfilling the necessary requirements in this program of national defense during the present period of national emergency.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION, YANKEE DIVISION VETERANS ASSOCIATION, SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1941

Be it hereby resolved, That we the Yankee Division Veterans Association, in meeting at twenty-second national convention, in Manchester, N. H., do hereby favor the passage of a bill known as H. R. 4523.

This bill recognizes the high public service rendered by soldiers who volunteered and served in trench-fever experiments in the American Expeditionary Forces.

Danger Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, do you know—

First. That our Navy, patrolling the high seas in blockaded areas, has now

been ordered by the President to shoot on sight German and Italian ships, even though Congress has not declared war?

Second. That British warships have for months been undergoing repair in American harbors in violation of international law?

Third. That the President has declared that the Axis Powers must be destroyed?

Fourth. That high-ranking British officers have told us that the war cannot be won, except on German soil and with the aid of American manpower, which they insist we send?

Fifth. That under the guise of preparing for national defense the President, disregarding his promises, and this administration have been prepared to send another A. E. F. to Europe to aid in crushing Hitler?

Sixth. That on August 24 Prime Minister Winston Churchill, of Great Britain, declared that Great Britain and the United States intend to become the armed policemen of the world after crushing Hitler?

Seventh. That under date of September 17 the press carried the announcement of the British statesman, Hore-Belisha, that:

> Churchill had an imaginative idea in offering France common citizenship with Britain. There is far more reason for common citizenship with America. If we can replace the Declaration of Independence with a declaration of interdependence, we should lay the firmest foundation for permanent world peace.

SCRAP THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE—A WICKED SUGGESTION

Scrap the Declaration of Independence? The Declaration which gave birth to liberty and to freedom; which has been the foundation upon which our civilization, our prosperity, and our security has been built, and sign up with Great Britain in a declaration of "interdependence" and "Union Now"?

Are we so weak, so lacking in courage, in confidence, in our own ability, that we must now renounce the freedom for which our forefathers fought and which they sacrificed so much to gain and maintain, and acknowledge our dependency upon the British Empire?

Scrap the Declaration of Independence, says Hore-Belisha. Patriotism calls to us in clear, ringing tones; self-interest admonishes us and oppressed people the world over beseech us to maintain our independence and to prepare our national defense to meet and to defeat all aggressors who may seek to destroy us, whether it be by armed forces, which no true American fears or will shirk from meeting, or by insidious propaganda which creates fear, conceals the true purpose of those who are either our enemies or would use us for their own selfish ends.

The Far Eastern Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1941

ARTICLE BY MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. RIVERS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, these are days when our people are looking with great concern to the east and to the west, to the north and to the south. We seek enlightenment from responsible sources, and weigh in our minds the most important of what we read.

The Far East is at the moment one of our big concerns. One of those very familiar with conditions in that section of the world is Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, retired, who discussed the Japanese situation in an article in the New York New Leader last Saturday, and because of the information contained in the article I have asked unanimous consent to present it here.

The article follows:

[From the New York New Leader of September 20, 1941]

(By Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, retired)

Articles about the situation in the Far East flood our newspapers and magazines. A well-known writer believes that peace cannot come from the negotiations with Japan; that only a truce is possible. Lewis Mumford, a brilliant writer, expressed gloomy convictions in a recent issue of the New Leader concerning President Roosevelt's dealings with Japan. Mr. Mumford states that the President has lost the first Pacific battle by failing to use force against Japan; the Japanese waters are guarded by a navy inferior in number of ships and in fighting power to our Navy; that air bombers from Manila could set fire to the cities in Japan—if the United States had sufficient intelligence and moral fortitude to use its power. Also, that we could cut off Japanese supply lines by the sea and choke off the Japanese manufacture of munitions. And that our own indecision and moral weakness have allowed Japan to get into a position to strike effectively in eastern Asia either to the south or to the north.

I have taken part in campaigns and battles in all our important wars during the more than half a century since my graduation from West Point. Loaned by the Army for duty with the Philippine government, I served the unusual period of 11 successive years in the Philippines—when the law of Congress forbade Army officers from serving more than 3 years on one tour in the islands. I aided building up the Constabulary—a military police force of Filipino riflemen—of which I became the chief. My work required me to reside in all parts of the scattered archipelago. I was much in the jungle. I worked in close cooperation with the Filipino provincial governors, the Filipino judges, and other officials. I had the opportunity to visit Japan and other places in the Far East. I have continued my study of the strategy of the Pacific Ocean since my return from the Far East.

My conviction is that the conclusions of Mr. Mumford are much in error. He fails to mention our responsibilities and our dangers in the Atlantic. A discussion such as the one under consideration must view our position in all parts of the present World War, if it is to be thorough. The other assertions of Mumford require great modification. They are too favorable to the United States. They underestimate the power of Japan in her own waters.

Mr. Mumford states the navy of Japan is inferior to our own Navy; that our Navy alone could cut off Japan's supply line, and that our air bombers from Manila could attack the cities in Japan proper. Japan has one of the world's great battle fleets. It has the tradition of victory. It may be as large as our fleet. Japan has also a great field army. Japan is situated in a most favorable position which renders her almost impregnable to attack from the sea side.

Japan's danger is from the North. The great distances across the Pacific, the shape of the curved coast lines of Northeastern Asia and the location of Japan—and of her encircling chains of defensive islands running from the Arctic to the Equator—all aid greatly a defense of Japan against any attack or blockade from the west coast of the United States or from Hawaii. The almost 2,000 miles from Manila to Japan would render ineffective any attempt to bomb Japan from Manila. Japan has a larger air force in the Far East than we have. Japan could easily bomb such places as Manila and Guam from her great base at Formosa and from the Bonin Island base.

The smallest globe will show the position of Japan—squarely between our coast and Manila and on the straight, short, normal steamer line out to the East. Many are confused as to this, because they consult only the Mercator maps in all our atlases. These maps are distorted for the northern regions—for any region far from the Equator.

Japan has no desire to attack the United States. She cannot make such an attack. Hawaii is the greatest naval, military, and air base in the world. Our eight new island bases in the Aleutians and in the eastern part of the Pacific shelter air and naval forces which would operate against any attack from the western part of the Pacific.

Hitler is the principal danger to the Western Hemisphere. Germany cannot bring forces across the North Atlantic in order to attack the United States. However, a Germany victorious over Britain and Spain could send military and air forces from Dakar to Brazil. Such invading forces could then work northward and attack the Canal at Panama. The distance from Natal, in Brazil, to Dakar is only 1,862 miles. From Natal to Puerto Rico it is 1,100 miles farther. Natal to New York is 6,700 miles.

The President has recently announced that the time has come to defend the Americas. Our Navy has orders to seek out and eliminate submarines and other war vessels that endanger the defense of the waters of the Americas. Our defense line in the Atlantic is somewhat as follows: Labrador, Greenland, Iceland, the islands of the East Atlantic down to Cape Town. Naval authority has given our defense line in the Pacific as running from the Aleutians to the Hawaiians and to Samoa and to the Canal at Panama—all in the eastern Pacific. We so often say that the people who live in the Americas shall control the future of the Americas. My judgment is that it is the same for northeast Asia—that the people who live in north-

east Asia are bound to control the future of that region. Western nations, singly or in combination with other western countries, dream when they think of establishing again the old control over the Far East.

Other illusions are that we may have in the Far East a great trade. Canada has a population about that of greater New York—ten millions. Yet we sell Canada, at our door, far more than we sell the 500,000,000 people from Vladivostok to Australia—the teeming millions. There is no great trade in the Far East. Our trade with the Philippines and China has been a great disappointment. Another illusion is that the Philippines form an asset for us. The far-away islands are an economic and strategic liability.

Our trade with Japan is, I think, our only asset in the Far East. It has a balance favorable to us. It is much greater than our trade with China and the Philippines combined. The balance in the case of the two last-named countries is unfavorable to us. The large favorable balance on our trade with Japan makes up for the large unfavorable balance to us on our trade with the 20 nations to the south.

"Taking the initiative in the Pacific" would mean trying to dominate the western part of that great ocean. It would mean a costly war with Japan. It would mean abandoning the sensible idea that we are to control only the eastern half of the Pacific. It would mean doing exactly as Hitler would like us to do. It would mean that we might face the Axis Powers in Europe, and possibly in South America, with divided fleets and armies.

My own conviction is that we should make with Japan a new treaty of trade and friendship, and that the new treaty ought to contain a clause indicating the interest of Japan in the continued independence of the Philippines after 1946. I believe Japan has no intention to annex the Philippines after 1946. In any event Japan will get more and more of the trade with the Philippines. Japan is so near those islands.

We should first of all arrange our own affairs so as to get our main battle fleet east of the Canal at Panama.

Sabotage Against the Tyrant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the address of Representative EMANUEL CELLER, in part delivered over station WOR at New York City on September 9, 1941:

Europe before Hitler was divided and subdivided into national and international differences and disagreements. Today most of Europe is united—in hate of Hitler. It is a solid union of grim abhorrence that ignores boundaries and racial and social prejudices. Poles and Czechs, blond Norsemen, and swarthy Greeks and Slavs are now bound together by a common vengeance.

A Gestapo reign of terror in the conquered provinces has caused this federation of venom and hostility to the Hakenkreuze and all it implies. Rapine, pestilence, disease, plunder, and famine have aroused an opposition that even torture cannot still. Reprisals are rampant. Tens of thousands of political prisoners have been seized and forced into refined torture chambers. Thousands of pastors, priests, and rabbis are summoned by the Gestapo and insulted and defiled. They are forced to substitute prison clothes for their religious garb and are forbidden to conduct mass or say prayers. Regardless of age or infirmities, they are forced to do degrading manual work—to clean latrines and scrub floors.

Thousands of laborers and intellectuals resisting Nazi tyranny are machine-gunned and massacred. Scores caught escaping are brought back and subjected to sadistic cruelties. Here is a typical case of torture of students in Czechoslovakia who protested the ousting of certain professors because of their beliefs. Hundreds of these students were beaten into insensibility by blows from thick clubs and cudgels. Still others had their ears torn off and their eyes struck out by blows from whips. Groups of four youths were given whips and ordered to slash at each other. If they did not attack with sufficient savagery, they were goaded on and burned with flaming torches or slit with sharp swords. A number of girl students seized in raids were dragged into large open spaces and violated in view of bound male students, who were powerless spectators of these horrible scenes. Their cries of anguish and fright were met with new and more cruel tortures. These are but a few of the dreadful rites practiced by the German soldatin—the so-called Herrenvolke. These wretched soldiers are the vanguard of the master people (the German) who would make Sklavenvolk (slaves) of all other people.

Small wonder the world stands aghast, and the victims cry out in anguish and fear. Small wonder that resentment and hatred of Hitler grows—a hatred and a sabotage that one day will overwhelm this tyrant, Hitler, and his blood-stained cohorts.

Prometheus, now bound, is stirring.

The curses against Adolf Shicklegruber, if not loud, are still very deep. Subterranean forces that even he fears are at work. A common agony of pain drives all Europe against him.

The subject peoples may be prostrate and broken but they are not hopeless. They have weapons sharper than steel—ridicule, invective, insult, derision, intrigue, sabotage, terrorism.

These weapons will suffice temporarily until rifles, guns, bombs, and planes can be made available. Meanwhile, they suffer and wait. But they have a hope and faith that moves mountains.

In Belgium, Holland, Norway, Bohemia, Moravia, Greece, and Yugoslavia, Nazi storm troopers and the Italian Brasellieri no longer dare walk alone at night.

In all the conquered provinces, supply trains are stalled or strange and mysterious errors in signals send cars headlong into collisions; factories suddenly are stopped with machinery "monkey wrenched"; telegraph, telephone, and cable wires are cut; lighting systems suddenly fail; railroad tracks are blown up; rails are removed, and large rocks are placed across tracks causing dreadful wrecks; "Go" signals are substituted for "Stop" signals red and green running lights on ships are interchanged; kerosene-soaked rags are carefully flung through windows, air shafts, ventilators, hatches, and at convenient moments are ignited—detection is difficult; sand, ground glass, grit, cement, steel filings are inserted or flung into engine cylinders; a pailful of sand easily disables a factory, and weeks are required to put engines right again; motors of airplanes, tanks, trucks are disabled by sprinkling their parts first with cement and then with water; supplies at warehouses, cargoes at dock yards or at sea are destroyed by water, especially salt water; food supplies are rendered inedible by dousing with coal dust or fuel oil.

Hitler has not triumphed. He has partial obedience but no acquiescence. Resentment and stifled rebellion are everywhere—from Narvik to Athens.

In Norway the most despised and hated men are Reichskommissar Joseph Terboven and his stooge, Norway's first Nazi, Vidkun Quisling (Quisling is now a name synonymous with traitor, like Benedict Arnold or "copperhead"). Quisling has really succeeded in bringing about a complete underground national union—against himself. Quisling has jailed, tortured, shot, and sent to concentration camps thousands of Norwegian patriots. Serious demonstrations against Nazi occupation authorities are frequent. Military establishments are often the objects of widespread sabotage. Arrests and torture of victims only enrages the populace to more daring and more damaging deeds. The Nazis do not dare issue postage stamps with the picture of Quisling for fear the people will spit on the wrong side of the stamp. When he arrived in Bergen for the first time thousands shouted, "Down with Quisling" and sang the national anthem. Bergen, Stavanger, Namsos, and many other towns have been put under a strict curfew because of anti-Nazi demonstrations. In the country regions power lines controlling Nazi antiaircraft devices have been cut repeatedly. Frequent landslides, engineered by Norwegians, block for days the Bergen-Oslo railroad. Whenever a prominent Nazi speaks on the radio a crowd gathers outside and sings the national anthem loud enough to be picked up by the microphone. Military stores show an increasing tendency to spontaneous combustion.

A fisherman rowed out to a spot at sea where a plane crashed. He thought it was a British plane and wanted to pick up survivors. He suddenly let the men slip back into the water. When the fisherman returned, he was accosted by the crowd on the shore who were watching the rescue. Someone said, "Why were not the aviators brought back?" The fisherman replied, "They turned out to be Germans." "But were they not alive?" "Well, one of them said he was alive, but you know how these Nazis lie."

A clown struts across the stage of a local playhouse and mimics King Haakon, now in exile. When he reaches the opposite side, he sticks his head out of the wings and asks, smilingly, "Shall I return?" The audience thunderingly says, "Yes."

If Vidkun Quisling is still alive, it is a miracle.

Between 300,000 and 350,000 Nazi soldiers are in Norway to keep 2,900,000 Norwegians in subjugation. That is rather a vast army of occupation. It is proof of the vast resentment and sabotage in Norway.

In Holland, insulting and contemptuous anti-Nazi slogans are constantly chalked on fences and house walls. Nazi reprisals only stimulate the Dutch to greater daring. The local Nazi commander at Eindhover permitted a parade of workers to celebrate the

fiftieth anniversary of the founding of their employer's factory. To the astonishment of the local Nazis, the procession turned into a grand demonstration of over 20,000 people carrying orange flags, testifying their loyalty to Queen Wilhelmina and the House of Orange.

In Amersfoort, in a period of 6 hours, over 100 fires and explosions occurred simultaneously. They were the secret work of Dutchmen expressing their hostility to Nazis.

The Quisling of the Netherlands is Anton Mussert, leader of the Dutch Nazi Party. He, too, is an object of scorn and derision.

The Hollanders say of their rationed potatoes, "They are like the Nazis themselves—black, and rotten to the core."

Distribution of pamphlets attacking the Nazis, notwithstanding great dangers attached to it, is widespread throughout Holland. Mass arrests by Nazi storm troopers for sabotage and disrespect shown to German authorities are frequent, as well as torture of prisoners in order to obtain information they allegedly hold back. Burgomasters refuse to check hostilities to Mussert and his Dutch Nazis, who are ridiculed, spat upon, slandered, pestered, and sneered at when they march through the towns. Seyss-Inquart, Hitler's Gauleiter for Holland, berated the Hollanders and threatened dire punishment for "dislocating administration machinery." He charged that Hollanders were not filling out correctly the various official forms. Incomplete and erroneous data is supplied. They write thousands and thousands of anonymous letters to befog officials. Thousands of senseless complaints are made. Wholesale and unnecessary visits are paid to officials to create administrative chaos and trouble. The Gauleiter admits that he is powerless against much of this form of sabotage.

Revenge societies are formed everywhere. A group selects a Dutch Nazi or an occupation trooper or officer. The victim is followed day and night by one of the local group. Eventually, during a black-out, the victim is found drowned in a canal.

Despite cruel and inhuman punishments visited upon priests, the Catholic church has forbidden the sacrament to Dutch Nazis. There is no burial in Catholic cemeteries for Nazis and the christening of children born of Dutch Nazis is barred.

Pictures of Queen Wilhelmina are forbidden. Her name must not be mentioned. But Dr. Arthur Seyss-Inquart and his cringing Dutch Nazis are often forestalled by natives, who christen their children after the Queen or after members of the royal family. Frequently the newly born are baptized Wilhelmina, Johanna, Beatrix, Irene, thus naming definitely all the living female members of the House of Orange.

To annoy the Nazis, Dutchmen express their loyalty to the House of Orange by sipping in public orangeade slowly and ostentatiously. Children on bicycles, when making a turn, put out their arm with the index and third fingers outstretched to form the victory "V."

The underground information service on behalf of the Allies is functioning with wellnigh uncanny efficiency in Holland, permitting R. A. F. fliers to score direct hits repeatedly on vital targets. Such grapevine intelligence, apparently carried out in most instances with secret radio sets, time and again has foiled German ruses designed to prevent the bombing of supply trains, supply depots, ammunition dumps, and other important objectives.

The Nazis, e. g., tried to circumvent the British air raiders by using hospitals as ammunition dumps and barracks. But the underground intelligence worked. R. A. F. flyers scored direct hits on the hospital, killing 200 German soldiers.

The Dutch are simple folk. They are great individualists. They cannot stomach that Austrian, Arthur Seyss-Inquart, sent to regiment them. Their violent tactics to free themselves from Hitler are just the same as their machinations to dethrone their oppressor, King Philip of Spain, centuries ago.

The crime of this age was the Nazi destruction by ruthless air bombardment of Amsterdam, in which 30,000 were decimated and 80,000 made homeless, 25,000 dwellings smashed to smithereens. The Dutch will not rest until Amsterdam is avenged.

The Crown Princess' husband is Prince Bernhard. He is very popular. Thousands of Dutchmen decided to celebrate his birthday, June 29, by wearing his favorite flower, a white carnation. The Nazis tried to snatch them away, ripped them from coat lapels. The canny Dutch then inserted needles and old razor blades in the flowers. The Nazis cut and lacerated their fingers. They boiled with rage, but were powerless.

Hitler may close Dutch schools and universities. He may fill all papers with propaganda and lies. He may broadcast Nazi speeches 24 hours a day. But he will never turn the Dutch into Nazis. He will never quench their indomitable spirit.

When a Nazi puts a question in German he gets no answer, although knowledge of German is widespread in Holland. When a German enters a cafe all Dutchmen leave. When the Dutch were forbidden to leave a cafe in a demonstrative way as soon as a German entered they all placed their watches in front of them and left exactly after a quarter of an hour. No Dutch girl will dance with a German. Little children run away from him. He is an outcast.

Dutchmen wear coins displaying the Queen's portrait. The Nazis Deutsche Zeitung called this a "silly demonstration of political lunatics." The next day the whole populace practically wore coins.

Every success of the Allies, every defeat of the Germans is translated into jokes that spread rapidly. They do much to keep up the spirits of the people and wear upon the nerves of the Nazis. Each time the R. A. F. bombed military targets of the Germans in Holland the Dutch papers were forced to report no damage had been done, "except that a few cows had been killed." After some time the Dutch whispered that Goebbels would shortly unveil the statue of the "unknown cow."

A lady was arrested for listening to the B. B. C.—British short wave. Unperturbed, she defended herself by saying: "After the fall of France Adolf Hitler announced he would soon speak over the British wireless from London. I was so afraid of missing this historical speech."

Food and clothing are rationed. In protest, a Dutchman walked into the streets of Amsterdam stark naked except for hat, stockings, and umbrella. He explained that the meager clothes allowed forced him to go naked. The Nazis were infuriated. The Dutch laughed. He was sent to a concentration camp for what the Nazis called impudence but for what the Dutch called courage.

In Schiedam a soldier was made drunk. The natives fixed a board on his back with the inscription: "Although I am a German dog, I may wear Orange on my back."

Such pranks recur daily. Mass punishment of the population only brings more reprisals against the Germans.

The Danes are suffering under the Nazi yoke. Economically, Hitler is plundering the country by making the Danes pay 450,000,000 kroner for Reich "protection." Denmark now owes the Reich 1,500,000,000 kroner because by Nazi hocus-pocus the National Bank of Denmark must finance German imports with unlimited credit. Unemployment, inflation, famine in a country of plenty are the portion of the Danes. They show resentment in many ways. Copenhagen University refuses to exchange its professors with Reich universities. Threat of padlocking is unavailing. It still refuses. On June 5, Denmark's Constitution Day, a crowd at a soccer game bombarded German soldiers with rocks and bottles.

When we took Greenland into our keeping, the Danes expressed their pleasure by wearing little Statue of Liberty insignia on their lapels. When the Nazis forbade display of such insignia, the Danes wore the emblem under their lapels.

In Denmark, where in normal times the ore is worth about a quarter of a cent, the newsboys now cry: "Papers. Eight ore's worth of lies, four ore's worth of advertisements." The cry of the newsboys, the letter says, sums up the Dane's opinion of the censored press.

In Copenhagen, a newsdealer displayed a textbook, English in Fifty Hours, under a poster saying: "Learn English before the Tommies arrive." Nazi occupation authorities made him take down book and poster. Next day the newsdealer displayed a new book, German in Fifty Hours, under a new sign: "Learn German before our friends the Germans depart."

In Yugoslavia, 80,000 Serbian men and women have been hanged or killed by firing squads. Most were members of the "Chetniks," a far-flung organization of patriotic Serbs, sworn to die rather than give in to the Nazis. They have been conducting a guerrilla warfare against their Nazi conquerors. Nazis are constantly being shot, stabbed, poisoned, and garroted. These guerrilla fighters operate in groups of 15 or 50. They are well equipped extremely mobile, and hide in the mountains and in the woods. The Nazis have tried to rebuild the destroyed railway from Belgrade to Salonika, but what is built during the day is destroyed at night. Despite the heavy toll of dead, the fight for freedom continues and will continue.

The Germans have warned that 100 Serbs will be killed for every German or Croat shot by the "Chetniks."

All over Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia signs appear chalked up on walls, bridges, and painted on rocks, "Tuka (Nazi gauleiter) is a traitor; bring back Benes." "Throw out the Hlinka Guards (storm troopers); Benes is coming back." Barge crews and dockmen prevented, by sabotage, transport of oil from Rumania to Germany. Hate of Hitler has united at last all Czechoslovakia.

The most incredible refinement of medieval torture have been employed against the people of Masaryk and Benes. Czechs and Slovaks have had their teeth broken, their faces mutilated—even their eyes put out—fingers broken, nails torn off. With bestial sadism, some of the Nazis attack and befoul Czech women. All these tortures have bred a resentment and revenge that grows daily. No terror can intimidate these peoples.

Small wonder the Nazi army of occupation is over 250,000, with legions of Gestapo agents.

The inhabitants of Louvain, in Belgium, have been ordered to examine their house fronts every morning and to wash off all inscriptions insulting to the Germans painted or chalked on them during the night.

At Roulers (West Flanders) the Germans are still offering rewards of 1,000 marks each for information regarding sabotage and the distribution of illegal pamphlets. As this shows them to be unable to discover the channels of distribution, the distributors are becoming bolder and more pamphlets than ever before are circulating.

At Malines acts of sabotage and the distribution of anti-German pamphlets have grown to such proportions that former Minister Bouchery and former Municipal Councilor Van Kesbeech have been arrested as hostages. A number of priests have also been arrested for helping in the systematic distribution of La Libre Belgique (paper of Belgium freedom).

And what of France? In Lille, 100 truckloads of ammunition and machines were ready to be sent to Germany. They blew up.

Unable to discover the saboteurs, the German authorities decided to punish workers by imposing a large cut in wages. A general strike ensued, and the Germans were forced to give in. At Chartres the telephone lines to the German-controlled airdrome were cut. For this a 15-year-old boy, who refused to give the names of his coworkers, received a sentence of death. There was a huge demonstration of protest, particularly by women. The local gauleiter, in fear of personal violence, was compelled to withdraw the sentence of death. The town of Nantes was fined 5 times, nearly a total of 9,000,000 francs, to pay for destruction of railroads, telephone lines, and factories. The Nazis offered huge rewards for the apprehension of the wreckers. The solidarity of the resentment against the Nazis was so great that not a single workman was caught. Not far from Marseilles 200 railway cars were filled with ammunition for Germany. The cars were suddenly blown up. This act of destruction was so systematically prepared that the German and French authorities were unable to point a finger of responsibility at anyone. There have been, up to date, over 100 cases of reported railroad sabotage. The warnings of Marshal Petain and Admiral Darlan are unavailing. There are all manner and kind of riots in Paris, despite the stern warnings of Heinrich von Stuelpnagel, the Reichfuehrer's military commander in France. In fact, the Nazis have turned Paris into an armed camp, with 20,000 boches patrolling its streets. Scores of night terrorists' courts have been set up to punish the brave French rioters. There is a veritable spread of arson in both occupied and unoccupied zones of France directed against arms plants and war industries under German control. Mystery fires have destroyed the Graff factories at Versailles and other Nazi-controlled plants in Lyons and many other places. Underground cells to create unrest and insurrection are springing up all over France. When R. A. F. bombers appear over parts of northern France, villagers crowd the streets and hail British aviators. Photographs of General De Gaulle, leader of the Free French movement, appear everywhere. His pictures, cut from the newspapers that have the temerity to print them, are framed and venerated by scores of thousands.

Sometimes the population of entire villages gather nightly in five or six houses that have receivers with strong enough reception to hear the B. B. C. short-wave broadcast. Threats of dire punishment are unavailing. The two great heroes of France today are General De Gaulle and President Roosevelt. On Armistice Day, last, the French were prohibited from covering war memorials with the tri-color. Instead they managed to secure red, white, and blue flowers and, despite the ban, the cemeteries and monuments were filled with flowers of these three shades. The heavy German propaganda is no match for French wit. Its lies are no longer believed, and mostly laughed at. In France the people read nothing but Swiss papers. They club together to buy the Journal de Geneve or Gazette de Lausanne.

In Paris it is not uncommon to see a German storm trooper with a piece of paper pinned on his back, "I am for De Gaulle." In Alsace the young people will march and shout "long live England." In the city of Thann the hinged cross, the hakenkreuze, that floated over the city, was taken down and burned. All Nazi strategems and reprisals to find the culprit were unavailing. In Alsace-Lorraine there is a motto in French, the translation of which is "hold tight—try to stay put—not to give place to those across the Rhine till that later day when we shall see them leave again." This slogan strikes a response in almost the entire population of Alsace-Lorraine and plagues and stuns the Nazi forces. A popular form of greeting is the word "elf," an abbreviation for "es lebe Frankreich." (France lives.)

Films shown may be French, but news reels are always German. When Hitler appears Parisians and Frenchmen in cities like Vichy, Lyons, Nimes, and Marseilles invariably hiss. When Mussolini appears they laugh. At a cinema in Paris one night these manifestations of ridicule and hate became so great that the local German kommandantur ordered the lights turned on. He then mounted the stage and said that the news reel would be repeated and at the slightest disorder one Frenchman would be taken from each row and he would—disappear. The lights were lowered, the film was rerun. When the theater was again lighted no Frenchman was to be seen. They had all left.

Paul Collette, who shot at Pierre Laval and Marcel Dent, Quislings of France, has now become a hero, like Pastor Niemöller in Germany.

This shooting symbolizes a new French Renaissance against brute Nazi force.

The French Chamber of Deputies, consigned to the dog house, has courageously emerged and defied Petain and Laval. Over 100 members under former Premier Herriot have met in rump session and denounced Vichy "collaboration."

In Paris all sorts of jokes are played on the Boches. Stickers are fastened to them, particularly where there is corporeal affluence. On these stickers is a notation, "Pig for sale—without food tickets." All over France posters by Goebbels against England are regularly torn down. Despite arrests and threats of execution, the destruction continues.

Letters smuggled out of France tell of rifles and cartridges and other instruments of war being stored in scores of towns and villages—for the eventful day.

In a town students posted signs with the following inscription: "Greece is hot; macaroni is cooked; long live General De Gaulle." In reprisal the town was condemned to 40 days without meat. Anti-Nazi demonstrations followed. The posters appeared in greater profusion. Additional punishments were unavailing. Wherever possible the cross of Lorraine takes the place of the crooked cross of the Nazis. Near St. Malo shopkeepers were ordered to display the picture of Admiral Darlan surrounded by French colors. One shopkeeper did so, but under the picture he placed a card marked "Sold."

The mass arrests and executions in France call to mind the terrible scenes from the Paris Commune of 1871 and the reign of terror of a century and a half ago. The new reign of terror speaks volumes for the unrest and native resistance against Hitler throughout France. The very word "collaboration" is now anathema. Blaming all the sabotage upon the Jews and/or Communists "won't wash." That trick does not work any more. Hitler has slain too many Banquos, whose ghosts now arise to plague him.

The R. A. F. pounds German and Italian military objectives throughout Greece. Yet no air-raid alarms are sounded. Asked for a reason, a German officer said frankly: "Sound the sirens? Why, we'd have all Athens on the rooftops whooping and yelling and waving handkerchiefs to the British airmen." Little Greek lads follow the Italian Bersaglieri and beg them for feathers from their hats. Usually crowds of their elders urge the lads to pester the Italians to "pluck their feathers."

There are thousands of Greek snipers or "swamp foxes," not unlike those commanded by Francis Marion during our Revolutionary War. "Swamp foxes" acquired their name, you may remember, by their habit of hiding in swamps and suddenly striking out to harass enemy troops and supplies. These patriotic Greek guerillas snoop out of wooded river banks and caverns and make life miserable for the I alians.

The intense spirit of resistance is typified by the Greek soldier who tore down the Nazi flag from atop the Acropolis and hoisted in its place the Greek light blue and white banner. When ordered by the German commander to tear down the Greek flag he took it down gently, wrapped it around his body, and leaped to death on the rocks far below. Frequently the Greeks show their hatred of the German by risking their lives by smearing with mud and mire the swastika hung on the Acropolis.

The most tortured nation is Poland, where many thousands have been machine-gunned and gassed—murdered for what the Nazis call eugenics—the Poles being a lowly, inferior race, according to the Nazis. Mass executions have claimed more lives than did the Polish-German War. The thirst for revenge is thus most ravishing and insatiable. Two-thirds of the German obituary notices in the newspaper are of the Gestapo and Nazi occupational officers—dark work with knife and gun. More than 2,000 clandestine groups have organized to carry on ceaseless opposition to the Nazi war machine. So vigorous is anti-swastika sabotage that Hitler must keep 37 divisions, or 555,000 Boches in Poland.

The "V" campaign started by the British made its appearance first in France, where Frenchmen chalked the "V" everywhere for final victoire, much to the chagrin and discomfiture of the Nazis. The idea soon spread like wildfire across all frontiers. It has become the tocsin for British victory.

In Prague the "V" appears on walls, in movies, on streetcars, busses, and trains. The Victory slogan repeatedly meets the eye in Cracow, Warsaw, Copenhagen, Antwerp, Vichy, Oslo, Athens, Belgrade—in short, everywhere Nazi troops are found.

The Morse Code for "V" is three dots and one dash. The opening bar of Beethoven's fifth symphony is a series of three short notes followed by one long note, corresponding in rhythm with the Morse "V"—three dots and one dash. Thus the oppressed of Europe soon learned to play, sing, or whistle and tap on counters and glasses the now famous "V."

Propaganda Minister Dr. Joseph Goebbels, irked by the devastating effect of the "V" nerve war claimed the "V" idea as his own. He clumsily spread a counterfeit propaganda and proclaimed "V" meant "viktoria" or German victory. He was laughed at. He dismally failed. The "V" is painted, chalked, splashed, printed, played, sung, whistled, and tapped with increasing profusion and intensity. By July 21 last there were over 6,200 "V" prosecutions by the Nazis in Paris alone. "V" in France has become a great counter-offensive against "collaboration" with Hitler. "V" may, we hope, become a handwriting on the wall, as at Belshazzar's feast.

The British Library of Information, in its bulletin dated August 6 last, says:

"According to a report received in Basle from Germany on July 21, a Nazi training plane which crashed into a village in south Germany recently, killing pilot and student, and injuring several villagers, was found to have the letter 'V,' democratic victory symbol, painted in red on the engine casing. The accident was said to be only one of many mishaps to training planes which have brought death to more than 200 pilots and student fliers within the past 3 months. The Nazi authorities were said to have laid this long list of accidents to sabotage in factories in occupied France which are making plane parts for the Reich. Three of the French factories, Hispano, Gnome-Rhône and Salmson, which were recently reequipped by the Germans and put into commission are under Gestapo scrutiny for sabotage. To date, however, the Nazis have failed to track down the saboteurs and the accidents to training planes continue. The Oslo correspondent of the Neue Zürcher Zeitung reports 'practically everybody' wore the 'V' sign during the week-end. The Bremen radio admitted that during the last few days newspapers, flags, railway carriages, motor cars, and walls, almost everywhere in Europe, have carried the letter 'V'."

The "V" nerve war is not unlike the slogans and catch phrases used in many wars. We are reminded of "Liberty, equality, and fraternity" which ushered in the French Revolution. During our Revolutionary War we used "Taxation without representation is tyranny." We defeated the Barbary pirates with "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

Others were "R· ·mber the Alamo" during our War with Mexico, "Remember the Maine" during the Spanish-American War, "Over the top" and "Lafayette, we are here" during the first World War.

Bismarck, whom Hitler emulates, frequently instigated insurrection against his "blood and iron" rule.

His troops, like Nazi troops in Greece, in Holland, in Norway, were fired upon from roofs. Those who could not get arms assaulted the loyal troops with whatever they could lay their hands on. Tiles were torn off houses and paving stones were carried to the roofs in baskets, later to be hurled at the German troopers. So it is today. History repeats itself.

Napoleon, like Caesar and Alexander before him, was well aware of the resistance, active and passive, of the people he conquered. He recognized the force of sabotage when he said, "Bayonets are effective weapons, but they are not so good to sit on." In fact, sabotage is a word of French origin. Sabot means wooden shoe in French. Frenchmen, arising in wrath and rebellion, often threw their sabots into machinery to wreck it—hence the word "sabotage," to resist by destroying.

The predecessor dictator of Hitler, Kaiser Wilhelm II, feared an untimely end by assassination, just as Hitler does today. He, too, ruled with merciless rigor. He incurred the everlasting hatred of his victims. He proclaimed, e. g., all Social Democrats enemies of his empire and ordered his young recruits assembled at Potsdam, if necessary, to shoot down in the streets said Social Democrats even if they were "your relatives, brother, and even parents. * * * You must obey my orders without a murmur."

How like Hitler speaking. Neither he, nor the Hohenzollerns before him, successfully stifled revolt against their tyranny. Already in the Reich there are portents of revolt.

All is not quiet and well there. There is great discontent.

There is much complaining and unrest within the German Army itself, reports returning traveler from Germany. The German people, rationed almost to nakedness and starvation, surfeited with endless propaganda, tired of "heiling" and kowtowing to officers, weary of enforced listening over the radio for hours at end to military bands and speeches about lebensraum (living space) and about macht und erde (power and earth), heartsick over the daily trainloads of wounded streaming in the cities from the Russo-German front—they are becoming disillusioned and suspicious.

The Atlantic charter of Churchill and Roosevelt, the insistent R. A. F. bombings have given them something to ponder over. The future does not look so rosy. They have grown to disbelieve most of the communiques of that runt, Goebbels, and of even the German high command.

They were not impressed with the show that Hitler and Mussolini put on at the Russian front. They realized it was a weak imitation of the Roosevelt-Churchill meeting at sea. It was "ersatz," like their coffee. The Germans have the jitters.

Seditious leaflets thrown on the pavement or stuck on house fronts, have lately made their appearance in Berlin. They are generally in doggerel rhyme. One of the most popular runs:

"Wir wollen Keinen Krieg (we want no war).

"Wir wollen Keinen Sieg (we want no victory).

"Wir wollen Keine Eiche (we want no honors).

"Wir wollen Hitler's Leiche (we want Hitler's corpse)."

Gauleiter Mutschmann, of Saxony, to put a good face on the tobacco shortage prior to the supply brought in and stolen from the Balkans, had placards posted up: "A good German does not smoke in public." The next morning the text had received an additional sentence. It said, " A good German does not fly to Scotland."

Hitler annihilates daily hundreds of those who refuse to bear his yoke. Yet for every one he shoots scores of others take the place of the martyred ones in plotting riot and revenge against him.

The behavior of the oppressed is no different today against Hitler and Mussolini than it was against Frederick the Great, Hannibal, Xerxes, Augustus, and Caesar. Then as now arson, assassination, riots, strikes, and insurrection were and are the most effective weapons.

The rule of force of dictators always engenders a reaction of subdued fires of hate with embers always ready at opportune time to leap to flame.

Farms for City Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a very constructive editorial appearing in the Boston Post, entitled "Farms for City Men," which is worthy of profound consideration, and of legislative action:

[From the Boston Post of September 22, 1941]

FARMS FOR CITY MEN

A peculiar set of modern circumstances conspire today to make a genuine back-to-the-land movement opportune.

But, things being what they are, little is being done about the movement by local, State, or Government agencies.

Our Federal Government has proclaimed it desirable that the movement be stimulated. America was a better balanced country when most of its population was on the land.

Financial storms are weathered better on small farms than elsewhere. The man who can raise his own provender, or a large part of it, not only does not need to worry so much about depressions but he actually does not worry.

The large farms, which are almost like industries in themselves, are hit by depressions like any other large industries. They are troubled with labor and mortgage and loan involvements. But the little farms, such as we commonly have in New England, are the greatest buffers against money troubles and governmental idiocies ever conceived.

New England is a section where large cities are not far by rail or automobile from the deep countryside. Many of our city people have come to the cities from New England farms.

Therefore, with a war boom on and ready cash gradually getting into the hands of urban dwellers, the thought has come to many of them that this would be a good time to sink a couple of thousand dollars in a farm within 2 or 3 hours' driving distance.

Supposing the war boom lasts 3 years, with shipyards and factories giving regular employment.

In that time a man could earn enough money to buy a small farm outright. In this period he could visit it regularly by automobile to ready it and keep it from falling into irreparable disuse.

At the end of the boom he would not be absolutely helpless if a violent depression strikes.

He would not see his savings go for living purposes and finally have to go on relief.

He would have his house and this piece of land on which he could live nicely, with a reasonable amount of labor, and in addition he would be drawing from our historic soil the spirit of independence which is the mark of a free American.

The small towns throughout the countryside would benefit, for hundreds of their unused farms would go back on the tax lists and new blood would enter their communities.

The city workers should benefit in health, just as the rich men do when they retire to their estates and country acres. The buffer to widespread financial panic should be tremendous. The mills and factories could close right and left, but the provident worker would not have to worry.

Government agencies do not provide any system so that a thrifty city man or industrial worker can strike out now into the country and buy himself a home for himself and his heirs and assigns forever.

Banks are reluctant to adopt any system to encourage this sort of buying. Some Government agency should be set up immediately to make the back-to-the-land movement a simple and speedy affair, and this is the time to do it.

It Is Time for a Show-down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 22, 1941

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] needs no defender or interpreter. He is perfectly competent to take care of himself, and anybody who tries to tell us what the gentleman from Illinois means by what he says might save a lot of time by stating that Mr. DIRKSEN says just what he means. If there is any Member of the House who can competently speak more fluently, eloquently, or effectively, I have yet to hear him.

You had better read his speech if you did not hear it.

NO DELUSIONS

I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] almost 100 percent. I labor under no delusions in undertaking to go a bit further than the gentleman from Illinois went, for there are those who are so convinced that no good whatever can come out of the White House or from Mr. Willkie that it is really no use to try to convince them otherwise or to

tell them that the time has come for them either to cut bait or to fish.

It seems to me that Senator CAPPER, of Kansas, has about the right idea as to what he and all of us should do when he says:

By taking the action he told us about, the Commander in Chief ordered the Army and Navy to clear the seas of all German and Italian war vessels they can find.

Whether, under our Constitution and traditions and way of life, the President should have consulted with and advised the Congress before taking this fateful step was the President's to decide. He decided not to do so. He cast the die himself. For weal or woe, the United States and the people of the United States are involved to whatever extent President Roosevelt has gone to implement his policy of national defense.

My own position is simply this:

For myself, I will support the national-defense program, as I have been doing. The United States must be kept a free and independent and powerful nation at all costs. The President having acted, the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States must and will support that action. There is no other course of action open to us.

NOW FOR A SHOW-DOWN

There must be a show-down. We have a right to know whether or not those directing the policies of the parties are going to continue to permit disunity, lack of harmony, and demoralization of defense by the extension of a political, partisan feud which results in inability to unite all factions for the common defense.

Is the defense program to be "damned with faint praise," stalled, defeated, abandoned because of the lukewarm attitude of the leadership, or are we going to get behind the one and only foreign policy and program, for there can be but one, which shall insure our adequate defense?

As Commander in Chief, the President assumes a tremendous responsibility. He has discharged it efficiently, in the main, despite the attempts of many to destroy popular confidence in him and in the foreign-policy program. These people have contributed no little to the situations of which they complain. They have confused and frightened the people, disturbed the morale of the men in the Army and Navy, and encouraged our enemies to believe that there could be no such thing as unity of policy in a democracy.

TOO BAD BUT TOO TRUE

It is time to ask these people, as Walter Lippmann suggested—

Whether they are in fact in favor of arming the United States, and, if they are, what effort they have ever made in these past 3 critical years to see to it that the United States had a great navy, a large air force, and an adequate army.

Mr. Lippmann goes on to say:

They go about saying that they favor national defense; but when, for example, did Mr. Hoover or Mr. WHEELER advocate in advance any important defense measure, or use his influence to get one enacted? Have they not been either ominously silent or openly opposed, while others, Republicans and Democrats alike, were struggling to plan, enact, and administer the defense program?

It will then be in order to ask them whether, in opposing effective support of Britain and China, after failing to commit themselves to the arming of the United States, they will, if Britain and China fall, continue to give even nominal support to the arming of the United States. If, with the Axis and Japan held at bay by the heroic resistance of the British and the Chinese and the Russians, they give no positive support to the American defense program, what will they advise the country to do if they succeed in paralyzing its support to Britain, China, and Russia, and if they compel it to stand alone against a victorious alliance of Germany and Japan?

Will they, if they manage to get America entirely isolated and encircled, advise us to continue arming for defense, or will they then advise us to reduce the appropriations, repeal conscription, demobilize, and disarm? If, as they now profess, they favor an impregnable defense, what will they do if the totalitarian victors demand that we disarm or prepare to fight? For, surely, they cannot be so infantile as to imagine that if Germany and Japan conquer all opposition in Europe and Asia, the victors will then sit quietly by and let the United States produce the greatest naval and aerial power on earth.

So when we come to the show-down with the opposition we shall need to know whether, when they have isolated the United States, they intend to disarm and surrender, or to arm and resist.

And these are only a few of the questions that they will be asked, and should be.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE THINK

Do you know what the great majority of American people are thinking today? Obviously too few understand what a tremendous tidal wave of popular opinion is in the making. The people think, as evidenced by what my friend the Honorable W. Arthur Simpson said in his Patterns for Tomorrow, that

To be an isolationist is the easy way of life. Of course, we do not want to shed American blood. All the sympathy is on the side of America first. None of the little nations of Europe wanted war but today they are chained to the chariot of the conqueror. They hung separately because they would not hang together.

With the fall of Denmark, Norway, and Holland, and the encirclement of Sweden there perished the finest cooperative society in the world, the finest forms of social security, the finest types of health insurance, and the ideals of great peace-loving peoples. Finland has no heart in the struggle except to regain and preserve its own territories. Rumania does not want to fight for Nazi overlords and the good Italian peasants have no desire to perish on the steppes or in the marshes of Russia.

* * * * *

The wishful thinking of really sincere men and women and the skillful maneuvering of politicians who are afraid to face facts or fear loss of votes have little validity in the face of grim realities which must be faced without soft concealment. Liberty is fighting for its life.

The people know we are at war even if there are those who still think Hitler's intentions to embrace this hemisphere are honorable. He is a murderous fiend and a national rapist without any good intentions. We should do nothing to aid him in the slightest degree to accomplish his purpose to ravage the world.

WORLD FIRE OF WAR

However, the fact that the world fire of war was set by an incendiarist, a warmad lunatic, still at large, seems to make no impression upon those who, while they cry loudly that if their house be endangered they will unite to help put out the blaze, yet do everything in their power to hinder and to distract the firemen who are attempting to check the carnage before it reaches us. Their misguided attempts to check the ravaging flames of war by hurling their rhetorical bombs of dynamite and combustible hot air at the firemen and into the flames reflect no credit on them. Those who in days to come will coldbloodedly write the history of these times will make very plain that fact. It needs no prophet to make such an indisputable prediction.

EAT THEIR WORDS

There is another thing I want to talk about, and it does not take a seventh son of a seventh son to make this prophecy. Some of the disappointed, jealous, defeated office holders or seekers and some of the Members of Congress, who have been so vociferously vocal, privately and publicly, and who have taken every opportunity to denounce and to criticize the statesmanlike attitude of the titular leader of the Republican Party, the Honorable Wendell Willkie, will have to eat their words eventually. The position he has taken with respect to supporting the foreign policy of the President is impregnable. Moreover, it is approved by an overwhelming majority of the people. That is a sufficient defense against such attacks as have been made against him on this floor and elsewhere, were any such defense needed—which it is not.

However, to ignore such attacks might lead some to think that all of us are in agreement with them. We are not.

That these people have a right to do and to say what they please, I grant, but that does not make it right for them to do it; and I must not be counted as submitting to their pronouncements because up to date I have not publicly said I did not go along with them. My votes would indicate that fact, however.

It is going to be a rude awakening that will be theirs eventually. You just cannot get away with a continued attempt to hamstring defense under the guise of political patriotism. It never has worked. The wastebasket of the world is filled with the names and the speeches of those who in days gone have undertaken to do it.

I AM NO MOSES

Mr. Speaker, I am no Moses. It is not up to me to lead the Republican Party out of the wilderness. Nobody has asked me to do it. Nevertheless, I am the sole Representative of the only consistently Republican State in the Union, and as such I assert my right to be heard.

Recognizing the fact that there cannot successfully be two foreign policies followed by the United States, my State of Vermont has, almost unanimously, voted and voiced its determination, by its legislature assembled, to support the foreign policies announced by President Roosevelt.

This fact is significant. The people of Vermont are realists, believing in free speech and inclined to feel that abuse of that freedom is just as conducive to disunity in these days as would be any restriction of its use. Moreover, they pay little if any attention to the vaporings of that self-appointed, if not anointed, group of apostles of isolationism, nor do they heed those who see fit to take

advantage of the situation to vent their spite and voice their spleen of pet peeves against Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie.

VERMONT KNOWS

Up in Vermont we know that war is coming closer and closer every day. To us this means that there will be no A. E. F. We shall need our manpower here in order to defend ourselves. That is the answer.

We were not born yesterday. We look askance at the straw men these opponents of the program for defense and to insure the freedom of the seas are setting up to knock down for their own personal, political, and publicity purposes.

We are not too much disturbed, yet we view with alarm the attempts of these people to play politics with national defense. We disavow utterly and completely the right of these people to undertake to brand the Republican Party as opponents of national defense or of the President's policies, which are ours. They are in the wrong pew.

We have but little time to spend listening to or considering what these straddlers or "if and wheners" have to offer. We are of the opinion that the time has come for a show-down and that the sheep should be separated from the goats. We do not propose to be the goats.

We have a place where we think all those who are breeding disunity and discord ought to go. If they want to talk, let them accept and assume full responsibility for what they say, as individuals, and not as persons speaking for or under the banner of the Republican Party. They certainly do not represent the Republicans of this land, 80 to 90 percent of whom, though opposed to the New Deal and its mal- and mis-administration of internal affairs, are, nevertheless, 100 percent American, for the Constitution and for constitutional government, and, therefore, are back of the policies announced by the President and confirmed by the Congress.

APOSTLES OF DISUNITY

These apostles of disunity seem to get a lot of fun out of the fact that, as they say, "Vermont declared war against Germany." Let me tell them, as Molly does Fibber, " 'Tain't funny."

A WASTE OF TIME

It is a waste of time to undertake to talk to such egocentrics, although the history of the world is filled with stories that parallel the experiences of these days. There always have been and there always will be those theorists, egocentrics, world-saver pseudo-patriots (for their intentions are good) who, had their efforts been directed along proper channels, might have made a record for themselves than which none could be finer or better. However, because of mental aberrations, for which they possibly should not be held responsible, they have always fought windmills and furnished the hot air with which to disturb the atmospheric political currents. Except for giving them credit for being patriotic, though crazy, we might as well ignore them as they have been ignored, largely.

VERMONTERS ARE REALISTS

As I say, Vermonters are realists. To us it is not so much a matter of concern as to who got us into the war or how we got into it. We are in it. We know that Hitler's plan of world domination involves this continent, for he has told us so. These are facts. They cannot be beaten down.

Those of the Republican Party who have repeatedly talked for but voted against national defense, and who have assured us that they would be for national defense "if and when, and so forth and so forth," and who have been motivated by petty spite or petty peeve, have bred discontent and prevented unity and are laying up wrath against the day of wrath and against a day of reckoning which is as sure to come as is the sun to rise and set. The people cannot be fooled all the time.

THE REPUBLICANS OF THE NATION RESENT

The fact is that the Republican Party, en masse, country-wide, is against this group, and is against their attempt to brand it—the party—as opposed to national defense.

Now, no Member of Congress has been more active or more vociferous in his denunciation of the New Deal policies, internal and economic, than have I. The record bears out this statement. I have tried ineffectually to make the people understand where they were headed and which way they were going. I challenge anybody to match my persistent opposition to the administration's policies and its paternalistic inclinations.

However, this is a different proposition. We are at war. What profit is there in trying to tell the people we have been led into it? They know better. They have ears and eyes and brains. They know the Hitler program involves all of us, and them.

Those who profess to believe otherwise talk to empty seats or empty heads. They do the Republican Party at large a disservice by seeking to make it appear that the party is opposed to the foreign policies of the President. They straddle and wiggle and talk about coming down off the fence if and when they can decide on which side to jump and whether or not we are at war. They make a lot of noise. They get a lot of publicity.

WE ARE AT WAR

We are at war.

Of course, the people of this country are opposed to war and are opposed to an A. E. F. Why talk about it? What these good friends of mine neglect to appreciate is that the people are just as much opposed to all their attempts to play politics. The people are determined to defend themselves, to maintain this form of government, to preserve and conserve their blood-bought liberties.

Every day these misguided patriots spend trying to find some limb on which to hang themselves and those who are supporting the President's foreign policy, is just so much wasted time on their part. Every day the war comes closer and closer and knocks their theories galley-west. Every day, what these people say becomes more and more silly, inspired as it evidently is by their desire to talk while the opportunity for talking is good. That is that, and that is the truth. Forgive me.

The State of Vermont proposes, and I as its Representative shall undertake, to support the foreign policy of the President, the Commander in Chief under the Constitution. That is the only thing to do in order that constitutional government, about which these people talk so much, can be continued and our democratic form of government maintained.

TIME FOR A SHOW-DOWN

It is time for a show-down. It is high time for somebody to say something lest silence be assumed to be an assent to the remarks of the rabble rousers. I have spoken and have no wrong ideas as to the reaction that my colleagues will accord this speech.

"Thus endeth the first lesson."

Do not get the wrong idea. Do not be mistaken. I am laboring under no impression that it is up to me to lecture my fellow Members, nor am I trying to spank anybody, or to force my conclusions on anybody. Far be it from me to undertake to do that.

I am only asserting my constitutional right to say what I believe.

But do not fool yourselves. I am not talking for the fun of it. I am convinced that it is my duty to make this speech. And, believe it or not, I deliberated for a long time before reaching that conclusion. Then, before deciding to stick my neck out, I had access to a very careful survey of the country and a more careful study of the political situation, Nationwide, in order to get the picture as the people see it.

I have told the story in my own words, but I am assuming to speak for uncounted millions of real Republicans and Americans who do not propose to do otherwise than to defend themselves, maintain constitutional government—and that now—and who are determined that the good name and wonderful record of the Republican Party shall not be impugned by the has-beens or would-be's who presume or assume, unwarrantedly, to speak, as leaders, for the rank and file of the Republican Party. They do not speak for me, or them, or it.

I am making this speech on my own responsibility, but with the conviction that it is high time somebody on our side of the aisle let the world know that we could, and can, and will, in time of national emergency, as of today and as heretofore, rise above partisanship and prejudice and vigorously contribute to that unity without which we as a democracy are sunk with lost Atlantis.

Address by the Postmaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. FRANK C. WALKER AT ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the address deliv-

ered by the Honorable Frank C. Walker, Postmaster General, at the annual convention of the National Association of Postmasters held at Boston, Mass., on September 18, last. It is a very learned discourse, and I think all will be interested in reading it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is good to be in Boston this evening to meet with the members of the National Association of Postmasters assembled here for their annual national convention.

It is particularly appropriate that the postmasters are met in Boston for perhaps no other community in the United States is so steeped in postal tradition.

It was here in Boston that the first post office in America was established away back in 1639, when the Massachusetts General Court designated the house of Richard Fairbanks "as the place appointed for all letters which are brought from beyond the seas, or which are to be sent thither."

Years later, when a colonial postal system was laid out along the Atlantic seaboard, there was inaugurated a post route service by couriers on horseback between Boston and New York. This famous old post route, today knwn as the Boston Post Road, was the real beginning of the overland mail service in this country.

Here in Boston, at what is now 17 Milk Street, was born Benjamin Franklin, later to become first Postmaster General under the Continental Congress; and a native of Boston, Samuel Osgood was selected as the first Postmaster General under the Constitution.

In those days the important function of the Postal Establishment was the carrying of the mail, but since that time other functions have been given to us, functions which the public expects to see conducted as expeditiously, efficiently, and economically as modern-day invention, operating procedure, and organization will allow, and in keeping with the finest traditions of the Postal Service.

But the execution of our present functions is not a simple matter because for each of the many services we perform for the public there are thousands of technical and complicated problems which must be solved. These problems, both in the field and in the Department, are becoming of increasing complexity because of modern business and social life and the demands of the public for speed.

There are few households in the country, and certainly no business, which do not in some degree depend upon the Postal Service. Postal administration must be sensitive to local and temporary changes. If a new factory is constructed, if a new army camp is built, if a new community comes into being, the Postal Establishment must be ready to provide service.

It must prepare for special events such as Christmas, great industrial fairs and expositions, great conventions, vast public gatherings, and similar events, all of which demand special services. For none of these events, as the public has learned by experience, do we interrupt our normal and usual service.

Great emergencies and unforeseen events such as floods, droughts, fires, wrecks, which dislocate the ordinary service, create their own necessities, which the public expects us to meet efficiently and quickly. For instance, the induction and enlistment of hundreds of thousands of Americans in our military and naval service, the creation of new army camps and posts, and the transfers of the military forces to and from various camps and in the course of maneuvers created a mail problem that had to be met promptly and effectively. Many thousands of these young men inducted into the military service have left home for the first time. In order that they maintain the bond with their homes, their relatives, and their friends, it is most important that they receive the best possible mail service, as the maintenance of this bond of communication has a vital effect upon the morale of these young men. With the cooperation of the War and Navy Departments, we are today providing the boys in the camps and at sea with mail service the equal of that which they received back home.

I cannot impress too strongly upon our postmasters the necessity of constant vigilance so that we may continue to provide the best and the most expeditious mail service possible to those in the naval and military service.

In addition to our regular service and meeting emergency conditions, special tasks are given us from time to time because the Government and the public have come to expect that the Postal Establishment can do a job and do it well. Recently we have received the special assignment of distributing and selling throughout the Nation defense postal savings stamps and series E defense bonds. This task, in and of itself, is one of first magnitude. To finance the defense needs of our Nation and thus insure our national security in this chaotic world the full assistance of every American is needed.

After considerable planning, in consultation with postmasters, departmental officials of our own and other agencies of the Government, and postal employee organizations, a comprehensive program has been developed.

This program, which will soon come to the postmasters of the Nation for action, will require wholehearted and enthusiastic service by every postmaster and post-office employee. I am confident that we can—and we will—inspire the Nation by the excellence of our performance in providing this important service to national defense. Yet with it all, in keeping with our fine traditions, the regular and usual post-office service to the public will be continued unimpaired.

Effective execution of our regular duties, our special assignments, and meeting of emergencies combine to make the management of the postal business a most complex undertaking.

Our business is sensitive not only to the economic state of the country, with its peaks and valleys, but also to the fortunes of particular localities. Every general improvement in the business of the country is reflected by rising business in the Postal Establishment, and every decline in the prosperity is stated by lowering postal revenues. We are a fine barometer of general business.

Because of the general over-all growth and prosperity of our Nation, the Postal Establishment is now one of the largest single businesses in this country, if, indeed, it is not the largest in the world. It provides employment for more than 300,000 persons. Each year it handles, through some 44,000 post offices, more than 27,000,000,000 pieces of mail, weighing some 6,000,000,000 pounds, a city block of mail a mile and a third high.

We are a far-flung organization. Every day and night trains and planes carrying mail go to the four corners of the United States. Thousands of mail trucks circulate between post offices and the thousands of carriers who are going their way from village to village, house to house. Service to the ports and airfields link the Postal Establishment to every village in the civilized world.

We in the Postal Service manage and operate a Nation-wide savings-bank system with resources of over $1,300,000,000. Through the money-order system each year we issue, and later pay out, more than 250,000,000 separate money orders. The Postal Establishment as a whole during a year handles more than $8,000,000,000 in cash.

There are vast numbers of special-service transactions each year. Through post offices 55,000,000 registries are made, 80,000,000 insurance transactions are completed, we make 35,000,000 C. O. D. collections, and we execute 96,000,000 special deliveries.

Of these services the public has long known. However, it has been little aware of the problems behind the familiar everyday business of the Postal Service. But in the past few years the public has shown itself ready in many ways to interest itself in its own business, and one of the public's largest operations is the Postal Establishment.

Although it is a business, yet it differs from a commercial business, for a commercial business must constantly seek out and constantly entice its customers and the public to trade with it. The public, however, has ordered the Postal Establishment by law to have available and in constant readiness its services to any and every person who chooses to use its fine conveniences.

Our responsibility is to the public; it is not merely a responsibility to some private individuals. Our organization, our methods of operation, and our procedures must be such as will insure the continuity of service and the stability and efficiency of our operations.

Another important difference is found in the matter of economy. In private business the results of extravagance may affect a small group of employees, a small group of investors, or a small group of stockholders. Extravagance or imprudent management of the Postal Establishment—indeed, of any post office—affects every single man, woman, and child in the United States, for each and every one of them are taxpayers.

If inefficiency is allowed to creep into our operations, if economies are not practiced, the public, slowly but nonetheless surely, becomes willing to support drastic changes.

Public criticism, which is an outside check on extravagance, is slow to rise. No department of government should conduct itself so as to merit public criticism.

I have heard it argued that while management of private business has to justify its stewardship to its stockholders, no such spur exists in the case of the Postal Establishment. Furthermore, it is argued that the necessity of maintaining a particular company's business in the face of outside competition and the requirement of earning a dividend that will satisfy the stockholders is an incentive to efficiency which is absent in the case of the Postal Service. It is therefore argued that an organization running a business without stockholders, and performing its prime function without competition, will lack the spirit of progress.

I sincerely feel that the Postal Service is progressive. The glorious reputation of the Service, the many conveniences we have for the use of the public, did not come by mere accident or ordinary voluntary growth. They came because thousands of employees, hundreds of postmasters, dozens of officials, inspired by love for the Service, have studied public needs, worked out practical procedures to handle those needs, and have done their work well.

The Postal Service always has been and still is evolutionary. Our last service for the public has not been inaugurated; our work is not one simply of refinement of method of operating present conveniences. The public expects that we shall improve and extend conveniences for its benefit.

As we review our history, we are mindful of the fact that in the main the public has been a good employer. While it has not been lavish in its treatment, the public, through the years, has seen to it that we employees in the Postal Service have been fairly and honorably treated.

To conduct this business for the public we have been permitted a generous personnel. For new tasks and assignments additional employees have been provided. Furthermore, in improving working conditions for us in the Postal Service, such as reducing hours, the public has further authorized additional employees.

As we review the various acts of Congress, many of them passed during this administration, we appreciate that we have been favored in our working conditions.

We have, in common with other governmental departments, provision for retirement

both for age and disability, and benefits for injury or death in the course of employment. In common with other Federal employees we have provisions for annual vacation and sick leave; provisions for grade to grade, administrative and automatic or successive promotions. We are establishing machinery whereby employees may appeal from administrative action in respect of assignment, ratings, and classification.

But in addition generally in our service we have a 40-hour week. We have a workday limit of 8 hours in 10. We have payment for overtime. We have provision for compensatory time. We have a night differential. We have security of tenure in the Postal Service, and recognize the principle of seniority.

Each of these is a charge on the public in two ways, one, in the charge to each customer of the Postal Service, and two, the charge to the general taxpayers of the country. These two charges have been paid with little resentment because the postal services are services that the public wants.

However, because the public has ordered, and is presently paying for the various conveniences provided by the Postal Establishment, and because there is no particular clamor about it, it does not necessarily mean that further important postal-service improvements are not possible. Nor does the fact that the public is satisfied to a large extent with our services mean that we are not expected to continually and constantly make more efficient and economical the conduct of our business.

This is the fifth successive year in which postal revenues have reached record highs. A year ago our revenues reached the then unheard of total of $767,000,000, but it was apparent with the defense program getting into full swing with the accompanying boom in business and industry that the peak had not been reached. This past year postal revenues and volume were the highest in history. Preliminary figures indicate that never before has there been such a volume of mail of all types and classes moving through the post offices of the land. This was reflected in postal revenues for that period which for the first time reached the peak sum of approximately $812,000,000.

This means that the public has placed with us the greatest volume of orders we have ever received. However, unlike a commercial business, we cannot place our increased orders from the public on the shelf and thus build up a backlog of orders to await the time when with existing plant facilities and personnel we may finally make delivery on the orders. Neither can we, like a commercial business, in slack times build up a stock pile of our wares, so that in periods like the present we can fill orders from an inventory built up when our orders did not keep existing plant and facilities fully occupied.

We must fill the orders as each one of them is placed. We must carry the mail now. We must provide the service when the public wants it in whatever amount or volume it wishes.

It is for these reasons that increased postal revenues actually require increased postal expenditures. We should conduct the affairs of the Postal Service in such a manner as to be in a position to cushion ourselves for the decline in postal revenue and volume, that is certain to be felt some time in the future.

You postmasters must keep these facts in mind at all times, and you should be guided by this outlook in considering your requirements from the budget of the Post Office Department.

We have only to look back at the recent history of the Post Office Department to see what happened when the Department expanded its forces at the peak of the postwar boom in the late 1920's.

You know of that experience. When postal volume, and particularly postal income, dropped sharply with the corresponding curtailment in business and industrial activity in the early 1930's, the burden fell on the postal personnel.

We must guard against that today. We must look at the current business increase throughout the Postal Service not only in terms of today, but in terms of future years when postal income is bound to drop with the end of great national-defense outlays.

I do not suggest that no new postal extensions, or services will be authorized at this time, but I do say that it is the patriotic duty of every postmaster to determine the absolute necessity of each such addition on the basis of a definite long-range need of the Postal Service and the public.

In view of the vast sums that represent postal expenditures, the public has the right to require us to seek constantly to control our expenditures and reduce them.

To fulfill our public trust, we must constantly scrutinize every service. We must take pains to ascertain how our various conveniences can be adapted and improved, and what services are needed to fit more closely the needs of business and social life. We must better evaluate new postal proposals and constantly seek out more efficient methods. We must search for ways and means to simplify procedure and eliminate records, reports, and forms that have become outmoded. We must seek better and more accurate information as to costs, seek possible reductions of costs and yet retain and increase efficiency in operations.

The need for financial studies and investigations of the various services of the Postal Establishment is therefore a continuing one.

I should like to see us more and more bring to the notice of the public the many post-office facilities which individuals and business could use more fully to their own advantage, but which are often unknown. I should like to see rules, regulations, orders, and instructions which guide the postmasters in their day-to-day duties simplified and written in plain language. Some of our rules lack clarity, many are outdated, many require amendment and modification. I should like to see a more widespread establishment of our own schools of instruction for post-office personnel so that we may all the better understand operating and financial procedures.

As we go forward with our work I am hopeful that in the time to come there can be devised a practical and effective plan whereby there are provided more opportunities for postmasters to come in touch with officials of the Department so that the postmasters and the officials will know more of each other's problems, so that there may be more exchange of ideas. There are great numbers of thoughtful postmasters who, with the interest of the Service at heart, are continually studying their own operations and constantly improving their own offices. There should be more. There are great numbers of earnest postal employees interested in the improvement of the Service. We should encourage that interest. From even the least of these can come many helpful and wholesome ideas and suggestions.

The vast majority of those in the Postal Service, indeed with very few exceptions, all personnel of the Postal Establishment honor the trust reposed in them by the public which they serve. We have a reputation for integrity. The account of stewardship of the 44,000 postmasters, as I see it reflected in the day-by-day operations, not only is a great tribute to this fine Service, but demonstrates clearly that we can do much to improve and become more efficient. To that task we should dedicate ourselves. And on that task America confidently and proudly knows you will do your duty. I thank you.

The Obligations of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ARTHUR CAPPER, OF KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a radio broadcast delivered by myself over broadcasting station WIBW, Topeka, Kans., and the Kansas network, September 21, 1941, on the obligations of citizenship in these times.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends in the radio audience, by a series of successive steps very similar to the "piece by piece"—"country by country"—methods by which Hitler has conquered one nation and then another in Europe, the United States in the past 2 years has been led to the very brink of active military participation in the latest European war.

Through a series of successive pronouncements and actions the direction, the objective, of the foreign policy of the United States has been changed from defense of the Western Hemisphere to an unrealistic but very real policy by which the United States recognizes its responsibility to build a democratic world.

Now, as I pointed out months ago, national defense—even defense of the Western Hemisphere—is one thing.

Carrying the four freedoms everywhere in the world is, as I see it, something entirely different.

I believe it is only fair to those of us who have opposed each of these successive steps by which our entire national policy has been changed—in effect, has become an international foreign policy instead of an American foreign policy—I repeat, it is only fair that the distinction we of the opposition make between national defense, including Western Hemisphere defense on the one hand and a policy on the other hand of underwriting the building of a democratic world through force of arms and economic pressure—that this distinction be kept in mind.

Very frankly, as between a foreign policy which is based on the interests of the United States of America and a foreign policy based on domination of the world in the interest of international solidarity, I consider the American foreign policy better for the United States—in the long run a sounder policy for all the world—than an international foreign policy calling for domination of all the world by a chosen people.

Unless I work myself into a frenzy, whether a frenzy of fear, a frenzy of hate, or a frenzy of Messianic fanaticism, it is very difficult for me to see how the United States, even with the assistance, guidance, and leadership of Britain, can hope to bring an end to the hitherto endless conflicts among scores of European nations, nationalities, and peoples.

Suppose we had in the United States, instead of 48 States inhabited in the main by homogenous peoples, recognizing ourselves as one people, one nation—suppose we had 26 or 27 or 30 States, each sovereign, each

fearful of the others, frequently with age-old hatreds of each other. We are having trouble as it is in attaining and maintaining complete national unity.

Looking at this picture, how can you, except in moments or days or years of frenzy, hope for international unity between Communist Russia and the United States; between Germany and France; among the warring Balkans; among China, India, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, the Dutch Indies?

My friends, I have tried to paint this background for you at this time because, as I fully realize, the time may come soon when we no longer can think of our foreign policy in terms of the interest of the United States of America, or even of the interests of the Western Hemisphere. It may be only a matter of months, weeks, or even days, before the United States of America has become definitely, and I fear inextricably, merged into the tumult and conflict, the maelstrom, of European power politics. A few more steps in the direction we are going, and the only thing any American can consider will be winning the war.

I had hoped this place would not be reached. I still hope, though rather desperately I must admit, that the stage of all-out war for the United States will not be necessary.

I believe just as completely and sincerely as I ever did that the perpetuation of the Republic of the United States; the preservation of democracy in the United States; depends upon our keeping out of the entanglements, the hatreds, the jealousies, the intrigues, and quarrels and conflicts and wars of the Old World.

I know that the American farmers, the American workers, the great mass of the American people, want no part in this all-out war, no matter how high-sounding the language with which the bitter pill of truth is enameled. These folks know if we get all the way in they will do the suffering; they will lose the war, no matter what government or combination of governments forces the enemy capitulation.

I am opposed to sending our American boys to fight in foreign lands in what I consider, very frankly, a foreign war. If we keep them at home, and prepare an adequate national defense—then if our country is attacked (which in my judgment it will not be) our boys will be ready to defend us; they will not have been already sacrificed in vain.

While I am opposed to our getting into this war—have been opposed; still am opposed—I shall continue to do my best for strong and continued armament for national defense.

So much for the international aspects of the world situation. Now, how about our situation, right here in the United States?

We have the four freedoms, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom from fear, freedom from want, in measurable degrees. I can worship God in my own way, and the God that I choose to worship. I can speak my mind, express my opinions—except perhaps in some isolated communities, in parts of some States. Candor compels the statement that we do not have entire freedom from fear, nor entire freedom from want.

Nor will we attain freedom from want (for ourselves or for people every where in the world) through war. War brings poverty, destitution, suffering. The burden of debt from our previous war "to save democracy and to end war" was the biggest single factor in the depression that gave us the New Deal. The $40,000,000,000 that war cost us dealt a heavy blow to freedom from want in this country, in the whole world.

This Nation is not a nation of pacifists, though we are basically a peace-loving people. This Nation won its independence from Britain—and from involuntary participation in Old World wars—by fighting and winning the War of Independence. This Nation, united and unafraid, would fight to retain that freedom and independence.

The Constitution of the United States, which I for one still regard as the fundamental law of the land, provides for the making and waging of wars. It provides that the Congress of the United States has the power, and the responsibility, to declare war.

I hold that means that the United States should not enter this war, or any war, without the approval, the action of the Congress.

If the question of entering this war was submitted to Congress, I would vote against going to war.

If Congress declared war, as the Constitution provides, I would consider myself, and every other loyal American, bound from that time on to support the declaration of war; to help win that war; to make every sacrifice necessary to win that war.

A week ago tonight, I made a statement that has been criticized in some quarters, commended in other quarters, through what I believe is a misunderstanding of what I said. I said at that time, and I repeat the statement:

"For myself, I will support the national-defense program, as I have been doing. The United States must be kept a free and independent nation at all costs."

Let me call attention to those words, "a free and independent nation at all costs." I mean just that.

Continuing I said—and I now repeat—what is to me the perfectly obvious fact that after the President, as Commander in Chief, has ordered the Navy to shoot first, neither the Congress nor the people can countermand that order. It is an accomplished fact. Following are the exact words I used:

"The President having acted, the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States must and will support that action. There is no other course of action open to us."

To me that is perfectly obvious. This does not mean that I approve the action taken, even though I must accept it. It does not mean I believe the President had the right—though I do not question his having the power—to put us into the war. I say he does not have the right.

It certainly does not mean (because this order to shoot on sight is an accomplished fact) that I cannot oppose, because I will oppose, the step which may follow: A declaration of war and the sending of American expeditionary forces abroad to fight in foreign wars. I am utterly and unalterably opposed to that.

Getting back to our Government. The Constitution gives certain powers to the President; certain other powers to the Congress. The forefathers did not contemplate a one-man government, any more than our American system contemplates a one-party government.

I believe I am a realist, as well as a patriot.

Congress has given many of its powers to the President. Few of them have come back to Congress. Another emergency has been drawn out of the hat always before an existing emergency ended.

Congress continues to give away its powers to the President; sometimes these powers, from my viewpoint, are taken by the President a little at a time without the formality of Congress yielding them. And until another election is held, Congress is powerless to take these powers back.

I tell you, my friends, if this process is kept up, there is danger that there soon will be no Congress such as was contemplated by the framers of the Constitution.

Without any authorization whatever by Congress (in the face of a formal declaration of intent by Congress in the terms of the lease-lend bill) the United States today apparently is in an undeclared—though not yet an all-out—war.

This is not a question of hating Hitler. No one hates the things for which Hitler stands, the things which Hitler has done, more than I do. I sincerely hope that this madmen's war in Europe will destroy both nazi-ism and communism.

But I say this is a question of preservation of the United States, and its preservation as a free and independent nation. That is where a line is drawn between nationalism and internationalism. I grant anyone's right to favor internationalism. As for me, on this issue, I am for nationalism.

Of even more immediate moment is the question of preserving our republican-democratic form of government. As things are going in the United States today it seems more and more a struggle between legislative government (with the Executive enforcing the laws) and a one-man government (with the legislative branch relieved of all power except to pass the necessary appropriations).

If we become involved, all-out, in Europe's war now, as seems likely, will it be by authority of Congress or by decision of the President? Is that the way the gravest decision our Government can make—peace or war—be decided?

I do not hesitate to repeat that we should build our air force and our Army and Navy to superlative strength so that no nation will dare attack us. President Roosevelt has my support to the limit on that kind of a program, and will continue to have it.

But I do object to sending our men overseas to fight other peoples' wars.

I am opposed to our going into undeclared wars solely upon announcement by the President, when the Constitution places that responsibility and power in the hands of Congress.

I am opposed to our attempting to police all Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Seven Seas; and to our paying the costs of all their wars.

I want to see Hitler stopped. I want nazi-ism and communism stamped out.

But my first consideration is the defense of my own country.

I am for saving America for Americans.

Addresses, Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the able senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations on September 22, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Three years ago I was elected by the people of Ohio to represent them in the United

States Senate, principally on a program of opposition to the domestic policies of the New Deal. Until the war in Europe we succeeded in blocking any further extension of the New Deal program, and I think it is fair to say that except for the war the people of the entire United States would have expressed in 1940 the same opposition to the New Deal which the people of Ohio made evident in 1938.

1. I AM OPPOSED TO THE PRESIDENT'S POLICY OF INVOLVING THE UNITED STATES IN THE EUROPEAN WAR

For most of the time since I have been in Washington, however, the principal issues have related to foreign policy. I have found myself in substantial disagreement with some of the fundamental features of President Roosevelt's foreign policy because that policy has been guided by an underlying determination to involve the United States in the problems of Europe, to proselyte the four freedoms throughout the world, and to intervene in the European war.

I voted for repeal of the arms embargo because I felt our markets should be open to the French and British, who had always relied upon those markets and supported them. I was in favor of extending aid to Britain also by loans of money and extension of credit, even though it stretched strict principles of neutrality. But it gradually became apparent that the foreign policy of the Roosevelt administration went much further than this. The only logical conclusion from the many speeches made by the President is that he is in favor of intervening in the European war in order to assist Great Britain against Germany. While he has not acted as quickly as the interventionists desire, intervention is the logical and inevitable conclusion of his policy.

There are many people in the United States who believe we should go to war with Germany in order to crush Hitler. While I do not agree with their arguments, I recognize their sincerity and strength. But I have often stated my own reasons for my conviction that the United States should refuse to intervene in the European war. If isolation means isolation from European war, I am an isolationist. My reasons today are the same reasons I gave in 1939. My position is the same position occupied by the President in 1940. It is the same position occupied by Mr. Willkie in 1940. It is the same position occupied by the American Legion for years. It is a policy of all-out defense of America on the lines of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, plus the extension of aid to Britain short of war. I see no reason to change those views. In fact, there is much less danger to this country from Hitler today than there was 2 years ago, certainly much less than there was 1 year ago.

2. THE PRESIDENT'S POLICY HAS CONSTANTLY DECEIVED THE PEOPLE AS TO HIS REAL PURPOSE

Not only do I disagree fundamentally with the President's policy, but I object strenuously to the deceptive way in which that policy has been developed. It is perfectly apparent now that that policy has always been steadily designed to involve the United States in a shooting war as rapidly as any semblance of public opinion could be rallied in support of such action. But the President has been frank neither with the people nor with the press. Only a year ago he was promising the American people that "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack." Conditions today are in no way different from what they were a year ago when that promise was made. In fact, at that time Hitler had almost complete domination of the air over England, and it looked as if an invasion might occur at any moment. Today an invasion of England is almost impossible. The German, Italian, French, and British Navies have suffered substantial losses; our own is stronger than it ever was. We have a tremendously increased capacity to build airplanes.

When the lease-lend bill was before Congress, its advocates asserted that it was intended to secure peace, but as a matter of fact it placed in the hands of the President that power to involve us in war, which he is now exercising. The occupation of Iceland was represented to be defense of the United States. I pointed out at that time that the President had no legal or constitutional right to occupy Iceland, which is in the eastern Atlantic and as far away from the United States as Ireland. The occupation of Iceland, of course, was not defense of the United States, but defense of Great Britain. Since it is in the actual war zone, it has led and will lead again inevitably to incidents like that of the *Greer* and ultimately to war. In my opinion it was so intended by the President.

The President in his recent speech, without consulting Congress, proposed a new policy, which if carried through, must lead to war with Germany. He is ordering the Navy to attack any German and Italian war vessels in what he vaguely calls our defense waters, reserving to himself, apparently, the right to determine what waters are defense waters. Of course, such defense waters now include the Atlantic all the way to Iceland, which is three-fourths of the way across. His speech seems to imply that they may include any waters to which American ships, or neutral ships carrying American contraband may go, such as the Red Sea and the Mediterranean. It is a policy of convoying, although the President himself has said that "convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war." In view of all the outrages perpetrated by Germany in Europe, there are arguments for our entry into the war, but the pretense that these things are being done in the name of defense is not worthy of the ruler of a sovereign nation.

3 THE PRESIDENT HAS NO LEGAL OR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO ENTER UPON A NAVAL WAR WITH GERMANY

In my opinion, the President has no legal or constitutional right to enter upon a war, declared or undeclared, with Germany and Italy without action by Congress. There is, of course, no question that the Constitution confers the right to declare war only upon Congress. It has been frequently stated that the President has power to begin a war because he is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. It may well be true that the President has it within his power to make war without authority from Congress. Undoubtedly, since he is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, if he orders the Army or Navy to go anywhere in the world, they will obey him. In this sense he may perhaps have it within his power today to begin even a land war with Germany by ordering the Army to land on the German coast. But this does not mean that he has any legal or constitutional right to order either a military or naval attack on Germany. The mere fact that power may be usurped is no evidence of legal right.

The President's legal powers are limited to the defense of the United States and of its citizens and of the property of its citizens. Of course, he has, without the approval of Congress, the right and duty to resist insurrection and invasion of the United States. If another nation makes or declares war on the United States, it is the President's duty to carry on that war, whatever Congress does.

4. THE PRESIDENT'S POLICY IS UNSOUND

In my opinion, the action of the President is therefore contrary to law and to the Constitution. It is clearly contrary to the promises which he made to the people before the last election. Finally, it is supported by utterly unsound arguments, trying to give the policy a defense aspect on the ground that we are defending the freedom of the seas. There probably could be no more illogical discussion of the freedom of the seas than that contained in the President's address. He confuses freedom of the seas in time of peace with the very different question of freedom of the seas in time of war. No one that I know of is proposing to deny the freedom of the seas in time of peace. In time of war that freedom has always been strictly limited by no nation more than England. It has never included the right to send contraband material to one of the nations engaged in war.

Under international law any German raider or submarine has a perfect right to go anywhere it can get and to stop any vessel carrying contraband. In the sinking of the *Robin Moor* and the attack on the *Greer*, the Germans went far beyond their legal rights; but even in the World War we did not consider such incidents a cause for war until they had occurred many times, resulted in great loss of American life, and been apparently adopted as a deliberate policy.

Furthermore, the policy of the Neutrality Act was to avoid such incidents by keeping American ships away from the areas in which they might occur. That policy in the main has been successful, and I believe that the people thoroughly approve of it. They are not disposed to go to war because of some interference with American trade thousands of miles away from the United States.

If there is any such thing as freedom of the seas in time of war the British today are limiting it far more than the Germans. No American ship can take even foodstuffs to Belgium, Holland, France, or any of the occupied countries of Europe, because the British maintain the same kind of general blockade against which the President protests in the case of Germany, and the Neutrality Act is still the law of the land.

5. THERE IS NO OBLIGATION TO SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT'S WAR POLICY WHEN IT HAS NEVER BEEN APPROVED BY CONGRESS

Holding these very definite opinions on the legality and the wisdom of the President's policy, should I now cease to express those opinions simply because the President's actions relate to foreign affairs? It is suggested that because the President has taken this action, everyone must acquiesce in that policy for fear that in some way the prestige of the United States will be affected. With that position I absolutely disagree. Once the United States, in a constitutional way, adopts a foreign policy, I propose to support that policy without stint or qualification. I have supported the policy of the lease-lend bill, although I believe that the bill went far beyond the proper assistance we might have given Great Britain. I propose to vote for the new lease-lend appropriation.

But the lease-lend policy does not justify the President's proposal or the orders given to the Navy. In fact, the lease-lend bill, extensive as are the powers given, expressly provides that nothing in the act shall be construed to authorize the convoying of vessels by naval vessels of the United States, the entry of any American vessel into a combat area, or the extension of the use of the land and naval forces of the United States.

The policy of the Neutrality Act, as modified by the lease-lend policy, is still the law of the land. It is a policy of defending the United States on the line of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, plus the delivery to Great Britain, in the United States, free of charge, of war materials and equipment. While such a policy might lead to war, yet if it were carried out in good faith by a President desiring peace it probably would not have involved the United States in the present war.

But the President has now pressed far beyond that policy without consulting Congress. I deny the right of the President to

take us into war against the wishes of the American people without obtaining authority from Congress, designated by the Constitution as the people's representative on the question of waging war.

If Congress repeals the Neutrality Act and authorizes a naval war to eliminate German vessels from the Atlantic, I will support that policy, even though I disapprove it, as I have the lease-lend policy. But I am convinced that if the question of war is submitted to the people by referendum or if it is submitted to Congress, a great majority will speak for peace and aid to Britain, but against war. The most recent Gallup poll, carefully ignored and played down by the whole interventionist press, shows that the percentage of American voters favoring American entrance into a shooting war has declined in 2 months from 24 to 17 percent of the American people, and that sentiment in favor of convoys has decreased from 56 to 52 percent. What right has the President to take us into war against the wishes of the American people? What right have I, as a representative of 7,000,000 of those people, to acquiesce in that policy without protest?

It is not an agreeable task for me to question the authority of the President to take any action which he has taken in the name of the Government of the United States, but I believe it would be most unfortunate if the Congress of the United States acquiesced without protest in acts of the President which may nullify for all time the constitutional authority distinctly reserved to Congress to declare war.

Today the defense program is being used to promote every policy which the New Deal advocated in time of peace in the direction of economic planning and state socialism. The President is asserting his right to make war without the consent of Congress. He is asserting his right to fix prices without the consent of Congress. The theory that an emergency justifies the suspension of all peacetime rights is combined with the theory that the President can declare an emergency at his own sweet will. Only last week Arthur Krock, the leading columnist of the New York Times, seriously discussed in the Times the proposition that the emergency might be used as an excuse for setting aside the election of Congress in 1942. If Congress does not protest against usurpation of power by the present Executive, there will be no Congress left to protest.

6. THE CONSEQUENCES OF A WAR POLICY ARE GIVEN NO CONSIDERATION

In my opinion, those who are urging our entrance into the war are utterly mistaken. I believe that if we choose to defend the United States on the line of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans it is so impossible for Hitler or anyone else to attack us that there will not even be an attempt to make such an attack. We have the largest navy in the world. We have unlimited ability to increase our shipbuilding capacity. The President's argument that the total shipbuilding capacity of Europe is greater than ours is utterly unsound, because ours can be increased indefinitely, and our ability to manufacture steel and other ship materials is greater than all of Europe combined. Furthermore, we will have several years' start on our two-ocean navy, and Hitler could never catch up with us. It would not be easy for him to organize the productive capacity of Europe. How is he going to get any enthusiastic cooperation from the shipbuilding labor in a dozen countries whose people he is oppressing with an alien dictatorship?

The ability of airplanes to fly the Atlantic Ocean has been used to frighten the people into the belief that America is now more subject to attack. The truth is that the development of air forces has made it much more difficult for an army or a navy to cross the Atlantic Ocean. No navy far from its base can stand up against a great air force operating from land bases. Troop transports are particularly vulnerable to air attack. With our great capacity to build airplanes today, even a navy twice as large as the American Navy could not safely approach our shores. The threat of an attack by Hitler is, and always has been, a bugaboo to scare the American people into war.

The war policy has never been thought through. It seems to me impossible to bring a war with Germany to a successful conclusion except after many years of destructive warfare. Vast expenditures of money and men will exhaust this country as they are exhausting the world. In the end we may crush Hitler, but in the process of doing so we are likely to set up a complete dictatorship in this country from which we may never return to American democracy as we have known it.

Of course, it is being said now that there will be no expeditionary force. Mr. Walter Lippmann is now advocating the policy of a naval war while we reduce the Army. But just as the President advanced from peace to lease-lend, and from lease-lend to a shooting naval war, the adoption of a naval war policy, after a few months of stalemate, is bound to lead, Lippmann or no Lippmann, to another American expeditionary force.

Then if we succeed in crushing Hitler and marching to Berlin, that will only be the beginning. The advocates of war frankly now look forward to domination of the world by the United States and Great Britain. That implies not only the shutting off of all other nations from the high seas except with our consent but a continued policing of the continent of Europe to prevent the development of another Hitler. For such a policy of imperialism this country is not adapted. It is inconsistent with the whole theory of American democracy. Either the entire structure will tumble about our ears or we will have to turn ourselves into a militaristic and totalitarian nation as Rome turned from a republic to an empire.

Furthermore, let us not fool ourselves about the four freedoms throughout the world. Those freedoms, and a democratic form of government, cannot be conferred on the rest of the world by force, by war, or by our domination of the world. Democracy must rest on local self-government arising from within each people itself.

Let those who favor intervention in the war think through the course which they are advocating. If that is the course we are to take, it should be thoroughly debated by Congress either on the proposal of a declaration of war or on a repeal of the Neutrality Act. If and when the American people do decide to go to war, I will support that war as vigorously as the President himself, but I shall continue to deny the right of the President without consulting Congress to involve us in a war with Germany, or to send American naval vessels, either as convoys or otherwise, into the war zones of Europe. I believe it is not only the right but the duty of all those who feel as I do to continue to oppose the arbitrary actions of the President.

Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL, OF TEXAS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD the able address delivered by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] at Fair Park, Dallas, Tex., on Constitution Day, September 7, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I deem it not only a privilege, but it is a great pleasure to me to have the opportunity of speaking to the citizens of Texas at this time. This is Constitution Day. This Constitution Day is set apart in commemoration of the signing of the Constitution of the United States.

I believe that when this document was signed it enunciated the greatest principles of government which have ever been conceived by the minds of civilized and Christianized people. I believe that the fundamental principles laid down in the Constitution were at the time it was signed milestones in the progress of mankind toward the ideal of a free and representative democracy. I know that it has recently become somewhat unpopular to talk about the fundamental principles of the Constitution of the United States. I know that we have among us today many people who look upon the Constitution as something to be evaded rather than something to be observed. But I, for one, believe that the principles of government laid down in the Constitution were sound when this document was written and I believe they are just as sound today as they were then. Furthermore, I believe that many of the difficulties which face us today could have been avoided if we had steered our course a little closer to the ancient landmarks which were given us by the fathers of this Nation.

There are many things which deal with detail legislation going on in Washington which I should like to discuss, but I feel that it would be inappropriate on the occasion of this great patriotic rally to consume the time in a discussion of legislative details because we should at this time be thinking more in the broad terms of fundamental principles of government. Therefore, if I make reference this evening to pending legislation, it shall be only incidental to the main objective which I have in mind, and that is a discussion of some of the broad fundamental principles of government upon which this Nation has been built, to the end that we may consider now the course which we are charting for future generations.

We are now engaged in a great effort to equip this Nation to defend itself and to preserve the principles of democratic government here and abroad. I should like to say, with all of the emphasis which I can command, that I for one believe that if we are to maintain the principles of democratic government in the United States that this Nation must be ready and willing to lend aid in a proper manner to the maintenance of these principles throughout the world. The principles of right and justice are at stake, the issue is being determined as to whether or not the world shall live under a dictatorship or if we shall continue to have free governments where free people rule.

I am as much opposed to war as anyone, but I say to you that I am thoroughly committed to the principle that we should grant all the aid we possibly can to England and to the other democracies that are fighting to save civilization.

I believe in stating plain facts. I do not believe in stating nonfacts. This, as yet, is not our war. We have not declared war. When and if it becomes our war—and God grant that shall never happen—but I say, when and if it does become our war, then we shall conduct it as we have conducted every one of our previous wars and win it, as we have won every other war. In the meantime, I am strongly in favor of furnishing all the war equipment and ammunition we can

possibly spare to any nation that will fight, weaken, and possibly subdue the common enemy of democracy which has its angry covetous eyes focused on us. It is unfair in the extreme to charge those who are willing to fight to maintain these principles of free government, with being warmongers. Was George Washington a warmonger? God grant no ungrateful beneficiary of his bequest to freedom and civilization may accuse him of being such. Were Abraham Lincoln, Grant, Lee, and others, who fought and sacrificed for noble principles, warmongers? God forgive any sane citizen of this great united Republic from ever making such an accusation. Were Sam Houston, Travis, Crockett, Bonham, and others warmongers because they fought and sacrificed their very lives on the altar of freedom and liberty, that we might live to enjoy the fruits of their efforts? God forgive any descendant of that generation of brave people from ever saying they were. Those three wars, successfully fought and won on American soil, should convince any nation or combination of nations that American force is invincible and American freedom is perpetual. It is founded on the unchangeable Word of God and the perfect philosophy of His Son, as expressed in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution of the United States. As long as we cling to those fundamental ideas of organized human society, none of us need have any fear.

I believe the Constitution of the United States, when it was written, was written by men who not only believed in the principles of government there enunciated, but I believe it was written by men who were willing to fight to maintain these principles. I believe it was written by men who had an abiding confidence in the willingness of all future generations of America when the time came to stand firm to maintain these great fundamental principles of government. No people on the face of the globe have proved by their acts a greater desire for peace than the people of the United States. We are not seeking to acquire an empire; we are not seeking to rule the world; but what we are seeking to do is to maintain a world which will be free for freedom-loving people. We are seeking to maintain a world where the business intercourse between nations will be carried on in the future as it has been in the past. We are seeking to avoid a world where some dictator, by simple decree, determines whether or not there shall be freedom of the seas and whether or not there shall be open markets. This, to my mind, represents the fundamental principles which those who wrote the Constitution of the United States believed should be maintained. One thing is certain: We cannot have in this Nation a nation of free people from a social standpoint and from a governmental standpoint unless we maintain the necessary degree of freedom along economic lines. Now I think I have made myself clear with reference to my views as to the position which this Government should take in discharging its duty under the Constitution to its own citizens, as well as in discharging its duty to mankind throughout the world, and, may I add, discharging it as we believe the Creator of this earth desired that human inhabitants should discharge their duties in order to insure freedom to all freedom-loving people forever.

There is another matter, and I say to you that I think it is as important if not more important than the general program of national defense, and that is the question of the maintenance of free government within our own borders. Those who study world affairs, and I will say that my short stay in Washington has impressed this fact upon me, had as well realize now that if free government is to be maintained in America, we are going to have to guard two fronts: On one front we must guard to prevent the dictators of the Old World from being able through force to control the affairs of our Nation and to implant on our shores all of those foreign "isms"—nazi-ism, communism, and fascism. In other words, we must prevent the invasion of dictators from without, and while we are doing that, we must not forget there is another front on which the invasion is being waged every day and that front is right here at home. Well-organized groups, with powerful leadership, have for a good many years been seeking quietly, but effectively, to undermine the fundamental principles of the Constitution of the United States and to substitute for the American system of free enterprise a socialized system of business, where the power of government comes from the top down instead of going from the bottom up. They have been trying to establish in this country a government where the public officials are the masters of the people rather than the servants of the people. They have been striking at the very foundation of democratic government which is the rule of local government and the rule of State government, and day in and day out the battle has gone on in an effort to centralize the control of most everything in Washington.

Those who wrote the Constitution of the United States were wise enough to know that this Nation is too large, that it represents too many diverse interests, for us ever to be able to establish in Washington a government that would be wise enough and honest enough to decide all of the problems for all of the people. Therefore, if you will read the Constitution of the United States, you will see written into it from the beginning to the end the hope and belief that the sovereignty and the integrity of local government and of State government would always be maintained.

There are those who will tell you that due to the great changes in the economic life of the people, due to the fact that business has become more complex, we have now reached the stage in our development where government has become too complex to be understood by the average man, where it has become too complex to be administered by State and local government, and that it is time, therefore, to begin to centralize all of the power of government in Washington. So far as I am concerned, I do not subscribe to that philosophy. I believe that we have built in America a great nation because we have recognized initiative, because we have protected the theory of free enterprise, because we have made it possible for our citizens to be rewarded for their efforts in proportion to the intelligence and the diligence which they put forth. And I do not believe that anything would be gained by destroying these virtues and by setting up a highly socialized government in the Capital at Washington, where the bureaucrats rather than the people will rule. It is only necessary to observe the meager results which have thus far been obtained in our national-defense effort, to realize that the centralization of power in Washington is not an answer to the problems of today. The Constitution of the United States grants to the President very broad powers to act in great national emergencies, such as faces this Nation at this time. The Congress of the United States has by law further enlarged these powers. In fact, during the past 7 or 8 years, it seems that we have simply been jumping from one emergency to another and every time there was a change some fair-haired governmental theorist discovered that as a result of this change, more power could be taken away from the people and more power vested in the Federal Government.

Today we have in Washington so many bureaus and agencies that it would be necessary for you to live there probably 2 or 3 years to even have time to make a superficial call on each one of these governmental boards. This highly centralized machinery is not working very well. Evidence of the fact that it is not working lies in the statement that it is not getting satisfactory results. Our Army is not getting enough equipment. We are nothing like meeting our promises to other nations of the world to help in the great emergency. But when one of these governmental agencies fails to function, the remedy which would be applied in a business organization is never applied in Washington. The agency is never abolished, but what they do is always to create a still bigger agency and superimpose the new agency on the one which has failed to function. Thus we go merrily on spending the taxpayer's money by the hundreds of millions of dollars, maintaining fat patronage pay rolls and getting but little results. When it seems that conditions have become almost unbearable, a new bureaucratic board is set up. The Constitution of the United States was not written with this idea or this plan of government in view. The Constitution of the United States was written on the theory that this was to be a government of law; that the citizens of this Nation were to be ruled by law. It was never the theory of those who wrote the Constitution of the United States that we would have a government of men where some bureaucrat would be able on his own authority to write rules and regulations which have the effect and power of law. No one questions the fact that in a great emergency, such as we are now engaged upon, that there must temporarily be a broadening of the power of the Federal Government and a strengthening of the power of the executive department of government, but, on the other hand, those who wrote the Constitution did not believe that it would be necessary to destroy the fundamental principles of free government in order that democracy might function. It is my opinion that one of the gravest questions which faces the Congress of the United States today is the question of how we may achieve success in our great program of national defense and how we may meet our obligations to the world and at the same time maintain the fundamental principles of democratic government at home. After all, what is our program of national defense?

First, it is to train soldiers and sailors, but you cannot mobilize an army running into the millions without some place to care for them. Therefore, it became necessary to build great Army camps throughout the Nation. It became necessary to draft the young manhood of this country, to take them away from their work, send them into the Army, and pay them the paltry sum of $21 a month to serve and save the country. But while this has been in progress, we have seen all over this Nation the construction of these Army camps held up by strikes and labor troubles. We have seen the great munitions plants tied up with strikes and labor troubles. We have seen the great munitions plants tied up with strikes. We have seen the plants where they are manufacturing airplanes and bombers tied up with strikes, and at the same time we have seen a government in Washington, created under this great system of centralized bureaucratic control which has proved itself either unwilling or unable to cope with these problems involved. So far as I am concerned, I believe that this great national-defense effort should be a Nation-wide effort and if we are going to call from the homes of this Nation the youth of the Nation and without consulting their wishes, force them to render service in the Army and in the Navy for a compensation of only $21 a month, then I say to you that that same government which is making this demand on the youth of this country, has an obligation to have enough courage and enough backbone to say to the C. I. O. and to the A. F. of L. and all of the other representatives of special classes, that these munitions plants, and all other national-defense plants, are going to operate continuously and at full capacity and they

are going to operate free from violence in strikes. For going on 2 years, these demoralizing strikes have been continually in progress in this Nation, and the Congress of the United States has not done one single thing to try to stop them. These unjustified strikes could not thrive and flourish were the wild-eyed labor leader agitators and perpetrators not legally clothed by inaction of Congress with the right to take clubs and knock honest free men in the head because they want to work at honest jobs of their own choosing. As per my promise to the citizens of Texas, I introduced a bill in the United States Senate that would make force and violence in strikes a felony punishable by prison sentence. In fact, I introduced it twice; once as a bill and once as an amendment to another bill. The amendment was acted on and killed by a voice vote of "No's" which sounded louder to me than the roar of a gang of rowdy professional politicians at the Beaumont convention. After the roar subsided, I asked another Senator to ask that the vote be reconsidered and ayes and nays called for. He said, no, he would not do that because there were too many Senators who didn't want to make a record of their vote on that question. I finally got Senator Eastland of Mississippi, who has been in the Senate only about a month longer than I have, to ask for reconsidering and a vote by ayes and nays, but we couldn't get enough votes to force a yea-and-nay vote.

What kind of a United States Senate do we have in this country, when they vote against a bill that will give protection to honest laboring men by serving to keep them from being beaten over the head just because they want to work at an honest job of their own choice? Do you believe anything like that was ever contemplated by the honorable framers of our Constitution? Those who framed the Constitution of the United States never believed that the time would ever come in America when organized minorities would be able, through political wire pulling, to dominate the Government of the United States. And I say to you that if this Nation is going to carry on successfully its great program of national defense, and if we are going to meet the promises which we have made to the democracies of the world, it is going to be necessary for us to have in all places of public authority in Washington—in the House, in the Senate, in the executive department of government, as well as in the judicial department of government—men of courage and men who cannot be intimidated by organized minorities, regardless of the voting strength of such minorities. The whole national-defense program is now bogged down, and it will still be bogged down until we have a demonstration in Washington of some of the courage of leadership upon which this Nation was originally built. This problem is not going to be solved so long as the main thing Congressmen, Senators, or other public officials are thinking about is holding their jobs first, and saving the Nation second. Unless a man is blind to events, he must know that there is a well-organized plan whereby an effort is being made throughout the United States today to take the emergency of national defense as a means to dominate production in every essential industry and to establish over the American workmen a dictatorship of various and sundry organized minorities of labor. Think of it, if you will: The great strike in New Jersey, where the issue involved was a demand on the management that every man who worked in the shipbuilding plant who was a member of some labor organization be required to keep his dues to that organization paid up and in good standing or be dropped from the pay roll. And picture, if you will, the Government of the United States lending moral support, as it did, to just such a demand. On every hand we have the imperative call from England and all of the other democracies of the world to furnish them ships, to furnish them with supplies. We have at the same time an effort to build for the defense of this country a two-ocean Navy; but, in spite of all this, this great shipbuilding plant is closed down for days, not a wheel turned, because a labor union wants the management to assume the responsibility of collecting labor-union dues.

Let me ask you people who are here this evening if you believe that those who wrote the Constitution of the United States anticipated any such condition as this would ever be possible in free America? It is my opinion that when this Nation faced the great emergency which we now face, that the Congress of the United States should have written on the statute books of this Nation a bill which would provide that it would be unlawful for any industry engaged in production for national defense to sign any contract which would either prevent his employees or coerce his employees in the joining of a labor union. I think the defense of America is of far more importance than the building up of the membership of organized labor. I believe that every plant in America where goods are being produced for national defense should be open to every honest and competent workman. And I do not believe that any workman who is seeking to serve his country by pushing forward the great program of national defense should be forced to pay tribute to any group, no matter who they are, for the privilege of working. And I believe, further, that the principles upon which this Government was built presupposed that the right to work would always be protected, and certainly that it would be protected when the work being done was essential to the preservation of democratic government. We have other powerful minorities as dangerous to our national welfare and security as union labor leader "racketeers." The citizens on the Atlantic seaboard were threatened with a shortage of gasoline and petroleum products which they need for national-defense purposes because some people claim—and may I say claim falsely—that shipping facilities are not available to move the products from source of supply. As a member of the Senate committee which sat for 2 weeks and listened to testimony in the alleged gasoline-shortage case, may I say that I am fully convinced, personally, that there is no gasoline shortage, and never has been, and that there is no shortage of transportation for gasoline and petroleum products, and never has been, and the unanimous report of our committee to the Senate so stated. As an individual member of that committee, and as your Senator, I am also fully convinced that the whole detestable plot of trying to manufacture the gasoline shortage was conceived and engineered by certain people for selfish financial purposes, one of which was to get permission to build a large 24-inch pipe line from Texas to the large industrial States of the East through which they could siphon one of Texas' greatest God-given natural resources—natural gas—and thus impede Texas' industrial progress and deprive Texas laboring people and others of their heritage, all for the gain and profit of a few big corporations of the East.

It is my opinion that we have some people in both public and private life who would be glad to see an occasion develop which would enable them to put over a complete program of Government ownership and control of the oil business in this country, and I also think we have some big corporations who do not fear Government control, because they believe in the end they can control the Government, and I think both factors entered into this gasoline-shortage scare on the Atlantic coast, which we proved did not exist. These two forces are synonymous and represent minority rule of force by money in some instances and by force of votes in other instances. I do not believe the framers of our Constitution ever expected these things to happen in this country. They are both impeding our national-defense program; therefore extremely dangerous to the very existence of our democracy. The Congress of the United States, by the terms of our Constitution, is wholly responsible for the existence of these dangerous elements in our Nation, because the Congress could curb such unwholesome acts promptly by legislation.

The principles of equality and justice are the guiding principles upon which the Constitution of the United States was built. I believe that those who framed this document believed that in great emergencies, such as we now face, all of our people should be required to contribute their fair share toward the maintenance of our free institutions. I believe that it was in the mind of those who framed this Constitution that the rights of all of our citizens would be protected and that in periods of great emergency none would be allowed to profiteer at the expense of others.

So far as I am concerned, I believe in this principle. I am opposed to racketeering and profiteering out of the national emergency, regardless of whether it be done by a system of awarding fat contracts to political favorites or if it be done by racketeers promoting the interest of selfish groups, or whether it be done by a few businessmen who represent much of the wealth of the Nation. I do not believe that any businessman should be allowed to make an excessive profit out of this great emergency. And I say to you that it is not necessary to do what is being proposed, and that is, to destroy the whole system of free enterprise in this country in order to prevent the making of a few war millionaires. Do not be deceived about it—under the plan we are operating now, we are making plenty of war millionaires and we will probably be making many more. But if the Congress of the United States would put on the statute books of this Nation a law which would provide that all excess profits—and by that word "all" I mean 100 percent of the excess profits—would go into the tax fund to pay the cost of national defense, then, in that event the problem of making war millionaires would be solved. All lines of business, if they are to operate, should be allowed to earn a normal profit to be determined by a fair formula, but none should be allowed to earn an excess profit over and above that normal profit.

There is being advocated in Washington today a great system of price control urged upon our public officials by selfish people for profit motives. Now, obviously, it is necessary to have priorities on supplies in order that these supplies may be channeled into the proper sources, but there is no necessity for setting up a great bureau in Washington to fix prices. Having been in business myself and having had the experience of meeting business pay rolls I think I know something about the question of price fixing. Whenever the Government undertakes to fix the price for which one commodity may sell, then this price fixing upsets the price structure of many other commodities. A system of putting power to control prices in the hand of the Federal Government is unwise for another reason—it would probably take seven hundred thousand or a million men in the United States actually and effectively to establish and operate a real system of price control and to enforce it, and it would probably take 3 or 4 years to get this personnel trained to do the job, and when it was eventually accomplished you would then have completely destroyed the whole system of free enterprise in American business.

Therefore, any general scheme of governmental price fixing is objectionable: First,

because it would take too long to secure sufficiently trained personnel to make the plan work, even if it could be made to work; and, second, it would destroy the whole system of free enterprise when it commenced to work and we might never get out from under this system, even when the emergency is over; the third objection to the establishment of price control is that it is not needed. If the Government will pass an effective tax measure which will take in all of the people, if they will raise by current revenue at least 75 percent of every dollar spent currently, and if as a part of this tax bill they will take all excess profits, then they can forget about price control, and when the emergency is over we will not have a socialized business run by a few bureaucrats, sitting behind mahogany desks in Washington, and telling every individual in this Nation what to do and when to do it.

Certainly the Constitution of the United States did not presume the time would ever come in this Nation when we would attempt to grant as much authority to any individual as it would be necessary to grant if we were to establish a dictatorship over the price structure of American business.

Some people seem to be greatly concerned about the willingness of all people who are in public life to fit into the plan of national administration to handle the present emergency. I have stated and I should like to restate here my position with reference to this matter. So far as I am concerned, I believe that the present emergency can be met, and it can be met well within the limits of the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution gives to the executive department of government broad powers to conduct our foreign affairs; it gives to the executive department very broad powers to deal with domestic affairs in periods of great emergency. These powers granted by the Constitution properly belong to the executive department of government and to that department alone. The Congress of the United States has enacted numerous laws which have expanded the Executive authority of government in this emergency. I recognize that every citizen of this country has the right of free speech, but it is my honest opinion that during these times of great national emergency it is harmful to the general welfare of our Nation for people like Senator WHEELER, Colonel Lindbergh, and others identified with the America First Committee to be continually sniping at the President of the United States about the way he does his job. I do not think that does any good for our country. I think it is ill-advised and harmful.

The Constitution of the United States puts in the hands of the President the authority to command the United States Army and Navy, puts in his hands the power to carry on the foreign affairs—it does not put part of the power in his hands to carry on foreign affairs, it puts all of the power in his hands to do this, except where in the exercise of this power it becomes necessary to make a treaty with a foreign nation or to declare war in which instance it is the responsibility of the President under the Constitution to submit these matters to the Congress of the United States for its approval. So neither the Senate nor the House has any responsibility or any authority to deal with any of these matters unless they are submitted to the Congress by the President.

I think senseless sniping at the President, such as is being done by some organized minorities, is not only a waste of time but it is positively harmful. These people seem to forget that when we wrote the Constitution of the United States, when we vested in the executive department of government certain powers, when the Congress further enlarged these powers, that it then became perfectly legal and legitimate not only for the executive department of government to do the wise thing, but it also has the constitutional authority to do the unwise things. In other words, it is a power exercised not jointly but solely by the executive department of government, and no one has the right to tell the executive department of government what it shall do within this field except as that authority is written into the Constitution of this Nation. So I do not appreciate those who stand on the sidelines and criticize the President when he is acting within his authority as granted by the Constitution and laws of this Nation. He has as much right to do things wrong as he has to do them right. The Constitution did not presuppose that perfect men should ever be chosen as President, because there are no perfect men living. In my opinion, most of our troubles in this country are caused by bad laws. The President does not pass the laws. Bad laws passed by Congress permitted the establishment of bureaucratic departments, and bureaucratic departments can do untold damage to our economic form of life and undermine our democracy.

Now my position is simply this: When the President of the United States is acting within the limits of the authority granted to him by the Constitution, and within the limits of the authority granted to him by the Congress of the United States, I, for one, expect to give him 100-percent support. In other words, I do not think it is any of my business or my responsibility as a member of the legislative department of government to attempt to tell the executive department of government how that department should be run. My responsibility is that when the law has been enacted and the power to execute it has been placed in the hands of the executive department to give the executive department 100-percent support, whether I like the law or not; and this I have always done and this I expect to continue to do. I think that is what the Constitution of the United States presumed every Member of Congress would do. I do not believe in sniping at the executive department of government when it is doing the best it can to carry out the mandates of the Constitution and the laws which Congress has passed. Therefore, believing as I do, I have assured the President of the United States of my 100-percent support in carrying out his duties, and I expect to make good on that promise.

Now, on the other hand, the Constitution vests in the Congress of the United States certain responsibilities. It is the responsibility of the Congress to pass laws, and whenever a law comes before Congress I expect to consider every angle of the law, I expect to seek all the information I can get from every source, and when I have done this I shall vote for what I believe is the best interest of this Nation. So far as I am concerned I did not go to Washington to be a rubber stamp for anybody. And again, as this is Constitution Day, let me say that I believe this position is in full accord with the fundamental principles of the Constitution of the United States. I am concerned about the domestic affairs of this country and I am concerned about the future of democratic government in America, primarily because of the fact that it does not seem to me that the American people as a whole realize the tremendous significance of some of the things that are happening to this country, and particularly at our Nation's Capital at this time, nor do they realize the significance of the fact that some of these things which are happening, which strike at the very fundamental principles of free government, are being done under authority of the Federal Government in Washington.

I do not think I am an alarmist, but I believe we all realize that one of the very foundation stones upon which democracy rests is based upon the absolute freedom of the press. I believe that the press should always be free to say what it pleases, about all public questions, to criticize or to praise public servants, and to give to the people an unbiased account of public affairs. In view of the personal experience which I have had, wherein it seems that many of the great daily papers here in this State have taken keen delight in writing page after page of unjust, unfair and untrue criticism and condemnation of me, it may seem strange for me to stand here this evening demanding freedom of the press, but I want to say to you that whenever you destroy the freedom of the press in this country you will destroy the very fundamental principles upon which the Constitution of the United States was based, and no man who is worthy of holding public office would ever seek to limit this freedom for any purpose. From experience I am able to testify that free press can never damage a good nation or a good cause. The great rank and file of our people are smarter than the editors of some newspapers.

I believe that we have in Washington today influences that believe they are better judges about what the people should hear and what the people should know than the newspapers are. Thank God for the fact that they are not now in the majority, but that influence is definitely prevalent. And, I want to say furthermore that I am definitely of the opinion that the Federal Government has already gone further than it should go in controlling and in establishing a censorship over radio programs. Radio has become an instrument as vital in the dissemination of public information as the press and I believe it is essential that the men who own the radio stations be given the utmost freedom consistent with reasonable regulation in the operation of these stations. I do not believe that they should be held as they are now under the constant threat of the possibility of incurring the ill will of some governmental bureaucrat at Washington, and I do not believe the people generally realize the danger of this situation. It is my opinion that if you will allow the people of America to have full access to all of the facts you may rely upon those people to reach correct conclusions. But when you consider the millions upon millions of dollars now being expended by governmental bureaus in Washington for pure propaganda purposes, it is my considered opinion that we are moving toward that theory of government where the masters in Washington will tell the slaves at home what to think. There is another very fundamental danger facing this Nation today and under this great program of national defense, this danger is being magnified and materially increased and that is the attempt of those who hold power in Washington to secure control of State government and to secure control of the Members of Congress and the Members of the United States Senate by using political patronage and the awarding of fat contracts to political contractors in order that the Congress of the United States may cease to function as the Constitution supposed it would function as an independent agency of government, and make of that body a rubber stamp to do what it is told to do. And I would impress upon you this evening that this is not a question of men I am discussing; it is not important as it affects individuals; but it is tremendously important as it affects the future welfare of this Nation. This Nation is too large and it has too diverse interests for it to ever be operated on any basis where all of the thinking is done in Washington and where the people receive orders from their masters as to how they shall vote.

I am concerned about the domestic affairs of this country for another reason. For many years we have listened to some of the demagogues who hold political power, day after day, preach to the American people the doctrine of class hatred—the employer and the businessman have been held up to scorn and tolerated only as a necessary evil which must be kept for taxpaying purposes only. The Constitution of the United States never comprehended that we would ever have in

public life in this country, public servants who represented all of the people, who would seek to appeal to class prejudice and to the mob by trying to array one group of our people against some other group. The Constitution presumed that our public officials would write the laws which are to rule the conduct of business in this country and as a referee they would see that these laws of fair play were observed, and when this was done, they would accord to every citizen the right which he actually possesses and that is, the right to honor and respect regardless of whether he might live in a humble cottage or a mansion. And I believe as firmly as I believe anything that today some of the greatest difficulties which we now face, have come about because of the ill-advised action of some men in public life who have sought to create the impression that every man who was successful in business, was a crook. I say to you that no government can long exist if it permits either wealth or poverty to be a standard by which the honesty and integrity of its citizens are judged because you cannot measure those sterling qualities of manhood and womanhood in this country on such a basis. Some of the greatest citizens we have ever had in this country have, when their life was over, failed totally to ever accumulate a dollar, many of them have died in abject poverty. On the other hand, some of the greatest citizens of this country have been men who have accumulated great wealth, who have used that wealth honestly and sincerely for the benefit of America. I am concerned about the domestic affairs of this country for another reason.

During recent years the Federal Government has enacted laws where the alleged purpose of these laws was to protect the rights of the workingman of America, but, unfortunately, some of these laws, especially the National Labor Relations Act, has been so administered that it has simply become a club in the hands of labor racketeers to dominate and control the workingman of America, to control the business of America, and to control the Government itself. I, for one, believe as strongly as anyone in the rights of all of our citizens, whether they be laboring men who wear overalls or bankers who sit behind mahogany desks. I believe in the right of labor to organize. I believe in the right of labor to bargain collectively. But there are some things I do not believe. I do not believe in the right of labor racketeers to use force and violence to prevent other men from working when they want to work. I do not believe that when we have called from the homes of this country millions of young men and have sent them to camps to be trained to serve his nation, possibly to give their lives for this Nation, that we should permit a bunch of labor racketeers to tie up the munition plants and the other defense industries of this country with senseless and useless strikes. And I want to warn you people here tonight that this power and this influence must be checked. It is absolutely foolish to talk about maintaining Democracy in America if we do not maintain in America the right to work. Whenever the time comes in this nation, whether it be in the time of normal business operation or in a period of great emergency, when the citizens of this country are deprived of the right to work in their chosen vocation unless they pay tribute to some organization or some agency, then I say to you that democracy is at an end. You have something worse than government dictatorship, you have a dictatorship of organized minorities who are under the control of none except their unrestrained leaders.

Let me say to you people to whom I am talking tonight, if you believe in America, if you believe in the freedom of America, if you believe in the rights of individual citizens, if you want to see the young manhood of this country during the next century live where they will be free, then I say to you that it is just as essential to stop the establishment of this line of dictatorship as it is to stop the challenge of the dictators from Europe. And let me impress upon you people that it is not a visionary idea which I have, but it is an immediate and a present danger. If you do not believe this, all you have to do is to think of this fact: We have today in the United States Army millions of young men who are training with broomsticks or branches of trees for guns, who are walking because they do not have trucks in which to ride, we have regiment after regiment that is not equipped even sufficiently to carry on a proper training course, to say nothing of actually entering a war. We have made broad promises and commitments not only to defend this Nation, but to aid other democracies of the world, but still we do not have in our Government at Washington men who have sufficient courage to meet this issue and to take the necessary steps to solve the issue. When I introduced in the Congress of the United States my bill which simply proposes to make it a felony for anyone to use force and violence to prevent a man from engaging in his lawful vocation, it caused quite an uproar. Now, bear in mind, this bill in no sense interferes with the right to strike, the right of labor to organize, or any other rights; it merely provides that it shall be a felony to take a club and beat a man up because he may happen to want to work at a lawful job to earn an honest living.

Before I introduced this bill I was told, by a man who was supposed to have a rather broad knowledge of public affairs, that the introduction of such a piece of legislation at this time would be dangerous because if it should be enacted into law, it might cause a Nation-wide strike. My answer to him was this: "I think you are absolutely wrong and I do not think American labor is composed of that kind of men.

I do not believe the average workman of the United States wants the privilege of beating up his fellowman. I told him that I believed the rank and file of American labor would like to see this curb put on the racketeers and their beef squads, but I also told him that if he was right, if it is true that we just think we have a democratic government in this country, but if, in fact, we are now subject to the dictation of a few high-powered labor-union racketeers, then I think we should just as well find it out and the sooner we find it out, the better. In other words, while we are engaged in this great effort of national defense to preserve the fundamental principles of the United States and to preserve the principles of free government, if we have already lost democracy in this country, if we have already established class dictatorship, then the sooner we find it out, the better. I want to say to the people who are here this evening, that the laboring man of this country, the professional man, and the businessman should realize that this is a real and pressing problem now. When you fight the battle for freedom of democracy and for the freedom of mankind, do not forget that if you would preserve this freedom at home no dictatorship must ever be established regardless of whether it be the dictatorship of labor or the dictatorship of capital. Let us keep America as a place where all men are equal; where the rights of all are respected. These things, I believe, are essential for the preservation of the principles of the Constitution of the United States. It is, in my judgment, time to retire from public life the pussyfooting politicians. I think it is time now to stop awarding fat contracts for political reasons. I think it is time to stop thinking about whether we are helping or hurting the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. We are engaged in a great battle and we are fighting that battle on two fronts. We are engaged in a battle to keep the dictators out of America and while we are doing this, let us not forget to press forward the battle to prevent the establishment of a dictatorship which comes from within.

Be not deceived, there are plenty of influences at work in Washington now which would welcome a complete change in our form of government and who would like to use this national emergency to bring about the change. It is time now for the people to be alert if they would preserve the principles of the Constitution of the United States. Let us rededicate ourselves to the fundamental principles of government laid down in the Constitution of the United States. Let us as a people demand that the Congress of the United States see that the rights of the average man are protected. As the young manhood of this country goes forth to battle, let them go with the assurance that those who stay at home will bend every energy to see that there is placed in their hands every modern implement of war. Let them go forth to battle with the assurance that no selfish minority will be allowed to tie up production in essential industries while they argue about the question of forcing the employer to collect union dues. Let the youth of America go to the front with the knowledge that all of America stands back of them, that all of the people are going to work together to give them 100-percent support. Let these soldier boys who are making such great sacrifices know that while they are making those sacrifices, others who remain safely at home will not become war millionaires. Let us by law take from every person and every industry every dollar of excess profits. Let no man earn more than a normal profit out of the national-defense program. Let us reestablish in the hearts of the American people the principles which have made this country great and then with confidence we can look to the future and we can invoke the blessings of Almighty God on all our efforts. Let us eternally stick to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and to the Holy Word of God and the teachings of Christ. So mote it be.

Our Hope for Freedom Lies in the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, AT CARNEGIE HALL, NEW YORK

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at Carnegie Hall, New York, on September 17, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One hundred and fifty-four years ago today at Independence Hall, in Philadelphia, 39 members of the Constitutional Convention signed the completed document of the Constitution of the United States which Mr. Gladstone appropriately termed "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." Both the inspiration of its construction and

the tenacity of its existence have fully justified that praise bestowed upon it. On us rests the responsibility to perpetuate it.

The Constitution provided that it should go into effect after nine States had approved it, and the signal satisfaction of being the decisive ratifying State fell to the State of New Hampshire, which I have the honor to represent in the Senate of the United States.

We have heard often of late the phrase "the horse-and-buggy age" applied to the sayings and wisdom of our founding fathers. My only hope is that history may remember as kindly the officials who thus desecrate the memory of those who presided at the modest beginning of our great Government, which has brought a greater degree of liberty, prosperity, and happiness to our people than that enjoyed anywhere else in the world—a government that, until recently, was at peace with the world and respected by the world.

The wisdom and philosophy of the Constitution has been tested by the whirlwind of party passions, fratricidal warfare, and grave economic convulsions. Never until these last few years have the great merit and immortal principles of this document been assailed.

Think of the magnitude of the task which confronted the fathers in Philadelphia in 1787. They were called upon to write down upon parchment, for the first time in history, a scheme for a government that would insure the preservation and evolution of liberty for all time. Their problem was clearly stated by Lincoln in 1858 in these words: "It has long been a grave question whether any government, not too strong for the liberties of the people, can be strong enough to maintain itself in a great emergency." Still they created a government which was to prove not so strong as to trample upon the rights of the slave with shackles on arms and ankles, and yet was strong enough to maintain itself in the face of the greatest trials and hardships that ever confronted a republic in the history of the world

True to the trust reposed in them by the people, our founding fathers steered clear of autocracy; rule by one man, which can only mean tyranny and despotism. They realized that God has not yet created any one man wise enough or benevolent enough to seize and enforce his individual pattern to govern the minds, property, and lives of every citizen in the land. They comprehended the true science of government. Passionately, they believed that powers of the Government must be separated. As often expressed by them "the accumulation of all the powers of government in the same hands, whether of one, or a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elected," could justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.

Let us review a few of the modern trends and developments which threaten to destroy our constitutional form of government.

I will not enumerate the series of deviations from the letter and spirit of the Constitution which have marked the philosophy of government behind the President from his first election to the present period of war hysteria. I but mention, in passing, the flood of "must" legislation, concentrating always more and more power in the hands of the President and railroaded through a "rubber stamp" Congress.

Added to this line of evasion of the Constitution by the President was his flagrant and unprecedented attempt to destroy one of the three coordinate branches of our Government I refer to his attempt to dilute the effectiveness of the Supreme Court by packing it, as an unprincipled lawyer would try to pack a jury, a recent issue of Collier's magazine to the contrary notwithstanding.

The latest maneuver of this master of a free people was accomplished in his last radio talk, in which he announced the issuance of orders to the Atlantic Fleet to eliminate the submarines, but his radio talk went much further even than that. By that talk the President eliminated the Congress along with the submarines. Fellow Americans, the President has, in fact, eliminated your Congress just as effectively as a depth charge puts a submarine out of business.

I measure my words when I say that, in my opinion, the greatest menace to this country and to our form of government does not come from any enemy abroad but rather exists right here in our own country, and more particularly and specifically under the Capitol dome in Washington, where the people's representatives in the Congress have apparently lost their sense of responsibility under the Constitution to act as a separate but coordinate branch of the Federal Government and have yielded to pressure and blandishments of another branch, the Executive. Therein is the great threat to the American way of life and the American form of government.

We of America need a new declaration of independence by the American Congress.

This is a fateful hour in the history of our Nation. Common honesty and integrity have been cast to the winds and the people are being deceived in a gigantic conspiracy to drive them into the war. We all should have a share in arriving at such a momentous decision as faces our Nation. No one man—no one group of men—should be allowed to make the decision for us, only the people's representatives in Congress, to whom the Constitution grants the sole power to declare war. A great fundamental precept of the Declaration of Independence is that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Tonight as we look across the seas at the Old World, we see the lights of civilization being again extinguished in another chapter of the many wars which have devastated the peoples of Europe for generation after generation. We can characterize this war as Romain Rolland did the last: "A sacrilegious conflict which saw a maddened Europe ascending its funeral pyre and, like Hercules, destroying itself with its own hands."

Today, certain forces in our country, intrigued by international interests, are bending their every effort to embroil us in the European holocaust, by ignoring the constitutional prerogatives of the people's representatives in the Congress, which body has the sole power to declare war.

I ask you: Shall the American people be driven into that chaos by leaders in this country in violation of their solemn promises to the American people?

Shall the American people lose to power-inebriated leaders in this country the individual rights which they now hold under the Constitution?

Shall the American Congress be reduced to a supine group of fear-stricken, timid men, as was the German Reichstag?

Last November the American people throughout the country went to the polls with promises of peace still ringing in their ears. Both major parties had adopted strong and unequivocal peace planks. For months Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie had been competing with each other in making more and more vigorous promises, more and more reassuring promises that the American people would not be driven into the European war. Mr. Roosevelt pledged this in the following words, I quote: "And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again, your sons are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

In a voice vibrant with emotional appeal and with the ring of sincerity designed to win votes, Mr. Willkie said, I quote: "The battle of America is a battle for liberty. It belongu right here at home. I believe we should keep out of war at all hazards. We are being urged toward war by an administration which is alike careless in speech and in action." But when after election some of his campaign statements were recalled to Mr. Willkie, he replied, "That was a bit of campaign oratory."

Can our people no longer listen to the words of our so-called statesmen with any confidence that they are speaking what is in their minds and hearts?

Are we, like the European nations, to have a government of men and not of laws?

Are we to be tricked and duped with impunity, only to awaken like the Germans and the Russians to find that we are mere cogs in the wheel of government and no longer free individuals endowed with inalienable rights?

Can the President and Mr. Willkie successfully jeopardize the well-being and the very lives of the American people on the assurance of Lend-Lease Administrator Harry Hopkins that "the people are too damned dumb to know what it is all about"?

Shame on any man, whether he be the President, whether he be counsel for the motion-picture industry, or whether he be a Communist office holder in an administrative department of our Government—shame on any man who would deliberately deceive the plain people of America on a matter which means life and death to them.

Administration spokesmen are criticizing the majority of the people because they are not united for war in Europe. National unity is much to be desired, but you can't have national unity by deceiving the people or by going against the will of the people.

Fellow Americans, we can achieve national unity overnight if the President, by action and words, would adhere to the will of the people by announcing and carrying through a program for national defense—a defense policy to make the United States so strong that no nation or combination of nations would dare attempt to set foot in the Western Hemisphere—we could have national unity overnight if the administration would return to the principle of America for America, with no entangling alliances with any of the European nations.

Europe has always been engaged in wars, and it will not cease to be a cesspool of bloody ventures until it has spent its hatreds, its passions, its greeds, and until it has learned the principles of the Prince of Peace, that those who live by the sword shall perish by the sword.

History has proven that America cannot ally herself with any nation in war with any assurance that her decision of the moment is a wise one. Our boys died on the battlefields to defeat the Kaiser, but after the war Woodrow Wilson went to Europe to arrange the peace and came back a disillusioned man. In the Genesis of the World War, by Harry Elmer Barnes, professor of historical sociology at Smith College, we read the following:

"Perhaps the best 'epitaph' on the whole episode of America and the World War and the finest proof of the futility of intervention, is contained in the statement of Mr. Wilson to James Kerney on December 7, 1923, relative to the policy of Poincaré—'I should like to see Germany clean up France, and I should like to see Jusserand and tell him so to his face.'"

He knew that the peace terms of that war could result in nothing but a greater war to come.

Only a short time ago we were helping Finland against Russia. Today we are sending munitions to Russia which will be used to bomb Finland. Today we would ally ourselves with Russia in her war with Germany, but it is possible that 10 years from now we might ally ourselves with Germany to halt the menace of communism sweeping Europe.

Why spend the lives of our richest blood on the battlefields of Europe on such uncertain and impermanent ventures? Why not take a

lesson from our experiences and follow the wisdom of the father of our Nation, in his advice against entangling alliances?

But there are those who say: But what are we going to do to stop Hitler? These people are divided into two groups. One is the group of those who use this fear propaganda because they have selfish motives for getting us into the war, and are willing to use any pretext to get us in. Take for example the group in the motion-picture industry which has control of one of the greatest instruments of propaganda in the country.

It has been advised that the motion-picture industry has millions of dollars owed to it by British motion-picture interests. It is obvious that they have a reason for wanting us to get into the war. Million-dollar investments must be protected.

There are those in another group, however, who have a sincere and honest apprehension that Hitler can conquer the world. My answer to that is that Hitler has built up so many hates in Europe that he will never be able to untangle the potential "fifth column" against him, which exists throughout the Continent, should he live a thousand years.

Each new conquest—each new country he invades—only weakens him and hastens his downfall. He cannot turn his back on the people of Europe and Russia and seriously threaten the United States either militarily or economically. No less an authority than Bernard Baruch has testified that even though Hitler should win a technical military victory in Europe, Germany, and not the United States, would be the loser of the economic campaign for world trade.

Let those who sincerely fear invasion by Hitler listen to the considered judgment of Lt. Col. Thomas R. Phillips, of the General Staff Corps of the United States Army. I quote: "Even if the United States had no harbor defenses, it would be impregnable to invasion. And this still would be true if our Navy were inferior to that of an invading power. * * * The bomber has made the American coast impregnable to invasion."

And yet, despite this, there are those who are bent on getting us into the war, even by the twisting of the true meaning of freedom of the seas. Let me tell you something about that.

Freedom of the seas does not mean that one nation can send ships laden with contraband to a warring nation without accepting the risk of their being sunk by that nation's enemies. As a matter of fact, Great Britain will not allow American vessels to carry food to the stricken peoples of Europe. Let a group in this country try to ship food to the starving Greeks or to ship medicine to our friends in Finland, and see what happens. Let it be remembered that the American merchant ship *Steel Seafarer* which was sunk in the Red Sea was loaded with contraband of war at least 12,000 miles from our shores.

Let those who urge us to go to war to uphold the doctrine of freedom of the seas, be honest in discussing this subject. The American people are not children. They know what contraband is.

We have one clear duty, to build up our Army and our Navy and our military production with unceasing determination, and thereby demonstrate to Hitler that any attempted invasion of the Western Hemisphere is out of the question.

Bear in mind that after the war is over Europe will be filled with depraved minds and starving bodies, and the seeds of communism will find fertile soil and insure its growth. The Russian doctrines will over-ride Europe and the pressure of that propaganda upon our own Nation will be tremendous. By building up our economic strength, by building up our productive capacity and by making the four freedoms a reality in our home country we will better be able to withstand this menace, both militarily and politically, than we would if we were to throw our all into the death struggle of Europe.

There is a deadly conspiracy to get us into the war, but it is not too late to make that conspiracy an unsuccessful one.

Two well-known columnists, Mr. Alsop and Mr. Kintner, have received appointments in the United States Navy. One of them is a cousin of Franklin Roosevelt. On June 4 they frankly stated in their syndicated column that the President and the men around him hoped that the Atlantic patrol would result in an incident which could be used as an excuse for taking this country into war. That was expert testimony but the sinkings have not been fast enough, and now orders have been issued which are expected to produce more incidents. Congress is being bypassed. Congress, which has the sole power to declare war, has been eliminated in the matter. Congress will come back and exercise its prerogatives only if the people demand of the individual Members the courage that is so greatly lacking today.

If those who are seeking an incident to involve our Nation as a shooting participant in the European War are successful what lies ahead of us? What price war?

A debt unprecedented, so staggering in its magnitude as to make inevitable inflation, the impairment of savings, life insurance, and annuities; the crippling of trust funds, educational and charitable institutions, and the repudiation of a large part of our national debt; a depression in industry and finance which will make the depression of 1931 and 1932 seem mild in comparison; the sacrifice of millions of lives of young American manhood and, what is even worse, a tragic harvest of mentally incapacitated men, broken-hearted mothers and fathers and families.

We will lose our democratic way of life, the liberties and freedoms vouchsafed us in our Constitution, while in their place there will arise some Fascist or Communistic form of government.

What a heritage for our children! And in the long years of aftermath of the hell of it all those of us still living will turn back in sad retrospection to these days, and the youth of that day will turn and ask us why we permitted the warmongers of 1941 to push this Nation into the maelstrom of European intrigue and selfishness.

Wake up America. The hour is late. The danger is acute.

Demand that there shall be no waging of war by Executive decree but only by the considered action of the one branch of our Government empowered to declare war by the Constitution—the people's representatives, the Congress of the United States. Article I, section 8, of our Constitution has not been repealed.

So, on this anniversary, when we turn our minds to that sacred document, the Constitution, on this day when our individual liberty and the welfare of our Nation is at stake, let us give solemn thought to the words of former Chief Justice Hughes: "But in the great enterprise of making democracy workable, we are all partners. One member of our body politic cannot say to another, 'I have no need of thee.' We work in successful cooperation by being true, each department to its own functions, and all to the spirit which pervades our institutions; exalting the processes of reason, seeking through the very limitations of power the promotion of the wise use of power, and finding the ultimate security of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and the promise of continued stability and a rational progress, in the good sense of the American people."

To that good sense we appeal tonight.

Address by Representative Plumley on the One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of Admission of Vermont into the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE ROCKWOOD PUBLICATIONS, FAIR HAVEN, VT.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Representative CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, of Vermont, who was the principal guest speaker at the sesquicentennial celebration recently held in the town of Wells, Vt., in commemoration of the entry of Vermont as the fourteenth State into the Union. The address is taken from the Rockwood Publications, of Fair Haven, Vt., under date of August 28, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rockwood Publications, Fair Haven, Vt., of August 28, 1941]

CONGRESSMAN PLUMLEY SAYS IT IS "THEY" OR "WE"

"If we let England fall we must be prepared to fight, at a midnight hour of our desperation, for self-preservation in an almost endless war against the mightiest, maddest, most ruthless coalition of murderous conquerors the world has ever known."

Congressman CHARLES ALBERT PLUMLEY was the principle guest speaker at the sesquicentennial celebration held in the town of Wells on Saturday and in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary since the entry of Vermont as the fourteenth State of the Union.

Approximately 600 persons from Wells and adjacent towns were in attendance at this observance and listened to the address delivered by the Representative from Vermont in the Lower House of the Federal legislative body at Washington, D. C.

In his speech Mr. PLUMLEY said:

"Mr. Chairman, it is a long look back to 1761 when the charter of Wells was granted—then only 152 years from the date Champlain first saw the lake that thereafter was to bear his name forever. And your town was organized in 1773—a long, long time ago and at a time when every man and woman prized their freedom to such a measure that they were determined to enjoy it no matter what it cost.

"The story of those early days is the record of the achievements of men and women who greatly dared and greatly did.

"Hardy, grim, resolute, with incredible toil and unbelievable risk too great to try to measure they laid deep and firm and strong the foundations of civilization for the opportunities and all the blessings we inherit.

"It is therefore most fitting and it is right and proper that we should meet here today to glory in the accomplishments for which our pioneer forebears paved the way; yet lip service awaits but little. The deeds of our ancestors should be no excuse nor alibi for our

failure to show by deeds that we also have courage and strength and are ready to dare greatly and do nobly if and when the need and the occasion shall arise.

"In the great part which our country and each and all of us hereafter must play (whether we will it or not) in the world at large, let us emulate the example of our forebears, enthused and inspired by their confident faith in the future and in themselves, and by their purpose and determination that all men shall be free.

"I have a particular and a peculiar interest in the observance of the sesquicentennial of Vermont's admission to the Union. My great grandfathers on both sides of the family contributed their part to make it possible and my great grandmothers kept the home fires burning. They, my great grandfathers, were at Bunker Hill, at Hubbardton, at Ticonderoga, at Bennington, and if there was a fight for freedom going on anywhere in New England's forest you will find the names of my ancestors in the official records as present and accounted for. Incidentally, my great grandfather, Ebenezer Fletcher, was taken prisoner at Hubbardton. He wrote his story of the battle in a pamphlet which has appeared times without number as a historical document. Naturally I am proud of these old Green Mountain Boy ancestors of mine, and if once in a while my blood boils and I feel the urge to fight against tyranny I lay it to them, and hope I have enough of their spirit in me to make me want to fight for and enable me to maintain the honor of the State, my country, and my family.

"Anyway, who can analyze or fathom the pathos, emotion, passion, and love of a Vermonter for his homeland? No one but a Vermonter knows the answer.

"The love of that place where and by whose institutions he has been molded and by whose laws he has been protected and defended is an inborn sentiment which no power can erase, fixed and immovable as are our mountains. There is no power which can strike from our hearts the memory of the hamlet or town, the cottage or the mansion, in whose atmosphere we first breathed and with whose soil and scenery the innumerable and imperishable associations of our childhood and our lives are linked.

"All of us are so busy making history these days that we are prone to treat too much as commonplace the wonderful tradition and the history that is ours, but 150 years is a long time in the life of a Nation or a State, and its passing should be appropriately observed.

"Before and since the Revolution the territory occupied by the Green Mountain Boys was and has been the scene and seat of intense patriotism, local and national. The reckless courage and daring, the bold defiance of conventions, the natural military genius, and the determined purpose to win and to defend the liberty and freedom to which they believed themselves entitled made and make the Green Mountain Boys the intrepid heroes they were and are in song, story, and fact.

"The years only serve to testify the deferred but always deserved appreciation accorded those fearless fighters for the cause of the humble citizen, those contending for the rights of individual property and the equal dispensation of justice under the law.

"The very pyramids have forgotten their builders, but so long as courage and daring, love of liberty, justice, and country shall last, the story of the struggles of the Green Mountain Boys, enemies to oppression, strangers to fear, will be held in the memories of and be venerated by their appreciative countrymen.

"As someone has well said, deeds, not stones, are the true monuments of the great. The Green Mountain Boys erected to themselves a monument more lasting than brass, more sublime than the pyramids; a monument which neither the storms of the centuries that waste, nor of the years which succeed each other innumerably with their everlasting flight of the seasons, shall be able to demolish.

"So today we are observing the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the admission to the Union of the State of Vermont, which event was made possible by the sacrifices and the services of those men and women—150 years of enjoyed liberty under law made possible for us by those brave, patriotic, farseeing men and women who built the foundations of our State.

"Today we, their descendants, are confronted by the threat of the loss, the possibility of the obliteration of the rights and privileges of free men and women, and the destruction of civilization itself.

"The pagan, atheistic philosophy of Hitler and Mussolini, their totalitarian theory of government, and our Christian civilization and democratic form of government cannot coexist in the world. The issue is clear-cut and as well defined as anything possibly could be. It is reduced to a matter of principle. A man's judgment in these days of perplexity is safe when, and only when, it follows the line of principle, as he undertakes to chart a course of patriotic action. The two forms of government and the two philosophies of life cannot coexist; and the sooner we realize what confronts us and face facts, the quicker we can determine what is demanded of us by the emergency.

"Looking into the jaws of a Hitler hell, can there be any question in your mind as to the course we must choose to follow to the end? Are you for freedom? Remember that only those can defend freedom who are free and who love it.

"I tell you, my friends, that we cannot relieve ourselves of our responsibility to ourselves, to our children, and to the world, by trying to purchase peace at any price; nor by making a money contribution to our own temporary safety. Can it be measured in dollars and cents alone, or assured?

"Appeasers and isolationists and all of us should make no mistake. Whether we like it or not, we cannot dodge the fact that if we let England fall we must be prepared to fight, at a midnight hour of our desperation, for self-preservation, in an almost endless war against the mightiest, maddest, most ruthless coalition of murderous conquerors the world has ever known. Who questions it?

"The remorseless logic of facts and events proves the truth, and that the issue has long been drawn and is clear Remember what I tell you. It is either they or we in the last analysis. It is not easy to assume the responsibility for that statement; but it is right and will prevail.

"Calvin Coolidge was right when he said, as some of you have heard me quote before:

" 'No great question has ever been decided by the people of this Nation on the sole basis of dollars and cents. All that is needed,' said he, 'is for us to give what we think America is worth.'

"Love of money and the greed for gold always have been and always will be at the root of all this old world's troubles. Thirty pieces of silver sold Christ to crucifixion. There are other and better standards of measurement of the value we place on our lives and liberty.

"We must face facts. We should prove to the world that democracy can save itself. We should not hide behind the skirts of expediency, in an emergency, nor should we be blinded by personal prejudice or political partisanship.

"We should not fear the consequences of doing everything in our power to save ourselves. We should be desperately afraid of the consequences of doing too little too late. To see what is right and not to do it is cowardly. As Samuel Johnson once said:

" 'When desperate ills demand a speedy cure, distrust is cowardice and prudence folly. I say to you that we must be fit in order to be free.'

"INDIVIDUALITY

"In these days of centralization of government we are too prone to forget that it is not by pruning away individuality but by cultivating it wisely that human beings become valuable to themselves and to others and that human life becomes rich, diversified, and interesting. Individuality is equivalent to development. This the pages of history abundantly demonstrate.

"We Vermonters are called rugged individualists. While we know that is true, we modestly conceal from everybody our appreciation of the fact that the story of the Green Mountain Boys parallels even that of the Greeks at Thermopylae in its uniqueness with respect to the intrepidity and the bravery exhibited, in its intense interest to students of government and in its appeal to lovers of liberty. That is the Vermonter in us.

"UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

"I would like to take advantage of this occasion to go on record again with respect to my position concerning all the un-American organizations and groups and activities that infest this land in its day of peril.

"We are so dumb we are fairly numb in our insensibil'ty to what we have tolerated to be done to us. It is time to speak out about some of these things we see and know. The people have a right to be told, and should be told what is being done to them, and for one, I do not propose later to be held accountable for not having done my best to advise them.

"So far as I am personally concerned, and as your Representative, it might as well be understood by 'fifth columnists,' 'parlor pinks,' 'fellow travelers,' 'pseudo liberals,' and all those 'lickspittle,' 'milksop' Americans who criticize me for being outspoken against them and their kind that I have no question as to what my duty is in the premises.

"My position can best be stated once for all, and for all time, in the words of Daniel Webster, which I have the presumption and determination to make my own, when he said:

" 'I mean to stand upon the Constitution. I need no other platform. I shall know but one country. The ends I aim at shall be my country's, my God's, and truth's. I was born an American; I live an American; I shall die an American; and I intend to perform the duties incumbent upon me in that character to the end of my career. I mean to do this with absolute disregard of personal consequences. Let the consequences be what they will, I am careless. No man can suffer too much and no man can fall too soon if he suffer or if he fall in defense of the liberties and constitution of his country.'

"The principles, methods, and aims of the Communists, their fellow travelers and sympathizers and supporters are the very antithesis of liberty and freedom and equality and justice under the law. Their scheme of government has no place in America anywhere, nor has any individual so inclined. That's plain talk, but true.

"Candor is a bitter pill for such people, however high they ride, to have to swallow, but millions of Americans agree with me and hold that the greed of this group and some individuals for money; their love of power; their obsession for experimentation; their egocentric monomania for publicity at the people's expense; and other things too numerous to mention, are responsible for the weakening of the moral fiber, the breaking down of morale and morals, the turmoil and the lack of confidence found in the body politic today. It is too bad, but too true, but not too late to correct it.

"The light of pitiless publicity should be mercilessly turned on the activities of these very people. They should be exposed. No

one should be overimpressed, awed, coerced, or cowed by the position any of these people happen to occupy, or by their delusions of grandeur, and, least of all, by their fantastic theories—social, economic, and paternalistic.

"The 'fifth column' has been at work here ever since Hitler made his plan to dominate the world. Right here in Vermont, my friends, there have been, and there are still, a few of those who under the egocentric impulse and the camouflage that they are 'liberals' are promulgating un-American ideas and theories clearly destructive of those fundamentals on which this State and the United States were founded.

"If they love some other country better than their own and what it affords, then they should go to that country or we should send them there. There is no neutral ground. It is either we or they.

"Every red-blooded American ought to join in heart and spirit with the cadets at West Point in their Sunday morning prayer when they say, 'Strengthen and increase our admiration for honest dealing and clean thinking, and suffer not our hatred of hypocrisy and pretense ever to diminish. * * * Endow us with courage * * * that knows no fear when truth and right are in jeopardy.'

"So today, as we observe the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Vermont's admission to the Union, we honor ourselves by recalling the deeds of valor, the sacrifices, the determination, and the farsighted vision of our ancestors who made possible for us all that we now enjoy.

"Anyone who is conversant with our early history must be impressed by the fact that the men and women who laid the foundations of our State meant exactly what they said and had the faculty to say what they meant—and in no uncertain terms. It is probably true that 'Vermont as nearly as any spot upon the earth's crust has been the scene of the most conspicuous action by men in all efforts to create, maintain, and advance a true independence of person and State and upon principles fundamentally included in the term "self-government." '

"In fact, the history of Vermont 'upon utmost analysis discloses that no people organized as a State have more nearly attained to perfect sovereignty or maintained it under their constitution and political methods. Vermont has been an extraordinary upbuilder of the Nation because of the intrinsic character of the people who compose it.'

"The question which now confronts you and me is, Will we carry on? Can we carry the load? Our responsibility is tremendous. Are we afraid? Of whom?

"These are critical days and troublesome times for those who love liberty. We come from a stock to whom the more abundant life only means one that we can carve out for ourselves without the dictation or interference of a paternalistic government. We may well remember that a typical Vermonter, Calvin Coolidge, once said that: 'The America which Washington founded does not mean we shall have everything done for us, but that we shall have every opportunity to do everything for ourselves.' That is 100-percent Americanism.

"The problems which confront us are too numerous to permit at this time even a cataloging, not to say a discussion of them seriatim. The question is, Where are we and where are we going? Who knows?

"Shall we quit? Never.

"It is our task to finish the job or to go down with all that has been accomplished, blotted out in a complete black-out. What a picture.

"We must go forward. We must turn our faces to the future, come what may. There must be no retreat.

"There is no such word as retreat in the vocabulary of a Vermonter.

"We might as well, each and all of us, invoke the spirit of Tennyson's Ulysses, who said:

" 'Come my friends,
'Tis not too late to seek a newer world.
Push off, and sitting well in order smite
The sounding furrows; for my purpose holds
To sail beyond the sunset, and the baths
Of all the western stars until I die. * * *
To strive, to seek, to find—and not to yield.'

"It is strange that Americans do not appreciate the fact that this world revolution now in progress will not stop short of America. It is incapable of stopping short of anywhere until it has conquered the world or been conquered by the world. 'Nobody can stay out of a world revolution. It can be resisted or accepted.' It cannot be ignored.

" 'There will be no second chance for us unless the revolution is beaten' has been well said, for it is true.

"So 'put the Vermonters ahead once more and close up the column.'

"It is no idle boast for us Vermonters to say as Americans that what we purpose that we perform. So today, imbued, enthused, and encouraged by the independence that is ours, and the thought of all that those who preceded us have made possible for us, let us go forward with determination to preserve, protect, and defend all that is ours, and to transmit to posterity our priceless privileges on a shield unsullied and without a stain.

" 'To what new fates, my country, far
And unforeseen of foe or friend,
Beneath what unexpected star
Compelled to what unchosen end?

" 'Across the sea that knows no beach
The Admiral of Nations guides
Thy blind obedient keels to reach
The harbor where thy future rides!

" 'I do not know beneath what sky
Nor on what seas shall be thy fate.
I only know it shall be high;
I only know it shall be great.' "

Address by the Postmaster General Before Democratic Editorial Association of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. FRANK C. WALKER

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Frank C. Walker, Postmaster General, before the Democratic Editorial Association of Indiana at French Lick Springs, Ind., on September 20, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want you to know that I consider it a great compliment to have been invited to address this fine organization of editors of Indiana, which has had for its guests some of the most notable figures in the public life of America. May I at the outset add a personal touch and say it is especially gratifying because it is here within the confines of your good State that I spent 3 of the happiest years of my life. It was here at Notre Dame during these years where I received a goodly part of my early education and served as a sort of reporter on South Bend and Indianapolis papers. Because of this background, I feel that it has made it easier to discuss with you directly and personally a dominant issue of national concern, upon the outcome of which depends the welfare of our country.

The responsibility which American editors and publishers have to convey information to the public is correlated to the responsibility which the President and his administration have—to chart a course, to establish a direction for the active progress of our people.

It is a striking evidence, too seldom noticed, of our really effective democracy that the responsibility for the welfare of our people should rest not exclusively on one group or political party; nor even upon the elected officials of government. From the early days of our Republic, the press of this country has grasped keenly its privilege, and its obligation, to the people. Our press, at its best, has been developed not as an adjunct of government or an ally of any self-seeking pressure group. It has attained unparalleled distinction as the conscientious expression of free men for whom truth was sacred. The telling of that truth was, and is, the ultimate justification for the freedom of the press.

The hard-working editors and writers of the American press are scientists searching for facts—scientists tracing our currents of opinion—and recording the events of human action. Like true scientists everywhere they are more devoted to the cause of truth and public welfare than to their own individual concern.

As the living channels of information and well-springs of opinion, newspapers are the pedagogs of the public mind. They furnish the information, they impart the knowledge, upon which intelligent judgment must be founded. They furnish a platform for public discussion, for an interchange of opinion, for the expression of opposing views.

To interfere with this function, to inhibit it in any way; to intimidate the security of its freedom by any kind of pressure, would be to undermine one of the bulwarks of the democracy of this Nation.

But as the press is charged with responsibility for telling the truth, as the truth may be known, it is not equally charged with fixing national policy. That is the obligation of the Government, and, in a singular manner, of the President of the United States.

In the arena of action rather than of argument, his moves are decisive for us all. His tactics are ours; by our choice, by our election, and by virtue of our democracy which consents to authoritative action without suppressing individual argument.

A President, loved by millions of his fellow citizens for his proved love of them, needs no defense against rash accusations. To a man who is pained by the suffering of the poor and humble; to a man who delights to share in the simple pleasures of ordinary Americans, the horror of a possible war has been an agonizing burden on his soul. Indeed, it was his very dread of war that sharpened his extraordinary perception of its approach. He saw it afar off. In foreseeing it, he was almost alone; in striving to prevent it, he was almost unaided.

Events of the past 2 years have moved so rapidly and have taken such frightful and tragic turns that few of us have paused to consider what has gone before the outbreak of this war that now directly engulfs more than a billion and a quarter persons—a war which each day is slowly but inevitably deciding who shall dominate more than three-quarters of the earth—a war which is deciding what fundamental philosophy shall regulate the hearts and minds of men, women, and

children everywhere in relation to the home, the church, and the state.

May I remind you of the successive steps our President took as he wisely and consistently fixed our policy? In May 1933, 2 months after he took office—yes, 6 years before the war began—President Roosevelt focused the eyes of the world upon the causes of the growing unrest when he said they could be traced to—

First, "the desire, disclosed or hidden, on the part of governments to enlarge their territories at the expense of a sister nation," and

Second, "the fear of nations that they will be invaded."

At that very time in Europe and Asia, in our own hemisphere—indeed, in the world—this Nation stood practically friendless.

Through many years nothing had been done to make this Nation a good neighbor or to encourage other nations to be good neighbors. But at the very outset of his leadership, President Roosevelt, thoughtful and informed in international affairs, recognized the implications in existing world conditions, and promptly—8 years ago—urged all nations of the world "to translate their professed peace policies into action," because without such concerted action "the fear of aggressive war was justified." Yes; 8 years ago—more than 6 years before the fall of France—the President said, "Modern weapons of offense are vastly stronger than modern weapons of defense. Frontier forts, trenches, wire entanglements, coast defenses—in a word, fixed fortifications—are no longer impregnable to the attack of war planes, heavy mobile artillery, land battleships called tanks, and poison gas."

Eight years ago—more than 6 years before the fall of Warsaw—he urged "the elimination from possession and use of the weapons which make possible a successful attack." Even though his appeals fell upon deaf ears, 8 years ago—with the help of his able counselor, Secretary of State Cordell Hull—the President sought to make friends for this Nation throughout the world, to the end that the Nation might enjoy the security and tranquillity which come to a good neighbor among good neighbors. He alone led us into the paths of friendship—all the while encouraging neighbors to seek the ways of peace.

When his appeals failed, and when the grim significance of the failure of other nations to follow the ways of peace became clear, the President once more cautioned the people of this country, in March 1934, when he said "that activities vital for national defense cannot be sacrificed for passing advantage." On January 4, 1935, the President said to Congress, "I cannot, with candor, tell you that general international relationships are improved. New strivings for armament and power rear their ugly heads." In October 1935 he said, "War is a potent danger at this moment to the future of civilization." And, on Armistice Day of that year, he added, "the dangers that confront mankind as a whole are greater to the world, and therefore to us, than the dangers which confront the people of the United States by and in themselves alone." Again—6 years ago—the President declared, "America must and will protect herself. Defense is our accepted policy and the measure of that defense is and will be the amount necessary to safeguard us against the armaments of others." Five years ago, the President spoke as follows: "The Americas must take cognizance of a world situation that has in it elements that lead to the tragedy of a general war." "If there are nations that wish us not good but ill, they know that we are strong; they know that we can and will defend ourselves and defend our neighborhood."

Even though the President was a man of peace he did not believe that the Nation should allow its defenses to become impaired. From the day that he first heard the faint rumblings of thunder on the distant horizon, the President set about rebuilding the American Navy and revitalizing the United States Army.

As early as 1933, he earmarked $250,000,000 for naval construction. Thirty-two fighting ships were laid down. All of these vessels have since been completed and are now operating with the fleet. The following year the Vinson-Trammell Act authorized the building of the Navy up to treaty tonnages. The Congress appropriated funds for 20 fighting ships in 1935, 22 in 1936, and 30 in 1937. In 1938 the Navy was authorized to exceed treaty tonnages by 20 percent, and early in 1940 came the 11 percent blanket increase. Later in the same year came the supplementary 70 percent increase and at last the two-ocean navy was to become a reality.

During the first 8 months of 1941, 213 naval vessels of all kinds were completed or placed in active service, including 2 giant 35,000-ton battleships, 9 submarines, and 12 destroyers. In these 8 months 436 new keels have been laid, including those for 2 battleships, 13 cruisers, 18 submarines, 2 aircraft carriers, 57 destroyers, and 91 patrol craft, not to mention 81 auxiliaries and 172 district craft.

The speed with which naval construction in this country is now proceeding has been made possible to a large degree through plant and yard extensions, which were undertaken several years ago in keeping with the Roosevelt policy of building up the American Navy. Today we have the largest navy in the world.

There has been an accompanying increase in the air forces of both the Army and Navy, not great in numerical terms until the last 3 years, yet because of the President's policy there has been developed the best military aircraft in the world here in the United States. That his policy has succeeded is best proven by the record of American planes in the war to date. The airplane expansion program advocated 3 years ago is now bearing fruit at the rate of more than 1,500 airplanes a month with a goal set by the President of 50,000 planes a year by mid 1942.

Through the years the President continued his search for peace and gave every assistance and encouragement to all others who sought to save mankind from destruction. Animated by a desire to collaborate in a movement for peace, in 1939 he appointed a special envoy to the Vatican.

On April 14, 1939, he addressed a message to Hitler and Mussolini—a message of peace and good will designed to bring all of Europe's great nations together around the council tables in an effort to avoid the impending disaster of war, reduce armaments, guarantee the security of frontiers, and consummate agreements on international trade.

Even when the forces of might were on the march he sought to bring the aggressor nations to a peaceful conference. In August of 1939, a few days before the outbreak of the war, he again asked Hitler to mediate his differences with Poland. But once again his plea fell on deaf ears.

And when the threat to this Nation became a cold reality the President promptly supplemented his measures for our defense with alien registration, selective service, acquisition of new strategic bases, lease-lend, and the Atlantic patrol.

Now it seems to some of us that, respecting the war, too little attention has been given thus far to action and too much to argument. We need not attempt to pass judgment on the merits of the contemporary debate concerning our relation to the war. On such a vital issue, public and private discussion is necessary if our democracy is to survive. Inevitably, the argument has aroused heated emotions; and in questions of life and death, when emotions are not aroused, humanity is dead. So long as we have a choice, and if we have a choice, we are pledged to the hate of war. If it is an issue that does not affect our vital security and our political continuance, we are stanchly neutral.

So long as we had a choice, the interventionists and the isolationists, and other groups (pinned with somewhat misleading labels) performed a service by the diffusion of their views, even when these views were partial and dictated by emotional sympathies and dislikes. The so-called isolationist, at his patriotic best, fortified the deep American desire (a desire upon which this Republic was founded) to be free from the devious and discouraging entanglements of European power politics. Through a long line of Presidents, from Washington to Roosevelt, ours has been a fixed policy of no foreign alliances.

The so-called isolationists have served to arouse us, if we needed to be awakened, to the sanctity and the preciousness of human life and to the horror of shedding blood in quest of lustful power or in the vanity of an arbitrary interference.

On the other hand, the so-called interventionists saw the war as an ultimate menace to the security of this Nation and this hemisphere. They feared for the effect upon this Nation, and upon the world, of a triumph of force; they saw a world dominated by Hitler as a world destroyed, as a society corrupted. They were interventionists because they saw the world as a tight, small thing; they saw humanity itself as one thing, and they viewed national boundaries as but weak barriers to a rampant aggressive evil. With varying convictions and from various motives they urged us to active, participating resistance lest the spreading fire of a consuming wickedness should destroy us.

So long as the war was a German war, a British war, a French war, or an Italian war, it is no criticism of anyone to say that some opinions were colored by racial and religious backgrounds and by harsh memories of an historic past. Quite understandably, the Jewish people longed for the overthrow of the arch-enemy of their very life; Christian peoples desired the suppression of the vicious Paganism propagated by the Nazi or Communist regimes. The Irish people saw no reason for assisting Britain in a political or economic combat; the Americans of German descent or of Italian descent protested lest the scales be weighted against the nations of their forefathers, whose gentle, cultured ways and sturdy virtues had enriched their own life heritage, as, indeed, they have enriched America. These and many other aspects, frankly and clearly, entered into our divergent opinions so long as the war remained (if it ever was) a war in which we could be neutral.

But it is a curious fact that the action of that war has outdistanced the argument about it. And it is no less curious, while deeply significant of our will to peace, that all of us have been aware of that action while we were still arguing, as if we could control the circumstances that might bring about our involvement in the war. We were aware that this Nation was arming on a scale so vast as to defy description; we were aware that the war had entered forcibly into our everyday calculations. During the past 2 years, every city, every town, village, and farm throughout this Nation has been profoundly altered in the conduct of its daily affairs; we have pledged our generation, and also the next, to a tremendous burden of financial obligation and of economic sacrifice. We were aware of the action of the war.

The great issue of our lives, if not of our speech, has been the war. Our instinct has outmarched our reasoned deliberations. Our instinct has kept pace with the march of Hitler.

We did not wish war—we do not wish war—but we know now that the war is upon us; it is upon us through the necessity of defense. We did not go out to meet it, but

like a hurricane it has swept over the seas challenging our freedom, jeopardizing our national and soon, our individual lives.

As Chief Executive of the United States, prayerfully mindful of his grave responsibility, President Roosevelt has declared that the time has come when the Americas themselves must now be defended and stand their ground against assault upon their sovereignty and freedom. The time has come to say to the inhuman seekers of world domination by the sword, "You seek to throw our children and our children's children into your form of terrorism and slavery. You have now attacked our own safety. You shall go no further."

This is no action of intervention. It is no action of isolation. It is not an action selected by choice; it is an action compelled by circumstance. It is an action of inescapable defense against a creeping monstrosity of terror.

As action, it has the character and value of a fact; as a fact, it is, for all of us, a turning point from discussion to complete, united effort. The action of the war has been met by the counteraction of the Commander in Chief of the United States.

There has ben some who said that former actions of our President were leading us into war without due provocation. There were some who asserted that our President was seeking out an occasion to project our people into the conflict. There were some who said that he was being influenced in his judgments by the blandishments and praise of other nations.

The plain fact of the matter is that the actions of the President throughout the years from early 1933 to this very moment bear witness to a remarkable insight and a prophetic struggle carried on by him before most of us had heard the roar of guns or knew the direction of their firing.

The one who did know; the one who counseled us and cried out a warning to the world, the one who watched the facts and not the controversy; the one who, astonishingly, has resisted aggression, yet avoided active combat—that man, our President, now declares that the action of the war immediately threatens our vital interests and our national security.

We are poised on no arbitrary adventure; we are alined by no artificial choice. But we stand embattled before an insane and fratricidal tyranny that strikes, with the lawlessness of a maniac, to enslave the world.

To that tyranny our President has said, "You shall go no further." And at his summons we, all of us, stand ready, watchful, waiting.

Effect of Defense Program on Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., OF WISCONSIN

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Defense Program Threatens Extinction of Small Business," written by me and published in the Progressive of August 30, 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Progressive, Madison, Wis., of August 30, 1941]

BOB LA FOLLETTE SAYS

DEFENSE PROGRAM THREATENS EXTINCTION OF SMALL BUSINESS

The small businessman—a vital segment of industrial America—is being sacrificed on the altar of national defense. An economic pincers movement more powerful and destructive than the giant industrial monopolies have ever been able to muster is being fostered by the Government itself. We face a paradox of depression and unemployment in the midst of defense prosperity. We are threatened with the permanent extinction of small business.

The two jaws of the Government pincers are priorities and defense contracts. Priorities are depriving nondefense industries of raw materials necessary for their existence. Defense contracts have gone for the most part to big business. The result is that small business which is denied materials for normal production must shut down, while big business gets defense contracts to replace normal production.

Already more than 300 items are on the priorities critical list, running the entire alphabet from acetone to zinc. Practically all the industrial raw materials, especially metals, are now included, as well as such varied consumers goods as wool blankets, men's underwear, tent stoves, and field glasses. Numerous raw materials, including aluminum, copper, nickel, zinc, chromium, magnesium, tungsten, borax, and resin have already been subjected to strict allocation by O. P. M.

Contract allocation bungled

Present very conservative estimates are that upward of 5,000 small plants face complete idleness in the near future and unemployment directly attributable to priorities may exceed 2,000,000 people. The magnitude of these figures can be appreciated best with these comparisons:

The sharp industrial recession at the end of 1937 involved the lay-off in manufacturing of only about two-thirds as many employees. The upswing in manufacturing employment between June 1940 and June 1941, due both to the direct and indirect effects of the multibillion defense contracts, afforded additional employment for only 1,700,000 people. All manufacturing activity in June 1941 employed less than 12,000,000 people. The major defense industries, according to O. P. M., employed less than 2,500,000.

Of course, the theory of the defense program is that defense production will supplant civilian curtailments and that priorities will entail but a transitory crisis. Such optimism, however, is not warranted. The key to the situation—the allocation of defense contracts—has been bungled by the administrators. While paying lip service to the small industrialist, they have awarded almost three-fourths of the dollar value of all defense contracts to 56 giant corporations.

Present situation is crucial

As of June 1941, four corporations—Bethlehem Steel, New York Shipbuilding, General Motors, and Curtiss-Wright—had received almost one-fourth of the dollar value of defense supply contracts; with almost a billion dollars worth of supply contracts going to the top corporation—Bethlehem Steel. At the other end of the American industrial structure tens of thousands of small industrialists have not shared appreciably in defense contracts and are now being barred from obtaining sufficient materials for their normal civilian production.

Normally the small and medium plants, employing less than 500 people each, produce about 60 percent of our manufacturing output. These are the plants that are being liquidated by the defense program. A manifold economic waste is involved, not only in the vast production capacity unutilized, the idle men and idle machines, but also in the impairment of efficiency in the wholesale shuffling of economic factors to conform to the abnormal allocation of contracts. It should not be overlooked, as reported to the T. N. E. C. by the Federal Trade Commission, that small and medium-size corporations are the most efficient producers, that the major advantage of size is in sales and market tactics.

For 60 years the small business man has been fighting an up-hill battle against the unfair competition of trusts and monopolies. Government antitrust laws, when enforced, have aided him. Crocodile political tears have been shed over his troubles by this administration. But now, with eyes turned in another direction, the administration's defense policies are selling him down the river to big business.

The present situation is crucial. The future implications are even more serious. A heavy responsibility rests on those administering the defense program that past mistakes may be corrected before it is too late.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

Explanation of Priorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

RADIO INTERVIEW WITH DONALD M. NELSON

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on September 22, 1941, Mr Donald M. Nelson was interviewed by Mr George Hicks, on a radio program donated by the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. to national-defense interests, explaining the meaning of priorities in the new national-defense set-up. I ask unanimous consent that the interview be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The ANNOUNCER. On this Office for Emergency Management defense report, we hear from one of America's foremost businessmen called into the service of his country by the President of the United States. He is Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Executive Director of the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board.

Mr. HICKS. This is George Hicks speaking. Here in our Washington studio Mr. Donald M. Nelson, who holds not one but two of the most important posts in America today—Executive Director of the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board, and Director of Priorities,

Office of Production Management, is going to discuss on this program some phases of the work he and others are doing in defense of America. Mr. Nelson—this business of priorities—I think a great many of our audience must feel, as I do, a little vague as to the meaning of priorities. We hear a lot about them, of course.

Mr. NELSON. I don't doubt that, and I think you will hear a lot more about them in the future.

Mr. HICKS. Why is that, Mr. Nelson?

Mr. NELSON. Because priorities are going to become more and more important in the daily lives of the average man and average woman in the United States.

Mr. HICKS. Isn't this priorities system the Government has set up rather difficult for the average person to understand?

Mr. NELSON. No; there is nothing very dark or mysterious about it. Naturally, there are a good many issues involved. It touches practically every phase of our national economy. But the underlying idea is as simple as a, b, c.

Mr. HICKES. How would you define priorities then, Mr. Nelson?

Mr. NELSON. It is just seeing that first things come first. That means that those things this country needs for its defense—materials for planes and tanks and guns and ships—get a prior rating; the right-of-way over things that this country can safely do without.

Mr. HICKS. I wonder if you would explain that more fully for our audience, Mr. Nelson.

Mr. NELSON. I'll try to put it simply in this way: Our peacetime economy was geared for peacetime needs—so many tons of steel for bridges, so many tons of rubber for automobile tires, tennis balls, rubber boots, etc.; so many bales of silk for women's stockings and men's neckties; so many tons of aluminum for kitchen pots and pans. Only a very small amount of those peacetime materials went for military needs. Then suddenly we were confronted with an emergency that called for an immediate expansion of our military and naval equipment.

Mr. HICKS. I can understand how that would change the picture.

Mr. NELSON. It changed that whole peaceful picture practically overnight. Steel was needed for ships, rubber for Army trucks, silk for parachutes, aluminum to build planes. We had our choice—either to continue manufacturing millions of rubber boots and tennis balls or devote that rubber to Army tanks; either to cut down the number of aluminum percolators in our kitchens or cut down the number of planes we needed; either to supply our wives with silk stockings or our aviators with parachutes. We couldn't do both.

Mr. HICKS. You refer, Mr. Nelson, to these shortages that developed?

Mr. NELSON. Exactly.

Mr. HICKS. I think a great many Americans are puzzled on that score. We've always gone under the impression that here in America we had materials galore.

Mr. NELSON. That's true. We have always had plenty for our peacetime needs, and in some materials enough to supply our armed forces, too. But remember, a great many of our most essential raw materials that we took so much for granted in the good old carefree days—things like cork, rubber, tin, silk, to mention only a few that everyone knows about—those came to us from overseas in ships. Many of those ships are now being used for war purposes, and many of those ships are now at the bottom of the sea.

Mr. HICKS. Would you say then, Mr. Nelson, that this shortage of ship led directly to shortages of material?

Mr. NELSON. It is one important factor. But it is not the whole story. We Americans have been careless and wasteful of the things we had. We dug into our piles of raw materials with no thought of the future—no idea that an emergency might arise that would tax every available resource we had. That emergency is here now and we must stop wasting. We must conserve what resources we have.

Mr. HICKS. Iron and steel, for instance?

Mr. NELSON. Yes. And steel is a good example of what we are up against in this choice between what we'd like to have and what we must have. Just the hull of a 35,000 ton battleship alone takes as much iron and steel as 24,000 automobiles. That means that, if we are to have that battleship we can't use that metal for those 24,000 pleasure cars. The battleship comes first. We can't have our cake and eat it, too.

Mr. HICKS. I think our audience is beginning to see the meaning behind the expression, "First things first," Mr. Nelson.

Mr. NELSON. It means that we've all got to tighten our belts a little and do without some of the things we're used to. We've got to cut down on our free-for-all consumption of essential materials. We've got to stop manufacturing those extra cars and extra coffee percolators. We've got to distribute the steel and the aluminum to the places where they are most necessary. And that is where our job comes in.

Mr. HICKS. The Supply Priorities and Allocations Board?

Mr. NELSON. Yes. We're the traffic cop in this emergency. Not always a pleasant job but vitally necessary if he is to keep traffic from getting snarled and bottlenecked at the crossing. As national traffic cop we must give the go-ahead signal to the ambulance that is answering an emergency call and the stop signal to the pleasure cars that are just out for the ride. In other words, we are giving the ambulance—and by that I mean all the essential materials for defense—the prior right-of-way.

Mr. HICKS. How's that done, Mr. Nelson?

Mr. NELSON. By controlling raw materials—allowing to defense industries what they need and restricting those materials to industries less essential to defense.

Mr. HICKS. Doesn't that, Mr. Nelson—alloting materials such as steel and rubber to one manufacturer and cutting down on the supply to another manufacturer—doesn't that work hardships on a good many people?

Mr. NELSON. It does in some cases. It takes a great deal of cooperation on the part of everyone for this priorities plan to succeed. It means sacrifice on the part of the manufacturer and the consumer. We cannot avoid that. We try to make this control as fair and reasonable as possible, keeping in mind always that this country's military needs must come first. That is a must, not an if or a perhaps.

Mr. HICKS. How about the consumer you speak of, Mr. Nelson—the plain, everyday American who is not a manufacturer? How are priorities going to affect him as an individual in his daily life?

Mr. NELSON. The answer to that question is not going to please everyone. But I am going to answer it plainly and definitely. Some automobile driver is not going to get that new car he has been planning on. His wife is going to have to do with her old set of aluminum kitchenware. Priorities are going to take away silk hosiery from his daughter and the bicycle his 12-year-old son gets won't have shiny chromium trimmings. Our priority system is going to reach into millions of homes and take the things this country needs for defense.

Mr. HICKS. Now that you've made the reasons clear to us, Mr. Nelson, I don't believe most of us will object to making those sacrifices.

Mr. NELSON. They are very minor sacrifices compared to the sacrifices and deprivations the people of this country would face if, for any reason, we should fail in this defense effort. We would get priorities then, but they would be dictated to us and we would have no choice in the matter. We're not going to wait for that to happen. In the final analysis, we are saving and doing without now so that we'll have weapons to fight for something well worth saving—something we cannot do without. And by that I mean this great country of ours.

The Neutrality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann on the Neutrality Act. I may point out that when the present Neutrality Act was enacted in 1937—the act which has since been amended—I was one of six United States Senators who voted against it then and I have been consistently against it since. I stated at the time that it was impossible for a nation to legislate peace as much as we would like to do so and that in times of international crisis a nation should not be handicapped by laws of its own making.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator also will agree that the Neutrality Act was enacted by the Congress under the whip and spur of the present President of the United States and his administration?

Mr. BRIDGES. It was; and it is interesting to note that of the six United States Senators who at that time voted against it five were members of the minority party, and one was a member of the majority party, and all that was said at that time by the minority members who opposed the enactment of the neutrality law has since been proved to be correct, and the very individuals who insisted upon the enactment of the neutrality law and supported it most vigorously are now asking for its repeal. I agree with their present views but wish they had seen the situation as I did in 1937.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of September 25, 1941]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE NEUTRALITY ACT

On January 31, 1917, the German Ambassador delivered a note to the Secretary of State announcing that beginning the next day "in a zone around Great Britain, France, Italy, and the eastern Mediterranean * * * all ships met within the zone will be sunk." This announcement, which caused President Wilson to break off diplomatic relations with Germany, is the substance of our present Neutrality Act. The simple truth about the Neutrality Act is that it has made the illegal policy of Germany in the other war the statutory law of the United States in this war. The zone which in 1917 Germany closed to our ships is under the Neutrality Act now closed to our ships by domestic legislation; the suspension of international law on the high seas is under the Neutrality Act accepted as a fact. Thus the United States, which had asserted its rights on the sea, legislated away the rights for which it had victoriously contended, and placed upon its own statute books the prohibitions of Admiral Tirpitz.

That this was an extraordinary thing for a great nation to do is admitted in the preamble of the law itself, which states that "by so doing the United States waives none of its own rights and privileges to which it and its nationals are entitled under the law of nations * * * and expressly reserves the right to repeal, change, or modify this joint resolution or any other domestic legislation in the interests of the peace, security, or welfare of the United States and its peoples."

The first great war which broke out after the enactment of the Neutrality Act was the very great war between Japan and China. This was in the summer of 1937. The law has never been applied to this war, and the isolationists who sponsored the law have never seriously asked that the law be applied. So American ships continue to carry goods, including weapons of war, both to Japan and to China. There are no barred zones in the Pacific into which American ships may not enter. Though for 4 years there has raged a bloody war in Asia, the Neutrality Act is not in force.

Why? Because Japan, as a matter of self-interest, chose not to call the war a "war" but only an "incident," finding it convenient to receive American war supplies; because China, as a matter of self-interest, chose not to declare war against the invader, finding it convenient to receive American war supplies; because the United States chose not to recognize that the war was a war, finding it expedient, and also profitable, to continue to trade Thus in the Pacific during the greatest war ever waged in the Orient, the Neutrality Act is nonoperative and traditional American rights are still in effect.

We are then in the remarkable position of nullifying our own recently enacted law because it suits us to do so and it suits the belligerents to let us do so. But any moment either Japan or China could by issuing a declaration of war compel us to enforce an American statute which as a matter of policy and self-interest we prefer to nullify.

Thus we have placed in the hands of foreign governments the power to determine whether we may continue to violate our own domestic laws in order to enjoy our rights under international law, or whether we must enforce our domestic law and then surrender our international rights.

Two years later war broke out in Europe, and the law which had been nullified in the Pacific was immediately put into effect in the Atlantic. Not only did we forbid our ships to go to the belligerents—to Germany, France, and Britain—but we forbade them also to go to Holland, Belgium, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland—all of them then neutrals. We also forbade our ships to go to Eire. On the other hand, we allowed them to go to Italy, which was then still nonbelligerent. The reason for this discrimination was that American ships passing to the northern neutrals were within range of the German submarines, which sink at sight, whereas ships passing to the southern neutrals were within range only of the British and French Navies, which did not sink at sight but observed the rules of international law.

Thus we placed ourselves in the remarkable position of withdrawing from waters where war was waged lawlessly and ruthlessly and of continuing to enter waters where war was waged lawfully and humanely. In the Pacific we were exercising our rights by grace of the fact that Japan found it expedient not to make a formal declaration of war against China. In the Atlantic we were exercising our rights only outside the reach of the German Navy. When Italy entered the war we ceased exercising our rights in the Mediterranean, where the British Navy though at war had recognized our rights, because the Italian Navy would probably follow the German policy of sinking at sight.

This policy must have created the impression in many minds, perhaps even in Hitler's, that we had deliberately decided as a matter of national policy to submit to force.

But that did not end the progress of American humiliation. The zones which we had closed to American ships and opened to absolute lawlessness were not large enough to suit the Nazis. So they proclaimed a much larger war zone in the North Atlantic—in fact one which surrounded Iceland and extended to Greenland. Having been taught to believe by our neutrality law that what Germany declares to be her purposes will in the end become accepted as American law, the Nazis have been preying on ships well outside our own self-imposed combat zone. It just happens that their combat zone is bigger than ours, and therefore, according to Berlin, it is legal to sink ships there without warning

But even that is not the end of it. In the case of the *Robin Moor*, an American ship was traveling outside the German war zone, outside our own combat zone, in fact on the high seas. This ship was stopped and sunk, and its crew and passengers set adrift in mid-ocean. And what was the justification of this extension of the area of lawlessness? We have had it from some of our own Senators—that the *Robin Moor* was carrying contraband of war and, therefore, her crew and passengers had no rights which Germany was bound to respect or that the United States ought to presume to defend.

There may be room for differences of judgment as to whether what is left of the Neutrality Act is now of practical importance, and what as a matter of fact it is useful to do about it. The law is nullified in the Pacific. In the Atlantic it is not observed by Germany and in fact not by the United States.

But there is, I think, no room for a difference of opinion that the neutrality law has proved itself to be an act of national self-debasement, a mortifying submission to force, without logic, without honor, and without value even to achieve the purpose for which it was originally designed.

A Private's Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ARTICLE BY PVT. JAMES L. HOWARD, JR.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article, written by Pvt. James L. Howard, Jr., which appeared in the Camp Edwards Digest, Camp Edwards, Mass. Mr. Howard is a resident of my State.

I think Members of Congress, particularly those who have been greatly disturbed by rumors of unsatisfactory conditions in the Army camps, will find this article interesting and very encouraging.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE ANSWERS PRESS INDICTMENT OF MORALE

I read last night the article in the New Bedford Standard Times, which purported to show that morale at Camp Edwards is "low and unhealthy." It quoted statements from privates and officers alike that the soldiers were "framed" into the service, that there were "stupid junior officers," that the training was "sloppy," and that the townspeople were hostile toward the soldiers.

If I were a civilian and read that article, I might say, "Well, finally they're telling the truth. After all these rumors I've been hearing, it's about time someone had the guts to give us the real story about Camp Edwards."

But I'm not a civilian. I'm a soldier. I've been here since January. And I think I have a clearer conception of life at Camp Edwards than a reporter who spent only 2 days at camp—and yet says he interviewed "200 draftees and 50 officers." (He must have been interviewing 24 hours a day.)

I have no doubt that this reporter heard every one of the rumors he printed. I also have no doubt that he came down here with one mission, "to dig up the dirt in Edwards."

Anyone who snoops around a town of 28,000 people can find rumors about everyone from the mayor to the street cleaner—if he goes about it in the right way. And the same goes for a camp of 28,000 soldiers.

Just give a soldier a chance to gripe, just give him the right conversational lead, and he'll tell you a swell story. It's the fashion. It's just as much a military custom as saluting—and 10 times more enjoyable.

But, remember one thing the next time you hear any Army grouse: consider the source. As a rule, the larger the complaint the more insignificant the source it comes from.

If this article in the Standard Times were more than merely a composite grouse, I would not resent it. But for a reporter who obviously knows nothing about military procedure to take these grouses and represent them as the whole situation at Camp Edwards is a malicious falsification of facts. It is more than that. It is a definite morale depressor

and as dangerous as any deliberate "fifth columnist" activity.

First, concerning the statement that we selectees were "framed" into the service.

There are many of us selectees who make statements like that. It gives us a martyred feeling—puts a sort of invisible halo around our head.

But I think that most of us realize, way down deep, although we would never say it, that our military service has but one purpose: To preserve the way of life which we cherish in this country. It is impossible for us to listen to the radio or to read the newspapers without being aware of the destruction and chaos taking place in Europe; about the muzzling of our personal liberties, suffering, and torment. The press and radio tell us every day that It Can Happen Here. It is not necessary to digress on the plight of France or the 13 other nations that Hitler has conquered or the reason that they have been conquered: Unpreparedness. Every soldier knows that. And every soldier knows if we are going to preserve our way of life, there is one price we must pay—constant military preparation and training.

To this Nation the draft is something new, a sacrifice not brought about because of our shortcomings, but because of the bestiality of aggressor nations. It is so new that there are some of us who resent it without thinking of the reason for it.

I am not being idealistic. I am being ruthlessly practical. I realize that I am not a separate individual, free to do anything I please, but a member of society. And the good of society is my good.

I know the sacrifices that I am making during my services, and I can appreciate the sacrifices that other soldiers are making. True, some of us gave up good jobs, others had to postpone marriage. But one fact still remains; we have a job to do, and we've got to do it. So if we "cry-baby" occasionally, remember that we're only human. Way down under, we realize the necessity for what we are doing.

Concerning the "stupid junior officers," some of them obviously have to lean rather heavily on the top sergeant during their first few months of duty. But recall this: All of them are college graduates, all of them have to go to officers' training school, and all of them have to demonstrate to a board their ability to lead men.

A top sergeant with 11 years' experience may resent taking orders from a rosy-cheeked lieutenant fresh out of college, but the sergeant should not forget that if he had the qualifications, he could be a lieutenant himself.

As for officers drinking in the mess hall and the barracks, I have no doubt that there are cases of insubordination as mentioned by the reporter in his article. But such cases are the exception rather than the rule. In any stratum of life there is, inevitably, personal bickering. To publicize this is more than to wash dirty linen in public. It is to destroy the enlisted man's respect for the officers.

We have been taught in the Army to salute the insignia which an officer wears and not the man himself. That is very hard for civilians to understand, but it has been found by long experience to be the most efficient way to conduct the Army.

We have been taught to obey orders, without question or doubt. That, too, is hard for the civilian to understand. Yet, if you consider that the Army is the largest single organization this country has yet produced, you will see that for an individual to take matters into his own hands without consulting a superior would lead to considerable confusion.

Any unwarranted publication or rumor that tends to disrupt the soldier's confidence in his superiors is going to besmirch the uniform that the officer wears, not the officer himself. Any unwarranted statement by an officer to a newspaperman will reflect on the officer's rank, not on the officer. Such statements accomplish nothing constructive and much that is destructive.

If training of the men at Camp Edwards is sloppy, as the writer accuses, and if he has any improvements to offer, the Army will welcome them, and act on them. But a civilian who is criticizing the Army should always remember that he is a civilian, and that his concepts might not be the same, had he the responsibilities and perspective of a high-ranking officer.

Concerning the statement that the townspeople are hostile toward the soldiers, this strikes me as the most untrue of all. Civilians have never, to my knowledge, shown anything but a friendly interest and a desire to help Camp Edwards soldiers.

If ever they show a discrimination against a man in uniform, it is because of what he may do personally and not because he wears a uniform. Obviously, there is a small minority of soldiers who feel that a uniform entitles them generally to raise hell. In that case, any civilian resentment is purely personal and not against the Army.

But I will make one criticism of civilians. They are sympathetic with the soldiers, but they are not sympathetic with the Army. Rather than being sympathetic to the soldier because of his sacrifices and respecting him for what he is doing, they pamper him because they think an injustice has been done him. They nurse his gripes. They take a perverse delight in trying to find that things are not going as well as they might in the Army.

You know as well as I do that there are unpleasant duties in the Army, that soldiers get depressed, that they sometimes resent higher authority.

But remember: We soldiers are no hired troops called in to fight your battles. We are part of you. It is your battle just as much as it is ours. You are out there furnishing us with the materials with which we are arming ourselves.

We must have more than your material aid if we are going to achieve our ends together. We must have your sympathy and understanding of what we are striving to do. With that, I think, we cannot fail.

The Daily Drift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. H. SCHWARTZ
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WYOMING EAGLE

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, the Wyoming Eagle is one of the important newspapers of the Rocky Mountain area. I desire to have incorporated in the RECORD an editorial from that journal dealing with the President's address in particular and our foreign policy in general.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wyoming Eagle of September 13, 1941]

THE DAILY DRIFT

The close of the second week in September finds the United States poised on the brink of a "shooting war." The isolationists say we have been "on the brink" for more than a year. Their reaction to the President's Thursday night speech probably will be that "now we're all the way in."

As to the address to the Nation and the world, it is the consensus of opinion that it is one of the best Mr. Roosevelt ever has delivered. It was fearless, it was to the point and as his secretary, Stephen Early, had previously announced, it left no questions unanswered. Mr. Hitler and Mr. Mussolini now know definitely that they can go so far and no further.

Shoot first and talk about it later. This is the new policy of our Government. The Navy has been ordered to destroy any German or Italian warship found in any waters "we deem necessary for our defense." That is a comprehensive definition. This country considers all waters over which aid is transported to Britain as necessary for our defense—if we can believe all that has been said in behalf of the lend-lease law. It can be stretched to include the Red Sea over which United States ships are carrying supplies to the British in Egypt. And as time goes on, the inclination will be to extend the area in which the American Navy will be expected to shoot on sight.

The American people, we believe, will welcome this stiffening of our foreign policy. It has been disheartening to know that food and guns and munitions which we have produced at great cost and sent to the aid of beleaguered democracies were being sunk by enemy raiders. What price aid to Britain if the much-needed materials were destroyed before they arrived at their destination? Nobody wants war although a few seem to desire peace at any price demanded by Adolf Hitler.

It would be absurd to assume that every isolationist is actuated only by partisan or selfish motives. Some of them undoubtedly believe, in all sincerity, that in some mysterious fashion we can preserve our way of life and keep out of war if the Axis Powers conquer the rest of the world. They may sincerely believe that once the Axis has instituted its new order in Europe, Asia, and Africa, it will not bother about the existence of liberty-loving nations in the Western Hemisphere. It may be their idea that the conquerors would turn benignant, and forget and forgive our having delayed and made more difficult their conquests by becoming the arsenal of democracy. But mistaken beliefs and false hopes never saved anybody.

Unquestionably, there were honest Tories during our Revolutionary War—men perfectly sincere in their theory that Britain's might would overcome Washington's ragged patriots, and that our country's future would be brighter as a British colony than if we went on our own, even if we were successful. Their sincere beliefs may have been as harmful to the cause of independence as Benedict Arnold's deliberate treason, though the honest Tory may have acted as he thought right, while the traitor sold out his country.

There were conscientious appeasers in Lincoln's day—northern men who believed that Abraham Lincoln preferred war to peace, men who would have compromised with the Confederacy even at the price of seccession. But the fact that these men believed they were right and Lincoln wrong adds to Lincoln's greatness in that he pursued his own concept of right against the bitterest of vindictive opposition. Their opposition made the preservation of the Union more difficult,

it prolonged the agony of the Civil War, even though they may have been honest in their opinions.

The President's course has proceeded without deviation for 2 years, in the face of protests and prophecies of dire disaster from the isolationists. They were scared when he asked for and obtained the repeal of the neutrality law, which repeal enabled us to sell munitions and general supplies to Great Britain under certain restrictions. They were frightened when we passed the lend-lease bill, after England had exhausted her dollar exchange; they were panic-stricken when we established our naval patrol, and agonized when we occupied Iceland.

In each of these acts they saw a challenge to Hitler to begin hostilities against us; but if it were a challenge, it was never accepted, for the obvious reason that until he had completed his conquest of Europe he did not dare add the forces of the great Republic to his active enemies.

Now the order for the Navy to shoot on sight will invoke further blasts from the isolationists, further prophecies of dire disaster. But however honest they are in their beliefs, we believe they are of the type that would have ordered the Minute Men to disperse at Bunker Hill in preference to engaging in a shooting war, and those who would have evacuated Fort Sumter without firing a shot.

However, though the President has been splattered with epithets, of which "warmonger" is about the mildest, he has avoided our country getting into war for 2 tense years, and that is perhaps the most skillful bit of statesmanship of the century.

Resolution of Southeastern Theatre Owners' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

RESOLUTION PASSED IN CONVENTION AT JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a resolution passed by the Southeastern Theatre Owners' Association, which was passed in convention in Jacksonville, Fla. Because of the fine attitude of this organization and the splendid tone of the resolution I wish to include it in the RECORD:

Whereas our country and our kind of world are today subjected to one of the most vicious assaults in all history by those who have made sabotage, espionage, and deception the chief instrument of their evil policy; and

Whereas it has been the policy of the dictators who hurl such assaults, not only to strike from the outside but to bore from within the body politic of their enemies; and

Whereas a nation is no stronger than its spirit and its unity and the morale of the people: Now, therefore,

We, the Southeastern Theatre Owners' Association, do hereby denounce all those agencies and efforts designed to undermine the foundations of our institutions, to produce dissension and confusion amongst our people, to break down the morale of our citizens, and to paralyze the will and the mind of this Nation to defend itself and remain a great and free land: Be it further

Resolved, That we, the Southeastern Theatre Owners' Association, do further commend and endorse all those governmental agencies such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the intelligence units of the Army and Navy, the State, county, and municipal police officers, and all civic and patriotic organizations who have made it their purpose to ferret out these sinister and insidious agencies and all others who are giving aid or comfort to our dictator enemies and trying to destroy the safety and security of our land; be it further

Resolved, That we heartily endorse the courageous and worthy American leadership of our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his heroic defense of our country, our continent, and democracy of the world; be it further

Resolved, That we do call upon the President to strengthen and add to those Federal agencies which are engaged in fighting against the despised "fifth columnist," the Trojan horse, and other un-American influences which have been gnawing at the vitals of our country; be it further

Resolved, That we, the Southeastern Theatre Owners' Association in convention assembled at Jacksonville, Fla., September 9, 1941, do call upon the public to lend all possible cooperation to Federal, State, and municipal agencies as well as to all worthy patriotic organizations endeavoring at this crucial time to defend our land, our homes, and all that we love; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to each Member of the House and Senate, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and to the press.

Government Expenditures and the Public Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

LETTER AND STATEMENT FROM THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication from Hon. D. W. Bell, Under Secretary of the Treasury, together with the accompanying statements:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, September 10, 1941.

The CHAIRMAN,
House Committee on Appropriations,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: By direction of the Secretary and in accordance with the arrangements made as outlined in his letter of January 31, 1941, I am enclosing herewith the following statements:

Statement No. I. General Budget summary—receipts and expenditures, showing (1) Budget estimates for the fiscal year 1942 and actual figures for the fiscal year 1941, and (2) actual figures for the first 2 months of each of the fiscal years 1941 and 1942.

Statement No. II. Effect on the public debt of financing the deficit, showing (1) estimated amounts for the fiscal year 1942 and actual figures for the fiscal year 1941, and (2) actual figures for the first 2 months of each of the fiscal years 1941 and 1942. This statement shows the extent to which the net deficit has been met through borrowings and reductions in the Treasury's cash balance. It also shows the debt at the beginning and the close of each period.

Statement No. III. Statutory debt limitation, showing the amount of the debt outstanding which is subject to the debt limitation and the balance of the borrowing authority; i. e., the amount of additional debt which may be issued pursuant to existing limitations.

Statement No. IV. General-fund balance, showing an analysis of the general-fund balance and the changes therein during the period. This statement sets forth the balances at the beginning and the close of the period classified as to working balance, increment on gold, and seigniorage. It shows how the general-fund balance was affected by (1) borrowings, (2) excess of receipts or expenditures in trust accounts, etc., and (3) the net deficit as set forth in statement No. I.

Statement No. V. Obligations of corporations and credit agencies guaranteed as to principal and interest as of August 31, 1941. This statement shows the contingent liabilities of the Government; i. e., the outstanding securities issued by corporations and credit agencies which are guaranteed by the United States as to principal and interest.

Statement No. VI. Combined statement of assets and liabilities of governmental corporations and credit agencies, as of July 31, 1941, based upon the latest official reports received by the Treasury. This statement shows the total assets of such corporations and agencies, the liabilities (including reserves), and their net worth. The liabilities are segregated according to obligations guaranteed by the United States and obligations not so guaranteed. The net worth is classified as to the amounts of the Government's proprietary interest and of the proprietary interests not owned by the Government. The total amount of interagency interests of all corporations and agencies included in this statement is also shown.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

I. General Budget summary[1]*—Receipts and expenditures*

[On basis of daily Treasury statements; i. e., checks paid by the Treasurer of the United States. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years		July 1 to Aug. 31	
	Budget estimates,[2] 1942	Actual, 1941	Actual, fiscal year 1942	Actual, fiscal year 1941
Receipts:				
Income tax	5,420.0	3,469.6	142.3	87.3
Miscellaneous internal revenue	3,135.0	2,966.9	537.0	583.5
Taxes under Social Security Act	847.0	788.2	214.1	170.5
Taxes upon carriers and their employees	145.0	136.9	6.5	7.6
Customs	390.0	391.9	71.3	48.9
Return of surplus funds from Government corporations		319.2	2.4	7.4
Other	177.0	195.8	35.8	28.3
Total receipts	10,114.0	8,268.5	1,009.4	933.5
Less net amounts transferred to Federal old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund	712.0	661.3	199.9	155.0
Net receipts	9,402.0	7,607.2	809.5	778.4
Expenditures:				
Departmental [3]	725.0	[4] 778.5	132.1	[4] 139.5
Agricultural program [5]	1,202.0	1,126.3	134.1	164.2
National defense:				
War	6,940.0	3,635.5	1,087.1	170.6
Navy	3,950.0	2,216.8	754.7	205.9
National defense funds for the President	353.0	[6] 103.1	30.6	.3
Selective Service	32.0	17.5	4.9	
United States Maritime Commission [3]	350.0	43.8	3.3	19.0
Defense aid (lend-lease)	3,500.0	21.4	103.3	
Federal Security Agency	69.0		32.6	
National-defense housing (Federal Works Agency)	225.0	[4] 42.0	44.0	
Other agencies	231.0	(7)	23.6	(7)
Total	15,650.0	6,080.1	2,084.0	395.9
Interest on the public debt	1,275.0	1,110.7	33.4	40.0
Federal Loan Agency	9.0	11.5	.7	2.2
Federal Security Agency	872.0	[4] 944.0	178.9	177.0
Federal Works Agency [8]	1,134.0	1,673.9	227.0	301.2
Tennessee Valley Authority	40.0	[4] 51.2	14.2	[4] 3.1
Veterans' Administration	569.0	552.7	92.0	92.1
Transfers to trust accounts	268.0	234.6	153.1	138.7
Return of surplus funds from Government corporations		[9] 329.0		[9] 30.0
All other	425.0	[4] 476.1	77.6	[4] 100.3
Total expenditures [10]	22,169.0	12,710.6	3,127.1	1,524.2
Net deficit (excess expenditures over receipts) [10]	12,767.0	5,103.4	2,317.6	745.8

[1] Figures in this statement have been rounded to nearest millions and will not necessarily add to totals.
[2] Revised June 1, 1941.
[3] Figures for the fiscal year 1942 and corresponding period last year, have been revised by transferring expenditures of the U. S. Maritime Commission from the departmental classification to national defense. The expenditures for the Maritime Commission include expenditures heretofore classified as emergency ship construction. The figures for Maritime Commission are net and include receipts credited to the construction loan fund.
[4] Includes national-defense expenditures augmenting regular activities.
Not including departmental expenditures of Department of Agriculture.
[6] Reflects adjustment to give effect to sec. 5, act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1127), by merging funds allotted to Federal Works Agency from allocations made by the President to the War Department for national-defense housing with funds appropriated to Federal Works Agency for the same purpose.
[7] Expenditures included in totals for "Departmental," "Tennessee Valley Authority," "Federal Security Agency," and "All other." See note 4.
[8] Exclusive of national defense housing activities shown above.
[9] Credits, deduct.
[10] Exclusive of debt retirements pursuant to sinking fund and other appropriations.

II. Effect on the public debt of financing the deficit[1]

[On basis of daily Treasury statement. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years		July 1 to Aug. 31	
	Budget estimates,[2] 1942	Actual, 1941	Actual, fiscal year 1942	Actual, fiscal year 1941
Net deficit (statement I)	12,767.0	5,103.4	2,317.6	745.8
Changes in cash accounts during period:				
Add: Increase in general fund balance during period	[3] 663.4	742.4	239.6	562.9
Total	12,103.6	5,845.8	2,557.2	1,308.7
Deduct: Excess of receipts over expenditures in trust accounts, etc., during period	37.8	[4] 148.1	597.7	371.0
Total financed by increase in public debt	12,065.8	5,993.9	1,959.5	937.7
Add: Public debt at beginning of period	48,961.4	42,967.5	48,961.4	42,967.5
Public debt at end of period	61,027.2	48,961.4	50,921.0	43,905.2

[1] Figures in this statement have been rounded to nearest millions and will not necessarily add to totals.
[2] Revised June 1, 1941.
[3] Decrease, deduct.
[4] Excess of expenditures, add.

III. Statutory debt limitation as of Aug. 31, 1941

[Under sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended. In millions of dollars]

Limitation		65,000.0
Deduct:		
Gross public debt outstanding Aug. 31, 1941	50,921.0	
Unearned discount on United States savings bonds (difference between current redemption value and maturity value)	1,188.4	
	52,109.4	
Less: Debt outstanding not subject to statutory limitation	575.6	
Total		51,533.8
Balance of borrowing authority		13,466.2

IV. General fund balance [1]

[On basis of daily Treasury statements. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years		July 1 to Aug. 31	
	Budget estimates, 1942 [2]	Actual, 1941	Actual, fiscal year 1942	Actual, fiscal year 1941
Balance in general fund at beginning of period:				
Working balance	1,884.6	1,162.8	1,884.6	1,162.8
Increment on gold	143.2	142.8	143.2	142.8
Seigniorage (silver)	605.4	585.2	605.4	585.2
Total	2,633.2	1,890.7	2,633.2	1,890.7
Increases:				
Borrowings—net increase in public debt	12,065.8	5,993.9	1,959.5	937.7
Net receipts, trust accounts, etc	37.8	[3] 148.1	597.7	371.0
	14,736.8	7,736.5	5,190.4	3,199.4
Decreases: Net deficit (statement I)	12,767.0	5,103.4	2,317.6	745.8
Balance in general fund at end of period	1,969.8	2,663.2	2,872.7	2,453.7
Analysis of general fund balances at end of period:				
Working balance	1,195.9	1,884.6	2,120.0	1,720.4
Increment on gold	143.7	143.2	143.2	142.8
Seigniorage (silver)	630.2	605.4	609.6	590.5
Total	1,969.8	2,633.2	2,872.7	2,453.7

[1] Figures in this statement have been rounded to nearest millions and will not necessarily add to totals.
[2] Revised June 1, 1941. [3] Net expenditures—deduct.

V. Obligations of corporations and credit agencies guaranteed as to principal and interest as of Aug. 31, 1941

[In millions of dollars]

Corporation or agency	Limit of authority	Outstanding liabilities [1]		
		Total	Matured [1]	Unmatured
Commodity Credit Corporation	2,650.0	905.5	0.2	905.3
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	2,000.0	1,269.5	.1	1,269.4
Federal Housing Administration	[2] 4,100.0	17.0	.1	16.9
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	[4] 4,750.0	2,417.4	8.5	2,408.9
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7,394.4	2,101.5	.1	2,101.4
Tennessee Valley Authority	[5] 61.8	----------	----------	----------
U. S. Housing Authority	[6] 800.0	226.3	----------	226.3
U. S. Maritime Commission	[7] 200.0	----------	----------	----------
Total	----------	[8] 6,937.2	9.0	6,928.2

[1] Exclusive of obligations owned by the Treasury.
[2] Funds have been deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for payment of all obligations guaranteed by the United States, representing outstanding matured principal amounting to $9,000,000 and interest of $2,600,000.
[3] Limit of authority to insure mortgages. This amount may be increased by $1,000,000,000 upon approval by the President. Debentures may be issue and tendered only in exchange for insured property acquired through foreclosure.
[4] The Corporation was authorized to issue bonds for an amount not to exceed $4,750,000,000 to be exchanged or sold to obtain funds for financing home mortgage loans or for the redemption of any of its outstanding bonds. Its authority to make loans expired on June 13, 1936, and the above limit may only be increased for the purpose of retiring its outstanding bonds by an amount equal to the amount of the bonds to be retired, which would not affect the net amount outstanding after June 13, 1936.
[5] Exclusive of $8,300,000 issued on the credit of the United States and held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
[6] Represents gross limit of borrowing authority. The corporation has issued obligations totaling $495,256,000, leaving a balance of borrowing authority amounting to $304,744,000.
[7] Limit which may be outstanding at any one time with respect to the insuring of mortgages and the issuance of debentures.
[8] The total amount of assets of these corporations and agencies is in excess of the total amount of liabilities, including obligations guaranteed by the United States. See statement VI.

VI. Combined statement of assets and liabilities of governmental corporations and credit agencies, as of July 31, 1941

[In millions of dollars]

Corporation or agency	Assets		Liabilities			Net worth	
	Exclusive of amounts due from Government corporations and agencies	Due from Government corporations and agencies [1]	Obligations guaranteed by the United States [2]	Due to Government corporations and agencies	All other (including reserves)	Proprietary interest of the United States	Other
Commodity Credit Corporation	1,200.1	----------	908.1	----------	190.1	101.9	----------
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	1,462.3	3.8	1,279.1	1.5	85.5	100.0	----------
Federal Housing Administration	86.7	----------	16.8	----------	3.9	66.0	----------
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	2,487.4	100.0	2,429.2	----------	50.1	108.1	----------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,992.4	1,091.7	2,104.1	16.7	424.0	539.3	----------
Tennessee Valley Authority	419.8	1.3	----------	56.9	18.3	345.9	----------
U. S. Housing Authority	463.1	----------	227.1	92.0	6.1	137.9	----------
U. S. Maritime Commission	462.9	78.9	----------	----------	333.9	207.9	----------
Federal land banks	2,223.4	10.3	----------	.7	1,798.5	212.8	221.7
All other	3,815.5	181.4	----------	847.9	1,027.9	1,917.9	203.2
Subtotal	14,613.6	1,467.4	[3] 6,964.4	1,015.7	3,938.3	3,737.7	424.9
Less: Interagency interest shown above	----------	−1,467.4	----------	−1,015.7	----------	−451.7	----------
Total	14,613.6	----------	[3] 6,964.4	----------	3,938.3	3,286.0	424.9

[1] Includes capital stock and paid-in surplus of Government corporations and agencies.
[2] Includes principal and accrued interest. [3] Excludes $148,800,000 held by the Treasury.

NOTE.—The foregoing figures are compiled from latest reports received by the Treasury Department from the respective corporations and agencies. The amounts covering obligations guaranteed by the United States differ from those shown in table V for the reason that they are stated in this table as of July 31, 1941, instead of Aug. 31, 1941, and include accrued interest.

Dangers From Within

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. E. E. COX, OF GEORGIA, AT ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I made last Thursday at Atlanta, Ga.:

My friends, our perils are as great today as they were when Washington's unshod soldiers were leaving their bloody tracks in the snows of Valley Forge, and the uncertainties that confronted General Washington were no greater than those that face us at this hour.

The liberties of the people are being threatened by "the two encroaching seas of arbitrary power and lawless anarchy" and thus far the people have not manifested the spirit to do much about it.

We are told that we are at war, and that the safety and security of the Nation is imperiled by the aggressions of dictators across the seas. This we accept as a fact and it is for this reason that I want to see emphasis taken off of reform and put on defense. It is for this reason that I would like to see this softening process to which the people are constantly subjected come to an end, and it is for this reason that I want all this Pollyanna talk about making a Utopia out of this country cease, for cities with streets of gold and rivers flowing with milk and honey are to be found alone in heaven. This is a matter-of-fact world and its problems must be dealt with in a matter-of-fact way.

The aggressions of the mad dictators across the seas do threaten our future, and they must be driven back, but this threat is not so great and so dangerous as those that arise within the Nation itself. The movement to strangle free competitive enterprise that has made this Nation great has been pushed far along the way. Those who have been striving to destroy the economics of the country and change it to a collectivist system have found their way into positions that carry enormous powers. Many whose business it is to protect the country have seemingly entered into the marriage state with those who have made it their business to destroy it. We are at this hour engaged not only in the wars across the seas, but we are in the midst of a political and economic revolution here at home.

There is nothing to be gained by closing our eyes to the plain facts of the situation. Under the guise of national defense, under the excuse of establishing priorities here, price controls there, and prohibitions somewhere else, we see the economic structure of the country being torn to pieces. No one expects business to be conducted as usual, but we ought to be sensible and profit by the experience of other peoples of the world and our own past. We should not commit the same blunder that England has committed; that is, we should not destroy the small business enterprises of this country.

Every person who has ever set himself up over his people has begun his campaign, first, by trying to make the wage earners discontented with their lot; second, by strangling small business; third, by taking over big business.

It is vastly easier for those who want to take over the control of the American economic system to capture a few great businesses in which all industry has been concentrated than it is to capture thousands of small businesses. This is so because when industry is concentrated in the hands of the big operators, it is a comparatively simple matter for the bur-aucrats in Washington to arouse the people against what they call big business.

Business has not always been wise in this country. Too often has it been selfish and stupid. But this does not mean all business. The vastly greater part of business is honest, and want to do the right thing. On the other hand labor leaders and racketeers have been both selfish and stupid. But this does not mean all labor. The vastly greater number of laborers are honest at heart and want to do the right thing. It is the self-seeking, greedy, racketeering labor leaders who are leading the rank and file of labor to ruin American business and to operate against their own best interest.

It is said that for several years we have had a political administration that has been openly hostile to business and notoriously too indulgent of the racketeers in labor. Irrespective of what you might think, it is a fact that the labor record of the administration is one of which America cannot feel proud.

I have always held to the view that to strike against the Government in times of emergency—an emergency bringing into play the war powers of the President is lawless insurrection. To strike against the national defense, against the young men who have been drafted into the Army to soldier for the country, against their loved ones back home, against all the people, is sabotage and treason and should be dealt with as such. It is a despotism which, if not stamped out, will take us the way of poor France. There is a complete parallel.

I hold no brief for big business, but I do hold a brief for my country. I have not a private interest to protect, but I have a public duty to perform. The Russianizing of America would not affect me greatly, but it would ruin the country.

It is business that devises and invents and risks its money to manufacture goods and find the market for them. It is business that pays the wages which give the American men and women economic security. Destroy the business structure in this country and you will have destroyed the economic security of every man, woman, and child in this country. Make it impossible or unwise for savings to be risked in business investments and you will have destroyed the mechanism which devises jobs and finds the money to pay the wages of the workers.

A great peril that faces us today comes from the fact that it is a very simple and easy matter for bureaucrats in high places of power to utilize the powers which come into their hands through the exigencies of the national preparedness to throttle and to suffocate small business of this country.

We find that the power of priorities can be used to punish or to kill any business. One individual by a stroke of the pen can deny to any business its supply of raw materials or its light and heat and power or its quota of transportation service.

We are preparing now to establish price control. Just how it is possible to establish price control in this country presumably to head off inflation without establishing control over wage rates at the same time, is beyond my comprehension.

Leon Henderson, when asked by a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, if it was possible to establish effective price control without also exercising control over the prices of raw materials, wages, and all other factors of cost, made answer in terms that it is not possible to establish an effective price control without having the authority to establish control over every element that enters into production cost—and that certainly includes wages.

More recently we read in the press that Mr. Henderson says that wages ought not to be controlled along with prices, for undoubtedly wage increases will be continuously demanded by the workers in the future. If this is true, then the establishment of price control can operate to do but one thing, and that is to strangle business and small industry in America.

It has been an outstanding characteristic of the so-called Defense Mediation Board that it has given organized labor practically every demand that has been made. The Mediation Board's method of settling strikes is to grant labor all of its demands and to compel the employer to comply. That isn't mediation. That is connivance between the Federal Government and private labor unions to hold up and to rob American business and American industry.

Do not misunderstand me, my fellow citizens, I want American working men and working women to have a living wage and even a better than living wage. I want American working men and women to have the highest, the best, the most healthful, and the most comfortable living and working conditions it is possible for them to have. And that is why I say that the welfare of the working people is not being served by those who would crush out and strangle and suffocate business and industry in this country.

There are those in Washington and all over the United States in fact—thinking men and women who have watched developments over the years—who believe that we are headed for a radical socialist government and that the reds in and out of the Government are being used to hurry on that day.

All over this country, in every hamlet and village, in every little community, small factories are being closed by denial of necessary raw materials, power, and transportation, and credit—factories which have been operating for years; factories on whose pay rolls communities have depended for economic security and progress; factories in which the employees have grown gray, are closing up and those employees are being rendered jobless. By whom? By the very bureaucratic fumblers who have pretended to be labor's friends.

For the past several years the working people of America have been told by the Communists, and the Pinks and the Labor Socialists, "Let us run the factories; let us command the business of the Nation, and you will have better jobs and better wages." What has been the real result? Labor, through the National Labor Relations Board, the Wage Hour Board, and the bureaucrats at Washington, have had practical control of business in this country. What has been the result I ask? The result has been strike after strike. Strikes called not to get an increase of wages, not to better working hours of wage earners themselves, but strikes to broaden and cement the power and to fill the pocketbooks of racketeering labor leaders. American labor finds itself today facing the closed shop, which means that no working man, free, white, and 21 can go sell the energy of his brains and his brawn in a free market. He must first get the consent of a labor racketeer; he must first pay a tribute of whatever price that labor racketeer may establish for his right to work at all; he must submit in many cases to having such dues and assessments as are levied against his wages by these labor racketeers taken from his pay envelope by his employers before his hands ever touch it.

Talk about the Bill of Rights. Talk about the inherent right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Talk about freedom of contract. Those rights for the working man are being wiped out in this country.

The greatest menace that threatens this country now is the vast, far-reaching, the incredibly tremendous power placed in the hands of a few men that can be exerted secretly against the business structure of this country. They are not men who submit their policies or their views or their past for the approval or disapproval of the people. They are men who never ran for office; they never stood before the people to declare their policy; they have no responsibility to the people, but they are men who never met a pay roll in their lives, who never conducted a successful business for 15 minutes, whose whole concept of business is theoretical instead of practical, and whose attitudes are entirely hostile to the free enterprise system.

That is why I am here to warn you businessmen against these dangers. If you want to know how arrogant, how irresponsible, and how dangerous bureaucrats can be, go to Washington and try to get some perfectly just, simple question decided, or some right granted and see how quickly some petty bureaucrat, some man with a 5-cent intellect, clothed with a $5,000,000,000 power, will look at you with an accusing eye and say, "Don't you know we are at war now?"

Do you believe that statement? I say to you that a short while ago a delegation of Democratic and Republican Representatives went to Leon Henderson's bureau to plead for important factories in their districts, fully capable of performing national-defense work, were told in cold and measured terms that it was an effrontery for them to dare to come down to Mr. Henderson's bureau and even suggest that they wanted to intercede for those factories.

If we call the roll of the men who are in positions of the highest power, there would not be among all of them as many as you could count on the fingers of one hand, who have been successful in business; who have met pay rolls; who have built up factories; who have originated and provided jobs and wages for workingmen and women.

Most people outside of Washington are accustomed to think of William Knudsen, Mr. Biggers, Mr. Batt, and Mr. Stettinius, businessmen of that sort, as being in charge of the national defense and as determining the powers of priorities and price control and commandeer. They are not. When you get down to the bare facts you will find it is Sidney Hillman, Dave Saposs, Walter Reuther, a group of C. I. O. partisans, Leon Henderson and people of their kind who are in control.

There has not been a time in all the history of this country when business has been abused, manacled, leg-ironed, and then accused of not doing its part as has been the situation in the past several years.

It is time for American citizens to look at the facts. It is time for American citizens to rise up and let the administration know that there are good and loyal American citizens that can be had to run the national defense. We do not need imported agitators from Russia, Lithuania, Austria, or elsewhere.

To read the lists of those in power makes an American wonder what has happened to us. Get down to the family names of those in power and you can't even pronounce them. They are foreign names. Call up the departments in Washington and you can scarcely understand what is spoken over the phone because of the foreign accents. The ranks of the Government workers are filled with people who do not speak better than broken English. It is in the ranks of those people that we find the greatest hostility to American Government, to constitutional procedure, and free enterprise.

Despite all that you have heard for the past several years, despite the whole philosophy of most of these bureaucrats in Washington, I want to say to you that success is not a crime; it is to be desired.

Failure is not a virtue; it is to be avoided.

Wealth in itself is not evil; it should be put to good use. Poverty in itself is not good; it is a misfortune.

Honesty, intelligence, thrift, ability, and initiative should be encouraged.

Incompetency, extravagance, idleness, and inefficiency should be discouraged.

The American way to national prosperity and security is not in the limitation of opportunity for some; it is in equality of opportunity for all.

Business can be big without being bad; it can be bad without being big.

Big business naturally requires closer scrutiny than small business because of its greater power for good or evil.

Ninety-nine percent of American business is honest and law abiding. It must be preserved and encouraged. The crooked 1 percent should be eliminated without penalizing the honest 99 percent.

Business can succeed under proper governmental regulation; it will fail under governmental domination and competition. Prosperity and security in this Nation lie in free enterprise fairly conducted.

The welfare of finance, industry, agriculture, and labor is in mutual cooperation. It depends upon prosperous consumers.

Our Republic functions at its highest efficiency only under an administration wholly sympathetic to constitutional government.

Control and regulation by a political bureaucracy mean tyranny and retrogression. Self-government by the people assures freedom and progress.

Experience and caution are to be preferred over experimentation and rashness in Government.

America is still sound. We can recover prosperity, we can stay out of trouble, we can put our unemployed back to work in private industry at good American wages without giving up a single essential liberty or privilege.

By achieving these goals we can render ourselves and our posterity secure, and make free constitutional government the strongest incentive to other peoples to give up the ways of war and to follow the paths of peace.

Let us read carefully the signs of the time. Let us consider the trends. Let us remember that when the national preparedness has been achieved and when the wars end, as sometimes they must end, America must go on living and working. Not only must America go on living and working after the national preparedness has been achieved and the wars have ended but America must go on working and living in a world that will have been exhausted by senseless, useless destructions of war. America will have to go on living and working with every other country in the world trying to get on our W. P. A. The propaganda now being fed to us is nothing to the appeal that will lie in the propaganda to get us to feed the other peoples of the world, to rebuild their shattered industries, to give them the money and the machines and the goods to get started in a normal peacetime life again.

I say to you that America cannot police the world. Neither can America support the world. Nor can America undertake to pay for all the wars in the world and then to pay for all the rehabilitation of the destruction wrought by those wars everywhere in the world.

America must go on living and working after these wars are over, because no people anywhere in the world can possibly exist and endure on a steady diet of war and defense work. The way of war is the way of destruction. The way of peace is the way of construction and progress.

Let me say to you in conclusion, my friend, that it is going to take the best there is in the sons and daughters of those pioneers who carved this great Nation out of the trackless plains and trailless forests of this continent to survive the shocks that inevitably will come to us—the economic shocks, the sociological shocks—when finally this awful madness of war has exhausted itself and men and nations prostrate start to struggle back toward the beacon of liberty and peace.

On the hills of Gallilee 2,000 years ago a great Man said to the multitude: "What profiteth a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

I ask you now, What shall it profit America if we try to take the four freedoms to peoples everywhere in the world and lose them here at home? What shall it profit us or the world if we seek to take economic security to peoples everywhere in the world and lose our own economic security in the process? What shall it profit us or the world if in trying to rebuild the war-shattered nations, we ourselves fail because the foundations of our land of freedom and of our constitutional government have secretly been eaten away by the insidious gnawing of alien agitators, who are willing to crush themselves to push down the pillars of our free Government?

In God's name, as Americans, as sensible men and women, let us look these facts in the face, arouse ourselves, demand of our Representatives in Congress that they prevent these things and see to it that those in high places in Government who are using their powers under the guise of the national defense to throttle and to strangle business in this country, to rob the people of their economic security and their freedom; demand of their Representatives that they scourge those wreckers from the ranks of official life even as Jesus of Nazareth scourged the money changers from the temple.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., OF WISCONSIN

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article, The St. Lawrence Seaway Is Vital to Our National Defense, written by me and published in the current issue of the magazine Look.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From current issue of Look Magazine]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY IS VITAL TO OUR DEFENSE

(By Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.)

THIS UNITED STATES-CANADIAN PROJECT WOULD GIVE US WARSHIPS, TRANSPORT, POWER

The United States has set out to construct, for this hemisphere, military and economic defenses so strong that no foe will dare to test them. Awaiting the approval of Congress is one of the most important steps toward this goal—the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Three fundamentals for the defense of this hemisphere are (1) sea power, (2) mobility in military operations, and (3) productive resources. To increase our sea power, we must build ships—quickly. To attain mobility, we must expand and diversify our transportation services. To convert our vast resources into defense materials, we must have ample electrical energy.

In all three fundamentals the St. Lawrence seaway would give us a tremendous boost.

A WATER HIGHWAY CROSSING HALF THE CONTINENT

The St. Lawrence project would provide a 2,450-mile deep water highway from Superior-Duluth, at the western end of Lake Superior, to the mouth of the St. Lawrence River. An agreement on the project was signed by the United States and Canada in 1934, and again this past March. It calls for deepening certain channels between the Great Lakes and the international section of the St. Lawrence (where ocean shipping now begins) and for building several new canals and locks. To control the flow of the St. Lawrence, and to generate electricity for both the United States and Canada, a 2,200,000-horsepower dam would be thrown across the river at Massena, N. Y. The project would take about 4 years to complete. Its total cost to the United States would be $295,000,000.

43 CRUISERS ARE WAITING

Our decision to build a two-ocean navy and to rebuild our merchant marine has created an urgent need for shipyards and skilled shipbuilders. All of our ocean shipyards are working at capacity, with backlog orders that will keep them humming for 2, 3, and 4 years. They will be unable to deliver some of our new cruisers and destroyers until 1947. Meanwhile, many shipyards on the Great Lakes are idle or working only part time. To be sure, 10 submarines are being constructed at Manitowoc, Wis., and several other Great Lakes yards hold contracts for small escort vessels, mosquito boats, and the like. But this is far from "all out" defense. On the American side of the Great Lakes right now there are facilities for building 30 cruiser-size ships at the same time. On the Canadian side are facilities for 13 more. Other shipyards on both sides could be building destroyers and commercial ships.

Why aren't we making use of these facilities? Simply because large ships cannot now pass from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean. The St. Lawrence seaway would give all but battleships and aircraft carriers the deep draft passage (27 feet) they need for this journey. If the project were started now, the big ships we need could also be started now. By the time the ships were finished, the seaway would be ready to take them out to the fleet.

Besides shipyards and ways, the Great Lakes offer experienced yard managers and skilled ship workers. This region also produces many of the materials and much of the machinery needed for shipbuilding. The cost of materials—delivered to the shipyard—constitutes more than half the total cost of building a ship. Hence, the closeness of the Great Lakes yards to the steel plants of Buffalo, Cleveland, Gary, and Chicago would make it cheaper to build ships in them than in many of our coast yards.

Furthermore, because of our new fleet and air base at Newfoundland, Great Lakes shipyards would be less vulnerable to enemy attack than any others on this continent.

PREPARING FOR A WAR OF MOVEMENT

As the defense program shifts from planning to production, our transport facilities—the very essence of military mobility—will feel a tremendous strain. Already our eastern railroads are pressed to near capacity. Some roads have failed to maintain their equipment in recent years. Many companies that formerly supplied railroad equipment are now devoted to the production of tanks, gun carriages, and other armament. Before long, middle western farmers and manufacturers may find rail facilities for moving their products at a premium.

Moreover, authorities predict that by 1945, come war or peace, our transport requirements will have grown enormously.

It is inexcusable for us not to relieve this pressure on our railroads by every means possible. The St. Lawrence seaway would add

16,000,000 tons annually to United States and Canadian freight capacity.

A SPARK FOR DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

In New York State and in Canada, industries now producing such vital defense materials as aluminum, ferro-alloys, chemicals, and abrasives—all of which require large amounts of cheap power—are already facing a power shortage. The Federal Power Commission warns us that by 1945, despite planned additions to generating capacity, this shortage will be acute.

Only a comparatively few regions of the country are blessed with water resources that can be harnessed to supply electricity. In most areas, power shortages can be overcome only by building steam generating plants. Factories that produce equipment for such plants are now booked up with orders for many months ahead. Under these circumstances, development of the St. Lawrence water power would be the speediest and, in the long run, the cheapest method of making up New York State's power deficiencies.

THE FUTURE WE ARE DEFENDING

When this war is over, no matter what its outcome, the United States will face a tough foreign-trade problem. Europe is sure to be unified economicaly, under either British or Nazi control. In either case, when our industries go back to making consumer goods, we shall have to compete with products made by cheaper labor abroad. If we wish to maintain our living standards, we must be able to meet this competition without reducing wages. Everything that contributes to economy—to cheaper power, adequate transportation, etc.—will help us. The St. Lawrence seaway would be an impressive contribution toward this end.

The seaway is neither a sectional nor a partisan affair. True, it would be of primary benefit to the 45,000,000 people in the Great Lakes area. But I think we have learned that the only way a nation can gain lasting prosperity is by increasing its ability to produce and consume. This, in turn, means giving every part of the Nation an opportunity to make maximum use of its natural and human resources.

We have come to understand that high power costs for aluminum factories in New York State, or high transport costs for grain growers in the Middle West, ultimately reduce the markets of shoe manufacturers in New England, of fruit growers in California and Florida, of cattle ranchers in Texas. We learned these lessons at great cost. Action, now, on the St. Lawrence project is one way to show that the lessons have had some effect.

Resolution of Connecticut State Industrial Union Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

LETTER AND RESOLUTION FROM T. R. MOLLOY

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. T. R. Molloy, president of the Connecticut State Industrial Union Council, C. I. O., and with it a resolution which was adopted by the council supporting the President's recent radio address.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONNECTICUT STATE INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL, C. I. O.,
Waterbury, Conn., September 18, 1941.

Senator FRANCIS MALONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: The executive board of the Connecticut Industrial Union Council, C. I. O., at its meeting September 13, endorsed in full the President's recent radio address.

I am enclosing a copy of the statement that was unanimously adopted at that time.

Sincerely yours,

T. R. MOLLOY, *President.*

The Connecticut State Industrial Union Council, C. I. O., as the true descendant of people's organizations which fought for American independence in 1776 and founded this Nation, hereby goes on record in support of the recent radio address of President Roosevelt.

The council states its belief that the President expressed the sentiment of the majority of the American people. Organized labor, above all, will continue to back fully all steps aiding in the defense of this Nation by helping to crush Hitlerism: Be it

Resolved, That this statement be transmitted to President Roosevelt, Connecticut Congressmen, and the press.

Influence of Racial Groups on Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. SCHWARTZ

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, we have heard a great deal lately as to the extent, if any, which certain racial groups are supposed to be influencing action by the administration. In that respect I desire to offer for publication in the RECORD a recent article by Dorothy Thompson appearing in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 13, 1941]

ON THE RECORD

LINDBERGH'S CLAIM THAT JEWS ENDANGER UNITED STATES BY CONTROL OF MEDIUMS MOLDING THOUGHT CONTRADICTED

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The remark to end all remarks on the Jewish question was made by Mark Twain, who said, "The Jews are members of the human race—worse I can say of no man."

However, Mr. Lindbergh and the Charlie McCarthys of the America First Committee in the Senate subcommittee "investigating" the movie industry have neither the wit, logic, nor humanity of Mark Twain. Mr. Lindbergh, therefore, managed in one breath to express his sorrow for the persecution of the Jews in Germany while advocating their persecution here if they exercise the same rights as other citizens.

Following the line taken in Washington against the movies, he says that the "British, Jewish, and administration groups" are the only important interventionists in this country, and that "the greatest danger to this country lies in the large Jewish ownership and influence in our motion pictures, our press, our radio, and our Government."

Leaving Mr. Lindbergh's motives aside, what is the plain factual truth about his statement? Is it a fact that Jews are the leading interventionists in the United States? Is it a fact that they have large ownership or influence in the motion pictures, press, radio, and Government? And, if they have ownership, is there any ground for thinking that their racial origin determines the way they use their influence?

THE INFLUENTIAL INTERVENTIONISTS

I have written down a list of the most prominent and influential interventionists in the United States, in Government, radio, journalism, the press, and public life, including the two pro-interventionist organizations, the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies and the Fight for Freedom.

In the Government: President Roosevelt, Cordell Hull, Henry L. Stimson, Frank Knox, and Col. William J. Donovan. In organized public activity: Herbert S. Agar, ex-Senator Ernest Willard Gibson, Bishop Henry Wise Hobson, James B. Conant, Wendell Willkie. Among the more influential radio commentators: Raymond Swing, H. V. Kaltenborn, Elmer Davis, Walter Winchell, William L. Shirer. Among journalists: Leland Stowe, H. R. Knickerbocker, Edward C. Taylor, Edgar Mowrer, John Gunther, Vincent Sheean, John Whitaker, William Stoneman, Quentin Reynolds, and the editor of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Hamilton Fish Armstrong. Among columnists: Walter Lippmann, Jay Franklin, Raymond Clapper, Samuel Grafton, and myself.

Of these 30 names, who would certainly be the first people to be suppressed, exactly 2 are Jewish. The others are racially of Dutch, British, Irish, and German extraction—there are three of pure German extraction to three of Jewish. Four of them—maybe more—Roosevelt, Swing, Hamilton Fish Armstrong, and Edgar Mowrer, are descendants of the oldest American families extant.

Well, are the Government, movies, radio, and press saturated with Jewish influences?

BANKS OWN FILM INDUSTRY

The only Jew in the cabinet is Mr. Morgenthau. The policy-making bodies in foreign affairs are the President, the State Department, the Army, and the Navy. Jews are almost nonexistent in all these departments.

There are a great many Jewish executives in Hollywood. Jewish enterprise, which has never commanded really great capital in this country, was the first to see a latent big industry in the moving picture; they were the pioneers. But, if I am correctly informed, most of the present ownership is in the hands of banks, and there are very few Jewish banks in America. None of the big three is Jewish: Chase National, Guaranty Trust, National City.

Radio is owned by tens of thousands of stockholders in several corportaions. Does Mr. Lindbergh want to go over the lists and expropriate the stock in Jewish hands? He's got precedents for it in Fascist countries. Mr. Sarnoff, a young radio wizard, was discovered by Owen D. Young and became president of R. C. A. N. B. C. has its own president

and he has never been Jewish. Of 26 directors and members of the advisory council two are Jewish. C. B. S. has a Jewish president but not a Jewish majority on the board. Mutual is a cooperative system in which one of the stockholders is the rabidly isolationist Chicago Tribune.

PUBLIC DECIDES ON RADIO

Radio commentators have only one trouble with the broadcasting companies: They are not permitted to editorialize, and they are supposed to avoid controversy. Since the America First Committee considers even facts controversial if the facts don't help the America First Committee, and since the America First Committee organizes boycotts and letter-writing campaigns to sponsors, the lot of the radio commentator is hard. But if the public does not like the commentator, he goes off the air. Here again, the public decides. And the most influential commentators are not paid by the networks but by sponsors. Does Mr. Lindbergh think no Jewish firms should be allowed to advertise?

Mr. Lindbergh's reference to Jewish influence falls completely wide of the mark when it comes to the press. There is an amazingly small amount of Jewish ownership of newspapers. The big news services—Associated Press, United Press, and International News Service—are not Jewish. The largest chains are Scripps-Howard and Hearst—not Jewish. The New York Times is Jewish owned, but has an overwhelming gentile editorial board. Of the 11 most powerful interventionist newspapers in the country, only 1 is Jewish owned.

POLICY WOULD CONTINUE

The most powerful interventionist weekly press is the Luce press. Not Jewish. The two monthly magazines with the strongest interventionist editorial policy are the Ladies' Home Journal and the Atlantic Monthly. Not Jewish.

In fact, if every American Jew died tomorrow it would make not the slightest difference in the policy of the movies, the radio, the Government, or the press—unless, of course, Mr. Lindbergh and his followers could fill whatever positions were left vacant from the lists of the America First Committee.

There are precedents for that, too, in Fascist countries.

But first he would have to deal with some of us who are not Jews.

Economic Suggestions by Elbert Eastman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

LETTER FROM ELBERT EASTMAN, OF PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter bearing on economic questions, addressed to me by Mr. Elbert Eastman, of Portland, Oreg., under date of August 5, 1941.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *August 5, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES L. McNARY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The other day the Oregonian published a leading editorial entitled "Planning a New World." It was thought-provoking. It started out with the question, "What if the Allies should win the war?" Then it referred to the years 1923–25 and the report of the Brookings Institution which said:

"That is, without increasing the manpower or increasing the capital investment, industry could turn out goods at a vastly augmented rate—a situation very dispiriting to capital and labor alike, in that both found themselves with huge surpluses."

Then the editorial goes on to say that now the surpluses are used for defense purpose and then it asks, "What of the plants expanded for defense purposes; what of the men in uniform and those in defense industries?" etc.

Now, Senator, these are very serious questions and it is the duty of Congress to formulate committees with experts to make findings and to give out those findings to the press of the Nation, that the people may discuss them, and thus public opinion will demand the correct solution, or at least the solution the people want.

And as every progressive economist will point out the following in brief is a solution if Congress and the Nation has the courage to bring about the change: Let American industry produce to its highest capacity; raise wages to the highest level; cut the working day to 6 hours; cut the working days to 200 out of the 365 per year; put all over age 60 on a decent pension. If we do this and then issue money, based on production and levy taxes so that the money will come back to the source of issue and then destroy it as fast as it is turned back to the Government in the form of taxes so as to balance the issue and prohibit inflation, we will then get the products of production in the hands of people who will use them and we will have an equalized prosperity. Along with this should come Government ownership and operation and exploitation of all natural resources. The old theory of "competition is the life of trade" is archaic. It is a farce. Competition is rapidly fading under monopolies—witness the telephone company, chain stores of a thousand varieties, railroads with the same rates, etc. We must plan for this new world the Oregonian speaks of and it must be done through cooperatives, helped, aided, and abetted by the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. That means we must plan for this new world through the city governments, the county governments, the legislatures, and through Congress. And since the natural resources are owned by all the people and Congress represents all the people, we, the people, must look to you as our guide.

And now as to the foreign policy, trade agreements and trade restrictions, tariffs, and foreign investments: The principle should be adopted that if an American goes in business in a foreign country he should become as a citizen of that particular country, abiding by all its laws and regulations and not look to the United States for protection, and that same rule should apply to any person that comes to this country to do business. In other words this Nation should have no investments in foreign countries. If our countrymen invest in foreign countries they should look to that particular country for protection and not to the United States. If we adopt that policy we will have no trouble with foreign countries. And again, if our standard of living is so high in this country that we cannot compete with other countries which ship in their goods, then we should produce for us alone and buy from them at a high price if we need their goods—for we can always buy from them if we pay enough. For instance I remember years ago the farmers went to Congress and wanted the tariff taken off wheat sacks so the price would come down. What happened? The American manufacturer moved his factory to India where he manufactured with cheap labor and shipped wheat sacks in duty free, but the farmer paid the same price. Our leading packing plants have established packing plants in Argentina and Uruguay where they buy cheap grass-fed beef and pack it with cheap labor and ship it to this country thus hamstringing the cattle grower of United States. A high protective tariff shutting out all products that we can produce here is the remedy. Then we should ship in duty-free products that we cannot raise or produce such as coffee, tea, silk, camphor, rubber, etc. The world cannot accuse us of selfishness for we will sell to them without duty what we have. If they will not buy then produce for use here. If we produce too much cut the working day, increase the pensions, and raise wages. Let the machine do the work, and put them to work at full capacity.

ELBERT EASTMAN.

St. Louis Labor Union Pledges National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CENTRAL TRADES AND LABOR UNION OF ST. LOUIS AND VICINITY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no organization in the United States more loyal than the Central Trades and Labor Union of St. Louis and vicinity. It has time and again gone on record with the parent organization, the American Federation of Labor, in support of the President's foreign policy. It has likewise been one organization that has cleaned its own house when it was found that undesirable persons sought to control or were in control of affiliated organizations.

It is with pleasure that I call to the attention of the Congress a resolution passed by this organization September 23, and include same as part of my remarks. The resolution follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *September 23, 1941.*

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was adopted by unanimous vote at the last meeting of our Central Trades and Labor Union held September 16.

Respectfully yours,
CENTRAL TRADES AND LABOR UNION
OF ST. LOUIS AND VICINITY,
By W. M. BRANDT, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF GREAT BRITAIN AND ALL COUNTRIES FIGHTING HITLER AND HITLERISM

Whereas President William Green and the General Council of the American Federation of Labor have expressed the support of our organization to the fight of Great Britain

and all countries fighting Hitler and Hitlerism, and

Whereas our Central Labor body has expressed a number of times its hatred of Hitlerism, and its devotion to the cause of democracy, and

Whereas as workers and trade-unionists, we are particularly conscious of the brutality and degradation that is brought down upon us by Hitlerism, as we have witnessed so clearly in the murder of our brother trade-unionists in Norway, and

Whereas as devoted citizens of our country, we know that our national security is threatened by the Hitler military machine; therefore be it

Resolved, That our Central Labor body goes on record in the support of the policy laid down by President William Green and that we pledge our untiring efforts to maintain national unity in support of the policy expressed by the President of our country, Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Roosevelt, President William Green, the Congressmen and Senators of Missouri, and to the press.

Resolution of Louisiana Coalition of Patriotic Societies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS ON MONDAY, JULY 28, 1941

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the work of destroying subversive activities and creating patriotism and good citizenship has been nobly carried on in my native city of New Orleans for many years by the Louisiana Coalition of Patriotic Societies.

This group, made up of representatives of civic, patriotic, veterans, and similar organizations, has been most effective and has prevented the scourge of subversion which has struck many other sections of our Nation.

Recently the board of the society adopted a splendid resolution in support of the foreign policy of this Government and I am herewith incorporating it into the RECORD.

Whereas the Board of Directors of the Louisiana Coalition of Patriotic Societies has complete confidence in the able leadership of the President of the United States in his determination to prepare our Nation for complete national defense; and

Whereas the Board of Directors of the Louisiana Coalition of Patriotic Societies has observed with profound misgiving the acts and utterances of various public figures and legislators tending to delay and hinder our national-defense preparations and to disunite the citizenship of our country at a time of crisis: Be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Louisiana Coalition of Patriotic Societies approves and endorses the policy of the President of the United States and his administration with regard to national defense and calls upon the elected representatives of the people and upon all citizens to lend their best efforts to the support of the President of the United States and his administration in all matters pertaining to the defense of the United States of America: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Louisiana in the Congress of the United States and to the press.

Sapientia et Doctrina (Wisdom and Knowledge)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ADDRESS BY THE VERY REVEREND ROBERT I. GANNON, S. J., PRESIDENT OF FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the centenary celebration of Fordham University was another notable event in its history. The world of culture and scholarship gathered at Rose Hill to march in procession to honor Fordham on this its one hundredth birthday, and to acknowledge the leadership and attainments of President Gannon.

The citizens of my city, New York, are proud of Fordham and, because of their love for this fine, Catholic institution, they, regardless of race, color, creed, or formal training, have adopted it as their alma mater.

I ask the Members of the House to read the centenary address of Father Gannon, which is a masterpiece of rhetoric and a challenge to the thinking men and women of America.

The address follows:

What was said and done on the feast of St. John the Baptist, 1841, when a new little college opened its doors here in the open field, we shall, unfortunately, never know No program was printed for the occasion. The Reverend Mr. John McCloskey, our first president, and afterwards the first American member of the Sacred College of Cardinals, probably drove up from Mott Street, dismounted, stiff and dusty, at the old stone steps, noted the deathly stillness of the country and cried: "Isn't the heat insufferable". At least that is the sort of speech great men really make on great occasions, and this was a great occasion—greater than anyone knew. Everyone hoped, of course, that the new venture would have some considerable success. Father McCloskey dreamed of a time when there might be two—even three hundred students here, and his superior, the young Coadjutor Bishop, was perfectly sure that his college would soon outdistance Georgetown and always be the most important Catholic institution in the country, because, after all, he had not had the pleasure of founding the others. But still, if some angel of God could have pierced the fog of the future, year after year for a hundred long and crowded years, could have shown them from the back steps of that Old Manor House over there the brilliant and distinguished gathering which honors us today. John Hughes would have cried: "This is Europe! This is Paris! Our vision is looking back, not forward. This is the Paris of the thirteenth century". Imagine his astonishment at seeing you here, a thousand men and women in doctors' gowns, half of you teaching here in this university city, half of you come as delegates from the important seats of learning all over the world. While here in our midst, he would see the ruler of our State as an honorary member of the faculty. Here most reverend bishops and archbishops, chief among them our own beloved Son and Father in Christ, and here a special representative of the Holy Father, the apostolic delegate

As for us of the Centenary year, though quite as gratified as our Founder would have been, we are not as much surprised by either your numbers or your splendor. We take for granted, after all these years, the growing spirit of fellowship and understanding amongst educators that has brought felicitations from so many and such great institutions of learning. We take for granted too, the fact that you have come in your wedding garments "In vestitu deaurato circumdati varietate" and rejoice especially in this latter fact because it is your splendor rather than your graciousness that opens up the following train of thought.

Here in the United States, side by side with the youthful, bounding spirit of research, we are all aware of a certain nostalgic hoarding of older glories. Prior to the Civil War, this hoarding was rather of substantial things, of educational ideas and traditional curricula All our American institutions of learning were still within striking distance of the trivium and the quadrivium, so that every college student in the city of New York knew silver from golden Latin and could recognize the Attic spirit in literature. He was even held responsible for the elements of logic and was never allowed, even in debate, to derive conclusions through an illicit process of the major. On the other hand, academic robes had not appeared as yet on this side of the Atlantic. Old Sir J. J. Thompson, the physicist and Master of Trinity, frequently enjoyed telling us that he had himself witnessed the American premiere of caps and gowns at the opening of the Johns Hopkins University, and used to add good natured but typical British comment at our expense.

With the rise, however, of a secular and scientific spirit, with the growing predominance of German influence on our leading institutions, extraordinary changes of opinion occurred with regard to the essential subject matter of an education. So that now if one of our first graduates, Bishop Rosecrans, for example, were to examine the mental content of a modern college student who had majored, let us say, in traffic problems or in hotel management, he might in his simplicity, mistake an arts man for an apprentice. But as though in compensation for the change of what our forebears would have called essential, there has been a decided growth of interest in medieval pageantry. Bachelors' gowns are now being worn in Freshman, high school, grammar school. Specially tinted hoods have been devised for the most unexpected branches of learning. Long processions, led by a mace, wind their way across campuses where not a word of Latin is spoken, to amphitheaters where not a word of Greek is understood. Schools of methodology where credits are amassed by future creditors are being housed in arched and groined gothic dreams that would have inspired a Jowett or a Newman. Cynics may derive what conclusion they will. To us simpler folk, this wistful glancing backward is a heartening sign. It means that more people than we realize are still aware that education, especially higher education, has a two-fold function; that its aim is not only to increase knowledge, but to preserve it; that it must, therefore, always be not only progressive but conservative, in the original meaning of the words progredi and conservare; that where in isolated cases, familiar to us all, it is merely forging ahead and has lost all contact with the precious past, it

must risk a liberal damnation and become (some courage is required to use the awful word) reactionary. It must, that is, double back on its tracks until it can pick up the golden thread once more.

As if to echo this two-fold function of increase and preservation, someone endowed this University many years ago with our only endowment, an excellent motto for the official seal: "Sapientia et Doctrina", wisdom and information. The "Veritas" on Harvard's seal is simpler and embraces just as much. The "Yahveh" of Yale is simpler still and all-embracing. But "Sapientia et Doctrina" carries with it a suggestion of analysis and emphasis that makes it a specific thing, a definite educational ideal. For it stresses Wisdom before Information and helps to answer the ageless question: "How much information is it wise for one generation to have?"

Now everyone knows, in a general way, what is meant by Wisdom, even though he may not be able to give the Scholastic definition straight from the treatise on the speculative intellectual virtues. He may never have thought of it as a "knowledge of conclusions through first causes", involving as that does, the First Cause of first causes, but he does know that there are thoughtful people here and there who have lived long and unselfishly, who have been through danger and suffering who have had their little moments of triumph, their hours of disillusionment, their days and nights of silence and spiritual growth. He knows of harassed men who can pause in their incredibly busy lives to say, with the simplicity of children, "I believe that character not wealth or power or position, is of supreme worth. I believe that love is the greatest thing in the world". He knows that such people have a quality that enables them to realize values, to weigh motives and to understand how God works through His creatures. Although this quality in greater or less degree may sometimes glow in the mind of a self-taught man, or even in the mind of a man who cannot read or write, he knows that there are short cuts in its acquisition. There is much that a wise and loving father can give to an admiring son. There is much that one generation can hand down to another through that great, deep, wide channel of tradition, the Liberal Arts, especially through the wisdom studies—theology, philosophy, history and literature. For these are the studies that bring us closest to the ideal of knowing conclusions through first causes, of understanding how God works through His creatures

As with individual man, so with groups of men, whole generations of men. Some we find who lay more store on Sapientia, some who find Doctrina more important. In the past millennium, for instance, we can discern a kind of watershed somewhere in the middle of the 15th and 16th centuries. On one side the stream of inspiration seems to be flowing from the past. On the other, strangely enough, from the unseen future. The latter of course, appeals to us as obviously preferable, because we are of the 19th and 20th centuries. We have been brought up in an evolutionary atmosphere that leads us to expect, contrary to human experience, always better and better things. We are still hypnotized by the charm of the very latest, the most advanced, convinced as we are that to march forward is alway to improve our condition, even though we march from a fertile field into a trackless waste; even though we march straight over a cliff. This modern tendency has of course produced great changes in the lives of men. We are fond of boasting that there has been more progress in the fifty years just passed than in the previous five hundred. But progress toward what? We have undoubtedly been rocketing toward some part of space with terrific and accelerated speed, but when we get there, are we sure that we shall find it worth the journey? We are progressing undeniably, but with every step we grow more conscious of increasing instability.

Even those very ends for which we have sacrificed so much health, culture and comfort, are being blown from the face of the earth. It is true that killing people off is a more complicated business than it used to be, but are we not cleverly solving all the complications?

When we come, at length, to examine the cause of our unprofitable speed, it seems to lie partly at least in our graceless and unseasonable youthfulness. It may be embarrassing to admit that 2,400 years after the age of Pericles we are suffering from a dangerous and recurrent adolescence, but the sad truth is that when the intellectuals of the last few centuries successfully cut off our past, they cut off, to a great extent, our only source of maturity, Wisdom, and condemned us to play the role of brash and ignorant children who despite the yesterdays of which they know so little.

For seeking inspiration from the past is not peculiar to a primitive people, nor does it normally mean that a generation lacks confidence in itself because of small achievement. Rather, it indicates a degree of disillusionment which belongs to years of discretion. Like older men, maturer civilizations have a haunting suspicion that there were heroes before Agamemnon. Rome was in her prime, already showing her wrinkles in fact, when the poet wrote of her the line once at the top of every schoolboy's copybook: "Moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque". And Troy was all but finished when the warning came from Apollo: "Antiquas exquirite matres". Greek philosophers and scientists built upon the wisdom of the East. The Romans built upon the Greeks. In the high noon of the Middle Ages, Sentences and Summas organized, enriched and modernized Plato and Aristotle and the early Fathers of the Church. And even in the proud, self-conscious Renaissance, when Doctrina began to surge ahead exuberantly, Wisdom studies and veneration for tradition were long in dying.

In fact they are not quite dead even now, though information at the expense of Wisdom has become the earmark of our modern schooling. We realize with concern that too many of our Principals and Supervisors and University Faculties have been false to their high trust. They have become infected with a dangerous—because exaggerated—experimentalism that seeks, like communism, its real parent, to begin a new world, not by building on, but by obliterating the old. Worse still, the people as a whole, educators, parents and students have yielded little by little to the insidious kind of pragmatism which applies the yardstick of immediate utility to every subject in the curriculum. As a result, the wisdom subjects are giving way all along the line to the merely informational. Theology went overboard many years ago. Philosophy flourishes in outline form as a species of cultural history. Metaphysics has become a Roman Catholic aberration. Literature, while still conspicuous in the catalogs, has become in practice more and more the science, or the bones of literature. Of all the Wisdom subjects which linger today, waging a losing fight with practicality, History alone seems to hold its ancient place. But even here, it is not the more important philosophy of history that is regarded with such favor, but the enormous mass of information which constitutes its material cause.

Largely as a by-product of this worship of utility, we are faced by the problem of overspecialization. The same processes which have met with such success in modern American industry have now been applied of late with strange results to the intellectual world. A kind of assembly line has been introduced into our universities, where each of our busy educators, like a factory hand, knows only one operation. One cuts, one fits, one pads, one makes the buttonholes. A Dean, a Registrar, a Department Head, a struggling Instructor. A strange life that, making intellectual buttonholes for the clothing of the mind! Of course in education as in industry, the result of our efficiency is a very much cheaper suit. But the method has distinct advantages.

It certainly increases the sum total of information in the world and simplifies considerably the staffing of an intellectual factory. It is so much easier to find a thousand brand new, shiny minds that know all about some particular fragment of knowledge than to find one great, mellow mind, broad and deep, the kind of mind that was once regarded as the normal goal of a liberal education, the kind of mind still sought by Christian Humanism as it strives, in the felicitous phrase of the distinguished editor of Thought, "to develop the intellect, the conscience and the taste in the light of both reason and revelation; with the force of both passion and grace". There is consequently every sign that Doctrina is on the increase. Soon we shall have the universe completely tabulated, and no one will know what it means.

In the midst of our Celebration today, therefore surrounded by distinguished representatives of all that is best in modern thought, we cannot banish the formless fear that this glory of ours is a touch of autumn coloring, reminding us that another winter is at hand. Some pessimistic observers look rather for another ice age that will end our particular cycle of civilization. Would that we could blame some individual tyrant for its approach. Would that we could say "There is only one enemy to destroy, one 'Rattlesnake' to scotch. If Democracy but attacks him now, with so many supertanks and flying fortresses, vigor will return to our Christian principles. Our Churches will be holy and our homes will be chaste again. There will be respect for marriage vows and love for children. Prosperity, hand in hand with social justice, will enter on the scene and educational institutions will return to educational pursuits". But no one so deludes himself except for political purposes. We all know that the present crop of dictators in the world is a symptom, not a cause. We all know that poor old Europe was already sick unto death long before she decided to end it all with an overdose of modernity. Sometimes we read in Sunday supplements that we are sinking back again into the Middle Ages. Shades of Canterbury and of Chartres!

For years past we have been sinking forward into a thoroughly modern chaos, a scholarly and documented chaos, worthy of our most Liberal and Progressive thinkers For years past our universities of Europe and America have been hacking away at the twin foundations of their own house. Like men gone mad with pride they have recklessly attacked Christianity and Hellenism as though they could by some legerdemain preserve Western Civilization and still destroy the two great traditions on which it rests For years past wise men have been warning them that if they did not desist from their crazy undermining operations they would bring the roof down on all our heads. Now they have done it. Let us then put the blame exactly where it belongs. This annihilating war of ideas which is closing our hectic chapter of history comes to us straight from the lecture halls of Europe and America. It would have come sooner or later in any event. Our brilliant professors who are long on Doctrina and short on Sapientia would surely have found some method of destroying us, even though the rulers of the modern world had happily died in their baptismal innocence. As it is, our educators prepared the way for intellectual slavery by giving us, in place of education—bewilderment. In place of Wisdom, and at the expense of the sources of Wisdom, they spread

before their students more undigested information than the human race has ever had before, much more than the human race knows how to use at the present time. They produced a glut of facts to which we are not at this time entitled, for no age is entitled to more facts than it has wisdom to assimilate.

Now that the harm is done, however, no one would have us declare a moratorium on information. But as Universities our role must be the gradual restoration of Wisdom to the world. We must push forward in every line of modern research with continued and breathless devotion, but like the athletes put out the light. For the new world that will be born of all this pain must be, "a brave new world", but not brave with the bravery of a dehumanized machine. We want no heroes of the Soviet type to shape our futures for us; reckless heroes who are ready to throw away their lives in defense of indefensible principles which they never understood in the first place. We want the enlightened bravery of Christian Humanism. Our children's children, in this brave new world which we may never see, must realize that they are men, angels, as well as animals; men with powers of imagination, reason, will and capacities for unselfishness that verge on the sublime; men whose fathers often reached the heights before them and left inspiring records for them to read, in Philosophy, in History and in Literature; men who are above all, God's own children, to whom theology should be an alphabet. Far from despairing then, in the growing darkness, the universities of the world should be inspired by the glorious realization that they were never more needed than today because the Liberal Arts were never more necessary, Wisdom never more precious.

We cherish in our archives a long and affectionate letter from His Holiness Pope Pius XII Gloriously reigning, in which he reminds us that our future is rich in promise because we cherish the priceless inheritance of the past. In urging us to be true to the traditions, the principles, the ideals of Fordham, which are the traditions, principles and ideals of Christian Humanism, he assures us that in doing so we shall not only be serving God and Country, but shall likewise be meriting for ourselves an incorruptible crown which shall be ours for Eternity.

Municipal League of Michigan Urges Completion of Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the Municipal League of Michigan consists of many cities and municipalities within the State organized for the purpose of improving government and administration through cooperative effort. I believe it represents a fair cross section of public opinion within the State.

Recently at a State convention held at Traverse City, Mich., September 12, 1941, the league passed a resolution urging adequate water transportation for the people of the States in the Great Lakes section through the creation of the St. Lawrence waterway, as proposed by the President and his predecessors in office.

In order that the people of the country may know the sentiment and opinion, at least of a majority of the citizens of the State of Michigan, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein copy of the resolution thus adopted by the league:

Whereas the State of Michigan is primarily an industrial State whose productive activities are vital to national defense; and

Whereas the State of Michigan, among other States bordering upon the Great Lakes, relies greatly upon the existence of adequate water transportation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in order to make the products of Michigan farms and industries and those of the other States bordering upon the Great Lakes readily available to our Nation and to the democracies of the world, the delegates of the Michigan Municipal League, in convention assembled this 12th day of September, 1941, do petition the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress to give their support to legislation which will make available such adequate water transportation through the creation of the St. Lawrence waterway proposed by the President of the United States and many of his predecessors in office.

Addresses Republican Women's Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM G. MILLER

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address recently delivered by the Honorable William G. Miller, formerly a Member of the House from the State of Connecticut:

It was with a great deal of pleasure that I accepted your invitation to speak to this group of Republican women. Two weeks ago I addressed a meeting of the Republican women of Middlesex County. While attending that meeting I learned that Miss Byrne had set a goal of 50,000 members for the Republican women's clubs in Connecticut. That you will reach and exceed that goal I have no doubt. Oh, I learned a lot at that Middlesex County meeting. Miss Anna Mae Surtoski reported as chairman of your new speakers' bureau. For a long time I have felt that the party should have not only a speakers' bureau but also study groups. Your organization is leading the way, and I sincerely hope that the Republican men, both young and old, will follow your commendable example. We need men and women who will prepare themselves and go out to present the truth to luncheon clubs and to organizations of all kinds. Too many men will say they haven't the time to study the problems of government and to prepare addresses that will give the people of Connecticut the truth about developments in Washington. My answer to such men is just this: If the businessmen of Connecticut, both large and small, fail to do something toward improving our present situation, they will soon find that they have nothing but time left; their business will have been destroyed or taken over by Uncle Sam, and free enterprise will be a thing of the past.

I believe it was Lincoln who once said, "Give the people all of the facts and they will find the correct solution." There never has been a time in our history when it was so important that we get the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. It is my contention that for the past few years the administration in Washington has not given us the truth. They have not been frank with us; they have not taken the people of the country into their confidence.

Washington is full of illegally appointed publicity agents sending out reams of propaganda. Millions of dollars are being wasted in the preparation of movies picturing the alleged glories of New Deal agencies. We still finance Mellet's clipping bureau, costing the taxpayers a million and a half dollars a year. This bureau was started with $50,000 taken from relief funds. It now receives an annual appropriation from Congress. Millions of dollars are spent each year sending out tons of speeches printed and delivered at taxpayers' expense.

If the American people knew the truth about what is going on in Washington, they would certainly elect a Republican House in 1942 and a Republican President in 1944.

For example—and it's a little thing but indicative of the loose way in which millions of our tax dollars are being spent—in the recent $8,000,000,000 deficiency appropriation bill for national defense there was an item of $200,000,000 to be spent by the President during the emergency for any unforeseen need that might arise. There was no serious objection to that item, although it should be recalled that out of the last $100,000,000 appropriated for that purpose the President turned $1,000,000 over to the Army engineers for taking borings on the St. Lawrence River, a project that could hardly qualify as an emergency national-defense measure; however, a proviso was added to the paragraph appropriating $200,000,000 stating that not more than $4,000,000 was "to be spent by the President without voucher." We have successfully fought previous wars, but never before have we given to anyone the right to spend $4,000,000 without at least submitting a voucher to the Treasury Department.

Speaking about getting the truth, is there any reason under the sun why we should not have the facts relating to the alleged oil and gasoline shortage along the eastern seaboard? It is admitted that there is no shortage of fuel oil or gasoline in the United States; it is claimed that the shortage in the East is due only to lack of tankers. Mr. Pelley, president of the Association of Railroads, issued a statement setting forth that there are 20,000 empty tank cars standing idle on the tracks of our American railroads. At the same time Mr. Ickes claims that he cannot find out how many tank cars the railroads have idle.

It is claimed by the administration that it was necessary for us to give Great Britain 70 tankers so that her war machine would be amply supplied with gas and oil. Recently it has been suggested that we may have to part with more of our tankers for the same purpose; yet an official of one of the largest oil companies issued a statement (published under a London date line) in which he points out that 300 tankers will provide for Britain's war needs. He also points out that at the outbreak of the present war Britain had 500 tankers and that she now has 900, including those obtained from the United States and European countries overrun by Hitler.

A committee of the United States Senate is now trying to unearth the true facts, and as a result of that committee's investigation I expect that we shall soon know the truth.

I predict it will be proven that with proper handling there would be no shortage. Is there any reason why we should not have had the truth without going to the expense of a senatorial investigation?

Millions of our citizens would like to have the facts, the truth, about the need for the recently enacted law extending the period of training for the selectees now serving in our Army. If the administration in Washington had told the men in service, the Congress, and the country the plain truth, there would have been very little opposition to a reasonable extension of the period of training. Instead of trying to make us believe that it was being seriously proposed by anyone that two-thirds of our Army should be discharged at once, the President had issued a statement something like this:

A year ago we thought it would be possible to draft, equip, and train a million men in a year's time and return them home as trained reservists, but we have found out that it has been impossible to carry out such a program. In the first place, it took longer to build the camps than we thought it would; this is borne out by the fact that these camps have cost us twice as much as was first estimated. After we had the camps ready we discovered that we did not have, nor could we get within a year, the material necessary for your proper training. Due to this lack of material and equipment, although you have spent a year in the Army you have had little more than a 13-week hardening-up process or basic training. The President could have gone on and said, rather than send you home untrained, we are going to extend your term for another year; but if we find that we can get the needed equipment, we will send you home in less than the additional year.

Perhaps it would be asking too much to expect the administration to issue such a statement, for that would be to admit a mistake in judgment, and, with the exception of admitting that changing the date for Thanksgiving was a mistake, I cannot recall any such admission by President Roosevelt. It would also be an admission that our national-defense procurement program has been badly bungled from start to finish. Instead of being frank in admitting the error, the President misled the country by saying that it would be dangerous to discharge two-thirds of our Army at this time, and that those who refused to support his proposal were trifling with the country's safety. This was just another attempt to lead us to believe that every Member of Congress who follows his orders and sits on the Democratic side of the House of Representatives is a statesman, and that everyone on the Republican side is just a politician, caring nothing for the country's safety.

Just what is the truth? What was proposed by the minority in the House of Representatives? They proposed that the service of the National Guard and Reserve officers be extended, but that those who had been drafted for 1 year's training, along with those who had volunteered for 1 year, be discharged to the Reserve when their year was completed. Would that have meant discharging two-thirds of the Army? Not at all. It meant that 50,000 men would be discharged in October of 1941, about 60,000 in November, and on up to the maximum of 123,000 in March of 1942. As fast as these men were sent home, new recruits would be brought in to take their places.

Since this draft-extension bill was signed by the President, the War Department has come out with an announcement that they are going to discharge 200,000 men almost at once—more than would have been discharged in any one month if the minority's proposal had been adopted. It has been said by some New Deal spokesman that those who voted against the administration's bill were voting against the judgment of both the President and the Chief of Staff, General Marshall. I have read and reread the hearings on this bill when it was before the House Military Affairs Committee, and I fail to find that General Marshall testified that the minority's proposal meant discharging two-thirds of our Army. He did say—and no one can disagree with him—that it would not be safe to discharge two-thirds of the Army.

Because of a commendable desire for unity, there are those who say that we should not dicuss nor argue about the administration's foreign policy or national-defense proposals. With such a contention I disagree. There is a proper time for debate and discussion of foreign policy under our form of government, and that is while the policy is being formulated; however, after the various measures introduced in Congress to carry into effect our foreign policy have been adopted and signed by the President, it is our duty to support those measures. For example, take the lease-lend bill. Regardless of what anyone may have thought of its provisions, once it has become law it should be supported by all of us. That does not mean that the next lease-lend bill, soon to be sent to Congress and providing for another $5,000,000,000, should not be scrutinized carefully.

It has already been suggested by administration spokesmen that no reference should be made to Russia in the new lease-lend bill; that its benefits be made available to Great Britain, China, and two or three other small countries still able to resist aggression. Is that being frank with the country? Not at all, when at the same time it is pointed out that there is no need of bringing Russia into the debate in Congress, inasmuch as the President can order the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to loan Russia all the money she may need without further authorization by Congress.

If we, as a party, are to take on the task of giving the people of Connecticut the truth, we want to continue a fearless type of leadership. Oftentimes we hear it said that it isn't safe to discuss this or that for fear someone's toes will be stepped upon. If it's the truth, the people should have it.

I have heard it said that the Kearny, N. J., situation should not be discussed for fear some friend of organized labor might misunderstand. Members of organized labor in the United States, whether they be members of the C. I. O., the A. F. of L., or the railroad brotherhoods, are, first of all, loyal Americans. The rank and file of organized labor does not approve of the President's illegal action in taking over the Federal Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. at Kearny, N. J.

Last June the shipbuilders operating along the Atlantic seaboard entered into an agreement with the C. I. O., in which they increased wages to the extent of $223,000,000. It was also agreed between the shipbuilders and the C. I. O. that there would be no strikes or lock-outs during the next 2 years, and that any disputes that might arise would be referred to a mediation board. A dispute did arise between the C. I. O. and the Federal Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. Thirteen different points were in disagreement. The company and its employees readily reached an agreement on 12 of the 13 points. The thirteenth point, to which the company could not agree, required the company to discharge any employee who for any reason refused to pay his dues to the C. I. O. As a practical matter, that meant that any loyal American trying to bring up his family decently would lose his job if he refused to pay his dues to a C. I. O. local, even though he knew that that particular local was communistically controlled.

I have referred to the illegal action of the President. Congress recently refused to pass a bill which would have given the President power to take the action that he has taken at Kearny, N. J. The only possible provision of law under which the President may have acted is a provision in the Burke-Wadsworth bill, which provides that the President may take over a given factory if a particular company refuses to accept a Government contract at a reasonable price. Certainly there was no question of industry's refusing to accept a contract in Kearny, N. J. The issue there reduces itself to this one question: Does the Constitution of the United States mean anything today? Is the Government to take over industry and make this a Fascist state, or are we to continue the free-enterprise system under which we have prospered for more than a hundred and fifty years?

There are many other matters about which our people should have the truth. I wish there was time to discuss the omnibus river and harbor bill soon to be considered by Congress. That bill rates deep and serious study, involving as it does the spending of more than a billion dollars on projects, most of which have no possible connection with national defense. The expenditures authorized in the bill are only a starter for many of the projects. For example, the St. Lawrence seaway item authorizes $265,000,000, while it is estimated that before it can be completed it will cost more than a billion dollars. I urge you to study the St. Lawrence waterway project, because I consider it the greatest threat to the prosperity of Connecticut and New England ever considered by Congress. This omnibus pork-barrel bill also contains, in addition to the St. Lawrence project, most of which is in Canada, several comparatively small projects—the Florida ship canal, the Tombigbee River project, or, as one Member of Congress expressed it recently, just about every river and harbor project ever thought of except the Passamaquoddy project.

The Republican Party has a job to do if democracy is to survive here in the United States. While giving lip service to economy in nondefense spending, this Congress has appropriated millions more for the various departments of government not connected with national defense than was appropriated last year. Every one of these appropriation bills has been signed by the President without a word of protest or warning. Your speakers' bureau has its work cut out for it, but I know that with your demonstrated enthusiasm you will successfully compete with the gigantic propaganda agencies now operating in Washington.

American Molasses Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

LETTER FROM CHARLES W. TAUSSIG

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AMERICAN MOLASSES CO.,
New York, August 25, 1941.

Hon. HALE BOGGS,
Representative from Louisiana,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOGGS: In your speech in the House of Representatives on July 17, 1941, you made the following statement: "The American Molasses Co. has interest in at least two Cuban sugar mills."

This statement is incorrect. The fact is that the American Molasses Co. has not at this time, nor has it had at any time, any

interest directly or indirectly in any Cuban sugar mills.

I would appreciate it if you would make a correction of your statement for the record.

Sincerely yours,

CHAS. WM. TAUSSIG.

Nominating State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard L. Neuberger from the Progressive of September 20, 1941:

[From the Progressive of September 20, 1941]

NOMINATING STATE OF WASHINGTON

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

SPOKANE, WASH.—People often speculate on which State has the most progressive delegation in Congress. All sorts of nominations have been put forward. Now I am going to propose mine. First, let me point out, however, that I do not refer to one or two individuals who are progressives or liberals but to the general tenor and viewpoint of the entire delegation.

For example, Wisconsin has BOB LA FOLLETTE, Oregon has CHARLES MCNARY, Nebraska has GEORGE W. NORRIS, New York has ROBERT F. WAGNER, and Massachusetts has LAWRENCE CONNERY and ARTHUR HEALEY; but these men are merely a few among many in their respective delegations. For all-around liberalism give me the delegation which represents the State of Washington.

Perhaps other readers of the Progressive have a different idea. If so, let's hear it by all means. If you think some other congressional delegation should get the prize for general service on the progressive battle line, send in your nominations. In the meanwhile I'll go through the Washington personnel, Senate as well as House, and tell why I pick that State.

CONSISTENTLY LIBERAL AND PROGRESSIVE

On domestic issues the members of the Washington delegation are consistently liberal and progressive. They disagree considerably so far as foreign policy is concerned. Of the eight men in the delegation, five opposed extending the service of Army selectees and three supported it. By and large, every member of the delegation has taken a consistently forward-looking attitude on most of the major questions of the day.

Here are the Washington representatives in the National Capital, listed by the length of their service:

HOMER T. BONE, senior Senator: He has been a leader in the public-ownership movement since 1908, and is one of the men responsible for the fact that his home city of Tacoma has the lowest light rates in the United States. Once he was mysteriously defeated for Congress when, on election day, the local streetcar system broke down and the people in the working-class districts were unable to get to the polls. A militant and dynamic speaker, he has spoken innumerable times in behalf of public-power proposals. He is a close Senate associate of GEORGE W. NORRIS. Now BONE is leading a determined crusade for an agency in the Columbia River Basin similar to the T. V. A. He voted against extending the service of draftees.

MON C. WALLGREN, junior Senator: He is a businessman who sees all sides of political and economic questions. A jeweler in the town of Everett, WALLGREN served in the House from 1933 until 1940. Last year he was elected to the Senate by an overwhelming vote. He is known throughout America as a conservationist, and pushed legislation through Congress setting aside the great "rain forest" of the Olympic Peninsula as a national park. WALLGREN has supported practically all New Deal proposals and has high standing at the White House. President Roosevelt personally favored him to succeed Lewis Schwellenbach, now a Federal judge, in the Senate. WALLGREN voted to extend the service of draftees.

SMITH SPEAKS FOR PENSION GROUPS

MARTIN F. SMITH, Third Congressional District: In the House of Representatives the largest lumbering area in the United States is represented by MARTIN F. SMITH, who enjoys the support of both A. F. of L. and C. I. O. lumber workers. The huge Bonneville Dam project is in SMITH's district, and he has led many attempts to extend the scope of Bonneville's service. He also is a spokesman for many old-age pension groups and served in the World War. He has been particularly effective in supporting such worth-while New Deal agencies as the Farm Security Administration and the C. C. C. He is an attorney of note. SMITH voted against extending the service of Army men.

HILL CHAMPIONS THE FARMER

KNUTE HILL, Fourth Congressional District: The administration's bill for a Columbia River power bureau in the Department of the Interior has been introduced by KNUTE HILL, one of the most progressive Members of Congress. He lists himself in the Congressional Directory as a Progressive Democrat. HILL was formerly an officer in his State Grange and has led many fights for better treatment for the farmer. The colossal Grand Coulee Dam, greatest power project in the world, is in his district. HILL has taught school and practiced law. He supports President Roosevelt's domestic program, but is a determined critic of his foreign policy and spoke frequently against extending the service of draftees.

JOHN M. COFFEE, Sixth Congressional District: Like all the other members of the Washington delegation, JOHN COFFEE is a Democrat. For the past 2 years he has raised his voice constantly in the House against the abortive policy of sending oil and scrap iron to Japan, to be used to bomb and mutilate the people of China. At last the administration has adopted his views. COFFEE is a specialist on labor legislation and represents the city of Tacoma, which has given him the biggest majorities it ever gave any Congressman. He enjoys the confidence of President Roosevelt, who addresses him as "Dear John." COFFEE is chairman of the Pacific Coast Conference of Liberal Democrats in Congress. He opposed extending the service of selectees.

LEAVY SAVES DAY FOR COULEE DAM

CHARLES H. LEAVY, Fifth Congressional District: Practically all liberal citizens in the Pacific Northwest are hoping that Congressman LEAVY soon will be a Federal judge. He served with distinction on the Washington superior bench and has been one of the most able Members of Congress ever to come from his State. On the strategic Appropriations Committee he has kept funds in motion for Grand Coulee. Twice when it seemed that the money for Coulee might be stopped Representative LEAVY stepped into the breach and turned the tide. Now, with Coulee power needed for aluminum plants, he is hailed as far-sighted and prophetic. He has a consistently liberal record on all questions touching labor, power, and agriculture. A supporter of the administration's foreign policy, he voted to keep the draftees in service.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON, First Congressional District: The greatest city in the Northwest is represented by youthful, good-looking WARREN MAGNUSON. He once belonged to the teamsters' union himself and is noted as a champion of labor. He also is chairman of the Alaska-Puget Sound Highway Committee and is playing a leading part in obtaining authorization of that vital project, an undertaking essential to war and peace alike. MAGNUSON is a lieutenant commander in the Naval Reserve and recently served a tour of active duty. He is a brilliant orator and some day probably will be Governor of Washington. Democrats already are grooming him for that post in 1944. He voted against extending the service of draftees.

HENRY M. JACKSON, Second Congressional District: Tyro of the highly progressive Washington delegation is 28-year-old HENRY M. JACKSON, who was elected last year to fill the House seat vacated when MON WALLGREN jumped to the Senate. JACKSON has yet to prove himself, but has voted with the progressives on virtually all domestic questions. He has made a good impression in his district by holding hearings in numerous counties on issues of importance to those particular localities. He is a lawyer and attended Stanford University. He voted for the bill extending the service of Army men.

That's my nomination for a liberal congressional delegation. What's yours?

Wisdom of T. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

QUOTATIONS FROM THEODORE ROOSEVELT'S CYCLOPEDIA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I offer the following quotations taken from the Theodore Roosevelt Cyclopedia, a collection of approximately 5,000 quotations from Roosevelt's speeches and writings recently published by the Roosevelt Memorial Association:

AMERICANISM

Americanism is a question of principle, of purpose, of idealism, of character; not a matter of birthplace or creed or line of descent (1908).

RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE

Discrimination against the holder of one faith means retaliatory discrimination against men of other faiths. The inevitable result of entering upon such a practice would be an abandonment of our real freedom of conscience and a reversion to the dreadful conditions of religious dissension which in so many lands have proved fatal to true liberty, to true religion, and to all advance in civilization (1908).

FOLLY TO HIT SOFT

There is no use in saying that we will fit ourselves to defend ourselves a little, but not much. Such a position is equivalent to announcing that, if necessary, we shall hit, but we shall only hit soft. The only right principle is to prepare thoroughly or not at all. The only right principle is to avoid hitting if it is possible to do so, but never under any circumstances to hit soft. To go to war a little,

but not much, is the one absolutely certain way to insure disaster. To prepare a little, but not much, stands on a par with a city developing a fire department which, after a fire occurs, can put it out a little, but not much (1916).

"SPEAK SOFTLY AND CARRY A BIG STICK"

Boasting and blustering are as objectionable among nations as among individuals, and the public men of a great nation owe it to their sense of national self-respect to speak courteously of foreign powers, just as a brave and self-respecting man treats all around him courteously. But though to boast is bad, and causelessly to insult another worse, yet worse than all is it to be guilty of boasting, even without insult, and when called to the proof to be unable to make such boasting good. There is a homely old adage which runs: "Speak softly and carry a big stick; you will go far." If the American Nation will speak softly, and yet build, and keep at a pitch of the highest training a thoroughly efficient Navy, the Monroe Doctrine will go far (1903).

THE LABOR PROBLEM

The labor problem is a human and a moral, as well as an economic, problem; * * * a fall in wages, an increase in hours, a deterioration of labor conditions mean wholesale moral, as well as economic, degeneration, and the needless sacrifice of human lives and human happiness; while a rise of wages, a lessening of hours, a bettering of conditions mean an intellectual, moral and social uplift of millions of American men and women (1913).

THE STRIKE SITUATION

The strike situation in the United States at this time is a scandal to the country as a whole and discreditable alike to employer and employee. Any employer who fails to recognize that human rights come first and that the friendly relationship between himself and those working for him should be one of partnership and comradeship in mutual help no less than self-help is recreant to his duty as an American citizen, and it is to his interest, having in view the enormous destruction of life in the present war, to conserve and to train to higher efficiency alike for his benefit and for its, the labor, supply. In return, any employee who acts along the lines publicly advocated by the men who profess to speak for the I. W. W. is not merely an open enemy of business but of this entire country and is out of place in our Government (1915).

Regulation of Consumer Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

RESOLUTION TO MARRINER ECCLES, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution to petition the Federal Reserve Board to give labor a voice in its regulation of consumer credit:

To the Honorable MARRINER ECCLES, chairman:

Whereas on July 9, 1941, and again on September 16 there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD detailed statements of fact concerning the social and economic unsoundness and the outright oppressiveness of conditions in the licensed loan-shark racket; and

Whereas in the interim between the two statements an Executive order was made directing the said Federal Reserve Board to act in the public interest; and

Whereas, acting under said order, the said Board has disregarded the interests of labor; and

Whereas its actions have totally disregarded the bad practices which force and encourage many millions of the Nation's laborers into debt entanglements, from which they are unable to extricate themselves; and

Whereas the economic fabric to be whole must protect, in the public interest, these millions of laborers from vulturous profiteers; and

Whereas it is the sworn opinion of the Price Administrator that "This is the time for people to get out of debt, to restrain credit, and save by buying defense bonds; hence create a backlog of demand to be released at a happier time"; and

Whereas the total amount of indebtedness in small loans is approximately $2,000,000,000; and

Whereas approximately $1,000,000,000 of this $2,000,000,000 octupus is in the hands of licensed loan sharks that have in their clutches 8,000,000 laborers and defense workers; and

Whereas these licensed business concerns do and are permitted to charge rates of discount on marginal balances which their oppressive practices force on the workers—rates of discount the lowest of which is 31 percent and the highest of which is 72 percent, with a norm of 55 percent annual discount or the billion which they are licensed by the Federal Reserve Board to loan out; and

Whereas the loan sharks to justify such outrageous profiteering deceitfully cover up in supervision and management charges enormous income that is exempted from taxes; and

Whereas the apathy of the Federal Reserve Board in countenancing such mulcting and milking of such a large segment of the Nation's workers of a million dollars a day; at a time when the administration urges and there is a need for private economy, and a patriotic duty to conserve all wealth, and lastly an official duty that rests upon the shoulders of the Federal Reserve Board to act in the premises; and

Whereas the Federal Reserve Board has barred all of labor's representatives from the Board's discussions and consideration of its rules and regulations which vitally affect millions of the Nation's laborers; and

Whereas these 7,000,000 workers are inarticulate voices in the wilderness of debt enslavement: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in the interest of justice and in consonance with democratic principles the Federal Reserve Board should permit a representative of these borrowers to sit at the council table with the Board in all of its deliberations and discussions relating to rules or regulations affecting labor.

Mr. Willkie in New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1941

NEWS ITEM FROM MANCHESTER (N. H.) UNION-LEADER

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, public opinion on the international situation appears to be crystallizing in New England much more rapidly than in the rest of the Nation, though the trend is growing more distinct everywhere. In that connection, it is interesting to point out the note sounded by the titular head of the Republican Party, Mr. Wendell L. Willkie, in a recent address in New Hampshire, in which he praised the stand taken by Senator STYLES BRIDGES and our colleague, Representative FOSTER STEARNS, of that State. Mr. Willkie's words will bear reiterating in the form in which they appeared in the news columns of the Manchester (N. H.) Union-Leader on September 1, 1941:

Wendell L. Willkie, Republican standard bearer, struck out today at the isolationists and lauded Senator Styles Bridges, Congressman Foster Stearns, and Gov. Robert O. Blood "for asserting leadership of the type the Republican Party should follow."

"I could not come to New Hampshire," Willkie said, "without expressing my praise of and support for the position and leadership on international questions taken by your able Senator STYLES BRIDGES.

"FOSTER STEARNS, another Republican and Congressman from this district, has rendered equal service in support of this same position which is the growing sentiment of Republicans all over the United States.

"The impression that the Republican Party represents isolationism," Mr. Willkie continued, "has arisen because of the votes of the majority of Republicans in Congress. If one examines the positions of Republican Governors and the views of the rank and file, a different conclusion will arise."

Farm Prices

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dangerous proposals ever made, so far as the farmers of the Nation are concerned, is that of giving to a Government bureau or Government agency the right to fix a ceiling over farm prices. If that is done, it will likely mean ruination of the people in the cotton-growing States, and it will also likely mean ruination of the wheat growers and the corn growers and other farmers in other sections of the country.

If farm prices were raised to a real parity with prices of other commodities, cotton would be selling today at 32 cents a pound, wheat at $2.19 a bushel, and corn at $1.32 a bushel. This estimate was borne out by farm leaders in a meeting recently held in Memphis, Tenn.

I hope every Member of this House whose constituents till the soil will let the country and the Congress know that we are going to oppose any such effort to hold down the price of the crops the farmers have to sell, and at the same time raise the prices of everything the farmer has to buy.

Let farm prices continue to rise until agriculture is placed on a real parity with

industry—32-cent cotton, $2.19 wheat, $1.32 corn, and other crops in proportion.

Then the farmers of the Nation can enjoy their just measure of real prosperity.

Air Power and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KNUTE HILL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include therein an article appearing in this morning's Times-Herald, I wish to say that this article shows conclusively the necessity, the feasibility, and the desirability of a separate and distinct air department in our executive branch of the Government. The present war shows the wisdom of such a policy as evident in England, in Russia, and in Germany. With an adequate air force our country would be impregnable and safe from any attempted invasion by any dictator or group of dictators. Let us spend a reasonable amount of our defense appropriations for such a sane and logical defense program.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 25, 1941]

IN THE NEWS

AIR POWER CAN KEEP US SECURE FROM INVASION

On March 27, 1938, your columnist wrote in a signed editorial:

"The way to defend the United States of America from attack in any form by any hostile power is with airplanes.

"The way to halt and hamper an invading army is with airplanes.

"The way to destroy an attacking fleet is with airplanes.

"The way to defend our coasts and our interior cities, too, from the most destructive hostile armament of all—a force of bombing airplanes—is by a force of defensive airplanes larger and better and more effective than that of the invaders.

"The next war will be fought in the air and won in the air.

"Of course, auxiliary defense forces will be necessary.

"It is not contended here that airplanes alone could completely defend this widely extended and varied country and coast line to the best and fullest advantage.

"But airplanes will be, and must be, the main arm of defense, and the immediate arm of defense, and the determining arm of defense.

"They are the modern arm of defense and of destructive offense.

"They are the quickest to build, and the cheapest to provide, and the easiest to operate."

Of course, your columnist does not possess the knowledge of a military expert.

All he has is a little common sense, and not overmuch of that—reminding one of the irate husband who said to his sweet and gentle spouse:

"All I want of you is silence, and mighty little of that."

And mighty little of it is what he got.

However, this is a digression.

Let us return to our muttons.

It is agreed that your columnist is not a military expert.

But Lt. Col. Thomas R. Phillips is a most distinguished expert.

He is a member of the General Staff of the United States Army—a military expert in the service of the Army.

Mention has already been made in this column of an article by Colonel Phillips published in the current issue of Army Ordnance, a military journal.

Further details are herewith printed.

In his contribution to this journal, Colonel Phillips presents his views to his professional associates under the title of "Air Power and Coast Defense."

The conclusion of Colonel Phillips is that the time has passed when the United States could be invaded by any enemy from across the seas.

The treatise is a convincing argument for an adequate national defense, based mainly upon an overwhelming air force.

Of course, Colonel Phillips is one of the younger members of the general staff, with a mind accessible to modern ideas.

It is hardly to be expected that the ancient order of military bureaucrats and back numbers will accept Colonel Phillips' conclusions.

Yet those conclusions were foreshadowed by Gen. William L. Mitchell 20 years ago, and have been amply confirmed by the varied experiences of the present war.

The attitude of the antediluvians, however, is shown in the opposition voiced by our somnolent Secretary of War to the proposal of Congress to vote a medal to General Mitchell as posthumous recognition of his farsightedness in realizing and predicting the effectiveness of the airplane in the destruction of naval vessels and in the defense of the Nation.

Recognition of General Mitchell's progressiveness would have been, in the view of the mossbacks, a reflection on their own power of vision—or lack of it.

Therefore, their own reactionary attitude will probably be maintained in spite of convincing argument and established fact.

Nevertheless Colonel Phillips, deriving his findings from his own training and experience and from actual operations in the war zones, presents his argument with telling effect.

He says:

"The bomber has made the American coast impregnable to invasion.

"This is the most important military fact that can be deduced from the European war."

Colonel Phillips voices a warning that this country is about to undertake a huge scheme of coastal fortifications, at an enormous cost, which aviation has already rendered largely obsolete.

"A great program of harbor-defense construction is proposed and is partially under way," he observes.

"One wonders if this program has been devised with full realization of the ability of air power to perform many functions of harbor-defense installations.

"The United States is about to build harbor defenses to make the country secure for 50 years to come.

"Is this really looking forward or are the harbor defenses being provided to cover the 50 years which have just passed?"

Colonel Phillips concretely illustrates his thesis by discussing our defense position in the Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean Sea.

He says:

"In the July-August 1941 issue of Army Ordnance * * * General Hagood gave a 13-point program for coast defense in which $200,000,000 would be spent.

"There was little to cavil at in this program except that it appears to have been based on the obsolete missions of coast defense.

"For example, General Hagood recommended new harbor defenses in the Houston-Beaumont area of Texas with special reference to the protection of the oil fields. * * *

"This proposal obviously was intended to prevent a sea-borne invasion from capturing the oil fields, since they are not close enough to the coast to be bombarded.

"Air power not only has made such an operation impossible, but new American defenses closing the gaps into the Caribbean through the Greater and Lesser Antilles will make this sea, through which the Gulf ports of the United States must be approached, a trap which no hostile naval force or transports would dare to enter.

"The West Indies, if fully exploited to close the Caribbean, furnish complete protection for the American Gulf coast.

"Not only are no new harbor defenses needed, but those now in existence have little further reason for being maintained."

Even more: The same defense arrangements, now being established on the islands, would, according to Colonel Phillips, preclude an air invasion of the South.

"Not only do American defenses along the Antilles protect the Gulf Coast," Colonel Phillips remarks, "but they also secure the northern shores of Venezuela and Colombia, the Panama Canal, and the eastern coast of Central America and Mexico."

In other words, no Old World power could obtain and hold the land bases necessary to launch and sustain an aerial attack upon us.

In time of peace, of course, this country, in order to uphold the Monroe Doctrine, would prevent the establishment of such bases by any European or Asiatic country.

If, in time of war, such bases were started, our air and naval forces would simply obliterate them at their beginning.

However, Colonel Phillips does not argue that all existing land fortifications should be dismantled, or that no new land defenses should be erected anywhere.

On our mainland, exposed harbors and naval shore stations need to be guarded against naval bombardments and raids—not against invasion.

Likewise, our new insular defense posts and seaplane bases "are subject to naval bombardment during raids and must have seacoast guns to keep enemy raiders beyond range."

Also—

"Against some of our foreign possessions an attacking naval force might be able to bring superior air power on carriers; hence all the old missions of harbor defense apply with full force to them."

But these strategic considerations no longer apply as of old to the mainland of this country, Colonel Phillips insists.

"Even if the United States had no harbor defenses, it would be impregnable to invasion," he asserts.

"And this still would be true if our Navy were inferior to that of an invading power.

"Land-based air power has made the United States impregnable to sea-borne invasion.

"If this country takes advantage of the defensive powers given to it by the bombardment airplane, its impregnability to military invasion is assured in the foreseeable future."

Moreover, with our great industries engaging in mass production of military aircraft, we can be invincibly armed, believes this expert, long before we can be attacked on our shores.

"Doubt as to the availability of air power can be dismissed so far as the United States is concerned," Colonel Phillips explains.

"We shall always have it in the future in ample quantity, and instead of a dozen or

two dozen guns defending a harbor we shall have 2,000 or 4,000 bombers ready to be concentrated for the defense of any point, not of harbors alone but of all the beaches and all the coasts."

The accuracy of Colonel Phillips' analysis of "Air power and coast defense" seems to be unquestionable since it is based upon data accumulated from actual experiences of the European war.

Therefore the bogey of hostile armies descending upon us and blitzkrieging our cities into ruins ought to vanish forever if we are properly prepared in the air to defend our coasts and country against any invading fleets of ships or planes.

Hitler Cannot Conquer the Human Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ABERDEEN (S. DAK.) AMERICAN-NEWS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I place in the RECORD an editorial written by J. A. Bailey, of the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News, which says in an inspiring way what many Americans have believed as to the eventual outcome of the present world struggle. The editorial follows:

[From the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News]

For a long time, even during the dark day immediately following the fall of France we have clung tenaciously to the conviction that Hitler would lose this war.

The oft-voiced contention of some of the leading isolationists that there was not a chance for Great Britain to survive never carried complete conviction as far as we were concerned.

Now with Hitler facing a winter on the violent battlefields of Russia their contention loses most of the force it once had.

Corroborating the views of this writer is Roger W. Babson, the noted economist and prophet, who in a letter to the editor states in detail his reason for believing Hitler will finally go down to defeat.

He cites the facts that Great Britain still has control of the seas; the latent manpower of the British Empire, China, and Russia, totaling a billion souls who can be trained and united; the tremendous industrial producing power of the United States when really awakened; and, finally, the great superiority of these nations in natural resources compared with Germany, Italy, and Japan.

Far more important in his mind, however, is the spirit of those who are fighting for freedom and justice. The "still, small voice" in the human soul is more powerful than horses and chariots or than tanks and bombers.

As a sick man turns to God for help, says Babson, so will the people of the innocent nations which the Germans today hold in brutal subjugation.

The Gestapo can take the arms away from these millions; they can confiscate their writings and imprison those of them who speak for freedom and justice.

The German military machine, even if multiplied a hundredfold, cannot prevent the Dutch, Greeks, Danes, Norwegians, Belgians, Balkans, and other innocent peoples from praying. Ultimately these millions will unite in doing this—silently, and unbeknown to their enemies.

These prayers, added to the material sacrifies and efforts which all of us must make, will bring victory. The two combined have never been known to fail.

"All nations are now praying that their armies may be victorious," Babson says, "but such prayers may be selfish; and if so, are of no avail. Both sides in every war ask God to give them victory. This has not amounted to much. Today, however, a great third group of victimized neutrals are involved whose prayers will count. The great spiritual awakening which I have long been forecasting is coming. It may be born, however, not in the American and English churches, as I had hoped but in the souls of the downtrodden millions of Europe, Asia, and Africa. Yes; I am a radiant optimist as to the ultimate outcome of this war and the better world which surely is to follow."

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, Wally is O. K., but between the two I'll take Queen Elizabeth.

Secretary Wickard was embarrassed when asked if he intended to lease-lend food to England—yet it is in this new L-L bill.

It is fitting that a committee which provides such vast quantities of shooting equipment for the democracies should have as its chairman a man named CANNON.

The Roosevelts and Windsors agree on love and war—they both favor shooting and in order to encourage marriage they think divorces should be made easy.

If the Lone Eagle had flown over the British Embassy, the big, long, red almshouse up Massachusetts Avenue way, Thursday he could have spotted his warmakes No. 1.

A part of the billion to feed Britian is earmarked for garden seed—and lo for over 13 years I have been unable to get any for my undernourished constituents.

Mr. Wickard told the committee the farmers are sold on this being our war. My check on this during the last 5 weeks in the First Kansas District was that it was only the Willkie-New York City bankers.

What has become of Harry Hopkins? And what has become of the Russian aid bill? All witnesses swore Harry never was actual lease-lend director. The new bill makes no reference to the Communists and their aid in the bill is denied by all. Another subterfuge is planned under broad powers to the Chief.

The President's demand for speed on the new bill articulates his disdain for congressional procedure and helps prove the military dictatorship trend. Testimony reveals that next summer would be the earliest possible for production under this bill if labor cooperates. Our old billions are not half processed yet.

The Injustice of the 49-Cent Wheat-Quota Penalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

SPEECH OF OSCAR B. SMITH

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Oscar B. Smith, of Frankfort, Ind., delivered for the Indiana Marketing Quota Protest Association:

The chief complaint against the wheat-quota penalty is that it was placed on excess wheat just prior to harvesting and at an increase over what was stipulated at seeding time. The 15-cent penalty agreed upon at seeding time was not objectionable so long as we must tolerate the A. A. A., but it did become objectionable when it was increased to 49 cents after the wheat was ready for harvest. The rules were changed in the middle of the game, which is unfair, undemocratic, and un-American. This nauseous juggling is in itself enough to condemn the entire program, but below the surface of things conditions are much worse. According to the 1930 census, there were 1,208,091 wheat farms in the United States. Of these, approximately one-third signed A. A. A. contracts during the first 3 years of its operation, and this one-third represented 78 percent of the acres growing wheat. In other words, two-thirds of the farms growing wheat represented only 22 percent of the wheat acreage. The vote of the referendum in favor of the quotas was 453,569, or only 37.5 percent of the wheat farmers registered in the 1930 census. The vote in the referendum against the quotas was 106,061, or 8.8 percent of the wheat farmers of the 1930 census. Therefore only 46.3 percent of the wheat farmers voted, and when we consider that this includes the landlords and tenants, the number of farms is smaller than shown by their percentage. The percent of farmers that voted "yes" is practically the same percentage of farms that make up 78 percent of the acreage. By setting a minimum of 15 wheat acres as a qualification to vote, the result of the election was a foregone conclusion, and it therefore applied to only the large operators. The small farmer was exempted from the penalty and so was disfranchised in the referendum. The penalty did not apply to him, but he was affected by the law, and by not applying to him the argument was that he should not vote, and therefore he could not vote against the principle. Yet the referendum was called the will of the majority. The law providing the 49-cent penalty became effective May 26, 1941, and the referendum was held 5 days later. Does anyone believe that all these farmers were fully advised during this 5-day period?

MARKETING QUOTA PENALTIES

The small operator was discriminated against in the referendum, and excess producers are discriminated against in the markets. With his excess he can either pay the 49-cent penalty, store it under bond, or give it to the Government for relief purposes. Canadian wheat comes into our markets under a tariff of only 42 cents, and therefore places the American farmer at a disadvantage. That is not an all-compelling argument against the penalty provision, but it is a perfectly sound objection to the present policy. The Canadian farmer can pay the 42-cent tariff, take back American money, exchange it for his own money, and have 10 to 20 cents more per bushel than the American farmer with a few extra bushels of "hot wheat." If the American farmer had been imposed with a compulsory acreage reduction and then had violated it, then he could be properly penalized, but not otherwise. Cotton is subject to a quota penalty of 6.9 cents per pound, yet foreign cotton comes in duty-free. If a quota penalty is placed on corn, the penalty against the American farmer will be 35 cents per bushel, while Argentine corn will only carry an import tariff of 25 cents. This duty figured in an Argentine peso, worth only 20 percent of its normal value, becomes negligible after it reaches the American market. A bill has only recently been introduced to place a quota penalty on potatoes of 1¼ cents per pound. Other bills are, no doubt, in the making to further regiment the American farmer, and when independence is legislated and administered out of the American farmer, the independence of our great Republic is indeed imperiled. A United Press dispatch of June 19, reads in part as follows: "Administration and farm organization officials today planned a new omnibus farm bill to carry out a long-range program of agricultural self-sufficiency. Details were developed at a conference of farm leaders summoned by Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard. They expect to introduce it at this session of Congress. * * * Details of the bill have not been completed, but Wickard said it will provide a further reduction in wheat acreage, perhaps to 50,000,000 acres, compared with present A. A. A. allotments of 55,000,000. * * * The proposed legislation would include provisions for marketing agreements regulating the sale of 'all products which the farmers vote to include,' Wickard said."

SURPLUSES

All these allotments, marketing agreements, quotas, penalties, reciprocal treaties, and the like are necessary, we have been told, to regulate our overproduction and huge surpluses. We have been told that our overproduction of wheat has given us a present inventory on hand of 660,000,000 bushels. Page 23 of the 1940 Statistics of the Department of Agriculture show that from 1930 to 1939, inclusive, the United States produced 7,474,500,000 bushels of wheat. Distribution for the same period was 7,551,100,000 bushels. This distribution was used for seed, farm feed, commercial feed, and exports, including flour. Therefore, during this period, we produced 76,600,000 bushels less wheat than we distributed, proving that we are on an import basis. During the entire year of 1940 our total feed-wheat imports were 314,894 bushels (feed wheat is that which is unfit for human consumption). The first 5 months of 1941 saw 2,394,000 bushels of Canadian feed wheat pour into our United States markets. It is now being delivered f. o. b. Baltimore, Md., for 15 cents per bushel ($5 per ton) cheaper than the corresponding grade of United States wheat. As a result, 95 percent of the poultry-feed manufacturers are now using Canadian feed wheat in their scratch-grain feeds. They have switched over on assurances that there will be a continuing supply of the cheaper Canadian feed wheat. Estimates are now that there is a 60-day supply of this feed wheat in Atlantic seaboard storage, which came in under a 5-percent ad valorem tariff (approximately 5 cents a bushel). United States farmers are begging for storage space, and are told that they have overproduced, but cheap foreign wheat takes our eastern storage space and the poultry-feed market away from the penalty-taxed citizen farmer. I say give the penalties to the foreign producer and the protection to the American farmer. Canadian hogs and pork products are now being imported into the United States at a greatly increased tempo. The first 3 months of 1941 saw these imports increase 910 percent over the corresponding period of 1940. In 1940 we imported 227,000 dozens of eggs, but on July 21, 1941, one New York company alone contracted with Argentina to import 360,000 dozens from that country during the next 12 months.

YEARS OF BUMPER CROPS

Yes, my friends, we are getting on an import basis and getting there fast. Apparently we must import to create a United States produced surplus, and all for the sake of the A. A. A. program. What a fantasy. Our greatest corn crop was in 1920 and the next largest was in 1906. The yields of 1932 and 1937, which were supposed to have created such large surpluses of corn, favorably compare with the yields of 1896 and 1905. The all-time record yield of wheat was in 1915, and cotton reached its peak production in 1926, yet in all those years of bumper crops the surplus problem solved itself. Why? Because the farmer was receiving his proportionate share of the national income. The 1-1-7 ratio of the iron laws of economy was functioning properly. Wealth was created at its sources—namely, the soil, the air, and the water—and of these the soil created 70 percent of the total. During those years true wealth was paid for in its cash equivalent. A dollar of farm income supports $1 in pay rolls and $7 of national income. Overproduction, underconsumption, and lack of purchasing power are synonymous terms.

CONSUMPTION OF SURPLUSES

What are the true facts imaged forth by the picture? The statistics of 1939 and the Bureau of the Census show that we produced 8.2 bushels of wheat per capita from 1900 to 1905. This per-capita production has gradually dropped until in the period from 1930 to 1935 we produced 5.8 bushels per person, and from 1935 to 1939 we produced 5.9 bushels per person. By the same token we find that world production of wheat has fallen from 2.27 bushels per capita in 1911–15 down to 1.82 bushels per capita in the period of 1932 to 1939. Production itself has remained fairly constant, and in the United States it has not kept pace with our growing population which has increased 40 percent since 1900.

THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM

I have been asked times without number if the penalty can be avoided on excess wheat. The law plainly states that it may be stored under bond, given to the Government for relief purposes, or the penalty paid, and the National Marketing Quota Protest Association does not advise breaking the laws by sundry methods. Our hope lies in declaring the quota penalty unconstitutional thereby throwing out the A. A. A. Our ambition aims at putting these paid penalties in escrow thereby placing them in the same category as the old hog-processing tax. This hog-processing tax refund, by the way, has recently passed the Senate and I counsel all farmers to hold their processing receipts a while longer as the House of Representatives will surely take action on it shortly. Our other aim is to nullify the A. A. A. by appropriate legislation, and have something really constructive to take its place. The most promising of such legislation thus far introduced in Congress is the Massingale bill H. R. 1101. This bill is the 1941 streamlined version of the original McNary-Haugen bill. It will give the American market to the American farmer at an American price, by establishing full market parity on all farm products. It will stop all this nonsense of allotments, quotas, penalties, foreign dumping, and the like. It will do away with the necessity of continuous borrowing, and permit us to earn our way. I have no objections to industry receiving a defense contract on a 10-percent-cost-plus basis, but I do insist on the same treatment for the American farmer.

FARM BUREAU ATTITUDE

It is to combat these evils and to adopt a constructive program for agriculture that the National Marketing Quota Protest Association was formed. Its founder, Mr. Lamont O'Harra, of Newcastle, Ind., has been a member of the American Farm Bureau since its inception and had hopes that his parent organization would give the farmer his rightful place in the Nation's economy. Shortly after the wheat-quota referendum was held he telegraphed Mr. Hassell Schenk, president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, as follows:

"Did our organization support the increase on excess wheat from 15 cents to 49 cents per bushel? Did our organization endorse the manner in which the wheat referendum was conducted?

"(Signed) LAMONT O'HARRA."

To which he received the following wire:

"Farm Bureau initiated and secured passage A. A. A. amendment increasing loan value to 85-percent parity. See my article in July Hoosier Farmer. Please drop in at our office your earliest convenience.

"(Signed) HASSEL E. SCHENK."

Still not satisfied, Mr. O'Harra on July 17, 1941, sent the following wire to Mr. Ed O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau:

"What steps is our Farm Bureau taking to secure reduction or removal of 49-cent penalty on excess wheat?

"(Signed) LAMONT O'HARRA."

And the next day there came the following reply:

"American Farm Bureau is opposed to removing present penalty on excess wheat. Noncooperators can avoid penalty by storing excess wheat and can obtain Government loan and 12-cent storage allowance. Notwithstanding penalty noncooperators are enjoying better net return due to price increase resulting from 85-percent load program.

"(Signed) ED O'NEAL,
"President, American Farm Bureau Federation."

Mr. O'Neal probably means "loan program" instead of "load program" but so far as the Federal Treasury and the taxpayers are concerned I prefer his telegram as is. The price increase came with the German invasion of Russia, but suppose the "load program" did put 5 cents in our pockets. It came back later and took away 49 cents. Why does not the Farm Bureau support full market parity as a floor under farm prices, instead of an 85 percent ceiling? Why does the Farm Bureau take credit for securing passage of the 85-percent parity loan, and shirk its responsibility of its part in putting on the 49-cent wheat penalty which is part and parcel of the parity-loan law? Why does the Farm Bureau object to the American farmer feeding his excess wheat, when Canadian wheat is overflowing our markets? The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 29, 1941, reports the following wire from Mr. O'Neal to Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY:

"Respectfully urge you oppose amendments to H. R. 5300, particularly proposals to reduce penalties to noncooperators or permit them to escape penalties by feeding excess wheat,

as these proposals would break down program."

Commenting, Senator ELLISON D. SMITH said, "Certain farm experts farm the farmer and do not farm the land."

And so my friends it remains for the National Marketing Quota Protest Association to come to the rescue of the American farmer. It is joined in this struggle by the National Grange, the National Farmers Guild, and the National Hog Processing Tax Recovery Association. The American farmer must make his protests loud enough, and not be deterred by threats, bickerings, and name calling. The American farmer must not be abashed by A. A. A. motor caravans touring the country under the guidance of leeches taking a free ride on the back of the farmer. Our investigation shows that 54 of these tourists have a wheat allotment greater than that which was allotted to the entire State of Indiana. Farmers must not be deterred by smear campaigns staged by the A. A. A. as reported by the Associated Press from Detroit July 22, as follows:

"A regional director of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration said here last night that protests over wheat quotas and regulations arose from misunderstandings or came from areas heavily populated by farmers of German ancestry. In a talk broadcast from Detroit, Harry N. Schooler, director of the A. A. A.'s north-central region, asserted: 'It is significant to note that whenever there is a concentration of farmers of German ancestry one finds this agitation to overthrow the work of the Department of Agriculture.'"

Of all the unnecessary, unreasonable, and absolutely false assertions I ever heard, this surpasses them all. Agriculture is the backbone of our Republic, and if farmers cannot assemble publicly and express themselves without having their actions labeled as subversive, then is our Republic tottering and the constitutional right of petition becomes a mockery. I call Mr. Schooler's attention to the American Legion endorsed pamphlets of the Constitutional Educational League of New Haven, Conn., and there let him read the names and communistic affiliations of those directing the destinies of the A. A. A. Anyone reading these lists is convinced that the ultimate aim of the A. A. A. is to Sovietize American agriculture.

So to maintain a free America, farmers must gird themselves as never before to resist regimentation and the loss of their identity. It is to this end that we pledge ourselves through the National Marketing Quota Protest Association.

Texas Iron Ore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE MINEOLA (TEX.) MONITOR

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a short statement concerning Texas iron ore which recently appeared in the Mineola (Tex.) Monitor.

The statement is as follows:

[From the Mineola (Tex.) Monitor]

TEXAS IRON ORE

War's effects are not always bad. The disruptions brought by the stress and strain of conflict and the short cuts taken to fill emergency needs sometimes bring about beneficial developments that otherwise would have lagged due to the inertia of peacetime routine procedure. Texas iron-ore resources may turn out to be such an example. For many years it has been known that this State has great iron-ore deposits in east Texas, and to less extent in the central mineral region of the Burnet-Llano area. Over a long period, beginning before the Civil War and extending through 1909, there was intermittent production in Marion, Harrison, Cherokee, and other east Texas counties. But there was no coal adaptable to the making of coke. When the charcoal furnaces of east Texas could no longer compete with the growing iron industry of the Pennsylvania-Ohio-Great Lakes region, Texas furnaces closed down.

Vast new fuel resources have been discovered in oil and gas deposits, and some authorities now contend that these can be used in the economical production of iron and steel. There is a possibility also that improved methods have made Texas lignite available for the production of coke. A small plant has been built near Longview for production of iron by the Madras process, utilizing gas, and it will make its first run within 2 or 3 weeks. There is a less advanced project in Rusk County.

Wartime demands will undoubtedly take all iron that can be produced at present. If it is to be a mushroom industry to die after emergency demands have passed, it will be of little economic consequence to Texas. But many authorities believe that, once the force of the inertia of established industry in the North is overcome and Texas iron production is started, it will become a large and permanent part of the Texas economy. If wartime demands can "prime the pump" for the latent Texas industry, another New Birmingham may arise to a happier destiny than the one which rose above and then sank below the tops of the tall east Texas pines.

Air Power and Coast Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 1941

ARTICLE FROM ARMY ORDNANCE BY LT. COL. THOMAS R. PHILLIPS

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lt. Col. Thomas R. Phillips, published in the current issue of Army Ordnance:

Even if the United States had no harbor defenses, it would be impregnable to invasion. And this still would be true if our Navy were inferior to that of an invading power. In spite of this, a great program of harbor-defense construction is proposed and is partially under way. One wonders if this program has been devised with full realization of the ability of air power to perform many functions of harbor-defense installations. The United States is about to build harbor defenses to make the country secure for 50 years to come. Is this really looking forward or are the harbor defenses being provided to cover the 50 years which have just passed?

The argument by which coast defenses are sold to the public is very much like the argument of the book salesman. It is not the books he is selling, but rather an education for the child. Harbor defenses are supported by the argument that they will prevent invasion of the United States. Actually they never were intended to prevent invasion. If the need for harbor defenses depended upon their ability to protect the United States from invasion, it would be very simple to prove that no harbor defenses are necessary. Land-based air power has made the United States impregnable to a sea-borne invasion.

The attempted counterinvasion of Norway by the British supplied the factual proof of the well-established theory that sea-borne invasions are impossible against land-based air power. This particular operation took place under the most favorable circumstances possible for the British: The Norwegians welcomed their coming and desired their help; the British did not have to contend with any harbor defenses nor enemy forces when they made their landings at Aandalsnes and Namsos—there was nothing to oppose them until they had marched a considerable distance into Norway, where they met advanced detachments of the German Army; nevertheless the invasion failed.

Prime Minister Churchill gave as explanation for this failure "intense, continuous bombings of the bases at Namsos and Aandalsnes which prevented the landing in those small fishing ports of any large reenforcements and even of artillery for the infantry already landed. It therefore was necessary to withdraw the troops or to leave them to be destroyed by overwhelming forces. The decision to withdraw was undoubtedly sound. The withdrawal of these 12,000 men—less than a division—was accomplished with very great skill and, I must add, very good luck."

In other words, nothing but the "intense, continuous bombings" prevented the success of the British counterinvasion of Norway. There were no harbor-defense guns to fire against the British nor were any German troops at the harbors to give the slightest opposition to the landings. This was purely a victory of air power over a sea-borne invasion which had no aerial support.

On the German side, the means to repel the invasion were quite inadequate. Germany had occupied the airdromes at Oslo and Stavanger. Oslo is 325 miles from Namsos and 200 miles from Aandalsnes. Stavanger is 260 miles from Aandalsnes and 420 miles from Namsos. Thus the German air forces operating against the British invasion bases had to operate from considerable distances. Not only that, but they were very limited in numbers—to the numbers that could be placed on four rather inadequate airdromes—and were engaged primarily in supporting the ground operations of the German troops who were driving through the Norwegian valleys in an effort to reach the British.

Another factor of great importance in favor of the British was the short distance that the expeditionary forces had to go to reach Norway and the fact that their ships could approach the Norwegian coast beyond range of German bombers closely enough so that the final run to the coast could be made in darkness and without fear of bombing. Bombing was possible only after the ships reached the harbors.

It might be thought rash to conclude from a single example that impregnability to a sea-borne invasion could be considered as proved. The British effort in Norway was a very special case, however, in which every factor, except readiness, perhaps, favored the invader. If the conditions under which an invasion would have to be attempted against

the United States are visualized, it will be seen that the problem of invading this country would be infinitely more difficult than was the British problem of landing troops in Norway. Leaving aside naval interference, imagine a convoy of 40 or 50 troopships crossing the 3,000 miles of the Atlantic Ocean toward the United States. The departure of such an invading force could not be kept secret. Our defending bombers would start attacking it a thousand miles from the coast. The attacks would grow in intensity as the convoy approached. The invasion might not be stopped before it reached the coast, but it would be badly damaged.

Imagine, then, this convoy attempting to come into a harbor and remaining practically stationary for days in narrow waters with the entire bombing force available to the United States working on it. The picture is incredible. The invasion would be doomed. No military leader would ever think of making such an attempt. The presence or absence of harbor defenses along the American coast would be of no importance whatsoever against a sea-borne invasion, as long as we possess ample land-based air power.

It may be argued that naval vessels have not been driven off the seas within bombing range in the North Sea and the Mediterranean, and that convoys are operating occasionally even in the English Channel. The reasons that this is possible will be considered in more detail later. It suffices for the present to note that these ships are subject to bombing raids for relatively short periods of time, that they first must be discovered, and that they are not tied up at docks nor subject to bombardment for long periods. None of these favorable factors applies to an effort to unload troop transports nor to the continuing supply and reenforcement of troops already landed. In Norway, the British landed their first troops but could not reenforce them once the bases were discovered and watched and bombed constantly.

What leader would be willing to risk thousands of men packed like sardines in a transport under the bombing conditions that can be visualized? Churchill would not. And if these transports had to come across an ocean to be met with enormously more intense bombing, no leader would consider it. The whole business of invasion across the sea against ample land-based air power no longer is in the book of possibilities.

Almost no other event in the history of warfare equals this in importance. For the United States, particularly, the conclusion is transcendental. It makes it possible for this country to insure not only its own continental territory from invasion but, by the provision of a suitable air-base and airways system, to insure the impregnability of all North and South America. If this country takes advantage of the defensive powers given to it by the bombardment airplane, its impregnability to military invasion is assured in the foreseeable future.

The successful German invasion of Norway through its principal harbors—Oslo, Stavanger, Trondheim, Narvik—has been cited to prove that had Norway been supplied with adequate harbor defenses, or if those defenses had not been tricked into impotence, Norway could not have been invaded by the Germans. To quote one protagonist: "The salient fact was that the Germans went on in unopposed, tied up at the docks, put their men and supplies ashore, and proceeded to overrun the country." From this was deduced proof that had the Norwegian harbor defenses functioned effectively, the invasion could not have succeeded. Historically, however, most landings on hostile shores have been made away from harbors, and the troops have proceeded overland to capture from the rear the harbor defenses and the cities they protected. Norway did have harbor defenses, and good ones, at Trondheim and Oslo. It was easy to trick them, and once the Germans were within the harbors, these defenses no longer had any value.

Much more important was the fact that Norway had no air force. Had a Norwegian air force been in existence, it would have been able to block the German invasion of Norwegian harbors just as effectively as the German air force later blocked the British invasion of Norwegian harbors. And this would be true whether or not Norway had any harbor defenses. In the case of the ports distant from Germany—Trondheim and Narvik—an ample Norwegian air force would have made German operations in these ports impossible. They were too distant for hostile operations to be protected by German air power based in Denmark or Germany. Even Oslo is 200 miles from the Aalborg airport used by the Germans in Denmark, and a small air force should have been able to best much larger German fighter forces that might have been used to protect the landing in Oslo. The Norwegian harbor defenses were made impotent by false messages or treachery. Within an hour, their usefulness had vanished because German forces had passed them. The air forces might have been tricked for a short time, but since air bases usually are back from the coast, their impotence would have been of short duration.

Air power has still another advantage as a defensive force. This is its ability to assemble and concentrate its entire power for operations against a single point. Harbor defenses are immovable, and the individual forts can give no assistance to the forts 50 or 200 miles away. But all the bombing planes in the nation can be concentrated so as to apply their power at the single threatened point, and this concentration can take place with almost incredible rapidity—in a day or two at the most.

Harbor defenses never were intended to prevent invasion, although they have an incidental mission of providing artillery support to the defense against landing attacks within range of their weapons. There are plenty of good reasons for constructing harbor defenses, but the prevention of invasion of our shores is the least of these and is only incidental to the others.

The ability of air power to prevent invasion is the question of air power versus sea power. The present war has shown apparently contradictory results in the struggle between air and sea forces. The contradictions have been apparent only. In general, they can be explained by the time available for bombing, the distance over which bombing operations must be conducted, the number of bombers available, and the weather.

Prime Minister Churchill stated one time that 200 or 300 bombs must be dropped to insure hitting a naval vessel. This could mean a single trip by 100 to 250 planes or 10 trips by 10 to 15 planes or 100 to 150 trips by a single plane. If it were 15 planes making 10 trips 500 miles from the base, 10 days would be required to let this air force drop enough bombs to insure a hit on the naval vessel. It can be seen that effective bombardment of naval vessels either requires a great enough number of planes to insure hits in one or two trips or else that the target ships should be stationary in a harbor where they can be bombed on many successive days by a smaller number of planes, if these were all that were available.

Naval vessels are much harder to hit than merchant ships or transports. Warships are armored, are usually of very high speed and capable of dodging, and have a tremendous number of antiaircraft guns to interfere with the bomber's aim. Thus, although 200 to 300 bombs may have to be dropped to attain a hit on a naval vessel, merchant ships, which act as transports and are the carriers for invading forces, probably would not require more than a quarter as many bombs to hit them.

Prime Minister Churchill explained the failure of the British Fleet to operate in the Skagerrak on German communications to Norway as follows: "But immense enemy air strength, which can be brought to bear on our patroling craft, makes this method far too costly to be adopted. Important forces would have to be employed in order to maintain a steady surface patrol and the losses which would have been inflicted on the patrol from the air would undoubtedly very soon constitute a naval disaster." In other words, the British patroling vessels would have had to remain on duty in the Skagerrak subject to continuous bombing by immense air forces. The operation was impossible and the British were correct in not making the effort.

Prime Minister Churchill's objections to operating in the Skagerrak were abundantly proved when the British Fleet operated under similar conditions in attempting to prevent the invasion of Crete. After the loss of four cruisers and seven destroyers the fleet withdrew. Here the real factors in the question of air power versus sea power were demonstrated in one operation, namely, immense bombing forces and the fact that the ships would have to remain subject to bombing.

Malta also shows the impossibility of a fleet remaining within range of large bombing forces. It is only 60 miles from Italy and is untenable as a fleet base. The fact that the British still hold it is of minor importance. It is no longer a base—it is just a piece of land. On the other hand, Gibraltar—750 miles from Italy—hardly has been bothered by bombing. The distance is too great for bombardment operations to be carried on with the necessary mass and continuity. Gibraltar is protected from massive and continuous bombing by distance.

Convoys operating in the North Sea, the English Channel, and the Mediterranean gain partial protection from the time element. By making use of darkness to pass the more dangerous areas, the convoys are within effective bombing range too short a time to be disastrously endangered, unless massive bombing forces are on hand to operate against them. There have been many ships lost and other ships injured, but the damage has not been great enough to prevent occasional passage. Scapa Flow, 300 miles from Norway, has been made untenable as a fleet base by the bombing threat. In this case, Germany has a sufficient number of bombing planes based closely enough to make the danger of remaining at the base too great for the possible military advantages that would be obtained.

In the Mediterranean, Italian air operations originally appeared to give the lie to all these contentions. Failure of the Italian air force to be more successful in preventing British convoy and fleet operations close to Italian and Libyan coast was one of the major mysteries of the war. The British even penetrated the Adriatic (at night), December 19-20, 1940, and bombarded the Albanian seaport of Valona without aerial interference by the Italians. It is now apparent that Italian air power was not operating in sufficient mass in these waters to perform its missions effectively. When it was reenforced by German squadrons, the last British convoy to pass through suffered such extensive losses that no more convoys have been attempted. The war has shown one fact conclusively—air power dominates sea power in narrow seas and near the coasts.

Was not the insufficiency of Italian air power in the Mediterranean one of the inherent weaknesses of air power? And if air power is depended upon, are we not apt to find that it may be unavailable at the critical time? Harbor defenses are so comforting. The big ugly muzzled guns are always there, ready and waiting—a definite assurance of protection for one little spot for all time. Doubt as to the availability of air power can be dismissed as far as the United States is concerned. We shall always have it in the future in ample quantity. And instead of

a dozen or two dozen guns defending a harbor, we shall have 2,000 or 4,000 bombers ready to be concentrated for the defense of any point, not of harbors alone, but of all the beaches and all the coasts.

Harbor defenses in the past were constructed to perform the following functions: First, to permit movement of our naval forces in and out of harbors; secondly, to protect harbor facilities and ships in the harbor from naval gunfire and torpedoes; thirdly, to prevent enemy ships from entering the harbor; fourthly, to furnish incidental support to defense against landing attacks within range of the defense guns.

What has air power done to these missions? If a hostile fleet cannot remain on guard outside a harbor to prevent the exit or ingress of our own fleet because of the threat of bombing, then no harbor defenses are necessary for that purpose alone. Except for hostile air power the British Fleet might have been maintained close to the Skagerrak or to the Kiel Canal or to Heligoland. This mission of harbor defenses is ended. Air power can perform this mission far more effectively than guns ever could, since guns never had the necessary range to provide ample maneuver room for a fleet leaving a harbor.

Protection of ships and harbor facilities from naval gunfire and torpedoes is still as necessary a function of harbor defense as ever. The European war has shown that ships can stay within bombing range at night long enough to make raids on short installations. The French and British both raided Italian shore installations and escaped with minor damage. The British have raided the Dodecanese and the Libyan coast and have escaped without serious injury. The British bombarded the German-held airdromes at Stavanger from cruisers for several hours. Thus the experience of the European war seems to prove that air power is not yet sufficiently strong to prevent raids and naval bombardments. Harbor defenses must be provided for this purpose.

Whether or not air power can deny enemy ships access to harbors and adjacent waters depends upon the nature of the harbor. In such a harbor as Puget Sound, where hostile ships would have to steam 300 or more miles to get in and out, and where they never could be lost sight of in the narrow waters, air power should suffice to entrap the raiders. They might get in, but they never could get out. In the case of shallow harbors easy of access, the problem would be similar to that of a naval raid: some guns would be required to prevent a raid, but air power would be ample to prevent the continued use of the harbor.

The question of the ability of air power to prevent invasion already has been discussed. Harbor defenses never were built primarily with that end in view, and this question certainly needs no consideration in their construction in the future. This affirmation, however, applies only when the defensive air power is immeasurably superior to that which can be brought against it. The case of a German invasion of Great Britain across the narrow English Channel is different from an invasion across the ocean, since, in the former case, the invader's air force can operate from land bases. Against some of our foreign possessions an attacking naval force might be able to bring superior air power on carriers; hence all the old missions of harbor defense apply with full force to them.

In the July-August 1941 issue of Army Ordnance (vol. XXII, No. 127, p. 46), General Hagood gave a 13-point program for coast defense on which $200,000,000 would be spent. There was little to cavil at in this program except that it appears to have been based on the obsolete missions of harbor defenses. For example, General Hagood recommended new harbor defenses in the Houston-Beaumont area of Texas with special reference to the protection of the oil fields. Beaumont and Houston are inland ports with narrow channels leading to them. No naval force or transports could live for 24 hours in these channels under bombing attack.

This proposal obviously was intended to prevent a sea-borne invasion from capturing the oil fields, since they are not close enough to the coast to be bombarded. Air power not only has made such an operation impossible, but new American defenses closing the gaps into the Caribbean through the Greater and Lesser Antilles will make this sea, through which the Gulf ports of the United States must be approached, a trap which no hostile naval force or transports ever would dare to enter.

The West Indies, if fully exploited to close the Caribbean, furnish complete protection for the American Gulf coast. Not only are no new harbor defenses needed, but those now in existence have little further reason for being maintained. And not only do American defenses along the Antilles protect the Gulf coast, but they also secure the northern shores of Venezuela and Colombia, the Panama Canal, and the eastern coast of Central America and Mexico.

On the other hand, many new seacoast-gun installations for the protection of factories and bases from naval bombardment might very well have been recommended. Naval air-patrol stations will be constructed at many new points in continental United States and the Caribbean Sea; since these are for seaplanes and are close to the coast, they are subject to naval bombardment during raids and must have seacoast guns to keep enemy raiders beyond range.

Naval bombardments and raids are much more probable now and will be waged against many objectives that would not have been attacked in the past. International law formerly exercised some control against the bombardment of open towns, even though factories were engaged in producing war materials in them. Bombardments once were restricted, but air warfare now has broken down all scruples. Today, any factories or facilities of military value close to the shore are apt to be bombarded from the sea. These will have to be protected along with all new naval shore stations. Thus, many new harbor defenses are required, but at different points than commonly visualized. On the other hand, a number of the old harbor defenses constructed for now nonexistent missions do not need modernizing. There is no need to destroy them since their maintenance on a caretaker's status and eventual occupancy in time of war by the National Guard does not represent a serious drain, and they still aid in preventing naval raids.

Can we depend upon the present ability of air power to provide for certain of the functions of coast defense, or will conditions change so rapidly that air power will not be able to fulfill them in the future? Possibly naval protection against aerial bombing is at its lowest point at the present time. Most naval vessels now in commission were built at a time when aerial bombing was not a serious threat. The result is that they are poorly protected and not very effectively armed against it. Naval protection may improve so greatly that bombing will not remain a serious threat, at least against battleships.

However, even if this takes place, the present relationship between air power and sea power will not be changed. Transports and small naval vessels will continue to be vulnerable, even though they may be better armed in the future. On the other hand, bombing accuracy may improve fast enough to overcome advances in protection. Here again, the present relationship may be modified slightly, but the fundamental factors are not likely to change. The only foreseeable change is that improvement in bombing accuracy and the availability of large numbers of bombing planes may make naval raids less likely, hence there will be a smaller requirement for coast-defense protection against them.

Air power has not superseded coast defenses, but it can perform some of their functions more effectively than guns ever did. On the other hand, the increase in naval air installations on the shore, together with acceptance of bombardment of nonmilitary installations as legitimate targets, makes more harbor defenses necessary for their protection. Any harbor defenses constructed or modernized should take into account the ability of the bombing plane to perform certain of the old missions.

The bomber has made the American coast impregnable to invasion. This is the most important military fact that can be deduced from the European war. If new harbor defenses are to be constructed, let them be built with our eyes on today and tomorrow and not on yesterday.

Addresses Convention of Woman's Auxiliary, American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTIE W. CARAWAY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPHUS DANIELS

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Josephus Daniels, American Ambassador to Mexico, at the convention of the Woman's Auxiliary of the American Legion at Milwaukee, Wis., on September 17, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is not on record a higher or more deserved tribute to the women of America—the women who make up the Legion Auxiliary and their patriotic sisters—than was paid by President Wilson in appreciation of their chivalric contribution to the winning of the World War.

In person he spoke to the Senate near the end of the war urging that the ballot be given to women. He based his appeal not alone upon their fitness for the exercise of suffrage but insisted particularly their distinguished and sacrificial service during the war called for the highest recognition by their Government. It is well today to recall this illuminating incident in this emergency when the daughters and sisters are emulating the example of the women in 1917-18. The patriotic service of American women in that era made a complete convert of Woodrow Wilson to the equal right of women to a voice in the Government under which they live.

I am not here to detail the value of what the women did in those high and hard days. Their record shines with that of their brothers who gave the decisive strength which brought victory to the forces fighting to make the world safe for democracy. If the high goal has not been obtained, the fault lies in the fact that statesmen lacked the wisdom to garner the fruit of valor and consecration. Except on the actual field of battle and on the iron decks of the ships, women followed everywhere the leadership of Anna Howard Shaw and Carrie Chapman Catt, members of

the woman's branch of the Council of National Defense. There was no dearth of woman's tenderness where fighting men needed their ministrations; no lack of skill in the labor of women in every department of government where they stepped in to fill the places of their brothers as they donned the military uniform and went forth to battle; no delay in providing hostess houses, where soldiers and sailors found the nearest approach to the delights of home; no lack of generosity and organization to supply the needs and comforts for men in barracks, in training, and on the fighting front in France and on the high seas. The sentiment expressed by a patriotic woman who asked for a job in the Navy gun factory, "I wish to do something that will make me truly enlisted in the war, making guns or torpedoes," was not different from other women who wanted a job where all their strength was required.

In addition to these varied enlistments of womanhood in the World War, I have intimate knowledge of the debt owed by the Navy and the country to the patriotic Yeomen (F), the women who became an integral part of the naval personnel, performing important work efficiently and sharing with their sailor and marine brothers full participation in the hardships and benefits, including the bonus, a grateful country gave to all who went down to the sea in ships or contributed ashore to the carrying on in wartime. A ship, feminine in all our languages, demanded a woman's benediction as the assurance of favoring winds and prosperous voyages. There were 12,982 of these yeoman (F) marinettes and nurses, and I defy any organization to produce more capable and beautiful young women or to devise a more becoming and natty uniform.

Following the Armistice, and because the country needed the unerring instinct and wisdom of women in its national housekeeping, and as appreciation of the part women had played in winning the war, the woman suffrage amendment was ratified. Then women ceased, politically, to be the superior of the male sex and became their equal. I am one of those who long advocated the granting of equal suffrage, and I am one of those who decry the propaganda that there has not come within these few short years that purification of government which many advocates of suffrage predicted would follow woman's participation in the affairs of government. If women have not yet proved equal to high expectations in the elevation of government to higher standards, the answer is that it was not reasonable to expect that they could repair the many defects which male voters had engrafted on the body politic in the long years when they alone controlled the processes of Government. Women voters at first naturally were timid about demanding large recognition and few offered for office. They acted as if they must serve their apprentice days in learning the ropes before asking to be entrusted with high official stations. As time has gone on, however, we have seen women of ability and poise win distinction in high public stations. Women Senators and Representatives in Congress, member of the Cabinet, diplomatic officials, wearers of the judicial ermine, leaders in important positions in emergency agencies, and other public stations have demonstrated the old truth that there is "not a place in heaven or earth without a woman in it." Not even the barber shops now are exclusively for males. Everywhere men and women are equals in promoting measures to bless their country.

You do well at this session of your convention to emphasize continental solidarity. Too long have the men and women of the United States denied themselves the privilege and benefit of close association with their neighbors to the south. And too long have Americans south of the Rio Grande, like those north of the dividing line, had their eyes turned too exclusively toward Europe. In our schools we have studied French and German, forgetting that Spanish is the prevailing language of nearly every Republic in this hemisphere, and Latin Americans have been more at home in the mastery of the language and customs of the European continent rather than with the tongue of the dwellers above the Rio Grande. This barrier of language, plus the lack of communications and transportation, have stood in the way of the intimate relations which should exist between all the dwellers of the Western Hemisphere. Fortunately the last two are rapidly becoming the handmaidens of all the 21 Pan American republics, and more Spanish speaking people are learning English today and more English speaking people are learning Spanish than in all the preceding centuries. In all schools on this continent both these languages should take precedence over all others. The removal of the barrier of inability to converse with our nearest neighbors will wipe out misunderstandings and disagreements and make continental solidarity in brotherhood as in defense. The evidence that the spirit of neighborliness is in flower recalls a golden legend long cherished by Mexicans.

According to the best authorities, San Ysidro was plowing in his garden one spring day. He looked up and beheld an angel, who said to him: "The Lord wants to see you, Ysidro. Come with me." He answered that he was busy. "I can't go now. You tell the Lord that I am late in getting my corn planted and that I'll see him when I have finished." The angel retired, but soon another heavenly messenger appeared in the field and said: "The Lord wishes to see you immediately, Ysidro, and directs me to say that if you do not come at once. He will send hot winds and drought that will wither your corn." Ysidro, dripping with perspiration in the hot sun, continued plowing, pausing to send back the message: "I've seen hot winds and droughts many a time before. They don't bother me. I can bring water from the river. Tell the Lord I can't come now, but I will see Him when I have finished planting my corn." Not long afterward another heavenly courier with stern mien tapped Ysidro on the shoulder and said: "I am commissioned to tell you that the Lord does not like your attitude and sends word to you that unless you come with me right now, He will send a plague of locusts to devour your corn from the top and a plague of cutworms to eat its roots." Ysidro did not stop plowing, but sent back the answer: "That does not frighten me. I've had plagues before but by the use of fire and hoeing and hard work, I've harvested my corn all right. You tell the Lord I'll finish my plowing tomorrow and will see Him when my work is completed."

The messenger from the skies disappeared, and before the fourth messenger descended he had finished several furrows. This last angel had the appearance and bearing of authority. As he flapped his wings and walked along the furrows to keep step with the stubborn plowman, the angel spoke sternly: "The Lord isn't going to argue with you any more, Ysidro. He commands me to tell you that if you do not come with me without a moment's delay He will send you a bad neighbor."

That threat terrified San Ysidro. He called "whoa" to his mule, stopped him short and wrapped the reins around the plow handle. The look of his eyes showed that fear had taken possession of him. "The Lord says unless I come He will send me a bad neighbor does He? I cannot stand that infliction. Life isn't worth trying to live with a bad neighbor. You tell the Lord I can stand hot winds, and droughts, locusts, cutworms, and all kinds of plagues. I can endure anything but a bad neighbor. I'll go with you right now," and he stopped short in the middle of the row, not even waiting to unhitch the mule from the plow.

I bring to you the message that south of the Rio Grande, men and women committed to the good-neighbor policy, surrendering nothing of sovereignty, are united with the United States in the unbreakable bonds of cooperation for the preservation of the independence of each country and in devotion to the permanence of government by the consent of the governed. Not yet, either in the United States or in other New World countries have we fully apprehended, but one and all are pressing forward to the goal of "All for one and one for all."

The heart's desire of Americans, North, Central, and South, today is compressed in this aspiration: "God made us neighbors; let understanding and a common unity, and justice and equality make and keep us friends."

National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES E. MURRAY, OF MONTANA

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address I recently delivered at Helena, Mont.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow citizens, I have been invited to address you in the interests of national unity and national safety. This is not a political meeting in any sense; it is a meeting of plain citizens of Montana, without regard to racial, religious, or political affiliations. It is a meeting of loyal citizens who love their country and who wish to preserve it in a war-mad world. I have accepted this invitation and have come here because I feel that it is my duty—as it is the duty of every loyal citizen—to defend and protect our country from its enemies or traducers, whether they work as wily, underhanded "fifth columnists" or as open enemies of the Nation.

The people of the United States stand today as the greatest force for liberty, for peace, and for justice in the whole world. They are opposed to war and they are striving to save our country and the world from the threat of Nazi domination and slavery. We are facing at this moment a great world crisis. Our country, I need not tell you, is in imminent peril. No citizen of the United States should have the slightest doubt about the fact that the future of our country as a great, free democratic Nation rests upon the loyalty, unity, and cooperation of the American people. It rests upon our ability to overcome the subtle influences of foreign propaganda seeking to undermine American morale. It rests on the extent we may be able to unite our people and effectively organize our military and economic forces to meet the ugly threats directed at us from across the Atlantic and the Pacific.

In the face of these dangers which threaten us any person who seeks, by devious and un-

dishanded methods, to mislead, confuse, or disunite the people of this country for selfish political motives, or because of hatred or spite against our Government or the President of the United States, is the most dangerous enemy this country can have. There has been, as we all know, a steady and persistent effort to confuse this country on problems of national defense and foreign policy. To hear some of the sensational attacks being made on our Government by fanatical and deluded political partisans one would be led to think that our national foreign policy is a purely personal arrangement of President Roosevelt's. Through this propaganda the people are being told that our foreign policy, under the direction of President Roosevelt, has been influenced by international bankers and British propaganda. This despicable effort to discredit the Government of our country has been in operation for some time. The whole purpose of this scheme is to confuse the American people in matters vitally affecting our national safety and security.

These propagandists represent the President of the United States as a warmonger—as an Anglomaniac designing not to protect and defend the United States but to use the great wealth and power of the Nation to aid Great Britain and other European countries defending against Hitler in a war in which, they assert, this country has no concern. The President and other officials of our National Government have been held up to public ridicule and condemned. They have been pointed to as tools of international Jewish bankers who are supposed, in some occult manner, to be responsible for the Nazi plan of world conquest. A great German propaganda machine which was located in New York City until recently spent millions of dollars in spreading this mendacious propaganda in America. In Washington even United States Senators and Congressmen, until it was suppressed, were receiving weekly large packages of this Nazi propaganda

Many well-meaning people in this country have been deceived and misled by this propaganda. At mass meetings held throughout the country, innocent people have been brought together for the purpose of condemning our American foreign policy. At these meetings, bundists, Christian frontists, Roosevelt haters, and "fifth columnists" have crowded the halls to hiss and boo the name of the President of the United States and slander his efforts in the defense of the Nation. They have sought to block every step to carry out the will of Congress to extend aid to the European nations victimized by Hitler's merciless aggression.

The very existence of this Nazi scheme to confuse the American people on these questions should be a warning to all sincere, intelligent citizens. It should have no other effect than to unite the American people solidly back of our Government in support of our national policies.

Many people fail to understand that the present foreign policies of the United States are the result of the deliberate action of Congress. Shortly prior to 1939, we had established in this country a policy of absolute isolation. The isolationists, backed by a pressure group of innocent but deluded crusaders, had dominated Congress and forced this ill-considered policy of absolute isolation on the country, beginning with the first neutrality legislation of 1935. I do not question their motives We may concede sincerity, but it is clear today that they were victims of illusions dangerous to our country.

If that policy had not been repealed at the outset of this war, it would have resulted in making America virtually an ally of Hitler and would have insured the defeat of Britain and the complete conquest of Europe. Upon the outbreak of the war in Europe, however, that policy was quickly recognized as a snare and a delusion. It was absolutely contrary to the traditional foreign policies of our country. When the war broke in 1939 it was immediately brought under revision in Congress. In that body it was condemned in measured terms as having encouraged Hitler in his plans for world conquest.

There is no doubt but that the isolationist stand we took did influence Hitler. History will certainly record that the American isolation policy, which proposed to cut off the supply of war materials to Hitler's victims in Europe, virtually gave Germany the green light to let loose her dogs of war upon an unprepared world. Thus our isolation policy guaranteed Hitler that he could arm to the teeth and march his Nazi hordes against his unoffending and unprepared neighbors, with the assurance that we would immediately cut off his victims from American military supplies. Can anyone justify such a policy of asininity?

At the commencement of the war in Europe we quickly saw the dangerous and unneutral operation of that isolation policy, and Congress, after full debate, by an overwhelming majority, repealed it and passed the new neutrality legislation of 1939, authorizing this country to sell war materials to all countries invaded by aggressor nations, under certain requirements. This was in the interests of justice and international decency. Isolation was a policy in the aid of Hitler. It was against our interests and against the interests of the whole civilized world.

The isolationist policy was again repudiated when Congress passed the lease-lend bill authorizing and directing all possible aid to Britain and other nations defending against the aggression of Hitler.

Thus, as I have demonstrated, Congress has totally repudiated the isolation policy and has adopted a foreign policy of giving all possible aid to those countries struggling to block Hitler's march of world conquest.

It was also that same isolation policy, imposed upon this country by well-meaning people pathetically lacking in statesmanship, that delayed the United States in preparing to defend itself in this world crisis. The prolonged delays in Congress, due to the bitter struggle to overcome the established isolationist policy put the United States far behind in the program of national defense. For years these misguided isolationists in Congress have voted against all efforts of our Government to build up our national defenses They opposed and defeated all attempts to adequately expand our military, naval, and air forces, while Hitler was at the same time engaged in building the greatest military machine of all time. It was not until after Hitler started his ruthless Nazi hordes marching in Europe, raining death and destruction on the unsuspecting isolationist countries of Poland, Norway, Holland, and Belgium, that the American people and the Congress in Washington were able to see and understand the dangers inherent in the philosophy of isolationism. It is now fully demonstrated that we live in a world that is interdependent. If peaceful nations are to survive in this world, they must stand together against the brute forces of militaristic nations bent on aggression. The Congress at the outset of this war recognized these truths, and, as I have already pointed out, quickly repudiated and set aside the policy of isolation.

It will be seen, therefore, that the Congress of the United States finally came to see the danger of isolation and is responsible for the present foreign policies of our country. If Congress had not acted, the United States today would be completely cut off from the balance of the world. It still would be sitting supinely by, pursuing a pusillanimous policy of isolation and permitting Hitler to overrun Europe and set himself up as the master of the world. The Congress of the United States changed that ill-advised policy because it recognized its dangerous effect on our own safety and security. It feared the Nazi program of world conquest. It recognized that our vital American interests and future safety were at stake in this epoch-making world revolution.

Why, then, let me ask, is all this abuse leveled at President Roosevelt on these questions relating to foreign policy and national defense, when, as I have shown, the responsibility for these policies rests completely on the Congress of the United States? The Congress acted in accordance with constitutional methods, and those who attack our foreign policy are in effect striking at the very base of our American system. They are, in effect, innocently serving as "fifth columnists" for Hitler and using President Roosevelt as a scapegoat. The answer is that they dare not attack Congress, but they can abuse, misrepresent, and slander Roosevelt. That is American politics operating in its basest form. They purport to set themselves above the Congress of the United States. Those who follow that course are undermining our democratic system. They are unconsciously serving as Hitler's tools in America, entitled to Nazi medals for subversive activities.

Now, my fellow citizens, I have fully demonstrated, and it must be clear to every informed person in this country, that our foreign policy and program of national defense is absolutely sound and has the full sanction of the Congress of the United States. The American people are well-nigh unanimous in supporting it as essential to our safety. Nevertheless, we have this small but vociferous group in the country who continue to attack the President and seek to disparage and discredit every move the national administration is making to carry out our national policies. They wholly ignore the fact that Congress has acted in establishing the course our country is to follow, and they continue to hamper, harass, and oppose the President and the officers of the Army and the Navy in every vital move necessary to make effective our national defense. There is, of course, not the slightest warrant in logic or reason for these attacks upon the President, or on the members of his Cabinet, or the officers of the Army and Navy, who are cooperating and carrying out these policies established by the Congress of the United States. This is indeed a strange paradox we are witnessing in American politics.

Now, in all that I am saying I do not wish to be understood as attacking the sincerity of anyone They may all be sincere, but it is becoming plain to us all that they are as dangerous to our country as hired protagonists of Hitler. I say I do not question the sincerity of those who are opposing our national policies. They have a right to oppose them, if they conscientiously believe they are wrong. I do charge, however, that there is not the slightest justification for any citizen to place his untrained, unexperienced judgment against the combined judgment of the Congress of the United States. The Congress of the United States is cooperating with and supporting our State Department, our War Department, and our Navy Department, in the defense of our country. Everything that is done is the result of careful study by the military and naval experts of these departments, under the direction of the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Naval Operations, and the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of our armed forces.

I do not question the motives or sincerity of anyone who offers a legitimate criticism of the President or the foreign policies of our country, but I do question the intellectual balance and poise of those who arbitrarily seek to set themselves above the Congress of the United States and the voice of the majority. They are victims of illusions and imagine that they know more than the Congress of the United States and the experts of

the Army and the Navy. They assume that they alone are loyal and patriotic and that all others are warmongers and anglophiles.

In the face of this confusion in our country, we are in a dangerous situation. Therefore I have accepted the invitation to come here and make this appeal to my fellow citizens. My appeal is an appeal to reason and common sense. I appeal for American unity and cooperation. I ask our citizens to set aside all feelings of hate and partisanship and come to the defense of our country. Every thinking citizen regrets that in this dangerous crisis there should be the slightest variation of judgment on the vital problems of national defense and foreign policy.

Disunity and opposition can only breed confusion. This weakens the national morale and brings discredit and contempt upon our country in the eyes of the world. Every attack on the President and our foreign policy brings encouragement to Hitler and his codictators. No one contends that these vital problems should not be subjected to the greatest scrutiny on the part of the Congress and on the part of the people of our whole country, but when Congress has acted under our democratic system, as it has in this instance, following full and free debate, and has established the course we are to follow in this war-mad world, it is time to pause and consider the danger we are inviting by continuing baseless political opposition. It must be clear to every intelligent patriotic citizen that, with the enemy virtually approaching our gates, we are faced with chaos and destruction, if we fail to promptly close our ranks and present a united front.

It should also be clear to everyone that, in view of the action of the Congress, clearly fixing the course we are to follow in this world crisis, there can be no basis for this continued bitter and irresponsible opposition.

The turn of the war today involves the greatest peril this country has ever faced. The present attack on Russia is a step further in Hitler's plans for world domination. If he succeeds in defeating Russia, he will have acquired unlimited supplies of raw materials and agricultural products. If he defeats Russia he will have access to bases in Siberia across the straits from Alaska.

On the other hand, if Russia holds out a few months longer, and it looks now as though Russia may even defeat Hitler, then Britain and the United States can rapidly increase the production of planes and war materials, and there will be an opportunity to bring about the ultimate and complete defeat of Hitler.

Every recognized authority on air power now concedes that this war will be finally won in the air. While the other countries of the world were sleeping or engaged in domestic wrangling, Hitler has prepared his mightly military organization with all possible speed. He built up the most powerful fleets of air bombers the world had ever known. These air forces have accounted for all his spectacular victories. They carried his armies to speedy victories in Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France. They quickly bombed the Balkans into submission and drove the British out of Crete.

Hitler's air forces are now being concentrated on Russia, but he is meeting with serious trouble in his battle with Stalin. He has spread out his forces all over the European Continent. He is far behind his schedule of victory. He has the Russian bear by the tail and can't let go. It is now recognized that he can never invade Britain or break the British blockade. If the Russians hold him in check during the year, the British, with American airplanes, will soon be able to wrest from him the supremacy of the air.

With giant American and British bombers, they will pulverize German industry, German ports, and German cities, just as he has been bombarding and destroying British ports and cities during the past year. The Germans will then see the handwriting on the wall and peace will loom on the horizon, a peace that will be based on justice.

Let no one be misled—the greatest danger confronting our country today is not the danger of being invaded by a foreign power but the danger of being destroyed from within. Lack of unity and cooperation among our leaders in political life will slowly but surely undermine national confidence and national unity. It destroyed France and will destroy America, too. Already sabotage is suspected in several sections. Incidents of this kind will surely increase, if the full range of demagogery and unlicensed abuse of the President and our national policies continues. If we are to escape the dangers presented by this world revolution, we must have a united country. Our people must be united behind our Government and behind those lawfully authorized to conduct our national defense.

Hitler and his codictators have been led to believe that this country is divided. That is the real explanation for the recent moves of the Japs in the Pacific. Germany and Japan are both banking on the failure of the United States to achieve unity. They have their ears to the ground listening to political brawls in America.

Let me warn the country, with all the vigor I possess, that the time has come when our Government must have a united people back of it. Only a united nation, a united people can be successful in carrying out our program of national defense. The whole world is in torment, while peace-loving nations are being overrun, and their entire productive efforts are being made to serve the purpose of Hitler in his program of world conquest.

The complete unity of America would be the severest blow that could be administered to Hitler. It would electrify the whole world, and this war could be ended without a shot being fired by an American soldier. United we stand, divided we fall.

But, my friends, we are told by some of our politicians that we are helping Great Britain. We are told that the British are not free from sin. All the past crimes and wrongs perpetrated by Britain are conjured up to convince us that we should have no interest in extending aid to the hard-pressed people of Britain. The answer is that Britain's record in this world revolution is wholly irrelevant, just as the record of Russia is irrelevant. If they can defeat Hitler, it is our duty to give them our support. Mistakes, crimes, and harsh oppression can be unearthed in the history of all nations. But, my fellow citizens, the present situation presents a cold-blooded question, What does the best interest of the United States call for? No American citizen should permit his personal feelings regarding a foreign nation, his personal hate of another country, to interfere with his loyalty to the United States. Our first allegiance is to our own country.

We are engaged here in defending the United States against the threat of Hitler. Any man who allows misguided hate of Russia or of England to influence his conduct in regard to our own country is a poor American. The unfortunate people of England or Russia are not responsible for the past wrongs or mistakes of their rulers. For my part, I have no hate in my heart against the people of England or Russia. I stand tonight with the President and my Government in all its efforts to aid these countries as a means of defending our own country. As citizens of this country, we are all bound to support and defend our Government. We are all obligated to bear true faith and allegiance to our country without mental reservation or evasion.

For my part, I am supporting the Government of the United States and offering no sympathy to its enemies or traducers. I am upholding the arm of the President and backing up the entire national-defense program, seeking to have Montana play a noble and patriotic part, not an ignominious one in this hour of danger. I feel that if I took any other course, I would be recreant to my oath of office, false to my State, and false to my country.

Inflation, Its Dangers and Remedies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the Pennsylvania Savings and Loan League, Harrisburg, Pa., on September 26, 1941, on the subject Inflation, Its Dangers and Remedies.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A. THE DANGER OF INFLATION

The Congress has now under consideration a bill authorizing the Federal Government to fix prices not only for commodities of all kinds, but for all services connected with the process, distribution, storage, installation, repair, and negotiation of the purchases or sales of commodities. Up to this time Mr. Leon Henderson, without the shadow of legal authority, has been issuing orders purporting to fix prices and threatening all kinds of Government action authorized for other purposes against those who disobey his illegal orders. Up to date the price-fixing program has been a kind of legal blackmail. Certainly legislation of some kind is preferable to the present confused and illegal program.

I have always been bitterly opposed to Government fixing of prices and wages, because I believe if adopted as a permanent policy it must lead to complete Government regulation and control of all economic processes, to a totalitarian state. But as our experience during the World War proved, that need not be the result, if it is adopted as a strictly temporary measure.

While I do not approve the arbitrary powers requested in the present bill, I have come to the conclusion with hesitation and distaste that some form of temporary price fixing is made necessary by the defense program. We undoubtedly face a crisis from which serious inflation is almost certain to develop. With the tremendous defense program and the operations under the Lease-Lend Act, the deficit for the year which ended July 1, 1941, was more than $5,000,000,000. In the year ending July 1, 1942, Government and lease-lend expenditures are likely to total $25,000,000,000, and our taxes, even with the current tax bill, are not likely to exceed fourteen billion, so that there will be a deficit of about $10,000,000,000. In effect the Government prints that amount of money and pays it out for labor and materials. Most

of that money finds its way into the hands of people who spend it at once for the purchase of nondefense goods of all kinds. Even allowing for a reasonable sale of defense bonds to the recipients of Government money, it is likely that five to eight billion dollars of purchasing power is going to be created out of thin air. That will expand production to its physical limit not only in defense activity, but in nondefense activities. The inevitable result will be a shortage of goods and a steady rise in prices. We have seen that rise begin already. If no action is taken, it is likely to equal the increase during the World War when prices rose more than 100 percent.

The immediate dangers of inflation are obvious. The Government will have to pay more for all the various materials needed for defense. Even more important, the general market price rise will affect every individual in the United States and increase the cost of living. That, in turn, will force another rise in wages and a further rise in prices in an unending upward spiral. Such a change in the price level is a tremendous hardship on wage earners, and even more on those who draw fixed salaries, and on widows and others living off the investments made from past earnings. It decreases the value of all savings. It creates a tremendous hardship on insurance policyholders and on private colleges and other institutions paying their expenses from endowment funds.

But even these obvious dangers are less than those which will occur after the war is over. At best we face a dangerous reaction when the defense program tapers off. If prices have risen to unnatural levels and distorted all commercial relationships, that reaction will be all the more violent. History seems to show that the more excessive the boom the greater the depression. That means tremendous unemployment, hardship, injustice, bankruptcy for countless businesses, and a condition which may well threaten the permanence of all our institutions.

We face two great problems today. How can we prevent inflation during the present emergency? The restraint of inflation today should reduce the seriousness of the post-war crisis but cannot possibly prevent that crisis. What plans can we make to meet the crisis after the war? How can we avoid those fallacious panaceas so dear to the heart of the New Deal economist?

B. REMEDIES FOR INFLATION

Of course, the best way to prevent inflation is to reduce the Government deficit, which is the real cause of the danger. That can be done on the one hand by reducing expenditures, and on the other by levying more taxes.

Up to this time almost nothing has been done to reduce nondefense expenditures. Those of us who have hammered on economy have achieved little positive success. Secretary Morgenthau has talked about the necessity and possibility of cutting at least a billion dollars from nondefense expenses. His policy, however, has been contradicted by the President, who continues to send in demands for the same appropriations and resists any effort on the part of Congress to eliminate or reduce the activities of Government departments, particularly of the New Deal agencies like the W. P. A., N. Y. A., and C. C. C.

The tax bill which has just been passed, however, provides for the creation of a Congressional Budget Committee of six Senators, six Congressmen, Secretary Morgenthau, and the Director of the Budget. That committee was suggested by Senator BYRD. Its success depends on the cooperation which is received from the President and from Congress. I feel quite confident that if the President, through the Director of the Budget, supports a substantial reduction in nondefense expenses, Congress will back him up. But it must be remembered that the President is not only President, but also leader of the Democratic Party, and that the Democratic Party has an overwhelming majority in both Houses of Congress. As long as the President indicates his sympathy with continued spending and his department heads protest vigorously to Congress regarding the slightest reduction in their appropriations, it is not reasonable to believe that the Democratic majorities will oppose his known wishes, no matter what Secretary Morgenthau says. There must be a real desire on the part of the President to economize, and a willingness to use the veto power.

The Budget Committee furthermore should secure a substantial reduction in defense expenditures. Up to date we have necessarily regarded these as sacred. But there is no doubt today that a vast amount of waste has occurred, and an intelligent control of the purse strings can reduce the cost of the vast defense program without reducing in the least its effectiveness. The present request for lease-lend appropriations should be most carefully scrutinized.

In the field of taxation we have just passed a bill which will produce at least three and one-half billion dollars in taxes. That is not enough and work has begun on another bill. While I disapproved of some of the provisions of this bill, I do feel that in a general way its burdens are equitably distributed. Roughly speaking, one-third of its burden falls on individual incomes. This is a direct check to inflation, because it leaves every family less money to spend on nondefense articles. It thereby reduces the demand for many commodities, and reduces the pressure so likely to increase prices. The reduction of exemptions and increase in rate will not be a great hardship, however, because wages are steadily increasing, and there will be few indeed in the lower brackets who will not be better off in 1942 in spite of the increased taxes. The reduction of exemptions increases the tax-paying class to about 13,000,000 families out of the total of 30,000,000 families in the United States. It still imposes no burden on the low-income group who are least able to pay; but these are reached by many of the excise or sales taxes which are estimated to raise a billion dollars. Two-fifths of the new money is raised from additional corporation taxes. All corporations must now pay 30 percent of their net income, plus excess profits at rates up to 60 percent additional.

I note that yesterday Secretary Morgenthau advocated the confiscation of all corporate earnings over 6 percent of the invested capital. This seems to me a most unwise and demagogic proposal even for a wartime program. Many businesses, especially small businesses, have a small invested capital. They have succeeded because of the ability, ingenuity, and diligence of those who operate the business. Perhaps they have been profitable because of exceptionally satisfactory service to their customers. Perhaps they have devised efficient systems of doing business which others have not yet followed. In strict accordance with the American principles of free enterprise, they have been rewarded for their ability over and above rewards received by lazy, incompetent, or stupid operators in the same line of business.

If we allow only a 6-percent return on capital invested, without any consideration for the normal profits which were made in time of peace, then we are going to destroy many businesses altogether, and prevent the growth of many others. We are going to crucify small business particularly. We are going to destroy all incentive to improve business conditions and service to the public. Furthermore, corporations are only groups of stockholders who have invested their money. Many investors have bought stocks on the basis of earnings. In fact, prices of stocks are seldom related very closely to invested capital, which is a long and complicated calculation. Stockholders of this kind would not receive 6 percent on their invested capital, but perhaps only 2 or 3 percent. Furthermore, no corporation is in a position to distribute all its earnings, so that the average stockholder would get a smaller percentage of the company's invested capital than 6 percent. Then he would have to pay a high personal income tax on what he does receive. Many New Dealers have been inspired for a long time with the theory that profits are wicked and represent a form of extortion from the public. They can't seem to see that most profits represent the savings in operation which are effected by ability, ingenuity, and diligence. Certainly we wish no one to profit from the war. Certainly we wish to prevent inflation. But inflation is going to result a great deal more from increased spending and the printing of Government paper than it is from permitting the continuation of peacetime profits, now subject in any event to greatly increased normal taxes. Certainly we need taxation and more taxation, but the confiscation of profits will simply kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

Of course, inflation can occur as it did in the twenties, through the increase of private credit as well as through the increase of public credit, represented by Government deficit. It is not likely that the increase in private credit will even compare with the great volume of increased Government debt, but nevertheless, it is increasing. Bank loans today are $3,450,000,000 greater than they were 12 months ago. On the 1st of last January the Federal Reserve Board recommended that it be given increased power over bank reserves, and I introduced a bill to carry out that recommendation. The administration has completely ignored this proposal for 9 months, but today there are some signs that the conflicting forces in the administration intend to proceed with legislation along the line I suggested. Certainly it should not be too easy for any business to borrow money, particularly for nondefense purposes, with the resulting increase in purchasing power and demand for commodities which result from an increase in bank loans.

Another instrument of inflation is the increase of consumer installment debt. To the extent that outstanding installment credit is greater than it was a year ago, it represents an inflation of purchasing power. It is somewhat difficult to get exact figures on credit of this kind. The Federal Reserve Board estimates that outstanding installment debt has increased about $1,000,000,000 in a year; and the Federal Reserve Board is now regulating installment credit, although it seems to me that their legal power to do so is extremely doubtful. I am not greatly concerned about this increase, because so large a proportion of it is represented by automobiles, refrigerators, electrical equipment, and the like. The supply of these articles is going to be substantially cut by priorities, because there is not enough material to make them. If automobile production is cut 50 percent of what it was a year ago, I believe there will be a reduction for that reason in the total volume of installment credit, instead of an increase. Probably, however, the Federal Reserve Board should be given increased power to deal with this subject.

Finally, inflation may be at least retarded by Government price control. This power cannot prevent inflation, nor can it prevent a gradual rise in prices, but it can slow up the process and perhaps eliminate the possibility of run-away prices. If it is going to be effective, it seems to me absolutely essential that farm commodities be included. On the other hand, farm prices have been abnormally low compared to industrial products, and a larger increase should be permitted in farm prices for that reason.

There has been a great deal of demand that wages be also fixed. I do not think that the Government can or should fix wages. Even if wages are not included, I believe that price control can be effectively carried out for a few years, although it should certainly be accompanied by a general effort on the Government's part to stabilize wages. The deliberate policy of increasing wages, which has been followed up to this time, should be abandoned for the time being.

Of course, if wages do increase, prices will have to be gradually increased to conform to the increased cost of production. The idea that wages can be increased over a long period without an increase in prices, by decreasing profits, is completely untenable. Temporarily, however, I believe that inflation can be checked by the control of commodity prices.

The bill which has been presented is subject to serious criticism. It gives the President the price-fixing power, and therefore delegates to him the power which Congress itself ought to exercise, the designation of the agency to do the job. A commission like the Interstate Commerce Commission ought to be set up, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and every industry should be given a hearing on the justice of the action which is proposed. The bill should be confined to basic commodities and authorize the methods which were successful during the World War. I shudder at the idea of permitting the Government to require licenses, with arbitrary power to shut down a business if regulations are violated. We should rely on a criminal penalty to be prescribed by a court in accordance with the severity of a violation.

C. THE POST-WAR CRISIS

One of the great purposes of controlling inflation at the present time is to prevent the crisis which will certainly develop when the defense program is gradually reduced to a very small proportion of what it is today. Inevitably that will throw many men out of work. It will reduce purchasing power. It will cause a drop in prices and the development of many surpluses. It will precipitate a financial depression which might be even worse than that of 1932. If such a depression occurs again, it may be difficult to preserve at all the American free enterprise system. It may be difficult to preserve democracy itself, for if we who believe in free enterprise can't devise a system that will give men employment when they wish to work, the people may well come to the conclusion that they better try some other system.

On the other hand, the remedies that will be proposed to deal with the situation may be even worse than the depression. I am deeply concerned about the economic philosophy which prevails in Washington today. It is exactly the same as that which produced the vast Government deficits of the past 9 years. It is exactly the same which has persecuted business, large and small; which has discouraged saving; and turned to bureaucratic regulation to solve every problem. It is the same old theory that Government deficits are a blessing in disguise. To my mind the greatest danger which we face after the war is that in order to prevent depression, we will plunge into a tremendous spending program for domestic purposes. Every expansion of Government activity will be encouraged, largely on the ground that spending is a virtue in itself.

This is no imaginary fear. Read the remarks of the National Resources Planning Board sent to the Congress by the President on March 17. That Board outlines the vast program of public works. I quote from the report:

"The barrier that stands between us and the attainment of what we have looked on as the American standard of living is in part a psychological barrier. It is the notion that only through a vast national abstinence can we provide needed capital, improvements or public works; that if we wish to provide these things, we shall have to 'tighten our belts,' that is, reduce our standard of living. We have too long burdened our thinking with those false analogies drawn from a simple economy of scarcity * * * as a current and dramatic example, the decision by the Congress and the Executive to do the things required in our defense program has set in motion a connected series of forces which will in time go far toward attaining the goal of full employment. Given our resources, equipment, techniques, and skills, only that decision—only that courageous implementation of the will to do—was required to release the log jam of idle plants and idle men."

The National Resources Planning Board does not even mention the fact that besides the "courageous implementation of the will to do," we had to increase the Government debt $15,000,000,000 in 2 years. It is apparently quite prepared to go ahead increasing that debt at the rate after the war.

Mr. Eccles has very much the same theory. In his article in the August Fortune he blames the unemployment during the past decade on the failure of the Government to spend enough money, although it increased the deficit some $20,000,000,000 during that period. He says:

"Throughout the decade, however, we remained in a state of semidepression, because we were not willing to have the Government supplement private enterprise with a sufficient amount of activity and expenditure to employ our idle manpower and resources * * *. Had we been able to see clearly in the past decade—had we turned our immense productive machinery to making the things of peace as we are now obliged to use it to produce the things of war—our standard of living would have exceeded anything the world had ever seen. We could have afforded it—indeed, the tragedy of the period is that we thought we could not afford it."

Evidently Mr. Eccles also thinks that after the war deficits of $10,000,000,000 a year can and ought to be continued.

Mr. Henderson likewise said very much the same thing over the air last spring.

But unlimited Government borrowing and spending to produce prosperity is, after all, only one feature of the general New Deal philosophy which threatens to direct our post-war course. It includes also a complete discouragement of saving by individuals and business. It includes a continued subsidy to those groups considered by the New Dealers to be underprivileged, particularly if they have votes. It includes hostility to all private business which dares to be profitable. Saving by individuals is to be discouraged except temporarily in wartime when they are to be encouraged to save in order to hand their money over to the Government for war purposes. A deep-seated prejudice exists, however, among the New Deal economists against saving in the form of life insurance, against saving in your building and loan associations for the construction of homes, against saving by individuals for investment in business. The staff of the Temporary National Economic Committee spent much time and effort in trying to prove through Professor Currie and Professor Hansen that there was grossly excessive saving in this country even today. The Government is first to discourage and prevent saving, then to tax away all the savings it can. And finally, if it cannot prevent saving in any way, it is to borrow these savings and use them for Government expenditures. That is the essence of the theories of Mr. Mordecai Ezekiel.

Men like yourselves who are engaged in the building and loan business realize that this theory is completely destructive of the whole theory of free enterprise as it has been developed in America. We ought to begin to combat it now. We ought to develop plans of our own for solving the post-war problem.

We have in the United States a tremendous plant, thousands of cities with millions of buildings, residences, factories, skyscrapers. We have a great railroad system and a great utility system. We have millions of improved farms. Every stick and every stone represents money that somebody saved, and invested with the idea of providing a home for his family, an income for his old age, education for his children or a provision for his widow after his death. All of the great physical improvements which characterize civilization today are the result of saving. It may be true that at some periods there has been excessive saving. I think it may have been true in 1928 and 1929, but in the long run the danger is far more in failure to save. Human nature resists the postponement of present enjoyment and provision for a distant future.

In my opinion the claim of the New Dealers that there is too much saving today is based on completely unsound calculations. They include in the savings the setting aside of depreciation, which is not saving. They underestimate the tremendous wear and tear on existing plant. They fail to see that New Deal policy has checked the sound investment of savings so necessary to progress and prosperity.

The first objection to the Government-spending and discourage-savings theory is that it will not do the very thing which it promises. Our experience in the thirties shows that with average Government deficits of three billion a year prosperity could not be restored. Of course, temporarily a large amount of Government spending can stimulate business activity. It is doing so today. But certainly no one will advocate that we continue the manufacture of goods that are not needed in time of peace. No one will claim that we can go on indefinitely borrowing money and taxing people to produce goods which the people either do not want or are unwilling to buy. It is a remedy which cannot be continued more than a short time without bankrupting the Nation and impoverishing the people. Undoubtedly it could postpone the development of the depression after the war, but only for a short time. Then the depression which would occur would be even greater and more violent and more dangerous than if it developed immediately after the war.

Certainly in the first 8 New Deal years we gave the spending theory as good a trial as any spender could ask. We increased the debt by twenty-five billions and it did not solve our problem. We discouraged savings and reduced interest rates, and we left 10,000,000 unemployed. No depression in the history of the country ever lasted so long.

For 150 years this country operated on principles of thrift and investment, private enterprise, home building, and sound government fiscal policy. No nation has ever prospered as this Nation did in such a short period of time. Why depart now to a philosophy which is absolutely the opposite of everything justified by American experience?

Not only has the spending theory failed to accomplish its purposes, but its inevitable result will be a complete socialization of industry. Gradually all of the capital is acquired by the Government. Individuals cease to save, and that which has already been saved is transferred to the Government by inheritance taxation or other capital levies. In seeking new methods by which Government money may be spent, we encourage the extension of Federal activity into private business and into every field now occupied by State and local government. Sooner or later the indefinite extension of debt and unlimited increase in taxes destroys all savings and in a general financial collapse wipes out what is left of individual initiative, independent enterprise.

The best features of the New Deal have been those humanitarian measures extending assistance to the poor families of the Nation

through relief, old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, housing, and medical care. There is no doubt that as the American system developed there were many families which did not share in the general improvement in standard of living and earned too little to assure what we have come to consider a reasonable existence. Either we must find the way to increase the income of these families or we must by taxation provide assistance from the earnings of more fortunate families.

But as a producer of prosperity and a cure for unemployment the spending of Government money in relief activity was a tremendous disappointment. For some reason the payment of Government money to the consumer does not seem to stimulate the economic machine to increased activity. It merely increases the production of consumer goods by a small percentage and puts very few more people to work. Our experience seems to show that if we wish to speed up the economic machine we must stimulate production first and sell its products to the people by advertising. The only way to build up activity apparently is to stimulate the processes of saving money and investing it in new business, in homes, in durable goods of all kinds, in stocks and bonds and securities which in turn can be used for building and the development of industry. Under socialism the Government would theoretically do all of this saving and investing. As a practical matter, however, Government tends inevitably to bureaucracy and seldom develops the initiative which can be developed by millions of individual Americans. The whole theory of Government spending and the discouragement of private saving has checked progress before the war and can easily destroy it after the war.

Even in continuing and extending relief pensions, unemployment insurance, housing, and medical care we must be exceedingly careful to work out the program in such a way that it will not destroy the steady growth of production. We must be exceedingly careful not to destroy basic principles of American success. We should never by Government hand-outs place any man in a better position than the friend or neighbor who has earned his own way. For example, the man who receives an old-age pension to which he has not contributed has an income of $360 a year. Contrast the man who has spent his whole life saving $10,000. Under most State laws he will receive no old-age pension, and he will have a hard time getting an income of $360 a year from his savings of $10,000. If the biggest bum in town is as well off at the end of his life as the most diligent artisan, it will not be long before we have a Nation of sluggards. It is necessary to give old-age pensions, but the income of those who have saved some property of their own should also be supplemented so that they will still have the rewards of their diligence and self-denial.

In the utterly confused housing program of the New Deal we find the same injustice. A man who lives in one of the new Government housing projects is likely to be very much better off than the man who has saved his money and built his own home in the next block where he is subject to all the taxes of local government.

This country has succeeded because our system paid a man to work and work hard. It pays him to develop his ingenuity and his ability. It has been based on incentive and reward. Perhaps those rewards have been excessive in some cases and not always strictly in accordance with merit, but they have made the wheels go round for the benefit of all other Americans.

It is my belief that the only way to cure unemployment is to restore a just system of incentives and rewards modified by Government assistance to the more unfortunate.

Today every possible handicap has been placed on private business, but the stimulation of prosperity and employment can only come by encouraging every man to try his hand in some business of his own. It can be done by removing Government restraint and regulation. The Government should be a policeman anxious to see only that private restraints and monopolies do not interfere with the development of small business and new enterprise.

One inevitable accompaniment of the whole New Deal economic theory is a discouragement of home owning. Government housing projects contemplate a leasing of apartments which can never be owned. Houses were built in Tugwelltowns with the understanding that they should never be sold to any individual. Fortunately, the effect of the F. H. A. has been to recognize again the value to any nation of home ownership. The whole Federal housing policy must be restudied and consolidated. It must be worked into a consistent scheme of assisting the poorer families without discouraging private enterprise. It must be based on an ideal of a nation of home owners.

It is a pleasure to talk to the savings and loan associations of Pennsylvania because no institution can be more typical of the American system. You represent and encourage the whole theory of saving. You stand for home ownership to which the savings are applied. No one should be more interested in preventing inflation today. No one should be more interested than you in preserving our whole system after the war is over. No one should be more interested than you in combating openly and consistently, day and night, year in and year out, philosophies of government spending which can only lead to destruction of those institutions which are loved by you and me and the great majority of the average people of America.

Smaller Business Looks Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. HAROLD H. BURTON, OF OHIO

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] before the Greater Cleveland Council, Smaller Business of America, Inc., at Cleveland, Ohio, on September 23, 1941, on the subject Smaller Business Looks Ahead.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America's great need is for clear thinking. This calls for accurate statements of facts and clear reasoning. America's great danger is from confused thinking. This easily arises from inaccurate statements of facts, the mixing of separate problems, and loose reasoning.

One general phase of present-day conditions that is in the greatest need of clear thinking is that of the smaller businessman. The smaller businessman usually knows well the facts as to his particular business and analyzes clearly the problems of its internal management. If general conditions were favorable to him and were not constantly changing, this mastery of his personal affairs might be enough.

However, at least since the beginning of the depression, conditions have been so unfavorable to him and have been changing so rapidly that a mastery of the internal management of his business has not been enough. Today he must know the governmental regulations directly affecting his business. In addition, because the smaller businessman long has been the forgotten businessman of the Government, he must initiate steps to call his Government's attention to the needs of smaller business, and to the practical effect upon smaller business of governmental regulations carefully drafted to regulate big business, but thoughtlessly made to apply to small business as well as to big business.

I shall deal briefly with the general situation and then with its relation to smaller business. The first part of my statement might be called America Looks Ahead; the second, Smaller Business Looks Ahead.

As America looks ahead, let us look first at the distant future. Is there hope for America and hope for the world? Is there a chance that our standard of living will be maintained or even improved? Or are we at the end, for the time being at least, of all substantial human advancement and therefore must we stop to divide up the wealth and the work that we have among constantly increasing numbers of people who make up our Nation and the world? If we have reached the end of the discovery of all new wealth, it might be necessary to give the second answer and it might be necessary for us at once to direct our thinking to the permanent regimentation of our existing resources and to our diminishing individual shares in those resources.

I do not believe this is the fact. If we permit ourselves to look forward to the resources and the markets of the world as a whole, there is real wealth available in abundance. There is likewise great undiscovered wealth closer at hand than this. Right here in America, though there may not be great undiscovered gold mines or great regions of fertile public land to be settled, there are, in effect, "acres of diamonds" close at hand to be discovered by the limitless inventive genius of man. It is but necessary to recall recent discoveries in the fields of electric power, of chemistry, and in the amazing realms of atom cracking to realize that if we are but permitted to remain at peace and to develop the treasures close at hand we will find that we are merely beginners in the creation of the standards of living of the future. We need but mention the Diesel engine, aviation, and the radio, plastics, and the soybean to realize that within the span of a single generation the creation of new forms of wealth has passed the bounds of earlier imagination. It was not long ago when it was a rule of our own Patent Office that time should no longer be wasted in examining applications for patents submitted either for perpetual motion machines or for flying machines. Both were thought to be impossible.

I believe, therefore, that we are justified in continuing to think in terms of possible abundance rather than in those of inevitable scarcity. We should continue to encourage and protect initiative and free enterprise.

But, before we enter upon the happy, distant, possible future, we must face the unhappy actual present. As America looks ahead she is faced by an extraordinary immediate obstacle. It is the kind of an obstacle that faced our pioneer ancestors when, in addition to the natural hazards of climate and agriculture, they found themselves suddenly attacked by a pack of wolves. For the moment it was necessary to drop everything else and defend themselves. It was necessary to erect stockades and to so order their daily lives that the wolves no longer would try to attack or so that the wolves would surely be beaten off if they did attack.

AMERICA'S PROBLEM TODAY IS DEFENSE

Today America's immediate problem again is that of defense. Today only the strong can be safe. The Nazis are waging a relentless, lawless, boldly announced campaign to conquer the world. Their army sings, "Today Europe is ours—tomorrow the whole world." They follow no rules but the rules of force. We wish it were not so; we know that such a policy can lead only to the destruction of the world's standard of living and happiness; but nevertheless the fact is there. The outlaws are attacking, and we must drop our problems of peace until this man-made hazard is overcome. We cannot gamble with the safety and the very life of our Nation. It is the inescapable responsibility of this year and next to make America safe both from without and from within.

To make America safe from without we must meet the danger on the scale that it presents. The attack is on a far greater scale than ever before has been tried. Some 15 peaceful, prosperous nations have fallen before it. We have decided, practically unanimously, in America upon a policy of adequate defense. Congress has appropriated the necessary dollars for a good start, but those appropriations are not guns. We have made a good start, but as yet our production of modern antiaircraft guns is negligible. We have made a good start, but, as yet, our production of heavy tanks is negligible. We have a good one-ocean Navy of about 325 major naval vessels. We have made a good start on a two-ocean Navy of about 700 major vessels, but it will take 4 or 5 years to complete it. We have made a good start, but as yet our production of combat planes is about 700 a month, while the Nazis' production is between 2,000 and 3,000 a month. Our ammunition is not ready, and this time the loaded French 75's that we borrowed 24 years ago are no longer there to be borrowed.

The lend-lease law has been adopted by this Nation as the key to additional time, while we continue to prepare. It has helped us to gain that invaluable time. Our first responsibility, therefore, is to understand this law clearly. It involves no alliances with any government. It implies no support of the internal policy of any nation other than our own. America's duty under it is to America. What it does do is to authorize the President to supply materials and supplies to any nation, if—but only if and when—the President deems the defense of that nation vital to the defense of the United States. It is part of our program of defense.

SUCCESS OF OUR DEFENSE IS DETERMINED WITHIN AMERICA

The success of our defense actually is being determined within America. We could choose no more favorable place for a test than on our own famous industrial assembly lines, and that is where the test is to be made. Agriculture, labor, industry, capital, and government share the obligation to create those assembly lines and keep them going and producing the defense we need. It is our obligation to unite, work, produce, play a little, laugh a little, grouch and kick a little, but put the work through faster and better than anyone else in the world has ever done or than anyone else can now do. We must make ourselves too strong to justify the risk of an attack upon us. If attacked, we must win, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek has said, "The more we sweat in peace, the less we bleed in war."

If we are to have a future worthy of our past, and worthy of our ideals, we must preserve the freedom of our 48 States, our insular possessions, the Western Hemisphere, and our ideals. At the same time, knowing the suffering, waste, and folly of war, we owe it to America to do our best to win this war without fighting it, and that is our immediate defense policy.

HIGHER TAXES

That policy must be paid for. It means increased taxation now and in the future. If we could afford to pay for all of it as we go, that would, in the long run, be the best policy. We cannot do this. Even now our defense program is costing nearly twice what our war program cost in the World War. From April 1917 through April 1919, we paid an average of about a million dollars an hour; today in the early stages of all-out defense we are paying nearly $2,000,000 an hour, and the program as it stands will call for nearly $4,000,000 an hour by this time next year. If we were actually fighting the war, it would be nearer to six or eight million dollars an hour. This means tremendous taxes and even greater indebtedness. The fair distribution of this taxation, the limitation of every possible unnecessary waste of governmental expenditure, becomes a vital part of the over-all program. Taxes should be imposed as far as possible in proportion to the ability to pay and the war profits, if any, should be turned back to the Government Treasury in war-time excess-profits taxes.

SCARCITY OF MATERIALS, MACHINES, AND MANPOWER

There cannot possibly be enough materials, manufacturing equipment, or manpower to provide both our nondefense standard of living of pre-war days and also our defense requirements. This compels us to divide our materials between defense and nondefense requirements, and even to establish priorities within those general subdivisions. The necessity is obvious. The difficulties of administration are equally obvious.

In addition to the need for the declaration of priorities due to the shortage of materials, there is the need for regulating the prices of materials, products, and labor, if we are to avoid runaway inflation.

If there develops an unregulated shortage of any kind of desired articles there will be a natural competition for them. If some people have larger resources than others, and are permitted to do so, they will offer higher prices both for defense materials and civilian supplies, and they will obtain the goods. This will force up the cost of living. This soon will bring an irresistible demand for higher wages and salaries, and so the price of goods and the price of labor will go up, although the goods sold and the labor done may be exactly the same as before. This is inflation. It means that the real wealth and the real labor is the same, but that it costs more dollars. In other words, the dollar buys less. If inflation comes slowly and the general price level rises gradually over many years, this makes no great difference; but when it comes fast, runaway inflation spells temporary tragedy.

The seriousness of the tragedy is in proportion to the speed and extent of the inflation. If prices suddenly go up and the value of money therefore suddenly goes down, those who receive fixed incomes, those who receive the proceeds of insurance policies, those who live on their cash savings, and those public-welfare institutions, like hospitals and colleges, that are supported in part from the proceeds of endowments, suddenly find that their income may be the same in numbers of dollars but that in actual value it amounts to little. With such a result, down goes our standard of living, lost are our savings for rainy days, and gone is the stability of our individual lives. It is our clear responsibility to use every means possible to forestall and prevent such a collapse in the value of our money. We should cooperate to this end and be patient and helpful in supporting a vigorous, bona fide effort to protect us against this tragedy.

STOP INFLATION BY STOPPING GOVERNMENTAL EXTRAVAGANCE

To stop inflation calls for stopping governmental extravagance, it calls for heavy taxation of incomes, it calls for converting earned incomes and real savings into Government bonds, it calls for a governmental declaration of policy against the issuance of worthless paper money, against the further devaluation of the gold dollar, and against the excessive issuance of bonds to banks in return for the issuance of credit by those banks. Finally, and most of all, it calls for widespread regulation of the prices payable for materials, products, and labor.

Turning from this general picture, let us then see how this will affect smaller business.

SMALLER BUSINESS LOOKS AHEAD

Until recently, and in fact for the most part even now, smaller business apparently has been completely forgotten in Government planning. It does not fit easily into state socialism. It is built upon individual courage and initiative. Smaller business won its own way to the front when, a few years ago, representatives of it were called informally to Washington and, to the surprise of those who called them, insisted upon thinking for themselves and speaking their own minds. The cause of freedom in America is deeply indebted to those who took the initiative on that occasion.

TODAY ONE IMPORTANT COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE TO AID SMALL BUSINESS

Today there is at least one important special committee of the Senate directly studying this problem and, while many may be familiar with its work, it is of such possible importance to the consideration of our problem that I wish to review briefly its accomplishments to date. It is called the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business. It was authorized by Senate Resolution 298, approved October 9, 1940. It consists of Senators MURRAY, of Montana; MALONEY, of Connecticut; ELLENDER, of Louisiana; MEAD, of New York; STEWART, of Tennessee; CAPPER, of Kansas; and our own ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio. Its clerk is Charles G. Daughters, who long has been devoted to the cause of smaller business. Its legal counsel is Crichton Clarke, who some years ago succeeded Louis D. Brandeis as counsel for the American Fair Trade League. It has the following six-point program:

1. A subcommittee which includes Senator TAFT is studying the vital question of smaller business capital.

2. Another subcommittee is studying discriminations in transportation.

3. The committee, as a whole, is making a separate study of the problems related to large-scale advertising and the effect of the control of mediums of general publicity and propaganda by big business.

4. Crichton Clarke is preparing a report on the effect of trade diversion caused by such activities as the use by big business of loss-leaders and profitless sales.

5. He recently has completed his report upon the interpretation of the Sherman Antitrust Act by the Supreme Court as affecting smaller business.

6. Charles G. Daughters is studying the possibilities of a cooperative program for smaller business education in connection with the Department of Commerce and the business colleges of America.

SENATE SMALL-BUSINESS COMMITTEE HAS ISSUED SEVEN PUBLICATIONS

Seven publications have been issued. These are:

1. Tentative Industrial Classification of Small Business. This is to help the committee analyze the scope of its problem and it divides small business into 164 classifications.

2. A Report on the Proposed Federal Reports Act of 1941. This was issued June 22 in connection with the introduction into Congress of S. 1666 and its companion bill H. R. 5180. This bill attempts to relieve small business and big business also from the unnecessary multiplication of Federal reports. Through the Director of the Budget it seeks to eliminate repetition of reports, reduce their cost and minimize the burden of their preparation. Relief in this field will

be welcome whether or not anything else is accomplished.

8. Small Business Problems of the Nursery Industry.

4. Small Business Problems of the Tire and Rubber Manufacturers and Retailers.

5. Report by Crichton Clarke on The Supreme Court in Relation to Small Business and the Sherman Act.

6. An excellent Small Business Bibliography, which not only lists available material, but contains an informative brief analysis by Dr. W. H. Gilbert of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress covering 15 major headings under which he classifies the problems of smaller business.

7. I understand that there is another publication, which I have not seen, and that it lists some 3,000 of the problems presented by about 2,000 representatives of small business in answer to questionnaires sent to them.

THIS COMMITTEE A STARTING POINT TO DEVELOP FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Obviously this committee provides an excellent starting point from which to develop Federal legislation that may be needed. Ohio is fortunate in being represented on the committee from its very beginning last fall by Senator TAFT, who has taken a great interest in the subject.

The one piece of legislation already introduced on behalf of the committee, seeking to reduce the number, expense, and burden of Federal reports from small business, is a simple illustration of the value of this committee even in its first few months of operation.

DISTRIBUTION OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Probably the most pressing problem of small business today is that related to the distribution of defense contracts. This apparently was completely neglected during the first year of the defense program. The Nation is suffering today from this neglect and probably will not recover from it without paying some serious penalties. I am glad to report, however, that in the past two weeks important progress has been made. There has been created a new division in the defense program called that of contract distribution. It is headed by Floyd B. Odlum, a competent businessman whom I have known personally from the beginning of his career more than 25 years ago. He is a clear and fearless thinker. He is a good organizer. He is anxious to render a competent public service in a businesslike way to the Nation and particularly to the small businessmen of the Nation. I conferred with him and with Leon Henderson and a number of Senators on this subject on September 18, the very day I left Washington.

ODLUM ESTIMATES 2 TO 4 MONTHS TO ORGANIZE SERVICE

Mr. Odlum estimates that it will take 2 to 4 months to organize the needed service. He is devoting every moment to this organization work. Pending completion of this organization, he endeavors to meet emergencies, but he does not wish to establish new offices until he is able to fill them with the right men and place them in the right places with the right kind of help, so that when the small businessman comes there to do business he will feel that not a moment of his time is being wasted. He hopes to establish these offices not in the marble halls of the Federal Reserve bank buildings where the gates close at 4:30 and where many small businessmen feel ill at ease in attempting to carry on business in their usual manner. He expects to establish 200 or more offices in industrial centers of the Nation at places where every man who may wish to do business with the Government on defense contracts may do so with reasonable convenience. He hopes to staff these offices with men having actual industrial experience, and even with men competent to give to each small business some of the technical guidance on defense contracts that each big business has on its own staff. This is to help avoid mistakes and to save time and money, both for the Government and for small business.

ODLUM HOPES ARMY AND NAVY WILL BREAK DOWN CONTRACTS INTO SMALLER UNITS

He hopes to induce the War and Navy Departments to break down their primary contracts into smaller units. Where that is not practicable, he hopes to increase the distribution of the work through subcontracts, in the hope of using existing facilities, speeding up production and keeping up employment in small industries that have been forced out of nondefense production. He hopes particularly to protect industries in communities that depend upon one or two small industries. In Floyd Odlum small business has a friend interested in doing the best possible service for the preservation of small business, both for its own sake and for the sake of the stability of our country. It will be impossible for him to do a completely satisfactory piece of work, but if small businessmen are sympathetic with him they will find that he will be able to do as much as they would be able to do themselves, if they were in his place.

SMALLER BUSINESSES MUST HAVE THEIR OWN INDEPENDENT ORGANIZATIONS

Finally, this brings us to the obvious need of small business emphasized by your own organization, and doubly emphasized by the call for help which is being issued by the new Director of the Division of Contract Distribution. There must be active associations of small businessmen through which they can act quickly and effectively. Small business cannot receive the representation it needs through industrial organizations or chambers of commerce, unless there be maintained special groups or divisions within these which will devote themselves primarily, rather than secondarily, to the interests of small business.

If there is to be not merely freedom of speech, assembly, press, and worship, but also the vitally important but less easily defined freedom of opportunity—which has been the key to America's development—small business and its friends must lead the way to preserve that freedom. This calls for clear thinking not only upon the internal problems of the individual business of each small businessman, but also upon the policies of his Nation and of his world and especially upon the place of small business in our future society. America is engaged in the defense of civilization. America's best weapon is her example.

Closed-Shop Drive Threatens National-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 29, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. STYLES BRIDGES, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, yesterday, for release this morning, I issued a statement relative to the current delays in the national-defense program, particularly the part the National Defense Mediation Board is playing in imposing the will of certain labor agitators on the Nation. The statement which I issued has brought a denial from a spokesman for the Board. This anonymous spokesman is quoted as saying:

The Board's record speaks for itself.

There is no record so far as the public is concerned. The only releases have been censored, publicized releases. Many newspaper reporters, including such men as Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, and others, and many of the public, have made futile attempts to obtain pertinent material which they know exists, and which is not made public. I know of no greater service the Board could perform at this time than to make available to the American people the public transcripts of the proceedings before the Board in every case they have heard thus far.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me relative to the closed-shop drive and the work of the National Defense Mediation Board.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee who has supported the administration defense-preparations program unreservedly, I am deeply concerned over a situation which is seriously impeding the progress of that program and threatens to do it further incalculable harm.

I refer to the present attempts of John L. Lewis and attempts of certain other labor leaders which are to follow, to deny workers, especially in defense plants, the right to work unless they pay dues to various unions, and to enforce their will by widespread defense-plant strikes if necessary.

The plan with which Mr. Lewis and others are now seeking desperately to chain unorganized workers is the age-old closed shop disguised under such innocent sounding titles as "Union maintenance," etc. What the plan contemplates in plain language is just this: Employers are to be forced, under penalty of having serious strikes or their plants seized by the Government, to agree to discharge any employee who does not join a union and pay his dues promptly.

Work on this Nation-wide program is just now getting under way, but the hope of Mr. Lewis and others is that by taking advantage of the defense situation they will spread their control over workers in all large industries, such as aviation, steel, and motors, and exact tribute from every one of them in the form of union dues—dues, by the way, which are spent without any public accounting.

Currently a drive is being made for closed-shop control of the so-called captive coal mines of the steel industry. At present they are operated as open shops. Earlier a similar drive was made against various shipbuilding companies, including the one at Kearny, N. J., which the Government seized. These cases, and other smaller ones, I am convinced by evidence at hand, have been mere trial balloons for the major drive to come when Lewis and others feel they have laid their lines sufficiently well to strike hard. If questioned, Mr. Lewis, who usually is frank about his efforts to entrench himself in his job and otherwise add to his personal fortunes regardless of the crudity of his methods, probably would admit the broad scope of his program.

I have, however, other indisputable evidence that a national drive is rolling. Chester Wright, author of a Washington labor letter and a close confidant of Mr. Lewis and other labor leaders, recently advised his clients as follows:

"A national drive to enforce the closed shop is under way. A drive for the closed

shop in every industry and in every plant is the immediate objective of organized labor wherever the issue can be forced without endangering past gains.

"C. I. O. will join the check-off with closed-shop demand.

"A. F. of L. unions generally do not want the check-off, but they will ask for the closed shop, stimulated somewhat by C. I. O. success.

"That is the coming big labor issue in defense industries. It is the one on which strikes will hinge."

Aiding Mr. Lewis in launching his part of the program, possibly under a mistaken impression that he is performing a patriotic service, is Mr. W. H. Davis, Chairman of the National Defense Mediation Board. Employers who have appeared before the Chairman report that he has told them in private conferences that they should agree to practically any terms, such as the closed shop, that Mr. Lewis proposes, as only through such acquiescence can Mr. Lewis be prevented from calling strikes and stopping defense work. When it has been suggested to Chairman Davis that he try to induce Mr. Lewis to yield on some of his demands, Mr. Davis, I am informed, has replied that such appeals would be futile, as Mr. Lewis is a very determined man who will not compromise. Protests at the glaring unfairness of this attitude by a member of a Government board have brought only a response stressing that defense work must go on and indicating that in the interest of "defeating Hitler" employers and unorganized workers should submit to Mr. Lewis' lash and make the best of the situation.

The work of the Mediation Board generally to date has been a pretty sorry chapter of defense history. Initially, the Board's composition was wrong. Four members were named to represent labor, four to represent employers, and three to represent the public. It quickly became evident that the so-called public representatives were swinging their weight in most cases to the union side. Quick to seize advantage of this situation, certain C. I. O. leaders began to threaten wholesale strikes and then hold them in abeyance only if the cases were certified to the Board. The Board docket soon was cluttered with cases promoted by confident C. I. O. leaders. They seldom were disappointed with results. Almost every employer who came before the Board had two strikes on him at the start, especially if he had tangled with the C. I. O.

Rules adopted by the Board providing for the transaction of business in secret and the refusal of the Chairman to make public minority reports in cases of great public interest soon caused public suspicion to be cast on every Board action.

The first big blow-off came with the North American Aircraft Co., of Inglewood, Calif., last May. This plant, engaged in carrying out vast defense contracts, was taken over by the Army, as ordered by the President, while negotiations in a C. I. O.-promoted strike were in progress before the Board. A minority of workers and Communist- or Nazi-inspired leaders had compelled the plant to close and were keeping it closed. The plant was subsequently returned to its owners, but not until they had accepted in toto the proposition of the C. I. O. leaders and the orders, sometimes euphemistically called "recommendations," of the Defense Mediation Board.

Not only were the union leaders not penalized by the recommendations of the Board for their behavior in the North American case, but they came out of it with everything they wanted, including a "maintenance of membership" or closed-shop contract.

Then came the Kearney shipyards case. There the union leaders pulled a strike in violation of a freshly signed master agreement not to strike for 2 years in return for substantial increases in wages and other considerations. It was common talk that the strike did not have the support of the majority of the men in the yards. I do not know that this has been proved, one way or the other. No proof ever was presented that a majority did support the strike.

At any rate, the issue was the closed shop, or a variation of it, a maintenance-of-membership contract. The employer refused to be a party to this device to compel men to remain members of the union and to pay dues against their will. So the Board, acting on an opinion approved by a union and a public member of a panel of three, recommended the closed-shop clause. The only alternative was the loss of the property by the owners. When they refused to accept the closed-shop clause, the Navy, by order of the President, took the plant over.

All efforts to obtain a copy of the dissenting view of the employer representative on the panel, Mr. C. E. Adams, have proved futile. Chairman Davis just will not give it out. Mr. Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, stated in his column of September 25 that he had sought vainly to get a copy of the Adams letter. Chairman Davis has dodged and evaded and has flatly refused to make public the Adams opinion and reasoning. It does not agree, apparently, with the philosophies of Chairman Davis and certain C. I. O. leaders.

This brings us up to the latest and current maneuver in the closed-shop war on the defense program. Two weeks ago John L. Lewis ordered the workers in the coal mines owned by the steel companies to strike and intimated that he was ready to call out other members of the United Mine Workers, if necessary, to enforce his desires. The entire output of these captive mines goes to the steel companies for use in making steel. They are integral operating parts of the process of steel making. An interruption to these mines is an interruption to steel making and hence to the whole defense program.

The sole issue in this strike of Mr. Lewis' in a critical defense industry is the closed shop. He does not even pretend that there is another issue. It is estimated that 95 percent of the workers in the mines are already members of Mr. Lewis' union. While there is no doubt that he would welcome the few thousand who remain out for reasons of their own, if they could be chained to the oars of his galley by a closed-shop contract, that is not the real reason for this one-man promoted captive-mine strike.

Mr. Lewis' effort to invoke the closed-shop clause in the captive-mine situation is to soften up steel companies for the big national closed-shop drive. The mine controversy has been brought to the Defense Mediation Board promptly. Chairman Davis, after backing away from the closed-shop issue in some inconsequential cases while the after heat of the Kearney case was on him, is again loyally allied with Mr. Lewis in this key case to get the closed-shop wedge into the steel companies. Mr. Lewis' act is to be adamant and Mr. Davis' act is to persuade or force the companies to give in because Mr. Lewis will not budge and production must go on. It is not an inspiring spectacle for the boys in Army camps who have been drafted away from their good jobs, their comfortable homes and friends to fight and perhaps die at a pay of $21 to $30 per month. When they and others are making great sacrifices they cannot understand the justice of Mr. Lewis' cash-and-carry collection methods.

After sundry meetings between employers and Mr. Lewis set before a Board panel consisting of Chairman Davis; Hugh Lyons, regional director of the C. I. O.; and Walter C. Teagle, an employer representative, in which employees protested against vigorous efforts of the chairman to impose Mr. Lewis' will upon them, the conference has adjourned until Tuesday, October 7. If the employers do not yield to Mr. Lewis' demands at that time, it is confidently expected that a majority report of the panel, signed by Chairman Davis and the C. I. O. representative, will recommend that the mine owners accept the closed-shop contract in accordance with Mr. Lewis' demands.

Meantime Chairman Davis is experiencing a good deal of difficulty in trying to remove the bad odor from the closed-shop clause. First he and certain other fellow Board members tried to conceal the fact that they were promoting the closed shop by calling it "union maintenance" and other sweet-smelling names. This did not go so good, because a closed-shop clause under any name proved just as odiferous as ever. In fact, an official Labor Department publication says all closed-shop clauses are identical.

In the Monthly Labor Review of October 1939, under the general subject of closed shop and check-off in union agreements, on page 832, an article describes "membership maintenance" as a "modification" of the closed shop and says: "This arrangement insures the union against membership losses. As in the closed shop, union members who lose their standing with the union would be discharged."

Another allegation about the closed-shop clause which has been giving Chairman Davis headaches is that an employer who signs such an agreement violates the Wagner Act. The specific question is whether signing a closed-shop contract is a violation of section 8 (3), which prohibits discrimination by an employer to encourage or discourage membership in a labor organization.

President Roosevelt on September 11 last addressed a letter to Chairman Davis asking him about this situation and closed with this paragraph:

"May I suggest that you and your associates consider this question—if necessary, with the members of the National Labor Relations Board—in order that the Government may avoid any conflict in its position."

On September 17 Chairman Davis replied to the President's suggestion that he take the matter up with the members of the N. L. R. B., and enclosed an "opinion" by the general counsel of the N. L. R. B. confirming Mr. Davis' stand that the membership maintenance agreement was legal under the Wagner Act. Mr. Davis closed his reply to the President with this statement:

"I think it is clear, therefore, that there is no conflict between the recommendations of this Board and the National Labor Relations Act."

The impression was given by Chairman Davis that the supporting opinion was the result of having acted upon the President's suggestion to "consider this question—if necessary, with the members of the National Labor Relations Board, etc." Mr. Davis failed to say in his letter to the President that the opinion was only a personal view of the general counsel of the N. L. R. B. and that there was no evidence of it having been endorsed by the members of the N. L. R. B. Nor does it appear that Mr. Davis told the President that the opinion was so qualified in a covering letter from the general counsel to Mr. Davis.

Whether this was an oversight or further evidence of zeal by Mr. Davis to promote the closed shop, I do not know. I cannot judge intent, but the result must have been to mislead the President, as it did others who read Chairman Davis' press release, in a critical matter affecting a policy of Government and the property and livelihood of thousands of people.

Here is one pertinent paragraph of the general counsel's letter. I am supplying the single quotes:

"'While neither the legislative history of the Wagner Act nor the decided Board or court cases deal with the problem directly,' there is nothing in either which in my view casts doubt upon the validity of such con-

tracts under the act, but, on the contrary, both indicate, as stated in the memorandum, that such contracts are within the express language of the proviso."

Chairman Davis and other promoters of the closed shop also have been striving desperately to create the impression that Congress in passing the Wagner Act gave approval to the closed shop. The facts are that both Senate and House committees which handled the bill declared emphatically in their reports on the measure that it did not seek to impose the closed shop on industry and that employers would not even be asked by Government to accept closed-shop contracts. It was generally agreed that the bill was doomed if it did provide in any way for imposing the closed shop on industry. Realizing this fact, proponents of the act took great pains to deny over and over that there was any such intent or that it would have such an effect.

Even Mr. John L. Lewis said to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor during the hearings on the bill:

"The united mine workers * * * does not have to go out and ask for anything that will compel men to join the organization. We do not want that."

Mr. Lewis seems to have changed his view since he was trying to get the Wagner Act passed.

Senator Wagner said on the floor of the Senate: "This bill does not establish the closed shop or even encourage it. * * * The virulent propaganda to the effect that this bill encourages the closed shop is outrageous. * * *"

The report of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor which accompanied the bill reassured critics in this positive language: "Propaganda has been widespread that this proviso attaches special legal sanctions to the closed shop or seeks to impose it upon all industry. This propaganda is absolutely false * * * the bill does nothing to facilitate closed-shop agreements."

The report of the Labor Committee of the House was equally vigorous:

"The proviso to the third unfair labor practice, dealing with the making of closed-shop agreements, has been widely misrepresented. The proviso does not impose a closed shop on all industry; it does not give new legal sanctions to the closed shop. * * * And it should be emphasized that no closed shop may be effected unless it is assented to by the employer."

As an appendix, I am attaching more complete quotations from the record of the hearings, the reports of the committees, and the debates on the closed-shop question. There can be no doubt that Congress never intended to approve the closed shop in any way at any time.

Despite the efforts of Mr Lewis to take advantage of the country's crying need for help in its defense program and set himself up as labor dictator of the Nation, and despite the earnest efforts of Chairman Davis to help Mr. Lewis achieve his selfish ends, I cannot believe President Roosevelt is going to permit this outrageous thing to happen. The President has led and is leading this Nation in a fight for freedom—the right to live our own lives as we see fit. To this cause we have dedicated our wealth, our efforts, our lives, and the lives of our sons. We are ready to make any sacrifice that we may be free men, undominated by Hitler or any other dictator.

Of what avail is it to us, then, if while we are busy defeating a Hitler, another dictator, a Lewis, or any other labor boss who refuses us the right to work unless we pay him tribute, assumes control of our destinies?

Must the defenseless worker who does not want to pay tribute to the professional labor organizer have him boosted on his back by a Davis while bent over trying to earn the cost of keeping off a Hitler?

Right here let me state my lifelong position on labor matters and the rights of the worker.

I have always, in public and private life, defended the right of the worker to organize, to bargain collectively, to strike legitimately, the right to picket lawfully and peacefully, and to protect the interests of himself and his family in any other fair and legal way. At the same time I have insisted, and shall continue to insist, on the right of every worker, whether a member of a union or not, to work whenever and however he chooses. Further, I deny the right of any labor leader, any government, or any enemy of our Government to deny any free-born citizen this privilege.

Frankly, the defense-production program has been badly slowed up, due chiefly to the desires of certain labor leaders for more power as well as the cleverly manipulated schemes of Nazi workers and other subversive elements. Fortunately, however, this condition can be remedied by one national leader. That man is President Roosevelt himself. He cannot only restore order in defense industries but also prevent further serious displacement of production by taking the following steps:

1. Operate the seized Kearny, N. J., shipbuilding plant on the Regular Navy open-shop principle free of control of any labor leader.

2. Decline to make the refusal of employers to accept closed-shop contracts a ground for further seizure of plants.

3. Reorganize the personnel of the National Defense Mediation Board so that the so-called public representatives will be truly representative of public and not C. I. O. opinion and insist on giving full publicity to all Board proceedings.

4. Prohibit the calling of any strike in a defense plant unless it is approved by a majority vote of workers employed in the plant at a secret ballot election held under Government supervision.

With perhaps one exception, the placing of the power to call strikes in the hands of the workers themselves, this suggested program can be put into effect without special legislation. If legislation is needed to place the calling of strikes into the hands of workers, the President can get it easy enough. As a member of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor I now pledge him my support for such legislation, and I am sure that a vast majority of all Members of Congress would pledge him their help.

The only argument offered at any time against regulating labor organizer promoted strikes is that you cannot compel a man to work at the point of a bayonet. The plan of having the workers decide for themselves by secret ballot if they desire to strike supplies a perfect answer to that argument. Permitting a man to say whether he wishes to continue working instead of putting his fate in the hands of a leader to whom strikes mean profits is not interferring with his rights. Rather, it is restoring to him a God-given right which has been taken away from him—the right to control his own destiny. So I predict that all workers who actually toil—such as the 20,000 Pennsylvania miners who now are striking against paying increased cash tribute to John L. Lewis—would welcome an opportunity to vote their convictions on striking. The only protests against this plan will come from labor leaders whose private bank accounts would be adversely affected by its adoption, and Mr. Davis, who apparently thinks that battles are won by surrender.

Friends with whom I have discussed putting this strike-control plan up to the President say he never will accept it because of the opposition of John L. Lewis and other labor leaders. Let me say that if this is the case, it is no good reason why this simple, effective step should not be taken. If placing the power to call strikes in the hands of workers will speed up defense production, the wishes of neither labor leaders, Nazi sympathizers, nor any other person who is obstructing the defenses of the United States, should be given the slightest consideration.

The safety and security of America must come first.

APPENDIX

Mr. WAGNER. While outlawing the organization that is interfered with by the employer, this bill does not establish the closed shop or even encourage it. The much-discussed closed-shop proviso merely states that nothing in any Federal law shall be held to illegalize the confirmation of voluntary closed-shop agreements between employers and workers. This insertion is necessary to prevent repetition of those mistaken interpretations which have held that Congress intended to outlaw the closed shop when it enacted section 7 (a) of the Recovery Act.

I hold no brief for or against the closed shop, but there are some who believe that it is a device which at times may be necessary to advance and preserve the living standards of employees. It is legal in many States, and there is no reason why Congress should make it illegal in those places where public policy now sustains it.

The virulent propaganda to the effect that this bill encourages the closed shop is outrageous in view of the fact that in two respects it actually narrows the now existing law in regard to the closed-shop agreement: In the first place, while today an employer may sign a closed-shop contract even with a minority group, the bill provides that he shall be allowed to negotiate such an agreement only with an organization which represents the majority of employees in the appropriate collective-bargaining unit covered by such agreement when made; secondly, the bill is extremely careful to forestall the making of closed-shop agreements with unions that are interfered with or dominated by the company, or with any organization that has been tainted at any time in the past by practices which are now declared to be unfair. The closed-shop agreement is to be allowable only when an organization has been free from its inception. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 15, 1935, p. 7570.)

Mr. WALSH. First of all, it does not require or request any employee to join any organization of any kind, shape, form, or character. Secondly, it does not seek to encourage or bring about the establishment of any labor organization under any employer where there is now none. It makes absolutely no change whatever in existing law, so far as the relation of employers and employees are concerned, except in those limited respects that relate to collective bargaining and the right of employees to organize without interference by employers. What the law now is with respect to the relations of employees with each other remains as it is * * * (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 16, 1935, p. 7658.)

Mr. WALSH. * * * That, standing alone, would make an employer commit an unfair labor practice if he required his employee to be a member of a union. The Senator understands that, of course. The reason why an exception has been made to the rule is that there are already contracts existing, permitted and authorized by certain States, permitting employers to make contracts with employees limiting their personnel to the members of a particular union.

That practice is quite common among the plasterers and the bricklayers and other masons. All this bill says is that no employer may discriminate in hiring a man, whether he belongs to a union or not, and without regard to what union he belongs; but if an employer wishes to agree and make a contract of his own volition with his

employees to hire only members of a company union or of a trade union, he can do so.

The provision in the bill makes it possible for an employer to say, "I will hire only company union men"; but the agreement must be voluntarily entered into and not forced upon him. Or he can say, "I will hire, as I do now and as the unions exist now, only members of trade unions."

In other words, if there were not this exception, what we should do by this bill would be merely to pass a law allowing closed shops. However, it is provided that the employer must give his consent. Even though nine-tenths of his men insist on their demands, the agreement must be voluntary, and it can be made only if he voluntarily gives consent. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 16, 1935, p. 7674.)

Mr. WILLIAM GREEN. Positively not. And we would not deny to a worker the right to say whether he wanted to belong to a union or stay out. We want him to have his free choice.

* * * * *

Senator WALCOTT. And you want to also, do you, leave him entirely free to his individual choice, whether he should belong to any union or not?

Mr. GREEN. Absolutely. (Hearings before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on S. 2926, 73d Cong., 2d sess., pt. I, pp. 79–80 (hereafter referred to as "hearings"), Mar. 15, 1934.)

Senator BORAH. Do the unions ever undertake to say to a corporation whom they shall employ?

Mr. JOHN L. LEWIS. Whom it shall employ?

Senator BORAH. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. I have no knowledge of such policy.

Senator BORAH. What I mean is, do the different labor organizations ever undertake to impose upon the corporations their union?

Mr. LEWIS. Oh, they ask for the recognition of their unions; yes. They ask for everything.

Senator BORAH. Of course they ask to be recognized, but do they ever undertake by strikes or otherwise to force the corporation to employ——

The CHAIRMAN (Senator WALSH). A member of the union?

Senator BORAH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. They sometimes require, do they not, a member of the union to be employed in some trade-unions?

Mr. LEWIS. I have no doubt that certain contracts provide for employment of none but members of the union, the so-called closed-shop contracts.

The CHAIRMAN. It is particularly true in the building trades, is it not?

Mr. LEWIS. I do not have specific knowledge of the building trades, but I do know that such contracts are in existence. May I say, however, that in the mining industry we do not press that point. In large areas of the mining industry every miner belongs to the united mine workers, but we do not press that consideration as a matter of contract. We think that the average man who works for a living would like to join a union and have the services of that union to protect him in his daily employment.

* * * * *

Before that time (the passage of the N. I. R. A.) we told committees of the Congress that if you would pass legislation that would give these men freedom of action they would of themselves join the union. They join an organization because they know enough to know that the union is a beneficient influence for a man who works with his hands because it can protect him better than he can protect himself as an individual, and it does not need the impassioned pleadings of a fervent orator to convince the modern American workman that it is to his advantage to join a union; he will join a union and avail himself of its influence and its privileges if you give him conditons that will enable him to do it.

The same is true in the iron and steel industry. There is no particular organization right now in the iron and steel industry. Why? Well, because the steel companies imposed a plan of company union on the men, because they prohibit them from joining other unions, and because the men are not free. They maintain an espionage system, they discharge them if they join the union, and there is no organization there. But give the workers in the iron and steel industry freedom from certain ghastly company unions that are imposed upon them and they will join to a man the legitimate unions of this country. They are trying to protect themselves through the modern practice of collective bargaining and increase their wages and improve their working conditions.

Now, the United Mine Workers, which is one of the standard organizations of the country, of course, does not have to go out and ask for anything that will compel men to join the organization. We do not want that. All we ask is freedom of opportunity for the individual and we know he will join the United Mine Workers, and we know he will pay his dues, and that is demonstrated by the fact that now, as I sit here, we have between 600,000 and 700,000 United Mine Workers of America in the bituminous and anthracite coal industry, practically all there is. (Hearings, pp. 151–152. March 16, 1934.)

Senator BORAH (speaking to John L. Lewis). The American workman has the absolute right to choose where he shall work, whether he shall be in a union or out of it, and corporations have no right whatever to interfere with his voluntary choice. (Hearings, p. 155. Mar. 16, 1934.)

There is nothing in the bill which requires any employee to join any form of labor organization.

* * * * *

In cases where employees choose to belong to an organization, there is nothing in the bill to compel an employer to make a closed-shop agreement with that organization or to consent to a deduction of pay to meet the dues of that organization (i. e., the check-off). These matters are left to the parties to settle by the orderly process of collective bargaining, and free from suggestion, much less direction, from the Government. (Report of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on S. 2926, printed in the record of the hearings on S. 1958, the later draft of the Wagner bill in the 74th Cong. Hearings, p. 23.)

The proviso that follows the fourth unfair labor practice (NOTE.—Section 8 (3) of the N. I. R. A as passed, but which governs the whole act as well as other statutes) is not intended to require any employer to enter into an agreement conditioning employment upon membership in any labor organization. * * * This proviso is not a mandate, but is a permissive exception made necessary by other provisions of the law. If this proviso were not in the bill a willing employer and willing employees could not of their own accord agree that thereafter a person seeking employment should be required, as a condition of employment, to join the employees' organization.

* * * * *

The committee is of opinion that if employers and employees of their own accord, in a voluntary spirit of cooperation, want to require persons thereafter seeking employment to belong to an organization; they ought generally to be allowed to do so. (NOTE.—In the original drafts of the bill the closed-shop proviso was effective as to new employees only. Employees already employed could not be required to join a union.) (Report on S. 2926, record of hearings on S. 1958, 74th Cong., 1st sess., p. 26.)

Senator WAGNER. Furthermore, the terms of the bill do not compel or even encourage a man to join any union. Nothing could be more false than the charge that a gigantic closed shop would be forced upon industry. The much-discussed closed-shop proviso merely states that nothing in any Federal law shall be held to illegalize the consummation of closed-shop agreements when they are sought by the majority of the employees in the unit to be covered by them when made. * * *

I hold no brief for or against the closed shop. * * *

The CHAIRMAN (Senator WALSH). Is that provision changed from the bill of last year?

Senator WAGNER. It is in most respects similar to last year's.

The CHAIRMAN. As I remember, it provides that by agreement employers and employees may decide to maintain the closed shop, and only by agreement.

Senator WAGNER. It must have the support of at least a majority of the workers. (Hearings on S. 1958, 74th Cong., 1st sess., Mar. 11, 1935, p. 41.)

Problem of the closed shop

The proviso attached to the third unfair labor practice deals with the question of the closed shop. Propaganda has been widespread that this proviso attaches special legal sanctions to the closed shop or seeks to impose it upon all industry. This propaganda is absolutely false. * * * The bill does nothing to facilitate closed-shop agreements or to make them legal in any State where they may be illegal; it does not interfere with the status quo on this debatable subject, but leaves the way open to such agreements as might now legally be consummated, with two exceptions about to be noted.

The assertion that the bill favors the closed shop is particularly misleading in view of the fact that the proviso in two respects actually narrows the now existent law regarding closed-shop agreements (Final report of Senate Committee on Education and Labor to accompany S. 1958, 74th Cong., 1st sess., dated May 1, 1935, Rept. No. 573, p. 11.)

The proviso to the third unfair labor practice, dealing with the making of closed-shop agreements, has been widely misrepresented. The proviso does not impose a closed shop on all industry; it does not give new legal sanctions to the closed shop. All that it does is to eliminate the doubts and misconstructions in regard to the effect of section 7 (a) (NOTE.—of N. I. R. A.) upon closed-shop agreements and possible repetition of such doubts and misconstructions under this bill, by providing that nothing in the bill or in section 7 (a) or in any other statute of the United States shall illegalize a closed-shop agreement between an employer and a labor organization, provided such organization has not been established, maintained, or assisted by any action defined in the bill as an unfair labor practice and is the choice of the majority of the employees, as provided in section 9 (a), in the appropriate collective-bargaining unit covered by the agreement when made. The bill does nothing to legalize the closed-shop agreement in the States where it may be illegal; but the committee is confident that it would not be the desire of Congress to enact a general ban upon closed-shop agreements in the States where they are legal. And it should be emphasized that no closed shop may be effected unless it is assented to by the employer. (Final report of Labor Committee, House of Representatives, to accompany S. 1958, 74th Cong., 1st sess., dated June 10, 1935, Rept. No. 1147, p. 19.)

Nor does the majority rule in itself establish a closed shop or encourage a closed shop, that being a matter of negotiation and agreement requiring the assent of the employer, as discussed above. (Same, p. 21.)

Education in a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. JOSEPH ROSIER, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER] entitled "Education in a Democracy." The article was published in the West Virginia School Journal of September 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the West Virginia School Journal of September 1941]

EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRACY

(By JOSEPH ROSIER, Member U. S. Senate)

There is much discussion these days about democracy and what it means to the people of our Nation. Those of us who have worked in the field of public education and have been devoting our lives to the development of our public-school systems feel that the American public school has done much for the development of our American way of living; and it is the outstanding achievement of our democratic form of government.

Our educational system is based upon the theory that general intelligence among the masses of our people is essential for the existence and perpetuation of our democratic institutions. The level of intelligence among our people will depend entirely upon the educational privileges which the young people enjoy. I think it was Emerson who once made the statement that "America is another word for opportunity."

That statement comes more nearly being true in our country than in any other today, but it is far from being a realistic fact for all of our people. In our modern civilization success and achievement depend very much upon the amount of education which the individual has received. We must not overlook the fact that large numbers of young people in our country, for various reasons, are denied the privileges of education adequate for their complete mental development. Someone once made the statement that the greatest human tragedy is "that a young person capable of high intellectual development should live and die in ignorance, and without the opportunity of growth in his highest capacity."

The ideal back of the establishment and promotion of the American public-school system has been that we shall have, in this country, an open stairway of opportunity for every young person of ability where he may climb, round by round, from the lowest grade in the elementary school to the highest courses in college and university.

We have probably done more to make that ideal a reality than any other nation, but the fact still remains that a large proportion of our young people find it impossible to ascend that stairway on account of the handicaps imposed by poverty and lack of opportunity.

In a democracy it is recognized that native talent and ability are not confined to the children of any one group or class. Leaders in our national life have been discovered and developed from many groups. It is the pride of our people that men have reached positions of great leadership and power in our American life from very humble beginnings. Men high in public affairs, who have sprung from humble ancestry and economic conditions, have often been referred to as illustrations of what may be achieved by an individual in this land of freedom and opportunity.

A democracy cannot survive unless it has trained and competent leadership to direct and control its affairs. In our country we do not have a ruling class brought up with the idea that they are born to govern and must be trained to control our Government. Our Nation, in an idealistic way, is a government of the people; and, in a very wide sense, it has realized its ideal. It is not an idle statement to say that any boy in our country may become President. It is true that very few ever will attain that eminence, but this is one of the few nations in the world where young people, without regard to class or wealth, may aspire to the highest positions of leadership in the State and Nation. In this land of freedom the greatest stimulus to the individual has been the consciousness that he may aspire to leadership among his fellow men.

In surveying human values the educator believes that the greatest loss sustained by our Nation is found in the lack of opportunity and the failure of development of those young people who have capacity for intellectual and spiritual growth. In times of great national crises the talent and the ability of a group of great leaders educated in our free institutions may be worth all that the Nation has spent for the education of its entire population. Our national history is replete with the names of men who rendered great service in the preservation and perpetuation of our institutions, and whose leadership was made possible by our American system of education.

We must never lose sight of the fact that citizenship in this country is a real possession of each individual, and that the collective exercise of this right provides the foundation for real democracy.

In view of these facts no one can overemphasize the importance of providing the best possible educational opportunities for the children of all of our people. There was a time when education was largely a matter of family and community responsibility. As our civilization has developed and life has become more complex we have learned that there are many localities which cannot provide the educational privileges that will enable their children to compete in life with those of more favored communities.

Our democracy will be preserved by raising the general average of intelligence among all of the people. We destroy the very foundations of national unity in a democracy when, owing to economic and other considerations, young people in some neighborhoods enjoy far greater educational privileges than those in less favored localities. In the struggle to build up a real democracy through the development of our school system we have shifted the support of public education from the smaller local units to larger units and to the States, and we hope the Nation will soon recognize its obligation to aid our educational system.

Many States have found is impossible to provide equal educational opportunity for all of their children, through local units; and so, slowly but surely, States are recognizing their obligations to provide adequate educational facilities for all of their children, without regard to the economic conditions in the communities where those children live. It is reasonable to hope the time may come when our Nation will recognize its responsibility for aiding in securing equality of educational opportunity for all of our people. The future existence of our American form of government, and our way of life, is absolutely dependent upon the intellectual and spiritual development of all our people.

The democracies of the world are threatened with a so-called "New Order" that would substitute for individual freedom a totalitarian authority which would subordinate the lives of people to the control of an overlord. Our Nation is recognizing its responsibility for the preservation of the rights of a free people under a democratic form of government controlled by the people themselves, and not by any supreme power.

We are engaged in a great effort for the preparation of our national defenses, so that we may repel material aggression and preserve the liberties of our people and of those in other democracies. In this period of stress, democracy and its type of government will meet their supreme test. There will be a strong temptation to subordinate those agencies and institutions which have been established in our country for the development of our spiritual and intellectual powers. Wars put a great deal of emphasis upon material force, and those who conduct them are inclined to minimize the powers of the human mind and spirit.

The totalitarian leaders have declared that democracies are ineffective and lacking in the coherent power to maintain themselves in a world of material forces. It is the duty of our Nation to demonstrate to the aggressors that a democracy can organize all of its powers for the achievement of a great purpose, and for the preservation of that freedom which has been gained through generations of struggle. The educator holds to the opinion that the development of the individual for the exercise of his freedom is essential to the very essence of democracy. The framers of our Government placed much emphasis upon citizenship, and all that it implies. They clearly recognized the fact that a government of the people could not be maintained unless it is supported by sovereign citizens of intelligence. The founders of our Republic early recognized the value and importance of an educated citizenship in the building up of our form of government, and our American institutions. More than 100 years ago, under the leadership of a great American, Horace Mann, was begun the movement for a system of public education that would provide an intelligent citizenship for the support of our American Government, and the development of our way of living.

It would be a calamity if, in carrying out our efforts in a great program of national defense, we should overlook the continued support of all our agencies for education. This Nation must depend upon the intelligence of the masses of our people. It is only in this way that we can preserve our form of Government. So, in our program of national defense, we must build more and larger battleships, more efficient airplanes, and larger and more powerful armies. But, back of all of these projects, we must continue our great program of education. This is important, not only that democracy and the freedom for which it stands may be preserved, but it is more highly important that we may have an intelligent people to cooperate with the leaders of our Government.

Aside from any contribution which education may make to our national defense in this emergency must be considered the difficult problems which our Nation and people will confront when this emergency has passed. The social, political, and economic problems with which we must deal after we have passed through our present emergency, will test the supreme ability of our people and their leaders. For this reason, even though expenditures for national defense reach towering

proportions, there should be no relaxing in the support of our systems of education. In fact, in view of the trying situations which will confront us after the emergency is over, really greater efforts should be put forth for the training and education of our people.

Students of history are convinced that, in the long run, the destinies of nations are in the hands of great intellectual and moral leaders. From time to time nations and peoples have been menaced by selfish and aggressive leaders who thought that the minds and souls of people could be controlled by material force. History disproves that theory, and is filled with evidences that aggressors in the affairs of nations have never achieved any permanent or lasting success. For this reason, in all of our program of national preparedness we should not overlook providing the widest possible opportunity for the development of our great intellectual and spiritual powers.

We give the highest possible recognition to the church and all of the agencies that it has developed for the improvement of the minds and the hearts of men. We give full credit to all of those humanitarian efforts that have been put forth for the amelioration of the condition of our people. We believe firmly that our system of universal education is the very foundation of our modern democracy.

We do not believe that a great nation can be built with masses of people groping in ignorance. As a democratic nation, we are launched on the great enterprise of building and perpetuating a government of all of our people. That freedom can be effective only as the rights of freemen are exercised with intelligence and judgment.

So today, in the midst of a world struggle, our Nation stands out among the nations of the world as the defender and protector of those who believe in the freedom of men. A great teacher has said that, "We shall know the truth, and it will make us free." Our Nation is built upon the theory of freedom of knowledge and freedom of inquiry and discussion. No program of national defense should overlook these principles which are the very essence of our form of government and way of life. A free people, with free minds, must continue to have ever-increasing opportunities for study and investigation of their own problems. Unless these freedoms are guarded and preserved, it would be futile to oppose the aggressors of the world today.

National Americans All Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 29, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. ADOLPH SABATH, OF ILLINOIS, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE, ANNOUNCING HIS ACCEPTING CO-CHAIRMANSHIP OF NATIONAL AMERICANS ALL WEEK

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement issued by the Honorable ADOLPH SABATH, chairman of the Committee on Rules, of the House of Representatives announcing his acceptance of the co-chairmanship of National "Americans All" Week.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The main problem confronting the American people today is the defense of our national existence against the menace of Hitlerism. One of the elements essential for this defense—just as important as tanks and battleships—is a united people.

There are more than 14,000,000 Americans who were not born in the United States. They came here from Austria, Spain, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland, France, Greece, Italy, England, Russia—those countries whose independence is now destroyed or imperiled by Hitler's schemes for world domination. Because of their loyalty to this country and their sympathy for the people of their native lands, the foreign-born wholeheartedly support every measure for the defeat of Hitler.

The foreign-born recognize that only the military defeat of the Nazi army will break the shackles which enslave their native lands and will remove the peril to the existence of their adopted America.

By their toil in the factories and in the fields, by the service they and their sons are rendering in the armed forces, the foreign-born are contributing of their utmost to our Nation's defense. By their hatred of tyranny and their devotion to freedom—for which they came to this country—the foreign-born have enriched our democracy and bolstered our determination to render all possible aid to the opponents of Hitler.

However, technical difficulties and unnecessary delays in the naturalization process interfere with the full participation of the noncitizen in our national endeavors. Discrimination against Americans of foreign birth in public and private employment deprives us of greatly needed labor and creates disunity at a time when national unity is essential to the security and defense of America. These barriers to unity must be eliminated because they are grist to the mill of appeasers and fifth columnists in their efforts to undermine our national safety and to prevent fulfillment of our common desire to put an end to Hitlerism.

Our national security can be safeguarded only if every person in the land—native- and foreign-born, citizen and noncitizen—is enabled to participate in its defense. Every obstacle to that goal must be removed.

In order to break down the false barriers of birth and citizenship that tend to divide the people and to eliminate unnecessary delays in the naturalization of noncitizens, the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born is conducting a National "Americans All" Week beginning October 21. This celebration will culminate in the national observance of the fifty-fifth anniversary of the dedication of the Statue of Liberty on October 28.

More than 100 prominent individuals in all walks of American life have united to sponsor this tribute to the contributions made by the foreign-born to the building of America and to their vital role today in our fight against Hitlerism. Together with the noted author, Louis Bromfield, I have accepted to serve as co-chairman of the committee of sponsors for National "Americans All" Week.

The supporters of Hitlerism in our own country would aid his schemes for world domination by dividing our people into native- and foreign-born. Therefore, they spread discrimination, promote unfounded suspicion and hysteria against Americans of foreign birth.

We hope that National "Americans All" Week will serve to convince the American people of the need for sympathetic understanding and action to eliminate undemocratic treatment of the foreign born as one of the steps necessary for the establishment of national unity. We know that once existing discriminations and difficulties are eliminated, the foreign-born and their organizations will be encouraged and enabled to redouble their efforts for the defense of America.

We urge that the people of the United States and their organizations unite in local community meetings and ceremonies during National "Americans All" Week as a fitting demonstration of our determination to establish unity of all Americans and to defend our country.

Southeastern World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ADDRESS BY MR. JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and interesting address delivered by Mr. Justice William O. Douglas, under the auspices of the Atlanta Civitan Club, at the Southeastern World's Fair, Atlanta, Ga., September 26, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the easy-going days of an earlier period the occasion which we celebrate today might have slipped by unnoticed. Earlier generations were concerned only with normal peacetime duties of the citizen. But in this day of world tension and turmoil the taking of the oath of American citizenship is a significant and historic event. Your duty as citizens becomes your duty to act in the noble tradition of free men and women. For today the world has taken sides: The sons of freedom are alined against the hosts of tyranny.

Those who take or renew their oaths of American citizenship this day cast their lots with the cause of free men. They join the ranks of those who pledge their lives and their fortunes against the destruction of our democratic institutions by the ugly forces which strut across the world.

In making that choice you take the same conscious risks that those earlier patriots did who forged the destinies of this Nation. You sign the Declaration of Independence in your own hand just as surely and with the same calm and grim determination as did those who signed it in 1776.

That document was no mere academic dissertation on freedom. The men who signed it knew that they must succeed or be marked for the hangman's noose. They knew what they were doing. You remember how John Hancock, as he signed his name in the big, bold handwriting which you see in copies of the Declaration today, remarked, "George III will be able to read that without spectacles."

When you raise your hand today in the oath of citizenship, our modern tyrants likewise will see it without spectacles.

Today Hitler's Mein Kampf condemns democratic institutions to destruction and their adherents to death or enslavement. His record of accomplishment on that score speaks for itself.

To think that we Americans have acquired immunity is to assume that a highwayman is not interested in the richest and most prosperous person who travels the road.

How the world came to be in the position where it now finds itself is at present a rather academic question. While germane to post-war problems, it gives no clue to protection against the hurricane which now sweeps the oceans. When the Nazi youth sing, "Today we are masters of Europe, tomorrow of all the world," they do not add "except America."

And so it is that this day the oath of citizenship has peculiar and special importance. It is a compact among free men that the tyranny of this age, the so-called wave of the future, will not engulf us. We do not fear to look into the future. We know it is ours.

The rights of citizenship are not automatically guaranteed. Each generation must underwrite them anew.

Freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of assembly in groups like this, freedom of opportunity, the right to read the newspaper of your choice, the right to listen to any radio program you choose, the sanctity of the ballot, the right to say whatever you wish to whomever you wish within the bounds of human decency, protection from unreasonable searches and seizures, the right of jury trial, these freedoms in final analysis depend on the will of the people. For in the end our machinery of government is nothing more nor less than the instrument by which the citizens convert their will into action.

That is our great strength, for by that means we can build our civilization along changing lines and meet the exigencies of each generation through evolution rather than revolution.

But these freedoms have been labeled by their enemies as our weakness. Dictators say that the very existence of these freedoms makes us an easy target for internal dissension and revolt.

At the same time they have endeavored to blind us to our own self-interest. They would like to have us say to ourselves that we are strong and that no tyrant can conquer us, and then have us sit back and pursue our normal course.

They would like to have us believe that we already are so invincible that we need have no fear. They would like to have us believe that no one would dare attack us.

Knowing our aversion toward war, they have used every available means to make "war" and "defense" synonymous. They have tried to invest our defense effort with all the immorality associated with war. They have tried to make us hate the defense effort and to hate ourselves for engaging in it.

They have played endlessly on our traditional longing for peace. They know that our way of life is not a "will to war." Hence, they would have us withdraw unto ourselves. For a "do nothing" American policy is part of the pattern of Nazi internationalism.

The medley of voices which arises when America expresses its opinion is a great asset. Through the free electoral process all citizens become willing and eager participants in our great national programs. But foreign influences seek to turn each protestation against a domestic injustice into a condemnation of our free institutions. They aim to magnify each of our complaints into an irreconcilable difference of opinion among us.

In that way dissension is sought. We are encouraged to look for motes in each other's eyes; it is hoped that we will be suspicious of our neighbor's motives; it is hoped that we will be convinced that a Nazi triumph will make up for democracy's failings.

But America has fast been seeing through this international trickery.

Democracy is not faultless. We are not blind to the imperfections in the civilization we have built. We know that we are not perfectionists, that much must be reconstructed anew along more just and equitable lines.

America has come to realize, however, that if this generation and unborn generations are to have the chance, the opportunity, to evolve a better society, its free institutions must be preserved. Under the evil eye of a Gestapo no such opportunity exists. Then all hope is lost; the mind and the body are enslaved.

Thus the efforts of those who would immobilize us were not successful. They did not lull us into the dream of self-confidence from which, as recent European history shows, there is no awakening.

Nor were we confused by that much-abused word "peace." Through a vast preparedness program we have sought to purchase insurance against the day of aggression.

We have done all those things because we know that were the rest of Europe and Africa to fall tomorrow, there would be no peace for us.

We know that we could not do business with Hitlerism without bartering away our precious liberties and living constantly under the pressure of blackmail.

We know that we could not safely send our ships to sea.

We know that we could not devote our productive facilities to normal peacetime ends.

We know that we should be forced to double and redouble a thousandfold our military preparations.

We know that we would have to reconstitute our economy and abandon many of our liberties to compete with the Nazi system.

That would be the meaning of peace for us under a Nazi victory.

These are the lessons which the tragedies of Europe have taught us.

And so it is that America, through the smokescreens of conflicting emotions, is seeing more clearly than ever before just where the lines of this world conflict are drawn. In spite of dangerous distractions designed to strain the bonds of our unity, Americans will not be divided into two or more irreconcilable groups.

In the first place, tolerance, and freedom, and civil rights are not debatable issues in America. They are the principles upon which this Nation was founded. They are the principles which unite us and have made it possible for us to make one Nation from many nationalities. They are the very meaning of America. On these issues America stands united.

In the second place, somewhere between the English Channel and Chesapeake Bay the great overwhelming majority of Americans have always kept hoisted the old flag of Revolutionary War days—Don't Tread on Me. On that point all Americans stand shoulder to shoulder. There they reach their common denominator. In final analysis, the question of whether at any particular time we are in danger of being tread upon is a very limited one. Any debate on that score is one of facts and figures involving a military and naval judgment. But when national survival is at stake, shrewd America takes no chances. A difference of judgment as to whether we are safe is reason enough to make certain that we are absolutely safe.

It is just because we cannot take any chances that we are getting down to the serious business of preparing our vast lines of defense—to the business of building more planes, more ships, more guns than the world has ever seen.

This is not an easy task. It is not an easy one even for America, with her untold resources and her great wealth of the world's finest scientists, engineers, and craftsmen—English, Italians, Germans, and Russians; Protestant, Jew, and Catholic. It means that we must do without, and that we must toil more than ever before and that we must give up many things which we have come to regard as necessities.

The American people are not alarmed and will not be alarmed at the meaning—or the magnitude—of the task that confronts them. Once they see what the security of the Nation requires them to do they will do it whatever the cost.

That cost will be measured in many ways. It will be measured not only by dollars. It will be measured by more men, more work, more effort, and more ingenuity. It is a cost which must be borne by all of us, and which will come home to us in myriad ways. We shall feel it not merely in taxes, and increased cost of living, but in denying to ourselves the luxury of doing our jobs on a business-as-usual basis. This is and must be a total effort, whether we are workers in an airplane factory, farmers, housewives, business executives, Government officials. Whatever our job is, we must do it better and more efficiently and more economically than ever before.

Some will merely feel the pinch of higher taxes and costs—will have to put off buying a new car or a new refrigerator. Others will have to work harder and more zealously—will have to make some sacrifice of time and money. Some will be confronted with problems that will try their souls, and test their deepest devotion and patriotism.

These are not problems that can frighten America. They are not problems that can split it into factions and groups. This Nation, moulded in the heat of battle against tyranny, tempered by generations of struggle for the common good, is not a fragile thing. It has the power of millions of men and women who have the strength of freedom, of tolerance, and of the achievements of a new and youthful country, enriched by a fusion of many races and heritages.

Sacrifice and work will not deter America. Since a group of daring men set up a new and united Nation on this continent, it has been our recurrent task to build a newer and wider prosperity and freedom from the foundations that had served a past age. That is our job again today.

Never in its history has America failed to do a job when it was finally convinced that the job had to be done. And we can do this job. Our enemies may try to scare us out of doing it by telling us that they are sure we cannot get it done. But they are only telling us that because they themselves are deathly scared that we will get it done. Once we turn loose the enormous industrial power of this country in this age of machines, once we turn loose the innate determination of this country in a struggle where victory goes to the people who can hold on the longest, we can and we will defend America.

The shouldering of the responsibility to do that job is a privilege, not a chore, for its citizens. Today American citizenship is one of the few remaining symbols of human hope throughout the world. It is a prized possession. It is a sacred covenant passed on to you by the founders of this Republic.

I know that you, like them, will bring it new honor and new glory as you march forward under the banner of victory for freedom.

All Out for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM S. KNUDSEN

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD an address delivered by Mr. William S. Knudsen, Director General, Office of Production Management, before the Union League Club at Chicago, Ill., on September 22, 1941, on the subject All Out for Defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I wish to express my appreciation of the privilege of addressing you on the subject of All Out For Defense. With all modesty, I imagine that I can deal with the subject first hand. This is my 16th month on defense work, and I have seen it grow from practically an infant to adolescent size—gangling, shambling, with too many hands and feet, but with great potentialities for the near future.

First, why "defense," and why "all out." When I was first called to Washington last June, the defense program, as laid out, did not amount to much in man-hours. Events followed quickly however, the most important being the imperative demand for help to Britain. The American appropriations were increased steadily; the lend-lease program was passed—well, you know the story. We have today the biggest production program of any country in any time in history, with a time factor which can most correctly be described as "X."

Not to go back over the past too much, the general picture is as follows: The Services have placed over 20,000 supply contracts of $10,000 or more with a total value of over $14,000,000,000. New plants and additions to plants in the number of 2,750 and with a value of 4.8 billions of which 3.8 billions is Government financed, and 1 billion privately financed. There are still a number of plants projected with Government funds, these being principally explosives and ammunition plants, for which there are no private facilities available.

As to production, it can be split into four major groups: Planes, tanks, guns and ammunition, and ships. We have expanded every existing airplane plant in the country, and have either built or have under construction seven additional large plants, mainly on the bomber program. We have correspondingly expanded the motor facilities and all accessory plants necessary to round out the picture.

On tanks we have created seven sources, and feel that we can cope with any demands that may come through expanded requirements. On guns we have provided for the small guns with proper facilities for all demands. This also applies to ammunition. On the larger guns the quantities are proportionally smaller and require heavier equipment, but we are on our way. On ships the initial work is done. We have provided for 165 ways for merchant ships and the launching program calls for 131 ocean-going ships to be completed in 1941, and 561 to be completed in 1942. On Navy ships, which were started earlier, we are in somewhat better shape, although it should be remembered that Navy ships have infinitely more man-hours in each unit, due to the higher technical standard of propulsion and armament. While this gives, after a fashion, the high spots of the program, you must remember that there are thousands of items involved and practically every scarce material which constantly has a tendency to increase the critical list of these materials.

This brings me to the material question, which is perhaps the most important one in the program. The material requirements of the civilian economy in the United States, based on precious years of experience, were not large enough to cause any concern—in fact, in very few instances were they beyond 75 percent of plant capacity. However, with the advent of the defense program and the general increase of national income, they rose rapidly and, parallel with this, the defense program growing with leaps and bounds has increased the estimated over-all requirement on critical materials to an unprecedented degree. For a dozen of the major raw materials vital to defense the estimated increase in the 1941 demand over amounts consumed in 1939 ranges from 33 percent in rubber to 250 percent in brass. The 1942 requirements, taking our program as it is defined today—and it may well be drastically augmented—will call for increases over 1939 ranging from 45 percent in rubber to 314 percent in aluminum and 393 percent in brass. The necessary expansion to accomplish this manifestly cannot be accomplished within the time allotted, so we are forced to consider how we can fit the situation to our facilities after expanding these facilities to the limit within a reasonable time.

One of the first functions of the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board is to pass on these expansions and the reduction in civilian supply, and try to allocate the available material between defense and civilian supply, so as not to upset entirely the economy. On the other hand, to assume that we can fully take care of both when defense requirements are an unknown quantity is rather ridiculous.

This defense job is getting to be of such magnitude that we must be prepared to accept sacrifices in our daily life. We cannot have as good a time and be involved in a war, regardless of how far away the war may be at this particular time. When I talk to some of our fellows here who cross the ocean in 5 hours going east and 12 to 14 hours going west, I feel that the distance from theaters of war is shrinking fast, and that we cannot depend on distance any more. When we add to that the fact that a substantial amount of our critical materials is imported and dependent upon shipping, we cannot consider ourselves isolationists in that particular respect, anyway. We have a definite stake in keeping the sea open, even if we have to do it with a club.

My experience during the last year tells me that conditions change so rapidly from day to day, when war is going on anywhere in the world, that we must be set up to deal with them promptly and decisively, and to that end I believe the newly created Supply Priorities and Allocations Board can perform a real service. Previous to this, the only means our office had of obtaining requirements was when submitted by the services, when appropriations were being prepared, and such items as Treasury lend-lease and South American requirements came through piecemeal for clearance. This resulted in an immense amount of paper work, which in many cases was all out of proportion to the amount of goods involved. With definite requirement forecasts procured in advance, the clearance becomes superfluous, and work can proceed in an orderly way with distribution taking place after the finished articles are available. The early days of the program also presented many difficulties, because specifications varied between countries, and it took months of patient negotiations to get the product in shape to where in the main it was uniform and the differences confined to minor details. Even now, when shipping war materiel abroad, it has been proved to be absolutely essential to have American mechanics available at destination to handle the assembling and particularly the servicing of the equipment, in order to get the quickest and best use of it in the field.

The problems connected with the program have been many, and there will be still more as time goes on. To change our industrial picture to a munitions picture in a short time is a heavy undertaking, but I feel that I can sincerely say that after a year's work dating from the day of the granting of the major appropriations and program is under way, and it is only a question of getting and keeping its importance before our people in a way that insures its unqualified support—not only when things go bad or good abroad, but at all times, until the job is done.

The question of enlisting the small manufacturers in the all-out effort is an important one, specifically as in a good many cases priorities are going to cut in on the small manufacturer's supply of material. In the early days this was recognized, and the Defense Contract Service was set up to bring the smaller and larger contractors together. Also, on prime contracts for standard material requiring no special tools, contracts were split up in smaller units to spread the work more evenly over the country. There was, however, when material for civilian consumption was plentiful, no particular response to the effort. Manufacturers who had been used to subcontracting followed their regular policy, and some success was had getting the percentage of subcontracting increased. District offices were created in 36 cities to expedite subcontracting, and a definite campaign was put on, with the result that this department alone accounted for $97,000,000 worth of contracts for the month of August. I have to pay tribute to the men who have accomplished this with Robert Mehornay as leader, as they had nothing but their ability to sell to support them.

However, in September it became evident that with civilian curtailment entering into the picture heavily and unemployment in some industries becoming a stark reality, more effort was needed to get both prime and subcontracts spread to a still greater degree. The manufacturer who had been busily employed on civilian goods suddenly became a source of supply for defense, and the pressure for defense employment became intense. Therefore, by Presidential order the scope of the Contract Distribution Division was enlarged. Directives were issued to the Service Procurement offices to encourage subcontracting or smaller prime contracts. The Division was set up as an independent division under O. P. M., with Mr. Odlum in charge, and was definitely made responsible for getting more contracts, prime or sub, into more places. It was further instructed to give particular attention to localities where employment was affected by priorities, and was given, through the services, some leeway in the matter of cost and freight, so that negotiated contracts could take the place of the bidding system, and consideration given to prime contractors who were able to sublet a greater portion. I have every feeling that this will help to spread the work even at some loss in cost and time; it will have an immense value in getting the full use of the well-known American ingenuity in tackling the problem in so many places. It will create employment to offset the loss in the civilian picture, and will make a greater part of our mechanical workers feel that they are part of the defense program

This brings me to the last part of my discussion, and perhaps the most important part. From personal experience I know the value of having general approval of the object of any task and of the organization carrying it out. When we first arrived in Washington a year ago, there was, with the exception of our President and his immediate Cabinet, no great concern over American defense and aid to foreign governments. A short time after the fall of France, Dunkirk and the bombardment of Britain whipped up public feeling to the extent of fear that England would be conquered and we were next on the list. However, when Britain held out, the same people immediately swung around to the idea that if the Nazis could not cross 20 miles of channel they certainly could not cross the ocean. And finally in December Secretary Hull told a few of us what the situation really was, and it was bad, and we all

went out to impress all we could with the seriousness of the picture. When Hitler entered Russia we seemed to drift further toward wishing that Russia might win, rather than that we might speed up.

The first attempts at civilian curtailment were met with streams of protests from business and labor, and somehow a good many of us seem to feel that business can go on on a comfortable scale while we arm the United States and take care of a good part of the rest of the world besides with goods and munitions.

Here is where I have to get quite frank. I think it behooves us all to wake up. This armament program of ours is the biggest ever attempted within the time limits given. It is not up to us that make it to speculate on where the stuff goes or how much better off we would be if we didn't have to do it. It is up to us, and now I mean all of us, to get behind the President and our Government and see this job through, regardless of the sacrifices we have to make in our comfortable standard of living to accomplish just that. I take the liberty of emphasizing that work is the only thing that will accomplish this job, and those of us who cannot work can join a cheering squad for those who are working. I think we should all give of our strength and good will everything we have toward the program and its successful completion. Nobody knows right now how much farther we will have to go in armament manufacturing to accomplish our object, but every one of us knows that whatever is necessary America can do and do it quicker and better than any other nation on earth. When I think of what has happened to the world in the last 4 or 5 years and how a strictly military organization, created for the express purpose of conquest, sets out to turn the world into a shambles, with hunger and disease following in its wake, then I think it is up to America to take a hand and state its position to the effect that this sort of gangster stuff has got to be stopped and stopped for all time.

When millions of lives are lost and tens of millions of lives are ruined because of an insane ambition to get everything everywhere under one thumb, then I think it is up to us to help to stop it. And I know that everyone in this room is willing to go along on that proposition. I have often said that any country is as strong as its families. They are what we have to protect for the country's future, and by the everlasting God, let us get behind our President as a united country and get it done.

Joseph Rosier, Teacher-Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ARTICLE BY MEDORA MASON

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Medora Mason, head of the department of journalism of Fairmont State Teachers College, entitled "JOSEPH ROSIER, Teacher-Senator." The article was published in the West Virginia School Journal of September 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the West Virginia School Journal of September 1941]

JOSEPH ROSIER, TEACHER-SENATOR

(By Medora Mason, head of department of journalism, Fairmont State Teachers College)

Ability to promote and accept progressive advancement and to grow continuously are among the reasons West Virginia's most illustrious educator, Dr. JOSEPH ROSIER, president for 25 years of Fairmont State Teachers College, was appointed on January 13 to become a Member of the Seventy-seventh Congress of the United States.

Chosen by his long-time friend, the Honorable Matthew Mansfield Neely, Governor of West Virginia, to serve the remaining 2 years of the latter's unexpired term in the Senate, Dr. ROSIER, again, as in the past, heads the list of distinguished educators who have brought national distinction and honor to the teaching profession, as well as to the entire State of West Virginia.

From village schoolmaster to the presidency of the National Education Association and to the Halls of the United States Senate is a long and steep ascent, but Dr. ROSIER, who is, and always will be, "Uncle Joe" to thousands of men and women in all professions and businesses who have come in contact with him through the years, has climbed it quietly and unpretentiously.

Honors have come to him because he deserved them, and because he merited them, and not because he sought them. That is why the teachers of West Virginia, as well as countless others, always have admired and respected him, and have been proud and glad when he was chosen to lead them in high places. Someone said recently, "He never sought greatness, nor envied those who did achieve."

Whether as a youth teaching his first term of school at Cherry Camp Run in Harrison County, as the president of a fine teachers college, or as the president of great State and national teachers' organizations, Dr. ROSIER always has been cognizant of his duties and his responsibilities in whatever role he has been placed, and he has given the best possible service to all of them. That he will exercise the same type of leadership in his new position goes without saying.

A native of the State to which he has brought honor for so many years, Dr. ROSIER was born in the village of Wilsonburg, in Harrison County, the son of John Wesley and Rebecca (Miller) Rosier. He is a descendant of a long line of honorable West Virginia ancestors. Educated in the elementary schools of Harrison County, Dr. ROSIER began his teaching career in 1890. Thus for more than 50 years he has been actively engaged in the field of education. This will be the first time he has retired from it even for a temporary absence.

From a village school Dr. ROSIER went to the principalship of the Salem school, thence to the superintendency of the schools of Harrison County. It was there that his public career began in earnest. At the same time he was furthering his formal education and in 1895 received his B. Pd. degree from Salem College. Later he received an A. M. degree, and in 1933, after the National Education Association had honored him as its president, Marshall College conferred an LL. D. on him.

But West Virginia's newly named Senator did not acquire his education merely by going to school. From the very first he liked association with people in all walks of life, and he learned from them. When he was county superintendent, later as city superintendent in Fairmont, and after he became president of Fairmont State Teachers College, Dr. ROSIER made it his business to contact people of every status. He has talked and taught at county institutes in practically every county in West Virginia, and he still believes those old institutes were good, even though they are outmoded; he has talked in high schools all over this State and elsewhere; he has served the National Education Association for more than 30 years, and has attended its meetings all over the United States, and he has been an active member of Rotary, making contacts with all of its activities throughout the country, in an official capacity. Through these associations, and the very active life they entailed, Dr. ROSIER expanded his viewpoints, enriched his thinking, and deepened his knowledge of life. Those who know him are quite aware that he goes to the United States Senate with a mind which is open and alert to the ever-changing times.

Books, preferably biography, likewise have been one of Dr. ROSIER'S sources from which he has developed a philosophy of living. He has a fine library, and he has been instrumental in building up, at his own institution, one of the finest college libraries in the State.

Young people always have been a source of inspiration to Dr. ROSIER, and his close association with them throughout his lifetime may be one of the reasons why he has maintained a youthful and optimistic viewpoint and why he has been termed "progressive" in so many ways by so many people. Fairmont State College is known throughout the country for its fine student government. It has such a government because Dr. ROSIER believes in young people and in their integrity when they are given responsibility. The students at his institution consider him their warm and close friend and they already have given him much acclaim for the new honor which has come to him.

The same may be said of alumni of the institution and of the teachers throughout the State, who have received benefits through the years because of his wise counsel and his deep interest and activity in the behalf of education.

When Dr. ROSIER was president of the National Education Association in 1932, one of the most trying periods in the history of education in this country, Oliver Shurtleff, dean of instruction at Fairmont, said, at the dinner given the former in Fairmont to celebrate his election: "He is the 'great commoner' in education. He has been an inspiration to pupils and to teachers. To the teacher he brought out the beauty of teaching and the glory of the profession. In all of his work he has realized and emphasized the idea of responsibility. He has always been able to rise to responsibility. As leader of the largest professional organization in the country, he will not fail."

Nor did he. Dr. ROSIER carried the association through that trying year, and climaxed his activity with an outstanding convention in Chicago. That he will acquit himself through the next 2 years is as much to be expected as was the success predicted for him in that other important national job.

So much for the educational motif in this distinguished West Virginian's life—a life which he feels has been very full and very satisfactory, largely because he chose the profession of educator in preference to others in which there might have been more material reward.

Despite the fact that Dr. ROSIER always has been a stanch Democrat, this is the first political office he ever has held. Nor has he actively engaged in campaigns, other than to be definitely alined to the party of his choice. He has made no public speeches in

behalf of any candidates, but his advice and counsel have been sought and given on many occasions. His friendship with Governor Neely began more than 40 years ago when Dr. ROSIER was a springtime instructor at Salem College, and Governor Neely, who long since had been acclaimed in high places of the State's distinguished sons, was a student there. Since then they have been warm friends. It is enough to say, perhaps, that their political philosophy has coincided through the years, and that Governor Neely's appointment of the educator who is his friend and supporter was not a surprise to anyone who has followed their careers.

As governor of the one hundred and eighty-fifth district of Rotary International from 1939 to 1940, Dr. ROSIER proved himself a "good fellow" and friend. He made it his business to visit every club in the district. He laid down plans for their advancement; he adhered to the policies of Rotary; he published a fine monthly bulletin and he put on an outstanding convention at Parkersburg. In other words, he made Rotary his very definite business for that year, and those connected with it saw marked advancement.

As a public-spirited citizen, Dr. ROSIER has given of his time, his knowledge, his wisdom, and his substance through the years. He served Marion County as food administrator during the World War, and is a consultant on education for the Work Projects Administration. In Fairmont he has served the interests of the public library, welfare, hospital, and board of commerce groups, and has acted in an official capacity with many of these, as well as with Rotary, and with the church of his faith, the First Methodist.

As a public speaker he has appeared all over the United States at educational meetings, and has broadcast many times on national hook-ups. He has spoken to gatherings of illustrious intellectuals in the big cities of the Nation, and to small, humble groups tucked in the valleys and hills of West Virginia. To all of them he has given the same fine presence, the same wisdom, the same cryptic humor, and the same excellent philosophy which have made him an outstanding leader.

When he was a young man, working toward a degree, and beginning his public life, Dr. ROSIER married Iva Randolph, daughter of two prominent West Virginia families, the Randolphs and the Mereditha. She also was a young school teacher. Together they have lived quietly and without ostentation, working, rearing a family, traveling, reading, enjoying their lives together, and making and keeping hundreds of friends.

Their home in Fairmont is a cheerful, modest, comfortable one. It is there and at their summer home on the Tygarts Valley River, which Mrs. Rosier supervises, and where Dr. ROSIER goes to rest and relax, that they enjoy their grandchildren, and it is at the latter place they do most of their entertaining, largely among the faculty group and a few other close associates.

Their three children, all of whom are married and have children of their own, are Mrs. Hugh Simpson, of Canton, Ohio; Robert Rosier, and Mrs. Herndon Smith, of Fairmont.

Dr. ROSIER is devoted to his family and to his grandchildren, and they to him.

In conclusion, it may be said that simplicity, honesty, and fair dealing with everyone, perhaps above all, summarize everything which has been written, or could be written about Dr. ROSIER.

He has given his life to the public. In return he has been given the plaudits and the rewards of that greatest of critics. As a United States Senator he will continue to bring honor to the teaching profession of West Virginia and to the Nation.

Father of Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON SENTINEL

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial dated August 29, 1941, from the Washington Sentinel, of Kirkland, Wash. The subject of the editorial is Father of Public Power. It has reference to the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE]. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Sentinel, Kirkland, Wash., of August 29, 1941]

FATHER OF PUBLIC POWER

With the Northwest teeming with preparedness activity—with huge manufacturing enterprises vying for every kilowatt hour of the Northwest's giant hydraulic generators—come thoughts of the man whose vision was far out in front, who single-handed and alone blazed the trail for public power.

Politicians may safely, now, exploit the benefits of these great hydro plants; it was Senator HOMER T. BONE who conceived them; in the midst of uncertainty, doubt, and disapproval; and he blazed the electric trail at his own political peril.

Today with Bonneville at its peak, Grand Coulee scheduled to full capacity, and a large-scale development program for the Seattle Skagit plant almost certain, it all seems a dream—an electrical dream—in the light of what was and what might reasonably be expected to accrue, at the time Senator BONE first began to talk public power.

We wonder if even Senator BONE could have conceived then the great hydro development of today.

It is true that these harnessed waterfalls could not have materialized without the sympathetic understanding of the Roosevelt administration.

It is also true that a wartime expansion has brought a great capacity demand.

Yet industry will be drawn to the site of these great dams; obviously the waterfalls cannot be taken to industry.

In other words, will West expand at the expense of the East?

Now a controversy is raging over the form of administrative control; the development of a great electrical empire is no longer doubted or considered.

It is present.

An advocate of one certain form of authority (or administrative control) is Senator BONE, and it seems that as an insignia of a task well done he might be accorded the honor of setting up the electrical authority. Not to mention the knowledge he must have acquired as the principal builder of this great electrical empire.

Unconceived as has been the present rise of hydroelectric power, so may the future portray still greater and unexpected electrical advancements as well as industrial developments.

Batteries of humming giant generators, swift cascading waters at Coulee, Bonneville, Skagit, and other hydroelectric developments to come, may presage the future and greater happiness wrought by the Creator's gift to humankind; they must ever bear mute testimony to the vision of the man who conceived the magnitude of the blessing.

In the distant future, when greater electrical and industrial development must have occurred, the plaint of these humming generators and cascading waters must ever be the magic words "HOMER T. BONE."

National Newspaper Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. NELSON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, we do well to observe Newspaper Week, October 1–8. In these disturbed days the country weekly and small-city daily represent the safest guide and best poll of public opinion. An old philosopher who knew folks said "Given light, the people will find their way." These words, true now as then, were uttered in tallow-candle days, yet they apply with equal emphasis to the present when lights of billions of candlepower streak the sky and almost shame the sun.

The great metropolitan daily, with readers numbering a million or more and whose managing editor is unknown and whose world is after all so very small, is too often out of touch with what is going on outside four walls. If we seek to learn what men and women are thinking, if we would listen to the heartbeats of humanity, we do well to leisurely travel Main Street rather than rush madly through Wall Street.

The country weekly and small-town daily not only represent the honest views of some local man, but the chances are that what the editor writes in his editorial columns is in harmony with the best thought of his readers. So the small publication, small in size but not in worth, is more than a publication. It is an institution plus a personality.

The editor of the kind I know is not easily swayed, is impervious to propaganda, and is absolutely unpurchasable. He dares tell the truth regarding public matters and, while never a snooper, will, when his suspicion is aroused, turn over a chip to see if there is a bug under it, and occasionally he finds one.

The hurried taker of polls may gallop along this way or that, sometimes with accuracy and at other times with mere acclaim, but for a real poll of unbiased opinion, including that of such 100-percent Americans as live at the forks of the creek, I prefer by far the pages of the small-town press. Here are to be found facts rather than wishes.

The country weekly, with its story of You All's House, like the small-town

daily, fills a permanent place in the lives of a free people. No metropolitan publication, no radio, no other source of publicity can replace it. Its editorial utterances are not for sale. Expressing community thought, standing for the upbuilding and betterment of homes, it is an influence far-reaching and helpful. The overstuffed daily may be glanced at and thrown aside. Not so with the country weekly, which tells the simple story of joy and sorrow, and which keeps us in touch with friends and acquaintances of the yesteryears. Its editor is not unknown. The paper reflects the views of an individual, rather than a company or corporation.

So, in these days of lurid headlines, too often misleading or printed to sell a special edition—or worse still, an idea—"We the People" in whom the fathers of the Constitution of the United States of America put their trust, a trust never betrayed, do well to observe Newspaper Week. There are nations where a free press is today unknown. Let us thank God that ours is not one of those.

Neutrality Repeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mark Sullivan entitled "Neutrality Repeal—Dodges Make Law Meaningless."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of September 26, 1941]

NEUTRALITY REPEAL

(By Mark Sullivan)

DODGES MAKE LAW MEANINGLESS

Movement for repeal of the Neutrality Act, or drastic revision, will get under way probably next week. President Roosevelt wants it. There is a drive on for it, and in Congress much assent to it.

The Neutrality Act makes certain things unlawful, among others, the following:

Unlawful for any American citizen or corporation to loan money or extend credit to a nation at war.

Unlawful for any American to sell war material to a nation at war, except for cash—never on credit.

Those are two main provisions of the Neutrality Act. Today they mean nothing. They may have had some effect for a year or so following enactment of the law (November 3, 1939). But in March of this year we enacted the lease-lend law. By this law our Government, as a government, extends practically unlimited credit to Britain; provides her with goods of all kinds (and the other nations on Britain's side). Obviously, when Britain can get abundant money and credit and goods from our Government as a government, she has no reason to wish to get them from our bankers and businessmen. In short, passage of the Lease-Lend Act was in effect repeal of much of the Neutrality Act. Repeal of these two provisions of the Neutrality Act would make no change in what we are doing.

In the Neutrality Act is another "unlawful." It is unlawful for an American cargo ship to go to any nation at war or even into a combat zone, which means the waters within 200 or 300 miles of a nation at war.

Superficially this provision of the Neutrality Act has real meaning. It prohibits American cargo ships from carrying our lease-lend materials to Britain; they must be carried in British ships or neutral ships.

The provision prohibits something, but does not wholly prevent it. For what do we do? American ships go through some devil-around-the-stump process by which they get under the flag of Panama. Then they carry lease-lend goods to Britain. Apparently even the United States Government does this. This seems to have been the recent case of the *Pink Star*—it was owned by the United States Government through the Maritime Commission, but was under the flag of Panama.

Repeal of this section of the Neutrality Act would be a repeal of a law in force, to be sure. But it would merely legalize what we are doing by indirect methods.

Yet another "unlawful" in the Neutrality Act is, "Unlawful for an American cargo ship to be armed."

This prohibition is sweeping, stringent. Even a ship that never goes near a war zone, one from California to Chile, must not be armed. The provision reads: "Unlawful * * * for any American vessel engaged in commerce with any foreign state to be armed, except with small arms (which may be) necessary for discipline aboard such vessel."

Repeal of this "unlawful" would mean something. But just how much? The administration wishes to arm American cargo ships. But what would that amount to? Any arming that could be done to a cargo ship would hardly amount to much more than an air rifle, as against a modern German submarine or raider. Probably the chief effect of arming American cargo ships would be symbolic, as a gesture of America's intention to protect its rights.

Ought we repeal the Neutrality Act? Many will answer on the basis of whether repeal would take us farther toward war. Would it? Not necessarily. For observe all those "unlawfuls." Every one of them is a prohibition put upon American citizens and upon ourselves as a Nation—so to speak—voluntary handcuffs. We have a perfect right to repeal prohibitions we have put upon ourselves. This can be no justified offense to the Nazis, no reason for them to regard us as more at war.

The real question is what we do after repeal. After we restore to ourselves freedoms of action we voluntarily surrendered, what do we do with the freedoms? At that point we can, if we want to, take steps toward war. And if we don't want to, we can refrain.

The immediate question, whether we ought to repeal the Neutrality Act under present conditions and whether to repeal all or only a part—all that is for Congress to decide. The law ought never to have been enacted. It is now seen to have been futile; it has not saved us from involvement in the war. Some of us felt at the time that it would be futile and knew quite well it was unworthy. Here was the most powerful nation in the world looking out upon a war arising in Europe. And this powerful nation was so hysterically eager to avoid involvement that it sought immunity by putting handcuffs upon itself and upon its own citizens by surrendering rights which it and its citizens and every neutral nation had possessed under international law from time immemorial.

Reclamation in the Great Plains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN C. PAGE

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of the House to the address made by Commissioner John C. Page, of the Bureau of Reclamation, on Reclamation in the Great Plains, at the first annual convention of the North Dakota Reclamation Association at Minot, N. Dak., on September 23.

An appropriate additional title for this splendid presentation of the importance of water conservation and utilization in the West would be, Don't Forget the Drought. The Great Plains is mindful of the disastrous results of low rainfall during the 1935–40 decade and through the Reclamation program seeks insurance against future disasters of a similar nature.

Mr. Page calls attention to the service Reclamation is rendering the cause of national defense on the Pacific coast and elsewhere through expediting its power program. Similarly, Reclamation can assure adequate food supplies for domestic purposes and to feed the war victims of other countries.

This program should not be halted in the Great Plains or elsewhere.

The address follows:

The invitation to address the first annual convention of the North Dakota Reclamation Association was received by me with genuine pleasure. The formation of this organization is an event of major significance. The problems left by the scourge of drought and the dangers inherent in a disregard of the lessons of the past demand a continuing interest in irrigation. The leadership that has organized this association can arouse and maintain that interest.

The urgent need for an organization with the objectives of your association was foreshadowed 52 years ago by John Wesley Powell, director of the Geological Survey and the outstanding pioneer of water conservation. On August 5, 1889, before the North Dakota constitutional convention, Major Powell said:

"The State of North Dakota has a curious position geographically in relation to agriculture. The eastern portion of the State has sufficient rainfall for agricultural purposes; the western part has insufficient rainfall, and the western portion is practically wholly dependent on irrigation.

"In the western portion all dependence on rain will ultimately bring disaster to the people. They are unwilling yet, a good many of them, to admit it, but * * * they will have to depend forever on artificial irrigation for all agriculture. * * *

"Years will come of abundance and years will come of disaster, and between the two the people will be prosperous and unprosperous, and the thing to do is to look the question squarely in the face and provide for this and for all years."

The years of abundance are here today. In his letter asking me to attend your convention my friend, Harry E. Polk, wrote that for the first time in 15 years a common sight on the streets of Williston was a line of trucks loaded with wheat awaiting their turn to unload at the city's elevators. But some of you may remember when North Dakota and the entire Great Plains region were swept by a series of droughts. When the reclamation law of 1902 was enacted many sections of the semiarid areas were still suffering from the disastrous effects of the years of low rainfall from 1886 to 1895. Those were the years of disaster, and without irrigation they will come again.

In this early drought period the Reclamation Service was importuned to come to the aid of distressed areas in your State. The Missouri River pumping project was put under construction to irrigate 25,000 acres in Williams County. But just as the project facilities were available for service a wet cycle came on. The farmers of that region lost their interest in irrigation. The sole exceptions were those in McKenzie County served by our lower Yellowstone project.

Time passed and North Dakota farmers continued to depend on rainfall for their livelihood. Under the spur of wartime prices for wheat vast areas of the Great Plains—not only in North Dakota but to the southward—were broken to the plow. Forgotten was the admonition of Major Powell that irrigation alone could make agriculture permanently secure in this area of undependable rainfall.

The chain of events that conspired to force abandonment of the Missouri River project by the Bureau of Reclamation and defeat the expansion of irrigation in North Dakota had tragic consequences. Barely had the Bureau officially withdrawn from the venture in Williams County when a fresh series of dry years came on. Williams County from 1930 to 1940 saw more than one-fourth of its rural population driven out of their homes. But not so in nearby McKenzie County, the only irrigated region in North Dakota. Bolstered by a stabilized area of 15,000 acres, its farmers were far better able to weather the troubled years.

Forty-eight of the 53 counties in North Dakota lost population. For the first time in its history the State showed a decrease in the census of its inhabitants. The loss totaled 5.7 percent.

Farm families were unable to exist under these conditions. They fled the rural areas. Power farming curbed the market for farm labor and contributed to the debacle. Complete statistics are not available, but census records indicate that nearly 100,000 persons abandoned the farms of North Dakota. Nearly half of the farms in the State went through foreclosure proceedings.

Meantime your cities and towns, almost wholly dependent on agriculture, faced the impossible task of absorbing farm refugees.

The conditions which prevailed in North Dakota also affected the other four States to the southward in the Great Plains. Repercussions of the drought years were felt from the Missouri River to the Pacific and from the Canadian border to the Mexican boundary.

But while irrigation had been abandoned in North Dakota except for the strip along the Yellowstone in McKenzie County, the conservation of water to the westward had moved forward. From 1900 to 1930 the irrigated area in the 11 Pacific and Mountain States was more than doubled. Wherever irrigation expanded in the arid regions, however the land provided was a magnet for drought refugees. The pace of water conservation was inadequate to provide farm homes for the immigrants who streamed from the Great Plains. I cite two examples. In Fremont County, Wyo., where the Riverton project of the Bureau of Reclamation is located, the population increased nearly 60 percent in 10 years. Malheur County, Oreg., site of the Vale and Owyhee projects, gained more than 75 percent.

A more striking example of the results of irrigation developments exists right in the heart of the Great Plains drought area. I refer to Scottsbluff County, Nebr., where the economy of both the rural and urban areas is dependent on irrigated agriculture. The county as a whole, from 1930 to 1940, gained 18.3 percent and the city of Scottsbluff showed an increase of 41.15 percent. Meanwhile the population of the State as a whole decreased 4.7 percent.

These population figures indicate that the secure growth of the arid and semiarid region rests not alone on irrigated agriculture but upon the development and maintenance of family-size irrigated farms as contemplated in the National Reclamation policy.

This policy is emphasized in the Water Conservation and Utilization legislation—an outgrowth of the original Great Plains program which was designed to combat the ravages of drought in the Dakotas and Nebraska. The family-size irrigated farm is the heart of the far-sighted effort initiated 40 years ago to conserve the land and water resources of the West and provide for its growing population.

Today the normal activities of Federal reclamation—and they include the rehabilitation of the drought-stricken areas of the Great Plains—are directed at three objectives of equal importance. One is to anchor farm families in their present locations by the irrigation of unsuccessfully dry-farmed areas to support an increased number of inhabitants and stabilize the surrounding region, including the cities and towns. Another is to replenish or supplement depleted water supplies for established irrigated agricultural areas. The third is to provide new agricultural opportunities by irrigation developments where farm families who have been forced to migrate can become self-sustaining.

Despite improved climatic conditions, migrations westward from many sections of the country are continuing. Many of those uprooted are lured by prospects of industrial employment on the Pacific coast, but others are seeking opportunities to return to the soil. The demand for irrigated land is unabated.

A frequent question asked is why the Federal Government should be so concerned over the drought, the migrations, and the disruptions of the economy of the States of the Great Plains and those farther west. The answer is that the Federal Government has a duty and a responsibility with respect to the conservation and utilization of its water resources and its human resources, too. The Congress has acknowledged and confirmed this duty and responsibility.

But, if you will, you may regard this concern purely from the viewpoint of dollars and cents.

During the 8 years from 1933 to 1941 the Work Projects Administration and its predecessors expended more than a billion dollars of Federal funds in the six States of the Great Plains drought area—North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. In this same period North Dakota's allotments were slightly more than $100,000,000. Incidentally, they were 15 percent higher than the State's quota.

You are perhaps more familiar than I am with what relief has cost your local and State governments. I note that from 1936 to 1939 the expenditures for relief of State, local, and county funds totaled $23,111,346. There is no doubt that the load was too great for North Dakota and other individual States to handle.

But the drain on the United States Treasury did not stop with the Great Plains. The far western States, unable to provide employment for newcomers from the eastward, also turned to the Federal Government. In those same fateful 8 years more than one and three-quarter billion dollars were spent for Federal relief in the 11 far western States.

This total western expenditure of $2,800,000,000 can be contrasted with the total cost of the Federal reclamation program, including expenditures since 1902 and outlays now definitely planned. The entire amount involved in this forty-odd-year program is just about half this Federal relief burden.

As in its early days of the present century, the Bureau of Reclamation today still stands ready to aid the Great Plains and the West in meeting the problems incident to the drought and the maintenance of its population.

I have never forgotten my impressions of the intensity of the drought when I visited this area in 1936 as a member of the President's Great Plains Committee. Subsequently, we participated in a series of studies looking to ways and means of alleviating pressing conditions and of planning security through irrigated agriculture.

The Great Plains program inaugurated by the Interior Appropriations Act of 1940 was a concrete effort toward the pooling of the activities of Federal agencies concerned with drought problems. Under the President's instructions, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, the Work Projects Administration, and the Civilian Conservation Corps have worked together. The National Resources Planning Board has been exceedingly helpful. Your State authorities in North Dakota have been most cooperative.

The combined efforts of these agencies have evolved into the broad water-conservation and utilization program. This program is our program. It is highly important that we and you of the Great Plains take a common view of water conservation and reclamation. We must recognize that the areas to the westward are confronted by problems which to them are as critical as those which have driven 350,000 farm families from your rural areas. It is only through united effort that the West can present a solid front which alone can bring solutions of these problems.

Under the water conservation and utilization program, there have been authorized for construction 12 projects in 8 States. These projects aim at readjustment of 2,500 families now enduring a precarious existence. Not all of them can be placed on irrigated land, but more than a fourth of them will be given security by the stabilization that irrigation will bring to the surrounding areas.

Take, for example, the Buford-Trenton project being constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation in Williams County, where an earlier reclamation development was abandoned in the days of heavy rainfall. The Farm Security Administration, which is planning the settlement and operation of the project, estimates that 265 families will be benefited. Thirty-five families now attempting dry farming on the project land will be rehabilitated in their present locations, while 115 additional families will be resettled on irrigated farms. Another 115 families will receive new security through readjustments that will be possible in the surrounding grazing and farming area.

This number of families seems small compared to the number who have been uprooted by drought and other vicissitudes. But this is only the beginning. A full expansion of this program will not be limited to the mere 2,500 families already provided for. It spells security for 20 times that number—50,000 families, more than 200,000 American men, women, and children.

Estimates of the Farm Security Administration are that for each irrigated acre in these water conservation and utilization

projects in the Great Plains, 30 acres of grazing land can be made available for the support of the livestock industry. Thus the 13,400-acre Buford-Trenton project will extend its benefits to more than 400,000 acres.

It is a matter for satisfaction on the part of all agencies involved that the Buford-Trenton project is now ready to begin its service. A large part of the credit must go to the landowners. They were cooperative.

On the other hand, the Bismarck project has been stalemated. Indifference to the distress of neighbors and the desire to make a personal profit have delayed the start of construction. I regret this deeply. But I assure you that my regret, no matter how deep, will not shake my determination to help build a project of benefit to the entire community. I hope that through the influence of the North Dakota Reclamation Association it may be possible to avoid another Bismarck in the future.

With the progress made in the water conservation and utilization program so far, it is clear drought-stricken Great Plains and other areas may be rehabilitated. It can be shown that by turning relief labor into beneficial construction, Federal funds can be channeled into great and lasting good. Sixty percent of the costs of these projects goes into labor at the site.

Furthermore, the reimbursable feature of direct appropriations for declamation from the Federal Treasury—the backbone of the reclamation policy for 40 years—still holds true. It has not been abandoned. It is evidence of the good faith of the beneficiaries of reclamation developments.

Now let us turn a page and look at the future of a program I know is close to the hearts of every member of this association.

Within the limits of funds available, investigations are being pressed by the Bureau of Reclamation to uncover worthy projects that qualify economically under the provisions of the law. With the installation of power-generating facilities at Fort Peck Dam, now probable in 1943, the Bureau of Reclamation will be able to provide low-cost power for pumping at projects which may be constructed in North Dakota and Montana. Reports are awaited with interest on the investigations of two major pumping developments. Both contemplate turning the waters of the Missouri River into channels for the preservation of agriculture in western North Dakota. Preliminary reports on the North Dakota pumping and the Fort Peck pumping investigations indicate highly interesting possibilities which, if found economically feasible, will go far toward averting future consequences of critical droughts.

Other investigations include areas on Knife River, the Cannonball, Heart River, and the Little Missouri.

I can assure you that these investigations will be prosecuted not only in North Dakota but throughout the Great Plains and the areas to the westward. But the people of the areas affected must take a realistic view of what irrigation means to their communities and the State. It will not do to assume that the Bureau of Reclamation will recommend a project without the interest and cooperation of the citizens of the area to be benefited. The project must not only be desirable but also desired.

Assuming that the North Dakota Reclamation Association will interest itself in this aspect, I call your attention to the dominating factor in our national life today. The country has set itself to an all-out effort for the preservation of our way of life on this hemisphere, and all other activities must be subordinated to this end.

The construction activities of the Bureau of Reclamation are necessarily affected by this policy. What new construction work is undertaken will depend on its relation to national defense. The continuance of the construction of projects under way will rest to a large extent on the availability of labor, priority, and transportation facilities for equipment and materials.

Food supplies are a vital consideration in the national defense. The problem of feeding 132,000,000 people in the United States and the multimillions of war-torn countries must be met. Federal reclamation is called upon to aid in meeting this problem, just as it is coping with threatened power shortages on the Pacific coast and the Rocky Mountain region.

"Food will win the war and write the peace," says Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, speaking from San Francisco on September 8.

The great western livestock industry will need more hay and pasture to produce the meats and dairy products that only irrigated land can insure in the face of this emergency and all droughts to come.

Nutritious vegetables, both fresh and for canning, and certain fruits in the increased quantities necessary must come from land for which moisture is certain to be available in the growing season.

It is only through the Federal reclamation program that an increased output of foodstuffs can be assured west of the one-hundredth meridian. The 4,000,000 acres of irrigated land reclamation projects are now serving are already enlisted in the cause of increased production. Nearly 7,000,000 additional acres, half of which are now inadequately irrigated, will be given a secure water supply by projects under construction.

The Great Plains and other drought regions will receive their full share of attention in the advancement of this program.

Similarly the power to drive airplane factories and other industries producing critically needed equipment is coming from multiple-purpose projects of the Bureau of Reclamation. The present capacity of a million kilowatts in reclamation plants is being trebled under current plans.

Preparedness for peace is as vital as preparedness for defense. The Bureau of Reclamation, while giving all-out aid to national defense, aims to have in readness a shelf of feasible projects strategically located with respect to labor. We propose to speed the completion of construction work which may be temporarily delayed during the emergency.

Work for unemployed industrial workers, soldiers, and sailors, and settlement opportunities on irrigated land for many thousands of families will be the prime objectives.

The North Dakota Reclamation Association can participate in this program of preparedness. With us you can follow the advice of Major Powell. "Don't forget the drought" is an appropriate slogan for reclamationists in North Dakota as well as throughout the West and for the entire country. Maintaining public interest in irrigation as an insurance against ravages of droughts in the future will help the people of the Great Plains to "look the question squarely in the face and provide for this and for all years."

Administration of Foreign-Agent Registration Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 14, 1941

REPORT OF INSTITUTE OF LIVING LAW

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, every law passed by Congress requires a period of actual trial before it can become clear as to whether or not the law is adequately and effectively framed to meet all the contingencies it was supposed to meet.

In the case of the Foreign Agent Registration Act there is at present an obvious need of the most vigorous enforcement and the most effective bringing out of the facts about foreign agents which the act was intended to give to the American people.

The Institute of Living Law, a group of earnest and able lawyers and social scientists, has prepared a report on this matter which I believe merits the careful study of Members of Congress. What follows is a summary of this report:

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE FOREIGN AGENT REGISTRATION ACT

THE PROBLEM OF PROPAGANDA

The Foreign Agent Registration Act requires agents of foreign governments that seek to influence American public opinion to disclose certain facts about themselves. Congress hoped thereby to deprive their work of the extra effectiveness arising from secrecy. The antidemocratic material that reaches our shores from foreign countries has behind it the well-knit, powerful force of the dictator-ridden states. But the pro-American counter-propaganda issued in this country is sporadic and disunited. This is as much of a disadvantage in this ideological struggle as if the dictators had guns and we had none; as if they had armies and we had only disorganized bands of farmers armed with clubs and scythes. Unless some effective defense is devised, democracy may be condemned by its best friends without the benefit of a fair trial upon its merits. Most Americans believe that all, however hateful their opinions may be, have the right to speak their minds. But it is contrary to our spirit of fair play for anyone to pretend to be disinterested, or to speak as an individual, and yet really to represent an ulterior interest. This explains why the first weapon chosen by our Government to combat the insidious propaganda of the dictators was, not the un-American weapon of suppression of the propaganda, but the American way—disclosure of its sources, methods, and purposes.

A desirable byproduct of full disclosure of this sort would be a degree of protection to those who, because they promote unpopular causes, are falsely attacked as foreign agents. Careful administration of the act would protect bona fide foreign agents themselves, as well. To those agents of foreign countries who wish to deal with us on a fair and open basis, the Foreign Agent Registration Act offers an opportunity to prove their good faith.

PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

The act seeks to make known to the American people the sources of foreign propaganda. It requires registration at the State Department of each "agent of a foreign principal." But the act specifically excludes diplomats, foreign government officials, traders, consular officials, and those engaged only in religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits. It requires that agents file not only their names but also their addresses, the names of their principals, copies, or descriptions of their agency contracts, and a statement of the form and amount of pay they receive. They must also file supplementary statements every 6 months describing their activities. Congress intended to give the Department of State power to "fill in the details" of legal requirements by its grant of power to the Secretary of State to prescribe rules, regulations, and forms.

THE INTENTION OF CONGRESS

Any judgment concerning the act's success or failure must be based upon the intentions of the people's representatives who framed and enacted the law. That intention may be learned both from the act and from statements made by them at the time it was under discussion.

This report undertakes neither to challenge nor to support the validity of all those purposes of Congress. But if Congress passed the act to get these things done, then the act ought to do them. This report merely analyzes the act and its administration in view of those purposes, and attempts to determine its effectiveness. The basis of our evaluation and of our suggested changes in the act and regulations is the answer to the following questions:

(a) Does the act, as administered, actually disclose the foreign agents intended to be disclosed, namely, promoters of racial and religious disunity, subverters of democracy, and foreign-policy propagandists?

(b) Does it obtain the kind of information that Congress wanted, including the identity of the agents; the principals backing such agents, including not only foreign governments but also private and political groups acting in their behalf, not only the nominal or pretended principals but also the real ones; the duties and relations of the agents to their employers; and the details of their propaganda activities?

(c) Is this information subjected to intense publicity, calculated to render the activities of such agents less effective?

In connection with all of these questions, the general inquiry must also be made whether any failure fully to achieve the purposes of the legislation is caused by faults in the act or by improper or inadequate administration and what changes in either regard will render it more effective

ACTUAL COVERAGE OF PROPAGANDISTS

An examination of the State Department files does not reveal the names of any of the Communist leaders in this country. Yet the Communist Party's organizational manual says:

"The decisions of the executive committee of the Communist International are binding for all parties belonging to the Commintern (Communist International), and must be promptly carried out."

Many notorious propagandists in behalf of Nazi interests are also omitted from the State Department's list. Examination of the lists themselves confirms the conclusion that they contain the names of very few of the foreign agents actually engaged in propaganda activities. About 300 agents are now listed in the public files at the State Department, but it is questionable whether any substantial minority thereof are actually engaged in the kind of propaganda that Congress wanted disclosed.

Certain specific faults in the law and its administration would prevent any enforcement, however vigorous, from being effective. The first of these faults is in the interpretation that the State Department has chosen to put upon the word "agent." The regulations provide that subagents, subsidiaries, and branch offices are not considered subject to the requirement of registration. Congress certainly did not intend to limit the registration requirement by any such nice legal distinctions. Even if Congress did intend to make such distinctions, commercial law would not support the Department's interpretation of the word "agent." This interpretation is effective to exclude hundreds of persons in the employ of registered and unregistered foreign agents.

LOOPHOLE FOR ASSOCIATIONS, ETC.

While the act blithely declares that the term "person" means "an individual, partnership, association, or corporation," the fact remains that our criminal law does not provide any procedure by which an unincorporated association (or, for that matter, a partnership) can be prosecuted or imprisoned; nor does it recognize any way in which an impecunious corporation can be punished effectively. Therefore, it seems that the Foreign Agent Registration Act could not be effectively enforced against an unincorporated association servicing a foreign master or against a corporation that took care to see that it had no funds available for attachment. If the statute required the officers of such an organization to file statements on its behalf, then they, at least, could be imprisoned or fined for its failure to register.

LOOPHOLE FOR CONSULAR EMPLOYEES, ETC.

Another series of loopholes may be found in those provisions of the present statute which exempt from the requirement of registration various classes of individuals who would otherwise be foreign agents in the strictest sense. Although the diplomatic representatives of a foreign government are, by customary rules of international law, exempt in their official capacity from civil and criminal jurisdiction in the country wherein they serve, consular agents and their staffs are not immune from such jurisdiction. Thus, it would be no infraction of the rules of customary international law for the United States to require that consuls engaging in propaganda activities register as agents of foreign principals. The elimination of these exemptions is important.

LOOPHOLE FOR PROFESSED TRADERS, ETC.

When the act exempts from registration requirements persons active in furtherance of the "bona fide trade or commerce" of foreign principals, or of "bona fide * * * scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits, or of the fine arts," it lays down standards which are inapplicable to totalitarian states. It is of the essence of totalitarianism that commerce, education, science, and art, as well as business, must be subordinated to the interests of the state. These exemptions, therefore, do much to destroy any possible efficiency of the existing law.

ACTUAL DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION

Congress intended that the act should require the filing, not only of the agent's name, but also of full and complete information about him with regard to his identity, his relationship with his foreign principal, and the nature of his activities. In this regard the State Department has not taken full advantage of the broad congressional authority to prescribe necessary rules and regulations. Documents defining the organizational set-up of corporations, associations, and partnerships are referred to in the prescribed forms but not in terms specifically requiring them to be filed. While the registration statements do require the names of officers and directors of corporations and associations and partners of partnerships, the names of "dummies" apparently would be sufficient even though the actual management might be in the hands of an employee or some persons bearing no formal relationship to the organization. One of the commonest and handiest of devices for obscuring the identity is to do business first under one corporate or associate name until it has been discredited in the eyes of the public, then to close up shop and open up shortly thereafter under a new corporate name. The only way to keep track of such shenanigans is to follow other bits of identifying information that may appear upon the public record. The State Department might have prepared cross-indexed, tabulated, and publicized such information. Instead, when the act was but a year in operation, it appealed to Congress to amend the law so that as soon as one such "front" is abandoned all the records concerning it may be withdrawn from public view. As a result, it would be very difficult for any private citizen to trace the relationship to each other of the various associations used by such "quick-change" artists to cover up their activities. The questionnaire requires a full statement as to contracts that are entirely oral but states no details as to the kinds of information required. The supplementary statement has no reference to changes that might have taken place in the agency relationship. Thus it would be quite possible for a foreign agent to have a contract for 363 days of the year which would never be revealed to the public at all under this statute. The State Department has ample administrative power to require full information about the sponsors of foreign propagandists as such. But it has seen fit to ask only the most elementary questions concerning the foreign nations, individuals, and organizations for which such agents act. Such questions as are asked certainly cannot reveal the kind of information that Congress desired about the identity and nature of both the foreign nation involved and the specific persons who are the propaganda agents' more immediate superiors. An examination of the material on file reveals that they certainly have not done so.

ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN AGENTS

Naturally, the most important information required by the act, both from the point of view of public information and from that of law enforcement, concerns the details of the activities of such agents. It is worthless to know who an agent is or for whom he works or what he has agreed to do if we don't know anything about what he is actually doing. It is because of this very fact that Congress provided for the filing of a semiannual supplemental registration statement that is required to contain "such details required under this act as the Secretary shall fix, of the activities of such persons as agent of a foreign principal during the 6-month period." Under this broad authority what details have been required? It is almost incredible, but the fact is that none at all is required There is not a single question in either registration statement that would require a description of any of the foreign agent's activities during the period between statements.

ACTUAL PUBLICITY AND AVAILABILITY

It was not the filing of information but rather the turning upon it of "the pitiless spotlight of publicity" that was considered a deterrent to foreign propagandists. The first action that might be expected would be the preparation of a list of the registrants, giving all the basic facts about them, properly classified and indexed, with, perhaps, a summary or abstract of all the important parts. No such thing has been done. The list is prepared without indexes or classifications and (mirabile dictu!) not in alphabetical order. No word of description of the agents registered or of information about them except their addresses appears on this list. Apparently no efforts have been made by the Department to use the press, radio, and other channels in accordance with the intent of the framers of the act. No press releases on the act were issued during the 3 years that the act has been effective except one which merely assured the general public that registration affords no grounds for assuming that the registrant is engaged in unpatriotic activity.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT

The lack of initiative of the office charged with enforcement of the act is high lighted by contrasting it with the recent action of the Post Office Department in holding up vast quantities of propaganda received from foreign countries, the mailers of which were agents of foreign governments.

The first task of the State Department is to promote the diplomatic interests of this country. It is not easy for one official of the State Department to deal on friendly terms with diplomatic representatives of foreign countries when some other official of the same Department is making trouble for their

propaganda agents. The administration of the act is not essentially a foreign affair at all. It is quite unnecessary to delegate this power to the office charged with management of our diplomacy. The State Department, less than any other department of the Government, believes in exposing its files to public view. The Secretary of State is the only important governmental official who does not make a regular report to Congress. Dominating the public relations of the State Department is the assumption that public comment, criticism, and participation in the conduct of foreign affairs is an unfortunate incident which cannot be wholly dispensed with in a democracy, but which should be restricted within the narrowest possible limits. The administration of the act devolves upon the Division of Controls within the State Department. For the performance of these and many other functions the Division of Controls has at its disposal a staff for which the total salary expenditure in 1940 was $52,815. Estimated requirements of this office for 1941 and 1942 run only slightly higher ($59,663 for each year). The bulk of these appropriations is expended for purposes other than registration of foreign agents and no single officer of the Division devotes his full time to such registration activities. Apart from any considerations of the capacity of the personnel employed in this Division, the notion that a $60,000 agency, on a part-time basis, can exercise any effective control over agents of foreign principals spending amounts hundreds and thousands of times as great is ridiculous. In a letter to Chairman SUMNERS, of the House Judiciary Committee, the First Assistant Secretary of State, Hon. Sumner Welles, took pains to point out, with reference to this act, that "the policy by which this Department was made the agency to receive registrations of this type was a policy initiated by the Congress and not by this Department." Here is a clear implication that the State Department does not want to be charged with the registration of foreign agents. To place upon the State Department and the Division of Controls the burden of administering a statute which they neither desire to administer nor have proper administrative facilities for administering is to invite the failures which have occurred. Our recommendation is that the implied request of the State Department to be freed from this responsibility be granted.

An objective analysis of the operations of the Foreign Agent Registration Act must convince any unprejudiced observer that the act has been rendered a dead letter, of no practical importance in exposing the propaganda activities it was designed to expose. Part of the responsibility for this failure may be attributable to deficiencies in the terms of the act itself, notably the long list of exemptions contained in the act, the failure to specify the kind of information to be supplied by registrants, the failure to provide effective sanctions against associations or corporations, and the permission to remove registration statements granted by an amendment which the State Department sponsored. These defects, however, might have been rendered comparatively innocuous if the act had been vigorously enforced. Chief responsibility for the fact that this act has become a dead letter must be laid at the door of the State Department. The Division of Controls, in that Department, has not been effective in carrying out the purpose of bringing correct information to the American people which the act was designed to effectuate. It has refrained from publicizing the information it has collected. The regulations issued by the State Department for the enforcement of the act make it inevitable that the information that Congress wanted is not collected. This result is reached by exempting the most dangerous propagandists from the requirements of the act, by omitting from the registration forms all questions relating to details of the agent's propaganda activities, and by inserting a series of loopholes which have the effect of facilitating evasion of the purposes of the act.

It is clear that if the purposes of the act are to be accomplished, the regulations under which it is administered must be drastically revised and responsibility for enforcement must be vested in an agency that is in a better position to carry out the objective of the act. Finally, the complete achievement of the purposes of the act will require certain minor strengthening amendments in the act itself.

Emergency Powers Relating to Business and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 29, 1941

COMPILATION BY HON. HARRY B. HAWES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Compilation of Emergency Powers Relating to Business and Industry Granted the Executive by the Congress, prepared by Hon. Harry B. Hawes, which, I think, will be of great value to Members of the Congress. The Government Printing Office estimates that it will require three pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to print the compilation and that the cost will be $135.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPILATION OF EMERGENCY POWERS RELATING TO BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY GRANTED THE EXECUTIVE BY THE CONGRESS, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE EMERGENCY POWERS GRANTED FROM MARCH 1933 TO AUGUST 1941

(By Harry B. Hawes)

EMERGENCY POWERS OF THE EXECUTIVE RELATING TO BUSINESS

Frequent inquiries from clients and correspondents relating to the emergency powers of the President have suggested this memorandum for the general information of businessmen.

Eliminating most of the emergency powers granted prior to President Franklin D. Roosevelt's election, and also the grants of military and naval emergency powers, the following may be found useful in general consideration of the subject.

The emergency powers granted the Executive fall into three classes: First, direct power; second, power qualified by ratification of the Senate; and third, power which, if exercised, requires appropriations from Congress.

The constitutional powers of the President may be summarized as follows:

Presidential constitutional powers are not enumerated in the statutes; they are derived from the Constitution with implied powers of execution.

The general powers of the President derived from the Constitution may be summarized as follows:

He has the administration of all Federal statutes, their execution, and the appointment and removal of Federal officers.

Congress may create public offices but all administrative officers are appointed by him.

He shall, from time to time, give Congress "information of the state of the Union." He may convene both Houses or either of them.

Subject to the approval of the Senate, he shall appoint ambassadors, ministers, and consuls.

He has the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties with foreign nations.

He is Commander in Chief of both Army and Navy.

Approximately 200 emergency powers have been granted our Presidents by the Congress prior to the election of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

To review each separate power granted would be a voluminous work, too large for ready reference. In attempting brevity there is a possibility of omission.

Emergency powers relating to business granted the Executive prior to 1933

On October 5, 1939, the then Attorney General, Frank Murphy, directed the attention of the Senate to certain emergency powers granted to the Executive prior to 1933, and included those granted to the end of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Act of June 19, 1912 (37 Stat. 138, sec. 2; 40 U. S. C. 325): The President is authorized to waive stipulations of the 8-hour law in public contracts "during time of war or a time when war is imminent."

Penalties are not to be imposed for violations which were "due to any extraordinary events or conditions of manufacture or to any emergency caused by fire, famine, or flood, by danger to life or to property, or by other extraordinary event or condition on account of which the President shall subsequently declare the violations to have been excusable."

Act of March 3, 1913 (37 Stat. 726; 40 U. S. C. 321): Employment of laborers and mechanics on public works for more than 8 hours a day is prohibited, "except in case of extraordinary emergency."

Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 204, sec. 86; 32 U. S. C. 39): Material of war, purchased by States from Army stores, may be requisitioned by the United States for use in the military service "in time of actual or threatened war."

Same (p. 213, sec. 120; 50 U. S. C. 80): The President is authorized, "in time of war or when war is imminent," to place orders through the heads of departments for arms or other required material with any factory, etc.; such orders are obligatory and must be given precedence over other orders at such times. Failure to give such precedence subjects the factory, etc., to immediate possession by the Government, and the manufacturer, etc., to imprisonment up to 3 years and a fine up to $50,000.

Same (p. 604; 10 U. S. C. 1362, 49:6 (8)): The President may demand, "in time of war or threatened war," that preference and precedence over all other traffic be given for the transportation of troops and war material.

Act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 645; 10 U. S. C. 1361): The President is empowered to assume control of transportation systems for the transfer of troops, war material, etc. (See also act of Feb. 28, 1920; 41 Stat. 457 (c).)

Act of September 8, 1916 (39 Stat. 799, Nos. 805, 806; 15 U. S. C. 76, 77): The President may prohibit importation into the United States of articles from countries which prohibit, contrary to the law and practice of nations, the importation of any products of the United States.

The President may also withhold clearance of vessels of a belligerent discriminating unfairly against American vessels, etc., during a foreign war.

Act of March 4, 1917 (39 Stat. 1192; 40 U. S. C. 326): The President may suspend provisions of the 8-hour law as to contracts with the United States "in case of national emergency."

Act of March 4, 1917 (39 Stat. 1192–1193; 50 U. S. C. 82): The President is authorized, within certain appropriation limits, to procure ships and war material, commandeer factories, etc.

Same (p. 220, 50 U. S. C. 191–194): The Secretary of the Treasury may assume control, etc., over vessels, foreign or domestic, in United States ports.

Act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 219, sec. 6, 220, sec. 1; 50 U. S. C. 36, 191): The President "in time of war or in case of national emergency" may designate places used for Army or Navy storage as places concerning which information is not to be published, in the interest of national defense; he may approve regulations concerning vessels in territorial waters, upon declaring that a national emergency exists "by reason of actual or threatened war, insurrection, or invasion, or disturbance or threatened disturbance of the international relations of the United States."

Espionage Act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 221–223; 18 U. S. C. 25, 27, 31–38): The President is authorized: To withhold clearance of vessels, domestic or foreign, carrying arms, etc., to a belligerent; to detain privately owned armed vessels to prevent their use against a nation with which the United States is at peace; to prohibit sending out armed vessels for delivery to a belligerent, and to require manifests to be delivered before departure of vessels.

Act of July 2, 1917 (40 Stat. 241, ch 35; 50 U. S. C. 171): Immediate possession may be taken of land needed for military purposes at the commencement of condemnation proceedings "in time of war or the imminence thereof."

(Extended by act of April 11, 1918 (40 Stat. 518, ch. 51), to nitrate plants, etc.; and by act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 888; 50 U. S. C. 172), to timber, etc.)

Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385–389; 50 U. S. C. 121–133, 135–143): The manufacture, distribution, etc., of explosives in the United States is restricted.

Acts of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 394, ch. 95; 40 Stat. 422 No. 10 (1); 35 U. S. C. 42), as amended by the act of July 1, 1940 (54 Stat. 710, ch. 501; Public, No. 700, 76th Cong.): If it is found that the publication of an invention by the granting of a patent might be detrimental to the safety or defense of the United States, such grant may be withheld until the termination of the war.

Trading with the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411–426): Penalties are imposed for unlicensed (1) trading in the United States with an enemy or ally of an enemy; (2) transportation of an enemy to or from the United States; also, for sending out of, or receiving into, the United States any communication except in the regular course of the mail. Corporations are required to transmit to the Alien Property Custodian lists of stockholders believed to be enemies; the President may require property of enemies, etc., to be conveyed to the Alien Property Custodian (amended and broadened by act of November 4, 1918; 40 Stat. 1020); persons holding property, etc., for enemies are required to make report to the Alien Property Custodian; regulations are prescribed concerning applications for patents, etc., by enemies.

Act of July 15, 1918 (40 Stat. 901, sec. 4; 46 U. S. C. 835): It is declared unlawful, "when the United States is at war or during any national emergency, the existence of which is declared by proclamation o the President," without first obtaining the approval of the Shipping Board (now the U. S. Maritime Commission; see 49 stat. 2016, sec. 904; 46 U. S. C. Supp. 1243), to transfer any American ship to a foreign registry; to sell any American vessel to other than a citizen; to agree to construct vessels, etc., before the end of the war or emergency, for other than citizens; to vest in foreigners a controlling interest in shipyards, etc.; or to cause an undocumented American-built vessel to depart from a port of the United States.

Act of February 28, 1920 (41 Stat. 477 (15); 49 U. S. C. I (15): The Interstate Commerce Commission is to direct that preference be given to transportation of such traffic as the President deems essential to national defense and security "in time of war or threatened war."

Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1072, sec. 16; 16 U. S. C. 809): The United States may take possession of any project licensed for the manufacture of nitrates, etc., when in the opinion of the President "the safety of the United States demands it."

Act of June 17, 1930 (46 Stat. 696, sec. 318; 19 U. S. C. 1318): "Whenever the President shall by proclamation declare an emergency to exist, by reason of a state of war or otherwise," he may authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to extend the time prescribed in the Tariff Act of 1930 for the performance of any act thereunder, and to permit the free importation of food, clothing, and medica supplies for use in emergency relief work.

Emergency powers relating to business granted by the Congress to the Executive from March 1933 to August 15, 1941

(The following references were compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, a bureau established by the Congress for legislative research.)

Act of March 9, 1933 (48 Stat. 1, sec. 2; 2, sec. 4; 12 U. S. C. 95a, 95): "During time of war or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President," he may regulate transactions in foreign exchange and the export, hoarding, melting, etc., of gold or silver coin, bullion, or currency, by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and "during such emergency period as the President of the United States by proclamation may prescribe," member banks of the Federal Reserve System are not to transact any banking business except in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury approved by the President.

(Amended by joint resolution of May 7, 1940 (54 Stat. 179, ch. 185; Public Resolution No. 69, 76th Cong.), by extending the provision for regulation, etc., by the President to payments to banking institutions, and to transfers, withdrawals, or exports of or dealings in, evidences of indebtedness or ownership of property in which any foreign state, etc., has any interest.)

Act of May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 51, sec. 43; 31 U. S. C. 821): Whenever the President finds that "the foreign commerce of the United States is adversely affected" by foreign-currency depreciation or action "is necessary in order to regulate and maintain the parity of currency issues of the United States," or "an economic emergency requires an expansion of credit," or an expansion of credit is necessary for the "stabilization at proper levels of the currencies of various governments," he is authorized (a) to conduct open-market operations in United States obligations through the Federal Reserve Board; (b) to direct the issuance of United States notes; or (c) to fix the weight of the dollar at not less than 50 percent of its present weight (amended by adding "nor * * * more than 60 percent" by act of Jan. 30, 1934, 48 Stat. 342, sec. 12).

(These powers of the President expire June 30, 1941, unless he "sooner declares the existing emergency ended"; act of July 6, 1939 (53 Stat. 998, ch. 260; 31 U. S. C. Supp. 821); but see H. R. 4646 (77th Cong.).)

Act of May 18, 1933 (48 Stat. 68, sec. 20; 16 U. S. C. 831s): The United States reserves the right, "in case of war or national emergency declared by Congress," to take possession of property described in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, for the purpose of manufacturing explosives or for other war purposes.

Act of May 18, 1933 (48 Stat. 62 (m); 16 U. S. C. 831d (m)): Products of the Tennessee Valley Authority may be sold, for use outside the United States, to allies of the United States.

Act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1104, No. 606; 47 U. S. C. 606): The President may direct that "during the continuance of any war in which the United States is engaged" such communications as he deems essential to the national defense and security be given preference by any carrier subject to the Communications Act.

Act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1104, sec. 606; 47 U. S. C. 606): "Upon proclamation by the President that there exists war or a threat of war or a state of public peril or disaster or other national emergency, or in order to preserve the neutrality of the United States," he may suspend regulations of the Federal Communications Commission as to radio stations, or close or assume control of stations.

Act of June 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 1262 (f); 12 U. S. C. 1431): The Federal Home Loan Bank Board may require Federal home-loan banks to rediscount notes in certain cases "whenever in the judgment of at least four of its members an emergency exists."

Act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 849 (c); 16 U. S. C. Supp. 824a): The Federal Power Commission may require certain temporary connections of facilities, etc., to prevent shortage of electric energy "during the continuance of any war in which the United States is engaged, or whenever the Commission determines that an emergency exists."

Act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1013, ch. 825, sec. 6; 40 U. S. C. Supp. 276a–5): The President may suspend certain provisions of law relating to wages of laborers, etc., under public building contracts, "in the event of a national emergency."

Act of April 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1210 No. 4 (2) (e) (f); 46 U. S. C. Supp. 1305): Under contracts for the carriage of goods by sea, neither the carrier nor the ship is to be liable for loss or damage arising or resulting from an "act of war" or "act of public enemies."

Act of September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 916, sec. 509; 7 U. S. C. Supp. 1179): "Whenever the President finds and proclaims that a national economic or other emergency exists with respect to sugar," he may suspend titles II (Quota provisions) and III (Conditional-payment provisions) of the Sugar Act of 1937.

Act of February 16, 1938 (52 Stat. 64, sec. 371 (b); 7 U. S. C. Supp. 1371): Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe that, because of "a national emergency," etc., the marketing quotas for corn, wheat, cotton, rice, or tobacco should be increased or terminated, he must cause an immediate investigation to determine whether such increase or termination is needed. (Amended by act of April 3, 1941 (55 Stat. —; Public Law 27, 77th Cong.), to include peanuts.)

Act of June 16, 1938 (52 Stat. 708, ch. 458, No. 3; 50 U. S. C. Supp. 93): A statutory limit r the educational orders (for the manufacture of special munitions, etc.) which may be awarded to any one actory is not applicable "during any war in which the United States is engaged."

Act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811, sec. 4; 50 U. S. C. Supp. 98c): Strategic and critical materials acquired to supply industrial, military, and naval needs of the country and to prevent the dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for such supplies are to be "used only upon the order of the President in time of war, or when he shall find that a national emergency exists with respect to national defense as a consequence of the threat of war."

Act of June 29, 1939 (53 Stat. 890): The President may make available certain funds

for the protection of American citizens in any foreign country, whenever he "shall find that a state of emergency exists endangering the lives" of such citizens.

Act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1254, sec. 1 (d); 1255, sec. 3 (a); 46 U. S. C. Supp. 1202, 1242): "Whenever the President shall proclaim that the security of the national defense makes it advisable, or during any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President," the United States Maritime Commission may terminate charters of vessels, and may requisition, etc., vessels of citizens for any period during such emergency.

Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418, ch. 701; 15 U. S. C. Supp. 713a–6): The Commodity Credit Corporation, in selling surplus agricultural commodities to foreign governments, must require the condition that these commodities are to be held in reserve for at least 5 years "unless a war or war emergency results in a serious interruption of normal supplies of such commodities."

Neutrality Act (joint resolution) of November 4, 1939 (54 Stat. 4–12; Public Res. No. 54, 76th Cong.; 22 U. S. C. Supp. 245j to 245j–19): The President or Congress may find that a state of war exists between foreign states; in such case arms, ammunition, and implements of war my be sold to the belligerents for cash, but American ships are prohibited from carrying arms, etc., to the ports of the belligerents, and from transporting supplies or passengers to the ports of the belligerents, except to certain ports which are not in the European war zone; exportation or transportation of any articles or materials to the belligerents prohibited, until all right, title, and interest therein shall have been transferred to some foreign government, agency, or national, except that private shipments to ports within the exempted areas, and inland transportation to Canada, can be made without transfer of title.

The President may define combat areas around belligerent or neutral ports into which American citizens or vessels must not go; the use of American ports by submarines or armed merchant vessels of the belligerents is restricted; vessels are required to give bond not to make deliveries to belligerent ships; restrictions are placed on travel by citizens of the United States on vessels of belligerents, on arming of American vessels, and on dealing in financial transactions with belligerents.

Provision is made for regulation of the munitions industry by the National Munitions Control Board. (For act of June 29, 1940, see No. 169 below.)

Navy Department Appropriation Act of June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 293, 297; Public, No. 588): The Secretary of the Navy may exceed the statutory limit, under the Bureau of Engineering and Bureau of Construction and Repair (consolidated into Bureau of Ships by act of June 20, 1940, 54 Stat. 492–493; Public, No. 644, 76th Cong.), on repairs and alterations to vessels commissioned or converted "to meet the existing emergency."

Thirty-four million dollars is appropriated as an emergency fund to enable the President to "provide for emergencies affecting the national security and defense," including purposes specified under the Navy Department Appropriation Acts of 1940 and 1941, the furnishing of Government-owned facilities at privately owned plants, the training of civilian personnel necessary for the protection of essential equipment, etc., and the procurement of strategic and critical materials.

Act of June 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 395, sec. 10; Public, No. 629): Provisions of the act of April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 591), authorizing contracts upon a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis in certain cases, are to be applicable to naval public works and utilities projects in the fourteenth naval district (at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii) "during the period of any national emergency declared by the President to exist."

Act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676–680; Public, No. 671): Whenever the President deems it to be in the best interests of national defense, "during the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist": (a) The Secretary of the Navy (or the Secretary of the Treasury, in the case of Coast Guard contracts) may make advance payments to contractors up to 30 percent of the contract prices; (b) the Secretary of the Navy may negotiate contracts for the acquisition, alteration, etc., of naval vessels or aircraft, without competition; and deliveries of materials authorized under this act must be given priority over all deliveries for private account or for export.

(Amended by the act of May 31, 1941 (55 Stat. —; Public, No. 89, 77th Cong.), which extends the priority provision for deliveries of material to deliveries under (1) contracts for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States under the Lease Lend Act; (2) contracts which the President deems necessary to promote the defense of the United States; and (3) subcontracts which the President deems necessary to the fulfillment of any contracts specified in the act.)

Certain restrictions on contracts for aircraft for the Navy are limited to contracts where the award exceeds $25,000 "during the period of the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist."

The Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy may, under regulations prescribed by the President, certify to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as to the cost, etc., of additional equipment needed under contracts for construction, etc., of vessels and aircraft "during the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist."

The regular working hours of the Navy Department and the Coast Guard are to be 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week "during the period of national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist," notwithstanding any other provisions of law; but these hours may be exceeded where additional employees cannot be obtained to meet the exigencies of the situation.

The President may suspend, for the War and Navy Departments and for the Coast Guard, "during the period of the national emergency declared by him on September 8, 1939, to exist," provisions of the act of March 3, 1931, authorizing Saturday half holidays for Government employees.

Provisions of law prohibiting more than 8 hours' labor a day of persons employed under Army, Navy, and Coast Guard contracts are to be suspended "during the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist."

The Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy may decide that the removal of civil-service employees is warranted by the demands of national security "during the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist."

The Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Treasury may decide which are the employees whose services "cannot be spared without detriment to the national defense" and who may, "during the period of the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist," forego their vacations and receive double pay instead.

Monetary limitations on payment out of Navy Department appropriations for certain Navy employees are to be suspended "during the limited national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist."

(For act of June 29, 1940, see No. 169, below.)

Act of June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 689–691; Public, No. 677, 76th Cong.): The United States Maritime Commission may insure water-borne commerce of the United States against war risks, etc., whenever the Commission feels that adequate insurance cannot be obtained on reasonable terms from companies authorized to do insurance business in a State.

The property which may be insured includes: (1) American vessels, their cargoes, disbursements, freight and passage moneys, and personal effects of masters, officers, and crews; (2) commercial vessels owned or controlled by the United States, Government cargoes, disbursements, freight and passage moneys, etc.

(This act is operative until March 10, 1942, unless the President by proclamation declares "that the extraordinary condition upon which it is predicated is passed.")

Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714, secs. 4, 5; Public, No. 703): The regular working hours of laborers and mechanics employed by the War Department in the manufacture or production of military equipment, etc., are to be 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week "during the period of any national emergency declared by the President"; overtime is to be paid for as time and a half.

The President may expend up to $66,000,000 (authorized herein) in providing for "emergencies affecting the national security and defense," including purposes specified under the War Department Appropriation Acts for 1940 and 1941, the furnishing of Government-owned facilities at privately owned plants, the training of civilian personnel necessary for the protection of essential equipment, etc., and the procurement of strategic and critical materials. (This $66,000,000 was appropriated by the Military Appropriation Act of June 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 377; Public, No. 611).)

Title III of Revenue Act of October 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 998–1003; Public, No. 801): Taxpayers may be allowed to amortize in 60 months the cost of an "emergency facility" (certified by the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense and the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy as "necessary in the interest of national defense during the emergency period") completed after June 10, 1940, during an emergency period beginning June 10, 1940, and ending on the date when the President proclaims the facility is no longer required in the interest of national defense. (Amended by joint resolution of January 31, 1941 (Public Law No. 3, 77th Cong.).)

Act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1029, ch. 777, sec. 9; Public, No. 809): The President may accelerate, "during any national emergency" proclaimed by him, the effective date of the law relating to the carriage of dangerous cargoes on vessels, etc.

Act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1125–1128; Public, No. 849): The President may determine in what areas a shortage of housing exists or impends which would impede national-defense activities, whereupon housing is to be provided by the Federal Works Administration. This authority is to terminate when the President declares "that the emergency declared by him on September 8, 1939, to exist has ceased to exist."

Act of October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205, ch. 903; Public, No. 873): Work in excess of 40 hours a week is to be paid for at not less than one and one-half times the regular rate, for certain employees of the field services of the War Department and of the Panama Canal "during the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist," and until June 30, 1942, "unless the Congress shall otherwise provide."

Lend Lease Act of March 11, 1941 (55 Stat. —; Public Law No. 11, 77th Cong.): The President may, for the benefit of any foreign nation whose defense he "deems vital to the defense of the United States," authorize Government departments or agencies to (1) manufacture; (2) sell, lend, or lease, up to the value of $1,300,000,000; (3) outfit, etc.; and (4) release for export, defense articles upon conditions satisfactory to him, when

he deems such action to be in the interest of national defense.

The Secretaries of War and Navy are authorized to acquire arms, ammunition, etc., produced abroad, if the President deems such acquisition "necessary in the interests of the defense of the United States."

(To enable the President to carry out this act, $7,000,000,000 was appropriated by the act of March 27, 1941 (55 Stat. —; Public Law No. 23, 77th Cong.).)

Act of March 28, 1941 (55 Stat. —; Public Law No. 24, sec. 603 (a), 77th Cong.): After July 1, 1942, "or after such earlier date as the emergency, declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist, has by his declaration ceased to exist," the Federal Housing Administrator is not to insure mortgages under section 603 of the National Housing Act, which provides for insurance of mortgages on property in an area in which the President finds that there is a shortage of housing detrimental to national defense.

Act of April 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 92, No. 5; Public Law No. 27): Secretary of Agriculture authorized to increase or terminate marketing quotas for peanuts.

Act of May 2, 1941 (55 Stat. —; Public Law 46, 77th Cong.): Whenever the President deems it to be in the best interests of national commerce and defense "during the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist, but not after June 30, 1942," the United States Maritime Commission may:

(1) negotiate contracts (without advertising or competitive bidding) for the acquisition, reconstruction, etc., of vessels, including plans, spare parts and equipment, subject to the overtime-compensation provisions of the act of October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1092), and not on a cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system (priority is to be given in the furnishing of materials and performance of work under such contracts);

(2) charter vessels, for operation in foreign commerce, to private citizen operators; and

(3) prescribe rules and regulations for working hours and overtime compensation of naval architects, marine engineers, etc., engaged in its ship-construction program.

Act of May 31, 1941 (55 Stat. 236, ch. 157; Public Law 89). Establishment of priorities for defense contracts.

Act of June 6, 1941 (55 Stat. — No. 1, 3; Public Law 101): The President may take over foreign merchant vessels lying idle in waters within the jurisdiction of the United States, including the Philippine Islands and the Canal Zone, which are necessary to the national defense, "during the existence of the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist, but not after June 30, 1942."

The United States Maritime Commission may, "during the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist, but not after June 30, 1942," whenever it finds that additional vessels are needed for transportation of foreign commerce of the United States or of commodities essential to the national defense, (1) charter vessels of a foreign country on a time-charter or bare-boat basis and (2) charter vessels chartered by the Commission to a private operator, a citizen of the United States, or to any department or agency of the United States, on a time-charter or bare-boat basis, for use in foreign trade or service, etc.

Act of June 21, 1941 (55 Stat. —, ch. 210, No. 1; Public Law 114). Application of provisions restricting entry into and departure from the United States.

Act of June 28, 1941 (55 Stat. —; Public Law 135, p. 8). Expenditure of up to $500,000 for protection of American citizens abroad.

Act of June 28, 1941 (55 Stat. —, No. 3 (No. 201), Public Law 137). Approval of construction by Federal Works Administrator of public works needed in connection with national-defense activities.

Act of June 30, 1941 (55 Stat. —, No. 7; Public Law 139). Practically same as act of May 29, 1941, above.

Act of June 30, 1941 (55 Stat. —, ch. 265; Public Law 142). Powers relating to stabilization fund and change of weight of the dollar continued to June 30, 1943.

Act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. —; Public Law 146). Expenditure of up to $360,000 to meet emergencies caused by epidemics of disease.

Joint Resolution of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. —; Public Law 143). Various powers are granted to the Federal Works Agency, etc., in relation to the expenditure of appropriations for emergency relief.

Act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. —; Public Law 144, p. 12). Secretary of Agriculture authorized to make expenditures (indefinite in amount) to meet emergencies arising out of epidemics of diseases of animals.

Act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. —, ch. 270 No. 4; Public Law 147). Secretary of Agriculture authorized to use funds of Commodity Credit Corporation to make loans on nonbasic agricultural commodities, up to 85 percent of "the parity or comparable price therefor."

Act of July 3, 1941 (55 Stat., ch. 276; Public 150, p. 6). Appropriation of $1,940,000 for "emergency health and sanitation activities (national defense)," under Public Health Service.

Act of July 3, 1941 (55 Stat. —, ch. 276; Public Law 153). Secretary of Commerce authorized to permit load lines for vessels, higher than those established under the International Treaty of 1930.

Act of July 11, 1941 (55 Stat. — No. 3; Public Law 163). Secretary of the Treasury authorized to negotiate contracts for construction, etc., of vessels for the Coast Guard with priority privileges.

Act of July 14, 1941 (55 Stat. —; Public Law 173). Authorization to Maritime Commission to issue warrants to vessels, giving priority in use of facilities for loading, discharging, etc.

Act of July 30, 1941 (55 Stat. —; Public Law 197). Authorization of construction of interstate petroleum pipe lines.

The above was prepared for ready reference in one document for my own convenience, with the additional thought it may prove of assistance to others.

Sincerely,

HARRY B. HAWES.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 15, 1941.*

St. Lawrence Power Development Needed for National Defense, Industrial, and Other Purposes

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS D. CULKIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

LETTER OF LELAND OLDS, CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, ON POWER SHORTAGE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months this publication has been filled with statements pro and con on the merits of the St. Lawrence seaway development. These have included the unfounded and selfish fears of certain States and localities which continue to be vocal on the transportation phases of the project. It is natural that these protesting groups should wish to continue to be bottlenecks in our transportation system. They desire to continue taking unjustified toll of all the citizens of the United States, both rich and poor alike. Under these circumstances the navigation question will continue to be somewhat mooted, but I am confident that Congress will see the reason for this antiattitude and give all the people of the United States their place in the transportation sun.

POWER DEVELOPMENT

On this phase of the development no confusion exists. No authoritative voice has denied the crying need for this power development. It is noteworthy that such distinguished opponents of the seaway as Mr. BEITER, of New York, and Mr. Chauncey Hamlin, chairman of the Niagara Frontier Planning Board, are actually for the power development. Even the railroads and their colleagues, the brotherhoods, who are attempting to bottle up the Great Lakes area and take unlimited toll of the American people in the transportation field, have seen the light on the power phases of this development and do not oppose it. Much to the credit of the utilities, who are technically familiar with this proposition, is the fact that not one leader in that field has appeared before the Rivers and Harbors Committee and opposed the development of the power phases.

Now comes Leland Olds, the able chairman of the Federal Power Commission, who clarifies the situation and proves beyond peradventure, over his own signature, that there is a great and growing shortage in the supply of generating capacity in the United States. Mr. Olds, be it said, is not only realistic but is a technician in this field. His letter is a call to arms on this question. He calls for the development of the St. Lawrence and states: "Failure to provide for St. Lawrence power will leave a bad gap in the Nation's defense power supply."

During my service here I have contacted a good many men, in and out of the House, who have had vision and foresight and whose first interest was the welfare of America. Mr. Olds is a real career man and will always be outstanding in this field. He brings to his office a high sense of public duty, splendid technical intelligence, and his conclusions on the Nation's needs for electricity are complete and authoritative.

Pursuant to the permission of the House I append hereto a letter from Mr. Olds to Judge MANSFIELD, chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, dated September 25, 1941. I recommend the careful reading of this letter by every Member of the House:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, September 25, 1941.

Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Rivers and Harbors Committee,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: In my testimony before your committee and in our memorandum of July 18, entitled "Coal Consumption and the St. Lawrence Power Project", we

stressed the importance of St Lawrence power to the defense program. The Federal Power Commission's national defense power program for 1943–1946, released with the President's consent, further confirms the defense urgency of this project.

The Commission's program shows that the country will need all of the new electric generating capacity, both steam and hydro, that the equipment manufacturers can produce if it is to provide adequately for the defense program. It calls for the installation of 13,888,000 kilowatts in addition to the 7,799,315 kilowatts of new capacity on order for installation after July 1, 1941. The St. Lawrence power project is included in the list of essential hydroelectric projects to come in during 1944 and 1945.

Any failure to develop those projects which call for the production of new hydroelectric generating facilities will defeat that program. There can be no substitute but severe curtailment of the use of power.

Recent conferences indicate that the upState New York area is today definitely short of power for the expansion of essential defense production. Defense expenditures at the rate of $3,000,000,000 a month for the entire country will mean a 1945 demand in that area estimated at 3,505,000 kilowatts. Without the 820,000 kilowatts of St. Lawrence power only 2,291,000 kilowatts of capacity, after allowance for the minimum reserves, is at present scheduled to meet this demand. This would mean a shortage of 1,214,000 kilowatts with a resulting cramping of the defense program.

Even with St. Lawrence power the area will still be 394,000 kilowatts short of the needed capacity unless still further additions to generating capacity are planned. And if alternative steam capacity is substituted, it will have the effect of depriving other essential war-material areas of necessary capacity because the plan calls upon the equipment manufacturers for 100 percent of their capacity to produce.

In other words, failure to provide for St. Lawrence power will leave a bad gap in the Nation's defense power supply.

A glance at the program indicates that the hydroelectric energy to be obtained from the St. Lawrence will supplement, not compete with, coal-generated power. In the New York-New England region the program, including new generating units now on order, calls for an increase of 2,327,500 kilowatts in steam capacity, or nearly three times as much in steam as the additional power which the St. Lawrence will provide. For the country as a whole, 14,319,500 kilowatts, or fully two-thirds of the total new capacity, will be fuel burning. That represents the maximum amount of steam capacity which the equipment manufacturers can provide.

The new steam installations recommended in the defense power program, after allowing for use of oil and gas and for partial displacement of older and less efficient capacity, will create a demand for approximately 10,000,000 more tons of coal annually, representing an increase of about 20 percent over the exceptionally large use of coal in the country's central electric stations in 1940 and 33 percent over the corresponding use in 1939.

Under present chaotic world conditions, of course, it is impossible to forecast more than a few years ahead. The Commission's proposed program is based on the assumption that the all-out effort will continue through 1946, which from a military standpoint is the only safe assumption. Developments of the next few years may slow the program up or even force it to accelerate. It is important to bear in mind however, that even under normal peacetime trends the capacity now projected by the Commission's program would be needed in the reasonably near future. The defense plan entails only a quickening of this normally rapid uptrend.

The Commission concludes that it would be a grave error in military planning to delay immediate construction of the St. Lawrence River power project. It is fallacious, moreover, to consider this project and coal-burning plants as rivals. Both are needed. That is the simple but inescapable fact.

Sincerely,

LELAND OLDS, *Chairman.*

Mr. Phillip J. Gallagher, Postmaster of Woburn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

LETTER WRITTEN BY WILLIAM E. KANE, MAYOR OF WOBURN, MASS., AND AN ARTICLE BY GEORGE T. CONTALONIS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to present a letter written by the Honorable William E. Kane, mayor of the city of Woburn, Mass., to the president of the National Association of Postmasters, which met recently in annual convention at Boston.

Mayor Kane not only urged the selection of his city as the site of the next convention, but he called particular attention to the honors the association has bestowed upon Postmaster Phillip J. Gallagher, of Woburn. Mr. Gallagher has served as national vice president of the National Association of Postmasters, and at the recent convention he was elected unanimously as its president for the ensuing year. He richly deserves the honor, for he has made an especially fine postmaster for Woburn. His courtesy, his progressiveness, and his constant efforts to please and serve his public well have earned him the respect and acclaim of the citizens of that city. Postmaster Gallagher has been tireless in his efforts while vice president of the association in improving the whole postmaster service of the United States. The high regard in which he is held by the postmasters of the Nation is indicated by his election to the high position of president of the National Association of Postmasters. To show in what esteem he is held by the men who work under him, I submit an article written by Mr. George T. Contalonis, a letter carrier at the Woburn Post Office. Mayor Kane's letter and the article follow:

WOBURN, MASS., *September 17, 1941.*

MICHAEL J. O'ROURKE,
President, National Association of Postmasters,
Convention Headquarters, Statler Hotel, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. O'ROURKE: From earliest colonial days sons and daughters of Woburn have demonstrated ability for leadership and excelled in the sciences, law, medicine, athletic field, and the armed forces of the United States.

Many honors have come to Woburn in recent years by the rise of Woburn's sons and daughters to positions of city, State, and national importance.

Your organization has recognized the ability and quality of leadership of another son of Woburn when you elected him to a position of trust, namely, one of your vice presidents.

Next year the city of Woburn will celebrate the tercentenary of its founding as a unit of government. I am sure that every citizen of Woburn joins with me in the hope that your organization in convention assembled at Boston will promote our native son to the presidency of your great organization.

This would be most timely and appropriate and bring further honor to our city as another local son would join with many other citizens of our city who have received similar honor and will join in our local celebration of 1942.

Qualified by a hard-earned education and experienced as a city official and member of the bar, in behalf of the citizens of Woburn who join with me in the thought, your organization can make no better choice than to elect our postmaster, Phillip J. Gallagher, to the highest office in your organization, an honor which will be of great significance to our city and sincerely appreciated by our distinguished citizens.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM E. KANE, *Mayor.*

(By George T. Contalonis, letter carrier, Woburn Post Office, Woburn, Mass.)

The election of Hon. Phillip J. Gallagher, of Woburn, Mass., as president of the National Association of Postmasters of America at the recent convention held at Boston, Mass., brought national honors again to the city of Woburn, Mass. A few years back Hon. Daniel J. Doherty served the American Legion as its national commander. Within a few years two illustrious sons have placed a city of a little more than 19,000 persons in the national limelight.

As a regular letter carrier at the Woburn post office I take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to the postmasters of this wonderful organization for electing to such a high office a man who worked his way up the ladder through many years of hard work and perseverance. Although a poor boy Mr. Gallagher went through Woburn High School and studied nights after work at the Suffolk Law School and was admitted to the Massachusetts bar. He practiced his profession honorably and successfully, and was later appointed postmaster by that great humanitarian, President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

His conscientious efforts in behalf of your organization were recognized in his various promotions to office. After 7 years of phenominal service in the postal department President Gallagher's ability was recognized by his promotion to the highest office within your power. Under him your organization will experience a material increase in membership and thereby a bigger and better organization.

The people of my city are proud of your new president as are the members of your association. He has demonstrated that under our form of Government a poor boy has an equal opportunity to succeed with the rich boy in this great land of ours. Unknown to the members of your organization 7 years ago he has since, through excellent organization work, become a national figure in postal circles.

We, who constitute the personnel at the Woburn post office, are elated that we are serving our Government as postal employees under a postmaster who is the new president of the National Association of Postmasters of America.

It is a signal honor to have the privilege of working under the supervision of a man

who has worked hard all his life for a living and knows the amount of work to expect from the personnel. I am glad to know that our postmaster will be the guiding influence of the organization during this year and will exert all his efforts to improve in any way possible our wonderful postal service. You have chosen a man who will merit the confidence you have reposed in him. It is your duty to join with him and cooperate to the fullest extent in all his undertakings which have a material bearing on the preservation of our great country. Let us all cooperate during this year whether we be postmasters or letter carriers or clerks, as members of that great family of postal workers under President Philip J. Gallagher, and thereby insure the success of the postal department, which is such an important Federal agency in our republican form of Government that guarantees us life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Should River and Harbor Legislation Be Subjected to the Time-Worn Pork-Barrel Charge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that there is some misunderstanding with respect to pending river and harbor legislation, as indicated by premature remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I refer to the speech of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 23, 1941. The gentleman apparently seeks to discredit river and harbor legislation generally by criticizing projects that have been proposed for the bill, which, as yet, is only in its nebulous stage.

The gentleman says the bill is a pork-barrel bill. There is nothing new in this contention. The approximate $600,000,000 expended upon the waterways adjacent to St. Louis since I have been associated with river and harbor legislation has been met with this same time-worn charge. The railroad propagandists coined that expression more than 40 years ago, expecting to use it in every instance where they were at a loss to find an intelligent reason for opposing expenditures on the Mississippi, the Missouri, and the Illinois.

The list of projects the gentleman referred to does not purport to be complete, neither have the proofs been read for correction. After the committee takes action on all the projects before it, and necessary corrections made, a final copy will be printed, and made available to all interested parties.

This tentative and incomplete list of projects has not been passed out by a committee clerk as stated in the gentleman's speech. I am advised that only a few members of the committee have as yet called for it, and only a small number of persons have been given copies. These persons were active in opposition to some of the projects embraced in the bill.

The gentleman, in his speech, says:

> In an apparent effort to counteract a prevailing belief in the public mind that this bill will be heavily loaded with "pork," one of the clerks in the Rivers and Harbors Committee has been passing out copies of a pamphlet entitled "Committee Print, September 17, 1941."
>
> The estimated cost to the United States of the projects heretofore adopted and those to be considered is as follows:

The quotation shows upon its face that it was a committee print. It was not public. It was for the information and guidance of the committee when they are to meet in executive session to compile the bill. Mr. McGann, clerk of the committee, prepared this tentative advisory list, following his usual custom of 42 years. This is the first time this prudent course has ever been publicly criticized.

During the 25 years that I have been in Congress it has been customary for the confidential nature of committee prints to be respected. I regret exceedingly that the gentleman has seen fit to violate the unwritten law on this subject and to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD confidential matters of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The gentleman in his speech says:

> I have quoted these figures with the word "plus," because there are a number of rivers and harbors projects which are scheduled to be included in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill which are not included in the committee print. The Trinity River project in Texas has been approved by the Army engineers at an estimated cost of $118,000,000. This project has support in the administration and is expected to be included in the omnibus bill, and yet by some oversight the Trinity River project was not included.

The gentleman seems to leave the impression that there is something sinister in the fact that the Trinity River is not listed in the tentative list of cost estimates approved by the committee. He facetiously says it is an oversight. I will say that the clerk of the Rivers and Harbors Committee does not transact business in the manner indicated by this inference. No report whatever has been referred to the committee on the Trinity River, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD fails to show that any such report has ever been received from the Secretary of War.

The gentleman from Missouri further says in his speech:

> The Rivers and Harbors Committee is still considering and approving projects for the omnibus bill which are not listed. On September 19, 1941, the committee heard testimony and approved a project for locks and dams on the Neches River in Texas at a cost of $23,000,000. This is not included in the committee print.

The gentleman's speech shows that the list of projects he copied from was dated September 17. The paragraph of his speech here copied shows that the hearing on the Neches River was held on September 19, and he calls attention to the fact that the action taken was not noted in the list printed 2 days before. Of course, one paragraph of his speech answers the other, and that should clear the clerk and chairman of the committee of any ulterior motive.

The gentleman was in error in saying the committee approved this project. Additional hearings have been held since the one he refers to, and no executive session has yet been held to take action. For his information I will say that no locks are embraced in the proposal, though two storage dams for impounding the flood waters are recommended as a necessary part of the development.

The tonnage on this waterway ranges from 39,000,000 to 41,000,000 tons per annum, which is not exceeded by any other port except New York and Duluth. The floods have been very destructive in the ship channel, causing many groundings and collisions of ships carrying highly inflammable cargoes, now urgent in defense operations.

Seven among the largest oil refineries in this country are located on this ship channel, including the Gulf and the Texas companies, whose filling stations are located in practically every city in the United States. They are also furnishing a large tonnage of necessary war materials to Britain.

The Navy and Maritime Commission are now carrying on extensive shipbuilding operations there, which are in great danger from the ravenous floods. Largely in the cause of national defense, 12,770 ocean-going ships passed in and out of this waterway the past year, a record exceeded only by the great port of New York. This being one of the few projects named by the gentleman from Missouri in his general charge of pork barrel, I will be glad if he will move to strike it out of the bill on that ground, and to hear the reply of the eloquent gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], in whose district the project is located.

During the summer months from time to time, under leave to extend my remarks, I placed in the RECORD remarks on waterway improvements by European countries for military preparedness which gave factual evidence of the high value placed on these improvements by the old countries in a war emergency. In fact, it was our experience with an overburdened and clogged transport system during the first World War that led us to hasten improvements and extend use of our own waterways. I mention these facts because any river and harbor bill that results from the present deliberations of the Rivers and Harbors Committee will include items that have important and immediate value to our military preparedness and defense program. For example, the most critical and troublesome section of the navigable channel of the Mississippi River between the ocean port of New Orleans and Minneapolis, as well as Chicago is the Chain of Rocks near St. Louis. It is expected that an item to remedy this advense situation will be included in any bill reported out by the committee. At a time when the movement of defense commodities on the Mississippi River has increased from 50 to 200 percent, improvement of the Chain of Rocks section should be made without delay in order that through commerce may not be hindered. The gentleman from Missouri

now intimates that he will vote against the bill containing this project for the reason that in his opinion it is a pork-barrel bill.

Forty years ago Congress passed a law prescribing the strictest possible provisions with reference to surveys and investigations of river and harbor projects. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors do not consider or report any project for enactment unless it has the approval of the Army engineers as required by that law. Every project that has been tentatively approved by the committee to be embraced in the bill now under consideration, has had the unqualified approval of the engineers. If Congress should take a view different from that of the engineers, it can very easily strike from the bill any project to which the majority objects. That being the case, how can anyone reasonably make the charge that a river and harbor bill is a pork-barrel bill?

The bill now in the process of the making contains a large number of projects which I assume will not be doubted by anyone as being urgently necessary for our national defense. I shall take no chance of imperiling the safety of our Nation.

In these times when unity is necessary for the safety of our country, we must not let our personal grievances lead us astray from our prime duties. One should be careful to avoid accepting and repeating incorrect information that may make him unwittingly the tool of the all-too-numerous malcontents, who are taking the chance of sabotaging our country's safety by inconsiderate criticism. Each and every one of us is either the man behind the gun or the man behind the man behind the gun.

My particular function is to be sure that nothing is left undone that should be done to keep our waterways capable of continuously transporting materials and supplies for the defense program. Let us not be diverted from the beaten path. The present Government of this great Nation is being led and directed with foresight, wisdom, and courage to the end that the ways of life and freedom which our forefathers fought for and saved for us may be preserved for our children's children for many generations to come.

Snake River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

EXCERPTS FROM HEARINGS BEFORE RIVERS AND HARBORS COMMITTEE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts taken from the hearings before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House on September 22, when the committee had under consideration a project for river development and improvement. Your attention is called to this testimony in view of many misleading statements about the omnibus river and harbor bill:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
Monday, September 22, 1941.

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

We have before us this morning the project for the Snake River. General Robins, are you going to tell us about the Snake River project?

General ROBINS. Yes, sir.

Here follows testimony of General Robins:

Mr. PITTENGER. How many years have the people been agitating this project?

General ROBINS. For 40 years, to my knowledge.

Mr. PITTENGER. This is another of the internal improvements that will promote the welfare of this country that has been neglected year after year by the Congress of the United States.

While we have been fiddling away with no cooperation on the part of Congress with the War Department engineers, with no plan for developing our natural resources, the countries of Europe have been going ahead and developing their rivers and other projects in connection with navigable waters, lakes, and streams; is that right?

General ROBINS. That is right. This is one of the strategic water routes that has been neglected.

Mr. PITTENGER. Do you know of any opposition to it in particular?

General ROBINS. No, sir. Of course, it is one of these cases where you cannot show commerce at the present date in the usual way that commerce is shown to justify a project. But you do have a country there that is full of mineral resources, and nobody knows just how great they are. But to develop them you have to have this cheaper water transportation, and they will not be developed unless you have it.

Mr. PITTENGER. It is one of those things to be done to develop the country.

General ROBINS. Yes; and you have to justify it on the potential result in the development of these minerals. That country is so wild that nobody has settled there, but it is known that there are valuable deposits there.

Mr. PITTENGER. The experience of the War Department engineers has been that when such projects, such as the building of dams for the improvement of navigation, have been carried out in the past, commerce naturally adapts itself to them.

General ROBINS. Yes, sir.

* * * * *

Mr. PITTENGER. I want to clear up something else here. There has been a lot of publicity in the newspapers and the statement circulated by selfish interests to the effect that this particular omnibus bill which the committee will report out is a pork-barrel proposition.

I would like for the record to show, as far as you are able to give it to us, the facts as to what you know in reference to omnibus bills and the method of procedure concerning bills which come from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. You have been appearing before this committee for many years.

General ROBINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is it not a fact that an omnibus bill has been the regular type of bill which has been reported out by this committee, as the result largely, if not almost entirely, of the testimony of the War Department engineers, from one session of Congress to the next?

General ROBINS. That has been done for the last 25 or 30 years. Every 2 or 3 years Congress passes an authorization bill, or a so-called omnibus bill, which merely authorizes the projects. It does not appropriate any money.

After a project is authorized the Engineer Department has to go to the Bureau of the Budget and ask for money to do any work on any of the projects authorized in the so-called omnibus bill.

Mr. PITTENGER. The purpose of the bill is to give a legal status to the project, so that it is provided by the law of the land that the projects are to be constructed.

General ROBINS. Yes, sir. The omnibus bill merely legalizes the results of planning for these improvements which Congress has authorized to be done.

Congress authorizes us to make investigations, surveys, and reports on all of these proposed improvements. We do that and submit the reports to Congress. Then the adoption of these plans which have been made by the direction of Congress is legalized in an omnibus bill.

Mr. PITTENGER. The improvement of all of the rivers and little lakes and streams of the United States has been under the absolute and sole jurisdiction of the War Department engineers——

General ROBINS. For over 100 years.

Mr. PITTENGER. So when people talk about the pending omnibus bill being a pork barrel, what you have said is about all the pork there is in it; there is not any.

General ROBINS. There is absolutely no pork in the bill. Congress is acting on the best advice they can get and on reports that are put out with the entire facts before them.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be well if the General would tell us, briefly, what the procedure is in approving these projects; how these projects receive the approval of the War Department engineers.

General ROBINS. The Army engineers are forbidden by law to originate or initiate any investigation, survey, or study unless authorized to do it by Congress. When Congress authorizes an investigation, the duty of making a preliminary examination is assigned to the division of district engineers in the field.

The district engineer starts out by holding public hearings and finding out what the people want, and the people come in and make all of the presentations they want as to what their desires are.

Then the district engineer makes a study of the situation, and if he finds from a preliminary study that the project appears to be economically sound, he recommends a survey and his report comes through the division engineer to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and if the Board agrees with the district engineer, the survey is ordered.

However, if the district engineer finds, on the face of it, that the project is no good, he recommends that no survey be made, and the report is sent to Congress with that recommendation.

When a survey is ordered it goes back to the field, and whatever engineering is necessary to be done is done by the United States Army engineers, and to establish definitely the economic status another public hearing is held.

Then the reports are sent back to the Chief of Engineers and referred to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. Their report goes back to the Chief of Engineers and he sends the report, with whatever comments or recommendations he desires to make, to Congress.

Mr. ANGELL. How many are on that board?

General ROBINS. Seven.

Mr. ANGELL. And they are high-ranking engineer officers of the Army, graduates of West Point?

General ROBINS. They are all senior members of the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. ANGELL. And after a project receives the approval of the Board, then it goes to the Chief of Engineers?

General ROBINS. This Board submits its findings to the Chief, and the Chief submits the report to the Congress, with his recommendations, and then it comes before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and that committee holds hearings, just as you are doing today.

So every project in an omnibus rivers and harbors bill has certainly been through the mill from start to finish. There is nothing about it left to the imagination.

Mr. PITTENGER. What percentage of projects do you reject, if you recall? Is not the number about 40 percent?

General ROBINS. It is a little less than 50 percent.

Mr. PITTENGER. At any rate, you reject a large number of projects, do you not?

General ROBINS. Practically as many as we recommend.

Mr. PITTENGER. So all of these steps you have detailed have been taken in connection with every project that this committee has voted to put in the pending river and harbor omnibus bill.

General ROBINS. Yes, sir.

Advantages of Army Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. DUNCAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ARTICLE FROM ST. JOSEPH (MO.) NEWS-PRESS

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press:

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press]

PAY CHECK IS SHORT—BUT ARMY LIFE HAS ITS ADVANTAGES, SAYS SOLDIER ON FURLOUGH

Although it takes a lot of stretching to make $21 last a full month, there are phases of Army life that compensate for the short pay check, according to Private Sherman Forman, son of Mr. and Mrs. B. Forman, 2837 Penn Street. Private Forman is home on a 15-day furlough from Geiger Field, Wash., where he is attached to the Army air base.

If you adopt the proper point of view, Forman said, the Army isn't so bad.

"I was inducted into the Army at Fort Leavenworth June 21," he said, "and since then I have seen a lot of things I never saw before. Geiger Field is located in one of the beauty spots of the country and the Government is paying me to live there.

"I am associated with several hundred men from all walks of life and there is nothing to prevent me from becoming a well-informed student of human nature. I feel that I am being paid for this opportunity.

"I am given six uniforms, four service outfits and two for dress occasions. I have three good meals a day and the best medical care is offered me if I need it. There is a well-equipped service center in Spokane, equipped for games, music, reading, and other forms of recreation, and I am a welcome guest at any time. All of these things are done for me because I am a soldier in Uncle Sam's Army. At home I have to secure these things for myself. Of course, I have my work to do, but they tell me there are a lot of fellows at home who still don't have a job, so maybe I'm pretty well off, at that."

Inflation Menaces Everybody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of September 28:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of September 28, 1941]

INFLATION MENACES EVERYBODY

The housewife who goes to market with $5 in her purse is coming home with a lot less in groceries and meat these days. Many food prices have gone up 10 percent; some have gone up as much as 40 percent. That means just one thing—inflation is under way in this country.

It is under way largely because Congress hasn't shown the courage to face honestly the problem of price fixing, and the reason that Congress is lacking in courage is that three large voting groups in the population, so far as they are vocal, are against an effective price control.

Businessmen, as represented by some chambers of commerce, are arguing for limited and selective control. Labor, as represented by the unions, is against control of wages—which means that it is also for limited control of another sort. The farmer, as represented by some of his leaders, is against control of farm prices, though he is willing that they be set at 110 percent of parity, if other prices are set.

The difficulty apparently is that these classes and some individuals in other groups do not really understand the menace of inflation once it gets beyond control. Somehow they think that ever higher prices and ever higher wages will mean prosperity. As a matter of fact, nobody in the long run gains from inflation. Every economist knows that.

There are temporary gains, of course. The owner of stocks benefits at first, while the owner of bonds loses. The employer gains and the employee loses. The farmer gains at the expense of the consumer. Debtors gain at the expense of creditors. But these gains are not long lived. As inflation speeds up, everybody is caught in the scramble. Money becomes well nigh worthless.

An extreme example of what inflation can do occurred in Germany in 1920 to 1923. The mark, normally worth 23.8 cents, descended in value in 3 short years so that finally 3,500,000,000,000 could be bought for one American dollar.

Even rather early in that German inflation, the Hamburg-American and North German Lloyd steamship companies were able to pay off mark loans totaling 130,000,000 marks ($32,500,000) with $10,000 in real money. If they had waited until the final crisis, they could have retired that debt with far less than one-hundredth of 1 cent in sound money. But these German steamship companies did not benefit in the long run. Their properties ran down because it was impossible to get together the sums of marks needed to make repairs.

Men who had saved a competence for old age found that their life accumulations were eventually not worth a single cup of coffee. Wages based on the buying power of one day were insufficient to buy even bread the next.

That sort of inflation might never come to us, and yet we might suffer nearly as much. There finally comes a limit to the effect of inflation, and Germany passed that limit long before the inflationary movement had run its course.

For it must be remembered that when inflation really gets going wages always lag behind prices. As prices go up 50 percent, wages go up 10 percent. Finally comes a point where money is so unimportant that those who have goods prefer to keep them or to barter them for other goods than to sell them for money. They don't want money, for nobody knows what that money will buy in the future.

Inflation ran away with things in Germany because nobody used effective means to check it at the beginning. There comes a moment when no means is at hand to check the ruinous descent in money values except repudiation of the existing currency and the establishment of a new money system.

We in the United States are far from that point now. We still have time to control inflation by general fixing of prices, wages, and rents. But the fixing must come soon, and it must apply to everything. It must be in the form of "freezing," with adjustments to be made individually at a later time where unfairness can be shown to exist.

The menace is serious, for it is by no means impossible that inflation such as Germany once knew could come to us—if we continue to put selfish and shortsighted obstacles in the way of effective measures to keep our price structure at normal levels.

Flag Raising at El Paso General Shops, Southern Pacific Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. E. THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ADDRESS OF ADOLPH A. STOY, OF EL PASO, TEX.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a speech made by my friend and constituent, Mr. Adolph A. Stoy, of El Paso, Tex., at a recent flag raising at the Southern Pacific shops in that city. Mr. Stoy has been an employee in the shops there for many years and this is one of the finest tributes to the flag I have ever read:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, fellow workmen, this assembly today should have a deep signification for all of us. The exercises incident to the dedication of this new flagpole and raising of the colors at El Paso general shops will soon be forgotten but the principles symbolized by the flag which is to

fly from the masthead above us are everlasting.

In America, as free men, we voluntarily choose the paths of social and economic freedom which we tread. No limitation is placed on the heights to which we may ascend, for they are guided largely by the degree of our own individual efforts and application. We are citizens of a great republic which undoubtedly is the last bulwark of freedom's domain.

The heritage committed to our care by our forefathers is priceless. We must, and do, stand ready to meet the challenges of the day, whatever they may be. In the maelstrom which now envelops the Old World, man no longer is his own master; he is but a component part of a great machine which, to accomplish its goal of conquest and domination, spreads destruction and desolation wide before it. We are living in a crucial period, in a period which in the final analysis may determine the future of our civilization.

That flag, the Stars and Stripes, which today is to be raised to the lofty pinnacle prepared for it in this shop reservation, is a symbol which should be cherished by every one of the 1,400 workers who are now employed within the confines of this immediate local Southern Pacific Railroad industry.

What the Cross means to the Christian, what the Star of David means to the Hebrew, as symbols of their respective religious faiths, just so indelibly does our flag symbolize our political faith in this land of the free.

The thought here suggests that possibly it would be fitting to dwell for awhile on a short historical outline concerning it—of its antecedents and devolution therefrom.

In the early period of the American Colonies they used the Union Jack of Britain. In it were combined the crosses of St. George and St. Andrew, and sometimes a pine tree or a hemisphere was figured in the upper left-hand quarter. The controversies incident to the Revolutionary War, whereby the 13 English Colonies in America separated themselves from Britain and became the United States of America (1775–83), brought forth many patterns of flags and banners, the greater number of which bore mottoes of defiance to the then mother country.

The colonial flag of New Amsterdam, which was carried by armed vessels sailing out of New York, had as its central figure a beaver, to indicate both the industry of the Dutch people and the wealth of the fur trade in the New World.

On the 17th of June 1775 the battle of Bunker Hill was fought, and a month thereafter General Putnam (1718–90) used a red banner, on one side of which was the Connecticut motto, and on the other the motto of Massachusetts, the latter reading: "An Appeal to Heaven."

In January 1776, at Cambridge, Mass., General Washington displayed a flag containing 13 stripes of red and white, with the British Union Jack in a blue canton, the stripes being considered emblematic of the union of the Thirteen Colonies against British tyranny.

The rattlesnake flag was another pattern, in which the snake was coiled to strike, with the motto: "Don't Tread on Me," and, generally, the rattles of the snake numbered 13, indicative of the Thirteen Colonies.

On June 14, 1777, definite action was taken by the Continental Congress with reference to a national flag, when it passed a resolution reading:

"That the flag of the 13 United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

After the Continental Congress had decided upon the design for the national flag a committee consisting of George Washington, Robert Morris, and George Ross called upon Mrs. Betsy Ross, a native of Philadelphia, and whose father (Samuel Griscom) assisted in the erection of Independence Hall, and requested her to undertake the sewing of the new flag. She offered the suggestion, which was accepted, that the stars have five points instead of six, and subsequently she received contract to make all Government flags. Her daughter, Mrs. Clarissa Wilson, continued the business until 1857.

It has been my privilege on many occasions to visit the shrine where our first flag was made, the Besty Ross house, located at 239 Arch Street, Philadelphia. To preserve this historic edifice to the Nation, the Betsy Ross Memorial Association was formed in 1898 and sufficient money was raised under its auspices to finally purchase it in 1905. As one of the school children of Philadelphia, I had the opportunity of subscribing to the fund—the modest school child's subscription of 10 cents, for which each of us received a certificate of membership. The American Flag House, where the Stars and Stripes were first brought into physical being, will be forever preserved to posterity, and a visit to it 5 years ago was just as interesting and appealing to me as the visits made during my childhood days.

In January 1794 Congress ordered a change made in the flag which had been adopted 17 years earlier; that it have 15 stripes, alternate red and white; that the union have 15 stars, white in a blue field, it apparently being the intention to add a stripe and a star for each new State admitted, as Vermont and Kentucky had been admitted in 1791 and 1792, respectively.

By 1818 the number of States had increased to 20 and Congress then enacted legislation of the tenor that the number of stripes in the flag be reduced to 13, to represent the Thirteen Original States, and increased the number of stars to 20, and further ordered that:

"On the admission of every new State into the Union one star be added to the union of the flag, and that such addition shall take effect on the 4th of July next succeeding such admission."

The stars were used in various arrangements until 1896, and, during that year, the Secretary of War, Hon. Daniel Lamont, ordered that they be placed in 6 rows; and, in 1912, by Executive order of President Howard Taft, the arrangement was fixed as 6 rows of 8 stars each, or, as we know the flag today. These 48 stars symbolize the States of the Union, in the order of their ratification of the Constitution and their admission to the Union, Delaware being the first, and Arizona, the forty-eighth and last. Texas, largest State of all is represented by No. 28.

Old Glory. An affectionate term for our beloved flag. That designation is attributed as having originated with Capt. William Driver, of Salem, Mass., these words being his salute to a beautiful new flag presented to his ship when starting on a voyage around the world in 1831.

Many are the interpretations offered by writers of prose and poetry as to the symbolism of the colors of the flag, but truly none can be more symbolic than that expressed by the United States Flag Association, headquarters at Washington, D. C., which has promulgated the following:

"Red for courage. The red in the flag proclaims the courage which the men and women of our race have always shown—the courage that inspires men and women to face danger and to do what is right.

"White for liberty. It is said that Washington once described the flag by saying: 'We take the stars from heaven, the red from the mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty.'

"Blue for loyalty. The blue stands for loyalty. It is the blue of the heavens—the true blue. It tells the story of thousands of men and women who have been loyal to their country through thick and thin, hardship and suffering—of men and women who have hesitated at no sacrifice, even of their lives, when their country demanded it of them."

The flag should be an ever-present reminder of the many rights granted to an individual by the Constitution of the United States, and as it symbolizes the historic and cherished landmarks embodied therein there must be acknowledged that with the privileges come responsibilities. In this day of world tumult and strife which we are now witnessing the principles of American citizenship must emblazon themselves as brightly as described by Daniel Webster (1782–1852) in his oration at the cornerstone laying of Bunker Hill Monument, near Boston, in 1825, in commemoration of the Battle of Bunker Hill, which had been fought 50 years prior thereto, when he said, in part—again I quote:

"We have indulged in gratifying recollections of the past, in the prosperity and pleasures of the present, and in high hopes for the future. But let us remember that we have duties and obligations to perform corresponding to the blessings which we enjoy. Let us remember the trust, the sacred trust, attaching to the rich inheritance which we have received from our fathers. Let us feel our personal responsibility to the full extent of our power and influence, for the preservation of the principles of civil and religious liberty. And let us remember that it is only religion and morals and knowledge that can make men respectable and happy under any form of government. Let us hold fast the great truth that communities are responsible as well as individuals, that no government is respectable which is not just; that without unspotted purity of public faith, without sacred public principle, fidelity, and honor no mere forms of government, no machinery of laws, can give dignity to political society. In our day and generation let us seek to raise and improve the moral sentiment so that we may look, not for a degraded but for an elevated and improved future. And when both we and our children shall have been consigned to the house appointed for all living may love of country and pride of country glow with equal fervor among those to whom our names and our blood shall have descended.

"And then, when honored and decrepit age shall lean against the base of this monument, and troops of ingenuous youth shall be gathered around it, and when the one shall speak to the other of its objects, the purpose of its construction, and the great and glorious events with which it is connected, then shall rise from every youthful breast the ejaculation: 'Thank God, I, I also, am an American!'"

The flag which we are unfurling today is the gift of Hamilton Fish Camp No. 2, United Spanish War Veterans. We, as employees of the great Southern Pacific Co., are grateful to them for the courteous gesture they have extended through its contribution and acknowledgment of such is hereby made.

For perpetual maintenance purposes there is a flag fund at El Paso general shops, to which all employes engaged within this shop reservation, in all departments, may contribute. The flags we use will always be the gift, not of any specially designated department or group, but the gift of all the employes. E pluribus unum—all for one and one for all!

And now, before we proceed to raise the colors for the first time on this new flag pole, I would like to ask that all of you face in the direction of the flag. At the command of salute, if covered remove the headdress with the right hand and hold it at the left shoulder, the hand being over the heart. Those of you without covering will stand at attention. Women should salute by placing the right hand over the heart. Everyone will please remain standing at attention until the final note of the bugle.

Here is the flag of our country, safe within its fold is the freedom and fealty of our Nation. Friends you will join me in saluting it.

Congress Controls the Purse Strings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN A. DAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. STEPHEN A. DAY, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I made over the radio on September 26, 1941:

On September 11, 1941, the President informed the American people that he had given orders to shoot any German or Italian vessels entering the waters the protection of which he deemed necessary for American defense. He gave these orders as Commander in Chief of the United States Army and Navy. He claimed no authority from any legislation passed by the Congress. Many are laboring under a misapprehension that he acted under the Lend Lease Act. That act furnishes no authority for the order to shoot, and there are no laws on the statute books which authorize such an order. His sole power to issue the order rests in the fact that he is Commander in Chief.

On March 5, 1941, Senator CONNALLY, now chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in the debate on the Lend-Lease Act, in speaking of the power vested in the President as Commander in Chief, carried on the following discussion with Senator BONE:

"Mr. CONNALLY. Control of the Army and Navy refers to the organization, promotion, courts martial, and the internal government and control of the Army and Navy, and has nothing on earth to do with the Commander in Chief and his power.

"Mr. BONE. If that is true, then the President could immediately take this country into war by merely lifting his hand.

"Mr. CONNALLY. Any President who wanted to get the country into war could do it at any time he desired.

"Mr. BONE. Unhappily, that is true.

"Mr. CONNALLY. Any President who wanted to disregard the interests of his country could do that; and many Senators seem to think that the pending bill and all these amendments are merely intended to protect the country from the President, and assume that he is going to do wrong; assume he is going to violate his oath; assume he is going to do something contrary to the interests of the United States. I prefer to assume, on the other hand, that any sworn officer is going to do his duty. What I said was predicated upon the theory that some willful President would just plunge the country into war. Of course, any President could get the country into war at any time he desired by bringing about a situation from which we could not well retreat."

When pressed by Senator ELLENDER as to whether there were any limitations on the power of the President as Commander in Chief, Senator CONNALLY made this significant statement:

"If the President has the power under the Constitution, there is nothing we can do about it in this bill (Lend Lease Act) one way or another except to refuse appropriations. Congress can control the Army and the Navy by refusing appropriations."

It has been announced that the appropriation bill for approximately $6,000,000,000 of additional lend-lease funds will come up in the House of Representatives on October 6. If the American people want to keep out of war, the time has come for them to speak out and inform their Representatives that they do not approve of the President's order to shoot and that no further appropriation should be made for the Army and Navy to provide the very things the delivery of which will make war certain, in view of the President's order to shoot.

So that the average citizen will fully comprehend the exact situation, we must think of the President as holding two offices. He is President and at the same time Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. As President, he will get the lend-lease materials, but no authority over the men who make up the rank and file of the Army and Navy. Let us suppose that he places these materials on our merchant ships. Up to this point, he is still at peace. He then decides to have these materials carried across the ocean to Britain and the merchant ships commence the voyage across the Atlantic. Up to this point he is still at peace. Now, he turns to his power as Commander in Chief, and deciding to use our battleships to convoy these merchant ships to Britain, he gives orders to the Army and Navy to shoot any German or Italian war vessels encountered on the way across. He obtained all of the authority up to the time of the shooting order from the Congress. He claims that his power to order shooting comes from the Constitution and that Congress has nothing to say about it. All those who have been urging the Members of Congress to do something to check the President, even to the point of impeaching him, are not aware of the fact that the President is acting under a power coming from the Constitution and not from the Congress.

To fortify his position the President stated on September 11, 1941:

"This situation is not new. The second President of the United States, John Adams, ordered the United States Navy to clean out European privateers and European ships of war which were infesting the Caribbean and South American waters, destroying American commerce. The third President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson, ordered the United States Navy to end the attacks being made upon American ships by the corsairs of the nations of North Africa."

As a constitutional lawyer, I take issue with the President. The fallacy in his position is that he is carrying materials to an active belligerent; he knows that his shooting order will mean war for he has said so himself. He knows that President Adams was attacking privateers which according to the dictionary means "armed private vessels commissioned to cruise against the commerce or war vessels of the enemy." He knows that President Jefferson was attacking corsairs. Turning again to the dictionary, we find that a corsair, in simple language, is a pirate. President Roosevelt has labeled Hitler and Mussolini as gangsters and pirates, and he can console himself with the reflection that he is protecting our commerce against gangsters and pirates. It is interesting to know from what source the President obtained this justification for his position.

In my book, We Must Save the Republic, published by the Shaw Publishing Co., Washington, D. C., on page 77, I state as follows:

"The lend-lease bill was passed by the Congress with a total misconception of international law as it is now interpreted by this administration. In fact, there has been such a radical departure from the tenets of international law, as it existed prior to this new interpretation, that practically no Members of either the Senate or the House of Representatives had any notion whatever of the present interpretation that authorizes the United States to engage in war against an aggressor, without a declaration of war by the Congress, as provided in the Constitution of the United States.

"Where did this interpretation come from? It was not born on American soil. It came from Budapest, in Hungary, and it had its origins in a conference of international lawyers, held at Budapest in September 1934."

After quoting from the testimony of Secretary Stimson before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in the hearings from January 27 to February 3, 1941, and the address of Attorney General Jackson, at Habana, Cuba, on March 27, 1941, both of whom gave their full approval to this new interpretation, on page 82 of my book the following is quoted from the address of Attorney General Jackson:

"President Roosevelt in his message to the Congress of January 6, 1941, said that 'such aid is not an act of war.'"

To what did Attorney General Jackson refer? President Roosevelt on January 6, 1941, appeared in person before the two Houses of Congress and said in part as follows:

"In fulfillment of this purpose we will not be intimidated by the threats of dictators that they will regard as a breach of international law and as an act of war our aid to the democracies which dare to resist their aggression. Such aid is not an act of war, even if a dictator should unilaterally proclaim it so to be. When the dictators are ready to make war upon us they will not wait for an act of war on our part."

Here is the understanding of the present situation. The dictators have not made war upon us. But the President is ready to start the shooting. The dictators did not claim that aid to Britain was an act of war. On January 6, 1941, the President spoke of Hitler and Mussolini as dictators, but he did not call them privateers and pirates. In other words, the dictators did not resort to open acts of aggression. They did not commit acts of war. War did not come from that source. Now the President, seeking to justify his order to shoot, cites the actions of two former Presidents who used our armed vessels to clear the seas of privateers and pirates. He no longer says, "Such aid is not an act of war." He states: "Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war."

When the Lend Lease Act was before the Senate for consideration it was clearly emphasized that it did not deal with men but only with war materials. Pressed by Senator ELLENDER in the debate on March 5, 1941, Senator BARKLEY stated:

"Mr. ELLENDER. Well, how can you convoy ships without men?

"Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; of course not, and the Senator from Louisiana knows that as well as I do; but in this bill we are dealing with equipment, all sorts of equipment. We are not dealing with an army. We are not dealing with a navy. We are dealing with the things that may be lent, leased, or otherwise disposed of by the President of the United States."

The complete answer to convoying can be found in these words of Senator BARKLEY. The things were to be carried by vessels manned by the British Government, and hence no American life could be taken if the vessel were attacked. This positively settles the claim that there is any authorization of convoying in the Lend Lease Act.

Furthermore, in this same debate Senator WHITE stated:

"It is charged that the passage of this legislation means that our warships will convoy our merchant vessels. The direct answer to this assertion is that the bill gives no such power. On the contrary, it says in

terms that nothing in the Act shall be construed to confer this right. There are those who insist that under his constitutional powers the President may do this thing. If they are right in this, if under his constitutional designation as Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, or if in the powers which inhere under the Constitution in the office of President, Mr. Roosevelt can so use the naval vessels of the United States, certainly we cannot take from him any right conferred by the Constitution. If, on the other hand, such right is not constitutionally his, he does not have it., This bill does not confer it."

In the recent statement of the President, when he announced that he had given orders to shoot, he positively claimed that as Commander in Chief he has the right and intended to use it. We are, therefore, confronted with this situation. The President claims that he has the right to order shooting without any action by the Congress. This order to shoot may get us into war. The President can only provoke war but he cannot declare war. There may be any number of shootings, but, there will still be no war until action by Congress.

This presents a very unwholesome situation and if neglected may result in great humiliation and embarrassment. Over 80 percent of the American people do not support the President in making war. They do not want war and they do not want him to provoke war. What is the duty of Congress in this critical hour?

Fortunately, we are not without a remedy. The President is asking for additional billions of dollars under the Lend Lease Act, a law which does not authorize him to order shooting. He himself has said that convoys mean shooting and shooting means war. How, then, can the Congress vote him additional billions of dollars when the Congress knows that he intends to act under his powers as Commander in Chief and in direct violation of the plain provisions of the Lend Lease Act? This charges the conscience of every member of Congress to compel the President to rescind his order to shoot or be denied any further appropriation. There is no escape from this conclusion. Believing that the President will not rescind his order to shoot, I shall never vote to provide him with additional moneys which are clearly not authorized by the Lend Lease Act.

We must bear in mind that the additional $5,985,000,000 is to be used for the purposes of the Lend Lease Act. He has not asked for moneys to carry out his powers as Commander in Chief. All of us know what he intends to do with the money. All of us know that he intends to use our Navy to convoy merchant ships. All of us know that such use of our Navy will provoke war. All of us know that this will not be a constitutional war but the President's own war. What a travesty. How long can this sort of thing continue without breeding in the minds of the people a feeling of utter dismay and humiliation? But that is just where we stand today.

Knowing that he intends to carry on his own shooting war, the President merely uses the Congress to provide him with the sinews of war. He is not willing to comply with the Constitution of the United States and ask the Congress to declare war. All Congress is asked to do is to furnish the money so that he can make a success of his war which is in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States. Can any Member voting him these additional billions of dollars ever again claim that he has been true to his oath of office and to the Constitution of the United States?

We have presented to us a clear choice and it is this: Follow the Constitution or follow the President. If you follow the Constitution, we can stay out of war and keep faith with the American people. If you follow the President, you will be untrue to the people and to your oath of office. The time has come for Congress to assert its powers, preserve its dignity and prerogatives under the Constitution by refusing to vote any additional moneys. Congress controls the purse strings. Only in this way can we express our disapproval of the action of the President.

This decision is made easy for the Members of Congress because the President has asked for additional moneys under a law that does not authorize the action which he has taken as Commander in Chief. If the President feels himself wronged by the refusal of Congress to make these appropriations, he has only himself to thank for such injury. He has stubbornly refused to consult Congress and has stubbornly refused to take the American people into his confidence. Many claim that he has directly violated his sacred pledge to the American people. Many have asked that the President be impeached. There is no need at this time of going that far. Congress now is afforded the opportunity of rebuking the President by refusing to provide additional billions of dollars to enable him to pursue a course which Congress has not authorized.

I appeal to the President to recall his request for additional lend-lease moneys. I do this to prevent utter humiliation for all of us. I do this because of my loyalty to the Constitution of the United States and for my heartfelt desire to preserve ordered liberty in the land we all love so dearly. I believe the President should be big enough to realize that he cannot further pursue his own shooting war without cruelly destroying and eliminating the Congress as one of the three great coordinate branches of the Government. Much as we abhor aggression and desire peace, we have lost everything when we lose respect for ordered liberty under the Constitution of the United States. As a Member of Congress, I must be vigilant of the powers of Congress. We all took an oath to that same Constitution and we all stand or fall together. It is my prayer that there will always be a Constitution and that there will always be a Congress. May God bless you all.

National Newspaper Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. WHEAT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, October 1 to 8 has been designated as National Newspaper Week, and I want to take this opportunity to express my opinion as to the importance of the newspapers in this country, particularly those known as the weekly newspaper.

Coming as I do from an agricultural district in the central portion of Illinois, composed of 8 counties with a population of 300,000, in which are located the University of Illinois—which maintains an excellent school of journalism, the Millikin University, and the Eastern Illinois State Teachers College, I have had an opportunity to come in contact with and to observe the importance of the 60 newspapers located in my district.

It is my considered opinion, based upon many years of experience, that these newspapers wield a tremendous influence for good downright Americanism in their respective communities, and that they will continue to do so as long as they remain free and unhampered. Of late, we have heard considerable talk about the possibilities of at least a partial press censorship. In my opinion, this would be a very grave error.

For the benefit of America, I sincerely trust that these newspapers may be permitted to continue to operate as free and individual units, unrestrained by censorship from Washington or from any other source. Freedom of the press was one of the fundamentals laid down by the founders in that immortal document—the Constitution of the United States. If this one goes by the board, I warn you here and now, it will not be long until it is followed by restraints upon other freedoms—worship, speech, and assembly—and the seeds of tyranny will have sprung forth full grown.

The Neutrality Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ARTICLE BY RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Clapper, from a recent issue of the Washington Daily News:

[From the Washington Daily News of September 26, 1941]

THE NEUTRALITY LAW

(By Raymond Clapper)

Two main questions appear to be involved in the issue of revising or repealing the neutrality law.

One question is whether Congress shall permit the arming of American merchant ships. The other is whether American ships shall be permitted to go into belligerent ports. Some other points are involved, but they are incidental to these two.

As to the arming of American ships, I don't see any two sides to that question. The Nazis are attacking shipping in the waters around Greenland and Iceland. We must run American ships to those points—that is, unless we are prepared to evacuate both places and leave it to the Nazis to occupy them if they wish, and thus plant themselves within striking distance of the North American continent. As we are not going to surrender those bases of potential attack against this hemisphere, the necessity of protecting the supply line to them is obvious. Arming of ships is a necessary part of that defense.

As to repealing other restrictions in the Neutrality Act so that American ships can go into belligerent ports, further discussion is in order. In the present situation such a step probably would mean active naval war on a full-out scale.

It would mean running American ships, carrying lend-lease supplies directly into British ports. It seems to me there is a clear distinction between this and the protection of American ships operating to our own bases in Greenland and Iceland. In the latter case we have set up a reasonable line of defense outposts, and the necessity of protecting them is part of the operation. Nazis operating in those waters are manifestly out looking for trouble, and if shooting results it is shooting of their own seeking, and it is not for us to run away from it.

But in carrying goods directly into Britain, we would be going into a war zone, and we would be legitimate targets of attack. There may be a lot of authority in the international lawbooks for a neutral country carrying on trade with belligerents, but that authority is academic. The fact is that Germany and England are at war, and that to carry goods into England is to lay ourselves open to Nazi attack, just as we would be open to attack from the British if we tried to carry goods through the British blockade to Hamburg.

It is true that the Neutrality Act is being evaded and that it has been in part repealed by the lend-lease action. But the restriction against American ships and crews going into belligerent ports is still operative in the Atlantic and to repeal the restriction would be to make a definite and a fundamental change in our relation to the war.

I do not want to see that step taken if it can be avoided. If that step meant the difference between Hitler winning and Hitler losing, I would be in favor of it. I am not sure that is the case. Not yet. From everything I hear in England, the North Atlantic situation improved vastly during July and August. The time may very well come when the volume of American supplies and the volume of new American shipping would make it desirable to do part of the carrying ourselves, and even necessary unless we were willing to transfer most of our new merchant fleet to foreign registry. I doubt if that time has arrived. If it has, then the information to demonstrate it should be made available.

In other words, I do not want to see us any further into the war than we have to be in it to save a free world from destruction. That we have an interest in such an outcome seems to me beyond argument, and we are preparing to contribute heavily to it in materials. If that assistance is sufficient, then a sacrifice of American lives in addition would be needless. I think we are entitled to more conclusive evidence before we are asked to send American ships straight through into belligerent ports.

Wait and See

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ADDRESS BY DR. NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, at the opening of the one hundred and eighty-eighth year of Columbia University, September 24, 1941, entitled "Wait and See":

The highest type of ability in all which concerns the cooperation of men is what we call the administrative. Administration is the art of planning with foresight and of getting done with promptness, with effectiveness and at least possible cost of labor and of resources, all that represents and reflects the interests and ambitions of men in any given field of endeavor. History makes it very plain that from the earliest times there has been marked administrative ability in certain fields of human interest. Among these are the military, the ecclesiastical, and the exploratory. Since the end of the eighteenth century, oportunities for the exercise of administrative ability have multiplied a thousandfold as a result of the industrial and economic evolution which has marked that period. In all that relates to production, to transportation, to commerce, and to finance, administrative ability has found new opportunity in every part of the world and to an extent which would have seemed quite impossible a century and a half ago.

The most important field of human interest and cooperation in which administrative ability seems to lag is the governmental policies of the modern democracies. This was not always the case, as is made plain by a reading of the history of Great Britain in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, of France in the eighteenth century, and of our own people when the foundations of our Federal Government were being laid and our political structure was being built upon those foundations. As the democratic process has developed and broadened, however, and as the number of individual citizens participating in the choice of political representatives and in the shaping of public policies has grown, differences of opinion and of personal and group interest have come to play a steadily increasing part in the story of governmental action. Theoretically, in each one of these modern democracies, a majority rules. Theoretically, when a vote is taken on a very difficult and disputed matter and a clear majority is recorded in favor of one definite way of dealing with it, the chosen representatives of the people should at once and promptly act in accordance with what must be regarded as their instructions. But if the minority be cleverly led and armed with strong and persuasive arguments or supported by powerful emotion, there may be and there usually is indefinite delay in the formal action of public authority in respect to the matter under consideration. If, as so often happens when a general election of legislative representatives is held in a democracy, there are half a dozen questions at issue and not merely one question, then the problem presented to the legislative body grows in difficulty and in complexity. Under such circumstances, a first effort is usually to try to find a working hypothesis by which in one way or another all of the leading elements in the constituencies may be either satisfied or at least mollified. This of course does not make for efficiency or for good government. It makes simply for getting along in what appears to be the best way possible. It leaves unsettled and unsolved numerous very important political problems, some of them quite fundamental. Just now there are several such problems in our American political life,[1] but there is no sign that the Government proposes to take any action about them, simply because there are at the moment no organized pressure groups armed with political threats endeavoring to get action by the Federal Government in regard to any one of them.

In such cases the answer of the legislators is, "Wait and see." That has become a most popular slogan in all the democracies. It has furnished and is furnishing material for sarcasm and for sneering at democracy by the present-day despots and their blind followers. These despots feel that they at least can get something done, whether that something be military or civil, moral or immoral, just or unjust, humane or cruel. They therefore claim for themselves and their doctrines a degree of efficiency in administration which they insist the democracies cannot imitate and will not endeavor to imitate.

It must never be forgotten that in a democracy the beginnings of all good government are to be found in local self-government. It is in the community, be it village or town, city or county, whose inhabitants are immediately interdependent and closely in touch with each other, that a high degree of efficiency in public administration usually exists. For example, in the United States it is almost certain that the local police, the local fire department, and the local tax-supported schools are effectively administered. When from these local political units one moves to the Government of a State or to that of the Federal Union conditions sharply change. We then begin to find extravagance, duplication of organization and of effort, lack of effective oversight, and in many ways lack of efficiency. An outstanding exception is the United States Postal Service, where there is a very high type of administrative efficiency. That service has the advantage of being very little and very infrequently interfered with by new forms of congressional action and control. It therefore can proceed on the basis of its own experience to serve the public with very high effectiveness in the field of communication, than which none is more important.

It is obvious that the policy of wait and see will not do if democracy is to hold its own. Wait and see not only diminishes efficiency of governmental service, but it puts democracy itself in very great danger. In a world where every sort and kind of self-seeking is at work in order to control increasing numbers of human beings and widening areas of the earth's surface, a policy of wait and see spells defeat. It should now be pretty plain that either this modern world is going to remain at war until the whole of what we call civilization has been destroyed and all its great monuments wrecked, or that the forces of constructive, liberal democracy will shortly be able to take leadership of the world and in reasonable time to put it upon a permanent foundation of order, of justice, of peace, and of prosperity. This certainly cannot be done, however, by the policy of wait and see. If we are only to wait and see, then the believers in liberal democracy are openly handing control of the future to their bitter and determined enemies.

By great good fortune, mankind has just now been offered definite and specific leadership in its search for the foundations upon which to build a new and orderly world of prosperity and of peace. This is given by the Atlantic declaration, announced to the world on August 14 last by the President of the United States of America and by the Prime Minister in the Government of Great Britain. To the American people, this Atlantic declaration comes like a new Declaration of Independence in the field of national policy and international relations. It is supported with sympathy and understanding by those hopes and policies which have been close to the heart of the American people since the days of Washington and Franklin, of Hamilton and Jefferson. It echoes the famous sentence of President McKinley spoken 40 years ago, "The period of exclusiveness is past." It is in harmony with the doctrines taught by Presidents Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, and Harding, as well as with statements contained in the declarations of principle that were adopted by the Democrat National Convention and by the Republican National Convention of 1920. It is in accord with the instructions to the American delegates to the Hague Conference of 1907, given by Elihu Root, then Secretary of State. It is in ac-

[1] See Nicholas Murray Butler, Across the Busy Years (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939-40) II, 344-374.

cord with the joint resolution approved June 25, 1910, adopted without a dissenting vote by both Houses of the American Congress, calling for the limitation of armaments and for constituting the combined navies of the world an international police force for the preservation of universal peace.

This Atlantic declaration, which in so complete and so splendid a fashion emphasizes and repeats this long series of statements of national policy, is the direct and conclusive answer to those who would continue to put their country in danger by preferring a policy of wait and see. This is no time to wait and see. The danger is too immediate and too great. It is time to think and to act.

A Congressman Looks at Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. KARL E. MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I was asked to write a magazine article under the title "A Congressman Looks at Congress," by an editor who said he believed that the people of America were growing more and more interested in the personalities and procedures of Congress. This article was printed in the September issue of the Republican, a monthly magazine published in Chicago.

In today's struggle to preserve and perfect the true functioning of self-government, I think it is important that as many citizens as possible interest themselves in the formula of freedom by which congressional and constitutional government operates in this Republic. It is with the humble hope that this article may help add to America's collective information on this subject that I take this opportunity of reprinting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Republican for September 1941]

A CONGRESSMAN LOOKS AT CONGRESS—WANT TO KNOW WHAT A CONGRESSMAN THINKS ABOUT HIS JOB AND HIS ASSOCIATES? HERE ARE THE FACTS PRESENTED DELIGHTFULLY AND READABLY

(By KARL E. MUNDT, Member of Congress, First District, South Dakota)

It used to be popular in this country, and maybe it still is, for clothiers and haberdashers to usher in the change of seasons with the slogan, "Look at your hat—everybody else does." That slogan might be paraphrased a bit to relate to the title of this article. "A Congressman Looks at Congress," by adding, "Why shouldn't he?—Everybody else does." At least everybody else should, because, if the full functioning of self-government is to survive in this country, its continuance will result from the ability of Congress to maintain itself as a fully coordinate and independent branch of the Federal Government.

The term "Congress," of course, refers to both the Senate and the House of Representatives, but of recent years it has come to be used with increasing frequency to denote the House of Representatives or the Lower House. Thus a Senator is never called a "Congressman," although he actually is one, and a Congressman is never called a Senator, although he frequently wishes that he were one.

We Congressmen, however, seldom share the awe and reverence for the Senate which Senators sometimes like to assume attaches to the so-called Upper House. We grant that "the other body," as our parliamentary rule book insists that we refer to the Senate on the floor of the House, is, of course, the Upper House, but we secretly cherish the belief that it got this name because of its persistent record in recent years of "upping" practically every appropriation bill which passed the Lower House—the Congress—the House of Representatives. In fact, any self-respecting Congressman feels that he is just as important as a Senator—except that the Senator lasts 4 years longer than a Member of the House.

HOUSE IS ULTRAEXCLUSIVE

In fact, if you press him hard enough, a Member of the House will deny vociferously that the Senate is "the most exclusive club in the world" and will insist with vigor and verve that, when it comes to downright exclusiveness the House makes the Senate look like a county fair picnic by comparison. And if he is a good Congresman, he can prove his point, too, with an argument running something like this: "It is the House of Representatives rather than the United States Senate that merits the title of 'the most exclusive club in the world.' Why, anybody can become a United States Senator who has reached the legal age and who happens to be a personal friend of the Governor of any State in which a Senate vacancy develops. It's as easy as getting appointed to the game and fish commission—only not as frequent.

"But every Member of the House of Representatives has to get there on his own power and can be sworn into office as a Congressman only after he has been elected by the people of his own district in an official election. Thus the House is the only branch of government which never has a Member who was not selected by the people themselves. Talk about exclusive. Why, the country might have even a President who was appointed Secretary of State by a predecessor, who failed to serve out his term and whose Vice President also failed to survive the 4 years; but it can never have a Congressman except by the exclusive American function of being elected by the real rulers of America—the citizens themselves." There is the Congressman's argument for the ultraexclusiveness of the House of Representatives where, if it is not true that only the fit survive, it is certainly true that only the survivors (of an election) are fit to serve.

But looking at Congress through the eyes of a Congressman (and I mean the eyes of a Republican Congressman as I could not see with any others), I observe much of vastly more importance than the age-old contest about which House of Congress outranks the other in importance—or, as some would have it, in impotence.

ABOVE-AVERAGE CROSS SECTION

My first impression, upon becoming a Member of Congress some 3 years ago, was that, like the old Ford automobile, Congress had survived its meanest critics and had far outdistanced its friendliest commentators. Members of Congress—yes, both Houses of it—are usually far more able, sincere, and unselfish in their service to the country than, as an outsider looking in, I had supposed they would be. Ranging in age from slightly over 25 to something over 80, and including representatives of most of the established businesses and professions in the country, the United States House of Representatives is a cross section of America, but it is a layer selected from above the medium. Since it cannot include all of the lawyers in the country, for example, it has some of the best. Likewise, its membership includes some of the best businessmen, some of the best preachers, best farmers, best editors, and so on down the line.

Looking down on Congress from the vantage point of a seat in the gallery of the House Chamber—or even from the press gallery—Members of Congress do not show up to advantage. Its 435 Members have no common denominator of appearance, of dress, of stature, or of behavior. Some are as undignified as boys at a circus; some are as austere as a mortician's crew of helpers. Some are gay, and some are garrulous. But each one earned his right to membership in his own district on his own merit, and a 6 weeks' study of the votes and actions of any Member reveals pretty well the type of district which he represents and the kind of people who inhabit his district. No Member of Congress ever gets very far away from his people for very long at a time and stays in Congress. The brevity of his 2-year term and the prevailing good judgment of the voters of America see to that.

THERE'S A REASON

The first week I was in Congress an old-timer sat down beside me one day and commented dryly, "I suppose when you hear some of these guys doing a little demagoguery down in the well of the House you wonder how in hell they ever got here in the first place. I used to feel that way about it, too, but if you stay around here for a few months, son, you'll soon discover that there's a pretty good reason why every one of these Members defeated anywhere from one to half a dozen rivals to win his seat in Congress." I have often thought of that old-timer's observations, and I'm sure today that he was eternally correct in his conclusions.

Membership in Congress is a good deal like membership in a large club. Members may argue with each other vigorously and with great heat for half a day on the floor of the House, but they do not bruise easily and they heal quickly. Bitterest of opponents on partisan or sectional or economic questions may fight it out to the last vote on the floor of the House, but after the count is taken the play is over; and, as Scarlett O'Hara put it, "Tomorrow's another day." and on "another day" a new question will be before the House, and opponents of yesterday may join as proponents in this new legislative battle, or vice versa. And against the outside world, against an unfair newspaper columnist or radio commentator, against some force or person who would intrude upon the sanctity of the House or assail its functions, the entire membership will join to defend one of its Members or its collective honor. The comraderie among Members of Congress crosses all party and sectional lines and survives the bitterest of congressional debates.

TWO FAMOUS BACHELORS

The two outstanding men in the House, as presently constituted, invariably demonstrate this "fight and forget" dualism. SAM RAYBURN, able and amiable Speaker of the House, is a Texas bachelor who marshals his Democratic (and New Deal) forces with great skill and success to withstand the attacks and criticisms, the objections, amendments, modifications, and proposals of JOE MARTIN'S group of embattled minority Members. SAM RAYBURN is both fair and fervent. He fights hard and long for the administration's point of view. The minority leader (adjudged last year by Capitol Hill correspondents as "the most valuable Member of Congress"), is a Massachusetts bachelor (these "singletons" go places in Congress) whose parliamentary skill, political sense, and all-around ability mark him easily as a leader of far better than average ability.

JOE MARTIN leads his minority as vigorously and valiantly as SAM RAYBURN leads his greater army; neither leader asks for quarter nor offers concessions to appease. Neither will sacrifice principle for politics nor honor for victory. Both retain the loyalty of their

respective parties and followers by "playing ball with the members of their own team." But after the balloting is over and the decision is made, it's "another day" for both SAM and JOE. And between the two of them exists a prevailing friendship and a deep sense of mutual respect which the roughest and longest of parliamentary battles will not tarnish.

For the fact that the House Republicans, during the past two sessions of Congress, so frequently have defeated unwise legislation, modified excessive legislation or postponed unnecessary legislation, JOE MARTIN deserves additional credit because of the dual facts that: (1), His Republican forces face an opposition majority of about an even hundred; and (2), the Republican Party meetings are never in the form of a caucus which binds the members to support a party policy, but are simply conferences to inform the members about the merit or demerit of impending legislation from the Republican viewpoint. Once the party conference is over, every Republican can follow the inclination of his own nose without falling into disrepute with his fellows and, unless he is convinced that the approach of the majority of his party is best for the Nation, he can rebel without becoming a rebel. In spite of such consideration for the rights of the individual Republican in Congress, "Joe's gang" have worked together to leave the imprint of the Republican point of view upon a surprisingly large amount of legislation since he became the minority leader in 1939.

DECLARATION OF G. O. P. POLICY

Illustrative of the technique behind the scenes in Republican congressional conferences was the recent party meeting to discuss the problems of national defense and foreign affairs. A set of resolutions was presented by a group of Republican Members, most closely associated with legislation in these fields, and after free and open discussion, the following statement was adopted by a near-unanimous vote of the party conferees as a declaration of Republican policy:

"The Republican Members of the House of Representatives, believing that the people of the United States are entitled to a definite expression of our views on national defense and foreign policy, hereby declare:

"(1) We reaffirm the pledge of our 1940 party platform: 'The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war. We approve the restatement of this principle, subsequently written into the 1940 Democratic Party platform: 'We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, Navy, or Air Forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack.' We demand the fulfillment of these pledges.

"(2) We reaffirm the declaration in our party platform: 'We condemn all executive acts and proceedings which might lead to war without the authorization of the Congress of the United States.'

"(3) We reaffirm the declaration of our party platform, as follows: 'Our national defense must be so strong that no unfriendly power shall ever set foot on American soil. To assure this strength, our national economy, the true basis of America's defense, must be free of unwarranted governmental interference.' We firmly believe in maintaining and upholding the Monroe Doctrine and safeguarding this hemisphere from foreign invasion. We insist that our national defense be strong enough to accomplish these objectives.

"(4) The 'lease-lend' policy was presented to the American people as a measure 'short of war.' We insist that it be administered as a 'short-of-war' measure.

"(5) We are convinced that this declaration of policy is overwhelmingly supported by American public opinion and that such a program will assure the greatest degree of national unity and security."

JOE HAS TACT, PERSISTENCE

To bring about a meeting of many minds from various sections of the country on the most important problems of our day, a congressional leader must be both tactful and persistent. JOE MARTIN has these qualities in rich abundance. Since the adoption of this "directional beam" of party policy in Congress, a new back-drop has been provided before which to study the parade of passing events with the collective power of party unity. No Member is bound by such a declaration of policy, but all Members are benefited by having such a reaffirmation of party policy before them as they approach the problems which come to hand. It is a demonstration of collective strength without the sacrifice of individual power.

The American Congress exemplifies one of the signal axioms of self-government in this Republic; namely, that for its successful functioning it depends upon the two-party system. A membership of 435 individual Congressmen would be too unwieldly to produce results of merit were it not for its division along two-party lines. The majority proposes major legislation; the minority analyzes it for defects, criticizes its weaknesses, suggests improvements. Each party has a definite responsibility in the American Congress just as it does in the bigger arena of all political activity in this Republic. When either the directing party or the disagreeing party fails to function in Congress, Congress fails to represent the people and begins to represent the Executive or the party in power.

Thus as "A Congressman Looks at Congress," it takes on the aspect of a great proving ground for all that is best in the science of self-government. It is the last great forum in the world in which the two-party system of government serves to protect the weak from the strong, the minority from the majority, and the permanently important from the ephemerally expedient. Come to think of it, however, there is another reason why Congress is so important to the survival of freedom in America.

It's because much more frequently than he "looks at Congress," a Congressman looks at the country. He looks out to his constituents who comprise in the aggregate all the citizens of this Republic. He looks out to them for "directional beams" to guide his acts and votes more often than he looks to congressional conferences or party parleys for such support. Yes; it is probably because "Congress looks to the country" to determine how it can serve America best that so much of the country looks to Congress with the hope and the confident prayer that, come what will, the United States of America long will continue to believe and to behave in accordance with the great American principle that "under God the people rule."

Senator Wagner Points Out Vital Necessity of Planning Now for Post-War Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, no one is better equipped to discuss the question of meeting the problems which will confront us when we stop spending these billions on defense than is the senior Senator from New York, Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER. I take pleasure in including with my remarks an article by the Senator which appeared in the America Laborite, official organ of the American Labor Party of New York.

[From the American Laborite of August 15, 1941]

PLAN FOR MILLIONS OF POST-WAR JOBS VITAL TO CUSHION END OF ARMS BOOM

(By ROBERT F. WAGNER, senior United States Senator from New York)

In the judgment of history, the Versailles Treaty is recognized as a bad peace because it was primarily a political settlement. It carved out new states, shifted old boundaries, transferred colonies, exacted reparations, and created a League of Nations with ineffective guaranties against military aggression and infringement of minority political rights. There was little if any regard for a lasting economic basis on which the political arrangement would have to stand or fall.

When peace came, the United States, like the rest of the world, went back to economic normalcy. A thoughtful program of post-war economic reconstruction, offered by American organized labor, did not win a favorable hearing. Our wartime agencies were promptly dismantled, and no agencies or even plans for adjustment to immediate or long-range peacetime economic and social needs were established in their place.

Looking back over the last two decades, we can see clearly how the failure to advance toward a just economic order inevitably led to world-wide depression, and unleashed the brute forces of intolerance that threaten our security today.

In the present conflict, President Roosevelt has proclaimed America's refusal not only to accept a Hitler-dominated world, but also to accept a world like the post-war world of the 1920's, "in which the seeds of Hitlerism can again be planted and allowed to grow." To that end, the President has stated, and responsible British statesmen of all parties have affirmed, that democracy's guiding peace aim must be social security in its broadest sense, within and between nations.

This time, before our free world crashes about us in utter and final ruin, the forces of democracy are determined to win the war, and, equally important, to win the peace as well.

British labor, speaking through the Labor Party, has taken the lead in formulating these aims, and the work of planning for post-war problems in Britain is being directed by a labor member (Arthur Greenwood, minister without portfolio) of Mr. Churchill's cabinet. British conservatives vie with laborites in recognizing that only through intelligent planning can democracy avoid the reproach of slums and poverty, of idle resources and chronic unemployment; that only through the practical cooperation of peoples in the necessary task of reconstruction can the peace be finally won.

In order to focus American attention on this far-reaching problem I introduced at the very beginning of this Congress a resolution to establish the Post Emergency Economic Advisory Commission, composed of 12 members—3 Members of the House of Representatives, 3 Members of the Senate, and 6 others chosen by the President from the executive departments and the general public. The Commission would be authorized to study the economic problems likely to confront the Nation upon the termination of the present defense emergency, and to formulate a comprehensive program for the full utilization of America's resources of men and machines in maintaining and improving

the economic well-being of all the people. The Commission would have authority to call on the various agencies and departments of government for materials, information, and personnel. From time to time the Commission would publish progress reports and recommend appropriate legislation.

If Hitler conquers the Old World, America's economic problem will be grave—armaments and more armaments will be the order of the day. If the war ends with Hitler's complete downfall, the way to a brighter future will be opened, but it must be won by a national effort even more complex than the organization of production for the military victory. Abroad, economic chaos will prevail in our normal world markets. At home, we will be faced with the twin evils of an expanded but largely unused industrial capacity and many millions of unemployed. The unemployment problem will be aggravated by substitute products and more efficient machinery developed under stress of defense production, and by vast migrations of workers from defense areas back to the farms and to peacetime industrial centers.

Temporary measures to cushion the shock will of course be necessary. An expanded relief program will be imperative. In addition, under a bill I have introduced, substantial funds would be appropriated now for the selection and planning of a "shelf" of public-works projects, ready for immediate use when the defense program is concluded. But these and other measures are only stopgaps; they cannot begin to meet the postdefense unemployment problem. In the last year, $45,000,000,000 have been made available for defense orders in American industry—and we still have millions of jobless. Relief spending on such a scale after the war is out of the question, for tax revenue will be declining at the same time we are seeking to retrench in Government spending.

The solution must be sought and found in the intelligent cooperation of labor, industry, and government under our system of free enterprise to keep our men and resources at work producing for the peacetime needs of the American people and of a reconstructed world. Can this be done? The answer is—it must be done, or else our free way of life will not survive. The Treasury could not withstand the drain on public funds, and our social system could not withstand the continued waste of unemployed men and machines. We have the resources, the factories, and the willing hands. In producing for defense, virtual miracles have been wrought, and armament schedules surpassed. With the same urgency and sacrifice, we can win the battle of production for peace.

We must be concerned with measures to be adopted now, in addition to those prepared and held in reserve when the emergency ends; for example, maintain sound defense tax and price policies, to avoid a cycle of inflation now and deflation later on; create a system of dismissal compensation for defense workers, financed out of present defense pay rolls and earnings; extend and improve our machinery for unemployment insurance and job exchanges; and provide that public housing built now for defense workers shall be available for slum dwellers after the emergency has passed. For a really effective industrial mobilization plan for peace, the time to begin work is now.

In centuries past, good cropland was scarce and the supply of material goods extremely limited. Wars were fought for control of these means of production. The modern world is blessed with machines fashioned by man and subject to man's control, machines that can produce for a better, happier standard of life than we have ever known. To begin thinking and planning now for that goal is really part of our defense effort. It is the very heart of the dynamic, democratic philosophy which is the only hope of a troubled world.

Niagara Falls Power Development and the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

LETTER TO THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION AND ARTICLE FROM THE BUFFALO COURIER-EXPRESS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I call the attention of the House to a recent statement of Chairman Leland Olds of the Federal Power Commission that immediate construction of the St. Lawrence project is needed to furnish additional power to up-State New York and my reply to Mr. Olds, citing the fact that further development of Niagara Falls and utilization of present facilities would supply the needed power. I have suggested to Chairman Olds that the Niagara Falls development project should have priority over the St. Lawrence seaway. My letter to the Commission and a release from the Buffalo Courier-Express of September 28, 1941, are included herein:

SEPTEMBER 27, 1941.

Hon. LELAND OLDS,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of September 19 in which you enclosed, at my request, a list of industrial plants served by the Niagara Falls Power Co., which you indicated at recent hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway would expand production if additional power is available.

Undoubtedly, you have received some indication from the companies mentioned that they could use more power for defense expansion in the Niagara Falls area. This was the reason that the Government authorized further diversion of water at Niagara Falls to put through existing power plants. I believe that the Niagara Falls Power Co. asked your Commission for the privilege of diverting added water through existing stations, the benefits of such increased diversion to go to the expanding war industries in that area.

It seems to me, however, that if added power for the mentioned industries is necessary at Niagara Falls the Federal Power Commission should not only authorize but direct the Niagara Falls Power Co. to use the full potentialities of the Adams station. When the members of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee visited the Niagara Falls plants on their St. Lawrence seaway inspection tour they saw idle generators there because the Government did not authorize a further diversion of water there so that the full capacity of that station would be utilized. This amounts to approximately 95,000 horsepower.

It the Federal Power Commission is concerned about expanding industries at Niagara Falls, I would suggest that you advocate the immediate and further development of Niagara Falls rather than the St. Lawrence seaway far up in the northern part of the State. The Power Authority of the State of New York, long an advocate of the St. Lawrence seaway, has recommended a new 25,000 second-feet full head plant at Niagara Falls, with certain power-diversion adjustments there. That authority concluded on page 43 of their 1938 annual report the following:

"The new power plant would add 787,500 horsepower to the 499,000 horsepower installed in the Schoellkopf station, the net effect of which would be to add 677,500 horsepower to the generating capacity of the State, giving consideration to the loss of 110,000 horsepower through the cancelation of present Canadian import contracts. The annual energy output on the United States side of the river would be increased from 2,746,000,000 kilowatt-hours to 7,255,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year, less the energy now obtained from the Canadian contracts, which amounts to approximately 650,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. The net effect, therefore, would amount to an increase of 3,859,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year in the energy supply of the State. In addition, there would be provided 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year of secondary energy without further investment, which would be available when the market is ready to absorb it."

From this it would appear that the Niagara Falls project should have priority over the St. Lawrence project, since the latter would take three times as long to complete, and when completed would be great distances from the areas where the demand for power does or will exist—not in the very heart of the electrochemical industry, as is the case at Niagara Falls.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED F. BEITER.

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express]

BEITER WANTS FALLS POWER DEVELOPMENT—TELLS FEDERAL COMMISSION HEAD WORK THERE SHOULD HAVE PRIORITY OVER ST. LAWRENCE—IDLE FACILITIES CITED—LEGISLATOR CHALLENGES STATEMENT BY OLDS CALLING SEAWAY PROJECT VITAL NOW

WASHINGTON, September 27.—The contention of Chairman Leland Olds, of the Federal Power Commission, that immediate construction of the St. Lawrence project is vital, because upper New York State now is short of power, was challenged today by Representative ALFRED F. BEITER, of the Forty-first District.

In a letter to Representative JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, Olds asserted that, even with completion of the St. Lawrence project in 1945, up-State New York will be 394,000 kilowatts short of the capacity estimated as necessary for expansion of essential defense production, unless further additions to generating capacity are planned. Olds said it is silly to consider the St. Lawrence project a rival for coal-burning electric-power plants, because both are needed. He added that "it would be a grave error in military planning to delay immediate construction of the St. Lawrence project."

URGES FALLS PRIORITY

In a letter sent at the same time to Olds, BEITER declared that if there is a shortage of power in upper New York, then development of Niagara Falls should have priority over the St. Lawrence development.

BEITER pointed out that it would require three times longer to complete the St. Lawrence project than to develop Niagara Falls power further, and that, when completed, the St. Lawrence stations will be great distances from Niagara Falls, where the demand for more power exists in electro-chemical and other defense industries.

"If added power for Niagara Falls industries is needed," BEITER says, "it seems to me that the Federal Power Commission should not only authorize but direct the Niagara Falls Power Co. to use the full potentialities of the Adams station.

"When the members of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee visited the Niagara Falls plants on their St. Lawrence seaway inspection tour they saw generators idle, because the Government did not authorize a further diversion of water so that the full capacity of that station would be utilized. This amounts to about 95,000 horsepower.

CITES POWER BOARD ATTITUDE

"If the Federal Power Commission is concerned about expanding industries at Niagara Falls, I would suggest that you advocate the immediate and further development of Niagara Falls, rather than the St. Lawrence seaway far up in the northern part of the State. The power authority of the State of New York, long an advocate of the St. Lawrence seaway, has recommended a new 25,000 second-feet full-head plant at Niagara Falls From this Niagara Falls development should have priority over the St. Lawrence development."

BEITER's challenge came almost simultaneously with release of Olds' letter to Mansfield. At a recent hearing on the St. Lawrence, Olds said some plants served by the Niagara Falls Power Co. would expand production if additional power were available. He listed Carborundum, R. & H. Chemicals, General Abrasives, Hooker Electro-Chemical, Niagara Smelting, Pittsburgh Metallurgical, Titanium Alloy Manufacturing, and Union Carbide companies and the Kimberly Clark and Vanadium corporations.

Conservation of Sheet Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

LETTER FROM FRANK A. HOLMES OF WATERLOO, IOWA

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, in these days of threatened shortage of raw materials every constructive suggestion which would result in saving should be very carefully considered. Under permission granted to me I include a letter written by a man who has made a great study of this subject, Frank A. Holmes, of Waterloo, Iowa. The adoption of the plan set forth in his letter for the continuous use of license plates for automobiles for a 5-year period instead of 1, as at present, would save annually in the State of Iowa 550 tons of steel. The saving to the taxpayers there would be $44,060.

The letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 8, 1941.

Hon. JOHN W. GWYNNE,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: About a year ago we had a conversation relative to the conservation of sheet steels. During the past year I have made a thorough investigation of the subject and have collected much data regarding the waste brought about by the discarding of automobile number plates each year.

At present there are approximately 37,000,000 sets of license plates issued annually in the United States. These plates weigh 1 pound 2 ounces per pair. Each year, on the 1st day of January and February, this enormous amount of steel is replaced by new steel and that of the past year is relegated to the dumps or otherwise destroyed. The metal content of these discarded plates is such as to justify their continuous use for a period of at least 5 years keeping them current by the use of a small gadget, weighing 1½ ounces, that when properly attached would give full identification and information as completely as the plate on first issuance. As this gadget would weigh but one-sixteenth of the weight of the original plate, a saving of fifteen-sixteenths in sheet metal would be effected. The State of Iowa uses approximately 550 tons of sheet metal annually for its license plates. By putting my suggestion into effect prior to the issuance of the 1943 plates, a savings of 515⅝ tons would be achieved for that year alone and all other States would have a proportionate saving yearly. It is my understanding that a similar practice has been followed in some other States with great success. There is enclosed a small photograph showing the attached gadget in position.

In addition to this suggestion for the future conservation of sheet metal, there is also a large amount of steel to be salvaged from discarded license plates of previous years which have not found their way to the dump but are still in the possession of private citizens. It is estimated that there are from 2 to 4 sets of old plates which are still retained by each of the purchasers of the 37,000,000 license plates issued annually. It is my belief that with publicity similar to that of the recent aluminum campaign and an appeal to patriotic, defense-minded Americans, these old plates could be collected at a central point in each State with a minimum cost to the Government.

It is suggested that the Government make public appeal by radio and press to the owners of discarded plates to have them bundled and delivered to the nearest post office, the same to be franked to some central point in each State.

Assuring you that I stand ready at any and all times to give you any assistance within my power toward the conservation of war materials, I am,

Sincerely yours,

F. A. HOLMES.

The Duty of Members of Congress in the Present International Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in fulfilling our duty as Members of Congress in formulating Government policies and casting the vote of the people we have the honor to represent, it is highly important that we have an expression of the views of those we have the responsibility to represent. The clear, concise statement of an Idaho businessman, who is a World War veteran, taxpayer, and Democrat, which is inserted herewith, is indicative of public opinion in the district that I have the honor to represent:

MIDDLETON, IDAHO,
September 16, 1941.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you for what you have done to keep us out of the European war, but it looks like the fight has just begun. It seems as though the President has forgotten the Democratic platform, his preelection pledges, and that we have a Congress.

I have been in business in this little town for the past 20 years, and I just know of one man here that wants to go to war, and he is past 70 years old.

The war crowd wanting us to team up with the Communists has made it unanimous here.

Thanking you for what you have done and assuring you my loyal support, I remain,

Yours truly,

T. H. ANDERSON,
World War Veteran, Taxpayer, Democrat.

A Different Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SIOUX FALLS (S. DAK.) DAILY ARGUS LEADER

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, one of the many distinguished newspapers displayed on the newspaper racks of the Members' lobby is the Daily Argus Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., the leading newspaper of the two Dakotas. In looking over the papers the other day, I came across a striking editorial in the Daily Argus Leader which I take this opportunity of calling to the attention of the Congress and the country since it seems to point to a most profound and potent truth. It is also of special interest in view of the remarks by Mr. Willkie recently before a subcommittee of the Senate.

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus Leader]

A DIFFERENT WILLKIE

Before Wendell Willkie proceeds too far in his attempt to purge the Republican Party of Senators and Representatives who do not endorse President Roosevelt's foreign policies, he might reflect upon what he himself told the American people last year.

Then, if he is a reasonable man, he might ponder about the justification of attempting to oust Congressmen because they endorse the policy that he expressed when he was a candidate for the Presidency.

Here are a few quotations concerning which Willkie should be reminded:

"I want to repeat what I said on several previous occasions that, despite our wholehearted sympathy for the Allied cause, we must stay out of the war. We do not intend to send men from the shores of this continent to fight in any war.

"I believe in national defense, not as a step toward war, but as a protection against it. It is the duty of the President of the United States to recognize the determination

of the people to stay out of war and to do nothing by word or deed that will undermine that determination."—Wendell Willkie at Brooklyn, June 18, 1940.

"Many persons have asked me whether, if I were nominated and elected, I would lead the United States to war. My reply is that the Chief Executive should not lead the people to war unless and until the people insist. It is the attitude of the Chief Executive to prevent war if he can possiby do so. In that awful decision, he should not push Congress. Congress should push him. In a democracy only the people have a right to decide upon war. The duty of a President is to be the restraining and calming influence in all periods of crises.

"And personality, in spite of my belief that we should help the Allies in every way possible, I have been against getting into this war or any other war. And I still am."—Wendell Willkie at Boston, June 14, 1940.

"It would be foolhardy for us to get into war at this time, I don't think we should get into this war at all, but we should show our sympathy for the Allies."—Wendell Willkie at Minneapolis, May 10, 1940.

"Henry Wallace, the Democratic Vice Presidential nominee, said recently that the Republican Party was the party of appeasement. That can mean two things. If he meant working out compromises with the dictators, then he was 100 percent wrong. But if Mr. Wallace meant to say that the Republican Party is the party of peace, he spoke the truth, because I shall never lead this country into any European war. And when I say that I mean it."—Wendell Willkie at Rushville, Ind., September 7, 1940.

"Our political foreign experts should be rid of the habit of whispering through the window and slipping things down the back alley. Our foreign policies should be forthright and clear."—Wendell Willkie in Fortune magazine, April 1940.

"The American people do not want war. They have no idea whatever of joining in any conflict, whether on the Atlantic or the Pacific. They are determined to keep America at peace. In this determination I stand with them. I am for keeping out of war. I am for peace for America."—Wendell Willkie at Cleveland, October 2, 1940.

"We shall not undertake to fight anybody else's war. Our boys shall stay out of Europe."—Wendell Willkie at Brockton, Mass., October 11, 1940.

"But I wish to make it plain tonight that I do not think the New Deal has been either wise or effective in foreign affairs. I do not believe that it has contributed to peace. I believe it has contributed to war. And I believe it has done so because of a fundamental misunderstanding—a fundamental failure to understand the role that America must play among the nations of the earth." (Wendell Willkie at St. Louis, October 17, 1940.)

And that's the record of Wendell Willkie—his own record. Not what somebody else might have said, his opinions were but what he himself said they were.

The only explanation he has provided for the sharp reversal of his position is to describe his effusions last year as campaign oratory.

That is a tragic thing to do. According to his own words he would have betrayed the people who supported him if he had obtained a majority of the electoral votes.

It is pathetic, indeed, that a man who would aspire to such a high office and be so signally honored by a major political party would have such a crass appreciation of his responsibilities.

Actually, as we realize now, the people had no choice in 1940. Candidates Roosevelt and Willkie both posed before the voters as men who had no intention of permitting American involvement in the war.

But when the votes had been counted they threw aside the verbal masks they had donned earlier in the year for the duration of the campaign.

The spectacle is not a pleasant one. The menace of Hitler was as apparent last October as it is now. France had fallen then, and England was being subjected to the heaviest bombardment of the war. Mein Kampf had been written.

We knew then what we know now.

There is a question, a real question, about the role which the United States should occupy.

There is no question, however, about the duty of men who seek high office to state their positions clearly and exactly on a problem so vital to the welfare of the United States.

Some persons still maintain that the voice of Willkie will be a dominant one in Republican councils in the future. It won't be. He is through, and Republican Congressmen have no occasion to worry about his opposition in the ranks of their own party. He now belongs—where his heart has always been—to the Roosevelt Party.

How Do Strikes Strike You, Taxpayer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ALMA (MICH.) RECORD

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Alma (Mich.) Record:

[From the Alma (Mich.) Record]

HOW DO STRIKES STRIKE YOU—TAXPAYER?

We can't read a newspaper or turn on the radio without seeing or hearing something about a strike, something that is interfering with defense programs, and yet the Government officials allow these strikes to go on, and in many cases secretly encourage them while at the same time they are calling for more billions of dollars from the pockets of the people for supposed defense purposes.

Now there is a hue and cry in Congress, promoted by those in authority, to raise more billions to send to Europe.

Only a few months ago a law was passed which was known as the lease-lend bill and that provided for taking $7,000,000,000 out of the pockets of the American people to raise money for John Bull, Tom, Dick, and Harry and other bulls. Now they are demanding of the people six billion more to give or lend to someone outside of our country, and American people have to pay.

If Congress would put a stop to these strikes and make the strikers work on defense programs the same as they make the soldiers fight for defense they would be doing something for the people besides robbing them of their earnings and savings.

If the labor leaders are permitted to strike and hold up defense programs, I see no reason why the taxpayers would not be justified in striking and refusing to pay any more taxes until the other strikers get down to business and work for the good of the country, instead of for their own selfish interests. It is the people's money that is being wasted and strikers are being paid out of unemployment taxes on business, while they sit on the seat of their pants and howl for increased pay for less production.

Here is an illustration of the extent of strikes which should wake the American people up and make them strike conscious to the extent of refusing to pay taxes to finance this kind of nonsense and rank injustice. Read it over for yourself and do your own deciding as to how strikes strike you, and how long you are going to stand for that kind of right down dishonest management of our affairs and the waste of our money.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, man-days lost by strikes in 1941 have increased 500 percent over 1940. During the first 7 months of 1940, 3,091,000 man-days were lost. In the similar 1941 period, 15,750,000 man-days were lost.

The number of strikes called in 1941 increased to 2,505 from the 1940 figure of 1,403.

A month-by-month comparison of numbers of strikes in 1941 and 1940 follows:

Month	1941	1940
January	220	128
February	240	172
March	230	178
April	400	228
May	500	239
June	385	214
July	430	244
Total	2,505	1,403

A comparison of man-days lost month by month follows:

Month	1941	1940
January	625,000	247,000
February	1,000,000	290,000
March	1,400,000	387,000
April	7,800,000	442,000
May	2,250,000	666,000
June	2,375,000	484,000
July	1,300,000	585,000
Total	15,750,000	3,091,000

Now, folks, let us break this record down and see just what it means to us in terms which we can understand, and then let us draw our own conclusions as to the justice and fairness of this sort of management.

Three hundred working days per year are considered as the average working year in all industry taking out Sundays and holidays. Now let us divide 15,750,000 by 300 and the result is 52,500 working years for one man that have been wasted in 7 months, and during all that time we have been yelling at the top of our voices for greater and faster production for defense in order that we may send enough to England and Russia to save our democracy, which is in greater danger from our own nonsense than from anything that is happening in Europe.

If we make another analysis of this situation and take a look at the problem from another angle, it would take 52,500 men working 1 whole year to make up that time lost by these strikes and it really does not take much hard thinking to estimate what could be accomplished in 1 year by 52,500 men working steadily every working day in honest-to-god fashion.

Had there been no strikes, and had the lost years been put in at honest labor, there would be no need for us to be yelling for greater speed for defense production and the material we need would have been produced and would be already in use. The newspapers would not be urging greater haste and the radio announcers would silence most of their senseless chatter about speed.

Just everyday horse sense tells us that the man who sits down and refuses to work is not producing anything, and further that he is not letting anyone else produce anything

for defense, or for any other purpose. Now the Government management that stands for that sort of thing has some loose headgear somewhere that is failing to function, in this time when the country is in great danger and needs the loyal service of every good American citizen.

The danger to the country grows steadily for one reason only, and that reason is the fact that millions of production days are lost because strikes go on and men loaf at public expense instead of producing for defense.

If our public servants in Washington are not big enough and do not possess the common sense and courage to put a stop to this outrage, then it is time for the people to speak right out in meeting to protect themselves.

We Pay Tribute to a Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. CLOUD (MINN.) NEWS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Cloud (Minn.) News of August 14, 1941:

[From the St. Cloud (Minn.) News of August 14, 1941]

WE PAY TRIBUTE TO A MAN

According to a criticizing editorial in a local daily, a group of Northwest Republicans voted to oust Wendell Willkie out of the Republican Party, and HAROLD KNUTSON is credited with heading that group.

In his usual way the editor makes the public believe that nearly everybody agrees with the war policy of his sheet and with the administration's foreign policy, by saying "if it should happen and that is the way it looks." * * * But may we ask whether this is the way it looks, meaning that the public wants war? Our answer is no, and we base this answer on the Other Peoples' Opinion column of the same paper where almost every writer within the trade territory of that paper is for a true defense of our country, because they are true Americans, but where every writer is equally opposed to our giving everything to England and the Communists. On the other hand, the only opinions that are appearing in the same paper in favor of our entry into this imperialistic war of Great Britain comes either from Dorothy Thompson, a paid propagandist, or some National Democratic Committee member who is doing the will of his master, who either holds a political job or seeks one, and who can't express his own honest opinion any more than can a Jew in Berlin.

On the other hand we have HAROLD KNUTSON, who is reminded by this daily editor of William Allen White's letter sent to JOE MARTIN recently, where White urged the Republicans to lay off criticizing the administration's foreign policy if they intend to run for Congress again.

Now let's get to the bare facts. HAROLD KNUTSON voted against our entry into the last war. It was later proven that he used very good judgment in voting thus. Harold then made the most of that vote, and was reelected time and again, during peacetime, because he told the people again and again and again and again that he was against sending troops to foreign soil. Harold did not promise that he was against the true defense of our own country, Harold did not promise that he was going to meet foreign diplomats at high sea or anywhere else to cook up schemes to create incidents, Harold did not promise to tax our people by the billions and then give these same billions to a foreign country that beat us out of our last war debts, Harold did not promise the boys that if they enlist in the Army they could go home after the first year and then double-crossed them and tried to keep them in the Army indefinitely, Harold did not talk about four freedoms abroad and curb his own people in his own district, Harold did not condemn communism in this country and then advocate all-out aid to Russia. We could go on forever, and show where Harold kept his word.

Today we are at a cross road, and so is Harold. For 20 years he was reelected on a promise to keep the American boys off the foreign battlefields, and today, when the time is here to deliver the goods as promised, it is Harold who is keeping his 20-year-old promise. Unfortunately we find him being criticized for wanting to oust a man out of his party who refused to live up to the principles of his party, and who refused to live up to his own promise. We see him criticized by Democratic Party stooges for being an American.

The Sixth Congressional District can justly be proud of HAROLD KNUTSON, for he is a man, a true American, a man who believes in the four freedoms in America. Let's never forget him.

No Seaway Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MONTREAL DAILY STAR

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Montreal Daily Star published at Montreal, Canada, in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway. This is additional proof that the people of Canada do not want the seaway and realize that its construction at this time would hamper the war effort.

The editorial follows:

[From the Montreal Daily Star of August 12, 1941]

NO SEAWAY NOW

Opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project is growing as time and calmer judgment bring realization that its construction now would not assist the war effort of Canada or the defense plans of the United States, but would, instead, hamper both by drawing away from more urgent enterprises men, money, and materials. When, in March of this year, President Roosevelt, in a message to Premier King, said that power should be developed in the St. Lawrence at the earliest possible moment "for the joint defense effort, including aid to Great Britain," many persons who had formerly stood firmly against the project as being of potential harm and certainly of no immediate value to Canada approved the agreement then made out of patriotic enthusiasm and a lively sense of gratitude to our neighbors for their help.

There was a general, if unwarranted and unreasonable, assumption that within the next few months power required for war industry would be pouring through new transmission lines, and ships building in the Great Lakes finding their way to the sea down the St. Lawrence to participate gloriously in the Battle of the Atlantic. All that was sheer illusion born of enthusiasm. We are now aware that power cannot be developed until from 2 to 4 years have elapsed nor the seaway constructed and in operation in less than 8, and more probably 10, years. We are prepared for a long war, but we cannot be convinced that it will last that long; and we are more than ever persuaded that if power is urgently needed, as Mr. Roosevelt asserts, it can be developed more quickly, more economically, and with less disruption of war industries by the addition of equipment at available sources, rather than by a process of construction that would take years to complete.

This whole view is supported by many considerations. An effective argument can be made against building the seaway at all. But at the moment we are not concerned to do this. What we suggest, indeed, what we assert with all possible emphasis, is that its construction now or within measurable time would add nothing to the war effort, would, in fact, hamper its effective prosecution, and, for that reason alone, should be abandoned.

It cannot be argued with any show of reason that this immense development can be undertaken without drawing heavily upon scientific brains and skilled workmen, to say nothing of the vast numbers of unskilled hands that would be required for the task. Such a diversion of labor and supervisory personnel could be effected only at the cost of tremendous sacrifices elsewhere in our vital war effort, and any sacrifice there inevitably involves the withholding of planes, munitions, and ships from Britain. If we have a choice to make between these two purposes—and assuredly we have—there can be no doubt which one we should make.

These considerations, applied here to Canada, are equally valid in their application to the United States. Our friends and neighbors cannot go "all out" for the production of war supplies to aid Britain and the other democracies and for their own defense, and at the same time cope with a huge and costly deep waterway development which would sap the life blood from essential industry and jeopardize the Nation's safety in any emergency that might arise before its completion.

No authoritative figures have been published about the quantities of labor and material that would be required for this gigantic undertaking, but, admittedly, it will be a project greater than the building of the Panama Canal. We know that in its peak construction year 50,000 men and 250,000 tons of material were required for that enterprise. Where are we to find that number of men now? We in Canada, as our industrial war effort nears its peak, are approaching a labor shortage. The United States will soon be in a comparable position. How, then, can either country afford to divert men and material and brains to a project whose value can be measured only in terms of years?

More emphasis has been placed, in the United States, on the need for power than on the possibility of building ships in the Great Lakes and moving them to the oceans by way of the St. Lawrence. The American public is not aware, as we are in Canada, that potential power to take care of all immediate requirements can be developed in Quebec and Ontario much more quickly than at the Long Sault. More than 5,000,000 horsepower can quickly be acquired, three-quarters of it in

this Province alone, whereas the potential development of the Long Sault, none of it likely to be available for at least 4 years, is only 2,000,000 horsepower. This electricity, according to competent engineers, can be developed in Canada and made available for transmission in a very few months.

No, the argument of urgency relating to the war effort hardly bears examination. If a deep waterway we must have, then in all reason let us have it as a post-war effort. Begun then, it might profitably employ our returned soldiers and the thousands of men who will be released from industries no longer required to produce war material. We must be prepared for a long and arduous period of reconstruction during which employment will be our principal problem. The St. Lawrence seaway project, undertaken then as a gigantic public work, would absorb much surplus labor and provide work and bread for vast numbers who might otherwise endure additional hardship.

Amendment of the Neutrality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. TOM CONNALLY, OF TEXAS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD a very eloquent and able radio address delivered by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], on the subject Freedom of the Seas: The So-called Neutrality Act Must Be Amended.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM OF THE SEAS—THE SO-CALLED NEUTRALITY ACT MUST BE AMENDED

The cruel and brutal war now raging in Europe and Asia, though its land battles are thousands of miles from our shores, has more and more affected our people and their interests as its bloody chapters have unfolded. The threat to our national security, to the safety of our territory, to the integrity of our institutions, and to the preservation of our international rights has become clearer and more imminent with each new conquest, with each new enslavement of a once free people.

Moved by the devotion of the American people to peace and their abhorrence of war, the Congress in 1935, years prior to the invasion of Poland, enacted an arms-embargo resolution, mistakenly called a Neutrality Act. It prohibited the shipment of arms and munitions from the United States to any nation at war. It was passed upon the theory that such a course would discourage armed conflict abroad and prevent our involvement therein. That act was not in truth a Neutrality Act. It limited our rights as a neutral nation. It denied to our citizens rights to which they were entitled by immemorial international sanctions. We laid upon our citizens prohibitions against the exercise of rights guaranteed to them by international law. It was soon revealed that the original act was unsound, and in 1936 it was amended. In 1937 Congress again modified its provisions.

After Hitler hurled his Nazi legions into Poland, in September 1939, it became amazingly apparent that the arms embargo operated to deny to peaceful nations and to peoples who had not armed to the teeth and who had not builded up great military machines securing arms and munitions from neutral nations for their necessary self-defense. The continued existence of such an act gave a premium to conquerors, to totalitarian masters who had through the years been carefully arming in order to overwhelm and subjugate nations who felt secure in their neutral and peaceful lives. The Nazi powers, equipped with all of the modern weapons of war and all of the mechanized equipment which ingenuity and genius could devise for the destruction of human life, did not need to acquire arms or munitions from America. The peaceful and unoffending nations of Europe, who were unarmed and defenseless, did need arms and munitions from the United States and other neutral nations. Under international law, they had a right to procure, and the United States had a right to supply, war materials and munitions for the defense of their homes and their lives.

In the fall of 1939 the Congress enacted the arms embargo repeal resolution. It removed the prohibition against the sale and shipment of arms to nations at war. However, still in the interest of peace, motivated by an extreme anxiety to preserve the peace and to protect the safety and the lives of the American people, the act laid limitations upon the freedom of our shipping and upon the rights of our citizens. It was required that nations at war purchasing arms in the United States should acquire title to the arms and munitions secured before the same should leave our shores. American ships were denied the right to transport arms and munitions. American ships were prohibited from carrying on commerce with any nation at war. The President was authorized to establish combat zones in belligerent areas into which American ships could not sail and into which American citizens were not permitted to travel, except under unusual circumstances.

These regulations were established in the hope and belief that if American ships did not sail to the ports of belligerent nations and were not permitted within combat zones, they would not be attacked or sunk upon the high seas, where they had a right to sail under international law, accepted and recognized by all civilized nations. That hope and belief have proven illusory. The brutal Nazi philosophy which on land conquered and subdued neutral and peaceful Holland, Denmark, and Norway, and Belgium, who had committed no wrong, unless the love of home and the desire to live in peace be wrong, with its swarming submarines and surface raiders upon the seas, sank the ships and murdered the citizens of neutral nations. The same defiant and truculent and ruthless spirit that dominated the German Government during the World War, enhanced and brutalized by the Nazi doctrines of Hitler, has recently attacked and sunk American merchant ships and a Nazi submarine attacked a United States naval destroyer. These attacks were not made upon ships within combat zones. They were not made upon ships trading with or sailing to nations at war. They were made upon American ships on the roadways of the high seas, where international law says they had a right to be, and where the laws of the United States say they had a right to be.

Hitler has decreed the death of our citizens and the destruction of our ships wherever his armed vessels may find them—wherever his skulking assassins of the seas, lying in wait for them, may shoot them in the dark and send them to graves in the watery deeps. Unrestricted submarine warfare means unrestricted murder, unrestricted assassination, unrestricted defiance of, and contempt for, all law of humanity and of civilized nations.

When Hitler, in September 1939, first hurled his Nazi legions into Poland, we entertained the fatuous hope that the war in Europe was over the Polish Corridor and Danzig. We eagerly pressed to our bosom, the hope that it would be localized—that it was a war of boundaries and territorial arrangements between Germany and Poland. Still entertaining that hope, the provisions of the Embargo Repeal Act, which limited our shipping and established combat zones, and prohibited the arming of merchant vessels, were adopted.

However, when Denmark was crushed—when Holland, peaceably sailing upon its canals was brutally bludgeoned—when Belgium, daring to stand upon its own soil, unoffending and neutral, was attacked by all the cruel weapons of might and murder—when Norway, living amidst its mountains and fjords, believing that it was distant from the bloody arena of war, was assailed from the sea and upon the land and from the air, by millions of missiles of death, the world began to see and the United States began to realize that Hitler's war was not to be a localized war—that it was not to be a war to secure the rights of the Nazis to Danzig or to a crossing of the Corridor. We began to see that it was a war to destroy the rights of all other nations, wherever their boundaries might reach, however peaceful their conduct, however innocent their lives, however guileless their behavior. We began to see that the Hitler ambition, that the Nazi terror, paused at no boundary, hesitated at no sea, halted before no mountain range, but, with an ambition greater than Lucifer's, with a savage lust for power, surpassing that of Genghis Khan, with a bestial appetite for loot and plunder and mastery, superior to that of Attila, the Hun, hurled their swarming armies upon their neighboring nations in a campaign of world conquest and world dominion. If the classic examples of Poland, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Yugoslavia, Greece, and other nations, are not convincing, the astounding case of Russia removes all doubt. Russia, a supposed sympathizer, though not a participant in the war, without pretext and without warning, was barbarously and suddenly attacked by all of the might and terror of the Nazi armies. Russia, living upon her own soil, having no part in the war, guilty of no aggression against Hitler, was made the victim of unexpected and murderous assault.

That same ruthless and relentless spirit; that same overmastering ambition; that same cruel and barbarous purpose, animate the fleets of submarines and of surface raiders that Hitler has sent out upon the seas, that belong, not to him, but belong to all the nations of the earth, to master them, to drive from them, the ships of all nations that do not fly the Nazi flag, to murder the citizens of all other nations that do not accept his rule and that do not bow the knee to his monarchy of military might.

But there are those who say that Hitler has no designs to attack or to conquer the United States or the nations of Central and South America. To these credulous minds, I would point to the trials in the courts of the United States in New York, of a horde of Nazi spies. If Hitler has no designs upon the United States; if he broods no injury to our people; if he contemplates no hostile action against us, why does he fill our land with spies to practice their espionage and sabotage, and to poison the minds of those of our citizens who may be unsuspecting and credulous? I point to Nazi infiltration into the countries of South America. The press has lately informed the world of the discovery of Nazi intrigue and Nazi conspiracy against a number of the republics of the

Western Hemisphere. These republics, vigilant and jealous of their sovereignty, have discovered these plots and these nests of treason and have taken steps to extirpate them. If Hitler has no designs upon the sovereignty, upon the security, and upon the territory and institutions of Latin-America, why does he set up foci of infection to spread his poisonous doctrines throughout the constitutional systems and the life of our Latin-American friends and neighbors?

All of these revelations, this unmasking to our gaze of the stark and naked menace of Hitler and his Nazi terrorism, have convinced civilized men who love their country, who hate conquest and oppression, to determine that Hitler and his Nazi terrorism must be destroyed.

Hitler seeks to dominate both the land and the sea. His denial of the right of other nations to sail the seas is a challenge to our undeniable rights and a threat to overthrow and destroy them. The restrictions in the arms-embargo repeal against the arming of merchant ships and the sailing of our vessels in combat zones or to nations at war were in derogation of our rights. They were domestic regulation of our citizens in the hope that our ships would not be attacked. As has already been seen, that hope was futile. Under Hitler's decree, our ships cannot sail upon any sea which he can reach with his submarines, with his surface raiders, or with his aircraft.

Hugo Grotius, the celebrated authority on international law, as early as 1608, laid down the rule "Every nation is free to travel to every other nation and to trade with it." He there enunciated the doctrine of freedom of the seas. He exploded the theory that the seas were the property of the nation with the longest sword. By the nineteenth century, it was universally accepted that the seas were the common property of all nations. The United States, since its foundation, has adhered to the doctrine of freedom of the seas. Under the Presidency of John Adams, France depredated upon our commerce, and in 1798, the House of Representatives, in an address to the President, stated that France had proclaimed "predatory warfare against the unquestionable right of neutral commerce, which, with our means of defense, our interests, and our honor, commanded us to repel." Congress authorized armed vessels to resist the armed vessels of the French. The case of the Barbary pirates is a classic example of our insistence upon the freedom of the seas. The United States Navy was dispatched to the Mediterranean, the pirates were subdued, and levies upon our commerce were terminated. The War of 1812, in its essence, was in defense of freedom of the seas. The doctrine was maintained by Madison when he was Secretary of State in 1806. Van Buren, in 1830, in his instructions to Ambassadors, asserted the doctrine.

It will be recalled that before and during World War I, our rights upon the seas were attacked by the German submarine campaign. In April 1916 the Government of the United States warned the Imperial German Government against the violation of our rights. The warning was disregarded and our ships were sunk and our citizens were murdered. During the entire period of the World War, and in all of the years that followed, the Government of the United States has steadfastly maintained its right to the freedom of the seas. It is true that there are those who claim that by the enactment of the arms-embargo repeal, the United States surrendered its right to the freedom of the seas. That is an erroneous assumption. While that act would restrict freedom of citizens and our shipping, the act expressly provided in its preamble that the United States surrendered none of its rights under international law. It was so specifically stated in the preamble to that act, which was in the form of an amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, now speaking. It was specifically provided that the restrictions contained in that act were domestic regulations for the control of our citizens and that "the United States waives none of its own rights or privileges or those of any of its nationals under international law." It was further specifically provided that "the United States reserves the right to repeal, change, or modify this joint resolution, or any other domestic legislation in the interest of the peace, security, and welfare of the United States and its people."

In the light of our historic and traditional maintenance of the doctrine of freedom of the seas, a doctrine that is essential to our continued growth and development as a great maritime and commercial nation, a doctrine, not limited to our own selfish interests, but one essential not alone to the safety of our own shipping and of our citizens upon the high seas where they have a right to be, but essential to the safety of the ships of other peaceful and neutral nations that may carry on commerce with the United States, we should now reassert and reordain our adherence to the doctrine of freedom of the seas by modifying and amending the so-called Neutrality Act. We are now building a two-ocean Navy, a Navy that will be superior to any that floats upon the oceans. It shall be dedicated to the protection of our people; to the protection of our citizens upon the sea as well as upon the land; to the security and to the sanctity of our territory, our institutions, and our soil. Shall we, at the ukase of a would-be master of the world, abandon the seas? Shall we at the edict of a would-be Napoleon, cringingly, withdraw our commerce and our ships from the seas where all civilized nations for centuries have said they have a right to be? The establishment of combat zones has failed. Hitler recognizes no combat zones. He sinks our ships wherever they may be. He sends his lurking submarines into our defensive waters He defies us. He murders our citizens. He assassinates our ships.

The repeal of the so-called Neutrality Act would not be unneutral. After its repeal, the United States would be a neutral under international law. That act prohibits the arming of our merchant ships. I favor the repeal of that provision. It is my view that merchant ships that are now being ruthlessly attacked upon the high seas, while on lawful business, ought to be allowed to arm for their necessary self-defense; for the defense of human lives upon their decks; for the defense of their property and their rights.

In the interest of our own safety, for the preservation of free government and democracy in the world, the Congress of the United States enacted the Lease Lend Act, to extend aid in the form of arms, munitions, and ships to the nations fighting against Hitler and his doctrines. That aid to be effective requires the delivery of arms, munitions, and implements of war where they can be successfully employed. It takes ships, it requires cargoes, to deliver weapons to the embattled democracies. Whatever the original views of any citizen may be with respect to the Lease Lend Act, it has become a national policy. It is our country's policy. We should support it in unity and with vigor.

It is, therefore, my further view that the so-called Neutrality Act should be amended with respect to the freedom of our ships to sail wherever they are permitted to sail under international law. I favor the removal of the ban against their entering combat zones or going on lawful missions to the ports of nations at war. These are our undeniable rights under the law of nations. We have, in years that are gone, in glorious fashion, shed our blood for their maintenance and for the protection of the rights of our citizens. Shall we surrender them? Shall we cringingly abandon them? Shall we succumb before this wild and fantastic plot of Adolf Hitler for world empire and world dominion? Shall we tremble because the conqueror stretches forth his sword?

Our forefathers chose our way of life. Their sacrifices, their sufferings, and their service fashioned it and builded it and fortified it. Our system, our way of life, our institutions, our love of law and of liberty must, and shall be, maintained. All the terrors and taunts, all the cruel contempt for law and for the dictates of humanity, of Hitler and his Nazi minions shall not prevail against us.

Help for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF ARTHUR CAPPER, OF KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio broadcast delivered by myself over station WIBW, Topeka, Kans., September 28, 1941, relative to the need of "help for small business."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends in the radio audience, the small businessman—the little fellow in the business world—faces more than making sacrifices in the $120,000,000,000 national-defense program.

The little fellow in business and his employees are in line to be the sacrifice in the national-defense program.

What that means to Kansas and surrounding States in the Mid-Continent area is something to think about.

Take our case in Kansas.

The foundation of our Kansas life and living is, of course, agriculture.

But the life and living of Kansas communities, while resting on farm prosperity, actually is built around the small industries and the small business establishments in our Kansas towns and cities.

We in our section do not have huge corporations, with thousands of employees.

We have hundreds—aye, thousands—of small business establishments around which the life of our communities is built.

When a small businessman goes to the wall, when an industry closes down, when a garage or a beauty shop goes out of business, the community suffers a heavy blow.

When these small businesses are closed out by the scores and hundreds and thousands, as they are being squeezed out by priorities in the defense program, the blows fall with terrific force.

Not all of you belong to the Rotary Club or Kiwanis, or Lions or similar organizations of businessmen, nor to the local chamber of commerce.

In ordinary times the ordinary citizen perhaps doesn't think much of such organizations. He does not see that they directly affect him.

But how would you like to see the bulk of the business and industries in your community that are represented in Rotary, etc., close up shop, discharge their employees, and quit doing business?

Well, my friends, that is the picture ahead of us this winter, according to the keenest business observers in Washington and over the country.

I have been warning of the danger to small business from the way the national-defense contracts have been handled for months past. So have others. Gen. Hugh Johnson calls it the slaughter of the innocents. Trade magazines, columnists—outside of those too busy propagandizing for war abroad to see what is happening at home—have warned of the dangerous situation from letting the bulk of contracts to a few dozen huge corporations.

Finally the administration itself has become alarmed, though I fear somewhat belatedly.

The shadow of priority casualties in business has fallen across the national-defense picture in Washington, as well as in the Mid-Continent.

Floyd Odlum, an exceptionally able businessman brought to Washington by the President to take a high position in the national-defense program, recently named Director of Contract Distribution Division, last week sent out a letter to 56 major defense contractors. In that letter he asks these to name "farming out directors" who will work with Government in spreading subcontracts to smaller firms.

It is necessary to spread defense orders, Director Odlum warns. Unless it is done, Director Odlum says, we cannot avert "the social catastrophe and economic dislocation which might follow if these small enterprises are put out of business. Such a tragedy must not happen."

Director Odlum does not mince words.

"Because of the tremendous all-out defense effort," he says, "thousands of small businesses which have been busy up to now face shut-downs due to lack of materials for civilian production.

"The personnel of these small enterprises represents the solid backbone of the country. They are our church leaders, our civic workers, our charity heads, our supporters of fraternal and public-spirited organizations."

I would say it this way. These men are the life of the small towns and cities and surrounding communities of America. Put them out of business and you have left only huge corporations facing huge labor organizations, waging relentless economic war. And when we reach that stage, the next step will be what some of the planners want—Government control of all business, all industry, all people in a collectivist state.

This danger to our American way of life from the destruction of small business—that really means the elimination of the individual in business of all kinds, including agriculture—is no figment of the imagination.

I am a member of a special Senate committee to study problems of American small business. Preliminary studies have been made by our committee. They show small business enterprises being strangled. One bicycle manufacturer has had to close down because he cannot get soldering rods. At the same time he sees British-made bicycles being imported as usual. He reads advertisements that these English-made bicycles are coming through despite the war, and may be purchased just the same as if there were no war.

Senator MURRAY, of Montana, a Democrat, a staunch new dealer, a supporter of the President's foreign policies 100 percent, is chairman of this committee. He is more than shocked. He is alarmed at what the preliminary investigations have shown. In a statement made public this week Senator MURRAY says small business enterprises have been discriminated against right and left.

"The administration of our defense program has been extremely muddled"—I am quoting Senator MURRAY—"big business dollar-a-year men," declared Senator MURRAY, "still drawing huge salaries from private corporations, have moved into control of the Defense Commission and have made it a badge of honor for big business.

"A campaign is now on to expand enormously the plant capacity of big business"—I am still quoting Senator MURRAY, New Deal Democrat. I want you to know what I am saying is not the attack on the administration from a disgruntled Republican, accused also of being an isolationist. The words I am quoting come from a New Deal Democrat who also is an interventionist.

Continuing, Senator MURRAY says:

"This means that big business will further monopolize defense contracts at a time when small plants all over the country find themselves in a desperate situation and are being forced to curtail production or close up because of lack of materials for their regular civilian production and their inability to secure any defense contracts."

Director Odlum says that if the industry or community facing shut-downs from lack of materials and inability to get contracts will notify the nearest office of his Contract Distribution Division (or Director Odlum himself) immediate steps will be taken to help the situation. Contracts or subcontracts may be awarded, at prices as much as 15 percent higher than have been allowed big contractors. These are to be accomplished through so-called special directives to purchasing divisions of the Army and Navy.

I sincerely hope, my friends, that Director Odlum is able to get results, quick results, and effective results. Otherwise, I hate to think of what is going to happen.

In this connection I have been hearing of some interesting planning being done by some of our best minds, on what Uncle Sam can do to save Europe after the war is over. These plans include feeding Europe from reserve stock piles of food—and I am for that.

But some of these planners (notably Clark M. Eichelberger, of the League of Nations Association, Inc., and also the prime mover in the Committee to Defend America and other interventionist organizations) are going much further than that.

Mr. Eichelberger says his organization has committees at work, by implication in conjunction with some administration people, also to help Europe in at least three other ways:

1. Use our $25,000,000,000 of gold to back an international European currency when the war is over.

2. Work out and finance from the United States Treasury a huge public-works program for Europe—in other words an international P. W. A. for Europe at Uncle Sam's expense.

3. Also in his program is a comprehensive unemployment relief program for Europe after the war—also backed by the Treasury of the United States.

Well, my friends, that is a pretty large order. That is planning on a large scale.

I do wish some of these international planners of ours would take a few days off and do some planning on how we are to preserve the small business enterprises of the United States, and the republican form of government of the United States, before bringing this millenium to Europe.

President Roosevelt continues to move steadily toward his goal in the field of foreign relations—the goal of all-out war.

His latest proposal, still unofficial so far as sending any message to Congress about it, calls for either modification or repeal of the Neutrality Act. He wants congressional authority to (1) use American-flag ships and American seamen to carry war supplies to Britain, Russia, China, and so on; and (2) to arm American merchant ships.

This proposal raises two questions:

1. The preservation of constitutional government by returning to Congress the responsibility for making decisions involving peace or war. Needless to say I think that is the proper procedure to follow. I sincerely wish that the President would not take us into war by the announcement route.

2. Whether or not Congress should now turn on the green light for further intervention in this European war, I am opposed to further war steps. I say Congress should vote against further intervention.

But if further steps are to be taken—and I am opposed to taking them—I say the decision should be made by Congress. Let me read you what the Constitution says, and just figure for yourself whether the President's "shoot on sight" order squares with the spirit, or even with the words of the Constitution. I read from the Constitution:

"The Congress shall have power to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations. To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water. * * * To provide and maintain a navy. To make rules for the government and regulation of land and naval forces."

What I have just read is what the Constitution says.

It is plain to me that the Constitution places the authority and the responsibility in the Congress. I think the editor of the Washington News stated it concisely and correctly:

"If President Roosevelt, though he be the fount of all wisdom and patriotism, should put this country into war without congressional consent, this would not be a democracy."

The result of such usurpations of authority by the President, even though it is in fact and reality impossible for the Congress to countermand orders or abrogate actions already taken—the result is bound to be loss of faith in the constitutional processes of government. That is not constitutional government; it is one-man government, no matter by what words you gloss over the fact.

When the Executive, through short circuiting, bypasing the Congress; through subterfuges and deceptions, causes Americans to lose faith in the form of our government, we lose our democracy.

I shall oppose repeal of the Neutrality Act. We are partly in the war, in the shooting war. Congressional approval of arming merchant ships and sending American ships into belligerent ports and combat zones would be taken at home and abroad as a blank check to the President for undeclared war. Then again the Constitution, the Congress, and the people would be circumvented by the White House.

Addresses New Jersey State Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM H SMATHERS, OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the able address

delivered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] before the New Jersey State Democratic Convention on Tuesday last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor Edison, Mr. Chairman, members of the New Jersey Democratic State committee, county chairmen, candidates for office, fellow Democrats, ladies and gentlemen, I was amazed and extremely amused to read where Representative EATON, keynoting for the Republicans last week, blasted the New Deal and the administration, but said that he and the Republicans were for the President's foreign policy. What rank hypocrisy. Representative EATON is no more for the President's foreign policy than Hitler is for our foreign policy. If you doubt what I say, look up his record, and you'll find he voted against lifting the embargo, the Lease Lend Act, the Draft Act, extension of the draft, and every measure that went into the forging of the President's foreign policy. Of course, now looking back over the last year and a half, he sees that the President was right, and he was wrong, so he's now for the President's foreign policy. You know, these Republicans remind me of that rare but now extinct bird, known as the "flu-flu" bird. It flew backward, because it didn't give a damn where it was going, for it was trying to find out where it was coming from.

There is not a man or woman in this audience, or in the State of New Jersey, for that matter, who does not realize that this Nation, yes, the entire world, is passing through the gravest crisis that ever confronted mankind. This being the case, I have come here today to talk to you about the Nation's foreign policy and world affairs.

Five years ago this fall you were good enough to send me to the United States Senate. I went there pledged to support the principles and policies of our President. That I have done faithfully and unflinchingly. That I did cheerfully and proudly. That I would do again under similar circumstances.

It was with great pleasure that I supported the President's remedies for curing the lingering pains of the most stubborn and prolonged depression the world has ever witnessed, and one which, mind you, the wise Republicans and the erudite Hooverites had struggled with in vain and abandoned in despair. All of the President's depression measures I voted for, because I had implicit faith in the President's superior judgment and fearless leadership. Besides, I could not think of, nor did I hear of, any better remedies than those proposed by the President being offered by anyone else. Time and events have since shown that the President's remedies, while not all perfect, were yet the soundest and the best to meet the sudden emergencies of that time. Of course, there were mistakes here and there, as is always the case with men of action and courage when dealing with difficult and unprecedented problems.

In like manner and for similar reasons, ladies and gentlemen, I have followed and supported the President's remedies for social reforms—remedies designed to improve, in particular, the conditions of the laboring man and the farmers, and, in general, for the improvement and betterment of the living conditions of the middle and lower classes—not forgetting the "forgotten man." When we had about worked our weary way up and out of the deepest and darkest depression of all times and began to see the light of day and to enjoy the first fruits of a brighter and better social order in America, along came from abroad the dreaded and destructive dictator war. We hated it—all of us hated all of it. We wanted no part of it. We had been badly burnt once before by the flames of a European war. So we did everything—tried everything—to confine the conflagration to the other side of the broad Atlantic. We tried neutrality; we tried embargoes, evasions, equivocations; we discontinued European commerce and trade; we denied England and France cash and credit; we called home our merchant marine; we isolated ourselves; we insulated our shores. For a long while we stood stupidly, gazing and gaping from afar at the death and devastation left in the wake of the strutting dictators as they marched across the Continent of Europe, looting, plundering, enslaving.

Gradually, however, Americans began to awaken—some of them are still asleep—and, as they awoke, they began to hate and fear the dictators of Europe and to realize that their eyes were fixed on America as their ultimate goal. But we dared not criticize them or offend them. So we appeased them, and thereby we emboldened and encouraged them the more. On the other hand, we keenly sympathized with the Allies, but we were too timid to express our sympathy, or give them openly any substantial comfort or support. Thus, my friends, we weakened their morale and we enfeebled their resistance.

In fact and truth, we were too intelligent to remain indifferent any longer, yet we were too craven to take a positive stand on the side of the oppressed. So, unchecked and unrestrained, this fire and flame of the dictator leaped from city to city, nation to nation, continent to continent, the sparks of which flew so far as to fall upon the Western Hemisphere. In Central and South America revolts began to break out, and stern measures had to be resorted to, to put them down. In the United States of America, warehouses, storehouses, wharves, and docks laden with supplies and armaments were suddenly destroyed by mysterious fires and explosions. Strikes multiplied in the defense plants. Military secrets and plans were stolen and sent abroad. By such despicable dictator tactics the American people finally realized that these dictators could not be trusted, and that this was no European war in which America had no interest or reason to intervene, but a world conflict from which we could not possibly escape.

Then came the Lease Lend Act, which epitomized the reassertion of America's mighty influence and her lofty independence in world affairs. By the same act America reestablished her traditional rights to the freedom of the seas, defended and battled for by every President from Washington to Wilson.

And so, my friends, while America wandered in the wilderness of appeasement, inaction, and isolationism, she was also wasting huge sums of money and precious time and materials. During that crucial period history was made in America of a character not creditable to the sons and daughters of Valley Forge, because America hesitated, debated, and divided on her attitude toward a world conflict which not only involved her own life and liberties, but the life and liberties of the entire civilized world.

But, through all the fright and hysteria, through all the chaos and confusion, through all the indecision and irresolution, through all the death and destruction caused by the mighty dictators, there have been, and still are, just two men in the whole world, world leaders, who were neither fooled by, nor afraid of, the bullying dictators. One was the inimitable and invincible Winston Churchill. Had his advice and warnings been heeded, Europe's magnificient cities and buildings would not today be reduced to ashes and ruins. Neither would her peaceful and liberty-loving people be reduced to starvation and slavery.

In like manner, if the advice and warnings of the other great and fearless leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt, had been heeded, the destructive dictators would have been quarantined and imprisoned in their own lands long before they became a world menace, and long before they began to bomb and blitzkrieg Europe to her knees and to her death. But when these warnings were given—before the storm broke—the Chamberlains were in power in England. They knew it all; they could be told nothing. So they decried and ridiculed the advice and warnings of Winston Churchill with the result that today poor Chamberlain is in his grave, and the proud people of England are sleeping in basements and bomb shelters.

Likewise, in America the Chamberlains were in power when President Roosevelt first began to warn the American people of the dictator menace. Like the Chamberlains of England, the Chamberlains of America had inside information—not available even to the President—about dictator ambitions and dictator intentions. They assured America there would be no World War No. 2. They knew it all; they would be told nothing. They had learned nothing from the last war, or since the last war; neither have they learned anything from the present war, or from the plight of Belgium, Holland, and France. These false prophets are the isolationists of today—the American Chamberlains. They carry a little red, white, and blue flag, instead of the traditional umbrella; but if given their way, they will be more deadly to America than Chamberlain was to England.

So today, my friends, the first and greatest menace to America is Hitlerism. The second greatest menace that affects America today is the subversive influence of the Lindberghs and the NYES, because, as prominent Americans, they preach and practice continually German propaganda for the sole purpose of destroying the morale of our American soldiers and undermining the confidence of the American people in their Government and in their Commander in Chief. But try as they may and have, Franklin D. Roosevelt is not to be defeated or destroyed by such "scuttlers" as the Lindbergh's the NYES, and other isolationists whom history will bury in ignominious oblivion. While, on the other hand, Franklin D. Roosevelt, with the aid of Churchill and other fearless leaders of the Old World and the New, will bring about the ultimate defeat of the dictators.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, to these two great men—Roosevelt and Churchill, who had the vision to see and the courage to act—we owe our security of today. In the hands of these two great men rests the future of America, the liberty and freedom of the American people, and the future of all the democracies throughout the world. Their leadership has brought us to a point where we are prepared to resist enslavement, and their continued leadership will bring about the destruction of Hitlerism and reestablish peace throughout the world. A peace based on man's individual security, liberty, and equality, with a guaranty to the people of any nation to have any form of government they may choose. To this leadership we pledge our faith, our confidence, and our full cooperation.

Thank you

Addresses Gold Star Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS OF MARYLAND

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and eloquent address recently delivered by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] in honor of Gold Star Mothers' day, at the Army War College, Washington, D. C., on Sunday, September 28, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. Burling, ladies, and gentlemen, the grim, tragic, and dramatic events of the present, call vividly to mind the limitless and unpayable debt which we owe to the Gold Star Mothers of America and to their heroic dead.

For the devastation and loss of life and treasure in the wars of Europe, Asia, and Africa serve to build in our hearts and minds strong bridges of memory, and over these bridges we travel again in fancy to the stirring days of 1918, when the sons of the Gold Star Mothers of America were fighting beneath the flag of our country on the seas and on the battlefields of Europe.

The sons of these mothers were then our comrades in the first great World War. With these young comrades of 23 years ago we shared the joys, the hardships, the sorrows, and the high drama which were inevitably a part of that titanic struggle.

Those comrades who made the supreme sacrifice, who gave the last full measure of devotion to their country, have, lo these many years, been sleeping in the little green tents of eternity, waiting for the last bugle call of all to blow. Twenty-three years ago they were the flower of the young manhood of the United States. They came to serve their Nation from the farm and the factory, the forest and the mine, the countinghouse and the university. Life was ahead of them—a long life—a span of time wherein dreams would come true.

But the Nation called them from these dreams and youth, laughing youth, responded to that call. Some did not come back, the sons of the mothers for whom this day has been set aside. Those who fell on the field gave their all—all they hoped and longed to be. No more for their eyes will the morning zephyr ripple across fields of waving wheat, in the countrysides of America. No more will they see the rosy glow of sunset, nor know the handclasp of their loved ones and friends.

But we, who are the beneficiaries of their sacrifice, can still sense the magnificent spectacles of nature, the comradeship of our fellows, and still work to make our dreams of youth come true, only because of them.

And so it has been throughout all human history, and particularly the history of the United States. Our greatness, our achievements, our institutions, our security, our future, we owe to our heroic soldier and sailor dead.

Yet we continue the struggle to find ways and means of letting our innermost thoughts have play. And so this great Nation has sanctified this day, set it aside for national observance that we might lay an invisible garland of flowers on the graves of our departed comrades wherever they may be, and pay a fitting tribute of reverence to the great mothers who bore them—to let you know they and you have not been forgotten.

In doing so, we are actuated by the richest and finest attributes of which the human heart is capable. To the mothers of these illustrious sons, these great American heroes, we try to say we too understand, if only in part, what you and they have given to this Nation.

We see all the women's days, the women's hours, of care and training, affection and guidance, with which you surrounded your sons, in order to bring them to full and sturdy manhood. These boys of yours have made the utmost sacrifice for us, and that sacrifice we want you to know we share in a very deep fullness.

I look upon the Gold Star Mothers of America as the real aristocracy of this Nation—a legion of women which is recognized both by religion and civilization as the greatest aristocracy of all—one not of position, wealth, or of material things, but an aristocracy of unselfish service and unsurpassed sacrifice for others. And that is the way this Nation feels, and will always feel, about you, the Gold Star Mothers of America. Whether we be soldier or civilian, we too treasure the memories of your heroic sons, and we revere and honor you and give you the fullest meed of our tribute and devotion—for those great men who were your very flesh and blood.

Now again this Nation is confronted with great problems and decisions, which have a kinship to the problems and decisions of 1917 and 1918. In solving these problems and making these decisions, we would be unworthy of you and of the fine tradition of your sons, if we did not make our decisions in the light of your great and measureless gifts to the people of this Nation. We shall, of course, counsel one with the other. We will try to view the unfolding of events realistically, calmly, and with the ultimate welfare of our country ever in mind.

It is inevitable that we shall frequently differ. It is certain that we cannot always see eye to eye. But let us not lose heart, for that is the genius of America—its strength and not its weakness. All of us, in office and out, will try desperately hard to find the true, sure road to our country's future success, security, and continued greatness.

Whatever course we may take, whether it be one which, with the aid of Providence, will keep us out of another holocaust—or whether an unkind fate shall decree that we reenact the tragic happenings of 1917 and 1918—America must act with unity, patriotism, courage, and vision. To do less would be to betray you and all that you have done to make the present-day America the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

Because of you and yours, we shall chart our course with a higher degree of love of country, with a fuller appreciation of the blessings of its citizenship, and with the firm purpose that this Nation shall weather the storms of the future, that it shall continue to be a Nation established and conducted upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity. For it was for these things your sons fought and died and for which American patriots have throughout the years sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

Gold Star Mothers, the Nation salutes you, it honors and reveres you, it loves you. Your sons have not made their sacrifice in vain.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. H. H. SCHWARTZ, OF WYOMING

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of American foreign policy delivered over the National Broadcasting Co. network by the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ]. The address was delivered on October 1.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT MATTER FOR PARTY POLITICS

America's foreign policy in the present world war is not a matter for partisan politics. That policy, solely one for our own national defense, is not to be confused with domestic issues.

Our foreign policy has the support of most of the more prominent and influential men and women in both Democratic and Republican Parties. It is endorsed by the great mass of the American public. It is criticized by some few Americans. That is to be expected in any democracy. They make up in noise what their arguments lack in reason.

It is necessary to make some reference to the President of the United States; not because he is a Democrat, but because the people elected him to office under the system of voting provided in our Federal Constitution; also because he is the chief point of attack by these critics, and because he first realized and warned us of our danger. It is proper therefore to refer to certain planks in the Democratic platform of 1940, a platform specifically approved by President Roosevelt in the presidential campaign. Some of the President's critics charge him with inconsistency, if not worse. When the whole matter is considered inconsistency disappears or consistency ceases to be a virtue. To those who insist on literal consistency I quote from Emerson: "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen."

One plank of the Democratic platform reads:

"The American people are determined that war, raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa, shall not come to America."

The President has sought to keep that pledge by every possible means. To that end we are supplying nations in Europe, Asia, and Africa with war material necessary to defeat Hitler, as promised in the Democratic platform. Hitler, defeated in Europe, will never come to America; victorious in Europe, he will knock at our gates.

AMERICAN LEGION APPROVES

The American Legion, always a good sounding board of true Americanism, has approved our present foreign policy. The Legion, always strenuously opposed to communism in any form, has endorsed our aid to Russia

for so long as that country is fighting the common enemy of democracy and all that is best in civilization. With the Legion first things come first. The evils of communism will be met when, as, and where they appear. Said my favorite Irish poet, Thomas Moore:

"Shall I ask the brave soldier who fights by my side
In the cause of mankind, if our creeds agree?"

WE ARE UNDER ATTACK

Critics of our foreign policy love to quote, in part, another plank in the 1940 platform. They usually leave out the limiting final clause, "in case of attack." The paragraph reads:

"We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

These critics say that determination to protect, by force where necessary, our American merchantmen, our naval vessels, and American citizens aboard these vessels when sailing the high seas violates the President's pledge. They have peculiar notions of what does not constitute an attack.

When an American merchant ship, flying the American flag, with Old Glory painted in 20-foot length colors on both sides of the vessel, is torpedoed and sunk, and the American citizens aboard are set adrift in open boats, on rough seas, several hundred miles from shore, is that not an attack on American citizens?

When a Nazi submarine fires torpedoes at an American cruiser on the high seas is not that an attack?

It is not necessary to recite many other piratical acts on the seas which constitute attacks upon America, to any reasoning mind.

Shall we send these ships to sea unarmed, to be destroyed by lurking submarines or swift raiders? To do so would be both cruel and cowardly.

The neutrality law was enacted in the hope we could thereby stay out of danger. Hitler has destroyed that hope. Our course is clear. We must arm our merchantmen, and protect them further by our Navy. The alternative is to keep off the ocean and abandon the world to Hitler.

When one comes upon a rattlesnake coiled and ready to strike, is it wrong if we strike first? Let us not split hairs between defense and offense when we meet Hitler's snakes. They are out to kill.

OUR MONROE DOCTRINE

We elected a President on a platform which declared:

"We favor and shall rigorously enforce and defend the Monroe Doctrine."

During Monroe's administration the autocratic European powers comprising the Holy Alliance contemplated the overthrow of the new republics in Spanish America and the reestablishment therein of Spanish sovereignty. President Monroe, after consulting with Jefferson, John Quincy Adams, and Calhoun, embodied the conclusions of these deliberations in his annual message to Congress in 1823. This message is our Monroe Doctrine, since reasserted by Tyler, Polk, Buchanan, Grant, Cleveland, and Roosevelt, and otherwise approved by every President since Monroe.

Lest these European powers should attempt to establish autocratic monarchial systems of government in this hemisphere, Monroe's message warned:

"We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those Powers to declare we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Of existing republics in this hemisphere, Monroe added:

"We could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

For 117 years we have refused to permit violation of the Monroe Doctrine. We have recognized that any violation would constitute an attack on our own security and safety. Must we wait until powerful Nazi forces, capable of waging actual and economic war upon us, have gained influence or control from Mexico to Paraguay before our somnolent isolationists will consider we are under attack? Certainly not.

To do so would imperil our own democracy. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty, notwithstanding the lucubrations of some of our more gloomy isolationists. Their arguments for appeasement get little favorable response in America, although they are reported with satisfaction in Berlin newspapers and serve to assure Hitler we are so divided that he need fear nothing from us. Hitler, thus deceived, is doomed to a rude awakening.

CAPITAL AND LABOR

We have in America some few labor leaders who think the fight against the Nazis is not important to American wage earners.

Where are the Italian, German, French, Belgian, Dutch, Danish, Norwegian, and Eastern European labor leaders of a few years ago? In graves, in prisons, in hiding. A few survive. Some have sold their independence for a mess of pottage, and now serve as labor taskmasters in nations under Nazi and Fascist control.

Where are the labor unions of these countries? Wiped out, outlawed. They do not exist. The Nazi-controlled governments fix the workers' hours of work, their wages; forces, grants, or denies their right to change the character of work, or the places where they may work. This slavery is not imposed merely through the necessities of war. It is part of the philosophy of nazi-ism, and war is the weapon by which this system is to be cemented and made permanent.

And where are the great captains of industry and principal owners of the giant corporations of industrial Germany? These men who, in their folly, financed and built up Hitler until he and his fellow racketeers destroyed free labor. They, too, have been crushed, despoiled, and rendered impotent by the Frankenstein of their own creation. Some few managed to escape from their native land. Here in America we have some industrial Fascists seemingly willing to travel the same road to their own economic death.

WHAT NAZI-ISM MEANS

Let labor consider Norway. There real democracy had reached almost perfection. Her people enjoyed every privilege and immunity set forth in the Bill of Rights in our own Federal and State constitutions. Capital and labor worked in harmony. It was a happy land. Then came the Nazi spies, the "fifth column" followed, seduced by bribe money; and finally the Nazi Army. Why did these emissaries of the devil come to Norway? They came to despoil that nation, to destroy a democracy that belied the Fascist-Nazi charge that "democracies are outmoded"; and they came to secure naval and military bases from which they hoped to destroy Britain, where capital and labor fight side by side.

In Norway the Nazi military power took control of the churches, muzzled its religious leaders, abolished teachers' organizations, disbanded the Boy Scouts of Norway, commandeered food, smothered labor organizations, restricted the food allotted to labor. They sent to the firing squads or to long imprisonment the few courageous labor leaders who protested against the steadily worsening conditions under which labor exists in that all but ruined country. And now, with the approach of winter, they seize the blankets from beds in Norwegian homes in order to warm the Nazi Army fighting Russia.

If ever there was a cause to which labor—leaders and rank and file—should give every support within their power, that cause is the defeat of Hitler, and all for which he stands.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION UNDER HITLER

To his other major crimes Hitler now adds the infamy of hypocrisy. His original deception was to lead the youth of his people to revere the pagan gods of Germanic and Norse mythology; he next appealed to the early tribal god of ancient Israel, the while persecuting the Jews; now he pretends that his assault on Russia is a holy crusade to save religion.

Let those who fear the religious ignorance of Russia fear rather the intelligence and military force of the Nazi oppressors of those who have faith in God. Let them not forget the fate of the Reverend Niemoller and his associates who sought only to preach in accordance with the creed of the Lutheran Church. Let them not forget the letter of Pope Pius in 1937 to the people of Germany wherein he stated that religious freedom in that unhappy country was beset on all sides; and "intrigues had been laid bare which aim at nothing less than a war of extermination." On Christmas Eve of 1937 Pope Pius declared "We will call things by their real names. In Germany there is a real religious persecution. A persecution so terrible and so grave as has rarely been seen before. A persecution in which are lacking neither brutality nor violence nor the snares of falsehood and lies."

In his persecution of the Jews living in Germany and in conquered territory now under Nazi control, words are inadequate to paint the horrors of rapine, starvation, humiliation, extermination, and robbery these unfortunates have suffered at the hands of Hitler and his tools. Through all his campaign for world dominion, this master gangster has sought to inculcate throughout the gentile population of the entire world a blind, unreasoning hatred of all Jews. Even here in America men are found who, in their desperation and declining influence, now seek to keep us divided by throwing into the arenas of public debate the twin evils of racial hatreds and religious intolerance. They will not succeed. Not in free America.

However, America does not condone past cruel persecutions against religion in Russia, even though religious teaching is now permitted there. But we do condemn as wholly without excuse or extenuating circumstances the like persecutions by Hitler and his followers and sympathizers who, one and all, acted and act with foreknowledge of true religion.

WHY HITLER MUST BE DEFEATED

We have adopted a foreign policy designed to best assure our own defense. The basis of our foreign policy, as urged by the President, and approved by Congress and the American people, is to aid, by every material means, and by moral and spiritual support, those who fight to preserve liberty and freedom, and to defeat Nazi and human slavery. To that end the Congress has appropriated billions. The American people will continue to support that program, accepting necessary burdens to the end that governments of the people, for the people, and by the people, shall not perish from the earth.

In support of this program, which we have adopted by reason and stern necessity, we are yet divided. We have in our midst secret spies and emissaries of Hitler. These must be and are being hunted out and driven from America, or incarcerated in our jails.

Unfortunately, we have some patriotic Americans who sincerely believe that Hitler

and Mussolini are mistaken when they say democracy and national socialism cannot coexist on this earth.

Some there are who imagine that Britain cannot win; that Hitler cannot be defeated by any or all of his opponents; that we should make peace with the Nazis before it is too late. Doubtless the democracies could now make peace with Hitler. He has begun to doubt the equivocation of the fiends whom he consults in his silent grotto at Berchtesgaden. A negotiated peace would be a Hitler peace, giving him time to lick his wounds and then renew his struggle for world domination. Time consumed in negotiations for such a peace would spell the doom of democracy. It would lull our own peace-loving people into false security, and a fatal slowing down of all our defense preparations. It would ruin the British who, in fighting for themselves, also fight for us.

Those who assert Hitler cannot be defeated speak as did the wealthy Tories who sneered at Washington and his ragged Continentals, as did the Vallandighams and the other copperheads of the War between the States, as do the Quislings, the Lavals, and cowardly traitors in every destroyed or threatened democracy of Europe.

All who oppose our foreign policy are entitled to be heard, and given respectful hearings. The cornerstones of our democracy are free speech, free press, and free religion. Even those who chisel at these foundations claim that protection.

DEMOCRACY WILL WIN AND SURVIVE

Let us keep faith. Democracy must, and will, win this war; democracy will survive the after effects of this war. When this cruel war is over, democracy will march on until it affords justice and equal opportunity for all and special privileges to none, and gives succor and aid to those unable to help themselves. It will make the ideals in our own Bill of Rights living realities in every nation which aspires to bring these blessings within its own borders.

Let us keep faith with our heroic forefathers, and preserve that for which they fought.

How To Find the Open Door of God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, Henry F. Schricker, our honored and esteemed Governor of Indiana, who is recognized by all who know him as typifying the very highest ideals of Christian citizenship, said in an address to the Indiana Methodist Conference at Indianapolis a few days ago:

The world is sick tonight because it has forgotten God. We grope around in the dark to find the answer to all these problems of ours and finally we find it in the open door of God. We are grateful tonight that the church bells still ring in our city. They have been silenced in many parts of the world. Democracy can only be saved by the spiritual strength of our people, and that spiritual life is needed today as it never has been needed before.

What solemn and arresting words these are, coming from the head of a great State!

In inspirational value they remind me of those powerful and appealing sentences of President Roosevelt a few years ago when he said:

No greater thing could come to our land today than a revival of the spirit of religion—a revival that would sweep through the homes of the Nation and stir the hearts of men and women of all faiths to a realization of their belief in God and their dedication to His will for themselves and for their world. I doubt if there is any problem—social, political, or economic—that would not melt before the fire of such a spiritual awakening.

The State of Indiana, among the least affected of all the States by the movement to high-pressure us into war, is ready, I am sure, to give its full faith and credence to the words of our Governor that the answer to the problems that are rocking the world is to be found not in the chancelleries of foreign powers where lurk the miasmas of hate, nor on the bloody battlefields where youths by the hundreds of thousands are tragically giving up their precious lives, but in the open door of God.

The challenge to the statesmanship of our time is to find the open door of God and lead humanity to it. It can be done. America can do it. America is the only power in the world that can do it. America can initiate a program of great moral and spiritual resurgence to lift the world out of hell, and sweep it back to safety and sanity.

Humanity right now is crying for America's leadership, not for war, but for peace.

In these terrific times, which seem to thinking persons to be the prelude to the destruction of civilization itself, there may still be hope for salvation if America will take the lead in bringing the world back to a realization of the divine order based on the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. We can all help in that direction if we will rid our minds of war madness and open them to more wholesome thoughts—if we will quit concentrating our attention on how to thrust a bayonet into the belly of a brother and twist it around and will say to him, "Your burden seems to be heavy, what can I do to lighten it?" While rivers are running red in Europe and millions of young men—the flower of the world's manhood—are giving up their lives on the battlefields; while millions more of human beings are facing the agonies of starvation; while widows, wives, and children are crying their eyes out as a result of man's inhumanity to man, there still stands, as Governor Schricker says, the open door of God.

Is there anything we can do toward leading the world toward this open door and stopping the hellish and murderous activity that is sabotaging Christianity all around the globe? Is there anything we can do to substitute the motto which stands out over the portals of the United States Supreme Court, "Equal justice under law" for the jungle law of tooth and claw?

I believe there is. In my opinion America is in a position to save the world and by saving the world, to save itself. But it will never accomplish this monumental objective by becoming just one more belligerent. To achieve the purpose, American leadership must be exerted away from war and in the direction of peace.

I have my views of the modus operandi of achieving this objective of supreme humanitarianism in a world gone mad. As I am not a member of any committee or group or organization dealing with foreign affairs I can truthfully say that it is my own idea, lock, stock, and barrel; no one else is responsible in any degree for it.

I would have the President of the United States take the initiative for peace by proposing to the 21 American republics that the Western Hemisphere shall offer its services as a mediator to end World War No. 2, and to bring about a peaceful world order, based on fundamental justice.

I believe that such a move by our President, offering the cherished hope of a realization of the principles of post-war justice to which America stands committed, would have an immediate and electrical reaction throughout the world. Its instant effect, I think, would be so to weaken the grip of the brutal tyrants, Hitler and Mussolini, that they would lose control of their peoples. How does Hitler get his hold on the German people? He gets it by making them believe that Britain and America are combined to exterminate them; that they have their backs to the wall and must fight for their very lives.

Once the German people really know that America, faithful to its high traditions, has no other purpose than to perform in the role of good neighbor and to do its part to establish a world order in which all nations shall receive their just dues, the Hitler lie will be exploded, and Hitler will be on his way out. Hitler, of course, is atrocious, and is richly deserving of summary and condign punishment, but one cannot say that of the masses of the German people, who are his dupes. I do not question for a moment that a movement by our President to offer the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediating agency would be hailed with joy by the people of Germany, Italy, and Japan, as well as Great Britain, for the people all around the world are weary of war. They are weary of its insufferable burdens, its griefs and heartaches, and the pain it puts in the hearts of mothers. Never before in humanity's history was there such an opportunity for the exercise of superlative statesmanship. It is my opinion that by taking the initiative in this proposed mediation movement our President would win the everlasting gratitude of the entire world by leading it out of its darkest night.

My mediation proposal was presented to the House in concrete form on February 27 last, and is embodied in House Concurrent Resolution No. 20, which is textually as follows:

Whereas it is the overwhelming desire of the American people that the United States shall remain at peace with the world and

free from foreign entanglements, while it faithfully performs its duties as a good neighbor; and

Whereas if the world ever needed a peacemaker, it needs one now; and

Whereas with war engulfing a large portion of the globe and threatening to draw other nations into its vortex, there is a real opportunity for the United States to demonstrate its sincerity as a good neighbor by assuming the role of a peacemaker; and

Whereas there is a possibility, faint though it may be, that the New World under the leadership of the United States might be the means of freeing the Old World from the miseries of war and reestablishing peace and tranquility on earth: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President shall be requested to invite the American republics to send delegates to a conference to be held at the earliest practicable date in the city of Washington to offer to the nations now at war the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator, to the end that the blessings of peace may be brought to a distraught world.

SEC. 2. This concurrent resolution shall be known as the Peace Resolution of 1941.

In the existing war atmosphere it is not always easy to raise one's voice for peace. Misrepresentation is the order of the day and at best one is likely to be misunderstood. Years ago when I was valiantly leading a movement for a referendum on foreign wars a newspaper editorial took some of the tuck out of me by saying: "LUDLOW is leading a one-man fight against war." In these latter days, when sabers are rattling and warmongers are vociferous, it sometimes seems to me that I am trying to lead a one-man fight for peace.

But I am going to stick to my guns. It is time someone should speak in favor of the things that cure and heal, instead of the things that hurt and maim and destroy. The human spirit has progressed a long way upward through the night toward emancipation; as trustees of civilization we should not, we must not, permit all human values to be blotted out by war. The world needs to be healed, and it is time for America to turn the tide away from the phantasmagoria of hates and horrid dreams and the hell of war toward the goal of deliverance.

On this Western Hemisphere we have an object lesson of what nations can accomplish when they want to compose their differences; an object lesson which the Western Hemisphere might well present to the Old World with great sentimental effect in extending the helping hand of mediation. Away up among the snow-crowned Andes Mountains the face of Christ shines in the bright sunlight. To my imaginative mind, the heroic statue of the Prince of Peace, on the borderland between Chile and Argentina, sends out on the ether waves of love and friendship its mute appeal for the mediation resolution I have introduced. That statue is deeply rooted in the sentiment of the American republics, because it was erected by the two nations to celebrate an accord that was reached after long and intense bitterness. It stands in towering majesty on a spot 13,000 feet high. It can be seen for a hundred miles and all who come near it are enthralled by its beauty and grandeur. The story of the Christ of the Andes has been told many times, but to a world stricken with war, or living in constant fear of war, it cannot be told too often. The statue bears this inscription:

These mountains must crumble to dust before the Argentines and the Chileans shall break the peace which they have sworn to maintain at the feet of Christ, the Redeemer.

Would it not be a grand thing if the moving hand of history were to write into the record of civilization this memorandum:

In the year 1941 a great Christian President of the United States, with the assistance of the 21 American republics, brought a warring world to the feet of Christ, the Redeemer.

Is it not worth trying?

American Help to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

EDITORIAL BY JOHN P. LEWIS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent editorial appearing in PM, written by Mr. John P. Lewis, under the caption "You don't have to love the Communists to help Russia stop the Nazis."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From PM of September 30, 1941]

YOU DON'T HAVE TO LOVE THE COMMUNISTS TO HELP RUSSIA STOP THE NAZIS

Since last June 22, when the Russians and the Germans went to war, there has been a lot of talk by a lot of people who feared that if the Communists won it would be just as bad for the world if the Fascists won. There developed quite a school of thought that the Communists and the Fascists should be allowed to fight it out and kill each other off. Then there would be no more communism and no more fascism and the goose would hang high for the democracies.

Which is a simple solution, but wars don't work that way. There are victors and there are losers. And nations don't kill each other off.

Recently, most of the news from the Russian lines has been bad. It has been clear for some time that the Russians alone could not stop the Germans where they were, much less win the war. The best the enemies of the Fascists have been able to hope for is that the Russians will continue strong enough to stop the drive some place on Russian soil and tie up a large part of the German Army in the east until Hitler's enemies in the west get squared away to lick him.

Now it is becoming clearer that Russia may not be able to hold the Germans without help—substantial help and immediate. It is clear now, even to those who most feared the consequences of a Soviet victory, that any nation that has been bled as the Russians have been bled isn't going to conquer the world. It is clear, too, that if Germany pushes the "red" army all the way over, no matter what the cost, the Fascists are going to be just that much harder to beat.

Stop for a minute and take a look at this war coldly and selfishly. Forget, for the time, the moral questions of right or wrong in our responsibility for helping the people who are helping us. Forget that men and women and children are dying at the hands of a madman. Forget that belly hunger has gripped a continent as the offspring of conquest. Forget the nights of terror, the days of oppression beyond the Atlantic. Forget that human beings again are in chains—slaves. Forget your humanitarian ideas, if you can. Don't listen to your conscience. Think only of self-interest.

Think brutally, if you will—laugh at the blood of others—but look at the facts, and still the news of the day cries out:

"Now is the time to give help—real help. Now throw everything we can throw into the fight to support Russia and put England in a position to strike."

To help the Communists or communism? Good God, no! To help ourselves.

Stop another minute and think about communism. When anyone starts talking frankly about the Communists, he is labeled by one side as a "red-baiter" and by the other side as a "red," but go on.

What does their form of government have to offer us? Well, we already have a form of government that has brought us a long way. Quite often we break out at the seams, and we have our problems, and our depressions, and our poor, and our hungry, and our oppressed, and our privileged. But we can stand up and say something about it, and do something about it—and raise hell and finally get things done the way we want them done. And that's more than a Communist dictator can give us.

We elect our public officers and if they don't do what we want, we can fire them. And that's more than the Communist can say.

You can go on and on like that, but you won't find anything that freemen can do that we can't do under democracy as well as or better than it can be done under communism.

But commmunism in this country hasn't been just an argument about government. Communism over here has been a lot of things, some good, some bad. The Communists are against racial intolerance and bigotry, and you can indict them for that. But you can indict them for their intolerance of any form of political thinking but the brand that is delivered straight from Russia. The Communists are opposed to fascism. But it was not until Hitler broke his defensive alliance with Russia by actual invasion of the Soviet Union that the Communists over here stopped fighting against our aid to the enemies of fascism.

You can go on down that road a long way, too; clear down to the argument that the Communists are great believers in free speech—but cancel it out because most of them are bores. You can toss that one out, but you can't toss out the fact that Communist policy over here is hand-tailored in Russia to the pattern of Russian needs, and isn't drawn up in this country to the pattern of American needs.

Now, what do these things, or all the indictments you care to pile up against the Communists, have to do with the question of our aid to the Soviet? Coldly, practically, selfishly—just exactly nothing.

Keep your selfish, cold-blooded approach—and what do we care what the Communists think and stand for if they are willing to die to stop the Fascists? Who are we to complain about who does the dying for us?

Is this the time to be choosy about our allies, at a point in history when fascism threatens to engulf the world and there are only two others on the globe standing be-

tween us and the Fascists—the Soviet Union and the British Empire?

Why should we refuse to send a gun to the Communist from Stalingrad with which to shoot our Nazi enemy, just because we don't like a street-corner orator in Peoria?

Regardless of his motive, we know that for every Communist who has the guts to stand up and fight and go down shooting at the Germans, that's just one less life of our own we're going to have to jeopardize to save our own country. If we're going to be cold-blooded about this war, let's be cold-blooded all the way and not kiss away the man who's carrying the gun for our side because we don't like the way he talks or the things he stands for.

JOHN P. LEWIS.

Dairymen Protest McNutt's Oleomargarine Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERLIN HULL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1941

LETTER FROM W. H. HATCHETT, CHAIRMAN, FOUR-STATE DAIRY PROTECTIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, at La Crosse, Wis., on August 31, nearly 4,000 dairy farmers gathered at the Inter-State Fair grounds to protest the action of Government departments favoring the oleomargarine makers and against the interests of the dairy farmers of the Northwest in particular. Those dairy farmers formed representative groups from the States of Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois, and Wisconsin. Many of them were present as representatives of the cooperative creameries which manufacture 60 percent of the butter produced in the States mentioned.

Strong resolutions were adopted condemning the new regulations for oleomargarine by the Federal Security Administration which are being so widely advertised by the oleo makers to promote their sales campaign. Equally strong were the protests of the dairymen over the free advertising by radio given such counterfeit butter by the Department of Agriculture on July 5.

That the farmers of the Northwest were and are thoroughly aroused over their situation is evident. At the very time when they are being appealed to to increase production of dairy products for national defense and aid to Britain comes this seeming hostility of two great Government departments to the butter producers in the form of boosting the consumption of oleomargarine instead of butter, of which there now is in storage more than 200,000,000 pounds awaiting a market.

The Four State Dairy Protection Committee is an organization of farmers and creamery cooperatives which called the meeting at the La Crosse fair grounds. Its headquarters are at Sparta, Wis. From its chairman, William H. Hanchett, a well-known Wisconsin dairyman long interested in protection of the dairy products from unfair competition, I have received the following letter, which I shall insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SPARTA, WIS., *September 22, 1941.*

Hon. MERLIN HULL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are submitting herewith some very pertinent reasons why we think the dairy interests of the United States are entitled to a congressional investigation of the recent action of Paul V. McNutt of the Federal Security Administration, and also of a recent broadcast of the Consumers' Division of the United States Department of Agriculture. The actual results already taken place in the creamery branch of the dairy industry are graphically outlined in a recent broadcast by Mr. J. E. Leverich, president of the Western Wisconsin Creamery Association, over radio station WKBH, from which we quote as follows:

"What does this all add up to? My friends, it is the most effective plan for complete destruction of the dairy industry that could be devised by man if a deliberate attempt were made to wreck this great and important industry.

"This is the way the scheme is working: Farmer patrons are rapidly quitting creameries and taking their milk to condenseries and cheese factories because of the higher price for condensed milk and cheese which has been arbitrarily set by the Department of Agriculture. This will cause many creameries to close or face bankruptcy, and oleomargarine, made to look and taste like butter, according to the standards approved by Mr. McNutt's Federal Security Administration, and given free advertising by the United States Department of Agriculture, will take the place of the butter which has been produced by these closed creameries for the tables of America.

"When this emergency is over, England will have no further use for our condensed milk and cheese, and oleomargarine will have captured tomorrow's butter market. Our memories cannot be so short that we have forgotten the vast surpluses of dairy products which we recently had, and the low prices these surpluses caused, and the money taken from the farmers' milk checks to advertise dairy products in an attempt to increase our markets. If we had surpluses which caused low prices recently, and we all know we did, what will be the situation after the emergency, when oleomargarine has captured the butter market which now consumes 40 percent of our milk, and the creameries have all been wrecked? I have heard some farmers who are patrons of cheese factories and condenseries and fluid-milk markets say, 'Why should I worry about the butter market, my milk is not made into butter.' The answer to this is that butter always has been the gold standard or price basis of the entire dairy industry, and it will undoubtedly be so again.

"After the emergency there will be approximately twice as much milk as can be used by condenseries, cheese factories, and the fluid-milk market if our butter market is turned over to oleomargarine, lock, stock, and barrel, with free advertising thrown in. A 40- or 50-percent surplus means practically no market at all, and all dairy farmers will be in the same boat. The farmers' milk checks, no matter where they are, will undoubtedly even be smaller than they were in 1933, and the consuming public had not been encouraged to eat oleomargarine by your United States Department of Agriculture at that time. If I remember correctly, most farmers thought the price of milk was awful low then, and it seems to me that I remember something about milk strikes at that time also.

"Someone may say, 'Why worry about this; everyone knows butter is better than oleomargarine, and we can start our creameries and make butter again when necessary.' My answer to this is that we cannot start them fast enough to avoid catastrophe. It has taken 100 years to develop our creameries and butter market, and it will take years to start our creameries again and recapture our butter market. It will be hard for farmers to spare the cash to start their cooperative creameries again during the depression which is sure to follow the present boom period caused by the war. The mistakes being made at this time, if not corrected immediately, are almost sure to cause the cooperative farmer-owned creamery—one of the most American of all American institutions—to become a thing of the past."

It is our opinion that Mr. Leverich is right, and that the free and untruthful advertising of oleomargarine by the Consumers' Division of the Department of Agriculture, together with the new standards of oleomargarine approved by Paul V. McNutt and the poorly planned diversion of milk to cheese factories and condenseries, does constitute a perfect plan to wreck the dairy industry.

If this plan is carried through to completion, we are certain that the American people will not only blame those who actually supported the plan but will also hold responsible for the resulting ill health of the people and economic hardships caused by the substitution of oleomargarine for butter those public officials who do not now actively attempt to stop the plan before it is too late.

We believe that the situation is so serious that a Congressional investigation of the following points should be made at once:

Who prepared the McNutt standards?

What help, if any, did they receive from the oleomargarine industry?

Are any former employees of the Food and Drug Administration now employed by the oleomargarine industry or vice versa? If so, what influence did these people have on the standards?

Did any Government employees receive compensation from the oleomargarine industry for work well done?

Why should oleo be made in imitation of butter?

Why should oleo be given the right to use the natural color of butter?

If oleo is made to look and taste like butter, and is colored like butter, how can a person eating in a hotel or restaurant be sure that he is being served butter? Oleo must be colored differently or operators of public eating places will be forced by competition to defraud their customers by using oleo.

Why are the makers of oleo permitted a wide latitude in the fats they may use, while butter can be made only from butterfat? This latitude permits oleo manufacturers to vary the content of their product so as to use the cheapest fats at any time. Some of the fats they are permitted to use are undoubtedly poorer than others.

What prompted the Consumers' Council to advertise oleo?

Who wrote the radio program?

Why was it insinuated that oleo was equal to butter?

Why was it suggested that the housewife could save by using a cheaper product?

What influence did the oleo manufacturers have on the personnel of the Consumers' Council either through financial help or otherwise?

Were any of the employees of the Consumers' Council, who had anything to do with the advertising, Communists or Communist sympathizers? If so, ruining the dairy farmers who are the backbone of democracy would work nicely into their plans for the revolution.

This advertising was untruthful. Why did they do it?

Mr. Montgomery, of the Consumers' Council, sets up the claim that nothing in the

broadcast referred to was "in any respect untruthful." We are glad Mr. Montgomery made this claim in just these words. Let us make a study of that broadcast and point out to you the deceitful and untruthful inferences of that broadcast. He also states: "If it be called free advertising, then this same characterization could be given to all of the information on food products which this Division and other agencies of the Department are constantly giving to the public"—to the effect that southern cotton farmers have much at stake in the sale of oleomargarine, and that no attempt at persuasion or influence was made in the broadcast.

A study of the Consumers' Council broadcast of July 5 reveals to me quite definitely that it tried to convince American consumers that there is one essential difference between the two products, oleomargarine and butter, and the difference is price. In my opinion, they deliberately went out of their way to create a Nation-wide butter price consciousness by emphasizing present butter price trends with the words, "That's mighty important right now, with the price of butter what it is," and "It costs a lot of money for people like us who must watch our pennies," and "People are finding out they can save quite a bit of money by using margarine instead of butter." In my opinion, this broadcast not only attempted to make consumers butter-price conscious, but offers a scare to consumers in an effort to dissuade them from using butter. Is not this an attempt at persuasion and influence?

In this broadcast this Department compared butter and oleo on a comparable basis, otherwise, by pointing out that both are chiefly fat, that the new standards set an 80-percent minimum for oleo, comparable with butter, and that in either case fat is fuel and energy for the human body. In an effort to make the two identically comparable, they say they are "equally digestible" and "equally rich in fuel value." The Division further cites comparability of vitamin A content when vitamin A is synthetically added to oleomargarine. So the broadcast leads the consumer to believing that these products in every respect, other than price, are wholly comparable. I claim this is not true.

What are the facts? According to Dr. E. B. Hart, world famed biochemist at the University of Wisconsin:

"There lies in the constitution of the fats, either qualitatively or quantitatively, or both, an inherent nutritive difference which can be demonstrated with young growing animals. This difference is not a vitamin A, D, or E difference, but a difference in the chemical constitution of the fats. It is probably a difference in the constitution of the fatty acids of the saponifiable fraction, although it may be due to some unrecognized essential nutrient carried by the butterfat but not carried by the vegetable oils. The mammary gland has synthesized something special for which there is, at present, no substitute. The ingestion of this something is reflected in the growth rate, appearance, and eventually the reproductive cycle of young animals. Experimental data are at hand showing the superiority for growth in young animals of butterfat over such vegetable oils as corn oil, cottonseed oil, soybean oil, and coconut oil, although the known fat soluble vitamins, such as A, D, and E, were adequately provided.

"Even the influence of the kind of fat ingested in the early life of the animal is felt in the later reproduction cycle. The kind of fat sets the life of the animal either for sterility or reproduction. Young rats 20 days old and grown to maturity with the vegetable oils as the principal source of the fatty acids failed to reproduce, although vitamin E was present. With butterfat the story was different—here reproduction occurred. Such data should be important in the education of the public to the use of milk as secreted by the mammary gland and in sustaining legislation aimed at the prevention of the substitution of some vegetable oil for the natural milk fat."

The broadcast in question, in my opinion, is further untruthful when it gives the impression that the consumer gains all information about oleo by reading the label. I cite the following: "Then, we really can find out the facts by reading the labels?" I ask you, does anyone, by reading the label, gain a realization that the new standards permit so wide a latitude in the use of ingredients that he fully understands and appreciates the changeableness of the content of oleo? Certainly not. In the case of butter, the 80 percent is always butterfat. In the case of oleomargarine it may be all vegetable fat; it may be all animal fat; and the only restriction as to ratio, if both animal and vegetable fats are used, is that the balance of nine to one either way shall be maintained. Perhaps today it is mostly soy oil; perhaps yesterday's was mostly coconut oil; and nobody, except the manufacturer, will know what it will be tomorrow. He will determine that, on the basis of price, taking advantage of the lowest market which gives him an almost perfect selectivity of profits so long as he comes under the wire at 80 percent fat. Is there anything in the label that tells all with respect to that?

Had the broadcast given all the facts, not part of them; had it told of the lack of dependability of the content of oleo; and the program not urged, persuaded, and influenced, I might then agree that it was a factual exposition and not a bold piece of advertising. Because of this, it falls in the category of propaganda, not education.

Mr. Montgomery's letter indicates that he thinks the sale of oleomargarine means much to the welfare and wealth of the cotton farmers. Since they produce primarily for the sale of lint, since cotton oil is a by-product, since the percentage of cotton oil is small at best, and since the wide latitude of contents used in variable proportions leaves the cotton grower little to depend on, I submit that he has overemphasized the importance of oleo as a source of additional income to the cotton farmer.

I further call your attention to the fact that the margin of price difference is much wider between the compressor and the finished oleo than it is between the cost of cottonseed and the price of oil at the compressor.

Further, may I call your attention to the fact that oleo is sold as an imitation. Unless made in the image of butter, which is an accepted product that has come down through the ages, oleo would find it necessary at great cost to blaze new trails of consumer acceptance. Butter sells for what it is. Oleomargarine sells for what it isn't. Oleo is not made from positive sources of fat combined in fixed ratios. Butter is made from one fat—the milk fat from cows. With it, there is no problem of ratios.

Even in its lower price range, oleo's margin of profit is wide. The margin of profit in the case of butter is surprisingly low. The profit that accrues from the processing and selling of oleomargarine is retained in the hands of a few. What little profit accrues from butter is disseminated into the hands of many. The manufacture and sale of oleomargarine is concentrated. In the case of butter, it is widely decentralized.

Butter and the dairy industry contribute more than any other type of agriculture to the building of soil fertility, the retention of soil moisture, and in this way are mighty factors to the upbuilding of national security for the future.

Also the Department should bear in mind that the dairy-farm capital investment in this country exceeds the investment in any other type of agriculture in America. Not only are more men and more millions of dollars involved directly in the butter industry than in the oleomargarine industry, even though we were to assume that the consumption of the two products were equal, but also to a far greater degree are more millions of men and more millions of dollars involved indirectly in the production of butter than in the development and manufacture of oleo.

In conclusion, may I say that I fear the Consumers' Council, like other groups, has lost sight of the vast economic, social, and health implications involved in this question of substituting butter. We believe that all the facts should be assembled—all the truths should be brought forward. We believe it is wrong to continue propaganda for a commodity when, on one hand, so much health and welfare is at stake while on the other, so much profit is involved to be turned into the hands of a few.

Is it necessary to supply England with cheese and condensed milk in such quantities that the people of the United States cannot have adequate dairy products? What will the effect be on the dairy industry after the war if production is increased and consumption at home curtailed?

Has any adequate investigation been made to determine the amount of cheese, condensed milk, etc., that England actually needs? If England were paying for these products, instead of getting them through the lend-lease program, would she demand the quantities she is now demanding? Are Canada and New Zealand diverting their milk from butter to cheese and condensed milk in order to help England? What is the oleo situation in Canada? Are the Canadians being urged to eat oleo by their Government? Why not ship some more wheat to England and some oleo to spread on the bread made from the wheat? Germany is doing a fairly good job of fighting, and from all reports they are not living on cheese and condensed milk.

Very truly yours,

W. H. HANCHETT,
Chairman,
Four State Dairy Protective Committee.

Are We Going To Have a Miracle?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ARTICLE FROM LIBERTY MAGAZINE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, many of us who are greatly concerned over the ever-mounting Federal expenditures and the desire to prevent our official house from crashing on our heads are concerned over the apparent inability of the administration or the Congress to curtail nondefense expenditures.

Under leave heretofore granted, I call attention to an article appearing in Liberty of October 4, 1941, which is worthy of consideration in connection with our whole fiscal policy. The article is as follows:

[From Liberty of October 4, 1941]

ARE WE GOING TO HAVE A MIRACLE?

A miracle may happen. The Senate Finance Committee has passed a resolution demanding a reduction in nondefense spending. Of

course, that doesn't mean that the Congress is going to obey the demand. But maybe it will. Maybe the protests that you have read on this page and elsewhere will bear some fruit. Perhaps the clamor of the long-suffering public, outraged at the beastly spectacle of the squandermaniacs in Congress still groveling around the pork barrel, has at last made an impression. Only a few weeks ago we reminded these representatives of the people that they would soon be coming up for reelection. By that time the new taxes would be hurting their own constituents, and the probabilities were that they would be kicked out of office, as they well deserved.

At this writing they propose to raise $28,000,000 by an increased tax on your local telephone bills and another $8,000,000 by taxing your electric-light bulbs. It will be interesting to see what are the items in nondefense spending of which Congress deprives itself. As the tax base is broadened and more people have to pay taxes, there is going to be a greater watchfulness over the gentlemen in Congress who so buoyantly appropriate our money.

Already the tax structure in this country is fantastic. Let us look at a few examples. The Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. paid a sum in taxes that was equal to three and a half times the net earnings of the world operations of the company. How long do the taxgatherers in Washington think such a condition can continue? For every dollar in salary paid by the Socony Co., it paid to Federal, State, and municipal governments $1.59 in taxes. Read that again. Ponder on it. Ask yourself if that is a businesslike way to run the United States Government. The taxes of the Texas Co. increased about 115 percent in 10 years. That represented a payment of $4,279 per employee. Next year these figures are to be enormously increased.

One of the most extraordinary Alice-in-Wonderland examples of our taxation program is to be found in the New York Telephone Co. In 1940 this company paid in taxes $40,500,000. Read that over again. That means that the New York Telephone Co. paid a tax of $1.25 a month for each telephone in use. Incredible? No. These are facts, and here are more. The telephone company paid a tax of $20 a week for each one of its 40,000 employees. Read that again, and remember it represents taxes paid by this one company of $132,000 for each working day of the year.

We could cite other examples, from the automotive industry, the railroads, and other industries, but we shall confine ourselves to two. In 1940 the United States Steel Corporation paid in taxes $85,000,000. In that year the Government received in taxes 55 percent more from the steel company than in 1929, but the stockholders received 45 percent less. The stockholders actually averaged less than 1 percent a year for the last 10 years. The E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., paid in taxes last year an average of $1,090,385 a week. No wonder Walter S. Carpenter, Jr., president of the Du Pont Co., said, "It is of vital concern * * * to the general welfare of all industry and to the future well-being of the country as a whole that the law for raising revenues for the Government should be so designed as to avoid needless injury to our basic institutions."

It is idle to point out that all this has virtually closed the door to new industrial undertakings. Government oppression has almost throttled private enterprise. But now a worse condition is emerging. They have done what they said they would do. They have soaked the rich. They have soaked big business. It is not enough—not nearly enough. Now they are going to soak everybody except themselves—unless this miracle really comes to pass.

Our country is big enough and rich enough to pay our national-defense bills and still remain a going concern. Our people are sensible enough and patriotic enough to accept their burdens cheerfully and faithfully. But no country is big enough, rich enough, or patriotic enough to squander its resources, to throw away its money, to rob its citizens for the benefit of politicians, and to remain a sound and going concern. The madness has gone far enough. Even the Senate Finance Committee demands that a halt be called.

We have been saying the same thing for a long time. We have been demanding that the squandermaniacs take their hands out of the people's pockets. Perhaps the day of miracles is not over. Maybe the Congress is going to economize. God grant it be so. If not, the American people are going to get angry. When that happens, the squandermaniacs had better watch out.

Prayer for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

ARTICLE BY H. I. PHILLIPS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, while it is true our first duty in this great emergency confronting us and the world is the battle of production, that we may be successful in the fight to preserve our own democracy and our way of life and to give all aid possible to other nations engaged in a like struggle, we should not overlook in this great hour of trial the spiritual strength which should accompany such an effort if it is to be successful.

As a part of my remarks under leave heretofore granted I include an article by H. I. Phillips on the subject of prayer for America, which is worthy of careful consideration of us all. The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of September 27, 1941]

THE ONCE OVER

(By H. I. Phillips)

PRAYER FOR AMERICA

"A national patriotic prayer week has been proposed for November 17 to 23 for the guidance and help of America in the present crisis."—(News item.)

First of all, O Lord, make us realize fully that in any prayer we are making a supplication, not placing a rush order.

In this critical hour in our Nation's life, help us to the ways of strength and fortitude through the ability to see ourselves as You see us! Make it possible for us better to gird ourselves for whatever tests may lie ahead by the power of completely honest self-appraisal.

Rid us of petty impulses, the corroding curse of self-interest and the besetting sin of intolerance. Strengthen us for the task ahead by the ability to see how far we have strayed from the ways of our forefathers. Grant that there may be restored to us something of their burning faith.

May we be humble enough to know that, even as we don the cloak of righteousness and take the sword of the crusader, we are not without guilt. May we be helped by the realization that our ways have not made a pretty picture. May we become stronger through the knowledge that we have permitted the America we fight for now to become far too worshipful of the cheap and tawdry.

Make us realize that this is no hour for the casual mood or the superficial gesture. May we understand fully that this is no job in which cheers, back slappings, music, confetti hurling, and the usual trappings of everyday endeavors shall suffice us.

Grant us the wisdom to understand that in this crusade cheap publicity, personal glorification, and supercilious small talk are sickening and wholly unavailing.

Rid us, O Lord, of the sickening, softening concept that the most comfortable road is the best, that any view of life is enhanced by a seat in a limousine, and that success and eminence depend almost wholly on the spotlight and the cameramen.

Fill us with disgust at the countless evils we have nurtured in days of peace; the love of personal glory, the quest of false gods, the pursuit of the main chance, and the debasement of countless high ideals of traditional American life.

Help us to be brave without being boastful, indignant without being intolerant, resolute without being unfair. May we keep constantly in mind Thy commandment, "And the greatest of these is charity," charity in the sense of tolerance and compassion. Keep us strong, yet not truculent.

May we see the frothy things of our civilization and all the glittering superficialities for what they are and know again the capacity for disgust and chagrin. Make us understand that we are at the crossroads, that this may now be the hour of our destiny. We shall need all the elements of our character which easy living has sapped. Give us spiritual strength, restore our faith, clear our vision, grant us strength and the sustaining memories of our sturdy forefathers and their honest, God-fearing way of life in peace or war.

And, oh Lord, through Thy saving grace, make it possible for us to recover the old trail and follow it to the end of the passage with the words ever in our minds, "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me." Amen.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, we are doing everything under lend-lease for which there is no authority any other place.

Added to our newly created coordinators, liaison officers, and super supervisors, we now have synchronizers.

A signed postal card addressed to the House Appropriations Committee had only three words, "You spending fools."

The six-billion bill will be passed without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t" so British and Bolshevik morale would not be weakened.

England warns little Finland not to invade Russia. This is funny and pathetic. As for me, Finns, give 'em 'ell; and in turn I hope the bear eats up Adolf.

The bases we are building in the Mediterranean, Red Sea, and Persian Gulf are for the purpose of protecting mother at Sabetha, Kans. (a la Smedley Butler).

We are doing every day to our neutrality and the international law what the U. S. S. R. did to religion—the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The A. P. quotes Howard O. Hunter, director of W. P. A. and promoter of David Lasser, as saying that their rolls will be increased thousands to care for the jobless made from defense priorities.

A huge rick of rare live oak logs was found recently while dredging in Brooklyn shipyards. Navy officers say they have been there over 100 years, probably concealed for security. Water preserves them.

The shortest distance between Topeka and Singapore west on my globe is 9,717 miles through Vancouver, Tokyo, and Manila. It is 10 miles farther through the North Pole, Russia, and China, but they are all our friends.

Mark Twain in the Mysterious Stranger showed more understanding than some later authors when he prophesied how future wars would start:

I can see a million years ahead, and this rule will never change in so many as half a dozen instances. The loud little handful, as usual, will shout for the war.

The pulpit will warily object at first. The great, big, dull bulk of the Nation will rub its sleepy eyes and try to make out why there should be a war, and will say, earnestly and indignantly, "It is unjust and dishonorable, and there is no necessity for it." Then the handful will shout louder.

A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war with speech and pen, and at first will have a hearing and be applauded, but it will not last long. Those others will outshout them, and presently the antiwar audiences will thin out and lose popularity.

Before long you will see this curious thing: The speakers stoned from the platform and free speech strangled by hordes of furious men who in their secret hearts are still at one with those stoned speakers, as earlier, but do not dare to say so. And now the whole Nation, pulpit and all, will take up the war cry and shout itself hoarse, and mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth. And presently such mouths will cease to open.

Next the statesmen will invent cheap lies, putting the blame upon the nation that is attacked, and every man will be glad of those conscience-soothing falsities, and will diligently study them, and thus he will, by and by, convince himself that the war is just, and will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys after this process of grotesque self-deception.

"Bloody Joe" Stalin—Disciple of Religious Tolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Iosiph Dzhugashvili, alias Joseph Stalin, that great crusader for liberty in that great Christian democracy, Soviet Russia, undoubtedly was vastly surprised, perhaps greatly delighted, and possibly no little embarrassed, if not chagrined, by the discovery by the President of the United States that the Russian Constitution affords and protects the same religious liberties as the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Roosevelt, at a press conference this week, sprung this one on the newspaper boys. He informed them that the Russian Constitution did grant the same religious liberties to all Russians and foreigners as does the Constitution of the United States, and Mr. Roosevelt's attitude was that this was a great discovery. It was. So great was the amazement of the press corps that some of the boys reeled and had to be helped out by their comrades into the open air.

It appears from Mr. Roosevelt's study of the Russian Constitution, with its "bill of rights," whatever that bill of rights may be, that the world has been in error in calling the Honorable Iosiph Dzhugashvili "Bloody Joe" Stalin. The gory purges in which all of the intelligentsia, the leading generals and strategists of the army, the leading scientists, engineers, and writers were "liquidated" by the thousands, together with their families, must all have been in the interest of religious liberty.

There is no question but that "Bloody Joe" was vastly surprised at the Roosevelt discovery. There can be no question that from one angle he will be delighted, because it will allow his borers-from-within in the United States to start boring harder than ever under a cloak of respectability thrown about them by the President of the United States when he declared the constitution of the U. S. S. R. to be similar in its religious tolerance to our own.

Undoubtedly "Bloody Joe" will be greatly embarrassed, if not chagrined, by Mr. Roosevelt's discovery at the same time that he is surprised and delighted. The bloody massacres of the hundreds of priests throughout Russia in the past; the wanton slaying of men and women belonging to religious orders; the utter and obscene desecration of the finest cathedrals in all Russia; the organization of education to teach the youth there is no God, and that the Soviet Government and its dictator are the objects of the supreme worship of the Russian people; the deliberately created famine in which 7,000,000 of men and women and children in the Ukraine were deliberately starved to a horrible death by the Honorable Joseph and his cohorts—all of these atrocities must have been somebody's mistake. They certainly are not in accord with those provisions of the Soviet Constitution which Mr. Roosevelt dug up this week, nor are they in accord with the character of a Christian democracy, which the propagandists of the New Deal administration are now attempting to drape about this godless dictatorship of the Russians.

A more amazing—and brazen—thing has not happened in the history of this Nation than this effort, in the light of the known and recent bloody massacres in Russia, to drape about that dreadful country and its terrible dictator a cloak of Christian respectability and tolerance.

It is one thing to give such military aid as may be necessary to the Russians while they are fighting Hitler's demoniac forces. It was something else a few months ago when the great advocate of liberty, "Bloody Joe" Stalin and this Christian democracy of Soviet Russia was raping poor, honorable little Finland. It was something else a few months ago when this great Christian leader, Joe Stalin, was driving a dagger in the back of Poland while she was facing overwhelming Nazi assaults.

I have said and I repeat that it is devoutly to be hoped that Hitler and his henchmen and Stalin and his henchmen will destroy each other in this fight.

It is something else again when the President of the United States, or any other responsible spokesman of the administration fires the opening gun in what undoubtedly will be a wave of propaganda to convince the American people that Stalin's unspeakable dictatorship is pervaded by sweetness, light and virtue, and that the philosophy of communism is acceptable to the citizens of this country.

The greatest menace to the future of America henceforth lies in the danger that propagandists will make the slimy, treacherous, anti-Christian, anti-American philosophy of communism popular or acceptable in this Nation.

It was a great disservice to this Nation when the President unlocked the door and opened the way for a wave of Soviet propaganda to be undertaken in this country by his amazing, incredible, defense of the Soviet dictatorship as one of religious tolerance and enlightenment.

The President or others may find in the Soviet Constitution some verbiage that might be tortured and twisted into meaning religious tolerance, but the Soviet Constitution means no more to the dictator, Joe Stalin, and it means no more to the Russian people, than the American Constitution will mean to us if this campaign of propaganda to popularize communism gets a foothold in this country.

Ten thousand Russian Soviet constitutions, every one written in the blood of the massacred men, women, and children who have been sacrificed to the insane fears and lust for power of Joe Stalin and his cohorts, could not wipe out for 1 hour the actual known record of satanic evil, obscene ungodliness, and filthy atheism which characterizes not only the dictators of Russia but their henchmen in the United States. Nine days before Joe Stalin made his pact with Adolf Hitler, Stalin's stooges inveigled some 400 outstanding intellectuals of the United States to sign a manifesto, in which clause No. 8 stated explicitly that Stalin in Russia had wiped out "the superstitions of old religion."

It is an insult to the intelligence of the American people for any individual, be he President or pants presser, seriously to contend for a moment that Soviet Russia is a nation of religious enlightenment and tolerance. It is a bloody, relentless, ruthless dictatorship. Its philosophy, spiritual and material, is anti-

American at every point, in every sentence, and in every word. Anything anybody may say or do in the future will not change those facts one iota.

The American people must now be more alert than ever against the insidious danger of communistic boring from within that will try—and might succeed—in wrecking the foundations of free government in the United States.

That danger must be guarded against at all hazards.

The Truth and Nothing But the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY MIRROR OF OCTOBER 2, 1941

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to the serious consideration of the House the following editorial, which, in my opinion, is most timely.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Daily Mirror of October 2, 1941]

YOUR STAKE IN AP, INS, UP

The truth is the first casualty, the first prisoner of war.

Without the truth, there has never been, there can never be, freedom.

The people of America get more truth than any other people in the whole world—we get more truth from inside Germany and even from inside England than the people of either of those nations can get. And, for our ringside seat on all the world's news, we are indebted to three great American news-gathering agencies that hide their own great story behind the tiny initials: INS, UP, AP.

Those initials stand for International News Service, United Press, and Associated Press.

Compare ours with Europe's news agencies. Biggest of the British agencies is Reuter's—which must sacrifice some of its independence as "pay-off" for the preferential rates it enjoys throughout the Empire, and the revenue it gets by selling its service to the British Government. Smaller, but quite independent, is the Exchange Telegraph Service.

Now look at the other countries:

In Germany, the one-time more or less independent agencies like Ullstein and Wolff were smashed by Hitler as soon as he came to power. Now the only functioning agency is the "official" Deutsche Nachrichten Buro (DNB). In Germany, the prefix "official" means "probably a lie, always propaganda."

In France, there used to be a pretty good news agency called Havas, biggest in the world in personnel and facilities. It had good men who got the news.

But when their cables hit the central office, there the "official" viewpoint began to seep in. You see, Havas was alleged to be secretly subsidized by the French Government.

Today, Havas is openly the "official" news agency of the Vichy government. That means it ranks with the rank DNB.

And the Tass Agency in Russia is also "official"; only difference between Tass and DNB is the German outfit tells more skillful lies from a psychological standpoint.

And in Italy, Stefani is the "official" news service; it enjoys a monopoly, and it pays for the monopoly by issuing fakes that Mussolini O. K.'s or dictates.

A century ago, Napoleon said that he would rather face the opposition of two regiments of troops than the criticism of two hostile, honest, and fearless newspapers.

Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini, and Petain share Napoleon's respect for the power of the printed truth.

Today, you can get a pretty good idea of the price of truth by the price Hitler has put on the head of any man, woman, or child caught reading or circulating any of the 500 bootlegged news sheets that print the truth as it is smuggled in from the outside world. The penalty is death.

And, conversely, you can visualize the high regard people hold for the truth—after they are deprived of it—when you know that all over Europe people are risking death to hear or read the truth from the outside.

Every year we have a national newspaper week here in America. This year, the week extends from October 1 to 8.

All year, 365 days and nights, the press and the great arterial news services that feed the press work to bring the American people the truth.

The Mirror has worked extraordinarily hard to bring the whole truth and nothing but the truth to our readers—the Mirror is the only New York morning newspaper that prints news from all three great services—AP, INS, and UP.

Accuracy is enforced by competition among the American news agencies: Associated Press is a cooperative, nonprofit organization of member papers—and the membership includes papers with all shades of opinions. AP cannot afford to be partisan any more than UP or INS.

Accuracy is equal to enterprise in selling UP or INS to client papers; inaccuracy and partisanship mean lost clients and bankruptcy.

We know the American people face tremendous decisions during the coming months; we feel that the best way we can help make sure that these decisions will be wise decisions is to print as much truth as possible.

And from INS, UP, and AP we get the truth—so you get the truth.

Defensive Powers of the Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

ADDRESS BY EDWARD H. FOLEY, JR.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Edward H. Foley, Jr., general counsel for the Treasury Department, delivered before the municipal-law section, American Bar Association, sixty-fourth annual meeting, Indianapolis, Ind.:

Twenty-four years ago this month Charles Evans Hughes spoke before the annual convention of the American Bar Association at Saratoga Springs, on the subject, War Powers Under the Constitution. He concluded his address with this statement:

"It has been said that the Constitution marches. That is, there are certainly new applications of unchanged powers, and it is ascertained that in novel and complex situations, the old grants contain, in their general words and true significance needed and adequate authority. So, also, we have a fighting Constitution. We cannot at this time fail to appreciate the wisdom of the fathers, as under this charter, 130 years old—the Constitution of Washington—the people of the United States fight with the power of unity—as we fight for the freedom of our children and that hereafter the sword of autocrats may never threaten the world."[1]

In September 1941 as in September 1917 many free nations of the world have set themselves to the business of war; now, as then, to prevent a new generation of autocrats from extending a tyranny which threatens the survival of liberty.

The rapid extension of a power whose purpose and design is to suppress basic liberties everywhere cannot fail to compel the concern of our country. And now the situation has progressed, beyond the implication of threat against our national security and freedom, to actual attacks on American ships at sea.

The President in his radio broadcast of September 11, 1941, announced that he had taken the defensive measure of instructing the Navy to eliminate German and Italian raiders from sea areas vital to American defense, without waiting for those raiders to attack. This step invites our inquiry into the basis of authority on which the President takes such action.

It is my purpose today to consider the way in which the Constitution provides for Presidential action in times of foreign crisis and to examine, in reference to past events, the practical interpretation which the fundamental law has received in this respect from its beginning.

I

It is necessary to keep in mind throughout our discussion the idea expressed by Hughes concerning the very nature of a constitution: that it is a statement of general principles enunciated and is not characterized by the specific and rather rigid quality of a body of rules aimed at dealing with a current situation and intended to be subject to frequent and speedy change. Chief Justice Marshall emphasized this in the brief words: "* * * we must never forget that it is a constitution we are expounding."[2]

A constitution is in any age conceived as having relative permanence and continuity without constant alteration. To be a vital force, it must be construed broadly with the changing circumstances of new events.

Section 1 of article II of the Constitution ordains: "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America." Other provisions of the same article confer on the President specific powers. And section 3 of the article commands the President to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." It is with the first of these sources of Presidential power that we are here particularly concerned.

It was observed by Alexander Hamilton that the legislative powers granted to Congress and the judicial power conferred upon the Supreme and inferior Federal courts were carefully limited in scope, while to the President was given "executive power" without qualification.[3] Shortly after the Civil War, Senator

[1] (1917) XLII Reports of the American Bar Association, 248.

[2] *M'Culloch* v. *Maryland* ((U. S. 1819), 4 Wheat. 316, 407).

[3] Works of Alexander Hamilton (Lodge ed., 1885), vol. 4, pp. 140–143 (Letters of Pacificus).

Reverdy Johnson restated succinctly Hamilton's theory in these words:

"* * * In express terms the powers conferred upon the legislative department of the Government are stated to be only those that are delegated in the first article. In the second place, the powers conferred upon the Executive by the second article are, as stated in the very beginning of that article, 'the executive power' of the Government, without any detail of the subjects upon which such power is exerted, as in the case in relation to the legislative department. And, in the third article, relating to the judicial department, only such cases are submitted as are specially enumerated. With regard, then, to the legislative and judicial departments, the powers vested in them are to be found in the articles constituting them. With regard to the executive department, the question as to the extent of its power depends upon the fact whether the power in question in its nature is executive, and not restricted by some of the express guaranties or prohibitions in the Constitution." [4]

After leaving the Presidency, Theodore Roosevelt stated his view that the President was "a steward of the people bound actively and affirmatively to do all he could for the people * * *, whenever and in whatever manner was necessary, unless prevented by direct constitutional or legislative prohibition." [5] That position was strongly criticized by William Howard Taft in his book entitled "Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers." He said:

"The true view of the Executive functions is, as I conceive it, that the President can exercise no power which cannot be fairly and reasonably traced to some specific grant of power or justly implied and included within such express grant as proper and necessary to its exercise. Such specific grant must be either in the Federal Constitution or in an act of Congress passed in pursuance thereof." [6]

Taft added the comment that:

"Mr. Roosevelt, by way of illustrating his meaning as to the different usefulness of Presidents, divides the Presidents into two classes, and designates them as 'Lincoln Presidents' and 'Buchanan Presidents'. In order more fully to illustrate his division of Presidents on their merits, he places himself in the Lincoln class of Presidents, and me in the Buchanan class. The identification of Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Lincoln might otherwise have escaped notice, because there are many differences between the two, presumably superficial, which would give the impartial student of history a different impression." [7]

Without passing on the merits of the controversy between Roosevelt and Taft, both of these distinguished statesmen would undoubtedly have agreed that the President is possessed of whatever executive power is lodged in the National Government by the Constitution.

The Supreme Court has declared that in the United States questions of external affairs are Federal, as well as executive. For example, in *The Chinese Exclusion Case* the Court said that—

"For local interests the several States of the Union exist, but for international purposes, embracing our relations with foreign powers, we are but one people, one nation, one power." [8]

It would seem that this was the view of the framers of the Constitution. In an address on the floor of the Constitutional Convention, Rufus King said of the several States:

"They did not possess the peculiar features of sovereignty, they could not make war, nor peace, nor alliances, nor treaties. Considering them as political beings, they were dumb, for they could not speak to any foreign sovereign whatever. They were deaf, for they could not hear any proposition from any such sovereign * * * *." [9]

In a series of lectures given at Columbia University before his appointment to the Supreme Court, George Sutherland analyzed the powers of the National Government. His conclusion also was that the powers of external sovereignty were never possessed by the States or by the people in the States separately. Speaking of the powers of the Federal Government over external affairs, he declared:

"These powers passed directly to the Nation as the result of successful revolution. They were never exercised, they were never possessed, by any government except the Government which, for the time being, represented the Nation. When the Constitution was framed, therefore, the undivided powers of external sovereignty were in the Union, which antedated the Constitution and was made more perfect by it." [10]

No one can now deny the supremacy of the Federal Government in the field of foreign relations. Confusion has sometimes arisen, however, in discussions of what branch or branches of the Federal Government is vested with this power.

II

As early as 1800, John Marshall, while a member of the House of Representatives, said that "The President is the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations." [11] This was the exact position embraced by the Supreme Court in recent years, when Mr. Justice Sutherland, speaking for the Court in Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation versus United States stated:

"It is important to bear in mind that we are here dealing not alone with an authority vested in the President by an exertion of legislative power, but with such an authority plus the very delicate, plenary and exclusive power of the President as the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations—a power which does not require a basis for its exercise an act of Congress, but, which, of course, like every other governmental power, must be exercised in subordination to the applicable provisions of the Constitution." [12]

It is well established that the President has plenary power over the recognition of foreign states and the severance of diplomatic relations.

The question of recognition arose early in the administration of President Monroe concerning the revolted Spanish colonies of Latin America. Henry Clay, in the House of Representatives, attempted, by moving the addition of a rider to an appropriation bill, to intrude congressional control into the matter; his motion was twice defeated, the opposition maintaining the executive character of the foreign relations power. [13]

Again, in 1896 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recommended adoption of a resolution recognizing the independence of Cuba from Spain. [14] President Cleveland believed that recognition would be premature, and that this method challenged his constitutional power. Secretary of State Olney communicated the President's view to the Senate committee, accompanied by a supporting opinion of the Attorney General. The committee then receded from its original position. [15]

A resolution introduced by Senator Fall, of New Mexico, in 1919, directed at breaking off relations with the Mexican Government of Carranza, likewise failed when President Wilson expressed vigorously his opposition on constitutional grounds. [16]

III

The President's control over foreign relations may, for practical purposes, involve the United States in war. This is shown clearly by such familiar incidents as the dispute in 1895 with Great Britain over the boundary with Venezuela and British Guiana. [17]

It has been urged that the vesting of Congress with the authority to declare war amounts to a denial by the Constitution of the President's power to act decisively in a situation like that of the Venezuela controversy. Reference to the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention on this clause of the instrument will, however, dispel all reasonable doubts.

As the war clause of the Constitution was reported to the Convention by the committee of detail, the power to "make war" was lodged with the "Legislature of the United States." Pierce Butler, of South Carolina, proposed that the committee provision be changed to vest the war-making power in the President,

---

[4] (1868) 82 CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, Appendix, p 67.

[5] Works of Theodore Roosevelt (National ed., 1926), vol. 20, pp. 347-348 (Autobiography).

[6] Taft, Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers (1916), 139-140.

[7] Id., 143-144. In a time of national emergency, President Buchanan was beset by doubts of the extent of his authority. As a result, he took no action when, on February 8, 1861, a provisional Confederate government was organized in Montgomery, Ala. Nearly a month of aimless Presidential fiddling elapsed before Lincoln took office and initiated measures of defense.

[8] (1889) 130 U. S. 581, 606. A similar statement was made by Mr. Justice Bradley in the *Legal Tender Cases* ((U. S. 1870), 12 Wall. 457, 555):

"The United States is not only a Government, but it is a National Government, and the only government in this country that has the character of nationality * * *."

[9] Papers of James Madison (1840), vol. II, pp. 905-906 (Debates in the Federal Convention).

[10] Sutherland, Constitutional Power in World Affairs (1919), 44.

[11] (1800) 10 Annals of Congress, column 613. The statement was made in connection with the extradition of Jonathan Robbins under the Jay treaty.

[12] (1936) 299 U. S. 304, 319-320. The same doctrine was developed by Thomas Jefferson in a letter to Citizen Genet, written November 2, 1793. He said:

"He being the only channel of communication between this country and foreign nations, it is from him alone that foreign nations or their agents are to learn what is or has been the will of the Nation; and whatever he communicates as such, they have the right, and are bound to consider as the expression of the Nation." Works of Thomas Jefferson (Washington ed., 1854, vol. 4, pp. 84-85).

[13] (1818) 32 Annals of Congress 1470 et seq.; S. Doc. No. 56, 54th Cong., 2d sess. 30.

[14] (1896) S. Rept. No. 1160, 54th Cong., 2d sess.

[15] See Tansill, War Powers of the President of the United States with Special Reference to the Beginning of Hostilities (1930), 45 Pol. Sci. Q. 1, 23-25.

[16] (1919) 59 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 73; see New York Times, December 9, 1919, p. 1, col. 6.

[17] In his annual message to the Congress in 1895 President Cleveland reaffirmed the applicability of the Monroe Doctrine and recommended an appropriation for the expenses of a commission to investigate the boundary dispute. He stated further:

"When such report is made and accepted, it will, in my opinion, be the duty of the United States to resist by every means in its power, as a willful aggression upon its rights and interests, the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of governmental jurisdiction over any territory which after investigation we have determined of right belongs to Venezuela." Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents (1897), vol. IX, p. 655.

who would have all the requisite qualities and would not make war but when the Nation would support it. Madison and Gerry then moved to substitute in the committee provision "declare" for "make" war, "leaving to the Executive the power to repel sudden attacks." This amendment was then agreed to by the Convention.[18]

It is plain from this that the President may engage American forces in hostilities, in case of attack, without any authorization from Congress. It may be asked: Who shall determine when an attack has been made on the United States by a foreign power? I suggest that the answer is: The President, as the sole organ of the Nation in external affairs. The members of the Constitutional Convention were well aware of the weakness and indecision of the Government of the United States under the Articles of Confederation in matters of international policy.[19] It could only have been their intention to confer on the Chief Executive power to undertake quick and decisive action where that is demanded by the press of circumstances abroad.

Our Presidents in the past have subscribed to the theory that they were constitutionally authorized by a grant of "executive power" to deal fully with foreign countries, using their authority as military commanders to support their external policy where necessary.

An early incident is Gen. Andrew Jackson's campaign in Florida against the Seminole Indians. The War Department had commissioned Jackson to end the raids, authorizing him to cross the border if necessary.

On the basis of this authority, Jackson proceeded into Florida, seized St. Marks and Pensacola, tried and executed two British subjects accused of inciting the Indians, established the revenue laws of the United States for this territory, and set up a military regime in place of the Spanish Government. The Spanish Government protested the American action and demanded indemnity.[20]

John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State in the administration of President Monroe, in his instructions to the United States minister concerning this protest, justified the action on the ground that "it arose from incidents which occurred in the prosecution of the war against the Indians, from the imminent danger in which the Fort of St. Marks was of being seized by the Indians themselves, and from the manifestations of hostility to the United States by the commandant of St. Marks and the governor of Pensacola, the proofs of which were made known to General Jackson, and compelled him, from the necessities of self-defense, to the steps of which the Spanish Government complains." [21]

An additional case occurred after President Tyler had negotiated in 1844 a treaty of annexation with the Republic of Texas. The Texas commissioners were assured that after signature of the treaty and pending its ratification the President would employ all means in his power to protect Texas against any foreign aggression.[22] In the next year President Polk ordered Gen. Zachary Taylor to prepare for embarkation from a United States port for the Texas frontier, and in early 1846 his troops reached the Rio Grande. A month later some Mexican cavalry attacked the American forces, and hostilities began.

The Senate had never ratified the annexation treaty with its attendant understandings, and Congress had only approved annexation by a joint resolution, without ever having authorized a Mexican war.[24] Later the Supreme Court said in the prize cases:

"The battles of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma had been fought before the passage of the act of Congress of May 13, 1846, which recognized 'a state of war as existing by the act of the Republic of Mexico.' This act not only provided for the future prosecution of the war, but was itself a vindication and ratification of the act of the President in accepting the challenge without a previous formal declaration of war by Congress." [24]

Again in 1871, President Grant submitted to the Senate a treaty for annexation of the Dominican Republic. While ratification was being considered, the Government of Haiti was overthrown by General Saget, who was known to be friendly with the Dominican insurgent, Cabral. For the protection of the government of the Dominican Republic, President Grant arranged for the dispatch of a naval force to Santo Domingo to inform the Haitian general that any interference in Dominican affairs would be regarded by the United States as a hostile act and to protect with force the Dominican Republic against any attack.[25] This armed protection was continued by Grant for more than a year and was the center of bitter senatorial debate. Senator Sumner introduced a resolution of censure. After a heated debate extending over 2 days and marked by opposing speeches of Senators Sumner and Harlan, the resolution was tabled and the President's action was thereby sustained.[26]

In the early years of World War I, repeated revolutionary disorders in both republics on the island of Santo Domingo provoked the fear by our Government that these strategically situated places in the Caribbean would fall prey to the influence of a European power such as Germany, and form the base for future expeditions against the vital Panama Canal. As a result, President Wilson authorized the sending of occupying forces to restore order and government.[27]

And in 1914, when American relations with the Huerta government of Mexico had come to the breaking point, President Wilson gave instructions for the bombardment of Vera Cruz, when a German merchant ship was about to land munitions there which might be used against the United States by Huerta.[28]

IV

These instances of the Presidential exercise of the power to engage in active defense against a foreign country without awaiting action by Congress or an actual invasion of United States territorial sovereignty make it at once clear that recent American military occupations of Greenland and Iceland at the direction of the President are not unique and novel occurrences; rather, they are examples of renewed application by the President of his executive power to direct the external affairs of the United States, implemented by his power as Commander in Chief of the armed forces.

Our Presidents have repeatedly interpreted the Executive power as authorizing the armed protection from attack of territory in process of becoming a part of the United States as well as the actual protection of foreign states themselves. There are many instances of pursuit and hostilities in foreign territory with temporary occupation. No President has hesitated long to include in such protection potential American territory, even though it never was annexed. And they have not hesitated to take active measures in foreign territory where the local situation threatened, in their judgment, to jeopardize American national defense.

Nor is this the limit of Executive action in matters of international affairs. Traditionally, the Executive power has been exerted abroad to protect American interests generally. President Jefferson ordered the Navy to put an end to the piracy of Tripoli corsairs practiced on American ships in North African waters.[29] Tripoli had declared war on the United States, and Jefferson received no authorization from Congress to proceed until 2 years after his original instructions.[30] His position in issuing them was, nevertheless, sustained by Madison in a letter to President Monroe written in 1827.[31] And later the Supreme Court gave him unequivocal support in the Prize cases, saying:

---

[18] Papers of James Madison (1840), vol. III, pp. 1351–1353. (Debates in the Federal Convention.)

[19] See, e. g., statement of Rufus King in the Convention of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on the adoption of the Constitution. Elliot's Debates, vol. II, pp. 78–79.

[20] (1819) S. Doc. No. 100, 15th Cong., 2d sess.; Bailey, Diplomatic History of the American people (1940), 168–169; see letter from James Madison to James Monroe, September 22, 1827. Writings of James Madison (1865), vol. III, p. 588. It is possible that Jackson exceeded his authority in seizing the forts and in establishing the laws of the United States; however, he was clearly authorized to invade Spanish territory, and in instructions to the General, President Madison added:

"I am aware that cases may occur when the commanding general, acting on his own responsibility, may safely pass the limit * * * [of his orders] with essential advantage to his country." For instance: "The officers and troops of the neutral power forget * * * their neutral character; they stimulate the enemy to make war; they furnish * * * arms; * * * they take an active part in their favor * * *. The general * * * pursues them to their post, * * * attacks and carries it, and rests on those acts for his justification."

Such a justification may not in fact have been demonstrated, but it was consistently Jackson's position that all his acts were authorized by the instructions. See James, Andrew Jackson, the Border Captain (1933), 317.

[21] American State Papers, Foreign Relations, vol. IV, p. 539 (Adams to George W. Erving, November 28, 1818).

[22] See Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents (1897), vol. IV, p. 317.

[23] See id at pp. 442–443.

[24] (U S. 1862) 2 Black, 635, 668.

[25] See Moore, Digest of International Law (1906) vol. I, p. 278 et seq; Nevins, Hamilton Fish (1936), ch. XIV.

[26] (1871) 98 CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 329. The resolution, which was tabled, read, in part, as follows:

"* * * the employment of the Navy without the authority of Congress in acts of hostility against a friendly foreign nation, or in belligerent intervention in the affairs of a foreign nation, is an infraction of the Constitution of the United States and a usurpation of power not conferred upon the President.

"* * * while the President, without any previous declaration of war by act of Congress, may defend the country against invasion by foreign enemies, he is not justified in exercising the same power in an outlying foreign island, which has not yet become part of the United States; that a title under an unratified treaty is at most inchoate and contingent, while it is created by the President alone, in which respect it differs from any such title created by act of Congress; and since it is created by the President alone, without the support of law, whether in legislation or a ratified treaty, the employment of the Navy in the maintenance of the Government there is without any excuse of national defense, and also without any excuse of a previous declaration of war by Congress" (1871), 98 CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE 294.

[27] Bailey, Diplomatic History of the American People (1940), 597.

[28] Id., at 607

[29] See Irwin, The Diplomatic Relations of the United States with the Barbary Pirates (1931), 92–124; Allen, Our Navy and the Barbary Corsairs (1905), 88–125.

[30] Act of February 6, 1802, 2 Stat. 129.

[31] Letter from James Madison to James Monroe, November 16, 1827. Writings of James Madison (1865), vol. III, p. 599.

"If a war be made by invasion of a foreign nation, the President is not only authorized but bound to resist force by force. He does not initiate the war, but is bound to accept the challenge without waiting for any special legislative authority." [32]

In the early 1850's the United States disputed with the British Government the latter's designs on the Mosquito coast of Central America as a violation both of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty and the Monroe Doctrine. The Government at Washington sent a warship to Greytown to protect American interests and the vessel's commander bombarded the town, destroying British and French property.[33] In a suit against him for damages arising out of the bombardment, the commander defended his action by relying on the authorization of the President and the Secretary of the Navy. Mr. Justice Nelson, sitting in the circuit court which heard the case, sustained Commander Hollins' position, stating:

"Now, as it respects the interposition of the Executive abroad, for the protection of the lives or property of the citizen, the duty must, of necessity, rest in the discretion of the President. Acts of lawless violence, or of threatened violence to the citizen or his property, cannot be anticipated and provided for; and the protection, to be effectual or of any avail, may, not unfrequently, require the most prompt and decided action * * *." [34]

Taking action which foreshadowed present-day patrols and convoys, President Buchanan in 1857 dispatched a naval force to Cuban waters with directions "to protect all vessels of the United States on the high seas from search or detention by the vessels of war of any other nation." The step was taken in answer to the repeated action of British warships in boarding American merchantmen for visit and search in time of peace. Great Britain subsequently conceded the correctness in international law of the American position, and the incident was closed without any hostilities.[35]

Numerous other similar incidents could be recounted; as responsible writers on the present subject have stated—

"* * * the armed forces of the United States 'have been landed on foreign soil for the protection of the lives and property of American citizens abroad on more than 100 occasions.' From the Aegean Islands to Manchuria, and from Mexico to the Falklands.

"'American seamen and marines have been sent ashore to prevent by force of arms the injury of their countrymen wherever these have been endangered, or to exact reparation for wrongs committed against them. Sometimes the force employed has been only a dozen seamen in a cutter, who chased a piratical schooner ashore. * * * On other occasions American armies of more than 3,000 men have engaged in long campaigns with the people of foreign states, operations which must have been classified as wars if it were not for the fact that the Congress of the United States never recognized them as such by a formal exercise of its unique power to declare war.'" [36]

If the President, without previous congressional approval, may with full constitutional authority employ the armed forces of the Nation to protect private interests abroad, surely this power must extend to such action when taken to protect and defend the entire Nation. It is in this light that we must view the President's acts in acquiring, by agreement and occupation, sites for military bases throughout the Western Hemisphere, in ordering the Navy to clear the seas of Axis submarines and surface raiders, and in providing for all possible protection on the seas between the American Continent and Iceland for every merchant ship carrying cargoes to Great Britain. In taking these steps the President is making articulate the national policy of freedom of the seas and of opposition to the aggressor states.

The President himself has initial responsibility for determining questions of his constitutional power, and this is especially true in cases relating to foreign affairs over which he exercises a unique and virtually exclusive jurisdiction. There can be scant danger to democratic institutions from concentrating such an "executive power" in one Chief Magistrate who alone is responsible to the entire electorate for his use of this power.

All our history has shown that crises demand the purposeful and unfaltering action of a single individual, clothed with all the authority that our Constitution confers. Through all of our history we have been blessed with leaders, from Washington and Jefferson to Lincoln and Wilson, who have not hesitated to use that authority. They were not assailed by timid fears. They did not let themselves be hampered by narrow doubts. They acted with a boldness that measured up to the full height of their responsibilities to the people of their day.

Today we are living through times that would have tried men's souls in any of the great emergencies our country has encountered. We are in the midst of a crisis in which the survival of our free democratic institutions is at stake. This is no time for confusion or doubt or half-way measures. As the President said on September 11, "The American people have faced other great crises in their history with American courage, with American resolution. They will do no less today." The people have a right to expect the full exercise of Presidential power which springs from the Constitution, which has been tested and proved for 150 years. I am confident that they will get the courageous leadership now which will again enable this Nation successfully to defend its freedom.

[32] (U. S. 1862), 2 Black. 635, 668.

[33] Bailey, Diplomatic History of the American People (1940), 293.

[34] *Durand* v. *Hollins* (C. C. S. D. N. Y., 1860), 8 Fed Cas. 111, 112; Fed. Cas. No. 4186.

[35] Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents (1897), vol. V, p. 507.

[36] Tansill, War Powers of the President of the United States with Special Reference to the Beginning of Hostilities (1930), 45 Pol. Sci. Q. 1, 47–48, quoting from Offutt, The Protection of Citizens Abroad by the Armed Forces of the United States (1928), 1.

They're Building Ships in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE PORTLAND (OREG.) JOURNAL

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the shipbuilding program in my native State of Oregon. In the last war we earned an enviable reputation in the construction of ships for use in the prosecution of the war, and we are keeping up with the record we then established in carrying forward at the present time our defense program.

I include as part of my remarks an editorial appearing in the Journal, published at Portland, Oreg., September 21, 1941, calling attention to some of these accomplishments. The editorial follows:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of September 21, 1941]

THEY'RE BUILDING SHIPS IN OREGON

Oregon is helping write the history of the second World War—writing it in ships—ships for the United States Navy, ships for the maritime commission, and ships for Britain.

Six Oregon companies, employing about 12,000 men at the moment and putting them on at the rate of at least 100 a day, are busy on $125,000,000 worth of ships. They're building minelayers, minesweepers, net tenders, and sub chasers for the Navy, and they're building part of the great "Liberty fleet" of merchant ships, as well as doing conversion jobs that are as big and as important as building entirely new vessels.

The speed with which crews and materials have been assembled is amazing, almost unbelievable. Ask shipyard executives how, and they'll tell you they themselves don't know. Great yards have bloomed into being almost overnight. Where, 10 months ago, there were only swamps, woodyards, and unsightly waterfront junk, great buildings and shipways now stand, and great ships take form.

Half a dozen conversion jobs and naval vessels have already been delivered by Commercial Iron, and Willamette Iron & Steel. And Oregon Shipbuilding, biggest of them all, has 8 ships on the ways, will launch the *Star of Oregon*, first of 43 vessels costing $75,000,000, September 27. Last February this company had some plans. Now it has more than 7,000 men at work, and they're turning out ships at the rate of 1 every 2 weeks. Before long, they'll launch 1 ship a week.

Willamette Iron & Steel, busy on two great minelayers costing $12,500,000 each, has already converted two ships and is busy on the *President Jackson*, and, as a sort of sideline, is building 50 great steam engines for the Maritime Commission.

Commercial Iron has finished four net tenders, has seven minesweepers coming.

Every shipyard in Oregon, including those at Astoria and North Bend, has been doing the impossible—starting from scratch, training men, beating time schedules, delivering ships—ships that will help win a war. That's because every hunk of steel put in place by a whirley crane, every riveter's tattoo, and the hiss of every welder, is a blow at Hitler.

Uncle Sam wants ships, does he? Okay; Oregon will give him ships.

Harry Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of the Members of Congress are gratified over

the fact that Judge Charles B. Sears has recommended the deportation of Harry Bridges. From all that can be ascertained, Judge Sears made his recommendation after a careful investigation and review of approximately the same evidence that was submitted to Dean Landis 2 years ago. Apparently Landis would not recognize a Communist even if it crawled in bed with him. I join with many of my colleagues in expressing the hope that legal technicalities will not long stand in the way of the speedy deportation of an extremely undesirable alien.

In connection with this case, I wish to call your attention to a timely editorial from a recent edition of the Washington Post. All of us should give particular attention to the advice contained in the editorial that Congress should take note of Judge Sears' forthright finding on the aims of the Communist Party in the United States. The sooner the Stalin political conspiracy in this country is uprooted and eradicated, the better for the future security of our democracy.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post]

CASE OF MR. BRIDGES

The Government's handling of the case of Harry Bridges certainly leaves much to be desired. After an elaborate hearing before James M. Landis, acting as a special examiner for the Labor Department, Mr. Bridges was found not to be a Communist 2 years ago. Now Judge Charles B. Sears, acting in a similar capacity for the Department of Justice, recommends deportation of the labor leader on the ground that he has been affiliated with the Communist Party and various allied organizations. To say the least, this apparent contradiction tends to shake one's confidence in the quality of justice that is meted out to aliens who run afoul of the law in this country.

It appears, however, that the findings of Judge Sears are more comprehensive and realistic than those of Dean Landis. Moreover, Congress has strengthened the law governing the deportation of aliens engaged in subversive activities since the previous hearing was conducted. Of equal importance is the fact that the public and some Government officials have learned a good deal about the Communist Party and its methods of operation in this country during the last 2 years. The Hitler-Stalin pact put the party-liners who were masquerading as American liberals to a test they could not meet. So Judge Sears probably faced a less difficult task than Dean Landis in addition to having a larger fund of evidence gathered by the F. B. I.

The only reasonable course for the Department of Justice is to act on Judge Sears' recommendations. If Mr. Bridges ultimately appeals to the courts, the case should bring much needed clarification of the law governing the rights of aliens who are associated with subversive organizations. Incidentally, Congress should take note of this forthright finding that "the Communist Party of the United States of America, from the time of its inception in 1919 to the present time, is an organization that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States." If this is true, communism in this country is not just another political cause, but a conspiracy against the Nation. Obviously, no such conspiracy should be allowed to flourish because of any mistaken belief that to uproot it would be illiberal.

Real Badge of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO CALL-BULLETIN

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I include the following editorial captioned "Real badge of honor," appearing in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin, September 29, 1941.

Mr. Speaker, in a few weeks, many young men will be returning to their homes, carrying honorable discharges from the United States Army, and showing they have served the Nation under the Selective Service Act.

The San Francisco Call-Bulletin suggests these men be accorded some inexpensive badge, which may be worn on the coat lapel, and which will not only be prized by the young men themselves, but will be a special badge of distinction.

The article follows:

[From the San Francisco Call-Bulletin of September 29, 1941]

REAL BADGE OF HONOR—UNCLE SAM'S GRADUATE SERVICE MEN DESERVE DISTINCTIVE EMBLEM

This is a salute to the largest and most important graduating class of 1941.

The class has 200,000 members and its uniform is not the cap and gown but the O. D. and overseas cap of the United States Army.

It is a class of veterans—young veterans, younger than most of us, but older than the majority of their fellows.

Between now and Christmas, these 200,000 members of the "Selective Service Class of '41" will have been released from the Army—without sheepskins, without magna cum laude, without degrees or any demonstrable award.

These veterans of '41 were ready, in varying degrees, to serve their country when they were chosen by lot in the Nation's first peacetime conscription.

As post-graduates, they will be ready, for the next 10 years, to be called back into active service at any time their country may need them.

MONEY WELL SPENT

The fact that they have been trained for a year, or the better part of a year, forms a very formidable and reassuring part of the Nation's future defense preparation.

They have given the Government a definite return for the effort and money expended in their training.

They should have something to show for it, too.

On behalf of the 21,200 "graduating" selectees to be released from service before the first of the year on the west coast, and their brothers throughout the country the Call-Bulletin herewith proposes some tangible form of recognition be given these men.

The Call-Bulletin respectfully suggests to the War Department, to the Selective Service Administration, and the Congress of the United States that some suitable emblem be authorized, designed, and produced for presentation to every selectee honorably completing his selective-service term.

WOULD THEY WEAR IT?

The emblem could be in the form of a small badge, a bronze button, or a lapel ribbon for wear on civilian clothes. Its significance is more important than its shape.

Would the ex-selectees wear it? Would it be appreciated?

We think they would and it would.

We think so because we asked some of the boys about it.

"You'd be surprised what it would mean to most of us," said a recent "graduate" who volunteered before his number was drawn.

"It would mean that we could walk down the street past fellows in uniform without wondering what they think about the fact we aren't there, too. After all, we've been there.

"Not all of us old fellows over 28 look too old to be packing a gun—particularly after a year of getting into condition.

"Besides, don't believe all you hear about low morale. The number of grousers and beefers has been exaggerated. Nine out of ten of the men I've met in the service would be proud to wear such an emblem if the Government gave it to them."

STRONG COMMON BOND

Such an emblem, also would help to carry into civilian life the sort of camaraderie which springs up among men of all walks of life in a draft army.

The group is not so tightly knit, true, as among veterans of overseas service, but there is a strong and definite common bond.

As one general at Fort Ord once told the men:

"You belong to a club that doesn't take a dollar to join, but in which membership cannot be bought for any amount of money."

We think Uncle Sam owes them some sort of a club pin.

It's the least he can do for them.

And such an award to the grads certainly would not hurt the morale of the newcomers—the 600,000 incoming freshmen which the Army expects to induct by next June 30.

Fight on Gestapo Launched by Catholic Bishop in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of September 29, 1941:

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 29, 1941]

FIGHT ON GESTAPO LAUNCHED BY CATHOLIC BISHOP IN GERMANY—PROTEST ON PERSECUTIONS SENT TO NAZI LEADERS, INCLUDING HITLER

SOMEWHERE IN EUROPE, September 29.—The Roman Catholic Church once again has collided head on with the S. S. (Hitler Elite

Guard) and the Gestapo in the conflict which may develop into a show-down in the Reich.

It must immediately be emphasized that the dispute involves no church pronouncement on Nazi foreign policy or the war with Russia and England, but is confined exclusively to internal affairs. It has the most far-reaching implications, however.

Continued persecutions of church institutions form the background. Convents, monasteries, and schools have been closed and their membership scattered, and restrictions have been placed on religious festivals. The church, for a long time relatively silent, is now striking back.

The leader is Count von Galen, bishop of Muenster and representative of an old, aristocratic Westphalian family. Whether the movement stems from a joint decision of German church leaders or the individual determination of the bishop to accept martyrdom is unknown. It is believed hardly possible that he is acting without the sanction of his superiors.

BOMBING SEEN AS PUNISHMENT

A historical accident contributed to make Muenster the center of the outbreak. During the Thirty Years' War the city was threatened with destruction by fire, but saved by a fortuitous wind. The anniversary, celebrated annually with solemn religious festival, was banned this year. That night British bombers again fired the city. The devout saw this as divine punishment for failure to observe the rites.

Bishop Galen subsequently preached three powerful sermons and addressed personal protests to ranking members of the Nazi regime, including Hitler. Only Dr. Hans Heinrich Lammers, head of the Reich Chancellery, replied, saying merely that the protest had been referred to the "competent official"—Gestapo Chief Heinrich Himmler. The bishop returned to Dr. Lammers a full report on Gestapo and S. S. activities, insisting that they be called to account.

His first sermon on July 13 likewise dealt with Gestapo persecutions and mentioned the dread secret police by name. Its directness astounded listeners. The bishop noted the large part the church had played in the historical development of Germany and accused Himmler's organizations of disrupting the national community (the Volksgemeinschaft).

CHURCH EXISTENCE CALLED ISSUE

Bishop Galen drew heavily from the so-called Fuldaer, or pastoral letter, dated 1 week earlier, in which the German bishops without specific reference to the Nazis had said that forces in the Reich were again attacking the church. They had hoped, said the letter, that the "crusade" against Russia would mean a respite for German churches but "with great sorrow" they found this to be untrue. The issues involved, said the letter, included the very existence of the church.

"Recently," the letter continued, "a book has been prepared in hundreds of thousands of copies, which expresses the opinion that we Germans today must elect between Christ and the German Volk. With flaming indignation we German Catholics deny that any such choice is necessary. We love our German people and serve them, if necessary, to death. But at the same time we live and die for Christ and will remain bound to Him now and for all eternity."

Bishop Galen's second sermon, July 27, is reported to have been a beautifully worded, powerful elaboration on a similar theme, again mentioning names which few clergymen previously had dared.

"We Christians," said Bishop Galen, "are the anvil, the others are the hammer, and the anvil never yet gave out first."

KILLING OF INSANE ASSAILED

His third sermon, on August 3, opened one of the sorest spots in internal German affairs, the killing of the insane, hopelessly ill, and crippled. This practice, which first became known in the Reich years ago, apparently has no legal foundation beyond the theories of the most extreme party elements, and has at least the tacit approval of Hitler.

Bishop Galen cited the law against murder and the statute making guilty any persons knowing in advance of a crime and failing to report to the authorities. Reciting the number of persons taken away "the day before yesterday" in Westphalia, the Bishop said in effect:

"I am now reporting to the competent authorities that these people have been taken away with intent to dispose of them. I am jointly guilty if I fail in this duty."

Bishop Galen said the victims were determined by irresponsible groups, a practice which might lead to untold excesses. He argued that the German people would soon distrust their own doctors, a weapon which might be used to wipe out whole elements of the population. Most of the victims, he said, had relatives on the Russian front, fighting to preserve the nation.

"Where," he asked, "is our national community?"

SERMONS MIMEOGRAPHED

These sermons were mimeographed in thousands and circulated throughout the entire Reich, according to reports. Many have been sent in the army post to soldiers at the front, where they have been widely read. They have created a sensation unlike any similar occurrence within the Reich in years.

The bishop's stand was supported by a second pastoral letter which, in more moderate and general language, without names or references to the Nazis or Germany, condemned unauthorized killings of invalids and the insane.

The church so far appears to hold the temporary advantage.

Persecutions of church institutions are reported to have been halted early in August. Bishop Galen was at first officially urged to travel for his health, preferably outside the Reich. He replied that his health was good and that he required no vacation. He is now said to be under house arrest though otherwise unharmed to the amazement of parishioners in the rest of Germany.

This coincides with the new report that Dr. Martin Niemoeller is no longer in solitary confinement at Sachsenhausen, but has been transferred to Dachau, where he shares three cells with two Catholic priests, giving him the opportunity for the first time in 4 years to speak to others except during the rare visits of his wife.

Muenster, an ancient Hanseatic city, has long been the scene of religious turmoil. Bishop Galen's forebears played an active role. Bishop Benhard von Galen seized the city forcibly in 1661.

Missouri Asks for Construction of Table Rock and Bull Shoals Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

RESOLUTION OF CITIZENS OF SOUTH MISSOURI AND NORTH ARKANSAS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, recently a large group of people, representative citizens of south Missouri, requested the immediate construction for the value of the defense program of Table Rock and Bull Shoals Dams on the main stem of the White River, one in Missouri and one in Arkansas. Together these projects will have an installed power production capacity of 330,000 kilowatts. I quote here the resolution asking for this construction:

Be it resolved, That this meeting composed of more than 5,000 adult citizens of South Missouri and North Arkansas assembled in the Ozarks region at Branson, Mo., on Lake Taneycomo, September 14, 1941, as follows:

First, that we heartily commend the Congress of the United States for the passage of the acts of 1936 and 1938 providing for complete surveys of the White River and its tributaries by the Army engineers; the authorization of the several projects contained in the latter act, and the President for his approval of both of said acts. We further commend the Army engineers for the faithful work performed by them in making such surveys.

Again we commend, and again we wish to express our deep appreciation to the Congress for the passage of the flood-control bill at the present session providing, among other things, for the installation of power facilities in the North Fork Dam and the construction of dual-purpose dams on White River at Bull Shoals in Arkansas and at Table Rock in Missouri. We are equally grateful to the President for his approval of said measure. Lastly, we pledge the Government the loyal support of the people of the Ozarks region in the furtherance of these several enterprises: Be it further

Resolved, That since there has long existed an inadequate supply of dependable power in the Ozarks region, and since the defense program requires vastly greater quantities of power than now available, we recommend to the President and the Congress provisions for the early construction of both Bull Shoals and Table Rock Dams as the best means of securing additional power in the four Ozarks States; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President, the Congress, and all agencies concerned in this important subject.

Adopted by a unanimous vote of those present and certified by:

REV. J. E. CHASE,
Chairman.

Attest:

EVELYN W. RUNYON,
Secretary.

The Lawyer's Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

ADDRESS OF VERY REV. J. HUGH O'DONNELL, C. S. C., PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Very Reverend J. Hugh O'Donnell, the eminent president of the University of Notre Dame, delivered at

the annual red mass of the Catholic Lawyers Guild of Brooklyn, on September 25, 1941, before a large congregation made up of jurists, attorneys, and civic officials. This annual event held by the lawyers' guild, which, I believe, is the largest group of lawyers in Brooklyn, has done much to strengthen the cordial relations existing among the various faiths there.

The address follows:

Occasionally an earnest but mentally earthbound reader of Genesis is brought up short by the account of the creation in which, you remember, there was light before the sun, the moon, and the stars were created. Here, surely, is a contradiction that must be extremely gratifying to the type of mind that delights in ferreting out passages in the Bible that do not seem to be in accord with what is indulgently known as the best in modern thought. But G. K. Chesterton, one of the wisest men of his or any other time, saw in this not a contradiction but a demonstrable truth. "There is," he wrote, "a very real metaphysical meaning in the idea that light existed before the sun and stars. It is not barbaric; it is rather platonic. The idea existed before any of the machinery which made manifest the idea. Justice existed when there was no need of judges, and mercy existed before any man was oppressed."

All this is just another way of saying that God's entire creative purpose existed in His infinite mind before he created man; that the natural law, under which our human law receives its only sanction, existed before God made man, breathed into him an immortal soul, and provided him with Nature's bounty. Let the pure scientist explore man's bodily origin; let the philosopher descant upon his journey's end; let the savant speculate about his future life. You and I can be concerned only with God's creative purpose. We know that man was created "to know God, to love Him, to serve Him in this world so that he may be happy with Him in the next."

Man's soul gives him intellect and will. It sets him above brute creation and makes him long to be the child of God that he is destined to be. Accountability to the Creator is the ultimate end of every soul. But God is just. Nothing is more manifest than the fact that if man is to be held accountable for his acts, he must be free to act, to accept or to reject God's commandments. Hence, God, who gave us life, gave us the twin boon of freedom—an inalienable right, the negation of which is a defiance of God's creative purpose and a denial of man's individual responsibility to God. God has also ordained that men should respect the rights of one another; that rightfully constituted governments be the protectors of life and liberty, to the end that all His creatures may lead full, free, virtuous lives.

THE WORLD IS MAN'S

It is a principle of Catholic theology that just as man is for God, so all things created are for man. Man is the center of the material world, just as God is the goal, eternal and immovable, of all life. The world is man's abode. It is his to use during his preparation for the glory of his eternal home. For him the beauty of the skies; for him the heights of the mountains and the depths of the seas; for him the loveliness of the flower and the utility of the animal kingdom.

It is this concept of man and his relation to his Creator that made one legal authority write: "Either the individual is a personal creature of God, or he is owned by the state. Either government is man's agent for the protection of God's gifts, or the Communist, Fascist, or some other cult of totalitarianism is correct. American Government is built upon the fact of God's creation of the human soul. Our Government is not the cause but the consequence of our God-given liberties."

All would have been well with man, and his pursuit of happiness would have gone on serenely, had he not perversely ignored the Eternal Maker of the beauty and strength created for his benefit. Under the changing labels of materialism, rationalism, agnosticism, modernism, and naturalism, a purely secular education destroyed the harmony of the world, cast God out of the life of man, and attacked man himself, the noblest of God's creatures. Man was gradually dehumanized until he became a mere automaton, a robot, a glorified animal, sufficient to himself because his sufficiency was from nature, and not from nature's God. He stood stripped of his faculties, robbed of his mind, and bereft of his soul. He became the "almighty man," divorced from Almighty God, who had fashioned him after His own image and likeness.

The result was inevitable. A machine age developed a machine man. The false god of science ruled supreme. All worldly things, man included, were forced to adapt themselves to the vagaries of self-appointed supermen.

The analysis of man by the exponents of two nations now locked in the horrors of war indicates what a travesty the concept of man has become. One ideology says that "a human person is a material substance that has organized itself"—a patent contradiction in terms. To expand this definition, Bucharin, in the Communist A B C, estimates that the elements of the human body have a commercial value of 1 ruble 95 kopecks (about 70 cents). That is what "almighty man" is worth.

The other—the racist ideology—holds that "a human person is different from material substance, but not essentially different from an animal." I quote the exact words of this biological materialism: "Between a man of a higher race and a man of a lower race there exists a more essential difference than between a man of a lower race and a highly developed animal." Accordingly, the human person can be only an illusion because he has no immortal soul. He has no faculties, no dignity, no rights. He is of the earth, earthy. What a contrast to the true artistry of man, "made to the image and likeness of God," and using the fruits of the earth only in relation to his last end.

FALSE CONCEPT OF MAN

But let us not point too pharisaical a finger at the ideologies that are ravaging Europe, because our own beloved country has also had a part in destroying the true concept of man.

Our heritage from the founding fathers is Christian. If only our spiritual growth had kept pace with our material progress. In the brief span of 165 years, the United States has become the richest nation in the world by applying man's ingenuity to Nature's gifts. But in our development are gross irregularities that cannot be reconciled with our heritage. We seem to have forgotten what our ancestors knew so well: That God exists both as an imminent force and as our Father in heaven; that He is the fountain head of all authority.

Our neglect—or denial—of our heritage is bearing fruit, among other places, in a field where it touches you, as Christians, as Americans, and as lawyers. Its effects are only too evident in certain law schools that fail to teach law in its God-related perspective. The substance and manner of their teaching can be construed only as an attack upon the very foundations of American jurisprudence. There are, thank God, exceptions.

One university that I know well—because it has been part of my life for many years—still cherishes the concept that gives American institutions their soul. In fact, the dean of its college of law recently stated publicly that an exhaustive study of the Declaration of Independence is a "must" for every student under his jurisdiction. I might add that his pronouncement has the militant approval of the president of that university.

You lawyers know even better than I that for some time an astute and tireless little band of atheists has been at work on a project for the secularization of American law. Surreptitiously but deliberately, they have been opening the veins of our legal system and draining off its vital life blood. In truth, witnessed by the Declaration of Independence, religion is the warp and woof of our entire American legal fabric. But these materialistic schemers are schooling our generation to think otherwise by constantly representing our law as a body of purely secular regulations for the efficient management of a completely secular order.

All this is cynically calculated, first, to weaken, and then, as soon as possible, to cut the cord that anchors American jurisprudence to its moorings of God's own truth. The watchword of secularist jurisprudence is expediency. This school of legal thought recognizes no truth that is not subject to change with time and circumstances. The secularists abhor the idea of natural law with natural rights of individual persons. Hence, they lose no opportunity to discredit the legal implications of the Declaration of Independence, the very birth certificate of American jurisprudence.

AN AMERICAN PRINCIPLE

No secularist can afford to admit what the Declaration of Independence affirms, namely, the self-evident truth of God-given inalienable rights. No secularist dares to confess that to secure those rights, government with its implements—its laws and officers—is instituted among men.

The Founding Fathers who defined the objects of our Government and the objects of its laws were men of unquestioned faith in God. Without equivocation and in crystal-clear terms, which even the intellectualists are unable to misconstrue, these Founding Fathers sentenced American law and American Government to serve forever as man's democratically chosen agent for the protection of God's gifts. Once and for all, the founders of this Nation welded the connection between religion and law. This is the safe anchorage of firm faith and fixed truth from which the secularists hope to cast adrift the American ship of state.

The self-evident truths of the American Declaration of Independence constitute the only political refuge left in this mad totalitarian world. These truths, and they alone, are the basis of our distinctively American and liberty-protecting practice of judicial review, which has its ultimate sanction, not in the letter, but in the spirit, of our constitutional system—that is, in the inalienable-rights doctrine of the Declaration. These truths, and they alone, keep the American citizen from descending to the level of a chattel, the servant of the state. They constitute the lawyer's only answer to the diabolical theories of the dictators.

If the secularists should succeed in proving that these self-evident truths are false, they will automatically prove that the totalitarian theories of Hitler and Stalin are scientific and correct. Like the European dictators, they are inoculated with a philosophy that leads eventually to the worship of the "almighty man." They would destroy God's creative purpose in regard to man, as so beautifully expressed by Shakespeare:

"What a piece of work is man!
How noble in reason!
How infinite in faculty!
In form and moving how express and admirable!

"In action how like an angel!
In apprehension how like a god!
The beauty of the world!
The paragon of virtue!"

—*Shakespeare, "Hamlet."*

Coincident with the fall term of court, you have assembled here this morning with your beloved bishop and priests to invoke the blessing of the Holy Spirit on another legal year.

THE THREAT OF TODAY

This is an ominous time, and God alone knows what the future holds. Yet as true Catholic lawyers you face that future with strong faith, noble courage, and uncompromising principle. The natural law is based on the eternal law, which is God Himself. It is your heritage, as it is the heritage of every Christian lawyer. You know as well as I that insidious movements now under way are based on the rank philosophy of naturalism. They have as their objective the ascendancy of man and of man-made law. Your attitude toward them is determined. Your course is fixed. You must rise up as a body, united against their devices, because you cannot compromise with objective truth.

When certain groups under the guise of rebuilding the United States attempt to change the substance of our Government, from which human positive law proceeds, take your stand on the side of justice, and, tearing off the mask of the dissemblers, say to them in the language of the court: "It shall not be. Case dismissed." For what is needed are legal lights to shine, not when the world is bright but when the world is dark, reflecting always the rays of the Supreme Lawgiver.

When Sangerites and others, purveyors of filthy doctrines, attempt to have their iniquitous teachings legalized by statute, take your stand on the side of basic morality, and declare that God's commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," is as binding today as it ever was, and in the language of the court say: "It shall not be. Case dismissed." For what is needed are legal lights to shine, not when the world is bright but when the world is dark, reflecting always the rays of the Supreme Lawgiver.

When certain legal ethicians attempt to develop a cult which changes the theory of the law so that the institution of marriage, the right to educate, the right to property, the protection of the weak, and other essential rights proper to the individual are taken from him and subordinated to State or Federal control, rally to the dignity of the human personality. For the rights involved here are antecedent to any human society. In the language of the court: "It shall not be. Case dismissed." For what are needed are legal lights to shine, not when the world is bright but when the world is dark, reflecting always the rays of the Supreme Lawgiver.

The great Webster said in his address on The Character of Washington: "Other misfortunes may be borne and their effects overcome. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these might be rebuilt. But who can reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who can raise again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who can frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? If these columns fall, they will be raised not again."

DUTIES OF THE LAWYER

It rests with you and your associates of the bar to enlighten the people, now befuddled in their thinking, to a realization of what bureaucratic government means. For what is needed are legal lights to shine, not when the world is bright, but when the world is dark, reflecting always the rays of the Supreme Lawgiver.

Yours is a noble calling, a distinguished profession. People look to you for guidance in the temporal as they do to the priest in the spiritual. You are the alter ego in relation to your clients. They confide in you, they trust you, they look to you for guidance. That you realize your duties and responsibilities is attested by the fact that you gather here annually to ask divine guidance and strength in their fulfillment. But if you are to teach and defend our fellow man, if you are to discharge your duties faithfully and honestly, permit me to suggest that you always keep before you the necessity of growing spiritually in the knowledge and love of the Supreme Lawgiver.

Accordingly, nourish your faith constantly by prayer and the sacraments. Revive your hope by reflecting on the emptiness of this world and all its fleeting show. And let the charity of Christ always pervade your minds and hearts. For, in the words of the inimitable Cardinal Newman: "Times come and go and man will not believe that that is to be which is not yet, or that what now is only continues for a season and is not eternity. The world passes, it is but a pageant and a scene; the lofty palace crumbles, the busy city is mute, the ships of Tarshish have sped away. On heart and flesh death is coming; the veil is breaking. The end is the trial."

May you meet the Supreme Lawgiver smiling.

William O'Dwyer Accepts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1941

ADDRESS OF JUDGE WILLIAM O'DWYER

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave unanimously granted to me, under date of September 23, 1941, I am privileged to extend my remarks by including therein the acceptance speech of Judge William O'Dwyer delivered at New York City.

I am prompted to preserve this speech as part of the record, because so much of it is devoted to a problem that is of such tremendous importance to the continued well-being of the country.

Judge O'Dwyer brings to the subject of his speech a wealth of experience gained from a useful life well spent in the service of this country, our city, and its people. His has been the saga of so many Americans—his steady rise, the glory of our democracy—laborer, student, policeman, magistrate, county judge, and district attorney of Kings County, one of the largest in the country. His life has been a continuous application of the Golden Rule which is so necessary at all times, and especially today. It is hoped that all who have the opportunity to read this splendid address will do so. It is as follows:

Last Tuesday I was nominated as the candidate of the Democratic Party for mayor of the city of New York. I accept the nomination, not only mindful of the honor but also conscious of the responsibility. I owe my nomination to no man or group of men; to no political leader or group of political leaders. In fact, not until after I was formally designated had I ever met any of the Democratic county leaders except the leader of my home borough and of the Borough of Queens.

I submitted my candidacy to the Democrats of this city on my character, my experience, and my record in the public service. I am the unanimous choice of the enrolled Democrats in this city, of whom there are 2,273,367. Therefore, I am beholden to no one but the Democratic men and women of this city for my nomination, but when I am elected I will represent not them alone but all the people of the city regardless of party, race, or creed.

I propose to conduct an aggressive and constructive campaign. I did not decide to become a candidate merely to go through the motions of a campaign, or to indulge in petty fault-finding, or to engage in petty criticism of things done or left undone by the present administration. I believe there are questions involved in this election which go to the very root of the government of the city of New York and the welfare of its people, and during the campaign I will fairly and fearlessly present the issues as I see them. I say fairly, for I would be less than truthful if I stated that the present administration has made no contribution to the city of New York. Every administration has contributed something to the city. It would be foolish to contend that the present administration has contributed nothing, but you must remember that during the last 8 years the city pay roll has increased from $322,821,594 to $379,089,631, exclusive of the Rapid Transit employees; an increase of $55,000,000; that the budget has increased from $615,327,071 to $677,026,580, an increase of $52,000,000; and that the city has received from the Federal Government $72,000,000 in cash out of a total of $83,000,000 authorized as grants, and has also received from the Federal Government on account of P. W. A projects loans totaling $31,350,000. These staggering increases have occurred despite the express promise of the mayor when he was first a candidate, and I quote, "to save $50,000,000 by clearing out a horde of political parasites and cutting out useless jobs."

Obviously, during the time available this evening I cannot define and consider all the questions which I believe should be discussed frankly and must be decided correctly if New York City is to grow and prosper. But at the very outset I wish to discuss and dispose of one issue which our opponents say is the fundamental issue in this campaign.

In a speech announcing his willingness to be a candidate again, the Mayor stated—and I quote—that all the city departments are in charge of "specialists, trained and competent men who, for ability and specialized knowledge and efficiency, form a cabinet the like of which does not exist in any government in this country." I challenge that statement. I admit that some members of the Mayor's cabinet are competent and efficient public servants and should be retained. I will, however, during the campaign show that other appointees of the Mayor are not only not specialists and were not named because of any particular talent or special aptitude for the positions they hold, but to repay political debts. I will demonstrate to the satisfaction of every fair-minded man and woman that some of them are a menace and should be promptly and peremptorily separated from the public service.

In the same speech offering himself as a candidate for reelection the Mayor stated—and I quote again—that the issue is between "nonpolitical, nonpartisan, and political machine-controlled government." I also challenge that statement.

I recognize that heretofore in both parties, Democratic and Republican alike, there have been cynical, selfish groups who thought of public office primarily, perhaps solely, in terms of patronage and political power. I also recognize that these men, leaders,

bosses—call them what you will—were able in many instances to exert their baneful and sinister influence over those chosen to administer the government. This situation existed not only in New York but in many other cities. It obtained not only in many municipalities but in many State governments as well. But times have changed. The day of old-fashioned machine government is gone forever, at least in the city and State of New York. It is as outmoded as the hoop skirt or high pants pockets. People now think for themselves. They have developed a social and political awareness which bodes ill for the man in public office or political position who does not realize that the old days of private profit—which is another name for political plunder—are gone forever. I do not want and will not have the support of any such political leader either within or without my party. Honesty in the public business is essential if democracy is to survive. I believe that the place for all crooks, whether they be pickpockets or politicians, is in jail.

True, I am a member of the Democratic Party. I recognize there is no Democratic or Republican way of cleaning a street or putting out a fire, but I believe that in a democracy, party responsibility adds greatly to the protection of the citizen. I also believe, however, that in a representative government no elected official may shift to his party the obligations which his oath of office casts upon him.

Yes; I am a Democrat. So is President Roosevelt; so is former Governor Smith; and so is Governor Lehman. As a Democrat, Al Smith was elected Governor three times. As a Democrat, Franklin Roosevelt was elected and reelected Governor. As a Democrat, Herbert Lehman was elected and three times reelected Governor. I am the candidate of the same party which nominated and sponsored each of those illustrious men. Is there anyone bold enough to suggest that as Governor any of them turned over the State government to a political machine or was controlled by a political boss? Of course not. Nor does anyone dare suggest that when I am mayor I will turn over the municipal government to a political machine or be dominated by a political boss.

My record first as a member of the New York City Police Department, then magistrate, then county judge, then district attorney of the largest county in the State and the second 'argest in the country, is a complete answer to any such suggestion. Throughout 17 years in public service, no political leader or anyone else ever influenced my judicial or official conduct. Nor has any political leader ever been brazen or foolish enough to make the attempt. In 1937, after serving 5 years as a city magistrate, Governor Lehman appointed me county judge of Kings County, to which office I was elected the following November. You will recall about that time crime was rampant in Brooklyn The guilty were not only not punished but frequently not even apprehended. Many major crimes were left unsolved. The situation was so serious that Governor Lehman convened an extraordinary term of the supreme court to expose the conditions and ascertain if there were any corrupt alliance between the wrongdoers and the law-enforcement agencies. I was happy and contented as county judge, for it was the realization of a life's ambition and afforded me an opportunity for greater usefulness not alone in ridding Brooklyn of the hardened and habitual criminal, but at the same time salvaging many an unfortunate youth who, because of home environment or lack of religious training, had committed his first misstep. Moreover, I was secure for 14 years, at a salary of $25,000 a year. Nevertheless, in response to a general demand and what I believed was my duty to my county, city, and State, I consented to become a candidate for district attorney, the term of which was only 4 years and at a greatly decreased salary.

During that campaign for district attorney I publicly stated what would be my attitude toward political organizations and political leaders if I were elected. I said I would devote my whole time to my duties as district attorney; that I would reorganize the office; that my assistants would be selected by me and me alone; that character and fitness would be the sole considerations for appointment to my staff; that while political affiliation would not disqualify, it could not aid any applicant; and that no political leader would be consulted as to who would be fired or hired. The opposing candidate, while admitting my good faith, said I would be powerless to carry out my plan. But the people of Brooklyn believed me and trusted me; they knew I meant what I said, and I kept that promise. Candor compels me to state that no political leader ever attempted to influence me in the selection of my staff or the conduct of my office. What has been done, what has been accomplished in the last 21 months is history. I trust I will not be deemed immodest, but since I became district attorney 87 murders, not only in Brooklyn but in other boroughs in the city and other counties in the State and in other States throughout the country, have been solved. Many of those who committed them and, more important, many of those who inspired them, have been apprehended, prosecuted, and punished; crime has decreased; our docket is up to date and Brooklyn is a cleaner, safer, and better place in which to live and do business. My record has gained the praise of the press regardless of politics and has won the approval of the people irrespective of partisanship.

I ask to be judged on that record. I offer it as an assurance that when I am mayor the government and affairs of the city of New York will be administered with integrity and efficiency and in the interests of all the people, taxpayer, and rentpayer, businessman and laboring man alike.

As the candidate for mayor I make this promise to the citizens of New York. It is the same promise I made to the people of Brooklyn when I was a candidate for district attorney. I promise to devote my whole time and all my energies to my duties as mayor. I will be a full, not a part-time mayor. I promise that no political machine and no political leader will control me or dictate the policies which I will pursue or the appointments which I will make; that each member of my cabinet and each judicial officer appointed by me will be my own selection, whether he be a member of the Democratic Party or the Republican Party or no party, chosen solely because of his character and fitness and for whose acts and conduct I will assume full responsibility. I can promise no more. I should be unworthy if I promised less.

This is my answer to what the mayor says is the fundamental issue in this campaign. I have met it squarely, discussed it frankly and disposed of it finally. If after examining my life's history and my public record you are satisfied that I mean what I say, that I will keep that pledge, I ask you to vote for me.

There is another matter to which I invite your attention, and I approach it in the same open and candid manner so every citizen of New York may readily understand my position.

I appreciate that a municipal campaign is no place for the discussion of national issues or international questions. Our foreign policy is not the business of the mayor of the City of New York. Power to deal with the country's foreign policy has been wisely delegated to the President and the Congress. But in view of the present world crisis, when during the last 2 years 13 countries have been invaded, their governments overthrown, their citizens killed and property destroyed by the wicked exponents of force, the people of this city have a right to know the attitude of the man who aspires to be their mayor. Hence, I repeat what I frequently have said before. I hate communism, fascism, and nazi-ism and I oppose all other ideologies hostile to our democracy. I believe in the democratic system and the American way of life. I abhor the dictators, whose greed and infamy are responsible for the suffering and misery which have been visited upon countless thousands of innocent men, women, and children, whom they have rendered homeless, helpless, and hopeless.

I believe with President Roosevelt that the most effective answer to Hitler's method of total attack is total defense. I endorse the policy of the President in defending our sovereignty and democracy and the policy of the President and Congress in giving aid to those countries which are resisting Nazi aggression. As mayor of the city of New York, which is the center of our industrial life, I will lend every assistance in promoting and perfecting the national defense. I will do my utmost to discourage intolerance and establish unity and harmony among our people.

That there are in our city certain persons seeking to disunite us by dividing us into racial and religious groups cannot be denied. They do not represent the patriotic people of America or the self-respecting citizens of New York. They are in the main motivated by the same impulses which years ago gave rise to the A. P. A. and the Know-Nothing movement, and later to the Ku Klux Klan. Only 13 years ago a great American, a great exponent of democracy, was denied an office for which he was eminently fitted, not because the members of the Klan and other bigots opposed his political views but because he professed before God and man the faith of his fathers.

Happily the Klan is now extinct, and its disciples have slunk back to the shadows whence they came. But recently there has sprung up amongst us another group of bigots who subscribe to a doctrine just as alien to our American concept as the Klan, even though they do not mask themselves in a sheet. This ugly and sinister thing is anti-Semitism. It is the principal export product of Hitler, designed to sow the seed of discontent, distrust, and hatred among the peoples of the world so as to facilitate their conquest. This group, which has been active in our city, has been ignored too long. Its members have been permitted at their street meetings to insult and vilify the Jew.

It is this group that conducted a whispering campaign against Herbert Lehman solely because of his race and religion when he was a candidate for Governor, just as the earlier group conducted the same kind of a campaign and for the same reasons against Al Smith when he was a candidate for President. When I was a candidate for county judge I abandoned my own campaign and in Brooklyn and elsewhere I denounced them and their practices, as I do tonight. When I was a candidate for district attorney I promised, if elected, that I would not stand idly by and permit these racial and religious fanatics to incite disorder, provoke violence, and create disunity in the life of our community.

I yield to no one in my devotion to the fundamental tenets of free speech, a free press, and freedom of worship, but I am happy to say that, without infringing upon any of these sacred guaranties and without any additional laws, I succeeded in stopping these undemocratic, un-American public demonstrations, and we now have no such public meetings in Brooklyn. When I am mayor we will have none in the city of New York.

The injection of racial and religious prejudice into the discussion of our domestic

problems or our foreign policies is an abuse of the right of free speech. That some of these fanatics, both anti-Catholic and anti-Semitic, were elevated to high place under the present administration is to be regretted.

I promise when I am mayor I will not appoint or tolerate in the city service anyone who preaches intolerance or class hatred and thereby sows the seed of discontent, distrust, and disunity. Nor will I appoint any man or woman who now or heretofore has been affiliated with any party, organization, or group which advocates the overthrow of our Government and the substitution of any other system or who does not believe in our democratic institutions and subscribe to the American way of life. If there be any such in the public service they will be promptly removed. There will be no room in my administration for a Gerson or a Kern, or any of their fellow travelers.

I would be thoughtless, indeed, if I failed to add a word about my colleagues on the Democratic ticket, Lloyd Church, the candidate for comptroller, and M. Maldwin Fertig, the candidate for president of the council. Judge Church is a distinguished member of the bar and during the last 7 years has been a justice of the supreme court. At great personal sacrifice he resigned that office to become a candidate for comptroller of the city of New York. He is a man of broad experience in business, legal, and governmental affairs, and by ability and training is abundantly equipped to manage the finances of the city of New York and as a member of the board of estimate to shape its policies.

Mr. M. Maldwin Fertig, the candidate for president of the council, has been an assistant to the corporation counsel of the city of New York. He also was counsel to President Roosevelt when he was Governor, and counsel to Governor Lehman. At present he is a member of the transit commission. I doubt if there is a man in this State who has a more intimate knowledge of the government of the city of New York than has Mr. Fertig.

Both these gentlemen are forceful, forthright men who have the intelligence to formulate opinions of their own and the courage to express them. While they will be of invaluable aid to me, they will, as they should, be independent of and not subservient to the mayor. We promise the people of the city of New York an honest, efficient, economical, and dignified administration.

The Small Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious threats which the people of this Nation face is the threat of the destruction of the small businessman. About every pet measure which can be enacted into law, and about every pet regulation that can be established by the various departments of government, the boards and commissions, which will cripple the small businessmen of our country has been enacted and put into effect. The small businessmen of our country are feeling the impress of those stern and staggering blows. Men and women who have engaged in business throughout their lives, and who have been both honorable and patriotic as Americans, are being forced to discontinue their life work because of their inability to secure priorities on needed materials for the continuance of their business.

These businessmen and women have been the very backbone of our country. They have aided in the growth and development of our Nation. They have paid their taxes, and they have employed such help as they have needed in the operation of their business. They have made a worthy contribution to the progress of the United States of America. But now, under the flimsy guise of the national emergency, they are not given defense contracts, and they are not given material by which they can continue in business. This unholy plan must be remedied at once or we will experience an unprecedented unemployment situation in our country. The people engaged in business must be protected rather than have their business destroyed and their employees thrown out of their jobs. A plan must be devised whereby at least 75 percent of the needed materials required by the nondefense industries may be supplied, thereby enabling them to continue their operation in part, and enabling them to keep their organization intact. Defense contracts should be provided to the various plants in order to maintain a continuous operation of those institutions in which the needed materials come in sharp conflict with those badly needed for defense production. This is essential in order to keep our factories and mills in continuous operation, and to assure to the employees continuous employment in the future.

Recently Secretary Morgenthau made a statement in which he suggested, under the price-fixing plan, that all business should be limited to 6-percent profit. Such a plan, if adopted, would be disastrous to business in our country. That would strike at the very heart of business. Such a plan would cause thousands of businessmen and women to close their doors and cease to operate their establishments. Their employees would be thrown out of their jobs. We must remember that if the employer is injured, the employee is likewise injured. The partnership of employer and employee is an inseparable unity; they work together; when the employer secures contracts for work, at a fair margin of profit, then the employeees have continuous work, at a fair and reasonable wage. This is a very happy condition.

But, Mr. Speaker, when the Government refuses to issue priorities for needed materials, even though the factory or the mill, or the contractor or the builder, has a contract or contracts to perform, then the work must stop. The employees are discontinued in their work. That is the destruction of both the plant, and the business, and the opportunity of the laborer to earn his own living—all caused by our own Government refusing to permit the needed materials to be allocated to that plant, or to that contractor. In that case, the Government is primarily responsible for the loss of the operation of the plant, and the completion of the contract, and it is also responsible for the employees being thrown off of the job.

Precisely this same result is obtained when there is such a sharp reduction in the allowable profits which may be earned. Plants and mills will be compelled to close; their employees will be thrown out of their jobs; all because of the governmental interference to the extent that the employer cannot maintain his plant, and take care of the ordinary wear and tear incident to its operation, and meet the high and staggering taxes and obligations which have been imposed by his county, State, and Government. These obligations must be met, and if they are not met in full accordance with the provisions of the existing tax and revenue laws penalties must be added; if the tax and the penalty is not paid, then the property will be sold. The employer and the small businessmen and women of our country face a very dark and dismal future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein a very interesting and enlightening editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, of the 26th day of August 1941, which I hope every Member of the House will read. The editorial reads as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 26, 1941]

EXIT THE SMALL BUSINESSMAN

The national-defense program is setting the stage for a hoped-for wiping out of Hitler and his philosophy, somewhere, somehow, sometime. But the defense program is also beginning to wipe out the small businessman in the United States; and up to now it is hard to see how the process can be stopped or even slowed down.

DEVASTATION BY PRIORITY

Defense demands get priority over demands for materials for nondefense goods. Many a small manufacturer, for all the optimistic talk on the subject, physically cannot shift over into making defense goods.

From this situation, all manner of consequences are already flowing. There are bad bottlenecks in aluminum, brass, copper, certain chemicals and plastics, chromium, zinc, and, above all, steel. These shortages produce shortages in such things as nuts, bolts, rivets, screws, zippers, paper clips, and innumerable other articles needed by small manufacturers to make consumer goods.

The paralysis spread from these manufacturers to dealers, who find themselves with less and less to sell, and consequently have to cut down their sales forces. Unemployment and discontent result all the way along this spiral. The harvest is unpredictable just now, except that you can safely predict that it will be a sour harvest.

THE WAR HAWKS

What is the reason for it? Our all-out effort to build a huge armament for ourselves and to arm or help arm every nation fighting an aggressor nation or nations.

Who is responsible? Mainly, as we dope it out, two groups in Washington.

One of these is the war party, headed by Colonel Knox and President Roosevelt. Colonel Knox likes war for its excitement and its glory, judging from his speeches and from the fact that he distinguished himself in two wars. The President hopes to bring to the whole world, through war, in our generation, freedom from want and fear and freedom of

religion and thought—something which nobody in all world history has yet done or, to our knowledge, even hoped to do.

THE RED WRECKERS

Then, there are the Communist-minded theorists and philosophers, with whom Washington is honeycombed.

These people feel that the modern trend is toward communism, in this and all other countries except Russia, which has already arrived at the goal.

In the Communist philosophy, landlords, investors, bankers, merchants, businessmen, lawyers, priests, nuns, and independent newspaper people are enemies of society. These groups make up the bourgeoisie, which the Communists hope to wipe from the face of the earth.

So the oncoming destruction of the small businessman in this country is O. K. by the comrades and fellow travelers now holding so many places of power in the United States Government. As they see it, the war will bring about the revolution here much faster than it could come in peacetime.

And they are as coolly willing to see the small businessman wiped out as they are to have one or more millions of American boys massacred in Europe to keep Communist Russia safe from Adolf Hitler.

FROM EVOLUTION TO REVOLUTION

Before the war began, the New Deal was moving toward a species of totalitarianism—meaning toward more and more government supervision over individual greed and ambition for the general welfare. We thought that was as it should be, and in line with evolution, and we still think so. But we also thought, and still think, that if this country could stay at peace and mind its own business the necessary readjustments could be made peaceably and gradually, and without wiping out whole economic layers of our society.

The New Deal was getting that result—jerkily and with many a stumble and mistake, true; but it was making the grade, until this war broke out. It even kept its head fairly well screwed on until the fall of France in June 1940.

Since that time, we have been dragged ever closer and closer to all-out participation in this war by our Washington masters. The people—from 75 to 85 percent of whom, we are convinced, do not want to go shooting into this war—have been able to do nothing up to now to call a halt.

The war hawks apparently have forgotten all about domestic reform and readjustment in their preoccupation with a foreigners' war. But the Communists and their fellow travelers in the Washington set-up have not forgotten the Communist revolution which they hope this war will speed up in the United States. You can almost see them licking their lips as they watch the small businessman being ground up in the priorities meat chopper.

Farm Prices Are More Than a Mere Theory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the price of farm products may be a theory to the regulators who sit in easy chairs in Washington, but to the farmer and his wife and children they are a grim reality. Many farmers depend for a living upon the weekly check that they receive for their cream, butter, eggs, and poultry.

When these prices go down it vitally affects the so-called human values so far as the farm family is concerned. In many cases a depressed price of farm produce means a definite hardship. At the best, it means that the farmer buys fewer shoes, clothing, furniture, radios, automobiles, and all the other things that he needs, as well as the bare necessities.

An outrageous attack has been made upon the American farm home by the subsidizing by the United States of butter substitutes. The taxpayers' money has been used to provide radio programs to advertise butter substitutes. The Government's financing of advertising of products that compete with the products of the American farmer cannot be justified before the court of public opinion.

Mr. Speaker, now comes some startling news in reference to the importation of eggs. I wish to include in my remarks an Associated Press article bearing date of October 1, 1941, which is as follows:

Arrival of 1,334,700 dozen Argentine eggs in New York, making the second time this month in which eggs have been shipped here from that country, helped to depress futures prices on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange yesterday.

Traders here were advised that 6,000 dozen of the Argentine eggs were sold in the New York wholesale market at 26 cents a dozen, compared with 32½-cents-a-dozen quotation here for domestically produced eggs of the same grade.

Mr. Speaker, I plead for a fair deal for the American farmer. Is he not entitled to the same protection that we give to American labor and American capital? To whom does the American market belong?

A Republican Goes Through the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE LIMA (OHIO) NEWS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by the city editor of the Lima (Ohio) News:

[From the Lima (Ohio) News]

A REPUBLICAN GOES THROUGH THE NEWS

(By Jim Blissell, city editor, the Lima News)

President Roosevelt last week again resorted to one of the favorite tactics of the New Deal when he ridiculed charges that the motion-picture industry is circulating war propaganda in films.

Now propaganda, as usually understood, is a lie in a newspaper or magazine and supposedly easily discernible. That is one good definition. Another, and more fitting definition, is that propaganda is anything that will motivate people to action or create a receptive mood or an acceptance of some philosophy. In our modern terminology, it is a job of "selling an idea."

While the President may ridicule the charges, the fact that he chooses to do so does not cloak him with an aurora of omnipotence nor his interpretation with the wisdom of a Solomon. As a matter of fact, he has been wrong, dead to rights, on many issues. A simple examination of a few of the facts regarding propaganda in movies will show him wrong again, ridicule to the contrary notwithstanding.

Senator NYE pointed out a number of films he said were propaganda bunk purely and simply. In his list he named Blackout, I Married a Nazi, Night Train, and Convoy. While we did not see those particular films, we did witness a few that contained the insidious and subtle appeal for appreciation of the British cause against the Nazis.

What were they? Well, They Met in Lisbon was a beaut. Fred MacMurray should have gagged when he uttered the dialogue in one scene. Enacting the role of an American ferrying bombers to England, the sequence in point shows him with his arm around an Englishman and telling him, in effect: "Yes, we are of the same blood; we talk the same language; we think alike; we act alike. We must stick together." That, to any fair-minded analyst, is certainly a play for sympathy and solidarity between the English-speaking classes.

FACTS STICK OUT IN RECENT FILMS

Quentin Reynolds, who has been cleaning up writing from London, had a "drammer" on the screens of this country at the Yuletide season that would put the old tear jerkers to shame. It was Christmas in London, if memory serves. That was probably the most bald-faced piece of propaganda foisted upon a public that pays to be entertained that we have seen in some time.

The Brothers Warner have come in for some criticism. How about their Dr. Ehrlich's Magic Bullet? In this supercolossal epic, all the good characters talked clear, concise, and intelligible English. All the bad characters talked with thick, guttural German accents.

The purpose? To work on your subconscious, friends. To sneak in the back door, so to speak, and impress upon you that the English are our cousins. That in this hour of Empire peril we should forget the "Uncle Shylock" appelation and once again give our manhood and our money to a cause that was lost long before hostilities ever broke out.

Mr. Roosevelt said he does not know of anyone in the administrative branch that has encouraged production of war propaganda films as charged in the Senate subcommittee inquiry.

It might be far-fetched, but a little number that played Lima not over 2 weeks ago was a honey. The picture, in beautiful technicolor and with Frank Craven, the epitome of An Average America, in the lead, was selling the glories of the Federal Housing Administration and Craven worked in from time to time the fact that only in a country such as this could such a thing happen. Mayhap you will say he was selling Americanism. We don't think a true American has to pay to have himself nor the glories of his country propagandized on the screen, first through taxes and then at the box office.

Maybe the "Barefoot Boy From Indiana," Wendell Willkie, who termed his own speeches as "campaign oratory," will be so eloquent he can convince a majority that it was all in good, clean fun on the part of the producers. But the facts will belie the claim. In any event, Willkie will collect a fee of $100,000 from the Hollywood moguls.

Propaganda for war takes more than one form. This pillar from time to time has

characterized various "emergencies" as pure hokum to keep the peoples in a constant state of hysteria.

No better example of this cry of "emergency" can be found than in the Ickes gasoline curfew in the East. After having been shown through absolute proof that his famine claims were without foundation in fact, "Honest Harold" characterizes a move to lift the ban as stupid.

Although a Senate investigation disclosed that Ickes must have been suffering from hallucinations when he proclaimed the shortage and curfew, he still insists he was right.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the mark of every move this administration has attempted. No matter what the facts, anyone high in the councils of the Roosevelt regime can do no wrong.

The proposition of this Nation entering a shooting war because of the intrigues of our leaders transcends political ties. The grave questions facing the Nation are not founded on whether or not it is a Republican policy or a Democratic (or New Deal) policy.

The issues are well defined. We have been promised peace by a leader who usurped the powers in the party that first elevated him to exalted office. He used that office to control a political machine on the one hand, while on the other he voiced high-sounding promises addressed to the mothers and fathers of this Nation.

Certainly in the light of the facts that are known, and excluding the suspicions that must enter the minds, there can be no conclusion but that the war emergency was a false cloud created by the Roosevelt regime to remain in power. Having created the Frankenstein, the beast now bids fair to devour its makers.

PATROL OPENS UP NEW DANGERS

The American people heard talks of "money on the barrel head" when the aid-to-England bill was being discussed. Now we have outright admissions by Secretary Knox that the Navy is convoying. First it was patrol; now it is convoy. In any event, the stretche. of the broad Atlantic were set off with precision by the President under emergency powers granted him, just as he opened the Red Sea.

There can be no misunderstanding. The defenses of this Nation do not lie in the Red Sea nor in the English Channel. Use of our Navy to convoy lend-lease goods to Britain will have two immediate effects.

First, and by far the most vital to this country, which everyone in Washington seems to be forgetting, is the fact that our sailors and ships will actually be shooting once they meet up with Axis men-of-war. The other is that by convoying, the British Navy will be released for more duty in the Mediterranean. Certainly the people of this Nation did not envision these things when they permitted their Congressmen and Senators to approve the war-bill powers granted Roosevelt.

Racial Problems in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

EXCERPTS FROM AN ARTICLE BY CHARLES ANDERSON GAULD

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the RECORD excerpts from the long article on Brazil and the Negro by Charles Anderson Gauld in the Negro History Bulletin for February 1941. I made references to this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 14 and 25, 1941. It is based on research in the Library of Congress, where Mr. Gauld was a specialist on Latin America.

Mr. Gauld is of an Army family and has stressed the importance of Brazil and the Negro to hemisphere unity and defense in this crisis which menaces the security of all the Americas. Emphasis is placed on the contributions of the Negro to the life, culture, and defense of both Brazil and the United States. The two largest nations of the New World cannot afford to deny their 30,000,000 Negro citizens their share of commissions in the armed forces and of industrial jobs in the defense of democracy on the economic front. Are we hoping for the destruction of nazi-ism in the Old World while retaining race prejudice in the New?

The article follows:

[From the Negro History Bulletin of February 1941]

BRAZIL: THE LARGEST NEGRO NATION

(By Charles A. Gauld)

Brazil is not generally credited with being the greatest Negro country. Yet possibly 16,000,000 of its 43,000,000 citizens are of African ancestry in whole or in part. The 1940 census in the United States counted Negroes with great accuracy. But Brazil's 1940 census will not yield statistics on the number of Negroes. Thus only estimates can be offered because no accurate figures exist.

The different manner in which the Negro is considered in the 1940 censuses in Brazil and the United States clearly illustrates the position he occupies in the two leading nations of Negro population. A census is chiefly an aid to a country's economy and government. In Brazil's fifth general census, which began on September 1, 1940, no specific questions were included on race. However, Brazil's approximately 14,000,000 white citizens were asked their European origins. These two circumstances are significant. They indicate that Brazil accepts her citizens of Negro descent without worry. Not so the more recently arrived and often potentially dangerous Europeans from lands now Fascist and their descendants.

* * * * *

RACIAL PROPORTIONS

An approximate impression of the racial proportions involved in Brazil's fascinating three-way blending can be gained by means of a diagram. Three circles represent the races. Largest circle is the white, next the Negro, and smallest the Indian contribution to the total Brazilian bloodstream. The circles should overlap so as to show a third of their combined area as unmixed white blood. The circles for Indian and Negro blood should only slightly extend beyond the overlapping zone of mixed blood. This is to indicate that but little Indian and Negro blood remains unmixed compared to the great amount combined with white blood in various three-way crossings. In other words, it is impossible to determine with exactness any data on the total number of whites, Negroes, mulattoes, and so on. Only by diagram can even an approximate picture be given of the diversity of Brazil's population and the difficulties involved in describing it.

It has been estimated that over 70 percent of United States Negroes have some white blood. In Brazil miscegenation has been freer and on a far grander scale between the three stocks. Therefore, probably over 90 percent of Brazilians of Negro ancestry have some white blood and possibly half in addition have a little Indian blood. The latter is generally remote, going back to colonial times. The white admixture is, however, more extensive than here, there being more persons in Brazil who are half or three-quarters Caucasian. Negroes in the United States have less Indian blood than in Brazil. Roy Nash in his excellent book in Brazil is enthusiastic for the future of the new race and culture being fused in Brazil by the white, Indian, and Negro. He feels it will be different from anything before produced by mankind.

NEGROES AND DEFENSE

Negroes have served with distinction in the wars of the United States and Brazil. Since the Brazilian Negroes helped expel the Dutch and French invaders in colonial times, the proportion of Afro-Brazilians in the army and navy has been notably larger than with us. Negro patriotism and loyalty are strong in both nations. There are no more American-minded citizens in either country. They are cold to European "isms." There is no "fifth column" among them. Nazis and Fascists may be able to organize many of the million German-Brazilians and some of the 3,800,000 Italian-Brazilians into dangerous antidemocratic groups. And the clerical dictatorship of Brazil's backward but delightful mother country Portugal may adversely influence the ideas of the five or six million Brazilians of pure Portuguese descent. The 1940 census reflects Brazil's suspicion of her European minority and her perfect confidence in her part-Negro citizens.

UNITED STATES NAVY PREJUDICED

It is ironical that there should be discrimination against Negroes in the armed forces of both republics. It is worse in the navies. The military academies of the United States and Brazil admit few Negroes; their naval academies admit practically none. The Brazilian Navy at least has thousands of Negro sailors and many Negro petty officers, while ours has no Negro sailors or officers. This undemocratic racism worthy of totalitarianism is morally inexcusable and strategically unsound. It is to be hoped that Presidents Roosevelt and Vargas will remedy it. It can be assumed that this denial of rights was inherited by our Navy from England and was copied in part in Brazil through admiration for British and American naval missions and traditions.

DEMOCRACY

In both Brazil and North America, Negroes are strong for democracy even though most of them are disfranchised. Most Brazilians are voteless not through prejudice but because of illiteracy. Our Negroes, outside the South, can be more active politically than Brazilian Negroes in recent years. During the well-intentioned regime of President Getulio Vargas, despite governmental reforms and marked economic progress, Brazil's troublesome problems have led to the suspension of national and state legislatures and elections. The Brazilian Negro holds no such potential political balance of power as our northern Negroes, as Brazil does not have a two-party system. Brazil is still evolving toward democracy, but must first reduce her present illiteracy of over 70 percent, and poverty, poor health, and faulty communications if she is to attain any large measure of real democracy by late in this century, many scholars feel

THE NEGRO'S ECONOMIC PLACE IN BRAZIL AND THE UNITED STATES

Brazilian Negroes live in a country that is potentially prosperous but that is still poor. United States Negroes are citizens of the world's richest nation. Special Negro political status here means that periodically politicians capitalize on discriminations and lynchings in bidding for the northern Negro vote. The Brazilian Negro seldom gets to vote, but he faces few discriminations and no lynchings. Discriminations are even fewer in predominantly non-Caucasian North Brazil

than in the mostly white South, the dominant part of the country. In the cities of South Brazil—Rio, São Paulo, Porto Alegre, and so on—where Europeans settled by the million, the Negro is outnumbered and is less freely admitted to economic and social equality. British and American businesses are numerous and important in South Brazil, and Anglo-Saxon prejudices have had a certain influence.

Despite being badly treated in the United States, the Negro in this rich land has made relatively more economic progress. He has better education, health, and income than Afro-Brazilians, who have less property partly because so many of them were not emancipated until after 1870. Final emancipation came peacefully by law in 1888 for the minority still in bondage. Happily Brazil suffered nothing comparable to our Civil War and reconstruction with their subsequent embittering of race relations. In Brazil there is no need for the Negro to organize separate schools, cafes, banks, and businesses. Colored people have attained prominence oftener in Brazil than here because of greater opportunities. President Nilo Pecanha had some Negro blood. Negroes have made equally eminent contributions in the two countries in art, music, and literature.

SOUTH BRAZIL

It must be admitted that South Brazil feels a certain regional and racial superiority over the nonwhite and economically less favored North After the decades of gradual emancipation and the law of 1888, North Brazil's plantations of sugar, rice, cocoa, and tobacco were hardest hit by the turning of thousands of Negroes to the cities, to industry, subsistence farming, and other activities. South Brazil's huge coffee plantations were able to escape losses by turning to the flood of Latin European immigrants who flocked in after 1885, particularly to the booming State and city of Sao Paulo. South Brazil, after the republic displaced the monarchy in 1889, dominated Brazil economically and politically. São Paulo became richer with the help of foreign capital through her coffee and factories than any half dozen of the poorer North Brazilian States. A pattern of regionalism, partly racial, arose. Brazilian society in the southern cities generally refuses to admit Negroes to its social life and clubs, or to allow its children to marry part-Negroes, even those of fine education and talents. North Brazil, the original plantation area and black belt, is now the neglected poorhouse of the nation. Like our South, its wealth has been drained to the financial and industrial cities.

THE NEGRO AND RELIGION

Religion, especially in its emotional and exuberant forms, has served in Brazil, too, as an escape from poverty, boredom and discriminations. It is, of course, an outlet for genuine mysticism and religious feeling in Brazil, as well as a social institution of large possibilities for future good in combating misery, disease, and illiteracy

* * * * *

NEGRO PAN-AMERICANISM

From the viewpoint of Brazilian Negroes, it would be advantageous for American teachers and medical missionaries to work among them. Inter-American relations should be cemented between Negroes. A first step could be in our colored churches and colleges. The need for doctors and teachers is great in our own South But if a good start were made in sending a few as emissaries of good neighborliness, support might be obtained from the Rosenwald, Rockefeller, and other foundations and even from our Government's inter-American program to help train young men and women. This would be no one-way process, however. Americans have much to offer Brazilian Negroes and, in turn, have so much to learn from Brazil in how diverse races and cultures can live together in harmony and contribute jointly to the development of a new civilization rich in its production of the arts and the things of the spirit.

THE CATHOLIC CONTRIBUTION

American Catholicism has a contribution to make to the Negro in both lands. How splendid it would be for Brazilian-American understanding if dozens of Afro-Brazilian candidates for the priesthood and teaching orders could study in our excellent Catholic colleges and seminaries. They could teach us much and return to Brazil able to spread good will between the two largest American nations. American Catholicism might then gain a larger following here among Negroes. It might be very good for both Protestantism and Catholicism throughout the New World to engage in friendly and constructive rivalry for religious, educational, and social betterment. Certainly the Negro would benefit.

THE GREATEST LATIN NATION

History is not clear as to the extent in ancient times of racial and cultural blending comparable to that among the 40,000,000 Brazilians. But it is probable that in the ancient high cultures of Egypt and the Mediterranean Basin, and possibly in Asia, that Negro vigor and creativeness were major factors. Brazil is now the largest part-Negro nation, and may shortly be the greatest and most populous land of Latin culture as France and Italy follow Spain into post-war decay. In Brazil's new synthesis of culture, the contribution of the Negro is very great and carries vast promise of a rich flowering of civilization in the Americas.

BOOKS ON BRAZIL'S NEGROES

Probably the best volume in English is the Negro in Brazil, by Arthur Ramos, translated by Richard Pattee of our Department of State, and published in Washington by the Associated Publishers, in 1939. Dr. Pattee contributed a fine foreword. The brief bibliography is good. Dr. Ramos' numerous volumes in Portuguese are to be strongly recommended. He is a foremost living authority and is still actively productive.

This is also true of Gilberto Freyre, eminent Brazilian sociologist and former student of Prof. Franz Boas. Professor Freyre edited a splendid series of scholarly studies on race and culture in Brazil. His own monumental works richly deserve to be translated into English. Their publication here would be a signal contribution to United States-Brazilian understanding. Dr. Freyre's study of the great house and slave quarters and the vast influence of the Negro in the plantation region of Brazil's northeast has gone into several editions under the title "Casa Grande e Senzala." Northeast Brazil has produced many other works on the Negro which might be published in the United States in translation as part of the program of the Office of Coordination of Inter-American Affairs. These works are cited in the books of Ramos and Freyre. Nearly all of them as Brazilian classics have been republished by the great Brazilian publishing house, Companhia Editora Nacional, of Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo. The Nazis for years have paid tribute to Brazilian scholarship by publishing Brazilian classics in German. Brazil is our best friend in Latin America and the United States should at least equal if not surpass the Germans through a publishing program both private and governmental.

Data on the Negro in Brazil appears in recent articles and books by the following North Americans: S. H. Lowrie, D. Pierson, L. Hanke, D. Holdridge, R. Pattee, A. O'Neill, D. Aikman, E. P. Hanson, H. Gibson, B. W. Diffie, S. Putnam, M. W. Williams, A. K. Manchester, C. H. Haring, P. A Martin, O Schmieder, H. G. James, R. Nash, J. F. Normano, C. Beals, M. J. Herskovits, R. Bilden, J. Brunk, and most recently Vera Kelsey and W. E. B. Du Bois.

ROY NASH ON BRAZIL

Among North Americans, one of the most creative and original thinkers on the Negro contribution to the historical development of Brazil and the New World is Roy Nash. Although written in Brazil during extensive studies and travels there in the early 1920's, his Conquest of Brazil will be useful and stimulating for decades to come. Roy Nash has a deep knowledge of non-Caucasian cultures and peoples gained from residence and shrewd observation in the Philippines, from service with American Negro troops in France in 1918 and through active participation in the N. A. A. C. P. after the World War. His interest in the rich history and culture of the Negro in the Americas is deep. For some years, Mr. Nash was with the Indian Service in California. The Conquest of Brazil is so important that it merits republication with additional chapters and bibliography and notes to bring the story of Brazil's tremendous melting pot down to date. He again traveled widely in Brazil in 1941.

BRAZIL'S NEGRO A. E. F.

Because of its peculiar present-day significance, let me quote a passage from Roy Nash: (In the Brazilian drama of history we) "witness the conscription of an African army of labor and its hurried transport across the Atlantic for the relief of the forces battling against Nature along a front far flung from Pará to Montevideo"; even greater in size and importance than the A. E. F., which in 1918 hastened across the North Atlantic. "The recruiting ground of the African expeditionary force was equally extensive. From Angola they were summoned and the Congo; from Dahomey, Lagos, Old Calabar, and the Central Niger and Hausaland; from Portuguese Guinea and the Gaboon. Far above Stanley Pool the arm of the Portuguese recruiting sergeant reached; even to Mozambique and the region south of the Kunene River on the East Coast. Upon the tribes of the Yoruba, Egba, Jekri, and Sobo they called for contingents. Upon Mandingoes and the Bateke peoples, upon Hottentots and Bushmen as upon the forest dwellers, levies were made. Both Moslem and pagan were listed in class 1-A of the draft boards that opened offices in Wydah and embarked the cohorts for Brazil."

If Carleton Beals ever spends a year in Brazil and studies and describes the Brazilian as fairly and saltily as he does the Negro in Spanish America and the Caribbean, in his superb book America South, the resulting volume should be a landmark.

VERA KELSEY

In 1940 Funk & Wagnalls published one of the best studies of Brazil this reader has yet seen, Vera Kelsey's "Seven Keys to Brazil." Some of the best writing on Brazil is by sociologists and reporters. Vera Kelsey is both. Two sections of her penetrating book dealing with the Negro (pp. 23–29 and 54–62) cannot be too highly praised. Miss Kelsey is now in Brazil, as is Professor Herskovits.

* * * * *

CHARLES ANDERSON GAULD.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Tribute to Senator George W. Norris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

POEM BY RICHARD W. HOGUE

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend

my remarks, I submit herewith a tribute in verse by Mr. Richard W. Hogue to Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS, of Nebraska.

Senator NORRIS' long service in the Senate and House, and the brilliant record that he has made as a national legislator, stamps him as one of America's outstanding statesmen.

As is well known, he voted against the entry of the United States in the last World War, but realizing as he does the danger to the United States from Adolf Hitler and the totalitarian powers abroad, he has loyally and ably supported the President's foreign policy in the present crisis. He realizes that appeasement will not stop Hitler and that President Roosevelt's foreign policy is the only way to successfully cope with the international situation now prevailing.

Mr. Hogue's poem deals with this phase of Senator NORRIS' views, and I think is worthy of being preserved.

The poem is as follows:

WITNESS AGAINST APPEASEMENT

(To Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS)

They bid me make appeasement with the world today,
Failing to comprehend the source of my stout refusal.
My mind has no natural affinity with the tides of turbulence,
My heart contains no chamber for communing with ill will;
No grimly guarded grudge and no nurtured hope of late revenge
For wrongs unjustly suffered or for rights denied
Seeks release from bondage of internment
Behind the walls of long-compelled repression.
The years have slowly healed all old wounds
And no reminding scars remain.

By inheritance I was bequeathed no antipathy to life,
No germ lay dormant in my blood at birth
Waiting to disseminate disease of discontent
Through childhood cheated of its chance
To unfold in conscious happiness, slowly drained
Of all incentive and capacity for growth
In wisdom gained from creative self-expression.
Hardship, adversity, and loss in later years
Failed to persuade that hope and aspiration
Were doomed to fatal impotence by foreordained defeat.
I hold no exonerating alibi reserved
For final evidence on which to claim reprieve.

Where I have failed, I have failed;
What I have lost, I have forfeited;
What I have gained, I have not gained alone.

Computed by comparison with those acclaimed the fortunate,
No rich material reward and no surcease from striving
Has been mine, won worthily or bestowed by chance.
Reckoned by the common lot of those foredoomed from birth,
Environment-imprisoned, held down by circumstance,
Life has been all too largely generous to me.

Where they have failed, they have not failed;
What they have lost, they have not forfeited;
That little they have won has been sorely earned.

This being so, and because of it,
No self-contained, insensitive complacency
Shall be allowed to paralyze the protest of my heart and will.
I shall be beguiled to no appeasement with a world
That leaves these living millions and millions yet unborn
Unprovided with the liberty to win release,
Shorn of the power to envision ultimate emancipation
From the thralldom of their vast, unrequited wrongs.

Not till these have been made free to live and move
Unbound by chains of tyranny old and new,
Shall I be free,
Or until my falsifying lips consent to praise
The things all honest minds repudiate
Shall I, suborned to terror-stricken truce with tyranny,
Seek to make my peace with a world
Whose shame unpurged and wrongs unrectified
Call to all those who hold human liberty in high esteem
To fortify their faith and energy for its defense,
Prepared anew to make their lives bear witness to the truth
That short of unhindered brotherhood among free men
Never has there been, nor can ever be,
A lasting peace.

—*Richard W. Hogue.*

The South and Food for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE R. WICKARD

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Secretary of Agriculture, Claude R. Wickard, before a meeting of agricultural leaders of the Southern States, in Memphis, Tenn., September 29, 1941:

As I recall it, I first visited Memphis about 4 years ago. I had been with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration about 6 years, but I still felt that I would soon go back to my Indiana farm to take up where I left off in 1933.

Some of my impressions of my first visit to this area still are very clear. I got my first glimpse of your famous Delta and decided that it was rich as they said it was. I had my first experience with southern hospitality also and decided that it too lived up to advance notices.

In these fast-moving days, 4 years seem a long, long time. Four years ago at this time the South had begun to harvest a huge crop of cotton. Somehow our worries over that cotton crop seem unimportant now, just as many of the things we were worrying about a few years ago seem unimportant now.

During the 1930's we talked a lot about threats to the Constitution, freedom, and democracy. That was all talk. In those days we looked on Hitler as a comic-opera figure and poked fun at him and his little mustache. The Nazis and their goosestep seemed ludicrous. But all the time Hitler and the Nazis represented the real threat to the Constitution, to freedom, and to democracy. It took us a long time to wake up to that real threat and longer still to decide to do something about it. But now we are awake, wide awake, and I advise anyone who thinks the United States isn't going to do something about Hitler to see what happens from here on out.

My reference to problems reminded all of you, I know, of a common problem—the farm problem. But that changes along with our other problems.

I have been going about the country recently urging farmers to grow more foodstuffs This is the fourth meeting of the kind I have attended. Yet, it still seems a little strange to be urging farmers to produce more milk, raise more hogs, more chickens, and so on through the list of things we need. Since I have been with the Department a lot of our worry has been what to do with the surplus on hand; not how to get more produced.

As a corn-hog farmer, it seems queer that there isn't too much lard. And raisins! I never thought to see the time when the raisin surplus would be absorbed. It hasn't been so long ago when it seemed that national farm programs might break down because we couldn't keep down production People were calling the Ever-Normal Granary the Ever-Normal Farm Board and it seemed that our very wealth—the ability to produce—would wreck our programs.

All of you know one of the reasons for the change, Adolf Hitler, the would-be world conquerer, and to him goes a lot of the credit for waking us up to the real threat to democracy.

We are asking the farmers of America to grow more food in 1941 than they ever grew before. Why? To help beat Hitler and the Nazis. Or, if you wish to put it another way, we want that food to keep England on her feet. Either answer adds up to the same result. Everything we do to help England we do to help ourselves. This war is our war.

Some people say the President wants to get us into war. Quite the contrary. If the country and the world had listened to the President a few years ago there would have been no war. But we wouldn't listen. After the war began, the President told the country to arm and he told them something else—the consequences of a Nazi victory.

Those consequences mean the encirclement of the United States by the dictators; the destruction of our traditional democratic system—and finally war—a desperate war in which the Axis Powers would have all the advantages.

Now that the majority of our people know what a Hitler victory means there will be no Hitler victory.

Through aid to England, the United States already has prevented a Hitler victory. Not everyone realized it, but American food has been just as valuable to England as American munitions. Without either, Britain could not have continued until now.

Before the war, England depended upon imports for a good portion of her food. The war did not change her dependence, but it has shifted a good part of that dependence to the United States. Danish bacon and Dutch dairy products, for example, were staples on English tables before 1939. Now, they are staples on the tables of the Nazis. From England, one can almost toss rocks onto the continent of Europe, but Europe might be halfway to the moon so far as furnishing food to Britain is concerned. The new order has come and all Europe tightens its belt and bows its back in response to its so-called blessings. The Nazi submarines and planes roam the oceans to destroy ships and lives and property upon the seas. The ships that are left must come and go as quickly as they can. To save precious time, they forsake long hauls to the Southern Hemisphere in favor of the shorter routes to the United States and Canada.

Already we have shipped or bought for England about a half billion dollars' worth of food. Within the next year we expect to ship or buy at least another billion dollars' worth.

The food is getting to them now, and will continue to get to them. We have partially freed the seas of the Nazi menace. Before we have finished the seas will be completely free.

We have promised England this food if she will continue the fight against Hitler. England has told us that she has no intention of quitting, but that she can't go on unless she has food. A furnace doesn't burn without fuel. A man or a nation can't fight without food.

So one big reason why we are here today asking for increased production of vital foods and England's needs. We want 8 percent more dairy products than the record production of 1941. Now, that isn't true. We need much more than that. The 8 percent is what we think we can get. We want more pork, more canned vegetables, more of almost everything except wheat, tobacco, and cotton.

Most of you know why we don't want more wheat, tobacco, and cotton. We'll talk more about these crops in a little while; but, first, I want to talk about some other reasons for increased production of vital foods.

One other reason is the increased demand for foodstuffs in our own country. Factories are going full blast and factory workers have more money to spend for food, and they are spending it. When a man making $5,000 a year or more gets a raise, he isn't likely to spend any more of it for food. He's eating well already. But when a laborer goes back to work or gets a raise, he does spend more of it for food. He buys more eggs, more milk, more pork chops, more of almost everything the farmer has to sell, including cotton goods. What accounts for the record consumption of cotton in the cotton year that ended July 31, 1941? More people were at work and more people at work meant more money spent for cotton goods. I know some of us may get peeved at labor sometimes, but I never had much trouble making a living farming while factories were busy. My troubles—and the troubles of other farmers, too—came when people were walking the streets looking for work.

There's still another big reason for producing more food at this time. Most of Europe is hungry and will get hungrier as time goes on. The Nazis are living fairly well, but they are doing it at the expense of the conquered countries. The sign of the new order is hunger. So long as it exists—and it will grow worse—Hitler can't consolidate his gains. Words won't fill empty stomachs and hungry men are never contented.

Despite his victories, Hitler is desperate. Unless he can find food and oil in huge quantities, his conquests will become liabilities. There will be continued sabotage and revolt among the conquered and a continuing drain upon Nazi nerves and Nazi resources.

Hitler will lose, but famine may be stalking all Europe when he does.

Those hungry people must be fed and we must do our part in feeding. We must do it for humanitarian reasons. And we must do it for practical reasons too.

Since we've got to help clean up this mess, we might as well do a good job of it. It's a little too much to ask the United States to go through this thing every 25 years. This time let's not only win the war, let's win the peace too.

Food, good food, and plenty of it, is one of the best missionaries for democracy that I know. Let's have plenty of it to spread the gospel when the time comes, and let's tell Europe's millions meanwhile that we're ready to help them out once they get rid of the Nazis. That shouldn't make Adolf's task any easier.

A little while ago I told you that we didn't need any more wheat, tobacco, and cotton right now. The reasons you know. We've got huge supplies of these commodities on hand. We have a 2-year supply of wheat and a cotton carry-over in the United States on August 1 of 12,200,000 bales. That is more cotton than we will probably consume and export this year.

The gain in consumption has been more than offset by the loss of exports. This country may export a million bales this year. It isn't likely to export more than 2,000,000 bales. The war has blitzed the export market for cotton and it may stay blitzed a long time.

This country is not withdrawing from the export market for cotton. One of the reasons for stopping Hitler is to keep our export markets. Yet there's no sense in continuing to pile up cotton for a market which may or may not exist after the war. There hasn't been a time since the early day of the depression when we didn't have too much cotton on hand. We still have too much on hand, and in my opinion, there hasn't been a better time than right now to shift some of our acreage from cotton production to other crops.

I say this with full realization that cotton is the principal cash crop of the South and will continue to be for some time to come. To people who tell them to quit growing cotton, southerners ask: "What will we do for a living?" The question is justified, but right now we've got the best answer we've had in years.

The pull of defense industries has eased some of the South's population pressure. Southerners who stayed on the farm because there was nothing else to do now have gone to factories or to the Army. The country needs milk, eggs, and meat a lot worse than it needs cotton. There's a market at good prices for all you can raise of the vital foods needed for the war effort.

In the back of your minds may be the thought that the South, generally speaking, leaves the commercial production of meat, eggs, and milk to other areas; that the South does not have the land or facilities to grow food products as other areas grow them. This is only partially true. We know the South can produce meat, eggs, and milk because it is producing them. The section we call the South is an empire in itself. The possibilities of increased production of foodstuffs in the South is much greater than has generally been realized.

I don't intend to tell you about the need for living at home. The South is steadily increasing its production of food and feed for home use and for sale locally.

But a good deal more needs to be done. A substantial increase in milk, eggs, meat, and other vital foods in the South helps in two ways. It makes for a healthier and happier people and extra food production in the South makes more food available for Britain and for the American people as a whole.

Whatever the future of cotton, I think the South and the country as a whole, for that matter, will produce more foodstuffs. Americans are the best-fed Nation in the world. Yet we aren't any too well fed. People are beginning to realize that health is more than just preventing sickness. A lot of people who think they are well are half sick all the time. We are just beginning to realize that enough of the right kinds of food is necessary for buoyant health, the health needed for vigor and morale. The science of nutrition is going to make great strides within the next few years. Among its contributions will be convincing the country that one of the best ways to preserve democracy is to be certain that our own people have enough good food.

I don't believe we are going to have much trouble utilizing the milk, eggs, and other vital foods we produce from here on out. After the war is over we are going to use most of them right here at home.

The program of production we have planned for 1942 and the years to come raises a number of questions that both farmers and consumers want answered.

Farmers want to know whether they will get fair prices for increased production. They want to know also whether they will be left holding the bag, as they were after the last war.

Consumers want to know what this defense effort means in the way of increased food prices. They are wondering—and so are farmers, for that matter—whether we will have inflation and its inevitable disastrous after effects.

You are aware of the fact that the 85-percent loan and the payments under the program will assure cotton farmers a parity return for 1941 and probably during the period of the emergency.

We've been talking about parity for quite awhile and I think the people responsible for parity have a right to brag a little about reaching it. Of course, the ones primarily responsible are the farmers who built and supported these programs. But they won't mind if some of the bureaucrats join in the boasting. I think all of us should take time out at this point to say this farm program of ours is the best farm program any nation ever gave its farmers.

So far as prices for hogs, eggs, and other foods are concerned, we also have protection for prices and income. This feature is brand new. It was added to the bill which this year increased the lending power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The legislation says that whenever the Secretary of Agriculture finds it necessary to encourage increased production of a nonbasic commodity, he shall issue a public notice to that effect, and then within the limits of available funds, support a farm price for the commodity of not less than 85 percent of parity. Furthermore, if conditions change, the price is to be supported until producers have had time to readjust to changed conditions; or, to put it another way, until they have had time to get out from under.

I have already given public notice that expansion is required in the production of hogs, eggs, evaporated milk, dry skim milk, cheese, and chickens. I shall amend the notice to cover other commodities if that becomes necessary.

I think this new law is splendid. It is one more evidence that the Congress (reflecting the wishes of the American public) wants to play fair with the American farmer. When the public calls on farmers to expand agriculture the public is willing to see that farmers aren' penalized for serving the national interest. In return farmers or the great majority of them, are eager to produce abundantly. Farmers don't want high prices—they want fair prices. They don't want inflation, for they know that farm prices stay up only a short time, but other prices stay up long after farm prices have sunk to rock bottom.

To consumers, let me say this: The only effective guaranty against high prices and inflation for farm products is abundant production. As I have said, farmers want to produce abundantly. They can't do the job, however, unless they get fair prices for the things they raise. If farmers get fair prices and if we get the production we are seeking, I have no fear of high prices for foods or other things that come off the farm.

I've talked at length about the job we want done and very little about the way we intend to do it. I may be wrong, but I don't think we need to dwell on that here in the South. We have organized U. S. D. A. defense boards to help coordinate the production effort. I am certain that every agricultural agency involved will do its part and more in this campaign to produce for the defense of democracy.

More clearly than any other section, perhaps, the South knows the issues involved in this struggle. The South knows that first

things come first. The first thing before the farmers of the South and the entire Nation is winning this war. I know southern farmers and the South will do whatever is necessary to crush the Nazi threat to democracy and civilization.

I am confident the war will be won. I am confident that a better and more secure world order will emerge after the war is won. I have faith in democracy. I have faith in the strength and courage of the American people. And I have faith in that great leader of democracy—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM BRAINERD (MINN.) JOURNAL PRESS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I desire to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely editorial from the Brainerd (Minn.) Journal Press. The editorial follows:

[From the Brainerd (Minn.) Journal Press]

During these high-pressure times one hears a great deal about "national unity," aptly explained by the metaphor: "When there s a fire, there should be no dissension among the fire fighters, and so forth, and so forth." By which, no doubt, it is implied that none of us should question the motives, the good intentions, the sincerity or sanity of what is happening in this country in the name of national defense.

Maybe so, but——

Back home we once had a fire chief who used to be the whole show whenever the fire bell rang. It didn't matter whether the emergency was a roast burning in somebody's oven or a three-alarm fire; he was always the center of attraction. Bug-eyed and crimson of face, he would bellow incoherent orders that could be heard for miles and scare the populace half out of their senses. Before the fear-crazed villagers knew what they were doing, most of the property in the neighborhood would be desolated almost as bad as the house visited by the fire. Pictures would be torn from the walls, lace curtains from the windows, carpets from the floors, windows smashed and furniture thrown out of them, and the whole neighborhood thrown into utmost confusion.

Of course some people criticized the chief's methods—but not to his face. Hadn't he made fire-fighting a life study? Hadn't he been given full authority to act under any emergency? Nobody could tell him what to do.

One night the feed stable back of the hotel went up in smoke. The shell-like structure made a most spectacular blaze and the chief, as usual, was in his glory. "The hotel's next! Nothing can save it! Save the furniture! Save the bedding! Don't stand there like fools! Save the furniture!" The hotel entrance, however, was barred by its grimly determined proprietor, armed with a shotgun. "There'll be no messing up my property," he said.

The hotel didn't burn down, but its proprietor was roundly condemned by the chief for obstructing him in the performance of his duty.

Back to the subject of national unity: In times of stress all people should look in the same direction in the matter of national security; but, thank God, there are a few men in this country calm and sensible enough and endowed with intestinal fortitude to tell the big chief and all his frenzied lesser lights to keep their shirts on.

Fresno (Calif.) Bee on St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE FRESNO (CALIF.) BEE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, from my own State, and from one of our best newspapers, comes the following editorial on the St. Lawrence project which I am glad to include with my remarks:

[From the Fresno (Calif.) Bee of September 8, 1941]

"SOCIALISTIC" TAG IS NOT FRIGHTENING TO PEOPLE

How some people stick to the old scarecrows.

For example, the Transportation Association of America, representing some of the major railroads of the country, is denouncing as socialistic the proposal to improve the channel of the St. Lawrence River and provide huge amounts of additional power for the national-defense program.

And, oddly enough, it apparently thinks that label is going to frighten sober and sound-thinking Americans.

These too well recall the record.

They remember that the Government's construction of the Panama Canal was so denounced by those who perhaps had the same selfish reason for opposing its construction.

They remember the Tennessee Valley Authority and how the monopolistic power interests tried to attach the same tag to it. Yet it has proved to be one of the most beneficial projects ever undertaken by any American administration. T. V. A power has brought not only inestimable blessings to hundreds of thousands of consumers, but had it not been available, the national-defense production of aluminum would have been shackled far worse than it actually is today.

Boulder Dam likewise was fearfully socialistic, but what private company could or ever would have undertaken its construction?

And even our Central Valleys project has been put in the same category by those who think it is a crime for a government to do anything which will interfere with the vested interests 'n which perhaps they own stocks and bonds.

Socialistic, indeed.

The opposition to the St. Lawrence project must be at a loss for good and sufficient reason to support their stand when they find themselves forced to trot out such a long-whiskered bugaboo.

Protection Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

LETTER BY ROBERT P. VANDERPOEL

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter by Mr. Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor of the Chicago Herald-American:

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel, Financial Editor, Chicago Herald-American)

I should like to write a personal letter to every man and woman in the United States who—

1. Owns a life-insurance policy.
2. Is the beneficiary of an insurance policy.
3. Has a savings account in the bank.
4. Has a postal-savings account.
5. Owns or is the beneficiary of an annuity.
6. Contributes to a pension fund.
7. Depends upon a pension to meet living costs or a portion thereof.
8. Owns defense bonds, defense stamps, or Government securities of any kind.
9. Owns any State, municipal, or corporate bond, debenture, or notes.
10. Possesses any preferred stock.
11. Works for a salary or wage which it is difficult to adjust promptly and repeatedly.
12. Receives an income from any trust or estate.

It will be seen that this letter would go to almost every man and woman in the United States.

THE LETTER

It would read as follows:

"DEAR SIR OR MADAM: Your stake in America is being pared. The funds which you have worked so hard to save or for which loved ones have sacrificed for your protection are threatened. Each day they are becoming worth less. You must look to Congress for protection.

"Inflation, one of the scourges of mankind, is on the loose. There are measures before Congress which, if enacted promptly, could control this menace. Write to your Senators, write to your Congressmen, demanding that immediate, effective action be taken to stabilize prices, wages, and rents.

"There are good ways and bad ways for accomplishing this end. Even the worst ways are greatly to be preferred to unbridled inflation.

"There are those who hope that they could beat the game.

"Some farmers hope that because they did not receive a fair share of the national income for some years it will now be possible for them to live fat off the rest of the country.

"Some workers and their leaders hope that because skilled workmen are now desperately needed they will be able to secure fabulous rewards for their services.

"Some owners of real estate, starved through long years of inadequate returns on their investment, are hoping that they will be able to hit the jackpot.

"Some businessmen, still smarting under the lean years of the last decade, are hoping that nothing will be done to restrain what they now regard as great opportunities to cash in on Aladdin-like rewards of the profit system.

"TO CERTAIN DISASTER

"To all of these I say, 'You are crying for the moon, reaching for the stars. Get your feet on earth. A stabilized economy offers rich rewards. The seeming prizes of inflation will prove but mirages, carrying you on and on and on—to certain disaster.'

"So, demand of your Senators and Congressmen action now which will protect you and those for whom you have sacrificed."

I cannot write to every man and woman in the United States, but I wish that every reader of this column would communicate with his Senators and Congressmen, and I should be glad to receive copies or carbons of letters that are sent.

A Poetic Reaction to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

POEM BY ALFRED LOCKWOOD

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an epic poem, composed by Mr. Alfred Lockwood, a resident of the city of Seattle in my State of Washington, in which the poet gives his view of war, its causes, its distresses, its horrendous aspects and its inevitable sequel. Mr. Lockwood has many friends who would be interested in having this poem put in the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it is at their request that I am seeking this privilege. I will let the poem speak for itself as a persuasive, moving and telling disquisition on the most gripping topic in the world today—war and peace.

A DELUGE OF BLOOD—THREE VIEWS OF WAR, FEBRUARY 1941

PICTURE I

A dark ominous craft
Is appearing abaft,
  And it's nearly abeam;
It is loaded with graft,
  And a star-chamber scheme.

It will follow a line
Which the past can define,
  And the present conceive;
And will be the design
  Its promoters achieve.

It will follow the course
Of a violent force;
  Flowing rivers of blood
From the only resource
  That can redden the flood.

And the only supply
Which the cunning and sly
  Can coerce or conscript,
Is the youthful and spry,
  They have always equipped.

And each youth is the pride
Of a mother or bride,
  That must linger behind,
And in patience abide,
  Through a war undefined.

And the rally and surge,
As the forces converge
  On a fortress or town,
Will encourage the urge
  To win bloody renown.

And the blood that will flow
Will yield nothing but woe,
  To replace the deceased;
And the flies, and the crow,
  And the vulture will feast.

And this tragic red stain
Will assure us no gain,
  Though we win in each clime;
And the men that are slain
  Will have died for a crime.

Will have died to atone
For a crime not their own,
  But a crime against them;
And it surely is known
  Who we have to condemn.

And the men that are maimed
Will be saddened and lamed
  All the rest of their days,
Which is properly blamed
  On a trade-hungry craze.

And the injured that come,
With a splinter of bomb,
  Or a lung full of gas,
May receive but a crumb,
  Till life's miseries pass.

And those coming, unhurt,
From the slaughter and dirt,
  May be greatly annoyed
When they have to revert
  To the massed unemployed.

And the folk that stay here,
Away back in the rear,
  Will be worried some, too,
As high prices appear,
  With excuses untrue.

And the liberty lost
Is a part of the cost
  That we people will feel;
Like a man double-crossed,
  In a treacherous deal.

PICTURE II

Our picture, number one,
Shows the fighting is done
  By the youngsters of toil;
Not the plotting old Hun
  That inspires the turmoil.

In picture number two,
Is the cold-blooded crew
  That fosters the strife;
But is never in view
  When there's danger to life.

And a soldier's distress,
In the bloodiest mess,
  Never moistens their eyes;
While retaining access
  To whatever they prize.

And remote from the fray,
They will frolic and play,
  As if nothing were wrong;
Where their strenuous day,
  Is not weary and long.

And their tongues will not parch,
In the course of a march,
  Through the blistering heat,
That would melt all the starch
  From their collars, so neat.

And the strain and the stress
Of a soldier's duress
  Will annoy none of these,
Who are free to recess,
  And recline at their ease.

And the snow and the rain
Will occasion no pain
  To these favored marplots,
Whose fine shelters remain
  In the safest of spots.

And the only alloy
Interrupting their joy,
  Is the time they must use,
On the schemes they employ,
  To corrupt and confuse.

For they make it appear
That the high financier
  Plays a prominent role,
As a tall musketeer,
  Of the dollar patrol.

And a glorious part,
On the bond-shaving mart,
  He undoubtedly plays;
But the strife will not start,
  Within range of his gaze.

For, no truculent storm
Shall disfigure the form,
  Or the face of their kind;
And their features will warm,
  Where the marplots are dined.

And the power they acquire
Will ascend ever higher,
  As the war rages on;
Until truth can retire
  The acquisitive spawn.

And no sign of a blush
Will develop a flush
  In their impudent cheeks,
While the profits still rush
  To their vulturine beaks.

And humanity's gore
Will discolor our shore
  Until something is done
To decipher the score
  And dismantle the gun.

PICTURE III

Our pictures, one and two,
Have shown the bitter brew
  Of warfare's dire distress;
And placed the credit, due
  To those it serves to bless.

And picture number three,
Will guess, in some degree,
  The likely aftermath;
And what the score will be,
  Beyond the purple bath.

When the war is at end,
And ex-warriors descend
  On their own native land,
Which they served to defend,
  Should they make some demand?

Might they ask some return,
And display some concern
  In their homeland affairs,
And endeavor to learn
  What percentage is theirs?

Will their needs be supplied,
And no justice denied,
  When their purses cave in;
And the ex-warrior tide
  May begin to feel thin?

Will the future look bright,
With a life of delight,
  Looming clearly ahead;
To replace the grim sight
  Of the injured and dead?

Will they get a New Deal,
With the pleasing appeal;
  Of a full recompense,
Under government seal,
  For the men of defense?

Or will the men that fought,
Be distressed and distraught,
  By the clubs of police;
Like the bonus men caught,
  Through a Hoover caprice?

Will they bow to a frown
And be browbeaten down?
  Or contend for their own,
And partition the town,
  Dispossessing the drone?

These new ex-service boys
May display ample poise,
  And we others may help;
And our unified noise
  May alarm every whelp.

Or it may be a fright,
For the bosses may fight,
To their last fawning fink;
Through a hideous blight,
To hell's titular brink.

And they have to be watched,
For their guns are well notched,
Where they number their kill;
And if they are not scotched,
We can look for a spill.

And the venom and spleen,
We have felt and have seen;
As they used it before
In their tear-gas machine,
May assail us once more.

But another tough loss,
In a tilt with the boss,
Is less apt to occur;
Since his butterfly gloss
Is beginning to blur.

And the worst of mankind
Is not totally blind,
And all infamous wares;
Are so clearly outlined,
That the vile may see theirs.

And no man, unless mad,
Can be utterly bad;
But the lack of a chance
Is the part that is sad,
In our halted advance.

But mankind should move on,
With no effort withdrawn,
And no bent to look back;
But with eye on the dawn,
That displaces the black.

And today's profiteer,
With his insolent leer,
Could be greatly improved;
Were his conscience made clear,
By a fortune removed.

Missouri Endorses Arkansas Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

RESOLUTION OF CITIZENS OF SOUTHERN MISSOURI

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, a representative group of people in the Ozarks region of Southern Missouri recently endorsed unanimously the pending Arkansas Valley Authority bill. Herewith, I insert their resolution in full.

AN ENDORSEMENT OF ARKANSAS VALLEY AUTHORITY

Be it resolved, That the members of this convention, composed of more than 5,000 adult citizens of south Missouri and north Arkansas, assembled in the Ozarks region at Branson, Mo., on Lake Taneycomo, September 14, 1941, acting for themselves and in behalf of other persons within the States of Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas who may later wish to join with us, form an association to be known by and bear the name of the Southwestern Water Resources Association. The object and purpose of the organization shall be to aid in the further development of the great natural resources in the territory between the Mississippi and Rio Grande Rivers. To that end, the association shall bring to the attention of the President, the Congress, the National Resources Planning Board, the Federal Power Commission, and the public officials and people of the States within this great area, these basic facts.

First, that the rivers, including the Arkansas, Red, St. Francis, and White, afford opportunities for limitless development in navigation, irrigation, flood control, soil erosion, forest and wildlife conservation, and power production.

Second, that of the minerals, both metallic and nonmetallic, there is greater variety and, in many instances, larger quantities here than can be found in any similar area in the country.

Third, that within the limits of these eight States there exists more oil and natural gas than in all of the other States combined.

Fourth, that within these eight States there is produced a greater variety of farm crops and a higher percentage of farm surplus than in any other like region in the United States.

Fifth, that the timber resources are large and the quantity grown equal to any produced in other sections of the country.

Sixth, that animal husbandry, the mainstay of American rural life, is carried on as extensively here as in any other section east or west.

That notwithstanding the superior natural advantages of this great domain and the improvement thus far made, the means of converting raw materials into the finished product are meager. As a result the economy is not in balance and inevitably a low level of per capita income exists.

That the thing we most need is to promote among our own people industrial enterprises adequate to the needs. This is an impossible task without a dependable supply of electric energy at low cost. The water resources of the region are ample if properly harnessed to supply low-cost power for industries large enough to utilize the raw products available. Our soil is fertile, moisture ample, climatic conditions good, transportation sufficient, intelligent and efficient labor abundant. But even so, without low-cost power industry cannot prosper. To equalize an unbalanced economy, the water resources of these southwestern States must be utilized. We believe that the best method of attaining this end is to group these eight States together as a unit and develop the water resources as a whole. To that end we invite the cooperation and support of the National Government, the State government, and the citizenship at large.

Therefore be it resolved, That this convention approve, endorse, and recommend to the Congress of the United States the early consideration of the bill now pending in the House and Senate or a similar bill creating the Arkansas Valley Authority and the passage and approval of said act during the present session of Congress.

Adopted by a unanimous vote of the convention at Branson, Mo., September 14, 1941.

REV. J. E. CHASE,
Chairman.

Attest:

EVELYN W. RUNYON,
Secretary.

International Constitutional Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

ADDRESS BY AMOS J. PEASLEE

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Amos J. Peaslee, of the New York Bar, before the American Society of International Law.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL LAW[1]

(By Amos J. Peaslee of the New York Bar)

This topic appears on the agenda of the annual meeting of our society for the first time in the 35 years of its history. It brings us face to face with several basic questions:

Does the Society of Nations exist as a political entity?

Have we already, in a sense, a super sovereignty—a system of world government superior to the will of any single nation?

Is there such a thing as an international constitution? If so, what sort of an instrument is it? What does it provide? What does it lack?

It would be easy to spend the evening discussing definitions of terms. Rather than to become involved in that, I propose to recall certain of the factual phenomena which have appeared during the past 300 years of the world's history, and let you answer the questions according to your own choice of language.

THE INTERNATIONAL BODY POLITIC AND BILL OF RIGHTS

It is fruitless to embark on these speculations without considering at the outset the gravity of the present challenge to international government and to international law. Let no one underestimate the extent of that challenge. Germany's war aims go far beyond the destruction of the Treaty of Versailles of 1919. They are directed at the Peace of Westphalia of 1648, which gave birth to the modern concept of a society of free nations.

Germany's war is a revolution—a civil war—against world government, as we know it.

To those who urge that the existing international situation proves that such a government does not exist, my reply is that it proves precisely the opposite. The "hue and cry" is rising today, just as it did in the three years following August 1914. Sooner or later—whether it requires 3 years or 30—it will swing the will and the might of most of the civilized nations of the world to enforce the cardinal concept that there is a right to live at peace with, and to be free from brutal attacks by, other nations.

That passion to live and let live and to be free is as prevalent among our South and Central American neighbors as it is among our English-speaking cousins. It is to be

[1] Address before the American Society of International Law, Washington, D. C., Friday evening, April 25, 1941.

found, with a few unfortunate exceptions, in every corner of the globe.

If democracy were confined—as some of our present day philosophers tell us—to only about 15 of the 64 (more or less) nations of the world, or to 6 nations, or to our own Nation alone, we would view with great alarm the possible outcome of this challenge. But there is no justification for so limited a definition of the democracies, either in the constitutions of the nations or in their governmental operations. About 95 percent of the 64 nations possessed in 1939 written constitutions providing for a form of government very similar to our own. Over half of those constitutions had been adopted since 1920 and about a quarter since 1930. With rare exceptions each contained a bill of rights guaranteeing liberty and equality of the individual, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of thought and conscience, and guaranties against arbitrary powers of the State.

If democratic institutions and free thought and free speech have proved anything within the span of a single generation, they have demonstrated that there are underlying conceptions which are common to the minds of most men—that friendliness and neighborliness, and justice are predominant instincts among 90 percent of the people of the world.

The American Institute of International Law at its first session in 1916 adopted what it described as a "declaration of the rights and duties of the nations." That declaration enumerated five fundamental national rights—

1. The "right to exist and to protect and to conserve its existence," but not "by the commission of unlawful acts against innocent and unoffending states."

2. The right of "independence" and the "pursuit of hapiness" and the right "to develop itself" with due regard to the rights of other states.

3. The right to equality before the law and before other nations.

4. The right to exercise "exclusive jurisdiction over its territory and all persons, whether native or foreign, found therein."

5. The right to have its rights "respected and protected by all other nations;" for, said the institute, "right and duty are correlative and the right of one is the duty of all to observe." [1]

World government is not synonymous with universal peace. Man has outlawed crime in municipal law but he has not abolished it. Better world government will not soon, if ever, mean a state of perfect peace, but it will mean the discarding in the law of nations of many concepts held a generation ago of unrestricted national rights.

The vigor of the fiction that neutrality and isolation are possibilities when international crime develops on a wholesale scale, are evidence of the indignant demand of each nation that it has the right to be let alone.

Mr. Root in his presidential address to this society in 1908 called attention to the fact that the first public national act in the New World of the Western Hemisphere, as found in our Declaration of Independence, was an appeal to the "decent respect for the opinions of mankind."

One of our human peculiarities is that we seem to require a common antagonist in order to combine effectively for a common purpose. I have sometimes thought that the organization of the Society of Nations has been retarded because it is an all inclusive concept. Perhaps the assaults against free nations which were launched in 1914, and again with intensified fury in 1939, have had at least one use. They have proved that without effective world government no individual nation can be assured of the enjoyment of its basic rights, or even of its independent existence.

LEGISLATIVE ORGANS OF THE SOCIETY OF NATIONS

In the field of international legislation up to the present time law making processes have differed basically from those of national governments. There is not and never has been a congress or parliament of the nations or of any considerable number of them, to which the nations have delegated legislative power.

The phenomenon of international relations which most closely resembles a national legislature is the international conference. Some conferences have been occasional, such as the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907, the London Naval Conference of 1908–9, the Versailles Conference of 1918–19, the Washington Disarmament Conference of 1921–22, the "Conference for the Progressive Codification of International Law" held at The Hague in 1930, the "Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace" held at Buenos Aires in 1936, and—in earlier times—the Congress of Vienna of 1815, and the "European Congress of Catholic and Protestant States" of 1644–48. Other international conferences have been periodic or more or less permanent in their character, such as the Sessions of the Assembly and Council of the League of Nations and the eight periodic "International Conferences of the American States" held from 1887 to 1938.

But whether periodic or permanent, international conferences have never assumed to exercise the final sovereign powers of a legislature.

They merely draft and propose measures. The measures become effective when, and only to the extent that, they are ratified by the nations represented at the conferences.

International legislation is, of course, not limited to the products of international conferences. Many multipartite treaties partaking of the nature of legislation have been negotiated entirely through diplomatic channels. Some conventions, such as the one providing for the creation of the Permanent Court of International Justice, are described within their own terms as "statutes."

If we go as far as Judge Hudson [2] we should place in the category of international legislation some 257 conventions, treaties, protocols, declarations, acts, or agreements signed during the 50 years preceding 1914, and not less than 400 which were signed during the 20 subsequent years. Personally I should describe some of the documents which Judge Hudson terms "legislation" as being more in the nature of contracts. Many of them, however, undoubtedly belong to the field of legislation.

Some conception of the rate at which international legislation is now being ground out, is to be gathered by recalling that at the single Seventh International Conference of American States, held at Montevideo in 1933, 95 resolutions, 6 conventions, and 1 protocol were adopted, and at the Special Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, at Buenos Aires in 1936, 11 treaties and conventions were signed, all of which were in the nature of legislative acts.

Crisscrossing among the nations there is a vast network of legislative documents which are becoming ever more important in the relations of the nations and somewhat appalling in their increasing complexity.

Finally, in contemplating the field of international legislation we should recall the progress which has been made toward codification of international law. The work in the Western Hemisphere which began by the appointment of the commission of jurists at the Rio Conference of the American States in 1906 finally ripened into the creation of the committee of experts which held its first meeting at the Pan American Union in April 1937. The League of Nations Assembly and Council, as you know, provided in 1924 for the creation of a committee for the progressive codification of international law. At the first international conference which met at The Hague in March and April 1930 under the inspiration of that committee, 48 states were represented. The draft conventions prepared by the Harvard research experts trace their roots to that committee and that conference.

The most serious handicap which confronts any effort to codify or improve international law is the cumbersome existing machinery for accomplishing international legislation. We know the difficulties experienced by the Assembly of the League of Nations under the principle of unanimous consent, and of its efforts to avoid or circumvent that principle in procedural measures. International legislation will continue to be lacking in simplicity of enactment and will always be of scattered geographical application unless and until the nations are willing to delegate to permanent representatives actual legislative powers.

JUDICIAL ORGANS OF THE SOCIETY OF NATIONS

This audience is far too familiar with international judicial organs to warrant even a summary review of them as they function today. The judicial department of the constitution of the society of nations—if we may employ that term—is, as we should expect, more mature than its legislative department, for, as we know, the development of law by custom and through arbiters and judges has almost always preceded legislation chronologically in the evolution of governmental organisms.

The Permanent Court of International Justice within the past two decades has become a functioning and living body. The Mixed Arbitral Tribunals in Europe and the German and Mexican Mixed Claims Commission operating in the Western Hemisphere since 1919, dealt with a volume of cases surpassing both in number and importance anything hitherto known in the history of international arbitrations. The Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, alone handled over 15,000 separate cases. Several of its single cases or groups of cases involved larger sums and graver issues than the entire Alabama arbitration or any other single arbitration to which the United States had previously been a party.

Not less than 130 [4] separate conciliation, arbitration, or compulsory adjudication treaties were signed by nations during the single decade which followed the conclusion of the last war, in addition to such general conventions as the Geneva Protocol of October 2, 1924, the general act for the pacific settlement of international disputes of September 26, 1928, and the inter-American treaties of conciliation and arbitration signed at Washington on January 5, 1929.

Six separate drafts of projects for the establishment of an inter-American court of international justice, submitted to several of the international conferences of the American states from 1923 to 1936, have been made the subject of a study and report by the governing board of the Pan American Union.[5]

[1] See the Recommendations of Habana Concerning International Organization, Scott, Oxford University Press, 1917, pp. 22, 67; and U. S. Supreme Court cases there cited.

[2] International Legislation From 1919 to 1934, Hudson.

[4] For list of these see Post-War Treaties for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, Habicht, Cambridge University Press, 1931.

Useful as these and other developments of international judicial organs have been, they are, with few exceptions, still haphazard in their character. At the Versailles Conference in 1919 I was bold enough to suggest[6] that, in addition to provision for a World Court in the Covenant of the League of Nations (whose first draft lacked any such provision), authority should be granted for the creation from time to time of inferior courts—much in the same manner as our United States Federal courts were established—in order ultimately to create a permanent unified international judicial system.

EXECUTIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANS OF THE SOCIETY OF NATIONS

Any supersovereign executive power for the Secretariat of the League of Nations was repeatedly disclaimed when the League was founded, and from time to time thereafter.

The Governing Board of the Pan American Union also shrinks from admitting any executive powers among the nations of the Western Hemisphere. You will recall that at the Buenos Aires Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace in 1936, attended by President Roosevelt, a resolution was adopted recommending extension of the scope of the work of the Pan American Union. On January 3, 1938, the Governing Board approved a comprehensive committee report which said:[7]

"It was the thought of the founders of the Union that through such cooperation an international atmosphere would be created in which any disputes that might arise would lend themselves to orderly settlement, through mediation, conciliation, or arbitration. It is true that at successive international conferences of American states an elaborate mechanism for the maintenance of peace has been developed, but the organs for this purpose are not integral parts of the Pan American Union, but may be said to run parallel to it * * *."

Since the Pan American Union traces its origin to a section of the State Department of the United States Government, and since its governing board still consists of diplomatic representatives of the 21 nations of the Western Hemisphere resident at Washington, D. C., it is easy to understand why, for these reasons alone, it would hesitate to admit that its functions are executive in any supersovereign sense. The report approved by the Governing Board refers, however, to "an elaborate mechanism for the maintenance of peace," which runs "parallel to" the functioning of the Pan American Union.

Whatever terminology we may employ as to the functions of the Pan American Union or of the Secretariat of the League of Nations, we certainly find not only within those bodies but also within a great many other international organs many of the attributes of administrative and executive institutions. The Bureau of Universal Postal Union has long been a most valuable organ of that character. So have the International Telegraphic Bureau, founded in 1868; the Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property, founded in 1883; the Union for Protection of Literary and Artistic Property, created in 1888; and various boundary commissions, plebiscite commissions, commissions for the control of navigable rivers, and commissions dealing with air navigation. At one single American conference—the Seventh International Conference of American States at Montevideo in 1935—eight international commissions were created.

How far it is to the interest of the nations to continue to disclaim any super-sovereign attributes for these various agencies may be open to question.

CONCLUSION

What then are your answers to the questions which this topic has raised? Is there already an unwritten constitution of the society of nations?

Whatever your answers may be, we must face frankly the fact that such government as the society of nations now possesses has proved inadequate to preserve peace and order and to guarantee the rights of the nations. The constitution of the society of nations at best is an infant organism which has not developed the immunity to disease or the vigor which we shall expect of it in its riper maturity.

It is not the province of the American Society of International Law to attempt to state any "war aims" or "peace aims." We may observe, however, that rapidly changing social customs inevitably demand changing institutions. The nations of the world during the past few decades have become vast economic organisms. They require, if complete chaos is to be avoided, far more effective instrumentalities of international government than now exist. Such organs must be financially self-supporting. They should be all embracing in their concept. With 300 years of failure of mere alliances and associations, and with the experience of two world wars in a single generation costing[8] per day in money alone more than what should be the normal cost per year of effective organs of international government, we can afford to take daring risks.

As our beloved Chief Justice in his presidential address to this society 12 years ago said:

"The building of the institutions of peace is the most distinctive enterprise of our time. * * * The difficulties do not make the task any the less the supreme task of modern civilization. * * * We shall have to build and rebuild and then mayhap, to build again, but the construction process must go on."

[6] Report of Projects on the Establishment of the Inter-American Court of International Justice, submitted to the Governments of the American republics by the Governing Board of the Pan American Union in compliance with resolution IV of the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace (see Bar Association of New York pamphlets, following vol. 187).

[6] See Proposed Amendments to the Judiciary Articles of the Constitution of the League of Nations, Peaslee, February 27, 1919, submitted to the American members of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace.

[7] See Report of Director General, Pan American Union, 1938.

[8] See Thomas J. Watson's estimate of the cost of the last war at 23,000,000 lives and $337,846,000,000; International Conciliation, October 1938, No. 343, p. 339.

Labor Day Address by Senator Bunker at Las Vegas, Nev.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER, OF NEVADA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the very able address delivered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER] on Labor Day at Las Vegas, Nev.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A few days ago I left the most interesting and important city in the world. Interesting because of the unusual individuals and personalities that make up the everyday life of this city. They come as actors from America and from the world to play their roles in the great tragedy humanity is experiencing today. Important because the decisions that are being made there are vital and will ultimately shape the destiny of civilization.

In the light of world conditions, this meeting tonight is a tribute to democracy. There are few nations left in the world today where representatives of organized labor can convene without fear, threat, or molestation. No occasion such as this could be celebrated in any totalitarian state. The organized labor movement in Germany, which was one of the most effective and best led, was annihilated in a single day by Hitler, and in turn a number of the outstanding leaders were assassinated.

In the countries which have been ground under the ruthless savagery of Hitler's legions trade-unionism has ceased to function. Hundreds of thousands of those who but a few months ago were protecting their rights as wage earners through their trade-unions are now prisoners of war, compelled to work for Germany under such conditions as a brutal, arrogant director imposes; compelled to work in the production of war material to be used for the purpose of dealing a death blow, if Hitler can have his way, to the free institutions of the parliamentary governed countries.

This is in marked contrast to the position of labor in America. Our Government is founded upon a Constitution which is a covenant and a pledge to those who toil to live, guaranteeing them the opportunity and the right to support and sustain themselves and their loved ones in respectability. Thus the labor movement in America, which plays such a vital part in the everyday life of us all, is one of America's greatest and most permanent institutions. The enviable position of this movement today does not tell the story of its humble beginning.

Fifty-nine years ago, in the city of New York, at a meeting of the Central Labor Union, Peter McGuire offered a simple resolution which was destined to set aside this day in commemoration of the workers of America. Two years later the American Federation of Labor endorsed the proposal of a national Labor Day holiday by unanimously adopting the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the first Monday in September of each year be set apart as labor's national holiday and that we recommend its observance by all wage workers irrespective of sex, calling, or nationality."

On June 28, 1894, Grover Cleveland signed the bill which made the first Monday in September a legal holiday.

Today, 59 years after that first Labor Day, we find that this movement has accomplished much in its unceasing endeavors to raise the American standard of living. Great social and economic reforms have been brought about to make our lot in life more pleasurable. Some of them are: Collective bargaining, employers' liability, minimum wage and maximum hours, Railroad Retirement Act, social security, unemployment compensation, and old-age assistance.

These gains touch the heartstrings of all 130,000,000 Americans. They have advanced humanity. It was not so many years ago that a man who was on the down-hill side of his productive years was turned away from employment with the phrase, "We're giving the job to a young man." Men of 60 and 65 were left with no work and no means of sustenance. There was no unemployment compensation. There was no old-age assistance. There was no social security. A man

had no place to turn that he might retain his self-respect and provide for his loved ones. But now we can approach age without fear. We can approach the period in life when we can no longer produce with the knowledge that we are not a burden on society but rather are entitled to a day's rest in the twilight of life, realizing that this is a partial reward and compensation for our long years of service.

And for these gains we must tonight pay tribute to organized labor. Were it not for the efforts of this organization, I venture to say that these gains would not have been enacted into law.

But there is yet work to be done. The problems are yet to be solved of broadening the social-security laws, providing more widespread medical attention, and securing for the worker better housing facilities.

As I have said, labor is responsible for the great gains that have been made. The American standard of living is the highest in the world. And "standard of living" and "labor" are one and the same thing, for it is American labor, through a constant vigil, that has made and maintained this standard of living which is the envy of the world. Twenty-five years ago America found herself in the position of preparing to defend the principles and ideals upon which our Nation was founded. History has a way of repeating itself. And tonight, unhappily, we find ourselves in almost a like position—a position in which uppermost in our minds is national defense. Again it is the responsibility of organized labor to defend and maintain these hard-fought social gains.

During the years 1914–17, wages increased 24 percent while living costs increased 42 percent, and by 1919, food, clothing, rent, and fuel had risen 98 percent. We cannot again allow this tremendous lag of wages behind the cost of living. The Government is making a sincere effort to equalize that which the worker receives with that which he must pay out for subsistence. Through the instrument of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, the administration is attempting to place ceilings on food, clothing, and shelter as well as other commodities.

The much-discussed work stoppages today are the result of labor's rightful way of maintaining these gains which are so much a part of democracy. But the use of this means is not nearly as alarming as the 100,000 accidental deaths recorded last year.

Thus we may point with pride to the condition of labor in our own country, but America is the sole example in the world today of upholding labor's rights and privileges of free men. Let us review the conditions in other countries. Under the Nazi regime, the birth rate has fallen and the death rate has increased. In the year 1938 the scourge of diphtheria in Germany was four times that of our own. Childbed fever, which is practically nil in America, has increased 55 percent in Germany. Youthful crime, drunkenness, and insanity are making vast inroads on the youth of that country. Venereal disease in the Rhine province was up 60 percent in 2 years. Accidental death has made a horrible gain of 25 percent. And the most significant statistics, that prove conclusively that many would rather die than live under such a government, is proven by the fact that the suicidal rate in Germany is the highest in the world.

Our position is much the opposite, in that the American soldiers of today are 2 inches taller and 15 pounds heavier than they were in 1917. Diphtheria declined 31 percent in a single year. Tuberculosis took a 50 percent drop in 10 years, and the fatality in pneumonia has been cut in half in 3 years. The average life of an American today is 16 years longer than in 1910. And again the most significant figures are that the suicidal and murder rate are the lowest on record. Thus the backbone of our defense is the health, happiness, and strength of the American people.

Let us analyze that beloved term, "American people." Those of English descent are by no means in the majority. In the boundaries of the United States there are 10,000,000 Irish, 16,000,000 Germans, 5,000,000 Italians, 5,000,000 Scandinavians, 5,000,000 Slavs, 5,000,000 Jews, 2,000,000 French, 1,000,000 Spanish, and other minority groups that range from one-quarter to three-quarter million in number. Over here, we are all immigrants together, even the American Indians. There is no race or creed or culture that has a monopoly on Americanism, except the human race, the creed of friendship and good will, and the culture of free speech and free opportunity. In America, there is nothing astonishing in the fact that a great defense program is in charge of Bill Knudsen and Sidney Hillman, both of them born in Europe and natives of conquered countries. They have special reason to appreciate what it really means to be an American. I like the story of Solomon Rizk who was an orphan living on what he could pick up in a poor village in Syria, when he discovered that his parents had been naturalized Americans. He woke up to find himself a citizen of a great Nation, though he was ragged and half starved and could speak no word of English. For 4 years, he doggedly struggled to reach his strange new country and finally succeeded. He can talk American now and has taught Americanism from New York to California. Solomon Riszk learned that we Americans are natives of all the world gathered here under one flag in the name of liberty.

A few days ago, a serious and tired man left the White House, boarded the Presidential yacht and steamed down the Potomac toward the sea. As the President traveled down the river, he must have raised his eyes for inspiration to the impressive monument, the Lincoln Memorial. Then as he gazed across the river, he must have remembered that many of America's sacred dead, including the Unknown Soldier, rest in Arlington Cemetery. As he contemplated the history connected with these historical shrines, the Presidential yacht would have rounded the bend in the river and come in full view of that beautiful southern plantation, Mount Vernon.

The Revolutionary War produced its Washington, who helped write the Constitution and established this form of government. The Civil War produced its Lincoln, who preserved the Constitution. The World War produced Woodrow Wilson, who, notwithstanding the fact that his ideals were far in advance of the times, defended the Constitution. All this the President must have realized as he made his way out to sea to meet with the Prime Minister of Great Britain.

How different this meeting was from those meetings of mockery held between Hitler and Mussolini on Brenner Pass. These were councils of war, and without exception after each of these diabolical meetings the world was made to suffer more misery, more death, and more destruction. I think I betray no confidence when I say that we in Washington realized that this historic meeting at sea was in the offing. How true that the results of this momentous conference carry out the ideals, ambitions, and aspirations of the President of the United States. History will record that the President set out on a peace program in the hopes of avoiding the tragic conflict which rages over the world today. On September 26, 1938, the President made a desperate effort to have the governments of Europe mediate the Czechoslovakian invasion. On the following day he appealed to Hitler to negotiate a settlement of the Sudeten dispute. In April 1939 identical messages were sent to Hitler and Mussolini, urging their assurance not to invade or attack a group of 31 nations for a period of 10 years. A like attempt was made at the beginning of the invasion of Poland. This is Roosevelt's peace record. Is it any wonder that out of the historic meeting between the great heads of the two democracies should come the proposal for a just and lasting peace.

No man knows the outcome of this infernal holocaust. Sometimes I think it is providential in view of the strength shown by the Soviet Union that these two totalitarian governments should become clasped in a death struggle. Let not the uncertainty of the outcome of this present struggle lull us into a feeling of false security at our own position. We hold no brief for any totalitarian government, nor any type of government which is so entirely different from our own. But because our position in this war is not one of sympathy but rather one that is realistic and practical, we propose to act as the arsenal for those who assist in overthrowing the tyrant of the world—Hitler. We are following this course for one reason, and one reason only; that is the defense of the United States of America.

Toward this goal, we have made much progress. And labor is responsible for this progress. If today, we have reached the point where we are producing some 1,800 planes per month, it is because of the efficiency and industry of labor. If today an American-made bomber can be flown across the North Atlantic in 6½ hours, it is because of the skill and genius of the American workmen. If in the past year we have performed a modern miracle and are now beginning to outstrip the world in production of quantity and quality of defense weapons, it is because America has put her shoulder to the wheel. For this requires total effort, the effort of all groups, the men on the farms, in the mines and factories, and the boys in the service of their country.

It is said that America has a rendezvous with destiny. And that destiny is the preservation of the ideals and institutions of freedom, the freedom that is our heritage placed in sacred trust by our forefathers who fought and died to maintain it.

Despite all that has been said by the opposition, America's position in this international crisis will secure the future safety of our people. The decisions that have been made by our President and the position taken by our Government is worthy of America.

In this crisis the American people will rededicate themselves to Americanism. I have confidence in the future of America because I have confidence in the people of America. We whose Government was founded to insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity will, through mutual trust and mutual sacrifice, lead the world from this darkness into a brighter day of a nobler and finer civilization.

Launching of the "Patrick Henry"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVA B. ADAMS

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, OF MARYLAND

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the very able and appropriate address delivered by the junior Sen-

ator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] on the occasion of the launching of the ship *Patrick Henry*, the address being broadcast over a Nation-wide hook-up.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today we are on the outskirts of Baltimore, near the spot where the Star-Spangled Banner was written. We are launching the *Patrick Henry* in the Bethlehem Fairfield Shipyards, where, in amazingly quick time, this ship has been built. Today at shipyards on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts vessels are being launched as a part of our rapidly expanding merchant marine. We call this 27th of September Liberty Fleet Day, and we do so rightly. On this day we are taking a very significant step forward in the sacred cause of liberty.

What are we building? In 1936 we started a shipbuilding program calling for the construction of 500 new ships over a period of 10 years. Today we are planning to build nearly three times as many.

Are we getting results? The answer is "Yes." This year, instead of the 50 ships originally planned, we will launch over 130. During 1942 we expect to add to our merchant-marine fleet approximately 600 new ships.

Some harassing obstacles have arisen, but these have not prevented us from building faster than specified in our schedule. Both owners of ships and workers in shipyards have shown, on the whole, a very patriotic spirit and have cooperated heartily in the carrying out of our construction program. See to it we must, and will, that the building of our ships is never jeopardized nor long delayed by lack of requisite materials nor by unsettled controversies between labor and capital. It is desirable, it is essential, that our building program move along efficiently and rapidly.

We are not only building new ships but we have reconditioned and are now using 200 old ones which were idle. We are also utilizing vessels obtained from foreign governments.

We are getting greater service out of our ships. We are finding that safety requirements will still permit us to load some of our boats more heavily. We are rerouting to secure economies in time and management. In many ways we are pooling effectively the activities of our shipping companies. Today the ships of this country are working on a basis of cooperation under the general supervision of the United States Maritime Commission, the like of which has not been known before in the history of our country.

Why do we need so many additional ships? Recall that until recently the most of our commerce with other countries was carried in foreign vessels, very many of which are no longer in their old trade routes. Our defense program is calling for commodities in ever-increasing amounts requiring greater transportation facilities by land, water, and air. The Army and the Navy are asking for more and more boats as auxiliaries. The giving of assistance to the Allies increases greatly the demands upon our own shipping facilities.

The launching of the *Patrick Henry* today has an appropriate setting. Maryland has played an outstanding role in the history of American shipping. Probably no ship was ever more graceful than the Baltimore Clipper, typified by the *Anne McKim*, or better known throughout the world. A large percentage of the American ships active in the War of 1812, both in commerce and in combat, were built in Baltimore. Among the most famous of these was the *Constellation*. That historic ship is again in the active service of our country. After this emergency is over, the *Constellation* will doubtless return permanently to the place of her birth in the waters of the Chesapeake.

In launching the good ship *Patrick Henry*, we congratulate the Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyards, Inc., upon a job of ship construction efficiently and quickly done. We congratulate the workmen in these yards, whose intelligent and untiring efforts have been an indispensable factor. We congratulate Admiral Land and his associates of the United States Maritime Commission upon work very well done. Admiral Land is daily giving proof that he is one of the most efficient men in public life in Washington.

We congratulate the people of Maryland upon this new glorious page in the history of shipping in our State. We congratulate the people of the United States upon the outstanding significance of this launching today. It is a convincing symbol that we continue to hold fast to the doctrine of the freedom of the seas. That is a doctrine which many years ago a man of Maryland, Stephen Decatur, enforced upon the Barbary pirates of North Africa.

The freedom of the seas is vital to our prosperity and to our safety. That freedom we will defend if necessary. No internal controversies nor external threats will swerve us from this, our purpose.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. SCHWARTZ

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. HARRY H. SCHWARTZ, OF WYOMING

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, on October 4, on a program of the Norwegian Broadcasting Service, I made an address to the people of Norway, which was broadcast in this country and transmitted to Norway by short wave from station WRUL in Boston, Mass. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My good Norwegian friends, in a radio address to the American people from Washington an October 2 I stated that our foreign policy is not a matter for partisan politics. It is rather a matter of national defense, and as such has the support of most of the more prominent and influential men and women in both Democratic and Republican Parties, and it is endorsed by the great mass of the American public.

In this speech I also emphasized the world-wide threat to the rights of labor which Hitler and his gang present, not only in all parts of Europe but here in the United States as well, and I made particular reference to the tragedy of Norway under Nazi control. For while other democracies of Europe also feel the bitter blight of nazi-ism, there are reasons why conditions in Norway hold particular appeal to me. Many years ago I was a resident of that part of our Central West then being settled by immigrants from Norway, and I learned from personal contact to respect and admire these men and women who, they and their descendants, are now among the best of American citizenship. The new arrivals were all intelligent, none of them illiterate. All were willing and eager to work. They helped us build towns and cities, people our then vacant public farm lands, and establish and improve our schools and universities. Some born in Norway, and many of their sons, were and are now Governors of our States and members of our State legislatures. Today they sit in the United States Senate and House of Representatives and hold positions of high trust and responsibility in the executive and judicial branches of our Government. America is determined that Norway shall again be free and independent. In many ways Norway has been an inspiration and help in improving our own democracy. All this and more I would like to have said in my radio appeal to the American people to strengthen even more our resolve to aid in every way in driving nazi-ism from the face of the earth. We will not consent to any peace until that is accomplished.

We have in America some few labor leaders who think the fight against the Nazis is not important to American wage earners. I asked them during my recent broadcast from Washington the following questions:

Where are the Italian, German, French, Belgian, Dutch, Danish, Norwegian, and eastern European labor leaders of a few years ago? In graves, in prisons, in hiding. A few survive. Some have sold their independence for a mess of pottage and now serve as labor taskmasters in nations under Nazi and Fascist control.

Where are the labor unions of these countries? Wiped out, outlawed. They do not exist. The Nazi-controlled governments fix the workers' hours of work, their wages; forces, grants, or denies their right to change the character of work or the places where they may work. This slavery is not imposed merely through the necessities of war. It is part of the philosophy of nazi-ism, and war is the weapon by which this system is to be cemented and made permanent.

And where are the great captains of industry, the controllers, and principal owners of the giant corporations of industrial Germany? These men who, in their folly, financed and built up Hitler until he and his fellow racketeers destroyed free labor. They, too, have been crushed, despoiled, and rendered impotent by the Frankenstein of their own creation. Some few managed to escape from their native land. They now bemoan their stupidity in the press and magazines of America and Britain. Here in America we have some few industrial Fascists seemingly willing to travel the same road to their own economic death.

Let labor consider Norway. There real democracy had reached almost perfection. Her people enjoyed every privilege and immunity set forth in the Bill of Rights in our own Federal and State Constitutions. Labor was organized in industry. Agriculture, labor, and capital worked together in harmony and in good will. Poverty and want did not exist. There was no selfish and cruel effort to accumulate great wealth and power at the expense of those who toiled to produce, transport, and distribute the products of the farm, the forest, and the factory. Norway is a fair land; it was a happy land. Then came the Nazi spies; the "fifth column" followed, seduced by bribe money; and finally the Nazi Army. Why did these emissaries of the devil come to Norway?

They came to despoil that nation, to destroy a democracy that belied the Fascist-Nazi charge that "democracies are outmoded," and they came to secure naval and military bases from which they hoped to destroy Britain, where capital and labor fight side by side.

But the democracy of Norway will not surrender. It fights on, even though the Nazi military power, working through the thin disguise of the bought and traitorous Quisling, took control of the churches, muzzled its religious leaders, abolished what in our country are county and State teachers and parent-teacher organizations, disbanded the Boy Scouts of Norway, commandeered food, smothered labor organizations, restricted the food allotted to labor. The Nazis have sent to the firing squads or to long imprisonment many courageous labor leaders who sought to bring about a mass protest against the

steadily worsening conditions under which labor exists in that all but ruined country, and now, with the approach of winter, they seize the blankets from beds in Norwegian homes in order to warm the Nazi Army fighting Russia.

If ever there was a cause to which both capital and labor, leaders and rank and file alike, should give every support within their power, that cause is the defeat of Hitler and all for which he stands.

And if ever there were men whom the workers of all countries should revere and remember, it is Hansteen and Vickstrom, the two Norwegian labor leaders who were executed by a Nazi firing squad on September 10. This execution has aroused the indignation of the whole civilized world; the protests against this brutal deed have come even from the trade-unions of Finland, Germany's present ally, and from Sweden. The American Federation of Labor, through its president, William Green, lost no time in declaring that "American labor is proud of the unconquerable spirit of the workers in Norway" and that "the plight of Norway should impress upon the workers of America and every other nation the fate that lies in store for them should Hitler's drive for world domination be permitted to succeed."

American newspapers by the hundreds made this execution the occasion for fighting words against nazi-ism and for words of praise for the brave people of Norway. Yes, the names of Viggo Hansteen and Rolf Vickstrom shall be remembered by Americans as well as by Norwegians. These men have already taken their place not merely in the list of labor's martyrs; they are in that band of heroes who represent all classes and all professions and who throughout the centuries have defended human freedom and human civilization.

I am glad that this short-wave broadcast makes it possible for me to say directly to the people of Norway that it is the fixed policy of the United States to aid to the extent of our every resource all those who fight nazi-ism.

In ever-increasing quantity American bombers and fighting planes, tanks, guns, and munitions are being sent to those who fight for freedom and independence in Europe. Many of these implements of war are manned by American pilots and gunners and serviced by American mechanics. All are volunteers in the cause of democracy. We realize that final victory cannot come immediately. But, be assured, you men and women of Norway, that we are redoubling our capacity to produce the weapons needed by those who fight Hitler in Europe, Asia, and Africa, and these weapons are being delivered, although some ships are lost at sea. Our Navy is now sweeping the seas to destroy the barbarians who sink our ships and your ships, and kill our own citizens and your citizens. Our course is charted. There will be no turning back. I bid you be of brave heart as you fight on.

Mobilization for Human Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the President and broadcast over a Nation-wide hook-up on the 3d of October in connection with the 1941 Community Mobilization for Human Needs.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Once more I am making a straightforward, simple appeal to the people of our country to support a great annual event—the community mobilization for human needs. Most of you do not recognize this name, but it represents the tying together of hundreds of local community efforts known as "community chests" or "community funds" or "welfare drives." These represent consolidations of many thousands of local charities run by churches, social-welfare organizations, health associations, and many others.

The American people have given generously in the past—very generously.

But this year I hope the American people will give more than ever before.

That is because in a great world threat to our future we must, for ourselves and our country, preserve and make secure our values and the strength of our institutions.

It is true that more people are at work in our land today than ever before. It is true that our national income is rising. But it is still true that millions of our fellow citizens are still under-nourished, ill-clad, and poorly housed. Bad health maims too many of our American households.

We must build up, not merely our Army and our Navy but we must build up the well-being of our civilian population.

In past years we have done this through a great humanitarian revival. This year we must do it for the added reason that adequate national defense definitely needs it.

Once more I point out to you that the Federal Government cannot and ought not to try to cover the whole field of social service. Private agencies in every locality are essential, not only for the good of the sick and the children and the mothers and the poor but they are of the utmost importance in instilling charity or greater love of our fellow beings in the hearts of all of us as individuals.

We can afford to be better neighbors to our neighbors. We can afford to give support to those noble men and women whose lives are devoted to the help of their fellows.

It would be a calamity for the Nation and its future if private charity did not exist and grow. That is why I am asking each and every individual in every town and village and on every farm to contribute something, large or small, toward this great and proven service. You will be helping to build a stronger and a better America. When I have said that, I have said all that is necessary, for it is a spiritual as well as a practical appeal to the better natures of my fellow citizens.

Repeal of Neutrality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. ALBERT B. CHANDLER, OF KENTUCKY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the able address delivered last evening by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] over the American Forum of the Air on the subject Shall We Repeal the Neutrality Act?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the light of events which have occurred with such lightning rapidity since 1939 it now seems apparent that the passage of the so-called repeal of the Arms Embargo Act in 1939 was in no sense a return to international law. It constituted a complete abandonment of those principles of freedom of the seas and neutral rights for which America had fought in 1798, 1805, 1812, and 1917. The President expressed the belief in 1939 that the arms embargo was vitally dangerous to American neutrality, American security, and American peace. But, in order to avoid a recurrence of events prior to our entrance into the war in 1917, we forbade all vessels and citizens to go to any European belligerent port thereby inviting the Germans to sink on sight all neutral ships without fear or protest from the Government of the United States. Hitler and his associates took full advantage of this opportunity and realized at once that this new standard of 1939 was not an entirely unmixed blessing for their enemies. Twenty-two years ago the United States had gone to war with Germany rather than accept the German terms which would have allowed one American vessel each week to go to Britain.

While the preamble of the bill stated that we waived none of our own rights and privileges, or those of any of our nationals, under international law, the text of the bill was an utter abandonment of neutral rights and freedom of the seas. By this act we sought earnestly to avoid bringing America into the war because of the obvious desire of all of the people of the country to avoid war, if humanly possible. We did a thing that had never before been done in the history of our country. That is, close the high seas to the use of our own ships, and those of 21 other neutrals. This, in spite of the fact that we had always insisted from time immemorial upon full respect for our rights to be free upon the high seas. That it has failed to accomplish its purpose is apparent. That we must at once either modify it, or repeal it, at least to the extent that we serve notice upon the German Government that we intend to arm our merchant ships in their own defense, and further that we intend to see that shipments of munitions and supplies authorized under the Lend Lease Act will reach their destination in safety.

We must strengthen the arm of the President of the United States and of Secretary Hull. We must not permit England and Russia to fall through our failure to supply them with the munitions and supplies which they so urgently need at this time. We must go forward with assurance and strength which this country possesses in such abundance. We must rely upon the leadership of the President of the United States and a divine providence, and it is my belief that providence usually walks with those who show by their deeds that they merit its protection.

Without aid immediately and in large proportions from the United States, Russia will be lost, England might also inevitably fall. If such a thing should occur it would place the United States in a position which some of our short-sighted statesmen have seemingly wished for, isolated and alone. We must realize that destiny has placed us in the position of being in or out. We must either cooperate while there is yet time, and while we have Allies, or become reconciled to the final act of this great tragedy when we shall have to defend ourselves alone. It is my sincere belief that a defeat for Russia

and Britain will bring disaster to the United States. We could not then defend ourselves against the combined power and resources of a ruthless German Government. Slave labor would be used to overcome the work of freemen and gradually the aggressors on the east and west would tighten the ring around the United States. This country must become wide awake to the dangers that threaten us. We do not escape danger by being weak, or by being afraid. We must shake off any spirit of defeatism which exists in the country. We must be "up and doing with a heart for any fate." America must put its faith in its own strength and in its own determination. It cannot expect President Roosevelt and Mr. Hull to achieve peace for the people of the country with a man of the caliber of Hitler who does not keep any agreement he makes. His attack on Russia was made in the face of a definite statement to his own Reichstag in September 1939, that he would not go to war as an enemy against Russia again. In his statement there he asserted that they had been enemies in 1917 and had fought on opposite sides with the result that both had been the losers. He vowed then that this would not happen again. The record speaks for itself.

We must remember, in this critical hour our country's history, that this is a world revolution and that we may not be able to escape its consequences. We must prepare ourselves in every way to help crush it. Churchill seems to have been the only statesman in Europe who realized the futility of dealing with the German military dictator. Churchill asserted that if this dictator came to England that they would fight him in every village and town and on every beach until one or the other perished. That seems to be the only way for the establishment of an enduring peace. Dr. Frederick Schuman, in his recent revealing book, Night Over Europe, states the case well when he says:

"In the days to come the fittest will survive and rule the world. The unfit will fail and lose body and soul. The fittest will be those who know that the world is one. The fittest will be those that know that national sovereignty and international anarchy are marked for death; that laissez-faire, feeble government, the rule of money and property are alike lost forever; that new visions and new life-giving deeds must replace the shibboleths of yesterday. The fittest will be those who know how to reconcile their preferences with stubborn facts. The fittest will be those who realize that the world of tomorrow belongs to the peoples who care enough about their way of living to sacrifice their prejudices and their wish dreams as well as their safety and their very lives in its defense. Only those are fit who are in form and attuned to the needs of the world as it is, not as they imagine or wish it to be. Only those who see why an old world is dying are fit to make a new world after their heart's desire. The fit will conquer the future."

Dedication of Waterman Memorial Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ADDRESS BY ELROY NEWTON CLARK

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, at Burlington, Vt., last Saturday, October 4, exercises were held incident to the dedication of the Charles Winfield Waterman and Anna Rankin Waterman Memorial Building on the campus of the University of Vermont. Charles Winfield Waterman was a Senator of the United States from the State of Colorado, and I know that many of us had the honor of associating with him here as a colleague before he passed away. On the occasion of the dedication of the memorial building an address was delivered by Elroy Newton Clark, of Denver, Colo., who, as well as Senator Waterman, was a native-born Vermonter. Both these men were together in the University of Vermont, members of the same class, and went to Denver and practiced the law there in the same firm. The address delivered by Mr. Clark is entitled to national consideration not only because of its references to a former Senator of the United States and to his gentlewoman wife, but also the address was singularly inspiring and encouraging to citizens of the United States who support and develop such institutions of learning as the University of Vermont, which combines a private eleemosynary institution with a State agricultural college in a union that has a public character under the patronage of the United States as well of the State.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Mr. Elroy Newton Clark on the occasion of the dedication of the memorial building.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, members of the board of trustees of the university, the faculty, undergraduates, ladies and gentlemen, we are met on this hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the university, you to receive and I to present to you, and especially to the undergraduates of this venerable institution, the final concrete embodiment of the life work of a distinguished alumnus and a loyal native son of this Commonwealth of Vermont.

As we stand here at its portal I can fancy that the silent shadowy forms of Ira Allen, Lafayette, Angel, Buckham, Powers, Waterman, and a host of other founders, teachers, and students mingle with us and silently approve. The university has received many splendid tributes from its grateful alumni, but none more impressive than this.

More than 60 years ago a young man came down from his modest home in your hills to qualify himself for the conflict which has confronted every young man and woman who has gone forth from these halls of learning during the past century and a half. In 1926 that youth, grown to manhood, after a brilliant professional career, was a candidate for the United States Senate, and at his request I wrote a brief sketch of his life. With your indulgence, I should like to repeat a pen picture of his early youth as depicted in that short biography:

"A little hillside farm carved by a sturdy ancestry from a New England wilderness, little fields walled with rocks laboriously gathered from their none too generous soil. A modest frame cottage, miles from a schoolhouse. A slender barefoot boy of 14 guiding a plow behind a team of drowsy oxen, or wielding a scythe or hoe, or gazing wistfully out across the few ancestral acres, over wooded hill and tumbling stream, into the great unknown world beyond. Seeing visions and dreaming dreams. Bidding adieu in the quiet, repressed fashion of boys brought up amidst such surroundings, to a gentle-faced mother and gray-bearded father who wish him Godspeed and all good fortune, and who would gladly furnish the youthful cavalier with good steed and brave trappings and armor, but could not because the land was lean and afforded scant sustenance for even those who tilled it. But they gave him a splendid heritage of clear vision, cool judgment, and dauntless courage."

That was the boy who, some 4 years later, matriculated here. At that early period of his evolution he gave little promise of one day becoming a national figure, but did receive his inspiration here, and here continued to see visions and dream dreams of the future. The acorn does not reveal the majestic size to which the embryo oak imprisoned in its shell may grow.

Men come and men go. Few of them leave any memorial to indicate to future generations that they have passed this way. Charles Winfield Waterman left this campus in 1885. He departed with no vainglorious thought of some day erecting here a monument to preserve his memory and perpetuate his fame. But I suspect that even in those distant days he nurtured an ambition to repay in service the inspiration debt which he felt he owed to the University of Vermont. It does not fall to the lot of many men to reach the goal of their ambition. To him it did. He has paid that debt in full measure. At the end of an honorable and brilliant career in a distant State and in the council chambers of his country he came back and laid all that he had gained upon the altar of his alma mater.

Undergraduates, this beautiful structure will remain an inspiration to you and those who come after you as long as brick and mortar shall cling together. It will touch you and speak to you and them for generations to come—the mystic touch of a vanished hand and the sound of a voice that is stilled, but forever dynamic and always vibrant, an inspiring tradition of dauntless courage and undying loyalty.

The trustees of the Waterman fund have finished their task. The architects and the builders have completed theirs. There remains only the formality of turning over to you and posterity the incarnate realization of a youthful vision, the brick and mortar embodiment of a dream come true and its dedication and consecration to the high purposes of the donor and founder. In the thought, and in part the words of Lincoln at Gettysburg, "In a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate. * * * The world will little note nor long remember what we say here," but as long as these walls stand, an ever-lengthening procession of teachers and students will remember what he did here. It is for them to dedicate themselves to those high purposes reflected in this splendid gift to them—not a mausoleum but a temple of hope and inspiration.

On behalf of my cotrustee and myself, and in the name of Charles Winfield Waterman and his wife, Anna Rankin Waterman, in deep humility but with pardonable pride, I present to you this beautiful memorial. May it endure as long as the morning shadows of Mansfield hover over it.

I realize full well the futility of this wish; I know that in the fullness of time another Kingsley may stand here and lament:

"How swift the words of men, back to earth again,
Ancient and holy things, fade like a dream."

But the breed of builders never dies. The spirit of loyalty and of progress will still survive after these walls have crumbled to dust. Above the lamentations of a future Kingsley will rise the triumphant song of a Holmes:

"Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul,
As the swift seasons roll;
Leave thy low-vaulted past.
Let each new temple, nobler than the last,
Shut thee from heaven with a dome more vast,
Till thou at length art free,
Leaving thine outgrown shell by life's unresting sea."

My good friends, I bid you now to enter, possess, and enjoy this stately mansion—this new temple of spiritual liberty and loyalty, and put it to the high uses which inspired its creation and which are reflected in the legend inscribed on the great seal of the university:

"Studiis et rebus honestis."

I leave it confidently in your keeping and in the keeping of those who will succeed you down through the ages—a sacred trust to you and them.

Objectives of the American Bar Association and the International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ADDRESS BY WALTER P. ARMSTRONG, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, on October 3, 1941, there was a luncheon in the Claypool Hotel at Indianapolis, Ind., in honor of Walter P. Armstrong, who was elected president of the American Bar Association. Mr. Armstrong delivered an address at that luncheon. I was attracted by what the newspapers said about it, principally the last part of his address, in which he devoted his remarks to the international question that is presented before the world today and suggested the viewpoint which the lawyers of America ought to take and the activities in which they should indulge in connection with that great question. Because of that portion of the address, although the entire address is very illuminating, I was influenced to telegraph Mr. Armstrong at Memphis, Tenn., where he resides, for a copy of the entire address. I have received it, and now hold it in my hand. I ask unanimous consent, for the reasons I have stated, that it be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD. I think it is a very illuminating address, particularly to the attorneys of the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are in my heart feelings it would be ungracious not to express and in my mind thoughts which I must voice that we may understand one another.

I have a deep appreciation of the honor you have conferred upon me. I hope you will not think it immodest of me to say that I consider it the highest nonofficial honor that can come to an American lawyer. For many years the American Bar Association has been a sort of religion with me. I have found more pleasure and satisfaction in my work in the association than in anything else I have ever undertaken. So while I fully realize that there are many others equally or more deserving than I, I yield to none in my belief in the association's mission, my devotion to its cause, and my determination by every means in my power to advance its interests.

I have a unique feeling about a recognition that comes to me from lawyers. They are so keen in their observance of one another and so realistic in their appraisals, that when one receives—whether or not one merits—their approval, one has at least survived an ordeal by battle.

Your lances have often found the chinks in my armor. Yet, in your generosity, you are willing that, for a little while, I should ride with the head of the column. I hope—I am determined—I shall not fail you.

I shall say only enough to enable you to understand what I am trying to do throughout the coming year. This I do because this is the only opportunity I shall have to express in advance to the association as a whole the vision I see.

It is not the prerogative of the president to determine the policy of the association, though he has not only the right but the duty of invoking, through proper channels, the action of the policy-making bodies upon subjects that he conceives to be of major importance. No president has a right to commit, or seem to commit, the association either to any action or any view that is merely a personal hobby of his own.

Moreover, the only way we can hope to obtain our objectives is by reasonable continuity of policy. If we merely zigzag from point to point we shall arrive nowhere. I need seek no further for an illustration than to emphasize what folly it would be to forfeit the gains made during the past year by failing to carry on the constructive work done under the splendid leadership of President Lashly.

The president, however, should be no outmoded seismograph, quiescent except to record the will of the association when it reaches temblor proportions. Subject always to the supervision of the house of delegates and board of governors, he has room for selection, as to the emphasis he, at least, shall place upon the various activities of the association. Not infrequently he must be the sole judge of the timeliness of presenting the various parts of the association's program.

Moreover, from time to time questions arise as to which the president need not hesitate to take a position, even though the association has not officially acted upon them. These are subjects upon which the views of the association are clearly implicit because of what it has done or said upon other subjects, or as a matter of general policy. As to these the president should be able to sense the views of the association and to express them with inerrancy and fidelity.

In short, my view is that I am your representative and not a mere delegate.

Because of world conditions, in which our own country is so deeply involved, one who would at this time venture to formulate an inexorable and inelastic program must either possess the vatic gift or be recklessly foolhardy. I know I do not have the one. I hope I am not the other. Therefore, the things I shall say are, to some extent, necessarily tentative conclusions.

So far as is now foreseeable, however, it seems that in the coming year the activities of the association can be cast in a fairly symmetrical pattern. The American Bar Association is not a reactionary organization. Its record is not one of intransigency, but one of sane progress. It has opposed change only when convinced that the proposed change was unnecessary and was contrary to some fundamental tenet of our system of government. There is no place in our creed for "lost causes, forsaken beliefs, and impossible loyalties." I would go even further—when changes are made that we would not have initiated we should yet assist in implementing and improving them so that they may function in a way best for all. We desire no place in the tent of the sulker. So, not wedded to the old, because of long-accustomed slow-pulsed acquiescence, and not enamored of the new because of a restless zest for change, we face the future, impatient with old abuses but somewhat skeptical of untried novelties, earnestly endeavoring to ascertain, to plan, and to help achieve whatever is best, not for ourselves but for our country.

Most of the objectives of our association are long-range objectives. Our constitution speaks of some of them. Ours is the self-imposed task of advancing the science of jurisprudence, of promoting the administration of justice, in all its modern forms and forums and of upholding the honor of the profession. Moreover, we have a general-welfare cause. We have assumed the burden of correlating the activities of the State bar organizations in the interest of the public.

These are positions that cannot be taken by assault. There is no zero hour. The advance has not been fast—indeed, oftentimes so slow that some of us have been forced to accept the reluctant philosophy of Horace Mann, who, as he looked back upon the slow progress some of his reforms had made, consoled himself with the thought, "The trouble was that I was in a hurry and God was not." We have lost some redoubts. Our line has sometimes been pushed back, but it has remained unbroken. On the whole, we have not only steadily advanced, but have consolidated our gains.

I shall not trespass upon your time by attempting to catalog all the ships we have launched. We have promoted the administration of justice by serving for the duration in the long fight to reform Federal procedure. We have advanced the science of jurisprudence by helping revoluntionize legal education. We have upheld the honor of the profession by formulating a code of ethics, and securing its acceptance by bar and bench. If we had accomplished only these things—and we have accomplished many more—we would at least in some measure have vitalized the vision that came to Judge Baldwin and his friends at Saratoga in 1878.

Not in an attempt to exhaust the list, but for the purpose of further illustration, I mention, also, the Journal, uniform State laws, legal aid, unauthorized practice, law lists, judicial salaries, judicial selection and judicial tenure, and laws affecting the rights of employees on labor relations. My purpose in alluding to these is to emphasize my conviction that their importance must not be lost sight of because of the present emergency. Indeed, one of the dangers of any emergency is that its exigent demands may generate a forgetfulness of other things, whose importance may be temporarily obscured but is in no wise lessened.

Because of our financial situation and the demands of the present and the immediate future, we may temporarily not be able to treat some of these activities as generously as we should like. This must not be taken as evidence of any diminution of interest. One and all we realize that the momentum must not be lost before comes that happier time when they can resume full speed ahead.

Some of our objectives are so basically related to our system of government that efforts on their behalf are always timely. Even as to these, however, a due sense of proportion demands that the extent of our efforts vary from time to time according to the conditions that confront us. In this connection it seems to me that the time is at hand when the association should not only not lessen, but, if possible, increase its efforts to deal with administrative tribunals in accordance with the principles formulated by the House of Delegates at the 1941 midwinter meeting.

Our desire to subject the work of administrative tribunals to the scrutiny of the courts—to test the new method, to some extent at least, by the old—in no sense indicates a complacent satisfaction with the old. Contrariwise, we recognize the need of constant improvement. Nor are we unwilling to borrow from the new methods that will better implement the old. In the Federal field the Rules of Civil Procedure have

revolutionized practice. The question of amending the rules is now upon us. Here again the association should take the initiative, especially in seeking to determine the best method by which proposed amendments can be brought before the court for its consideration.

The American Law Institute is sponsoring a code which will greatly liberalize the rules of evidence in those jurisdictions which adopt it. The association should consider whether it will seek to have its principles accepted, especially in the Federal courts.

We have committed ourselves to the revision of the Judicial Code. We should consider whether the time is propitious now to press this work without incurring the danger of diminishing the jurisdiction of the Federal courts.

These things seem to me to fall within a single framework: Proper judicial review of the adjudications of administrative tribunals, coupled with improvement and liberalization of the judicial process.

We cannot confine our efforts to the Federal courts. The impetus given to the reform of State practice by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure has been stepped up many times by the untiring and constructive work of the special committee on improving the administration of justice under the splendid leadership of Judge Parker. We must carry this work forward and to a conclusion, while the bar, the bench, and the people are in the mood, and while the vast store of accumulated material is available. We have repeatedly professed our faith in the courts. We must now demonstrate our ability to equip them to cope with present-day demands.

But beyond all this, wherever we turn, we recognize the impact of the gravity of the hour in the lines of every face we see. We are endeavoring and shall endeavor by all means in our power to contribute to national defense.

We have been fortunate in the constructive leadership of President Lashly. Mr. Beckwith's committee has vindicated its claim that the organized bar is the people's lawyer. The committee on coordination of national defense has made a substantial contribution by assisting in formulating legislation.

In this defense program I think we can also find a harmonious design: Aid to service men and their families; defense legislation; our duty, as phrased by the bill of rights committee in its report, "to give the fullest cooperation to the country during this grave period, and yet forestall that hysteria which always tends toward the obliteration of civil rights or unnecessary limitations of them."

With these things I would couple and suggest the expansion of the work of the junior bar conference and the standing committee on American citizenship, whose chartered purpose is "to devise ways and means for promoting the study of and devotion to American institutions and ideals."

I have spoken to you of concrete things. We have a job to do and cannot content ourselves with pious hopes. There is, however, something that seems to me to pervade all that I have said—something that is innate in all that we do or attempt to do—the existence and efficient organization of an independent and courageous bar are essential to the proper functioning of a democracy such as ours. To you I need not elaborate upon this belief, nor give reasons. This only do I say: The decadence of the bar would be among the greatest disasters that could befall our way of life. But it will not decay. It will survive—survive with ever-growing strength—survive because the American Bar Association will give to the lawyers of America leadership—leadership which will show them how they can and must continue to be as they have always been, one of the most salutary influences in American life.

President Lashly has dealt adequately and eloquently with the imponderables that pervade the present emergency. There is little I need add, except emphatically to associate myself with what he has said. We are all agreed that the success of the forces of evil which are personified in Hitler would be a grave and imminent threat, not only to the ideals of liberty, which we have always cherished, to the freedom of religion which we have always held sacred, but to our national security itself. The forces against which we are arrayed are, for the present, at least, disciplined forces moving with insensate and almost insane fury at the will of one man. To me it seems a self-evident fact that a democracy such as ours cannot combat these forces unless it imposes upon itself severe self-discipline. In helping the American people attain this self-discipline, the bar of America can render significant service. Aside from those who hold responsible public offices, lawyers, by training and experience, constitute the group best fitted to lead public opinion. Indeed, in this the members of the bar have one advantage over those charged with the duties of office. They are answerable only to their own conscience, and not to any constituent. They need have no fear that they will advance so rapidly that they will lose contact with their followers. The time has come for plain speaking.

The American people must be told not only boldly, but bluntly, the need for self discipline to which I have alluded; a discipline that must loyally and unanimously support the decisions of our Government after they are made, without carping criticism or partisan bickering, not the suppression of free speech, but the expression of informed patriotism; a discipline which will generate a public opinion which will irresistibly demand that those engaged in production begin to forget themselves and to think of their country; a discipline that will create in our minds an awareness that if the elimination of Hitler and Hitlerism is essential to our security the time is almost at hand when the question of how that can most effectively be accomplished is one largely of strategy for those best informed and in authority; a discipline which will make us realize that it is futile merely to strive for fancied security for weeks, months, or even a few short years, which would make us realize we are charting a course not only for ourselves, but for our children and our children's children—that must make us tough fibered enough to give, if necessary, our today for their tomorrow.

As urgent and as necessary a thing as this discipline is, it can only be achieved by the people themselves. Upon whether or not they can achieve it—short of a great ground swell of emotional patriotism engendered by actual armed conflict—depends in large part the future of our country. Realistically to aid in fostering this discipline furnishes the greatest opportunity and the most serious responsibility that has come or can come to the bar in our time.

Gliders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. HENRY H. ARNOLD

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, recently I went to Elmira, New York, to make some observations at the training school there relative to transports insofar as gliders are concerned. It was indeed a very interesting trip, and I am hopeful that those interested in the military advancement of the country may find themselves more thoroughly interested in the development of that branch of our national service.

On my return I read in the magazine Soaring, a very interesting article by Major General Henry H. Arnold, entitled "Speaking for the Army." I ask that the article be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Soaring of July-August 1941]

SPEAKING FOR THE ARMY

(Maj. Gen. Henry H. Arnold)

(Radio talk delivered by Maj. Gen. Henry H. Arnold, Deputy Chief of Staff for Air, Chief of the Army Air Forces, at Elmira, N. Y., 6:45 p. m., July 13, 1941, over station WENY)

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, I want you all to know I have had a very interesting time on Harris Hill this afternoon.

[NOTE.—The general had made a flight in a glider.]

In Napoleon's time armies fought on their stomachs. As long as combat was confined to water and land, warfare was not a very complicated matter, but when the Wright brothers proposed to the War Department 33 years ago that there was a place in warfare for a power-driven glider very few military authorities realized it, but the whole scheme of combat changed. From that time on, to be effective armies had to be equipped with all the scientific devices that the ingenious brain of modern man could evolve and produce.

This afternoon we witnessed the closing events of the national soaring contest here in Elmira, the glider capital of the Nation. For the first time since the Wright brothers put an engine in a glider and sold it to the War Department a powerless plane bearing the red, white, and blue insignia of the Army air forces and flown by an Air Corps officer soared over these hills along with those competing in the contest.

It happened here because for more than 6 months the Army air forces have been engaged in engineering research and training in connection with the prospective use of troop-carrying gliders. Once again we are embarking upon a new form of warfare. The glider has become a weapon. Within 90 days we hope to have experimental troop-carrying gliders delivered to the Army air forces so that we may determine by actual experience how best they may be employed in the country's defense.

Already two groups of Army officers, expert airplane pilots, have successfully completed courses in glider instruction. Additional classes will be started in the immediate future. Our decision of months ago, to study the use of gliders in warfare, was horribly justified just a few weeks ago when German troops swarmed down in gliders onto the island of Crete and captured the historic Greek island after bloody fighting.

They came in gliders carrying from 12 to 30 soldiers. They were towed by lumbering old transports unsuited for aerial combat but ideal for this new purpose with as many as 10 or 11 gliders strung out behind each plane. In an incredibly short time, the Germans, by air transport and gliders, landed 15,000 troops on the island, together with their rifles, light machine guns, heavy machine guns, and field pieces. They even brought medical supplies and radio equipment. If we ever had doubts about the military usefulness of the glider, those doubts

certainly would have been dispelled by the awful lesson of Crete.

We in the Army Air Forces have never denied or failed to appreciate the military possibilities of the glider. Power-driven planes have been our first consideration, because our geographical position has made that necessary. Our first priority must go to the long-range, heavy bomber, a weapon so necessary to carry out our policy of hemisphere defense. But that did not and does not now mean that, merely because our great distances make our military situation different from that of Europe, we have ignored the glider. Far from it—we knew that a modern army must have all new implements of war to be effective. Tanks, armored divisions, air infantry, parachute troops—all of them are necessary if we are to defend ourselves successfully.

We can't expect to tow strings of gliders behind airplanes over 3,000 miles of ocean, but we are certain that there are many missions for gliders which may develop in the future. For this reason, we don't know today what final form our glider force will take. We won't know until we have completed our studies, which are being undertaken here, at other gliding centers, and in our laboratories at Wright Field in Dayton, Ohio. We do know that we must have gliders, perhaps hundreds and possibly thousands of them, capable of carrying at least 15 men each, together with full equipment, including rifles, machine guns, and even lighter cannon.

Here in Elmira are gathered men and women who have kept the art of glider flying alive in this country, where restraint never has made it necessary, as was the case with Germany, for us to find a substitute for the expensive powered plane. This little band of soaring enthusiasts already has helped us in our studies, plans, and training. With their continual help, we shall have a glider force second to none, ready for service whenever and wherever it may be needed. That we all hope will never be. We have not been caught napping, nor will we be. We shall have such a force, and we will have it when we need it.

Pacific Northwest Power Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HOMER T. BONE AND REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN F. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement coming from the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], our colleague, who is now in the hospital, and Representative MARTIN SMITH. The title of the statement is "Pacific Northwest Power Resources Must Not Be Run by Political Bureau with Headquarters 3,000 Miles Away."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACIFIC NORTHWEST POWER RESOURCES MUST NOT BE RUN BY POLITICAL BUREAU WITH HEADQUARTERS 3,000 MILES AWAY

Two bills vitally affecting the future of the Pacific Northwest have been introduced in Congress. Both bills would set up a permanent Columbia Power Authority to replace the present temporary agency operating Bonneville and Grand Coulee electric systems. Both bills provide machinery for acquisition of privately owned electric utilities by the Authority, and resale to cities and P. U. D.'s of the distribution systems so acquired.

But these bills differ otherwise on seven important principles and on many details. One of these bills was drafted wholly by the Interior Department, with certain revisions suggested by Senator BONE. The other, known as S. 1852, was drafted by Senator BONE, with the aid of Congressman MARTIN SMITH, other Members of the State's congressional delegation, officers of the Interior and Treasury Departments, representatives of the Federal Power Commission, and representatives of labor and other organizations. This is the Bone-Smith bill.

SEVEN REAL ISSUES

While Mr. Ickes, in speeches in the Northwest, has conveyed the impression that the issue raised by the two bills is whether one man or three men shall run the Authority, that is relatively a minor issue, although not without importance. Here are the real issues:

1. Shall the Authority be plunged into politics by being made a mere arm of a political bureau, the Department of the Interior; or be a nonpolitical independent agency?

2. Shall the Authority be run by an official 3,000 miles away in Washington, D. C.; or be operated by a fully responsible board residing in the region of operation?

3. Shall the Authority be allowed to exercise arbitrary and dictatorial control over municipalities with which it does business; or shall the Authority be restricted by law to permit a large measure of local autonomy to cities, towns, and public-utility districts in operation of their plants?

4. Shall employees of Columbia Power Authority be denied rights important to labor and enjoyed by employees of private business and by employees of T. V. A.; or shall the Authority be required by law to bargain collectively with its employees?

5. Shall the administrator of Columbia Power Authority be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior without notice and without possibility of appeal or hearing; or shall a board or single administrator be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate after public hearings?

6. Shall we rely on the vague hope that future Congresses will appropriate to develop the Columbia Basin irrigation project; or shall adequate and definite provision for construction of the project be made now?

7. Shall the Authority be so surrounded with bureaucratic routine and red tape that it will take weeks to accomplish what ought to be done in days; or shall the agency be set up like a modern streamlined private business?

ICKES BILL IS UNSOUND

The Ickes bill places the Columbia Power Authority in politics and would permit any Secretary of the Interior to change without notice the policies and high administrative personnel of the Authority. The present or any future Secretary could appoint an administrator without Senate confirmation or even a public hearing. It would be possible in the future to have an administrator appointed who is opposed to the principles and practice of operating public power agencies. In other words, the Secretary of the Interior would be the real administrator, and every time the national administration changed or a new Secretary was appointed, the Columbia Power Authority would be in jeopardy.

On the other hand, the Bone-Smith bill provides for operation along the lines of T. V. A. The President would appoint a board of three, subject to Senate confirmation. If there were any doubt about the character and qualifications of a nominee, he could be searchingly examined at a public hearing. The board members would serve for 9 years, one member's term expiring every 3 years, thus assuring continuity of policies that fit our Northwest needs.

WASHINGTON, D. C., TOO FAR AWAY

The Ickes bill is impractical in that it proposes to operate a vast business enterprise from 3,000 miles away. It can't be done efficiently. Dr. Paul J. Raver, now Administrator, could do a better job if he were left free to work out his problems without being checked by Interior Department officials who know little about the technical problems on which they pass judgment.

Mr. Ickes has declared that his bill provides for quick-on-the-trigger administration, while the Bone-Smith bill provides for a debating society to run the Authority. The fact is the Ickes bill provides for four administrators, one above the other, permitting endless appeals on up the line. The administrator at Portland would be subject to the rulings of an assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, who would in turn be responsible to the Secretary, who in turn would take orders from the President. In contrast, the Bone-Smith bill provides for a single, responsible board, decisions of which would be final.

Under the Ickes plan anyone dissatisfied with the Administrator's ruling on such a matter as a contract could, if he had political pull, bring pressure to bear at Washington, D. C., to win his point. Disturbing reports have been received that such things have already been done.

HOW ABOUT HOME RULE?

The cities of Washington, such as Tacoma and Seattle and smaller places, have been successfully running power plants for a long time. They do not want the Authority to run their affairs for them. Under the Ickes bill the Authority could force public agencies and cooperatives that buy power from the Authority to sign contracts that would result in transferring a considerable measure of control of city and public-utility-district electric systems to the Federal agency. Under the Bone-Smith bill that would not be possible because the bill prohibits such dictatorial contracts. Which do you want—autocratic rule by Mr. Ickes or home rule by elected officials of cities and public-utility districts?

The Ickes bill is not satisfactory to labor for two reasons: It does not provide for collective bargaining; and it would require labor to negotiate with Federal officers separated from our State by the width of the continent. The Bone-Smith bill, on the other hand, is approved by labor. The provisions in the Bone-Smith bill are based on the satisfactory experience of T. V. A. with collective bargaining.

PROVISION FOR IRRIGATION

If the Bone-Smith bill goes through as now written, the future development of the Columbia Basin irrigation project is certain. The bill provides a definite formula for contribution of a portion of the power revenues from Grand Coulee Dam to aid in reclamation of basin lands. This contribution will bring reclamation costs down to a point where settlers can make farming pay. Yet the bill prohibits increase in power rates beyond the present Bonneville schedules.

The Ickes bill ties in the Columbia Power Authority with the General Accounting Office in the usual way. This would prevent the Authority from operating with the freedom and efficiency of a private business. The General Accounting Office—slow, ponderous, and overloaded with work—would impose all the usual restrictions on the Authority. The T. V. A. has been fighting to free its hands of the interminable red tape of G. A. O. On the other hand, the Bone-Smith bill takes advantage of the T. V. A. experience and provides the same sort of accounting checks as a private business has. While funds of the Authority are adequately safeguarded, the

endless quarreling with G. A. O. about details is eliminated. * * * In other words, the Bone-Smith bill is designed to set up an agency which, as far as possible, will be as quick acting as the best sort of private enterprise.

THE LONG VIEW

The Bone-Smith bill has been drafted on the basis of the long view ahead, in entire disregard of personalities of present or future Cabinet officers. Remember that no matter how well or how little you like Mr. Ickes, no one knows how long he will be Secretary of the Interior.

Senator BONE and Congressman SMITH will be glad to hear from anyone interested in the issues involved in the two bills. They want to know how the people stand on the question of centralizing control of our State's most important resource in an official in Washington, D. C.

Petition of the Indianapolis Association of Credit Men for a Sounder National Fiscal Policy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 29, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have filed today in the House of Representatives a supplemental petition signed by many outstanding businessmen of our city and State urging upon the Congress of the United States its obligation to bring about a sharp reduction in nondefense governmental expenditures. The signers are members of the Indianapolis Association of Credit Men, a large and influential group of business people which is taking the lead among business organizations throughout the country in calling attention to the perilous condition of our national finances and the danger of continuous spending vastly in excess of national revenues. Merritt Fields, the executive manager of the Indianapolis Association of Credit Men, is a keen student of the fiscal problems of government.

The objective of these businessmen is a reduction of at least $2,000,000,000 in the nondefense appropriations. Specifically, they invite favorable attention to the cuts proposed in itemized form by Dr. George S. Benson, president of Harding College, Searcy, Ark., in his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on May 15, last. Those cuts foot up to a total of $2,031,000,000.

In their petition to Congress the Indianapolis businessmen say:

> We, the undersigned, at the suggestion of the Indianapolis Association of Credit Men, who have to pay, and will pay cheerfully, for the defense of our country, earnestly urge Congress to devote as much thought to cutting expenses as is devoted to raising taxes. That seems only fair.

On July 15 last I submitted to the House, with remarks which I deemed appropriate at the time, the first installment of these petitions, signed by many hundreds of businessmen, voicing the hope of business for a sounder and more judicious national fiscal policy. The signers of the supplemental petition which I introduced today are as follows:

Company	Address	Representative
American National Bank	Indianapolis, Ind	J. S. Rogan.
Associated Silver Co	Chicago, Ill	G. E. Herring.
Benson Hotel Corporation	Indianapolis, Ind	E. W. Benson.
Samuel Bingham's Son Mfg. Co	do	L. D. McShane.
Buescher Band Instrument Co	Elkhart, Ind	E. R. Ong.
Bundy Incubator Co	Springfield, Ohio	B. A. Moyer.
Camillus Cutlery Co	Camillus, N. Y	Alfred B. Kaster.
Cattaraugus Cutlery Co	Little Valley, N. Y	P. T. Champlin.
Clore & Hawkins	Brightwood, Va	(Howard W. Smith.)
Coldwell Lawn Mower Co	Newburgh, N. Y	Hayden W. Wagner.
Commerce Mfg. Co	Commerce, Ga	F. E. Durst.
J. S. Cruse Realty Co	Indianapolis, Ind	C. Otto Janus.
Dean Hill Pump Co	Anderson, Ind	Noble Dean.
Duoform Co	Attica, N. Y	C. E. Brooks.
Equipment Service Co	Indianapolis, Ind	Knox Easterling
F. & N. Lawn Mower Co	Richmond, Ind	Harry E. Roe.
Faries Mfg. Co	Decatur, Ill	G. S. Foster.
Alfred Field & Co., Inc	New York, N. Y	C. A. Corbet.
First Bancredit Corporation	Indianapolis, Ind	Wm. E. Foley.
Georgia & Alabama Warehouse Co	Rome, Ga	N. N. Barnes.
Goshen Mfg. Co	Goshen, Ind	M. L. Cregier.
Griffith Distributing Corporation	Indianapolis, Ind	C. W. Hyde.
Hadley-Mahoney Co	do	H. J. Hadley.
Hincher Mfg. Co. of Indiana	Washington, Ind	E. C. Hermestruff.
Hoosier Mfg. Co	New Castle, Ind	C. L. VanZant.
Indiana Naval Stores Co	Indianapolis, Ind	T. V. Corbin.
Indianapolis Glove Co	do	A. W. Macy.
Do	do	E. V. Akard.
Do	St. Louis, Mo	Donald R. Arthur.
Do	Jackson, Mich	Harry L. Bell.
Do	Richmond, Ind	John W. Black
Do	New York, N. Y	B. M. Bloch.
Do	Seattle, Wash	Harry F. Bradshaw.
Do	Indianapolis, Ind	Ralph E. Brooks, Jr.
Do	do	Henry C. Clayton, Jr.
Do	Charlotte, N. C	C. Corbett Cole.
Do	Indianapolis, Ind	C. V. Curran.
Do	do	E. W. Eastes.
Do	Oklahoma City, Okla	Dewitt Fears.
Do	Indianapolis, Ind	A. G. Fisher.
Do	do	Geo. R. Furry.
Do	do	Perry Ghere.
Do	Pittsburgh, Pa	Robert Ghere.
Do	Birmingham, Ala	Laurence Gray.
Do	Lincoln, Neb	J. V. Harpham.
Do	Coshocton, Ohio	C. O. Heishman.
Do	Eaton, Ohio	W. E. Highland.
Do	Chicago, Ill	Hugh Kearns.
Do	Rushville, Ind	Edward H. Kroencke.
Do	Indianapolis Ind	Herbert Lacy.
Do	Washington, Ohio	John A. Leland.
Do	Springfield, Ohio	W. R. Lowry.
Do	Indianapolis, Ind	Walter G. Lutz.
Do	Huntington, W. Va	C. A. Price.
Do	Richmond, Ind	Russell J. Price.
Do	Marion, Ind	T. B. Risling.
Do	Fremont, Ohio	J. V. Sullivan.
Do	Indianapolis, Ind	W. O. Taber.
Do	Pittsburgh, Pa	Terrance G. Walsh.
Do	Richmond, Va	A. G. Williams.
Do	Charlotte, N. C	H. C. Williams.
Do	Washington, Ohio	G. H. Woodmansee.
Do	Indianapolis, Ind	L. W. Yancey.
Do	do	Charles F. Zwick.
Indianapolis Office Supply Co. Inc	do	Harold J. Hampton.
Keystone Steel & Wire Co	Peoria, Ill	G. H. Greene.
Kingan & Co	Indianapolis, Ind	W. R. Sinclair.
Kokomo Opalescent Glass Co	Kokomo, Ind	R. C. Trees.
Kol-Ax Co., Inc	Stroudsburg, Pa	R. L. Plumb.
J. J. McIntosh Sons Corporation	Tipton, Ind	G. H. McIntosh
McMahan & Leib Co	Anderson, Ind	W. F. Welsh.
Meier Electric & Machine Co	Indianapolis, Ind	Frank L. Meier.
Merchants National Bank	do	Wm. C. Grauel.
Mitchell Mfg. Co	Fort Smith, Ark	Albert Mitchell.
Morganton Furniture Co	Morganton, N. C	(H. L. Thuey.)
Nutz & Grosskopf	Indianapolis, Ind	R. Grosskopf.
Oakes Mfg. Co., Inc	Tipton, Ind	W. A. Zaloudek.
M. O'Connor & Co	Indianapolis, Ind	O. C. Haug.
Omco Products Corporation	Dayton, Ohio	G. A. Thomas.
Paper Art Products Co	Indianapolis, Ind	E. R. Krueger.
Quakertown Stove Works	Quakertown, Pa	N. H. Moyer.
Ready Mixed Concrete Corporation	Indianapolis, Ind	C. D. Gray.
Red Wing Potteries, Inc	Red Wing, Minn	E. H. Rehder.
Reel-Blue Lumber Co	Vincennes, Ind	E. C. Reel.
Rileytown Foods, Inc	Greenfield, Ind	E. J. Brooks.
Rome Mfg. Co	Rome, Ga	N. N. Barnes.
Rose Tire Co., Inc	Indianapolis, Ind	J. A. Rothbard.
Salem China Co	Salem, Ohio	F. W. McKee.
Saaders & Donaldson	Indianapolis, Ind	W. D. Donaldson.
G. I. Sellers & Sons Co	Elwood, Ind	(W. H. Larrabee.)
Shelby Salesbook Co	Shelby, Ohio	Henry E. Sheets.
Shelbyville Desk Co	Shelbyville, Ind	H. E. Karmire.
Shoaf Cutter Co	Indianapolis, Ind	J. S. Brown.
Sneath Glass Co	Hartford City, Ind	A. C. Crimmel.
Southern Coal & Coke Co	Cincinnati, Ohio	E. H. Brooks.
Tennessee Overall Co	Tullahoma, Tenn	B. H. Wilkins, Jr.
Thomasville Chair Co	Thomasville, N. C	J. G. Pennington.
Turner Manufacturing Co	Kokomo, Ind	R. W. Turner.
R. Wallace & Sons Manufacturing Co	Wallingford, Conn	Floyd Wallace.
Baxter Steel Equipment Co	Indianapolis, Ind	R. Norman Baxter.
L. S. Ayres & Co	do	Robert O. Bonner.
Bessire & Co	do	Roy Sahm.
Ridgely Trimmer Co	Springfield, Ohio	E. A. Schaeffer, Jr.
Stokely Bros. & Co	Indianapolis, Ind	J. C. Moore.
Union Trust Co	do	J. E. Reed.

Wings Above the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ARTICLE BY ARTHUR BARTLETT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Pan American Airways has operated so successfully in the Latin-American countries of Central and South America and the Caribbean, and in view of the further fact that the Pan American Airways has done so much to bring about, so to speak, a solidarity of friendship so far as possibly attainable between the 130,000,000 people of the North American Continent and those constituting the population of the Latin American countries of Central and South America and the Caribbean, equal in population to that of the United States, and in view of the further fact that all those who are familiar with our national-defense program and attempted national-defense perfection in the Western Hemisphere are well aware that the Pan American Airways has been of inestimable value to us because of its location of airports in all these countries, as a result of that interest and in appreciation thereof, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article in reference to this development, entitled "Wings Above the World." The article appeared in the special feature magazine of the New York Herald Tribune entitled "This Week," issue of September 21, 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From This Week in the New York Herald Tribune of September 21, 1941]

WINGS ABOVE THE WORLD—MEET JUAN TRIPPE, WHO HAS CARRIED THE AMERICAN FLAG, BY PLANE, TO MORE THAN 50 COUNTRIES AND FORGED A WORLD-WIDE NETWORK OF AIR TRANSPORT—A VITAL CHAPTER IN THE STORY OF OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

(By Arthur Bartlett)

The giant flying boat slid down out of the sky, settled gently in the bay in front of New York's LaGuardia Airport, and taxied up to the dock. The passengers filed out—diplomats, military men, all sorts of dignitaries. As they passed through customs and came into the big rotunda, curious visitors craned their necks. "There's Jimmy Roosevelt." "There's So-and-So—and So-and-So."

Another passenger stepped through the door, a youngish-looking man in a brown suit. A pleased smile lit up his face as somebody stepped forward to grasp his hand. "I wonder who he is," a woman standing near me whispered to her companion. "I wonder if he is anybody." Her voice implied doubt—there seemed no air of importance about him.

Just at that moment somebody stopped him in front of the huge mural map on the rotunda wall—the map with its bold blue lines stretching out across the oceans and linking the continents, the map showing the 75,500 miles of routes flown by the planes of the Pan American Airways to 57 different countries and colonies. If the whispering woman had only known, that map was the answer to her wonderings. It was the record of how the unobtrusive man with the boyish smile had conquered the world. His name was Juan T. Trippe, president of Pan American Airways.

I didn't take it on myself to inform the woman that he was a world conqueror. I doubt that she'd have believed it, anyway. He doesn't look the part. He is too mild. Of course, his conquests have not been military. The ever-more-powerful fleets of airplanes which he has sent through the air have carried not bombs but business to South and Central America, the Orient, Europe, Africa, Australia. Yet it is a fact that Juan Trippe, more than any other one man, is responsible for the fact that today there are bases and flying fields in crucial spots which only yesterday were impenetrable jungles, barren islands, mountain wildernesses—bases and fields which military planes, defending the Americas, would find invaluable.

HAS WHAT IT TAKES

Only last month President Roosevelt announced that the job of ferrying bombers to the British in West Africa had been turned over to Pan American. It was a sensational development—almost as if the Government had commissioned a private company to operate a branch of the postal system. But Pan American had the bases—in this country, in Bermuda, and Brazil and Africa; it had the flying franchises that would be needed, even in Liberia; it had the organization necessary to procure and train and transport pilots and mechanics and ground crews which would assure delivery of the planes ready for immediate combat. Any other outfit, private or governmental, would have had to start from scratch.

I was in Trippe's office one day when a new foreign crisis had arisen. Our talk had to be sandwiched in between long-distance telephone calls and messages. "The State Department is calling * * *." "The Navy wants to know * * *." "The War Department says * * *." So it went.

His organization these days, with its far-flung outposts and rapid communications, is virtually an unofficial arm of the Government. The great air fleets, comprising some 150 planes including the biggest that are in the air anywhere today, play a vital part in the plans of our military strategists. Their pilots—reserve officers almost to a man—are not only just about the most highly skilled aviators in the world, but they know the lands and seas and peoples beyond our immediate frontiers, where our regular military pilots may not ordinarily go.

In the Pan American training school at Miami nearly 2,000 Army and British airmen will this year learn advanced navigation. In the big hangar at LaGuardia Field, N. Y., Pan American mechanics have been overhauling big clippers for the British—clippers which were available only because Pan American ordered them for its own use long ago, and has released them. And of course the clippers which it sends across the Atlantic, ferrying Government officials on their errands of defense, are doing a liaison job of incalculable importance.

"I wonder if he is anybody." Well, there are people who know. There are the Nazis, for instance, who, with their Lufthansa air lines, were entertaining rosy visions of being top dog in South American air transportation—a position of more than commercial importance, as they very well understood—until this soft-spoken American businessman came down and stole the show. Not that the Nazis have given up their visions even yet. Right now, it is commonly reported, they have plans to extend the Lufthansa lines after the war to make them three times as big as Pan American is today. But—Mr. Trippe is pretty good at having visions, too. That's why there is a Pan American today.

His vision probably was a rather vague one when, like many another American boy, he started building model airplanes back in 1910 or so. The real planes that occasionally flew overhead in those days were almost as crude as his models, but he believed in them and had his visions just the same. When he was 17, and a freshman at Yale, World War I came along, and he had his first chance to make the visions come true.

He left college to become a naval aviation pilot. After the war, he came back to Yale and organized a flying club. (He played football, too, and was prominent in other campus activities; but then, as now, he did his stuff unobtrusively, and without any big noise; his nickname at Yale was "The Mummy.") Planes have never been out of his mind since then. His father was a New York banker, so he did make a dutiful stab at settling into the banking business when he finished college, but aviation was still his vision. He made it his business, too, in the early twenties.

TAKING A CHANCE

To most of his friends, except a few young air-minded cronies, that seemed a silly thing to do. Commercial flying in those days consisted mostly of barnstorming—taking passengers up for joy rides. Trippe set himself up as the Long Island Airways, and announced that he was prepared to carry passengers to definite destinations. Three old Army Jennies served as his first air fleet. Trippe, himself, was general manager, pilot, and, most of the time, mechanic. Passengers were infrequent, and it wasn't much of a business. But aviation, as a means of transportation, he insisted, was going to develop.

It did, with his help; and in 1926 he became general manager of the first United States transport air line—the Colonial Air Transport, which ran between New York and Boston. His connection with Colonial lasted only about a year, because the conservative New England shareholders thought his idea of having tri-motored planes built and extending the line to Florida was entirely too visionary.

Trippe withdrew, and with a small group of other ex-war flyers, who put up $25,000 apiece, organized a new company. Plans were vague, but they all agreed with Trippe that there was a future in long-distance commercial flying, and they meant to get into it. In 1927, their ambitions jelled into Pan American, and they began flying mail and passengers from Key West to Habana, with Trippe as general manager. It was the first American venture at overseas flying on a regular commercial route.

In all the fuss of completing financial deals and setting up the company, Trippe found himself with just 2 weeks in which to build the air line if the mail contract was to be carried out on time. He had a skeleton personnel, some Fokker planes and a half-finished airfield on a mud flat at Key West.

But there were no passenger stations or hangars, no arrangements about ports of entry, clearance papers, and all the official rigamarole which had now to be worked out for the first time in American history for an international air line. Nevertheless, on deadline day a Pan American plane flew the 90 miles across the water from Key West to Habana. A week later, regular schedules were under way.

From that time on, the story of Pan American, under Trippe's guidance, moves just about as fast as it did during those first hectic weeks. By the next spring, Trippe was flying over Central America on a survey flight. European lines had been in the Americas to the south for several years, backed officially or unofficially by their governments. That they were going to be tough competition was obvious. They weren't there merely

to make a profit out of transportation. They were there to establish their governments in potentially powerful positions, and if profits had to be temporarily disregarded to do it, that was all right. Nevertheless, Trippe set out to overtake them, not as a government but simply as an American businessman. And he succeeded.

The story of exploration trips through the jungles of South America in laying out routes, of building airfields in place where white men had never before penetrated, of all the engineering marvels of Pan American's expansion to the South, is a story primarily of other men. Trippe thought up the trips, and sent others to do the jobs—impossible or not—and they did them. But in the meantime, Trippe was doing some impossible jobs himself. He and his team were winning franchises in competition with some of the most powerful governments of Europe.

There is, of course, no such thing as freedom of the air. No plane may fly over a foreign country without permission. Germany, Britain, France, and Holland—all arrived in South America ahead of Pan American—could bring diplomatic pressure to get franchises for their government-backed monopoly air lines.

Trippe was on his own. Here and there he bought up lines that already had franchises, looking ahead to the time when he might need them. (He had franchises in the Far East long before the trans-Pacific flights were even possible.) Elsewhere, he sold his air-line service as a business proposition to the governments concerned. He showed them what it could do to expedite business, how it could develop their countries. And he got the franchises—in every country in Central and South America. The lines themselves followed the franchises in.

For some of the survey flights, Pan American engaged Colonel Lindbergh to do the flying. Trippe flew with him, but you would hardly have realized it by looking at the papers of the day. The headlines were all on Lindbergh. Most accounts, near the bottom, added: "Also on the plane was J. T. Trippe, president of Pan American." But South America, even then, was beginning to realize that Trippe was "somebody."

When a Pan American plane flew the first air mail up from Buenos Aires in July 1929—less than 2 years after the first Key West-Habana flight—it included letters from the presidents of most of the South American republics to President Hoover. But it also included letters from those same dignitaries to Juan T. Trippe.

By February 1930 he was able to report an increase in the line's routes from 261 miles (Miami to Habana) to 13,000 miles, within a year. And by September of the same year, Pan American was flying through every country in Central and South America—and was the largest air-transport line in the world.

Next came the Pacific flights in 1936 and the Atlantic flights in 1939—recent events which need no retelling here. Today Pan American's lines stretch from Alaska to Argentina and New Zealand, from China and the Malay States to Portugal and West Africa—in normal times to Ireland, England, and France. And Trippe, chief thinker-upper of this vast chain of things that couldn't be done, is still looking into the future, looking ahead to other impossible tasks.

HISTORY REPEATS

Back more than a century ago Navy records tell of another Trippe—John Trippe, his great-great-grandfather—who commanded the United States ship *Vixen* in the war against the pirates of the Barbary Coast, and was awarded a gold medal and sword by Congress for his part in keeping open America's trade routes. Those were the days when American clipper ships were the best in the world—were carrying American business to the four corners of the earth, winning for America respect and friendship wherever they plied, and bringing to America an era of prosperity such as never had been known before.

"We can do it again," Juan Trippe says today. "Today we hold the leadership on the world's trade routes of the air. When this war is over, if we have held that leadership and can go on holding it, we will be the country that is doing the most to stimulate the trade and commerce which all countries must have to live. They will naturally look to us for leadership. It will be one of the greatest opportunities of all history."

That is what he is dreaming and planning and working for: A new era in which airplanes mightier than any yet seen will link the countries of the world, making ever more insignificant the geographical barriers that used to loom so large. A new world prosperity, in which America will be the leader—not as an overlord, but as an enterprising neighbor. And his dreams have a way of coming true.

Some weeks ago a controversy raged on the floor of the Senate. Another line wished to parallel Pan American's trans-Atlantic service. Talk of monopoly arose, and during the discussion it was suggested that a Government-controlled line might be the eventual answer to the problem of maintaining American supremacy on the trade routes of the air. Said one of the Senators: "If that ever happens, I certainly hope we can get Juan T. Trippe to run it for us."

Attitude of American Legion Toward Senator Clark of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

LETTER WRITTEN BY JOHN J. WICKER, JR., OF RICHMOND, VA.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by John J. Wicker, Jr., of Richmond, Va., which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, correcting the statement made in numerous daily papers with regard to the attitude of the American Legion at its recent national convention at Milwaukee toward the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMP CLARK

In recent articles regarding the American Legion National Convention at Milwaukee, many periodicals and newspapers erroneously stated that United States Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK was greeted with boos when he arose to speak in favor of a resolution against American aid to Russia.

As one of the speakers on the opposite side from Senator CLARK in this matter, I was seated on the convention platform at the time, and am glad to state that when Senator CLARK (who was the first national commander of the American Legion) was recognized, he was greeted not by "boos" but by widespread applause.

There was no booing until, in the course of his remarks, he expressed some very unpopular views. Thereupon, a few hundred out of an audience of several thousand exhibited their strong disagreement with his opinions by some short but loud booing. However, these boos died out quickly.

As a former State commander and national executive committeeman, and as one of the charter members of the Legion, who has attended every national convention, I can truthfully say that BENNETT CHAMP CLARK has the personal respect and confidence of the great majority of American Legionnaires. We disagree violently with his isolationist views and speeches, which many of us consider cockeyed in the extreme, but at the same time, we respect him for his unquestionable honesty, his courage, and his sincerity.

JOHN J. WICKER, JR.

RICHMOND, VA., October 3.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH (PA.) PRESS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, last week was National Newspaper Week. I have read with deep interest the comments that have been made relative to this matter. Surely we are grateful in this country for the freedom of the press. We are indebted to the intrepid men who bring us yesterday's news in our morning newspapers. We know what sacrifices are necessary to a first-class job of reporting.

In our country we have many newspapers, too numerous to mention, which have made notable contributions to journalism. I wish to present for the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial—a reprint—from one of them, the Pittsburgh Press of October 4, 1941, entitled "Newspapers and Freedom."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of October 4, 1941]

NEWSPAPERS AND FREEDOM

Newspapers of the United States are observing National Newspaper Week. As they do so, both the newspapers and their 130,000,000 readers are facing the gravest situation which has confronted this country since 1861.

There is no longer any doubt that the American way of living—the life in which a man is free to choose his own livelihood and location—is opposed by another in which the state is altogether superior to the individual. The great peril in our own civilization is that in the effort to defeat the plan which makes the state all and the individual nothing, we may fall into the same path. We may arrive at the belief that to defeat the devil we shall have to use his fire—and if we do, everything that George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and Abraham Lincoln held dear will fall into fragments.

We lay down 3 cents for our favorite newspaper as a matter of habit, expecting it to put before us the latest information from every corner of the world. We look at the headlines, we laugh at the funnies, we swear at editorials, and run a finger down the batting averages. Only on the North American Continent does the worker and the housewife have that privilege.

Only in the United States and Canada today, in the Western Hemisphere, does the man and woman who make the world go round have the right to read the news of their neighbors approximately as it happens, without the slanting touch of a censor's pencil.

Is that important?

A minority of our people may think it is not. There are groups in the United States, called for convenience "isolationist" and "interventionist," which would limit the right of the press to report events which put their side in a bad light. There are people who think that the men and women of America cannot be trusted with the knowledge of events as they happen. But, we repeat, they are a minority.

The majority of the American people are awake today to what has happened in continental Europe since 1933. They are aware that the first move of the seizers of national power is the capture of the press. They saw the people of France betrayed by newspapers which took the enemy's money, either to remain silent or to misrepresent the facts from day to day. In Germany, they have seen the ruthless Nazi gang steal the newspapers which once not only represented, but formed, German public opinion.

They know that the dictators have attached the most severe penalties, short of death, to the crime of listening to news from abroad. They know that in one dictator country, now allined with democracies, all private radio sets have been confiscated, limiting the reception of news to the government-controlled loud speakers. They know that in all the dictator-controlled nations the press is as much an arm of the government as is the infantry, the navy, or the air force. There, it has ceased to be an agency of information. It is an instrument for the imposition of the dictator's will.

Mr. and Mrs. American like to consider that they know what is happening on the planet. They like to have opinions and they like to express them. They want the news, of neighborhood, village, city, county, State, Nation, and world—a circumstance which is abundantly attested by the fact that they buy more than 41,000,000 newspapers every weekday, more than 32,000,000 every Sunday and more than 20,000,000 weeklies.

There is more to it than the mere thirst for information. Our people know that when or if their source of primary information is taken from them, the process of destroying liberty is begun. Mr. American can sit any time with his pipe and his slippers and his favorite paper, secure in the knowledge that his freedom is his own. Tell him that he can no longer have the newspaper he wants to read, and he knows that more and worse is coming.

He knows that his spare time may no longer be his own. He knows that he can be called out to a party meeting or a parade before the local or national ruler, with a terrific penalty imposed for failure to obey the summons. He knows that when the newspaper comes under the state's dictation, the radio is equally or even more dominated by the tyrants in power.

Both the Nation and the press that serves it face the possibility of active war. Tradition and temptation both will be strong for the conversion of the American press to the European pattern if war does come. Many plausible reasons will be advanced for censorship and the use of the newspaper as a channel for propaganda, for the silencing of all criticism.

But the war to save democracy in the world cannot be won by destroying democracy here.

Oil Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

EDITORIAL BY A. H. WHEELER

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting editorial written by A. H. Wheeler, editor of the Texas Citizen, Fort Worth, Tex., on the subject of Oil Monopoly.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Citizen]

OIL MONOPOLY

(By A. H. Wheeler)

It appears certain, for the present time at least, that the final curtain has fallen on the boldest and most comprehensive plot of entrenched monopoly in the United States to use the Federal Government for selfish interests in building a 24-inch, steel-plate gas pipe line from the oil and gas fields of Texas to the Atlantic seaboard. This much is admitted by newspaper correspondents in Washington.

The Priorities Board has definitely declined the use of 700,000 tons of steel for the purpose, and only by the intervention of President Roosevelt could the decision of the Board be overruled, which intervention is almost certain not to occur.

For a number of years the large oil companies have been trying to get a huge pipe line built to the eastern seaboard, but they have run into many difficulties, chief of which were objections of certain States to the building of the lines across their domains. These objections were eliminated when the oil companies secured an order from President Roosevelt, under new Federal laws, declaring pipe line rights-of-way public domain through these States.

Then, in order to secure steel for the project, the oil companies had to go through the Priorities Board, and to gain that consent, the project had to be declared a defense necessity

Then, the oil companies made the boldest stroke of all. They declared a dangerous gasoline shortage in 17 States in the eastern part of the United States. They actually secured an order from the office of Oil Coordinator rationing gasoline in many eastern States.

This act aroused the entire country; the East because the people could see no reason for a gasoline shortage, and the oil-producing States, especially Texas, because they knew full well that there could be no gasoline shortage anywhere if the products of their fields could be made available.

A Senate investigation was demanded, and the investigation placed in the hands of a special committee of the Commerce Committee, of which FRANCIS T. MALONEY, Democrat, of Connecticut, was made chairman, and given the very able assistance of Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas.

If Senator O'DANIEL is up on anything, it is industrial conditions of his own State, and he made good use of his knowledge in this committee hearing.

Following a lead that there were at least 20,000 railway tank cars standing idle on side tracks over the United States, the Senate committee summoned to testify before it Ralph Budd, president of the Burlington Railway and defense transportation adviser, and John J. Pelly, president of the Association of American Railroads.

These two gentlemen, constituting the highest possible authority in rail transportation quickly confirmed the prevailing opinion that the railroads had all of the facilities necessary for the delivery of all of the needed gasoline and oil products from the fields in Texas and Louisiana to any point in the East where a shortage was threatened.

With all of the information before it, the special committee quickly ruled that there was no gasoline shortage anywhere, and recommended the use of rail transportation facilities to supply the demand for gasoline and oil products wherever needed.

In spite of the unanimous ruling of the committee, a protest was registered by Ralph K. Davies, Acting Petroleum Coordinator, that the shortage does exist.

* * * * *

And since all of the above has happened, the oil industry has suddenly discovered many idle barges for inland water traffic, and on September 16, had loaded out a cargo of 3,000,000 gallons for shipment from New Orleans to Pittsburgh. It is very strange how much convenient transportation can be found when it is really desired.

The above episode brings to light a condition in the economic set-up of our country not immediately in sight, and of very grave significance.

First, it is definitely proved that there was no gasoline shortage at any time, and that the alarm about one was of artificial construction for a very definite purpose, that of building a huge pipe line to the industrial East from the oil- and gas-bearing sections of the South.

Secondly, there is no need, never was and never will be, of pipe-line facilities for the transportation of liquid petroleum products from the oil fields of the South to the Eastern seaboard, because barge and tanker transportation by water is much less expensive than pipe-line transportation, and tankers and barges cost much less to build than pipe lines, and can be built very rapidly of wood and concrete, using very little metal needed for defense purposes. This mode of transportation can easily and quickly and inexpensively be made available at any time, in sufficient quantity to handle all of the liquid petroleum products ever needed in the Eastern Atlantic seaboard States, even without the use of rail transportation, if deemed necessary.

The conclusion is that the powerful oil interests desired a gigantic pipe line from the fields of the South to the industrial East, not for liquid petroleum products but for natural gas, as was clearly established before the special committee by Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas, in the extensive hearing.

The purpose of that gigantic gas pipe line is, of course, to rob Texas and Louisiana of one of their most valuable heritages, natural gas, but that is not the half of it, as the matter affects all of the United States. This I hope to show in a few brief paragraphs to follow. This is the Texas viewpoint, and it is amply proved by the experience of other sections of the United States. Colorado, Michigan, Illinois, and other States which have gas pipe lines from the Texas fields.

The use of this very cheap fuel from Texas has produced a great hardship in these States and thrown tens of thousands of people out of work by closing coal mines. Some of these States have found it necessary to protect their own industries by passing laws taxing natural gas coming in from other States.

The facts and conclusions in this article are brought out by interviewing many of the very best authorities on the petroleum industry of the South and Southwest among the independent operators, and also high authorities engaged in the manufacture of steel and other products in the areas affected by the importation of cheap natural gas fuel in competition with their own abundance of coal, coke, and artificial gas. These facts are indisputable, and can be confirmed by consulting authorities in the affected areas.

Below I give a summary of the case as it affects a wide area of this Nation.

The oil monopolies have subsidiary purchasing companies that make monthly nominations in Texas of the amount of crude oil they require or will purchase. The nominations are ridiculously low, being about one-thirtieth of the maximum capacity of Texas oil wells, and the price for same being about $1.15 average per gross barrel.

The low allowables of Texas crude oil causes an economic waste; many wells destroy themselves on account of salt water penetration because they are not properly operated.

The small industries that are supported by normal production have to close when oil is produced in such low quantities at such low prices, causing unemployment and depressed business.

But how different with the major companies, who can transfer their tankers to England and to foreign countries to transport their own cheaply produced crude oil to our own seaboard, Canada, and England, and get up to $2.75 a barrel for it.

This can only be continued by eliminating Texas competition.

The oil and gas monopoly, interested in many large eastern industries and greater profits, think they see the opportunity to get a gas line for future use that will let them have cheap fuel, thus enabling them to compete with the coal industry which will destroy it and cause much unemployment.

This would protect their own eastern industries as against Texas and such a natural-gas line would lower the recovery of Texas crude oil.

There is no need for a major pipe line. Ships, tugs, and barges afford cheaper transportation rates, and we need more employment that a pipe line eliminates.

Also our railroads and trucking industry are greatly benefited in getting additional tonnage. Our Government should first think of employing our own citizens.

Small concerns now know and are demonstrating that petroleum can be transported by ships, tugs, and barges to many industrial areas at lower cost than by pipe lines, and can be delivered for short hauls to our railroad and trucking industries that will create competition to where the price of $2.75 on the eastern seaboard and $1.15 in Texas will be equalized, and both Texas and all other States will have competitive and uniform prices.

The Southwest is entitled to a fair proportion of industry—not just cantonments and temporary assembly plants. They want to be allowed and helped by our Government to tool up their present small industries to be able to do their share in the defense program. They ask for the opportunity to exist; they believe the O. P. M. is too close to big business and is discouraging Government assistance to these smaller industries.

Extension of Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of October 3, 1941, entitled "For Social Benefits, Not Revenue."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer of October 3, 1941]

FOR SOCIAL BENEFITS, NOT REVENUE

Of the proposed extension of social security to bring its benefits to some 27,000,000 persons now outside the system, it is to be said at the outset that there can be no valid objection to such a measure of justice.

The principle of contributory payments by employers and employees for protection of the latter in old age has been accepted as a sound social reform. There is no reason for excluding any group of the Nation's workers from its operation.

The millions of proposed additional beneficiaries were not included in the original plan because of difficulties of administration and the fact that the plan was experimental, subject to changes as was later shown by the need for substantial amendments.

But if the time has now come when the Government can see its way to rounding out this admirable plan and removing present discriminations, the greatest care must be taken lest there be any departure from the plain purpose of the social-security system, or any confusion of its sole object with other governmental functions.

Particularly the danger of imposing any additional unnecessary burden on already tax-ridden business and workers should be guarded against, and the extra flow of funds into the Treasury from the pockets of millions of citizens should provide no opportunity for governmental extravagance and waste.

Unfortunately some proposals have been put forth that are extremely disquieting to those who would keep the principle of social security intact.

One is Secretary Morgenthau's suggestion that the rate of the social-security taxes be increased to supply more money for the defense program and also to aid in curbing inflation.

This is an utterly indefensible proposal. When the social-security system was first broached, fears were expressed that the huge funds it would produce might eventually be diverted to quite different purposes and constitute an invitation to stupendous governmental spending instead of being held in trust for the beneficiaries.

A social-security plan should not be converted into a device for raising revenue, whatever the Government's necessities. The two activities, from their nature, are as far apart as the poles.

The American people today are paying the heaviest taxes in their history to protect their country from war and before long will be paying much more. They do not begrudge their sacrifices so long as they know they are worth while.

They are being heavily taxed for defense. Well and good. There is no need to sugarcoat their taxes for this purpose or to levy any of them under a false label. To label certain levies as for social security, when the real purpose is to apply them to defense costs, would not be keeping faith with the people.

Nor is this the only consideration. Social-security taxes at the present rate are much higher than required to meet the benefits and administrative expenses and maintain an adequate reserve fund. The huge surplus goes into the Treasury and straight out again to help pay the Government's running expenses.

These taxes constitute a heavy burden on business, which receives no return, and on many employees who look for future benefits. This burden was recognized by Congress when it postponed a stepping up of the rates that had been fixed by the original schedule.

Obviously no possible need exists for increasing this burden now to insure the benefits of social security. Millions can be added to the rolls without raising the tax rates. The increased number of beneficiaries' and employers' contributions at present rates would of itself almost double the Treasury's revenue from this source.

As for a deterrent to inflation, it is true that higher social-security taxes would tend to diminish the public's buying power, but at the same time they would increase wage costs for the employer, and therefore the expense of production, and would make for higher prices, which are a form of inflation.

It is a question whether advocates of higher social-security levies have thought this matter through in all its aspects. For it is to be remembered that employers alone pay the 3-percent unemployment tax on their pay rolls and in addition a 1-percent levy for old-age pensions to match their employees' contributions.

It all sums up to this: Social-security benefits can be extended, but there is absolutely no excuse for boosting the tax rates. As for the proposal to help finance defense under the guise of social security, it is so pernicious on its face that it should not be given a moment's consideration by Congress.

National Unity, Now or Never

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ADDRESS BY FRED RIZK

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by a distinguished citizen of my State, Mr. Fred Rizk, on the subject National Unity, Now or Never.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentleman of the convention, it is an honor and a privilege for me to speak to you today on this, the tenth anniversary of the

founding of the Southern Federation of Syrian-Lebanon-American Clubs. And at the outset may I say that we have been indeed fortunate in our selection of a convention city, for here in this beautiful capital of the history-laden State of South Carolina and in the three host affiliate clubs, the Syrian-Lebanon American Society, the Syrian American Youth, and the Syriac Club, we have found a gracious welcome and a warm and generous hospitality that is of the essence of the South, unsurpassed and unsurpassable. To you, therefore, citizens of Columbia, may I, on behalf of the hundreds of your visitors, express a word of heartfelt thanks.

The federation has made tremendous progress since that memorable day, 10 years ago, when a small number of far-seeing, responsibility-conscious men and women, meeting in Beaumont, Tex., laid its foundations upon the cornerstones of fraternity, unity, charity, and patriotism. In the space of only a half-score years the federation has grown to become one of the largest organizations of its kind in the South today.

Yet, notwithstanding the rapidity of this expansion, it is happily evident that you, who have assembled here today from the far reaches of our beloved Southland, have not lost your zeal or enthusiasm or your burning desire for service. It is well, my friends, that you possess these passions for the grave problems of today desperately call for unity, zeal, and a burning desire for service.

I can recall no period in the history of the federation when its convention was called under more serious and thought-provoking national conditions than those which confront us as we meet today. In the short decade that has passed since that first convention history has marched with furious, unparalleled pace. Great black shadows have been cast over the greater part of the civilized world. Shadows of fear and want and hunger. Shadows of oppression, hate, and death. Shadows in which whole nations and peoples' theretofore living by the eternal standards of decency, order, law, and liberty, have been crushed under the heel of a ruthless conqueror. Cultural and political institutions embodying freedom of thought, freedom of expression, and freedom of worship, for which humanity's martyrs gave their lives to achieve, have been mutilated by this Frankenstein of destruction who knows no law and is conscious of no restraint. One by one the self-governing nations of Europe, by fire and bomb and insidious treachery, have been battered and broken and swept into his gaping maw. One by one they have been made to feel the lash of oppression, intolerance, greed, and a denial of decent fundamental rights. With a swastika installed in the place of Calvary's cross, with his vast evil power directed to dragging the civilization of the world back into the dens of ancient slavery and paganism, it is now abundantly clear that no nation which has not the will and the power to defend itself will be spared in his rapacious march to world conquest.

And while a fearful world is asking when will the monster be checked, when will come the deliverance, our President and our Congress, realizing the acuteness of the peril, have proclaimed a state of national emergency and have initiated measures to harness the Nation's resources to the end that it can and will defend itself.

Yet despite the fact that the Nation faces the most deadly and imminent peril in its entire history, despite the fact that the handwriting is plainly blazoned on the wall of destiny, despite the fact that the lesson of annihilation and doom to the disunited and unprepared has been repeatedly demonstrated to all who have eyes to see—the people of America stand today tragically lacking in that national unity—that indispensable oneness, that common facing in one outward direction, and that cheerful willingness to make substantial sacrifices to achieve security. The will of a nation to survive can best be measured by its ready capacity for great sacrifice. Let us not delude ourselves as to the danger, and thus gamble with posterity. It is high time that the policy of business as usual, the appalling dissension between labor and management, the constant bickering between persons in high position for political expediency, be discarded in the supreme interest of national unity and morale. For without these two we are wholly lost—and time is of the essence, for the shadows of Armageddon are lengthening. We cannot longer delay in putting our house in order. It is national unity—now or never.

In this grave hour we of the federation should well ponder our own responsibilities on behalf of the national program, for we are Americans, first, last, and always. Together with the Smiths, the Cunninghams, the McDermotts, and the O'Briens, we are products of the great melting pot that is America. We all share one thing in common: Our passionate lover for the freedom, the way of life, and the democracy that are set forth in imperishable line in the Constitution of the United States.

Ponce de Leon came in search of a fountain of youth; we came in search of a bill of rights. We came from a land over which 40 centuries of time have rolled, a land which say Egyptians and Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, and Macedonians, Romans, Byzantines, Arabs, Franks, and Turks in turn sweep over its terrain to pillage, suppress, and enslave. The heart of the peaceful native of that land cried out for peace, liberty, and security—and on these blessed shores they were found. On a family portrait of Joseph Arbeely, of Damascus, Syria, who was the first to bring his family to the United States, in 1878, we find this inscription in his own hand: "Here I and my children have happily found liberty." And so it has been with the more than 200,000 Syrian and Lebanese Americans who have taken permanent residence in the United States today. These loyal Americans, to be sure, are proud of their heritage and ancient lineage, proud of their enduring contributions to the progress of the world, which included the inventions of glass and earthenware, the alphabet, and commercial paper. They are proud of having given to mankind both monotheistic religions, and the beginnings of the moral and ethical codes that still control the world. They recall with pardonable satisfaction what Sir George Adam Smith was moved to declare: "Syria has been of greater significance to mankind spiritually and materially than any other country in the world."

Yes; they are proud of these things, but let me tell you that even beyond and above these they treasure their American citizenship and liberties. They will oppose any nation, whatever its previous ties, which threatens the democratic principles in which they passionately believe.

This has been demonstrated in the past few months when, after the fall of France, the traditional friend and protector of Syria and Lebanon for nearly a century past, the Nazis demanded the military use of the country. The Lebanese and Syrian people of the United States, through their organizations, particularly the Lebanese clubs, and at the instigation of their militant press, cabled the Vichy high commissioner, Gen. Henri Dentz, again and again to refuse the German demand and to stand fast with the forces of freedom and democracy. Thus, even a friendship of long standing was discarded in favor of democratic ideals by a liberty-loving people.

But now that we find these sacred institutions and liberties gravely menaced by a sinister force from across the seas and note those discordant elements in our national life which are tearing the national fiber apart, we are rightly fearful of the future. Can it be that our national leaders have not sufficiently made clear the danger to the people of the United States? Certainly, it is not sufficiently felt by them. Strong, clear, authoritative warnings in this direction, we believe, will serve to jolt the Nation out of its dangerous state of detached complacency, for when the people do fully realize the menace and its effect upon their country, their institutions, and their personal lives and fortunes, they will not countenance the tragic lethargy and division they now display.

We further believe that when a policy of preparedness has been settled upon, the people should be given as large a share as possible in its execution. Let the various civic, fraternal, and other representative organizations of the Nation be assigned tasks in the national effort of defense. Let the common responsibility be felt and shared by all. Let this great Nation of democracy-loving people be transformed into one gigantic organization which, putting aside personal gain and advantage, will direct its vast effort in the common defense of its cherished liberties.

Let this convention go on record therefore, Mr. President, calling upon the native and adopted sons and daughters of America to take on the spirit of sacrifice and to unite in heart and soul and mind in the great task of national defense that lies before us.

Let this convention go on record offering our services and facilities to the proper governmental agencies to effect a closer and more productive cooperation with the national program.

Let us also, Mr. President, urge upon our affiliates to contribute substantially to and otherwise support the United Service Organizations, the great army behind the Army, which this week known as National U. S. O. Week, commences its second drive, and also, to do their utmost in establishing local recreational facilities for the free use of men in the armed services of our country.

And lastly, let us break down every connotation of difference between ourselves and our fellow Americans, and reassert and repledge our allegiance to our country and its flag and dedicate our lives and our fortunes to their preservation.

If we stand united, my friends, in these dark days, they will surely pass and with their passing a new day will dawn, and in that beautiful dawn the Stars and Stripes of this glorious Republic will continue to wave in the morning breeze insuring the perpetuation of those lasting principles of justice, security, and democracy for the peoples of the earth.

The National Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

RADIO SCRIPT PREPARED FOR BROADCAST ON HEADLINE GUEST PROGRAM, STATION WINX, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix the radio program prepared for broadcast on Thursday, September 18, 1941, on station WINX, Washington, D. C., and participated in by Charles P. Clark, associate chief counsel of the Truman committee; Otis T. Wingo, director of public opinion analysts; and Miss Eleanor Bunker, headline guest interviewer, in which an outline was given of the work of the Truman committee.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Miss BUNKER. I want to thank you, Mr. Wingo, both on behalf of the chairman, Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, who is, at present, on a defense inspection tour in the Midwest and the acting chairman, Senator JAMES M. MEAD, for the opportunity of acquainting the public with the committee's work.

Question. What were the reasons for the creation of the Truman committee, Mr. Clark?

Mr. CLARK. At the beginning of the national-defense program, Senator TRUMAN, as well as other members of the Senate, received many complaints that there was gross waste and extravagance in the expenditure of public money appropriated by the Congress for national-defense purposes, and that negligence and incompetency were bogging down the program. Small businessmen were complaining that their pleas to participate in the defense program were being ignored by Government officials charged with the awarding of defense contracts. Senator TRUMAN, recalling the scandalous conditions prevailing during the last war, which went unnoticed until the war was over, personally made a preliminary study of these charges and became convinced that an impartial, objective study and investigation of the entire defense program should be made—an investigation coexistent with the defense program. On February 10, 1941, Senator TRUMAN introduced a resolution in the Senate, authorizing and directing a special committee of seven Senators to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the defense program, empowering such a committee to investigate the methods by which contracts were awarded, the efficiency with which such contracts were being performed, the extent to which the facilities of small business concerns were being utilized, factors which might unduly increase the cost of the program and other matters relating to the program which the committee might deem appropriate, and to report to the Senate from time to time the results of its investigations with suggested legislation.

The resolution was adopted unanimously by the Senate on March 1, 1941. A committee of seven Senators was appointed. Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, the author of the resolution, was designated as chairman. Others appointed were Senators CONNALLY, MEAD, WALLGREN, HATCH, BALL, and BREWSTER.

Members of this committee are particularly well equipped to serve on a committee of this kind. Senators TRUMAN and WALLGREN are members of the Military Affairs Committee; Senator BREWSTER is a member of the Naval Affairs Committee; Senator CONNALLY is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator HATCH has served on several important investigating committees.

Question. Mr. Clark, what authority has the committee?

Mr. CLARK. The committee has authority to investigate any agency of the Government concerned in any way with national defense. Particular emphasis should be made of the fact that the jurisdiction of the committee covers the spending of over $50,000,000,000 of defense appropriations.

Question. What is the policy of the committee?

Mr. CLARK. The committee is concerned with offering constructive assistance to governmental agencies charged with the responsibility of administering the defense program so that they may carry the program into execution as effectively as possible. In addition, the committee is vitally concerned with eliminating all bottlenecks so that private industry can exert the maximum effort under the defense program with a minimum of dislocation. The committee is particularly interested in seeing that a small American businessman is given an opportunity to make his contribution to the success of the program.

Question. Is the committee a prosecuting agency, Mr. Clark?

Mr. CLARK. The committee is an investigating, not a prosecuting body, but if evidence of criminality is found, such matters will be referred to the proper prosecuting officials.

Question. I understand, Mr. Clark, that the committee investigated the camp-construction program of the War Department. Would you care to discuss something about this investigation?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. One of the committee's first problems was the investigation of reports directed to the committee complaining about the inordinately excessive costs of the War Department's camp construction program. Committee investigators were sent to Army camps in various parts of the country, such as Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.; Fort George Meade, Md., Indiantown Gap, Pa.; Camp Blanding, Fla.; Camp Stewart, Ga.; Camp Hulen, Tex.; Camp Wallace, Tex.; Camp Davis, N. C.; and Camp San Luis Obispo, Calif., to inspect sites, to inquire into construction progress, to determine the efficiency with which contracts were being performed, and to develop facts relating to reports of excessive expenditures in the procurement of camp sites and prices paid for building materials and construction equipment. Charges of alleged labor racketeering were carefully investigated.

As a result of these investigations, public hearings were held in Washington at which time War Department officials in charge of the camp construction program, contractors, and other parties in interest appeared before the committee.

Question. With what result, Mr. Clark?

Mr. CLARK. On August 14, 1941, Chairman TRUMAN presented the findings and recommendations of the committee to the Senate. The report disclosed that the War Department had wasted in excess of $200,000,000 due, in a large measure, to lack of proper planning.

Question. Would you mention an instance of improper planning, Mr. Clark?

Mr. CLARK. The committee found that the War Department, in selecting camp sites did not make full utilization of engineering and topographical data which could have been developed by the Engineering Corps or could have been obtained from other governmental agencies. Fort Leonard Wood is a case in point. This fort was originally located in Iowa, but an engineering survey made after the camp was located at this site showed an adequate water supply could not be developed and it was necessary to move the location to Missouri.

Question. I understand that the War Department spent large sums of money for renting construction equipment. Did your committee study this phase of the construction program?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, indeed. In the course of the camp investigation, it was found that nearly $50,000,000 had been expended by the War Department for rental of construction equipment. Evidence adduced at the hearings showed that the War Department could have saved at least twelve or thirteen million dollars by purchasing instead of renting this equipment.

Question. Were any definite recommendations made to obviate these conditions?

Mr. CLARK. The committee's report severely criticized the Quartermaster Corps of the Army, and recommended that camp construction and maintenance should be taken out of the Quartermaster Corps and vested in a new division better equipped to cope with the problems.

The committee is now informed that the War Department has adopted this recommendation and legislation has recently been introduced for the purpose of taking such jurisdiction out of the Quartermaster Corps and vesting it in the Engineering Corps.

Question. Mr. Clark, did the committee investigate reported charges that intermediaries were employed to obtain Government contracts?

Mr. CLARK. The committee, in the course of its camp investigation, found that some individuals, principally here in Washington, have represented themselves to contractors as having influence with various Government departments and have been retained by such contractors on a fee basis. It was found that one of the most prominent of these intermediaries, a former general in the Army, had destroyed his files prior to being called upon to testify before the committee. However, the committee has found that this individual has received payment from a large number of contracting firms who have been successful in obtaining Army contracts. The committee is presently engaged in collecting facts and investigating the activities of a number of such intermediaries who represent themselves to contractors as being able to influence Government officials in the awarding of contracts. We feel that the committee has discouraged this practice.

Question. Is the committee making a study of Army ordnance plants?

Mr. CLARK. In line with its investigation of the camp-construction program, the committee is engaged in a Nation-wide investigation of charges of gross waste and inefficiency in the construction of Army ordnance plants.

Question. We were all interested in the committee's investigation of the aluminum situation. Would you mention something about this investigation, Mr. Clark?

Mr. CLARK. The committee was in receipt of conflicting opinions concerning the adequacy of the supply af aluminum, not only to meet military but civilian demands. Attempting to reconcile these conflicting views, the committee conducted an exhaustive investigation to determine just what the true situation was, regarding the available supply of aluminum.

Statements were made by high Government officials charged with the responsibility of ascertaining whether there was an aluminum shortage in this country that there was no shortage.

They even went so far as to say that it was unpatriotic to talk about a shortage. We even had the ironic situation of one of these officials sending a telegram commending another official for the fine work he did in ascertaining that there was no aluminum shortage.

The results of our investigations and public hearings proved incontrovertibly that there was an aluminum shortage and a very acute one—that there was not even sufficient aluminum for direct military requirements, let alone civilian requirements.

Question. Was the Aluminum Co. of America responsible in any way for the shortage?

Mr. CLARK. The committee found that the Aluminum Co. had convinced the Office of Production Management of the adequacy of the supply, their purpose being to discourage competitors who were attempting to enter the aluminum field.

Question. What did the committee specifically recommend to increase aluminum production, Mr. Clark?

Mr. CLARK. In its report to the Senate on June 26, the Committee recommended that new facilities be created immediately to produce an additional 600,000,000 pounds of aluminum to meet immediate military requirements. The O. P. M. announced plans for the construction of eight new aluminum plants to produce these additional 600,000,000 pounds annually, but the committee believes progress in this respect has been unduly slow and has cost us several times as much aluminum as was obtained from the pots-and-pans program.

Question. I understand, Mr. Clark, that huge power facilities are necessary for the production of aluminum. Did the committee make a study of the feasibility of developing new power projects?

Mr. CLARK. Here again testimony was presented with respect to the failure of the Aluminum Co. of America to develop one of the most vitally important and necessary power projects, the Fontana water site on the Little Tennessee River.

Testimony before the committee had shown that there was much indecision and inactivity on the part of the O. P. M. as to the best method of developing this water site. The committee recommended that the O. P. M. work out a plan immediately with the Tennessee Valley Authority, which was best equipped from an organizational and facility standpoint to undertake the development of this project.

Mr. Knudsen, a few months back, advised the chairman of the committee that O. P. M. would follow the committee's recommendations regarding the Fontana project and would recommend to the President that an appropriation be secured to enable the Tennessee Valley Authority to develop this vitally important Fontana project. It is our understanding that this has been done.

Question. Will the committee in the course of its investigation of the national-defense program make a study of the productive capacity of aircraft plants?

Mr. CLARK. The committee is obtaining information concerning the aviation industry to determine whether every available productive facility is being utilized. The committee has already held hearings on the west coast at which time much testimony was adduced concerning the problems of aircraft manufacture.

Question. Is the committee interested in the priorities problem, Mr. Clark?

Mr. CLARK. The question of priorities, particularly as they affect small business, is of great importance. The President of the United States has very recently directed a reorganization of the Priorities Division of O. P. M. in an attempt to unfreeze materials and stimulate production in the field of small business. However, this new plan contains no provision for enforcement. The committee has had the priority question under consideration for some time and has recommended that enforcement machinery be created which will insure participation in the defense program by small business.

Question. Mr. Clark, does the committee contemplate making an investigation into the background and business connections of dollar-a-year men?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; the committee has been collecting information about dollar-a-year men for the past 2 months.

Question. Will the committee make an investigation of the Defense Housing program, Mr. Clark?

Mr. CLARK. An extensive investigation of the Defense Housing program has been made by committee investigators during the past several months. Investigation discloses confusion and lack of coordination in the administration of this vast program. This in turn has led to delay in the building of necessary housing units. Lack of coordination has prevented the adoption of a priorities rating plan for building materials used in the construction of defense units with the result that private building is at present in a state of almost complete chaos.

The committee investigators have also probed charges of excessive cost and improper location of sites as well as allegations of favoritism in connection with the awarding of defense housing contracts. The committee will hold public hearings on the entire defense housing program beginning Thursday, October 2.

In conclusion, it is the intention of Chairman TRUMAN and the other members of the committee that our Government get dollar for dollar in this defense program.

The Attitude of Colonel Lindbergh Toward Hitler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE TAMPA (FLA.) SUNDAY TRIBUNE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Hon. E. D. Lambright, very able editor of the Tampa Sunday Tribune, published on September 7, 1941. The editorial is entitled "Here's Lindbergh's Answer."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Sunday Tribune of September 7, 1941]

HERE'S LINDBERGH'S ANSWER

We have another letter from the America First Committee—the Wood-Lindbergh or "America Last" Committee. Our correspondence with that group has finally brought forth what we think is the first statement by or from ex-Colonel Lindbergh as to why he has, in all his speeches, carefully avoided any criticism of Hitler and his associated dictators. Many attempts have been made to bring the ex-colonel into the open on this point—and we take some pride in the fact that our effort in that direction has been successful.

Readers will remember that the America First Committee, in a letter, took exceptions to a Tribune editorial in which we criticized the Lindbergh attitude and asked the direct question why he had not denounced Hitler and Hitlerism. That letter sought to defend Lindbergh's attitude, but ignored the question. We replied, calling the attention of the committee to the fact that the question remained unanswered. Now we have another letter from the committee. The previous letter was signed by a Mr. Whiteway; this one by a Mr. Laurence B. Holland. We have no doubt that it was either dictated or approved by the decorated ex-colonel himself.

Here's the Lindbergh explanation of the Lindbergh silence on Hitler, quoted verbatim:

"Mr. Lindbergh does not denounce Hitler and Nazi Germany, though he has denounced Hitlerism wherever found, because: (1) His time is limited; (2) study of United States history and diplomatic history shows that this Nation has often found it necessary and even effective in the interests of international peace to cooperate with nations whose political, social, religious, and military designs are in direct contradiction to ours, and even are an admitted enemy to our Nation and way of life; communistic Russia, with its aims at international revolution, and its spies and agents active in the United States, is an example; in view of these considerations, plus the fact that he believes that this Nation may in the near future find it possible and advisable to cooperate with a German-controlled Europe to protect the interests of democracy and peace, Mr. Lindbergh smears or vilifies or denounces no foreign leaders; (3) military experts are almost unanimous, and economic experts are predominantly agreed that this hemisphere will never be dominated by Germany or any power unless the United States, because of some inner collapse, fails to exert its powerful military, diplomatic, economic, and cultural influence in this hemisphere; accordingly, Mr. Lindbergh does not insult the American people by subjecting them to a fear-provoking barrage of vituperation which only serves to preclude the possibility of rational thinking and vigorous determination on the part of the people—qualities highly important in any crisis—and which prevents the Nation from ever pursuing the positive and constructive efforts which must be made to save democracy in this country and to extend it on an international scale by taking steps to extend it in this hemisphere where our efforts are insured of a measure of success."

HIS REASONS ARE MISERABLY WEAK

Let's go into these "reasons" a bit. To our mind they are miserably weak; they do not satisfactorily explain, to the loyal American mind, why this American citizen, who has been highly honored by his country, who has held a commission in its armed forces, who boasts of devotion to America First, has not yet said one word of censure or even of mild criticism of the dictators, their totalitarian governments, or their current campaign, by armed might of conquest, to conquer and enslave the world. We quote literally:

"Mr. Lindbergh does not denounce Hitler and Nazi Germany, though he has denounced Hitlerism wherever found." We don't get the distinction. "Hitler and Nazi Germany" surely are "Hitlerism," whether you spell it with a large or small letter. If he doesn't denounce Hitler and Germany he can't denounce "Hitlerism." They are one and the same.

"Because: (1) his time is limited." That is the most picayunish and absurd of excuses. Lindbergh has found an abundance of time to denounce the policy of his Government, to assert his belief in the defeat of Great Britain and the triumph of Germany, to decry and belittle national activity for national defense, to attack the President and other leaders who are striving to unite the country for our own protection—but he does not denounce Hitler because "his time is limited." Phooey!

"Because: (2) this Nation has often found it necessary in the interest of international peace to cooperate with nations whose political, social, religious, and military designs are in direct contradiction to ours; communistic Russia." The inference clearly is that, because we are not at the moment fighting or opposing Russia, for obvious reasons, it might be advisable for us to "cooperate" with Nazi Germany or Fascist Italy—in other words, negotiate with them for peace on their own terms, "beg for crumbs from their table," as the President put it, which would mean the surrender of every principle for which we have stood and fought through all the years of our history—a consummation which the America

First Committee evidently would be delighted to see come to pass. Lindbergh and the committee say just that in these words:

"Plus the fact that he believes that this Nation may in the near future find it possible and advisable to cooperate with a German-controlled Europe to protect the interests of democracy and peace." There the feline flops fully out of the sack. Lindbergh and his promoters and echoists have believed all along, and have said so, that Britain cannot win the war, even with our help, therefore that Germany will win it, and that there will be a "German-controlled Europe." Hence, they want this Nation to kowtow now to the inevitable conquerors, quit all effort at resistance to their nefarious purposes, join with them in their totalitarian concept and design of how to "protect the interests of democracy and peace." Could there be a more abject surrender of our national integrity, a more contemptible negation of our national history and principle?

WHAT CHANCE TO SAVE DEMOCRACY?

The third Lindbergh "because" is his belief that "a fear-provoking barrage of vituperation" (of Hitler et al.) would "prevent the Nation from ever pursuing the positive and constructive efforts which must be made to save democracy in this country and to extend it in this hemisphere where our efforts are assured of a measure of success." In this, the ex-colonel presumes that, if his prediction of a Hitler victory comes true, we could still save democracy or extend it in this hemisphere or anywhere else. Knowing the Hitler motive, method, and purpose as he must know it, surely Mr. Lindbergh cannot sincerely believe that, with Hitler master of all Europe, including Britain, we would have the slightest chance of saving or extending democracy, or anything else noble or uplifting or free, in Latin America, or even in our own territory.

No; we can't admit or recognize the validity or virtue of the Lindbergh reasons for his refusal to join with the great mass of right-thinking Americans in condemning Hitler and all his works; but we are gratified that we have been instrumental in having him make public those reasons, such as they are.

In his latest speech, the ex-colonel predicted that England would turn against America. That should occasion him neither surprise nor alarm. He has.

Aid to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ARTICLE BY RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by the able author, Mr. Raymond Clapper.

Mr. Clapper has recently returned from a visit to England, and what he has to say respecting the amount of aid going to Great Britain from this country is especially significant. Mr. Clapper's observations coincide with what was disclosed during my own investigations.

Up to this date, Mr. President, we have not given to Great Britain the military equipment and supplies she so desperately needs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ARMS REACHING BRITAIN CALLED "A POPGUN ARSENAL"

(By Raymond Clapper, Scripps-Howard Staff writer)

WASHINGTON, September 16.—The fact that we have delivered relatively little lend-lease aid to Britain is well covered up in President Roosevelt's report on 6 months' operation of lend-lease.

The figures, in terms of appropriations, allocations, and transfers, are large. In terms of deliveries, they shrink like a pair of wool socks in the laundry.

With regard to food going to England, the report is downright misleading. The President's report says that hundreds of thousands of tons of food have gone across the Atlantic. But on the same page the figures, which look large in pounds, reduce down to less than 150,000 tons. In England I was reliably informed that about 300,000 tons of lend-lease food have arrived. That is equal to 2½ days' consumption in England. No reference, naturally, is made in the report to the fact that for a time 25 percent of the eggs we sent arrived in England unfit to eat. That situation has been corrected, and the British have done their part in trying to cover up the affairs to save the American Government from embarrassment.

Food doesn't have to wait until factories are built. We are wasting it here, gorging ourselves. The British need it, especially for their heavy workers. Most of the people have enough to get by. Consumption has been cut 25 percent, but England is not starving. Heavy labor, however, is not being fed enough energy to do a good day's work. Children are not receiving the milk their bodies need. They need dried milk from here in far larger quantities than we are sending.

Under our lease-lend program we have allocated an amount of food equal to about 5 to 6 percent of England's annual consumption. Yet lend-lease has been operating half a year and we have sent just about 1½ percent of England's annual consumption in those 6 months.

The President's report does not mention numbers of planes sent, for obvious reasons. I am not permitted to mention numbers either. But I think the facts would support the statement that of needed types we have sent barely token quantities. I refer to heavy bombers and to high-altitude fighters. Britain badly needs more tanks, even though she is producing several times as many as we are. So far as the British are concerned, ours still is a popgun arsenal.

Take the President's own figures on total exports, lend-lease, and all others. His figures show that the total exports to the British Empire are but slightly higher than a year ago. Shipments to the British Empire in July of last year were in fact a trifle more than those of July this year. The other months this year look better but only by small margins.

Unfortunately, to say these things may give some comfort to Hitler. But it will be short-lived comfort if criticism now spurs us to greater effort, to the kind of job of which we are fully capable once we are truly determined to do it. Only now is the Government, after a year and a half, bringing in a cut of nearly 50 percent in automobile production. The British are making but 400 passenger cars a year, those largely for export. They have converted their industry far beyond anything we have even thought of.

I am not here getting into the argument about whether we should go fully into the war. I am talking about a policy adopted by Congress and for which $7,000,000,000 was appropriated nearly 6 months ago, and for which Mr. Roosevelt is about to ask several more billion dollars. Without our supplies the war against Hitler cannot continue. We have made it a policy to furnish those supplies.

The British may have no legitimate kick if we do not go to war. But they have a legitimate kick if we fail to deliver the goods as promised.

We have not set ourselves an impossible task. It is only that we have dawdled at it, cluttering it up with compromises, with red tape, with delays amounting to weeks in even getting orders through the White House and into the hands of the contractors. Perhaps the new production set-up will improve the situation. There certainly is plenty of room for improvement.

Continental Solidarity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPHUS DANIELS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a few days ago I received unanimous consent of the Senate to have printed in the RECORD a notable address made by Hon. Josephus Daniels, Ambassador of the United States to Mexico, before the convention of the American Legion in Milwaukee, Wis. The subject of the address was Continental Solidarity. I now have received from the Government Printing Office a statement that the speech exceeds the usual limit, and that the cost of printing it in the RECORD will be $165. In view of the estimate, I now renew my request that I have consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Commander, comrades, and shipmates, I count it a high privilege, animated by the spirit of the American Legion and devotion to the democratic principles of our country, to hold fellowship again with my comrades and shipmates as you hail the coming of the unity of all America, from Alaska to Argentina. This is a goal to which forward-looking men have aspired since colonialism and imperialism were driven from the New World.

You Legionnaires have been through the crucible of battle. You are the men who, more than others, realize that our day of need is here. You are the men who know that our concerted efforts and sacrifices are required in this hour to give us the mighty sinews of war to uphold our way of life. You are the men who know that not only concerted action on our part, but also on the part of the peoples of all the Americas, are vital to safeguarding those things which constitute our very existence. You, and all patriots, therefore, celebrate with enthusiasm the advent of continental solidarity.

Your countrymen, grateful for your valor in the World War, look to you for leadership in this critical period in the history of the world. You did not fail them in 1917–18. Please God, you will not fail them now.

In our sincere confidence in the innate good faith of mankind, the majority of us forgot after the armistice that it was only through steadfast and constant preparedness that we could preserve, not only for ourselves but also for our neighbors on this continent, those very things which mean a free way of life for the happiness of the individual. This forgetfulness was not true of the Legion. Its members returned from the armstice with a knowledge born of bitter experience that the only answer to greed is force—force to the limit.

From the day visionless Senators denied the United States the high privilege of taking its seat at Geneva to cooperate with other nations in the insurance of world sanity and undergirding the plighted pledge of universal peace, the American Legion has steadfastly, persistently, and constructively urged in more quiet days the full measure of preparation for defense which is now rapidly being achieved; but achieved now in the face of world conflict and desperate need for haste, with resultant added expense and increased difficulties to the national economic structure. It must be a matter of profound satisfaction and just pride that where others failed to see the necessity of preparedness the Legion foresaw the dangers which beset us today and sought to make ready against the hour of peril.

The naval program of 1915–19 would have given the United States the most powerful Navy in the world, but short-sighted men sank fighting ships nearing completion and steadily reduced naval strength to dangerous proportions.

Then the American Legion protested.

Decreased appropriations weakened the Army after the armistice to the point where military leaders warned of the loss of needed strength.

Then the American Legion protested.

Air power which the United States gained in the World War was permitted to lapse and the essential expansion needed and urged by military strategists and civilian leaders was neglected.

Then the American Legion protested.

Isolationists from 1920 to 1933 denied the sound doctrine of Washington "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

Then the American Legion protested.

The Legion declared again and again that the surest way to keep war from this continent was by such preparedness as would be an insurance against the dangers of war. The urging of the Legion, born of experience forged in the furnace of war, fell on barren ground, and it is because of that neglect in the years since 1920 that we are now feverishly bending every energy into production of weapons for our defense and to render aid to other countries fighting for their very lives. Belatedly we, one and all, pay tribute to the prophetic warning of the Legion in all the years since members of the American Expeditionary Force in a gathering at Paris laid the foundations of your organization.

We must not feel, however, that our rearmament should be or is limited to iron and steel. We have another type of armament and one which strengthens us beyond any material weapon. It is the arsenal of full cooperation of all the people of the New World in mutual defense against the permeation of imported "isms" or alien symptoms of government. A common experience and a common history and a common sacrifice contribute to unified action. All these republics have felt the sting of government imposed by imperialistic foreign rule. They all won their independence through the hard road of conflict by the exhibition of a noble courage. Their descendants, proud of their heritage, are ready now as were their forbears to make any and every sacrifice to preserve for themselves and their children the freedom won by their fathers.

With three continents burning up in the fires of war and their peoples raging with hate or suffering under oppression, this convention of Legionnaires, who have been tried in the furnace of battle and come out purified, gathers in the comforting and inspiring knowledge that the heart's desire of all Americans from Alaska to Tierra del Fuego, is consecrated to continental solidarity—solidarity to uphold and undergird democracy and the right of every man and peoples to self-government. Each and all have joined in the high resolve to stand together against any totalitarian invasion by propaganda, gun or bombs, and in the solemn consecration that in mutual protection any attack upon one will call into action the combined resistance of the other 21 republics.

This achievement of oneness did not come by chance. Nothing good happens in God's world—all blessings come from forethought and sacrifice. A century before the epoch-making gathering at Panama and at Habana in 1939–40, there were prophets who envisioned the cooperative "one for all and all for one" which we celebrate today. Monroe, in 1823, had the vision splendid and we have lived to see his doctrine move from unilateral to multilateral and become the possession of the whole hemisphere. Early in his administration President Roosevelt made it clear that the Monroe Doctrine was "for the Western Hemisphere against outside aggression; not as a weapon to be employed by one American Government against another."

Bolivar, justly called "the liberator," sensed the need of a hemispheric solidarity when he summoned the Congress of Panama in 1825 to bring that blessing into being—the cooperation in this hemisphere which now gladdens our hearts and strengthens our faith in the immortality of democracy.

Bolivar, who was a century in advance of his age, devised a plan by which all the republics of Ame ica would form a united front for mutual assistance against encroachment or penetration by what he called "the decadent philosophies of the Old World." Lack of communications and transportation and barrier of language, accompanied by misunderstanding of Bolivar's lofty and patriotic goal, conspired to prevent the full fruition of his shibboleth, "Union, union, union," in his day.

But no noble concept dies, no great dream perishes with the dreamer, no vision glorious fades permanently. A century and more after shortsightedness failed to achieve the ideals of Bolivar in that very Panama, representatives of all the Pan-American countries came together at the most appropriate of sites—the base of the monument erected to Bolivar—and doing obeisance to their immortal predecessor, to make the solemn pronouncement that enables us in these our times to celebrate the day for which past generations had waited—the day when our ideals and understanding give us shelter, sure and safe, from the destruction which befell those nations in Europe which failed to form an unbreakable league against the ruthless rule of force.

If it be given to those who have gone before to know what is transpiring in this sphere I can imagine the thrill that came to Simon Bolivar as he sensed the fulfillment in essence of his heart's desire. God willing, the spirit of Bolivar, as manifested at Panama, will guide us through the stormy seas of this tragic era and assure the American republics the enlargement and perpetuation of the liberties for the attainment of which Washington and Bolivar and Hidalgo gave the full measure of devotion.

Before Lima, before Panama, before Habana, before continental solidarity, and long before the flames of war lit up the horizons overseas, it was certain that some day a new doctrine must possess the hearts and souls of the peoples of Pan America. On March 4, 1933, in an historic inaugural address, President Roosevelt enunciated a policy which has been the guiding star of this period. It was given the name of the "good neighbor" policy.

He said:

"In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor—the neighbor who resolutely respects himself, and, because he does so, respects the rights of others—the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors."

With these words, the old slogans which had kept neighbors apart were sent into the discard and made as dead as any dinosaur. The policy of the good neighbor drove out the old slogans of "the big stick," "the big brother," "dollar diplomacy," replacing them with a brotherhood of equals, fraternizing to make a hemisphere consecrated to the defense of equal sovereignty and the preservation of the American way of life. The threats of spreading war have cemented the compact initiated at Panama and strengthened at Habana in 1940.

That declaration of President Roosevelt supplemented and implemented the voluntary pledge of Woodrow Wilson at Mobile in 1913, when he said, "The United States will never again consent to seek 1 additional foot of territory by conquest."

As far back as the close of the year 1933 President Roosevelt made this commitment:

"It has seemed clear to me as President that the time has come to supplement and implement the declaration of President Wilson by the further declaration that the definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention."

Skeptics abroad and imperialists at home accepted neither the Wilson nor the Roosevelt declaration at face value. "We have heard fine protestations of brotherhood before," said the unbelievers, and imperialists in the United States gave grounds for pan-American skepticism when they declared that Uncle Sam would send his marines wherever an American dollar was invested. When our President, in the Platt amendment, cut the strings that bound Cuba and withdrew the marines from the Caribbean and declared that never again would the United States intervene by force, the old misunderstandings disappeared, and today there are no differences between the states of this hemisphere that cannot be settled by the arbitrament of reason without resort to arms.

Later, speaking to the whole hemisphere, President Roosevelt declared that no one group or race in the New World had any desire to dominate the others, saying that the only goal sought is the never-ending bond of "good, old-fashioned neighborly friendship," and he declared, "So bound together we are able to withstand any attack," and "together we will be able to ward off any infiltration of alien political and economic ideas that would destroy freedom and our democracy."

The noble conception of the good-neighbor policy of President Roosevelt likewise burned in the hearts of great men in other pan-American republics. It was voiced about at that time by Dr. Saavedra Lama, Argentine Minister of Foreign Affairs, in a statement in which he said the good-neighbor declaration has "brought about for the first time a current of community ideas and sentiments without suspicion and without ill will."

That sentiment has been implemented by recent statements of leading statesmen and peoples of our sister republics. As you know, I have been the "good neighbor" Ambassador to Mexico for more than 8 years, and I think I am in a position to give you at first hand

the views of Mexican statesmen on this subject.

His Excellency, ex-President Lazaro Cardenas, in an international broadcast addressed to all the nations of the Americas on June 9, 1940, said:

"Mexico has faith in the future of the democratic institutions and participates eagerly in this work for peace and well-being that is stirring the inhabitants of this continent; and in the face of the serious problems that shake the earth as a result of the European tragedy, believes that the people of our America have the unavoidable duty of maintaining themselves in close understanding, constituting a single defensive front that will protect them against any violent and arbitrary intervention by alien forces that at any moment might attack the sovereign rights of our peoples who are united by the profound bond of their own liberty.

"Maintaining and strengthening the bonds of cooperation and friendship between the countries of America must constitute the most fervent desire of all the people of good will to whom this sincere message is addressed in the name of the Mexican nation."

His successor, President Avila Camacho, in his patriotic inaugural address, rang true in his well-known devotion to democracy and pan-American unity in his message to the Mexican Congress this month, September 1, 1941. He said:

"I consider it appropriate to reiterate that Mexico is ready to give her full support to the defense of America, thus strictly following that line of conduct which she has held from the beginning of the struggle which is afflicting the world—vigilant observation of those conflicts going on beyond the continent, but energetic collaboration in the exercise, the strengthening, and the guaranteeing of those democratic principles which serve as a basis for the union of the American peoples. Aware of our limitations and pacifists by desire and tradition, we wish to keep ourselves apart from any armed struggle; but, jealous of our independence, we will not omit a single effort for the maintenance, together with the inviolability of our territory and the sovereignty of our government (literally, institutions), of the integrity of America, and sacred right of thinking and of acting as freemen in a hemisphere where there is affirmed the great ideal of liberty and of justice."

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, His Excellency, Ezquiel Padilla, a man of wide experience in the service of his country at home and abroad, has reiterated his position and that of his country on numerous occasions. I quote for you some excerpts from statements made by him:

"The reaction against Nazi propaganda throughout the Americas is the strengthening of American solidarity. * * * Our conscience * * * is awake to the fact that nothing will save us in these days except the most compact unity."

Concerning the Roosevelt-Churchill meeting:

"In the midst of those shadows which now surround us, the noble principles expressed by the Governments of the United States and England are the principles of those conditions of equity, harmony, and civilized life that all sincere men desire for the future. * * * All these points * * * represent the will of America united now more than ever, before the threat of evil and destruction, in the democratic ideals of mutual respect between nations and equality among the peoples of the entire world."

* * * * *

"Mexico is on guard for any act which * * * tries to make Mexican soil a field for activities hostile to continental solidarity."

"The world is involved in shadows but * * * liberty is invincible and the dream of Morelos who foresaw a free America will endure throughout all evil designs for enslaving the world."

* * * * *

"I believe that all the governments of the continent should be on guard. We must watch against those maneuvers of invisible warfare now so well known and against that propaganda * * * whose object is to undermine the unity of nations and block the American solidarity of our continent."

* * * * *

"The cause of our continent against mechanized dictatorship and the motives we should preach among our people and we should plant in their hearts is * * * that the flag of democracy and of continental solidarity shall not serve as a cover to deceivers or imposition; that liberty shall be the basis of our life; that governments shall be the true expression of their peoples; that neither from within or from without, iniquity * * * shall crush the heart of mankind of America. * * * The students and teachers * * * are the crusaders of a great cause of a free America, united and indivisible."

By actions suitable to these words the Mexican Government has not hesitated for a moment to do any and everything necessary to carry out the declaration of its President and Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The views expressed by the Government are shared by the majority of the rank and file of the people and the Mexican press which are squarely alined with the cause of the democracies.

Let us now turn to the declarations and statements of those other great statesmen in our sister republics farther to the south when they touch upon the question of inter-American solidarity.

In his report for 1941 to the National Congress of Colombia, His Excellency Dr. Eduardo Santos, referring to the totalitarian systems set up in Europe and the doctrines of liberty and democracy prevailing in the Americas, said:

"In the presence of these two camps the Government of the United States formally invites the peoples of the Continent to keep firm, unanimous, and compact in the camp of democracy and liberty. And it itself prepares to fight without reserve and to the extreme limits in defense of the principles which it rightly considers as the supreme safeguard of the moral treasurers of humanity."

* * * * *

"The Government of Colombia considers that 'the policy of American solidarity' proclaimed at the conferences of Buenos Aires, Lima, Panama, and Habana is much more than mere words; it should constitute a precious course of action and thought, a definite orientation in our international life."

His Excellency, President Elie Lescot, of Haiti, in his inaugural address on May 15, 1941, stated:

"During the tragic hours through which all humanity is now living, it is impossible for any nation to play a hesitant role. The whole world must know that the Republic of Haiti intends to maintain a perfect union with the 20 sister republics of this continent."

On August 22, 1941, His Excellency, the President of Panamá, declared with reference to the eight points set forth by President Roosevelt after his conference with Churchill:

"I am sure that the eight points arrived at by President Roosevelt and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Winston Churchill, will radiate very wholesome influences all over America, for the prestige of republican and democratic principles and the good neighbor policy.

"I am particularly pleased that President Roosevelt should have extolled once again, in such an exalted and perfectly unequivocal manner, the sacred principles of territorial liberty and the political independence of all nations.

"In a very special manner the statement of the two governments pleases me, with the recognition of the sovereign rights of small countries and the right which each country has of adopting that form of government most appropriate to its idiosyncrasies, its needs, and the wishes of its own people, and with the principle of not accepting any territorial change which has not been freely consented to by the countries themselves and ratified by the constitutional powers in force."

Following a Cabinet meeting held on January 15, 1941, His Excellency, President Fulgencio Batista, of Cuba, and his Cabinet issued a joint statement, as follows:

"The Cabinet discussed Cuba's position in the international field and in the face of the world conflict. The President and the Cabinet ratified in their entirety the declarations recently made by the Prime Minister; they asserted again that Cuba would defend its principles and the democratic sentiments which are the basis of our nationality; and they also declared that we find ourselves at the side of our ally, the United States of America, to whom Cuba will always lend, to the extent that circumstances make necessary, all possible cooperation for the preservation of democracy, of liberty, and of the existence of the civilized world."

In an address before the members of the Venezuelan Congress and the visiting United States Subcommittee on Appropriations, the President of the Venezuelan Senate, Dr. Alejandro Rivas Vásquez, said:

"We understand perfectly the situation and outlook of the whole world at the present moment. We cannot and will not be misled by phrases and gestures. We wish facts and ask for facts. First: Independence, liberty, recognition of our own sovereignty; and, second, we are ready to give life, homes, wealth, and everything to preserve these sacred things and to contribute efficiently and proportionally to our size and means in the defense of the continent.

"We are ready here to join hands with our good neighbors and loyal friends at all times: The American citizens, in the defense of the Continent and to procure peace for all good nations in such a way as was dreamed by the master of American idealism—this American in the manner of a continental sentiment and view—President Woodrow Wilson."

His Excellency President Manuel Prado, of Peru, did not hesitate to declare himself, when, on April 1, 1941, and again on May 2, 1941, he said as follows:

"* * * (Peru) expresses once more its adherence to the cause of the States which fight resolutely to maintain, together with their independence, the integrity of the principles of democracy.

"In effecting this act of national affirmation in the exercise of our sovereignty directed to the progress and well-being of new generations, I comply with the unavoidable duty, responding to the dictates of my conscience as a citizen and as an official forged in the perennial truths which proclaim the spiritual liberty of man, of declaring that I share fully in the doctrine and policy of action which the President of the United States incarnates and which translate the profound hope of peoples to maintain their institutions, their honor, and their lives."

* * * * *

"Thus it is that America offers in this greatest period of history the fine spectacle of the renewal of its democratic faith and of its unbreakable decision to maintain its action of solidarity in the services of the principles which will shape the epic of their emancipation and which have characterized them in the universal concert as the home of liberty and of law."

His Excellency President Baldomir, of Uruguay, in a press interview given to La

Nación of Buenos Aires, on May 18, 1941, said in reply to a specific question as to what Uruguay's attitude would be in the case that war would reach the American Continent and that the sovereignty of the American states should be violated, said:

"In reply to this question I must state that Uruguay is disposed to carry out in every way and at any time, to the limit of its possibilities, and in the role which circumstances may assign, the pledges which it contracted in signing the agreements reached at the conferences of Panama and Habana; agreements which preestablish the joint and defensive action of all American countries against foreign aggression, thanks to diplomatic and armed cooperation and the practical mutual assistance of the several members of the continental community."

His Excellency, President Ubico of Guatemala, in the early part of March of this year, stated as follows to a correspondent of one of the great Argentine newspapers:

"Guatemala cooperates in continental defense in conformity with the principles of Panama and Habana, which are corollary to the solidarity, always more effective, between the Hispano-American nations and the United States, with which Guatemala has cultivated a warm friendship, particularly since 1871.

"My government has promulgated laws which proscribe ideological influences contrary to the democratic spirit of the institutions of the country."

His Excellency President Carias, of Honduras, on the occasion of the celebration of the Fourth of July in Tagucigalpa, stated:

"At this solemn hour, when we feel near to us the patriotic vigor of George Washington and Simon Bolivar, we must affirm our faith and our hope in the final triumph of democracy. The gallant effort of Great Britain cannot be futile. We have placed our confidence in your great country and its distinguished Executive, a leader of just causes, for his noble policy of the good neighbor."

In an address to the National Congress of Ecuador delivered on August 10, 1941, His Excellency President Arroyo del Rio stated:

"Ecuador will not display an apathetic front towards the defense of the continent, and it will cooperate in this defense to the extent that may be necessary for it to do so, because Ecuador, which has always felt deep appreciation for the necessity of American solidarity, could not betray the demands of its people. The Government hopes that the legislature will vest it with the broadest powers in connection with the work of the defense of democracy."

The Government of El Salvador on August 14, 1941, published an official statement of which the following is an excerpt:

"For these reasons the Government of El Salvador declares before the world its faith and devotion to democratic regimes, which it sustains and is disposed to defend with all the strength of which the Salvadoran soul is capable, all antidemocratic doctrines; formulates its unshakable intention of collaborating with the Americas, using all its spiritual and material resources to annihilate such doctrines, and expresses its vehement desire for the prompt return to the world of the reign of law and justice based upon democracy, the only form of government which satisfies the conscience of men of good will."

His Excellency President Getulio Vargas, of the United States of Brazil, in a speech made on the anniversary of Brazilian independence on September 7, 1940, said:

"Within the American Continent we enjoy an atmosphere of confidence and continue to practice the same century-old policy of friendly cooperation, offering, with absolute loyalty, our efforts for the prompt solution of all continental problems. The participation in today's civic festivities of special delegations from our neighboring countries, apart from affording us deep and sincere satisfaction, testifies in an eloquent manner to the spirit of fraternization and to the identity of sentiments which inspire our relations and transform into concrete action the generous ideal of American unity.

We all feel that, if necessary, the American peoples will, as they have done in the past during their struggle for emancipation, unite their soldiers and their arms in the defense of their own sovereignty and of continental integrity.

Again on September 7, 1941, Dr. Vargas, in a speech broadcast on the occasion of Brazilian Independence Day, said:

"The American nations form a 'defensive alliance which is prepared to resist aggression from any side.'

"Brazil," added the President, "is a pacific nation. Our greatest desire is to remain outside the terrible contingencies of the war, but we cannot predict the future nor what may be asked of us in this violent reform of the civilized world."

In an address made on June 4, 1941, the Foreign Minister of Brazil, Dr. Oswaldo Aranha, said:

"This pleasure, however, which is a family asset since it springs from our solidarity and neighborliness, must be preserved and defended in these times of such grave threats to human destiny. America, as we have always affirmed, has never been a source of quarrels and war, but the perennial inspiration for peace.

"Pan-Americanism is not an end, but a political community, a means for achieving wider objectives which are universal. A prosperous, peaceful, and happy humanity is the supreme aspiration of our peoples. America has helped to further the solution of the problems of the East and West because it does and always will represent in the world a happy medium between the two extremes."

His Excellency, President Somoza, of Nicaragua, on July 4, 1941, said:

"Sensible thinkers and statesmen of this continent, men who love peace and the principles of justice and order which we devotedly proclaim in the name of the heroes of our glorious independence; all peoples who feel the strangulation of force against right, and the noble spirits who suffer the weight of violence against human dignity; all of those who speak with the heart from the devastated shores of the Old World, turn their eyes toward America and all that great portion of scorned humanity realize that for us there will be no tragic hour of new slavery because we have learned much during our life as free peoples, and, having democracy as the support of our organization and defense, forming one block of aspirations, purpose, and hopes, we are ready to fight for our liberty."

On the occasion of the opening of the Bolivian Congress on August 6, 1941, his excellency, President Peñarenda, stated:

"It would be a mistake to think that political and economic repercussions of the European conflict will not reach or affect us. The nations of the world are so close to one another—regardless of the geographical distance which may separate them—and there exists such an interdependence among them, that no one country can consider itself aloof from the problems of others. We have seen in a bloody catastrophe, such as that now going on in the Old World, that nothing is held back. Anything is possible in the times in which we are living. We have seen centuries-old nations disappear within the course of a few weeks. We have seen principles disregarded which, until today, have been considered changeless. Humanity is living through a dramatic moment perhaps unique in all history. Everything seems to change; men and institutions, ideas and principles."

On July 7, 1941, His Excellency, Dr. Castillo, Acting President of the Argentine Republic, in a speech delivered in honor of the visiting chiefs of staff of the other American Republics, stated:

"In fulfilling the obligations which cannot be denied to any sovereign nation, Argentina's traditional policy of peace and harmony with all nations of the world has suffered no change; although the clash of extracontinental powers has upset our economy and modified our balance of trade, we believe the correct course is to keep alive collaboration with the American nations in order that the atmosphere of harmony will prevail here, where peace and order make nations great and nations respected."

His Excellency Ruiz Guiñazú, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Argentine Republic, stated on June 4, 1941:

"If I were to be permitted to anticipate briefly my impressions of this journey I should say without hesitation that I have become conscious of the existence of a renewed pan-American conscience, of a real unity of aspirations and sentiments, made public in the conferences of Panama and Havana, which has become more uniform and strengthened in giving greater value to the continent without in this manner reducing the personality of the powers which constitute it.

"Because the present pan-Americanism has deepened, the reason of its finality in public international law, more than in private international law, obeys a more realistic and positive judgment.

"There is in all this a stimulating objectivity. It is reality itself which speaks and decides in greater measure, determined by the strong comment of communities and peoples above personalities.

* * * * *

"In proclaiming our unbreakable faith in law and justice, we have definitively formed our political and juridical conscience.

"From another point of view the world already knows that there is no reason for suspicions or secrets in the diplomatic obligations of the American chancellories, and that when they propose to organize peace they exclude neither the defense against dissolving tendencies toward our republican and democratic institutions, nor the reciprocal aid which they should lend each other to maintain their own existence."

Excerpt from a speech made by His Excellency, Dr. Manuel de Jesus Ironcoso de la Concha, President of the Dominican Republic, on November 16, 1940:

"E pluribus unum should also and always be the motto of the Americas, to synthesize their spiritual union, cementing it in their identical love for their own sovereignty and independence and that of others, in the uplifting degree of this sentiment and of their democratic institutions by every means, and in the strengthening of their relations with all races, as a way of working together for the happiness of all and that of each one of the nations which compose the domain of the Western Hemisphere."

In an interview published in La Tribuna of San José, Costa Rica, on August 22, 1941, His Excellency, President Calderon Garcia, said:

"I have not had the opportunity to refer to the eight points of President Roosevelt due to the state of my health during the last few days. I believe I am expressing the feelings of the people of Costa Rica, as well as my own when I state that my Government is in complete accord with these points, in view of the European war and the threats against the world. America must remain compact, and share the same ideals; she must be jealous of her liberty and her independence. While it is true that many of the republics which make up this continent are small—diminutive, in fact—it is also true that solidarity makes us great and invincible. These countries are thoroughly conscious of the significance of democracy and liberty. They have lived under these ideals the greater part of their existence, and even though some

Governors have attempted against these sacred rights of the countries, and on other occasions foreign interventions have occurred, we can safely say, without any doubts, that such happenings are a thing of the past, and that little by little we have conquered the greatest ideals of freedom. President Roosevelt, through his policy of good neighbor and cooperation among the countries of America, has built the foundation of a new America that cannot distrust its brothers, but has complete confidence in the disappearance of political or racial differences that at other times have marred our history. Evolution has been slow, but it is now a fact."

In an address on September 2, 1941, His Excellency, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Chile said:

"American solidarity is a combination of the moral, economic, and physical forces of these countries to conserve intact together with their own sovereignty the beneficial democratic norms which rule us. The solidarity only contemplates the employment of force for the common defense in case of extra-continental aggression. Chile is disposed to participate in the defense with serene and irrevocable decision."

In April last, His Excellency, the President of Paraguay, said:

"Continental solidarity is a doctrine which merits the most frank adherence of the Paraguayan Government."

His Excellency, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Paraguay, stated:

"We proclaim solidarity, cooperation, and mutual assistance as substantial norms of American international life together."

You have heard what our friends to the south have to say on the question of continental solidarity. Let us now turn to what the President, the Secretary of State, and the Under Secretary of State have to say:

The President in a speech on May 27, 1941, stated:

"Now, as never before, the unity of the American republics is of supreme importance to each and every one of us and to the cause of freedom throughout the world. Our future independence is bound up with the future and independence of all our sister republics. * * * We reassert the solidarity of the 21 American republics and the Dominion of Canada in the preservation of the independence of the hemisphere. We have pledged material support to the other democracies of the world and we will fulfill that pledge. We in the Americas will decide for ourselves whether and when, and where, our American interests are attacked or our security threatened."

In an address made on May 16, 1941, the Secretary of State said:

"The American nations, beyond all others, have learned to live together, to work together, to join in solving common problems. We have achieved a unity in which no nation is afraid, and no nation's voice is unheard. The strength of any one of us is at the disposition of all; the problems of any one of us are the concern of all * * * as nations and as individuals, Americans have been vouchsafed the highest honor and responsibility ever granted to a group of peoples." * * *

In an address delivered on September 28, 1940, the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles, said:

"Today the governments of all the American republics are cooperating as one in the search for remedies for their common problems, and with a full and reciprocal recognition of their several needs and requirements. They are as one in their determination to preserve their domestic institutions, their ancient liberties, and their independence and integrity; but, more than that, they recognize today that the strength of every one of them is vastly enhanced by the combined strength of the rest. Speaking from the standpoint of a citizen of the United States, I can conceive of no greater safeguard to the national defense of the United States than the realization on our part that we possess the sympathy, the trust, and the cooperation of our neighbors of the New World."

And so it is that we find the free peoples of America banded together in one mighty purpose—the defense of freedom, tolerance, equality, opportunity, justice—not only for society as a whole but also for each particular individual. They are things for which our fathers contended, for which we have sacrificed, and for which, now, we are ready to defend. God willing, our common faith and our common tradition and our common unity will bring about a lasting triumph for the freedom we cherish and will never surrender.

My personal and political creed—and I commend it to you in this hour, when all Americans should stand shoulder to shoulder—was first enunciated by that great American sailor, Stephen Decatur, in a toast given at Norfolk, Va., April 17, 1816:

"Our country. In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right, but our country right or wrong."

It may be objected by some that no man should acquiesce in wrong under any circumstances. That was not the admonition of Decatur. He had supreme faith that his countrymen would reach the right conclusion and pursue the right course. He believed all citizens should accept the decision reached in legal and constitutional ways and give wholehearted support to the will of the land. His admonition was that no man should act on his own and in opposition to the lawfully declared policy of his country.

And what Decatur was ready to do all Americans of every decade should emulate as the high duty of every man who loves his country and wishes to preserve its free institutions.

Attitude of Axis Powers Toward United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. WHITAKER

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Mr. John T. Whitaker, published in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of September 18, 1941, under the heading "Cynical Contempt Shown by Axis Toward United States."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of September 18, 1941]

CYNICAL CONTEMPT SHOWN BY AXIS TOWARD UNITED STATES—"FRANCE WILL LOOK HEROIC BY COMPARISON WITH YOU," HIGH-PLACED FASCIST DECLARED, OUTLINING PLAN FOR NEW WORLD CONQUEST

(By John T. Whitaker)

The historical and only meeting between Roosevelt and Churchill did not take place until this August—almost 2 years after the commencement of hostilities.

Hitler and Mussolini met to discuss exactly the same problem last winter and they met not once but many times. The problem discussed by the democratic and by the Axis leaders alike was America's role in the war. It has long been plain to statesmen of their stature, as it ought to be to the man in the street, that the decision lies between Germany and America—that one or the other must win this war.

Early last fall, before the American Presidential election, German and Italian propaganda thumped for Willkie. Goebbels' poisoned pens described Roosevelt as a "deformed Jewish hireling of the armaments companies and the banks" who wanted to bring America into the war so that he could become dictator. If Roosevelt were elected, they said, American boys would be transported to the battlefields of Europe. And it was a great shame, said Axis propaganda, because Hitler secretly loved America and invasion was a fantastic dream. This propaganda was a tissue of lies based upon the near certainty, as "fifth columnists" reported, of Roosevelt's reelection and upon preparations already being made by Hitler and Mussolini for war against America.

INTERVIEW WITH CIANO

In this period I had one of many interviews with Count Galeazzo Ciano, Mussolini's son-in-law and foreign minister. I thought what he said interesting.

"I am absolutely certain of Roosevelt's election," he said. "So are the Germans."

"Why then does Axis propaganda attack Roosevelt and describe Willkie with enthusiasm?" I demanded.

"For exactly that reason," replied Ciano. "Because we know that Roosevelt will win the election. But don't think we don't understand Willkie. Willkie is a Republican and the Republicans are your traditional war party, the real imperialists of America.

"Willkie will take you to war as soon as Roosevelt. The man doesn't matter. Your interests involve you in this war. Either the totalitarian powers or the democracies must prevail."

That is the way the Axis leaders were thinking last fall. They knew that the ultimate and decisive show-down had to come between Germany and America—the greatest of the democracies. Their propaganda was designed to persuade the American public that it was not necessary or to the interest of America to go to war, that war was something Roosevelt personally wanted for personal reasons.

This was doubly cynical since one of the most important of the German diplomats told me that Mrs. Roosevelt was a profound pacifist, that she had a great influence on the President and that Hitler felt convinced that Roosevelt would never lead the United States into war before America was attacked.

WHAT DICTATORS DISCUSSED

The greatest secrecy surrounded Hitler's various talks with Mussolini through the winter. And yet within a few days or weeks of each of them important Germans and Italians knew most of what happened or the substance of the conversations always leaked out. One of the things the two dictators discussed—though certainly not in such disrespectful language—can be illustrated by an apocryphal anecdote first circulated by an Italian diplomat.

"Why can't you take Malta?" Hitler is supposed to have asked Mussolini.

"Malta is an island, too," Mussolini replied, according to this wit.

Facing the threat of an awakening America, which was talking at last about producing armaments in mass, Hitler and Mussolini found that England wouldn't collapse. When France collapsed both expected Britain to capitulate. When Britain would not capitulate both undertook terroristic mass bombing.

If Churchill were a stubborn warmonger—the only man who stood between Hitler and peace—the British people would be bombed into submission. Hitler and Mussolini cared nothing for American reaction to the mass bombing of civilians because they knew they had to defeat America to win in any event. Their problem was to knock out Britain before America could enter the war.

Had they bombed military objectives they might have starved Britain out, but they bombed civilians and that only raised British morale to the most stubborn heights ever reached by a desperate people fighting with its back to the wall and alone.

AMERICA PRINCIPAL FOE

Meeting in midwinter, Hitler told Mussolini frankly that they were in for a long war and that America was to be their principal foe. He outlined a joint plan. The Axis had to clear the Mediterranean, take the Balkans and the Middle East with Suez. Then Germany would conquer Africa and establish U-boat and bomber bases along the whole littoral of the South Atlantic.

Just as the combination of submersibles and planes was destroying commerce in the North Atlantic, so it would close the South Atlantic. Britain and America together could never replace the shipping lost. The French Fleet in cooperation with the Italian Fleet and new German units such as the *Bismarck* would drive commerce from the seas. America would be terrified and to insure her isolation Hitler had arranged that some time later Japan would join a tripartite alliance under which she would come to war if America intervened for Britain.

A long deadlock was plain to see and in subsequent weeks the British won Cyrenaica and pounded the Italian Fleet at Taranto while the Greeks, picked as a pushover, proved a monkey wrench in the timetable. Italian morale was collapsing and I went again to see Count Ciano, hinting that the moment had come for the Italians to make separate peace unless they were willing to see the Germans march in and turn them into a conquered province.

THE VALUE OF TIME

"Your Excellency knows as well as I that time is on the side of the democracies," I said.

Ciano, very serious, replied quietly.

"Yes, time is on the side of the democracies," he said, "provided—provided there is time enough."

Nothing has so succinctly summed up the grand strategy of Hitler and Mussolini in face of America. They must thank the American isolationists, no less than their own "fifth column," that American failed to act in the spring and is failing to act now.

The Axis leaders have retrieved their position in the Mediterranean and they are now conquering Russian raw materials and wiping out the armed forces on their most vulnerable flank. This is being done with no interference from America. American production and American morale will never be a threat to the Axis, in the opinion of every Axis spokesman with whom I have talked, until America has declared war.

Until America is on a war footing with a war psychosis the Axis leaders feel that they can keep the initiative. Then they will hit America before the country realizes that for a full year it has been denominated by Hitler as enemy No. 1.

"South America will go against you, your own public will be paralyzed and we will have every country in the world standing with us. Our long-range bombers will wipe out your industrial cities and we will land 25,000 men at a time in your key centers—land them by transport aircraft.

CONTEMPT FOR UNITED STATES

"France will look heroic by comparison with America—your fleet spread in two seas, your air force crippled by 'fifth columnists,' your money-mad citizens scrambling to climb onto what you call the band wagon."

These were the farewell remarks of an important Fascist leader to me as I was expelled from Italy.

"We know America," he said. "Our 'fifth column' is busy. You won't go to war this spring and you won't go to war this fall. Your people aren't the kind to make sacrifices. They won't ration food and clothing and gasoline. They won't live in training camps. They won't go abroad to die for the liberty you talk about so glibly."

This important Fascist added a personal warning.

"Whitaker, you are a fool," he said. "You could have chosen for us if you hadn't believed so profoundly in what you call democracy. You'll spend your latter days in a concentration camp in Axis-ruled America. I'll come to see you then."

"Don't bother," I told him. "I'll come to see you in Rome—I'll come in the uniform of the American Army."

It was 5 years ago that Mussolini said, "We or they." He meant it, and Hitler means it, too.

The Poles in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ARTICLE BY PROF. ROMAN DYBOSKI, OF CRACOW UNIVERSITY

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Roman Dyboski, Ph. D., professor, of the University of Cracow, on the subject The Poles in America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Polish Review, New York, N. Y., of September 8, 1941]

THE POLES IN AMERICA

(By Roman Dyboski, Ph. D., professor of the University of Cracow)

The immigrant elements from Continental Europe that went to the making of the modern population of the United States, may be divided into two categories: an earlier one, driven from Europe by political persecution and representative of its intellectual elite, played an active part in building up nineteenth-century American civilization; and a later category, mostly agricultural labor, that left Europe under the stress of dire poverty, to build railroads and provide unskilled labor to the mining and factory cities of America, making no other contribution to her creative achievements than sheer hard physical work.

The four and a half million Poles who live in compact masses in the working-class quarters of America's great industrial centers, are generally included wholesale in this second category.

Until recently, it was not realized by American opinion—nor even by the rank and file of the Polish-American element itself, that Poles figured prominently in the earlier immigration of chosen, liberty-loving spirits from among Europe's soldiers, politicians, intellectuals, and artists, that Poland was not behind other nations in contributing its quota of creative effort to the fabric of modern America. It is to recent and painstaking research by a Polish-American scholar, M. Haiman, in Chicago, that we are indebted for a better knowledge of the part played by individual Poles in the political development and intellectual progress of the United States; and it is on his studies that we mainly rely for this brief survey of a little-known subject.

POLES CAME IN 1608

Going back to the very beginnings of America's colonial history, we find that even the Pilgrim fathers had their Polish predecessors on American soil in the shape of certain Polish artisans introduced by the English into Jamestown in 1608 and praised by Capt. John Smith, the colonizer of Virginia, for their industry and their skill, especially in making pitch and tar for shipbuilding uses, as well as for their bravery in fighting the Indians. These Polonians were awarded the franchise of the colony by the Virginia Co. of London in 1619, having organized a regular strike for the express purpose of obtaining political rights.

In the same early period Polish farmers made their mark among Dutch settlers in what is now the State of New York, and the first secondary school founded in New Amsterdam (as New York was then called) was organized in 1659 by a Pole, Dr. Alexander Charles Curtius.

It was in the Dutch colony of Amsterdam also that another Polish settler, Albert Zaborowski, acquired wealth and authority in the middle of the seventeenth century, becoming the owner of large tracts of land on the Passaic River in northern New Jersey, and gaining fame as a friend and protector of the Indians of the region. He founded a widespread family, honorably known in many parts of the United States by its shortened name, "Zabriskie."

Poles were not merely among the established settlements, they also adventurously explored the remote and uninhabited wilderness. In 1735 a Pole, John Anthony Sadowski, reached the western outskirts of Ohio, anticipating systematic white colonization there by a hundred years. The town of Sandusky, Ohio, commemorates his name. He himself afterward lived in Virginia, where he was killed by the Indians. His sons, Jacob and Joseph, became companions of the famous Kentucky pioneer, Daniel Boone. They assisted in the first survey of Kentucky, were the first white men to camp on the spot now occupied by the town of Cincinnati, Ohio, and founded the town of Harrodsburgh. One of them actually reached New Orleans, going down the Mississippi in a boat built by himself. At the same time the first map of the coast of New England, a map still admired for its accuracy, was produced by a Polish surveyor in the British service named Charles Blaszkowicz.

These and other pioneering achievements of Poles in the seventeenth century were the outcome of the interest the Polish people had long taken in the New World. Poland, in her old University Library at Cracow, houses the earliest globe of European make, on which America noviter reperta figures as a separate continent (a replica now adorns the Polish room in the University of Pittsburgh). Plans for founding a Polish colony in the southern part of North America—to be called New Poland—were entertained by an eighteenth-century Polish statesman, T. Mostowski; but the first partition of Poland prevented the enterprise from maturing.

HEROES OF TWO WORLDS

A Polish name, far greater than those hitherto mentioned, illumines both America's War of Independence and Poland's last stand against her despoilers. Not in vain is Gen.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko (1746–1817) known to fame as the hero of two worlds—the Old and the New.

It was as a young captain of the Polish Army, commissioned after graduation from Polish and French military schools, that Kosciuszko decided, in 1776, to carry his sword across the Atlantic and help the American Colonies in their struggle for freedom, which was finding a sympathetic echo throughout Europe. His services to the cause of American independence are well known and have frequently been commemorated in oratory, literature, and art.

Kosciuszko's name has never ceased to be honored in America as well as in Poland; in the United States it is commemorated not only by monuments in all the chief cities but by several towns named after Kosciuszko. His name was also given to an island off the coast of Alaska, discovered several decades ago and recently explored by the Polish geographer, S. Jarosz.

Side by side with Kosciuszko, both nations honor the memory of Casimir Pulaski (1748–79), who gave his life for America's independence. Unlike Kosciuszko, he had his career as a leader of the Poles behind him and not before him when he came to America. For 3 years before the first partition of Poland, he had waged a dauntless guerrilla warfare against the Russian invaders. After 4 years of wanderings in exile, he offered his services to America through Benjamin Franklin in Paris, who sent him to Washington's headquarters. In the War of Independence, Pulaski won fame for the same intrepid courage in attack he had shown as a partisan leader in Poland. By his boldness he saved Washington's army at Brandywine and at Warren Tavern in 1777; and, at the head of a special detachment organized by himself—"Pulaski's legion"—he marched, in 1779, into South Carolina, raised the impending siege of the town of Charleston, and finally met a hero's death in leading French and American troops in the attack on Savannah, Ga.

Kosciusko and Pulaski were not the only Polish soldiers who distinguished themselves in America's War of Independence. Pulaski's Legion included many other Polish volunteers, some of whom share with him the glory of heroic death in battle, and one of whom, M. Rogowski, survived to write memoirs of the Revolutionary War. Other interesting memoirs on the early years of America's new life of freedom were written by two exiled Polish poets, the brilliant satirist, K. Wegierski (who visited America in 1784) and J. U. Niemcewicz, sometime aide de camp to Kosciusko and afterward a farmer in New Jersey with his American wife, Susanna Kean. In those early years of the United States' struggle for existence services no less valuable than those of Polish soldiers were rendered to America by the financial efforts of a rich Polish banker settled in Amsterdam, Holland, Peter Stadnicki, an early purchaser of United States bonds, who afterward for a time became chief banker for the United States in Europe, and, as one of the founders of The Holland Land Co., laid the foundation of agricultural settlement in the remoter parts of New York and Pennsylvania.

THOSE WHO FOUGHT FOR FREEDOM

The next important contribution by Poles to the national life and culture of the United States arose out of Poland's armed uprising against her Russian oppressor in 1830–31. The brave efforts and ultimate failure of the Polish insurrectionists elicited expressions of sympathy from all lovers of liberty among western nations; nor were American voices wanting in that general chorus. A Polish-American committee was organized in Paris by the joint efforts of James Fenimore Cooper, the eminent American writer, and Lafayette, America's French friend, who fought side by side with Kosciuszko for American independence. An American doctor and philanthropist, Samuel G. Howe, of Boston, who was to carry relief funds from the committee into Poland, suffered long imprisonment in Germany for his noble attempt; another American doctor, Paul F. Eve, of Georgia, actually served with distinction in the medical corps of the Polish Army during the insurrectionary campaign.

After the disastrous failure of the insurrection, thousands of its soldiers sought a new home abroad, in western Europe and in the United States. The American Congress granted them a whole township (6 square miles of land) in the State of Illinois, but the exiles were too poor to reach and develop it. They were scattered through the towns of New England States, and it was here that many of them, with later arrivals from Poland, made their mark in the development of the different American communities that gave them hospitable shelter. Among them were A. Kurek, the composer, who was the first organizer of touring orchestras in America; J. Fontana, another composer, who had been a friend of Chopin; H. Domochowski-Sanders, a sculptor, whose bust of Pulaski adorns the Capitol in Washington; A. Zengteller and A. Raszewski, engravers; J. Podbielski, a translator of Polish works into English; and an even better known translator, P. Sobolewski; the editor of a popular anthology entitled "Poets and Poetry of Poland" (1881); H. Kalusowski, a well-known doctor and philanthropist in Washington; K. Gzowski, founder of the city of Toronto in Canada and builder of the first bridge near Niagara Falls; L. Boeck, organizer of one of the first schools of engineering in America; Dr. F. Wierzbicki, known for a description of California, the first book printed in San Francisco (1849); A. Jakubowski, son of a distinguished Polish poet, himself a gifted writer of verse in Polish and English, whose early death was a great loss; finally, K. Kraitzir, a Hungarian by birth, but a volunteer soldier in the Polish insurrectionary war and author of The Poles in the United States (Philadelphia, 1937).

At the time when these exiles from Poland displayed their manifold intellectual and social activities, the territorial expansion of the United States toward the far West was in full progress and Poles were among its pioneers. Both in the conquest of Texas for the Union and in the Mexican War of 1846–48. Poles fought with distinction on the American side and some of them fell. One of the officers who had served against Mexico, K. Radziminski, also took an active part in the delimitation of the new frontiers. Another Pole, Truskolaski, did meritorious service as a surveyor of newly occupied territories both in Louisiana and in Utah.

In consequence of the individual achievements and services of Polish insurrectionary soldiers of 1831 in America, the forties were a time when the Polish element was well known in the United States and frequently received demonstrative proofs of political sympathy from the American people.

WITH GRANT AND LEE

Having been drawn so deeply into the inner life of the United States, the Polish exiles could not remain aloof during the great crisis which culminated in the Civil War of 1861–65.

The number of Poles living in the United States at the time of the outbreak of the Civil War is estimated at some 30,000. The majority of them lived in the Northern States; accordingly, 4,000 out of the 5,000 Poles who fought in the War, served under the banner of the Union, and only about 1,000 in the ranks of the Confederate Army. On the side of the Union a Polish leader, Gen. W. Krzyzanowski, won high rank and preferment. Exiled from Prussian Poland by political persecution, he went to America, was a railway builder in the Middle West, and a merchant in Washington. He was one of the first to respond to President Lincoln's historic appeal for volunteers; he organized a militia company in Washington; entering it as a private soldier, he was soon promoted captain, then colonel of the Fifty-eighth New York Infantry Regiment, known as the Polish Legion. He fought with distinction at Cross Keys, at Bull Run, at Chancellorsville, at Gettysburg, and in the expedition to Tennessee, becoming the idol of his soldiers. Leaving the service with the rank of brigadier general, he afterward became the first Governor of Alaska, and later served meritoriously in Panama and in the State of New York.

Another exile from Prussian Poland, Joseph Karge, who had begun his new life in America as a school teacher, became the commander of a New Jersey cavalry regiment and fought all through the war with distinction. On his return to civil life he earned popularity as a professor of foreign language and literature at Princeton University, where he taught for nearly 30 years. The names of Krzyzanowski and Karge have their counterpart on the Confederate side in that of Gen. K. Tochman, who organized and for a time commanded the Polish Brigade of New Orleans. And in both Armies many Poles laid down their lives for the cause in which they fought and sustained their country's reputation for heroic valor; some Polish women also earned praise for self-sacrificing heroism as army nurses, particularly Sister Veronica Klimkiewicz, of the Sisterhood of Mercy, who rendered valuable services to the Union Army and lived on into honored old age, to die in 1930 at Baltimore.

UNSKILLED LABOR COMES

The sixties open up a new era in the history of European, and particularly of Polish, immigration into the United States. In places of the political exiles of former days, representing the intellectual elite of Europe and introducing valuable creative elements into many walks of American life, masses of unskilled made their appearance, coming largely from the rural districts of southeastern Europe, largely Latin and Slav, and soon to be absorbed by America's rapidly growing industries.

The large Polish-American community that grew up in that period, is rightly regarded as a mainstay of the Polish national cause. It earned this reputation by its willingness to make large sacrifices for its oppressed motherland. Another outstanding characteristic of the Polish community in the United States is its attachment to Catholic tradition—a dominant feature of Poland's national life throughout history. The Polish peasant farmer, like the Irishman, is fervently devoted to the faith of his fathers. Roman Catholic priests, the people's most trusted advisers at home, became its first leaders and organizers abroad, and Roman Catholic parishes are the first and remain the fundamental units of Polish national organization and instruction in America.

It was at the summons of an immigrant priest, Father L. Moczygeba, that a group of Polish peasant farmers from Upper Silesia went out to settle in Texas as early as 1854. They brought domestic furniture and farm implements with them; nor were the very bells of the local parish church forgotten, as well as a huge wooden crucifix, to be planted in the midst of the primeval wilderness of the far West. The journey across the American Continent, still made by covered wagons, took months. The beginnings of the first settlement, piously named Panna Maria (the Virgin Mary) were hard, indeed, and many of the settlers succumbed. Yet all difficulties were overcome by the iron endurance of the sturdy peasant nature and Panna Maria became the center of several thriving settlements, whose inhabitants, the sons and grandsons of the original immigrants, are well-to-do American

farmers today, but cling closely to their religion and national traditions.

The Upper Silesian settlement in Texas was the forerunner of many others of a similar kind. But the majority of Polish emigrant peasants soon began to people the large industrial cities of New England, Pennsylvania, and of the Middle West. In 40 years, from 50,000 in 1870, the number of Poles in the United States rose to 3,000,000 in 1910. The majority worked in factories and mines, and only some 10 percent remained tillers of the soil. But a new growth of prosperous Polish farms has recently developed in some parts of New England, especially in the Connecticut Valley, where once prosperous farms are passing from the hands of old colonial families into those of Polish owners, originally farm hands. And Polish artisans and tradesmen, with an increasing class of professional men, especially doctors, architects, and lawyers, are now fairly numerous in the large Polish districts of such cities as Chicago (which has three such districts with nearly half a million Polish inhabitants), Detroit (whose borough of Hamtramck is solidly Polish), Cleveland, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, and Baltimore. In the South and in the West the Polish element is much less strong, though it is not entirely absent from any part of the United States.

WORLD WAR NO. 1

As Poles fought bravely in the Civil War, they again distinguished themselves in the Spanish-American War of 1898. Several companies of the National Guard that are still in existence were then composed entirely of Polish volunteers.

When the World War came and America associated herself with the Allied Powers, Americans of Polish origin were foremost in offering their services to their country. Their contributions to Red Cross funds and to the Liberty loans were out of all proportions to their numbers and to the wealth they possessed. Likewise their response to the call for men. Out of the first 100,000 volunteers who answered the summons of President Wilson, no fewer than 40,000 were Poles, and it is on record that the first American soldier to die on the field of honor in France was a Pole. His name was Joseph J. Czajka, of Milwaukee, Wis. Altogether, some 300,000 Poles served in the United States Army in the last war.

Poland's hopes for political resurrection were bound up with the cause of the western allies. Paderewski, looked upon by millions of Americans as one of the world's great artists, gave a new voice to Polish aspirations. His popularity in the United States and his gift of oratory were invaluable in the service of his country.

Coming to America in 1915, he campaigned on behalf of Poland, addressing countless meetings with never-flagging fire and magnificent mastery of speech. It was due to his efforts that the restoration of Poland became part of President Wilson's 14 points. He succeeded, by his personal magnetism, in creating a united Polish National Committee in Chicago in 1916, which, besides many other services to the cause of Poland, collected more than $10,000,000 for Polish national aims from the Polish-American community. Paderewski, by his appeals to American Poles, caused some 25,000 men from the United States and Canada to join the ranks of the Polish Army in France, which fought on the Allied side under the command of General Haller in the last stages of the World War. The services of the Polish-American community to the new Poland did not end with the restoration of Poland. American Poles were among the most generous subscribers of the first loan of the new Polish Republic, and they gave unflagging assistance to their motherland in all critical situations in which she found herself in the difficult early years of her new existence, right down to the disastrous floods in southern Poland in the summer of 1934, which called forth a splendid outburst of Polish-American relief activity.

These manifestations of attachment to the "old country" as Americans of Polish origin generally call Poland, are cherished in Poland's national memory together with the historic proofs of active sympathy, which the new Poland has at various times received from the Government and people of the United States, such as the heroic volunteer services of the "Kosciuszko Squadron" of United States airmen in the Polish-Bolshevik War of 1920; the post-war relief campaigns of the Hoover Mission, the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, and other agencies; the expert help of Professor Kemmerer and Mr. Charles S. Dewey as Poland's financial advisers and the large American loan of 1927; last but not least, the humanitarian and educational activities of the American Y. M. C. A. among Polish soldiers in wartime, continued among the civilian population in time of peace and culminating in 1923, in the creation, with generous material assistance from America, of a "Polish Y. M. C. A."

New Dealers Pull Another Paradox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE TOPEKA (KANS.) DAILY CAPITAL

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interesting and informative article from the Topeka Daily Capital of Topeka, Kansas, under date of September 27, 1941. The article is by Clif Stratton, who represents the Capital's Washington Bureau. Mr. Stratton is an able writer and has given a great deal of study to farm problems. It reads as follows:

[From the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital of September 27, 1941]

NEW DEALERS PULL ANOTHER FARM PARADOX—FORCE CANADIAN WHEAT, ARGENTINE BEEF DOWN THROATS

There are some mysterious goings-on in official circles these days. There is Secretary Wickard of Agriculture planning to reduce wheat acreage even below the 55,000,000 acres minimum established by Congress for the A. A. A. program—down to 50,000,000 acres.

This because of the huge surplus of wheat. We can understand that. But at the same time, here comes Secretary of Treasury Morgenthau, and urges that the bars be let down and that large quantities of wheat be imported into the United States from Canada, which also has large surpluses.

Also, there are stories going around that Canadian wheat is being milled in bond in flour mills as far south as Texas, grinding flour to be exported. There is a 42-cents-a-bushel tariff on wheat for human consumption; wheat for feeding to animals gets off with 10 percent ad valorem, or around 10 cents a bushel. But wheat can be brought in to be milled for export purposes in United States mills, and pays no tariff at all. So if some of the mills buy Canadian wheat for export flour, when it is lower in price than United States wheat, that is understandable.

But the justice of charging United States growers 49 cents a bushel to feed wheat to animals on their own farms, while Canadian wheat can be brought in on a tariff of 10 cents a bushel (frequently less)—well, that is one of the mysteries. And this observer believes the A. A. A. program, with all its faults, is the best yet tried out for the American wheat growers.

And here is something else—it is worrying the dairy people, instead of the wheat growers. Paul McNutt, Administrator of Federal Security Agency (for some reason he has been given charge of administering the Oleomargarine Act), has rewritten the oleo regulations so that oleo can be made to look just like butter, and if vitamins are added practically can be sold as butter to unsuspecting customers. Oh, I know the regulations don't say that, but the practical effect is just about that.

And, in addition, in the name of nutrition, radio programs are being put on by McNutt's department, advertising the wonderful qualities of oleomargarine. Maybe it has all those qualities claimed for it, but our understanding is that you can make oleo look like butter, taste like butter—but still it isn't butter, any more than near-beer was beer, and it doesn't have the nutritive value of butter from the good old dairy cow.

Also, our Government, ever anxious to get a new order going, remake the world, and so forth, now seems to be doing a clever job for the Argentine cattlemen, and for those smart American packers who have packing plants in the Argentine.

As part of the Nation-wide nutritional program, Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture has slipped in promotion of "corned beef and cabbage" days or weeks or something like that. Women taking home courses in home cooking from experts from the agricultural colleges are being urged to feed the men corned beef and cabbage.

Now the joker in that program, so far as the American farmer who handles beef cattle, is that the only tinned corned beef that can be bought in the United States is made from Argentine beef. So through this "corned beef and cabbage" course in nutrition, American housewives all over the country are being educated to buy Argentine beef.

Unless the foot and mouth disease quarantine is removed, cattle and fresh beef cannot be imported into the United States from Argentina—but canned beef can, and is.

At the same time, and for some time back, Secretary of State Cordell Hull has been and is working to lift the quarantine against Argentine fresh beef. The Eastern seaboard cities want it—it is cheaper than American-produced beef. Now if the housewives of the rest of the country can just be educated to use more and more Argentine beef in cans, it ought to make it easier somewhere down the road to get Nation-wide public sentiment in favor of Argentine fresh beef as well.

In our spare moments we wonder just how popular the "corned beef and cabbage"—Argentine tinned beef preferred—nutrition campaign is, say in the Kansas Flint Hills region.

This administration is strong for helping the farmer—and it has done a lot. But why, we pause to inquire, does it also insist on taking away more and more of the market from the American farmer? R. S. V. P.

Farm Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

PAMPHLET PUBLISHED BY THE FEDERATION OF NATIONAL FARM LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, a very enlightening pamphlet has just recently been published by the Federation of National Farm Loan Associations, entitled "Is the Farm Credit System Being Sold Down the River?"

I ask unanimous consent to extend this analysis of the new proposed Farm Credit Act, H. R. 5336, in the Appendix of the RECORD. Hearings are now being held on this bill by the House Committee on Agriculture.

The article follows:

[Analysis of the new proposed Farm Credit Act (H. R. 5336) with suggested remedies by the Federation of National Farm Loan Associations, conference held at Chicago, September 19, 1941]

IS THE FARM CREDIT SYSTEM BEING SOLD "DOWN THE RIVER"?

The Federal Land Bank System is in danger of being traded for a Government lending agency if House bill H. R. 5336 is passed in its present form, despite the many good features of the bill.

The farm credit system has grown for 25 years and has lived successfully through one war inflation, two depressions, and five changes of administration without serious criticism. Farmers have over $215,000,000 invested and should have a majority of control.

The danger of a federally controlled lending agency is that political prestige may replace sound farm values as a basis for the extension of credit, and political pressure might determine the collection policies. Thus we might ultimately lose the institution that has saved thousands of farmers in the past 25 years.

On March 25, 1941, we sent out to all farm-loan associations suggested remedies for the farm credit system. A bill has been drawn up by the Farm Credit Administration after consulting with the grange, the Farm Bureau, and the council of cooperatives, and has been introduced in Congress by Representative FULMER. It is known as H. R. 5336.

The Farm Credit Administration and the farm organizations did not agree on a number of amendments which the farm organizations believe are essential to the safety of the system, so the farm organizations will present these amendments to the committee when hearings are held.

While the bill has many good points, in its present form the bad points far outweigh the good. We do not want to spoil the good features of this bill, but prefer to correct the situation by eliminating the bad features, and unless they are eliminated by amendment we feel that the bill should be defeated.

Every farm-loan association and every borrower should study this bill and get in touch with his Congressman and Senator, requesting the elimination of the objectionable features and the addition of proper safeguards.

The greatest danger in the bill lies in the increase in centralized control. Practically every action of an association or a bank is made subject to the approval of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. There are three sections relating to scaling debts, in which the Governor would almost supplant the banks; in addition there are about 65 places where the activities of the banks and the associations are made subject to the approval of the Governor.

There has already been too much control in Washington. The function of the Farm Credit Administration should be to see that the law was enforced, while the boards of directors of the associations and the banks should be responsible for the operation of their own institutions.

There are a number of places where increased power is sought which can be corrected by amendment. Space prevents listing them all, but the following amendments are thought necessary to prevent complete control and operation from Washington:

A. LIMITING POWERS OF GOVERNOR OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

1. Remove the power of the Governor to veto salaries of individual employees and confine his approval to salary schedules, thus placing the responsibility for hiring and firing on the boards of directors where it belongs.

2. Provide for a Farm Credit Board of nine members, three appointed by the Governor, and six elected by the borrowers, two each by the National Farm-Loan Associations, the Production Credit Associations, and the Cooperatives which are borrowers from the Cooperative Bank.

3. Provide for an advisory committee chosen at conferences, made up of representatives of farm-loan associations, which, among other duties, could make nominations for directors and, further, furnish a closer contact between the land banks and the associations.

4. The bill dangerously provides for the adjustment of the debts of its farmer borrowers. It provides that any farmer, who believes his farm is worth less than his mortgage indebtedness against it, any time may apply for a scale down.

This would result in putting a premium on delinquencies, and would encourage the dishonest farmer to avoid payment of his debts, the loss being absorbed by the associations and the Federal land banks of the system, with the result that the honest, hard-working farmer would be paying the indebtedness of the drones of agriculture.

In regions where disaster has overtaken farmers, provisions for direct help from emergency agencies, or from the present revolving fund, should take care of those cases; and money should be paid into the revolving fund by the Government to cover these losses, as in many cases they were incurred at Government demand.

The entire debt-adjustment provisions of the bill should be eliminated, as these provisions of this bill are not sound and should not be a part of any sound credit system. The measure should be amended by striking out sections 10, 11, and 12 of H. R. 5336. A more helpful policy would be to amend the measure to provide that losses arising from emergency lending and collection policies ordered by the Government should be met from the Government paid-in surplus.

5. We believe the Governor should not be allowed to determine how much income each association is to have, if any.

6. We do not believe the Governor should be allowed to determine the extent of farmer participation in the Federal Land Bank System.

7. The bill takes authority for determining the issuance of bonds out of the hands of the banks and gives the control to the Governor. No Governor should have this power over a board. It covers the very source of funds on which the system operates.

8. Change the functions of the Governor to a law-enforcement officer and not the executive officer of the farm credit system by eliminating many of the provisions which give him final approval of the acts of the associations and banks which should be determined by their directors.

If the power to control the employees and the board were thus definitely settled in the borrowers, and a system of election established which would make it difficult to control the election while assuring membership selection, the gravest danger in the pending bill could be largely met, but these amendments appear essential.

B. OTHER DANGEROUS FEATURES

1. The bill provides for raising the Commissioner loan from $7,500 to $50,000. This opens the door for the substitution of Commissioner loans for all Federal land bank loans, and might easily result in seriously crippling the associations and the banks. It might even put them out of business.

The Commissioner loan is an emergency loan, and should be treated as such. Seventy-five-percent loans are normally inflationary in character and should be avoided. With reasonable prices, this emergency lending should ultimately pass out of the picture and should not be made permanent.

2. The bill provides for making loans to corporations. This encourages corporation farming. We feel that the backbone of the Nation has been built around the ownership of farm lands by common farm people, and the loans to corporations only encourages further farm tenancy.

Corporation loaning may furnish the means for Government ownership of land, further increasing tenancy, and possibly reducing the position of the farmer to communistic serfdom.

We believe that loans to corporations should be eliminated.

3. The bill provides that losses be split on a 50–50 basis between the banks and the associations. We believe that the profits should be divided in a similar manner. The main reason that we have impaired associations at the present time is because the associations have absorbed all the losses and the land banks kept the profits.

4. The bill provides for the payment of one-eighth of 1 percent payment from the Federal land banks to the associations; that with the approval of the Governor, the boards may pay to the associations an additional three-eighths of 1 percent. We believe that the Federal land bank should pay one-half of 1 percent to the associations without reservation, leaving a full 1 percent, or two-thirds of the spread, to the banks.

The farm credit system was set up with the intent that farmers should own and control it. The farmer borrowers of the United States now have over $215,000,000 invested in the land bank system, the control of which would be largely taken away from them and placed in the hands of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration at Washington. We believe that as much of the Government money has been returned, and is being returned, that control of this system should revert to the hands of its owners.

WE APPROVE—IF CONGRESS CUTS OUT OBJECTIONABLE PROVISIONS

If the above mentioned objectionable features are eliminated, or remedied, we feel that the bill has many good points and should pass. Among these favorable points are:

1. It pays the borrowers for their stock and substitutes member ownership.

2. Provides the associations with a definite income of from one-eighth of 1 percent to as high at one-half of 1 percent, and com-

pensation for loan servicing. While this is listed as an advantage, provisions should be made for the definite income to be not less than one-third of the 1½ percent spread between bond rate and loan rate, or one-half percent.

3. Would enable banks to pay dividends through creating a guaranty fund out of the Government funds in the system.

4. Provides means for keeping associations solvent.

5. Overcomes the difficulty of the stock not following the loan when the property is sold.

6. Provides for joint sharing of losses between banks and associations.

7. Guarantees 3½ percent interest until July 1, 1946, and thereafter based on the average cost of money, which should make low interest rates after July 1, 1946.

8. Provides for dividends to be paid on a patronage basis.

9. Assures associations and borrowers closer cooperation with the banks through the advisory committee which will help adjust or prevent differences.

10. Provides control of possible abuses from taking deficiency judgments.

11. Removes the burden of the Puerto Rico branch from the borrowers of the Baltimore land bank district.

12. Provides for variable-payment rates to meet trying times.

May we again repeat that the bill has many good points, all of which will be lost if we substitute a Government lending agency for the present farmer owned and controlled land bank system.

The farm organizations recognize the good points in this bill and are approving it only if proper amendments are made which will correct the tendency toward centralized control.

The next step after centralized control is dictatorship, and dictatorships lead to war. Let us keep the control of the farm credit system in the hands of its borrower owners.

The Great Salmon Mystery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in the September 13, 1941, issue of the Saturday Evening Post is contained a challenging article by Richard L. Neuberger, a thoughtful journalist of Portland, Oreg., on the subject The Great Salmon Mystery. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I have obtained an estimate from the Government Printing Office which indicates that the article will take 3¾ pages of the RECORD and will cost $168.75.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of September 13, 1941]

THE GREAT SALMON MYSTERY

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Since the memory of man, Indian and white, runneth not to the contrary, the finest and strongest and stoutest-hearted salmon on earth have spawned in the headwaters of the Columbia River. But never will a salmon spawn there again. The last fish has struggled valiantly up the steep ascent from the Pacific Ocean to the distant creeks and glacier run-offs which are the Columbia's origin. Irrevocably, and for as long as steel and concrete shall endure, the fabulous 1,200-mile salmon migrations that have been one of the wonders of the animal kingdom are blocked by Grand Coulee Dam.

From late spring till early fall the most valuable fish runs in the United States go up the Columbia River from the sea. They are on their way to spawn. Some impulse, mysterious and unfathomable, urges the mightiest salmon, the Chinooks, back to the far-off upland tributaries where they themselves emerged from eggs 4 or 5 years earlier. Up the Columbia they thrash and push, surmounting waterfalls with incredible leaps and twisting through a gantlet of nets and lines and spears. They do not end their inexorable journey until they spawn; they do not spawn until they reach the shallow, gravelly creeks in the mountains; and after they spawn they die.

One hundred and forty miles from the river's mouth Bonneville Dam rears a 72-foot obstacle. Last year, up a labyrinth of ladders and stairways and chutes at Bonneville, 391,595 ascending Chinooks were counted. Is this number large or small? Who knows? The biologists do not. They have no basis of comparison; never before have the fish in a vast stream been counted at all. What they do know is that 450 miles above Bonneville, like a great crenelated fortress, stands the stupendous wall of Grand Coulee. Water crashing over its spillway falls twice as far as Niagara. That frowning barricade not even Moby Dick could scale. So the Federal Government has begun a prodigious experiment—an experiment to determine if salmon whose forbears for centuries have spawned in the Columbia's last, lingering reaches can be schooled to consummate their lives at least 500 miles downstream. Frank A. Bank, chief engineer at Grand Coulee, calls the scheme Uncle Sam's fish college.

"G'wan, you're fooling," scoffed one skeptical wildlifer when lean and saturnine Joe Kemmerich, superintendent of the biggest fish hatchery in America, told him the general idea of the undertaking. But Joe was in dead earnest, and so are thousands of men and women along the Columbia's swift course as they wait for results. Their livelihood may be at stake. The Government values the fish runs in the Columbia River at $250,000,000 and the annual return is never less than 4 percent. This $10,000,000 supports a lot of families as well as many entire river-bank communities. Nor are the consequences likely to be merely regional. Rich, flaky salmon from the Columbia River has been baked, boiled, fried, or served from the can in countless kitchens all over the land.

Only a part of the Columbia's salmon population heads for the 620 miles of river back of Grand Coulee. But that part includes the best Chinooks, the fish with the most endurance and vitality. It is this strain of salmon which must not be allowed to become extinct.

Uncle Sam's academy for fish starts enrolling pupils when these salmon thoroughbreds are trapped below Grand Coulee. Then they are rushed 45 miles in tank trucks to ponds alongside the immense hatchery which Joe Kemmerich operates in the Washington town of Leavenworth. There the salmon are spawned artificially. After about a year in hatchery troughs and pools the resulting offspring, approximately 6 inches long now, are put in the trucks and turned loose in streams entering the Columbia River below Grand Coulee Dam. The theory is that if one generation of Chinooks had an irresistible urge to spawn in creeks above Grand Coulee because that was the scene of their early life, why will not the next generation of Chinooks go back to tributaries below Grand Coulee if that was where they were released as baby fish?

"Thus," announces the United States Fish and Wildlife Service reassuringly, "the hatchery-reared fish will return to the water in which they were planted, establishing new and natural runs in those streams."

Will this idea work? Government experts think so, but admit there will be no conclusive answer for 4 years—not until the salmon now being propagated artificially at Leavenworth come back up the Columbia to spawn. Will they continue on to Grand Coulee, over the route their ancestors traveled, and perish buffeting its cement ramparts? Or will they wind off toward their new habitats?

The ultimate outcome of this novel plan is only a single phase—albeit, a vital one—of the Great Salmon Mystery. All sorts of other questions must be settled, too.

Are enough Chinooks getting upstream past Bonneville Dam? Will the fingerling fish, on their way down to the Pacific, scoot safely through Bonneville's turbines or will they be mangled by the whirring propeller blades? What will be the effect of additional dams projected for the Columbia's tributaries—the Snake, the Umatilla, the Willamette? Will Congress accept the recommendations of the Army engineers for seven more big dams across the main stem of the Columbia?

What then? Do fish and civilization mix? Can salmon survive river pollution and increased cutting of the forests which guard the watershed? Will irrigation ditches be death traps for fish bound for both the sea and their spawning grounds? With what agility will fingerlings nurtured in hatchery pools dodge the trout and pike which are their natural enemies? Can the last untouched spawning ground in the Columbia Basin, Idaho's Salmon River, be kept that way? If the Salmon should be plugged too, how much hope will there be? Will the legislatures of Washington and Oregon generate sufficient political courage to shut off commercial fishing in the upper river?

THIS IS MY OWN, MY NATIVE SAND

A generation of salmon must live and die before doubts will be resolved. The situation today is so hedged about with imponderables that, after an exhaustive on-the-scene study, Dr. Willis H. Rich, eminent ichthyologist at Stanford University, could reach only this indecisive judgment: "The future outlook for the salmon fisheries of the Columbia River is not bright, but neither is it hopeless."

"You've got to remember," cautions Mike Hoy, master fish warden for the State of Oregon, "that you're not handling lumber or aluminum or iron ore or some other inanimate material. This is a problem which deals with living creatures, the strangest creatures in the United States of America. We're going to learn whether fish which absolutely must migrate upstream to perpetuate themselves can exist in a river system extensively developed for power, industry, and reclamation. Unfortunately this is something that can't be decided with finality in a laboratory. There are so many complicated factors involved that nothing but actual experience will tell the tale."

First and foremost among these factors is the fascinating life cycle of the great Chinook or King salmon. Tyee, the Indians call him. Far up the Kicking Horse River, in the shadow of the Continental Divide, Tyee bursts out of one of the four or five thousand eggs which his mother laid and his father fertilized. Then commences the obscure process by which Tyee comes to recognize the Kicking Horse from among the myriad of streams and creeks which rib the

Columbia River Basin. As Tyee increases in size the waves and eddies of the Kicking Horse caress his silvery sides and stir in him unforgettable sensations. But by the time half a year has passed, he is dominated by another urge, and he leaves the Kicking Horse and starts down to the sea. Only 6 or 8 inches long, Tyee must dart beneath rocks and logs to escape fish that would eat him, and often rapids leave him stunned and sore.

The Kicking Horse pours its milky glacier-fed waters into the Columbia. Through the deep gorges of the Canadian Rockies Tyee floats, beneath the C P. R. bridge at Revelstroke and on across the American line. With a terrifying roar he is slammed through the generators at Bonneville Dam and drifts in a daze for the next day and night. The Columbia is broader by this time and Tyee feels the surge of the tide. It lifts him on rolling billows. So at last he comes to the ocean. There he lives for more than 3 years. Where he goes no man can say with certainty.

In those years, if he keeps out of fishing nets, Tyee becomes a great Chinook salmon. He may weigh 60 or 70 pounds. And then some gentle spring day he feels the pull of the north country once more. Across all that weary distance he remembers the icy reaches of the Kicking Horse. Salmon spawn in the fall, but Tyee begins his migration in May, for he has a long way to travel. He must journey more than a thousand miles, and his belly bulges with rich oil to carry him on his course. After he enters the mouth of the Columbia he never feeds again, although he may snap angrily at a fisherman's spinner. The surplus oil padding his sides must take him home.

Nets of all descriptions stretch out for Tyee, but not for a dinner table was he destined. At Bonneville he flips up fish ladders, which are like watery staircases, and a click tells that he has been counted along with thousands of his kind. Other tributary streams beckon invitingly, but Tyee knows where he is bound. Celilo Falls presents a 15-foot bastion behind a plumelike curtain. Tyee must leap four times before a mighty effort takes him over the brink and into the smooth water above. He barely evades an Indian's spear and continues upstream.

And finally, in the sharp mountain autumn, "home is the sailor, home from the sea." Tyee has returned to the Kicking Horse. Beside him he notices a long, tapering female salmon. They thrash upstream together. Near the gravel bar where Tyee himself was spawned 5 years before, the female hollows a shallow pocket and deposits her eggs. With heavy rushes Tyee, too, scoops away the pebbly bottom and hovers over the eggs. His life is completed now and so is that of his mate. Out of the 259,000 square miles of the Columbia's watershed they have found the place they sought. The urge which carried them from the ocean to the core of the Rockies is gone and with it their last energy. They drift down the Kicking Horse, blind and battered. Before another sundown they are dead.

This is the life span of the Chinook salmon, the great fish of the Pacific seaboard. But Tyee's offspring will never spawn in the Kicking Horse. Instead they are to be enlisted in Uncle Sam's fish school and driven on the most remarkable ride ever taken by salmon or, for that matter, by any other fish.

Registration for the school takes place in the three fish ladders which ascend Rock Island Dam, a long, low barrier built across the Columbia, 150 miles below Grand Coulee, by a power company. In these ladders Joe Kemmerich and his assistants have placed fish traps. When a trap is full a worker in rubber boots sloshes in with a net and scoops out the scrap fish—suckers, pike, and eels. This cuts down the mortality among salmon eggs and fingerlings. Then the trap, with water and fish and all, is slowly hoisted 25 feet in an electrically operated elevator shaft.

Waiting for this cargo of thrashing, flipping salmon is a fleet of eight tank trucks. Each truck cost $7,638, holds 1,000 gallons of water, and this is chilled to the glacial temperature of the Columbia by a compartment packed with nearly a ton of cracked ice. Two big pumps maintain the oxygen supply in the tank. Dials show the driver the temperature and pressure of the water, which he can regulate with valves.

At the height of the fish runs the trucks travel the highway from 4 in the morning until midnight. The traps at Rock Island fill as fast as porridge bowls. "These aren't meat-packed fish you're carrying," Joe Kemmerich admonishes the truck drivers, who last year drove a total of 102,784 miles. "They're fish to reproduce thousands of other fish later on."

This program costs the Government $3,510,000. At Leavenworth the fish are dumped into holding ponds along Icicle Creek, where they are collected and spawned artificially. The eggs then are put in hundreds of trays and troughs until the fingerlings emerge. Today, at Leavenworth, 7,500,000 baby fish are being fed.

There are more than 100 ponds and pools. Twenty-five thousand pounds of ice are manufactured each day for the trucks alone. When it was feared that Icicle Creek might not provide the 173,000 gallons of cold water required every hour, a 2,600-foot tunnel was drilled through granite from the creek's source to the bottom of Snow Lake. For this job, rangers in the Wenatchee National Forest had to construct 6 miles of mountain trail, and 230 tons of supplies were hauled to Snow Lake on pack horses. A series of five dams on Icicle Creek supplements the water-control system.

After the fingerlings have been in the hatchery about a year they are taken in the tank trucks to tributaries which enter the Columbia below Grand Coulee Dam. The little Chinooks are emptied into the Entiat River and Nason Creek because for them fast water, flecked with whitecaps, has the greatest lure. The blueback or sockeye salmon, much smaller than the Chinooks, are released in the Wenatchee and Okanogan Rivers, for they spawn only in streams with lakes at their source.

Is this scheme foolproof? Just in case it isn't, not all the salmon trapped at Rock Island are being chauffeured to Leavenworth for artificial propagation. Some are hauled directly to the Wenatchee, the Entiat, and the other streams where the fingerlings are turned loose. The haul to Osoyoos Lake, near the rise of the Okanogan, is 155 miles, and the trucks must be reiced at way points. When these adult fish first were released, many of the West's leading biologists came out with pup tents and bacon and beans, and camped right along the bank to see what would happen. The salmon uniformly turned around and started back downstream toward the Columbia and their distant spawning grounds above Grand Coulee. But grilles had been set in the water, and they pushed against the grating like bears in a cage. A few Chinooks got through a faulty weir on Nason Creek and a week later battered out their lives against the masonry cliffs of Coulee. The bulk of the salmon, however, at last tired of bumping the grilles. They whipped about and, while the naturalists watched in wonder, went upstream to the gravel shoals and spawned.

Fred J. Foster, assistant regional director in the Northwest for the Fish and Wildlife Service, explains this alternative plan: "We are releasing some of the salmon as adults because we don't want to put all our eggs in one basket. We are working with many unknown quantities and we must check and double-check all the time. Although we are very hopeful about the entire situation, this is certainly a case where an auxiliary plan is advisable."

Transporting the salmon, adults as well as the little fish, exacts an operating cost of almost $100,000 annually. In 1944, Joe Kemmerich says, the program will be tapered off and perhaps eventually abandoned. That year the migrating salmon will not be trapped. Many of them will be let past Rock Island. They will be the first graduates of the fish university to come back upstream. They will be the salmon which, in the past year as fingerlings, have been acclimated to the new spawning spots. Then the test will be at hand.

If the Chinooks turn off up Nason Creek and the Entiat, and the bluebacks seek out the Okanogan and the Wenatchee, the experiment will be a brilliant success. The fish runs of the upper river will have been saved. But if Tyee's offspring and thousands of other salmon continue up the Columbia and hurl themselves at Grand Coulee, the outlook will be dismal. Artificial spawning on a stupendous scale might offer the only possible hope; the present program would have to be expanded and prolonged indefinitely, with results highly dubious at best. Inferior fish would be certain.

Downstream at Bonneville the Government has even more money invested in ways and means of sustaining the Columbia River salmon runs. The $7,022,000 fish ladders circumventing Bonneville Dam, which is only a fraction the size of Grand Coulee, but nevertheless quite a project, have been in use 3 years now. In 1940 a total of 391,595 Chinooks and 148,808 bluebacks were counted on their way up the cascading steps. This fails to indicate the true quantitative ratio between the two species, however, for while bluebacks average only 4 pounds the Chinooks average 23 and sometimes a sovereign of the river will weigh 100 pounds or more.

Has the Bonneville count any bearing on the great salmon mystery? Some skeptics confess they are surprised. Dr. William L. Finley, vice president of the Izaak Walton League of America, who thinks the Government has gone "dam crazy," admits the Bonneville fishways are by far the best ever built. And Prof. Lawrence E. Griffin, of Reed College, in Portland, while still afraid that the fisheries face a bleak future, concedes he was wrong in his original estimate of the ladders at Bonneville. "I don't grant yet," says he, "that enough salmon are passing the dam to keep the runs at their current level. How do we know what number of fish were in that stretch of the Columbia before the river was blocked and counting began? But I cheerfully admit that a lot more salmon are climbing the ladders than I expected."

The Bonneville passages for salmon have brought into existence an entirely new civil-service classification, that of fish counters. This is the first tally of fish in a major stream. The counters get 60 cents an hour and must be able to recognize on sight the species which inhabit the Columbia. On platforms in summer and in doghouselike shelters in stormy weather, they keep count with little meters as the fish slip through apertures at the top of the ladders. The busiest day the fish counters ever had was in September 1940, when 33,900 Chinooks turned the staircases into a milling mass of fish. Onlookers' hearts beat faster as they watched the spectacle.

PITY THE POOR FISH

Naturalists are pretty well agreed that the fishways at Bonneville have boosted the adult salmon upstream past the dam. But an equally essential phase of the life cycle of the Chinooks is for the fingerlings to get down to the sea, and here the experts have their fingers crossed. The Bonneville powerhouse is honeycombed with fingerling bypasses,

which are chutes twisting through the concrete. What happens, however, to the baby fish that drop into the penstocks? Do all of them survive the turbine blades? What about the maelstrom of water at the foot of the spillway? Will the suddenly changing pressure give fingerlings the bends, like divers yanked between levels too rapidly?

Oregon's Fish Commission has released a big batch of fingerlings above Bonneville Dam and another batch below. The fins of the two batches were carefully clipped in different manner for identification. When these fingerlings return from the Pacific as adult salmon, the markings will tell plainly the effect of Bonneville on the little fish.

Not long ago Federal and State biologists turned loose salmon fingerlings above the Portland General Electric Co. Dam, which spans the Clackamas River in Oregon. A diver went below and watched the fish come out of the tailrace. What he saw was a bloody mess. The fingerlings had been chopped to pieces in the generators. Bonneville's massive turbines have much more room, and naturalists believe this will not be duplicated there, but they are making no unqualified predictions. The size of the Government dam prevents a similar emphatic test, although hunks of balsam wood have passed through the powerhouse in fairly good shape.

WHEN KIPLING REALLY LIVED

The Clackamas was once alive with salmon. Whopping Chinooks spawned in its mountain-locked headwaters and went down to the Columbia and so to the ocean. Then dams at Cazadero and River Mill, built without adequate fish ladders, depleted the runs at a terrific rate. The Chinooks speedily disappeared from the river. Where a mustached little Englishman had caught 16 big salmon in 6 hours, fish virtually ceased to come. The Englishman's name was Rudyard Kipling and after he had fished in the Clackamas in 1888 he wrote back to the Civil and Military Gazette of Lahore, India:

"I have lived! The American continent may now sink under the sea, for I have taken the best that it yields, and the best was neither dollars, love, nor real estate. Hear now, gentlemen of the Punjab Fishing Club, who whip the reaches of the Tavi, and you who painfully import trout to Ootacamund, and I will tell you how I went fishing and you shall envy. * * * There be several sorts of success in this world that taste well in the moment of enjoyment, but I question whether the stealthy theft of line from an able-bodied Columbia salmon who knows exactly what you are doing and why you are doing it is not sweeter than any other victory within human scope."

As on the Clackamas, innumerable salmon spawning grounds in the Columbia Basin have been blocked off by dams built without safeguards for fish. In the opinion of B. M. Brennan, veteran director of the Washington State Department of Fisheries, this is one of the basic reasons why 43,000,000 pounds of Chinook salmon were caught on the Columbia River in 1883 and only 16,000,000 pounds in 1940. Brennan blames both the Government and private power companies. For example, the Black Canyon Dam, constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation across the Payette River, in Idaho, ruined a big Chinook spawning area and the privately built Wallowa Lake Dam in Oregon completely destroyed a valuable run of bluebacks. Congress in 1934 tried to prevent a repetition of this by ordering that any Federal or private project built in the future must make adequate provisions for the migration of fish.

Brennan believes that the next step in the protection of the Columbia salmon runs must be to bring Idaho into a tri-State compact with Washington and Oregon for the management of the fisheries in the basin. This has never been done in the past, because the Columbia does not wash Idaho soil at any point, yet the Columbia's largest tributary, the Snake, threads across Idaho for 750 miles. And of the Snake's largest tributary Brennan recently declared: "The Salmon River in Idaho is the only major Chinook salmon spawning ground remaining in the entire upper Columbia River watershed that is generally unaffected by dams, water diversions, pollution, and other hazards to the future abundance of salmon."

Both private and Government dams are athwart the Snake itself, although some of these are above the impassable barrier of Shoshone Falls. Idaho is one of the principal irrigation States and its farmers constantly demand water for their land and kilowatts to pump it there. But the Salmon is a wilderness river and to date its peaks and crags have stood off civilization's encroachments. Along with its various forks, the Salmon flows in chasms nearly a mile deep. It empties into Hell's Canyon, where the Snake has trenched a 6,100-foot gash which is the deepest abyss on the continent. Most of the Salmon's course is through the fastnesses of the Nez Percé, Idaho, Challis, and Salmon National Forests. No boats, only fish on their way to spawn, have ever traveled the Salmon upstream, and so it is known in Idaho as "the river of no return."

WITH DRAWN SWORDS, IF NEED BE

A graying Scotsman, Hugh C. Mitchell, Oregon's head fish culturist, says, "I wouldna be surprised if the Salmon is now the gr-reat spawning spot of the Northwest. We must protect that river with drawn swords, if need be." Keeping the Salmon River open and uncontaminated is a No. 1 order of business among fishermen and wildlife enthusiasts. Federal experts, now surveying this wilderness river, believe it is fully as important from a Chinook propagation standpoint as the main stem of the Columbia. Lloyd Royal, biologist for the State of Washington, contributes the added fact that most of the Columbia River steelhead trout passing Bonneville Dam, and 185,174 did so last year, go up the Salmon to lay their eggs. With these circumstances in mind, the Washington Legislature memorialized Congress to appropriate funds at once for the preservation of fish-spawning areas in Idaho.

Congress is now considering a proposal by two Members from Oregon, Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, Republican minority leader, and Representative WALTER M. PIERCE, a New Deal Democrat, for a $23,700,000 navigation dam across the Columbia at Umatilla Rapids, midway between Bonneville and Grand Coulee. Yet Royal believes this big barrier would have infinitely less effect on the Chinook runs than much smaller dams wedged into the upper reaches of the Salmon River. "If Umatilla Dam is fitted with the same kind of fishways as Bonneville and Rock Island," he explains, "I'm sure it won't do any material harm to the salmon." Maps of the United States Geological Survey show the Salmon studded with potential dam sites, but wildlifers, after giving in or being vanquished on practically every other river in the far West, say this is where they die with their boots on. They think hope lasts as long as the Salmon stays untrammeled. Hugh Mitchell underscores the fact that a little hatchery near the top of the Salmon River, within 15 miles of where Lewis and Clark crossed the Continental Divide and limped down Agency Creek, used to collect as many as 6,500,000 eggs annually. This is half the number Joe Kemmerich and his aides put in trays last year at the largest fish hatchery in the country.

SALMON VERSUS PEOPLE

In this entire situation the new dealers and their bitter foes, the utilities, are the joint targets of naturalists and fishermen. Some strange political alliances have resulted. When Dr. Finley, of the Izaak Walton League, claimed that plans of the Army engineers for high dams on the Willamette River would endanger that tributary's Chinook runs, he was simultaneously rebuked by the Oregon Statesman, newspaper of the State's anti-New Deal Governor, Charles A. Sprague, and by Representative J. F. Hosch, New Deal leader in the Oregon Legislature. "Must the Willamette Valley," indignantly asked the statesman, "forever remain a wilderness so that the supply of salmon may be maintained?" And Hosch wrote Finley accusingly, "You unquestionably are more concerned about a few fish than about the people who inhabit our land."

The controversy involves the whole development of the Northwest, which is the country's final frontier. "Salmon and civilization don't mix," say the fishermen. J. A. Craig, biologist for the Fish and Wildlife Service, recently decided that lumbering, mining, irrigation, and power production "are practically all deleterious to the productivity and survival of the fish population of the Columbia River." But today the Northwest is in the midst of the biggest industrial boom in its history. Forests are being felled to provide lumber for ships and barracks. New mines are being tapped. Soon plants along the Columbia will turn out nearly a third of the Nation's expanded aluminum production. Irrigation canals are being dug through the dry uplands.

Rivers glutted with logs are no good for fish, and logged-off hillsides are no good for rivers. Many a migrating salmon has accidentally poked into an irrigation ditch and ended his odyssey in an alfalfa field. Three hundred dead fingerlings were just found in a flume near Grants Pass, Oreg. Factories mean cities and cities mean pollution. The Willamette River is so full of offal and chemical wastes that its fall run of Chinooks is gone, literally choked to death. The spring run has survived only because of the fortunate coincidence that it comes upstream when freshets from the mountains immerse the excretion and sawdust and trash with which Portland clogs the waterway.

After fingerlings released below a Willamette River bridge had died and floated belly up in less than 4 minutes, William J. Smith, president of the Oregon Wildlife Federation, announced grimly that 125,000 sportsmen in the State were ready for political action if something is not done. In an attempt to prevent spread of these conditions, Dr. Paul J. Raver, Bonneville Dam administrator, is requiring as a condition of power sales the elimination of waste products.

PROTECTIVE MEASURES

The Washington Department of Fisheries is pressing for legislation to compel the screening of all irrigation canals and has set up nearly 300 filters already. Oregon's fish commission wants trolling in the ocean rigidly controlled, and its chairman, John C. Veatch, believes no commercial fishing should be allowed on the Columbia above Bonneville Dam. Senator MCNARY, of Oregon, believes that trolling at sea must be closely regulated. He has introduced a bill giving the Fish and Wildlife Service the right to prevent the catching of salmon under certain weights and sizes. "We know," he explains, that the Chinooks attain most of their growth in the ocean. It is an economic waste to permit the catching of a 9-pound salmon which in 3 or 4 months might weight 25 pounds. The reduction of spawning grounds in the upper Columbia makes more imperative than ever that we get every possible ounce of food value from the salmon which are netted in the Pacific." MCNARY says he has assurances that Canada will parallel any such action taken by the United States. A

number of wildlife experts hope to forbid Indians from spearing and netting the homeward-bound salmon at Celilo Falls, but others ask if we take away even this from the country's original owners what are we accusing Hitler of, anyway?

Ever since the first cannery was built on the Columbia 75 years ago salmon have been a red-hot political issue in the Pacific Northwest. Six times the people of Oregon have voted on referendums concerning the protection of fish. The voters of both Washington and Oregon resorted to action at the polls to do away with the basketlike fish wheels that never gave the Columbia River salmon half a chance. In 1926 Oregon knocked them out, and in 1934 Washington followed suit. Fish politics conform to no standard pattern. Rufus Woods, stanch Republican editor of the Wenatchee World, is sure the Leavenworth hatchery not only will salvage the upper river salmon runs but increase them immeasurably, although New Deal supporters will pray gratefully if the fish just hold their own.

A ONE-REGION FISH

The Portland Chamber of Commerce has warned the Izaak Walton League not to "undertake to thwart human progress." Advocates of Columbia River development minimize the damage which will be done to the Chinook runs. They say the naturalists exaggerate their alarm. But they contend that the development is worth the damage, if damage there will be. They cite the huge aluminum plants being rushed to completion as tangible evidence of benefits from Grand Coulee and Bonneville. They ask if the principal power river of the continent should be left unharnessed for fear of throwing the life of a few million fish out of kilter.

The naturalists, while not definitely committing themselves until 1944, have replied merely with a warning that power can always be harnessed, but that once the fish are gone they are gone for good. Salmon runs rarely return to a river from which they have vanished for a complete cycle. Empty streams in Maine attest to that. And one or two wildlifers have hinted that after the shooting stops in Europe, the taste for Chinook salmon may be more universal than the demand for aluminum.

There will be a lot of salmon in the world even if those in the Columbia River die out, but not Chinook salmon. Of 250,000 cases of Chinook canned everywhere in 1939, approximately 210,000 came from the Columbia River. The rest was scattered among Alaska, Puget Sound, and British Columbia. Tops among eating salmon is Columbia River Fancy Chinook. A case of one-pound flats brings $26.50, while a case of Alaska Red salmon of the same brand is worth only $14 and Alaska Pink salmon $8. Its price has soared. Less than half as many cases are packed along the Columbia now as in 1911, yet the present pack is worth $1,000,000 above the 1911 output. And, by and large, the Chinook is a one-region fish. Twenty-five years ago the Government tried to transplant fingerlings from the Columbia's tributaries to New England waters. The result was a puny 3-pound salmon. The reason for this was as inexplicable as the Chinook's other propensities. Some scientists said it was the water, some said the feed, others said the climate; but none knew.

Since 1935 the salmon catch in the Columbia has maintained a fairly steady level. The critical period for this traditional industry of the Northwest has now arrived. By 1945 at the latest the great salmon mystery will be unraveled for better or for worse.

"Civilization meant the end of the bison of our plains," comments one naturalist. "We are going to discover whether new and unique precautions can thwart civilization's assault on the finest fish in North America."

Inland Waterway Development Vital to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

STATEMENT BY THOMAS E. LYONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement entitled "Inland Waterway Development Vital to National Defense," by Thomas E. Lyons, Chief of the Division of Transportation, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce:

INLAND WATERWAY DEVELOPMENT VITAL TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

(By Thomas E. Lyons, Chief of the Division of Transportation, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce)

It has been said that the World War was won on the Monongahela River because that waterway afforded facilities for the shipment of raw materials to the giant industries manufacturing weapons and materials for weapons which finally overcame the Germans on the battlefields of France.

While railroads were the backbone of our transportation system during the first World War, as they are in the present emergency, new forms of transportation have been developed and old methods have been improved to the point where they can materially supplement the railroads, specially during periods of traffic strains.

In addition to the Monongahela River, which has been considerably improved for navigation since World War days, many other waterways and channels have been developed or created to aid the orderly flow of waterborne commerce. Extension of pipe lines during this same period and the development of motor transportation have made these agencies important mediums of interstate commerce.

HOW INLAND FREIGHT MOVES

According to a recent estimate, 1939 inland traffic was divided among the several transportation agencies substantially as follows:

	Freight revenue (ton-miles)	Passenger (miles)
	Percent of total	*Percent of total*
Railways:		
Steam	62.5	8.3
Electric	.1	.3
Inland waterways:		
Great Lakes	14.2	.3
Rivers and canals	3.7	.2
Petroleum pipe lines (excluding gathering lines)	9.5	
Highways (including private automobile traffic)	10.0	90.7
Airways	.9	.2

The foregoing table indicates that 18 percent, or nearly one-fifth, of the total ton-mileage of our present inland commerce moves by water.

Compared with pre-war years, traffic on inland waterway and coastal canals had made great strides, as the following pertinent statistics of our inland waterways for the year 1939 compared with 1914 indicate:

	1914	1939
Length (miles)	28,933	29,290
Traffic (short tons)	137,180,000	329,400,000
Expenditures (new work and maintenance)	$29,246,000	$78,342,453

The tonnage indicated for 1914 does not include traffic originating at Great Lake ports, but does include the volume moving through connecting channels of the Great Lake system. This also applies to the tonnage indicated for 1939.

Although the increase in inland waterways mileage has been slight during the past 25 years, much has been done in deepening channels and adding facilities to bring these traffic arteries to a fuller efficiency. Many of the streams which in 1914 were suitable only for boats of the shallowest draft are today providing safe navigation for vessels drawing 9 feet or more.

INLAND WATERWAYS HAVE LONG SERVED THE NATION

The Mississippi and other inland rivers were prime factors in the early development of the Middle West. The friendly waters of the Ohio, Missouri, and Columbia Rivers made it possible for Lewis and Clark to conduct their Northwest expedition, thus opening that vast region to settlement.

St. Louis and other cities along the Mississippi had developed into important trading centers long before railroads were introduced in the region. Following their coming, however, river traffic declined sharply.

The Erie Canal and other artificial waterways which had contributed so much to the early development of the country also suffered with the introduction of competing forms of transportation which provided faster service, and many of these waterways, including the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal connecting Washington, D. C., and Cumberland, Md., ceased to operate.

During the period of rapidly expanding railway facilities our waterways were seriously neglected. In 1916, however, when railways became overtaxed with the burden of the first World War effort, interest was renewed in waterways.

One of the principal functions of the Council of National Defense, established in 1916, was to investigate and make recommendations to the President on the utilization of inland waterways. Four million dollars were allocated by the Emergency Fleet Corporation for the construction of steel barges and steel tow boats to be used for transporting coal and iron ore between St. Louis and St. Paul.

This traffic did not develop as planned due to inadequate terminal facilities. A similar plan for moving coal and ore on the upper Mississippi is now being considered.

IN THE FIRST WORLD WAR

In 1918 the Director General of the railroads created a committee on inland waterways to take over these functions of the Council of National Defense. This committee immediately undertook a study to determine methods by which various inland waterways, including the Mississippi River, between St. Louis and New Orleans, and the Warrior River, could be utilized.

As little commerce was moving on these streams and floating equipment was not readily available, the Railroad Administration undertook to provide barges and tugs and engage in the construction of terminals necessary for the handling of waterway traffic.

AFTER THE FIRST WORLD WAR

The Transportation Act of 1920 provided for the transfer to the Secretary of War of boats and other transportation facilities on

inland, canal, coastal, and coastwise waterways, and directed that office to take such action as might become necessary to continue their operation.

Under the direction of the Secretary of War, the lower Mississippi and Warrior lines were operated until Congress provided for the creation of the Inland Waterways Corporation in 1924. Since that time the operation of the Inland Waterways Corporation has been extended to the upper Mississippi and the Missouri Rivers.

The purpose of creating the Inland Waterways Corporation (Federal barge line) was to demonstrate the feasibility of the utilization of inland waterway transportation on the Mississippi and Warrior Rivers and connecting waters.

That the point has been proven is clearly shown not only by the increased traffic of the Federal Barge Line but by the many other common carriers, contract carriers, and private lines which have established profitable operations on the Mississippi and its tributaries, including the Ohio River.

Traffic on the Mississippi waterway system has grown from 52,000,000 tons in 1923, the year before the Inland Waterway Corporation started operations, to 76,000,000 tons in 1939.

FACILITIES BEING FULLY UTILIZED

The strain on rail transport due to defense demands has already resulted in greatly increased inland waterway activity. All available waterway equipment is now being utilized in moving raw materials and finished products.

Larger tows of barges than customary are now assembled for the movement of steel from the producing areas of Pittsburgh and Birmingham to the Gulf where it is used in the fabrication of ships or for other construction projects. On the return trip raw materials for inland plants are carried.

For years the Mississippi River system has been used extensively for the transport of petroleum products in the middle western area. It is now being utilized to relieve the oil shortage on the eastern seaboard. Borderline distribution areas formerly served from Atlantic ports are now being supplied by extending operations of oil depots located on inland waterways.

The Federal Petroleum Coordinator recently announced that arrangements had been made with one of the larger oil companies for reversal of the flow in its pipe lines connecting New York with the Ohio River. This pipe line has been used for carrying refined products westward; it will not carry crude oil to the East.

Present plans provide for the delivery of Texas and Louisiana crude oil by barges at Midland, Pa., on the Ohio River, from whence it will be carried by pipe line to the New York area. As a crude line it will deliver 25,000 barrels daily.

BARGES CARRY PLENTY OF FREIGHT

Barges up to 2,800 tons now ply between St. Louis, New Orleans, and Mobile, by way of the Mississippi and the Gulf Coastal Canal. A barge of this type has a capacity equal to 60 freight cars. A 1,200-ton barge carries as much as 30 cars. In other words, one 2,800-ton barge or two 1,200-ton barges are capable of carrying freight in excess of that hauled by the average freight train.

Additional floating equipment and the adoption of a practical plan for extension of the interchange of barges between carriers would materially increase the effectiveness of our inland waterway operations and aid further in the defense effort. Shortage of steel, however, has limited the amount of material available for the construction of additional equipment.

The Maritime Commission is now considering the building of concrete barges of 28½ feet draft to carry oil and other bulk commodities for operation on deep-sea lanes. Their size and draft, however, would prevent the use of such equipment on inland waterways.

The British Admiralty recently announced that it is building a considerable number of ferro-concrete barges which have a carrying capacity of 200 tons and are constructed with shipshape ends.

They are intended for use in the various ports and river channels in England. While somewhat similar barges have been considered for operation on our inland waterways, no plan has as yet been developed for extensive construction of this type of equipment.

TRAFFIC ON THE GREAT LAKES

The annual report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, shows that the total United States commerce on the Great Lakes for 1929 amounted to 161,000,000 short tons, but that in 1939 this tonnage dropped to 141,000,000 short tons.

The 1940 figures are not available, but it is reasonable to assume that they will show a substantial increase over 1939. Traffic on the Great Lakes consists mainly of iron ore and grain moving from the Lake Superior area and coal being returned to the same region.

Records of the Sault Ste. Marie Canals are accurate indicators of traffic moving on the Great Lakes, as the bulk of the tonnage must move through these lanes. In 1929 a total of 92,622,000 short tons of freight passed through the Soo Canals, setting a record not theretofore or since equaled. Shipping officials and statisticians believed that this record would probably never again be attained.

Today shippers and steamship men on the Great Lakes predict that this season's freight shipments through the Soo Canals will exceed 100,000,000 tons.

A 75,000,000-ton ore movement is pointed out as the biggest single factor in establishing the new record. Grain and coal movements are also heavy. August shipments brought this year's freight movement through the Soo Canals to 68,500,000 tons.

The movement for September is expected to aggregate 14,000,000 tons and the cargo fleet will have another 6 weeks or more to operate during the current season. Freezing weather usually closes the Lakes to shipping late in November.

MORE ORE WILL BE CARRIED NEXT YEAR

Increased demands for steel for the national-defense program during 1942 definitely indicates that the ore movement on the Great Lakes must substantially exceed the record which is expected to be established this year. Plans are already being made to handle the increase. Five bulk freighters, each of 11,100 gross tons, are now under construction at Great Lakes shipyards and are expected to be ready for the 1942 season.

Recent legislation permitting Canadian flag vessels to engage in our lake ore carrying trade will also provide additional tonnage for this movement. This legislation was enacted too late to be of substantial benefit during the current season.

The Atlantic and Gulf Intracoastal Canals are also important from a defense viewpoint. Considerable quantities of essential commodities, including petroleum, lumber, phosphate rocks, sulphur, and cotton, move regularly over the various sections of these waterways.

THE MISSING LINKS

With the exception of a section in New Jersey, the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway provides a 12-foot channel from Boston, Mass. to the St. Johns River in Florida and an 8-foot channel from the St. Johns River to Miami.

The Gulf Intracoastal Canal now extends from Apalachicola, Fla., to Corpus Christi, Tex., with a controlling channel depth of 9 feet. This project will eventually extend to the Rio Grande River at Brownsville, Tex.

These waterways are essential, not only for commercial and recreational vessels but they will provide a sheltered channel for the movement of shallow draft naval vessels, including destroyers, between the various bases on the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico, if necessity arises.

Until the missing New Jersey and Florida sections are provided, the full effectiveness of the Atlantic and Gulf Intracoastal Waterway system can hardly be attained.

Tribute to the "Unmuzzled" Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure to add a few words to the many deserving compliments that have been paid the country press by Members of Congress and others during National Newspaper Week from October 1–7. Words of praise for the press have come from people of all walks of life and from every nook and corner of the United States. The country newspapers, including the small-town dailies, weeklies, and semiweeklies, have earned the many tributes paid them this week. The small-town paper has been referred to as a "symbol of the American way of life." Certainly it is a very important part of the American way of life. It has demonstrated that it is unhampered and unafraid. These so-called country papers represent one of America's really great democratic institutions.

The important part in small-town newspapers are playing in preserving American ideals as well as maintaining freedom of thought and speech cannot possibly be overemphasized. Because the country press is unhampered and unafraid it has long been a power for good in every community in all this land.

As long as we have an "unmuzzled" press the future of America is secure. May the influence of a free press live on and on with undiminished power.

A few weeks ago, in reply to a request from the editor of the American Press, I wrote a brief tribute to the country press that was printed in a recent issue of that publication, which I am pleased to include as a part of my remarks. It follows:

The small-town newspaper is as American as the village doctor or the little red schoolhouse. Through the years these many small voices have raised a united cry in defense of those principles which make America American—the freedom of speech, of worship, and of the press; life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The countless millions of town and country people, the real America, who have relied upon their small-town daily and weekly newspaper not alone for a review of world events but also for

the molding of public opinion, have done so in complete confidence that their fellow citizens who own and operate these local enterprises are honest, "aboveboard," and are uninfluenced by the pressure of political cliques or the lure of high-priced advertising.

Morgenthau's Tax on Invested Capital Favors Wartime Babies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I have sent to Hon. Henry Morgenthau, the Secretary of the Treasury:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am confident that despite the pressure of your heavy responsibilities you will not consider it inappropriate for me, as a Member of Congress, to ask of you the time necessary to reply to several questions in connection with your advocacy of 100-percent taxation of any profits of corporations that exceed 6 percent of invested capital.

Is the proposal, in effect, to limit the "pay" of every dollar at work and at risk in trade and industry to 6 cents a year, regardless of the type of work or risk involved? In other words, to enforce a situation, exactly comparable to limiting the wages of a worker to a specified sum per year, regardless of the innumerable degrees of skill, risk, and effort involved?

I believe, from my daily contacts with scores of small businesses in my district, that many of them would be ruined by such a tax. Small enterprises depend on energetic use of limited capital—capital almost always painfully accumulated. Frequently these small capital investments must be turned over many times in the course of a year, if the little enterprises are to keep their owners' heads above water. The result of a very modest gain on each turn-over of the capital may be, it is true, a high percentage of the little man's precious capital at risk, and yet a small sum, indeed, in dollars. If all of that modest sum in excess of 6 percent on the small capital is to be taxed away, how can the little enterprise survive?

The little man, especially the small manufacturer, has his troubles holding his own at present. He gets no priorities. His manufacturing is stalled for want of goods and material. Your proposal would add to his perplexities. In what way would your plan assure him any returns on brains, good will, initiative, or genius?

Is it not true that, unlike the railroad or public utility, the advertising corporation or the service corporation has little capital assets? Their profits might be a cascade, but would not their earnings passed on to stockholders be a mere trickle?

Would not your profit-freezing device place a premium on waste and unwarranted costs? Plants would be unduly expanded and salaries improperly increased to avoid tax. Pay rolls would be augmented. Duplicate positions for friends and poor relatives would be set up. There would be no incentive for sharp trading or dealing at arms length with supply men.

Would there not be discouragement to efficiency? There would be no rewards—no incentive for watchfulness. Why watch the pennies? The Government would take the dollars saved anyway. Would not corporations, to cut down tax, be most extravagant in expenditures for equipment and material? Would not such spending unduly increase purchasing power, make goods more scarce, and encourage inflation?

While I am primarily concerned with the small businessman, I would inquire also as to the probable effect of your proposal on the larger concerns. I do not have in mind the great corporation alone, for it is conceivable that it could divert large amounts to strengthening its position. I do, however, wonder what would happen to the millions of stockholders, who own such enterprises and who have invested their savings without any forewarning that normal earnings might no longer be passed on to them.

Do not businesses, large and small, operate under widely varying conditions in respect of invested capital, and, therefore, would not such a proposal, as yours, in many cases result in unconscionably drastic hardship? What is your answer? My constituents are pressing me. They are frankly worried.

Would not your plan discourage almost to the vanishing point all desire to invest in any common stock? There would no longer be a real incentive to risk savings in common stock. Is it your desire to do away with public financing and substitute governmental financing as the only way? That, unfortunately, is the totalitarian way.

Would not, Mr. Secretary, such a limitation of the wage of capital result in about the same sort of situation as would follow from paying exactly the same annual wage to every wage earner, regardless of either his skill or family responsibilities or nature of his work?

I am anxious for some detailed explanation from you, and I have purposely not referred to the probable effects on initiative and enterprise which might result from taxing the man who has saved money and put it at risk in a business. At first blush, does it not seem: "Tails I lose, heads the Government takes."

By all means take profits out of war. Permit no war millionaires. But does not your plan take undue profits out of all business, let alone defense babies?

If your plan would take away 100 percent of all profits above the average for a number of years prior to the emergency, that would be universally acclaimed. But do you not lay down an arbitrary minimum 6-percent profit on invested capital, on all corporations—defense and nondefense, large and small? Your plan seems unrelated to the war.

Furthermore, there is no guaranty the 6 percent would be reached. Over the years most corporations never make 6 percent each year, and under you scheme losses of 1 year cannot be carried over into the next year to offset profits. A corporation may lose in several years—have 1 good year but pay heavily for the streak of good fortune. It could not lay up reserves out of such profits for any lean year to come.

Under your plan would not the well-managed and conservatively capitalized corporation be limited as to profits, the same as would the corporation with bloated capital and inefficient management?

I have had a study made of the effect of your tax on numerous corporations. I commend it for your study; the study follows:

THE INVESTED-CAPITAL TAX FAVORS THE "WAR BABIES"—PEACETIME INDUSTRY SUFFERS

The following tabulation gives a cross section of industry that would (1) suffer from your 6-percent invested-capital excess-profits-tax exemption, and (2) benefit from such a mandatory invested-capital base.

I. The sufferers

The three columns of figures show (1) the exemption per share at 6 percent calculated from Standard Statistics estimates, (2) the 1940 net income, and (3) 4-year average earnings (1936–39) adjusted for the so-called growth company amendments to the 1940 tax bill.

	6-percent invested capital exemption	1940 net	4-year average earnings (1936–39)
Autos and parts:			
Libby-Owens-Ford	$1.05	$3.97	$3.45
Chrysler	2.60	8.69	7.45
Cleveland Graphite Bronze	1.00	4.10	3.80
Electrical products:			
Chicago Flexible Shaft	1.75	8.33	9.35
McGraw Electric	.55	3.08	2.60
Foods:			
American Chicle	1.50	8.42	8.45
Mead Johnson	2.55	9.44	10.20
Drugs:			
American Home Products	.75	5.32	5.15
Bristol-Myers	.75	3.73	3.60
Sterling Products	1.65	5.30	5.40
Retail:			
Green (H. L.)	1.20	3.46	3.30
Murphy (G. C.)	2.05	6.58	6.00
Penney (J. C.)	1.85	5.91	6.20
Tobacco:			
Liggett & Myers	2.65	6.62	6.30
Philip Morris	2.60	8.14	7.60
Miscellaneous:			
Bulova Watch	2.00	7.27	6.70
Coca-Cola	1.00	6.77	6.60
Columbia Broadcasting	.55	2.92	2.65
Melville Shoe	.60	2.56	2.96
Youngstown Steel Door	.45	2.10	1.60

II. The beneficiaries

Companies in the following list have built up large capitalizations through the years. A majority of these concerns benefit directly from defense. The three columns are identical with those in the first group.

	6-percent invested capital exemption	1940 net	4-year average earnings (1936–39)
Rail equipment:			
Pullman	$3.10	$1.96	$1.63
American Car & Foundry	6.00	5.23	[1]2.70
Rails:			
Atchison-Topeka	18.00	2.09	1.00
Great Northern	11.50	4.09	3.00
New York Central	8.75	1.75	.75
Pennsylvania	5.90	3.51	1.95
Southern Pacific	14.00	2.47	1.35
Union Pacific	18.50	6.96	6.50
Steels:			
Bethlehem Steel	8.00	14.04	3.70
Crucible Steel	5.30	10.24	1.60
Jones & Laughlin	9.50	5.60	.05
Republic Steel	2.60	3.32	.85
U. S. Steel	8.10	8.83	2.30
Youngstown Sheet & Tube	9.40	5.96	3.30
Miscellaneous:			
Mack Trucks	4.00	3.02	1.40
White Motors	3.20	3.12	.35
Worthington Pump	4.30	6.20	.40

[1] Deficiency.

Conclusion

Even a casual examination of the two groups above indicates that war babies—benefiting enormously from the defense program—find our defense program very profitable. Earnings this year and last are in practically every instance far in excess of the 4-year average.

Consumer-goods industries—pinched by priorities and virtually voiceless in our rising war economy—not only show very modest earnings gains over the base period, but would find it practically impossible to even equal 4-

year average earnings on a 6 percent of invested capital basis for excess profits.

Mr. Secretary, your proposal would severely penalize the small, well-managed company at the expense of the big, poorly run outfit that needed a war to create sufficient demand for full operation of its production capacity, top heavy by any normal yardstick.

Cordially yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Grand Coulee Dam

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday the first generator came into production at Grand Coulee Dam. In the Washington Star of yesterday, October 5, on page A–7 of part 1 there were pictures of the dam and generator and statements concerning it. In that statement there are two glaring inaccuracies. I am sure these inaccuracies were not intentional, and I do not mean even remotely to infer that they were made in bad faith. However, if these statements represented the facts, my representation through the last 5 years in securing millions of dollars in appropriations for this project would have been wrong.

I feel, therefore, that it is important that a correction be made of 2 statements contained in this news item, both of which are important and material statements of fact. The 2 statements that I refer to are: First, the statement that the dam will produce power for a city of 200,000, and the second statement is that the dam is located in northern Washington, about 100 miles north of Spokane. The actual facts are that generator No. 1 produces 108,000 kilowatts of electricity, which is enough to care for the needs of a city of 200,000 people. There are 17 more such generators to be installed at that project.

The full installed capacity of Grand Coulee Dam will supply not only the needs of a city of 200,000 people, but would supply the needs of 18 such cities, or a single city of 2,600,000 people.

Now, as to the second statement relating to the location of this dam, that also is grievously in error, because if it were located 100 miles north of the city of Spokane, that would place it 20 miles north of the International Boundary between the United States and Canada at a point in British Columbia. The dam is actually located by air line about 80 miles west of Spokane and slightly north.

Ordinarily I would not have made mention of this matter but for the fact that today, with the crying need for electrical energy and a shortage so critical as to virtually be causing a bottleneck in our defense program, it is extremely important that both Members of Congress and those groups of persons acting in official capacities in numerous executive agencies have a full and complete knowledge of the facts surrounding this mighty project that is frequently being referred to as the eighth wonder of the world. Here by an expenditure of public funds we can rapidly secure the greatest volume of electrical energy at the lowest cost, being at one-third of the cost of energy produced by new construction in any other part of the Nation, by reason of the fact that we have the dam completed and all the major facilities installed.

I have earnestly and to the best of my ability represented to this Congress from time to time the tremendous importance of speeding this giant development to completion. I would like to see orders immediately placed to install all the generators that the project is constructed to utilize. There should be a deficiency appropriation of $12,000,000 at once in order to provide for the earliest and orderly installation of at least 15 generating units out of the 18, and, at the very minimum, an appropriation of no less than $6,000,000 should be made to place orders for additional generators and complete the east powerhouse.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to make clear in this brief space of time what this stupendous structure means to our national defense and to correct the unintentional errors that appeared in the Washington Star, because I know that when we once fully understand the magnitude of this invaluable national asset we will rapidly take the steps to bring it into full use.

Russia and Its Constitution

REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I see in the newspapers that the New Deal, taking Russia into its arms and feeling the warmth of communism pressing on its bosom, ejaculates: "Ah, what a constitution! Even the ardent religious throbbings of her heart!"

Almost immediately upon the taste of personal power and prosperity the New Deal courted, and in November 1933 established, "friendly" relations with the godless, intriguing widow, Russia.

Naturally, Mrs. America was neglected and spurned. The New Deal did not like Mrs. America's old-fashioned Constitution, tired of her Supreme Courting, criticized her economy, attempted to purge her advocate, the Congress, and even reviled and castigated the children who were loyal to her.

But, ah, Mrs. Russia, what a woman. And such intelligent and well-mannered children.

All these long 8 years, too many of Mrs. Russia's children, as the house guests of America have enjoyed the best places and the largest helpings at the table, while with the browbeating assistance of the New Deal, sitting at the head of the table, they forced their ideas and manners and heaped their abuses upon Mrs. America and her children. And now the latter must witness this nauseating embrace of the sweet, virtuous, religious Mrs. Russia publicly and before their very eyes.

No wonder the majority of America's children view with disgust, revulsion, and alarm this spectacle of what may be the presentation of their future stepmother.

Mr. Speaker, I make these observations because in a few days the House may be called upon to make another appropriation under the Lease Lend Act and to include Russia as a beneficiary. I do not recall that Russia has asked for a loan. I do recall that a few weeks ago she asked Britain for help and Britain answered that it depended on the United States. I do recall that within the 3 months she has been at war, the newspapers stated that she asked for weapons but did not want credit as she could pay cash.

However loose our fiscal policy, it should not degenerate into unsolicited gifts from the New Deal to Russia, nor should it be done under the delusion that Russia is our religious affinity, or that we can regenerate her with genuine religion through our rifles and ammunition. If we are going to help her, let us do it on the level to help the downfall of Hitlerism with full cognizance of our revulsion against communism. After all, let us remember that Russia, although rich, still owes us four hundred and fifty millions with interest and that the billions we are lease lending will have to be paid by the American people in sweat and taxes.

Why Japan May Break Loose From the Axis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ARTICLE BY VICENTE VILLAMIN, FILIPINO LAWYER AND WRITER, IN THE SEPTEMBER WORLD AFFAIRS MAGAZINE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, American-Japanese relations are still loaded with dynamite. They are in a state of flux. Representatives of the two Governments are attempting to stabilize them, but they have not yet reached a conclusion. In the meantime, Japanese military and patriotic spokesmen are becoming more and more warlike in their utterances against the United States.

While we want peaceful settlement, we must be prepared for the worst, and we are prepared for the worst. I wish to include in my remarks an illuminating and optimistic article on present Japanese-American relations by a Filipino lawyer and writer, Mr. Vicente Villamin, which appeared in the September issue of the World Affairs magazine and two-score newspapers throughout the United States:

[From World Affairs of September 1941]

WHY JAPAN MAY BREAK LOOSE FROM THE AXIS

(By Vicente Villamin)

In a radio speech to the world on Sunday, August 25, the British Prime Minister, Mr. Winston Churchill, revealed that there were going on conversations between America and Japan looking to the early settlement of war-provoking differences between them.

After castigating Japan, the Prime Minister declared: "Every effort will be made to secure a peaceful settlement. The United States are laboring with infinite patience to arrive at a fair and amicable settlement which will give Japan the utmost reassurance for her legitimate interests. We earnestly hope these negotiations will succeed. But this, I must say, that if these hopes should fail we shall, of course, range ourselves unhesitatingly at the side of the United States."

These words give rise to two basic questions: (a) What are Japan's "legitimate interests" which America would acknowledge as such, and (b) what could be the motives and justification of America to satisfy those interests?

I

Today Japan's paramount overseas policy is to expand southward. She asserts that she means to carry it out peacefully; that her purpose is economic rather than political; that her method is persuasion and not coercion; and that her military might would be brought into play only to keep other nations from frustrating that policy.

Such must be the essence of Japan's "legitimate interests" today. If they really are, and if they should receive the reassurance and recognition by America and Britain, as Mr. Churchill suggests, then the only question to be solved would be how faithfully and how legitimately Japan would execute her program of expansion.

The present Japanese advance southward is not fundamentally different in motive and objective from her occupation of Korea and Manchuria of yesteryear. Then Japan's thesis was "special paramount interests in East Asia by reason of geographical propinquity," but now the thesis is "legitimate interests" rendered indispensable, according to Japanese Empire builders, by the requirements of Japan's world aspirations. This time, however, the Japanese, learning a bitter lesson from their violent experience with China, are adopting, almost with a vengeance, the policy of friendship toward the countries they desire to have become their associates in what they call a life of coexistence and coprosperity.

Positive results of the new method of approach are encouraging to the Japanese. Where they have used brute force, as in China, they stand to face hard and weary years, but where they have employed amicable means, as in Thailand and Indochina, they can expect good and profitable times.

II

What could be the motives and justification of America to satisfy the legitimate interests of Japan?

There is only one answer. America's urgent interest today is to keep Japan from joining her allies, Germany and Italy, as a shooting belligerent. This interest is justified by America's expectation that she may have to engage in a formal shooting war with Japan's European allies and hence the patent unwisdom of fighting a two-ocean war before the projected two-ocean navy is in being.

So we come face to face with what must be Japan's supreme triumph in timing and maneuvering—that is, if America would acquiesce in her plan and procedure. As a reward for remaining at peace, a peace that would be Japan's very salvation, she is due to receive the Anglo-American recognition of her "legitimate interests" in her southward push provided she does not invade American and British rights and domain in the process. As these lines are being written, it is becoming increasingly clear that America is going to insist on its position—to which Japan agreed a year ago and again lately—of urging the maintenance of the international status quo in the west Pacific which rules against aggression and conquest of the peaceful countries in that region.

If the Netherlands East Indies, besides their faith in their power of resistance, desire to reinsure their immunity from Japan's exertion of her "legitimate interests" and all its possibilities, a temporary protectorate by America and/or Britain would seem to commend itself. This is merely an observation and not a suggestion.

III

At this point it is well to reiterate for emphasis the two imperatives of the situation from the American standpoint. They are (a) America's possible recognition of Japan's "legitimate interests," and (b) America's desire to avoid a two-ocean war.

It is relevant to set forth here the assets, respectively, of America and Japan in the present international situation, as they constitute the basis for bargaining in the negotiations which Mr. Churchill revealed as proceeding between the two countries.

The major assets of America are the following:

(1) A national-defense program that could be dangerous to Japan even now and would be overwhelming for Japan in the near future, particularly when America fights Japan only;

(2) China's recognition of American leadership, which may be decisive, on the question whether China should continue or not her resistance to Japan, which resistance is sapping Japan's strength and depleting her resources;

(3) The valuable friendship of America which includes free trading, free financial operations, and free activities for the 122,000 Japanese residents in continental United States, 150,000 in Hawaii, and 25,000 in the Philippines; and

(4) The virtual unanimity of the American people to go to war against Japan when the cause arises, a unanimity that is impressive when it is considered that it does not exist in the case of a possible war with Germany and Italy.

The leading assets of Japan are as follows:

(1) Her membership in the Axis alliance which gives her a nuisance value as an enemy in the Pacific at a time when America may be engaged in a war in the Atlantic;

(2) Her naval power, her national unity, and her geographical nearness both to the probable theater of conflict and the countries which she wants to bring into her orbit;

(3) Her resultant relative strengthening if and when Germany shall have destroyed or crippled the Russian military machine and organization, for Russia has always been a disturbing element in Japan's problem of international security; and

(4) Her concrete policy of expansion purporting to rest on a plan of economic collaboration, mutual advantage and friendly relations, a policy that is convincing certain countries in the Far East that Japan is more interested in their development than either America or Britain.

IV

America's assets outweigh in extent and effectiveness those credited to Japan. But unless America takes the heroic course of facing the enemy both in the Atlantic and the Pacific simultaneously her desire to avoid a two-ocean war would apparently require that a high price be paid to Japan. As already intimated, Japan's price is the recognition, express or implied, of her right and necessity to gravitate to the south without undue impediment. After that recognition Japan will take care of the rest, which may be surmised in this light of her past performance in similar instances.

It is illuminating to bring up at this point the reasons advanced by America in opposing the Japanese southward expansion. They are: (a) The assurance given by Japan in favor of the maintenance of the status quo in the west Pacific which encompasses the concepts of no aggression and no conquest of countries in that region, and (b) the necessity for America to keep open the sources of strategic and critical commodities, like tin, rubber, and quinine, which the Netherlands East Indies produce.

The Japanese do not believe that they are violating the assurance of the status quo when they go to a country with the consent of that country or when they conclude commercial agreements or other arrangements without duress. As to the control of strategic and critical materials, Japan could be expected, if she is thus minded, to follow the example of America in the case of shipments of oil from this country to Japan in times of stress under the export-control law. That would be just one of the concomitants of war, and it is usually forestalled by building up reserves or stock piles of the materials in times of peace.

V

The importance to America of keeping Japan from joining the Axis in active warfare may be wholly exaggerated. The combination of the forces of China, the British dominions and colonies in Asia and Australasia, the American military establishments in the Pacific, the Dutch, the Filipinos, the Javanese, and other potential associates is not for Japan to minimize, especially when she has not been able so far to put down the Chinese alone.

Instead therefore of exacting a price for her abstention from war Japan should pay a price for not being dragged into the war. When this idea becomes better fixed in the minds of the American people they will support an immediate declaration of war against Japan the moment she gives the slightest justification for it. So, bluntly stated, while America may today be pleased to see Japan refrain from becoming a shooting belligerent, Japan may tomorrow find it expedient to make a sacrifice to keep America from becoming a shooting enemy.

VI

America and Japan have always professed to want to be on good terms with each other and to improve their relations whenever they deteriorate. The stacking of assets against assets and the setting off of liabilities against liabilities are the inefficient and the wrong way of ameliorating their relations, for they subordinate or exclude the human elements which are so nebulous and yet so powerful. The right and the effective method is to base ideas and actions on common interests and common aspirations, and the alpha and the omega of all these is the perpetuation of peace in the Pacific and the achievement of human progress, which is only possible in a regime of amity and tranquility.

A few pertinent interrogations are timely at this juncture. Is Japan rationally sure of the friendship of Germany in view of the fate of comparable friendships? Is Japan reasonably certain that Germany may not in time displace her in Indochina and other countries which Japan may occupy with Ger-

many's consent or recommendation? Is the German friendship of any strategic value to Japan in the event of a war in the Pacific in the future?

The following question deserves to be underlined: What has Japan done for Germany for which the Germans should be sincerely grateful? It is revealing of the German realistic thinking to quote an unnamed German leader who said the other day in Berlin that the German people are not f-hting and dying for the benefit of the Japanese, and he had reference to the Japanese ambition to occupy French Indochina and the Netherlands East Indies, whose mother countries Germany has conquered.

In peacetime Japan has relatively little to expect from Germany in the way of trade, capital, and market. German principles clash with the Japanese tenet of coequality. The late German Kaiser used to talk ominously about the "yellow peril." The Nazis of today consider the Japanese as political and racial upstarts as well as potential industrial competitors. It is clear that the present German-Japanese alliance is strictly a temporary one of convenience for Germany and has no logic to support its continuity.

VII

The world is witnessing the birth of a new German Empire with far-flung colonies. Its coexistence with the British Empire is one of the big problems ahead. Japan is building a similar empire of her own, an empire which, when realized, will assemble over half of the world's population under her flag. The Japanese Empire is bound to collide with both the German and British Empires, and the Japanese might have an Anglo-German united front to face. Most assuredly Germany is not going to help Japan become her formidable competitor in world economics and a rival in world politics.

After the present war it would not be improbable or impossible for the Germans and the British to agree on a modus vivendi to blunt, if not to remove, points of possible conflict between them in different parts of the world. The British Empire will remain intact. In constructing her new empire Germany will draw her overseas territories chiefly from the French possessions and from the region in the Far East upon which Japan is counting to make up her own empire. It wouldn't be surprising to see Germany secretly wishing that some strong nation like the United States might crack down on Japan and pull her out from the grand march of empires. From that wish Britain and other countries would not themselves be entirely free.

America's interests and policies are different. She does not aspire to any sort of empire. Without any political ties she is establishing voluntary relationships based on mutual advantages with the countries in the Western Hemisphere. She has no plan to establish her sovereignty in Asia or to expand territorially in the west Pacific. She intends only to hold what she has now and release them as she desires.

From the standpoints of national policies and general disinterestedness Japan has in America the best friend among the nations. Between them are more points of harmony than conflict. Even in these wartimes their common interests are outstanding, although unfortunately they are being overlooked and neglected. One of these interests has to do with the significance of the German march to Asia and the Pacific via Siberia in the north and southeast Europe and India in the south.

VIII

The German thrust into Russia is in the direction of the Pacific. Would Japan welcome the German flag at Vladivostok and other points in eastern Siberia? If Japan was irked by the old German spearhead at Tsingtau on the north China coast 25 years ago when bombing planes were not the awesome monsters they are today, how would she feel about German air bases in eastern Siberia within a few hours of flying distance from Japan's highly inflammable towns and cities?

For the same reason but with much less acuteness because of greater distance those German bases would be a menace to America also. So, it is manifest that both America and Japan should be interested in preventing Germany from establishing herself in eastern Siberia. It should be frankly stated here that to America Japan would be the lesser of the two menaces if Japan decides to get to eastern Siberia first and stop the possible German occupation.

After the Russian campaign is won it is logical to expect the Germans to move into Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, Baluchistan and then into India through to points beyond When that happens, would it not become clear, particularly to the Japanese, that the Germans would thus be reentering the Far East from which they were expelled by the Japanese themselves following the last World War? A German-Japanese reckoning would then be the next little matter the Germans would settle and settle to their satisfaction.

It is perfectly obvious that both the immediate and the long-range interests of Germany and Japan are headed for a collision. The opposite is true in the case of America and Japan. Every realist on both sides of the Pacific Ocean knows this, but the realists do not seem to be brave enough and effective enough to make the truth irresistible and compelling.

There is no need for any appeasement between America and Japan. All that is needed is for the two countries calmly to appraise their respective interests and be prepared to make some adjustments. In doing so they do not have to shoot each other for the sake of a third, far-distant power unless as peoples of blood and flesh they are driven by constant mutual verbal pin pricking to resort to the arbitrament of physical force.

America is the least selfish nation on earth. She is sure of herself, her good intentions, her moral stature, and her material competence. She can afford to be magnanimous and she means to be magnanimous. As nation to nation, on the basis of realism and reasonableness, America and Japan, if there is a will to achieve, could settle their major differences quickly and honorably.

Al Engel, His Camera and Notebook Serve the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ARTICLE BY RAY TUCKER

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ray Tucker in This Week Magazine on the able, timely, and patriotic services rendered our country by a dynamic and fearless Congressman, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Tucker herein gives credit where credit is due.

[From This Week Magazine]

ONE-MAN SHOW

(By Ray Tucker)

One morning a year ago, an Appropriations Committee clerk hurried into the office of Representative ALBERT J. ENGEL, of Michigan. The messenger placed a copy of the original $466,000,000 Army cantonment construction bill on the Congressman's desk, and asked for his immediate approval. Mr. ENGEL sputtered a refusal, slipped into his coat and scurried across the Plaza to the House of Representatives as swiftly as his short, thick legs would propel his 225-pound body.

He discovered that only two poorly mimeographed copies of the bill were available for House Members. Not even the men on the Appropriations Committee (of which Mr. ENGEL is a conscientious member) who are charged with handling War Department funds could make head or tail of the improvised documents. The measure had not been approved at a full meeting of the Appropriations Committee itself.

This disorderly management of those millions of dollars troubled ENGEL. He thought of himself when a dollar was a precious thing and his mind raced back to a bitter Thanksgiving morning in Chicago more than 25 years ago. His rent was paid until the next Monday, but the newcomer to the city had no job and only $1.50 on him—a 50-cent piece in three different pockets so that he couldn't lose all his fortune at once.

He entered a hash house and sat down before a 10-cent breakfast of coffee and doughnuts. He had fished a cast-off newspaper out of a trash can to read the want ads. But his eye fell on a Thanksgiving Day cartoon. It depicted a forlorn kid sitting in a beanery, with clouds in one corner representing his dreams of a turkey dinner and all the trimmings at home.

"I was the kid in that cartoon," ENGEL recalled. "And I'd have beat it home if I'd had the fare. And here I was—not too many years later—being asked to okay almost half a billion dollars without knowing what it was all about. I said 'No.'"

Eventually, however, he agreed to prompt passage because of the need for housing the expanding Military Establishment. But he warned the War Department that he would hold the spenders strictly accountable for every penny which Congress had handed out in such fife-and-drum-corps tempo.

When, a few months later, he satisfied himself that actual cost would exceed estimates by $338,000,000, he decided the time had come to keep his promise. Then began one of the oddest and most quixotic investigations which Capitol Hill has ever witnessed.

Rarely has there been such a simple, swift, and economical inquiry into the expenditure of almost a billion dollars. It is estimated that ENGEL's findings and resultant reforms may save the Government millions of dollars.

EXTRAORDINARY EXPENDITURES

Yet his sole investigative equipment consisted of a battered 28-year-old postal-card-size camera, a notebook, a pocketful of pencils, and the inexpensive family automobile. His expense account shocked the General Accounting Office; it totaled $238.47 for a 13-day tour of cantonments in the East.

His one-man investigation was novel in another respect. He subordinated partisanship. He dealt in facts rather than personalities, political or military, and nobody has disputed his factual claims.

Most congressional investigators discharge their duties leisurely and luxuriously. But not Hurry-up ENGEL. This was his average schedule: Driving sometimes 18 hours at a stretch, he'd arrange to pull up at a camp between 6:30 and 7 in the morning. If he arrived during the night, he lodged at a nearby cabin or snoozed in his automobile. Once, in northern New York, he used his car for a wayside inn when it was 16 below zero. After a breakfast of orange juice, two slices of whole-wheat toast, and a cup of coffee (25 cents), he drove his car to the cantonment. He arrived there bright and early—so early that he usually met up with the morning shift of workers, who were streaming through the gates in their flivvers. As

a matter of fact, it would have been difficult to have told him from the carpenters and bricklayers, for he has a hobby of laying bricks before breakfast on his backyard wall. And he looks like a hewer and hauler.

Once inside, he drove around for 3 or 4 hours. He watched laborers at work, he examined construction jobs, he inspected salvage piles for possible wastage. He noted the grade and quality of lumber with the practiced eye of one who, as a youngster, had been a roustabout in a Michigan logging camp. He studied the soil for dryness or swampiness, the selection of sites for key structures, the arrangement of public utilities, the type and suitability of terrain. He drove everywhere except on the rifle range. If challenged he could produce a letter from the Adjutant General, and his congressional credentials.

When he had completed his first-hand investigation, he presented himself to the commanding officer of the post, identifying himself, and explaining the purpose of his visit.

Immediately there were luncheon and entertainment invitations galore for the perspiring, carelessly attired stranger whose bristly gray hair, driving energy, and rapid-fire sputtering once led the Detroit News to dub him "the La Follette of Michigan." But these offerings of hospitality were refused by the Congressman, who does not smoke, drink, dance, play cards, golf, or tennis, or indulge in chatter for the sake of moving his lips.

"No, Colonel," he invariably replied. "You're too busy and so am I. But you can do three things for me. First, tell your public-relations officer that I am not here.. Second, instruct your construction quartermaster, the contractors, and the engineers to give me the information I ask. I will want 5 hours of their time. Third, please have delivered a bottle of milk and two sandwiches, ham or cheese on rye preferred, at the construction quartermaster's office at noon. Please ask the people I want to see to bring their lunch there. I need every minute I can have with them."

HE SKIPPED NOTHING

Any disposition to humor or stall off the inquisitor vanished after he triggered his cross fire of questions. He covered every item involved in building an Army cantonment. He asked about labor wages and difficulties. About the rental charge and condition of equipment. The cost and quality and wastage of materials. The price, acreage, and former owners of the land. Camp utilities. The actual cost against estimates. Contractors' troubles. The reasons for delays. The cause of failure to keep within appropriations.

When he had obtained a stranglehold on these statistics he toured the site again, first with the construction officials, then alone, snapping photographs of whatever seemed to merit more intensive investigation.

Leaving the camp, he drove to the nearest town for dinner, which was almost as frugal as breakfast and lunch. He spent a few hours each evening in a poolroom or recreation center, but not to play. He questioned camp workers and soldiers. Thus he got an insight into the problems and attitudes of the men who had to build and occupy the cantonments. They furnished him numerous leads for inquiry at other places. Around 10 o'clock he climbed into his car and left for the next job. On one trip he covered 1,655 miles in 7 days, investigating five camps.

His series of speeches on cantonment conditions disclosed details which would never have been checked except by a post-war inquiry had it not been for his spot investigation. He revealed that 40 percent of the land at Camp Blanding, Fla., was below nearby lake levels. He estimated, and no one argued with him, that it cost $5,000,000 extra to excavate the mud and fill with solid earth and rock. He told how Army officers, over the protest of civilian contractors, refused to build the new center at Camp Meade, Md., on the World War site. Failure to utilize existing drainage systems, roads, and other facilities set Uncle Sam back $2,000,000.

At Camp Edwards, Mass., he found that a lobster fisherman was foreman of one carpenters' crew. His crew included a bond salesman, an insurance man, a meat cutter, a gas-station attendant. They were paid $1.17½ an hour; double for overtime. And there was plenty of overtime.

By a comparison of costs, the Congressman was convinced that the competitive-bid system was more economical and efficient than the lump-sum-fixed-fee arrangement. Barracks for 63 men at Camp Dix, N. J., which went to the lowest bidder, cost only $9,800, as against $17,364 for the same type at Camp Meade, which was built on the fixed-fee basis. The Engel inquiry also exploded the Army's insistence on an 11-percent allowance for engineering and overhead charges. The Congressman's "spot check" showed that expenditures for this purpose invariably ran as low as 5 percent.

In summarizing, ENGEL estimated that there had been a waste of $250,000,000 on the $804,000,000 construction program—and again nobody disputed him. The Michigan Member wasted no time before seeking reforms. It wasn't too late to provide a remedy.

His very first disclosures precipitated a shakeup in the Army's contract-award system and personnel. A civilian committee which had chosen contractors and fixed fees was supplanted by Maj. Gen. W. D. Connor, a brilliant officer, former West Point commandant, and, oddly, ENGEL's commanding officer in the A. E. F. Suspected opportunities for favoritism were eliminated. General Connor also promised stricter supervision of construction operations.

The Engel amendment requiring competitive bidding was beaten by 4 votes—only because Democratic leaders feared it might tie the Army's hands in a crisis demanding speed rather than saving of money. But they announced publicly that the War Department would use this method wherever practicable.

The Congressman's proposal to restrict the engineering and overhead item to 7 percent was adopted by the House. When the War Department persuaded the Senate to strike it from the bill, he exploded. He threatened to block the bill on the House floor, then abandoned a floor show-down in return for a major concession:

Brig. Gen. Brehon Somervell, in charge of Army construction, agreed in writing to restrict these costs to 7 percent through administrative action, and to make periodical reports to Congress on this item. This 4-percent saving will amount to many millions of dollars. Yet this leakage would have escaped detection if somebody had not taken the trouble to go looking for it—and recognized it when he saw it.

Like most public officials who handle public money as if it were their own, Mr. ENGEL comes rightly by his saving streak. His parents were thrifty, industrious Alsatians, who emigrated to this country in 1871, settling near Massillon, Ohio. But in 1899, when young AL was 13, the family moved to northern Michigan. It was pioneer country then, and the son pitched in to cut timber and farm the cleared land.

Finishing formal schooling when he completed the eighth grade at 14, the boy got work in a logging camp. He felled trees, swamped, fired a narrow-gage engine, operated a mill slab saw, drove the sawdust cart. His legs still bear the scars of an ax awkwardly swung. His head shows the marks of blows sustained in camp scraps. Older loggers always matched him against juvenile newcomers to the settlement.

Then he bought a bicycle, and next he knew he was pedaling furiously to Saginaw, a town 150 miles away. He wore his first set of store clothes, but he was minus underwear or any footwear except his logging boots. He couldn't afford them.

At Saginaw he landed a job on a threshing machine, moving from farm to farm with the harvest, sleeping in bunkhouses with hay for a mattress and a sack stuffed with bran for a pillow. His pay was $1 a day and board.

With $75 he had saved by fall, he struck out for the big city—Chicago. He wanted to go to school, but he had to have work to eat. He was turned down at 22 different places because he lacked recommendations. Then, while walking the street one morning, he saw the door of a store fly open. Out stumbled a youngster with an angry man in pursuit. The boy, AL concluded, was being fired. He walked in and got the job. For $5 a week he swept out and ran errands for the broken-down picture-framing shop.

After a few weeks friends took him around to the Central Y. M. C. A., where he enrolled in an elementary law course. He went on to better jobs, working in the auditing department of railroads and an ice company. Then, in 1907, he quit so he could study law at Northwestern University.

He supported himself by driving an express truck from 5:30 to 11:30 each night (30 cents an hour) and doing spare-time auditing for his old employers. He finished a 4-year course in 3 years, and with several fellow-graduates set himself up as voluntary defender for poor clients. He got no money but plenty of experience.

"After a case, we never asked each other, 'Did you get him off?'" he recalls with a grin. "Simply, 'How many years did he get?'"

The 1913-14 depression drove him back to Lake City, Mich. In 1916 he ran for county prosecuting attorney because he "needed a job." He made a house-to-house campaign of the district in a worn-out flivver. When it broke down before election day, he covered the rest of the territory on foot. The thrifty Dutch voters liked his perseverance and industry, and elected him.

In April 1917, 2 months after he took office, he resigned to attend officers' school at Fort Sheridan, Ill. He yearned to go overseas and he wangled a transfer to a casual company en route to Europe. From his first stop at Pershing's Chaumont headquarters he was shipped to Bordeaux, where he organized base 2 of the A. E. F. statistical section. He kept the "war diary" of all troop and supply movements in that area.

Returning home in December 1919 he fixed his sights on a seat in the State senate. In his ignorance he did not know that he should have consulted the organization bosses. But it would have made no difference, for he has never taken political orders.

BEATS THE MACHINE

His opponent opened his campaign with the conventional announcement that "at the earnest solicitation of my good friends I have agreed reluctantly to offer myself to the electorate." AL said: "I want it distinctly understood that nobody asked me to be a candidate. I am running because I want the job."

He was elected.

He was returned again in 1926, and was reelected in 1928 and 1930, despite his liberalism and aloofness from the party organization. Then, in 1934—after three tries—he was elected to Congress, defeating the machine in both the primary and the election.

Except for his amazing, one-man investigation, he has not been a headliner or a spectacular figure on Capitol Hill. He is a plodding, conscientious, hard-working fellow. He has old-fashioned notions, as he explains in describing the idea behind his curiosity about Army costs:

"When I got on the Appropriations Committee, and found myself handling billions of the taxpayers' money, I decided that it was up to me to see how it was spent, and that the people who elected me got their money's worth. That's all there is to it."

The Late Honorable Alanson B. Houghton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

LETTER TO THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as one who had the privilege of observing at close range the outstanding work done by the late Hon. Alanson B. Houghton as Ambassador to Germany after the last World War and of enjoying his friendship from that time to the time of his death, I am glad, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, to include the following eloquent tribute to him by Oswald Garrison Villard, appearing in the New York Times of September 18:

THE LATE ALANSON HOUGHTON—TRIBUTE TO A FORMER AMBASSADOR WHO OCCUPIED DIFFICULT POSTS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The death of Alanson B. Houghton, former Ambassador to Berlin and London, deprives us of a really great American and one of the wisest and most farsighted statesmen I have ever encountered in my four decades of dealing with public men here and abroad. During almost all of the time of our friendship he and I were politically in different camps. Hence I am not basing my favorable judgment of him, as most of us do, merely on the fact that we often agreed notably on foreign issues, but because I came to know him well and his work and to place the highest evaluation on his wisdom, political common sense, and his selflessness. I do not believe he ever approached a public question with the thought of how his stand might affect him personally. But there are several other aspects of his rich and extremely useful life which seem to me to warrant especial stressing at this time.

In the first place, he was a rich man who had added considerably to an inherited fortune by managing and developing a great industrial enterprise. Its owners lived in the community and managed it themselves and were far happier in the fact that they had the regard and respect of their workers than they were of their financial success and their extraordinary contribution to the development of the art of glass making.

Alanson Houghton was proud of never having had a strike in his plant and happy that an able son was equipped to take his place as the family representative and as the head of the company when it came time for him to retire. He thus was anything but the "wicked capitalist" of which we have heard so much. He was a warm-hearted and generous creative and constructive industrial leader of widest vision.

ENTRANCE INTO PUBLIC LIFE

Next, Mr. Houghton set a remarkable public example in that in 1919 he decided to enter public life by running for Congress in the district in which he lived. I am sure that he felt the time had come to repay in some measure in public service the rewards that our social and industrial system had conferred upon him. Most successful businessmen have been content to make their sole contribution to the communial political life in the form of checks, which too often have gone into the wrong coffers or the wrong hands. Mr. Houghton had a different idea, and he was on his way to an extremely influential Congressional career when in his second term in Congress he was appointed the first Ambassador to Berlin after the World War.

I suppose that most people on reading of his selection felt that here was just another rich man to whom the office had been given for political reason or because of the size of his contribution to party funds or because of his social ambition. I myself wondered a little at the selection, but came to believe that no more perfect appointment could possibly have been made.

I arrived at this opinion after going to Berlin in 1922 and 1923 and seeing for myself what a position he had won for himself, how profoundly he was influencing developments in Germany and what a natural-born diplomat he was; how he stood head and shoulders above the rest of the corps, even above the British Ambassador, Lord D'Abernon, whose many achievements I would not belittle. It was an extraordinarily difficult situation. Ellis Loring Dresel had carried on well as interim representative of the United States, but to be the first Ambassador to this chaotic, beaten country from the nation which had gained a coup de grâce was something very different.

I found the German Government actually consulting Mr. Houghton as to its most important moves and being guided by his opinion again and again to its great benefit. They admired him and deferred to him in a remarkable way.

HELPED IN DIFFICULT SITUATION

He rose so extraordinarily to the situation because he came to Germany thoroughly imbued with the American point of view and wholly without hatred or bitterness or condescension. He had done post-graduate work in Berlin and Goettingen after graduating from Harvard, so that he had a working knowledge of German and a genuine affection for the German people as apart from their misleaders.

He felt that he was there to help a mighty people in their dire distress just as far as the representative of a foreign people possibly could He was simple, approachable, ever friendly, unusually modest, and he was helped no end by a rare and delightful humor. He had rare tact, sympathy and understanding, and his business ability and congressional experience stood him in the best stead in passing on the dreadful economic and financial situation.

Of course, Mr. Houghton soon earned the cordial dislike of the French because of his opposition to their invasion of the Ruhr and the other substantial contributions to the raising up of Adolpf Hitler and the coming of the present war. But time has justified him in every respect.

It is the simple truth that no other American Ambassador to Berlin has ever achieved such success or won such tributes or expressions of heartfelt respect when he left. Had this country been wise it would have kept him there as long as he would stay. Yet Mr. Coolidge did a just and proper thing by promoting him to the Court of St. James. In 3 years he had well earned that distinction.

In this time of stress and strain, when the state of the Republic is darker than ever before, it is most comforting to think that the crisis of 1922 produced in Mr Houghton just the man we needed for the Berlin task. There is still splendid material in all groups available for the finest type of public service. The difficulty is to get them in and to keep them in—and to keep many others out.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD.

Thomaston, Conn., September 17, 1941.

Strikes in Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested this afternoon in several speeches made by Members commenting favorably on the very enoyable demonstration and exhibition given Members of Congress last Thursday at Fort Belvoir. I join with my colleagues in expressing my sincere appreciation to the Secretary of War for that splendid and informative trip.

However, Mr. Speaker, there were at least two very disturbing elements on that memorable occasion. First of all, I was astounded at the price tag placed on much of that equipment that was so proudly displayed before us. I fully appreciate that in times of emergency one cannot quibble over the price tag placed on a needed piece of equipment. But on the other hand it does seem to me that a little sound judgment could save you and I, and the rest of our taxpayers, untold millions of dollars. I have heard Army men say that the Army has a hard enough time getting any suitable appropriations in peacetime and consequently when a war comes along they have to make up for lost time and the price tags placed on that equipment at Fort Belvoir bear out that statement.

Another thing I wondered about was just how much of that modern equipment we had on hand. I was not kept wondering very long, because the answer stood out right like a sore thumb within a very few hours when the sham battles were staged in the afternoon. Here you had a picture, Mr. Speaker, of a demonstration being staged, under the direction of the Secretary of War, for the Vice President of the United States, the Under Secretary of War, hundreds of Members of the House and Senate, and scores of newspapermen, as well as a score or more of uniformed military observers from foreign countries. And yet there was not enough equipment at Fort Belvoir—within 20 miles of the Nation's Capital—to stage that demonstration. There were a score or more of light tanks engaged in the sham battle, but there were also what seemed to be a number of automobiles or other equipment on which had been painted a false side to simulate additional tanks.

Mr. Speaker, you know the answer to this shortage just as well as I do. The bottleneck in American defense is in this continued wave after wave of strikes in defense industries, about which this administration does absolutely nothing—and Congress less.

A fearless editor of a local newspaper, back in my State, has hit the nail on the head in the following editorial which I

include in the RECORD at this point. He asks a real question when he asks, "How Do Strikes Strike You—Taxpayer?"

[From the Alma Record and Alma Journal]

HOW DO STRIKES STRIKE YOU—TAXPAYER?

We can't read a newspaper or turn on the radio without seeing or hearing something about a strike, something that is interfering with defense programs, and yet the Government officials allow these strikes to go on, and in many cases secretly encourage them while at the same time they are calling for more billions of dollars from the pockets of the people for supposed defense purposes.

Now there is a hue and cry in Congress, promoted by those in authority, to raise more billions to send to Europe.

Only a few months ago a law was passed which was known as the lease-lend bill and that provided for taking $7,000,000,000 out of the pockets of the American people to raise money for John Bull, Tom, Dick, and Harry, and other bulls. Now they are demanding of the people six billion more to give or lend to someone outside of our country, and American people have to pay.

If Congress would put a stop to these strikes and make the strikers work on defense programs the same as they make the soldiers fight for defense they would be doing something for the people besides robbing them of their earnings and savings.

If the labor leaders are permitted to strike and hold up defense programs, I see no reason why the taxpayers would not be justified in striking and refusing to pay any more taxes until the other strikers get down to business and work for the good of the country instead of for their own selfish interests. It is the people's money that is being wasted and strikers are being paid out of unemployment taxes on business while they sit on the seat of their pants and howl for increased pay or less production.

Here is an illustration of the extent of strikes which should awake the American people up and make them strike conscious to the extent of refusing to pay taxes to finance this kind of nonsense and rank injustice. Read it over for yourself and do your own deciding as to how strikes strike you and how long you are going to stand for that kind of right down dishonest management of our affairs and the waste of our money.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, man-days lost by strikes in 1941 have increased 500 percent over 1940. During the first 7 months of 1940, 3,091,000 man-days were lost. In the similar 1941 period, 15,750,000 man-days were lost.

The number of strikes called in 1941 increased to 2,505 from the 1940 figure of 1,403.

A month-by-month comparison of numbers of strikes in 1941 and 1940 follows:

Month	1941	1940
January	220	128
February	240	172
March	230	178
April	400	223
May	500	239
June	385	214
July	430	244
Total	2,505	1,403

A comparison of man-days lost month by month follows:

Month	1941	1940
January	625,000	247,000
February	1,000,000	290,000
March	1,400,000	387,000
April	7,800,000	442,000
May	2,250,000	656,000
June	2,375,000	484,000
July	1,300,000	585,000
Total	15,750,000	3,091,000

Now, folks, let us break this record down and see just what it means to us in terms which we can understand, and then let us draw our own conclusions as to the justice and fairness of this sort of management.

Three hundred working days per year are considered as the average working year in all industry, taking out Sundays and holidays. Now, let us divide 15,750,000 by 300 and the result is 52,500 working years for one man that have been wasted in 7 months, and during all that time we have been yelling at the top of our voices for greater and faster production for defense in order that we may send enough to England and Russia to save our democracy, which is in greater danger from our own nonsense than from anything that is happening in Europe.

If we make another analysis of this situation and take a look at the problem from another angle, it would take 52,500 men working one whole year to make up that time lost by these strikes and it really does not take much hard thinking to estimate what could be accomplished in 1 year by 52,500 men, working steadily every working day in honest to God fashion.

Had there been no strikes, and had the lost years been put in at honest labor, there would be no need for us to be yelling for greater speed for defense production, and the material we need would have been produced and would be already in use. The newspapers would not be urging greater haste, and the radio announcers would silence most of their senseless chatter about speed.

Just everyday horse sense tells us that the man who sits down and refuses to work is not producing anything, and, further, that he is not letting anyone else produce anything for defense or for any other purpose. Now the government management that stands for that sort of thing has some loose headgear somewhere that is failing to function in this time when the country is in great danger and needs the loyal service of every good American citizen.

The danger to the country grows steadily for one reason only, and that reason is the fact that millions of production days are lost because strikes go on and men loaf at public expense instead of producing for defense.

If our public servants in Washington are not big enough and do not possess the common sense and courage to put a stop to this outrage, then it is time for the people to speak right out in meeting to protect themselves.

America's Hope Lies in a Simple Faith in the Living God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. CARL T. CURTIS, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on October 5, 1941, the eighteenth annual Nebraska State Sunday at Valley Forge was observed. This service was held at 3 o'clock in the afternoon at the Washington Memorial Chapel at Valley Forge. It was sponsored by the National Society of Colonial Dames of America in Nebraska, and the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution in the State of Nebraska.

Nebraskans are greatly interested in this Memorial Chapel. The Nebraska State bell for the Washington Memorial National Carillon was the gift of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Nebraska. The Nebraska State panel in the roof of the Republic in the Chapel was a gift of the National Society of Colonial Dames of America in the State of Nebraska, and the Nebraska State Flag used in the service was given by Mrs. B. G. Miller, of Crete, Nebraska, the State director for Nebraska for the Children of the American Revolution.

I wish to extend my remarks by including the address delivered by me on the occasion above named. The address follows:

It is with a sense of awe and reverence I speak here at Valley Forge on Nebraska Day. This spot is so rich in American history and tradition that any American worthy of the name can feel his heart throb with a greater love for his country.

I am glad to appear as a Nebraskan on this Nebraska Day at this historic shrine. Nebraskans yield to no one in their love for their country and their willingness to sacrifice to the end that those honored dead whose blood flowed on this spot shall not have died in vain. I am happy that Nebraskans have contributed to the building of this beautiful chapel.

The present time is much like the period described by the poet in the long ago who said:

"We are living, we are dwelling,
In a grand and awful time;
In an age on ages telling,
To be living is sublime."

Valley Forge should have a new significance in the year of 1941. I say that because I believe that the qualities of character that were displayed by the men at Valley Forge are the qualities of character that we need so much today, namely, self-denial, sacrifice, toil, and faith. No picture of Valley Forge is complete without that great, God-fearing, wise, persistent, and courageous leader, Gen. George Washington. When we think of the sacrifices that had to be made, the obstacles that had to be overcome, and the impossible tasks that had to be performed we say to ourselves, How could Washington have done it? There is but one answer to that, and that answer is portrayed in the painting of Washington at prayer at Valley Forge. America i a great nation today because the Father of our Country was a general who was brave enough to pray.

So today we meet in a chapel erected to God, and in memory of the Father of our Country, to pray to the God of the Father of our Country.

Need I take time to argue that in these tragic days we do need divine guidance and help? Grover Cleveland once declared, "Above all I know there is a Supreme Being who rules the affairs of men and whose goodness and mercy have always followed the American people. I know that he will not turn from us now, if we humbly and reverently seek his powerful aid."

As one who loves to pursue the pages of American history, I like to visit our national shrines. I enjoy coming to Valley Forge. It does something for me. I enjoy visiting Mount Vernon, the home of George Washington. When I visit Mount Vernon and take

the path that leads down to the tomb of General Washington, and gaze upon that stone sarcophagus which holds his earthly remains, I cannot feel that George Washington is there. I prefer to believe that General Washington has taken his place in the realm of eternity and that he looks down upon his United States in our day and age. As I think of him in that great beyond looking down and observing our progress as a nation, our growth and development, our mistakes and our successes, our decisions and our choices, it would seem to me that he says, "Do not waste your time in eulogizing me—follow my advice."

Two of the things that stand out in the life of George Washington were his habits of reading the Holy Bible, and his faith in God as provider of all good things. It would be difficult for us to speculate upon what kind of a country we would have today if it were not for the life of George Washington. Likewise, it is equally hard to speculate on what the life of George Washington would have been if he had not sought the guidance and help of the divine Scriptures every morning and every evening throughout his life.

Mr. Will H. Houghton, the president of the Moody Bible Institute, in his book entitled "Let's Go Back to the Bible" says, "Days of darkness have been days of Bible ignorance." It can likewise be said that order was brought out of chaos during one of the darkest periods of our history by a man who had as his daily companion the Holy Scriptures.

There are many things that can be said about the faith of George Washington. We love to think of his habits of church attendance, his prayers, his support of the churches of his time, and other acts performed by him. But there is a thought expressed in his first inaugural address which shows how great was his faith. He then said: "It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that almighty being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect."

I ask you to notice, my friends, that George Washington believed in a God who rules over the universe, who presides at the council of nations, and whose providenial aids can supply every human defect. That is but another way of saying what Isaiah of old said, "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land."

King Solomon said it in this way: "Blessed is everyone that feareth the Lord, and walketh in His ways, for thou shall eat the labors of thine hands; happy thou shalt be, and it shall be well with thee."

And Job said: "If they obey and serve Him, they shall spend their days in prosperity and their years in pleasure."

These are sad and troubled days. Confusion and heartache seem to be the order of our day. In spite of all our wealth, our natural resources, and our manpower, we are faced with unhappiness, disappointment, unemployment, business failures, suicides, and all manner of difficulty.

The people of America have floundered around over a broad field searching for a solution to the problems of life. We have been eager to grasp the spirit of the age, when we should have held fast to the spirit of the ages. The problems of food, shelter, and of getting along with our fellow men are as great today as they were during the days of primitive man.

The trend of our Government over the last 7 or 8 years has been to the effect that the Government would solve all of our problems. This false and misleading philosophy that the "Government will take care of you" has not only been proclaimed, but the resources of our great Nation have been dissipated in proving the fallacy of such ideas. In our quest after a Government-directed and man-made prosperity, we have lost sight of the admonition, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and all its righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." Things are but the essence of prosperity.

A misguided philosophy of government has turned the hopes and imagination of 130,000,000 of people away from the City of God and directed it upon our Capital City. A people who at one time were consoled with the words of the old hymn, "God will take care of you, be not dismayed whate'er betide," are now taught, "Be not dismayed, whate'er betide—the Government will take care of you." An eminent divine in the city of Washington has declared, "We have supplanted the word government instead of God in the twenty-third Psalm. We have been taught, "The Government is my shepherd, I shall not want."

In other words, we have been rendering unto Caesar the things that are God's. Today our Nation is engaged in the great task of building a defense. I believe that America will come through in that job. When that defense job is over our domestic problems will still be with us and it would be foolhardy on our part if we did not heed the advice of those who say that after the present war emergency is over there will be another and a greater period of depression. It is well that we give some thought now as to how we will approach that problem and what our attitude will be.

It is a matter of history that America has never come out of any depression until a spiritual awakening had taken place. A noted example of this is the revival that followed the panic of 1857. At that time the large financial centers crashed; public confidence was prostrate; industry stood still; ruin confronted the leaders of business; and, desperate poverty was the lot of countless wage earners. Amidst such conditions a laymen's revival started in many of our great cities and swept over our country. Newspapers at that time carried accounts of men in all walks of life—porters, hand cartmen, policemen, tradesmen, mechanics, ministers, business and professional men of all ages—gathering at places of worship. Those men cried out to God, "Save my soul and restore my credit," or "Save my soul and get me a job." Their common conscience told them why they had to pray and their common predicament dictated what to pray for.

America came out of that depression and came out with a stronger citizenry. Commenting on it, the Reverend A. J. Patterson, of Portsmouth, N. H., said: "A religious awakening always follows the track of a business depression; this is convincing evidence of the reality of religion."

We should ever be mindful—

"That only men can make
A nation great and strong,
Men who for truth and honor's sake,
Stand fast and suffer long."

A great truth was uttered by William McKinley when he said, "Our faith teaches us that there is no safer reliance than the God of our Fathers, who has so singularly favored the American people in every national trial, and who will not forsake us now as long as we obey His commandments and walk humbly in His footsteps."

Modern statesmen need to take the view as expressed by Dr. Frank W. Gunsaulaus who said, "Statesmanship is seeing where Almighty God is going and then getting things out of His way."

Amidst strife, war, poverty, unemployment, distress, and failure, when a period of dark ages seem but around the corner, America's hope lies in a simple faith in the living God.

"If we would build,
And build to stay,
We must find God again,
And go His way."

Understudy for Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by John T. Flynn, chairman of the New York chapter of the America First Committee, September 27:

In these sad days wherever we turn we are met with that terrible word "war" and with the thoughts of war. Everywhere people argue whether we should stay out of the war or go into the war all the way or go in just a little bit. Does it not seem an intelligent thing, therefore, to have a very clear idea of the war we are talking about going into?

To know what this war is you have only to look at those dread scenes in Russia as the engines of death roll over her fields, her cities, her people.

Our image of war, unfortunately, is still a little feeble because it is still formed upon the conceptions of the wars we have known up to now. We have thought of war as barbarous, cruel, savage. But never anything so barbarous or cruel or savage as this war. In our youth we were shocked at the story of the bloody angle at Gettysburg or the mowing down of men like wild rabbits at Chancellorsville. And later we shuddered at the vast slaughter at Verdun in the Great War. But all these were as nothing compared with the carnage in Russia as Stalin and Hitler hurl human beings at each other as if they were only dry bones.

Our whole Revolutionary War was fought with only 4,000 Americans killed. The bloody battle of Gettysburg saw 3,500 Federals and 5,500 Confederates killed. What a safe place Gettysburg was compared with the fields around Leningrad or Kiev or Smolensk. The Germans say they have killed, wounded, or captured 5,000,000 Russians. The British concede it is 3,000,000. In the last war it took 4 years of killing to slaughter 1,500,000 Russians. In this war the Germans have done that in just 3 months. Verdun was called the bloodiest battle in history. A million men were killed in the armies of five nations in 4 months. In Russia three times as many have been blown to bits in the German and Russian Armies in just 3 months. All this does not include the wounded or, what is perhaps more terrible, that endless melancholy line of millions of prisoners which flows back of the lines of both armies to starve and rot with disease in the prison camps of Nazi Germany and Communist Russia. What the losses will be if this war rages for another year or another 5 years staggers the imagination.

When, therefore, some politician or some delicate-fingered preacher or professor, still flushed with a bounteous meal and safe behind his gray hairs, tells you that we should declare war on Germany, the war they are talking about is this far spreading orgy of blood and fire and murder which you see rolling over the doomed prairies of Russia. When the President of the United States or his warlike Secretary of the Navy seeks this week by one device and next week by another to inch you ever closer and closer and finally into war—this dread inferno of slaughter is the war they are trying to inch you into.

Now, let me tell you why I have called your attention to these grim facts. There can be no doubt that Russia is reeling toward defeat. From London and Washington come ominous warnings that this will happen soon. Now, if this is true then it is only a question of time when the Russian Armies will be out of the war. And when that happens there will be no enemy on the European Continent facing Hitler on the battlefield.

When France and England entered this war they did not plan on doing much fighting. France behind her Maginot Line and Britain with her Navy thought they could station themselves at all the gateways of the seven seas, bottle Germany up and starve her population into submission. But it did not work out that way. Somebody has had to fight Hitler. At this moment whatever fighting is being done against Hitler is being done by the Russians and the Russians alone. English fliers drop some bombs on the Continent, but chiefly on French and Belgian towns. England's Army keeps at home in England. When I say nobody is fighting Hitler but Russia I mean really fighting him with planes and tanks and guns and armies. And when Russia is knocked out nobody will be fighting him. Yet if Hitler is to be defeated somebody must fight him. The question is, Who will it be? Clearly, England has no intention of invading the Continent and attacking Hitler. She does not do it now while Russia has five and six million men in the field against him on his other front. She will certainly not do it when Russia is knocked out. And so I ask, "Who is to do it?"

On September 3, 1939, England declared war against Germany because of her attack on Poland. Britain then announced that she would fight Hitler and Nazism until both were destroyed. Here in America we were told Britain was fighting our battle. But now let us see whose battle has been fought and who has been doing the fighting.

This war has been a series of gigantic battles. First was the Battle of Poland. England promised aid to the Poles. All they got was a high commission. The Poles fought that battle. They met the Germans with an army of a million men. They were defeated in a few weeks. They lost their whole army and their liberties. Next came the Battle of France. France had 2,000,000 men, Belgium about 500,000. England sent only 350,000. France lost her whole army. So did Belgium. Britain's losses were negligible. The Battle of France was in fact fought by the French. They were defeated in a few weeks and lost their liberties. Next came the Battle of Greece and Yugoslavia. That battle was fought by the Greeks and the Yugoslavs. Britain sent a handful of men and suffered trivial casualties. Greece and Yugoslavia lost that battle, lost their entire armies and lost their liberties. Then came the Battle of Russia. Again Britain promised aid to the Russians. Again she sent Russia a high commission. The Battle of Russia is being fought by the Russians alone.

Thus the story goes. The Battle of Poland was fought by the Poles. The Battle of France was fought by the French. The Battle of Greece was fought by the Greeks and Serbs. The Battle of Russia is being fought by the Russians. And now when the Russians fold up and the next battlefield is ready, who will do the fighting? What nation with millions of men is being groomed now as the understudy for Russia, to step out upon the stage and play out the bloody rôle of crushing Hitler? Who has been elected by England to fight this next battle? For Hitler will never be defeated until somebody fights a battle with him who can bring more men and more tanks and more planes and more guns than Russia has brought into the battle. Who has been chosen by England for that job? Who, I ask you, is next on England's list? Of course you know the answer. America has been selected, is being prepared and propagandized to fight, not her own battle, for she is not mixed up in this, but England's battle. Yet we are such dupes that we allow British statesmen and propagandists to tell us that she is fighting ours.

That is why I have described to you the vast proportions of this war, so that as you consider whether you are to go into it or not you will know precisely what size war it is and what is the size of the job you are tackling. If we are to fight Germany let us understand, like sensible people, just what we must get together for that enterprise. Assistant Secretary of War McCloy told the Michigan Bar Association this week that Germany has 10,000,000 men under arms. She has more guns, more tanks, more planes than all the armies in the World War put together. Now, it is not a question whether we are afraid of Germany. It is a question of going about the job intelligently. If we fight the Germans, we will have to have as many men in our Army and as many planes, guns, and tanks as they have. Because we will have to go 3,500 miles away from our bases to fight them on their own soil and behind their own fortifications. When you start that job and read about the monstrous battles on the fields of France or Germany or Russia; when you hear of battles in which a million men are killed, the men you will be reading about will be not Russians or Poles, but your own American boys. When you hear of those terrible lines of prisoners, broken, hopeless, many wounded, marching by the millions behind the enemy lines into their prison camps of starvation and disease and cruelty, they will be your boys who will live out in those dread camps many years of agonized frustration. And so the question you have to ask yourself is a plain, common-sense one. Are you aware of any stake you have in this war; is any material or spiritual thing of ours here in America involved to such a point that you are willing to raise these vast armies, send them throughout the world, and cripple your whole economic and social system for years in the effort? And I beg you to keep this in mind: Great as will be the cost in men, in money, in debt and taxes, there is a far greater cost you must reckon on. You cannot turn this whole society of ours upside down, deliver it over to the deeds and the business of war, pile up the vast debts of war, unloose the violent emotions of war, without delivering a death blow to your economic system and your democratic life. If we go to war with Germany, to be sure we can win the war, though it may take many years. We can win against Germany at a frightful cost. But we cannot win against war itself. Germany cannot destroy us. But modern war, which in turn has destroyed victors and vanquished throughout the world, will destroy us; and we who pretend we are going to war to save the freedoms of France and Britain and Greece and Russia, will end by losing our own.

I warn you, my fellow Americans, that there is at work in this Nation a powerful engine of propaganda directed from Washington to get you all the way into this war. These men do not ask you to plunge headlong into war, because they know you would refuse. But they inch you along one small step at a time. They ask you to sell arms today. Then they ask you to give arms. Then they ask you to occupy Greenland and next it is Iceland. When that is done you have an American armed force actually over in the European hemisphere. You are against convoys, so they start what they call an Atlantic patrol. And having gotten away with that they now have started convoys. Now they want to arm American merchant ships and send them boldly into the war zones hoping some will be sunk and thus inflame the minds of Americans to actual war.

Your course is clear. Your Senator, your Congressman is your servant. Next year your Congressman must come to you for your votes. Write to him. Tell him you want no more of this war-making business. By whatever name they call it—convoys, arming merchant ships, sending money to Communist Russia, repealing the Neutrality Act—all these are only schemes to get us to the precipice and finally into war. Get your friends to write. Keep at them. Remember your Congressmen watch those letters. Nobody can stop this war but you.

Liquidation of Small Business Will Create a Few Gigantic Monopolies to Control American Economy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MANKATO (MINN.) FREE PRESS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, many things are being done in the name of national defense that are far afield from our effort to make our country strong on land, sea, and in the air. I call your attention again to the general liquidation of small business in the United States in the name of national defense.

Small business is not the recipient of defense contracts, and the strictly enforced priority system is denying these little fellows the privilege of securing essential materials to continue in business. Fifty-six large manufacturers are doing 75 percent of defense production.

Liquidation of small business may be a conspiracy on the part of those who seek to remake American economy. When the small businessman is out of the way, we will find a few gigantic monopolies in absolute control. These, in turn, will be controlled by the Government through threat of persecution and prosecution, or bodily taken over to fulfill the un-American scheme of a total socialized economy for the United States. It is time for Congress to act at once to save our great American middle class of small business before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, many great Americans are giving this important problem serious thought. Mr. Clifford H. Russell, the managing editor of the Mankato Free Press of Mankato, Minn., is one of this group. I commended Mr. Russell for his constructive work in behalf of the small businessman, and I am proud to include as a part of my remarks an editorial written by him which was published in the Mankato Free Press on October 1, 1941. The editorial follows:

TIME TO ACT NOW

New appeals are being voiced, new efforts are being made to arouse greater interest

in Congress over the plight of small business due to the defense program.

Defense demands must, of necessity, get priority over materials for nondefense goods.

It would seem, however, that any system of allocating priorities can and must be administered with some realization and appreciation of the long range effects it may have on the Nation's economic system.

As it is now the small industry, the small contractor, the little fellow in all fields, is denied materials with which to carry on normal nondefense activities, and at the same time he is getting no share of the billions that are being expended for the Nation's vast defense program.

He is being ground between two millstones and the question of his ability to survive has become a matter of serious doubt.

It is a critical situation for the Nation as a whole as well as for small business.

It is the smaller tributaries, the creeks and rivulets and springs in the virgin backcountry that feed our great rivers. Cut off these smaller streams, dry them up, tile them out, and your mighty streams for river traffic in time become nothing more than a succession of stagnant pools.

It is the small roots, the little, fibrous tendrils that supply the food, strength, and sustenance to support our mighty oaks. Cut off these little feeders and the major taproots are useless—in time your great oaks will wither and die.

Small business, the little fellows back in the hinterland, are the creeks and rivulets and feeder roots of this Nation's economic system. Dry them up, cut them off, and your great streams of commerce will shrink and stagnate, your mighty oaks of industry will die.

That's the very danger that our defense program presents, if it continues along present lines.

For more than a quarter century past there has been much talk and some action at successive sessions of Congress and in successive administrations about curbing and regulating monopoly. Yet the defense program as it is now being administered is doing more to foster, strengthen, and give unlimited power to monopoly than anything that has happened since Theodore Roosevelt inaugurated his famous "trust busting" campaign away back at the beginning of the century.

The big industries are getting the lion's share, and then some, of defense contracts, and they are refusing to sublet them.

Also they are getting priority orders for essential materials. They control contracts and as a result of those contracts they control the materials necessary to carry them out. The little fellow gets neither.

The paralysis that such a situation creates spreads from manufacturers to dealers, from factories down to the stores and shops of Main Street. The little independent is rapidly approaching a situation where his sales force must be cut; where he may even be compelled to close his doors. The larger retailers, the chains, and strongly financed groups are able to buy more heavily, are able to get more goods, will be able to weather the crisis without serious consequences.

All through the economic system the "little fellow" is at grips with forces too vast and too mighty for him to face or control. He finds the billions of his own Government arrayed against him.

It is a serious and a difficult situation, but it is not one that is impossible of solution.

The administration has recognized the crisis that threatens small business by setting up a special department and naming Floyd Odlum, of O. P. M., to head it. That is only a gesture, however. To merely study the situation is not enough. There must be action, and that action must come from Congress.

Wherever possible defense contracts must be sublet to give the smaller industries a chance to continue operating. Priorities can be enforced wisely, with due consideration of the long-range effects on small business, or they can be enforced blindly and arbitrarily.

It is the responsibility of Congress to set up some reasonable safeguards that insure the preservation of the smaller independent business units in our economic system. Otherwise the close of this defense effort to save our democracy may find us delivered into the hands of a totalitarian and monopolistic economic dictatorship as absolute and as objectionable as the foreign dictatorship against which we are arming.

The crisis is urgent, and the time for such action is now.

Russia and Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1941

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the President gave out a statement in which he very clearly implied that the situation with respect to freedom of religious worship in Russia is just what it is in the United States. Having outraged the sensibilities of the American people by that statement, the President then tried to make a strategic retreat by issuing a second statement in which he announced that he had instructed his emissary in Russia to enter into discussions with Joe Stalin over the matter of introducing freedom of religious worship for Stalin's slaves.

If the President knew, when he gave out his first statement on the subject, that the Soviet Constitution did not reflect the actual state of affairs in Russia, why did he not say so frankly instead of comparing Russia and the United States? If he knew that there was no freedom of religious worship in the Soviet Union, and that the situation was one which he ought to have his representative take up with Stalin, why did he insult the intelligence of the American people by calling their attention to a mere paper fraud—the Soviet constitution?

Even though red Stalin yesterday gave religious freedom to a handful of old Russians, as a bait for American money and arms, there is still no good reason why our Government should be a party to the belief that the Russian bear has gotten religion. If our Government should decide to aid Russia, then I would much rather see aid given on the more forthright basis that Communist Russia is but the lesser of two evils.

The President's recent statement is the kind of administrative juggling which has shaken public confidence to its roots at a time when it is so greatly needed. It is the kind of blindman's buff statesmanship which has forced the American people to be so skeptical of the motives of our Government now when we should be more united than ever before in our history. New Deal political chicanery, even under the guise of foreign affairs is easily discernible. Likewise, the American people do not favor the international crisis being made the guinea pig for New Deal socialization. Still, further, the American people do not care to use aid to Russia as an excuse for a flirtation on the part of our Government and its officials with the revolutionary theories of the Comintern. Nor do we care to make a three-card monte game out of an unlimited national emergency.

Mr. Speaker, in order to more clearly portray the absurdity of even thinking that the Russian Government has or will permit the freedom of religious worship, I include in the RECORD a letter which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] wrote to the President on the subject of freedom of religious worship in Russia:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 1, 1941.*

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It has come to my attention that a statement made by you at your press conference yesterday is being used by the publications of the Communist Party and some others, in a manner which is calculated to obscure the truth at a time when the truth concerning communism is of the utmost importance.

For example, the Daily Worker, mouthpiece of the Communist Party, declares in bold front-page headlines that Roosevelt Praises Freedom of Religion in U. S. S. R.

The fact that Stalin and Hitler are now locked in a deadly struggle, taken in conjunction with the fact that the American people are so wholehearted in their detestation of Hitler and all his works, creates a situation in which Stalin and the American Communist Party are conducting one of the most insidious propaganda campaigns ever turned loose upon the American people. Of course, the strategy of the Communists is to do all within their power to convert the anti-Nazi feelings of the American people into pro-Soviet sentiments. It is against the possible success of this strategy that we must do all within our power to make the truth prevail.

As chairman of the Special Committee on un-American Activities, I have sought for more than 3 years to sift the truth from the propagandistic falsehoods of the Nazis and the Communists alike. I have done my best to apprise the Congress and the American people of the facts which our investigations have made clear. I, for one, propose to continue at whatever cost to follow the course of giving the facts to the American people, and I intend, Mr. President, to seize upon every opportunity to let the American people know that the similarities between Stalin and Hitler are far more striking than any of their differences.

I note, Mr. President, that you called the attention of the press to Article 124 of the Soviet Constitution, the article which allegedly guarantees freedom of religious worship to the citizens of the U. S. S. R. Far be it from me, Mr. President, to assign any motive or purpose to your citation of this article from the Soviet Constitution. My sole concern is to point out that Stalin's record makes a mockery of his constitution.

In the name of tens of thousands of voiceless Christian martyrs who have been murdered by the Soviets, I rise to protest against

any effort in any quarter to dress the Soviet wolf in the sheep's clothing of the four freedoms.

In our investigations, we have learned that the very essence of Communist strategy is double-dealing. Two examples will, perhaps, make clear what I mean: In the period of the People's Front, from 1935 to 1939, the Soviet regime conducted its foreign policy around a world-wide anti-Nazi agitation. It succeeded in hoodwinking thousands of well-meaning American liberals into joining its anti-Nazi transmission belts. Then, in August of 1939, without a word of warning, Stalin double-crossed these liberals by signing a pact with Hitler—the pact, Mr. President, which was nothing more or less than Stalin's go-ahead signal for Hitler's general European war. Again, I call your attention, Mr. President, to the double-dealing of the American Communists. For weeks they picketed the White House in what they called at the time an antiwar demonstration. They carried their banners denouncing you and your policies as leading the American people into an imperialistic war. They organized and supported strikes of sabotage in many of the principal defense industries. I do not need to tell you that they came very near wrecking the defense program. Then, all of a sudden, the American Communists called off the White House picket line. They no longer saw the war as a conflict between equally unworthy imperialistic powers. They stopped their strikes of sabotage. All had changed. Stalin was now in the war.

Believe me, Mr. President, we have not seen the end of Soviet and Communist double-dealing. The ever zig-zagging line of the party will zig-zag again.

I wish to make the point that the Soviet constitution itself was nothing more or less than an ill-concealed device for hoodwinking foreign liberals into Stalin's camp during the People's Front period. Freedom of religious worship is, and always has been, as nonexistent in Soviet Russia as freedom of speech has been nonexistent in Hitler's Reich. The history of the Soviet regime in this connection is not one about which there can be any debate.

The present, unrepealed constitution of the Communist International has the following to say about religion: "One of the most important tasks of the cultural revolution affecting the wide masses is the task of systematically and unswervingly combating religion—the opium of the people."

In a published interview with an American delegation to Moscow, Stalin himself declared: "The party cannot be neutral toward religion, because all religion is something opposite to science."

Earl Browder, Stalin's agent in the United States, wrote the following: "We Communists do not distinguish between good and bad religions, because we think they are all bad for the masses."

A Communist Party pamphlet written by an American Communist, Prof. Bernhard Stern, has the following to say: "It is necessary to link the fight against the church and religion with the fight against capitalism and imperialism. The Soviet Union under a worker's and peasant's government is the only country in the world where religion and the churches are being combated with active cooperation of the government."

I could go on and on with an endless citation of the literary record of the Soviets and their agents on the subject of religion. Surely that is not necessary. I believe the American people know enough about the real facts to recognize the utterly fraudulent character of the Article of the Soviet Constitution which pretends that freedom of religious worship is permitted under Stalin's brutalitarian regime.

Communism and nazi-ism are equally possessed by the demon of hates which sets class against class or race against race. Religion cannot survive the triumph of communism or the ascendancy of nazi-ism. The truths which Americans hold most dear and which are incorporated in our institutions are in as much danger from Communism as they are from nazi-ism.

I call upon you, Mr. President, to clarify the situation with respect to Stalin and the four freedoms by making it unmistakably clear that the Soviet regime is utterly repugnant to the American people and nowhere more so than in its cruel pretense to freedom of religious worship.

I beg to remain,

Respectfully yours,

——— ———,

Chairman.

Tolerance Essential in Present Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. BARNES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES M. BARNES, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on September 25, 1941:

America, in this troubled hour, has been surfeited with hymns of hate, with chants of malice, and with the discordant notes of racial and religious prejudices.

Today, when our country needs men who can reason without passion, men who can act without prejudice, we find that the floodgates have been opened, and our country, a nation dedicated to tolerance, has been inundated with billingsgate.

Too often, as we have sought for facts, we have been given invectives; too often, as we have searched for knowledge, we have received aspersions.

Bitterness, hate, and intolerance is the theme of the song being sung by both advocates and opponents of America's present foreign policy.

"They have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind."

Before the storm descends, let those who still retain the power to reason gather with those in whom the spirit of tolerance yet lives. Let them, as Americans, as Americans dedicated to tolerance, insist that the fate of our Nation shall be determined in an American manner, and only in an American way. Let such people declare to all who have been defending or opposing our Nation's foreign policy in an un-American manner, let them, I say, declare that we have had enough of hate, that we have had too much of intolerance, that we have no time for bigotry, that there has been too much of name calling, that too many appeals to passion and prejudice have been made. Let them declare that from now on, henceforth, we want facts and reason, and facts and reason alone.

Let them declare that the iniquitous hell's broth which has been brewed, brewed by men on both sides of the argument, shall no longer pollute the lifeblood of America, as America in this troubled hour, America in this time of world anguish and crisis, needs facts in place of rancor, reason instead of prejudice, tolerance and not intolerance, charity and not bigotry.

America, torn asunder by the inflammatory statements of impassioned men, needs the calm, dispassionate reasoning of a Washington, the philosophical attitude of a Jefferson, the kindly, charitable viewpoint of a Lincoln.

This country has great questions to decide; its very existence as an independent nation may be at stake. Our every step must be calculated; our every move must be based on reason. We need knowledge and facts to guide us. We need experience and real patriotism as mentors. The sea ahead is uncharted; we know not where the rocks and shoals of disaster may lie. One false move and all may be lost. This is no time for genuine patriots to indulge their spites; this is no time for self-seeking. This is no time to arouse latent prejudices, religious or racial. This is a time when our country needs the best that is in every one of us; this is a time when true Americanism, real patriotism, will give the best

I would question the patriotism of few, if any, of those men on either side of the debate. I grant sincerity to most of them. But I cannot grant that the man who advocates a policy of isolation is, perforce, a Nazi sympathizer; neither can I grant that the man who advocates intervention is, consequently, a tool of Britain. Personally I favor, and as a Member of Congress I have voted for, aid to Britain. I have done so because I believe that the best interests of the America I love are so served. Believing that, I am also willing to believe that many who insist on a policy of isolation do so because they sincerely believe that the best interests of the America they love are so served.

We cannot both be right, but we can both be sincere.

To me the world crisis in which we are engaged is not a test of whether England shall endure; it is not a test of whether Germany shall endure. This struggle has long since ceased to be a war between nations; it is a war between two totally divergent philosophies, two wholly different ways of life. It transcends boundary lines; it reaches down onto the hearthstone of every home.

Totalitarianism is foreign—yes; it is repugnant—to the American ideal of democracy. The totalitarian concept exalts the state and debases the individual. The totalitarian concept glorifies brute strength and spurns the rights of minorities. The totalitarian concept denies individual liberty, individual effort, individual dignity.

Nations, peoples, cultures—these mean nothing to the totalitarians. They would impose their degrading system upon the entire world. They have demonstrated that treaties, pledges, and assurances given by them are worthless.

They have overrun one country after another. Their lust for conquest will not be satiated until the swastika dominates the world.

That they plan eventual penetration of this hemisphere, and domination of this hemisphere, by economic means, is denied by none. They themselves boast of it. And many are convinced that, failing in an effort at economic domination, the Nazis will resort to a military effort.

America cannot do business with Hitler unless we too become a totalitarian government. Under his system it is the state that engages in business. Under our democratic system it is the individual. Do you for one moment believe that an individual can compete with a nation in the foreign markets of the world?

All who are acquainted with Nazi methods know that you can't do business with Hitler; and they know that Hitler, if he succeeds in his present efforts, would not long let us do business with any of our present customers.

That is but the economic aspect of a Hitler victory.

In addition, one must keep ever in mind the other aspects—the denial of individual liberty, the substitution of force for justice, the substitution of the Gestapo for courts of law, the brutal disregard of hard won liberties, and the right of a free people to be free.

Who would permit the American way of life to be cast aside, and in its place, accept the Nazi way of life? Not I! Not you! And I doubt that you can find anywhere in this land, an American who would.

One of our most cherished American liberties is the right of free speech. This right does not exist in a Nazi country. Make certain, then, that we of America do not emulate the Hitlerites and create conditions in our midst that lead to a denial of this right to anyone. But demand of all that, in exercising their right of free speech, they deal in facts, not in hate. For hate has no part in the American way of life.

Let us declare a moratorium on hate; let us demand that the future of our country, its foreign policies, at least, be discussed and debated with logic, with reason, and with knowledge and without prejudice, without passion and without vituperation.

Birthday of General Von Steuben

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ADDRESS OF DR. A. H. DOELLEFELD

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, on September 17 it was my pleasure to speak to the Carl Schurz unit of the Steuben Society of America at the Congress Hotel in the city of St. Louis.

The chairman of the affair was Dr. A. H. Doellefeld. His very able introductory remarks of the event are worthy of extension here so that others may understand and appreciate the patriotism of this very fine group of our citizens:

Steubenites and friends, we have gathered here this evening to celebrate a triple event:

First. The two hundred and eleventh birthday of General von Steuben.

Second. The one hundred and fifty-fourth anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States of America.

Third. The twenty-second anniversary of the founding of the Steuben Society.

This threefold occasion is the setting of our 1941 Steuben Day banquet. The crucial world situation will give to this banquet the greatest significance it has ever had, an opportunity to strengthen our belief in the Constitution, institutions, and traditions of our country, the United States of America.

The annual banquet has become the one great Steuben affair, a traditional celebration, that means more than a banquet, more than meeting friends, more than food for both body and mind. It symbolizes the objectives of the Steuben Society.

We again have as guest speakers Representatives from Congress and the Army. This should be the greatest event we have ever held, an occasion to reaffirm our faith in the Constitution and our cause.

We know we are a loyal people with one common cause, for which we are united in one strong effort to attain our objectives, which are:

First: Fostering a patriotic spirit among all citizens.

Second. Guarding our political liberty by maintaining an honest equality of citizenship, regardless of the birth, origin, or religion of any citizen.

Third. Upholding the Constitution of the United States of America and defending it.

Fourth. Maintaining the traditions of our country.

Fifth. Opposing alien influenced government so we may live in peace and happiness and be worthy of the name American.

We as Steubenites are proud to have as our patron, Baron von Steuben, to follow his footsteps and to keep alive the spirit of Steuben. Every year our organization presents to the military academy at West Point a sword, a replica of General von Steuben's sword, to the graduate with the highest honors.

United States Cavalry on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1941

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, through the courtesy of my colleagues in granting me a leave of absence, and through the cooperation of the War Department, I recently had the privilege of serving a 30-day tour of active duty in my capacity as a Reserve captain with the First Cavalry Division, United States Army, at Fort Bliss, El Paso, Tex.

My reasons for desiring a tour of duty were twofold. Firstly, I believed it to be my duty, as it is the duty of every patriotic American, to prepare myself for service in the defense of my country. And secondly, I wished to familiarize myself with Uncle Sam's new army—its objectives, plans, equipment, training methods, and the morale of its soldiers—so that I might have a better understanding of national-defense problems as they arise in this body.

Upon reaching Fort Bliss, after obtaining the necessary clothing and equipment, I was assigned to duty as assistant to the division veterinarian's office, under Maj. Harvey R. Ellis. We immediately began the task of inspecting the various cavalry units, culling out all animals unfit for service in the big July maneuvers, which were about to begin. I found that these horses were well cared for, and that a very small percentage were unfit to make the march. Like the men, they must be well trained and equipped for service in wartime.

My first actual experience in the field was a command-post exercise—C. P. X.—conducted in the desert near Fort Bliss, in which about 5,000 troops and 800 horses took part. Engaging in these warm-up maneuvers were the Fifty-sixth Cavalry Brigade, the One Hundred and Twentieth Observation Squadron, the Two Hundred and Sixth Coast Artillery Antiaircraft, the Second Battalion of the Two Hundred and Sixtieth Antiaircraft, and many unattached units. Also in action were 25 planes, Signal Corps supply trains, tank cars, armored and medical units, and so forth, all of which were to play their part across the checkerboard of military science and tactics.

Here were 3 days that I will always remember, with the temperature between 110° and 115° under a scorching sun, as the troops moved over the hot desert sands. The men stood the march very well, but several horses had to be evacuated to the rear during the exercise.

During the second day's march we were surprised by gas attack. A few explosions, shrieking sirens, and everybody had their gas masks on in a hurry. It was soon over and the march resumed.

Yellow planes were friendly planes, black planes were the enemy. On the final day of the exercise, while my captain and I were driving toward the front lines, black planes suddenly appeared over the brow of a hill. Lightning speed was demanded as we abandoned our car and raced for the mesquite bushes. I imagine the pilots enjoyed a good laugh seeing us scoot for cover.

All troop movements at night were done without lights; not even a flashlight was permitted. Many of the troops marched for 48 hours without rest. Our group, however, managed to get some sleep each night.

The C. P. X. ended, and while soldiers and animals rested for the approaching war games, officers of the division and attached units gathered with the umpires for a critique, to discuss what was right and what was wrong with the initial exercise.

Shortly before dawn on July 17 the Red and Blue Armies, comprising about 16,000 troops and 10,000 horses, moved into position for the big maneuvers, about 35 miles northwest of Fort Bliss, between the Hueco Mountains and the Organ and Sacramento Mountains. With weapons of war for 10 days of rigid, realistic, two-sided maneuvers, the opposing armies began the engagement which was to extend over an area 70 miles by 60 miles.

More than 200 umpires closely observed the performance of soldiers who were preparing for the even bigger September maneuvers with the Third Army, in Louisiana and east Texas.

Movements of the troops were carefully planned in cooperation with the commanding general and the Chief of Staff. Movements were based on reported enemy positions, and orders were given to subordinate command posts, moving troops into position for attack or to repel attack.

In this phase of the maneuvers, while my companion, Captain Smit, and myself were trying to locate some injured horses about 25 miles from the veterinary collecting station, our truck became stuck in the mud and for 3 hours we dug, pulled, panted, sweat, and broke rope chains. Finally, with the aid of two more trucks and a dozen men, we extricated our car, only to find, about a half mile up the line, our injured horses already loaded

into another truck, stuck deep in the mud.

But these modern soldiers, many of whom were clerks, bookkeepers, and salesmen in civilian life, do not give up easily. With grim determination they went to work, unloaded the horses, and with our help soon had their loaded truck on the way to the collecting station.

That same evening at midnight another of our collecting trucks became mired in the mud and sand. Horses were unloaded, and the boys dug themselves out and reached the collecting station before daylight—all without the aid of lights.

Yes; they are making them tough down at Fort Bliss—tough and resourceful. These lads will soon be able to take care of themselves under any circumstances.

As for myself, I asked for no favors and received none. I ate with the boys, slept with them under the blue dome of heaven for a tent, and the sands for springs under our blankets. They are a fine, sturdy, hard-hitting, go-getting lot, these lads of Uncle Sam's 1941 Army. Let us give them all the equipment and support that we can.

The second phase of the maneuvers was a plan to cut a railroad and blow up a railhead. The Red Army was assigned to defend the railroad. After 2 days of maneuvering, the Blue forces slashed through the Red line and cut the railroad in several places. A few real casualties began to return to the rear, but none were serious.

The third phase of the maneuvers was what is termed in military science an orderly withdrawal, so named because it is said that the American Army never retreats. In this phase hordes of troops, animals, and motorized vehicles moved swiftly across the desert in direct and flanking attacks. Light tanks, trucks, armored scout cars, motorcycles and airplanes all took part.

Umpires dashed around in bantam cars flying white flags, designating the casualties. They moved flags to indicate blown-up bridges, culverts, and water wells. Long supply trains, including horse and mule pack troops, toiled through the desert wastes to keep the fighting troops stocked with ammunition, gasoline, forage, and food.

The veterinary collecting station moved forward 10 miles after dark. Supper was eaten without lights. After checking our string of weary horses, we gathered to discuss plans for the following day—then crawled between blankets, boots and all, only to be awakened early the next morning by a troop of Blue mounted cavalry yelling:

You are our prisoners!

The war was over.

I consider that I was fortunate in being a member of the veterinary collecting company, for we not only evacuated our own animals but also those of the "blue" army, thereby giving us an opportunity to observe both armies in action. Skirmishes between two opposing regiments of cavalry—antiaircraft in action, scout cars and tanks being wiped out, a charge through a mountain pass, supply trains resting along the roadside awaiting orders to move up, machine-gun troops attacking the enemy, heavy weapons thundering—all this took place before our very eyes. Even though the war was makebelieve, the exultation of the impending action gripped us and held us spellbound as we waited for the next skirmish.

I am deeply indebted to Gen. Innis P. Swift, commander at Fort Bliss, who took time out from his busy day for a conference after the maneuvers were over to bring to my attention the importance of the cavalry in the modern army.

General Swift pointed out that Hitler used over 700,000 head of horses in the Polish and French campaigns, and expressed the firm conviction that cavalry has a very vital role in modern warfare, especially in fighting over rough terrain.

"I am convinced," he told me, "after observing these maneuvers, that the cavalry is needed for 'mopping up' operations after bombers as air artillery, and mechanized equipment, have made determined advance attacks on the enemy.

"The cavalry, with the support of the air arm, can do the same job over rough ground that Hitler's infantry and motor trucks did over a good highway system in France last year," he said.

The general was then asked this question:

"When the terrain is so rough that trucks bearing troops cannot negotiate it, how can trucks carry supplies to the cavalry?"

The solution to that problem, he replied, is air transport. "That is where the air arm should coordinate with the cavalry," he said.

General Swift has recommended that the Army immediately assemble 13 commercial planes at Biggs Field for the purpose of conducting an extensive test with the First Cavalry Division in supply by air transport. The war has developed so rapidly, he declared, that planes already have been used successfully to transport supplies to troops at the front.

General Swift's hobbies are military strategy and the soldiers who serve under him. He frequently reminds his officers that one of their most important duties is to take a personal interest in the welfare of their men.

"Officers must see to it that the men in their care are properly fed and clothed," he declared. "They should know their weaknesses and shortcomings, and be able to discuss their problems understandingly. Officers may fool other officers but they cannot fool their men. It takes a real officer to command the genuine loyalty and respect of his troops."

General Swift and the officers and men of the First Cavalry Division deserve high praise for the determined effort each and every one is putting forth to build a great fighting machine, despite many obstacles. Their spirit and cooperation are an example to the rest of the armed forces of what can be done in the face of overwhelming difficulties. The men are being well fed, well clothed, and well housed, and in spite of a critical shortage in weapons, vehicles, and ammunition, well trained.

Yes; they are making them tough at Fort Bliss—these hard-charging, hard-riding soldiers of the First Cavalry Division—these lads who man the tanks and antiaircraft guns—these engineers who build the bridges—these boys who are sacrificing to make America strong.

I foresee that any nation that attacks us will meet a wonderful and terrible foe.

Another outstanding leader I was privileged to meet during my tour of duty was Lt. Gen. Walter Kreuger, commander of the Third Army, with headquarters at Fort Sam Houston.

General Kreuger came to Fort Bliss to observe the performance of troops in the big maneuvers, and to appraise the work of officers and men. I had a memorable conversation with him at breakfast one morning, and came away convinced that the Third Army is under capable leadership.

General Kreuger rose to his present high rank the hard way. Starting out as a buck private, he has advanced through the ranks to a position second only to Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff. Few enlisted men ever attain officer's ranking and General Kreuger's rise has been termed "little short of a miracle."

Now 60, he was decorated for World War service in France. His reputation is brilliant for handling large numbers of troops in swift and strategic operations. General Swift and General Kreuger—here are two leaders of Uncle Sam's Army that any man would be proud to follow into battle. They represent the very highest type of leadership, and bring to the United States Army those qualities of resourcefulness, youthful enthusiasm and genuine ability so necessary to the fighting forces of any country.

In closing I wish to extend a word of appreciation to Col. Raymond A. Kelser, Chief of the War Department's Veterinary Division, whose splendid cooperation made my tour of duty possible; to Col. Daniel B. Leininger, station veterinarian, Maj. Harvey R. Ellis, division veterinarian, and Capt. Walter Smit, with whom I worked; to Maj. Earl Thompson, Lt. Col. Paul C. Kucher, and Lt. Col. Delwin M. Campbell, for their many courtesies; and to my colleague from the Sixteenth District of Texas, Robert Ewing Thomason, through whose kindness and hospitality I made the acquaintance of many delightful El Paso citizens.

I discovered that the people of El Paso has a very warm place in their heart for Representative THOMASON, who has served them loyally and faithfully in Washington for many years. And I, in turn, have a very warm place in my heart for the people of El Paso who so graciously opened their homes to this "Yankee Republican" and made his sojourn in their midst a most pleasant and eventful one.

South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address delivered on the evening of September 30 over radio station WINX under an allotment of time to the State of South Carolina. This program was in charge of Mr. J. Austin Latimer, originally from Williston, S. C., my district, and now residing here in Washington, president of the South Carolina State Society, who also made an address concerning the South Carolina Society and our State.

The address follows:

I want to thank WINX for allotting this broadcast to South Carolina.

I am delighted and I feel very highly honored in being privileged to take part in this broadcast in representing the Palmetto State on this occasion.

South Carolina, which is one of the smallest States in the Union, borders on the Atlantic Ocean, where we have a large and important navy yard, and wonderful port facilities at that old, historic city, Charleston, overlooking the sea, with Fort Sumter, rich in history, nearby.

We of South Carolina are proud of the beautiful, picturesque coastal region, where we have the most wonderful gardens in the world—magnolia, middleton, and cypress gardens.

The forests, adjacent to the magnificent highways, are covered with beautiful hanging moss, presenting a real treat to the thousands of tourists who annually travel in this part of our State.

Then, there is the central area containing fertile agricultural farm lands, with an abundance of natural iodine content.

My home city, Orangeburg, is situated therein, on the Edisto River, where we have the beautiful Edisto gardens.

The capital city, Columbia, is located in the central part of the State, with its statehouse still showing the scars from the cannon balls fired by Sherman and his men in 1865.

Although the city was burned to ashes at that time, it is today one of the most beautiful, progressive, and prosperous cities to be found in the Southland.

South and west of Columbia nearby we have two large power projects, the Santee-Cooper and the Saluda dam, both of which cover thousands of acres of land with water, generating electricity, not only turning the wheels of industry, but today, under the Rural Electrification Administration, this power is going into farm homes, bringing to this forgotten class of people an opportunity to enjoy those things which mean relieving drudgery and substituting happiness and contentment.

There is, also, the Piedmont section in the upper part of the State, spreading south of the Blue Ridge Mountains, with Caesar's Head overlooking many prosperous cities like Greenville and Spartanburg.

This is a section rich in manufacturing.

If you will read the pages of history, you will find that South Carolina has played her part in furnishing men and women to fight for the independence of this country, the country we all love, and the maintenance of same.

In that desperate struggle for liberty and freedom—the kind of liberty that Patrick Henry was willing to fight for, and, if need be, to die for, under the leadership of the Father of our country, George Washington—there were such men as General Sumpter, the gamecock of South Carolina; General Marion, known as the swamp fox; Pickens, and others.

These and other South Carolinians were able to make a name for themselves and history for our State.

I call to your attention men like Edward Rutledge, Thomas Heyward, Jr., Thomas Lynch, Jr., and Arthur Middleton, who took part with Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and others in writing and signing the Declaration of Independence of the United States, January 18, 1777.

Among the signers of that great document the Constitution of the United States, on September 17, 1787, you will find the names of the following South Carolinians: John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Charles Pinckney, and Pierce Butler.

Later on you will find that the name of that distinguished South Carolinian and statesman, John C. Calhoun, was recorded in history with Webster and others of his day as a leader, not only for the South but for the Nation.

He it was who fought for States' rights, and against the passage of tariff legislation, which was finally enacted into law by the Congress, a law which was clearly and definitely in the interest of manufacturers at the expense of farmers and consumers.

Let me quote Senator Calhoun on the Tariff question. I quote:

"We are the serfs of the system, out of whose labor is raised not only the money paid into the Treasury, but the funds out of which are drawn the rich rewards of the manufacturer and his associates in interest. Their encouragement is our discouragement. The duty on imports, which is daily paid out of our labor, gives them the means of selling to us at a higher price; while we cannot, to compensate the loss, dispose of our products at the least advance."

The fight which Calhoun made for States' rights more than a hundred years ago is still a live issue, confronting those of us who believe in special privileges for all or special privileges for none.

Let me refer to that great leader in State and national affairs, at one time Governor of our State and United States Senator, Gen. Wade Hampton.

He it was, with his red-shirt brigade, my father being one of them, who delivered South Carolina from under the carpet-bag rule in 1876.

There are those who are serving in Congress now who will remember that distinguished South Carolinian, who is recorded in the history of our State not only because of his constructive services to the State as Governor, but for his outstanding services to his people and to his country when he served in the United States Senate for many years. I refer to Benjamin Ryan Tillman.

Let us not forget another outstanding citizen, who served many years in Congress as chairman of the Agricultural Committee, having many major pieces of legislation to his credit, the late Honorable Francis Lever.

South Carolina is not only rich in service to the State and Nation by her distinguished citizens, who have been able to take an important part in making history for the State and the Nation, but she is rich in natural resources, much of which is still undeveloped.

God has blessed us with a wonderful climate the year around.

Our State is populated with real Americans, and we can boast of the fact that we have the purest Americanism that can be found in any State in the Union.

Europe is at this time engaged in the most destructive war that history has ever recorded, wherein millions of innocent men, women, and children are being killed and wounded purely because of selfishness, a war which is even threatening that democracy for which our forefathers fought, and the destruction of the American way of life, which is based on justice, freedom, and religion.

There is no State in the Union which is more solidly behind the administration and the President's foreign policy than South Carolina and her citizens.

My people have not waited for the draft act to indicate their willingness to stand up and be counted showing their readiness to defend the liberty of our people and the preservation of our democracy.

Threat to Freedom of Expression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over station WMCA on September 26, 1941:

Freedom of expression is one of our sacred possessions. It has contributed greatly to our strength as a nation. It has given great confidence to our people. They may always speak their minds on any subject. Whatever their daily pursuits, they have an independence that perks them up and gives them ambition. They have great assurance and protection in the thought that they can talk and act freely without fear or trepidation. The Nazi, the Fascist, the Communist cannot express themselves. Brown Shirts, Black Shirts, and Ogpu bludgeon them into silence. Only Der Fuehrer, Il Duce, or Commisar Joe Stalin may speak. What a deadening effect upon one's desire to forge ahead. What a pall upon ambition. This freedom of thought has made possible our progress as a nation.

Must we not, therefore, protect to the utmost this cherished right? Every assault upon it must be resisted. Every threat must be repelled.

The current probe in Washington, set up by a subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee to investigate alleged war propaganda in the movies, and abetted by the America First Committee, is a dark shadow

across the sunlit path of free thought and speech. It threatens freedom of the screen. It is a direct menace.

Thomas Jefferson was so fearful of any inroads upon freedom of expression that he said: "The base of our governments being the opinion of the people the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left for me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

Freedom of opinion and expression involve the press, the drama, the radio, pantomine, the dance, painting, the pulpit, sculpture, etching, music, lyrics, telegraph, telephone, costumes, movies, literature, conversation and soap-box oratory. It runs the gamut of all human relations. Destroy one medium and you threaten the rest. Today it is the movies under attack; tomorrow it may be the radio, and the next day the press.

When the French Ambassador, Gaston Henri-Haye, complained recently to the State Department that cartoons were appearing daily holding up to obloquy and scorn Marshal Petain, because of his Vichy "collaboration," he was in turn ridiculed and subjected to horseplay. Why? Because freedom of thought and expression of the artist were involved. It seemed laughable to protest. This illustrates our deep reverence for liberty of opinion.

Congress can no more direct the pen of the cartoonist, no matter how deeply it may be dipped into the well of gall or humor, than it can direct and determine the scenario of a movie or theme of a story. The famous cartoonists, Rollin Kirby, of the New York Post, and Berryman, of the Washington Evening Star, slash at isolationists and Hitler daily. It were just as logical to investigate their wit as it were to investigate the subject matter of films. In either case, there is intimidation and threat to freedom of thought and expression.

Recently there was a parade in our city of native-born of countries overrun by Hitler. They appeared in quaint native costumes. Their dress made the parade more dramatic and effective. If the movie inquisitors are right, they could also have prohibited this display of costume as propaganda—as an undue incitement to get us into the war on the side of the nations represented in the parade.

There is a moving play, The Wookey, now running at the Plymouth Theater in New York City. It is a powerful and dramatic picture of the embattled English spirit facing Dunkerque and blitzkrieg. It may be termed pro-British propaganda—depending upon one's definition of "propaganda." Now, if the isolationist sponsors of the cinema inquiry can control legally the subject matter of the films and can eliminate this picture as pro-British and that picture as anti-Nazi, then with equal grace they could order this pro-British play off the boards.

If they can object to the film, That Hamilton Woman, because it extols the hero of Trafalgar, Lord Nelson, and makes the audience root for Britain, then why could they not similarly place the bar sinister upon and prevent the revival of a great play like Victoria Regina, which was so beautifully portrayed by Helen Hayes a few years ago. That play painted in most rosy hues the lives of Queen Victoria and her consort, Prince Albert.

I read that Gilbert Miller will soon produce an historical drama about another queen, Anne of England. He had better get clearance from the movie "Spanish Inquisitors" before he invests his money in scenery and casting of characters. He may be charged with engineering poisoned propaganda. Then there is the play, Candle in the Wind, by Maxwell Anderson, which had its premiere in Boston September 16. It goes to Washington soon, when the inquisitors can see for themselves a blistering attack upon the Nazis. It depicts the tortures of a concentration camp.

The films Night Train, Pastor Hall, U Boat 29, Mad Men of Europe are especial targets of the inquisitors. They are deliberately anti-Nazi. So is Lillian Hellman's drama, Watch on the Rhine, now playing on Broadway.

Both films and play tell of foul Nazi activities. Why should not the American public witness these Nazi Huns in true dramatic fashion? Their diabolical cunning and sadistic cruelties must be identified so that we may suitably protect ourselves. Shall producers be punished for thus rendering a patriotic service?

Friendship Bridge is a decidedly praiseworthy program over this station. British children temporarily here to escape blitz bombing in London speak thereby to their parents and guardians in England. This program is full of pathos and brings tears to the eyes. It may be deemed by some poignantly and effectively pro-British. If the movie inquisitors are right, they should stop Friendship Bridge and similar pro-British radio programs.

Isolationist witch hunters can rant and rail all they wish against Alfred A. Knopf for publishing Shirer's Berlin Dairy and Leland Stowe's No Other Road to Freedom and against Little, Brown & Co. for publishing Douglas Miller's You Can't Do Business With Hitler and the novel The Mortal Storm, later adapted for the movies and now on the banned list; rant and rail against the Saturday Evening Post for publishing and running serially Escape, which was subsequently filmed and is also on the banned list; but they cannot punish and censor these authors and publishers for pro-British and anti-Nazi sentiments expressed in these publications. If they are right and could legally ban The Mortal Storm and Escape as films, then they must per se order the burning of the books from which these films sprang. The film, Manhunt, which reveals the subtle brutalities of Nazi spies and which is on the prohibited list, was adapted from a novel called Rogue Male, also published by Little, Brown & Co. We thus have another book which is anathema, and I suppose must be burned.

I am of the opinion the inquisitors have the lion by the tail. They are conjuring up bogeys from nowhere. Isolationists behind the probe are figuratively spitting in the wind. They spit upon themselves. Their pretenses are as hollow as their efforts are unavailing. The country is rallying around Roosevelt. Opposition to his foreign policy is dwindling. The American Legion resolution of support is a healthy reflection of public opinion.

A picture especially condemned by the rainbow chasers is Charlie Chaplin's The Great Dictator. Chaplin, as Hitler, clowns throughout and makes Der Fuehrer look utterly ridiculous. Il Duce also is the subject of considerable buffoonery. This film employs weapons of ridicule and satire effectively sharp. Dive Bomber covers high-altitude flying and glorifies our air service. If that is warmongering, then Hitler is Little Lord Fauntleroy. We should have more of such pictures in the interest of our own defense program.

Sergeant York is a drama true to facts and and tells of a conscientious objector who becomes a World War hero. Our beloved Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, is portrayed therein as a Tennessee Congressman from the district in which Sergeant York resided. It is an intensely patriotic film.

The American Firsters demand that both sides of the international question should be shown. I suppose they want pictures about pot-bellied Reichsmarshal Goering and his Messerschmitts and Stuka bombers dynamiting Coventry and Rotterdam, or Admiral Raeder and his U-boat "rattlesnakes" blasting ships like the *Robin Moor*, the *Zamzam*, and the *Pink Star*. I would show the other side of the shield. I would present Goebbels and Himmler, for example, but I would get Walt Disney to show them up as boa constrictors and jackals, I would picturize Adolph Schicklegruber as a teppischfresser (carpet eater). Shirer, in his Berlin Diary, says he frequently goes on a rampage in his nervous crises, flings himself on the floor, and chews the edge of a carpet.

Confessions of a Nazi Spy is based upon F. B. I. records. Read the testimony of the present trial of 16 Nazi spies in the Federal court at Brooklyn, and how Wilhelmstrasse engineered through them the attempted theft of our secretly guarded bomb sight, gun turrets, antifog devices, and range finders. One rises in wrath against these malefactors.

Films like Confessions of a Nazi Spy teach us to beware of the Nazis. They are signals necessary to arouse some Americans out of a dangerous complacency.

Nurse Edith Cavell portrays this English heroine of the first World War who was ruthlessly shot by the Boche. Edith Cavell ranks with Florence Nightingale, heroine of the Crimean War, and our own beloved Clara Barton, of the Civil War. How can valid objection be made to the picturization of the greatness of Edith Cavell, who is the very embodiment of the Red Cross?

Lord Jeff, the Sun Never Sets, Lives of a Bengal Lancer, Wee Willie Winkie, Susanna of the Mounted, Gunga Din are pictures portraying incidents in British or European history prior to the outbreak of the present war and are unrelated to the present conflict. Calling them pro-British war propaganda is just whistling in the wind.

In the issue of the Nation of July 5 last, appeared the following: "In New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Los Angeles, in dozens of theaters throughout the country, Hitler's propaganda service is daily influencing people and making new friends. Through the medium of skillfully produced feature films and news reels German-American citizens are being reminded of the ties of blut and erde (blood and earth) which link them with the Fatherland, and an einheitsfront (united front) of Nazi sympathizers and dupes is being consolidated."

Is it not anomalous that not one of the abettors of this inquiry has raised a voice (be it ever so feeble) against the Third Reich in importing and circulating in our country celluloid propaganda. These films edited by Goebbels extol the exploits of the Luftwaffe and the panzer divisions. Sieg im Westen (victory in the West) was produced actually under the German high command. It depicts the dreadful cruelties of Hitler's conquest and seeks to convey to Americans and particularly German-Americans the futility of resistance to the invincible German Army. What of Blitzkrieg im Westen, whose theme is the irresistable new order of the Reich? It advises Americans that opposition to Hitler is hopeless and that resistance will bring most melodramatic revenge.

The Universum Film Aktiengesellschaft (U. F. A.) releases about 50 Nazi newsreels and 120 shorts each year. The closing of the Nazi consulates did not affect this volume of distribution. The Reich subsidizes many theaters where this Nazi barbarism is shown.

Is Nazi propaganda on the screen sacrosanct while pro-British is accursed?

I maintain that this movie probe oversteps the bounds prescribed by the Constitution in that it seeks to create a congressional channel through which must stream movie plot and story. Congress cannot legislate on such matters; therefore, it cannot investigate such matters. I have been asked what legally constituted body or procedure then would be constitutional to examine

into these factors. I answer, "There are none."

The Constitution says freedom of expression, whether in movies, television, press, or what have you, is sacrosanct insofar as congressional fiat is concerned. Our constitutional fathers wisely left judgment in such matters to the highest tribunal in the land—namely the court of public opinion.

If certain Senators, in answering questions put to them by a member of the subcommittee, had said that the purpose of the investigation was to probe the practice of block booking or to determine whether or not the movies violated the antitrust laws or were indecent or violative of public morals or incitement to treason—then the inquiry would be on firm ground. There could be no valid objection. But the answers of the gentlemen avoided all references to such taints or illegalities and pointed clearly and solely to an attack upon the movie producers' penchant for giving the public what it wants—pro-British and anti-Nazi pictures and shorts. They even vouchsafed that they had no specific legislation in mind. Apparently the inquirers are on a roving expedition, with neither chart nor compass. The probe is a mere sounding board, to voice the views of isolationists and enemies of Roosevelt's foreign policy.

I hold no brief for the movie companies. They may not be guiltless of many wrongs. I do not know. But they, like every other citizen, are entitled to freedom of expression and neither Congress nor any part of Congress can take away any of that right.

Finally, I say to the isolationists what Franklin said many years ago: "They that can give essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ADDRESS BY MISS STELLA AKIN, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address on national defense delivered by Miss Stella Akin, special assistant to the Attorney General, before the Lehigh County democratic meeting in Allentown, Pa.:

It is, indeed, a pleasure to come to Allentown.

In Washington we hear much of the work of our industrial centers. It is most gratifying, therefore, to be given an opportunity to visit this one, and to obtain first-hand knowledge that it is answering its Nation's call for defense material and other essential needs in this time of grave emergency.

That this is a time of crisis, let no one doubt.

In recent months production has been speeded up in your city. But the calls will come to you for more and more production just as they are going to every other corner of this country—to other industries, to the farmer, to labor, to every man and woman.

To answer these calls will not be an easy job. But the stake for which we are working is well worth-while. Our predecessors struggled to establish this Nation. It is up to us to maintain it—and maintain it we will.

For two long years the world has witnessed the fury of man against man—machine against machine.

Forces of violence and evil unleashed in other lands are unprecedented in the annals of history. Ruthless slaughter, crushing of freedoms, annihilation of minorities, and the blotting out of the principles of democracy we in this land hold dear are but a part of the devastation wrought by the iron fist of the dictator nations.

"All-out" calamity has been loosed by a mad corporal whose mechanical divisions, whose stukas and panzers, paint the world with the red of blood in the same sweeping way that this man once daubed less vivid colors on the houses and barns of his native land.

Thus far we have played but one part in the great struggle. Our material has gone to aid those arrayed in battle against the forces which threaten the existence of nations such as ours.

It has gone to help those people who, by gun and sword, are waging war against nazism, fascism, and the other "isms" which jeopardize the perpetuation of the only decent "ism"—Americanism.

Those people, our friends, have asked for aid. We are doing what we can to give it. But more will be asked, and more must be given. This is the least that we can do.

From American factories, American farms, and American fields, guns, tanks, food, and clothing must go forth in an unending supply. American hands, American hearts, must join together in keeping the vital lifeline of essentials intact.

Each one of us must do his or her part.

Sacrifices we must make. But our sacrifices, we can be certain, will result in a victory over the forces which threaten American principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The tasks of the men are many.

Our sons and brothers, thousands of them, have been called into the armed forces to prepare themselves for the defense of our country. Recruited from every walk of life, from every race and every creed, they are serving unswervingly to preserve the ideals which united these 48 States into one fortress of freedom. Woe unto him who challenges their loyalty, their ability, or their courage.

It has not been easy for many of these young men to alter the course of their lives—to abandon peaceful civilian pursuits for those of the Military Establishment. But they have done it, and we who stay at home can do much to make their paths more smooth.

Napoleon once said that "morale is to material as 3 is to 1." But a general in our Army said recently the ratio has been changed and that now "morale is to material as 10 is to 1."

Without morale no army can succeed, whether its goal be peacetime training or wartime conflict.

Various service clubs are endeavoring to provide entertainment for our soldiers, particularly when they are on leave. By assisting those organizations through personal services and contributions we can benefit our Army and our country. But we can do more than that.

Women especially can assist in the development and maintenance of this essential spirit.

These sons and brothers of ours miss their home life when away from their own firesides. We can alleviate that longing by opening our doors to them—by remembering and following the slogan, "Take a soldier home to dinner."

We have heard much of our good-neighbor policy. We should apply it to these—our defenders.

They, too, need materials from our factories and fields. While maintaining the life line to our friends abroad we must also provide the necessary equipment for the rapidly expanding armed forces.

Only by the utmost effort can we fulfill the demands to be made upon us. Only through unity of purpose can we achieve the necessary result.

Here again the women of America can play a vital role.

Some men may disagree, but from time immemorial the influence of women has had an important, a determining effect upon the actions and behavior of man.

Men may have enacted legislation, but very often its origin can be traced to the opposite sex, and the briefest summary of our history demonstrates that women for centuries have guarded the heritages established by their forefathers.

In a recent address to an organization of women, Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, said:

"It seems to me that there is a definite place in American life for an organization of women dedicated to service. I firmly believe that it has the potential capacity to do more in the furtherance of national unity and the building of national morale than can be accomplished by any other type of organization. In the first place, it begins with those who have through the ages guarded the customs and the behavior patterns of the clan, the tribe, and the Nation.

"Womankind has been the arbiter of what was and what was not accepted in conduct. When all of this sex decide that strikes are injurious to national defense legislative action will be unnecessary. The women of America have decided what America has believed, and they will decide what America will believe."

General Hershey should know of what he speaks. For in connection with the administration of selective service he has been closely associated with the wishes, the reactions, and demands of the mothers, wives, and sisters of our selectees, and they have been many and varied.

Women, with unity of purpose, can achieve any goal.

They can build the public morale, they can go a long way toward stopping strikes or slow-downs of production. They can influence public opinion and thus prescribe the destiny of a people.

Their sacrifices can guide the course of statesmanship.

Certain elements of our people at this time question the necessity of sacrifice, express doubt as to the wisdom of our course.

Other elements, by word and deed, for reasons of their own, seek not only to hinder but to block us in our progress.

It is a fundamental principle of democracy that every person is entitled to his own opinion. But when a nation faces the crisis of its life, the Judas who aids the enemy by deliberately obstructing the chosen path of the majority of his own people must be driven from the ranks.

Abroad, once proud nations bow their heads to the will of the Nazi and his satellites because charlatans were permitted to tap the arteries of preparedness—to drug the peoples with the narcotics of inertia and false security.

Norway, France, Belgium, Holland, Poland, and others listened too long to the voices of appeasers.

Attacked by the panzer divisions, the dive bombers, they fell before the might of Hitler's military machine—and the treachery of their own "fifth columists."

This must not happen here.

It will not happen if all of us do our share.

In doing our part there is one age-old heritage of this Nation which must not be forgotten.

This heritage precludes class distinction from interfering with the basic rights of all our people.

The work of one is as important as the work of the next. Particularly is this true in a time of emergency.

No man or woman should feel that he or she is a member of a particular class and for that reason is prevented from taking part in the common task. No man or woman can say that as a member of a class he or she is not obligated to work for the welfare of the country as a whole.

There must be a feeling among all of us that each one is an integral part of the whole.

We must achieve by voluntary means a singleness of purpose—a uniformity of action.

Only when this mutual bond exists can we hope for national success.

Our house must be put in order. We have straightened it up to a degree, but some of the corners still need dusting.

There are luxuries which we must forego, luxuries that these times will not permit—not tolerate.

The cost of our program will not be small. We must pay the bill for things we hope to achieve. The road to peace and freedom will not be paved with good intentions.

Our Government is seeking now to keep its indebtedness as low as possible by calling in necessary money to meet its obligations as it goes along. It cannot do this entirely, but it can alleviate the future burden in part.

Through taxation, sales of defense bonds and stamps, some of the needed funds are being gathered.

Once again the way is open for each of us to take part in our national program. Once again the women can play an important part. The giving up of some item, some item which we can do without, will permit the purchase of a defense stamp. A bit more sacrifice and we can become owners of defense bonds. The taxes may be higher than usual but we can plan for them and the burden will not be too cumbersome.

Bear in mind that the woman who foregoes a pair of stockings now and then, a facial or an occasional wave, is in much better position to talk friend husband into reducing the cost of cigars—to persuade him that a Sunday at home will permit him to contribute more to the national welfare than a round of golf.

The children will not mind the loss of a soda or a sundae if their elders guide the way.

Concessions must be made for the moment.

These concessions, these sacrifices do not mean that we are forsaking our traditions or our principles. When the Father of This Country, George Washington, waged war for freedom he asked his Congress to give him soldiers and unusual powers. It was the only way he could hope to win against the tyrants of that day.

When this Nation was disrupted by the War between the States, Abraham Lincoln asked for and received greater powers, as did Jefferson Davis, the President of the Confederacy.

In the War with Spain President McKinley obtained authority beyond the ordinary to carry on the conflict.

Woodrow Wilson was given almost unprecedented power to carry on this country's campaign against Germany in the World War.

These Presidents were acting in times of emergency and the Congresses were willing to give them the authority they needed to bring the conflicts to an end. But when the crises were concluded, when the smoke of battle cleared, then the extraordinary powers were taken from the Chief Executives and returned to their proper custodians—the people.

As these things were done in bygone emergencies, it is only natural that they will be done—are being done—in the present time of peril. But what we sacrifice now will be temporary and far better than the permanent surrender of our institutions.

The gravity of the situation is no less now than it was in the days of Washington, Lincoln, McKinley, and Wilson. Our people met the challenge in those days. They can and will do it again.

We do not want war. The American people despise war. At the present it seems that we can avoid armed conflict by giving a sufficiency of material aid to the people who are now fighting against Hitlerism.

This does not mean that the forces of the Nazis or the Fascists—the German, Italian, or Japanese Governments—can proceed to the desecration of the world without remonstrances from this Nation.

Their plottings, their intrigues, their brutalities already have come dangerously close to our shores. It is necessary for us to be on the alert constantly to guard against their encroachments.

Our Navies patrol the adjacent seas. Our planes shuttle back and forth across the mountains, the valleys, and the coast lines in ever-increasing numbers and splendor.

Our men and machines travel the road to preparedness. Our products leave our ports by night and day for those lands where the staunch and stalwart combat the might of the aggressor.

Yet there is room on the ways for more ships. Plane production has not reached the maximum. Many fields lie fallow. Our men need more materials of every kind, as do our friends across the sea.

It is up to you and the rest of us to supply the needs of this Nation and of those who wage war on the side of democracy.

The smoke must roll from our factory chimneys. The skies must be darkened with ships of the air. From the farms and fields must rise the dust of the thresher.

When all of these gather in the heavens there will be no black-out of democracy. For this truly will be the cloud with the silver lining.

And when the smoke and dust have been cleared away in time to come peace and serenity will again shine down upon this land of ours, and happily upon all the world. America will continue on the course fixed for it nearly two centuries ago—a free nation, a free people—with liberty and justice for all.

On the Life and Works of Hon. E. W. Marland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK NICHOLS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of Oklahoma lost a great and good friend in the death of Hon. E. W. Marland, former Member of Congress and former Governor. He was a servant of the people in a true sense of the word, and had performed thousands of kindnesses and personal favors for people all over the State that the general public did not know about.

When he had riches he shared them freely with those who were in need, and when he had official power and authority he used this in the manner that he thought was best calculated to be of good to the greatest number of people.

I believe that the passing of the years will add to the respect and esteem in which Mr. Marland is held by the people of Oklahoma. It is examples such as his that show us the true worth and dignity of the human soul.

The Saving of England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appears in the October 4 issue of The Saturday Evening Post, and as an introduction to the editorial may I quote from George Washington:

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens, the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake.

[From the Saturday Evening Post of October 4, 1941]

THE SAVING OF ENGLAND

When Winston Churchill took over, in May 1940, the bell appeared to be tolling for the British Empire. Five days after the Germans had marched into Paris he said to the Commons:

"The battle of France is over. The battle of Britain is about to begin. On this battle depends the survival of Christian civilization. Hitler knows he will have to break us in this island or lose the war. If we stand up to him all Europe may be freed and the life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands; but if we fail the whole world, including the United States * * * will sink into the abyss of a new dark age, made more sinister and perhaps more prolonged by the lights of a perverted science."

To the House of Commons again, on June 25, he laid the case bare. The moment of great despair had been when the dying appeal of France to America fell short. On that he made no comment, saying only what had happened:

"M. Reynaud, the courageous Prime Minister of France, asked me to meet him at Tours. * * * We agreed that a further appeal should be made by M. Reynaud to the United States, and that if the reply was not sufficient to enable Reynaud to go on with the fight then we should meet again. * * * On the 16th I received a message from M. Reynaud * * * to say that the American response had not been satisfactory, and requesting a formal release for France from her obligations under the Anglo-French treaty. * * * The House will naturally not expect me to say anything about the future. The situation at the present time is so uncertain and so obscure that it would be contrary to the public interests for me to attempt to pronounce upon it."

Now only America could save Britain. That was his battle—to win America. The key to his strategy—and it never changed—was set in his broadcast speed of July 14:

"We are fighting by ourselves, alone; but we are not fighting for ourselves, alone."

The idea of offering to the United States certain British bases in the Western Hemisphere was probably his own. Whether it was his own or not, it was, as he said, spontaneously British, and it made a great light. On August 20, he said to the House of Commons:

"There is, however, one direction in which we see a little more clearly ahead. * * * Some months ago we came to the conclusion that the interests of the United States and of the British Empire both required that the United States should have facilities for the naval and air defense of the Western Hemisphere * * * and that we should be glad to place such defense facilities at their disposal by leasing suitable sites in our trans-Atlantic possessions for their greater security. * * * Undoubtedly, this process means that these two great organizations of the English-speaking democracies, the British Empire and the United States, will have to be somewhat mixed up together in some of their affairs for mutual and general advantage. * * * No one can stop it. Like the Mississippi, it just keeps rolling along. Let it roll."

First, he said, there was no thought of quid pro quo, or at least no asking for it; yet down the Mississippi came quid in the form of 50 American destroyers, and this he announced to the House of Commons on September 5, thus:

"The memorable transactions between Britain and the United States which I foreshadowed when I last addressed the House have now been completed. * * * No doubt Herr Hitler will not like this transference of destroyers. I have no doubt he will pay the United States out if ever he gets the chance. That is why I am very glad the armed air and naval frontiers of the United States have been advanced along a wide arc into the Atlantic Ocean, and that this will enable them to take danger by the throat."

After that, for the duration of the Presidential campaign, and until the President has made his arsenal-of-democracy speech, Mr. Churchill was particular to refer to it always as the New World that was going to save England, as in a broadcast September 11:

"This wicked man * * * this monstrous product of former wrongs and shames * * * has lighted a fire which will burn with a steady and consuming flame until the last vestiges of Nazi tyranny have been destroyed, and until the Old World and the New can join hands to rebuild the temples."

And again to the House of Commons on November 21:

"I look to the time when the arsenals, training ground, and science of the New World and the Empire will give us that material superiority which, added to the loyalty of constant hearts, will surely bring us victory and deliverance to mankind."

But on January 9, this year, he said to the Pilgrims in London:

"If cooperation between the United States and the British Empire in the task of extirpating the spirit and regime of totalitarian intolerance * * * were to fail, the British Empire, rugged and embattled, might indeed hew its way through and preserve its life and strength for the inevitable renewal of the conflict. * * * But the chances of setting the march of mankind clearly and surely along the highroads of human progress would be lost and might never return. * * * I therefore hail it as a most fortunate occurrence that at this awe-striking climax in world affairs there should stand at the head of the American Republic a famous statesman, long versed and experienced in the work of Government, in whose heart there burn the fires of resistance to aggression and oppression, and whose sympathies and nature make him the sincere and undoubted champion of justice and freedom and of the victims of wrongdoing wherever they may dwell. And not less do I rejoice that this preeminent figure should newly have received the unprecedented honor of being called for the third time to lead the American democracies."

Introducing Harry Hopkins as the personal envoy of the President, Glasgow, on January 17, he said:

"Mr. Hopkins has come in order to put himself in the closest relation with things here. He will soon return and report to his famous chief. We don't require in 1941 large armies from overseas. What we do require is weapons, ships, and airplanes. All that we can pay for we will pay for, but we require far more than we will be able to pay for. And I watch with deep emotion the stirring processes whereby the democracy of the great American Republic is establishing its laws and formulating its decisions in order to make sure that the British Commonwealth is able to maintain, as it is maintaining at present, the front line of civilization and progress."

Then, while the lend-lease bill was pending in Congress, he said, February 9, in a broadcast speech:

"The other day President Roosevelt gave his opponent in the late Presidential election a letter of introduction to me, and in it he wrote out a verse in his own handwriting, from Longfellow, which, he said, 'applies to you people as it does to us.' Here is the verse:

"'Sail on, O ship of state!
Sail on, O Union strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all its hopes of future years
Is hanging breathless on thy fate.'

"What is the answer that I shall give in your name to this great man, the thrice-chosen head of a nation of 130,000,000? Here is the answer that I shall give to President Roosevelt: Give us your faith and blessing, and under Providence all will be well. We shall not fail or falter. * * * Give us the tools and we will finish the job."

On the coup d'état in Yugoslavia he said:

"We shall give all the aid we can. * * * I am sure that the President of the United States will be actuated by the same generous feelings. * * * According to the laws and Constitution of the United States—and, after all, as a great democratic leader he must move with the whole march of the Nation—I am certain that his sympathies and aid will also be extended in full measure to the Serbian people."

On the same day he spoke of peace aims:

"I am very glad to see that the illustrious leader of the American people, President Roosevelt, is of the same opinion, though in our correspondence the topic has never been mentioned. In speaking of the mission of his new Ambassador to this country, Mr. Winant—worthy representative of a great Nation at a crucial moment—President Roosevelt, when he was asked what instructions were given to the Ambassador about peace aims, replied that he did not see much use in speaking about peace aims until Hitler had been defeated."

After the lend-lease law was passed, the question was: Would the Americans let their aid be sunk in the ocean by Hitler? On that he said to the House of Commons, April 9:

"While I am hopeful we shall gain mastery over the air attacks upon our shipping, the U-boats and the surface raiders range ever farther to the westward, ever nearer to the shores of the United States, and constitute a menace which must be overcome if the life of Britain is not to be endangered and if the purposes to which the Government and people of the United States have devoted themselves are not to be frustrated."

And more to that point in a broadcast, April twenty-seventh:

"During the last year we have gained by our bearing and conduct a potent hold upon the sentiment of the people of the United States. * * * In that great Republic, now in much travail and stress of soul, it is customary to use all the many valid, solid arguments about American interests. * * * But in the long run, believe me, for I know, the action of the United States will be dictated not by methodical calculations of profit and loss but by moral sentiment and by that gleaming flash of resolve which lifts the hearts of men. * * * I could not believe that they would allow the high purposes to which they have set themselves to be frustrated and the products of their skill and labor sunk to the bottom of the sea. * * * When I said 10 weeks ago, "Give us the tools and we will finish the job," I meant, "Give them to us; put them within our reach." And that is what it now seems the Americans are going to do. * * * When you come to think of it, the United States are very closely bound up with us now, and have engaged themselves deeply in giving us moral, material, and within the limits I have mentioned, naval support."

After Greece, but before Crete, he said to the House of Commons:

"We must look to an immense construction of ships in the United States. * * * It may be that 1943, if we have to endure it as a year of war, may present easier problems. The United States patrol, announced by President Roosevelt, on which the American Navy and air force are already engaged, takes a considerable part of the Atlantic, in a certain degree, off our hands, but we need a good deal more help. I expect we shall get a good deal more * * * but here I speak with great caution because it is not for a British Prime Minister to forecast, still less to appear to prescribe, the policy of the United States. * * * So far in our relations with the great Republic * * * I do not think we have made any serious mistakes. When a mighty democracy of 130,000,000 gets on the move, one can only await full development of those vast psychological manifestations."

He was sure he knew his Americans. In a message to Rochester University on receiving a degree, June 16, he said:

"Here at least, in my mother's birth city of Rochester, I hold the latchkey to American hearts. * * * A wonderful story is unfolding. How it will end we are not allowed to know. But on both sides of the Atlantic we all feel—I repeat, all—that we are a part of it, and that our future and that of many generations is at stake. * * * United we stand. Divided we fall. Divided, the dark ages return. United, we can save and guide the world."

Hitler's sudden attack upon Russia created a political situation of extreme complexity. There was danger in it. How would the Americans like Stalin as a partner in the crusade for human freedom? On Sunday afternoon, June 22, before the American Government could speak, Mr. Churchill came on the air, saying:

"The third turning point was when the President and Congress of the United States passed the lease-lend enactment, devoting nearly two billions sterling of the wealth of the New World to help us defend our liberties and their own. The fourth is now upon us. * * * In another 6 months the help we are receiving from the United States in war materials of all kinds, especially in heavy bombers, will begin to tell. * * * It is not for me to speak of the action of the United States, but this I will say: If Hitler imagines that his attack on Soviet Russia will cause the slightest division of our aims or slackening of effort in the great democracies, who are resolved upon his doom, he is woefully mistaken. * * * His invasion of Russia is no more than a prelude to an attempted

invasion of the British Isles. He hopes, no doubt, that all this may be accomplished before the winter comes, and that he can overwhelm Great Britain before the fleets and air power of the United States will intervene."

His verge-of-war speech to the House of Commons, July 29, was a warning to the British to guard their speech and be mindful of what he was doing. He said:

"But apart from the circle where all the facts are known, outside in the United States, there is a vigorous campaign against the policy pursued by the President. I fear that harm has been done. * * * Sir J. Wardlaw-Milne said our people were only working up to 75 percent of their possible efficiency. * * * In America such a statement is meat and drink to isolationists. * * * The United States is giving us aid in a gigantic scale and is advancing in rising wrath and conviction to the very verge of war."

Then came his momentous meeting at sea with the President of the United States. In his report upon that, a speech that was broadcast on August 24—and much of it news to the American people—he claimed the battle, saying:

"* * * it was somewhere in the Atlantic. And there for 3 days I spent my time in company, and I think I may say in comradeship, with Mr. Roosevelt, while all the time the chiefs of staff and naval and military commanders, both of the British Empire and the United States, sat together in continual council. * * * We had the idea when we met there, the President and I, that without attempting to draw final and formal peace aims, it was necessary to give all people, and especially the oppressed and conquered peoples, a simple rough-and-ready wartime statement of the goal toward which the British Commonwealth and the United States mean to make their way. * * * The United States and Great Britain do not now assume that there will never be any more war again. On the contrary, we intend to take ample precautions to prevent the renewal in any period we can foresee, by effectively disarming the guilty nations. * * * You will perhaps have noticed that the President of the United States and the British representative, in what is aptly called the Atlantic charter, have jointly pledged their countries to the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny. That is a solemn and grave undertaking. * * * And of course many practical arrangements to fulfill that purpose have been and are being organized and set in motion. * * * The question has been asked, "How near is the United States to war?" There is certainly one man who knows the answer to that question. If Hitler has not yet declared war upon the United States * * * it is certainly not because he could not find a pretext. He has murdered half a dozen countries for far less. * * * If he can succeed in beating the life and strength out of us * * * then is the moment when he will settle his account, and it is already a long one, with the people of the United States."

Finally—for the present—the Canadian prime minister, speaking to the lord mayor's luncheon on September 4, asked that the United States give Britain such a guaranty as she gave to Canada 3 years ago—that we would not stand by if Canadian soil were threatened. And Mr. Churchill, indorsing Mackenzie King's words, declared that Germany could be beaten only by the full cooperation of all nations which "as yet lie outside the range of the conqueror's power. * * * I find further encouragement in the words of President Roosevelt last Monday when he said: 'I know I speak for the conscience and determination of the American people when I say that we shall do everything in our power to crush Hitler and his Nazi forces.'"

And there, in Mr. Churchill's grand words, is the story of the saving of England, the story of the evolution of American foreign policy as if you were reading it in a mirror, the story of how the United States became involved the second time in a war that was Europe's business—and a record of the most amazing singlehanded feat in the whole brilliant history of British diplomacy.

Freedom of the Seas and the Cost of War to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ARTICLE BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson:

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

With true Japanese diffidence this miserable column respectfully thinks that the Honorable Frank Knox ought to have his honorable head examined. He says that this country should join with Great Britain for perhaps 100 years to dominate the ocean to insure freedom of the seas—and that this is an ancient American doctrine.

The ancient American doctrine bravely insisted upon by us, as a small neutral Nation, was that no naval power should interfere with our commerce on the high seas with other neutrals, or, except in case of an actual and effective blockade with our commerce, not in contraband of war, with a belligerent. In case of an actual effective blockade, we conceded, and we made even Britain concede in our War Between the States, that ships sunk in attempts to crash it created no cause for war.

What we objected to—and made our objection stick—was attempts to forbid commerce on the seven seas by paper declarations to prevent our ships from carrying on their normal commerce. In other words, we objected to any dominion of all the oceans such as the Honorable Knox now advocates for us and Great Britain. His is a complete reversal of our principles and our doctrine.

If we, with Britain, are now to undertake to police the world, what is it going to cost and who is going to pay for it? You don't need to ask twice. It is going to cost, within a few years, more than all the wealth accumulated on these shores since Christopher Columbus, and we and our children are going to be charged with it.

Of course, neither we nor they can pay for it.

What Honorable Knox proposes is American bankruptcy—but think what a magnificent gesture it is. One would think he were again running—this time for Vice President of Great Britain. Of course, there isn't any such office and, if there were, the canny British wouldn't elect such a squanderer of national substance.

The war adventure on which we are already embarked has no limit in cost. I know that the recent chamber of commerce figures are right when they say that our tax burden is or soon will be greater than that of the British—and we have just begun to tax, spend, and incur debt.

The bearings of these taxes, priorities, and debts, and of the inflation that will go with them, on our people has scarcely been guessed, and there is no real attempt to guess them. But there are enough facts already in sight to be sure that they will be beyond endurance. This unplanned reckless destruction of our national heritage is as sure as sunrise to react on its authors with poisonous popular resentment.

This generation will have on its shoulders a reproach from its children that is almost unanswerable. We received in this country a heritage from generations of sweat and blood and tears of our forefathers, the richest on earth. It was safe, secure, almost free from debt, and with the highest standard of living ever known on earth.

We are passing it on after a few short years of experimentation and adventure, shattered in solvency, burdened with debt, and unauthorized assumption of responsibility from the welfare of the whole cockeyed world, terribly entangled, ruthlessly ruined.

It wasn't all because of Hitler. Much of it was done earlier. We have squandered, or are on the verge of squandering, our children's birthright for generations in scarcely 15 years. There must be a limit somewhere, and it is high time to find out where it is.

Prof. Max A. Scoli

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

LETTERS ANSWERING ATTACK ON CONSTITUENT

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters refuting an unjust attack on a friend and constituent of mine:

JULY 21, 1941.

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DICKSTEIN: It is not my desire to enter into any sort of controversy with you on general political or ideological issues, I wish merely to offer a personal opinion, based on a considerable period of observation that your statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, 1941, regarding Prof. Max Ascoli, are on their face unlikely to be true, and that I very much doubt whether they can be supported by any acceptable evidence. If you do indeed have any evidence that he is a covert Fascist or Communist, it would be so contrary to his long record of written and spoken opinion that it ought to be made public in detail at once. Similarly, if he or his associates have made any libelous statements or accusation against you or your friends, legal proceedings should at once be initiated in the courts in accordance with American law and American custom.

I might add that many of Professor Ascoli's friends and associates have made definite sacrifices for the cause of liberty and democracy such as you and I have not yet been called upon to make, and I think it distinctly ill-fitting that a Member of Congress who must be particularly on the alert to fight any spread of intolerance and bigotry should indulge in vague innuendos and unsupported

charges tending to arouse suspicion and hate against American citizens of foreign birth. This is especially unfortunate when, as in the present case, the person attacked enjoys, and, I believe, deserves the confidence of substantial and well-informed elements in our country.

Yours very truly,

HAMILTON FISH ARMSTRONG.

BURLINGHAM, VEEDER, CLARK & HUPPER,
New York, July 11, 1941.

Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
House Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have read your speech reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17 in defense of Mr. Generoso Pope and criticizing Prof. Max Ascoli and the Mazzini Society, of which he is president. I do not know Mr. Pope. I read Italian with some difficulty, but I have seen several articles in his two papers, and I believe it is true that these papers suppressed certain parts of President Roosevelt's radio address, which I consider unethical and unworthy of an honest newsaper.

Prof. Max Ascoli I know well and have known for 10 years and more. He is a man of the highest character and standards and ideals; and with all respect to you as a Representative of this city in the Congress, I resent your charging him or the Mazzini Society with stirring up false allegations against Mr. Pope. I have read their organ, Il Mondo, and I see nothing slanderous or improper in it. I know several of the founders of the Mazzini Society and know them to be men of fine character, and you may be assured that there is nothing Fascist about them or their society or their paper.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. ULRIC BELL,
Chairman, Executive Board of
Fight for Freedom Committee, Inc.,
New York City, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. BELL: I have your letter of July 2.

I should have thought it unnecessary to deny any allegations that Max Ascoli had sympathy for Fascist or Communist activities. Ascoli left Italy during the early days of the Mussolini regime because of disagreement with the principles of fascism. Since he has been in the United States he has been a member of the graduate faculty of the New School for Social Research. To be a member of this faculty under the leadership of Alvin Johnson is a guaranty in itself of liberal views and of antagonism to anything like fascism or communism. I think I am correct in saying that the only restriction imposed upon a member of the graduate faculty is that he shall not be a member of any organization which pretends to dictate to its members what they should think about political or other questions. If it is necessary, I can add my own testimony, based on a long friendship with Ascoli, that he is a true and, I believe, great liberal and a thorough supporter of American democracy and the American way of living.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS K. FINLETTER.

JULY 8, 1941.

Representative SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DICKSTEIN: I am simply horrified at reading an excerpt of a speech of yours which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17. In it you attack the Mazzini Society in which you say that it is Fascist, and you particularly pick out Professor Max Ascoli and say that he is of a questionable background as to political maneuvering abroad and you accuse him of political communistic propaganda. This is an outrageous statement.

I have known Professor Ascoli for years. He is one of the most virulent anti-Communists I know. He is absolutely anti-Fascist and has written any number of articles in leading magazines, as well as a book on fascism which makes his position absolutely plain. He is a distinguished political scientist and there is nothing whatever about his political background which is questionable. He was a college professor in Italy for several years after Mussolini came into power and tried to lead a quiet university life, and yet, for his activities among students, was finally put into prison, was dismissed, and came into this country through the efforts of the Rockefeller Foundation if I recall correctly.

I am sure that you do not wish to blacken the reputation of a man about whom you obviously know very little, and it is also perfectly clear that you know nothing about the Mazzini Society—that you have not been reading its publication. I gather, too, that you have not read Mazzini, for, if you had, I am sure you would realize that no Fascist society would take Mazzini as a leader.

I do not know any members of the Mazzini Society who have held high official positions under fascism, but I do know that Professor Ascoli never held any. I beg you for your own good name to make good this totally unjustified charge. Professor Ascoli is an American citizen—a naturalized one, Mr. DICKSTEIN—as your ancestors also were.

Somebody has been taking you for a ride.

Sincerely yours,

DOROTHY THOMPSON.

THE NEW SCHOOL FOR
SOCIAL RESEARCH,
New York, July 7, 1941.

Mr. ULRIC BELL,
Fight for Freedom, Inc.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. BELL: I have your letter of July 2 with the excerpts from Congressman DICKSTEIN's speech reflecting on Dr. Max Ascoli, dean of our graduate faculty.

Congressman DICKSTEIN is strangely misinformed as to the character and political position of Dean Ascoli. Prior to the advent of the Fascist regime in Italy, Professor Ascoli held respected academic positions in Italy. Being essentially a traditional Democrat he naturally found the Fascist regime intolerable, and came to this country as a Rockefeller fellow. It may be noted that if his record had not been flawless he could not have got a fellowship, nor could he have gotten visas enabling him to come to America. Since coming as a visiting student he has again been subjected to the tests of meeting the requirements of a permanent visa and of citizenship.

Ascoli has been a member of our graduate faculty for 8 years. He has not been involved in any group or movement that is inacceptable to any loyal American. His political position is one of ardent support of American democratic institutions.

It is possible that Ascoli's judgment of Generoso Pope is wrong. There can be no question that Congressman DICKSTEIN's judgment of Ascoli is utterly wrong.

Yours truly,

ALVIN JOHNSON, *Director.*

JULY 10, 1941.

I have just read the speech of Representative DICKSTEIN in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, defending Mr. Generoso Pope of the charge of Fascism, but attacking the Mazzini Society, and particularly its president, Dr. Max Ascoli. I do not wish to enter this controversy except to protest against this ill-mannered and unfounded attack upon Dr. Ascoli, whom I have known for many years. Nothing could be more untrue than to accuse him of being a Fascist as well as a Communist, as Mr. DICKSTEIN does at least by innuendo. Dr. Ascoli is a sincere scholar and teacher who is making a distiguished contribution to American democracy and intellectual life. It is highly regrettable that the floor of Congress should be used for such personal attacks. Representative DICKSTEIN, in my opinion, owes Dr. Ascoli an apology.

RAYMOND LESLIE BUELL.

American Mothers Organization Opposes Entry of United States Into European War

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

LETTER FROM AMERICAN MOTHERS ORGANIZATION

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AMERICAN MOTHERS ORGANIZATION, U. S. A. HEADQUARTERS,
Point Pleasant, N. Y., September 29, 1941.

UNITED STATES CONGRESS
(In care of Hon. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN, *Thirty-eighth District, New York State*).

GENTLEMEN: The American Mothers Organization of the United States of America with headquarters in Point Pleasant, N. Y., through its president, Mrs. Mabel McCormick, of 458 Peart Avenue, Point Pleasant, N. Y., request that you cause to have read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately the following remarks:

We, the American Mothers Organization of the United States of America oppose entry of the United States of America into any foreign war.

We oppose the sending of any of our armed forces to police or fight on foreign soil.

We are opposed to the order given our Navy by the President "to shoot on sight."

We are opposed to "aid to Russia."

We are opposed to the levying of taxes against American citizens to furnish arms and supplies to a foreign nation where we have no voice in their government and which is, as in revolutionary times, "taxation without representation."

All actions of our President to the present time seem proof enough that our President is bent upon the absolute destruction of our form of government and our way of life, and upon the utter enslavement of our people by piling up a huge national debt, which is bound to lower the standards of living in these United States of America and eventually cause a turn to totalitarianism as the only way out.

Therefore, we American mothers demand that the Congress of the United States of America take drastic action to preserve our American form of government, even if such action must be "the impeachment of the President."

We are all 100-percent Americans and we want a leadership which will show real action and dare to come cut and say, "We will not be an arsenal for any country but our own. We have not entered and will not enter the wholesale murder business."

For such leadership, together with more drastic action, we naturally look to the members of Congress for the intelligent leadership which we hopefully seek. We beg of you not to cause us mothers to loose faith in you.

Respectfully yours,

AMERICAN MOTHERS ORGANIZATION,
MABEL MCCORMACK, *President.*
MRS. CHAS. WHALEN, *Vice President.*

The Harry R. Bridges Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do, and I believe that many thousands of the people of the United States, hail the decision in the Bridges case with satisfaction and confidence. All of these people know of the subversive activities of Harry Bridges and I believe it is, therefore, useless to recount them, but I do think that there is one point that should be strongly stressed, and that is, that justice has finally prevailed.

In this day of laxity in law observance and law enforcement, many had come to the conclusion that a general breakdown of all law and order was unavoidable and evident. This decision, however, should destroy that destructive philosophy and add to the constructive philosophy of those who believe in law and order.

There was great talk of the political pressure that was brought about to save Bridges; much talk about the question of withholding evidence in order to save him. This came while the case was under the jurisdiction of Madam Perkins. The people knew of the activities of this man, particularly those who live in California, and viewed the proceedings under Perkins' Department with suspicion and lack of confidence, particularly with the C. I. O. tie-up that was said to prevail there. They were about to lose confidence in the enforcement of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States and in the enforcement of law and order. It is my belief that they will begin to have their confidence restored in the old maxim, "Justice will prevail." This justice will prevail where someone is interested enough to see that it does. My belief in this is one of the reasons why I was so actively interested in seeing that Harry Bridges was brought to justice.

Now that the decision is brought in by such an able judge as Charles B. Sears, confidence will again be restored in the institutions and laws of the United States. I believe, and many others believe, that Harry Bridges was the most flagrant violator of law and order, and that his activities did more to destroy our defense program than did any one man in the United States. Now he will be held accountable, as he should be.

This case, however, does not end here. Judge Sears was appointed to find certain facts, namely, whether Harry Bridges belonged to any organization, association, society, or group that believed in, advised, advocated, or taught the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States, and whether he aided by circulating, distributing, publishing, and so forth, the teachings of this subversive philosophy to overthrow by force and violence the Government of the United States.

Judge Sears decided fact No. 1, that Harry Bridges did belong to an organization of this character. The second fact that Judge Sears found was that the Communist Party in the United States was a party that, from the time of its inception to the present time, believed in, advised, advocated, and taught the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

Judge Sears' assignment was to find these facts for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice.

This is not final. Director Wixon, of the Department of Immigration and Naturalization in California, will now receive this finding of facts and then will make his recommendation to the Department of Justice here, Immigration and Naturalization Service, under the jurisdiction of Attorney General Biddle. This case will finally be heard for the Attorney General by the Board of Appeals. That will be the final decision so far as Harry Bridges and this Department are concerned.

No doubt a court fight will be on, with habeas corpus proceedings, and so forth, in which an attempt will be made to undo and override the Department of Justice decision to deport him if such a decision is made and order issued by Attorney General Biddle.

No one would deny Bridges or anyone else his constitutional rights, although Bridges would deny them to millions of others, but it is hoped by many that these proceedings will not be dragged out over a series of years in order that this alien, with such ideas as he has, may remain in this country and remain active while court proceedings and hearings are held. This case is important enough so that without denial of any rights it should be brought to a speedy wind-up. There is no question in the minds of many lawyers but that the Department of Justice has the power already, under laws prevailing, to deport Bridges forthwith. However, in any event, Harry Bridges should not be left to run at large and carry on the activities that he has been carrying on. If not immediately deported, Harry Bridges should be confined and his activities stopped until the final outcome of this case is had. This ought to follow in a case of this kind. Harry Bridges has been the man at whom the finger could be pointed more than any other man in this country, as a destroyer of the defense program of this country, and during times like this should not be left to run at large and continue his destructive program.

I congratulate Judge Sears, the F. B. I., the Department of Justice, and particularly Major Schofield in this department for the successful presentation of their case, and I hope they will be equally successful in their efforts to bring about the deportation of this man, who has had no business to have remained here as long as he has.

Use of Ether as an Anesthetic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ROME (GA.) NEWS-TRIBUNE

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rome (Ga.) News-Tribune:

[From the Rome (Ga.) News-Tribune]

THE MISTAKE LIVES ON

It is disheartening to win a point before the entire Nation and then have some fellow who has been slumbering through the controversy to pop up and put on public record the original error that was supposed to have been corrected.

The Honorable SAMUEL A. WEISS, of Pennsylvania, is the latest gentleman to arise from fog of the past and advance as authentic information a fact which had been publicly set to rights for, it was hoped, all time.

In an extension of his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Representative WEISS submitted historical highlights for September and listed the following:

"September 30: Dr. William Morton makes first successful use of ether as anesthetic in 1846."

Had Representative WEISS taken the time and trouble to look in the Capitol's Hall of Fame, he would have seen a marble likeness of Dr. Crawford W. Long, of Georgia, who, says Evans' History of Georgia, "is now recognized as the discoverer of the anesthetic power of sulfuric ether."

On March 30, 1842 (4 years before Morton's use of ether), Dr. Long performed an operation at his office in Jefferson, Ga., to remove two tumors from the neck of James M. Venable. Says Evans' History of Georgia: "Knowing that ether had deadened the pain of injuries received in the frolics, the young man agreed that Dr. Long might remove one tumor if he be allowed to inhale ether. The tumor was removed and the patient felt no pain. This was the first surgical operation ever performed with the patient under the influence of the pain-deadening vapor. On June 6, 1842, the other tumor was removed in the same painless manner. On July 3, 1842, Dr. Long amputated the toe of a Negro boy, and September 9, 1842, removed a tumor from the head of a woman, without pain to the patients."

Dr. Long, a modest man, sought no credit for his discovery, and 4 years later read in a medical journal where another man, Dr. Morton, had hit upon the same idea and was being credited with its discovery. The matter stood at that point until years later when

Georgians pushed Dr. Long's claim to the discovery and obtained national recognition for the Georgian who, in his life, was content merely with the knowledge that he had helped humanity along the way.

It is hoped the Members of the Georgia delegation in Congress will not let the error in Representative WEISS' "historical highlights" pass unchallenged.

One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the City of Knoxville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. E. E. PATTON

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Senator E. E. Patton, of Knoxville, Tenn., on the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Knoxville, Tenn., in accepting a flag of the United States, Tennessee, and the city of Knoxville, presented by the Morris Plan Bank of Knoxville to the Blount Mansion, delivered at the Blount Mansion on August 28, 1941. Senator Patton is a distinguished citizen of Knoxville and an eminent historian.

The address follows:

Madame President, invited guests, ladies and gentlemen, I want to express my appreciation of your courtesy in giving me an opportunity to accept, at the hands of one of Knoxville's progressive financial institutions, these emblems of our Nation, our State, and our city. It is a most gracious gift and should be appreciated by every loyal Tennesseean, every worthy citizen of Knoxville and every patriotic American.

First, I want to congratulate the citizens of this country on their right and privilege of meeting on an occasion of this kind. In far too many of the countries of the world, it would be necessary to get a permit from the dictator to hold a meeting of this character and then, perhaps, an armed guard would be at the door. We hate no race; we merely despise and loathe the actions of their dictators and despots.

Standing in New York Harbor is the Statue of Liberty, on whose base are carved these words:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

For more than a century we gave welcome to the huddled masses, the wretched refugee, the homeless; to the tired, the poor, the tempest-tossed; some of them came in the God-given spirit of high and holy adventure; they obeyed our laws; they respected our institutions; they swore allegiance to our flag; and they kept the faith. Those we welcomed.

Unfortunately, some of the huddled masses came to defy our laws and to overturn our Government. We welcome no such characters and we warn them to return to their own teeming shores at their first opportunity, and we shall undertake to make it convenient for them to depart without any word of benediction.

Henry Ward Beecher said that when we gaze upon a nation's flag we see not the cloth merely, but back and beyond the bunting or the silk we see the aims, purposes, struggles, the worthy ambitions, and the aspirations of the people themselves; that is what a flag typifies and represents. We do not need to apologize for ours. It stands for liberty and freedom.

Gazing today on the beautiful flag of our country, we see the meeting of the First Continental Congress on that fateful day in 1774; we hear the debates over the adoption of the immortal Declaration of Independence, the first document in the world to asser that the right of government is inherent in the people—that document penned by that valiant young Virginian, Thomas Jefferson. We are present at Cambridge, when Washington took command of the ragged armies of the new Republic.

We hear the hoofbeats of Paul Revere's horse as he galloped toward Concord and Lexington with the stirring news that the red coats were on their way. We are with Washington at Valley Forge, when his spirits were at their lowest ebb, when he sought help from the God of battles and of nations. In our vivid imagination, we march with Campbell, Cleveland, Shelby, and the knightly Sevier as they wend their silent way through the mountain fastnesses, under the friendly stars, toward King's Mountain and deathless glory.

We are present when the brave Britons—for they were brave men—laid down their arms at Yorktown, thus forever guaranteeing the liberty, the freedom, the independence of our own America. But back of this we can see Washington and his committee, as they visit the modest little shop of Betsy Ross, the Quakeress, whose name and fame will forever be enshrined in our national heart as the fashioner of Old Glory, to me, the greatest and the most beautiful flag kissed by Heaven's breezes. God grant that it shall never be lowered, God help us to keep it pure, undefiled, and unsullied by any "ism," that only Americanism shall be its watchword and its guardian.

One hundred and fifty years ago, William Blount, the first governor of a national territory, appointed by a President of the United States, left his palatial and comfortable home in the old north State, and rode horseback across the Alleghenies to establish his capital on this sacred spot. What hallowed memories are around and about us. Just across the street met that group of distinguished men who framed our first Constitution, pronounced by Jefferson as the most democratic constitution in the world.

Here we see the evolution of our State government, with a population, in 1796, of 65,000; in 1941 of 2,910,000, with resources and scenery the envy of our neighbors and the pride and delight of ourselves and our visitors. We see this State furnish three Presidents—Jackson, the first from west of the mountains; Polk, whose administration, measured by its results, the most brilliant in our history, and Andrew Johnson, that tribune of the people, the man, and the only man, in America who did not change his views regarding the right of a State to withdraw, peacefully or belligerently, from the Federal Union of our Fathers, and who, in calm contemplation of death, requested that his head be pillowed on the Constitution and that his body be wrapped in the sacred folds of the American flag.

We see John Catron, of Tennessee, as the first member of the United States Supreme Court from west of the mountains; we see John H. Eaton, who married Peggy O'Neal, the "Gorgeous Hussy," as the youngest man ever to hold a seat in the United States Senate, Time magazine, to the contrary notwithstanding; and Wm. Charles Cole Claiborne as the youngest man, by many months, to have a seat in the House of Representatives. We see this State furnish the greatest hero in the War between the States—Sam Davis, a brave young Confederate; we see the Old Volunteer State furnish the greatest hero of the first World War—Alvin Cullom York.

When we see the flag of Tennessee or the Nation, we think of David G. Farragut, the first admiral of the American Navy, born within 12 miles of this city. We see Mathew Fontaine Maury, the Pathfinder of the Seas, and the creator of our present Weather Bureau. Farragut followed the Stars and Stripes; Maury gave allegiance to the Stars and Bars. We see Albert Gleaves, son of a Federal, and Wm. B. Caperton, son of a Confederate, both sons of Tennessee, on the retired list of full admirals at the same time—a record never equaled by any other State in the Union.

But why go on? The list is too long to repeat; it would require hours merely to recite their names, to say nothing of their glorious deeds and daring exploits on the field of battle and their triumphs in legislative halls.

One hundred and fifty years ago we see Gen. James White, a North Carolina hero of the Revolution, cross the mountains and build his cabin and his fort on the site of the present city of Knoxville. With the exception of a few scattered settlements, all of this vast domain was an uncharted and unsettled wilderness. It took men of iron, with hearts of steel, to leave the civilization of Maryland, the Carolinas, and Virginia and meet the fierce and savage red men of the forest and match wits with those wily sons of battle. And, lest we forget, let's pay our meed of praise and tribute to the women who came with their husbands and fathers. They endured all the hardships and braved all the dangers of the frontier in order to establish a Christian civilization in the wilderness.

Today we stand on sacred and holy ground, sacred because of the blood our ancestors shed in order that we may be free from dictators and despots. From the noble deeds of our forefathers we should take renewed courage. The battlefields of the Revolution and of Tennessee have been hallowed by the blood of heroes, as Mr. Lincoln said, "far above our poor power to add or detract." "He who saves his country saves all; and all things saved do bless him; but he who lets his country die, dies himself, and all things dying do curse him." God forbid that we should be listed with those who let their country die.

As our ancestors stood upon the ramparts of liberty and gave battle to their country's foes, so let us stand today in the light of the history of their sacrifices, resolved to die, if necessary, that our country shall continue in her paths of peace, progress, and prosperity; of ordered government, with liberty and justice for all.

In the spirit of Washington and Betsy Ross; by the blessings of William Blount, Gen. James White, Col. Charles McClung, Gov. John Sevier, and all of their compatriots, let us here highly resolve that this Nation "shall have a new birth of freedom, founded under the benign spirit of the true God; that it may be a nation 'of the people, by the people, for the people' until time shall be no more."

And now, in the name and on behalf of this splendid association of brave, loyal, devoted, and patriotic women, I accept these

flags at the hands of their beneficient donors; and may God bless and save America.

We Knew What We Were Doing, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as a part of the attempt of this administration to change its own neutrality law because it has been too successful in keeping us out of war, the President has said that Congress retained the arms embargo in 1939 because Congress believed there would be no war, and that for this reason the President could not keep the war from starting. The record will show:

First. That Congress knew that war was imminent when it retained the Arms Embargo; and

Second. That it was the promise of repeal of the Arms Embargo, not the fact of its retention, that may have precipitated war.

In Colliers on October 4, 1941, the President says:

> The refusal on the part of the Congress to repeal the arms embargo was based in part upon the belief by practically all the Republican membership of the Congress and about 25 percent of the Democratic membership that there would be no war in 1939.

This statement is untrue. The fact is that when the House of Representatives passed the so-called Bloom neutrality bill containing the Vorys amendment providing for an arms embargo on June 30, 1939, the House believed that war was imminent—that war might start in 2 days, and in spite of this, the House retained the arms embargo. The headlines of the Washington press and the speeches of Members of Congress bear this out. The fact that the threatened crisis passed does not prove that retention of the arms embargo prevented war at the time, but it also does not prove that it precipitated war months later.

Here are headlines from the Washington papers of those days.

June 28, 1939:

Washington Star: "Daladier foresees gravest crisis in 20 years for France."

Washington News: "Tense Europe fears Danzig grab near." Under this headline appears these words: "Report piled on report that Hitler is ready to grab the free city of Danzig, possibly this week end."

Times-Herald: "Poles shoot down German warplane in Danzig region." "Britain, France put armies on war footing."

Washington Post: " 'Three million men at France's throat,' says Daladier." "Premier unexpectedly adjourns Parliament in order to free his hands for crisis."

June 29, 1939:

Washington Star: "Tripower warning to Reich on Danzig urged in France." "British, anticipating crisis, seek further reserves increase."

Washington News: "Polish citizens swear to fight for Corridor." "Danzig arms—invasion means war." "Experts say crops won't delay Hitler." "Churchill warns Hitler Britain can't retreat."

Times-Herald: "Warsaw to parade armed might today." "'Der Tag' set by Hitler for next Saturday, says report." Editorial heading: "Second World War has begun."

Washington Post: "Nazi showdown over Danzig reported near."

June 30, 1939 (the day the Vorys embargo amendment was adopted):

Washington Star: "Daladier summons Cabinet to weigh heightening crisis." "Halifax warning held gravest since war."

Washington News: "Hitler to visit Danzig." "Parade in Berlin follows Halifax warning to Nazis."

Times-Herald: "Ready for war at once, Hitler told by Britain." "Halifax threatens to use 'whole force' in event of new aggression by Fuehrer." "Nazis rush guns, troops to Danzig."

Washington Post: "Hitler told British would meet force with force." Editorial heading: "Eyes on Danzig."

This tension was reflected in the House debates on June 30. Speaker Bankhead took the floor and said:

> But look abroad in other parts of the world and what do you see? You see the tramp, tramp, tramp of marching arms. Every account that you see, particularly from Europe, deals with the preparation for some impending conflict at arms.
>
> Answer this question—where tonight or tomorrow, in what countries of the world war will be started, if at all?

Representative FISH said:

> You can almost hear the beatings of the wings of the angel of death as she hovers over England, France, Germany, Italy, and Poland tonight. * * * They are on the verge of war.

Our present Speaker, then floor leader, RAYBURN referred to our actions "in crises."

Representative JOHNSON of Texas, of the Foreign Affairs Committee, said:

> Failure to repeal the arms embargo * * * may mean the outbreak of another war.

On page 1 of the Times-Herald on June 30, 1939, was this headline "United States peace bid hinted—London hears persistent rumors Roosevelt would lead world parley."

I had argued to the House on June 30, 1939, that the President wanted repeal of the arms embargo to throw us into the balance of power in Europe, and that the danger from this was twofold:

First. No one could tell whether this would stop war.

Second. If war started, we would be forced to go in.

On June 30, 1939, I said:

> If you want to give the President the chance to take that desperate gamble of throwing our weight into the balance of power in Europe, then vote for this pending amendment (to strike out the arms embargo).

This record of what the newspapers said and what Congressmen on both sides of the debate said shows that Congress knew war was imminent and was determined to keep out of it. The war did not start that fateful week end, even though we had been told that retaining the embargo might mean war abroad. The war started 2 months later, when the President had in all probability convinced Britain and France that he could obtain repeal of the arms embargo, and they launched into a war for which they were unprepared. We in the House of Representatives knew what we were doing in the summer of 1939, Mr. President. Did you?

Let's Have Some Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN JARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE FRANKLIN (PA.) NEWS-HERALD

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial appearing in the News-Herald, Franklin, Pa.:

[From the Franklin (Pa.) News-Herald of September 30, 1941]

LET'S HAVE SOME ECONOMY

The record-breaking tax bill that Americans will have to pay this year emphasizes once again the immediate need for economy in Government expenditures. Substantial cuts can be made in nondefense items, providing pork-barrel politics can be forgotten long enough to permit them to be made.

Many Americans fail to realize that nondefense spending has doubled within the past 10 years. Every year since 1931 Washington has spent more money than it has collected. Today's rate of tax collection is double that of the peak of the World War period. Untold billions of defense spending are being piled on a tremendous level of civil spending. These nonmilitary expenditures have only been reduced by a comparatively few millions since the emergency began—and this in spite of the fact that millions of people recently unemployed are now working. The Government debt has reached gigantic proportions and is steadily going up.

This debt has a tremendous effect upon the standard of living of every one of us. Today the average person pays about 25 percent of his income in direct and indirect taxes. Every wasted dollar—every unnecessary expenditure—means that he has to pay more money to the Government. It means that he has that much less to spend for the necessities and luxuries that every American family needs and wants.

Today, when the rest of us are pulling in our belts to help pay for the defense program that we must have, it's time to insist that Washington pull in its belt, too.

In the past it has had considerable experience in plowing under pork. Why not plow under the pork barrel now?

Inflation is mounting along the same lines it pursued in 1917 and 1918. Not mere newspaper paragraphs, but actual charts drawn by experienced statisticians provide this proof. Meanwhile, the little old bank roll is only a shadow of its former self.

4-H Club Work—H. R. 4530

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter which I received from Mr. E. S. Grover, store manager, Sears, Roebuck & Co., Gloversville, N. Y., written me concerning the merits of H. R. 4530, providing funds for the purpose of extending and enlarging 4-H Club work.

I want to call your attention to the last two paragraphs of this letter, because they bear out the real facts as to the merits of the 4-H Club work program.

We are spending millions annually for the purpose of educating farmers. We have been doing it for many years. However, up until the present agricultural program was put into operation we did not get much results.

Under the present program, where we are giving subsidies to farmers to do that which they should have been doing all along, we are getting real results; for instance, in soil building, increasing production, and the growing of better types of farm products.

Look at the increased cotton poundage per acre and the improvement in the length of staple.

This line of work prepares boys and girls to enter into their farming operations on a successful basis gained out of their actual experience in properly doing things; that is, what it means to operate a farm on a good, sound basis, and in proper grading and proper marketing their farm products.

I fully realize that there will be those who oppose this legislation on the grounds that we must not spend any money at this time unless it is used in building our national defense program.

May I state that unless we are able to build a prosperous and successful agriculture there is not a possible chance to build a well-balanced and successful national-defense program.

We propose to hold hearings on this bill at a later date, and I am hoping that each and every Member of Congress will become acquainted with the type of work which these boys and girls are doing today, which tends to keep them on the farm, and which will put them in a position to take their proper place in defending our democracy and our American way of life.

The letter follows:

GLOVERSVILLE, N. Y., *September 25, 1941.*

Hon. H. P. FULMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FULMER: I understand there pends House bill 4530, providing funds for 4-H Club work.

The political preliminaries to the passage of this bill are unknown to me. If the time spent in promoting its passage interferes with the supreme defense effort necessary, disregard this letter.

But if its passage is fairly likely, please consider the following paragraph from one who has been close to all kinds of youth work in four different States.

The 4-H, unlike any other youth program, builds into older boys and girls a practical foundation for practical farm life and service. Through the use of projects and achievements it hastens the day when these young men and women will become the farm leaders of America.

I have never seen any money wasted or time lost or detours made by the 4-H leaders. They furnish their members with the material and advice, and progress has to be made, or else.

Yours truly,

E. S. GROVER,
Store Manager, Sears, Roebuck & Co.

Will an A. E. F. Be Necessary To Crush Hitler?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

ARTICLE BY EDWARD T. FOLLIARD

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this country has been approaching involvement in the World War a step at a time. In the beginning those favoring these steps indignantly protested that there never would be another A. E. F. fighting in Europe. By the step-at-a-time method the country has now reached that stage where the probability of an A. E. F. is receiving consideration.

Yesterday's Washington Post contained an article by the factual writer, Mr. Edward T. Folliard, which is most interesting and worth while. Pursuant to the permission granted to me, I include this article, which is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of September 5, 1941]

WILL AN A. E. F. BE NECESSARY TO CRUSH HITLER?

(By Edward T. Folliard)

Will another A. E. F. be needed to crush Nazi Germany? Or will it be possible for America to wage a "cheap war"?—cheap, that is, from the standpoint of casualties.

Nobody can answer these questions with any degree of certainty today. There are too many imponderables as the war goes into its third winter, with the Germans and Russians locked in the greatest battle of all history. One thing can be said, however, and that is that the best military opinion—meaning particularly the opinion of British Generals Wavell and Auchinleck—holds that another A. E. F. will be necessary.

What American military leaders think must remain unknown to the public, at least for the time being. They are not talking for publication. Instead they are training an American Army, and training it to combat just such a military power as Adolf Hitler is now throwing against Russia. It is not likely that they expect Hitler to bring that Wehrmacht of his over to the United States mainland.

The question of whether an A. E. F. will be needed is pertinent at this time because of the attitude of the American people, as reflected by the Gallup poll.

A majority of Americans, judging from this poll, are determined to see Germany defeated, and they apparently agree with President Roosevelt that "the only peace possible with Hitler is the peace that comes from complete surrender." With that thought in mind, they have been moving more and more over to the interventionist side.

They favor convoys, they approve the President's "shoot on sight" order to the Navy, and they want the Neutrality Act revised. But they do not want to "enter the war," if entering the war means sending another A. E. F. abroad.

RECIPE FOR VICTORY

President Roosevelt, it is said, hopes that in some way Hitler can be defeated without the employment of another A. E. F.

Six months ago, according to talk heard around Washington, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill were counting on these things to pave the way for a German defeat: The naval blockade, vastly increased bombardment of Germany from the air, uprisings among the conquered peoples of Europe, and a crack-up of German morale.

The one important thing lacking in this recipe for victory was a weakening of the great German army—what the military men call "attrition." Then, on June 22, came Hitler's attack on Soviet Russia, and the process of attrition began. It is still going on.

Some observers say that the question of whether another A. E. F. will be needed is now being answered in Russia. They apparently believe that the German army will be terribly weakened in Russia, and that therefore no Yanks will be needed overseas again. But the British military leaders do not agree with them.

What is the most that is expected of Russia? Is it not that Russia will do to Hitler what it did to Napoleon—make him realize that Russia, with her vastness, simply cannot be conquered?

Well, suppose that this did happen. There would still have to be a Waterloo for Hitler, just as there was for Napoleon, three years after his Russian adventure. Would the British be able to swing this by themselves? They didn't do it alone in 1815, and they don't expect to do it alone this time. Generals Wavell and Auchinleck are quite frank about this.

ALLIES DOMINANT IN THE AIR

As the war goes into its third winter, Britain and her allies are dominant in one element, the seas, and appear to be slowly achieving dominance in another element, the air. Germany, it is conceded, still is far superior on land.

With the Luftwaffe losing thousands of planes and pilots in Russia, it is doubtful if Germany ever again will be able to match Britain and her allies in the air, particularly if one of those allies should be the United States.

It is indeed possible to picture a situation, along about 1943, where Britain and her allies will have such strength in the air that the German pilots will find the tables turned completely on them, and thus be made to

realize how things were for the Poles, the R. A. F., the French, and the others they so clearly outnumbered in the early days of the war.

The theory that Britain could bomb Germany into surrender from the air was advanced here several months ago by Malcolm MacDonald, young British High Commissioner to Canada.

MacDonald, son of the late Prime Minister Ramsey MacDonald, had just made a tour of Canada and had observed the great hatchery for the war birds there. Under the Empire training program in Canada, something like 50,000 airmen are being trained annually.

BEAVERBROOK DISAGREES

From these schools, MacDonald said at a press conference at the British Embassy, would come the men who would bomb Germany into surrender, smashing at her war factories and shattering German morale. The German morale, he said, was much more brittle than the English.

A few weeks later Lord Beaverbrook came to town. He had just come from the meeting of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill off Newfoundland, and he too held forth before newspapermen at the British Embassy.

He was told about MacDonald's statement about bombing Germany into surrender. Did he agree with this thesis? Beaverbrock, who once was the head of British aircraft production, glowered and snapped.

"They couldn't bomb us into surrender, could they?"

Beaverbrook was reported to have told some Senators, in answer to their questions concerning an A. E. F., that Great Britain most certainly did expect another A. E. F.

Whatever Americans may think or hope on this score, therefore, the British are convinced that there is no such thing as a cheap war. Many spokesmen on this side of the Atlantic agree with them. Somebody—perhaps it was Gen. Hugh Johnson—once said that you can't fight a war just a little bit, any more than you can put out a fire just a little bit.

WAVELL-AUCHINLECK VIEWS

The interviews with Gen. Sir Archibald Wavell, now British commander in chief in India, and Gen. Sir Claude Auchinleck, British commander in the Middle East, were obtained by Harold Denny, of the New York Times. Denny interviewed both men in Cairo, Egypt; Wavell on July 4, and Achinleck on July 7. This it will be noted was after Germany launched her attack on Russia.

General Wavell told Denny that, notwithstanding the furious fighting that was then taking place in Russia, the West remained the principal battlefield.

"Can you win the war without America's full-scale participation?" Denny asked.

Wavell shook his head slowly and then replied:

"We shall have to have airplanes, tanks, munitions, transport, and finally men."

"When?"

"The sooner the better. But that depends on when you are ready, doesn't it? I suppose when you get into all-out production you will be able to equip any number of men for anywhere in the world."

"ON THEIR OWN SOIL"

To General Auchinleck, Denny put pretty much the same question, saying:

"Do you think American manpower will be needed before this war is won?"

"I do, certainly," said Auchinleck. "If this war is to be won properly—and it is not to be won unless it is won properly, with no armistice—it has got to be won in Europe. And in Germany.

"The Germans must be beaten on their own soil, exactly the way Napoleon was beaten. And if this is the way it is to turn out, we certainly are going to need American manpower, just as we did in the last war."

Lord Halifax, the British Ambassador, who has just come back from a visit to England, was asked here yesterday if the British were counting on an A. E. F.

"I never heard that question discussed in England," he said. "That I can truthfully tell you, for the reason that we feel that is a matter for the American people themselves to decide."

Lord Halifax said that he had always felt that the only way to defeat Germany was to inflict a military victory on her on land as well as in the air.

The insistence of Wavell and Auchinleck on beating Germany "properly" on her own soil recalls what Gen. John J. Pershing, commander of the last A. E. F. said about the World War. In his two-volume account of that war, he said it was a serious mistake for the Allies to have allowed the Germans an armistice whereby they were allowed to march home with banners flying, and without having to fight a battle on German soil. He would have had the Allies occupy Berlin just to remind the Germans who had won the war.

Extension of the Sugar Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE LABOR RECORD

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the extension of the Sugar Act and the principle which will be expected in such legislation will probably be considered by this Congress in the near future. This legislation and the principle embodied therein will be of tremendous importance to everybody in the United States—the sugar producer, both farmers and refiners, the working people, and the consuming public.

The viewpoint of the working people of our section is well expressed in an editorial that appears in the Labor Record in the August 1941 issue. The Labor Record, incidentally, is the local organ of the American Federation of Labor.

The editorial in question reads as follows:

LIFT THE SUGAR RESTRICTION

The growing of sugarcane and the production of raw and refined sugar has long been hampered in Louisiana and other States.

With European and Asiatic countries at war today, there will be, without question of doubt, an acute sugar shortage which will result in exorbitant prices and severe rationing.

The Washington powers have long deprived us the right to plant more cane and beets on an increased acreage basis because of the false belief that our "good neighbor" relations will be endangered. We have always been a stanch advocator of the good-neighbor policy, but we are stanchly opposed to a sugar-curtailment law or price fixing at these times, when our every resource should be used to help supply the sugar demands of the United States and our allies.

Sugar has always been one of the vital needs of the American public and the principal agricultural pursuit of several States. In normal times this community has been one of the largest sellers in the line of food products. At this time, when war is spread far and wide, sugar is supplying the energy needed by men on the battlefield and in defense plants. After the war is over the task of feeding the exhausted nations will remain with us, and, as usual, sugar in great quantities will be needed to supply the demand.

It is high time that Washington realizes our potential resources and gives us the green light, to plant and refine to capacity so that a serious sugar shortage will be averted.

Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial published by the New York Herald Tribune on September 17, 1941.

In these days, when forces all over seek to create intolerance in the United States, an editorial like the one I am now presenting to the House is as refreshing as the morning dew.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of September 17, 1941]

A LOATHESOME WEAPON

Anti-Semitism was the most contemptible, as it was also the most dangerous, of all the weapons in the armory with which Hitler subverted Germany and set out to enslave the world. And from time immemorial the meanest, the most contemptible, as well as the safest and easiest, excuse of those who have spread this poison—whether Nazis, or their sympathizers or their counterparts in other times and places—has been the pretense that the poisoner was really only a great-hearted friend of the Jews, trying to save them from the prejudices which their "unwisdom" or their "excesses" would otherwise arouse. One encountered it, ad nauseam, in the early days of the Hitler movement in Germany; one has met it over and over again elsewhere. Its viciousness is apparent; it is an obvious and despicable device for spreading the bigotry it pretends to combat. Yet this is the precise defense which Senator NYE has raised against the plain inference that the isolationists' precious "investigation" into the motion-picture industry is primarily an attempt to light the fires of Nazi anti-Semitism in aid of a cause already desperate.

Senator NYE, America First, and the other isolationist leaders alone know their own inner motives. Others, endeavoring to assess them, can only look at the evidence. They

can only infer that the increasing persistence with which the anti-Semitic poison has appeared in isolationist pronouncements is not an accident. It was hardly an accidental choice of names when Senator WHEELER, in an isolationist speech as long ago as last February, was denouncing "political control by a financial oligarchy, whether it be the Thyssens and Krupps in Germany, the Rothschilds in England and France, the Sassoons in India and China, or the Morgans, the Warburgs, the Kuhn-Loebs, and other international bankers in the United States." One cannot forget Senator NYE's speech on August 1 in St. Louis:

"Who is pushing and hauling America to plunge us into this war? Who are the men? Who is putting up the money for all this propaganda? * * * I haven't the time to name all those contributing to our march to war, but I will tonight name some of them."

Out of thousands he might have selected, he actually gave 17 names of men prominent in the motion-picture industry, all Jewish sounding (that at least 2 are actually non-Jews was not explained) and carefully omitting the names of non-Jewish executives of equal importance in some of the very companies to which he referred. The fact that the present investigation has been hastily broadened to bring in the names of a few non-Jewish motion-picture people does not remove the impression made by this speech.

One remembers America First's statement, appearing in the Daily News here on September 6, citing those who were attacking it. Among the thousands or hundreds of thousands of non-Jews who might have been used as examples, America First selected, in addition to British-born Dr. Frank Kingdon, three Jews, and a speaker before the Jewish War Veterans. After this, Mr. Lindbergh's virtually unconcealed appeal to antisemitism 5 days later could not be regarded as an isolated episode; and the motion-picture investigation, beginning with Senator NYE's pronouncement that "four names, each that of one of the Jewish faith, each foreign born" are "primarily responsible for propaganda in the motion-picture field" could take on, despite all the Senator's protestations, but one interpretation.

Many isolationists are not anti-Semitic, we are glad to concede. But the evidence that their leaders are deliberately taking up this despicable, disruptive, and profoundly inhuman and un-American weapon to bolster a lost cause is too strong to be disregarded; and there is no non-Jewish American deserving the name who will not turn from that business with loathing.

Life in the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter recently received by me:

OCTOBER 2, 1941.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Thanks to your help and cooperation, I am in the Navy now.

I hope I'm not taking up your valuable time reading this letter. But I am very happy to be able to serve my country, and ever so happy to be here.

The food is wonderful here and it makes a fellow feel like a man.

I can't thank you enough for helping me get into the Navy Mr. DINGELL.

I am the first platoon leader in my company.

Well, Mr. DINGELL, I'll close now as I thought I would write you a few lines to tell you how I like the Navy.

It's swell.

Respectfully yours,

LEONARD C. LANG,
Company 156, United States Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.

H. R. 10: Cherokee Jurisdiction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK NICHOLS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, referring to H. R. 10, Seventy-seventh Congress—House Report No. 289—Union Calendar No. 86:

The Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, by unanimous vote, passed the following resolution on the 6th day of May 1941:

"CERTIFICATE

"We hearby certify that the following preamble and resolution were adopted by the unanimous vote of the Oklahoma delegation in the House of Representatives on May 6, 1941:

"'Whereas the Government of the United States pledged the Five Civilized Tribes and the people of Oklahoma a settlement of the Indian claims against the United States if the Indians would agree to white settlement of Indian Territory and to the creation of the State of Oklahoma; and

"'Whereas Congress, in pursuance thereof, passed jurisdictional acts to that end, among others the Act of April 25, 1932, to permit the Eastern and Western Cherokees to present the claims now referred to in H. R. 10, Seventy-seventh Congress, and

"'Whereas the Oklahoma delegation petitioned the President of the United States to bring these claims to a settlement, and

"'Whereas the Secretary of the Interior drew a bill for this purpose which was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives, to wit, H. R. 10, which, after several hearings, was reported with amendments to the House, unanimously and favorably, and

"'Whereas it is manifest from the hearings before the Committee on Indian Affairs and from the reports of the Secretary of the Interior, these Indian groups are now entitled to a final judicial determination of their present claims on the merits, and

"'Whereas, the settlement of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes is of great importance to the State of Oklahoma and to the peace and security of its citizens, and

"'Whereas both the Democrats and Republican Members of this Congress were elected on national platforms respectively pledging a speedy settlement of all Indian claims: Therefore, be it

"'*Resolved*, That the Chairman of the Oklahoma Delegation, Hon. Wilburn Cartwright, is hereby requested on behalf of the State of Oklahoma to call to the attention of the chairmen of other State delegations, the request of the State of Oklahoma that H. R. 10, Seventy-seventh Congress, be passed, giving these Indians an opportunity to present their claims to the Court of Claims with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, and fulfilling the pledges made by our Government.'

"WILBURN CARTWRIGHT,
"Chairman of the Oklahoma Delegation.
"VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
"Secretary of the Oklahoma Delegation."

Mr. Speaker, the Eastern Cherokee case described in H. R. 10, has never been heard by any court on its merits, notwithstanding any suggestions to the contrary. The above statement I base upon the Jurisdictional Act contained in section 68 of the Cherokee Allotment Act, approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 716). This act authorized the Cherokee Tribe of Indians or any band thereof to sue the United States for any legal or equitable claim in accordance with the revised statutes 2103–06, which statutes required the attorney's contract to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The Eastern Cherokee never had any contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The manner in which the Court of Claims in 40 Court of Claims 252, and the United States Supreme Court in 202 United States 101, considered the equitable rights of the Eastern Cherokees was attained by the Court of Claims itself directing the attorney who represented individual Eastern Cherokees to intervene in the suit brought by the Cherokee Nation, or in the name of the Cherokee Nation, under the act approved July 1, 1902, aforesaid.

Three Eastern Cherokees from Oklahoma had employed attorneys to represent them and others having a like interest and this committee, consisting of David Muskrat, Daniel Gritts, and Frank J. Boudinot, had employed John Vaile, of Fort Smith, Ark., in a contract not approved by the Secretary of the Interior. John Vaile employed Robert L. Owen. Individual Cherokees east of the Mississippi River employed R. V. Belt and Belva Lockwood, respectively. Owen & Belt filed an intervening petition tentatively without any approved contract, the suit being numbered 23214. Belva Lockwood filed a like petition, numbered 23212. Having no approved contract, Owen & Belt and Belva Lockwood were directed by the court to intervene in No. 23199, which had been brought in pursuance of law, 2103–6 Revised Statutes. Their only issue was against the Cherokee Nation as to their ownership of item 2 of the accounting and the appeal to the Supreme Court in the name of the Eastern Cherokees was against the Cherokee Nation in their behalf exclusively. The Cherokee Nation, under the jurisdictional act of July 1, 1902, through the principal chief appointed attorneys to represent the Cherokee Nation—that is, the Cherokee government, then defunct. This contract by the Cherokee chief was

approved by the Secretary of the Interior, but the Cherokee Nation there represented was a totally different entity from the Eastern Cherokees. The Cherokee Nation represented by the Cherokee chief was a political entity, established to protect life and property in the Cherokee country. Its citizens included 16,000 persons who were not Eastern Cherokees—to wit, the intermarried whites, the Cherokee Freedmen, so called, the adopted Delawares, the adopted Shawnees, other adopted Indians, and the Western Cherokees. The Eastern Cherkoees contained 15,000 members who were not citizens of the Cherokee Nation, thousands of whom resided in probably a dozen States other than Oklahoma. The Guion Miller register of Eastern Cherokees made as Commissioner of the Court of Claims demonstrates this fact, that the Eastern Cherokees were an entirely different entity from the citizens of the Cherokee Nation.

The Cherokee Nation suit in the Court of Claims, filed in January 1903, was numbered 23,199, and did not contemplate any review of the treaties and accounts of the Cherokee Nation by court. It contemplated only bringing suit for an indebtedness acknowledged by the United States in the so-called Slade-Bender account. The Slade-Bender account arose under the contract of the Cherokee Nation to quitclaim the Cherokee outlet in Oklahoma to the United States. The Outlet contained over 8,000,000 acres of land. The payment of the account was an essential part of the purchase price to be paid to the Cherokee Nation for the land.

The United States agreed as part compensation for this quitclaim to make a statement of the amounts due the Cherokee Nation. The Secretary of the Interior employed Slade and Bender to make the account. It was not a judicial proceeding. It was an account made under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior. The account when made was accepted by the Secretary of the Interior. It was presented to the Cherokee Nation May 21, 1894, and accepted by the Cherokee Government December 1, 1894, on the condition that the amount acknowledged to be due should be immediately paid by the United States. It was not paid and suit was permitted by the act of July 1, 1902, known as the Cherokee Allotment Act, as heretofore recited.

When this matter went before the Court of Claims, Owen and Belt, on behalf of the Muskrat Committee, and in the name of the Eastern Cherokees, urged that the second item of the Slade-Bender account equitably belonged to the Eastern Cherokees under the ninth article of the Treaty of 1846 (9 Stat. 871) and did not belong to the Cherokee Nation or its citizens who were not Eastern Cherokees.

There was no misunderstanding of this matter in the Court. The Court of Claims directed the attorneys of the Muskrat Committee to intervene on behalf of their clients and they did intervene in the suit brought by the Cherokee Nation against the United States, No. 23,199. In intervening they did so by direction of the Court and not under the authority of the statutes of the United States, 2103–06, as the Secretary of the Interior did not recognize the attorneys of the Muskrat Committee as entitled to represent the Eastern Cherokees.

But the right of the Eastern Cherokees were not involved as far as a review of the treaties was concerned in the suit 23199 which related only to an account rendered by Slade and Bender and adopted by the United States, and the Court in commenting upon this claim of the Cherokee Nation made the following comment by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States in Two Hundred and Second United States Reports, page 101, quoting from the language employed by Chief Justice Nott, of the Court of Claims, in the case 23199, 40 Court of Claims, page 252, as follows, to wit:

In the opinion of the court this case is simply one to recover purchase money upon a contract of sale. * * * The account was merely a means to an end. The end was the immediate payment, as near as might be, of the whole consideration to be given for the cession of the outlet. * * * This is not the case of a party prosecuting an unliquidated debt, but a case of sale and delivery and nonpayment of the purchase money for the thing sold and delivered.

The above facts stated, fully justify the unanimous report of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the United States Senate (Senate 2952, 76th Cong., S. Rept. 1556); by the unanimous report of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives in its report on Senate 2952 (76th Cong, H. Rept. 2373); by the report of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House on H. R. 10 (77th Cong., Rept. 289), the bill now under consideration; and by the report of the Secretary of the Interior on Senate 2952 (76th Cong.), on H. R. 10 (77th Cong., H. Rept. 289); and by the opinion and judgment of the Court of Claims in case No. 23199, 40 Court of Claims 252; and by the opinion and judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States (202 U. S. 101, at p. 121).

The Eastern Cherokees is a different entity from the Cherokee Nation, plaintiff in case No. 23199 (40 Court of Claims 252).

The Eastern Cherokees contained about 15,000 members of the group who were not citizens of the Cherokee Nation and the Cherokee Nation aforesaid, contained about 16,000 citizens who were not members of the Eastern Cherokee group, to wit, Cherokee freedmen, intermarried whites, adopted Delawares, adopted Shawnees, other adopted Indians and Western Cherokees.

The Cherokee Nation aforesaid, the defunct Cherokee government, had no interest as such in the per capita promised to the Eastern Cherokees in the ninth article of the Treaty of 1846 (9 Stats. 871)—opinion of Attorney General P. C. Knox, 1903.

When the Eastern Cherokees attempted to obtain a settlement of their claim versus the United States, under the ninth article of the Treaty of 1846, from 1900 to 1902, the House of Representatives by resolution requested the Attorney General to advise the Congress as follows:

Resolved, That the Attorney General of the United States is hereby requested to advise the House of Representatives with all convenient speed in the case of the Eastern Cherokees against the United States whether or not the award rendered under the Cherokee agreement of December 19, 1891, ratified by act of Congress approved March 3, 1893, as set forth in House Executive Document No. 182 of the Fifty-third Congress, Third session, and the findings of fact of the Court of Claims of April 28, 1902, is res adjudicata; to review the opinion of the Department of Justice of December 2, 1895, and advise the House of Representatives whether the reasons set forth in that opinion now constitute a valid defense to the payment of said award. (H. Doc. No. 309, 57th Cong.)

Under this resolution the Attorney General, on January 22, 1903, reporting to the House of Representatives, said:

Neither the agreement nor the provision appropriating money to meet the expense of the accounting authorized an accounting with the Eastern Cherokees or between parties other than the United States and the Cherokee Nation, and if the accounting as had extended to matters outside of the authorization, it is surely in that respect not obligatory upon the United States. Nor is there anything in the findings of the Court of Claims which changes or enlarges the effect of this accounting, or makes it res adjudicata between the United States and the Eastern Cherokees. (H. Doc. No. 309, 57th Cong., 3d sess.)

As a group, the Eastern Cherokees never appeared in court under the authority of law until the Jurisdictional Act of April 25, 1932. United States Revised Statutes 2103–06 requires an Indian group to appear through attorneys having a contract made in pursuance of this statute and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

By section 68 of the Cherokee Allotment Act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stats. 716) the Court of Claims was authorized to hear and determine any suit brought by the Cherokee tribe or any band thereof through attorneys employed in pursuance of the revised statutes, Sections 2103–06, and to make parties any party having an interest in the suit. By an amendment of March 3, 1903, the Eastern Cherokees were given the status of a band for all purposes of said section 68 and the Court of Claims was directed to make the Eastern Cherokees party to any suit brought on the Slade-Bender Account (H. Doc. No. 309, 57th Cong.).

In cases 23199, 40 Court of Claims, 252, and 202, United States 101, three Eastern Cherokees, representing themselves and in the name of the Eastern Cherokees, filed a petition (No. 23214), setting up an equitable right to the second item of the Slade-Bender Account. Their attorneys had no approved contract, but were directed by the Court of Claims on the 14th of February, 1905, to intervene in the suit brought in the name of the Cherokee Nation—the defunct Cherokee Government—case 23199.

I submit herewith a photostatic copy of this intervening petition showing on its face that it was by order of the court, and also a photostatic copy on the back thereof giving the authority of the presiding

justice, Hon. Stanton Peelle, authorizing the filing of this intervening petition by the attorneys of the three Eastern Cherokees aforesaid. The intervening petition was signed by Robert L. Owen and R. V. Belt and was filed in the name of the Eastern Cherokees.

The portion of the petition which is not of importance in this matter is omitted. The record is confined to that portion which shows that the intervening petition was by order of the court and was limited to the issues in the case No. 23199.

Many thousands of the Eastern Cherokees reside in my district, largely full-blood Indians who are very poor, who are entitled to this money due them, amounting, if they win, to probably over $100 each. They are entitled to have their claim given a fair hearing with the same right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States as has been given to many other Indian tribes by the Congress where constitutional or treaty rights were involved, such as the Crow Indians of Montana, the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, various Indian tribes of Alaska, the Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin, the Klamath and Modocs of Oregon and Washington, and a band of Snake Indians of Oregon and Washington, Red Lake Band of Chippewas in Minnesota, and so forth.

For citations, see Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A4214.

EXHIBIT A

[In the Court of Claims. *The Cherokee Nation* v. *The United States*. No. 23199. The intervening petition of the Eastern Cherokees in the case of the *Cherokee Nation* v. *The United States*, No. 23199, filed under the order of the court]

Now come the Eastern Cherokees under the direction of the court to interplead in the case of the *Cherokee Nation* v. *The United States*, No. 23199, * * *.

Respectfully submitted.

OWEN O. BELT,
ROBERT V. BELT,
Attorneys of Record.
WM. H. ROBESON,
Of Counsel.

FEBRUARY 14, 1905.

No. 23199. In the Court of Claims. *The Cherokee Nation* v. *The United States*. Intervening petition of the Eastern Cherokees.

Let this petition be filed as of February 14, 1905.

F. P. P.

Filed February 14, 1905, Court of Claims.

OWEN O. BELT,
ROBT. L. OWEN,
R. V. BELT,
Attorneys.
W. H. ROBESON,
Of Counsel.

Mr. Speaker, the Five Civilized Tribes, with great docility and deeply against their own desire, agreed to relinquish their tribal ownership of the lands of the State of Oklahoma, and to allot the remainder to enable the United States to establish the State of Oklahoma, now represented by nine Members of Congress on this floor. They have testified, as above stated, that the United States agreed, as part consideration, that the United States would provide a means for a complete settlement of the claims of the five tribes.

The United States, in the last fiscal year, received over $78,000,000 of revenue from the people of Oklahoma, which would not have been received except for the concessions made by the Five Civilized Tribes. It is asking very little when the Oklahoma delegation demands the fulfillment of the pledges made by the United States to the five tribes. We trust our colleagues will be good enough to consider and remember this in passing on H. R. 10.

Price Fixing of Agriculture's Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

PETITION OF OKLAHOMA FARM ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition:

Petition and resolution

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM, M. C.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We, the Greer County Farmers Union, Oklahome Cotton Cooperative Association, Farmer's Union Cooperative Gin, and Quint County Cooperative Creamery, all of Greer County, Okla.,

Do petition the Congress of the United States of America, through the Honorable ELMER THOMAS, United States Senator of Oklahoma,

That the Congress of the United States of America refrain from placing any and all price-fixing ceilings on agricultural products; that the price of farm products be based on a par with industrial products.

To fix agricultural products at this time would place the American farmer in a position he could not meet, because of the rising cost of farm machinery and repairs, the increased cost of labor and living expenses.

The national emergency demands that food and clothing be produced in abundance; price ceilings would impair the national defense by hindering the production of agricultural products.

Therefore the members of the following farm organizations of Greer County, Okla., go on record as against price-fixing schemes for agricultural products by the Congress of the United States, assembled at Mangum, Okla., the 4th day of October 1941.

Resolution Committee:

W. O. LAWSON,
Greer County Farmers Union.
BOB HEATLEY,
Oklahoma Cotton Cooperative Association.
A. HINNON,
Farmers Union Cooperative Gins.
L. G. CLARK,
Quint County Cooperative Creamery.
H. J. BANKS,
Chairman of Joint Meeting.

Attest:

HENRY WORTHINGTON,
Secretary of Joint Meeting.

Izaak Walton League of America Adopts Important Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT MEETING IN CHICAGO, SEPTEMBER 20

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, only those with conveniently short memories can forget the exploitation of nature in this country which occurred during the World War period. America is still paying the penalty for short-sighted policies and dollar-grabbing practices which were in vogue at that time.

It is to be hoped that during the present emergency this country will not forget or ignore the lessons learned a quarter of a century ago. Let us not now commit crimes upon nature and circumvent the true practices of conservation in the name of national defense. Let us remember that when we permanently destroy the bounty of nature we destroy the basis of all that has made America great.

On September 20, the national directors of that outstanding conservation organization, the Izaak Walton League of America, met in Chicago and adopted the following thought-provoking resolution which I take this opportunity of calling to the attention of the Congress and the country:

Whereas the Izaak Walton League is committed to protection of public rights in natural resources, and

Whereas many bills now before Congress under the banner of national defense completely ignore these values while actually contributing nothing to valid defense: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the directors of the Izaak Walton League of America in meeting at Chicago on September 20, 1941, petition the President and the Congress to call a moratorium on these unessential projects as a serious sabotage of real national defense through their immense diversion of money, manpower, and material.

Report to the People of the Tenth District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. PADDOCK
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

INFORMATION AND VOTING RECORD JANUARY 3–OCTOBER 1, 1941

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a Member who represents a congressional dis-

trict like the Tenth Illinois, which includes more than 625,000 people, cannot reach them all through the newspapers, the radio, the postman, and personal interviews. I have, therefore, prepared a detailed report covering the period from January 3, 1941, to October 1, 1941. It may be of interest to other Members whose district problems are similar to ours.

REPORT OF CONGRESSMAN GEORGE A. PADDOCK TO THE PEOPLE OF THE TENTH DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Our district is the eighth largest in population in the country. It extends from the Wisconsin-Illinois line as far south as North Avenue in Chicago, and includes all of Lake County, four Cook County townships (New Trier, Northfield, Niles, and Evanston) and all or part of nine Chicago wards (41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, and 50). It contains farming territory, industrial areas, and suburban and city residential sections, with numerous educational institutions. Its population includes substantial numbers of lawyers, physicians, teachers, and other professional people, and the workers, managers, or stockholders of every type of American business. Its tax payments, direct and indirect, are a considerable fraction of the Nation's income.

Because of these facts the duties of its Congressman are unusually varied, requiring contacts with almost every department and bureau of the Federal Government.

My assignment to the important Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was a recognition of the diversified interests of the Tenth District. To this committee are referred bills on commercial aviation, the railroads, and the coal industry; it receives food-and-drug regulatory legislation, defines navigable streams and rivers, and considers bills regulating commercial brands, and travelers and agents in interstate commerce. The committee's recent legislation includes the Federal Communications Act, the Securities and Exchange Act (all S. E. C. amendments and bills come before the committee), and the Public Utility Holding Companies Act.

The work of every Congressman can be divided into three general groups: national legislation, district matters, and the personal affairs of constituents.

1. NATIONAL LEGISLATION

My complete voting record from January 3, 1941, to October 1, 1941, as compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, with citations to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is as follows:

January 22: H. R. 1437, additional shipbuilding facilities for the United States Navy. On passage, Yea, page 243.

January 31: H. R. 2788, independent offices appropriation bill. On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce nondefense appropriation by $25,000,000, Yea, page 456; on passage, Yea, page 457.

February 8: H. R. 1776, lend-lease bill. On motion to recommit with instruction to credit Great Britain not exceeding $2,000,000,000 for purchase of defense articles in the United States, Yea, page 814; on passage, Nay, page 815.

February 11: House Resolution 90, to continue Dies committee to investigate un-American activities, Yea, page 899.

February 17: H. R. 2665, apportioning of Representatives in Congress among the several States by the equal proportions method. On House Resolution 101, for consideration of bill, Nay, page 1079.

February 18: H. R. 2665, on motion to recommit, Yea, pages 1128–1129. On passage, Nay, pages 1129–1130.

March 11: H. R. 1776, lend-lease bill. On House Resolution 131 to agree to Senate amendments. Nay, page 2178.

House Resolution 120, investigation of national-defense activities. Yea, pages 2189–2190.

March 19: H. R. 4050, lend-lease appropriation bill ($7,000,000,000). On motion to recommit with limitations upon the expenditures, Yea, pages 2383–2384. On passage, Yea, page 2384.

March 21: H. R. 4124, first supplemental national-defense appropriations ($3,776,393,254). On passage, Yea, pages 2485–2486.

March 25: H. R. 3368, appropriation of $1,500,000 for the Office of Government Reports, a division of the Executive Office of the President. On passage, Nay, page 2566.

March 26: S. 262, cotton warehousing and commodity credit corporation bill. On passage, Nay, pages 2594–2595.

April 1: H. R. 968, provides weights and standardization of cotton baling. On passage, Nay, page 2799.

Senate Joint Resolution 43, Inter-American Coffee Agreement. On passage. Not voting, paired, page 2842.

April 2: House Resolution 162, to authorize studies and investigation of the progress of the national-defense program. Yea, page 2907.

April 23: H. R. 137, provides for appointment of one additional judge for the Eastern District of Missouri. On motion to recommit, Yea, pages 3266–3267.

H. R. 148, to permit United States attorneys to reside within 20 miles of the District of Columbia. On passage, Nay, page 3270.

April 28: H. R. 4342, provides for blackouts in the District of Columbia. On motion to strike out enacting clause, Yea, page 3352.

May 7: H. R. 4466, ship-seizure bill. On motion to recommit, Yea, pages 3727–3728. On passage, Nay, pages 3728–3729.

May 12: H. R. 3490, to fix annual amount for expenses of the District of Columbia. On passage, Nay, pages 3939–3940.

May 13: Senate Joint Resolution 60, to fix corn- and wheat-marketing quotas. On conference report, Nay, pages 3985–3986.

May 22: H. R. 4671, plant protection force for naval shore establishments. On amendment providing for appointment of personnel by the Secretary of the Navy without regard to civil-service laws, Yea, page 4336.

May 26: H. R. 4646, powers of President relating to stabilization fund and weight of the dollar. On House Resolution 211 for consideration of the bill, Nay, pages 4430–4431.

May 27: H. R. 4646, powers of President relating to stabilization fund and weight of the dollar. On motion to recommit, Yea, pages 4480–4481. On passage, Nay, page 4481.

May 28: S. 1438, extension of operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and Electric Home and Farm Authority, and increasing authority of the R. F. C. On passage, Nay, page 4528.

June 3: H. R. 3368, appropriation for the Office of Government Reports, a division of the Executive Office of the President. On conference report, Nay, pages 4683–4684.

June 9: H. R. 4965, Military Establishment appropriation bill. On Engel amendment to prohibit the use of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts by War Department, Yea, pages 4911–4912. On passages, Yea, page 4912.

June 11: S. 158, amending Federal Crop Insurance Act to include cotton and tobacco. On passage, Yea, page 5046.

June 13: House Joint Resolution 193, relief and work-relief appropriation bill, 1942. On Healy amendment to remove 18 months' clause for W. P. A. workers, Nay, pages 5150–5151. On Dirksen amendment that no part of appropriation be used to compensate David Lasser, Yea, pages 5151–5152.

June 19: H. R. 4590, Interior Department appropriation bill, on motion to recommit conference report, Yea, pages 5363–5364. On conference report, motion to concur in Senate amendments, Nay, pages 5367, 5371–5372.

June 24: H. R. 4693, National Housing Act amendments, on amendment to conference report regarding farm tenant mortgage insurance, Nay, page 5482.

June 27: H. Res. 212, to create a committee to study prices paid for necessities of life. Not voting, paired, page 5634.

June 30: H. R. 5049, District of Columbia appropriation bill. On conference report, amendment permitting free tuition to nonresidents in District of Columbia public schools. Nay, page 5776.

H. R. 4228, permits wire tapping in certain cases. On H. Res. 222 for consideration of bill. Nay, page 5767. On Walter amendment with respect to issuance of search warrants. Yea, page 5792. On passage, Nay, page 5793.

H. R. 5166, second deficiency appropriation bill. On conference report, motion to concur in Senate amendment relative to loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation. Not voting, paired, page 5799.

July 9: S. 1524, deferment of men by age groups under the Selective Service Training Act. On House Resolution 243 for consideration of bill. Yea, pages 5893–5894.

July 10: S. 1524, deferment of men by age groups under the Selective Service Training Act. On Healey amendments relative to provisions authorizing President to take over industry during strikes. Yea, pages 5983–5984, 5984; on passage, Yea, page 5985.

July 15: House Resolution 257, to investigate the feasibility of transferring certain Bureaus and Agencies from the District of Columbia. Yea, page 6082.

July 16: S. 1447, provides certain methods of maintaining cadets at United States Military Academy at authorized strength. On motion to strike out enacting clause. Yea, pages 6113–6114.

July 29: S. 1524, deferment of men by age groups under Selective Service Training Act. On motion to recommit conference report. Yea, page 6424.

July 30: H. R. 5417, revenue bill, 1941. On House Resolution 280 for consideration of bill. Nay, page 6465.

August 4: H. R. 5417, revenue bill, 1941. On amendment to strike out joint income-tax returns. Yea, pages 6731–6732. On passage. Yea, page 6732.

August 5: S. 1579, property-requisition bill. On passage. Nay, page 6791.

August 7: S. 1580, Defense Highway Act. To override President's veto. Nay, pages 6895–6897.

August 12: House Joint Resolution 222, extension of the Selective Service Training Act. On motion to recommit. Yea, pages 7073–7074. On passage. Nay, pages 7074–7075.

August 13: H. R. 5300, provides for corn and wheat marketing quotas. On conference report Nay, page 7095.

S. 1579, property-requisition bill. On motion to recommit conference report. Yea, pages 7104–7105.

In addition to these roll-call votes I have voted many times for reductions in nondefense appropriations in the Committee of the Whole, where there are no record votes.

I have supported every appropriation requested by the administration for national defense.

Bills I have introduced include the following:

H. R. 1424 provides for the registration of trade-marks and copyrights used in commerce.

H. R. 5065 would protect employees' profit-sharing and bonus plans by declaring them exempt from the cumbersome and expensive registration requirements of the Securities and Exchange Act, originally designed only for publicly sold securities, but which the S. E. C. is attempting to spread into the employees' plan field. The bill will be considered by the

Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with other S. E. C. legislation at an early date.

H. R. 5617 is a redefinition of the term "reorganization," to prevent the Treasury Department from taxing as "profitable" those transactions in which reorganized properties have been subsequently sold at actual losses to the bondholders who had taken them over. Since this proposal affects every individual or corporation owning bonds in one of these reorganized corporations, including the insurance companies which invested millions of dollars in such securities, this bill would benefit every Tenth District family containing such an investor or policyholder.

2. TENTH DISTRICT AFFAIRS

At the request of the Evanston City Council, I introduced H. R. 5120, authorizing the conveyance by the United States to the city of Evanston of the remainder of the Grosse Point Lighthouse tract. This bill was referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. On September 25, after receiving a letter of approval from the Treasury Department, the committee voted to report the bill and recommend its enactment. Passage by the House and Senate will probably result from this favorable action of the Treasury and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Waukegan's proposed Coast Guard station has been before Congress at frequent intervals in recent years, with adverse action based on unfavorable reports by Coast Guard authorities. Although Waukegan harbor handles an increasing amount of shipping for defense industries, and nearby Great Lakes Naval Training Station is steadily expanding, there is still no Coast Guard station between Wilmette, Ill. and Kenosha, Wis. This year a public hearing followed the introduction by me of H. R. 5325, and a five-officer board heard testimony of businessmen, yacht owners, fishermen, and others. The board has not yet reported. If it recommends the new station, H. R. 5325 has a good chance of enactment.

H. R. 5546, which I introduced at the request of North Shore park districts and the Cook County Forest Preserve District, would exempt from Federal taxation the admission fees to municipal, park, or forest-preserve beaches, golf courses, skating rinks, and other recreational facilities where such fees are used wholly for maintenance and improvement.

House Resolution 302 directs the Secretary of the Navy to report on the necessity for a second naval academy, and the advisability of locating it on Lake Michigan in Lake County, Ill. My proposal received much comment in western and Washington newspapers and many western Senators and Congressmen have promised support, Senator C. Wayland Brooks, of Illinois, introducing a similar resolution in the Senate. The attitude of the Navy Department has previously been unfriendly toward another academy, wherever located, but Secretary Knox's report may be favorable because of many new factors in the situation.

With Congressman Charles S. Dewey, of the Ninth District, I have urged the dredging of the north branch of the Chicago River to enable river shipyards to handle Navy smallcraft contracts, and I attended the hearing in Chicago on August 26 held by the War Department to discuss this important matter.

The request of school district 64 of North Chicago for an allotment of Federal funds for school facilities to meet the grave problem of Great Lakes Naval Training Station's expansion, now before the Public Works Administration, is receiving my active cooperation. In addition, there have been numerous interviews and telephone talks and much correspondence regarding appropriations and allocations of funds for Great Lakes, Fort Sheridan, and Glenview Naval Reserve Air Base; defense highway construction, landing strips along highways, recreation centers, and defense housing; post offices and postal routes, and other Government contacts with the district.

3. PERSONAL AFFAIRS OF CONSTITUENTS

The contacts of my office with the individual problems of the Tenth District residents have been numerous and varied. Since January 3, 1941, I have written more than 14,000 personal letters. Eight private bills have been introduced to bring about investigation of claims against the Government. We have given deserved cooperation to sick men who did not belong in the Army, and to healthy ones whose promotions or transfers were delayed by necessary departmental procedure. We have hastened passport visas, and assisted the transfer of money to dependents abroad. We have helped businessmen to get appointments, sent them applications and forms, and located for them the officials who could discuss contracts and priorities.

Almost every day we receive letters or calls from those who wish Government employment. For these people we make inquiries, write letters of recommendation, and refer them to possible openings. In numerous instances this cooperation has had successful results.

Aside from all the customary requests of constituents—for civil-service transfers or House gallery-admission cards, for bulletins on gardening and housekeeping or technical studies and tabulations—we have received a growing number of cases from the various branches of the services. The problems of military routine and the dislocations which service has caused reflect in our mail at frequent intervals. Many cases can be handled through company, regimental, or post commanders. Others are sent to the Illinois Soldiers and Sailors Service Council, of which I am a member. The rest must be taken to the proper divisions of the War or Navy Departments and brought to solution there.

Schools ask for information or publications, chambers of commerce and other commercial associations need the regulations of Government departments and agencies, libraries request reference material, and every manner of personal problem is presented for our assistance.

Each week we send copies of the Office of Government Reports' news bulletin, the official digest of the week's Federal and defense news, to a steadily increasing list who have requested this publication; we also have a mailing list of attorneys and businessmen who wish copies of important pending legislation. News releases on matters of local importance go to the 52 newspapers circulating in the Tenth District.

In conclusion, may I thank the thousands of Tenth District residents who have given me their opinions, comment, and suggestions. Such letters, including those which definitely disagree with my own positions, are extremely helpful and always welcome. Every Tenth District letter or card receives a prompt and personal answer, although I do not believe in making statements as to my future votes. In a rapidly changing situation it is often poor policy to make predictions on complicated and controversial subjects.

Every letter from the district helps in making a decision. I believe a Member of Congress should represent the interests and wishes of his district. When he votes his action protects those interests and interprets those wishes in the light of his own information and according to his own best judgment.

I hope this brief statement of my legislative record and report of office activities will interest many Tenth District residents. Perhaps it will suggest to some of them ways in which their Congressman can be of service.

It is a serious responsibility to be a Member of Congress under present conditions. Our decisions must be made with fallible human judgment on facts often conflicting and incomplete. However, whatever mistakes I have made have been done under my own power and not by remote control of any person, party, or pressure group.

The Americas Stand Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned to Washington from West Virginia where I attended the events of the twelfth annual Mountain State forest festival in my home town of Elkins. This year our programs centered on pan-Americanism. I believe it important in these days that we give increased attention to strengthening the bonds of understanding and mutual effort with our neighbors to the south. The festival theme was emphasized by outstanding speakers. Believing their remarks to be worth printing in the RECORD I include parts of them.

On Thursday afternoon, October 2, just before the coronation of our queen and the pageant—which was pan-American in treatment—we had the pleasure of listening to Col. Julio E. Briceno, Counselor of the Embassy of Panama. He said:

In 1826 Simon Bolivar, liberator of five South American countries, called together an international congress at Panama City whose purpose was to cement in unity the nations of this hemisphere. That congress was the first of its kind, and, in a way, it may be considered as the spiritual source of the League of Nations and of the Pan American Union.

Years passed. Divergent views and policies did little to cause a closer understanding and cooperation among the republics of the western world. But there were forces at work, forces that in the long run would triumph, forces that today are very near their goal. Ignorance, which has held in check many other aspects of human endeavor, has been the worst enemy to combat ignorance and its close ally, bigotry.

But today we are at last expanding our mental horizon; today, we, the nations of the Western Hemisphere, are increasingly conscious of our interdependence; today, at long last, we have come to realize that, despite differences in climate, language, and race, we have things of far greater importance in common—our beliefs, our form of government, our individualism, our determination to preserve the conquests of civilization from the evil forces now unleashed in an effort to destroy them.

The road toward Pan American unanimity of purpose, toward Pan American solidarity and good faith, has been a tortuous one, and at times one must admit that devious detours threw us off our course. But beginning with the Sixth Pan American Congress at Habana, Cuba, in 1928, we finally found the real path when a resolution was approved

barring any state from interfering in the internal affairs of another. Mutual respect was thus established, and happily so, because without respect there can be no understanding.

On April 12, 1933, President Roosevelt in an address to the governing board of the Pan American Union, which is formed by the Secretary of State of the United States and the chief of missions of the Latin American republics in Washington, proclaimed his transcendental good-neighbor policy. In that same year Secretary of State Cordell Hull confirmed the new policy of good neighborliness at the Seventh Pan American Conference in Montevideo, Uruguay, and a new phase of hemispheric relations was entered into.

In December 1936 President Roosevelt and his Secretary of State made the long trip to Buenos Aires to the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace. On that occasion Mr. Roosevelt said that other nations, seeking "to commit acts of aggression against us, will find a hemisphere wholly prepared to consult together for our mutual safety and our mutual good." This declaration was to make the Monroe Doctrine a multilateral policy of all the Americas. In itself this Presidential utterance was to create in the Latin American republics a sympathetic reaction toward its powerful neighbor in the north. The leaders of the American nations had exercised a considerable amount of foresight in sowing better understanding and mutual trust among our countries, so that when the threat of foreign aggression showed its ugly head we were prepared to meet it united as one big family.

We must not take this matter lightly and imagine all that was necessary was a friendly speech to change the attitude of years. No! International friendships come about laboriously, painfully sometimes. They are the outcome of patient work, of definite policies, of an underlying community of interests.

In the Lima Conference, held in December 1938, an effort was made to convert our international solidarity into a hemisphere foreign policy. The declaration of Lima read:

"The governments of the American states declare:

"First. That they reaffirm their continental solidarity and their purpose to collaborate in the maintenance of the principles upon which the said solidarity is based.

"Second. That faithful to the above-mentioned principles and to their absolute sovereignty, they reaffirm their decision to maintain them and to defend them against all foreign intervention or activity that may threaten them.

"Third. And in case the peace, security, or territorial integrity of any American republic is thus threatened by acts of any nature that may impair them, they proclaim their * * * determination to make effective their solidarity * * * by means of the procedure of consultation. * * *

"Fourth. That in order to facilitate the consultations, the ministers of foreign affairs of the American republics, when deemed desirable and at the initiative of any one of them, will meet in their several capitals."

Then came September 1939 and the new European war. Within a few days after peace had been broken, the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Panama, in accordance with the declaration of Lima and in view of the fact that a situation had arisen capable of disturbing the peace of America, extended invitations to the ministers of foreign affairs of the 21 American republics or their representatives to meet at Panama on September 23, sessions to continue until October 3, 1939.

All the governments of the American republics were represented at the meeting, 13 by their ministers of foreign affairs and 8 by representatives of the ministers.

It was divided into three sections—one on neutrality, one on the preservation of peace in the Western Hemisphere, and the third on economic cooperation. The Committee on Neutrality is responsible for the creation of the Inter-American Neutrality Committee which seats in Rio de Janeiro for the duration of the war, attending to problems arising out of the war in violation of our neutral status.

The second important contribution of this committee was embodied in Resolution No. VI on the humanization of war, which contains a request to the belligerents to abstain from the use of means that add unnecessarily to the horrors of war and which contains also an appeal to the National Red Cross Societies to broaden the scope of their humanitarian work for the relief of the victims of the recurrent European folly.

To the Committee on the Maintenance of Peace we are indebted for drafting the unprecedented Declaration of Panama, which established a zone of security around the Western Hemisphere to be kept free of belligerent activities as a measure of continental self-protection and so long as the Americas maintain their neutrality, reserving for our nations their inherent right to have those waters adjacent to the hemisphere, which we regard as of primary concern and of direct utility in our relations, free from the commission of any hostile act by any non-American belligerent nation. It furthermore established our right to undertake to patrol, either individually or collectively, the waters adjacent to our coasts within the specified area of security. It was this declaration which the President of Panama, under Resolution XV of the meeting, was asked to transmit, in the name of the American republics, to the belligerent powers in Europe.

The most important conclusion of Committee No. 3 on Economic Cooperation was the creation of an Inter-American Economic and Financial Advisory Committee composed of 21 experts, 1 from each American republic.

The Panama meeting, which set the bases for a new meeting in Habana, was tangible proof that the nations of the New World were prepared to work together in facing situations which affected them.

The conference held by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics at Habana in July 1940, was of an emergency character designed to consider primarily questions affecting the security and defense of the American continent. As a result of its deliberations two agreements were reached on the question of the provisional administration of European colonies and possessions in the Americas; a convention and the act of Habana. Both predicated on the principle that any transfer, or attempted transfer, of the sovereignty, jurisdiction or possession of American territory from one non-American power to another as a result of events which are taking place in Europe, would be regarded by the American Republics as against American principles and the rights of the American states to maintain their security and political independence. Accordingly, the convention sets forth a procedure for the provisional administration of such territories, by stipulating that if a non-American state shall directly or indirectly attempt to replace another non-American state in the sovereignty or control which it exercised over any territory located in America, thus threatening the peace of the Continent, such territory shall automatically be submitted to a provisional administrative regime to be exercised, as may be considered advisable in each case by one or more American states.

As soon as the reasons requiring this measure shall cease to exist, however, such territories will be allowed the right freely to determine their own destinies. It furthermore provides that any attempt on the part of a non-American state against the integrity or inviolability of the territory will be allowed the sovereignty, or the political independence of an American state shall be considered as an act of aggression against the state which signs said declaration.

In our foreign policy, at least, we in the Western Hemisphere are acting as a homogeneous nucleus, but there are other aspects which we must not neglect. Our cultural expressions must be kneaded into a harmonious pattern. Our economic life must be synchronized. We are to a great extent self-sufficient. It is important that our interdependence and opportunity for reciprocity be accentuated so that truly, at least in this hemisphere, we could say that we love our neighbor as ourselves.

As regards your people and my people, the people of Panama and of the United States offer the world the most noble example of international friendship, living side by side in mutual respect, mutual cooperation, and mutual trust. Together we broke the stiff backbone of the Andes, so that two oceans could meet upon the soil of Panama in a kiss of peace, thus realizing a dream of the century, a marvel of the ages—the Panama Canal. Daily we worked together, mixed our sweat, our blood, and our energies * * * we are partners in a great enterprise and jointly committed to protect it. The people of the American republics are fully aware that in unity there is a strength; that united we stand, divided we might fall.

Humanity has gone mad; humanity has gone berserk in an all-destructive rampage on other continents. Let us keep our sanity, for we are charged with the enormous responsibility of saving the cultural heritage of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, on the third day of the festival, Pan American and Aviation Day was appropriately observed with three speeches delivered at the Elkins Municipal Airport before several thousand persons. The first speaker was Thomas Burke, Chief of the Division of International Communications of the State Department. His remarks follow:

When the United States embarked upon its phenomenal program of industrialization, men who formerly lived on the land were swept into the processes of manufacturing with its inevitable impacts on their intellectual, spiritual, and economic habits. They no longer depended upon themselves to produce a relatively small number of a relatively large variety of things. They became specialists. As such they achieved greater efficiency and higher standards of living. The price that they paid for this transition was the sacrifice of their self-sufficiency. In the spiritual and social readjustments which followed it was inevitable that mass thinking in this country should become broadened to the extent that domestic insularity was broken down and men looked to the Government for guidance and protection which, during their agrarian days, they had been able to administer themselves. The advent of radio and aviation finally served to accelerate this trend not only in the United States but throughout the civilized world. Therefore it was amply apparent in the years immediately preceding 1938 that the fatiguing tempos and exacting demands of industrialization were creating at long last the foundation of a sturdier, yet more flexible, morality in which the wisdom of experience seemed destined to play a dominant role.

Then it was that a small group of malcontents in Europe decided to turn back the clock of civilization to a period when man's behavior was determined solely by his instincts. This small group of fanatics in the guise of a new order served notice on mankind that the trial-and-error progress of our Christianity was impotent and puerile. As they enunciated their primitive dogma, they fell upon and ravished the peoples of western Europe. Since that fearful day, 10 sovereign

states have been violated, international law has been flaunted, the sanctity of the pledged word has become a virtue that exists only in the surviving democracies, and the traditional practices of trade and economics have become the guideposts solely of the remaining nations of the earth that have decided not only to reject the so-called new order but to leave nothing undone within the scope of moral or statutory law to resist its sinister implications.

It is the consensus of sound opinion that in this moral union of free peoples there lies the sole hope for the survival of civilization as you and I have known it and as you and I intend to continue to know it. But the mere desire to enjoy the advantages of liberty and common decency is not sufficient. It will be recalled that at an earlier stage in history, paganism opposed Christianity, and Christianity grew in the black soil of controversy solely because its proponents realistically comprehended the need for aggressively protecting it. Democracy, like Christianity, had its origin in blood and tears. Wishful thinking had no part in its accomplishment and still less in its maintenance. The 21 American republics are notable examples of that principle. We who comprise the New World are by instinct and tradition dedicated to the proposition that we are endowed by the Creator with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That sturdy Christian philosophy not only motivated the Declaration of Independence by the 13 United States of America in 1776 but inspired with equal depth and determination the immortal Bolivar and served to guide the peoples who now comprise our sister republics in their struggle to establish their freedom. They, too, pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence" in order to have and to hold the rights and privileges of free men.

It should be a matter of great pride and profound satisfaction to every American citizen that in this fearful year of 1941, with the fate of civilization hanging in the balance, the peoples of the 21 American republics have unanimously proclaimed their determination, severally and jointly, to continue their way of life, and, if necessary, forcefully to eject any alien philosophy or people which would threaten to destroy it.

The existence between the peoples of the New World of such an identity of interests is not simply an emotional reaction to the barbarity which presently threatens to engulf the people of Europe; quite contrarily, as Under Secretary of State Welles recently put it, "it is the result of constructive statesmanship on the part of every one of the 21 American republics. We have all of us made our contribution to its existence. But there is no greater danger to its continuance than that any one of us should take it as a matter of course. Its continued vitality depends upon the constant willingness on the part of every one of the 21 sovereign republics of the New World to continue to make such contributions—moral and material—as are required to insure the joint security and welfare of all."

It is noteworthy that constructive statesmanship no longer connotes solely the accomplishment of purely political tranquillity between our governments, but in addition presupposes the will appropriately to assist each other in the mutual working out of the economic and commercial problems which arise as between our respective economies. Surrounded as we are by the grim reminders of the tragedy which stalks the world today, we who comprise the American republics have taken appropriate measures to protect our chosen way of life and the peace which it has brought to us. To that end we have materially augmented our respective air transportation facilities not only through the addition of equipment but, of still greater importance, through the training and development of the nationals of our sister republics in the vital science of aerodynamics. Among no other group of nations on earth could such an undertaking be carried on with such a singleness of purpose and spirit. In that regard it may be pointed out that the peoples of no other quarter of the globe have developed the degree of air-mindedness that characterizes the citizens of the New World. However, it should be borne in mind that in the area occupied by our sister republics the Andes Mountains loom up as one of the most formidable barriers to transportation in the civilized world. Since the days of the Conquistadores, many fertile and productive regions in the lower continent have remained tightly locked between towering walls of rock and dense jungles, chiefly because it would have required the wealth of Croesus to undertake even the primary stages of highway or railroad construction through the forbidding heights of Los Andes. The advent of practical commercial aviation has liberated these regions under the freer flow of normal commercial enterprise.

Let us pause for a moment to examine the aviation situation as it presently exists in the other American republics. At the beginning of 1941, approximately 44 air lines served that area, with a network of about 97,000 route-miles. During the year 1940, the activity of this network accounted for something in excess of 27,000,000 flown miles. An analytical break-down of the operating companies that performed this service showed that about 30 percent of them are owned by or closely affiliated with United States interests and exclusively use American equipment. This group of companies accounted for better than 50 percent of the route-miles and 60 percent of the total of the miles flown in the southern continent—Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean. The remaining lines within this territory, with the exception of 9 Axis-owned or dominated units, are locally operated and controlled. Exclusive of the Italian Lati—an overwater link between the mainland of Italy and the mainland of South America—the German Lufthansa is the guiding genius of the several feeder lines which constitute the Axis system in various areas in the lower continent. These Axis operations have been established wherever possible in highly strategic points and frequently have been conducted purely on the basis of their propaganda values. Covering about 22,000 route-miles or about 23 percent of the total route-miles in the American republics, they have accounted for approximately 3,500,000 flown miles annually. I am sure you will be glad to know that during the last 18 months this potential menace to the safety of the Americas has been sharply curtailed.

In bold relief against this background of so-called friendly penetration by the Nazis and the less effective contribution of the Fascists, there is in the process of construction through the joint efforts of the 21 American republics a series of national companies which ultimately will be operated and maintained exclusively by bona fide nationals of the Western Hemisphere and dedicated solely to the peaceful commercial and cultural pursuits of the countries in question. This laudable and thoroughly civilized plan will serve not only to weld a stronger link of communications between the Americas but it will eventually result in the strengthening of their respective economies, more particularly in terms of the improvement of the living standards of their peoples. It is mainly for that reason that the other American republics look upon the development of air transportation with such vital interest and enthusiasm.

In this connection it is noteworthy that the practical adaptation to the needs of mankind of motor-propelled, heavier-than-air craft was materially accelerated through the dauntless pioneering of such sons of the Americas as Santos-Dumont, Chavez, Guzmao, Godoy, Cardenas, Carranza, Newberry, Bielovucic, and the Wright brothers.

With such a tradition, it is not difficult to understand that, from the northernmost boundary of the United States of America to Cape Horn, there is an unswerving determination to maintain with justice, fairness, and equality the republican institutions under which we live. In that regard this Government is committed unequivocally to prevent the partners in the tripartite pact from gaining lodgment among us which would permit the carrying out of their policy of fraud, deceit, and brutality. To implement this determination, the United States expects to collaborate unstintingly with the other American governments in any manner that may be consonant with the fullest recognition of their sovereignty. Therefore, I am happy to reaffirm that no practical contribution necessary for the maintenance of our respective national economies or our defense will be spared by the Government of the United States. Through such singleness of purpose, a quarter of a billion men and women of the New World not only are determined to protect their chosen mode of life but, in their unity of purpose, to preserve the very foundation of civilization itself which we and the beleaguered and enslaved populations of Europe and the Orient may enjoy as freemen in the happier days which lie ahead of us.

Mr. Speaker, the next speaker, the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, discussed the rediscovery of America, in which he stressed the need of closer cooperation in the Americas in defense efforts:

This is the season of harvest, when we gather in the riches of the earth's bounty. All around us we see evidences of these riches produced so generously by the good earth. If we could only learn how to use them, there would be more than enough for all of us.

All around us we see evidences of the good life—the well-ordered, balanced life which all of us want to live. We have had with us at this pageant representatives of a way of life whose riches we are only beginning to discover—a life based upon devotion to religion, respect for law, reverence for culture, and love of freedom. The republics of South America are not near us geographically, but they are united with us in determination to preserve the independence for which our forefathers fought.

When we went to school we were taught the meaning of Lexington and Concord and Bunker Hill. But we knew little about the battles fought by our sister republics, which won for them the independence that is as precious to them as ours is to us.

Four weeks ago, on the one hundred and nineteenth anniversary of Brazilian independence, President Vargas proclaimed a watchword which we would do well to adopt for this hemisphere: "Vigilia das armas"—the vigil of arms. That phrase has a proud history, for it refers to the consecration of the noble knight and to the watch he kept over his arms.

Today we must consecrate ourselves anew to that vigil of arms. We know that we must be constantly on guard to protect our hard-won liberties. The present age has given a new meaning to the battles fought to gain those liberties.

We would do well to remember that the fight for freedom which resulted in the independence of the South American republics was fought under even greater odds than our own struggle for independence; that it suffered many and terrible disappointments and was won over a longer period of time. But it was won. It was won because when the hour struck men worthy of the hour were found to lead, no matter how great the odds.

One common thought, beneath the surface differences and disputes, animated the fathers of these republics. You will find it in the words of Washington, of Bolivar, of San Martin. You will find it in the words of Santander, whose passion for the establishment of a government of law was so great that he has been known ever since as the champion of legality.

If we look at the lives of these men, we will find that always it was the rule of law, of reason, of fair dealing, that animated the thoughts and inspired the deeds of the fathers of these republics.

I should like to dwell upon one of the greatest of them for a little space. We are familiar with the guiding ideals of our own leaders. Perhaps we have not been aware that those same ideals were the vital source, the nourishment, and the inspiration of the leaders who won independence in the other American republics. It was most fitting for Lafayette to send to Bolivar the gift of a miniature portrait of Washington, with these words: "Of all men living, and even of all men in history, Bolivar is the very one to whom my paternal friend would have preferred to send this present." Bolivar wore that decoration to his death. It was his prized possession.

Five republics owe their independence to that great soldier, statesman, and martyr. But more than that, every one of the American republics honors him for the guiding idea that we have taken for our common policy—a family of nations working and cooperating together for the common good. This is the heart of Pan Americanism.

"The most perfect system of government," said Bolivar, "is that which produces the greatest sum of happiness possible, the greatest sum of social security and political stability."

We will do well to bear in mind the wise counsel of this great benefactor, in contrast to the ravings of those who call themselves the proponents of the new order. I will quote a few words from Spengler, the apostle of chaos: "Man is by nature a beast of prey. * * * War is the natural state. * * * Peace is an illusion * * *." Spengler demanded the destruction of all existing government and the subjugation of the whole world under a Prussian leader. He cried out for the revival of barbarism and the rise of a leader who would rule the universe.

He got his leader. And a nation provided that leader with armies, airplanes, submarines, and all the trappings of war to carry on his barbaric conquests. That leader has now brought destruction, desolation, and death to half the world, and he means to bring it here. His new order is built on the supremacy of what is called a master race, with slavery in store for all other peoples. His new order is as old as savagery, as ancient as famine.

The world has faced similar dangers before, the dangers presented by lust of conquest. The ages before Christ had Alexander to deal with. The Dark Ages had Genghis Khan. The last century had Napoleon. The conqueror of our day is trying to follow in their footsteps, with a program of knocking his neighbors out one by one. If those neighbors had awakened to their peril in time and had taken common action, Hitler would have been ruined at the very start.

We of the Americas have that chance now. Face to face with the same dangers from without and the same "fifth column" from within, we have the common policy of resistance. Resistance, to be effective, calls for unity of purpose, unity of action. In our community of ideals we have a firm foundation for such unity. In carrying out our task we are rediscovering America.

One of the strongest bonds uniting us, and one which grows stronger day by day, is aviation. The flying officers from the South American republics who are now studying with the United States Army air forces afford proof of this new bond that units us. Our Air Corps officers have also undertaken to train 100 South American pilots for operation of national air lines in their own countries. This is a tangible sign that in our collaboration today we are planning for the new world of tomorrow. Another and a very important example of this collaboration was the creation at Lima of a permanent American aeronautical commission, whose purpose is to coordinate technical activities in aeronautics among all the American republics. Ten days ago the President announced the appointment of 12 top-ranking aviation experts to the United States branch of this permanent commission. This is another visible proof that we intend to adjust our economies for our mutual benefit. We believe in the future prosperity of our neighbors as we believe in our own.

The emergency in which we are now living every day does not give us peace to enjoy the earth's bounty as we would wish to do. But it has taught us valuable lessons. Among the greatest of these is the lesson that we must conserve our bounty, we must balance our agriculture and our industry—but not balance them as Hitler would do, with the bounty of all seized to enrich the one. We seek rather a balance in which we can all live in harmony together as civilized nations.

Meanwhile it is our task to produce the weapons of defense at a greater rate than we have ever produced them before, and to get them to the battle front without hindrance or delay. Every day is crucial. Every hour is vital. The business of this hemisphere is once again the defense of our liberties. If the tide should appear to turn against us, let us remember the words of that great liberator who said, "We will conquer, for Heaven does not want us in chains."

Mr. Speaker, Wings for Good Neighbors was the subject of the final speech, which was given by the Honorable G. Grant Mason, Jr., member of the Civil Aeronautics Board. His remarks follow:

Security for America depends upon security for the Americas. What is to the advantage of one of the 21 republics of the hemisphere is to the advantage of all. But the hemisphere is of tremendous size, reaching from the Arctic to the Antarctic and from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans. Time and distance handicap our mutual efforts to build that security.

For this reason we have turned to aviation as the best medium to solve our problem. Planes for defense are so much in the forefront of our thoughts that some of us forget how vital a part the nonmilitary plane is playing. On the wings of commercial air transportation we are maintaining our communications with the whole of pan-America. But we are going further—we are giving practical and effective help that daily adds to the security we all must have. In truth, pan-Americanism and aviation go hand in hand.

The vital relationship between hemisphere security and aviation was touched upon by the President of the United States when he said: "At one point between Africa and Brazil the distance is less than from Washington to Denver—5 hours for the latest type of bomber. * * * Any South American country in Nazi hands would always constitute a jumping-off place for a German attack on any one of the other republics of this hemisphere."

Several years ago the Axis Nations began developing an extensive air-line system throughout most of the countries of South America. The German air-line expansion within South America has been carried on by competent aviation experts with typical Teutonic efficiency. No more important preparation could have been made for any intended thrust against our hemisphere. The extent of the endeavor can be understood when it is realized that finally German and Italian airplanes and pilots were operating scheduled air-line service over 23,000 route-miles, which was approximately 10 percent more than the corresponding mileage operated in South America by the American air-line system.

It has been not only the extent of this Axis air-line penetration, but also the nature of its policies and activities which have represented a serious menace to our hemisphere. It long has been evident that those air lines were maintained for far more sinister reasons than mere commercial operations. And, since the outbreak of the European war, the threat has been practically demonstrated by the performance of certain functions having a more obvious military significance.

Several months ago, it was reported that, while cruising about 100 miles off the coast of Brazil, the British cruisers *Ajax* and *Exeter* sighted one of Syndicator Condor's four-engine transports high overhead. This fact was radioed to the British naval attaché in Buenos Aires who made immediate inquiry of Argentine officials at the airport and found that such a plane had taken off several hours before on a so-called test flight. When no satisfactory explanation could be given on their return a few hours later, the Argentine Government passed a regulation forbidding any of Condor's planes to make any but scheduled flights without an Argentine Army officer aboard. The following day an Argentine newspaper reported the incident and related it to the departure the day previous of a German steamer carrying a large number of the personnel of the German airline Lufthansa, who were going back to active duty with the German Air Corps. As the paper pointed out, knowledge of the exact location of the *Ajax* and the *Exeter* at that moment was invaluable to the safe passage of the German steamer. It also is reported that, more recently, L. A. T. I., the Italian trans-Atlantic carrier, made a similar unauthorized 7-hour flight out to sea from Natal, for which they were fined by the Brazilian Government.

However, L. A. T. I. may be expected in the future to conform more closely to Brazilian laws prohibiting such flights since protection of its right to operate to Brazil has become more important to the Axis governments than the service which could be rendered by an occasional unauthorized flight to sea. As the British blockade has become more effective, L. A. T. I. has become more important as a means of communication between Axis representatives here and their governments at home. On its flights to Brazil it brings funds and instructions for distribution to Axis agents throughout the Western Hemisphere. On its return flights to Europe, it has been carrying industrial diamonds, quartz crystals, and other easily transported war materials.

The groundwork to forestall these dangers was laid as early as the spring of 1939, long before war broke out in Europe. At that time, I was privileged to act as chairman of an interdepartmental committee which worked out a plan for aeronautical development in the Western Hemisphere, which was approved as a basic part of the aviation policy of our Government. This plan, which is being carried out, was founded on a basis of inter-American cooperation and conceived as a mutual benefit, both economic and defensive, to all the nations of our hemisphere.

Many agencies of the United States Government and our aviation industry are cooperating closely in offering every sort of necessary assistance toward eliminating Axis aviation penetration into our hemisphere. For example, if a German air line is stopped from operating, then our country offers every possible assistance, including airplanes and personnel, to replace the German service. Why should our country be willing to do this? Why should it make any difference to a South American country whether Germany is op-

erating an air line locally or whether the United States may appear to be doing the same thing? It is important to explore these questions thoroughly because there is all the difference in the world between the objectives and methods as they are applied to the same problem by Germany or by our country.

Whenever Germany has operated an air line within any country in South America, there has been constant insistence upon the use of German equipment and German personnel. Any efforts of the local government to introduce its own citizens or its own national control over the operations has been met with stiff resistance or flat refusal. The Germans have not wanted the citizens of the American republics to learn how to operate the air lines within their own countries and have opposed the nationalization of those air lines. German air lines within the Americas have been grimly determined to remain German in order to benefit only Germany.

Our own philosophy is utterly different than that which has been followed by Germany. We stand ready to offer all possible help to the end that domestic air line operations become nationalized as rapidly as possible. Besides helping the newly established national services to acquire American equipment and other assistance, we are ready to help them build up a reservoir of skilled pilots and mechanics among their own citizens. Beginning in January, the United States Army will be in a position to train 100 Latin American citizens to the point where they will be capable of serving as copilots. The Civil Pilot Training Program is preparing to take an additional 204 and train them as flight instructors. Then to round out the organization, 120 will be offered training as service mechanics, 120 as instructor mechanics, and 20 as aeronautical engineers. This program would give our neighbor countries a nucleus of 564 thoroughly skilled airmen about which to build their aeronautical future.

Colombia set a precedent for aviation nationalization more than a year ago when it established a new domestic air line company, Avianca, which took over Scadta and eliminated its German personnel. Pan American Airways is a part owner of the new company and acts in an advisory capacity on managerial and technical matters.

A few months ago, the Government of Bolivia canceled the operating right of Lloyd Aero Boliviana, the local German carrier. In order that Bolivia might not be without air service to Brazil, Pan American Grace Airways' route was immediately extended and aeronautical experts of our Government were promptly dispatched to La Paz to help in the creation of a new local company. Our Government is helping to obtain necessary American equipment and will continue to give other assistance until such time as Bolivians are prepared to take over for themselves. Today Bolivia has a national air transport company completely controlled by citizens of the new world and entirely free of Axis influence.

Shortly after Bolivia acted, Peru canceled the operating rights of Lufthansa Peru, the local German air line. Again American aviation assistance was forthcoming. Several experts have been on the scene for some time making surveys and giving other practical aid. American aircraft will again replace German Junkers.

One month ago, the Ecuadorian Government grounded S. E. D. T. A., the German air line. For the last 11 months, Pan American Grace Airways has paralleled most of S. E. D. T. A.'s route and assistance is available to help Ecuador set up a successor company.

The elimination of German air lines in the four countries just mentioned reduces the total routes under German operation in South America by over 11,000 miles. The United States is prepared to assist other countries in eliminating Axis air lines and replacing them, without disruption to their communications, by permanent national air lines, which we will help nurture through their early growth with financial and technical assistance.

Now, I should like to explain briefly how the United States happened to be in a position to render this assistance on such a large scale. The Axis nations may have been ahead in military output, but the United States leads the world in the quality and quantity of its commercial planes. Our civil air lines were flying more miles each year than all the rest of the air lines of the world together. Although we were late getting started, we have probably trained more pilots since war started in Europe than were ever trained in Germany in any similar period.

Our domestic fleet of air lines—about 350 planes in all—is small in comparison with the thousands of planes that are being produced. Yet, according to one estimate, in 1941 this efficient fleet will probably carry nearly a million more passengers, a million five hundred thousand more ton-miles of express, 3,750,000 more ton-miles of air mail than in 1940, due in large part to the demands of national defense. Not long ago 1,200 pounds of aluminum were rushed from Pittsburgh to California by air to avoid an aircraft production tie-up. To fix a broken Navy power shovel, an American company in Illinois recently shipped a 750-pound Diesel engine crankshaft 7,800 miles to Wake Island in the Pacific by air express. And, just this week, Pan American Airways announced the greatest transfer of Army technicians by air ever attempted in the Western Hemisphere. Over 700 men needed in the Canal Zone are to be flown to Panama in the next 90 days. Such examples could be multiplied a hundred times.

As the Air Transport Association has so aptly put it: "It can be truly stated that 24 hours each day our air lines are aiding industry in conserving that most essential of all defense material—time!" And, as defense production increases in our rearmament race against time, speed may be expected to become an even more precious element.

Recognizing the burden of defense responsibility which must be borne by our civil air lines, I believe that upward of 170 new planes may be needed for our domestic air lines by the end of next year to handle estimated increases in traffic. This estimate is based on the carrying capacity of types now in use, but it is my hope that it may be possible to obtain some percentage of larger and newer equipment than that now currently in use.

Although these additional planes would be greatly needed during the emergency, I am not thinking solely of the present crisis. Military use of aircraft gave civil aviation its greatest impetus after World War No. 1. In that post-war period, America lagged far behind. In our defense effort this time, civil aviation plays so important a role that there could be no excuse for the United States to be in any place except the forefront of commercial aviation development after this war. The Civil Aeronautics Board is giving much thought and study to this certain future expansion, for, in the post-war period to come, with its economic dislocations and painful political and industrial readjustments, a strong American civil aviation will do much to cushion the shocks and can be used as a powerful instrument for rehabilitation throughout the Western Hemisphere and the world.

Mr. Speaker, after the present war is ended, the trade route of the Americas will breathe new life into both continents. As we once sent our clippers over the seas in search of new markets, we will again send our clippers of the air into far places. We will unite not only the Americas but the entire world. We will forge not only the bonds of commerce but also friendship and mutual efforts. To such an undertaking let us go forward.

Air Power and Coast Defense—Has the Bombardment Airplane Made the United States Invasion Proof?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal arguments of the let's-get-into-the-war-now speakers and writers in this country is that unless we send our soldiers and sailors across the seas to fight, this country and/or this hemisphere will be in danger of invasion. It is an argument which should be carefully examined, because if it is true, the safety and security of our country is in danger; and, in that event, every true American would shirk no responsibility and stop at no risk in protecting this Republic. On the other hand, if the argument is fallacious and misleading, it is equally important that this country know the facts before it is lured into sending its sons into the slaughter beds of Africa, Asia, and Europe to fight a war in which our national safety is not in jeopardy. America today is entitled to know the facts.

Many radio speakers, platform orators, editorial writers, and newspaper columnists are now haranguing America with hysterical portraits of our susceptibility to invasion and attack unless we are protected by the British Navy or the Chinese or Russian Armies. Civilian spokesmen for the Army and Navy Departments have joined in the scare crusade; mahogany-desk strategists and a number of retired over-age Army and naval officers have added to the defeatist chorus to the effect that this greatest of all nations in the world cannot defend itself without the aid of foreign powers ranging in distance from our shores from three to seven thousand miles. Unlike the gallant leaders of England who proclaim "There will always be an England," and very unlike Churchill, who dares the enemy to attempt an invasion, many spokesmen for the administration's foreign policy in this country weakly apologize for America's lack of self-sufficiency as they see it and cringingly cry out that "America is doomed" if those who we now support in the bloody conflict are unable or unwilling at some future time to come to our support. Leadership should be made of sterner stuff in this Republic. Surely no one is more conspicuously and certainly a defeatist than he who preaches the fatalistic doctrine that America depends for its existence and its safety on the good fortune or the good intentions of some European or Asiatic power.

But what are the facts? Is America in danger of invasion, come what will across the seas? Are the American defeatists accurate when they would push this country into the war with the argument that we had better fight when others do because we cannot protect ourselves? Hanson W. Baldwin, internationally famous military analyst for the strongly interventionist New York Times but who writes what he believes from the facts which he knows, has this to say in his great new book, United We Stand, and I quote Mr. Baldwin's studied and significant words:

The author does not know a single responsible military or naval officer or Government official who believes that this Nation is threatened by direct invasion, even if Germany wins.

Mr. Baldwin made this challenging statement several months ago, and it has never been refuted—no responsible military man has dared to take issue with Mr. Baldwin's statement.

Now, in the current issue of Army Ordnance which has as its lead article an item by Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, comes evidence even more convincing than that provided by Hanson Baldwin. In this publication Lt. Col. Thomas R. Phillips, General Staff Corps, United States Army, supports Mr. Baldwin's findings in a thought-provoking article which every American citizen should read. It is gratifying to note that the career men and staff officers of the United States Army are not included among the defeatists who would label Uncle Sam before the world as the hapless and helpless step-child of a war-torn Europe. Lieutenant Colonel Phillips' article follows:

[From Army Ordnance of September-October 1941]

AIR POWER AND COAST DEFENSE—HAS THE BOMBARDMENT AIRPLANE MADE THE UNITED STATES INVASION-PROOF?

(Lt. Col. Thomas R. Phillips)

Even if the United States had no harbor defenses it would be impregnable to invasion. And this still would be true if our Navy were inferior to that of an invading power. In spite of this, a great program of harbor-defense construction is proposed and is partially under way. One wonders if this program has been devised with full realization of the ability of air power to perform many functions of harbor-defense installations. The United States is about to build harbor defenses to make the country secure for 50 years to come. Is this really looking forward, or are the harbor defenses being provided to cover the 50 years which have just passed?

The argument by which coast defenses are sold to the public is very much like the argument of the book salesman. It is not the books he is selling, but rather an education for the child. Harbor defenses are supported by the argument that they will prevent invasion of the United States. Actually they never were intended to prevent invasion. If the need for harbor defenses depended upon their ability to protect the United States from invasion, it would be very simple to prove that no harbor defenses are necessary. Land-based air power has made the United States impregnable to a sea-borne invasion.

THE LESSON OF NORWAY

The attempted counterinvasion of Norway by the British supplied the factual proof of the well-established theory that sea-borne invasions are impossible against land-based air power. This particular operation took place under the most favorable circumstances possible for the British. The Norwegians welcomed their coming and desired their help; the British did not have to contend with any harbor defenses nor enemy forces when they made their landings at Aandalsnes and Namoscs—there was nothing to oppose them until they had marched a considerable distance into Norway, where they met advanced detachments of the German Army; nevertheless the invasion failed.

Prime Minister Churchill gave as explanation for this failure "intense, continuous bombings of the bases at Namsos and Aandalsnes, which prevented the landing in those small fishing ports of any large reinforcements and even of artillery for the infantry already landed. It therefore was necessary to withdraw the troops or to leave them to be destroyed by overwhelming forces. The decision to withdraw was undoubtedly sound. The withdrawal of these 12,000 men—less than a division—was accomplished with very great skill, and, I must add, very good luck."

In other words, nothing but the "intense, continuous bombings" prevented the success of the British counterinvasion of Norway. There were no harbor-defense guns to fire against the British nor were any German troops at the harbors to give the slightest opposition to the landings. This was purely a victory of air power over a sea-borne invasion which had no aerial support.

On the German side the means to repel the invasion were quite inadequate. Germany had occupied the airdromes at Oslo and Stavanger. Oslo is 326 miles from Namsos and 220 miles from Aandalsnes. Stavanger is 260 miles from Aandalsnes and 420 miles from Namsos. Thus the German air forces operating against the British invasion bases had to operate from considerable distances. Not only that but they were very limited in numbers—to the numbers that could be placed on four rather inadequate airdromes—and were engaged primarily in supporting the ground operations of the German troops who were driving through the Norwegian valleys in an effort to reach the British.

Another factor of great importance in favor of the British was the short distance that the expeditionary forces had to go to reach Norway and the fact that their ships could approach the Norwegian coast beyond range of German bombers closely enough so that the final run to the coast could be made in darkness and without fear of bombing. Bombing was possible only after the ships reached the harbors.

It might be thought rash to conclude from a single example that impregnability to a sea-borne invasion could be considered as proved. The British effort in Norway was a very special case, however, in which every factor, except readiness, perhaps, favored the invader. If the conditions under which an invasion would have to be attempted against the United States are visualized, it will be seen that the problem of invading this country would be infinitely more difficult than was the British problem of landing troops in Norway. Leaving aside naval interference, imagine a convoy of 40 or 50 troopships crossing the 3,000 miles of the Atlantic Ocean toward the United States. The departure of such an invading force could not be kept secret. Our defending bombers would start attacking it a thousand miles from the coast. The attacks would grow in intensity as the convoy approached. The invasion might not be stopped before it reached the coast, but it would be badly damaged.

WHAT IT MEANS TO AMERICA

Imagine, then, this convoy attempting to come into a harbor and remaining practically stationary for days in narrow waters with the entire bombing force available to the United States working on it. The picture is incredible. The invasion would be doomed. No military leader would ever think of making such an attempt. The presence or absence of harbor defenses along the American coast would be of no importance whatsoever against a sea-borne invasion, as long as we possess ample land-based air power.

It may be argued that naval vessels have not been driven off the seas within bombing range in the North Sea and the Mediterranean, and that convoys are operating occasionally even in the English Channel. The reasons that this is possible will be considered in more detail later. It suffices for the present to note that these ships are subject to bombing raids for relatively short periods of time, that they first must be discovered, and that they are not tied up at docks or subject to bombardment for long periods. None of these favorable factors applies to an effort to unload troop transports nor to the continuing supply and reenforcement of troops already landed. In Norway the British landed their first troops, but could not reinforce them once the bases were discovered and watched and bombed constantly.

What leader would be willing to risk thousands of men packed like sardines in a transport under the bombing conditions that can be visualized? Churchill would not. And if these transports had to come across an ocean to be met with enormously more intense bombing, no leader would consider it. The whole business of invasion across the sea against ample land-based air power no longer is in the book of possibilities.

THE MOST IMPORTANT LESSON FROM THIS WAR

Almost no other event in the history of warfare equals this in importance. For the United States, particularly, the conclusion is transcendental. It makes it possible for this country to insure not only its own continental territory from invasion but, by the provision of a suitable air-base and airways system, to insure the impregnability of all North and South America. If this country takes advantage of the defensive powers given to it by the bombardment airplane, its impregnability to military invasion is assured in the foreseeable future.

The successful German invasion of Norway through its principal harbors—Oslo, Stavanger, Trondheim, Narvik—has been cited to prove that had Norway been supplied with adequate harbor defenses, or if those defenses had not been tricked into impotence, Norway could not have been invaded by the Germans. To quote one protagonist: "The salient fact was that the Germans went on in unopposed, tied up at the docks, put their men and supplies ashore, and proceeded to overrun the country." From this was deduced proof that had the Norwegian harbor defenses functioned effectively, the invasion could not have succeeded. Historically, however, most landings on hostile shores have been made away from harbors, and the troops have proceeded overland to capture from the rear the harbor defenses and the cities they protected. Norway did have harbor defenses, and good ones, at Trondheim and Oslo. It was easy to trick them, and once the Germans were within the harbors, these defenses no longer had any value.

Much more important was the fact that Norway had no air force. Had a Norwegian air force been in existence, it would have been able to block the German invasion of Norwegian harbors just as effectively as the German air force later blocked the British invasion of Norwegian harbors. And this would be true whether or not Norway had any harbor defenses. In the case of the ports distant from Germany—Trondheim and Narvik—an ample Norwegian air force would have made German operations in these ports impossible. They were too distant for hostile operations to be protected by German air power based in Denmark or Germany. Even Oslo is 200 miles from the Aalborg airport used by the Germans in Denmark, and a small air force should have

been able to best much larger German fighter forces that might have been used to protect the landing in Oslo. The Norwegian harbor defenses were made impotent by false messages or treachery. Within an hour, their usefulness had vanished because German forces had passed them. The air forces might have been tricked for a short time, but since air bases usually are back from the coast, their impotence would have been of short duration.

Air power has still another advantage as a defensive force. This is its ability to assemble and concentrate its entire power for operations against a single point. Harbor defenses are immovable, and the individual forts can give no assistance to the forts 50 or 200 miles away. But all the bombing planes in the nation can be concentrated so as to apply their power at the single threatened point, and this concentration can take place with almost incredible rapidity—in a day or two at the most.

Harbor defenses never were intended to prevent invasion, although they have an incidental mission of providing artillery support to the defense against landing attacks within range of their weapons. There are plenty of good reasons for constructing harbor defenses, but the prevention of invasion of our shores is the least of these and is only incidental to the others.

AIR POWER CAN PREVENT INVASION

The ability of air power to prevent invasion is the question of air power versus sea power. The present war has shown apparently contradictory results in the struggle between air and sea forces. The contradictions have been apparent only. In general, they can be explained by the time available for bombing, the distance over which bombing operations must be conducted, the number of bombers available, and the weather.

Prime Minister Churchill stated one time that 200 or 300 bombs must be dropped to insure hitting a naval vessel. This could mean a single trip by 100 to 250 planes, or 10 trips by 10 to 15 planes, or 100 to 150 trips by a single plane. If it were 15 planes making 10 trips 500 miles from the base, 10 days would be required to let this air force drop enough bombs to insure a hit on the naval vessel. It can be seen that effective bombardment of naval vessels either requires a great enough number of planes to insure hits in one or two trips or else that the target ships should be stationary in a harbor, where they can be bombed on many successive days by a smaller number of planes, if these were all that were available.

Naval vessels are much harder to hit than merchant ships or transports. Warships are armored, are usually of very high speed and capable of dodging, and have a tremendous number of antiaircraft guns to interfere with the bomber's aim. Thus, although 200 to 300 bombs may have to be dropped to attain a hit on a naval vessel, merchant ships which act as transports and are the carriers for invading forces probably would not require more than a quarter as many bombs to hit them.

CHURCHILL'S CAUTION PROVED JUSTIFIED

Prime Minister Churchill explained the failure of the British Fleet to operate in the Skagerrak on German communications to Norway as follows: "But immense enemy air strength, which can be brought to bear on our patrolling craft, makes this method far too costly to be adopted. Important forces would have to be employed in order to maintain a steady surface patrol and the losses which would have been inflicted on the patrol from the air would undoubtedly very soon constitute a naval disaster." In other words, the British patrolling vessels would have had to remain on duty in the Skagerrak subject to continuous bombing by immense air forces. The operation was impossible, and the British were correct in not making the effort.

Prime Minister Churchill's objections to operating in the Skagerrak were abundantly proved when the British Fleet operated under similar conditions in attempting to prevent the invasion of Crete. After the loss of four cruisers and seven destroyers, the fleet withdrew. Here the real factors in the question of air power versus sea power were demonstrated in one operation; namely, immense bombing forces and the fact that the ships would have to remain subject to bombing.

Malta also shows the impossibility of fleets remaining within range of large bombing forces. It is only 60 miles from Italy and is untenable as a fleet base. The fact that the British still hold it is of minor importance. It is no longer a base—it is just a piece of land. On the other, Gibraltar—750 miles from Italy—hardly has been bothered by bombing. The distance is too great for bombardment operations to be carried on with the necessary mass and continuity. Gibraltar is protected from massive and continuous bombing by distance.

THE LESSON OF SCAPA FLOW

Convoys operating in the North Sea, the English Channel, and the Mediterranean gain partial protection from the time element. By making use of darkness to pass the more dangerous areas, the convoys are within effective bombing range too short a time to be disastrously endangered, unless massive bombing forces are on hand to operate against them. There have been many ships lost and other ships injured, but the damage has not been great enough to prevent occasional passage. Scapa Flow, 300 miles from Norway, has been made untenable as a fleet base by the bombing threat. In this case, Germany has a sufficient number of bombing planes based closely enough to make the danger of remaining at the base too great for the possible military advantages that would be obtained.

In the Mediterranean, Italian air operations originally appeared to give the lie to all these contentions. Failure of the Italian air force to be more successful in preventing British convoy and fleet operations close to Italian and Libyan coasts was one of the major mysteries of the war. The British even penetrated the Adriatic (at night), December 19–20, 1940, and bombarded the Albanian seaport of Valona without aerial interference by the Italians. It is now apparent that Italian air power was not operating in sufficient mass in these waters to perform its missions effectively. When it was reinforced by German squadrons, the last British convoy to pass through suffered such extensive losses that no more convoys have been attempted. The war has showed one fact conclusively—air power dominates sea power in narrow seas and near the coasts.

Was not the insufficiency of Italian air power in the Mediterranean one of the inherent weaknesses of air power? And if air power is depended upon, are we not apt to find that it may be unavailable at the critical time? Harbor defenses are so comforting. The big ugly-muzzled guns are always there, ready and waiting—a definite assurance of protection for one little spot for all time. Doubt as to the availability of air power can be dismissed as far as the United States is concerned. We shall always have it in the future in ample quantity. And instead of a dozen or two dozen guns defending a harbor, we shall have 2,000 or 4,000 bombers ready to be concentrated for the defense of any point, not of harbors alone, but of all the beaches and all the coasts.

THE PASSING OF HARBOR DEFENSES

Harbor defenses in the past were constructed to perform the following functions: First, to permit movement of our naval forces in and out of harbors; secondly, to protect harbor facilities and ships in the harbor from naval gunfire and torpedoes; thirdly, to prevent enemy ships from entering the harbor; fourthly, to furnish incidental support to defense against landing attacks within range of the defense guns.

What has air power done to these missions? If a hostile fleet cannot remain on guard outside a harbor to prevent the exit or ingress of our own fleet because of the threat of bombing, then no harbor defenses are necessary for that purpose alone. Except for hostile air power the British fleet might have been maintained close to the Skagerrak or to the Kiel Canal or to Heligoland. This mission of harbor defenses is ended. Air power can perform this mission far more effectively than guns ever could since guns never had the necessary range to provide ample maneuver room for a fleet leaving a harbor.

Protection of ships and harbor facilities from naval gunfire and torpedoes is still as necessary a function of harbor defense as ever. The European war has shown that ships can stay within bombing range at night long enough to make raids on shore installations. The French and British both raided Italian shore installations and escaped with minor damage. The British have raided the Dodecanese and the Libyan coast and have escaped without serious injury. The British bombarded the German-held airdromes at Stavanger from cruisers for several hours. Thus the experience of the European war seems to prove that air power is not yet sufficiently strong to prevent raids and naval bombardments. Harbor defenses must be provided for this purpose.

Whether or not air power can deny enemy ships access to harbors and adjacent waters depends upon the nature of the harbor. In such a harbor as Puget Sound, where hostile ships would have to steam 300 or more miles to get in and out, and where they never could be lost sight of in the narrow waters, air power should suffice to entrap the raiders. They might get in, but they never could get out. In the case of shallow harbors easy of access, the problem would be similar to that of a naval raid; some guns would be required to prevent a raid, but air power would be ample to prevent the continued use of the harbor.

AIR POWER AIDS OUR DEFENSE—WEAKENS ATTACKERS

The question of the ability of air power to prevent invasion already has been discussed. Harbor defenses never were built primarily with that end in view, and this question certainly needs no consideration in their construction in the future. This affirmation, however, applies only when the defensive air power is immeasurably superior to that which can be brought against it. The case of a German invasion of Great Britain across the narrow English Channel is different from an invasion across the ocean, since in the former case the invader's air force can operate from land bases. Against some of our foreign possessions an attacking naval force might be able to bring superior air power on carriers; hence, all the old missions of harbor defense apply with full force to them.

In the July–August 1941 issue of Army Ordnance (vol. XXII, No. 127, p. 46) General Hagood gave a 13-point program for coast defense on which $200,000,000 would be spent. There was little to cavil at in this program except that it appears to have been based on the obsolete missions of harbor defenses. For example, General Hagood recommended new harbor defenses in the Houston-Beaumont area of Texas, with special reference to the protection of the oil fields. Beaumont and Houston are inland ports with narrow channels leading to them. No naval force or transports could live for 24 hours in these channels under bombing attack.

This proposal obviously was intended to prevent a sea-borne invasion from capturing the oil fields, since they are not close enough to the coast to be bombarded. Air power not

only has made such an operation impossible but new American defenses closing the gaps into the Caribbean through the Greater and Lesser Antilles will make this sea, through which the Gulf ports of the United States must be approached, a trap which no hostile naval force or transports ever would dare to enter.

The West Indies, if fully exploited to close the Caribbean, furnish complete protection for the American Gulf coast. Not only are no new harbor defenses needed, but those now in existence have little further reason for being maintained. And not only do American defenses along the Antilles protect the Gulf coast, but they also secure the northern shores of Venezuela and Colombia, the Panama Canal, and the eastern coast of Central America and Mexico.

On the other hand, many new seacoast gun installations for the protection of factories and bases from naval bombardment might very well have been recommended. Naval air-patrol stations will be constructed at many new points in continental United States and the Caribbean Sea; since these are for seaplanes and are close to the coast, they are subject to naval bombardment during raids and must have seacoast guns to keep enemy raiders beyond range.

Naval bombardments and raids are much more probable now and will be waged against many objectives that would not have been attacked in the past. International law formerly exercised some control against the bombardment of open towns, even though factories were engaged in producing war materials in them. Bombardments once were restricted, but air warfare now has broken down all scruples. Today any factories or facilities of military value close to the shore are apt to be bombarded from the sea. These will have to be protected along with all new naval shore stations. Thus many new harbor defenses are required, but at different points than commonly visualized. On the other hand, a number of the old harbor defenses constructed for now nonexistent missions do not need modernizing. There is no need to destroy them since their maintenance on a caretaker's status and eventual occupancy in time of war by the National Guard does not represent a serious drain, and they still aid in preventing naval raids.

AIR POWER CAN DEFEND THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Can we depend upon the present ability of air power to provide for certain of the functions of coast defense, or will conditions change so rapidly that air power will not be able to fulfill them in the future? Possibly naval protection against aerial bombing is at its lowest point at the present time. Most naval vessels now in commission were built at a time when aerial bombing was not a serious threat. The result is that they are poorly protected and not very effectively armed against it. Naval protection may improve so greatly that bombing will not remain a serious threat, at least against battleships.

However, even if this takes place, the present relationship between air power and sea power will not be changed. Transports and small naval vessels will continue to be vulnerable, even though they may be better armed in the future. On the other hand, bombing accuracy may improve fast enough to overcome advances in protection. Here again, the present relationship may be modified slightly, but the fundamental factors are not likely to change. The only foreseeable change is that improvement in bombing accuracy and the availability of large numbers of bombing planes may make naval raids less likely, hence there will be a smaller requirement for coast-defense protection against them.

THE BOMBER HAS MADE AMERICA IMPREGNABLE

Air power has not superseded coast defense, but it can perform some of their functions more effectively than guns ever did. On the other hand, the increase in naval air installations on the shore, together with acceptance of bombardment of nonmilitary installations as legitimate targets, makes more harbor defenses necessary for their protection. Any harbor defenses constructed or modernized should take into account the ability of the bombing plane to perform certain of the old missions.

The bomber has made the American coast impregnable to invasion. This is the most important military fact that can be deduced from the European war. If new harbor defenses are to be constructed, let them be built with our eyes on today and tomorrow and not on yesterday.

TWO LESSONS FOR AMERICANS TO PONDER

Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Colonel Phillip's scientific analysis of the ability of America to protect both itself and the Western Hemisphere as the result of the development of the bombing plane deserves the careful study of us all. I hope that both Congress and the country will ponder its conclusions and its recommendations thoughtfully and well. It is written by a man who knows. It is written by a man who cares. It is written by a man who dares to tell the truth. Unless the evidence presented in the foregoing article can be disproved, we Americans should tighten our belts and complete the development of a 100-percent defensive air force for this country without delay.

We need not gamble with fate nor risk our security with wars abroad if we will equip ourselves with sufficient bombing and other war planes, provide fields for their operation, and train pilots for their use. This, today, is the No. 1 job of the United States and neither desire for private profits, strikes for personal privileges or higher wages, sentimental attachments to foreign nations, or the wailing of defeatists who would tell us "it is all of no use—America is helpless to defend itself" should deter us from our job of making this Republic and this hemisphere impregnable.

And while devoting ourselves to the building of these defenses we can continue to make available to our friends across the seas all the supplies not needed for the No. 1 job of self-defense for this half of the world. But as self-defense is the first law of nature we must not permit our sympathies or our zeal to lead us to neglect the development of our own defenses now that science has pointed the way to make us secure and safe. Only through indifference, ignorance, or inattention to our own needs can America really become the helpless and defenseless weakling which some of the war-now speakers and writers would picture it as being.

A second lesson also stands out from Lieutenant Colonel Phillip's treatise and that is that just as American bombers can repel foreign invaders by making the attempt too costly in human lives so, too, can foreign fighting planes, based on foreign shores, be used to slaughter in countless thousands any American expeditionary force which we might send an equal distance across the seas to invade some foreign continent. Only governments which value the lives of their citizens most lightly will attempt transoceanic invasions against land-based fighting and bombing planes in this modern era of the supremacy of aviation in the business of self-defense which is the No. 1 responsibility of any government.

Ships Can Be Built in the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

EXCERPT FROM AN ARTICLE IN THE MARINE JOURNAL

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein a part of an article which appeared in the Marine Journal of June 15, 1941, entitled "Ship Transfer by Drydock." This article sets forth the manner in which ships were built in the Great Lakes during the first World War and their delivery at ocean ports.

It further brings to our attention that there will be a shipping shortage of major proportions, even more acute than during the years 1916, 1917, and 1918, due to the losses through the sinking of vessels in this, the second World War.

The article follows:

[From the Marine Journal of June 15, 1941]

SHIP TRANSFER BY DRYDOCK—FEASIBILITY OF BRINGING SHIPS FROM GREAT LAKES TO TIDEWATER AT THE GULF OF MEXICO ON COMPOSITE BARGE DRYDOCKS, UTILIZING THE CHICAGO DRAINAGE CANAL, ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI RIVERS

(By W. H. Rutland)

If, as history goes, it repeats events of the past, then this country must prepare itself for a shipping shortage of major proportions, even more acute than that which confronted Great Britain and the United States during the years 1916, 1917, and 1918.

In order to partially replace the tonnage sunk, or destroyed, during the World War, it was found that unusual and extraordinary methods of expediency had to be employed. On the Great Lakes there was a reservoir of ships to draw from, but in so doing great obstacles had first to be overcome. Among others, the following may be mentioned:

1. Limitations of length, width, and depth imposed by various locks in the St. Lawrence River, the controlling dimensions of which were and are: Length, 270 feet; breadth, 45 feet; and depth, 14 feet.

2. Insufficient structural strength of lake vessels to withstand the rigors imposed in ocean trades, and, by reason of this fact, it was necessary to reenforce the garboard, bilge, shear, and the deck strakes.

3. The complete outfitting with salt-water equipment, particularly with respect to stern tubes, pumps, seacocks, and bilge piping.

4. There were more than 50 of these lake vessels which were brought to the seaboard during the years 1916, 1917, and 1918 ranging

in length from 225 to 875 feet. Out of this number more than a dozen of lake-type ships had to be cut in half in order to pass through the 270-foot locks intervening between Port Colborne and Montreal. Seven of these "oversize" ships were *A. W. Thompson, Samuel D. Warriner, E. C. Pope, Maruba, Mohawk, Seneca,* and *Inland.*

After arrival at Montreal, or Levis, Quebec, the vessels were rejoined together and outfitted as seagoing ships. In addition to the fifty-odd boats which were taken from the Lakes and subsequently employed in ocean trading, 430 vessels were built on these inland seas during the years 1917 to 1921, both inclusive, for ocean service, to wit:

Name of builder and location	Number of ships	Dead weight tonnage
American Shipbuilding Co.:		
Chicago	27	102, 100
Cleveland	29	109, 550
Detroit	71	273, 650
Lorain	51	195, 200
Superior	44	186, 400
Total	222	808, 100
Globe Shipbuilding Co., Superior	19	71, 450
Great Lakes Engineering Works:		
Ashtabula	26	98, 850
River Rouge	58	225, 550
Total	84	324, 400
Manitowoc Shipbuilding Co., Manitowoc	35	108, 250
McDougal-Duluth Co., Duluth	34	124, 050
Saginaw Shipbuilding Co., Saginaw	18	66, 300
Toledo Shipbuilding Co., Toledo	31	109, 950
Recapitulation	430	1, 612, 500

From the foregoing performance it is apparent that shipbuilding establishments situated on the Great Lakes not only have the capacity to construct vessels in large numbers but also of a size much larger than boats built during the World War period for ocean service.

Pamela Hollingworth

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, early last evening I was overjoyed to receive word by telephone from Joseph E. Hollingworth that his little 5-year-old daughter, Pamela, had been found, alive and well, after being lost for more than a week in the dense forests of New Hampshire. This little child, the daughter of one of my friends and constituents, Mr. Joseph E. Hollingworth, of Lowell and Dunstable, Mass., strayed away from a picnic at White Ledge in the New Hampshire woods a week ago Sunday. Since that time, every foot of the densely wooded White Mountain National Forest has been searched by men of the United States Army, by rangers of the Forest Service, by C. C. C. boys, and by hundreds of Lowell men and boys, friends of the distraught father and mother, all of whom trudged the woods to the point of physical exhaustion to find the little girl. The Red Cross was there with food and first aid. That she was found alive and well was a miracle.

The soldiers from Fort Devens were the first Army men to arrive for the search, sent by General Wilby, of the First Corps Area Headquarters, and by Colonel Smith, the commander at Fort Devens. Men arrived from Portland, Maine, sent by General Terry, head of the Coast Artillery at Boston, and General Garrett, of the Coast Artillery station at Portland, Maine. General Garrett made several visits to the scene of the search and Major Spencer, of the Coast Artillery, was in constant supervision. The spirit of the men was noteworthy. When it was suggested that certain soldiers go back to Portland because their work had been so strenuous they begged to remain and carry on.

One of my purposes in calling this to the attention of the House is to commend the searchers for their untiring efforts, their persistence in the face of an almost universal belief that further search was futile. I visited the locality and saw with my own eyes the efficient, well-organized manner in which the search was conducted. The highest praise is due every man and boy who participated. The United States Army responded quickly and willingly to the request for men, and hundreds of soldiers were kept at the task of combing the woods. The United States Forest Service, under the direction of the forest supervisor of the White Mountain National Forest, deserves much praise and commendation.

The child was found by an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps, a member of camp P-61, of North Haverhill, N. H. While he will undoubtedly receive much credit for finding the little girl, each of his comrades of the C. C. C. should have equal praise, as well as the project superintendent who directed the men.

Equal praise should go to the Army for its efficient and tireless work, and to the forest rangers, under whose direction the search was carried on. It must be remembered that the child was found in a very rough section of the country. It was heavily timbered and covered with deep bush. There were no residences, nor clearings. In some places it was necessary to chop down trees and clear the underbrush in order to carry on the search.

It was the inspiration of a brave father and mother that carried these searchers on to final success. It was the faith the mother and father had that little Pamela was alive—their courage and insistence—that led and spurred the searchers for 8 days to their difficult and constant task. The father told me, "I knew she was alive. She is fearless and intelligent in doing the best for herself in the woods. When found, she said to me, 'Daddy, I have waited for you.'" It proved his faith was well-founded.

I know that my colleagues in Congress feel proud, as I do, that Government agencies have done so well in a humanitarian cause. It is noteworthy.

Casey in the Box—1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

POEM BY MEYER BERGER

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the New York Times of Monday, October 6, 1941:

[From the New York Times of October 6, 1941]

CASEY IN THE BOX—1941

(By Meyer Berger)

The prospects all seemed rosy for the Dodger nine that day.
Four to three the score stood, with one man left to play.
And so, when Sturm died and Rolfe the Red went out,
In the tall weeds in Canarsie you could hear the Dodgers' shout.

A measly few got up to go as screaming rent the air.
The rest were held deep-rooted by fear's gnaw eternal at the human breast.
They thought with only Henrich, Hugh Casey had a cinch.
They could depend on Casey when things stood at the pinch.

There was ease in Casey's manner as he stood there in the box.
There was pride in Casey's bearing, from his cap down to his sox
And when, responding to the cheers, he took up his trousers' sag,
No stranger in the crowd could doubt, he had them in the bag.

Sixty thousand eyes were on him when Casey toed the dirt.
Thirty thousand tongues applauded as he rubbed his Dodger shirt.
Then while the writhing Henrich stood aswaying at the hip,
Contempt gleamed high in Casey's eye. A sneer curled Casey's lip.

And now the leather-covered sphere came hurtling through the air
And Henrich stood awaiting it, with pale and frightened stare.
Close by the trembling Henrich the ball unheeded sped.
"He don't like my style," said Casey. "Strike one!" the umpire said.

From the benches black with people there went up a muffled roar
Like the thunder of dark storm waves on the Coney Island shore.
"Get him!" "Get him, Casey!" shouted someone in the stand.
Hugh Casey smiled with confidence. Hugh Casey raised his hand.

With a smile of kindly charity Great Casey's visage shone.
He stilled the Faithful's screaming. He bade the game go on.
He caught Mickey Owen's signal. Once more the spheroid flew,
But Henrich still ignored it. The umpire bawled, "Strike Two!"

"Yay!" screamed the maddened thousands,
and the echo answered, "Yay!"
But another smile from Casey. He held them
under sway.
They saw his strong jaws tighten. They saw
his muscles strain,
And they knew that Hughie Casey would get
his man again.

Pale as the lily Henrich's lips his teeth were
clenched in hate.
He pounded with cruel violence his bat upon
the plate.
And now Great Casey held the ball, and now
he let it go.
And Brooklyn's air was shattered by the whiff
of Henrich's blow.

But Mickey Owen missed this strike. The
ball rolled far behind,
And Henrich speeded to first base, like Clip-
per on the wind.
Upon the stricken multitude grim melan-
choly perched.
Dark disbelief bowed Hughie's head. It
seemed as if he lurched.

DiMaggio got a single. Keller sent one to
the wall.
Two runs came pounding o'er the dish, and,
oh, this wasn't all,
For Dickey walked and Gordon a resounding
double smashed.
And Dodger fans were sickened. All Dodger
hopes were hashed.

Oh, somewhere north of Harlem the sun is
shining bright,
Bands are playing in the Bronx, and up there
hearts are light.
In Hunts Point men are laughing, on the
Concourse children shout.
But there is no joy in Flatbush. Fate had
knocked their Casey out.

Repeal of the Neutrality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. LARRABEE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM H. LARRABEE

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement, which I have just issued, stating my position on the question of the Neutrality Act:

It is apparent to all persons who consider, without bias or prejudice, the recent developments in the international situation, that the time has come when the Congress of the United States should consider the drastic revision or outright repeal of the so-called Neutrality Act enacted in 1935 in a sincere attempt to prevent the occurrence of incidents which would lead to our involvement in the foreign conflict.

It is further apparent that we cannot, by legislation, govern the actions of foreign conquerors who have set forth on a program of world conquest and who will not hesitate to mark our own Nation as their objective whenever the time shall arrive which they believe to be to their advantage.

In 1935, when this country, endeavoring to remain aloof from Old World differences, partially abandoned its adherence to the century-old doctrine of freedom of the seas, it did so merely to safeguard American neutrality and not as a retreat, in any sense of the word, from our rights under international law.

Under the Constitution of the United States the President is vested with primary authority to conduct our international relations, but in the enactment of the Neutrality Act the Congress provided the President with new instruments intended to aid him in maintaining our neutrality.

The enactment of the Neutrality Act, worthy though its purpose was at the time, has not made us immune from attack or the danger of involvement in the war. Realizing that the struggle of all the democracies in the world against ruthless aggression is also helping to avoid the threat to our own way of living, the United States, by act of Congress known as the Lease Lend Act, adopted the policy of extending all-out aid to those countries who were and are valiantly holding back the hordes of Hitler.

Our purpose in this was not only to keep America out of the war but also to keep the war away from America.

The Lend Lease Act was given full and complete debate in both Houses of Congress before being submitted to a vote, and passed both Houses by an overwhelming majority. Thus again was demonstrated that we rely on the democratic processes for the establishment of our basic policy.

In addition, the Congress has appropriated billions of dollars, not only to arm our Nation for defense against any possible attack but also to extend aid in the form of materials and implements of war to those countries resisting aggression of the dictators.

It should be remembered that under the terms of the Neutrality Act it was made unlawful for any American individual or corporation to loan money or extend credit to any nation at war and also unlawful for any American individual or corporation to sell war materials to any nation at war, except for cash.

Both of these provisions, although still in effect, for all practical purposes are meaningless. It is obvious that the countries who are so seriously in need of assistance in the way of materials and implements of war would have no reason to try to secure them from American individuals or corporations when, as a matter of fact, the American Government itself, through its duly elected representatives, has decreed that our country shall extend them such assistance through the Government itself.

At the time of the first amendment of the Neutrality Act, in February 1936, although I favored the measure in principle, I believed that it would not provide permanent protection. In commenting on the measure at that time I made the following statement:

"The purpose of this law is not to provide permanent neutrality laws for this Nation, but to provide temporary instruments believed sufficient to keep the United States from being drawn into foreign entanglements until such time as Congress, through its properly designated committees, has sufficient opportunity to present sound, permanent plans.

"I have also felt that in the light of existing conditions there is grave danger that we might endanger the neutrality which we seek to maintain by going too far with intended prohibitory measures. I am firm in the belief that there is always danger in too much legislation."

The question at this time—and it is for Congress to decide—is whether or not present conditions make it advisable or desirable to modify or repeal the Neutrality Act.

I feel that the act having been rendered inoperative to a large extent by the enactment of the Lease Lend Act and the remaining provisions serving only as a departure from our rights under international law should be repealed.

I cannot but feel that the restrictions and prohibitions voluntarily put upon American citizens have not kept us from the danger of war, but, on the contrary, in a measure, have tied our hands in the carrying out of a national policy of aiding those to whom we look to keep the war away from our shores.

The Neutrality Act prohibits the arming of our merchant vessels, even for their own protection. The desire to protect ourselves from unprovoked attack is inherent, and I believe that our merchant ships which have been ruthlessly attacked on the high seas, not in combat zones but in purely defensive waters, should be permitted to arm for their own self-defense and protection. That is our right and privilege under international law.

And, after all, it is only reasonable to assert that after we have embarked on a policy of aiding those countries to whom we are furnishing materials of war it is extremely illogical to permit those materials, for which we are spending billions of dollars, to be lost at sea.

For these reasons I feel that our present neutrality laws serve no useful purpose and do not in any way aid us in avoiding the dangers of involvement in the war, and should be speedily repealed.

Double Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

[From the New York Times]

DOUBLE STANDARD

Administration spokesmen have made eloquent statements in the last few weeks against any attempt to include control of wages in price-control legislation. They have argued, as Secretary Morgenthau put it, that while prices should be fixed, wages should not be, because there is "a fundamental difference" between a commodity and personal services—"one is a human being and the other brick and mortar." "In free countries," said Mr. Morgenthau, "labor is not a commodity, human beings are not property, and they should not be treated as such." Leon Henderson, the Federal Price Administrator, supplemented this by declaring that direct control of wages is a device of totalitarian countries.

Those who argue against direct control of wages, even in wartime, can undoubtedly present a strong case, for such an undertaking would be formidable, and full of pitfalls and dangers. But apart from whether or not they are right on this point, it is clear that most administration spokesmen are applying a double standard. For while they harbor such fears of fixing wages, they have no qualms whatever about fixing prices.

The kinds of distinctions they draw are commonly false ones. What the worker has to sell is not himself, as Mr. Morgenthau im-

plies, but his services. That is also primarily what the professional man, farmer, manufacturer or retailer has to sell. Mr. Henderson points out, rightly, that direct wage control implies the right to say what the income of individuals or groups should be; but he fails to point out with equal force that direct price control also implies this right.

Administration spokesmen, in short, have put themselves in the position of saying that what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander. They eloquently expound the voluntary theory of government as applied to workers and just as eloquently support the compulsory theory as applied to manufacturers, retailers, and employers. But the economic system is a closely interdependent organism. We risk strains and eventual disruption if we attempt to keep it half frozen and half free. Whether we elect to choose during the present emergency the voluntary or the compulsory principle, or attempt to find some set of compromise principles in between, we must apply those principles without political discrimination in favor of or against any group.

Progress of the Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, OF NEW YORK

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over station WAGE Monday evening, October 6, 1941:

Men and women of up-State New York, once again it is my privilege to send my weekly transcription to station WAGE. Through the courtesy of the management of this great station I have been able throughout the past 2 months to throw my voice hundreds of miles over this great State. I have been attempting to pass on to my listeners information which comes to me first-hand and which will be of particular interest to the folks back home. At this time I want to thank Mr. William Lane, station manager, and Mr. Jack Curran, program director, for making this time available. The comment I have received in the mails is testimony enough of the widespread attention which this program is receiving. Let me also take this opportunity to thank my listeners.

Last Thursday, along with Vice President WALLACE, several Members of the Senate, and a large number of other Congressmen, I visited Fort Belvoir, Va. The reason for this visit was to examine the equipment and to witness the military maneuvers staged by the soldiers of that camp.

After having seen the most remarkable demonstration it has ever been my privilege to view, I came to some pretty sudden conclusions. The United States, in a year's time, will have one of the finest armies in the world. To some that may seem like a strong statement, but after viewing the careful, painstaking, and intensely thorough preparations that are being made, even in a comparatively small unit like Fort Belvoir, I am of the opinion that this Nation has caught the spirit of the national-defense program.

To begin with, the United States Army has the finest personnel ever gathered together. Although a conglomeration of races and environments, the young men who are answering the call to patriotic duty possess native intelligence, vigor, and determination. All reports that have come to my ears of the softness and flabbiness of our selectees now seem like nonsense after actually seeing these boys go through their routines of training, work, and play.

All members of the official party were conducted to Fort Belvoir from Washington in busses. Upon our arrival there we were escorted by trim-looking officers to the parade grounds where every type of field and antiaircraft gun was drawn up in impressive array. We examined numerous types of machine guns, Garand and Springfield rifles, and large sharp-nosed bullets capable of piercing the armor of tanks. Then there was a new type of mortar with improved sights for hitting targets beyond hills. We found several different sizes of antiaircraft guns capable of keeping airplanes at a high altitude and thereby rendering them harmless, and also those designed to bring down low-flying craft. We saw huge howitzers and looked into their long barrels and marveled at the size shell which they could throw 15 miles. Although it was my hope and prayer that these deadly and ponderous weapons might never be used, at the same time I was inwardly thankful that our Nation is producing them in profuse numbers in order to protect our shores.

The party then moved on to examine a field photography truck. Our group picture was taken, and within an hour this complete unit of multilithing and multigraphing had turned out many photos of us. In time of battle these trucks act as eyewitnesses and preserve important scenes and records.

We also were shown a $7,000 Red Cross ambulance with elaborate modern equipment. There were officers' field cars, giant supply trucks, and a number of small cars called Jeeps used to transport three or four men quickly and easily over rough terrain. After this emergency, as one officer remarked, the public will probably be able to buy these Jeeps at a nominal sum because there will be so many produced.

Most interesting of all the equipment, to me at least, was a large truck with windmill-like arms, antennas, and complicated gadgets for locating airplanes. This particular device, we were told, had saved London from continued severe bombings and had enabled antiaircraft fire to be most effective upon Nazi planes.

Next we were escorted to a cross-country runway where we saw the young soldiers undergoing a stiff test of endurance. They were started out in groups of six and had to run down a long rough hill, then over a row of logs for hurdles They then had to climb several difficult knolls, jump over rocks, scale a wall, cross a difficult stream by swinging like Tarzan across several overhead branches and continuing on over other obstacles. The officer told us that this was a real conditioning experiment and said that the boys were started out in shorts and gym shirts but as time went on and they toughened up they were gradually given more and more equipment until finally they had to make the run with 40-pound packs and rifles. After seeing the way most of the boys took it, I feel sure that they are rapidly getting into fine physical condition.

After this I was shown a large field with hundreds of young men in blue carpentry uniforms busy with hammers and saws assembling temporary sheds and small houses. The officer made it plain that just as soon as they had finished these buildings they would tear them down again and tomorrow another group would come to repeat the same process. Someone made the remark that after several weeks of building and tearing down the boards must look like swiss cheese, but it was all a part of the careful training that these young men are undergoing. I might add that Fort Belvoir is an engineers' replacement center specializing in training the vanguard of a modern army. It is the engineers, as you know, who precede the mechanized divisions, building roads, camps, and constructing bridges for both men and equipment.

One very interesting sight was seeing an Engineer Corps dash down to a stream and in about 5 minutes build a simple foot bridge over which a single column ran at top speed. This same company built a pontoon bridge to carry loads of 20 tons, which would include the lighter tanks and antitank trucks. This last operation was completed in 16 minutes. This is all the more remarkable in a real war if one considers that the engineers almost always do their work under machine-gun and rifle fire.

Our visiting party was then given a treat to Army fare and ate a hearty meal out in the open, waited on by cooking units of the engineers company.

In the afternoon we were given the real treat of the day and what I had been waiting for ever since the defense program started to work. We were escorted to the top of a hill overlooking miles upon miles of flat partially wooded, partially open country. To our rear the company commander, with the aid of a loud speaker, gave a very vivid and play-by-play description of a strangely realistic mock war between the Blue and Red Armies. After a demonstration which showed just how much an Army tank can take, and what punishment its crew will endure, the battle began in earnest. At a spot some 10 miles away we could see the Blue infantry approaching across open fields with their artillery pounding away at the Red defenders. We saw several pill boxes belonging to the Reds surrounded by flame throwers, and after the occupants had surrendered we saw the pill boxes blown high in the air by TNT. On came the Infantry then firing blanks but making the air resound with their fusillade. Then a group of Red tanks rushed into the field and started in the direction of the oncoming soldiers. They were stopped, however, by carefully laid tank mines. However, the Red machine-gun nests were able to hold the charging soldiers at bay for some time, but suddenly a large number of troop transport planes came from the hills beyond the Blue lines and several hundred Blue parachute troops floated down from a low altitude. This was my first sight of "para" troops, and from what I could see the American Army will do the proper thing to train many thousands of these. They landed in a compact group in a nearby field and immediately proceeded to set up machine guns which were also dropped from the planes. However, by that time a Red motorcycle regiment charged from the other side and swooping down upon the field where the paratroops had landed, they immediately proceeded to throw hand grenades with such devastating effect that the Blue paratroops soon surrendered.

The situation, however, was far from encouraging for the Red defenders, because at this point a swarm of Blue tanks had swept across the intervening 10 miles where the Blue infantry had originally started and were bent upon exterminating the remainder of the Red Army and penetrating the remainder of Red territory. Suddenly from behind, scores of antitank cars armed with large guns heretofore described, dashed into battle, and the smoke of their fire was so thick that it was impossible to tell what

damage they were doing. However, as soon as the confusion was over and the smoke had lifted it was found that the Red defenders had been victorious by the very strength of the antitank guns, and the field was strewn with tanks of all sizes put out of order by their penetrating shells.

Upon my return to Washington I felt extremely relieved. If I had had any misgivings about the progress which is being made in the defense program, as far as the Army is concerned at least, they have disappeared. If this progress continues, and if this demonstration of strength is augmented thousands of times, it will grow from several companies into hundreds of divisions. I repeat that in another year the United States will be on a par with any army in the world, providing every part of the Army develops as fast as the engineering replacement center at Fort Belvoir. This great Army and the already powerful Navy reaching out into the waters of both the Atlantic and Pacific will constitute a source of protection to the American people which will secure them against the ruthless aggressors who are today overrunning the continents of Europe and Asia. With the finest manhood in the world trained to use the volume of equipment which only a great industrial nation like the United States can produce, this country will continue to defend her Constitution and her glorious flag against those who would seek to deprive free men and women of the privileges and the liberties which this great Nation has guaranteed them for over 150 years.

The Truth About Oleo Versus Butter Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, since the dairy representatives were here about 2 weeks ago, to confer with Mr. McNutt regarding the oleomargarine standards set by his department much pro and con publicity has been devoted to this all-important subject.

Mr. Ralph E. Ammon, director of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, who is chairman of the United Dairy Committee, representing the entire dairy industry of the United States, has prepared a statement of facts bearing on this controversy. As I pointed out in an address I made here 2 weeks ago the dairy farmers are not attempting to injure the cotton or any other group of farmers. We all know that all the farmers have had to struggle for existence the last dozen years, and that hundreds of thousands lost their homes and their entire life's efforts and are now dependent upon relief or charity. So we do not want to create the impression that if oleomargarine were used, which will naturally replace that much butter, the cotton or any other group of farmers would be better off. Records show that the southern farmers received 100 times as much income from dairy products as they did from cottonseed oil used in oleomargarine.

It is not the southern farmer that is making all this noise and spreading this propaganda, but it comes from the oleo manufacturer that is not interested in any particular group of farmers, but is only interested in the profits that have been huge, but will be enlarged many times if they are permitted to camouflage their product so that it will be almost impossible to distinguish it from the genuine butter derived from the dairy cow.

I ask unanimous consent to include the brief prepared by Mr. Ammon, that I am certain will answer many questions that are not clear to many Members.

The claims made by those favoring this imitation and the answers or explanations thereto follow:

Certain contentions have been set forth by oleo manufacturers in an attempt to convince the public that the dairy industry is wrong in its attitude toward the new standards promulgated for oleomargarine.

The following are some of the contentions offered in defense of the oleo order and oleo propaganda:

1. Contention that the new standard requires oleo "to stand on its own feet."

This contention is exceedingly fallacious.

The new standard permits the manufacturer to use the same size and shape as a pound of butter, to add butter color, to add butter flavor, to use 9,000 U. S. P. units of vitamin A, to add butter itself, and to use benzoate of soda as a preservative.

Each of these, with the exception of the preservative, is an attempt to produce a product that can be sold as butter.

There are other attractive sizes and shapes, other appealing colors, other appetizing flavors.

Oleo could come in a square pound, could be peanut or peach flavor, could be peach or strawberry color. No one could say that any of these would be unappealing.

But any one of them would clearly distinguish oleo from butter. Therein lies the whole battle between butter and oleo. The butter industry wants the two products so made that the consumer can readily distinguish between them by sight and taste. The oleo manufacturer does not want that.

This fact strips from the oleo industry any right to claim persecution. It would be as logical for a horse thief to claim persecution because he isn't freely permitted to steal horses.

2. Contention that oleo is legally an imitation butter. This contention is based on the law of 1886 which legalized the manufacture of oleo.

This contention fails to hold, however, because the same law of 1886 placed a 6-cent tax on yellow oleo to dissuade the manufacturer from imitating the butter color. Obviously, the Congress of 1886 did not intend that oleo should fool the consumer; therefore it expressly penalized the use of butter color.

3. Contention that the new standard is a protection to butter in that it requires correct labeling of oleo.

This is a false contention. When the carton is removed in hotels and restaurants the label disappears.

Secondly, regardless of label, it will be sold to poor people as butter because it looks and tastes like butter.

Thirdly, the label does not tell the consumer all, because it does not state whether the animal fat in oleo comes from the hoofs, the intestines, or the neck of the animal.

4. Contention that oleo is manufactured only for poor people.

The oleo manufacturers have announced a $1,500,000 advertising program in magazines and on the air. Draw your own conclusions.

5. Contention that sale of oleo is a boon to cotton farmers.

In 1939 about one-sixth of the oil going into oleo was imported.

The new standard provides that either animal or vegetable fats may be used in ratio of 1 to 9 or 9 to 1 or anywhere in between. It is possible for the manufacturer to use 90 percent gut fat to 10 percent vegetable fat, and that 10 percent is just as likely to be soybean oil or coconut oil as cottonseed oil.

The records show that in 1939 southern farmers received 100 times as much income from dairy products as they did from cottonseed oil used in oleomargarine.

In many counties of the South the farmer gets nothing from the cottonseed except the free ginning of the cotton. The cotton farmer is not the one who makes the profit from oleo.

This is not a battle between the dairy farmer of the North and the cotton farmer of the South; it is a battle between the dairy farmers of America and the oleo manufacturers of Chicago who would by deception take the dairy farmers' market.

6. Contention that because of the present national-defense crisis we must use a substitute for butter.

Poppycock. There is a storage holding of 200,000,000 pounds of butter in America, an all-time high and 50,000,000 pounds above holdings in the so-called surplus days.

7. Contention that the 6-cent tax is protection against the use of butter color.

This is true at present, but there has been and will be bills offered in Congress to remove this tax. That was a part of the general scheme to follow the enactment of the new standard.

It is obvious that the main purpose of the tax on yellow-colored oleo was to prohibit the color rather than raise money.

There should be a law that straightforwardly prohibits the use of butter color and butter flavor by an imitation product.

8. Contention that the new standard won't hurt the dairy industry.

That is plain bunk. The oleo manufacturers will spend millions in advertising and premiums to replace butter with oleo. They will spend millions to deceive the consumer into thinking that the imitation is just as good as the real thing. Millions of people will be deceived. Three million dairy farmers and their families will be robbed in order to put a few million dollars more profit in pockets already bulging at the expense of the farmer.

9. Contention that fortified oleo is just as good as butter.

Fraudulent propaganda. There is no scientific evidence that synthetic vitamins can replace natural vitamins.

There is evidence that butter contains certain fatty acids essential to growth and not found in vegetable fats. Therefore, replacing butter in the child's diet with an imitation is dangerous to the child's health.

The dairy industry has not objected to the addition of vitamins to oleo; it has objected, however, to the unfounded claim that such fortification makes oleo equal to butter.

10. Contention that unless oleo is sold as imitation butter, it will be difficult to sell it at all.

Correct. Likewise Hitler can sell himself only as a benevolent fuehrer and not as an egotistical despot.

Anything parading under false colors is dangerous to public welfare.

RALPH E. AMMON,
Director, Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture.

The Small Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me at the semiannual convention of Rhode Island State branch of American Federation of Labor, Pawtucket, R. I., on Saturday, October 4, 1941:

A major problem facing the country—one which cannot be talked down or sidetracked—but which must be taken care of now—immediately—is the problem of protecting the small businessman from complete destruction.

Raising this question is not witch chasing or crying wolf. It is a present threat to the future welfare of the Nation.

I get letters and telegrams day in and day out—I have men at my office constantly raising the same problem—their story is far more pathetic even than the plea of the mothers who fear their sons will be sent abroad to war.

The small businessman, because of priorities in necessary products, and the red tape which surrounds the administration of those priorities, finds himself at the end of his rope. The business which he has spent the best part of his life building up and which employs the heads of families who are dependent upon his success for their livelihood, faces complete collapse because he can't get the materials to go on operating or because no effort is made to adapt his shop to defense production.

We had, just a short time ago, the report from the British Embassy, to the effect that while Britain might be using some lend-lease material for the manufacture of articles of commerce for sale in this country and the rest of this hemisphere, it was with the knowledge and consent of our country and because it was felt, as it was expressed at the time, "Britain must be kept a going concern."

A very fine sentiment and deserving, no doubt, of our good wishes. But at the same time we are constantly hammered with the story that we can't have "business as usual" and "gadgets must make way for guns."

What is it going to accomplish for us—as a people—if we are successful in making the Nation an arsenal for democracy and in doing so we keep others alive but do away with little business in America—which is responsible for the vast proportion of our economic life in times of peace.

Rhode Island has diversified industries. Almost all of them fall into the small business class. You can well realize what the result will be if the jewelry industry, in Providence, the pencil, watch case, curtain rod and other items of manufacture can no longer be turned out because the materials for producing them are not available. Unless those shops can be turned into production of defense items they will have to close. And the truth of the matter is they are closing now.

You men represent organized labor. Because of the fact that you work for a living—in this matter you represent every person who lives by the sweat of his brow. And because you do—this problem is yours just as much as it is the operators of this type of business.

You men in the building trades especially, know what is happening to your line of work—particularly in home construction—because of so-called shortage of steel. Yet the facts appear to disprove an actual shortage in this material which not only affects the building trades but many, many small factories and shops throughout the country.

The Office of Production Management has estimated that there will be a need for about 13,000,000 tons of steel in 1942—after our production has been stepped up to full capacity. Even this figure is attacked as being away too high. Under the lend-lease program there is to be shipped out of the country approximately 10,000,000 tons of steel. This brings the total necessary for defense to 23,000,000 tons—and last year, in 1940—we produced 66,932,686 tons. This year we will produce in the neighborhood of 80,000,000 tons, and in 1942 it is believed the output of steel from our mills will reach 90,000,000 tons. Taking the highest estimate made of defense needs in this commodity—there would still be about 77,000,000 tons left for civilian use and that is a good deal more steel than was consumed in the boom year of 1929. Yet, in spite of this apparent plenitude there is proclaimed a shortage, and the flow of this material into civilian channels is stopped.

The question doesn't confine itself to consideration of this fact alone. It has a much broader aspect.

We have seen the picture painted for us in the so-called oil shortage. A shortage that is alleged to exist in spite of the fact that—for one example—during the first 25 days of August 1941 there were 885,000 more barrels of oil brought into Narragansett Bay than during the same period in 1940.

That scare has forced out of work many people who depend on the oil, gas, and home-heating business for a livelihood, and there is no place to absorb that unemployment, because the prospects of more scares and more unemployment is daily growing greater.

If the oil shortage is a phoney, and it develops that the steel shortage is phoney, then how in God's name can we hope to have the faith of the people in an endeavor they are not sold on yet? We hear speeches and appeals for our participation in the present war—participation to a greater extent than the people are willing to have—and at the same time we have the specter of unemployment, bankruptcy, and privations—here amidst plenty.

The answer to our troubles isn't in the curtailment of nondefense spending alone; that is important, yes; but far more important is the job of saving the life of small business and the homes of those who depend on small business for their daily bread.

It may well be that there is a shortage in some strategic materials which are vital to the preparing of our proper defenses, but we have a right to know the facts, and we are not told those facts. We can't be expected to swallow these queer situations, such as the present priorities business, in the name of national defense, while we see huge surpluses piling up, huge surpluses which some day will be thrown in our faces and will force the closing of the industries now producing them—and while we see the continuance of the red tape which clutters up the offices of those who are charged with the administration of defense agencies.

The American people have proven their willingness to sacrifice for their country's welfare; America is worth making sacrifices for. But while we do sacrifice, we have a right to complete honesty, and we have a right to all the evidence. Our home life is disrupted by our boys going off to train for military service; our economic life is being disrupted by the constantly growing army of unemployed and the fears for the future which that army will bring with it.

Before we are asked for anything further we must provide for the future of these businessmen and their employees.

I don't attempt to argue they must continue without any inconvenience at all, but we must guarantee their existence, and if they can't exist, even under reduced operations, then all the foreign wars on earth aren't worth fighting.

The National Preparedness Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR, OF DELAWARE

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of speech delivered by me, Saturday, October 4, before Delaware State Federation of Labor banquet and floor show, Wilmington, Del.:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I want to thank you for inviting me here tonight. It has been a pleasure, and I appreciate the opportunity of helping you close your annual convention. From the proceedings here tonight I would say that it is a fitting climax.

The most important subject before us today is our national preparedness program.

The work that some of you men are doing today is just as important in our national-defense plan as though you were engaged in the defense of your country, particularly those of you who may be occupied directly in the production of critical war materials.

You workers of America have a big stake in the outcome of the present war. Neither business nor labor can ever do business with Hitler. Don't think that freedom of the seas is just a saying. Freedom of the seas or any other freedom means jobs and security. Free labor of America cannot remain free if our raw materials and markets are to be doled out or rationed to us by the Axis overlords.

Labor's outlook in the United States at the moment is bright. Today, for the first time in a dozen years, labor is at the top of the heap. We are in a workers' market. But it won't continue that way if Hitler wins. We all will be reduced to slavery and poverty such as we have never seen before.

Defense employment is increasing rapidly as new defense plants go into production. The aggregate is now in excess of three and one-half million workers, counting those in all stages of the plan. According to the program as now planned, defense output will call for the employment altogether of about 6,000,000 workers not later than the third quarter of next year.

Much defense employment is entirely outside the direct defense industries. Roughly, half of estimated defense employment is in basic industries providing plant, equipment, materials, and parts for defense as well as civilian products.

Latest figures show that aircraft frame, engine, and propeller plants, together with aircraft subcontractors, are already over the 400,000 mark and will probably require another 600,000 workers before the end of 1942.

Ship construction, while not a new industry, but one scheduled for the period of greatest activity in its history, ranks next after ordnance and aircraft in 1942 employment requirements. It is estimated that 625,000 workers will be employed in shipyards next September, while probably even more will be indirectly employed in the production of structural steel shapes, plates, engines, pumps, etc.

We don't want war, and I hope and pray that we will not have to enter the conflict because, as Sherman said, "war is hell." But to a certain extent some of the control of this appears to be getting out of our hands. Hitler and his ruthlessness seems to be the deciding factor. We are being forced to consider his next step whether we want to or not. He and his hordes must be defeated at any cost, if we are to remain a free and democratic Nation. That is why we must help the other countries who are fighting him unless we want to be surrounded by hostile powers. Taking into consideration the turn of events, it would not have been logical to follow previous commitments. Our policy has had to change from day to day to keep pace with the changes being forced on us.

We must share the tax burden unless we want to pay tribute under the Nazi yoke, which I am sure you don't want to do.

While Russia is not to be condoned for her past exploits, I do feel that she deserves consideration in her present struggle against Germany, to the extent that she is fighting Hitler, and I am for anybody or anything which may help to bring about his downfall. I agree that there is little to choose between Germany and Russia, but I feel that Russia is the lesser of two evils. However, I do not intend to imply or suggest that we should accept the "isms" or ideals of the nations fighting Hitler.

The situation is most unpleasant, but we all must subordinate our personal interests to that of our country during our national emergency if we are to survive.

We must realize the heavy responsibility which liberty imposes on those who enjoy it. We must stand for stable government, for the intelligent and unselfish application of those ideas and practices which make for peace, stability, and social advancement. We must have an equally strong determination to avoid the pursuit of onesided, artificial, self-defeating ideas and practices in national and international affairs. This requires sacrifice. Today we are living through a dark period. It is in times like this that each of us needs desperately to hold fast to the faith that is in us—a faith in the destiny of free men and the supreme worth of Christian morality. With that faith we shall gladly meet the sacrifices demanded of us by the harshness of these days. With that faith we cannot lose hope that the lesson which so many of us have learned will be learned by all.

Resolution of Farmers' Union of Jackson County, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY JACKSON COUNTY (OKLA.) FARMERS' UNION, SEPTEMBER 26, 1941

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution 1

Whereas the war in Europe has been in progress for 2 years and has evolved itself into two major groups upon the one hand, those who favor Hitler and fascism domination and controlling the economic and political life of all Europe in the very near future and ultimately in the entire world.

And whereas Hitler's policy had been to take over one nation at a time, assuring the rest of the world he has no further demand to make on any other nation, when in fact just as soon as he got control of one nation he jumped on the next one destroying every vestige of democratic government and setting a complete dictatorship with instructions to court martial and shoot all those who dare oppose leadership. No farm or labor organization or any other organization is allowed to exist that is not 100 percent for Hitler and fascism. This has happened to 10 or 12 little nations of Europe who had tried to stay neutral but were overrun just as soon as Hitler thought best.

While the Farmers' Union is opposed to war, opposed to the cause of war of aggression, we regard Hitler and his cohorts as being solely responsible for the destruction of all the nations he has attacked, killing millions of helpless people, we wholeheartedly join those who pledge themselves to help defeat Hitler and his cold-blooded helpers.

Since England and Russia have plenty of manpower their greatest need is war material and food. We heartily endorse every effort being made to supply the need of those who are doing the fighting. But we are opposed to sending American soldiers to fight on foreign soil.

A. E. BAGWELL,
Blair, Okla., Chairman.
W. W. SNIDER,
Blair, Okla., Secretary.
W. R. HARPER,
Eldorado, Okla.
J. K. SORRELL,
Blair, Okla.
P. H. BESSIRE,
Headrick, Okla.

Honore Provencal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WOONSOCKET (R. I.) CALL

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Woonsocket Call on Wednesday, the 1st day of October 1941, contains a very fine and highly deserving tribute paid to Honore J. Provencal, of Rhode Island, who is a veteran of the last World War and one of the pillars of the American Legion in his home community, for the outstanding courtesies shown to the people generally who visit Washington and the Nation's Capital, and especially to his own people from the State of Rhode Island. Mr. Provencal is highly deserving of this tribute.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein the article contained in the Woonsocket Call, of date Wednesday, October 1, 1941, in which a fine tribute is paid to that fine citizen of Rhode Island, Honore J. Provencal.

[From the Woonsocket (R. I.) Call of October 1, 1941]

HONORE PROVENCAL IS PAID TRIBUTE—GOVERNMENT WORKER LAUDED IN POEM FROM CLERK IN CONGRESS

Praise for the efficient manner in which Honore J. Provencal, a former resident of this city, performs his duties at the Nation's Capital, and for the courtesy he shows visitors from Woonsocket and other Rhode Island communities, is contained in a letter from H. V. Hesselman, clerk of the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the House of Representatives.

Hesselman prepared an acrostic adding to the words of praise contained in his formal letter, and asked that it be published. The communication from the House of Representatives clerk says Provencal "is a frequent visitor in our office and his duties are always extremely pleasant."

The acrostic follows:

HONORE J. PROVENCAL

H-ere's a salute to a Franco-American so true,
O-ne of the Capitol's most useful crew;
N-o one who knows him has aught bad to say
O-f New England's son who's always so gay.
R-hode Island is proud to laud this real man
E-ver so loyal to "Little Rhody's" clan.

J-ust, fair, and equal to all that he meets.

P-leasant amid success or defeats,
R-evels in spreading the sunshine to all.
O-ver the land—kind to great men or small,
V-ictors or losers—what's in a name?
E-ven the humblest receives his acclaim,
N-ever a snub in the life he has planned.
C-hildren or adults—all get a glad hand,
A-nd none justly criticizes—not e'en Walter Winchell—
L-oyal and faithful Honore J. Provencal.

America's Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSSIER BANNER, BOSSIER PARISH, LA.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bossier Banner, official journal for Bossier Parish, La.:

[From the Bossier Banner, Bossier Parish, La.]

AMERICA'S ANSWER

Every free-born, liberty-loving American should find pride in the announcement that a fleet of 338 warships, large and small—part of a $10,000,000,000 drive for a 2-ocean Navy, which is growing mightily daily—has taken up its fighting assignment of maintaining the "freedom of the seas" as defined by the President.

Back of this fleet—already rated by United States naval men as the world's strongest single sea force—were 400,000 men in shipyards working the clock around on all 3 coasts.

Keels of 436 vessels have been laid this year and 213 new vessels have joined the Navy. Since January 1 more than $85,000,000 has been spent in expanding shipyards and the number of ways more than 300 feet in length have been increased from 104 to 127.

In the fleet today are 15 battleships, 6 aircraft carriers, 37 cruisers, 168 destroyers, and 112 submarines. Building are 17 battleships, 12 aircraft carriers, 54 cruisers, 196 destroyers, and 74 submarines.

Two new 35,000-ton battleships, the *North Carolina* and the *Washington*, each mounting nine 16-inch guns in triple turrets, will join the fleet. Four more of the same class are due for completion during 1942 and keels have been laid for four 45,000-tonners. Seven more of 50,000 to 60,000 tons have been authorized.

The total number of naval planes on hand early this year was under 3,000. The immediate goal is something close to 10,000, and the ultimate objective 15,000.

American naval building policy in the past has greatly stressed armor, guns, and cruising range, rather than speed, but the newer ships are believed among the fastest on the seas.

On June 30, 1939, there were only 110,000 men in the United States Navy. This figure has been doubled, and a strength of close to 300,000 is foreseen for mid-1942. It will take a half-million seamen to man the full two-ocean navy.

The Navy's pilot-training program calls for about 6,000 pilots by the end of this year, and eventually about 17,000.

All this (and very much more) is but a gesture of an aroused people as given expression through Mr. Roosevelt and Congress. It means that free America will remain free and that the people of this great Nation have recognized that their inalienable rights are presently being threatened. That's all; but, as once before, it will prove enough to determine the pivotal point of putting down despotism.

National Defense, Aid to Britain, or Money for the 1942 and 1944 Campaigns?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the guise of national defense, aid to Britain, this administration is duplicating the policy which it pursued prior to the 1940 elections and when, back in the 1930's, under the plea of aid to the unemployed, it secured appropriations amounting to billions of dollars, not a little of which was used for the political advancement of the new dealers.

Now, under another name, that of national defense, aid to Britain, another drive for the perpetuation of themselves in power is being carried on by the new dealers.

Will Congress assert itself and save the taxpayers of the Nation from the burden of supplying the New Deal with the funds to carry on its 1942 and 1944 campaigns?

The following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of Monday, October 6, discloses facts which Congress should consider:

[From the Chicago Tribune of October 6, 1941]

WILL CONGRESS ASSERT ITSELF?

The last war, in which we had an A. E. F., cost us $22,000,000,000. The twenty-two billions did not all go for the A. E. F., but also paid for training of troops before they went overseas and for training troops who didn't go over. The twenty-two billions also took care of the equipment which was made, but which was either unusable or not made in time to be employed. The twenty-two billions included the vast sums taken by unscrupulous men out of dubious contracts, harbor appropriations, camp locations, and the many other spoils of war and politics. The twenty-two billions represented the aggregate direct cost of our participation in the World War.

The twenty-two billions which was spent directly on the World War was a sum so vast that it was said a few years ago that "such outpouring of money has never been remotely approached or dreamed of in any country in any period of history."

Now prepare for a surprise. The Roosevelt war-spending program already amounts to $65,000,000,000, including lend-lease. This is roughly three times as much as the whole cost of the last war. While we are still at peace, commitments have been made for an aggregate three times as much as the whole cost of the last war.

The present orgy of spending makes pikers out of the wasters of the World War era. What in heaven's name is the Roosevelt administration up to with its program of $65,000,000,000?

Mr. Chesly Manly, of the Tribune's Washington bureau, analyzed the available figures on costs of equipment for an army of 10,000,000 as a possible clew to the present objective. Mr. Manly found that $20,323,000,000 would be available out of the sixty-five billions for ordnance and other fighting equipment. He found on the basis of War Department estimates that 400 divisions—100 of them motorized—could be equipped for $4,550,000,000. He found that 100 completely equipped armored divisions could be provided for $3,434,000,000. Thus, an army of about seven and one-half million men made up of 400 infantry divisions, 100 of them motorized and 100 armored divisions, would cost $7,984,000,000. This would leave over $12,000,000,000 for reserve equipment and for the cost of equipping 2,000,000 men in an air force.

And the twenty billion to provide for an army of 10,000,000 men would still leave nearly forty-five billions of the Roosevelt program untouched.

Appropriations are made on this fantastic scale with little said about where the money is coming from. As the bills start coming in, the Secretary of the Treasury thinks about that. He first improvised a savings-bond scheme. That hasn't worked. Next, he asked for outrageous taxes on the income of persons and companies which increased some levies by as much as 300 percent besides imposts on consumers goods. Within recent weeks he has been crying out for the socialization of corporate incomes, taxes on workmen under the guise of social security, and finally what he termed "all-out taxation."

The billions were all voted by Congress. Without authorization of the legislative branch of the Government, the Roosevelt administration couldn't spend any money at all. The wanton waste of money has all been provided for by laws approved by both Houses of Congress. It is true that it takes a man of character to oppose a regime when anyone who refuses to be a "yes" man is likely to have his patriotism attacked.

But the legislative branch of the Government has a function to perform, and surely there are some men at the Capitol strong enough to stand up for the right. The President's majority is actually the smallest of his administration. Now that Morgenthau's speeches have shown what the consequences of the reckless waste of funds will be, Congress should be able to pull itself together and do its duty.

The Neutrality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. FRANK B. KEEFE, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech of Hon. FRANK B. KEEFE, of Wisconsin, Mutual network, Friday, October 3:

My fellow Americans, the recent sinking of American-owned merchant ships is constantly referred to by some people as a compelling cause for our active participation in the present European war.

It is unfortunate that newspaper headlines do not always convey the facts. In a period, however, when truth and facts, instead of hysteria and emotion, should control our thinking, it is apparent that some citizens, afraid or unwilling to face the facts, are by their intemperate and intolerant reasoning and utterances, confusing rather than clarifying the issue.

Let us calmly and dispassionately review the facts. On August 31, 1935, the President signed a joint resolution adopted by the Congress providing for the prohibition of the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to nations at war. It prohibited the transportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war by vessels of the United States for the use of nations at war. The world was at peace when it was passed by the Congress and signed by the President. Its passage was the result of the exercise of calm, temperate judgment by the Congress, unaffected by the hysteria and emotionalism generated by war. It had the full approval of the President and was hailed by him as one of the great constructive pieces of legislation in the cause of keeping this Nation at peace.

On May 1, 1937, the President approved a joint resolution amending the Neutrality Act of 1935. This resolution again expressed the will of the Congress and the President and had the overwhelming support of the American people. The resolution of 1937 strengthened the existing neutrality legislation and again prohibited the exports of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to nations found by the President to be at war. It made it unlawful for citizens of the United States to travel on any vessel of a nation at war.

Two successive Congresses thus expressed their determination to prevent the sinking of American ships with loss of American lives by prohibiting them from carrying munitions to nations at war. Twice the President urged the adoption of such legislation and twice he gave it his unqualified approval. This legislation gave notice to the world that the United States intended to maintain its neutrality and stay out of foreign wars.

The American people thought calmly then. They fully realized that as citizens we are constantly compelled to accept restrictions on our personal rights in order that safety and good order might prevail. They knew, for example, that although the Constitution guaranteed the right of free speech, such right did not include the right to yell "Fire" in a crowded theater. They knew that it did not include the right to slander and provoke riots and disorder. They knew and know now that our rights are restricted in many ways in order that we may maintain a well-ordered society. They knew and know now that in case of fire, good citizens do not insist upon driving cars across the fire hose and entering the scene of danger. The American people, still smarting and suffering from the bitter results of the last war, were only too willing to accept some restrictions on their technical, legal rights in order to preserve our neutrality and avoid involvement in foreign war.

It was in this spirit that the Neutrality Acts of 1935 and 1937 were written. From the very nature of things, the neutrality legislation would not be called into action unless a war broke out between foreign states. Congress and the President simply said to our people: "If and when war does break out between other nations, we shall impose restrictions upon American citizens in order that we shall not become involved."

The President referred to the neutrality legislation when he spoke at Chautauqua, N. Y., on August 14, 1936. Listen carefully to his words:

"Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fools' gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality. It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace."

War did break out in Europe. Passions began to flame. Cold logic and solid reason gave way to emotionalism. Hysteria fanned by prejudice and propaganda demanded the immediate repeal of the arms embargo. It was repealed by the Congress after a bitter fight, and the President approved its action on November 4, 1939.

Important changes were thus written into the neutrality law under the stress and strain of existing war conditions. In the Neutrality Act of 1939 it was provided that whenever the President finds that a state of war exists between foreign states, it shall be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any article or material to any state named in the Presidential proclamation. The legislation changed the law which prohibited the sale of arms and munitions to nations at war and adopted the so-called cash-and-carry provisions, permitting states at war to purchase arms and munitions and any other materials provided that title was transferred before leaving our shores, that cash in advance was paid therefor, and that the materials were taken from our shores in foreign vessels. The President was empowered to define combat areas and to prohibit American ships and American citizens from entering such areas.

Thus again, as late as 1939, with the European war in full progress, the Congress and the President approved the principle of denying the right of American ships to enter combat zones and the right to carry arms and munitions or other war materials to nations at war.

The President sent a message to the Congress on September 21, 1939, urging repeal of the arms embargo. He said, among other things, and I quote:

"By the repeal of the embargo the United States will more probably remain at peace than if the law remains as it stands today. I say this because with the repeal of the embargo this Government clearly and definitely will insist that American citizens and American ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zone of conflict. This means less likelihood of incidents and controversies which tend to draw us into conflict as they did in the last World War. There lies the road to peace."

That was the solemn pledge of the President. Let us now examine the subsequent facts. Pursuant to the existing neutrality law, the President proclaimed and defined combat areas and thus prohibited American ships from sailing into those zones. What happened? Ship after ship was transferred with the consent of the United States Maritime Commission to registry under the laws of the little Republic of Panama. By this simple device these ships took down the stars and stripes and unfurled from their mastheads the flag of the Republic of Panama. By this simple device these ships surrendered their status as American vessels. The private corporations operating them, lured by the prospects of great profits to be achieved in the war business, deliberately chose to become subject to the laws of the Republic of Panama. They deliberately succeeded by this subterfuge in evading our neutrality laws. They could now carry war materials directly into zones prohibited to American-flag ships. This deceit and trickery was accomplished with the consent of our Government.

I say to you they are not American ships and they are not entitled to the protection of the United States Government. Their owners or operators elected voluntarily to surrender that protection when they became registered under the flag of the Republic of Panama.

Thus we find that ships owned or operated by private corporations have been transferred to Panamanian registry in order that they might engage in the profitable war trade, the very thing which our neutrality law sought to prevent. It must seem clear to the most casual-minded citizen of the United States that such profits are the fools' gold that the President so bitterly denounced in his Chautauqua address on August 14, 1936, and that such ship operators are the type who now clamor for repeal of our neutrality laws in order that they might further enrich themselves by engaging in the hazardous business of transporting arms and munitions to nations at war.

I say to you, my fellow Americans, that when such ships sail into combat areas where American-flag ships are prohibited from entering, they take their own risk and their sinking is no cause to sacrifice our blood and treasure on the altar of war.

Three of the five ships sunk, namely, the freighters *Montana*, *Sessa*, and *Pink Star*, fall in this class.

The other two ships sunk were the *Robin Moor* and the *Steel Seafarer*. These ships sailed under the American flag. The latter was sunk in the Red Sea 12,000 miles from our shores. It was sailing in an area first designated by the President as a combat zone. It was loaded with war munitions destined for delivery to a nation at war. Under all international law it was subject to capture or sinking. No American life was lost.

The *Robin Moor* was sunk in the South Atlantic. No American life was lost. It was carrying contraband to the Union of South Africa, a nation at war. Again it is conceded that in such circumstances, under international law it sailed at its own risk.

Let me call your attention, however, to the fact that the plain mandate of our neutrality law was definitely violated when these ships were permitted by our Government to sail from our ports loaded with contraband material. Remember, my fellow citizens, that our law strictly prohibits an American-flag ship from carrying war materials to a nation at war.

Are you willing to go to war because of the sinking of these ships? I am confident your answer will be an emphatic "No." I know you feel now as the President felt in 1936 when in discussing this subject, he said:

"If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—'We choose peace'."

Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NATIONAL INDEPENDENT, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time an interesting editorial, which appeared in the September, 1941, issue of the National Independent, New York City, N. Y., George J. Burger, publisher, entitled "Small Business." It is as follows:

[From the National Independent, New York, N. Y., of September 1941]

SMALL BUSINESS

It is becoming increasingly evident that our time-worn and battle-scarred system of small business is today in more dire peril than at any former period of its history. For if the malign forces now working within our Government and in our business structure, too, are not curbed, we are in grave danger of shortly becoming a Nation of a relatively few gigantic corporations, a Nation in which the right of every individual to embark alone upon the seas of economic endeavor will be "deader" than the proverbial "dodo."

This is a fact. It is not an idle chimera. Nor is it unduly alarmist. If you'd rather not take our word for it, don't.

In June it was Thurman Arnold who warned that big business, labor, and the present method of handling priorities, were crushing little business. Again in June, it was P. R. Nehemkis, Jr., of the O. P. M., who predicted that before the end of summer one-third of American industry will be obliged either to change over to munitions making or stop operating entirely. (In this connection it is significant to note that small business, although it has the ability to handle war orders efficiently, is receiving almost none of this business.)

In July it was a prominent member of O. P. M. who said that as many as 5,000 small firms face shut-downs, some ruination. Again in July it was Hugh Johnson, well-known columnist, friend, coworker, and confidant of B. M. Baruch, Chairman of our War Industries Board of World War I, who wrote "this mighty production effort vastly increases monopolistic tendencies, and, if something is not done to control it, will do more to wipe out small individual enterprise and the continuation of competition than anything that has ever happened in this country."

Reason for this state of affairs is not too difficult to find. In the first place there are at present either actual or pending shortages in certain critical raw materials which are necessary components of needed war equipment. Mounting defense orders, for our-

selves, Britain, China, Soviet Russia, and all other nations fighting for the preservation of democracy, are devouring ever greater amounts of these basic materials. Consequently a curtailment in the production of goods, manufactured from these materials, for purposes of civilian consumption has been ordered.

Manufacturers of these goods have, therefore, been forced to forego a great part of the profit necessary to their continuance in existence. To compensate for this loss a new field of endeavor has been opened—the production of goods for war consumption. Profits can be, and are being, had from these operations.

Unfortunately however, to date only a comparative few of these concerns—in almost every case the largest—have received the bulk of this new business. Our smaller firms have received little or none of it. They are being forced to go along as best they can on their reduced production.

Then, too, taxes are steadily spiraling upward, the cost of labor is increasing, and materials for manufacture stand at levels substantially above those of a year ago. Big business, because of its connections, its preferential war orders, and its moneyed backing, is in a good position to withstand the impact of those new conditions. But small business, having been left "in the cold," is definitely, as we have said, in a precarious plight.

Fortunately, there is in our Government, as we have noted elsewhere in this paper, increasing evidence of a new-born interest in the cause of small business. This is even more healthy and heartening when it is recognized that this interest is of a nonpartisan nature. Republicans and Democrats alike have their shoulders to the wheel. That is the way it is. That is the way it should be.

Are We Children?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, are we children, so immature, so lacking in intelligence and courage, that we cannot be told the facts which vitally affect our individual and our national existence?

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The President told us that the "four freedoms" must be carried to the uttermost ends of the earth, by force if necessary. Then he said we must become the ally of Russia, which, as everyone knows, denies freedom of worship and teaches that religion is a fraud; that there is no God.

To soften the people's animosity toward such an alliance, the President last week said that Russia did have freedom of religion. To that statement Bishop Raymond J. Wade, head of the Methodist Detroit area, replied that the President's observations on Russia's religious policies were obviously untrue and utterly misleading.

Yesterday, the President, forced to admit the inaccuracy of his statement that Russia did have freedom of worship, issued another statement, which a Washington paper headlined as follows: "President hopes Soviet will grant religious rights."

Why should the President attempt to deceive us? Most school children know Russia's record of persecution of priests and ministers; of the destruction of churches; of the denial of opportunity to worship.

ON OUR WAY

Returning from a trip to Europe, a writer for the Detroit Free Press, which supports the President's foreign policy, tells us that we must send more than 2,000,000 fighting men across the seas, if we are to accomplish the President's purpose of invading Germany, destroying Hitler.

If that is what the people want; if they are willing to pay the price and offer to the war gods, to the advocates of international trade, a sacrifice of another 2,000,000 or more American men, then so be it. But, until Congress declares war, I shall do everything I can to prevent the sending of another A. E. F. to Europe, while at the same time doing everything possible to aid this country in its national-defense program.

That the President is determined to send an A. E. F. to Europe is shown by his statement on page 45 of Collier's of October 4, where he said that we had pledged our manpower—note that, manpower—to aid Britain, and by his further statement in Collier's of October 11 that:

> It has now become apparent that the very physical security of the United States is at stake. * * * Its physical safety and independence are being threatened.

Obviously, an incorrect statement.

Not a single military expert here or elsewhere believes that statement. Every one has said in no unmistakable terms that Hitler could not successfully invade the United States.

POLITICS INTERFERING WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE

Time and again we have been told that we should forget politics in considering national defense. We should. Since the question of national defense arose, I have had no thought in mind other than what was best for my country. Unfortunately, the administration has persistently played politics with our national-defense program.

The Currier Lumber Co., of Detroit, an open-shop company, was, by governmental agencies, forced into a union. The company told its men to pick a union, join, and it would sign a contract. The men joined the C. I. O. The company signed a written contract. Then the company bid on the construction of homes for defense workers. The company's bid was $979,000, which was $431,000 less than the next lowest bid. The bid was $1,440 per house less than the next lowest bid. The workingmen who buy these houses would have, had Currier's bid been accepted, paid $10 less per month over a period of 12 years for each of these homes.

Although the acceptance of Currier's bid would have meant a saving to the Government of almost half a million dollars and a saving of $1,440 to each individual workingman who purchased a home—and there were several hundred of them—the O. P. M. refused Currier's bid because his workmen did not belong to the A. F. of L.

Can you tie that? All those workingmen denied jobs because they belong to the C. I. O. instead of to the A. F. of L.; the Government cheated out of $431,000 because the workers belong to the C. I. O. instead of the A. F. of L.; the defense workers themselves required to pay $1,440 more for each home because they were members of the C. I. O. instead of the A. F. of L.

It is time the Aegean stables in Washington were cleaned of the Communists, of the politicians, of new dealers, which are infesting them.

Problems of Small Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

LETTER FROM A. P. NONWEILER, OSHKOSH, WIS.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago we called attention to the lamentable situation that is developing in this country with respect to the inability of small manufacturers to remain in business under the present system of priorities and allocation of war business.

We incorporated in those remarks a letter received from Mr. A. P. Nonweiler, of Oshkosh, Wis., a small paint manufacturer, dealing with this subject. In his letter, Mr. Nonweiler very clearly and succinctly pointed out the problem and suggested a remedy. Since that time, considerable comment has been received relative to the suggestions therein contained.

Because we deem the suggestion of Mr. Nonweiler worthy of continued consideration, we are pleased to incorporate in these remarks a subsequent letter under date of September 30, 1941. The letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 30, 1941.

Unfortunately I had to be in Minneapolis during your last visit. I wanted to thank you personally for the prompt efforts you made in behalf of small businessmen. That was a fine thing, Frank, and I want to tell you it has earned the sincere appreciation of all of us. It is indeed heartening to know that it is still possible in these turbulent times to be heard. You certainly function as a representative of your people; and, best of all, you don't lose any time doing it.

As I predicted, already more and more businessmen are becoming conscious of their predicament and are beginning to think. That's a good sign; pretty soon they'll form a group, and with good leadership something will be done. I've talked over my idea with some really intelligent people, and they agree with me on the following points:

The crisis is here now.

The big fellows are getting practically all the business.

The small businessman must have some Government business at once or he'll have to close down.

The Government must fix prices on Government specification materials, and those prices must be figured on a cost basis of a small manufacturer who buys less-than-carload lots. Those prices should be f. o. b. point of production.

I do not believe it is too fantastic to assume that the Government would like all small businessmen to get a just share of defense business. I think we should adopt that premise in our reasoning. It has been argued that if the Government fixed the price of, say, a certain grade of paint, what would be the basis of awarding the business if the price were the same? There are several answers to that, but above all we must keep in mind the major thought, and that is to distribute it on a more equal basis. Truly that is really more important to everyone concerned than the Government giving it all to some low bidder who might even take a loss.

By establishing a price based on a small manufacturers' cost, a fair price is made certain. That is point No. 1. In making the price f. o. b., point of production, it will automatically distribute the business to many localities because of freight-rate advantage. Furthermore, it will eliminate the necessity of burdening transportation by, for example, filling up a freight car with paint from Cleveland, Wilmington, New York, and shipping it to Oshkosh or Green Bay or Madison, when only a truck and a short haul from Oshkosh is required. And by the same token it will eliminate the economic waste of hauling paint from Oshkosh to Chicago when there is a manufacturer in Chicago who can truck it where it is needed. That is point No. 2.

In making the material nearer where it is to be used it will speed up delivery; in distributing the business to more communities it will keep small business intact; and that point alone is worth any means whatever to justify it. It will further serve to enroll thousands of plants in the defense effort, which will result in enormous productive capacity, less liable to disruption or dislocation by strikes, sabotage, transportation shortages, etc. That is point No. 3.

It will still preserve the spirit of free enterprise because there will still be competition, but that competition will be healthy, not vicious or ruinous or calculated to destroy small business. Where, for example, a company is making a product for the Army or Navy which requires a Government specification paint, they should be furnished with a list of approved manufacturers in their district, the price stipulated, and the choice given them to favor any 1 of 5 or 20 with their business.

The big fellow will still get his share, but not more than his share, and prices being figured on the small manufacturer's cost, he will actually make more profit, but that again will be leveled with the application of the tax program.

This plan will work, Frank.

Important as this is, there is still one step that has to be taken first. And it must be taken immediately, regardless of any political anxiety. It is this:

A general decree must be issued immediately to freeze all prices on today's level; that includes all commodities, labor, rents, rates on interest, discount, everything, with this proviso: In each industry, such as steel, automobiles, paint, foods, dairy, drugs, etc., a board to be set up to hear complaints, investigate, and, if just cause exists, to refer to a general board of parity set up by the Government to make adjustments in the light of parity.

There is no use to dwell any longer on what possible horror labor or farmers may express at this idea. It is better to soberly contemplate the terrific maladjustment that will certainly occur if this is not done at once. No sensible person or group can argue against the immediate stability this will provide against the wild uncertainty that will surely follow if this is not done.

I say today's prices should be frozen rather than any other period because as yet the situation is still somewhat in hand, and within reason. If we go back to 1939 or 1940, there are sure to occur losses on inventory which would cause untold hardships.

As a basis of price fixing, take the cost of manufacture of small business and contemplate a small profit of 6 to 10 percent on invested capital, all business with $100,000 or more invested allow 6 percent, and all less than $100,000 allow up to 10 percent, graduated so anyone with $25,000 or less invested can make 10 percent.

If a price-fixing decree of a general nature such as I have outlined above is made immediately, stability will prevail at once, people will realize immediately something has been done, hysteria will vanish, confidence will return, small business will be kept intact, the farmer and laborer will feel secure, and big business will not suffer.

There is no good argument against this that will provide in its place a better solution immediately. Nor will it be any fairer to all concerned.

Talk this over with your colleagues, Frank, and let me know what you think of it. Best regards.

Yours very sincerely,

A. P. NONWEILER CO.
A. P. NONWEILER,
President.

America for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

PETITION OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL DEFENSE LEAGUE OF WOMEN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I insert herewith a copy of the petition being circulated by the Constitutional Defense League of Women:

Petition to the Congress of the United States:

Whereas our Government at Washington is patriotically arming the Nation to repel any attack or invasion by the armed forces of any armed power, it is no less the patriotic duty of the Government to deliver America from the invasion of communism, nazi-ism, or fascism—an invasion which violates our national sovereignty, which insults our citizenship, and which seeks to destroy the Government itself;

Whereas the Communist party of the United States of America, affiliate of the Third Internationale, while pretending that "communism is twentieth-century Americanism," is in reality organized for and dedicated to the overthrow by violence or otherwise of the American system of government;

Whereas investigators have already found substantial evidence that Communists are established in trade unions all over the Nation, voting solidly with Nazis and Fascists on strike questions, forming a powerful sabotage and spy ring ready to act on short notice, and who at this moment are deliberately fomenting discord in the ranks of labor as a means of impeding American rearmament and further undermining the national-defense effort of this country, on which we are spending millions of dollars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respectfully request the Congress of the United States to take such measures and enact such laws as will cover the following resolutions:

We, the undersigned, heartily approve the resolutions herein adopted. They are as follows:

Resolved, That our national-defense program is paramount to all other issues; and therefore be it

Resolved, That all Communists be expelled from the C. I. O. (reported by the Dies committee to number approximately 40,000);

Resolved, That all labor unions with Communist members or officers be expelled from bargaining rights in defense-industry strikes;

Resolved, Expulsion of every Communist, Nazi, or Fascist, and every person who has been active in foreign-controlled political organizations from defense industries;

Resolved, Deportation at the earliest possible moment of aliens, including anyone who is a member of a foreign-controlled political organization;

Resolved, To stop immigration from every country which refuses to take back citizens ordered deported from the United States;

Resolved, Revocation of citizenship of every naturalized citizen who takes part in activities of a foreign controlled political organization.

Name Address

So that all petitions may be presented to Congress at one time in a mighty demonstration of patriotic sentiment, please mail all signed petitions to

CONSTITUTIONAL DEFENSE
LEAGUE OF WOMEN,
Congress Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

For a Revised Ellis Bill—A. V. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE TULSA (OKLA.) TRIBUNE

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in the Tulsa Tribune, of Tulsa, Okla., an editorial that demands the best thought of this Nation with regard to the development of a vast area of the Southwest. Not that I endorse it or decline to endorse it but that others may have the benefit of it, I quote it here in full:

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune]

A decisive step now to insure the speedy construction and use of additional dams on the Grand and White Rivers for national-defense power will do more for a well-balanced future of industry and agriculture in eastern Oklahoma and western Arkansas than a decade of normal developments. The current showing of private utilities that there is a surplus of 58,000 kilowatts in the State is overwhelmed by the testimony of William S.

Knudsen before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives that "I don't believe we will ever have power enough in the United States," and that his 30-year experience as an industrialist convinces him water power is the cheapest. Knudsen knows that "only the savage neglects to cultivate his crops when his stomach is full," and favors the development of the water power in the Arkansas Valley, which means in Oklahoma and Arkansas, for there are no power rivers above the Grand. He knows the national defense needs, and we should follow his counsel and not those who have personal aims to advance.

In the interest of the preparedness program Congressman CLYDE ELLIS, of Arkansas, should consent to changes in his bill proposing the creation of an Arkansas Valley Authority to federalize all the water in this great region. That is a highly controversial subject in western Oklahoma, Kansas, and Colorado, where water is a fixed form of private property for irrigation, and it will take more time than is available now to work out a social and economic program like this in fairness to each State and its people.

It will be better to write a new bill setting up an authority restricted to distributing the power from the new dams. In fact, this is necessary, for Norfork and Denison Dams will soon be producing energy and no method of distribution has been set up. The power that will come from the Markhams Ferry, Fort Gibson, Tenkiller, Bull Shoals, and Table Rock projects when they are built, and, if possible, the power from the State-owned Pensacola Dam should be put into this pool and then national-defense industries should be built here to use it. The lesson of the Pacific Northwest and T. V. A. is that where great power pools are created, industry comes in and remakes the entire region.

Pronouncing the Pacific Northwest a second Ruhr in America, the magazine Business Week, in its issue of August 2, describes in detail how industry has moved to that region, where Bonneville and Grand Coulee dams are being finished. Eleven great metal-reducing and other plants have already gone there. They are to be followed by many fabricating and other smaller plants. Only the creation of a vast surplus of cheap power has made this western development possible, and if you can believe Mr. Knudsen, these expansions have only started in the United States.

The trend to power pools is clearly illustrated by the announcement last week that T. V. A. is to operate the five-dam hydroelectric system of the Aluminum Co. of America on the Little Tennessee River. T. V. A. will not assume ownership but will direct and control their operations and integrate them within its own system of dams "in such a way as to obtain maximum public usefulness." This was not a forced decision but was arrived at by company and T. V. A. studies establishing "that the maximum production of power and maximum flood-control benefits could not be secured by independent operation of the two systems."

That ought to prove that Pensacola and Markhams Ferry and Fort Gibson cannot be operated efficiently independently. It is no secret that when the State instead of the Army engineers built Pensacola, the heart was cut out of flood control. It must be put back in the larger project but it cannot be restored without unified control.

Undoubtedly Oklahoma will stand for Congressman ELLIS' bill if he will modify it. Senator THOMAS in Tulsa Saturday expressed pained surprise that a few Oklahomans were opposing the new dams. Senator LEE and Congressman DISNEY write they are watching the operations of G. R. D. A. closely and are impressed with the arguments for efficient central control of such resources. Congressman NICHOLS frankly favors the pooled control. Such a conservative organization as the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, through its general manager, Russell S. Rhodes, hails the announcement that Markhams Ferry and Fort Gibson will be built in an editorial in the current issue of the Tulsa Spirit. "We have been contending for years that the future of eastern Oklahoma depends upon an abundance of cheap power, whether public or private, for the development of our natural resources," Rhodes writes. "The Cardox Corporation's plant for processing potassium perchlorate, a private enterprise, was located at Claremore primarily because cheap (G. R. D. A.) power was available. One industry often brings another or several complementary enterprises. The long-term outlook for industrializing our part of the State is definitely promising."

But building dams with public money and operating them in the public interest are sometimes two separate and distinct things. At this juncture Congressman ELLIS probably has it within his power to make the changes that will make the plan work. He is wise and he is sincere. We hope he will agree to the revision.

Price Control of Agricultural Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY LOUISIANA FARM COUNCIL

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the question of control of price by artificial means is one that is now giving our people a great deal of concern. At a meeting of the Louisiana Farm Council on August 14, 1941, a resolution was adopted expressing the views of this very representative body and placing the organization on record as being opposed to the establishment of a maximum price or ceiling on agricultural products.

The resolution in question is as follows:

Be it resolved, That the Louisiana Farm Council go on record as being opposed to the establishment of a maximum price, or ceiling, on agricultural products; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to the two Louisiana Senators, and to all of Louisiana's Congressmen.

Louisiana Farm Council: By R. N. Amacker, president, Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation; J. R. Barry, president, Louisiana Sweet Potato Association; J. D. Blanton, president, Louisiana Jersey Cattle Club; Clyde E. Causey, president, Louisiana Poultry Improvement Association; John Doles, chairman, State Agricultural Conservation Committee; Arthur L. Gayle, president, Louisiana Cattlemen's Association; W. F. Giles, president, American Sugar Cane League; R. G. Harmon, President, Louisiana Certified Seed Growers Association; G. S. Harmount, president, Louisiana Potato Growers Association; L. C. Hutchinson, president, Louisiana Pecan Growers Association; W. E. McFatter, president, Southwest Wool Growers Association; Thomas S. Plunket, vice president, American Rice Growers Cooperative Association; G. C. Taylor, president, Louisiana Dairymen's Association; N. C. Williamson, president, Louisiana Cotton Cooperative.

Right Will Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

EDITORIAL WRITTEN BY EDWARD K. SLATER

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, millions of American people, who are largely dependent upon the dairy industry, were shocked and chagrined because of the new standards recently promulgated by the Federal Security Agency in connection with the manufacture and marketing of oleomargarine.

It seems incomprehensible to those interested in preserving and protecting the welfare of the American farmer engaged in the dairy business that the Government should encourage by regulatory action the manufacture and sale of a butter substitute which not only permits but advertises oleomargarine to be manufactured, colored, and sold as butter.

The position of the dairy farmer is most clearly expressed in an editorial written by Mr. Edward K. Slater and published in the October issue of the National Butter and Cheese Journal, entitled "Right Will Triumph."

I esteem it a privilege to be permitted to incorporate this editorial as part of these remarks.

[From the National Butter and Cheese Journal of October 1941]

RIGHT WILL TRIUMPH

Dairymen will win their fight against those who are doing their best to ruin the dairy industry. The high offices of some and the sly maneuvers of others will not save them. Of this we are fully convinced because dairymen are fighting for that which is good, not only for their industry but also for the country. Much confusion prevails now, but the truth will eventually lead honest lawmakers and honest administrators to do what is best for the greatest number of all our people. It may be a long fight, one that will tax the resources of the industry more than anything that has gone before, but it will be worth all its cost to have the issues cleared.

The oleo makers and their aides, in and out of public office, took full advantage of the apathy which has gripped dairy leaders for many years. The latter left the job of protecting their industry against fraud to law enforcement officers and went on their way complacently thinking that all was well. The fight they are now in is the result.

Thirty years ago the consumers of the country were pretty well informed about the oleo industry and its history of fraud and deception. They were in sympathy with the laws governing its production and sale. We say they were in sympathy because otherwise the laws would not have been enacted. Those

were days when Congress reflected the opinions of the voters.

Consumers were informed because for years the fight between the Oleo Trust and the dairymen occupied the attention of each succeeding session of Congress. Now they are not so well informed. Millions of new consumers have come upon the scene and millions of the old have forgotten the reasons why the legislation was enacted. Ignorance of the reasons why oleo is taxed while butter is not is both appalling and widespread.

Many consumers, for instance, can't understand why the butter maker is permitted to use coloring matter in his product while the oleo maker is not unless he pays an additional tax. Just the other day the editor of a great city newspaper, in his efforts to justify coloring oleo yellow, asked "who started using color?" He inferred, of course, that if coloring a food product is wrong the butter maker is more guilty than the oleo maker.

Yes, the butter maker started it, but he didn't use color to make his product look like something else, thereby committing a fraud. He colored it and has continued to color it at certain seasons of the year in order to maintain a uniform color throughout the year. That was, and is, his sole object in using coloring matter. When the oleo maker uses coloring matter he does so in order to make his product look like something else—butter.

If the oleo maker is to be permitted to color his product to simulate butter, flavor it artificially to make it taste and smell like butter, and to fortify it with vitamins to approximate the nutritional value of butter there is nothing left to protect the consumer against fraud and the dairy industry against unfair competition. True, it must be labeled, but the whole history of oleo regulation proves the inadequacy of labeling. Labels are easily removed, and even when retained mean nothing when the product is removed from the package, as it must be before being consumed.

Space does not permit a recital of case records involving fraud in the sale of oleo, but the record is filled with them. The oleo business has, during its entire history, fought to kill or evade legislation to prevent fraud. Makers of oleo have always striven to make it easy for sellers of their product to substitute it for butter. They have always wanted to make it so that it would smell and taste like butter, and look like butter, not oleo.

No maker of butter ever wanted to make his product look like, smell like, and taste like something else.

Yes, dairymen have a fight ahead of them, but it is our firm conviction that right will eventually prevail and that a majority of consumers, now befuddled by shrewd propaganda, will again be in sympathy with adequate legislation to protect them against fraud and the Nation's greatest agricultural industry against unfair competition.

How the Court Martial Works Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. ALLEN W. GULLION

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Maj. Gen. Allen W. Gullion, the Judge Advocate General and the Provost Marshal General, United States Army, before the junior bar conference of the American Bar Association, Indianapolis, Ind., September 28, 1941:

In my own behalf I thank the conference for the very great honor it has done me in asking me to address it. In behalf of the Army I thank the conference for the excellent work it has done through its committee on public information. I am well aware of the time and effort expended by many of your members in acquainting the country with the necessities of national defense. The Army is also grateful for the devotion and energy with which the conference has cooperated with the American Bar Association's committee on national defense, which has performed such splendid service in aiding soldiers and officers of all ranks in the solution of their personal problems.

The scene is Philadelphia and the year is 1776, but the historic event which I shall recall to your minds is not the Declaration of Independence. On this very day, 165 years ago, on September 28, 1776, the new Pennsylvania Constitution directed: "The penal laws as heretofore used shall be reformed by the future legislature of the State as soon as may be and punishments made in some cases less sanguinary, and in general more proportionate to the crimes." That constitutional mandate and the laws soon passed to implement it were the beginning of the reform throughout our country of the provincial criminal codes which, with their barbarities only slightly lessened, we had inherited or assimilated from England.

The year 1776 also marks the adoption for the Army of the United States of the first articles of war—substantially identical with the British articles then in force. Starting with that easily remembered year of independence, we have had in our country 165 years of experience with two separate criminal codes—the military code and the nonmilitary code—which, for convenience and with apologies to the Roman law for any terminological inexactitude, we Army lawyers sometimes call the civil code.

It may throw light on How the Court Martial Works Today if we look for a moment at the criminal nonmilitary codes in England and America as they existed at our point of departure—1776. Then when we examine the court martial today, both as to its procedure and as to sentences it adjudges, we may ascertain whether the military code has lagged too far behind—whether the conventional estimate of the military mind is correct, whether the military mind is too conservative and hidebound to adapt in its service enlightened modern methods of trial and punishment.

In 1776 in England over 200 offenses were punishable by death—among them larceny of 12 pence from a person, poaching, and consorting with a gypsy. Children of tender years were not exempt from capital punishment. In the Royal Services the punishments were, if possible, more severe, and soldiers and sailors were sometimes flogged to death. In the colonies, generally speaking, the assemblies had in many cases softened the English system, but it was still a ferocious code ferociously administered with retribution publicly made that the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1776 and its implementing statutes reformed. That reformation set an example followed sooner or later by the rest of the country.

I shall digress for a moment to pay tribute to the men who, appalled by "man's inhumanity to man," were principally instrumental in that reformation. The father of the humane Pennsylvania codes was William Bradford, attorney general of Pennsylvania, and later Attorney General of the United States. Bradford freely acknowledges the influence of Beccaria and of Montesquieu. Beccaria published his Essay on Crimes and Punishments in 1764. In that essay he clearly stated the principles of punishment which most of us today believe to be true ones. Those principles are: (1) The purpose of punishment is to deter, not to wreak vengeance; (2) deterrence is obtained not by undue severity but by the certainty and promptness of the punishment; and (3) the measure of punishment is the damage to society caused by the crime. Please bear in mind that last principle, "the measure of the punishment is the damage to society caused by the crime." I shall refer to it later in explaining why certain offenses are punished more severely under the military than under the nonmilitary code.

Although some ancient philosophers had similar ideas, Beccaria was influenced by certain eighteenth century French writings, particularly the Persian Letters and the Spirit of the Laws of Baron Montesquieu. I was once a week-end guest at La Brede, near Bordeaux, still the country seat of the Montesquieu family. The old chateau still stood with the baron's enormous study hall unchanged since his death in 1755, the year of the Lisbon earthquake and the building of Dr. Holmes' Wonderful One-Horse Shay. As I saw the dented leather chair in which Montesquieu sat as he dictated his great work to his daughter, Denise, I thought how he had indirectly influenced the reformation of the criminal code and how his views on the separation of powers, known to leading members of the Constitutional Convention, were importantly incorporated in our great charter of 1787.

Eight days before the adoption of the Pennsylvania Constitution Congress enacted new Articles of War, very similar, as I have said, to the contemporary British articles. In 1806 the articles were revised. In 1916, due to the leadership of my distinguished predecessor, Maj. Gen. Enoch H. Crowder, the articles were thoroughly revised and many changes in procedure made, especially with a view to insuring greater protection to the defendant who, in the Army, is always called the "accused." In 1920, following our experience in the first World War, other changes were introduced to guarantee more protection to the accused.

There are three kinds of courts martial—the summary court, the special court, and the general court. The summary court consists of one commissioned officer, the special court of three or more commissioned officers, and the general court of five or more commissioned officers. Punishing power of the two inferior courts, summary and special, is limited by statute, the summary not being empowered to adjudge confinement in excess of 1 month and forfeiture of more than two-thirds of 1 month's pay. The special court may not adjudge confinement in excess of 6 months and forfeiture of more than two-thirds per month pay for 6 months. The punishing power of the general court is usually, by the wording of the article of war denouncing a particular offense, left to the discretion of the court. That apparently unlimited power does not, however, exist. In a few instances the article itself prescribes the punishment for a particular offense. In all other cases the President under authority given him by an article of war has prescribed a table of maximum punishment which may not be exceeded by any court, inferior or general. The punishment of all purely military offenses has thus been restricted to a reasonable maximum by the President. The punishment of nearly all offenses which are denounced by the common law and by nonmilitary codes has been similarly limited by the President. In the rare event that an offense is committed which is not covered by the President's limit of punishment order the punishment may not exceed that fixed as a maximum for that offense by the United States Penal Code or the Criminal Code for the District of Columbia. The sentence of no court martial has validity until it has been approved by the officer appointing the court.

The sentences of all general courts martial are, as I shall explain a little later on, subject to a series of reviews and approvals or disapprovals in which the record of trial is examined not only to determine its legal sufficiency but also to insure that no sentence of unnecessary harshness is finally executed.

I shall take a general court-martial case and trace it from its beginning, that is, from the time of the commission of the offense to the time of the last review and final action in the War Department or in some cases by the President. Let us assume that the offense is the willful disobedience of the lawful order of a commissioned officer. And here let me revert to Beccaria's third principle, namely, "the measure of the punishment is the damage to society caused by the crime." Here, of course, we should read in place of the word "society" the words "discipline and efficiency of the Army and indirectly the defense of the country." Forgive the cliché but an Army without discipline is a mob and discipline cannot exist unless all lawful orders are accorded implicit and immediate obedience. This is true in peacetime; it is all the more true today when a grave public emergency exists. If in times like these willful disobedience is not sternly dealt with, it will be difficult to obtain from a command that unquestioning and instant obedience so necessary to success in battle. Let us now take the case of a private who has willfully disobeyed the orders of his battery commander and who after having been allowed a cooling-off period of 24 hours persists in his flagrant disobedience. The case against him is started by the writing out of a formal charge supported by formal specifications reciting the details of each instance of disobedience. These charges and specifications must be signed and sworn to by a person subject to military law. This is the first of the safeguards against unfounded accusations. The papers containing the charges and specifications, after having been sworn to, are then transmitted to the accused's commanding officer, normally his colonel. The colonel may investigate the case himself or he may refer it to a lieutenant colonel or some other officer, usually a field officer, for a thorough and impartial investigation. In that investigation the accused is present, is confronted by the witnesses against him, and is shown any documentary evidence against him. He may cross-examine the accusing witnesses and he may introduce witnesses in his own behalf. He is carefully warned of his rights, namely, that he is at liberty to make or not to make a statement as he pleases, but that if he makes a statement it may be used against him. At the close of the investigation the investigating officer makes a formal report in writing, summarizing the evidence for and against the accused and recommending trial or other disposition of the case. When the report of investigation is laid before the colonel he may decide that the case is unfounded, in which event so far as the accused is concerned, the case is closed, or the colonel may decide that the matter may be disposed of by a heart to heart talk with the accused, or by what is called summary punishment, that is, restriction of privileges or imposition of extra fatigue. The accused may, if he so desires, refuse to accept summary punishment and demand a trial. Or the colonel may decide that the case should be sent to a special or a general court martial. Suppose the colonel decides upon a general court martial. In that event he transmits the charges, specifications, report of investigation, and his recommendation to the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction, normally the major general commanding the division or similar unit. Up to this point the procedure under the military code is roughly analogous to the finding of a true bill by a grand jury, but it is readily seen that the military investigation prior to trial by a general court martial is much fairer to the accused than the ex parte showing made by a State's attorney to a grand jury in the absence of the accused or defendant.

When the charges and related papers reach the major general or other officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction they must under the law be referred by that authority to his staff judge advocate, a trained military lawyer, for consideration and advice. The staff judge advocate is not a prosecutor but an impartial reviewer of the charges and the expected evidence. The staff judge advocate submits a written report to the general recommending trial, dropping of the charges, or other disposition of the case. Normally the general accepts the recommendation of his staff judge advocate. Let us suppose that trial is recommended. Thereupon all the papers are referred for trial to the trial judge advocate of a general court martial, consisting, as I have told you, of five or more commissioned officers. For each such court there are appointed a trial judge advocate and an assistant trial judge advocate, a defense counsel and an assistant defense counsel. The defense counsel serve the accused at no expense to him. The duty of the defense counsel is to defend, by all legitimate methods known to the law, any accused ordered for trial before their court. The accused is furnished with a copy of the charges and specifications, upon which he may not be tried until after 5 days have elapsed, unless he consents. He is informed of his right to be defended by the regularly appointed defense counsel and that he may if he so desires employ civilian counsel, in which event the military defense counsel may be excused or serve as assistant counsel as he may elect. He may request additional military counsel and his request will be granted if practicable. All proceedings of the trial are stenographically reported and transcribed and a carbon copy of the record furnished the accused, without cost to him. In the course of the trial every safeguard which a defendant has in nonmilitary trials is afforded the accused and the rules of evidence are applied as they are in nonmilitary courts. In order to prevent junior members of the court from being influenced by the senior members, voting on the question of guilt or innocence and on the question of the sentence is by secret written ballot. Two-thirds of the members of the court must concur in a finding of guilty, otherwise a finding of not guilty is rendered. Here there may be less protection than a civilian defendant has before a trial jury where all 12 members must concur in a finding of guilty. On the other hand, there is no such thing as a hung jury in the case of a general court martial. It may not be inappropriate to point out that the members of the average general court martial are certainly superior in education and probably superior in intelligence to the members of the average jury. They should, therefore, be less subject to prejudice and less subject to an oratorical appeal, whether it come from the trial judge advocate or defendant's counsel.

We in the Army believe that while a guilty man has less chance of acquittal before a general court martial than he has in the hands of a trial jury, an innocent man on the other hand is less apt to be convicted by a general court martial than he is by a jury. When the record of trial is transcribed it is read and subscribed by the president of the court and trial judge advocate and then transmitted to the appointing authority who ordered the trial, or his successor in command. Before the appointing authority takes action he requires his staff judge advocate to submit to him a thorough written review. In that review the evidence for and against the accused is analyzed. The effect of errors, if any, is considered and if any error, considering the record as a whole, has substantially prejudiced the rights of the accused, the staff judge advocate recommends that the finding be disapproved. The staff judge advocate also makes a recommendation whether the sentence should be reduced. If, following the report of his staff judge advocate the appointing authority does not disapprove the finding, the record is transmitted to the Office of the Judge Advocate General in Washington. There at least two officers make an independent review of every record in which dishonorable discharge has been suspended. In the more serious cases in which dishonorable discharge is not suspended or in which a penitentiary is designated as the place of confinement, the record is read by a statutory board of review of three officers who make a careful, written review and submit it to the Judge Advocate General. All cases involving general officers, or the dismissal of an officer or cadet, or the suspension of a cadet, or involving the death penalty are submitted to the Secretary of War and the President. Any important case may be so submitted. All of these reviews (the entire appellate procedure) are automatic and cost the accused soldier not 1 penny. Since the present Judge Advocate General has been in office a systematic and successful effort has been made to harmonize and make uniform general court-martial punishments for approximately similar offenses arising throughout all our general court-martial jurisdictions, at present numbering about 100. A board of officers brings to the attention of the Judge Advocate General any sentence which seems unduly harsh or out of line with that customarily applied in other jurisdictions. If the Judge Advocate General agrees with that view of the sentence he sometimes writes to the officer who exercised general court-martial jurisdiction over the case, normally the major general of the division or similar organization, and suggests a reduction in the sentence. When this action is not effective, or if the need for immediate action is plain, the Judge Advocate General in cooperation with The Adjutant General takes the matter up with the Secretary of War or the Under Secretary of War with a view to having orders issued reducing the sentence to a proper limit. Mr. James V. Bennett, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, who has been very helpful to the present Judge Advocate General in the latter's effort to harmonize all sentences, wherever practicable and to prevent the execution of harsh sentences, informs me that so far as he knows the Army affords the only example in American jurisprudence of effective procedure whereby sentences for approximately similar offenses are made reasonably uniform.

The problem of administering military justice lies not so much in preventing undue punishment as it does in preventing unnecessary trials. Reviewing authorities may and do, as we have seen, reduce excessive sentences, but it is the company commander who has most to do with reducing the number of trials for he is usually the first officer to whom knowledge comes of misconduct on the part of his men. He it is, therefore, who has most to do with whether an offender shall be tried. It is largely a question of personality and leadership. An alert, sympathetic, and firm company commander can control his men except in rare cases without preferring charges. As a rule, the best companies have the fewest trials. Ready resort to the court martial as an aid to discipline too often means laziness or inefficiency on the part of the company commander. Under the leadership of Secretary Stimson and General Marshall the Army today has the lowest peacetime court-martial rate in its history. On October 20, 1940, General Marshall addressed the Army, saying, among other things:

"The task * * * before us is the expeditious development of a unified, efficient fighting force of citizen-soldiers.

"The Army of the United States, keenly aware of its great responsibility, assumes this task as a profound privilege.

"First in importance will be the development of a high morale and the building of a sound discipline, based on wise leadership and a spirit of mutual cooperation throughout all ranks. Morale, engendered by thoughtful consideration for officers and enlisted men by their commanders will produce a cheerful and understanding subordination of the individual to the good of the team. This is the essence of the American standard of discipline, and it is a primary responsibility of leaders to develop and maintain such a standard."

At the same time the Judge Advocate General circularized all judge advocates as follows:

"In view of the rapid expansion of the Army, I am most solicitous that no case be recommended for trial by general court martial until it has had the most careful consideration of all facts involved, including the nature of the offense, moral and psychological factors, and the salvage value of the offender. I am confident that the exercise by staff judge advocates of imagination, humanity, and sound judgment, with attention to technical details only in cases in which law and justice demand it, will greatly assist in obtaining results which attest the wisdom of Congress in adopting selective service as a peacetime method of personnel procurement."

There has been an encouraging drop in the rate of all three kinds of courts martial in the last 10 years. In 1931, twenty-eight out of every thousand enlisted men were tried by a general court martial. When the present Judge Advocate General took office 4 years ago, sixteen men out of every thousand were tried by a general court martial. For the fiscal year ending last June only four and one-half per thousand were so tried. When the curve was plotted showing the general court-martial rate, it was feared that the decrease in trials by general courts martial would be offset by an increase in the number of trials by the inferior courts, but the curves for the special and the summary courts had fallen in lines roughly paralleling the descent in the general court-martial rate. In 1931, forty-six out of every thousand men were tried by special court. Last fiscal year only thirteen out of every thousand were so tried. In 1931, one hundred and five men out of every thousand were tried by a summary court. Last fiscal year only thirty-one out of every thousand were so tried. When you compare the present court-martial rate with that in President Cleveland's time, the result is amazing. In his first annual message to Congress on December 8, 1885, Mr. Cleveland reported that the Army numbered 24,705 enlisted men and that there had been 14,179 trials by all forms of court martial during the preceding fiscal year. Of course, some men had been tried more than once, but as Mr. Cleveland pointed out, probably over one-half the Army had been tried, the percentage being 57 percent. Last year the percentage was 4.85, but we are not satisfied with that. Four and eighty-five one-hundredths men out of every hundred tried by some form of court martial is not good enough, and we are constantly working to better it. The most vexatious problem arises out of petty thievery. Because of the close community in which soldiers live in barracks and in camps with no way of protecting their property at all times a petty thief disturbs harmony, causes mutual distrust, and breaks up the teamwork necessary to the success of a company in peace or in war. There is an old Army saying, "There is no place in the Army for a petty thief." So until recently the almost invariable custom has been to try by a general court martial all cases of prima facie petty thievery and to adjudge dishonorable discharge in the event of conviction. Dishonorable discharge for stealing brands a boy for life. So many distressing cases came to the attention of The Judge Advocate General that he recently circularized all staff judge advocates on the subject, saying among other things:

"Often a company commander may dispose of a case without trial or trial may be had by inferior court when the circumstances indicate that the taking of property was due to impulse or sudden temptation. The company commander should try to determine whether the taking was the act of a real thief or an unpremeditated act in disregard of property rights, unfortunately not very uncommon in youth. Such cases offer an opportunity for the company commander to exercise discrimination and true leadership to the end that the self-respect of the soldiers and military manpower may be preserved."

In the remarkable series of lectures on the common law which Oliver Wendell Holmes delivered at the Lowell Institute at Boston over 60 years ago, he restated the three theories of punishment, retribution, reformation, deterrence. He showed very clearly that he leaned to the theory of deterrence. Reformation may in some cases be worked by punishment. In its disciplinary barracks the Army employs psychiatry and other methods of modern penology, but in my view there is a point very soon reached beyond which further confinement ruins rather than mends a boy. I have never been able to understand, much less follow, Hegel, protagonist of the retribution theory, and my brain whirls when I try to unravel his cryptic statement: "Wrong being the negation of right, punishment is the negation of that negation, or retribution." Anyhow, retribution, like its analog vengeance, may well be left to the Lord, who has an emphatically laid claim to it. The Army will probably never reach the high plane of Clarence Darrow and proceed upon the theory that punishment does not deter. So the Army will continue in its effort to avoid trials wherever possible and to hold punishment down to that minimum which seems adequate to deter.

But should we go to war, there will be instances where severe sentences may be adjudged for purely military offenses. Those sentences will be reviewed by my successor—for I expect soon to be relieved, and devote my entire time to the office of provost marshal general—and reviewed by the Secretary or Under Secretary. If such sentences after review and final action still seem severe, I trust the country will realize that in the considered judgment of humane and sympathetic men the sentences were measured by the damage to military discipline and efficiency and to the safety of the country and were regarded as necessary.

Progress and Problems in Highway Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN M. CARMODY, FEDERAL WORKS ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address prepared by Federal Works Administrator John M. Carmody for delivery on September 29, 1941, before the annual convention of the American Association of State Highway Officials at Detroit, Mich. Because of illness, Mr. Carmody was unable to attend the convention and deliver his address in person, and it was read by Mr. H. S. Fairbank, Chief of the Division of Information of the Public Roads Administration.

Mr. Carmody's address follows:

My first appearance before this association occurred 2 years ago. Then I felt somewhat like a stranger among you. As Administrator of the newly created Federal Works Agency, I had been given supervision of the Public Roads Administration only about 3 months earlier.

For more than 2 years now, I have worked with you through the Public Roads Administration. I have seen highway construction under the Federal-aid plan progress in an orderly manner and at a rapid rate. The 11,724 miles of Federal-aid highways completed during the past fiscal year by the State highway departments represent an increase over the work of the previous year.

I have also seen the State highway departments respond to the exigencies of the defense program as completely as available funds and the limitations of the law would permit.

By the end of August, construction of 186 miles of access roads and elimination of 13 grade crossings on access roads had been approved under the Federal-aid highway program, and much of the work was under way. Surveys also have been authorized or engineering supervision is being supplied on over 1,450 miles of access road. This work is scattered over about three-fourths of the States and is to cost nearly sixteen and one-fourth million dollars, of which nearly nine million will be paid from Federal-aid funds.

A marked upswing in volume of work on the 78,000-mile strategic network of highways of military importance also is evident. By the end of August, Federal-aid projects completed during the fiscal year, under construction or approved for construction, included 4,298 miles of highway and 145 grade-crossing eliminations. This work is estimated to cost $172,505,000, of which $95,289,300 is to be paid with Federal-aid funds. An additional 1,500 miles to cost about $64,000,000 is programmed.

So I come before you this year not as a stranger but as one thoroughly acquainted with your work and deeply gratified with the cooperation between the Federal Works Agency (through its Public Roads Administration) and the State highway departments. I might add that I wish all my dealings as Administrator of the Federal Works Agency functioned as smoothly as those with the State highway departments.

So much for the past. Now about the future.

The apportionment of Federal-aid road funds for the fiscal year beginning next July 1 will be made in December. I am sure we can count on your continued cooperation in spending funds made available for the Federal-aid system to a desirable extent for the strengthening of weak links in the strategic system. After all, these roads are your main highways. All improvements will be serviceable in the future as well as in the present national emergency. But, above all, I am sure that you of the States, no less than we of the Federal Government, welcome the opportunity to be of service to our country at this critical time. I predict that next fall it will be possible to point with still greater pride to our accomplishments in reconditioning the strategic network.

I do not need to enumerate the weaknesses that exist in the roads of principal military importance. You are already thoroughly familiar with them. You also have a realistic

understanding of the enormous size of the reconditioning job. You know that even the best you can do with the money that will be available will still leave a large amount yet undone. But I am sure I speak for you as well as the Public Roads Administration when I say we will do our utmost during the coming year to fit the important highways of the country for the heavier duty that will be put upon them.

As for access roads to military and naval reservations and defense industries, legislation authorizing special funds is now before Congress. It seems reasonably certain that money will be provided to meet the urgent needs for these special roads.

Thanks to the 1940 authorization to use Federal-aid funds in making engineering surveys of defense roads and to the close cooperation of the State highway departments and the Public Roads Administration in this survey work, we are ready to begin access-road construction almost immediately after funds are made available. And thanks to the insistent effort of the Public Roads Administration the necessary machinery for obtaining preference ratings for defense highway work is in good order.

Funds would have to be made available in impossible proportions to finance all the highway construction that has been proposed in the name of defense. Demands of the cities are particularly heavy. We do not question the need for these improvements. We simply know there is no prospect that such an extensive program can be undertaken at the present time.

But we are glad the metropolitan areas are thinking about their needs. We even hope they will carry their thinking to the point of definite planning for the necessary improvements.

In the Federal Works Agency, we want to do everything that is possible to promote the accumulation of advance plans for future construction projects by States and local governments. Among other projects, we have in mind the advance planning of the highways of tomorrow, and the agencies best qualified to perfect such plans are those that are represented in this convention. The need for immediate planning of post-war improvement of an interregional system has been generally acknowledged.

Congress has given definite expression of its approval of advance planning of the kind of improvements that are proposed. Legislation now pending would provide $10,000,000 for expenditure through the Public Roads Administration in cooperation with the State highway departments to accelerate this planning work.

The President recommended advance planning work of this type at least as early as January 1941. At one time or another he has said of these advance-planning activities:

"* * * It is very wise for us to establish a reservoir of post-defense projects to help absorb labor that later will be released by defense industry. * * *

"* * * If projects are to be ready at hand for rapid inauguration in times of need, the surveys and investigations, the engineering plans and specifications must be prepared in advance. * * * The planning * * * fund * * * would make available a shelf of useful projects without in any way committing the Government to the immediate construction of such works."

In our report, Highways for the National Defense, made last February at the President's request, we called for a $12,000,000 appropriation for advance planning of important highways, "including the extensions of the system into and through municipalities and metropolitan areas." All other funds listed in the report were recommended for financing immediate construction of defense roads.

The conception of an interregional system of main highways has developed since 1935. By that time the pioneer road job of "getting the traffic out of the mud" had been completed. State highway departments and local authorities had surfaced about a million miles of road in 20 years' time.

That was a large accomplishment, but it rather suddenly became inadequate. The Public Roads Administration reported in 1928:

"The design of motor vehicles has been so perfected that speed considerably in excess of former possibilities can be attained without increase of hazard so far as the vehicles themselves are concerned."

So you began a section-by-section adaptation of the old roads to the faster vehicles. But the real problem was to select out of the million miles of surfaced road the highways carrying large volumes of swiftly moving traffic between main population centers, and to modernize this network consistently as a whole in the shortest possible time.

The Public Roads Administration took the first step in 1935 by inviting the State highway departments to join in State-wide highway planning surveys. These State-by-State surveys were to provide the factual foundation for a general highway program for the States and the Nation.

May I interject at this point one comment about these planning surveys? This work you are now doing—your traffic counts, your studies of highway capacities, your research on the life of roads—all this is going to be of the greatest importance in convincing the public that your plans for the highways of tomorrow are sound and that you have developed your plans in a businesslike way.

The public must be convinced of this, because the projects you plan are going to be exceedingly costly. You have the job of convincing the public that the improvements are needed on the scale you plan them, and that the large expenditures are justified. Your highway planning surveys will provide the facts for this educational work.

Shortly after the highway planning surveys got under way, President Roosevelt gave the movement for a modernized network of highways additional impetus when he expressed his interest in the development of a system of interregional routes. In a preliminary conference on the subject in 1938, he personally roughed out on an outline map of the United States his general conception of a network of such highways.

The Federal Highway Act of 1938 carried the evolution of the idea of an interregional system a step further, as you will recall. It directed the Public Roads Administration to investigate and report to Congress on the feasibility of building and operating as toll roads not exceeding six superhighways, three spanning the country from coast to coast and three from north to south.

On the basis of the wealth of basic data which you obtained through the highway planning surveys, the Public Roads Administration concluded that the financing of such a system of roads by means of tolls would not be feasible.

You are familiar with the alternative recommendation—"a master plan for free highway development," including:

"The construction of a special, tentatively defined system of direct interregional highways with all necessary connections through and around cities, designed to meet the requirements of the national defense in time of war and the needs of a growing peacetime traffic of longer range."

The President gave renewed expression of his interest last April when he appointed a national interregional highway committee to review existing data and surveys and outline and recommend a limited system of national highways designed to provide a basis for improved interregional transportation. To members of the committee he expressed the hope that as a result of their recommendations it would be possible to prepare detailed plans and specifications and permit, upon the conclusion of the defense program, a productive utilization of some of the manpower and industrial capacity then available to construct a national system of interregional highways.

The membership of the committee includes Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads; G. Donald Kennedy, Michigan State Highway Commissioner; Bibb Graves, former Governor of Alabama; C. H. Purcell, California State Highway Engineer; Frederic A. Delano, Chairman, National Resources Planning Board; Harland Bartholomew, city planner, St. Louis, Mo.; and Rexford G. Tugwell, Governor General of Puerto Rico.

This committee has before it the great mass of factual data on highway conditions and use collected by the State highway departments and the Public Roads Administration. Its conclusions and recommendations will establish a basis for the detailed planning of these most important of all highway facilities.

As you know, the big job in building an interregional system will be at the approaches to and the routes through cities. And the main handicap in making highway improvements in these urban areas is the high cost of right-of-way.

The extension of an interregional system through cities is further complicated by the necessity of complimentary improvement of all express highways radiating from a city. The main highways carrying an interregional system through a city would otherwise soon be overloaded by traffic attracted to its improvements, and the city would develop outward along the interregional routes faster than would be economical.

And this leads to another thought regarding the influence of highway improvements on the growth of a city. In the development of an interregional system, city, State, and Federal highway authorities have a new responsibility—to take counsel with all other agencies that will have a part in determining the future development of the cities before deciding definitely upon the location and routing of the major highways in order that there may be assurance of a proper harmony between the various development plans.

Provision of off-street parking facilities is an unavoidable step in solving congestion problems on main city arteries. Until now we have been building transportation lines with almost no thought of terminal facilities. Places for vehicles to stop are just as much a part of the transportation problem as the highways on which vehicles move. The numerous difficulties that have prevented a more ample provision of vehicle terminals deserve your serious consideration.

These and other complicated problems in developing an interregional system in urban areas call for close cooperation between city, State, and Federal Governments.

But the most important job of all is to lay the idea before the public. The public must understand the problem, the logic and practicability of the solution, and the necessity for the expenditures that will have to be made to create a satisfactory and adequate interregional system of main highways.

There is your job:

One, the educating of the public to accept the bold strokes necessary in developing an interregional system.

Two, the planning of the system now so that when men and time are available for construction, projects will be ready to go.

And three, immediate action to meet the requirements of the present emergency—that is, constructing access roads and strengthening the strategic system as rapidly as Federal-aid and special funds are made available, and working increasingly on the terminal or parking problem.

A Free and Courageous Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

EDITORIAL WRITTEN BY WILLIAM J. McHALE, OF THE CHILTON (WIS.) TIMES-JOURNAL

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, during the past week the people of America observed National Newspaper Week, and well-earned tribute was paid to the great rank and file of the newspapers of this country, who, in these days of stress and emotion, are maintaining the finest attributes of a great, free American press.

In the newspaper field the weekly paper published in small communities throughout the country plays a most potent and important part in presenting to the American people the truth.

Many editors of small papers are making an outstanding contribution to American welfare by their courageous and unerring presentation of facts to the American reading public. One of the outstanding such editors is the Honorable William J. McHale, editor of the Chilton Times-Journal, published at Chilton, Wis., in the district which I have the honor to represent.

Under date of Thursday, October 2, Mr. McHale wrote and published an editorial entitled "A Free and Courageous Press." This editorial should be read, not only by Members of Congress but by people throughout the country, because of the courageous, clear, and outstanding contribution that it makes toward the preservation of a free and untrammeled press in America.

It affords me distinctive pleasure to incorporate this editorial as part of these remarks:

[From the Chilton (Wis.) Times-Journal of October 2, 1941]

A FREE AND COURAGEOUS PRESS

Scarcely a week passes that we do not find in one or more of the weekly newspapers that come to our desk some caustic criticism of the policies of the Chicago Tribune. Now, we did not sit down to write this little piece with any idea of championing the cause of the Chicago Tribune. It does not need championing from this puny source. Since, however, this is being observed as National Newspaper Week, it strikes us as an appropriate theme for comment.

To begin with, we have observed that some of the soundest thinkers we know—men whose Americanism is as unchallengeable as that of Washington himself—read the Tribune and other periodicals that are fearless and forthright. They read them to be sure they get both sides of controversial issues. They know they can get the Government side in full measure from the speeches and comment of Government leaders, and they want the other side for a balanced diet.

We notice also in our weekly exchanges frequent comment on the enormity of the printed matter sent out by Government departments in Washington. The volume is truly great. We know, of course, that it is written by men on the Government pay rolls, that it is printed and circulated at Government expense, that it will reveal no Government weakness and criticize no Government policy. We do not mean to imply that this propaganda is intended to mislead the public, but we can be certain beyond doubt it does have for its purpose to make the policies and acts of the Government appear to be thoroughly sound and strictly in the public interest.

If we are to get the other side of the case, it must be presented by some fearless independent source. Unless we get the other side, we, the people, are in no better position to form a correct opinion than a judge in a civil court would be to render a just verdict after having heard the evidence of only one side. The Government is able to present its side capably and at great length because it can secure the services of the ablest talent and does not have to count the cost. That's for the taxpayers to worry about. We know, too, that those who hold office by grace of a political party—any political party—will go slow about criticizing the party's policies even when they have grave doubts of their soundness. The fellows in Germany who hail Hitler loudest are the fellows who are reaping the greatest honors and private gains from his regime. The same holds true of the worshipers of dictators elsewhere. Let us not think that human nature is different in America.

Our point is that we don't need to worry seriously about a private publication whose policies may strike us as extreme, because no private organ can hope to acquire instruments of power which the people cannot control. That is not true of government. As far back as 1936 President Roosevelt publicly admitted that the new instruments of public power created at his behest could, in wrong hands, provide shackles for the people of America. That is truly a fearful admission, and in 1936 the President possessed only a fraction of the power which the Chief Executive exercises today. If someone else had made that comment, the partisans of the President would have called it a wild figment of the imagination. But the President himself said it, and it stands as a pertinent reminder of the wisdom of the warning that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

The small newspaper publishers know that the constitutional guaranty of freedom of the press has its practical limitations. They know that frank criticism, however justifiable, may bring the penalty of damaging business reprisals. In proportion as their sources of revenue are limited, they are confronted by the practical need of respecting the veto power which their business patrons exercise over their freedom to print what they think. This is true not only of the small newspapers. Many of the larger publications deliberately avoid editorial partisanship for the sake of the larger patronage that a neutral position may win.

For these reasons we are glad that the country still has newspapers that have the interest and courage to buck the popular trend. Whether we consider them reasonable or rabid, their existence should be to us a sign that the constitutional guaranty of a free press is not dead. Should the time come when the country lacks newspapermen capable of risking unpopularity and foregoing financial gains for the sake of their convictions, we shall then have real cause to worry for a free press—and a free country.

We close with a note on the fate of the once free press of Germany. When Hitler attained power in 1933 the House of Ullstein was the foremost German publishing firm. It was located in the heart of Berlin and owned four daily newspapers, one with a circulation of 600,000; 6 magazines, the largest of which had 2,000,000 readers; and a book department that turned out 2,000,000 volumes a year. The firm followed a policy of neutrality in politics and by that policy its periodicals attained tremendous circulation. The board of directors sensed the threat of regimentation in Hitler's rise to power, but even then they did not think they could "afford to have opinions" in political matters. It would be bad for their business.

In the space of 2 years they found themselves not only without the right to express publicly their opinions but without their property as well. They valued their property at $24,000,000. Hitler allowed them one-fifth of that amount and then exacted from them in the form of taxes, fines, and penalties about all that he gave them. Hitler has since enjoyed the profits of the Ullstein property. And the House of Ullstein, had it been Chicago Tribune minded, might have saved Germany the tragedy of the Hitler regime.

After the War, What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE SOUTHWEST AMERICAN, FORT SMITH, ARK.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most intelligent and far-sighted discussions that I have seen of our course after the war, appeared in the Southwest American of Fort Smith, Ark., Arkansas' third largest newspaper, in the form of an editorial on October 2. I take pleasure in inserting it in full in the RECORD:

[From the Southwest American, Fort Smith, Ark.]

"If nothing is done now, we shall face at the end of the defense boom a depression incomparably more serious than that which commenced in 1929."

Almost any thoughtful person might have said that. Actually it was said by Leon H. Keyserling, general counsel and deputy administrator of the United States Housing Authority, in a recent speech.

It isn't the man who said it nor the occasion but the challenge of the statement which merits attention.

It is obvious that the present business boom is founded upon defense enterprises. The labor of millions is being employed along with billions of capital to produce armaments. So intense is the effort to produce defense goods that civilian enterprise is suffering. We are developing already a priority unemployment—idleness of workers in plants which can no longer get supplies for normal civilian goods.

It is obvious that there will be a terrific let-down when the need for those defense goods has passed, as it one day will pass.

What shall we do about it?

No one is wise enough to foresee clearly what conditions will be when the defense emergency has ended. No one can see now just how the defense emergency can come to an end. A negotiated peace in Europe under existing conditions would not end the emergency, because it would be necessary under those circumstances for the United States to live in a perpetual state of heavy armament.

Only an end of the war which ends the menace of totalitarian aggressors will permit the United States to slow down its defense effort. How long that will take no one knows. What economic conditions will be in the United States at that time is equally cloudy.

But this much we know:

When war's demands have slackened we shall have millions of men and billions of capital seeking new outlets for their production. We shall have an accumulated shortage of civilian goods in the United States and everywhere else in the world. We shall be needing and buying and making the goods which we could not make during the emergency because of the prior claims of defense. We shall have plant capacity, manpower, and potential markets.

The areas which will recover first and fastest from the afterwar depression will be the areas which have prepared to produce goods economically and make the fullest use of their natural resources.

In the battle for afterwar markets it seems to me the advantage will be heavy in favor of those areas which have developed their power possibilities, conserved their natural productivity and their natural resources, and provided a variety of outlets for the energies of their people.

Here in the Southwest the development of stream-control works seems to me the foundation of our preparation for the afterwar emergency.

Depression in the thirties hit us hard, partially because we were so dependent on agriculture and so handicapped in competition for industrial markets.

We had enough power for our existing enterprises, but not enough for the excess to create a pressure for more industries.

We had some markets for our industrial output, but they were markets terribly limited by the high and unfair freight-rate structure of the Nation.

We had rich lands, but too much of them were wasted every year by floods.

The program of stream control to stop flood losses, develop power, and aid navigation is by no means a cure-all. There isn't any. But it appeals to me that the stream-control program now under way and contemplated under the general Arkansas Valley Authority proposal is the most intelligent approach we can make here in the Southwest to meet the problems of that day when the shouting and the tumult die and we try again to make a living out of our natural resources and our civilian markets.

America Being Sold Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD today, I wish to make the following statement. The British war is costing Great Britain $44,000,000 daily, according to a statement made last week by the Chancelor of the Exchequer, Sir Kingsley Wood, when he informed the House of Commons that the British war expenditures have risen so that they are now running to $44,000,000 a day and that the current expenditures are 50 percent higher than during the peak of the World War.

Now let us make a comparison of what the British Government is doing in order to protect itself from expulsion from the British Isles by the ruthless hands of Hitler, and what America is doing to aid the United Kingdom of Great Britain. However, before I give you the figures of our own country, let us just see what our neighbor north of us—Canada—is doing to aid Great Britain. In the first place, Canada has no conscription law. They are not sending so many men to Europe to fight the battles of the United Kingdom, and other British provinces are in a measure doing likewise—some of them nothing at all, such as the Irish Free State. What has the United States done, through the propaganda that is being sent out over the radio and in the newspapers and by correspondence through the United States mails to interest the American people to come to the aid of Great Britain? Naturally my sympathies are with Great Britain in her struggle to keep from being wiped off the map of Europe by a ruthless Hitler. But I am not interested in having America destroyed for the sake of helping Great Britain. That is the point I make, because I am afraid that America is being sold short and Great Britain is the recipient of all the favors that America can give that country at a time when we are not in position to render the service which they want and expect from us. I am unable to find out where Great Britain has ever done anything for America. I am unable to find any American who can point his finger to one particular thing Great Britain ever did for us that they should expect our all to be given to them at a time when they are in great danger. We cannot forget the $6,000,000,000 they owe us from World War No. 1, and because of the situation after the World War the Johnson Act was passed prohibiting America from lending any aid or loaning any more money to those countries which refused to recognize their debt, not even pay the interest. This was the act of Great Britain. Yet today the President of the United States and Messrs. Willkie, Knox, and Stimson want us to tax our people to death in order to give Great Britain the assistance they think she ought to have. I do not share that opinion. Not because of any dislike for Great Britain but because I love America too much to sacrifice our people in this country for the benefit of Great Britain. I am 100 percent for the United States, thus I want to protect her from bankruptcy and from ruination. Our entrance in the European and Asiatic war spells our doom.

Now, let us just view the situation and what we have done since March 11, when the lease-lend bill gave the President $7,000,000,000 to lease and lend to Great Britain or any other nation, ships, TNT, powder, guns—anything to destroy mankind. This will cost every man, woman, and child in America, or the 130,000,000 people in America, the sum of $53.07 apiece. Now the President asks for $5,985,000,000 more, which will amount to $46.78 for each man, woman, and child in America, and will make a grand total cost of $99.85 to each of the 130,000,000 people of this country—to be given away as the President sees fit; too much money for one man; too much power for one man.

This last legislation you will be asked to support before the week is over. Almost $13,000,000,000, after the Johnson Act prohibited any extension of credit to the nations indebted to us because of the last World War. Certainly we are evading the law, and under the terms of the crazy lease-lend bill the President has all this great sum in his power to do with as he chooses. It is contrary to our Constitution to place that much power in the hands of any one man. Why should we have a conscription law and raise an army of 2,000,000 men when Canada does not have one? Why should we compel our boys to go into the service for 2½ years when our neighbor, Canada, does not do it? They are a part of Great Britain. We are independent. It does not seem right to me, and I am opposed to it. It will create hardships on America that we will never get over.

Now, since Sir Kingsley Wood informed the House that Britain was spending $44,000,000 a day, let me inform the American people that since July 1 the American Government has been spending $55,000,000 a day, or over $11,000,000 a day more than Great Britain. We claim that we are not at war, but we are doing almost everything that a nation would do in time of war. That is not all. The worst about the whole thing is the fact that the United States is going in the red each day over $35,000,000 since July 1. According to the statement of the Federal Government dated September 29, we have gone in the red in the past 90 days, or from July 1, the sum of $3,063,885,255.84, and the national debt listed in that statement is over $51,000,000,000. But that does not tell the whole story. We have guaranties that are outstanding in an amount of $10,000,000,000 more than $51,000,000,000. It will not be many months until we will be compelled to lift the debt limit of this country from $65,000,000,000 upward, and you will recall that Jesse Jones said that we could probably stand a ceiling for a debt up to $90,000,000,000. I can say to you and to the American people that any fool can spend money, but it takes brains to make it. Almost anyone can squander our birthright; but when this great debt is created, who is going to get us out? Do the American people think this administration can do it? I want to say now, once for all time, that to my way of thinking this administration can never pull us out of the hole. They have not got the brains; they have not got the ability or the business experience.

Director of the Budget Harold D. Smith predicted on last Saturday that the defense expenditures out of the Treasury will total $18,000,000,000 this fiscal year, or $135 for every man, woman, and child in America. In the near future, he said, defense costs will take 18 percent of the national income. This is more than the defense costs during the World War. Director of the Budget

Smith says that the Treasury will spend $24,581,000,000 this year, and that they would take in $11,998,000,000 in taxes and other revenue, and that our deficit at the end of this fiscal year would be $12,583,000,000. That, you can see, will be over a billion dollars a month. Now, make your comparison with the last fiscal year, when our expenditures were $12,710,000,000, our receipts $7,607,000,000, and our deficit for last year was $5,103,000,000. Director of the Budget Harold D. Smith says that by New Year's we will be going in the red at the rate of a billion and a half dollars a month, and by next June, 1942, we will be going in the red at the rate of $2,000,000,000 a month. Think of it. Does anybody think that, unless something unforeseen happens, this rate of spending does not mean bankruptcy for this Nation? Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, are you going to sell America down the river? Are you one that will destroy her?

Another thing that disturbs me is that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, according to a statement made by Jesse Jones on October 1, has made a loan of $425,000,000 to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, $75,000,000 of which was granted on that date. Now, this loan has been made notwithstanding the fact that the Johnson Act prohibits this country from loaning money to nations who owed us after the World War. Why do we do it? Are we giving any consideration whatever to the future of America? Are we going to wreck our Nation financially by this terrible spending? Again I say to the Congress of the United States: Where are you going to get the money? Again I say to the Congress of the United States: You are responsible for this spending because you have appropriated the money, and unless you cease permitting these expenditures, the responsibility is directly upon you, and your vote will tell the tale. Are you going to permit the President to have $6,000,000,000 more to give away when we are not building up our own national defense as we should?

I say to you now that I am ten times more afrad of communistic activities in America today than I am that Hitler will ever try—yes, ever try—to come to the Western Hemisphere. Then consider the statement made by the President that Stalin has guaranteed freedom of religion to Russia. Can you imagine such a thing, after they have crucified and terrorized all those who tried to worship in their own churches. But it appears that we figure Stalin's and the Russian Government would make good bedfellows for America so that we could give them practically anything they wanted to prosecute the war.

I say in closing, let us allow the Russians and Germans, and all the people in Europe who want to fight, fight it out. But instead of giving all our assistance to Great Britain, war materials and food when we have the hundreds of thousands of women and children in Belgium and Holland and Norway and other countries who are starving for want of food today it seems to me we should compel Great Britain to permit us to give them at least soup in order to sustain life while this war is going on, or we should not send millions of dollars worth of foodstuff to Great Britain at the expense of the American taxpayer. I feel that the Good Lord will not approve of the things that we are doing in America. Certainly I do not.

Keep America out of war. Keep America solvent. Keep America neutral. This European and Asiatic war is not our war. The Monroe Doctrine says we will not interfere with the affairs of the Eastern Hemisphere. Then why do we not do it? Remember the good-neighbor policy. Stay in the Western Hemisphere and obey the Monroe Doctrine. Make America our home, a better place in which to live.

Making Defense Safe for Alcoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

ARTICLE BY I. F. STONE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by I. F. Stone:

[From the Nation for October 4, 1941]

MAKING DEFENSE SAFE FOR ALCOA

(By I. F. Stone)

WASHINGTON, September 26.—The contract drafted by Oscar Ewing, vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee and lawyer-lobbyist for the Aluminum Co. of America, was signed with little change by Jesse Jones on August 17. The terms as given to the press made the contract seem a victory for the Government. Alcoa would operate the new Government-owned alumina and aluminum plants, but 85 percent of the profits would go to the R. F. C. Alcoa would keep a modest 15 percent as its operating fee. It was announced at the same time that Alcoa had agreed to reduce the price of aluminum ingot from 17 to 15 cents a pound. It looked as though shrewd Jesse Jones had driven another of his hard bargains.

It was not explained that the reduction in the price of ingot was a purely oral understanding, binding on Alcoa only so long as it chose to be bound thereby. It was not explained that before this oral understanding was reached the Government had signed two contracts with Alcoa's Canadian Siamese twin, Aluminum, Ltd., for 700,000,000 pounds of aluminum at 17 cents a pound. One Canadian contract was signed on May 2, the other on July 15. Were Aluminium, Ltd., prepared to deliver that aluminum or any considerable part of it this year, it would be well worth the extra 2 cents. But while the cut in price goes into effect at the end of this month, deliveries under the Canadian contract do not begin until next year and continue through 1944. The 15-cent price, as long as it continues in effect, will serve to deter potential competitors in this country, while the Canadian affiliate, which need fear no competition, will continue to get 17 cents or more. The Canadian contracts contain escalator clauses permitting an increase in the price if labor, freight, or raw-material costs go up. The Canadian company will be receiving its raw material, bauxite, from Alcoa in Alcoa ships. It is not inconceivable that Alcoa might be encouraged by these escalator clauses to increase the prices it charges its Canadian alter ego for bauxite and shipping. Nor is there any clause in the Canadian contracts which would prevent Aluminium, Ltd., from buying 15-cent aluminum from Alcoa and reselling it to the United States for 17 cents. This may never happen, but Jesse Jones is rarely so trusting in the contracts he signs.

The signing of the contract was accompanied by announcement of the reduction in price to 15 cents, but the contract itself does not specify any price. The contract provides only that the same price shall be charged for aluminum produced in the Government-owned plants as for aluminum produced in Alcoa's. The peculiar system set up by the contract for pooling the operations of both types of plants and for allocating their expenses and profits is such that any price which covers the costs of the Government-owned plants will yield a very wide margin of profit on Alcoa's.

The contract says that the price of aluminum is to be fixed from time to time by Alcoa and the Defense Plant Corporation, the R. F. C. subsidiary which will hold title to the Government plants. The contract contains provisions for arbitration in the event of disagreement on most matters, but the price of aluminum is specifically excepted from the arbitration clause. In practice this will mean that if Alcoa doesn't get the price it wants the Government will get no aluminum, for there is nothing in the contract which would force Alcoa to operate the plants at an unsatisfactory price or permit the Government to operate them if Alcoa staged a sit-down strike. A sit-down strike will hardly be necessary. If Jesse Jones was willing to sign this contract, he is not likely to balk at giving Alcoa anything else it wants. The expenses of the Government plants will be so high and their share of earnings relatively so small that the R. F. C. will want a higher price set for aluminum in order to cover costs.

The provision for a uniform price is the heart of the contract. The high-cost Government plants will be the price pacemaker for the low-cost Alcoa plants. Alcoa's plants will be obtaining low-cost bauxite from Dutch Guiana and its deposits in Arkansas. The Government plants will have to bear the expense of developing newer and more costly sources of bauxite, much of it low grade. The difference in the cost of bauxite will provide the first, but not the only, extra profit margin to Alcoa under the uniform-price provision. The contract provides other profit margins for Alcoa by permitting Alcoa to overstate the expenses and understate the earnings of the Government-owned plants it will operate.

The expense account is so padded as to give Alcoa large additional operating fees under the guise of expenses. All the costs of operating the Government-owned plants will, of course, come out of their earnings, and as we shall see, the Government will have no way of checking on most of these costs. This is like giving a reporter an expense account and telling him that most of its items will never be audited. In addition to all items which Alcoa considers operating costs, it is allowed one-fourth cent per pound of aluminum for expenses, salaries, and facilities used in connection with operation of the Government plants, "even though part of the time of such employees and part of such facilities are also used in part in connection with Alcoa's own operations or own overhead." Jesse Jones ad-

mitted on the stand before the Truman committee that this might include part of the rent for Alcoa's office building in Pittsburgh.

On top of all ordinary expenses and these part-time expenses the contract provides that "in order to compensate Alcoa for such portion of its own overhead as cannot thus be specifically allocated to the operation of the leased plants, Alcoa may also include as an item of operating expense the sum of one-half cent per pound of aluminum produced in the leased plants (in which calculation 2 pounds of alumina will be considered the same as 1 pound of aluminum)." Two pounds of alumina make 1 pound of aluminum, and Hugh Fulton, counsel to the Truman committee, pointed out at the hearings that there was nothing in the contract to prevent Alcoa from taking both the quarter-cent and the half-cent on each 2 pounds of alumina and then an additional quarter-cent and half-cent on the pound of aluminum made from those same 2 pounds of alumina. On this basis, according to Fulton, the present contract, plus a new contract being drawn up with Alcoa for another 600,000,000 pounds of alumina capacity, would give Alcoa $2,100,000 a year under the quarter-cent clause and another $4,200,000 a year under the half-cent clause. Even if the quarter-cent for part-time services does not duplicate items that Alcoa will have already included in operating costs, the extra half-cent is really a disguised fee equal to a 4-percent return on a $100,000,000 investment. This isn't bad considering that Alcoa will not have a cent of its own money invested in these plants.

The contract does provide that Alcoa shall keep separate cost-accounting records on the operation of the Government-owned plants, a point which would be taken for granted in most agreements of this kind but is regarded as quite a victory for the Government in this case. But these figures can mean very little unless the Government knows the comparable figures for operation of Alcoa's own plants. Otherwise it has no way of knowing whether Alcoa is dealing fairly with it. The contract gives the Government the right to an annual accounting for purposes of comparison, but the only figures on the operation of its own plants which Alcoa agrees in advance to furnish are of a very limited character. They would cover merely the cost of labor and five raw materials entering into the manufacture of aluminum. These are alumina, power, cryolite, aluminum fluoride, and carbons. As for any other items of cost or expense, the contract says, "Such certified public accountant shall also report to Defense [Plant] Corporation with respect to any other facts deemed by both Defense Corporation and Alcoa important and pertinent to a comparison of the operations in the leased plants with operations in other plants." This clause gives Alcoa the right to refuse any of these facts on the ground that they are not "important and pertinent." I do not think provisions of this sort would be accepted by Jesse Jones in leasing a plant of his own, or that they will encourage Alcoa to operate the Government's plants with the maximum efficiency and economy.

The contract provisions for estimating revenues show Jesse Jones in as gullible a mood as do the provisions for estimating expenses. The simple way to estimate the revenues of the Government plants would be to multiply their output by the price per pound received, as the simple way to operate the plants would be to have them produce aluminum and furnish it at cost to the Government. This is too simple for Alcoa. The contract has an appendix A headed "Method of computing profit or loss," which is based on the elementary method of accounting known as heads I win, tails you lose. Instead of the Government-owned plants being credited with their actual production, they are to be credited with their "theoretical" production. The intricate and tricky formula for arriving at this production reads as if Alcoa had called in Einstein as a consultant. I am going to simplify it; even simplified, it may make the reader bite his nails.

First, the actual amount of aluminum produced in the Government plants is computed, and then it is added to the actual production in Alcoa's plants. This sum is then added to the amount of "any aluminum purchased and received by Alcoa" during the year. The percentage of Government production to the second sum is then applied to the first, and this provides the figure for "theoretical" production. Let us say that during the year the Government plants make 100 pounds of aluminum and Alcoa's plants make 100 pounds and Alcoa buys an additional 100 pounds elsewhere for its fabricating plants. The ratio of Government production to this total is 1 to 3. The ratio of 1 to 3 applied to the 200-pound combined production of the Government and the Alcoa plants gives 66⅔ pounds. The Government plants, instead of being credited with their actual production of 100 pounds, would be credited with a "theoretical" production of 66⅔ pounds. Since revenues are pooled, Alcoa would no doubt siphon off the extra gravy in those theoretically nonexistent extra 33⅓ pounds.

Next week, in closing, I will show that in the rigging of this contract and in current negotiations for additional sources of aluminum Alcoa is using Jesse Jones and the O. P. M. to safeguard its monopoly position not only at the expense of the Government but at the expense of the defense program.

Vote at Every Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker—

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. (Fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.)

The right of election is the very essence of the Constitution.

Election Day is Independence Day. So long as we retain the right to select our own public officials, we retain our freedom.

Every time we fail to exercise the privilege of voting we forfeit our right to criticize those who have gained public office. Every time we find it more convenient to stay at home or discover that we are too busy to vote we abandon our American heritage of freedom.

From indifference to the choice of public officials, it is only a small step toward indifference to our rights of free press, free speech, free worship. We cannot join the long and growing list of those nations which have forgotten all human liberties.

Municipal elections, town meetings, State and county elections—every one of these plays its part in the development of American history.

You owe it to yourself and to your Nation to vote at every public election.

Let the people of every city in America demonstrate by their votes that they cherish the love of freedom for which our country stands.

Let no election in our country go by default. If you are registered as a voter, go to the polls.

Other nations speak through bullets. Let America continue to speak through a tremendous flow of ballots.

Vote at your elections November 4. It took thousands of years to win you that right to vote. Exercise it.

The Secretary of the Interior Visits the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein an article by the eminent publicist, the Honorable Richard L. Neuberger, from a recent issue of the Portland Oregonian.

Mr. Neuberger discusses our Secretary of the Interior, the inimitable Harold Ickes, in his own colorful and distinctive fashion. I wish it were possible to include the attractive photographs with which the newspaper article was embellished, in this extension of remarks. But let the author speak for himself.

[From the Sunday Oregonian of Portland, Oreg., September 7, 1941]

MR. ICKES SPEAKS ON CONSERVATION—SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR BELIEVES THAT FUTURE GENERATIONS WILL COMMEND DECISIONS THAT LED TO CREATION OF WASHINGTON'S OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Like "the boss," which is his way of referring to the President of the United States, Harold L. Ickes says he would like to return to the Pacific Northwest "again and again and again."

The Secretary of the Interior, under whose jurisdiction are a fourth of the lands of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, walked slowly along the shores of blue Lake Crescent in the Olympic National Park. He pointed up at the great Douglas fir "rain forests" mantling the steep slopes of Storm King Mountain. A shred of cloud hung like a banner on Storm King's pinnacled summit.

"This is a wonderful part of America," said Mr. Ickes, who has had charge of the national parks longer than any other Cabinet officer in history. "The boss is absolutely sold on it. He thinks the Pacific Northwest is one

of the most magnificent spots on earth. Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, the Olympic National Park, and countless other undertakings are all indications of the President's faith and admiration for this region."

TREES WERE GROWING BEFORE COLUMBUS SET SAIL

The Secretary sat down on a log and looked out across Lake Crescent's cobalt surface. "I regard this park," he said, "as one of the most worthwhile achievements of my administration as head of the Interior Department. In this park are set aside for all time forests which can never be duplicated. We have protected forever from ax and saw trees that were growing before Christopher Columbus set sail from Huelva. A thousand years from now, when our age is but a memory, the men and women of the future will be glorying this scenery."

Mr. Ickes explained that he has no intention of asking for further national parks in the Pacific Northwest. "It has been claimed," said he, "that I have ambitions to lock up vast expanses of the region in additional parks. This is not true. I am not even asking for the creation of new national monuments. The Forest Service has declared that there are areas of such superb grandeur in the Northwest that they ought to be preserved in perpetuity.

"For my own part, I would like to see the establishment of recreational areas in appropriate instances instead of national monuments. Instead of the power under which the President may establish national monuments, which he now has, I suggest that he be given the lesser power to create national recreational areas.

"In such areas hunting and fishing and mining and grazing and water development for power and irrigation would be permitted. Of course, lumbering would not be, but neither would lumbering be allowed if effect were given to the Forest Service policy of setting the same regions aside as primitive areas."

AMERICANS DESIRE TO ENJOY NORTHWEST SCENERY

The Secretary said he hoped this would assure the people of the Northwest that he has no desire to lock up enormous stretches of land in new national parks. "We must strike a balance," he declared, "between the use of resources and their preservation. Some places are admirably fitted for recreational purposes only. Travel is one of the great industries of the Pacific Northwest. Millions of Americans look to this region for soul-satisfying scenery, for fishing, for hunting, for tramps and rides across ever-changing uplands."

Mr. Ickes walked up the steps of Storm King cottage, nestled among tall firs, and sat down in the log living room. He was shown several of the recent motor logs sponsored by the Oregonian and the Oregon State Motor Association. Carefully he looked over two on Mount Rainier Park in Washington and the Mount Jefferson wild area in Oregon.

Pointing to the stories, he said, "Our people should be encouraged to visit places like this. Communion with the woods and wilderness is good for our citizens. The more of them who know about the forests and mountains the better."

Besides being Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes is also Oil Administrator for the President. He was asked about the effect on travel of shortages in facilities for transporting petroleum. "Well," he answered, slowly, "there may be some adverse effect for a time.

"However, the travel to places like the Olympic National Park may not begin again in force until next spring. By then we sincerely hope to have the problem solved, at least on the Pacific coast. Oil tankers are being constructed faster than ever before. American ingenuity and resources are turning out these vessels in record time."

Mr. Ickes explained that the shortage in oil transportation stemmed from the fact that tankers ordinarily used to take petroleum to American ports are now in use on the vital run to England. "It is utterly imperative," he said, "that Great Britain be supplied with oil, which is one of the main sinews of the war against Hitler."

He pointed out that domestic needs in the United States must be regarded as secondary to the shipping of oil across the Atlantic for the British Fleet and the planes of the Royal Air Force.

"However," the Secretary continued, "by next spring our people may again be able to step hard on the throttle and drive where they please. We are doing our utmost toward that end, anyhow. I am having the laboratories and research men in my Department make countless tests with new types of motors and fuels. Perhaps we can find a way of getting considerably more mileage per gallon. That would make motorists and travelers happy and solve many problems. I have high hopes that some of these experiments may prove successful.

"At least," he went on, "I am having the Department investigate thoroughly every suggestion and idea which comes along. You never can tell when some idea will be the real one, and I don't want anyone to be able to say that Ickes turned down a scheme that did wonders and broke the bank."

BOUNDARIES HELD JUSTIFIED IN OLYMPIC PARK

Mr. Ickes strolled out on the veranda of the little cottage. He looked across the lake to the wooded hills beyond. Night was beginning to shroud the Olympic Peninsula. The last shafts of day tinted the green slopes. "No wonder," he said, "that the boss was sold on this place as a national park when he was here in 1937. It was raining cats and dogs that day, but President Roosevelt saw at once the possibilities of the region. That was why he stated in Spokane, as he left the Northwest, that he was certain of the future of these States."

The Secretary pushed an old straw hat back on his head. "It wasn't an easy job to set aside this park," he volunteered. "There was plenty of opposition.

"I suppose I made many enemies insisting on an adequate park with wide, generous boundaries. All I can say is that I feel it was worth it. I am sure that you on your motor-log trip will agree to that, and I am sure that men, women, and children will feel that way for many generations to come. Surely no one can really grudge to posterity this beautiful corner of our vast land."

The Olympic National Park was established by Congress and President Roosevelt in 1938, 1 year after the President visited the Northwest to dedicate Bonneville Dam and was so impressed by this section of America. It is the Nation's newest national park.

The Washington State Progress Commission describes it as "the last big woods." The park is approximately 892,000 acres in extent, and is in the extreme upper left-hand corner of the United States. From its mountain peaks the ocean, Puget Sound, and the straits leading to Vancouver Island present a great panorama of salt water.

A few years ago a bitter and prolonged controversy, in which Secretary Ickes was the central figure, surrounded the creation of the park. Many people contended that the park boundaries were too far-flung and would remove from production highly valuable forests and timberlands. The Forest Service felt that its multiple-use program would provide both recreation and economic advantages for the area. However, President Roosevelt, on his 1937 journey, peered through the rainstorms and decided that a national park with ample territory was desirable.

RAIN FORESTS RANGE OVER OLYMPIC PENINSULA

One of the President's main reasons for favoring a big park was to protect the fir, spruce, and hemlock forests stretching like a great, green carpet around the Olympic Mountains. Secretary Ickes urged such a course on the President; such a course, in turn, was urged on the Secretary by John B. Yeon, well-known Portland conservationist.

If anywhere in the Northwest there are forests primeval, the Olympic Peninsula is that place. Within a few rods of Lak Crescent Lodge and Storm King Cottage the thick woods begin. Long before white men looked across the sea and saw America's distant shores these trees were growing. They grew in the rain. No part of continental United States has heavier precipitation than the Olympics. Rain in some parts of the peninsula reaches 122 inches. The forests are of tropical thickness and density. Woodsmen call them rain forests.

Spanish moss clings to trunks and branches. Ferns are higher than a man's head. Logs and branches are piled in reckless abandon. The trees of ages ago line the ground, victims of old age—age counted in epochs rather than years. Windfalls are 50 feet high and as tight and compact as stone fortifications. In places sunlight reaches through only in filtered shafts. These are the sort of woods small boys read about in Tarzan, and one might almost expect the fabulous ape man to come swinging along on one of the great vines or creepers.

If the climate were warmer, the forests of the Olympic Peninsula would be tropical in quality and filled with palms and mangroves and parrots and pythons. They have as much rain as some of the woods of the Congo. But the climate of the peninsula is temperate, and so the forests are made up of fir and cedar and hemlock and spruce.

The late Robert Marshall, director of recreation for the Forest Service, called the "rain forests" of the Olympics one of the last great memories of the America which used to be. They are more like stockades than ordinary woods, and in them one gets the sense of standing in a great cathedral or temple rather than in the outdoors. Some of the trees are 300 feet high and as straight as Corinthian columns.

Best known of the resorts in the Olympic National Park is Lake Crescent, along the extreme northern edge of the area. Trout fill the lake, and in the hills to the south there are trails of boundless beauty and intrigue. Lake Crescent is only 20 miles from Port Angeles, one of the taking-off places by boat for Victoria. Many Portlanders spend their vacation on its evergreen shores. When the motoring party trudged into the lobby of Lake Crescent Lodge, Dr. and Mrs. Arthur Rosenfeld, of Portland, and their children, Helen, Eddie, and Alan, were sitting on a lounge waiting for the dinner chimes. "My wife and I have come here each summer for the past 19 years," the doctor said, "We think it's the greatest spot in the United States."

Lake Quinault at the extreme southern end of the park is another famous resort. The lake is still in the Olympic National Forest and under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service although it lies along the park boundary. The entire park is ribbed with trails. These are wilderness trails in every sense. Roads penetrate but a small portion of the park's total area. Most of it is accessible only to the adventurer willing to go by horseback or on foot. The Hoh Valley and the Queets River present spectacular vistas and picturesque trails.

Yet primarily the Olympic National Park is a museum for the forests of America's yesterday. In the first World War the Government built a twisting railroad line into the peninsula to bring out spruce for airplanes. The peninsula is a storehouse for the oldest trees in the Nation.

"Surely future generations," says Miss Harlean James, famous authority on parks and planning, "will rise up and call blessed

this generation which acted before it was too late to save these pedigreed forests of Douglas fir, Sitka spruce, and Alaska cedar and hemlock."

So we started back over the 300 miles of good roads between the Olympic National Park and Portland. Bill Pease clicked his final picture of Secretary Ickes at Storm King cottage and threw his last flashlight bulb in the fire. The Secretary trudged back into the log cabin. We wheeled the white car along the highway through a corridor of trees. Through the trunks we could see the wide water of the lake. Across it a gleam came from the windows of Storm King cottage and the nearby inns and lodges. The car crossed the boundary of the park and the end of the 1941 motorlog season was near at hand.

The Petroleum Situation—the Value of Water-Borne Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in reference to the shortage of gasoline and oil along the eastern coast and its hinterland, owing to the lack of tanker transportation.

This situation brings to the attention of our citizens the value of our Federal waterway systems, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert here a letter and statement from the Marine News from its editor, Mr. S. Willson Richards, dated September 30, 1941:

THE MARINE NEWS,
New York, N. Y., September 24, 1941.

The Marine News will say editorially in its forthcoming issue:

"Until a gasoline and oil shortage loomed along the Atlantic seaboard, owing to a shortage of tankers, it is probable that only a handful of people knew that it has cost about 10 times more to transport petroleum products by rail than by water. This is but one of the many examples of the immense savings through water transportation.

"Almost all the iron and steel, so vital now in implements of defense, is manufactured from ore transported about 1,000 miles over the Great Lakes waterway system, with its Federally constructed locks, channels, and canals, at about one-ninth of the cost of other means of transportation. Millions of tons of coal, grain, lumber, steel, and other bulk materials move over the Nation's inland and intracoastal waterways annually with tremendous savings to the people. These savings, when contrasted with the taxation for building and maintaining the Federal waterway system, show a credit balance of immense proportions.

"The vessels making the mighty Navy of the Nation were all constructed in shipyards located on Federal waterways; their inshore movements are through waterways prepared by the Federal Government. The Nation's greatest bulwark of safety are its intracoastal and inland waterways, its harbors and connecting channels. Unlike their commercial worth, their value here cannot be measured in dollars; it is inestimable.

N. R. Danielian Argues With the Canadian Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1941

EDITORIAL AND LETTERS FROM THE GAZETTE, MONTREAL

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention from several sources recently that Mr. Danielian, director of the St. Lawrence survey for the Department of Commerce, has been carrying on a running battle with the Gazette, Montreal. Mr. Danielian, true to form, presumes to tell everyone how much he knows about their business.

His publications on the St. Lawrence project for the Department of Commerce are anything but judicious documents presenting in an unbiased manner plain truths. In these publications he takes an opposite view to practically all labor, industrial, and commercial leaders engaged in the various industrial, transportation, mining, and commercial businesses of the country—men who have devoted their lives to making these bulwarks of democracy virile.

Now he steps across the boundaries of our country to enter upon a controversy with one of the great Canadian newspapers. The unfortunate part of this dispute is that he is involving the whole Department of Commerce.

The Canadian answers completely dwarf the arguments for the St. Lawrence seaway presented by Mr. Danielian.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles published in the Gazette, Montreal, on August 27, September 17, and September 23. From these the House may judge the wisdom and prudence of chief propagandist N. R. Danielian, and behold at first hand the utter weakness and fallacies of the St. Lawrence seaway defense argument.

[From the Montreal Gazette of August 27, 1941]

WE LEARN ABOUT OURSELVES

Promoters of the St. Lawrence seaway project at Washington are supplying some interesting information about Canada, interesting and surprising, all the more so in that it emanates from an official source. A booklet has been issued containing certain remarks by Congressman L. C. RABAUT, Democrat, of Detroit, who asked a number of questions. Answers to these questions are supplied by M. J. Danielian, Director of the St. Lawrence Survey, in the United States Department of Commerce. Says Mr. Danielian: "The St. Lawrence project would strengthen our defenses in the northeastern corner of the North American Continent by giving us a protected inland water route to our new military base at Newfoundland. At present, because there are no rail connections east of Quebec, all supplies and equipment for our Newfoundland base must be sent through the Atlantic sea lanes. In time of war this route might be hazardous, but with completion of the seaway defense materials could be sent down the St. Lawrence River to Newfoundland without fear of interference from enemy naval units."

There is so much wrong with this statement, particularly as made by a Government official and used for propaganda purposes, that any Canadian reader must be inclined to question the accuracy of his own reading. So far as water facilities are concerned, these are present now and can be used for the purpose which Mr. Danielian has conjured up. There is a 14-foot all-water route from the foot of Lake Ontario to Montreal and a route of a minimum depth of 35 feet from Montreal to Newfoundland. Ships of 14 feet draft can transport supplies from any point on the Great Lakes to the head of ocean navigation, and vessels of 35-foot draft can operate between Montreal and Newfoundland, or from Sorel, Three Rivers, or Quebec, all ports with modern equipment and connected by rail with all parts of the United States. So much for that.

Mr. Danielian asserts that "there are no rail connections east of Quebec." He has not so much as glanced at a Canadian railway map, assuming, of course, that he has made his statement in good faith—that he is honestly ignorant of the facts. The main line of the Canadian National Railways, extending down into the maritime Provinces, reaches the port of North Sydney, Nova Scotia, a point within 100 miles of the Newfoundland railway terminus at Port Aux Basques. Materials for the United States base in Newfoundland can be sent to Sydney by rail from any place in the United States. It is an extraordinary thing that the Director of the St. Lawrence Survey, speaking and acting for the United States Department of Commerce, should make himself responsible, and the Department responsible, for a statement so widely at variance with the facts that he did not even take the elementary precaution of ascertaining what the facts are. The information was easily available, probably in Mr. Danielian's own office, but it was not obtained and apparently not sought.

The trouble is that this kind of propaganda is likely to influence congressional and other opinion in the United States and to have a bearing upon congressional judgment. An assertion from a presumably authoritative source is always likely to be accepted because of its origin. In this instance acceptance is certain wherever knowledge of the truth does not exceed Mr. Danielian's understanding of it. If the St. Lawrence waterway issue is to be decided on its merit, well and good, but it should not be determined on misstatements and misinformation.

WASHINGTON EXPLAINS

SIR: Your editorial of August 27 entitled "We Learn About Ourselves" has come to my attention. In it you take issue with statements published in a pamphlet by Congressman L. C. RABAUT, of Michigan, with regard to the effect of the St. Lawrence seaway upon the defense of the northeastern corner of the North American Continent. Since these statements were supplied by the Department of Commerce, and the Department was made the subject of criticism by your distinguished paper, may I be permitted the privilege of clearing up some misapprehensions in your editorial? I request the courtesy of the requisite space in your columns.

It is asserted in the publication issued by Congressman RABAUT that the "St. Lawrence project would strengthen our defenses in the northeastern corner of the North American Continent by giving us a protected inland water route to our new military base at Newfoundland. At present, because there are no rail connections east of Quebec, all supplies and equipment for our Newfoundland base must be sent through the Atlantic sea lanes.

In time of war this route might be hazardous, but with completion of the seaway defense materials could be sent down the St. Lawrence River to Newfoundland without fear of interference from enemy naval units." You take issue with this statement on the grounds that there is water transportation now between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean, restricted to 14-foot navigation over the St. Lawrence River above Montreal and 35-foot navigation from Montreal to the sea. You propose making transshipments at Montreal, Three Rivers, or other points. No one questions the feasibility of your proposal and there is nothing stated in Congressman RABAUT's publication which denies this possibility.

You forget, however, that the statement which you quote for purposes of criticism was in answer to the following question: "Would the seaway-power project impede or aid our defense program?" Would you not concede that the transshipment at two points, on the Upper Lakes and at Montreal and Quebec, increases the cost of transportation and certainly enables delay? There are cases where such hard-way-of-doing-things makes the present waterway useless. Has the Gazette considered, for instance, the difficulties of transshipping, from lake carrier to canal carrier and then again to deep draft vessel, a 16-inch coastal defense gun? It is difficult to comprehend how anyone can question the greater desirability of a direct route without intermediate transshipment and delays between the arsenals and factories in the Great Lakes cities and our mutual defense outposts.

You also take issue with the statement that there are no rail connections east of Quebec. In refutation of this you point out that there is a rail connection to the port of North Sydney, Nova Scotia, from which supplies could be shipped a hundred miles across to Port Aux Basques, Newfoundland, and then by rail to final destination in Newfoundland. Again, here you prefer a circuitous, expensive, and slow method of transportation which will involve several handlings, to the direct method which the accredited Governments of our two countries seem to prefer. Let me state that the St. Lawrence survey of the Department of Commerce is fully cognizant of the rail services available south of the St. Lawrence River to Nova Scotia. However, the main point at issue in our statement is the defense of the northeastern corner of the continent, which, of course, includes Newfoundland, the north shore of the St. Lawrence River, and the Gulf of St. Lawrence and Labrador. You know full well that when Quebec is used as a point of reference in the statement that there are no rail connections east of this city, the statement should be read in the light of the main problem—defense of these northeastern areas. Certainly you do not claim that there are adequate rail connections from Quebec beyond to the north side of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. I do not wish to presume knowledge of the Canadian rail situation superior to your distinguished paper but all the sources I have been able to consult, including the Canada Yearbook, published by your Government, leave no doubt in my mind that there are no adequate rail connections at present that could serve in an emergency to supply transportation to eastern Quebec Province and Newfoundland. Reference to any Canadian railway map will confirm this.

N. R. DANIELIAN,
Director, St. Lawrence Survey.
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., U. S. A.,
September 11, 1941.

MR. DANIELIAN IN TROUBLE

SIR: Mr. N. R. Danielian's attempt to answer your fair criticisms of a recent statement of his, as published in your correspondence column of September 17, does not improve his case. You quoted his statement that "at present, because there are no rail connections east of Quebec, all supplies and equipment for our Newfoundland base must be sent through the Atlantic sea lanes." He answers that he meant that he was thinking of the defense of Newfoundland, the north shore of the St. Lawrence River, and Labrador. What he said flatly was that supplies could not be sent to Newfoundland for the lack of rail connection east of Quebec, and that is flatly untrue. He again says that there is no doubt in his mind "that there are no adequate rail connections at present that could serve in an emergency to eastern Quebec Province and Newfoundland." That is nonsense, and, in any event, what he is recommending is not further rail connections to the north shore of the St. Lawrence but the deepening of the St. Lawrence canals. At present the north shore of the St. Lawrence east of Quebec is served from the adequate rail lines on the south shore and it would still have to be so served after the canals above Montreal were deepened.

Disingenuously or from lack of knowledge, Mr. Danielian says that, for example, at present, a 16-inch coastal-defense gun brought from up the Lakes to the lower St. Lawrence would have to be transferred from a Lake carrier to a canal carrier and then again to a deep-draft vessel. Nothing of the kind would occur, as every transportation man in North America knows. The modern ships which ply the canals, and especially the package freighters, are quite able to and do reach upper Lake ports and lower St. Lawrence ports. If the United States War Department wanted to send a shipload of supplies from Cleveland to St. Simeon or Tadoussac or Notre Dame de Betsiamites, or anywhere on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, it would, if it wanted to use a water route, charter a boat capable of doing this by one movement. It would not call in Mr. Danielian and ask him to arrange shipment involving two transfers. Almost certainly, even in the case of shipments from Cleveland, and absolutely certainly in the case of shipments from points not on the Great Lakes, the United States War Department would send such shipments by rail to one of the many ports on the Intercolonial line, and then by boat to destination, thus increasing the speed of shipment very greatly.

Shipments to Labrador are handled in summer by steamer and in winter by rail to Sydney and then by steamer. They would still be handled in those ways, even if the canals were deepened. This is the way in which shipments will have to be handled even if the Congress and Parliament approve a silly scheme, until 1948. After 1948 it would still be the best way of handling the supplying of any military bases on the north shore of the St. Lawrence or in Labrador.

I trust that Mr. Danielian will answer this comment on his absurd suggestion.

TRANSPORTATION.

Another Attempt To Smear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1941

EDITORIAL BY FRANK SPARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, as every Congressman well knows, let him be loyal to our country before he considers the interest of any other country, and he may expect a blast or, if you prefer, a handful of mud from those who still believe we should replace the Declaration of Independence with a declaration of interdependence.

A striking example of the smear which those who think of Britain first hand out to every Congressman who refuses to follow their lead into a foreign war is referred to in an editorial of Frank Sparks which appeared in the Grand Rapids Herald of September 27.

There is not a Member of Congress who ever questioned the ability, the sincerity, or the loyalty of BARTEL J. JONKMAN. Only a small group of gentlemen, satisfied that they, and they alone, know loyalty when they see it, would venture to question his loyalty.

Since he came to Congress, Congressman JONKMAN has earned, he deserves, and he has the respect of his fellow Members of Congress and doubtless the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Michigan, who do not believe that the United States is so weak and so helpless that she must hide behind Great Britain or any other nation, will long return him as their trusted Representative.

The editorial to which reference was heretofore made is as follows:

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of September 27, 1941]

WHERE THE "DISLOYALTY?"

Congressman JONKMAN, like every other American citizen has a guaranteed right to think what he thinks and to express his thoughts on whatever matter or in whatever manner he may choose. The same applies to Dr. Charles Warren Heisley, and all the members of his Committee to Defend America. The fact that Mr. JONKMAN happens to be a Congressman does not deprive him of a single one of his rights. Indeed, if he is to do his duty by his country and by his constituents who sent him to the Congress, he should be even more critical than one of us ordinary persons.

So we think the Committee to Defend America, which in an open letter charged Congressman JONKMAN with "disloyalty" when he voiced his objections to some of the methods now being pursued to take us into the European war, arrogated to itself quite a little excess importance and authority, while at the same time attempting to deprive Mr. JONKMAN of some of his own inalienable rights as an American citizen and a Congressman of the United States.

The Committee to Defend America deplores Mr. JONKMAN's opposition to some of the peregrinations of the administration, and holds that the United States is committed to certain policies. May we ask who committed this country? Was it the Congress in manner provided by the Constitution which formulated them? Did the Congress, as representatives of the people of the United States, authorize the giving away of 50 destroyers, the taking over and manning of Iceland, the extension of our territorial limits almost to the shores of England, the ordering of our Navy to scour the oceans and shoot on sight at any Axis craft?

Not at all. All this was done by the imperial decree of the President and we venture to say contrary to the will and wishes of a vast majority of Mr. JONKMAN's constituents.

Is it "poor taste," as the Committee to Defend America insists, for Mr. JONKMAN to protest the extravagant giving of the money of the American people to England, when England still owes us more than $5,000,000,-

000 we advanced to her in the last war, and makes absolutely no pretext of an intent to repay anything we may loan or lease or otherwise turn over to her in this conflict.

The committee, likewise, objects to JONKMAN'S "condemnation of Russia" and thinks he and we all should climb right into bed with a Government which, for more than 20 years, has sought to destroy our Government by force, which until she actually was attacked by Hitler, not only was his ally, but was seeking to destroy in America whenever and wherever possible whatever we were undertaking to do in our own defense.

We do not question the "loyalty" of the Committee to Defend America as it questioned Mr. JONKMAN'S "loyalty," but we do question the judgment of the members of the committee who signed the letter, and suggest that perhaps the best way to "defend America" is to defend America rather than to seek to defend the rest of the world which, as usual, will never appreciate any of our efforts.

What Brandeis Means to Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY MIRROR

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

[From the New York Daily Mirror of October 8, 1941]

WHAT BRANDEIS MEANS TO US

The late Louis Dembitz Brandeis never changed his mind about certain fundamental beliefs; for instance, in 1905, he defined a conception of democracy that had to be earned and deserved:

"Democracy is only possible—industrial democracy—among people who think * * * and that thinking is not a heaven-born thing. It is a gift which men and women make for themselves. It is earned, and it is earned by effort."

He never changed his mind about that conception of democracy; he was until his death a great liberal—as the word was understood before it was usurped by a new brand of "liberals" who presumed for themselves the sole right to think for all the people.

Mr. Brandeis was a liberal when Wilson nominated him to the Supreme Court—reactionaries all over America howled their wrath at the appointment. But since then every shade of opinion in America reached agreement on one point:

Deep respect for the sincerity, the integrity, and the wisdom of Justice Brandeis.

Justice Brandeis was 81 years old in 1937, when President Roosevelt began his fight to infuse "new young blood" into the Supreme Court. The implication of the President's fierce attack upon the aging personnel that formed this fulcrum of the balance of power between the executive and the legislative branches of government was unfortunate and unwise.

The Supreme Court fight began February 5, 1937. Justice Brandeis retired from the Court 2 years later.

But while he was still on the high bench, he joined with Chief Justice Hughes in phrasing a letter to a congressional committee, opposing the President's Court-packing plan.

Of the 16 major New Deal laws that came before the Court while Mr. Brandeis was a Justice, he opposed the administration 6 times.

Significantly, he voted with a unanimous Court in declaring the N. R. A. unconstitutional; and again in the unanimous decision that President Roosevelt committed an illegal act in the dismissal of William E. Humphrey from the Federal Trade Commission.

And yet, in neither of those cases did any fair-minded American think of Justice Brandeis in the terms that President Roosevelt used with qualification in his magazine article about the Court fight a few weeks ago:

"A dead hand was being laid upon the whole program of progress—to stay it all. It was the hand of the Supreme Court of the United States."

The President, at a time when his recurring plea is for national unity, revives once more a fight that split America; and there is still smoldering bitterness as he looks back and thinks of the Court as "a dead hand."

We look upon the Supreme Court and its place and function in our representative form of government with its three-way system of checks and counterbalances, in terms of the career of Justice Brandeis.

We admit that "practical" politicians are probably correct when they say that no Jew, no Catholic could ever be elected President of the United States of America.

But the Supreme Court as well as the Congress has succeeded in rising up through the welter of stubborn prejudice to a plane that permits and invites both Jews and Catholics to render service to their country, in proportion to their love of their country and their ability to serve it.

The Supreme Court of America is a citadel inside which true liberals like Louis Dembitz Brandeis can serve as a last refuge for every minority group, every minority opinion.

The priceless essence of democracy, our kind of democracy, is the protected and guaranteed right of dissent.

The career of Justice Brandeis, the "great dissenter," strengthened that citadel of democracy during its time of greatest peril.

When America has time again for reflection, we will feel the gratitude we owe this man.

Mr. Ickes and Mr. Pelley and the Solution of the Oil Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1941

LETTERS WRITTEN BY HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, OF TEXAS, TO HON. HAROLD L. ICKES AND J. J. PELLEY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks there is quoted below letters that I have written to Mr. Ickes and Mr. Pelley:

OCTOBER 2, 1941.

Hon. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Administrator, Oil Administration,
Department of Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ICKES: I have been reading in the newspapers with a great deal of interest what you and Mr. Pelley have been saying about the oil and gasoline situation in the East.

In order to remedy conditions and, at the same time, avoid the large expenditures of money and steel necessary for a long pipe line half way across the Continent, you could connect the Gulf Coast Inland Waterway and the Atlantic Coast Inland Waterway with a pipe line from the vicinity of Fort St. Joe, Fla., to Jacksonville, Fla.

I am informed that the Southeastern Pipe Line Co. at Atlanta, Ga., estimates that the above-mentioned pipe line could be constructed in from 30 to 90 days, would be 235 miles long, would require 50,000 tons of steel, and would cost about $12,000,000. With such a pipe line an additional 200,000 barrels of oil or gasoline per day could be moved from the Gulf Coast to the Atlantic seaboard over the intracoastal waterways. We will never be able to handle the tonnages required for our defense program until we make full use of our waterways which have been planned and executed to meet such demands as we now have.

Yours sincerely,

J. J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman.

OCTOBER 2, 1941.

Mr. J. J. PELLEY,
President, Association of American
Railroads, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PELLEY: I have been reading in the newspapers with a great deal of interest what you have been saying about railroad tank cars being available for the relief of the oil and gasoline shortages along the Atlantic seaboard, and I see in the papers this morning that there are not available as many tank cars as there was thought to be in the first place.

You could solve your dilemma by hauling oil and gasoline only across Florida. In this way it could be transported by barge from the Gulf coast to Port St. Joe, Fla. From this point the tank-car service could move via the Apalachicola Northern Railroad to River Junction, Fla., or to Climax, Ga., and from River Junction to Jacksonville via the Seaboard Air Line, or from Climax to Jacksonville via the Atlantic Coast Line. One of these routes is 317 miles long and the other is 317 miles long. With some additional terminal facilities (costing about $2,700,000) an additional 200,000 barrels per day could be transported via this combination rail-and-water route from the Gulf coast to the Atlantic seaboard. Obviously, a much smaller number of tank cars would be required to move oil about 300 miles than would be required to move the oil halfway across the continent.

Yours sincerely,

J. J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman.

Ernest W. Marland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE TULSA (OKLA.) WORLD

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, for more than a quarter of a century the name of Ernest Marland has been a household word in Oklahoma and the Southwest.

He was beloved by his intimates to the point of adulation. His personal charm bound his friends closely to him. His was a conceiving, constructive mind. The size or formidability of any objective did not deter him. He lightly pushed aside all obstacles.

His whole career was a paradox of success and failure—as we gage the world's standards. But mankind is the better for Ernest Marland's having lived.

He hit the high and the low of finance and politics. Once fabulously rich, he died without means. At one time a meteoric success in political affairs, he left the office of Governor a disappointed man. His political force was dissipated.

His philanthropies were as forthright as his financial and political methods. Marland's every step blazed some kind of a trail of good deeds done, kindnesses shown, and of aid to the needy.

But he probably said to himself as the final day came, that all this, too, has been vanity and vexation of spirit.

The Tulsa World has written a beautiful editorial about this man, about Marland, which is eminently worthy of permanent place in the records of the Congress in which Ernest Whitworth Marland served so well and faithfully.

The editorial follows:

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) World]

MARLAND'S EXCEPTIONAL CAREER

Into a life of moderate length, Ernest W. Marland crowded accomplishments and experiences seldom equaled in variety and number. The familiar term "colorful" applied to him, but his career cannot be adequately described by any one phrase or ordinary statement. He illustrated, to a high degree, the possibilities of this new southwestern country. He was a many-sided man, and we know of no career substantially paralleling his.

Mr. Marland had a monumental record of successes and failures. He came to Oklahoma somewhat before statehood and in the early days of the oil business; he attained almost fabulous wealth and then suffered a financial debacle. From lawyer and lease man, without means, he moved on to the headship of a great corporation with holdings and operations scattered over two countries. Meanwhile, two other notable phases of his life developed. He became a philanthropist and a politician. In all three of his major fields he was fast moving and spectacular. In a period of about 40 years he touched extremes many a time.

The vivid accomplishments and failures of E. W. Marland have already passed into the swift history of Oklahoma. As an oil man he was daring, and even original. As a philanthropist, he dispensed money with a touch of profligacy. As a politician, he suddenly achieved sensational election to Congress, then passed on to the Governorship. Neither in politics nor oil did he make an impressive come-back.

Some of the characteristics of Mr. Marland in philanthropy were taken into the governorship. He had large and liberal ideas, and his administration was a costly one. He had a passion for helping people, and it was nothing new when he went to Oklahoma City. He had plans for benefiting the public on a large scale, and his field was increased from Ponca City to the whole State.

At the height of his prosperity Mr. Marland planned and built one of the great estates of the country, almost certainly the finest and most impressive in the Southwest. While building for himself he built many homes for his officials and for relatives, and he contributed very decidedly to the upbuilding of Ponca City. His benefactions always had an artistic side; it was understood in his home town that he would not finance any project which left out artistic values. He put money into a great many things.

Mr. Marland became nationally and even internationally known through his sponsorship of the statue of the Pioneer Woman. That monument and the remarkably fine estates he developed are still outstanding.

A vivid, colorful career, in which the practical and the idealistic, the brilliant and the commonplace, failure and success and surprise were thoroughly mixed, came to a close Friday with the death of Ernest Whitworth Marland.

Foreign Relations and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE IOWA STATE GRANGE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, at the seventy-second annual session of the Iowa State Grange, held in Newton, Iowa, September 30, October 1 and 2, 1941, the report of the resolutions committee on foreign relations and national defense was adopted. Herewith I insert the resolution in full:

The whole world is passing through trying times. We need calmness and clear thinking by the people, true statesmanship by our representatives, and, above all, we must have national unity if this Government of ours is to survive the crisis.

The Grange, through the 75 years of its history, has always been thoughtful and conservative in State and National affairs.

We offer this as a statement of our policy, and move that copies of it be mailed to the President and also the two Senators and the nine Representatives from Iowa.

Agriculture has always pledged its unqualified support to national defense, and we now demand that industry and labor unselfishly do likewise, without thought of excessive profit.

We believe that maintenance of our democratic form of government is vital to our future and that democracy is worth defending here in the Western Hemisphere. We believe the neutrality law was wisely drawn in calm deliberation, and neutrality, together with hemisphere defense, will save our democracy and preserve our way of life. However, if this policy does not bring us honorable peace and national security, then Congress should exercise the power it now has and take such action as they deem necessary.

We believe that the results of inflation could be somewhat modified if a greater part of defense costs were met on a pay-as-you-go basis.

We condemn all labor groups and industries which seek excessive profit or advantage by tying up defense industries. We must all remember that especially in this time of emergency we are citizens of a great Republic first of all, and only secondly are we farmers or laborers, clerks or housewives. National unity is our first line of defense. Without it all other efforts are futile.

We, the Iowa State Grange, pledge our full support during this emergency to the President and the Congress of the United States.

C. P. KAISAND.
C. B. KLAUS.
MORRIS TRUSLER.
WALTER GOREHAM.
Mrs. L. M. RYAN.
Mrs. E. DURREY.

The American Bar and the Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1941

ADDRESS OF CHARLES W. BRIGGS, OF ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission graciously granted me by the House to extend my remarks, I desire to have incorporated a timely address delivered by Mr. Charles W. Briggs, of St. Paul, Minn., one of the leading attorneys of the Northwest, before the American Bar Association at its Indianapolis meeting on September 30, 1941. What Mr. Briggs had to say upon that occasion should be read by every Member of Congress as he is a student of economics and political philosophy as well as of jurisprudence. I consider that Mr. Briggs made a real contribution to American thought upon that occasion.

The address follows:

WHAT SHOULD A STATE OR LOCAL BAR ASSOCIATION CONCERN ITSELF WITH DURING THE CURRENT EMERGENCY?

I appreciate the honor that comes from Mr. Thompson's invitation to speak before this important section of the American Bar Association. The work of this section has been received with country-wide enthusiasm. Last spring there was a regional meeting in Minneapolis. The program, including an address by Judge Parker, was of a high order of excellence. This section, under Mr. Thompson's able leadership, is trying to bring to members of the bar something of benefit and inspiration to them in their professional capacities. Lawyers like myself are the capillaries of the blood-system of the bar. If bar associations do not nourish them and cause them to function, the system withers, and the associations die. Mr. Thompson's ultimate goal, of course, is to emphasize through bar associations, the increasing necessity that lawyers discharge their duties to the public.

Mr. John Q. Public is applying as never before a methodical system of measuring lawyers. He is doing it in Forest City, Iowa, in St. Paul, in New York City, and everywhere. He is asking the lawyers: "What is going on in the realm of law and in the sphere of government, and what do you propose shall be done about it?" He is saying to the lawyers: "What is your business in this life of ours?"

We will have to define the word "emergency" for our present purposes. We have had a lot of emergencies, and much has been done in their name. Some have been generated by spontaneous combustion, and others have been declared. I suppose there is one emergency that has never been declared:

"The difficulty of a lawyer's contact with a dollar, and the further difficulty of maintaining contact once he makes it!"

I think the emergency with which we are concerned here is the vast upheaval of the foundations and conditions of human society. Such upheavals, like volcanic eruptions, are not new. From the present eruption we see pouring out the same sort of lava, the same sort of fire and smoke and ashes, that have appalled and confounded men in generations past and gone. Social and economic tremors are again shaking and shattering the governments of the earth. With ever-increasing severity the shocks are being felt in America. And it all comes down to this: Shall a man continue to be free to work and keep his horse and his cow or any other investment he may have, if he acquires one?

The job of bar associations is to help the people evaluate the disturbances, and find an answer that is compatible with sound and lasting public welfare. Our job is not to stand in awe or put to sea for personal safety. We must, I think, realize that this emergency was not created by the present war. We had this emergency before the war. The importance of the bar associations' job is not minimized or postponed by the war. For the ranks of the lawyers who are militant in the battle of human rights—and I include therein property rights—there is no such thing as a 1-year enlistment. Lawyers are in for the duration, which is for their natural lives. No matter when the military conflict ends, and no matter where victory may rest, the lawyers' battle will go on, into the conflict of peace. Our job is to help the people decide whether the past and present socialistic tendencies in this country, accelerated by the demands of war, shall be fastened upon this country as a permanent policy of peace. There are now existing or contemplated far-reaching controls over business and the lives of the people. These contain more than a suggestion that the objective is not national defense but complete socialization of industry.

Never before have bar associations been faced with such grave responsibilities. Their members will, indeed, serve their country in war if need be, but their duties run far deeper than this. Their duties go back to where the problems of the administration of justice and government begin; they have to do with what should be the rights of men in organized society. Perhaps we have complacently thought that these problems had almost been solved, but again they confront the world for solution. Again people are bewildered, and they are no more positive about the ultimate good to the public in these matters than were wise men of centuries and centuries ago. The whole fabric of human affairs, like a jigsaw puzzle, is being torn asunder into its jagged pieces, and these pieces are again thrown at our feet. Shall we use the old pattern or shall we devise another one? I shall not say a new one. Again we are confronted with the age-old questions: "What is justice and how can it be best achieved in an organized society; what should be the rights of individuals under a government?"

What should a bar association do in this emergency?

At least its members should familiarize themselves with the current of legal situations, with the changing social, economic, and governmental ideologies, and be prepared to give the public their best judgment. The bar association should constitute itself a general staff, which makes an estimate of the situation and then reports to the commander, the sovereign people, what, in its opinion, should be the decision and the plan of action. The people will make some decision, and it should not be made in default of the lawyers' profound consideration. At the very least, a bar association, by every means at its command, should stimulate the study of government and the fruits thereof.

* * * * *

My principal thesis today is that bar associations in the present emergency should specialize in the study of government.

Lawyers in the colonial days, during the period of the founding of this Nation, and well into the years after the Civil War, were leaders in the study and appraisal of government. They were the mentors of the people in this respect. Lawyers not only fathered this Government but they delivered it, and they watched over its adolescence. Not only the leaders of the bar did this, but the rank and file did it. They all contributed to the debate. They all contributed to the comparison of one form of human society with another. They made an exhaustive analysis of the ways men have tried to get along together for the best of all concerned. And they did not hesitate to make known to the public their judgment as to what theory and framework of society were best for the happiness and welfare of mankind, and for the reasonable protection of one citizen against another. They went deeply into the experiences of the past, into ancient and modern methods of exercising sovereignty, and they led the people in arriving at a solution.

Perhaps during the period of great industrial development in this country, lawyers, being otherwise occupied, have taken our scheme of government too much for granted, and have permitted a great deal of dust to accumulate on the experience of the ages. Now the whole subject of government is up for reexamination. Lawyers are grounded in the ethics and philosophy of government. They understand the relation of sociology and economics to government and law. Bar associations must give the benefit of their wisdom to the people. If they do not, they sterilize their abilities, to the great loss of the public which it is their privilege and bounden duty to serve.

Lawyers have naturally been engrossed in the material aspects of life. They serve their clients' immediate needs. Perhaps they have lost sight of matters of greater magnitude and of more fundamental concern for the long pull. Perhaps lawyers have lost sight of the conflicts in society outside of the law reports—conflicts that must be reconciled if our present system is to endure. We lawyers draw our deeds and mortgages, trusts and wills and contracts; we organize corporations; and we probate estates. We serve our clients whose interests derive from the Government that has recognized the institution of private property and the capitalistic system. Perhaps we have become oblivious of the flood that threatens to engulf this system. I have seen farmers along the Mississippi River toiling with their crops, and refusing to believe that the river would again rise to wipe out their efforts. I wonder if lawyers should continue to labor in the field of private rights, and ignore the rising current of collectivism that threatens to engulf the field and leave them in the treetops and on a few isolated high spots, there to speculate upon the dubiousness of a rescue until after another leveling onset has spent its fury?

History is a great storehouse of experience. If only bar associations could induce the people to look into the pages of history, they would go far to justify their existence. I think that the founders of this Government of ours would say—and we may say—that the presently exalted schemes for bossing people are simply variants of what has been tried out before. Spectrum analysis in the laboratory of government will reveal that all of the "isms" and "ocracies" of today throw the same bands of color that students have detected through the ages. After all, there are only three forms of government—government by one man, government by a minority, and government by a majority. There is nothing fundamentally new in practice about dictatorships or national socialism. New dealism may indicate nothing but a degree of change to an authoritarian state.

From a practical standpoint, great minds have been in all ages of which we have any record, wrestling with the problem of human welfare, the relation of the individual to the state, and the extent and justification of the exercise of power over the lives of human beings. If we put the ideas and methods of ancient kings, of the great figures of Greece and Rome, of the great Khans, of Chinese dynasties, of the kings of divine right, of the leaders of the French Revolution, into the hopper, we will find that there is not much new under the sun. The great philosophers of all ages have studied this business of regimentation and human liberty. Lawyers must study it now.

And I think we should acknowledge that mere change in and of itself carries no virtue or advantage. The human race has been rotating its crops of government and social systems since the dawn of history. The Greek philosophers, long before the Christian Era, were familiar with the cycle of democracy, anarchy, aristocracy, dictatorship, monarchy, and so on.

Our ancestors thought they had found a crop that would produce the most fruit for mankind—a representative or republican form of government, with a constitutional base; a government created with checks and balances that would serve to retard revolution while the people could dispassionately deliberate upon the course to be taken. They thought they had set up a scheme accommodated to the fundamental traits of human nature.

But we have come to think and talk in terms of democracy. No matter what the pill is, it is put in the capsule of democracy. We talk of immediate response to the wants of the people. We conjure with this word democracy and find difficulty with its meaning. In final analysis democracy means a state where the people have and exercise the right and power to choose their own rulers. But that conception is too refined, and falls short of describing the things that democracy has meant to the people of this country.

There have been associated with democracy in America certain vital things. In addition to free election of the rulers of the people, democracy has meant freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, of religion, the right to a fair and impartial trial, freedom of opportunity, and freedom in the ownership and enjoyment of property that satisfies to a reasonable degree the acquisitive faculty of human beings.

Now, what are we doing with these things? We have been and are now putting them in jeopardy. A few weeks ago I was startled to hear a professor of one of our large universities passionately arguing that the time had come when freedom of speech and of assembly should be suppressed in this country.

I think lawyers can see the trend. It is so unmistakable that no thinking man or woman should overlook it. One look at the social and political barometer will show it. The fact is we are dangerously near considering democracy in terms of equal distribution of property and the fruits of toil. If we focus upon such a concept, we will soon become oblivious of all the things we have associated with democracy. If equal distribution of property and equal sharing of the fruits of business and employment is our goal, then it will take autocratic power to attain and hold that goal. No government that violates the inherent instincts of people can exist without autocratic power. Collectivism generates such power and grows upon what it generates. You may create a collectivism with a government agent sitting in judgment upon every aspect of life, and call it democracy, but Hitler and Mussolini will call the hand better than that.

In the present emergency the lawyers must be prepared to answer the question: Is socialism, manned by an inevitable dictatorial government, the solution that will accomplish the highest degree of public welfare? That is the question with the bark off. And that suggests another question: Are we going to fasten upon ourselves a system that seems to satisfy the material needs and selfish purposes of the moment, in disregard of the ultimate havoc that may result to capital and labor alike?

Socialism is the negation of private property and capitalism.

Mr. Justice Butler, at a banquet in St. Paul just before he took his seat on the Supreme Court, said: "The issue before the American people is the preservation of the institution of private property." That was a prophetic statement, and it was made in 1923. That issue is now being fought out. We may as well admit that the right of private ownership of property is being challenged today. We are again in the struggle of the "have-nots" against the "haves," which is as old as the hills. In this country we are well on the way toward depriving owners of the incidents of private ownership. Once these incidents are taken away, the existence of private property becomes a delusion. The bare legal title to property means nothing. If property produces no earnings that the owner may keep, it is valueless, and capitalism is at an end.

This is no idle alarm. We see the ever-rising current of income and ad valorem taxes, estate taxes, and other countless exactions—many of them for the avowed purpose of destroying estates and otherwise regimenting our lives. We see these superimposed upon the river of government, State, and municipal debt, with the flood of inflation and money tinkering in the offing. These constitute the core of the leveling and equalizing process now going on that forbodes destruction of the capitalistic system and opens the way for production for use and service. Every businessman and laboring man is anxiously awaiting the answer to the question: "What does all of this mean?" The lawyers of this country can accept the role that was accepted by lawyers of the formative period of this Government. They can help point the way before a relentless march, step by step, on one path, destroys all possibility of a choice of direction.

* * * * *

Bar associations should discuss government and social systems and analyze them for the people without camouflage. The things that are masqueraded in the name of democracy should be uncovered in the cold light of truth. Any attempt to put totalitarian practices in democratic dress should invite candid explanation. Is there to be recognized no distinction between the powers of our Government when at war, and when at peace? Are we to live in a perpetual emergency? Or does it make any difference whether we do or not?

People should be told that it is idle to think that the present war will preserve democracy or any other form of government. This war may determine whether the people of this Nation are to maintain their power to choose their own form of government. Nothing more. Freedom from foreign aggression does not mean that freedom will remain within our borders. National integrity is the only thing at issue in this war. What the form of our Government and society shall be will remain for the people to choose, regardless of the outcome of this war.

The people should be told that the Constitution is no longer the ark of their covenant. The Constitution has become a highly elastic thing, by broad interpretation. Our Constitution has become, in effect, little more than an unwritten constitution like that of England. In Minneapolis, years ago, Lord Birkenhead said: "In times of great stress your Constitution will mean no more than ours." I did not believe him then, but I am inclined to do so now. We are approaching parliamentary supremacy. The efficacy of constitutional limitations is gone. It has been judicially said that the people, through their representatives, are responsible for molding the form and directing the practical course that our Government shall take. The limits of experimentation in government are as broad as the demands of a majority of the people. Responsibility for government rests upon the people, and it has been said that "what the people want they ultimately get." The people should be told that the practical effects of the exercise of governmental power are the same, whether that power exists under a constitution or otherwise, and that they have the power to say what these practical effects shall be.

The test of a government is what is done under it. The people of this country, consciously or unconsciously, will decide the great issue of private property—the issue of capitalism against collectivism, the issue of regimentation against freedom of enterprise. The distance we shall travel on the road of socialization will be for the people to measure.

The people should be told that continued existence of a dual system of goverment in this country is being imperiled; that local autonomy has been whittled away by methods indirect as well as direct. The sovereign powers of the States are being taken away. Self-government is being forgotten. Their attention should be called to the danger of monopolization of forms of indirect taxation in this country by the Federal Government, which would deprive the States of necessary means of raising revenue. This will mean taxation of capital assets to the point of eventual confiscation, and will drive the States to further surrender of their sovereignty to the Federal Government or to acceptance of socialization.

A Giant Goes to Work—Grand Coulee Dam, the Eighth Wonder of the World

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1941

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, the first of 18 of the world's greatest generating units went on the line last Saturday at Grand Coulee and began pouring energy the equivalent of 150,000 horses into the production of aluminum and other badly needed war essentials.

I am naturally gratified, and, while to some of my colleagues I may appear to show an undue enthusiasm, yet those who have seen this mighty structure located in the eastern district of Washington, all agree that its magnitude and possibilities can be only partially appreciated when seen, and that language is totally inadequate to describe it.

The Spokane Daily Chronicle, of Spokane, Wash., of October 3, has an editorial under the caption, "A memorable day in power annals," which, though brief, is quite descriptive of what it means to the Nation to have this power available.

The editorial follows:

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Daily Chronicle of October 3, 1941]

A MEMORABLE DAY IN POWER ANNALS

The greatest hydroelectric generator of all time—150,000 horsepower—tomorrow afternoon joins the world power race.

The mammoth machine will start spinning at Grand Coulee Dam Saturday, the first of 18 generators to enter production. Water falling 310 feet at the rate of 141 tons a second will strike the blades of the great turbine when the word is given by the Bonneville power administration.

This machine alone can produce power enough for an industrial city of 200,000. In the next few months 2 more will join the production line and when all 18 are in service they will produce more power than all that was produced by the public utility power plants in the United States in 1905.

Saturday's ceremonies mark one of the great milestones in industrial history and, because of the importance of power in the world armament race, the event rates as one of the mighty steps in national defense.

In the same issue of the Spokane Daily Chronicle, under the news item entitled "Electric Output Goes Up at Dam," is furnished some statistical facts of this stupendous giant that is rapidly coming into use far ahead of the original schedule.

Today we have in the deficiency appropriation bill before us an item of $6,000,000 to further speed construction and bring into use the much needed electrical energy to insure the success of our determined emergency-defense program.

The news item follows:

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Daily Chronicle of October 3, 1941]

ELECTRIC OUTPUT GOES UP AT DAM

COULEE DAM, October 3.—Grand Coulee Dam has added more than 100,000 kilowatts of electrical energy to the national-defense power pool.

Power from the first of the 108,000-kilowatt generators, which will be placed in service formally at 5:30 p. m. Saturday, has been sending power on a test basis to the Bonneville-Grand Coulee power authority lines since Tuesday.

The dam has been serving the Bonneville lines for several months from its two 10,000-kilovolt-ampere station service units.

The big generator, first of 18 which eventually will be installed in Grand Coulee's powerhouses, has been tested and checked steadily since last summer and has been in the making for 3 years. It is the first of 3 to be installed in the next few months, and will produce more power by one-third than any other generator ever turned on.

ITS SIZE IS VAST

A 150,000-horsepower turbine will spin the 825-ton generator rotor. Turning the water wheel of the turbine for 1 generator alone will require 140 tons of water a second, enough for every person in the United States to take a bath every day.

Other figures regarding the electric giants at the Coulee include:

The generator installation from the bottom of the water wheel to the top of the generator is as high as an 18-story building.

The generator housing is 45 feet across and the main shaft is 42 inches thick. Turbine and generator weigh 2,000 tons.

One generator would light 1,500,000 60-watt lamps, or enough for Chicago. The full installation would light New York and Chicago both, supply all power needs, and still have some left over.

The generator will start turning 8 years after work was started on Grand Coulee Dam and 2½ years ahead of the original schedule.

National Reclamation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1941

PROGRAM OF ANNUAL CONVENTION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a memorandum containing the program of the tenth annual convention of the National Reclamation Association at Phoenix, Ariz., October 15–17.

From the Canadian border to the Rio Grande, from the Great Plains to the Pacific, the proceedings of this convention will be watched with interest. On the united effort it puts forth will depend the future of irrigation in 17 Western States represented at its council table.

Attention has been centered to some extent in recent years on power for national defense as a major objective of reclamation, but we must not lose sight of the fact that food for defense is as important for the safety of this Nation as power to turn the wheels of industry. There is only one way that we can insure adequate food supplies for this country, come drought or floods, and that is through maintenance of the irrigation program that the National Reclamation Association is sponsoring.

The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESS—FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

The future of the billion-dollar Federal reclamation program affecting 17 Western States will be the center of discussion at the tenth annual convention of the National Reclamation Association at Phoenix, Ariz., October 15–17, Secretary-Manager F. O. Hagie, of the association, announced today.

Heading a delegation of speakers from the Department of the Interior whose Bureau of Reclamation is the mainspring of the program, will be Under Secretary John J. Dempsey, Reclamation Commissioner John C. Page, and Acting Director Abe Fortas, of the Power Division. The place of irrigation and particularly power developments like those at Boulder Dam and Grand Coulee in the national-defense effort will have an important place on the program of the convention. The importance of the irrigation developments for food supplies and employment will be stressed.

Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, chairman of the Interior Department subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, will be the principal speaker at the annual banquet concluding the sessions of the convention. Other speakers include Acting Chief Forester Earl H. Clapp, of the United States Forest Service, Milton S. Eisenhower, coordinator, land-use program, United States Department of Agriculture, and many other men prominent in Federal and State activities.

Gov. Sidney P. Osborn, of Arizona, will welcome the convention to Phoenix, and Dr. Alfred Atkinson, president, University of Arizona, will be toastmaster at the banquet.

The program in full is as follows:

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 15

9 a. m. to 1 p. m.: Registration of delegates, Hotel Westward Ho. (NOTE.—A registration desk will be open from 7 p. m. to 11 p. m. Tuesday evening, October 14, at the Westward Ho for the convenience of those who wish to register at that time.)

10 a. m. to 12: State caucuses, with the following order of business: Elect member of legislative committee; elect member of resolutions committee; elect director; discuss reclamation problems and policies of the State, including budget and State quota.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON

Fiesta room, Hotel Westward Ho

1:30 p. m.: First convention session, president, O. S. Warden presiding.

1:35 p. m.: Invocation, Dr. R. N. Merrill, First Methodist Church, Phoenix, Ariz.

1:40 p. m.: What about Phoenix, Dr. Reed Shupe, mayor of Phoenix.

1:50 p. m.: What about Arizona, Hon. Sidney P. Osborn, Governor of Arizona, Phoenix, Ariz.

2 p. m.: President's address, O. S. Warden, publisher, Great Falls Tribune, Great Falls, Mont.

2:30 p. m.: Treasurer's report, J. A. Ford, manager, Spokane Chamber of Commerce, Spokane, Wash.

2:40 p. m.: Secretary-manager's report, F. O. Hagie, secretary-manager, National Reclamation Association, Washington, D. C.

3:10 p. m.: Honoring George H. Maxwell, executive director of the National Reclamation Association, which was organized as the National Irrigation Association on June 2, 1899, father of the Reclamation Act of 1902.

3:20 p. m.: Reports on State caucuses, by director from each State (5 minutes each).

4:30 p. m.: Announcements and adjournment.

WEDNESDAY EVENING

6:30 p. m.: Dinner meeting of directors' advisory committee, Continental Room, Westward Ho, President Warden presiding. Advisory committee composed of director, member of legislative committee, member of resolutions committee from each State, and two others from each State chosen by the director.

7:30 p. m.: Water users' forum, Fiesta Room, Hotel Westward Ho. Raymond A. Hill, consulting engineer, Los Angeles, presiding. An informal discussion of the problems of the water users. Program chairman, Lin B. Orme, president, Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, Phoenix, Ariz.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16

Fiesta Room, Hotel Westward Ho, President O. S. Warden, presiding

9:45 a. m.: Western development, John J. Dempsey, Under Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

10:05 a. m.: Relation of power to reclamation, Abe Fortas, Acting Director, Division of Power, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

10:25 a. m.: Answers to questions from the floor.

10:35 a. m.: Today's reclamation program, John C. Page, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Washington, D. C.

11:05 a. m.: John C. Page Question Box. During this hour Commissioner Page will answer questions submitted in writing not later than 7 p. m., Wednesday, October 15. If time permits, he will also answer questions from the floor.

11:50 a. m.: Official convention photograph, in the Patio, Hotel Westward Ho.

12:15 p. m.: Luncheon, Patio, Hotel Westward Ho, auspices of convention committee. Ora Bundy, first vice president, Ogden, Utah, presiding.

12:45 p. m.: Entertainment.

1 p. m.: Interests of the Manufacturer in Reclamation, W. W. Shoemaker, chairman, agricultural committee, National Association of Manufacturers, and vice president, Armour & Co., Chicago, Ill.

1:30 p. m.: Announcements and adjournment.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON

Fiesta Room, Hotel Westward Ho, President O. S. Warden, presiding

2 p. m.: The Problems of Agriculture, Carl H. Wilkin, economic analyst, raw materials national council, Sioux City, Iowa.

2:25 p. m.: The Sugar Picture Today, E. W. Rising, executive vice president, Western Beet Growers Association, Nampa, Idaho.

2:50 p. m.: Wheeler-Case Projects—Their Problems and Progress, Wesley R. Nelson, Chief, Engineering Division, Bureau of Reclamation, Washington, D. C.

3:20 p. m.: Answers by speakers to questions on any of above subjects.

4 p. m.: Tour of Salt River project, ending with dinner at steam plant of C. A. L. & P. Co.

THURSDAY EVENING

7 p. m.: Steak dinner at steam plant, C. A. L. & P. Co., hosts. William R. Wallace, presiding. (a) Informal speeches by visiting Governors, Congressmen, Senators, and distinguished guests. (b) Motion picture, The Lifeblood of the Desert, by Lin Orme, president, Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, Phoenix, Ariz.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 17

Fiesta Room, Hotel Westward Ho, President O. S. Warden, presiding

9:45 a. m.: Forest Management and Reclamation, W. S. Rosecrans, president, American Forestry Association, Los Angeles, Calif.

10:10 a. m.: Development and Care of the Forests in Our Watersheds, Earl H. Clapp, Acting Chief Forester, United States Forest Service, Washington, D. C.

10:30 a. m.: Evaluation of Priorities in Beneficial Use of Water, Royce J. Tipton, consulting engineer, Denver, Colo.

11 a. m.: New and Pending Water Legislation, Clifford H. Stone, director, Colorado Water Conservation Board, Denver, Colo.

11:30 a. m.: Answers by speakers to questions on any of above subjects. Announcements and adjournment.

12:15 p. m.: Luncheon, Patio, Hotel Westward Ho, auspices of convention committee. J. R. Fauver, director, Exeter, Calif., presiding.

12:45 p. m.: Entertainment.

1 p. m.: A Menacing Long Drought, Halbert P. Gillette, president, Gillette Publishing Co., San Marino, Calif.

1:30 p. m.: Announcements and adjournment.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON

Fiesta Room, Hotel Westward Ho, President O. S. Warden, presiding

2 p. m.: The Settlement of Irrigation Projects, Clifford Kaynor, publisher, Ellensburg Daily Record, Ellensburg, Wash.

2:25 p. m.: Changing Attitudes in Agriculture, Milton S. Eisenhower, coordinator, land-use program, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

2:50 p. m.: The National Values of Western Resources, Ralph Bradford, secretary, United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

3:15 p. m.: Business session. Report of auditing committee, report of budget committee, report of legislative committee, report of resolutions committee, selection of next convention city. Announcements and adjournment.

4 p. m.: Meeting of new board of directors.

FRIDAY EVENING

7:30 p. m.: Tenth annual banquet, Patio, Westward Ho Hotel, auspices of Phoenix convention committee (informal). Toastmaster,

Dr. Alfred Atkinson, president, University of Arizona, Tucson.

Entertainment: Floor show, troubadours, dancing.

Messages from friends of reclamation, President O. S. Warden.

Address, Hon. CARL HAYDEN, United States Senator from Arizona.

Fifteen-Fifteen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1941

ADDRESS BY DR. ARNAUD C. MARTS, PRESIDENT OF BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Dr. Arnaud C. Marts, president of Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa., at the first chapel session at the opening of the academic year, September 25, 1941.

The address follows:

It has become customary for me to speak at the first chapel session at the opening of the academic year in order to try as your leader to give some direction to our common life together on this campus of inspiration. I shall speak, therefore, briefly this morning about the responsibilities which this Bucknell community of 1,300 students and 150 teachers and administration have in this fateful fall of 1941 in our mutual endeavor to aid each other, to serve humanity, and to aid the slow and painful advance of civilized living on this earth.

I shall take as my starting point a question asked of me last spring by a senior in our mechanical engineering department.

Each May our mechanical engineering seniors spend an hour with me in a question-and-answer period. A week before the conference they send me a written list of questions related to problems that are troubling them, and thus I have some time to think about my answers. There is only one subject which is barred—by mutual recognition of the fact that I know less than they do about it—mechanical engineering. Otherwise, no range of questions is barred—not even advice to the lovelorn.

Last May one of many interesting questions presented to me was this: "Why is it that in time of war there occurs an increase of religious interest and at the same time a let-down of moral standards?"

This was an excellent question—one which on the surface seems to reveal a paradox, an inconsistency or insincerity in human nature. But under the surface, when one gives it deeper reflection, it provides an insight into human behavior which can illuminate our course of action at this time of crisis.

The answer to this question is very simple, when one gets the key to it. And the simple answer to this question is the answer to some of the basic problems which face modern civilization.

The answer is, of course, that there are three sorts of people; there always have been and there probably always will be.

This is best illustrated by certain experiences which I am having in my council of defense work at Harrisburg. We have 10 departments of our work there and 1 of them has to do with recreation for men in uniform when they are on leave. Experts in this department find that always about 15 percent of the men are interested only in the very best types of recreation. They know exactly how they want to spend their leaves—they want to visit relatives or friends; or they want to go to the theater or a concert; or they want to attend a baseball game or take part in some sport; or they want to go to a dance or other sort of party with a self-respecting girl; or take part in some other wholesome form of recreation. Their standards are established. They seek out the opportunities for fine recreation and it does not matter how many dives or low resorts they encounter, they pass them by instinctively without any temptation to lower their standards of conduct.

But in each camp there is another 15 percent of the men whose tastes in recreation and conduct are exactly the opposite. They are the lads whose instincts are coarse and unrefined. They make a beeline—like a homing bumble bee—straight to the hot spots. The U. S. O. could line their pathway with movies and canteens and reception centers and sports, but those 15 percent would pass them all by on the run, for they don't want wholesome recreation; they want only the booze joints and gambling dives, on a level with their own tastes.

And in between this upper 15 percent of lads in the uniformed forces and the lower 15 percent, the remainder—the great 70 percent—are undecided, mobile, ready to go in the direction of the strongest attraction at the moment. If wholesome recreation is available and companions lead them in that direction, they will go there. Or if they are led toward the hot spots, they will go there.

This cross section of the recreational standards of our men in uniform is a cross section of our whole life. About 15 percent have high ideals and standards of life to which they will be loyal through all kinds of experiences. And 15 percent have low standards and ideals, and are too selfish to want them elevated. And in between, many of the 70 percent will follow the one or the other 15 percent.

You are all familiar with John Oxenham's poem which expresses this same thought in beautiful lines:

A HIGH WAY AND A LOW

"To every man there openeth
A way, and ways, and a way.
And the high soul climbs the high way,
And the low soul gropes the low;

"And in between, on the misty flats,
The rest drift to and fro.
But to every man there openeth
A high way and a low,
And every man decideth
The way his soul shall go."

—*John Oxenham.*

ONE SHIP DRIVES EAST

"One ship drives east and another west,
While the selfsame breezes blow,
'Tis the set of the sail and not the gale
That bids them where to go.

"Like the winds of the air are the ways of fate
As we journey along through life;
'Tis the set of the soul that decides the goal,
And not the storm or the strife."

—*Ella Wheeler Wilcox.*

When you have this cross section in mind then you have the key to the answer to the mechanical engineer's question. The reason that at a time of national excitement there is an increase of religious interest and observance, and at the same time a let-down of moral standards, is that there are these two "15 percents" of our people and they react to the situation in opposite directions.

The top 15 percent come to a sharper realization than they have ever had of their share of responsibility for the sanity and decency of the world, and they undertake, with increased energy, to keep standards of conduct and ideals high at a time of danger and confusion. Thus we have the increase in religious interest.

And at the other end, the 15 percent who live selfishly and vulgarly see the standards are being lowered and they become more aggressive and energetic in their low pursuits and in their endeavors to bring all standards down to their level in order that they may have a larger company.

We are following the pattern now in 1941 that those of us who are old enough to remember can recall so vividly in 1916 and 1917 when as America approached the verge of war in those months, excitement and apprehension began to rise and there was an increase of religious interest and observance by the top 15 percent who endeavored to lead the Nation on the pathway of high purpose and unselfish ideals, and at the same time there was also a vast increase of activity on the part of the lower 15 percent who felt the wave of excitement about to pass over the Nation and who preached the gospel of "eat, drink, and be merry for tomorrow we die."

Never before has our modern world experienced a second great World War so soon after a first great World War. These great periodical conflicts and armed revolutions used to be spaced 50 or 60 or 70 years apart. Consequently the memory of the current active generation did not go back to the experiences of the previous war. But this time the second World War broke out only 21 years after the close of the prior World War. Perhaps this is due to the speed-up of all our modern life, or perhaps it is due to the remarkable phenomenon of an Adolf Hitler's genius who brought the storm of hate and bitterness to a culmination much sooner than any previous revolutionary leader has been able to do.

But whatever the cause or reason for this speed-up, we find ourselves now on the verge of a second world conflict and with a generation of men and women who can remember in every detail the patterns of national life before and during and after the previous World War. Let us hope that our memories will be so faithful that we shall be guided by them to a nobler course of action than this Nation followed in connection with the first World War.

During the days of 1916 and 1917 the lower 15 percent took over the leadership of the social and moral conduct of our Nation; "eat, drink, and be merry for tomorrow we die," was their text in one expression or another, and with that text they led America into an era of unprecedented lowering of ideals and deterioration of moral standards. It was a silk-shirt era of boisterous pleasure and selfish indulgence which left our Republic weaker to this very day. So they ate, they drank, and they were merry, but did not die.

It was not a quick revolution of moral conduct by any means. It came slowly, by letting down a little here and a little there. People began to use Sunday for sport instead of attending church; the night club began to creep out of the underworld into the life of the upper crust; standards of modesty and restraint were lowered bit by bit; drinking, which had been barred from all ordinary social life in America, became first admitted, then expected, and, finally, almost socially compulsory.

From one let-down to another, our Nation went with increasing momentum, each person excusing himself or herself against conscience, with the universal alibi, "Everyone else is doing it."

This cheapening of standards spread to the colleges, of course, and college students of the 1920's became generally regarded as a peculiar breed of noisy, ill-bred young people,

clad in coonskins and resembling fur-bearing animals also in their cultural capacities.

The reputation of the colleges still suffers from that cheap era; Professor Cooper, of Girard, says the movies still regard a college as "a place where students have a small room, lined with banners, to sleep in, and a huge stadium to play in. The professors are all stupid, and the students get most of their education by fooling them. The deans are the most stupid of all, although the president runs a close second. On rare occasions the students attend classes, but they spend most of their time dancing and playing. They are always falling in love, and when the football hero wins the beautiful co-ed the whole college turns out and holds a dance and parade."

This silly and false picture is a hang-over from the 1920's.

Those who knew America prior to 1916, and America since 1916, realize that some of the finest elements of our previous national life have been missing ever since those hectic years when the lower 15 percent grabbed the pennant of the Nation and marched furiously toward the era of selfishness, of greed, of stupidity, and of gambling, which characterized the life of this Nation in the 1920 decade.

There was but one possible culmination to the decade dedicated to these low standards of personal and national life. The downhill decade went its foolish course through bootlegging, racketeering, kidnaping, and gambling, and climaxed in the last quarter of 1929 in a financial collapse which shook the very foundation of this Republic and which soon shook the structure of the whole world.

The 1929 collapse wasn't just a financial collapse. It was something far deeper than that. It was the final failure of the national selfishness which had been initiated back in 1916 when the lower 15 percent persuaded the majority of this Nation to lower their standards and to cast aside their habits and traditions of American honesty, honor, and plain decency for an era of boisterous, selfish, personal pleasure.

Since 1929 all America, indeed, all the world, has been paying the price of our previous folly. During the 1930's sick America nursed the headache of the morning after. At that time America, of all nations in the world, with the greatest mission of any nation in history, should have been strong to deal with the growing danger spots in Europe and Asia. America should have been strong enough to preserve the peace of the world. Instead of being strong for this great service to humanity, America was weak and prostrate, using all our great energy simply to survive and recuperate.

Now we stand where we stood once before in 1916—the world is in flames on each horizon—America is the hope of civilization as we know it. We see ourselves approaching step by step toward that final fateful decision just as we saw ourselves approaching a similar point of decision in 1916 and as we find ourselves in this similar situation, so we observe also the lower 15 percent again taking advantage of the excitement as it arises; once again we hear the same text murmured—this time in different words—instead of "eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we die," the words of the same text today are "It's a crazy world; what's the use; let's have our own gay time." Of course, it isn't a crazy world, it's the crazy people in it. During the past few months I have observed a letting down of standards and a deterioration of ideals exactly similar to the patterns of 1916, and I for one am not willing to see America led again down this same pathway to our national destruction. It's the turn this time of the upper 15 percent, instead of the lower 15 percent, to keep American ideals and standards high through the dangerous crisis that lie before us. Only in this way can we emerge from these experiences, upon which we seem about to enter, strong enough and fine enough to take the leadership of the reconstruction of Christian civilization after this cruel war shall be over.

Here on the Bucknell campus are gathered hundreds of young men and young women who believe in high ideals and high standards, or you would not be here. Here on this campus, in this year of national danger, it is our privilege and our duty to keep our standards high and to dedicate ourselves to the service of a future America infinitely finer and nobler and stronger than the America which emerged from the first World War in 1918.

The world after this war will sorely need a generation of young people with high ideals and with utter devotion to the principles of Christian civilization. There will be fewer young people in the world with those ideals than there were at the close of the first World War, for during the past 10 years the oncoming generations of Germany and of Russia, and of Japan, have been actively inoculated with a zeal for selfish and cruel living. They have been taught by their leaders, whom they trusted, that they must be strong and aggressive and cruel in serving themselves only. The problems of the reconstruction of civilized living will be infinitely more difficult than they were 20 years ago, because of these vast areas where the youth have been deliberately trained to cruel and selfish attitudes.

The youth of America have a challenge and an opportunity which will require your finest intelligence and your finest devotion to the concepts of Christian civilization. Henry Luce, the publisher of Time and Life, recently wrote an editorial in Life in which he said, "The twentieth century is America's age. America must at last take the responsibility of leadership in the reconstruction of our civilization."

America cannot take that leadership and that responsibility if she follows the lower 15 percent, as she did 25 years ago.

The strength of a nation lies not in its material resources only, but in the character and unselfishness and devotion of its people. A Washington columnist says that during the 9 months between the beginning of the war in September 1939 and the fall of France in June 1940 some of the gayest parties since the days of Napoleon III featured the social life of Paris. Parisians entertained as never before; some of them even rented villas and ducal estates from the old French nobility and spent thousands of francs to do them over merely to give one party for 1 night. The lower 15 percent were in the saddle in France and they rode the French Republic into the valley of disaster. They were escapists—while their country was about to die they hid themselves in selfish, noisy pleasure.

Can we learn from our experiences of 25 years ago and from our observation of these other tragedies about us?

It is my hope and prayer for our life together on the Bucknell campus this year that we shall consciously keep the faith in high standards of intellectual effort and moral conduct. We have treasures to preserve here, treasures of mind and spirit and purpose. This is no ordinary place. This is a place of rare privilege and responsibility. This is a colony of the upper 15 percent. I want you, each of you, to be on guard against these influences and persons who are already seeking to spread their gospel of "What's the use—let's go."

I ask this for your sake—each of you—in order that you may discover life's real secret of inner happiness—the feeling that you have been true to the very best that is in you.

I ask it for Bucknell's sake, in order that, regardless of how standards around us may deteriorate, this campus may be kept by you as a repository of civilization's noblest values.

I ask it for America's sake. Once before in my memory I have seen America go through the valley of the shadow of dishonor and human tragedy because at a time similar to the present, just 25 years ago, the upper 15 percent were unable to lead our beloved Republic.

I get letters and phone calls and personal pleas every day in my office at the capitol in Harrisburg asking me what very definite thing they or their organization can do in the defense program. Most of them are hoping to get an assignment with a uniform or a badge or a bit of personal excitement. There are few such assignments as yet, except in two special danger centers in the State. But there is a tragically essential service which every man and woman can now render America in this hour, the hour of the greatest peril our Nation has ever faced.

It is for the private citizen to stand true to high ideals of personal life—to be honest in work and play, to be decent and orderly and law-abiding in every relationship, to be unselfish in every word and deed. An America made up of such individual citizens has nothing to fear.

And no citizen can serve America better at this moment or in the days of trial that lie ahead of us than to make himself or herself such a person.

Let us make this year which we are to share at this place of inspiration an experience which we shall never forget because of its very fineness and its strength of honor and beauty.

If high ideals prevail this time, I believe we can look across the valley of this present world tragedy with the poet to victory for Christian civilization.

"VICTORY

"Ye that have faith to look with fearless eyes
Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife,
And know that out of death and night shall rise
The dawn of ampler life;
Rejoice, whatever anguish rend the heart,
That God has given you the priceless dower
To live in these great times and have your part
In freedom's crowning hour,
That ye may tell your sons who see the light
High in the heavens—their heritage to take—
'I saw the powers of darkness take their flight,
I saw the morning break.'"

—*Owen Seaman.*

Effect of the New River Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

ADDRESS BY ABRAM P. STAPLES BEFORE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able address delivered before the National Association of Attorneys General at Indianapolis, Ind., September 30, 1941, by the Honorable Abram P. Staples, attorney general of the State of Virginia. At the same meeting, Mr. Staples was

elected president of the National Association of Attorneys General of America. The address of Attorney General Staples deals with a most vital question and, therefore, I desire to have his remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I realize that this is not an appropriate time for the States to agitate or initiate controversies involving any of the rights or powers which conflict with those now asserted by the Federal Government, nor is it my purpose or intention to advocate any such action during the present emergency. The entire Nation is now exerting its supreme efforts to train its armies, to produce airplanes, tanks, guns, and other munitions of war, and to build ships and take other effective steps to convey these supplies, or a large part of them, to other nations to aid them in their valiant and desperate struggle to preserve the freedom of the human race and prevent its enslavement at the hands of ruthless aggressors. It is clear that the successful accomplishment of these worthy aims demands a thoroughly harmonious and united Nation. Certainly, the Attorneys General will do nothing to impede or obstruct these efforts of the Government or to impair the national unity. I hope, therefore, that what I have to say will be considered to be in conformity with this spirit. On the other hand, however, we must be alert to prevent, so far as possible, any further permanent encroachments by the Federal Government in the field of powers and jurisdiction reserved to the States by the Constitution.

The subject upon which I have the honor to address the association is The Effect of the New River Case. This case (*United States v. Appalachian Power Company*) involved the broad question whether the Commonwealth of Virginia had jurisdiction to regulate the generation of electrical energy at a power plant constructed by the Appalachian Co. in the New River at Radford, Va., or whether the Federal Power Commission possessed the paramount regulatory jurisdiction over same. The power dam and plant was being constructed by the power company pursuant to and in conformity with a license granted by Virginia. The object of the suit, instituted in the name of the United States, was to enjoin the construction and operation of the project unless and until a license authorizing same should be obtained from the Federal Power Commission. This Federal Commission had tendered the Appalachian Co. a license provided for by the Federal Water Power Act. This license contained conditions the effect of which was to bring the project within the direct and complete regulatory control of the Commission. The company refused to accept the license.

The main questions on which the decision turned were, first, whether New River at Radford was a navigable water of the United States, and, second, even if navigable, whether the regulatory jurisdiction or power of the Federal Government over such waters extended to matters in no way connected with navigation. Virginia and West Virginia filed briefs as amici in the district court and in the circuit court of appeals. Forty-one States filed briefs in the Supreme Court of the United States, and I, as Attorney General of Virginia, was granted leave to argue the case orally in that court. Both the district court and the circuit court of appeals, after an exhaustive review of the evidence, found as a fact that New River at Radford was not a navigable water of the United States. Both courts also held that, even if it were such a navigable water, the measure of control or regulation sought to be exercised over the project by the license tendered by the Federal Power Commission was not a regulation of interstate commerce, but of the manufacture of electrical energy, and that the regulation of such an activity was solely within the reserved powers of the States. The position taken by all of the 41 States in their briefs in the Supreme Court was that these two decisions of the lower courts should be affirmed.

The Supreme Court, however, reversed the case and held exactly the opposite on both points, in an opinion by Mr. Justice Read, with a dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Roberts in which Mr. Justice McReynolds concurred. Chief Justice Hughes did not sit in the case.

The effect of the decision on the powers of the States is far reaching, not only because of the Court's conclusions but also of the reasons advanced in their support. It not only broadens the previously existing concept of what constitutes navigable waters of the United States but also enlarges the former generally accepted idea of the extent of Federal powers over such waters. Let us consider, first, how far the decision operates to bring within the control of the Federal Power Commission waters over which the States have heretofore asserted their own exclusive jurisdiction, a jurisdiction which had never been challenged since the foundation of the Government.

The former decisions of the Supreme Court had clearly established that navigable waters of the United States were only those streams which in their natural condition were capable of being commonly used in interstate commerce of a substantial character. New River, a wild mountain stream, clearly did not meet this test of navigability. But a new test was applied, depending, not on the usefulness of the stream in its natural condition but upon whether it is possible, at a cost commensurate with the need, to so improve the stream as to make it navigable in fact. Although holding New River navigable under this test, the opinion does not undertake to measure or compare the cost with the need, or even to point out any need for a waterway for keelboat navigation in this mountainous region with its ample railway and highway facilities. It is, therefore, impossible to formulate from the opinion any test or rule to determine whether there is "a balance between cost and need" in any particular case. In fact, the opinion says: "We do not purport now to lay down any definitive test." The Court further held that it is not necessary "that the improvements should be actually completed or even authorized." They were not authorized in New River.

It is clear, therefore, that the effect of the new test of navigability is to bring about a marked change in the status of many State streams and in the control of the States over them. Many streams formerly considered nonnavigable, when subjected to the new test, will or have become navigable waters of the United States. With respect to others, where the results of an attempt to apply such a test are doubtful, the rights of the States over them rest under a cloud. They may be said to occupy a sort of twilight zone.

The right of control by the State over its streams not actually used for navigation, and which it is certain will never be so used, is a matter of the profoundest importance. Sections 9 and 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (33 U. S. C. A., secs. 401, 403) prohibit the building of any bridge, dam, dike, causeway, or pier in any navigable water of the United States "until the consent of Congress shall have been obtained" and "until the plans for the same shall have been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and by the Secretary of War," and then only in accordance with such approved plans. An exception to this is that the Federal Power Commission may license without congressional consent a hydroelectric dam to be constructed and operated under its supervision.

Let us consider, first, the effect upon the States in relation to their highway bridges or other works of internal improvement, such as fish hatcheries and local flood-control or irrigation projects, and, secondly, the effect upon the development of water power in streams of this type.

The problem of highway bridges will suffice as an illustration of the first-mentioned class of State activities. Before the State may build a bridge over a navigable stream the consent of Congress must be obtained. Experience proves that such consent will not be granted except with the approval of the local Representative in Congress. If he disapproves the kind of bridge or its location, he may prevent congressional consent, thus enabling him to dicate to the highway department the location of the road, which is frequently a highly controversial local matter. But assuming the Congressman is cooperative, there may be delay not only in Congress, which may be in recess, but also in securing the approval of the plans by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War. They may, indeed, require a much more expensive structure than the State desires or feels it is justified in building, as has sometimes happened.

Now, these Federal requirements are no doubt perfectly proper as applied to waters which it may be reasonably contemplated will be utilized as a navigable highway in interstate commerce. But to impose these restrictions on streams where there is no contemplation of such use operates as a tremendous burden and unjustifiable obstruction to the governments of the States in the administration of their internal affairs. The New River case holds: "The point is that navigable waters are subject to national planning and control in the broad regulation of commerce granted the Federal Government." I am afraid we cannot escape the conclusion that as matters now stand the States have been divested in large measure of control, or even use, of practically all their rivers of any substantial size except with the consent of Congress. It may be argued that no effort will be made by the Federal agencies to enforce the prohibitions of the Rivers and Harbors Act as to these streams not heretofore considered navigable, and this may be true. But the State officers violating the act may incur a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $2,500 and imprisonment of 1 year (U. S. C. A., sec. 406). And this penalty applies not only to violation of the act itself, but also to "any rule or regulation made by the Secretary of War in pursuance of the provisions of said sections."

This is not an enviable position for State officers, particularly when there has been no judicial determination of the navigability of a stream in the twilight zone or any assertion of its navigability by Congress or any governmental agency. The State officer must act at his peril or else secure the requisite Federal consent. If the stream is navigable the State cannot lawfully, without such consent, erect any structures therein or make any excavations, or fill-ins, or in any manner alter or modify the channel of the stream. The State cannot even improve it for local navigation, although the stream is not in actual or contemplated use in interstate commerce.

If, as appears to be the case, the effect of the decision is to divest the States of their heretofore believed exclusive sovereign dominion over a great many of their rivers, lakes, and streams, with respect to the building of bridges and other structures therein, and their use for irrigation, local navigation and other internal activities, let us next consider its effect upon the development of hydroelectric power. These streams, being navigable waters of the United States under the new test, become subject to the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act and the regulatory jurisdiction and control of the Federal Power Commission. Neither a riparian owner, nor a municipality, nor even

the State itself, may construct or operate a power project without a license from this Commission.

In addition to the question of navigability, on which the jurisdiction of the Federal Commission turned, another question of far-reaching importance to the States was decided in the New River case. This was whether the regulatory control of the Commission, although within the terms of the Federal Water Power Act, could constitutionally be extended to matters having no relation to the regulation of stream flow or navigation. The Federal Act confers on the Commission authority to regulate, not only the type and plan of structure to be erected by a licensee, but also the entire business of generating electrical energy. As stated in the Court's opinion referring to the license provision: "The criticized provisions summarized above are not essential to or even concerned with navigation, as such." The regulatory provisions summarized in the opinion are too numerous to refer to in detail in a paper of this scope. Many of them are extremely burdensome, so burdensome in fact as to amount to a virtual prohibition of the development of water power by private industry, or by the States either for that matter. One provision, which I deem particularly objectionable to the States, is the so-called recapture of the project by the United States at the expiration of the license period—50 years. The Power Commission is authorized to require the setting aside of amortization reserves to be applied in reduction of the value of the investment for condemnation purposes, with the result that the amount of these reserves may be so adjusted over the license period as to completely amortize the investment and leave no value or equity at its expiration. The United States could thus acquire the property for nothing. This provision is objectionable to the States for two reasons; first, because the setting aside of the amortization charges will necessitate a higher power rate which the public must pay, and, secondly, because the taking over of the property by the Government will destroy an important source of State taxation and revenue, and hinder the States in the use of valuable natural resources heretofore considered as belonging to them. It was believed that the States had the paramount right to condemn such properties.

Prior to the decision in the New River case it had been generally believed to be a principle well established by the Supreme Court decisions that the only jurisdiction which Congress could exercise over navigable waters, in addition to that exercised over fast land, was the protection and regulation of navigation. Hon. Cordell Hull so stated in discussing the water power question in the House of Representatives in 1928. He referred to the power of Congress over navigable streams as a "naked right, with no power given to use the water for any other purpose than navigation." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD vol. 9, pt. 8, p. 8222.) However, in the New River opinion, the Court distinguishes the cases thought to have established this principle, and holds "recovery of the cost of improvements through utilization of power are likewise part of commerce control." And thus, although the Court, in *Utah Power and Light Company* v. *Pfost*, 286 U. S. 165, expressly held that the generation of electricity is manufacture and not commerce—that commerce only begins after manufacture ends—the Court in the New River case apparently reaches the conclusion that the manufacture of electricity on a navigable stream is interstate commerce, and this even though the energy generated is not sent beyond State lines. It is not believed, however, that the effect of the decision is to classify as interstate commerce every activity in navigable waters. It has never been contended, so far as I know, that the States do not have exclusive jurisdiction over seafood industries in such waters, except insofar as they might obstruct navigation, or that such industries constitute commerce between the States. Virginia and Maryland have always exercised regulatory jurisdiction over them in the Chesapeake Bay and other tidal waters. The States have always regulated fishing by sportsmen in their lakes and streams. But it must be conceded that the effect of the opinion is to give Congress paramount regulatory jurisdiction over hydroelectric projects in navigable waters, and that under the new test of navigability this embraces such projects in practically all of the important streams in the several States.

One other matter of interest is the effect of the opinion upon the question of ownership of the property right in the water power inherent in these streams. In the *Ashwander case* (297 U. S. 288, 330) the Supreme Court said: "The water power, the right to convert it into the electrical energy thus produced, constitute property." Virginia owns the beds of its streams and, therefore, would seem to own the water power flowing over the bed. From early days, in granting patents of land to private individuals, Virginia has reserved the ownership of her streams for the benefit of the people of the State. Does the naked power to regulate commerce among the several States operate to transfer the title to the property right in these streams from the State to the United States? It is hardly conceivable that the commerce clause could be given such a broad effect, nor does the opinion expressly so hold. The Court does say: "Water power development from dams in navigable streams is, from the public's standpoint, a byproduct of the general use of the rivers for commerce," but there is no discussion of the ownership of this byproduct, whether by the people of the State owning the stream or the people of the entire United States. The opinion says further: "The Federal Government has domination over the water power inherent in the flowing stream. It is liable to no one for its use or nonuse. The flow of a navigable stream is in no sense private property." But the Court evidently did not consider as presented to it for decision at this time the question whether the State or Federal Government owns the property right in the water power. This question would arise only if and when the Federal Government actually takes over the plant through condemnation proceedings as provided for by the Federal Water Power Act. Said the Court further: "To predetermine, even in the limited field of water power, the rights of different sovereignties, pregnant with future controversies, is beyond the judicial function. The courts deal with concrete legal issues, presented in actual cases, not abstractions."

It has always been the general thought that the States own their water power. This is borne out by the views expressed by no less a person than President Roosevelt. When Governor of New York, in his messages to the legislature and in other public addresses, time and time again he asserted and reiterated that this source of energy in New York's rivers is the property of the people of that State (public papers and addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, vol. 1). So far as I know he has said nothing since to indicate any change of view.

Summarizing, then, by way of conclusion, it may be said that the New River decision has had the effect of broadening the former judicial concept of what constitute navigable waters of the United States, and consequently of bringing within Federal control many important streams and lakes theretofore controlled by the several States; that the status of many other streams and lakes as to navigability is doubtful because of the difficulty of determining when the cost of improvements necessary to render them navigable in fact is commensurate with the need for using them as a common highway in commerce among the States; that the provisions of the Rivers and Harbors Act, when made applicable to so many new waters, constitute a very serious obstruction to the governments of the States in administering their internal affairs; that amendments to said act to clearly define and to some extent restrict the extent of its operation are desirable; that the scope of the Federal regulatory power under the commerce clause has been extended beyond previous decisions of the Supreme Court so as to embrace the generation of electrical energy in a navigable stream; and, finally, that the question of whether the several States own the property right in the water power in such streams, or whether it is owned by the Federal Government is left an open question.

Has Madam Perkins Reformed, or Is This Some More of Her Political Demagogery to Mislead the Public?

REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a news item from the Washington Times-Herald, under date of October 8, referring to Secretary Perkins' urge to the American Federation of Labor to clean house, stating that their leaders should be American citizens. The reason I am inserting this in the RECORD is that perhaps, when Madam Perkins is confronted with her own statement, she may forget that she said it, the same as she has forgotten in the past some of her damaging statements and would probably deny that she made them. So in order that this one may not be lost, I am placing it in the RECORD. At some future date, Madam Perkins may wish to deny this statement, particularly after the C. I. O. leaders, who belong to subversive groups that she is now backing, take her to task.

Are not Madam Perkins' statements, as shown here, particularly in view of her past actions, the arch demagogery and the 22-carat hypocrisy of the year? We all know Perkins, and recognize her for what she is and what she does. Certainly, we cannot recognize or know her by her statements, particularly these new statements. If her name were not attached to this item, no one in the United States would ever attribute the statements to her. Is it possible that her own chickens have come home to roost in such great numbers that she now finds her position so hot that it is untenable?

Is it possible that she has at last realized that about 90 percent of all the people in the United States know her now for what she is, and that she is trying to hide behind the skirts of demagogery, to create a new personality, in order that she may continue in her help to the subversive interests in the C. I. O.? If

Madam Perkins does realize how wrong she has been, how she has disgraced her office, she should immediately resign, because her record of administration has been so terrible she can never be reinstated in the confidence of the American people.

You will note she calls on the American Federation of Labor to drive out racketeering influences, and to elect trustworthy officers, and furnish full details of union finances. Why does she pick out the American Federation of Labor, who, after all, is certainly no friend of hers, and, when compared to the C. I. O., stands so high above the C. I. O. as a constructive union that it is not equitable even to make a comparison? Have you ever heard Perkins ask the C. I. O. to throw out its Communists, its racketeers, its Socialists, its subversive interests, and those who seek to destroy the United States? You certainly have not. But, on the contrary, you have seen her come to the rescue of Harry Bridges, condone his actions, defend him, and do everything that she could to protect him. The history of the attempt to deport Harry Bridges under the administration of Perkins is a disgrace and a blot upon the escutcheon of all Cabinet officers which neither time nor memory will ever blot out. It is my opinion that the last thing in the world that she wanted Bridges to have was justice, and in order to bring Bridges to justice the whole Department of Immigration and Naturalization had to be taken away from her because of the disgraceful and incompetent manner in which she carried it on.

I think the same may be said of her conduct of the Labor Department. This has been a one-sided C. I. O. administration from start to finish, in which she has backed the subversive interests which are destroying this Government. For any of these reasons she should resign, and I, for one, would like to see Congress still impeach her. She declares labor should be accountable to the public, as are banks, insurance companies, and stock exchanges. Have you ever heard her ask any of the socialistic, alien, communistic, racketeering outlaws, who are feathering their own nests at the expense of the honest rank and file of labor under them, for an accounting? These racketeers do not account to anybody, and I am surprised that the Treasury Department has not gotten after them and brought them to account and put them where they belong. How many of these make income-tax returns?

How many of the rank and file know what the finances are under these men? Many of us do know not only the amounts of money that have been extracted from honest labor in the form of rackets, but we also know what coercion and brutality the honest rank and file have had to put up with. Have you ever heard Perkins say anything to this bunch of C. I. O. outlaw leaders about this? No; you never have; and perhaps you never will, unless she is forced to it by a public demand—and I, for one, hereby make that demand.

Madam Perkins also asserts that all union citizens should be American citizens. Did you ever notice Madam Perkins giving any support to my bill that provides, briefly, in substance, that "no alien may represent labor in collective bargaining with any business or industry"? No; she did not, for she could not and maintain the relationship that she has had with these subversive leaders.

It was stated in the paper that "this was seen as her repudiation of Harry Bridges, west coast C. I. O. leader, whose cause she had once championed." I have stood on this floor day after day and have asked Madam Perkins to throw out Harry Bridges, and we even passed the bill to deport him. Madam Perkins would not budge; but you will note that when the bill was finally passed, the Department got too hot for her to handle and it was immediately handed to the Department of Justice. You will note, too, after this Immigration and Naturalization Service was transferred to the Department of Justice, the difference in administration, and that her friend Bridges is now on his way out. When she finds herself with this hot coal in her hands, no doubt she would throw over Bridges in order selfishly to protect herself.

This demand on the part of Madam Perkins in asking unions to maintain high standards, particularly in handling other people's money, to me is the most farcical demagogery and piece of chicanery, in order to fool the American people, that I have ever seen.

Did it never occur to Madam Perkins that it is just as necessary and desirable that she handle the public's labor business just as carefully as she would suggest that the unions handle other people's money? Perkins does not come before the court with clean hands because she has handled the business of the people of the United States, with reference to labor, in even a far worse manner than the racketeering outlaw labor leaders have handled other people's money.

This is another arch piece of hypocrisy:

The public also expects of its institutions that no individuals shall gain at the expense of the public and that no funds will be sidetracked into the pockets of those whose activities serve either their personal greed or antisocial purpose.

Let us look at Perkins' record. You will find that she has violated every one of the fundamental premises that she has expounded here, namely, that she has supported the C. I. O. group in their fight to extract unreasonable amounts, in socialistic control of business, in unreasonable hours, and many other things, and particularly in the amounts of money. Is this Labor Secretary so dumb that she does not yet realize that all of the citizens of the United States have to pay in taxes these things which she has so inequitably given away to these subversive leaders? Could it be a fact that at last it is percolating through her head that many of the upstanding and outstanding young manhood of this country are serving at $21 a month, when this so-called Secretary of Labor has been feathering the nests of the racketeering, socialistic, communistic, outlaw labor leaders of the C. I. O.?

If ever a person wrote their own indictment, their failures in office, their violations of all the rules of decency, Madam Perkins could not have made a more perfect job of it than she has here made to the American Federation of Labor. In view of this, Madam Perkins, and in view of your own record, you are the type of person that certainly should be gotten out of Government, if not out of the United States entirely. Has this not yet percolated through your thick head? And if it has, will you not resign before you are thrown out?

The article to which I have referred follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of October 8, 1941]

SECRETARY PERKINS URGES A. F. OF L. TO CLEAN HOUSE—LEADERS SHOULD BE AMERICAN CITIZENS, SHE TELLS CONVENTION

SEATTLE, WASH., October 7.—Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins today called on the American Federation of Labor in its sixty-first annual convention to drive racketeering influences out of its unions by making these organizations elect trustworthy officers and furnish full details of union finances. She declared labor should be as accountable to the public as are banks, insurance companies, and stock exchanges.

Madam Perkins also asserted that all union officials should be American citizens. This was seen as her repudiation of Harry Bridges, west coast C. I. O. leader, whose cause she had once championed.

NOT INTERESTED IN BRIDGES

Bridges' deportation to his native Australia on a finding that he once belonged to the Communist Party, which advocated overthrow of American Government, has been recommended by a Federal referee. Madam Perkins said she was "not interested" in Bridges.

The delegates exhibited sharply contrasting attitudes in listening to messages from President Roosevelt and Governor Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota. Little more than half of the 600 delegates were in the hall when the President's address was read, and the handclapping was subdued. He had called on labor to support his all-out program of aid to Great Britain and Russia by avoiding any stoppages of defense work.

All the delegates were in their places, however, when Stassen delivered his talk in person. He was interrupted by loud cheers when he called on the Government to prevent abuses that precipitate strikes and ask labor to keep the administration's widespread powers on only a temporary basis. He was given a long standing ovation when he finished.

URGES HIGH STANDARDS

Secretary Perkins, while not using the specific word "racketeering," said the public demands that unions maintain high standards, particularly in the handling of "other people's money."

"The scrupulous accounting for money, regular independent and public audits of all moneys, including insurance funds, dues, and assessments, is bound to be expected," she said, "and it should be done voluntarily by the trade unions, rather than under compulsion. Many of the best unions have established such methods and are to be congratulated.

"With the trade union basic right protected by statute, surely no moneys need be expended, except as authorized by the membership and for purposes which can be stated in a public accounting without embarrassment to anyone.

"The public also expects of its institutions that no individuals shall gain at the expense of the public and that no funds will be sidetracked into the pockets of those whose activities serve either their personal greed or antisocial purpose. The public has this

same expectation of banks, insurance companies, and stock exchange."

SPECULATE ON BROWNE

There was speculation as to whether Madam Perkins' remarks were inspired by the case of George E. Browne, twelfth vice president of the A. F. of L. and president of the International Association of Theatrical and Stage Employees. There have been reports he will not be renominated to the A. F. of L. executive council. He is scheduled to go on trial in New York tomorrow on charges of conspiracy to extort $550,000 from motion-picture companies.

Governor Stassen said the Government should have a clear-cut labor policy and should not take away the right to strike.

Asking for Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. GERALD P. NYE, OF NORTH DAKOTA, BEFORE AMERICA FIRST COMMITTEE RALLY AT NEWARK, N. J.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject, Asking for Trouble, delivered by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] at Newark, N. J., on September 23, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The candidate of the Republican Party for President in 1940 has since become a director in a British-dominated insurance company, a director of the New York Ship Building Co., which is enjoying contracts approaching a half billion dollars with the United States Government, has become a director or has been nominated to become a director in the Lehman Bros. Corporation, and is an outfront advocate of further involvement of our country in Europe's war.

Nevertheless, he is the same man who on November 12, a few days following the Presidential election, said:

"Mr. Roosevelt and I both promised the people in the course of the campaign that if we were elected we would keep this country out of war unless attacked. Mr. Roosevelt was reelected, and this solemn pledge for him I know will be fulfilled, and I know the American people desire him to keep it sacred."

Some of us are still asking that those promises made by President Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie be kept sacred. I think it altogether fair, in light of what is being revealed by polls and immediate contact with the people, that 90 percent of the people of these United States are prayerfully urging that these Roosevelt-Willkie promises of the late campaign be kept sacred.

Because we are asking and insisting that our country be kept from involvement in foreign war we are called isolationists, with emphasis upon the implication that we are blind, or would bury our heads in the sands, that we would have no social, no economic relations with the rest of the world, that we would simply ignore all the world, and that we would even abandon foreign trade.

Now let's just pause long enough here to see who are the real isolationists in keeping with this loose defining of what constitutes isolationism.

As a result of Presidential conduct of our foreign policy during the last 2 or 3 years, the United States has virtually no shipping or trade activity in the Pacific, we have surrendered to others our ships and tankers until we have all but abandoned trade with South America, and are even without the usual intercoastal shipping on the Atlantic seaboard, largely because we have given our ships to others. Whatever trade exists on the Atlantic Ocean is a Santa Claus trade, a trade that brings us only debt, a trade most costly of maintenance. This is the result, I repeat, of the manner in which our foreign policy has been conducted, a policy that was threatening virtually every power upon this earth excepting only one, a policy which endangered hatred and suspicion. This has been the policy of the interventionists.

This interventionist policy has all but completely isolated the United States. Those who would get us nearer to, or actually into the foreign wars, have accomplished an isolation more complete than the United States has known in all its history. And when this madness is over with, as it will be one day, we shall doubtless find that Great Britain has all our cargo-carrying ships, continuous control of all the sea lanes, her own trade intact, while we have abandoned ours and are without the shipping capacity needed to undertake renewal of our lost foreign trade.

That will be the result invited by the kind of isolationist policy pursued by the Roosevelt administration and the interventionists of America.

Washington and Jefferson were isolationists, but in quite another sense. They were isolationists against the hates and the wars of foreign lands. They were isolationists against the notion that we could hope to reform or in any wise influence Europe in the adoption of American ideology. Jefferson expressed his style of isolation well when he said:

"For us to attempt to reform all Europe, and bring them back to principles of morality and a respect for the equal rights of nations, would show us to be only maniacs of another character."

Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, president of Stanford University, brings the Jefferson thought down to date in more modern language when he says:

"If anyone believes the American people can go out and force other nations around to our way of thinking, he has a Hitler complex."

President Roosevelt was once this style of isolationist. It wasn't more than 4 years ago that the President was saying that he would not object to being called an isolationist so long as isolation meant isolation against other people's wars.

I know that I, along with millions of Americans, am isolationist in the sense only of seeking to avoid trouble with and part in other people's wars. The interventionists have won isolation by seeking for and asking for trouble.

The Monroe Doctrine afforded in essence, the kind of isolation that I believe in but definitely not the kind of isolation which the interventionists advocate and further. The President and the interventionists have redefined the Monroe Doctrine. We have had the Doctrine so redefined as to make it an invitation to trouble. As construed by American leadership today the Monroe Doctrine is an instrument which forbids non-Americans any interference on the American continent but which permits America to interfere anywhere in the world. It becomes now, in the hands of interventionists, an instrument to invite trouble for ourselves.

There is nothing new about this venture because for many months the administrators of our American affairs have been asking for trouble; threatening, daring, and pushing others to extremes which could not win anything but trouble. This asking for trouble has brought our country to a distressing need for more of the instruments of national defense. In the providing of that defense, however much people may differ with the occasion for it—in the winning of national defense of adequacy, there is no disunity among the people or in the Congress. There is disunity on the theory that our defense is adequately provided for by defending others or providing the defense instruments for others who in turn might one day surrender them to those against whom we feel required to provide a larger defense for ourselves.

The saddest thing in this day is the knowledge that our national invitations to and for trouble have been always in the name of peace, of keeping our country out of other peoples' wars. With no enemy in sight, with no threat made against us, or even implied, we have pursued a defense policy that has made us, if not in word then by deed at least, a partner of certain belligerent nations.

Look now to the question of how we have been asking for trouble at every turn in the conduct of our foreign policy of the last 3 years.

First came repeal of the arms embargo in the name of keeping us out of war. This action violated neutrality in the eyes of international law and understanding. Indeed, it violated international law. Repeal could have been accomplished only as the administration sold Congress on the theory that the repeal would help us keep out of war. And it will be remembered that with the repeal of the embargo the President said:

"This Government clearly and definitely will insist that American citizens and American ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zones of conflict."

Need the American people be shown in detail how far afield from this declaration of September 21, 1939, the President has flown since he accomplished his purpose with repeal?

As if asking for more trouble, and in violation of our own laws, the President dispossessed us of exceedingly valuable ships at a time when our Navy was pleading for more ships. This act, too, was represented by the President as being a step to keep us out of war, however much it violated the spirit of international law.

Asking for trouble as we were, we found ourselves eventually ready to adopt the ways of Europe, the instrument without which a dictator could never thrive; we adopted peacetime conscription and later put military training on a 30-month basis, whereas up in Canada, which is at war, compulsory military training is a requirement for only 4 months, with the Canadian conscriptee subject to service away from home only as he volunteers that service.

This policy of ours of asking for trouble found the President speaking pleasantly only of those countries which would pitch their strength with one belligerent, with "stab in the back" language for those that would not ally themselves as the President would choose they might ally themselves.

The lend-lease bill, with its provisions in violation of international law permitting the repairing of the ships of a belligerent nation in our own ports, and permitting other acts which were in violation of international law, was a further asking for trouble and was attained by the President and his administration with their representation that even these steps were in the interests of keeping us out of war.

The President, and his sons who have chosen to speak elsewhere in the world, have shown a terrible impatience in the lack of

incidents which would bring us more actual trouble, in a seeming policy of everlastingly asking for trouble.

With patience gone, seemingly, because the incident did not occur in sufficient degree to enrage the American people, the President took to the air waves 12 days ago and proclaimed a war. Not a constitutional war, but a war by Presidential utterance. In that fireside chat he ordered American ships to shoot on sight the vessels of certain nations not at war against us. And quite simultaneously comes the announcement of the Secretary of the Navy that our Navy is convoying ships across the Atlantic. This convoying had to be upon the orders of the President of the United States; the very same President who, when in attaining these steps to trouble one after another in the name of helping us keep out of war, had said upon occasion: "Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war."

Put two and two together and we must acknowledge that we are today at war, not constitutionally at war but at war by Presidential proclamation, in violation of the Constitution, and in violation of the wishes of the great majority of the American people.

This is the result of a program of many months of asking for trouble in the name of keeping our country out of war. There may be some confusion in some minds about this day but historians 25 and 50 years hence are going to have no difficulty understanding just what is responsible for our predicament of this hour, or what will be responsible for our involvement in the war if we are involved. Historians are not going to look with any sympathy upon the Presidential declaration, after all of these invitations to trouble have been issued, to the effect that the decision of war or peace is now up to Germany. By what right can any man order our ships to shoot the ships of other nations and then say that the choice of war or peace is up to that other nation alone?

Asking for trouble! And while we have been asking this, we have been parading our representation of interest in peace, peace, peace.

And not once has our Government, under President Roosevelt, made the slightest move to bring about peace. Never has our Government sought to bring warring nations to an understanding. Instead, he has prodded and gibed and driven others on to war. Again, when history of these days is recorded, it shall have to be everlastingly recorded that there never was a better time for peace than now. No peace accomplished later on can be any better or any more enduring than a peace that could be entertained right now. But instead of trying to accomplish an end to this world slaughter, American leadership says, as the President said last February 25: "The first thing is to win the war."

Oh, fellow Americans, who can be so blind as to fail to know the part which our country, under its present leadership, is playing in a continuation of this world slaughter.

How much longer will the American people consent to the surrender by its Congress to Presidential request, Presidential dictate? How much longer will the people let their Congress consent to this continuing asking for trouble? How much longer will there be consent to a leadership of our American thinking by British minds which are bent upon bringing not only American machinery but American lives, and still more American dollars, into the preserving of domination of the world by one power?

I am not blaming Britain for her persistent effort to get us into this war. I cannot avoid blaming my country for the seeming blindness which is taking us into that war. Might I suggest that if we Americans must listen to British statesmen, that we listen to British statesmen speaking in an hour when they were less selfish than they are in this terrible hour of pressure upon them.

We like to think that what we are doing for Great Britain, Great Britain would do for us if we were in her shoes. Winston Churchill told us in 1934, told all the world, in fact, that Great Britain "must be safe from undue foreign pressure. * * * We cannot confine the safety of our country to the passions or the panic of any foreign nation which may be facing some desperate crisis." So we need more notice than that of what we might expect from Great Britain if our positions were reversed in this hour.

Lord Beaverbrook comes to us and eternally preaches that there can be not even faint suggestion of peace with one so lacking in honesty and sincerity as Hitler. Yet in 1938 it was the same Lord Beaverbrook who declared:

"We certainly credit Hitler with honesty and sincerity. We believe in his purpose. * * *"

Britain's lords and earls engage in most persistent effort to convince us that there can be no peace with Hitler. Yet Lord Rothermore in 1938 declared:

"There is no man living whose promise given in regard to something of real moment I would sooner take. He is simple, unaffected and obviously sincere. He is supremely intelligent."

The lone cause of this war, we are told, and we want to believe, is Hitler. Lord Lothian did a grand job for his country in parading this belief for American consumption. Yet it was the same Lord Lothian who in 1938 said of the trouble that was brewing in Europe:

"We are largely responsible for the situation that confronts us today—('we' meaning Great Britain).

"If another war comes and the history of it is ever written the dispassionate historian a hundred years hence will not say that Germany alone was responsible for it, even if she strikes the first blow, but that those who mismanaged the world between 1918 and 1937 had a large share of responsibility."

"The thing to do now is win the war," says the President. "Stop the aggressors." And Winston Churchill seconds the motion with more demonstration of how impossible it is to even think of talking about a peace with Hitler. He may wish now that he had not said it, but in 1938 we found the same Churchill saying:

"I have always said that if Great Britain were defeated in war, I hoped we should find a Hitler to lead us back to our rightful position among the nations."

Aren't we making ourselves the laughing stock for all time to come when we let our thinking be so completely dominated by the pressure of Britons who are under pressure at the moment? Are we going to anticipate that history will record as fact that which some would have us believe today, namely, that our present predicament is one occasioned by unavoidable circumstances? Isn't it rather clear that time must show to our satisfaction, if we are not satisfied now, that our predicament is one by invitation and proclamation of our own, encouraged and invited by foreign and selfish influences that would not do as much for us under reversed circumstances?

We did not make this man Hitler; Britain did. Hitlerism is not the cause that Britain fights; Hitlerism is only the result of a cause. Waste our blood and our wealth in destroying Hitlerism if we will, but let us know that when our war is won, we will have defeated, not the cause of this war but the consequence of Britain's dictated peace following the last war. No one makes quite so plain and clear the causes of this war as has David Lloyd George, who, after this present war was declared by Britain against Germany, stood on the floor of the British Parliament on the 9th day of May 1940 and delivered himself of this feeling, knowing, and understanding address:

"The Treaty of Versailles was not carried out by those who dictated it. A good deal of the trouble was due to that fact. We were dealing with governments in Germany which were democratic governments, based on a democratic franchise, with democratic statesmen, and it is because we did not carry out the undertakings we had given to those democratic governments that Hitler came into power. There was a good deal that was done in Germany more particularly with regard to disarmament. The solid promise that we gave, not merely in the treaty itself but in a document which I took part in drafting, which was signed by M. Clemenceau on our behalf, that if Germany disarmed, we should immediately follow her example, was not carried out, and there is no government that is more responsible for that than the present National Government which came into power in 1931. They had their opportunity. America was ready, Germany was ready—it was a time when Herr Bruening was in charge—but we refused to carry out the terms after Germany had been completely disarmed. We had the certificate of the ambassadors to say that disarmament was completed, but in spite of that we did not carry out our part."

No one outside the inner circle can speak authoritatively in this hour concerning the possibility of the existence of commitments made by Americans, with or without the consent and knowledge of the President, but commitments nevertheless which might have been made to Great Britain, to France, to Russia, to Poland, to the Balkan countries. But it is altogether fair to say, and to say again and again, that if commitments have been made regarding what America would do in certain eventualities—if these commitments have been made and become now embarrassing under invited circumstances, let the President of the United States be made to remember at every minute that he has made commitments as well to 131,000,000 Americans, the folks at home. Commitments that are a first obligation upon the President of the United States.

Come, Americans, chins up. This is nothing more than a Presidential war. Your country is not at war, and will not be at war until it is declared by your representatives in Congress. Don't let that opposition which would break this splendid united front of nonintervention if it could—don't let them inject prejudices and racial strife to accomplish that end. Chins up. The cause of nonintervention is not lost. Indeed, the winning may be just around the corner. We can win. I repeat there has been as yet no declaration of a constitutional war. And I can say to you here and now, without fear of contradiction, that no one knows better than the President of the United States himself that he can't obtain, with the situation what it is at this moment, a declaration of war out of the Congress of the United States.

My Views on Federal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN, OF OREGON, AT PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Ore-

gon [Mr. HOLMAN] in Portland, Oreg., on Friday evening, September 12, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, friends and neighbors, our Government is beset with many serious problems—problems vital to our people. These problems involve the safety as well as the prosperity and happiness of all of us who are American citizens. They involve international questions of policy as well as national economic issues.

I would like to talk over with you here tonight my observations relative to these matters. I, as a member of the Senate Committee for Appropriations, its subcommittees for Deficiencies and Naval Affairs, and the Senate Committee for Military Affairs, have some particular knowledge of them due to the exceptional opportunities to learn about them from original and authentic sources of reliable information.

As your Senator in the Federal Congress, I would like to give you, my neighbors, my present views on some of these questions of Federal policy. Can we not consider this most serious situation which now is confronting us without excitement, anger, or malice?

I am more concerned about the growing strength of subversive, intolerant, and disorderly forces within our own country which appear to receive support and encouragement from the executive department of our Government than I am alarmed about possible invasions of our country by foreign foes.

In foreign relationships, let us look before we leap. Now, before any rash commitments are made irrevocably, let us calmly survey the entire field of national perils, our resources, opportunties, and obligations, and then let us do what is best for our own people—the American people.

I am for America first. I must be. I took a solemn oath before the Vice President of the United States in the Senate Chamber of the National Capitol when I was sworn in as a United States Senator. This oath obligates me to give my entire loyalty to the service of the United States Government and to the American people. Others may wander far afield in their thoughts, words, and deeds, but I cannot. I must be faithful to my oath of office, and that is my natural inclination and ardent desire, as well as my patriotic duty. No man can serve two masters.

I cannot have an American allegiance and an allegiance to any foreign nation, or foreign people, at the same time. All I want to do now is to discover the wisest course to pursue whereby I may serve best the interests of all American people and then to follow that course. I can be a politician and choose to run with propagandized and misguided popular clamor regardless of the disasters which such an unprincipled course would produce, or I can take the course which is best calculated to preserve our Government under the Federal Constitution and to protect the American people, even though that course may be very unpopular at the moment. Either course is open to me now. I am free to make a choice.

I have not forgotten the martyrdom of Oregon's most patriotic Senator of 25 years ago—the late Senator Harry Lane; nor am I oblivious to the fact that those politicians are always most popular who vote for every appropriation and against every tax levy. However, I see before me the path which George Washington took when our country labored under very similar circumstances in 1793. I can hear the voice of the patient and wise Abraham Lincoln calling from the same direction. I believe I know what the tormented veterans in the hospital on Marquam Hill and the forever silent soldiers in Mount Scott Cemetery would have me do. I shall try to go along with those who always serve their country regardless of what the personal consequences may be to themselves. I assure you I have no selfish nor ambitious motives now.

During my campaign for the Senatorship 3 years ago, I stated that I favored making our country so strong in a military way that no foreign nation would dare to attack us, and then we should mind our own business. I have adhered to that policy. I have even been effective in raising the President's recommendations for national defense. Let us not confuse, however, national defense with international offense. Let us call things by their right names.

Before we can be effective in any military action, regardless of what our motives and desires may be, we first must have adequate armies, air forces, and navies trained, organized, officered, equipped, and supplied, fit and prepared for any eventuality. We do not have now such a military organization.

While our Navy is prepared, it is held inactive in the Pacific Ocean by the constant menace of the Japanese Navy. Let us consider for a moment this situation.

I am led to believe that it is the conviction of those who are hot for war that our objectives are in Europe. Where we can land our forces there, I do not know. We cannot get to Europe unless our Navy is in the Atlantic Ocean. We cannot take our Navy into the Atlantic Ocean without taking it out of the Pacific Ocean. We then, under present conditions, automatically would surrender the Pacific Ocean to the control of the Japanese.

It is my opinion that without the American Navy in the Pacific Ocean now, Singapore, Australia, and New Zealand would be lost to Britain, and the Philippines, the Hawaiian Islands, and other island outposts would be lost to America; moreover, the Panama Canal, Alaska, and the entire Pacific coast would be exposed to attack, with only an inadequate defense available to us.

The Panama Canal is of vital importance to our national defense. Its defensive protection is not yet completed. I am advised that if a first-class military power should get a foothold—establish a base for operations—in Alaska, the successful defense of the entire territory of our country west of the Rocky Mountains would present some extremely difficult military problems.

Let us consider the present defense of our immediate area—the Oregon country, the Columbia River watershed, which is one of the greatest breadbaskets in the world—a hungry world which soon may be a starving world. Let me remind you that tens of millions of workers in the world have been taken out of construction and production and put into destruction and consumption.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, I have inspected within the past month the fortifications at the mouth of the Columbia River. Much which I know and is pertinent to this discussion I cannot disclose because it is executive information; but I am not violating any confidence when I tell you there is not a piece of ordnance in Forts Stephens, Canby, or Columbia of later design or efficiency than 1898. Whatever could serve Britain at this time has been removed. These obsolete fortifications are exposed to attack from the air. The best guns there have a range of something more than 7,000 yards. The guns on a modern battleship have a range of more than 14,000 yards. Our present defenseless situation is obvious.

I am doing what I can to correct it and to have located and completed at the earliest moment, air bases and depots for both the Army and the Navy in this area; but the fact is there is much to do and not sufficient time or materials and labor with which to do it, if we are to begin hostilities immediately. I have also inspected the naval hydroplane base at Tongue Point. It is modern and up to date; but incomplete and short of certain supplies on account of our aid to Britain. I cannot be more specific. But the condition of our defenses in the Oregon country is about the condition of the national defenses generally throughout the country and for the same reason. After the defeat at Dunkirk our magazines and arsenals were stripped to aid England. I am not criticizing this. I am merely stating a fact; but it leaves us unprepared.

About 5 or 6 years ago the strength on paper of the American Navy was to the Japanese Navy about as 5 is to 3, if calculated on even, or equal, terms as to location. However, the effective strength of a navy, like the effective strength of an army, decreases as the distance of combat increases from its base. The American Navy is stronger off our coasts than it would be off the coast of Asia.

However, during the past 5 or 6 years some of our townsmen, among others, have made large profits in merchandising scrap iron which Japan has needed so desperately. With this scrap iron Japan laid down the keels of larger and more powerful battleships than those of previous design. To meet this increase in the naval strength of Japan we authorized the construction of a two-ocean Navy and made the necessary, current appropriations. We, too, increased the size and strength of our new battleships. We were forced to do this or become an inferior naval power. Then, we discovered that the present locks in the Panama Canal were not large enough to accommodate the battleships and airplane carriers of the new and increased size. So then we had to authorize and make the current appropriations, for a new set of larger locks at Panama. But, of course, we have this satisfaction—some of our citizens made money selling scrap iron to a potential enemy. Others have made personal profits by supplying prospective foes with tin plate when our own stock piles are insufficient for our own needs, while other international traders sold airplane beacons, fuel oil, cotton—an ingredient of some forms of explosives—and a number of other strategic materials and critical minerals to foreign nations now strengthened by these military supplies and apt to attack us with them.

I have been in the West—Utah, Nevada, California, Idaho, and Oregon—much of the time while the Senate has been in a practical recess during the past 2 months, endeavoring to expedite the domestic production of strategic minerals, a number of which are rapidly becoming of critical importance to the national defense. Then we discover that some rash bureaucrats in Washington, without following the ramifications of their impulsive orders all the way through, establish priorities and limit prices for many materials without regulating the costs of essential elements in those materials. This results in the cessation of production of the very things we need most.

Many important industries are facing a shut-down because they cannot now get supplies or equipment vitally necessary for their continued operation. Because a southern Oregon, or northern California, miner of chrome could not obtain a replacement for a broken part of his automobile truck, he had to stop his mining operations. Without chrome and other strategic minerals, the national-defense program will bog down.

This thing of entering and waging a victorious war—and who wants to wage an unsuccessful war—is a most complicated and hazardous undertaking. We have been less than 3 years preparing for the national defense. Germany has been preparing for war for 20 years. She has had the assistance and cooperation of the international profit seekers and traders and financiers of England, France, and America, and now the youth of America is expected to again face slaughter to salvage civilization. It is not fair. One group augments its profits while another group perishes.

No American youth has appealed to me to rush this country into war nor to find a place for him in the active combat units of our military forces. I have heard only from those who do not themselves intend to take an active part in any armed battle of a shooting war.

If it becomes inevitable that this Nation must go to war with somebody, let us be prepared to be effective in that war and to know just whom we are to fight and why. A year ago we were helping Finland fight Russia. Now we are helping Russia fight Finland. France and England each made a solemn covenant with the other that neither ever, ever, ever would make a separate peace with Germany but that both would continue to fight against Germany as long as either of them had anything with which to fight. Since then, France has had to make a separate peace with Germany, and now England is trying to starve and destroy France and France is opposing England. Much of the military equipment and supplies which we sent to France to aid her in her extremity has been used to destroy London and other places in England. May it not eventually transpire that England may find it to her advantage to make a separate peace with Germany as France did? Then what?

I have given effective cooperation to providing aid by this country to England, France, Finland, Norway, and other victims of ruthless aggressions (except in the case of Iran) and shall continue to do so and to protect the American flag wherever it may be; but let us be extremely careful where and when and under what conditions we send the American flag.

In 1788, Alexander Hamilton made the following observation in the Federalist:

"The causes of hostility among nations are innumerable. There are some which have a general and almost constant operation upon the collective bodies of society. Of this description are the love of power, or the desire of preeminence and dominion—the jealousy of power or the desire of equality and safety. There are others which have a more circumscribed, though an equally operative, influence within their spheres. Such are the rivalships and competitions of commerce between commercial nations. And there are others, not less numerous than either of the former, which take their origin entirely in private passions; in the attachments, enmities, hopes, and fears of leading individuals in the communities of which they are members." This observation is equally true today.

The international situation is dreadfully complicated and constantly changing. However, I am conscious all the time that we must make our own country strong—so strong that we shall be prepared to meet any eventuality at the earliest possible moment. Until then let us be very cautious and hold our peace if possible.

America has developed wonderfully efficient airplanes, ordnances, and devices for combat use; but our production of them has been disappointing. Strikes which cause shut-downs of industries essential to the national defense and the shortage of aluminum, have been very serious in the delays which they have caused.

I have not yet been effective in making any contribution to the remedy of the strike situation but I have been able to expedite production of aluminum by securing authorizations and appropriations ahead of schedule for the ultimate installation of all the generators in Bonneville Dam which now supplies power for the production of about half of all the aluminum used for national-defense purposes.

Our armies are short of heavy and light artillery, motorized cavalry, airplanes, tanks, explosives, and matériel of all kinds. On account of these shortages those boys whom we drafted for training have not had the instruction which it is necessary for them to receive to enable them to be efficient soldiers in warfare under modern conditions. In my opinion, it would be cruel folly to rush them into active foreign combat now.

In the program for efficient national defense there are a number of steps which we must take, each in its order. We have planned the first step but have not yet completed it. When we do complete it, prudence dictates that in the light of our experience, resources, and conditions confronting us at that time, we plan and take the second step; and so on until we are truly prepared to be efficient and effective. It seems to me that the President wants to take the thirteenth step first. He would shingle the roof before laying the foundation of his house.

I have observed that some merchants when an unprofitable business seems irretrievable, venture everything upon the destruction of their establishments in a possibly profitable fire. Likewise, I suspect that this urge on the part of the President to get nearer and nearer and ever nearer and finally into the European war may be with the idea of burying the record of 8 years of administrative failures in an international conflict.

At present, it seems to me, we should confine the use of our Army to the defense of our homeland.

Forewarned is forearmed. Consider the fate of France. Let us get prepared for any national need without delay. Let us unite as one people and go forward with sense and unafraid for whatever may be in store for us as American nationals defending our Government under the Federal Constitution and protecting the American people in their homes and in their employments. By rushing into wars abroad between foreign governments we may lose at home that government under the Federal Constitution which has protected the freedom and liberty of every American citizen for a hundred and fifty years. Let us not be rash and impulsive. It is better to be sure than sorry.

Address by Polish Ambassador at Pulaski Day Parade, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JAN CIECHANOWSKI

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by His Excellency Jan Ciechanowski, Ambassador of Poland, on the occasion of the annual Pulaski Day parade on October 5, 1941, in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This great and magnificent city of New York is the proud stronghold of democratic freedom and civilization, wherein millions of free people of many different races have settled as a unanimous and splendid expression of true Americanism and all that it stands for. It has today celebrated the memory of Casimir Pulaski, the noble Polish-American fighter in the American War for Independence.

Today's Pulaski parade has been greater, more powerful, more impressing than ever before. In watching it one could not help feeling that in this march of many thousands of free people there was much more than a mere tribute paid to the memory of one great fighter for American freedom or of one great military leader. The beauty and fervor displayed today in this parade were the spontaneous expression of the deep love for liberty and the readiness to fight for its preservation, which, at this crucial time, when the destinies of human freedoms are in the balance, directs countless millions of civilized human beings.

No people today has a greater mission to fulfill than the American people. The mighty principles of freedom and democracy which inspired the revolutionary movements of the eighteenth century have found their permanent home in this country. Here they have been cherished, respected, and preserved for over 165 years by the American people. They have been applied with sincerity in every walk of life. American history proves that the "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" is no longer an experiment in statesmanship. Its full application has brought lasting happiness, peace, and prosperity. If it ever needed a proof of its wisdom and greatness, the American democracy is today that living proof.

And now, after nearly 2 centuries, during which enlightened humanity has enjoyed the benefits of freedom and of the evolution of progress in thought, inspiration, and scientific advancement, the whole structure of our modern civilization, so painstakingly erected by generations of worthy and God-fearing men and women, is ruthlessly challenged by a barbarous creed, based on human madness, unleashed upon the world by one race alone in quest of an insane lust for world domination.

Practically all the free peoples of Europe who have stood up to fight this menace, the very existence of which is a disgrace to the twentieth century of our Christian era, have been enslaved by its barbaric power.

The American people have benefited by their privileged geographical situation and by the desperate armed resistance of the European democracies to this scourge. During the peace period the American people have anxiously watched the grim evolution toward inevitable war of the peace settlement concluded 20 years before the outbreak of this new catastrophe. That peace was to make the world "safe for democracy," was to make war impossible. It was to sound the opening of a new era of happiness and prosperity to mankind. It was a peace based upon the noble principles of a great American President. It lasted only 20 years, and even less when we take into account the seizure of Austria, the violation of Czechoslovakia, the tearing up of the various clauses of Versailles, and was in fact but a precarious armistice, a breathing spell necessary to the rearmament of those whom the civilized world has today unanimously branded as the enemies of free humanity.

It is but just and fair to commemorate at this time the great fights for freedom of the past centuries. It is just and fair to celebrate the memory of Casimir Pulaski. His love of freedom inspired him to regard this great human birthright not as the privilege of his own nation alone, or of one continent alone, but as the birthright of the entire human race, as an ideal and a creed so universal in its greatness that it is not only the duty but the signal privilege of every human being to sacrifice his time, his fortune, and his life in its defense.

And now, by fateful return of history, to all nations of good will in Europe, to all those whose freedom has been torn from them over

their dying and dead bodies, to all those who have been enslaved by the barbaric hordes of Hitlerite pan-Germanism, the great American democracy and the American people stand out as the stronghold of the lofty ideals for which they are fighting, as the last oasis of human sanity and peace, as the great hope of a better dawn in the future. That is why I take the liberty of stressing the great responsibility of the American people in this fateful hour of human destiny.

In the course of these 2 years of the war the people of the United States, under the leadership of their President, have proved that they are conscious of the menace which has swept the Eastern Hemisphere into practical slavery and which threatens this hemisphere as well.

The future happiness of the whole world depends on the further rapid development of the powerful support which this great democracy is now so generously giving to insure the victory of democracy in the name of the four human freedoms over the forces of destruction. In fact it is hardly too much to say that you, the American people, hold the destinies of the world in your hands. Your effort alone can save humanity. And on victory alone, there being no possibility of compromise, a new, better, more secure and lasting peace will have to be established. And it can be established if this time we have at last learned the lessons of past and present history, and if democracy proves itself worthy of its ideals. If it is prepared to go the whole length in readjusting, nay, in building up from its very foundations, a new, just, and powerful world system, based upon the wise principles of the equality of rights of nations, of federation and community of interests as well as of unity of ideals. Democracy has not proved itself ready or willing to launch a united offensive in wartime. From all angles of the world, democracies have watched complacently as one after the other of its bulwarks were being ruthlessly torn down. It has also been remiss in peacetime, during which democratic statesmen indulged in wishful thinking, when it was time to act.

This must not happen again. Over the countless millions of human lives sacrificed in its name, democracy must rise to its full height. It must revise its own record. It must purify its practices. It must regain its virility. It must remember that it has been created as a system of life for peaceful relations between human beings. It must therefore take the offensive in the creation of a new and bold peace settlement, based on security, indomitably prepared not only to defend, but to attack all those who may challenge it in the future. It must be bold and brave in solving all those human problems which this war has bared and shown up in all their urgent vastness. Democracy must be prepared to meet the requirements of these great and terrible times that we are at present living. It must solve unflinchingly together with the problems of security, the great social and economic problems as well.

No lasting peace can endure without security, because security alone inspires confidence, and no international relations can develop normally if they are not based upon mutual confidence. No viable system of social welfare can exist which is not based upon a more just distribution of wealth. As security is the basis of peace, so prosperity and contentment are the bases of its durability.

In this conflict the very survival of human freedom everywhere is threatened. The greatness of what is stake is such as to justify any sacrifice and every effort. But the eleventh hour has struck.

There is no time to lose.

"Very Sad Case"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD P. NYE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

LETTER FROM FRED H. FREE

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to the Sioux City Tribune from Mr. Fred H. Free be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux City Tribune of October 4, 1941]

"VERY SAD CASE"

EDITOR SIOUX CITY TRIBUNE: Your readers may be interested in the sad fate of a neighbor of mine who was formerly engaged in the retail mercantile business. He ran a general merchandise store for many years and extended credit very liberally to his many customers. Finally he attempted to collect these accounts because he was financially embarrassed. With but one exception, all of the customers told him that they were too poor to pay. Only one Finlander paid his debt. Just as my friend was about to go into bankruptcy he fell heir to considerable money. He paid the wholesale bills and notified all of his dead-beat customers that he was going to run a cash-and-carry store from now on, and since the aforesaid dead beats still did not have any money he would loan them some to buy goods at his store. Said that these people were good neighbors and Anglo-Saxons like himself and he wanted to keep their friendship. In order to make these loans he compelled his own family to live under conditions of extreme economy. One-third of the family were not properly fed or clothed.

His wife filed charges of insanity against him. He claimed before the insanity commission that he was running his affairs just as the brightest college professors had advised and the Government at Washington was doing, but the insanity commission said he was so nutty that a medical examination was unnecessary, and he was committed to the State hospital for the insane. From there he writes to his friends asking them to get rich by spending all the money they have. He also writes articles on how to attain the more "abundant life" by cutting down production, raising taxes, and increasing the output of ships, munitions, and airplanes by encouraging strikes. This keeps him from getting out on parole.

It is a very sad case.

Yours truly, FRED H. FREE.

The Right to a Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

ADDRESS BY NICHOLAS ROOSEVELT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, there was held in Washington this week an interesting series of meetings preparatory to the Nation-wide celebration next December 15 of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the so-called Bill of Rights amendments to the Constitution of the United States. A joint resolution, sponsored by Representative LEON SACKS, of Pennsylvania, in the House, and by myself in the Senate, has been approved, and designates December 15, 1941, as Bill of Rights Day, commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of approval of the first 10 amendments by the State of Virginia, this ratification by the State of Virginia being the action that adopted the amendments.

On Tuesday of this week a number of patriotic organizations participated in a pilgrimage to Gunston Hall, in Washington, at one time the home of George Mason, known in history as the "father of the Bill of Rights amendments." Preceding the pilgrimage to Gunston Hall, a luncheon under the auspices of the Citizenship Educational Service at the Hotel Raleigh was addressed by Nicholas Roosevelt, editor of the New York Herald Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

George Mason, James Madison, and those others who inspired and framed our Bill of Rights a century and a half ago, used the phrase, "freedom of the press." I have sometimes thought that if they were alive today they would use, instead, the words, "freedom of expression."

The right to freedom of expression belongs to all the pepole, and not merely to a single group, whether it be newspaper owners, the officers of the Government, or the spokesmen for a political party. Newspaper publishers and editors, of course, are vitally interested in freedom of the press because this freedom directly affects their livelihood. But the press is only a channel through which people may be informed of what is happening in the world and in their particular community, and through which opinions about these things may be aired. If the people are deprived of a free press and are given, instead, a press which is controlled by the Government, they are denied one of the most important mediums of free expression and constructive criticism of public affairs.

Many agents of government have, of course, always wanted to be able to control the press, for the simple reason that if they can silence criticism, prevent the publication of the truth, and mislead the people, they, the agents of government, will be free to do what they want without fear of being brought to book. This is why fredeom of the press has always been resented by wrongdoers, feared by weaklings, and abolished by dictators.

Freedom of the press is, as a matter of fact, inseparable from freedom of speech and freedom of the air. It includes the right to denounce evildoing even if it be in the seats of the mighty, and to criticize the acts and policies of those in office. It implies freedom to read and freedom to hear—freedoms, mark well, which the dictators have ruthlessly suppressed. Its very essence is freedom to think, and freedom to hold and communicate an opinion. But these freedoms mean freedom from government control and regulation, and should not be confused with editorial policy, or with the moral obligations of an editor to present facts accurately.

When a government takes over control of what may be said in print or over the air, this control is not limited to what the publishers and broadcasters themselves may say.

Government censors will hold these men responsible for what they print or allow to be broadcast—which means that they will be held responsible for what other people say, as well as for what they say themselves. Not only will they not be permitted to air views of their own which the censor does not like, but they will be forbidden to circulate the views of anyone else which rile the censors. In this manner government will easily assume control over everything which anyone may write or say. It is but a step from such censorship to the punishment, not only of publishers, editors, writers, and broadcasters, but also of any individual who persists in expressing his own views or in circulating articles, pamphlets, books, or broadsides which express his views.

When you punish men for the thoughts that they hold, you put an end to freedom. As that great apostle of liberty, the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, put it, "we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe and believe to be fraught with death."

As a matter of fact, there is no greater tribute to the importance and value of freedom of the press than the promptness and completeness with which the newspapers have been muzzled by each new dictator in Europe. The only thing to equal it is the severe penalty which the Nazi government has imposed for listening to foreign radio broadcasts in Germany. Each dictator is so fearful of the truth that he has done everything in his power to suppress it. The breath of life of a free press, in contrast, is to be able to air the truth, and, when the truth is obscure, to facilitate the freest possible discussion of current problems. No dictatorship can long endure if the press remains free.

In the light of what we now know about the methods of despotic rulers it is, I think, particularly interesting to hark back to the very words which the great statesman who lived in this beautiful Gunston Hall himself wrote into Virginia's Declaration of Rights: "The freedom of the press," he said, "is one of the great bulwarks of liberty, and can never be restrained but by despotic governments." Despotic governments, as I have already pointed out, cannot tolerate a free press. By the same token a free people cannot keep a free government without an informed public opinion. There can be no informed public opinion except through the unrestricted use of the printed and spoken word. This is why any attempt to curb the freedom of the press must be regarded as an attack on the very foundations of the American system. This is why, so long as the means of expression remain unhampered by Government control, the American way of life can be made to prevail.

Statement of Hon. Oscar Johnston, President, National Cotton Council of America, Respecting Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. OSCAR JOHNSTON, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMERICA, TO HON. HENRY B. STEAGALL, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Hon. Oscar Johnston, president, National Cotton Council of America, dated August 6, 1941, to Hon. HENRY B. STEAGALL, chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, respecting the fixing of prices and submitting essential provisions to be incorporated in H. R. 5479 or any other bill relating to fixing prices, to wit:

NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Scott, Miss., August 6, 1941.

Hon. HENRY B. STEAGALL,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEAGALL: With your very kind permission, the following statement is submitted to your committee, with the request that due consideration be given to the statements and recommendations contained therein.

The statement is made by the National Cotton Council of America in behalf of an organized raw-cotton industry. Embraced in the industry are some 10,000,000 people engaged in and dependent upon production of raw cotton and cottonseed, some 12,000 cotton ginners, some four or five thousand cotton warehousemen, some four or five thousand cotton merchants, some 1,000 or more spinners of raw cotton, and between four and five hundred persons, firms, or corporations engaged in the business of crushing raw cottonseed.

We have given careful and mature consideration to the terms and provisions of H. R. 5479, entitled "An act to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes."

We here take the liberty of making certain definite recommendations with regard to the proposed legislation.

We recognize the necessity of safeguarding the Nation against unsound and unhealthy commodity inflation as well as against a monetary inflation.

We feel definitely that any artificial interference with normal economic laws is only justified when essential to protect two groups of citizens, namely, producers and consumers.

In a well-ordered economy there should be a constant flow of raw products—vegetable, animal, and mineral—from the producer to the consumer, and of money in payment therefor from the consumer to the producer. Around the circumference of the economic circle so created are numerous essential intermediaries—buyers, dealers, handlers, processors, transportation, insurance, warehousing, distribution, and banking facilities. These various intermediaries are an essential part of our economic system. Each and all must function to insure a sound system, and each such essential intermediary is entitled to a just and equitable compensation for his skill, labor, capital, and service.

A sound economic system can be said to exist only when the original producer receives for his product, by way of compensation, a price which will insure to him an equitable share of the Nation's income, and when each subsequent intermediary receives for the service performed an equally equitable compensation, and when finally the finished product, ready for consumption or utilization, comes into the hands of the ultimate consumer at a price determined by, and definitely related to, the price paid to the producer plus the cost incident to the processing, handling, transporting, etc.

Our Government should be interested in protecting, and, insofar as it may be able to do so, guaranteeing to producers markets for their commodities in sufficient quantities and at prices per unit which will give to the producers an equitable and ratable share in the Nation's income, enabling them to maintain a standard of living equal to the standard enjoyed by others, having due consideration for labor, skill, capital, and other related factors involved.

A government is only justified in interfering with the normal operation of economic principles when such interference is essential to preserve for and guarantee to its citizens those standards of living to which the American citizen is entitled because of the enormous existing and potential wealth of the Nation.

When it is essential that the Government undertake to regulate and control the application of economic principles it is important that it do so to as limited an extent as will accomplish the desired end; it is equally important that, insofar as possible, each and every act of the Government conform to natural economic laws.

The primary objective of the Government should at all times be to protect, preserve, and promote income of producers, having in mind at the same time protection of the consumers.

To the end that both producers, consumers, and the intermediary agencies may be protected, it is important that such action as may be taken by the Government affecting price levels be taken only after painstaking and exhaustive investigation to determine with certainty the consequences which will follow such action.

In the interest of our general economy the National Cotton Council of America respectfully submits that such legislation as may be enacted in this connection contains the following fundamental essential provisions:

1. There should be an administrative body consisting of a board of not less than five individuals appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, the members of this board to be representative of agriculture, labor, manufacturing, distribution, with at least one member specifically designated to represent the consumer. The board should be charged with full authority to administer and execute the provisions of the act in question.

2. The board should have full authority to set up such an organization and employ such personnel as may be essential to the administration of the law, and should be adequately financed.

3. Decrees, orders, and rulings of the board should have the force and effect of law, and violation thereof by persons to whom such decrees, orders, and rulings are applicable should be punished as crimes or misdemeanors.

4. Decrees, orders, and rulings of the board, having the force of law, should only be entered by the board when predicated upon and in accordance with the weight of evidence adduced at, or as the result of, full investigation, including open-record hearings as which interested persons shall have had an opportunity for presenting statements and evidence of whatsoever character or nature relevant to the subject matter under investigation. All reports of investigators, all documentary evidence, and transcripts of all testimony submitted in connection with any such investigation should be made a matter of record, such record being available to the public. In any trial of a person charged with violating a decree, order, or ruling of the board, the court having jurisdiction may, at the instance of the defendant, examine the record upon which the decree, order, or ruling is predicated for the purpose of judicially determining whether or not such decree, order, or ruling is predicated upon the weight of the evidence, and if the court shall find that the decree, order, or ruling is not so sustained, the defendant shall be acquitted.

5. All decrees, orders, or rulings affecting or attempting to fix price levels should give due consideration to producers, consumers, and intermediary agencies.

6. No decree, order, or ruling made by the Board should be retroactive, or impair the obligation of any valid contract, or affect the operation of any contractual relationship be-

tween persons, firms, associations, individuals, or political entities.

7. In cases where price levels are fixed, such levels should be sufficiently flexible to permit and require raising or lowering such levels ratably and proportionately as the factors upon which such levels are predicated shall vary.

8. When and if a price level is determined, prices and costs, upon which such level is predicated, must be simultaneously determined, this to include cost of raw material, cost of labor or wage levels, the spread allowed for each step or process taken or applied in the passage of the raw product through its various stages into the hands of the consumer. The board should have the power to control these factors by licensing persons in any way engaged in the distribution of commodities involved.

9. In the matter of fixing prices, the board should at all times be required to maintain such price levels as will protect the original producer, the laborer, or wage earner, the intermediary agencies, and the ultimate consumer.

Respectfully submitted.

NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
By OSCAR JOHNSTON, *President*.

Freedom of Speech and of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a valuable editorial from the Boston Post of the issue of October 1, 1941, relating to interference with free speech and to censorship of the press. Speaking as a former newspaperman, I hope that this will not become a national policy, because that is not the way to get national unity.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Post of October 1, 1941]

A FADING FREEDOM

This is the week in which the freedom of the press is noted, written about and extolled in the public prints from sea to sea, in the cities and in the countryside of our native America.

It is a delicious feeling, to be sure, to revel in the heartening atmosphere which these blurbs engender.

But the man who gives American readers the straight truth about freedom of the press cannot be honest with himself if he praises the present situation in this country. Either that or he doesn't know what he is writing about.

Free speech is on its way out in this country. The man who raises his voice is called a friend of Hitler from the White House.

And the free press, despite constitutional guaranties and a red-blooded history of crusade against oligarchies, bureaucrats and special interests, is also on its way out.

To the utter shame and dismay of the organized press, the first move toward governmental control of the news matter in your daily paper came from a newspaper publisher.

That man is Frank Knox.

Despite the fact that he was rejected by the people of this country when he aspired to high office, he was placed in the post of Secretary of the Navy and from this eminence he slapped down a censorship which not only was un-American but was stupid.

The Navy as an organization has long been noted for its abysmal ignorance of public affairs and the public mind.

Perhaps it is because the service, of its nature, is remote from sources of public information. But time and again, in disasters, newspapermen have found the Navy totally lacking in any knowledge of what the public is entitled to in the way of information.

When Secretary Knox took office the Navy was improving in public relations. But his censorship reversed that situation. British sailors flooded our streets and he swung the big stick on reports of why they were here. The former publisher, however, used attractive tid-bits of information in his own magazine articles.

The Knox censorship served as an entering wedge into the whole question of freedom of the press, which was bothering the advocates of the Socialist labor dictatorship which is facing the country.

Leon Henderson, who is a price czar even before Congress has passed a law on price fixing, showed the press where it stands when price fixing is in vogue.

He declared that he would not be deterred from controlling newspaper advertising prices by "any waving of the freedom of the press at me." This seems to assure his accusers of his Communist background.

The new dealers are examining carefully what the automobile and oil companies are spending for advertising, with the view to shutting off from revenue those journals which do not agree in entirety with the schemes of the mighty men of Washington.

The pressure is on. The plans are complete and in event of total war a free press would be no longer present, despite the Constitution and the will of the people of America.

Charles A. Lindbergh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD P. NYE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

TELEGRAM FROM S. STANWOOD MENKEN TO AMOS R. E. PINCHOT, AND REPLY THERETO

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram from S. Stanwood Menken, and a letter in response thereto from Amos R. E. Pinchot, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y.

AMOS R. E. PINCHOT,
Milford, Pike County, Pa.:

May I as an old friend knowing your broad democratic and humanistic views urge upon you to consider the importance of the America First Committee disavowing Lindbergh. We have no room in America for his pro-Nazi undemocratic advocacy. He is a great comfort to Germany, and you can do no greater service than disavowing him.

Best personal regards,

S. STANWOOD MENKEN.

NEW YORK, *October 4, 1941.*

S. STANWOOD MENKEN, Esq.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR STANWOOD: Your wire to me came at a time when the National Committee of America First was about to meet in Chicago to issue their statement re Colonel Lindbergh's Iowa speech. And since that statement was published, perhaps the need of an answer to your wire lies only in the fact that you are an old friend whose opinion and good will I truly value.

Our statement said that we did not consider the Lindbergh speech anti-Semitic. As you know, it did not criticize, or tend in any way to criticize, the Jewish people on the ground of race or religion. It did, however, state plainly what I think you will agree is true—namely, that as a group the Jews of America are for intervention and that they constitute one of the main forces for intervention. And this I have heard no Jewish leader or critic of the speech in any way deny. They may have done so, but I haven't heard of it up to date. Indeed, the strong and almost universal prointervention sentiment of the Jews in this country is as generally conceded as it is natural and understandable.

I may be wrong, but in view of this I see no more impropriety in expressing the opinion, provided it is sincere and well founded, that the Jews are interventionists than in saying, for example, the people of Polish or Dutch descent in this country are as a group interventionist. After all, why, in discussing the affairs of our country, is it either wrong, antisocial, or intolerant to say that any group is interventionist? Interventionism is no crime. Therefore, why should the Jewish people, who, because of Hitler's persecutions, have so much reason to desire intervention, and who are undeniably for it, ask that this fact should never be discussed, and that it should be surrounded by a taboo?

It seems to me—and here I would like very much to have your opinion—that the way for the Jewish people to have met Lindbergh's statement, if it wasn't true, was to have some of their conspicuous leaders come out and say it wasn't true in clear words. Instead of that, as it seems to me, they have put forward a claim to a sort of special privilege to have immunity from having their stand spoken about in public. And I don't think this is good stuff or wise stuff in the long run.

In this country decisions are still made, to a large if diminishing extent, by public opinion. In any democracy it is desirable that all groups of people, all interests should record their opinions and their stands on public questions frankly and openly, and should welcome equally open and frank discussion. That, I think, is the way we get on best. And I don't for a minute believe that it helps things to say: "Why, here is a group, here is a portion of our body politic—Jews, or Catholics, or Protestants, or people of French, Belgian, German, Russian, or other extraction—whose particular opinions and aims must never be mentioned aloud, and may be spoken of only in whispers."

I am deeply concerned about this matter. I think the Lindbergh statement was true. And so far I have met no Jewish man or woman who doesn't admit it's true, and very few who are not hell-bent for intervention.

I'm inclined to believe that it would have been better, from many points of view, if Jewish leaders had replied to Colonel Lindbergh by saying: "Yes, of course we are for intervention. And here are our very good reasons," or else not to have taken issue at all. As things stand, many who are pressing the country along the road to war are now engaged in calling attention to the Jewish

prointervention stand by denouncing Lindbergh, who mentioned it aloud, as intolerant.

I think the matter could be helped if some big Jewish leader would take the bull by the horns and state the facts. But I am by no means convinced that the errors that have been made can so easily be healed.

Nobody is much concerned if one says that the people of German or Italian extraction in this country are, on the whole, anti-interventionist, which happens to be the fact. No one is much concerned if it is said that the administration, heavily backed by the opinion of certain Southern States and various domestic and foreign groups, is interventionist, that is to say believes that this country should enter the war on the side of Great Britain. But if you say the Jews are, on the whole, for the same program as the President, etc., you must expect trouble. And this seems to me quite silly and unnecessary in a nation which supposedly plays no favorites, in a nation where the public attitudes of the people and all groups that compose them should obviously be discussible.

Needless to say I'm thoroughly opposed to anti-Semitism in any form, and equally opposed to any discrimination for or against any group on account of race, nationality, creed, or anything else. And I just can't bring myself to believe that any group ought to regard itself as occupying a position where its deeds, words, or attitudes in regard to any public question should be unmentionable. There's something wrong about that. And there's something wrong about the idea that the person who does mention them, fairly and objectively, should be accused of trying to incite prejudice.

I want to be fair and reasonably sensible, especially as I'm convinced that the worst possible thing for the Jews in America is to sour on anybody who talks frankly about questions affecting the Jews, and refuses to surround them with foolish taboos which, in the long run, cannot fail to defeat their purpose.

At the present moment we, as American citizens, face the responsibility of taking our part in choosing between intervention and nonintervention, between peace and war, which is perhaps the most important decision a people is ever called on to make. On the one hand we can choose peace and maintain the so-called defensive position, advocated by America First; Colonel Lindbergh; Hanson Baldwin, of the New York Times; Maj. Al Williams; Col. Frederick Palmer; Lieutenant Colonel Phillips, of the Army General Staff; and almost every military authority, a position in which our country and, indeed, this continent and hemisphere, is admittedly safe from invasion, provided we go to it and accumulate the air power which is within our ability to have in the near future.

On the other hand, we can, if we like and, as the interventionists advise, abandon the defensive position and send our military forces to fight abroad from three to nine thousand miles from our home bases. We can follow a naval war up with an expeditionary force on the, I believe, utterly false theory that a great overseas expedition can be landed on hostile shores, against modern land defenses and modern bombing power, without incurring a staggering disaster. But whichever course we choose, it is essential that everyone of us should be guided by just one primary consideration, asking ourselves but one question: Which course is for the best good of our country?

Many of us, and I happen to be among the number, have had friends or relatives who have been liquidated or subjected to barbarities at the hands of one or another of the unspeakable dictators of Europe. And the effect of this upon our attitude toward war is necessarily strong. Nevertheless, hard as it may be, and irrespective of whether we are Catholics, Jews, or Protestants, we should try to allow no such circumstance to sway us in our judgment on the war and peace issue. I hope and believe that you will agree that it is the interest of our country and our people that should guide us exclusively in this matter. Americans should be for America first, just as the English are for England first, preferring the welfare of their own land to that of all others.

The foregoing seems to be not only the proper, decent, and human conclusion, but the practical one dictated by common sense and the lessons of history. For the sake of our own civilization and, for that matter, civilization in general, we should protect and cultivate our own garden, maintain our own political and economic systems and way of life that have made us a mighty, free, and beneficent power.

Speaking of history, we must not forget that nothing stands out more clearly in history, whether ancient or modern, than the fact that no nation has ever embarked on and followed far-flung, ambitious schemes of world conquest, world control, and world reform, such as Mr. Roosevelt is propagandizing right now, without losing its own integrity, its power, and its usefulness to its own people and everyone else.

One of the reasons that I joined America First was that it sternly rejects the destructive and silly notion that America should go forth over the world and dominate it, fight its wars, write its peace, and from that point proceed to reform all the peoples of the world, democratizing them and guaranteeing them a millennium of justice and happiness, world without end, amen!

Stanwood, this frothy yet deadly, megalomanial dream, "dream of the strong man making great and greater ever things that are not of God," as our friend Euripides put it some time ago, is as crazy as the mutterings of some poor devil dying of ureamic poisoning. And, what is more, it is the same terrible dream that inspired the Greeks, when they multiplied their responsibilities beyond their strength and went in for empire; that sustained Louis XIV when, drunk with executive power, he went forth to bring French culture to the world; that bled the French people white under Napoleon and landed their peerless leader in exile; and that now lurks in the minds of people who have no use for democracy and think in terms of personal power, here and abroad.

Drop me a line, or drop into my office some day on the way uptown. I'd like to see you again and talk things over, especially if, in your estimation, my letter is on the wrong track.

Sincerely yours,

AMOS PINCHOT.

P. S.—Re your estimate of Lindbergh, I must disagree with you on that point. He is neither pro-Nazi nor undemocratic. He is simply saying now what Roosevelt and Willkie were saying up to the moment the ballots were counted on November 5, namely, that the interests of the American people demand that we should keep out of foreign wars and promptly build an impregnable defense. If that is being pro-Nazi, or "a comfort to Germany," then Roosevelt, Willkie, and the principal leaders in both parties were a comfort to Germany till they suddenly changed their tune when the polls closed on election day. The truth is Lindbergh has remained sincerely and uncompromisingly American, at a time when foreign and domestic propagandists and hyphenates have, as in the case of the former World War, made it fashionable, in certain circles, to put almost any country ahead of our own. I am personally grateful to Colonel Lindbergh for helping to keep America patriotic and sane.

One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the City of Hamilton, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GREG HOLBROCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE HAMILTON (OHIO) JOURNAL-NEWS

Mr. HOLBROCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, We See a City of Progress, by Mr. Homer Gard, publisher, on the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Hamilton, Ohio.

Mr. Gard is a distinguished citizen of Hamilton.

The editorial follows:

[From the Hamilton (Ohio) Journal-News]

WE SEE A CITY OF PROGRESS

(By Homer Gard)

Fifty years ago I stood at the corner of High and Second Streets and watched the Hamilton centennial parade of 1891 go by. My part in that one-hundredth anniversary celebration of Hamilton was, first, a newspaper helper, and, secondly, an onlooker. Men older than I, and at that time among the leading men of Hamilton, were prominently active in many ways.

The forward-looking picture of Hamilton presented by Thomas Millikin in 1891 continues as impressively today. In the last 50 years the increase in size of our manufacturing plants, our retail-store business, our educational institutions, our banks, our schools, our churches, the ownership of our public utilities, all go to make up a city in excess of 50,000 population, a city unique in the United States that owns and operates all its public utilities. The tax value of Hamilton 50 years ago was $40,000,000. Today, in our sesquicentennial year, the tax value is estimated at $160,000,000.

One of the things that impressed me at the 1891 centennial celebration was the opening address by Thomas Millikin, lawyer, who was the president of the general centennial committee. Knowing him so well personally, I listened most intently to his eloquently expressed thoughts. So today, at this sesquicentennial celebration, it seems to me that some of the things Mr. Millikin said are just as interesting, possibly more so, than when he spoke them in 1891. So I turn back the pages of history and quote Mr. Thomas Millikin, the president of the general committee of Hamilton's centennial in 1891.

"We look back from this day through a hundred years—through a century of marvelous growth and development. The same sky is overhead, the same sun shines upon us, the same river that in January 1791 bore upon its bosom the canoes of Simon Girty with 300 Indian warriors to the attack upon Dunlap's Station, and in September of the same year flowed past the site of Fort Hamilton, still flows in its channel. The same hills that stood sentinel over the valley, and looked down upon the old fort are still here, but stripped of the magnificent oaks that were their glory."

This week is dedicated to the beginning of Hamilton, to those men and their families who came as pioneers into the forests between the two Miami Rivers and to those men and women who have since played parts, no matter how large or small, in the development of Hamilton and Butler County.

Hamilton had its beginning in 1791 as a fort—an outpost established by the white man in his expansion westward. Today, after 150 years, Hamilton is still a fort, not in the sense of an outpost against the Indians, but in the sense of a fort in which are the deep-rooted democratic ideals of an American community determined to retain those principles written with the sacrifice and blood of our forefathers.

Hamilton and Butler County history is rich in accomplishment. Business and industry and agriculture have grown steadily through the years and with their growth has been the companion growth of community pride and civic interest. Today Hamilton is known in the world's markets for its products and in world civilization for its democratic ideals.

The Journal-News believes it is fitting that Hamilton and Butler Counties properly celebrate this one hundred and fiftieth birthday. The Journal-News believes that such a celebration not only creates an interest in things gone before but also makes the people of today aware of their obligations to the generations to come.

One hundred and fifty years is a long, long time indeed. But as the Hamilton and Butler Counties of today look back through the century and a half of history, there is reason indeed to have fitting celebration for the rich heritage of the passing years.

Too often in this twentieth century do people forget the richness of the past and think only of the things in which they are interested today. Too often do people forget that many of the things they enjoy today have been made possible only because of the work or sacrifice of people who have gone before. And too often do people forget that we in this generation can do things for the future generation just as the founders of Hamilton did things for us.

Let us, therefore, be mindful in this sesquicentennial year of the rich heritage we have received from those gone before. And let us be mindful of our obligation to the future so that our heritage to future generations will be of the same high standard received by us.

Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the question as to when Louis D. Brandeis, retired Justice of the United States Supreme Court, who died Sunday night in Washington, first took up the practice of law was one that was debated for a long period, but the late Justice settled this question himself by declaring that he was admitted to the bar in the city of St. Louis in 1878, following his graduation from the Harvard University Law School, and it was there that he began practice, in November 1878, in a building at 505 Chestnut Street. It was in May 1931 that Justice Brandeis wrote a letter to Mr. Irving Dilliard, editorial writer of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, on this subject. The letter follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 29, 1931.*

Re yours of 25th.

DEAR MR. DILLIARD: My thanks for your generous clipping.

Answering your inquiries:

I lived in St. Louis from November 1878 to June 1879; was admitted to the State and Federal bars (probably in November); and had my office with James Taussig (whose assistant I was) at 505 Chestnut Street. I lived with my sister, Mrs. Charles Nagel, at 2044 Lafayette Avenue.

I think my first printed brief was in the case of *Martin Michael* v. *Joseph H. Locke*, in the circuit court, city of St. Louis, at the June term, 1879; later submitted to the court of appeals as *Cimbat Co.* v. *Locke*.

Cordially,

LOUIS D. BRANDEIS.

MR. IRVING DILLIARD.

In 1936 the St. Louis Bar Association prepared a bronze commemorative tablet which will be found at 505 Chestnut Street. The inscription on that tablet reads as follows:

On this site Louis Dembitz Brandeis, Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, began the practice of law in 1878. From this spot spread the influence of a great lawyer, a social philosopher, and a wise and just judge. Presented by his friends, under the auspices of the Bar Association of St. Louis, 1936.

The above information undoubtedly will be of value in the future because in years to come biographies of this great man are sure to appear.

Mr. Speaker, I was a great admirer of Justice Brandeis. While it was stated at the outset, when his nomination to the Supreme Court was opposed, that he lacked a proper judicial temperament, this was not the real reason for the opposition to his confirmation. In one sentence the Honorable DAVID I WALSH, who is now a United States Senator from the State of Massachusetts, and who appeared before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate in support of the nomination, gave the real reason for the opposition. I am quoting that sentence:

The real crime of which this man is guilty is that he has exposed the iniquities of men in high places in our financial system.

Mr. Speaker, I wish everyone in this country could read the book written by Justice Brandeis long before he was nominated by President Wilson entitled "Other People's Money." If the Congress of the United States had created the Securities and Exchange Commission and passed the laws that are now upon the statute book which are administered by that Commission, I say without fear of contradiction the people of this country would have been saved billions of dollars. In that little brochure Justice Brandeis told the story of interlocking directorates and how the great financiers of this country handled other people's money. Justice Brandeis was never forgiven by the great financiers of this country for writing that book.

Had the laws I refer to been passed when that book was written, there would never have been a depression nor would stock and bond holders have lost billions of dollars in the stock-market crash of 1929.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and St. Louis Star-Times. The editorials follow:

[From the St. Louis Post Dispatch of October 6, 1941]

MASTERPIECE OF PUBLIC SERVICE

If a young lawyer, just admitted to the bar, should seek an example for his career in the legal profession, where would he find a better model than Louis D. Brandeis?

Justice Brandeis, who died last night, ripe in years and full of honors, had the humble beginning that any lawyer might have had. He started in 1878 at the bottom rung—as it happens, as assistant to James Taussig, of St. Louis, at 505 Chestnut Street, a stone's throw from the Old Courthouse. Later he rose brilliantly in the bar of Boston. Legal skill and unending industry brought him important cases and handsome fees. He could have been content with a large fortune and a life of comparative ease as a lawyer's lawyer and consultant.

Yet he was not. He became, as no lawyer before him, an advocate for the people, the great unorganized mass of ordinary citizens who so often went unrepresented when their interests were at stake in court proceedings, public hearings, and legislative bodies. When the Dingley tariff was before the House Ways and Means Committee of McKinley's time, Louis Brandeis, with no more credentials than his intense belief in democracy, appeared to testify.

"Whom do you represent?" the chairman asked.

"I represent the consumer," came the reply.

The laughter of the committee echoed in headlines and "pert paragraphs," but the young lawyer spoke only the truth. He did represent the consumer—he represented him on that occasion and many times thereafter. He represented the consumer in his battles for better living and working conditions, in his furtherance of trade unionism, in his many services as a mediator of labor disputes, his probing of financial, utility, and railroad schemes. Had he done no more than fight the lone but successful battle for mutual savings-bank life insurance in Massachusetts a generation ago, that achievement in itself—safe low-cost insurance for working people—would have earned him a lasting place in the record of American social progress.

It was this career for the consumer, for ordinary men and women, who could hire no great-name lawyers, which caused the great storm of protest among the vested interests when Woodrow Wilson nominated Louis Brandeis to the United States Supreme Court in 1916. It is impossible now to recapture the bitterness of that fight. Seven past presidents of the American Bar Association found it their painful duty to declare him unfit for a seat on the highest bench. Among those who so testified were William Howard Taft, Elihu Root, and President Lowell of Harvard.

From January until June the battle raged, but the Wilson of the New Freedom knew why he had chosen Louis Brandeis and he stood by his nominee without flinching. In the end, 22 Senators voted against confirmation, and many of them, like Borah of Idaho, would have been glad in later years to have expunged their share in that partisan record.

Justice Brandeis' contributions to our constitutional law were many and great. Yet they derived from very simple views of our Federal system. He found in the Constitution an ample charter for our changing needs. He

joined with Justice Holmes in allowing the States wide experimentation in coping with the essentially economic problems raised by new trends in ways of living and working.

He never stopped refining his own views as new information came to his hand; he believed and profoundly practiced that "your opinion is no better than your information." He stood as stanchly as any man for the right of free expression. And when narrow minds sought to stay legislative response to new forces, he said, "If we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold."

The success of this open mind is written in changed business practices, in now accepted regulation of corporate enterprise, in the United States Supreme Court reports from 1916 until this very day, when his late associates, led by Chief Justice Stone, bow in his memory as another term opens.

For many a view Justice Brandeis expressed in dissent is today the law of the land. Indeed, there were times when not even Holmes stood with him, as for example when Justice Brandeis first argued for Federal taxation of personal income derived from lands leased by States to private operators. But by slow progress through the years he was able to do what he said early he would like to do, amend, not the Constitution, "but men's social and economic ideals."

The strength of American democracy lies in men like Louis Dembitz Brandeis.

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of October 7, 1941]

THE FAITH OF LOUIS BRANDEIS

Where shall we find the key to the character of Louis Dembitz Brandeis, who died Sunday night after a long lifetime ar rich in productive achievement for democracy as that of any American this era can remember?

It was not his intellectual capacity, though Brandeis revealed himself in his judicial opinions as a scholar of the law and though his search for knowledge was avid and unending. Other men, who at heart were mere snobs, have possessed equal or superior intellectual ability.

It was not his courage, either physical or spiritual, though tidal waves of criticism beat about his head on many occasions before he had lived long enough to become respected and cherished. Other human beings have bravely faced social disapproval, and some have even paid the death penalty for their temerity, without quite reaching the level of Brandeis.

It was not his radicalism—though Brandeis uttered criticisms of vicious corporate malpractices and the manipulation of other people's money which, coming from a Supreme Court Justice, made the turgid corporation baiting of professional radicals look pale and vapid.

And assuredly it was not a habit and custom of dissent, a maudlin, contrary, perverse antagonism to the status quo or to the majority. Brandeis, though circumstances forced him for many years into a dissenting role, was a man of great affirmative faiths. He believed in moral law. He believed in liberty—that shining thing which too many are so easily persuaded to trade for some mess of pottage. He believed, deeply and passionately, in the dignity and the rights of ordinary human beings. He believed in many such simple verities, which less great-souled men timidly hesitate to acknowledge.

Here, indeed, we touch the underlying faith of Louis Brandeis, the basic impulse which motivated his conduct. He believed in man. He believed in democracy. Like some other Americans one can remember—like Lincoln, for one, and a certain few poets—he gave actual faith and credit to the high principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

And in these beliefs his career unfolded. Because of them he turned his back on the life of a successful, wealthy corporation lawyer which was wide open before him in his young manhood. Because of them he fought for "the consumer" against special interests. Because of them he braved the enmity of the rich and powerful. And when he rose to the Supreme Court—in an appointment to the everlasting credit of Woodrow Wilson—the trappings and comfort and exalted security of his position worked no evil in his heart.

He still trusted the people, so he dissented from narrow legalistic interpretations which would have made the Constitution a crabbed and constricting influence on this generation. He still respected individual rights and he protected the victims of racial and class prejudice. He spoke often for the rights of free speech and free assembly. He had no doubts for our future so long as we preserved our independence of mind and our willingness to experiment boldly, and it is characteristic that one of his philanthropies was an obscure little "radical" labor college in Arkansas which the authorities of that sovereign State saw fit only to persecute.

If American democracy is still vital and strong to face its new problems, Brandeis, with his incorruptible faith in the people, helped make it so. And it is to the credit of our democracy that it cradled Brandeis, and gave him place, and took him at last to its heart.

The New Farm Program and Human-Labor Hours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

COMMUNICATION TO THE SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS BY MR. O. F. BLEDSOE, PRESIDENT, STAPLE COTTON COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication from my friend and neighbor, Mr. O. F. Bledsoe, president of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association, of Greenwood, Miss., a successful grower and a successful seller of cotton, who has devoted much time and thought to an unselfish solution of the cotton problem, entitled "The New Farm Program and Human-Labor Hours," to wit:

THE NEW FARM PROGRAM AND HUMAN-LABOR HOURS

OCTOBER 1941.

To the Seventy-seventh Congress of the United States of America:

The human-labor hour is the foundation of all wealth. It performs a dual function of production and consumption. These God-given rights should be carefully safeguarded and equitably administered by our Government to maintain our democracy.

The cotton plant, the South's gift from God, should be cherished, nourished, and glorified, for it consumes the greatest volume of human-labor hours of any product of our country's soil. Our first farm program converted 15,000,000 acres of cotton, consuming 85 human-labor hours per acre, into oats and hay that consume 15 human-labor hours per acre. This loss of 70 human-labor hours per acre on 15,000,000 acres produced a total loss of over 1,000,000,000 human-labor hours. This tremendous economic loss was absorbed by the W. P. A. and the remaining cotton acres.

Now comes the new farm program for cotton with a proposal for another 3,000,000-acre voluntary reduction of the cotton-acreage quota, and an added loss of 210,000,000 more human-labor hours, making a grand total of 1,260,000,000 human-labor hours, with no provision for productive work for these unfortunate people. We shall ask the Seventy-seventh Congress of the United States of America to carefully consider the trend of this continuous pressure for reduction of the limited employment of this type of labor.

Should the great labor-consuming cotton plant be treated in this manner because it produces ample, and more than ample, fiber to clothe the small percent of the world's population that inhabits this political subdivision which proclaims a sanctified role with its neighbors? Would this program be a sound economic proposal if the cotton South was south of the Rio Grande?

If the intention of the Department of Agriculture is to reduce the cotton South to domestic fiber consumption, then the sound and direct economic procedure would be to select the best 10,000,000 acres of cotton land which would produce ample fiber for domestic consumption. Instead of continuous agony, accentuated with barbs of derision and scorn, this major operation would produce a loss of 70 human-labor hours on 30,000,000 acres, or a grand total of over 2,000,000,000 human-labor hours. How will the United States Department of Agriculture provide work to consume this tremendous volume of this type of labor? We will have to feed them out of the United States Treasury or export our surplus lint cotton so they can earn a decent living at their natural calling. I respectfully call your attention to the Bankhead-Eastland bill that is a fair arrangement for providing export subsidies from import duties.

The most wonderful feature of the cotton plant is that it produces 2 pounds of food and feed to 1 pound of fiber. The linters from the cottonseed provide the powder for a shooting war, while the meal and hulls provide feed for the dairy cow producing necessary milk and butter, and the cottonseed oil assists the dairy cow with an excellent cheap spread to help out the butterfat, as well as frying fat and soap stock.

The present price of human-labor hours as related to the price of cotton and cottonseed, based on published reports of the United States Department of Agriculture, are approximately as follows:

1. Average yield of lint cotton per acre, pounds	250
2. Average yield of cottonseed per acre, pounds	500
3. Average number of human-labor hours per acre	85
4. One human-labor hour produces:	
Lint cotton, pounds	3
Cottonseed, do	6
5. Parity price (approximately), cents	17
6. Average price of cottonseed (approximately) (per ton)	$50
7. Fertilizer and soil-building crops per pound of cotton, cents	1
8. Parity price less fertilizer and soil building, cents	16
	Cents
One human-labor hour produces 3 pounds of lint cotton at 16 cents	48
Plus 6 pounds of cottonseed, less ginning, at 2 cents per pound	12
Total returns per human-labor hour	60
Labor's share is 50 percent, or rate per hour	30

A single family, limited by conditions of Nature to working 12 acres of cotton and producing 6 bales, would expend 1,020 human-labor hours at 30 cents, making a cash income of $306.

O. F. BLEDSOE.

Tennessee's Part in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. ESTES KEFAUVER, OF TENNESSEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio address delivered over station WINX in Washington on October 7, entitled "Tennessee's Part in National Defense." The program was sponsored by the Tennessee State Society:

Whenever the United States is imperiled, Tennessee stands ready to do its share. The raging world-wide conflict that Hitler started more than 2 years ago has long since reached the southern highlands and fertile regions of Tennessee and has found its challenge met by a people unafraid. Tennesseans have ever been lovers of freedom and liberty. And in the face of this latest threat to the American way, by ruthless international brigands, the State of Tennessee has offered to the Nation its complete services unreserved, with a spiritual fervor commensurate with its great God-given natural resources. Independence is a fetish here. To know that fact is but to know the history of Tennessee whose cognomen connotes the spirit which caused it to be called the Volunteer State. Within its boundaries, its rugged pioneer settlers in the Watauga Association as early as 1772 drafted the first constitution to be written and adopted by independent white Americans. No menace to this country's safety has found the ensuing summons to arms unheeded. Tennessee's sons have fought in all of the wars of the United States of America and the independence of Texas was espoused and won largely by transplanted Tennesseans and Kentuckians and Tennessee furnished a majority of the volunteers who fought in the Mexican War. As in history—so now. A dispatch from Drew Middleton, Associated Press War Correspondent, in Reykjavik, Iceland, states, "A regiment of seasoned soldiers recruited from the factories and farms of Ohio, Tennessee, and Kentucky and with a history studded with battle honors from Bull Run to the Argonne, forms a prominent part of the American fighting force on Iceland." Once again then true to tradition, Tennesseans mount the bastions of Americans' farthest outposts of national defense.

Warfare is no longer a matter of superiority of manpower alone, but a gigantic struggle among economic forces. Competitive industrial development demands huge natural resources. A vast reservoir of materials active and latent are available in Tennessee, long recognized for the richness of its mineral resources. More than 70 minerals and chemicals, a larger variety than is to be found in any other Southern State, are produced in Tennessee. Not more than a half dozen States in the Union have a greater number. They range the field from ever-needed coal, marble, and phosphate to the much-emphasized strategic minerals, such as copper and manganese.

Tennessee is wonderfully blessed with water. Indeed, it has been estimated that there are from 25,000 to 30,000 miles of rivers and streams in the State—more than enough to reach around the world. The Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers are, economically, among the most important rivers in the United States. With their major tributaries they form systems of waterways which nearly cover the entire State.

To the region traversed by the rivers of Tennessee has come a giant, girded for war. The giant is the Tennessee Valley Authority, which, in addition to its established program of navigation and flood control, supplies the electric power essential and vital to our industrial machine for national defense. Born in the shadow of the first World War, the T. V. A. now gears its mighty dam-building, soil-saving, electricity-producing operations to the needs of the present emergency. An integrated unit of many dams working as a single system for power, navigation, and flood control is envisaged, but just now the emphasis is primarily on power. The power market in the Tennessee Valley 8 years ago was using only a fourth of the present installed capacity, but even the present capacity may be doubled within another 3 years. Power and still more power is now recognized as the key to national defense. To be sure the essentials of the conservation and fertilizer program are still being carried on, but it has been tersely pointed out that the Tennessee River and its tributaries are primarily at this moment a line of battle—and such is the nature of modern war that this is no figure of speech but a statement of cold fact. R. L. Duffus in a recent article in the New York Times succinctly described the scene in the Tennessee Valley.

"The war machines are hungry. They will eat all the power there is and clamor for more. They can be built faster than the dams and generators that feed them. It is no longer a question of public versus private power, of waterpower versus steam—it is a question of power alone. The water behind the high dams is more than liquid gold. It is liquid aluminum, magnesium, rubber, high explosives, tanks. First and foremost, it is bombers. Out of this valley must come, in substance, a good part of the air-borne fleets that may strike down Hitler. * * *

"The river is at war, even though the Nation, in the legal sense of the word, is not. A desperate energy has seized upon the valley. If electric power is wings, it is time that makes them precious.

"The valley throbs with the beat of those mighty wings, of ore not yet refined, of metal not yet cast or rolled. Destiny moves upon the green and brown of falling water.

"It is with this sense of wings hovering and swooping—the wings of bombers, the wings of death, the wings of fate—that one watches T. V. A. at work and looks at the machine it feeds. What has to be done may be prose. Its significance is epic poetry."

Every section of the State is a contributor to the building of the arsenal within an arsenal of democracy. There is the Montsanto phosphorus plant at Columbia, the Wolf Creek ordnance plant near Milan, ferro-alloys plants, and the Volunteer ordnance plant to make TNT at Chattanooga, the gigantic Vultee airplane plant at Nashville, a General Motors plant making aircraft parts at Memphis, the large smokeless-powder plant at Memphis, the Aluminum Co. of America at Alcoa and Maryville, the Tennessee Copper Co. at Copperhill, the largest single sulfuric acid supply source in America, and other war industries too numerous to mention.

A map dotted with storage depots, artillery ranges, barrage-balloon training centers, and encampments like the great Camp Forrest cantonment at Tullahoma attests the realism of the military preparation being made for our defense.

Aviation, one of the deadliest phases of current warfare, has not been neglected. The pound of beating propellers and the whir of wings have told a dramatic story in Tennessee in the past few years. The progress of flying in Tennessee has been a real success story. In 1929 the State had only 3 airports. At present it boasts 23 airports, either already modern, up-to-date, and able to meet all requirements of their respective fields or else being rapidly made that way. There are airports at Chattanooga, Clarksville, Cookeville, Dyersburg, Fayetteville, Gallatin, Jackson, Nashville, Knoxville, Memphis, Tullahoma, and others along with innumerable intermediate landing fields, private and Army air fields and numerous landing strips. Tennessee has shown fine foresight in sponsoring instruction in gliding and has placed itself in the forefront of this important new movement in the Nation's program of aviation for defense. The Tennessee Bureau of Aeronautics has pioneered with its new school in gliding and soaring training, the first in the country sponsored by any government unit. And the spread of gliding instruction, expected as the United States profits by the Nazi experience in the value of this type of training will find Tennessee already in service in this field. To those tangibles of manpower and natural and industrial resources must be added in times of national stress, great leadership. Here neither is Tennessee lacking. In the shades of Jackson, Polk, Johnson, walks that great Tennessean who has contributed so largely to the formation of the foreign policies which have so ably steered the United States through the treacherous seas of international discord.

A host of native sons of the Volunteer State are carrying on in posts of leadership. No résumé of leaders would be complete which omitted the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, the Honorable KENNETH D. MCKELLAR, whose dauntless courage is at this very time finding expression on the floor of the Senate in an effort to repeal those laws which are not in accord with the avowed determination of the American people in their international dealings. His service to his State is a living example to those Tennesseans in many high places who are emulating the heroic deeds of their hardy ancestors.

And so from the fertile soil in which it is embedded, to the mighty rivers that course its veins from its lowlands to its mountain tops; from the lofty Appalachians to the banks of the mighty Mississippi comes the unisoned voice of a Tennessee dedicated anew to the tasks of national defense.

Let's Have Economy and Honesty in the Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

ARTICLE BY I. F. STONE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, future historians will see clearly that, in these dangerous days of the onrush of the powerful and seemingly irresistible Nazi war machine, our Nation has been twice put

in jeopardy—first from the Hitler menace, second from those in our Government who have the power and the will to bend the defense program to a pattern which allows great financial and other returns to a privileged few.

Some of the men who are appealing to the public for an all-out defense effort appear to be deeply concerned, in private, to protect monopoly rather than to guard the interests of the public. Acts of this Congress have made it possible for them to hazard our financial soundness and our whole economic structure, as well as an important part of the defense program, in a poker game played for tremendous stakes. They are actually gambling with our safety, destroying national confidence, and undermining the morale of private citizens, as well as of those young men selected to defend the system which made them possible, and protects them.

Every Congressman is currently receiving many propaganda letters demanding economy in our nondefense budget. Why should we not expect ordinary vigilance, honesty, and economy in defense expenditures as well? Any who would use a national emergency for private profit or power or aggrandizement are traitors to our national cause. The location of aluminum plants in the Northwest has been made without due economy and with millions of dollars of unjustifiable costs—and with wicked delays, and unnecessary use of strategic materials.

We are in grave danger from foes from without who know our internal weaknesses, and they are sweeping toward the lands of this hemisphere and toward the seas which we call our frontiers. We must put a stop to every individual and every group endangering our national strength and unity by plundering, through defense contracts, or wasting our resources through ignorance or gross carelessness. We have men of integrity and ability whom we can trust. We must insist that the great responsibility is put into their hands. We must rid ourselves of those who are preying upon us in our all-out effort to aid those nations which are meeting the onslaught while we are spared.

I have frequently called the attention of this House to the shortage in aluminum, especially as connected with the need for electric power, which is supplied so cheaply in the Pacific Northwest. On Tuesday of this week, October 7, I made a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in regard to the Aluminum Co. contract negotiated for the Government by the R. F. C. I have called attention to the investigations of the Truman committee in connection with this contract. The terms of the contract, the inexcusable delay in arranging for the manufacture of aluminum, and the very apparent willingness to make that aluminum costly to the Government are matters which should concern every Member of Congress.

The obtainable facts seem to indicate that a great monopoly, the Aluminum Co. of America, does not want to make cheap aluminum, which would thereby compete with their own more expensive output in plants where power costs are higher. Our agents in our defense program have given them the right and the privilege of fixing the prices of aluminum. As indisputable evidence there is the contract already signed and entered into, a contract drawn by Alcoa's attorney and nursed along by Alcoa's agents and officials in O. P. M. Senator TRUMAN, in his press statement, suggested that the contract should be abrogated. Possibly a public burning would be a more wholesome and salutary procedure. Something must be done to restore confidence. Before any action can be taken all the facts must be made known.

On Tuesday I inserted in the RECORD, with the permission of this House, the second article of Mr. I. F. Stone's very careful and informative series which has been running in the New York Nation. I now ask permission to insert the first one of those articles entitled "Making Defense Safe for Alcoa," which appeared in the September 27 issue of the Nation. This correspondent has done a very fine piece of work which is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the conduct of the defense program.

[From the Nation of September 27, 1941]

MAKING DEFENSE SAFE FOR ALCOA

(By I. F. Stone)

WASHINGTON, September 19.—Last Monday the Truman committee, a Senate committee investigating the defense program, heard two witnesses. One was Jesse Jones. The other was Arthur H. Bunker, executive vice president of the Lehman Corporation, now Chief of the Aluminum and Magnesium Section in the Materials Division of the O. P. M. Both were unwilling witnesses. The story drawn from them, painfully and piecemeal, was a sensational story and an important story, for it dealt with aluminum. Without enough aluminum we cannot make enough planes, and without enough planes we can neither help the British and the Russians to survive nor defend ourselves in the event of their defeat.

Some important stories are dull stories—full of statistics and complicated facts. "Pig iron" we used to call them. The story developed by the Truman committee hearing was hardly dull. The testimony showed that (1) Bunker, the dollar-a-year man in charge of aluminum and magnesium, is still drawing his $60,000-a-year salary from Lehman Corporation, which owns stock in the Aluminum Co. of America and its sister corporation, Aluminum Ltd., of Canada; (2) after 4 months not a shovelful of dirt has been turned on the 600,000,000-pound aluminum expansion program announced by the O. P. M. last May; (3) the first contract to be signed under that program obligates the Government to spend $52,000,000 to finance new alumina and aluminum plants but leaves the Aluminum Co. of America to build these plants when it chooses and to operate them as it pleases; (4) this one-sided contract was negotiated by Jesse Jones, who can be the country's most hard-boiled horse trader in dealing with some small businessman or municipality; (5) Jones signed the contract 2 days after the receipt of a letter from Secretary of the Interior Ickes protesting that the contract was unfair to the Government and contrary to the public interest, and ought not to be signed; (6) Jones testified that the contract was written "in the first instance" by "Mr. Cliff Durr, our General Counsel," but a moment later Durr was forced to admit that the first draft was written by Oscar Ewing, counsel for the Aluminum Co. of America. I can add, as my own contribution to this story, that there was very little difference between the first draft of that contract and the last, and that Ewing is not only one of Alcoa's principal attorneys and local lobbyists but also vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. At this point the Truman committee pulled its punches.

I went over the contract between Alcoa and Jesse Jones last week end and mentioned it in last week's letter because I was naive enough to think the press could hardly ignore the story and would squeeze all the juice out of it before a weekly could get around to covering it. I saw eight or nine newspapermen at the committee hearing on Monday, and I see a good many papers every day, but the only place I saw the story printed was in the Baltimore Sun, which ran a short Associated Press account. Until yesterday the only clipping the Truman committee had received on the hearing was from the Baltimore Sun. The Ewing angle is political dynamite, but the Republican Herald Tribune in New York charitably overlooked it. The New York Times, which is for all-out aid to Britain, seems to have failed to see the connection between aluminum and planes. It does not hate Hitler less; perhaps it merely loves Alcoa more. The Washington papers kept mum on the story, although the Washington Post on Monday ran a rewrite of an A. P. dispatch, saying that Jones would be put on the griddle by the Truman committee.

I think the silence of the press on the matter is as shocking as the inactivity of the O. P. M. Together they present Mussolini with a fine example of what he calls a "plutodemocracy." They show how little the real controls of the defense program have been changed behind all the recent scene-shifting and shake-ups. This is the kind of thing that rots empires and prepares defeats, and it is time that Mr. Roosevelt woke up to what is going on in his own defense household instead of continuing the grandiose farce by which a Stettinius—more responsible than any other man for the delay in expanding aluminum production—is placed in charge of speeding up the lend-lease program.

The darkest aspect of this aluminum story is its one bright spot. When William L. Batt appeared before the Truman committee last May 12, he was able to show by some strenuous arithmetic that the present production of aluminum plus the expansion planned would be just enough by the spring of 1942 to take care of our "direct" military needs. The new bomber programs—which remain headline hashish without aluminum—have since increased those direct military needs for the light metal. Four months have been lost, and the only contract signed covers but half the expansion planned. The new aluminum-producing facilities will not be ready by next spring. I learned from Truman committee investigators, however, that the consequences will not be as serious as might have been expected because the lag in aircraft production is greater than the lag in aluminum production. Aircraft production is now expected to hit its full stride by December of 1942 instead of next spring, and aluminum planning is in terms of the winter and spring of 1942–43.

Judging from the testimony last Monday and the contract, what we have to begin worrying about now is whether present expansion plans will materialize in time to take care of expanded plane production in the winter and spring of 1942–43. Unless Alcoa's grip on the O. P. M. and the R. F. C. is loosened, I do not think we will get that aluminum in time. The contract with Alcoa provides for four new plants. One is for alumina, the intermediate product from which aluminum is made. This plant, to be erected in Arkansas, will supply 400,000,000 pounds of alumina a year, or enough to make only an additional 200,000,000 pounds of aluminum. The three other plants are

aluminum plants, one with a capacity of 150,000,000 pounds a year, to be built near Massena, N. Y.; the second, with a 90-000,000-pound capacity, to be constructed "adjacent to deep water" in Washington or Oregon; the third, with a capacity of 100,-000,000 pounds, to be set up in Arkansas. That is a total of 340,000,000 pounds of aluminum. No contracts have yet been signed for the rest of the 600,000,000-pound expansion promised in May, or for the additional alumina required to produce the aluminum, or for the additional fabrication facilities necessary. Aluminum ingots don't fly.

The contract is full of loopholes that lawyers will appreciate. No time is fixed for completion of the plants, and there is, of course, no penalty clause. Alcoa merely agrees to "use its best endeavors" to obtain the land necessary for construction of the plants, and it is doubtful whether the sites have yet been picked. The best Jones could say was, "I think the site at Massena, N. Y., has been picked. I am not certain about Arkansas. I think the site for the Northwest plant has been picked." Alcoa agrees to prepare plans, and if the plans are approved by the Government, to complete the work "as soon as practicable." Jones said it was his recollection that Alcoa thought it would have the plants ready in less than a year's time. When Hugh Fulton, counsel to the committee, asked him why that wasn't put into the contract with a penalty clause attached, Jones said, "I can't tell you." Jones' testimony is a lexicographer's nightmare. At one point he interpreted the word "shall" in the contract as meaning "maybe," and at another he said "or" meant the same as "both." In the construction of the plants Alcoa is not obligated to exercise "good faith and reasonable care," the usual formula, but "good faith or that degree of care which they normally exercise in the conduct of Alcoa's business." The nonlawyer reader may take my word for it that the second clause would make proof of negligence, much less bad faith, very difficult. Fulton wanted to know why the term "reasonable care" wasn't used instead and why the contract said "or" instead of "and." I quote from the record:

"JONES. I don't agree with you that 'or' means one or the other. 'Or' means 'both.'

"FULTON. 'Or' means 'both'?

"JONES. Certainly."

Aluminum is made from alumina and alumina from bauxite. Ninety percent of the country's high-grade bauxite, the only kind being used, is controlled by Alcoa. After the bauxite is purchased, on Alcoa's terms, the Government will still have to ask Alcoa's permission to make alumina from it in the Government's own alumina plant. The contract says, "When the alumina plant is completed, the production of alumina therein shall be at such rates within its capacity and for such periods as shall be agreed upon from time to time by Defense [Plant] Corporation and Alcoa." Fulton asked Jones, "Suppose Alcoa tells you it doesn't agree that that plant should be operated, even though you have a good many millions of Government money in it? I don't quite see under this contract how you could require it to be operated."

"JONES. I suspect you could if you were to try.

"FULTON. Under what provision of the contract?

"JONES. You could do it without a contract. * * *

"FULTON. Why sign a contract where they have a right such as that, Mr. Jones, when you have no right to control and operate the plant? Why not insert a provision authorizing you to operate the plant if they don't want to?

"JONES. I think we are fully protected."

Under the contract, after Alcoa has permitted alumina to be produced in the Government plant, the Government cannot use its own alumina to make aluminum in its own aluminum plants except at a price satisfactory to Alcoa. If any alumina is left over, which could be made available to other manufacturers of aluminum, it cannot be sold except on terms satisfactory to Alcoa. Alcoa gets a 5-year lease on the aluminum plants. The lease begins either 7 years from the execution of the contract or whenever production reaches 80 percent of capacity, whichever is earlier. This allows 2 years for construction of the plants. Once they are in operation, production in the Government-owned plants is to be at the same rate as in Alcoa's plants, and under the contract the Government cannot cancel the lease unless production is restricted to less than 40 percent of capacity. I am going to tell some more about this extraordinary contract and its equally extraordinary companion contracts with the Canadian Aluminum Co. next week. In the meantime I wish some Senator would have the courage to ask Jesse Jones whether this contract was written to defend the United States or the Aluminum Co. of America.

The Indispensable Quality of Highways to the National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. THOMAS H. MACDONALD, COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC ROADS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered on September 29, 1941, by Hon. Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of the Public Roads Administration at the twenty-seventh annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials at Detroit, Mich., on the indispensable quality of highways to the national defense.

Commissioner MacDonald's address was as follows:

In the June 1941 issue of Current History and Forum, Mr. Frederic Sondern, Jr., former foreign correspondent in Germany, has rendered a great service for all of us in this country. He has disclosed the factual background, and step by step described first, the development of the conception of Germany as the dominant world power, and in sequence the building of a vast organization for planning and for gathering data as a basis for the planning through world-wide espionage, in addition to those official representatives generally accepted in good faith by and between all nations. With the background now supplied we should be prepared to accept without shock any disclosures of espionage. And we have the knowledge of just why events have shaped themselves as they have. The following is quoted from Mr. Sondern:

"For the fourth time in 20 months Germany has rolled its forces irresistibly against the weakest points of its opponents' defenses at exactly the right moment. No army has ever been so precisely led, so effectively directed, or had the way so thoroughly prepared for its advance with propaganda, political sabotage, and economic pressure.

"The development of this formula of destruction and the split-second timing which has sent the Nazi juggernaut rolling across Europe without serious hindrance is the work of one man.

"Maj. Gen. Prof. Dr. Karl Haushofer and his Geo-Political Institute in Munich with its 1,000 scientists, technicians, and spies are almost unknown to the public, even in the Reich. But their ideas, their charts, maps, statistics, information, and plans have dictated Hitler's moves from the very beginning.

"Here is an organization for conquest, a machine for scientific planning, which no conqueror before Hitler ever had at his command."

The resulting coldly calculated, scientific methods for world conquest integrating motor-powered equipment on the highways and in the air is accurately reported in a June 1941 memorandum by Lt. Col. Lacey V. Murrow, former State highway commissioner of the State of Washington. Colonel Murrow was temporarily released by the Army Air Corps, at the request of the Federal Works Administrator, to go to England for the purpose of observing the demands upon highway services and the relationships between air services and highways which have grown out of the titanic European war operations. The following is quoted:

"RAPID FLEXIBLE TRANSPORT CHIEF FACTOR IN THE NEW FORM OF WARFARE

"Adequate modern transportation has proven to be one of the greatest single factors in present offensive or defensive warfare. In all of the campaigns in which the German Army has thus far been engaged, rapid transportation facilities have been of the greatest importance. Perhaps in no single instance was this fact more clearly demonstrated than in the battle of France.

"Discussions with French, Belgian, and English officers, who participated in and observed the full extent of this operation, disclose two most interesting facts. The German Army made full use of the entire road net, and it has been stated that there was little or no cross-country movement of tanks or other mechanized units. Every detail as to the movement, supply, and maintenance of these mechanized units was carefully worked out in advance. Allied aerial observation reports indicate that there was never at any time confusion or congestion on the various portions of the road system that were being used by the advancing German Army.

"UNORGANIZED TRANSPORT A FATAL WEAKNESS IN FRANCE

"On the other hand, it was stated by the same officers that there was utter confusion insofar as traffic was concerned behind the Allied lines. After the break-through at Sudan, there was no semblance of order in the movement of either military or civilian traffic. There was apparently no successful attempt at segregation and no establishment of priorities for certain classes of traffic. Records on file in the British War Office describe road blocks in France extending for miles and lasting for many hours made up of all classes of refugee vehicles and all classes of military transport. It would appear that only behind the British-held sectors was there any semblance of order."

But this Nation is not engaged in war. The national effort is directed toward two great objectives, the mass production of matériel of war for ourselves and for those nations who are valiantly defending themselves from aggressor nations, and simultaneously the building and equipping of an adequate army and navy for our own protection.

We know we are facing two periods of crisis, the immediate future of a life-and-death struggle involving the nations of the world to an extent we cannot yet know, and

then, sooner or later, the aftermath of dislocated industry, unemployment, debts, and unprecedented, world-wide social and economic disaster.

It is only intelligent to accept that all this disruption in the life of the world, the momentum achieved first by the German Nazi political party, and now by the German war machine, have advanced from a street brawl in Munich to a domination of most of the countries of Central Europe as a climax of a decade of painstaking, scientific planning and production. These elements of German national policy have converted mechanical power and engineering invention, designed to free men from the tyranny of physical labor, into coordinated weapons to impose upon nation after nation, the tyranny of a dictator's fancy. No matter what we think of the ethics between nations that are violated, no matter how immeasurable the suffering, the destruction, the loss of economic and social independence of the conquered nations, the conditions exist. These are real and are to be faced. This places the problem of what to do, what attitude to take, squarely before every individual. In our particular capacities of highway officials the responsibility is greater than the average. With each one it is not a question of individual action. It is a matter of official attitude and leadership. The responsibility extends beyond the limits of a locality, even a State, and for each of us pertinently raises the question, What is my responsibility to the Nation as a whole? In this national crisis, what contribution can I, as a highway official, make that will advance the interests of the Nation?

The experience of the past few months has been illuminating. Since it became evident that the Nation was in danger, there has been generally a response from the highway officials in attitude and in action that glorifies the spirit of solidarity of the highway organizations in the service of the United States. The measure of this response is indicated by the facts.

Directly in the interest of national defense, a program has been launched consisting of work on the strategic network and on access road projects, which as of August 31, 1941, embraces a total of 6,105 miles of programmed and approved highways.

On the 78,000-mile strategic network, 1,159 miles have been completed at a total cost of nearly $29,000,000; 4,288 miles have been approved for construction to cost in excess of $172,000,000; and an additional 1,517 miles have been programmed to cost approximately $64,000,000. The total programmed and approved mileage of strategic network, 5,805 miles, is estimated to cost $236,606,000, of which $127,565,000 or 54 percent is to be paid with Federal-aid funds. The program on this system also includes 585 structures and work on grade crossings to the extent of 145 eliminations and 105 protections.

Approximately 300 miles of access road projects have been programmed and approved at a total cost of $26,478,000 on which the Federal share is about 57.5 percent or in excess of $15,000,000. Surveys also have been authorized or engineering supervision is being supplied on over 1,450 miles. This work includes 58 structures and grade-crossing work, comprising 13 eliminations and 10 protections.

In a few States—it may be accented, in a very few States—there has been a meager response. The theory advanced is that defense highways are a responsibility of the National Government. This attitude prompts the question, Whose nation is this? The very essence of our national philosophy pivots upon our individual willingness to sacrifice political and personal interests to advance the common good. In no other way can the democratic principles underlying our national life be preserved. Because of these principles men as individuals are free within the laws to choose their own course. As public officials, they must accept the limitation upon their official decisions that is dictated by the advancement of the common good. In the time of national distress there is no place for self-interest or partisan politics. The record is now in the course of being written.

What has been accomplished on our highways during the past year to meet the known deficiencies measured by defense needs has been through the generous cooperation of the State highway departments through adjusting their current programs and the directing of expenditures of State and Federal funds to this end. There is no doubt that Federal legislation will be enacted that will materially augment these efforts. This is certain. However, there is a growing responsibility for both State and Federal highway officials. This is to concentrate upon the program of action that will insure the adequacy of indispensable services that can only be rendered by the highways. Transportation of persons and commodities over the highway has become so interwoven with the fabric of the life of every individual and all industry that, like the air we breathe, it is accepted without conscious thought. Highway service has become indispensable to our national life in normal times and much more in times of national emergency.

The universal transportation fallacy is in thinking of the units that move, and not the combination of the units that move and the roadbeds over which they move. This is true of all forms of transportation.

No matter how well the motive power and car equipment of the railroads are managed, efficient rail transport is dependent upon the constant day-by-day maintenance, including betterment and replacement of roadbeds and bridges. No matter how advanced the design of airplanes, they are dependent upon adequate runways to get off the ground or to land with safety. It has certainly been well demonstrated there is nothing more helpless on the ground than an airplane. Their effectiveness for either defense or offense depends upon how rapidly they can be put into the air.

So with motor transport. Adequate highways and bridges and organized operation are fundamental to their utility, and this can become accented with accelerated swiftness in an emergency. In his report of May last to Maj. E. W. Ridings, the head of the Civil Defense Mission which was sent to England in March of this year, Mr. Frederick C. Horner, a member of the Mission, assigned to study transportation and public utilities, quotes the Chief Engineer of the British Ministry of Transport, Maj. F. C. Cook, a highly competent engineer of long service in this capacity, as follows:

"You must have alternate highway routes and you must plan now—ahead of the emergency—how you propose to use them. In England, no effort was made before the war to work out strategic roads because we never expected invasion. You should not make that same mistake.

"Give your highway engineers, who are experienced in these matters, full control of the highways, repairs, and maintenance of both bridges and carriageways. Let the military authorities, working in the closest cooperation with the highway engineers, make the plans, but wherever possible, even including the theatre of war, let the highway engineers do the work."

Conceding the differences between a nation heroically defending itself through months now lengthening into years, and a nation turning its whole energies and resources at a rapidly accelerating rate toward preparedness to defend itself and to render essential assistance to other nations, the statement of Major Cook concisely, authentically defines the place in the organized plan for effective action that can be best filled by the highway officials in the providing of adequate highway facilities. In the broader field of highway transport there must be complete coordination with the motor-vehicle administrators, with the State and local traffic control organizations, and the establishment of cooperation with and between all classes of road users.

The plans for the orderly, efficient use of highway transport have been progressing but the real effort is yet ahead. Probably the detailed knowledge that we have for quick reference of the condition and capacity of the highways of the Nation, particularly the more important routes, is unsurpassed. Just what needs to be done is not a matter of conjecture. The facts are known, and among other things we know there are many, many miles of highly important routes that for some time have been loaded beyond their reasonable capacity both as to tonnage and numbers of units. But the work ahead must incorporate more than the remedying of these defects. It must include the orderly planning and execution of a program that continues logically along lines already determined. The steps which have been taken to carry into operation a defense-highway program include many related yet widely differing activities. These are here reviewed.

1. DESIGNATION OF THE STRATEGIC NETWORK

Beginning in 1935, the State highway departments and the Public Roads Administration inaugurated cooperative State-wide highway planning surveys which have provided a complete inventory of the highway facilities of the Nation. The application and use of the information gained in these studies have proven of inestimable value in the defense effort now being made by this country. The study of events in Europe during the past 2 years emphasizes the importance of highway transportation to any successful defense or war effort, and requires a system of strategic highways, which, as the name implies, will afford continuity of movement over predetermined routes for military traffic.

The results obtained largely from the planning surveys have provided the basis for the final selection of a strategic network, in the making since 1922, composed of 78,000 miles of highway extending into all sections of the country, taking maximum advantage of existing facilities and affording the greatest opportunity for the unimpeded flow of traffic. Selected in collaboration with military authorities, and finally approved by the Secretary of War, the routes comprising the strategic network connect all major centers of population and are most highly correlated with traffic origins and destinations. The consideration of modernization to meet the needs of swiftly moving traffic in the shortest possible time has been paramount in the final selection of this network. Since that time the greatest possible emphasis has been placed on the necessity for the speedy correction of existing deficiencies, which from a military point of view are most critical.

2. ACCESS ROAD PROJECTS

The national-defense effort has created a Nation-wide situation analogous to a major industrial migration. Though an attempt has been made carefully to plan and coordinate the plant expansion essential to defense production and the facilities for defense transportation, nevertheless serious dislocations have been countenanced in the interest of speeding the effort. New and expanded industrial plants for the production of ordnance and aircraft items, and for shipbuilding, and the development of Air Corps training centers and replacement camps have all added to the need for the coordinate expansion of existing access roads and for the construction of many new access highway facilities. The improvement of access roads subscribes only to the general procedure of establishing particular requirements by surveys of individual cases, and of affording relief according to their relative urgency within the limitations of available funds.

As of September, there have been certified to the Public Roads Administration some 400 military, naval, and industrial areas for study. In these areas it is anticipated that the construction of 3,150 miles of access road costing $256,000,000 is indicated. In 220 military areas need is indicated for 2,410 miles of access road at a cost of $138,000,000. Some 70 naval areas presently require 340 miles of access road to cost $67,000,000, and in approximately 110 industrial areas 400 miles costing $50,000,000 are now indicated as necessary.

The importance of adequate access to and from plant and camp and major highway routes cannot be overemphasized. We cannot expect to move trained men and equipment out of camps and plants unless we move supplies and raw materials into them.

3. ALTERNATE AND AUXILIARY ROUTES FOR CIVILIAN DEFENSE

In England, the Ministry of Transport, in cooperation with the Ministry of Home Security and the military, have laid out a system of strategic and tactical highways. Considerable study has recently been given to the control and operation of this system. Although their strategic system is somewhat like our network, their control and operation are somewhat further advanced by reason of the urgency of their present situation. Military authorities can take full control at any time, including policing, and can exclude all civilian traffic.

In particularly vulnerable areas, carefully worked-out schemes provide for the evacuation of civilians over alternate roads not forming a part of the strategic or tactical system. Arrangements have been made for the civilian crossing of the strategic system by civilian traffic on the auxiliary routes with a minimum of interruption to the military movements. The provisioning of canteens in strategic areas has been worked out to facilitate the evacuation of civilians. The thoroughness with which this plan has been developed testifies to the close coordination of the Ministry of Transport, the Ministry of Home Security, the military and the civilian police

One of the next undertakings in which we feel certain of the full cooperation of the State highway departments is the planning of supplementary and alternate routes for civilian use and defense.

4. HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE BY REPLACEMENT PROGRAMS

It may be, perhaps paradoxically, stated that the complete highway system is never completed. Over a period of years, a series of construction projects are built up of various surface types designed to meet the requirements of variant traffic volumes and integrated into a system which provides continuity of traffic flow. At any interval in the development of a planned highway system, the relatively small project elements composing it express the complete range of service life, design standard, traffic adequacy, and degree of modernization.

In the dynamic advance toward system modernization adequate to the expanding volumes of highway transportation, maintenance is the only static element. Maintenance is properly the function of preserving the initial status of the constructed facilities; of protecting the assets created by construction during an economical period of service life. Thus, at all times, the variant ages of the project elements composing the highway system require varying degrees of maintenance expenditure to check the forces of depreciation and obsolescence. Maintenance, however, cannot indefinitely offset wear and tear, obsolescence, and traffic inadequacy, so that attempts to unduly prolong service life may result in exorbitant maintenance expense, which in turn may inhibit the replacement essential to economical traffic service.

Recent studies of special maintenance-cost sections in a number of States have revealed instances of maintenance cost exceeding 50 percent of all highway expenditure without contributing to essential modernization.

Continual replacement is therefore dictated by continual lapse of obsolete and inadequate projects into a category of uneconomical maintenance. Especially in the defense effort, the systematic and planned replacement of the weak links strained by the defense load is the best guaranty of sustained highway capacity equal to that effort.

It should be more generally understood that the highway programs that are most important now do not contemplate the building of new highways. The important—the essential—work is the replacement of facilities now in use that can no longer provide the required service.

5. PRIORITIES ON MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT

Conferences between the Priorities Division of O. P. M., the Priorities Committee of the Army and Navy Munitions Board, and the Public Roads Administration resulted in an outline of policy governing the assignment of preference ratings to several categories of highway construction. This policy recognizes the prior defense importance of access road and strategic network construction, but is broad enough to cover all construction activities of the State highway departments.

To implement the policy a procedure has been established providing for the submission, through the Public Roads Administration, to the Office of Production Management, of applications requesting the assignment of preference ratings to groups of projects, appropriately classified. Preference rating orders issued to the State highway departments may be used to assure delivery of material and equipment to contractors.

Negotiations are now under way for the issuance of an order covering the maintenance activities of State and other highway departments.

6. HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE WAR DEPARTMENT

The War Department recognizes that the burden placed on highway transportation as a result of troop movements in connection with mobilization and training maneuvers, requires the scheduling of convoy movements and the advance planning of maneuvers so as to incur a minimum of interference with civilian pursuits. That Department also realizes that maximum facility of movement, with the least interference to civilian activity, cannot be obtained without the cooperation of civilian authorities in the various States. To effectuate such cooperation the Secretary of War has appointed a committee, designated as the Highway Traffic Advisory Committee to the War Department, composed of the heads of the national associations whose members will be directly concerned in three major problems:

1. Routing of troop and convoy movements.
2. Provision of civilian driver records.
3. Conduct of a Nation-wide bus and truck inventory.

The first problem will enlist the aid of the State police, the motor vehicle administrators, and the highway departments in assisting and routing convoy or other movements of military forces and equipment.

The second problem will require the assistance of the State motor vehicle administrators in connection with the Army's driver-training program.

The third problem will require the complete cooperation of the State motor vehicle administrators, highway planning survey representatives of the Public Roads Administration, the War Department, and the Work Projects Administration, in order to provide a complete list of truck and bus equipment which will be available for necessary emergency defense use.

It is intended that the national committee be a directing agency to coordinate the operation of similarly constituted subcommittees in the various States, appointed at the request of the Secretary of War, known as State highway traffic advisory committees and consisting of the chief of State police, who acts as liaison officer between the State committee, the Army, and the national committee; the State motor vehicle administrator; and the commissioner or chief engineer of highways. A series of recent meetings has resulted in the organization of the State committees into regional groups coextensive with the Army corps areas.

7. CENTRAL MOTOR TRANSPORTATION CUMMITTEE

It was inevitable that the defense effort would develop the need of plans for the efficient and economical use of highways and motor vehicles, and require machinery for the determination of highway-transportation needs, in order to assure an adequate supply of motortruck equipment. To meet these requirements and to advise on motortruck transportation problems, a Central Motor Transportation Committee was formed late in June by Mr. Ralph Budd, Transportation Commissioner, Office for Emergency Management.

The central committee is composed of the Interstate Commerce Commissioner in charge of the Bureau of Motor Carriers as chairman, the Commissioner of the Public Roads Administration, representatives of the Interstate Commerce Commission, organized and private trucking consultants to the Transportation Division, Office of Civilian Defense, National Grange, and for-hire and private truck operators. The central committee has authority to establish such subcommittees as may be deemed necessary.

With the central committee are 16 regional committees with headquarters in the field offices of the Motor Carrier Division of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Members represent the various types of carriers and include public members from the Highway Traffic Advisory Committee to the War Department and the Office of Civilian Defense.

Work of the central committee formed the basis for the issuance by O. P. M. of a program to facilitate the acquisition of material for the production of trucks and passenger carriers. This program, based on estimated requirements for 1,189,000 trucks during the 1942 model year, includes a limitation order which gives specific instructions as to the number and kind of trucks and allied products which can be made during a specified period. Also included is a limited preference rating order which extends a rating of A-3 for use in obtaining material for truck production to the extent provided. This is a typical blanket rating order and is extendible by producers to their suppliers.

8. COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The Revenue Act of 1941 under Title VI, Section 601, established a committee to investigate Federal expenditures, to be composed of (1) three members of the Senate Committee on Finance and three members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; (2) three members of the House Committee on Ways and Means and three members of the House Committee on Appropriations, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and (3) the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The committee is charged with the duty of making a full and complete investigation and report, to the President and to the Congress, of all expenditures of the Federal Government with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of those deemed nonessential. The committee is authorized to hold hearings, subpena witnesses and take testimony and also to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government.

The Public Roads Administration as the major Federal highway agency is prepared to

cooperate fully with this committee to establish the requirements for adequate highway transport and for the construction of new facilities essential to the defense effort.

A comparison of the requirements for defense and civil vehicles in 1941 with those of 1940 clearly demonstrates the increased burden which defense activity has superimposed on the highway systems of the country.

From 1940 to 1941, military and civil requirements for new trucks and busses increased by 205,000 vehicles.

In the same period, the number of military and civil vehicles in service increased by more than 294,000 units.

It is estimated that military vehicles traveled nearly eleven times farther in 1941 than in 1940 and that the bulk share of this travel was added to an already heavy load due to the increase of civil traffic following on the defense effort.

Based on the best available evidence, it is estimated that the total 1941 carried load on rural highways approaches 72 billion ton-miles. This is approximately 24 percent higher than the estimated total 1940 movement on rural highways.

A recent analysis of the distribution of average trip lengths of motortrucks operating on rural highways shows that 66.1 percent of all trips are under 25 miles; 13.1 percent are from 26 to 50 miles in length; 10.7 percent are from 51 to 100 miles; and 10.1 percent are over 101 miles. In view of the predominance of short trips by highway trucks as compared with the relatively longer trips involved in railroad haul, it appears that truck haul on the highways is essentially supplementary to, rather than competitive with, rail haul. It is highly possible that peak transport periods may produce a definite shortage of motortruck equipment

Recent large increases in traffic volume and extensive defense migration of large numbers of persons into strange surroundings operate to make imperative the provision of maximum protection to highway traffic, particularly at railroad grade crossings. Recent progress in the evaluation of relative accident hazard at grade crossings permits of obtaining the maximum of aggregate hazard elimination with a given sum of money.

SUMMARY

From a consideration of the foregoing description of the current demands on highway transport and of the procedures established to deal with the problems presented, it should be self-evident that:

First. Federal highway expenditures must be directed toward defense objectives and all other requirements must be subordinated thereto.

Second. Highway administrative agencies—national, State, and local—must be fully prepared to justify, as essential, the expenditures made for highway improvement.

Dr. Edward L. Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. COLE, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents, Dr. Edward L. Israel, for more than 18 years rabbi of Har Sinai Congregation, has been chosen to lead the union of American Hebrew Congregations, a national organization with more than three-quarters of a century of service in the cause of liberal Judaism in America.

The acceptance of this offer necessitated Dr. Israel's removal from Baltimore to the new national headquarters of the Union in Washington, D. C. As might be expected on the departure from the community of so outstanding a civic leader, beloved by many within and without his congregation, there was a round of farewell meetings and parties in his honor.

As I looked over the group attending one of these gatherings, the realization came to me that this was not merely a well-deserved tribute of affection and esteem for an individual, but that the occasion had a higher significance. The atmosphere of the assembly in which I found myself impressed me with the uniqueness and greatness of America. Here was a rabbi who had been called to lead the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the great organized expression of liberal Judaism in America. But this was not a sectarian occasion. Gathered to honor him were men of widely differing religious beliefs and political opinions—a Roman Catholic priest, the president of a Catholic college, leading Protestant ministers of the great city of Baltimore, and an outstanding group of laymen among whom I found Protestant, Catholic, and Jew. I could not but reflect that a meeting such as this could not take place in Nazi Germany, in Fascist Italy, in communistic Russia, or in any of the other countries which are now under totalitarian domination. Yet here was expressed in dramatic form the way of life that we have endeavored to build in America, and which is threatened by the forces of tyranny in the world today.

How much better and how much more worthy was the scene which I beheld that evening than those that are being enacted in other lands. In those unhappy places men of different creeds and races are divided by suspicions and hatreds; here they joined irrespective of creed in amity and good will to signalize the service rendered by a good citizen in the promotion of those virtues which are held in common esteem by all creeds. Voices have been raised that would bring disunity and ill-will into our midst; but I believe that the sound common sense and sense of decency of Americans will not incline them to heed appeals to racial and religious dissention and prejudice.

Again and again in the past few years we have witnessed the technique employed by the enemy to divide and destroy one country after another by sowing the seeds of bigotry. The technique is clear. It is merely to inflame one group against another, to bring internal strife and confusion, to divert attention from the evil designs of the real enemy. America is not oblivious to the lessons of experience. I hope it will not be led astray by false and inflammatory appeals.

As I reflected over the broadly representative character of those who had joined in comradeship to do honor to Rabbi Israel, I remembered that our President has correctly emphasized, that inherent within the forces of organized religion are those great ideals of human brotherhood which as democracy loving Americans we are striving to preserve. I am glad to have participated in the tribute to my friend, Dr. Israel, the new head of the Union of American Hebrew congregations. Cherished democratic traditions of this country will be maintained not by bitter divisions but my united effort of this and other religious organizations, and by the common loyalty of men of many races.

Dr. Israel, I hope, will meet many Members of Congress personally. His personality, sincerity, and entire make-up radiate confidence in any position he takes. There are ever recurring problems affecting his work which require men of his type and character. His race and the country are fortunate in having a man of his strong character and forceful approach assigned at this time to such an important work, with headquarters at the National's Capital.

President Writes His Endorsement of Dams and Arkansas Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter which I have just received from President Roosevelt, and which, with your permission, I read to the House:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 26, 1941.

Hon. CLYDE T. ELLIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLIS: In reply to your letter of September 23 in regard to the Arkansas Valley Authority bills, I want to assure you of my continued interest in the enactment of this legislation.

The value of such authorities in assuring defense power supply has been amply demonstrated during the past 2 years. I am glad that the White and Red Rivers projects, which in effect will form the nucleus of this Arkansas Valley regional program, are going ahead. Recent studies of the power requirements of the defense program indicate that they should be expedited.

I am also convinced that such authorities, based on full utilization of the resources of our river basins, can play a vital role in the eventual adjustment to a peacetime economy which the post-war world will require.

You are, of course, aware of the difficult problems involved in reconciling varying points of view toward this type of legislation. For this reason I am sure that you will appreciate the importance of the careful work which the Bureau of the Budget is doing in reaching a solution which will assure the expediting of these river-basin programs on the soundest possible basis. It would please me very much to see the enactment of the Arkansas Valley Authority at this session.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The President's Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

POEM BY H. I. PHILLIPS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by H. I. Phillips, from the Boston Daily Globe of September 10, 1941:

[From the Boston Daily Globe of September 10, 1941]

THE PRESIDENT'S MOTHER

(By H. I. Phillips)

She walked serenely through the far-flung years;
Within her the eternal mother shone;
God blest her in the treasured hills she loved
And kept her from declining years alone.

There was a certain something in her eyes—
A look so gallant, yet a little sad;
Devotion seemed forever dwelling there,
It was a look like this my mother had!

The spirit of another age was hers
An age of crinoline and candlelight.
A nation's stalwarts with her walked the stage
When ancient glories put today's to flight.

The tinkling music box, the flickering glow
Of oil lamps, and the sound of carriage wheels,
Torch light parades for chiefs long dead and gone,
The memory of waltz, gavotte, and reel.

Her life was linked with days of sailing ships—
With packet, stage coach, and the first steamboat—
A girlhood contact with the China trade,
In times when perils marked each day afloat.

A voyage on a clipper ship she knew
Around the Horn when but a girl of eight;
She'd seen Napoleon and smiled to watch
Empress Eugenie by a Paris gate.

As she looked out on Hyde Park's placid fields
Such shadows as she saw in silent joy!
Old friends long gone, in garden paths again—
Her husband, and, a child again, her boy!

The early years when lofty plans she made
To fit him for whatever might befall—
And, yes, the thought that every mother has—
Might fate decree him for a far, high call?

The sun it now makes elfin pools of light
Beneath the trees, and there again she sees
Him in a thousand phases, moods, and forms
To fill her heart with lovely memories.

That day she took her son to Washington
And Grover Cleveland took him by the hand.
What dream was hers to mark that distant day?
Ah, she alone could know and understand.

Those years when she beheld him stricken down—
And all high hopes seemed buried in the dust—
Her matchless faith, unfaltering, proclaimed,
"He will go on! I know he will! He must!"
As if she willed it so by that strong faith,
So dominant in mothers through the years,
He did go on—on to the cherished goal.
And, overjoyed, her eyes were damp with tears.

Three times she saw him take the solemn oath—
And listened to his words fall one by one;
But there amid the pomp and panoply
She merely saw a well-deserving son.

Stately and regal in her four-score years,
She was the valiant mother all sons know;
Even in death she seems but in a sleep,
Waiting to give him strength, her heart aglow.

Now in the Hudson's hills this lady rests
Amid the memories so rich and rare.
"Courage, my son!" he seems to hear her say—
And this, too, is a saddened Nation's prayer.

The Danger Confronting America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

LETTER FROM HON. OTTOMAR KRUEGER, PRESIDENT OF CONCORDIA COLLEGE

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I received today from the Honorable Ottomar Krueger, president of Concordia College, Fort Wayne, Ind.:

CONCORDIA COLLEGE,
Fort Wayne, Ind., October 8, 1941.

The Honorable GEORGE W. GILLIE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: This letter is being written you by an individual American citizen who has for almost 50 years been exceedingly proud of his country, flag, and all of the traditional American ideals and who hopes and prays that he may continue to feel that same way during the remainder of his life. The letter is written to you as a representative of the American people and one to whom a great trust has been transferred. I hope that you will give this letter consideration and some study.

From all indications our country is being brought steadily but surely into another war which then may be designated as a World War, a war which has to do primarily with European nations and European ideals and philosophies of life. Our American tradition since the days of the founding fathers, particularly so since President George Washington, has been one of isolation and independence and one which expressly remained aloof from all European complications and quarrels. Once before we were led through much propagandizing to forsake our traditional ideals much to our sorrow, for we are laboring now under the aftermath of that first World War and have never completely recovered, especially not morally.

In this entire affair, the rank and file of the American citizenry has never been consulted, and by rather reliable polls it has been demonstrated repeatedly that from 80 to 83 percent of the people are opposed to our intervention in any European war although they may favor the strongest kind of home defense both in the Army and Navy. The 80 to 83 percent have declared over and over again to a man that they are willing to lay down their lives for the defense of their country, but they are not willing to shed any blood, their own nor other people's blood, for European entanglements and involvements.

In order to bring the United States to the brink of war and to create a certain warmindedness among the people, highly dictatorial powers have been used. The people have been kept in ignorance. Even our legislative bodies, elected by the people for purposes of safeguarding the rights of the United States have been ignored and a small coterie of people have shaped the tragic affairs as we now find them. All of this is certainly indicative of what the future may bring to our Nation and it is the best encouragement for all these factions and much malcontent among the people.

Certainly there will be a day of accounting for the actions of the United States Government, with the President in leadership, and that accounting will take on a double form, one the moral accounting which must be given for the lives of any American citizens lost through involvement in a European war. There is after all a God to whom even the kings of nations are responsible and likewise the authorities of our country. In the second place there will be an accounting in the political history and future development of our Nation. Who can guarantee what the outcome of this war will be, and who is there that is not afraid that the traditional democratic form of Government which we have enjoyed these many years will disappear at the close of this war. There are elements in our country today who would be willing at the incitation of certain leaders to overthrow the American Government. The Members of our Congress and Senate know this. You have people who speak openly of rebellion. Not long ago a letter appeared in one of our local newspapers in which the writer suggested that there should be a march on Washington. Communism and other isms are working day and night to undermine our American form of government. If now dictatorial measures are used to involve us in this war and to help other people who have never concerned themselves about our welfare, many of whom have done everything to hinder the development of the United States and our American way of life, will not these unruly and dissatisfied elements probably link together to do all in their power to bring about the downfall of our form of government when this entire affair is over? Millions of people believe that they are deliberately hoodwinked and betrayed, and such conditions do not bode well for the country.

I should like to encourage you as one elected by the people to represent our interests to do all in your power by way of opposition to our being urged and finally compelled into this war. I personally believe you owe it to your constituency.

Furthermore, as a father of a family and as an educator of youth, I should like to raise my voice in protest against this undermining of the Government of the people and the American form of government. Certainly I should like for my children and all of the young people with whom I am dealing daily to enjoy the same splendid liberties and inexpressible privileges that I have enjoyed in this my fatherland. I am one who realizes also that there is no other country in the world like unto ours and that nowhere else have people found such material bounty and happiness as here, and I should like to do all in my power to preserve all of these good things for the coming generations.

May the Lord grant our Government wisdom and courage to do that which is Godpleasing in this matter and which will in the end serve our Nation best, and may He hold His hand over us and preserve peace

unto our people, and may He preserve our American traditions.

I am,

Very sincerely yours,

OTTOMAR KRUEGER, *President.*

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

RESOLUTION OF SUGARCANE ADVISORY COMMITTEE, LOUISIANA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution relative to price control that was unanimously adopted by the Sugarcane Advisory Committee of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation on September 25, 1941.

No issue now before the Congress is of more vital importance to the American people, and especially to the American farmers, than this problem of price control.

The membership of this committee is composed of leading and well-informed farmers. Their views on this vital topic, I am sure, will be of greatest interest to Members of the Congress.

The resolution in question reads as follows:

Whereas the executive committee of the American Farm Federation in session July 11-12, 1941, adopted a resolution having to do with price fixing, in which is embodied the following: "* * * representatives of the federation * * * should insist upon the adoption of a policy that no maximum price should be fixed on any agricultural commodity or product thereof which would result in a price of less than 110 percent of parity, by current periods * * *" and

Whereas farm bureau members and officials in session at Hot Springs, Ark., adopted a resolution, which reads in part "If it becomes necessary to impose ceilings, we insist that such ceilings be applied clear across the board upon industry, upon agriculture, and upon labor. * * * And we insist that no ceilings be placed upon farm prices at less than 110 percent of the parity price": Therefore be it

Resolved by the Sugar Cane Advisory Committee of the Louisiana Farm Bureau, That the recent action of Mr. Leon Henderson, Federal Price Administrator, in arbitrarily fixing the ceiling on raw sugar at 3.5 cents per pound without consulting the producers of sugarcane or sugar beets from which raw and refined sugar is made, is unfair and unjustified; and be it further

Resolved, That we do hereby call upon the Louisiana Farm Bureau and the executive committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation to vigorously protest the said action of Mr. Henderson and to use the means at their disposal to prevail upon Mr. Henderson to review his decision and call for facts and figures upon which to base a more fair determination; and be it further

Resolved, That we call attention to the dangerous probability that if the action of Mr. Henderson in setting a ceiling of 3.5 cents on raw sugar is allowed to go unchallenged, he may arbitrarily take upon himself to set ceilings on the prices of any and all agricultural products.

Resolved further, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the Louisiana delegation in Congress, President Ed. O'Neal, and Milton Tainter, secretary-manager at Baton Rouge.

Termination of Defense Contracts and Allotments Under Lease-Lend Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the defense contracts all carry a clause which provides for termination in the event of the end of the war.

The following is a sample of the termination clauses:

Termination by the Government. The Government may terminate this contract at any time by giving the contractor 30 days' written notice of its intention so to do, and at the termination of such 30 days, or such longer period as may be specified in said notice, this contract shall be terminated, and shall be of no further force and effect, without prejudice, however, to the contractor's right to receive payments theretofore due.

If the contract is thus terminated, the contractor shall be entitled to payment for the work done by it under this contract up to the date of termination and for which the contractor has not theretofore been paid.

The President's order turning over to Edward R. Stettinius the power to make allotments under lease-lend appropriations is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 18, 1941.

Hon. E. R. STETTINIUS, JR.,
Lease-Lend Administrator.

MY DEAR MR. STETTINIUS: Pursuant to section 9 of the act of March 11, 1941, I authorize you, as Lend-Lease Administrator, or your designee, to allocate, after consultation with the Bureau of the Budget, up to the sum of $300,000,000 out of the Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941, to various departments and agencies of the Government for the procurement of defense articles, information, and services, for administrative expenses, and for such other services and expenses as are necessary to carry out the purposes of the act of March 11, 1941; and to amend, alter, or revoke such allocations.

I further authorize you, or your designee, to transfer defense articles, information, and services up to the value of $300,000,000 to those nations whose defense I shall have found vital to the defense of the United States; to retransfer to such countries defense articles, information, and services heretofore or hereafter transferred; and to revoke, alter, or amend transfers and retransfers heretofore or hereafter made.

I further authorize you to increase or decrease quantities of defense articles, information, services, and expenses, or substitute other defense articles, information, services, and expenses in lieu thereof, within the aggregate amounts heretofore or hereafter allocated to each department or agency in section 1 (a), 1 (b), 1 (d), and 1 (e) of the Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941.

I further authorize you to exercise any functions necessary to carry out the authorizations contained in the three preceding paragraphs.

I would very much appreciate your reporting to me monthly on action taken under these authorizations. Copies of such reports should be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget.

The authorizations to the Executive Officer of the Division of Defense Aid Reports contained in my letter of July 26, 1941, and of August 29, 1941, are hereby revoked.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

As Hoover Sees It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, ex-President Herbert Hoover is one of a select group of probably not to exceed four or five Americans of whom it can be rightfully said that they are the best informed citizens in our Republic on matters of international affairs and foreign policy. Consequently his observations and counsel on the trying problems of today always warrant the most careful study and consideration.

Even the most vicious and vigorous of Mr. Hoover's critics have never even hinted by innuendo or suggestion that our former President is pro-Nazi or pro-Fascist or pro-Communist. He speaks and writes his convictions with the sole desire to serve the country which he loves so well and which has honored him so highly. His present opposition to the involvement of this country in an outright shooting war is all the more impressive by virtue of the fact that when he ran for his second term the smear artists of the New Deal who were at that time just beginning to learn the art of character assassination, which they have since developed to the *n*th degree, called for President Hoover's defeat because they called him "pro-British" and "too international-minded." These disciples of the Charley Michelson line of poison politics harangued America with speeches and articles recounting President Hoover's long residence in England, in China, and in Europe. They accused the then President Hoover of being more interested in England and in China than in America, and urged his defeat in the interests of "America first." The Democratic campaign speakers even accused Mr. Hoover of having at one time been a British subject.

Mr. Speaker, how rapidly our modern medicine men can change their minds!

One of the outstanding editorial writers of the entire Middle West is Fred C. Christopherson, of the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus Leader, the leading and the largest newspaper of the two Dakotas. I think the Congress and the country will be interested in reading the following analysis of Herbert Hoover's last radio address to America, and I call attention to the following editorial in pursuance with permission granted to me by the House:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus Leader]

AS HOOVER SEES IT

Herbert Hoover spoke calmly, thoughtfully, and dispassionately last night. He approached the greatest problem of our times as it should be approached—in a spirit of penetrating realism and solid reason, devoid of name calling and intolerance.

He speaks as an American—and, we might add, as a great American. His public record and his experience, both here and abroad, have expanded his understanding and his wisdom. He views the current crisis from the position of a man who is familiar with the events preceding and following the World War as well as this war.

His speech last night was notable in its detachment from the excitement of the moment. He discussed basic fundamentals, and he studied the entire picture, not only a part of it.

It is natural to contrast Hoover's speech with that of President Roosevelt last week, and to the advantage of the former.

Hoover exploded the mythical argument about freedom of the seas quite effectively by a simple reference.

"Any definition of freedom of the seas in wartime," he said, "is largely academic. Britain could not accept the President's definition and carry on an effective blockade."

This is a statement which no logician can question. The issue of freedom of the seas is a false one now, as it was in 1917. If we are to enter the war, let us do so on a genuine issue, not one which is manufactured.

Hoover also advanced into the foreground a factor that has been overlooked too generally in recent discussions—the situation in Europe that causes wars, including the multiplicity of small nations, traditional hatreds and long-time boundary disputes, the insufficiency of many countries and the differences in habits and tongues.

It may be argued with some validity that we are concerned now with the effect, not the causes. That we must put out the fires of war first and then proceed to correct the causes so that other similar fires may not flare to plague us.

This is true. Yet our current approach to the subject will not be wholly intelligent unless we are constantly aware of the causes.

Hoover fears, with considerable reason, the grave troubles that may afflict us if we become participants in the war. He considers it a threat to the maintenance of our democracy.

Discussing economic freedom, he said last night that: "A large number of the men administering our preparedness program do not believe in this freedom. With a long war—and it will be long if we put our boys into it—then their methods with the inevitable debt, inflation, unemployment, and demoralized agriculture will make us over into state socialism, probably under some other name."

This is not an idle warning. Instead, it is one whose reality is apparent in countless words and deeds.

There are men in Washington, many prominently placed, who have no faith in the capitalistic system. Insidiously as well as directly, they have sought to advance other ideas—a new deal that out-deals even the original New Deal. These are the men who whisper that we need not worry about increasing Federal debt or insolvency—who blandly say in respect to the debt that "we owe it to ourselves." These, too, are the men who believe in advancing the influence of the Government at every opportunity, who array class against class, and who seek to discredit the private operators of business.

We need not fear their activities if we are conscious of their objectives. But today they are using the label of defense to work toward their nondefense objectives.

The general theme of Hoover's address was an emphasis of our ability to defend ourselves against attack from overseas and to retain in operation in our country a workable democracy.

He voices the plain statement, which is not disputed by military authorities, that an invasion of the United States is a virtual impossibility.

This, by the way, is something which President Roosevelt does not say though he should have available to him the opinions of leading American Army and Navy experts.

To adopt the attitude displayed by Hoover last night is not a confession of weakness. He neither fears nor admires Hitler. But he is realistic. He understands the problems involved in direct American participation and he appreciates the devious ways in which we can be maneuvered into a position where our national honor would compel us to go overseas to squelch the German aggressor.

And he sought to point these out to the American people. In so doing, he was supplying a notable service.

To our advantage, we might study and restudy two statements near the close of his address. They follow:

"We can do our greatest service to civilization by strengthening here in the Western Hemisphere free institutions and free men and women. This is not isolation. It is a service to all mankind. * * *

"Let us never forget we came over the ocean to this oasis of liberty. We extended this oasis greatly by mighty streams of freedom. They were dug and builded by the toil of our fathers and defended with their blood. Are we now to march out into the desert of European war and see the wells of freedom dried up behind us?"

Repeal of Neutrality Act and Aid for Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY IOWA UNIT OF FIGHT FOR FREEDOM, OCTOBER 7, 1941

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following resolution of the Iowa unit of Fight for Freedom, recommending unqualified repeal of the Neutrality Act and all-out aid to Russia:

Resolved, That the Iowa unit of Fight for Freedom approves and recommends the unqualified repeal of the Neutrality Act.

Resolved, That the Iowa unit of Fight for Freedom approves and recommends all-out aid to Russia.

J. J. Hughes, George E. Hise, George Wrightman, Robert W. Colflesh, Gov. Dan Turner, Robert J. Shaw, George Cosson, Harley Stipp, Barry Oakes, George Mahoney, Arthur Boreman, B. F. Williams, Professor Scott Rawley, Lloyd Ross, Guy Logan, Harlan Miller, Mark Reno, L. C. Clark, C. H. Greenley, Kent Emery, R. E. White, Ira Downing, C. B. DeWitt, A. J. Kirkpatrick, H. E. Nelson, Arnold Myhra, L. S. Hines.

The National Income and National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

ARTICLE BY VICE PRESIDENT WALLACE

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent contribution by the Vice President of the United State, Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, on The National Income and National Debt.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Land Policy Review for August 1941]

THE NATIONAL INCOME AND NATIONAL DEBT

(By HENRY A. WALLACE)

(The Vice President considers the increasing national debt and contends that "we will have little to fear if we do all in our power to maintain a relatively stable price level and if we don't allow unemployment and curtailed purchasing power to develop.")

When the war comes to an end there inevitably will be certain persons who will think that the Federal Budget ought immediately to be cut in half, or more.

Those persons will have a tremendous influence when this war is over, and their influence will be felt at once with respect to several farm programs.

I know that many farmers have expressed concern over the mounting Federal debt—what it means to farm prices, to land values, national financial stability, the permanence of our land policies.

Let me cite a few facts, not generally available, which I find useful in balancing our viewpoints on the debt burden and our ability to pay for the things the Nation needs for adequate defense and to prevent unemployment afterward.

To many persons it may be surprising that this year, with our national income greater than in 1929, interest charges on total debts in the United States will be only about $6,300,000,000, compared to about $9,500,000,000 in 1929, a reduction of about $3,000,000,000, or one-third.

It is important that we understand why we have been able to carry an increased

Federal debt and still have interest charges on all debts less than in 1929.

Most of the increase in the Federal debt since 1932 has been due to the fact that private capital, in the face of world preparations for war, could not expand sufficiently to restore full employment and purchasing power.

More recently the increase in the Federal debt has been due to the need for building our defenses to prevent being engulfed by aggression.

By the end of 1941 we shall find that private long-term debts will be about $10,000,000,000 less than in 1929, private short-term debts about $13,000,000,000 less, State and local government debts about $3,000,000,000 greater, and the net debt of the Federal Government about $30,000,000,000 greater. Thus the total of these debts, which in 1940 was $5,000,000,000 less than in 1929, will this year be about $10,000,000,000 greater than in 1929; but interest charges, because of lower interest rates, will be fully $3,000,000,000 less than in 1929.

Gross and net public debt

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Gross public debt				Net public debt		
	Total	Federal	Federal agency	State and local	Total	Federal and Federal agency	State and local
1921	32,364	23,438	450	8,476	29,573	23,025	6,548
1929	34,928	16,301	1,867	16,760	28,946	15,706	13,240
1932	42,265	20,805	2,130	19,330	34,462	18,142	16,320
1933	46,611	23,815	3,279	19,517	36,030	19,691	16,339
1940	73,079	45,024	7,809	20,246	52,507	36,296	16,211
1941 [1]	84,000	54,750	9,250	20,000	62,000	46,000	16,000

[1] Estimated.

Net private debt in the United States for selected years

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Total long- and short-term private debt	Short-term private debt	Long-term private debt			
			Total	Corporate	Noncorporate	
					Farm mortgage	Urban real-estate mortgage
1921	95,413	38,982	56,431	32,350	10,702	13,379
1929	143,650	56,504	87,146	45,316	9,631	32,199
1932	121,596	35,591	86,205	46,845	8,638	30,722
1933	113,200	31,927	81,273	45,444	7,887	27,942
1940	115,017	39,335	75,682	41,692	6,910	27,080
1941 [1]	120,000	43,000	77,000	42,000	6,900	28,100

[1] Estimated.

So far we have fought our way out of the economic depression and have made headway on our defense program without any real burden to the Nation as a whole. This is clear from the fact that this year's interest charges on private long-term and Government debts are only 6 percent of the national income, whereas in 1932 they amounted to more than 15 percent of a national income that had been cut in two, and to 7.5 percent of the national income in 1929.

If we can keep this healthy relation between the Nation's capacity to carry its justifiable debts and the annual interest costs, we have little to worry about.

But we will have a great deal to worry about if, when the defense program is over, the props are knocked from farm purchasing power by the destruction of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the ever-normal granary, the stamp plan, and the surplus removal system, and if we also knock the props from city purchasing power by allowing unemployment to develop.

We must be realistic enough to know that at that point many short-sighted persons with old ideas will urge the destruction of these protective devices that rest on Government credit and Government fiscal policies. Such a destruction would reduce the national income to such a low point that interest charges would represent at least 15 percent and possibly 20 percent of our national income. No country can endure such a situation without upheaval.

We will have little to fear if we do all in our power to maintain a relatively stable price level and if we don't allow unemployment and curtailed purchasing power to develop. These evils we can stave off if, as consumers, we conserve and save our rising purchasing power for the post-defense time, when we shall need it; if, as businessmen, we begin to think up post-defense production programs for peacetime goods; and, if, as Government agents, we plan for public works and other programs in which private and Government capital cooperate to keep our manpower and our physical resources fully employed.

The steps needed to sustain full employment beyond the defense program have not been developed. I hope a rural conservation works program will be included. The National Resources Planning Board has made recommendations to develop resources and stabilize employment, with special reference to land use and public works, and water and energy development policies. There are proposals for a rural housing program and for transcontinental highways. Private industry, too, is thinking of new products and new uses of old products at lower costs as ways of supplying employment when defense orders taper off. Much is expected of the greatly expanded air-transport industry for peacetime commerce.

If we inaugurate these broad programs of conservation and development, major financial requirements will be involved; the Federal Budget, as well as private capital, will need to play a major role.

It is in this connection that our data on the annual cost of carrying an increasing national debt, public and private become pertinent.

Those who have seriously studied the greatly changed economic and financial conditions are no longer as concerned about so-called Government spending as they used to be. Not that we see our way clearly through the new debt structure that has been reared by the circumstances of the depression of the 1930's and the defense program, but we do see more clearly that the huge volume of Federal finances is but a feature of the tremendous world changes of the past few years.

Ten years ago we were frightened by the prospect of a Federal deficit of one or two billion dollars, when we saw a national income of only $40,000,000,000 or $50,000,000,000. Now we are beginning to envision a national income of $100,000,000,000 or more and see more clearly the joint function of Government and private funds in relation to the development of natural and human resources and to the preservation of our way of life.

Net public debt and interest

Year	Federal Government and Federal agency debt			State and local government debt		
	Net debt	Interest rate	Interest	Net debt	Interest rate	Interest
	Million dollars	Per cent	Million dollars	Million dollars	Per cent	Million dollars
1921	23,025	4.297	989	6,548	4.48	293
1929	15,706	3.994	627	13,240	4.54	601
1932	18,142	3.496	634	16,320	4.55	743
1933	19,691	3.202	631	16,339	4.52	739
1940	36,296	2.519	914	16,211	3.50	567
1941 [1]	46,000	2.500	1,150	16,000	3.30	560

[1] Estimated.

Net private debt and interest

Year	Private long-term—			Private short-term—		
	Debt	Interest rate	Interest	Debt	Interest rate	Interest
	Million dollars	Per cent	Million dollars	Million dollars	Per cent	Million dollars
1921	56,431	5.68	3,205	38,982	6.68	2,604
1929	87,146	5.73	4,993	56,504	5.83	3,294
1932	86,205	5.72	4,931	35,391	4.71	1,667
1933	81,273	5.68	4,616	31,927	4.27	1,363
1940	75,682	4.62	3,497	39,335	2.63	1,035
1941 [1]	77,000	4.55	3,504	43,000	2.60	1,118

[1] Estimated

Net debt and interest

Year	Grand total; public and private long-term and short-term—			Private long-term and all Government—		
	Debt	Interest rate	Interest	Debt	Interest rate	Interest
	Million dollars	Per cent	Million dollars	Million dollars	Per cent	Million dollars
1921	124,986	5.67	7,091	86,004	5.22	4,487
1929	172,596	5.51	9,515	116,092	5.36	6,221
1932	156,058	5.11	7,975	120,667	5.23	6,308
1933	149,230	4.92	7,349	117,303	5.10	5,986
1940	167,524	3.59	6,013	128,189	3.88	4,978
1941 [1]	182,000	3.48	6,332	139,000	3.75	5,214

[1] Estimated.

Interest on specified debts related to national income

Year	Interest charges on—			National income	Interest charges as percentage of national income	
	All net debts	Private long-term and Government debts	Private short-term debts		All interest	On private long-term and Government debts
	Million dollars	Million dollars	Million dollars	Million dollars	Per cent	Per cent
1921	7,091	4,487	2,604	52,800	13.4	8.5
1929	9,515	6,221	3,294	83,365	11.4	7.5
1932	7,975	6,308	1,667	39,991	19.9	15.8
1933	7,349	5,986	1,363	42,489	17.3	14.1
1940	6,013	4,978	1,035	76,035	7.9	6.5
1941 [1]	6,332	5,214	1,118	88,000	7.2	5.9

[1] Estimated.

Muncie, the Typical American City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the typical American city of Muncie, Ind., which is located in the congressional district I have the high honor to represent, has taken a long step toward community unity. This has been accomplished by

the formation of the Muncie Cooperative Committee, which is composed of the representatives of labor, trade, industry, education, religion, and agriculture. This committee meets regularly, and in the meetings the various problems which confront the people are thoroughly discussed and many of these ponderous and perplexing problems have been solved by this splendid group which represents practically every part and parcel of that fine citizenship. This community forum is an exemplification of democracy working—and when the forum speaks, the people listen. Theirs is a community development, which has become the very soul of action in that fine industrial and agricultural section. In this forum, where labor and industry are seated together at the table, the differences of employees and employers have been settled and strikes have been avoided. All have the same common interest: that their community may develop and the progress of the people may not be retarded. They are working in unison and their goal is a common one.

Mr. Speaker, the people of that typical American city of Muncie, Ind., are to be commended for this splendid achievement in their community. They are building for the future. The people are working in harmony and they are making progress under this outstanding plan of community unity. May I compliment all those who have had a part in this splendid community plan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor, of recent date, in which the citizens of Muncie are highly commended for their foresight and community interest, which follows:

THE COUNTRY SPEAKS: MUNCIE—MUNCIE'S UNIQUE FORUMS

(By Ralph W. Cessna)

Twice a month, on Friday nights, a group of a dozen or so men climb a flight of stairs, gather in the big front room at the Muncie Chamber of Commerce, and talk things over. What do they talk about? Everything, from bootlegging to the gasoline shortage. They sit around a long shiny table. Sometimes feet go up on the table. Always there are elbows on the table—and in the summer time they are coatless elbows.

Once in a while a fist comes down with a bang on the mahogany surface. That's just to emphasize a point, though. It's not a sign of a frayed temper. For these folks don't get much excited. They're friends. They have different, even diverging interests, but they know each other, and have respect for each other. They've learned that they can get more done by talking calmly, and letting the facts speak for themselves.

It's the Muncie Co-operative Committee in action. It is composed of representatives from the following organizations: City of Muncie, Delaware County Farm Bureau, Delaware County Industrial Union Council (C. I. O.), Muncie Central Labor Union (A. F. of L.), Muncie Chamber of Commerce, Muncie Merchants Association, Muncie Ministerial Association, Muncie Real Estate Board, Vocational Department of the City Schools, a Township Trustee, the Township Assessor, a member of the County Council, and a member of the County Commission.

That's a long list, but look it over. You have government, labor—in fact, two ordinarily belligerent factions of labor—trade, industry, education, religion, agriculture. That's a pretty good cross-section of people—except for the women folks. In this particular instance—still not forgetting about the women—such a cross section has some added significance for you'll remember that Muncie is "Middletown." It was designated by economists as "the typical American City." Might we not assume that here in this Muncie Co-operative Committee we have a human agency that comes not too far from reflecting American opinion and American ways, and American potentialities?

Anyway this Co-operative Committee has some most interesting meetings. It began in February this year, as a sort of citizens indignation meeting, to see what could be done about getting more defense contracts for Muncie. They did give that subject a good going over and they haven't by any means dropped it. But they found, when they got into their discussions, maybe to the surprise of a lot of them, that they could—these laborers, and these ministers, and merchants, and industrialists, and politicians, and educators—that they could talk together easily; that they had quite a bit in common.

Gradually other matters popped up at the meetings. It grew to the point where it was accepted that anyone could in fact bring up anything he wanted to. And they did. Sometimes they just talked. Sometimes they adopted resolutions and sent them to Washington. More often, though, they just talked.

But out of the talking has come a new understanding among Muncie's people. For one thing there has been established the basis for the amicable setting of labor disputes. In fact, there have been few if any serious labor disputes, because all of the responsible leaders of groups that might be a party to such disputes have been at these meetings, or represented there. Troubles have been settled before they started. C. I. O. leaders called A. F. of L. leaders by their first names—politely.

The committee was instrumental in pushing a clean-up of bootlegging in the county. They looked into the matter of the national debt, and asked Congress to reduce the domestic budget by $2,000,000,000, so there would be plenty for defense. They discussed the gasoline shortage and memorialized Congress to stop selling oil to Japan. They have looked into the local real-estate situation. And right now they're trying to get Washington to declare the county a defense area so that needed housing projects may be established here.

The good that comes from these meetings in the front room of the Muncie Chamber of Commerce isn't measured though in terms of tangible action on specific things. The good lies chiefly in the fact that these good Americans have found a common denominator; each has seen the other's viewpoint.

If you want to see democracy in action, I can't think of a better place than a meeting of the Muncie Cooperative Committee.

There Will Come a Better Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. CORDELL HULL

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement made by our Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, which appeared in the October 1941 issue of the Free World Magazine:

"THERE WILL COME A BETTER DAY * * *"

We are in the midst of desperately serious days which involve all peoples and all nations. Unfortunately, many people fail to grasp the nature of this world-wide crisis and its meaning to our country.

Too many people assume that the present struggle is merely an ordinary regional war, and that when it comes to an end the side which is victorious will collect indemnities but otherwise leave the defeated nations more or less as they were before the conflict began. This assumption would prove entirely erroneous should the aggressor powers be the winners. As waged by them this is not an ordinary war. It is a war of assault by these would-be conquerors, employing every method of barbarism, upon nations which cling to their right to live in freedom and which are resisting in self-defense.

The would-be conquerors propose to take unto themselves every part of every conquered nation: the territory, the sovereignty, the possessions of every such nation. They propose to make the people of each conquered nation into serfs; to extinguish their liberties, their rights, their law, and their religion. They systematically uproot everything that is high and fine in life.

Although the task is huge, though time is pressing, and though the struggle may continue for a long time, I am confident that at the end there will come a better day. We are at work not only at the task of insuring our own safety but also at the task of creating ultimate conditions of peace with justice. We can help to lay a firm foundation for the independence, the security, and the returning prosperity of the members of the family of nations. I have absolute faith in the ultimate triumph of the principles of humanity, translated into law and order, by which freedom and justice and security will again prevail.

CORDELL HULL.

Who Were the Mourners?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial from the Pacific Rural Press, one of the leading farm journals on the Pacific coast, calls attention to the fact that one more left wing publication has given up the ghost. It is extremely gratifying to learn that another misleading slander sheet has passed to its just reward, probably because the necessary funds and sponsorship were withdrawn.

Excerpts from the editorial to which I refer are rather interesting and under leave to extend my remarks they are included as follows:

WHO WERE THE MOURNERS?

The Rural Observer is dead and buried.
With its dying gasp it passed the torch to the communist Peoples World.
All of which has been widely publicized.

But it may be interesting to inquire who, if any, were mourners? Who wept at the wailing wall?

The Simon Lubin Society might well do so. It is the father of the Rural Observer. Its officers and directors, if such there be, might drop tears in the casket. But if they did it must have been an incognito act, because freedom of speech as practiced by the Rural Observer did not extend to featuring in publicity such details as officers, directors, constitution, bylaws, set of noble purposes, etc.

A diligent lawyer, seeking to find who was officially back of the Lubin Society, so he could bring suit for an aggrieved farmer, gave it up as too much puzzle for him.

However, the Lubin Society did announce "sponsors" and an "advisory committee," doing this back in 1938 and 1939 in the peak days of its uproaring. It is proper to inquire if any of these brought flowers and tears.

Culbert L. Olson, often announced as sponsor, was first publicized as sponsor before his election as Governor. Recently he got a divorce, denouncing the society as "red," according to press quotations.

Stewart Meigs, chairman of the State Board of Agriculture, chairman of the State Fair Board, and regent of the University of California, was publicized as a member of the "advisory committee."

Carey McWilliams, famed in uproar, and chief of the State Department of Immigration and Housing, was named as both sponsor and adviser.

There was also a liberal sprinkling of preachers and professors.

In these latter days when the sowing of "red" oats is not so popular, it is proper for citizens to inquire where these folk stand now.

The editorial then published a list of members of the sponsor committee and the advisory committee, which I shall not place in the RECORD, as some of them may have learned the error of their ways and left the Rural Observer before its all too extended career terminated. However, in the stress of social emotion many honest, square-minded citizens are misled and many times give aid and comfort to un-American organizations whose objectives are not for the best interests of good government. To suggest that they should look before leaping is no more than good advice that all of us can profit from.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy of this column still remains that it is Europe's dog fight.

Why does not the President ask for a declaration of war and have it over with?

There are $90,000,000 in the two lend-lease bills for tobacco for over there.

The soaked-up and flooded Dust Bowl of western Kansas extends its sympathy to the parched eastern coast.

Our country is in a bad way. We are looking to England for our war policy and to Russia for our economics.

The Kansas share of the two lend-lease bills of $13,000,000,000 is $108,000,000. Do you think they would have voted that in a bond election?

A post-war planning commission, like the proposed price-fixing set-up, would require an army of handlers. The war for bureaucracy is ours first.

General Cornwallis at Yorktown turned over 13 colonies to America. Henry Corn-Wallace is ready to guide the Senate in turning over 48 States to Britain.

Do you remember that just following the war in 1920 a sweeping victory was won against the ticket of Cox and Franklin Roosevelt on an America-first campaign?

One of the men stenographers before the committee always keeps five lead pencils sharpened on both ends and ready while he uses the sixth. This is preparedness.

"Is this you, Joe? This is Franklin speaking. How about taking on religion for the duration?" "Sure; sure; Franklin. Send over a Bible with the next lend-lease shipment of bombers."

Some people's conception of patriotism is only to follow the President, even though he is not following the Constitution. Webster said it was one thing to support a temporary President and quite another to support the Government.

The Union now has its victories. Mr. Young, formerly of the Treasury but who now administers the lend-lease, in his formal statement to the committee, like a thoroughbred Englishman, refers to Britain as "His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom."

Berlin's gag about Harriman's Moscow conference being the last desperate effort of the United States and Soviet Russia to drag Great Britain into the war is as nasty as Willkie's hoarse protests last November that "the President is leading us down the road to war."

Former Canadian Opposition Now Strong Supporters of Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

CANADIAN NEWS RELEASE

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks I include herein two short Canadian Newspaper releases showing that Senator Paterson of the Dominion Parliament, one of the largest shippers and operators of elevators in Canada, now strongly supports the St. Lawrence Seaway. These newspapers quote Senator Paterson as follows:

[From Shipping Register and North American Ports, July 1941]

NO IDLE SHIPS ON THE GREAT LAKES FOR YEARS TO COME—DEVELOP THE ST. LAWRENCE NOW

"The present is the most favorable time to deepen the St. Lawrence for the future prosperity of Canada, and for the development of the West." (By Senator N. W. Paterson, of the Dominion Parliament, who is said to be one of the largest owners and operators of lake freighters and terminal elevators in Canada.)

Senator Paterson continued:

"In 10 years the shipping business in Canada has altered more than any other industry.

"From a surplus of ships both on the Great Lakes and through the canal we are at present in the position of having a great shortage of tonnage compared with the business to be handled. This has been caused by two things, first, the surplus of canal boats have been fitted out and sent to various places on the ocean, where they found considerable trade, and, second, the immense growth in business, such as coal, pulp, pulpwood, sulfur, sugar, pitch, and many other commodities too numerous to mention. The grain business has altered to the extent that the railroads are now handling 75 percent of the receipts in Montreal from Georgian Bay ports. The canal ships are not handling grain because of delays in being unloaded through congestion at eastern elevators. The larger steamers on the upper lakes have found business in pulpwood, coal, iron ore, and grain more than sufficient to keep them going 100 percent, and now that the American Government have opened their business to Canadian ships there is not likely to be idle ships during 1941, and it will be a good many years after this war is over before Canadian inland-water ships will find any difficulty in getting cargoes.

"ST. LAWRENCE SHOULD BE DEVELOPED

"From being an active opponent of the deepening of the St. Lawrence Canal, I have been converted to the idea that shipping in Canada has nothing to fear from this construction. If the canals are lengthened we can picture our upper lake ships coming to Montreal with cargoes of grain, in this way making up some of the shortage of canal ships, and I cannot see where ocean ships can become plentiful enough in a number of years to take the time to travel on our inland waters. * * * In looking at the map one feels that this great waterway should be utilized to its utmost, and the tremendous growth of western Canada, after hostilities have ended, will require every means of transportation available. This whole development must be looked at in a broad light with the great future of this country always in mind."

[From the Fort William Times-Journal (Liberal) (Dominion of Canada) of August 21, 1941, forwarded to the American Legation at Ottawa on August 22, 1941, by the American consul at Fort William, Ontario, Canada]

SENATOR PATERSON BACKS WATERWAY

In an article contributed to the twenty-third annual harbors and waterways edition of Shipping Register and North American Ports, Senator Norman M. Paterson, of Fort William, announces his conversion from opposition to the deepening of the St. Lawrence Canal to the idea that shipping in Canada has nothing to fear from this construction. He goes on to say that if the canals are lengthened we can picture our upper lake ships coming to Montreal with cargoes of grain and taking back cargoes of coal from Montreal, in this way making up some of the shortage of canal ships. The senator goes on to say that he cannot see where ocean ships can become plentiful

enough in a number of years to take the time to travel on inland waters. * * * The senator concludes by saying: "In looking at the map one feels that this great waterway should be utilized to its utmost and the tremendous growth of western Canada after hostilities have ended will require every means of transportation available. This whole development must be looked at in a broad light with the great future of the country always in mind."

In his article Senator Paterson notes radical changes that have come about in the shipping business of Canada in the last decade and sums up this development by saying: "There is not likely to be an idle ship during 1941, and it will be a good many years after the war is over before Canadian inland water ships will find any difficulty in selling cargoes."

In announcing his conversion on the matter of deepening the St. Lawrence canals, Senator Paterson automatically has reduced to a large extent opposition to the project. His practical knowledge of navigation matters appertaining to the Great Lakes route makes his change of opinions most significant and augurs ultimate sanction of the enterprise when it reaches the Canadian Parliament.

The Loyal Opposition—In re Senator Austin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1941

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I am including an article by Walter Lippmann in the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, October 7, entitled "The Loyal Opposition."

I desire particularly to call attention to what Lippmann has to say about the position of the Republican Party if it rejects the leadership of Willkie, Stimson, Knox, Austin, Wadsworth, and the advice of men like Capper and Dirksen.

Up in Vermont we do not minimize the importance of the positions which the senior Senator has taken outspokenly. The Brattleboro Reformer well says:

It might be said of Senator AUSTIN that he has been out in front of the pack, and has been leading the administration, rather than merely falling in line with it.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of October 7, 1941]

THE LOYAL OPPOSITION

(By Walter Lippman)

It is said that the opposition in Congress intend to treat the new lend-lease appropriations and the modification of the Neutrality Act as the equivalent of a declaration of war. They will do a grave disservice to the Nation, and also to themselves, if they take this line. For they will be trying to place the country in a dangerous dilemma; they will be forcing the country to choose between the paralysis and collapse of its foreign policy on the one hand and, on the other, what might easily be tremendous new entanglements in a vastly expanded war.

The policy of the United States is to keep the Axis locked up in Europe and to keep Japan locked up in Asia in order to prevent the country from becoming engaged in a great two-ocean interhemispheric struggle that might go on for a generation. This policy, which has now been in effect for about a year, has been extraordinarily successful. It has helped to avert the catastrophe of an Axis victory. It has made possible the development of the armed forces of the United States. It has, as compared with the situation a year ago, greatly improved the security of the Americas.

The American policy is carried out by a mixture of diplomacy, economic action, and naval power, and it would be in the highest degree reckless for the congressional opposition to say that this policy must now be scrapped, and the country must now either do nothing or it must commit itself to a universal war. In this complicated and dangerous world why on earth should we compel ourselves to choose between nothing and everything?

The opposition, and particularly the Republican opposition in Congress, have gone as far as they can afford to go in obstructing American foreign policy, and in the showdown which is now at hand they will face a very serious test. By the action of the President and the Congress this country has been thoroughly committed to a stupendous program of defense against the aggressor nations. The country is committed already to an expenditure of sixty billions which has already begun to grip the whole economic life of the Nation. The country is committed to the support of Britain and of other countries, Congress having voted that their defense was vital to the defense of America. The country is committed by the President to the control of the seas against the aggressor states, and this commitment, though it has not had the formal approval of Congress, was well advertised in advance by authorized official speeches and it was made in the open while Congress was in session and free to express its disapproval.

The Nation's policy has, therefore, been fixed, and the questions now before Congress arise out of measures to make the policy effective. The test which the opposition now face is whether they will refuse to support a policy which has already been adopted. They cannot evade this test by a propagandist maneuver which would make it appear that what is at stake is not the existing policy of limited intervention but the very different question of whether to declare an all-out war which might mean universal war in both oceans. If on the pretext that they are trying to avert this universal war they obstruct the national policy which is, in fact, designed to avert universal war, the maneuver will be quite obvious and will easily be exposed.

The Republican Party in Congress would then find itself in a position where, being irreconcilably opposed to the Nation's policy, the future of the party would become identified with the defeat of the Nation. The Republicans would be making a record in Congress on which they could reap a political profit only if America were defeated and humiliated. There are politicians in Congress who imagine themselves rising to power upon a wave of popular revulsion similar to that which brought Warren Harding to the White House in 1920. But can the Republican Party—its responsible leaders and managers—afford to play a game of that sort?

They cannot afford to do it. If the United States is defeated, if the revolutionary conquerors become masters of the world, does anyone in his senses imagine that in the ensuing disaster, men like Hoover, Landon, Taft, Vandenberg, Martin, will be returned to power? Or that in the chaos and confusion of such a world-wide catastrophe, all that will happen is that the country will shed the New Dealers and then lapse into another Coolidge era? Surely it must be possible for the loyal opposition to realize that they cannot profit by an American defeat. Surely they must be able to grasp the fact that even the political strategy of 1920 was possible only because America had won the war, and that in a defeated country power goes not to the conservatives but to revolutionaries.

There are the profoundest reasons, therefore, both of public duty and of partisan advantage, why the Republican Party cannot afford to be placed in the position where it is gambling on a disaster to the United States. Yet that is the position the Republican Party will be in if it rejects the leadership of Willkie, Stimson, KNOX, AUSTIN, WADSWORTH, and the advice of men like CAPPER and DIRKSEN. It will become known as the party which hopes to win the next election because America has failed and has been defeated in the greatest crisis of modern history. The Republican Party will have invested its political capital in an American defeat and it will have acquired a vested interest in an American disaster. That would be a sorry end, indeed, to the party of Washington and Hamilton, of Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt.

Moreover, once a party, however sincerely, takes a position which can be profitable only if the country is defeated, it will attract to itself those who not merely prophesy defeat, but also the lunatic fringe who are actively engaged in trying to produce defeat. Once men commit themselves irrevocably to the view that their country is wrong and is headed for disaster, refusing to support the decisions of the majority, they are bound, sooner or later, to become entangled with, to become compromised and contaminated by adventurers and malcontents, by revolutionists and foreign agents, who are working to produce disaster.

And so, the great mass of solid reputable citizens who are the rank and file of the Republican Party are going to feel themselves badly misled if the Republican politicians do not stop walking in their sleep.

Southern Agricultural Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 10, 1941

ADDRESS OF I. W. DUGGAN, DIRECTOR, SOUTHERN DIVISION, AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable I. W. Duggan, director, southern division, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, before a meeting of the Louisiana State Farm Bureau Federation, at Natchitoches, La., on September 4, 1941:

It is always a pleasure for me to visit Louisiana and come in close personal contact with the farmers of this State. It is especially gratifying to appear before a Farm Bureau Federation meeting.

Your organization today can look back on many definite achievements in the interest of the American farmers. No small part of the credit is yours that farmers in general are better off at the present moment than at any time since 1929.

There is a strong temptation for us to pat ourselves on the back, point with pride to our accomplishments, and to trust to luck for the future.

You know perfectly well that trusting to luck has never brought anything but trouble to the farmers of this country, particularly here in the South. Whatever improvements have come to their lot have come the hard way—the way of careful planning, the way of wholehearted cooperation, and the way of determined action.

I mention action because it is the watchword of your organization. Action, intelligent, effective action, is just what the national farm program seeks to provide. I think we are all agreed that the old days of wishful thinking and endless talking about the farmer's ills are gone forever. Since the inauguration of the A. A. A. in 1933, we have been substituting action for words. We undoubtedly have made some mistakes. But never the mistake of standing idly on the side lines, never the mistake of refusing to come to grips with reality.

Louisiana farmers, more than 100,000 strong, have turned to the program as a realistic approach to their problems. Cotton acreage in your State has been cut about half a million acres since 1932. It was, roughly, about 1,700,000 acres in 1932 and about 1,100,000 acres this year.

Much of this land, taken out of cotton, has been planted to crops that build up the soil and check erosion. Some has been devoted to establishing pastures, some to seeding legumes and grasses, and much of the land has been terraced. More soybeans, more velvet beans, more Austrian winter peas—such is the goal of Louisiana farmers.

In looking over their soil-conservation record for last year, I was particularly pleased to note that nearly 120,000 pounds of artificial reseeding went for pasture improvement. I also note that the home-garden provision of the program was utilized by nearly 19,000 farm families in your State last year.

These pasture and garden features are all to the good, now that farmers, factory workers, and businessmen are giving so much thought and effort to our program of all-out defense of the Nation. The defense effort does not in any way overshadow the farm problem. In fact, the pressure of defense needs has brought home to millions of city people the plight of the farming population.

It is recognized now on all sides that food will win this war, just as food in the last analysis has won many other wars. On the farmer lies the burden of supplying food and fiber necessary for the final winning punch in this great military struggle.

The farmer's interest, therefore, becomes one with the national interest. Agriculture must march abreast with industry and labor if our defense effort is to bear full fruit.

In spite of certain adverse effects of the present World War upon their foreign markets, American cotton farmers have much to be thankful for today. Not only cotton farmers but tobacco farmers also, peanut farmers, hog farmers, dairymen, and all other farmers have much to be thankful for. They should be thankful for the farm programs which bring them nearer to equality of opportunity with other economic groups—an equality of opportunity which was denied farmers for so long a time.

They have even more than this to be thankful for today because they can, with genuine joy, be thankful that they are Americans. With the privilege of being Americans also go responsibilities for protecting and maintaining the American way of life. Farmers have as much responsibility as do other groups in America for protecting and supporting the ideals for which we stand. I am sure that they will do as much as any other group to see that democracy continues to exist in the world.

I know that farmers are not only sending their sons to the Army and helping swell the ranks of labor in defense industries but that they are also making their full contribution to national defense in the production of raw agricultural commodities. I am also sure that southern farmers, and farmers in the entire United States, are thankful for this opportunity to serve their Nation and help other countries that are now resisting aggression.

Farmers have an important role to play in national defense. They must do their part to keep us a united people. They must help to make it certain that we not only have abundant supplies of airplanes, of tanks, of guns, and of other materials of war, but also abundant supplies and reserves of raw materials, of food, and of fiber products—for we must have vigorous and healthy men and women, well fed, well housed, and well clothed, to defend the country.

Every farmer, as well as every other individual in this country, must appreciate strongly the fact that he has things worth defending; that he is assured of an opportunity to earn an abundance of nourishing food, of clothing, and of housing facilities.

It is important not only that we have sufficient quantities of healthful food for this country, but that we have for Great Britain and her allies adequate reserves of milk, of poultry products, of canned tomatoes, of pork and pork products, and of beef and beef products. It is likewise essential that we keep our ever-normal granary well stocked for any emergencies that may arise. In this way, when the war is over, we may be in a position to assist in the rehabilitation of the oppressed countries.

Yet we must not make the same mistakes we made in the World War, when we expanded our agricultural plant with no thought of the future, but with the single idea of producing enough food to win the war. You are familiar with the waste of our land and of our soil resources that came about as a result of the World War expansion of the acreage devoted to soil-depleting crops. With our present farm programs, this can be avoided. We must not lose sight of the necessity for conserving and increasing the fertility of the soil. This can be done while we are expanding production of the agricultural products we need.

Although the increase in farm prices and the balancing of supplies with demand has been of immeasurable benefit to farmers, comparable benefits will result from the soil-building and soil-conserving features of the program. We should, therefore, be thankful that we have a farm program that can serve this country in time of war as well as in time of peace, and, we also hope, in the time of rebuilding this war-shattered world. We should also be glad that this program will enable us to expand production of needed farm commodities and to accumulate reserves without either causing producers to receive disastrously low prices or exhausting our valuable soil resources.

I therefore am proud of the record we have made in conserving and building up our soil. We must continue to place added emphasis on this phase of the A. A. A. program, especially here in the South.

Of course, the center of the stage in the South is still occupied by cotton. This great staple is too deeply embedded in our social and economic life to be assigned any secondary role. Today cotton farmers have much to be thankful for. They know before the first boll of cotton is picked what the minimum price will be for this year's crop. This price will be the best received since 1929.

How often in the past have farmers known, before they took a bale of cotton to market, even approximately, what that bale would be worth and that its price would be a fair one?

I am sure you all know full well that the loan at 85 percent of parity is responsible for the present cotton price level. I know also you realize that because of the large carryover of American cotton in this country at the present time and the large stocks of cotton in the outside world, the price of American cotton would be exceedingly low in the absence of the A. A. A. program—if there were any market at all.

While we may all rejoice over the present price of cotton and the assurance of conservation and parity payments, there are some dark spots in the cotton picture, and we must give consideration to these.

Domestic consumption of American cotton is, of course, running at record levels. We consumed about 9,718,000 bales in this country for the season just ended. This is the largest domestic consumption of cotton on record. World consumption of American cotton amounted to approximately 12.4 million bales, or roughly the equivalent of last year's crop.

However, because of the war exports for the crop year just ended amounted to only 1,083,000 bales. The export prospects for this year and for the duration of the war are not at all encouraging.

Although the passage of the bill providing for loans at 85 percent of parity on cotton and other agricultural products has given much needed immediate relief, it has not of itself permanently assured cotton farmers of prosperity. The income from cotton is not determined by the price of cotton alone. This income is determined by multiplying the price by the volume of production—a fact which producers must never lose sight of. This fact is being brought home forcefully just now to cotton farmers in Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, parts of Louisiana, and other States where the boll weevil and other factors have seriously cut the crop.

As long as we are embarked on an all-out defense program we may be reasonably sure that domestic consumption of cotton will remain at a high level. But it is also probable that production of rayon and other synthetic fibers and competing products will expand to a high degree; and, while we have not been aware of the competition from rayon and other substitutes for cotton this year because of the strong demand for cotton products, the competition nevertheless exists.

Increasing the price of cotton to a fair level may further encourage competition from substitutes unless some action is taken to offset this increase in the price of cotton. Cotton farmers should think about this. In general, they realize that the cost of raw cotton is a very small percentage of the cost of the finished product. Many are aware, in fact, that there is an average of only about 12 cents worth of raw cotton in the cotton articles costing a dollar which consumers purchase. For that matter, a laundryman who launders the shirt you wear receives twice as much each time he launders that shirt as the farmer received for the cotton in the shirt.

Yet we must not forget that the cost of the raw material in many articles is still an important item in the cost of the finished product and may encourage competition from commodities whose prices have not advanced as much as the price of cotton. Once the war is over and we reach normal times, we may expect increased competition from factories currently being expanded for the production of rayon and other synthetic products which may be substituted for cotton. At present, cotton farmers are enjoying relatively favorable prices, prices which are not out of line

with other commodity prices, since the parity principle is aimed at fairness for all. But they should not be lulled into a false sense of security or assume that the cotton problem has been solved.

The loss of exports for the duration of the war would have been disastrous for the one-third of the farm population which lives on cotton farms had it not been for the increase in domestic consumption, the cotton loan program, and the assurance of soil-building and parity payments. In normal times we exported about one-half of the annual cotton crop. In fact over a 10-year period we exported more than 6,000,000 bales annually, and in 1 year, 1926, we exported almost 11,000,000 bales. Therefore, cotton farmers must cooperate in making sure that they have the type of program which will enable them to compete successfully in world cotton markets when the war is over. During the war they should sell every bale they can in those foreign markets still available to them. They should discuss in groups such as yours the problem of competition from synthetic and other competing fibers, as well as the problem of our loss of foreign markets. It is in discussions such as these that programs are developed. Programs are neither developed nor executed in Washington. We in Washington merely represent and express the combined thoughts and desires of the people at home.

No one can say with any degree of certainty just what we must do to maintain our position in world markets after the war, because we don't know in just what condition our former customers will be. It may be that we will have an international agreement between the cotton-producing countries of the world. I think this would be very desirable.

It is almost certain that we will have to accept goods in exchange for our cotton to a greater degree than in the past. If so, it may even be necessary for Government to take a far larger part in the actual bartering and handling of our export trade in order to increase the bargaining power of the American farmer. Our Government might also find it expedient to renew export subsidies on raw cotton and to take additional steps to increase the relative quality and appearance of American cotton intended for export. And, of course, we must continue and even increase our present efforts to stimulate the domestic consumption of American cotton.

We should be thinking about these things and charting the course we expect to follow. It is only through the concerted action of a well-informed people that we can develop a sound and workable program. Our farm programs are standing up admirably under the stress of the defense emergency. I know the collective intelligence of the farmers will stand up as well. We must be alert to avoid the pitfalls that followed the first World War. We must do all in our power to head off inflation and its attendant disasters. I doubt very much that our democratic form of government can survive another crack-up such as the one we suffered in the 1920's when inflation swept us to the brink of ruin.

Farmers are just as interested as any other group in keeping our price system on an even keel. Farmers have just as big a stake in the national economy as any other workman or businessman. Agriculture is set against runaway prices.

In the effort to avoid inflation, however, the farmer feels that his sacrifices should be no greater than those of other groups. Just now he is being represented in some quarters as grabbing for all he can get at a time of national crisis. The farmers are familiar with this type of criticism. They are not disposed to answer their critics in kind. I can see no peril of inflation arising from the meager income of the cotton farmers.

Before the present emergency all that agriculture sought was equality with labor and industry. This equality continues to be the goal of American farmers. More than equality farmers have never asked. Less than equality no genuine democracy can withhold.

Farmers remember that organized industry for years enjoyed immense advantages showered by local, State, and Federal Governments. They remember the billions of dollars they have paid into the protective-tariff coffers of domestic manufacturers. The burdens of this system alone outweigh all the benefits put together which government has extended to agriculture from the beginning of our national life down to the present day.

Farmers remember the process, stage after stage, by which monopoly gained control of many important sectors of American business. As recently as 1935, according to internal-revenue reports cited by President Roosevelt, less than 5 percent of our corporations owned 87 percent of the total corporate assets of the Nation, insofar as these assets were reported to the Government.

This single fact throws a flood of light on the picture of monopoly control and concentration of economic power under which industrial production is limited and prices fixed. More could be added to fill in the outlines—discrimination in freight rates, abuse of the patent laws, and operations of the banking system.

Bear in mind, all these advantages fell to the lot of business because of the active, friendly intervention of the Government, because of man-made laws, and not because of the free play of natural economic laws. Under a monopoly, the law of supply and demand is repealed. From the sound of some of the talk I hear, you would think that farmers were the first and only body of citizens to receive favors from Washington.

Organized labor has far outstripped the farmers in the race for equality with business. Membership in labor unions has trebled since the low point of the depression. Hand in hand with striking gains in employment and income have gone the series of remedial measures dealing with the problems of labor—unemployment compensation, old-age insurance, the Social Security Act, the Wages and Hours Act, placing a floor under wages, a ceiling over hours, and outlawing child labor; the Public Contracts Act; immigration laws; and many other similar measures with which you are familiar.

Farmers are much nearer to their goal of equality with other economic groups than they have been for years. One of the reasons is the growth of farm organizations. Farmers must be well organized, just as other groups in this country are well organized. Farm organizations must grow in numbers, for in numbers there is strength.

Group organizations are natural and healthy products of democracy. It is only when these groups become coercive and selfish that they defeat their purpose.

Too often some of these groups put their own special interests ahead of the general welfare. This is a ruinous policy. In the long run the pressure group will suffer for such actions.

I feel confident that the farmers of this country will not make such a mistake. Yours is a wonderful opportunity for showing what can be done by concerted action directed toward the welfare of all the people.

If you can always stand squarely for the interests of the farmers without forgetting that the consumer, too, has his rights; if you can continue the fight for permanent parity for agriculture and at the same time support the legitimate claims of labor and of industry; if you can hold out for security and a decent American standard of living on every American farm, and at the same time not begrudge the city worker the privilege of seeking such security and such a standard of living—then you will deserve to become, and I believe you will become, a stronger and a greater organization.

The Life of Judge Brandeis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1941

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, many years ago a book was published entitled "Dissenting Opinions," by Mr. Justice Holmes. In this book there were collated the judicial opinions of Oliver Wendell Holmes, the son of New England, who was a member of our Supreme Court tribunal for so many years, representing the liberal views of that Court on a conservative background.

In 1916 another son of New England joined the Supreme Court. Louis Dembitz Brandeis became a judge and colleague of Justice Holmes, and for many years thereafter decisions of that tribunal used to read, "Mr. Justices Holmes and Brandeis dissent." Thus the two famous dissenters were linked together in our highest Court, and it was they who helped to mold judicial opinions to such an extent that from dissenters they became the leaders of that tribunal.

Justice Brandeis was described by one of his eulogists during the many birthday celebrations which were arranged in his honor as being "by descent a Galician Jew, by birth a Kentuckian, by training a New Englander, and by temperament the judge."

Brandeis was the kind of individual who did not espouse a cause because it was popular, nor did he ever fail to give his aid and assistance to any worthy cause simply because his own interests might have been opposed to it. Brandeis was the attorney for large corporations and stood to gain a great deal by representing their interests. Nevertheless, he became known as the people's attorney, and without compensation and from his own purse defended many causes which his personal self-interest should have urged him to fight against. It was Brandeis' rule, as an attorney for many years, to limit his income from the profession to $15,000 a year. Whenever his earnings exceeded that sum he would not take on any cases that year, and any surplus thus earned would be turned over to the public interests which he represented.

When Brandeis was appointed to the Supreme Court in 1916 there was a storm of opposition raised against his selection, and many a protagonist of vested interests appeared before the committee of the Senate which was considering his nomination to voice his opposition to the appointment of Judge Brandeis because of his activities on behalf of the people.

Nevertheless, Brandeis' nomination was confirmed, and during his many years of service on the Supreme Court Bench he exhibited to a very large degree that wonderful quality of his mind which made him the foremost dissenter, and then the leader of our highest court.

In 1916 Brandeis was looked upon as a wild-eyed Socialist. In 1939, upon his retirement, he was considered one of the most conservative judges. Chief Justice Taft, before he himself ascended the bench of the Supreme Court, had appeared before the Senate committee in 1916 against the nomination of Justice Brandeis. In 1930, however, Justice Taft, then Chief Justice of the United States, publicly stated to Mr. Justice Brandeis that he was not justified in his opposition to him and tendered him the humblest apologies for his action in 1916. Judge Brandeis magnanimously accepted Chief Justice Taft's apologies, and from thence on the two became very close and intimate friends.

When Mr. Justice Brandeis retired from the bench in 1939 there was not a member of that Court, or the attachés of that Court, or an attorney who ever appeared before that Court, who did not feel that in Justice Brandeis' retirement from the bench, one of its most outstanding characters was lost. Not only as a judge, however, but also as the author of many important books on the law, particularly addresses and speeches, will Justice Brandeis be remembered. In his writings he exhibits that wonderful style which furnishes that unique flavor, which will live forever in the annals of our jurisprudence.

Justice Brandeis lived in retirement during the last 1½ years and little was heard from him. He was nursing his frail health, which was never too robust, and whatever influence was shed by his benignant personality was given to private conversations with friends and other well-wishers. While Justice Brandeis' work on the Supreme Court Bench came to an end by his retirement, the rays of his personality reflected in the work of his brethren, and those who sat at his feet while he was expounding the law from that august tribunal which he graced for almost one-quarter of a century.

Dedication of New Home of Lincoln Post, No. 89, American Legion, in Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 10, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered before Lincoln Post, No. 89, of the American Legion:

Commander Upshur, Dr. Perkins, Colonel Gilbert, officers of Colonel Gilbert's staff, Gold Star Mothers, comrades of the auxiliary, my comrades, ladies, and gentlemen, I am honored to join you on this great occasion when you are gathered together to dedicate the new home of Lincoln Post No. 89 of the American Legion. This splendid meeting place should fill you with pride today—and I must confess to you that I share your pride in a particular and personal way. For you have built an important civic center just within three blocks of the house where I was born, grew up, and lived my entire life. Lincoln Post will ever be a source of pleasure and inspiration to your comrades and to all Philadelphians. The spacious building here erected will be a lasting tribute to the men whose ability, devotion, and sacrifices made it possible and especially a memorial to your founders, Comrades VanAdams, McEachern, Clyde Allen, George Washington Forster, Maxwell, Dewey Wynn—as well as to those pioneers who carried on after them, Charles Smith, Cottman, and William (Pop) Taylor.

I could go on and cite other names of legionnaires who worked long and unselfishly for this post. But you know those men as well as I. And, as we look about at the officers and members of your post, we can see many of them here to rejoice with us this afternoon.

My congratulations are tendered to all of you here. And at the same time I wish to congratulate Colonel Howard Gilbert, commanding officer of the Three Hundred and Seventy-Second United States Infantry, who is here on the platform with his entire staff and whose regimental band, seated immediately in front of the stand, has stirred us by its music just as the clear and forceful remarks of the distinguished Colonel Gilbert have inspired me.

That all of you are here today is eloquent, silent testimony that you have a great meaning to America, and that America has a great meaning to you.

As Americans, we glance at the world beyond our hemisphere in this troubled time, and we glimpse in every land war and all the doom companions of war—hatred, suffering, famine, pestilence, and every evil hostile to civilization.

We are assembled here in an hour when loyal citizenship, militant patriotism, thoughtful courage, and faith in God must characterize every American. It is a period for reason and serenity joined with the firm purpose to preserve America inviolate, its ideals, its traditions, and its free institutions.

These are the qualities needed in America now more than ever, and these are the qualities exemplified by the members of American Legion Lincoln Post, No. 89. No wonder then that I find it a distinct privilege to greet you and to urge you to continue the patriotic services which you rendered in time of war, during this momentous period of the world's history.

Some who learn of your post may possibly ask: Why a Negro post for any group of war veterans? The establishment and maintenance of Lincoln Post does not mean that you are not satisfied and proud to be comrades and fellow members with those veterans who compose the other posts. It does signify, however, your desire to take justifiable pride in the contribution which your race has made in the military service of the United States to the defense and upbuilding of America.

It also fulfills the splendid purpose of making the general public aware of the willingness of the children of your race to make the supreme sacrifice for the preservation of American institutions. Most important of all, the mere existence of this post should finish forever the prejudicial propaganda of those who would seek to deny to your people the full enjoyment of the civil and religious liberties guaranteed to all citizens under the Constitution

Let us reflect for a moment upon the glorious record of Negro veterans, for it is a record that attests the patriotism, the loyalty, and the considered courage of your ancestors—first in the Revolution of 1776 and thereafter in every war in which the United States has been engaged.

The first blood to wet American soil in the War for Independence was shed from the breast of Crispus Attucks, as that Boston statue to his memory testifies; and during the struggle of the Colonies that followed, more than 3,000 of your people fought for our new country in the same heroic manner. We cannot forget those early heroes—Peter Salem at Bunker Hill, Pompey at Stoney Point, Austin Dabney in Georgia, the 700 Negro soldiers at Monmouth, or the valiant regiment in the Battle of Rhode Island.

It was in the same tradition of valor that Negro soldiers fought in the War of 1812. They battled bravely under Perry on the sea. They came to Andrew Jackson's rescue and saved the day in the Battle of New Orleans in 1815, and by their bravery drew from him highest praise for their defense of this new country.

In the Civil War 178,000 Negro soldiers maintained the honor of the Nation and proved that they could not be surpassed as brave defenders of their country.

The Negro soldiers of the United States fought valiantly at Santiago in the Spanish-American War. The Tenth Cavalry and the Twenty-fourth Infantry distinguished themselves as the heroes of their generation.

In the World War the Negro officers and troops held sectors at St. Mihiel and Verdun with such singular success as to merit the heartfelt praise of the commanding general.

In peace or war, in victory or time of peril, the Negro soldier has exemplified a loyalty and a bravery that rank as the highest expression of patriotism. All true Americans are rightfully proud of these heroes, as they are of the peacetime accomplishments of the Negro people.

For the Negro in his contribution to the development of this Nation has not been limited to the military alone. We cannot forget Frederick Douglass and Sojourner Truth during the period of the reconstruction. Booker T. Washington, like Washington and Lincoln, has been commemorated by a United States postage stamp. Phillis Wheatley, who came to America as a slave, before her death was recognized as foremost among the literary figures of her time. It is not surprising that the most delightful tribute ever tendered to George Washington was the creation of her pen.

We know well—and as Americans we are proud of that distinguished painter whose work was recognized even before the Civil War—Edward M. Bannister; of that sculptor of the same period, Edmonia Lewis; of Henry O. Tanner, who, since their time, has established his right to be honored among the greatest of American painters. Ranking among the most artistic are the productions of Paul Laurence Dunbar and James Weldon Johnson. On the stage rightful recognition has been granted to Paul Robeson, Richard B. Harrison, and Ira Aldridge, among others. First lady in the world of music is Philadelphia's well-loved Marian Anderson, whose glorious, cultivated voice has thrilled the hearts of hundreds of thousands here in the United States and abroad. We cannot forget Benjamin Bannaker, the mathematician and astronomer; or that profound man, George Washington Carver, the agricultural chemist; or Dr. Carter G. Woodson, the eminent scholar and historian; but I could go on and on calling the roll of thousands of contemporary Negroes who have distinguished their people and America by their achievements in art and science, in industry and government.

More eloquent than any words of mine, this Lincoln post is a monument to the pride of patriotism, pride of accomplishment, and progress of the Americans of your race.

And it is significant that the most favorable steps forward in Negro life have been taken under the leadership of liberals. That true liberal, Abraham Lincoln, is properly honored by your post. But after the splendid humanitarian work of Lincoln, little or nothing was done for your people until a new era of liberalism for all Americans came into existence under our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And the leaders of your race played a tremendous part in this revival of liberalism under Roosevelt. Fittingly—in his administration—for the first time in the history of the United States, a President elevated to the rank of commanding general a Negro; one who in his own right is a great soldier, having the respect and admiration of the high command of our Army; a man who is affectionately known as Gen. Ben Davis.

Liberalism can be maintained only by eternal vigilance, which is the price of true liberty, to borrow a phrase from one of our first American statesmen. That is still true today and should be the watchword for us veterans of the last World War who look out on a war-weary world.

All races, creeds, and colors which go to make up the American family must unite still more closely under the banner of freedom and tolerance, under the flag of courage, loyalty, and patriotism, and thus exemplify the true meaning of the liberal democracy that is the United States of America.

We veterans of the last World War cannot think our battles are over. There is nothing more foreign to the free institutions of America than to question or deny the birthright of every American—no matter what his race, creed, or color—to enjoy the equality of opportunity, the religious liberty, and the social and political justice that are guaranteed to all.

It is not enough to look askance at the vicious intolerance of the totalitarian nations—rather, we must be alert and aggressive to prevent such doctrines from taking root in the free soil of America.

We must be on guard to preserve our priceless heritage from the insidious forces of destruction within our own land—we must defend and make secure the democratic institutions of our own beloved country. We must be vigilant against those who would annihilate the freedom for which our ancestors fought and died. With faith in God and basic devotion to American ideals we can be ever victorious over those who would undermine the liberalism of America.

Guarding the destinies of America against the perils that threaten it from abroad and the sinister enemies that would sabotage it at home is more than ever a cause to which you and I may well dedicate ourselves.

Weeks for War if Necessary To Beat Nazis; Foe of New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER STEARNS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 10, 1941

ARTICLE BY W. E. MULLINS

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by W. E. Mullins:

[From the Boston Sunday Herald of October 5, 1941]

WEEKS FOR WAR IF NECESSARY TO BEAT NAZIS; FOE OF NEW DEAL

(By W. E. Mullins)

Just as hostile now as he ever has been to the domestic doctrines of the Roosevelt administration, Sinclair Weeks, one of the most distinguished Republicans in New England, nevertheless yesterday appealed to his party associates, particularly those in public life, to disregard all political considerations in their approach to the Nation's current foreign policy and to join with the administration in support of it.

Giving public expression to his views for the first time since the 1940 election campaign, this Massachusetts member of the Republican National Committee and executive high in its councils urged Republicans in general to enlist for the duration of the emergency in a commitment to all-out aid to Britain without reservation.

* * * * *

Colonel Weeks spoke as the father of two sons of military age and also as a soldier who saw service in the United States Army in every grade and rank up to lieutenant colonel and as a member of a combat unit in the A. E. F. which saw 9 months' service at the front.

* * * * *

In his interview, Colonel Weeks said:

"I readily concede there are two sides to this issue. I have found Republicans on both sides of it. Nevertheless, I am convinced that I express the point of view of a majority of Republicans throughout the country, and certainly in Massachusetts, when I appeal for support for the administration's foreign policy.

ADJOURNED AT WATER'S EDGE

"I have no quarrel with those who disagree with my point of view. I do insist, however, that when we come to the water's edge, politics must be adjourned. I am not an extremist to the extent that I should insist upon throwing out of office a man who has voted as I should vote on 99 out of 100 issues simply because he disagrees with me on our foreign policy, provided only that his vote be predicated on his sincere and honest convictions as to what he believes to be best for the country.

"I believe that active and complete aid to England is the best policy for our country. I believe I can support the administration in this particular and continue to be hostile to its other doctrines without diluting my Republicanism. One of the tragedies of this situation is the wisdom of the Roosevelt foreign policy in contrast with its socialistic and utterly inefficient approach to the administration of our domestic affairs and the defense program.

"I know that I can be uncompromisingly in support of the one and equally opposed to the other, while continuing to be a loyal American citizen.

BELIEF IN WILLKIE

"I believed in Wendell Willkie when I committed myself to his cause before last year's Republican convention. I believed in him during the campaign. I believe in him today. He speaks for me in his current discussions of foreign policy and in his views on our domestic problems. He has not changed.

"This talk of Willkie selling out to Roosevelt is pure bunk, if I may use the expression. It took courage for him to act as he did act; but he never hesitated. I do not believe he has the slightest degree more confidence in Mr. Roosevelt as an administrator and executive today than he had 1 year ago today.

"Mr. Willkie could not play politics with the country in danger. He has done what he has thought to be in the best interest of this country. He is just as much wrapped up today in his endeavor to preserve the system of private enterprise as he was during the campaign, and so am I. He believes his course is the course to be pursued. He believes a victory for Hitler will menace private enterprise. And so do I.

"Men far more able than I have advanced countless reasons why the totalitarian system must be destroyed. I have long ago concluded that their logic is unanswerable.

WORLD SMALLER TODAY

"The world is smaller today than it was 20 years ago when we came back from France. The development of aviation in that period alone demonstrates this, and at its current rate of advancement in 10 to 20 years more the world will be infinitely smaller. I venture to predict that within 5 years it will be as simple for us to go to India as it now is to go to Chicago. Who can deny this?

"If we agree that the world is getting smaller, it is from our own selfish viewpoint, even if for no other reason, vital that we be interested in what goes on in Europe and elsewhere in the world.

"Is it in dispute that within a period of 3 years Hitler has caused more misery and human suffering and privation than any man in history? Generations to come will say of him, as has been said of his infamous ancestor, that where he stepped, there the grass never grew again.

"Is it in dispute that all genuine Americans are opposed to every bit of Nazi ideology which does violence to our conceptions of freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press for all?

VERY EXISTENCE AT STAKE

"Our conception of these freedoms and their very existence is at stake, and it is ridiculous beyond measure for us to say that we are not interested in their preservation. This is what the British Empire now is engaged in, and for us to stand idly by is to completely ignore the realities of the situation.

"If it is true that we are interested, we have to do something about it, and it is my belief that we should do whatever is necessary to aid the British Empire. We should aid it in supplying matériel. We should aid it by convoying their matériel. We should even be prepared to fight beside England if active participation in the war becomes necessary to accomplish the destruction of the Axis Powers.

"If Hitler prevails, we in North America will be as on an island in the midst of a hostile world, under the perpetual necessity of maintaining a huge defense program the cost of which will bear down upon us to a vastly greater degree than the cost of getting in and doing the job now. It is inconceivable to me that sane Americans are ready to stand aside and see this come about.

REPUBLICAN'S ATTITUDE

"That is the picture I hope Republicans in public life will see. I do not anticipate that all of them will agree with me, and I don't propose to quarrel with those who do not see it as I do, but I believe that the Republicans of the Nation are just as much opposed to the things that the Nazi stands for as Democrats are.

"When you consider the prospects of making political capital out of opposition to our foreign policy, it is barely conceivable that success might stem from it; but, personally, I do not care to see political capital made out of such a world situation as we witness today. The various tests of public opinion will, I believe, indicate that I reflect the opinion of my fellow citizens wherever they live.

TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

"It is imperative that we maintain our two-party system of government. In view of the Nation's financial plight it is even more

essential now because of the conditions that will confront us when the war ends, as it inevitably must some day.

"Remove this administration from the field of foreign affairs and I don't think there are words of condemnation sufficiently severe to denounce its activities and its encouragement of socialistic and communistic doctrines.

"Employment today is 20 percent up over 1929 and what do we see? We see for example an administration continuing to encourage enrollment in the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A.—organizations which were designed solely to take our idle youth off the streets and to furnish employment of various descriptions for them in the depression period.

"The President's stubborn refusal to delegate authority in the direction of defense production is reprehensible beyond degree and is the final index of his own limitations as an administrator in contrast to the superb qualifications of patriots who would be delighted to aid. By far the greatest bottleneck of our production is right in the White House.

POLITICAL INSTRUMENT

"The defense production program has been used shamelessly as a political instrumment to implement the New Deal. High-salaried jobs have been portioned out to politicians just as they were in the days when the New Deal was up to its elbows wallowing in political patronage. I make no defense of this phase of the administration.

"Even more subject to criticism, I believe, is the utter disregard of the morale of the soldiers in the camps, serving for $21 a month while their Commander in Chief lifts not a finger to eliminate strikes in defense industries—promoted on a wildcat basis, in some instances, by racketeers whose loyalty to the country may well be questioned.

"It is essential that we keep an opposition party intact as a vigorous and militant institution to combat the moves of the New Deal administration, which, under the guise of defense, gives broad authority to planners who would substitute national socialism for the private-enterprise system which, over a period of 150 years, gave this Nation the highest standard of living the world has known.

FELLOW TRAVELERS

"These planning groups, composed to a large extent of fellow travelers, are high in the Government, and their recorded views disclose that they are concerned not in the slightest with the national debt or any other phase of the Government's financial picture.

"After the war there will be need for a Republican administration to restore the ancient standards we revere. The New Deal has disclosed no capacity to produce sound government, and unless we change our course and substitute good management we are inevitably headed for the bankruptcy that became our goal the day Mr. Roosevelt took over the Government.

"All these considerations will amount in importance with the end of the war, but meanwhile we have this other problem of destroying Hitlerism to solve. In many ways the President has made it even more difficult than it ordinarily would be to solve, and he also has made it difficult for many Republicans to go along with him.

ANYTHING BUT FRANK

"For instance, consider the methods he has employed. He has been anything but frank with the Congress. Repeatedly he withholds information to which the Members are clearly entitled. He has played politics with the defense, and he has steadfastly refused to give vital and adequate information to those who should be taken into his confidence.

"Accordingly, holding these views, it has not been easy for me to maintain my steadfast attitude in support of the Roosevelt foreign policy. It is not easy for me to talk of the prospect of plunging the Nation into war. I have two sons of military age, so I am not without a personal interest in such a decision."

* * * * *

Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUCIEN J. MACIORA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 10, 1941

Mr. MACIORA. Mr. Speaker, we who live in a land blessed by peace cannot fully appreciate how great is this privilege unless we stop and think—stop and think of events which are going on abroad. United here today are men and women of every race and creed. Here we have no classes; no geographical lines separate the so-called superior races from the so-called inferior races. Nowhere else in the world today could there be such an intermingling of persons, gathered to pay homage to an individual who personifies an ideal. Elsewhere in the world ideals have been shattered. There is no time for sentiment—no time for respect for the persons and the things which have accounted for the progress the world has made.

The history of General Pulaski is too well known to all lovers of American tradition to require detailed repetition by me. With George Washington and his aides General Pulaski fought, died, to make this the land of the free. Today it is our privilege and our responsibility to keep it the land of the brave. If General Pulaski were alive today and in his native Poland he would be in the thick of the fight against oppression and persecution.

If he were alive today and the United States once more were on the march to freedom, he would be at our shores volunteering, again, to do his part to enshrine the sacred principles of a free people, self-governed.

Since the dawn of time humanity has struggled against oppression, and in each of those struggles strong, brave men have risen to the top. The times have always produced leadership when leadership was the crying need of the day. To Pulaski waging the fight for freedom was an honor and a privilege.

Before the Revolutionary War he was at his father's side in the defense of his country's borders. He had been described by Benjamin Franklin as "an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of liberty."

From volunteer status he rose to the rank of brigadier general in the forces of George Washington. He was the father of cavalry in the United States Army, originally known as Pulaski's Legion.

There was something appealing, something which touched the romantic spirit of our people in the dashing character of this young liberty-loving soldier from another land. The boldness of heroes always moves men and women, and Pulaski's boldness as he led his little picked band in daring attacks was astounding.

This country will always revere the name of General Pulaski because he loved liberty and justice beyond the bounds of race or country, and sacrificed his young life on the altar of American freedom. He died when he was but 31—that we might live.

But Pulaski lived on in the hearts and minds of the legions which went to the battlefields midway through the nineteenth century to preserve the Union and to make imperishable the principle that all men are born free and equal.

Pulaski lived on in the legions which went abroad in 1917—many of the legionnaires, men from our own city. He lives on today in the minds of the young men who have been called to serve in a peacetime protective army, whose sleeves are rolled up, ready if necessary for a defense which we pray they may never have to wage.

We should always carry with us the memory of his noble life and heroic deeds, because he taught us to remember that our liberty is the greatest asset we have. We should guard it zealously. A united nation—we will guard it.

Investigation of the Detroit Office of the Federal Housing Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 10, 1941

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, based on a long and thorough study of facts presented to me regarding the Detroit office of the Federal Housing Administration, I have today introduced a resolution providing for a congressional investigation of that office.

I have interviewed a number of people in this connection and have made a personal investigation of some of the facts presented to me and an unbiased and careful study of the situation indicates that irregularities exist in the administration of the office not only in my district but in the whole of Wayne County, Mich.

Appraisals and commitments as made by the local Federal Housing Administration office show a crying need for an investigation as well as a thorough reorganization of the local set-up from top to bottom. Some of the facts regarding the relation between the Detroit F. H. A. and certain mortgage companies, builders,

and a few lumber concerns strongly indicate collusion between the F. H. A. and these companies. I have interviewed real estate men, builders, and new-home buyers. I have even been in some of these new homes.

I find that the bulk of the business has gone to a restricted number of people. Former members of the Detroit F. H. A. seem to belong to this select few and are doing a most lucrative business in connection with mortgages. Mortgage summaries for the past 3 years show this. These gentlemen always have an entre, while, strange as it may seem, reputable businessmen, contractors, builders, and so forth, find themselves compelled to waste time in anterooms until someone deigns to attend to their matters.

We still find some nonlicensed appraisers working in the F. H. A. office. Appraisal and commitments are not equitable. Appraisals run high on favored subdivisions, and inversely are too low on others which, in most cases, are rejected for reasons that defy reason. You will find the F. H. A. blessing bestowed on property identical to adjoining property having the same improvements which is disapproved. Reputable realestate concerns have had so much difficulty with the Detroit F. H. A. that many have ceased trying to obtain F. H. A. approvals on properties.

Reports show that the Government is losing money on homes built with F. H. A. approval. In one of the letters received from a reputable citizen I find the following:

If anyone has occasion to examine the realty records in Wayne County, he cannot help but note the large number of properties under foreclosure that are covered by F. H. A. insured mortgages. I am informed that a larger number of properties covered by F. H. A. insured mortgages are being foreclosed each week, and that the Government is taking a severe loss in most cases.

F. H. A. inspectors have permitted shoddy and careless construction in numerous cases. Final inspections are made on new buildings not completed, and local building codes are ignored. Building specifications mean nothing. A certain few builders have been allowed to interpret codes and laws pertaining to building construction to their own advantage. I have a letter written by one of these builders to a new home buyer, and I quote therefrom:

The house has been completed for some time and our records reveal that a certificate of approved final compliance inspection report was issued by the F. H. A. on (date).

And again in the same letter:

We shall have no alternative but to enter the house for sale to others, and charge you with any loss we may sustain by your refusal to perform your contract.

This home buyer was given a week in which to comply and he moved into this new home notwithstanding the fact that the paint job was incomplete, a cracked front door was not repaired or replaced, and the roof leaked. He was afraid he would lose his down payment and probably incur other expenses through litigation. And this was a case taken up with both the F. H. A. and the builder to no avail.

Faulty construction has been found in hundreds of homes and complaints were made to Mr. Foley personally and to members of his staff, but these people who have put their savings into homes have received no consideration from the F. H. A. office. The following wires were sent to me from home buyers:

About time something was done about F. H. A. inspections. Neighbors all around me complaining homes not built to specifications. Why?

Have to hang lemon on my home in order to get my home built to specifications. What is wrong with the F. H. A.?

Cannot understand why my home is not brought up to specifications. No cooperation from builder or the F. H. A.

Having some difficulty trying to have my home built to specifications. Would like to get some action from F. H. A., but can't get any.

F. H. A. will not request builder to bring my home up to specifications, and it is in very bad condition.

Would like home completed; no cooperation from builder or F. H. A.

Home office of F. H. A. in Detroit here not cooperative with home owner. My home not complete.

F. H. A. here does not request builder to do what is written in black and white in book of specifications. Something wrong somewhere.

My home not complete. Builder threatened to sell if I didn't move in. F. H. A. not cooperative here.

Paid hard-earned money on my home, which is not complete. No results from builder or F. H. A.

F. H. A. not request builder put slaters felt on roof. Very important. Book of specifications calls for it.

What's wrong with the F. H. A. here? Home not up to specifications.

Why is slaters felt put on some roofs and not on others by the same builder?

Home not complete. Had several F. H. A. inspectors, still no results.

Why can't I get some action on my home? Roof leaks. May need new ceilings; contacted builder, no results.

These are but a few of the many specific cases which have been brought to my attention. This only scratches the surface, and it is my opinion that the situation justifies an immediate and thorough investigation.

Joe Martin—The Measure of an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 10, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE LOS ANGELES TIMES

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine in California encloses in his letter a clipping from the Los Angeles Times and says:

Believe it or not, the people out this way agree with all that Kyle Palmer says, and would go him one better if they knew how to say it. Joe made a great record for himself on his trip to us. We appreciate the effort he made. You fellows are fortunate to have such a leader.

I agree, and, under the unanimous consent granted me, am pleased to include the following article from the Los Angeles Times of recent date:

[From the Los Angeles Times]

THE MEASURE OF AN AMERICAN

(By Kyle Palmer, Times political editor)

Not particularly encouraging or reassuring was the message JOE MARTIN brought from troubled Washington to the people of California.

But the message had courage in it—courage and faith—and determination and simple devotion to fundamental things.

For a full understanding of the message, of its value and sincerity, it is necessary to have an understanding of the man who brought it; necessary to weigh him in terms of integrity and power and competent leadership.

JOE MARTIN was born in a small town in Massachusetts. When he is not attending to official duties in the National Capital he lives with his mother in a house not 200 yards from the place in which he was born. During the greater part of his life he has lived in the physical and the spiritual shadow of Plymouth Rock.

DESPERATE DANGER

JOE MARTIN is a plain and simple man—loyal to his friends, to his principles, and to his country. By no means an ordinary man, he looks very much as an ordinary man looks, not being striking in manner, appearance, or speech. Without ostentation or fanfare or self-proclaiming, there is greatness in him.

JOE MARTIN is more—far more—than a smart politician; there are many smart politicians in the land. His shrewdness is Yankee shrewdness—it is not the mere surface artfulness of a professional student of politics.

REASON FOR CHOICE

Reasons why he was chosen as the chairman of the Republican National Committee—a post he did not seek and gladly would relinquish—are not obscure. MARTIN is sagacious, calm, trained in political organization and procedure, and is a tower of strength in the councils either of his party or of the Nation.

Experience has shown that his fund of common sense is inexhaustible; that his fidelity to party interests has never caused him to place those interests ahead of public interests; that his chief virtue as a public official is his basic virtue as a citizen.

JOE MARTIN is a good American—the unvarnished type that speaks a simple language and leads a simple life. He knows the value of a dollar; yes, and he knows the value of human independence and usefulness and service.

SIMPLE SERVICE

Through the frugal and self-reliant tenets of his own life JOE MARTIN approaches the larger and more complex problems and policies of government. He believes the Government should be strong, but not stronger than the will of the people that creates and maintains government in a democracy; he believes that the treasure of the Nation should be poured forth without stint to assure national welfare and national security, but that government should not waste the substance of the people; he believes that liberty is safeguarded best by laws and not by men.

Above all, as a plain man without pretension to greatness or to the persuasions of oratory and eloquence, JOE MARTIN believes that the Constitution and the Bill of Rights come nearer than any other documents or doctrines to a full realization of the basic rights and aspirations of humanity—of the fundamental responsibility of man for man.

JOE MARTIN believes there are men in government and men outside of government in the United States who would scrap the established democratic ideals and principles of the American people and substitute therefor a home-grown version of contemporary dictatorships.

He believes that this plan will succeed if the people do not fight it wholeheartedly, aggressively, and intelligently.

MANY QUALITIES

One of the best political horse traders in the Congress, one of the wiliest strategists political Washington has seen in many a day, one of the most skillful party leaders developed either by the Republicans or the Democrats in his generation, one of the strongest partisans in the hectic political battles of his State and of the Nation at large, JOE MARTIN is as steadfast and as unyielding in his fundamental Americanism as any of the founding fathers of the Republic.

Therefore, to study JOE MARTIN is to study more than a contemporary American; it is to study the soul and heart and bone and sinew of that Americanism from which an American is formed.

This is the man who came hurriedly from his busy duties and heavy responsibilities in Washington to speak to the Republicans and to all the people of California.

He came here primarily in his capacity as the party's national chairman, and he spoke directly to those interested in party matters.

SPEAKING TO ALL

In a larger sense JOE MARTIN spoke to all the people of all party affiliations and of all colors and creeds and races.

Without alarm or malice, but with deadly earnestness and with stern candor—appealing neither to passion nor to prejudice—JOE MARTIN, American, warns his fellow citizens that their institutions are in peril.

Not from the military conquerors in Europe and Asia, not even necessarily from sinister and treacherous foes outside the country, but from the machinations and schemes of Americans who have ceased to believe in the American system and the American way of life.

Loose talk, loose accusations, intemperate speech, intolerant views have to some extent blunted our sensibilities in this era of world disorder. We remain detached and unmoved as we hear or read of the slaughter of thousands, of the wretched sufferings of humanity beyond the seas, of the gradual advance of a mighty and ruthless force that sweeps ahead over the murdered bodies and the wrecked dreams of millions of men and women and children.

CONFIDENT OF WINNING

His admonitions are not to be confused with the clamor of either of the so-called isolationists or interventionists; he speaks neither pro nor con on questions that have divided our people into critical and carping factions; he merely urges the people to stand guard at the door of the citadel of their freedom.

Speaking not of other battles but of the Battle of America, JOE MARTIN says: "This is the battle to keep this Nation a republic and American in all its aspects."

JOE MARTIN says we will win that battle.

The Inner Enemies of the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 10, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Chicago Tribune of October 9 comes the following editorial:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

THE INNER ENEMIES OF THE REPUBLIC

Sir Arthur Salter, head of the British shipping mission, told William Fulton, Tribune correspondent in New York: "Well, we have been carrying on. We have lived and kept our factories working full time. We should say the situation is serious but not desperate." The figures on British shipping show that Great Britain now has control of 45 percent of the world's merchant marine. Before the war the Empire had 21,000,000 tons and since then the tonnage has been increased by the taking over of American ships and foreign ships to over 33,000,000 tons. The loss has been less than 8,000,000 tons.

British factories are operating, as Salter says, at full time. British imports are being maintained in all available markets, including the markets of the United States. Here our production for civilian use is wholly disorganized by the priority orders and by the expenditure of money and the use of ships to carry materials as free gifts into the war zones.

It is now proposed to take from our export business what few ships we have left and send them with munitions to Britain so there will be more than the present 45 percent of world shipping to take our trade away from us.

The small American businessman and the small American industrialist face extinction, although these elements are regarded as the bulwark of the American system of government and social order. The big corporations are falling into the grasp of the Federal Government, which proposes to reduce all American economy to seizable proportions and then seize it.

Who are the people who are leading this country into certain doom? They are found in the effeminate army of the Fight for Freedom Committee, who are hysterical and incapable of reason.

They are the job holders in Washington with delusions of grandeur, thinking that they are all American Hitlers.

They are the hired bureaucrats and salaried speakers, creators of vile characters in fiction, and writers of indecent plays. They are collectivists and Communists, who see more clearly than the majority of the American people that the American way of life is being destroyed and who expect to profit from it.

Unfortunately here in America today we come down to a classification of citizenship which our entire theory of government wanted to avoid. It was designed to avoid it. It was intended to allow every man to view his fellow as an equal and never compel him to view him as a superior. The American's hat was supposed to be on his head except when courtesy and the amenities required him to take it off. He never was compelled to hold it in his hand out of respect to the person he was addressing or who was addressing him.

If we are getting classes, it is against the intent of the primary American documents of government and freedom and in line with the wishes of the people who are about to destroy this Republic. Unfortunately, we are obliged to recognize that classes have arisen.

So, reluctantly we refer to the middle class, the great stratum of ordinary American citizens who have made this system of government work. They are supposed to be represented in Congress. Their politicians may not be scrupulously on the up and up, but in the past they were supposed to have had good common political sense and a fair perception of what the Nation's necessities were. They may have trimmed their own personal ambitions and their desires to profit, but in the past they have more or less represented the imperative requirements of the American Nation when it was in trouble.

Now the middle class, so-called, is threatened with extinction and with its extinction goes the life of the Republic. If the politicians in Congress have become Hitler Reichstag Members, we're probably sunk. If somebody set a fire on Capitol Hill and burned down the Halls of the two Chambers, we'd probably have a Nazi precedent for what seems to be happening here.